

# Category Theory by Example

Ivan Murashko

July 31, 2018



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Base definitions</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Definitions . . . . .	7
1.1.1	Object . . . . .	7
1.1.2	Morphism . . . . .	8
1.1.3	Category . . . . .	10
1.2	Examples . . . . .	11
1.2.1	<b>Set</b> category . . . . .	11
1.2.2	Programming languages . . . . .	15
1.2.3	Quantum mechanics . . . . .	19
<b>2</b>	<b>Objects and morphisms</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1	Equality . . . . .	21
2.2	Initial and terminal objects . . . . .	22
2.3	Product and sum . . . . .	24
2.4	Exponential . . . . .	24
2.5	Programming languages and algebraic data types . . . . .	24
2.6	Examples . . . . .	25
2.6.1	<b>Set</b> category . . . . .	25
2.6.2	Programming languages . . . . .	25
2.6.3	Quantum mechanics . . . . .	28
<b>3</b>	<b>Functors</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1	Definitions . . . . .	29
3.2	Natural transformations . . . . .	30
3.3	Examples . . . . .	30
3.3.1	<b>Set</b> category . . . . .	30
3.3.2	Programming languages . . . . .	30
3.3.3	Quantum mechanics . . . . .	30
<b>4</b>	<b>Monads</b>	<b>31</b>



# Introduction

There is an introduction to Category Theory. There are a lot of examples in each chapter. The examples covers different category theory application areas. I assume that the reader is familiar with the corresponding area if not the example(s) can be passed. Anyone can choose the most suitable example(s).

The most important examples are related to the set theory. The set theory and category theory are very close related. Each one can be considered as an alternative view to another one.

There are a lot of examples from programming languages. There are Haskell, Scala, C++. The source files for programming languages examples (Haskell, C++, Scala) can be found on github repo [\[4\]](#).

The examples from physics are related to quantum mechanics that is the most known for me. For the examples I am inspired by the Bob Coecke article [\[1\]](#).



# Chapter 1

## Base definitions

### 1.1 Definitions

#### 1.1.1 Object

**Definition 1.1** (Class). A class is a collection of sets (or sometimes other mathematical objects) that can be unambiguously defined by a property that all its members share.

**Definition 1.2** (Object). In category theory object is considered as something that does not have internal structure (aka point) but has a property that makes different objects belong to the same [Class](#)

**Remark 1.3** (Class of Objects). The [Class](#) of [Objects](#) will be marked as  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  (see fig. 1.1).



Figure 1.1: Class of objects  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) = \{a, b, c, d\}$

### 1.1.2 Morphism

Morphism is a kind of relation between 2 **Objects**.

**Definition 1.4** (Morphism). A relation between two **Objects**  $a$  and  $b$

$$f_{ab} : a \rightarrow b$$

is called *morphism*. Morphism assumes a direction i.e. one **Object** ( $a$ ) is called *source* and another one ( $b$ ) *target*.

The **Set** of all morphisms between objects  $a$  and  $b$  is called as  $\text{hom}(a, b)$ .

**Definition 1.5** (Domain). Given a **Morphism**  $f : a \rightarrow b$ , the **Object**  $a$  is called domain and is denoted as  $\text{dom } a$ .

**Definition 1.6** (Codomain). Given a **Morphism**  $f : a \rightarrow b$ , the **Object**  $b$  is called codomain and is denoted as  $\text{cod } a$ .

**Morphisms** have several properties.<sup>1</sup>

**Axiom 1.7** (Composition). If we have 3 **Objects**  $a, b$  and  $c$  and 2 **Morphisms**

$$f_{ab} : a \rightarrow b$$

and

$$f_{bc} : b \rightarrow c$$

then there exists **Morphism**

$$f_{ac} : a \rightarrow c$$

such that

$$f_{ac} = f_{bc} \circ f_{ab}$$

**Remark 1.8** (Composition). The equation

$$f_{ac} = f_{bc} \circ f_{ab}$$

means that we apply  $f_{ab}$  first and then we apply  $f_{bc}$  to the result of the application i.e. if our objects are sets and  $x \in a$  then

$$f_{ac}(x) = f_{bc}(f_{ab}(x)),$$

where  $f_{ab}(x) \in b$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>The properties don't have any proof and postulated as axioms



**Axiom 1.9** (Associativity). The *Morphisms Composition* (Axiom 1.7) should follow associativity property:

$$f_{ce} \circ (f_{bc} \circ f_{ab}) = (f_{ce} \circ f_{bc}) \circ f_{ab} = f_{ce} \circ f_{bc} \circ f_{ab}.$$

**Definition 1.10** (Identity morphism). For every *Object*  $a$  we define a special *Morphism*  $1_{[a]} : a \rightarrow a$  with the following properties:  $\forall f_{ab} : a \rightarrow b$

$$1_{[a]} \circ f_{ab} = f_{ab} \quad (1.1)$$

and  $\forall f_{ba} : b \rightarrow a$


$$f_{ba} \circ 1_{[a]} = f_{ba}. \quad (1.2)$$

This morphism is called *identity morphism*.

