

On the Unity of Logic: a Sequential, Unpolarized Approach

Norihiro Yamada

Department of Computer Science

University of Oxford

Wolfson Building, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3QD, United Kingdom

Email: norihiro.yamada@cs.ox.ac.uk

Abstract—The present work aims to give a *unity of logic* via standard *sequential, unpolarized* games. Specifically, our vision is that there must be mathematically precise concepts of *linear refinement* and *intuitionistic restriction* of logic such that the linear refinement of *classical logic* (CL) coincides with (*classical*) *linear logic* (LL), and its intuitionistic restriction with the linear refinement of *intuitionistic logic* (IL) into *intuitionistic LL* (ILL). However, LL is, in contradiction to the name, cannot be the linear refinement of CL at least from the *game-semantic* point of view due to its *concurrency* and *polarization*. In fact, existing game semantics of LL employs concurrency, which is rather exotic to game semantics of ILL, IL or CL. Also, linear negation in LL brings polarization to logic, which is never true in (game semantics of) ILL, IL or CL. In search for the linear refinement of CL (or the *classicalization* of ILL), we carve out (a calculus of) *linear logic negative* (LL^-) from (the two-sided sequent calculus of) LL by discarding linear negation, restricting the rules Cut, $\otimes R$, $\wp L$, $\& R$, $\oplus L$ and $\multimap R$ (for they cause concurrency) in a certain way, and adding *distribution rules* to recover these rules (except $\multimap R$) and give a translation of sequents $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ for CL into the sequents $! \Delta \vdash ? \Gamma$ for LL^- . We then give a categorical semantics of LL^- , for which we introduce *why not monad* $?$, dual to the well-known of *course comonad* $!$, giving a categorical translation $\Delta \Rightarrow \Gamma \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} ?(\Delta \multimap \Gamma) \cong ! \Delta \multimap ? \Gamma$ of CL into LL^- , which is the Kleisli extension of the standard translation $\Delta \Rightarrow \Gamma \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} ! \Delta \multimap \Gamma$ of IL into ILL. Moreover, we instantiate the categorical semantics by a *fully complete* (sequential, unpolarized) game semantics of LL^- (without atoms), for which we introduce *linearity* of strategies. Moreover, employing the above categorical translations, it automatically leads to game semantics of ILL, IL and CL as well. Thus, we establish a sequential, unpolarized unity of logic, where discarding the co-Kleisli construction $(_)$; and/or the Kleisli construction $(_)$ [?], and imposing *well-bracketing* on strategies capture linear refinement and intuitionistic restriction of logic in a syntax-independent manner, respectively.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Linear Logic

Linear logic (LL) [1] is often said to be *resource-conscious* or *resource-sensitive* because it requires proofs to consume each premise exactly once to produce a conclusion. One of the achievements of LL is: Like *classical logic* (CL) [2], [3] it has an *involution* negation, and more generally the *De Morgan dualities* [1], [4], in the strict sense (i.e., not only up to logical equivalence), called *linear negation* $(_)^\perp$, while like *intuitionistic logic* (IL) [5], [6], [3] it has *constructivity* in the sense of non-trivial semantics [7], where note that neither

CL nor IL (in the form of the sequent calculi *LK* and *LJ* [8]) achieves both the dualities and the constructivity [7], [3].

Strictly speaking, LL has both classical and intuitionistic variants, *CLL* and *ILL*, and LL usually refers to CLL [9], [10]. Let us call the standard (and two-sided) sequent calculi for LL and ILL [1], [9], [3], [10] *LLK* and *LLJ*, respectively.

B. Game Semantics

Game semantics [11], [12] refers to a particular kind of *semantics of logic and computation* [13], [14], [15], in which formulas (or types) and proofs (or programs) are interpreted as *games* and *strategies*, respectively.

A game is a certain kind of a rooted forest whose branches correspond to possible developments or (*valid*) *positions* of the ‘game in the usual sense’ (such as chess and poker). These branches are finite sequences of *moves* of the game; a play of the game proceeds as its participants, *Player* who represents a ‘mathematician’ (or an ‘agent’) and *Opponent* who represents a ‘rebutter’ (or an ‘environment’), alternately and separately perform moves allowed by the *rules* of the game.

On the other hand, a strategy on a game is what tells Player which move she should perform at each of her turns, i.e., ‘how she should play’, on the game.

C. Concurrency and Polarization in Logic and Games

Problems in the game semantics of LL by Andreas Blass [16] were the starting point of game semantics in its modern, *categorical* form [17]. Today, Guy McCusker’s variant [18] models ILL and IL in a *unified* manner, embodying *Girard’s translation* $A \Rightarrow B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !A \multimap B$ of IL into ILL [1]. Even game semantics of computation with classical features has been proposed [19], [20] though game semantics of CL in general has not been well-established yet.

Notably, modern game semantics of LL [21], [22] employs *concurrent* games, in which more than one participant may be active simultaneously, as opposed to standard *sequential* games, in which only one participant may perform a move at a time. Importantly, however, *concurrency is not necessary at all for game semantics of CL* mentioned above.

Another approach is to model the *polarized* fragment of LL by *polarized* (yet sequential) games [23]. A game has the *positive* (resp. *negative*) polarity if Player (resp. Opponent) always initiates a play of the game [23]; standard *unpolarized* games

are all negative. Also, polarization in games corresponds to polarization in logic [4], [24], giving a unity of logic.

However, polarization is rather exotic to (game semantics of) CL; hence, it seems to have nothing to do with *classicalization* of logic or games. Also, polarization never occurs in (game semantics of) ILL, and therefore, it appears irrelevant to *linear refinement* of logic.

D. Sequential, Unpolarized Unity of Logic

Hence, we are concerned with LL *without concurrency or polarization*, which let us call *linear logic negative* (LL^-), and moreover, conjecture that there are mathematically precise concepts of *linear refinement* and *intuitionistic restriction* of logic such that the linear refinement of CL coincides with LL^- , and its intuitionistic restriction with the linear refinement of IL into ILL, giving a sequential, unpolarized *unity* of logic (n.b., classicalization is the inverse of intuitionistic restriction).

Motivated in this way, we carve out the language of LL^- from that of LL by discarding linear negation (for it brings polarization) and a sequent calculus LLK^- for LL^- from LLK by restricting the rules Cut, $\otimes R$, $\wp L$, $\& R$, $\oplus L$ and $\multimap R$ (for they cause concurrency) in a certain way and adding *distribution rules* to recover these rules (except $\multimap R$) and translate sequents $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ in LK^- into the sequents $!\Delta \vdash ?\Gamma$ in LLK^- , where LK^- is the calculus obtained from LK by restricting $\Rightarrow R$ in the same way as $\multimap R$ in LLK^- . We then give a cut-elimination procedure on LLK^- by *normalization-by-evaluation* (NBE) [25], exploiting the game semantics below.

In terms of these calculi, linear refinement corresponds to eliminating exponentials ! and/or ? imposed (implicitly) in LK^- and LJ, and intuitionistic restriction to limiting the number of formulas on the RHS of sequents to at most one. In other words, LK^- (resp. LJ) is obtained from LLK^- (resp. LLJ) by the translation $\Delta \vdash_{LK^-} \Gamma \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !\Delta \vdash_{LLK^-} ?\Gamma$ (resp. $\Delta \vdash_{LJ} B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !\Delta \vdash_{LLJ} B$), and LLJ (resp. LJ) from LLK^- (resp. LK^-) by intuitionistic restriction, and the two operations commute, where the subscripts indicate the underlying calculi.

E. Sequential, Unpolarized Unity of Games

We then aim to establish the game-semantic counterpart of the unity on LLK^- , LK^- , LLJ and LJ. Let us first explain our approach in terms of *categorical logic* [26], [27]. Recall that the standard categorical semantics of ILL (without \perp or \oplus) is a *new-Seely category* (NSC) [28], which is a *symmetric monoidal closed category* (SMCC) $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \multimap)$ with finite products $(1, \&)$ equipped with a comonad ! and isomorphisms $\top \xrightarrow{\sim} !1$ and $!A \otimes !B \xrightarrow{\sim} !(A \& B)$ natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the canonical adjunction between \mathcal{C} and the co-Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}_!$ is monoidal. Its charm is its *unified* semantics of ILL and IL: $\mathcal{C}_!$ is cartesian closed, inducing the standard semantics of IL (without \perp or \vee) [26], [27].

Then, to model LL^- , it is a natural idea to impose on \mathcal{C} another symmetric monoidal structure (\wp, \perp) , finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$, a monad ? and natural isomorphisms $?0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \perp$ and $?(A \oplus B) \xrightarrow{\sim} ?A \wp ?B$ such that the canonical adjunction between \mathcal{C} and the Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}^?$ is monoidal. However,

it is not possible; thus, we require that \mathcal{C} is equipped with a lluf subcategory $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ whose morphisms are all *strict*, which has the NSC-structure inherited from \mathcal{C} (except \multimap), finite coproducts and the triple $(\wp, \perp, ?)$. Moreover, we impose a *distributive law* between ! and ? [29] on $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ so that the co-Kleisli and the Kleisli constructions on $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ are extended to each other, leading to the *bi-Kleisli category* $\sharp\mathcal{C}_!^? \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\sharp\mathcal{C}_!)^? \simeq (\sharp\mathcal{C}^?)_!$. Then, if $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ has certain natural transformations/isomorphisms, it models LLK^- , and $\sharp\mathcal{C}_!^?$ does LK^- , while \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{C}_!$ do LLJ and LJ.

Finally, we instantiate the categorical semantics by a game-semantic NSC \mathcal{LG} satisfying the required axioms, for which we introduce *linearity* of strategies. As the main theorem, we establish a *fully complete* [30] game semantics of LLK^- (without atoms) in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ and a game semantics of LK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}_!^?$. Also, focusing on the intuitionistic part of the interpretations, we establish a fully complete game semantics of LLJ (without atoms) in the lluf subNSC \mathcal{LG}^{wb} of \mathcal{LG} , in which strategies are *well-bracketed* [31], and a game semantics of LJ in $\mathcal{LG}_!^{\text{wb}}$.

Thus, we establish a semantic unity of logic, where linear refinement and intuitionistic restriction correspond respectively to deletion of the co-Kleisli construction $(_)_!$ and/or the Kleisli construction $(_)^?$, and imposing well-bracketing on strategies.

F. Our Contribution and Related Work

Broadly, our main contribution is to establish the novel, in particular sequential and unpolarized, unity of logic in terms of sequent calculi, categories and games. Novelties are the unified (categorical and game) semantics and linearity of strategies; highlights are the full completeness results.

Our approach stands in sharp contrast to the concurrent and/or polarized approaches [21], [22], [23], [32], [33], [34] for they stick to LL or its polarized fragments, while we modify the logic into the sequential, unpolarized LL^- .

Our categorical account is based on the established categorical semantics of ILL [35], [36], [37], [28] and of IL [26], [27], as well as the study of the relation between monad and comonad [29] and its application in game semantics [38].

G. Structure of the Paper

We first present the sequent calculi in Sect. II, and the categorical semantics in Sect. III. Then, we establish the game semantics in Sect. IV together with some consequences in Sect. V. Finally, we show the full completeness in Sect. VI, and draw a conclusion and propose future work in Sect. VII.

II. SEQUENT CALCULI FOR THE LOGICS

We assume that the reader is familiar with the formal languages and the sequent calculi for *classical logic* (CL) and *intuitionistic logic* (IL) [8], [3], and those for *linear logic* (LL) and *intuitionistic linear logic* (ILL) [1], [3], [9].

Throughout the paper, we focus on *propositional* logic [39].

A. Sequent Calculi for Classical and Intuitionistic Logics

Let us first present our sequent calculi LK^- for CL, and LJ for IL. Roughly, LK^- is obtained from Gentzen's LK [8] by restricting the rule $(\Rightarrow R) \frac{\Delta, A \vdash B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash A \Rightarrow B, \Gamma}$ to $\Rightarrow R^-$ given in Fig. 1 (so that they can be modeled by *sequential* game semantics).

As minor points, we *define* negation \neg by $\neg A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} A \Rightarrow \perp$, and include *top* \top and the right-rule on *bottom* \perp for our *unified* approach. Also, we modify $\wedge L$ and $\vee R$ into the ones closer to the calculi for (I)LL [1], [3] for convenience, which, in the presence of the structural rules, does not matter.

