

Monadic reflection in Lax Logic

Tristan CROLARD

LACL – University of East Paris

TPDC'11

Novi Sad – May 29, 2011

Introduction

- Revisit “*Representing monads*” [Filinski, 1994] from a logical standpoint.
- **Goal:** understand the logical meaning of **shift/reset** in the restricted framework of a major application, i.e. implementing monadic reflection.
- Through the formulas-as-types interpretation, a monad \diamond_{\square} corresponds to the modality from Lax logic [Curry, 1952]:

$$\vdash \mathit{unit} : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi \qquad \vdash \mathit{bind} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \psi) \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \psi$$

- Monadic reflection is given by these logical rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \varphi}{\Gamma \vdash [t] : \diamond \varphi} \text{[reify]} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \diamond \varphi}{\Gamma \vdash \mu(t) : \varphi} \text{[reflect]}$$

- In this talk, we consider only *provability*.

Example: the exception monad

ε : *type*.

$\diamond\varphi = \varphi \vee \varepsilon$.

unit = $\lambda a:\varphi.$ **inl** a .

bind f = $\lambda t.$ **case** t **of** (**inl** a) $\mapsto f$ a | (**inr** b) \mapsto **inr** b .

Defining **raise** and **handle** in direct style:

raise = $\mu(\mathbf{inr} t)$.

t **handle** $e \mapsto h$ = **case** [t] **of** (**inl** a) $\mapsto a$ | (**inr** e) $\mapsto h$.

Moggi's monadic translation (CBV)

Translation of types (σ atomic):

- $\sigma^\diamond \equiv \sigma$
- $(\varphi \Rightarrow \psi)^\diamond \equiv \varphi^\diamond \Rightarrow \diamond\psi^\diamond$
- $(\diamond\psi)^\diamond \equiv \diamond\varphi^\diamond$

Translation of terms:

- $x^\diamond \equiv \text{unit } x$
- $(\lambda x.t)^\diamond \equiv \text{unit } \lambda x.t^\diamond$
- $(t_1 t_2)^\diamond \equiv \text{bind } (\lambda f.(\text{bind } f t_2^\diamond)) t_1^\diamond$
- $\mu(t)^\diamond \equiv \text{bind id } t^\diamond$
- $[t]^\diamond \equiv \text{unit } t^\diamond$

Lemma. *If $\Gamma \vdash t : \varphi$ is derivable then $\Gamma^\diamond \vdash t^\diamond : \diamond\varphi^\diamond$ is derivable.*

Proof.

$$\frac{\Gamma^\diamond \vdash t^\diamond : \diamond\varphi^\diamond}{\Gamma^\diamond \vdash \text{unit } t^\diamond : \diamond\diamond\varphi^\diamond} \text{[unit]}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma^\diamond \vdash t^\diamond : \diamond\diamond\varphi^\diamond}{\Gamma^\diamond \vdash \text{bind id } t^\diamond : \diamond\varphi^\diamond} \text{[join]}$$

Filinski's CPS-translation (CBV)

Define $\nabla\varphi = (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o) \Rightarrow \diamond o$ where o is some **universal answer type** (not sound).

Translation of types (σ atomic):

- $\sigma^\nabla \equiv \sigma$
- $(\varphi \Rightarrow \psi)^\nabla \equiv \varphi^\nabla \Rightarrow \nabla\psi^\nabla$
- $(\diamond\psi)^\nabla \equiv \diamond\varphi^\nabla$

Translation of terms:

- $x^\nabla \equiv \lambda k.k x$
- $(\lambda x.t)^\nabla \equiv \lambda k.k (\lambda x.t^\nabla)$
- $(t_1 t_2)^\nabla \equiv \lambda k.t_1^\nabla (\lambda f.t_2^\nabla (\lambda a.f a k))$
- $\mu(t)^\nabla \equiv \lambda k.t^\nabla (\text{bind } k)$
- $[t]^\nabla \equiv \lambda k.k (t^\nabla \text{ unit})$

