

Series of combinatorial games

PAOLO LIPPARINI

ABSTRACT. We present a tentative definition for the sum of a sequence of combinatorial games. This sum turns out to be invariant under Conway equivalence and coincides with the classical sum in the case of a converging sequence of real numbers. It coincides with the infinitary natural sum in the case of a sequence of ordinal numbers.

1. Introduction

The problem of evaluating infinite sums has a long history, in a sense—in hindsight—starting as early as Zeno’s Achilles and the tortoise paradox [9]. See also [8].

Conway’s surreal numbers [5] generalize, at the same time, real numbers and ordinals. Surreal numbers form a Field, have been studied from different points of views [1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 15] and have been recently found useful in making progress to the solution of an old problem by Skolem [4].

Needless to say, limits and series play a fundamental role in analysis. Limits and infinite sums are also present in the theory of ordinals [3]. See [10, 16] for further references. Various notions of “surreal limits” or infinite sums appear, among others, in [5, p. 40], [14], [15, Definition 3.19] and [12]. In passing, notice that the sum defined in [5, p. 40] does not necessarily coincide with the ordinal sum, for example, $\omega + \omega^2 + \omega^3 + \dots$ is not defined in the sense of [5, p. 40].

Conway [5] also introduced a general notion of “games” of which “numbers”, i.e., surreal numbers, are a proper subclass. To the best of our knowledge, no notion of infinite sum or limit has ever been proposed for arbitrary combinatorial games.

Here we introduce a notion of series for arbitrary combinatorial games, show that the definition is invariant up to Conway equivalence and evaluate it in a few cases. In particular, the sum of a (classically) converging series of reals has the same value also in a game theoretical sense. In the case of ordinal numbers, the sum we introduce coincides with the so-called *infinitary natural sum*. See [10] for details and further references.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 91A46;40J05.

Key words and phrases: Combinatorial game; Series of games; Conway equivalence.

Work performed under the auspices of G.N.S.A.G.A. The author acknowledges the MIUR Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C18000100006.

In conclusion, what we propose is a purely game-theoretical definition of an infinite sum which coincides with classical and useful notions in at least two significant cases.

2. Series of games

We assume familiarity with the basic notions of combinatorial game theory. A *combinatorial game*, or simply *game* for short, is a position in a possibly infinite two-player game with perfect information, no chance element, no draw and no infinite run, as studied, for example, in [15, Chapter VIII]. Games are possibly *partizan* and we always assume *normal* (not *misère*) *play*. The two players are called *Left* and *Right* and in each play on some game they can move either as the first or the second player. We sometimes capitalize *First* and *Second* in order to denote the player who plays first or second in some specified play, no matter whether she is Left or Right.

All the notions we introduce are independent up to Conway equivalence, hence we will generally not distinguish between a game and its *value* (its Conway equivalence class).

Definition 2.1. Given a sequence $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of games, we are going to define a game $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$, sometimes written as $G_0 + G_1 + G_2 + \dots$ or, possibly, $G_0 + G_1 + \dots + G_i + \dots$, etc. The game $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ will be called an *infinite sum* and sometimes a *series*, in order to avoid confusion when comparing it with some finite sum, e. g., some partial sum. Thus we do not reserve the word “series” only to the classical notion of analysis (we will see in Section 4 that the notion we are going to define actually incorporates the classical notion).

Rather informally, a play on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ goes as follows. If First has no move on any G_i , First loses the game. Otherwise, First chooses some natural number n and she makes a move G_i^F on some G_i with $i \leq n$. The resulting position on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ after First move is $G_0 + \dots + G_i^F + \dots + G_n + G_{n+1} + \dots$.

Then Second can either

- make a move on some G_j with $j \leq n$ (of course, moving on G_i^F , not on G_i , if $j = i$), or
- choose some natural number $m \geq n$ and make a move G_j^S on some G_j with $j \leq m$ (with the same provisions as above).