Definition 1 (LK^-). The calculus LK^- for CL consists of the rules in Fig. 1.

$$\begin{array}{l}
(\text{ID}) \frac{}{A \vdash A} \quad (\text{CUT}) \frac{\Delta \vdash B, \Gamma \quad \Delta', B \vdash \Gamma'}{\Delta, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma'} \\
(\text{XL}) \frac{\Delta, A, A', \Delta' \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A', A, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\text{XR}) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma, B, B', \Gamma'}{\Delta \vdash \Gamma, B', B, \Gamma'} \\
(\text{WL}) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\text{WR}) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B, \Gamma} \\
(\text{CL}) \frac{\Delta, A, A \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\text{CR}) \frac{\Delta \vdash B, B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B, \Gamma} \\
(\top L) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, \top \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\top R) \frac{}{\vdash \top} \\
(\perp L) \frac{}{\perp \vdash} \quad (\perp R) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \perp, \Gamma} \\
(\wedge L) \frac{\Delta, A_1, A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A_1 \wedge A_2 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\wedge R) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1, \Gamma \quad \Delta \vdash B_2, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \wedge B_2, \Gamma} \\
(\vee L) \frac{\Delta, A_1 \vdash \Gamma \quad \Delta, A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A_1 \vee A_2 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\vee R) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1, B_2, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \vee B_2, \Gamma} \\
(\Rightarrow L) \frac{\Delta \vdash A, \Gamma \quad \Delta, B \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A \Rightarrow B \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\Rightarrow R) \frac{A \vdash B, \Gamma}{\vdash A \Rightarrow B, \Gamma}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. The sequent calculus LK^- for CL

In Sect. V, we give a *cut-elimination* procedure [8], [3] on LK^- by *normalization-by-evaluation* (NBE) [25], exploiting the *fully complete* game semantics given in Sect. IV.

If one identifies sequents *up to currying*, which is implicitly assumed by the *one-sided* calculus for CL [3] and justified by the game semantics, the change of $\Rightarrow R$ into $\Rightarrow R^-$ is not a real restriction. In this sense, LK^- is equivalent to LK .

Definition 2 (LJ [8], [3]). The calculus LJ for IL consists of the rules of LK that have only *intuitionistic* sequents, i.e., ones such that the number of formulas on the RHS is ≤ 1 .

B. Sequent Calculi for Linear Logic

In the present work, let us call the sequent calculi for LL and ILL [1], [3] LLK and LLJ , respectively. As mentioned in the introduction, LL and LLK are *concurrent* and *polarized*; thus, we introduce the following *sequential, unpolarized* fragment:

Notation. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\bar{n} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Definition 3 (LL^- and LLK^-). The formal language of *linear logic negative* (LL^-) is obtained from that of LL by discarding linear negation $(_)^\perp$. The calculus LLK^- for LL^- consists of the rules in Fig. 2, where $f(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} f A_1, f A_2, \dots, f A_k$ for all $f \in \{!, ?\}$.

That is, LLK^- is obtained from LLK by discarding linear negation $(_)^\perp$, restricting the rules (CUT) $\frac{\Delta \vdash B, \Gamma \quad \Delta', B \vdash \Gamma'}{\Delta, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma'}$,

$$\begin{array}{l}
(!L) \frac{\Delta, ?!A \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, ?!A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (!R) \frac{\Delta \vdash ?!B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash ?!B, \Gamma} \\
(\otimes L) \frac{\Delta, (A \otimes B) \wp C \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A, B \wp C \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\otimes R) \frac{\Delta \vdash A \otimes (B \wp C), \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash A \otimes B, C, \Gamma} \\
(\text{ID}) \frac{}{A \vdash A} \quad (\text{CUT}^-) \frac{\Delta \vdash B \quad \Delta', B \vdash \Gamma'}{\Delta, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma'} \\
(\text{XL}) \frac{\Delta, A, A', \Delta' \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A', A, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\text{XR}) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma, B, B', \Gamma'}{\Delta \vdash \Gamma, B', B, \Gamma'} \\
(!W) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, !A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (?W) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash ?B, \Gamma} \\
(!C) \frac{\Delta, !A, !A \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, !A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (?C) \frac{\Delta \vdash ?B, ?B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash ?B, \Gamma} \\
(\text{ID}) \frac{\Delta, A \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, !A \vdash \Gamma} \quad (?D) \frac{\Delta \vdash B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash ?B, \Gamma} \\
(?L) \frac{! \Delta, A \vdash ? \Gamma}{! \Delta, ?A \vdash ? \Gamma} \quad (!R) \frac{! \Delta \vdash B, ? \Gamma}{! \Delta \vdash !B, ? \Gamma} \\
(0L) \frac{}{0 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (1R) \frac{}{\Delta \vdash 1, \Gamma} \\
(\top L) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, \top \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\top R) \frac{}{\vdash \top} \quad (\perp L) \frac{}{\perp \vdash} \quad (\perp R) \frac{\Delta \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \perp, \Gamma} \\
(\otimes L) \frac{\Delta, A_1, A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A_1 \otimes A_2 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\otimes R^-) \frac{\Delta_1 \vdash B_1 \quad \Delta_2 \vdash B_2}{\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash B_1 \otimes B_2} \\
(\& L) \frac{\Delta, A_i \vdash \Gamma \quad i \in \bar{2}}{\Delta, A_1 \& A_2 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\& R^-) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1 \quad \Delta \vdash B_2}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \& B_2} \\
(\wp L^-) \frac{A_1 \vdash \Gamma_1 \quad A_2 \vdash \Gamma_2}{A_1 \wp A_2 \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2} \quad (\wp R) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1, B_2, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \wp B_2, \Gamma} \\
(\oplus L^-) \frac{A_1 \vdash \Gamma \quad A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{A_1 \oplus A_2 \vdash \Gamma} \quad (\oplus R) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_i, \Gamma \quad i \in \bar{2}}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \oplus B_2, \Gamma} \\
(\multimap L) \frac{\Delta_1 \vdash A, \Gamma_1 \quad \Delta_2, B \vdash \Gamma_2}{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, A \multimap B \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2} \quad (\multimap R^-) \frac{A \vdash B, \Gamma}{\vdash A \multimap B, \Gamma}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. The sequent calculus LLK^- for LL^-

$(\otimes R) \frac{\Delta_1 \vdash B_1, \Gamma_1 \quad \Delta_2 \vdash B_2, \Gamma_2}{\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \vdash B_1 \otimes B_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2}$, $(\wp L) \frac{\Delta_1, A_1 \vdash \Gamma_1 \quad \Delta_2, A_2 \vdash \Gamma_2}{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, A_1 \wp A_2 \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2}$, $(\& R) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1, \Gamma \quad \Delta \vdash B_2, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \& B_2, \Gamma}$, $(\oplus L) \frac{\Delta, A_1 \vdash \Gamma \quad \Delta, A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A_1 \oplus A_2 \vdash \Gamma}$ and $(\multimap R) \frac{\Delta, A \multimap B, \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash A \multimap B, \Gamma}$, respectively, to Cut^- , $\otimes R^-$, $\wp L^-$, $\& R^-$, $\oplus L^-$ and $\multimap R^-$ given in Fig. 2, and adding the *distribution rules* $!L$, $!R$, $\otimes \wp L$ and $\otimes \wp R$. It is easy to see that Cut , $\otimes R$ and $\wp L$ are derivable in LLK^- in the presence of $\otimes \wp L$ and $\otimes \wp R$. For example, Cut is derived in LLK^- by:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Delta' \vdash \otimes \Delta'}{\Delta', \Delta \vdash (\otimes \Delta')} \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash \wp(B, \Gamma)}{\Delta \vdash \wp(B, \Gamma)} \quad \frac{\Delta', B \vdash \Gamma'}{\otimes(\Delta', B) \vdash \Gamma'} \quad \frac{\otimes(\Delta', B) \wp (\wp \Gamma) \vdash \Gamma'}{\otimes(\Delta', B) \wp (\wp \Gamma) \vdash \Gamma', \Gamma}}{\Delta', \Delta \vdash \otimes(\Delta', B) \wp (\wp \Gamma)} \quad \frac{\Delta', \Delta \vdash \Gamma', \Gamma}{\Delta, \Delta' \vdash \Gamma, \Gamma'}$$

where the double line indicates a multiple application of rules, $\otimes \epsilon \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \top$, $\otimes(\Delta, A) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\otimes \Delta) \otimes A$, $\wp \epsilon \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \perp$ and $\wp(\Gamma, B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\wp \Gamma) \wp B$. These *derived* Cut , $\otimes R$ and $\wp L$ faithfully represent our categorical semantics given in Sect. III.

On the other hand, the remaining two distribution rules $!L$ and $!R$ enable us to translate LK^- into LLK^- :

Theorem 4 (Translation of LK^- into LLK^-). *There is a translation \mathcal{T}_c of formulas and proofs that assigns, to every proof p of a sequent $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ in LK^- , a proof $\mathcal{T}_c(p)$ of a sequent $!\mathcal{T}_c^*(\Delta) \vdash ?\mathcal{T}_c^*(\Gamma)$ in LLK^- , where $\mathcal{T}_c(\top) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \top$, $\mathcal{T}_c(\perp) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \perp$, $\mathcal{T}_c(A \wedge B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} ?\mathcal{T}_c(A) \& ?\mathcal{T}_c(B)$, $\mathcal{T}_c(A \vee B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !\mathcal{T}_c(A) \oplus !\mathcal{T}_c(B)$ and $\mathcal{T}_c(A \Rightarrow B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !? \mathcal{T}_c(A) \multimap ?! \mathcal{T}_c(B)$.*

Proof. We shall translate each rule of LK^- into a proof tree in LLK^- . First, note that we have shown that Cut is admissible in LLK^- ; then, Cut of LK^- is translated into LLK^- by:

$$\frac{\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?B, ?\Gamma}{!\Delta \vdash !?B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{!\Delta', !B \vdash ?\Gamma'}{!\Delta', !?B \vdash ?\Gamma'}}{!\Delta, !\Delta' \vdash ?\Gamma, ?\Gamma'}$$

WL, WR, CL, CR, XL and XR of LK^- are translated, by !W, ?W, !C, ?C, XL and XR of LLK^- , respectively, and Id of LK^- by Id, !D and ?D of LLK^- , in the obvious manner.

$\top L$ and $\top R$ of LK^- are translated by:

$$\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?\Gamma}{!\Delta, \top \vdash ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{\vdash \top}{\vdash ?\top}$$

respectively into LLK^- ; $\perp L$ and $\perp R$ are symmetric.

$\wedge L$ of LK^- is translated into LLK^- by:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{!\Delta, !A_1, !A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma}{!\Delta, ?!A_1, ?!A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma}}{!\Delta, !?A_1, !?A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma}}{(\text{Sub}_{?!A_1, ?A_2}^{\otimes, \&}) \frac{!\Delta, !?A_1 \otimes !?A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma}{!\Delta, !(?A_1 \& ?A_2) \vdash ?\Gamma}}$$

where $\text{Sub}_{X,Y}^{\otimes, \&}$ is Cut^- with:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{X \vdash X}{X \& Y \vdash X}}{!(X \& Y) \vdash X} \quad \frac{\frac{Y \vdash Y}{X \& Y \vdash Y}}{!(X \& Y) \vdash Y}}{!(X \& Y), !(X \& Y) \vdash !X \otimes !Y} \quad \frac{}{!(X \& Y) \vdash !X \otimes !Y}$$

Next, it is not hard to translate $(\wedge \vee L) \frac{\Delta, (A \wedge B) \vee C \vdash \Gamma}{\Delta, A \wedge (B \vee C) \vdash \Gamma}$ and $(\wedge \vee R) \frac{\Delta \vdash A \wedge (B \vee C), \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C, \Gamma}$ into LLK^- (by $\otimes \mathfrak{A}L$, $\otimes \mathfrak{A}R$, $?\mathfrak{L}$ and $!R$); we omit the details for lack of space. Thus, translations of $\wedge R$ and $\vee L$ are reduced to those of $(\wedge R^-) \frac{\Delta \vdash B_1 \quad \Delta \vdash B_2}{\Delta \vdash B_1 \wedge B_2}$ and $(\vee L^-) \frac{A_1 \vdash \Gamma \quad A_2 \vdash \Gamma}{A_1 \vee A_2 \vdash \Gamma}$, respectively, in the obvious way.

