

ordinals.1 Basic Properties of the Ordinals

sth:ordinals:basic:
sec

We observed that the first few ordinals are the natural numbers. The main reason for developing a theory of ordinals is to extend the principle of induction which holds on the natural numbers. We will build up to this via a sequence of elementary results.

sth:ordinals:basic:
ordmemberord

Lemma ordinals.1. *Every **element** of an ordinal is an ordinal.*

Proof. Let α be an ordinal with $b \in \alpha$. Since α is transitive, $b \subseteq \alpha$. So \in well-orders b as \in well-orders α .

For transitivity, suppose $x \in c \in b$. So $c \in \alpha$ as $b \subseteq \alpha$. Again, as α is transitive, $c \subseteq \alpha$, so that $x \in \alpha$. So $x, c, b \in \alpha$. But \in well-orders α , so that \in is a transitive relation on α by **??**. So since $x \in c \in b$, we have $x \in b$. Generalising, $c \subseteq b$ □

sth:ordinals:basic:
ordissetofsmallerord

Corollary ordinals.2. $\alpha = \{\beta \in \alpha : \beta \text{ is an ordinal}\}$, for any ordinal α

Proof. Immediate from **Lemma ordinals.1**. □

The rough gist of the next two main results, **Theorem ordinals.3** and **Theorem ordinals.4**, is that the ordinals themselves are well-ordered by membership:

sth:ordinals:basic:
ordinductionschema

Theorem ordinals.3 (Transfinite Induction). *For any formula $\varphi(x)$:¹*

$$\text{if } \exists \alpha \varphi(\alpha), \text{ then } \exists \alpha (\varphi(\alpha) \wedge (\forall \beta \in \alpha) \neg \varphi(\beta))$$

where the displayed quantifiers are implicitly restricted to ordinals.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi(\alpha)$, for some ordinal α . If $(\forall \beta \in \alpha) \neg \varphi(\beta)$, then we are done. Otherwise, as α is an ordinal, it has some \in -least **element** which is φ , and this is an ordinal by **Lemma ordinals.1**. □

Note that we can equally express **Theorem ordinals.3** as the scheme:

$$\text{if } \forall \alpha ((\forall \beta \in \alpha) \varphi(\beta) \rightarrow \varphi(\alpha)), \text{ then } \forall \alpha \varphi(\alpha)$$

just by taking $\neg \varphi(\alpha)$ in **Theorem ordinals.3** and reasoning as in **??**.

sth:ordinals:basic:
ordtrichotomy

Theorem ordinals.4 (Trichotomy). $\alpha \in \beta \vee \alpha = \beta \vee \beta \in \alpha$, for any ordinals α and β .

Proof. The proof is by double induction, i.e., using **Theorem ordinals.3** twice. Say that x is *comparable* with y iff $x \in y \vee x = y \vee y \in x$.

For induction, suppose that every ordinal in α is comparable with *every* ordinal. For further induction, suppose that α is comparable with every ordinal in β . We will show that α is comparable with β . By induction on β , it will

¹The formula may have parameters, which need not be ordinals.

follow that α is comparable with every ordinal; and so by induction on α , every ordinal is comparable with every ordinal, as required.

It suffices to assume that $\alpha \notin \beta$ and $\beta \notin \alpha$, and show that $\alpha = \beta$.

To show that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$, fix $\gamma \in \alpha$; this is an ordinal by [Lemma ordinals.1](#). So by the first induction hypothesis, γ is comparable with β . But if either $\gamma = \beta$ or $\beta \in \gamma$ then $\beta \in \alpha$ (invoking the fact that α is transitive if necessary), contrary to our assumption; so $\gamma \in \beta$. Generalising, $\alpha \subseteq \beta$.

