

Spatiality for formal topologies

NICOLA GAMBINO[†] and PETER SCHUSTER[‡]

[†]*Laboratoire de Combinatoire et Informatique Mathématique,
Université du Québec à Montréal, Case Postale 8888, Succ. Centre-Ville,
Montréal (Québec) H3C 3P8, Canada
Email: gambino@math.uqam.ca*

[‡]*Mathematisches Institut, Universität München, Theresienstrasse 39, 80333 München, Germany
Email: Peter.Schuster@mathematik.uni-muenchen.de*

Received 30 November 2005; revised 6 May 2006 and 1 July 2006

We define what it means for a formal topology to be spatial, and investigate properties related to spatiality both in general and in examples.

1. Introduction

The development of the theory of locales provides substantial evidence that much of classical topology can be developed assuming open sets rather than points as the primary object of study (Johnstone 1982). Apart from its conceptual elegance, the point-free approach has led to important applications in the context of topos theory (Joyal and Tierney 1984). This is because large parts of the theory of locales can be developed without the assumption of the axiom of choice, and hence can be internalised in any elementary topos (Johnstone 1983; Johnstone 1991). The point-free and the point-wise approaches are related by the adjunction between the category of locales and the category of topological spaces (Fourman and Scott 1979; Johnstone 1982). This adjunction restricts to an adjoint equivalence between the category of spatial locales and the category of sober topological spaces, so that one might say that the point-free and point-wise approach are essentially equivalent on these subcategories. For the precise history of this adjunction, see Johnstone (1982, page 76).

In many examples of interest, the statement expressing the spatiality of a locale cannot be proved within the internal logic of an elementary topos (Fourman and Grayson 1982; Fourman and Hyland 1979). An extreme example of this situation is given by the spectrum of prime ideals of a commutative ring endowed with the Zariski topology. The existence of a prime ideal in an arbitrary non-trivial commutative ring is equivalent to the Boolean ultrafilter theorem (Banaschewski 1983; Rav 1977). Accordingly, the prime spectrum might not have any point at all within an elementary topos (Johnstone 1977). In these circumstances, it is generally the locale, rather than the topological space, that exhibits the desired topological properties. For example, the space of Dedekind reals cannot be shown to be locally compact constructively, while its point-free counterpart is a locally compact locale (Fourman and Grayson 1982; Johnstone 1982).

Our aim here is to begin a systematic study of spatiality for formal topologies. The notion of a formal topology, which was originally introduced in Sambin (1987), may be understood as a reformulation of the notion of a locale that makes it convenient for developing point-free topology within foundational settings that are even more restrictive than that of an elementary topos. The study of formal topologies can be carried out within the dependent type theories of Martin-Löf (Martin-Löf 1984; Nordström *et al.* 2000) and their variants (Gambino and Aczel 2006; Maietti and Sambin 2005), or within the constructive set theories of Myhill (Myhill 1975) and Aczel (Aczel and Rathjen 2001). Despite the constraints necessary to work within these settings, parts of locale theory have already been reconstructed (Aczel 2006; Gambino 2006; Maietti and Valentini 2004; Sambin 1987). Furthermore, interesting connections to the theory of inductive and coinductive definitions have begun to emerge (Coquand *et al.* 2003; Fox 2005; Sambin 2003; Schuster 2006).

In the following, we work within Constructive Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory (Aczel and Rathjen 2001). This allows us to exploit the usual set-theoretic notation that is used in common mathematical practice, as well as to give a careful treatment of some predicatively meaningful distinctions. Mathematics in Constructive Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory (CZF) differs substantially from both classical mathematics in Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory and constructive mathematics in either Intuitionistic Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory or in an elementary topos. This is because the axiom system of CZF does not include the Power Set axiom, and assumes the Restricted Separation axiom instead of the Full Separation axiom. As a consequence of this, it is also essential to work with proper classes when developing constructive mathematics in CZF. For example, the class of points of a formal topology is sometimes too large to form a set. Nevertheless, since the language of CZF contains unrestricted quantifiers, we are allowed to use quantifiers ranging over the elements of a class (Aczel and Rathjen 2001). In particular, we can quantify over the class of points of a formal topology.

The starting point for our study is the definition of the notion of spatiality for a formal topology. Thanks to Aczel’s reformulation in CZF of the adjunction between topological spaces and locales (Aczel 2006), which we review in Section 2, it is possible to provide a definition of spatiality for formal topologies that is completely analogous to the one for locales (Fourman and Scott 1979; Johnstone 1982). We will then show how this conceptually clear definition relates to the definition of spatiality for a formal topology already existing in the literature (Sambin 1987). The rest of the paper is devoted to the study of various concepts related to spatiality, and several examples. In particular, we will extend the results in Schuster (2006) concerning the spatiality of the formal Zariski topology. We will also rephrase in the context of formal topologies the characterisations of the spatiality for the point-free counterparts of the Baire space and the Cantor space that have been obtained for locales in Fourman and Grayson (1982). In the context of formal topologies, the link between the spatiality of the formal Baire space and the principle of monotone bar induction has already been described in Sambin (1987).

Remark. The notion of category that we assume in this paper allows for objects and maps to have the size of classes. See Aczel and Rathjen (2001) for background on CZF.

2. Point-free and point-wise topology in constructive set theory

Formal topologies

We begin by recalling some terminology and abbreviations concerning ordered structures that will be used throughout the paper. By a preordered class we mean a class A equipped with a class relation \leq on A : that is, a subclass \leq of $A \times A$ that is a preorder. If A is a set, we assume implicitly that the preorder relation is actually a subset of $A \times A$. By the Restricted Separation axiom of CZF, this is always the case when the preorder is defined by a restricted formula: that is, a formula in which all bound variables range over sets. If (A, \leq) is a preordered class, for $a \in A$, let $\downarrow a =_{\text{def}} \{x \in A \mid x \leq a\}$, and for $a, b \in A$, let $a \downarrow b =_{\text{def}} \downarrow a \cap \downarrow b$. We can extend these definitions to subsets of A as follows: for $U \subseteq A$, let $\downarrow U =_{\text{def}} \bigcup_{x \in U} \downarrow x$, and for $U, V \subseteq A$, let $U \downarrow V =_{\text{def}} \downarrow U \cap \downarrow V$. A subset $U \subseteq A$ is said to be downward closed if $\downarrow U \subseteq U$, and hence $U = \downarrow U$.