Then, a translation of $\wedge R^-$ is very simple:

$$\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?B_1 \quad !\Delta \vdash ?B_2}{!\Delta \vdash ?B_1 \& ?B_2} \quad \frac{}{!\Delta \vdash !(?B_1 \& ?B_2)}$$

Similarly, $\vee L^-$ is translated by:

$$\frac{!A_1 \vdash ?\Gamma \quad !A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma}{!A_1 \oplus !A_2 \vdash ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{!(A_1 \oplus A_2) \vdash ?\Gamma}$$

Also, $\vee R$ is translated by:

$$\frac{\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?B_1, ?B_2, ?\Gamma}{!\Delta, \vdash !?B_1, !?B_2, ?\Gamma}}{!\Delta, \vdash ?!B_1, ?!B_2, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{(\text{Sub}_{!B_1, !B_2}^{\oplus, \mathfrak{A}} \mathfrak{A} ?\Gamma) \frac{!\Delta, \vdash (?!B_1 \mathfrak{A} ?!B_2) \mathfrak{A} ?\Gamma}{!\Delta \vdash ?(B_1 \oplus B_2), ?\Gamma}}$$

where $\text{Sub}_{X,Y}^{\oplus, \mathfrak{A}} \mathfrak{A} Z$ is Cut^- with:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{X \vdash X}{X \vdash X \oplus Y}}{X \vdash ?(X \oplus Y)} \quad \frac{\frac{Y \vdash Y}{Y \vdash X \oplus Y}}{Y \vdash ?(X \oplus Y)}}{?X \vdash ?(X \oplus Y) \quad ?Y \vdash ?(X \oplus Y)} \quad \frac{}{?X \mathfrak{A} ?Y \vdash ?(X \oplus Y), ?(X \oplus Y)} \quad \frac{}{?X \mathfrak{A} ?Y \vdash ?(X \oplus Y)} \quad \frac{Z \vdash Z}{(?X \mathfrak{A} ?Y) \mathfrak{A} Z \vdash ?(X \oplus Y), Z}$$

Next, $\Rightarrow L$ is translated by:

$$\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?A, ?\Gamma \quad !\Delta, !B \vdash ?\Gamma}{!\Delta \vdash !?A, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{!\Delta, !?A \multimap ?!B \vdash ?\Gamma, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{!\Delta, !(?!A \multimap ?!B) \vdash ?\Gamma}$$

and $\Rightarrow R^-$ by:

$$\frac{!\Delta \vdash ?B, ?\Gamma}{?!A \vdash ?B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{?!A \vdash ?B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{?!A \vdash !?B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{?!A \vdash ?!B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{\vdash !?A \multimap ?!B, ?\Gamma} \quad \frac{}{\vdash ?(?!A \multimap ?!B), ?\Gamma}$$

which completes the proof. \square

The translation \mathcal{T}_c of Thm. 4 is, as far as we are concerned, a novel one. In contrast to the translations of CL into LL given in [1], [4], [32], [23], our translation is *unpolarized*.

Finally, note that the following standard result (Thm. 6) can be seen as the *intuitionistic restriction* of Thm. 4 (except \vee):

Definition 5 (LLJ [9], [10]). The formal language of ILL is obtained from that of LL by discarding $(_)^\perp$, $?$ and \mathfrak{A} . The calculus **LLJ** for ILL consists of the rules of LLK that have only intuitionistic sequents.

Theorem 6 (Translation of LJ into LLJ [1], [4]). *There is a translation \mathcal{T}_i of formulas and proofs that assigns, to every proof p of a sequent $\Delta \vdash B$ in LJ, a proof $\mathcal{T}_i(p)$ of a sequent $!\mathcal{T}_i^*(\Delta) \vdash \mathcal{T}_i^*(B)$ in LLJ, where $\mathcal{T}_i(\top) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \top$, $\mathcal{T}_i(\perp) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \perp$, $\mathcal{T}_i(A \wedge B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{T}_i(A) \& \mathcal{T}_i(B)$, $\mathcal{T}_i(A \vee B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !\mathcal{T}_i(A) \oplus !\mathcal{T}_i(B)$ and $\mathcal{T}_i(A \Rightarrow B) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !\mathcal{T}_i(A) \multimap \mathcal{T}_i(B)$.*

Remark. Note that \mathcal{T}_c translates $\vee L$ in terms of $\oplus L^-$ by utilizing distribution rules, while \mathcal{T}_i translates $\vee L$ in terms of $\oplus L$. Nevertheless, except the mismatch between the translations of $\vee L$, \mathcal{T}_i can be seen as the intuitionistic restriction of \mathcal{T}_c .

III. CATEGORICAL SEMANTICS

Next, we proceed to give *categorical semantics* [26], [27] of the sequent calculi introduced in Sect. II in a *unified* manner.

We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic concepts of *symmetric monoidal (closed) categories* ($SM(C)Cs$) and *monoidal adjoints* [40], [28]. To indicate what is to be modeled, we frequently employ notations from LL for categorical structures in this section. Also, we often do not specify natural isomorphisms even if they are part of a categorical structure.

Remark. Since cut-eliminations on the calculi are given in Sect. V, we postpone (equational) soundness/completeness of the semantics to Sect. V, and in this section just assign objects and morphisms to formulas and proofs, respectively.

A. Categorical Semantics of ILL and IL

Let us first recall the standard categorical semantics of LLJ (without \perp or \oplus), introducing a nonstandard terminology:

Definition 7 (BwLSMCs). A SMC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top)$ is **backward liberalizable** (**BwL**) if it has finite products $(1, \&)$ and is equipped with:

- A comonad $! = (!, \epsilon, \delta)$ on \mathcal{C} such that the canonical adjunction between \mathcal{C} and the co-Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}_!$ of \mathcal{C} over $!$ is monoidal;
- Isomorphisms $\top \xrightarrow{\sim} !1$ and $!A \otimes !B \xrightarrow{\sim} !(A \& B)$ natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$.

In other words, a BwLSMC is simply a **new-Seely category** (NSC) [28] without a *closed* structure \multimap ; it is just to state Thm. 13 and Def. 16 concisely. Recall that NSCs give a (equationally sound and complete) semantics of ILL without \perp or \oplus (w.r.t. the term calculus given in [36], [37]):

Theorem 8 (Semantics of ILL without \perp or \oplus [28]). *NSCs give a semantics of LLJ without \perp or \oplus .*

Recall that a strong advantage of NSCs is the following:

Theorem 9 (CCCs via NSCs [35], [28]). *The co-Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}_!$ of a NSC \mathcal{C} over the equipped comonad $!$ is cartesian closed.*

Proof (sketch). Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \multimap, !)$ be a NSC, and $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_!$. First, we may give, as a terminal object and a binary product of A and B in $\mathcal{C}_!$, a terminal object 1 and a diagram $A \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{A \& B; \pi_1}} !(A \& B) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{A \& B; \pi_2}} B$ in \mathcal{C} , respectively.

Next, we may give $!A \multimap B \in \mathcal{C}$ as an exponential object $A \Rightarrow B$ from A to B in $\mathcal{C}_!$. In fact, we have an isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_!(A \& B, C) &= \mathcal{C}(! (A \& B), C) \\ &\cong \mathcal{C}(!A \otimes !B, C) \\ &\cong \mathcal{C}(!A, !B \multimap C) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_!(A, B \Rightarrow C) \end{aligned}$$

natural in $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$. \square

The *linear decomposition* $A \Rightarrow B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !A \multimap B$ of exponential objects in $\mathcal{C}_!$ into the comonad $!$ and the closed structure \multimap in \mathcal{C} is the categorical counterpart of Girard's

translation [1], and it gives a *unified* semantics of ILL and IL, where note that CCCs give the standard categorical semantics of IL (without \perp or \vee) [26], [27]. What about \perp and \vee ?

It then seems a natural idea to add finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$ to the NSC \mathcal{C} . As pointed out in [35], however, finite coproducts in \mathcal{C} become *weak* in $\mathcal{C}_!$: The morphism $!0 \xrightarrow{\epsilon_0} 0 \dashrightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} is a morphism $0 \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{C}_!$ for each $A \in \mathcal{C}$, but it may not be unique for $!0$ is not necessarily initial in \mathcal{C} ; also, it seems reasonable to take, as a coproduct of $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_!$ in $\mathcal{C}_!$, a coproduct $!A \xrightarrow{\iota_A} !A \oplus !B \xrightarrow{\iota_B} !B$ in \mathcal{C} , but the induced copairings in $\mathcal{C}_!$ do not necessarily satisfy uniqueness as they may not be copairings in \mathcal{C} . Meanwhile, this construction clearly works for *weak* coproducts in \mathcal{C} as well, which is important as the game-semantic NSC in Sect. IV has only weak ones. To summarize:

Corollary 10 (Semantics of ILL and IL [35], [28]). *A NSC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \multimap, !)$ with weak finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$ gives a semantics of LLJ. Moreover, the co-Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}_!$ has:*

- *Finite products just given by finite products $(1, \&)$ in \mathcal{C} ;*
- *Exponential objects given by $A \Rightarrow B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !A \multimap B$ in \mathcal{C} for all $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_!$;*
- *Weak finite coproducts given by $(0, !(_)\oplus!(_))$ in \mathcal{C}*

and thus, $\mathcal{C}_!$ gives a semantics of LJ [26], [27].

Note that the derivation of the categorical semantics of IL in $\mathcal{C}_!$ from that of ILL in \mathcal{C} coincides with the translation $\mathcal{T}_!$.

B. Categorical Semantics of LL⁻ and CL

Our main idea on modeling LLK⁻ is then to introduce the following symmetric structure to BwLSMCs:

Definition 11 (FwLSMCs). A SMC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \wp, \perp)$ is **forward-liberalizable** (**FwL**) if it has finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$ and is equipped with:

- A monad $? = (?, \eta, \mu)$ on \mathcal{C} such that the canonical adjunction between \mathcal{C} and the Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}^?$ of \mathcal{C} over $?$ is monoidal;
- Isomorphisms $?0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \perp$ and $?(A \oplus B) \xrightarrow{\sim} ?A \wp ?B$ natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$.

Corollary 12 (Coproducts and weak products in FwLSMCs). *The Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}^?$ of a FwLSMC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \wp, \perp, ?)$ with weak finite products $(1, \&)$ has:*

- *Finite coproducts given by finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$ in \mathcal{C} ;*
- *Weak finite products given by $(1, ?(_)\&?(_))$ in \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. Symmetric to Cor. 10. \square

Naturally, it seems a reasonable idea to require the FwL-structure on NSCs to model LLK⁻, but it is impossible for the game-semantic NSC \mathcal{LG} in Sect. IV: The game-semantic \wp and $?$ are not well-defined on *non-strict* [15], [18] strategies; they may generate *concurrent* (or *nondeterministic*) strategies from non-strict, sequential (or deterministic) strategies. As we shall see, the non-strictness is caused by *currying* of strategies, i.e., the closed and the FwL-structures of \mathcal{LG} are incompatible.

This suggests employing the lluf subBwLSMC $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ of \mathcal{LG} whose strategies are all *strict*. Of course, $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ is *not closed*, but

currying w.r.t. the entire domain and uncurrying w.r.t. the entire codomain are possible. This observation actually motivates the rules $\Rightarrow R^-$ and $\neg O R^-$ given in Sect. II. It also leads to:

Lemma 13 (Semantics of LL^-). A NSC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \neg, !)$ equipped with a FwLSMC $\sharp\mathcal{C} = (\sharp\mathcal{C}, \wp, \perp, ?)$ such that:

- 1) $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ is a lluf subBwLSMC of \mathcal{C} , in which \top is terminal, \perp is initial, $\sharp\mathcal{C}(A, \perp) = \mathcal{C}(A, \perp)$ and $\sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, B) = \mathcal{C}(\top, B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$;
- 2) It is equipped with the following morphisms in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$:

$$\Omega_{A,B,C} : A \otimes (B \wp C) \rightarrow (A \otimes B) \wp C$$

$$\Upsilon_A : !\top A \rightarrow ?!A$$

$$\Sigma_{A,B} : !(A \wp ?B) \rightarrow ?!A \wp ?B$$

$$\Pi_{A,B} : !A \otimes ?B \rightarrow ?(!A \wp B)$$

natural in $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$;

- 3) It is equipped with the following isomorphisms in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$:

$$A \wp \top \cong \top \quad (1)$$

$$A \neg B \cong \neg A \wp B \quad (2)$$

natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\neg A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} A \neg \perp$;

gives a semantics of LLK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. We interpret proofs of each sequent $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m \vdash B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n$ in LLK^- by morphisms $A_1 \otimes A_2 \cdots \otimes A_m \rightarrow B_1 \wp B_2 \cdots \wp B_n$ in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ by induction on the proofs, where we indicate the interpretation of logical constants and connectives of LL^- by the notation for \mathcal{C} (n.b., the domain of the morphisms is \top if $m = 0$, and the codomain is \perp if $n = 0$).

