COQ CHEATSHEET

Jules Jacobs

December 9, 2021

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	Goal tactics	2
3	Hypothesis tactics	3
4	Equality, rewriting, and computation rules	3
5	Inductive types and relations	3
6	Intro patterns	4
7	Forward reasoning	4
8	Composing tactics	5
9	Automation with eauto	5
10	Searching for lemmas and definitions	5
11	Common error messages	5

1 INTRODUCTION

This is Coq code that proves the strong induction principle for natural numbers:

```
From Coq Require Import Lia.

Lemma strong_induction (P : nat -> Prop) :
  (forall n, (forall m, m < n -> P m) -> P n) -> forall n, P n.

Proof.
  intros H n.
  eapply H.
  induction n.
  - lia.
  - intros m Hm.
   eapply H.
  intros k Hk.
  eapply IHn. lia.

Qed.
```

Coq proofs manipulate the *proof state* by executing a sequence of *tactics* such as intros, eapply, induction. Coq calculates the proof state for you after executing each tactic. Here's what Coq displays after executing the second intros m Hm.:

The proof state consists of a list of variables and hypotheses above the line, and a goal below the line. A tactic may create 0, 1, 2, or more subgoals. A goal is solved if we succesfully apply a tactic that creates no subgoals (such as the lia tactic). Some tactics create multiple subgoals, such as the induction tactic: it creates one subgoal for the base case of the induction, and one subgoal for the inductive case. We have to solve all the subgoals with a bulleted list of tactic scripts:

```
tac1.
+ tac2.
+ tac3.
+ tac4.
```

Bullets can nested by using different bullets for different levels (-, +, *):

```
tac1.
+ tac2.
* tac3
* tac4.
+ tac5.
```

We can also enter subgoals using brackets:

```
tac1.
{ tac2. }
{ tac3. }
tac4.
{ tac5. }
```

This is most useful for solving side conditions. With bullets, we get a deep level of nesting if we have a sequence of tactics with side conditions. With brackets, we do not need to enclose the last subgoal in brackets, thus preventing deep nesting.

2 GOAL TACTICS

```
Tactic
  Goal
 P \rightarrow Q
             intros H
   \neg P
             intros H (Coq defines \neg P as P \rightarrow False)
 \forall x, P(x)
             intros x
 \exists x, P(x)
             exists x, eexists
  P \wedge Q
             split
  P \vee Q
             left, right
    Q
             apply H, eapply H (where H: (...) \rightarrow Q is a lemma or hypothesis with conclusion Q)
             apply H, eapply H (where H: (...) \rightarrow \neg P is a lemma or hypothesis with conclusion \neg P)
  False
Any goal exfalso (turns any goal into False)
Skip goal
             admit (skips goal so that you can work on other subgoals)
```

¹ Coq allows us to do induction not only on natural numbers, but also on other data types. Induction on other data types may create any number of subgoals, one for each constructor of the data type.

3 HYPOTHESIS TACTICS

```
Hypothesis Tactic

H: False destruct H

H: \exists x, P(x) destruct H as [x H]

H: P \land Q destruct H as [H1 H2]

H: P \lor Q destruct H as [H1|H2]

H: \forall x, P(x) specialize (H y)

H: P \rightarrow Q specialize (H G) (where G : P is a lemma or hypothesis)

H: P apply G in H, eapply G in H (where G : P \rightarrow (...) is a lemma or hypothesis)
```