Note that *Identity morphism* is unique, see *Identity is unique* (Theorem 2.3) below.

**Definition 1.11** (Commutative diagram). A commutative diagram is a diagram of *Objects* (also known as vertices) and *Morphisms* (also known as arrows or edges) such that all directed paths in the diagram with the same start and endpoints lead to the same result by composition

The following diagram commutes if  $f_{ab} = f_{cb} \circ f_{ac}$ .



**Remark 1.12** (Class of Morphisms). The *Class* of *Morphisms* will be marked as  $\text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$  (see fig. 1.2)

**Definition 1.13** (Monomorphism). If  $\forall g_1, g_2$  the equation

$$f \circ g_1 = f \circ g_2$$

leads to

$$g_1 = g_2$$

then  $f$  is called *monomorphism*.



Figure 1.2: Class of morphisms  $\text{hom}(\mathbf{C}) = \{f, g, h\}$ , where  $h = f \circ g$

**Definition 1.14** (Epimorphism). If  $\forall g_1, g_2$  the equation

$$g_1 \circ f = g_2 \circ f$$

leads to

$$g_1 = g_2$$

then  $f$  is called *epimorphism*.

**Definition 1.15** (Isomorphism). A **Morphism**  $f : a \rightarrow b$  is called isomorphism if  $\exists g : b \rightarrow a$  such that  $f \circ g = \mathbf{1}_{[a]}$  and  $g \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{[b]}$ .

**Remark 1.16** (Isomorphism). There are can be many different **Isomorphisms** between 2 **Objects**.

### 1.1.3 Category

**Definition 1.17** (Category). A category  $\mathbf{C}$  consists of

- **Class** of **Objects**  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$
- **Class** of **Morphisms**  $\text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$  defined for  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$ , i.e. each morphism  $f_{ab}$  from  $\text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$  has both source  $a$  and target  $b$  from  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$

For any **Object**  $a$  there should be unique **Identity morphism**  $\mathbf{1}_{[a]}$ . Any morphism should satisfy **Composition** (**Axiom 1.7**) and **Associativity** (**Axiom 1.9**) properties. See fig. 1.3

The **Category** can be considered as a way to represent a structured data. **Morphisms** are the ones to form the structure.




Figure 1.3: Category  $\mathbf{C}$ . It consists of 4 objects  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and 7 morphisms  $\text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) = \{f, g, h = f \circ g, 1[a], 1[b], 1[c], 1[d]\}$

**Definition 1.18** (Opposite category). If  $\mathbf{C}$  is a [Category](#) then opposite (or dual) category  $\mathbf{C}^{op}$  is constructed in the following way: [Objects](#) are the same, but the [Morphisms](#) are inverted i.e. if  $f \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$  and  $\text{dom } f = a, \text{cod } f = b$ , then the corresponding morphism  $f^{op} \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C}^{op})$  has  $\text{dom } f^{op} = b, \text{cod } f^{op} = a$  (see fig. 1.4)

**Remark 1.19.** Composition on  $\mathbf{C}^{op}$  As you can see from fig. 1.4 the [Composition](#) ([Axiom 1.7](#)) is reverted for [Opposite category](#). If  $f, g, h = f \circ g \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$  then  $f \circ g$  translated into  $g^{op} \circ f^{op}$  in opposite category.

## 1.2 Examples

There are several examples of categories that will also be used later

### 1.2.1 Set category

**Definition 1.20** (Set). Set is a collection of distinct object. The objects are called the elements of the set.

**Definition 1.21** (Binary relation). If  $A$  and  $B$  are 2 [Sets](#) then a subset of  $A \times B$  is called binary relation  $R$  between the 2 sets, i.e.  $R \subset A \times B$ .

**Definition 1.22** (Function). Function  $f$  is a special type of [Binary relation](#). I.e. if  $A$  and  $B$  are 2 [Sets](#) then a subset of  $A \times B$  is called function  $f$  between the 2 sets if  $\forall a \in A \exists! b \in B$  such that  $(a, b) \in f$ . In other words function does not allowed “multi value”.




Figure 1.4: Opposite category  $C^{op}$  to the category from fig. 1.3 . It consists of 4 objects  $\text{ob}(C^{op}) = \text{ob}(C) = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and 7 morphisms  $\text{hom}(C^{op}) = \{f^{op}, g^{op}, h^{op} = g^{op} \circ f^{op}, 1[a], 1[b], 1[c], 1[d]\}$

**Example 1.23** (Set category). In the set category we consider a **Set** of **Sets** where **Objects** are the **Sets** and **Morphisms** are **Functions** between the sets.

