∃∫∀ *Journal of Logic & Analysis 5:4 (2013) 1–10*
ISSN 1759-9008

Embedding an analytic equivalence relation in the transitive closure of a Borel relation

EDWARD J GREEN

Abstract: The transitive closure of a reflexive, symmetric, analytic relation is an analytic equivalence relation. Does some smaller class contain the transitive closure of every reflexive, symmetric, closed relation? An essentially negative answer is provided here. Every analytic equivalence relation on an arbitrary Polish space is Borel embeddable in the transitive closure of the union of two smooth Borel equivalence relations on that space. In the case of the Baire space, the two smooth relations can be taken to be closed, and the embedding to be homeomorphic.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification 03E02 (primary); 28A05 (secondary)

Keywords: analytic equivalence relation, transitive closure

1 Introduction

This note answers a question in descriptive set theory that arises in the context of the Bayesian theory of decisions and games. It concerns the notion of common knowledge, formalized by Robert Aumann [1]. For an event A that is represented as a subset of a measurable space Ω, Aumann defines the event that an agent *knows* A to be the event $\Omega \setminus [\Omega \setminus A]_{\mathcal{P}}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the agent's *information partition* of Ω.[1] If $\mathcal{P}$ is the meet of individual agents' information partitions (in the lattice of partitions where $\mathcal{P}' \leq \mathcal{P}'' \iff \mathcal{P}''$ refines $\mathcal{P}'$), then Aumann defines

$$\Omega \setminus [\Omega \setminus A]_{\mathcal{P}} \tag{1}$$

to be the event that A is common knowledge among the agents.[2]

[1] $[A]_{\mathcal{P}}$ denotes $\bigcup\{\pi \mid \pi \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } \pi \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$, the saturation of A with respect to $\mathcal{P}$. If E is an equivalence relation, then $[A]_E$ denotes the saturation of A with respect to the partition induced by E. Aumann's definition corresponds to the truth condition for $\Box A$ in Kripke [3].

[2] Aumann sketches an argument—reminiscent of a general principle in proof theory (cf Pohlers [6, Lemma 6.4.8, p. 89]) that this definition is equivalent to the intuitive, recursive definition of common knowledge: that A has occurred and that, for $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, both agents know. . . that both agents know (n times) that A has occurred.

Published: March 2013 doi: 10.4115/jla.2013.5.4

Aumann restricts attention to the case that Ω is countable (or that the Borel σ-algebra on Ω is generated by the elements of a countable partition), so that measurability issues do not arise. But, otherwise, measurability problems dictate that information partitions should be represented as equivalence relations. If E_1 and E_2 are Σ^1_1 (that is, analytic) equivalence relations, then the meet of the partitions that they induce is induced by the transitive closure of their union. This transitive closure is also a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation.[3]

In most applications to Bayesian decision theory and game theory, it is reasonable to specify each agent's information as a Δ^1_1 (that is, Borel) equivalence relation, or even as a smooth Borel relation or a closed relation rather than as an arbitrary Σ^1_1 equivalence relation.[4] Thus it may be asked: if the graphs of E_1 and E_2 are in Δ^1_1 or in some smaller class, then how is the graph of the transitive closure of $E_1 \cup E_2$ restricted?

It will be shown here that no significant restriction of the common-knowledge partition is implied by such restriction of agents' information partitions. This finding is not surprising, since restricting the complexity of individuals' equivalence relations does not obviate the use of an existential quantifier to define the transitive closure of a relation. Nevertheless, it needs to be shown that common-knowledge equivalence relations derived from Borel equivalence relations are not lower in set-theoretic complexity, as a class, than their definition would suggest.[5]

