

Combinatorial Spacetimes

by

David Hillman

Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh, 1995

dhi@olympus.net

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Pittsburgh

defended: November 30, 1995
most recent correction: June 13, 2018

Combinatorial Spacetimes

David Hillman, Ph.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 1995

Combinatorial spacetimes are a class of dynamical systems in which finite pieces of spacetime contain finite amounts of information. Most of the guiding principles for designing these systems are drawn from general relativity: the systems are deterministic; spacetime may be foliated into Cauchy surfaces; the law of evolution is local (there is a light-cone structure); and the geometry evolves locally (curvature may be present; big bangs are possible). However, the systems differ from general relativity in that spacetime is a combinatorial object, constructed by piecing together copies of finitely many types of allowed neighborhoods in a prescribed manner. Hence at least initially there is no metric, no concept of continuity or diffeomorphism. The role of diffeomorphism, however, is played by something called a “local equivalence map.”

Here I attempt to begin to lay the mathematical foundations for the study of these systems. (Examples of such systems already exist in the literature. The most obvious is reversible cellular automata, which are flat combinatorial spacetimes. Other related systems are structurally dynamic cellular automata, L systems and parallel graph grammars.) In the 1+1-dimensional oriented case, sets of spaces may be described equivalently by matrices of nonnegative integers, directed graphs, or symmetric tensors; local equivalences between space sets are generated by simple matrix transformations. These equivalence maps turn out to be closely related to the flow equivalence maps between subshifts of finite type studied in symbolic dynamics. Also, the symmetric tensor algebra generated by equivalence transformations turns out to be isomorphic to the abstract tensor algebra generated by commutative cocommutative bialgebras.

In higher dimensions I attempt to follow the same basic model, which is to define the class of n -dimensional space set descriptions and then generate local equivalences between these descriptions using elementary transformations. Here I study the case where space is a special type of colored graph (discovered by Pezzana) which may be interpreted as an n -dimensional pseudomanifold. Finally, I show how one may study the behavior of combinatorial spacetimes by searching for constants of motion, which typically are associated with local flows and often may be interpreted in terms of particles.

Preface

Though I no doubt have not entirely succeeded, my goal in writing this document was to produce a work that even I, had I not already done this research, could understand. To this end I have sacrificed brevity, but hopefully not to the point of excess. Many concepts are presented in more than one way. There are plenty of examples and pictures. An understanding of several basic ideas in algebra and topology is assumed on occasion.

Thanks to John Baez, Tim Boykett, André de Carvalho, Bob Heath and Danrun Huang for helpful discussions. Thanks to Doug Lind for sending me a preprint of his book with Brian Marcus on symbolic dynamics. Thanks to Jack Wagoner for pointing out the connection of my work with John Franks' paper. Thanks to Ken Manders, John Porter and Frank Slaughter for being on my committee. Thanks to Erica Jen for bringing me to Los Alamos and working with me a few summers ago. And many, many thanks to George Sparling, my advisor. He treated me as an equal even though mathematically we are not even remotely close to being equal; this made being his graduate student a pleasure. He was enthusiastic and patient, and I learned many things from him. And it was he who noticed that my blackboard scrawlings resembled the axioms of a bialgebra; I knew nothing of bialgebras, so I do not know when or if I would have discovered this on my own.

Finally, special thanks go to me, who has had to put up with myself during over six years of graduate school. That certainly could not have been easy.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Examples | 9 |
| 3 | Related systems | 29 |
| 4 | Space+time picture and spacetime picture | 33 |
| 5 | The 1+1-dimensional oriented case | 37 |
| 5.1 | Reversible one-dimensional cellular automata | 37 |
| 5.2 | A modification | 38 |
| 5.3 | The class of one-dimensional space sets | 46 |
| 5.4 | Initial attempts to generate 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes | 47 |
| 5.4.1 | Existence of a rule-generating algorithm | 48 |
| 5.4.2 | Standard forms and the shift | 58 |
| 5.4.3 | Zeta functions and the matching condition | 65 |
| 5.4.4 | First results | 75 |
| 5.5 | Transformations of space set descriptions | 90 |
| 5.6 | Elementary maps and matrix moves | 100 |
| 5.7 | Equivalence classes of space sets | 109 |
| 5.7.1 | Some useful space set transformations | 109 |
| 5.7.2 | Invariants of integer matrices | 110 |
| 5.7.3 | Invariants of reduced matrices | 113 |
| 5.7.4 | Positive reduced matrices | 114 |
| 5.8 | Flow equivalence of subshifts of finite type | 124 |
| 5.9 | Bialgebras | 128 |
| 5.9.1 | The abstract tensor representation | 129 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 5.9.2 | A simplification | 130 |
| 5.9.3 | The bialgebra principle | 135 |
| 5.9.4 | Bialgebras, flow equivalence and space set transformations . . | 138 |
| 5.10 | The Bowen-Franks group | 139 |
| 6 | The general 1+1-dimensional case | 145 |
| 7 | Cauchy surfaces | 155 |
| 8 | Invariants and particles | 175 |
| 9 | Higher dimensions | 193 |
| 9.1 | Space sets defined by lists of allowed neighborhoods | 193 |
| 9.2 | The spacetime picture of 1+1-dimensional dynamics | 197 |
| 9.3 | Two-dimensional spacetime dynamics | 201 |
| 9.4 | Space sets defined by systems of faces and hinges | 202 |
| 9.5 | Multidimensional bialgebras | 216 |
| 10 | Conclusion | 229 |

1 Introduction

Pure mathematicians often say that their interest in an area of mathematics is completely intrinsic, and quite apart from questions of relevance to the physical world. One mathematician I know, for example, says she studies general relativity because it is “nice geometry.” For whatever reason, I do not seem to be made this way. I get my mathematical thrills when I feel that the mathematics I am doing may be related to fundamental laws of nature. In particular, I have a fantasy that I can make a positive contribution towards the search for principles that will enable us to unify general relativity and quantum mechanics in a single consistent physical theory.

The empirical evidence available to me indicates that my fantasies rarely come true. I only mention this one here because it influences, in a general way, the choices I make in the work that follows. More specific influences arise from the following hunches of mine concerning the probable nature of a consistent unified physical theory.

Hunch 1 *The universe is simple.*

It is not clear how one should make the notion of simplicity precise. For heuristic purposes I will use the idea of algorithmic information theory, which says (roughly) that the simplicity of an object can be measured by the length of its shortest description.

There is a natural candidate for a type of universe satisfying this criterion. Such a universe can be completely described in a finite number of bits by specifying an initial state and a deterministic algorithm by which that state evolves.

In the case where the law of evolution is invertible, the “initial” state need not be initial in the usual sense; it must, however, be a Cauchy surface, and the universe must be completely describable by evolving this surface backwards and forwards in time. I will sometimes call such a state an initial state anyway.

Quantum field theory is not appealing from this point of view, because it (supposedly) contains randomness as an essential component. Thus it is not at all al-

gorithmic, and hence the associated universe is not at all simple, according to my adopted heuristic definition of simplicity.

On the other hand, general relativity avoids this difficulty by being deterministic. It also allows scenarios such as the big bang, which is itself appealing from this point of view because in such a scenario there is an initial state which is very small, hence perhaps easily described.

But smallness of the initial state in itself does not insure finite describability. From the point of view taken here, it is a weakness of general relativity that it makes no restrictions on the complexity of the initial state.

If the initial state is finitely describable and it evolves algorithmically, then subsequent states must also be finitely describable. A second hunch is that this finite describability is a *local* property of spacetime.

Hunch 2 *The universe is locally simple.*

The idea here is that any finite chunk of spacetime is finitely describable. According to this view, the chunk of spacetime located at the present moment inside this letter “o”, while no doubt quite complicated, is probably not infinitely complicated. Again, general relativity does not insure this.

A natural way to insure that one’s mathematical models of universes are locally simple is to let spacetimes be combinatorial objects that are made from a finite set of allowed neighborhoods by piecing copies of those neighborhoods together in a prescribed manner. This insures that there are only finitely many allowed pieces of spacetime of any given finite size.

It is certainly to be expected that some continuous models also may possess this property of local simplicity. If so, then it seems likely that in some sense such models are isomorphic to combinatorial models of the sort described above. Since it is not immediately obvious which continuous models are locally simple and which are not, it seems safer to concentrate on the combinatorial models, which are guaranteed to be locally simple, and later to examine the question of the local simplicity of continuous models.

There are two more hunches, somewhat different from the previous two.

Hunch 3 *The law of evolution is invertible.*

The idea here is that the universe is foliated by Cauchy surfaces. This is true in general relativity, and it would also be true of quantum field theory were it not for wave function collapse. The alternative to invertibility is dissipation: information is lost as the universe evolves. Certainly the universe cannot be too dissipative, since from present conditions we have very substantial ability to reconstruct the past, and what information we do lose about the past may easily be attributed to the spreading out of that information rather than to the absence of invertibility. My guess is that, rather than the universe being just a little bit dissipative, it isn't dissipative at all.

Hunch 4 *The law of evolution is local, and so is its inverse.*

The idea here is to preserve the notion of maximum velocity of causal propagation (light-cone structure) from general relativity. Quantum field theory is consistent with this point of view in an important sense, since in that theory probabilities are propagated in a local fashion. A particle in quantum field theory may travel faster than light; this, however, is not evidence against local causation, since it is naturally explained by local actions of virtual particles and antiparticles. Later I will present an example of a local, deterministic model in which this same phenomenon occurs.

As a natural result of possessing this point of view, I chose to study mathematical models of spacetimes that have the following properties.

- Spacetimes are combinatorial objects which can be constructed by piecing together copies of a finite number of allowed neighborhoods in a prescribed manner.
- A spacetime may be described by specifying a Cauchy surface and an invertible, local, deterministic law of evolution.
- There is no fixed background geometry; the geometry evolves in accordance with the local law of evolution, just as it does in general relativity; “curvature” happens, and big bangs are possible.

It will be noted that, apart from the first property listed above, these systems are modeled after general relativity. What, then, of quantum field theory? Since the models are deterministic, they would qualify as hidden variable theories if they exhibited quantum phenomena. But the models are also local, and it is commonly believed (see [8]) that no local, deterministic hidden variable theory can exist, since no such theory can violate the Bell inequalities (as quantum field theories do). So

how can I hope that these systems might be relevant to the quantum aspects of our universe? I do hope so, for several reasons.

Firstly, the combinatorial nature of these models implies an essential discreteness, which also seems to be present in quantum phenomena (and which in fact was partly suggested by these phenomena). I have already found that in many of these models particles and antiparticles play an important role. It is natural to wonder how far towards quantum phenomena one can go simply by inserting this sort of discreteness into models which in other respects resemble general relativity.

Second, models such as the ones I have described here have hardly been studied. I think it is dangerous to make far-reaching conclusions about what properties can or cannot be present in models without having studied them. It is far too easy in such cases to make unwarranted assumptions or to use an inappropriate conceptual scheme. I believe that this concern may be applicable in the case of the standard arguments against deterministic, local hidden variable theories. What I would prefer to these arguments is a direct verification that the models I am interested in do or do not violate the Bell inequalities. But how is this to be done? What constitutes a measurement in these systems, or an observable? The answer to these questions is by no means obvious, and without one I do not see how one can judge whether or not these systems contain quantum phenomena. (For other arguments in favor of the possibility of local, deterministic hidden variable theories, see 't Hooft [19].)

Even if it turns out that this class of models does not include one that closely resembles our universe, I believe that there may be much of value to be learned from them. The natural approaches to studying combinatorial dynamical systems are somewhat different from those used to study standard dynamical systems. My hope is that insights may be gained into the nature of dynamical systems in general through the interplay of these different approaches.

The best way to begin learning about combinatorial spacetimes is to study specific examples of these systems. It turns out that it is easy to construct such examples by hand. Chapter 2 describes how this may be done, and carries out several such constructions in detail.

A number of types of combinatorial dynamical systems appear in the literature that are related to combinatorial spacetimes. The most obvious of these is reversible cellular automata; these are a special case of combinatorial spacetime in which spacetime is flat. L systems and their generalizations are another example of a related

class of systems. Though space tends not to be closed in these systems, and though L systems with invertible dynamics are rarely studied, these systems come closer to combinatorial spacetimes than do cellular automata in the sense that they allow for a more flexible spacetime geometry (expanding universes; curvature). These various relationships are described in Chapter 3.

In combinatorial spacetimes there is, at least initially, no concept of continuity, hence no such thing as a diffeomorphism. However, the role of diffeomorphism in differential geometry is played here by something called a “local invertible map.” These maps play two roles, which in turn correspond to two ways of looking at dynamical systems: the space+time picture and the spacetime picture. In the first case, one views local invertible maps as laws of evolution; in the second, one views them as equivalences between spacetimes. This is described in Chapter 4.

Local invertible maps are different from diffeomorphisms in the sense that they are not just maps of one space or spacetime to another, but maps of one set of spaces or spacetimes to another. It is natural to wonder whether one might be able to put a topology on each set of spaces such that each local map from one space set to another is a homeomorphism. If so, then combinatorial dynamics would be a species of topological dynamics. In 1+1 dimensions this indeed turns out to be the case; details are in Section 5.8.

My attempts to arrive at a cohesive mathematical picture of the set of all 1+1-dimensional oriented combinatorial spacetimes are described in Chapter 5. This is the largest chapter in the dissertation, for it is here that I have achieved my highest degree of success (which is not surprising, since these systems constitute the simplest case). The solution that I arrived at seems sufficiently elegant as to provide a model for the sort of setup one may hope to achieve in higher-dimensional cases. It involves descriptions of sets of spaces and local transformations of those descriptions. The space set descriptions may be provided in three equivalent ways: by square matrices of nonnegative integers, by directed graphs, or by scalars in the algebra of symmetric tensors. The transformations of these descriptions are generated by a single type of basic matrix operation (and by an analogous operation on graphs and on tensors). A law of evolution is obtained by composing a sequence of these operations together to obtain a map from the original space set description to itself.

This formulation allowed me to discover several relationships between my work and other areas of mathematics. For example, I solved an important special case

of the problem of finding the equivalence classes of space sets under these transformations, only to discover that this solution had been arrived at ten years earlier by Franks [11], who was working in the field of symbolic dynamics. It turns out that flow equivalence maps, a not-terribly-well-known sort of map which arises in symbolic dynamics, are exactly the transformations between sets of spaces that I had discovered. On another front, the algebra obtained by adding the above-mentioned operation to the algebra of symmetric tensors turns out to be isomorphic to the abstract tensor algebra generated by commutative cocommutative bialgebras. This means that there is a relationship between 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes and Hopf algebras, which, given the relationship of Hopf algebras to so many other parts of mathematics, is intriguing.

My investigations of combinatorial spacetimes involving other sorts of spaces are in more of an embryonic state than those just described. Nevertheless, I believe that I have taken some steps in the right direction. Results in the general 1+1-dimensional case (where orientedness is no longer required) are described in Chapter 6; higher-dimensional cases are discussed in Chapter 9.

Finally, one hopes in studying these systems not just to understand the structure of the set of all such systems, but to understand the individual systems themselves. What happens when one of these systems evolves? How can one know whether the evolution of a particular space under some rule will be periodic, or whether that space will expand forever? How does one find the true dynamical properties of one of these systems—that is, the intrinsic properties of the system, and not those properties which depend on the fact that the system is described in a certain manner? What levels of complexity can one expect to arise in such systems? I have barely begun to study such questions, and only in the case where space is one-dimensional.

Several techniques have proven useful. In Chapter 8 I describe how to find constants of motion, which I call “invariants.” These correspond to a local flow, which in turn can often be interpreted in terms of particles. Sometimes the particles are solitons. Some particles have associated antiparticles. In some cases systems can be described completely in terms of their constituent particles and their interactions. In Chapter 7 I take a different approach: in the flat case (reversible cellular automata), I study the properties of straight-line surfaces. I was able to prove that such systems possess a light-cone structure, and that if one performs an analogue of a Lorentz transformation on these systems the result is another cellular automaton. However,

the new description of spacetime obtained in this way generally is not isomorphic to the original description. The question of whether there exists a relativistic combinatorial spacetime remains an interesting and unanswered one.

I have made a beginning, but much remains to be done. My sense is that many deep and beautiful mathematical results remain to be discovered in this field.

2 Examples

In later chapters I will place emphasis on understanding the structure of combinatorial spacetimes in as much generality as possible. Here, however, my goal is to give the reader a hands-on feel for the nature of these systems. To that end, I will present a simple, practical method for generating examples of combinatorial spacetimes, and then use this method to generate two particular examples: one in which space is one-dimensional, and one in which it is two-dimensional.

The method proceeds in three steps. One begins by defining a set \mathcal{X} of spaces. Next, one drums up (by whatever means) several very simple local invertible operators on \mathcal{X} such that these operators do not all commute with one another. Finally, one composes these simple operators with one another in various ways to generate new operators. Though the original operators may be trivial, the fact that they do not all commute with one another means that one may obtain infinitely many operators in this way, and that some of these may be quite interesting.

Consider the case where space is one-dimensional. In the continuous case there are two basic sorts of closed one-dimensional spaces: those that are homeomorphic to a circle, and those that are homeomorphic to a line. Here, however, we need to consider combinatorial structures. The natural ones to consider are graphs in which each vertex has degree two. (A graph in which every vertex has degree k is called a *k-regular graph*; hence these are 2-regular graphs.) If such a graph contains a finite number of vertices, then it must be a circuit (hence resembling a circle); otherwise it resembles a line.

In most of what follows I will restrict my attention to the oriented case. One may give 2-regular graphs an orientation in a natural way by requiring them to be directed graphs where each vertex has one incoming edge and one outgoing edge.

We may also attach properties to these graphs. This amounts to coloring them in some way. We may color vertices, edges, or both. Here, let us color the vertices only. (Later, we will color edges instead of vertices. I will sometimes use the term

cell to mean a piece of graph—either vertex or edge—that contains a single color.)

Now we are ready to define a set of allowed one-dimensional spaces. To do this, we must pay attention to the local simplicity requirement described in Chapter 1. To make this precise, we need to be able to measure the size of a neighborhood of a “point” in space. Let us consider the vertices to be the points. The natural measure of distance between two vertices in a graph is the minimum number of edges on the paths that join them. Let us use this as our measure here, and define the size of the neighborhood of a vertex to be the maximum distance from that vertex to the other vertices in the neighborhood. The local simplicity requirement may be interpreted to mean that there must be only finitely many allowed vertex neighborhoods of any given finite radius. This means, for instance, that the neighborhood of a vertex with radius zero—that is, the vertex itself—must have only a finite number of possible states. Hence the number of allowed colors must be finite. If the number of allowed colors is finite, then clearly, for finite r , any radius- r neighborhood of a vertex will also have a finite number of possible states. Hence this restriction on the number of allowed colors is the only one we need.

It is also possible to impose further local restrictions on which arrangements of colors are allowed. Indeed, as will become clear later, it is important to consider such restrictions. However, at present it is not necessary to do this. Let the number of allowed colors be k . Any choice of k determines a set \mathcal{X}_k of allowed spaces: namely, the set of all oriented nonempty k -colored 2-regular graphs. These are the sets of spaces which will be considered in this chapter.

I will use parentheses to denote a connected vertex-colored oriented 2-regular graph with a finite number of vertices (i.e., an oriented circuit). For example, $(abacc)$ denotes an oriented circuit whose vertices are colored consecutively by the colors a , b , a , c and c , where the left-to-right direction in the notation corresponds to the direction of the edges in the graph. Thus $(abacc)$ means the same thing as $(bacca)$.

It is also useful to define the concept of a *segment* of an oriented vertex-colored 2-regular graph. A segment consists of colored vertices and directed edges. Every vertex in the segment has degree two, with one edge pointing in and one pointing out. However, a segment is not, strictly speaking, a colored directed graph, because not every edge in the segment is connected to a vertex at each end. More precisely, one edge in the segment does not point towards a vertex, and one does not point away from a vertex; otherwise, every edge in the segment connects two distinct vertices.

The edge which does not point towards a vertex and the edge which does not point away from a vertex may be the same edge; in this case the segment consists of this edge alone, and has no vertices. This is the *empty* segment. The length $|S|$ of a segment S is equal to the number of vertices it contains; hence the number of edges in S is equal to $|S| + 1$. Square brackets will usually be used to denote segments, though occasionally they will be omitted. For example, $[abc]$ contains three vertices, colored a , b and c , and four edges: one points towards the a -colored vertex; one goes from the a -colored vertex to the b -colored vertex; one goes from the b -colored vertex to the c -colored vertex; and one points away from the c -colored vertex. The symbol $[\]$ represents the empty segment.

Segments may be *embedded* in other segments or in spaces; this notion will be used often in what follows. (Whenever I say later on that a segment is “in” or “contained in” a segment or space, I mean that it is embedded.) To describe embeddings rigorously, one needs coordinates. A particular description of a space implicitly gives coordinates to its vertices. Consider, for instance, the space $(abacc)$. In this case, there are five vertices; we assign each successive vertex a coordinate in \mathbb{Z}_5 , in ascending order. The colors of the vertices are read off from the colors in the description in the natural way; hence here the 0th vertex is colored a , the 1st vertex is colored b , and so on. In addition, the edge which points towards the i th vertex will be called the i th edge. Coordinates are assigned to segments in the same way (though there is only one way to assign coordinates to a segment, while a space containing w vertices may be assigned coordinates in w ways). If x is a space and we have a coordinate system for that space in mind, then the notation $x_{i,j}$ will refer to the segment embedded in x that begins at the i th edge in x and has length j . For example, there are two possible ways to embed the segment $[a]$ in $(abacc)$, and these are given by $(abacc)_{0,1}$ and $(abacc)_{2,1}$. An embedded segment may wrap around a space any number of times; hence $(abacc)_{1,13}$ refers to an embedding of the segment $[baccabaccabac]$ in $(abacc)$. Similarly one may speak of the segment $S_{i,j}$ embedded in S ; however, here there can be no wrapping around.

Let S_i be a segment for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Then we may define $S = [S_0 \dots S_{n-1}]$ to be the segment formed by overlapping the rightmost edge of S_i with the leftmost edge of S_{i+1} for each $i < n - 1$. Similarly, we may define $x = (S_0 \dots S_{n-1})$ to be the space formed by overlapping the rightmost edge of S_i with the leftmost edge of S_{i+1} for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. In this context, it is useful to think of each element of K as a segment

of length one. Then our previous definitions of $[c_0 \dots c_{n-1}]$ and of $(c_0 \dots c_{n-1})$ agree with the above definitions; also, we may mix segments and colors, and define things like $[Sc]$. Note that sometimes I shall specify a different rule for overlapping the segments in $[S_0 \dots S_{n-1}]$ or in $(S_0 \dots S_{n-1})$; however, single-edge overlap will be the default.

The next task is to find a law of evolution. In other words, we need an invertible operator $T : \mathcal{X}_k \mapsto \mathcal{X}_k$ where T and T^{-1} are “local.” For now, I shall only use the idea of locality as a heuristic concept, rather than attempting to give it a precise definition. Heuristically, local laws are those in which the maximum velocity at which causal effects may be propagated is finite.

Here is an example of the sort of thing we are *not* looking for. Let $k = 3$. Then the allowed colors are a , b and c . Let $\bar{a} = b$ and $\bar{b} = a$. Let $x = (x_0 \dots x_{n-1})$ be an arbitrary space, where the subscripts of x are considered modulo n (n may be infinite). If $x_i \neq c$, let $L(i)$ be the smallest positive number such that $x_{i+L(i)} = c$ (if no such cell exists, $L(i)$ is infinite). Similarly, if $x_i \neq c$, let $R(i)$ be the smallest positive number such that $x_{i-R(i)} = c$. Let $F(i) = L(i) + R(i) + 1$. Then $F(i)$ is the size of the largest segment in x containing the i th cell of x and having the property that no cell in the segment is colored c . Suppose that T maps $(x_0 \dots x_{n-1})$ to $(y_0 \dots y_{n-1})$ where $y_i = x_i$ when $x_i = c$ or when $F(i)$ is odd, and $y_i = \bar{x}_i$ otherwise. Then T is invertible, but not local: in order to determine y_i one needs to know the colors of cells i through $i + L(i)$, where $L(i)$ may be arbitrarily large. Since the number of cells at time t which need to be examined in order to determine the color of a cell at time $t+1$ is unbounded, there is no maximum finite “velocity” at which causal effects may be propagated (where velocity is measured by considering each application of T to represent a unit of time, and each edge on a graph at time t to represent a unit of distance).

It turns out that it is not difficult to construct simple examples of local, invertible maps T such that T is its own inverse. One way to do this is to choose segments s_0 and s_1 and specify that T acts on x by replacing each occurrence of s_i in x with s_{1-i} and leaving the rest of x invariant. One must choose one’s segments carefully and be precise about what “replacing” means (sometimes overlap may be involved) so that the map is well defined and so that $T = T^{-1}$. But this may be done; and one may easily verify that any such T (and hence its inverse, which is also T) is local in the heuristic sense defined earlier.

The simplest examples of this sort involve segments of length one. For instance, consider a map which replaces $[a]$ with $[b]$ and $[b]$ with $[a]$. This map is clearly well defined, and it is its own inverse. It leaves the vertices and edges of the graph fixed, but permutes its colors. For example, this map sends $(abbababb)$ to $(baababaa)$.

A more complicated example is the map that replaces the segment $[aa]$ by the segment $[aba]$ and vice versa, and leaves everything else fixed. The idea is to operate on a graph as follows: wherever you see an $[aa]$, insert a b between the two a 's; and wherever you see an $[aba]$, delete the b . Note that these segments can overlap: for example, $[aaa]$ contains two consecutive overlapping segments $[aa]$, which means that two b 's are inserted. Also, note that segments may wrap around and hence contain the same cell more than once; hence (a) contains one copy of $[aa]$, and (ab) contains one copy of $[aba]$. Again, it is easy to see that this map is well defined and is its own inverse. It sends $(aaabbabaabb)$ to $(abababbaababb)$. Clearly this map can cause the number of vertices in the graph to change.

Another example is the map that exchanges $[a]$ with $[bc]$, leaving everything else fixed. Another example is the map that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$, leaving everything else fixed. And so on; it is easy to write down many such examples.

These examples provide trivial evolutions (since they have period two). But any composition of these maps is again a local, invertible map. In addition, many of these maps do not commute with one another. (For example, let T be the map which permutes the colors a and b , let U be the map which exchanges $[aa]$ with $[aba]$, and let $x = (a)$. Then $UT(x) = (b)$, but $TU(x) = (ba)$. Hence T and U do not commute.) Because of this noncommutativity, the local, invertible maps that result from composing several of these period-two maps together often turn out to be quite interesting.

Let us examine one such interesting case. Let $k = 3$, let the colors be a , b and c , and consider the map which operates on a graph in four steps, as follows:

1. Exchange $[ab]$ with $[ac]$.
2. Exchange $[ab]$ with $[c]$.
3. Exchange $[a]$ with $[c]$.
4. Exchange $[a]$ with $[b]$.¹

¹Note that the last two steps together perform the permutation (acb) on the colors; I list them separately so that each step is its own inverse. This insures that the inverse of the entire map may be obtained by performing the same steps in the opposite order.

For example, this map sends $(acbaabcb)$ to $(abbaaccb)$ via step 1, to $(cbaaababb)$ via step 2, to $(abccccbbb)$ via step 3, and finally to $(bacccacaa)$ via step 4.

Suppose that the initial state is (ab) . Figure 1 displays the orbit of this state under the above map. (The intermediate results of steps 1, 2 and 3 are omitted.) This evolution has period 183 and attains a maximum width of 11. By studying the orbits of this map empirically, one quickly arrives at the conjecture that every orbit has finite period. These periods tend to be quite large. For instance, the orbit of $(abcb)$ has period 898 and attains a maximum width of 18; the orbit of $(aabab)$ has period 6,360 and attains a maximum width of 22; and the orbit of $(ababcb)$ has period 343,904 and attains a maximum width of 29. A proof that every orbit of this map has finite period will be given in Chapter 8.

Much more will be said about the case of one-dimensional spaces later on, but now I will turn my attention to other sorts of spaces. Since our spaces are combinatorial, we may consider spaces whose dimension is not immediately obvious (if it is definable at all). For example, if our spaces are graphs with colored vertices or edges, we might define a set of spaces to be all graphs such that the radius- r neighborhood of any vertex of the graph lies in some finite set of allowed radius- r neighborhoods. Perhaps there is a known way to assign some sort of fractal dimension to spaces of this sort; I have not pursued the question. Here I will focus instead on sets of combinatorial spaces which are related in clearly defined ways to n -dimensional manifolds or pseudomanifolds.

The usual way to construct combinatorial n -dimensional manifolds (or pseudomanifolds) is to use simplicial complexes. However, one may also represent such objects by graphs that have certain simple properties. It seems to me that this is easier than using complexes, so this is the procedure that I will follow here.

Let Γ be a graph containing three types of edges (called 0-edges, 1-edges and 2-edges) such that each vertex meets exactly one edge of each type. (This implies that each vertex has degree three, and that each edge meets two distinct vertices.) One may consider any such graph as a two-dimensional manifold in the following way. If one begins at a vertex and travels along edges of type 0 and 1 in an alternating manner (first type 0, then type 1, then type 0, and so on), then there is only one way to proceed at any stage, and eventually (if the graph is finite) one must return to the original vertex. The path traced out in this manner is a circuit (which necessarily contains an even number of edges). We will think of the edges of this circuit as the

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|----|---------------|-----|--------------|-----|---------------|
| 0 | (ab) | 46 | (aacaccca) | 92 | (acacbcaa) | 138 | (ccaaaccb) |
| 1 | (cca) | 47 | (cbbcacacac) | 93 | (bbacacc) | 139 | (cacaccbcaa) |
| 2 | (cab) | 48 | (caaacabbb) | 94 | (aabbca) | 140 | (bbcaacacb) |
| 3 | (cacca) | 49 | (caccbccaaa) | 95 | (cccaacac) | 141 | (aacacbba) |
| 4 | (bcab) | 50 | (bcaacacacb) | 96 | (cacacacb) | 142 | (cbbaac) |
| 5 | (acacca) | 51 | (acacbbbcaa) | 97 | (cabbbaa) | 143 | (caaacb) |
| 6 | (bbcac) | 52 | (bbaaacacc) | 98 | (ccaaacb) | 144 | (caccba) |
| 7 | (aacab) | 53 | (aacbbca) | 99 | (cacaccba) | 145 | (bcaab) |
| 8 | (cbcca) | 54 | (cbcaaacac) | 100 | (bbcaab) | 146 | (aacacca) |
| 9 | (acacab) | 55 | (caacaccbb) | 101 | (aacaccca) | 147 | (bbcacac) |
| 10 | (bbcca) | 56 | (cacbbcaaa) | 102 | (cbbcacac) | 148 | (aacabb) |
| 11 | (caacacac) | 57 | (baacaccb) | 103 | (caaacabb) | 149 | (cbccaa) |
| 12 | (cacbbb) | 58 | (acbbcaa) | 104 | (caccbccaa) | 150 | (acacacb) |
| 13 | (cabaaa) | 59 | (baacacc) | 105 | (bcaacacacb) | 151 | (bbba) |
| 14 | (ccaccb) | 60 | (acbbca) | 106 | (acacbbba) | 152 | (caaac) |
| 15 | (cacabcaa) | 61 | (baacac) | 107 | (bbaaac) | 153 | (caccb) |
| 16 | (bccacacb) | 62 | (acbb) | 108 | (aaccb) | 154 | (cabcaa) |
| 17 | (acacabba) | 63 | (baa) | 109 | (cbcaa) | 155 | (ccacacb) |
| 18 | (bbccaac) | 64 | (cacc) | 110 | (acacb) | 156 | (cacabba) |
| 19 | (aacacacb) | 65 | (cabca) | 111 | (bba) | 157 | (bccaab) |
| 20 | (cbbba) | 66 | (ccacab) | 112 | (caac) | 158 | (acacaccca) |
| 21 | (aaab) | 67 | (cacabcca) | 113 | (cacb) | 159 | (bbcacac) |
| 22 | (cccca) | 68 | (bccacacab) | 114 | (caba) | 160 | (aaacabb) |
| 23 | (cacacab) | 69 | (acacabbcca) | 115 | (ccab) | 161 | (cbccaa) |
| 24 | (cabbcca) | 70 | (bbccaacacac) | 116 | (cacacca) | 162 | (caacacacb) |
| 25 | (ccaacacab) | 71 | (aacacacbbb) | 117 | (bbcab) | 163 | (cacbbba) |
| 26 | (cacacbbcca) | 72 | (cbbbaaa) | 118 | (aacacca) | 164 | (baaab) |
| 27 | (bbaacacab) | 73 | (aaacb) | 119 | (cbbcac) | 165 | (accca) |
| 28 | (aacbbcca) | 74 | (ccbcaa) | 120 | (caaacab) | 166 | (bcacacac) |
| 29 | (cbaacacac) | 75 | (caacacb) | 121 | (caccbcc) | 167 | (acabbb) |
| 30 | (caacbbb) | 76 | (cacbba) | 122 | (bcaacacab) | 168 | (bccaaa) |
| 31 | (cacbaaa) | 77 | (baab) | 123 | (acacbbcca) | 169 | (cacacaccc) |
| 32 | (baccb) | 78 | (acca) | 124 | (bbaacacac) | 170 | (cabbbcaca) |
| 33 | (abcaa) | 79 | (bcacac) | 125 | (aacbbb) | 171 | (ccaacabb) |
| 34 | (ccacacc) | 80 | (acabb) | 126 | (cbaaa) | 172 | (cacaccbcaa) |
| 35 | (cacabbca) | 81 | (bccaa) | 127 | (accb) | 173 | (bbcaacacacb) |
| 36 | (bccaaacab) | 82 | (cacacacc) | 128 | (bcaa) | 174 | (aacacbbba) |
| 37 | (acacacbbca) | 83 | (cabbcca) | 129 | (cacacc) | 175 | (cbbaaac) |
| 38 | (bbbacacac) | 84 | (ccaaacab) | 130 | (cabbca) | 176 | (caaaccb) |
| 39 | (aaabbb) | 85 | (cacaccbcca) | 131 | (ccaacab) | 177 | (caccbcaa) |
| 40 | (ccccaaa) | 86 | (bbcaacacab) | 132 | (cacacbbca) | 178 | (bcaacacb) |
| 41 | (cacacacb) | 87 | (aacacbbcca) | 133 | (bbacacab) | 179 | (aacbba) |
| 42 | (cabbbaaa) | 88 | (cbbaacacac) | 134 | (aabbcca) | 180 | (bbaac) |
| 43 | (ccaaacacb) | 89 | (caaacbbb) | 135 | (cccaacacac) | 181 | (aacb) |
| 44 | (cacacbbba) | 90 | (caccbaaa) | 136 | (cacacacbbb) | 182 | (cba) |
| 45 | (bbcaaab) | 91 | (bcaaccb) | 137 | (cabbbaaa) | 183 | (ab) |

Figure 1: An evolution of a one-dimensional oriented space under a local, invertible operator (period 183).

sides of a polygonal face of a two-dimensional manifold. Any polygonal face of this sort will be called an 01-face. Similarly, there are 02-faces and 12-faces. Every edge in the graph is the side of exactly two polygons. For example, a type-0 edge is the side of an 01-face and an 02-face. We may construct a two-dimensional space by gluing together all such polygonal faces along their common sides.

It turns out that the manifold associated with Γ is orientable if and only if the vertices of Γ may be divided into two groups such that each edge joins a vertex in one group to a vertex in the other. Such a graph is said to be *bipartite*. Suppose that we are given a division of the vertices of Γ into two such groups. Color the vertices in the first group black and those in the second group white. Then we may assign an orientation to the manifold associated with Γ as follows. The orientation of each face will be specified in terms of arrows whose tails are at black vertices on the boundary of the face. For an 01-face, the arrows point in the direction of the 0-edges emerging from those vertices. For an 02-face, they point in the direction of the 2-edges emerging from the vertices. For a 12-face, they point in the direction of the 1-edges emerging from the vertices. One may verify that, due to the properties of the coloring, the orientations of these faces must be compatible. Conversely, given any orientation of the manifold there is exactly one way to color the vertices of Γ black or white so that no edge joins two vertices having the same color and so that the arrows just mentioned point in the appropriate directions.

Several examples of graphs which represent two-dimensional manifolds are shown in Figure 2. In the manifold associated with such a graph, let V be the number of vertices, E be the number of edges and F be the number of faces. Then the Euler characteristic χ equals $V - E + F$. Since each vertex in the graph has degree 3, it follows that $3V = 2E$. (Note that this means that the number of vertices must be even, and that the number of edges must be divisible by three.) So $\chi = F - V/2$. By using this formula and (if necessary) determining whether or not the graph is bipartite, one may easily determine the topology of these manifolds.

What is especially nice about this graphical representation of two-manifolds is that it may be generalized in a surprisingly simple way. Let Γ be a graph containing $n + 1$ types of edges (labeled 0 through n) such that each vertex meets exactly one edge of each type. Graphs of this sort have different names in the literature; I will call them *n-graphs*. It turns out that, for $n > 0$, every *n-graph* can be associated with an *n-pseudomanifold*.




Figure 2: Representation of two-dimensional manifolds by graphs. Here the three types of edges are indicated by zero, one or two hatch marks on the edge. The three possible graphs with four or fewer vertices are displayed in the upper row. In the leftmost of these, there are three faces (an 01-face, an 02-face and a 12-face), each with two sides; the 01-face is glued to the 12-face along the 1-edge, the 12-face is glued to the 02-face along the 2-edge, and then the 02-face is glued to the 01-face along the 0-edge; the result is a sphere. In the upper central graph, there are four faces; the 12- and 02-faces each have 4 sides, and are glued together to form a cylinder; the two 01-faces cap the ends of the cylinder to form a sphere. One may also verify that these are spheres by using the Euler characteristic $\chi = F - V/2$; in the first case $F = 3$ and $V = 2$, and in the second case $F = 4$ and $V = 4$, so in both cases $\chi = 2$. In the upper right-hand graph, $F = 3$ and $V = 4$; hence $\chi = 1$, so this is a projective plane. The lower left-hand graph is a sphere: the vertices have been arranged in the picture to suggest a cube, and this is exactly what the graph represents since the faces of the suggested cube are exactly the 01-, 02- and 12-faces of the graph. On the other hand, the lower right-hand graph has its edge types switched on the “front” edges. Now $F = 4$ and $V = 8$, so $\chi = 0$. Since one may color the vertices of this graph with two colors in such a way that no edge connects two vertices of the same color, this is orientable; hence it is a torus.

If T is a topological space, then $C(T)$, the *cone* over T , is defined to be the identification space $T \times [0, 1] / \sim$ where \sim is the relation identifying all points in the set $\{(t, 1) \mid t \in T\}$. The construction of an n -pseudomanifold from an n -graph Γ proceeds inductively using cones.

The k -*faces* of an n -pseudomanifold represented by an n -graph correspond to the components of each subgraph that is obtained by deleting all edges whose types are not in K , for any $K \subset \{0, \dots, n\}$ containing k integers. If K is empty then these components are the vertices of the n -graph; the faces corresponding to these vertices are distinct points. If $|K| = 1$ then the components are pairs of vertices joined by a single edge; the face corresponding to such a component is a line segment joining the two 0-faces corresponding to the vertices. If $|K| > 1$ then each component corresponds to a $(k - 1)$ -pseudomanifold. In this case the associated k -face is the cone over this pseudomanifold.

To construct an n -pseudomanifold from its associated n -graph, one begins by constructing each of its n -faces. Each $(n - 1)$ -face of the pseudomanifold is contained in exactly two n -faces. (This corresponds to the fact that any subset of $\{0, \dots, n\}$ containing $n - 1$ elements is in exactly two subsets containing n elements.) If two n -faces contain the same $(n - 1)$ -face, these points are identified in the obvious way; the result after all of these identifications are made is the desired n -pseudomanifold.

One standard definition of pseudomanifold is given in terms of simplicial complexes (see [38]). Let P be the set of simplicial complexes which satisfy the rules for n -pseudomanifolds, and let G be the set of manifolds constructed from finite connected n -graphs as described above. It turns out (I will omit proofs) that there exist local 1-1 topology-preserving maps $f : G \mapsto P$ and $g : P \mapsto G$. Hence not only are the elements of G pseudomanifolds from a topological point of view, but every topological pseudomanifold is represented in G . In our case, we are not concerned just with topology, but also with geometry: the particular combinatorial structures involved in constructing these spaces are important. The fact that f and g are local and 1-1 indicates that G and P are in some sense equally rich in their descriptions of pseudomanifolds in terms of combinatorial structures.

Note also that the space constructed from an n -graph turns out to be orientable if and only if the graph is bipartite. Again, I will omit the proof.

Apparently this connection between n -graphs and n -pseudomanifolds was first discovered in the 1970s by Pezzana [33], then rediscovered by Vince [46], then partially

rediscovered by Lins and Mandel [28]. (The latter reference contains further pointers to the literature on this subject.) Later I too rediscovered this connection in a slightly altered form. (I was concentrating on oriented pseudomanifolds and did not realize that, with a slight modification, my result applies to unoriented pseudomanifolds also; and in my version there is an additional complication which, while unnecessary, does result in the nice property that the Poincaré dual of a pseudomanifold can be obtained simply by performing a certain permutation on the colors of the edges of the associated graph. See Section 9.4 for more details.) Perhaps the connection would not have been rediscovered so often if it were better known. In my opinion it deserves to be better known, since the definition of an n -graph is much simpler than the definition of a simplicial complex.

My suggestion, then, is that n -graphs provide a suitable basis for a definition of a set of n -dimensional spaces. We may add properties to these graphs by coloring them in some way. Since the edges already are colored (by their type numbers), the easiest thing is to color the vertices. Again, the local simplicity requirement implies that the number of colors must be finite. We may also restrict which configurations of vertices and edges are allowed locally by choosing a radius r , making a list of vertex neighborhoods of radius r , and defining the set of spaces to be all colored n -graphs such that each neighborhood of a vertex is in this list.

A set of spaces of the sort just described automatically satisfies the requirement that, for finite k , the set of allowed k -neighborhoods of a vertex is finite. However, it is not clear that they satisfy the requirement that, given a finite radius r , the set of allowed radius- r neighborhoods of a *point in space* is finite. What should we think of as being the “points” in space? There are several possibilities to consider here.

First, we might decide to think of the points in space as being the vertices of the graph. If we do this, then every set of spaces of the sort just described satisfies the local simplicity requirement.

On the other hand, it is natural to think of the n -dimensional faces of a pseudomanifold as *containing* points. For example, in the two-dimensional case we might wish to think that the points in space do not merely lie on the boundary of a polygonal face, but inside that face. If we think of each such face as being homeomorphic to a disk, then there are infinitely many points in the interior of a face. But this presents a problem. Is there any way to adopt this point of view and also hold to the view that the set of radius- r neighborhoods of a point ought to be finite? We have not adopted

a metric for these points, so it is not clear what a radius- r neighborhood would be. But if, for instance, the metric has the property that the distance of a point in the interior of a face from the boundary of that face takes on infinitely many possible values, then this means that infinitely many points have distinct r -neighborhoods if r is large enough; hence local simplicity is violated.

A third possible point of view, in some sense intermediate between the first two, is that, if there are to be finitely many “points” in a finite piece of n -dimensional space, then those points should be thought of not as zero-dimensional objects, but as little n -dimensional objects. In this case, the natural choice for a point is an n -face. For example, in the two-dimensional case we would think of the polygonal faces as themselves being the points. Of course, it may well be that “point” is not the correct word to use in this case. In any event, if our local simplicity requirement says that the set of allowed radius- r neighborhoods of n -faces must be finite, this places a restriction on which sets of spaces are allowed, for it means that the number of allowed types of n -faces must itself be finite. Restricting the allowed neighborhoods of a vertex does not necessarily accomplish this. For instance, the set of all 2-graphs in which the vertices are colored a or b may have polygonal faces containing as many vertices as you like. If we wish to have finitely many n -faces, then there must be a finite number of allowed vertex colors *and* a maximum finite number of vertices contained in any n -face.

The above discussion about “points” and “radius- r neighborhoods” is, of course, somewhat vague. This comes with the territory when one is trying to apply heuristic principles which have not been given precise mathematical definitions. Practically speaking, the question in this case is: do we concern ourselves with sets of spaces in which there are arbitrarily many types of n -faces, or not? Probably the best approach would be to be as general as possible, to allow arbitrarily many types of n -faces; then a set of spaces with finitely many types of n -faces can be studied as a special case. However, as I am somewhat partial to the third point of view described above, my tendency thus far has been to focus on those cases where there are only finitely many types of n -faces.

Thus, my promised two-dimensional example is defined on a set of spaces of this sort. The set of spaces is the set of 2-graphs such that there are three types of vertices (called a -vertices, b -vertices and c -vertices), and such that no face has more than 8 sides.

Let F_s be the number of faces with s sides in one of our spaces. Then $\chi = F - V/2 = F_2 + F_4 + F_6 + F_8 - V/2$. But $V = (2F_2 + 4F_4 + 6F_6 + 8F_8)/3$. Hence $\chi = \frac{2}{3}F_2 + \frac{1}{3}F_4 + 0F_6 - \frac{1}{3}F_8$. We may think of each face as carrying ‘‘gaussian curvature,’’ where the amount of curvature of F_s is equal to its coefficient in this last equation, and where the total curvature of a manifold is taken to be equal to its Euler characteristic. The fact that faces with six sides carry zero curvature corresponds to the fact that one may tile the plane with hexagons. Note that curvature in this setting only comes in multiples of one-third. Since I am allowing eight-sided polygons in my spaces, this means that I am allowing negative curvature.

The next step is to come up with some local invertible operators on this set of spaces. Again, I will look for maps T such that $T = T^{-1}$. As was the case in one dimension, some simple maps of this sort are obtained by exchanging a pair of colors. Here we may exchange colors on the vertices (e.g., one such map turns a -vertices into b -vertices, turns b -vertices into a -vertices, and leaves the rest of the graph alone), or on the edges (one such map turns 0-edges into 1-edges, turns 1-edges into 0-edges, and leaves the rest of the graph alone).

Other period-2 maps may be designed which do not affect the underlying graph, but only affect its colors. A useful example is the following (for fixed i, w, x, y, z): if an i -edge connects a w -vertex to an x -vertex, change w to y and x to z ; if it connects a y -vertex to a z -vertex, change y to w and z to x . This map is only well defined if either $w \neq x$ and $y \neq z$ or $w = x$ and $y = z$.

We also need period-2 maps which affect the underlying graph. Four such maps are sketched in Figure 3. The rules for these maps are somewhat complex, because they must preserve the property that no polygonal face has more than eight sides. These rules are not shown in the figure, but will be described below.

In the first map a 0-edge joining two a -vertices is transformed by inserting a two-sided 12-face containing two b -vertices in the middle of the edge, and vice versa: a two-sided 12-face containing two b -vertices each of which is connected along a 0-edge to an a -vertex is transformed by removing the 12-face and joining the two a -vertices by a 0-edge. These transformations only take place if certain conditions are satisfied. The original 0-edge is in a 01-face and a 02-face. One must make sure that these faces have six or fewer sides before performing the right-to-left move, since this move increases their number of sides by two. In addition, in order to perform the move going in either direction it is required that the dotted-line portion of the 01-face




Figure 3: Local invertible period-2 transformations in two dimensions. Here a vertex with color a is represented by an open circle, and a vertex with color b is represented by a filled-in circle. A sequence of an indeterminate number of edges which alternate between type 0 and type 1 is represented by a dotted line with an “01” next to it, and so on. In each case, the double arrow is meant to indicate that the left-to-right move and the right-to-left move are performed simultaneously, at all locations in the manifold containing the left or right configurations. Exact details of these moves are given in the text.

does not contain either of the sequences $a0a$ or $a0b1b0a$ (where “ $a0a$ ” refers to a connected portion of the graph containing an a -vertex, then a 0-edge, then an a -vertex). Similarly, the dotted-line portion of the 02-face is required not to contain either of the sequences $a0a$ or $a0b2b0a$. This insures that the 01-face and the 02-face are stable except for possibly this single operation.

In the second map a 0-edge joins two a -vertices which are not in the same 12-face and which are joined by 1- and 2-edges to (not necessarily distinct) b -vertices. The a -vertices are removed, the b -vertices that were joined to the a -vertices by i -edges are joined to one another by an i -edge ($i \in \{1, 2\}$), and each b -vertex is changed into an a -vertex. And vice versa: if a 12-face contains exactly one occurrence of each of the sequences $a1a$ and $a2a$, the color of each of these a -vertices is changed to b , the 1- and 2-edges joining them are removed, and two new a -vertices are added as shown in the figure. Neither of these operations takes place unless two additional conditions are satisfied. Firstly, the dotted-line sections of 12-faces (including the vertices which terminate these sections) cannot contain the sequences $a1a$, $a2a$ or $b1a2b$ either before or after the proposed transformation (one must check both cases since the terminal vertices change color during the transformation). Secondly, if a 1-edge in the dotted-line section of a 01-face or a 2-edge in the dotted-line section of a 02-face is not also in one of the 12-faces shown in the figure, then the 12-face that it is in must not contain exactly one occurrence of each of the sequences $a1a$ and $a2a$, nor may it contain the sequence $b1a2b$. These conditions are somewhat complicated, but something like them is needed to insure that nothing is going on in the neighborhood of the location of the proposed move that would make the map ill-defined or not invertible.

The first two maps are somewhat related, respectively, to the “two-dipole” and “one-dipole” moves described by Ferri and Gagliardi [10]. These are moves on an n -graph which preserve the topology of the associated pseudomanifold. Ferri and Gagliardi define a k -dipole to be a pair of vertices connected to one another by k edges such that, if one removes all edges from the graph which have the same color as those k edges, the two vertices are not in the same component of the resulting subgraph. A k -dipole move is the move which removes the pair of vertices and joins the remaining edges to one another, or its inverse. (Note that the requirement about vertices being in a separate component is checked in our second map, but not in our first map.) Ferri and Gagliardi show that, if one restricts attention to graphs

which are associated with manifolds (rather than pseudomanifolds), then any two graphs whose associated manifolds have the same topology can be transformed into one another using k -dipole moves. (Note that these moves are intended to act at one spot on an n -graph at a time, while the maps I have been describing act all over the graph at once, with the moves adding k -dipoles and the moves removing k -dipoles happening in parallel.)

One may easily verify that if a graph is bipartite before applying either of the first two maps, then it is bipartite afterwards; furthermore, these maps preserve the Euler characteristic. Hence each of the first two maps does not change the topology. But it is also possible to come up with maps which operate locally on an n -graph and which *do* change the topology. The last two moves in Figure 3 are of this type.

In the first of these, if a 2-edge joins two a -vertices v_0 and v_1 and two 0-edges join v_i to w_i , $i \in \{0, 1\}$, then these 0-edges are removed and new ones are inserted that join v_i to w_{1-i} , $i \in \{0, 1\}$. If the two 0-edges are in the same face before this move, then they will be in different faces after the move, and vice versa. The move is not performed unless the face containing both 0-edges (either before the move or after it) has eight or fewer sides. It also is not performed unless the 02-face and 12-face containing the 2-edge do not contain any other 2-edges joining two a -vertices. The number of vertices is preserved by this operation, but the number of faces (locally) is increased or decreased by one. Therefore, locally this map can change χ by one, so globally it can change the topology.

In the second of these maps, which is the last one in the figure, an a -vertex is replaced by three a -vertices as shown (and vice versa). The move is only allowed when there are no other a -vertices in the 01-face, 02-face or 12-face given by dotted lines, and when these faces have eight or fewer sides both before and after the move is performed. Here the number of faces is preserved, but the number of vertices (locally) is increased or decreased by two. Therefore again this map locally can change χ by one, so globally it can change the topology.

Should maps which change the topology be studied? Should we be interested in laws of evolution in which handles and crosscaps appear and disappear? I do not know. As has just been shown, maps can easily be constructed that act locally on the graph, are invertible, and change the topology. (In fact, I have found examples of maps of this sort which exhibit very complex behavior.) On the other hand, perhaps the fact that we have a defined topology loses its significance if we consider such

maps. (It would seem that the natural analog of a “local” map in the topological setting is a *continuous* map. These preserve the topology; so we seem to have two competing versions of locality here.) Probably the best approach is to be inclusive by studying all invertible maps that act locally on the graph; then the topology-preserving maps would be a special case. Nevertheless, I have focused most of my efforts in the two-dimensional case on studying topology-preserving maps.

Now that we have some simple operators, we may compose them with one another to produce new operators. I found that it was necessary to compose approximately five or more of them together before anything interesting happened. Otherwise, the resulting maps tended to produce small, finite orbits. But I did manage to find numerous maps which give complex orbits. My example map proceeds in five steps, as follows:

1. Change a -vertices into c -vertices and c -vertices into a -vertices.
2. Change 0-edges into 1-edges and 1-edges into 0-edges.
3. Change 0-edges into 2-edges and 2-edges into 0-edges.²
4. If a 2-edge joins a c -vertex to an a -vertex, change the a to b ; and if it joins a c -vertex to a b -vertex, change the b to a .
5. Perform the second operation sketched in Figure 3.

This operator does not change the topology. The results of applying it to a simple initial state are illustrated in Figure 4. The only step which changes anything but the colors of edges or vertices is step 5, which has no effect on anything until one applies the operator to the $t = 3$ state. The graph marked “almost $t = 4$ ” in the figure represents the state after applying steps 1 through 4 to the $t = 3$ state. This produces a 12-face with a 1-edge and 2-edge each joining two a -vertices; all other requirements for performing the right-to-left step-5 operation are also satisfied, so the result is that two new vertices are added to the graph in the manner shown. The manifolds in this example are spheres; this has enabled me to draw the graphs so that each area of the page separated by lines of the graph corresponds to a face of the manifold. (Note that this means that the portion of the page outside of the graph corresponds to a face of the manifold.)

²Again, the last two steps together perform a (012) permutation on edge types.




Figure 4: An evolution of a two-dimensional space under a local, invertible, topology-preserving operator. Here a -vertices are represented by open circles, b -vertices by filled-in circles, and c -vertices by shaded circles.

The vertex count of the manifold in this example tends to increase with time. It does not always do this; for instance, at $t = 5$ there are six vertices, but at $t = 10$ there are four. The vertex count at $t = 100$ is 12; at $t = 1,000$ it is 20; at $t = 10,000$ it is 120; at $t = 40,000$ it is 3,916. It appears that the number of vertices (at least in this portion of the evolution) grows at roughly an exponential rate, doubling every 5,000 to 7,000 time steps. Approximately the same growth rate seems to hold if one runs the law in reverse, though it begins more slowly: at $t = -10,000$ there are only 48 vertices, and at $t = -40,000$ there are 1,040. I have also run the same law using a four-vertex projective plane (as shown in Figure 2) with three a -colored vertices and one b -colored vertex as my initial state. The same growth rate seems to apply, though again the growth seems to take off more slowly: at $t = 40,000$ the vertex count is 1,280, and at $t = -40,000$ it is 976.

It is easy to count vertices; and the fact that the number of vertices increases without exhibiting an apparent regular pattern indicates that something complex is happening here. But what, exactly, is happening? Is it simply a random swirling of colors and polygons, like some sort of gas? Or does this universe eventually contain a phenomenon that might accurately be described as a two-dimensional equivalent of Madonna? At present, there is no way of knowing.

3 Related systems

Several areas in the literature involve dynamical systems related to the sort that I wish to study here. These include cellular automata, structurally dynamic cellular automata, L systems and parallel graph grammars, and symbolic dynamics.

In cellular automata, the geometry of space is usually chosen to be a rectangular n -dimensional lattice (occasionally other sorts of spaces are studied, such as hexagonal lattices, or even arbitrary graphs) whose vertices are colored by k colors; a local homogeneous map specifies how to evolve the colors of the state at time t to produce the state at time $t + 1$. If we add the requirement that the map be invertible, then these systems become combinatorial spacetimes. However, they are a restricted form of combinatorial spacetime, since the geometry in cellular automata does not evolve. One-dimensional cellular automata will be discussed further in Chapters 5 and 7.

Ilachinski and Halpern [25] discuss the idea of allowing the geometry in cellular automata to evolve locally. They call such systems “structurally dynamic cellular automata.” Further discussion appears in [14, 15]. Because they do not focus on the case where the law of evolution is invertible, and because their examples (from my point of view) are somewhat cumbersome geometrically, there is not much concrete information to be gained from these papers that is relevant to the discussion here. However, apart from the concept of invertibility, the basic ideas of combinatorial spacetimes are indeed present in these papers.

Another class of related systems has been studied primarily from the point of view of biology, linguistics, and computer science. In the one-dimensional case these are called L systems. An L system consists of an initial state and a local rule by which this state evolves. The state is a string of symbols. The local rule allows the number of symbols in the string to increase or decrease. Typically the string of symbols does not wrap around to form a circle, and the law of evolution is typically not invertible. But otherwise, these systems closely resemble one-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. Numerous books and papers have been written about them (see for example [35, 36]).

My impression has been that the point of view of those engaged in studying L systems is generally very different from mine. For example, L systems are often used as a way to model various forms of growth. Hence the rules of evolution are often restricted to be such that the string only grows, and never shrinks. Such rules cannot be invertible. An additional restriction often imposed is that the rules are “context-free.” What this means is that there is no interaction in the system. From a physical point of view, these are the most uninteresting systems possible. Finally, the fact that closed spaces are not considered is a difference which, from my point of view, introduces an unnecessary complication. I suspect that it would have been quite difficult for me to achieve the sorts of results described here had I not restricted myself to closed spaces.

Because of this differing point of view, I have not invested much time in studying L systems. However, this is not to say that L systems are irrelevant to my work. Certainly there is some overlap; in fact, we will see one example of this in Section 5.4.4.

Generalizations of L systems to higher dimensions are provided by parallel graph grammars (see [36, 9]). Instead of a state being a string of symbols, here it is a colored graph; laws of evolution involve local transformations of these graphs which are applied in parallel at all points on the graph. Various methods have been suggested for defining systems of this sort. Again there is often a focus on context-free systems and growth problems, but there are schemes which do not restrict themselves in these ways; these seem interesting from my point of view. As we have seen, combinatorial n -dimensional manifolds and pseudomanifolds may be represented by graphs, so it is possible that $n + 1$ -dimensional combinatorial spacetimes may be seen as a type of parallel graph grammar. I have not investigated this connection in detail, however.

