

Part 1: Let  $\{A_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$  and be  $\{B_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$  sequences of sets.

1. Prove:

a. If  $A_n \subseteq B_n \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ , then  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ .

Proof: Let  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Then, by the definition of the union of a family of sets, there exists some  $m \in \mathbf{N}$  such  $x \in A_m$ . Now, since  $A_n \subseteq B_n \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ , we have that  $A_m \subseteq B_m$ . So, by the definition of subset,  $x \in B_m$ . Thus, by the definition of the union of a family of sets,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ . So,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  implies that  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ , and by the definition of subset,  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ , as desired.

b. If  $A_n \subseteq B_n \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ , then  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ .

Proof: Let  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Then, by the definition of the intersection of a family of sets,  $x \in A_n, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Now, since  $A_n \subseteq B_n \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ , by the definition of subset,  $x \in B_n, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Thus, by the definition of the intersection of a family of sets,  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ .

So,  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  implies that  $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ , and by the definition of subset,

$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ , as desired.

2. Prove that  $\left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right)' \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n'$ .

Proof: Let  $x \in \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right)'$ . Then, by the definition of complement,  $x \notin \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right)$ . So, by the (negation of the) definition of the intersection of a family of sets, there exists  $m \in \mathbf{N}$  such  $x \notin A_m$ . But then, by the definition of complement,  $x \in (A_m)'$ . So,

by the definition of the union of a family of sets,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n)'$ . So,  $x \in \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right)'$  implies  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n)'$ , and by the definition of subset,  $\left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right)' \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n)'$ , as desired.

3. Suppose  $F = \{A\}$  is a family of sets, and suppose  $D$  is a set for which  $D \subseteq A$  for every  $A \in F$ . Prove that  $D \subseteq \bigcap_F A$ .

**Proof:** Let  $d \in D$ . Then since  $D \subseteq A$  for every  $A \in F$ ,  $d \in A$  for every  $A \in F$ . Therefore by the definition of intersection  $d \in \bigcap_F A$ . Since  $d \in D \rightarrow d \in \bigcap_F A$ , then  $D \subseteq \bigcap_F A$  by definition of subset.

Part 2: Consider the following statements:

- a.  $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}, \exists k \in \mathbf{R}$ , such that  $k > n$ .
- b.  $\exists n \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $\forall k \in \mathbf{R}, k \leq n$ .

4. Explain what each of the statements (a. and b.) means. You must do more than just translate into words to get full credit.
- a. The statement in part a. says that, for all  $n$  in the natural numbers, there exists  $k$  in the real numbers such that  $k$  is greater than  $n$ . That is, the reals are not bounded by any natural number.
  - b. The statement in part b. says that there exists an  $n$  in the natural numbers such that for all  $k$  in the real numbers,  $k$  is less than or equal to  $n$ . That is, there exists a natural number that is greater than all real numbers. (Notice, this is the negation of the statement in part a.)
5. Prove or disprove each statement (a. and b.).
- a. Let  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  be an arbitrary natural number, and let  $k = n + 1$ . Notice that  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ , so clearly,  $k \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $k > n$ . Thus, the statement is true for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .
  - b. This statement is false. To disprove the statement, we need to show that no such  $n$  exists. That is, for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , there exists some  $k \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $k > n$ . But this is precisely the statement in part a., which we have already shown to be true (let  $k = n + 1$ ). So, we have shown the statement to be false.