Exactly similar reasoning, using the second induction hypothesis, shows that $\beta \subseteq \alpha$. So $\alpha = \beta$. □

As such, we will sometimes write $\alpha < \beta$ rather than $\alpha \in \beta$, since \in is behaving as an ordering relation. There are no deep reasons for this, beyond familiarity, and because it is easier to write $\alpha \leq \beta$ than $\alpha \in \beta \vee \alpha = \beta$.²

Here are two quick consequences of our last results, the first of which puts our new notation into action:

Corollary ordinals.5. *If $\exists \alpha \varphi(\alpha)$, then $\exists \alpha (\varphi(\alpha) \wedge \forall \beta (\varphi(\beta) \rightarrow \alpha \leq \beta))$. More-over, for any ordinals α, β, γ , both $\alpha \notin \alpha$ and $\alpha \in \beta \in \gamma \rightarrow \alpha \in \gamma$.* sth:ordinals:basic:ordordered

Proof. Just like ?? □

Problem ordinals.1. Complete the “exactly similar reasoning” in the proof of [Theorem ordinals.4](#).

Corollary ordinals.6. *A is an ordinal iff A is a transitive set of ordinals.* sth:ordinals:basic:corordtransitiveord

Proof. *Left-to-right.* By [Lemma ordinals.1](#). *Right-to-left.* If A is a transitive set of ordinals, then \in well-orders A by [Theorem ordinals.3](#) and [Theorem ordinals.4](#). □

But, although we have said that \in well-orders the ordinals, we have to be very cautious about all this, thanks to the following:

Theorem ordinals.7 (Burali-Forti Paradox). *There is no set of all the ordinals* sth:ordinals:basic:buraliforti

Proof. For reductio, suppose O is the set of all ordinals. If $\alpha \in \beta \in O$, then α is an ordinal, by [Lemma ordinals.1](#), so $\alpha \in O$. So O is transitive, and hence O is an ordinal by [Corollary ordinals.6](#). Hence $O \in O$, contradicting [Corollary ordinals.5](#). □

This result is named after [Burali-Forti](#). But, as van Heijenoort explains:

Burali-Forti himself considered the contradiction as establishing, by *reductio ad absurdum*, the result that the natural ordering of the ordinals is just a partial ordering. ([Heijenoort, 1967](#), p. 105)

²We could write $\alpha \subseteq \beta$; but that would be wholly non-standard.

It was Cantor in 1899—in a letter to Dedekind—who first saw clearly the *contradiction* in supposing that there is a set of all the ordinals. (For further historical discussion, see [Heijenoort 1967](#), p. 105.)

To summarise, ordinals are sets which are individually well-ordered by membership, and collectively well-ordered by membership.

Rounding this off, here are some more basic properties about the ordinals which follow from [Theorem ordinals.3](#) and [Theorem ordinals.4](#).

Proposition ordinals.8. *Any strictly descending sequence of ordinals is finite.*

Proof. Any infinite strictly descending sequence of ordinals $\dots \in \alpha_3 \in \alpha_2 \in \alpha_1 \in \alpha_0$ has no \in -minimal member, contradicting [Theorem ordinals.3](#). \square

[sth:ordinals:basic:
ordinalsaresubsets](#)

Proposition ordinals.9. $\alpha \subseteq \beta \vee \beta \subseteq \alpha$, for any ordinals α, β .

Proof. If $\alpha \in \beta$, then $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ as β is transitive. Similarly, if $\beta \in \alpha$, then $\beta \subseteq \alpha$. And if $\alpha = \beta$, then $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ and $\beta \subseteq \alpha$. So by [Theorem ordinals.4](#) we are done. \square

[sth:ordinals:basic:
ordisoidentity](#)

Proposition ordinals.10. $\alpha = \beta$ iff $\alpha \cong \beta$, for any ordinals α, β .

Proof. The ordinals are well-orders; so this is immediate from Trichotomy ([Theorem ordinals.4](#)) and ???. \square

[sth:ordinals:basic:
probunionordinalsordinal](#)

Problem ordinals.2. Prove that, if every member of X is an ordinal, then $\bigcup X$ is an ordinal.

Photo Credits

Bibliography

Burali-Forti, Cesare. 1897. Una questione sui numeri transfiniti. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo* 11: 154–64.

Heijenoort, Jean van. 1967. *From Frege to Gödel: A Source Book in Mathematical Logic, 1879–1931*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.