

# The two typing relations

---

Question: What is the relation between these two statements?

1.  $t : T$

2.  $\vdash t : T$

## The two typing relations

---

Question: What is the relation between these two statements?

1.  $t : T$
2.  $\vdash t : T$

First answer: These two relations are completely different things.

- ▶ We are dealing with several different small programming languages, *each with its own typing relation* (between terms in that language and types in that language)
- ▶ For the simple language of numbers and booleans, typing is a *binary* relation between terms and types ( $t : T$ ).
- ▶ For  $\lambda_{\rightarrow}$ , typing is a *ternary* relation between contexts, terms, and types ( $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ ).

(When the context is empty — because the term has no free variables — we often write  $\vdash t : T$  to mean  $\emptyset \vdash t : T$ .)

## Conservative extension

---

Second answer: The typing relation for  $\lambda_{\rightarrow}$  *conservatively extends* the one for the simple language of numbers and booleans.

- ▶ Write “language 1” for the language of numbers and booleans and “language 2” for the simply typed lambda-calculus with base types `Nat` and `Bool`.
- ▶ The terms of language 2 include all the terms of language 1; similarly typing rules.
- ▶ Write  $t :_1 T$  for the typing relation of language 1.
- ▶ Write  $\Gamma \vdash t :_2 T$  for the typing relation of language 2.
- ▶ *Theorem:* Language 2 conservatively extends language 1: If  $t$  is a term of language 1 (involving only booleans, conditions, numbers, and numeric operators) and  $T$  is a type of language 1 (either `Bool` or `Nat`), then  $t :_1 T$  iff  $\emptyset \vdash t :_2 T$ .