4 EQUALITY, REWRITING, AND COMPUTATION RULES

Tactic	Meaning
reflexivity symmetry	Solve goal of the form $x = x$ or $P \leftrightarrow P$ Turn goal $x = y$ into $y = x$ (or $P \leftrightarrow Q$)
symmetry in H	Turn hypothesis $H : x = y$ into $H : y = x$ (or $P \leftrightarrow Q$)
unfold f	Replace constant f with its definition (only in the goal)
unfold f in H	Replace constant f with its definition (in hypothesis H)
unfold f in *	Replace constant f with its definition (everywhere)
simpl	Rewrite with computation rules (in the goal)
simpl in H	Rewrite with computation rules (in hypothesis H)
simpl in *	Rewrite with computation rules (everywhere)
rewrite H.	Rewrite $H : x = y$ (in the goal).
rewrite H in G.	Rewrite $H : x = y$ (in hypothesis G).
rewrite H in *.	Rewrite H1 (everywhere).
rewrite <-H.	Rewrite $H : x = y$ backwards.
rewrite H,G.	Rewrite using H and then G.
rewrite !H.	Repeatedly rewrite using H.
rewrite ?H.	Try rewriting using H.
subst	Substitute away all equations $H : x = A$ with a variable on one side.
injection H as H	Use injectivity of C to turn $H: C x = C y$ into $H: x = y$.
discriminate H	Solve goal with inconsistent assumption $H : C x = D y$.
simplify_eq	Automated tactic that does subst, injection, and discriminate automatically.

5 INDUCTIVE TYPES AND RELATIONS

Assume that Foo is some inductive type or Foo x y is an inductive relation.

Goal	Tactic
Foo x y	constructor, econstructor (tries to solve goal using some constructor of Foo)
Hypothesis	Tactic
Н : Foo Н : Foo	destruct H as [a b c d e f] induction H as [a b IH c d e IH1 IH2 f IH]
H : Foo x y H : Foo x y	inversion H (use when x,y are fixed terms) induction H (use when x,y are variables)

It is often useful to define the tactic Ltac inv H := inversion H; clear H; subst. and use this instead of inversion.

The following tactics are useful to obtain the correct induction hypothesis:

Hypothesis	Tactic
H : P	revert H (opposite of intros H: turn goal Q into $P \rightarrow Q$)
x : A	revert x (opposite of intros x: turn goal Q into $\forall x, Q$)
H:P,x:A	clear H, clear x (remove hypothesis H or variable x)

A common pattern is revert x. induction n; intros x; simpl.

6 INTRO PATTERNS

The destruct x as pat and intros pat tactics can unpack multiple levels at once using *intro* patterns. The intros tactic can be chained: intros x y z. \equiv intros x. intros y. intros z.

Data	Pattern
∃x, P	[x H]
$P \wedge Q$	[H1 H2]
$P \vee Q$	[H1 H2]
x = y	-> or <-
Inductive type	[a b c d e f]

Furthermore, (x & y & z & ...) is equivalent to [x [y [z ...]]].

7 FORWARD REASONING

Tactic	Meaning
assert P as H	Create new hypothesis H : P after proving subgoal P
cut P	Split goal Q into two subgoals $P \rightarrow Q$ and P

Intro patterns can be used in combination with the assert tactic, e.g. assert (A = B) as -> or assert (exists x, P) as [x H].

8 COMPOSING TACTICS

Tactic	Meaning
tac1; tac2	Do tac2 on all subgoals created by tac1.
tac1; [tac2]	Do tac2 only on the first subgoal.
tac1; [tac2]	Do tac2 only on the last subgoal.
tac1; [tac2 tac3 tac4]	Do tactics on corresponding subgoals.
tac1; [tac2 tac3 tac4]	Do tactics on corresponding subgoals.
tac1 tac2	Try tac1 and if it fails do tac2.
try tac1	Try tac1, and do nothing if it fails.
repeat tac1	Repeatedly do tac1 until it fails.
progress tacl	Do tac1 and fail if it does nothing.

9 AUTOMATION WITH eauto

The eauto tactic tries to solve goals using eapply, reflexivity, eexists, split, left, right. You can specify the search depth using eauto n (the default is n = 5).

You can give eauto additional lemmas to use with eauto using lemma1, lemma2. You can also use eauto using foo where foo is an inductive type. This will use all the constructors of foo as lemmas.

10 SEARCHING FOR LEMMAS AND DEFINITIONS

TODO

11 COMMON ERROR MESSAGES

TODO

Please submit your errors to me so that I can add them to this section.

You can also suggest additional content.

julesjacobs@gmail.com