

**No maximum element.**

Every nonempty bounded set has a least upper bound, but not every set contains a “maximum.”

Does the set  $(0, 1)$  contain a largest element? **No!** For every number in  $(0, 1)$ , I can find a larger one: namely, if you say that  $x \in (0, 1)$  is the largest number in  $(0, 1)$ , then I will tell you that  $(1 + x)/2$  is also in  $(0, 1)$ , but it is bigger.

It helps to think of a concrete example: you might say that 0.963 is the largest number in  $(0, 1)$ , but I will retort that

$$0.963 < \frac{1 + 0.963}{2} = .9815 \in (0, 1)$$

and 0.9815 is bigger than your number.

**Repeating decimals.**

You might claim that  $0.\bar{9}$  is the “biggest” number in  $(0, 1)$ . But I will say that  $0.\bar{9} = 1$ , so  $0.\bar{9}$  is not in the set  $(0, 1)$ .

Why? What might we mean by  $0.\bar{9}$ ? Take a look at the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 0.9 &= 9 \cdot 10^{-1} \\ 0.99 &= 9 \cdot 10^{-1} + 9 \cdot 10^{-2} \\ 0.999 &= 9 \cdot 10^{-1} + 9 \cdot 10^{-2} + 9 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ 0.9999 &= 9 \cdot 10^{-1} + 9 \cdot 10^{-2} + 9 \cdot 10^{-3} + 9 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ &\vdots \\ 0.\bar{9} &= 9 \cdot 10^{-1} + 9 \cdot 10^{-2} + 9 \cdot 10^{-3} + 9 \cdot 10^{-4} + \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

or in fancier notation,  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 9 \cdot 10^{-n}$ .

In any case,  $10 \cdot 0.\bar{9} = 9.\bar{9}$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} 9 \cdot 0.\bar{9} &= (10 - 1) \cdot 0.\bar{9} \\ &= 10 \cdot 0.\bar{9} - 0.\bar{9} \\ &= 9.\bar{9} - 0.\bar{9} = 9. \end{aligned}$$

Divide both sides by 9 to see that  $0.\bar{9}$  must be another name for 1.

**A much shorter argument.**

You might already believe that  $0.\bar{3} = 1/3$ . Multiply both sides by three, to get  $0.\bar{9} = 1$ .

**There are many ways to write a number.**

Just because 1 looks different than  $0.\bar{9}$  doesn't mean it is different: **IV** is not 4, which is not “four,” which is not “,” but all of these (might) mean the same thing. *The signifier is not the signified.*