

Here are the essentials:

1. For any two terms  $a$  and  $b$ , we intend ' $a \sim b$ ' to be a type (in  $U\{1\}$ )
2. For any term  $a$ , ' $a \sim a$ '
3. For two terms  $a$  and  $b$ , ' $a \sim b$ ' if  $b$  computes to  $a$  (normal direct computation)
4. For any of the following types  $T$ , and two terms  $a, b$  in  $T$ , we have ' $a = b$  in  $T \Rightarrow a \sim b$ '
  - a.  $\text{int}$
  - b.  $\text{Atom}$
  - c. any equality type (such as  $\text{Unit}$ )
5. Two terms ' $\text{opid1}\{\text{params1}\}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ ' and ' $\text{opid2}\{\text{params2}\}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ ' are squiggle equal if  $\text{opid1}$  and  $\text{opid2}$  are the same,  $\text{params1}$  and  $\text{params2}$  are the same, the arity of the terms is the same, and ' $a_1 \sim b_1$ ', ..., ' $a_n \sim b_n$ '
 

-- This rule is not strictly necessary, given the substitution rule, and the reflexive rule, but it is pretty useful in any case.
6. Substitution: if ' $T[a]$ ' is a hypothesis or conclusion in a sequent, and ' $a \sim b$ ', then ' $T[a]$ ' can be replaced by ' $T[b]$ ' (and there is no need to prove functionality).

We don't have a rule for proving when two squiggle types are equal, so we can't use the squiggle type as a hypothesis. If we had one, the rule would be something like this:

' $a \sim b = c \sim d$  in  $U1$ '

if ' $a \sim b \Leftrightarrow c \sim d$ ' and all free variables in  $a, b, c$ , and  $d$  belong to "canonical" types ( $T$  is a canonical type if 'all  $a, b: T. a = b$  in  $T \Rightarrow a \sim b$ ').