

(1.3.8) Proposition (Lindenbaum Lemma) (6)

Suppose Γ is a consistent set of L-formulas. Then there is a consistent set of L-formulas $\Gamma^* \supseteq \Gamma$ which is complete.

Pf.: The set of L-formulas is countable, so we can list the L-formulas as

$$\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$$

[Why countable? Alphabet $\rightarrow \rightarrow () p_1 p_2 \dots$ is countable. ~~Each~~ Formulas are finite sequences of these. the set of these is countable.]

Define inductively sets of L-formulas:

$$\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma_2 \subseteq \dots$$

where $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$ and, suppose Γ_n has been defined:

If $\Gamma_n \vdash \phi_n$ then let

$$\Gamma_{n+1} = \Gamma_n$$

If $\Gamma_n \not\vdash \phi_n$ then let

$$\Gamma_{n+1} = \Gamma_n \cup \{\neg \phi_n\}$$

By an inductive argument using Prop. 1.3.7, each Γ_n is consistent.

Let $\Gamma^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_n$

Claim 1 Γ^* is consistent

If $\Gamma^* \vdash \phi$ and $\Gamma^* \vdash (\neg \phi)$

then as deductions are finite
 there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with
 $\Gamma_n \vdash \phi$ and $\Gamma_n \vdash (\neg \phi)$.

Contradiction.

(1.3.9) Lemma. Suppose Γ^* is a complete, consistent set of L-formulas. Then there is a valuation v such that for every L-formula ϕ

$$v(\phi) = T \Leftrightarrow \Gamma^* \vdash \phi .$$

Claim 2 Γ^* is complete.

Let ϕ be any L-formula.

Then ϕ is ϕ_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By construction either

$\Gamma_n \vdash \phi$ or $\Gamma_{n+1} \vdash (\neg \phi)$

So either $\Gamma^* \vdash \phi$
 or $\Gamma^* \vdash (\neg \phi)$. $\#$.

(1.3.10) Cor.

(1) Suppose Δ is a consistent set of L-formulas. Then there is a valuation v with $v(\Delta) = T$.

(2) Suppose Γ is a consistent set of L-formulas and $\Gamma \not\vdash \phi$.
 Then there is a valuation v with $v(\Gamma) = T$ and $v(\phi) = F$.

Pf (1) By (1.3.8) there
is a complete consistent

$\Delta^* \supseteq \Delta$. Then 1.3.9
gives us a valuation v
with $v(\Delta^*) = T$
So $v(\Delta) = T$.

(2) Apply (1) to

$$\Delta = \Gamma \cup \{\neg\phi\}$$

(which is consistent, by 1.3.7).

Gives a val. v
with $v(\Gamma) = T$

& $v((\neg\phi)) = T$, so

$$v(\phi) = F.$$

(1.3.11) (Completeness / Adequacy
of \vdash) (3)

(1) (General form)

Suppose Γ is a consistent set of
~~L-fm~~ and ϕ is an L-formula
L-formulas Γ such that

whenever v is a valuation with
 $v(\Gamma) = T$ then $v(\phi) = T$

THEN $\Gamma \vdash_L \phi$.

(2) (Special case) If ϕ is a
tautology, then $\vdash_L \phi$.

Pf: (1) By 1.3.10 (2).

(2) By (1) (with $\Gamma = \phi$). #.

[Note: Don't need to assume
consistency in (1).] J.

Proof of 1.3.9.

Γ^* complete, consistent

Want: a valuation v with
 $v(\phi) = T \ (\Rightarrow \Gamma^* \vdash \phi)$ (t)

Each variable p_i is an L-funk so by the properties of Γ^* either $\Gamma^* \vdash p_i$ or $\Gamma^* \vdash (\neg p_i)$ (and only one happens) -

Let v be the unique valuation with $v(p_i) = T \ (\Rightarrow \Gamma^* \vdash p_i)$ (for $i \in \mathbb{N}$).

Show by induction on the length of ϕ that (t) holds.

Base case ϕ is a variable ⑨
- this is the def. of v.

Inductive step -

Case 1 ϕ is $(\neg \psi)$

\Rightarrow : Suppose $v(\phi) = T$.

So $v(\psi) = F$ (as v is a val.)

By ind. hyp. $\Gamma^* \not\vdash \psi$.

As Γ^* is complete, $\Gamma^* \vdash (\neg \psi)$

so $\Gamma^* \vdash \phi$.

\Leftarrow : Suppose $\Gamma^* \vdash (\neg \psi)$

$\Gamma^* \not\vdash \psi$ (by consistency)

By ind. hyp. $v(\psi) \neq T$, so

$v(\psi) = F \Rightarrow$ thus. $v(\phi) = T$.

Case 2 ϕ is $(\psi \rightarrow x)$

\Leftarrow : Suppose $v(\phi) = F$. Then

$v(\psi) = T$ and $v(x) = F$.

[Show: $\Gamma^* \not\vdash \phi$]

By ind. hyp. $\Gamma^* \vdash \psi$

and $\Gamma^* \not\vdash x$.

Suppose for a contradiction

that $\Gamma^* \vdash \phi$.

then by MP $\frac{\Gamma^* \vdash x}{\text{contradiction}}$

\Rightarrow : Suppose $\Gamma^* \not\vdash \phi$

[show $v(\phi) = F$].

So $\Gamma^* \not\vdash (\psi \rightarrow x)$

then $\Gamma^* \not\vdash x$ (6)

(as $\vdash (x \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow x))$) ... (1)

Also $\Gamma^* \not\vdash (\neg \psi)$

(as $\vdash ((\neg \psi) \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow x))$ I-2.7(a))

... (2)

By O,O + ind. hyp.

$v(x) = F$

$v(\neg \psi) = F$ (Case 1
+ ind. hyp.)

So $v(\psi) = T$. So

$v(\phi) = F$, as required.
#.