Delimited control

Reflect/reify are *definable in direct style* from **shift/reset** [Filinski, 1994]

$$\begin{aligned} [t] &= \mathbf{reset} (\mathit{unit} \ t). \\ \mu(t) &= \mathbf{shift} (\lambda k. \mathit{bind} \ k \ t). \end{aligned}$$

That is, these equations are valid:

- $(\mathbf{reset} (\mathit{unit} \ t))^{\nabla} = [t]^{\nabla}$
- $(\mathbf{shift} (\lambda k. \mathit{bind} \ k \ t))^{\nabla} = \mu(t)^{\nabla}$

where:

- $\mathbf{reset}^{\nabla} = \lambda m. \lambda c. (c (m \ \mathit{id}))$
- $\mathbf{shift}^{\nabla} = \lambda h. \lambda c. (h (\lambda v. \lambda c'. c' (c \ v)) \ \mathit{id})$

Answer type polymorphism

Footnote from “*Representing monads*”:

“Alternatively, **with a little more care**, we can take $\nabla\varphi = \forall\alpha(\varphi \rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \rightarrow \diamond\alpha$; it is straightforward to check that both the term translation and the operations defined in the following can in fact be typed according to this schema.”

So, let us do it *carefully*:

- Formalization in Twelf (work in progress)
- Experimenting with TeXmacs as a front end (the Twelf source is generated from the slides)

Plan of the rest of the talk

- Formalize System F in Twelf
- Check that the operations are well-typed in direct style
- Check that the CPS-translations of the operations are well-typed
- Interpret the logical type of **shift** for the usual monads:
 - continuation monad
 - state monad
 - exception monad

System F (HOAS)

Types

$type$: **type**.

$\sqcup \Rightarrow \sqcup$: $type \rightarrow type \rightarrow type$.

$\sqcup \wedge \sqcup$: $type \rightarrow type \rightarrow type$.

$\sqcup \vee \sqcup$: $type \rightarrow type \rightarrow type$.

$\forall \sqcup . \sqcup$: $(type \rightarrow type) \rightarrow type$.

binding $1 \mapsto 2$ **in** $\forall \sqcup . \sqcup$

void = $\forall \beta . \beta$.

Terms

term : **type**.

Abstraction

$\lambda_{\square:\square.\square} : \text{type} \rightarrow (\text{term} \rightarrow \text{term}) \rightarrow \text{term}.$

binding $1 \mapsto 3$ **in** $\lambda_{\square:\square.\square}$

Application

$\square \square : \text{term} \rightarrow \text{term} \rightarrow \text{term}.$

Polymorphic abstraction

$\Lambda_{\square.\square} : (\text{type} \rightarrow \text{term}) \rightarrow \text{term}.$

binding $1 \mapsto 2$ **in** $\Lambda_{\square.\square}$

Instantiation

$\sqcup\{\sqcup\} : \text{term} \rightarrow \text{type} \rightarrow \text{term}.$

Derived syntax for **let**

let $\sqcup : \sqcup = \sqcup$ **in** $\sqcup = [\tau] [u] [t] (\lambda x : \tau. t[x]) u.$

binding $1 \mapsto 4$ **in** **let** $\sqcup : \sqcup = \sqcup$ **in** \sqcup

Pairing

$\langle \sqcup, \sqcup \rangle : \text{term} \rightarrow \text{term} \rightarrow \text{term}.$

Pattern matching

let $\langle \sqcup, \sqcup \rangle = \sqcup$ **in** $\sqcup : \text{term} \rightarrow (\text{term} \rightarrow \text{term} \rightarrow \text{term}) \rightarrow \text{term}.$

binding $2 \mapsto 4$ **in** **let** $\langle \sqcup, \sqcup \rangle = \sqcup$ **in** \sqcup

binding $1 \mapsto 4$ **in** **let** $\langle \sqcup, \sqcup \rangle = \sqcup$ **in** \sqcup

Injections

inl \square : $term \rightarrow term$.

inr \square : $term \rightarrow term$.

