Intermediate version 6

Inconsistent countable set in second order ZFC and nonexistence of the strongly inaccessible cardinals. Non consistency results in topology.

Jaykov Foukzon

jaykovfoukzon@list.ru
Israel Institute of Technology,Haifa,Israel

Abstract: In this article we derived an importent example of the inconsistent countable set in second order ZFC (ZFC_2) with the full second-order semantic.Main results are:

(i) $\neg Con(ZFC_2)$,(ii) let k be an inaccessible cardinal and H_k is a set of all sets having hereditary size less then k, then $\neg Con(ZFC + (V = H_k))$.

Keywords: Gödel encoding, Completion of ZFC_2, Russell's paradox, ω-model, Henkin semantics, full second-order semantic,strongly inaccessible cardinal

1.Introduction.

Let us remind that accordingly to naive set theory, any definable collection is a set. Let R be the set of all sets that are not members of themselves. If R qualifies as a member of itself, it would contradict its own definition as a set containing all sets that are not members of themselves. On the other hand, if such a set is not a member of itself, it would qualify as a member of itself by the same definition. This contradiction is Russell's paradox. In 1908, two ways of avoiding the paradox were proposed, Russell's type theory and the Zermelo set theory, the first constructed axiomatic set theory. Zermelo's axioms went well beyond Frege's axioms of extensionality and unlimited set abstraction, and evolved into the now-canonical Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory ZFC. *"But how do we know that ZFC is a consistent theory, free of contradictions? The short answer is that we don't; it is a matter of faith (or of skepticism)"*— E.Nelson wrote in his not published paper [1]. However, it is deemed unlikely that even ZFC_2 which is a very stronger than ZFC harbors an unsuspected contradiction; it is widely believed that if ZFC_2 were inconsistent, that fact would have been uncovered by now. This much is certain — ZFC_2 is immune to the classic paradoxes of naive set theory: Russell's paradox, the Burali-Forti paradox, and Cantor's paradox.

Remark 1.1. Note that in this paper we view the second order set theory ZFC_2 under the Henkin semantics [2],[3] and under the full second-order semantics [4],[5].Thus we interpret the wff's of ZFC_2 language with the full second-order semantics as required in [4],[5].

Designation 1.1. We will be denote by ZFC_2^{Hs} set theory ZFC_2 with the Henkin semantics and we will be denote by ZFC_2^{fss} set theory ZFC_2 with the full second-order semantics.

Remark 1.2.There is no completeness theorem for second-order logic with the full second-order semantics. Nor do the axioms of ZFC_2^{fss} imply a reflection principle which ensures that if a sentence Z of second-order set theory is true, then it is true in some (standard or nonstandard) model $M^{ZFC_2^{fss}}$ of ZFC_2^{fss} [2]. Let Z be the conjunction of all the axioms of ZFC_2^{fss}. We assume now that: Z is true,i.e. $Con\left(ZFC_2^{fss}\right)$. It is known that the existence of a model for Z requires the existence of strongly inaccessible cardinals, i.e. under ZFC it can be shown that κ is a strongly inaccessible if and only if $(H_\kappa,\in)$ is a model of ZFC_2^{fss}. Thus $\neg Con(ZFC_2^{fss} + \exists M^{ZFC_2^{fss}}) \Rightarrow \neg Con(ZFC + (V = H_k))$. In this paper we prove that ZFC_2^{fss} is inconsistent. We will start from a simple naive consideration.Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be the countable collection of all sets X such that $ZFC_2^{fss} \vdash \exists! X\Psi(X)$, where $\Psi(X)$ is any 1-place open wff i.e.,

$$\forall Y\{Y \in \mathfrak{I} \leftrightarrow \exists\Psi(\cdot)\exists! X[\Psi(X) \wedge Y = X]\}. \qquad (1.1)$$

Let $X \notin_{\vdash_{ZFC_2^{fss}}} Y$ be a predicate such that $X \notin_{\vdash_{ZFC_2^{fss}}} Y \leftrightarrow ZFC_2^{fss} \vdash X \notin Y$. Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be the countable collection of all sets such that

$$\forall X\left[X \in \mathfrak{R} \leftrightarrow X \notin_{\vdash_{ZFC_2^{fss}}} X\right]. \qquad (1.2)$$

From (1.2) one obtain

$$\mathfrak{R} \in \mathfrak{R} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{R} \notin_{\vdash_{ZFC_2^{fss}}} \mathfrak{R}. \qquad (1.3)$$

But obviously this is a contradiction. However contradiction (1.3) it is not a contradiction inside ZFC_2^{fss} for the reason that predicate $X \notin_{\vdash_{ZFC_2^{fss}}} Y$ not is a predicate of ZFC_2^{fss} and therefore countable collections $\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{R}$ not is a sets of ZFC_2^{fss}. Nevertheless by using Gödel encoding the above stated contradiction can be shipped in special consistent completion of ZFC_2^{fss}.

Remark 1.3. We note that in order to deduce $\sim Con(ZFC_2^{Hs})$ from $Con(ZFC_2^{Hs})$ by using Gödel encoding, one needs something more than the consistency of ZFC_2^{Hs}, e.g., that ZFC_2^{Hs} has an omega-model $M_\omega^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}$ or an standard model $M_{\mathbf{st}}^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}$ i.e., a model in which the *integers are the standard integers* [6].To put it another way, why should we believe a statement just because there's a ZFC_2^{Hs}-proof of it? It's clear that if ZFC_2^{Hs}

is inconsistent, then we won't believe ZFC_2^{Hs}-proofs. What's slightly more subtle is that the mere consistency of ZFC_2 isn't quite enough to get us to believe arithmetical theorems of ZFC_2^{Hs}; we must also believe that these arithmetical theorems are asserting something about the standard naturals. It is "conceivable" that ZFC_2^{Hs} might be consistent but that the only nonstandard models $M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}$ it has are those in which the integers are nonstandard, in which case we might not "believe" an arithmetical statement such as "ZFC_2^{Hs} is inconsistent" even if there is a ZFC_2^{Hs}-proof of it.

Remark 1.4. However assumption $\exists M_{\mathbf{st}}^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}$ is not necessary. Note thatin any nonstandard model $M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}$ of the second-order arithmetic Z_2^{Hs} the terms $\bar{0}$, $\mathbf{S}\bar{0} = \bar{1}, \mathbf{SS}\bar{0} = \bar{2}, \ldots$ comprise the initial segment isomorphic to $M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}} \subset M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}$. This initial segment is called the standard cut of the $M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}$. The order type of any nonstandard model of $M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}$ is equal to $\mathbb{N} + A \times \mathbb{Z}$ for some linear order A [6],[7]. Thus one can to choose Gödel encoding inside $M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}$.

