Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic
Volume XVI, Number 4, October 1975
NDJFAM

A CORRECTION TO MY PAPER "A SOLE SUFFICIENT OPERATOR"

T. C. WESSELKAMPER

In an accompanying note, see [1], Professor Gerald J. Massey points out that there is an evident error in a recent article by this author [2]. This writer intended to claim that the operator S, therein discussed, is complete with constants over $X(n)$ for each natural number n. The article gives the distinct impression that the author is claiming completeness. The problem lies in the fact that the syntax for S is never made explicit. Something like the following paragraph should have been included.

Let a set W of well-formed formulas be defined by:

1. each propositional variable, e.g., x, y, z, is in W;
2. each constant of $X(n)$ is in W;
3. if α, β, and γ are in W, then $S\alpha\beta\gamma$ is in W;
4. W contains only the expressions formed by 1, 2, and 3.

A set A of functions over $X(n)$ is complete with constants if each element of A is defined by a formula in W.

In the classic definition of completeness, condition 2 above would be omitted. An alternative definition of completeness with constants would be to say that a set A is complete with constants if the union of A and the set of constant functions is complete. With this clarification, the result in the paper is correct.

REFERENCES

[1] Massey, G. J., "Concerning an alleged Sheffer function," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, vol. XVI (1975), pp. 549-550.

[2] Wesselkamper, T. C., "A sole sufficient operator," *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, vol. XVI (1975), pp. 86-88.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

Received June 1, 1975