The **Identity morphism** is trivial function such that  $\forall x \in X : 1_X(x) = x$ .

In general case when we say **Set** category we assume the set of all sets. But the result is inconsistent because famous Russell’s paradox [9] can be applied. To avoid such situations we assume the some kind of limitations are applied on our construction, for instance ZFC [10]

**Remark 1.24** (Set vs Category). There is an interesting relation between sets and categories. In both we consider objects(sets) and relations between them(morphisms/functions).

In the set theory we can get info about functions by looking inside the objects(sets) aka use “microscope” [3]

Contrary in the category theory we initially don’t have info about object internal structure but can get it using the relation between the objects i.e. using **Morphisms**. In other words we can use “telescope” [3] there.

**Definition 1.25** (Singleton). The *singleton* is a **Set** with only one element.

**Definition 1.26** (Domain). Given a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , the set  $X$  is the domain.

**Definition 1.27** (Codomain). Given a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , the set  $Y$  is the codomain.

**Definition 1.28** (Surjection). The function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is surjective (or onto) if  $\forall y \in Y, \exists x \in X$  such that  $f(x) = y$  (see figs. 1.5 and 1.9).



Figure 1.5: A surjective (non-injective) function from domain  $X$  to codomain  $Y$




Figure 1.6: A non-surjective function  $f$  from domain  $X$  to codomain  $Y' \subset Y$ .  $\exists g_1 : Y' \rightarrow Y', g_2 : Y \rightarrow Y$  such that  $g_1(Y') = g_2(Y')$ , but as soon as  $Y' \neq Y$  we have  $g_1 \neq g_2$ . Using the fact that  $Y'$  is codomain of  $f$  we got  $g_1 \circ f = g_2 \circ f$ . I.e. the function  $f$  is not epimorphism.

**Remark 1.29** (Surjection vs Epimorphism). [Surjection](#) and [Epimorphism](#) are related each other. Consider a non-surjective function  $f : X \rightarrow Y' \subset Y$  (see fig. 1.6). One can conclude that there is not an [Epimorphism](#) because  $\exists g_1 : Y' \rightarrow Y'$  and  $g_2 : Y \rightarrow Y$  such that  $g_1 \neq g_2$  because they operates on different [Domains](#) but from other hand  $g_1(Y') = g_2(Y')$ . For instance we can choose  $g_1 = \mathbf{1}_{[Y']}$ ,  $g_2 = \mathbf{1}_{[Y]}$ . As soon as  $Y'$  is [Codomain](#) of  $f$  we always have  $g_1(f(X)) = g_2(f(X))$ .

As result we can say that an [Surjection](#) is a [Epimorphism](#) in **Set** category. Moreover there is a proof [7] of that fact.

**Definition 1.30** (Injection). The function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is injective (or one-to-one function) if  $\forall x_1, x_2 \in X$ , such that  $x_1 \neq x_2$  then  $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$  (see




Figure 1.7: A injective (non-surjective) function from domain  $X$  to codomain  $Y$



Figure 1.8: A non-injective function  $f$  from domain  $X$  to codomain  $Y$ .  $\exists g_1 : A \rightarrow X, g_2 : B \rightarrow X$  such that  $g_1 \neq g_2$  but  $f \circ g_1 = f \circ g_2$ . I.e. the function  $f$  is not monomorphism.

figs. 1.7 and 1.9).

**Remark 1.31** (Injection vs Monomorphism). [Injection](#) and [Monomorphism](#) are related each other. Consider a non-injective function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  (see fig. 1.8). One can conclude that it is not monomorphism because  $\exists g_1, g_2$  such that  $g_1 \neq g_2$  and  $f(g_1(a_1)) = y_3 = f(g_2(b_1))$ .

As result we can say that an [Injection](#) is a [Monomorphism](#) in **Set** category. Moreover there is a proof [6] of that fact.

**Definition 1.32** (Bijection). The function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is bijective (or one-to-one correspondence) if it is an [Injection](#) and a [Surjection](#) (see fig. 1.9).



Figure 1.9: An injective and surjective function (bijection)

There is a question what's analog of a single [Set](#). Main characteristic of a category is a structure but the set by definition does not have a structure. Which category does not have any structure? The answer is [Discrete category](#).

**Definition 1.33** (Discrete category). Discrete category is a [Category](#) where [Morphisms](#) are only [Identity morphisms](#).

### 1.2.2 Programming languages

In the programming languages we consider types as [Objects](#) and functions as [Morphisms](#). The critical requirements for such consideration is that the functions have to be pure function (without side effects). This requirement mainly is satisfied by functional languages such as Haskell and Scala. From other side the functional languages use lazy evaluation to improve the performance. The laziness can also make category theory axiom invalid (see [Haskell lazy evaluation](#) ([Remark 1.35](#))).