Remark 1.5. However there is no any problem as mentioned above in second order set theory ZFC_2 with the full second-order semantics becouse corresponding second order arithmetic Z_2^{fss} is categorical.

Remark 1.6. Note if we view second-order arithmetic Z_2 as a theory in first-order predicate calculus. Thus a model M^{Z_2} of the language of second-order arithmetic Z_2 consists of a set M (which forms the range of individual variables) together with a constant 0 (an element of M), a function S from M to M, two binary operations $+$ and $\times$ on M, a binary relation $<$ on M, and a collection D of subsets of M, which is the range of the set variables. When D is the full powerset of M, the model M^{Z_2} is called a full model. The use of full second-order semantics is equivalent to limiting the models of second-order arithmetic to the full models. In fact, the axioms of second-order arithmetic have only one full model. This follows from the fact that the axioms of Peano arithmetic with the second-order induction axiom have only one model under second-order semantics, i.e. Z_2, with the full semantics, is categorical by Dedekind's argument, so has only one model up to isomorphism. When M is the usual set of natural numbers with its usual operations, M^{Z_2} is called an ω-model. In this case we may identify the model with D, its collection of sets of naturals, because this set is enough to completely determine an ω-model. The unique full omega-model $M_{\omega}^{Z_2^{fss}}$, which is the usual set of natural numbers with its usual structure and all its subsets, is called the intended or standard model of second-order arithmetic.

Main results are: $\neg Con(ZFC_2^{Hs} + \exists(\omega\text{-model of } ZFC_2^{Hs})), \neg Con(ZFC_2^{fss})$.

2.Derivation inconsistent countable set in $ZFC_2^{Hs} + \exists M^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}$.

Let **Th** be some fixed, but unspecified, consistent formal theory. For later convenience, we assume that the encoding is done in some fixed formal second order theory **S** and that **Th** contains **S**.The sense in which **S** is contained in **Th** is better exemplified than explained: if **S** is a formal system of a second order arithmetic Z_2^{Hs} and **Th** is, say, ZFC_2^{Hs}, then **Th** contains **S** in the sense that there is a well-known embedding, or interpretation, of **S** in **Th**. Since encoding is to take place in **S**, it will have to have a large supply of constants and closed terms to be used as codes. (e.g. in formal arithmetic, one has $\bar{0}, \bar{1}, \ldots$.) **S** will also have certain function symbols to be described shortly.To each formula, Φ, of the language of **Th** is assigned a closed term, $[\Phi]^c$, called the code of Φ. We note that if $\Phi(x)$ is a formula with free variable x, then $[\Phi(x)]^c$ is a closed term encoding the formula $\Phi(x)$ with x viewed as a syntactic object and not as a parameter. Corresponding to the logical connectives and quantifiers are function symbols, $neg(\cdot)$, $imp(\cdot)$, etc., such that, for all formulae Φ, Ψ : $\mathbf{S} \vdash neg([\Phi]^c) = [\neg\Phi]^c$, $\mathbf{S} \vdash imp([\Phi]^c, [\Psi]^c) = [\Phi \to \Psi]^c$ etc. Of particular importance is the substitution operator, represented by the function symbol $sub(\cdot,\cdot)$. For formulae $\Phi(x)$, terms t with codes $[t]^c$:

$$\mathbf{S} \vdash sub([\Phi(x)]^c, [t]^c) = [\Phi(t)]^c. \quad (2.1)$$

It well known [8] that one can also encode derivations and have a binary relation $\mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(x,y)$ (read "x proves y " or "x is a proof of y") such that for closed t_1, t_2 : $\mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_1, t_2)$ iff t_1 is the code of a derivation in **Th** of the formula with code t_2 . It follows that

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi \text{ iff } \mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t, [\Phi]^c) \quad (2.2)$$

for some closed term t. Thus one can define

$$\mathbf{Pr_{Th}}(y) \leftrightarrow \exists x \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(x,y), \quad (2.3)$$

and therefore one obtain a predicate asserting provability. We note that is not always the case that [8]:

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi \text{ iff } \mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c). \quad (2.4)$$

It well known [8] that the above encoding can be carried out in such a way that the following important conditions $\mathbf{D}1, \mathbf{D}2$ and $\mathbf{D}3$ are meet for all sentences [8]:

$$\mathbf{D}1.\, \mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi \text{ implies } \mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c),$$

$$\mathbf{D}2.\, \mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c) \to \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c)]^c),$$

$$\mathbf{D}3.\, \mathbf{S} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi \to \Psi]^c) \to \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Psi]^c).$$

Conditions $\mathbf{D}1, \mathbf{D}2$ and $\mathbf{D}3$ are called the Derivability Conditions.

Definition 2.0. Let Φ be well formed formula (wff) of $\mathbf{Th}$. Ten wff Φ is called $\mathbf{Th}$-*sentence* iff it has no free variables.

Designation 2.1.(i) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an ω-model $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and Φ is an $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence, then:

Φ_ω is a $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence with all quantifiers relativized [13],[23] to ω-model $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}}$, and

$\mathbf{Th}_\omega$ is a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ relativized to model $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}}$, i.e., any $\mathbf{Th}_\omega$-sentence has a form Φ_ω for

some $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence Φ.

(ii) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an non-standard model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and Φ is an $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence, then:

Φ_{Nst} is a $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence with all quantifiers relativized to non-standard model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$, and

$\mathbf{Th}_{Nst}$ is a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ relativized to model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$, i.e., any $\mathbf{Th}_{Nst}$-sentence has a form Φ_{Nst} for

some $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence Φ.

(iii) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an model $M^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and Φ is an and Φ is an $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence, then:

Φ_M is a $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence with all quantifiers relativized to model $M^{\mathbf{Th}}$, and

$\mathbf{Th}_M$ is a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ relativized to model $M_M^{\mathbf{Th}}$, i.e., any $\mathbf{Th}_M$-sentence has a form Φ_M for

some $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence Φ.

Designation 2.2. (i) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an ω-model $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and there exist $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence denoted by $Con(\mathbf{Th}; M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}})$ asserting that $\mathbf{Th}$ has a model $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}}$;

(ii) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an non-standard model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and there exist $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence denoted by $Con(\mathbf{Th}; M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}})$ asserting that $\mathbf{Th}$ has a non-standard model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$;

(iii) Assume that a theory $\mathbf{Th}$ has an model $M^{\mathbf{Th}}$ and there exist $\mathbf{Th}$-sentence denoted by $Con(\mathbf{Th}; M^{\mathbf{Th}})$ asserting that $\mathbf{Th}$ has a model $M^{\mathbf{Th}}$;

Remark 2.0. It is well known that there exist an ZFC-sentence $Con(ZFC; M^{ZFC})$ [21],[22].

