

Multisets and Distributions

Dexter Kozen

Computer Science Department
Cornell University

Ithaca, New York 14853-7501, USA

 kozen@cs.cornell.edu

Alexandra Silva

Computer Science Department
Cornell University

Ithaca, New York 14853-7501, USA

 alexandra.silva@gmail.com

Abstract—We give a lightweight alternative construction of Jacobs’s distributive law for multisets and distributions that does not involve any combinatorics. We first give a distributive law for lists and distributions, then apply a general theorem on 2-categories that allows properties of lists to be transferred automatically to multisets. The theorem states that equations between 2-cells are preserved by epic 2-natural transformations. In our application, the appropriate epic 2-natural transformation is defined in terms of the Parikh map, familiar from formal language theory, that takes a list to its multiset of elements.

Index Terms—probability, multiset, monad, distributive law

I. INTRODUCTION

A notoriously difficult challenge in the semantics of probabilistic programming is the combination of probability and nondeterminism. The chief difficulty is the lack of an appropriate distributive law between the powerset and distribution monads [1]. Many researchers have grappled with this issue over the years, proposing various workarounds [2]–[14].

Very recently, Jacobs [15] has shown that there is a distributive law for finite multisets over finite distributions, an important breakthrough. He gives a comprehensive study of this distributive law from various points of view. His treatment is a combination of categorical and combinatorial reasoning, involving the commutativity of multinomial distributions with *hypergeometric distributions*, discrete probability distributions that calculate the likelihood an event occurring k times in n trials when sampling from a small population without replacement.

In this paper we give a lighter alternative construction that does not involve any combinatorics. Our approach is based on the premise that *lists* are more intuitive and notationally less cumbersome than multisets. There is an intuitively simple distributive law for lists over distributions: given a list of distributions, sample them independently to obtain a list of outcomes; the probability of that list of outcomes is the product of the probabilities of the components. We show that this operational intuition is correct using purely equational reasoning, then apply a general theorem on 2-categories that maps properties of lists down to properties of multisets.

The general theorem, which may be of independent interest, states that *equations between natural transformations are preserved by epic 2-natural transformations*. In our application, the appropriate epic 2-natural transformation is defined in terms of the *Parikh map*, familiar from formal language theory,

that takes a list to its multiset of elements. This theorem allows monad and distributive laws involving multisets to be obtained automatically from monad and distributive laws involving lists.

The contributions of this paper are two-fold. On the one hand, we present a concrete construction of an important distributive law between multisets and distributions. Jacobs [15] presents multiple constructions, all of which required more involved machinery. Here our argument is that a simpler presentation is possible, though the alternative ones in [15] are valuable in different ways (as the author also argues). On the other hand, our general result provides a useful tool that may be applicable in other contexts.

We start with some brief preliminaries in §II introducing the multiset and distribution monads as submonads of a common monad. In §III we present the ingredients needed to define the desired distributive law between multisets and distributions and show how it can be obtained from a distributive law between lists and distributions via the Parikh map. In §IV we present a general theorem on 2-categories and show that many of the concrete results of the previous section are instances of the general theorem.

II. THE DISTRIBUTION AND MULTISSET MONADS

The distribution and multiset monads are both submonads of a common generalization. Consider the endofunctor

$$F : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set} \quad FX = \{f \in \mathbb{R}_+^X \mid |\text{supp } f| < \infty\},$$

the set of nonnegative real-valued functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with finite support, and for $h : X \rightarrow Y$,

$$Fh : FX \rightarrow FY \quad Fh(f) = \lambda b \in Y. \sum_{h(a)=b} f(a).$$

Note that F is covariant, unlike the usual hom-functor $\text{Hom}(-, \mathbb{R}_+)$. For $f \in FX$, let $|f| = \sum_{a \in X} f(a)$.

The functor F carries a monad structure (F, μ, η) with $\eta : I \rightarrow F$ and $\mu : F^2 \rightarrow F$, where for $a \in X$ and $f \in F^2X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_X(a) &= \lambda b \in X. [b = a]^1 \\ \mu_X(f) &= \lambda a \in X. \sum_{g \in FX} f(g) \cdot g(a). \end{aligned}$$

Restricting the range of functions to \mathbb{N} , we get a submonad (M, μ, η) , where

$$MX = \{m \in FX \mid \forall a \in X \ m(a) \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

This is the *multiset monad*. The value $m(a)$ denotes the multiplicity of $a \in X$ in the multiset m . On the other hand, restricting to convex functions, we get a submonad (D, μ, η) , where

$$DX = \{d \in FX \mid \sum_{a \in X} d(a) = 1\}.$$

This is the *distribution monad*. The value $d(a)$ denotes the probability of $a \in X$ under the distribution d .

We will sometimes annotate η and μ with superscripts M and D to emphasize that we are interpreting them in the respective submonads, but the definitions are the same. In more conventional notation, $\eta_X^D(a) = \delta_a$, the Dirac (point-mass) distribution on $a \in X$, and distributions can be expressed as weighted formal sums with real coefficients as in [15].

Clearly $\mu^M : M^2 \rightarrow M$, as \mathbb{N} is closed under the semiring operations, and $\mu^D : D^2 \rightarrow D$, as a convex function of convex functions flattens to a convex function.

The Eilenberg-Moore algebras for F are the \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodules (see §C), although we do not need to know this for our study.