Unlike the above approaches to combinatorial dynamical systems, my approach combines a geometric flexibility with a focus on invertible local maps. I believe that this offers several mathematical advantages. For example, the class of cellular automaton models is a difficult one to study. If, however, one *expands* that class by allowing for geometry change, one obtains a class of models which, it seems to me, is easier to comprehend as a whole. For now many simple transformations between models are possible which were not possible before. These can simplify the picture (examples of this will be seen later on). In addition, if one focuses on *invertible* local maps, the gains are twofold. Firstly, it seems that nondissipative systems are in important ways mathematically more tractable than dissipative ones. And secondly,

by studying such maps one gains information concerning *equivalences* between systems. This subject of equivalences, while of central importance in most mathematical fields, has, I think, not been sufficiently taken into account in the study of cellular automata.

The area of dynamical systems which perhaps has the most important relationship with combinatorial spacetimes is symbolic dynamics (see [27]). The nature of this relationship is, to me, somewhat surprising and obscure. Nevertheless, it exists.

In the study of dynamical systems, one may examine the trajectories of points on a manifold M under iteration of some diffeomorphism $f : M \mapsto M$. In certain cases, one may identify a finite number m of regions R_i in M whose union is R such that $x \in R$ if and only if $f(x) \in R$. Given any point $x \in R$ at time 0, one may write down a history vector x_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $f^i(x)$ is contained in region R_{x_i} for each i . In certain cases, it turns out that distinct points in R always have distinct history vectors. In addition, the set of history vectors of points in R sometimes form what is known as a *subshift of finite type*. This means that there exists some finite r such that, if you write down a list of all length- r sequences contained in history vectors, the set of history vectors is precisely all vectors containing the symbols 1 through m which contain only those allowed length- r sequences.

In this case, one may put a topology on the set of allowed history vectors H . A basis for this topology is given by $\{x_i \in H \mid x_{i_j} = a_j, 1 \leq j \leq s\}$ for each choice of finite s , sequence of coordinates i_j , and sequence of values a_j . (In other words, each set of vectors that is obtainable by placing restrictions on finitely many coordinate values is a basis element.) The resulting topology is a Cantor set. One also defines a *shift map* $\sigma : H \mapsto H$ where $\sigma(x) = y$ if and only if $y_i = x_{i+1}$. Then σ is continuous under the Cantor set topology.

Next, one investigates *topological conjugacy*. If H_1 and H_2 are sets of history vectors with the Cantor set topology and σ_1 and σ_2 are the associated shift maps on H_1 and H_2 , then $g : H_1 \mapsto H_2$ is a conjugacy of σ_1 and σ_2 if g is a homeomorphism and $\sigma_2 g = g \sigma_1$.

It turns out that topological conjugacy maps $g : H \mapsto H$ are exactly the same thing as reversible one-dimensional cellular automaton maps (provided that one extends the usual definition of cellular automata so that they are defined on subshifts of finite type). This is well known. To symbolic dynamicists, conjugacy maps are interesting as equivalence maps; to those interested in cellular automata, the same

maps (if they map a space to itself) are of interest for their dynamical properties when iterated.

This, I thought, was as far as the connection went. But it turns out that there is another sort of equivalence map between subshifts of finite type which arises in symbolic dynamics. This is called a *flow equivalence map*. It is less well known. The relationship of conjugacy maps to reversible one-dimensional cellular automata is precisely analogous to the relationship of flow equivalence maps to 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. That is: the set of flow equivalence maps $g : H \mapsto H$ is identical to the set of laws of evolution which I discovered in my 1+1-dimensional case. All of this will be discussed in Section 5.8.

4 Space+time picture and spacetime picture

The examples in Chapter 2 were developed from the space+time point of view. The general setup from this perspective is as follows. There is a set of sets of allowed spaces, and a set of local, invertible maps from one set of allowed spaces to another. Such a map $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ is called an *equivalence* between space sets. If $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}'$, then T is also a *law of evolution*: it is an operator on \mathcal{X} , and the orbits of \mathcal{X} under this operator are considered as spacetimes. In other words, given any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, one considers the set $\langle T, x \rangle = \{T^t(x) \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ as a foliation of spacetime by Cauchy surfaces contained in \mathcal{X} , where these surfaces are indexed by the time parameter t . Here one is not concerned with the particular value of the time parameter, but only with relative values; hence $\langle T, x \rangle$ is equivalent to $\langle T, T^t(x) \rangle$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also, the choice of whether t increases or decreases in a particular direction perpendicular to the Cauchy surfaces is simply a matter of convention; hence $\langle T, x \rangle$ is equivalent to $\langle T^{-1}, x \rangle$.

At first glance there would appear to be no specified local connection between spaces from this perspective. There is a space x at time t , and a space $T(x)$ at time $t+1$, and these are separate objects. However, the fact that T is a local law provides an implicit local causal structure linking these objects. So the result of evolving a space using T really is a spacetime.

From this point of view, two space sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' are equivalent if and only if there exists a local invertible map $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$. If two space sets are equivalent, then there is a local invertible map $T \mapsto UTU^{-1}$ between laws of evolution on \mathcal{X} and laws of evolution on \mathcal{X}' . These are the only equivalences between laws that arise naturally in the space+time picture.

Note that an equivalence between laws induces a local equivalence between spacetimes: if $S = UTU^{-1}$ then the map U sends $T^t(x)$ to $S^t(U(x))$ for each t ; hence

U induces a local invertible map which sends $\langle T, x \rangle$ to $\langle S, U(x) \rangle$. We may think of $\langle T, x \rangle$ and $\langle UTU^{-1}, U(x) \rangle$ as being descriptions of the same set of spacetimes using different coordinate systems; then maps of the form $\langle T, x \rangle \mapsto \langle UTU^{-1}, U(x) \rangle$ are the allowed coordinate transformations. From the space+time point of view, the dynamical properties of a set of spacetimes are precisely those properties which are invariant under these coordinate transformations. (There is obvious analogy here with linear operators: the operator itself is independent of the basis; the properties of the operator T are those which are invariant under change of basis, which again takes the form UTU^{-1} for some invertible U . One difference is that here I am only considering operators T which are themselves invertible.)

The space+time point of view is a straightforward one, but it is not the best one. In general relativity the natural point of view is the spacetime point of view, and this is also the case here. In the spacetime picture, two *spacetime* sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' are equivalent if and only if there exists a local invertible map $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$. Certain spacetime sets will contain laws of evolution, and others will not. Those that do will admit foliations into Cauchy surfaces, any one of which locally determines the rest of the spacetime; those that don't will not admit such foliations.

By “set of spacetimes” I here simply mean some sort of set of combinatorial objects that is defined by specifying what the allowed neighborhoods are and how they are allowed to be pieced together. Since the word “spacetime” normally refers to situations in which there is some sort of dynamics, I suppose that it would be better to restrict the use of that word to refer to those sets of objects that admit a foliation into Cauchy surfaces as described above. But for now I will not do this, since I have no precise general definition which describes when laws of evolution exist and when they do not, let alone a general method of how to detect their existence. The above idea about foliation into Cauchy surfaces is at the moment only a heuristic one.

The main point that I wish to make about these two points of view has to do with the equivalence of laws and with dynamical properties. In the spacetime point of view, the law of evolution really in a sense *is* the set of spacetimes. The set of spacetimes is a set of rules concerning which neighborhoods are allowed and how they may be glued together. If these rules imply that there is a foliation into Cauchy surfaces, then the rules are in effect the law of evolution, since they determine how one constructs the rest of the spacetime from one of the Cauchy surfaces. From the spacetime point of view, then, two laws are equivalent if and only if the associated sets

of spacetimes are equivalent. It is natural to expect that this is a broader notion of equivalence than the space+time one: every space+time equivalence transformation no doubt corresponds to a spacetime equivalence transformation, but not vice versa.

This has implications regarding the nature of dynamical properties. If from the space+time point of view we find that P is a dynamical property, we cannot be certain that P will transform invariantly under the larger class of equivalence transformations provided by the spacetime picture. In the spacetime picture, it is only those properties which are invariant under spacetime equivalence transformations which should be regarded as dynamical properties. Thus the spacetime picture should allow us to get a better idea of which properties are important from a dynamical point of view.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to adopt the spacetime point of view at the start. In order to do so, one needs a higher-dimensional theory. At the moment that theory is not well developed. The geometry of one-dimensional spaces is simple; for this reason, most of the work to be discussed here is approached from the 1+1-dimensional perspective. A two-dimensional theory is required in order to understand these systems from a spacetime point of view. My attempts to formulate such a theory will be discussed in Chapter 9.

Despite the difficulty of adopting the spacetime point of view, it turns out to be easy to find examples of a certain sort of equivalence between laws which is a natural one in the spacetime picture but does not arise naturally in the space+time picture. These will be discussed in Chapter 7.

5 The 1+1-dimensional oriented case

In this chapter I trace the development of my ideas about 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes in a somewhat historical manner. The path which is traced begins with reversible cellular automata, passes through a straightforward attempt to extend these systems, and eventually arrives at a new point of view which is related to symbolic dynamics and to bialgebras. One purpose of presenting the subject in this manner is that it provides an easy introduction to combinatorial spacetimes for those familiar with cellular automata, and demonstrates why the transition from reversible cellular automata to the new point of view is inevitable. A second reason for proceeding in this way is that my story is by no means completed, and contains a number of holes. For example, though I believe that the various points of view presented here describe the same class of systems, I have not proven this. In addition, though the new point of view is more elegant than the older ones, it is possible that the older ones may yet serve a purpose. I have attempted to provide the reader with every type of tool known to me that might be useful in further study of these systems.

5.1 Reversible one-dimensional cellular automata

When I first became interested in exploring the subjects discussed in this document, the only systems known to me that fit the criteria I had in mind were reversible cellular automata (i.e., cellular automata where the laws of evolution are invertible). These systems had been brought to my attention by papers of Fredkin and Toffoli [12], Toffoli [43, 44], Margolus [29] and Vichniac [45]. I decided to begin by exploring the simplest of these systems: i.e., one-dimensional systems. It soon became apparent that one-dimensional cellular automata (without the restriction of reversibility) had been studied most extensively by Wolfram [48, 49, 50]. My early research on reversible one-dimensional cellular automata focused on the question of how to generate all such systems; the results (and further references) are in [17]. (See also a paper by Boykett [5], who independently obtained similar results in a different and interesting

way. Also see Williams [47]; it turns out that the above results are closely related to his main theorem concerning topological conjugacy maps between subshifts of finite type.)

The set of states in a traditional one-dimensional cellular automaton is the set of functions $\{f : \mathbb{Z}_w \mapsto K \mid w \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}\}$ (here $\mathbb{Z}_\infty \equiv \mathbb{Z}$) where K is a fixed, finite set of allowed “colors.” In other words, it is a closed one-dimensional lattice of cells where the cells are indexed by \mathbb{Z}_w and where each cell contains a color in K . If $w = \infty$ then the lattice has the form of a line; otherwise it has the form of a circle. The number w is called the *width* of the automaton.

Each state in a cellular automaton is associated with a variable t (time), with $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ if the automaton is reversible and $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ otherwise. The law of evolution T associated with the automaton acts homogeneously on the spatial lattice by examining the state of a neighborhood of a cell at time t and thereby deciding what color that cell should be at time $t + 1$. Typically the neighborhood of cell i is chosen to be the $2r + 1$ consecutive cells beginning at cell $i - r$ and ending at cell $i + r$ for some fixed positive integer r . But one may choose any neighborhood one wishes, as long as it is finite. For example, in what follows I will sometimes think of the neighborhood of cell i as being the d consecutive cells beginning at cell i and ending at cell $i + d - 1$, for some fixed positive integer d .

The law T can therefore be described by a function mapping each possible state of a cell’s neighborhood to the color that a cell becomes at time $t + 1$ if its neighborhood is in that state at time t . This may be represented nicely by a table with two columns; the left-hand column lists the possible states of the neighborhood, and the right-hand column lists the associated color.

Several such tables for laws which will be referred to later in the text are presented in Figure 5. These laws happen to be invertible; the tables for their inverses are also shown in the figure.

5.2 A modification

My next step was to modify this scheme to allow for the possibility of geometry change. Consider the case where space is a one-dimensional lattice containing a finite number of cells and forming a circle. The only thing that geometrically differentiates one such space from another is the number of cells in the lattice. This number is

| | <i>A</i> | | <i>B</i> | | <i>C</i> | | <i>D</i> | | <i>E</i> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>ac</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>ad</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>db</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>dc</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |

| <i>F</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>f</i> |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> |
| <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>f</i> |
| <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> |
| <i>f</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> |

| <i>F⁻¹</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>f</i> |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>e</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>f</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>f</i> | <i>b</i> |

Figure 5: Some invertible one-dimensional cellular automata. The first table displays five laws (*A* through *E*) defined on \mathcal{X}_4 . Each of these laws and their inverses have the same left-hand column containing all length-2 segments in \mathcal{X}_4 ; this is displayed at the far left of the table. Each law name is associated with two columns: the first is the right-hand column for the law; the second is the right-hand column for its inverse. Laws *F* and *F⁻¹* are also $d = 2$ laws, but they are defined on \mathcal{X}_6 . Here I have used a more compact “product” notation which is particularly suited for $d = 2$ laws: each left-hand segment is of the form $[LR]$, where *L* and *R* are colors; the right-hand segments are placed in a matrix, where the rows are indexed by *L* and the columns by *R*. All laws given here are “center-reversible” laws; for further discussion (and another type of compact notation) see [17].

an invariant in traditional cellular automata. The obvious idea is to modify the setup so that the number of cells is now allowed to change. This change should be accomplished by the action of the local law alone: we want it to be possible that certain neighborhoods at time t cause new cells to appear at time $t + 1$, while others cause cells to disappear.

If one is to insert cells or delete them at certain spots in the lattice, then what happens to the cell coordinates? It is impossible to have them be updated in a local way and still maintain the property that the coordinate numbers of adjacent cells differ by one. There is an easy solution, however: dispense with coordinates. Formally, this can be expressed as follows. Let X be the original set of states $\{f : \mathbb{Z}_w \mapsto K \mid w \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}\}$. Define a relation on X : $f \sim g$ if and only if there exists an m in \mathbb{Z}_w such that $f(i) = g(i + m)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_w$. It is easy to see that this is an equivalence relation on X . Let \mathcal{X} be the set of equivalence classes $\{[x] \mid x \in X\}$. Then the elements of \mathcal{X} are the coordinate-free states.

Now examine again the tables in Figure 5. I will now present a different interpretation of these tables, which will be helpful in the process of generalizing one-dimensional cellular automata to allow for geometry change.

The first step is to view the entries in the table as *segments* (see Chapter 2). A table consists of two length- n columns of segments, where $n = |K|^d$ (d is the neighborhood size). The set of segments in the left column will be denoted by L , and the set of segments in the right column by R ; the i th segment on the left side will be denoted L_i , and so on. Each left-hand segment has length d , and each right-hand segment has length 1.

Secondly, the left-hand side of the table may be viewed as containing not just a list of segments, but (implicitly) a set of rules for how these segments may be glued together to form a state. The gluing rules are as follows: if the last $d - 1$ cells of L_i have the same state as the first $d - 1$ cells of L_j , then L_i may be glued to L_j by overlapping those matching $d - 1$ cells.

Note that these gluing rules have two parts. The first is the matter of *adjacency*: which segments may be glued to which? When two segments are glued together, the right end of one is glued to the left end of the other (when both segments are aligned so that the directed edges point to the right). Hence adjacency has a direction. In the above example the right end of L_i is glued to the left end of L_j ; we say that L_j follows L_i . The set of adjacency rules may be nicely encoded in a $n \times n$ matrix A_{ij} of

may make two copies of $[aa]$, one copy of $[ab]$ and one copy of $[ba]$, arrange them in a circle, and then glue them together to form $(aaab)$.

This situation has two important features. Firstly, it is easy to see that, given any state of the automaton, there is one and only one way to obtain it by gluing left-hand segments together in accordance with the rules. Secondly, if we start with a state of the automaton and disassemble it into an ordered collection of left-hand segments, this process is a *local* one. What I mean by this is that there is a fixed finite radius r (in this case, $r = d - 1$) such that, if S is a connected piece of the state, then the portion of the segment decomposition of the state that overlaps S may be determined by looking at the state of S plus its r neighbors to either side. For instance, if $(aababb)$ is the state, $d = 2$, and the piece of state in question is $[abb]$, we need only look at $[abb]$ plus its neighbor on either side (i.e, at $[babba]$) in order to see that the portion of the segment decomposition that overlaps the piece $[abb]$ is the sequence $[ba]$, $[ab]$, $[bb]$, $[ba]$.

Now the cellular automaton law may be seen to work as follows. Suppose that $[x]$ is the state of the cellular automaton at time t . One begins by decomposing $[x]$ into an arrangement of left-hand segments and left-hand gluing rules. This decomposition is unique. The state of the automaton at time $t + 1$ is then constructed by replacing each left-hand segment with the associated right-hand segment, replacing each left-hand gluing rule with the associated right-hand gluing rule, and then gluing the resulting segments together using the new gluing rules. Since the decomposition into left-hand segments is a local one, the resulting map is local. One additional property is required in order for the map to be a local law of evolution: it must be possible to iterate the map. Hence in all cellular automata tables it is the case that every state that can be assembled from right-hand segments can also be assembled from left-hand segments.

This may be formalized in the following way. Let F be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z}_w \mapsto \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $A_{f(i),f(i+1)} = 1$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_w$. Define a relation on F as follows: $f_1 \sim f_2$ if and only if there exists a j in \mathbb{Z}_w such that $f_1(i) = f_2(i + j)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_w$. This is an equivalence relation. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of equivalence classes, and denote the equivalence class containing f by $[f]$. Recall our earlier definitions of X and of \mathcal{X} . One may construct an element of X from f by defining l_i to be a copy of segment $L_{f(i)}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_w$, defining gluing rule $g_{i,i+1}$ to be a copy of $g_{f(i),f(i+1)}^L$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_w$, and then gluing the resulting segments together using these gluing

rules. This defines a map $h_L : F \mapsto X$. In addition, since $h_L(f) = x$ implies that $h_L[f] = [x]$, we may define a map $H_L : \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ by the rule $H_L([f]) = [h_L(f)]$. If, on the other hand, we use right-hand segments and right-hand gluing rules in the above construction process, this gives us a map $H_R : \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$. We require that $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{X}$. If H_L is invertible and H_L^{-1} is local, then $H_L^{-1}H_R$ is a cellular automaton law.

One may also view this in terms of graphs. If A is an $n \times n$ matrix of nonnegative integers, then it corresponds to a directed graph Γ_A with n vertices, where there are A_{ij} edges directed from vertex i to vertex j . Suppose that A is an adjacency matrix for a cellular automaton table. Then \mathcal{F} is simply the set of closed directed paths in Γ_A . Thus there is an invertible map between the set of closed directed paths in Γ_A and the set of states of the cellular automaton. One may then view the segments as being associated with the vertices, and the closed directed paths as recipes for assembling copies of these segments into states.

It is now easy to generalize one-dimensional cellular automata to produce systems in which there is geometry change. We may drop the requirement that the left-hand segments are all of length d and are glued together by a $(d - 1)$ -cell overlap; and we may drop the requirement that the right-hand segments are all of length one and are glued together by placing them next to one another. All we need is that the gluing rules produce well-defined maps H_L and H_R as defined above, that H_L is invertible, that H_L^{-1} is local, and that $H_R(\mathcal{F}) \subset H_L(\mathcal{F})$.

A further generalization will prove useful later on: instead of requiring A to be a matrix of 0's and 1's, we may allow it to be a matrix of nonnegative integers. Now A_{ij} represents the number of ways in which the j th segment may directly follow the i th segment. In other words, instead of there being at most one gluing rule g_{ij} for each ordered pair of segments, we now allow there to be a finite set $\{g_{ij}^k \mid 1 \leq k \leq A_{ij}\}$ of such rules. The associated graph Γ_A has A_{ij} edges going from vertex i to vertex j . This requires us to modify the definition of F : if G is the set of gluing rules, then F is the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z}_w \mapsto G$ with the property that if $f(m) = g_{ij}^k$ and $f(m + 1) = g_{qr}^s$ then $j = q$.

Let us set up some notation to deal with these systems. A rule table will be denoted by the tuple $\langle L, R, G^L, G^R, A \rangle$ where L and R are sets of segments, G^L and G^R are sets of gluing rules, and A is an adjacency matrix. It is also useful to consider tuples $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$. Such a tuple will be called a *description* of a set of spaces. The set of spaces it describes will be denoted by $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$. It is the set of 2-regular graphs

obtained by gluing the segments in L together using the adjacency rules in A and the gluing rules in G^L ; in other words, it is the set $H_L(\mathcal{F})$. If H_L is invertible and its inverse is local, we will say that $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ is a *faithful description* of $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$.

One may obtain a compact notation for a description by encoding the gluing-rule information in the adjacency matrix. A gluing rule g_{ij}^k may be thought of as a segment which has the property that L_i is embedded at the left end of the segment and L_j is embedded at the right end of the segment. For example, if $L_i = [abc]$ and $L_j = [cb]$, then $g_{ij}^k = [abcb]$ means that L_i is glued to L_j with a two-cell overlap, while $g_{ij}^k = [abc|cb]$ means they are to be glued together with no overlap, and $g_{ij}^k = [abc|acb]$ means they are to be glued together by inserting an a between them. Consider the matrix A such that A_{ij} is written as a formal sum of the segments corresponding to each gluing rule g_{ij}^k , with the order of the sum corresponding to the order of the index k . It is useful in this case to omit square brackets and think of the colors as free variables. The empty segment corresponds to a product of zero variables; hence it is denoted by 1. Now A contains all gluing-rule information. The original adjacency matrix may be obtained by setting each color variable to 1.

Here are two examples, both of which are descriptions of \mathcal{X}_3 :

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} [a] & aa & ab & ac \\ [b] & ba & bb & bc \\ [c] & ca & cb & cc \end{array} \qquad [] \mid a + b + c$$

The segments are written in the left-hand columns. The left-hand description is the standard one with length-2 segments and one-cell-overlap gluing rules. The right-hand description involves a single empty segment (recall that this is simply an edge) and three ways to glue two such segments together by putting a vertex between them (one for each color).

In terms of descriptions, a rule table $\langle L, R, G^L, G^R, A \rangle$ may be denoted as $\langle D, E \rangle$, where $D = \langle L, G^L, A \rangle$, $E = \langle R, G^R, A \rangle$, $\mathcal{X}_E \subset \mathcal{X}_D$, and D is a faithful description.

Since I am primarily interested in the case where the law of evolution $\langle D, E \rangle$ is local and has a local inverse, this is the case that will be treated here. Such systems will be called *1+1-dimensional oriented combinatorial spacetimes*. In this case both H_L and H_R must be invertible, and their inverses must both be local. Hence D and E must both be faithful descriptions. Furthermore, it must be the case that $\mathcal{X}_D = \mathcal{X}_E$. Such a law, then, is simply a pair of faithful descriptions of a set of spaces \mathcal{X} that share the same adjacency matrix. It follows that, in order to study the set of all such

invertible maps on \mathcal{X} , it is important to obtain an understanding of the set of all faithful descriptions of \mathcal{X} . More will be said about this topic in Section 5.5.

It should be noted that I have been focusing on laws of evolution, but that this formalism is perfectly suited to deal with local maps $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$ where \mathcal{X} is not necessarily equal to \mathcal{Y} . Such a map is given by any pair of descriptions $\langle D, E \rangle$ such that D and E share the same adjacency matrix and D is a faithful description. The important case here will be when T has a local inverse. In that case it is also required that E is a faithful description. Maps of this sort will be discussed in Section 5.6.

Finally, consider the orientation-reversing map on \mathcal{X} . In many contexts orientation reversal is not thought of as a local map. It is local in this context, however, because it operates on a space simply by switching the direction of the arrows in the directed graph. This operation is completely analogous to operations which act locally on colors. In fact, the oriented case is a subset of the general 1+1-dimensional case (see Chapter 6), in which both oriented and unoriented space sets are allowed. In that context one may represent oriented spaces by singling out two colors for special roles; reversal of orientation amounts to permuting those two colors.

This map cannot be given in the form $\langle D, E \rangle$. Neither can other maps which involve orientation reversal in an essential way. To generalize our formalism to include these maps we must drop the assumption that the orientation of segments always goes from left to right as written on the page. Instead, the orientation of each segment must be given explicitly in the rule table. Now $A_{ij} = 1$ will be taken to mean that the right-hand end of L_i may be glued to the left-hand end of L_j . In order for this gluing to make sense, it must be the case that if $A_{ij} = 1$ then the orientations of L_i and L_j are the same: they both point to the right or they both point to the left. Here is an example of a simple rule table of this sort:

$$\begin{array}{c} \rightarrow a \rightarrow \quad \Big| \quad \leftarrow b \leftarrow \\ \rightarrow b \rightarrow \quad \Big| \quad \leftarrow a \leftarrow \end{array}$$

I have drawn the directed edges in these length-1 segments to indicate orientation. This rule acts on \mathcal{X}_2 by permuting the colors and then reversing orientation; e.g., it sends $(aababbb)$ to $(aaababb)$.

Define a *simple orientation-reversing map* to be one in which the left-hand and right-hand segments are the same (as read from left to right) except perhaps for directions of edges. In general, while one may compose maps of the form $\langle D, E \rangle$ with simple orientation-reversing maps in whatever way one pleases, any such map is equal

to a composition of two maps PT where T preserves orientation and P is a simple orientation-reversing map. Hence one may easily derive the set of all maps involving orientation reversal from the set of orientation-preserving maps. Since accounting for orientation reversal makes life a bit complicated, I will largely ignore it in what follows, and focus on maps that preserve orientation.

5.3 The class of one-dimensional space sets

Up to now I have only discussed sets of spaces in which there are k colors and no neighborhood restrictions; i.e., any color may be adjacent to any other. These space sets will appear frequently in the sequel. As before, I shall refer to such a set as \mathcal{X}_k , and label the k colors with lower-case letters of the alphabet, beginning with a .

The requirement that finite pieces of spacetime contain finite amounts of information does not restrict us to these space sets alone, however. It is satisfied simply by allowing only a finite number of colors. We may impose further restrictions on which patterns of colors are allowed.

Here is a natural way to do this. Choose a finite positive integer d . Then list all allowed neighborhoods of diameter d . Let the set of spaces be that subset of \mathcal{X}_k in which each d -neighborhood is in the list of allowed neighborhoods.

Such a space set is easily described by a set of segments and gluing rules. For example, the set of segments can simply be the set of allowed d -neighborhoods, and the gluing rules can be the same as those implied by the left-hand side of a traditional cellular-automaton table (one may glue two segments together by forming a $(d - 1)$ -cell overlap whenever the overlapping cells match).

In symbolic dynamics these space sets are called *subshifts of finite type*. They arise naturally when considering the reinterpretation of the cellular automaton rule table described above; and, as shall be seen, they are essential in the work that follows.

One may also consider sets of spaces with other kinds of restrictions. For example, one might wish to consider the subset of \mathcal{X}_2 in which the length of a sequence of a 's is always even. This particular set of spaces may also be generated by segments and gluing rules. For example: one may do it using three segments $x = [a]$, $y = [a]$, and $z = [b]$, where the gluing rules are that there are no adjacency restrictions except that x must be followed by y , and that there is no overlap. It is easy to see that any space in this subset of \mathcal{X}_2 may be decomposed into these segments in one and

only one way. However, this decomposition is not local in the sense described earlier. For given a cell in some state whose color is a , in order to tell whether the segment overlapping this cell in the decomposition is x or y one would need to scan to the left or right to find the first cell whose color is b . This scan might extend arbitrarily far, since a sequence of a 's in this space set may be as long as you like. Hence there is no finite r , and the definition for locality is not satisfied. In fact, there does not exist an $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ that is a faithful description of this set of spaces.

Consider now the set of space sets that may be obtained by requiring the segments to be of length one, letting the adjacency matrix be arbitrary, and requiring that the gluing be done without overlap. In symbolic dynamics these space sets are called *sofic shifts*. The above example is a sofic shift. In addition, it is easy to show that *any* set of spaces generated by segments and gluing rules is a sofic shift. (Hence all subshifts of finite type are sofic shifts.)

It is possible that dynamical systems with laws of evolution that are in some sense local can be designed for sofic shifts which are not subshifts of finite type. But these laws would not be local in the sense defined above. In the next section I will show that a set of spaces that has a faithful description must be a subshift of finite type. We already know that every subshift of finite type has a faithful description. Hence the subshifts of finite type are exactly those sets of oriented one-dimensional spaces that have faithful descriptions. For this reason, they are the sets of spaces which I will consider in what follows.

5.4 Initial attempts to generate 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes

I did not immediately arrive at the general point of view concerning segments and gluing rules described above. Initially, I only realized that one could view the right-hand side of the table as a set of segments that were glued together by certain rules, and that one could modify the existing setup by allowing these segments to be of varying lengths (including length zero) instead of always being length one. I retained the rule that the right-hand segments were to be glued together by placing them next to one another without overlap. It was clear that this new setup allowed for change in the width of the state as the system evolved. So I tried to find an algorithm which, if allowed to run forever, would generate all invertible rules of this type. I will call

these rules the *nonoverlap rules*.

In the remainder of this section, then, we will consider only rule tables of the form $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$, where L is a list of all n allowed segments of width d (each such distinct segment listed once, in lexicographical order) and A and G^L correspond to the $(d - 1)$ -overlap gluing rules. The symbol N denotes the nonoverlap gluing rules. The set of spaces $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$ is denoted by \mathcal{X} , and K denotes the set of allowed colors. Given $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$, our task is to find all $\langle R, N, A \rangle$'s such that $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ is a law of evolution. Thus we want to find R such that $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ is a faithful description of \mathcal{X} .

5.4.1 Existence of a rule-generating algorithm

If one does not concern oneself with invertibility, then there are infinitely many such R 's for each choice of $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$. For if \mathcal{X} is nonempty then it is easy to show that it must contain a finite space $(a_1 \dots a_m)$. Let $S_j = [a_1 \dots a_m]$ for every j . Then each space $(S_1 \dots S_r)$ must also be in \mathcal{X} for any $r > 0$. We may therefore choose segment R_i to be $[S_1 \dots S_{r_i}]$, where $r_i > 0$ for each i . There are infinitely many ways to choose the R_i 's in this manner, and each choice results in a set of segments that generates spaces in \mathcal{X} .

It turns out, however, that this is not the case once one imposes two conditions. The first is that the directed graph Γ_A associated with the adjacency matrix A is the union of its strongly connected components. (I will also say in this case that the matrix A is the union of its strongly connected components; in general, I will often speak of a graph and of its adjacency matrix interchangeably.) A *strongly connected component* of a directed graph is a maximal subgraph such that, for any vertices i and j in the subgraph, there is a directed path contained in the subgraph that connects i to j . (A directed graph is *strongly connected* when it has one strongly connected component and it is equal to that component; this property will be useful later on. The term *irreducible* is also used for this property in the literature.) The graph Γ_A is the union of its strongly connected components if and only if every vertex in that graph is contained in a closed finite path. Thus if this property holds it follows that each L_i (each R_i) appears in a decomposition into segments of at least one finite-width space in $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$ ($\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, G^R, A \rangle}$).

The second condition is that the rule is invertible.

Theorem 1 *For each L whose adjacency matrix A is the union of its strongly connected components, there are only finitely many invertible nonoverlap rules.*

PROOF. Consider the process of constructing R by adding one right-hand segment at a time. At any moment in this process we may consider the spaces generated by this partial set of right-hand segments. Suppose that this assignment process is not yet complete. Consider an unassigned segment r_i . Since A is the union of its strongly connected components, r_i must be present in a segment decomposition of some finite-width space. This space cannot also be generated by the assigned segments, for then the rule would not be invertible. Hence the set of finite-width spaces not generated by the assigned segments is nonempty. It follows that there must exist a space of finite width w that is not generated by the assigned segments, while every space with width less than w is generated by those segments. Since the rule is invertible, this space must be decomposable into right-hand segments, each of which cannot have width greater than w (due to the nonoverlap rule). At least one of these segments must be unassigned. Thus there must exist at least one not-yet-assigned segment whose width is less than or equal to w . Require that this segment be the next one assigned. Then there are only finitely many ways to make this assignment. Since this is true at each stage in the segment-assigning process, the proof is complete. \square

This assignment process does not constitute an algorithm for generating invertible nonoverlap rules unless we add a routine that checks whether $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ is a faithful description of \mathcal{X} . Here is such an algorithm.

Let $R_{i,j}$ indicate the j th cell in R_i . We may construct an associated description $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ in which each of the cells $R_{i,j}$ now appears as a length-1 segment in R' . The new adjacency matrix A' is constructed as follows. If j is less than the length of segment R_i , then $R_{i,j}$ is succeeded only by $R_{i,j+1}$. If not, then one uses A to find all possible chains of segments that succeed R_i such that each segment in the chain is of length zero except for the terminal segment in the chain; then $R_{i,j}$ is succeeded by the first cell in each of these terminal segments. An example of this construction is shown in Figure 7.

The description $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is useful not only because it is in fact a description of $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$ (which indeed it is) but also because there is a local invertible map between the closed paths in Γ_A and the closed paths in $\Gamma_{A'}$. It follows that $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ is a faithful description of $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$ if and only if $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is a faithful description of

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | [c] | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [c] | | [c] | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [cc] | | [c] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [b] | | [b] | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| [a] | | [a] | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [a] | | [a] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [aca] | | [a] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| [] | | [c] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| [] | | [a] | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| [ca] | | [c] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | | [a] | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Figure 7: The set R of nine variable-length segments at the left, with associated adjacency matrix A , is transformed into the set R' of eleven segments of length one (and new adjacency matrix A') shown at right. (None of these segments overlap.) The segments on the right are the cells in the segments at the left, taken in order of appearance. The two sets of segments generate the same set of spaces. Note that if L is the set of all width-2 segments containing 3 colors, taken in alphabetical order, and G^L is the 1-cell-overlap gluing rule, then the adjacency matrix for L is also A ; it turns out that $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ is the 1+1-dimensional rule described in Chapter 2.

$\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$.

We now focus our attention entirely on $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ and attempt to generate a certain set P of sets of ordered pairs of elements of R' , as follows. (In the remainder of this section I will assume that Γ_A , and hence $\Gamma_{A'}$, is the union of its strongly connected components.)

Let S be an arbitrary nonempty segment. Then S may be constructed by assembling the elements of R' using the gluing rules in a finite number of ways. (This number may be zero.) Let each way of constructing S be associated with an ordered pair (i, j) such that R'_i is the first segment used in this particular construction of S and R'_j is the last segment used in this construction. Let P_S be the set of all such ordered pairs. We say that the segment S is “associated” with the set P_S . (If $P_{S'} = P_S$ then S' is also associated with P_S ; in other words, more than one segment can be associated with one of these sets of ordered pairs.) If $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{X}_k$ then P is the set of all elements P_S for each nonempty segment S that occurs in a space in \mathcal{X}_k .

There are two requirements we have about these sets P_S . The first requirement is that, given any ordered pair (i, j) in P_S , there must be exactly one way to construct

S (or any other segment associated with P_S) whose beginning segment is R'_i and whose ending segment is R'_j . For if there were two such ways, then, since $\Gamma_{A'}$ is the union of its strongly connected components, the segment S may be completed to form a finite space; there will then be at least two distinct ways to construct that space using $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$, which therefore will not be a faithful description of $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$. The second requirement is that if $|S| > 1$ and the first color of S is equal to the last color of S , then there must be at most one element of P_S which is of the form (i, i) . For any such S may be closed up to form a finite space in \mathcal{X}_k by identifying its first and last elements. This space may or may not be in \mathcal{X} . If $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is to be a faithful description then there must be at most one way to construct this space using elements of R' , and this will be true if and only if at most one element of P_S is of the form (i, i) . (This follows since any ordered pair of this form is associated with exactly one method of constructing S . To construct the associated space, one simply identifies the identical beginning and ending segments in this construction of S .)

Given P_S , it is a straightforward process to create $P_{[Sc]}$ for each $c \in K$. (I will call this process “extending one cell to the right.”) The process does not depend on a choice of S (in other words, if $P_S = P_{S'}$ then $P_{[Sc]} = P_{[S'c]}$). All information needed to carry out the construction is present in P_S itself and in the gluing rules. Furthermore, it is possible at each stage to insure that the two requirements described above are met. The second requirement is easy to verify: one simply examines the resulting $P_{[Sc]}$ to see whether or not it contains two ordered pairs of the form (i, i) . The first requirement cannot be checked by examining the resulting $P_{[Sc]}$; it must be checked during the process of creating it. It fails if and only if there are elements (w, x) and (w, y) in P_S with $x \neq y$ such that, according to the adjacency matrix A' , both R'_x and R'_y may be followed by some segment R'_z . If either condition fails, we say that an error has occurred.

The process of constructing the set P of all such elements P_S is initiated by creating an element $P_{[c]}$ for each $c \in K$. One then extends to the right each element P_S which has been constructed but not yet extended until an error occurs or until one cannot do this anymore. The process is bound to terminate since there are only finitely many possible sets of ordered pairs of elements of R' . It is easy to see that, in the case of termination without error, the set of elements P_S that we have constructed must be complete: every nonempty segment S will be associated with one of the constructed sets of ordered pairs. An example of a successfully constructed

| | |
|--------|---|
| [a] | $\{(5, 5), (6, 6), (7, 7), (9, 9), (11, 11)\}$ |
| [c] | $\{(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (8, 8), (10, 10)\}$ |
| [ac] | $\{(5, 1), (5, 2), (7, 8), (9, 1), (9, 2), (9, 10), (11, 1), (11, 2), (11, 10)\}$ |
| [aca] | $\{(7, 9), (9, 11), (11, 11)\}$ |
| [caca] | $\{(3, 9), (8, 11), (10, 11)\}$ |
| [ca] | $\{(3, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7), (8, 9), (10, 11)\}$ |
| [cc] | $\{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 3)\}$ |
| [cac] | $\{(3, 1), (3, 2), (3, 8), (8, 1), (8, 2), (8, 10), (10, 1), (10, 2), (10, 10)\}$ |
| | |
| B | $\{\{5, 9, 11\}, \{6, 9, 11\}, \{7, 9, 11\}, \{4\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3, 8, 10\}\}$ |
| | |
| E | $\{\{5, 6, 7\}, \{9\}, \{11\}, \{4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 8\}, \{1, 2, 10\}\}$ |

Figure 8: The set P for the example in Figure 7. The elements of P which are not products are each associated with a finite number of segments; these segments are listed. Those that are products are all elements of the form $b \times e$, $b \in B$, $e \in E$. Each of these is associated with infinitely many segments. The fact that *every* product $b \times e$ is an element of P results from the fact that $\Gamma_{A'}$ in this case is strongly connected; this need not be the case if $\Gamma_{A'}$ is merely the union of its strongly connected components. Note that if $b \in B$ and $e \in E$ then $b \cap e$ contains at most one element.

set P is given in Figure 8.

When the process terminates due to an error, we know that $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is not a faithful description. It turns out that the converse is also true: if the process terminates without error, then $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ must indeed be a faithful description. This, however, is by no means obvious. What is obvious is that, if the process terminates without error, then no *finite* space is constructible in more than one way; this is guaranteed by the first condition. But a further argument is required in order to prove that the same holds for infinite spaces, and that the decomposition of spaces into segments is a local process.

To proceed, it is necessary to consider two directed graphs which are associated with P ; I will call these the *right graph* and the *left graph*. In each case the vertices of the graph are the elements of P . The edges are labeled with the elements of K . One edge of each color points outward from each vertex. In the right graph, the edges correspond to the operation of extending to the right: for any nonempty S and for each $c \in K$, there is a c -colored edge pointing from P_S to $P_{[Sc]}$. In the left graph, the edges correspond to the operation of extending to the left.

Let S be an arbitrary nonempty segment, and c be an arbitrary color. Let B_{P_S} be the set of all first elements in the ordered pairs in P_S , and let E_{P_S} be the set of all second elements in those ordered pairs. Then it is easy to see that $B_{P_{[sc]}} \subset B_{P_S}$, and that $E_{P_{[cs]}} \subset E_{P_S}$. In other words, as you travel in the direction of the edges along the right graph, the sets B_{P_S} form a nested, nonincreasing chain, and the same is true of the sets E_{P_S} as you travel in the direction of the edges along the left graph. It follows that, as you travel along any circuit in the right graph, B_{P_S} must remain constant; the same must hold for E_{P_S} in the left graph.

I will say that P_S is a *product* whenever $P_S = B_{P_S} \times E_{P_S}$.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that the algorithm to generate P terminates without error. Let S be a segment that begins and ends with the same color, with $|S| > 1$. Let S^m denote the segment formed by joining m consecutive copies of S together with a one-cell overlap. If there exists an $m > 1$ such that $P_{S^m} = P_S$, then P_S is a product.*

PROOF. First note that (p, q) is in $P_{S^{k+1}}$ if and only if there exists an i such that (p, i) is in P_{S^k} and (i, q) is in P_S . It follows inductively that (p, q) is in P_{S^k} if and only if there exist $i_0 \dots i_k$ such that $p = i_0$, $q = i_k$, and $(i_j, i_{j+1}) \in P_S$ for each j , $0 \leq j < k$.

Now consider any $(p, q) \in P_S$. Since $P_S = P_{S^m}$, it follows that $P_S = P_{S^{1+r(m-1)}}$ for each $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Hence for each such r there is a sequence $Y_r = (i_0^r, \dots, i_{1+r(m-1)}^r)$ such that $p = i_0^r$, $q = i_{1+r(m-1)}^r$, and $(i_j^r, i_{j+1}^r) \in P_S$ for each j , $0 \leq j < 1 + r(m-1)$. (The superscripts of i denote indices, not exponents.)

Since the number of segments in R' is finite, there must exist $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_s^{r_0} = i_{s+t}^{r_0}$. Since (i_j^r, i_{j+1}^r) is in P_S for any j , it follows that (i_j^r, i_{j+k}^r) is in P_{S^k} for any j and k . Hence $(i_s^{r_0}, i_s^{r_0})$ is in P_{S^t} . Let $h = i_s^{r_0}$. Then there must be a sequence (m_0, \dots, m_t) such that $m_0 = m_t = h$ and (m_j, m_{j+1}) is in P_S for each j . The sequence $(n_0, \dots, n_t) = (m_1, \dots, m_t, m_0, m_1)$ also has the property that (n_j, n_{j+1}) is in P_S for each j . So (m_1, m_1) is in P_{S^t} . Since $|S| > 1$ and therefore $|S^t| > 1$, there can be at most one element in P_{S^t} of the form (i, i) . It follows that $m_1 = h$. So $(m_0, m_1) = (h, h)$ is in P_S .

From the above it follows that (p, h) is in P_{S^s} . But since (h, h) is in P_S , it must also be true that (p, h) is in $P_{S^{s+j}}$ for any nonnegative j . Hence (p, h) must be in $P_{S^{1+r(m-1)}}$ for large enough r . But this is the same as P_S . So (p, h) is in P_S . Similarly, (h, q) must be in P_S .

Next consider any (p, q) and $(s, t) \in P_S$. Since $(s, h) \in P_S$ and $(h, h) \in P_S$ and $(h, q) \in P_S$, it is easy to verify that $(s, q) \in P_{S^k}$ for any $k > 1$. Hence $(s, q) \in P_{S^m}$. But $P_{S^m} = P_S$. So $(s, q) \in P_S$. Similarly, $(p, t) \in P_S$. Hence P_S is a product. \square

Theorem 3 *Suppose that the algorithm to generate P terminates without error. If S is a segment whose first and last cells have the same color and $|S| > 1$, then there exists a $k > 0$ such that P_{S^k} is a product.*

PROOF. Consider P_{S^i} for all i . Since there are only finitely many elements in P , there must exist a positive integer k such that $P_{S^k} = P_{S^{k+m}}$ for some $m > 0$. Hence $P_{S^k} = P_{S^{k+qm}}$ for any nonnegative q . So $P_{S^k} = P_{S^{k+km}} = P_{S^{k(1+m)}} = P_{(S^k)^{1+m}}$, and the result follows because S^k meets the conditions of the previous theorem. \square

Theorem 4 *Suppose that the algorithm to generate P terminates without error. Then P_S is in a circuit in the right graph (or left graph) if and only if it is a product.*

PROOF. In what follows I will use the rule that $[ST]$ means that S and T overlap by one cell, rather than the usual rule that they do not overlap.

Suppose that P_S is a product and that (p, q) is in P_S . Then (i, q) and (p, j) are also in P_S for each $i \in B_{P_S}$ and each $j \in E_{P_S}$. Since $\Gamma_{A'}$ is the union of its strongly connected components, it contains a directed path from the q th vertex to the p th vertex. Hence there exists a segment T which begins with the color of R'_q and ends with the color of R'_p such that $P_{[ST]}$ contains (i, p) for each $i \in B_{P_S}$. It follows that $P_{[ST^2]}$ contains (i, j) for each $i \in B_{P_S}$ and for each $j \in E_{P_S}$; i.e., it contains $B_{P_S} \times E_{P_S}$. Furthermore, $P_{[ST^2]}$ is obtained from P_S by extending to the right, and it is also obtained from P_S by extending to the left. Hence $B_{P_{[ST^2]}} \subset B_{P_S}$ and $E_{P_{[ST^2]}} \subset E_{P_S}$. It follows that $P_{[ST^2]}$ is contained in $B_{P_S} \times E_{P_S}$. Hence $P_S = P_{[ST^2]}$. Thus P_S is in a circuit in the right graph and in the left graph.

Now suppose that P_S is in a circuit in the right graph. Then $P_S = P_{[ST]}$ for some segment T that begins and ends with the same color, with $|T| > 1$. It follows also that $P_S = P_{[ST^m]}$ for any $m > 0$. By the previous theorem, there exists a $k > 0$ such that P_{T^k} is a product. Consider any element (p, q) in P_S such that q is in $B_{P_{T^k}}$. Then (p, i) is in $P_{[ST^k]}$ (and hence in P_S) for each $i \in E_{P_{T^k}}$. Since this is true for each such $(p, q) \in P_S$, and since there are no elements in $P_{[ST^k]}$ (and hence in P_S) except for those that are generated in this way, it follows that P_S must be a product. \square

Let B be the set of all B_{P_S} such that P_S is a product. Let E be the set of all E_{P_S} such that P_S is a product.

Theorem 5 *Suppose that the algorithm to generate P terminates without error. Then the intersection of an element of B with an element of E must contain less than two elements.*

PROOF. Suppose that P_S and P_T are products, and that i and j are distinct elements of $B_{P_S} \cap E_{P_T}$. Then P_S and P_T are nonempty, so there exists $p \in B_{P_T}$ and $q \in E_{P_S}$. Let $[TS]$ be the segment where T and S overlap by one cell (this makes sense since the cell in common must have the same color). Then there are at least two distinct ways to construct $[TS]$ using elements of R' that begin with R'_p and end with R'_q (one way passes through R'_i and the other through R'_j). This cannot be, since it violates the first requirement for $P_{[TS]}$. \square

Theorem 6 *Suppose that the algorithm to generate P terminates without error. Then $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is a faithful description.*

PROOF. Let S be a length-1 segment. Consider the set of segments T such that $B_{P_{[ST]}} \in B$ but $B_{P_{[ST']}} \notin B$ if $T = [T'c]$ for some c . This set is finite since for long enough T $P_{[ST]}$ is a product. Let t be the maximum number of cells in any such segment T , where the maximum is taken over all possible S . Similarly, consider the set of segments U such that $E_{P_{[US]}} \in E$ but $E_{P_{[U'S]}} \notin E$ if $U = [cU']$ for some c , and let u be the maximum number of cells in any such segment U .

Now suppose we are examining a particular cell in a space, and considering the decomposition of this space into elements of R' . This cell must be the leftmost cell in one of the segments $[ST]$ described above; hence, in the decomposition of the space into segments, the cell must be represented by an element of $B_{P_{[ST]}}$. The cell must also be the rightmost cell in one of the segments $[US]$ described above; hence, in the decomposition of the space into segments, the cell must be represented by an element of $E_{P_{[US]}}$. But $B_{P_{[ST]}} \in B$ and $E_{P_{[US]}} \in E$; hence they intersect in at most one element. If they do not intersect, then the space in question is not in $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$. If they intersect in exactly one element i , then R'_i is the segment which must be assigned to the cell in the decomposition. Hence there is only one way to decompose the space into segments, and this decomposition may be carried out in a local manner where the neighborhood examined has size $t + u + 1$. \square

The segments $[UST]$, as described in the above proof, determine which element of R' is assigned to the length-1 segment S in the decomposition. I call the set of these segments (for all such U , S and T), with the segment S identified in each and assigned a segment R'_i , a set of *forcing strings* for $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$. They contain all the information needed to compute the decomposition of a space. An example of a set of forcing strings is given in Figure 9.

Theorem 7 *If $\Gamma_{A'}$ is the union of its strongly connected components, then $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is a faithful description if and only if there is a unique way to decompose each finite space in $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ into segments.*

PROOF. The forward implication is trivial. Suppose that there is a unique way to decompose each finite space in $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ into segments, and we attempt to generate P . We have already shown that violation of the first requirement means there are two ways to construct a finite space, so this cannot happen. If the second requirement is violated, then there are two ways to construct some segment S both of which begin with the same element R'_i and end with the same element R'_j . Since $\Gamma_{A'}$ is the union of its strongly connected components, there exists a segment T which may be constructed by beginning with R'_j and ending with R'_i . Let (ST) denotes the space where S and T overlap by one cell at each end. This space clearly may be constructed in two different ways. Hence this requirement may not be violated either; so the algorithm to compute P must terminate without error, which means that $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ must indeed be a faithful description. \square

Theorem 8 *If $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ is a faithful description, then $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ is a subshift of finite type.*

PROOF. Consider the set of forcing strings described above, where the maximal length of T is t and the maximal length of U is u . It is a straightforward procedure to construct all allowed segments of length $t+u+2$ that are generated by $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$. My claim is that $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ is exactly that subset \mathcal{Y} of \mathcal{X}_k obtained by requiring each $(t+u+2)$ -neighborhood to be one of these segments. Surely $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. Let x be any space in \mathcal{Y} . Any length- $(t+u+1)$ neighborhood in x contains a forcing string which determines that, in any decomposition of x into segments, the $(u+1)$ st cell of this neighborhood must be represented by some particular segment R'_i . Since any cell in x is the $(u+1)$ st cell in an $(t+u+1)$ -neighborhood, its representation

| <u>[ST]</u> | | <u>[US]</u> | <u>R'_1</u> | <u>R'_3</u> | <u>R'_4</u> | |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| $\{R'_6, R'_9, R'_{11}\}$ | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | $\{R'_5, R'_6, R'_7\}$ | <u><i>cb</i></u> | <u><i>cca</i></u> | <u><i>b</i></u> |
| $\{R'_5, R'_9, R'_{11}\}$ | <i>ab</i> | <i>ba</i> | $\{R'_5, R'_6, R'_7\}$ | <u><i>cb</i></u> | | |
| $\{R'_7, R'_9, R'_{11}\}$ | <i>aca</i> | <i>aaca</i> | $\{R'_9\}$ | <u><i>cc</i></u> | <u>R'_6</u> | <u>R'_9</u> |
| $\{R'_5, R'_9, R'_{11}\}$ | <i>acb</i> | <i>ba</i> | $\{R'_9\}$ | | <u><i>aaa</i></u> | <u><i>aaca</i></u> |
| $\{R'_5, R'_9, R'_{11}\}$ | <i>acc</i> | <i>acaca</i> | $\{R'_{11}\}$ | <u>R'_2</u> | <u><i>baa</i></u> | <u><i>baa</i></u> |
| $\{R'_4\}$ | <i>b</i> | <i>bcaca</i> | $\{R'_{11}\}$ | <u><i>ca</i></u> | <u><i>caa</i></u> | <u><i>caca</i></u> |
| $\{R'_3, R'_8, R'_{10}\}$ | <i>ca</i> | <i>ccaca</i> | $\{R'_9\}$ | | | |
| $\{R'_1\}$ | <i>cb</i> | <i>bca</i> | $\{R'_{11}\}$ | <u>R'_5</u> | <u>R'_7</u> | <u>R'_{10}</u> |
| $\{R'_2\}$ | <i>cca</i> | <i>cca</i> | $\{R'_5, R'_6, R'_7\}$ | <u><i>ab</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| $\{R'_1\}$ | <i>ccb</i> | <i>b</i> | $\{R'_4\}$ | <u><i>acb</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| $\{R'_1\}$ | <i>ccc</i> | <i>aac</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_8\}$ | <u><i>acc</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| | | <i>bac</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_8\}$ | <u><i>bab</i></u> | | |
| | | <i>acac</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_{10}\}$ | <u><i>acb</i></u> | <u>R'_8</u> | <u>R'_{11}</u> |
| | | <i>bcac</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_{10}\}$ | <u><i>acc</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| | | <i>ccac</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_8\}$ | <u><i>cab</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| | | <i>bc</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_{10}\}$ | <u><i>acb</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |
| | | <i>cc</i> | $\{R'_1, R'_2, R'_3\}$ | <u><i>acc</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> | <u><i>aca</i></u> |

Figure 9: Forcing strings for the example in Figure 7. Here the segments $[ST]$ and $[US]$ are given, along with a list of the ways in which they restrict the element of R' assigned to S . Then a set of forcing strings is listed. There is one set of forcing strings for each element of R' . The cell which is forced to be that element of R' is underlined. Instead of listing the set of forcing strings $[UST]$, I have chosen here to list a smaller set of forcing strings. Smaller sets such as this can often be constructed. (In general a set of forcing strings can be defined to be a set of segments, each having an identified cell assigned some R'_i , with the property that, for any cell in an allowed space, a segment in the set can be embedded in the space so that the identified cell of the segment maps to the chosen cell in the space.) For example: since here R'_2 is associated only with the single $[ST]$ segment $[cca]$, all you need to force $[c]$ to be R'_2 is a ca after it; you don't have to list all seven strings $[Ucca]$. This is the unique smallest set of forcing strings for this example; in the general case, however, it is not always possible to find such a unique smallest set.

in the decomposition is determined. Thus there is at most one way to decompose x into segments. The question remaining is whether the decomposition determined by the $(t + u + 1)$ -neighborhoods is a valid one: if R'_i and R'_j are assigned to neighboring cells, is it allowed for R'_j to follow R'_i ? The answer is obtained by examining the $(t + u + 2)$ -neighborhood containing the cell assigned to R'_i as its $(u + 1)$ st cell and the cell assigned to R'_j as its $(u + 2)$ nd cell. This neighborhood is constructible using the description $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$. But it contains the two $(t + u + 1)$ -neighborhoods which fix the representations of its $(u + 1)$ st cell and $(u + 2)$ nd cell to be R'_i and R'_j , respectively. Thus it must be allowed for R'_j to follow R'_i . So the decomposition is a valid one; hence $x \in \mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$. So $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$. So $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle} = \mathcal{Y}$, which is a subshift of finite type. \square

The proof of the above theorem provides the final tool needed to complete our algorithm for generating all rules $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ given a faithful description $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$. The algorithm proceeds by generating each candidate for R in turn. For each candidate, we run the algorithm to generate P . If it terminates without error, then $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ is a faithful description. Furthermore, we know that the set of spaces $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$ is given by a list of its allowed $(t + u + 2)$ -neighborhoods, as described above; hence it is determined by a list of its allowed m -neighborhoods for any $m \geq t + u + 2$. Similarly, the set of spaces $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$ is determined by a list of its allowed m -neighborhoods for any $m \geq d$. We therefore compute the set of allowed m -neighborhoods for $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$ and for $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$, where $m = \max\{t + u + 2, d\}$. If these sets are the same, then $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$; in this case $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ is a valid rule.

5.4.2 Standard forms and the shift

Consider a no-overlap rule described by a table whose left-hand segments have width d . We may easily describe the same rule using a table whose left-hand segments have width e for any $e > d$. This can be done as follows: if L_i and R_i refer to the segments in the original table, L'_j is a left-hand segment in the new table, and the subsegment of L'_j consisting of its first d cells is L_i , let $R'_j = R_i$.

This is one example of the fact that there are many ways to describe the same rule. In this case one may easily find the smallest possible d , and express the rule using that value of d . This is sufficient to give a canonical form in the case of cellular

automata. However, once one dispenses with coordinates, it is no longer sufficient; certain tables which previously described different rules now describe the same rule. When in addition one allows right-hand segments to have lengths different from one, one obtains a greater freedom of description which results in the fact that some rules may be described in a great many ways for a fixed value of d .

For example, consider the following four tables.

| | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| aa | a | aa | a | aa | a | aa | a |
| ab | a | ab | - | ab | ab | ab | b |
| ba | b | ba | ba | ba | - | ba | a |
| bb | b | bb | b | bb | b | bb | b |

The first and last of these tables are traditional cellular automaton tables which represent (slightly) different laws. Given the convention that the neighborhood of a cell begins at that cell and extends to the right, the first table represents the identity law, and the last represents the law in which the colors of the cells are shifted one unit to the left. Once we dispense with coordinates, however, the difference between these two laws disappears. Clearly, this is a good thing. Our choice of convention regarding the position of the neighborhood is arbitrary, and merely determines where we write down the state at time $t + 1$ relative to the state at time t . The choice is a representational one; it has no effect on the intrinsic behavior of the cellular automaton. This would not be the case if the laws of evolution being studied depended on the coordinates. But they do not; they are translation invariant. By removing the coordinates, we have removed the need for this convention.

The right-hand columns of the second and third tables contain segments of length zero, one and two. (A dash stands for the empty segment.) Hence these are not traditional cellular-automaton tables. Nevertheless, it is easy to verify that these two tables also represent the identity law. Additional ways of representing this same law are given in Figure 10, which displays all 41 ways to describe the identity law on \mathcal{X}_2 when $d = 3$. For a given value of d the identity law seems to have more representations than other laws, but other laws do often have multiple representations.

