

SEPARATION PRINCIPLES AND BOUNDED QUANTIFICATION

BY
A. M. DAWES¹

This note is concerned with the implication $\text{Sep}_{II}(Q) \rightarrow \text{Sep}_I(Q)$ where Q is a class of subsets of some set S .

DEFINITION.

$$\text{Sep}_I(Q) \equiv \forall X, Y \{X, Y \in Q \ \& \ X \cap Y = \emptyset \rightarrow \exists Z (Z, cZ \in Q \ \& \ X \subset Z \ \& \ Y \subset cZ)\}$$

$$\text{Sep}_{II}(Q) \equiv \forall X, Y \{X, Y \in Q \rightarrow \exists U, V (cU, cV \in Q \ \& \ U \cap V = \emptyset \ \& \ X - Y \subset U \ \& \ Y - X \subset V)\}$$

where cZ denotes $S - Z$.

It is well-known that in general the above implication is false (e.g. let Q be the closed subsets of the reals). However in many cases of interest the class Q is separable_{II} by a special mechanism dependent on the underlying structure of Q . These cases all fall into a common pattern (for a complete discussion of these examples and the analogies between them, see Addison's paper [1]). We have an index set I , a class Γ of relations on $I \times S$, and Q is the class of sets formed from Γ by universal quantification (intersection) over I . That is, for $X \subset S$,

$X \in Q$ iff there is some R in Γ for which

$$x \in X \equiv \forall i \in I \ R(i, x).$$

Furthermore, we have a binary relation $<$ on I , and Γ has properties:

- (A) $R \in \Gamma \rightarrow \sim R \in \Gamma$
- (B) $R, T \in \Gamma \rightarrow R \vee T \in \Gamma$
- (C) $R \in \Gamma, i \in I \rightarrow \forall j < i \ R(j, x) \in \Gamma$

For example if Q is the class of G_δ sets of reals, Γ may be defined by

$$R \in \Gamma \text{ iff } \forall i \in N (\{x: R(i, x)\} \text{ is in the Boolean algebra generated by the open sets})$$

where N is the natural numbers. Two sets X, Y in Q are normally separated_{II} by reducing the sets cX, cY under the assumption that $<$ is a well-order. That is,

⁽¹⁾ The result in this note appeared in the author's Ph.D. thesis [2].

we have R, T in Γ for which

$$(1) \quad x \in X \equiv \forall iR(i, x), \quad x \in Y \equiv \forall iT(i, x)$$

and we define U, V by

$$x \in U \equiv \exists i(\sim T(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j < iR(j, x))$$

$$x \in V \equiv \exists i(\sim R(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j \leq iT(j, x)).$$

It follows from (A)–(C) that cU, cV are in Q , and obviously $X - Y \subset U, Y - X \subset V$. The only remaining requirement for U, V to separate_{II} X, Y is disjointness:

(D) For any R, T in Γ ,

$$\exists i(\sim T(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j < iR(j, x)) \rightarrow \sim \exists i(\sim R(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j \leq iT(j, x)).$$

We note (i) if $<$ is a linear order, then (D); (ii) if $<$ is a well-order, then cQ is reducible (as is well-known).

THEOREM. *If Q is formed from Γ as above, and Q is separable_{II} in the standard fashion, i.e. (A)–(D) hold, then Q is separable_I.*

Proof. Let X, Y be as in (1) with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. Let $W(i, x)$ be the relation $\sim T(i, x) \rightarrow \exists j < i \sim R(j, x)$. Then W is in Γ , and so the set Z defined by $\forall iW(i, x)$ is in Q . It is clear that $Y \subset Z$ and furthermore using $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ we can show $X \cap Z = \emptyset$. Using (A)–(D) we separate_{II} X and Z by U, V where

$$x \in U \equiv \exists i(\sim W(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j < iR(j, x))$$

$$x \in V \equiv \exists i(\sim R(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j \leq iW(j, x)).$$

Expanding, we find that

$$x \in U \equiv \exists i(\sim T(i, x) \ \& \ \forall j \leq iR(j, x))$$

i.e. $x \in U \equiv x \notin Z$. Since $X \cap Z = \emptyset$ we must have $X \subset U, Z \subset V$ and it follows that $V = Z$. This shows that $cZ \in Q$ and so Z is a separating_I set for X and Y .

REFERENCES

1. J. W. Addison, *Separation principles in the hierarchies of classical and effective descriptive set theory*. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* XLVI (1958) pp. 123–135.
2. A. M. Dawes, *First-order hierarchies in general models and in models of Peano arithmetic*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, 1972.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO