

THE PRINCIPLE OF POINTFREE CONTINUITY

KAWAI TATSUJI AND GIOVANNI SAMBIN

Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology 1-1 Asahidai, Nomi, Ishikawa 923-1292, Japan
e-mail address: tatsuji.kawai@jaist.ac.jp

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Padova, via Trieste 63, 35121 (PD) Italy
e-mail address: sambin@math.unipd.it

ABSTRACT. In the setting of constructive pointfree topology, we introduce a notion of continuous operation between pointfree topologies and the corresponding principle of pointfree continuity. An operation between points of pointfree topologies is continuous if it is induced by a relation between the bases of the topologies; this gives a rigorous condition for Brouwer’s continuity principle to hold. The principle of pointfree continuity for pointfree topologies \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} says that any relation which induces a continuous operation between points is a morphism from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} . The principle holds under the assumption of bi-spatiality of \mathcal{S} . When \mathcal{S} is the formal Baire space or the formal unit interval and \mathcal{T} is the formal topology of natural numbers, the principle is equivalent to spatiality of the formal Baire space and formal unit interval, respectively. Some of the well-known connections between spatiality, bar induction, and compactness of the unit interval are recast in terms of our principle of continuity.

We adopt the Minimalist Foundation as our constructive foundation, and positive topology as the notion of pointfree topology. This allows us to distinguish ideal objects from constructive ones, and in particular, to interpret choice sequences as points of the formal Baire space.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a number of writings, Brouwer analysed functions from choice sequences to the natural numbers, and claimed that every total function on choice sequences is continuous in a very strong sense (see e.g. Brouwer [3]). As a corollary, he obtained the continuity theorem of real numbers: every total function on the unit interval is uniformly continuous. In more recent accounts of Brouwer’s intuitionism (e.g. Kleene and Vesley [16]), it is common to decompose Brouwer’s analysis into two principles: continuity principle and bar induction.¹ Continuity principle says that every total function from choice sequences to the natural numbers is pointwise continuous, while bar induction says that every monotone bar is an inductive bar (cf. Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Chapter 4]).

Key words and phrases: constructive mathematics; pointfree topology; continuity principle; spatiality; choice sequences; Baire space; real numbers.

¹There are many variations of these principles, depending on the strength of continuity and complexity of bars. The versions of continuity principle and bar induction that we present here are deliberately chosen to suite our aims.

The aim of this paper is to show that continuity principle can be maintained if we take seriously the constructive and pointfree approach to topology [22, 25], while bar induction is the principle which is exactly needed to bridge the gap between pointwise continuity and pointfree continuity.

As to the first claim, in the constructive pointfree topology, a point appears as a set of its formal neighbourhoods. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that every constructively defined operation on the collection of points must be induced by a relation between the formal neighbourhoods of the relevant pointfree topologies. Actually, one of the main points of this paper is that every pointwise continuous operation between points of pointfree topologies is induced by a relation between formal neighbourhoods, and conversely if a relation between formal neighbourhoods gives rise to a total operation between points, then such operation is automatically pointwise continuous. Hence, we obtain continuity for free if we start from a relation between formal neighbourhoods; see Theorem 2.12.

Given two pointfree topologies \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , it is then natural to ask whether a relation from formal neighbourhoods of \mathcal{S} to those of \mathcal{T} which gives rise to a total operation between points is actually a pointfree map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} . This is not necessarily the case unless the topology on points of \mathcal{S} coincides with \mathcal{S} . Hence, we formulate this transition to a pointfree map as a principle, called *the principle of pointfree continuity* for \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} ($\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}}$); see Definition 2.19 for the precise formulation. We discuss some sufficient conditions on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} under which $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}}$ holds in Section 2.4.