It turns out that all of these equivalent descriptions are related by a simple transformation and its inverse. Suppose that we are given a law table and we choose a length- $(d - 1)$ segment S . Let R^1 be the set of right-hand segments whose associated left-hand segments end with S , and let R^2 be the set of right-hand segments whose associated left-hand segments begin with S . Then R^1 and R^2 are two subsets of the

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| <i>aaa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>aab</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | - | - | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>aba</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>b</i> | - |
| <i>abb</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | - | <i>b</i> |
| <i>baa</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>b</i> | - | <i>baa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>bab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>ba</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bb</i> | - |
| <i>bbb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>aaa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>aab</i> | - | <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>aab</i> | <i>aa</i> | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>ab</i> |
| <i>aba</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | - |
| <i>abb</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>abb</i> | - | <i>b</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>abb</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | - |
| <i>baa</i> | <i>a</i> | - | - | <i>aa</i> | <i>baa</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | - | <i>a</i> |
| <i>bab</i> | - | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>a</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | - | <i>ab</i> |
| <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>b</i> | - | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>bbb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>aaa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>aab</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>aab</i> | - | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | |
| <i>aba</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>ba</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | |
| <i>abb</i> | <i>bb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>bb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | |
| <i>baa</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | - | <i>a</i> | |
| <i>bab</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | |
| <i>bba</i> | - | - | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>ba</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>ba</i> | <i>a</i> | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | |
| <i>bbb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | |

Figure 10: The 41 descriptions of the identity law on \mathcal{X}_2 when the width of the left-hand segments is three. The left-hand segments are shown to the left of the double line; the remaining columns represent right-hand segments. These descriptions are obtainable from one another by shift operations.

set of right-hand segments such that every segment in R^1 must be followed by some segment in R^2 and every segment in R^2 must be preceded by some segment in R^1 . If every segment in R^1 ends in a cell with color j , then we may delete these cells from the segments in R^1 and then add a cell with color j to the beginning of each segment in R^2 . The resulting table represents the same law as the original one. Similarly, if every segment in R^2 begins with a cell with color j , then we may delete these cells from the segments in R^2 and then add a cell with color j to the end of each segment in R^1 ; the law remains unchanged. I call these two operations the *left shift* and *right shift* operations.

Consider the first of the four tables listed above. In this table, R_1 is $[a]$. The segments that can come after R_1 are R_1 and R_2 ; these are both $[a]$. Hence the presence of R_1 in the decomposition of a space forces the presence of $[aa]$ in that space, where the first a is associated with R_1 itself and the second a is associated with the segment that follows R_1 . Note that this is the largest contiguous segment which is determined in this way; if we look at the second segment past R_1 , this can be anything, hence the corresponding cell may be a or b ; and the segment before R_1 may be R_1 or R_3 , which again corresponds to a cell which is either a or b . I will say that $[aa]$ is the segment that is *forced* by R_1 .

This definition is problematical if an infinite number of cells are forced by R_i , since segments are by definition finite. If Γ_A is the union of its strongly connected components, then such a situation can only arise if the strongly connected component containing the i th vertex consists of a single circuit. I will call such a component *trivial*. In this section, I will assume that Γ_A is the union of its strongly connected components, and that none of these components is trivial.

Given a nonoverlap representation $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ of a rule, we may now construct another representation $\langle L, R', G^L, G^{R'}, A \rangle$ of the same rule by letting R'_i be the segment forced by R_i and letting the gluing rules include the proper amount of overlap. For example, in the table we were just discussing each new segment R'_i turns out to be exactly the same as L_i ; the gluing rule becomes a 1-cell overlap in each case. I will call the representation obtained in this way the *forcing segment representation*.

Notice that, if we apply the same procedure to each of the remaining three tables in our list, the same new representation results. This is an example of the following easily verified fact: the left shift and right shift operations do not alter the associated forcing segment representation. Thus by using the forcing segment representation we

may remove the problem of multiplicity of representation caused by left and right shifts. (An additional advantage of this representation in the case of the identity law is that both sides of the table are identical, which makes it obvious that the law represented is the identity law.)

It is also possible to verify the following facts, though I will not do so here:

- Suppose that R'_i is glued to R'_j with an m -cell overlap. Then if R'_i is followed by R'_k they will be glued with an m -cell overlap; and if R'_j is preceded by R'_h they will also be glued with an m -cell overlap. If L_i ends with a $(d-1)$ -cell segment S , then m is the largest number such that, for all j such that L_j begins with S , the first m cells of R'_j are the same. Similarly, if L_j begins with a $(d-1)$ -cell segment S , then m is the largest number such that, for all i such that L_i ends with S , the last m cells of R'_i are the same.
- If one begins with any nonoverlap representation $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ and performs left shifts repeatedly until this can no longer be done, one ends up with a representation which may be obtained from the associated forcing segment representation by chopping off the right-hand portions of each segment R_i that overlap with segments that follow it. An analogous result holds if one performs right shifts repeatedly until this can no longer be done. The process of performing repeated left shifts (or right shifts) is guaranteed to terminate so long as our assumption about Γ_A holds.

It follows that another way to remove the problem of multiplicity of representation caused by left and right shifts is to use the (unique) representation obtained by shifting left (or right) repeatedly until this can no longer be done. I will call these the *left representation* and the *right representation*.

Illustrations of these various canonical forms and of their relation to one another are provided in Figure 11.

These canonical forms allow us to describe a rule $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ in a unique way. However, the objects of primary interest here are not the maps themselves, but equivalence classes of rules. As described in Chapter 4, if $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ is a rule, then T is equivalent to UTU^{-1} where $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ is a local invertible map. In particular, when $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}'$ the map $T \mapsto UTU^{-1}$ is an equivalence map between rules on the space set \mathcal{X} .

| | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| aa | c | c | c | $aaaa$ | \overline{aaaa} | a | a |
| ab | $cc\underline{a}$ | cc | cca | $aaab$ | $\overline{aaa\underline{b}}$ | aaa | b |
| ac | b | b | b | $aaba$ | \overline{baab} | - | aab |
| ba | \overline{a} | a | - | $aabb$ | \overline{b} | - | - |
| bb | $\overline{a\underline{a}}$ | a | a | $abaa$ | $\overline{baa\underline{b}}$ | baa | - |
| bc | $\overline{a}ca$ | aca | ca | $abab$ | $\overline{baab\underline{ab}}$ | baa | ab |
| ca | - | - | - | $abba$ | \overline{b} | - | - |
| cb | \underline{a} | - | a | $abbb$ | $\overline{baabaab}$ | - | $aabaab$ |
| cc | ca | ca | ca | $baaa$ | \overline{baaa} | b | aaa |
| | | | | $baab$ | $\overline{b\underline{b}}$ | b | b |
| | | | | $baba$ | $\overline{bab\underline{aab}}$ | ba | aab |
| | | | | $babb$ | $\overline{ba\underline{b}}$ | ba | - |
| | | | | $bbaa$ | \overline{b} | - | - |
| | | | | $bbab$ | \overline{bab} | - | ab |
| | | | | $bbba$ | $\overline{baabaab}$ | $baabaa$ | - |
| | | | | $bbbb$ | $\overline{baabaab\underline{aab}}$ | baa | aab |

Figure 11: Canonical forms for two rules. The first rule is the 1+1-dimensional rule described in Chapter 2. The second rule operates by first exchanging segments $[aba]$ with $[abba]$ and then exchanging segments $[bb]$ with $[baab]$. Three canonical forms are given for each rule. The first is the forcing segment representation. In each segment, the section that overlaps any segment that precedes it is overlined, and the section that overlaps any segment that follows it is underlined. The next two forms are the left and right representations. Note that the left representation is obtained by removing the underlined portion from each segment in the forcing segment representation, and the right representation is obtained by removing the overlined portion. It takes just one right shift to move from the left representation to the right representation of the first rule, but a large number of right shifts are needed to do the same thing for the second rule. (Note that the second rule is symmetric under orientation reversal; this is associated with a symmetry in its forcing segment representation and in a symmetric relationship between its left and right representations.)

It would be nice to know when two rules on \mathcal{X} were equivalent. Then when we generated rules on \mathcal{X} we could store one representative for each equivalence class. Unfortunately, the problem of determining such equivalence is completely unsolved at the moment. I can sometimes tell that two rules are not equivalent. For example, sometimes it is possible to show that the number of orbits of size n in one law is different from the number of orbits of size n in a second law. In this case those two laws cannot be equivalent. (An equivalence map, as shown in Chapter 4, is also an equivalence on orbits, and it sends orbits of size n to orbits of size n .) And, of course, given a rule I can generate lots of equivalent rules by operating on the original rule using different U 's. But at present it is not at all clear to me that there exists a general method for proving the equivalence or nonequivalence of rules; if there is one, I have no idea how it might work.

Nevertheless, in our representation of rules it is useful to take into account certain simple equivalences. For example, let U be a map which acts on a space by changing the color of each cell according to some permutation. This map is local and invertible. If it maps \mathcal{X} to itself, then the map $T \mapsto UTU^{-1}$ is an equivalence. We may obtain a description of UTU^{-1} from a description $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ of T by permuting all colors in L and R and then rearranging the rows in each (and the rows and columns in A , simultaneously) so that the new L has its segments listed in lexicographical order.

The map P that reverses orientation is another simple example of a local, invertible map. Again, if P maps \mathcal{X} to itself then it induces an equivalence map $T \mapsto PTP$ (here $P = P^{-1}$), and it is straightforward to obtain a description of PTP from a description $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ of T by switching the order of cells in all segments, transposing the matrix A , and then rearranging the rows and columns as in the previous example.

Finally, one may take a table $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ to stand for more than one rule, as follows. Let $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ be a permutation of colors. If one applied the permutation specified by U to the colors in the R segments only, the resulting table describes the rule that results if you first apply the original rule and then apply U . A rule table may be taken to stand for all rules that result from permuting the colors of the R segments in this way.

All of this comes in handy when one is generating rules, because it makes it possible to reduce storage requirements. The idea is that each stored table represents all equivalence classes under color permutation and orientation reversal of all rules

obtained by permuting the colors in the R segments of the table. Given a generated rule table, one computes all of the rule tables that it represents; then one stores only that table among them that comes first lexicographically.

5.4.3 Zeta functions and the matching condition

If one is given $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ and wishes to generate rules $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$, the above tools are inadequate. There are simply too many candidates for R . Very few of them turn out to be good candidates. A successful rule-generating program of this sort needs additional tools. One such tool is provided by the the following theorem.

Theorem 9 *If A and B are square matrices over a commutative ring with identity, then $\text{tr } A^n = \text{tr } B^n$ for all $n > 0$ if and only if $\det(I - xA) = \det(I - xB)$.*

PROOF. We first define a formal power series $\mathcal{F}^M \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M^{n+1}x^n$ for any square matrix M over a commutative ring. What we wish to prove is that $\text{tr } \mathcal{F}^A = \text{tr } \mathcal{F}^B$ if and only if $\det(I - xA) = \det(I - xB)$. Since

$$\mathcal{F}^M = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M^{n+1}x^n = M + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M^{n+1}x^n = M + xM\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M^{n+1}x^n\right) = M + xM\mathcal{F}^M,$$

it follows that $(I - xM)\mathcal{F}^M = M$. Write $\mathcal{F}^M = [\mathcal{F}_1^M \dots \mathcal{F}_r^M]$ and $M = [M_1 \dots M_r]$, where the \mathcal{F}_i^M 's and M_i 's are column vectors. Then $(I - xM)\mathcal{F}_i^M = M_i$ for each i . Since the constant term of $\det(I - xM)$ is 1, it is a unit in the ring of formal power series; hence we may apply Cramer's rule:

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^M = \frac{\det C(i, j)}{\det(I - xM)},$$

where $C(i, j)$ denotes the matrix obtained from $I - xM$ by replacing the j th column with M_i . Hence

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{F}^M = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \det C(i, i)}{\det(I - xM)} = \frac{-\frac{d}{dx} \det(I - xM)}{\det(I - xM)},$$

where $\frac{d}{dx}$ means the formal derivative operator. Let $\det(I - xA) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^i$ and $\det(I - xB) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i x^i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} \mathcal{F}^A &= \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{F}^B \iff \\
\frac{-\sum_{i=1}^m i a_i x^{i-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^i} &= \frac{-\sum_{i=1}^m i b_i x^{i-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^m b_i x^i} \iff \\
\left(\sum_{i=1}^m i a_i x^{i-1}\right)\left(\sum_{i=0}^m b_i x^i\right) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^m i b_i x^{i-1}\right)\left(\sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^i\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By using the fact that $a_0 = b_0 = 1$ and equating coefficients of x^i on both sides, one may easily show that $a_i = b_i$ for all i . \square

Note that $\det(I - xA) = \det(I - xB)$ if and only if the characteristic polynomials $\det(Ix - A)$ and $\det(Ix - B)$ differ by a factor of x^k for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Consider a faithful description $\langle L, N, A \rangle$ where each segment in L has length one. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle L, N, A \rangle}$, and let K be the set of colors used in \mathcal{X} . Let G be the free group whose generators are the elements of L , and let $R(G)$ be the group ring of G over \mathbb{Z} . We may create a new matrix \tilde{A} over $R(G)$ by setting $\tilde{A}_{ij} = L_i$ whenever $A_{ij} = 1$, and setting $\tilde{A}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Then $(\tilde{A}^n)_{ij}$ contains a formal sum of a set of length- n words in the alphabet L . There is a natural one-to-one correspondence between this set of words and the set of allowed recipes for gluing together $n + 1$ elements of L , beginning with L_i and ending with L_j , to form a segment. (The word contains the first n of these elements of L , in order; it omits the final L_j .) If $i = j$ then the first and last elements of L in this construction process may be identified. Hence each word s in the formal sum in a diagonal element of \tilde{A}^n may be considered as a means of constructing an element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ that contains n cells. I will say in this case that x is *associated* with s .

A given element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ may be associated with more than one word in the diagonal of \tilde{A} . If S is any segment, let $\operatorname{rot}([Sc]) = [cS]$ for each c such that the segment $[Sc]$ is allowed. If S is a segment and $x = (S)$ then, using the fact that \mathcal{X} is a faithful description, it is easy to show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the words associated with x in the diagonal of \tilde{A} and the elements of the set $\{\operatorname{rot}^z(S) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$. Thus the number of words associated with x in the diagonal of \tilde{A} depends only on x itself, and not on the particular description $\langle L, N, A \rangle$.

Now consider the free group \hat{G} generated by the elements of K , the group ring $R(\hat{G})$ of \hat{G} over \mathbb{Z} , and the ring map $h : L \mapsto K$ which sends a segment L_i to the

color of its single cell. Let $\hat{A}_{ij} = h(\tilde{A}_{ij})$. From the discussion in the above paragraph, it follows that if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L,N,A \rangle} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle M,N,B \rangle}$, where each segment in M also has length one, we must have $\text{tr } \hat{A}^n = \text{tr } \hat{B}^n$ for each $n > 0$.

This is where Theorem 9 comes in. It does not apply directly to matrices over $R(\hat{G})$ since this is a noncommutative ring. But suppose we have a ring map $f : R(\hat{G}) \mapsto \bar{R}$ where \bar{R} is a commutative ring with identity, and let $\bar{A}_{ij} = f(\hat{A}_{ij})$ and $\bar{B}_{ij} = f(\hat{B}_{ij})$. Then if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L,N,A \rangle} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle M,N,B \rangle}$ as above, we must also have $\text{tr } \bar{A}^n = \text{tr } \bar{B}^n$ for each $n > 0$. Now we may apply the theorem and conclude that $\det(I - x\bar{A}) = \det(I - x\bar{B})$.

Two such ring maps are relevant here, which I will call f_c and f_w (the c stands for ‘‘colors’’ and the w for ‘‘widths’’).

Let $r(\hat{G})$ be the abelianized version of $R(\hat{G})$, and let $f_c : R(\hat{G}) \mapsto r(\hat{G})$ be the natural map. If $\bar{A}_{ij} = f_c(\hat{A}_{ij})$, then \bar{A} is the same as \hat{A} except that its entries are taken to be free commuting variables. In this case, the ordering of colors in a word s in a matrix element $(\hat{A}^n)_{ij}$ is removed in the corresponding word s' in $(\bar{A}^n)_{ij}$; what remains in s' is a count of how many cells of each color are present in s . Let $K = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$, $\bar{A}_{ij} = f_c(\hat{A}_{ij})$, and $\bar{B}_{ij} = f_c(\hat{B}_{ij})$. Then $\det(I - x\bar{A}) = \det(I - x\bar{B})$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L,N,A \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle M,N,B \rangle}$ contain the same number of spaces that have exactly n_i cells with the color c_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, for every set $\{n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ of nonnegative integers.

Let $f_w : R(\hat{G}) \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ be the ring map that is induced by sending zg to z for each $z \in Z$ and each $g \in \hat{G}$. If $\bar{A}_{ij} = f_w(\hat{A}_{ij})$, then \bar{A} is just A . In this case, if a matrix element $(\hat{A}^n)_{ij}$ is a sum of m words in K for some nonnegative integer m , then the corresponding matrix element $(\bar{A}^n)_{ij}$ is m . Let $\bar{A}_{ij} = f_w(\hat{A}_{ij})$ and $\bar{B}_{ij} = f_w(\hat{B}_{ij})$. Then $\det(I - x\bar{A}) = \det(I - x\bar{B})$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L,N,A \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle M,N,B \rangle}$ contain the same number of spaces that have exactly m cells for every positive integer m .

The above discussion is closely related to the topic of *dynamical zeta functions* (see [27, 37]). Let $T : X \mapsto X$ be an invertible map on any set X . Let $p_n(T)$ denote the number of elements $x \in X$ such that $T^n(x) = x$. One defines the zeta function $\zeta_T(t)$ as follows:

$$\zeta_T(t) = \exp \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_n(T)}{n} t^n \right).$$

In dynamical systems one is concerned with subshifts of finite type represented by matrices A of nonnegative integers. Let E be the set of edges g_{ij}^k in Γ_A . Let X

be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto E$ such that, for each $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, if $f(z) = g_{ij}^m$ then $f(z+1) = g_{jk}^n$ for some k and n . Let σ_A be the shift operation on X : if $f \in X$ then $(\sigma_A(f))(z) = f(z+1)$. In this case it was shown by Bowen and Lanford [4] that

$$\zeta_{\sigma_A}(t) = [\det(I - tA)]^{-1}.$$

From this one may easily deduce the results obtained above in the case of f_w .

Theorem 10 *Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix over a commutative ring. Let Γ_A be the directed graph with n vertices such that there is an edge going from vertex i to vertex j if and only if $A_{ij} \neq 0$. Denote any such edge by (i, j) . Let \mathcal{Y} be the set of all sets of disjoint circuits in Γ_A . If $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let V_Y and E_Y be the sets of vertices and edges appearing in Y . Let \mathcal{Y}' be the subset of \mathcal{Y} such that, if $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$ and $i, j \in V_Y$, then the i th and j th rows (or columns) of A are not equal. If $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let $\bar{Y} = \prod_{(i,j) \in E_Y} A_{ij}$. Then*

$$\det(I - A) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y} = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}'} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}.$$

PROOF. Let π_n be the set of permutations of $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $\det(I - A) = \sum_{\sigma \in \pi_n} \text{sgn } \sigma \prod_{i=1}^n (I - A)_{i\sigma(i)}$ (by a standard formula for determinants). So $\det(I - A) = \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_S \sum_{\tau} (-1)^k \text{sgn } \tau \prod_{i \in S} A_{i\tau(i)}$, where S is a subset of N containing k elements and τ is a permutation of S . In the cyclic decomposition of τ let $|\tau|$ be the number of cycles, o be the number of odd cycles and e be the number of even cycles. Then $\text{sgn } \tau = (-1)^e$. Since also $(-1)^k = (-1)^o$, it follows that $(-1)^k \text{sgn } \tau = (-1)^{e+o} = (-1)^{|\tau|}$. So $\det(I - A) = \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_S \sum_{\tau} (-1)^{|\tau|} \prod_{i \in S} A_{i\tau(i)}$.

If τ is such that $A_{i\tau(i)} = 0$ for some i , then the associated term $\prod_{i \in S} A_{i\tau(i)}$ in the above formula is zero. Otherwise, each cycle in the cyclic decomposition of τ corresponds to a circuit in Γ_A , and the set of all such cycles corresponds to a set of disjoint circuits in Γ_A . Thus each such τ is associated with an element $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and in this case $|\tau| = |Y|$ and $\prod_{i \in S} A_{i\tau(i)} = \bar{Y}$. It follows that $\det(I - A) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$.

Let A_S be the matrix obtained from A by deleting those rows and columns whose indices are not in S . Then $\sum_{\tau} (-1)^{|\tau|} \prod_{i \in S} A_{i\tau(i)} = (-1)^k \det(A_S)$. Therefore, in our formula for $\det(I - A)$ we need not sum over those values of S which have the property that $\det(A_S) = 0$. This will clearly be the case when there exist distinct indices $i, j \in S$ such that rows (or columns) i and j of A are equal. When seen in

terms of Γ_A , this means that we may compute $\det(I - A)$ by summing over \mathcal{Y}' instead of \mathcal{Y} . \square

Theorems resembling the one above appear in [7].

Theorem 11 *Let $\mathcal{X} = \langle L, N, A \rangle$, where the segments in L have arbitrary length and K is the set of colors appearing in \mathcal{X} . Let \mathcal{Y} be the set of all sets of ways to assemble spaces using elements of L such that no element of L is used twice. Let \mathcal{Y}' be the subset of \mathcal{Y} such that, if $Y \in \mathcal{Y}'$ and L_i and L_j are used in Y , then the i th and j th rows (or columns) of A are not equal. If there are n_{ik} cells with color c_k in segment L_i for each i and k , let \bar{A} be the matrix over $r(\hat{G})$ obtained from A by setting \bar{A}_{ij} to $\sum_k n_{ik} f_c(c_k)$ if $A_{ij} = 1$, and setting $\bar{A}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. If $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and, for each $c_i \in K$, n_i denotes the number of cells in the spaces associated with Y whose color is c_i , then let $\bar{Y} = \sum_i n_i f_c(c_i)$. Then $\det(I - \bar{A}) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y} = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}'} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$.*

PROOF. This is a straightforward application of Theorem 10. \square

Theorem 12 *Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$ where the elements of L are width- d segments, no segment occurs twice in L , and the gluing rules G^L are the $(d-1)$ -overlap rules. Let $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ be any nonoverlap description. Let \mathcal{Y} be the set of subsets of \mathcal{X} in which no length- $(d-1)$ segment appears twice. Let $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$ be the natural map given by the rule table $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$. If $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let \bar{Y} be the abelianization of the spaces in Y , as before (it is the product of the colors in Y , where each color is considered to be a free commuting variable). Similarly, let $\overline{T(Y)}$ be the abelianization of $T(Y)$. Then the number of spaces having n_i cells with color c_i is the same in \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle}$ for each sequence n_i of nonnegative numbers if and only if $\sum_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} (-1)^{|Y|} (\bar{Y} - \overline{T(Y)}) = 0$.*

PROOF. If we delete every cell except the leftmost one in each segment in L , we obtain a set of segments L' such that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle L', N, A \rangle}$. Using the method illustrated in Figure 7, we may create $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$ such that each segment in R' has length one and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R, N, A \rangle} = \mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$. Consider the colors in K as free commuting variables. Let \bar{A} be the matrix obtained from A by letting $\bar{A}_{ij} = c$ when $A_{ij} = 1$ and the cell in L'_i is colored c , and letting $\bar{A}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Let \bar{A}' be defined similarly (this time using R' instead of L'). Then $\det(I - x\bar{A}) = \det(I - x\bar{A}')$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L', N, A \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ contain the same number of spaces that have exactly n_i cells colored c_i ,

$1 \leq i \leq |K|$, for every set $\{n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq |K|\}$ of nonnegative integers. Since the colors are free commuting variables, and the power of x in one of these determinants is equal to the number of colors that are present in that term, the x 's carry no information. So $\det(I - \bar{A}) = \det(I - \bar{A}')$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L', N, A \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ contain the same number of spaces that have exactly n_i cells colored c_i , $1 \leq i \leq |K|$, for every set $\{n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq |K|\}$ of nonnegative integers.

Let \mathcal{U} be the set of all sets of ways to assemble spaces using $\langle L', N, A \rangle$ such that no element of L' is used twice. Let \mathcal{U}' be the subset of \mathcal{U} such that, if $U \in \mathcal{U}'$ and L'_i and L'_j are used in U , then the i th and j th rows (or columns) of A are not equal. Let \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' be defined similarly with respect to $\langle R, N, A \rangle$. Let \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{W}' be defined similarly with respect to $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$.

Let B be the matrix obtained from A by letting B_{ij} equal the product of colors in R_i if $A_{ij} = 1$, and letting $B_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. (Again the colors are considered as commuting variables.) By Theorem 11, $\det(I - \bar{A}') = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{W}} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$ and $\det(I - B) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{V}} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$, where \bar{Y} is as defined in that theorem. There is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the ways of generating a space using $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ and the ways of generating a space using $\langle R', N, A' \rangle$. This correspondence induces an invertible map $h : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{W}$ such that $\bar{Y} = \overline{h(Y)}$ for each $Y \in \mathcal{V}$. Hence $\det(I - \bar{A}') = \det(I - B)$. So $\det(I - \bar{A}) = \det(I - B)$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L', N, A \rangle}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\langle R', N, A' \rangle}$ contain the same number of spaces that have exactly n_i cells colored c_i , $1 \leq i \leq |K|$, for every set $\{n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq |K|\}$ of nonnegative integers.

By Theorem 11, $\det(I - \bar{A}) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{U}'} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$ and $\det(I - B) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{V}'} (-1)^{|Y|} \bar{Y}$. The theorem follows trivially once one notices that the sets of spaces associated with the elements of \mathcal{U}' are just the elements of \mathcal{V} and that the sets of spaces associated with the elements of \mathcal{V}' are just the elements of $T(\mathcal{V})$. \square

Theorem 12 says that a matching condition holds between the left-hand and right-hand sides of a valid rule table $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$. Write the sets of spaces in \mathcal{V} with $|Y|$ odd in one column and with $|Y|$ even in another column, and consider the colors in these spaces as free commuting variables. What we would like is to be able to pair up equal terms, one from the odd column and one from the even column, so that each term is in a pair. To do so, we add terms as needed to either column. These terms, with appropriate sign, constitute $\det(I - x\bar{A})$. Now substitute $T(Y)$

for each element $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ in these two columns and consider the colors of $T(Y)$ as free commuting variables; do not alter the previously added terms from the determinant. The theorem says that if you again pair up equal terms, one from each column, then none will be left over. The situation is illustrated in Figure 12.

If one is given $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ and seeks to find all laws T given by rule tables of the form $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$, the matching condition may be used to construct an algorithm to generate partial information about the description $\langle R, N, A \rangle$. Let $v_j^i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ denote the number of cells with color c_j that are in segment R_i . Then if a space x generated by $\langle L, N, A \rangle$ decomposes into n_i^x copies of L_i for each i , the number of colors c_j in $T(x)$ is given by $\sum_{i=1}^n n_i^x v_j^i$. The goal of the algorithm will be to find every v that satisfies the matching condition and one additional condition. The additional condition is that the number of cells in each space x must be positive; i.e., for any x we must have $\sum_{j=1}^{|K|} \sum_{i=1}^n n_i^x v_j^i > 0$.

Given any solution v , we may construct another solution in the following way. Choose a length- $(d-1)$ segment S , and a vector z_j , $1 \leq j \leq |K|$. If we add z to each v^i such that L_i ends with S , and then subtract z from each v^i such that L_i begins with S , then the numbers of colors in $T(x)$, as computed by the above formula, is left invariant. This is the commutative analogue of the left shift and right shift operations described in Section 5.4.2. The operation may make v_j^i negative for some i and j . For the moment, let us allow this. We will seek all solutions v such that $v_j^i \in \mathbb{Z}$. However, we will continue to require that the number of cells in each space must be positive.

I will say that v is equivalent to v' whenever v' may be obtained from v by a sequence of commutative shift operations (i.e., adding and subtracting z as described above). Instead of looking for all solutions v , then, we may look for representative of each of the equivalence classes whose members satisfy the two conditions.

This makes the computation simpler, because now we can set some of the v^i to zero. To do this, it is useful to consider a certain directed graph Γ . The vertices of Γ correspond to the allowed length- $(d-1)$ segments of \mathcal{X} ; the edges correspond to the allowed length- d segments of \mathcal{X} , with the i th edge going from vertex S to vertex S' if and only if L_i begins with S and ends with S' . In order to set variables to zero, we construct a spanning tree of Γ . To do this, we first choose as the root of this tree any vertex S in Γ . Next we repeatedly choose edges to put in the tree. The edge is chosen

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---------|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| (a) | a | (c) | a | c | a |
| (b) | b | (a) | b | a | b |
| (c) | c | (ca) | c | ac | c |
| (ab) | (a)(b) | (cca) | (c)(a) | ac ² | ac |
| (ac) | (a)(c) | (b) | (c)(ca) | b | ac ² |
| (bc) | (b)(c) | (aca) | (a)(ca) | a ² c | a ² c |
| (abc) | (ab)(c) | (ccaca) | (cca)(ca) | a ² c ³ | a ² c ³ |
| (acb) | (ac)(b) | (ba) | (b)(a) | ab | ab |
| (a)(b)(c) | (bc)(a) | (c)(a)(ca) | (aca)(c) | a ² c ² | a ² c ² |

Figure 12: The matching condition for colors. This is condition on $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ and $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ which holds whenever the two descriptions generate the same number of spaces with n_i cells colors c_i for any set of nonnegative integers n_i . Here we consider $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ as shown on the left-hand side of Figure 11; hence $d = 2$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_3$. In the left-hand table we enter the sets of spaces in which no $(d - 1)$ -length segment appears twice; this means simply that no color appears twice. The sets of spaces containing an odd number of spaces are placed on the left; the sets with an even number of spaces are placed on the right. Here I have lined them up so that sets that are next to one another in the table contain the same colors. The first four rows contain sets of spaces which are matched instead by products of colors written without parentheses; these correspond to the terms in $\det(I - \bar{A}) = 1 - a - b - c$, written with positive terms on the left and negative terms on the right. (Notice that the first entry on the top of the right-hand column is the empty set of spaces; there are no cells in these spaces, so the product of their colors is 1.) Each space in the left-hand table is replaced with the image of that space under the rule $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ in the middle table, with the terms corresponding to the determinant left intact. The colors in sets of spaces in the middle table (considered as free commuting variables) are multiplied together to produce the right-hand table. If this rule is invertible then there must be a one-to-one correspondence between entries in the left-hand column of this table and those in the right-hand column in which corresponding entries are equal (there is such a correspondence in this case).

so that it points from a vertex in the tree to a vertex not in the tree. (I am assuming that Γ_A , and hence Γ , is strongly connected; if so, then such an edge can always be found if there is a vertex not yet in the tree.) Call this latter vertex S' . The edge just added corresponds to some segment L_i which ends with S' . Subtract v^i from each v^j that ends with S' , and add it to each v^j that begins with S' . This sets v^i to zero (since it cannot both begin and end with S' , since it is in a tree), and does not affect v^j if the edge associated with L_j is already in the tree (hence any variable that has been set to zero remains zero). We may thus continue adding edges and setting variables to zero until every vertex is in the tree (and hence it is a spanning tree). If Γ contains V vertices, then the completed spanning tree contains $V - 1$ edges. Hence each equivalence class contains a representative v such that $v^i = 0$ for any $V - 1$ segments L_i whose associated edges constitute a spanning tree of Γ .

For example, if $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ is given by the left-hand column on the left side of Figure 11 (i.e., if it is the standard description of \mathcal{X}_3 for $d = 2$) then the tree Γ has three vertices (corresponding to the length-1 segments $[a]$, $[b]$ and $[c]$) and nine edges (corresponding to the nine length-2 segments). One spanning tree of Γ is given by the edges L_7 and L_8 (which correspond to the length-2 segments $[ca]$ and $[cb]$). Hence we may set v_j^7 and v_j^8 to zero for each j , $1 \leq j \leq |K|$.

Now we may replace each set of spaces in our matching table with a sum of variables which tells how many cells of each color are in the image of these sets of spaces under the mapping T . In Figure 13 this is shown for the matching table on the left side of Figure 12, which is the table corresponding to the example of $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$ given above. Of course, the variables which we have set to zero may be omitted.

One relationship between the variables may be read off immediately. Clearly the sum of all entries in the odd column must equal the sum of all entries in the even column (since the elements in the two columns must match pairwise). This gives us a linear relation among the variables which, if it is nontrivial, enables us to eliminate one variable. (See Figure 13 for an example.)

Now we begin the matching process. At any stage before the end of the process, some of the entries in the two columns of the table still contain variables, and some contain only a constant term. One begins by striking out matching pairs of constant-term entries, one from each column.

Define the width of a constant term c to be $\sum_{j=1}^{|K|} c_j$. Consider the non-constant entries that correspond to a single space. These are in the odd column. In the

| | | | |
|-----------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | | (0, 0, 0) | (0, 0, 0) |
| (a) | a | v^1 | (1, 0, 0) |
| (b) | b | v^5 | (0, 1, 0) |
| (c) | c | v^9 | (0, 0, 1) |
| (ab) | (a)(b) | $v^2 + v^4$ | $v^1 + v^5$ |
| (ac) | (a)(c) | v^3 | $v^1 + v^9$ |
| (bc) | (b)(c) | v^6 | $v^5 + v^9$ |
| (abc) | (ab)(c) | $v^2 + v^6$ | $v^2 + v^4 + v^9$ |
| (acb) | (ac)(b) | $v^3 + v^4$ | $v^3 + v^5$ |
| (a)(b)(c) | (bc)(a) | $v^1 + v^5 + v^9$ | $v^6 + v^1$ |

Figure 13: The matching table in terms of variables. The left-hand table is the same as the left-hand table in Figure 12. In the right-hand table, sets of spaces have been replaced by variables. Each variable v^i is a vector, so the table entries are vectors. The j th component of the vector in an entry associated with a set of spaces is the number of cells colored by the j th color that are present in the image of that set of spaces under the map T . (The first color is a , the second is b and the third is c .) Here we have set v^7 and v^8 to zero (see text); hence these variables have been omitted. Since the columns must match pairwise, it follows that the sums of the columns must be equal. This means that $v^2 + v^3 + v^4 + v^6 = (1, 1, 1) + v^1 + v^5 + v^9$. So $v^2 = (1, 1, 1) + v^1 + v^5 + v^9 - v^3 - v^4 - v^6$; this may be substituted into the right-hand table to reduce the number of variables by one. (Note that here I am using summation rather than product to denote the commutative group operation; this differs from the notation used in Figure 12.)

completed table, each such entry will have a positive width. Let m be the minimum such width. Then every non-constant entry in the even column will have width greater than m (since it corresponds to a set of spaces containing one of the spaces whose width is at least m plus at least one other space). Hence there must be an unmatched constant entry of width m in the even column. Furthermore, there must be no unmatched constant entry of width less than $m + 1$ in the odd column, because this cannot be matched.

Hence, the next step is to find those entries with smallest unmatched width m . These must exist (it cannot be that every constant entry is matched), and they must all be in the even column, for otherwise the table cannot be successfully completed. Every such entry must be matched with a non-constant entry in the odd column that corresponds to a single space. So next we choose one of the constant entries of width m and one of the non-constant entries that correspond to a single space, and we set these to be equal. This gives us a nontrivial linear equation which allows us to eliminate one of the variables. By repeating this process, eventually all variables are eliminated; if the sides of the table match, then we have a solution. If we perform our selections in all possible ways, we get all solutions.

Given such a solution v , which is a representative of an equivalence class of solutions (and which may contain negative entries), it is a straightforward process to generate all members of this equivalence class which contain only nonnegative entries. Each such member gives us a possible configuration of the R segments in terms of numbers of cells of each color. By ordering these cells in all possible ways and applying the algorithm described in Section 5.4.1 to detect whether the resulting $\langle R, N, A \rangle$ is a faithful description of $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, G^L, A \rangle}$, one may obtain all R such that $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle}$ is a law of evolution.

It is a strange and unexplained fact that, in over one hundred cases in which I have generated representatives v of equivalence classes of solutions as described above, there has always turned out to be exactly one corresponding R (up to equivalence by shift transformation) such that $\mathcal{X}_{\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle}$ is a law of evolution.

5.4.4 First results

At a somewhat early stage in my investigations I made an extended attempt to generate nonoverlapping rule tables by computer. At this point I had not considered subshifts of finite type in general, so my attempt only involved the space sets \mathcal{X}_k .

In fact, due to difficulty of computation, I only obtained useful results for \mathcal{X}_2 , \mathcal{X}_3 and \mathcal{X}_4 .

This effort involved at least a thousand hours of programming and many overnight runs on an 80386D-20 CPU. Numerous programming insights and algorithmic improvements were required. The final best algorithm made heavy use of the matching condition described in the previous section.

The algorithm begins by letting each variable v^i represent the number of cells in segment $R_i \bmod 2$. The matching condition must hold for these v^i , but one cannot use the matching algorithm described at the end of the previous section because the widths of constant-term table entries (i.e., the number of cells in the images under T of the space sets corresponding to these entries) are unknown. Hence all mod 2 solutions are computed by brute force.

Next these solutions are used as templates for finding all mod 4 solutions to the matching condition by brute force. Next the mod 4 solutions are used as templates for finding all solutions to the matching condition for the case where $v^i \in \mathbb{Z}$; here v^i represents the number of cells in R_i (except that it can be negative, due to shift operations). Now the widths of constant-term table entries are known, so the matching algorithm can be employed (one simply pretends that all cells are the same color). Finally, the solutions for widths are used as templates for finding the solutions where v_j^i is the number of cells in R_i colored by the j th color; again the matching algorithm is used, and then the desired set of R 's is computed (as described at the end of the previous section).

The efficiency of the algorithm depends also on its use of information about standard forms and equivalences between laws described in Section 5.4.2. I will not go into the details here.

The results, which took approximately eight hours of CPU time to obtain in the final version, are given in Figures 14, 15 and 16. In a sense these results are not very satisfying, since most (if not all) of the laws found here may be found much more easily by hand, via the method described in Chapter 2. But they constitute the only large set of examples that I have generated by computer; and they do have the virtue of being complete in the sense that they constitute all $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ for the given $\langle L, G^L, A \rangle$.

In the remainder of this section I will present a brief phenomenological tour of the 1+1-dimensional systems that I have encountered so far. These include the systems

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| $aa \parallel a$ | $ab \parallel b$ | $ba \parallel a$ | $bb \parallel b$ | $aaa \parallel a \parallel a$ | $aab \parallel b \parallel b$ | $aba \parallel - \parallel a$ | $abb \parallel ab \parallel b$ | $baa \parallel aa \parallel a$ | $bab \parallel b \parallel b$ | $bba \parallel - \parallel a$ | $bbb \parallel ab \parallel b$ | $aa \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a$ | $ab \parallel - \parallel - \parallel b$ | $ac \parallel - \parallel b \parallel c$ | $ba \parallel ba \parallel c \parallel c \parallel a$ | $bb \parallel c \parallel ba \parallel b \parallel b$ | $bc \parallel c \parallel bab \parallel bba \parallel c$ | $ca \parallel ca \parallel aa \parallel a \parallel a$ | $cb \parallel b \parallel - \parallel - \parallel b$ | $cc \parallel b \parallel b \parallel ba \parallel c$ | $aaaa \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a$ | $aaab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel -$ | $aaba \parallel bba \parallel a \parallel a \parallel ba$ | $aabb \parallel a \parallel b \parallel b \parallel abb$ | $abaa \parallel - \parallel a \parallel - \parallel -$ | $abab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel bb$ | $abba \parallel aba \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a$ | $abbb \parallel bbb \parallel b \parallel b \parallel b$ | $baaa \parallel a \parallel a \parallel aa \parallel a$ | $baab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel -$ | $baba \parallel ba \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a$ | $babb \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel b$ | $bbaa \parallel - \parallel a \parallel - \parallel -$ | $bbab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel bb$ | $bbba \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a$ | $bbbb \parallel b \parallel b \parallel b \parallel b$ |
| $aaaa \parallel a \parallel a$ | $aaab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b$ | $aaba \parallel ba \parallel - \parallel - \parallel ba \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel - \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel - \parallel aab \parallel aab$ | $aabb \parallel a \parallel a \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel bab \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel a \parallel aab \parallel - \parallel aab \parallel aab \parallel - \parallel -$ | $abaa \parallel - \parallel a \parallel aa \parallel - \parallel aa \parallel - \parallel aa \parallel aa \parallel aa \parallel a \parallel - \parallel - \parallel a \parallel a \parallel -$ | $abab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel aab \parallel b \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel aab \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel ab$ | $abba \parallel abba \parallel - \parallel - \parallel a \parallel - \parallel -$ | $abbb \parallel bbb \parallel ba \parallel ab \parallel bb \parallel ab \parallel ab \parallel abab \parallel ab \parallel aba \parallel aab \parallel abab \parallel aab \parallel aab \parallel aabaab \parallel aabaab$ | $baaa \parallel a \parallel aa \parallel a \parallel aa \parallel a \parallel aaa \parallel a \parallel a \parallel a \parallel aa \parallel aaa \parallel aaa \parallel aa \parallel aa \parallel aaa$ | $baab \parallel - \parallel bb \parallel b \parallel b \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel bab \parallel bb \parallel b \parallel b \parallel b \parallel baab \parallel b \parallel b$ | $baba \parallel bba \parallel - \parallel - \parallel ba \parallel aab \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel aab \parallel - \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel aab \parallel aab$ | $babb \parallel - \parallel a \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel a \parallel aab \parallel - \parallel aab \parallel b \parallel - \parallel -$ | $bbaa \parallel - \parallel ba \parallel aa \parallel - \parallel aa \parallel - \parallel aa \parallel aa \parallel abaa \parallel a \parallel - \parallel - \parallel a \parallel a \parallel -$ | $bbab \parallel - \parallel ab \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel aab \parallel b \parallel - \parallel b \parallel b \parallel aab \parallel ab \parallel - \parallel b \parallel ab$ | $bbba \parallel a \parallel - \parallel - \parallel a \parallel - \parallel -$ | $bbbb \parallel b \parallel ba \parallel ab \parallel b \parallel ab \parallel ab \parallel ab \parallel ab \parallel aba \parallel aab \parallel ab \parallel aab \parallel aab \parallel aab \parallel aab$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 14: Computer-generated nonoverlap rules. All such rules were found in five cases: $k = 2, d = 2$; $k = 2, d = 3$; $k = 3, d = 2$; $k = 2, d = 4$; $k = 4, d = 2$ (here k is the number of colors and d is the width of the left-hand segments). Results for the first four cases are presented in this figure; results for the last case are presented in the next two figures. Each right-hand column represents the class of right-hand columns obtained by permuting the colors of the column, and is given in its maximally-shifted-to-the-right form. (Note that the results for $k = 2, d = 2$ are a subset of the results for $k = 2, d = 3$, which are in turn a subset of the results for $k = 2, d = 4$.)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ac</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ad</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>daa</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>daa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>caa</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> |
| <i>db</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>dc</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ac</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ad</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>bb</i> | <i>bb</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>baab</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>db</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>bb</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>baab</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>baab</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>baab</i> | <i>baab</i> | <i>bab</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>cb</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>aaa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>db</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | - | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | - | - | <i>aa</i> | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dc</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>a</i> | - | - | - | - | <i>a</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>aab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ac</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ad</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>db</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>baaba</i> | <i>baba</i> | <i>baaba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>db</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>a</i> | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dc</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>a</i> | - | - | - |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>aba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |

Figure 15: Some of the nonoverlap rules for $k = 4$, $d = 2$.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ac</i> | - | - | - | - | <i>b</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ad</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>baaba</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>dba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>bba</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>cba</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>db</i> | - | - | - | - | <i>cb</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dc</i> | - | - | - | - | <i>d</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>ac</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>b</i> | - | - |
| <i>ad</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>cba</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>bb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>babaa</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>bac</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>cba</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>babaa</i> | <i>babaa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>bba</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>babaa</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>db</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>dc</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>b</i> | - | - |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>baa</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ba</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <i>aa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>ab</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>ac</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>ad</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>ba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>bb</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>bc</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>cab</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>bd</i> | <i>cac</i> | <i>cac</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>cca</i> | <i>bbaa</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>ca</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>cb</i> | - | - | <i>b</i> | <i>ab</i> | - | <i>bba</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>cc</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>bba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>cd</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>bbaba</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |
| <i>da</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>aa</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> |
| <i>db</i> | - | - | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | - | - | <i>cb</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> |
| <i>dc</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | - | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> |
| <i>dd</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>cb</i> | <i>ca</i> | <i>ba</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> |

Figure 16: The remaining nonoverlap rules for $k = 4$, $d = 2$.

described in Figures 14, 15 and 16, as well as the reversible cellular automata which I generated in [17].

In the case of reversible cellular automata, the period of each evolutionary orbit is necessarily finite. This is because there are only finitely many spaces having a given width w , and this number w is conserved. Hence there must be a p_x such that $x = T^{p_x}(x)$.

In the very simplest cases, there is some smallest positive constant p such that p_x divides p for all x . For example, if T is the identity law on any set \mathcal{X} then $p = 1$. If T is rule A from Figure 5, then $p = 2$. If T is rule D from Figure 5, then $p = 4$.

Another common occurrence is that there exists a constant c such that p_x divides cw_x for each x (here w_x is width of x). A simple example of this (with $c = 1$) is given by rule C from Figure 5. This rule may be interpreted as containing four kinds of particles (see Figure 17). Each diagonal line in the lattice contains a particle. Two particles always travel up and to the right, and the other two travel up and to the left. The particles do not interact. The state of a cell in the automaton records which pair of particles are crossing at that point. Since there is no interaction, after w_x time steps the system returns to its original state. Clearly one may generalize this example so that there are m particles that travel up and to the right and n that travel up and to the left; each such system is a reversible cellular automaton.

In another class of cellular automata, there is a constant c such that, if one examines p_x for many random initial states x , the values of p_x cluster around cw_x . In several cases of this sort I found that these systems contain solitons, and that the solitons completely describe the system. Typically there are several types of solitons, with some types going to the left and others to the right. When these particles cross there is a slight jog in their trajectories and then they continue onward in their original directions. The value of p_x in such cases tends to be a linear function of the number of solitons of the various types. For random initial conditions, these numbers tend to cluster around a certain value which is proportional to the width. I believe that this situation is probably characteristic of those systems whose periods display this property. An example is given by rule E from Figure 5. The behavior of this system is analyzed in detail in Chapter 8, where I examine the existence of constants of motion and particles in combinatorial spacetimes.

In other cases, there is typically no obvious pattern to the values of p_x . I have found one case, however, in which, for a certain restricted set of initial conditions,




Figure 17: A cellular automaton rule T with four noninteracting types of particles that move diagonally and do not change direction. The rule table is given at left in product form (see Figure 5). At center, a portion of an evolution is displayed (time moves up). The two types of particles that move up the diagonal to the right are displayed by solid and dotted lines, and similarly for the two that move up the diagonal to the left. The vertex color specifies which types of particles cross at that point; for instance, b means that a dotted line going up and to the right crosses a solid line going up and to the left. The right-hand table shows one way to interpret the four colors as a four-group. Each space in \mathcal{X}_4 having w cells can be interpreted as being the direct sum of w copies of this four-group. Since $T(x+y) = T(x) + T(y)$ for any space x and y of width w , T is said to be “linear.” It is natural in this setting to interpret the dotted-line particles as background (since a is the identity element for this choice of group). One associates a two-dimensional field with each cell at time t by setting the colors of all other cells at time t to the identity element and then evolving the resulting space using T . Here the field associated with a cell is given by the solid-line particles (if any) that pass through the cell. The entire evolution of the cellular automaton may be obtained by summing all fields of cells at time t .

the period is an exponential function of the width. This case is rule F from Figure 5. If the initial state x contains a single b against a background of a 's, then empirically I have found that $p_x = (5)(2^{w_x-2}) - 1$. For large enough widths, the appearance of this system is that of a river against a fixed background. The river very gradually widens. Periodically a region of a 's appears in the river, widening to a maximum size and then shrinking to zero. My guess based on observations is that this system is counting in base two: the size of the river is related to the number of nonzero bits needed to represent the number; the number is incremented every five time steps; the region of a 's are the carry bits being transmitted locally throughout the system (the larger the region, the farther the carry bits have to be transmitted). But I have not worked out the details.

A property which is useful in analyzing the behavior of some laws is that of *linearity* (this is also referred to as *additivity* in the literature). For some discussion of this property (and other references), see [17]. The idea is that, if $\mathcal{X}(w) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid x \text{ has width } w\}$, then it may be possible to define each $\mathcal{X}(w)$ to be an abelian group in such a way that the law of evolution T acts linearly on these groups; i.e., if $x \in \mathcal{X}(w)$ and $y \in \mathcal{X}(w)$ then $T(x+y) = T(x) + T(y)$. (Note that this definition only works for cellular automata, since otherwise there is no guarantee that $T(x)$ and $T(y)$ have the same width.) If the set of spaces is \mathcal{X}_k then the easiest way to obtain a group structure is to define an abelian group operation on K and then considering the set of spaces of width w to be the direct sum K^w . In linear rules there is no interaction; spacetime may be considered to be a superposition of fields, where each field is associated with a cell in a preselected Cauchy surface. One example has already been presented in Figure 17; two more are given in Figure 18.

The definition of linearity given above is one which, in my view, needs to be generalized. If T is linear then we ought to be able to define linearity so that UTU^{-1} is also linear for any U . At present this is not the case, since UTU^{-1} may not be a cellular automaton. We could specify that any law T is to be called linear if and only if there exists a U such that UTU^{-1} is a linear cellular automaton according to the above definition. However, this will only work if whenever T and UTU^{-1} are both cellular automata then T is linear if and only if UTU^{-1} is. I doubt very much that this is the case. In addition, I have found rules which have no interaction and which have the superposition property but which do not seem to be linear according to the present definition. It would seem that this superposition property is the important

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>a</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| <i>d</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>b</i> | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>b</i> | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 18: Two linear systems. The upper left-hand table is the product form of law B from Figure 5. This rule is linear if \mathcal{X}_4 is given the structure of a four-group as shown in the lower left-hand table. Here a is the identity. A portion of the fields associated with b , c and d are displayed in the center diagram (time moves up). One should view this diagram as extending to the left and right indefinitely; all cells not shown contain a 's. (Since for each $k \in \{b, c, d\}$ this diagram contains a row containing one k and the rest a 's, it describes all three fields.) The rightmost diagram describes a portion of the field associated with 1 for the $d = 2$ cellular automaton on \mathbb{Z}_2 where the law of evolution is addition mod 2. The law is linear on \mathbb{Z}_2 . All entries not displayed are 0. This rule is not invertible (it is a 2-1 map); hence the field only extends in the forward-time direction. Note that the numbers displayed are the binomial coefficients mod 2. It turns out that these two systems are closely related (see Chapter 7).

one dynamically. For this property to hold, there is no reason why $\mathcal{X}(w)$ needs to be a group; for instance, it might be a subset of a group, or perhaps just a commutative semigroup. More work needs to be done here.

In the case of cellular automata, it is easy to create a two-dimensional display of the evolving spacetime on a computer screen. There is a limit to how much such a display can reveal. For instance, one typically cannot see explicitly the particles in a system on the screen unless one makes a special effort to reveal them. A particle is typically encoded in any one of a number of color patterns which may stretch across several cells; this is difficult to pick out visually. However, when I am able to detect mathematically that a system contains particles, the visual display usually has a certain sort of look: it has the appearance of lines streaming along at some angle, and other lines streaming along at other angles, with the lines crossing and interacting.

In addition to these particle-containing systems, there are many systems which have this same sort of look but for which I have not been able to find particles. My guess is that there is a way to analyze these systems in terms of particles. At present my technology for finding particles in systems is quite limited, so it is easily possible that particles exist in these systems whose detection is beyond this technology. Also, it may be that my working mathematical definition of particle is not broad enough to adequately capture the phenomenon.

Besides the “particle look” described above, there is another sort of visual appearance that reversible cellular automata can have. Here there are no streaming lines, or if there are then they are interrupted by large gaps. These gaps seem characteristic of such systems. They are regions of a particular color, or having a particular pattern, which appear and disappear and which can be arbitrarily large. In these systems I have rarely found particles, and I have never been able to analyze such a system entirely in terms of particles. In fact, up to this point I have not been able to analyze the behavior of these systems at all.

Though it seems unwise to place too much reliance on visual clues, I do believe the unadjusted visual appearance of these systems can contain useful hints as to the type of system involved. In the case of those 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes which are not cellular automata, however, such clues are at present available to me only in a much cruder form. These systems are not (at least not self-evidently) flat, so there is no easy way to display their two-dimensional evolution on a computer

screen. It would be useful to develop a method to do this. For now I have settled for a one-dimensional display (the state of the system at time t), as well as a readout of the width of the state, the number of cells of each color, and other statistical information.

Let $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ be a cellular automaton law. Let $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ be an equivalence map. Then the map $UTU^{-1} : \mathcal{X}' \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ is a 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetime, but it is quite often no longer a cellular automaton (according to the usual definition of cellular automaton). That is: the width of a space $x \in \mathcal{X}'$ might be different from the width of $UTU^{-1}(x)$. Thus cellular-automatonness (in the traditional sense) is not an invariant property of 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. It is tempting to think of cellular automata as “flat,” and as analogous to Minkowski space in general relativity. The situation there is similar: there are metrics which are not the Minkowski metric but which are equivalent to the Minkowski metric under a change of variables. In order to make flatness an invariant property, one defines all such metrics to be flat. Similarly, it is natural to define all combinatorial spacetime rules $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ to be flat whenever there exists a $U : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ such that UTU^{-1} is a reversible cellular automaton law.

In the case where T is flat, every orbit of T must be finite, since $T \mapsto UTU^{-1}$ maps orbits of period p into orbits of period p . In many cases, it appears empirically that laws in which the width is not a constant of motion do in fact have this property. We have already seen this in the 1+1-dimensional example in Chapter 2. This example is extreme, compared to many other examples, in that the orbits are very large and in that there is great variation in size of spaces within an orbit. In every other case I have seen so far, whenever the period is always finite then the orbits are smaller and the widths do not change very much within an orbit. My guess is that the example in Chapter 2 cannot be transformed into a cellular automaton, but that these other examples can. I succeeded in doing so for one such example, which is illustrated in Figure 19.

Just as it is not a simple matter to determine whether there exists a change of variables that transforms a given metric into the Minkowski metric, I do not know an algorithm to determine whether, for a given T , there exists a U such that UTU^{-1} is a reversible cellular automaton law. I suspect, however, that the solution to the latter problem may be simpler than the solution to the former one. The solution would seem to be related to the problem of analyzing systems in terms of constants

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|-----|
| aa | a | | | | | | | | | | e^* | e |
| ab | $-$ | | | | | | | | | | f^* | j |
| ac | $-$ | | | | | | | | | | g^* | i |
| ad | $-$ | | | | | | | | | | h^* | h |
| ba | c | a | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | i^* | k |
| bb | b | ba | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jf | l |
| bc | b | baa | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jj | l |
| bd | b | b | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jh | l |
| ca | da | ca | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ji | f |
| cb | d | c | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jj | f |
| cc | ba | da | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jk | f |
| cd | ba | d | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | jl | f |
| da | baa | | | | | | | | | | k^* | g |
| db | ba | | | | | | | | | | lf | f |
| dc | d | | | | | | | | | | lg | f |
| dd | d | | | | | | | | | | lh | f |
| | | | | | | | | | | | li | l |
| | | | | | | | | | | | lj | l |
| | | | | | | | | | | | lk | l |
| | | | | | | | | | | | ll | l |

Figure 19: Transforming an expanding law into a cellular automaton. The left-hand table is a representation of the original law $T_1 : \mathcal{X}_4 \mapsto \mathcal{X}_4$. The central table contains two nonoverlap descriptions D and E associated with the same adjacency matrix A , given in the central 8 columns of this table. The left-hand and right-hand columns contain the segments for descriptions D and E , respectively. Let $U = \langle D, E \rangle$. The right-hand table depicts a reversible cellular automaton law $T_2 : \mathcal{X}_E \mapsto \mathcal{X}_E$. (Note that each asterisk in this table stands for any color that is allowed by the adjacency matrix to be in that position.) One may verify that $\mathcal{X}_D = \mathcal{X}_4$, and that $T_2 = UT_1U^{-1}$.

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----------------|----|-----|----------------|
| | | (caaaaacaaaaaa) | | | (bcbbcbcbcbcb) |
| | | (caaacacaaaaa) | | | (bcbbcbcb) |
| aa | a | (caacacaaaa) | aa | c | (bcbbcb) |
| ab | — | (cacacaaaa) | ab | — | (bcb) |
| ac | c | (bcacaaa) | ac | b | (bc) |
| ba | b | (bacaaa) | ba | a | (b) |
| bb | ca | (baacaa) | bb | bc | (c) |
| bc | cac | (baaab) | bc | ccb | (a) |
| ca | aa | (baaaaba) | ca | cc | (ba) |
| cb | — | (baaaaabaa) | cb | — | (cba) |
| cc | c | (baaaaaabaaa) | cc | b | (acba) |
| | | (baaaaaabaaaa) | | | (baacba) |
| | | (baaaaaabaaaaa) | | | (cbabaacba) |

Figure 20: Two expanding 1+1-dimensional systems. A $d = 2$ nonoverlap description is given for each rule, followed by a portion of an evolution. Time moves up.

of motion (see Chapter 8). The width is a constant of motion of a cellular automaton T . The map $T \mapsto UTU^{-1}$ must send this constant of motion into another constant of motion (which may no longer be the width). If we knew which properties a constant of motion needed to have if it were to be a transformation of the width constant of motion, and if we could detect whether a system possessed such a constant of motion, this would seem to go a long way towards determining whether the desired U exists.

If it is not true that every orbit of a rule T is periodic, then it seems usually to be the case that almost all orbits of T are infinite. (Sometimes it seems that all of them are infinite.) In this case the easiest property of the system to study is the function $w_x(t)$, that is, the width of the system at time t when the initial state is x .