A *formal topology* consists of a preordered set (A, \leq) equipped with a class relation, called the cover relation of the formal topology, $a \triangleleft U$ between elements $a \in A$ and subsets $U \subseteq A$ such that for every subset $U \subseteq A$ the class $j(U) =_{\text{def}} \{x \in A \mid x \triangleleft U\}$ is a set, and the following axioms hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \downarrow U \triangleleft U & && \text{(Reflexivity)} \\ a \triangleleft U, U \triangleleft V &\implies a \triangleleft V && \text{(Transitivity)} \\ a \triangleleft U_1, a \triangleleft U_2 &\implies a \triangleleft U_1 \downarrow U_2, && \text{(Stability)} \end{aligned}$$

where we use the standard abbreviation $U \triangleleft V =_{\text{def}} (\forall x \in U)(x \triangleleft V)$. A continuous map $p : A \rightarrow B$ between formal topologies is a relation, given by a subset $p \subseteq A \times B$, satisfying four axioms. To express these axioms, we define, for $U \subseteq A$ and $V \subseteq B$,

$$p_*(U) =_{\text{def}} \{y \in B \mid (\forall x \in U)p(x, y)\}, \quad p^*(V) =_{\text{def}} \{x \in A \mid (\exists y \in V)p(x, y)\}.$$

The relation $p \subseteq A \times B$ is a continuous map if the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} p(a, b), b \triangleleft V &\implies a \triangleleft p^*(V) \\ a \triangleleft U, b \in p_*(U) &\implies p(a, b) \\ A \triangleleft p^*(B) & \\ a \triangleleft p^*(V_1), a \triangleleft p^*(V_2) &\implies a \triangleleft p^*(V_1 \downarrow V_2). \end{aligned}$$

We write **FTop** for the category of formal topologies and continuous maps. The identity map $i_A : A \rightarrow A$ is the relation $i_A(a, b) =_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft \{b\}$. The composition of $p : A \rightarrow B$ and $q : B \rightarrow C$ is the relation $q \cdot p : A \rightarrow C$ defined by

$$(q \cdot p)(a, c) =_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft \{x \in A \mid (\exists y \in B)p(a, y) \wedge q(y, c)\}.$$

As shown in Aczel (2006, Section 4) working in CZF, the category **FTop** is equivalent to the category **Loc** of set-generated locales and continuous maps. Given a formal topology A , following Sambin (1987), we say that a subset $U \subseteq A$ is saturated if $j(U) \subseteq U$, so that $U = j(U)$. The restriction of j to the set-generated frame of downward closed subsets of A is a nucleus (Johnstone 1982; Simmons 1978); whence the class $\text{Sat}(A)$ of saturated subsets of A , preordered by inclusion, acquires the structure of a

set-generated frame. For a continuous map $p : A \rightarrow B$ of formal topologies, there is a continuous map $\text{Sat}(p) : \text{Sat}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sat}(B)$ of set-generated locales, given by the frame homomorphism mapping a saturated subset $V \subseteq B$ into $j(p^*(V)) \subseteq A$. These definitions determine a functor $\text{Sat} : \mathbf{FTop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Loc}$, which is part of an equivalence of categories

$$\mathbf{FTop} \simeq \mathbf{Loc}. \tag{1}$$

For more information concerning the structure of the category \mathbf{FTop} , see Maietti and Valentini (2004) and Palmgren (2005b).

Constructive topological spaces

We will work here with the category \mathbf{Top} of constructive topological spaces and continuous functions (Aczel 2006, Definition 4). Following Sambin and Gebellato (1999) and Vickers (1989), a constructive topological space is given by a class X of points, a set A of neighbourhood indices, and a class relation between points $\zeta \in X$ and neighbourhood indices $a \in A$, written $\zeta \Vdash a$, that expresses the idea that a point ζ lies in the neighbourhood indexed by a . This relation is subject to both topological and set-theoretical axioms: the former express structural properties; the latter require appropriate classes to be sets. If we define $X_a =_{\text{def}} \{\zeta \in X \mid \zeta \Vdash a\}$, for $a \in A$, and $X_U =_{\text{def}} \bigcup_{a \in U} X_a$, for $U \subseteq A$, there is a preorder on A defined by letting

$$a \leq b =_{\text{def}} X_a \subseteq X_b. \tag{2}$$

This definition allows us to use the notation for preorders introduced earlier. The topological axioms for a constructive topological space can then be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X &= X_A \\ X_{a_1} \cap X_{a_2} &= X_{a_1 \downarrow a_2}. \end{aligned}$$

The set-theoretical axioms for a constructive topological space state that, for $\zeta \in X$, the classes $A_\zeta =_{\text{def}} \{a \in A \mid \zeta \Vdash a\}$ and $\{\psi \in X \mid A_\zeta = A_\psi\}$ are sets.

It is then possible to define a functor $\text{Pt} : \mathbf{FTop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ that maps a formal topology A into the constructive topological space of its formal points. Recall that a formal point of a formal topology A is defined to be a continuous map $p : 1 \rightarrow A$, where 1 is the formal topology on the singleton set $1 =_{\text{def}} \{*\}$, preordered by the equality relation, with cover $a \triangleleft U =_{\text{def}} a \in U$. It can be seen immediately that a formal point can be identified with a subset $\zeta \subseteq A$ such that, defining $\zeta \Vdash a =_{\text{def}} a \in \zeta$ and $\zeta \Vdash U =_{\text{def}} (\exists x \in U)\zeta \Vdash x$, the following three properties hold:

$$\begin{aligned} &\zeta \Vdash A \\ \zeta \Vdash a, \zeta \Vdash b &\implies \zeta \Vdash a \downarrow b \\ \zeta \Vdash a, a \triangleleft U &\implies \zeta \Vdash U. \end{aligned}$$

These properties imply that there is a constructive topological space with the class $\text{Pt}(A)$ of formal points of A as its class of points, and the set A as its set of neighbourhood indices. As we will see, it is possible to define formal topologies whose associated constructive

topological spaces are homeomorphic to the Baire space, the Cantor space and the Zariski spectrum.