Strictly speaking neither Haskell (pure functional language) nor C++ can be considered as a category in general. As a first approximation the functional language (Haskell, Scala) can be considered as a category if we avoid to use functions with side effects (mainly for Scala) and use strict (for both Haskell and Scala) evaluations.

In any case we can construct a simple toy category that can be easy implemented in any language. Particularly we will look into category with 3 objects that are types: `Int`, `Bool`, `String`. There are also several functions between them (see [fig. 1.10](#)).




Figure 1.10: Programming language category example. Objects are types: Int, Bool, String. Morphisms are several functions

### Hask category

**Example 1.34** (**Hask** category). Types in Haskell are considered as **Objects**. Functions are considered as **Morphisms**. We are going to implement **Category** from fig. 1.10.

The function `isEven` that converts Int type into Bool.

```
isEven :: Int -> Bool
isEven x = x `mod` 2 == 0
```

There is also **Identity morphism** that is defined as follows

```
id :: a -> a
id x = x
```

If we have an additional function

```
stringLength :: String -> Int
stringLength x = length x
```

then we can create a **Composition** (**Axiom 1.7**)

```
isStringLengthEven :: String -> Bool
isStringLengthEven = isEven . stringLength
```



**Remark 1.35** (Haskell lazy evaluation). Each Haskell type has a special value  $\perp$ . The value presents and lazy evaluations make several category law invalid, for instance [Identity morphism](#) behaviour become invalid in specific cases:

The following code

```
seq undefined True
```

produces *undefined* But the following

```
seq (id.undefined) True
seq (undefined.id) True
```

produces *True* in both cases. As result we have (we cannot compare compare functions in Haskell, but if we could we can get the following)

```
id . undefined /= undefined
undefined . id /= undefined,
```

i.e. [\(1.1\)](#) and [\(1.2\)](#) are not satisfied.

## C++ category

**Example 1.36** (C++ category). We will use the same trick as in [Hask category](#) ([Example 1.34](#)) and will assume types in C++ as [Objects](#), functions as [Morphisms](#). We also are going to implement [Category](#) from [fig. 1.10](#).

We also define 2 functions:

```
auto isEven = [](int x) {
    return x % 2 == 0;
};

auto stringLength = [](std::string s) {
    return static_cast<int>(s.size());
};
```

Composition can be defined as follows:

```
// h = g . f
template <typename A, typename B>
auto compose(A g, B f) {
    auto h = [f, g](auto a) {
        auto b = f(a);
        auto c = g(b);
```

```

    return c;
  };
  return h;
};

```

The [Identity](#) morphism:

```

auto id = [] (auto x) { return x; };

```

The usage examples are the following:

```

auto isStringLengthEven = compose<>(isEven, stringLength);

auto isStringLengthEvenL = compose<>(id, isStringLengthEven);

auto isStringLengthEvenR = compose<>(isStringLengthEven, id);

```

Such construction will always provides us the category as soon as we use pure function (functions without effects).

### Scala category

**Example 1.37** (Scala category). We will use the same trick as in [Hask category](#) ([Example 1.34](#)) and will assume types in Scala as [Objects](#), functions as [Morphisms](#). We also are going to implement [Category](#) from [fig. 1.10](#).

```

object Category {
  def id[A]: A => A = a => a
  def compose[A, B, C] (g: B => C, f: A => B):
    A => C = g compose f

  val isEven = (i: Int) => i % 2 == 0
  val stringLength = (s: String) => s.length
  val isStringLengthEven = (s: String) =>
    compose(isEven, stringLength)(s)
}

```

The usage example is below

```

class CategorySpec extends Properties("Category") {
  import Category._
  import Prop.forAll

  property("composition") = forAll { (s: String) =>

```

```

    isStringLengthEven(s) == isEven(stringLength(s))
  }

  property("right id") = forAll { (i: Int) =>
    isEven(i) == compose(isEven, id[Int])(i)
  }

  property("left id") = forAll { (i: Int) =>
    isEven(i) == compose(id[Boolean], isEven)(i)
  }
}

```

### 1.2.3 Quantum mechanics

The most critical property of quantum system is superposition principle. The **Set** category (Example 1.23) cannot be used for it because it does not satisfied the principle.

A simple modification of the **Set** category can satisfy the principle.

**Example 1.38 (Rel category).** We will consider a set of sets (same as **Set** category (Example 1.23) ) i.e. **Sets** as **Objects**. Instead of **Functions** we will use **Binary relations** as **Morphisms**.

