———— MODULE MonadsAndPipes

2 Extends Sequences, Naturals

The goal of this module is to explore the similarity between monads and pipes (as defined below).

The lemmas/theorems/assumptions are provided without proof (neither formal nor informal), and could be wrong. A mistake could invalidate the relationship in some or all cases, but could also be fixable.

There could also be technical mistakes in the spec, as no formal verification has been performed, and I haven't gone over everything carefully, and I may have been sloppy.

Utility definitions

1

17 F

```
22 Range(f) \triangleq \{f[x] : x \in DOMAIN f\}
```

24
$$AddFirst(seq, x) \triangleq \langle x \rangle \circ seq$$

$$26 \ Last(seq) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} seq[Len(seq)]$$

28
$$RemoveN(seq, n) \triangleq SubSeq(seq, 1, Len(seq) - n)$$

$$RemoveLast(seq) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} RemoveN(seq, 1)$$

We begin by specifying the monadic type M(A) through its constructors and deconstructors. We do it this way because it will be necessary when looking at the **operational** semantics of a *bind*. (Constants are module parameters that don't dynamically change over time.)

```
42 CONSTANTS Constructors(_),
43 Deconstructors(_)
```

We assume a monadic value is constructed by a set of constructors. A constructor is a function of a list of values in A. The constructors don't correspond with the data constructors of the monadic value, rather, they are only functions of a list of As, and so "reify" any other arguments, and there can be infinitely many of them.

For example, the Maybe monad would only have two constuctors here, but the Either monad would have one corresponding to Right, and infinitely many corresponding to Left (one for each possible value)

```
56 ASSUME \forall A : \forall cons \in Constructors(A) : Domain cons \subseteq Seq(A)
```

```
59 Our monadic type
```

```
60 M(A) \triangleq \text{UNION} \{Range(cons) : cons \in Constructors(A)\}
```

62 Constructors' ranges are disjoint (but cover all of M(A))

```
63 ASSUME \forall A : \forall c1, c2 \in Constructors(A) : c1 \neq c2 \Rightarrow Range(c2) \cap Range(c2) = \{\}
```

65 Deconstructors' domains are disjoint, but cover all of M(A)

66 ASSUME $\forall A$:

```
67   \( \rangle \ \ des \in Deconstructors(A) : \ \ \ SMA \in \ \ \ SUBSET \ M(A) : \ des \in [SMA \rightarrow Seq(A)] \\
68   \( \rangle \ d1, \ d2 \in Deconstructors(A) : \ d1 \neq d2 \Rightarrow \ \ DOMAIN \ d1 \cap \ DOMAIN \ d2 = \ \ \ \ \ UNION \ \ \ \ DOMAIN \ \ des \in Deconstructors(A) \} = M(A) \\
71  \( \text{ASSUME } \forall A : \\
72  \( \rangle \ des \in Deconstructors(A) : \ \ \ \ accord \ cons[\ des[ma]] = ma \\
73  \( \rangle \ dcons \in Constructors(A) : \ \ \ \ des \in Deconstructors(A) : \ \ \ \ as \in Domain \ cons : \ des[\ cons[as]] = as \\
\end{array}
```

There's actually more we can say about the de/constructors and other functions here. That they're parametric means that the parametericity theorem ("free theorems") holds. But we won't bother specifying it.

We'll later define our bind using a monoidal compose

ΙN

des[ma]