The above claim and the principle of pointfree continuity make sense for arbitrary pointfree topologies — not just for the Baire space and the natural numbers for which continuity principle and bar induction are usually formulated. However, the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ for the formal (i.e. pointfree) Baire space \mathcal{B} and the formal topology of natural numbers \mathcal{N} is equivalent to monotone bar induction, and hence to spatiality of the formal Baire space. Moreover, some well-known notions such as neighbourhood function and decidable bar induction [26, Chapter 4] naturally arise when we consider a variant of $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ formulated with respect to a restricted class of relations from the formal neighbourhoods of \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} ; see Section 3. Furthermore, the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1], \mathcal{N}}$ for the formal unit interval $\mathcal{I}[0, 1]$ and the formal topology of natural numbers \mathcal{N} is shown to be equivalent to Heine–Borel covering theorem, and thus to spatiality of the formal topology of real numbers; see Section 4.

Remark on foundations. In this paper, we adopt the Minimalist Foundation [18, 19] as our constructive foundation and positive topology [25] as the notion of pointfree topology (see Section 2.2). For the details of the Minimalist Foundation, we refer the reader to [18, 19] or the first two chapters of the forthcoming book by the second author [25]. It should be noted, however, that the results in Section 3 and Section 4 do not make essential use of the structure of positive topology, and thus they can be understood in the setting of formal topology [22].

In what follows, we elaborate on why working in the Minimalist Foundation could be relevant to this work. The Minimalist Foundation distinguishes collections from sets and logic from type theory. In particular, points of a positive topology usually form a collection rather than a set, and hence we can regard a point of a positive topology as an ideal object. For example, points of the formal Baire space, which are equivalent to functions between the natural numbers, form a collection rather than a set. This is due to the separation of logic from type theory, which allows us to keep the logical notion of function distinct from

the type theoretic notion of constructive operation. Because of this, we can view a point of the formal Baire space as a choice sequence which is not necessarily lawlike (see also the discussion following Proposition 3.3).

It is clear from Brouwer's writings that not only the notion of choice sequence but also that of lawlike operation (which he called algorithm in [3]) plays a crucial role in his analysis of continuity on the Baire space. Hence, any satisfactory account of Brouwer's intuitionism requires both the notion of choice sequence and that of lawlike sequence which are kept separate. The Minimalist Foundation can serve as a practical foundation of intuitionism where we can talk about choice sequences as a "figure of speech". For example, it might be possible to postulate bar induction on choice sequences while maintaining the view that every type theoretic operation is lawlike.²

Notation 1.1. We adopt notations which illustrate distinctions between sets, collections, and propositions in the Minimalist Foundation. If a is an element of a set S , we write $a \in S$, and if a is an element of a collection \mathcal{C} , we write $a : \mathcal{C}$. A subset $U(x)$ of a set S (written $U \subseteq S$) is a propositional function on S with at most one variable $x \in S$. If $a \in S$ is an element of a subset $U \subseteq S$, that is $U(a)$ is true, then we write $a \in U$. Two subsets are said to be equal if they have the same elements.

The collection of subsets of a set S (i.e. the power of a set) is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Note that $\mathcal{P}(S)$ is not a set except when S is empty. We say "*impredicatively*" to mean that we temporarily assume that the power of a set is a set.

A relation from X to S is a propositional function with two arguments, one in X and one in S . Equivalently, a relation from X to S is a subset of the cartesian product $X \times S$. Every relation $s \subseteq X \times S$ determines the image operation $s_* : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$ defined by

$$s_*(D) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in S \mid (\exists x \in D) x s a\}$$

for each subset $D \subseteq X$. We usually write s_*D for $s_*(D)$ and s_*x for $s_*\{x\}$. Following the usual mathematical convention, we drop the subscript " $_*$ " and simply write sD and sx whenever doing this does not cause confusion. The inverse image operation $s^{-*} : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ (often written simply s^{-}) is just the image operation of the opposite relation $s^{-} \subseteq S \times X$ of s .

