Correction to the paper „Some Impredicative Definitions in the Axiomatic Set-Theory" by Andrzej Mostowski.

(Fund. Math. 37, 1950, p. 118).

Dr Hao Wang from the University of Harvard has called my attention to the fact that a statement made on p. 118 of my cited paper is incorrect.

Contrary to what is said in the quoted place the scheme

(Σ) *if Φ is provable in* (S), *then Φ is true*

contains formulas which are certainly unprovable in (S') provided that the system (S) is consistent. Indeed, if Φ_0 is an arbitrary formula of (S) such that the negation of Φ_0 is provable in (S), then the sentence

if Φ_0 is provable in (S), *then Φ_0 is true*

could be provable in (S') only if (S) were inconsistent.

The correct wording of the scheme (Σ) is as follows:

(Σ^*) *For every Φ — if Φ can be proved in* (S) *in at most n steps from at most n axioms, then Φ is true* ($n=1,2,3,...$).

It is exactly this scheme which is actually proved in the paper (cf. scheme (Σ_{11}) on p. 121). The scheme (Σ) although stated in the introductory remarks to the section 2 was neither proved nor used anywhere in the paper.

For symmetry one could still reformulate the theorem (T) on p. 118 as follows:

(T) *For every Φ and every n — if Φ can be proved in* (S) *in at most n steps from at most n axioms, then Φ is true.*

Note that in the incorrect scheme (Σ) it is the letter „Φ" which has to be replaced by an arbitrary formula of (S) in order to obtain a sentence of (S') whereas in the correct scheme (Σ^*) the variable „Φ" is bound and a sentence of (S') can be obtained upon substituting an arbitrary numeral 1, 2,... for the variable „n".