

THE PATCH TOPOLOGY IN UNIVALENT FOUNDATIONS

IGOR ARRIETA, MARTÍN H. ESCARDÓ, AND AYBERK TOSUN

ABSTRACT. Stone locales together with continuous maps form a coreflective subcategory of spectral locales and perfect maps. A proof in the internal language of an elementary topos was previously given by the second-named author. This proof can be easily translated to univalent type theory using *resizing axioms*. In this work, we show how to achieve such a translation *without* resizing axioms, by working with large and locally small frames with small bases. This requires predicative reformulations of several fundamental concepts of locale theory in predicative HoTT/UF, which we investigate systematically.

1. INTRODUCTION

The category **Stone** of Stone locales together with continuous maps forms a coreflective subcategory of the category **Spec** of spectral locales and *perfect* maps. A proof in the internal language of an elementary topos was previously constructed by Escardó (1999, 2001), defining the patch frame as the frame of Scott continuous nuclei on a given frame.

In the present work, we show that the same construction can be carried out in predicative and constructive univalent foundations. In the presence of Voevodsky’s (2011) resizing axioms, it is straightforward to translate this proof to univalent type theory. At the time of writing, however, there is no known computational interpretation of the resizing axioms. Therefore, the question of whether resizing can be avoided in the construction of the patch locale is of interest. In such a predicative situation, the usual approach to locale theory is to work with presentations of locales, known as *formal topologies* (Sambin, 1987; Coquand et al., 2003; Coquand and Tosun, 2021). We show in our work, however, that it is possible to work with locales directly. This requires a number of modifications to the proofs and constructions of Escardó (1999, 2001):

- (1) The major modification is that we work with large and locally small frames with small bases. The reason for this is that, in the absence of propositional resizing, there are no non-trivial examples of frames (de Jong and Escardó, 2021). See Section 3 for further discussion.
- (2) The patch frame is defined as the frame of Scott continuous nuclei by Escardó (1999, 2001). In order to prove that this is indeed a frame, one starts with the frame of all nuclei, and then exhibits the Scott continuous nuclei as a subframe. This procedure, however, does not seem to be possible in the context of our work, as it is not clear whether all nuclei can be shown to form a frame predicatively; so we construct the frame of Scott continuous nuclei *directly*, which requires predicative reformulations of all proofs about it inherited from the frame of all nuclei.

Key words and phrases. Univalent Foundations, Constructive Mathematics, Pointfree Topology, Locale Theory, Patch Topology, Spectral Locale .

- (3) In the impredicative setting, any frame has all Heyting implications, which are needed to construct open nuclei. Again, this does not seem to be the case in the predicative setting. We show, however, that it is possible to construct Heyting implications in large and locally small frames with small bases, by an application of the posetal instance of the Adjoint Functor Theorem.
- (4) Similar to (3), we use the posetal Adjoint Functor Theorem to define the right adjoint of a frame homomorphism, which we then use to define the notion of a *perfect map*, namely, a map whose defining frame homomorphism's right adjoint is Scott continuous. This notion is used by Escardó in his impredicative proof (1999; 2001).

For the purposes of our work, a *spectral locale* is a locale in which any open can be expressed as the join of a family of compact opens. A continuous map of spectral locales is *spectral* if its defining frame homomorphism preserves compact opens. A *Stone locale* is one that is compact and in which any open is expressible as the join of a family of clopens. Every Stone locale is spectral since the clopens coincide with the compact opens in Stone locales. The patch frame construction is the right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathbf{Stone} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Spec}$. The main contribution of our work is the construction of this right adjoint in the predicative context of univalent type theory. We have also formalized (Tosun, 2023) the development of this paper in the AGDA proof assistant (Norell, 2009) as part of the `TYPE TOPOLOGY` library (Escardó and contributors, 2023). Our presentation here, however, is self-contained and can be followed independently of the formalization.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present the type-theoretical context in which we work. In Section 3, we introduce our notion of locale discussed above. In Section 4, we present our definitions of spectral and Stone locales that provide a suitable basis for a predicative development. In Section 5, we present the posetal instance of the Adjoint Functor Theorem for the simplified context of locales that is central to our development. In Section 6, we define the meet-semilattice of perfect nuclei as preparation for the complete lattice of perfect nuclei, which we then construct in Section 7. Finally in Section 8, we prove the desired universal property, namely, that the patch locale exhibits the category \mathbf{Stone} as a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{Spec} , where we restrict ourselves to locales with small bases.

Finally, we note that a preliminary version of the work that we present here previously appeared in (Tosun and Escardó, 2023). Our work here extends *loc. cit.* in several directions. The presentation that we provide through Theorem 4.17 and Theorem 4.30 here involves new results. Furthermore, we provide a complete proof of the universal property of \mathbf{Patch} through a new approach, as given in Theorem 8.8 and Theorem 8.10.

2. FOUNDATIONS

In this section, we introduce the type-theoretical setting in which we work and then present the type-theoretical formulations of some of the preliminary notions that form the basis of our work. Our type-theoretical conventions follow those of de Jong and Escardó (2021; 2023) and [The Univalent Foundations Program \(2013\)](#).

We work in Martin-Löf Type Theory with binary sums $(-) + (-)$, dependent products \prod , dependent sums \sum , the identity type $(-) = (-)$, and inductive types including the empty type $\mathbf{0}$, the unit type $\mathbf{1}$, and the type $\mathbf{List}(A)$ of lists, or *words*, over any type A . We denote by π_1 and π_2 the first and the second projections of a \sum type. We adhere to the convention of the HoTT Book (2013) of using $(-) \equiv (-)$ for judgemental equality and $(-) = (-)$ for the identity type.

We work explicitly with universes, for which we adopt the convention of using the variables $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}, \dots$. The ground universe is denoted \mathcal{U}_0 and the successor of a given universe \mathcal{U} is denoted \mathcal{U}^+ . The least upper bound of two universes is given by the operator $(-) \sqcup (-)$ which is assumed to be associative, commutative, and idempotent. We do not assume that the universes are, or are not, cumulative. Furthermore, $(-)^+$ is assumed to distribute over $(-) \sqcup (-)$. Universes are computed for the given type formers as follows:

- Given types $X : \mathcal{U}$ and $Y : \mathcal{V}$, the type $X + Y$ inhabits universe $\mathcal{U} \sqcup \mathcal{V}$.
- Given a type $X : \mathcal{U}$ and an X -indexed family, $Y : X \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, both $\sum_{x:X} Y(x)$ and $\prod_{x:X} Y(x)$ inhabit the universe $\mathcal{U} \sqcup \mathcal{V}$.
- Given a type $X : \mathcal{U}$ and inhabitants $x, y : X$, the identity type $x = y$ inhabits universe \mathcal{U} .
- The type \mathbb{N} of natural numbers inhabits \mathcal{U}_0 .
- The empty type $\mathbf{0}$ and the unit type $\mathbf{1}$ have copies in every universe \mathcal{U} , which we occasionally make explicit using the notations $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{U}}$.
- Given a type $A : \mathcal{U}$, the type $\text{List}(A)$ inhabits \mathcal{U} .

We assume the univalence axiom and therefore function extensionality and propositional extensionality. We maintain a careful distinction between *structure* and *property*, and reserve logical connectives for *propositional types* i.e. types A satisfying $\text{isProp}(A) \equiv \prod_{x,y:A} x = y$. We denote by $\Omega_{\mathcal{U}}$ the type of propositional types in universe \mathcal{U} i.e. $\Omega_{\mathcal{U}} \equiv \sum_{A:\mathcal{U}} \text{isProp}(A)$. A type A is called a *set* if its identity type is always a proposition i.e. $x = y$ is a propositional type, for every $x, y : A$.

We assume the existence of *propositional truncation*, given by a type former $\|-\| : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and a unit operation $|-| : A \rightarrow \|A\|$. The existential quantification operator is defined using propositional truncation as $\exists x : A, B(x) \equiv \|\Sigma x : A, B(x)\|$.

When presenting proofs informally, we adopt the following conventions for avoiding ambiguity between propositional and non-propositional types.

- For the anonymous inhabitation $\|A\|$ of a type, we say that A is inhabited.
- For truncated \sum types, we use the terminologies *there is* and *there exists*.
- We say *specified inhabitant* of type A to contrast it with the anonymous inhabitation $\|A\|$. Similarly, we say there is a *specified* or *chosen* element to emphasize that we are using \sum instead of \exists .
- When we use the phrase *has a*, we take it to mean a *specified* inhabitant. In contrast, we say *has some* when talking about an unspecified inhabitant. If we want to completely avoid ambiguity, we prefer to use the more explicit terminology of *has specified* or *has unspecified*.

If a given type A is a proposition, it is clear that it is logically equivalent to its own propositional truncation. The converse, however, is not always true: there are types that are logically equivalent to their own propositional truncations, despite not being propositions themselves. Types that satisfy this more general condition of being logically equivalent to their own truncations are said to have *split support*, and have previously been investigated by Kraus et al. (2017).

Definition 2.1 (\mathcal{V} -small type). A type $A : \mathcal{U}$ is called \mathcal{V} -small if it has a copy in universe \mathcal{V} . That is to say, $\sum_{B:\mathcal{V}} A \simeq B$.

Lemma 2.2. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *For every type $A : \mathcal{U}$ and universe \mathcal{V} , the property of being \mathcal{V} -small is a proposition.*
- (2) *Univalence holds.*

We also have the notion of *local smallness* which refers to the equality type always being small with respect to some universe.