Lastly, since the logic of the Minimalist Foundation is intuitionistic, we distinguish between inhabited subsets and non-empty subsets. To this end, it is convenient to use the following notation:

$$U \nexists V \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\exists a \in S) a \in U \cap V.$$

2. CONTINUITY PRINCIPLE FOR POSITIVE TOPOLOGIES

The Minimalist Foundation, in particular its distinction between sets and collections, leads us to introduce two different notions of topology which replace the classical notion of topological space. When points form a set, we reach the notion of concrete space. When points form a

²Another candidate for a practical foundation of Brouwer's intuitionism is the theory of choice sequences CS by Kreisel and Troelstra [17]. It should be noted, however, that the treatment of choice sequences in the Minimalist Foundation is quite different from the analytic approach of CS where conceptual analysis of an individual choice sequence plays a central role. But the treatment in the Minimalist Foundation may be more coherent and easier to understand, since it arises naturally from the fundamental distinction between collections and sets, and logic and type theory.

collection, it is more appropriate to understand them as ideal points of a pointfree structure, which we call positive topology.

We briefly review these notions in the next two subsections, and refer the reader to [24] or the forthcoming book [25] for further details.

2.1. Concrete spaces. The first is the pointwise notion of topological space.

Definition 2.1. A *concrete space* is a triple $\mathcal{X} = (X, \Vdash, S)$ where X and S are sets and \Vdash is a relation from X to S satisfying

$$(B1) \text{ ext } a \cap \text{ ext } b = \text{ ext } (a \downarrow b)$$

$$(B2) X = \text{ ext } S$$

for all $a, b \in S$, where

$$\text{ ext } a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Vdash^- a$$

$$\text{ ext } U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Vdash^- U = \bigcup_{a \in U} \text{ ext } a$$

$$a \downarrow b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{c \in S \mid c \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}} \{a\} \ \& \ c \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}} \{b\}\}$$

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}} \{b\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \text{ ext } a \subseteq \text{ ext } b$$

for all $a, b \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$. The notation \downarrow is extended to subsets by

$$U \downarrow V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{a \in U, b \in V} a \downarrow b$$

for all $U, V \subseteq S$.³

Conditions (B1) and (B2) say that the subsets of the form $\text{ ext } a$ constitute a base for a topology on X . Thus, a concrete space is a set equipped with an explicit set-indexed base.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, \Vdash, S)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, \Vdash', T)$ be concrete spaces. A *relation pair* (r, s) from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} is a pair of relations $r \subseteq X \times Y$ and $s \subseteq S \times T$ such that

$$\Vdash' \circ r = s \circ \Vdash,$$

where \circ is composition of relations. A relation pair $(r, s): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is said to be *convergent* if

$$(C1) \text{ ext } (s^- a \downarrow s^- b) = \text{ ext } s^-(a \downarrow' b)$$

$$(C2) \text{ ext } S = \text{ ext } s^- T$$

for all $a, b \in T$. Two convergent relation pairs $(r, s), (r', s'): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ are defined to be *equal* if

$$\Vdash' \circ r = \Vdash' \circ r'. \quad (2.1)$$

The collections of concrete spaces and convergent relation pairs form a category **CSpa**. The identity on a concrete space is the pair of identity relations. Composition of two convergent relation pairs is the coordinate-wise composition of relations. It is easy to see that composition respects equality on relation pairs. By exploiting the way in which morphisms

³The notations $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}}$ and \downarrow are instances of the same notations that appear in Definition 2.3. This will become clear when we define the notion of representable topology (cf. (2.3)).

are defined in **CSpa**, one can prove that **CSpa** is impredicatively equivalent to the category of *weakly sober* topological spaces and continuous functions.⁴

2.2. Positive topologies. The pointfree notion of topology arises from abstraction of the structure induced on the base (or its index set thereof) of a concrete space; see (2.3) below.