Pattern matching

case \square **of** (**inl** \square) $\mapsto \square$ | (**inr** \square) $\mapsto \square$: $term \rightarrow (term \rightarrow term)$
 $\rightarrow (term \rightarrow term) \rightarrow term$.

binding 4 \mapsto 5 **in** **case** \square **of** (**inl** \square) $\mapsto \square$ | (**inr** \square) $\mapsto \square$

binding 2 \mapsto 3 **in** **case** \square **of** (**inl** \square) $\mapsto \square$ | (**inr** \square) $\mapsto \square$

Monadic constants

unit : $term$.

bind : $term$.

Delimited control operators

reset : $term$.

shift : $term$.

Typing judgment

$\vdash \square : \square$: *term* \rightarrow *type* \rightarrow **type**.

$$\frac{\{x\} \vdash x : \varphi \rightarrow \vdash t[x] : \psi}{\vdash \lambda x : \varphi . t[x] : \varphi \Rightarrow \psi} \text{ [lam]}$$

$$\frac{\vdash t_1 : \varphi \Rightarrow \psi \quad \vdash t_2 : \varphi}{\vdash t_1 t_2 : \psi} \text{ [app]}$$

$$\frac{\{\alpha\} \vdash t[\alpha] : \psi[\alpha]}{\vdash \Lambda \alpha . t[\alpha] : \forall \alpha . \psi[\alpha]} \text{ [abs]}$$

$$\frac{\vdash t : \forall \alpha . \psi[\alpha]}{\vdash t\{\varphi\} : \psi[\varphi]} \text{ [inst]}$$

Typing judgment

$$\frac{\vdash t_1 : \varphi \quad \vdash t_2 : \psi}{\vdash \langle t_1, t_2 \rangle : \varphi \wedge \psi} \text{ [pair]}$$

$$\frac{\{x\} \vdash x : \varphi \rightarrow (\{y\} \vdash y : \psi \rightarrow \vdash u[x][y] : \tau) \quad \vdash t : \varphi \wedge \psi}{\vdash \mathbf{let} \langle x, y \rangle = t \mathbf{in} u[x][y] : \tau} \text{ [match]}$$

$$\frac{\vdash t : \psi}{\vdash \mathbf{inr} t : \varphi \vee \psi} \text{ [inr]}$$

$$\frac{\vdash t : \varphi}{\vdash \mathbf{inl} t : \varphi \vee \psi} \text{ [inl]}$$

$$\frac{\{x\} \vdash x : \varphi \rightarrow \vdash u_1[x] : \phi \quad \{y\} \vdash y : \psi \rightarrow \vdash u_2[y] : \phi \quad \vdash t : \varphi \vee \psi}{\vdash \mathbf{case} t \mathbf{of} (\mathbf{inl} x) \mapsto u_1[x] \mid (\mathbf{inr} y) \mapsto u_2[y] : \phi} \text{ [case]}$$

Lax logic

Primitive monad or lax modality [Curry, 1952]

$\diamond_{\sqcup} : \text{type} \rightarrow \text{type}.$

$\vdash \text{unit} : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi$ [unit]

$\vdash \text{bind} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \psi) \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \psi$ [bind]

Delimited control

Fixed answer type

o : *type*.

$$\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi^{\text{[reset]}}$$

$$\vdash \mathbf{shift} : ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o) \Rightarrow \diamond o) \Rightarrow \varphi^{\text{[shift]}}$$