First, Id , $\top R$ and $\perp L$ are interpreted by identities in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$. We may handle $\top L$ and $\perp R$ by the unit laws of \top and \perp , and $1R$ and $0L$ by (1) and initiality of 0 , respectively. Also, the distribution rules are modeled by Ω and Υ in the obvious way.

We interpret Cut^- by $\frac{f:\Delta \rightarrow B \quad f':\Delta' \otimes B \rightarrow \Gamma'}{\Delta \otimes \Delta' \xrightarrow{\varpi_{\Delta, \Delta'}} \Delta' \otimes \Delta \xrightarrow{id_{\Delta'} \otimes f} \Delta' \otimes B \xrightarrow{f'} \Gamma'}$, where $\varpi_{\Delta, \Delta'}$ is the symmetry w.r.t. \otimes .

The interpretations of $\otimes L$ and $\wp R$ may be reduced to the induction hypotheses; $\otimes R^-$ and $\wp L^-$ are interpreted by $\frac{f_1:\Delta_1 \rightarrow B_1 \quad f_2:\Delta_2 \rightarrow B_2}{f_1 \otimes f_2:\Delta_1 \otimes \Delta_2 \rightarrow B_1 \otimes B_2}$ and $\frac{g_1:A_1 \rightarrow \Gamma_1 \quad g_2:A_2 \rightarrow \Gamma_2}{g_1 \wp g_2:A_1 \wp A_2 \rightarrow \Gamma_1 \wp \Gamma_2}$.

The interpretations of $\& L$ and $\oplus R$ are given by $\frac{l_i:\Delta \otimes A_i \rightarrow \Gamma \quad i \in \overline{2}}{\Delta \otimes (A_1 \& A_2) \xrightarrow{id_{\Delta} \otimes \pi_i} \Delta \otimes A_i \xrightarrow{l_i} \Gamma}$ and $\frac{r_i:\Delta \rightarrow B_i \wp \Gamma \quad i \in \overline{2}}{\Delta \xrightarrow{r_i} B_i \wp \Gamma \xrightarrow{\iota_i \wp id_{\Gamma}} (B_1 \oplus B_2) \wp \Gamma}$, and those of $\& R^-$ and $\oplus L^-$ by $\frac{r_1:\Delta \rightarrow B_1 \quad r_2:\Delta \rightarrow B_2}{\langle r_1, r_2 \rangle:\Delta \rightarrow B_1 \& B_2}$ and by $\frac{l_1:A_1 \rightarrow \Gamma \quad l_2:A_2 \rightarrow \Gamma}{[l_1, l_2]:A_1 \oplus A_2 \rightarrow \Gamma}$, respectively.

The interpretation of $\neg O L$ is given as follows. Given $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\Phi_{A,B,C,D} : A \otimes B \otimes (C \wp D) \rightarrow (A \otimes C) \wp (B \otimes D)$ be the natural transformation obtained by composing Ω and symmetries w.r.t. \otimes in the obvious manner. Then, given $h_1 : \Delta_1 \rightarrow A \wp \Gamma_1$ and $h_2 : \Delta_2 \otimes B \rightarrow \Gamma_2$ in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$, we compose $(A \wp \Gamma_1) \otimes \neg A \cong (\neg A \otimes \top) \otimes (A \wp \Gamma_1) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{A, \neg A, \top, \Gamma_1}} (\neg A \otimes A) \wp (\top \otimes \Gamma_1) \cong (A \otimes \neg A) \wp \Gamma_1$, for which we write $\Phi'_{A, \Gamma_1, \neg A}$. Then, we obtain $\Delta_1 \otimes \Delta_2 \otimes (A \neg B) \xrightarrow{id_{\Delta_1} \otimes \Delta_2 \otimes (2)} \Delta_1 \otimes \Delta_2 \otimes (\neg A \wp B) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \neg A, B}} (\Delta_1 \otimes \neg A) \wp (\Delta_2 \otimes B) \xrightarrow{(h_1 \otimes id_{\neg A}) \wp h_2} ((A \wp \Gamma_1) \otimes \neg A) \wp \Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{\Phi'_{A, \Gamma_1, \neg A} \wp id_{\Gamma_2}} ((A \otimes \neg A) \wp \Gamma_1) \wp$

$\Gamma_2 \xrightarrow{((ev_{A, \perp} \circ \varpi_{A, \neg A}) \wp id_{\Gamma_1}) \wp id_{\Gamma_2}} (\perp \wp \Gamma_1) \wp \Gamma_2 \cong \Gamma_1 \wp \Gamma_2$, where $ev_{A, \perp} : \neg A \otimes A \rightarrow \perp$ is obtained from $id_{\neg A} : \neg A \rightarrow \neg A$ by uncurrying in \mathcal{C} (n.b., $ev_{A, \perp}$ must be in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ because its codomain is \perp). The interpretation of $\neg O R^-$ is by currying in \mathcal{C} , for which $\sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, B) = \mathcal{C}(\top, B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{C}$ is employed.

Note that $!D$, $!W$ and $!C$ may be handled just as in the interpretation of ILL in NSCs [36], [37]; $?D$, $?W$ and $?C$ are just symmetric. Also, XL and XR are interpreted by symmetries w.r.t. \otimes and \wp , respectively.

Finally, $?L$ is interpreted by $\frac{a:!\Delta \otimes A \rightarrow ?\Gamma}{!\Delta \otimes ?A \xrightarrow{\pi_{\Delta, A}} ?(!\Delta \otimes A) \xrightarrow{?a} ?\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mu_{\Gamma}} \Gamma}$, and $!R$ by $\frac{b:!\Delta \rightarrow B \wp ?\Gamma}{!\Delta \xrightarrow{\delta} !\Delta \xrightarrow{!b} !(B \wp ?\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{B, \Gamma}} !B \wp ?\Gamma}$. \square

In particular, for each $A \in \mathcal{C}$, currying in \mathcal{C} gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp\mathcal{C}(A, A) &\cong \sharp\mathcal{C}(\top \otimes A, A) \\ &\cong \sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, A \neg A) \\ &\cong \sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, \neg A \wp A) \text{ (by (2))} \end{aligned}$$

where $\neg A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} A \neg \perp$ is the **negation** of A . This natural bijection allows $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ to model (linear) classical laws:

- We may get:

$$lem_A \in \sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, \neg A \wp A)$$

from $id_A \in \mathcal{C}(A, A)$, which models the classical law of *excluded middle (LEM)* [3];

- We may further compose:

$$dne_A \in \sharp\mathcal{C}(\neg\neg A, A)$$

by $\neg\neg A \cong \neg\neg A \otimes \top \xrightarrow{id_{\neg\neg A} \otimes lem_A} \neg\neg A \otimes (\neg A \wp A) \cong \neg\neg A \otimes \top \otimes (\neg A \wp A) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\neg\neg A, \top, \neg A, A}} (\neg\neg A \otimes \neg A) \wp (\top \otimes A) \cong (\neg\neg A \otimes \neg A) \wp A \xrightarrow{ev_{\neg\neg A, \perp} \wp id_A} \perp \wp A \cong A$, which models *double negation elimination (DNE)* [3].

Recall that our aim is to give a *unity* of logic; thus, we shall obtain semantics of CL from that of LL^- , i.e., NSCs satisfying the assumption of Lem. 13. For this point, we employ:

Definition 14 (Distributive laws [29]). Let \mathcal{C} be a category, and $? = (?, \eta, \mu)$ and $! = (!, \epsilon, \delta)$ a monad and a comonad on \mathcal{C} . A **distributive law** of $!$ over $?$ is a natural transformation $d : !? \Rightarrow ?!$ such that $? \epsilon \circ d = \epsilon ? : !? \Rightarrow ?$, $? \delta \circ d = d ! \circ ! d \circ \delta ? : !? \Rightarrow ?!$, $d \circ ! \eta = \eta ! : ! \Rightarrow ?!$ and $d \circ ! \mu = \mu ! \circ ? d \circ d ? : !?? \Rightarrow ?!$.

Theorem 15 (Bi-Kleisli extension [29]). Let $? and ! be a monad and a comonad on a category \mathcal{C} , and $d : !? \Rightarrow ?!$ a distributive law of $!$ over $?$. The Kleisli construction on \mathcal{C} over $?$ is extended to the co-Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}_!$, and the co-Kleisli construction on \mathcal{C} over $!$ to the Kleisli category $\mathcal{C}^?$. Moreover, the extended Kleisli and co-Kleisli categories are equivalent, i.e., $(\mathcal{C}_!)^? \simeq (\mathcal{C}^?)_!$.$

Given a distributive law of $!$ over $?$, we define $\mathcal{C}_1^? \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\mathcal{C}_!)^? \simeq (\mathcal{C}^?)_!$ and call it the **bi-Kleisli category** of \mathcal{C} over $!$ and $?$.

As one may have already expected, we propose $\mathcal{C}_1^?$ as our categorical structure to interpret CL . Hence, we define:

Definition 16 (BiLSMCCs). A *bi-liberalizable (BiL) SMCC* is a NSC $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \multimap, !)$ such that it has weak finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$, and it is equipped with:

- A lluf subBwLSMC $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ and a triple $(\mathfrak{A}, \perp, ?)$ such that \top (resp. \perp) is terminal (resp. initial) in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$, $\sharp\mathcal{C}(A, \perp) = \mathcal{C}(A, \perp)$ and $\sharp\mathcal{C}(\top, B) = \mathcal{C}(\top, B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\sharp\mathcal{C} = (\sharp\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{A}, \perp, ?)$ is FwL with finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$;
- Natural transformations Ω, Σ and Π in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ (Lem. 13);
- Natural isomorphisms (1) and (2) as well as

$$?(A \multimap B) \cong !A \multimap ?B \quad (3)$$

$$\neg A \oplus \neg B \cong \neg(A \& B) \quad (4)$$

(natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$) in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$;

- A distributive law Υ of $!$ over $?$.

Theorem 17 (Semantics of LL^-). *Each BiLSMCC \mathcal{C} gives a semantics of LLK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lem. 13. \square

The natural isomorphisms (3) and (4) are not necessary for Thm. 17, but they induce some of the De Morgan laws:

$$\begin{aligned} ?\neg A &\equiv ?(A \multimap \perp) \\ &\equiv !A \multimap ?\perp \text{ (by (3))} \\ &\equiv \neg !A \mathfrak{A} ?\perp \text{ (by (2))} \\ &\equiv \neg !A \mathfrak{A} \perp \text{ (by } ?\perp \cong ?0 \cong \perp) \\ &\equiv \neg !A \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

natural in $A \in \mathcal{C}$, as well as:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg A \mathfrak{A} \neg B &\equiv A \multimap (B \multimap \perp) \text{ (by (2))} \\ &\equiv (A \otimes B) \multimap \perp \\ &\equiv \neg(A \otimes B) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

natural in $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$. Note that (4) is also one of the De Morgan laws. As we shall see in Sect. V, these natural isomorphisms exist in the game-semantic and the syntactic instances.

By Thm. 4 and 17, a BiLSMCC \mathcal{C} may interpret LK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$. In addition, it is easy to see that the interpretation of LK^- occurs always in the bi-Kleisli category $\sharp\mathcal{C}_i^?$, and therefore:

Corollary 18 (Semantics of CL). *Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top, \multimap, !)$ together with $\sharp\mathcal{C} = (\sharp\mathcal{C}, \mathfrak{A}, \perp, ?, \Omega, \Sigma, \Pi, \Upsilon)$ be a BiLSMCC. The bi-Kleisli category $\sharp\mathcal{C}_i^?$ gives a semantics of LK^- such that \wedge, \vee and \Rightarrow are interpreted by:*

$$\begin{aligned} A \wedge B &\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} ?A \& ?B \\ A \vee B &\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !A \oplus !B \\ A \Rightarrow B &\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !?A \multimap ?!B \end{aligned}$$

for all $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, and there are natural isomorphisms in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(A \wedge B) &\cong \neg A \vee \neg B \\ A \Rightarrow B &\cong ?(\neg A \vee B) \end{aligned}$$

and a natural transformation in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$:

$$\neg\neg A \rightarrow A.$$

Proof. By the proofs of Thm. 4 and 17, the interpretation of LK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ actually occurs in $\sharp\mathcal{C}_i^?$; thus, it suffices to establish the natural isomorphisms and transformation. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \neg(A \wedge B) &= \neg(?A \& ?B) \stackrel{(4)}{\cong} \neg ?A \oplus \neg ?B \stackrel{(5)}{\cong} !\neg A \oplus !\neg B = \\ &= \neg A \vee \neg B \text{ and } A \Rightarrow B = !?A \multimap ?!B \stackrel{(3)}{\cong} ?(?A \multimap !B) \stackrel{(2)}{\cong} \\ &= ?(\neg ?A \mathfrak{A} !B) \stackrel{(5)}{\cong} ?(!\neg A \mathfrak{A} !B) = ?(\neg A \vee B). \text{ Finally, we have} \\ &!(\neg\neg A) \stackrel{\epsilon_A}{\rightarrow} \neg\neg A \stackrel{dne_A}{\rightarrow} A \stackrel{\eta_A}{\rightarrow} ?A, \text{ completing the proof. } \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Note that the interpretation of Cor. 18 matches the translation $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{C}}$. On the other hand, $\neg(A \vee B)$ and $\neg A \wedge \neg B$ (resp. $\neg(A \mathfrak{A} B)$ and $\neg A \otimes \neg B$, $\neg(A \oplus B)$ and $\neg A \& \neg B$) should *not* be isomorphic for they are not in the game semantics below.

