

item :: Parser Char

$(\gg=) :: \text{Parser } a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{Parser } b) \rightarrow \text{Parser } b$

The following parser checks to see if the first character on the input satisfies some predicate:

```
satisfy :: (Char → Bool) → Parser Char
satisfy p = do c ← item
              if p c
                then produce c
                else fail
```

This is syntactic sugar for the following equivalent definition:

```
satisfy' :: (Char → Bool) → Parser Char
satisfy' p = item >>= \c →
  if p c
    then produce c
    else fail
```

With `satisfy`, we have the building blocks for lots of parsing.

$\text{char} :: \text{Char} \rightarrow \text{Parser Char}$
 $\text{char } c = \text{satisfy } (c ==)$

NOTE: $(c ==) :: \text{Char} \rightarrow \text{Bool}$
and is defined by:

$$(c ==) x = c == x$$

This parser parses a single Char
and returns it if it succeeds.

Now we can use this to write a parser
that recognises strings:

$\text{string} :: \text{String} \rightarrow \text{Parser String}$

$\text{string } [] = \text{produce } []$

$\text{string } (c:cs) = \text{do char } c$

$\text{string } cs$

$\text{produce } (c:cs)$

This definition is syntactic sugar for:

$\text{string } (c:cs) = \text{char } c \gg= \lambda c' \rightarrow$

$\text{string } cs \gg= \lambda cs' \rightarrow$

$\text{produce } (c:cs)$

Another definition which will be more like parsing grammars in general is the following:

string :: ~~String~~ String → Power String
 string cs = foldr ($\lambda x \text{ pxs} \rightarrow$
 $(:) <\$> \text{char } x <*> \text{pxs}$)
 (produce []) cs
 ↑ ↑
 parses a char parses the string xs

This is the derivation:

given $cs = c_0 : c_1 : c_2 : c_3 : []$
string cs

C_0	C_1	C_2	C_3	[]	
	(:) <\$> char ₀ <*>	...			
				↓	
... (:) <\$> char _L <*>	(:) <\$> char C ₃ <*>	(produce []))