

More Reality

- infima, +, -, maybe other horrors

Recall:

- if $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ \exists A has an upper bound $u \in \mathbb{R}$, then the least upper bound or supremum of A is $U_A = \bigvee_{a \in A} a$
- if $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ \exists A has a lower bound $l \in \mathbb{R}$, then the greatest lower bound (or infimum) of A is the schmitt $\wedge A$ (if no largest element) where b is the largest element of $\wedge A$ (if it has one)

$$(\wedge A) \cap \mathbb{Q} = \left(\bigcap_{a \in A} a \right) \cap \mathbb{Q}$$

Definition: Suppose $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ (ie s, t are both schmitts), then $s \vee t$ is the schmitt:

$$s \vee t = \{ p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p \in s, q \in t \}$$

$$I_R = \{ p \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p < 1_R \}$$

$$2_R = \{ q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q < 2_R \}$$

- Check $s \vee t$ is a schmitt is s, t are

(1) $s \vee t \neq \emptyset$ b/c there are $a \in s, b \in t \Rightarrow a \vee b \in s \vee t$

$s \vee t \neq \mathbb{Q}$ b/c there are $a \in s, b \in t \Rightarrow a \vee b \notin s \vee t$

(2) $s \vee t$ has no largest element:

suppose $p \in s \vee t$ so $p = a \vee b$ for some $a \in s, b \in t$

since s has no element, there is a $c \in s$ with $a < c$. & similarly there is a $d \in t$ such that $b < d$

then $p = a \vee b < c \vee d = q \in s \vee t$

(3) $s \vee t$ is downward closed:

suppose $p \in s \vee t$ & $q < p$

(why $q < p$?)

since $p \in s \vee t$, there are $a \in s, b \in t$ such that $p = a \vee b$ (we need $c \in s, d \in t$ such that $q = c \vee d$)

let $x = \frac{p+q}{2}$ ($2x = p+q$) & then let:

$c = a - x$ & $d = b - x$ then

$c \vee d = (a - x) \vee (b - x)$

$= (a \vee b) - 2x$

$= p - 2(\frac{p+q}{2})$

$= q$

$\therefore q \in s \vee t$ so $s \vee t$ is downward closed

How do we define multiplication on \mathbb{R} ? (using schmitts)

$s \vee t = \{ a \vee b \mid a \in s, b \in t \}$ is not a schmitt even if s, t are b/c by choosing $a < 0$ in s & $b < 0$ in t :

we can get any rational $q \geq 0$ as $q = a \vee b$

- if s, t was a schmitt it wouldn't be a schmitt after all

\rightarrow fix: if $0 < s$ & $0 < t$ then define $s \vee t = \{ q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q < 0 \} \cup \{ a \vee b \mid a \in s, b \in t, a < 0, b < 0 \}$

Q: how do we extend this to possibly non-positive schmitts?

1. given a schmitt $s \in \mathbb{R}$, how do we define " $-s$ " as a schmitt?

$$-s = \{ p \mid p \in s, 0 < p \}$$

(if $q = \sup(s)$ is a rational)

2. we let $-s = 0_{\mathbb{R}} \cup \{ 0_{\mathbb{R}} \} \cup \{ q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q < 0 \} \cup \{ r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid r = \sup(s) \}$ if $s = \{ q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q < r \}$ for $r \in \mathbb{Q}$

Now we extend the definition of multiplication

s	t	$s \cdot t$
+	+	as before
+	-	$-(s \cdot (-t))$
-	+	$-((-s) \cdot t)$
-	-	$(-s) \cdot (-t)$

} where we multiply positives