A commonly occurring phenomenon is that, for large enough $|t|$, there exists a c_x such that $w_x(t + 1) = w_x(t) + c_x$. A simple example is the first rule pictured in Figure 20. This is the rule which first exchanges segments $[ba]$ and $[ca]$, and then exchanges segments $[b]$ and $[ca]$. The action of this rule is simple. Wherever there is a b followed by one or more a 's, one of the a 's is removed. Wherever there is a b which is not followed by an a , it is changed into ca . Wherever there is a c followed by one or more a 's, another a is inserted after the c . Hence there are finitely many locations in a space where the law has an effect, and the number of locations is preserved. The number n of locations is equal to the number of b 's plus the number of ca 's. Each

b is eventually turned into a ca , but the reverse does not occur. When all b 's have become ca 's, from then on the law adds an a at each location; so from that point forward the width increases by n each time the law is applied. Similarly, if one goes backwards in time eventually every location is associated with a b . From that point backward, the width increases by n each time the inverse of the law is applied.

Another common occurrence is that, for large enough $|t|$ and certain initial states x , $w_x(t)$ satisfies a linear recursion. An example is given by the second rule pictured in Figure 20. This rule (call it T) may be obtained by first exchanging $[ba]$ and $[ca]$, then exchanging $[b]$ and $[ca]$, and then performing an (acb) permutation on colors. If there exists a t_0 such that $T^{t_0}(x)$ has no a 's, then from then on the rule acts by replacing $[b]$ with $[bc]$ and $[c]$ with $[b]$. Let k_t be the number of k -colored cells in $T^t(x)$. Then if $t > t_0 + 1$ it follows that $b_t = b_{t-1} + c_{t-1} = w_x(t-1)$ and $c_t = b_{t-1} = b_{t-2} + c_{t-2} = w_x(t-2)$. Hence $w_t = b_t + c_t = w_x(t-1) + w_x(t-2)$; so the widths satisfy the Fibonacci recursion. Similarly, if there is a t_1 such that $T^{t_1}(x)$ has no $[bc]$'s and you proceed backwards in time, from then on T_{-1} acts by replacing $[c]$ with $[a]$, $[b]$ with $[c]$ and $[a]$ with $[ba]$. If $t < t_1 - 2$ it follows that $a_t = c_{t-1} + a_{t-1}$, $b_t = a_{t-1}$ and $c_t = b_{t-1}$, so $b_t = c_{t-2} + a_{t-2} = b_{t-3} + c_{t-3} + a_{t-3} = w_x(t-3)$, so $w_x(t) = a_t + b_t + c_t = c_{t-1} + a_{t-1} + w_x(t-3) + b_{t-1} = w_x(t-1) + w_x(t-3)$. So the widths follow a different linear recursion in the reverse direction.

While these recursions may be present for many initial states x , there may be exceptions. In this example, for instance, there exist many x such that no t_0 exists. If $[bcba]$ is present in x , then it must be present in $T^t(x)$ for all t . Suppose there is a t_2 such that $T^{t_2}(x)$ has only b 's and c 's except possibly for some a 's that are in $[bcba]$ segments. From then on, T acts as it does when $t > t_0$, with one exception: if $[b]$ is followed by a then, instead of replacing $[b]$ with $[bc]$, $[ba]$ is replaced with $[a]$. It follows that for $t > t_2 + 1$ we have $a_t = a_{t-1}$, $b_t = b_{t-1} + c_{t-1} - a_t = w_x(t-1) - 2a_{t_2}$, and $c_t = b_{t-1} - a_t = b_{t-2} + c_{t-2} - 2a_{t-2} = w_x(t-2) - 3a_{t_2}$. Hence $w_x(t) = w_x(t-1) + w_x(t-2) - 4a_{t_2}$; so the widths follow a nonhomogeneous linear recursion relation. I have not completed my analysis of T , but as far as I know it is possible that there does exist such a t_2 for every x .

I have found many examples of linear recursions of this type; some are quite complex. Though my focus here has been on recursions involving w_x , in doing so I have also mentioned recursions involving numbers of colors. It may well be that other types of recursion are often relevant, possibly involving larger segments. At any rate,

the role of linear recursion in these systems seems worth exploring. Perhaps it already has been. For example, the map on strings of b 's and c 's which sends $[b]$ to $[bc]$ and segc to $[b]$ is well known; it is called the *Fibonacci morphism*. It has been studied in the context of L systems (see [2]). As mentioned earlier, most work in L systems does not involve invertibility (and note that our rule T is necessarily more complex than the Fibonacci morphism because that morphism is not invertible). However, here is an instance where the analysis of noninvertible rules can shed light on at least some aspects of the behavior of invertible rules.

In both rules pictured in Figure 20, there is little or no interaction. (Certainly there is no interaction in the first of these rules.) Such systems resemble particle collisions: noninteracting particles approach one another, collide, and the resulting particles disperse. (This resemblance is clearly illusory in the first example, since there is in fact no interaction; in other instances I suspect the description is more apt.) Typically the sorts of spaces one encounters in the noninteracting past portion of the evolution and in the noninteracting future portion of the evolution are distinct in an obvious sort of way.

And then there are the rest of the rules, which are not flat and whose widths display no obvious pattern. Here no doubt there is often very complex behavior. I have not made a serious attempt to understand these rules, and have been content simply to watch them and to observe their typical rates of growth. It seems in general that rules either expand at a linear rate (e.g., the first rule in Figure 20) or at an exponential rate (e.g., the second rule in Figure 20). In the exponential case, if one is able to determine that the expansion is based on a linear recursion then one may calculate the rate precisely; otherwise I must depend on statistics, and it is difficult to collect many of these since the systems quickly exceed the bounds of my computer. It seems visually that the most complex systems are those that expand exponentially at the slowest rates.

It seems likely that more progress in understanding expanding 1+1-dimensional systems can be made by analyzing them in terms of constants of motion and their associated particles. Algorithms for detecting invariants of this type will be described in Chapter 8. Earlier I mentioned their usefulness in studying flat systems; it turns out that such invariants are present in expanding systems as well. Thus far I have detected the presence of these invariants in many cases, but for the most part have not attempted to make use of them.

Here ends my tour. Clearly these systems provide a very large (perhaps inexhaustible) supply of research problems. Of course, if one's goal is to gain physical insights about the real world then not all solutions to these problems are likely to be important. Still, some experience with the analysis of the behavior of individual 1+1-dimensional systems is likely to yield methodology that is applicable to higher-dimensional cases.

5.5 Transformations of space set descriptions

The foregoing methodology for generating 1+1-dimensional laws of evolution suffers from several limitations. While designing it, I had not yet realized that allowing flexibility in gluing rules was useful (though this had become more evident after analyzing the properties of the shift). In addition, it took some time for me to see that allowing my sets of spaces to be subshifts of finite type, rather than just \mathcal{X}_k , was a natural thing to do and required virtually no alteration of my formalism. Also, I did not consider maps $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ where \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' were not the same, which turn out to be important. Finally, I had not completely understood that the primary objects of study ought to be the faithful descriptions themselves, rather than rule tables.

My main breakthrough came after I began to consider whether there were any natural transformations that changed a faithful description of \mathcal{X} into another faithful description of \mathcal{X} . My hope was that, from a single faithful description of \mathcal{X} and a few simple transformations, one could generate all faithful descriptions of \mathcal{X} .

One benefit of this would be that my current procedures for generating rules involved much trial and error, but this new one, if it existed, would not. Every description generated from a faithful description of \mathcal{X} would be guaranteed to be a faithful description of \mathcal{X} . The problem of finding rules would be reduced to the problem of detecting which of these descriptions had the same adjacency matrix.

The indices assigned to segments in a faithful description of \mathcal{X} are arbitrary; hence one rather trivial invertible transformation is simply to permute these indices. In terms of the adjacency matrix, this means performing a permutation σ on both the row indices and column indices simultaneously. Similarly, if we allow the possibility that $A_{ij} > 1$ (as I shall do from now on), then the order of the gluing rules g_{ij}^k , $1 \leq k \leq A_{ij}$, is arbitrary; so another rather trivial invertible transformation is to

permute these gluing rules.

In addition, I soon came up with two nontrivial invertible transformations. I call them *splitting* and *doubling*.

Let $\langle L, G, A \rangle$ be a faithful description of \mathcal{X} , where the description is in standard form with respect to the shift (each segment is extended to the left and right as much as possible). Choose i . Let $F_i = \{g_{ij}^k \mid 1 \leq j \leq |L|, 1 \leq k \leq A_{ij}\}$. Then F_i is the set of gluing rules in which L_i is the leftmost segment. Suppose that $H_1 \cup H_2 = F_i$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. Then we may construct a new faithful description of \mathcal{X} as follows. First, remove segment L_i and replace it with two copies of itself, L_{i_1} and L_{i_2} . Next, if g_{ii}^k is in H_j ($j \in \{1, 2\}$), replace it with two copies of itself, $g_{i_j i_1}^k$ and $g_{i_j i_2}^k$. Next, if g_{im}^k is in H_j ($j \in \{1, 2\}$), replace it with one copy of itself, $g_{i_j m}^k$. Next, replace each g_{mi}^k with two copies of itself, $g_{mi_1}^k$ and $g_{mi_2}^k$. Finally, extend L_{i_1} and L_{i_2} to the left if possible to make sure the result is in standard form, and extend all gluing rules in columns i_1 and i_2 to the left as needed so that they end with L_{i_1} and L_{i_2} . I call this a *splitting* transformation. The idea is simple: in the old decomposition of spaces in \mathcal{X} , some copies of L_i are glued to the segments that follow them using a rule in H_1 , and others are glued to the segments that follow them using a rule in H_2 ; the transformation simply gives new names to these two groups of L_i segments. In this case I say that the new transformation is obtained from the old one by *splitting to the right*; there is an analogous transformation, which I call *splitting to the left*, in which one focuses on gluing rules in which L_i is the rightmost segment, rather than the leftmost segment.

Here is an example:

| | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--------|--|
| (A) | | (B) | | (C) |
| $\begin{array}{l} [a] \\ [b] \\ [c] \end{array} \begin{array}{ l} aa \quad ab \quad ac \\ ba \quad bb \quad bc \\ ca \quad cb \quad cc \end{array}$ | \iff | $\begin{array}{l} [a] \\ [ab] \\ [b] \\ [c] \end{array} \begin{array}{ l} aa \quad aab \quad 0 \quad ac \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad ab \quad 0 \\ ba \quad bab \quad bb \quad bc \\ ca \quad cab \quad cb \quad cc \end{array}$ | \iff | $\begin{array}{l} [a] \\ [ab] \\ [ab] \\ [b] \\ [c] \end{array} \begin{array}{ l} aa \quad aab \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad ac \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad ab \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ aba \quad abab \quad 0 \quad abb \quad abc \\ ba \quad bab \quad 0 \quad bb \quad bc \\ ca \quad cab \quad 0 \quad cb \quad cc \end{array}$ |

(A) is the standard $d = 1$ description of \mathcal{X}_3 . This is transformed by splitting $[a]$ to the right, where $H_1 = \{g_{11}^1, g_{13}^1\}$ and $H_2 = \{g_{12}^1\}$. This means that two copies of $[a]$ are made; however, the second of these is always followed by a b , so it becomes $[ab]$. The fact that segment L_{i_2} has been extended to the right means that each gluing-rule segment in column i_2 of the matrix must also be extended to the right so that it ends

in ab instead of in a . The resulting description (B) is then transformed by splitting $[b]$ to the left, where $H_1 = \{g_{23}^1\}$ and $H_2 = \{g_{33}^1, g_{43}^1\}$. Two copies of $[b]$ are made, but the first of these is always preceded by an a , so it becomes $[ab]$; the gluing-rule segments in row i_1 are also extended to the left so that they begin with ab instead of with b . Notice that, in terms of an adjacency matrix, a transformation which splits L_i to the right is obtained as follows: first obtain an $(n+1) \times n$ matrix by replacing row i with two adjacent rows i_1 and i_2 such that these rows sum to row i ; then obtain an $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix by replacing column i with two adjacent columns i_1 and i_2 which are copies of column i .

Now again consider $\langle L, G, A \rangle$. Choose i . Then we may obtain a new faithful description of \mathcal{X} as follows. First replace L_i with two copies of itself, L_{i_1} and L_{i_2} . Next, replace each g_{ji}^k with a copy of itself, $g_{ji_1}^k$; and replace each g_{ij}^k with a copy of itself, $g_{i_2j}^k$. Finally, add a single gluing rule $g_{i_1i_2}^1 = L_i$; in other words, L_{i_1} is followed only by L_{i_2} , and they are glued by overlapping them completely. I call this a *doubling* transformation. The new description is the same as the old one, except that each occurrence of L_i in a decomposition of a space using the old description is replaced in the new description by two successive copies of L_i (named L_{i_1} and L_{i_2}), where these two copies of L_i overlap completely.

Here is an example:

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|------|----|-----|-----|--------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| (C) | | | | | | (D) | | | | | |
| [a] | aa | aab | 0 | 0 | ac | \iff | [a] | aa | aab | 0 | ac |
| [ab] | 0 | 0 | ab | 0 | 0 | | [ab] | aba | abab | abb | abc |
| [ab] | aba | abab | 0 | abb | abc | | [b] | ba | bab | bb | bc |
| [b] | ba | bab | 0 | bb | bc | | [c] | ca | cab | cb | cc |
| [c] | ca | cab | 0 | cb | cc | | | | | | |

The segment $[ab]$ in (D) is doubled to obtain (C). In terms of adjacency matrices, a doubling transformation involves inserting a row of zeros before row i and a column of zeros after column i , and then setting the entry at the intersection of the new row and column to 1.

Splits and doublings are invertible (their inverses are called *unplits* and *undoublings*). The types of splitting and doubling operations that can be performed on a faithful description are completely determined by its adjacency matrix A . (Choose an i . Then for each way to divide the integers from 1 to A_{ij} into two groups for each j , there is a corresponding split to the right; and for each way to divide the

integers from 1 to A_{ji} into two groups for each j , there is a corresponding split to the left. Also, for each i there is a corresponding doubling.) However, it seems at first glance that the same cannot be said of the inverse operations, at least in the case of unsplit. To see this, consider the unsplit-to-the-left operation which goes from (C) to (B). Here segments L_3 and L_4 are combined to form a single segment. The new segment is determined by aligning L_3 and L_4 on the right and seeing what they have in common as you scan to the left. In this case $L_3 = [ab]$ and $L_4 = [b]$, so they have $[b]$ in common when they are aligned on the right. The condition on the adjacency matrix which makes the unsplit possible is that the third and fourth rows of this matrix be identical. However, we also need an additional condition on the gluing rules. To transform L_3 into the new segment $[b]$, one removes a from the left. Similarly, one must remove a from the left of each gluing rule in row 3. (L_4 is the same as the new segment, so nothing needs to be done to row 4.) In order for the unsplit operation to be performed, corresponding gluing rules in rows 3 and 4 must now be identical. These become the gluing rules that begin with $[b]$ in (B).

The adjacency matrix in (D) contains a (24) symmetry, by which I mean that one may exchange indices 2 and 4 and leave the matrix invariant (since the second and fourth rows are the same, and the second and fourth columns are the same). Above I have shown that one may perform the following sequence of moves on (D): first double the second segment to obtain (C), then unsplit segments 3 and 4 to the left to obtain (B), then unsplit segments 1 and 2 to the right to obtain (A). Can we exchange indices 2 and 4 in (D) to produce a description (D'), and then perform these same moves on (D')? If so, then we would arrive at a description whose adjacency matrix was the same as that of (A), and these two descriptions of \mathcal{X}_3 would thus provide us with a law of evolution. The first move is no problem; we simply double $[c]$ instead of $[ab]$:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(D')} \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{l|cccc}
 [a] & aa & ac & 0 & aab \\
 [c] & ca & cc & cb & cab \\
 [b] & ba & bc & bb & bab \\
 [ab] & aba & abc & abb & abab
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \iff
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(C')} \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{l|cccccc}
 [a] & aa & ac & 0 & 0 & aab \\
 [c] & 0 & 0 & c & 0 & 0 \\
 [c] & ca & cc & 0 & cb & cab \\
 [b] & ba & bc & 0 & bb & bab \\
 [ab] & aba & abc & 0 & abb & abab
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Next we need to do an unsplit-to-the-left operation which combines segments 3 and 4. If we align these segments ($[c]$ and $[b]$) on the right, we see that they have nothing

unsplit segments 1 and 2 to the left. The resulting description (A'') has the same adjacency matrix as (A) , and the law $\langle(A), (A'')\rangle$ is the one which exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$. These transformations are shown in Figure 21.

Note also that, if (G) is the description obtained from (A) by permuting indices 1 and 2, then the law $\langle(A), (G)\rangle$ is the (ab) color permutation; and if (H) is the description obtained from (A) by permuting indices 1 and 3, then the law $\langle(A), (H)\rangle$ is the (ac) color permutation.

Given the left-hand description (A) , I have now described how to obtain, via a series of transformations, the right-hand description of each of the four laws which are composed to produce the example 1+1-dimensional law in Chapter 2. Given these transformations, it turns out that we may construct the right-hand description of the example law, given that its left-hand description is (A) , in a straightforward way. To do this, we need the following theorems.

Theorem 13 *Let $T = \langle D, E \rangle$ be a law on \mathcal{X} , and let f be a transformation of space sets. Then $T = \langle fD, fE \rangle$ whenever fD and fE are well defined.*

PROOF. Let L_i and g_{ij}^k denote the segments and gluing rules in D , and let R_i and h_{ij}^k denote the segments and gluing rules in E . Let $U = \langle fD, fE \rangle$. Let L'_i and G_{ij}^k denote the segments and gluing rules in fD , and let R'_i and H_{ij}^k denote the segments and gluing rules in fE .

Suppose that $T(x) = y$. Then there exist finite sequences of indices i_k and j_k , $1 \leq k \leq m$, such that $(L_{i_1} g_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1} L_{i_2} \dots L_{i_m} g_{i_m i_1}^{j_m})$ is the decomposition of x into segments and gluing rules under D , and $(R_{i_1} h_{i_1 i_2}^{j_1} R_{i_2} \dots R_{i_m} h_{i_m i_1}^{j_m})$ is the decomposition of y into segments and gluing rules under E .

Suppose that f is given by a permutation σ of segment indices. This means that $L'_{\sigma(i)} = L_i$ and $G_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}^k = g_{ij}^k$, and that $R'_{\sigma(i)} = R_i$ and $H_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}^k = h_{ij}^k$. So $(L'_{\sigma(i_1)} G_{\sigma(i_1)\sigma(i_2)}^{j_1} L'_{\sigma(i_2)} \dots L'_{\sigma(i_m)} G_{\sigma(i_m)\sigma(i_1)}^{j_m})$ is the decomposition of x into segments and gluing rules under fD , and $(R'_{\sigma(i_1)} H_{\sigma(i_1)\sigma(i_2)}^{j_1} R'_{\sigma(i_2)} \dots R'_{\sigma(i_m)} H_{\sigma(i_m)\sigma(i_1)}^{j_m})$ is the decomposition of y into segments and gluing rules under fE . Since the indices involved in these two decompositions are identical, it follows that $U(x) = y$. A similar argument shows that $U(x) = y$ if f is a permutation of gluing rules g_{ij}^k and h_{ij}^k for fixed i and j .

I have written the argument in detail for permutations to show how this sort of argument works; now I will sketch the remainder of the proof, since the details are cumbersome. Suppose that f is a splitting to the right. This means that a row index

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| (A) | $[a]$ | aa | ab | ac | | | (A) | $[a]$ | aa | ab | ac | | |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bb | bc | | | | $[b]$ | ba | bb | bc | | |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cb | cc | | | | $[c]$ | ca | cb | cc | | |
| (B) | $[a]$ | aa | aab | 0 | ac | | (E) | $[a]$ | aa | ab | 0 | ac | |
| | $[ab]$ | 0 | 0 | ab | 0 | | | $[ab]$ | aba | 0 | abb | abc | |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bab | bb | bc | | | $[b]$ | ba | 0 | bb | bc | |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cab | cb | cc | | | $[c]$ | ca | 0 | cb | cc | |
| (C) | $[a]$ | aa | aab | 0 | 0 | ac | (F) | $[a]$ | aa | ab | 0 | ac | 0 |
| | $[ab]$ | 0 | 0 | ab | 0 | 0 | | $[ab]$ | aba | 0 | abb | 0 | abc |
| | $[ab]$ | aba | $abab$ | 0 | abb | abc | | $[b]$ | ba | 0 | bb | 0 | bc |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bab | 0 | bb | bc | | $[ac]$ | aca | 0 | acb | 0 | acc |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cab | 0 | cb | cc | | $[c]$ | ca | 0 | cb | 0 | cc |
| (D) | $[a]$ | aa | aab | 0 | ac | | (F') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | 0 | ab | 0 |
| | $[ab]$ | aba | $abab$ | abb | abc | | | $[ac]$ | aca | 0 | acb | 0 | acc |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bab | bb | bc | | | $[b]$ | ba | 0 | bb | 0 | bc |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cab | cb | cc | | | $[ab]$ | aba | 0 | abb | 0 | abc |
| (D') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | 0 | aab | | | $[c]$ | ca | 0 | cb | 0 | cc |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cc | cb | cab | | (E') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | 0 | ab | |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bc | bb | bab | | | $[ac]$ | aca | 0 | acb | acc | |
| | $[ab]$ | aba | abc | abb | $abab$ | | | $[b]$ | ba | 0 | bb | bc | |
| (C') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | 0 | 0 | aab | | $[\]$ | a | 0 | b | c | |
| | $[c]$ | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | (A') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | ab | | |
| | $[c]$ | ca | cc | 0 | cb | cab | | $[\]$ | a | b | c | | |
| | $[b]$ | ba | bc | 0 | bb | bab | | $[\]$ | a | b | c | | |
| | $[ab]$ | aba | abc | 0 | abb | $abab$ | | | | | | | |
| (B') | $[a]$ | aa | ac | 0 | aab | | | | | | | | |
| | $[c]$ | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | $[\]$ | a | c | b | ab | | | | | | | | |
| | $[ab]$ | aba | abc | abb | $abab$ | | | | | | | | |
| (A') | $[\]$ | a | c | aab | | | | | | | | | |
| | $[\]$ | 1 | b | ab | | | | | | | | | |
| | $[ab]$ | ab | abb | $abab$ | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 21: The $[ab] \Leftrightarrow [c]$ and $[ab] \Leftrightarrow [ac]$ transformations.

q is chosen, along with sets H_1 and H_2 . To produce the decomposition of x under fD from the decomposition of x under D one proceeds as follows: replace g by G and L by L' ; then replace $L'_q G_{qj}^k$ by $L'_{q_r} G_{q_r j}^k$ if $g_{qj}^k \in H_r$ ($r \in \{1, 2\}$). The identical procedure is carried out to produce the decomposition of y under fE . Hence the indices in both decompositions are the same, so $U(x) = y$. A similar argument holds if f is a splitting to the left. If f is a doubling, this means that an index q is chosen. To produce the decomposition of x under fD from the decomposition of x under D one proceeds as follows: replace g by G and L by L' ; replace G_{iq}^k by $G_{iq_1}^k$; replace G_{qj}^k by $G_{q_2 j}^k$; replace L'_q by $L'_{q_1} G_{q_1 q_2}^1 L'_{q_2}$. Again the identical procedure is carried out to produce the decomposition of y under fE ; hence the indices in both decompositions are the same, so $U(x) = y$.

Since each f is invertible, it follows that $U(x) = y$ if f is an unsplitting or undoubling transformation. Since $T = U$ for each of the basic transformations, it must also hold if f is any composition of these transformations. \square

It follows from this that if $\langle D, f^{-1}gfD \rangle$ represents a law of evolution then $\langle fD, gfd \rangle$ represents the same law. As an application of this, note that $\langle (D), (D') \rangle$, $\langle (C), (C') \rangle$ and $\langle (B), (B') \rangle$ are also representations of the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[c]$, and that $\langle (F), (F'') \rangle$ and $\langle (E), (E'') \rangle$ are representations of the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$.

Theorem 14 *Suppose that f and g are transformations of space set descriptions, that fD and fgD are defined, and that $T = \langle fD, D \rangle$ and $U = \langle gD, D \rangle$ are laws of evolution. Then $TU = \langle fgD, D \rangle$.*

PROOF. Since fD and fgD are defined, it follows from the previous theorem that $U = \langle fgD, fD \rangle$. The result follows from the fact that if $U = \langle D, E \rangle$ and $T = \langle E, F \rangle$ are laws of evolution then $TU = \langle D, F \rangle$. \square

As a corollary, note that if $T = \langle D, fD \rangle$ and $U = \langle D, gD \rangle$ then $T^{-1} = \langle fD, D \rangle$ and $U^{-1} = \langle gD, D \rangle$, so $U^{-1}T^{-1} = \langle gfd, D \rangle$, so $TU = \langle D, gfd \rangle$. That is our situation here. Suppose that the example law is given by $\langle (A), (U) \rangle$. To obtain (U) , we begin with (A) and apply transformations in reverse order. Hence we begin with the transformation associated with the (ab) color permutation; in other words, we exchange indices 1 and 2. Next we perform the transformation associated with the (ac) color permutation; i.e., we exchange indices 1 and 3. Next we perform the

transformations associated with the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[c]$, and finally we perform the transformations associated with the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$. These transformations are shown in Figure 22.

So far, we have been lucky: every time we have attempted to do an unsplit transformation (given that the necessary condition on the adjacency matrix was satisfied), we have been successful. Now I will give an example where this does not happen. Consider the following description of \mathcal{X}_3 :

$$\frac{(V)}{[\] \mid a + b + c}$$

Suppose that we wish to express the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$ using (V) as the left-hand description. Theorem 13 gives us a means to attempt to do this. Suppose we can find a transformation f that maps (V) to (A). We already have a transformation g which maps (A) to (A''). The theorem says that $\langle (A), (A'') \rangle$, which represents the desired law, is equal to $\langle f^{-1}(A), f^{-1}(A'') \rangle$ if $f^{-1}(A'')$ is defined. The latter representation is just $\langle (V), f^{-1}gf(V) \rangle$, which is what we are after.

We may indeed obtain (A) from (V) by first splitting segment 1 to the left with $H_1 = \{g_{11}^1\}$, and then splitting segment 2 to the left with $H_1 = \{g_{12}^1, g_{22}^1\}$:

$$\frac{(V)}{[\] \mid a + b + c} \iff \frac{(W)}{\begin{array}{c|cc} [a] & aa & ab+ac \\ \hline [\] & a & b+c \end{array}} \iff \frac{(A)}{\begin{array}{c|ccc} [a] & aa & ab & ac \\ \hline [b] & ba & bb & bc \\ \hline [c] & ca & cb & cc \end{array}}$$

Thus we have our f . Now we wish to see if it is possible to apply f^{-1} to (A''); if so, then we have our desired representation. To begin to attempt this transformation, first we perform an unsplit-to-the-left operation that combines segments 2 and 3. This can be done:

$$\frac{(A'')}{\begin{array}{c|ccc} [a] & aa & ac & ab \\ \hline [\] & a & b & c \\ \hline [\] & a & b & c \end{array}} \iff \frac{(X)}{\begin{array}{c|cc} [a] & aa & ac+ab \\ \hline [\] & a & b+c \end{array}}$$

Next we attempt to perform an unsplit-to-the-left operation that combines segments 1 and 2. But now we are stuck. If we align segments 1 and 2 on the right, we see that the new segment must be $[\]$, and that we must remove a from the left of each gluing-rule segment in row 1. But now rows 1 and 2 are supposed to be the same,

| | | | |
|-----|--|-----|---|
| (A) | $\begin{array}{c ccc} [a] & aa & ab & ac \\ [b] & ba & bb & bc \\ [c] & ca & cb & cc \end{array}$ | (O) | $\begin{array}{c cccc} [c] & cc & cb & 0 & cca \\ [b] & 0 & 0 & b & 0 \\ [] & c & b & a & ca \\ [ca] & cac & cab & caa & caca \end{array}$ |
| (G) | $\begin{array}{c ccc} [b] & bb & ba & bc \\ [a] & ab & aa & ac \\ [c] & cb & ca & cc \end{array}$ | (P) | $\begin{array}{c ccc} [] & c & b & cca \\ [] & 1 & a & ca \\ [ca] & ca & caa & caca \end{array}$ |
| (I) | $\begin{array}{c ccc} [c] & cc & ca & cb \\ [a] & ac & aa & ab \\ [b] & bc & ba & bb \end{array}$ | (Q) | $\begin{array}{c cccc} [] & c & b & 0 & cca \\ [b] & b & 0 & ba & bca \\ [a] & a & 0 & aa & aca \\ [ca] & ca & 0 & caa & caca \end{array}$ |
| (J) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [c] & cc & cca & 0 & cb \\ [ca] & 0 & 0 & ca & 0 \\ [a] & ac & aca & aa & ab \\ [b] & bc & bca & ba & bb \end{array}$ | (R) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [] & c & b & 0 & cca & 0 \\ [b] & b & 0 & ba & 0 & bca \\ [a] & a & 0 & aa & 0 & aca \\ [cca] & cca & 0 & ccaa & 0 & ccaca \\ [ca] & ca & 0 & caa & 0 & caca \end{array}$ |
| (K) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [c] & cc & cca & 0 & 0 & cb \\ [ca] & 0 & 0 & ca & 0 & 0 \\ [ca] & cac & caca & 0 & caa & cab \\ [a] & ac & aca & 0 & aa & ab \\ [b] & bc & bca & 0 & ba & bb \end{array}$ | (S) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [] & c & cca & 0 & b & 0 \\ [cca] & cca & 0 & ccaa & 0 & ccaca \\ [a] & a & 0 & aa & 0 & aca \\ [b] & b & 0 & ba & 0 & bca \\ [ca] & ca & 0 & caa & 0 & caca \end{array}$ |
| (L) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [c] & cc & cca & 0 & cb \\ [ca] & cac & caca & caa & cab \\ [a] & ac & aca & aa & ab \\ [b] & bc & bca & ba & bb \end{array}$ | (T) | $\begin{array}{c cccc} [] & c & cca & 0 & b \\ [cca] & cca & 0 & ccaa & ccaca \\ [a] & a & 0 & aa & aca \\ [] & 1 & 0 & a & ca \end{array}$ |
| (M) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [c] & cc & cb & 0 & cca \\ [b] & bc & bb & ba & bca \\ [a] & ac & ab & aa & aca \\ [ca] & cac & cab & caa & caca \end{array}$ | (U) | $\begin{array}{c ccc} [] & c & cca & b \\ [a] & a & aa & aca \\ [] & 1 & a & ca \end{array}$ |
| (N) | $\begin{array}{c ccccc} [c] & cc & cb & 0 & 0 & cca \\ [b] & 0 & 0 & b & 0 & 0 \\ [b] & bc & bb & 0 & ba & bca \\ [a] & ac & ab & 0 & aa & aca \\ [ca] & cac & cab & 0 & caa & caca \end{array}$ | | |

Figure 22: Obtaining the 1+1-dimensional law in Chapter 2 via space set transformations. The law is represented by $\langle\langle(A), (U)\rangle\rangle$.

and they are not: the second entry in row 1 is $c + b$, and the second entry in row 2 is $b + c$. The order here is important. Somehow we are supposed to merge the c in the first row with the b in the second row, and vice versa. Our formalism does not allow this, so the operation fails.

It is important to notice, however, that this operation fails only because the formalism used here, though more general than the original no-overlap formalism, is still too restrictive. There *is* a sense in which this operation can be carried out. The resulting adjacency matrix, as in (V), is a 1×1 matrix whose single entry is 3. This corresponds to a graph with one vertex and three edges. The segment corresponding to the single vertex may be taken to be the empty segment. The first edge corresponds to the color a . The second edge corresponds to c if the previous color is a , and to b otherwise. The third edge corresponds to b if the previous color is a , and to c otherwise. One may easily verify that, if (Y) is interpreted in this way, then it is indeed a faithful description of \mathcal{X}_3 , and $\langle (V), (Y) \rangle$ is a representation of the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$.

In fact, the gluing-rule condition on unshift transformations can be ignored. If the adjacency matrix satisfies the rules for an unshift transformation, then one may make sense out of that transformation. One way to do this is to further generalize space set descriptions, which means obtaining an expanded view of what a vertex and edge may represent. While obtaining such an expanded view is a worthwhile goal, there is also an easier way to proceed. We may dispense with complicated descriptions of space sets, and work only with adjacency matrices. This will be shown in the next section.

5.6 Elementary maps and matrix moves

Consider an $n \times n$ matrix A of nonnegative integers. We may associate any such matrix with a faithful description of a set of spaces \mathcal{X}_A as follows. Let each vertex in Γ_A be assigned the empty segment. Let each edge a_{ij}^k ($1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq A_{ij}$) in Γ_A be assigned a length-1 segment where the color of the cell in this segment is given simply by the edge label a_{ij}^k , considered as an abstract symbol. Clearly any such description is faithful, since every edge is colored and since there is only one edge containing any given color. I will call descriptions of this sort *matrix descriptions*.

In order to avoid the subscripts and superscripts associated with the names a_{ij}^k for

the colors in \mathcal{X}_A , it will often be useful to give alternative letter names to these colors. This may be done by writing down a gluing matrix associated with A containing these alternate names. In these gluing matrices, since each gluing relation consists of a length-one segment, it is simpler to omit plus signs. Hence, for instance, I might say that A is the 1×1 matrix (abc) ; this simply means that a stands for a_{11}^1 , b stands for a_{11}^2 , and c stands for a_{11}^3 . It will sometimes be convenient to assign the same names to colors in different matrix descriptions. This causes no problems; however, it is important that every edge in a given matrix description be assigned a distinct color. To simplify notation, I will use the same name A to refer to an adjacency matrix and to its associated matrix description; the intended usage should be clear from the context.

In this section, rather than focusing on the many ways in which one may describe a space set, I will focus on equivalence maps between space sets given by matrix descriptions. If $\langle L, G, A \rangle$ is a description of a space set \mathcal{X} , and if one considers the space set \mathcal{X}_A given by the matrix description A , then these two descriptions have the same adjacency matrix; hence \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}_A are locally equivalent. So we are not losing any equivalence classes of space sets by restricting ourselves to matrix descriptions.

Let f be one of the elementary transformations of space set descriptions defined in the previous section: that is, it is a permutation of matrix indices, or a permutation of gluing rules g_{ij}^k for fixed i and j , or it is a splitting, doubling, unsplitting or undoubling transformation. For each such transformation f that maps a space set description D with adjacency matrix A to a description fD with adjacency matrix B , we will associate an equivalence map $T : \mathcal{X}_A \mapsto \mathcal{X}_B$ where $T = \langle fA, B \rangle$. Note that T is always well defined, since if A is a matrix description and f is one of these elementary transformations then fA is always well defined.

As an example, let A be the 1×1 adjacency matrix (3), and let the matrix description A be given by the gluing matrix (abc) . This is exactly the description (V) given in the previous section. There we produced (W) from (V) by performing a transformation f which split segment 1 to the left with $H_1 = \{g_{11}^1\}$. The adjacency matrix B for (W) is $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Let $\begin{pmatrix} d & ef \\ a & bc \end{pmatrix}$ be the gluing matrix for the matrix description B . The map T associated with f is given by

$$T = \langle fA, B \rangle = \langle (W), B \rangle = \left\langle \begin{array}{c} [a] \\ [] \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{cc} aa & ab + ac \\ a & b + c \end{array} \right. , \begin{array}{c} [] \\ [] \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{cc} d & e + f \\ a & b + c \end{array} \right. \right\rangle.$$

T acts by changing the color of a cell if it is preceded by an a -colored cell; in this case it changes a to d , b to e and c to f . Note that the fact that some of the colors in A and B are the same simplifies the description of T , because it makes it possible for T to leave certain colors alone.

Now consider a sequence of elementary transformations f_i mapping $\langle L_i, G_i, A_i \rangle$ to $\langle L_{i-1}, G_{i-1}, A_{i-1} \rangle$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, where $A_0 = A_n = A$, $D = \langle L_n, G_n, A \rangle$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_D$. Then there is a law of evolution $T = \langle L_0, L_n, G_0, G_n, A \rangle = \langle f_1 \dots f_n D, D \rangle$ on \mathcal{X} . For each f_i there is an associated equivalence map $T_i : \mathcal{X}_{A_i} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_{A_{i-1}}$. Let $U = \langle D, A \rangle$. Then UTU^{-1} is a law of evolution on \mathcal{X}_A that is equivalent to T . The composition $U = T_1 T_2 \dots T_n$ is a map from \mathcal{X}_A to \mathcal{X}_A ; hence it is also a law of evolution on \mathcal{X}_A .

Theorem 15 *If $T = \langle f_1 \dots f_n A, A \rangle$ and A_i, f_i, T_i and U are as defined above for each i , then $UTU^{-1} = T_1 \dots T_n$.*

PROOF. By definition, $T_i = \langle f_i A_i, A_{i-1} \rangle$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$T_i = \langle f_i f_{i+1} \dots f_n D, A_{i-1} \rangle \langle f_i A_i, f_i f_{i+1} \dots f_n D \rangle$$

by the rule of composition, since all descriptions involved are well defined and since the descriptions paired in angle brackets share the same adjacency matrix. By Theorem 13 it follows that $T_i = \langle f_i \dots f_n D, A_{i-1} \rangle \langle A_i, f_{i+1} \dots f_n D \rangle$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 \dots T_n &= (\langle f_1 \dots f_n D, A_0 \rangle \langle A_1, f_2 \dots f_n D \rangle) (\langle f_2 \dots f_n D, A_1 \rangle \langle A_2, f_3 \dots f_n D \rangle) \\ &\dots (\langle f_{n-1} f_n D, A_{n-2} \rangle \langle A_{n-1}, f_n D \rangle) (\langle f_n D, A_{n-1} \rangle \langle A_n, D \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Cancelling adjacent pairs of inverse maps gives $T_1 \dots T_n = \langle f_1 \dots f_n D, A_0 \rangle \langle A_n, D \rangle = \langle D, A \rangle \langle f_1 \dots f_n D, D \rangle \langle A, D \rangle = UTU^{-1}$ (using the rules for composition and the fact that $A_0 = A_n = A$). \square

The above theorem says that if T is any law generated by elementary transformations of space set descriptions, then T is equivalent to a law which is the composition of “elementary maps” of the form $\langle fA, A \rangle$ (where A is a matrix description and f is an elementary transformation of space set descriptions). On the other hand, let D be any description with adjacency matrix $A = A_0 = A_n$, let each f_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) be an elementary transformation which maps descriptions with adjacency matrix A_i to descriptions with adjacency matrix A_{i-1} as above, and suppose that $\langle f_1 \dots f_n D, D \rangle$ is not defined. In this case each rule $T_i = \langle f_i A_i, A_{i-1} \rangle$ is still defined, so $T = T_1 \dots T_n$

is a law of evolution on \mathcal{X}_A . This is why our inability noted in the previous section to perform certain transformations of descriptions can be diagnosed as being the result of a too restrictive definition of a description; the desired map is indeed well defined in all such cases.

For example, at the end of the previous section we attempted to generate a description of the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$ by transforming (V) into (Y), but we had trouble writing this down. The above theorem provides us with an alternative way to describe this law in terms of composition of elementary maps. Details are provided in Figure 23.

It is possible, then, to adopt the following point of view. Consider the set of matrices of nonnegative integers. To each such matrix, associate a matrix description. For any matrix description A in this set of descriptions, there are only finitely many elementary maps $\langle fA, B \rangle$ where B is another description in this set. The entire setup may be represented by a directed graph Γ in which there is a one-to-one correspondence between vertices and matrix descriptions and between edges and elementary maps (the edge corresponding to $\langle fA, B \rangle$ points from A to B). There are infinitely many vertices, and each vertex has finite degree.

Choose a vertex A in Γ . The set of vertices in the component of Γ containing A correspond to the set of matrices B of nonnegative integers such that \mathcal{X}_A and \mathcal{X}_B are related by the equivalence relation generated by elementary maps. Consider any finite closed path beginning and ending at A . This corresponds to a law of evolution on \mathcal{X}_A (obtained by composing the maps associated with the path's edges in the order given). Let F_A be the set of all such paths. These paths form a group under composition; it is isomorphic to the fundamental group of Γ . Some of the paths correspond to the identity law on \mathcal{X}_A . (For example, if A is the matrix description (abc) and α is the path corresponding to the law that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$, then α^2 is the identity on A .) The set of all such paths is a subgroup I_A of F_A . It is a normal subgroup, since if $\alpha \in F_A$ and $\beta \in I_A$ then $\alpha\beta\alpha^{-1}$ must correspond to the identity law on \mathcal{X}_A , so it is in I_A . The quotient group F_A/I_A corresponds to the set of laws on \mathcal{X}_A (for α and β correspond to the same law on \mathcal{X}_A if and only if $\alpha\beta^{-1}$ corresponds to the identity law on \mathcal{X}_A , and hence is in I_A).

Let B be another vertex in the same component as A . Then there is a path γ going from A to B . This path corresponds to an equivalence map $U : \mathcal{X}_A \mapsto \mathcal{X}_B$. The map from F_A to F_B given by $\alpha \mapsto \gamma\alpha\gamma^{-1}$ is an isomorphism of groups. It is also




Figure 23: Generating a law by composing elementary maps. Here the law T is the one that exchanges $[ab]$ with $[ac]$. Let f_i , $1 \leq i \leq 5$, be the transformations given earlier such that $f_1(V) = (W)$, $f_2(W) = (A)$, $f_3(A) = (E)$, $f_4(E) = (F)$ and $f_5(F) = (F')$. We attempted to obtain T in the form $\langle (V), (f_1)^{-1}(f_2)^{-1}(f_3)^{-1}(f_4)^{-1}f_5f_4f_3f_2f_1(V) \rangle$, but were not able to successfully apply $(f_1)^{-1}$. Here we associate an elementary map T_i with each f_i ; the law is then $(T_1)^{-1}(T_2)^{-1}(T_3)^{-1}(T_4)^{-1}(T_5)^{-1}T_4T_3T_2T_1$ (since the f 's are on the right, we reverse their order and take inverses; since $f_5 = (f_5)^{-1}$ this is the same as taking the f 's in their original order). I have chosen gluing matrices in such a way that the maps T_i are as simple as possible. Each arrow between matrices represents such a map; a description of each map is attached. The notation " $\underline{a}b \Rightarrow e$ " means that if a cell b is preceded by an a , its color is changed to e . Pairs of maps that are above and below one another in the diagram are inverses of one another. At bottom an example is given: the T_i 's are applied in order to an original space x ; the result is that the map which exchanges $[ab]$ and $[ac]$ has been performed.

an isomorphism of the subgroups I_A and I_B . Hence it is an isomorphism of F_A/I_A and F_B/I_B . Said another way: every law T on \mathcal{X}_A that corresponds to some path α is equivalent to a law UTU^{-1} on \mathcal{X}_B which corresponds to the path $\gamma\alpha\gamma^{-1}$, and vice versa (switch roles of A and B). To find all non-equivalent laws generated by elementary maps, then, it suffices to choose one vertex A_σ in each component σ of Γ , and to generate the group $F_{A_\sigma}/I_{A_\sigma}$ for each such vertex A_σ .

This is a nice point of view, and one might hope that the set of maps generated in this manner might contain all the maps one needs. More precisely, one might, via wishful thinking, come to believe the following:

Conjecture *The elementary maps generate all orientation-preserving local maps with local inverses on oriented 1+1-dimensional space sets given by the set of matrix descriptions A such that every vertex of Γ_A is in a circuit.*

I do in fact believe this, but I have not proven it. Recall that all I did earlier was to come up with a few transformations of space set descriptions. I never showed that every description of a space set \mathcal{X}_D could be generated by applying these transformations to D . In fact, it is not completely clear what it would mean to generate “every description,” since it is clear that my definition of space set descriptions is inadequate. However, at minimum it would be nice to know that all descriptions given by the current definition can be so generated. This would imply that the laws in F_A/I_A include all laws on \mathcal{X}_A that are of the form $\langle D, E \rangle$ where D and E satisfy the current definition of description. I have found no reason to believe that this is not the case, but this is no substitute for a proof.

Note that if the conjecture holds then the situation is similar to that of invertible linear operators in finite-dimensional linear algebra. There we have a theorem that the set of all such operators is generated by the elementary linear operators. Here the situation is a bit more complicated because our elementary maps may not be operators; they may go from \mathcal{X}_A to \mathcal{X}_B where $A \neq B$. But otherwise it is the same.

I have not yet attempted to write a computer program to generate laws on \mathcal{X} by generating the group F_A/I_A . To do so, it would be nice to have some understanding of the structure of I_A . I do not have any such understanding, nor do I know whether it is possible to gain one; perhaps it is extremely complicated. Nevertheless, without knowing anything about I_A one could still easily write an algorithm which finds all closed paths of length n that begin and end at A . Each such path would correspond

to a law. Many laws found in this way would be the same as one another, so it would be useful to put the laws in some sort of standard form in order to detect this (some new techniques would need to be developed here, but I do not think this would be difficult). By doing this for each n , in increasing order, one would in the limit generate all such laws. I expect that the resulting algorithm would be far more efficient than the one described earlier in this chapter.

The condition on matrix descriptions mentioned in the conjecture (that every vertex of Γ_A be in a circuit) may easily be removed by allowing another rather trivial elementary transformation, which I will call *reducing*. The move is this: if a vertex contains only incoming edges and no outgoing edges, or only outgoing edges and no incoming edges, then that vertex and all edges connecting to that vertex may be removed. The inverse move, *unreducing*, is also allowed.

This picture may be simplified somewhat by revising the definition of elementary map. It turns out that we may replace the maps associated with splitting, doubling and reducing with a single type of map, described in Figure 24. Henceforth when I say “elementary transformation” I will be referring to this move and its inverse. The move will also be referred to as “adding a vertex” or “removing a vertex.”

Theorem 16 *The splitting, doubling and reducing moves and their inverses are equivalent to the elementary transformation.*

PROOF. Let k be the in-degree of the black vertex in Figure 24. If $k = 0$ then removing the vertex is the same move as the reducing move. If $k = 1$ then removing the vertex can be accomplished by a split, then an undoubling, then an unsplit, as shown in the first row of Figure 25. If $k > 1$ then removing the vertex can be accomplished by $k - 1$ splits followed by k applications of the removing-the-vertex operation when $k = 1$, as shown in the second row of the figure.

Conversely, the reducing move and undoubling moves are special cases of removing a vertex. Let k be the in-degree and j be the out-degree of a vertex being split to the left. To accomplish the split, we begin by adding j vertices so as to replace each of the j outgoing edges with two consecutive edges.. Then two vertices are added so that the two chosen subsets of the k incoming edges are separated. Now the original vertex is removed. Then the j vertices that had been added are removed. This is shown in the third row of the figure. □




Figure 24: The elementary space set transformation. The transformation is shown here in three ways. In terms of matrices, the $n \times n$ matrix A is transformed into an $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix A' by writing down an $(n + 1)$ st row c_i , $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$, and an $(n + 1)$ st column b_j , $1 \leq j \leq n + 1$, with $b_{n+1} = c_{n+1} = 0$, and then subtracting $b_i c_j$ from entry (i, j) for each i and j . The transformation is allowed if A' is a matrix of nonnegative integers. An example of how this transformation affects a graph is given. Instead of using arrows, I will use the convention that edges emerging from the top of a vertex point away from that vertex, and that edges emerging from the bottom of a vertex point toward that vertex. Here an open circle denotes a “free” vertex: that is, it refers to some unknown vertex (so different free vertices may refer to the same vertex). A filled-in circle denotes a “fixed” vertex: all edges connecting to it are shown (hence no free vertex refers to a fixed vertex). Hence the right-to-left transformation is simply the following: remove a vertex which has no edge going from that vertex to itself, and replace each length-2 path through that vertex with a length-1 path. The path replacement in terms of segments is listed on the right.




Figure 25: Proof of the equivalence of splitting, doubling and reducing moves to vertex removal moves (see text for further details). In the first row the vertex below the black vertex is split right (convention: arrows point upwards in the diagram) to produce the second diagram; then the edge pointing towards the black vertex is undoubled to produce the third diagram; then the two vertices that were produced by the split are unsplit to produce the fourth diagram. In the second row the black vertex is split left twice to produce the second diagram; then the move from the first row is applied three times to produce the third diagram. In the third row a vertex is added to each upper edge and two vertices are added at bottom to produce the second diagram (now the edges to be split are at bottom); the original vertex is removed to produce the third diagram; and the final step (not shown in the picture) is to remove the top three vertices.

5.7 Equivalence classes of space sets

Given results in previous sections, it should now be apparent that the problem of finding the equivalence classes of space sets under local equivalence maps reduces to the problem of finding the equivalence classes of matrices of nonnegative integers (or, equivalently, of directed graphs) under elementary transformations.

I was able to solve this problem for an important special case: namely, the case where the graph contains exactly one nontrivial connected component, and no other connected component. In this case, it turns out that a certain set of invariants completely determines the equivalence classes.

5.7.1 A new matrix representation, and some useful space set transformations

Consider the $n \times n$ nonnegative integer matrix A and the pair of consecutive elementary transformations described in Figure 26. The net result is that A has been transformed to another $n \times n$ matrix by adding row j to row i and subtracting 1 from A_{ij} . By an analogous pair of transformations, one may add column i to column j and subtract 1 from A_{ij} . Since the transformations are invertible, one may also subtract row j from row i and add 1 to A_{ij} , or subtract column i from column j and add 1 to A_{ij} . In all of these cases, the transformations are only allowed if all entries in the intermediate and final matrices are nonnegative. This means two things. Firstly, A_{ij} must be at least 1 *before* the moves involving row or column addition, and it must be at least 1 *after* the moves involving row or column subtraction. And secondly, after a subtraction the resulting matrix must not contain negative integers.

A simplification can be obtained as follows. Instead of representing \mathcal{X}_A by the matrix A , let us represent it by the matrix $B = A - I$, where I is the identity matrix. I call B a *reduced* representation of \mathcal{X}_A . The set of allowed reduced matrices is the set of all matrices B such that $B_{ij} \geq 0$ if $i \neq j$, and $B_{ii} \geq -1$. In terms of the reduced matrix, the pair of transformations given in Figure 26 becomes simpler: while before we added row j to row i and then subtracted 1 from A_{ij} , now all we do is add row j to row i . (This follows since 1 has already been subtracted from A_{jj} .) A similar result holds for columns. Hence the advantage of using the reduced matrix is that the above-described transformations now become standard row and column operations from linear algebra: one may add or subtract one row or column from another row

$$\begin{array}{c}
\left(\begin{array}{ccc} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & \cdots & A_{nn} \end{array} \right) \implies \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1(n-1)} & 1 & A_{1n} - 1 \\ A_{21} & \cdots & A_{2(n-1)} & 0 & A_{2n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & \cdots & A_{n(n-1)} & 0 & A_{nn} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \implies \\
\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} A_{11} + A_{n1} & \cdots & A_{1(n-1)} + A_{n(n-1)} & A_{1n} + A_{nn} - 1 & \\ A_{21} & \cdots & A_{2(n-1)} & & A_{2n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & \cdots & A_{n(n-1)} & & A_{nn} \end{array} \right)
\end{array}$$

Figure 26: An equivalence transformation involving row addition. Here first an elementary equivalence transformation is performed in which an $(n + 1)$ st vertex is added, as shown. Then the n th vertex is removed. The net result is that row n has been added to row 1 and then 1 has been subtracted from A_{1n} . The operation may only be performed if $A_{1n} > 0$ (so that each entry in these three matrices is nonnegative). (In terms of Γ_A , this operation first removes an edge e going from vertex 1 to vertex n . Then, for each formerly existing two-edge path that went along e from vertex 1 to vertex n and then from vertex n to vertex k , a new edge is added going from 1 to k .) By composing this operation with index permutations, one may perform the operation in which row j is added to row i and then 1 is subtracted from A_{ij} for any $i \neq j$.

or column. As before, there are restrictions. Firstly, one must check that B_{ij} is at least 1 before adding row j to row i or column i to column j , and that it is at least 1 after subtracting row j from row i or column i from column j . And secondly, after a subtraction the resulting matrix must be a valid reduced matrix.

5.7.2 Invariants of integer matrices under a subset of standard row and column operations

What happens if we consider only $n \times n$ matrices for fixed n , allow the entries of these matrices to be *arbitrary* integers, and try to find the equivalence classes generated by the operations of adding and subtracting one row or column from another? This is the problem that I will address in this section. It turns out that it may be solved by making a slight adaptation to a standard algorithm from linear algebra. The solution involves a set of matrix invariants which completely determine the equivalence classes. As it turns out, these invariants are also invariants of reduced matrices under

equivalence transformations.

The algorithm in question is one for reducing a matrix of polynomials to Smith normal form, as described, for example, in Hoffman and Kunze ([18], pp. 253-261). There are some slight differences, because the operation of multiplying a row or column by a constant is allowed for polynomial matrices, but is not allowed here. However, the basic methods of the algorithm still go through. I describe it below in detail, in part because the ideas in this algorithm will be used to prove the main invariants theorem later on.

Theorem 17 *Let B be an $n \times n$ integer matrix. Let the allowed operations on B consist of adding an integer multiple of row i to row j or of column i to column j , where $i \neq j$. Then B may be transformed by a finite sequence of these allowed operations into a unique $n \times n$ diagonal matrix D , where D_{ii} divides D_{jj} if $i < j$, and where all entries are nonnegative except possibly for D_{nn} .*

PROOF. The main tool used here is a variant of the Euclidean algorithm for finding a greatest common divisor of two positive integers. In this case the integers may be positive, negative or zero. Here we will consider “greatest common divisor” to mean greatest in *absolute value*. Hence a set of integers either has a greatest common divisor of zero (in which case the integers are all zero) or it has two greatest common divisors (d and $-d$ for some positive integer d).

We begin by considering the first row. Either it contains a greatest common divisor of its entries or it does not. If it does not, then it must contain two nonzero entries B_{1i} and B_{1j} with $|B_{1i}| > |B_{1j}|$. If B_{1i} and B_{1j} have the same sign, then subtract column j from column i ; otherwise, add column j to column i . In either case, the sum of the absolute values of the entries in row 1 decreases. Now repeat the process. If row 1 does not yet contain a greatest common divisor of its entries, perform another column operation which decreases the sum of the absolute values of its entries. This sum cannot decrease past zero; therefore, row 1 will eventually contain a greatest common divisor of its entries in some entry $B_{1k} = g_1$. By adding multiples of column k to the other columns, each entry in row 1 may be set to g_1 .

Either g_1 divides all of the entries in B or it does not. Suppose it does not divide some entry B_{ij} . Now we do the same thing to column j as we did above to row 1: add or subtract rows in order to decrease the sum of the absolute values of the entries in column j until column j contains a greatest common divisor of its entries in some

sign of its single entry S_{nn} cannot be changed. The result of all of these operations is a diagonal matrix D in which D_{ii} divides D_{jj} for $i < j$, and in which $D_{ii} > 0$ for $1 \leq i < n$, as required.

It is easy to show that, for $1 \leq k \leq n$, the number $\delta_k = \prod_{i=1}^k D_{ii}$ is equal to a greatest common divisor of the $k \times k$ minors of D . If $k < n$ then δ_k is the absolute value of the greatest common divisors of the $k \times k$ minors; and δ_n is the (signed) determinant of D . It is also a standard result (see [18], pp. 157, 259) that the allowed row and column operations do not change the greatest common divisors of the $k \times k$ minors of a matrix, nor do they change its determinant. Therefore, the matrix B may be transformed into only one matrix D satisfying the conditions in the theorem. \square

It follows that the equivalence class in which the matrix B belongs may be precisely identified by the associated matrix D , or, equivalently, by the determinant of B and by the absolute values of the greatest common divisors of its $k \times k$ minors. I will refer to the list of these absolute values, ordered from highest to lowest, as the *list of invariant factors* of B .

5.7.3 Invariants of reduced matrices under equivalence transformations

The next task is to find out what role the determinant and the list of invariant factors play when we switch our attention to reduced matrices and equivalence transformations of space sets. An elementary equivalence transformation maps an $n \times n$ matrix to an $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix. It turns out that this transformation maps the determinant of the matrix and its invariant factors in a natural way.

Theorem 18 *Let $T : A \mapsto A'$ be an elementary equivalence transformation, where A is an $n \times n$ matrix and A' is an $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix. Then $\det(I - A) = \det(I - A')$, and the list of invariant factors of $I - A$ and of $I - A'$ are the same once trailing 1's are removed.*

PROOF. The situation is illustrated in Figure 28. Since the bottom matrix in the figure has been obtained from $I - A'$ by adding multiples of rows or columns to one another, it has the same determinant and set of invariant factors as does $I - A'$. But this bottom matrix contains $I - A$ as an $n \times n$ submatrix. If we apply the standard algorithm to reduce this to Smith normal form, only the submatrix will be affected

$$\begin{array}{c}
\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 - A_{11} + b_1 c_1 & -A_{12} + b_1 c_2 & \dots & -A_{1n} + b_1 c_n & -b_1 & \\
-A_{21} + b_2 c_1 & 1 - A_{22} + b_2 c_2 & \dots & -A_{2n} + b_2 c_n & -b_2 & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
-A_{n1} + b_n c_1 & -A_{n2} + b_n c_2 & \dots & 1 - A_{nn} + b_n c_n & -b_n & \\
-c_1 & -c_2 & \dots & -c_n & 1 &
\end{array} \right) \implies \\
\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 - A_{11} & -A_{12} & \dots & -A_{1n} & 0 & \\
-A_{21} & 1 - A_{22} & \dots & -A_{2n} & 0 & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
-A_{n1} & -A_{n2} & \dots & 1 - A_{nn} & 0 & \\
-c_1 & -c_2 & \dots & -c_n & 1 &
\end{array} \right) \implies \left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 - A_{11} & -A_{12} & \dots & -A_{1n} & 0 & \\
-A_{21} & 1 - A_{22} & \dots & -A_{2n} & 0 & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
-A_{n1} & -A_{n2} & \dots & 1 - A_{nn} & 0 & \\
0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 &
\end{array} \right)
\end{array}$$

Figure 28: Invariants of elementary matrix transformations. The first matrix shown is $I - A'$, where A' was obtained from A as described in Figure 24. The second matrix is obtained from the first one by adding b_i times the last row to the i th row for each $i \leq n$. The third matrix is obtained from the second one by adding c_j times the last column to the j th column for each $j \leq n$. From this one may easily conclude that $\det(I - A) = \det(I - A')$ and that the list of invariant factors of $I - A$ is the same as that of $I - A'$ once trailing 1's have been deleted.

because of the zeroes in the $(n+1)$ st rows and columns. Hence the resulting matrix will have the same list of invariant factors as does $I - A$, except for an additional trailing 1. Also, its determinant is clearly equal to $\det(I - A)$. \square

Henceforth when I refer to a list of invariant factors I will mean that trailing 1's have been deleted. Given that the elementary equivalence transformations generate the entire set of equivalence transformations, it follows that the determinant and the list of invariant factors are invariants of equivalence maps on reduced matrices. Since the greatest common divisor of the $n \times n$ minors of B is just $|\det B|$, it follows that all information is contained in the list of invariant factors except when $\det B$ is nonzero, in which case the additional information provided by $\det B$ is its sign.