Obviously there exist an ZFC_2^{Hs}-sentence $Con\left(ZFC_2^{Hs}; M^{ZFC_2^{Hs}}\right)$ and there exist an Z_2^{Hs}-sentence $Con\left(ZFC_2^{Hs}; M^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)$.

Designation 2.3. Let $Con(\mathbf{Th})$ be the formula:

$$\begin{cases} Con(\mathbf{Th}) \triangleq \forall t_1 \forall t_1' \forall t_2 \forall t_2' \neg [\mathbf{Prov}_{\mathbf{Th}}(t_1, [\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Prov}_{\mathbf{Th}}(t_2, neg([\Phi]^c))], \\ \\ t_1' = [\Phi]^c, t_2' = neg([\Phi]^c), \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

and where t_1, t_1', t_2, t_2' is a closed term.

Lemma 2.1. (**I**) Assume that: (i) $Con(\mathbf{Th}; M^{\mathbf{Th}})$, (ii) $M^{\mathbf{Th}} \models Con(\mathbf{Th})$ and (iii) $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi]^c)$, where Φ is a closed formula. Then $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$,

(**II**) Assume that: (i) $Con(\mathbf{Th}; M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}})$ (ii) $M_\omega^{\mathbf{Th}} \models Con(\mathbf{Th})$ and (iii) $\mathbf{Th}_\omega \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_\omega}([\Phi_\omega]^c)$, where

Φ_ω is a closed formula. Then $\mathbf{Th}_\omega \nvdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_\omega}([\neg\Phi_\omega]^c)$,

Proof. (**I**) Let $Con_{\mathbf{Th}}(\Phi)$ be the formula :

$$\begin{cases} Con_{\mathbf{Th}}(\Phi) \triangleq \forall t_1 \forall t_2 \neg[\mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_1,[\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_2, neg([\Phi]^c))], \\ \forall t_1 \forall t_2 \neg[\mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_1,[\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_2, neg([\Phi]^c))] \leftrightarrow \\ \leftrightarrow \{\neg\exists t_1 \neg\exists t_2 [\mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_1,[\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_2, neg([\Phi]^c))]\}. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

where t_1,t_2 is a closed term. From (i)-(ii) follows that theory $\mathbf{Th} + Con(\mathbf{Th})$ is consistent. We note that $\mathbf{Th} + Con(\mathbf{Th}) \vdash Con_{\mathbf{Th}}(\Phi)$ for any closed Φ. Suppose that $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$, then (iii) gives

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c). \quad (2.7)$$

From (2.3) and (2.7) we obtain

$$\exists t_1 \exists t_2 [\mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_1,[\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Prov_{Th}}(t_2, neg([\Phi]^c))]. \quad (2.8)$$

But the formula (2.6) contradicts the formula (2.8). Therefore $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$.

(**II**) This case is trivial becourse formula $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_\omega}([\neg\Phi_\omega]^c)$ really asserts provability of the

$\mathbf{Th}_\omega$-sentence $\neg\Phi_\omega$. But this is a contradiction.

Lemma 2.2. Assume that: (i) $Con(\mathbf{Th})$ and (ii) $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$, where Φ is a closed

formula.Then $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \mathbf{Pr_{Th}}([\Phi]^c)$.

Proof. Similarly as above.

Example 2.1. (i) Let $\mathbf{Th} = \mathbf{PA}$ be Peano arithmetic and $\Phi \Leftrightarrow 0 = 1$. Then obviously by Löbs theorem $\mathbf{PA} \vdash \mathbf{Pr_{PA}}(0 \neq 1)$, and therefore $\mathbf{PA} \nvdash \mathbf{Pr_{PA}}(0 = 1)$.

(ii) Let $\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit} = \mathbf{PA} + \neg Con(\mathbf{PA})$ and $\Phi \Leftrightarrow 0 = 1$. Then obviously by Löbs theorem

$$\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit}}(0 \neq 1),$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit} \nvdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit}}(0 = 1).$$

However

$$\mathbf{PA}^{\clubsuit} \vdash [\mathbf{Pr_{PA}}(0 \neq 1)] \wedge [\mathbf{Pr_{PA}}(0 = 1)].$$

Assumption 2.1. Let $\mathbf{Th}$ be an second order theory with the Henkin semantics. We assume now that:

(i) the language of $\mathbf{Th}$ consists of:

numerals $\overline{0},\overline{1}$,...

countable set of the numerical variables: $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots\}$

countable set $\mathcal{F}$ of the set variables: $\mathcal{F} = \{x,y,z,X,Y,Z,\Re,\ldots\}$

countable set of the n-ary function symbols: $f_0^n, f_1^n, \ldots$

countable set of the n-ary relation symbols: $R_0^n, R_1^n, \ldots$

connectives: $\neg, \rightarrow$

quantifier: $\forall$.

(ii) $\mathbf{Th}$ contains ZFC_2,

(iii) $\mathbf{Th}$ has an an ω-model $M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}$ or

(iv) $\mathbf{Th}$ has an nonstandard model $M_{Nst.}^{\mathbf{Th}}$.

Definition 2.1. An $\mathbf{Th}$-wff Φ (well-formed formula Φ) is closed - i.e. Φ is a sentence - if it has no free variables; a wff is open if it has free variables.We'll use the slang 'k-place open wff ' to mean a wff with k distinct free variables.

Definition 2.2.We said that,$\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ is a nice theory or a nice extension of the $\mathbf{Th}$ iff

(i) $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ contains $\mathbf{Th}$;(ii) Let Φ be any closed formula, then $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi]^c)$ implies $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \Phi$.

Definition 2.3.We said that,$\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ is a maximally nice theory or a maximally nice extension of the $\mathbf{Th}$ iff $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ is consistent and for any consistent nice extension $\mathbf{Th}'$ of the $\mathbf{Th}$: $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#}) \subseteqq \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}')$ implies $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#}) = \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}')$.

Remark 2.1. We note that a theory $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ depend on model $M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}$ or $M_{Nst.}^{\mathbf{Th}}$, i.e. $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} = \mathbf{Th}^{\#}[M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}]$ or $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} = \mathbf{Th}^{\#}[M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{\mathbf{Th}}]$ correspondingly. We will consider the case $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}^{\#}[M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}]$ without loss of generality.

Proposition 2.1. Assume that (i) $Con(\mathbf{Th})$ and (ii) $\mathbf{Th}$ has an ω-model $M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}$.Then theory $\mathbf{Th}$ can be extended to a maximally consistent nice theory $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}^{\#}[M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}}]$.