To define the transitive closure of $R \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$, let $R^{(1)} = R$ and $R^{(n+1)} = RR^{(n)}$ (that is, the composition of relations R and $R^{(n)}$). Letting $\mathbb{N}_+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, denote the transitive closure of R by $R^+ = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} R^{(n)}$. It will be proved here that, if Ω is a Polish space and $E \subset \Omega \times \Omega$ is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation, then there are smooth Δ^1_1 equivalence relations E' and E'' and a Δ^1_1 subset Z of Ω, such that $(E' \cup E'')^+ \restriction Z$ is Borel equivalent to E.[6] If Ω is the Baire space, then E' and E'' can be taken to

[3]Composition is defined with a single existential quantifier, and thus takes a pair of Σ^1_1 relations to a Σ^1_1 relation. The countable union of Σ^1_1 relations is Σ^1_1. (Moschovakis [5, Theorem 2B.2, p. 54])

[4]Smoothness (also called tameness) and closedness are co-extensive for equivalence relations on subsets of Polish spaces. (Harrington, Kechris and Louveau [2, proof of Theorem 1.1, p. 920])

[5]If the graph of a function defined on a Borel set in a Polish space is an analytic set, then it is a Borel set. (Moschovakis [5, exercise 2E.4]) This is an example of a class of Borel sets, the definition of which does not have a syntactic form that overtly excludes non-Borel analytic sets from the class.

[6]$R \restriction Z = R \cap (Z \times Z)$. Let restriction take precedence over Boolean operations. For example, $X \cup R \restriction Z \cap Y$ means $X \cup (R \restriction Z) \cap Y$.

be closed, Z can be taken to be open, and the Borel equivalence can be taken to be a homeomorphic equivalence.

2 The case of the Baire space

First take Ω to be the Baire space, $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$.[7] Define subsets X and Y of $\mathcal{N}$ by $X = \{\alpha|\alpha_0 > 0\}$ and $Y = \{\alpha|\alpha_0 = 0\}$. X and Y are both homeomorphic to $\mathcal{N}$, and homeomorphisms $f\colon X \to Y$ and $g\colon Y \times Y \times Y \to Y$ are routine to construct.[8] Each of X and Y is both open and closed in $\mathcal{N}$. It follows that, if Z is either X or Y, then $A \subseteq Z$ is open (resp. closed, Borel, Σ^1_1) as a subset of A iff it is open (resp. closed, Borel, Σ^1_1) as a subset of Z. This invariance to the ambient space extends to product spaces. (For example a subset of $X \times Y$ is closed in $X \times Y$ iff it is closed in $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$.) In subsequent discussions, subsets of these subspaces will be characterized (for example, as being closed) without mentioning the subspace.

Theorem 2.1 *If $E \subseteq X \times X$ is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation, then there are equivalence relations I and J on $\mathcal{N}$, each of which has a closed graph, such that $E = (I \cup J)^+ \restriction X$.*

Remark It is important that the closed eqivalence relations are defined on a bigger domain than the original analytic one. Thus it still remains a problem whether I and J can have the same domain as the original E.

Before proceeding to the proof of this theorem, note that $I \cup J$ is a closed, reflexive, symmetric relation. Thus, theorem 2.1 has the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2 *If $E \subseteq X \times X$ is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation, then there is a closed, reflexive, symmetric relation R on $\mathcal{N}$, such that $E = R^+ \restriction X$.*

Theorem 2.1 can be viewed as being a stronger version of corollary 2.2, in which the closed, reflexive, symmetric relation R of the corollary is specified to be the union of two closed equivalence relations, I and J. The following example shows that not every closed, reflexive, symmetric relation on $\mathcal{N}$ is such a union. In fact, although every closed, reflexive, symmetric relation is trivially the union of $2^{\aleph_0}$ closed equivalence

[7] $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \ldots\}$. $\mathcal{N}$ is topologized as the product of discrete spaces.

[8] Since Y is homeomorphic with $\mathcal{N}$, g can be constructed from the function described by Moschovakis [5, p. 31].

relations, no lower cardinality suffices. Moreover, the trivial lower bound on cardinality cannot be improved even if the equivalence relations are not required to be closed.

Denote the diagonal (that is, identity) relation in $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ by $D = \{(\alpha, \alpha) | \alpha \in \mathcal{N}\}$. D is closed.