The fundamental adjunction

The notion of a standard constructive topological space and that of a standard continuous function are strengthenings of the notions of a constructive topological space and of a continuous function that are obtained by imposing further set-theoretical axioms. A constructive topological space is said to be standard if, for each subset $U \subseteq A$, the class $\{a \in A \mid X_a \subseteq X_U\}$ is a set (Aczel 2006, Definition 5). In this way, one obtains the subcategory \mathbf{Top}' of \mathbf{Top} consisting of standard constructive topological spaces and standard continuous maps.[†] The main reason for the interest in these notions is that they allow the definition of a functor

$$\mathbf{Top}' \xrightarrow{\Omega} \mathbf{FTop}.$$

Indeed, for a standard constructive topological space with class of points X and set of neighbourhood indices A , the set A , equipped with the preorder defined in (2) and the cover relation defined by $a \triangleleft U =_{\text{def}} X_a \subseteq X_U$, is a formal topology.

Using these notions, Aczel was able to reformulate in CZF the familiar adjunction between topological spaces and locales. He considered the subcategory \mathbf{FTop}' of \mathbf{FTop} consisting of those formal topologies and continuous maps that are mapped by the functor $\text{Pt} : \mathbf{FTop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ into standard constructive topological spaces and standard continuous functions, respectively. The functor $\Omega : \mathbf{Top}' \rightarrow \mathbf{FTop}$ factors through the inclusion of \mathbf{FTop}' into \mathbf{FTop} , and so, as proved in Aczel (2006, Section 5), it is possible to obtain an adjunction of the form

$$\mathbf{Top}' \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Omega'} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Pt}'} \end{array} \mathbf{FTop}'. \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, assuming the Power Set and Full Separation axioms of IZF, the categories \mathbf{Top}' and \mathbf{FTop}' are equivalent to the usual categories of topological spaces and of locales, respectively (Aczel 2006, Theorem 9 and Proposition 13). It is straightforward to define a subcategory \mathbf{Loc}' of \mathbf{Loc} such that the equivalence in (1) restricts to an equivalence:

$$\mathbf{FTop}' \simeq \mathbf{Loc}'. \tag{4}$$

We can define \mathbf{Loc}' as the category of standard set-generated locales and standard continuous maps, where a set-generated locale and a continuous map are said to be standard if the formal topology and continuous map corresponding to them via the equivalence in (1) are standard.

[†] Note that \mathbf{Top}' does not seem to coincide with the full subcategory of \mathbf{Top} consisting of standard constructive topological spaces. This is because it does not seem possible to show that an arbitrary continuous function between standard constructive topological spaces is standard (Aczel 2006).

3. Spatial formal topologies

Spatiality

We will now focus on the comonad on \mathbf{FTop}' induced by the adjunction in (3). We write $\text{Sp} : \mathbf{FTop}' \rightarrow \mathbf{FTop}'$ for its functor part. Unfolding the relevant definitions, we get that for a standard formal topology A , the standard formal topology $\text{Sp}(A)$, called the spatial coreflection of A , has underlying set A with preorder given by

$$a \leq_{\text{Sp}(A)} b =_{\text{def}} (\forall \xi \in \text{Pt}(A))(\xi \Vdash a \implies \xi \Vdash b).$$

The cover relation is defined by

$$a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} U =_{\text{def}} (\forall \xi \in \text{Pt}(A))(\xi \Vdash a \implies \xi \Vdash U). \tag{5}$$

The component at A of the counit of the adjunction is the standard continuous map of formal topologies $\varepsilon_A : \text{Sp}(A) \rightarrow A$ defined by

$$\varepsilon_A(a, b) =_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} \{b\}.$$

Note that, for $U \subseteq A$, the definition of the notion of a formal point implies that

$$(\forall a \in A)(a \triangleleft U \implies a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} U). \tag{6}$$

This fact can be used to prove that the relation ε_A is indeed a continuous map of formal topologies. We can now define the notion of spatiality for formal topologies analogously to the way it is defined for locales (Fourman and Scott 1979; Johnstone 1982).

Definition 3.1. A standard formal topology A is *spatial* if $\varepsilon_A : \text{Sp}(A) \rightarrow A$ is an isomorphism.

If a formal topology is spatial, it is isomorphic to the formal topology associated with a constructive topological space, namely the constructive topological space of its formal points. In Section 4 we will study logical equivalents of the statements asserting that various examples of formal topologies are spatial. In order to do so, it is convenient to characterise spatial formal topologies purely in terms of their cover relations. The converse implication to (6), which does not necessarily hold, allows us to characterise spatial formal topologies as follows.

Proposition 3.2. A standard formal topology A is spatial if and only if

$$(\forall a \in A)(a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} U \implies a \triangleleft_A U) \tag{7}$$

for all subsets $U \subseteq A$.

Proof. We assume that (7) holds for all $U \subseteq A$, and define a relation δ_A between A and $\text{Sp}(A)$ by letting $\delta_A(a, b) =_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft_A \{b\}$. The assumption (7) implies that this defines a continuous map $\delta_A : A \rightarrow \text{Sp}(A)$. The definition of composition and of identities in the category \mathbf{FTop}' imply that δ_A and ε_A are mutually inverse.