Proof. Let $\Phi_1 \ldots\ \Phi_i \ldots$ be an enumeration of all wff's of the theory $\mathbf{Th}$ (this can be achieved if the set of propositional variables can be enumerated). Define a chain $\wp = \{\mathbf{Th}_i | i \in \mathbb{N}\}, \mathbf{Th}_1 = \mathbf{Th}$ of consistent theories inductively as follows: assume that theory $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is defined. (i) Suppose that a statement (2.9) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } [\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \Phi_i] \wedge [M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \Phi_i]. \tag{2.9}$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$. Using Lemma 2.1 we will rewrite the condition (2.9) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c), \\ \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \Phi_i], \\ M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \Phi_i \Leftrightarrow Con(\mathbf{Th} + \Phi_i; M^{\mathbf{Th}}). \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Remark1. Notice that predicate $\mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c)$ is expressible in $\mathbf{Th}_i$ because $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is a recursive theory and $Con(\mathbf{Th} + \Phi_i; M^{\mathbf{Th}}) \in \mathbf{Th}_i$.

(ii) Suppose that a statement (2.11) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } [\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \neg\Phi_i] \wedge [M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \neg\Phi_i]. \tag{2.11}$$

Then we define theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$. Using Lemma 2.2 we will rewrite the condition (2.11) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)\ , \\ \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \neg\Phi_i], \\ M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \neg\Phi_i \Leftrightarrow Con(\mathbf{Th} + \neg\Phi_i; M^{\mathbf{Th}}). \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Remark2. Notice that predicate $\mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ is expressible in $\mathbf{Th}_i$ because $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is a recursive theory and $Con(\mathbf{Th}+\neg\Phi_i;M^{\mathbf{Th}}) \in \mathbf{Th}_i$.

(iii) Suppose that a statement (2.13) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \Phi_i. \tag{2.13}$$

We will rewrite the condition (2.13) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \\ \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \Phi_i] \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i$.

(iv) Suppose that a statement (2.15) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \neg\Phi_i. \tag{2.15}$$

We will rewrite the condition (2.15) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \\ \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \neg\Phi_i] \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i$. We define now a theory $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \triangleq \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{Th}_i. \tag{2.17}$$

First, notice that each $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is consistent. This is done by induction on i and by Lemmas 2.1-2.2. By assumption, the case is true when $i = 1$. Now, suppose $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is consistent. Then its deductive closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$ is also consistent. If a statement (2.14) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi_i]^c)$ and $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi_i$, then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$ is consistent since it is a subset of closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$. If a statement (2.15) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ and $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \neg\Phi_i$, then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$ is consistent since it is a subset of closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$. Otherwise:(i) if a statement (2.9) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi_i]^c)$ and $[\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \Phi_i] \wedge [M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{\omega} \models \Phi_i]$ then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$ is consistent by Lemma 2.1 and by one of the standard properties of consistency: $\Delta \cup \{A\}$ is consistent iff $\Delta \nvdash \neg A$; (ii) if a statement (2.11) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ and $[\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \neg\Phi_i] \wedge [M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{\omega} \models \neg\Phi_i]$ then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$ is consistent by Lemma 2.2 and by one of the standard properties of consistency: $\Delta \cup \{\neg A\}$ is consistent iff $\Delta \nvdash A$. Next, notice $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$ is maximally consistent nice extension of the $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th})$. $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$ is consistent because, by the standard Lemma 2.3 belov, it is the union of a chain of consistent sets. To see that $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$ is maximal, pick any wff Φ. Then Φ is some Φ_i in the enumerated list of all wff's. Therefore for any Φ such that $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi]^c)$ or $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi]^c)$, either $\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ or $\neg\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}^{\#}$. Since $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}) \subseteqq \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$, we have $\Phi \in \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$ or

$\neg\Phi \in \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$, which implies that $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^{\#})$ is maximally consistent nice extension of the $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th})$.

Lemma 2.3. The union of a chain $\wp = \{\mathbf{\Gamma}_i | i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of consistent sets $\mathbf{\Gamma}_i$, ordered by $\subseteq$, is consistent.

Definition 2.4. We define now predicate $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\Phi]^c)$ and predicate $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$ asserting
provability in $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\Phi]^c) \iff \exists i(\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}_i)[\mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi]^c)] \vee [\mathbf{Pr}^{*}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi]^c)], \\ \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\neg\Phi]^c) \iff \exists i(\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}_i)[\mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi]^c)] \vee [\mathbf{Pr}^{*}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi]^c)]. \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

Notice that predicate $\mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ and predicate $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$ is expressible in $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$ because for any i, $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is a recursive theory and $Con(\mathbf{Th} + \neg\Phi_i; M^{\mathbf{Th}}) \in \mathbf{Th}_i$.

Definition 2.5. Let $\Psi = \Psi(x)$ be one-place open wff such that the conditions:

$(*)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi [\Psi(x_\Psi)]$ or

$(**)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)$ and $M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{\omega} \models \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$ is satisfied.

Then we said that, a set y is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set iff there is exist one-place open wff $\Psi(x)$ such that
$y = x_\Psi$. We write $y[\mathbf{Th}^{\#}]$ iff y is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.

Remark 2.2. Note that $[(*) \vee (**)] \Rightarrow \mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$.

Remark 2.3. Note that $y[\mathbf{Th}^{\#}] \iff \exists \Psi[(y = x_\Psi) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)]$

Definition 2.6. Let $\Im$ be a collection such that : $\forall x \big[x \in \Im \leftrightarrow x$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set$\big]$.

Proposition 2.2. Collection $\Im$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.

Proof. Let us consider an one-place open wff $\Psi(x)$ such that conditions $(*)$ or $(**)$ is satisfied, i.e. $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$. We note that there exists countable collection $\mathcal{F}_\Psi$ of the one-place open wff's $\mathcal{F}_\Psi = \{\Psi_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that: (i) $\Psi(x) \in \mathcal{F}_\Psi$ and (ii)

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[[\Psi(x_\Psi)] \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[\Psi(x_\Psi) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_\Psi)]\}] \\ \text{or} \\ \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_\Psi)]^c) \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_\Psi) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_\Psi)]^c)\}] \\ \text{and} \\ M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{\omega} \models \exists! x_\Psi[[\Psi(x_\Psi)] \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[\Psi(x_\Psi) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_\Psi)]\}] \end{cases} \quad (2.19)$$

or of the equivalent form

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_1[[\Psi_1(x_1)] \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[\Psi_1(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_{n,1}(x_1)]\}] \\ \text{or} \\ \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_1)]^c) \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_1)]^c)\}] \\ \text{and} \\ M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{\omega} \models \exists! x_\Psi[[\Psi(x_1)] \wedge \{\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[\Psi(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_1)]\}] \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

where we set $\Psi(x) = \Psi_1(x_1), \Psi_n(x_1) = \Psi_{n,1}(x_1)$ and $x_\Psi = x_1$. We note that any collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k} = \{\Psi_{n,k}(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, k = 1,2,\ldots$ such above defines an unique set x_{Ψ_k}, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_{k_1}} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{\Psi_{k_2}} = \varnothing$ iff $x_{\Psi_{k_1}} \neq x_{\Psi_{k_2}}$. We note that collections $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}, k = 1,2,..$ is no part of the ZFC_2, i.e. collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}$ there is no set in sense of ZFC_2. However that is no problem, because by using Gödel numbering one can to replace any collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}, k = 1,2,..$ by collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k})$ of the corresponding Gödel numbers such that

$$\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}) = \{g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k))\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, k = 1,2,\ldots . \quad (2.21)$$