5.7.4 Positive reduced matrices

The invariants found above do not completely determine the equivalence classes of reduced matrices under equivalence transformations. This can easily be seen by first noting that the number of strongly connected components of a matrix is preserved

under equivalence transformations. Given a strongly connected matrix, it is easy to construct another matrix with the same invariants whose graph contains several strongly connected components. For example, suppose that A is a strongly connected $n \times n$ matrix such that n is even and $\det(I - A) > 0$. Let D be the diagonal matrix such that D_{ii} is equal to the i th invariant factor of $I - A$. Then $D + I$ is a matrix of nonnegative integers whose invariants are the same as those of A . But $D + I$ contains n strongly connected components, and cannot be in the same equivalence class as A since $n > 1$.

Even if we restrict our attention to matrices with one strongly connected component, the invariants do not completely determine the equivalence classes. Consider the (unreduced) matrices $A_1 = (1)$ and $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. In both cases $\det(I - A_i) = 0$ and the list of invariant factors contains a single zero entry. But one may easily verify that every matrix in the equivalence class of A_1 has a *trivial* strongly connected component (consisting of a single circuit). This is not true of A_2 . Hence these matrices are in different equivalence classes.

It turns out that this is the only exception. There is a single equivalence class consisting of all matrices containing one trivial strongly connected component and no other strongly connected components. If we restrict our attention to the set of matrices which have one nontrivial strongly connected component and no other strongly connected components, then the invariants found so far completely determine the equivalence classes. A proof of this assertion is the subject of the next section. This proof requires the following theorem, which asserts the existence of a relevant property which distinguishes this set of matrices from all others.

Theorem 19 *Let B be an $n \times n$ reduced matrix. Then Γ_{B+I} contains one nontrivial strongly connected component and no other strongly connected components if and only if B is equivalent via equivalence transformations to a reduced $k \times k$ matrix in which all entries are positive for each $k \geq n$.*

PROOF. Suppose B can be transformed to a matrix M in which all entries are positive. Then Γ_{B+I} must contain exactly one strongly connected component, since Γ_{M+I} is strongly connected and the number of strongly connected components is invariant under equivalence transformations. But it cannot be trivially strongly connected, since no reduced matrix in that equivalence class has all entries positive.

Conversely, suppose that Γ_{B+I} contains one nontrivial strongly connected component and no other strongly connected component. If vertex i of Γ_{B+I} is not in a strongly connected component, then $(B+I)_{ii}$ must be zero, so the i th vertex may be removed via an elementary transformation. We may continue to remove vertices in this way until the resulting graph is strongly connected.

Now suppose that B contains an element $B_{ii} = -1$. We may remove vertex i using an elementary equivalence transformation, thereby reducing the dimension of B by 1. This operation may be repeated until there are no more negative diagonal elements (this must happen eventually since the 1×1 reduced matrix with diagonal entry -1 is not strongly connected).

Now suppose that all of the entries of B are nonnegative and that $B_{ij} = 0$. Since B is strongly connected, its associated graph contains a directed path connecting vertex i to vertex j . The path may be chosen so that no two vertices on the path are the same except possibly for the first and last vertices (if $i = j$); for if we have a path in which any pair of vertices other than the first and last are the same, we may shorten it by removing the segment of the path connecting that vertex pair. Furthermore, we may require that every edge in the path connects two distinct vertices. This follows automatically from the above if $i \neq j$. Suppose $i = j$. Then $B_{ii} = 0$. But this means that n cannot be 1, since then B would be trivially strongly connected. Since $n > 1$ and B is strongly connected there must be an edge connecting i to some other vertex k , and then a path with no vertices repeated from k back to i ; this path satisfies our requirements.

Let such a path be m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k with $m_1 = i$ and $m_k = j$. Since m_1 connects to m_2 and $m_1 \neq m_2$, it follows that $B_{m_1 m_2} > 0$ and that we may add row m_2 to row m_1 . We know that $B_{m_2 m_3} > 0$ since m_2 connects to m_3 and $m_2 \neq m_3$; since row m_2 was added to row m_1 , this means that now $B_{m_1 m_3} > 0$. If $k > 3$ then $m_1 \neq m_3$, so we may now add row m_3 to row m_1 . Continuing in the same manner, we eventually add row m_{k-1} to row m_1 , which causes $B_{m_1 m_k} = B_{ij}$ to become greater than zero. No entry of B has been decreased by these operations, so there is now at least one fewer zero entry in B . If the whole process is repeated often enough, eventually all entries in B will be positive.

Given an $m \times m$ matrix B with all entries positive, one may apply an elementary equivalence transformation followed by a row operation to produce an $(m+1) \times (m+1)$ matrix with all entries nonnegative, as shown in Figure 29. By our previous results,

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{11} & B_{12} & \dots & B_{1m} & 0 \\ B_{21} & B_{22} & \dots & B_{2m} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{m1} & B_{m2} & \dots & B_{mm} - 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{array} \right) \implies \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} B_{11} & B_{12} & \dots & B_{1m} & 0 \\ B_{21} & B_{22} & \dots & B_{2m} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{m1} & B_{m2} & \dots & B_{mm} - 1 & 1 \\ B_{m1} & B_{m2} & \dots & B_{mm} & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

Figure 29: A reduced $m \times m$ matrix with all entries positive is equivalent to a reduced $(m + 1) \times (m + 1)$ matrix with all entries positive. The matrix B is transformed to produce the matrix B' , shown at left. Since $B'_{(m+1)m} = 1$, we may add row m to row $m + 1$ to produce the matrix shown at right. All entries of the right-hand matrix are nonnegative, so this matrix can be transformed into one with all entries positive.

this may be transformed into an $(m + 1) \times (m + 1)$ matrix with all entries positive. Clearly one may continue to expand B in this manner. Hence B is equivalent to a $k \times k$ matrix with all entries positive for each $k \geq m$. \square

If B is equivalent to a reduced matrix all of whose entries are positive, I will call it a *positive reduced matrix*.

Finally, note that if B is a $k \times k$ matrix with all entries positive and $k > 1$, then it is equivalent to infinitely many such $k \times k$ matrices. For since all entries are positive one may generate equivalent matrices with all entries positive by adding rows or columns to one another with wild abandon.

Theorem 20 *Let B_1 and B_2 be positive reduced matrices. Suppose that $\det(-B_1) = \det(-B_2)$ and that the lists of invariant factors of B_1 and B_2 are identical. Then B_1 and B_2 are in the same equivalence class.*

PROOF. To begin, note that B_1 or B_2 may be expanded by elementary equivalence transformations until they are both $n \times n$ matrices for some n . All that is required, then, is that we prove the theorem for the case that B_1 and B_2 are both $n \times n$ matrices.

The strategy here, as in the proof of Theorem 17, is to provide an algorithm which reduces any positive reduced $n \times n$ matrix B to a canonical form, which is also an $n \times n$ matrix. There will be only one canonical form for each distinct set of invariants; hence it will follow that any two positive reduced $n \times n$ matrices with the same set of invariants must reduce to the same canonical form.

In the proof of Theorem 17, this canonical form was a diagonal matrix. This will not be satisfactory here since diagonal $n \times n$ matrices are not connected when $n > 1$; hence they are not positive reduced matrices. Instead, the canonical form used here is built around the circuit $(12 \dots n)$. This is illustrated in Figure 30.

There will be two variables associated with the algorithm. The variable c refers to the submatrix S_c being worked on; it also refers to a designated column. The variable r refers to a designated row. To begin the algorithm, c is set to 1 and r is set to n . In addition, using the previous theorem we initially transform B so that all of its entries are positive.

The algorithm proceeds by performing a sequence of row and column operations on B in order to transform S_c in a certain way. Unlike the case in Theorem 17, here we must check each such operation to make sure that it is allowed. One portion of this checking is to insure that the result of any subtraction is an allowed reduced matrix. This will be checked as we go; in fact, the algorithm will insure that B always consists of nonnegative integers. The other portion of the checking is to insure that $B_{ij} > 0$ before adding row j to row i or column i to column j and after subtracting row j from row i or column i from column j . If B_{ij} lies in S_c , then this too will be checked as we go. If it does not, then there is a trick which insures that the desired operation will always be allowed. The trick depends on the following fact: the algorithm guarantees that all entries in the r th row and the n th column of S_c are positive whenever an application of the trick is required.

Suppose that we wish to add column i to column j , or to subtract column i from column j , where both columns contain elements of S_c . Instead of attempting to perform the desired operation directly, we may do the following:

1. Add columns $c - 1, c - 2, \dots, 1$ to column j , in that order.
2. Add column i to column j , or subtract column i from column j (if allowed).
3. Subtract columns $1, 2, \dots, c - 1$ from column j , in that order.

We may add column $c - 1$ to column j because $B_{(c-1)j}$ is in row r of S_c , and hence is guaranteed by the algorithm to be positive. This sets $B_{(c-2)j} = g_{c-1} > 0$, so we may add column $c - 2$ to column j , which sets $B_{(c-3)j} = g_{c-2} > 0$, so we may add column $c - 3$ to column j , and so on. Finally we add column 1 to column j , which sets $B_{nj} = g_1$. The result is that each element of column j that is not in S_c is now positive. After the desired operation is performed, we may subtract column 1 from

$$\begin{array}{c}
\left(\begin{array}{c} \boxed{S_1} \end{array} \right) \Rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \boxed{S_2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ g_1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array} \right) \Rightarrow \\
\left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \quad g_2 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad \boxed{S_3} \\ 0 \quad 0 \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ 0 \quad 0 \\ g_1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array} \right) \Rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \quad g_2 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad g_3 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \boxed{S_4} \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ g_1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array} \right) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow \\
\left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \quad g_2 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad g_3 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \ddots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \cdots \quad g_{n-1} \quad g_{n-1} \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad g_{n-1} \quad g_{n-1} + g_n \\ g_1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array} \right) \text{ or } \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \quad g_2 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad g_3 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \ddots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \cdots \quad g_{n-1} \quad g_{n-1} + g_n \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad g_{n-1} \quad g_{n-1} \\ g_1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 0 \end{array} \right)
\end{array}$$

Figure 30: Reduction of reduced matrices to canonical form. Note the similarities to Figure 27. Again, g_i divides g_{i+1} for each i . Here, however, one does not always proceed to the final stage. If one arrives at a state where every element of S_i is equal to some number g_i , then this is the canonical form. In this case $\det(I - A)$ (which is $\det(-B)$) is zero; the list of invariant factors begins with $n - i$ zeros and continues with the numbers g_i through g_1 (omitting trailing 1's). Otherwise one keeps on with the process. If one reaches S_{n-1} and all elements of this 2×2 matrix are not equal, then the determinant is nonzero and the reduction process terminates in one of two possible ways (in one $\det(I - A)$ is positive, and in the other it is negative); in this case the numbers g_n through g_1 (with trailing 1's omitted) constitute the list of invariant factors.

column j because $B_{1j} = g_2 > 0$; this zeroes B_{nj} . Then we may subtract column 2 from column j because $B_{2j} = g_3 > 0$; this zeroes B_{1j} . And so on. Finally, we may subtract column $c - 1$ from column j because $B_{(c-1)j}$ is in row r of S_c and hence is guaranteed by the algorithm to be positive. Step 3 reverses the effects of step 1, and the net result is that the desired column operation (if allowed) has been performed.

A similar trick works if $c > 1$ and one wishes to add row j to row i , or to subtract row j from row i , where rows j and i contain elements of S_c :

1. Add rows $n, 1, 2, \dots, c - 2$ to row i , in that order.
2. Add row j to row i , or subtract row j from row i .
3. Subtract rows $c - 2, c - 1, \dots, 1, n$ from row j , in that order.

We may add row n to row i because B_{in} is guaranteed by the algorithm to be positive. This sets $B_{i1} = g_1$, so we may add row 1 to row i , which sets $B_{i2} = g_2$, so we may add row 2 to row i , and so on. The result is that each element in row j that is not in S_c is made positive. After the desired operation is performed, we may subtract row $c - 2$ from row i because $B_{i(c-2)} = g_{c-2} > 0$; this zeroes $B_{i(c-1)}$. Then we may subtract row $c - 3$ from row i because $B_{i(c-3)} = g_{c-3} > 0$; this zeroes $B_{i(c-2)}$. And so on. Finally we may subtract row n from row i since B_{in} is guaranteed by the algorithm to be positive; this zeroes B_{i1} . Step 3 reverses the effects of step 1, and the net result is that the desired row operation (if allowed) has been performed.

The trick for columns is illustrated in Figure 31. In the remainder of this section, when I say, for instance, that we may add column i to column j since B_{ij} is not in S_c , I mean that we can add it by using the trick. Note that if all entries of S_c are positive both before and after a row or column operation on S_c , then that operation (perhaps via the trick) is allowed.

Now for the algorithm proper. To start, all entries of S_c are positive. Consider some row m of S_c . (Whenever I refer to a row or column, I will refer to it by its index in B , but I mean to imply that this is a row or column containing entries in S_c .) Suppose that there exist columns i and j such that $B_{mi} > B_{mj}$. Let h_1 be the greatest common divisor of the entries in this row. We would like to reduce the sum of these entries by subtracting column j from column i . At the same time, we wish to preserve the condition that all entries of S_c are positive. This is not possible if there is a row k such that $B_{ki} \leq B_{kj}$. However, if this is the case then we may add row m repeatedly to row k ; if we do it often enough, then, since $B_{mi} > B_{mj}$, eventually

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 12 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Rightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 12 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Rightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 12 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Rightarrow & \\
\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Rightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \Rightarrow & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 8 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & &
\end{array}$$

Figure 31: The trick for performing column operations on S_c . Here S_c is the 2×2 submatrix obtained from B by deleting columns 1 and 2 and rows 1 and 4. We wish to subtract column 4 from column 3 in order to modify S_c . To do this, it is necessary that B_{43} is positive after the operation is performed. So we add column 2 to column 3 (which we can do since $B_{23} > 0$) and then add column 1 to column 3 (which we can do since now $B_{13} > 0$). Now all elements of column 3 are positive, so we may do the desired subtraction (since $B_{43} > 0$ after the subtraction). Next we subtract column 1 from column 3 (which we can do since $B_{13} > 0$ after the subtraction), and then subtract column 2 from column 3 (which we can do since $B_{23} > 0$ after the subtraction). The net effect is that we have subtracted column 4 from column 3.

we will have $B_{ki} > B_{kj}$. Thus we can create the situation where $B_{ki} > B_{kj}$ for each k . Now we may subtract column j from column i , thereby reducing the sum of the entries in row m . If there still exist columns i and j such that $B_{mi} > B_{mj}$, we repeat the procedure. Eventually, the process must terminate: now the entries of row m will all have the same value. Since our operations on row m did not change the greatest common divisor of the row, this value must be h_1 .

Let g_c be the greatest common divisor of the elements of S_c . If $h_1 \neq g_c$, then there exists a column such that the greatest common divisor of its elements is h_2 , with $h_2 < h_1$. By repeating the procedure described in the above paragraph, we may set all of the elements of that column to h_2 . If $h_2 \neq g_c$, then there exists a row such that the greatest common divisor of its elements is h_3 , with $h_3 < h_2$, and we may again transform S_c so that all elements in this row are equal to h_3 . And so on. Since the sequence h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots is a decreasing sequence of positive integers, this process must terminate. We end up with a row or column whose entries are all equal to g_c . By repeating the procedure described in the preceding paragraph one or two more times, we may set all of the elements of column c to g_c .

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{r} | $\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}$ | \mathbf{i} | \mathbf{i} | \mathbf{i} | |
| $\mathbf{k} \Rightarrow$ | \mathbf{k} | \Rightarrow | $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{r}$ | \Rightarrow | $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{r}$ | \Rightarrow | \mathbf{r} |
| \mathbf{i} | $\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}$ | $\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}$ | $\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}$ | $\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{k}$ | \mathbf{k} | \mathbf{k} | |

Figure 32: Rotation of three rows using row addition and subtraction. The three rows in the table above represent rows r , k and i in the matrix. The symbols \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{i} represent the row vectors containing the initial values of these rows. The following operations are performed: row k is added to row i , row r is added to row k , row i is added to row r , row k is subtracted from row r , row r is subtracted from row i , and row i is subtracted from row k . The result is that the row vectors have been rotated. If all entries of the three rows are positive at the beginning of the procedure, then they are also positive at each stage during the course of the procedure.

The next step is to see if there is a column j in which all entries are not equal. If not, then all columns are multiples of column c . By subtracting column c from each of the other columns as many times as needed, we may transform S_c to a matrix in which all entries are equal to g_c . (The subtractions are allowed since again all entries in S_c remain positive.) The resulting matrix B is our canonical form, so we exit the algorithm.

If, on the other hand, there does exist such a column j , then there is an element B_{ij} in S_c which is less than some other element in that column.

If $c = n - 1$ then we subtract column $n - 1$ from column n as many times as we can while preserving the fact that each entry of S_{n-1} is positive. The resulting matrix B is our canonical form. Now S_{n-1} contains three entries which are equal to g_{n-1} and one larger entry k that is divisible by g_{n-1} . We set $g_n = k - g_{n-1}$ and exit the algorithm.

Suppose now that $c < n - 1$. If $i \neq r$ then we choose any row k with $k \neq i$ and $k \neq r$. We now perform the sequence of operations shown in Figure 32. The result is a rotation of rows: row i has moved to row r , row r to row k , and row k to row i .

So far, every entry of S_c has been positive before and after each row and column operation, so these operations are all allowed. Now, however, we want to create some zero entries, so we need to be more careful.

Now there exists some row k such that $B_{rj} < B_{kj}$. Suppose there is a column $m > c$ such that $B_{rm} \geq B_{km}$. Then we may add column j to column m as many times as needed until this is no longer the case. In this way we obtain the situation in which $B_{rm} < B_{km}$ for each $m > c$. Now we subtract row r from row k . The result

is that $B_{kc} = 0$ and all other entries are positive. This subtraction is allowed since B_{kr} is not in S_c .

Now choose row i to be any row except for row k and row r . It is allowed to add row k to row i as many times as one wishes; for B_{ik} is positive, and remains so after any such operation. In this way one may insure that $B_{im} > B_{rm}$ for each $m > c$, while $B_{ic} = B_{rc} = g_c$. Now row r may be subtracted from row i , since B_{ir} is not in S_c . The result is that $B_{ic} = 0$, while the rest of row i remains positive. By doing this for each i , one may set each element of column c to zero except for B_{rc} , which still equals g_c , while leaving the rest of S_c positive. Now let column j be any column other than column c . Column c may now be repeatedly subtracted from column j until $B_{rj} = 0$; the operations are allowed since the value of B_{cj} after each subtraction is positive (in fact, the only value affected by the operation is B_{rj}). This is repeated for each j . (Note that now for the first time we are setting elements of row r and column n of S_c to zero, so the trick may no longer be allowed; but this does not matter, since the trick is no longer needed.) The result is that all entries in column c and in row r are zero except for B_{rc} , which equals g_c , and all other entries of S_c are positive. These remaining positive entries constitute our submatrix S_{c+1} . We increment c , let $r = c - 1$, and repeat the algorithm. \square

Soon after proving this theorem I realized that the invariants I had found were also invariants under reversible cellular automaton maps, which I knew were equivalent to topological conjugacy maps of subshifts of finite type, and were studied in symbolic dynamics. I wrote to Jack Wagoner, asking him if these invariants had already been discovered in that context. He directed me to a 1984 paper by John Franks ([11]) which, to my surprise, contained the exact theorem proven above, with an almost identical proof.

Unbeknownst to me, in symbolic dynamics there had naturally arisen a type of map between subshifts of finite type called a *flow equivalence map*. It turns out that the set of all such maps is identical to the set of maps generated by my elementary space set transformations. The nature of this connection between symbolic dynamics and combinatorial spacetimes will be the subject of the next section.

The history of the discovery of the invariants is as follows. Parry and Sullivan [31] showed that $\det(I - A)$ is an invariant; they also found the first characterization of flow equivalence in terms of simple matrix operations. Then Bowen and Franks [3] discovered not only that the list of invariant factors was an invariant, but that these

factors were associated with an invariant abelian group, known as the Bowen-Franks group. This will be discussed in Section 5.10.

5.8 Flow equivalence of subshifts of finite type

In Chapter 3 I briefly discussed the general setting of symbolic dynamics within the field of dynamical systems. Here I begin by defining some of the same concepts discussed earlier in a more formal way, and then introduce the concept of flow equivalence.

Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix of nonnegative integers. Let E_A be the set of edges of Γ_A . Give E_A the discrete topology. Let \mathbb{Z} denote the integers. Then the product space $E_A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ contains a subspace $\Sigma_A = \{\alpha \in E_A^{\mathbb{Z}} \mid \text{the head of edge } \alpha_i \text{ meets the tail of edge } \alpha_{i+1} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $\sigma_A : \Sigma_A \mapsto \Sigma_A$ be the mapping such that if $\sigma_A(\alpha) = \beta$ then $\beta_i = \alpha_{i-1}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then σ_A is a homeomorphism, and is called the *subshift of finite type* associated with the matrix A .

Given any homeomorphism $h : X \mapsto X$ one may define an equivalence relation \sim on $X \times \mathbb{R}$ by the rule $(x, s + 1) \sim (h(x), s)$. Consider the identification space $Y = X \times \mathbb{R} / \sim$, and denote elements of Y by $[(x, s)]$, $x \in X$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the map $\phi : Y \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto Y$ given by $\phi_t[(x, s)] = [(x, s + t)]$ is a flow on Y , and is called the *suspension flow* of h . The space Y is called the *suspension* of h .

Two flows $\phi_1 : Y_1 \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto Y_1$ and $\phi_2 : Y_2 \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto Y_2$ are said to be *topologically equivalent* if there exists a homeomorphism $h : Y_1 \mapsto Y_2$ which maps orbits of ϕ_1 onto orbits of ϕ_2 and preserves their orientation. If the subshifts of finite type σ_A and σ_B have topologically equivalent suspension flows, then σ_A and σ_B (and the associated matrices A and B) are said to be *flow equivalent*.

Consider the following symmetric relations between square matrices of nonnegative integers:

- (W) $A \sim B$ whenever $A = RS$ and $B = SR$ for some (not necessarily square) matrices R and S of nonnegative integers. (This is due to Williams [47].)
- (PS) $A \sim B$ whenever $A_{21} = 1$, the remaining entries of row 2 and column 1 of A are zero, and B is obtained from A by deleting row 2 and column 1. (Also write $B \sim A$ in this case, to make it symmetric.)

Parry and Sullivan [31] showed that the flow equivalence relation on matrices of nonnegative integers is generated by the relations (W) and (PS).

Another useful relation was found by Franks [11]:

- (F) $A \sim B$ (and $B \sim A$) if, for distinct integers i and j such that $A_{ij} > 0$, B can be obtained from A by subtracting 1 from the (i, j) th entry and then adding row j to row i .

Note that this is the same relation shown in Figure 26. A similar relation exists for columns. Franks showed that matrices of nonnegative integers that satisfy these relations are flow equivalent.

Theorem 21 *The equivalence relation on matrices of nonnegative integers generated by elementary transformations is the same as the flow equivalence relation.*

PROOF. Let (V) denote the vertex removal operation (and its inverse). It suffices to show the following: (V) \Rightarrow (PS); (V) \Rightarrow (W); (F) and (W) \Rightarrow (V).

The first implication is easy. Consider (PS). In Γ_A there is an edge from vertex 2 to vertex 1, and there are no other edges leaving vertex 2 or arriving at vertex 1. The move is to combine vertices 2 and 1 into a single vertex having the predecessors of vertex 2 and the successors of vertex 1. This is the undoubling operation. It is a special case of (V), since the move is achieved by removing either of vertices 1 or 2.

Now consider (W). Let R be an $n \times m$ matrix and S be an $m \times n$ matrix (of nonnegative integers). Let $A = RS$ and $B = SR$. The picture to consider here is as follows (see Figure 33). Let v_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, and w_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, be vertices of a graph Γ . Let R_{ij} be the number of edges from v_i to w_j , and let S_{ji} be the number of edges from w_j to v_i . Then Γ_A is the graph which results from removing each of the vertices w_j from Γ via the (V) transformation; and Γ_B is the graph which results from removing each of the vertices v_i from Γ via the (V) transformation. So a (W) transformation may be accomplished by successively applying m inverse (V) transformations followed by n (V) transformations.

Now consider (F). The graphical picture here is similar to the one for (V), except that here it is an edge being removed rather than a vertex. The edge to be removed (call it e) connects vertex i to vertex j , where $i \neq j$. For each edge from vertex j to vertex k (where k is any vertex in the graph), there is a two-edged path from i to k whose first edge is e . This path will no longer be present when e is removed. The transformation (F) replaces each such path with a new edge from i to k .

Suppose that in some graph Γ_A there are no edges connecting vertex i to itself. Using (F) repeatedly, one may remove in turn each of the m edges which are directed




Figure 33: Proof that the two equivalence relations are the same. In the first row, matrices R and S are interpreted as the graph pictured between them, where pairs of vertices labelled v_i are identified for each i to obtain the graph. Arrows go from left to right. R indicates which edges go between the leftmost v 's and the w 's; S indicates which edges go between the w 's and the rightmost v 's. The w 's are removed to obtain the graph at right (again the v 's are identified to obtain the graph). This graph is described by the matrix RS . If the v 's were removed instead, the resulting graph would be described by SR . In the second row, the leftmost configuration is transformed by removing the lower edges one by one, and then removing the central vertex (note that the latter move is a type (W) move). The result is that the elementary vertex-removal operation has been performed.

towards i . None of the edges added in this process involve i ; so the only remaining edges that involve i are directed away from i . Those edges and the vertex i itself may now be removed by a (W) transformation. The resulting transformation (see Figure 33) is identical to the (V) transformation that removes vertex i . So (V) is accomplished by m applications of (F) and a single application of (W). \square

The fact that these equivalence relations are the same is by no means a coincidence. It turns out that space sets and equivalence maps between them are hidden in this picture.

Consider the suspension \mathcal{F}_A associated with a set of spaces \mathcal{X}_A . The spaces in \mathcal{X}_A are closely related to the *flow lines* of \mathcal{F}_A . Topologically, these flow lines turn out to be exactly the arcwise-connected components of \mathcal{F}_A . As subspaces of \mathcal{F}_A , the flow lines are homeomorphic to lines or circles. They are circles when the corresponding

element of \mathcal{X}_A is periodic: i.e., it is of the form $(SSS \dots S)$ or $(\dots SSS \dots)$ for some segment S . For a given S , each such element of \mathcal{X}_A corresponds to the same flow line in \mathcal{F}_A . The presence of infinitely many such spaces associated with a given segment S is in a sense a redundancy in \mathcal{X}_A , since locally they look the same (and therefore, for example, if T is a local equivalence map sending (S) to (U) it will also send (SS) to (UU)). Thus we do not lose anything significant if we throw all such spaces except for the single space (S) out of the space set \mathcal{X}_A . If we do so, then there is a natural invertible map between the elements of \mathcal{X}_A and the flow lines of \mathcal{F}_A .

Since the flow lines are the arcwise-connected components, any homeomorphism $h : \mathcal{F}_A \mapsto \mathcal{F}_B$ must map flow lines to flow lines. Hence it maps spaces to spaces. Since it is a homeomorphism, this induced map on space sets is invertible. It turns out that these maps are exactly our orientation-preserving space set equivalence maps. They preserve orientation because of the definition of flow equivalence, which specifies that the homeomorphism must preserve the direction of flow lines. If we drop this requirement and consider the set of all homeomorphisms between suspensions of subshifts of finite type, we simply pick up those maps which involve some orientation reversal; thus these constitute exactly the entire set of oriented space set equivalence maps.

Of course, these assertions require proof. I have only recently managed to prove them, and do not have time to include the proofs here. In fact, I have proven that the map on space sets induced by a flow equivalence map can be represented by a nonoverlap rule table; this makes possible at least a partial resolution of the conjecture of Section 5.6. These results will appear in a paper shortly.

While the same maps are studied in symbolic dynamics and in 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes, the roles of these maps in the two fields are different. In fact, the roles of dynamical maps and equivalence maps in combinatorial spacetimes are reversed in symbolic dynamics. In symbolic dynamics the dynamical system being discussed is the shift map. The flow equivalence map is a type of equivalence between shift dynamical systems. But from the combinatorial spacetime point of view the shift map is not a dynamical map at all. In fact, it is an equivalence map: given spaces with coordinates, any two spaces related by a sequence of shifts are considered to be equivalent. And, of course, the flow equivalence maps are the ones whereby spaces evolve; hence they are the dynamical maps.

The existence of this connection between flow equivalence and combinatorial

spacetimes means that results from one field may be applied to the other. For example, it turns out that a relationship has been discovered between flow equivalence maps and a special type of C^* -algebra called a Cuntz-Krieger algebra; these algebras are therefore also related to 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. I have not explored this relationship. See [21, 22, 23, 24] for further details and references.

While the connection with C^* -algebras is apparently restricted to a small class of those algebras, it turns out that another connection exists between 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes and algebra which is much more general. This is the subject of the next section.

5.9 Bialgebras

Bialgebras are objects of much recent study, largely in the guise of Hopf algebras (or quantum groups). The latter are bialgebras with some extra structure (the antipode); connections have arisen between these bialgebras and statistical mechanics, knot theory and many other areas of mathematics. It turns out that combinatorial spacetimes is yet another area that is connected with bialgebras. (It follows that flow equivalence, and hence symbolic dynamics, is also connected to bialgebras; this, I believe, has not been noticed up to now.)

I will begin by presenting the definition of a bialgebra (see Sweedler [39], Abe [1]) and its abstract tensor representation. I then define tensors $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ for each $r, s \geq 0$. Each of the standard objects in a bialgebra is represented by one of these tensors: the unit scalar is T ; the unit is T^a ; the counit is T_a ; the Kronecker delta is T_a^b ; multiplication is T_{ab}^c ; comultiplication is T_a^{bc} . It turns out that the axioms of a bialgebra can be described in this context by two related axioms. (This reformulation of the bialgebra axioms may itself be of interest; I have not seen it in the literature.)

The fact that there are two axioms rather than one is really only due to notation. The two axioms embody a single principle. This principle has to do with directed paths through abstract tensor diagrams. In such diagrams a tensor is considered as a vertex with some extra structure resulting from the noncommutativity and noncommutativity of the tensor. An upper index labels the tail of a directed edge, and a lower index labels the head of a directed edge; when two such indices are the same (due to contraction), they refer to the same edge. The extra structure at each vertex means that, at a vertex, the edges entering the vertex are ordered, as are the edges

leaving the vertex. This ordering induces an ordering on all directed paths ending at the vertex and on all directed paths beginning at the vertex. The axiom then says the following: if a tensor subdiagram does not contain closed directed paths, it may be replaced by any other tensors subdiagram that does not contain closed directed paths provided that the number of paths between each pair of terminal vertices and the ordering of paths at those vertices are preserved.

In the case of scalars, it is possible to write down the two axioms as a single axiom. Now suppose that the bialgebra is commutative and cocommutative. In this case there is no ordering at vertices; the diagrams of scalars are just directed graphs, and the bialgebra axiom for scalars turns out to be exactly the same as the elementary space set transformation.

My approach to the problems discussed below was inspired by Kauffman [26], and in particular by his diagrammatic use of abstract tensors. This in turn is related to work of Penrose [32].

5.9.1 The abstract tensor representation

Let A be a vector space over a field K and let \otimes represent the tensor product. Define $\tau : A \otimes A \mapsto A \otimes A$ (the “twist” map) to be the bilinear map sending $a \otimes b$ to $b \otimes a$ for each $a, b \in A$. Suppose there are multilinear maps $\mu : A \otimes A \mapsto A$ (“multiplication”), $u : K \mapsto A$ (“unit”), $\Delta : A \mapsto A \otimes A$ (“comultiplication”), and $\epsilon : A \mapsto K$ (“counit”) satisfying the following axioms (for all $a, b, c \in A$):

$$(A1a) \quad \text{Associativity: } \mu(a \otimes \mu(b \otimes c)) = \mu(\mu(a \otimes b) \otimes c)$$

$$(A1b) \quad \text{Coassociativity: } (1 \otimes \Delta)(\Delta(a)) = (\Delta \otimes 1)(\Delta(a))$$

$$(A2a) \quad \mu(u(1) \otimes a) = \mu(a \otimes u(1)) = a$$

$$(A2b) \quad (\epsilon \otimes 1)(\Delta(a)) = (1 \otimes \epsilon)(\Delta(a)) = a$$

$$(A3) \quad \epsilon(u(1)) = 1$$

$$(A4a) \quad \Delta(u(1)) = u(1) \otimes u(1)$$

$$(A4b) \quad \epsilon(\mu(a, b)) = \epsilon(a)\epsilon(b)$$

$$(A5) \quad \Delta(\mu(a, b)) = (\mu \otimes \mu)((1 \otimes \tau \otimes 1)((\Delta \otimes \Delta)(a \otimes b)))$$

Then $\langle A, \mu, u, \Delta, \epsilon \rangle$ is called a *bialgebra*. If in addition it satisfies

$$\text{Commutativity: } \mu(a \otimes b) = \mu(b \otimes a)$$

$$\text{Cocommutativity: } \Delta(a) = \tau(\Delta(a))$$

then it is called a *commutative cocommutative bialgebra*.

Let a and b be any two elements of A . If A is finite-dimensional as a vector space, then we may write $a = V^a$ and $b = W^b$, and there exist tensors M_{ab}^c, M_c^{ab}, U_a and U^a such that $\mu(a, b) = M_{ab}^c V^a W^b, \Delta(a) = M_c^{ab} V^c, u(1) = U^a$, and $\epsilon(a) = U_a V^a$. These tensors satisfy the following axioms:

$$(B1a) \text{ Associativity: } M_{ax}^d M_{bc}^x = M_{ab}^x M_{xc}^d$$

$$(B1b) \text{ Coassociativity: } M_d^{ax} M_x^{bc} = M_x^{ab} M_d^{xc}$$

$$(B2a) \text{ } M_{xa}^b U^x = M_{ax}^b U^x = \delta_a^b$$

$$(B2b) \text{ } M_b^{xa} U_x = M_b^{ax} U_x = \delta_b^a$$

$$(B3) \text{ } U_a U^a = 1$$

$$(B4a) \text{ } M_c^{ab} U^c = U^a U^b$$

$$(B4b) \text{ } M_{ab}^c U_c = U_a U_b$$

$$(B5) \text{ } M_{ab}^x M_x^{cd} = M_a^{wx} M_b^{yz} M_{wy}^c M_{xz}^d$$

In this context commutativity is the relation $M_{ab}^c = M_{ba}^c$, and cocommutativity is the relation $M_c^{ab} = M_c^{ba}$.

If we now drop the assumption of finite-dimensionality and instead think of the tensors $M_{ab}^c, M_c^{ab}, U^a, U_a$ and δ_a^b simply as symbols which obey the rules of tensor algebra plus the above axioms, then we have the *abstract tensor representation* of a bialgebra.

5.9.2 A simplification

One may now define tensors $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ for any nonnegative integers r, s inductively as follows. Let $T = 1, T_a = U_a, T^a = U^a, T_a^b = \delta_a^b$. If $r > 1$ then let $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_{r-2} w}^{b_1 \dots b_s} M_{a_{r-1} a_r}^w$. If $s > 1$ then let $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_{s-2} w} M_w^{b_{s-1} b_s}$. Note that $T_{ab}^c = \delta_c^a M_{ab}^c = M_{ab}^c$ and $T_c^{ab} = \delta_c^w M_w^{ab} = M_c^{ab}$. Hence each of our original tensors is equal

to one of the tensors $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$; thus the abstract tensor representation of a bialgebra may be completely expressed in terms of these new tensors.

It follows from the above definition that, if r and s are nonzero, then $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ acts on r bialgebra elements (i.e., on r vectors) by multiplying them together in a particular order and then performing $s - 1$ comultiplications.

Now we may rewrite axioms (B1) through (B5) using $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s, add several additional axioms to capture the defining properties of the $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s, and thereby obtain an expression of the abstract tensor representation of a bialgebra which is written entirely in terms of the new tensors.

$$(C1a) \quad \text{Associativity: } T_{ax}^d T_{bc}^x = T_{ab}^x T_{xc}^d$$

$$(C1b) \quad \text{Coassociativity: } T_d^{ax} T_x^{bc} = T_x^{ab} T_d^{xc}$$

$$(C2a) \quad T_{xa}^b T^x = T_{ax}^b T^x = T_a^b$$

$$(C2b) \quad T_b^{xa} T_x = T_b^{ax} T_x = T_b^a$$

$$(C3) \quad T_a T^a = T = 1$$

$$(C4a) \quad T_c^{ab} T^c = T^a T^b$$

$$(C4b) \quad T_{ab}^c T_c = T_a T_b$$

$$(C5) \quad T_{ab}^x T_x^{cd} = T_a^{wx} T_b^{yz} T_{wy}^c T_{xz}^d$$

$$(C6a) \quad \text{If } r > 1 \text{ then } T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_{r-2} w}^{b_1 \dots b_s} T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^w$$

$$(C6b) \quad \text{If } s > 1 \text{ then } T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_{s-2} w} T_w^{b_{s-1} b_s}$$

$$(C7a) \quad \text{If } 1 \leq j \leq r \text{ then } T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_{j-1} w a_{j+1} \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} T_{a_j}^w$$

$$(C7b) \quad \text{If } 1 \leq j \leq s \text{ then } T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_{j-1} w b_{j+1} \dots b_s} T_w^{b_j}$$

The axioms (C1) through (C7) define a tensor algebra in the $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s which is equivalent to the original tensor algebra. They are pictured diagrammatically in Figure 34.

The value of using these new tensors lies in the fact that one may now express the original tensor algebra using many fewer axioms.

Theorem 22 *If $1 \leq j \leq r$, $0 \leq s$ and $0 \leq m$, then*




Figure 34: Diagrams of the bialgebra axioms. Each tensor $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ is represented by a vertex. Edges are ordered from left to right at the bottom and top of the vertex; they enter from the bottom and exit from the top. Edges adjacent to only one vertex (“free” edges) come in two types: “upper” edges point away from the vertex, and “lower” edges point towards the vertex. In each axiom, pairs of upper edges from the left and right side of the equation are identified if they occupy corresponding positions in the diagram (and the same goes for lower edges). Shown (in order) are diagrams for axioms (C1a), (C2a), (C3), (C4a), (C5), (C6a) and (C7a). For $i \in \{1, 2, 4, 6, 7\}$, the diagram of axiom (C*i*b) can be obtained from the diagram of axiom (C*i*a) by turning it upside down. By convention the product of zero tensors is 1; hence the empty diagram represents 1.

$$(D1a) \quad T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} T_{c_1 \dots c_m}^{a_j} = T_{a_1 \dots a_{j-1} c_1 \dots c_m a_{j+1} \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$$

$$(D1b) \quad T_{a_1 \dots a_s}^{b_1 \dots b_r} T_{b_j}^{c_1 \dots c_m} = T_{a_1 \dots a_s}^{b_1 \dots b_{j-1} c_1 \dots c_m b_{j+1} \dots b_r}$$

PROOF SKETCH. If $m > 0$, then (D1a) says that a certain rearrangement of the parentheses in a multiplication does not change anything, which follows from (C1a); and (D1b) says that a certain rearrangement of the parentheses in a comultiplication does not change anything, which follows from (C1b). If $m = 0$ then the result follows by applying (C2a), (C2b), (C3), (C7a), (C7b), (D1a) and (D1b) (in the case where $m > 0$), and induction on r and s . \square

In what follows, the symbol \prod will refer to the tensor product.

Theorem 23 *If $r \geq 0$ and $s \geq 0$, then*

$$(D2) \quad T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^r T_{a_i}^{x_{i,1} \dots x_{i,s}} \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^s T_{x_{1,j} \dots x_{r,j}}^{b_j} \right)$$

PROOF.

Case 1. $r = 0$ and $s = 0$. Then (D2) says (via our convention for defining a product of zero $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s) that $T = 1$, which is true by definition.

Case 2. $r > 0$ and $s = 0$. Then (D2) says that $T_{a_1 \dots a_r} = T_{a_1} T_{a_2} \dots T_{a_r}$. This is clearly true if $r = 1$. Suppose that $r > 1$ and that the statement holds for $r - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_{a_1 \dots a_r} &= T_{a_1 \dots a_{r-2} x} T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^x && \text{(by (C6a))} \\ &= T_{a_1} T_{a_2} \dots T_{a_{r-2}} T_x T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^x && \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= T_{a_1} T_{a_2} \dots T_{a_{r-2}} T_{a_{r-1}} T_{a_r} && \text{(by (C4b)).} \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $r = 0$ and $s > 0$. Similar to case 2.

Case 4. $r = 1$ and $s \geq 1$. Then (D2) says that

$$T_{a_1}^{b_1 \dots b_s} = T_{a_1}^{x_{1,1} \dots x_{1,s}} T_{x_{1,1}}^{b_1} T_{x_{1,2}}^{b_2} \dots T_{x_{1,s}}^{b_s},$$

and this follows from (C7b).

Case 5. $r \geq 1$ and $s = 1$. Similar to case 4.

Case 6. $r = 2$ and $s = 2$. Then (D2) says that

$$T_{a_1 a_2}^{b_1 b_2} = T_{a_1}^{x_{1,1} x_{1,2}} T_{a_2}^{x_{2,1} x_{2,2}} T_{x_{1,1} x_{2,1}}^{b_1} T_{x_{1,2} x_{2,2}}^{b_2};$$

but this is just (C5).

Case 7. $r \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$. We use induction on $r + s$. Case 6 shows that (D2) holds if $r + s = 4$. Now assume that $r + s > 4$ and that $r > 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} &= T_{a_1 \dots a_{r-2} w}^{b_1 \dots b_s} T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^w \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r-2} T_{a_i}^{x_{i,1} \dots x_{i,s}} \right) T_w^{x_{w,1} \dots x_{w,s}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s T_{x_{1,j} \dots x_{r-2,j} x_{w,j}}^{b_j} \right) T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^w \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r-2} T_{a_i}^{x_{i,1} \dots x_{i,s}} \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^s T_{x_{1,j} \dots x_{r-2,j} x_{w,j}}^{b_j} \right) T_{a_{r-1} a_r}^{x_{w,1} \dots x_{w,s}} \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r-2} T_{a_i}^{x_{i,1} \dots x_{i,s}} \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^s T_{x_{1,j} \dots x_{r-2,j} x_{w,j}}^{b_j} \right) \otimes \\ &\quad T_{a_{r-1}}^{x_{r-1,1} \dots x_{r-1,s}} T_{a_r}^{x_{r,1} \dots x_{r,s}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^s T_{x_{r-1,k} x_{r,k}}^{x_{w,k}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

(by applying (C6a), then the inductive hypothesis, then (C6a), then the inductive hypothesis), and now the desired result (D2) follows by applying (C6a) to remove all instances of indices involving w . A similar argument holds if we assume that $s > 2$ instead of assuming that $r > 2$. \square

Examples of diagrams for these new axioms, as well as an illustration of the proof of Case 7 above, appear in Figure 35.




Figure 35: The new bialgebra axioms. The top row gives diagrams for examples of axioms (D1a) and (D2). The bottom row shows how Case 7 of Theorem 23 is proven for $r = 2$ and $s = 3$.

Theorem 24 *The axioms of a bialgebra are completely generated by (D1a), (D1b) and (D2).*

PROOF SKETCH. This one is very easy. (C1a), (C2a), (C6a) and (C7a) follow from one or two applications of (D1a). (C1b), (C2b), (C6b) and (C7b) follow from one or two applications of (D1b). (C5) is a special case of (D2). (C4a) follows by applying (D1b) and then (D2). (C4b) follows by applying (D1a) and then (D2). (C3) follows by applying either (D1a) or (D1b) and then (D2). \square

Theorems 22, 23 and 24 imply the following:

Theorem 25 *The axioms of the abstract tensor representation of a bialgebra are equivalent to the axioms (D1a), (D1b) and (D2).*

This is the best we can do if our notation consists entirely of $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s. By adding a few elements to our notation, we can do a little bit better.

For instance, it would be nice to write axioms (C7a) and (C7b) simply as follows:

$$(E1) \quad T_a^b = \delta_a^b.$$

Graphically, δ_a^b represents an edge. The axiom then says that you can insert a vertex in the middle of any edge. This is simpler, so let us allow it. It means that in our diagrams we are now allowing there to be edges that are not attached to any vertices.

I have already described the notion of free and fixed vertices in terms of graphs (see Figure 24). Here I would like to adapt these notions to the case of tensor diagrams in the $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$'s. A fixed vertex refers to a $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$, and is represented by a filled-in circle. A free vertex refers to a *location* on some unknown $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$, and is represented by an open circle (or oval). Free vertices come in two types, “upper” and “lower”: all edges adjacent to an upper vertex point towards it, and all edges adjacent to a lower vertex point away from it. If several edges hit a free vertex, then they are ordered from left to right just as at fixed vertices. They are thought of as being adjacent to one another; they are an *ordered clump* of edges located someplace on an unknown $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$. As before, free vertices may refer to locations on the same unknown $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$, and no free vertex refers to a location on any of the fixed vertices.

The terms “free edge,” “upper edge” and “lower edge” will continue to be used (see Figure 34). The free edges are those which are connected to at most one vertex; that vertex may either be fixed or free.

I will use the symbols $P_\alpha^{a_1 \dots a_n}$ and $P_{a_1 \dots a_n}^\alpha$ to denote the two kinds of free vertices. Greek letters will label free vertices; roman letters will label free edges.

Theorem 26 *The axioms (E1) and*

$$(E2) \quad \left(\prod_{i=1}^r P_{\alpha_i}^{a_i} \right) T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s P_{b_j}^{\beta_j} \right) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^r P_{\alpha_i}^{x_{i,1} \dots x_{i,s}} \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^s P_{x_{1,j} \dots x_{r,j}}^{\beta_j} \right)$$

are equivalent to the axioms (D1a), (D1b) and (D2).

PROOF SKETCH. (See Figure 36 for illustrations.) We have already seen that (E1) is a consequence of (C7a) and (C7b), and hence of (D1a), (D1b) and (D2). (E2) may be obtained by applying (D2) and then removing all fixed vertices by applying (D1a) and (D1b). Conversely, (D1a) may be obtained by applying (E1) to each free edge, then applying (E2), then applying the inverse of (E1) to remove each vertex that had been added by applying (E1). (D2b) may be obtained similarly. And (D2) may be obtained by applying (E1) to each free edge and then applying (E2). \square

5.9.3 The bialgebra principle

By now it should be obvious that there is really only one basic sort of thing going on with these bialgebra axioms.




Figure 36: Proof that (E1) and (E2) constitute a valid axiom set for bialgebras. In the upper left, (D2) is applied to the central vertex and then (D1a) is applied three times and (D1b) two times to eliminate the fixed vertices. The result is that (E2) has been performed. In the upper right, (E1) is applied to each of the five edges, and then (E2) is applied to the central vertex; the result is that (D2) has been performed. At bottom, (E1) is applied to the bottom three edges, then (E2) is applied to the central vertex, then the inverse of (E1) is applied three times; the result is that (D1a) has been performed.

The axiom (E1) is pretty trivial, and it is *almost* a consequence of (E2). If there are vertices at both ends of an edge, then applying (E1) to that edge is indeed a special case of (E2). Hence (E1) is only needed when free edges are involved. It seems that the existence of (E1) is mostly a matter of notation; the main principle behind the bialgebra axioms is contained in (E2).

In (E2), one transforms a vertex with r lower edges and s upper edges. There are rs paths through this vertex. The vertex is removed, but the paths are maintained. Each length-2 path that had passed through the vertex is replaced with a length-1 path. And the ordering of paths is also maintained, in a sense to be explained below.

A more expanded view of this principle may be obtained by considering a tensor subdiagram G that contains no directed loops and no free edges but which may contain free vertices. Let the free lower vertices of G be given by v_1, \dots, v_m and the free upper vertices by w_1, \dots, w_n .

Consider the set of directed paths $P = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ that begin at a v vertex and end at a w vertex. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in P$ be any two paths that begin at v_i . If we start at v_i and travel forwards along α_r , there must be some point where we diverge for the first time from α_s . If α_r goes to the left at that point and α_s goes

to the right, write $\alpha_r >_v \alpha_s$; otherwise write $\alpha_s >_v \alpha_r$. Now for each j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, let $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in P$ be any two paths that end at w_j . If we start at w_j and travel backwards along α_r , there must be some point where we diverge for the first time from α_s . If α_r goes to the left at that point and α_s goes to the right, write $\alpha_r >_w \alpha_s$; otherwise write $\alpha_s >_w \alpha_r$.

Now we may construct a new subdiagram G' consisting of free vertices v_1, \dots, v_m and w_1, \dots, w_n and no other vertices. For each directed path in G going from v_i to w_j there is a corresponding edge in G' going from v_i to w_j , and these are all of the edges. It remains to determine the ordering of the edges at each vertex v_i and w_j . This is given by the relations $>_v$ and $>_w$: if α_r and α_s both begin at v_i , then the tail of the edge corresponding to α_r is to the left of the tail of the edge corresponding to α_s if and only if $\alpha_r >_v \alpha_s$; and if α_r and α_s both end at w_j , then the head of the edge corresponding to α_r is to the left of the head of the edge corresponding to α_s if and only if $\alpha_r >_w \alpha_s$.

Theorem 27 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two subdiagrams containing no directed loops and no free edges, but containing free vertices v_1, \dots, v_m and w_1, \dots, w_n as described above ($m, n \geq 0$). Then $G'_1 = G'_2$ if and only if G_1 is equivalent to G_2 via axiom (E).*

PROOF SKETCH. Consider first the definition of (E). If G_1 is the diagram associated with the left-hand side of this definition and G_2 is the diagram associated with the right-hand side, then it is easy to see that $G_2 = G'_1$, where the path $a_i b_j$ through G_1 has been replaced by the edge x_{ij} in G_2 . This one-to-one map between the paths through G_1 and the paths through G_2 preserves the ordering of these paths at the free vertices.

Now consider what happens when G_1 is arbitrary and one transforms it using (E). This transformation consists of a one-to-one mapping of paths through a subdiagram which preserves their ordering at the free vertices of the subdiagram. It is easy to verify that the transformation therefore also consists of a one-to-one mapping of paths through G_1 which preserves their ordering at the free vertices of G_1 . If G_2 is obtained from G_1 by repeated applications of (E), then there is a one-to-one mapping of paths through G_1 with paths through G_2 which preserves their ordering at the free vertices. But then it follows that $G'_1 = G'_2$.

Conversely, one may transform G_1 using (E) to remove each fixed vertex in turn until it no longer contains a fixed vertex. Since these transformations preserve paths




Figure 37: The bialgebra principle. The diagram at left is transformed into the diagram at right by removing vertices via axiom (E2). Paths between free vertices, and path ordering at those vertices, is preserved.

and their orderings at free vertices, the resulting diagram must be G'_1 . If one does the same thing to G_2 , one must obtain G'_2 . Thus if $G'_1 = G'_2$ then G_1 and G_2 are equivalent via (E). \square

This theorem is illustrated in Figure 37.

5.9.4 Bialgebras, flow equivalence and space set transformations

Now we shall consider the abstract tensor representation of commutative cocommutative bialgebras. In these bialgebras multiplication and comultiplication are commutative. This implies that our tensors $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ are symmetric. Thus in our tensor diagrams there is no longer any ordering at vertices. The above theorem remains true with all statements about ordering deleted; thus the bialgebra principle becomes simply the preservation of paths.

Theorem 28 *Equivalence classes of one-dimensional oriented space sets under elementary space set transformations are scalars in the abstract tensor representation of commutative cocommutative bialgebras.*

PROOF. A scalar diagram is a tensor diagram with no free edges. In the commutative cocommutative case, scalar diagrams are directed graphs (and every directed graph is a scalar diagram).³ Since there are no free edges in these diagrams, (E1) is implied

³There is actually one exception: δ_a^a represents a scalar diagram, but it is not a directed graph. This does not matter.

by (E2). Hence (E2) generates all equivalent diagrams. And in the commutative cocommutative case, (E2) is the same as (V). \square

An obvious corollary is that flow equivalence classes of subshifts of finite type are scalars in the abstract tensor representation of commutative cocommutative bialgebras.

We may say more than this. A one-dimensional oriented space set is represented by a matrix of nonnegative integers or by its associated directed graph. We now see that it is also represented by an associated scalar diagram in the abstract tensor representation of a commutative cocommutative bialgebra. The bialgebra axioms generate local invertible maps between space sets. If a finite sequence of bialgebra axioms transforms a scalar diagram to itself, the resulting map may be iterated; it is a law of evolution.

It is tempting to consider the possibility that a dynamical interpretation of bialgebras might be obtained when those bialgebras are not necessarily commutative or cocommutative. Each scalar diagram would again represent a set of spaces. But I do not know what the spaces would be. Would they again be the closed paths through the diagram? What, then, is the function of ordering at vertices? I have not managed to make sense of this.

5.10 The Bowen-Franks group

The invariant factors of $I - A$, which earlier were found to be invariant under elementary transformations of A , resemble the structure constants of an abelian group. In fact, they *are* the structure constants of an abelian group.

Bowen and Franks [3] proved that if matrices A and B are flow equivalent then the abelian groups $\mathbb{Z}^n/(I - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\mathbb{Z}^n/(I - B)\mathbb{Z}^n$ are isomorphic. The group $\mathbb{Z}^n/(I - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$ is called the *Bowen-Franks group* associated with A , and is denoted by $BF(A)$.

We can describe this group in terms of commuting generators and relations. Let s_1, \dots, s_n be the standard basis for \mathbb{Z}^n . Then the s_i 's generate the group $\mathbb{Z}^n/(I - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$. If $x = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i s_i \in (I - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$, then x is in the column space of $I - A$. Then in the group $\mathbb{Z}^n/(I - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$ we must have $\sum_{i=1}^n (I - A)_{ij} s_i = 0$ for each j between 1 and n ; and these generate all of the relations on the s_i 's. In other words, if $s = [s_1, \dots, s_n]$ is a row vector, then the desired group is given by the commuting




Figure 38: Invariance of groups and semigroups under space set transformations and bialgebra axioms.

generators s_i and the relations $s(I - A) = 0$.

If one operates on $I - A$ by adding a multiple of row j to row i or a multiple of column j to column i with $i \neq j$, then $BF(A)$ is not affected. The column operation does not change the column space of A ; hence it does not change the group. The row operation has the effect of replacing generator s_j with $s'_j = s_j - s_i$; again this does not change the group. If we use these operations to reduce $(I - A)$ to the diagonal form given in Figure 27, the relations $s(I - A) = 0$ are of the form $g_i s_i = 0$, where the g_i 's are the invariant factors. If $g_i = 1$ then the generator s_i plays no role. If $g_i = 0$ then there are no constraints on s_i . Thus $BF(A)$ is a direct product of cyclic groups whose orders are given by the list of invariant factors (with order 0 corresponding to the cyclic group \mathbb{Z}).

Now consider the directed graph Γ_A . Associate the generator s_j with each edge emerging from vertex j . The equation $s(I - A) = 0$ is equivalent to $sI = sA$, which is equivalent to the set of equations $s_j = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i A_{ij}$ for each j . This says that the sum of the generators on the edges entering a vertex is equal to the value of the generator on each of the edges leaving that vertex, and that these are all of the relations on the generators.

In Figure 38 the effect of an elementary space set transformation of Γ_A on the group $BF(A)$ is shown. Each incoming vertex carries a value equal to the product of the generators attached to the edges arriving at that vertex. On the left-hand side these values are multiplied together and then sent to each outgoing vertex. On the right-hand side the values are sent individually to each outgoing vertex. In both cases, at each outgoing vertex the generators are then multiplied with whatever other generators are on edges pointing towards that vertex to produce the generator on the

edges leaving the vertex. Thus the net effect is the same in both cases, so $BF(A)$ is indeed an invariant of space set transformations (and of flow equivalence).

We can say more, however. Suppose that we drop the requirement of commutativity. Then the diagram in Figure 38 represents a scalar in a bialgebra. Now the generators are no longer commutative; they generate a group. The figure shows that this group is left invariant by the elementary transformation, since the order of multiplication is the same on the left-hand and right-hand sides. Since the elementary transformation is the only one needed to generate the equivalent representations of scalars, the group is invariant under the bialgebra axioms.

Furthermore, let us now drop the requirement that these generators have inverses. Now they are generators of a semigroup with identity. (The identity is needed since if no generators point towards a vertex then the generators attached to the edges leaving the vertices must be set equal to the identity.) Clearly the elementary transformation does not change the semigroup either. So the semigroup is invariant under the bialgebra axioms.

The fact that these groups and semigroups are invariant under the bialgebra axioms means that we can think of them as themselves being bialgebras.

Let K be a field and S a semigroup with identity. Consider the free unitary K -module KS generated by S . This is a vector space with dimension equal to the order of S . We may now define multilinear maps $\mu : KS \otimes KS \mapsto KS$, $u : K \mapsto KS$, $\Delta : KS \mapsto KS \otimes KS$, and $\epsilon : KS \mapsto K$ by setting $\mu(s, t) = st$, $u(1) = 1_S$, $\Delta(s) = s \otimes s$ and $\epsilon(s) = 1$ for all $s, t \in S$, and extending linearly. Then $\langle KS, \mu, u, \Delta, \epsilon \rangle$ is a bialgebra; it is called the *semigroup bialgebra* of S over K (and it is called the *group bialgebra* of S over K if S is a group).