112

113 115

```
CONSTANTS Return(\_),
                    Compose(\_)
 86
     ASSUME \forall A : Return(A) \in [A \to M(A)]
     IsUnit(unit, A) \triangleq
 90
         \forall ma \in M(A) : \land Compose(A)[ma, unit] = ma
 91
                             \land Compose(A)[unit, ma] = ma
 92
     Unit(A) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} CHOOSE \ unit \in M(A) : IsUnit(unit, A)
     Assume \forall A:
 96
                LET compose \stackrel{\Delta}{=} Compose(A)IN
 97
                \land compose \in [M(A) \times M(A) \rightarrow M(A)]
 98
                \wedge \exists unit \in M(A) : IsUnit(unit, A)
 99
                \land \forall x, y, z \in M(A) : compose[compose[x, y], z] = compose[x, compose[y, z]]
100
     For any constuctor the composition of values yielded by two arg lists is the value yielded from the
     concatenation of the lists. Is this true? Partly true?
     THEOREM \forall A : \forall xs, ys \in Seq(A), cons
                                                           \in Constructors(A):
107
                    Compose(A)[cons[xs], cons[ys]] = cons[xs \circ ys]
108
     ConsOf(A, ma) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} CHOOSE \ cons \in Constructors(A) : ma \in Range(cons)
110
```

 $Deconstruct(A, ma) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} LET \ des \stackrel{\triangle}{=} CHOOSE \ des \in Deconstructors(A) : ma \in DOMAIN \ des$

——— MODULE Bind —

We'll specify the operational semantics of a single composition of bind:

```
Bind: M \ a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow M \ b) \rightarrow M \ b
```

- 123 CONSTANT A, B
- 125 CONSTANT F This is the monadic function
- 126 ASSUME $F \in [A \to M(B)]$

Since the monad is parametric, the only way for us to get values in A is by deconstructing the monadic value. However we can apply F to any of them any (finite) number of times.

Bind could rely on the M(B) value returned from F to determine further invocations of F. This may or may not be true for all monads – I haven't thought about it enough (e.g. it may or may not break associativity), but if it doesn't, it will require us to add another capability to our pipes.

So in order to express the restriction that we cannot rely on the return value for further invocations, we'll assume there is some function Ap, that computes a list of A values to be passed, one by one, to F from the monadic value input. Ap is not the same as Deconstruct, as it can also depend on the constructor.

```
146 CONSTANT Ap(-)

147 ASSUME \forall T: Ap(T) \in [M(T) \rightarrow Seq(T)]

149 VARIABLES x, The monadic input

150 as, The values that F will be consecutively applied to

151 mb, The most recent return value from F

152 y The "current" monadic value in M(B)

154 vars \triangleq \langle x, y, as, mb \rangle
```

By convention, TypeOK is a "type" invariant on all variables

When we begin, xs are the deconstruction (with Ap of the first argument to bind.

```
169 Init \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \wedge \exists \ ma \in M(A) : as = Ap(A)[ma]
170 \wedge y = Unit(B)

172 Next \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \wedge as' \neq \langle \rangle
173 \wedge as' = Tail(as)
174 \wedge \text{LET } a \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Head(as)
175 \text{IN } \wedge mb' = F[a]
176 \wedge y' = Compose(B)[y, mb']
```

```
177 \land UNCHANGED x
179 Spec \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Init \land \Box [Next]_{vars}
181 THEOREM Spec \Rightarrow \Box TypeOK
```

We can talk about the denotation of our spec in the functional denotational semantics of FP. We'll use this opportunity to specify the monad laws

```
MonadLaws(bind) \stackrel{\triangle}{=}
         \wedge \ bind \in [M(A) \times [A \to M(B)] \to M(B)]
189
         \land \forall \, a \ \in A, \, f \in [A \ \rightarrow M(B)] : bind[Return(A)[a], \, f] = f[a]
190
         \land A = B \Rightarrow \forall ma \in M(A) : bind[ma, Return(A)] = ma
191
         \land LET kl[f \in [A \to M(A)], g \in [B \to M(B)]] \stackrel{\triangle}{=} [a \in A \mapsto bind[f[a], g]]
192
           IN \forall C : \forall f \in [A \to M(A)], g \in [B \to M(B)], h \in [C \to M(C)] :
193
                  kl[kl[f,g],h] = kl[f,kl[g,h]]
194
      MonadDenotation \triangleq
196
           \exists \ bind \in [M(A) \times [A \to M(B)] \to M(B)]:
197
             \land \forall ma \in M(A) : (x = ma) \land Spec \Rightarrow \Diamond \Box (y = bind[ma, F])
198
             \land MonadLaws(bind)
199
202
```

204

To talk about pipes, we must first define them. In order to deserve the name, they must resemble POSIX-style shell pipes:

```
p_1|p_2|...|p_n
```

In this first attempt, a pipes input (and a process's output) is a stream of monadic values. We'll later address that.

Intuitively, you can think of the process as reading values of type A and emitting values of type M(A), and the pipes as doing the converse.

```
Specifies some component that can write to in and read from out
218
      ReaderWriter(A, in, out) \triangleq
219
           \lor \land \exists x \in Seq(A) : in' = x \circ in
220
              \land UNCHANGED out
221
           \vee \wedge \exists n \in 0 ... Len(out) : out' = SubSeq(out, 1, n)
222
223
              \wedge UNCHANGED in
                                           — module Process1 –
225
     Constant F
227
     VARIABLES in, out LIFO channels
229
      Init \stackrel{\triangle}{=} in \in Seq(DOMAIN F)
      Compute \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \land in \neq \langle \rangle
233
                       \wedge in' = RemoveLast(in)
234
                       \wedge out' = AddFirst(out, F[Last(in)])
235
     Environment \triangleq ReaderWriter(DOMAIN F, in, out)
      Next \triangleq Compute \lor Environment
     Spec \triangleq Init \wedge \Box [Next]_{(in, out)}
                                          — MODULE Pipe1 —
^{246}
```

Note that in a composition chaing a single pipe and a single bind don't perform the same function. A pipe performs half the function of the previous bind and half of that of the next.

```
254 CONSTANT A 256 CONSTANT Ap(\_) 257 ASSUME Ap(A) \in [M(A) \to Seq(A)] 259 VARIABLES in, The channel out,
```

```
state Our current state
261
      vars \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \langle in, out, state \rangle
263
      TypeOK \triangleq \land in
                                   \in Seq(M(A))
265
                        \wedge state \in M(A)
266
                        \land out \in Seq(A)
267
      Init \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \wedge in \in Seq(M(A)) \wedge in \neq \langle \rangle
269
                  \wedge state = Last(in)
270
                  \wedge out \in Seq(A)
271
      Receive \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \land in \neq \langle \rangle
273
                       \wedge in' = RemoveLast(in)
274
                       \land state' = Compose(A)[state, Last(in)]
275
      Send \triangleq \land in = \langle \rangle
277
                   \wedge out' = Ap(A)[state] \circ out
278
                   \land UNCHANGED state
279
      Environment \triangleq \land ReaderWriter(A, in, out)
281
                               \land UNCHANGED state
282
      Next \triangleq Receive \lor Send \lor Environment
284
      Spec \triangleq Init \land
                                \Box [Next]_{vars}
     THEOREM Spec \Rightarrow \Box TypeOK
290
                                          - MODULE PipesAndProcess1 -
292
      We compose two pipes and a process ( |p| )
      Constant A, B
298
      Constant F
299
      CONSTANT Ap1(\_), Ap2(\_)
300
      Variables in1, state1,
302
                      p_in, p_out,
303
                      out2, state2
304
                  \stackrel{\Delta}{=} Instance Pipe1
                                                WITH Ap \leftarrow Ap1, in \leftarrow in1, state \leftarrow state1, out \leftarrow p\_in
306
      Process \stackrel{\triangle}{=} INSTANCE \ Process1 \ WITH \ in \leftarrow p_in, \ out \leftarrow p_out
307
      Pipe2
                \stackrel{\Delta}{=} INSTANCE Pipe1
                                                 WITH A \leftarrow B,
308
                                                          Ap \leftarrow Ap2, in \leftarrow p\_out, state \leftarrow state2, out \leftarrow out2
309
311 Spec \triangleq Pipe1!Spec \land Process!Spec \land Pipe2!Spec
```

```
MODULE MonadsArePipes1 —
317 CONSTANTS A, B
     Constant F
318
     CONSTANT Ap1(\_), Ap2(\_)
321 VARIABLES x, as, mb, y
     The main refinement theorem
     Monad \triangleq \text{Instance } Bind \text{ with } Ap \leftarrow Ap1
     Pipes(out2, p\_out) \stackrel{\triangle}{=}
                                   We hide out2, because, being part of the function of the next bind
                                   in the chain, it is not modeled by this monad instance.
                                   We also hide p\_out, as it's not directly modeled by our Bind.
         INSTANCE PipesAndProcess1 WITH in1 \leftarrow \langle x \rangle,
338
                                                   state1 \leftarrow \langle x \rangle,
339
                                                   p_-in \leftarrow as,
340
                                                   state2 \leftarrow y
341
     THEOREM MonadsArePipes1 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \exists out2, p\_out : Monad!Spec \Rightarrow Pipes(out2, p\_out)!Spec
345
```