For the converse implication, we assume that $\varepsilon_A : \text{Sp}(A) \rightarrow A$ is an isomorphism. Via the equivalence of categories between standard formal topologies and standard set-generated locales, we have that the frame homomorphism $\text{Sat}(\varepsilon_A) : \text{Sat}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sat}(\text{Sp}(A))$ is an

isomorphism. Unfolding the definitions and using the axioms for a formal topology, it can be seen immediately that this frame homomorphism maps a saturated subset $U \subseteq A$ into $\{x \in A \mid x \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} U\}$. The statement in (7) follows from the fact that this map, being an isomorphism, is a monomorphism. \square

Note that the formula in (7) also makes sense for formal topologies that are not standard. In the following, we will therefore assume, as in Sambin (1987), that the statement in (7) is the definition of spatiality for formal topologies that are non-standard.

Variants of spatiality

The property in (6) for the empty subset $\emptyset \subseteq A$ can easily be shown to be equivalent to

$$(\forall a \in A)(\text{Neg}(a) \implies \neg \text{Sat}(a)) \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Neg}(a) &=_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft \emptyset \\ \text{Sat}(a) &=_{\text{def}} (\exists \xi)(\xi \Vdash a). \end{aligned}$$

We read $\text{Neg}(a)$ as saying that a is negative, and $\text{Sat}(a)$ as saying that a is satisfiable. The statement in (8) then says that if a is negative, it is not satisfiable. Its classical contrapositive, given in (9), also holds:

$$(\forall a \in A)(\text{Sat}(a) \implies \neg \text{Neg}(a)). \tag{9}$$

Neither of the converses of the implications in (8) and (9) is generally derivable. We refer to these converses as the Sufficiency (10) and Existentiality (11) properties, respectively:

$$(\forall a \in A)(\neg \text{Sat}(a) \implies \text{Neg}(a)) \tag{10}$$

$$(\forall a \in A)(\neg \text{Neg}(a) \implies \text{Sat}(a)). \tag{11}$$

Note that Sufficiency is exactly the property in (7) for $U = \emptyset$. The next proposition, whose proof is an exercise in intuitionistic logic, describes some aspects of the relationship between Sufficiency and Existentiality.

Proposition 3.3.

- (a) Sufficiency is equivalent to its contrapositive together with the stability of Neg.
- (b) The contrapositives of Sufficiency and Existentiality are equivalent.
- (c) Sufficiency is equivalent to the contrapositive of Existentiality together with the stability of Neg.

The analogous results can be obtained when Sufficiency and Neg are exchanged with Existentiality and Sat, respectively: Existentiality is equivalent to its contrapositive together with the stability of Sat, and thus also to the contrapositive of Sufficiency together with the stability of Sat.

Subspaces

Although Existentiality is often related to assumptions like the axiom of choice, the failure of Sufficiency in a constructive framework can be explained by Brouwerian

counterexamples. To illustrate this, we need to obtain some results concerning closed subspaces. Given a formal topology A with preorder \leq and cover relation \triangleleft , the closed subspace A_U of A associated with any given $U \subseteq A$ is defined to be the formal topology with A as the underlying set, the same preorder \leq and the cover relation \triangleleft_U defined by

$$a \triangleleft_U V =_{\text{def}} a \triangleleft U \cup V.$$

It is easy to see that this definition determines a cover relation. In particular, the closed subspace of A associated with $U = \emptyset$ coincides with A . The next lemma, which can be found without proof as Proposition 3.3 of Palmgren (2005a), characterises the formal points of a closed subspace and allows us to regard A_U as the formal counterpart of the closed complement of the open $X_U = \bigcup_{x \in U} X_x$ in the constructive topological space of points of A . We give a proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.4. Let A be a formal topology and $U \subseteq A$. A subset $\xi \subseteq A$ is a formal point of A_U if and only if it is a formal point of A such that $\xi \cap U = \emptyset$.

Proof. First let $\xi \subseteq A$ be a formal point of A_U . If $a \in \xi \cap U$, then $\xi \Vdash a$ and $a \triangleleft_U \emptyset$, so that $\xi \Vdash \emptyset$, which is absurd. So $\xi \cap U = \emptyset$. If $\xi \Vdash a$ and $a \triangleleft V$, then we also have $a \triangleleft_U V$, and thus $\xi \Vdash V$. Next, let $\xi \subseteq A$ be a formal point of A . If $\xi \Vdash a$ and $a \triangleleft_U V$, which means $a \triangleleft U \cup V$, then $\xi \Vdash U \cup V$, and thus $\xi \Vdash V$ if, in addition, we have $\xi \cap U = \emptyset$. For the remaining parts of the definition of a formal point, there is nothing to prove. \square

Let \mathfrak{A} be a class of formal topologies. We say that \mathfrak{A} is closed under the formation of closed subspaces if $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ implies that $A_U \in \mathfrak{A}$ for all $U \subseteq A$. We say that Sufficiency (respectively, Existentiality) holds for \mathfrak{A} whenever Sufficiency (respectively, Existentiality) holds for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $a \in A$.

Proposition 3.5. If \mathfrak{A} is closed under the formation of closed subspaces, then every formal topology in \mathfrak{A} is spatial if and only if Sufficiency holds for \mathfrak{A} .

Proof. Sufficiency is the special case with $U = \emptyset$ of (7). By Proposition 3.2, \mathfrak{A} consists of spatial formal topologies if and only if (7) holds for all its elements. The statement in (7) for $U \subseteq A$ follows from Sufficiency for A_U as follows. Suppose that $\xi \Vdash a$ implies $\xi \Vdash U$ for all formal points ξ of A . By contraposition, $\neg(\xi \Vdash U)$ implies $\neg(\xi \Vdash a)$ for all formal points ξ of A . But $\neg(\xi \Vdash U)$ is equivalent to $\xi \cap U = \emptyset$, so, by Lemma 3.4, we have $\neg(\xi \Vdash a)$ for all formal points ξ of A_U . By Sufficiency for A_U and $a \in A$, we get $a \triangleleft_U \emptyset$, which is to say that $a \triangleleft U$. \square

We next extend a result from Schuster (2006), which goes back to Negri (2002). A formal topology A is finitary if $a \triangleleft V$ implies the existence of $U \subseteq_{\omega} V$ such that $a \triangleleft U$. Here and in the following, $U \subseteq_{\omega} V$ means that U is a finite subset of V . For the sake of brevity, we will use ‘finite set’ to mean what is generally called a finitely enumerable set in the literature, namely a set U for which there exists a natural number n and a surjective mapping from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ to U . Thus a finite set U is either empty or inhabited depending on whether $n = 0$ or $n \geq 1$.