Definition 2.3 (Local \mathcal{V} -smallness). A type $X : \mathcal{U}$ is called *locally \mathcal{V} -small* if the identity type $x = y$ is \mathcal{V} -small for every $x, y : X$.

We have mentioned the *propositional resizing* axiom in Section 1. Having formally defined the notion of \mathcal{V} -smallness, we can now give the precise definition of this axiom.

Definition 2.4. The *propositional $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ -resizing axiom* says that any proposition $P : \Omega_{\mathcal{U}}$ is \mathcal{V} -small. The *global propositional resizing* axiom says that, for any two universes \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} , the propositional $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ -resizing axiom holds.

Definition 2.5 (The set replacement axiom). Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a function from a type $X : \mathcal{U}$ into a set $Y : \mathcal{V}$. The *set replacement axiom* says that if X is \mathcal{U}' -small and the type Y is locally \mathcal{W} -small then $\text{image}(f)$ is $(\mathcal{U}' \sqcup \mathcal{W})$ -small, where

$$\text{image}(f) := \sum_{y:Y} \exists_{x:X} f(x) = y.$$

Remark 2.6. Notice that we obtain the following as a special case of the set replacement axiom: given a locally \mathcal{U} -small set $X' : \mathcal{U}^+$, the image of any function $f : X \rightarrow X'$ is \mathcal{U} -small whenever the type X is \mathcal{U} -small.

We now proceed to define, in the presented type-theoretical setting, some preliminary notions that are fundamental to our development of locale theory.

Definition 2.7 (Family). A *\mathcal{U} -family on a type A* is a pair (I, α) where $I : \mathcal{U}$ and $\alpha : I \rightarrow A$. We denote the type of \mathcal{U} -families on type A by $\text{Fam}_{\mathcal{U}}(A)$ i.e. $\text{Fam}_{\mathcal{U}}(A) := \sum_{I:\mathcal{U}} I \rightarrow A$.

Convention 2.8. We often use the shorthand $(x)_{i:I}$ for families. In other words, instead of writing (I, x) for a family, we write $(x_i)_{i:I}$ where x_i denotes the application $x(i)$. Given a family (I, α) , a subfamily of it is a family of the form $(J, \alpha \circ \beta)$ where (J, β) is a family on the index type I . When talking about a subfamily of some family $(x_i)_{i:I}$, we use the notation $(x_{i_j})_{j:J}$ to denote the subfamily given by a family $(i_j)_{j:J}$.

We will also be talking about families (I, α) where the function α is an *embedding*. We refer to such families as *embedding families*.

Definition 2.9 (Embedding). A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called an *embedding* if, for every $y : Y$, the type $\sum_{x:X} f(x) = y$ is a proposition.

Definition 2.10. A \mathcal{U} -family (I, α) on a type A is said to be an *embedding family* if the function $\alpha : I \rightarrow A$ is an embedding. We denote the type of *embedding families* by $\text{Fam}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\rightarrow}(A)$.

3. LOCALES

A *locale* is a notion of space characterized solely by its lattice of opens. The lattice-theoretic notion abstracting the behaviour of a lattice of open subsets is a *frame*: a lattice with finite meets and arbitrary joins in which the binary meets distribute over arbitrary joins.

Our type-theoretic definition of a frame is parameterized by three universes: (1) for the carrier set, (2) for the order, and (3) for the join-completeness i.e. the index types of families on which the join operation is defined. We adopt the convention of using the universe variables \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{V} , and \mathcal{W} for these respectively.

Definition 3.1 (Frame). A $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$ -*frame* L consists of:

- a set $|L| : \mathcal{U}$,

- a partial order $(-) \leq (-) : |L| \rightarrow |L| \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$,
- a top element $\mathbf{1} : |L|$,
- an operation $(-) \wedge (-) : |L| \rightarrow |L| \rightarrow |L|$ giving the greatest lower bound $U \wedge V$ of any two $U, V : |L|$,
- an operation $\bigvee(-) : \mathbf{Fam}_{\mathcal{W}}(|L|) \rightarrow |L|$ giving the least upper bound $\bigvee(I, \alpha)$ of any \mathcal{W} -family (I, α) ,

such that binary meets distribute over arbitrary joins, i.e. $U \wedge \bigvee_{i:I} x_i = \bigvee_{i:I} U \wedge x_i$ for every $x : |L|$ and \mathcal{W} -family $(x_i)_{i:I}$ in $|L|$.

As we have done in the definition above, we adopt the shorthand notation $\bigvee_{i:I} x_i$ for the join of a family $(x_i)_{i:I}$. We also adopt the usual abuse of notation and write L instead of $|L|$.

The reader might have noticed that we have not imposed a sethood condition on the underlying type of a frame in this definition. The reason for this is that it follows automatically from the antisymmetry condition for partial orders that the underlying type of a frame is a set.

Lemma 3.2. *Let L be a $(\mathcal{U}^+, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U})$ -frame and let $x, y : L$. We have that $x \leq y$ is \mathcal{U} -small if and only if the carrier of L is a locally \mathcal{U} -small type.*

Proof. Let $x, y : L$. It is a standard fact of lattice theory that $x \leq y \leftrightarrow x \wedge y = x$. (\Rightarrow) If the frame is locally small in the sense that $x \leq y$ is \mathcal{U} -small for every $x, y : L$, then the identity type $x = y$ must also be \mathcal{U} -small since $x = y$ is equivalent to the conjunction $(x \leq y) \wedge (y \leq x)$. (\Leftarrow) Conversely, if the carrier of L is a locally small type, then $x \leq y$ must be \mathcal{U} -small since it is equivalent to the identity type $x \wedge y = x$ which is \mathcal{U} -small by the local smallness of the carrier. \square

We also note that, in the work of de Jong and Escardó (2021; 2021; 2023), the term \mathcal{V} -dcpo is used for a directed-complete partially ordered set whose directed joins are over \mathcal{V} -families. This terminology leaves the carrier and the order implicit as in most cases, the completeness universe is the only one relevant to the discussion.

We gave a highly general definition of the notion of frame in Definition 3.1: all three universes involved in the definition are permitted to live in separate universes. This generality, however, is never needed in our work. In fact, we know that locales of a certain form cannot be constructed predicatively; it follows from a result due to de Jong and Escardó (2021) that the existence of a nontrivial small locale is equivalent to a form of propositional resizing that is known to be independent of type theory — see (de Jong and Escardó, 2021, Theorem 35) for details. In short, the carrier set is naturally forced to be large when taking a predicative approach to locale theory.

In light of this, we restrict attention to $(\mathcal{U}^+, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$ -frames, which we refer to as *large and locally small frames*.

Convention 3.3. From now on, we fix a *base* universe \mathcal{U} , and refer to types that have isomorphic copies in \mathcal{U} as *small types*. In contrast, we refer to types in \mathcal{U}^+ (with no isomorphic copies in \mathcal{U}) as *large types*. Accordingly, we hereafter take frame/locale to mean one whose underlying type is *large and locally small* i.e. a $(\mathcal{U}^+, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$ -frame/locale.

Definition 3.4 (Frame homomorphism). Let K and L be two locales. A function $h : |K| \rightarrow |L|$ is called a *frame homomorphism* if it preserves the top element, binary meets, and joins of small families. We denote by \mathbf{Frm} the category of frames and their homomorphisms (over our base universe \mathcal{U}).

We adopt the notational conventions of Mac Lane and Moerdijk (1994). A *locale* is a frame considered in the opposite category denoted $\mathbf{Loc} := \mathbf{Frm}^{\text{op}}$. To highlight

this, we adopt the standard conventions of (1) using the letters X, Y, Z, \dots (or sometimes A, B, C, \dots) for locales and (2) denoting the frame corresponding to a locale X by $\mathcal{O}(X)$. For variables that range over the frame of opens of a locale X , we use the letters U, V, W, \dots . We use the letters f and g for continuous maps $X \rightarrow Y$ of locales. A continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is given by a frame homomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$.

Definition 3.5 (Nucleus). A *nucleus on a locale X* is an endofunction $j : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ that is inflationary, idempotent, and preserves binary meets.

In Section 7, we will work with inflationary and binary-meet-preserving functions that are not necessarily idempotent. Such functions are called *prenuclei*. We also note that, to show a prenucleus j to be idempotent, it suffices to show $j(j(U)) \leq j(U)$ as the other direction follows from inflationarity. In fact, the notion of a nucleus could be defined as a prenucleus satisfying the inequality $j(j(U)) \leq j(U)$, but we define it as in Definition 3.5 for the sake of simplicity and make implicit use of this fact in our proofs of idempotency.

In point-set topology, a *basis* for a space X is a collection \mathcal{B} of subsets of X such that every open $U \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ can be decomposed into a union of subsets contained in \mathcal{B} . These subsets are called the *basic opens*. In the context of pointfree topology, the notion of a basis is captured by the lattice-theoretic notion of a *generating lattice*. In (Johnstone, 2002, p. 548), for example, a basis for a locale $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is defined as a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(X)$ such that every element of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is expressible as a join of members of \mathcal{B} . We now give the formal definition of this notion in our type-theoretical setting.

Definition 3.6 (Directed family). Let $(x_i)_{i:I}$ be a family on some type A that is equipped with a preorder $(-) \leq (-)$. This family is called *directed* if

- (1) I is inhabited, and
- (2) for every $i, j : I$, there exists some $k : I$ such that x_k is an upper bound of $\{x_i, x_j\}$.