Proposition 2.3 *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$. Define $R = D \cup (\{\alpha\} \times \mathcal{N}) \cup (\mathcal{N} \times \{\alpha\})$, and define*

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigcup \{D \cup \{(\alpha, \beta), (\beta, \alpha)\} | \beta \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{\alpha\}\} .$$

$R = \bigcup \mathcal{E}$; every $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is an equivalence relation; R is closed, reflexive, and symmetric; and $2^{\aleph_0}$ is the cardinality of $\mathcal{E}$. Except for $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E} \cup \{D\}$, there is no other set $\mathcal{F}$ of equivalence relations such that $R = \bigcup \mathcal{F}$. Thus, R is not a union of fewer that $2^{\aleph_0}$ equivalence relations.

Proof The assertions regarding $\mathcal{E}$ are obvious from its construction. To obtain a contradiction from supposing that $\mathcal{E}$ were not unique, suppose that R were also the union of a set $\mathcal{F} \notin \{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E} \cup \{D\}\}$ of equivalence relations. $\mathcal{F}$ could not be a proper subset of $\mathcal{E}$, for, if $D \cup \{(\alpha, \beta), (\beta, \alpha)\} \notin \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{E} \cup \{D\}$, then $(\alpha, \beta) \in R \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{F}$. Consequently, there must be some $E \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}$. By symmetry, there must be three distinct points, α, β, γ such that $\{(\beta, \alpha), (\alpha, \gamma)\} \subseteq E$. Since E is transitive, $(\beta, \gamma) \in E \setminus R$, contrary to $R = \bigcup \mathcal{F}$. □

3 Proof of the theorem

If $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in \mathcal{N}^k$, then a transposition mapping is defined by $t_{ij}(\vec{\alpha}) = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_j, \alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}, \alpha_i, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_k)$.[9] The abbreviation $\widetilde{A} = t_{12}(A) = \{t_{12}(\alpha) | \alpha \in A\}$ will sometimes be used. Each t_{ij} is a homeomorphism of $\mathcal{N}^k$ with itself. Note that $t_{ij} \restriction X$ and $t_{ij} \restriction Y$ map X^k and Y^k homeomorphically onto themselves.

Recall that a relation $E \subseteq X \times X$ is $\frac{1}{1}$ iff there is a set F such that

(2) $\quad F \subseteq X \times X \times \mathcal{N}$ is closed, and $(\alpha, \beta) \in E \iff \exists \gamma\ (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F$.

Lemma 3.1 *If $E \subseteq X \times X$ is symmetric, then E is $\frac{1}{1}$ iff there is a closed, t_{12}–invariant set $F \subset X \times X \times X$ that satisfies $(\alpha, \beta) \in E \iff \exists \gamma\ (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F$.*

[9] A sub-sequence of subscripted alphas distinct from α_i and α_j having subscripts that are not increasing, which occurs if $i = 1$ or $j = i + 1$ or $j = k$, denotes the empty sequence.

Proof Let F_0 satisfy (2). Let h be a homeomorphism from $\mathcal{N}$ onto X, and define $F_1 \subseteq X \times X \times X$ by $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F_0 \iff (\alpha, \beta, h(\gamma)) \in F_1$. F_1 also satisfies (2), then, and it is closed. By symmetry of E, $\widetilde{F_1}$ is another closed set that satisfies (2). Consequently, $F = F_1 \cup \widetilde{F_1}$ is a t_{12}–invariant closed set that satisfies $(\alpha, \beta) \in E \iff \exists\gamma\ (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F$. □

