Half of an inseparable pair

Arnold W. Miller[1]

Abstract: A classical theorem of Luzin is that the separation principle holds for the $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$ sets but fails for the $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ sets. We show that for every $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ set A which is not $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$ there exists a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ set B which is disjoint from A but cannot be separated from A by a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ set C. Assuming $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$-determancy it follows from a theorem of Steel that a similar result holds for $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets. On the other hand assuming V=L there is a proper $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set which is not half of a Borel inseparable pair. These results answer questions raised by F.Dashiell.

The separation principle is a classical property of point classes in descriptive set theory. For every countable ordinal α and every pair of disjoint sets $A, B \subseteq 2^\omega$ in the multiplicative class α ($\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$) there exists a set C in ambiguous class α ($\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$) which separates them, i.e., $A \subseteq C$ and $C \cap B = \emptyset$. It is also a classical result of Luzin that the separation principle must fail for the dual classes $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$. For proofs, see Kechris [15] §22.

For Γ a class of subsets of ω^ω, define the dual class $\widetilde{\Gamma} = \{\omega^\omega \setminus A : A \in \Gamma\}$, $\Delta = \Gamma \cap \widetilde{\Gamma}$, and

$\mathrm{Sep}(\Gamma) \equiv \forall A, B \in \Gamma \;\; A \cap B = \emptyset \to \exists C \in \Delta \;\; A \subseteq C$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$.
Γ is continuously closed iff for all continuous $f : \omega^\omega \to \omega^\omega$ if $A \in \Gamma$ then $f^{-1}(A) \in \Gamma$. Γ is nonselfdual iff $\Gamma \neq \widetilde{\Gamma}$.

Van Wesep and Steel [34] [35] [32] proved that for continuously closed nonselfdual Γ in the Borel subsets of ω^ω either ($\neg\mathrm{Sep}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{Sep}(\widetilde{\Gamma})$) or ($\neg\mathrm{Sep}(\widetilde{\Gamma})$ and $\mathrm{Sep}(\Gamma)$), i.e., separation holds on one side and fails on the other. This result is true for all continuously closed nonselfdual classes, if the Axiom of Determinacy holds.

In Dashiell [8], Luzin's theorem on the failure of separation for $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ is used to prove that the Banach space, $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$, of Baire class α-functions is not isomorphic to the space $\mathcal{B}_{\omega_1}$ of Baire functions.

---

[1] Thanks to Jindrich Zapletal who organized the SEALS meeting at the University of Florida, Gainesville in March 2004 during which part of these results were obtained.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 03E15, 03E35, 03E60.

LaTeX2e - texed on October 31, 2006

The following Theorem settles a question raised by F. Dashiell. He already knew the result for $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_1$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$. It was also asked by Luzin [19] in 1930, see the top of page 73, "Un autre problème ..." and the last paragraph on page 76. Henryk Torunczyk informs me that Theorem 1 follows from the results in the paper Louveau and Saint-Raymond [18].

Theorem 1 *Suppose X is a Polish space and $A \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ but not $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$. Then there exists $A^* \subseteq X$ which is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ such that $A \cap A^* = \emptyset$ but there does not exist a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ set C which separates A and A^*, i.e., $A \subseteq C$ and $C \cap A^* = \emptyset$.*

Proof
For $\alpha = 1$, if A is any open set which is not closed, then it cannot be separated from the interior of $X \setminus A$. So we may assume $\alpha \geq 2$. By Theorem 4 of Kunen-Miller [16], there exists a set $P \subseteq X$ such that P is homeomorphic to a closed subset of 2^ω and $P \cap A$ is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha \setminus \mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$. So without loss of generality we may assume $A \subseteq 2^\omega$.

For subsets $B, C \subseteq 2^\omega$ define $B \leq_W C$ (Wadge reducible) iff there exists a continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ such that $f^{-1}(C) = B$. Associated with Wadge reducibility is the Wadge game whose payoff set is of roughly the same complexity as B and C. It follows from Borel determinacy, see Martin [23], that for every pair of Borel sets B and C that either $B \leq_W C$ or $C \leq_W (2^\omega \setminus B)$, see for example Van Wesep [34]. It follows from this that for any $B \subseteq 2^\omega$ which is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ we have that $B \leq_W A$, since otherwise $A \leq_W (2^\omega \setminus B)$ would make A a $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$ and hence $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$, which is contrary to our assumption.

Now assume $\alpha = 2$. Let $D, D^* \subseteq 2^\omega$ be countable dense and disjoint. Note that they are $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ sets which cannot be separated, since dense $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_2$, i.e., G_δ, sets must intersect by the Baire Category Theorem. Since $D \leq_W A$ there exists a continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ with $f^{-1}(A) = D$. Let $A^* = f(D^*)$. Since it is countable, A^* is a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ set. It cannot be separated from A, because if C is a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_2$ with $A \subseteq C$ and $A^* \cap C = \emptyset$, then $D \subseteq f^{-1}(C)$ and $D^* \subseteq f^{-1}(2^\omega \setminus C)$ would separate D and D^*.

Now assume $\alpha > 2$. By a result of Harrington, see Steel [31] or Van Engelen, Miller, Steel [33], for any B which is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ there exists a one-to-one continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ such that $f^{-1}(A) = B$. By a classical theorem of descriptive set theory (see Kechris [15]) there exists disjoint $B, B^* \subseteq 2^\omega$ $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ sets which cannot be separated by a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ set. Let f be one-to-one and continuous with $f^{-1}(A) = B$. Let $A^* = f(B^*)$. Since f is one-to-one, it is a homeomorphism onto its range and hence A^* is a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ set disjoint from A.

The set A^* cannot be separated from A because the preimage of a separating set would separate B and B^*.
QED

Dashiell's proof of Theorem 1 for $\alpha = 2$ is as follows. Suppose X is a Polish space and $A \subseteq X$ is some F_σ set which is not a G_δ. By Baire's theorem on functions of the first class, there exists a closed $F \subseteq X$ on which the characteristic function of A has no point of continuity relative to F. That is, both $A \cap F$ and $A \setminus F$ are dense in F. Let A^* be a countable dense set in $A \setminus F$ (hence an F_σ). Clearly now A and A^* can not be separated by disjoint G_δ sets of X, because intersecting with F would give two dense G_δ subsets of the complete metric space F, which must meet.

