

The Crossroads of Categorical Algebra and Game Semantics

An investigation into the application of Kleisli
categories and related constructions to the study of
Full Abstraction for nondeterministic effects in
Algol-like languages

William John Gowers

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Computer Science
University of Bath
United Kingdom
August 2019

COPYRIGHT Attention is drawn to the fact that
copyright of this thesis rests with the author. A copy of
this thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone
who consults it is understood to recognise that its
copyright rests with the author and that they must not
copy it or use material from it except as permitted by law
or with the consent of the author.

This thesis may be made available for consultation within
the University Library and may be photocopied or lent to
other libraries for the purposes of consultation. _____

Contents

1	Parametric monads	3
1.1	The Melliès category	4
1.2	The category \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{X}	6
1.3	Lax 2-colimits	11
1.4	Lax natural transformations and functoriality of lax colimits .	13
1.5	Lax 2-colimits in Cat	15
1.6	Examples of lax 2-colimits in Cat	21
1.7	Finite products distribute over lax colimits in Cat	23
1.8	Monoidal structure of \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{X}	25
1.9	Symmetric monoidal structure of \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{X}	29
1.10	Monoidal closed structure of \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{X}	30
1.11	Cartesianness of the monoidal structure	33
2	Reader actions on Set	37
2.1	Colimits of actions are monoidal functors	37
2.2	Reader actions on Set vs change of base	40
2.3	From monoidal endofunctors to reader actions	42
2.4	Actions of categories with terminal objects	49
2.5	Reader actions and denotational semantics	51

List of Figures

1.1	The composite $k_a(f); k_a(g)$ is equal to $k_a(f; g)$ in $\pi_* \int F$	17
1.2	Proof that \hat{l} respects composition.	20
1.3	Proof that the associators and unitors in \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{X} are indeed natural transformations.	28
2.1	Proof that the colimit of a monoidal action satisfies the multiplicative criterion for being a monoidal functor.	38
2.2	Proof that the colimit of a monoidal action satisfies the unital criteria for being a monoidal functor.	39
2.3	Melliès composition and base-changed composition agree for symmetric reader actions on Set	43

Chapter 1

Promonads and parametric promonads

The purpose of this short chapter is to shine some light on the definition of the Melliès category for a parametric monad, showing why it is natural to think of it as being an analogue for the Kleisli category on a monad.

As a technical tool to prove the results we want, we shall introduce multicategories, which are a small generalization of monoidal categories. The main purpose of this generalization is to allow us to do without coends wherever possible: for example, while we need coends to make $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ into a monoidal category, we do not need them to make it into a multicategory.

The first half of this chapter is, in the interests of completeness, fairly technical, and may be skimmed over on a first reading. In chapter ??, we introduce the multicategory of endoprofunctors on a category \mathcal{C} , which generalizes the monoidal category of endofunctors on \mathcal{C} . As monoids in $\mathbf{End}(\mathcal{C})$ are called monads on \mathcal{C} , so we will call monoids in $\mathbf{Endoprf}(\mathcal{C})$ *promonads* on \mathcal{C} . We will observe that a promonad may be regarded as a sort of category, and that the Kleisli category may be characterized as the embedding of monads on \mathcal{C} into promonads on \mathcal{C} .

The main result will then be to show that an \mathcal{X} -parametric promonad on a category \mathcal{C} – i.e., a multifunctor $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Endoprf}(\mathcal{C})$ – may be regarded as a sort of $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category, and that the Melliès category may similarly be regarded as an embedding of \mathcal{X} -parametric monads on \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{X} -parametric promonads on \mathcal{C} .

1.1 Multicategories

Definition 1.1.1 ([Lei03]). A *multicategory* \mathcal{M} is given by a set of objects $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{M})$ whose elements are called *objects* and, for each (possibly empty) list a_1, \dots, a_n of objects and each object b , a set

$$\mathcal{M}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; b)$$

whose elements are called the $(n\text{-ary})$ *multimorphisms* $a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$.

Given collections $(a_{ij} : i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, k_i), (b_i : i = 1, \dots, n), c$ of objects and multimorphisms

$$f_i : a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i,k_i} \rightarrow b_i \quad g : b_1, \dots, b_n \rightarrow c,$$

there is an operation that forms the *composition*

$$(f_1, \dots, f_n); g : a_{11}, \dots, a_{1k_1}, \dots, a_{n1}, \dots, a_{nk_n} \rightarrow c.$$

Moreover, for each object a of \mathcal{M} , there is a distinguished multimorphism $\text{id}_a : a \rightarrow a$ called the *identity* on a .

The composition and identity are subject to associativity and unitality conditions. Namely, let

$$\left(\begin{array}{l} p = 1, \dots, n \\ a_{pqr} : q = 1, \dots, k_p \\ r = 1, \dots, l_{pq} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(b_{pq} : \begin{array}{l} p = 1, \dots, n \\ q = 1, \dots, k_p \end{array} \right) \quad (c_p : p = 1, \dots, n)$$

$$d$$

be collections of objects and let

$$f_{pq} : a_{pq1}, \dots, a_{p,q,l_{pq}} \rightarrow b_{pq} \quad g_p : b_{p1}, \dots, b_{p,k_p} \rightarrow c_p \quad d : c_1, \dots, c_n \rightarrow d$$

be multimorphisms. Then we require that

$$\begin{aligned} & (((f_{11}, \dots, f_{1k_1}); g_1), \dots, ((f_{n1}, \dots, f_{n,k_n}); g_n)); h \\ &= \\ & (f_{11}, \dots, f_{1k_1}, \dots, f_{n1}, \dots, f_{n,k_n}); ((g_1, \dots, g_n); h). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we require that if $f : a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$ is a multimorphism, then

$$(\text{id}_{a_1}, \dots, \text{id}_{a_n}); f = f \quad f = (f); \text{id}_b.$$

Remark 1.1.2. We will use a slightly different form of commutative diagrams for multicategories, which should be fairly straightforward to understand. If, for example, we say that the following diagram commutes,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a_1, \dots, a_n & \xrightarrow{f_1, \dots, f_j} & b_1, \dots, b_j \\ g_1, \dots, g_k \downarrow & & \downarrow h \\ c_1, \dots, c_k & \xrightarrow{i} & d \end{array}$$

where the arities of f_1, \dots, f_j sum to n , as do the arities of g_1, \dots, g_k , then we mean that the composite $(f_1, \dots, f_k); h$ is equal to the composite $(g_1, \dots, g_k); i$. We leave it to the reader to extend this to more complicated diagrams.

Example 1.1.3. If \mathcal{C} is an ordinary category, then \mathcal{C} may be regarded as a multicategory $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ in which $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1(a; b) = \mathcal{C}(a, b)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; b) = \emptyset$ for $n \neq 1$. At the same time, if \mathcal{M} is a multicategory, then it has an *underlying ordinary category* \mathcal{M}_1 whose morphisms are the morphisms in \mathcal{M} with a single source object.

Example 1.1.4. If \mathcal{M} is a *monoidal* category, then \mathcal{M} may be regarded as a multicategory $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; b) = \mathcal{M}(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n, b) \quad n \geq 1 \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_0(; b) = \mathcal{M}(I, b)$$

If we're being careful, then we should note that the expression $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n$ does not define a single object of \mathcal{M} , since the tensor product is not in general strictly associative. Since the tensor product is not necessarily strictly associative, it is not obvious exactly what we mean by $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n$. It is enough to fix any one of the possible bracketings (e.g., to make $_ \otimes _$ always associate to the right).