Monadic reflection

Reflect/reify are definable from **shift/reset**:

$$\begin{aligned} [t] &= \mathbf{reset} (\mathit{unit} \ t). \\ \mu(t) &= \mathbf{shift} (\lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o.\mathit{bind} \ k \ t). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma. *The following typing rules are derivable:*

$$\frac{\vdash t : \varphi}{\vdash [t] : \diamond \varphi} \text{ [reify]} \quad \frac{\vdash t : \diamond \varphi}{\vdash \mu(t) : \varphi} \text{ [reflect]}$$

$$\% \text{solve} \quad \vdash t : \varphi \rightarrow \vdash [t] : \diamond \varphi$$

$$\% \text{solve} \quad \vdash t : \diamond \varphi \rightarrow \vdash \mu(t) : \varphi$$

Polymorphic monadic reflection

Polymorphic type for **shift**:

$$\vdash \mathbf{shift} : \forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \Rightarrow \varphi \text{ [shift]}$$

Reflect is still definable from **shift**:

$$\mu(t) = \mathbf{shift} (\Lambda \alpha. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha. \mathit{bind} \ k \ t).$$

Lemma. *The following typing rule is derivable:*

$$\frac{\vdash t : \diamond \varphi}{\vdash \mu(t) : \varphi} \text{ [reflect]}$$

$$\% \mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash t : \diamond \varphi \rightarrow \vdash \mu(t) : \varphi$$

Remark. $\forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha)$ is equivalent to $\diamond \varphi$.

$$\% \mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash t : \diamond \varphi \rightarrow \vdash \Lambda \alpha. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha. \mathit{bind} \ k \ t : \forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha)$$

$$\% \mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash f : \forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond \alpha) \rightarrow \vdash (f \{\varphi\} \mathit{unit}) : \diamond \varphi$$

Derived typing rule for reify

lemma $\vdash t : \varphi \implies \vdash [t] : \diamond \varphi$

Proof.

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_1} \vdash t : \varphi \implies \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi}{\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi} [\text{reset}]}{\vdash \mathbf{reset} (unit\ t) : \diamond \varphi} [\text{app}] \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdash unit : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi}{\vdash unit : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi} [\text{unit}]}{\vdash unit\ t : \diamond \varphi} [\text{app}]}{\vdash \mathbf{reset} (unit\ t) : \diamond \varphi} [\text{app}] \quad \mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_1} \vdash t : \varphi}{\vdash \mathbf{reset} (unit\ t) : \diamond \varphi} [\&]$$

```
%mode   + $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_1}$   $\implies$  - $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_2}$ 
%worlds ()  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_1}$   $\implies$   $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_2}$ 
%total  {}  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_1}$   $\implies$   $\mathcal{D}_{\text{of}_2}$ 
```


Different continuation monads

1. Continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = (\varphi \Rightarrow o) \Rightarrow o.$$

2. Modal continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o) \Rightarrow \diamond o.$$

3. Polymorphic continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = \forall\alpha.(\varphi \Rightarrow \alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha.$$

4. Polymorphic modal continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = \forall\alpha.(\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha.$$

Remark. Cases 1 and 3 are obtained by taking \diamond as the identity monad.

Modal continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o) \Rightarrow \diamond o.$$

$$unit_{\nabla} = \lambda t: \varphi. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond o. (k t).$$

$$bind_{\nabla} = \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\psi. \lambda m: \nabla\varphi. \lambda c: \psi \Rightarrow \diamond o. m (\lambda v: \varphi. k v c).$$

$$\%solve \vdash unit_{\nabla} : \varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\varphi$$

$$\%solve \vdash bind_{\nabla} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\psi) \Rightarrow \nabla\varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\psi$$

Polymorphic modal continuation monad

$$\nabla\varphi = \forall\alpha.(\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha.$$

$$unit_{\nabla} = \lambda t:\varphi.\Lambda\alpha.\lambda k:\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha.(k\ t).$$

$$bind_{\nabla} = \lambda m:\nabla\varphi.\lambda k:\varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\psi.\Lambda\alpha.\lambda c:\psi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha.m\{\alpha\} (\lambda v:\varphi.(k\ v)\{\alpha\} c).$$

$$\%solve \quad \vdash unit_{\nabla} : \varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\varphi$$

$$\%solve \quad \vdash bind_{\nabla} : \nabla\varphi \Rightarrow (\varphi \Rightarrow \nabla\psi) \Rightarrow \nabla\psi$$