III. LISTS AND DISTRIBUTIONS

In this section we set the stage by giving an intuitive account of our approach. It will be evident that it is possible to obtain the desired distributive law in a piecemeal fashion using only arguments in this section; but in §IV we will show how to encapsulate these arguments in a general theorem and to obtain them all at once. Nevertheless, the development of this section is essential motivation for understanding the more abstract version of §IV.

A. A distributive law $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$

Let (L, μ^L, η^L) be the list monad. Define $\otimes_X^L : LFX \rightarrow FLX$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \otimes_X^L([f_1, \dots, f_n]) \\ = \lambda[a_1, \dots, a_m] \in LX. \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i) & \text{if } m = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}^2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We abbreviate this by writing

$$\otimes_X^L([f_1, \dots, f_n]) = \lambda[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in X^n. \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i)$$

with the convention that the right-hand side, while defined on all of LX , vanishes outside X^n . The support $\text{supp } \otimes_X^L([f_1, \dots, f_n])$ is the cartesian product $\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supp } f_i$.

¹Iverson bracket: $[\varphi] = 1$ if φ is true, 0 if false

² $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ denotes a list of n elements, not to be confused with the Iverson bracket $[\varphi]$. We trust the reader will be able to distinguish them by the difference in fonts and by context.




Fig. 1: Axioms for the distributive law $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$

Theorem III.1. $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$ is a distributive law for (L, μ^L, η^L) over (F, μ, η) . That is, it is a natural transformation and satisfies the axioms of Fig. 1.

Proof. The proof uses only elementary equational reasoning and is given in its entirety in §A. \square

Applied to a list of n distributions over X , \otimes_X^L gives the joint distribution on the cartesian product X^n obtained by sampling the component distributions independently.

$$\otimes_X^L([d_1, \dots, d_n])([a_1, \dots, a_n]) = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i(a_i).$$

As \otimes^L produces a distribution on LX when applied to a list of distributions on X , it specializes to $\otimes^L : LD \rightarrow DL$.

We would like to have a similar distributive law $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$, which will also specialize to $\otimes^M : MD \rightarrow DM$ when applied to a multiset of distributions. We will show how to derive \otimes^M from the distributive law $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$ and a natural transformation $\# : L \rightarrow M$, the *Parikh map* familiar from formal language theory.

B. The Parikh map $\# : L \rightarrow M$

Consider the monoid $(LX, \cdot, [])$, where (\cdot) denotes list concatenation (often elided) and $[]$ is the empty list. This is the free monoid on generators X . Consider also the monoid $(MX, +, 0)$, where $+$ is pointwise sum of real-valued functions and 0 is the constant-zero function, representing multiset union and the empty multiset, respectively. This is the free commutative monoid on generators X . The two monoids are connected by the *Parikh map* $\#_X : LX \rightarrow MX$, where $\#_X(x)(a)$ gives the number of occurrences of $a \in X$ in the list $x \in LX$. This is a monoid homomorphism from the free monoid on generators X to its commutative image.

More generally, we will show below that $\#$ is a morphism of monads

$$\# : (L, \mu^L, \eta^L) \rightarrow (M, \mu^M, \eta^M)$$

(Theorem A.1). This means that $\# : L \rightarrow M$ is a natural transformation that commutes with μ and η ; in other words,

it is a monoid homomorphism, regarding monads as monoids over the category of endofunctors.

Because $\#_X$ is a monoid homomorphism, we have

$$\#_X([\]) = 0 \quad \#_X(xy) = \#_X(x) + \#_X(y).$$

On generators $[a]$,

$$\#_X([a]) = \lambda b \in X. [b = a] = \eta_X(a).$$

Using these facts, we can show that $\# : L \rightarrow M$ is natural transformation. For $f : X \rightarrow Y$,

$$\begin{aligned} & Mf(\#_X([a_1, \dots, a_n])) \\ &= Mf\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \#_X([a_i])\right) = Mf\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda a \in X. [a = a_i]\right) \\ &= \lambda b \in Y. \sum_{f(a)=b} \sum_{i=1}^n [a = a_i] = \lambda b \in Y. \sum_{i=1}^n [b = f(a_i)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \#_Y([f(a_i)]) = \#_Y([f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)]) \\ &= \#_Y(Lf([a_1, \dots, a_n])), \end{aligned}$$

thus $Mf \circ \#_X = \#_Y \circ Lf$.

C. A distributive law $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$

We first define the natural transformation $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$, then show that it satisfies the requisite properties of a distributive law. For any $x \in LX$, define

$$S(x) = \{y \in LX \mid \#_X(y) = \#_X(x)\} = \#_X^{-1}(\#_X(x)).$$

Then $y \in S(x)$ iff y and x have the same length, say n , and y is a permutation of x ; that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & S([b_1, \dots, b_n]) \\ &= \{[b_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, b_{\sigma(n)}] \mid \sigma \text{ a permutation on } \{1, \dots, n\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma III.2. *Let $S = S([b_1, \dots, b_n])$. For any fixed permutation π on $\{1, \dots, n\}$, the map*

$$[a_1, \dots, a_n] \mapsto [a_{\pi(1)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n)}] \quad (1)$$

is a bijection $S \rightarrow S$.