Dashiell pointed out that for a fixed countable ordinal α if we let X_α be the Stone space of the Boolean algebra of $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ subsets of the reals, then the cozero sets in X_α whose closures are not open (i.e., not clopen) correspond to the proper $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ sets. (Recall that a zero set is a closed set which the preimage of singleton zero under a real-valued continuous map and a cozero set is the complement of a zero set.) Hence, by Theorem 1, we know that every cozero set A whose closure is not open has an inseparable disjoint sibling, i.e., a cozero set B disjoint from A but the closures of A and B must meet.

Dashiell tells us that the question from [8] of whether $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{B}_\beta$ can be isomorphic Banach spaces for some $1 < \alpha < \beta < \omega_1$ is still open.

Dashiell also raised the same question for the coanalytic sets, $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$. The classic result (see Kechris [15] §34,35) is that any pair of disjoint analytic sets ($\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$) can be separated by a Borel set ($\mathbf{\Delta}^1_1$), but separation fails for $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$. Luzin proved this by applying the reduction principle to a pair of doubly universal sets.

Theorem 2 *Suppose $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$-determinacy holds, then for any $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set A in a Polish space X, if A is not $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$, then there exists $A^* \subseteq X$ a $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set disjoint from A which cannot be separated from A by a Borel set ($\mathbf{\Delta}^1_1$).*

Theorem 3 *Suppose $V = L$, then there exists a Π^1_1 set $A \subseteq 2^\omega$ which is not $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ with the property that for any $B \subseteq 2^\omega$ a $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set disjoint from A there exists a Borel set C with $A \subseteq C$ and $C \cap B = \emptyset$.*

Proof
For Theorem 2 note that since there is a Borel bijection between X and 2^ω we may assume that $X = 2^\omega$. Theorem 2 is an immediate corollary of

a Theorem of Steel [31], who showed that $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$-determinacy implies that for any two properly $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ subsets A_1, A_2 of 2^ω there exists a Borel automorphism $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ such that $f(A_1) = A_2$. Hence if we take $C, C^* \subseteq 2^\omega$ to be any disjoint pair of $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets which are not Borel separable and $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ a Borel automorphism with $f(A) = C$, then $f^{-1}(C^*) = A^*$ will be the required set.

For Theorem 3 we use for A the self-constructible reals studied by Guaspari, Kechris, and Sacks, see Kechris [14] §2, where the self-constructible reals A are denoted $\mathcal{C}_1$.

Define

$$A = \{x \in 2^\omega \ : \ x \in L_{\omega_1^x}\}$$

where ω_1^x is the least ordinal which is not the order type of a relation recursive in x. It is also the least ordinal α such that $L_\alpha[x]$ is an admissible set. Suppose that B is a $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set disjoint from A. Then we may assume that B is $\Pi^1_1(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in A$ since by Kechris [14] 2A, every real in L is recursive in some $x_0 \in A$.

Let $\gamma < \omega_1^{x_0}$ be the least ordinal so that $x_0 \in L_\gamma$. For any $y \in 2^\omega$ define $\gamma^+(y)$ to be the least $\alpha > \gamma$ such that $L_\alpha[y]$ is an admissible set.

Lemma 4 *For any $C \subseteq 2^\omega$ a nonempty $\Pi^1_1(x_0)$ set there exists $y \in C$ such that $y \in L_{\gamma^+(y)}$.*

Proof
The proof is a slight generalization of Sacks [27] III Lemma 9.3 p. 82.

Recall that a binary relation (X, R) is well-founded iff every nonempty subset of X has an R-minimal element. A map $f : X \to$ Ordinals is called a rank function iff

$$\forall s, t \in X \ \ sRt \to f(s) < f(t).$$

Then (X, R) is well-founded iff it has a rank function on it. For (X, R) well-founded the canonical rank function on X is defined inductively by

$$f(s) = \sup\{f(t) + 1 : tRs\}.$$

The range of the canonical rank function is called the rank of (X, R). Furthermore, if $(X, R) \in \mathbb{A}$ is a well-founded relation in an admissible set $\mathbb{A}$, then its rank and its canonical rank function are in $\mathbb{A}$. See Barwise [3] V.3.1 p.159.

Claim 4.1. Suppose δ_1 an ordinal and $T \subseteq \delta_1^{<\omega}$ is a subtree, $T \in L_{\delta_2}$ where $\delta_2 > \omega$ is a limit ordinal. For each $s \in T$ define $T_s = \{t \in T \ : \ s \subseteq t\}$. For each ordinal $\alpha < \delta_2$ if $\text{rank}(T_s) = \alpha$ then the canonical rank function, on T_s, i.e., $t \mapsto \text{rank}(T_t)$ is an element of $L_{\delta_2+\alpha+1}$.
Proof
Note that $(T \times \alpha) \in L_{\delta_2}$ since α is small. Fix α and $s \in T$ with $\text{rank}(T_s) = \alpha$. For each $\delta < \delta_1$ if $s\delta \in T$ and $\text{rank}(T_{s\delta}) = \beta$, then the canonical rank function on $T_{s\delta}$ is in $L_{\delta_2+\beta+1} \subseteq L_{\delta_2+\alpha}$ and is uniformly definable from $T_{s\delta}$, hence the canonical rank function on T_s is in $L_{\delta_2+\alpha+1}$.
QED

Claim 4.2. Suppose T, δ_1 and δ_2 satisfy the hypothesis of Claim 1. For any ordinal α define

$$T(\alpha) = \{s \in T \ : \ \text{rank}(T_s) < \alpha\}.$$

Then $T(\alpha) \in L_{\delta_2+\alpha+1}$.
Proof
This follows from the previous claim since the canonical rank functions are elements of $L_{\delta_2+\alpha}$.
QED

By the Addison-Kondo Theorem we may assume that C is a $\Pi^1_1(x_0)$ singleton, i.e. $C = \{y_0\}$.

Now by standard arguments there exists a tree $T \subseteq \cup_{n<\omega}(\omega^n \times 2^n)$ which is recursive in x_0 such that for every $y \in 2^\omega$ we have that

$$y = y_0 \text{ iff } T\langle y\rangle =^{def} \{s \ : \ (s, y \restriction |s|) \in T\} \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \text{ is well-founded.}$$

Now since the tree $(T\langle y_0\rangle, \supset)$ is well-founded and it is an element of the admissible set $L_{\gamma^+(y)}[y]$, its rank δ_0 is strictly less than $\gamma^+(y)$ and its canonical rank function $R : T\langle y_0\rangle \to \delta_0$ is in $L_{\gamma^+(y)}[y]$.