Composition is then given by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & a_{11} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{1k_1} & \otimes & \dots & \otimes & a_{n1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{nk_n} & \\ \longrightarrow & (a_{11} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{1k_1}) & \otimes & \dots & \otimes & (a_{n1} \otimes \dots \otimes a_{nk_n}) & \\ \xrightarrow{f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_n} & b_1 & \otimes & \dots & \otimes & b_n & \\ \xrightarrow{g} & & & c, & & & \end{array}$$

where the first arrow is induced from the normal monoidal coherences (exactly which ones depends on how we choose to interpret the iterated tensor product).

1.2 Representable multicategories

We call a multicategory *representable* if it is isomorphic to a multicategory that arises from a monoidal category as in Example ???. The next theorem gives a criterion for a multicategory to be representable.

Theorem 1.2.1 ([Her00]). *Let \mathcal{M} be a multicategory and suppose that for each natural number n and each sequence a_1, \dots, a_n of objects of \mathcal{M} there is an object $\otimes \vec{a}$ and a multimorphism*

$$\pi_{\vec{a}}: a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow \otimes \vec{a}.$$

Suppose that the $\pi_{\vec{a}}$ are strongly universal in the sense that if $b_1, \dots, b_k, c_1, \dots, c_l$ are two (possibly empty) lists of objects, and d is an object, then any multimorphism

$$f: b_1, \dots, b_k, a_1, \dots, a_n, c_1, \dots, c_l \rightarrow d$$

factors uniquely through $\pi_{\vec{a}}$; i.e., there is a unique morphism

$$\hat{f}: b_1, \dots, b_k, \otimes \vec{a}, c_1, \dots, c_l \rightarrow d$$

such that

$$f = (\text{id}_{b_1}, \dots, \text{id}_{b_k}, \pi_{\vec{a}}, \text{id}_{c_1}, \dots, \text{id}_{c_l}); \hat{f}.$$

Given objects a, b of \mathcal{M} , define $a \otimes b = \otimes a, b$, and let I be the object $\otimes \epsilon$, where ϵ is the empty list. Then the operation $_ \otimes _$ and I give rise to the multicategory structure on \mathcal{M} :

- $_ \otimes _$ and I are the monoidal product and unit of a monoidal category on \mathcal{M}_1 , the underlying category of \mathcal{M} .
- For any sequence a_1, \dots, a_n of objects of \mathcal{M} there is a canonical isomorphism

$$a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \cong \otimes \vec{a},$$

for any bracketing of the left hand side, and the associators and unitors in \mathcal{M}_1 are induced from these isomorphisms.

- The set of multimorphisms $a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$ is in bijection with the set of morphisms $a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n \rightarrow b$ for $n \geq 1$, and the set of multimorphisms $\rightarrow b$ is in bijection with the set of morphisms $I \rightarrow b$, and these bijections commute with the multicategory composition in \mathcal{M} and the composition in \mathcal{M}_1 .

Definition 1.2.2. A *symmetric multicategory* is a multicategory \mathcal{M} together with an action of the symmetric group on the sets $\mathcal{M}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; b)$ that respects composition. In other words, for each natural number n , each multimorphism $f: a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$ and each permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ there is a multimorphism

$$\sigma_* f: a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)} \rightarrow b$$

such that if $(a_{ij}: i = 1, \dots, n), (b_i: i = 1, \dots, n)$ are objects,

$$f_i: a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i,k_i} \rightarrow b_i \quad g: b_1, \dots, b_n \rightarrow c$$

are multimorphisms, σ_i is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, k_i\}$, and τ is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, then

$$(\sigma_{1*} f_q, \dots, \sigma_{n*} f_n); (\tau_* g) = (\tau * (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n))_* ((f_1, \dots, f_n); g),$$

where $\tau * (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ is the permutation of

$$\{(1, 1), \dots, (1, k_1), \dots, (n, 1), \dots, (n, k_n)\}$$

that sends (i, j) to $(\tau(i), \sigma_i(j))$.

Moreover, we require that for any morphism $f: a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$ and permutations σ, τ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$\sigma_* \tau_* f = (\sigma \circ \tau)_* f \quad \text{id}_* f = f$$

Example 1.2.3. Any multicategory arising from an ordinary category is symmetric.

Example 1.2.4. A monoidal category is a symmetric multicategory if and only if it is a symmetric monoidal category.

1.3 Product and unit multicategories

Definition 1.3.1. Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be multicategories. The *product multicategory* $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{N}$ has, as objects, pairs (a, b) , where a is an object of \mathcal{M} and b an object of \mathcal{N} . The multimorphisms are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{N})_n((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n); (c, d)) = \\ \mathcal{M}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; c) \times \mathcal{N}_n(b_1, \dots, b_n; d). \end{aligned}$$

Composition and the identity are similarly defined pointwise.

Definition 1.3.2. The *unit multicategory* 1 has a single object I , and for each n , the set

$$1_n(I, \dots, I; I)$$

is a singleton.

This is a representable multicategory; indeed, it may be identified with the usual unit monoidal category.

1.4 Multifunctors & multinatural transformations

Definition 1.4.1. Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be multicategories. A *multifunctor* from \mathcal{M} to \mathcal{N} is a map F from the objects of \mathcal{M} to the objects of \mathcal{N} together with, for each list a_1, \dots, a_n, b of objects of \mathcal{M} , a function

$$\mathcal{M}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n; b) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_n(Fa_1, \dots, Fa_n; Fb)$$

that commutes with the composition operator.

Definition 1.4.2. Given multicategories \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} and multifunctors

$$F, G: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N},$$

a *multinatural transformation* $\phi: F \Rightarrow G$ is given by morphisms

$$\phi_a: Fa \rightarrow Ga$$

for each object a of \mathcal{M} , such that if $f: a_1, \dots, a_n \rightarrow b$ is any morphism in \mathcal{M} , then the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Fa_1, \dots, Fa_n & \xrightarrow{\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \phi_{a_n}} & Ga_1, \dots, Ga_n \\ Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow Gf \\ Fb & \xrightarrow{\phi_b} & Gb \end{array}$$

Proposition 1.4.3. *If \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} are monoidal categories, considered as multicategories, then multifunctors $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ are the same thing as lax monoidal functors. Multinatural transformations are the same thing as monoidal natural transformations.*

Definition 1.4.4. Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be multicategories, where \mathcal{M} is symmetric. Then the collection of multifunctors $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ forms a multicategory. A multimorphism $F_1, \dots, F_n \Rightarrow G$, where F_1, \dots, F_n, G are multifunctors $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, is given by a family

$$\phi_a: F_1(a), \dots, F_n(a) \rightarrow G(a)$$

such that for any multimorphism $f: a_1, \dots, a_m \rightarrow b$ in \mathcal{M} , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_1(a_1), \dots, F_n(a_1), \dots, F_1(a_m), \dots, F_n(a_m) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \phi_{a_m}} & G(a_1), \dots, G(a_m) \\ \sigma_* \downarrow & & \downarrow Gf \\ F_1(a_1), \dots, F_1(a_m), \dots, F_n(a_1), \dots, F_n(a_m) & & \\ F_1 f, \dots, F_n f \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F_1(b), \dots, F_n(b) & \xrightarrow{\phi_b} & G(b) \end{array}$$

commutes, where σ is the map

$$\begin{aligned} \{(1, 1), \dots, (n, 1), \dots, (1, m), \dots, (n, m)\} &\rightarrow \\ \{(1, 1), \dots, (1, m), \dots, (n, 1), \dots, (n, m)\} & \end{aligned}$$

that sends (i, j) to (j, i) , considered as a permutation of $\{1, \dots, mn\}$.

