UNTITLED LEAN THESIS

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Georgetown College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Logan Johnson

Georgetown, Kentucky

May 2024

Abstract

UNTITLED LEAN THESIS

Logan C. Johnson

idk dr burch?? maybe dr white???

Here is the text of your abstract. It goes on and on and on. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. The rest of this paragraph is a filler. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. It goes on like this for about 150 words, so it should all fit on this page. Note that the Abstract comes before the title page and has no page number. If your abstract is more than 250 words, consider shortening it.

APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESES:

____

Dr. Homer White, Department of Mathematics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

____

Dr. Barbara Burch, Director

DATE:__________________________

Table of contents

Preface **1**

Incorporating Some Code 1
Showing the Infoview with Picture Sequences 1
Showing Infoview with Columns 2
Acknowledgments 3

1 Real Analysis **4**

2 Functional Programming **6**

3 Lean as a Theorem Prover **7**

Differences From Paragraph Style Proofs 7
Inequality Addition 8
a is Less Than or Equal to b 13
Absolute Convergence 21
Convergence of a Specific Sequence 33

4 Conclusions **37**

5 Works Cited **38**

6 Additional space **39**

Preface

Incorporating Some Code

I will also be able to use some LaTeX equations within the document which could halp to make the paper look quite nice.

If $a < b$ and $c \leq d$, prove that $a + c \leq b + d$. It just so happens that I was able to prove this using lean!

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b) (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1
  push_neg at h3
  have h4 : c < d := by
    apply Ne.lt_of_le h3 h2
  apply add_lt_add h1 h4
  done
```

Now to display the benefits of the lean infoview!

Showing the Infoview with Picture Sequences

Not going to do this now as I think the columns are far superior.

Showing Infoview with Columns

As we can clearly see, this is the first step of the code and it can now be explained with great ease. Now onto the next step!

Lean File

```
theorem Example_3_2_4_v2 (P Q R : Prop)
    (h : P → (Q → R)) : ¬R → (P → ¬Q) := by
  assume h2 : ¬R
  assume h3 : P
  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
P Q R : Prop
h : P → Q → R
h2 : ¬R
h3 : P
⊢ ¬Q
```

Click on the *Extensions* icon on the left side of the window, which is circled in red in the image above. That will bring up a list of available extensions:



Acknowledgments

1 Real Analysis

Symbol	Meaning
$\neg$	not
$\wedge$	and
$\vee$	or
$\rightarrow$	if ... then
$\leftrightarrow$	iff (that is, if and only if)

Name	Equivalence		
De Morgan's Laws	$\neg(P \wedge Q)$	is equivalent to	$\neg P \vee \neg Q$
	$\neg(P \vee Q)$	is equivalent to	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$
Double Negation Law	$\neg\neg P$	is equivalent to	P
Conditional Laws	$P \rightarrow Q$	is equivalent to	$\neg P \vee Q$
	$P \rightarrow Q$	is equivalent to	$\neg(P \wedge \neg Q)$
Contrapositive Law	$P \rightarrow Q$	is equivalent to	$\neg Q \rightarrow \neg P$

$$A \cap B = \{x \mid x \in A \wedge x \in B\} = \text{ the } \textit{intersection} \text{ of } A \text{ and } B,$$

$$A \cup B = \{x \mid x \in A \vee x \in B\} = \text{ the } \textit{union} \text{ of } A \text{ and } B,$$

$A \setminus B = \{x \mid x \in A \wedge x \notin B\} =$ the *difference* of A and B,

$A \triangle B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) =$ the *symmetric difference* of A and B.

2 Functional Programming

$\forall x\, P(x)$ means "for all x, $P(x)$,"

Quantifier Negation Laws		
$\neg\exists x\, P(x)$	is equivalent to	$\forall x\, \neg P(x)$
$\neg\forall x\, P(x)$	is equivalent to	$\exists x\, \neg P(x)$

3 Lean as a Theorem Prover

Differences From Paragraph Style Proofs

Despite the incredible power that lean could provide in the verification of mathematical proofs, this does pose some difficulties, namely the ease with which the aforementioned proofs can be written up. Typically, proofs are simply written up in a paragraph style, where the steps being taken and the theorems being applied are laid out in plain terms so that it can be easily understood by fellow mathematicians. There are often times when mathematicians will take things for granted or skip over steps that they think the reader will either already know to be fact or can easily reason out for themselves when writing out typical proofs. This lax approach for conveying information simply does not work when trying to communicate with technology, and a much more specific and methodical approach must be adopted in order to take advantage of the logical verification benefits. Thankfully, lean has a community working to create libraries of previously proven theorems that can be applied to speed up the writing and verification of future proofs. This thankfully means that all proofs do not need to be taken all the way back to basic axioms: Users can save time by avoiding proving adjacent theorems and instead focus only on the immediately relevant steps of their proof.

For each of the following proofs, I will first provide a typical "paragraph style" version of the proof, so the differences between the two can easily be compared.

Inequality Addition

Theorem. *If $a < b$ and $c \leq d$, prove that $a + c < b + d$*

There are multiple ways to approach this in a paragraph style proof, so I will attempt to have this proof follow along the same lines as the lean proof.

Proof. There are two possible cases: either $c = d$ or $c < d$. We will first consider the case where $c = d$. We know $a < b$, so it would also be true that $a + c < b + c$. Then because $c = d$, $a + c < b + d$. Now consider the case where $c < d$. We know $a < b$, so $a+c < b+c$ and $b+c < b+d$ because $c < d$. Thus by transitivity of inequalities, we could say $a + c < b + d$ □

Seting up the problem

Here I put the theorem we want to prove into lean and we can see the resulting infoview panel. I name our two assumptions `h1` and `h2`, for hypotheses one and two. After a colon I then write out the thing I am trying to prove with those hypotheses and use `by` to put lean into tactic mode.

It can now be seen that the infoview panel lists out both of our hypotheses as well as the goal we are working towards at the bottom. This panel will continue to change as more code is added to the lean file.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
⊢ a + c < b + d
```