The two closed equivalence relations that theorem 2.1 asserts to exist are defined from the homeomorphisms f and g introduced in Section 2, and the closed, t_{12}–invariant set F guaranteed to exist by lemma 3.1, as follows. Recall that D denotes the diagonal (that is, identity) relation in $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ by $D = \{(\alpha, \alpha) | \alpha \in \mathcal{N}\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
j(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= g(f(\alpha), f(\beta), f(\gamma)) \\
&\qquad [j \text{ maps } X \times X \times X \text{ homeomorphically onto } Y]; \\
G &= \{(\alpha, j(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)) | (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F\} \subseteq X \times Y; \\
H &= \{(j(\alpha, \beta, \gamma), j(\beta, \alpha, \gamma)) | (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in X \times X \times X\} \subseteq Y \times Y; \\
I &= D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \subseteq D \cup ((\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}) \setminus (X \times X)); \\
J &= D \cup H \subseteq D \cup (Y \times Y).
\end{aligned} \tag{3}
$$

The assertions collected in the following lemma are routinely verified.

Lemma 3.2 *D, G, $\widetilde{G}$, H, J, $\widetilde{G}G$ and I are closed. $G\widetilde{G} = D \restriction X$. $\widetilde{G}G = \{(j(\alpha, \beta, \gamma), j(\alpha, \delta, \epsilon)) | (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F \text{ and } (\alpha, \delta, \epsilon) \in F\}$. $H = \widetilde{H}$. $H^{(2)} = D \restriction Y$. $GH = \{(\alpha, j(\beta, \alpha, \gamma)) | (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in F\}$. $GH\widetilde{G} = E$.*

Lemma 3.3 *I and J are equivalence relations.*

Proof These relations are reflexive and symmetric, so their transitive closures are equivalence relations. Thus, the lemma is equivalent to the assertion that $I = I^+$ and $J = J^+$. For any relation K, $K^{(2)} = K$ is sufficient for $K = K^+$. In the following calculations of $I^{(2)}$ and $J^{(2)}$, composition of relations is distributed over unions. Terms that evaluate by identities that were calculated in lemma 3.2 to a previous term or its sub-relation, are omitted from the expansion by terms in the penultimate step of each calculation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
I^{(2)} &= (D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G)(D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G) \\
&= (D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G) \cup (G \cup G\widetilde{G} \cup G\widetilde{G}G) \cup (\widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \cup \widetilde{G}\widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}\widetilde{G}G) \\
&\quad \cup (\widetilde{G}G \cup \widetilde{G}GG \cup \widetilde{G}G\widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G\widetilde{G}G) \\
&= D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \\
&= I. \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
J^{(2)} &= (D \cup H)(D \cup H) \\
&= (D \cup H) \cup (H \cup H^{(2)}) \\
&= D \cup H \\
&= J.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Proof of theorem 2.1 Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 show that the each of the relations I and J on $\mathcal{N}$, is an equivalence relation that has a closed graph. It remains to be shown that that $E = (I \cup J)^+ \cap (X \times X)$. Note that, since $D \subseteq I \cup J$, $I \cup J \subseteq (I \cup J)^{(2)} \subseteq (I \cup J)^{(3)} \subseteq \ldots$ Hence, if $(I \cup J)^{(n)} = (I \cup J)^{(n+1)}$, then $(I \cup J)^{(n)} = (I \cup J)^+$.

The following calculation shows that $(I \cup J)^{(5)} = (I \cup J)^{(6)}$. The calculation is done recursively, according to the following recipe at each stage $n > 1$:

(1) Begin with the equation $(I \cup J)^{(n+1)} = (I \cup J)(I \cup J)^{(n)}$.

(2) Rewrite $(I \cup J)$ as $D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \cup H$ according to (3), rewrite $(I \cup J)^{(n)}$ according to the result of the previous stage, and then distribute composition of relations over union in the resulting equation.

(3) For each identity stated in lemma 3.2, and for each identity that, for some $K \in \{G, \widetilde{G}, H\}$, equates a composition KD or DK of K and D (or a restriction of D to a product set of which K is a subset) to K, do as follows: Going from left to right, apply the identity wherever possible.[10] Repeat this entire step (consisting of one pass per identity) until no further simplifications are possible.