Proof. Since S is closed under permutations,

$$\{[a_{\pi(1)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n)}] \mid [a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S\} \subseteq S.$$

But the map (1) is injective, so

$$|\{[a_{\pi(1)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n)}] \mid [a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S\}| \geq |S|,$$

therefore equality holds, so (1) must be a bijection on S . \square

The desired natural transformation $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$ is defined in the following lemma.

Lemma III.3. *There is a unique natural transformation $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$ such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} LF & \xrightarrow{\otimes^L} & FL \\ \#F \downarrow & & \downarrow F\# \\ MF & \xrightarrow{\otimes^M} & FM \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Proof. Let

$$X^{(n)} = \{m \in MX \mid \sum_{a \in X} m(a) = n\},$$

the multisets over X of size n . For a given $[f_1, \dots, f_n] \in LFX$, define

$$\begin{aligned} & \otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_1, \dots, f_n])) \\ &= \lambda y \in X^{(n)}. \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in \#_X^{-1}(y)} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i). \end{aligned}$$

Again by convention, it is assumed that the function on the right-hand side is defined on all of MX , but vanishes on $MX \setminus X^{(n)}$. This defines \otimes_X^M on the multiset $\#_{FX}([f_1, \dots, f_n])$; we must show that the definition is independent of the choice of $[f_1, \dots, f_n]$.

For any $[b_1, \dots, b_n] \in LX$, we have $\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_n]) \in MX$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_1, \dots, f_n]))(\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_n])) \\ &= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in \#_X^{-1}(\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_n]))} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i) \\ &= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S([b_1, \dots, b_n])} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any permutation $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, f_{\sigma(n)}]))(\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_n])) \\ &= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S([b_1, \dots, b_n])} \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\sigma(i)}(a_i) \\ &= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S([b_1, \dots, b_n])} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}) \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{[a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}] \in S([b_1, \dots, b_n])} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}) \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in S([b_1, \dots, b_n])} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i). \quad (5)$$

The inference (3) is from the commutativity of multiplication, (4) is from Lemma III.2, and (5) is by reindexing. Thus $\otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_1, \dots, f_n]))$ and $\otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, f_{\sigma(n)}]))$ agree on all elements of the form $\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_n]) \in MX$, and both take value 0 on elements of the form $\#_X([b_1, \dots, b_m])$ for $m \neq n$. But this is all of MX , as $\#_X$ is surjective.




Fig. 2: Naturality of \otimes^M from \otimes^L




Fig. 3: An axiom of distributive laws

The equation (2) now follows from the definitions of $F\#_X$ and \otimes_X^L :

$$\begin{aligned} & \otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([f_1, \dots, f_n])) \\ &= \lambda y \in X^{(n)}. \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in \#_X^{-1}(y)} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i) \\ &= \lambda y \in X^{(n)}. \sum_{\#_X([a_1, \dots, a_n])=y} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i) \\ &= F\#_X(\otimes_X^L([f_1, \dots, f_n])). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show the naturality of \otimes^M . That is, for $f : X \rightarrow Y$,

$$FMf \circ \otimes_X^M = \otimes_Y^M \circ MFf. \quad (6)$$

We will take this opportunity to illustrate the general observation that allows us to map properties interest from L down to M via $\#$. Suppose we know that \otimes^L is a natural transformation. In Fig. 2, the commutativity of the top face asserts this fact, and we wish to derive the same for the bottom face. The front and back vertical faces commute by (2). The left and right vertical faces commute by the naturality of $\#$. Using these facts, we can show the following paths in Fig. 2 are equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} LFX &\rightarrow MFX \rightarrow FMX \rightarrow FMY \\ &= LFX \rightarrow FLX \rightarrow FLY \rightarrow FMY \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$= LFX \rightarrow LFY \rightarrow FLY \rightarrow FMY \quad (8)$$

$$= LFX \rightarrow MFX \rightarrow MFY \rightarrow FMY \quad (9)$$

The inference (7) is from the back and right vertical faces, (8) is from the top face, and (9) is from the left and front vertical faces. Thus

$$FMf \circ \otimes_X^M \circ \#_{FX} = \otimes_Y^M \circ MFf \circ \#_{FX}.$$

But since $\#_{FX} : LFX \rightarrow MFX$ is an epimorphism, we can conclude that

$$FMf \circ \otimes_X^M = \otimes_Y^M \circ MFf. \quad \square$$

We can apply the same technique to show that \otimes^M satisfies the axioms of distributive laws. These are the same as those of Fig. 1 with M in place of L . Assuming these diagrams hold for L (which we still have to prove—see §A), we can derive them for M . For example, to transfer the upper left property of Fig. 1 from L to M , we use the diagram of Fig. 3, where

$$\#\# = M\# \circ \#L = \#M \circ L\#$$

$$\#F\# = MF\# \circ \#FL = \#FM \circ LF\#.$$

The top face of Fig. 3 asserts the property of interest for L , and we wish to derive the same for the bottom face. We obtain an equivalence of paths

$$\begin{aligned} LLF &\rightarrow MMF \rightarrow MFM \rightarrow FMM \rightarrow FM \\ &= LLF \rightarrow MMF \rightarrow MF \rightarrow FM \end{aligned}$$

using the commutativity of the top and vertical side faces, then use the fact that $\#F : LLF \rightarrow MMF$ is an epimorphism to conclude that the bottom face commutes. The commutativity of the top face is proved below in §A; the side faces are from (2), the naturality of $\#$, and the monad laws.