Definition 3.7 (Basis of a frame). Let X be a locale. A *basis* for X is an embedding family $(B_i)_{i:I}$ such that for every $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$, there is a specified directed small family $(i_j)_{j:J}$ on the basis I satisfying $U = \bigvee_{j:J} B_{i_j}$. We often drop the embedding requirement, in which case we speak of *intensional bases*. When we want to emphasize the distinction, we speak of *extensional bases* when we require the embedding condition.

Notice that the embedding requirement says that the family in consideration does not have repetitions. However, it will often be convenient to work with families which might have repetitions. Such repetitions can be removed (constructively) if necessary, by factoring the family through its image. In the case of a spectral locale, for example, there can be different intensional bases but the extensional basis is unique.

Even though we do not require a basis to be given by a small family, we always work with small bases in our work.

Remark 3.8. In the definition above, we required covering families to be directed. This requirement is not essential since a basis can always be *directified* by closing it under finite joins, that is, given a basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$, we can define $B^\uparrow : \text{List}(I) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ as

$$B^\uparrow(i_0, \dots, i_{n-1}) \quad \equiv \quad B_{i_0} \vee \dots \vee B_{i_{n-1}},$$

which yields an equivalent basis. We nevertheless prefer to include the directedness requirement in the definition for technical convenience. Finally, we also note that the directification of a small basis gives a small basis.

Lemma 3.9. *Given any locale X with some small intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$, the image of $B : I \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is small.*

Proof. Since being small is a propositional type (by Lemma 2.2), we can appeal to the induction principle of propositional truncation and assume we are given a *specified* intensional small basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$. By appealing to the set replacement axiom (Definition 2.5) as explained in Remark 2.6, it just remains to show that the carrier of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is locally small, which is always the case in a locally small locale thanks to Lemma 3.2. \square

4. SPECTRAL AND STONE LOCALES

The standard impredicative definition of a spectral locale is as one in which the compact opens form a basis closed under finite meets (see II.3.2 from (Johnstone, 1982)). To talk about compactness, we define the *way-below* relation.

Definition 4.1 (Way-below relation). We say that an open U of a locale X is *way below* an open V , written $U \ll V$, if for every directed family $(W_i)_{i:I}$ with $V \leq \bigvee_{i:I} W_i$ there is some $i : I$ with $U \leq W_i$.

Lemma 4.2. *Given any two opens $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$, the type $U \ll V$ is a proposition.*

The statement $U \ll V$ is thought of as expressing that open U is compact *relative* to open V . An open is said to be compact if it is compact relative to itself:

Definition 4.3 (Compact open of a locale). An open $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$ is called *compact* if $U \ll U$.

4.1. Spectral locales.

Definition 4.4 (Compact locale). A locale X is called *compact* if the top open $\mathbf{1}_X$ is compact.

We denote by $\mathsf{K}(X)$ the type of compact opens of a locale X . In other words, we define

$$\mathsf{K}(X) \quad \equiv \quad \sum_{U : \mathcal{O}(X)} U \text{ is compact.}$$

Since our locales are large and locally small, we have that the type of compact opens lives in \mathcal{U}^+ i.e. is not *a priori* small. A spectral locale, also sometimes called *coherent* in the literature (Johnstone, 1982, II.3.2), is defined in impredicative locale theory as one in which the compact opens (1) are closed under finite meets, and (2) form a basis. In our formulation of this notion, we capture the same idea but impose the additional requirement that the type $\mathsf{K}(X)$ of compact opens forms a small type.

Definition 4.5 (Spectral locale). A locale X is called *spectral* if it satisfies the following conditions.

- (SP1) It is a compact locale (i.e. the empty meet is compact).
- (SP2) The meet of two compact opens is a compact open.
- (SP3) For any $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$, there exists a small directed family $(K_i)_{i:I}$, with each K_i compact, such that $U = \bigvee_{i:I} K_i$.
- (SP4) The type $\mathsf{K}(X)$ is small.

The last two conditions are together equivalent to saying that the compact opens form a small basis, although this is not immediate (Theorem 4.17). Notice that in the impredicative notion of spectral locale, everything is small. One way of understanding the above definition is that we only make the *carrier* large, but everything else, including the basis, remains small. This is important for a variety of reasons.

Without the smallness condition, it does not seem possible to (1) define Heyting implication, and hence open nuclei, (2) show that frame homomorphisms have right adjoints, and so define the notion of perfect frame homomorphism. Additionally, a natural Stone-type duality to consider is that between small distributive lattices and spectral locales, for which it becomes absolutely necessary that we work with small bases as in the above definition. Notice that the same kind of phenomenon occurs when we work with locally presentable categories, which are large, locally small categories with a small set of objects that suitably generate all objects by taking filtered colimits (Adámek and Rosický (1994); Johnstone (2002)).

Lemma 4.6. *For any locale X , the statement that X is spectral is a proposition.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 4.2 and the fact that the \prod type over a family of propositions is a proposition. \square

The natural notion of morphism between spectral locales is that of a *spectral map*.

Definition 4.7 (Spectral map). A continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of spectral locales X and Y is called *spectral* if it reflects compact opens, that is, the open $f^*(V) : \mathcal{O}(X)$ is compact of X whenever the open V is compact.

We denote by **Spec** the category of spectral locales with spectral maps as the morphisms. We recall the following useful fact (see e.g. Escardó (1999)).

Lemma 4.8. *Let X be a spectral locale and let $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$ be two opens.*

$$U \leq V \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \prod_{K:\mathcal{O}(X)} K \text{ is compact} \rightarrow K \leq U \rightarrow K \leq V.$$

In the context of the definition of spectrality that we gave in Definition 4.5, where we have conditions ensuring that the compact opens form a small basis, it is natural to ask whether the basis in consideration is unique. This is indeed the case, but it is subtler than one might expect, and is proved in Theorem 4.17 below. We first need some preparation.

Given that the conditions in Definition 4.5 capture the idea of the compact opens behaving like a small basis closed under finite meets, one might wonder if the same notion can be formulated by starting with a small basis closed under finite meets and requiring it to consist of compact opens.

Definition 4.9 (Intensional spectral basis). An *intensional spectral basis* for a locale X is a small intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$ for the frame $\mathcal{O}(X)$ satisfying the following three conditions.

- (1) For every $i : I$, the open B_i is compact.
- (2) There is an index $t : B$ such that $B_t = \mathbf{1}_X$.
- (3) For any two $i, j : I$, there exists some $k : I$ such that $B_k = B_i \wedge B_j$.

We say that the basis is *extensional* if the map $B : I \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is an embedding. When we say *spectral basis* without any qualification, we mean an extensional spectral basis.

In Remark 3.8, we mentioned that a basis can always be directified by closing it under finite joins. The same applies to spectral bases as well since the join of a finite family of compact opens is compact.

Lemma 4.10. *Given any locale X with an intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$, every compact open of X falls in the basis, that is, for every compact open K , there exists an index $i : I$ such that $B_i = K$.*

Proof. Let $K : \mathcal{O}(X)$ be a compact open. As $(B_i)_{i:I}$ is an intensional basis, there must be a specified directed family $(i_j)_{j:J}$ on I such that $K = \bigvee_{j:J} B_{i_j}$. By the compactness of K , there must be some $k : J$ such that $K \leq B_{i_k}$. Clearly, $B_{i_k} \leq K$ is also the case, since K is an upper bound of the family $(B_{i_j})_{j:J}$, which means we have that $K = B_{i_k}$. \square

Lemma 4.11. *Given any locale X with an intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$ consisting of compact opens, we have an equivalence of types $\text{image}(B) \simeq \mathbf{K}(X)$.*

Lemma 4.12. *If a locale X has an unspecified, intensional, spectral, and small basis, then X is spectral.*

Proof. First, notice that the conclusion is a proposition since being spectral is a proposition (by Lemma 4.6). This means that we may appeal to the induction principle of propositional truncation and assume we have a specified intensional spectral basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$. We know that $\text{image}(B) \simeq \mathbf{K}(X)$ by Lemma 4.11, which is to say that the type $\mathbf{K}(X)$ is small, by the smallness of $\text{image}(B)$ (given by Lemma 3.9) meaning (SP4) is satisfied.

The top element is basic and hence compact so (SP1) holds. Given two compact opens K_1 and K_2 , they must be basic meaning there exist k_1, k_2 such that $K_1 = B_{k_1}$ and $K_2 = B_{k_2}$. Because the basis is closed under binary meets there must be some k_3 with $B_{k_3} = K_1 \wedge K_2$ which means condition (SP2) also holds.

For (SP3), consider an open $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We know that there is a specified a small family $(i_j)_{j:J}$ of indices such that $U = \bigvee_{j:J} B_{i_j}$. The subfamily $(B_{i_j})_{j:J}$ is then clearly a small directed family with each B_{i_j} compact which is what we needed. \square

Lemma 4.13. *If a locale X is spectral, then it has a specified, extensional, and spectral small basis.*

Proof. Let X be a spectral locale. We claim that the inclusion $\mathbf{K}(X) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$, which is formally given by the first projection, is an extensional and spectral small basis. The fact that it is small is given by (SP4). By (SP1) and (SP2), we know that this basis contains $\mathbf{1}_X$ and is closed under binary meets. It remains to show that it forms a basis. To define a covering family for an open $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$, we let the index type be the subtype of compact opens below U , which is again small by (SP4), and the family is again given by the first projection. It is clear that U is an upper bound of this family so it remains to show that it is its least upper bound. Consider some V that is an upper bound of this family. By Lemma 4.8, it suffices to show $K \leq U$ implies $K \leq V$, for every compact open K . Any such compact open $K \leq U$ is below U by construction, which implies $K \leq V$ since it is an upper bound. \square

Definition 4.14 (Extensionalization of an intensional basis). For an intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$ on a locale X , its *extensionalization*, is defined by taking the index set to be the $\text{image}(B)$, and the family to be the corestriction of B to its image, which is given by the first projection, and hence is an embedding.

