Localic uniform completions via Cauchy sequences

Graham Manuell graham@manuell.me Stellenbosch University

Summer conference on topology and its applications Coimbra

11 July 2024

Recall that a frame is a kind of lattice abstracting the lattice of open sets of a topological space. A locale is a frame viewed as a space (with maps in the reverse direction to frame homomorphisms).

Recall that a frame is a kind of lattice abstracting the lattice of open sets of a topological space. A locale is a frame viewed as a space (with maps in the reverse direction to frame homomorphisms).

An advantage frames have over spaces is that, since frames are algebraic structures, they can be presented by generators and relations.

For example, the frame of reals may be presented as

$$egin{aligned} \mathcal{O}\mathbb{R} &= \langle \ell_q, u_q, \ q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \ell_p = \bigvee_{q > p} \ell_q, \ u_q = \bigvee_{p < q} u_p, \ & \bigvee_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \ell_q = 1, \ \bigvee_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} u_q = 1, \ & \ell_p \wedge u_q = 0 \ ext{ for } p \geq q, \ & \ell_p \lor u_q = 1 \ ext{ for } p < q
angle. \end{aligned}$$

Uniform spaces

A uniform space is a set X equipped with a filter \mathcal{E} of binary relations on X satisfying, for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$:

- 1. $\Delta_X \subseteq E$,
- 2. $E^{o} \in \mathcal{E}$,
- 3. $\exists F \in \mathcal{E}. F \circ F \subseteq E.$

The elements of \mathcal{E} are called entourages and should be thought of as approximate equality relations.

A uniform space is a set X equipped with a filter \mathcal{E} of binary relations on X satisfying, for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$:

- 1. $\Delta_X \subseteq E$,
- 2. $E^o \in \mathcal{E}$,
- 3. $\exists F \in \mathcal{E}$. $F \circ F \subseteq E$.

The elements of \mathcal{E} are called entourages and should be thought of as approximate equality relations.

Uniform spaces are a general setting in which to discuss uniform continuity and completeness.

A metric $d: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ induces a uniformity with basic entourages $\{(x, y) \mid d(x, y) < \varepsilon\}.$

A pre-uniform locale is then a locale X equipped with a filter \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{O}(X \times X)$ satisfying the same axioms as before.

A pre-uniform locale is then a locale X equipped with a filter \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{O}(X \times X)$ satisfying the same axioms as before.

The uniformity on a pre-uniform locale might induce a 'coarser topology' than that given by the underlying locale.

A pre-uniform locale is then a locale X equipped with a filter \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{O}(X \times X)$ satisfying the same axioms as before.

The uniformity on a pre-uniform locale might induce a 'coarser topology' than that given by the underlying locale.

Define $v \triangleleft^{E} u$ (for $u, v \in \mathcal{O}X, E \in \mathcal{E}$) to mean $E \circ (v \oplus v) \leq u \oplus u$ and $v \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u$ to mean $v \triangleleft^{E} u$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$.

A pre-uniform locale (X, \mathcal{E}) is a uniform locale if $u = \bigvee_{v \triangleleft \mathcal{E}_u} v$ for all u.

There is a notion of completeness for uniform locales. Every uniform locale has a unique completion: a complete uniform locale into which it uniformly embeds as a dense sublocale.

There is a notion of completeness for uniform locales. Every uniform locale has a unique completion: a complete uniform locale into which it uniformly embeds as a dense sublocale.

The completion of a uniform space/locale is usually constructed in terms of (regular) Cauchy filters.

A regular Cauchy filter on a uniform locale (X, \mathcal{E}) is a proper filter F on $\mathcal{O}X$ such that

- for every $E \in \mathcal{E}$, there is some $u \in F$ with $u \oplus u \leq E$,
- if $u \in F$ then there is a $v \in F$ such that $v \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u$.

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X.

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X. We define a presentation with a generator $[u \in F]$ for each $u \in OX$ and the following relations:

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X.

We define a presentation with a generator $[u \in F]$ for each $u \in OX$ and the following relations:

- $[1 \in F] = 1$
- $[u \land v \in F] = [u \in F] \land [v \in F]$
- $[0 \in F] \leq 0$

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X.

We define a presentation with a generator $[u \in F]$ for each $u \in OX$ and the following relations:

- $[1 \in F] = 1$
- $[u \land v \in F] = [u \in F] \land [v \in F]$
- $[0 \in F] \leq 0$
- $\bigvee_{u \oplus u \leq E} [u \in F] = 1$ for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$
- $[u \in F] \leq \bigvee_{v \triangleleft \mathcal{E}_u} [v \in F]$

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X.