The verification of the other axioms proceeds similarly. In fact, in §IV we will prove a general theorem that allows us to derive these all at once.

Theorem III.4. $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$ is a distributive law. Restricted to multisets of distributions, it specializes to $\otimes^M : MD \rightarrow DM$.

Proof. The verification of the four distributive law axioms can be done individually along the lines of the argument above, or all at once using Corollary IV.2 below.

For the last statement, we observe that for distributions d_1, \dots, d_n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \in MX} \otimes_X^M (\#_{FX}([d_1, \dots, d_n]))(m) \\ &= \sum_{m \in MX} \sum_{\#_X([a_1, \dots, a_n])=m} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i(a_i) \\ &= \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_n] \in LX} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i(a_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{a \in X} d_i(a) = 1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

IV. A GENERAL RESULT

In this section we show how results of the previous section can be obtained as a consequence of a general theorem on 2-categories to the effect that *equations between 2-cells are preserved under epic 2-natural transformations*. In our application, this theorem allows equations involving L and F to be mapped down to equations involving M and F via a 2-natural transformation defined in terms of $\#$.

Recall that in a 2-category, composition of 1-cells and composition of 2-cells are called *horizontal* and *vertical composition*, respectively. We will write \circ for vertical composition and denote horizontal composition by juxtaposition. Horizontal composition also acts on 2-cells and satisfies the property: If $F, F', F'' : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $G, G', G'' : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ are 1-cells and $\varphi : F \rightarrow F', \varphi' : F' \rightarrow F'', \psi : G \rightarrow G',$ and $\psi' : G' \rightarrow G''$ are 2-cells, then

$$(\varphi' \circ \varphi)(\psi' \circ \psi) = (\varphi'\psi') \circ (\varphi\psi) : FG \rightarrow F''G''. \quad (10)$$

Categories, functors, and natural transformations form a 2-category Cat , in which the 0-cells are categories, the 1-cells are functors, and the 2-cells are natural transformations. In Cat , horizontal composition on natural transformations is defined by: for $\varphi : F \rightarrow G$ and $\psi : H \rightarrow K$,

$$\varphi\psi : FH \rightarrow GK = \varphi K \circ F\psi = G\psi \circ \varphi H \quad (11)$$

and conversely, $\varphi H = \varphi \text{id}_H$ and $F\psi = \text{id}_F\psi$.

Let \mathcal{F} be the free 2-category on finite sets of generators \mathcal{O} , \mathcal{T} , and \mathcal{R} for the 0-, 1-, and 2-cells, respectively. Let \mathcal{C} be another 2-category, and let $\Phi, \Psi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be 2-functors such that $\Phi O = \Psi O$ for each $O \in \mathcal{O}$.

Suppose that to each 1-cell generator $S \in \mathcal{T}$ there is associated a 2-cell $(\#)_S : \Phi S \rightarrow \Psi S$ of \mathcal{C} . If $S = S_1 \cdots S_n$ is a 1-cell of \mathcal{F} , define $(\#)_S$ to be the horizontal composition

$$(\#)_S = (\#)_{S_1} \cdots (\#)_{S_n} : \Phi S \rightarrow \Psi S.$$

In particular, for $n = 0$, for $I_O : O \rightarrow O$ an identity 1-cell of \mathcal{F} , $(\#)_{I_O} : \Phi I_O \rightarrow \Psi I_O$ is the identity 1-cell on $\Phi O = \Psi O$.

Theorem IV.1. *If the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Phi S & \xrightarrow{\Phi\sigma} & \Phi T \\ (\#)_S \downarrow & & \downarrow (\#)_T \\ \Psi S & \xrightarrow{\Psi\sigma} & \Psi T \end{array} \quad (12)$$

commutes for each 2-cell generator $\sigma : S \rightarrow T$ in \mathcal{R} , then it commutes for all 2-cells σ generated by \mathcal{R} . Consequently, $(\#)$ is a 2-natural transformation $\Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ with components $(\#)_S$.

Proof. For identities,

$$\begin{aligned} (\#)_S \circ \Phi(\text{id}_S) &= (\#)_S \circ \text{id}_{\Phi S} && \text{since } \Phi \text{ is a 2-functor} \\ &= \text{id}_{\Psi S} \circ (\#)_S \\ &= \Psi(\text{id}_S) \circ (\#)_S && \text{since } \Psi \text{ is a 2-functor.} \end{aligned}$$

For vertical composition $\tau \circ \sigma : S \rightarrow U$ with $\sigma : S \rightarrow T$ and $\tau : T \rightarrow U$, if (12) commutes for σ and τ , that is,

$$(\#)_T \circ \Phi\sigma = \Psi\sigma \circ (\#)_S \quad (\#)_U \circ \Phi\tau = \Psi\tau \circ (\#)_T, \quad (13)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &(\#)_U \circ \Phi(\tau \circ \sigma) \\ &= (\#)_U \circ \Phi\tau \circ \Phi\sigma && \text{since } \Phi \text{ is a 2-functor} \\ &= \Psi\tau \circ (\#)_T \circ \Phi\sigma && \text{by (13), right-hand equation} \\ &= \Psi\tau \circ \Psi\sigma \circ (\#)_S && \text{by (13), left-hand equation} \\ &= \Psi(\tau \circ \sigma) \circ (\#)_S && \text{since } \Psi \text{ is a 2-functor.} \end{aligned}$$