IV. GAME SEMANTICS

This section gives a game-semantic BiLSMCC \mathcal{LG} . We employ Guy McCusker's games and strategies [18].

A. Review: Game-Semantic NSC

Notation. Given a finite sequence $s = x_1 x_2 \dots x_{|s|}$, where $|s|$ is the *length* of s , we write $s(i)$ for x_i ($i \in |s|$). We define $\text{Even}(s) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} |s| \equiv_2 0$, where \equiv_2 is the equality on \mathbb{N} modulo 2, and $\text{Odd}(s) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} |s| \equiv_2 1$ for a finite sequence s , and $S^{\text{Even}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in S \mid \text{Even}(s)\}$ and $S^{\text{Odd}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} S \setminus S^{\text{Even}}$ for a set S of finite sequences. We write ϵ for the *empty sequence*.

Recall that games are based on *arenas* and *legal positions*: An arena defines the basic components of a game, which in turn induces its legal positions that specify the basic rules of the game. Let us first recall these two preliminary concepts.

Definition 19 (Arenas [18]). An *arena* is a triple $G = (M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G)$, where:

- M_G is a set whose elements are called *moves*;
- λ_G is a function from M_G to $\{O, P\} \times \{Q, A\}$, called the *labeling function*, in which O, P, Q and A are arbitrarily fixed symbols, called the *labels*;
- \vdash_G is a subset of $(\{\star\} \cup M_G) \times M_G$, where \star is an arbitrarily fixed element such that $\star \notin M_G$, called the *enabling relation*, that satisfies:

- (E1) $\star \vdash_G m$ implies $\lambda_G(m) = OQ \wedge (n \vdash_G m \Leftrightarrow n = \star)$;
- (E2) $m \vdash_G n \wedge \lambda_G^{\text{QA}}(n) = A$ implies $\lambda_G^{\text{QA}}(m) = Q$;
- (E3) $m \vdash_G n \wedge m \neq \star$ implies $\lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(n)$

in which $\lambda_G^{\text{OP}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \pi_1 \circ \lambda_G : M_G \rightarrow \{O, P\}$ and $\lambda_G^{\text{QA}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \pi_2 \circ \lambda_G : M_G \rightarrow \{Q, A\}$.

A move $m \in M_G$ is *initial* if $\star \vdash_G m$, an *O-move* (resp. a *P-move*) if $\lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(m) = O$ (resp. if $\lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(m) = P$), a *question* (resp. an *answer*) if $\lambda_G^{\text{QA}}(m) = Q$ (resp. if $\lambda_G^{\text{QA}}(m) = A$). Let $M_G^{\text{Init}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{m \in M_G \mid \star \vdash_G m\}$ and $M_G^{\text{Init}} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_G \setminus M_G^{\text{Init}}$.

Definition 20 (Occurrences of moves). Given a finite sequence $s \in M_G^*$ of moves of an arena G , an *occurrence (of a move)* in s is a pair $(s(i), i)$ such that $i \in |s|$. More specifically, we call the pair $(s(i), i)$ an *initial occurrence* (resp. a *non-initial occurrence*) in s if $\star \vdash_G s(i)$ (resp. otherwise).

To be exact, positions of games are not finite sequences but:

Definition 21 (J-sequences [18]). A **justified (j-) sequence** of an arena G is a pair $s = (s, \mathcal{J}_s)$ of a finite sequence $s \in M_G^*$ and a map $\mathcal{J}_s : |s| \rightarrow \{0\} \cup |s| - 1$ such that for all $i \in |s|$ $\mathcal{J}_s(i) = 0$ if $\star \vdash_G s(i)$, and $0 < \mathcal{J}_s(i) < i \wedge s(\mathcal{J}_s(i)) \vdash_G s(i)$ otherwise. The occurrence $(s(\mathcal{J}_s(i)), \mathcal{J}_s(i))$ is called the **justifier** of a non-initial occurrence $(s(i), i)$ in s .

Notation. We write \mathcal{J}_G for the set of all j-sequences of an arena G , and $s = t$ for any $s, t \in \mathcal{J}_G$ if $s = t$ and $\mathcal{J}_s = \mathcal{J}_t$.

The idea is that each non-initial occurrence in a j-sequence must be performed for a specific previous occurrence, viz., its justifier, in the j-sequence.

Remark. Henceforth, by abuse of notation, we keep the pointer structure \mathcal{J}_s of each j-sequence $s = (s, \mathcal{J}_s)$ implicit and abbreviate occurrences $(s(i), i)$ in s as $s(i)$. Moreover, we usually write $\mathcal{J}_s(s(i)) = s(j)$ if $\mathcal{J}_s(i) = j$.

Definition 22 (J-subsequences). Let G be an arena, and $s \in \mathcal{J}_G$. A **j-subsequence** of s is any $t \in \mathcal{J}_G$ that satisfies:

- t is a subsequence of s , written $(s(i_1), s(i_2), \dots, s(i_{|t|}))$;
- $\mathcal{J}_t(s(i_r)) = s(i_l)$ iff there are occurrences $s(j_1), s(j_2), \dots, s(j_k)$ in s eliminated in t such that $\mathcal{J}_s(s(i_r)) = s(j_1) \wedge \mathcal{J}_s(s(j_1)) = s(j_2) \cdots \wedge \mathcal{J}_s(s(j_{k-1})) = s(j_k) \wedge \mathcal{J}_s(s(j_k)) = s(i_l)$.

Next, let us recall ‘relevant part’ of previous occurrences:

Definition 23 (Views [18]). The **Player (P-) view** $[s]_G$ of a j-sequence $s \in \mathcal{J}_G$ of an arena G is the j-subsequences of s given by the following induction on $|s|$: $[\epsilon]_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \epsilon$; $[sm]_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [s]_G.m$ if m is a P-move; $[sm]_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} m$ if m is initial; and $[smt_n]_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [s]_G.mn$ if n is an O-move such that m justifies n . The **Opponent (O-) view** $[s]_G$ of s is symmetric to $[s]_G$.

We may now recall *legal positions* of an arena [18], [11]:

Definition 24 (Legal positions [18], [11]). A **legal position** of an arena G is a j-sequence $s \in \mathcal{J}_G$ that satisfies:

- (ALTERNATION) $s = s_1 m n s_2 \Rightarrow \lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\text{OP}}(n)$;
- (VISIBILITY) If $s = t m u$ with m non-initial, then $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$ occurs in $[t]_G$ if m is a P-move, and in $[t]_G$ otherwise.

Notation. We write \mathcal{L}_G for the set of all legal positions of G .

We are now ready to recall the following central notion:

Definition 25 (Games [18], [11]). A **game** is a quintuple $G = (M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G, P_G, \simeq_G)$ such that $(M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G)$ is an arena, P_G is a non-empty, prefix-closed subset of \mathcal{L}_G , whose elements are called (**valid**) **positions** of G , and \simeq_G is an equivalence relation on P_G , called the **identification of (valid) positions** of G , that satisfies:

- (I1) $s \simeq_G t \Rightarrow |s| = |t|$;
- (I2) $sm \simeq_G tn \Rightarrow s \simeq_G t \wedge \lambda_G(m) = \lambda_G(n) \wedge (m, n \in M_G^{\text{init}} \vee (\exists i \in |s|. \mathcal{J}_{sm}(m) = s(i) \wedge \mathcal{J}_{tn}(n) = t(i)))$;
- (I3) $s \simeq_G t \wedge sm \in P_G \Rightarrow \exists tn \in P_G. sm \simeq_G tn$.

The set P_G is non-empty because there is always the starting position or ‘moment’ of a game G , and prefix-closed because each non-empty ‘moment’ of G must have the previous ‘moment’. Identifications of positions are originally introduced in [41] and also employed in Section 3.6 of [18]. They are to identify positions up to inessential details of ‘tags’ for disjoint union of sets of moves for *exponential* ! (Def. 29). For this underlying idea, the axioms I1, I2 and I3 should make sense.

Recall that a game G is **well-founded (wf)** if so is \vdash_G [42], i.e., there is no infinite sequence $\star \vdash m_1 \vdash m_2 \vdash m_3 \dots$, and **well-opened (wo)** if $sm \in P_G \wedge m \in M_G^{\text{init}} \Rightarrow s = \epsilon$ [18].

The **top game** $\top \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\epsilon\}, \{(\epsilon, \epsilon)\})$ and the **bottom game** $\perp \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\{q\}, q \mapsto \text{OQ}, \{(\star, q)\}, \{\epsilon, q\}, \{(\epsilon, \epsilon), (q, q)\})$ are, e.g., wf and wo. We also write 1 and 0 for \top and \perp , and call them the **one game** and the **zero game**, respectively.

Now, let us recall standard constructions on games. For brevity, we usually omit ‘tags’ for disjoint union of sets. For instance, we write $x \in A + B$ iff $x \in A$ or $x \in B$; also, given relations $R_A \subseteq A \times A$ and $R_B \subseteq B \times B$, we write $R_A + R_B$ for the relation on $A + B$ such that $(x, y) \in R_A + R_B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} (x, y) \in R_A \vee (x, y) \in R_B$.

We first review *tensor* \otimes . A position of the tensor $A \otimes B$ of games A and B is an interleaving mixture of positions of A and B , in which only Opponent may switch the AB -parity.

Definition 26 (Tensor product of games [18], [11]). The **tensor (product)** $A \otimes B$ of games A and B is defined by:

- $M_{A \otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_B$;
- $\lambda_{A \otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\lambda_A, \lambda_B]$;
- $\vdash_{A \otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \vdash_A + \vdash_B$;
- $P_{A \otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{A \otimes B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$, where $s \upharpoonright A$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B$) is the j-subsequence of s that consists of moves of A (resp. B);
- $s \simeq_{A \otimes B} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} s \upharpoonright A \simeq_A t \upharpoonright A \wedge s \upharpoonright B \simeq_B t \upharpoonright B \wedge \text{att}_{A \otimes B}^*(s) = \text{att}_{A \otimes B}^*(t)$, where $\text{att}_{A \otimes B}^* : M_{A \otimes B} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ maps $a \in M_A \mapsto 0, b \in M_B \mapsto 1$.

It is easy to see that in fact only Opponent may switch the AB -parity of moves during a play of $A \otimes B$ by alternation.

Next, let us recall the space of *linear functions* [1], [24]:

Definition 27 (Linear implication between games [18], [11]). The **linear implication** $A \multimap B$ from a game A to another B is defined by:

- $M_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_B$;
- $\lambda_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\overline{\lambda_A}, \lambda_B]$, where $\overline{\lambda_A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \langle \overline{\lambda_A^{\text{OP}}}, \lambda_A^{\text{QA}} \rangle$ and $\overline{\lambda_A^{\text{OP}}}(m) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} \text{P} & \text{if } \lambda_A^{\text{OP}}(m) = \text{O} \\ \text{O} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$;
- $\vdash_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{(\star, \hat{b}) \mid \star \vdash_B \hat{b}\} + \{(\hat{b}, \hat{a}) \mid \star \vdash_A \hat{a}, \star \vdash_B \hat{b}\} + (\vdash_A \cap (M_A \times M_A)) + (\vdash_B \cap (M_B \times M_B))$;
- $P_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{A \multimap B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$;
- $s \simeq_{A \multimap B} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} s \upharpoonright A \simeq_A t \upharpoonright A \wedge s \upharpoonright B \simeq_B t \upharpoonright B \wedge \text{att}_{A \multimap B}^*(s) = \text{att}_{A \multimap B}^*(t)$, where $\text{att}_{A \multimap B}^* : M_{A \multimap B} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ maps $a \in M_A \mapsto 0, b \in M_B \mapsto 1$.