These types of bialgebras are well known (see [1] for further details). Clearly these rules for multiplication and comultiplication exactly parallel the conditions that we assigned to the generators of our group or semigroup. Thus we may think of this group or semigroup as being a group bialgebra or semigroup bialgebra (defined on some arbitrary field K) that is assigned to an abstract bialgebra scalar.

Note that there are actually two invariant groups or semigroups that may be obtained from a scalar using this technique. We may reverse the roles of upper and lower indices and then perform the same construction. The result will be another group or semigroup. In the commutative cocommutative case, if we restrict ourselves to groups then this reversal amounts to finding $BF(A^T)$. Since the invariant factors of

A^T are the same as those of A , these groups are necessarily isomorphic. This does not seem to be the case when semigroups are used instead of groups, and it does not seem likely to be the case when the restrictions of commutativity and cocommutativity are removed.

Let us now focus on the commutative cocommutative case. Let $S(A)$ represent the semigroup obtained using our original definition (as opposed to the one obtained by switching the roles of upper and lower indices).

Theorem 29 *If $A - I$ is a positive reduced matrix, then $S(A) = BF(A)$.*

PROOF. Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix. If $A - I$ is positive then it may be transformed so that each of its entries are positive, while leaving $S(A)$ unchanged. Suppose that this transformation has been carried out. Then the semigroup relations are that $s_i = s_i + \sum_{j=1}^n (A - I)_{ji} s_j$ for each i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since each $(A - I)_{ji}$ is positive, it follows that each generator of $S(A)$ may be written as a sum of generators of $S(A)$ in which every generator appears at least once. Since the elements of $S(A)$ are sums of generators of $S(A)$, it follows that for any $x \in S(A)$ there exists $y \in S(A)$ such that $x = y + s_1$. Let $e = \sum_{j=1}^n (A - I)_{j1} s_j$. Then $s_1 = s_1 + e$. So $x + e = y + s_1 + e = y + s_1 = x$. So e is the identity on $S(A)$. Since $(A - I)_{j1} > 0$ for each j , it follows that $s_i + \sum_{j=1}^n ((A - I)_{j1} - \delta_{ij}) s_j = e$. So each s_i is invertible. So each element of $S(A)$ is invertible. So $S(A)$ is a group. So $S(A) = BF(A)$. \square

Thus semigroups are no better than groups for discriminating the equivalence classes of positive matrices. (One might have hoped that they would pick up the information contained in $\text{sgn det}(I - A)$.) On the other hand, consider the matrices $A = (1)$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Here $BF(A) = BF(B) = \mathbb{Z}$ (and $\text{sgn det}(I - A) = \text{sgn det}(I - B) = 0$). But these matrices are in different equivalence classes, since B is positive but A isn't. Since B is positive, the above theorem says that $S(B) = \mathbb{Z}$. But the single relation for $S(A)$ is $s_1 = s_1$; hence $S(A) = \mathbb{Z}^+$. So in this case semigroups are more powerful than groups.

I have found other instances in which semigroups distinguish matrices that belong to different equivalence classes, while groups do not. Clearly, though, semigroups do not do the whole job. Are the semigroups plus $\text{sgn det}(I - A)$ sufficient to distinguish the equivalence classes? I do not know. Also, I cannot help but wonder whether there might be another algebraic structure (again some type of bialgebra) which could be

attached to scalars and which would entirely distinguish these equivalence classes. However, I have not found any such structure.

A relevant fact, which has only just come to my attention, is that recently Danrun Huang [21, 22, 23, 24], coming from the flow equivalence/ C^* -algebra point of view, has completely solved the equivalence class problem. I have not had an opportunity to review his results. Another result which I have not yet digested is the recent discovery by Boyle and Handelman [6] of an “ordered” abelian group which is an invariant of flow equivalence and which is a complete invariant in the case of positive matrices. Here, then, is a single object containing information of both the Bowen-Franks group and the sign of the determinant, at least in the positive-matrix case. This bodes well for the existence of a single algebraic object that is a complete invariant in all cases.

It is natural to ask: what is the set of semigroups that can be obtained from these diagrams? Again, I have no answer.

Though the relevance to combinatorial spacetimes is not clear, we may also ask the same sorts of questions in the noncommutative case. What are the equivalence classes of abstract scalars in a bialgebra? How far do these groups and semigroups go towards distinguishing them? And what is the set of groups and semigroups that may be obtained in this way?

Finally, let us return to the commutative case. Consider a sequence σ of elementary equivalence transformations which transform a matrix A to itself. This sequence of transformations corresponds to a local invertible operator $T_\sigma : \mathcal{X}_A \mapsto \mathcal{X}_A$. It also corresponds to an automorphism f_σ of $BF(A)$; for as one makes these transformations one can track the generators which are attached to the edges and see which map to which. Is this automorphism a property of T , or is it only a property of the particular sequence σ of transformations used to obtain T ?

The question reduces to the following: if T_σ is the identity law on \mathcal{X}_A , is f_σ the identity automorphism of $BF(A)$? If not, then the answer to the original question is no, since then $f_{\sigma^2} \neq f_\sigma$ but $T_{\sigma^2} = T_\sigma$. And if so, then the answer to the original question is yes, since if $T_\sigma = T_\tau$ then $T_{\sigma^{-1}\tau}$ is the identity on \mathcal{X}_A , so $f_{\sigma^{-1}\tau}$ is the identity automorphism of $BF(A)$, so $f_\tau = f_{\sigma\sigma^{-1}\tau} = f_\sigma f_{\sigma^{-1}\tau} = f_\sigma$.

It would be nice if one could canonically associate an automorphism of a Bowen-Franks group with an operator T . (At present, for instance, I know no easy way to determine whether a set of operators T_i generate another operator U . These automorphisms would provide a small portion of the answer: if the automorphisms

associated with the T_i 's did not generate the automorphism associated with U_i , then the T_i 's could not generate U_i .) Similarly, it would be interesting to know whether automorphisms of other algebraic flow-equivalence invariants are canonically associated with operators. One might even hope that there is some such algebraic invariant with the property that there is an invertible map between its automorphisms and the operators. On my more optimistic days, I do hope this.

6 The general 1+1-dimensional case

Our one-dimensional spaces up to now have been colored directed graphs. A natural generalization is obtained by removing the directedness from the graphs. Now segments no longer have an orientation; $[ab]$ is the same as $[ba]$. Similarly, (abc) is the same as (cba) . Again we may define a space set by listing all allowed neighborhoods of a given width w ; the space set is the set of all unoriented vertex-colored 2-regular graphs having the property that every embedded width- w segment is in the list.

Suppose that one has defined an oriented space set \mathcal{X} by listing the allowed width- w segments. Choose two colors L and R which do not appear in \mathcal{X} . Replace each oriented segment $[c_1 c_2 \dots c_w]$ with the three unoriented width- $3w$ segments $[LRc_1 LRc_2 LR \dots LRc_w]$, $[Rc_1 LRc_2 LR \dots LRc_w L]$ and $[c_1 LRc_2 LR \dots LRc_w LR]$. The resulting list of unoriented segments determine a new space set \mathcal{Y} in which the spaces are unoriented vertex-colored 2-regular graphs. The implied map between \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} is local and invertible, and its inverse is local; so \mathcal{X} is equivalent to \mathcal{Y} .

Thus in the new setup orientedness is a property of a particular set of allowed neighborhoods, rather than a built-in property. It is not necessary to use colors L and R in this way to define an oriented space set; any other space set which is locally equivalent to one defined in this way deserves the name “oriented.”

Note that if we define an oriented space set using L and R then the orientation-reversal map is performed simply by permuting the colors L and R . Thus the orientation-reversal map is not different in character from other local equivalence maps.

In the general one-dimensional case there are two kinds of segments: symmetrical and asymmetrical. A segment $[c_0 \dots c_k]$ is symmetrical if and only if $c_i = c_{k-i}$ for each i . Hence the unoriented empty segment is symmetrical, and each unoriented length-1 segment is symmetrical. The symmetrical segments have the property that they remain unchanged when their ends are reversed. All oriented segments are asymmetrical.

If a space set is defined by a list of allowed unoriented length- w segments, it cannot be unoriented if one of its spaces contains a symmetrical length- w segment. For suppose that S is such a symmetrical segment. Choose one of its ends. Since S is in a space, it follows that we may add segments indefinitely to that end. Since S is symmetrical, we may add the exact same segments, in the exact same order, to the other end of S . The result is an infinite space which is symmetrical about the center of S . Since the space is symmetrical, it cannot be part of an oriented space set. (No space made of directed edges is symmetrical about a point.)

Hence, for example, any nonempty set of spaces defined by a list of allowed unoriented width-1 segments is unoriented. Thus \mathcal{X}_2 is oriented, but the set of spaces defined by the list of unoriented segments $[a]$ and $[b]$ is not.

Suppose that a set of spaces is defined by a list of allowed unoriented asymmetrical width- w segments. Discard those segments which do not appear in a space. Suppose that the edges of the remaining segments can be replaced with directed edges in such a way that segments can only be glued together so that all edges in the resulting segment point in the same direction. Then the space set is oriented. And if this is not possible, the space set is not oriented. For if it is not possible, then there must be allowed segments S and U such that $S = [s_1 \dots s_w]$ and $V = [s_1 \dots s_w U s_w \dots s_1]$ is a segment that appears in some space. Choose one end of V and extend V indefinitely at that end. Extend V indefinitely in exactly the same way at the other end. Though the resulting infinite space x may not be symmetrical (because U may not be symmetrical), it does have the property that, for any n , there are segments T and R such that $T = [t_1 \dots t_n]$ and $[t_1 \dots t_n R t_n \dots t_1]$ is embedded in x . This means that an orientation may not be *locally* assigned to x ; hence the space set cannot be locally equivalent to any of the space sets described in Chapter 5. (This discussion shows that such space sets might better be called “locally oriented.” However, I will continue to use my original terminology.)

One may express space set descriptions using adjacency matrices in a manner similar to that used in the oriented case. Here is an example:

$$\begin{array}{l|ll} [a] & aa & ab \\ [b] & ba & bb \end{array}$$

It is the space set defined by the list of allowed unoriented width-1 segments $[a]$ and $[b]$. This should be interpreted in the same way as in the oriented case, except that now there may be two closed directed paths through the matrix that correspond to the

same space. For example, the space $(aababb)$ corresponds to the paths $(1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 2)$ and $(2, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1)$, where the numbers listed refer to consecutive vertices in the path (the edges in the path are implicit in this case).

In the above example all segments attached to vertices are symmetrical. A further wrinkle must be added if this is not the case. Here is an example:

$$\begin{array}{l|cccc} [a] & aa & 0 & ab & 0 \\ [b] & 0 & bb & 0 & ba \\ [ab] & 0 & ab & 0 & 0 \\ [ba] & ba & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

Here $[ab]$ and $[ba]$ are taken to represent the same asymmetrical segment $[ab]$. One assembles spaces by travelling along a directed path in the associated directed graph. While travelling, one may encounter either end of an asymmetrical segment first. Thus any such segment must be present in two different ways.

Note that both of these matrices possess a symmetry property: if one reverses the direction of each segment, transposes the matrix, and reverses the order of pairs of indices which correspond to the same asymmetrical segment, the result is the same as the original matrix. This corresponds to the fact that the successors of an asymmetrical segment aligned in one direction with respect to the directed edges in the graph must be the same as the predecessors of the segment aligned in the other direction. For any closed path through the directed graph that corresponds to a space, there is another (not necessarily distinct) closed path corresponding to the same space which traverses the vertices in the opposite order. For instance, in our second example the paths corresponding to the space $(aababb)$ are the distinct paths $(1, 1, 3, 2, 4, 1, 3, 2, 2, 4)$ and $(3, 2, 2, 4, 1, 3, 2, 4, 1, 1)$ (again the edges are implicit). Note that the second path was obtained from the first by listing the vertices in reverse order and then replacing each vertex corresponding to an asymmetrical segment with the vertex corresponding to the opposite alignment of the same segment. The symmetry property insures that for each directed path through the matrix the corresponding directed path obtained by transforming the original path in this manner does in fact exist.

Note that the second description can be obtained from the first by performing two successive elementary transformations. In the first transformation a vertex is inserted in the middle of the edge connecting segment $[a]$ to segment $[b]$. But this operation violates our symmetry condition. So we need also to perform the second

transformation, which inserts a vertex in the middle of the edge connecting segment $[b]$ to $[a]$. The segments associated with the two new vertices represent a single asymmetrical unoriented segment aligned in the two possible ways with respect to the directed edges.

Thus it appears that the situation is as follows. General one-dimensional space sets may be represented by descriptions possessing the above symmetry property. Transformations of space set descriptions are the same as our transformations of oriented space set descriptions, except that they must preserve the symmetry condition. This means that either a vertex corresponding to a symmetrical segment is created or removed, or two vertices corresponding to the two alignments of an asymmetrical segment are created or removed.

So far I have only worked through a small number of examples. Presumably, if one transforms a simple description often enough, eventually one encounters the difficulties of notation that we came up against in the oriented case. These difficulties may be more severe since both symmetrical and asymmetrical segments are involved. Again, it may be possible to avoid the problem by dealing instead with some analogy of the matrix descriptions and elementary space set transformations used in the oriented case. Since some segments are symmetrical and some are not, the matrix descriptions and allowed transformations in the general case are liable to be somewhat complicated. I have not tried to work this out. Also, I have not investigated the question of invariants (or equivalence classes of space sets) under these transformations; some of these invariants would appear to be related to the invariants found in the oriented case, since similar transformations are involved.

Now consider the situation from the bialgebra point of view. The problem with the space set descriptions given above, from this point of view, is that they are in some sense nonlocal. That is: a space may be represented by two paths through the graph, rather than one. If moves on space set descriptions are to be given by local axioms, then we do not want this.

Suppose first that there are no symmetrical segments. Then the general case differs from the oriented case only in that there is no distinction between upper and lower ends of a vertex. In other words, while a vertex still has two sides (it is asymmetrical), now an edge can connect any side of one with any side of another.

This means that we need to add a *metric tensor* to the bialgebra. That is: we need tensors g_{ab} and g^{ab} which satisfy the following axioms:

1. $g_{ab} = g_{ba}$ and $g^{ab} = g^{ba}$;
2. $g_{ab}g^{ac} = \delta_b^c$;
3. $U^a g_{ab} = U_b$ and $U_a g^{ab} = U^b$;
4. $M_{ab}^c g^{ad} g^{be} g_{cf} = M_f^{de}$ and $M_c^{ab} g_{ad} g_{be} g^{cf} = M_{de}^f$.

Graphically, a metric tensor is simply an edge that connects an upper index to an upper index or a lower index to a lower index. The axioms imply that, by using metric tensors, any tensor U or M can be turned upside down.

The other axioms remain the same as they were before. I believe that this new system completely describes one-dimensional space sets that contain no symmetrical segments.

In the oriented case, spaces corresponded to closed directed paths through the scalar diagram. Once the metric is added, the rules change slightly: now spaces correspond to closed paths through the diagram which are constructed using the rule that one may travel along an edge or a vertex without turning around. (The vertices are two-sided: one arrives at a vertex at one end, proceeds through it to the other end, and then continues along an edge.) Due to the presence of the metric tensor, it is possible that the same path heads upwards at one point and downwards at another. In fact, it may even head along the same edge in two different directions during different parts of the same path.

A simple example of such a space set is given by the scalar $M_{ab}^c M_c^{de} g^{ab} g_{de}$. We may express this space set in terms of segments by assigning segments with two different colors to each edge in the scalar diagram. The two different colors insure that the associated segment is asymmetrical. In this diagram there are three edges: the edges associated with the two metric tensors (associate with them the segments $[ab]$ and $[de]$ in the obvious way), and the edge associated with the index c that joins the two M vertices (associate with this edge the segment $[cf]$, with the c below the f in the diagram). The diagram states that the length-4 segments $[cfde]$, $[cfed]$, $[abcf]$ and $[bacf]$ are allowed, and that these may be glued together with a 2-cell overlap in any desired way to form a space. Spaces therefore include $(cfdefcba)$, $(cfedfcba)$, $(cfdefcbacfedfcba)$, and so on. In short, any space has the form $[\dots cfS_1fcT_1cfS_2fcT_2 \dots cfS_nfcT_n \dots]$ where S_i is $[de]$ aligned in either of the two possible ways, and T_i is $[ab]$ aligned in either of the two possible ways. This is locally equivalent to the set of spaces obtained from this one by deleting all of the c 's and f 's.

Now suppose that there are also symmetrical segments. Our tensor edges are asymmetrical, so they are not useful for representing a symmetrical segment. Besides, if the two ends of a symmetrical segment are represented by two ends of an object in our scalar diagram, this poses a problem. For the entire diagram must be symmetrical with respect to these ends: what one encounters as one travels outwards from one end must be exactly the same as what one encounters when one travels outwards from the other end. If our scalars are composed of tensors and of local rules for hooking them together, then this symmetry condition cannot be imposed. And local transformation rules cannot preserve such a symmetry.

The solution is to represent a symmetrical segment as an object having only *one* end: namely, as a vector or covector. The idea, then, is to add new tensors V_a and V^a to our tensor algebra. These tensors satisfy the following axioms:

1. $V_a g^{ab} = V^b$ and $V^a g_{ab} = V_b$;
2. $V_a U^a = V^a U_a = 1$;
3. $V_z M_{ab}^z = V_w M_a^{wx} M_b^{yz} V_z g_{xy}$ and $V^z M_z^{ab} = V^w M_{wx}^a M_{yz}^b V^z g^{xy}$.

The idea behind this new tensor is that it is a *turn-around point*. Again spaces are represented by closed paths through the scalar diagram. The new wrinkle is this: if the path travels along an edge which ends at a tensor V_a or V^a , it reverses course and heads back along that edge in the opposite direction. Thus the U tensors represent dead ends where one is not allowed to turn around; the V tensors represent mirrors. They are symmetry points in the space set description.

One may represent the space set described by a scalar in terms of segments by associating length-2 asymmetrical segments with each edge, as before. For example, consider the scalar $V_a V^a$. Associate the segment $[ab]$ with the single edge (with the a below the b). To find the spaces, we follow closed paths through the scalar diagram, bouncing at the mirrors. Thus this scalar represents a space set whose spaces are $(abba)$, $(abbaabba)$, and so on. The space set contains all spaces constructible from the symmetrical segment $[abba]$ where the nonoverlap gluing rule is used. Clearly this is locally equivalent to the set of spaces determined by the single allowed length-1 segment $[a]$.

Another example is given by the scalar $V^a M_a^{bc} V_b V_c$. Here we may associate $[ab]$ with edge a , $[cd]$ with edge b , and $[ef]$ with edge c (with a below b , c below d and e below f). The resulting space set is the set of spaces constructible from $[abcdcba]$

and $[abeffeba]$ using the nonoverlap rule. Thus it is locally equivalent to the set of spaces determined by the allowed length-1 segments $[a]$ and $[b]$.

Now consider a space set defined by a list of allowed unoriented width- w segments. We may associate a scalar with this space set as follows. Each symmetrical segment is represented by a tensor of the form $V_x T_{a_1 \dots a_m}^x$ or $V^x T_x^{a_1 \dots a_m}$ (it doesn't matter which). (The tensors $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$ are the bialgebra tensors defined in Section 5.9.) Each asymmetrical segment is represented by a tensor of the form $T_{a_1 \dots a_r}^{b_1 \dots b_s}$; one end of the segment is arbitrarily associated with the top end of the tensor, and the other end is associated with the bottom. The number of free edges in each case should be equal to the number of segment ends the given segment end is adjacent to. It remains to connect the free edges. If a segment end is adjacent to itself, the corresponding free edge is traced with a new vector V_x or V^x . This procedure is justified because an end glued to itself is indeed a symmetry point of the space set: if $S = [s_1 \dots s_w]$ and the right end of S can be adjacent to itself, then the rightmost $w - 1$ cells of S must constitute a symmetrical segment S' , so the segment formed by gluing two copies of S together at their right-hand ends is $s_1 S' s_1$, which is symmetrical. If two distinct segment ends are adjacent, the corresponding free edges are traced or joined by g_{ab} or g^{ab} . An example is shown in Figure 39.

The first two axioms given above for the V 's are straightforward, but the third requires explanation. In the general case there are two obvious types of matrix transformations: removal of a vertex corresponding to an symmetrical segment, and removal of two vertices corresponding to an asymmetrical segment. It is reasonable to hope that these two types of moves generate all desired transformations. The second type of move involves only asymmetrical segments; hence it is generated by the standard bialgebra axioms. But the first type of move requires something extra. The moves of this sort look like this (see Figure 40):

$$V_x T_{a_1 \dots a_n}^x = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{a_{i1} \dots a_{in}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right).$$

On the left-hand side there is one path from each lower edge back to itself, and one path from any lower edge to any other lower edge. When this symmetry point is removed, each of these paths must be explicitly replaced. This is what happens on the right-hand side. (Note that there end up being more V 's after the "removal" of the original V that there were beforehand. If a tensor has a V in it, it can only be equivalent to tensors with V 's in them.) The third axiom given above for the V 's




Figure 39: Bialgebra representation of an unoriented space set. The space set is the one defined by the unoriented width-3 segments $[aaa]$, $[aab]$, $[aba]$, $[abb]$, $[bab]$ and $[bbb]$. The adjacency matrix for this space set is shown at left; gluing is done by 2-cell overlap. Segments $[aab]$ and $[abb]$ each correspond to two matrix rows and columns, since they are asymmetrical. On the right is the associated tensor diagram. One may think of the upward direction (in terms of tensor indices) as being the left-to-right direction in this diagram; since a metric is present, such directions do not really matter. The black boxes represent the standard bialgebra tensors; the short lines with single edges attached represent the vectors V_a and V^a . The diagram is equivalent to the scalar given by the expression $V^a T_a^{bc} V_b T_c^{de} T_{df}^{g} V_g V^h T_h^{ij} V_j T_i^{kl} T_{ml}^n V_n g_{ek} g^{fm}$.




Figure 40: Removal of a symmetry point for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. The rule for $n = 2$, along with the bialgebra and metric axioms, generates the rules for all n .

is exactly this move for $n = 2$. It turns out that this is sufficient, in conjunction with the standard bialgebra axioms, to generate the moves for any n . For suppose inductively that the moves have been generated for all $n \leq m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
V_x T_{a_1 \dots a_{m+1}}^x &= V_x T_{a_1 \dots a_{m-1} y}^x T_{a_m a_{m+1}}^y \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_{c_{mm}} T_y^{c_{m1} \dots c_{mm}} T_{a_m a_{m+1}}^y \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_{c_{mm}} T_z^{c_{m1} \dots c_{m(m-1)}} T_y^{c_{mm}} T_{a_m a_{m+1}}^y \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_{c_{mm}} T_z^{c_{m1} \dots c_{m(m-1)}} T_{qr}^{c_{mm}} T_{st}^{qs} T_{a_m}^{rs} T_{a_{m+1}}^{rt} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_u T_s^{uv} T_t^{wx} V_x g_{vw} T_{qr}^{c_{m1} \dots c_{m(m-1)}} T_{a_m}^{qs} T_{a_{m+1}}^{rt} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_u V_x g_{vw} T_q^{q_1 \dots q_{m-1}} T_r^{r_1 \dots r_{m-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} T_{q_i r_i}^{c_{mi}} \right) T_{a_m}^{quv} T_{a_{m+1}}^{rwx} \\
&= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} V_{c_{ii}} T_{a_i}^{c_{i1} \dots c_{im}} \right) \left(\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m-1} g_{c_{ij} c_{ji}} \right) V_u V_x g_{vw} T_{a_m}^{q_1 \dots q_{m-1} uv} T_{a_{m+1}}^{r_1 \dots r_{m-1} wx} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} T_{c_{im}}^{q'_i r'_i} g_{q'_i q_i} g_{r'_i r_i} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which equals the desired result once several index substitutions and simplifications are carried out. (The third axiom for the V 's is used in going from line 4 to line 5; otherwise only the bialgebra and metric axioms are used.) It seems promising, then, that the axioms given above are the only ones needed, and that scalars in the bialgebra tensors, the metric tensors and the V 's, along with the bialgebra axioms and the axioms given in this section, completely describe general one-dimensional space sets and their local equivalence transformations.

Though the relevance to combinatorial spacetimes is unclear, it may also be interesting to investigate bialgebras that are not commutative or cocommutative but that have tensors g and V satisfying the above axioms. The axioms may need to be adjusted slightly so that the orderings of paths is in some sense preserved (the definition of ordering of a path which switches direction midstream may need to be considered). It would be interesting to know whether bialgebras of this sort have already arisen in some other context.

7 Cauchy surfaces

In general relativity, there is more than one way to foliate spacetime with Cauchy surfaces. One might expect the same to hold here. When one defines a 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetime, one does so in terms of a chosen foliation. Are other foliations possible? Can we find other one-dimensional surfaces besides the chosen ones whose states causally determine the entire spacetime? Do these systems have a “light-cone” structure? These are the sorts of questions that will be addressed here.

I have so far only studied these questions in the context of one-dimensional cellular automata. (By cellular automata I mean not the usual definition where the set of spaces is \mathcal{X}_k , but the generalization obtained by allowing the set of spaces to be any subshift of finite type.) Despite the naturalness of the questions, and the fact that cellular automata have been around for quite a while, I don’t know of anyone else who has done this.

Since the lattices in these cases are fixed and regular, the natural initial approach is to examine one-dimensional surfaces that are associated with straight lines determined by two points on the lattice. Let time proceed upwards and space be horizontal in our original specification of the cellular automaton. If one chooses any two lattice points, this determines a line with slope m , with $m \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$. The set of lines having this slope foliate spacetime. We may now ask: is it possible to redescribe this system as a combinatorial spacetime in which the spaces are associated with these lines? In order to show that this is the case, several things must be verified. First, one must verify that the one-dimensional surfaces associated with the slope- m lines are Cauchy surfaces. Second, one must verify that the set of allowed surfaces associated with these lines constitute a subshift of finite type. And finally, one must determine that the law of evolution associated with these lines is a local one.

The main result of this chapter is that every reversible cellular automaton has a light-cone structure. That is: there are slopes $m_1 < 0$ and $m_2 > 0$ such that, if $m_1 < m < m_2$, then one may redescribe the system as a cellular automaton whose




Figure 41: The addition-mod-2 rule. On the left is the rule table; at center is a portion of an empty lattice with coordinates (x, t) attached; at right is a portion of a lattice containing cell values. The law of evolution is $c(x, t) + c(x, t + 2) = c(x + 1, t + 1) \pmod{2}$.

spaces are associated with the slope- m lines in the original spacetime lattice.

I will call any redescription of this sort a *rotation*. Rotations of a cellular automaton may be thought of as coordinate transformations, and as means of finding equivalent descriptions of the original system. Interestingly, the subshifts of finite type obtained in this way typically are not equivalent to one another via a local invertible map. Thus rotational equivalences are different from the ones found using a UTU^{-1} transformation, as described in Chapter 4.

Let us begin with a slightly surprising example: a $d = 2$ cellular automaton on \mathcal{X}_2 which is *not* reversible. This system is displayed in Figure 41. For $d = 2$ cellular automata it is often convenient to stagger the lattice rows so that two cells at time t determine the value of the cell that is directly between them at time $t + 1$. Here I will let K , the set of allowed colors, be the set \mathbb{Z}_2 (rather than $\{a, b\}$). In this case, the rule T of the automaton is simply addition mod 2.

I will adopt the convention that lattice points (which I will also call cells or vertices) are two units apart in the horizontal and vertical directions (this way all lattice points have integral coordinates). Assign coordinates (x, t) to the lattice. Then (x, t) are the coordinates of a lattice point whenever $x + t = 0 \pmod{2}$. Denote the color of the lattice point with coordinates (x, t) by $c(x, t)$. Then the law T says that $c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x, t) + c(x + 2, t)$.

It follows that $c(x, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x + 2, t)$, and also that $c(x + 1, t + 1) + c(x + 2, t) = c(x, t)$. Suppose the colors of all cells $(2x, 0)$ are specified (call this state

x). Assign a color to $(-1, -1)$ arbitrarily. Then $c(1, -1)$ is determined by $c(-1, -1)$ and $c(0, 0)$, $c(3, -1)$ is in turn determined by $c(1, -1)$ and $c(2, 0)$, and so on; in this way $c(-1 + 2n, -1)$ is determined for each $n \geq 0$. Similarly, $c(-3, -1)$ is determined by $c(-1, -1)$ and $c(-2, 0)$, $c(-5, -1)$ is determined by $c(-3, -1)$ and $c(-4, 0)$, and so on; in this way $c(-1 - 2n, -1)$ is determined for each $n < 0$. Each of the two possible choices for $c(-1, -1)$ corresponds to a state y such that $T(y) = x$. Hence T is two-to-one.

Now consider the lines $\{(z + 2n, z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. These lines foliate the spacetime. The equation $c(x, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x + 2, t)$ implies that the colors of the line $\{(z + 2(n + 1), z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ may be obtained from the colors of the line $\{(z + 2n, z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ by applying a simple rule. The rule, in fact, is just addition mod 2. This is the same rule as T . Thus the system may be broken into space+time in a different way: let space be the direction along the lines $\{(z, z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, and let $c(x, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x + 2, t)$ be the law of evolution. Our new description, if abstracted from the lattice and considered as a 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetime, is identical to the original one.

The same clearly applies if we consider the lines $\{(z + 2n, -z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$; in this case the law of evolution is $c(x + 2, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x, t)$. Given some choice of colors on the line $\{(z, -z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, this law determines the colors of the lines $\{(z - 2n, -z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for each $n > 0$.

Next, I wish to examine the lines which go in the direction of the vector $(3, 1)$. Here I must be more careful about my definitions. The set of lattice points which lie directly on a line travelling in this direction through the point $(2n, 0)$ is $\{(2n + 3z, z) \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. These points are too spread out for the set of points to be a spatial surface in some space+time decomposition of this system. In order to define a one-dimensional spatial surface in the direction given by a vector (a, b) , one typically has to include more lattice points than those which lie exactly on a line.

In this case, and in many of those which I will consider here, an appropriate choice is to consider the path generated by moving from the point (x, t) to $(x + a, y + b)$ ($a, b \geq 0$) by first heading in either a positive horizontal or positive vertical direction and then changing course by a 45-degree angle at the moment required in order to arrive at the correct destination. Typically, each vertex which lies on this path is included in the surface. For example, to move from (x, t) to $(x + 3, t + 1)$, I first move horizontally to the right, arriving at $(x + 2, t)$, and then upwards and to the right




Figure 42: Foliations of the two-dimensional lattice used in the addition-mod-2 rule. On the left is the $[1, 1]$ foliation. Each path made by solid lines and each path made by dashed lines represents a portion of a one-dimensional surface. Each vertex is in two surfaces. On the right is the $[2, 1]$ foliation; here there are solid lines, dashed lines and dotted lines, and each vertex is in three surfaces.

at a 45-degree angle, arriving at $(x + 3, t + 1)$. Each of the vertices (x, t) , $(x + 2, t)$ and $(x + 3, t + 1)$ are included in the surface. I then repeat the procedure, adding $(x + 5, t + 1)$ and $(x + 6, t + 2)$ to the surface, and so on. Examples of the foliation of spacetime into surfaces in this manner are given in Figure 42.

For now, I will only consider surfaces whose slopes are between 1 and -1 . If a surface is described by proceeding h vertices horizontally to the right and then k vertices on a 45-degree angle up and to the right, I will say that the surface is an $[h, k]$ surface. If it is obtained by moving h vertices horizontally to the right and then k vertices on a 45-degree angle down and to the right, I will say that it is an $[h, -k]$ surface.

There are $h + k$ different types of vertices in an $[h, k]$ surface. Types 1 through h are those situated on a horizontal segment of the surface, beginning with the leftmost vertex on this segment (which is also the rightmost vertex on a slope-1 segment) and ending with the next-to-rightmost vertex. Types $h + 1$ through $h + k$ are those situated on a slope-1 segment of the surface, beginning with the leftmost vertex on this segment (which is also the rightmost vertex of a horizontal segment) and ending with the next-to-rightmost vertex. For fixed h and k , each vertex in the lattice is in $h + k$ different $[h, k]$ surfaces; it is a different type of vertex in each surface. If (x, t) is a vertex on an $[h, k]$ surface, then $\{(x + n(2h + k), t + nk) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the set of vertices on the surface which have the same type as (x, t) . Let (x, t) be a type-1

vertex in an $[h, k]$ surface. I will say that the line associated with this surface is the line in the direction $(2h + k, k)$ which passes through (x, t) .

It is necessary for our purposes that each set of surfaces that foliate spacetime be linearly ordered; for if we are to be able to redescribe spacetime by making these surfaces be the spaces, we must be able to assign each such surface a time coordinate in a sensible way. It is therefore necessary to exclude the situation in which several surfaces are associated with the same line. Consider an $[nh, nk]$ surface with $n > 1$. Then the line associated with the surface containing $(0, 0)$ as a type-1 vertex is the same as the line associated with the surface containing $(2h + k, k)$ as a type-1 vertex, even though these surfaces are distinct. This situation is avoided if one considers only $[h, k]$ surfaces for relatively prime h and k . Then no two $[h, k]$ surfaces are associated with the same line, and the set of $[h, k]$ surfaces is linearly ordered in the same way that the set of associated lines is naturally ordered in the plane.

If our set of surfaces $[h, k]$ turns out to be a subshift of finite type, then one must be able to describe it in the usual manner, as a set of closed one-dimensional spaces made from sequences of colors in some finite set K . Typically, one may do this by considering each group of $h + k$ consecutive vertices on the surface (beginning with a type-1 vertex and ending with a type- $(h + k)$ vertex) as a single cell in the one-dimensional space. Each state of those $h + k$ vertices which is allowed by T is assigned a unique color. The adjacency rules are then determined: for example, $[abc]$ ($a, b, c \in K$) is allowed if and only if the sections of the surface corresponding with a , b and c are allowed to follow one another consecutively. If the adjacency rules may be completely described by listing all allowed neighborhoods of width d for some finite d , then $[h, k]$ is a subshift of finite type.

My convention for choosing the vertices that are in a surface having direction (a, b) is an arbitrary one. A more general method of specifying a surface in direction (a, b) ($a + b = 0 \pmod{2}$) is as follows: fix a vertex (x, t) ; choose a nonnegative integer m ; define sequences of integers x_i and t_i with $x_i + t_i = 0 \pmod{2}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$; and let the surface consist of the vertices $(x + na + x_i, t + nb + t_i)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let this surface be identified with the line in direction (a, b) through (x, t) . If we now let (x, t) vary, we get a set of surfaces associated with lines having the direction (a, b) . Clearly, if we consider any lattice line which has this direction, we may choose (x, t) to be a vertex on this line and thereby obtain a surface associated with this line. In addition, if no vertex lies on the interior of a line segment joining

(x, t) to $(x + a, t + b)$, then no two surfaces in this set are associated with the same line; in this case we may assign a time parameter to the surfaces in this set in a natural way. One may now attempt to describe the set of surfaces as a subshift of finite type by considering the set of vertices $\{(x + na + x_i, t + nb + t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ as a single cell for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and then proceeding as described above to find colors and adjacency rules.

In an important case, however, the particular choice of description of a set of surfaces in the direction (a, b) does not matter. Suppose that we have two sets of surfaces S_1 and S_2 , each associated with lines having the direction (a, b) . Suppose in addition that S_1 and S_2 are each describable as a subshift of finite type, and that one may formulate a space+time description of spacetime in such a way that either S_1 or S_2 is the set of spaces. Then I claim that the two descriptions of spacetime obtained in this way are equivalent via a local, invertible map. I will not prove this rigorously here, but the argument goes roughly as follows. Let S_3 be the set of surfaces in direction (a, b) such that the surface in this set associated with a particular line is equal to the union of the surfaces associated with that line in S_1 and S_2 . Then S_3 is a set of surfaces of the sort described earlier, and it is a set of Cauchy surfaces. Furthermore, the colors of the vertices that are in a surface in S_3 and not in the corresponding surface in S_1 are locally determined by the colors of the surface in S_1 , because S_1 is a Cauchy surface. Hence there is a one-to-one correspondence between the cells in S_1 and those in S_3 , and it is straightforward to describe a local, invertible map between them. The same relationship holds between S_2 and S_3 , and therefore between S_1 and S_2 .

I now return to considering surfaces with direction $(3, 1)$ in our example. These are surfaces of type $[1, 1]$. We will take the “cells” in these surfaces to be pairs of consecutive horizontal vertices. Since our original spaces were in \mathcal{X}_2 , each vertex may have two colors, so our cell has four possible states, corresponding to four colors in a new color set K' . Let us for the moment assume that these are all of the restrictions on states of our surface; i.e., that each vertex in this surface may be colored 0 or 1, and that any coloring of this sort is compatible with our original law T .

The surfaces are associated with a time parameter T in the following way: if $(x, 0)$ and $(x + 2, 0)$ constitute a cell in the surface at time T , then $(x - 2, 0)$ and $(x, 0)$ constitute a cell in the surface at time $T + 1$.

Suppose that we know the states of two consecutive cells in our surface at time

T . That means we know $c(x, t)$, $c(x + 2, t)$, $c(x + 3, t + 1)$, $c(x + 5, t + 1)$. Then $c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x, t) + c(x + 2, t)$, so the colors of these two cells determine the color of the cell constituted by $(x + 1, t + 1)$ and $(x + 3, t + 1)$, which is in the surface at time $T + 1$. Clearly the colors of all cells in the $T + 1$ surface may be determined in this way. Hence all states at times greater than T are determined by the state at time T in a local way. Also, $c(x + 4, t) = c(x + 2, t) + c(x + 3, t + 1)$, so the colors of these two cells also determine the color of the cell constituted by $(x + 2, t)$ and $(x + 4, t)$, which is in the surface at time $T - 1$. The colors of all cells in the $T - 1$ surface may be determined in this way also. Hence all states at times less than T are also determined by the state at time T in a local way.

Thus our original law T implies that the colors on any one of these surfaces determine all of the remaining colors of the spacetime. It is easy to verify that the resulting spacetime is consistent with T ; this validates our assumption that the vertices in $(3, 1)$ surfaces may be colored in an arbitrary manner. Moreover, the surfaces in this set are Cauchy surfaces. This is part of what is surprising about this example: the original representation of the system is in terms of a two-to-one law, but it turns out to be representable in terms of an invertible law.

Our original law was on \mathcal{X}_2 ; the new law T' is on \mathcal{X}_4 . Note that \mathcal{X}_2 and \mathcal{X}_4 have different Bowen-Franks groups, and hence are not equivalent sets of spaces. On the other hand, it is a consequence of the above discussion that there does exist a local equivalence between the sets of *spacetimes* generated by T and T' . The rule T' is displayed in Figure 43.

In our example the $(3, 1)$ surfaces are Cauchy surfaces, but they are not alone. In fact, there are only three sets of surfaces along lattice lines that are *not* Cauchy surfaces. These are the surfaces corresponding to the lines with slope 0, 1 and -1 . Every other set of straight-line surfaces is a set of Cauchy surfaces. Here I am not referring merely to surfaces of type $[h, k]$ or $[h, -k]$. As we shall see shortly, even the set of surfaces corresponding to *vertical* lines is a set of Cauchy surfaces. This is the second unexpected feature of the addition-mod-2 rule: it contradicts one's usual expectations about light cones.

Consider a set of $[h, k]$ surfaces for fixed h and k . The claim is that for $h > 0$ and $k > 0$ a surface of this type is a Cauchy surface. Suppose that we fix the colors on one such surface, which contains type-1 vertex (x, t) . Then T means that the colors in cells (x, t) through $(x + 2h, t)$ determine the colors in cells $(x + 1, t + 1)$ through




Figure 43: A coordinate transformation of the addition-mod-2 rule. The cells in the selected Cauchy surface are shown by solid-line ovals. Orientation of the new surface goes up and to the right. The colors in the two consecutive cells $[ab]$ and $[de]$ determine the colors of cell $[cd]$ in accordance with the right-hand table. Hence the colors of the selected Cauchy surface determine the colors of the surface whose cells are shown by dotted-line ovals. This rule is equivalent to rule B in Figure 5 (let $a = [00]$, $b = [11]$, $c = [01]$ and $d = [10]$). The addition-mod-2 rule and rule B are linear; for details, see Figure 18.

$(x + 2h - 1, t + 1)$. In other words, we may evolve a horizontal segment of the surface one step forward in time using T . If we do this to each horizontal segment in the same way, we end up with another $[h, k]$ surface. The process may now be repeated. Eventually the colors of all cells in the future of our original surface are determined. Next, notice that the colors in cells $(x + 2h, t)$ through $(x + 2h + k, t + k)$ determine the colors in cells $(x + 2h + 2, t)$ through $(x + 2h + k + 1, t + k - 1)$. In other words, we may evolve a slope-1 segment of the surface one step backward in time using the relation $c(x, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x + 2, t)$. If we do this to each slope-1 segment, we end up with another $[h, k]$ surface. The process may be repeated. Eventually the colors of all cells in the past of our original surface are determined.

This demonstrates that each $[h, k]$ surface with $h > 0$ and $k > 0$ is a Cauchy surface. Again, it is easy to verify that the resulting spacetime forced by the surface is consistent with T ; hence we may assign colors 0 and 1 arbitrarily to the surface without causing a contradiction. Hence the set of $[h, k]$ surfaces, for fixed h and k , is a subshift of finite type. In fact, this subshift of finite type must be $\mathcal{X}_{2^{h+k}}$, since there are $h + k$ vertices in each cell, and each vertex has two states, and hence the cell has 2^{h+k} states. It is easy to verify that the state of the surface at time $T + 1$ is caused by the state of the surface at time T in a local way, and vice versa. Hence if $h > 0$ and $k > 0$ (and h and k are relatively prime) this system may be described as a 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetime where the $[h, k]$ surfaces are the spaces. By the left-right symmetry of T , it follows that the same is true if we replace $[h, k]$

with $[h, -k]$.

The proof that the addition-mod-2 system only has three non-Cauchy surfaces (among its straight-line surfaces) now follows by noting that this system possesses a threefold symmetry, where the symmetry transformations send straight lines into straight lines. The spaces for law T are horizontal. Consider the lines with slope 1 and -1 . We may rotate the horizontal lines in either a clockwise or counterclockwise direction and stop as soon as they have slope 1 or -1 . As we do this, the spaces corresponding to intervening lines are Cauchy surfaces. The spaces corresponding to the lines with slope 1 and -1 , on the other hand, are not Cauchy surfaces. Consider again the definition of T : $c(x, t) + c(x + 2, t) = c(x + 1, t + 1)$. The lines with slope 1 and -1 are associated with this definition in the following way: those with slope 1 are the ones joining (x, t) and $(x + 1, t + 1)$, and those with slope -1 are the ones joining $(x + 2, t)$ and $(x + 1, t + 1)$.

Now consider the surfaces with slope 1 as spaces for another representation of T . Here the rule T is given by $c(x, t) + c(x + 1, t + 1) = c(x + 2, t)$. Thus the lines with slopes 1 and -1 in our original version correspond here to the ones joining (x, t) to $(x + 2, t)$ and the ones joining $(x + 1, t + 1)$ to $(x + 2, t)$. These are the lines with slope 0 and -1 (this is reasonable, since we expect these lines not to be Cauchy surfaces). If we rotate the lines with slope 1 in either direction until they have slope 0 or slope -1 , then the surfaces corresponding to intervening lines must be Cauchy surfaces. But this means that all lines with slope greater than 1 or less than -1 must correspond to Cauchy surfaces (see Figure 44).

In constructing surfaces corresponding to lines with slope greater than 1 or less than -1 , we must deviate slightly from our previous method for constructing surfaces. The problem is that if we simply include in the surface the vertices that we cross while travelling vertically, these vertices will not be sufficient. The reason is that the vertices lying on a vertical line do not constitute a Cauchy surface. However, the vertices lying on two adjacent vertical lines do constitute a Cauchy surface. So every time we move vertically, we must include the vertices lying on two adjacent vertical lines.

For example: we may construct a surface corresponding to a vertical line by including the vertices $(x, t+n)$ and $(x+1, t+1+n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. A cell in this surface may be taken to be constituted by the two vertices $(x, t + n)$ and $(x + 1, t + 1 + n)$; thus each cell has four colors and there are no adjacency restrictions. So the vertical




Figure 44: The threefold symmetry of the addition-mod-2 rule. Shown are the three orientations of the straight-line surfaces which are not Cauchy surfaces. All three surfaces are causal in one direction only (this direction is indicated by the arrows); the rule for determining the next state in each case is addition mod 2. Straight-line surfaces having all other orientations are Cauchy surfaces.

surfaces correspond to \mathcal{X}_4 . There is only one set of surfaces corresponding to \mathcal{X}_4 on the lines having slope between 0 and 45 degrees; recall that these were the (3,1) surfaces, and that the rule corresponding to this set of surfaces is shown in Figure 43. It follows that the vertical surfaces must correspond under the threefold symmetry transformations to the (3,1) surfaces. It is easy to verify that this is the case.

I have developed this example in so much detail both because it is an interesting example and because it illustrates many of the techniques involved in making rotational transformations. The subject of rotational transformations is a nice application of the theory developed in the preceding portion of this document. For example, an understanding of subshifts of finite type is required in order to break up a surface into cells in a reasonable way. And without the notion of equivalent space sets, it would have been difficult to make sense of all of the different ways in which one may design Cauchy surfaces that lie along a particular line; with the notion, all such ways are seen to be equivalent.

Subshifts of finite type have been largely ignored by cellular automata theorists, who typically concentrate (in the one-dimensional case) on the sets of spaces \mathcal{X}_k .

| | 15 | 30 | 45 | 51 | 60 | 90 | 105 | 106 | 150 | 154 | 170 | 204 |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 000 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 001 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 010 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 011 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 100 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 101 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Figure 45: The twelve Wolfram rules that are reversible after a rotation. These are $d = 3$ rules on \mathcal{X}_2 . The rules are listed in the left-hand table. Each number at the top of a right-hand column in this table is equal to that column considered as a binary number; this is the usual way to identify Wolfram rules. On the right, the key relationships which cause most of these rules to be reversible after a rotation are displayed. Here, the colors of the marked cells determine the color of the unmarked cell (time moves up).

The above example, however, shows that they can be quite relevant to the study of systems defined on \mathcal{X}_k . Using subshifts of finite type, we showed that the addition-mod-2 rule describes a system which, seen from almost any other angle, is reversible. It is natural to ask: does something similar hold for other seemingly irreversible one-dimensional cellular automata?

To this end, I examined the most famous one-dimensional cellular automaton rules. I call these the Wolfram rules; they are the $d = 3$ rules defined on \mathcal{X}_2 , and were popularized by Wolfram [50]. The accepted view is that these only contain a few trivial reversible rules. However, I have found that 12 different Wolfram rules are reversible after a rotation (see Figure 45). The proof (in all but the trivial cases) is almost identical to our proof that the $(3, 1)$ surfaces in the addition-mod-2 rule are Cauchy surfaces. Note that this proof depended only on the fact that the colors at (x, t) and $(x + 1, t + 1)$ determined the color at $(x + 2, t)$. Similarly, in these cases one may easily verify that the colors at (x, t) , $(x + 1, t)$ and $(x + 1, t + 1)$ determine the color at $(x + 2, t)$, or else that the colors at $(x + 2, t)$, $(x + 1, t)$ and $(x + 1, t + 1)$ determine the color at (x, t) (here I am using standard rectangular lattice coordinates). In either case, one may use this fact to verify that a certain surface is Cauchy.

I suspect that these 12 Wolfram rules may be all of the Wolfram rules with this property, because they are exactly those Wolfram rules with the property that the

set of allowed infinite spaces does not change after application of the rule. (In other words, the “regular language” of the states of the system is invariant under the rule; see Wolfram [50], pp. 523-526.) For example, the addition-mod-2 rule T (which is identical to Wolfram rule 60) has this property: the set $T(\mathcal{X}_2)$ contains the same infinite spaces as does \mathcal{X}_2 (but fewer finite spaces; $T(\mathcal{X}_2)$ contains half as many width- w spaces as does \mathcal{X}_2 for any finite w). Perhaps this property is related to reversibility.

I turn now to a derivation of the main result of this chapter.

Let T be a one-dimensional reversible cellular automaton defined in the standard way using a left-hand column with width- d_0 segments. Let us temporarily use a rectangular lattice with standard coordinates (x, t) , and specify that the colors of the cells (x, t) through $(x + d_0 - 1, t)$ determine the color of cell $(x, t + 1)$. Since T^{-1} exists and is also a cellular automaton, it may be represented in the standard way using a left-hand column with width- d_1 segments for some $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the colors of the cells $(x, t + 1)$ through $(x + d_1 - 1, t + 1)$ determine the color of the cell $(x + k, t)$.

Next, we widen the boundaries of the width- d_0 segments and the width- d_1 segments until a certain symmetry condition is reached. If $k < d_1 - 1$ then let $e_1 = d_1 - 1$ and $b_0 = k - d_1 + 1$; otherwise let $e_1 = k$ and $b_0 = 0$. If $k < d_0 - 1$ then let $b_1 = k - d_0 + 1$ and $e_0 = d_0 - 1$; otherwise let $b_1 = 0$ and $e_0 = k$. Then the color of $(x, t + 1)$ is forced by the colors of the segment from $(x + b_0, t)$ to $(x + e_0, t)$, and the color of $(x + k, t)$ is forced by the colors of the segment from $(x + b_1, t + 1)$ to $(x + e_1, t + 1)$. Let c_0 be the relative position of the cell forced by the first segment, and c_1 be the relative position of the cell forced by the second segment. Then $c_0 = 0$ and $c_1 = k$. The symmetry property may now be seen as follows: $c_1 - b_0 = e_1 - c_0$ and $c_0 - b_1 = e_0 - c_1$. Hence $e_0 - b_0 = e_1 - b_1$; i.e., the segments are of the same length $d = e_0 - b_0 + 1$.

Now we may construct a representation of T which will be useful in proving the main theorem. The structure of the lattice for this representation depends on d . If d is odd, it is a standard rectangular lattice, but now the coordinates of the lattice points are $(2x, t)$ for integers x and t . If d is even, the lattice is the sort that we considered in the addition-mod-2 case, with coordinates (x, t) , $x + t = 0 \pmod{2}$, as before. We represent T on one of these lattices by specifying that the state of the segment in cells (x, t) through $(x + 2(d - 1), t)$ forces the color of $(x + d - 1, t + 1)$. Because of the symmetry condition, it must also be the case that the state of that




Figure 46: The central representation of a one-dimensional reversible cellular automaton. In the example shown here, T is a $d = 3$ law and T^{-1} is a $d = 5$ law. (Time moves up.) In the upper left-hand figure, the lattice representation is chosen so that a 3-neighborhood at time t forces the cell above the left-hand end of that neighborhood at time $t + 1$. Given such a choice, the 5-neighborhood shown at time $t + 1$ will force some cell at time t ; in this example we assume it forces the second cell from the left. (Forced cells are shaded.) In the first transformation, we extend the 3-neighborhood three cells to the left and the 5-neighborhood one cell to the left so that a symmetry property holds. Next, the row at time $t + k$ is shifted $.5k$ cells to the left, so that the cell at time $t + 1$ forced by the 6-neighborhood at time t is in the center of that neighborhood. The result is that the law may be seen as a $d = 6$ law with causal properties as shown in the last figure.

same segment forces the color of $(x + d - 1, t - 1)$. In other words, the state of a segment of width d at time t forces the state of the cell whose x -coordinate is exactly in the center of that segment at times $t + 1$ and $t - 1$. The situation is pictured in Figure 46.

Any representation of T that is constructed in this manner will be called a *central representation* of T .⁴

⁴The procedure just described is adapted from one which I used in [17] to construct “center-reversible” representations. These were central representations with the additional restriction that $d = 2$. Note, however, that the idea of equivalence used in [17] is not the same as the one used here. I claimed there that every reversible one-dimensional cellular automaton had a center-reversible representation. Part of the proof of this involved a claim that every one-dimensional cellular automaton was equivalent to a $d = 2$ cellular automaton. The equivalence map used to verify this latter claim, while no doubt a useful sort of map, is not a locally invertible one.

While I am on the topic of [17], let me take the opportunity to correct several errors that appeared there. The proof of Theorem 1 was a bit garbled. In the last paragraph of page 286, it says “Then each element of $Y_i \times X_j$ can occur in at most one set D_m .” Instead, this should read “Then each set D_m may contain at most one element of $Y_i \times X_j$.” Similarly, the next paragraph begins “Since each element of $Y_i \times X_j$ can occur in at most one set D_m ,” and instead this should read “Since each set

Theorem 30 *Let T be a reversible one-dimensional cellular automaton with a width- d central representation. Let $-\frac{1}{d-1} < m < \frac{1}{d-1}$. (If $d = 1$ then let $-\infty < m < \infty$.) Then a rotation of T exists in which the spaces of the rotated system are associated with the slope- m lines in the original spacetime lattice.*

PROOF. It is only necessary to prove this for $0 < m < \frac{1}{d-1}$; the rest follows by symmetry. Let the direction of lines with slope $\frac{1}{d-1}$ be called the *diagonal*. Assign new coordinates $[X, T]$ to the lattice using the horizontal and the diagonal as coordinate axes, retaining the original origin, and rescaling the horizontal axis so that vertices are one unit apart. (I will use brackets to indicate that the new coordinates are being used.) Then $x = 2X + (d-1)T$ and $t = T$. If $[X, T]$ is a vertex, then so is $[X+h, T+k]$ for any integers h and k . In terms of these new coordinates, the state of cells $[X, T]$ through $[X+d-1, T]$ forces the state of $[X, T+1]$ and of $[X+d-1, T-1]$ for any X and T .

The lines with slopes between 0 and $\frac{1}{d-1}$ in the original coordinates have slopes between 0 and ∞ in the new coordinates. Hence there is a one-to-one correspondence between the allowed slopes and the set of ordered pairs (h, k) where h and k are positive and relatively prime. For each such ordered pair (h, k) , the line $\{[X+nh, T+nk] \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ has one of the allowed slopes, and all such lines may be obtained in this way.

Let h and k be positive and relatively prime. I will define the surface associated with the line $\{[X+nh, T+nk] \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ to be the set of vertices $\{[X+nh+i, T+nk+j] \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq i \leq h+d-2, 0 \leq j \leq k-1\}$. Each such surface consists of a series of rectangles (parallelograms in the original coordinates); some examples are given in Figure 47. I will call this surface the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface. If $\{[X+nh+i, T+nk+j] \mid 0 \leq i \leq h+d-2, 0 \leq j \leq k-1\}$ is a rectangle in the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface, I will call this the $[X, T, h, k, n]$ rectangle. In addition, the smallest rectangle that contains the w consecutive rectangles from $[X, T, h, k, n]$ through $[X, T, h, k, n+w-1]$ will be referred to as the $[X, T, h, k, n, w]$ rectangle.

It is easy to show that any such surface is a Cauchy surface. Using the forward law, the colors in cells $\{[X+nh+i, T+(n+1)k-1] \mid 0 \leq i \leq h+d-2\}$ force the colors in cells $\{[X+nh+i, T+(n+1)k] \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\}$ for each n . It follows that

D_m may contain at most one element of $Y_i \times X_j$. Finally, on page 292 the number 1200 should be changed to 1224, and in the figure on that page where it says there are 12 distinct laws for $k = 28$, the 12 should be changed to 36.




Figure 47: Surfaces in two cellular-automaton lattices. The laws here are assumed to be given in their central representations; time moves up. The first figure shows two cells of a surface with $[h, k] = [3, 4]$ for a $d = 2$ law; the second figure shows four cells of a surface with $[h, k] = [1, 2]$ for a $d = 3$ law.

the state of the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface forces the state of the $[X, T + 1, h, k]$ surface. If one now repeats this process, eventually one forces the state of all cells in the future of the original surface. The state of all cells in the past of the surface is forced in exactly the same way, using the reverse law.

Let each $[X, T, h, k, n]$ rectangle be considered as a cell in the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface. The next task is to show that the surface is a subshift of finite type. Thus we must find $w \in \mathbb{N}$ and a list of strings of w consecutive cells such that the only restriction on the allowed arrangements of cells in this surface is that any string of w consecutive cells must be in this list.

Consider any rectangle in the $[X, T]$ coordinates (by this I mean a set of vertices $\{[i, j] \mid i_0 \leq i \leq i_1, j_0 \leq j \leq j_1\}$). I will say that this rectangle is *self-consistent* when the following holds: for any segment containing the d consecutive cells $[i, j]$ through $[i + d - 1, j]$ such that all of these cells are in the rectangle, if $[i, j + 1]$ is in the rectangle then its color must be the one forced by evolving the segment forward in time, and if $[i + d - 1, j - 1]$ is in the rectangle then its color must be the one forced by evolving the segment backward in time.

Our rule will be that a K -coloring of the $[X, T, h, k, n]$ rectangle in the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface constitutes an allowed color of the associated cell if it is self-consistent. The rule for determining the allowed w -neighborhoods of these cells is similar. Consider w consecutive rectangles $[X, T, h, k, n]$ through $[X, T, h, k, n + w - 1]$. If a K -coloring of the $[X, T, h, k, n, w]$ rectangle (which is the smallest rectangle that contains these w rectangles) is self-consistent, then so are the induced colorings of the w rectangles inside it; hence these colorings correspond to allowed colors of the associated cells. The sequences of colorings of w consecutive cells that are obtained in this way are exactly the allowed w -neighborhoods.




Figure 48: Self-consistency of the lattice if it is assumed that a surface is a subshift of finite type determined by its width- w neighborhoods. In the example shown, the law is displayed in a $d = 4$ central representation, and the surface shown has $[h, k] = [1, 2]$. Note that rectangles in $[X, T]$ coordinates show up as parallelograms on this lattice. The vertex at the lower left has coordinates $[X + nh, T + nk]$. The four regions shaded with lines are cells in the surface. The lines surrounding the parallelograms $[X, T, h, k, n, w]$ and $[X, T, h, k, n + 1, w]$ are drawn for $w = 3$. The “upper” and “lower” parallelograms are shaded with dots.

