
(1)
$(\stackrel{)}{ })$ Let $b$ be the infimum of $S$.
Then by def, $b$ is a lower bound for $S$.
So, (i) is true.
Now lets show (ii).
Let $\varepsilon>0$.
Case 1: Suppose $b \in S$.


Set $x=b$.
Then $x \in S$ and $b \leq x<b+\varepsilon$ is satisfied.
Case 2: Suppose b\&S.
What would happen if there was no $x \in S$ satisfying $b \leq x<b+\varepsilon$ ?

Then b would no longer be a lower bound for $S$.


Why?
Set $x=b+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.


Then $b \leq x<b+\varepsilon$.
And $x$ would be a lower bound for $S$, because no elements of $S$ are in the interval $\left[b, b+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right]$

This would contradict $b$ being the infimum of $S$ because $x$ would be a greater lower bound than $b$.
Thus, for case (ii), we must have that there exists $x \in S$ with $b \geqslant x>b+\varepsilon$.

Therefore we have show $(i)$ and $(i i)$. And the proof is complete.
$(\notin)$ Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and
(i) $b$ is a lower bound for $S$, and
(ii) for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $x \in S$ with $b \leq x<b+\varepsilon$.

We must show that $b$ is the
are true. infinum of $s$.
We know $b$ is a lower bound for $S$. We must show that it is the greatest lower bund for $S$. Let $C$ be another lower bound

We must show that $c \leq b$.
Suppose otherwise, that is
suppose that $b<c$.
Let $\varepsilon=\frac{c-b}{2}$.
Because $\varepsilon$ is half the distance between $c \& b$ we have that
 $b<b+\varepsilon<c$.
By property (ii) there would then exist $x \in S$ with $b \leq x<b+\varepsilon$.
But then $x \in S$ and $x<b+\varepsilon<c$.
This would contradict the fact that $c$ is a lower bound for $S$. Thus, we must have $c \leq b$.
We have show that $b$ is the infinum of $S$.
(2) Let $\left(a_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a non-decreasing sequence where $a_{n} \leq M$ for all $n \geqslant 1$ for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$.
Let $S=\left\{a_{k} \mid k=1,2,3, \ldots\right\}$

$$
=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}, \cdots\right\}
$$

Then $M$ is an upper bound for $S$.
Thus, by the completeness axiom for $\mathbb{R}$ we know that the supremum of $S$ exists.

Let $L=\sup (s)$.
We will show that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n}=L$.

Let $\varepsilon>0$.
Since $L$ is the supremum of $S$, there exists $a_{N} \in S$ where

$$
L-\varepsilon<a_{N} \leq L
$$

Suppose $n \geqslant N$.
Because $\left(a_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is non-delreasing
 we know

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { we know } \\
& a_{1} \leqslant a_{2} \leqslant a_{3} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant a_{N} \leqslant a_{N+1} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant a_{n} \leqslant \cdots \\
& a_{0} \leqslant a_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

That is, since $n \geqslant N$ we have $a_{N} \leq a_{n}$. Since $a_{n} \in S$, and $L$ is an upper buran for $S$ we know that $a_{n} \leq L$.

Summaring, if $n \geqslant N$ then

$$
L-\varepsilon<a_{N} \leqslant a_{n} \leqslant L
$$



So, if $n \geqslant N$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { if } n \geqslant N, \text { then } \\
& L-\varepsilon<a_{n} \leqslant L<L+\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

That is, if $n \geqslant N$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { is, if } n \geqslant a_{n}<L+\varepsilon_{n} \\
& L-\varepsilon<a_{n}<
\end{aligned}
$$

2 same as
So, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n}=L$