1.5 Monoids in multicategories

Definition 1.5.1. Let \mathcal{M} be a multicategory.

Then a *monoid* in \mathcal{M} is an object a of \mathcal{M} together with multimorphisms

$$m: a, a \rightarrow a \quad e: \rightarrow a$$

satisfying the following associativity and unitality laws.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} a, a, a & \xrightarrow{m, \text{id}_a} & a, a \\ \text{id}_a, m \downarrow & & \downarrow m \\ a, a & \xrightarrow{m} & a \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_a} & a \\ e_a, \text{id}_a \downarrow & \nearrow m & \\ a, a & & \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_a} & a \\ \text{id}_a, e_a \downarrow & \nearrow m & \\ a, a & & \end{array} \end{array}$$

Note that a monoid in a multicategory \mathcal{M} may equivalently be defined as a multifunctor $1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ [Lei03, 2.1.11].

1.6 Categories enriched over multicategories

Definition 1.6.1. Let \mathcal{V} be a multicategory. Then a \mathcal{V} -enriched category \mathcal{C} is given by a collection $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ of objects together with, for each pair a, b of objects, an object

$$\mathcal{C}(a, b)$$

of \mathcal{V} and, for objects a, b, c of \mathcal{C} , composition and identity multimorphisms

$$;_{a,b,c} : \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, c) \quad \eta_a : \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, a)$$

that satisfy the following associativity and unitality laws for all objects a, b, c, d of \mathcal{C} .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, c), \mathcal{C}(c, d) & \xrightarrow{;_{a,b,c}, \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(c,d)}} & \mathcal{C}(a, c), \mathcal{C}(c, d) \\ \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(a,b)}, ;_{b,c,d} \downarrow & & \downarrow ;_{a,c,d} \\ \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, d) & \xrightarrow{;_{a,b,d}} & \mathcal{C}(a, d) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(a,b)}} & \mathcal{C}(a, b) \\ \eta_a, \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(a,b)} \downarrow & \nearrow ;_{a,a,b} & \\ \mathcal{C}(a, a), \mathcal{C}(a, b) & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(a,b)}} & \mathcal{C}(a, b) \\ \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}(a,b)}, \eta_b \downarrow & \nearrow ;_{a,b,b} & \\ \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, b) & & \end{array}$$

Remark 1.6.2. These definitions clearly generalize the same definitions for categories enriched over a monoidal category.

In particular, a monoid in a multicategory \mathcal{M} is the same thing as an \mathcal{M} -enriched category with a single object.

Remark 1.6.3. If \mathcal{V} is a symmetric multicategory and \mathcal{C} is a \mathcal{V} -enriched category, then we may define the *opposite category* \mathcal{C}^{op} whose objects are the objects of \mathcal{C} and where

$$\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}(a, b) = \mathcal{C}(b, a).$$

Composition is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}(b, a), \mathcal{C}(c, b) \xrightarrow{\tau_*} \mathcal{C}(c, b), \mathcal{C}(b, a) \xrightarrow{;_{c,b,a}} \mathcal{C}(c, a),$$

where τ is the permutation that transposes the two values.

1.7 Multicategory-enriched functors and natural transformations

Definition 1.7.1. Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be categories enriched over some multicategory \mathcal{V} . An \mathcal{V} -enriched functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a map F from the objects of \mathcal{C} to the objects of \mathcal{D} together with, for each, pair a, b of objects of \mathcal{C} , a (unary) multimorphism

$$F: \mathcal{C}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F(a), F(b))$$

such that for all a, b, c the following diagrams commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, c) & \xrightarrow{\quad ;_{a,b,c} \quad} & \mathcal{C}(a, c) \\ \downarrow F, F & & \downarrow F \\ \mathcal{D}(F(a), F(b)), \mathcal{D}(F(b), F(c)) & \xrightarrow{\quad ;_{F(a), F(b), F(c)} \quad} & \mathcal{D}(F(a), F(c)) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\eta_a} & \mathcal{C}(a, a) \\ & \searrow \eta_{F(a)} & \downarrow F \\ & & \mathcal{D}(F(a), F(a)) \end{array}$$

Definition 1.7.2. Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be categories enriched over a multicategory \mathcal{V} and let $F, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be \mathcal{V} -enriched functors. An \mathcal{V} -enriched natural transformation $\phi: F \Rightarrow G$ is given by a family of 0-ary multimorphisms

$$\phi_a: \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F(a), G(a))$$

such that for all objects a, b the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b) & \xrightarrow{\quad F, \phi_b \quad} & \mathcal{D}(F(a), F(b)), \mathcal{D}(F(b), G(b)) \\ \downarrow \phi_a, G & & \downarrow ;_{F(a), F(b), G(b)} \\ \mathcal{D}(F(a), G(a)), \mathcal{D}(G(a), G(b)) & \xrightarrow{\quad ;_{F(a), G(a), G(b)} \quad} & \mathcal{D}(F(a), G(b)) \end{array}$$

1.8 The categories enriched over a symmetric multicategory form a multicategory

Definition 1.8.1. Let \mathcal{V} be a symmetric multicategory. Given \mathcal{V} -enriched categories $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n, \mathcal{D}$, a multimorphism

$$F: \mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$$

is given by a function

$$F: \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \cdots \times \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_n) \rightarrow \text{Ob}(\mathcal{D})$$

together with, for each $a_i, b_i \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, a multimorphism

$$F: \mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \cdots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F(a_1, \cdots, a_n), F(b_1, \cdots, b_n)),$$

such that the diagrams in Figure ?? commute.

In the case $n = 1$, this is the same thing as a \mathcal{V} -enriched functor from \mathcal{C}_1 to \mathcal{D} .

1.9 Change of base

Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be multicategories, let $F: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a multifunctor and let \mathcal{C} be an \mathcal{M} -enriched category. Then we can form an \mathcal{N} -enriched category $F_*\mathcal{C}$ whose objects are the objects of \mathcal{C} and where the morphisms are given by the formula

$$F_*\mathcal{C}(a, b) = F(\mathcal{C}(a, b)).$$

We get composition and identities by applying the multifunctor F to the composition and identity multimorphisms in \mathcal{C} . By functoriality of F , these composition and identities are associative and unital, meaning that $F_*\mathcal{C}$ is indeed an \mathcal{N} -enriched category.

This process is called *base change along F* .