For horizontal composition $\sigma\tau : SU \rightarrow TV$ with $\sigma : S \rightarrow T$ and $\tau : U \rightarrow V$, if (12) commutes for σ and τ , that is,

$$(\#)_T \circ \Phi\sigma = \Psi\sigma \circ (\#)_S \quad (\#)_V \circ \Phi\tau = \Psi\tau \circ (\#)_U, \quad (14)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &(\#)_{TV} \circ \Phi(\sigma\tau) \\ &= ((\#)_T(\#)_V) \circ ((\Phi\sigma)(\Phi\tau)) && \text{since } \Phi \text{ is a 2-functor} \\ &= ((\#)_T \circ \Phi\sigma)((\#)_V \circ \Phi\tau) && \text{by (10)} \\ &= (\Psi\sigma \circ (\#)_S)(\Psi\tau \circ (\#)_U) && \text{by (14)} \\ &= ((\Psi\sigma)(\Psi\tau)) \circ ((\#)_S(\#)_U) && \text{by (10)} \\ &= \Psi(\sigma\tau) \circ (\#)_{SU} && \text{since } \Psi \text{ is a 2-functor. } \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary IV.2. *Suppose the conditions of Theorem IV.1 hold. If in addition $(\#)_S$ is an epimorphism for every 1-cell S of \mathcal{F} , then every 2-cell equation that holds under the interpretation Φ also holds under the interpretation Ψ . That is, for all 2-cells $\sigma, \tau : S \rightarrow T$ of \mathcal{F} , if $\Phi\sigma = \Phi\tau$, then $\Psi\sigma = \Psi\tau$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi\sigma \circ (\#)_S &= (\#)_T \circ \Phi\sigma && \text{by Theorem IV.1} \\ &= (\#)_T \circ \Phi\tau && \text{since } \Phi\sigma = \Phi\tau \\ &= \Psi\tau \circ (\#)_S && \text{by Theorem IV.1.} \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\#)_S$ is an epimorphism, $\Psi\sigma = \Psi\tau$. \square

In our application, \mathcal{C} is Cat , the 2-category of categories, functors, and natural transformations, and

- $\mathcal{O} = \{O\}$,
- $\mathcal{T} = \{P : O \rightarrow O, Q : O \rightarrow O\}$,
- $\mathcal{R} = \{\mu : PP \rightarrow P, \eta : I \rightarrow P,$
 $\mu' : QQ \rightarrow Q, \eta' : I \rightarrow Q, \otimes : PQ \rightarrow QP\}$,
- $\Phi = \{O \mapsto \text{Set}, P \mapsto L, Q \mapsto F, \mu \mapsto \mu^L, \eta \mapsto \eta^L,$
 $\mu' \mapsto \mu^F, \eta' \mapsto \eta^F, \otimes \mapsto \otimes^L\}$,
- $\Psi = \{O \mapsto \text{Set}, P \mapsto M, Q \mapsto F, \mu \mapsto \mu^M, \eta \mapsto \eta^M,$
 $\mu' \mapsto \mu^F, \eta' \mapsto \eta^F, \otimes \mapsto \otimes^M\}$,
- $(\#)_P = \#, (\#)_Q = \text{id}_F$.

We need to verify the conditions of Theorem IV.1 and Corollary IV.2. For the condition (12) of Theorem IV.1, we

must show that (12) commutes for each of the 2-cell generators in \mathcal{R} . These conditions are

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{ccc} LL & \xrightarrow{\mu^L} & L \\ \#\# \downarrow & & \downarrow \# \\ MM & \xrightarrow{\mu^M} & M \end{array} &
\begin{array}{ccc} I & \xrightarrow{\eta^L} & L \\ \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \# \\ I & \xrightarrow{\eta^M} & M \end{array} &
\begin{array}{ccc} LF & \xrightarrow{\otimes^L} & FL \\ \#F \downarrow & & \downarrow F\# \\ MF & \xrightarrow{\otimes^M} & FM \end{array}
\end{array}$$

plus two more conditions for μ^F and η^F , which only involve identities and are trivial. The rightmost diagram is just (2), which was verified in Lemma III.3. A complete proof for the remaining two is given in §B.

For Corollary IV.2, we must show that all $(\#)_S$ are epimorphisms. In light of (11), we need only show that $\#$ is an epimorphism, and that the functors L , F , and M preserve epimorphisms. For any set X , $\#_X : LX \rightarrow MX$ takes a list of elements of X to the multiset of its elements and is clearly surjective. The functors L , F , and M are left adjoints, therefore preserve all colimits, including epimorphisms.