Lemma 4.15. *If $(B_i)_{i:I}$ is a spectral basis, then so is its extensionalization.*

Lemma 4.16. *From an unspecified intensional spectral basis on a locale X we can obtain a specified extensional spectral basis.*

Proof. Let X be a locale with an unspecified intensional spectral basis. By Lemma 4.12, we know that it is spectral and therefore that it has a specified extensional basis by Lemma 4.13. \square

Recall that a type X is said to have *split support* if $\|X\| \rightarrow X$ (Kraus et al., 2017). With this terminology, the above lemma says that the type of intensional spectral bases on a locale X has split support.

Theorem 4.17. *The following are logically equivalent for any locale X .*

- (1) X is spectral.
- (2) X has an unspecified intensional small spectral basis.
- (3) X has an unspecified extensional small spectral basis.
- (4) The inclusion $\mathbf{K}(X) \hookrightarrow X$ is an extensional spectral basis, where to an open U we assign the directed family of compact opens below it as in the construction of Lemma 4.13.
- (5) X has a specified intensional small spectral basis.
- (6) X has a specified extensional small spectral basis.

Notice that the first four conditions are propositions, but the last two are not in general.

Proof. We have already established one direction of the logical equivalence (2) \leftrightarrow (5) in Lemma 4.16, and the other is the unit of propositional truncation. Every extensional basis is intensional, and so (6) \rightarrow (5) is clear. The implication (1) \rightarrow (6) is Lemma 4.13. By Corollary 4.11, we know that $\text{image}(B) \simeq \mathbf{K}(X)$ for any intensional spectral basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$. This implies that any extensional spectral basis is equivalent to the basis $\mathbf{K}(X) \hookrightarrow X$. Conversely, the inclusion $\mathbf{K}(X) \hookrightarrow X$ is always a small extensional basis, so that we get (6) \leftrightarrow (4). We also clearly have (6) \rightarrow (3) \rightarrow (2), which concludes our proof. \square

4.2. Stone locales. Clopenness is central to the notion of Stone locale, similar to the fundamental role played by the notion of a compact open in the definition of a spectral locale. To define the clopens, we first define the well-inside relation.

Definition 4.18 (The well-inside relation). We say that an open U of a locale X is *well inside* an open V , written $U \prec V$, if there is an open W with $U \wedge W = \mathbf{0}_X$ and $V \vee W = \mathbf{1}_X$.

Definition 4.19 (Clopen). An open U is called a *clopen* if it is well inside itself, which amounts to saying that it has a Boolean complement. We denote by $\mathbf{C}(X)$ the subtype of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ consisting of clopens.

Before we proceed to the definition of a Stone locale, we record the following fact about the well inside relation:

Lemma 4.20. *Given opens $U, V, W : \mathcal{O}(X)$ of a locale X ,*

- (1) *if $U \prec V$ and $V \leq W$ then $U \prec W$; and*
- (2) *if $U \leq V$ and $V \prec W$ then $U \prec W$.*

Definition 4.21 (Stone locale). A locale X is called *Stone* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (ST1) It is compact.
- (ST2) For any $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$, there exists a small directed family $(C_i)_{i:I}$, with each C_i clopen, such that $U = \bigvee_{i:I} C_i$.
- (ST3) The type $\mathbf{C}(X)$ is small.

Lemma 4.22. *For any locale X , being Stone is a proposition.*

Proof. Being compact is a proposition (Lemma 4.2) and being small is a proposition by Lemma 2.2 (assuming univalence). The condition (ST2) is a proposition since the \prod -type over a family of propositions is a proposition. \square

We denote by **Stone** the category of Stone locales with continuous maps as the morphisms. The defining frame homomorphism of any continuous map of Stone locales automatically preserves clopens.

The following two lemmas are needed to prove that the compact opens and the clopens coincide in Stone locales, which we will need later. The proofs are standard (Johnstone, 1982, Lemma VII.3.5). We provide the proof of Lemma 4.24 for the sake of self-containment, since it uses our reformulation of the notion of a Stone locale.

Lemma 4.23. *In any compact locale, $U \prec V$ implies $U \ll V$ for any two opens U, V .*

Lemma 4.24. *In any Stone locale, $U \ll V$ implies $U \prec V$ for any two opens U, V .*

Proof. Let $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$ with $U \ll V$. We know that $V = \bigvee_{i:I} C_i$ for a family $(C_i)_{i:I}$ consisting of clopens. Since $V \leq \bigvee_{i:I} C_i$, it must be the case that there is some $k : I$ with $U \leq C_k$ as we know $U \ll V$. We then have $U \leq C_k \prec V$ which implies $U \prec V$ by Lemma 4.20. \square

Lemma 4.25. *In any Stone locale, the type $\mathsf{K}(X) \simeq \mathsf{C}(X)$.*

Lemma 4.26. *Every Stone locale X is spectral.*

A consequence of Corollary 4.25 is that we immediately get a characterization of Stone locales analogous to the notion of intensional spectral basis that we gave in Definition 4.9.

Definition 4.27 (Basis of clopens). An *intensional basis of clopens* for a locale X is a small intensional basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$ for the frame $\mathcal{O}(X)$ that consists of clopens. We say that the basis is *extensional* if the map $B : I \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is an embedding. When we say *basis of clopens* without any qualification, we mean an extensional basis of clopens.

Notice that, because clopens are closed under finite joins, the directification of a basis of clopens is again a basis of clopens. For the next lemma, recall the notion of extensionalization given in Definition 4.14.

Lemma 4.28. *If $(B_i)_{i:I}$ is a basis of clopens, then so is its extensionalization.*

Lemma 4.29. *If a locale X is compact and has an unspecified, intensional, and small basis of clopens, then it is Stone.*

Proof. Since being Stone is a proposition (by Lemma 4.22), we can work with a specified basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$ with each B_i clopen. Condition (ST2) is immediate since any covering family given by the basis is a subfamily of $\mathsf{C}(X)$. It remains to show that $\mathsf{C}(X)$ is a small type (ST3). Let $C : \mathsf{C}(X)$. Since X is compact, C must be a compact open by Lemma 4.23, and hence must fall in the basis by Lemma 4.10. The other direction is direct by construction meaning $\mathsf{C}(X) \simeq \mathsf{image}(B)$, which concludes that $\mathsf{C}(X)$ is small by Remark 2.6. \square

Theorem 4.30. *The following are logically equivalent for any locale X .*

- (1) X is Stone.
- (2) X is compact and has an unspecified intensional small basis of clopens.
- (3) X is compact and has an unspecified extensional small basis of clopens.
- (4) X is compact and the inclusion $\mathsf{C}(X) \hookrightarrow X$ is an extensional basis of clopens, where to an open U we assign the family of all clopens below it.
- (5) X is compact has a specified intensional small basis of clopens.
- (6) X is compact has a specified extensional small basis of clopens.

Notice that the first four conditions are propositions, but the last two are not in general.

Proof. We know by Corollary 4.26 and Corollary 4.25 that every Stone locale X is spectral and has $\mathbf{K}(X) \simeq \mathbf{C}(X)$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.17, we know that $\mathbf{C}(X)$ is an extensional basis of clopens, which gives the implication (1) \rightarrow (4). The implications (4) \rightarrow (6) \rightarrow (5) \rightarrow (2) are direct, and the implication (2) \rightarrow (1) is Lemma 4.29. We also clearly have (6) \rightarrow (3) \rightarrow (2), which concludes our proof. \square

5. PREDICATIVE FORM OF THE POSETAL ADJOINT FUNCTOR THEOREM

We start with the definition of the notion of an adjunction in the simplified context of lattices.

Definition 5.1. Let (X, \leq_X) and (Y, \leq_Y) be two preordered sets. An adjunction between X and Y consists of a pair of monotonic maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow X$ satisfying

$$f \dashv g \quad \equiv \quad f(x) \leq y \leftrightarrow x \leq g(y) \text{ for all } x, y : X.$$

In locale theory, it is standard convention to denote by $f_* : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Y)$ the right adjoint of a frame homomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ corresponding to a continuous map of locales $f : X \rightarrow Y$. The right adjoint here is known to always exist thanks to a simple application of the Adjoint Functor Theorem which amounts to the definition:

$$f_*(U) \quad \equiv \quad \bigvee \{V : \mathcal{O}(Y) \mid f^*(V) \leq U\}.$$

In the predicative setting of type theory, however, it is not clear how the right adjoint of a frame homomorphism would be defined as the family $\{V : \mathcal{O}(Y) \mid f^*(V) \leq U\}$ might be too big in general. This gives rise to the problem that it is not *a priori* clear that its join in $\mathcal{O}(X)$ exists. To resolve this problem, we use the assumption of a small basis. The use of a small basis for the posetal Adjoint Functor Theorem in a predicative setting was independently observed by Tom de Jong (personal communication).