1.10 Closed multicategories

Definition 1.10.1 ([Man09]). We say that a multicategory \mathcal{M} is *closed* if for any pair a, c of objects, there exists an object

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}(a, c)$$

and a multimorphism

$$\text{ev}_{a,c}: a, \underline{\mathcal{M}}(a, c) \rightarrow c$$

such that for any sequence b_1, \cdots, b_n of objects of \mathcal{M} , the function

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \kappa_{a,b_1,\dots,b_n,c}: \mathcal{M}_n(b_1, \cdots, b_n; \underline{\mathcal{M}}(a, c)) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{M}_{n+1}(a, b_1, \cdots, b_n; c) \\ f & \mapsto & (\text{id}_a, f); \text{ev}_{a,c} \end{array}$$

is a bijection.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \mathcal{C}_1(b_1, c_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n), \mathcal{C}_n(b_n, c_n) & \xrightarrow{!a_1, b_1, c_1, \dots, !a_n, b_n, c_n} & \mathcal{C}_1(a_1, c_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, c_n) \\
\downarrow \sigma_* & & \downarrow F \\
\mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n), \mathcal{C}_1(b_1, c_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(b_n, c_n) & & \\
\downarrow F & & \\
\mathcal{D}(F(a_1, \dots, a_n), F(b_1, \dots, b_n)), \mathcal{D}(F(b_1, \dots, b_n), F(c_1, \dots, c_n)) & \xrightarrow{!F(a_1, \dots, a_n), F(b_1, \dots, b_n), F(c_1, \dots, c_n)} & \mathcal{D}(F(a_1, \dots, a_n), F(c_1, \dots, c_n))
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\eta_{a_1, \dots, \eta_{a_n}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{C}_1(a_1, a_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, a_n) \\
& \searrow \eta_{F(a_1, \dots, a_n)} & \downarrow F \\
& & \mathcal{D}(F(a_1, \dots, a_n), F(a_1, \dots, a_n))
\end{array}$$

Figure 1.1: The rules for preservation of composition and identity by multimorphisms of \mathcal{V} -enriched functors are similar to those for ordinary enriched functors. Note that it is essential for the \mathcal{V} to be a symmetric multicategory. This generalizes the usual construction for categories enriched over a symmetric monoidal category.

Proposition 1.10.2 ([Man09]). *If \mathcal{V} is a closed multicategory, then \mathcal{V} gives rise to the structure of a \mathcal{V} -enriched category on the underlying category \mathcal{V}_1 of \mathcal{V} . We will also call this category \mathcal{V}_1 , relying on context to distinguish the two. The objects of \mathcal{V}_1 are the objects of \mathcal{V} , while the morphisms are given by*

$$\mathcal{V}_1(a, b) = \underline{\mathcal{V}}(a, b).$$

If \mathcal{V} is a closed multicategory and $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$ are \mathcal{V} -enriched categories, then a functor $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is given by a map $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \dots \times \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_n) \rightarrow \text{Ob}(\mathcal{V})$ and, for each $a_i, b_i \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_i)$, a multimorphism

$$\mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{V}}(F(a_1, \dots, a_n), F(b_1, \dots, b_n))$$

By the definition of a closed multicategory, this is equivalent to providing a multimorphism

$$F(a_1, \dots, a_n), \mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n) \rightarrow F(b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

In what follows, we will denote these multimorphisms (and their various permutations) with the letter p .

We have seen so far that multicategories provide us with a rather straightforward generalization of monoidal categories. We might ask the question, then: why make this generalization?

To answer this question, we introduce some natural multicategories that are not representable.

1.11 The multicategory of endoprofunctors

Let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} be ordinary categories. Recall that a *profunctor* $F: \mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an ordinary functor $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

More generally, if \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} are enriched over some symmetric closed multicategory \mathcal{V} , then a \mathcal{V} -enriched profunctor $F: \mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a \mathcal{V} -enriched functor $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1$.

Let $F_1, \dots, F_n, G: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1$ be \mathcal{V} -enriched profunctors $\mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is a \mathcal{V} -enriched category.

We then define a multimorphism $\phi: F_1, \dots, F_n \Rightarrow G$ to be given by a family of multimorphisms

$$\phi_{a, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}, c}: F_1(a, b_1), \dots, F_n(b_{n-1}, c) \rightarrow G(a, c)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C}(a, a'), F_1(a', b_1), \dots, F_n(b_{n-1}, c), \mathcal{C}(c, c') & \xrightarrow{\text{id}, \phi_{a', \vec{b}, c}, \text{id}} & \mathcal{C}(a, a'), G(a', c), G(c, c') \\
\downarrow p, \text{id}, \dots, \text{id}, p & & \downarrow p \\
F_1(a, b_1), \dots, F_n(b_{n-1}, c') & \xrightarrow{\phi_{a, \vec{b}, c'}} & G(a, c')
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F_1(a, b_1), \mathcal{C}(b_1, b'_1), F_2(b'_1, b_2), \dots, F_{n-1}(b'_{n-2}, b_{n-1}), \mathcal{C}(b_{n-1}, b'_{n-1}), F_n(b'_{n-1}, c) & & \\
\swarrow p, \dots, p, \text{id} & & \searrow \text{id}, p, \dots, p \\
F_1(a, b'_1), \dots, F_n(b'_{n-1}, c) & & F_1(a, b_1), \dots, F_n(b_{n-1}, c) \\
\searrow \phi_{a, \vec{b}', c} & & \swarrow \phi_{a, \vec{b}, c} \\
& G(a, c) &
\end{array}$$

Figure 1.2: Extranatural transformations between endoprofunctors. The coherences we require on the multimorphisms between endoprofunctors are essentially the axioms for an extranatural transformation as in [EK66].

that make the diagrams in Figure ?? commute.

A 0-ary multimorphism $\rightarrow G$ is an ordinary enriched natural transformation $\mathcal{C}(a, c) \rightarrow G(a, c)$.

We say that $\phi_{a, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}, c}$ is *natural* in a and c and *extranatural* in the b_i .

We will often drop the component objects from ϕ and from the profunctors in question where they can be inferred from context.

We compose these multimorphisms pointwise. The following proposition shows that this is indeed a well-defined composition.

Proposition 1.11.1. *Let \mathcal{V} be a symmetric closed multicategory and let \mathcal{C} be a \mathcal{V} -enriched category. Let $F_1, \dots, F_n, G_1, \dots, G_m, H$ be profunctors $\mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$, and let $0 = k_0, \dots, k_m = n$ be a (not necessarily strictly) increasing subsequence of $\{0, \dots, n\}$. Let $\phi^{(i)}: F_{k_i+1}, \dots, F_{k_{i+1}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_i, \psi: G_1, \dots, G_m \rightarrow G$ be multimorphisms of profunctors.*

Then the family of multimorphisms

$$F_1, \dots, F_n \xrightarrow{\phi^{(1)}, \dots, \phi^{(m)}} G_1, \dots, G_m \xrightarrow{\psi} H$$

forms a multimorphism $F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow H$.

Proof. For the first condition (naturality), we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C}, F_1, \dots, F_n, \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}, \phi^{(1)}, \dots, \phi^{(m)}, \text{id}} & \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_m, \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}, \psi, \text{id}} & \mathcal{C}, H, \mathcal{C} \\ p, \text{id}, \dots, \text{id}, p \downarrow & & \downarrow p, \text{id}, \dots, \text{id}, p & & \downarrow p \\ F_1, \dots, F_n & \xrightarrow{\phi^{(1)}, \dots, \phi^{(m)}} & G_1, \dots, G_m & \xrightarrow{\psi} & H \end{array},$$

where commutativity of the left hand square is the naturality condition on $\phi^{(1)}$ and $\phi^{(m)}$, while commutativity of the right hand square is the naturality condition for ψ .

For the second condition (extranaturality), see Figure ??.

□

This composition is associative, because it is given pointwise by composition in \mathcal{V} , and its unit is given by the identity natural transformation. This gives us a multicategory.