These results give us an alternative proof of Theorem III.4. Since our application satisfies the conditions of Theorem IV.1 and Corollary IV.2, we have that any 2-cell equation that holds under the interpretation Φ also holds under Ψ . In particular, the monad equations for $\mu^L : LL \rightarrow L$ and $\eta^L : I \rightarrow L$ and the equations for the distributive law $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$ also hold for $\mu^M : MM \rightarrow M$, $\eta^M : I \rightarrow M$, and $\otimes^M : MF \rightarrow FM$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The support of the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-2008083 is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Beck, “Distributive laws,” in *Seminar on Triples and Categorical Homology Theory*, ser. Lect. Notes Math., B. Eckman, Ed. Springer, 1969, no. 80, pp. 119–140.
- [2] R. Affeldt, J. Garrigue, D. Nowak, and T. Saikawa, “A trustful monad for axiomatic reasoning with probability and nondeterminism,” *J. Funct. Program.*, vol. 31, p. e17, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796821000137>
- [3] Y. Chen and J. W. Sanders, “Unifying probability with nondeterminism,” in *FM 2009: Formal Methods, Second World Congress, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, November 2-6, 2009. Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Cavalcanti and D. Dams, Eds., vol. 5850. Springer, 2009, pp. 467–482. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-05089-3_30
- [4] F. Dahlqvist, L. Parlant, and A. Silva, “Layer by layer - combining monads,” in *Theoretical Aspects of Computing - ICTAC 2018 - 15th International Colloquium, Stellenbosch, South Africa, October 16-19, 2018, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, B. Fischer and T. Uustalu, Eds., vol. 11187. Springer, 2018, pp. 153–172. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02508-3_9
- [5] A. Goy and D. Petrisan, “Combining probabilistic and non-deterministic choice via weak distributive laws,” in *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, H. Hermanns, L. Zhang, N. Kobayashi, and D. Miller, Eds. ACM, 2020, pp. 454–464. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373718.3394795>
- [6] J. den Hartog and E. P. de Vink, “Mixing up nondeterminism and probability: a preliminary report,” in *First International Workshop on Probabilistic Methods in Verification, PROBIV 1998, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA, June 19-20, 1998*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, C. Baier, M. Huth, M. Z. Kwiatkowska, and M. Ryan, Eds., vol. 22. Elsevier, 1998, pp. 88–110. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(05\)82521-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(05)82521-6)

- [7] K. Keimel and G. D. Plotkin, “Mixed powerdomains for probability and nondeterminism,” *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2017. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(1:2\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(1:2)2017)
- [8] M. W. Mislove, “Nondeterminism and probabilistic choice: Obeying the laws,” in *CONCUR 2000 - Concurrency Theory, 11th International Conference, University Park, PA, USA, August 22-25, 2000, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, C. Palamidessi, Ed., vol. 1877. Springer, 2000, pp. 350–364. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44618-4_26
- [9] M. W. Mislove, J. Ouaknine, and J. Worrell, “Axioms for probability and nondeterminism,” in *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency, EXPRESS 2003, Marseille, France, September 2, 2003*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, F. Corradini and U. Nestmann, Eds., vol. 96. Elsevier, 2003, pp. 7–28. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2004.04.019>
- [10] D. Varacca, “Probability, nondeterminism and concurrency: Two denotational models for probabilistic computation,” Ph.D. dissertation, Aarhus University, 2003.
- [11] D. Varacca and G. Winskel, “Distributing probability over nondeterminism,” *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 87–113, 2006. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129505005074>
- [12] D. Wang, J. Hoffmann, and T. W. Reps, “A denotational semantics for low-level probabilistic programs with nondeterminism,” in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, MFPS 2019, London, UK, June 4-7, 2019*, ser. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, B. König, Ed., vol. 347. Elsevier, 2019, pp. 303–324. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2019.09.016>
- [13] M. Zwart, “On the non-compositionality of monads via distributive laws,” Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University, 2020.
- [14] M. Zwart and D. Marsden, “No-go theorems for distributive laws,” *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2022. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18\(1:13\)2022](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18(1:13)2022)
- [15] B. Jacobs, “From multisets over distributions to distributions over multisets,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2105.06908, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06908>
- [16] T. Jakl, D. Marsden, and N. Shah, “Generalizations of bilinear maps – technical report,” *CoRR*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.05382>

APPENDIX

A. $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$ is a distributive law

We must verify that $\otimes^L : LF \rightarrow FL$ is a distributive law. However, because we are working with lists instead of multisets, the task is notationally much less cumbersome and involves only elementary equational reasoning. This is the true benefit of this approach.

Proof of Theorem III.1. We must show that the diagrams of Fig. 1 commute. Let us start with the easy ones. For $f \in FX$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \otimes_X^L (\eta_{FX}^L(f)) \\
&= \otimes_X^L ([f]) = \lambda[a]. f(a) \\
&= \lambda y. \sum_{\eta_X^L(a)=y} f(a) = F\eta_X^L(f).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\bar{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_n] \in LX$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \otimes_X^L (L\eta_X^F(\bar{a})) \\
&= \otimes_X^L ([\eta_X^F(a_1), \dots, \eta_X^F(a_n)]) \\
&= \otimes_X^L ([\lambda b. [b = a_1], \dots, \lambda b. [b = a_n]]) \\
&= \lambda [b_1, \dots, b_n] \in X^n. \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda b. [b = a_i])(b_i) \\
&= \lambda [b_1, \dots, b_n] \in X^n. \prod_{i=1}^n [b_i = a_i] \\
&= \lambda \bar{b} \in X^n. [\bar{b} = \bar{a}] \\
&= \eta_{LX}^F(\bar{a}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the top-left diagram of Fig. 1, we need to show

$$F\mu_X^L \circ \otimes_{LX}^L \circ L \otimes_X^L = \otimes_X^L \circ \mu_{FX}^L.$$