Theorem 5.2 (Posetal Adjoint Functor Theorem). *Let X and Y be two locales and let $h : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ be a monotone map of frames. Assume that Y has some small basis. The map h has a right adjoint if and only if it preserves the joins of small families.*

Proof. Let $h : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ be a monotone map of frames and assume that Y has a small basis $(B_i)_{i:I}$. The forward direction is easy: suppose h has a right adjoint $g : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Y)$ and let $(U_i)_{i:I}$ be a family in $\mathcal{O}(Y)$. By the uniqueness of joins, it is sufficient to show that $h(\bigvee_i U_i)$ is the join of the family $(h(U_i))_{i:I}$. It is clearly an upper bound by the fact that h is monotone. Given any other upper bound V of $(h(U_i))_{i:I}$, we have that $h(\bigvee_i U_i) \leq V$ since $h(\bigvee_i U_i) \leq V \leftrightarrow (\bigvee_i U_i) \leq g(V)$ meaning it is sufficient to show $U_i \leq g(V)$ for each U_i . Since $U_i \leq g(V)$ if and only if $h(U_i) \leq V$, we are done as the latter can be seen to hold directly from the fact that V is an upper bound of the family in consideration.

For the converse, suppose $h(\bigvee_i U_i) = \bigvee_{i:I} h(U_i)$ for every small family of opens $(U_i)_{i:I}$. We define the right adjoint of h as

$$g(U) \quad \equiv \quad \bigvee \{\beta(b) \mid i : I, h(B_i) \leq U\}.$$

We need to show that g is the right adjoint of h i.e. that

$$h(V) \leq U \leftrightarrow V \leq g(U)$$

for any two $V : \mathcal{O}(Y)$, $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$.

For the (\rightarrow) direction, assume $h(V) \leq U$. It must be the case that $V = \bigvee_{j:J} B_{i_j}$ for some specified covering family $(i_j)_{j:J}$. This means that we just have to show $B_{i_j} \leq g(U)$ for every $j : J$, which is the case since $h(B_{i_j}) \leq h(V) \leq U$.

For the (\leftarrow) direction, assume $V \leq g(U)$. This means that we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h(V) &\leq h(g(U)) \\ &= h\left(\bigvee \{B_i \mid i : I, h(B_i) \leq U\}\right) \\ &= \bigvee \{h(B_i) \mid i : I, h(B_i) \leq U\} \\ &\leq U \end{aligned}$$

so that $h(V) \leq U$, as required. \square

Our primary use case for the Adjoint Functor Theorem is the construction of Heyting implications in locally small frames with small bases.

Definition 5.3 (Heyting implication). Let X be a locale with some small basis. Given any open $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$, the map $(-) \wedge U : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ preserves joins by the frame distributivity law. This means, by Theorem 5.2, that it must have a right adjoint $U \Rightarrow (-) : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$. The operation $(-) \Rightarrow (-)$ is known as *Heyting implication*.

Definition 5.4. By Theorem 5.2, for any continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of locales where Y has an unspecified small basis, the frame homomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ has a right adjoint, denoted by

$$f_* : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Y).$$

Definition 5.5 (Perfect frame homomorphism). Let X and Y be two locales and assume that Y has an unspecified small basis. A continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be *perfect* if f_* is Scott continuous, that is, it preserves small directed suprema.

Let us also record the following fact about perfect maps that we will need later.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a perfect map where Y is a locale with some small basis. The frame homomorphism f^* respects the way below relation, that is, $U \ll V$ implies $f^*(U) \ll f^*(V)$, for any two $U, V : \mathcal{O}(Y)$.*

A proof of this fact can be found in (Escardó, 1999) and it works in our predicative setting.

Lemma 5.7. *Perfect maps are spectral as they preserve the compact opens.*

In fact, the converse is also true in the case of spectral locales. The proof given in (Escardó, 1999) works, once we know that the required adjoints are available, as established above. We include it in order to illustrate this point.

Lemma 5.8. *Let X and Y be locales and assume that Y has some small basis. A continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is perfect if and only if it is spectral.*

Proof. The forward direction is given by Corollary 5.7. For the backward direction, assume $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to be a spectral map. We have to show that the right adjoint $f_* : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Y)$ of its defining frame homomorphism is Scott continuous. Letting $(U_i)_{i:I}$ be a directed family in $\mathcal{O}(X)$, we show $f_*(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i) = \bigvee_{i:I} f_*(U_i)$. The $\bigvee_{i:I} f_*(U_i) \leq f_*(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i)$ direction is easy. For the $f_*(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} f_*(U_i)$ direction, we appeal to Lemma 4.8. Let K be a compact open with $K \leq f_*(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i)$. By the adjunction $f^* \dashv f_*$, it must be the case that $f^*(K) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} U_i$ and since $f^*(K)$ is compact, by the spectrality assumption of f^* , there must exist some $l : I$ such that $f^*(K) \leq U_l$. Again by adjointness, $K \leq f_*(U_l)$ which implies $K \leq \bigvee_{i:I} f_*(U_i)$. \square

6. MEET-SEMILATTICE OF SCOTT CONTINUOUS NUCLEI

In this section, we take the first step towards constructing the defining frame of the patch locale on a spectral locale i.e. the frame of Scott continuous nuclei. We start by constructing the meet-semilattice of *all* nuclei on a frame.

Lemma 6.1. *The type of nuclei on a given frame $\mathcal{O}(X)$ forms a meet-semilattice under the pointwise order.*

Proof. The top nucleus is defined as the constant map with value $\mathbf{1}_X$ and the meet of two nuclei as $j \wedge k := U \mapsto j(U) \wedge k(U)$. It is easy to see that $j \wedge k$ is the greatest lower bound of j and k so it remains to show that $j \wedge k$ satisfies the nucleus laws.

Inflationarity can be seen to be satisfied from the inflationarity of j and k combined with the fact that $j(U) \wedge k(U)$ is the greatest lower bound of $j(U)$ and $k(U)$. To see that meet preservation holds, let $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$; we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (j \wedge k)(U \wedge V) &= j(U \wedge V) \wedge k(U \wedge V) \\ &= j(U) \wedge j(V) \wedge k(U) \wedge k(V) \\ &= (j(U) \wedge k(U)) \wedge (j(V) \wedge k(V)) \\ &= (j \wedge k)(U) \wedge (j \wedge k)(V) \end{aligned}$$

For idempotency, let $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} (j \wedge k)((j \wedge k)(U)) &= j(j(U) \wedge k(U)) \wedge k(j(U) \wedge k(U)) \\ &= j(j(U)) \wedge j(k(U)) \wedge k(j(U)) \wedge k(k(U)) \\ &\leq j(j(U)) \wedge k(k(U)) \\ &= j(U) \wedge k(U) \\ &= (j \wedge k)(U) \end{aligned}$$

□

We now show that this meet-semilattice can be *refined* to the Scott continuous nuclei (i.e. the *perfect* nuclei).

Lemma 6.2. *The Scott continuous nuclei on any locale form a meet-semilattice.*

Proof. Let X be a locale. The construction is the same as the one from Lemma 6.1; the top element is constant map with value $\mathbf{1}_X$, which is trivially Scott continuous so it remains to show that the meet of two Scott continuous nuclei is Scott continuous. Consider two Scott continuous nuclei j and k on $\mathcal{O}(X)$ and a directed small family $(U_i)_{i:I}$. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} (j \wedge k) \left(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i \right) &\equiv j \left(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i \right) \wedge k \left(\bigvee_{j:I} U_j \right) \\ &= \left(\bigvee_{i:I} j(U_i) \right) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{j:I} k(U_j) \right) \quad [\text{Scott continuity of } j \text{ and } k] \\ &= \bigvee_{(i,j):I \times I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_j) \quad [\text{distributivity}] \\ &= \bigvee_{i:I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_i) \quad [\dagger] \\ &\equiv \bigvee_{i:I} (j \wedge k)(U_i) \quad [\text{meet preservation}] \end{aligned}$$

where, for the (\dagger) step, we use antisymmetry. The (\geq) direction is immediate. For the (\leq) direction, we need to show that $\bigvee_{(i,j):I \times I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_j) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_i)$, for which it suffices to show that $\bigvee_{i:I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_i)$ is an upper bound of $\{j(U_i) \wedge k(U_j)\}_{(i,j):I \times I}$. Let $m, n : I$ be two indices. As $(U_i)_{i:I}$ is directed, there must exist some o such that U_o is an upper bound of $\{U_m, U_n\}$. Using the monotonicity of j and k , we get $j(U_m) \wedge k(U_n) \leq j(U_o) \wedge k(U_o) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} j(U_i) \wedge k(U_i)$ as desired. \square

7. JOINS IN THE FRAME OF SCOTT CONTINUOUS NUCLEI

The nontrivial component of the patch frame construction is the join of a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of Scott continuous nuclei, as the pointwise join fails to be idempotent in general, and not inflationary when the family in consideration is empty. When the family in consideration is directed, however, the pointwise join is idempotent, and so it is the join in the poset of Scott continuous nuclei.

Lemma 7.1. *Given a directed family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of Scott continuous nuclei, their join is computed pointwise, that is, $(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i)(U) = \bigvee_{i:I} k_i(U)$.*

Proof. The argument given in the paragraph preceding (Escardó, 1998, Lemma 3.1.8) works in our setting. \square

Regarding arbitrary joins, the situation is more complicated. A construction of the join, due to Escardó (1998), is based on the idea that, if we start with a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of nuclei, we can consider the family with index type $\text{List}(I)$ of words over I , defined by

$$(i_0 i_1 \cdots i_{n-1}) \mapsto k_{i_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ k_{i_1} \circ k_{i_0}.$$

This family is easily seen to be directed.

To talk about such families of finite compositions over a given family of (pre)nuclei, we adopt the following notation.

- ε denotes the empty word.
- Given words $s : \text{List}(I)$ and $t : \text{List}(I)$, the concatenation is denoted by st .

