

Some criteria for implementations of disjunction and conjunction in microKanren

Anonymous Author(s)

Abstract

We describe how an additional language feature—namely variadic, “rest argument” functions—can lead to a more powerful kernel language. We implement disjunction and conjunction functions that preserve search order and that do not create superfluous closures. The result is a shorter and simpler overall implementation that is more elegant.

ACM Reference Format:

Anonymous Author(s). 2022. Some criteria for implementations of disjunction and conjunction in microKanren. In *Proceedings of miniKanren Workshop (mKW '22)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

More languages than ever before support variable arity functions/methods (aka `varargs` aka `slurpy` methods), including JavaScript, Raku, Java, Python, and Ruby, to name just a few. microKanren [5] is a compact approach to implementing a relational programming language. The microKanren approach has worked out well as a tool for understanding the guts of a relational programming language through studying its implementation. The microKanren reimplementations separates surface syntax macros from function definitions. In doing so, the authors hoped this separation would simultaneously aid future would-be implementers when studying the source code, and also that the functional core would make the language easier to port to other functional hosts. To support both those efforts, they also chose to program in a deliberately small and workaday set of Scheme primitives.

This note shows how an implementer using a host language with variadic (any number of arguments) functions can build a somewhat more powerful kernel language and obviate macros for disjunction and conjunction. Until now there was a large gap between those microKanren implementations in languages with expressive macro systems and those without; variadic functions permit an intermediate

point in the language design space. Even implementers in languages *with* macro systems might choose to replace existing less powerful language primitives by our comparatively short but more powerful variants. Beyond that, this more powerful kernel language obviates several macros in the desugaring layer, and eventually leads us to see merit in modifying the core language’s syntax. This is, of course, subjective.

Beyond being a conceptually simpler foundation for a full Kanren language at the level of *The Reasoned Schemer, Second Edition*, this implementation appears to be more *efficient*. Right-associative conjunction is already conjectured in miniKanren implementation folklore to be an inefficient design choice. We were pleasantly surprised that thinking about the expressivity of primitives and code improvement “horse sense” led us to the same improved design.

In Section 2, we briefly revisit microKanren implementations and illustrate why surface syntax macros had seemed practically mandatory. In Section 3, we implement conjunction and disjunction, and in Section 4 we discuss the reimplementation of the impure operators. We close with a discussion of some performance impacts of these implementation choices, and consider how Kanren language implementers outside of the Scheme family might benefit from these alternatives.

2 All Aboard!

We assume the reader is familiar with the miniKanren language as described in *The Reasoned Schemer, Second Edition* and in particular with microKanren implementations. See minikanren.org for many implementations across multiple host languages.

The world’s shortest subway system is Haifa’s Carmelit, with only six stations. The system is a line, so its trains travel back and forth. If we wanted to describe the order in which we rode the train from the beginning to the end, we could use the `carmelit-subway` relation in Listing 1. We express this relation using the more compact miniKanren syntax because unfolding this relation into binary conjunctions and disjunctions would be painful. We certainly *could* write it out by hand—in fact, we could write it out many ways. We could nest those conjunctions to the left, or to the right, or try and reduce the indentation by trying to keep them somewhat balanced: the program itself does not seem to obviously encourage one particular choice.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

mKW '22, September 15, 2022, Ljubljana, Slovenia

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

```

111 (defrel (carmelit-subway a b c d e f)
112   (conde
113     ((= a 'carmel-center)
114      (= b 'golomb)
115      (= c 'masada)
116      (= d 'haneviim)
117      (= e 'hadar-city-hall)
118      (= f 'downtown))
119     ((= a 'downtown)
120      (= b 'hadar-city-hall)
121      (= c 'haneviim)
122      (= d 'masada)
123      (= e 'golomb)
124      (= f 'carmel-center))))

```

Listing 1. A miniKanren version of the Carmelit subway.

```

128 (define-syntax conde
129   (syntax-rules ()
130     ((conde (g ...) ...)
131      (disj (conj g ...) ...))))
132
133 (define-syntax disj
134   (syntax-rules ()
135     ((disj) #u)
136     ((disj g) g)
137     ((disj g0 g ...) (disj2 g0 (disj g ...))))
138
139 (define ((disj2 g1 g2) s)
140   (append∞ (g1 s) (g2 s)))
141
142 (define-syntax conj
143   (syntax-rules ()
144     ((conj) #s)
145     ((conj g) g)
146     ((conj g0 g ...) (conj2 g0 (conj g ...))))
147
148 (define ((conj2 g1 g2) s)
149   (append-map∞ g2 (g1 s)))
150

```

Listing 2. Macro based implementations of disj and conj.

Listing 2 shows typical macro-based implementations of conde and the underlying conjunction and disjunction operations. Here, #s and #u represent primitive goals that unconditionally succeed and fail, respectively.