If Second chooses the eventuality ••, the play continues on the finite sum $G_0 + \dots + G_i^F + \dots + G_n + \dots + G_j^S + \dots + G_m$ (possibly with the double subposition addendum G_i^{FS} , instead).

In the eventuality •, First can go on moving on games with index $\leq n$, but she cannot change the value of n . Then, again, Second has the possibility of keeping himself on indexes $\leq n$, or of choosing some $m \geq n$ as in ••. As soon as Second chooses ••, the play continues on a finite sum $H_0 + \dots + H_m$, where H_0, \dots, H_m are the subpositions chosen so far from the games G_0, \dots, G_m .

For short, each player has (exactly one time) the possibility of choosing some index, and then she has to move on some game with the same or a smaller index. After both players have made their choices of the indexes, the play continues on the finite sum of the games up to the larger chosen index. The same description applies to *runs*, ie, when the same player is supposed to make two or more consecutive moves (a *play* is an alternating run; the development of Conway theory requires the general definition of runs). Notice that, after the choice of n by First and until Second applies the eventuality $\bullet\bullet$, the play essentially proceeds on $G_0 + \dots + G_n$, which is a finite sum of games, hence either the game ends after a finite number of moves, or Second is forced to apply $\bullet\bullet$. After this, the game definitely proceeds on a finite sum with a fixed index m , hence the game eventually terminates. Thus $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ has no infinite run.

We now define $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ formally. We need to introduce auxiliary games such as $(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i)/L, n$, with the intended meaning that “Left has already made the choice of her index n ”. For clarity, we may possibly write $(G_0 + G_1 + G_2 + \dots)/L, n$ in place of $(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i)/L, n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i \right) / R, n = \\ & \left\{ (G_0 + \dots + G_i^L + \dots + G_n + \dots) / R, n, G_0 + \dots + G_j^L + \dots + G_m \mid \right. \\ & \left. (G_0 + \dots + G_i^R + \dots + G_n + \dots) / R, n \right\}, \text{ and} \\ & \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i \right) / L, n = \left\{ (G_0 + \dots + G_i^L + \dots + G_n + \dots) / L, n \mid \right. \\ & \left. (G_0 + \dots + G_i^R + \dots + G_n + \dots) / L, n, G_0 + \dots + G_j^R + \dots + G_m \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where m is always intended to be $\geq n$ and $0 \leq i \leq n$, $0 \leq j \leq m$. For each fixed n , the above definition is by transfinite induction on the natural sum of the birthdays of G_0, \dots, G_n . Indeed, after some move on G_i , the natural sum of the birthdays of, say, $G_0, \dots, G_i^L, \dots, G_n$ is strictly smaller than the natural sum of the birthdays of $G_0, \dots, G_i, \dots, G_n$, hence the induction carries over. Notice that $G_0 + \dots + G_m$ might have a birthday as large as any ordinal, but $G_0 + \dots + G_m$ is well defined in any case, and the induction does not involve its birthday. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i = & \left\{ (G_0 + \dots + G_i^L + \dots + G_n + \dots) / L, n \mid \right. \\ & \left. (G_0 + \dots + G_i^R + \dots + G_n + \dots) / R, n \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We now state some simple facts about the above notions. As usual in the classical theory of series, if $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is an infinite sum, the corresponding *partial sums* are the finite sums of the form $G_0 + \dots + G_{h-1}$, for some $h \geq 0$ (the notation allows the possibility for an empty sum, however, here we will have no use for it).

Recall that $G \geq 0$ if Left has a winning strategy when playing second on G .

Observation 2.2. Suppose that $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of games.

- (1) If all but finitely many G_i are second winner, then $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is Conway equivalent to $G_0 + \cdots + G_h$, where h is such that G_i is second winner, for every $i > h$.
- (2) If there are infinitely many partial sums which are ≥ 0 (resp., ≤ 0), then Left (resp., Right) wins when playing second on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$. In particular, if both eventualities hold, then $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is second winner.
- (3) If each G_i is an ordinal, then $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is the supremum (in the ordinal sense) of the partial sums (which, in the ordinal sense, are intended as *natural sums* [3]).
- (4) An infinite sum of impartial games is a second winner game, if infinitely many summands are first winner (notice that if only finitely many summands are first winner, the outcome is given by (1), since an impartial game is either first or second winner).