Let $[\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_n] \in LLFX$, where $\bar{f}_i = [f_{i1}, \dots, f_{ik_i}]$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& F\mu_X^L(\otimes_{LX}^L(L \otimes_X^L([\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_n]))) \\
&= F\mu_X^L(\otimes_{LX}^L([\otimes_X^L(\bar{f}_1), \dots, \otimes_X^L(\bar{f}_n)])) \\
&= F\mu_X^L(\otimes_{LX}^L([\lambda \bar{a}_1. \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} f_{1i}(a_{1i}), \dots, \lambda \bar{a}_n. \prod_{i=1}^{k_n} f_{ni}(a_{ni})])) \\
&= F\mu_X^L(\lambda [\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n]. \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} f_{ij}(a_{ij})) \\
&= \lambda y. \sum_{\mu_X^L(x)=y} (\lambda [\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n]. \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} f_{ij}(a_{ij}))(x) \\
&= \lambda [a_{11}, \dots, a_{1k_1}, \dots, a_{n1}, \dots, a_{nk_n}]. \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} f_{ij}(a_{ij}) \\
&= \otimes_X^L([f_{11}, \dots, f_{1k_1}, \dots, f_{n1}, \dots, f_{nk_n}]) \\
&= \otimes_X^L(\mu_{FX}^L([\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_n])).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the bottom-left diagram of Fig. 1, we need to show

$$\mu_{LX}^F \circ F \otimes_X^L \circ \otimes_{FX}^L = \otimes_X^L \circ L\mu_X^F.$$

Let $\bar{f} = [f_1, \dots, f_n] \in LFFX$, $f_i \in FFX = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^X}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{LX}^F(F \otimes_X^L(\otimes_{FX}^L(\bar{f}))) \\
&= \mu_{LX}^F(F \otimes_X^L(\lambda \bar{g}. \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i))) \\
&= \mu_{LX}^F(\lambda y. \sum_{\otimes_X^L(x)=y} (\lambda \bar{g}. \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i))(x)) \\
&= \mu_{LX}^F(\lambda y. \sum_{\otimes_X^L(\bar{g})=y} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i)) \\
&= \lambda a \in LX. \sum_{g \in FLX} (\lambda y. \sum_{\otimes_X^L(\bar{g})=y} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i))(g) \cdot g(a) \\
&= \lambda a \in LX. \sum_{g \in FLX} (\sum_{\otimes_X^L(\bar{g})=g} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i)) \cdot g(a) \\
&= \lambda a \in LX. \sum_{\bar{g} \in (FX)^n} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i) \cdot (\otimes_X^L(\bar{g}))(a) \\
&= \lambda [a_1, \dots, a_n] \in LX. \sum_{\bar{g} \in (FX)^n} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n g_i(a_i) \\
&= \lambda [a_1, \dots, a_n]. \sum_{\bar{g} \in (FX)^n} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(g_i) \cdot g_i(a_i) \\
&= \lambda [a_1, \dots, a_n]. \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{g \in FX} f_i(g) \cdot g(a_i) \\
&= \otimes_X^L([\lambda a \in X. \sum_{g \in FX} f_1(g) \cdot g(a), \dots, \\
&\quad \lambda a \in X. \sum_{g \in FX} f_n(g) \cdot g(a)]) \\
&= \otimes_X^L([\mu_X^F(f_1), \dots, \mu_X^F(f_n)]) \\
&= \otimes_X^L(L\mu_X^F(\bar{f})). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

B. Conditions of Theorem IV.1

We must also establish the remaining conditions (12) required for the application of Theorem IV.1. Again, the proofs involve only elementary equational reasoning.

Theorem A.1. *The following diagrams commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
LL & \xrightarrow{\mu^L} & L \\
\#\# \downarrow & & \downarrow \# \\
MM & \xrightarrow{\mu^M} & M
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
I & \xrightarrow{\eta^L} & L \\
\text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow \# \\
I & \xrightarrow{\eta^M} & M
\end{array}$$

Proof. For the left-hand diagram, let $\ell_i = [a_{i1}, \dots, a_{ik_i}]$,

$a_{ij} \in X$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} f_i &= \#_X(\ell_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \#_X([a_{ij}]) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \lambda a \in X.[a = a_{ij}], \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\#\# = \#M \circ L\#$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\#_X(\mu_X^L([\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n])) \\ &= \#_X([a_{11}, \dots, a_{1k_1}, \dots, a_{n1}, \dots, a_{nk_n}]) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \#_X([a_{ij}]) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i, \\ &\mu_X^M(\#_{MX}(L\#_X([\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n]))) \\ &= \mu_X^M(\#_{MX}([\#_X(\ell_1), \dots, \#_X(\ell_n)])) \\ &= \mu_X^M(\#_{MX}([f_1, \dots, f_n])) = \mu_X^M(\sum_{i=1}^n \#_{MX}([f_i])) \\ &= \mu_X^M(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda h \in FX.[h = f_i]) \\ &= \lambda a \in X. \sum_{h \in FX} (\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda h \in FX.[h = f_i])(h) \cdot h(a) \\ &= \lambda a \in X. \sum_{h \in FX} \sum_{i=1}^n [h = f_i] \cdot h(a) \\ &= \lambda a \in X. \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(a) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the right-hand diagram, for $a \in X$,

$$\#_X(\eta_X^L(a)) = \#_X([a]) = \lambda b \in X.[b = a] = \eta^M(a). \quad \square$$

C. Eilenberg-Moore algebras for F

The EM-algebras for the functor F are the \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodules. This seems to be folklore; it is asserted without proof in [16]. As a bonus feature, we provide a proof of the difficult direction here.