To define the join operation, we will use the iterated composition function k that we define as follows:

Definition 7.2 (Family of finite compositions). Given a small family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of nuclei on a given locale X , its *family of finite compositions* is the family defined by

$$k^*(i_0 \cdots i_{n-1}) \quad ::= \quad k_{i_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ k_{i_0}.$$

By an abuse of notation, we omit the superscript “ $*$ ” when there is no possibility of confusion.

The order of composition is actually not important. A finite composition k_s is, in general, not a nucleus. It is, however, always a prenucleus which we prove below.

Lemma 7.3. *Given a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of nuclei on a locale, k_s is a prenucleus for every $s : \text{List}(I)$.*

Proof. If $s = \varepsilon$, we are done as it is immediate that the identity function id is a prenucleus. If $s = is'$, we need to show that $k_{s'} \circ k_i$ is a prenucleus. For meet preservation, let $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$.

$$\begin{aligned} (k_{s'} \circ k_i)(U \wedge V) &= k_{s'}(k_i(U \wedge V)) \\ &= k_{s'}(k_i(U) \wedge k_i(V)) && [k_i \text{ is a nucleus}] \\ &= k_{s'}(k_i(U)) \wedge k_{s'}(k_i(V)) && [\text{inductive hypothesis}] \\ &= (k_{s'} \circ k_i)(U) \wedge (k_{s'} \circ k_i)(V) \end{aligned}$$

For inflationarity, consider some $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We have that $U \leq k_i(U) \leq k_{s'}(k_i(U))$, by the inflationarity property of k_i and the inductive hypothesis. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Given a nucleus j and a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of nuclei on a locale, if j is an upper bound then it is also an upper bound of the family of finite compositions.*

Proof. Let j and $(k_i)_{i:I}$ be, respectively, a nucleus and a family of nuclei on a locale. Let $s : \text{List}(I)$. We proceed by induction on s . If $s = \varepsilon$, we have that $\text{id}(U) \equiv U \leq j(U)$. If $s = is'$, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} k_{s'}(k_i(U)) &\leq k_{s'}(j(U)) \quad [\text{monotonicity of } k_{s'} \text{ (Lemma 7.3 and monotonicity of prenuclei)}] \\ &\leq j(j(U)) \quad [\text{IH}] \\ &\leq j(U) \quad [\text{idempotency of } j] \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.5. *Given a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of Scott continuous nuclei on a locale, the prenucleus k_s is Scott continuous, for every $s : \text{List}(I)$*

Proof. Any composition of finitely many Scott continuous functions is Scott continuous. □

Lemma 7.6. *Given a family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of nuclei on a locale, the family of finite compositions is directed.*

Proof. The family $(k_s)_{s:\text{List}(I)}$ is indeed always inhabited by the identity nucleus given by k_ε . The upper bound of nuclei k_s and k_t is given by k_{st} , which is equal to $k_t \circ k_s$. The fact that this is an upper bound of $\{k_s, k_t\}$ follows from monotonicity and inflationarity. □

Lemma 7.7. *Let j be a nucleus and $(k_s)_{s:\text{List}(I)}$ a family of nuclei on a locale X . Consider the family of finite compositions over the family $(j \wedge k_i)_{i:I}$. Each finite composition $(j \wedge k)_s^*$ is a lower bound of $\{k_s, j\}$ for every $s : \text{List}(I)$.*

We are now ready to construct the join operation in the meet-semilattice of Scott continuous nuclei hence defining the patch frame $\mathcal{O}(\text{Patch}(X))$ of the frame of a locale X .

Theorem 7.8 (Join of Scott continuous nuclei). *Let $(k_i)_{i:I}$ be a family of Scott continuous nuclei. The join of K can be calculated as*

$$\left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i \right) (U) \equiv \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U).$$

Proof. It must be checked that this is (1) indeed the join, (2) is a Scott continuous nucleus i.e. it is inflationary, binary-meet-preserving, idempotent, and Scott continuous. The inflationarity property is direct. For meet preservation, consider

some $U, V : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right)(U \wedge V) &= \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U \wedge V) \\
&= \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U) \wedge k_s(V) && \text{[Lemma 7.5]} \\
&= \bigvee_{s,t:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U) \wedge k_t(V) && [\dagger] \\
&= \left(\bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U)\right) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{t:\text{List}(I)} k_t(V)\right) && \text{[distributivity]} \\
&= \left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right)(U) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right)(V)
\end{aligned}$$

where step (\dagger) uses antisymmetry. The (\leq) direction is direct whereas for the (\geq) direction, we show that $\bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U) \wedge k_s(V)$ is an upper bound of the family $(k_s(U) \wedge k_t(V))_{s,t:\text{List}(I)}$. Consider arbitrary $s, t : \text{List}(I)$. By the directedness of the family of finite compositions we know that there exists some $u : \text{List}(I)$ such that k_u is an upper bound of $\{k_s, k_t\}$. We then have

$$k_s(U) \wedge k_t(V) \leq k_u(U) \wedge k_u(V) \leq \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U) \wedge k_s(V).$$

For idempotency, let $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\bigvee_i k_i\right) \left(\left(\bigvee_i k_i\right)(U)\right) &\equiv \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s \left(\bigvee_{t:\text{List}(I)} k_t(U)\right) \\
&= \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} \bigvee_{t:\text{List}(I)} k_s(k_t(U)) && \text{[Lemma 7.5]} \\
&\leq \bigvee_{s,t:\text{List}(I)} k_s(k_t(U)) \\
&\leq \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U) && [\dagger] \\
&\equiv \left(\bigvee_i k_i\right)(U),
\end{aligned}$$

where for the step (\dagger) it suffices to show that $\bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U)$ is an upper bound of the family $(k_s(k_t(U)))_{s,t:\text{List}(I)}$. The prenucleus k_{st} is an upper bound of k_s and k_t (as in Lemma 7.6). We have that

$$k_s(k_t(U)) = k_{st}(U) \leq \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U).$$

For Scott continuity, let $(U_j)_{j:J}$ be a directed family over $\mathcal{O}(X)$. We then have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right) \left(\bigvee_{j:J} U_j\right) &\equiv \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s \left(\bigvee_{j:J} U_j\right) \\
&= \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} \bigvee_{j:J} k_s(U_j) && \text{[Lemma 7.5]} \\
&= \bigvee_{j:J} \bigvee_{s:\text{List}(I)} k_s(U_j) && \text{[joins commute]} \\
&\equiv \bigvee_{j:J} \left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right)(U_j)
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

The fact that $\bigvee_i k_i$ is an upper bound of $(k_i)_{i:I}$ is easy to verify. To see that it is *the least* upper bound, consider a Scott continuous nucleus j that is an upper bound of $(k_i)_{i:I}$. Let $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. We need to show that $(\bigvee_i k_i)(U) \leq j(U)$. We know by Lemma 7.4 that j is an upper bound of the family of finite compositions, since it is an upper bound of $(k_i)_{i:I}$, which is to say $k_s(U) \leq j(U)$ for every $s : \text{List}(I)$ i.e. $j(U)$ is an upper bound of the family $(k_s(U))_{s:\text{List}(I)}$. Since $(\bigvee_i k_i)(U)$ is the least upper bound of this family by definition, it follows that it is below $j(U)$. \square

We use Lemma 7.7 to prove the distributivity law.

Lemma 7.9 (Distributivity). *For any Scott continuous nucleus j and any family $(k_i)_{i:I}$ of Scott continuous nuclei, we have the equality:*

$$j \wedge \left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i\right) = \bigvee_{i:I} j \wedge k_i.$$

It follows that the Scott continuous nuclei form a frame.

Definition 7.10 (Patch locale of a spectral locale). The *patch locale* of a spectral locale X , written $\text{Patch}(X)$, is given by the frame of Scott continuous nuclei on X .

Notice that the truth value of the relation $j \leq k$ between Scott continuous nuclei lives by default in the universe \mathcal{U}^+ . However, it has an equivalent copy in the universe \mathcal{U} :

Lemma 7.11. *For any spectral locale X and any two nuclei $j, k : \text{Patch}(X)$, we have that*

$$j \leq k \text{ if and only if } j(K) \leq k(K) \text{ for all } K : \mathbf{K}(X),$$

and hence $\text{Patch}(X)$ is locally small.

Proof. The usual pointwise ordering obviously implies the basic ordering so we address the other direction. Let j and k be two Scott continuous nuclei on a spectral locale X and assume $j(K) \leq k(K)$, for all $K : \mathbf{K}(X)$. We need to show that $j(U) \leq k(U)$ for every open U so let $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$. By (SP3), U can be decomposed as $U = \bigvee_{i:I} K_i$ for some directed covering family $(K_i)_{i:I}$ consisting of compact opens. We then have $j(\bigvee_{i:I} K_i) = \bigvee_{i:I} j(K_i)$ by Scott continuity and

$$\bigvee_{i:I} j(K_i) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} k(K_i)$$

since $j(K_i) \leq k(K_i)$ for every $i : I$. Finally, because the quantification is over the small type $\mathbf{K}(X)$, the proposition “ $j(K) \leq k(K)$ for all $K : \mathbf{K}(X)$ ” is small. \square

8. THE COREFLECTION PROPERTY OF Patch

We prove in this section that our construction of **Patch** has the desired universal property: it exhibits **Stone** as a coreflective subcategory of **Spec**. The notions of *closed* and *open* nuclei are crucial for proving the universal property. We first give the definitions of these. Let U be an open of a locale X ;

- (1) The *closed nucleus* induced by U is the map $V \mapsto U \vee V$;
- (2) The *open nucleus* induced by U is the map $V \mapsto U \Rightarrow V$.