It is easy to prove that any collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}), k = 1,2,..$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set. This is done by Gödel encoding [8],[10] of the statament (2.19) by Proposition 2.1 and by axiom schema of separation [9]. Let $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)), k = 1,2,..$ be a Gödel number of the wff $\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)$. Therefore $g(\mathcal{F}_k) = \{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where we set $\mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}$, $k = 1,2,..$ and

$$\forall k_1 \forall k_2[\{g_{n,k_1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap \{g_{n,k_2}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = \varnothing \leftrightarrow x_{k_1} \neq x_{k_2}]. \quad (2.22)$$

Let $\{\{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of the all sets $\{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. By axiom of choice [9] one obtain unique set $\mathfrak{I}' = \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\forall k[g_k \in \{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}]$. Finally one obtain a set $\mathfrak{I}$ from a set $\mathfrak{I}'$ by axiom schema of replacement [9]. Thus one can define a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set $\mathfrak{R}_c \subsetneqq \mathfrak{I}$:

$$\forall x[x \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow (x \in \mathfrak{I}) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([x \notin x]^c)]. \quad (2.23)$$

Proposition 2.3. Any collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}), k = 1,2,..$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.

Proof. We define $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)) = [\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)]^c, v_k = [x_k]^c$. Therefore $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Fr}(g_{n,k}, v_k)$ (see [10]). Let us define now predicate $\Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k)$

$$\begin{cases} \Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_k[\Psi_{1,k}(x_1)]]^c) \wedge \\ \wedge \exists! x_k(v_k = [x_k]^c)[\forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([[\Psi_{1,k}(x_k)]]^c) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}(\mathbf{Fr}(g_{n,k}, v_k))]]. \end{cases} \quad (2.24)$$

We define now a set Θ_k such that

$$\begin{cases} \Theta_k = \Theta'_k \cup \{g_k\}, \\ \forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[g_{n,k} \in \Theta'_k \leftrightarrow \Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k)] \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

But obviously definitions (2.19) and (2.25) is equivalent by Proposition 2.1.

Proposition 2.4. (i) $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \exists \mathfrak{R}_c$, (ii) $\mathfrak{R}_c$ is a countable $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.

Proof.(i) Statement $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \exists \mathfrak{R}_c$ follows immediately by using statement $\exists \mathfrak{I}$ and axiom schema of separation [4]. (ii) follows immediately from countability of a set $\mathfrak{I}$.

Proposition 2.5. A set $\mathfrak{R}_c$ is inconsistent.

Proof.From formla (2.18) one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \mathfrak{R}_c \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^{\#}}([\mathfrak{R}_c \notin \mathfrak{R}_c]^c). \quad (2.21)$$

From formula (2.21) and Proposition 2.1 one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \mathfrak{R}_c \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_c \notin \mathfrak{R}_c \quad (2.22)$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash (\Re_c \in \Re_c) \wedge (\Re_c \notin \Re_c). \tag{2.23}$$

But this is a contradiction.

Proposition 2.6.Assume that (i) $Con(\mathbf{Th})$ and (ii) $\mathbf{Th}$ has an ω-model $M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}}$. Then theory $\mathbf{Th}$ can be extended to a maximally consistent nice theory $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}^{\#}[M_{\mathbf{Nst}}^{\mathbf{Th}}]$.

Proof. Let $\Phi_1 \ldots \Phi_i \ldots$ be an enumeration of all wff's of the theory $\mathbf{Th}$ (this can be achieved if the set of propositional variables can be enumerated). Define a chain $\wp = \{\mathbf{Th}_i | i \in \mathbb{N}\}, \mathbf{Th}_1 = \mathbf{Th}$ of consistent theories inductively as follows: assume that theory $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is defined. (i) Suppose that a statement (2.24) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } [\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \Phi_i] \wedge [M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \Phi_i]. \tag{2.24}$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$. Using Lemma 2.1 we will rewrite the condition (2.24) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c), \\ \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \Phi_i]. \end{cases} \tag{2.25}$$

(ii) Suppose that a statement (2.26) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } [\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \neg\Phi_i] \wedge [M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \neg\Phi_i]. \tag{2.26}$$

Then we define theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$. Using Lemma 2.2 we will rewrite the condition (2.26) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \,, \\ \mathbf{Pr}^{\#}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [M_{\omega}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \neg\Phi_i]. \end{cases} \tag{2.27}$$

(iii) Suppose that a statement (2.28) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \Phi_i. \tag{2.28}$$

We will rewrite the condition (2.28) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{*}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c), \\ \mathbf{Pr}^{*}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \Phi_i] \end{cases} \tag{2.29}$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i$.

(iv) Suppose that a statement (2.30) is satisfied

$$\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \text{ and } \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \neg\Phi_i. \tag{2.30}$$

We will rewrite the condition (2.30) symbolically as follows

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c), \\ \mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \wedge [\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Rightarrow \neg\Phi_i] \end{cases} \quad (2.31)$$

Then we define a theory $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}$ as follows: $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i$. We define now a theory $\mathbf{Th}^\#$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{Th}^\# \triangleq \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{Th}_i. \quad (2.32)$$

First, notice that each $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is consistent. This is done by induction on i and by Lemmas 2.1-2.2. By assumption, the case is true when $i = 1$. Now, suppose $\mathbf{Th}_i$ is consistent. Then its deductive closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$ is also consistent. If a statement (2.28) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi_i]^c)$ and $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi_i$, then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$ is consistent since it is a subset of closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$. If a statement (2.30) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ and $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \neg\Phi_i$, then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$ is consistent since it is a subset of closure $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_i)$. Otherwise:(i) if a statement (2.24) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi_i]^c)$ and $[\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \Phi_i] \wedge [M^{\mathbf{Th}}_\omega \models \Phi_i]$ then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\Phi_i\}$ is consistent by Lemma 2.1 and by one of the standard properties of consistency: $\Delta \cup \{A\}$ is consistent iff $\Delta \nvdash \neg A$; (ii) if a statement (2.26) is satisfied,i.e. $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)$ and $[\mathbf{Th}_i \nvdash \neg\Phi_i] \wedge [M^{\mathbf{Th}}_\omega \models \neg\Phi_i]$ then clearly $\mathbf{Th}_{i+1} \triangleq \mathbf{Th}_i \cup \{\neg\Phi_i\}$ is consistent by Lemma 2.2 and by one of the standard properties of consistency: $\Delta \cup \{\neg A\}$ is consistent iff $\Delta \nvdash A$. Next, notice $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$ is maximally consistent nice extension of the $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th})$. $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$ is consistent because, by the standard Lemma 2.3 belov, it is the union of a chain of consistent sets. To see that $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$ is maximal, pick any wff Φ. Then Φ is some Φ_i in the enumerated list of all wff's. Therefore for any Φ such that $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi]^c)$ or $\mathbf{Th}_i \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi]^c)$, either $\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}^\#$ or $\neg\Phi \in \mathbf{Th}^\#$. Since $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}_{i+1}) \subseteq \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$, we have $\Phi \in \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$ or $\neg\Phi \in \mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$, which implies that $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th}^\#)$ is maximally consistent nice extension of the $\mathbf{Ded}(\mathbf{Th})$.

