

## A NOTE ON OMITTING THE REPLACEMENT SCHEMA

A. BUNDY

In [1] Heath considers a formalisation of primitive recursive arithmetic similar to that given in Goodstein [2], in which the replacement schema (Goodstein's  $\mathbf{Sb}_2$ ) is deduced from special cases of itself, using a double recursive uniqueness rule. The deduction of  $\mathbf{Sb}_2$  given in [1] is, however, incomplete. This is rectified in the present note. The special cases of  $\mathbf{Sb}_2$  taken by Heath are:

- (i)  $A = B \vdash SA = SB$
- (ii)  $A = B \vdash x + A = x + B$
- (iii)  $A = B \vdash A + x = B + x$
- (iv)  $A = B \vdash x \div A = x \div B$
- (v)  $A = B \vdash A \div x = B \div x$

*Remark* In fact either (ii) or (iii) can be omitted since  $x + y = y + x$  can be proved without using (ii) or (iii) and then one can be derived from the other.

In order to derive the full  $\mathbf{Sb}_2$ , i.e.,  $A = B \vdash f(A) = f(B)$ , for any primitive recursive function  $f$ , it is necessary to show that the substitution theorem,  $x = y \rightarrow f(x) = f(y)$ , persists under definition by a primitive recursive schema. Heath shows that it persists under the recursion without parameter, which I shall call  $\mathbf{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) &= (0), \\ f(Sx) &= g(x, f(x)), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., that from  $x = y \ \& \ w = z \rightarrow g(x, w) = g(y, z)$  we can deduce  $x = y \rightarrow f(x) = f(y)$ . He then quotes a theorem of R. M. Robinson that all primitive recursive functions are generated from 0,  $x$ ,  $Sx$ ,  $x + y$  and  $x \div y$  by substitution and the recursion  $\mathbf{R}$ . To complete the proof it would be sufficient to show that Robinson's reduction of primitive recursion can be carried out in the restricted primitive recursive arithmetic (i.e., without full  $\mathbf{Sb}_2$ ). This would involve defining the pairing functions  $J(x, y)$ ,  $K(x)$  and  $L(x)$  given by Robinson, deriving their main properties, e.g.  $L(Sx) \neq 0 \rightarrow K(Sx) = K(x) \ \& \ L(Sx) = S(Lx)$ , and checking that the substitution theorem is satisfied by them. This part was omitted by Heath, and it is not clear that this programme could be carried out.

*Received October 7, 1971*