Now define a tree

$$T^* \subseteq \cup_{n<\omega}(\delta_0^n \times 2^n)$$

which basically consists of attempts at a rank function into δ_0 for $T\langle y_0\rangle$. More formally, suppose $\{t_i : i < \omega\}$ is a reasonable recursive listing of $\omega^{<\omega}$, e.g., it should have the properties that $|s_i| \leq i$ and if $s_i \subset s_j$ then $i < j$.

Define $(r, s) \in T^* \cap (\delta^n \times 2^n)$ iff for each $i, j < n$
if $(t_i, s \restriction |t_i|), (t_j, s \restriction |t_j|) \in T$ and $t_i \subset t_j$ then $r(j) < r(i)$.

Let $R^* : \omega \to \delta_0$ be the corresponding map to R, i.e.,

$$R^*(i) = \begin{cases} R(t_i) & \text{if } t_i \in T\langle y_0\rangle \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that T^* is an element of $L_{\gamma^+(y_0)}$ and (y_0, R^*) is an infinite branch thru it. We claim that (y_0, R^*) is the lexicographically least infinite branch thru T^*. To see this, note that if (y, S) is an infinite branch in T^*, then $y = y_0$, since S will be a rank function for $T\langle y\rangle$, hence $T\langle y\rangle$ is well-founded and so $y = y_0$. On the other hand R assigns to any $s \in T\langle y_0\rangle$ the smallest possible ordinal for any rank function, and so R^* will be lexicographically less than S.

Let

$$LF = \{\sigma \in T^* : \sigma \text{ is lexicographically left of } (y_0, R^*)\}.$$

Then $(LF, \supset)$ is a well-founded relation and it is an element of the admissible set $L_{\gamma^+(y_0)}[y_0]$. Hence its rank δ_1 is strictly smaller than $\gamma^+(y_0)$. By identifying the tree T^* with a tree on $(\delta_0 + \delta_0)^{<\omega}$, i.e., by mapping $(i, \alpha) \in 2 \times \delta_0$ to $\delta_0 \cdot i + \alpha$ we may apply Claim 2. Hence the tree $T^* \setminus T^*(\delta_1)$ and its leftmost branch (y_0, R^*) (which is Δ_1 in it) are elements of $L_{\gamma^+(y_0)}$.

Hence $y_0 \in L_{\gamma^+(y_0)}$ as was to be shown. This proves Lemma 4.
QED

Now we prove Theorem 3. The relation

$$\{(u, v) : u \in \Delta^1_1(v)\}$$

is Π^1_1. Hence the set

$$C = \{y \in B : x_0 \in \Delta^1_1(y)\}$$

is $\Pi^1_1(x_0)$. If it is nonempty, then there exists $y \in C$ with $y \in L_{\gamma^+(y)}$. But since $x_0 \in \Delta^1_1(y)$ we know that $\omega_1^y \geq \omega_1^{x_0} > \gamma$ hence $y \in L_{\omega_1^y}$ which contradicts $A \cap B = \emptyset$. It follows that

$$B \subseteq \{y : x_0 \notin \Delta^1_1(y)\} \subseteq \{y : \omega_1^y < \gamma\}$$

The second inclusion is true since every element of $L_{\omega_1^y}$ is in $\Delta^1_1(y)$. It is well known that for any countable γ the set $D = \{y \in 2^\omega : \omega_1^y < \gamma\}$ is Borel. For example, a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ definition and $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ definition are given by:

1. $y \in D$ iff there exists $\alpha < \gamma$ such that $\forall e \in \omega$ if $\{e\}^y$ is characteristic function of a well-ordering $(\omega, \leq^y_e)$, then order-type$(\omega, \leq^y_e) < \alpha$.

2. $y \in D$ iff there does not exist $e \in \omega$ and $f : (\omega, \leq_e^y) \to (\gamma, <)$ an isomorphism where $\{e\}^y$ is the characteristic function of the relation $(\omega, \leq_e^y)$.

But note that $D \cap A \subseteq L_\gamma$ is countable and $B \subseteq D$, so A and B can be separated by a Borel set. This proves Theorem 3.
QED

Martin and Solovay [22] have shown that assuming Martin's Axiom, not CH, and $\omega_1 = \omega_1^L$ that every set of reals of cardinality ω_1 is $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$. This result also appears in Fremlin [11] 23J. Henryk Torunczyk informs me that under these assumptions any set of reals of cardinality ω_1 cannot be half of an inseparable pair of $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ sets.

Question 5 *If every non Borel $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$ set is half of an inseparable pair, then is $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$-determinacy true?*

See Harrington [12] for some properties of coanalytic sets which imply $\mathbf{\Pi}_1^1$-determinacy.

Cliff Weil raised the question of whether we can get a large number of examples in Theorem 3, e.g.,

Question 6 *Assuming V=L, does there exist continuum many coanalytic sets which are pairwise non Borel isomorphic and each of which is not half of an inseparable pair?*

In Cenzer and Mauldin [7] it is shown that assuming V=L there are continuum many coanalytic sets no two of which are Borel isomorphic.

Separation for subsets of ω.

We could also consider the failure of separation for (lightface) classes of subsets of ω. Addison [1] shows that separation holds for the class of Π_n^0 and fails for the class Σ_n^0 subsets of ω. However, not every proper Σ_1^0 subset of ω is half of an inseparable pair. A set $A \subseteq \omega$ is simple iff it is recursively enumerable (equivalently Σ_1^0), coinfinite, but its complement does not contain an infinite recursively enumerable subset. Simple sets were first constructed by Post [26] (or see Soare [29]), and clearly a simple set cannot be half of an inseparable pair. We are not sure exactly which recursively enumerable sets are half of inseparable pair, perhaps just the complete ones.

Post also showed that a subset of ω is Σ^0_{n+1} iff it is $\Sigma^0_1(0^{(n)})$ (see Soare[29] IV 2.2). By relativizing his construction of a simple set to the oracle $0^{(n)}$ we get a properly Σ^0_{n+1} subset of ω which is not half of an inseparable pair.