Proposition 3.6. Let A be a formal topology. For $a \in A$, define

$$U_a = \{x \in A \mid a = x, \neg \text{Neg}(a)\}.$$

For the statements

- (i) $\text{Neg}(a)$ is decidable,
- (ii) $a \triangleleft U_a$,
- (iii) if $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(A)} U_a$, then $a \triangleleft U_a$,

the following implications hold:

$$(i) \implies (ii) \implies (iii).$$

Furthermore, if A is finitary, the reverse implications hold.

Proof. If $\text{Neg}(a)$, then $a \triangleleft U_a$ by Transitivity, but if $\neg \text{Neg}(a)$, then $a \in U_a$, and thus $a \triangleleft U_a$ by Reflexivity. This shows that (i) implies (ii).

The implication from (ii) to (iii) is trivial.

To conclude the proof, assume that A is finitary, and that (iii) is valid. For every formal point ζ , if $\zeta \Vdash a$, then $\neg \text{Neg}(a)$ by (9), so $a \in U_a$, and thus $\zeta \Vdash U_a$, with witness $a \in \zeta \cap U_a$. By (iii), we have $a \triangleleft U_a$. Since A is finitary, there is $U_0 \subseteq U_a$ with U_0 finite and $a \triangleleft U_0$. As a finite set, U_0 is either empty or inhabited. In the former case, we have $\text{Neg}(a)$, whereas in the latter case we also have that U_a is inhabited, which is to say $\neg \text{Neg}(a)$. \square

When reading the hypothesis of the following, observe that although constructively it is not generally possible to show that every subset of a finite set is finite, the finitary formal topologies are closed under the formation of closed subspaces. In fact, if $W \subseteq_{\omega} U \cup V$, then $W = U' \cup V'$ for suitably defined $U' \subseteq_{\omega} U$ and $V' \subseteq_{\omega} V$, so if A is a finitary formal topology, then so is A_U for every $U \subseteq A$. Another class of finitary formal topologies that is closed under the formation of closed subspaces will be considered later: the class of formal Zariski topologies (Proposition 4.4).

Corollary 3.7. Let \mathfrak{A} be a class of finitary formal topologies that is closed under the formation of closed subspaces. If Sufficiency holds for \mathfrak{A} , then $\text{Neg}(a)$ is decidable for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $a \in A$.

4. Principles related to spatiality

Inductively generated formal topologies

As with locales (Johnstone 1982; Mac Lane and Moerdijk 1994; Simmons 2004), definitions by ‘generators and relations’ provide a convenient method for obtaining examples of formal topologies (Aczel 2006; Battilotti and Sambin 2006; Coquand *et al.* 2003). For formal topologies, this method is closely related to the theory of inductive definitions. In particular, to carry over these definitions to Constructive Set Theory, it is convenient to work in the extension of CZF that includes the Regular Extension Axiom (REA), which was originally introduced in Aczel (1986). This axiom ensures that, for a wide class of inductive definitions, inductively-defined classes are sets (Aczel and Rathjen 2001). From now on, we work assuming the REA.

Given a preordered set (A, \leq) , a covering system consists of a function mapping each element $a \in A$ into a set $C(a)$ of subsets $U \subseteq A$ such that the following hold:

- (1) For all $U \in C(a)$, $U \subseteq \downarrow a$.
- (2) If $a \leq b$, then for every $V \in C(b)$ there exists $U \in C(a)$ such that $U \subseteq \downarrow V$.

Given such a covering system, we can define inductively a cover relation on A . Observe that the cover relation is completely determined once we define for each $U \subseteq A$ the set $j(U) =_{\text{def}} \{x \in A \mid x \triangleleft U\}$. The set $j(U)$ is then defined inductively as the smallest downward closed set X containing U such that $a \in X$ whenever there exists $U \in C(a)$ such that $U \subseteq X$. This definition implies that Reflexivity is automatically verified. Furthermore, Transitivity and Stability can be shown to hold (Aczel 2006; Coquand *et al.* 2003).

The formal points of an inductively generated formal topology can be characterised purely in terms of the covering system that generates the formal topology. For a preordered set (A, \leq) with a covering system C on it, a subset $\xi \subseteq A$ is a formal point of the induced formal topology induced if and only if, with the definitions $\xi \Vdash a =_{\text{def}} a \in \xi$ for $a \in A$ and $\xi \Vdash U =_{\text{def}} (\exists a \in U)\xi \Vdash a$ for $U \subseteq A$, the following properties hold for all $a, b \in A$ and $U \in C(a)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \xi \Vdash A \\ & \xi \Vdash a, \xi \Vdash b \implies \xi \Vdash a \downarrow b \\ & \xi \Vdash a, a \leq b \implies \xi \Vdash b \\ & \xi \Vdash a, U \in C(a) \implies \xi \Vdash U. \end{aligned}$$

Baire space

To define the formal Baire space, we define a partial order on the set \mathbb{N}^* of finite sequences of natural numbers by letting

$$a \leq b =_{\text{def}} b \text{ is an initial segment of } a.$$

For $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we can then let $C(a)$ be the set whose unique element is the set of sequences $[a, n]$ obtained by appending a natural number n to the end of the sequence a . We may observe that this is a covering system: property (1) follows immediately by the definition of the partial order on \mathbb{N}^* ; property (2) follows by observing that if $b \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is an initial segment of $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[b, m]$ is an initial segment of $[a, n]$. We refer to the resulting formal topology \mathcal{B} as the formal Baire space. It is possible to show that the constructive topological space $\text{Pt}(\mathcal{B})$ of the formal points of \mathcal{B} is homeomorphic to the Baire space (Gambino 2002). In particular, we identify a formal point ξ with a sequence $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers, and an element $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ with a neighbourhood index for the Baire space. We then define a relation between points and neighbourhood indices by letting $\xi \Vdash a$ mean that a is an initial segment of ξ .