Proof. (1) We need to show that the sum of $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ and $-G_0 - G_1 \cdots - G_h$ is second winner. Let Second choose some $m \geq h$, as soon as he moves on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$. Then the game is played on $-G_0 - G_1 \cdots - G_h + G_0 + G_1 \cdots + G_h + G_{h+1} + \cdots + G_m$, thus Second can use the mirror-image strategy on $-G_0 \cdots + G_h$ and the winning strategy for the second player on each of G_{h+1}, \dots, G_m (possibly, an empty set of games). It might happen that First plays later on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$, so she may choose some $n > m$. In any case, G_{m+1}, \dots, G_n are second winner, hence they do not change the outcome.

(2) After First has chosen n , let Second choose some $m \geq n$ such that $G_0 \cdots + G_m \geq 0$, respectively, ≤ 0 .

(3) The surreal sum of two ordinals is their natural sum. Right cannot move on an ordinal, and a Left move on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ simply amounts to choosing some m and moving on the corresponding partial sum. This is exactly the same as moving on the ordinal limit of the partial sums.

(4) Let First play on such a sum and choose some n . Second can always move on $G_0 + \cdots + G_n$ until all such games are 0, since the games are impartial. If Second has won, we are done.

Otherwise, just let him chose the first $m > n$ such that G_m is first winner (by assumption, there are infinitely many such games). Now second has a winning move on the first winner game G_m , hence he wins, since the remaining games are second winner and $G_0 + \cdots + G_n$ has been emptied. \square

The infinite ordinal sum described in (3) has been extensively studied in [10]. See [10, Definition 2.3].

The main novelty in the present approach seems to be the possibility of considering sums of games which are not numbers. However, Observation 2.2(4) shows that there are situations in which the outcome of the sum is trivial.

3. Invariance under Conway equivalence

It is standard to see that $-\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-G_i)$.

Theorem 3.1. *If G_i is Conway equivalent to H_i , for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ is Conway equivalent to $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i$.*

Proof. In view of the comment before the statement, we have to show that $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$ is second winner.

Suppose that, say, Right moves first and decides to make his first move on the sum on the left (the other cases are treated symmetrically). So Right chooses some n for the game $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ together with some option G_i^R . Since, by assumption, G_i is Conway equivalent to H_i , $G_i - H_i$ is second winner, hence Left has a winning move on $G_i^R - H_i$. There are two cases.

(a) If the winning strategy for Left on $G_i^R - H_i$ prescribes a move on $-H_i$, let Left choose the same n as above on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$ and make the prescribed move on $-H_i$. At this point, Right cannot change the n on the left-hand sum, but he can eventually change the n on the right-hand sum. Until he makes this latter change, the play continues on (the remaining options of) $G_0 + \dots + G_n - H_0 - \dots - H_n$, on which Left has a winning strategy. As far as Right changes n to some m on the right-hand sum, consider that Left has a winning strategy on $G_{n+1} + \dots + G_m - H_{n+1} - \dots - H_m$. It is thus enough that Left chooses m for $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ as soon as she moves on $G_0 + \dots + G_m$, in order to get a winning strategy for $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$.

(b) Otherwise, after Right first move, the winning strategy for Left prescribes a move on G_i^R . In this case Left is not required to choose some $m \geq n$, according to the possibility given by \bullet in Definition 2.1, so she simply moves on G_i^R . As long as the players go on moving on the G_j s, Left continues with her winning strategy on $G_0 + \dots + G_n - H_0 - \dots - H_n$, never changing the value of n . Sooner or later, some player will be forced to move on the H_j s.

(b1) If Left is the first to move on the H_j s, she can win by applying the same strategy as described in (a), namely choosing n in $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$.

(b2) If Right is the first to move on the H_j s, he must choose some n' for $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$. If $n' \leq n$, let Left choose n on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$ as soon as she moves there. If $n' > n$, let Left choose n' on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (G_i)$ as soon as she moves there. In any case, the game continues on (the remaining options of) $G_0 + \dots + G_m - H_0 - \dots - H_m$, for $m = \max\{n, n'\}$ and, by the assumptions, Left has a winning strategy on this game.

We have described a winning strategy for the second player on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-H_i)$ and this means that $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i$ are Conway equivalent. \square

Remark 3.2. Allowing to Second the possibility of using the rule \bullet in Definition 2.1 is necessary for Theorem 3.1 to hold. Namely, Theorem 3.1 does not generally hold if Second is required to choose some $m \geq n$, as soon as she moves on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$.

For example, $0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$ is Conway equivalent to ω ; in fact, Right cannot even move on $0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$, while for Left a move on $0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$ corresponds to choosing some $n - 1$, as a game.

On the other hand, if Second is not allowed to move according to \bullet , then $(-1 + 1) + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$ is strictly smaller than ω . Indeed, Right has a winning strategy on the sum of $(-1 + 1) + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$ and $-\omega$. Just let Right move on $(-1 + 1)$ (no matter the n he chooses), so Left should choose some m on $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$, which is losing against $-\omega$. In fact, without allowing \bullet , $(-1 + 1) + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots$ is Conway equivalent to $\omega - 1$.

4. Series of real numbers

Recall that each real number can be considered as a game, in fact, a particular surreal number.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i$ is a series of real numbers, converging (in the classical sense of analysis) to some real number r . Then $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i = r$ also in the sense of Definition 2.1.*

Proof. We have to show that $-r + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i$ is a second winner game. By Theorem 3.1, we may assume that all the numbers under consideration are expressed in surreal *canonical representation* [7, Theorem 2.8]. By Observation 2.2(1), we may also assume that the sequence $(r_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not eventually 0.

Suppose that Right moves first (the other case is treated symmetrically).

(a) If Right moves on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i$, he chooses some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and moves on some r_i , getting a subposition $r_i^R > r_i$, since r_i is a (surreal) number. Thus the series $r_0 + \dots + r_i^R + \dots + r_n + \dots$ classically converges to $s = r + r_i^R - r_i$ and $s > r$. By convergence of the latter series, there is some $m \geq n$ such that $H = r_0 + \dots + r_i^R + \dots + r_n + \dots + r_m > r$. That is, $-r + H = -r + r_0 + \dots + r_i^R + \dots + r_n + \dots + r_m > 0$ and this means that Left has a winning strategy on $-r + H$. If the winning strategy requires Left to move on $-r$, let her move there. Then Right can move either on $(-r)^L$ or on $r_0 + \dots + r_i^R + \dots + r_n$, but in the latter case he cannot change the value of n . As soon as Left strategy involves moving on H , let her apply $\bullet\bullet$ on the remaining options of the infinite sum $r_0 + \dots + r_i + \dots + r_n + \dots$ (on which Right has already moved, hence, formally, it is a game of the form $(s_0 + s_1 + \dots)/R, n$, in the notation from Definition 2.1) and let her choose the natural number m . Then the game continues on (the remaining options of) $-r + H$, so Left wins.

(b) Otherwise, Right moves on $-r$ and we have $(-r)^R > -r$, again by a property of numbers. Let $-s = (-r)^R$, thus $s < r$. Moreover, $(-r)^R$ has finite birthday since a real number has birthday $\leq \omega$ and options have always strictly smaller birthday. So there is some $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that Right can perform at most h consecutive moves on $(-r)^R$.

Since $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i = r$ in the classical sense and $s < r$, where r and s are real, there is $n' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_0 + r_1 + \dots + r_m > \frac{r+s}{2}$, for every $m \geq n'$. Since

the series is converging, $\lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} r_n = 0$, thus there are $n'', p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|r_\ell| < \frac{1}{2^p} < \frac{r-s}{2^{(h+1)}}$, for every $\ell \geq n''$.