Suppose that \mathcal{V} is the category of sets, so that the multimorphisms

$$F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow G$$

are ordinary extranatural transformations

$$\phi_{a, \vec{b}, c} : F_1(a, b_1), \dots, F_n(b_{n-1}, c) \rightarrow G(a, c).$$

Then the definition of the *coend*

$$\int_{b_1, \dots, b_{n-1} : \mathcal{C}} F_1(a, b_1) \times \dots \times F_n(b_{n-1}, c)$$

is that it is universal among all objects admitting such an extranatural transformation out of them. It follows that in this case (and more generally, if \mathcal{V} is a cocomplete monoidal category), that the multicategory of endoprofunctors on \mathcal{C} is representable, with monoidal product given by

$$F \otimes G(a, c) = \int_{b : \mathcal{C}} F(a, b) \times G(b, c).$$

This is the usual notion of composition for **Set**-enriched profunctors. However, if \mathcal{V} is not cocomplete, then the multicategory of endoprofunctors on \mathcal{C} need not be representable, even if \mathcal{V} is representable.

We have only considered profunctors going from a category into itself. Profunctors in general form a structure called an *fc-multicategory* [Lei03], though we shall not be using this notion.




Figure 1.3: Proof that extranaturality is preserved by composition. Commutativity of the central square is by extranaturality of the $\phi^{(i)}$, while that of the four-cornered triangle at the right is by extranaturality of ψ . The triangles on the left commute automatically, while the parallelograms at the top and the bottom commute by naturality of the $\phi^{(i)}$.

1.12 Functors are a special case of profunctors

The reason why we refer to a functors $F: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ as a *profunctors* $\mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is that they generalize ordinary functors $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Specifically, if $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a functor, then we can identify it with the profunctor

$$\tilde{F}(d, c) = \mathcal{D}(d, F(c)): \mathcal{D}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}.$$

This gives us an embedding of the monoidal category of endofunctors $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ into the multicategory of endoprofunctors $\mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$:

Proposition 1.12.1. *Let \mathcal{V} be a closed symmetric multicategory and let \mathcal{C} be a \mathcal{V} -enriched category. Let $F_1, \dots, F_n, G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be functors. Then the set of natural transformations $F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n \rightarrow G$ is naturally in bijection with the set of extranatural transformations*

$$\hat{F}_1, \dots, \hat{F}_n \rightarrow \hat{G}.$$

Proof. We have a natural multimorphism

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{C}(a, F_1(b_1)), \dots, \mathcal{C}(b_{n-1}, F_n(c)) \\ \xrightarrow{\text{id}, \dots, F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_{n-1}} \mathcal{C}(a, F_1(b_1)), \dots, \mathcal{C}(F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_{n-1}(b_{n-1}), F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n(c)) \\ \xrightarrow{;}^* \mathcal{C}(a, F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n(c)), \end{array}$$

which is natural in a, c and extranatural in the b_i .

If $\phi: F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n \rightarrow G$ is a natural transformation, then it gives rise (via postcomposition) to a natural transformation

$$\mathcal{C}(a, F_1(\dots(F_n(c))\dots)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, G(c)),$$

which we can compose with the multimorphism above to get the required extranatural transformation

$$\mathcal{C}(a, F_1(b_1)), \dots, \mathcal{C}(b_{n-1}, F_n(c)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, G(c)).$$

In the other direction, suppose that we have some extranatural transformation

$$\phi_{a, \vec{b}, c}: \mathcal{C}(a, F_1(b_1)), \dots, \mathcal{C}(b_{n-1}, F_n(c)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, G(c)).$$

Then we can take components of the form

$$\phi_{a, F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n(c), \dots, F_n(c), c}: \mathcal{C}(a, F_1 \circ \dots \circ F_n(c)), \dots, \mathcal{C}(F_n(c), F_n(c)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, G(c))$$

and compose with $\text{id}, \eta, \dots, \eta$ to get our natural transformation

$$\mathcal{C}(a, F_a \circ \dots \circ F_n(c)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, G(c)).$$

It is easy to check that these two constructions are inverses and that they respect composition of natural transformations. \square

1.13 Promonads are categories

Since a monad was defined to be a monoid in the category of endofunctors on a category \mathcal{C} , we can define a *promonad* to be a monoid in the multicategory of endoprofunctors on \mathcal{C} .

Proposition 1.13.1 (See, e.g., [SG12]). *Let \mathcal{V} be a symmetric closed multicategory. Let \mathcal{C} be a \mathcal{V} -enriched category. Then a promonad $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is the same thing as a \mathcal{V} -enriched category \mathcal{D} together with an identity-on-objects functor $j: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. This is a matter of unwrapping the definitions.

Let $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{C} \nrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be such a promonad. So \mathcal{D} is given by a \mathcal{V} -enriched functor $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1$, together with extranatural transformations

$$m_{a,b,c}: \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(a, c) \quad e_{a,b}: \mathcal{C}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(a, b)$$

such that the following diagrams commute (see Definition ??).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, c), \mathcal{D}(c, d) & \xrightarrow{m_{a,b,c}, \text{id}} & \mathcal{D}(a, c), \mathcal{D}(c, d) \\ \text{id}, m_{b,c,d} \downarrow & & \downarrow m_{a,c,d} \\ \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, d) & \xrightarrow{m_{a,b,d}} & \mathcal{D}(a, d) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, c) & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathcal{D}(a, c) \\ e_{a,b}, \text{id} \downarrow & \nearrow m_{a,b,c} & \\ \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, c) & & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{C}(b, c) & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathcal{D}(a, c) \\ \text{id}, e_{a,b} \downarrow & \nearrow m_{a,b,c} & \\ \mathcal{D}(a, b), \mathcal{D}(b, c) & & \end{array}$$

If we set $a = b$ in the second diagram and $b = c$ in the third, and compose with the identity multimorphisms η , then these are exactly the diagrams (see Definition ??) for \mathcal{D} to have the structure of a \mathcal{V} -enriched category on the collection of objects of \mathcal{C} !

Then the full versions of the second and third diagrams give us our desired enriched functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. It is the identity on objects and is the multimorphism $e_{a,b}$ on morphisms.

We can show that this is indeed a functor using the diagram in Figure ??.

□

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{C}(a,b), \mathcal{C}(b,c) & \xrightarrow{i_{a,b,c}} & \mathcal{C}(a,c) & & \\
 \downarrow e_{a,b}, e_{b,c} & \searrow \text{id}_{e_{b,c}} & & \downarrow e_{a,c} & \\
 & \mathcal{C}(a,b), \mathcal{D}(b,c) & & & \\
 & \swarrow e_{a,b}, \text{id} & \searrow p & & \\
 \mathcal{D}(a,b), \mathcal{D}(b,c) & \xrightarrow{m_{a,b,c}} & \mathcal{D}(a,c) & &
 \end{array}$$

Figure 1.4: Proof that the identity-on-objects functor arising from a promonad is indeed a functor. The proof uses naturality of $e_{a,b}$ for commutativity of the large triangle at the top right.

Consider the case that \mathcal{D} is an actual functor, so that $\mathcal{D}(a,b) = \mathcal{C}(a, F(b))$ for some endofunctor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Then, by Proposition ??, a promonad structure on \mathcal{D} is the same thing as a monad structure on F . If we consider \mathcal{D} as a category, then the objects of \mathcal{D} are the objects of \mathcal{C} , and morphisms from a to b are morphisms from a to $F(b)$ in \mathcal{C} ; i.e., Kleisli morphisms for F .

If we work the definitions through the proof of Proposition ??, then we see that the composition of morphisms $f: a \rightarrow F(b)$ and $g: b \rightarrow F(c)$ in \mathcal{D} is given by the composite

$$a \xrightarrow{f} Fb \xrightarrow{Fg} FFc \rightarrow Fc,$$

where the rightmost arrow arises from the promonad structure on \mathcal{D} . In other words, \mathcal{D} is precisely the Kleisli category for the monad F :

Slogan 1.13.2. The Kleisli category is the category we get by considering functors as profunctors.