We shall now investigate the spatiality of the formal Baire space. To do so, we recall from Dummett (2000) that a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is said to be monotonic if

$$(\forall a \in \mathbb{N}^*)(a \in U \implies (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) [a, n] \in U),$$

and it is called inductive if

$$(\forall a \in \mathbb{N}^*)((\forall n \in \mathbb{N})[a, n] \in U) \implies a \in U.$$

Observe that the definition of the covering system for the formal Baire space \mathcal{B} implies that a set is monotonic and inductive if and only if it is a saturated subset of the formal topology \mathcal{B} . The principle of monotone bar induction asserts that for all monotonic and inductive subsets $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$(\forall a \in \mathbb{N}^*)(a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{B})} U \implies a \in U),$$

where $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{B})} U$ is defined as in (5) and it is usually read in this example as saying that U is a bar above a .

Proposition 4.1. Spatiality of the formal Baire space is equivalent to the principle of monotone bar induction.

Proof. We assume that \mathcal{B} is spatial, and then derive the principle of monotone bar induction. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be monotonic and inductive. By the spatiality of \mathcal{B} , we have

$$(\forall a \in \mathbb{N}^*)(a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{B})} U \implies a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U). \tag{12}$$

Since U is monotonic and inductive, it is saturated. Therefore $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ implies $a \in U$, as required. For the converse, it is sufficient to apply the principle of monotone bar induction to the set $\{x \in \mathcal{B} \mid x \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U\}$, which is saturated and hence monotonic and inductive. By Reflexivity, it contains U . □

Cantor space

The formal Cantor space can be defined in an analogous way to the formal Baire space. We now deal with sequences (finite or infinite) of elements of $\{0, 1\}$ rather than of natural numbers. To analyse the spatiality of the formal Cantor space, we identify the points of the formal Cantor space with elements of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The principle related to its spatiality is the Fan Theorem, which we now recall. For $U \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$U_n =_{\text{def}} \{x \in U \mid \text{length}(x) \leq n\}.$$

The following lemma is the key to proving that the spatiality of the formal Cantor space is equivalent to the Fan Theorem.

Lemma 4.2. Let $a \in \{0, 1\}^*$, and $U \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U_n \implies a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U_n.$$

Proof. We distinguish two cases. If $n < \text{length}(a)$, let ξ be a point such that $\xi \Vdash a$. Assuming $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U_n$, we prove that there exists $x \in U$ such that $\text{length}(x) \leq n$ and $\xi \Vdash x$. Therefore, we get

$$\text{length}(x) \leq n < \text{length}(a).$$

Furthermore, we have $\xi \Vdash a$ and $\xi \Vdash x$, so x has to be an initial segment of a . Since $x \in U_n$, we have $a \triangleleft U_n$, as required. We now consider the second case, which arises when

$\text{length}(a) \leq n$. We wish to show

$$\{x \mid x \leq a, \text{length}(x) \leq n\} \triangleleft U_n. \tag{13}$$

To see this, let $x \leq a$. We first consider the case for which x has length n . If $\xi \Vdash x$, then $\xi \Vdash a$, so there is $y \in U_n$ such that $\xi \Vdash y$. By reasoning analogous to that employed in the first case, we get that y is an initial segment of x , and hence $x \triangleleft U_n$. If the length of x is $n - 1$, the reasoning above can be adapted to show that both $x \cdot 0 \triangleleft U_n$ and $x \cdot 1 \triangleleft U_n$ hold. This implies that $x \triangleleft U_n$ by the inductive definition of the cover. We can proceed in this fashion to prove (13). Since $\text{length}(a) \leq n$, we get $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U_n$, as required. \square

Let \mathcal{C} be the formal Cantor space. The following implication, which should be read as saying that every bar above a has a bound relative to a , is generally referred to as the Fan Theorem:

$$(\forall a \in \{0, 1\}^*)(a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U \implies (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U_n)).$$

Proposition 4.3. Spatiality of the formal Cantor space is equivalent to the Fan Theorem.

Proof. We begin by assuming the Fan Theorem. If $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U$, an application of the Fan Theorem implies that there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U_n$. With an application of Lemma 4.2, it follows that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U_n$. Since $U_n \subseteq U$, we get $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U$, as required.

For the converse implication, assume that the formal Cantor space is spatial. We derive the desired conclusion by adapting the argument showing that the principle of monotone bar induction implies the Fan Theorem (Dummett 2000, Section 3.2). We assume that $a \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U$, and use the spatiality of the formal Cantor space to deduce $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U$. Then we define

$$V =_{\text{def}} \{x \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(x \triangleleft_{\text{Pt}(\mathcal{C})} U_n)\}.$$

Direct calculations show that $U \subseteq V$, and thus, using $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} U$, we get $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{C}} V$ by Reflexivity and Transitivity. Now observe that V is a saturated set for the formal Cantor space (because it is monotonic and inductive). It therefore follows that $a \in V$, and hence we get the conclusion of the Fan Theorem, as required. \square

Zariski spectrum

As recalled in detail in Schuster (2006), the Zariski topology has a counterpart in formal topology. Following Sigstam (1995), given a commutative ring A , define a preorder on it by letting

$$a \leq b =_{\text{def}} (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists x \in A)(a^n = bx).$$

Then define a covering system on (A, \leq) by letting

$$C(a) =_{\text{def}} \{\{b_1, \dots, b_k\} \subseteq \downarrow a \mid k \geq 0, b_1 + \dots + b_k = a\}.$$