[10]Let $P = D \restriction X$ and $Q = D \restriction Y$. Identities are applied in the following order at each stage of the recursion: $DD = D$, $DE = E$, $DG = G$, $D\widetilde{G} = \widetilde{G}$, $DH = H$, $DP = P$, $DQ = Q$, $ED = E$, $EE = E$, $EP = E$, $GD = G$, $G\widetilde{G} = P$, $GH\widetilde{G} = E$, $GQ = G$, $\widetilde{G}D = \widetilde{G}$, $\widetilde{G}P = \widetilde{G}$, $HD = H$, $HH = Q$, $HQ = H$, $PD = P$, $PE = E$, $PG = G$, $PP = P$, $QD = Q$, $Q\widetilde{G} = \widetilde{G}$, $QH = H$, $QQ = Q$.

(4) Delete compositions of relations that include terms KL such that the range of K and the domain of L (viewed as correspondences) are disjoint, in which case the term denotes the empty relation. Delete $D \upharpoonright X$ (occurring as a term by itself), of which D is a superset.

(5) Delete each term of form $[K]\widetilde{G}[L]$ (resp. $[K]G[L]$) from a union in which the corresponding term for its superset, $[K]\widetilde{G}E[L]$ (resp. $[K]EG[L]$) also appears. (One or both of the bracketed sub-terms may be absent from both terms in the pair.) Delete D (occurring as a term by itself) from every union that contains both $D \upharpoonright Y$ and E, since $D \subseteq D \upharpoonright Y \cup E$.

(6) Reorder terms lexicographically, in the order $D < D \upharpoonright Y < E < G < \widetilde{G} < H$. Delete repeated terms.

$$
\begin{aligned}
(I \cup J) &= D \cup G \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \cup H \\[2ex]
(I \cup J)^{(2)} &= D \cup D \upharpoonright Y \cup G \cup GH \cup \widetilde{G} \cup \widetilde{G}G \cup \widetilde{G}GH \\
&\quad \cup H \cup H\widetilde{G} \cup H\widetilde{G}G \\[2ex]
(I \cup J)^{(3)} &= D \upharpoonright Y \cup E \cup EG \cup GH \cup \widetilde{G}E \cup \widetilde{G}EG \cup \widetilde{G}GH \\
&\quad \cup H \cup H\widetilde{G} \cup H\widetilde{G}G \cup H\widetilde{G}GH \\[2ex]
(I \cup J)^{(4)} &= D \upharpoonright Y \cup E \cup EG \cup EGH \cup \widetilde{G}E \cup \widetilde{G}EG \cup \widetilde{G}EGH \\
&\quad \cup H \cup H\widetilde{G}E \cup H\widetilde{G}EG \cup H\widetilde{G}GH \\[2ex]
(I \cup J)^{(5)} &= D \upharpoonright Y \cup E \cup EG \cup EGH \cup \widetilde{G}E \cup \widetilde{G}EG \cup \widetilde{G}EGH \\
&\quad \cup H \cup H\widetilde{G}E \cup H\widetilde{G}EG \cup H\widetilde{G}EGH \\
&= (I \cup J)^{(6)}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

Thus $(I \cup J)^{+} = (I \cup J)^{(5)}$. Note that $D \upharpoonright Y$, G, $\widetilde{G}$, H and all relations of form or $\widetilde{G}Q$ or HQ or QG or QH (where variable Q ranges over compositions of G, $\widetilde{G}$, H, and E), are disjoint from $X \times X$. Therefore, from the calculation in (5) of $(I \cup J)^{(5)}$ as a union of E with such relations, it follows that $(I \cup J)^{+} \upharpoonright X = E$. □

4 The general case of a standard Borel space

In this concluding section, theorem 2.1 is generalized in two ways to an arbitrary standard Borel space (that is, to a Borel subset of a Polish space with its inherited Borel structure). A *Borel isomorphism* of standard Borel spaces Φ and Ω is a Δ^1_1 function $k\colon \Phi \to \Omega$ such that $k^{-1}\colon \Omega \to \Phi$ exists and is also Δ^1_1. Every two uncountable standard Borel spaces are isomorphic.[11]