Classically, separation holds for the class of Σ^1_1 subsets of ω and fails for Π^1_1. A proof analogous to the simple set type construction will give a proper Π^1_1 subset of ω which is not half of an inseparable pair (see the proof of Sacks [27] VI Theorem 2.1 or 2.4). Another "natural" example of such a Π^1_1-set can be given as follows. Let $(\omega, \preceq)$ be a recursive linear ordering whose well-ordered initial segment is isomorphic to ω_1^{CK}, the first non recursive ordinal. The existence of such a linear ordering is due to Feferman [10] or perhaps Harrison [13] see also Ash and Knight [2] 8.11. Now let A be the initial well-ordered segment of $\preceq$, i.e.,

$$A = \{n \in \omega : \{m : m \prec n\} \text{ is well-ordered by } \preceq\}.$$

Then A is a proper Π^1_1 set. It cannot be half of an inseparable pair because if $B \subseteq \omega$ is Π^1_1 and disjoint from A then there must exists some $n_0 \notin A$ such that $k \succeq n_0$ for every $k \in B$. Otherwise

$$\omega \setminus A = \{m \in \omega \ : \ \exists k \in B \ \ k \preceq m\}$$

but A is not a Δ^1_1 set.

Another light-face question one might ask is the following. Suppose A and B are disjoint Π^1_1 subsets of ω^ω which cannot be separated by a Δ^1_1-set, then can they be separated by a $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^1_1$-set? Here is a counterexample. Let $A, B \subseteq \omega$ be disjoint Π^1_1 sets which cannot be separated by Δ^1_1 subset of ω. Define $A^* = \{f \in \omega^\omega : f(0) \in A\}$ and $B^* = \{f \in \omega^\omega : f(0) \in B\}$. Then A^* and B^* are disjoint Π^1_1 which are clopen and hence separable by clopen sets. But they cannot be separated by a Δ^1_1 subset of ω^ω. Suppose $C \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is Δ^1_1 and $A^* \subseteq C$ and $B^* \cap C = \emptyset$. For each $n < \omega$ let $x_n \in \omega^\omega$ be the constant function n. Then

$$C^* = \{n < \omega \ : \ x_n \in C\}$$

is a Δ^1_1 set separating A and B.

Natural pairs of inseparable sets.

A number of authors have given natural examples of inseparable pairs of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^1_1$ sets.

Luzin [20] p.263 gives the following example. Let

$$\phi : \omega^\omega \times \omega^\omega \to \omega^\omega$$

be a Borel function such that for every $f : \omega^\omega \to \omega^\omega$ continuous there exists x such that $\forall y \;\; \phi(x, y) = f(y)$. Let

$$E = \{(x, z) : \exists! y \; \phi(x, y) = z\}$$

$$E_0 = \{(x, z) \in E : \exists! y \; \phi(x, y) = z \text{ and } y(0) \text{ is even } \}$$

$$E_1 = \{(x, z) \in E : \exists! y \; \phi(x, y) = z \text{ and } y(0) \text{ is odd } \}$$

Then E_0 and E_1 are disjoint inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets.

Sierpinski [28] gives the following pair of inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ be a universal G_δ set for subsets of the plane, i.e., U is G_δ and for every G_δ set $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ there exists an $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $U_x = V$. Then

$S_1 = \{(x, y) \; : \; \neg\exists z \; (x, y, z) \in U\}$

$S_2 = \{(x, y) \; : \; \exists! \; z \; (x, y, z) \in U\}$

are a pair of inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ subsets of the plane.

Dellacherie and Meyer [9] give the following pair of inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets (or perhaps the analogous families of trees): Let LO be the space of linear orderings on ω which we can regard as a closed subspace of $P(\omega \times \omega) \equiv 2^{\omega\times\omega}$. Let $WO \subseteq LO$ be the well-orderings. For two linear orderings let $L_1 \not\hookrightarrow L_2$ mean that L_1 cannot be order embedded into L_2. The following two sets cannot be separated by a Borel set:

$D_1 = \{(L_1, L_2) \in LO^2 \; : \; L_1 \in WO \text{ and } L_2 \not\hookrightarrow L_1\}$

$D_2 = \{(L_1, L_2) \in LO^2 \; : \; L_2 \in WO \text{ and } L_1 \not\hookrightarrow L_2\}$

To see that these sets are not separable by a Borel set, first note that for any $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set $A \subseteq 2^\omega$ there exists a continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to LO$ such that $f^{-1}(WO) = A$. (Such a map can be obtained by using the Kleene-Brouwer ordering on a possible well-founded tree $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ and mapping $\omega^{<\omega} \setminus T$ to and ω sequence at the end.) Similar, for any $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ set $B \subseteq 2^\omega$ there exists a continuous map $g : 2^\omega \to LO$ such that $g^{-1}(WO) = B$. Now if A and B happen to be an inseparable disjoint pair, then the map $h(x) = (f(x), g(x))$ has the property that $h(A) \subseteq D_1$ and $h(B) \subseteq D_2$. Hence if C separated D_1 and D_2, then $h^{-1}(C)$ would separate A and B.

Maitra [21] uses an open game $G(x)$ on ω^ω due to Blackwell and shows that

$I = \{x \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \; : \; G(x) \text{ is won by player I } \}$

$II = \{x \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \ : \ G(x)$ is won by player II $\}$
are disjoint inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets. They are not complementary sets because in the game considered there may be 'ties'.

Becker [4],[5] contains several examples of inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets, for example,
$B_1 = \{f \in C([0,1]) \ : \ f$ is nowhere differentiable $\}$
$B_2 = \{f \in C([0,1]) \ : \ \exists! x \ f'(x)$ exists $\}$
are inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets. He gives other examples in the compact subsets of the plane:
$C_1 = \{K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^2) \ : \ K$ is path-connected and simply connected$\}$
$C_2 = \{K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^2) \ : \ K$ is path-connected and has exactly one hole$\}$

Milewski [24] shows that the following pair of $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets in the space of compact subsets of the Hilbert cube, $[0,1]^\omega$, are inseparable:
$M_1 = \{K \in \mathcal{K}([0,1]^\omega) \ : \$ all components of K are finite dimensional $\}$
$M_2 = \{K \in \mathcal{K}([0,1]^\omega) \ : \$ exactly one component of K is ∞-dim $\}$

Camerlo and Darji [6] give several families of pairwise inseparable coanalytic sets. For any compact set $K \subseteq \omega^\omega$ let
$CD(K) = \{T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} \ : \ \{x \in \omega^\omega : \forall n \ x \restriction n \in T\}$ is homeomorphic to $K\}$
Then for any two nonhomeomorphic compact set K_1 and K_2 the sets $CD(K_1)$ and $CD(K_2)$ are inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets.

