## Tactics for Natural Deduction in Coq

The Coq proof assistant is based on (predicative) Calculus of Inductive Constructions (CIC), a combination of a higher-order logic and a richly-typed functional programming language. CIC is very expressive and can encode the whole of (intuitionistic) first-order logic. Proof construction using Coq can also be carried out in a manner very much like that using natural deduction in the sequent form.

	^	V	$\rightarrow$	Т		_
	/\	\/	->	True	False	~
Introduction	split	left	intro	exact I		intro
		right	$\mathtt{intro}\ H$			$\mathtt{intro}\ H$
Elimination	apply $H$	case $H$	apply $H$		$\mathtt{elim}\; H$	apply $H$
	$\verb"elim" H$	$\mathtt{elim}\; H$				$\mathtt{elim}\; H$

	$\forall$	3	=	
	forall	exists	=	
Introduction	intro	exists $v$	reflexivity	
	$\mathtt{intro}\ H$			
Elimination	apply $H$	apply $H$	rewrite <- ${\cal H}$	
		$\mathtt{elim}\; H$	$\verb"rewrite"H$	

(other tactics: assumption, cut, and assert, explained below)

In the above, H names, or gives name to, an assumption (which is a "higher-order term") in the environment (i.e., the antecedent of the current sequent/goal); same for v (in exists v). In Coq,  $\neg A$  is written as "A, which is defined to be A -> False (i.e.,  $A \to \bot$ ).

Always end a tactic with a period "." so that Coq knows the proof command is completed. Say "assumption" when you find the current goal to be an axiom as in the rules of Natural Deduction (appended below). It may occur that you want to apply the  $\rightarrow$ -Elimination rule (see the appendix), while  $A \rightarrow B$  is not immediately available in the set  $\Gamma$  of assumptions. Use "cut A" in this case; enclose A in parentheses if it is a compound formula. A similar tactic is "assert A," which you may find more convenient.

## Appendix

## **Intuitionistic Natural Deduction**

Below are the inference rules in the sequent form for intuitionistic first-order logic with equality.

$$\overline{A_1,\cdots,A_i,\cdots,A_n\vdash A_i}$$
 (Hyp<sup>i</sup>)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \land B}{\Gamma \vdash A \land B} (\land I) \qquad \frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \land B}{\Gamma \vdash A} (\land E_1)}{\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \land B}{\Gamma \vdash B} (\land E_2)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A \lor B} (\lor I_1) 
\underline{\Gamma \vdash B}_{\Gamma \vdash A \lor B} (\lor I_2)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \lor B} (\lor I_2)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \lor B}{\Gamma \vdash C} (\lor E)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \to B} \, (\to I) \qquad \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \to B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \, (\to E)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \top$$
  $(\top I)$ 

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \bot}{\Gamma \vdash A} (\bot E)$$

Note: the last rule says that, if we can deduce  $\perp$  (or False , representing a contradiction), then we can deduce anything.

Note: with the  $\rightarrow$ -Elimination rule, one can deduce a contradiction (and hence anything) from  $\neg A$  (or  $A \rightarrow \bot$ ) and A.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[y/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \forall xA} \ (\forall I) \qquad \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall xA}{\Gamma \vdash A[t/x]} \ (\forall E)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A} \; (\exists I) \qquad \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A \qquad \Gamma, A[y/x] \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \; (\exists E)$$

Note: in the quantifier rules above, we assume that all substitutions are admissible. In Rule  $\forall I, y$  does not occur free in  $\Gamma$  or A, and in Rule  $\exists E, y$  does not occur free in  $\Gamma$ , A, or B.

Let  $t, t_1, t_2$  be arbitrary terms and again assume all substitutions are admissible.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t = t}{\Gamma \vdash t = t} (= I) \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash A[t_1/x]}{\Gamma \vdash A[t_2/x]} (= E)$$

Note: the = sign is part of the object language, not a meta symbol.