

# Morphisms between plays

Paul Blain Levy

University of Birmingham

August 19, 2014

In a poset  $A$

$U \subseteq A$  is *lower* when, for any  $s \sqsubseteq t$ ,

$t \in U$  implies  $s \in U$ .

In a poset  $A$

$U \subseteq A$  is *lower* when, for any  $s \sqsubseteq t$ ,  
 $t \in U$  implies  $s \in U$ .

In a small category  $\mathbb{A}$

$U \subseteq \text{ob } \mathbb{A}$  is *lower* when, for any  $s \longrightarrow t$ ,  
 $t \in U$  implies  $s \in U$ .

# The point of the talk

Let  $R$  be an arena.

# The point of the talk

Let  $R$  be an arena.

We form a category whose objects are plays on  $R$ .

# The point of the talk

Let  $R$  be an arena.

We form a category whose objects are plays on  $R$ .

The lower sets turn out to be something interesting.

# The point of the talk

Let  $R$  be an arena.

We form a category whose objects are plays on  $R$ .

The lower sets turn out to be something interesting.

Examples:

- 1 Innocence
- 2 Single-threadedness
- 3 Asynchronous games

The first two examples use alternating plays.

A play  $s$  consists of

- an initial segment moves  $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}$
- (justification pointers) a map moves  $s \rightarrow \{*\} + \text{moves } s$
- (arena elements) a map moves  $s \rightarrow R$  (arena element).

with the usual conditions.



# Strategies recap

A strategy  $\sigma$  (Opponent first) on  $R$  is a set of even-length plays that

- is lower wrt the prefix order
- contains the empty play
- is deterministic.

A strategy  $\sigma$  (Opponent first) on  $R$  is a set of even-length plays that

- is lower wrt the prefix order
- contains the empty play
- is deterministic.

## Traces and divergences

- **Finite trace** is  $s \in \sigma$
- **Divergence** is  $sm \perp$  where  $s \in \sigma$  but  $\nexists n. smn \in \sigma$ .
- **Infinite trace** is infinite play whose even-length prefixes are all in  $\sigma$ .

- A **P-visible play** is one in which Proponent always points to a move in the current P-view.
- A **P-visible strategy** is one in which all plays are P-visible.
- An **innocent** strategy is a special kind of P-visible strategy.
- It can be represented as a set of **P-views**. (After the first move, Opponent always points to the previous move.)

Innocent strategies are used to model **state-free terms**.

# Single-Threaded Strategies

- A **thread-visible play** is one in which Proponent doesn't change thread.
- A **thread-visible strategy** is one in which all plays are thread-visible.
- A **single-threaded** strategy is a special kind of thread-visible strategy.
- It can be represented as a set of **well-opened plays**. (After the first move, Opponent never again points to \*).

Single-threaded strategies are used to model **values**.

## Traditional innocence

Doesn't work for certain language features:

- Nondeterminism, under linear time semantics
- Name generation ( $\nu$ -calculus)
- Polymorphism

In each case there are state-free terms whose denotation isn't "innocent".

# Some problems

## Traditional innocence

Doesn't work for certain language features:

- Nondeterminism, under linear time semantics
- Name generation ( $\nu$ -calculus)
- Polymorphism

In each case there are state-free terms whose denotation isn't "innocent".

## Traditional single-threadedness

Doesn't work for polymorphism.

There are (state-free) values whose denotation isn't "single-threaded".

# A category for innocence

We form a category of P-visible plays and **P-viewing morphisms**.

P-viewing morphism  $s \xrightarrow{f} t$

- A function moves  $s \rightarrow$  moves  $t$ .
- Preserves arena elements and justification pointers.
- If  $n^O$  is followed by  $m^P$  then  $f(n)$  is followed by  $f(m)$ .
- If  $n^O$  is followed by  $\perp$  then  $f(n)$  is followed by  $\perp$ .

## Theorem

A P-visible strategy is innocent iff



## Theorem

A P-visible strategy is innocent iff

both its finite trace set and its divergence set are lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

## Theorem

A P-visible strategy is innocent iff

both its finite trace set and its divergence set are lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

(Cf. Melliès' paper: "Asynchronous Games 2: the true concurrency of innocence".)