With this covering system, the inductive definition of the cover relation of the formal topology gives us

$$a \triangleleft U \iff (\exists n \geq 1) (a^n \in I(U)),$$

where $I(U)$ is the ideal of A generated by U . Note that $I(\emptyset) = 0$, so

$$a \triangleleft \emptyset \iff (\exists n \geq 1) (a^n = 0).$$

Let us note that for a commutative ring A the formal points of the formal Zariski topology associated with A are exactly the prime filters of A . In Schuster (2006, Proposition 27), this characterisation was proved with a slightly different notion of formal topology, where the underlying set has the structure of a monoid rather than of a preorder. To prove the equivalence between the two definitions, it suffices to show

$$\xi \Vdash ab \iff \xi \Vdash a \downarrow b.$$

We assume $\xi \Vdash a \downarrow b$, and let $x \in A$ such that $\xi \Vdash x$, and $x \leq a, x \leq b$. Hence $x^n = ay$ and $x^m = bz$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y, z \in A$. We then get $x^{n+m} = (ab)(xy)$. Since $\xi \Vdash x$ and $x \leq x^{n+m}$, we have $\xi \Vdash (ab)(xy)$, so we get $\xi \Vdash ab$ by $(ab)(xy) \leq ab$. The converse implication is obvious.

The formal Zariski topology is an example of a finitary formal topology. Following Sambin (2003), one can say that a finitary formal topology is a predicative presentation of a coherent frame (or, equivalently, of a spectral locale). In this vein one may think of the basic opens as of the compact elements of the locale. The concept of a spectral locale, which is the point-free counterpart of the notion of a spectral space (Hochster 1969), is crucial for non-Hausdorff point-free topology in general, and for its applications in domain theory in particular (Vickers 1989, Chapter 9). The notion of a spectral space comprises the characteristic properties of the Zariski spectrum of a commutative ring: that is, the whole of its prime ideals endowed with the Zariski topology.

Proposition 4.4. The formal Zariski topologies are closed under the formation of closed subspaces.

Proof. Let A be the formal Zariski topology of a commutative ring. Given $U \subseteq A$, consider the quotient ring $A/I(U)$ of A modulo the ideal $I(U)$ generated by U . The closed subspace A_U is isomorphic to the formal Zariski topology of $A/I(U)$. To see this, note first that giving an element of $A/I(U)$ is the same as giving an element of A . As for the cover relations, let $a \in A$ and $V \subseteq A$. By definition, $a \triangleleft_U V$ is $a \triangleleft U \cup V$, which is to say that $a^n \in I(U \cup V)$ for some $n \geq 1$. Since $I(U \cup V) = I(U) + I(V)$, this amounts to $a^n \in I(V)$ modulo $I(U)$ for some $n \geq 1$, which is just $a \triangleleft V$ in the formal Zariski topology of $A/I(U)$. □

Corollary 4.5. All formal Zariski topologies are spatial if and only if Sufficiency holds for all formal Zariski topologies.

Proof. This is a consequence of Proposition 3.5 and Proposition 4.4. □

Let us note that for the formal Zariski topology on a commutative ring A , Sufficiency is equivalent to

$$(\forall \xi)(a \notin \xi) \implies (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(a^n = 0).$$

This is the classical contrapositive of

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(a^n \neq 0) \implies (\exists \zeta)(a \in \zeta),$$

which is classically equivalent to

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})(a^n \neq 0) \implies (\exists \pi \subseteq A)(\pi \text{ prime ideal, } a \notin \pi).$$

The validity of the latter implication for all $a \in A$ and every commutative ring A is equivalent to the assertion that every non-trivial commutative ring has a prime ideal.

It was shown in Schuster (2006) that spatiality of all formal Zariski topologies, expressed as in (7), implies the Limited Principle of Omniscience (LPO), which asserts that if $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing binary sequence, then either $\lambda_n = 1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $\lambda_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In view of Corollary 4.5, this result can be given by the following corollary (we give a proof for the sake of completeness).

Corollary 4.6. Sufficiency for all formal Zariski topologies implies the limited principle of omniscience.

Proof. Given an increasing binary sequence (λ_n) , consider the commutative ring

$$A = \mathbb{Z}[T]/I (\{\lambda_n T^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}).$$

Writing a for the equivalence class of T , we have

$$a^n = 0 \iff \lambda_n = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a^n \neq 0 \iff \lambda_n = 0.$$

Hence $\text{Neg}(a)$ amounts to the existence of an index n with $\lambda_n = 1$. To complete the proof, we use Corollary 3.7 and Proposition 4.4. □

5. Future work

Positivity

A natural direction for future research is the extension of the results presented here to the context of formal topologies equipped with a positivity predicate, which are related to open locales. This direction is currently being pursued by the second author in collaboration with Giovanni Sambin.

Independence results

The principles of spatiality for the formal topologies in the examples have been shown to be independent of the internal logic of a topos using sheaf models (Fourman and Hyland 1979; Moerdijk 1984). It seems, therefore, natural to investigate whether those proofs can be recast within the theory of sheaf models for Constructive Set Theory (Gambino 2002; 2006).

Points

Another potentially interesting direction for further research is represented by the relationship between spatiality and the study of conditions on a formal topology for it to have

a ‘small’ set of points (Aczel 2006; Curi 2003; Curi 2006), a condition that we shall refer to as smallness. There seems to be an essential difference between spatiality and smallness: spatiality is a structural property, concerned with the relationship between a formal topology and its space of its points, while smallness does not depend on the topology on the space of its points. Smallness, however, has been shown to be related to topological properties of the formal topology (Aczel 2006; Curi 2006), and these topological properties, at least in the context of locales, are related to spatiality (Johnstone 1982). We should note, however, that even for the formal topologies that enjoy smallness, such as those in the examples presented here, the spaces of their points do not generally possess the desirable topological properties of their point-free counterparts.

Acknowledgements

Nicola Gambino gratefully acknowledges the support of the Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences (MIMS), where this paper was completed, and wishes to thank Peter Aczel and Harold Simmons for helpful discussions. Both authors wish to thank Laura Crosilla for giving the initial impetus to this paper while the first author was in Munich at the invitation of the DFG-hosted Graduiertenkolleg Logik in der Informatik.