Consider the $w + 1$ consecutive cells $[X, T, h, k, n]$ through $[X, T, h, k, n + w]$, and suppose that the colorings of the first w cells and of the last w cells are allowed. Then the $[X, T, h, k, n, w]$ and $[X, T, h, k, n + 1, w]$ rectangles are self-consistent. I wish to choose w so that the smallest rectangle containing the $w + 1$ consecutive cells, namely the $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ rectangle, is self-consistent.

The situation is pictured in Figure 48. The colors of the vertices in the $w + 1$ cells are given. The remaining cells form two subrectangles of $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$: one is in the bottom right-hand corner, and the other is in the top left-hand corner. By applying T^{-1} , all colors in the lower subrectangle are determined; by applying T , all colors in the upper subrectangle are determined. It remains to check for self-consistency. To do this, we must check all applications of T which involve vertices in the lower subrectangle and all applications of T^{-1} which involve vertices in the upper subrectangle.

The basic method of proving self-consistency is as follows. Consider any segment of d consecutive vertices that contains at least one vertex in the lower subrectangle. Let that segment contain the vertices $\{[i, j] \mid i_0 \leq i \leq i + d - 1\}$. If the rows of $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ are wide enough, then they will contain $\{[i, j + 1] \mid i_0 - d + 1 \leq i \leq i + d - 1\}$. (All that matters here is the width, since the rows are guaranteed to go far enough to the right; the only question is whether they go far enough to the left.) If $w > 1$, the colors in the j th row are guaranteed, by construction, to be the

ones forced by the colors in the $(j + 1)$ st row using T^{-1} . In this case, this means that every color of the length- d segment is forced by vertices above it. But that means that if c is the color which results from applying T to the length- d segment, then the color of vertex $[i_0, j + 1]$ must be c (for otherwise T would not be the inverse of T^{-1}). Since there are h vertices in a row of the lower subrectangle, it turns out that, in order to insure that the proper vertices are in row $j + 1$ of $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ it is sufficient to require that the rows of $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ contain $h + 2d - 2$ vertices. A simple calculation shows that the rows of $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ actually contain $(w + 1)h + d - 1$ vertices. Thus we may insure consistency for the lower subrectangle by requiring that $w > 1$ and that $(w + 1)h + d - 1 \geq h + 2d - 2$; the latter relation may be written more simply as $wh \geq d - 1$.

A similar argument applies to the upper subrectangle. The final result is that, for any w such that $w > 1$ and $wh \geq d - 1$, $[X, T, h, k, n, w + 1]$ must be self-consistent. This means that the subrectangle $[X + 1, T, h, k, w]$, which contains w consecutive cells in the $[X + 1, T, h, k]$ surface, is self-consistent. Also, the subrectangle $[X, T + 1, h, k, w]$, which contains w consecutive cells in the $[X, T + 1, h, k]$ surface, is self-consistent. Now suppose that the state of the surface $[X, T, h, k]$ consists entirely of allowed sequences of w colors. Then the state of the $[X + 1, T, h, k]$ surface forced by the state of $[X, T, h, k]$ must also consist of allowed strings of w colors; the same goes for the state of the $[X, T + 1, h, k]$ surface. By repeating the procedure, it follows that the state of every $[X', T', h, k]$ surface in the spacetime forced by the state of the $[X, T, h, k]$ surface must only contain allowed strings of w colors. In addition, the entire spacetime forced by $[X, T, h, k]$ must not contain any inconsistencies, for these have been checked at each stage. Hence every such state $[X, T, h, k]$ is allowed; so the set of surfaces associated with the lines $\{[X + nh, T + nk] \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the subshift of finite type determined by the list of allowed strings of w cells.

Thus our original system may be redescribed as a new system where the spaces are the surfaces in the direction of the lines with slope m , the set of allowed spaces is a subshift of finite type, and any such space determines the rest of spacetime via a new invertible law T' . It is easy to verify that T' must be local. So the new description is a reversible cellular automaton. \square

Let S_q^1 be the subspace of the circle S^1 consisting of all points with rational coordinates. If we associate the set of allowed slopes with ξ_q^1 in the natural way, then this theorem implies that the set \mathcal{M}_T of slopes which correspond to allowed rotations

is an open subset of ξ_q^1 . However, the theorem does not tell us how to find \mathcal{M}_T . Given our original description, we may find part of \mathcal{M}_T . We might then check the diagonal to see whether a rotation in which the diagonals are the spaces is possible. If so, we may reapply the above theorem to expand our knowledge of which slopes are in \mathcal{M}_T . But it is not clear how one may verify that an open region of ξ_q^1 is *not* contained in \mathcal{M}_T .

In my investigations of various diagonals, I have found that some are Cauchy surfaces (for instance, if T is the identity law on any set of spaces \mathcal{X} then every straight line corresponds to a Cauchy surface except for the vertical). Others are causal in one direction only (for instance, in the addition-mod-2 rule the diagonals force the past but not the future). Still others are not causal in either direction. In every case, I have found that there is a set of surfaces associated with the diagonal which is a subshift of finite type. But I have not investigated all that many diagonals, and do not have any general results on this.

We have seen that, given law T , there is a map $f_T : \mathcal{M}_T \mapsto \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is the set of equivalence classes of subshifts of finite type discussed in Section 5.7. It would be interesting to learn more about these maps. (Actually, the objects one would wish to study here are the equivalence classes of such maps that are generated by rotations.) What is the set of all possible maps of this sort? Given any two elements of \mathcal{A} , does there exist an f_T with both of those elements in its range? The maps describe a local property of a point in spacetime. To what extent does this property characterize the spacetime?

It may be that these questions can only be properly investigated once the approach described in this chapter has been generalized. How does one define the set of Cauchy surfaces in a general 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetime? I believe that the answer to this question is closely related to the problem of finding an appropriate definition of *geodesic* in the combinatorial-spacetime setting. I have not solved this, but do not believe that it is a difficult problem. (The answer, I think, is related to the subjects discussed in Chapter 8.) Presumably the straight-line surfaces in cellular automata correspond to Cauchy surfaces; in general, one would hope that each geodesic could be investigated as to whether a surface lying along the geodesic is Cauchy, whether such a surface is a subshift of finite type, and so on. Clearly there is much work to be done in this area.

The rotations which I have described here are reminiscent of Lorentz transfor-

mations in Minkowski spacetime. There is a natural analogy between Minkowski spacetime (vis-a-vis other spacetimes in general relativity) and reversible cellular automata (vis-a-vis other combinatorial spacetimes). Both of these are *flat* spacetimes.⁵ In both cases one is concerned with straight-line surfaces, and with rotations corresponding to those surfaces. In both cases there is an open set of allowed rotations. And, of course, in both cases locality plays an important role, which no doubt has something to do with why in both cases similar light-cone structures are found. However, Minkowski spacetime has one property which cellular automata typically do not have. That property is *relativity*: if you perform a rotation in Minkowski spacetime, the laws of nature do not change. That is, the description of the law of nature in terms of the new set of spaces is identical to the description of that law in terms of the original set of spaces. This leads to a natural question: does there exist a reversible 1+1-dimensional cellular automaton which also has this property?

It would be very nice to find such an automaton. I have made some attempts, without success. In the case of reversible cellular automata the first prerequisite for law $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ to be equivalent to $T' : \mathcal{X}' \mapsto \mathcal{X}'$ to be equivalent is that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' be equivalent as sets of spaces. Thus the problem of finding a relativistic reversible 1+1-dimensional cellular automaton is related to the question of whether there exists a T such that the function $f_T : \mathcal{M}_T \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ is constant. In all the examples I have studied, these functions have been far from constant. However, the problem of obtaining general results in this case seems to be a difficult one.

If such an automaton were found, one might even imagine that length contraction and time dilation could be a natural consequence. Perhaps so, but at this point such a thing would be difficult to detect, since it is not at all clear how an observer would measure time or distance in cellular automata. For example: there are many equivalent descriptions of the same cellular automaton. The number of vertices contained in an observer can vary wildly in such transformations (as can the number of vertices in the objects surrounding the observer). What is the natural length scale that the observer would experience? I suspect there is one, but do not know how to make this precise at present.

An additional puzzle is the following. One property of transformations in cellular

⁵Just as in general relativity one considers any metric to represent a flat spacetime if there is a coordinate transformation sending it to a Minkowski metric, so here it is natural to consider any combinatorial spacetime to be flat if it may be transformed via a local, invertible map to a cellular automaton.

automata which is not present in transformations of Minkowski spacetime is that the size of cells in the cellular automaton transformation (at least in the particular transformation given here) depends on the complexity of the slope as a rational number. If the slope is $\frac{50}{99}$, the transformed cell size will be way bigger than it would have been if the slope were $\frac{50}{100}$. Perhaps this difference may be transformed away somehow; certainly the UTU^{-1} -type transformations do not respect cell size. Nevertheless, it is natural to wonder whether this property corresponds to an intrinsic feature of cellular automata which is very different from Minkowski spacetime.

In summary, I am quite in the dark as to whether a relativistic 1+1-dimensional reversible cellular automaton can exist. I suspect that advances in a number of areas will be needed before this question can be satisfactorily answered.⁶

⁶Recently I discovered a paper by Milnor ([30]) which addresses some of the issues described above. His investigation of information density in cellular automata seems relevant to understanding the question of whether a cellular automaton can be relativistic. Also, it appears to me now that the main theorem by Williams ([47]) on topological conjugacy of subshifts of finite type could be profitably used to aid the analysis attempted here. As the dissertation must be handed in momentarily, I cannot comment further at this time. *Note added May 1998:* There are further problems in interpreting these systems as relativistic which I do not have time to go into in detail. Briefly, the local equivalence maps I have considered preserve information content. Thus information is an intrinsic property of these systems, and hence is related to the metric (if there is one). For a reversible 1+1-dimensional cellular automaton to be relativistic, this implies that null lines should contain no information, which is provably false except in very trivial cases. It is possible that some of the difficulty arises from the fact that my spacetimes can be foliated into Cauchy surfaces in such a way that the set of these surfaces (for a particular foliation, e.g. the set of all time slices in my space+time formulation) is a subshift of finite type. 't Hooft ([20]) has described a type of inherently two-dimensional (rather than 1+1-dimensional) system which I believe typically cannot be foliated in this way. (The set of *all* Cauchy surfaces in 't Hooft's systems seems to be a subshift of finite type; whether this is true of my systems as well is not clear.) This may be important because it allows, for example, a particle to be emitted, bounce off something and return to the emitting body in such a manner that the body has evolved considerably in the interim, while the particle itself during that period consists simply of two graphical edges. This is a relativistic sort of thing, and it seems impossible in my systems due to the foliation. My guess is that the set of two-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes is much bigger than the one I have studied; there may also be transformations I have missed, having to do with causal structure, which would make all of these systems transparently relativistic. However, at this point I have no answers.

8 Invariants and particles

By far the most useful method I have found for analyzing the behavior of combinatorial spacetime laws of evolution is to investigate their constants of motion. I will call these constants of motion *invariants*. Typically the presence of an invariant implies the existence of a local flow, which in turn (due to the combinatorial nature of the system) may often be interpreted in terms of particles.

Again I will focus on the 1+1-dimensional case. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of one-dimensional spaces, let K be the set of colors in \mathcal{X} , let \mathcal{X}' be the set of finite spaces in \mathcal{X} , and let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the set of (finite) segments that occur in elements of \mathcal{X} . Let $\#(S, x)$ denote the number of occurrences of a segment S in a space x . Let G be an abelian group, and consider a function $f : \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}} \mapsto G$ where $f(S) \neq 0$ for only finitely many $S \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The function f induces a function $F : \mathcal{X}' \mapsto G$ as follows: if $x \in \mathcal{X}'$ then $F(x) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}} \#(S, x) f(S)$. Since f is nonzero for only finitely many S , only finite sums are involved; hence F is well defined. If $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$ is a local invertible map and $F(T(x)) = F(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}'$, I will say that F is a G -invariant of T .

The set of functions $\mathcal{F}_G(T)$ that induce G -invariants of T form a group under addition. The zero of this group is the function $z_G^{\mathcal{X}}$ which assigns zero to every segment in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The invariant induced by this function is a function $Z_G^{\mathcal{X}}$ which assigns zero to every space in \mathcal{X}' . The function $Z_G^{\mathcal{X}}$ will be called the *zero G -invariant* of \mathcal{X} . It is a G -invariant of *every* local invertible map $T : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}$. Though $Z_G^{\mathcal{X}}$ itself is trivial, the structure of the set $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$ of functions that induce $Z_G^{\mathcal{X}}$ typically is not trivial, and this is what makes the zero G -invariant of \mathcal{X} important.

For example, if $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_2$ and $f : \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}} \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ sends $[aa]$ to 1, $[ab]$ to 1, $[a]$ to -1 and all other segments to zero, then f induces the zero \mathbb{Z} -invariant of \mathcal{X} . This is true because every segment $[a]$ in any space $x \in \mathcal{X}_2$ is the leftmost cell in a two-cell segment whose rightmost cell is colored a or b . Similarly, if $g : \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}} \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ sends $[aa]$ to 1, $[ba]$ to 1, $[a]$ to -1 and all other segments to zero, then g induces the zero \mathbb{Z} -invariant of \mathcal{X} .

The set $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$ is a group under addition. (Thus, in the example described above, the function $f - g$ also induces the zero \mathbb{Z} -invariant on \mathcal{X}_2 . This is the function that sends $[ab]$ to 1, $[ba]$ to -1 , and all other segments to zero.) For any T , $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$ is a subgroup of $\mathcal{F}_G(T)$. If $f \in \mathcal{F}_G(T)$ and f induces the G -invariant F , then so does $f + g$ for any $g \in \mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$. The set $\mathcal{I}_G(T)$ of G -invariants of T is itself a group: it is simply the quotient group $\mathcal{F}_G(T)/\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$.

If f is in $\mathcal{F}_G(T)$, let w equal the maximum width of the (finitely many) segments S in $\mathcal{S}_\mathcal{X}$ such that $f(S) \neq 0$. (I will call w the *width* of f .) Suppose there is a segment $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{X}$ whose width is less than w such that $f(S_0) = g \neq 0$. Consider the function $h : \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{X} \mapsto G$ which maps $[S_0c]$ to g for each $c \in K$ that is allowed to follow S_0 , maps S_0 to $-g$, and maps all other segments to zero. Then h is in $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$, so f and $f + h$ induce the same G -invariant F of T . I will say that $f + h$ is obtained from f by “extending S_0 to the right.” By repeating this process of extending segments to the right, one can construct a function f' which also induces F such that every segment S with $f'(S) \neq 0$ has width w .

Let F be a G -invariant of T , and let w be the minimum width of all functions that induce F . I will call F a *width- w G -invariant* of T . By the above argument, there exists an f inducing F which is zero on all segments that do not have width w . Thus, in order to find all G -invariants of T it suffices to examine, for each $w > 0$, the set of functions $f : \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{X} \mapsto G$ such that $f(S) = 0$ if the width of S is not w .

Given $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_A$, it is easy to list some functions $f \in \mathcal{Z}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $f(S) = 0$ if $|S| \neq w$. Let U be any allowed segment in \mathcal{X} of width $w - 1$. Let g_U be the function such that $g_U(U) = -1$, $g([Uc]) = 1$ for each c that may follow U , and $g_U(S) = 0$ for all other segments S . Let h_U be the function such that $h_U(U) = -1$, $h([dU]) = 1$ for all d that may precede U , and $h_U(S) = 0$ for all other S . Then g_U and h_U are in $\mathcal{Z}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{X})$. It follows that $f_U \equiv g_U - h_U$ is in $\mathcal{Z}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{X})$; and $f_U(S) = 0$ whenever $|S| \neq w$.

In fact, the above functions f_U generate the space of all $f \in \mathcal{Z}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{X})$ having the property that $f(S) = 0$ if $|S| \neq w$. To see this, consider a finite collection of width- w segments. Suppose that we wish to assemble them to form a space, or to form several spaces, in such a way that no segments are left over. Then the number of segments of the form $[d_j U]$ must equal the number of segments of the form $[Uc_i]$, so that these may be glued to one another to form segments of the form $[d_j Uc_i]$. This is exactly the condition specified by the relation f_U . Furthermore, if these conditions are met then one may glue the segments together to form spaces without any segment being




Figure 49: Zero $w = 3$ invariants for \mathcal{X}_2 . At left the functions $f_{[aa]}$, $f_{[ab]}$, $f_{[ba]}$ and $f_{[bb]}$ are displayed. These generate the space of zero $w = 3$ invariants. Note that the sum of these functions is zero; they are dependent. Their span has dimension one less than the number of functions. At center is the spanning tree of Γ . At right Γ and the functions f_U are used to reduce an arbitrary function f to canonical form.

left over. So the segments cannot satisfy any other independent linear relations.

Consider the directed graph Γ whose vertices are associated with the width- $(w - 1)$ segments and whose edges are associated with the width- w segments; an edge associated with S points from the vertex associated with U to the vertex associated with V if and only if U is embedded in S at the beginning of S and V is embedded in S at the end of S . Suppose that Γ is strongly connected. Then we may construct a directed spanning tree of this graph, with the edges in the tree pointing away from the root. Let $f : \mathcal{S}_X \mapsto G$ have the property that $f(S) = 0$ if $|S| \neq w$, and let F be the function induced by f . We may use Γ to put f in a canonical form, as follows. Choose a vertex that is distance 1 from the root. This vertex is associated with a width- $(w - 1)$ segment U ; the edge pointing towards it is associated with a segment $[dU]$. Let $f' = f + f_U f([dU])$, and then let $f = f'$. Now $f([dU]) = 0$. Now repeat the process, each time choosing a new vertex that is not the root but is as close to the root as possible. One may easily verify that, once $f([dU])$ is set to zero during this process, its value is left unchanged thereafter. The end result is that $f(S) = 0$ for each S associated with an edge in Γ . An example is illustrated in Figure 49.

Suppose f is in $\mathcal{F}_G(T)$ and we wish to know if it is in $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$. We can find out in the following way. First, by extending to the left and right, express f so that $f(S) = 0$ whenever $|S| \neq w$ for some w . Second, construct Γ and a spanning tree of

Γ (as above), construct the set of generators of the zero width- w invariants, and use these objects to reduce f to canonical form. Then $f \in \mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if $f(S) = 0$ for all S .

Let T be given by $\langle L, R, G^L, N, A \rangle$ where each segment L_i has width d . Recall that we can associate with the j th length-1 segment embedded in R_i a set of k forcing strings R_{ijk} using an algorithm described in Section 5.4.1. If $w \geq d$ then we can associate with each length- w segment S a set of forcing strings S_i as follows. Suppose $S = [L_{i_1} L_{i_2} \dots L_{i_k}]$, where here the segments are glued together with $(d-1)$ -cell overlap. Then the forcing strings associated with S are obtained by concatenating the forcing strings associated with each length-1 segment embedded in $[R_{i_1} R_{i_2} \dots R_{i_k}]$ (where here the segments are glued together with no overlap). The concatenation is done in the obvious way: the strings for the leftmost cell are overlapped in all possible ways with the strings of the next cell to the right so that the two marked cells appear next to one another in the proper order and so long as overlapping cells match one another; then the resulting segments are overlapped with those associated with the next cell to the right, and so on.

For example, suppose we are considering the law whose forcing strings are described in Figure 9. If we are given the segment $S = [baa] = [L_4 L_1]$, then the image $[R_4 R_1]$ is the segment $[R'_5 R'_1]$. To find the associated forcing strings, we attempt to concatenate the nine forcing strings associated with R'_5 with the three forcing strings associated with R'_1 . Start with the strings associated with R'_5 . The strings are to be concatenated by overlapping them so that the underlined cell in the string associated with R'_5 is directly to the left of the underlined cell in the string associated with R'_1 . The first string associated with R'_5 is $[a\underline{a}b]$. Since b directly follows the underlined cell in this string, it cannot be concatenated with any of the three strings associated with R'_1 , whose underlined cells are c in all cases. On the other hand, $[a\underline{a}cb]$ can be concatenated with $[\underline{c}b]$ to produce $[a\underline{a}cb]$; $[a\underline{a}cc]$ can be concatenated with $[\underline{c}cb]$ and $[\underline{c}cc]$ to produce $[a\underline{a}ccb]$ and $[a\underline{a}ccc]$, and so on. The result is that there are nine forcing strings associated with S .

Let f be a function that induces a G -invariant F of T . Suppose that $f(S) = 0$ if $|S| \neq w$. For each width- w segment $S \in \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{X}$, let $f'_S(U) = 1$ for each forcing string U associated with S , and let $f'_S(U) = 0$ otherwise. Let f' be the sum of the functions f'_S . Let F be the function on \mathcal{X}' induced by f , and let F' be the function on \mathcal{X}' induced by f' . Then it is easy to verify that $F(x) = F'(T(x))$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The reason

for this is basically that for each width- w segment S in x there is associated exactly one forcing string U in $T(x)$. (Actually the same U in $T(x)$ may be associated with several width- w segments in x . But if so, these width- w segments must be adjacent to one another, and the presence of any one of them must force the rest of them to be present. In that case the sum of f over those width- w segments is exactly the value of $f'(U)$.)

The important fact to notice here is the following. If F is a G -invariant of T , then it must be the case that $F = F'$. Hence the function $f' - f$ must be in $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$.

We may now characterize all width- w invariants of T as follows. For each allowed width- w segment S assign a commutative generator h_S such that $f(S) = h_S$, and let $f(S) = 0$ for all other segments. Compute the forcing strings, and compute $f' - f$. Extend to the left and right until $f' - f$ is nonzero only on segments of width y for some fixed y . Then put $f' - f$ in canonical form. Since $f' - f \in \mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X})$, all of the entries of the canonical form of $f' - f$ must be zero. This gives a set of relations on the h_S 's. The resulting set of generators and relations describes an abelian group H . Let G be an abelian group and $h : H \mapsto G$ be any homomorphism. Let $g : \mathcal{S}_X \mapsto G$ be given by $g(S) = h(f(S))$ for each segment S . Then g induces a width- w G -invariant of T , and all width- w invariants of T may be obtained in this way.

Though this procedure is straightforward, it does tend to produce many redundant relations. I suspect that another procedure can be found which does not do this.

Invariants of the sort described here were first introduced in the context of cellular automata by Pomeau [34], and more recently were discussed in a series of papers by Takesue [40, 41, 42] and in a paper by Hattori and Takesue [16]. The latter paper includes a procedure for computing all width- w \mathbb{R} -invariants for one-dimensional cellular automaton rules defined on spaces \mathcal{X}_k . The above procedure is somewhat different from theirs: it is specially adapted to invertible rules, and it is valid for general 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. (I have an algorithm to compute the width- w invariants for any rule given by a nonoverlap rule table, even if it is not invertible; however, I will not describe this here.)

Figure 50 shows an example of the results of a width-2 invariants computation for a cellular automaton rule T . The rule is given in the first two columns; the invariants are given in the third column. The six variables w, r, y, z, s and u are free variables. Suppose that we are interested in \mathbb{Z} -invariants. Then these invariants are spanned by those that are obtained by setting one of the six variables to 1 and the rest to 0.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|
| aa | a | $w + r$ | $(w - k, k + r)$ | 1 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| ab | d | $w + y$ | $(w - z - k, k + y + z)$ | 3 | 01 | 00 | 10 | 01 | 01 | $(1, -1)$ |
| ac | a | $w + r + y + u$ | $(w - k, k + y + u + r)$ | 2 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 01 | $(1, 0)$ |
| ad | d | $w + r - z$ | $(w - z - k, k + r)$ | 2 | 00 | 00 | 10 | 00 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| ba | a | $w + r - y$ | $(w - y - k, k + r)$ | 1 | 00 | 10 | 00 | 00 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| bb | d | w | $(w - y - z - k, k + y + z)$ | 3 | 01 | 10 | 10 | 01 | 01 | $(1, -1)$ |
| bc | a | $w + r + u$ | $(w - y - k, k + y + u + r)$ | 2 | 00 | 10 | 00 | 00 | 01 | $(1, 0)$ |
| bd | d | $w + r - z - y$ | $(w - y - z - k, k + r)$ | 2 | 00 | 10 | 10 | 00 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| ca | c | $w + r + z + s$ | $(w - k, k + s + r + z)$ | 1 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 01 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| cb | b | $w - u$ | $(w - u - r - k, k + r)$ | 2 | 10 | 00 | 10 | 10 | 00 | $(0, 0)$ |
| cc | b | w | $(w - u - r - k, k + u + r)$ | 3 | 10 | 01 | 10 | 10 | 01 | $(0, 0)$ |
| cd | c | $w + r + s$ | $(w - k, k + s + r)$ | 2 | 00 | 00 | 01 | 01 | 00 | $(1, 0)$ |
| da | c | $w + z$ | $(w - s - r - k, k + s + r + z)$ | 2 | 10 | 10 | 00 | 01 | 10 | $(0, 0)$ |
| db | b | $w - u - s$ | $(w - u - s - r - k, k + r)$ | 1 | 10 | 00 | 00 | 00 | 00 | $(0, 0)$ |
| dc | b | $w - s$ | $(w - u - s - r - k, k + u + r)$ | 2 | 10 | 01 | 00 | 00 | 01 | $(0, 0)$ |
| dd | c | w | $(w - s - r - k, k + s + r)$ | 3 | 10 | 10 | 01 | 01 | 10 | $(0, 0)$ |

Figure 50: Invariants and particles for a reversible cellular automaton on \mathcal{X}_4 . The two columns at left give the automaton rule table. The next column lists the functions that induce $w = 2$ invariants. The column entries are the group elements assigned by the function to the segment in the leftmost column. The space of functions is spanned by the six functions obtained by setting any five of the six variables to zero. The next column describes the local flow for these functions. Here there are seven variables. The leftmost entry in an ordered pair is the quantity sent to the left; the rightmost entry is the quantity sent to the right. The next column is the period invariant. The next five columns are the five solitons. Here “ ij ” means that i is sent to the left and j is sent to the right ($i, j \in \{0, 1\}$). The last column is a local flow for the rotation invariant.

Let us call the associated functions for these six invariants f_w, f_r, f_y, f_z, f_s and f_u .

Consider, for instance, the function f_w obtained by setting $w = 1$ and $r = y = z = s = u = 0$. Then $f_w(S) = 1$ for each width-2 segment S . So the induced invariant $F_w(x)$ is the number of width-2 segments in x , which is just the width of x . Hence the width is an invariant of T . (Of course this must be true, since T is a cellular automaton.)

Now set $w = 3, s = u = 1, z = -1, r = -2$ and $y = 0$. The resulting function f is given in the fifth column of the figure. It turns out that in this case $F(x)$ is the period of the orbit of x under T . In other words, $T^{F(x)}(x) = x$. Note that the average value of $f(S)$ is 2. Thus the period of the orbit of x under T is approximately two times the width of x . That is: for random x of a fixed width w , the periods cluster around $2w$.

Now consider f_r . The induced invariant F_r turns out to give the amount that x is *rotated* in a single orbit under T . That is: if one displays the cellular automaton on a lattice as shown in Figure 51, so that for each length-2 segment L_i at time t the associated length-1 segment R_i at time $t + 1$ is situated between the lattice points associated with L_i at time t , then after one orbit the original space x has been rotated $F_r(x)$ cells to the right.

In the example pictured in Figure 51, the original space x contains the segments $[aa], [ab], [bc], [cd]$ and $[da]$. Thus the invariant associated with this space has the value $(w + r) + (w + y) + (w + r + u) + (w + r + s) + (w + z) = 5w + 3r + u + y + s + z$. Setting $w = 1$ and the rest to zero gives the width (5); setting $r = 1$ and the rest to zero gives the rotation (3); and the period is $5(3) + 3(-2) + 1 + 0 + 1 + (-1) = 10$. The evolution of x shown in the figure verifies that these numbers are in fact the width, rotation and period.

Note also that the width-2 zero invariants are spanned by the standard zero invariants, which are induced by $f_y - f_z, f_u - f_y, f_s - f_u$ and $f_z - f_s$. (The space of the zero invariants has dimension 3; the sum of any three of these equals the fourth. Also it follows from this that f_y, f_z, f_s and f_u all induce the same invariant of T .)

The reason for these various aspects of T becomes evident when one examines the *local flow* associated with the width-2 \mathbb{Z} -invariants of T .

Let f be a function that induces a G -invariant. A local flow for this function is a local rule about how a group element associated with some segment S in x is transmitted to the group elements associated with segments in $T(x)$. Such a rule is




Figure 51: Particles associated with the rule of Figure 50. A complete period is given for the evolution of the width-5 space ($abcd$) (note that the horizontal rows of the figure wrap around). Time moves up. In the left-hand figure the first and fourth soliton types given in Figure 50 are shown. There are two solitons of each type. The first type of soliton is given by the darker lines; they tend to move to the left. When they collide with the second type of soliton (which tends to move to the right), the two solitons move along the same path for two time steps before continuing on their separate ways. The right-hand figure shows particles associated with the rotation invariant. One can view them either as particles and antiparticles which are created and annihilated in pairs, or as particles which sometimes travel briefly backwards in time and whose net velocity is faster than “light.”

described as follows. For a finite set of segments S that includes (but is not necessarily limited to) those S with the property that $f(S) \neq 0$, one chooses a finite set of neighborhoods $[USV]$. If this neighborhood is embedded in x , then some segment W is forced to be embedded in $T(x)$. The transmission rule assigns a group element g_U to each segment U embedded in W so that the sum of these group elements is $f(S)$. (Thus the group element assigned to S locally spreads out as the space evolves.) Now let x be any space, and let S be any segment in $T(x)$. If the transmission rule has the property that the sum of the group elements transmitted to S is always equal to $f(S)$, then the rule is a local flow of f .

A simple type of local flow exists for any f if the rule T is a cellular automaton rule with the property that the left-hand segments in its rule table have width 2. Suppose for simplicity that the adjacency matrix associated with the rule table is strongly connected. Let f be a function such that $f(S) = 0$ whenever $|S| \neq w$. Let S be any width- w segment located in x . Then there is a width- $(w - 1)$ segment

U with the property that $[cUd]$ is present in $T(x)$ for some c and d that depend on S 's immediate neighbors in x . Consider the type of path-designating rule which transmits group elements S_l to $[cU]$ and S_r to $[Ud]$, where S_l and S_r depend only on S . It turns out that there is always a one-parameter group of rules of this sort which are local flows for f .

To prove this, begin by choosing any width- w segment S . Let $S_r = k$ where k is an unknown group element. Suppose $S = [dU]$. Consider $[Sc] = [dUc]$ for each color c . If this is present in x , then T forces a width- w segment V to be present in $T(x)$. The sum of group elements transmitted to V must equal $f(V)$. So $[dU]_r + [Uc]_l = f(V)$, so $[Uc]_l = f(V) - k$. Also, the sum of group elements transmitted from $[Uc]$ must equal $f([Uc])$. So $[Uc]_r = f([Uc]) - f(V) - k$. Proceeding in a similar way by extending S further to the right, one eventually computes a value of U_l and U_r for each width- w segment U . The values depend only on f and on k . Using the fact that f induces a G -invariant of T , one may easily check that any transmission rule derived in this way is consistent: given any space x the transmitted values that arrive at or leave a width- w segment U are guaranteed to sum to $f(U)$.

The width-2 local flow of this sort for our example rule is given in column 4 of Figure 50. The ordered pair in each row is (U_l, U_r) where U is the segment in the left-hand column of the table. Clearly $U_l + U_r = f(U)$. The presence of the new variable k corresponds to the fact that one can add any fixed group element to each of the left-hand entries of the ordered pairs provided that one subtracts the same group element from each of the right-hand entries.

To see how this flow works, consider for instance $[aab]$ at time t . This forces $[ad]$ to be present at time $t + 1$. The transmission rule says that from $[aa]$ at time t the element $k + r$ is transmitted to the right, arriving at $[ad]$ at time $t + 1$; and from $[ab]$ at time t the element $w - z - k$ is transmitted to the left, arriving at $[ad]$ at time $t + 1$. The sum of these two elements arriving at $[ad]$ is $w - z + r$, which is exactly the group element associated with $[ad]$.

I have been able to prove that the width- w invariants of any rule given by a nonoverlap rule table where the left-hand segments have width 2 are always associated with a local flow (even when the rule is not a cellular automaton). A result of Hattori and Takesue [16] implies that there is guaranteed to be a local flow associated with the width- w invariants of any cellular automaton. I am convinced that there is a simple proof that this also holds for any 1+1-dimensional oriented combinatorial spacetime,

but have not found this proof.

Certain local flows may easily be interpreted in terms of particles. For example, suppose that we find an integer solution to the local flow in which each ordered pair is of the form $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0)$ or $(0, 0)$. The value 1 may be thought of in this case as a particle travelling through the lattice. Each such particle moves either to the left or to the right; it sometimes may change direction, but it never vanishes. So it is a soliton.

For example, in Figure 50 five integer flows are given that correspond to five solitons. These are the only five width-2 solutions of this type. The first three solitons tend to move to the left, but occasionally move to the right. The last two solitons tend to move to the right, but occasionally move to the left. The number of left-moving particles and the number of right-moving particles are invariants, induced respectively by $f_w - f_r$ and $f_w - f_r + f_s$.

Examine the behavior of solitons of types 1 and 4 in Figure 51. Given a list of which solitons are present at time 0 and which direction they are headed in at that time, one may easily compute the paths of the solitons in accordance with a simple set of propagation and interaction rules. Moreover, given the pattern of solitons on the lattice one may compute the vertex colors as follows. Each vertex may be bordered by solitons on any of four possible sides: top left, top right, bottom left and bottom right. A vertex is bordered at bottom right by a type-4 soliton and not a type-1 soliton if and only if its color is c . A vertex whose color isn't c is bordered at top right by a type-1 soliton if and only if its color is d . A vertex whose color isn't c or d is bordered at bottom left by a type-1 soliton if and only if its color is b . And all other vertices are colored a . Thus these solitons are really the whole story for this system.

Note that the system is also completely described by choosing other pairs of solitons, where one is a left-moving soliton and one is a right-moving soliton. Not all such pairs work, however.

Also note that the period of the system is equal to the number of solitons plus the width, and the rotation to the *left* (which is the width invariant minus the rotation invariant) is equal to the number of left-moving solitons. In the course of one period, each left-moving soliton passes through each right-moving soliton exactly once, and at each passing-through there is a slight delay in its travel to the left. By taking this into account, one can easily prove that the so-called period invariant is in fact the

period, and that the so-called rotation invariant is in fact the rotation.

Solitons abound in these systems, but there are also other kinds of particles. For example, consider a local flow where each ordered pair is of the form $(1,0)$, $(0,-1)$, $(1,-1)$ and $(0,0)$. Here the 1's can be considered as particles and the -1 's as antiparticles. The particles move to the left; the antiparticles move to the right. Particle-antiparticle pairs may be produced. And it may happen that a particle will collide with an antiparticle and they will annihilate one another.

An interesting example of this type of particle is a certain local flow associated with the rotation invariant of our example law; this is given in the last column of Figure 50. An evolution of these particles is pictured in Figure 51. The particle travels to the left. Occasionally a particle-antiparticle pair is produced. But this can only happen when there is also a particle situated one cell to the right of the pair production. (Since the particles and antiparticles have width 2, an adjacent particle and antiparticle overlap one another by one cell. Here the rightmost cell of an antiparticle is, according to the rules, always the leftmost cell of a particle.) Thus the antiparticle can only travel rightwards for one time step before it hits the particle. The pair annihilate one another, while the left-moving particle continues on its way.

One may think of the situation as described above. Or, following Feynman, one may think of the new left-moving particle as really being the same particle as the left-moving particle that was just annihilated. In the new description the original particle simply jogged briefly backward in time and then moved forward again. In this case Feynman's description seems particularly appropriate. Since causal effects propagating at maximum velocity travel along the diagonals for this rule, we may think of a particle moving along a diagonal as travelling at the speed of light. If we think of the particle as sometimes briefly moving backwards in time, then this type of particle (when looked at over large time intervals) moves faster than light.

I will conclude this chapter by analyzing the behavior of the 1+1-dimensional system described in Chapter 2. Recall that empirically I found that orbits in this system were always finite (though typically quite large). Here I will prove that the orbits are finite by analyzing the system in terms of invariants and particles. While in the case analyzed above one can understand the behavior of the system in terms of a finite number of particle types, here it seems that an infinite sequence of particle types is required.

My first step was to compute the width-3 invariants using the methods described

earlier. The result, after simplification, is that the function f with the property that $f([ab]) = f([acc]) = f([acb]) = 1$ (and $f(S) = 0$ otherwise) induces an invariant. Because of the structure of $\mathcal{Z}_G(\mathcal{X}_3)$, it follows that the function g such that $g([ba]) = g([cca]) = g([bca]) = 1$ (and $g(S) = 0$ otherwise) induces the same invariant.

Since I do not have a general method for determining how invariants are propagated locally, I tried to do this by hand. To do this, one evolves a segment forward in time to see what all possible results are, given boundary conditions. The table of forcing strings in Figure 9 is useful for this purpose. In this case the solution is simple. The segment $[ab]$ forces $[cca]$, no matter what surrounds it. Similarly, $[acc]$ always evolves to $[bca]$, and $[acb]$ always evolves to $[ba]$. Moreover, it is simple to check that this process is invertible: $[cca]$, when evolved backwards, always produces $[ab]$, and so on. Also, each of the segments $[ba]$, $[cca]$ and $[bca]$ evolves to something involving $[ab]$, $[acc]$ and $[acb]$ (for example, the nine forcing strings for R'_5 , which are the strings associated with $[ba]$, each end in either $[ab]$, $[acc]$ or $[acb]$), and this process is also invertible.

Thus we may view this invariant locally as being represented by a single type of soliton which may be represented in six different ways. Let $A = \{[ab], [acc], [acb]\}$, and let $B = \{[ba], [cca], [bca]\}$. A soliton is present wherever one finds one of the segments in A or in B . Whenever the soliton is represented by a segment in A , it evolves to one in B , and vice versa.

The solitons break a space x up into two types of sections, which I call the ac sections and the bc sections.

An ac section is a sequence of a 's and c 's which does not contain two consecutive c 's. Either the entire space is a section of this sort, or else the section is bounded on the left and right by solitons. A soliton that bounds it on the left takes the form $[ba]$, $[bca]$ or $[cca]$; a soliton that bounds it on the right takes the form $[ab]$, $[acb]$ or $[acc]$. If the section is bounded, then it begins and ends with a , and these a 's are also part of the bounding solitons.

A bc section is a sequence of b 's and c 's. Either the entire space is a section of this sort, or else the section is bounded on the left and right by solitons. A soliton that bounds it on the left takes the form $[ab]$, $[acb]$ or $[acc]$; a soliton that bounds it on the right take the form $[ba]$, $[bca]$ or $[cca]$. If the section is bounded, it must either have length greater than one or it must consist of a single b . A bounded section includes the b 's and c 's that are part of its bounding solitons.

Hence every space consists either of a single ac or bc section, or an alternating sequence of sections separated by solitons. In the latter case the sequence is like this: a soliton represented by a segment in A ; then a bc section; then a soliton represented by a segment in B ; then an ac section; then a soliton represented by a segment in A , and so on. There is always an even number of solitons, half represented by segments in A and half represented by segments in B .

Since a segment in A evolves to one in B and vice versa, it follows that an ac section evolves to a bc section and vice versa.

In another example of always-periodic evolution that I examined, it turned out that there was a soliton present, and that this soliton placed a restriction on the size of the space. That is: given the nature of the soliton, it was not possible for two consecutive solitons to be arbitrarily far apart. Hence the number of possible spaces containing n solitons was bounded for any n ; since this number was conserved, evolutions were forced to be periodic. This is not the case here, however. Two consecutive solitons of the sort that we have looked at so far may be separated from one another by an arbitrarily large distance, since an ac section and a bc section may be as large as you like. My hope was that the periodicity of evolution of this system could be explained by another particle that lived in the ac and bc sections and put restrictions on their widths.

This did not quite turn out to be the case. Instead, I found that the bounded sections are themselves solitons. It turns out that this system contains an infinite sequence of types of solitons; each bounded section belongs to one of these types. I shall call these soliton types P_n , $0 \leq n < \infty$ (and I will call the soliton type we discussed earlier the Q soliton to distinguish it from these). Each soliton type P_n has only a finite number of states (since it corresponds to a width- w invariant for some w), and any space x containing a Q -type soliton consists entirely of solitons (these alternate between P -type solitons and Q -type solitons). Since the number of solitons of each type is conserved, the width of the space in this case is bounded and evolution is forced to be periodic. In the case where x does not contain any Q -type solitons and consists of a single section, it is easy to verify that its evolution is also periodic; hence it is periodic in every case.

In what follows I will focus attention on the *interior* of a bounded bc section. This refers to that portion of a bc section that remains when the b and c cells belonging to its two bounding Q solitons are stripped away. The definition only makes sense

if the bc section is large enough so that the bounding Q solitons do not overlap one another; I will at first assume that this is the case, and treat exceptions later.

Consider Figure 52, which describes the evolution of an arbitrary nonempty interior of a bounded bc section through four time steps. Here it is assumed that we are given a fixed nonempty interior I of a bc section bounded by two Q solitons. It is not assumed that we know anything about what the representation of those Q solitons is, or about what lies beyond them. All possible evolutions are computed. It turns out that, if I does not consist of a single cell b , then the result is the interior of a bounded bc section which may be obtained from I in the following way: first append one of a set A of nine strings of cells to the right-hand end of I ; then delete one of a set A' of nine strings of cells from the left-hand end of the resulting string.

The set A has this property: given a sufficiently long bounded string of b 's and c 's, the right-hand end of that string will be identical to exactly one element of A . The strings in A' are the left-right reflections of those in A . Hence the set A' has this property: given a sufficiently long bounded string of b 's and c 's, the left-hand end of that string will be identical to exactly one element of A' .

In the same figure another set B_1 of 24 strings of cells is displayed. These are the interiors of bounded bc sections that correspond to P_1 solitons. The set B_1 has this property: if $s \in B_1$ and you add one of the strings in A to its right-hand end and then delete a string in A' from its left-hand end, you get back an element of B_1 .

For example: bbc is in B_1 . The string $bccb$ is in A ; if we add this to the right-hand end of bbc we get $bbcbccb$. If we now wish to delete an element of A' from the left-hand end, there is only one way to do this: we must delete $bbcb$; the result is ccb , which is also in B_1 .

We now inductively define sets of strings B_n for each $n > 1$. The set B_n is obtained by appending an element of A to the right-hand end of an element of B_{n-1} in all possible ways. Since there are 9 elements in A and 24 in B_1 , there are 9 ways to append an element of A to the right-hand end of each element of B_1 , and hence $24 \times 9 = 216$ elements in B_2 ; in general there are $24 \times 9^{n-1}$ elements in B_n .

The key fact is that each set B_n has the same property as did the set B_1 .

Theorem 31 *For each $n > 0$, if we append an element of A to the right-hand end of any string in B_n then there is always a unique way to delete an element of A' from the left-hand end of the resulting string, and the result is again an element of B_n .*

PROOF. This is true of B_1 . Assume that it is true of B_{n-1} . Let s be an element of B_n . Then $s = uv$ where $u \in B_{n-1}$ and $v \in A$. By the inductive hypothesis we may delete an element of A' from the left-hand end of uv in a unique way and obtain some string $w \in B_{n-1}$. Now suppose we add an element z of A to the right-hand end of s , obtaining sz . This equals $uvwz$, so there is a unique way to delete an element of A' from the left-hand end of this string. The result is wz , which is obtained by adding an element of A to the right-hand end of an element of B_{n-1} , and hence is in B_n . \square

Consider now a bc section whose interior is in B_n . Since b is not in B_n , the above theorem implies that evolving this section for four time steps leads to a bc section whose interior is in B_n . It turns out that evolving the original section for two time steps also leads to a bc section whose interior is in B_n . Thus the soliton type P_n , $n > 0$, is represented by the bc sections containing elements of B_n as interiors, and by the ac sections which may be obtained from these bc sections by evolving them for one time step.

Now consider any interior I of a bc section. We wish to know if the interior is in B_n for some n . If I is long enough, one may obtain a shorter string from it by deleting an element of A from its right-hand end (there is always one way to do this). If enough such deletions are performed, one ends up with one of the following strings: c , cc , bb , cbb , cb , ccb , b , or the empty string. In the first six cases, these strings are in B_1 (and hence I is in B_n for some n). In the latter two cases, adding any element of A to the right-hand end of the remainder string produces an element of B_1 . Hence I is in B_n for some n unless no element of A may be deleted from its right-hand end and its interior (if it has a defined interior) is b or the empty string. There are 24 bc sections which fall into this category (they have interior b , or empty interior, or else they are made of two overlapping Q solitons); these constitute the soliton P_0 .

It is natural to wonder whether the set of P_n solitons ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) might be generated in some fashion by a single invariant. Perhaps this is possible with some new type of invariant, but it is not possible with the type of invariant considered here. The reason is illustrated in the following theorem.

Theorem 32 *There does not exist a width- m invariant I (for some m) such that the value of I associated with a P_n soliton is n .*

PROOF. A P_n soliton may be represented by a bc segment whose interior is a string

of c 's having length $3n - 2$, $3n - 1$ or $3n$. Let $3n - 2$ be larger than m . If one adds a c to the interior of a bc segment consisting of $3n - 2$ c 's, the same soliton P_n is still represented. Hence the value of I should not change; it follows that the value of I on a string of m c 's must be zero. However, if one adds a c to the interior of a bc segment consisting of $3n$ c 's, the soliton represented by that segment changes from P_n to P_{n+1} . Hence the value of I should increase by 1; it follows that the value of I on a string of m c 's must be 1. This is a contradiction. \square

While I did manage to use invariants and particles to solve the problem of the periodicity of this system, my computer would not have been so lucky. My current algorithms to find invariants can only do so for a specified width. This width has to be pretty small; otherwise there are too many equations. In addition, the algorithm cannot find infinite sequences of invariants, as I have done here. It would not surprise me, however, if there are better algorithms for finding invariants of a specified width, and algorithms for finding infinite sequences of invariants. Perhaps there even exists an algorithm for finding all invariants of a 1+1-dimensional system in finite time; this remains to be seen. At any rate, I suspect there is much room for progress in this area.

9 Higher dimensions

The end result of Chapter 5 was a simple, attractive model which (if the conjecture holds) describes all 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes. The main characteristics of this model are:

- A set of combinatorial objects, each of which describes the set of allowed spaces;
- A set of elementary transformations of these objects which correspond to local, invertible maps on the spaces and which generate all such maps.

It is natural to hope that a similar model can be found in higher dimensions. This chapter describes my preliminary attempts to find such a model.

9.1 Space sets defined by lists of allowed neighborhoods

In Chapter 2 I suggested that our n -dimensional spaces be given by vertex-colored n -graphs, and that sets of n -dimensional spaces be given by choosing a nonnegative integer r , listing all allowed vertex neighborhoods of radius r , and specifying that the allowed spaces are exactly those which have the property that the radius- r neighborhood of each vertex in the space is in this list. An equivalent formulation (and one which is more in line with our procedure in the one-dimensional case) is expressed in terms of neighborhoods, rather than vertex neighborhoods. In this case a set of spaces is defined by choosing a positive integer d , listing all allowed neighborhoods of diameter d , and specifying that the allowed spaces are exactly those which have the property that each diameter- d neighborhood in the space is in this list.

This sounds reasonable enough, but it contains an ambiguity. What does it mean, exactly, to specify a neighborhood? A seemingly natural choice is to define a neighborhood in a graph Γ to be a particular kind of subgraph of Γ . More precisely, we might say that a neighborhood of diameter d in a graph Γ is defined to be a connected subgraph S of Γ that is maximal in the property that the maximum distance between vertices in S is equal to d . (By “maximal in the property” I mean that there does

not exist a subgraph S' of G such that S is contained properly in S' and S' also has this property.)

However, this choice of definition does not precisely match our procedure in the one-dimensional case. There our neighborhoods were not subgraphs; they were *segments*. A segment is similar to a subgraph; however, it does not contain a certain sort of information that a subgraph does contain. For example, consider the space (ab) . If we travel from the a -colored vertex to the right, we pass through the b -colored vertex and arrive back at the *same* a -colored vertex from which we began the trip. Segments ignore this notion of sameness; they are concerned only with the sequence of colors encountered as we travel to the right. The segment $[aba]$ is contained in (ab) , but there is no subgraph of (ab) containing three vertices. And certainly there is no segment that looks anything like the subgraph (ab) of (ab) . In fact, a subgraph and a segment do not mean the same thing even if their appearances are similar. If S is a subgraph of Γ then every vertex and edge in S is assumed to be a distinct vertex or edge of Γ ; this is not assumed for segments.

We may in fact view segments as finite connected subgraphs, not of the graph Γ , but of the *universal covering space* of Γ . This is the infinite directed 2-regular graph that looks like Γ locally but which contains no closed loops. (The universal covering space of (ab) is the infinite directed 2-regular graph in which a 's and b 's alternate; it may be represented as $(\dots ababab \dots)$, where here the parentheses need not be taken to mean that somehow the graph closes up at infinity.)

Note that our choice to define sets of one-dimensional spaces in terms of allowed segments, rather than allowed subgraphs, seems not to be dictated by any of the original set of defining principles for combinatorial spacetimes. And there is nothing to prevent us from defining space sets in terms of subgraphs. For example, if we define a set of spaces by specifying that the allowed width-2 subgraphs are $[aa]$, $[ab]$, $[ba]$ and $[bb]$ (where here I mean $[ab]$ to be the subgraph consisting of an a -colored vertex connected by a directed edge to a b -colored vertex), we get the same spaces that are in \mathcal{X}_2 *except* that no length-1 spaces are included. We might also include the subgraph (cd) in our list; this would mean that the single space (cd) is also in our space set. It is natural in this case to extend our definition: instead of only specifying allowed subgraphs of diameter d , we may also specify allowed *closed* subgraphs of diameter less than d . Hence we may also specify that (e) is in our set of spaces.

The space sets that we have just defined are not definable using segments. One

may easily verify that, by using the subgraph method of defining space sets, one may define all of the space sets that can be defined using segments. Thus the subgraph method is the more general one. However, we did obtain an elegant formulation of 1+1-dimensional combinatorial spacetimes using segments. This suggests that segments may be preferable; these other space sets obtained by using subgraphs may not be worth considering.

Now let us examine the analogous question in higher dimensions. Again, if our neighborhoods are connected subgraphs then a neighborhood is allowed to be an entire space. Even if a connected subgraph is not an entire space, its topology can be complex. For example, in two dimensions a connected subgraph which is not a closed space might have any number of handles or crosscaps. Also, the boundary of a connected subgraph might not be connected; for instance, in two dimensions the subgraph might be a cylinder. In addition, a connected subgraph is not required to be oriented; thus in two dimensions an allowed neighborhood would be the Möbius strip. In summary, if one uses this definition then a neighborhood may have the topology of any pseudomanifold with or without boundary.

The use of segments in the one-dimensional case suggests that this definition of neighborhood might not be the most useful one. The idea instead is that a neighborhood should be defined to be a subgraph of the universal covering space of some allowed space. But what should we mean in the higher-dimensional context by a covering space? Two possibilities suggest themselves. On the one hand, we might mean the universal covering space of the graph that describes the pseudomanifold. On the other hand, we might mean the universal covering space of the pseudomanifold itself.

This question has already been discussed in Chapter 2, from a slightly different point of view. If we define the set of allowed neighborhoods to be the set of finite connected subgraphs of universal covering spaces of allowed spaces, then these neighborhoods are finite colored trees. If the dimension of our set of spaces is n , then the edges of the trees have $n + 1$ colors and no vertex meets two edges of the same color. We define a set of spaces by listing the allowed neighborhoods of a certain size; the allowed spaces are exactly those whose universal covering spaces contain only those neighborhoods.

This setup is well defined, and perhaps it is a useful one. However, the space sets obtained in this manner have the characteristic that if x is an allowed space then so is any space y whose graph is a covering graph of the graph of x . What this means is

that in our space sets there are infinitely many types of allowed faces. In Chapter 2 I gave some of the reasons why I believe that this is not a desirable property. An additional reason is given in the next section.

Consider, then, our second option, which is that we think about covering spaces of pseudomanifolds rather than covering spaces of the associated graphs. In the one-dimensional case we obtain a universal covering space by making infinitely many copies of the one-dimensional faces of our original space and piecing them together so that the adjacency relations of the faces in the original space are maintained, but so that no closed loop is formed. We might try a similar procedure to form the covering space of an n -dimensional pseudomanifold, using n -dimensional faces rather than one-dimensional faces. However, this procedure fails whenever the original space is not flat. For example, consider the 2-sphere represented by the upper left-hand graph in Figure 2. There is only one space that can be obtained by assembling copies of the three faces in this 2-sphere (namely, the 2-sphere itself). The reason for this is that in our setup faces are not simply topological in nature; they are geometrical. In this case, they contain curvature. If you attach them, there is only one way to do so, and they close up automatically into a sphere.

So it seems that both of these attempts to generalize the notion of segment to higher dimensions run into difficulties.

Of course, there are other possibilities to consider. One natural idea is to require that the neighborhoods in our list of allowed neighborhoods are homeomorphic to n -dimensional disks. This procedure is analogous to that used to define manifolds in differential geometry. I am somewhat reluctant to accept this idea because it makes life complicated. In order to insure that our proposed neighborhoods are of the desired type, it is necessary to compute their homology groups. In addition, this will not be sufficient in the four-dimensional case unless in the meantime someone proves the Poincaré conjecture. I would prefer a simple combinatorial criterion for whether a neighborhood is allowed or not. However, there is no denying the importance of manifolds to mathematics and to physics, so this path is probably worth pursuing.

So far I have concentrated my research on two other approaches to this problem. The starting point for each of these approaches is the formulation of the 1+1-dimensional case in terms of matrix descriptions. A matrix description may be thought of as a list of one-dimensional faces and zero-dimensional hinges. The hinges are branch points. The natural generalization of this procedure is to define

n -dimensional space sets using faces and hinges. This idea is explored in Section 9.4. A second approach is to generalize the notion of bialgebra. Earlier we found that the scalars in a commutative cocommutative bialgebra describe sets of one-dimensional spaces, and that the axioms of a bialgebra correspond to equivalence maps between these space sets. One might hope to generalize this setup by finding a sequence of algebraic systems in which the scalars correspond to sets of n -dimensional spaces and the axioms again correspond to equivalence maps between space sets. This approach is discussed in Section 9.5.

9.2 The spacetime picture of 1+1-dimensional dynamics

Let A_i be a matrix of nonnegative integers for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, with $A = A_0 = A_n$ and $\mathcal{X}_A = \mathcal{X}$. Let $T_i : A_{i-1} \mapsto A_i$ be an elementary map for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $T = T_n T_{n-1} \dots T_1$ be a law of evolution on A . Our goal is to describe a set \mathcal{Y} of two-dimensional spaces in which there is a local invertible map between \mathcal{Y} and the 1+1-dimensional evolutions of \mathcal{X} under T . This map should have two properties. Firstly, we should be able to foliate each Y into one-dimensional spaces Y_t in such a way that, for some fixed $x \in \mathcal{X}$, Y_t is locally equivalent to $T^t(x)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Secondly, if neighborhoods of $T^t(x)$ and $T^{t+1}(x)$ are causally linked, the corresponding neighborhoods in Y_t and Y_{t+1} should be near one another in Y .

One method for doing this is illustrated in Figure 53. Each space set A_i corresponds to a horizontal row of 01-faces in the figure. Each map $T_i : A_{i-1} \mapsto A_i$ corresponds to a row of 12-faces between the row of 01-faces corresponding to A_{i-1} and the row of 01-faces corresponding to A_i . The entire set of two-dimensional spaces can be completely specified by writing down the set of allowed 01-faces, 02-faces and 12-faces and the set of adjacency rules for these faces. There is only one kind of 02-face; it has four sides and can be adjacent to any 01-face or 12-face. There are n distinct rows of 01-faces and of 12-faces (corresponding to the n space sets A_1 through A_n and the n maps T_1 through T_n); faces in distinct rows are distinct from one another. In the row of 01-faces associated with A_i there is exactly one type of face for each color in A_i . The face has either 8, 10 or 12 sides, depending on whether the associated color is mapped into two colors by the maps T_i and T_{i+1} . For each possible arrangement of neighboring 01-faces in A_{i-1} and A_i there is a distinct 12-face in the row of 12-faces corresponding to T_i . The 12-face has six sides if an expansion




Figure 53: A method for embedding a sequence of elementary maps of one-dimensional space sets in a set of two-dimensional spaces. Each cell in a one-dimensional space is associated with a 01-face. The color of the cell is written in the associated face. Each horizontal row of 01-faces is associated with a space, with the orientation of the space going from left to right. Time moves up. The first elementary map sends $[a]$ to $[d]$, $[b]$ to $[ef]$, and $[c]$ to $[g]$; the second map sends $[d]$ to $[hi]$, $[e]$ to $[jk]$, $[f]$ to $[l]$, and $[g]$ to $[m]$; and so on. Different colors are used for each space set in the sequence. If one is given elementary maps T_i such that $T = T_n \dots T_1$ is a map from a space set to itself, one may use this procedure to define a two-dimensional space set corresponding to the evolutions of spaces in \mathcal{X} under T by writing down a set of allowed faces of each type and a set of adjacency rules for those faces. The 01-faces and 12-faces should be thought of as having no symmetries. Each 01-face is identified by its associated color and orientation with respect to space and time; the 12-faces are identified by the configuration of their neighboring 01-faces. The 02-faces may all be taken to be identical and symmetrical.

or contraction is taking place at that point, and eight sides otherwise.

Given these rules for constructing \mathcal{Y} , it follows that if a row of 01-faces in a spacetime $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ corresponds to a space $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then if one moves up n rows of 01-faces in Y one arrives at a row of 01-faces corresponding to $T(x)$.