Example: the continuation monad

$$\diamond\varphi = (\varphi \Rightarrow o) \Rightarrow o.$$

$$unit_{\varphi} = \lambda t: \varphi. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow o. (k t).$$

$$bind_{\varphi, \psi} = \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi. \lambda m: \diamond\varphi. \lambda c: \psi \Rightarrow o. m (\lambda v: \varphi. k v c).$$

$$\%solve \vdash unit_{\varphi} : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%solve \vdash bind_{\varphi, \psi} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi) \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi$$

$$\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi^{[reset]}$$

$$\vdash \mathbf{shift} : \forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \varphi^{[shift]}$$

$$[t] = \mathbf{reset} (unit_{\varphi} t).$$

$$\mu(t) = \mathbf{shift} (\Lambda \alpha. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha. bind_{\varphi, \alpha} k t).$$

$$\%solve \vdash t: \varphi \rightarrow \vdash [t] : \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%solve \vdash t: \diamond\varphi \rightarrow \vdash \mu(t) : \varphi$$

Example: the continuation monad

Defining **escape** in direct style:

escape = $\lambda h: (\varphi \Rightarrow \psi) \Rightarrow \varphi. \mu(\lambda c: \varphi \Rightarrow o. [h \ \lambda a: \varphi. \mu(\lambda c': \psi \Rightarrow o. c \ a)] \ c).$

%solve \vdash **escape** : $((\varphi \Rightarrow \psi) \Rightarrow \varphi) \Rightarrow \varphi$

What is the logical meaning of $\diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$?

Since $\diamond \varphi \equiv (\varphi \Rightarrow o) \Rightarrow o$, for some formula o , we get $\neg\neg\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$ which extends the logic to classical logic if we take $o = \perp$, but this axiom is incoherent if o is a theorem (note that it is always at least classical logic).

Example: the state monad

σ : *type*.

$$\diamond\varphi = \sigma \Rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \sigma).$$

$$\mathit{unit}_\varphi = \lambda a:\varphi.\lambda s:\sigma.\langle a, s \rangle.$$

$$\mathit{bind}_{\varphi,\psi} = \lambda f:\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi.\lambda t:\diamond\varphi.\lambda s:\sigma.\mathbf{let} \langle x, s' \rangle = t \ s \ \mathbf{in} \ f \ x \ s'.$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash \mathit{unit}_\varphi : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash \mathit{bind}_{\varphi,\psi} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi) \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi$$

$$\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi^{\mathbf{[reset]}}$$

$$\vdash \mathbf{shift} : \forall\alpha.((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \varphi^{\mathbf{[shift]}}$$

$$[t] = \mathbf{reset} (\mathit{unit}_\varphi t).$$

$$\mu(t) = \mathbf{shift} (\Lambda\alpha.\lambda k:\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha.\mathit{bind}_{\varphi,\alpha} k t).$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash t:\varphi \rightarrow \vdash [t] : \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \quad \vdash t:\diamond\varphi \rightarrow \vdash \mu(t) : \varphi$$

Example: the state monad

Defining **fetch** and **store** in direct style:

$$\mathbf{unit} = \forall \alpha. \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha.$$

$$\langle \rangle = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda x: \alpha. x.$$

$$\% \text{solve} \quad \vdash \langle \rangle : \mathbf{unit}$$

$$\mathbf{store} = \lambda n: \sigma. \mu(\lambda s: \sigma. \langle \langle \rangle, n \rangle).$$

$$\mathbf{fetch} = \lambda x: \mathbf{unit}. \mu(\lambda s: \sigma. \langle s, s \rangle).$$

$$\% \text{solve} \quad \vdash \mathbf{fetch} : \mathbf{unit} \Rightarrow \sigma$$

$$\% \text{solve} \quad \vdash \mathbf{store} : \sigma \Rightarrow \mathbf{unit}$$

What is the logical meaning of $\diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$?

