

9/21

Nathan Keough

Acknowledgements: Utilized the study session, recieved help on 1.3.7 from other students, proofs finished independently.

---

**Wade 1.3.4**

Prove that a lower bound of a set need not be unique but the infimum of a given set  $E$  is unique.

*Proof.*

We must show that:

- ① Lower bound need not be unique.
- ② inf are unique.

- ① Consider a set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R} \ni E \neq \emptyset$  and  $E$  is bounded below, so,  $\exists m \in \mathbb{R} \ni x \geq m \forall x \in E$ .  
Now, consider  $n \leq m$ , thus  $\forall x \in E, x \geq n$ .  
It has been shown that two lower bounds of a set  $E$  may exist,  $\therefore$  a lower bound for a set need not be unique.
- ② Assume there exists two inf of a set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i_1, i_2$  respectively whereby both are lower bounds of  $E$ . Then,  $i_1 \leq x$  and  $i_2 \leq x \forall x \in E$ .  
By definition of infimum,  $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq x$  and  $i_2 \leq i_1 \leq x$  must be true.  
The only case where this holds is when  $i_1 = i_2$ .  
 $\therefore$  the infimum of a given set  $E$  is unique.

□

**Wade 1.3.7**

- a. Prove that if  $x$  is an upper bound of a set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in E$ , then  $x$  is the supremum of  $E$ .

*Proof.*

Consider a nonempty set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  that is bounded above and let  $x \in E$ .

Let  $x \in m \forall$  upper bounds  $m$  of  $E$ .

$x \in m \implies \forall y \in E, y \leq x$ .

Since  $x \in E$ ,  $x \leq m$  By definition of supremum,  $y \leq x \leq m$

$\implies \sup E = x$ .

$\therefore$  if  $x$  is an upper bound of a set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in E$ , then  $x$  is the supremum of  $E$ .

□

- b. Make and prove an analogous statement for the infimum of  $E$ .

*Proof.*

Consider a nonempty set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  that is bounded above and let  $x \in E$ .

Let  $x \in n \forall$  upper bounds  $n$  of  $E$ .

$x \in n \implies \forall y \in E, y \geq x$ .

Since  $x \in E$ ,  $x \geq n$  By definition of infimum,  $x \geq y \geq n \implies \inf E = x$ .

□

- c. Show by example that the converse of each of these statements is false.

Take for example, the set  $E = (0, 1)$ . Neither 0 nor 1 are in the set,

yet the infimum and supremum of  $E$  is  $\inf E = 0, \sup E = 1$

$\therefore$  since  $\inf E = 0, \sup E = 1$  and  $0, 1 \notin E$ , the converse of these statement must be false.