Definition 2.7. We define now predicate $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([\Phi_i]^c)$ asserting provability in $\mathbf{Th}^\#$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow [\mathbf{Pr}^\#_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c)] \vee [\mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\Phi_i]^c)], \\ \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([\neg\Phi_i]^c) \Leftrightarrow [\mathbf{Pr}^\#_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)] \vee [\mathbf{Pr}^*_{\mathbf{Th}_i}([\neg\Phi_i]^c)]. \end{cases} \quad (2.33)$$

Definition 2.8. Let $\Psi = \Psi(x)$ be one-place open wff such that the conditions:
$(*)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$ or
$(**)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)$ and $M^{\mathbf{Th}}_{Nst} \models \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$ is satisfied.
Then we said that, a set y is a $\mathbf{Th}^\#$-set iff there is exist one-place open wff $\Psi(x)$ such that
$y = x_\Psi$. We write $y[\mathbf{Th}^\#]$ iff y is a $\mathbf{Th}^\#$-set.

Remark 2.4. Note that $[(*) \vee (**)] \Rightarrow \mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$.

Remark 2.5. Note that $y[\mathbf{Th}^\#] \Leftrightarrow \exists\Psi[(y = x_\Psi) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)]$

Definition 2.9. Let $\Im$ be a collection such that : $\forall x\left[x \in \Im \leftrightarrow x \text{ is a } \mathbf{Th}^{\#}\text{-set}\right]$.

Proposition 2.7. Collection $\Im$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.

Proof. Let us consider an one-place open wff $\Psi(x)$ such that conditions $(*)$ or $(**)$ is satisfied, i.e. $\mathbf{Th}^{\#} \vdash \exists! x_{\Psi}[\Psi(x_{\Psi})]$. We note that there exists countable collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi}$ of the one-place open wff's $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi} = \{\Psi_n(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that: (i) $\Psi(x) \in \mathcal{F}_{\Psi}$ and (ii)

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_{\Psi}\left[[\Psi(x_{\Psi})] \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)[\Psi(x_{\Psi}) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_{\Psi})]\right\}\right] \\ \text{or} \\ \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_{\Psi}\left[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_{\Psi})]^c) \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_{\Psi}) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_{\Psi})]^c)\right\}\right] \\ \text{and} \\ M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \exists! x_{\Psi}\left[[\Psi(x_{\Psi})] \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)[\Psi(x_{\Psi}) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_{\Psi})]\right\}\right] \end{array}\right. \quad (2.34)$$

or of the equivalent form

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_1\left[[\Psi_1(x_1)] \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)[\Psi_1(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_{n,1}(x_1)]\right\}\right] \\ \text{or} \\ \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_{\Psi}\left[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_1)]^c) \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Psi(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_1)]^c)\right\}\right] \\ \text{and} \\ M_{Nst}^{\mathbf{Th}} \models \exists! x_{\Psi}\left[[\Psi(x_1)] \wedge \left\{\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)[\Psi(x_1) \leftrightarrow \Psi_n(x_1)]\right\}\right] \end{array}\right. \quad (2.35)$$

where we set $\Psi(x) = \Psi_1(x_1), \Psi_n(x_1) = \Psi_{n,1}(x_1)$ and $x_{\Psi} = x_1$. We note that any collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k} = \{\Psi_{n,k}(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, k = 1,2,\ldots$ such above defines an unique set x_{Ψ_k}, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_{k_1}} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{\Psi_{k_2}} = \varnothing$ iff $x_{\Psi_{k_1}} \neq x_{\Psi_{k_2}}$. We note that collections $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}, k = 1,2,\ldots$ is no part of the ZFC_2^{Hs}, i.e. collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}$ there is no set in sense of ZFC_2^{Hs}. However that is no problem, because by using Gödel numbering one can to replace any collection $\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}, k = 1,2,\ldots$ by collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k})$ of the corresponding Gödel numbers such that

$$\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}) = \{g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k))\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, k = 1,2,\ldots\ . \quad (2.36)$$

It is easy to prove that any collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}), k = 1,2,\ldots$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set.This is done by Gödel encoding [8],[10] of the statament (2.19) by Proposition 2.6 and by axiom schema of separation [4]. Let $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)), k = 1,2,\ldots$ be a Gödel number of the wff $\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)$. Therefore $g(\mathcal{F}_k) = \{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where we set $\mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k},\ k = 1,2,\ldots$ and

$$\forall k_1 \forall k_2[\{g_{n,k_1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap \{g_{n,k_2}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = \varnothing \leftrightarrow x_{k_1} \neq x_{k_2}]. \quad (2.37)$$

Let $\{\{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of the all sets $\{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. By axiom of choice [9] one obtain unique set $\Im' = \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\forall k[g_k \in \{g_{n,k}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}]$. Finally one obtain a set $\Im$ from a set $\Im'$ by axiom schema of replacement [9].Thus one can define a $\mathbf{Th}^{\#}$-set $\Re_c \subsetneqq \Im$:

$$\forall x[x \in \Re_c \leftrightarrow (x \in \Im) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([x \notin x]^c)]. \tag{2.38}$$

Proposition 2.8. Any collection $\Theta_k = g(\mathcal{F}_{\Psi_k}), k = 1,2,..$ is a $\mathbf{Th}^\#$-set.