In both generalizations, the concept of smoothness of a Borel equivalence relation substitutes for the concept of closedness that appears in theorem 2.1. If $E \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ is a Δ^1_1 equivalence relation, and if there is a set $\{Y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Δ^1_1 sets such that $(\psi, \omega) \in E \iff \forall n\ [\psi \in Y_n \iff \omega \in Y_n]$, then E is a *smooth* equivalence relation. By Harrington, Kechris and Louveau [2, proof of Theorem 1.1, p. 920], every equivalence relation with closed graph is smooth. If $k\colon \Phi \to \Omega$ is Δ^1_1 and $E \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ is a smooth Δ^1_1 equivalence relation, then $F \subseteq \Phi \times \Phi$ defined by $(\phi, \chi) \in F \iff (k(\phi), k(\chi)) \in E$ is also smooth, with F-equivalence determined by $\{k^{-1}(Y_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

The first generalization of theorem 2.1 asserts Borel embeddability of an arbitrary Σ^1_1 equivalence relation. If Φ and Ω are standard Borel spaces, and $F \subseteq \Phi \times \Phi$ and $E \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ are Σ^1_1 equivalence relations, then a *Borel embedding* of F into E is a function $e\colon \Phi \to Z \subseteq \Omega$ that extends naturally to a Borel isomorphism from F to $E \restriction e(Z)$. That is, $(\phi, \chi) \in F \iff (e(\phi), e(\chi)) \in E$.

Corollary 4.1 *Let Ω_0 and Ω be standard Borel spaces, and let $E_0 \subseteq \Omega_0 \times \Omega_0$ be a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation. There are smooth Δ^1_1 equivalence relations $E_1 \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ and $E_2 \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ such that E_0 is Borel embeddable in $(E_1 \cup E_2)^+$. If Ω is the Baire space, then E_1 and E_2 can be chosen to be closed.*

Proof If Ω_0 is countable, then E_1 and E_2 can both be taken to be the union of D with the image of E_0 under an arbitrary injection of Ω_0 into Ω. Otherwise, there is a Borel isomorphism k_0 from Ω_0 onto X (where X is as in theorem 2.1), and there is a Borel isomorphism k from Ω onto $\mathcal{N}$. Define $e = k^{-1} \circ k_0$. Note that the range of e is a Borel set, as is required for e to be an embedding. If $E \subset X \times X$ is defined by $(\alpha, \beta) \in E \iff (k_0^{-1}(\alpha), k_0^{-1}(\beta)) \in E_0$, then E is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation.[12] Let I and J be the closed equivalence relations defined in (3), and define $(\psi, \omega) \in E_1 \iff (k(\psi), k(\omega)) \in I$ and $(\psi, \omega) \in E_2 \iff (k(\psi), k(\omega)) \in J$. E_1 and

[11] Mackey [4, pp. 338–9].

[12] Moschovakis [5, Theorem 2B.2, p. 54].

E_2 are smooth. Now the corollary follows from theorem 2.1. That is: (a) k_0 is an embedding of E_0 in E by construction; (b) E is embedded in $(I \cup J)^+$ by theorem 2.1; and (c) $(I \cup J)^+$ is embedded in $(E_1 \cup E_2)^+$ by construction; so the corollary holds, since the composition of embeddings is an embedding. □

The second generalization of theorem 2.1 concerns embedding the restriction, to the uncountable complement in Ω of some Borel subset B of Ω, of a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation into the transitive closure of a smooth relation on Ω by the inclusion map.[13] This corollary is proved in a closely analogous way to corollary 4.1, by setting $E_0 = E \restriction \Omega_0$ and setting e to be the inclusion map.