References

- Aczel, P. (1986) The type theoretic interpretation of Constructive Set Theory: inductive definitions. In: Marcus, R. B., Dorn, G. and Weingartner, P. (eds.) *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science VII*, North-Holland 17–49.
- Aczel, P. (2006) Aspects of general topology in constructive set theory. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **137** (1–3) 3–29.
- Aczel, P. and Rathjen, M. (2001) Notes on constructive set theory. Technical Report 40, Institut Mittag-Leffler, The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences.
- Banaschewski, B. (1983) The power of the ultrafilter theorem. *J. London Math. Soc.* **27** 193–202.
- Battilotti, G. and Sambin, G. (2006) Pretopologies and a uniform presentation of sup-lattices, quantales and frames. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **137** 30–61.
- Coquand, T., Sambin, G., Smith, J. and Valentini, S. (2003) Inductively generated formal topologies. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **124** (1–3) 71–106.
- Curi, G. (2003) *Geometry of observations*, Ph.D. thesis, Università di Siena.
- Curi, G. (2006) On the collection of points of a formal space. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **137** (1–3) 126–146.
- Dummett, M. (2000) *Elements of Intuitionism*, Oxford University Press, second edition.
- Fourman, M. and Grayson, R. (1982) Formal spaces. In: Troelstra, A. S. and van Dalen, D. (eds.) *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, North-Holland 107–122.
- Fourman, M. P. and Hyland, J. M. E. (1979) Sheaf models for analysis. In: Fourman, M. P., Mulvey, C. J. and Scott, D. S. (eds.) *Applications of Sheaves. Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **753** 280–301.
- Fourman, M. P. and Scott, D. S. (1979) Sheaves and logic. In: Fourman, M. P., Mulvey, C. J. and Scott, D. S. (eds.) *Applications of Sheaves. Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **753** 302–401.

- Fox, C. (2005) *Point-set and point-free topology in constructive set theory*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Mathematics, University of Manchester.
- Gambino, N. (2002) *Sheaf interpretations for generalised predicative intuitionistic systems*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester.
- Gambino, N. (2006) Heyting-valued interpretations for constructive set theory. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **137** (1–3) 164–188.
- Gambino, N. and Aczel, P. (2006) The generalised type-theoretic interpretation of Constructive Set Theory. *J. Symb. Logic* **71** (1) 63–103.
- Hochster, M. (1969) Prime ideal structure in commutative rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **142** 43–60.
- Johnstone, P. T. (1977) Rings, fields, and spectra. *J. Algebra* **49** 283–260.
- Johnstone, P. T. (1982) *Stone Spaces*, Cambridge University Press.
- Johnstone, P. T. (1983) The point of pointless topology. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **8** (8) 41–53.
- Johnstone, P. T. (1991) The art of pointless thinking: a student's guide to the category of locales. In: Herrlich, H. and Porst, H.-E. (eds.) *Category Theory at Work*, Heldermann Verlag 85–107.
- Joyal, A. and Tierney, M. (1984) An extension of the Galois theory of Grothendieck. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **390**.
- Mac Lane, S. and Moerdijk, I. (1994) *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic*, Springer-Verlag.
- Maietti, M. E. and Sambin, G. (2005) Towards a minimalistic foundation for constructive mathematics. In: Crosilla, L. and Schuster, P. (eds.) *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis*, Oxford University Press 91–114.
- Maietti, M. E. and Valentini, S. (2004) A structural investigation on formal topology: coreflection of formal covers and exponentiability. *J. Symb. Logic* **69** (4) 967–1005.
- Martin-Löf, P. (1984) *Intuitionistic Type Theory* – Notes by G. Sambin of a course given in Padua in 1980, Bibliopolis.
- Moerdijk, I. (1984) Heine-Borel does not imply the fan theorem. *J. Symb. Logic* **49** (2) 514–519.
- Myhill, J. (1975) Constructive Set Theory. *J. Symb. Logic* **40** (3) 347–382.
- Negri, S. (2002) Continuous domains as formal spaces. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **12** 19–52.
- Nordström, B., Petersson, K. and Smith, J. M. (2000) Martin-Löf Type Theory. In: Abramsky, S., Gabbay, D. M. and Maibaum, T. S. E. (eds.) *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science* **5**, Oxford University Press.
- Palmgren, E. (2005a) From intuitionistic to point-free topology. U.U.D.M. Report 2005:47, Department of Mathematics, University of Uppsala.
- Palmgren, E. (2005b) Quotient spaces and coequalisers in formal topology. *J. UCS* **11** (12) 1996–2007.
- Rav, Y. (1977) Variants of Rado's selection lemma and their applications. *Math. Nachr.* **79** 145–165.
- Sambin, G. (1987) Intuitionistic formal spaces – a first communication. In: Skordev, D. (ed.) *Mathematical Logic and its applications*, Plenum 187–204.
- Sambin, G. (2003) Some points in formal topology. *Theoretical Computer Science* **305** 347–408.
- Sambin, G. and Gebellato, S. (1999) A preview of the basic picture: a new perspective on formal topology. In: Altenkirch, T., Naraschewski, W. and Reus, B. (eds.) *Types for proofs and programs (Irsee 1997)*. Springer-Verlag *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **1657** 194–207.
- Schuster, P. (2006) Formal Zariski topology: positivity and points. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **137** (1–3) 317–359.
- Sigstam, I. (1995) Formal spaces and their effective presentations. *Arch. Math. Logic* **34** (4) 211–246.
- Simmons, H. (1978) A framework for topology. In: MacIntyre, A., Pacholski, L. and Paris, J. (eds.) *Logic Colloquium '77*, North-Holland 239–251.
- Simmons, H. (2004) The coverage technique for enriched posets. Available from the author's web page.
- Vickers, S. (1989) *Topology via Logic*, Cambridge University Press.