


Bulletin of Symbolic Logic. 12 (2006) 143-67. 

John Corcoran, *Complete enumerative inductions*.
Philosophy, University at Buffalo,
Buffalo, NY 14260-4150
E-mail: corcoran@buffalo.edu

This largely expository paper explores analogues of ω -completeness and ω -inconsistency, starting with “finite cases”. For each positive integer n , let L_n be a first-order language having exactly n [individual] constants, say the digits ‘0’, ‘1’, etc. of a base- n arithmetic notation. An *instance of a universal sentence* is the result of deleting the quantifier and replacing every occurrence of the freed-up variable by one and the same constant. The *complete induction sentence* [for L_n] is the sentence expressing “for every object x , x is 0 or x is 1 or etc.”, for L_3 , in symbols, $\forall x(x = 0 \vee x = 1 \vee x = 2)$. A set of sentences is *n-complete* iff it [deductively] yields every universal sentence each of whose instances it yields. Theorem COM: In order for a set to be *n-complete* it is necessary and sufficient for it to yield complete induction. A set of sentences is *n-inconsistent* iff it [deductively] yields the negation of some universal sentence each of whose instances it yields. Theorem INC: in order for a set to be *n-inconsistent* it is necessary and sufficient for it to yield the negation of complete induction. In that both of these theorems reduce a condition concerning infinitely many deductions to the deducibility of a single sentence, they are syntactic, or proof-theoretic, results analogous to semantic, or model-theoretic, results about ω -completeness and ω -inconsistency in second-order languages announced in my abstract “Semantic omega properties and mathematical induction”, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1997) 280. When we leave either the “finite” case or the second-order case to consider intermediate cases such as sublanguages (involving constants for zero and successor) of the usual first-order languages of number theory, we find that they do not admit of ω -completeness or ω -inconsistency being reducible to the deducibility of a single sentence.