

Ordinals II

2020-11-18

①

We need to finish the proof that if α & β are ordinals, then $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in \beta$.

\Leftarrow Finished last time.

\Rightarrow Suppose $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$. Then $\beta \setminus \alpha = \{x \in \beta \mid x \notin \alpha\} \neq \emptyset$.

Since \in is a well-order on β , $\beta \setminus \alpha$ has a least element b .

Claim: $b = \alpha$ [which we'll show by showing $b \subseteq \alpha$ & $\alpha \subseteq b$]

1^o $b \subseteq \alpha$: Suppose $x \in b$. Then $x \notin \beta \setminus \alpha$, since otherwise x would be smaller than b and $b \in \beta \setminus \alpha$, but b is the least element of $\beta \setminus \alpha$. Since $x \in b$ & $b \in \beta$, $x \in \beta$ by transitivity, so $x \in \alpha$. Thus $b \subseteq \alpha$.

2^o $\alpha \subseteq b$: Suppose $x \in \alpha$. Then $x \in \beta$ since $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$, but $x \notin \beta \setminus \alpha$. Since $b \in \beta$ too, trichotomy tells us that exactly one of $x \in b$, $x = b$, or $b \in x$ holds.

a) If ~~$x \in \beta$~~ ^{$b \in x$} , then $b \in x \in \alpha$, so $b \in \alpha$. (2)

Then $b \notin \beta \setminus \alpha$, contradicting the fact that $\beta \setminus \alpha$ has b as its least element.

$\therefore b \notin x$.

b) If $b = x$, then $b = x \in \alpha$. Then, as above,

$b \notin \beta \setminus \alpha$, contradicting the choice of b .

$\therefore b \neq x$.

Thus it must be the case that $x \in b$.

$\therefore \alpha \in b$.

Hence the least element of $\beta \setminus \alpha$ is $\alpha = b$, so in particular, $\alpha \in \beta \setminus \alpha$, ie $\alpha \in \beta$, as desired. //

Notation: The collection of all ordinals is usually called ON . ③
[We can't use \mathbb{N} , since that's taken, as is \mathbb{O} , which is usually used for the octernions/octonions, which are the number system after the quaternions.]

It turns out that ON is too large to be a set, as we'll see.

Prop: ~~Suppose~~ \in is a well-order of ON .

proof: We first show that \in is a linear order on ON .

- 1) \in is irreflexive: If $\alpha \in ON$, $\alpha \notin \alpha$ by Foundation.
- 2) \in is transitive: If $\alpha \in \beta$ & $\beta \in \gamma$ (for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in ON$), then $\alpha \in \gamma$ because γ is an ordinal.
- 3) \in satisfies trichotomy: Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in ON$. We need to check that exactly one of $\alpha \in \beta$, $\alpha = \beta$, or $\beta \in \alpha$, holds.

3) \in is trichotomous on ON: Suppose $\alpha, \beta \in \text{ON}$. (4)

We need to check that exactly one of $\alpha \in \beta$, $\alpha = \beta$, or $\beta \in \alpha$ is true.

If $\alpha = \beta$, then $\alpha \notin \beta$ and $\beta \notin \alpha$ by the Axiom of Foundation.

If $\alpha \neq \beta$, then at least one of $\alpha \setminus \beta$ or $\beta \setminus \alpha$ is not empty.

i) If $\alpha \setminus \beta \neq \emptyset$. Then $\alpha \setminus \beta$ has a least element a .

Observe that $a \in \beta$ because

$x \in a \Rightarrow x \notin \alpha \setminus \beta$ [since a is the least element of $\alpha \setminus \beta$]

$\Rightarrow x \in \beta$ ~~$a \in \alpha \setminus \beta$~~ $\subseteq \alpha$, so $x \in \alpha$, so

we must have $x \in \beta$

$\therefore a \in \beta$.

Since $a \notin \beta$, we know that $a \not\subseteq \beta$ by a previous proposition. we can't have

(since $a \not\subseteq \beta \Leftrightarrow a \in \beta$ since a & β are ordinals)

$\therefore \alpha = \beta$, \Leftrightarrow $\beta \in \alpha$.

ii) If $\beta \setminus \alpha \neq \emptyset$, a similar argument shows that $\alpha \in \beta$.

(3)

So if $\alpha \neq \beta$, then one of $\alpha \in \beta$ or $\beta \in \alpha$ must be true. They can't both be true (i.e. $\alpha \in \beta \in \alpha$, ...) by one of the consequences of the Axiom of Foundation.

∴ If $\alpha, \beta \in ON$, then exactly one of $\alpha \in \beta$, $\alpha = \beta$, or $\beta \in \alpha$ is true, i.e. trichotomy holds.

Hence \in is a linear order on ON . To check that it is a well-order we need to show that every non-empty subcollection of ON has a least element.

Suppose A is a non-empty subcollection of ON .

Pick an $\alpha \in A$ and consider $\alpha \cap A$.

1) If $\alpha \cap A = \emptyset$, then α is the ϵ -least element of A , so we're done. (6)

2) If $\alpha \cap A \neq \emptyset$, then by the fact that α is an ordinal, $\alpha \cap A$ has an ϵ -least element β . But then $\beta \in A$ and β must be less than every other element of A (since any lesser element of A would also have to be in $\alpha \cap A$, contradicting β be the least such.).

Either way, we have a least element!

$\infty \in$ is a well-order of ON . //

Prop: Suppose A is a non-empty set of ordinals. Then $\cup A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \alpha$ is an ordinal, and is the least upper bound of A in ON .

proof: Let $\mathcal{P} = \cup A$. We claim that \mathcal{P} is an ordinal. (7)

(2) \mathcal{P} is downward closed under \in :

Suppose $x \in y \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{P} = \cup A$, there is some $\alpha \in A$ s.t. $y \in \alpha$. Since α is an ordinal and $x \in y \in \alpha$, $x \in \alpha$. But then $x \in \alpha \subseteq \cup A = \mathcal{P}$.

(1) \mathcal{P} is well-ordered by \in : Since \mathcal{P} is the union of a non-empty set of ordinals, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{ON}$, which are well-ordered by \in . Since \in linearly orders ON , it linearly orders every subcollection of ON , and \mathcal{P} in particular. \mathcal{P} has the least element property since if $B \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ & $B \neq \emptyset$, we have $B \subseteq \text{ON}$ & has a least element when $B \neq \emptyset$, because \in is a well-order of ON .

$\therefore \mathcal{P}$ is an ordinal. //

Corollary: ON ~~is~~ is not a set.

(8)

proof: If ON was a set, then $\cup ON$ would be an ordinal and then we'd have $\cup ON \in ON$. Also, we know that $S(\cup ON) = (\cup ON) \cup \{\cup ON\}$ would be an ordinal. $\cup ON \in S(\cup ON) \in ON$
 $\in \cup ON$

$\therefore \cup ON \in \cup ON$ \otimes to Foundation. //

Why ordinals? ^{reason} One \uparrow is to have a framework for induction that goes past infinity.