## A forcing proof of the Silver dichotomy

## Dino Rossegger

## February 8th, 2022

Our goal is to prove the following theorem about coanalytic equivalence relations due to Silver.

**Theorem 0.1** (Silver). Suppose X is a Polish space and E is a  $\Pi_1^1$  equivalence relation on X. Then either E has countably many equivalence classes or a perfect set of pairwise inequivalent elements.

We will prove the effective version of the Theorem. The boldface version follows by relativizing. It will be convenient to assume that  $X = \omega^{\omega}$ . The proof we give is a forcing proof due to Harrington. The presentation follows Arnold Miller's "Descriptive Set Theory and Forcing". The forcing used is often referred to as Gandy forcing or Gandy-Harrington forcing. Our forcing notion  $\mathbb{P}$  consists of the non-empty  $\Sigma_1^1$  subsets of  $\omega^{\omega}$  ordered by inclusion.

Let us first prove a general observation about Gandy forcing. Gandy forcing was first used by Gandy in the proof his Basis Theorem and later refined by Harrington. Of course, in the original application it was not written in forcing language but as a classical construction of a real in  $\omega$  many steps. After all, Gandy proved his basis theorem before Cohen invented the forcing method. In forcing one often refers to generic reals. This is warranted as the following lemma says.

**Lemma 0.2.** Let G be a  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic filter, then there exists  $a \in \omega^{\omega}$  such that  $G = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : a \in p\}$  and  $\{a\} = \bigcap G$ .

*Proof.* Given  $s \in \omega^n$  let  $[s] = \{x \in \omega^\omega : x \supset s\}$ , then [s] is clearly  $\Sigma^1_1$  and for every forcing condition p and every n, there is [s] compatible with p. However, if s and t are two incompatible strings in  $\omega^{<\omega}$  and  $[s] \in G$ , then  $[t] \notin G$ . Thus there is a unique  $a \in \omega^\omega$  with  $[a \upharpoonright n] \in G$  for each n and clearly,  $\bigcap G \subseteq \{a\}$ . Also note that  $G \subseteq \{p \in \mathbb{P} : a \in p\}$ .

Now, let  $B \in G$ , we need to show that  $a \in B$ . As B is  $\Sigma_1^1$  it is defined by a formula of the form

$$x \in B \Leftrightarrow \exists (y \in \omega^{\omega}) \forall n \theta(x \upharpoonright n, y \upharpoonright n, n)$$

where  $\theta$  is a recursive predicate. We can associate to  $\theta$  a tree T in  $\omega^{\omega} \times \omega^{\omega}$  such that  $B = \{x : \exists y \langle y, x \rangle \in [T]\}.$ 

We show that  $a \in B$  by induction. Let  $[T^{y \upharpoonright n, a \upharpoonright n}] = [T] \cap [\langle y \upharpoonright n, a \upharpoonright n \rangle]$  and  $p[T^{y \upharpoonright n, a \upharpoonright n}]$  be its right projection. Assume that  $p[T^{y \upharpoonright n, a \upharpoonright n}] \in G$ . First, e that

$$p[T^{y \restriction n, a \restriction n + 1}] = [a \restriction n + 1] \cap p[T^{y \restriction n, a \restriction n}]$$

and as the two latter sets are in G,  $p[T^{y \upharpoonright n, a \upharpoonright n+1}] \in G$ . Notice that

$$p[T^{y \restriction n, a \restriction n + 1}] \in G = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} p[T^{(x \restriction n)^\smallfrown k, a \restriction n + 1}]$$

The set  $\{q: \exists kp[T^{(x\upharpoonright n)^{\smallfrown}k,a\upharpoonright n+1}] \cap q \neq \emptyset\}$  is dense below  $p[T^{x\upharpoonright n,a\upharpoonright n}]$  and thus for some k,  $p[T^{(x\upharpoonright n)^{\smallfrown}k,a\upharpoonright n+1}] \in G$ . Let  $x\upharpoonright n+1=(x\upharpoonright n)^{\smallfrown}k$ . So  $\langle x,a\rangle \in [T]$  and thus  $a\in B$ . Hence,  $\bigcap G=\{a\}$ .