3 disj and conj logical goal constructors

The disj and conj macros of Listing 2 are not *quite* defined as simple recursions over their binary functional primitives. The definition of zero-way conjunction (disjunction) is independent of the unfolding of conj₂ (disj₂). In a sense

```

166 (define ((disj g . gs) s)
167   (D (g s) gs s))
168
169 (define (D s∞ gs s)
170   (cond
171     ((null? gs) s∞)
172     (else
173      (append∞ s∞
174       (D ((car gs) s) (cdr gs) s))))))
175

```

Listing 3. Re-implementation of disj.

```

176
177
178 (define ((conj g . gs) s)
179   (C gs (g s)))
180
181 (define (C gs s∞)
182   (cond
183     ((null? gs) s∞)
184     (else
185      (C (cdr gs)
186       (append-map∞ (car gs) s∞))))))
187

```

Listing 4. Re-implementation of conj.

the disj and conj macros confuse and entangle primitive success and failure goals with those recursive unfoldings in terms of the binary operators.

Those zero-way logical operation base cases don't add much. The programmer who tries to write an elegant, efficient solution to a pure relational programming task would not encounter these additional base cases in conde expressions. The programmer knows statically how such goals should behave, so there is no benefit to executing them. A conjunction of no goals would simply succeed, and a disjunction of no goals would simply fail. Truthfully, only the impure conda operator seems to require these additional base cases (discussed further in Section 4). They are for all intents and purposes superfluous.

Here, we want to implement disjunction and conjunction over one-or-more goals as functions. These implementations will rely on variadic function syntax, but should not require apply or rely on the binary disj₂ and conj₂. Further, they should not build any extraneous closures: unnecessarily building closures at runtime is always a bad idea.

Listings 3 and 4 show our new implementations. Mandating one-or-more arguments lets us re-implement these operators as shallow wrappers over simple folds. The first step in each is merely to remove the rest argument gs and act as if there were no need for a rest argument. That is, all of our focus will be on the *list*, gs. Unlike D, the function C does not take in the state s; the help procedure does not need the state for conjunction. In each recursive call, we accumulate by mapping (using the special delaying implementation of

append-map for miniKanren streams) the next goal in the list. This left-fold implementation of conjunction therefore left-associates the conjuncts.

3.1 Implementation correctness

Equipped with variadic functions, a developer might discover these definitions as follows. We start from the definition of the disj macro in Listing 5. At the cost of an apply, we can build the corresponding explicitly recursive disj function.

```
(define-syntax disj
  (syntax-rules ()
    ((disj g) g)
    ((disj g0 g1 g ...)
     (disj2 g0 (disj g1 g ...))))
```

```
(define (disj g . gs)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) g)
    (else (disj2 g (apply disj gs)))))
```

Listing 5. Deriving disj function from macro.

Since disj produces and consumes goals, we can η expand the definition in Listing 5 by a curried parameter s . We then split disj into two mutually-recursive procedures, to build the variant in Listing 6.

```
(define ((disj g . gs) s)
  (D g gs s))

(define (D g gs s)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) (g s))
    (else ((disj2 g (apply disj gs)) s))))
```

Listing 6. An η expanded and split definition of disj.

We can replace the call to disj₂ in Listing 6 by its definition in terms of append $^\infty$ and perform a trivial β -reduction. The explicit s argument suggests removing the call to apply and making D recursive. The result is the version of D in Listing 7. The definition of disj in remains unchanged from Listing 6.

```
(define (D g gs s)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) (g s))
    (else
     (append $^\infty$  (g s)
                 (D (car gs) (cdr gs) s))))
```

Listing 7. Derivation of disj function definition.

We combine g and s in each clause; this suggests constructing that stream in disj and passing it along. Making this final change results in the definition in Listing 8.

```
(define-syntax conj
  (syntax-rules ()
    ((conj g) g)
    ((conj g g1 gs ...)
     (conj (conj2 g g1) gs ...))))

(define (conj g . gs)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) g)
    (else
     (apply conj
              (cons (conj2 g (car gs)) (cdr gs))))))
```

Listing 8. conj₂-based conj function and macro.

We can derive the definition of conj from Listing 4 via a similar process. Starting with the variadic function based on the macro in Listing 8, we first η -expand and split the definition.

```
(define ((conj g . gs) s)
  (C g gs s))

(define (C g gs s)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) (g s))
    (else
     ((apply conj
              (cons (conj2 g (car gs)) (cdr gs)))
      s))))
```

Listing 9. Derivation of split conj function definition.

We next substitute for the definitions of conj and conj₂.

```
(define (C g gs s)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) (g s))
    (else
     (C (lambda (s) (append-map $^\infty$  (car gs) (g s)))
        (cdr gs)
        s))))
```

Listing 10. Replacing apply in C function definition.

Finally, since C only needs s to *build* the stream, we can assemble the stream on the way in—instead of passing in g and s separately, we pass in their combination as a stream. The function is tail recursive, we can change the signature in the one and only external call and the recursive call. We show the result in Listing 4.

Both the variadic function based and the macro based versions of Listing 8 use a left fold over the goals, whereas the versions of `disj` use a right fold. This is not an accident. It is miniKanren folklore that left associating conjunctions tends to improve miniKanren performance. A full, thorough, explanation of everything known about this behavior is outside the scope of our work here, but see discussions and implementation of [7]. The matter seems so significant that the community might consider reclassifying left-associative conjunction as a matter of correctness rather than an optimization, as in “tail call optimization” vs. “Properly Implemented Tail Call Handling” [3]. However, we have generally resorted to small step visualizations of the search tree to demonstrate why that might be. The authors believe it is worth considering if we can make an equally compelling argument for this preference through equational reasoning. Listing 11 shows a right-fold variant of `conj`. The choice to fold left becomes a little more obvious after we η -expand, unfold to a recursive help function, substitute in the definition of `conj2`, and β -reduce.

```
(define (conj g . gs)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) g)
    (else (conj2 g (apply conj gs)))))
```

Listing 11. A right-fold variant of `conj`.

```
(define ((conj g . gs) s)
  (C gs (g s)))

(define (C g gs s)
  (cond
    ((null? gs) (g s))
    (else (append-map $\infty$  (apply C gs) (g s)))))
```

Here, we cannot (easily) replace the `apply` call by a recursive call to `C`, because we are still waiting for an `s`. We can only abstract over `s` and wait.

```
(define (C gs s $\infty$ )
  (cond
    ((null? gs) s $\infty$ )
    (else
     (append-map $\infty$ 
      ( $\lambda$  (s) (C (cdr gs) ((car gs) s)))
      s $\infty$ )))))
```

Since we know that any call to `append-map ∞` we construct will always yield a result, the version in Listing 4 is tail recursive. The equivalent right-fold implementation needs to construct a closure for every recursive call. If we want to implement a variadic version that does not rely on a primitive `conj2` and does not resort to `apply`, we have the two aforementioned choices. Basic programming horse sense suggests the variant from Listing 4.

```
(defrel (carmelit-subway a b c d e f)
  (disj
    (conj (== a 'carmel-center)
          (== b 'golomb)
          (== c 'masada)
          (== d 'haneviim)
          (== e 'hadar-city-hall)
          (== f 'downtown))
    (conj (== a 'downtown)
          (== b 'hadar-city-hall)
          (== c 'haneviim)
          (== d 'masada)
          (== e 'golomb)
          (== f 'carmel-center)))))
```

Listing 12. A new Carmelit subway without `conde`.

Though this note mainly concerns the choice to implement surface language behavior as functions, it may also point to these as more natural user-level primitives than `conde`. An implementation could choose to forego `conde` and provide just those underlying logical primitives `disj` and `conj` to the user, as in the new definition of Carmelit in Listing 12. Moreover, reintroducing the nullary case only requires a simple wrapper macro, or otherwise, a run-time `null?` check for a very slight cost.

4 Tidying up the Impure Operators

The operators `conda` and `conde` look superficially similar, syntactically. Semantically though, `conda`’s nested “if-then-else” behavior is quite different, and implementing the desired behavior for `conda` from existing pieces points to some strangeness. The definition of `conda` (see Listing 13) requires one or more conjuncts per clause and one or more clauses. The consequent of each `conda` clause is the one and only place in the whole language implementation that permits nullary conjunctions of goals. This soft-cut operator seems to force both nullary conjunction and those primitive goals `#s` and `#u` into the language.

Some programmers would be perfectly satisfied just using `ifte` directly. But just as the standard forked `if` begat McCarthy’s `if` notation and `cond`, we can suspect that a programmer would eventually feel the need for a nested implementation. There are other alternative implementation choices one could consider.

1. Syntactically mandate that all clauses *except the final default clause* contain at least two goals.
2. Introduce a special clause of the `conda` macro specifically for “if then” clauses with a single goal.
3. Unconditionally add an `#s` goal to each clause during macro expansion.

```

441 (define-syntax conda
442   (syntax-rules ()
443     ((conda (g0 g ...) (conj g0 g ...))
444      ((conda (g0 g ...) ln ...)
445       (ifte g0 (conj g ...) (conda ln ...)))))
446
447 (define ((ifte g1 g2 g3) s)
448   (let loop ((s∞ (g1 s)))
449     (cond
450      ((null? s∞) (g3 s))
451      ((pair? s∞)
452       (append-map g2 s∞))
453      (else (lambda ()
454               (loop (s∞)))))))

```

Listing 13. A typical implementation of conda.

```

458 (define ((conda q a . q-and-a*) s)
459   (A (q s) a q-and-a* s))
460
461 (define (A s∞ a q-and-a* s)
462   (cond
463    ((null? s∞)
464     (cond
465      ((null? (cdr q-and-a*)) ((car q-and-a*) s))
466      (else (A ((car q-and-a*) s)
467                (cadr q-and-a*)
468                (cddr q-and-a*)
469                s))))
470    ((pair? s∞) (append-map∞ a s∞))
471    (else (lambda () (A (s∞) a q-and-a* s)))))

```

Listing 14. A functional conda implementation.

Each of these choices can, implicitly or explicitly, force additional unneeded executions of unwanted goals. Working with variable arity function syntax also suggests a more elegant solution for conda.

The implementation in Listing 14 includes the delay-and-restart behavior of ifte together with conda’s logical cascade. The s_{∞} can be either empty, non-empty, or a function of no arguments. In the last case, we invoke s_{∞} . Rather than building a largely redundant implementation of conda, we expose the higher-order goal once to the user. The definition of once in Listing 15 is taken directly from [4]. The programmer can simulate conda by wrapping once around every test goal.

5 Conclusion

This note shows that at the cost of one additional feature—namely, variadic functions—implementers provide a somewhat more powerful core language and significantly reduce

```

496 (define (once g)
497   (lambda (s)
498     (let loop ((s-inf (g s)))
499       (cond
500        ((null? s-inf) '())
501        ((pair? s-inf)
502         (cons (car s-inf) '()))
503        (else (lambda ()
504                 (loop (s-inf)))))))

```

Listing 15. The once function.

the need for macros in implementing a language as expressive as the full “microKanren + macros” approach provides. Our desugaring macros would have worked whether we left or right associated. Removing a degree of freedom in the implementation, and forcing ourselves to program the solution functionally, led us to what seems like the right solution.

The result is closer to the design of Prolog, where the user represents conjunction of goals in the body of a clause with a comma and disjunction, either implicitly in listing various clauses or explicitly with a semicolon.

We assume it is agreed that our definitions of disj and conj themselves are sufficiently high-level operators for a surface language and that the zero-element base cases are at best unnecessary and likely undesirable; given the opportunity to define a surface language and its desugaring, we really shouldn’t tempt the programmer by making undesirable programs representable when we can avoid it.

Scheme’s polyvariadic function syntax (that is to say “at least k arguments”, for some positive integer k) ensures at a host-language level that the microKanren programmer provides at least one parameter to conj and disj. Embeddings in languages with variadic but without polyvariadic function syntax would have to implement that check.

We have not fully obviated the use of macros. While neither run nor run* have to be macros, for now we still want to implement defrel and fresh with macros. The former to prevent exposing the implementation of streams and delays, and the latter to avoid the inefficiency and clumsiness of introducing variables one at a time.

From time to time we find that the usual miniKanren implementation is itself lower-level than we would like to program with relations. Early microKanren implementations restrict themselves to syntax-rules macros. Some programmers use macros to extend the language further as with matche [6]. Some constructions over miniKanren, such as minikanren-ee [1], may rely on more expressive macro systems like syntax-parse [2].

We would still like to know: are our design goals here also causally related to good miniKanren performance? Regardless, we hope this document helps narrow the gap between implementations in functional host languages with

and without macro systems and helps implementers build more elegant, expressive and efficient Kanrens in their chosen host languages.

References

- [1] Michael Ballantyne, Alexis King, and Matthias Felleisen. 2020. Macros for domain-specific languages. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4, OOPSLA, 1–29.
- [2] Ryan Culpepper. 2012. Fortifying macros. *Journal of functional programming*, 22, 4-5, 439–476.
- [3] Matthias Felleisen. 2014. Re: question about tail recursion. (2014). <https://lists.racket-lang.org/users/archive/2014-August/063844.html>.
- [4] Daniel P. Friedman, William E. Byrd, Oleg Kiselyov, and Jason Hemann. 2018. *The Reasoned Schemer, Second Edition*. The MIT Press, (Mar. 2018). ISBN: 0-262-53551-3. mitpress.mit.edu/books/reasoned-schemer-0.
- [5] Jason Hemann and Daniel P. Friedman. 2013. Mkanren: a minimal functional core for relational programming. In *Scheme 13*. <http://scheme-workshop.org/2013/papers/HemannMuKanren2013.pdf>.
- [6] Andrew W Keep, Michael D Adams, Lindsey Kuper, William E Byrd, and Daniel P Friedman. 2009. A pattern matcher for minikanren or how to get into trouble with cps macros. *Technical Report CPSLO-CSC-09-03*, 37.
- [7] Gregory Rosenblatt, Lisa Zhang, William E Byrd, and Matthew Might. 2019. First-order minikanren representation: great for tooling and search. *Proceedings of the miniKanren Workshop*, 16.