The **Rel** category is similar to the finite dimensional Hilber space especially because it assumes some kind of superposition. Really consider  $\mathbf{C_R}$  - the **Rel** category.  $X, Y \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C_R})$  - 2 sets which consists of different elements. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  - **Morphism**. Each element  $x \in X$  is mapped to a subset  $Y' \subset Y$ . The  $Y'$  can be **Singleton** (in this case no differences with **Set** category (Example 1.23) ) but there can be a situation when  $Y'$  consists of several elements. In the case we will get some kind of superposition that is analogiest to quantum mechanics.

**Example 1.39 (FdHilb category).** We are going to consider finite dimensional Hilber space as a category where **Objects** are the collections (**Sets**) of system states in the Hilbert space and **Morphisms** are linear operators which transforms one state into another one.

TBD



# Chapter 2

## Objects and morphisms

### 2.1 Equality

The important question is how can we decide whenever an object/morphism is equal to another object/morphism? The trivial answer is possible for if an **Object** is a **Set**. In this case we can say that 2 objects are equal if they contains the same elements. Unfortunately we cannot do the same for default objects as soon as they don't have any internal structure. We can use the same trick as in **Set vs Category** (**Remark 1.24**) : if we cannot use “microscope” lets use “telescope” and define the equality of objects and morphisms of a category  $\mathbf{C}$  in the terms of whole  $\text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Objects equality). Two **Objects**  $a$  and  $b$  in **Category**  $C$  are equal if there exists an unique **Isomorphism**  $f : a \rightarrow b$ . This also means that also exist unique isomorphism  $g : b \rightarrow a$ . These two **Morphisms** are related each other via the following equations:  $f \circ g = \mathbf{1}_{[a]}$  and  $g \circ f = \mathbf{1}_{[b]}$ .

Unlike **Functions** between **Sets** we don't have any additional info <sup>1</sup> about **Morphisms** except category theory axioms which the morphisms satisfied [2]. This leads us to the following definition for morphisms equality:

**Definition 2.2** (Morphisms equality). Two **Morphisms**  $f$  and  $g$  in **Category**  $C$  are equal if the equality can be derived from the base axioms:

- **Composition** (**Axiom 1.7**)
- **Associativity** (**Axiom 1.9**)
- **Identity morphism**: (1.1), (1.2)

---

<sup>1</sup> for instance info about sets internals. i.e. which elements of the sets are connected by the considered functions

or [Commutative diagrams](#) which postulate the equality.

As an example lets proof the following theorem

**Theorem 2.3** (Identity is unique). *The [Identity morphism](#) is unique.*

*Proof.* Consider an [Object](#)  $a$  and it's [Identity morphism](#)  $1_{[a]}$ . Let  $\exists f : a \rightarrow a$  such that  $f$  is also identity. In the case (1.1) for  $f$  as identity gives

$$f \circ 1_{[a]} = 1_{[a]}.$$

From other side (1.2) for  $1_{[a]}$  satisfied

$$f \circ 1_{[a]} = f$$

i.e.  $f = 1_{[a]}$ . □

## 2.2 Initial and terminal objects

**Definition 2.4** (Initial object). Let  $\mathbf{C}$  is a [Category](#), the [Object](#)  $i \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  is called *initial object* if  $\forall x \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) \exists ! f_x : i \rightarrow x \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$ .

**Definition 2.5** (Terminal object). Let  $\mathbf{C}$  is a [Category](#), the [Object](#)  $t \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  is called *terminal object* if  $\forall x \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) \exists ! g_x : x \rightarrow t \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C})$ .

As you can see the initial and terminal objects are opposite each other. I.e. if  $i$  is an [Initial object](#) in  $\mathbf{C}$  then it will be [Terminal object](#) in the [Opposite category](#)  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{op}}$ .

**Theorem 2.6** (Initial object is unique). *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  is a category and  $i, i' \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  two [Initial objects](#) then there exists an unique [Isomorphism](#)  $u : i \rightarrow i'$  (see [Objects equality](#))*

*Proof.* Consider the following [Commutative diagram](#) (see fig. 2.1) □

**Theorem 2.7** (Terminal object is unique). *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  is a category and  $t, t' \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  two [Terminal objects](#) then there exists an unique [Isomorphism](#)  $v : t' \rightarrow t$  (see [Objects equality](#))*

*Proof.* Just got to the [Opposite category](#) and revert arrows in fig. 2.1. The result shown on fig. 2.2 and it proofs the theorem statement. □




Figure 2.1: Commutative diagram for initial object unique proof




Figure 2.2: Commutative diagram for terminal object unique proof




Figure 2.3: Product  $c = c_1 \times c_2$ .  $\forall c, \exists! h \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C}) : \pi'_1 = \pi_1 \circ h, \pi'_2 = \pi_2 \circ h$ .