We define a presentation with a generator $[u \in F]$ for each $u \in OX$ and the following relations:

- $[1 \in F] = 1$
- $[u \land v \in F] = [u \in F] \land [v \in F]$
- $[0 \in F] \leq 0$
- $\bigvee_{u \oplus u \leq E} [u \in F] = 1$ for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$
- $[u \in F] \leq \bigvee_{v \triangleleft \mathcal{E}_u} [v \in F]$

The points of the resulting frame are precisely the regular Cauchy filters as we defined before.

We construct the classifying locale CX of regular Cauchy filters on X.

We define a presentation with a generator $[u \in F]$ for each $u \in OX$ and the following relations:

- $[1 \in F] = 1$
- $[u \land v \in F] = [u \in F] \land [v \in F]$
- $[0 \in F] \leq 0$
- $\bigvee_{u \oplus u \leq E} [u \in F] = 1$ for all $E \in \mathcal{E}$
- $[u \in F] \leq \bigvee_{v \triangleleft \mathcal{E}_u} [v \in F]$

The points of the resulting frame are precisely the regular Cauchy filters as we defined before.

There is an obvious locale embedding $\gamma: X \hookrightarrow CX$ obtained by sending $[u \in F] \in \mathcal{OCX}$ to $u \in \mathcal{OX}$. This is the completion of X.

Metric spaces have uniform structures and the uniform completion agrees with the familiar metric completion.

Completions of metric spaces constructed using Cauchy *sequences*, not Cauchy filters. Why not use Cauchy sequences for uniform completions?

Metric spaces have uniform structures and the uniform completion agrees with the familiar metric completion.

Completions of metric spaces constructed using Cauchy *sequences*, not Cauchy filters. Why not use Cauchy sequences for uniform completions?

Unfortunately, in the usual approach Cauchy sequences do not give the correct completion of uniform spaces.

Compare how sequentially compact spaces can fail to be compact.

Metric spaces have uniform structures and the uniform completion agrees with the familiar metric completion.

Completions of metric spaces constructed using Cauchy *sequences*, not Cauchy filters. Why not use Cauchy sequences for uniform completions?

Unfortunately, in the usual approach Cauchy sequences do not give the correct completion of uniform spaces.

Compare how sequentially compact spaces can fail to be compact.

But Cauchy sequences do work in the pointfree setting!

There is no apparent way to define a classifying locale for such logically complex objects.

There is no apparent way to define a classifying locale for such logically complex objects. Instead we 'Skolemise' the definition to give $\exists m \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}. \forall E \in \mathcal{B}. \forall n, n' \ge m(E). (s(n), s(n')) \in E.$

There is no apparent way to define a classifying locale for such logically complex objects. Instead we 'Skolemise' the definition to give $\exists m \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}. \forall E \in \mathcal{B}. \forall n, n' \ge m(E). (s(n), s(n')) \in E.$

(Actually, Skolemisation needs the axiom of choice, so we use left-total relations $m: \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}$ instead of functions.)

There is no apparent way to define a classifying locale for such logically complex objects. Instead we 'Skolemise' the definition to give $\exists m \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}. \forall E \in \mathcal{B}. \forall n, n' \ge m(E). (s(n), s(n')) \in E.$

(Actually, Skolemisation needs the axiom of choice, so we use left-total relations $m \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}$ instead of functions.)

Such an m is called a modulus of Cauchyness. A sequence equipped with such a modulus is called a modulated Cauchy sequence.

There is no apparent way to define a classifying locale for such logically complex objects. Instead we 'Skolemise' the definition to give $\exists m \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}. \forall E \in \mathcal{B}. \forall n, n' \ge m(E). (s(n), s(n')) \in E.$

(Actually, Skolemisation needs the axiom of choice, so we use left-total relations $m: \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N}$ instead of functions.)

Such an m is called a modulus of Cauchyness. A sequence equipped with such a modulus is called a modulated Cauchy sequence.

We can now define a locale of modulated Cauchy sequences.

The locale of modulated Cauchy sequences

Let $X = (X, \mathcal{E})$ be a uniform locale with base $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. We give a presentation for the frame of ModCauchy(X).