## Theorem

A P-visible strategy is innocent iff

both its finite trace set and its divergence set are lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

(Cf. Melliès' paper: "Asynchronous Games 2: the true concurrency of innocence".)

There's an analogous theorem for OP-visible strategies.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular names ( $f$  should preserve and reflect name equality)  
and polymorphism.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular names ( $f$  should preserve and reflect name equality) and polymorphism.

In these settings, **define** an innocent strategy to be a P-visible strategy whose finite trace set and divergence set are both lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular names ( $f$  should preserve and reflect name equality) and polymorphism.

In these settings, **define** an innocent strategy to be a P-visible strategy whose finite trace set and divergence set are both lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

Likewise, working up to may-testing, we define an **innocent nondeterministic strategy** to be a set of P-visible plays lower wrt P-viewing morphisms and containing the empty play.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular names ( $f$  should preserve and reflect name equality) and polymorphism.

In these settings, **define** an innocent strategy to be a P-visible strategy whose finite trace set and divergence set are both lower wrt P-viewing morphisms.

Likewise, working up to may-testing, we define an **innocent nondeterministic strategy** to be a set of P-visible plays lower wrt P-viewing morphisms and containing the empty play.

Conjecture: these are precisely the strategies definable by a state-free term.

# A category for single-threadedness

We form a category of thread-visible plays and **threading morphisms**.

Threading morphism  $s \xrightarrow{f} t$

- A function moves  $s \rightarrow$  moves  $t$ .
- Preserves arena elements and justification pointers.
- If  $n^O$  is followed by  $m^P$  then  $f(n)$  is followed by  $f(m)$ .
- If  $n^O$  is followed by  $\perp$  then  $f(n)$  is followed by  $\perp$ .
- If  $m^P$  is thread-followed by  $n^O$  (there might be moves in between, but not from the same thread) then  $f(m)$  is thread-followed by  $f(n)$ .



## Theorem

A thread-visible strategy is single-threaded iff

## Theorem

A thread-visible strategy is single-threaded iff both its finite trace set and its divergence set are lower wrt threading morphisms.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular polymorphism.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular polymorphism.

In this setting, **define** a single-threaded strategy in that setting: a thread-visible strategy whose finite trace set and divergence set are both lower wrt threading morphisms.

Adapt the category to other settings.

In particular polymorphism.

In this setting, **define** a single-threaded strategy in that setting: a thread-visible strategy whose finite trace set and divergence set are both lower wrt threading morphisms.

Conjecture: these are precisely the strategies definable by a value.

Laird, Ghica, Murawski gave a game semantics for concurrent calculi, up to may-testing, as follows.

A strategy  $\sigma$  on  $R$  is a set of **non-alternating** plays

- lower wrt the prefix order
- containing the empty play
- (P-swap) if  $sm^P nt \in \sigma$  then  $snm^P t \in \sigma$  (assuming it's a play)
- (O-swap) if  $smn^O t \in \sigma$  then  $sm^O nt \in \sigma$  (assuming it's a play)
- (O-completeness) if  $s \in \sigma$  then  $sm^O \in \sigma$ .

# Problems with swap formulation

- Challenging to prove basic categorical properties, e.g. left and right identity laws.

# Problems with swap formulation

- Challenging to prove basic categorical properties, e.g. left and right identity laws.
- Challenging to adapt to infinite plays, where we might want to perform infinitely many swaps simultaneously



# A category for asynchrony

We form a category of non-alternating plays and **asynchrony morphisms**.

Asynchrony morphism  $s \xrightarrow{f} t$

- A partial injection moves  $s \longrightarrow$  moves  $t$ .
- Preserves arena elements and justification pointers.
- For any  $m^P \in \text{moves } s$ ,
  - $f(m)$  is defined
  - for any  $n^O < f(m)$ , there is  $n' < m$  such that  $f(n') = n$ .

## Theorem

A set of non-alternating plays is an asynchronous strategy iff it is lower wrt asynchrony morphisms and contains the empty play.

## Theorem

A set of non-alternating plays is an asynchronous strategy iff it is lower wrt asynchrony morphisms and contains the empty play.

A similar result was proved by Mohamed Menea, and used to establish the categorical properties of the asynchronous game model.