## 2.3 Product and sum

The pair of 2 objects is defined via so called universal property in the following way:

**Definition 2.8** (Product). Let we have a category  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  -two **Objects** the product of the objects  $c_1, c_2$  is another object in  $\mathbf{C}$   $c = c_1 \times c_2$  with 2 **Morphisms**  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  such that  $a = g_a c, b = g_b c$  and the following universal property is satisfied:  $\forall c' \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  and morphisms  $\pi'_1 : \pi'_2 c' = c_1, \pi'_2 : \pi'_2 c' = c_2$ , exists unique morphism  $h$  such that the following diagram (see fig. 2.3) commutes, i.e.  $\pi'_1 = \pi_1 \circ h, \pi'_2 = \pi_2 \circ h$ . In other words  $h$  factorizes  $\pi'_{1,2}$ .

If we invert arrows in **Product** we will got another object definition that is called sum

**Definition 2.9.** [Sum] Let we have a category  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  -two **Objects** the sum of the objects  $c_1, c_2$  is another object in  $\mathbf{C}$   $c = c_1 \oplus c_2$  with 2 **Morphisms**  $i_1, i_2$  such that  $c = i_1 c_1, c = i_2 c_2$  and the following universal property is satisfied:  $\forall c' \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C})$  and morphisms  $i'_1 : i'_1 x_1 = c', i'_2 : i'_2 x_2 = c'$ , exists unique morphism  $h$  such that the following diagram (see fig. 2.4) commutes, i.e.  $i'_1 = h \circ i_1, i'_2 = h \circ i_2$ . In other words  $h$  factorizes  $i'_{1,2}$ .

## 2.4 Exponential

TBD

## 2.5 Programming languages and algebraic data types

TBD





Figure 2.4: Sum  $c = c_1 \oplus c_2$ .  $\forall c, \exists! h \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C}) : i'_1 = h \circ i_1, i'_2 = h \circ i_2$ .

## 2.6 Examples

### 2.6.1 Set category

**Example 2.10** (Initial object). **[Set]** Note that there is only one function from empty set to any other sets [5] that makes the empty set as the **Initial object** in **Set category** (Example 1.23).

**Example 2.11** (Terminal object). **[Set]** **Terminal object** in **Set category** (Example 1.23) is a set with one element i.e **Singleton**.

**Example 2.12** (Product). **[Set]** The **Product** of two sets  $A$  and  $B$  in **Set category** (Example 1.23) is defined as a Cartesian product:  $A \times B = \{(a, b) | a \in A, b \in B\}$ .

**Example 2.13** (Sum). **[Set]** The of two sets  $A$  and  $B$  in **Set category** (Example 1.23) is defined as disjoint union [8]. Let  $\{A_i : i \in I\}$  be a family of sets indexed by  $I$ . The disjoint union of this family is the set

$$\sqcup_{i \in I} A_i = \cup_{i \in I} \{(x, i) : x \in A_i\}.$$

The elements of the disjoint union are ordered pairs  $(x, i)$ . Here  $i$  serves as an auxiliary index that indicates which  $A_i$  the element  $x$  came from.

### 2.6.2 Programming languages

In our toy example fig. 1.10 the type `String` is **Initial object** and type `Bool` is the **Terminal object**. From other side there are types in different programming languages that satisfies the definitions of initial and terminal objects.

#### Hask category

**Example 2.14** (Initial object). **[Hask]** If we avoid lazy evaluations in Haskell (see **Haskell lazy evaluation** (Remark 1.35)) then we can found

the following types as candidates for initial and terminal object in haskell. Initial object in **Hask** category (Example 1.34) is a type without values

```
data Empty
```

i.e. you cannot construct a object of the type.

There is only one function from the initial object:

```
absurd :: Empty -> a
```

The function is called absurd because it does absurd action. Nobody can proof that it does not exist. For the existence proof can be used the following absurd argument: “Just provide me an object type Empty and I will provide you the result of evaluation”.

There is no function in opposite direction because it would had been used for the Empty object creation.

**Example 2.15** (Terminal object). **[Hask]** Terminal object (unit) in **Hask** category (Example 1.34) keeps only one element

```
data () = ()
```

i.e. you can create only one element of the type. You can use the following function for the creation:

```
unit :: a -> ()
unit _ = ()
```

**Example 2.16** (Product). **[Hask]** The **Product** in **Hask** category (Example 1.34) keeps a pair and the constructor defined as follows

```
(,) :: a -> b -> (a, b)
(,) x y = (x, y)
```

There are 2 projectors:

```
fst :: (a, b) -> a
fst (x, _) = x
snd :: (a, b) -> b
snd (_, y) = y
```

**Example 2.17** (Sum). **[Hask]** The **in** **Hask** category (Example 1.34) defined as follows

```
data Either a b = Left a | Right b
```

The typical usage is via pattern matching for instance

```
factor :: (a -> c) -> (b -> c) -> Either a b -> c
factor f _ (Left x) = f x
factor _ g (Right y) = g y
```

**C++ category**

**Example 2.18** (Initial object). [C++] In C++ exists a special type that does not hold any values and as result that cannot be created:

```
void
```

You cannot create an object of that type: you will get a compiler error if you try.