Step 1

Here I lay out the two possible cases of our second hypothesis which allows me to strengthen the information that we know. We see this strengthened hypothesis reflected in `h3` in the infoview.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
h3: c = d
⊢ a + c < b + d
```

Step 2

Here I used hypothesis 3 to rewrite he c in our final goal as a d. This change is reflected in the infoview for this step.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
h3: c = d
⊢ a + d < b + d
```

Step 3

In this step I applied a theorem already in the Mathlib library for lean. The `add_lt_add_right` theorem simply states that if you have a `b < c`, then `b + a < c + a` which is exactly what we need to prove the goal for the first case. As the first case has been completed, the infoview then switches to the second case which is reflected in the new `h3` and reset goal.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
h3: ¬c = d
⊢ a + c < b + d
```

Step 4

In order to better work with our new hypothesis, I use a tactic which pushes the negation symbol further into the thing it is negating. This results in a hypothesis which can actually be applied later on.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1
  push_neg at h3

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
h3: c ≠ d
⊢ a + c < b + d
```

Step 5

Here I am laying out a new hypothesis which will be useful later in the proof. This hypothesis seems like an obvious conclusion based on hypotheses two and three, but we must still lay it out simply for lean if we want to actually use it. The infoview panel always displays the most current goal, which is why it is displaying the goal for `h4` rather than the main goal.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1
  push_neg at h3
  have h4 : c < d := by

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
abcd: ℝ
h1: a < b
h2: c ≤ d
h3: c ≠ d
⊢ c < d
```

Step 6

Here I apply another theorem already in lean which takes the information `h3` and `h2` gives us and shows our current goal. Writing out `h4` like this is technically optional, as lean allows you to evaluate tactics within arguments for other tactics. Despite this, I personally find it more convenient and clear to write out extra hypotheses like this rather than just giving the body of the argument when necessary. Now that our new hypothesis has been proven, the infoview displays that we have no goals until we get back into our main theorem.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1
  push_neg at h3
  have h4 : c < d := by
    apply Ne.lt_of_le h3 h2

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
No goals
```

Step 7

I now use the calc tactic to work through the rest of the theorem. This tactic is quite useful as it allows us to chain together multiple equalities or inequalities while still giving proofs for each step. This is essentially a shortcut of writing out individual hypotheses and then using the rewrite tactic to get our desired goal.

In this case, I only need to do two steps of chaining inequalities, where I use transitivity to show that the starting value is less than the final value. It essentially follows the same path as the paragraph style proof, where the tactics `add_lt_add_right` and `add_lt_add_left` justify the steps taken.