One schema for obtaining natural disjoint inseparable pairs is to take a naturally defined filter F on ω and its dual ideal $F^* = \{\omega \setminus X : X \in F\}$. Note that F and F^* have the same complexity since there exists a recursive homeomorphism taking one to other, i.e., $X \mapsto \omega \setminus X$. The cofinite filter COF and its dual ideal FIN are naturally inseparable $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ sets in $P(\omega)$. Louveau's filter $G\mathcal{N}$ [17] is an example of a $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ filter which cannot be separated from its dual ideal by a Borel set. This filter is on the subsets of $\omega^{<\omega}$ and is defined as follows:

$A \in G\mathcal{N}$ iff Player I has a winning strategy in the game $J(A)$.

where $J(A)$ is the game:

$$\begin{array}{lccccccc}
\text{Player I:} & n_0 & & n_1 & & n_2 & & \cdots \\
\text{Player II:} & & m_0 \geq n_0 & & m_1 \geq n_1 & & m_2 \geq n_2 & \cdots
\end{array}$$

Player I wins iff for some k all $s \supseteq (m_i : i < k)$ are not in A. (We use $\supseteq$ to denote end extension of sequences.) This can also be described as follows: $A \in G\mathcal{N}$ iff $\exists \sigma : \omega^{<\omega} \to \omega \ \forall x \in \omega^\omega$ if $\forall n \ x(n) \geq \sigma(x \upharpoonright n)$ then $\exists n \ \forall s \supseteq x \upharpoonright n \quad s \notin A$. Although superficially it seems as if $G\mathcal{N}$ is Σ^1_2, Louveau proves it is Π^1_1 by using the fact that open games are determined and noting that Player I has a winning strategy iff Player II does not.

Louveau proves that any Borel real valued function on a compact metric space is the $G\mathcal{N}$-limit of a sequence of continuous functions. Hence $G\mathcal{N}$ is a kind of ultimate generalization of the cofinite filter.

Proposition 7 *$G\mathcal{N}$ cannot be separated from its dual ideal $G\mathcal{N}^*$ by a Borel set.*

Proof
This follows easily from Corollaire 8 (ii) in Louveau [17] which states that for any separable metric space X and disjoint $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets C_1 and C_2, there exists a sequence, $(H_u)_{u \in \omega^{<\omega}}$ of closed subsets of X such that

$$C_1 \ \subseteq \ \liminf_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u \ \subseteq \ \limsup_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u \ \subseteq \ X \setminus C_2.$$

where

$$x \in \liminf_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u \quad \text{iff} \quad \{u \ : \ x \in H_u\} \in G\mathcal{N}$$

and

$$x \in \limsup_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u \quad \text{iff} \quad \{u \ : \ x \in H_u\} \notin G\mathcal{N}^*.$$

Now take $X = 2^\omega$ and let C_1 and C_2 be any two disjoint inseparable $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets and take $H_u \subseteq 2^\omega$ to be the closed sets as in Louveau's Corollaire 8. Suppose for contradiction that $B \subseteq P(\omega^{<\omega})$ is a Borel set with $G\mathcal{N} \subseteq B$ and $G\mathcal{N}^* \cap B = \emptyset$. Define

$$Q = \{x \in 2^\omega : \{u : x \in H_u\} \in B\}.$$

Since B is Borel the set Q is Borel. Note that

$$\liminf_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u \subseteq Q \subseteq \limsup_{G\mathcal{N}} H_u$$

and so $C_1 \subseteq Q$ and $Q \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus C_2$ which contradicts that C_1 and C_2 cannot be separated.
QED

There are plenty of natural examples of proper $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ filters which can be separated from their duals by Borel sets.

$W_1 = \{A \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} : \neg\exists f \in \omega^\omega\ \exists^\infty n\ f \restriction n \in A\}$

$W_2 = \{A \subseteq \omega^{<\omega} : \neg\exists f \in \omega^\omega\ \exists^\infty n\ \exists s \supseteq f \restriction n\ \ s \in A\}$

W_1 is the ideal of well-founded subrelations, W_2 is the ideal generated by well-founded subtrees. However, note that $W_1 \subseteq W_2 \subseteq NWD$ where NWD is the Borel ideal of nowhere dense subsets of $\omega^{<\omega}$ defined by

$A \in NWD$ iff $\forall s\ \exists t \supseteq s\ \forall r \supseteq t\ \ r \notin A$.

Similarly,

$W_3 = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{Q} : A \text{ is well-ordered }\}$

$W_4 = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{Q} : cl(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \text{ is compact }\}$

we have that $W_3 \subseteq W_4 \subseteq NWDQ$ where $NWDQ$ is the Borel ideal of nowhere dense subsets of the rationals $\mathbb{Q}$.

Hence, it is the case that each of W_1, W_2, W_3, W_4 can be separated from their duals by a Borel set.

In Solecki [30] it is shown that for any $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_3$ filter F there exists a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ set B with $F \subseteq B$ and $F^* \cap B = \emptyset$. He leaves open whether the analogous result holds for $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_4$ filters. Let F be the cofinite × cofinite filter on $\omega \times \omega$, i.e., for each $A \subseteq \omega \times \omega$ we have that

$$A \in F \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall^\infty n\ \forall^\infty m\ (n, m) \in A$$

Then F is a proper $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_4$ set (see Kechris [15] §23) and so is its dual ideal F^*. In Solecki [30] Example 1.7, it is shown that F cannot be separated from F^* by a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ set. Also according to [30] Corollary 1.5, they cannot be separated by a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_3$ sets. They can however be separated by a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ set. Let

$$Q = \{A \subseteq \omega \times \omega : \forall^\infty n\ \exists^\infty m\ (n, m) \in A\}$$

Then Q is Σ^0_3 and $F \subseteq Q$ and $F^* \cap Q = \emptyset$.

Question 8 *Is there a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ filter F which cannot be separated from its dual ideal F^* by a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_3$ set? In fact, is there a $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ filter F which is not $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$?*

Question 9 *For F the cofinite × cofinite filter does there exist a natural $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_4$ set G such that F and G are a disjoint inseparable pair. (How would you prove there isn't a natural one?)*

There is an easy way to generate examples of inseparable $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_n$ sets.