At last we need to verify that  $G \supseteq \{p \in \mathbb{P} : a \in p\}$ . Towards a contradiction assume there is  $p \notin G$  with  $a \in p$ . As the set  $\{q \in \mathbb{P} : q \leq p \lor q \cap p = \emptyset\}$  is dense there must be  $q \in G$  disjoint from p. But as for every  $q \in G$ ,  $a \in q$ ,  $p \cap q \neq \emptyset$ , a contradiction.

**Lemma 0.3.** Say a is  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic and  $a = \langle a_0, a_1 \rangle$ , then  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  are both  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic.

*Proof.* Suppose  $D \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  is dense open and let

$$E = \{ p \in \mathbb{P} : \{ x_0 : x \in p \} \in D \}.$$

We claim that E is dense. For arbitrary  $q \in \mathbb{P}$  let  $q_0 = \{x_0 : x \in q\}$ , e that  $q_0 \in \mathbb{P}$  as it is  $\Sigma^1_1$  and non-empty. As D is dense there is  $r_0 \leq q_0$  with  $r_0 \in D$ . Let  $r = \{x \in q : x_0 \in r_0\}$ . Then  $r \in E$  and  $r \leq q$ , so E is dense. Thus, there is  $p \in E$  with  $a \in p$  and hence  $a_0 \in p_0 = \{x_0 : x \in p\} \in D$ . Thus  $a_0$  is generic. The proof for  $a_1$  is symmetric.

**Theorem 0.4** ( $\Pi_1^1$  reduction). Let  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  be  $\Pi_1^1$  sets, then there exist disjoint  $\Pi_1^1$  sets  $B_i \subseteq A_i$  such that  $A_0 \cup A_1 = B_0 \cup B_1$ .

*Proof.* As the  $A_i$  are  $\Pi_1^1$ , there are recursive functions  $p_{A_i}$ , taking  $x \to T^{i,x}$  such that  $x \in A_i$  if and only if  $T_{i,x}$  is well founded. Construct the sets  $B_i$  as follows:

- 1.  $x \in B_0$  iff  $x \in A_0$  and  $T_{1,x} \not\prec T_{0,x}$
- 2.  $x \in B_1$  iff  $x \in A_1$  and  $T_{0,x} \not\preceq T_{1,x}$

Then the  $B_i \subseteq A_i$  are  $\Pi_1^1$  as  $\preceq$  and  $\prec$  are  $\Sigma_1^1$ . If  $x \in A_0$  and  $x \notin A_1$ , then  $x \in B_0$ , as  $T_{1,x}$  is ill-founded and  $T_{0,x}$  is well-founded. Similarly if  $x \in A_1$  and not in  $A_0$ . On the other hand if  $x \in A_0 \cap A_1$ , then either  $T_{0,x} \preceq T_{1,x}$  or  $T_{1,x} \prec T_{0,x}$ . In either case x is in at most one of the  $B_i$ .

**Corollary 0.5** ( $\Sigma_1^1$  separation). Suppose  $A, B \subseteq \omega^{\omega}$  are disjoint  $\Sigma_1^1$ . Then there exists a  $\Delta_1^1$  separator for A and B, i.e., a  $\Delta_1^1$  set C such that  $A \subseteq C$  and  $C \cap B = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* As A, B are disjoint  $A^c \cup B^c = \omega^\omega$ . Let  $A_0$  and  $B_0$  be  $\Pi_1^1$  sets reducing  $A^c, B^c$ , then  $A_0^c = B_0$ , so they are  $\Delta_1^1$ . Let  $C = B_0$ , then  $C \supseteq A$ . But also  $C \subseteq B^c$  and thus  $C \cap B = \emptyset$ .

**Lemma 0.6.** Suppose  $B \subseteq \omega^{\omega}$  is  $\Sigma_1^1$  and for every  $x, y \in B$  xEy. Then there exists  $\Delta_1^1$   $D \supseteq B$  such that for all  $x, y \in D$ , xEy.

*Proof.* Let  $A = \{x \in \omega^{\omega} : \forall yy \in B \to xEy\}$ . Then A is  $\Pi_1^1$  and  $A \supseteq B$ . Thus  $B \cap A^c = \emptyset$  and hence by  $\Sigma_1^1$  separation there is  $\Delta_1^1$  C separating B and  $A^c$ . We have that  $B \subseteq C \subseteq A$  and by transitivity of E, all elements of C are E equivalent.

**Theorem 0.7.** There are  $\Pi_1^1$  sets  $P^+, P^- \subseteq \omega \times x$  and  $D \subseteq \omega$  such that

- 1. for any  $n \in D$ ,  $P_n^+ = (P_n^-)^c$ ,
- 2. and for any  $\Delta_1^1$  set A there is  $n \in D$  such that  $A = P_n^+$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P \subseteq \omega \times \omega^{\omega}$  be a universal  $\Pi_1^1$  set and define

$$Q^{+}(\langle m, k \rangle, x) \Leftrightarrow P(m, x)$$
$$Q^{-}(\langle m, k \rangle x) \Leftrightarrow P(k, x)$$

Then  $Q^+$  and  $Q^-$  are  $\Pi^1_1$ . By  $\Pi^1_1$  reduction let  $P^+$  and  $P^-$  be disjoint  $\Pi^1_1$  subsets such that  $P^+ \cup P^- = Q^+ \cup Q^-$ . Define

$$n \in D \Leftrightarrow P_n^+ \cup P_n^- = X$$

Then D is  $\Pi_1^1$  and the properties 1 and 2 are satisfied.

We now come to the heart of Harrington's proof. Define

$$H = \{x \in \omega^{\omega} : \text{ for no } \Delta_1^1 U \text{ s.t. } x \in U, U \subseteq [x]_E\}.$$

First assume that  $H = \emptyset$ , then every equivalence class contains a  $\Delta_1^1$  set. As there are only countably many  $\Delta_1^1$  sets, this implies that E contains only countably many equivalence classes. We proceed to show that if  $H \neq \emptyset$ , then E has perfectly many equivalence classes.

Note that H is  $\Sigma_1^1$  as we have

$$x \in H \Leftrightarrow \forall U \in \Delta_1^1 (x \in U \to \exists y (y \in U \land \neg x E y))$$

and can rewrite this as:

$$x \in H \Leftrightarrow \forall n((n \in D \land x \in P_n^+) \to \exists y(y \notin P_n^- \land \neg xEy)).$$

**Lemma 0.8.** Suppose  $c \in \omega^{\omega}$ . Then  $H \Vdash \neg \check{c}E\dot{a}$ .

*Proof.* Assume the contrary , and let  $C \subseteq H$  such that  $C \Vdash cEa$ . There must be two reals  $c_0, c_1 \in C$  such that  $\neg c_0 E c_1$ , otherwise we would have that there is a  $\Delta_1^1$  superset of C that meets only one equivalence class. But these are disjoint from H. Let

$$Q = \{c : c_0 \in C, c_1 \in C, \& \neg c_0 E c_1\}$$

and let  $a \in Q$  be generic. Then both  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  are generic,  $\neg a_0 E a_1$ ,  $a_0, a_1 \in C$ . But then  $a_0 E c$ ,  $a_1 E c$  and  $\neg a_0 E a_1$  and as being an equivalence relation is absolute we obtain a contradiction.

Notice that the above lemma implies that if  $(a_0, a_1)$  is  $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$  generic over V and  $a_1 \in H$ , then  $\neg a_0 E a_1$  as  $a_1$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -generic over  $V[a_0]$ . To finish the proof it remains to show that there is a perfect set of product generics.