347

The pipes so far may have been a little disappointing because we usually think of pipes as letting data values flow, but here processes emit monadic values.

We can do better. Our processes will emit a stream of only simple (nonmonadic) data values, and, in addition, pass a single control value to the pipe (perhaps like a signal or line on stderr).

Intuitively, think of the control value a process emits as a constructor of a monadic value, and the data values it emits as the arguments to that constructor.

```
362 A tombstone value, which will be used later. Must not be a constructor
```

```
363 EMPTY \stackrel{\triangle}{=} CHOOSE \ x : \forall \ A : x \notin Constructors(A)
```

```
365 MODULE Process2
```

```
367 Constants A, B
```

368 CONSTANT F

370 ASSUME
$$F \in [A \to M(B)]$$

372 VARIABLES in, out,

373 control

To simplify matters, we assume that the consumer (pipe) reads all elements from out and sets $control_out$ to EMPTY at once.

```
Environment \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \land ReaderWriter(DOMAIN F, in, out)
380
                               \land \lor \texttt{UNCHANGED} \ out
381
                                   \lor control' = EMPTY
382
      TypeOK \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \wedge in \qquad \in Seq(A)
384
                                      \in Seq(B)
385
                         \land control \in Constructors(B) \cup \{EMPTY\}
386
      Init \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \land in \in Seq(DOMAIN F)
388
                  \wedge out = \langle \rangle
389
                  \land control = EMPTY
390
      Compute \triangleq \land in \neq \langle \rangle
392
                          \wedge in' = RemoveLast(in)
393
                          \wedge LET mb \stackrel{\triangle}{=} F[Last(in)]
394
                             IN \wedge out' = Deconstruct(B, mb) \circ out
395
                                    \land control' = ConsOf(B, mb)
396
      Next \triangleq Compute \lor Environment
398
      Spec \stackrel{\Delta}{=} Init \land \Box [Next]_{\langle in, out, control \rangle}
402 THEOREM Spec \Rightarrow \Box TypeOK
```

