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## Curriculum

- Student in the Computer Science in ENS de Lyon
- In 4th year of the ENS de Lyon's program : already have a M2
- In exchange at the Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences at UTokyo as a Special Auditor
- Interested in Graph, Automata, Proof theories and Logic
- Hence here in Applied Mathematics


## What I do as an Auditing Student

- Free to attend any courses if the ENS de Lyon agrees
- Attend courses from the Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences
- Attend courses from the Graduate School of Information Science and Technology
- Attend seminars with students of Professor Ryu Hasegawa $\rightarrow$ Mainly about type theory, but a lot of use of categories


## Type theory

$\rightarrow$ Used in Logic and Computer Science
$\rightarrow$ Several type theories, in particular
Alonzo Church's typed $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$-calculus cf. later
Per Martin-Löf's intuitionistic type theory (constructive mathematics)

## Necessity of type theory

Russel's paradox : $\mathrm{R}=\{\mathrm{w} \mid \mathrm{w} \notin \mathrm{w}\}$<br>$R \in R$ iff $R \notin R$

The class of all sets cannot be a set itself.
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## Necessity of type theory

Russel's paradox : $\mathrm{R}=\{\mathrm{w} \mid \mathrm{w} \notin \mathrm{w}\}$
$R \in R$ iff $R \notin R$
The class of all sets cannot be a set itself.

One solution : hierarchy of types and assigning each concrete mathematical entity to a type

Entities of a given type are built exclusively of subtypes of that type :
$\rightarrow$ preventing an entity from being defined using itself.

## Simply Typed Lambda Calculus

Types:

- Atomic types $\mathrm{T}_{1}, \mathrm{~T}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{n}}$;
- U and V are types then $\mathrm{U} \rightarrow \mathrm{V}$ is a type (function type).

Terms:

- Variables $\mathrm{x}_{1}{ }^{\mathrm{T}}, \mathrm{x}_{2}{ }^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots$ for each type T ;
- If $v$ is a term of type $V$ and $x_{n} U$ is a variable of type $U$ then $\lambda x_{n} U$. $v$ is a term of type $U \rightarrow V$;
- If $t$ and $u$ are terms of types respectively $U \rightarrow V$ and $U$, then tu is a term of type $V$.
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$$
\text { Bool }_{\mathrm{U}}=\mathrm{U} \rightarrow \mathrm{U} \rightarrow \mathrm{U}
$$

Church's booleans
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\begin{aligned}
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## Application of Lambda-calculus

## Booleans

$$
\text { Bool }_{\mathrm{U}}=\mathrm{U} \rightarrow \mathrm{U} \rightarrow \mathrm{U}
$$

Church's booleans

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { true }=\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot x \text { of type Bool }{ }_{U} \\
& \text { false }=\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot y \text { of type Bool }
\end{aligned}
$$

ifelse true $395^{8}=$ true $395^{8}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow(\lambda x \cdot \lambda y \cdot x) 395^{8} \\
& \rightarrow(\lambda y \cdot 39) 5^{8}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\rightarrow 39
$$

## Curry Howard Principle

Analogy between formal logic and computational calculi

| Logic side | Programming side |
| :---: | :---: |
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## Curry Howard Principle

Analogy between formal logic and computational calculi

Curry Howard's
isomorphism between natural deduction and Simply Typed Lambda Calculus

| Logic side | Programming side |
| :---: | :---: |
| Formula | Type |
| Proof | Term |
| $[A]$ |  |
| $\vdots$ |  |
|  | $\frac{B}{A \Rightarrow B} \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ |
| $\vdots$ |  |
| $A$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other variants

| Logic side | Programming side |
| :---: | :---: |
| Intuitionistic Natural Deduction | Simply typed Lambda Calculus |
| Hilbert's style Natural Deduction | Typed Combinatory Logic |
| System F | Polymorphic Lambda Calculus |
| Classical Natural Deduction | Typed Lambda-Mu Calculus |

## Difference Japan-France

- System of student seminar
- No internship as in France
- Place of Master program in the curriculum : often linked with License program in France, but with PhD program in Japan


## Difference Japan-France

- System of student seminar
- No internship as in France
- Place of Master program in the curriculum : often linked with License program in France, but with PhD program in Japan

Since at the crossroad of Mathematics and Informatics
$\rightarrow$ Don't know whether these differences are due to differences Japan/France or to differences Mathematicians/ Computer scientists