Let Left move on $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i$ and choose an n such that $n \geq n', n \geq n''$ and such that, moreover, there are at least $h+1$ nonzero distinct games $r_{\ell_0}, r_{\ell_1}, \dots, r_{\ell_h}$ with $n'' \leq \ell_0 \leq n, \dots, n'' \leq \ell_h \leq n$. As we mentioned at the beginning of the proof, we may assume this in view of Observation 2.2. We claim that Left has a winning strategy choosing r_{ℓ_0} for her move. If $r_{\ell_0} > 0$, she can move to 0 on r_{ℓ_0} , since games are in canonical representation, so the value of the total game decreases by r_{ℓ_0} . If $r_{\ell_0} < 0$, she can decrease the value of the game by less than $\frac{1}{2^p}$, since $|r_{\ell_0}| < \frac{1}{2^p}$, so the sign expansion of r_{ℓ_0} starts with a minus sign followed by at least $p+1$ plus signs, so she can remove the $p+1$ th plus sign and whatever follows.

(b1) If Right second move is on the infinite sum, he chooses some $m \geq n$. Since $n \geq n', r_0 + r_1 + \dots + r_m > \frac{r+s}{2}$, for the original games. However, Left has played on r_{ℓ_0} , so we need to compute $r_0 + \dots + r_{\ell_0}^L + \dots + r_m > \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{1}{2^p} > \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{r-s}{2^{(h+1)}} \geq \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{r-s}{2} = s$. Since $s < r$, Left wins on $-r + r_0 + \dots + r_{\ell_0}^L + \dots + r_m$, no matter the move of Right, which has increased the value of the game.

(b2) Otherwise, Right second move is again on $(-r)^R$ and $(-r)^{RR} > (-r)^R$. Left can go on moving on r_{ℓ_1} , as above, contributing a negative difference of less than $\frac{1}{2^p}$ to the value of the total game. Since Right can move only h times on $(-r)^R$, Left has a sufficient number of games r_{ℓ_k} to move on.

Eventually, Right is forced to move on the infinite sum and he chooses some m . If K is the sum of the options remained so far, arguing as above, $K > \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{h+1}{2^p} > \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{(r-s)(h+1)}{2^{(h+1)}} = \frac{r+s}{2} - \frac{r-s}{2} = s$. As above, since $s < r$, Left wins on $(-r)^{RRRR\dots} + K$, no matter the moves of Right. \square

5. Further remarks

Remark 5.1. (a) As we have seen in the previous sections, the infinite sum introduced in Definition 2.1 has some good properties. However, it misses an important property a notion of limit is usually supposed to share, namely, it is not always true that the outcome of a sum depends only on the “tail” of the sequence of the partial sums. In detail, it could be expected that if $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i$ are two series and there is some h such that, for every $k \geq h$, the two partial sums with k elements have the same value, then the series have the same value.

This is not always true for the notion introduced in Definition 2.1. For example, $-1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots = \omega - 1$ and $0 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots = \omega$, though, from $h = 2$ onward, the partial sums have the same value.

We do not know whether there is some variation of Definition 2.1 such that the above desirable property is satisfied. Of course, the above “tail property” holds in many significant cases, e. g., sums of ordinals, or converging sums of real numbers, by Observation 2.2(3) and Theorem 4.1.

(b) Remark (a) suggests that a related definition is quite natural. Define an infinite sum as in Definition 2.1, except that each player, once and for all, can choose subsets I and J of \mathbb{N} , rather than simply natural numbers n, m . After both choices have been made, the game is played on the finite sum $\sum_{i \in I \cup J} G_i$, while similar rules as in Definition 2.1 are applied just after the first choice.