Definition 2.3. A *positive topology* is a triple $(S, \triangleleft, \ltimes)$ where S is a set, called the *base*, and \triangleleft and \ltimes are relations from S to $\mathcal{P}(S)$ such that

$$\begin{array}{lll} \frac{a \in U}{a \triangleleft U} \text{ (reflexivity)} & \frac{a \triangleleft U \quad U \triangleleft V}{a \triangleleft V} \text{ (transitivity)} & \frac{a \triangleleft U \quad a \triangleleft V}{a \triangleleft U \downarrow V} \text{ (\downarrow-right)} \\ \frac{a \ltimes U}{a \in U} \text{ (coreflexivity)} & \frac{a \ltimes U \quad (\forall b \in S) (b \ltimes U \rightarrow b \in V)}{a \ltimes V} \text{ (cotransitivity)} & \\ & \frac{a \triangleleft U \quad a \ltimes V}{U \ltimes V} \text{ (compatibility)} & \end{array}$$

for all $a \in S$ and $U, V \subseteq S$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U \downarrow V &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{a \in U, b \in V} a \downarrow b \\ a \downarrow b &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{c \in S \mid c \triangleleft \{a\} \ \& \ c \triangleleft \{b\}\} \\ U \triangleleft V &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\forall a \in U) a \triangleleft V \\ U \ltimes V &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\exists a \in U) a \ltimes V. \end{aligned}$$

A relation \triangleleft which satisfies (reflexivity), (transitivity), and (\downarrow -right) is called a *cover* on the set S , and a relation \ltimes which satisfies (coreflexivity) and (cotransitivity) is called a *positivity* on S . Thus, a positive topology is a set equipped with a compatible pair of cover and positivity.

Remark 2.4. From Section 3 on, we will deal only with positive topologies in which the cover is generated by induction from some axioms. In this case, a positivity compatible with the cover can be generated by coinduction from the same axioms, and it becomes the greatest positivity compatible with the cover. However, this does not mean that the notion of positivity is redundant because

(1) a positivity need not always be the greatest compatible one with the given cover;

⁴The following remark assumes that the reader is familiar with locale theory [13] and has read Section 2.2 and 2.3 of this paper. A concrete space \mathcal{X} is *weakly sober* if for every ideal point α of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$, there exists a unique $x \in X$ such that $\alpha = \diamond x$. Classically, weak sobriety is equivalent to sobriety, but intuitionistically it is strictly weaker. This is because the ideal points correspond to a certain subclass of completely prime filters of opens of \mathcal{X} ; see Aczel and Fox [1] (n.b. ideal points are called strong ideal points in [1]).

One can show that the category of weakly sober concrete spaces and *continuous functions* is impredicatively equivalent to **CSpa**. Indeed, the former category can be easily embedded into **CSpa**. On the other hand, every concrete space \mathcal{X} is impredicatively isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}})$, which is weakly sober. Then, by defining the notion of weak sobriety for topological spaces in terms of completely prime filters that correspond to ideal points, the claimed equivalence is obtained. A detailed proof appears in [25].

⁵Note that $U \triangleleft V$ is universal in character and $U \ltimes V$ existential, which might be confusing. But these notations are quite useful when we define the notion of formal maps and their images (cf. Definition 2.6 and (2.5)).

- (2) when no information on a cover is available about its generation, one can only define the greatest positivity compatible with the cover through an impredicative definition (cf. (2.6)).

Notation 2.5. We often use letters \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} to denote positive topologies of the forms $(S, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $(T, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{T}})$ respectively. The subscripts attached to \triangleleft and \bowtie are omitted when they are clear from the context.

In the same way the definition of positive topology is obtained from a concrete space, the definition of morphism between positive topologies is obtained by abstraction of the properties of the right side of a convergent relation pair.

Definition 2.6. Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies. A *formal map* from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} is a relation $s \subseteq S \times T$ such that

- (FM1) $S \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}T$
- (FM2) $s^{-}b \downarrow s^{-}c \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}(b \downarrow c)$
- (FM3) $b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} V \rightarrow s^{-}b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}V$
- (FM4) $s^{-}b \bowtie_{\mathcal{S}} s^{*}V \rightarrow b \bowtie_{\mathcal{T}} V$

for all $b, c \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$, where $s^{*}V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in S \mid s\{a\} \subseteq V\}$.⁶ Two formal maps $s, s' : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ are defined to be *equal* if

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}b \leftrightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s'^{-}b \quad (2.2)$$

for all $a \in S$ and $b \in T$.