Similarly to tensor $A \otimes B$, a position of the linear implication $A \multimap B$ is an interleaving mixture of positions of A and B , but only Player may switch the AB -parity again by alternation.

For lack of space, we leave the details of **product** & on games to [18]. Roughly, the set $P_{A \& B}$ of all positions of the product $A \& B$ of games A and B is the disjoint union $P_A + P_B$.

Next, we introduce *coproduct* or *sum* of games:

Definition 28 (Sum of games). The **sum** $A \oplus B$ of games A and B is defined by:

- $M_{A \oplus B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) + M_A + M_B$;
- $\lambda_{A \oplus B} : (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}} \mapsto \text{OQ}, a \in M_A \mapsto \lambda_A(a), b \in M_B \mapsto \lambda_B(b)$;
- $\vdash_{A \oplus B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{(\star, (\hat{a}, \hat{b})) \mid \star \vdash_A \hat{a}, \star \vdash_B \hat{b}\} + \vdash_A + \vdash_B + \{((\hat{a}, \hat{b}), a) \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) \times M_A \mid \hat{a} \vdash_A a\} + \{((\hat{a}, \hat{b}), b) \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) \times M_B \mid \hat{b} \vdash_B b\}$;
- $P_{A \oplus B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{A \& B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A \vee s \upharpoonright B \in P_B, s = xt \Rightarrow x \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) \cap (P_A \times P_B)\}$, where $s \upharpoonright A$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B$) is the j-subsequence of s that consists of moves $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}$ and $a \in M_A$ (resp. $b \in M_B$) with the former changed into \hat{a} (resp. \hat{b});
- $s \simeq_{A \oplus B} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} s \upharpoonright A \simeq_A t \upharpoonright A \vee s \upharpoonright B \simeq_B t \upharpoonright B$.

That is, a non-empty position of $A \oplus B$ is of the form $(\hat{a}, \hat{b})t$ such that $\hat{a}t \in P_A \vee \hat{b}t \in P_B$. It is easy to see that an initial move of the form $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}$ may occur in a position s only as the first element of s . Our sum of games is different from the one given in [18] to give a *unity* of logic.

Now, let us recall the game semantics of *of course* !:

Definition 29 (Exponential of games [18]). The **exponential** (or **of course**) $!A$ of a game A is defined by:

- $M_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A \times \mathbb{N}$;
- $\lambda_{!A} : (a, i) \in M_A \times \mathbb{N} \mapsto \lambda_A(a)$;
- $\vdash_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{(\star, (\hat{a}, i)) \in \{\star\} \times (M_A \times \mathbb{N}) \mid \star \vdash_A \hat{a}\} \cup \{((a, i), (a', i)) \in (M_A \times \mathbb{N}) \times (M_A \times \mathbb{N}) \mid a \vdash_A a'\}$;
- $P_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{!A} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. s \upharpoonright i \in P_A\}$, where $s \upharpoonright i$ is the j-subsequence of s that consists of moves (a, i) yet changed into a ;
- $s \simeq_{!A} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}). \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. s \upharpoonright \varphi(i) \simeq_A t \upharpoonright i \wedge \pi_2^*(s) = (\varphi \circ \pi_2)^*(t)$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is the set of all permutations of natural numbers.

Lemma 30 (Well-defined constructions on games). *Games (resp. wf-games) are closed under \otimes , \multimap , $\&$, \oplus and $!$.*

Proof. Similarly to the corresponding proof in [18]. \square

Next, let us recall another central notion of *strategies*:

Definition 31 (Strategies [18]). A **strategy** on a game G is a non-empty subset $\sigma \subseteq P_G^{\text{Even}}$, written $\sigma : G$, that satisfies:

- (S1) *Even-prefix-closed* (i.e., $\forall smn \in \sigma. s \in \sigma$);
- (S2) *Deterministic* (i.e., $\forall smn, s'm'n' \in \sigma. sm = s'm' \Rightarrow smn = s'm'n'$).

As positions of a game G are to be identified up to \simeq_G , we must identify strategies on G up to \simeq_G , leading to:

Definition 32 (Identification of strategies [18]). The **identification of strategies** on a game G , written \simeq_G , is the relation on strategies $\sigma, \tau : G$ given by $\sigma \simeq_G \tau \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \forall s \in \sigma, t \in \tau. sm \simeq_G tl \Rightarrow \forall smn \in \sigma. \exists tlr \in \tau. smn \simeq_G tlr \wedge \forall tlr \in \tau. \exists smn \in \sigma. tlr \simeq_G smn$. A strategy $\sigma : G$ is **valid** if $\sigma \simeq_G \sigma$.

The identification \simeq_G of strategies on each game G forms a *partial equivalence relation* (PER); see [18], [41].

Next, we need to focus on strategies that behave as *proofs*, which we call *winning* ones:

Definition 33 (Winning of strategies). A strategy $\sigma : G$ is:

- **Total** if $s \in \sigma \wedge sm \in P_G$ implies $\exists smn \in \sigma$ [42], [43];
- **Innocent** if $smn, t \in \sigma \wedge tm \in P_G \wedge [tm]_G = [sm]_G$ implies $tmn \in \sigma \wedge [tmn]_G = [smn]_G$ [31], [18], [11];
- **Noetherian** if σ does not contain any strictly increasing infinite sequence of P-views of positions of G [42];
- **Winning** if it is innocent, total and noetherian.

In addition, an innocent strategy $\sigma : G$ is **finite** if the set $[\sigma]_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{[s]_G \mid s \in \sigma\}$ of all P-views of σ is finite.

A conceptual explanation of winning is as follows. First, a proof or an ‘argument’ for the truth of a formula should not get ‘stuck’, and thus, strategies for proofs must be total. In addition, since logic is concerned with the truth of formulas, which are invariant w.r.t. ‘passage of time’, proofs should not depended on *states*; thus, it makes sense to impose *innocence* on strategies for proofs [31], [11]. Next, recall that totality is not preserved under *composition* of strategies [43], but it can be solved by adding noetherianity [42]. It conceptually makes sense too because if a play by an innocent, noetherian strategy keeps growing *infinitely*, then it cannot be Player’s ‘intention’, and therefore, it should result in *win* for Player.

In addition, let us introduce the game-semantic counterpart of *linearity* of proofs in logic [1]:

Definition 34 (Linearity of strategies). A j-sequence s is **linear**, written $L(s)$, if, for each even-length prefix t of s , an initial move q in t justifies exactly one question q' in t , and the number of answers justified by q' equals that of answers justified by q in t . A strategy $\sigma : G$ is **linear** if $\forall s \in \sigma. L(s)$.

Also, we slightly generalize *strictness* of strategies in [23]:

Definition 35 (Strictness of strategies). A strategy $\phi : A \multimap B$ is **strict** if $\forall smn \in \sigma. m \in M_B^{\text{Init}} \Rightarrow n \in M_A^{\text{Init}}$.

Next, let us proceed to recall standard constructions on strategies. The simplest strategies are the following:

Definition 36 (Copy-cats [17], [41], [31], [18]). The **copy-cat (strategy)** cp_A on a game A is defined by:

$cp_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{A_{[0] \multimap A_{[1]}}}^{\text{Even}} \mid \forall t \preceq s. \text{Even}(t) \Rightarrow t \upharpoonright 0 = t \upharpoonright 1\}$ where the subscripts $(_)_{[i]}$ on A are to distinguish the two copies of A , and $t \upharpoonright i \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} t \upharpoonright A_{[i]}$ ($i = 0, 1$).

Lemma 37 (Well-defined copy-cats [17], [18]). *Given a game A , cp_A is a valid, innocent, total, linear, strict strategy on the game $A \multimap A$. In addition, it is noetherian if A is wf.*

Proof. We just show that cp_A is noetherian if A is wf for the other points are trivial, e.g., validity of cp_A is immediate from the definition of $\simeq_{A \multimap A}$. Given $smm \in cp_A$, it is easy to see by induction on $|s|$ that the P-view $\lceil sm \rceil_{A \multimap A}$ is of the form $m_1 m_1 m_2 m_2 \dots m_k m_k m$, and thus, there is a sequence $\star \vdash_A m_1 \vdash_A m_2 \dots \vdash_A m_k \vdash_A m$. Therefore, if A is wf, then cp_A must be noetherian. \square

Next, let us recall *composition* and *tensor* of strategies:

Definition 38 (Composition of strategies [18]). Given games A, B and C , and strategies $\phi : A \multimap B$ and $\psi : B \multimap C$, the **parallel composition** $\phi \parallel \psi$ of ϕ and ψ is given by:

$$\phi \parallel \psi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{J}_{((A \multimap B_{[0]}) \multimap B_{[1]}) \multimap C} \mid s \upharpoonright A, B_{[0]} \in \phi, \\ s \upharpoonright B_{[1]}, C \in \psi, s \upharpoonright B_{[0]}, B_{[1]} \in pr_B\}$$

where the subscripts $(_)_{[i]}$ on B ($i = 0, 1$) are to distinguish the two copies of B , $s \upharpoonright A, B_{[0]}$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B_{[1]}, C$, $s \upharpoonright B_{[0]}, B_{[1]}$) is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves of A or $B_{[0]}$ (resp. $B_{[1]}$ or C , $B_{[0]}$ or $B_{[1]}$), and $pr_B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{B_{[0]} \multimap B_{[1]}} \mid \forall t \preceq s. \text{Even}(t) \Rightarrow t \upharpoonright 0 = t \upharpoonright 1\}$.

The **composition** $\phi; \psi$ (or $\psi \circ \phi$) of ϕ and ψ is defined by:

$$\phi; \psi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \upharpoonright A, C \mid s \in \phi \parallel \psi\}$$

where $s \upharpoonright A, C$ is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves of A or B .

That is, the composition $\phi; \psi : A \multimap C$ plays implicitly on $((A \multimap B_{[0]}) \multimap B_{[1]}) \multimap C$, employing ϕ if the last O-move is of A or $B_{[0]}$, and ψ otherwise, while Opponent plays on $A \multimap C$, where ϕ and ψ communicate with each other via moves of $B_{[0]}$ or $B_{[1]}$, but it is ‘hidden’ from Opponent.

Lemma 39 (Well-defined composition of strategies [18], [42]). *Given games A, B and C , and strategies $\phi : A \multimap B$ and $\psi : B \multimap C$, $\phi; \psi$ is a strategy on the game $A \multimap C$. If ϕ and ψ are winning (resp. linear, strict), then so is $\phi; \psi$. Given strategies $\phi' : A \multimap B$ and $\psi' : B \multimap C$ such that $\phi \simeq_{A \multimap B} \phi'$ and $\psi \simeq_{B \multimap C} \psi'$, we have $\phi; \psi \simeq_{A \multimap C} \phi'; \psi'$.*

Proof. It is well-known that innocent strategies are closed under composition [11], [18]. Also, it is shown in [42] that the conjunction of innocence, totality and noetherianity is preserved under composition. Finally, composition clearly preserves linearity, strictness and identification of strategies. \square

Definition 40 (Tensor product of strategies [17], [18]). Given games A, B, C and D , and strategies $\phi : A \multimap C$ and $\psi : B \multimap D$, the **tensor (product)** $\phi \otimes \psi$ of ϕ and ψ is given by:

$$\phi \otimes \psi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D} \mid s \upharpoonright A, C \in \phi, s \upharpoonright B, D \in \psi\}$$

where $s \upharpoonright A, C$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B, D$) is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves of A or C (resp. B or D).

Intuitively the tensor $\phi \otimes \psi : A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D$ plays by ϕ if the last O-move is of A or C , and by ψ otherwise.

Let us leave the details of **pairing** $\langle _, _ \rangle$, **copairing** $[_, _]$, **promotion** $(_)^\dagger$ and **derelictions** der to [18] for lack of space.

