:ROAM$_{\text{REFS}}$: `https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1rpqDXysh8GJJodXCTbWCj4MmIx87mT_ksyMqHoq-hkk/edit`

1 | **Logicomix**

2 | **Category Theory**

- Very general formalism of *objects* and *morphisms* - things and ways to connect them.

- Almost like a 'theory of everything' for math.

2.1 | **Origins**

- At some point Feynman realized that it's useful to draw linear operators as diagrams in a systematic manner.

- Later, Penrose realized that this can be applied more broadly. Representing linear operators in a topological/geometric manner became its own field.

- Separately, logicians had started using categories where the objects were propositions and morphism were proofs.

    - Programmers started using them where objects are data types and morphism are programs.

- Category theory describes all these things in an abstract manner

    - Focus on approaching these relationships and how to compose them in a way abstracted away from objects

- Curry-Howard correspondence

    - Person that Haskell is named after
    - Modeling programs as proofs

2.2 | **Rosetta Stone**

Category Theory	Physics	Topology	Logic	Computation
object	system	manifold	proposition	data type
morphism	process	cobordism	proof	program

2.3 | **Intro to Categories**

A *category* C consists of:

- a collection of *objects*, where if X is an object $X \in C$, and

- for every pair of objects (X, Y), there is a set $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ of morphisms from X to Y We call this set $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ a **homset**. If $f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)$ then f maps X to Y, or more formally, $f : X \to Y$

such that

- for every object X there is an identity morphism that maps X to X.

- morphisms are composable: given $f : X \to Y$ and $g : Y \to Z$ there is a morphism $gf : X \to Z$

- an identity morphism is both a left and a right unit for composition (identities are commutative)

- composition is associative

These objects and morphisms could be anything (see 2.2). Consider the symbols X and Y as sets capable of internal structure.

One example would be Haskell code. Take functions like `words` as morphisms and data types like strings as objects (objects can be different types!). Our output is another object.

```
words "Hello World"
-- ["Hello", "World"]

length ["I", "like", "cats"]
-- 3
```

Just like a normal morphism, we can *compose* functions in Haskell.

```
let countwords = length . words
countwords "Yay for composition!"
-- 3
```

A more casual definition of a category is a *network of composable relationships*… of anything. The generality of category theory allows it to be useful to a wide variety of fields.

2.4 | **Functors**

A *functor* $F : C \to D$ from a category C to a category D is a map sending:

- any object $X \in C$ to an object $F(X) \in D$,

- any morphism $f : X \to Y$ in C to a morphism $F(f) : F(X) \to F(Y)$ in D

in such a way that:

- F preserves identities

- F preserves composition

The primary difference here is how functors can act on both objects and morphisms.

In logic, a category is a *theory* and the functor a *model* of a theory (allowing you to create a representation in another space).

2.5 | **Natural Transformation**

Gives us a way to turn functors into one another.

Given two functors $F, F' : C \to D$ a natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow F'$ assigns to every object X in C a morphism $\alpha_x : F(x) \to F'(X)$ such that for any morphism $f : X \to Y$ in C, the equation $\alpha_y F(f) = F'(f)\alpha_x$ holds in D.

2.6 | **Types of Categories**

2.6.1 | **Monoidal Categories**   **review**

A monoidal category has a function $\otimes : C \times C \to C$ (a product of categories outputs pairs of morphisms and pairs of objects??) that takes two objects and puts them together to give a new object $X \otimes Y$. This allows execution of morphisms in *parallel* or *series* by acting on pairs.

2.6.2 | **Braided Monoidal Categories**   **unresearched**

2.6.3 | **Closed Categories**   **unresearched**

hom(X $\otimes$ Y, Z) $\cong$ hom(Y,X Idea of turning an operation into an object? Connection to currying.

2.7 | **Lambda Calculus**   **unresearched**