# Abstract Categorical Semantics for Functional Reactive Programming with Resources

Wolfgang Jeltsch

TTÜ Küberneetika Instituut Tallinn, Estonia

### Joint Estonian-Latvian Theory Days at Ratnieki

2-5 October 2014





Functional Programming with Resources





2 Functional Programming with Resources

3 Functional Reactive Programming with Resources

Wolfgang Jeltsch (TTÜ Küberneetika Instituut) Abstract Semantics for FRP with Resources

A ▶

# Functional reactive programming (FRP)

- programming paradigm for dealing with temporal aspects in a declarative fashion
- two key features:
  - time-dependent type membership
  - temporal type constructors
- Curry–Howard correspondence to temporal logic:
  - time-dependent trueness
  - temporal operators
- time:
  - linear
  - not necessarily discrete

process consists of a continuous part and optionally a terminal event:



- different process types with different termination guarantees:
  - nontermination possible
  - termination guaranteed
  - termination guaranteed with upper bound on termination time

# Processes that deal with the present

• processes that start immediately:



• processes that may terminate immediately:



•  $\triangleright'$  and  $\triangleright$  definable in terms of  $\triangleright''$ :

$$A \triangleright' B = A \times A \triangleright'' B \qquad A \triangleright B = B + A \triangleright' B$$



### 2 Functional Programming with Resources

### Functional Reactive Programming with Resources

A ▶

# Functional programming with resources

- programming paradigm for dealing with resources in a declarative fashion
- examples of resources:
  - files
  - GUI widgets
  - threads in a concurrent program
- two key features:
  - resource-dependent type membership
  - resource-related type constructors
- Curry–Howard correspondence to the logic of bunched implications (which is similar to linear logic)

- correspond to resource types
- value of such a type describes how to construct a resource from the current resource
- examples:

File file construction Widget widget construction Thread thread construction

(B) < B)</p>

# Resource-related type constructors

- type constructors:
  - ⊗ resource splitting and simultaneous resource construction
  - / construction of the empty resource (destruction)
  - consumption of additional resource
- structure of a symmetric monoidal closed category:
  - $\otimes$  is associative and commutative
  - I is neutral element of ⊗
- generally no duplication and disposal:

 $\begin{array}{l} A \twoheadrightarrow A \otimes A \\ A \twoheadrightarrow I \end{array}$ 



2 Functional Programming with Resources

3 Functional Reactive Programming with Resources

- 47 ▶

- N

• take constructs from both paradigms:

processes  $\triangleright''$ resources  $\otimes$ , *I*,  $\multimap$ 

extend processes:

additionally describe resource transformation over time

generalize semantics for FRP to become semantics for FRP with resources

# Categorical semantics for FRP with and without resources

### basic structure:

without resources cartesian closed category *C* with coproducts  $(\times, 1, \rightarrow, +, \text{ and } 0)$ with resources cartesian closed category *C* with coproducts and a symmetric monoidal closed category structure (all of the above plus  $\otimes$ , *I*, and  $-\circ$ )

• functor that models process type constructor:

 $\triangleright'': C \times C \to C$ 

natural transformations that model FRP operations

# Process joining

• each  $A \triangleright''$  – is something similar to an ideal monad:

$$\vartheta_B^{\prime\prime}:A \triangleright^{\prime\prime} (A \triangleright B) \to A \triangleright^{\prime\prime} B$$

• concatenation of a continuous part with a follow-up process:



makes sense with and without resource transformations in processes

(I) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2)) < ((2))

### Process expansion

• each  $- \triangleright'' B$  is an ideal comonad:

$$\theta_A^{\prime\prime}:A \triangleright^{\prime\prime} B \to (A \triangleright^{\prime} B) \triangleright^{\prime\prime} B$$

• generation of a continuous part of shorter and shorter suffixes:



makes sense with and without resource transformations in processes

(4月) トイヨト イヨ

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \times A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + B_1 \times A_2 + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



• for FRP with resources replace  $\times$  by  $\otimes$ 

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \rhd'' B_1 \times A_2 \rhd'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \rhd'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + B_1 \times A_2 + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



• for FRP with resources replace  $\times$  by  $\otimes$ 

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \times A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + \frac{B_1}{A_2} + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



• for FRP with resources replace  $\times$  by  $\otimes$ 

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \times A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + B_1 \times A_2 + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



• for FRP with resources replace  $\times$  by  $\otimes$ 

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \times A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + B_1 \times A_2 + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



for FRP with resources replace × by ⊗

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \times A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \times A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \times B_2 + B_1 \times A_2 + A_1 \times B_2$$

merging of two processes:



• for FRP with resources replace  $\times$  by  $\otimes$ 

• binary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$A_1 \triangleright'' B_1 \otimes A_2 \triangleright'' B_2 \to (A_1 \otimes A_2) \triangleright'' C$$

with

$$C = B_1 \otimes B_2 + B_1 \otimes A_2 + A_1 \otimes B_2$$

merging of two processes:



for FRP with resources replace × by ⊗

• nullary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$1 \rightarrow 1 \rhd'' 0$$

• construction of canonical nonterminating processes:

1 ⊳″ 0: →

• for FRP with resources replace 1 by /

• nullary coherence map of a lax symmetric monoidal functor:

$$I \rightarrow I \rhd'' 0$$

• construction of canonical nonterminating processes:

/ ⊳‴ 0: →

• for FRP with resources replace 1 by /

# Abstract process categories (APCs)

- our existing abstract semantics for FRP without resources
- different, but equivalent, notion of merging, where suffix of longer process is retained:

$$(A_1 \times A_2) \vDash'' D: \qquad \stackrel{\bullet}{\longrightarrow} \qquad \stackrel{\bullet$$

 $\bullet\,$  definition of merging in APCs uses the peculiarities of  $\times\,$  and 1  $\,$ 

### Theorem

APCs correspond to those of our new categorical models that have the following properties:

- The symmetric monoidal closed category structure (C, ⊗, I, ¬) is the cartesian closed category structure (C, ×, 1, →).
- The corresponding APC-style merging operator is an isomorphism.