**Lemma 0.9.** Suppose M is a countable transitive model of ZFC and  $\mathbb{P}$  is partially ordered in M. Then there exists  $\{G: x \in 2^{\omega}\}$ , a perfect set of  $\mathbb{P}$ -filters, such that for every  $x \neq y$ ,  $(G_x, G_y)$  is  $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$ -generic over M.

*Proof.* Let  $D_n$  list all dense open subsets of  $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P}$  in M and construct  $\langle p_s : s \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$  by induction on the length of s so that

- 1.  $s \subseteq t$  implies  $p_t \leq p_s$  and
- 2. |s| = |t| = n + 1 and s and t are distinct, then  $(p_s, p_t) \in D_n$ . Define for any  $x \in 2^{\omega}$

$$G_x = \{ p \in \mathbb{P} : \exists n p_{x \upharpoonright n} \le p \}.$$

To finish the proof let M be a countable transitive set isomorphic to an elementary substructure of  $V_{\kappa}$  for some sufficiently large  $\kappa$ . Let  $\{G_x : x \in 2^{\omega}\}$  be the generic filter given by the above lemma and let  $P = \{a_x : x \in 2^{\omega}\}$  be the corresponding generic reals. By Lemma 0.8 we have that for  $x \neq y \in 2^{\omega}$ ,  $a_x E a_y$ . Furthermore P is perfect, as the map  $x \to a_x$  is continuous. This is because for any  $n \in \omega$  there exists  $m < \omega$  such that every  $p_s$  with  $s \in 2^m$  decides  $a \upharpoonright n$ .

Corollary 0.10. Every  $\Sigma_1^1$  set containing a non- $\Delta_1^1$  real contains a perfect subset.

*Proof.* Let  $A \subseteq \omega^{\omega}$  be a  $\Sigma_1^1$  set. Define xEy iff  $x, y \notin A$  or x = y. Then E is  $\Pi_1^1$ . As A contains a real that is not  $\Delta_1^1$ , H is non-empty, so there is a perfect set P of non-equivalent elements which is a subset of A.

Corollary 0.11. Every uncountable  $\Sigma_1^1$  set contains a perfect subset.

## Analytic equivalence relations

What about analytic equivalence relations? Unfortunately, the Silver dichotomy fails for analytic equivalence relations. Consider the following example:

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \exists f : x \cong y \lor x, y \not\in WO$$

Then  $\sim$  contains isomorphism classes of well orders and one class containing all non-well ordered reals.

**Lemma 0.12** ( $\Sigma_1^1$  boundedness). If  $A \subseteq WO$  is  $\Sigma_1^1$ , then there is  $\alpha$  such that  $A \subseteq WO_{<\alpha}$ .

Proof. Assume not, then

$$x \in WO \Leftrightarrow \exists (y \in A)x \hookrightarrow y$$

and thus WO would be  $\Sigma_1^1$ , a contradiction.

So if X was a perfect subset of non-equivalent elements, then it would be  $\Sigma_1^1$  and so would be  $X \cap WO$  which is off by at most 1 in size of X. Then, by the lemma, X would be countable, a contradiction.

One dichotomy for  $\Sigma_1^1$  equivalence relation is due to Burgess.

**Theorem 0.13.** Let E be a  $\Sigma_1^1$  equivalence relation. Then there are Borel equivalence relations  $E_{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \leq \omega_1$  such that  $E = \bigcap_{\alpha < \omega_1} E_{\alpha}$ .

*Proof idea.* Assume that E is  $\Sigma_1^1$ , then there is a continuous map  $(x,y)\mapsto T_{xy}$  such that

$$xEy \Leftrightarrow T_{xy} \not\in WF$$

Let  $xE_{\alpha}y$  if and only if  $T_{xy}$  has rank greater than  $\alpha$ .  $E_{\alpha}$  is Borel but an equivalence relation for all  $\alpha$ . The theorem is proven by showing that there exists a club C such that every relation in  $\{E_{\alpha}: \alpha \in C\}$  is an equivalence relation.  $\square$ 

A corollary of this theorem is that E has either a perfect set of non-equivalent elements or  $\leq \omega_1$  many equivalence classes.