Let a, b, c denote elements of a semimodule and let r, s denote scalars in \mathbb{R}_+ . The axioms of \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodules are:

$$\begin{aligned} a + (b + c) &= a + (b + c) & a + b &= b + a & 0 + a &= a \\ (rs)a &= r(sa) & 0a &= 0 & 1a &= a \\ (r + s)a &= ra + sa & r(a + b) &= ra + rb. \end{aligned}$$

It is routine to verify that every \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodule A is an F -algebra (A, α) , where

$$\alpha(f) = \sum_{a \in A} f(a) \cdot a.$$

The difficult direction is the converse. Let (A, α) be an EM-algebra for F . Define an \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodule structure on A as follows.

$$a + b = \alpha(\eta_A(a) + \eta_A(b)) \quad 0 = \alpha(\lambda a \cdot 0) \quad ra = \alpha(r\eta_A(a)).$$

Lemma A.2.

- (i) $\alpha(f) + \alpha(g) = \alpha(f + g)$
- (ii) $r\alpha(f) = \alpha(rf)$.

Proof. Reasoning equationally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &F\alpha(\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g)) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} (\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g))(h) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} (\lambda h.[h = f] + \lambda h.[h = g])(h) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} [h = f] + [h = g] \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} [h = f][\alpha(h) = a] + [h = g][\alpha(h) = a] \\ &= \lambda a \in A. [\alpha(f) = a] + [\alpha(g) = a] \\ &= \eta_A(\alpha(f)) + \eta_A(\alpha(g)). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_A(\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g)) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} (\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g))(h) \cdot h(a) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} (\lambda h.[h = f] + \lambda h.[h = g])(h) \cdot h(a) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} ([h = f] + [h = g]) \cdot h(a) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. f(a) + g(a) \\ &= f + g. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &F\alpha(r\eta_{FA}(f)) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} (r\eta_{FA}(f))(h) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} (r\lambda h.[h = f])(h) \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{\alpha(h)=a} r[h = f] \\ &= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} r[h = f][\alpha(h) = a] \\ &= \lambda a \in A. r[\alpha(f) = a] \\ &= r\eta_A(\alpha(f)). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_A(r\eta_{FA}(f)) \\
&= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} (r\eta_{FA}(f))(h) \cdot h(a) \\
&= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} (r\lambda h.[h = f])(h) \cdot h(a) \\
&= \lambda a \in A. \sum_{h \in FA} r[h = f] \cdot h(a) \\
&= \lambda a \in A. rf(a) \\
&= rf.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha(f) + \alpha(g) \\
&= \alpha(\eta_A(\alpha(f)) + \eta_A(\alpha(g))) \quad \text{by definition of } + \\
&= \alpha(F\alpha(\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g))) \quad \text{by (15)} \\
&= \alpha(\mu_A(\eta_{FA}(f) + \eta_{FA}(g))) \quad \text{by an axiom of monads} \\
&= \alpha(f + g) \quad \text{by (16)}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& r\alpha(f) \\
&= \alpha(r\eta_A(\alpha(f))) \quad \text{by definition of scalar multiplication} \\
&= \alpha(F\alpha(r\eta_{FA}(f))) \quad \text{by (17)} \\
&= \alpha(\mu_A(r\eta_{FA}(f))) \quad \text{by an axiom of monads} \\
&= \alpha(rf) \quad \text{by (18)}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem A.3. Every EM algebra for F is an \mathbb{R}_+ -semimodule.

Proof. We verify all the axioms using Lemma A.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
a + (b + c) &= \alpha(\eta_A(a)) + \alpha(\eta_A(b) + \eta_A(c)) \\
&= \alpha(\eta_A(a) + \eta_A(b) + \eta_A(c)) = (a + b) + c
\end{aligned}$$

$$a + b = \alpha(\eta_A(a) + \eta_A(b)) = \alpha(\eta_A(b) + \eta_A(a)) = b + a$$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 + a &= \alpha(\lambda b.0) + \alpha(\eta_A(a)) = \alpha(\lambda b.0 + \eta_A(a)) \\
&= \alpha(\eta_A(a)) = a
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(rs)a &= \alpha((rs)\eta_A(a)) = \alpha(r(s\eta_A(a))) \\
&= r(\alpha(s\eta_A(a))) = r(s\alpha(\eta_A(a))) = r(sa)
\end{aligned}$$

$$0a = \alpha(0\eta_A(a)) = \alpha(\lambda a.0) = 0$$

$$1a = \alpha(1\eta_A(a)) = \alpha(\eta_A(a)) = a$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(r + s)a &= \alpha((r + s)\eta_A(a)) = \alpha(r\eta_A(a) + s\eta_A(a)) \\
&= r\alpha(\eta_A(a)) + s\alpha(\eta_A(a)) = ra + sa
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
r(a + b) &= r\alpha(\eta_A(a) + \eta_A(b)) = \alpha(r\eta_A(a) + r\eta_A(b)) \\
&= \alpha(r\eta_A(a)) + \alpha(r\eta_A(b)) \\
&= r\alpha(\eta_A(a)) + r\alpha(\eta_A(b)) = ra + rb. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$