Corollary 4.2 *Suppose Ω is a standard Borel space, that $E \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ is a Σ^1_1 equivalence relation, and that that B is uncountable Δ^1_1 proper subset of Ω. Then there are smooth Δ^1_1 relations E_1 and E_2, such that $E \restriction (\Omega \setminus B) = (E_1 \cup E_2)^+ \restriction (\Omega \setminus B)$. That is, the inclusion map embeds $E \restriction (\Omega \setminus B)$ in $(E_1 \cup E_2)^+$.*

Finally, corollary 4.3 provides a negative answer to the question, implicit in the preceding discussion of Aumann's formulation of common knowledge of an event, of whether the saturations of Borel sets (or even of singletons) with respect to the transitive closures of unions of smooth Borel equivalence relations lie within any significantly restricted sub-class of Σ^1_1.

Corollary 4.3 *Suppose Ω is a standard Borel space and that $S \subseteq \Omega$ is a Σ^1_1 set such that, for some Δ^1_1 set Ω_0, $S \subseteq \Omega_0$ and $\Omega \setminus \Omega_0$ is uncountable. Then there are smooth Δ^1_1 relations E_1 and E_2, such that for every non-empty $A \subseteq S$, $[A]_{(E_1 \cup E_2)^+} \cap \Omega_0 = S$.*

Proof Define $(\psi, \omega) \in E \iff [\{\psi, \omega\} \subseteq S \text{ or } \psi = \omega]$, specify $B = \Omega \setminus \Omega_0$, and apply corollary 4.2. For some block, π, of the partition induced by $(E_1 \cup E_2)^+$, $\pi \cap \Omega_0 = S$. Therefore, if $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq S$, then $[A]_{(E_1 \cup E_2)^+} \cap \Omega_0 = S$. □

[13] An analogous result, in which the B is required only to be Σ^1_1—not necessarily Borel—can be formulated by adding a hypothesis under which the complement of B will have an uncountable Borel subset. One sufficient condition for an uncountable Π^1_1 set, W, to have an uncountable Δ^1_1 subset is that there should be a nonatomic measure, μ, on Ω such that $\mu^*(\Omega \setminus W) < \mu(\Omega)$ (where μ^* is outer measure). Another sufficient condition is that W should have a perfect (hence both uncountable and Δ^1_1) subset. A sufficient condition for every uncountable Π^1_1 set to have a non-empty perfect subset—albeit one that is independent of ZFC set theory—is that Π^1_1 is determinate. (Moschovakis [5, Exercise 6G.10, p. 288]) It is provable in ZFL that there is an uncountable Π^1_1 set (in fact, a Π^1_1 set) without a non-empty perfect subset. (Moschovakis [5, Exercise 5A.8, p. 212])

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the Human Capital Foundation, (`http://www.hcfoundation.ru/en/`) and particularly Andrey P. Vavilov, for research support through the Center for the Study of Auctions, Procurements, and Competition Policy (CAPCP, `http://capcp.psu.edu/`) at the Pennsylvania State University. Also he gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of CEMFI (`http://www.cemfi.es/`) where the research was conducted. The exposition of the article has benefitted significantly from suggestions made by an anonymous referee.

References

[1] **R J Aumann**, *Agreeing to disagree*, Ann. Statist. 4 (1976), 1236–1239; doi:10.1214/aos/1176343654.

[2] **L A Harrington**, **A S Kechris**, **A Louveau**, *A Glimm-Effros dichotomy for Borel equivalence relations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 3 (1990), 903–928; doi: 10.1090/S0894-0347-1990-1057041-5.

[3] **S A Kripke**, *A completeness theorem in modal logic*, J. Symbolic Logic 24 (1959), 1–14.

[4] **G W Mackey**, *Borel structure in groups and their duals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 85 (1957), 134–165; doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-1957-0089999-2.

[5] **Y N Moschovakis**, *Descriptive Set Theory*, second edition, American Mathematical Society, 2009.

[6] **W Pohlers**, *Proof Theory: The First Step into Impredicativity*, Springer-Verlag, 2009.

Department of Economics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

`eug2@psu.edu`

`http://personal.psu.edu/eug2`

Received: 21 July 2012 Revised: 12 March 2013