Proposition 10 *Suppose that* $Q \subseteq 2^\omega$ *is a complete* $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_n$ *set. Let*

$Q_0 = \{(x_n : n < \omega) : \exists n \text{ even } x_n \in Q \text{ and } \forall m < n \;\; x_m \notin Q\}$

$Q_1 = \{(x_n : n < \omega) : \exists n \text{ odd } x_n \in Q \text{ and } \forall m < n \;\; x_m \notin Q\}$

Then Q_0 *and* Q_1 *are* $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_{n+1}$ *sets which cannot be separated by a* $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_{n+1}$ *set.*

Proof

Let $A, B \subseteq 2^\omega$ be a disjoint inseparable pair of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_{n+1}$ sets. Write them as unions of $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_n$ sets, $A = \cup_{n<\omega} U^0_n$ and $B = \cup_{n<\omega} U^1_n$. Since Q is complete, there are continuous maps $f_{2n+i} : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ with $f^{-1}_{2n+i}(Q) = U^i_n$. Then the map $x \mapsto (f_m(x) : m < \omega)$ shows that Q_0 and Q_1 are inseparable.

QED

Similarly there is a natural pair of inseparable $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ sets:

Proposition 11 *Let*

$E = \{x \in \omega^\omega \;:\; \liminf_n \; x(n) \text{ is even } \}$

$O = \{x \in \omega^\omega \;:\; \liminf_n \; x(n) \text{ is odd } \}$

Then E *and* O *are disjoint inseparable* $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ *sets.*

Proof

The set $A = \{x \in \omega^\omega \;:\; \liminf_n \; x(n) < \infty\}$ is known to be a complete $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$, see Kechris [15] p.180. This means the given any $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ set $B \subseteq 2^\omega$ there exists a continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to \omega^\omega$ with $f(A) = B$. Now suppose that B_1 and B_2 are a disjoint inseparable pair of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_3$ sets and f_i continuous with $f_i^{-1}(A) = B_i$. Define $h : 2^\omega \to \omega^\omega$ by $h(x)(n) = 2f_1(x(n)$ if $f_1(x)(n) \leq f_2(x)(n)$ and $h(x)(n) = 2f_2(x(n) + 1$ otherwise. Then h is continuous and $h(B_1) \subseteq E$ and $h(B_2) \subseteq O$ and so E and O cannot be separated.

QED

References

[1] Addison, J. W.; Separation principles in the hierarchies of classical and effective descriptive set theory. Fund. Math. 46 1959 123–135.

[2] Ash, C. J.; Knight, J.; Computable structures and the hyperarithmetical hierarchy. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 144. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2000. xvi+346 pp. ISBN: 0-444-50072-3

[3] Barwise, Jon; Admissible sets and structures. An approach to definability theory. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. xiii+394 pp.

[4] Becker, Howard; Some examples of Borel-inseparable pairs of coanalytic sets. Mathematika 33 (1986), no. 1, 72–79.

[5] Becker, Howard; Descriptive set-theoretic phenomena in analysis and topology. Set theory of the continuum (Berkeley, CA, 1989), 1–25, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 26, Springer, New York, 1992.

[6] Camerlo, Riccardo; Darji, Udayan B.; Construction of Borel inseparable coanalytic sets. Real Anal. Exchange 28 (2002/03), no. 1, 163–180.

[7] Cenzer, Douglas; Mauldin, R. Daniel; Borel equivalence and isomorphism of coanalytic sets. Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 228 (1984), 28 pp.

[8] Dashiell, F. K., Jr.; Isomorphism problems for the Baire classes. Pacific J. Math. 52 (1974), 29–43.

[9] Dellacherie, C.; Meyer, P. A.; Ensembles analytiques et temps d'arrêt. (French) Séminaire de Probabilités, IX (Seconde Partie, Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, années universitaires 1973/1974 et 1974/1975), pp. 373–389. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 465, Springer, Berlin, 1975.

[10] Feferman, Solomon; Classifications of recursive functions by means of hierarchies. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 104 1962 101–122.

[11] Fremlin, D. H.; Consequences of Martin's axiom. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 84. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984. xii+325 pp. ISBN 0-521-25091-9

[12] Harrington, Leo; Analytic determinacy and $0^\sharp$. J. Symbolic Logic 43 (1978), no. 4, 685–693.

[13] Harrison, Joseph; Recursive pseudo-well-orderings. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 1968 526–543.

[14] Kechris, Alexander S.; The theory of countable analytical sets. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 202 (1975), 259–297.

[15] Kechris, Alexander S.; **Classical descriptive set theory**. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 156. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. xviii+402 pp.

[16] Kunen, Kenneth; Miller, Arnold W.; Borel and projective sets from the point of view of compact sets. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 94 (1983), no. 3, 399–409.

[17] Louveau, Alain; Sur la génération des fonctions boréliennes fortement affines sur un convexe compact métrisable. (French) [Generating strongly affine Borel functions on a metrizable compact convex space] Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 36 (1986), no. 2, 57–68.

[18] Louveau, A.; Saint-Raymond, J.; Borel classes and closed games: Wadge-type and Hurewicz-type results. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 304 (1987), no. 2, 431–467.

[19] Luzin, N.; Analogies entre les ensembles mesurables B et les ensembles analytiques, Fund. Math. 16 (1930), 48–76.

[20] Luzin, N.; Leçons sur les Ensembles Analytiques, Chelsea Publishing Company, 1972 (First edition Paris 1930).

[21] Maitra, Ashok; On the failure of the first principle of separation for coanalytic sets. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 46 (1974), 299–301.

[22] Martin, D. A.; Solovay, R. M.; Internal Cohen extensions. Ann. Math. Logic 2 1970 no. 2, 143–178.

[23] Martin, Donald A.; Borel determinacy. Ann. of Math. (2) 102 (1975), no. 2, 363–371.

[24] Milewski, Paweł; On Borel-inseparable pair of coanalytic sets in dimension theory. Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. 49 (2001), no. 3, 269–273.

[25] Novikov, Pierre; Sur les fonctions implicites measurables B, Fund. Math. 17(1931), 8-25.

[26] Post, Emil L.; Recursively enumerable sets of positive integers and their decision problems. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 50, (1944). 284–316.

[27] Sacks, Gerald E.; **Higher recursion theory**. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. xvi+344 pp. ISBN: 3-540-19305-7

[28] Sierpinski, W.; Sur deux complementaires analytiques non separables B, Fund. Math. 17(1931) 296-297.

[29] Soare, Robert I.; Recursively enumerable sets and degrees. A study of computable functions and computably generated sets. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987. xviii+437 pp. ISBN: 3-540-15299-7

[30] Solecki, Sławomir; Filters and sequences. Fund. Math. 163 (2000), no. 3, 215–228.