**Example 2.19** (Terminal object). [C++] C++ 17 introduced a special type that keeps only one value:

```
namespace std {
    struct monostate {};
}
```

**Example 2.20** (Product). [C++] The [Product](#) in [C++ category](#) ([Example 1.36](#)) keeps a pair and the constructor defined as follows

```
namespace std {
    template< class A, class B > struct pair {
        T1 first;
        T2 second;
    };
}
```

There is a simple usage example

```
#include <utility>
#include <iostream>

int main()
{
    std::pair<int, bool> p(0, false);

    std::cout << "First projector: " << p.first << std::endl;
    std::cout << "Second projector: " << p.second << std::endl;

    return 0;
}
```

Really any struct or class can be considered as the product.

**Example 2.21** (Sum). [C++] The modern C++ suggest TBD  
TBD

**Scala category**

**Example 2.22** (Initial object). [Scala] We used a same trick as for [Initial object](#) ([Example 2.14](#)) and define [Initial object](#) in **Scala** category ([Example 1.37](#)) as a type without values

```
sealed trait Empty
```

i.e. you cannot construct a object of the type.

**Example 2.23** (Terminal object). [Scala] We used a same trick as for [Terminal object](#) ([Example 2.15](#)) and define [Terminal object](#) in **Scala** category ([Example 1.37](#)) as a type with only one value

```
abstract final class Unit extends AnyVal
```

TBD i.e. you can create only one element of the type.

TBD

**2.6.3 Quantum mechanics**

TBD

# Chapter 3

## Functors

### 3.1 Definitions

**Definition 3.1** (Functor). Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  are 2 categories. A mapping  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  between the categories is called *functor* is it preserves the internal structure (see fig. 3.1):

- $\forall a_C \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C}), \exists a_D \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{D})$  such that  $a_D = F(a_C)$
- $\forall f_C \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{C}), \exists f_D \in \text{hom}(\mathbf{D})$  such that  $\text{dom } f_D = F(\text{dom } f_C), \text{cod } f_D = F(\text{cod } f_C)$ . We will use the following notation later:  $f_D = F(f_C)$ .
- $\forall f_C, g_C$  the following equation holds:

$$F(f_C \circ g_C) = F(f_C) \circ F(g_C) = f_D \circ g_D.$$

- $\forall x \in \text{ob}(\mathbf{C}) : F(1_x) = 1_{F(x)}$ .



Figure 3.1: Functor  $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  definition

**Remark 3.2** (Functor). When we say that functor preserve internal structure means that functor is not just mapping between [Objects](#) but also between [Morphisms](#).

**Definition 3.3** (Category Composition). TBD

**Definition 3.4** (Category Identity). TBD

**Definition 3.5** (Cat category). TBD

**Definition 3.6** (Category Product). TBD

**Definition 3.7** (Bifunctor). TBD

## 3.2 Natural transformations

TBD

## 3.3 Examples

### 3.3.1 Set category

TBD

### 3.3.2 Programming languages

**Hask category**

TBD

**C++ category**

TBD

**Scala category**

TBD

### 3.3.3 Quantum mechanics

TBD

# Chapter 4

## Monads

TBD





# Index

- C++** category
  - example, [17](#)
- C++** category example, [27](#)
- Cat** category
  - definition, [30](#)
- FdHilb** category
  - example, [19](#)
- Hask** category
  - example, [16](#)
- Hask** category example, [17](#), [18](#), [26](#)
- Rel** category
  - example, [19](#)
- Scala** category
  - example, [18](#)
- Scala** category example, [28](#)
- Set** category
  - example, [12](#)
- Set** category example, [19](#), [25](#)
- Associativity axiom, [10](#), [21](#)
  - declaration, [9](#)
- Bifunctor
  - definition, [30](#)
- Bijection
  - definition, [14](#)
- Binary relation, [11](#), [19](#)
  - definition, [11](#)
- Category, [10](#), [11](#), [15–18](#), [21](#), [22](#)
  - definition, [10](#)
  - dual, [11](#)
  - opposite, [11](#)
- Category Composition
  - definition, [30](#)
- Category Identity
  - definition, [30](#)
- Category Product
  - definition, [30](#)
- Class, [7](#), [9](#), [10](#)
  - definition, [7](#)
- Class of Morphisms
  - remark, [9](#)
- Class of Objects
  - remark, [7](#)
- Codomain, [13](#)
  - definition, [8](#), [12](#)
- Commutative diagram, [22](#)
  - definition, [9](#)
- Composition
  - opposite category, [11](#)
  - remark, [8](#)
- Composition axiom, [9–11](#), [16](#), [21](#)
  - declaration, [8](#)
- Discrete category, [15](#)
  - definition, [15](#)
- Disjoint union, [25](#)
- Domain, [13](#)
  - definition, [8](#), [12](#)
- Epimorphism, [13](#)