We denote the closed nucleus induced by open U by $\mathbf{c}(U)$ and the open nucleus induced by U by $\mathbf{o}(U)$.

Lemma 8.1. *For any spectral locale X and any monotone map $h : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$, if for every $U : \mathcal{O}(X)$ and compact $K : \mathcal{O}(X)$ with $K \leq h(U)$, there is some compact $K' \leq U$ such that $K \leq h(K')$, then h is Scott continuous*

Proof. It suffices to show the relation $h(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} h(U_i)$ holds. Since X is spectral, let $(K_j)_{j:J}$ be a small family of compact opens such that $\bigvee_{j:J} K_j = h(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i)$. For any $j : J$, we have $K_j \leq h(\bigvee_{i:I} U_i)$, so by assumption there is a compact open $K \leq \bigvee_{i:I} U_i$ such that $K_j \leq h(K)$. By compactness of K there is an $i : I$ such that $K \leq U_i$, and so $K_j \leq h(K) \leq h(U_i) \leq \bigvee_{i:I} h(U_i)$ and so we can take $K' := K_j$. \square

Lemma 8.2. *For any open of any locale, the closed nucleus $\mathbf{c}(U)$ is Scott continuous, whereas the open nucleus $\mathbf{o}(U)$ is Scott continuous if the open U is compact.*

Proof. The Scott continuity of the closed nucleus is easy to see. For the open nucleus, let D be a compact open of a locale. By Lemma 8.1, it is sufficient to show that for any open V and any compact open C_1 with $C_1 \leq D \Rightarrow V$, there exists some compact $C_2 \leq D$ such that $C_1 \leq D \Rightarrow C_2$. Let V and C_1 be two opens with C_1 compact and satisfying $C_1 \leq D \Rightarrow V$. Pick $C_2 := D \wedge C_1$. We know that this is compact by (SP2). It remains to check (1) $C_2 \leq V$ and (2) $C_1 \leq D \Rightarrow C_2$, both of which are direct. \square

In Lemma 8.4, we prove that the map whose inverse image sends an open U to the closed nucleus $\mathbf{c}(U)$ is perfect. Before Lemma 8.4, we record an auxiliary result:

Lemma 8.3. *Let X be a spectral locale. The right adjoint $\varepsilon_* : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(X)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ to the closed-nucleus formation operation $\mathbf{c}(-)$ is given by $\varepsilon_*(j) = j(\mathbf{0})$ for every Scott continuous nucleus j on X .*

The proof of Lemma 8.3 can be found in Escardó (1999). It is omitted here as it is unchanged in our predicative setting.

Lemma 8.4. *The function $\mathbf{c}(-)$ is a perfect frame homomorphism $\mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(X))$.*

Proof. We have to show that the right adjoint ε_* of $\mathbf{c}(-)$ is Scott continuous. Let $(k_i)_{i:I}$ be a directed family of Scott continuous nuclei. Thanks to Lemma 8.3, it suffices to show

$$\left(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i \right) (\mathbf{0}) = \bigvee_{i:I} \varepsilon_*(k_i).$$

By Lemma 7.1, we have that $(\bigvee_{i:I} k_i) (\mathbf{0}) = \bigvee_{i:I} k_i(\mathbf{0})$. \square

This function defines a continuous map $\varepsilon : \mathbf{Patch}(X) \rightarrow X$, which we will show to be the counit of the coreflection in consideration.

8.1. Patch is Stone. Before we proceed to showing that the patch locale has the desired universal property, we first need to show that $\text{Patch}(X)$ is Stone for any spectral locale X . For this purpose, we need to (1) show that it is compact, and (2) construct a basis for it consisting of clopens. We start with compactness.

Lemma 8.5. *Patch(X) is a compact locale for any spectral locale X .*

Proof. Recall that the top element $\mathbf{1}$ of $\text{Patch}(X)$ is defined as $\mathbf{1}_{\text{Patch}} := U \mapsto \mathbf{1}_X$. Because ε^* is a frame homomorphism, it must be the case that $\mathbf{1}_{\text{Patch}} = \varepsilon^*(\mathbf{1}_X)$ meaning it suffices to show $\varepsilon^*(\mathbf{1}_X) \ll \varepsilon^*(\mathbf{1}_X)$. By Lemma 5.6, it suffices to show $\mathbf{1}_X \ll \mathbf{1}_X$ which is immediate by (SP1). \square

To construct a basis consisting of clopens, we will use the following fact, which was already mentioned above:

Lemma 8.6. *The open nucleus $\mathbf{o}(U)$ is the Boolean complement of the closed nucleus $\mathbf{c}(U)$.*

Lemma 8.7. *Let X be a spectral locale. Given any perfect nucleus $j : \text{Patch}(X)$, we have that*

$$j = \bigvee_{K:\mathbb{K}(X)} \mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K) = \bigvee_{\substack{K_1, K_2:\mathbb{K}(X) \\ K_1 \leq j(K_2)}} \mathbf{c}(j(K_1)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K_2).$$

Proof. The second equality in the statement is clear, so let us show the first one. We use the fact, proved in (Johnstone, 1982, Lemma II.2.7), that for any nucleus j on any locale,

$$j = \bigvee_{U:\mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbf{c}(j(U)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(U).$$

Suppose now additionally that X is spectral and the nucleus j is Scott continuous. The inequality $\bigvee_{K:\mathbb{K}(X)} \mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K) \leq \bigvee_{U:\mathcal{O}(X)} \mathbf{c}(j(U)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(U) = j$ is trivial, so let us show the reverse one. Let $K : \mathbb{K}(X)$ and notice that $(\mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K))(K) = (j(K) \vee K) \wedge (K \Rightarrow K) = j(K)$. Therefore

$$j(K) = (\mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K))(K) \leq \left(\bigvee_{K':\mathbb{K}(X)} \mathbf{c}(j(K')) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K') \right)(K),$$

so the required relation follows from Lemma 7.11. \square

Theorem 8.8. *Patch(X) is a Stone locale, for every spectral locale X .*

Proof. Compactness (ST1) was given in Lemma 8.5. For (ST2), let $j : \text{Patch}(X)$. We take the intensional basis

$$\begin{aligned} B &::= (\mathbf{c}(K_1) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K_2))_{(K_1, K_2):(\mathbb{K}(X) \times \mathbb{K}(X))} \\ I_j &::= \left(\left(\sum_{K_1, K_2:\mathbb{K}(X)} K_1 \leq j(K_2) \right), \gamma \right) \text{ where,} \\ \gamma(K_1, K_2) &::= \mathbf{c}(K_1) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K_2) \end{aligned}$$

Even though this family is not a priori directed, we know that it can be directified as explained in Remark 3.8. We therefore obtain a specified, small, intensional basis of clopens by Lemma 8.7. We denote the directed form of the basis by B^\uparrow which is small by Remark 3.8 since $\mathbb{K}(X)$ is small by (SP4). Since in a compact locale, clopens are compact by Lemma 4.23, and so the clopens fall in the basis by Lemma 4.10. Therefore, we get the equivalence of types

$$\mathbb{C}(X) \simeq \text{image}(B^\uparrow),$$

which concludes (ST3) by Lemma 3.9. \square

8.2. The universal property of Patch. We now show that **Patch** is the right adjoint to the inclusion **Stone** \hookrightarrow **Spec**.

Lemma 8.9. *Given any spectral map $f : X \rightarrow A$ from a Stone locale into a spectral locale, define a map $\bar{f}^* : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ by*

$$\bar{f}^*(j) \quad \equiv \quad \bigvee_{K:\mathbf{K}(A)} f^*(j(K)) \wedge \neg f^*(K).$$

Then, the map $\bar{f}_ : \mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A))$ defined by*

$$\bar{f}_*(V) \quad \equiv \quad f_* \circ \mathbf{c}(V) \circ f^*$$

is the right adjoint of \bar{f}^ .*

Proof. First, note that $f_* \circ \mathbf{c}(V) \circ f^*$ is indeed a Scott continuous nucleus, and both \bar{f}^* and \bar{f}_* are clearly monotone. Let us first prove the forward implication. Assume that for $j : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A))$ and $V : \mathcal{O}(X)$ the relation $\bar{f}^*(j) \leq V$ holds. By Lemma 7.11, in order to show that $j \leq \bar{f}_*(V)$, it suffices to show that for any compact open $K : \mathbf{K}(A)$, the inequality $j(K) \leq \bar{f}_*(V)(K)$ holds. Hence, let $K : \mathbf{K}(A)$, and note that

$$f^*(j(K)) \wedge \neg f^*(K) \leq \bar{f}^*(j) \leq V$$

Notice that $f^*(K)$ is clopen, by the fact that f^* is a spectral map and Lemma 4.24. It is therefore complemented in the lattice $\mathcal{O}(X)$, and so we have $f^*(j(K)) \leq V \vee f^*(K) = \mathbf{c}(V)(f^*(K))$, which by adjunction yields $j(K) \leq f_*(\mathbf{c}(V)(f^*(K))) = \bar{f}_*(V)(K)$, as required.