[31] Steel, John R.; Analytic sets and Borel isomorphisms. Fund. Math. 108 (1980), no. 2, 83–88.

[32] Steel, John R.; Determinateness and the separation property. J. Symbolic Logic 46 (1981), no. 1, 41–44.

[33] van Engelen, Fons; Miller, Arnold W.; Steel, John; Rigid Borel sets and better quasi-order theory. Logic and combinatorics (Arcata, Calif., 1985), 199–222, Contemp. Math., 65, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987.

[34] Van Wesep, Robert; Wadge degrees and descriptive set theory. Cabal Seminar 76–77 (Proc. Caltech-UCLA Logic Sem., 1976–77), pp. 151–170, Lecture Notes in Math., 689, Springer, Berlin, 1978.

[35] Van Wesep, Robert A.; Separation principles and the axiom of determinateness. J. Symbolic Logic 43 (1978), no. 1, 77–81.

Arnold W. Miller
miller@math.wisc.edu
http://www.math.wisc.edu/∼miller
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Mathematics, Van Vleck Hall
480 Lincoln Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1388

Appendix A

This is not intended for publication but only for the electronic version.

Details of the proof of Lemma 4.

Claim. Every nonempty $\Pi^1_1(x)$-set contains a $\Pi^1_1(x)$ singleton.
Proof
Most proofs of the Addison-Kondo Theorem that every Π^1_1 set contains a Π^1_1 singleton relativizes, e.g., Kechris [15]. It is also follows from Π^1_1 Uniformization property (Addison-Kondo Theorem.) Namely let $U \subseteq \omega \times 2^\omega \times 2^\omega$ be Π^1_1 set such that for every $x \in 2^\omega$ and for every set C which is $\Pi^1_1(x)$ there exists $n < \omega$ such that $C = U_(n, x)$. By the Addison-Kondo Theorem there exists $V \subseteq U$ such for every (n, x) if there exists y with $(n, x, y) \in U$, then there exists a unique y with $(n, x, y) \in V$.)
QED

Claim. If $(X, R) \in \mathbb{A}$ is a well-founded relation in an admissible set $\mathbb{A}$, then its rank and its canonical rank function are in A.
Proof
Define $\psi(r, D, \alpha)$ iff

1. $r : D \to \alpha$ is onto the ordinal α,
2. $D \subseteq X$,
3. $\forall x \in D\ \forall y \in X\ \ (yRx \to y \in D)$, and
4. $\forall x \in D\ \ r(x) = \sup\{r(y) + 1 : yRx\}$.

Then ψ is a Δ_0 formula. Also for any $D \subseteq X$ which is closed under R both r and α are unique and this uniqueness is provable in KP. Let

$$Q = \{(r, D, \alpha)\ :\ \mathbb{A} \models \psi(r, D, \alpha)\}$$

First note that for any $(r_1, D_1, \alpha_1), (r_2, D_2, \alpha_2) \in Q$ that

$$(r_1 \cup r_2, D_1 \cup D_2, \sup(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)) \in Q,$$

since canonical rank functions must agree on their common domain. Now define $F(x, \beta)$ iff there exists $(r, D, \alpha) \in Q$ with $x \in D$ and $r(x) = \beta$. Then

F is Σ_1 predicate on $\mathbb{A}$ which is the graph of a (possibly partial) function which we also denote F. By the Σ_1-replacement axiom of KP there exist $\delta_0 \in \mathbb{A}$ such that for all $x \in X$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{A}\quad F(x,\beta) \to \beta < \delta_0$. First we show that the domain of F is X. We are assuming that (X, R) is well-founded, so there exists an R-least $x \in X$ such that x is not in the domain of F. Let $R(x)$ be the smallest subset of X which contains $\{y \;:\; yRx\}$ and is closed downward with respect to R. Then $R(x) \in \mathbb{A}$ (of course this is obvious if we assume that R is a strict partial order). Now $F \upharpoonright R(x) \in \mathbb{A}$ since its graph is a Δ_1 subset of $R(x) \times \delta_0$. This yields a contradiction since we can then assign map x to the $\sup\{F(y)+1 \;:\; yRx\}$ and get an element of Q with $x \in D$. It follows that the domain of F is all of X and by a similar argument that $F \in \mathbb{A}$.

Here is a direct proof of the following result of Solecki.

Claim. Let F be the cofinite × cofinite filter. Then F and F^* cannot be separated by a $\boldsymbol{\Delta}^0_3$ set.
Proof

First we prove:

Lemma. Suppose A and B are disjoint Σ^0_3 subsets of 2^ω. Then there exists a continuous map $h : 2^\omega \to P(\omega\times\omega)$ such that $h(A) \subseteq F$ and $h(B) \subseteq F^*$.
Proof
The set

$$C = \{x \in 2^{\omega\times\omega} \;:\; \forall^\infty n\ \exists m\ x(n,m) = 1\}$$

is a complete $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^0_3$ set, see Kechris [15] §23. Hence using the theory of Wadge games there exists a super Lipschitz continuous map $f : 2^\omega \to 2^{\omega\times\omega}$ such that $f^{-1}(C) = A$. By super Lipschitz continuity of f we mean that $f(x) \upharpoonright (n\times n)$ is determined by $x \upharpoonright n$. Let's use f^* to denote this, i.e., $f(x) \upharpoonright (n\times n) = f^*(x \upharpoonright n)$. The same is true for the set B and let g and g^* be the corresponding maps.

Now we use f^* and g^* to construct the map h^* which we think of as a strategy in a Wadge game. Fix n_0. Given any $s \in 2^{n_0}$ assume we have already determined $h^*(s \upharpoonright (n_0-1)) \subseteq (n_0-1)\times(n_0-1)$. First of all

$$h^*(s) \cap (n_0 \times (n_0-1)) = h^*(s \upharpoonright (n_0-1))$$

Given any $n < n_0$ let $i_1^n \leq n$ be the minimal i such that for all k with $i < k < n$ there exists $m < n_0$ such that $f^*(s)(n,m) = 1$. (If there isn't any such k then $i_1^n = n$. Analogously but using g^* define i_2^n. Now put $(n, n_0) \in h^*(s)$ iff $i_1^n \leq i_2^n$. In other words, what we are doing is looking at the nth column and seeing when we look back at whether $f(x)$ or $g(x)$ is more likely to be in C.