Lean File

```
example (a b c d : ℝ) (h1: a < b)
    (h2 : c ≤ d) : a + c < b + d := by
  by_cases h3 : c = d
  rw [h3]
  apply add_lt_add_right h1
  push_neg at h3
  have h4 : c < d := by
    apply Ne.lt_of_le h3 h2
  exact calc
    a + c < b + c := add_lt_add_right h1 c
    _ < b + d := add_lt_add_left h4 b
  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
No goals
```

a is Less Than or Equal to b

Setting up the problem

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
⊢ a ≤ b
```

Step 1

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: ¬a ≤ b
⊢ False
```

Step 2

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
⊢ False
```

Step 3

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by

    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
⊢ ε > 0
```

Step 4

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h

      done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
⊢ 0 < a - b
```

Step 5

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
h3: ε > 0
⊢ False
```

Step 6

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done
  have h4 : a ≤ b + ε := by

    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
h3: ε > 0
⊢ a ≤ b + ε
```

Step 7

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done
  have h4 : a ≤ b + ε := by
    apply h1

    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
h3: ε > 0
⊢ ε > 0
```

Step 8

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done
  have h4 : a ≤ b + ε := by
    apply h1
    apply h3
    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
h3: ε > 0
h4: a ≤ b + ε
⊢ False
```

Step 9

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done
  have h4 : a ≤ b + ε := by
    apply h1
    apply h3
    done
  dsimp at h4

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
R: Type u_1
inst†: Ring R
ab: ℝ
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  a ≤ b + ε
h2: b < a
ε: ℝ := (a - b) / 2
h3: ε > 0
h4: a ≤ b + (a - b) / 2
⊢ False
```

Step 10

Lean File

```
example (a b : ℝ) (h1 : ∀ ε : ℝ,
    ε > 0 → a ≤ b + ε) :
    a ≤ b := by
  by_contra h2
  push_neg at h2
  let ε := (a - b) / 2
  have h3 : ε > 0 := by
    refine half_pos ?h
    exact Iff.mpr sub_pos h2
    done
  have h4 : a ≤ b + ε := by
    apply h1
    apply h3
    done
  dsimp at h4
  linarith
  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
No goals
```

Absolute Convergence

I will now display how I used to lean to demonstrate that a sequence converges if and only if the absolute value of that sequence converges.

Laying out the goal

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
⊢ ConvergesTo s1 0
  ↔ ConvergesTo |s1| 0
```

Step 1

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
⊢ (∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |s1 n - 0| < ε) ↔
    ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |abs s1 n - 0| < ε
```

Step 2

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by

    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
x: ℕ
⊢ |s1 x| = |abs s1 x|
```

Step 3

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
⊢ (∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |s1 n - 0| < ε) ↔
    ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |abs s1 n - 0| < ε
```

Step 4

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards

  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
⊢ (∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |s1 n - 0| < ε) →
    ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |abs s1 n - 0| < ε
```

Step 5

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1

  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
  n ≥ N → |s1 n - 0| < ε
⊢ ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |abs s1 n - 0| < ε
```

Step 6

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp

  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
  ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
  n ≥ N → |s1 n - 0| < ε
⊢ ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    N ≤ n →
    |abs s1 n| < ε
```

Step 7

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1

  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
  ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
  N ≤ n → |s1 n| < ε
⊢ ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    N ≤ n →
    |abs s1 n| < ε
```

Step 8

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp [← h3]

  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
  ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
  N ≤ n → |s1 n| < ε
⊢ ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    N ≤ n →
    |s1 n| < ε
```

Step 9

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp [← h3]
    apply h1
  · --Reverse

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
⊢ (∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |abs s1 n - 0| < ε) →
    ∀ (ε : ℝ), ε > 0 →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    n ≥ N →
    |s1 n - 0| < ε
```

Step 10

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp [← h3]
    apply h1
  · --Reverse
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp_rw [h3]

  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
s1: ℕ → ℝ
h3: ∀ (x : ℕ), |s1 x| =
  |abs s1 x|
h1: ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
  ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
  N ≤ n → |abs s1 n| < ε
⊢ ∀ (ε : ℝ), 0 < ε →
    ∃ N, ∀ (n : ℕ),
    N ≤ n →
    |abs s1 n| < ε
```

Step 11

Lean File

```
example (s1 : ℕ → ℝ) :
    ConvergesTo s1 (0 : ℝ) ↔
    ConvergesTo (abs s1) (0 : ℝ)
    := by
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  rw [ConvergesTo]
  have h3 (x : ℕ) : |s1 x| =
      |abs s1 x| := by
    simp [abs]
    done
  apply Iff.intro
  · --Forwards
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp [← h3]
    apply h1
  · --Reverse
    intro h1
    simp
    simp at h1
    simp_rw [h3]
    apply h1
  done
```

Tactic State in Infoview

```
No goals
```

Convergence of a Specific Sequence

The following is an example of one situation where lean is somewhat lacking in comparison to a paragraph style proof. In this attempt to prove the convergence of a specific sequence, there were many issues with simplifying involving arbitrary variables and the change from natural numbers to real numbers. These sorts of things can be easily explained in a paragraph style proof, but required significant work to prove in lean.

Lean internally defines limits using filters and topology rather than the real analysis approach of epsilons, so the approach I was taking here is not the optimal approach for theorems involving limits in lean. While this high level definition of a limit is very useful for the people who know how to use it, it makes lean more difficult to use for those who have not yet studied topology. Definitions such as this start to portray that lean is not really something meant to be used for lower level mathematics, but rather complex and high level proofs.