The collections of positive topologies and formal maps with the relational composition form a category **PTop**. The identity on a positive topology is the identity relation on its base.

Each concrete space $\mathcal{X} = (X, \Vdash, S)$ determines a positive topology $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}} = (S, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{X}})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}} U &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \text{ext } a \subseteq \text{ext } U \\ a \bowtie_{\mathcal{X}} U &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \text{ext } a \not\subseteq \text{rest } U \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where $\text{rest } U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X \mid \diamond x \subseteq U\}$ and $\diamond x \subseteq S$ is the set of open neighbourhoods of a point $x \in X$:

$$\diamond x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in S \mid x \Vdash a\}. \quad (2.4)$$

While the meaning of $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{X}} U$ is clear, the meaning of $a \bowtie_{\mathcal{X}} U$ needs some explanation: it is easy to check that $\text{rest } U$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{X} and the closure of a subset $D \subseteq X$ is of the form $\text{rest } \bigcup_{x \in D} \diamond x$. Thus the closed subsets consist of subsets of the form $\text{rest } U$ for some $U \subseteq S$. Hence $a \bowtie_{\mathcal{X}} U$ means that the open subset $\text{ext } a$ intersects with the closed subset represented by $U \subseteq S$.

Definition 2.7. A positive topology is said to be *representable* if it is of the form $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ for some concrete space \mathcal{X} .

Here \mathcal{X} is not a part of the structure of a representable topology. In fact, some representable topologies admit purely pointfree characterisations, e.g. Scott topologies on algebraic posets [23], or more generally on continuous posets [29].

If $(r, s) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a convergent relation pair, then s is a formal map from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

⁶The operation s^{*} is universal in character. Thus, contrary to the image operation s_{*} , it cannot be defined as a union of its values on singletons.

Theorem 2.8. *The assignment $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(r, s) \mapsto s$ determines a functor $\text{Fs}: \mathbf{CSpa} \rightarrow \mathbf{PTop}$. Moreover, Fs is full and faithful.*

Proof. First, it is routine to check that Fs is a functor. Next, Fs is full because for every formal map $s: \text{Fs}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \text{Fs}(\mathcal{Y})$ one can define a relation

$$x \ r_s \ y \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \Diamond y \subseteq s \Diamond x$$

from X to Y such that (r_s, s) is a convergent relation pair. Finally, Fs is faithful because condition (2.2) applied to $\text{Fs}(r, s)$ and $\text{Fs}(r', s')$ can be shown to be equivalent to (2.1). For details, the reader is referred to the forthcoming book [25]. \square

Theorem 2.8 says that the notion of positive topology is a full and faithful abstraction of the structure induced on the base of a concrete space. In the classical pointfree topology [13], this corresponds to the embedding of the category of sober topological spaces into that of locales.

Remark 2.9. The notion of positive topology is richer than that of formal topology [22], being enriched by positivity \ltimes . This extra structure allows us to prove Theorem 2.8. Moreover, the category of formal topologies can be embedded into that of positive topologies (Ciraulo and Sambin [5]). However, not all the practical benefits of such extension of the purely pointfree setting have been explored.

2.3. Continuity theorem. The notion of ideal point of a positive topology allows us to talk about ideal elements of the corresponding space. An ideal point is defined abstracting the properties of the neighbourhoods $\Diamond x$ of an element x of a concrete space.

Definition 2.10. Let \mathcal{S} be a positive topology. An *ideal point* is a subset $\alpha \subseteq S$ such that

- (1) α is *inhabited*, i.e. $\alpha \not\Downarrow \alpha$;
- (2) α is *filtering*, i.e. $a, b \in \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \not\Downarrow (a \downarrow b)$ for all $a, b \in S$;
- (3) α *splits* \triangleleft , i.e. $a \triangleleft U$ & $a \in \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \not\Downarrow U$ for all $a \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$;
- (4) α *enters* \ltimes , i.e. $a \in \alpha \subseteq V \rightarrow a \ltimes V$ for all $a \in S$ and $V \subseteq S$.

The collection of ideal points of a positive topology \mathcal{S} is denoted by $\text{IPt}(\mathcal{S})$.

The collection $\text{IPt}(\mathcal{S})$ is equipped with a pointwise topology generated by open subcollections of the form

$$\text{Ext}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{S}) \mid a \in \alpha\}$$

for each $a \in S$. This topology can be represented by a *large* concrete space $\mathcal{Ip}(\mathcal{S}) = (\text{IPt}(\mathcal{S}), \ni, S)$, where $\alpha \ni a \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in \alpha$.

The modifier *large* is due to the fact that the left-hand side of $\mathcal{Ip}(\mathcal{S})$ is a collection rather than a set, and thus it is not a concrete space in a proper sense. However, it is convenient to consider such structures, and we will do so in the following. The reason why it is safe to consider large structures is that we work on them using only predicate logic, which applies to collections as well as to sets. Thus, the results on concrete spaces that depend only on logic apply automatically to large concrete spaces. The same remark applies to large covers and large positivities, which will be introduced at the beginning of Section 2.4.

Definition 2.11. If \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are positive topologies, a *continuous map* from $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$ is a pair (g, s) where $g: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{T})$ is an operation and $s \subseteq S \times T$ is a relation which makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow s \\ \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{T}) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T \end{array}$$

The above definition is motivated by the following observation on representable topologies: let $(r, s): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a convergent relation pair. Then s is a formal map from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ and hence (as we will see in Corollary 2.15 below) s_* is an operation from $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}})$ to $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{Y}})$. Since (s_*, s) trivially makes the above square commute, it is a continuous map from $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}})$ to $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{Y}})$.

Every continuous map (g, s) is pointwise continuous, that is

$$b \in g(\alpha) \rightarrow \exists a \in \alpha [(\forall \beta: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})) a \in \beta \rightarrow b \in g(\beta)]$$

for all $\alpha: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})$ and $b \in T$. More specifically, from the open neighbourhood $\text{Ext}(b)$ of $g(\alpha)$, by commutativity one can trace b backward along s and find an open neighbourhood $\text{Ext}(a)$ of α whose image under g falls within $\text{Ext}(b)$. Thus, the relation s acts as a *modulus* of continuity for the operation g .

Commutativity of the square means that

$$b \in g(\alpha) \leftrightarrow s^{-1}b \frown \alpha \leftrightarrow b \in s_*(\alpha)$$

for all $b \in T$ and $\alpha: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})$, which is equivalent to saying that g is equal to the image operation $s_*: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ on $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})$. Hence, every continuous map from $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$ is of the form (s_*, s) where $s \subseteq S \times T$ is a relation which maps $\alpha: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})$ to $s_*(\alpha): \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{T})$. Conversely, if $s \subseteq S \times T$ is a relation which induces a well-defined operation $s_*: \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{T})$, then the pair (s_*, s) clearly makes the square commute. In summary, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12 (Continuity theorem). *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies, and let $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation. If s_* is a mapping from $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}Pt(\mathcal{T})$, then (s_*, s) is a continuous map from $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$. Moreover, every continuous map from $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$ is induced by a relation from S to T in this way.*

Theorem 2.12 should be compared to the familiar form of continuity principle “every full function is continuous”. The theorem articulates a condition on operations between ideal points in which the continuity principle holds, i.e. that of being induced by a relation between bases. This condition is reasonable from the constructive point of view since in order to define an operation on an infinite object like an ideal point, we can only rely on finite information about it, i.e. its formal neighbourhoods and a relation between them (cf. Vickers [28]). From a predicative point of view, we believe that the notion of continuous map is one of the simplest way of characterising continuous operations between ideal points.