Lemma 41 (Well-defined constructions on strategies [18]). *Given games A, B, C and D , and strategies $\phi : A \multimap C$ and $\psi : B \multimap D$, $\phi \otimes \psi$ is a strategy on $A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D$. If ϕ and ψ are winning (resp. linear, strict), then so is $\phi \otimes \psi$. Given strategies $\phi' : A \multimap C$ and $\psi' : B \multimap D$ such that $\phi \simeq_{A \multimap C} \phi'$ and $\psi \simeq_{B \multimap D} \psi'$, we have $\phi \otimes \psi \simeq_{A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D} \phi' \otimes \psi'$. Similar statements hold for pairing and promotion. The dereliction der_A is a valid, innocent, total, linear, strict strategy on $!A \multimap A$; in addition, it is noetherian if A is wf.*

Definition 42 (Category \mathcal{LG}). The category \mathcal{LG} is given by:

- Objects are wf-games;
- Morphisms $A \rightarrow B$ are the equivalence classes $[\phi] \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{\phi' : A \multimap B \mid \phi \simeq_{A \multimap B} \phi'\}$ of valid, winning, linear strategies $\phi : A \multimap B$;
- Composition of morphisms $[\phi] : A \rightarrow B$ and $[\psi] : B \rightarrow C$ is given by $[\psi] \circ [\phi] \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\psi \circ \phi] : A \rightarrow C$;
- Identities are given by $id_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [cp_A] : A \rightarrow A$.

Theorem 43 (NSC \mathcal{LG}). *The tuple $\mathcal{LG} = (\mathcal{LG}, \otimes, \top, \multimap, \multimap, !)$ forms a NSC with finite products $(1, \&)$.*

Proof. As outlined in [12] and by Lem. 30, 37 and 41 (constructions on strategies are lifted to their equivalence classes, and games are wf for copy-cats to be noetherian). \square

For lack of space, we leave the details of **well-bracketing** (**wb**) of strategies to [31], [18]. It is easy to show:

Corollary 44 (NSC \mathcal{LG}^{wb}). *The lluf subcategory \mathcal{LG}^{wb} of \mathcal{LG} , in which for each morphism $[\phi]$ the strategy ϕ is wb, forms a subNSC of \mathcal{LG} with finite products $(1, \&)$.*

B. Game-Semantic BiLSMCC

Now, let us define a FwL-structure $(\mathfrak{A}, \perp, ?)$ on:

Definition 45 (Subcategory $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$). The lluf subcategory $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ of \mathcal{LG} has exactly morphisms $[\phi]$ in \mathcal{LG} such that ϕ is strict.

Clearly, $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ is not closed, but Thm. 43 immediately gives:

Lemma 46 (BwLSMC $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$). *The category $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ together with the triple $(\otimes, \top, !)$ inherited from \mathcal{LG} is a BwLSMC with finite coproducts $(0, \oplus)$ (n.b., they are weak in \mathcal{LG} as in [18]).*


Definition 47 (Par on games). The **par of games** A and B is the game $A \wp B$ defined by:

- $M_{A \wp B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) + M_A + M_B$;
- $\lambda_{A \wp B} : (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}} \mapsto \text{OQ}, a \in M_A \mapsto \lambda_A(a), b \in M_B \mapsto \lambda_B(b)$;
- $\vdash_{A \wp B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{(\star, (\hat{a}, \hat{b})) \mid \star \vdash_A \hat{a}, \star \vdash_B \hat{b}\} + \vdash_A + \vdash_B + \{((\hat{a}, \hat{b}), a) \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) \times M_A \mid \hat{a} \vdash_A a\} + \{((\hat{a}, \hat{b}), b) \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}) \times M_B \mid \hat{b} \vdash_B b\}$;
- $P_{A \wp B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{A \wp B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B, s = xt \Rightarrow x \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}\}$, where $s \upharpoonright A$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B$) is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}$ and $a \in M_A$ (resp. $b \in M_B$) with the former changed into \hat{a} (resp. \hat{b});

- $s \simeq_{A \wp B} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\iff} \text{att}_{A \wp B}^*(s) = \text{att}_{A \wp B}^*(t) \wedge s \upharpoonright A \simeq_A t \upharpoonright A \wedge s \upharpoonright B \simeq_B t \upharpoonright B$, where $\text{att}_{A \wp B}$ is the function $M_{A \wp B} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ that maps $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}} \mapsto 0, a \in M_A \mapsto 1, b \in M_B \mapsto 2$.

Dually to tensor \otimes , a position of $A \wp B$ is an interleaving mixture of positions of A and B in which only Player may switch the AB -parity again by alternation. Also, similarly to sum \oplus , only the first element of each position of $A \wp B$ can be of the form $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}$. Note also that our par on games slightly generalizes that on *wo*-games given in [23].

For instance, typical plays of $A \wp B$ are as follows:




where $\hat{a}a_2a_3a_4 \in P_A$, $\hat{b}b_2\hat{b}'b'_2, b_1b_2b_3 \in P_B$, and the arrows represent the justification relation in the positions.

Definition 48 (Par on strategies). Given games A, B, C and D , the **par of strategies** $\phi : A \multimap C$ and $\psi : B \multimap D$ is the subset $\phi \wp \psi \subseteq P_{A \wp B \multimap C \wp D}^{\text{Even}}$ defined by:

$$\phi \wp \psi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{A \wp B \multimap C \wp D}^{\text{Even}} \mid s \upharpoonright A, C \in \phi, s \upharpoonright B, D \in \psi\}$$

where $s \upharpoonright A, C$ (resp. $s \upharpoonright B, D$) is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in M_A^{\text{Init}} \times M_B^{\text{Init}}$, $(\hat{c}, \hat{d}) \in M_C^{\text{Init}} \times M_D^{\text{Init}}$, $a \in M_A$ and $c \in M_C$ (resp. $b \in M_B$ and $d \in M_D$) with the first two changed into \hat{a} and \hat{c} (resp. \hat{b} and \hat{d}), respectively.

$\phi \wp \psi$ may not satisfy the axiom S2 (Def. 31) unless ϕ and ψ are both strict. If ϕ and ψ are strict, $\phi \wp \psi$ plays, e.g., as:



where $\hat{c}\hat{a}a_2c_2\hat{c}'c'_2 \in \phi$ and $\hat{d}\hat{b}b_2\hat{b}'b'_2d_2 \in \psi$. Hence, \wp cannot be a bifunctor on \mathcal{LG} , but it can be on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$:

Definition 49 (Functor par). The **functor par** is the bifunctor \wp on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ that maps objects $(A, B) \in \sharp\mathcal{LG} \times \sharp\mathcal{LG}$ to $A \wp B \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}$, and morphisms $([\phi], [\psi]) \in \sharp\mathcal{LG} \times \sharp\mathcal{LG}((A, C), (B, D))$ to $[\phi \wp \psi] \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}(A \wp B, C \wp D)$.

Lemma 50 (Well-defined par). *The functor par \wp is indeed a well-defined bifunctor on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$.*

Proof. First, \wp on objects is clearly well-defined. Next, \wp on strict strategies is well-defined, and it clearly preserves linearity, totality, noetherianity and identification of strategies.

For preservation of innocence, let $\phi : A \multimap B$ and $\psi : B \multimap D$ be innocent. Note that, during a play of the game $A \wp B \multimap C \wp D$, each O-move occurring in the codomain $C \wp D$ cannot change the CD -parity, while the domain $A \wp B$ part of each P-view must be that of A or B . Hence, the P-view of each element $s \in \phi \wp \psi$ is either the P-view of $s \upharpoonright A, C \in \phi$ or $s \upharpoonright B, D \in \psi$, whence $\phi \wp \psi$ is innocent.

Finally, \wp clearly preserves composition and identities. \square

Definition 51 (Why not on games). The **why not of a game** A is the game $?A$ defined by:

- $M_{?A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}} + (M_A \times \mathbb{N})$, where $M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}}$ is the set of all functions $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow M_A^{\text{Init}}$;
- $\lambda_{?A} : \alpha \in M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}} \mapsto \text{OQ}, (a, i) \in M_A \times \mathbb{N} \mapsto \lambda_A(a)$;
- $\vdash_{?A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\{\star\} \times M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}}) + (\{\star\} \times (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times \mathbb{N})) + \{(\alpha, (a, i)) \in M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}} \times (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times \mathbb{N}) \mid \alpha(i) \vdash_A a\} + \{((a, i), (a', i)) \in (M_A^{\text{Init}} \times \mathbb{N})^2 \mid a \vdash_A a'\}$;
- $P_{?A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathcal{L}_{?A} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. s \upharpoonright i \in P_A, s = xt \Rightarrow x \in M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}}\}$, where $s \upharpoonright i$ is the j -subsequence of s that consists of moves $\alpha \in M_A^{\text{Init}, \mathbb{N}}$ and $(a, i) \in M_A \times \mathbb{N}$ yet changed into $\alpha(i)$ and a , respectively;
- $s \simeq_{?A} t \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\iff} \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}). \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. s \upharpoonright i \simeq_A t \upharpoonright \varphi(i) \wedge (\varphi \circ \text{att}_{?A})^*(s) = \text{att}_{?A}^*(t)$, where the function $\text{att}_{?A} : M_{?A} \rightarrow \{\star\} + \mathbb{N}$ is given by $\alpha \mapsto \star$ and $(a, i) \mapsto i$.

Definition 52 (Why not on strategies). The **why not of a strategy** $\phi : A \multimap B$ is the subset $?\phi \subseteq P_{?A \multimap ?B}^{\text{Even}}$ given by:

$$?\phi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{?A \multimap ?B}^{\text{Even}} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. s \upharpoonright i \in \phi\}$$

where $s \upharpoonright i$ is the obvious analogue of that given in Def. 51.

Why not is essentially the infinite iteration of par, i.e., $?A \cong A \wp A \wp A \dots$ and $?\phi \cong \phi \wp \phi \wp \phi \dots$. A similar construction was introduced independently in [38] for a different purpose. As outlined in the paper, we may lift $?$ to a monad on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$:

Definition 53 (Why not monad). Given $A \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}$, strategies $\text{wst}_A : A \multimap ?A$ and $\text{abs}_A : ??A \multimap ?A$, called the **waste** and the **absorption** on A , respectively, are defined by:

$$\text{wst}_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{A \multimap ?A}^{\text{Even}} \mid \forall t \preceq s. \text{Even}(t) \Rightarrow t \upharpoonright A = t \upharpoonright ?A \upharpoonright 0\}$$

$$\text{abs}_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{??A \multimap ?A}^{\text{Even}} \mid \forall t \preceq s. \text{Even}(t) \Rightarrow \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}. t \upharpoonright ?A \upharpoonright i \upharpoonright j = t \upharpoonright ?A \upharpoonright \langle i, j \rangle\}$$

where $\langle _, _ \rangle$ is any fixed bijection $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$. The **why not monad** is the monad $? = (?, \eta, \mu)$ on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$, where:

- The functor $?$ is given by $A \in \sharp\mathcal{LG} \mapsto ?A \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}$, and $[\phi] \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}(A, B) \mapsto [?\phi] \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}(?A, ?B)$;
- The components of the natural transformations $\eta : \text{id}_{\sharp\mathcal{LG}} \Rightarrow ?$ and $\mu : ?? \Rightarrow ?$ on each $A \in \sharp\mathcal{LG}$ are given by $\eta_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\text{wst}_A]$ and $\mu_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\text{abs}_A]$, respectively.

Lemma 54 (Well-defined why not). *The why not monad is a well-defined monad on $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$.*

Proof. Similarly to the corresponding proof in [38]. \square

Now, based on Lem. 46, 50 and 54, it is easy to establish:

Theorem 55 (BiLSMCC \mathcal{LG}). *The NSC \mathcal{LG} together with the lluf subBwLSMC $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$, the triple $(\mathfrak{A}, \perp, ?)$, the obvious natural transformations Ω , Σ and Π , natural isomorphisms (1)-(4), and the distributive law $\Upsilon : !? \Rightarrow ?!$ given by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_A &\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{!A \multimap ?!A}^{\text{Even}} \mid \forall t \preceq s. \text{Even}(t) \\ &\Rightarrow \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. t \upharpoonright !?A \upharpoonright 0 \upharpoonright i = \pi_1^*(t \upharpoonright ?!A \upharpoonright i)\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_1^*(t \upharpoonright ?!A \upharpoonright i)$ is obtained from $t \upharpoonright ?!A \upharpoonright i$ by replacing each occurrence (a, j) with a , is a BiLSMCC.

V. CUT-ELIMINATION, SOUNDNESS AND COMPLETENESS

Next, let us define cut-elimination processes on the calculi given in Sect. II by the game semantics given in Sect. IV.