```
example : ConvergesTo (fun (n : ℕ) ↦
    ((2 * n) / (n + 1))) 2 := by
  intro ε
  intro h1
  obtain ⟨k, h13⟩ :=
    exists_nat_gt (2 / ε - 1) --Archimedean Property
  use k
  intro n
  intro h2
  dsimp
  have h3 : (2 : ℝ) = 2 * ((n + 1) / (n + 1)) := by
    have h4 : ((n + 1) / (n + 1)) =
        (n + 1) * ((n + 1) : ℝ)⁻¹ := by
      rfl
      done
```

```
    rw [h4]
    have h5 : (n + 1) * ((n + 1) : ℝ)⁻¹ = 1 := by
      rw [mul_inv_cancel]
      exact Nat.cast_add_one_ne_zero n
      done
    rw [h5]
    exact Eq.symm (mul_one 2)
    done
  nth_rewrite 2 [h3]
  have h6 : 2 * ((↑n + 1) : ℝ) / (↑n + 1) =
      ((2 * n) + 2) / (n + 1) := by
    rw [Distribute n]
    done
  have h7 : 2 * (((↑n + 1) : ℝ) / (↑n + 1)) =
      2 * (↑n + 1) / (↑n + 1) := by
    rw [← mul_div_assoc 2 ((n + 1) : ℝ) ((n + 1) : ℝ)]
    done
  rw [h7]
  rw [h6]
  rw [div_sub_div_same (2 * n : ℝ) (2 * n + 2) (n + 1)]
  rw [sub_add_cancel']
  rw [abs_div]
  simp
  have h8 : |(↑n + 1 : ℝ)| = ↑n + 1 := by
    simp
    apply LT.lt.le (Nat.cast_add_one_pos ↑n)
    done
  rw [h8]
  have h9 : (2 : ℝ) / (↑n + 1) ≤ 2 / (k + 1) := by
    apply div_le_div_of_le_left
    · --case 1
      linarith
      done
```

```
      · --case 2
        exact Nat.cast_add_one_pos k
        done
      · --case 3
        convert add_le_add_right h2 1
        apply Iff.intro
        · --subcase 1
          exact fun a => Nat.add_le_add_right h2 1
          done
        · --subcase 2
          intro h14
          apply add_le_add_right
          exact Iff.mpr Nat.cast_le h2
          done
        done
    done
  have h10 : 2 / (k + 1) < 2 / (2 / ε - 1 + 1) := by
    apply div_lt_div_of_lt_left
    · --case 1
      linarith
      done
    · --case 2
      simp
      apply div_pos
      linarith
      apply h1
      done
    · --case 3
      convert add_le_add_right h2 1
      apply Iff.intro
      · --subcase 1
        intro h11
```

```
          exact Nat.add_le_add_right h2 1
          done
        · --subcase 2
          intro h11
          have h12 : 2 / ε - 1 < (k : ℝ) := by
            simp only []
            apply h13
            done
          exact add_lt_add_right h12 1
          done
        done
      done
    calc
      2 / (↑n + 1) ≤ (2 : ℝ) / (k + 1) := by
        apply h9
        done
      _ < (2 : ℝ) / (2 / ε - 1 + 1) := by
        apply h10
        done
      _ = ε := by
        ring_nf
        apply inv_inv
        done
    done
```

4 Conclusions

$$[x]_R = \{y \in A \mid yRx\}.$$

The set whose elements are all of these equivalence classes is called A *mod* R. It is written A/R, so

$$A/R = \{[x]_R \mid x \in A\}.$$

Note that A/R is a set whose elements are sets: for each $x \in A$, $[x]_R$ is a subset of A, and $[x]_R \in A/R$.

5 Works Cited

This work had been formatted and styled from the book *How To Prove It With Lean*, written by Daniel J. Velleman. *How To Prove It With Lean* contains short excerpts from *How To Prove It: A Structured Approach, 3rd Edition*, by Daniel J. Velleman and published by Cambridge University Press.

```
example : square1 = square2 := by rfl

#eval square1 7     --Answer: 49
```

6 Additional space

Extra chapter to write more things if needed!!