The resulting infinitary operation is still Conway invariant, and, for real summands, the notion of *absolute convergence* is recovered. There is no essential difference with respect to the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 4.1. Moreover, this modified operation is invariant under permutations of \mathbb{N} . When restricted to ordinals, the two kinds of sums coincide [10].

(c) Series are connected with limits, so we can associate to Definition 2.1 a notion of limit for sequences of combinatorial games. In detail, if $(H_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of games, we may define $\lim_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (H_i - H_{i-1})$, where $H_{-1} = 0$.

This translates to a direct definition. For short, First moves on some H_i , then Second might continue moving on H_i or, sooner or later, chose some $j > i$. Then the play continues on $H_j - H_i + H_i^*$, where H_i^* is the subposition of H_i remained after the previous moves.

This limit has some natural properties, corresponding to Observation 2.2. If the sequence $(H_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ has constant value from some point on, the limit assumes this constant value. If $H_i \geq 0$ for infinitely many indexes i , then the limit is ≥ 0 . If each H_i is impartial and the value of the sequence is not eventually constant, then the limit is second winner (in view of Theorem 3.1, after First move on H_i , it is enough that Second choses some j such that $H_j \neq H_i \oplus H_i^F$).

As in (a) above, this limit generally depends also on the first items of the sequence, and not only on its “tail”, though there are significant cases in which this dependence does not occur.

(d) The sum introduced in Definition 2.1 satisfies really few associativity properties. For example, $-1+1+1+1+\dots = \omega-1$ but $(-1+1)+1+1+\dots = \omega$.

Of course, under really modest assumptions, there are many forms of associativity which cannot be expected to hold for an *everywhere defined* infinitary operation [10, Example 2.5]. See [16, Chapter 5] for an ample discussion of incompatibilities of desiderata for infinite sums.

(e) The behavior of \sum is not always good with respect to addition, either. $1+1+1+1+\dots = \omega$ but also $2+2+2+2+\dots = \omega$. Hence $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} H_i$ is not necessarily equal to $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (G_i + H_i)$.

The same example shows that it is not always the case that, for surreals, $\lambda \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda G_i$. Recall that, for arbitrary games, the product is not even invariant under Conway equivalence.

(f) Definition 2.1 can be extended with no particular difficulty to sums indexed by an ordinal.

Define $\sum_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$ by transfinite induction on α as follows. We set

$$\sum_{\beta < 0} G_\beta = 0$$

and

$$\sum_{\beta < \alpha+1} G_\beta = \left(\sum_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta \right) + G_\alpha.$$

For α a limit ordinal, a play on $\sum_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$ goes as follows. First chooses some $\beta < \alpha$ and moves on some G_β with $\gamma < \beta$. Second can either play on some $G_{\gamma'}$ with $\gamma' < \beta$, or choose some δ such that $\beta \leq \delta < \alpha$. After Second performs this choice, the play continues on (the remaining options of) $\sum_{\beta < \delta} G_\beta$, which has been already inductively defined, since $\delta < \alpha$.

A result analogue to Theorem 3.1 holds for $\sum_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$.

When $(G_\beta)_{\beta < \alpha}$ is a sequence of ordinals, $\sum_{\beta < \alpha} G_\beta$ turns out to be the same as the sum studied in [11]. See Definition 3.1 therein and see the quoted source for historical remarks and further references.

We expect that if the surreal s is expressed in Conway normal form as $\sum_{\beta < \alpha} \omega^{\alpha_\beta} r_\beta$ then s is also the value of the sum computed according the above rules, but we have not fully checked every detail, yet.

