

Theorem 4.10: If  $\Gamma$  is a consistent set of formulas of  $L_p$ , then there is a maximally consistent set of formulas of  $L_p$ ,  $\Sigma$ , such that  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$ .

Recap:  $\Gamma$  is consistent if you can't prove a contradiction from  $\Gamma$ , and  $\Sigma$  is maximally consistent if it is consistent and  $\Sigma \cup \{\alpha\}$  is inconsistent for any  $\alpha \notin \Sigma$ . ]

proof: We know that the set of formulas of  $L_p$  is countable, i.e. the formulas (all of them) can be enumerated indexed by the natural numbers, say  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_n, \dots$ . We will inductively construct sets of formulas  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_{n+1}$  as follows:

(2)

$$\Sigma_0 = \Gamma$$

Note that this is consistent by hypothesis.

Given that  $\Sigma_n$  has been defined for some  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\text{let } \Sigma_{n+1} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_n \cup \{g_n\} & \text{if this is consistent} \\ \Sigma_n & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notice that each  $\Sigma_n$  is consistent by the construction. (Also,  $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma_1 \subseteq \Sigma_2 \subseteq \dots$ )

$$\text{Let } \Sigma = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \Sigma_n. \text{ Obviously, } \Gamma = \Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma.$$

Claim that  $\Sigma$  is maximally consistent.

(i)  $\Sigma$  is consistent; If not, there is some finite subset  $\Delta$  of  $\Sigma$  which is inconsistent (Prop. 4.4 Corollary 4.5).

But any finite subset  $\Delta$  of  $\Sigma$  must be entirely present

in some  $\Sigma_n$  [ $n = \max\{k \mid g_k \in \Delta\}$ ]. Thus

would mean  $\Sigma_n$  is inconsistent [by Cor. 4.5], contradicting its definition.

(3)

(iii)  $\Sigma_i$  is maximally consistent: Suppose  $\alpha \notin \Sigma_i$ .

Then  $\alpha$  is  $\varrho_n$  for some  $n$ , which means that we did not put it into  $\Sigma_{i,n+1}$  because otherwise it would be in  $\Sigma_i$ . The only reason not to put it in at stage  $n$  would be if

$\Sigma_{i,n} \cup \{\varrho_n\} = \Sigma_{i,n} \cup \{\alpha\}$  was inconsistent.

i.e.  $\Sigma_{i,n} \cup \{\alpha\} \vdash \neg(\beta \rightarrow \beta)$  for some formula  $\beta$

Since  $\Sigma_{i,n} \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq \Sigma_i \cup \{\alpha\}$ , it ~~would~~ follows.

that  $\Sigma_i \cup \{\alpha\} \vdash \neg(\beta \rightarrow \beta)$ , so  $\Sigma_i \cup \{\alpha\}$  is inconsistent.

//

Use: Given a consistent  $\Gamma$ , expand it to a maximally consistent  $\Sigma_i$ , and use  $\Sigma_i$  to define a truth assignment satisfying  $\Sigma_i$ , and hence  $\Gamma$ .