The continuous function h is just given by

$$h(x) = \cup_{n<\omega} h^*(x \restriction n).$$

Now we verify that $h(A) \subseteq F$ and $h(B) \subseteq F^*$. Suppose $x \in A$. Since A and B are disjoint we know that $f(x) \in C$ and $g(x) \notin C$. This means there exists a N_0 so that for all $n > N_0$ we have that there exists m with $f(x)(n,m) = 1$ and there is $N_1 > N_0$ so that $g(x)(N_1, m) = 0$ for all m. (There are infinitely many such columns N_1 so just choose the smallest one bigger than N_0.)

We claim that for all $n > N_1$ the set $h(x) \cap \{n\} \times \omega$ is cofinite in $\{n\} \times \omega$. This is because for a sufficiently large stage $n_0 > n$ in the game the witnesses m will have shown up, i.e. be less than n_0 and so i_1^n will be less than or equal to N_0 but i_2^n will never be less than N_1 and so we will always put (n, n_0) into $h^*(x \restriction n_0)$.

The proof that $h(B) \subseteq F^*$ is analogous.
QED

The Lemma implies that F and F^* cannot be separated by a $\mathbf{\Delta}_3^0$ set, since separation fails for $\mathbf{\Sigma}_3^0$.
QED

Appendix B

This is not intended for publication but only for the electronic version.

Lecture notes from
Slippery Rock conference
Summer Symposium XXVIII June 2004

For X a Polish space, i.e., separable completely metrizable, define the Borel classes $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$, $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$, and $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ inductively for countable ordinals α as follows:

- $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_1$ is the family of open sets in X
- $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ is the family of all countable unions of sets from $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathbf{\Pi}^0_\beta$
- $\mathbf{\Pi}_\alpha = \{X \setminus A : A \in \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha\}$
- $\mathbf{\Delta}_\alpha = \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha \cap \mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$

The Borel subsets of X are those in $\bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$. Lebesgue proved that for any uncountable Polish X that $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha \neq \mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$ for any $\alpha < \omega_1$. For $\Gamma = \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ or $\Gamma = \mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$ define the classical separation principle:

$$\mathrm{Sep}(\Gamma) \equiv \forall A, B \in \Gamma \;\; A \cap B = \emptyset \to \exists C \in \Delta \;\; A \subseteq C \text{ and } A \cap B = \emptyset.$$

Luzin [19] proved that $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha)$ holds for $1 < \alpha < \omega_1$ (also $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathbf{\Pi}^0_1)$ if X is zero dimensional). He also proved that $\neg\mathrm{Sep}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha)$. He gets an inseparable pair by applying the reduction principle to a pair of a doubly universal sets, see Kechris [15] §22 p.171.

The following result answers a question of Dashiell. It came up when he was studying Banach spaces of Baire classes of functions [8] although the question does not appear there.

Theorem 1 *Suppose X is a Polish space and $A \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ but not $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$. Then there exists $A^* \subseteq X$ which is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha$ such that $A \cap A^* = \emptyset$ but there does not exist a $\mathbf{\Delta}^0_\alpha$ set C which separates A and A^*, i.e., $A \subseteq C$ and $C \cap A^* = \emptyset$.*

Define $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ (or analytic) subsets of X to be the smallest family of subsets of X which contains the Borel sets and is closed under continuous images. $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ is the family of coanalytic sets or complements of analytic. Suslin showed that disjoint analytic subsets of X can be separated by Borel sets and so Sep($\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$) holds and $\mathbf{\Delta}^1_1$ =Borel. Luzin's argument goes thru to show that $\neg$Sep($\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$). Dashiell also raised the same question for the coanalytic sets $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$. In this case the answer is independent.

Theorem 2 *Suppose* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$*-determinacy holds, then for any* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ *set* A *in a Polish space* X*, if* A *is not* $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$*, then there exists* $A^* \subseteq X$ *a* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ *set disjoint from* A *which cannot be separated from* A *by a Borel set.*

Theorem 3 *Suppose* $V = L$*, then there exists a* $A \subseteq 2^\omega$ *and* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ *set which is not* $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ *with the property that for any* $B \subseteq 2^\omega$ *a* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ *set disjoint from* A *there exists a Borel set* C *with* $A \subseteq C$ *and* $C \cap B = \emptyset$*.*

Theorem 2 is an easy corollary of a result of Steel [31]:

Theorem 4 *(Harrington [12], Steel [31]) The following are equivalent:*

(a) $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$*-determinacy*

(b) For all $A \subseteq X$ *and* $B \subseteq Y$ *if* X *and* Y *are Polish and* A *and* B *are properly analytic, then there exists a Borel bijection* $f : X \to Y$ *such that* $f(A) = B$*.*

Theorem 3 uses the self-constructible reals A studied by Guaspari, Sacks, and Kechris, see [14].

$$A = \{x \in 2^\omega \ : \ x \in L_{\omega_1^x}\}$$

where ω_1^x is the smallest ordinal not recursive in x.

Question 5 *If every non Borel* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ *set is half of an inseparable pair, then is* $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$*-determinacy true?*

Cliff Weil raised the question after the talk of whether we can get a large number of examples in Theorem 3, e.g.,

Question 6 *Assuming V=L, does there exist continuum many coanalytic sets which are pairwise non Borel isomorphic and each of which is not half of an inseparable pair?*

A number of authors have given natural examples of inseparable pairs of $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ sets, Luzin [20], Novikov [25], Sierpinski [28], Dellacherie and Meyer [9], Maitra [21], Becker [4],[5], Milewski [24], and Camerlo and Darji [6].

Another method for obtaining a disjoint inseparable pair is to take a filter F on ω and its dual ideal $F^* = \{\omega \setminus X : X \in F\}$. Note that F and F^* have the same complexity since there exists a recursive homeomorphism taking one to other, i.e., $X \mapsto \omega \setminus X$. This was suggested by the results in Solecki [30].

The cofinite filter COF and its dual ideal FIN are naturally inseparable $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_2$ sets in $P(\omega)$. Louveau's filter $G\mathcal{N}$ [17] is an example of a proper $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ filter. Louveau proves that the Borel real valued function on a compact metric space are exactly the $G\mathcal{N}$-limits of sequences of continuous functions. Hence $G\mathcal{N}$ is a kind of ultimate generalization of the cofinite filter.

Proposition 7 *$G\mathcal{N}$ cannot be separated from its dual ideal $G\mathcal{N}^*$ by a Borel set.*