- definition, 10
- Function, 12, 19, 21
  - definition, 11
- Functor
  - definition, 29
  - remark, 30
- Haskell lazy evaluation
  - remark, 17
- Haskell lazy evaluation remark, 15, 25
- Identity is unique theorem, 9
  - declaration, 22
- Identity morphism, 9, 10, 12, 15–18, 21, 22
  - definition, 9
- Initial object, 22, 25, 26, 28
  - C++** example, 27
  - Hask** example, 25
  - Scala** example, 28
  - Set** example, 25
  - definition, 22
- Initial object example, 28
- Initial object is unique theorem
  - declaration, 22
- Injection, 14
  - definition, 13
- Injection vs Monomorphism
  - remark, 14
- Isomorphism, 10, 21, 22
  - definition, 10
  - remark, 10
- Monomorphism, 14
  - definition, 9
- Morphism, 8–12, 15–19, 21, 24, 30
  - C++** example, 17
  - FdHilb** example, 19
  - Hask** example, 16
  - Rel** example, 19
- Scala** example, 18
- Set** example, 12
  - definition, 8
- Morphisms equality
  - definition, 21
- Object, 7–12, 15–19, 21, 22, 24, 30
  - C++** example, 17
  - FdHilb** example, 19
  - Hask** example, 16
  - Rel** example, 19
  - Scala** example, 18
  - Set** example, 12
  - definition, 7
- Objects equality, 22
  - definition, 21
- Opposite category, 11, 22
  - definition, 11
- Product, 24–27
  - C++** example, 27
  - Hask** example, 26
  - Set** example, 25
  - definition, 24
- Set, 8, 11, 12, 15, 19, 21
  - definition, 11
- Set vs Category
  - remark, 12
- Set vs Category remark, 21
- Singleton, 19, 25
  - definition, 12
- Sum
  - C++** example, 27
  - Hask** example, 26
  - Set** example, 25
- Surjection, 13, 14
  - definition, 12
- Surjection vs Epimorphism
  - remark, 13
- Terminal object, 22, 25, 28

**C++** example, [27](#)

**Hask** example, [26](#)

**Scala** example, [28](#)

**Set** example, [25](#)

definition, [22](#)

Terminal object example, [28](#)

Terminal object is unique theorem  
declaration, [22](#)



# Bibliography

- [1] Coecke, B. Introducing categories to the practicing physicist / Bob Coecke. — 2008. — <https://arxiv.org/abs/0808.1032>.
- [2] ([https://math.stackexchange.com/users/142355/david\\_myers](https://math.stackexchange.com/users/142355/david_myers)), D. M. How should i think about morphism equality? — Mathematics Stack Exchange. — URL:<https://math.stackexchange.com/q/1346167> (version: 2015-07-01). <https://math.stackexchange.com/q/1346167>.
- [3] Milewski, B. Category Theory for Programmers / B. Milewski. — Bartosz Milewski, 2018. — <https://github.com/hmemcpy/milewski-ctfp-pdf/releases/download/v0.7.0/category-theory-for-programmers.pdf>.
- [4] Murashko, I. Category theory. — <https://github.com/ivanmurashko/articles/tree/master/cattheory/src>. — 2018.
- [5] ProofWiki. Empty mapping is unique / ProofWiki. — 2018. — [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Empty\\_Mapping\\_is\\_Unique](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Empty_Mapping_is_Unique).
- [6] ProofWiki. Injection iff monomorphism in category of sets / ProofWiki. — 2018. — [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Injection\\_iff\\_Monomorphism\\_in\\_Category\\_of\\_Sets](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Injection_iff_Monomorphism_in_Category_of_Sets).
- [7] ProofWiki. Surjection iff epimorphism in category of sets / ProofWiki. — 2018. — [https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Surjection\\_iff\\_Epimorphism\\_in\\_Category\\_of\\_Sets](https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Surjection_iff_Epimorphism_in_Category_of_Sets).
- [8] Wikipedia. Disjoint union — wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. — 2017. — [Online; accessed 13-April-2017]. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Disjoint\\_union&oldid=774047863](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Disjoint_union&oldid=774047863).
- [9] Wikipedia contributors. Russell's paradox — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. — 2018. — [Online; accessed 29-July-2018]. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russell%27s\\_paradox&oldid=852430810](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Russell%27s_paradox&oldid=852430810).

- [10] Wikipedia contributors. Zermelo–fraenkel set theory — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. — 2018. — [Online; accessed 29-July-2018]. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Zermelo%E2%80%9993Fraenkel\\_set\\_theory&oldid=852467638](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Zermelo%E2%80%9993Fraenkel_set_theory&oldid=852467638).