To define the cut-elimination processes, the following inductive, categorical notion plays a key role:

Definition 56 (LL^- morphisms). Given a BiLSMCC \mathcal{C} , a morphism in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ is LL^- if it is of the following form:

$$A \xrightarrow{\phi} A' \xrightarrow{\psi} B' \xrightarrow{\varrho} B \quad (7)$$

such that ϕ , ψ and ϱ are morphisms in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ inductively constructed respectively by the following grammars:

- $\phi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} id \mid !^\top \mid !^\perp \mid \phi \otimes \phi \mid \phi \mathfrak{A} \phi \mid \langle \phi, \phi \rangle \mid [\phi, \phi] \mid \phi; \phi \mid !\phi \mid ?\phi \mid \lambda(\phi) \mid \lambda^{-1}(\phi)$
- $\psi \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} id \mid \Omega \mid \Upsilon \mid \Pi \mid \alpha \mid \ell \mid \varpi \mid \epsilon \mid \delta \mid \theta \mid \pi_i \mid (2) \mid \varsigma \otimes \varsigma \mid \varsigma \mathfrak{A} \varsigma \mid \varsigma; \varsigma$
- $\varrho \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} id \mid \Omega \mid \Upsilon \mid \Sigma \mid \alpha \mid \ell \mid \varpi \mid \eta \mid \mu \mid \vartheta \mid \iota_i \mid (1) \mid \varrho \otimes \varrho \mid \varrho \mathfrak{A} \varrho \mid \varrho; \varrho$

where $!^\top$ (resp. $!^\perp$) is the canonical one to \top (resp. from \perp), α , ℓ and ϖ respectively range over associativities, units and symmetries w.r.t. \otimes or \mathfrak{A} , θ (resp. ϑ) over natural isomorphisms of $!$ (resp. $?$), π_i and ι_i over projections and injections ($i = 1, 2$), respectively, $!$ ($= (!, \epsilon, \delta)$), $?$ ($= (?, \eta, \mu)$), and λ (resp. λ^{-1}) is currying w.r.t. the entire domain (resp. uncurrying w.r.t. the entire codomain).

Lemma 57 (Inductive semantics of LL^-). *The interpretation of any proof in LLK^- in any BiLSMCC is LL^- .*

Proof. By induction on proofs in LLK^- . \square

Lemma 58 (Inductive definability). *Given a BiLSMCC \mathcal{C} , let Δ and Γ be sequences of formulas of LL^- , and $f : \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$ a LL^- -morphism in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$, where $\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}$ are the interpretations of the sequences. Then, there is a proof p of a sequent $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ in LLK^- whose interpretation $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ equals f .*

Proof. Since f is LL^- , we may write $f = \varrho \circ \phi \circ \varsigma$; see (7). By the structural and the distribution rules in LLK^- and naturality of ς and ϱ , ς and ϱ may be excluded; thus, it suffices to prove definability of ϕ . Then, it is immediate by induction on ϕ . \square

By Lem. 57 and 58, we may first compute the interpretation $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ of any given proof p in LLK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ (as defined in the proof of Thm. 17) and then calculate the proof $\text{nf}(p)$ in LLK^- , called the **normal-form** of p , from $\llbracket p \rrbracket$ such that $\llbracket \text{nf}(p) \rrbracket = \llbracket p \rrbracket$ (as defined in the proof of Lem. 58). Note that there is no

Cut $^-$ occurring in $\text{nf}(p)$, i.e., $\text{nf}(p)$ is *cut-free*; that is, we have defined a *cut-elimination* process nf on LLK^- . Combined with Thm. 4, it is not hard to give such a process on LK^- , and by the same method, on LLJ (without \oplus) and LJ (without \vee) as well, which for lack of space we omit. To summarize:

Theorem 59 (Correctness). *Given a proof p of a sequent $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ in LLK^- (resp. LK^- , LLJ , LJ), the normal-form $\text{nf}(p)$ of p is cut-free, and $\llbracket \text{nf}(p) \rrbracket = \llbracket p \rrbracket$, where $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$ is the interpretation of the calculus in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ (resp. $\sharp\mathcal{LG}_i^?$, \mathcal{LG}^{wb} , $\mathcal{LG}_i^{\text{wb}}$).*

Theorem 60 (Categorical soundness/completeness). *Given a BiLSMCC \mathcal{C} , the interpretation of LLK^- (resp. LK^- , LLJ , LJ) in $\sharp\mathcal{C}$ (resp. $\sharp\mathcal{C}_i^?$, \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{C}_i) is equationally sound and complete w.r.t. the cut-elimination defined above.*

Proof. The soundness is by induction on proofs, and the completeness immediately follows from Thm. 55. \square

VI. FULL COMPLETENESS

Lem. 58 characterizes definable strategies only *inductively*, which is not satisfactory as full completeness *per se* (n.b., it was to define the cut-elimination procedure). This last main section addresses the problem: Focusing on finite, *strongly linear* strategies, it gives a *non-inductive* full completeness:

Definition 61 (Strong linearity of strategies). A strategy $\phi : A \multimap B$ is **strongly linear** if it is linear, strict, and satisfies:

- 1) If $B = (X_1 \otimes X_2) \mathfrak{A} Y$ for some games X_1, X_2 and Y , then $\phi = A \multimap X_i \otimes (X_j \mathfrak{A} Y) \xrightarrow{\Omega} (X_1 \otimes X_2) \mathfrak{A} Y$ for some $\phi' : A \multimap X_i \otimes (X_j \mathfrak{A} Y)$, where $i \neq j$;
- 2) If $A = X_1 \otimes (X_2 \mathfrak{A} Y)$ for some games X_1, X_2 and Y , then $\phi = X_1 \otimes (X_2 \mathfrak{A} Y) \xrightarrow{\Omega} (X_i \otimes X_j) \mathfrak{A} Y \xrightarrow{\phi''} B$ for some $\phi'' : (X_i \otimes X_j) \mathfrak{A} Y \multimap B$, where $i \neq j$;
- 3) If $B = !X \mathfrak{A} ?Y$ for some games X and Y , then $\phi = A \multimap !(A \mathfrak{A} ?Y) \xrightarrow{\Sigma} !X \mathfrak{A} ?Y$ for some $A \multimap !(A \mathfrak{A} ?Y)$;
- 4) If $A = !X \otimes ?Y$ for some games X and Y , then $\phi = !X \otimes ?Y \xrightarrow{\Pi} ?(!A \mathfrak{A} Y) \xrightarrow{\phi''} B$ for some $?(!A \mathfrak{A} Y) \multimap B$;
- 5) If $B = B_1 \oplus B_2$, then $\phi = A \multimap B_i \xrightarrow{\iota_i} B_1 \oplus B_2$ for some $i \in \overline{2}$ and $\phi_i : A \multimap B_i$.

Theorem 62 (Full completeness). *Let $\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$ be the interpretation of a sequent $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ without atoms in LLK^- (resp. LLJ without \oplus) in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ (resp. \mathcal{LG}^{wb}), and $[\phi] : \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$ in the category such that ϕ is finite and strongly linear. Then, there is a proof p of $\Delta \vdash \Gamma$ in the calculus such that $\llbracket p \rrbracket = [\phi]$.*

Proof. By finiteness and strong linearity of ϕ , we may show full completeness of the interpretation of LLK^- in $\sharp\mathcal{LG}$ by induction on Δ, Γ . Finally, full completeness of the interpretation of LLJ (without \oplus) in \mathcal{LG}^{wb} is shown just similarly. \square

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have given a unity of logic in terms of sequent calculi, categories and games. As future work, we would like to develop *term calculi* that match our semantics. We are also interested in extending the present work to *predicate logic*.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.-Y. Girard, “Linear logic,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 1–101, 1987.
- [2] S. Shapiro, “Classical logic,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2018.
- [3] A. S. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg, *Basic proof theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, no. 43.
- [4] J.-Y. Girard, “Linear logic: its syntax and semantics,” *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, pp. 1–42, 1995.
- [5] A. Heyting, “Die formalen regeln der intuitionistischen logik,” *Sitzungsbericht Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin, physikalisch-mathematische Klasse II*, pp. 42–56, 1930.
- [6] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, “Constructivism in mathematics. Vol. I, volume 121 of,” *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, p. 26, 1988.
- [7] J.-Y. Girard, P. Taylor, and Y. Lafont, *Proofs and Types*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 1989, vol. 7.
- [8] G. Gentzen, “Untersuchungen über das logische schließen. i,” *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 176–210, 1935.
- [9] S. Abramsky, “Computational interpretations of linear logic,” *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 111, no. 1&2, pp. 3–57, 1993.
- [10] P.-A. Mellies, “Categorical semantics of linear logic,” *Panoramas et synthèses*, vol. 27, pp. 15–215, 2009.
- [11] S. Abramsky and G. McCusker, “Game semantics,” in *Computational Logic: Proceedings of the 1997 Marktoberdorf Summer School*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1999, pp. 1–55.
- [12] M. Hyland, “Game semantics,” in *Semantics and Logics of Computation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, vol. 14, p. 131.
- [13] G. Winskel, *The Formal Semantics of Programming Languages: An Introduction*. MIT press, 1993.
- [14] C. A. Gunter, *Semantics of programming languages: structures and techniques*. MIT press, 1992.
- [15] R. M. Amadio and P.-L. Curien, *Domains and Lambda-Calculi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, no. 46.
- [16] A. Blass, “A game semantics for linear logic,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 183–220, 1992.
- [17] S. Abramsky and R. Jagadeesan, “Games and full completeness for multiplicative linear logic,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 59, no. 02, pp. 543–574, 1994.
- [18] G. McCusker, *Games and Full Abstraction for a Functional Metalanguage with Recursive Types*. London: Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [19] H. Herbelin, “Games and weak-head reduction for classical PCF,” in *International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*. Springer, 1997, pp. 214–230.
- [20] V. Blot, “Realizability for Peano arithmetic with winning conditions in HON games,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 168, no. 2, pp. 254–277, 2017.
- [21] S. Abramsky and P.-A. Mellies, “Concurrent games and full completeness,” in *Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE, 1999, pp. 431–442.
- [22] P.-A. Mellies, “Asynchronous games 4: A fully complete model of propositional linear logic,” in *LiCS 2005–Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 386–395.
- [23] O. Laurent, “Polarized games,” in *Proceedings of the 17th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE, 2002, pp. 265–274.
- [24] J.-Y. Girard, *The Blind Spot: lectures on logic*. European Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [25] U. Berger and H. Schwichtenberg, “An inverse of the evaluation functional for typed lambda-calculus,” 1991.
- [26] J. Lambek and P. J. Scott, *Introduction to Higher-order Categorical Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 1988, vol. 7.
- [27] B. Jacobs, *Categorical Logic and Type Theory*. Elsevier, 1999, vol. 141.
- [28] G. M. Bierman, “What is a categorical model of intuitionistic linear logic?” in *International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*. Springer, 1995, pp. 78–93.
- [29] J. Power and H. Watanabe, “Combining a monad and a comonad,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 280, no. 1-2, pp. 137–162, 2002.
- [30] P.-L. Curien, “Definability and full abstraction,” *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 172, pp. 301–310, 2007.
- [31] J. M. E. Hyland and C.-H. Ong, “On full abstraction for PCF: I, II, and III,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 163, no. 2, pp. 285–408, 2000.
- [32] J.-Y. Girard, “On the unity of logic,” *Annals of pure and applied logic*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 201–217, 1993.
- [33] P.-A. Mellies and N. Tabareau, “Resource modalities in tensor logic,” *Annals of Pure Applied Logic*, vol. 161, no. 5, pp. 632–653, 2010.
- [34] P.-A. Mellies, “Game semantics in string diagrams,” in *Proceedings of the 2012 27th Annual IEEE/ACM Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society, 2012, pp. 481–490.
- [35] R. A. Seely, *Linear logic, *-autonomous categories and cofree coalgebras*. Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec: CEGEP John Abbott College, 1987.
- [36] N. Benton, G. Bierman, V. de Paiva, and M. Hyland, *Term assignment for intuitionistic linear logic (preliminary report)*. Citeseer, 1992.
- [37] N. Benton, G. Bierman, V. De Paiva, and M. Hyland, “A term calculus for intuitionistic linear logic,” in *International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*. Springer, 1993, pp. 75–90.
- [38] R. Harmer, M. Hyland, and P.-A. Mellies, “Categorical combinators for innocent strategies,” in *22nd annual IEEE symposium on logic in computer science*, 2007, pp. pp–379.
- [39] J. R. Shoenfield, *Mathematical Logic*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1967, vol. 21.
- [40] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 5.
- [41] S. Abramsky, R. Jagadeesan, and P. Malacaria, “Full abstraction for PCF,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 163, no. 2, pp. 409–470, 2000.
- [42] P. Clairambault and R. Harmer, “Totality in arena games,” *Annals of pure and applied logic*, vol. 161, no. 5, pp. 673–689, 2010.
- [43] S. Abramsky et al., “Semantics of interaction: An introduction to game semantics,” *Semantics and Logics of Computation*, vol. 14, pp. 1–31, 1997.