Proof. We define $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)) = [\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)]^c, v_k = [x_k]^c$. Therefore $g_{n,k} = g(\Psi_{n,k}(x_k)) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Fr}(g_{n,k}, v_k)$ (see [10]). Let us define now predicate $\Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k)$

$$\begin{cases} \Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_k[\Psi_{1,k}(x_1)]]^c) \wedge \\ \wedge \exists! x_k(v_k = [x_k]^c)\left[\forall n\left(n \in M_{\mathbf{st}}^{Z_2^{Hs}}\right)[\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}([[\Psi_{1,k}(x_k)]]^c) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}(\mathbf{Fr}(g_{n,k}, v_k))]\right]. \end{cases} \tag{2.39}$$

We define now a set Θ_k such that

$$\begin{cases} \Theta_k = \Theta_k' \cup \{g_k\}, \\ \forall n(n \in \mathbb{N})[g_{n,k} \in \Theta_k' \leftrightarrow \Pi(g_{n,k}, v_k)] \end{cases} \tag{2.40}$$

But obviously definitions (2.39) and (2.40) is equivalent by Proposition 2.6.

Proposition 2.9. (i) $\mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash \exists \Re_c$, (ii) $\Re_c$ is a countable $\mathbf{Th}^\#$-set.

Proof.(i) Statement $\mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash \exists \Re_c$ follows immediately by using statement $\exists \Im$ and axiom schema of separation [9]. (ii) follows immediately from countability of a set $\Im$.

Proposition 2.10. A set $\Re_c$ is inconsistent.

Proof.From formla (2.18) one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash \Re_c \in \Re_c \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}^\#}([\Re_c \notin \Re_c]^c). \tag{2.41}$$

From formula (2.41) and Proposition 2.6 one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash \Re_c \in \Re_c \leftrightarrow \Re_c \notin \Re_c \tag{2.42}$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{Th}^\# \vdash (\Re_c \in \Re_c) \wedge (\Re_c \notin \Re_c). \tag{2.43}$$

But this is a contradiction.

3.Derivation inconsistent countable set in set theory ZFC_2 with the full semantics.

Let $\mathbf{Th} = \mathbf{Th}^{fss}$ be an second order theory with the full second order semantics.We assume now that: (i) $\mathbf{Th}$ contains ZFC_2^{fss},(ii) $\mathbf{Th}$ has no any model. We will write for short $\mathbf{Th}$ and ZFC_2 instead $\mathbf{Th}^{fss}$ and ZFC_2^{fss} correspondingly.

Definition 3.1. Using formula (2.3) one can define predicate $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}^{\omega}(y)$ really asserting provability in ZFC_2^{fss}

$$\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}^{\omega}(y) \leftrightarrow \exists x\left(x \in M_{\omega}^{Z_2}\right)\mathbf{Prov}_{\mathbf{Th}}(x,y), \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.1.[12].(Löb's Theorem for ZFC_2^{fss}) Let Φ be any closed formula with code $y = [\Phi]^c \in M_{\omega}^{Z_2}$, then $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}^{\omega}([\Phi]^c)$ implies $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \Phi$ (see [12] Theorem 5.1).

Proof. Assume that

(#) $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Th}}^{\omega}([\Phi]^c)$.

Note that

(1) $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \neg\Phi$. Otherwise one obtains $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\neg\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi]^c)$, but this is a contradiction.

(2) Assume now that (2.i) $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\Phi]^c)$ and (2.ii) $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \Phi$.

From (1) and (2.ii) follows that

(3) $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \neg\Phi$ and $\mathbf{Th} \nvdash \Phi$.

Let $\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi}$ be a theory

(4)$\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi} \triangleq \mathbf{Th} \cup \{\neg\Phi\}$. From (3) follows that

(5) $Con(\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi})$.

From (4) and (5) follows that

(6) $\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$.

From (4) and (#) follows that

(7) $\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi}}([\Phi]^c)$.

From (6) and (7) follows that

(8) $\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi}}([\Phi]^c) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}_{\neg\Phi}}([\neg\Phi]^c)$, but this is a contradiction.

Definition 3.2. Let $\Psi = \Psi(x)$ be one-place open wff such that the conditions:

$(*)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$ or

$(**)$ $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)$ is satisfied.

Then we said that, a set y is a $\mathbf{Th}$-set iff there is exist one-place open wff $\Psi(x)$ such that

$y = x_\Psi$. We write $y[\mathbf{Th}]$ iff y is a $\mathbf{Th}$-set.

Remark 3.1. Note that $[(*) \vee (**)] \Rightarrow \mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]$.

Remark 3.2. Note that $y[\mathbf{Th}] \Leftrightarrow \exists\Psi[(y = x_\Psi) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\exists! x_\Psi[\Psi(x_\Psi)]]^c)]$

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a collection such that : $\forall x\big[x \in \mathfrak{I} \leftrightarrow x$ is a $\mathbf{Th}$-set$\big]$.

Proposition 3.1. Collection $\mathfrak{I}$ is a $\mathbf{Th}$-set.

Definition 3.4. We define now a $\mathbf{Th}$-set $\mathfrak{R}_c \subsetneqq \mathfrak{I}$:

$$\forall x[x \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow (x \in \mathfrak{I}) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([x \notin x]^c)]. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.3. (i) $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists\mathfrak{R}_c$, (ii) $\mathfrak{R}_c$ is a countable $\mathbf{Th}$-set.

Proof.(i) Statement $\mathbf{Th} \vdash \exists\mathfrak{R}_c$ follows immediately by using statement $\exists\mathfrak{I}$ and axiom schema of separation [4]. (ii) follows immediately from countability of a set $\mathfrak{I}$.

Proposition 3.4. A set $\mathfrak{R}_c$ is inconsistent.

Proof.From formla (3.2) one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathfrak{R}_c \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Pr}^{\omega}_{\mathbf{Th}}([\mathfrak{R}_c \notin \mathfrak{R}_c]^c). \tag{3.3}$$

From formula (3.3) and definition 3.1by Theorem 3.1 one obtain

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash \mathfrak{R}_c \in \mathfrak{R}_c \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_c \notin \mathfrak{R}_c \tag{3.4}$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{Th} \vdash (\mathfrak{R}_c \in \mathfrak{R}_c) \wedge (\mathfrak{R}_c \notin \mathfrak{R}_c). \tag{3.5}$$

But this is a contradiction.

Therefore finally we obtain:
Theorem 3.2.[12].$\neg Con(ZFC_2^{fss})$.
It well known that under ZFC it can be shown that κ is inaccessible if and only if $(V_\kappa, \in)$ is a model of ZFC_2 [5],[11].Thus finally we obtain.
Theorem 3.3.[12].$\neg Con(ZFC + (V = H_k))$.

4.Non consistency Results in Topology.

