

The ordinal numbers represent not the size of a set, but the position within the ordered sequence  $0, 1, 2, \dots$ . They are well-ordered<sup>1</sup> and every ordinal has a unique successor, obtained by adding 1 and denoted by  $\#1$ , which is larger than the original. The von Neumann definition of ordinals is as the set containing all smaller ordinals (and nothing else). The  $\#1$  operation is equivalent to ‘the set containing all ordinals up to and including this one’, i.e.  $x \#1 = x \cup \{x\}$ . The naturals  $\mathbb{N}_0$  are defined in a very precise way: 5 is defined as ‘one more than’ 4, etc. Under this definition,  $x$  is an ordinal if every element of  $x$  is also a subset of  $x$ . For example, 3 has three elements:  $0, 1, 2$ .  $0 = \{\}$ , the empty set, which is a subset of every set (and hence of 3).  $1 = \{0\} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2\} = 3$ . Finally,  $2 = \{0, 1\} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2\} = 3$ . For ordinals  $x, y$ , we define  $x < y$  if and only if  $x \in y$  if and only if  $x \subseteq y$ . Be careful, as it is easy to get confused in all this.  
 $0 = \{\}$ ,  $1 = \{0\} = 0 \#1$ ,  $2 = \{0, 1\} = 1 \#1$ ,  $3 = \{0, 1, 2\} = 2 \#1$ ,  $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\omega \#1 = \{0, 1, \dots, \omega\}$ .

Every ordinal  $n$  is necessarily one of three following types. Statements about ordinals will typically handle the three cases separately.

1.  $n = 0$ , the unique smallest ordinal, a special case. 0 is not a successor or a limit.
2.  $n = m \#1$  for some other ordinal  $m$ . We say that  $n$  is a *successor* ordinal, and  $m$  is its *predecessor*.
3.  $n$  has no predecessor; for every  $m < n$  we also have  $m \#1 < n$ . We say that  $n$  is a *limit ordinal*.

Every element of  $\mathbb{N}$  (note that  $0 \notin \mathbb{N}$ ) is a successor; the smallest ordinal after all of  $\mathbb{N}$  is called  $\omega$ , omega. We can now define addition of ordinals<sup>2</sup>, as follows. Let  $x, y$  be ordinals.

1. If  $y = 0$ , then  $x + y = x$ .
2. If  $y$  is a successor, then for some ordinal  $z$ , we have  $y = z \#1$ . We define  $x + y$  as the successor of  $x + z$ ; i.e.  $x + y = (x + z) \#1$ .
3. If  $y$  is a limit ordinal, then  $y = \lim_{z < y} z$ . We then define  $x + y = \lim_{z < y} (x + z)$ .

Note:  $\#1$  means successor, which is a set operation (it is not addition). However, these two coincide:

**Lemma** For any ordinal  $x$ ,  $x + 1 = x \#1$ .

*Proof.*  $1 = 0 \#1$ . Hence  $x + 1$  by property 2 equals  $(x + 0) \#1$ , which by property 1 equals  $x \#1$ . □

Exercises:

1. Prove that  $3 < 5$  in three ways:  $3 \subseteq 5$ ,  $3 \in 5$ , and we can get from 3 to 5 using the successor operation.
2. Prove that  $3 < \omega$  in two ways:  $3 \subseteq \omega$ ,  $3 \in \omega$ . Can we get from 3 to  $\omega$  using the successor operation?
3. Express 3, 4 in von Neumann notation using only symbols  $\{\}, \in$ . e.g.,  $1 = \{\{\}\}$ ,  $2 = \{\{\}, \{\{\}\}\}$ .
4. Prove that  $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  is a limit ordinal.
5. Calculate  $4 + 2$  and  $2 + 4$ . Note that although the answer is the same the method is quite different.
6. Show that  $1 + \omega = \omega \neq \omega + 1$ .
7. For any nonzero ordinals  $x, y$ , prove: (1) If  $y$  is a successor then  $x + y$  is a successor; and (2) if  $y$  is a limit then  $x + y$  is a limit. Hence if one of  $x, y$  is a successor and the other is a limit,  $x + y \neq y + x$ .
8. Calculate  $(3 + (\omega + 4)) + ((\omega + 5) + 6)$ .

<sup>1</sup>This does not *necessarily* mean we assume the axiom of choice (there may be non-ordinal numbers that are not in this well-ordering), however we may as well assume AC since it makes things conceptually simpler.

<sup>2</sup>This addition is associative, but the proof is difficult and we omit it.