1.14 The multicategory of functors

Let \mathcal{X} be a monoidal category and let \mathcal{M} be a multicategory. We define a multicategory $[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}]$ where the objects are ordinary functors

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1$$

and where multimorphisms $F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow G$ are natural transformations

$$\phi_{x_1, \dots, x_n}: F_1(x_1), \dots, F_n(x_n) \rightarrow G(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n).$$

Remark 1.14.1. Suppose that \mathcal{M} is the category of sets, regarded as a multicategory through its Cartesian structure. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_p$ be objects of \mathcal{X} . Then for any collection of functors

$$F_1, \dots, F_n, G_1, \dots, G_p, H: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set},$$

the set of natural transformations

$$\phi_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}}: \prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j) \rightarrow H(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n \otimes y_1 \otimes \dots \otimes y_p)$$

may be written as the end

$$\int_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \left[\prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j), H \left(\bigotimes_i x_i \otimes \bigotimes_j y_j \right) \right].$$

We may then perform some co/end calculus (See the similar computation in [Pis14], but note that that version is not quite sufficient to prove representability according to Theorem ??).

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \left[\prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j), H \left(\bigotimes_i x_i \otimes \bigotimes_j y_j \right) \right] \\ & \cong \int_{\vec{x}, z, \vec{y}} \left[\mathcal{X} \left(\bigotimes_i x_i, z \right), \left[\prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j), H \left(z \otimes \bigotimes_j y_j \right) \right] \right] \\ & \cong \int_{\vec{x}, z, \vec{y}} \left[\prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \mathcal{X} \left(\bigotimes_i x_i, z \right) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j), H \left(z \otimes \bigotimes_j y_j \right) \right] \\ & \cong \int_{z, \vec{y}} \left[\int^{\vec{x}} \left(\prod_i F_i(x_i) \times \mathcal{X} \left(\bigotimes_i x_i, z \right) \right) \times \prod_j G_j(y_j), H \left(z \otimes \bigotimes_j y_j \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

In other words, this multicategory is representable by the Day convolution that we met in Definition 1.1.3:

$$(F \otimes_{\text{Day}} G)(z) = \int^{x,y} F(x) \times G(y) \times \mathcal{X}(x \otimes y, z) .$$

However, this multicategory is not representable in general, particularly in the cases when we are working with enriched multicategories (not defined here), where the enriching multicategory is not cocomplete, or when the category \mathcal{M} is not the enriching category.

1.15 Monoids on functors are multifunctors

It might seem strange that the objects of the multicategory of functors are ordinary functors rather than multifunctors. We appear to have ignored the monoidal structure of \mathcal{X} and the multicategory structure of \mathcal{M} .

One way to make sense of this fact is to note that an object of a category \mathcal{C} is the same thing as a functor

$$1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C} .$$

In the same way, perhaps the correct way to think of an ‘element’ of a multicategory is that it is a *multifunctor*

$$1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M} ;$$

i.e., a monoid in \mathcal{M} .

Then the following proposition tells us that the ‘elements’ of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ in this sense are the multifunctors.

Proposition 1.15.1. *Let \mathcal{X} be a monoidal category and let \mathcal{M} be a multicategory. Then a monoid in $[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}]$ is the same thing as a multifunctor $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.*

This can be proved by setting $\mathcal{N} = 1$ in the following stronger result.

Proposition 1.15.2 ([Pis14, 2.8]). *Let \mathcal{X} be a monoidal category and let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be multicategories. Then a multifunctor $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{M}]$ is the same thing as a multifunctor $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.*

1.16 Two perspectives on monoids in **Set**

We now come to our main result of the chapter. We will approach it from an oblique perspective. First note the following two rather different generalizations of the notion of an internal monoid in **Set**.

1. A monoid in **Set** may be regarded as a lax monoidal functor (i.e., a multifunctor) $1 \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. This generalizes to arbitrary lax monoidal functors $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, for monoidal categories \mathcal{X} .
2. A monoid in **Set** may also be regarded as a category with a single object. This generalizes to arbitrary categories.

We shall now attempt to unify these into a single grand unifying generalization of a monoid. From Proposition ??, we know that a category with one object is the same thing as a monoid in the category $\mathbf{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(*)$, where $*$ is the category with a single object and only an identity morphism.

We can clearly generalize this to the idea of a monoid in $\mathbf{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})$ for an arbitrary category \mathcal{C} . This then generalizes to the universal idea of a multifunctor

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C}),$$

(which we might call a *parametric promonad on \mathcal{C} parameterized by \mathcal{X}*), which generalizes both lax monoidal functors $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ (when $\mathcal{C} = *$) and **Set**-enriched categories (when $\mathcal{X} = 1$).

However, we can also do things the other way round. From Proposition ??, a lax monoidal functor $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a monoid in the multicategory $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$. This is the same thing as an $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category with a single object, so another way of generalizing monoids in **Set** is to generalize them to monoids in the multicategory

$$\mathbf{Endoprof}_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}(\mathcal{C})$$

for some monoidal category \mathcal{X} and some $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category \mathcal{C} .

This generalizes categories in the case that $\mathcal{X} = 1$. It generalizes monoidal functors $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ in the case that \mathcal{C} is the enriched category $*_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}$ with a single object $()$, where the morphisms $() \rightarrow ()$ are given by the functor $[I, _]$, for I the monoidal unit in \mathcal{X} , this being the initial object in $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$.

Our main result will tell us that it doesn't actually matter which way round we choose: these two ways of unifying the two generalization of a monoid

in fact give the same result. The only ingredient we are missing is an appropriate change of base to move from ordinary **Set**-enriched categories to $[\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched categories.

Definition 1.16.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a monoidal category. We have a multifunctor

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow [\mathbf{Set}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

given by

$$x \mapsto \mathcal{X}(I, x) \times _ .$$

By Proposition ??, this may equivalently be given as a multifunctor

$$\partial_{\mathcal{X}}: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

that sends a set A to the functor

$$\mathcal{X}(I, _) \times A .$$

The important property of this particular multifunctor is as follows.

Proposition 1.16.2. *If $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$ are categories, then $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched functors $\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ are the same thing as ordinary functors from $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_n$ to $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$ be categories. An $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched functor

$$F: \partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

is given by a map

$$F: \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_1) \times \dots \times \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}_n) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ob}([\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]) ,$$

together with, for all objects a_i, b_i of \mathcal{C}_i , a multimorphism

$$\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_1(a_1, b_1), \dots, \partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}_n(a_n, b_n), F(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow F(b_1, \dots, b_n) ;$$

i.e., a natural transformation

$$\left(\prod_i \mathcal{X}(I, x_i) \times \mathcal{C}(a_i, b_i) \right) \times F(a_1, \dots, a_n)(y) \rightarrow F(b_1, \dots, b_n)(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n \otimes y) .$$

By the Yoneda lemma, such a natural transformation is the same thing as a natural transformation

$$\prod_i \mathcal{C}(a_i, b_i) \times F(a_1, \dots, a_n)(y) \rightarrow F(b_1, \dots, b_n)(I \otimes \dots \otimes I \otimes y);$$

i.e., a natural transformation

$$\mathcal{C}(a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}(a_n, b_n) \times F(a_1, \dots, a_n)(y) \rightarrow F(b_1, \dots, b_n)(y).$$

But this is precisely the data of an ordinary functor $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$.