Note that each space set A_i is oriented: there is a distinction between left and right. Also time is oriented: there is a distinction between up and down. Hence each face should be thought of as having two kinds of arrows painted on it: an arrow pointing to the left which indicates the direction of spatial orientation, and an arrow pointing up which indicates the direction of time. It follows that the faces are completely asymmetrical; one cannot nontrivially rotate or reflect a face and obtain the same face. (Since these spacetimes are oriented manifolds, the two arrows are actually more than enough to achieve this purpose: the direction of one of the arrows may be inferred from the direction of the other arrow and the orientation of the face.)

Note also that the set of faces and adjacency rules have the following property: each 01-face can meet several different 12-faces at a 1-edge, but each 12-face can meet only one 01-face at a 1-edge. Thus the branching in this description of a set of spaces essentially takes place only at the 01-faces. (Here I am ignoring the 02-faces, which do not play any role apart from the fact that they each have four sides.)

The figure shows how a neighborhood of a 1+1-dimensional evolution can be mapped onto a two-dimensional spacetime. However, my goal was to find a set of two-dimensional spacetimes that was in one-to-one correspondence with a set of 1+1-dimensional evolutions. To make this correspondence work, we need a slightly more sophisticated notion of “1+1-dimensional evolution” than has been mentioned up to now.

For example: suppose that x is a space and that the orbit of x under T has size m . We usually think of m as the minimum positive integer such that $T^m(x) = x$. But here we need to think of there being a family of 1+1-dimensional evolutions associated with this orbit. For if we examine all spacetimes in our set which contain x as a space, we will find one which has nm rows of 01-faces for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Secondly, suppose that x is equal to (S^k) for some segment S and some positive integer k . If one evolves x using T , then after nm time steps one arrives again at x . But now if one wishes to identify this x with the original x to form a closed spacetime, there are k different ways of making the identification. Each of the resulting objects must be considered to be a distinct 1 + 1-dimensional evolution.




Figure 54: Related 1+1-dimensional evolutions as represented in two dimensions. In the figure certain pairs of edges are labelled by the same label; these edges are to be identified to form a closed graph. The leftmost graph represents the evolution of a space (a) under a map T which sends this space to itself. If T is applied twice, this also maps (a) to itself; this evolution is shown in the second graph. If one starts instead with a space (aa), T again maps this space to itself; however, it can do this in two ways, which correspond to two different evolutions. The right-hand graph represents one of these evolutions if one identifies w with q , x with r , y with s and z with t ; it represents the other evolution if one identifies w with s , x with t , y with q and z with r . Note that the center and right-hand graphs are covering graphs of the left-hand graph in which polygon types and gluing relations are preserved.

These matters are illustrated in Figure 54. It is easy to see that if we define our set of 1+1-dimensional evolutions in this way, then there is indeed an invertible map between these evolutions and the set of two-dimensional spacetimes described in Figure 53.

There are, of course, many other ways in which 1+1-dimensional evolutions may be described as sets of two-dimensional spacetimes. One would hope that, given an as-yet-to-be-developed sophisticated notion of equivalence among sets of two-dimensional spacetimes, it would follow that each of these distinct ways produce sets of spacetimes that are equivalent.

The above scheme is a useful model to keep in mind when we examine ways to define sets of two-dimensional spaces in Sections 9.4 and 9.5. Note that in each resulting set of spacetimes there are finitely many allowed types of faces. This is further evidence that spacetimes having this property form an important class of objects.

9.3 Two-dimensional spacetime dynamics

Each of the spacetimes obtainable by the method of embedding described in the above section can, of course, be foliated into spaces in such a way that each space determines the remainder of the spacetime in a local manner. I will say that any set of spacetimes having this property *contains dynamics*. The question briefly addressed here is: are there other two-dimensional spacetimes, not equivalent to these, which contain dynamics?

For example, each closed two-dimensional graph corresponding to one of our 1+1-dimensional evolutions has the topology of a torus. But it is not immediately obvious that this is a necessary property of two-dimensional dynamics-containing spacetimes.

Consider, for instance, a sphere. If one foliates this sphere with horizontal circles and views each circle as a Cauchy surface, then there seemingly is a problem. The north and south poles are degenerate circles; more importantly, if time moves up then the south pole has no predecessor and the north pole has no successor. Hence this foliation is not compatible with our space+time view of a law of evolution as an invertible map on a set of spaces. However, one may still imagine in this case that the state of each space determines the remainder of the spacetime. The set of possible poles would in this case be a set of disks (rather than circles). Certain disks might evolve to circles; other circles might evolve to disks.

In this case one could obtain both spherical and toroidal spacetimes. Note, though, that there could be only finitely many spherical spacetimes in such a set of spacetimes. This is because a spherical spacetime would be completely determined by a Cauchy disk that it contained. Each such disk would be an allowed neighborhood, and the number of allowed neighborhoods is finite.

Hence it is not clear that allowing for spherical spacetimes of this sort adds anything significant to the picture. I have not yet considered other sorts of foliations or other spacetime topologies.

If the above reasoning is correct and extends to the rest of the two-dimensional picture and also to higher dimensions, then it would seem that time must extend both forwards and backwards from an “initial” singularity in a set of combinatorial spacetimes (except perhaps in the case of finitely many elements of the spacetime set). This does not fit the usual picture of the big bang in general relativity. Of course, in general relativity the initial singularity truly is singular; we don’t know what really goes on there.

If this reasoning does hold up in the two-dimensional case, one should not take it to indicate that our 1+1-dimensional evolutions essentially tell the story of two-dimensional spacetime dynamics. It is possible to imagine a foliation of a set of two-dimensional spacetimes into Cauchy surfaces, each of which is a circle, which has the property that the set of allowed circles is *not* a subshift of finite type. It will be important to investigate this possibility further.

9.4 Space sets defined by systems of faces and hinges

In our matrix descriptions, one-dimensional spaces are described by specifying a set of allowed edges and vertices and a set of adjacency rules for these objects. The adjacency rules are described by uniquely specifying the vertex neighbors of each edge. In a one-dimensional space a vertex has exactly one edge coming in and one edge going out; here, though, a vertex may have many edges coming in and many going out. Hence the vertices are branch points, or “hinges,” in the space set description.

This suggests that we might try to describe n -dimensional space sets by specifying faces and hinges. As in the one-dimensional case the faces are one-dimensional and the hinges are zero-dimensional, it is natural to try to generalize this to the n -dimensional case by letting the faces be n -dimensional and the hinges be $(n - 1)$ -dimensional. In this section I will describe several such generalizations along these lines.

If $n = 2$, then the faces are polygons and the hinges are edges. Forget for a moment the idea of representing two-dimensional spaces by 2-graphs. Let a set of spaces be made up of a set of polygons and edges and a set of rules which specify uniquely how the edges are to be glued to the sides of a polygon. Suppose there are k edges, represented by the numbers 1 through k . An edge has two ends; label them a and b . Hence $5b$ refers to the b th end of edge 5. We may specify our set of spaces by writing down a list of all allowed polygons and rules for how they attach to the edges. Each polygon and its associated rules can be specified by a circular list of the edges adjacent to the polygon. The edges are listed in order as they are encountered when traversing the boundary of the polygon in a particular direction. It is necessary to specify which end of the edge is encountered first as we traverse the boundary. For example, $(3a, 5a, 3b, 8b)$ indicates a polygon with four sides which hits edge 3 twice. It is the same as $(5a, 3b, 8b, 3a)$, and also as $(3b, 8a, 3a, 5b)$ (in the second case we are traversing the boundary of the polygon in the opposite direction; hence the order of




Figure 55: A two-dimensional space set with no vertex restrictions. The space set is described by the single polygon shown at upper left; it may also be described by the single circular list $(1a, 2a, 1a, 2a)$. The tail of an arrow represents the a end of an edge; the head represents the b end. No orientability is assumed. To assemble spaces one makes copies of the polygon and then glues edges together in pairs so that edge labels and arrows match. Many spaces can be created in this way. For example, two polygons can be glued together to make a sphere; in this case the vertices resemble the one pictured at bottom left. The polygons can tile the plane by letting every vertex have degree four, as shown at center. In fact, for any n there exists a space in which a vertex has degree $2n$. A vertex with degree eight is shown at right.

encountering the ends of the edges is reversed). The same circular list may be listed as often as we like; this simply means that there are a number of differently colored polygons having the same size and adjacency rules.

If we restrict ourselves to oriented spaces, then we can specify that the order of edges in our circular lists corresponds to the direction of the orientation of the associated polygons. If two polygons are to be glued together at edge m , this must be done in such a way that their orientations are compatible. This means that, when travelling in the direction of the orientations of these two polygons, one polygon must meet ma first and the other must meet mb first.

This scheme is illustrated in Figure 55. It is simple, but it has one feature which I consider to be undesirable. The undesirable feature is that, while the size of faces is controlled in this setup, the size of vertices is not. That is: given a set of polygons and adjacency rules, one can assemble a space containing vertices having arbitrarily large degree. This is undesirable since it means that a vertex has infinitely many allowed neighborhoods, hence violating the local simplicity requirement. It is also

undesirable from the point of view of Poincaré duality: faces are dual to vertices, so if it is important to allow only finitely many faces one might suppose that it must be equally important to allow only finitely many vertices. Finally, note that in our scheme for constructing a spacetime description of 1+1-dimensional dynamics the size of vertices is restricted.

I claim, then, that in order to define space sets of the desired type, one must have control over the size of faces *and* of vertices. This applies in n dimensions.

Another scheme which suggests itself is derived from n -graphs. In the two-dimensional case we have three types of polygons and three types of edges. We may carry out the same procedure as above with these polygons: the edges of type i may be numbered by integers from 1 to k_i ; then circular lists may be provided for polygons of each type with the lowest-numbered edge type given first (e.g., the list $(3a, 5a, 3b, 8b)_{01}$ represents a 01-polygon which hits the third 0-edge, then the fifth 1-edge, then the third 0-edge again, then the eighth 1-edge). A set of circular lists of this sort constitutes a description of a set of spaces.

If we restrict ourselves to sets of oriented spaces, this simplifies somewhat. Again the order of our circular lists corresponds to the direction of orientation of the polygons. In 2-graphs, the polygons that hit a given edge may be divided into two groups such that any gluing at the edge attaches a polygon from one group to a polygon from the other group. For example, at a 0-edge the two groups are the 01-polygons and the 02-polygons. We may specify that each 01-polygon always hits the a end of 0-edges first as one travels around in the direction of orientation. It follows that each 02-polygon must hit the b ends of 0-edges first as one travels around in the direction of orientation (so that the orientations match when gluing a 01-polygon to an 02-polygon at a 0-edge). The same goes for 1-edges and 2-edges. The result is that the a 's and b 's in our circular lists are implicit, and can be omitted.

This scheme is illustrated in Figure 56. Note that in this case we do not have the undesirable feature of the previous scheme, since each vertex has degree 3.

I have thus far omitted one important detail from this discussion, which has to do with symmetry. Suppose in the case of oriented 2-graphs that we have a four-sided 01-polygon given by $(1, 1, 1, 1)_{01}$. Should we consider this polygon to possess a nontrivial symmetry, or not? This is up to us to choose. On the one hand, we may suppose that the only relevant properties of polygons are their sizes, orientations and adjacency relations. Then the above polygon has a nontrivial symmetry: you may




Figure 56: Defining space sets on n -graphs by listing the allowed n -faces and their adjacency relations. Here an oriented two-dimensional space set is described by the three polygonal faces at left. The hinges are edges. There are three 1-edge hinges (numbered 1 to 3), one 0-edge hinge and one 2-edge hinge. The space set may be described by the circular lists $(1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 3)_{01}$, $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)_{02}$ and $(1, 1, 2, 1, 3, 1)_{12}$. The graph at center is an example of a space in this set which has three faces, one of each type. Here $F - V/2 = 0$, so this is a torus. The polygons may be used to tile the plane as shown at right.

rotate it by 180 degrees and obtain the same polygon. On the other hand, we may suppose that each polygon is marked in some way: e.g., imagine that the polygons are white except for a black dot near one of the edges. In the oriented case this insures that the polygon has no nontrivial symmetries. A third alternative is to suppose that some polygons are marked and some are not.

Consider two space sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} corresponding to the same set of circular lists of allowed polygons. Let the properties of polygons in \mathcal{X} be determined by sizes, orientations and adjacency relations only. Let the polygons in \mathcal{Y} each contain a black dot near one of the edges, as described above. Then there may be polygons in \mathcal{X} with nontrivial symmetries, but there are no such polygons in \mathcal{Y} . Given $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we may obtain a corresponding space $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ by replacing each polygon p in x with a corresponding polygon p' , where p' now has a dot near one of its edges. If p contains nontrivial symmetries, then there is more than one way to place the dot in p' . Hence if x contains a polygon with nontrivial symmetries then it corresponds to more than one space in \mathcal{Y} . It follows that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are typically quite different.

For example, the 02-face in the space set pictured in Figure 56 may be considered

to be symmetrical under 120-degree rotations, or it may be considered to be asymmetrical. In the former case there is only one torus and one plane tiling of the sort shown in the figure. In the latter case there are three tori and infinitely many plane tilings.

In my research I have run into difficulties when trying to allow symmetries. The difficulties arise when trying to write down local equivalence transformations. But I am new at this, and it is quite possible that these difficulties are imaginary or easily surmountable. Symmetries seem to be quite important in physics, and it would be nice to know how to deal with them here. However, as a result of these difficulties I have focused most of my efforts on the case where all polygons are taken to have no nontrivial symmetries. Perhaps this is the natural case to treat first. This was my procedure in one dimension, where oriented space sets have no symmetries; it turned out there that adding symmetries to the space set (in the unoriented case) required an extra element to be added to the bialgebra. Thus in a sense symmetries made the problem more complex; perhaps this is true in general.

From now on, then, we will assume that all polygons have no nontrivial symmetries. Note that the sets of two-dimensional spaces corresponding to oriented 1+1-dimensional dynamics have this property.

Consider again our formulation of a two-dimensional space set as being determined by a list of polygons and edges of all three types, in which the edges are branch points in the sense that many polygonal sides may be adjacent to the same edge, but only one edge may be adjacent to a given polygonal side. This may be easily generalized to n dimensions. In that case, one provides a list of n -faces and $(n - 1)$ -hinges. Each $(n - 1)$ -facet of an n -face is mapped by a graph isomorphism to an $(n - 1)$ -hinge.

When $n = 2$ there are always two possible isomorphisms; hence our a and b notation. In general the situation is more complex. However, it is simplified if we choose to assume that each hinge contains no nontrivial symmetries. Then we may place a special mark on one of the vertices of each hinge. The isomorphism is then determined by indicating the vertex of the $(n - 1)$ -facet that is to be mapped to the marked vertex of the hinge.

Again the formulation is not complete until we decide whether or not to treat our n -faces as possessing nontrivial symmetries.

I will now add two wrinkles to this scheme. Both wrinkles are present in the two-dimensional space sets corresponding to 1+1-dimensional dynamics that we described

earlier.

First consider the two-dimensional case. The first wrinkle is to specify that each 02-face has only four sides and no other significant properties. Then a space set is described by giving circular lists for the 01-faces and 12-faces. The only hinges in this case are located at the 1-edges. One is allowed to assemble a space from the 01-faces and 12-faces in any manner such that the adjacency rules at 1-edges are followed and such that each resulting 02-face has four sides. (One may consider there to be only one type of 02-face, symmetrical under a 180-degree rotation; alternatively, one may consider that there is a unique asymmetrical 02-face for each way that a 02-face can be surrounded by the 01-faces and 12-faces. It does not matter; in either case the only role played by 02-faces is that they have four sides.)

This restriction may seem arbitrary at first glance. However, it is based on the following general construction.

In what follows I will use the notation “ k -face” to mean a k -dimensional face in the usual way. The notation “ j -component” will mean a component of the subgraph obtained from the original n -graph by deleting all j -colored edges. The notation “ jk -component” will mean a component of the subgraph obtained from the original n -graph by deleting all j -colored and k -colored edges. The notation “ ij -polygon” will mean a component of the subgraph obtained from the original n -graph by deleting all edges whose colors are not i or j . Hence if $n = 2$ an ij -polygon is the same as what we previously called an ij -face (though these could also now be referred to as k -components). The notation “ j -edge” will continue to mean a j -colored edge.

Now instead of considering the set of all n -graphs, consider the set of n -graphs in which each ij -polygon has four sides whenever $|i - j| > 1$. I will call these the *Poincaré n -graphs*. They may be viewed as pseudomanifolds in the following way.

If $n = 1$ a closed graph represents a circle or a line as before, only now we view the 0-edges as 1-faces (“edges”) and the 1-edges as 0-faces (“vertices”). If $n = 2$ then the 2-components (i.e., the 01-polygons) are taken to be the two-dimensional faces whose one-dimensional facets are glued together in pairs to form the two-dimensional manifold. The one-dimensional facets of a 2-component are its 0-edges. The 2-edges indicate the isomorphism between these facets. This is why each 02-polygon has four sides: two of them are the 0-edges to be glued together, and the gluing is accomplished by shrinking the 2-edges to points and performing the resulting identification of the 0-edges. It follows that each 02-polygon represents a 1-face (“edge”) of the manifold:

each edge is in two 2-faces, and this structure is indicated explicitly by the 02-polygon. Similarly, each 12-polygon represents a 0-face (“vertex”) of the manifold: each vertex is surrounded by a circle of 2-faces, and again this structure is indicated explicitly by the 12-polygon. Said another way, the k -faces of a Poincaré 2-graph are given by its k -components.

The construction generalizes inductively to arbitrary n . Each n -component of an n -graph is an $(n-1)$ -graph, which therefore represents an $(n-1)$ -dimensional pseudomanifold. The n -faces of the desired n -dimensional pseudomanifold are taken to be the cones over these $(n-1)$ -dimensional pseudomanifolds. The $(n-1)$ -dimensional facets of these n -faces are represented by $(n-1, n)$ -components. These are $(n-2)$ -graphs, which therefore represent $(n-2)$ -dimensional pseudomanifolds; the facets are the cones over these pseudomanifolds. The requirement that each j n -polygon has four sides for $j \leq n-2$ implies that the n -edges join together two facets whose graphs are isomorphic. The isomorphism between facets is given by shrinking the n -edges to points and identifying the vertices and edges of the subgraphs in the indicated manner. When the n -faces are glued together at $(n-1)$ -facets via these isomorphisms, the result is an n -dimensional pseudomanifold. It turns out that it is natural to consider the k -components to be the k -faces of this pseudomanifold.

Note that we may also view a Poincaré n -graph as an n -graph in the usual way. That is: there are two ways to construct pseudomanifolds from these graphs. The resulting pseudomanifolds are homeomorphic. From the n -graph point of view the k -faces of the Poincaré graph are now blown up into n -faces; each such n -face may be seen to represent topologically the n -dimensional neighborhood of the corresponding k -face.

I believe that it is possible to generalize the definition of Poincaré n -graphs slightly by allowing the j n -polygons ($j \leq n-2$) to have either two or four sides. What this means in practice is that an $(n-1)$ -dimensional facet may be glued to itself. I think that these self-gluing may be precisely defined in a consistent manner, though I have not worked out the details in higher dimensions and will not use this generalization in what follows.

Though an extra complication is involved in the definition of Poincaré n -graphs (as compared to n -graphs), the former have the property that they behave very nicely with regards to Poincaré duality (hence their name). This is because the Poincaré dual of a Poincaré n -graph is given simply by permuting the colors of the edges in the

graph (the permutation sends i to $n - i$ for each i). Graphically speaking, a k -face of a Poincaré n -graph looks like an $n - k$ face of that graph; hence the representation of duality in these graphs is quite explicit. For an example, see Figure 57.

My first wrinkle, then, in n dimensions, is to use Poincaré n -graphs rather than n -graphs. With n -graphs we defined space sets by describing all allowed n -faces and their connectivity properties. There were $n + 1$ different types of n -faces (for these were represented by i -components, and there are $n + 1$ possible values of i). Here we will define space sets by describing all allowed n -faces *and* all allowed 0-faces. There is only one type of n -face (an n -component) and one type of 0-face (a 0-component); hence there are fewer types of objects to describe. An n -face and a 0-face meet at $0n$ -components. Hence these components may be used as the hinges when describing connectivity. (Note that in two dimensions these components are just the 1-edges.)

The second wrinkle is to modify the Poincaré-graph picture by disallowing a certain type of branching. We do this by imposing the requirement that each of the hinge-components described in the above paragraph may be adjacent to any number of n -faces, but may only be adjacent to one 0-face. Thus the 0-faces that border a given n -face are uniquely determined, while the n -faces that border a given 0-face are not. Since each hinge is now identified with the unique $0n$ -component in a 0-face that attaches to the hinge, we may think of the hinge as being part of the 0-face.

Note that our representation of oriented one-dimensional space sets by a matrix description A has this property. The n -faces are the edges of Γ_A ; the 0-faces are the vertices of Γ_A . Using Poincaré graphs we would represent this by letting the edges of Γ_A be 1-edges and the vertices of Γ_A be 0-edges. In this case the branch points ($0n$ -components) are vertices of the Poincaré graph. The adjacency rules specify that any number of 1-faces may be adjacent to a 0-face at a given vertex of the graph, but that only one 0-face is adjacent to a given 1-face at a vertex.

Our representation of 1+1-dimensional dynamics by two-dimensional space sets also took exactly this form, except that the roles of 0-faces and n -faces were reversed. It follows from Poincaré duality that such role reversal does not matter; the choice of roles for 0-faces and for n -faces is only a matter of convention.

In this section I have described three methods of describing n -dimensional space sets using faces and hinges (apart from the method in which there was no control over vertex size). It is possible that all three methods will turn out to be equivalent from the point of view of combinatorial dynamics. I have presented all of them since at




Figure 57: A 2-face and 1-face from a three-dimensional Poincaré graph. A 2-face is a two-dimensional boundary between two 3-faces. It is bordered not only by the 3-faces, but also by the 1-faces and 0-faces which constitute the polygonal border of the region. This can be seen explicitly in the left-hand figure. The 3-faces intersect the 2-face at the top and bottom 01-polygons. These polygons in this case have six sides, which means that they represent triangles (the 0-edges represent sides of the triangle; the 1-edges represent vertices of the triangle). Hence the 2-face meets three 1-faces (at 03-polygons) and three 0-faces (at 13-polygons). Now for the dual case. A 1-face is an edge. It is bounded by two vertices at either end, as well as by the 3-faces which meet at that edge, and by an equal number of two-dimensional boundaries between those 3-faces. This can be seen explicitly in the right-hand figure. The two 0-faces meet the 1-face at the top and bottom 23-polygons. In this case there are three 3-faces meeting the 1-face at 02-polygons, and three 2-faces meeting the 1-face at 03-polygons. The structure of these faces, and the duality relation between them, is thus made very readily apparent by this graphical representation.




Figure 58: An oriented two-dimensional space set defined by the third method. The space set is described by the 0-face and 2-face shown at left (or by the set of circular lists containing the single element $((1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 1), (1, 2))$). An edge number on the 2-face is circled in order to make the face asymmetrical. One may verify that there is only one 2-graph such that each 12-polygon and 02-polygon has four sides and each 01-polygon has eight sides. It follows that there are two spaces in the set; these are shown.

present I do not know whether they are equivalent or not, and since even if they are equivalent it may turn out that one is easier to use than another. In my research I am currently focusing on the third of these methods, since less information is required to specify a space set using this method and it is therefore easier to implement on a computer.

For example, in the oriented two-dimensional case a space set of this sort may be described by a set of circular lists of ordered pairs. Each list corresponds to a 2-face; each ordered pair corresponds to a 1-edge in the 2-face. The edge information is listed in the order of orientation. The first element of the ordered pair indicates a 0-face; the second indicates an edge of that 0-face. For example, if a space set is defined by the single circular list $((1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 1), (1, 2))$, this means that there is one 2-face with four sides, and that there is one 0-face with two sides (since the first elements of the ordered pairs are all 1, and since the second elements of ordered pairs of the form $(1, x)$ are 1 and 2). This space set is illustrated in Figure 58.

Let us use this third method, then, to describe space sets. The next step is to determine simple transformations of space set descriptions which generate local equivalences between space sets. In the one-dimensional case we found that one set of moves that seemed to be sufficient for our purposes consisted of the splitting,




Figure 59: Splitting the space set pictured in Figure 58. The edge labelled 1 in that figure occurs twice in the 2-face. The goal is to create two different edges, one which hits the 2-face in the first location and one which hits the 2-face in the second location. To do this we must replace the original 0-face with two 0-faces. The edges of 0-faces are all distinct, so now we have four edges. Edge 1 in the original figure has now become edges 1 and 3. The two edges labelled 1 in the 2-face are relabelled 1 and 3. But also edge 2 has now become edges 2 and 4. So it is necessary to make four copies of the 2-face so that the edges that were formerly labelled 2 now are labelled 2 or 4 in every possible way.

doubling and reducing moves (and their inverses). In higher dimensions there are natural analogues of these moves. I will call them by the same names, except that the doubling moves will now be called the *topological equivalence* moves.

In the splitting moves, we select a 0-face V . Let $\{H_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ denote the set of hinges contained in V . We select one of these hinges (call it H_j). Let S be the set of all $0n$ -components in n -faces which are attached to H_j . We break S into disjoint subsets S_1 and S_2 such that $S_1 \cup S_2 = S$. Now we remove our original 0-face V and replace it with two copies of itself, V_1 and V_2 . In so doing, we have removed each hinge H_i in V and replaced it with H_{i1} in V_1 and with H_{i2} in V_2 . We attach each $0n$ -component in S_1 to H_{j1} and each component in S_2 to H_{j2} . Next we replace each n -face F_k with 2^{r_k} n -faces, where r_k is the number of $0n$ -components of F_k that were adjacent to some H_i for $i \neq j$. These faces are obtained by replacing each such H_i by H_{i1} or H_{i2} in all possible ways.

The procedure is illustrated in Figure 59. Note that our splitting procedure in one dimension is a special case of this more general definition of splitting. The move is invertible; the inverse of this move is also an allowed move.

The topological equivalence moves on space set descriptions are analogues of the moves that generate topological equivalence on spaces (e.g., in n -graphs or in Poincaré graphs). In fact, the moves are exactly the same in both cases except that if we have a space set description then we cannot apply the move unless there is no branching in a sufficiently large region of the description. Whenever there is no branching in a region of a description, then in that region the description looks like a portion of a single space. We may then apply a topological equivalence move to that region. The result is that the move in question is applied to every space that contains the region.

An example of this is the doubling move in the one-dimensional case. Suppose there is a vertex in a one-dimensional space set description such that only one edge comes into the vertex and only one edge goes out. Then there is no branching in this region of the description; the edge-vertex-edge sequence looks like a piece of a single space. This is exactly when we may apply the undoubling move: we remove the vertex and combine the two edges into a single edge. The result is that the same move is applied to each space that contains those two edges and vertex. The move is valid since if any space contains any part of the edge-vertex-edge sequence, then it contains the rest of that sequence. It is easy to see that the doubling and undoubling moves generate topological equivalence on 1-graphs.

It would be useful, then, to possess a finite set of local moves that generate topological equivalence on n -graphs or on Poincaré n -graphs for any n . At the moment I have only solved this problem in two dimensions. Recall from Chapter 2 that the k -dipole moves were proven by Ferri and Gagliardi to generate topological equivalence in the case where one is restricted to manifolds. I would prefer not to impose this restriction, for reasons mentioned earlier: differentiating manifolds from pseudomanifolds is a complex business involving computation of homology groups at best, and a solution of the Poincaré conjecture at worst. So it seems desirable to find a set of moves which are suitable to the general case of pseudomanifolds.

Meanwhile, we may examine the two-dimensional case. The k -dipole moves clearly are sufficient for 2-graphs. However, we are considering Poincaré graphs; the k -dipole moves do not preserve the property of being a Poincaré graph. Nevertheless it is not difficult to find a set of moves which generate topological equivalence of Poincaré graphs. Such a set is shown in Figure 60. (I shall omit the proof of the sufficiency of these moves; it is not difficult.)

Consider the move from the upper row of this figure which goes from the central




Figure 60: Topological equivalence moves on Poincaré 2-graphs. The two moves at top involving the central configuration and any single move from the bottom (and their inverses) are sufficient to generate topological equivalence.

configuration to the right-hand configuration. In order to apply this move to a space set description, we need to find a region of the description that looks like the central configuration. This may be done as follows. Choose a 0-edge on a 2-face. Draw in the four-sided 02-polygon containing this edge. The 1-edges on either side of this 0-edge in the 2-face are adjacent to hinges in 0-faces. Draw these 0-faces in. Now the 02-polygon is bordered on three sides. It remains to see how one may glue a 2-face to the fourth side. If there is only one way to do this, then locally the space set looks like the central configuration, and the move may be applied. The procedure is similar for the other moves.

Now for the reducing moves. In one dimension this move deletes a 0-face (and all adjacent 1-faces) if it cannot be “completed”: that is, if it cannot be surrounded by 1-faces. In n dimensions one wishes also to be allowed to remove a 0-face (and all adjacent n -faces) if it cannot be surrounded by n -faces. One such situation occurs when there is a hinge in the 0-face which is not attached to any $0n$ -components of n -faces; the removal of the 0-face is certainly allowed in this case. Unfortunately, this move is not sufficient for reducing purposes if n is greater than one. The problem is that, while each hinge of the 0-face may be attached to at least one $0n$ -component of an n -face, there may be no set of $0n$ -components of n -faces which can be attached to




Figure 61: Reducing the space set in Figure 59 by completing 2-faces. The first and last 2-faces in that figure appear here as the central 2-face in the left and right diagrams, respectively. Then 0-faces are added in every possible way (there is only one way to do this compatible with the requirement that all 02-polygons have four sides). The result in each case is that another complete 2-face is forced to be part of the diagram. But these additional 2-faces are not part of the space set. Hence the first and last 2-faces in Figure 59 may be deleted without changing the space set.

each of the hinges of the 0-face simultaneously without causing some sort of incompatibility. A similar problem may occur while trying to complete an n -face. These situations do not arise in one dimension.

For example, in two dimensions when we surround a 2-face by 0-faces it is implied that 2-faces with certain properties need to exist. If they do not, then the original 2-face cannot be surrounded by 0-faces in that way. If there is no way to surround the 2-face with 0-faces, then the 2-face cannot be part of any space in the space set; hence it may be removed. This situation is illustrated in Figure 61.

A simpler reducing move in two dimensions involves the completion of an edge, rather than a vertex. Recall that an edge is a 02-polygon, which is required to have four sides. Given a 0-edge on a 2-face, one must be able to surround the four-sided 02-polygon that is adjacent to that 0-edge by 0-faces and 2-faces. If this cannot be done, then the 2-face may not be contained in a space, so it may be removed. I do not know whether this edge-reducing move (in concert with splitting moves and topological-equivalence moves) is sufficient to generate all other sorts of reducing moves in two dimensions.

In summary, the situation is rather complex. In the one-dimensional setting we were able to generate all transformations using a single elementary operation:

namely, removing a 0-face. One might hope that this same sort of procedure would be possible in n dimensions as well, and that it would make life simpler. However, in two dimensions I have found that removing a 0-face is a pretty complicated operation.

Currently I am in the process of writing a computer program which generates two-dimensional space set descriptions and transforms them using various moves. From this I hope to gain some intuitions concerning whether the moves I am considering do everything I want them to do, and what a minimal set of generators for these moves might be.

One test for whether a set of moves is sufficient is that all space set descriptions which describe the empty space set ought to be transformable into one another using elementary moves. If they are not, I will conclude that my set of moves needs to be expanded.

More generally, I suspect (but am by no means certain) that all space set descriptions which describe a finite set of spaces should be transformable into one another if and only if the sets contain equal number of spaces having the same topology. To see why I suspect this, examine Figure 62. Here a space set containing two spaces is transformed so that the descriptions of these spaces are disjoint from one another. (This possibility of “freezing out” certain finite spaces so that their descriptions are disjoint from the descriptions of other spaces was not present in the one-dimensional case.) If such disjointness can always be achieved for finite space sets, then the topological equivalence moves imply that the above conjecture about space set equivalence does in fact hold.

9.5 Multidimensional bialgebras

My other approach to defining higher-dimensional space sets is tensorial in nature. It is an attempt to generalize the bialgebra approach that proved successful in the oriented one-dimensional case.

Consider an n -graph which represents an n -dimensional pseudomanifold. In the oriented case there are two kinds of vertices (colored white and black), and each edge connects one kind of vertex to the other. Thus the edges are directed (we may adopt the convention that edges point from black vertices to white vertices). Let each vertex be represented by a tensor. The $n + 1$ different colors of edges refer to $n + 1$ different vector spaces. So we need two types of tensors: $V^{a_0 \dots a_n}$ represents




Figure 62: Separating a finite space set. The space set in Figure 58 was split in Figure 59 and reduced in Figure 61. Edge 1 occurs twice in the resulting space set; this set is now split to produce the description shown in the first two rows of this figure. The middle two 2-faces may then be removed by edge-reducing. Edge 3 occurs twice in the resulting space set; this set is now split to produce the description shown in the next two rows. Again the middle two 2-faces may be removed by edge-reducing. The two spaces in the resulting space set are disjoint: each 0-face and 2-face is used in only one of the spaces.

a black vertex (since edges point away from black vertices) and $V_{a_0 \dots a_n}$ represents a white vertex (since edges point towards white vertices). The position of an index in one of these tensors is important, since each position is associated with a different vector space. Hence an upper index in the i th position may only be traced with a lower index in the i th position. The scalars in these V 's correspond exactly to the set of n -graphs.

For example, if $n = 2$ then $V_{abc}V^{abc}$ is a sphere; it is the upper left-hand space in Figure 2. Similarly $V_{afb}V_{cdh}V_{ile}V_{kgj}V^{ade}V^{cgb}V^{ifj}V^{klh}$ is a torus; it is the bottom right-hand space in that figure.

Our aim, though, is to represent *sets* of spaces tensorially, not just single spaces. Thus it is desirable to introduce some sort of branching into this picture. One natural idea is the following: instead of allowing a tensor to possess only one index per vector space, allow it to possess many such indices. From the graphical point of view, we are allowing many edges of each color to hit a vertex. Call this an n -multigraph. Each vertex and edge in the multigraph is given a distinct label. We may now potentially construct more than one space from such a multigraph: select vertices in the multigraph, and at each selected vertex select one edge of each color in such a way that each edge is selected either at both of its adjacent vertices or at neither. The resulting subgraph is an n -graph, and thus represents an n -pseudomanifold.

But clearly this is not what we are after. Space sets of this sort can only contain finitely many spaces. In a matrix description a given edge or vertex in the graph Γ_A can be present many times in a single space. We want the same to be true here.

So, a natural next step is to suppose that the spaces associated with an n -multigraph are those labelled n -graphs having the properties that the labelled vertices and edges in the graph are copies of those in the multigraph, and that a vertex and edge are adjacent in the graph only if their counterparts are adjacent in the multigraph. But here we run into the same problem found earlier: there is no limitation on the size of n -faces if this method is used. If a four-sided 2-face is present in the multigraph, it is possible that a graph in the space set might contain an associated $4k$ -sided 2-face for any positive k .

This problem can be eliminated if one supposes that the space set associated with a multigraph is made up of those spaces that can be constructed from the n -faces present in the multigraph. An n -face in an n -multigraph is a k -component contained in the multigraph ($0 \leq k \leq n$). That is: it is a connected subgraph containing no




Figure 63: A two-dimensional space set represented by a multigraph. The multigraph is displayed at upper left. The remainder of the figure shows the nine 2-faces contained in the multigraph. The resulting space set contains four spaces.

k -edges and having the property that every vertex is adjacent to exactly one i -edge for each $i \neq k$.

Note that adjacency relations between faces are given automatically by the fact that each vertex and edge of the multigraph has a unique label. If an n -graph (with labelled vertices and edges) can be written down in such a way that each n -face in the graph is also an n -face in the multigraph, then any two adjacent n -faces in the graph must also be adjacent in the multigraph. For example, in the one-dimensional case a k -component consists of two vertices connected either by a 0-edge or a 1-edge. Two such components can be adjacent only if their common vertex has the same label (and of course the rules of 1-graphs must be obeyed; hence for instance a 0-component cannot be next to a 0-component).

A two-dimensional example is given in Figure 63. Note that the sort of branching in multigraphs seems to have a different character than the sort of branching that occurs in the various face/hinge formulations. It may still be the case that the multigraph formulation is equivalent to one or more of the face/hinge formulations, but such an equivalence would seem to be nontrivial.

Tensorially, we may attempt to express a multigraph by writing down one tensor for each type of multigraph vertex. This means that there must be infinitely many tensor types: for any sequence of positive integers k_i , $0 \leq i \leq n$, we need a tensor

with k_i indices associated with vector space i for each i . It would be nicer if, as in the case of standard bialgebras, one could express the desired algebraic system using finitely many tensor types.

A natural way to attempt to do this is to introduce symmetric branching tensors $T(i)_{a_1 \dots a_k}^c$ and $T(i)_c^{a_1 \dots a_k}$ for each vector space i and for each nonnegative integer k . Now we may use the original V 's and these T 's in combination to indicate branching. If a white vertex is adjacent to k_i edges of type i for each i , then we will write this vertex as $V_{x_0 \dots x_n} T(0)_{a_{01} \dots a_{0k_0}}^{x_0} \dots T(n)_{a_{n1} \dots a_{nk_n}}^{x_n}$. Black vertices are treated similarly. For example, the tensor $V^{wcg} V_{xch} V^{ydh} V_{zdg} T_w^{ab} T_x^{ab} T_y^{ef} T_{ef}^z$ represents the multigraph in Figure 63. Note that it is not necessary to indicate the vector space associated with each T here, since it is implicit: if a T is traced with the i th index of a V tensor, then it must be associated with the i th vector space.

The situation is similar to that of a commutative cocommutative bialgebra. Each $T(i)_{a_1 \dots a_k}^c$ can be thought of as a commutative multiplication operator. Then if $k > 1$ we may write $T(i)$ in terms of tensors of the form $T(i)_{ab}^x$ satisfying the commutativity and associativity axioms. If we reverse upper and lower indices we get tensors of the form $T(i)_x^{ab}$ satisfying the cocommutativity and coassociativity axioms. If $k = 1$ then we have tensors of the form $T(i)_a^c$. These indicate that there is a single edge going from a to c ; hence $T(i)_a^c = \delta(i)_a^c$ where $\delta(i)$ refers to the Kronecker delta on vector space i . If $k = 0$ then we have tensors of the form $T(i)^c$. These play the role of the unit in a bialgebra. Reversing upper and lower indices gives the counit $T(i)_c$. Both of these tensors indicate that a pathway comes to a dead end. Hence it is reasonable to suppose that $T(i)_{ab}^c T(i)_c = T(i)_a T(i)_b$, $T(i)_{ab}^c T(i)^a = \delta(i)_b^c$, and $T(i)_a T(i)^a = 1$.

In short, for each vector space i we have abstract tensors $T(i)_{ab}^c$, $T(i)_c^{ab}$, $T(i)_a^c$, $T(i)_c$ and $\delta(i)_a^b$ satisfying all of the axioms of a commutative cocommutative bialgebra *except* for the main bialgebra axiom $T(i)_{ab}^c T(i)_c^{de} = T_a^{wx} T_b^{yz} T_{wy}^d T_{xz}^e$ relating multiplication and comultiplication. It is tempting to think that this axiom should be included also. But this turns out to be mistaken, as we shall see.

The next step is to introduce additional axioms which generate local equivalence transformations of these space sets. We already have axioms which describe relationships among the T 's. We still need axioms that describe relationships among the V 's, and axioms that relate the T 's to the V 's.

The former sort of axioms are the topological equivalence moves. Just as in the previous section, the idea is to perform these moves at a place where no branching is




Figure 64: The first group of topological equivalence moves on n -graphs. Here the moves for $n = 1$ through 4 are shown (in column 1 through 4 of the figure). In the first row, color the edges in any way you like such that the rules of n -graphs are maintained. This determines the free edges of each diagram (I did not draw in the free edges). Each diagram contains one free edge of each color. Each move exchanges two of these diagrams with the free edges of the same color identified. A similar set of moves is obtained by reversing vertex colors. In the second row, color the edges of the right-hand diagrams in any way consistent with n -graph rules. Then the two free edges have the same color i . The single edge in the left-hand diagrams denotes $\delta(i)_a^b$. The bottom-row move generates the top-row move (in the same column) that exchanges the first two diagrams.

involved. Thus these are moves on the V 's alone. The moves need to be tensorial in nature; that is, they must be local on the tensor diagram. (The moves should be of the form “the product of these tensors traced with one another in this way is equal to the product of those tensors traced with one another in that way.”) The dipole moves do not satisfy this requirement, since they involve checking the properties of components of subgraphs. Hence new moves are required. At present I know some promising moves in n dimensions, but have only proven their sufficiency in the two-dimensional case.

The moves that I have found fall into two groups. Those in the first group (see Figure 64) are the following:

$$V_{a_0 \dots a_r b_{r+1} \dots b_n} V^{c_0 \dots c_r b_{r+1} \dots b_n} V_{c_0 \dots c_r d_{r+1} \dots d_n} = V_{a_0 \dots a_r d_{r+1} \dots d_n}$$

for $0 \leq r < n$. These moves are special cases of dipole moves in which the checking of components may be done locally. Note that the $r = 0$ move is implied by the simpler

move

$$V_{ab_1\dots b_n} V^{cb_1\dots b_n} = \delta_a^c,$$

so it is better to substitute this move for the $r = 0$ move.

Suppose we are about to apply one of these moves to an n -graph. Define the face vector $f = (f_0 \dots f_n)$ where f_k is the number of k -faces in the pseudomanifold before applying a move. Let f' be the face vector of the pseudomanifold after the move is applied. Due to the symmetry of the situation there are $\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ different types of moves. For each type of move there is an associated constant vector g_k , independent of the particular n -graph being operated on, such that $f'_k = f_k + g_k$. It turns out that the $\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ vectors g_k are independent. This means that these moves cannot be sufficient to generate topological equivalence unless there are $n+1 - \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$ independent linear relations on face vectors that are topological invariants of n -graphs. The Euler characteristic is one such relation; the relation $(n+1)V = 2E$ (V is the number of vertices; E is the number of edges) is another. It is possible that n -graphs are such that other linear invariants of this sort exist, but I doubt it. My guess is that if one imposes restrictions on the types of allowed pseudomanifold, more such relations might show up. For example, the Dehn-Sommerville relations (see [13]) are linear relations among faces of simplicial complexes that hold when the complexes are required to be Eulerian manifolds. Something like this might hold also for n -graphs. But, without such a restriction, more face-number-changing moves are probably needed.

The moves in the second group (see Figure 65) do not affect face vectors. It is difficult to write down a general formula for these moves; instead I will describe an inductive method of generating them.

To begin, consider the following construction in n dimensions. We start by drawing an n -simplex in the usual way. Now construct a graphical diagram associated with this simplex. Place vertices at the center of each k -face of the simplex, and color them white if k is even and black if k is odd. If a k -face is contained in a $(k+1)$ -face, draw an edge of the graph connecting the vertex at the center of the k -face to the vertex at the center of the $(k+1)$ -face. For each white vertex at the corners of the simplex (i.e., the vertices at the centers of the 0-faces) draw a “free” edge emerging from the vertex and pointing away from the simplex.

Now each vertex in the diagram has degree $n+1$. It remains to color the edges. Arbitrarily assign each of the colors 0 through n to the free edges. Next consider

any other edge e . It joins the vertex at the center of a k -face to the vertex at the center of a $(k + 1)$ -face that contains it. Consider the free edges at the corners of the $(k + 1)$ -face. Exactly one of these edges is not at a corner of the k -face. Give edge e the same color as the color of that free edge. The result is that every vertex in the diagram meets exactly one edge of each color. Topologically, the diagram represents an n -ball.

Call any such k -dimensional diagram a “ k -ball.” For $0 < k < n$ we construct n -dimensional moves from these k -balls as follows. Let $N = \{0, \dots, n\}$. Choose a k -ball whose edge colors lie in some set $K \subset N$ (hence $|K| = k + 1$). Create a new vertex outside the k -ball. For each of the $n - k$ colors in $N \setminus K$, attach an edge of that color connecting the central vertex of the k -ball (i.e., the vertex that was placed at the center of the k -face of the k -simplex) to the new vertex, and attach a free edge of that color to each of the other vertices in the k -ball. For each color in K , attach a free edge of that color to the new vertex. Now we pair up the free edges and label them. The pairs of edges are labelled a and a' , b and b' , and so on; each pair is labelled with a distinct symbol. The pairing is as follows. If the color of a free edge attached to a vertex on the k -ball is in K , it is paired with the free edge with the same color that is attached to the new vertex. Otherwise, each free edge is paired with the free edge of the same color that is attached to the opposite vertex of the k -ball. (A vertex of the graph is the center of a face of the simplex. This face is determined by m corner vertices of the simplex. The vertex of the graph that is at the center of the face determined by the remaining corner vertices of the simplex is the opposite vertex.) The resulting diagram is the left-hand side of the move. The right-hand side is a copy of the same diagram, with primed and unprimed indices reversed, and with the colors of the vertices reversed if k is even.

Examples are given in Figure 65. It is by no means self-evident that there exists a finite set of local moves that generate topological equivalence in n dimensions, let alone that these groups of moves are sufficient for this purpose. In fact, I do not even know whether or not the moves in group 2 preserve the topology when $n > 2$. (They seemed such a nice generalization of the $n = 2$ group-2 move that I could not resist writing them down.) What I do know is that these moves are indeed sufficient in two dimensions, in which case there is one type of move in each group. The moves in this case are similar to those for two-dimensional Poincaré graphs (see Figure 60).

A question which I have avoided thus far is this: what is the meaning of a scalar




Figure 65: Topological equivalence moves from group two. Pictured at left in row one is a 1-ball and in row two is a 2-ball (free vertices are not drawn). To the right in row 1 are two moves using the 1-ball (for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$). To the right in row 2 is a move using the 2-ball (for $n = 3$).

that involves only T 's and no V 's? A clue is provided by the bottom row of moves in the figure. They suggest a way of interpreting T 's which gives a means to directly translate any scalar in T 's and V 's (whether V 's are present or not) into a multigraph. This is shown in Figure 66. Also shown there are the multigraphs associated with the scalars $T_{ab}^c T_c^{ab}$ and $T_a^{wx} T_b^{yz} T_{wy}^a T_{xz}^b$. The second scalar is obtained from the first by applying the main bialgebra axiom. However, the first multigraph describes a set of two spaces, and the second graph describes a set of three spaces. So this axiom is not correct in the present context.

Finally we need axioms relating the V 's and T 's. An obvious axiom of this sort arises from the fact that if a vertex doesn't connect to anything along a certain vector space, then it cannot be present in any pseudomanifold in the space set. Hence it may be removed, and its connections to other tensors may be replaced by units or counits. Thus $V_{a_0 \dots a_n} T(0)^{a_0} = T(1)_{a_1} \cdots T(n)_{a_n}$. (For each axiom there is a corresponding symmetry class of axioms generated by orientation reversal [i.e., switching upper indices with lower indices] and by permuting vector spaces. I will only list one element of each symmetry class.)

This relates vertices to units; now it would be nice to relate vertices to the multiplication and comultiplication tensors. A simple axiom of this sort is the following




Figure 66: An interpretation of T 's in terms of multigraphs. The leftmost figure is a way to picture a tensor $T(0)_a^{bc}$ that is consistent with our foregoing discussion. This gives a means for associating a multigraph with the tensors $T(0)_{ab}^c T(0)_c^{ab}$ (center) and $T(0)_a^{wx} T(0)_b^{yz} T(0)_{wy}^a T(0)_{xz}^b$ (right). The center multigraph contains two spaces (one containing the leftmost 0-edge and one containing the rightmost 0-edge). The right multigraph contains three spaces (one containing the leftmost 0-edge and not the rightmost 0-edge, one containing the rightmost 0-edge and not the leftmost 0-edge, and one containing both the leftmost and rightmost 0-edges). Thus these multigraphs are not equivalent.

analogue of the splitting axioms described previously. If the paths emerging from a vertex along vector space i branches into two parts, we may replace this vertex with two vertices, one whose path along i goes along one branch, and one whose path along i goes along the other branch. The paths along vector spaces other than i which led to the original vertex must now themselves branch and go to each of the two new vertices. Thus we have $V_{a_0 \dots a_n} T_{xy}^{a_0} = V_{x b_1 \dots b_n} V_{y c_1 \dots c_n} T_{a_1}^{b_1 c_1} \dots T_{a_n}^{b_n c_n}$.

I suspect that these axioms are not sufficient. Presently I am puzzling over the situation in Figure 67. Here there are two versions of moves in two dimensions which resemble the main bialgebra axiom. One of the moves seems to be correct, and the other doesn't, as explained in the figure. I do not know how to obtain the correct-seeming move using the moves mentioned so far. So there is more work to be done here.

Note that in one dimension the topological equivalence moves are $V_{ab} V^{ac} = \delta_b^c$ and $V_{ba} V^{ca} = \delta_b^c$. We may add to this, for example, the move

$$V_{ab} V^{ac} T_{de}^b T_c^{fg} = V_{rd} V_{se} V^{tf} V^{ug} T_{wx}^r T_{yz}^s T_t^{wy} T_u^{xz}.$$

It follows that all bialgebra moves hold on the T 's, that each scalar may be expressed




Figure 67: Two two-dimensional moves suggested by the main bialgebra move. The left one works; the right one doesn't. Here large vertices (colored black and white) represent the V 's; small vertices represent T 's. In the left-hand diagram of the first move, two 01-polygons meet two 02-polygons at a 0-edge. In the right-hand diagram, each 01-polygon and 02-polygons now corresponds to two polygons, and each 01-polygon can meet exactly one 02-polygon. Thus in both cases there are four ways for the polygons to meet at this juncture. In the second move, on the left four 01-polygons meet one 02-polygon. On the right, it is not clear anymore how many 01-polygons there are; there now might be new polygons that pass through this piece of the multigraph twice. This is the source of the problem with the second move.

entirely in terms of T 's, and that from the combinatorial spacetime point of view this algebraic formulation is equivalent to the bialgebra formulation.

To summarize, in n dimensions our algebraic structure contains $n + 1$ vector spaces, the tensors V , and multiplication, comultiplication, unit and counit tensors on each vector space i . The latter satisfy all axioms of a commutative cocommutative bialgebra except for the main bialgebra axiom. There is an axiom relating the V 's and the units and counits, and other axioms (perhaps including generalizations of the main bialgebra axiom) relating the V 's and the multiplication and comultiplication tensors. Finally there are topological equivalence axioms on the V 's.

The construction of these algebraic systems is a work in progress. My hope is that the finished systems will have the property that scalars will describe sets of oriented n -dimensional spaces and that the axioms will generate all local, invertible, topology-preserving transformations on these space sets. Of course, this may not turn out to be possible. If it does turn out to be possible, then it seems that these systems

might be considered to be natural n -dimensional generalizations of commutative cocommutative bialgebras. If we then drop the commutativity and cocommutativity axioms from the T 's, perhaps the resulting systems might be considered to be natural n -dimensional generalizations of bialgebras.

10 Conclusion

Clearly no unified field theory has emerged from these pages. In fact, no direct contact has been made with any part of mainstream physics whatsoever.

However, worse things could have happened. The research program could have come to a dead end. There might have been no obtainable general results of any significant sort.

Quite the opposite has occurred. Repeated advances have been made. New and elegant structure has emerged. Points of contact (often unexpected ones) have been established with various more established areas of mathematics (including Hopf algebras, which seemingly have some relevance to physics). No roadblocks have appeared to prevent further progress.

As I see it, the evidence indicates that the point of view which I have tried to put forth here (indeed, it is this point of view which to my mind constitutes the main substance of this dissertation) is a mathematically fruitful one. It remains to determine whether it will be a physically fruitful one as well.

I suggest, then, that the project is worth continuing. Any and all interested readers are encouraged to join in.

References

- [1] Eiichi Abe, *Hopf Algebras*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- [2] Jean Berstel, “Fibonacci words—a survey,” *The Book of L*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- [3] Rufus Bowen and John Franks, “Homology for zero-dimensional nonwandering sets,” *Annals of Mathematics* **106** (1977) 73-92.
- [4] Rufus Bowen and O. E. Lanford III, “Zeta functions of restrictions of the shift transformation,” *Global Analysis*. Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, volume 14. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 1970.
- [5] Tim Boykett, “Combinatorial construction of one dimensional reversible cellular automata,” in *Contributions to General Algebra*, volume 9, edited by G. Pilz. Wien: Verlag Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995.
- [6] Mike Boyle and David Handelman, “Orbit equivalence, flow equivalence and ordered cohomology,” preprint.
- [7] Richard A. Brualdi and Herbert J. Ryser, *Combinatorial Matrix Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [8] James T. Cushing and Ernan McMullin, editors, *Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory: Reflections on Bell’s Theorem*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- [9] Hartmut Ehrig, Hans-Jörg Kreowski and Gregorz Rozenberg, editors, *Graph Grammars and Their Applications to Computer Science: Fourth International Workshop*, proceedings. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [10] M. Ferri and C. Gagliardi, “Crystallisation Moves,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **100** (1982) 85-103.
- [11] John Franks, “Flow equivalence of subshifts of finite type,” *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **4** (1984) 53-66.
- [12] Edward Fredkin and Tommaso Toffoli, “Conservative Logic,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **21** (1982) 219-253.

- [13] Branko Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*. London: Interscience, 1967.
- [14] Paul Halpern, “Sticks and stones: a guide to structurally dynamic cellular automata,” *American Journal of Physics* **57** (1989) 405-408.
- [15] Paul Halpern and Gaetano Caltagirone, “Behavior of topological cellular automata,” *Complex Systems* **4** (1990) 623-651.
- [16] Tetsuya Hattori and Shinji Takesue, “Additive conserved quantities in discrete-time lattice dynamical systems,” *Physica D* **49** (1991) 295-322.
- [17] David Hillman, “The structure of reversible one-dimensional cellular automata,” *Physica D* **52** (1991) 277-292.
- [18] Kenneth Hoffman and Ray Kunze, *Linear Algebra*, second edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [19] Gerard 't Hooft, “Equivalence relations between deterministic and quantum mechanical systems,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **53** (1988) 323-344.
- [20] Gerard 't Hooft, “A two-dimensional model with discrete general coordinate invariance,” *Physicalia Magazine* **12** (1990) 265-278.
- [21] Danrun Huang, “Flow equivalence of reducible shifts of finite type,” *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **14** (1994) 695-720.
- [22] Danrun Huang, “The classification of two-component Cuntz-Krieger Algebras,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* (forthcoming).
- [23] Danrun Huang, “Flow equivalence of reducible shifts of finite type and Cuntz-Krieger algebras,” *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik* **462** (1995) 185-217.
- [24] Danrun Huang, “Flow equivalence of reducible shifts of finite type and Cuntz-Krieger algebras II: complete classifications,” preprint.
- [25] Andrew Ilachinski and Paul Halpern, “Structurally dynamic cellular automata,” *Complex Systems* **1** (1987) 503-527.
- [26] Louis H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics*, second edition. Singapore: World Scientific, 1993.
- [27] Douglas Lind and Brian Marcus, *An Introduction to Symbolic Dynamics and Coding*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [28] Sóstenes Lins and Arnaldo Mandel, “Graph-encoded 3-manifolds,” *Discrete Mathematics* **57** (1985) 261-284.
- [29] Norman Margolus, “Physics-like models of computation,” *Physica D* **10** (1984) 81-95. Also appears in [50].

- [30] John Milnor, "On the Entropy Geometry of Cellular Automata," *Complex Systems* **2** (1988) 357-386.
- [31] Bill Parry and Dennis Sullivan, "A topological invariant of flows on 1-dimensional spaces," *Topology* **14** (1975) 297-299.
- [32] Roger Penrose, "Applications of negative dimensional tensors," *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications*, edited by D. J. A. Welsh. London: Academic Press, 1971.
- [33] M. Pezzana, "Diagrammi di Heegaard e triangolazione contratta," *Boll. Univ. Mat. Ital.* **12** (1975) 98-105.
- [34] Y. Pomeau, "Invariant in cellular automata," *Journal of Physics A* **17** (1984) L415-L418. Also appears in [50].
- [35] Grzegorz Rozenberg and Arto Salomaa, *The Mathematical Theory of L Systems*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- [36] Grzegorz Rozenberg and Arto Salomaa, editors, *Lindenmayer Systems: Impacts on Theoretical Computer Science, Computer Graphics, and Developmental Biology*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [37] David Ruelle, *Dynamical Zeta Functions for Piecewise Monotone Maps of the Interval*. CRM Monograph Series, volume 4. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 1994.
- [38] H. Seifert and W. Threlfall, *A Textbook of Topology*. Translated by Michael A. Goldman. Boston: Academic Press, 1980.
- [39] Moss E. Sweedler, *Hopf Algebras*. New York: W. A. Benjamin, 1969.
- [40] Shinji Takesue, "Reversible cellular automata and statistical mechanics," *Physical Review Letters* **59** (1987) 2499-2502.
- [41] Shinji Takesue, "Ergodic properties and thermodynamic behavior of elementary reversible cellular automata. I. Basic properties," *Journal of Statistical Physics* **56** (1989) 371-402.
- [42] Shinji Takesue, "Fourier's law and the Green-Kubo formula in a cellular-automaton model," *Physical Review Letters* **64** (1990) 252-255.
- [43] Tommaso Toffoli, "Physics and computation," *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **21** (1982) 165-175.
- [44] Tommaso Toffoli, "Cellular automata as an alternative to (rather than an approximation of) differential equations in modeling physics," *Physica D* **10** (1984) 117-127.

- [45] Gérard Y. Vichniac, “Simulating physics with cellular automata,” *Physica D* **10** (1984) 96-116.
- [46] A. Vince, “Combinatorial maps,” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory B* **34** (1983) 1-21.
- [47] R. F. Williams, “Classification of subshifts of finite type,” *Annals of Mathematics* **98** (1973) 120-153; errata **99** (1974) 380-381.
- [48] Stephen Wolfram, “Statistical mechanics of cellular automata,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **55** (1983) 601-644. Also appears in [50].
- [49] Stephen Wolfram, “Universality and complexity in cellular automata,” *Physica D* **10** (1984) 1-35. Also appears in [50].
- [50] Stephen Wolfram (ed.), *Theory and Applications of Cellular Automata*. Singapore: World Scientific (1986).