Definition 4.1.[19].A Lindelöf space is indestructible if it remains Lindelöf after forcing with
any countably closed partial order.
Theorem 4.1.[20].If it is consistent with ZFC that there is an inaccessible cardinal, then it
is consistent with ZFC that every Lindelöf T_3 indestructible space of weight $\leq \aleph_1$ has size
$\leq \aleph_1$.
Corollary 4.1.[20] The existence of an inaccessible cardinal and the statement:
$\mathcal{L}[T_3, \leq \aleph_1, \leq \aleph_1] \triangleq$ “every Lindelöf T_3 indestructible space of weight $\leq \aleph_1$ has size $\leq \aleph_1$”
are equiconsistent.
Theorem 4.2.[12].$\neg Con(ZFC + \mathcal{L}[T_3, \leq \aleph_1, \leq \aleph_1])$.
Proof.Theorem 4.2 immediately follows from Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 4.1.
Definition 4.2.The $\aleph_1$-Borel Conjecture is the statement: $BC[\aleph_1] \triangleq$ “a Lindelöf space is
indestructible if and only if all of its continuous images in $[0;1]^{\omega_1}$ have cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$".
Theorem 4.3.[12]. If it is consistent with ZFC that there is an inaccessible cardinal, then it
is consistent with ZFC that the $\aleph_1$-Borel Conjecture holds.
Corollary 4.2.The $\aleph_1$-Borel Conjecture and the existence of an inaccessible cardinal are
equiconsistent.
Theorem 4.4.[12] $\neg Con(ZFC + BC[\aleph_1])$.
Proof.Theorem 4.4 immediately follows from Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 4.2.
Theorem 4.5.[20]. If ω_2 is not weakly compact in $\mathbf{L}$, then there is a Lindelöf T_3
indestructible space of pseudocharacter $\leq \aleph_1$ and size $\aleph_2$.
Corollary 4.3.The existence of a weakly compact cardinal and the statement:
$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}[T_3, \leq \aleph_1, \aleph_2] \triangleq$ “there is no Lindelöf T_3 indestructible space of pseudocharacter $\leq \aleph_1$
and size $\aleph_2$ are equiconsistent.

Theorem 4.6.[12].There is a Lindelöf T_3 indestructible space of pseudocharacter $\leq \aleph_1$ and
size $\aleph_2$ in $\mathbf{L}$.

Proof.Theorem 4.6 immediately follows from Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 4.7.[12]. $\neg Con\Big(ZFC + \widetilde{\mathfrak{L}}[T_3, \leq \aleph_1, \aleph_2]\Big)$.

Proof.Theorem 3.7 immediately follows from Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 4.3.

5.Conclusion.

In this paper we have proved that the second order ZFC with the full second-order semantic is inconsistent,i.e. $\neg Con(ZFC_2^{fss})$. Main result is: let k be an inaccessible cardinal and H_k is a set of all sets having hereditary size less then k, then $\neg Con(ZFC + (V = H_k))$. This result also was obtained in [7],[12],[13] by using essentially another approach. For the first time this result has been declared to AMS in [14],[15]. An important applications in topology and homotopy theory are obtained in [16],[17],[18].

5.Acknowledgments

A reviewers provided important clarifications.

References.

[1] E. Nelson.Warning Signs of a Possible Collapse of Contemporary Mathematics.https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/warn.pdf

[2] L. Henkin, "Completeness in the theory of types". Journal of Symbolic Logic 15 (2): 81–91. doi:10.2307/2266967. JSTOR 2266967

[3] M. Rossberg, "First-Order Logic, Second-Order Logic, and Completeness". In V.Hendricks et al., eds. First-order logic revisited. Berlin: Logos-Verlag.

[4] S. Shapiro, Foundations without Foundationalism: A Case for Second-order Logic. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-825029-0

[5] A. Rayo and G. Uzquiano,Toward a Theory of Second-Order Consequence, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic Volume 40, Number 3, Summer 1999.

[6] A. Bovykin, “On order-types of models of arithmetic”. Ph.D. thesis pp.109, University of Birmingham 2000.

[7] J.Foukzon, Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms, Pure and Applied Mathematics Journal, Vol.2, Issue Number 3. pp.119-127 http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/pam DOI: 10.11648/j.pamj.20130203.12

[8] C. Smorynski, Handbook of mathematical logic, Edited by J. Barwise. North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977

[9] G. Takeuti and W. M, Zaring.Introduction to Axiomatic Set Theory, Springer-Verlag, 1971.

[10] E. Mendelson,Introduction to mathematical logic.June 1, 1997. ISBN-10: 0412808307. ISBN-13: 978-0412808302

[11] J. Vaananen, Second-Order Logic and Foundations of Mathematics, The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic, Vol.7, No. 4 (Dec., 2001), pp. 504-520.
[12] J. Foukzon,Generalized Lob's Theorem.Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms. Consistency Results in Topology. http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.5340v10
[13] J.Foukzon,E. R. Men'kova,Generalized Löb's Theorem. Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms, Advances in Pure Mathematics, Vol.3 No.3, 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/apm.2013.33053
[14] J. Foukzon, "An Possible Generalization of the Lob's Theorem," AMS Sectional Meeting AMS Special Session. Spring Western Sectional Meeting University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO 13-14 April 2013. Meeting # 1089. http://www.ams.org/amsmtgs/2210_abstracts/1089-03-60.pdf
[15] J. Foukzon, Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms. Fall Southeastern Sectional Meeting University of Louisville, Louisville, KY October 5-6, 2013 (Saturday -Sunday) Meeting #1092 http://www.ams.org/amsmtgs/2208_abstracts/1092-03-13.pdf
[16] J. Foukzon, Consistency Results in Topology and Homotopy Theory, Pure and Applied Mathematics Journal, 2015; 4(1-1): 1-5 Published online October 29, 2014 doi: 10.11648/j.pamj.s.2015040101.11 ISSN: 2326-9790 (Print); ISSN: 2326-9812 (Online)
[17] J. Foukzon, Generalized Lob's Theorem. Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms. Consistency Results in Topology,IX Iberoamerican Conference on Topology and its Applications 24-27 June, 2014 Almeria, Spain. Book of abstracts, p.66.
[18] J. Foukzon, Generalized Lob's Theorem. Strong Reflection Principles and Large Cardinal Axioms. Consistency Results in Topology, International Conference on Topology and its Applications, July 3-7, 2014, Nafpaktos, Greece. Book of abstracts, p.81.
[19] F.D. Tall, On the cardinality of Lindelöf spaces with points G_δ, Topology and its Applications 63 (1995),21–38.
[20] R.R. Dias, F. D. Tall, Instituto de Matemática e Estatística Universidade de São Paulo,15-th Galway Topology Colloquium, Oxford, 2012.
[21] F. Larusson, A proof that cannot be formalized in ZFC. [FOM] Fri Oct 5 23:35:03 EDT 2007. https://www.cs.nyu.edu/pipermail/fom/2007-October/012009.html
[22] P. Cohen, Set Theory and the continuum hypothesis. ISBN-13: 978-0486469218

[23] P. Lindstrom, “First Order Predicate Logic with Generalized Quantifiers,” Theoria, Vol. 32, No. 3, 1966, pp. 186-195.
[24]