

## Exercises

E3.88 [02M]Difficulty:\*.<sup>a</sup> Consider the following quotient of the family of all integer valued sequences

$$\mathbb{X} = \{a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\} / \sim$$

where we define  $a \sim b$  iff  $a_k = b_k$  eventually in  $k$ .

We define the ordering

$$a \leq b \iff \exists n \text{ s.t. } \forall k \geq n, a_k \leq b_k$$

that is,  $a \leq b$  when  $a_k \leq b_k$  eventually. This is a preorder and

$$a \sim b \iff (a \leq b \wedge b \leq a)$$

so it passes to the quotient where it becomes an ordering, see Prop. [127].

Let  $a^k$  be an increasing sequence of sequences, that is,  $a^k \leq a^{k+1}$ ; we readily see that it has an upper bound  $b$ , by defining

$$b_n = \sup_{h, k \leq n} a_h^k.$$

We can then apply the Zorn Lemma to assert that in the ordered set  $(\mathbb{X}, \leq)$  there exist maximal elements.

Given  $a, b$  we define

$$a \vee b = (a_n \vee b_n)_n$$

then it is easily verified that  $a \leq a \vee b$ . So this a *direct* ordering, see [06N].

We conclude that the ordered set  $(\mathbb{X}, \leq)$  has an unique maximum, by [06S].

This is though false, since for any sequence  $a$  the sequence  $(a_n + 1)_n$  is larger than that.

What is the mistake in the above reasoning? What do you conclude about  $(\mathbb{X}, \leq)$ ?

---

<sup>a</sup>Originally published in <https://dida.sns.it/dida2/Members/mennucci/curiosa/>