

Let  $c$  be any class of *formulae*. We denote by  $\text{Flg}(c)$  (set of consequences of  $c$ ) the smallest set of *formulae* which contains all the *formulae* of  $c$  and all axioms, and which is closed with respect to the relation “*immediate consequence of*”.  $c$  is termed  $\omega$ -consistent, if there is no *class-sign*  $a$  such that:

$$(n) [Sb \left( a \frac{v}{Z(n)} \right) \in \text{Flg}(c)] \ \& \ [ \text{Neg}(v \text{ Gen } a) ] \in \text{Flg}(c)$$

where  $v$  is the free variable of the *class-sign*  $a$ .

Every  $\omega$ -consistent system is naturally also consistent. The converse, however, is not the case, as will be shown later.

The general result as to the existence of undecidable propositions reads:

**Proposition VI:** To every  $\omega$ -consistent recursive class  $c$  of *formulae* there correspond recursive class-signs  $r$ , such that neither  $v \text{ Gen } r$  nor  $\text{Neg}(v \text{ Gen } r)$  belongs to  $\text{Flg}(c)$  (where  $v$  is the free variable of  $r$ ).

Proof: Let  $c$  be any given recursive  $\omega$ -consistent class of *formulae*. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} Bw_c(x) &\equiv (n) [n \leq l(x) \rightarrow A x (n \text{ Gl } x) \vee (n \text{ Gl } x) \in c \vee \\ &(Ep, q) \{0 < p, q < n \ \& \ \text{Fl}(n \text{ Gl } x, p \text{ Gl } x, q \text{ Gl } x)\}] \\ &\ \& \ l(x) > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

(cf. the analogous concept 44)

$$x B_c y \equiv Bw_c(x) \ \& \ [l(x)] \text{ Gl } x = y \tag{6}$$

$$Bew_c(x) \equiv (Ey) y B_c x \tag{6.1}$$

(cf. the analogous concepts 45, 46)

The following clearly hold:

$$(x) [Bew_c(x) \sim x \in \text{Flg}(c)] \tag{7}$$

$$(x) [Bew(x) \rightarrow Bew_c(x)] \tag{8}$$