By naturality of the Yoneda transformation (and the left unitor), this process preserves and reflects the property of respecting composition and units. \square

Theorem 1.16.3 ('Stokes's Theorem'). *Let \mathcal{X} be a monoidal category and let \mathcal{C} be a category. Then we have an isomorphism of multicategories*

$$[\mathcal{X}, \text{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})] \cong \text{Endoprof}_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}(\partial \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{C}).$$

Proof. Let $F: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be an ordinary functor. We may view F either as the object

$$F(x, _, _): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})_1$$

of $[\mathcal{X}, \text{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})]$ or, by Proposition ??, as the object

$$F(_, a, b): \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

of $\text{Endoprof}_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}(\partial \mathcal{X} * \mathcal{C})$. Moreover, every object of each of the two categories arises in such a way. Our aim is to show that the two categories give rise to identical notions of multimorphisms between such F .

Let $F_1, \dots, F_n, G: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be functors. Considering the F_i as objects of $[\mathcal{X}, \text{Endoprof}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})]$, a multimorphism $F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow G$ is given by a transformation

$$F_1(x_1, _, _), \dots, F_n(x_n, _, _) \rightarrow G(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n, _, _);$$

natural in the x_i i.e., a transformation

$$F_1(x_1, a, b_1) \times \dots \times F_n(x_n, b_{n-1}, c) \rightarrow G(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n, a, c).$$

natural in the x_i, a, c and extranatural in the b_i .

A multimorphism $\rightarrow G$ is given by a multimorphism

$$\rightarrow G(I, _, _);$$

i.e., a morphism

$$\mathcal{C}(a, c) \rightarrow G(I, a, c).$$

Now let us consider the F_i, G as objects of $\text{Endoprf}_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}(\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C})$. A multimorphism $F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow G$ is given by a transformation

$$F_1(_, a, b_1), \dots, F_n(_, b_{n-1}, c) \rightarrow G(_, a, c)$$

natural in a, c and extranatural in the b_i ; i.e., a transformation

$$F_1(x_1, a, b_1) \times \dots \times F_n(x_n, b_{n-1}, c) \rightarrow G(x_1 \otimes \dots \otimes x_n, a, c)$$

natural in a, c and the x_i and extranatural in the b_i .

A multimorphism $\rightarrow G$ is given by an extranatural transformation

$$\partial_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{C}(a, c)) \rightarrow G(_, a, c);$$

i.e., a natural transformation

$$\mathcal{X}(I, x) \times \mathcal{C}(a, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(x, a, c),$$

which by the Yoneda lemma is the same thing as a natural transformation

$$\mathcal{C}(a, c) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(I, a, c).$$

Thus, the two multicategories are isomorphic. \square

Now consider the case that we have a parametric monad $_ \cdot _ : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ on a category \mathcal{C} . By considering functors as profunctors, we may identify this with a multifunctor $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Endoprf}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})$, which is the same thing as a monoid in $[\mathcal{X}, \text{Endoprf}_{\mathbf{Set}}(\mathcal{C})]$. Then, by Theorem ??, we may identify this multifunctor with a monoid in $\text{Endoprf}_{[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]}(\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C})$; i.e., an $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched promonad on $\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}\mathcal{C}$.

But now, by Proposition ??, this promonad is the same thing as an $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category that has the same objects as \mathcal{C} and admits an identity-on-objects $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched functor out of $\partial_{\mathcal{X}*}(\mathcal{C})$.

The objects of this $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category are the objects of \mathcal{C} . By working the definitions through the proofs of Proposition ?? and Theorem ??, we see that the object of morphisms from a to b is

$$x \mapsto \mathcal{C}(a, x.b),$$

and that composition of morphisms is the multimorphism

$$\mathcal{C}(a, x.b) \times \mathcal{C}(b, y.c) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(a, (x \otimes y).c)$$

in $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ given by sending morphisms $f: a \rightarrow x.b$, $g: b \rightarrow x.c$ to the composite

$$a \xrightarrow{f} x.b \xrightarrow{x.g} x.y.c \xrightarrow{m} (x \otimes y).c,$$

which is precisely the definition of composition in the Melliès category.

We get a new analogue of Slogan ??.

Slogan 1.16.4. The Melliès category is precisely the $[\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched category that we get by considering functors as profunctors.

Bibliography

- [Adá03] Jiří Adámek. On final coalgebras of continuous functors. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 294(1):3 – 29, 2003. Category Theory and Computer Science.
- [AHM98] S. Abramsky, K. Honda, and G. McCusker. A fully abstract game semantics for general references. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, LICS '98, pages 334–, Washington, DC, USA, 1998. IEEE Computer Society.
- [AJM00] Samson Abramsky, Radha Jagadeesan, and Pasquale Malacaria. Full abstraction for PCF. *Information and Computation*, 163(2):409 – 470, 2000.
- [AM96] Samson Abramsky and Guy McCusker. Linearity, sharing and state: a fully abstract game semantics for Idealized Algol with active expressions: Extended abstract. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 3:2 – 14, 1996. Linear Logic 96 Tokyo Meeting.
- [AP81] K. R. Apt and G. D. Plotkin. A cook’s tour of countable nondeterminism. In Shimon Even and Oded Kariv, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 479–494, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1981. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [AP86] K. R. Apt and G. D. Plotkin. Countable nondeterminism and random assignment. *J. ACM*, 33(4):724–767, August 1986.
- [Bau06] Andrej Bauer. König’s lemma and the Kleene tree. Published via blog post at <http://math.andrej.com/2006/04/25/konigs-lemma-and-the-kleene-tree/>, April 2006.

- [Bla92] Andreas Blass. A game semantics for linear logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 56(1–3):183 – 220, 1992.
- [CCPW18] Simon Castellan, Pierre Clairambault, Hugo Paquet, and Glynn Winskel. The concurrent game semantics of probabilistic pcf. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '18*, pages 215–224, New York, NY, USA, 2018. ACM.
- [CLM13] Martin Churchill, Jim Laird, and Guy McCusker. Imperative programs as proofs via game semantics. *CoRR*, abs/1307.2004, 2013.
- [Day70] Brian Day. On closed categories of functors. In S. MacLane, H. Applegate, M. Barr, B. Day, E. Dubuc, Phreilambud, A. Pultr, R. Street, M. Tierney, and S. Swierczkowski, editors, *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar IV*, pages 1–38, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1970. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [DE11] Vincent Danos and Thomas Ehrhard. Probabilistic coherence spaces as a model of higher-order probabilistic computation. *Information and Computation*, 209(6):966 – 991, 2011.
- [DH00] V. Danos and R. Harmer. Probabilistic game semantics. In *Proceedings Fifteenth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (Cat. No.99CB36332)*, pages 204–213, June 2000.
- [Dij97] Edsger Wybe Dijkstra. *A Discipline of Programming*. Prentice Hall PTR, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1st edition, 1997.
- [EK66] Samuel Eilenberg and G.M Kelly. A generalization of the functorial calculus. *Journal of Algebra*, 3(3):366 – 375, 1966.
- [EPT18] Thomas Ehrhard, Michele Pagani, and Christine Tasson. Full abstraction for probabilistic pcf. *J. ACM*, 65(4):23:1–23:44, April 2018.
- [FH92] Matthias Felleisen and Robert Hieb. The revised report on the syntactic theories of sequential control and state. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 103(2):235 – 271, 1992.
- [Fie96] Adrian Fiech. Colimits in the category dcpo. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 6:455–468, 1996.