Note that in a composition chaing a single pipe and a single bind don't perform the same function. A pipe performs half the function of the previous bind and half of that of the next.

```
Constant A
414
     CONSTANT Ap(\_)
416
      ASSUME Ap(A) \in [M(A) \to Seq(A)]
417
      VARIABLES in,
419
                      control,
420
                      collect,
421
                     state,
422
423
                      out
      vars \triangleq \langle in, control, collect, state, out \rangle
425
      TypeOK \triangleq \land control \in Constructors(A) \cup \{EMPTY\}
427
                                    \in Seq(A)
                       \wedge in
428
429
                       \wedge out
                                    \in Seq(A)
                       \land collect \in Seq(A)
430
                       \land state \in M(A)
431
      Environment \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \land ReaderWriter(A, in, out)
433
                             \wedge \vee \text{UNCHANGED } in
434
                                 \lor control' \neq EMPTY
435
                             \land UNCHANGED collect
436
      Init \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \wedge in \in Seq(M(A)) \wedge in \neq \langle \rangle
                 \land control = \langle \rangle
439
                 \land out \in Seq(A)
440
      Receive \triangleq \land control \neq EMPTY
442
                      \land UNCHANGED control
443
                      \wedge IF in \neq \langle \rangle THEN \wedge in' = RemoveLast(in)
444
                                                \land collect' = AddFirst(collect, Last(in))
445
                                      ELSE UNCHANGED in
446
      Send \triangleq \land LET \ cons \triangleq control
448
                           ma \triangleq cons[collect]
449
                            \wedge state' = Compose(A)[state, ma]
450
                            \wedge out' = Ap(A)[state']
451
                   \wedge \ collect' = \langle \rangle
452
                   \land control' = EMPTY
453
                   \land UNCHANGED in
454
```

```
456 Next \stackrel{\Delta}{=} Receive \lor Send \lor Environment
     Spec \stackrel{\triangle}{=} Init \wedge \Box [Next]_{vars}
460
                            MODULE PipesAndProcess2 —
462
     Constant A, B
464
     Constant F
465
466
     CONSTANT Ap1(\_), Ap2(\_)
     VARIABLES in 1, control 1, state 1, collect 1,
468
469
                    p_in, p_out,
                    control2, collect2, state2, out2
470
     Pipe1 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} INSTANCE \ Pipe2 \quad WITH \ Ap \leftarrow Ap1, \ in \leftarrow in1, \ control \leftarrow control1,
472
                                                      collect \leftarrow collect1, state \leftarrow state1, out \leftarrow p\_in
473
     Process \triangleq \text{INSTANCE } Process2 \text{ WITH } in \leftarrow p\_in, out \leftarrow p\_out, control \leftarrow control2
474
     Pipe2 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} INSTANCE Pipe2  WITH A \leftarrow B,
475
                                                      Ap \leftarrow Ap2, in \leftarrow p\_out, control \leftarrow control2,
476
                                                      collect \leftarrow collect2, state \leftarrow state2, out \leftarrow out2
477
     Spec \triangleq Pipe1!Spec \land Process!Spec \land Pipe2!Spec
481
                               ——— MODULE MonadsArePipes2 ————
483
     Constants A, B
485
     Constant F
486
     CONSTANT Ap1(\_), Ap2(\_)
487
489
     Variables x, as, mb, y
     The main refinement theorem
     Monad \stackrel{\triangle}{=} INSTANCE Bind WITH <math>Ap \leftarrow Ap1
     In addition to the variables we hide (intermediate ones and ones Bind doesn't model, we also
     quntify over control2 and collect2, as we only look at them at the moment of Pipe2 send (i.e.,
     when the monadic value is constructed).
     DuringSend(in) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} in = \langle \rangle
503
      Pipes(control2, collect2,
505
              control1, collect1, p\_out, out2) \triangleq
506
507
          INSTANCE PipesAndProcess2
                          WITH in1
                                             \leftarrow \langle x \rangle,
508
```

 $\leftarrow as$,

 $p_{-}in$

509

```
state1 \quad \leftarrow x,
510
                                   control2 \leftarrow \text{IF } DuringSend(p\_out) \text{ THEN } ConsOf(B, mb) \text{ ELSE } control1,
511
                                    collect2 \leftarrow \text{IF } DuringSend(p\_out) \text{ THEN } Deconstruct(B, mb) \text{ ELSE } collect1,
512
                                   state2 \quad \leftarrow y
513
     Theorem MonadsArePipes2 \stackrel{\triangle}{=}
515
           \exists control2, collect2, control1, collect1, p_out, out2:
516
                  Monad!Spec \Rightarrow Pipes(control2, collect2, control1, collect1, p\_out, out2)!Spec
517
518
519
```