

1. a) Let $A = \{1, 2, 4\}$ and $B = \{1, 3, 4\}$. What is $A \cup B$?

$$A \cup B = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \quad \text{by def.}$$

because

def states that any x in $A \cup B$ is $\{x \mid x \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$

- b) Let $A = \{1, 2, 4\}$ and $B = \{1, 3, 4\}$. What is $A \cap B$?

$$A \cap B = \{1, 4\}$$

for any element in $A \cap B$ is $\{x \mid x \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$

- c) Let $C = [0, 5]$ and $D = (4, 8)$. What is $C - D$?

$$C - D = \{x \mid x \in C \text{ and } x \notin D\}$$

$$C - D = [0, 4]$$

Great

2. a) Let $\mathbb{N}^+ = \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$. Let $A_n = (0, n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. What is $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} A_n$?

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} A_n = \mathbb{R}^+ = \{x \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } x > 0\}$$

This is true since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $n > x$, so $x \in A_n$, but for $x \leq 0$ we don't have $x \in (0, n)$ for any n .

b) Let I be a set such that for each $i \in I$, B_i is itself a set. Then $A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$.

If $x \in A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$ then $x \in A \wedge x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$

This can be written $x \in A \wedge x \in B_i$ for some $i \in I$ or $x \in A \wedge x \in B$

Therefore we know $x \in A \cap B_i$ for some $i \in I$

which can be written $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$

so $A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$ since any element in the set on the left will also be in the set on the right.

If $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$ then $x \in (A \cap B_i)$ for some $i \in I$.

Therefore $x \in A \wedge x \in B_i$ for some $i \in I$

which can be written $x \in A \wedge x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$

Therefore we know $x \in A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$

And since any element in $\bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$ is also in $A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$ we know

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i) \subseteq A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$$

Since they are subsets of each other, we know by def. of set equality that $A \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)$ Excellent!

3. a) $\forall b \in \mathbb{R}$, if $b > 0$, then $0 < \frac{b}{2} < b$.

$$b > 0 \Rightarrow \frac{b}{2} > \frac{0}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{b}{2} > 0 \quad (\text{by multiplication principle})$$

So we know

$$0 < b \quad \& \quad 0 < \frac{b}{2}$$

And if we take $0 < \frac{b}{2}$ add $\frac{b}{2}$ to each side

$$0 < \frac{b}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{b}{2} + 0 < \frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{b}{2} < b \quad (\text{by addition principle})$$

We can now put these pieces together by the Great! transitive principle to get

$$0 < b + 0 < \frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{2} < b \Rightarrow \boxed{0 < \frac{b}{2} < b} \quad \text{giving us what we wanted to prove}$$

b) $\forall b \in \mathbb{R}$, $|b| \geq 0$.

By definition of absolute value we know...

$$\text{if } b \geq 0 \Rightarrow |b| = b \Rightarrow |b| \geq 0 \quad (\text{by substitution})$$

$$\text{if } b < 0 \Rightarrow |b| = -b$$

$$-|b| = b \quad (\text{by multiplying each side by } (-1))$$

$$-|b| < 0 \quad (\text{by substituting } -|b| = b < 0)$$

$$|b| > 0 \quad (\text{by multiplying each side by } -1 \text{ \& flipping the greater than/less than sign, this was proven to be valid in earlier proofs})$$

Nice
Job!

Thus we have $|b| \geq 0$ b/c since we know $|b| > 0$ it is not changing it at all to add the "or equal to" line as well. Thus since by the tricotomy princ we know b can only be $b=0$ $b < 0$ $b > 0$ thus we've proven $|b| \geq 0$ in all possible cases.

4. Let A be a set. Show that $A - A = \emptyset$.

$$A - A = \{x \mid x \in A \wedge x \notin A\}$$

If $x \in A - A$, then we know that $x \in A \wedge x \notin A$.

If $x \in A$ then $\neg x \notin A$ so no elements appear in both sets.

Because of this, we know that $A - A$ contains no elements.

Therefore any element $x \in A - A$ vacuously is also in \emptyset .

Therefore $A - A \subseteq \emptyset$.

Since \emptyset contains no elements, we know that any $x \in \emptyset$ vacuously is contained in $A - A$.

Therefore $\emptyset \subseteq A - A$.

Because $A - A \subseteq \emptyset$ and $\emptyset \subseteq A - A$, by def. of set equality we know that $A - A = \emptyset$.

Great!

5. a) $\forall a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$, if $a > b$ and $c > d$, then $a + c > b + d$.

$$a > b \quad + \quad c > d$$

↓

$$a + c > \underline{b + c}$$

↓

$$\underline{c + b} > d + b$$

(by addition principle)

Thus by transitivity we can say

$$a + c > b + c > d + b \Rightarrow \underline{a + c > b + d}$$

Excellent!

b) $\forall a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$, if $a > b$ and $c > d$, then $a - c > b - d$.

$$3 - 2 > 0 + +4$$

$$1 > 4$$

Consider the case where

$$a = 3 \quad b = 0$$

$$c = 2 \quad d = -4$$

Nice.

We see that $a > b \Rightarrow 3 > 0$ is valid

+ that $c > d \Rightarrow 2 > -4$ is also true.

But $a - c > b - d \Rightarrow 3 - 2 > 0 - (-4) \Rightarrow 1 > 4$

Which we know to be false b/c $1 \not> 4$.

Thus we have at least one contradiction and that proves the statement to be false.