- [FKM16] Soichiro Fujii, Shin-ya Katsumata, and Paul-André Melliès. Towards a formal theory of graded monads. In Bart Jacobs and Christof Löding, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 513–530, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2016. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Ghi05] Dan R. Ghica. Slot games: A quantitative model of computation. In *Proceedings of the 32Nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL ’05, pages 85–97, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM.
- [GHN15] David Gepner, Rune Haugseng, and Thomas Nikolaus. Lax colimits and free fibrations in ∞ -categories, 2015.
- [GL17] William John Gowers and James Laird. Sequoidal categories and transfinite games: A coalgebraic approach to stateful objects in game semantics. In *CALCO*, 2017.
- [GL18] W. John Gowers and James D. Laird. A Fully Abstract Game Semantics for Countable Nondeterminism. In Dan Ghica and Achim Jung, editors, *27th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2018)*, volume 119 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 24:1–24:18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [SGA1] Alexander Grothendieck. *Revêtements étales et groupe fondamental (SGA 1)*, volume 224 of *Lecture notes in mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [Har99] Russell S. Harmer. Games and full abstraction for nondeterministic languages. Technical report, 1999.
- [Har06] Russell Harmer. Innocent game semantics. 2006.
- [Her00] Claudio Hermida. Representable multicategories. *Advances in tics*, 151(2):164 – 225, 2000.
- [HM99] R. Harmer and G. McCusker. A fully abstract game semantics for finite nondeterminism. In *Proceedings. 14th Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (Cat. No. PR00158)*, pages 422–430, 1999.

- [HO00] J.M.E. Hyland and C.-H.L. Ong. On full abstraction for PCF: I, II, and III. *Information and Computation*, 163(2):285 – 408, 2000.
- [JK02] G. Janelidze and G. M. Kelly. A note on actions of a monoidal category. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 9, 01 2002.
- [Joh02] Peter T Johnstone. *Sketches of an elephant: a Topos theory compendium*. Oxford logic guides. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, NY, 2002.
- [Jon95] Mark P. Jones. Functional programming with overloading and higher-order polymorphism. In *Advanced Functional Programming, First International Spring School on Advanced Functional Programming Techniques-Tutorial Text*, pages 97–136, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995. Springer-Verlag.
- [Joy77] André Joyal. Remarques sur la théorie des jeux à deux personnes. *Gazette des sciences mathématiques de Quebec*, 1(4), 1977.
- [Kle65] H. Kleisli. Every standard construction is induced by a pair of adjoint functors. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 16(3):544–546, 1965.
- [Lai] James Laird. Functional programs as coroutines: A semantic analysis. *Logical methods in computer science*. To appear.
- [Lai01] J. Laird. A fully abstract game semantics of local exceptions. In *Proceedings of LICS '01*, pages 105–114. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2001.
- [Lai02] J. Laird. A categorical semantics of higher-order store. In *Proceedings of CTCS '02*, number 69 in ENTCS. Elsevier, 2002.
- [Lai15] J. Laird. Sequential algorithms for unbounded nondeterminism. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 319:271 – 287, 2015.
- [Lai16] James Laird. Higher-order programs as coroutines. to appear, 2016.
- [Lam68] Joachim Lambek. A fixpoint theorem for complete categories. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 103(2):151–161, 1968.

- [Lam74] J. Lambek. Functional completeness of cartesian categories. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 6(3):259 – 292, 1974.
- [Lei98] Tom Leinster. Basic bicategories, 1998.
- [Lei03] Tom Leinster. Higher operads, higher categories, 2003.
- [Lev01] Paul Blain Levy. Call-by-push-value. Technical report, Queen Mary College, 2001.
- [Lev08] Paul Blain Levy. Infinite trace equivalence. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 151(2):170 – 198, 2008.
- [Lev14] Paul Blain Levy. Morphisms between plays. Lecture slides, GaLoP, 2014.
- [LN15] John Longley and Dag Normann. *Higher-Order Computability*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
- [Mac71] Saunders MacLane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5.
- [Man09] Oleksandr Manzyuk. Closed categories vs. closed multicategories, 2009.
- [Mel12] Paul-André Mellies. Parametric monads and enriched adjunctions. <https://www.irif.fr/~mellies/tensorial-logic/8-parametric-monads-and-enriched-adjunctions.pdf>, 2012. Preprint on webpage.
- [Mel14] Paul-André Mellies. A survival guide on coherence spaces. <https://www.irif.fr/~mellies/mpri/mpri-m2/mpri-mellies-lecture-notes-2.pdf>, 2014. Preprint on webpage.
- [Mel17] Paul-André Mellies. The parametric continuation monad. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 27(5):651–680, 2017.
- [Mes77] J. Meseguer. On order-complete universal algebra and enriched functorial semantics. In Marek Karpiński, editor, *Fundamentals of Computation Theory*, pages 294–301, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1977. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- [Mog91] Eugenio Moggi. Notions of computation and monads. *Information and Computation*, 93(1):55 – 92, 1991. Selections from 1989 IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science.
- [MT16] Andrzej S. Murawski and Nikos Tzevelekos. Nominal game semantics. *Found. Trends Program. Lang.*, 2(4):191–269, March 2016.
- [MTT09] Paul-André Melliès, Nicolas Tabareau, and Christine Tasson. *An Explicit Formula for the Free Exponential Modality of Linear Logic*, pages 247–260. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [Nic94] Hanno Nickau. Hereditarily sequential functionals. In *International Symposium on Logical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 253–264. Springer, 1994.
- [nLa19] nLab authors. 2-limit. <http://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/2-limit>, February 2019. Revision 52.
- [OR95] P.W. Ohearn and J.G. Riecke. Kripke logical relations and pcf. *Information and Computation*, 120(1):107 – 116, 1995.
- [Pis14] Claudio Pisani. Sequential multicategories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 29(19):496 – 541, 2014.
- [Plo77] G.D. Plotkin. LCF considered as a programming language. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(3):223 – 255, 1977.
- [PP02] Gordon Plotkin and John Power. Notions of computation determine monads. In Mogens Nielsen and Uffe Engberg, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 342–356, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Sch04] Andrea Schalk. What is a categorical model for linear logic?, October 2004.
- [Sco76] D. Scott. Data types as lattices. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(3):522–587, 1976.
- [SG12] Mike Shulman and Richard Garner. Categories, functors, and profunctors are a free cocompletion. Octoberfest 2012, October 2012.

- [Shr04] Steven E Shreve. *Stochastic calculus for finance 2, Continuous-time models*. Springer, New York, NY; Heidelberg, 2004.
- [Str72a] Ross Street. The formal theory of monads. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 2(2):149 – 168, 1972.
- [Str72b] Ross Street. Two constructions on lax functors. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques*, 13(3):217–264, 1972.
- [Str80] Ross Street. Fibrations in bicategories. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques*, 21(2):111–160, 1980.
- [TO14] Takeshi Tsukada and C.-H. Luke Ong. Innocent strategies are sheaves over plays - deterministic, non-deterministic and probabilistic innocence. *CoRR*, abs/1409.2764, 2014.
- [TO15] Takeshi Tsukada and C. H. Luke Ong. Nondeterminism in game semantics via sheaves. In *Proceedings of the 2015 30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, LICS '15, pages 220–231, Washington, DC, USA, 2015. IEEE Computer Society.