The generators are:

- $[s(n) \in u]$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in \mathcal{O}X$,
- [m(E) = k] for $E \in \mathcal{B}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The locale of modulated Cauchy sequences

Let $X = (X, \mathcal{E})$ be a uniform locale with base $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. We give a presentation for the frame of ModCauchy(X).

The generators are:

- $[s(n) \in u]$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \in \mathcal{O}X$,
- [m(E) = k] for $E \in \mathcal{B}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The relations are:

- ∨_α∧_{u∈Fα}[s(n) ∈ u] = [s(n) ∈ ∨_α∧ F_α] for each family (F_α)_α of finite subsets of OX,
- $1 \leq \bigvee_{k \in \mathbb{N}} [m(E) = k]$ for each $E \in \mathcal{B}$,
- $[m(E) = k] \leq \bigvee_{u \oplus u' \leq E} [s(n) \in u] \land [s(n') \in u'] \text{ for } E \in \mathcal{B}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n, n' \geq k$.

We now define a map from ModCauchy(X) to the completion of X, which 'takes the limit' of the Cauchy sequences.

We now define a map from ModCauchy(X) to the completion of X, which 'takes the limit' of the Cauchy sequences.

This map $q: \operatorname{ModCauchy}(X) \to \mathcal{C}X$ is given by

$$q^*([u \in F]) = \bigvee_{E \in \mathcal{B}} \bigvee_{v \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u' \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u} \bigvee_{k' \leq k \in \mathbb{N}} [m(E) = k'] \land [s(k) \in v].$$

We now define a map from ModCauchy(X) to the completion of X, which 'takes the limit' of the Cauchy sequences.

This map $q: \operatorname{ModCauchy}(X) \to \mathcal{C}X$ is given by

$$q^*([u \in F]) = \bigvee_{E \in \mathcal{B}} \bigvee_{v \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u' \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u} \bigvee_{k' \leq k \in \mathbb{N}} [m(E) = k'] \land [s(k) \in v].$$

Intuitively, this says q((s, m)) lies in u iff $s(k) \in v$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \triangleleft^{E} u' \triangleleft^{\mathcal{E}} u$ such that $m(E) = k' \leq k$.

We claim $q: ModCauchy(X) \to CX$ is a well-behaved quotient map. We show this by defining a kind of 'multivalued section' to q. We claim $q: \operatorname{ModCauchy}(X) \to CX$ is a well-behaved quotient map. We show this by defining a kind of 'multivalued section' to q. More formally, we define a join-preserving map $g: \mathcal{O}\operatorname{ModCauchy}(X) \to \mathcal{O}CX$ such that $gq^* = \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{O}C}$ and $g(a \wedge q^*(b)) = g(a) \wedge b$. This exhibits q as a triquotient map. We claim $q: \operatorname{ModCauchy}(X) \to CX$ is a well-behaved quotient map.

We show this by defining a kind of 'multivalued section' to q.

More formally, we define a join-preserving map $g: \mathcal{O}ModCauchy(X) \to \mathcal{O}CX$ such that $gq^* = id_{\mathcal{O}C}$ and $g(a \wedge q^*(b)) = g(a) \wedge b$. This exhibits q as a triquotient map.

I will omit the definition of g, but intuitively it associates a point p of the completion to a collection of modulated Cauchy sequences that converge to p 'sufficiently quickly'.

How do we make sense of this, given that this was supposed to be impossible for uniform *spaces*?

How do we make sense of this, given that this was supposed to be impossible for uniform *spaces*?

The spatial approach would involve restricting to the points of ModCauchy(X) before we take the quotient.

How do we make sense of this, given that this was supposed to be impossible for uniform *spaces*?

The spatial approach would involve restricting to the points of ModCauchy(X) before we take the quotient. And the spatial coreflection does *not* commute with the quotient.

How do we make sense of this, given that this was supposed to be impossible for uniform *spaces*?

The spatial approach would involve restricting to the points of ModCauchy(X) before we take the quotient. And the spatial coreflection does *not* commute with the quotient.

Moreover, note that ModCauchy(X) can be highly non-spatial when \mathcal{B} is uncountable. Intuition: $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{B}}$ is non-spatial for uncountable \mathcal{B} .

- S. Vickers, Localic completion of quasimetric spaces, Tech. Report DoC 97/2, Imperial College London, 1997.
- 2. G. Manuell, *Sequences suffice for pointfree uniform completions*, to appear on the arXiv soon!