Solution to 1.3.3

1.3.3 (a) Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ be nonempty and bounded from below and $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ the set of lower bounds of A. Show that $\sup B = \inf A$.

(b) Explain why we don't need to assert the existence of greatest lower bounds in the Dedekind completeness axiom for \mathbb{R} .

Solution

- (a) We proceed in three steps: (i) prove that sup *B* exists; (ii) prove that sup *B* is a lower bound of *A*; (iii) prove that sup *B* is the greatest lower bound of *A*.
- (i) First, $B \neq \emptyset$ since A is bounded from below. Second, if $a \in A$, then $b \leq a$ for every $b \in B$, since b is a lower bound of A, so B is bounded from above by a. In particular, B is bounded from above since $A \neq \emptyset$. Since B is nonempty and bounded from above, its supremum sup B exists by the Dedekind completeness axiom for \mathbb{R} .
- (ii) Since every a ∈ A is an upper bound of B, we have sup B ≤ a since sup B is the *least* upper bound of B. Hence sup B is a lower bound of A. (So sup B ∈ B and sup B is the maximal element of B.)
- (iii) If b is any lower bound of A, then $b \in B$, so $b \leq \sup B$ since $\sup B$ is an upper bound of B. It follows that $\sup B$ is the greatest lower bound of A, which proves that $\inf A$ exists and is equal to $\sup B$.
- (b) The preceding argument shows that we can deduce the existence of the infimum of a nonempty set that is bounded from below from the existence of the supremum of a nonempty set that is bounded from above, so it's not necessary to require the existence of infima in the completeness axiom. Note that we didn't assume anywhere in (a) that inf A exists; rather we showed that $\sup B$ exists and is the greatest lower bound of A.

Remark. In class, we deduced the existence of infima from suprema by noting that $\inf A = -\sup(-A)$. The proof in this question has the advantage that it only uses the order properties of \mathbb{R} , not the field properties, so it applies equally well to any Dedekind complete ordered set.