Since $\diamond \varphi \equiv \sigma \Rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \sigma)$, for some formula σ , we get $(\sigma \Rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \sigma)) \Rightarrow \varphi$ which is not valid in general. This axiom is derivable if σ is a theorem, but it is incoherent if we take $\sigma = \perp$.

Example: the exception monad

ε : *type*.

$$\diamond\varphi = \varphi \vee \varepsilon.$$

$$\mathit{unit}_\varphi = \lambda a: \varphi. \mathbf{inl} \ a.$$

$$\mathit{bind}_{\varphi, \psi} = \lambda f: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi. \lambda t: \diamond\varphi. \mathbf{case} \ t \ \mathbf{of} \ (\mathbf{inl} \ a) \mapsto f \ a \mid (\mathbf{inr} \ b) \mapsto \mathbf{inr} \ b.$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \ \vdash \ \mathit{unit}_\varphi : \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \ \vdash \ \mathit{bind}_{\varphi, \psi} : (\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi) \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\psi$$

$$\vdash \ \mathbf{reset} : \diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\varphi^{\mathbf{[reset]}}$$

$$\vdash \ \mathbf{shift} : \forall \alpha. ((\varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha) \Rightarrow \varphi^{\mathbf{[shift]}}$$

$$[t] = \mathbf{reset} \ (\mathit{unit}_\varphi \ t).$$

$$\mu(t) = \mathbf{shift} \ (\Lambda \alpha. \lambda k: \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond\alpha. \mathit{bind}_{\varphi, \alpha} \ k \ t).$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \ \vdash \ t: \varphi \rightarrow \vdash \ [t] : \diamond\varphi$$

$$\%_0\mathbf{solve} \ \vdash \ t: \diamond\varphi \rightarrow \vdash \ \mu(t) : \varphi$$

Example: the exception monad

Defining **raise** and **handle** in direct style:

raise = $\lambda e:\varepsilon.\mu(\mathbf{inr}\ e).$

handle = $\lambda t:\varphi.\lambda h:\varepsilon\Rightarrow\varphi.\mathbf{case}\ [t]\ \mathbf{of}\ (\mathbf{inl}\ a)\mapsto a\ |\ (\mathbf{inr}\ e)\mapsto h\ e.$

%solve $\vdash \mathbf{raise} : \varepsilon \Rightarrow \alpha$

%solve $\vdash \mathbf{handle} : \varphi \Rightarrow (\varepsilon \Rightarrow \varphi) \Rightarrow \varphi$

What is the logical meaning of $\diamond\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$?

Since $\diamond\varphi \equiv \varphi \vee \varepsilon$, for some formula ε , we get $(\varphi \vee \varepsilon) \Rightarrow \varphi$ which is not valid in general. This axiom is incoherent if ε is a theorem, but it is derivable if $\neg\varepsilon$ is derivable.

Concluding remarks

- Depending on \diamond , the type of **shift** can be:
 - *intuitionistic*
 - *classical*
 - *incoherent*
- However a proof of $\vdash \perp$ is translated into a proof $\vdash \diamond \perp$ (and the target logic is consistent since \diamond is defined)
- In a dependently typed framework $\vdash \mathbf{reset} : \diamond \varphi \Rightarrow \diamond \varphi$ is useless. Is it just an optimization?
- Similarly, we can replace **shift** by the \mathcal{D} -operator.
- Why should we expect **shift** to be logically sound?

Bibliography

- [1] H. B. Curry. The elimination theorem when modality is present. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 17 (4): 249–265, 1952. ISSN 0022-4812.
- [2] A. Filinski. Representing monads. In *Conference Record of the Twenty-First Annual Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 446–457, Portland, Oregon, January 1994.