There is another possible definition for a sum $\sum_{i \in I} G_i$ of combinatorial games, where I is an arbitrary, possibly infinite, set of indices. Simply let each player, at her turn, move on some game G_i , or in the option which has remained. This rule gives rise—of course—to a game with possibly infinite runs, hence not a combinatorial game in the strict sense. After, say, ω moves and for each fixed i , only a finite number of moves have been played on the combinatorial game G_i , hence some played option on G_i , possibly 0, remains fixed from some point on. If at the ω th step we take all such remaining options, we still have a possibly infinite game on which the play can go on (unless all the games have been exhausted). We can do the same at each subsequent infinite step. If I is a set, and assuming the axiom of choice, each play eventually terminates after a run of length $< |I|^+$ (the successor cardinal of $|I|$, thought of as an ordinal), since we have $< |I|^+$ suboptions in total. Thus, while some proper subposition of $\sum_{i \in I} G_i$ might be isomorphic (in a natural sense) to $\sum_{i \in I} G_i$, the game has no loop.

The above discussion introduces a natural notion of *run* on $\sum_{i \in I} G_i$, but does not lead to a definite notion of *alternating run*. If we intend an alternating run in the sense that First is always the first player to move at each limit step, we get quite counterintuitive conclusions, so that we have dubbed such games as “Dadaist”. For example, if I is countable and infinitely many games are $1-1$, the resulting infinite game is always second winner, no matter the value of the remaining games. So, for example, with the above notion of alternating run, $\omega + (1-1) + \omega^\omega + (1-1) + \omega^{\omega^\omega} + (1-1) + \dots$ is a second winner game.

Another possibility is to compute alternating runs by not considering consecutive moves, so that if, say, in the above game Left first moves on ω and

then both players move alternatively on each $1 - 1$, the only remaining move to be considered is Left's. Then Right is assumed to play first at the ω th step. With this definition, second winner summands do not contribute to the sum and some aspects of the notion are less counterintuitive.

Another possibility is to partition I into finitely many classes and, at each limit step, consider some partition to be *active* if cofinally many moves have been done on games indexed by elements in the partition. At the limit step the player to move is the first player who has ever moved *on an active partition*. With this definition we can recover parts of the theory of Conway equivalence. We hope to be able to present further details in [13].

REFERENCES

- [1] Alling, N. L., *Foundations of analysis over surreal number fields*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, **141**, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, (1987).
- [2] Altman, H., *Intermediate arithmetic operations on ordinal numbers*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **63**, 228–242 (2017).
- [3] Bachmann, H., *Transfinite Zahlen, Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 1 (Springer-Verlag, 1967).
- [4] Berarducci, A., Mamino, M., *Asymptotic analysis of Skolem's exponential functions*, J. Symb. Log., **87**, 758–782 (2022).
- [5] Conway, J. H., *On numbers and games*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, **6**, Academic Press, London-New York, (1976). Second Edition, 2001.
- [6] Ehrlich, P., *The absolute arithmetic continuum and the unification of all numbers great and small*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **18** (2012), 1–45.
- [7] Gonshor, H., *An introduction to the theory of surreal numbers*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **110**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [8] Hardy, G. H., *Divergent Series*, Oxford, Clarendon Press (1949).
- [9] Huggett, N., *Zeno's Paradoxes*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2024 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.)
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2024/entries/paradox-zeno/>
- [10] Lipparini, P., *An infinite natural sum*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **62**, 249–257 (2016).
- [11] Lipparini, P., *Some transfinite natural sums*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **64**, 514–528 (2018).
- [12] Lipparini, P., Mezö, I., *Surreal limits*, arXiv:1603.09289, 1–12, 2017.
- [13] Lipparini, P., *Infinite sums of combinatorial games (Dadaist games)*, in preparation.
- [14] Rubinstein-Salzedo, S., Swaminathan, A., *Analysis on surreal numbers*, J. Log. Anal. **6**, Paper 5, 1–39, 2014.
- [15] Siegel, A. N., *Combinatorial game theory*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **146**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013.
- [16] Wontner, N. J. H., *Views from a peak: Generalisations and Descriptive Set Theory*, ILLC Dissertation Series DS-2023-NN, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Amsterdam (2023).

PAOLO LIPPARINI

Dipartimento di Matematica, Viale della Ricerca Combinatoria, Università di Roma
 “Tor Vergata”, I-00133 ROME ITALY, (currently retired)
 URL: <http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~lipparin>