Let us now show the reverse implication. Let $j : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A))$ and $V : \mathcal{O}(X)$ and assume that $j \leq \bar{f}_*(V)$. Once again, by the definition of the ordering on $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A))$, for all $K : \mathbf{K}(A)$ we have $j(K) \leq f_*(V \vee f^*(K))$, which by adjunction equivalently yields $f^*(j(K)) \leq V \vee f^*(K)$. Since $f^*(K)$ is clopen, and hence complemented in the lattice $\mathcal{O}(X)$ it follows that $f^*(j(K)) \wedge \neg f^*(K) \leq V$. Hence, $\bar{f}^*(j) \leq V$. \square

Theorem 8.10. *Given any spectral map $f : X \rightarrow A$ from a Stone locale into a spectral locale, there exists a unique spectral map $\bar{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Patch}(A)$ satisfying $\varepsilon \circ \bar{f} = f$, as illustrated in the following diagram in **Spec**:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & & \\ f \downarrow & \searrow \bar{f} & \\ A & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon} & \mathbf{Patch}(A) \end{array}$$

Proof. Assume that a locale map $\bar{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Patch}(A)$ satisfies the condition in the theorem. Then, for any $j : \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Patch}(A))$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}^*(j) &= \bar{f}^* \left(\bigvee_{K:\mathbf{K}(A)} \mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K) \right) && \text{[Lemma 8.7]} \\ &= \bigvee_{K:\mathbf{K}(A)} \bar{f}^*(\mathbf{c}(j(K)) \wedge \mathbf{o}(K)) && \text{[}\bar{f}^* \text{ preserves small joins]} \\ &= \bigvee_{K:\mathbf{K}(A)} \bar{f}^*(\mathbf{c}(j(K))) \wedge \neg \bar{f}^*(\mathbf{c}(K)) && \text{[}\bar{f}^* \text{ preserves binary meets and complements]} \\ &= \bigvee_{K:\mathbf{K}(A)} f^*(j(K)) \wedge \neg f^*(K) && \text{[commutativity of the diagram]} \end{aligned}$$

and hence \bar{f} is uniquely determined. If we now define a monotone map $\bar{f}^* : \mathcal{O}(\text{Patch}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ by

$$\bar{f}^*(j) \quad := \quad \bigvee_{K:\mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(j(K)) \wedge \neg f^*(K),$$

it is easy to show it preserves the top element (namely the top nucleus with constant value $\mathbf{1}_A$) because $\mathbf{0}_A$ is compact. It also preserves binary (pointwise) meets as

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{f}^*(j_1) \wedge \bar{f}^*(j_2) \\ &= \bigvee_{K_1, K_2: \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(j_1(K_1)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_1) \wedge f^*(j_2(K_2)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_2) && \text{[distributivity]} \\ &= \bigvee_{K_1, K_2: \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(j_1(K_1) \wedge j_2(K_2)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_1) \wedge \neg f^*(K_2) && \text{[} f^* \text{ preserves binary meets]} \\ &\leq \bigvee_{K_1, K_2: \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(j_1(K_1 \vee K_2) \wedge j_2(K_1 \vee K_2)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_1) \wedge \neg f^*(K_2) && \text{[monotonicity]} \\ &= \bigvee_{K_1, K_2: \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*((j_1 \wedge j_2)(K_1 \vee K_2)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_1) \wedge \neg f^*(K_2) \\ &= \bigvee_{K_1, K_2: \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*((j_1 \wedge j_2)(K_1 \vee K_2)) \wedge \neg f^*(K_1 \vee K_2) && \text{[De Morgan law]} \\ &= \bar{f}^*(j_1 \wedge j_2). && \text{[} \mathbb{K}(X) \text{ closed under } (-) \wedge (-) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Lemma 8.9 and Theorem 5.2 ensure that \bar{f}^* preserves small joins and so it is a frame homomorphism.

Let us finally show that \bar{f} makes the diagram commute. Since compact opens form a small basis of A , it suffices to show that $\bar{f}^*(\mathbf{c}(K)) = f^*(K)$ for any $K : \mathbb{K}(A)$. Let $K : \mathbb{K}(A)$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}^*(\mathbf{c}(K)) &= \bigvee_{K': \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(K \vee K') \wedge \neg f^*(K') \\ &= \bigvee_{K': \mathbb{K}(A)} f^*(K) \wedge \neg f^*(K') && \text{[} f^* \text{ preserves binary joins]} \\ &= f^*(K) \wedge \bigvee_{K': \mathbb{K}(A)} \neg f^*(K') && \text{[distributivity]} \\ &= f^*(K) \wedge \mathbf{1}_X && \text{[} \mathbf{0}_X \text{ is compact]} \\ &= f^*(K), \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

9. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have constructed the patch locale of a spectral locale in the predicative and constructive setting of univalent type theory. Furthermore, we have shown that the patch functor

$$\text{Patch} : \mathbf{Spec} \rightarrow \mathbf{Stone}$$

is the right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathbf{Stone} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Spec}$ which is to say that **Patch** exhibits the category **Stone** as a coreflective subcategory of **Spec**. As we have elaborated on in Section 4, answering this question in a predicative setting involves several new ingredients, compared to Escardó (1999, 2001):

- (1) We have reformulated the notions of spectrality and Stone-ness in our predicative type-theoretic setting and have shown that crucial topological facts about these notions remain valid under these reformulations.

- (2) We have developed several notions that capture the locale-theoretic notion of a basis and have shown their equivalences in Theorem 4.17 and in Theorem 4.30.
- (3) In Escardó's (1999) construction of the patch locale, the proof of the universal property relies on the existence of the frame of *all* nuclei. As it is not clear that the poset of all nuclei can be shown to form a frame predicatively, we developed a new proof of the universal property using Lemma 8.9, which is completely independent of the existence of the frame of all nuclei.

We have formalized all of our development, most importantly Theorem 8.8 and Theorem 8.10. The formalization has been carried out by the third-named author (Tosun, 2023) as part of the `TYPE TOPOLOGY` library (Escardó and contributors, 2023).

In previous work (Escardó, 1999, 2001), which forms the basis of the present work, the patch construction was used to

- (1) exhibit **Stone** as a coreflective subcategory of **Spec**, and
- (2) exhibit the category of compact regular locales and continuous maps as a coreflective subcategory of of stably compact locales and perfect maps.

In our work, we have focused on item (1). The question of taking a predicative approach to item (2) was previously tackled by Coquand and Zhang (2003) using formal topology. We conjecture that it is possible to instead use the approach we have presented here, namely, working with locales with small bases and constructing the patch as the frame of Scott continuous nuclei. It should also be possible to show predicatively that the category of small distributive lattices is dually equivalent to the category of spectral locales as defined in this paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first-named author acknowledges support from the Basque Government (grant IT1483-22 and a postdoctoral fellowship of the Basque Government, grant POS-2022-1-0015).

REFERENCES

- Adámek, J. and Rosický, J. 1994. *Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press.
- Coquand, T., Sambin, G., Smith, J., and Valentini, S. 2003. Inductively generated formal topologies. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 124(1):71–106.
- Coquand, T. and Tosun, A. 2021. Formal topology and univalent foundations. In *Proof and Computation II*, chapter 6, pp. 255–266.
- Coquand, T. and Zhang, G.-Q. 2003. A representation of stably compact spaces, and patch topology. 305(1):77–84.
- de Jong, T. 2023. *Domain theory in constructive and predicative univalent foundations*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.
- de Jong, T. and Escardó, M. H. 2021. Predicative aspects of order theory in univalent foundations. In Kobayashi, N., editor, *6th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2021)*, volume 195 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 8:1–8:18. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- de Jong, T. and Escardó, M. H. 2021. Domain theory in constructive and predicative univalent foundations. In Baier, C. and Goubault-Larrecq, J., editors, *29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2021)*, volume 183 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 28:1–28:18. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.

- Escardó, M. H.** 1998. Properly injective spaces and function spaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 89(1):75–120.
- Escardó, M. H.** 1999. On the Compact-regular Coreflection of a Stably Compact Locale. In *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, volume 20, pp. 213–228.
- Escardó, M. H.** 2001. The regular-locally compact coreflection of a stably locally compact locale. *Journal of pure and applied algebra*, 157(1):41–55.
- Escardó, M. H. and contributors** 2023. TypeTopology. Agda development.
- Johnstone, P. T.** 1982. *Stone Spaces*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnstone, P. T.** 2002. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium*, volume 1 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, Oxford OX2 6DP, UK.
- Kraus, N., Escardó, M. H., Coquand, T., and Altenkirch, T.** 2017. Notions of anonymous existence in Martin-Löf Type Theory. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 13(1).
- Mac Lane, S. and Moerdijk, I.** 1994. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic*. Universitext. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Norell, U.** 2009. Dependently typed programming in Agda. In **Koopman, P., Plasmeijer, R., and Swierstra, D.**, editors, *Advanced Functional Programming: 6th International School, AFP 2008, Heijen, The Netherlands, May 2008, Revised Lectures*, pp. 230–266. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Sambin, G.** 1987. Intuitionistic Formal Spaces — A First Communication. In **Skordev, D. G.**, editor, *Mathematical Logic and Its Applications*, pp. 187–204. Springer US.
- The Univalent Foundations Program** 2013. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.
- Tosun, A.** 2023. Formalization of locale theory in univalent mathematics in AGDA. Part of the TypeTopology library. HTML rendering of AGDA code available at <https://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~mhe/TypeTopology/Locales.index.html>.
- Tosun, A. and Escardó, M. H.** 2023. Patch Locale of a Spectral Locale in Univalent Type Theory. In *Proceedings of MFPS XXXVIII*, volume 1 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Informatics and Computer Science*.
- Voevodsky, V.** 2011. Resizing rules – their use and semantic justification. Invited talk at TYPES 2011.