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## An Example

```
Theorem plus_n_O_firsttry : forall n:nat,
    n = n + 0.
Proof.
    intros n.
    simpl. (* Does nothing! *)
Abort.
```


## An Example

```
Theorem plus_n_O_secondtry : forall n:nat,
    n=n+o.
Proof.
intros n. destruct n as [| n'] eqn:E.
-(* n = 0 *)
        reflexivity. (* so far so good... *)
- (* n = S n' *)
simpl. (* ...but here we are stuck again *)
Abort.
```


## An Example

Theorem plus_n_O : forall $\mathrm{n}:$ nat, $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{n}+\mathrm{o}$.

## Proof.

intros n . induction n as [| $\left.\mathrm{n}^{\prime} \mathrm{IHn} \mathrm{n}^{\prime}\right]$.

- (* $\mathrm{n}=0$ *) reflexivity.
- (* n = S n' *) simpl. rewrite <- IHn'. reflexivity. Oed.


## Another Example

```
Theorem minus_n_n : forall n,
    minus n n=0.
Proof.
intros n. induction n as [| n' lHn'].
    -(* n = 0 *)
        simpl. reflexivity.
    - (* n = S n' *)
        simpl. rewrite -> IHn'. reflexivity.
Qed.
```


## Proofs Within Proofs

Theorem mult_o_plus' : forall n m : nat, $(o+n) * m=n * m$.

## Proof.

intros n m.
assert (H: o + n = n). \{reflexivity. \}
rewrite -> H.
reflexivity.
Oed.

## Proofs Within Proofs

Theorem plus_rearrange_firsttry : forall $\mathrm{n} \mathrm{m} \mathrm{p} \mathrm{q} \mathrm{:} \mathrm{nat}$, $(n+m)+(p+q)=(m+n)+(p+q)$.

Proof.
intros nmpq.
(* We just need to swap ( $n+m$ ) for $(m+n)$... seems
like plus_comm should do the trick! *)
rewrite -> plus_comm.
(* Doesn't work... Coq rewrites the wrong plus! :-( *) Abort.

## Proofs Within Proofs

Theorem plus_rearrange : forall nmpq : nat, $(n+m)+(p+q)=(m+n)+(p+q)$.

Proof.
intros n m p q.
assert (H: n + m = m + n).
\{rewrite -> plus_comm. reflexivity.\}
rewrite -> H. reflexivity.
Qed.

## Formal vs. Informal Proof

- Informal proofs are algorithms; formal proofs are code.
- A proof is an act of communication.
- A "valid" proof is one that makes the reader believe P.
- There is no universal standard.
- The formal proof is much more explicit in some ways (e.g., the use of reflexivity) but much less explicit in others (e.g., the proof state).

Write formal proof more algorithmically!

## 作业

－完成Induction．v中的至少 10 个练习题。

