

THE NUMERAL AXIOMS

RICHARD BUTRICK

The introduction of the numerals as individual constants of formal number theory is generally done by appeal to a pretheoretic or intuitively given concept of the succession of numbers. A typical account might run as follows:

The terms '0', '0¹', '0¹¹', . . . we shall call numerals abbreviated by (accounts frequently and mistakenly say 'denoted by') '0', '1', '2', In general, if n is a non-negative integer, we shall let ' \bar{n} ' stand in place of (mistake: 'stand for') the corresponding numeral $\lceil 0^{1^1 \cdots 1} \rceil$, with n strokes.

What is pedagogically prior is not necessarily epistemologically prior, but certainly one is taught the numerals before one's "intuition" of the succession of numbers is "awakened." Regardless, it is possible to introduce the numerals without appeal to some intuitively given concept of the natural number sequence. The following axioms and axiom schemata may, for convenience, be given the title of 'the theory of numeral succession,' (NS).

The following axiom and definition schemata provide for the usual correlation of "numbers" with numerals and a characterization of the successor function. Definition of 'numeral': '0' . . . '9' are simple numerals. If n_1 and n_2 are simple numerals and $n_1 \neq '0'$ then $\lceil n_1 n_2 \rceil$ is a compound numeral. If n_1 and n_2 are compound numerals, $\lceil n_1 n_2 \rceil$ is a compound numeral. (In the following n_1 and $n_3 \neq '0'$.)

Axiom schema (1): $\lceil z(n_1, n_2) = n_1 n_2 \rceil$.

Let $n_1 = '12'$, $n_2 = '3'$. Then $\lceil z(n_1, n_2) = n_1 n_2 \rceil = \lceil z, ('12', ', '3', ')', (=, '12', '3') \rceil$. The use of quasi-quotes has the effect of quoting the constant contextual background for n_1 and n_2 . 'z' is intended as a function constant on a par with '(', '=', and ')', as far as quasi-quotes are concerned, i.e., part of the constant context for n_1 and n_2 . Thus $\lceil z(12, 3) = 123 \rceil$ is an instance of axiom schema (1), and NS asserts that $z(12, 3) = 123$.

Axioms (0) . . . (9): ' $s(0) = 1$ ', . . . ' $s(8) = 9$ ', ' $s(9) = 10$ '.

Axiom schema (2): If n_1 is a numeral and n_2 is a simple numeral \neq '9', then $\ulcorner s(n_1, n_2) = z(n_1, s(n_2)) \urcorner$ is an axiom schema of **NS**.

Axiom schema (3): If $n_2 =$ '9' and n_1 is simple and \neq '9', then $\ulcorner s(n_1, n_2) = z(s(n_1), '0') \urcorner$ is an axiom schema of **NS**.

Axiom schema (4): If $n_1 =$ '9' and $n_2 =$ '9', then $\ulcorner s(n_1, n_2) = '100' \urcorner$ is an axiom schema of **NS**.

Axiom schema (5): If $n_2 =$ '9' and if n_1 is compound, i.e., $\ulcorner n_1 = z(n_3, n_4) \urcorner$ is the form of a theorem, with n_4 simple, then $\ulcorner s(n_1, n_2) = z(s(n_3, n_4), '0') \urcorner$ is an axiom schema of **NS**.

Consider ' $s(1999)$ '. Axiom schemata (1) . . . (4) do not apply, i.e., '1999' is not an instance of $\ulcorner n_1, n_2 \urcorner$ where n_2 is simple \neq '9', nor can n_1 and n_2 be simple. However, $\ulcorner '1999' = z('199', '9') \urcorner$ is an instance of axiom schema (1) as is $\ulcorner n_1 = z(n_3, n_4) \urcorner$ with $n_1 =$ '199' and $n_3 =$ '19' and $n_4 =$ '9'. Therefore axiom (5) applies and **NS** asserts that $s(1999) = z(s(199), 0) = z(z(s(19), 0), 0) = z(z(z(s(1), 0), 0), 0) = 2000$. It would seem that formal number theory does not characterize the successor function except by appeal to an intuitive notion of the successor function. In order to prove that $s(0^{111}) = 0^{1111}$ (for ' $s(0^{111}) = 0^{1111}$ ' to be a theorem) one must rely on a pre-theoretic, pre-formal ability to count up. If formal number theory is to be formal, axioms along the foregoing lines must be added. The axioms rely on a syntactic matching rather than an explicit knowledge of the "numbers".

*Ohio University
Athens, Ohio*