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MATH 350 : REAL ANALYSIS

## SOLUTION SET 1

## Textbook Problems

JP1.1 Let $A:=\{1,2,3,4\}$ and $B:=\{1,3,5,7,9\}$, both in the universe $\{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10\}$.
(a) $A \cup B=\{1,2,3,4,5,7,9\}$
(b) $A \cap B=\{1,3\}$
(c) $A \backslash B=\{2,4\}$
(d) $B \backslash A=\{5,7,9\}$
(e) $A^{c}=\{5,6,7,8,9,10\}$
(f) $B^{c}=\{2,4,6,8,10\}$

JP1.4 Claim. $A \subseteq \emptyset$ if and only if $A=\emptyset$.
Proof. As usual with if and only if statements, we prove both directions.
$(\Leftarrow)$ The empty set is a subset of every set.
$(\Rightarrow)$ We know $\emptyset \subseteq A$, so if $A \subseteq \emptyset$ as well then $A=\emptyset$.

JP1.11 Claim. If $A \subseteq B$ then $B^{c} \subseteq A^{c}$.
Proof 1. We prove the contrapositive of the claim. Suppose $B^{c} \nsubseteq A^{c}$. Then there exists $x \in B^{c} \backslash A^{c}$, or in other words, $x \notin B$ and $x \in A$. This implies $A \nsubseteq B$, a contradiction, so we conclude that $B^{c} \subseteq A^{c}$ as desired.

Proof 2. Assume $A \subseteq B$, and pick an arbitrary $x \in B^{c}$. Then $x \notin B$, whence $x \notin A$ (since $x \in A \Longrightarrow x \in B)$. But this implies $x \in A^{c}$. Since $x \in B^{c}$ was arbitrary, we deduce $B^{c} \subseteq A^{c}$.
(2) Consider the set $A:=\{x: x$ is a nonempty set $\}$. Is $A$ an element of itself? Briefly justify your answer.

Clearly $A$ is a set; I claim it's clearly nonempty. For example, the set of all currently enrolled Williams students is nonempty, hence is an element of $A$, so $A \neq \emptyset$. (If you want to be rigorous, $\{\emptyset\}$ is a nonempty set, hence is an element of $A$, so $A$ must be nonempty.) We conclude that $A$ is a nonempty set. Since $A$ contains all nonempty sets, it must contain $A$ itself: $A \in A$.

Note: $\in$ and $\subseteq$ are quite different. For example, $\emptyset \subseteq A$, but $\emptyset \notin A$. Similarly, $A \subseteq A$ for any set $A$, but it's pretty unusual for $A \in A$.
(3) Let $S$ be the set consisting of all sets that aren't elements of themselves. Carefully explain why this set is problematic. [This problem illustrates the pitfalls of never carefully defining what a set is!]
There are two possibilities: either $S \in S$ or $S \notin S$. I claim that neither holds, which is a problem.

Suppose $S \in S$. Since $S$ consists of all sets that aren't elements of themselves, this would imply that $S$ cannot be an element of $S$. Contradiction!

Now suppose instead that $S \notin S$. Then, again by the definition of $S$, we deduce $S \in S$, a contradiction.

Note: $S$ is non-empty, since $\{1\} \in S$. (Check this!) But also, $S$ isn't the set of all sets, since the set $A$ from the previous problem isn't an element of $S$.
(4) Using only the definition of ordered pair (in particular, without using Theorem 2.2 from the book), prove that the only ordered pair corresponding to the set $\{\{1\}\}$ is $(1,1)$.

Suppose $(a, b)$ is an ordered pair corresponding to the set $\{\{1\}\}$. Then

$$
\{\{a\},\{a, b\}\}=\{\{1\}\}
$$

In particular, $\{\{a\},\{a, b\}\} \subseteq\{\{1\}\}$, so $\{a\} \in\{\{1\}\}$, which implies $\{a\}=\{1\}$. This implies $a \in\{1\}$, so $a=1$. A similar argument shows that $\{1, b\}=\{1\}$, meaning $b \in\{1\}$, which implies $b=1$.

Note. It is not a valid proof to start with the set $\{\{1\}\}$ and expand it to $\{\{1\},\{1,1\}\}=$ $(1,1)$; this merely shows that $(1,1)$ is one interpretation of $\{\{1\}\}$, but doesn't prove it's the only interpretation!