2.4. Principle of pointfree continuity. Our next aim is to relate the notion of continuous map to that of formal map.

Given a positive topology \mathcal{S} , let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} = (S, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}p}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{I}p})$ be the *large* positive topology associated with the concrete space $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ (cf. (2.3)). Note that $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}p}$ and $\bowtie_{\mathcal{I}p}$ are defined

by quantifications over $IPt(\mathcal{S})$, which is not necessarily a set, and hence they are *large* structures in general. There is a formal map $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ represented by the identity relation on S . In particular, we have

$$a \triangleleft U \rightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}p} U \qquad a \ltimes_{\mathcal{I}p} U \rightarrow a \ltimes U$$

for all $a \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation between the bases of positive topologies \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . Then*

- (1) $S \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{-}T$ if and only if $s_*(\alpha)$ is inhabited for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$;
- (2) $s^{-}b \downarrow s^{-}c \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{-}(b \downarrow c)$ for all $b, c \in T$ if and only if $s_*(\alpha)$ is filtering for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$;
- (3) $b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} V \rightarrow s^{-}b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{-}V$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$ if and only if $s_*(\alpha)$ splits $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$;
- (4) $s^{-}b \ltimes_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{*}V \rightarrow b \ltimes_{\mathcal{T}} V$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$ if and only if $s_*(\alpha)$ enters $\ltimes_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$.

Proof. (1) Since every ideal point is inhabited, $S \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{-}T$ is equivalent to $\alpha \Downarrow s^{-}T$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$, that is $s_*(\alpha) \Downarrow T$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$.

(2) Similar to (1) using the fact that every ideal point is filtering.

(3) By unfolding the definition, $b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} V \rightarrow s^{-}b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{-}V$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$ if and only if $b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} V \rightarrow \forall \alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S}) [\alpha \Downarrow s^{-}b \rightarrow \alpha \Downarrow s^{-}V]$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$. This is easily seen to be equivalent to $b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} V \ \& \ b \in s_*(\alpha) \rightarrow s_*(\alpha) \Downarrow V$ for all $b \in T$, $V \subseteq T$ and $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$, that is $s_*(\alpha)$ splits $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$.

(4) By unfolding the definition, we have $s^{-}b \ltimes_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^{*}V \rightarrow b \ltimes_{\mathcal{T}} V$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$ if and only if $\exists \alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S}) [\alpha \Downarrow s^{-}b \ \& \ \alpha \subseteq s^{*}V] \rightarrow b \ltimes_{\mathcal{T}} V$ for all $b \in T$ and $V \subseteq T$. This is equivalent to $b \in s_*(\alpha) \ \& \ s_*(\alpha) \subseteq V \rightarrow b \ltimes_{\mathcal{T}} V$ for all $b \in T$, $V \subseteq T$ and $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$, that is $s_*(\alpha)$ enters $\ltimes_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$. \square

Proposition 2.14. *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies and $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $s_*(\alpha): IPt(\mathcal{T})$ for all $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{S})$;
- (2) (s_*, s) is a continuous map from $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S})$ to $\mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$;
- (3) s is a formal map from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p}$ to \mathcal{T} .

Proof. (1 \Leftrightarrow 2) This is the content of Theorem 2.12.

(1 \Leftrightarrow 3) Immediate from Lemma 2.13. \square

Corollary 2.15. *If $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a formal map, then (s_*, s) is continuous, i.e. s_* is a mapping from $IPt(\mathcal{S})$ to $IPt(\mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. If $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is a formal map, then composition with the canonical map $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ gives a formal map $s: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Then, the conclusion follows from Proposition 2.14. \square

If the pointwise cover and positivity coincide with the pointfree ones, i.e. the canonical map $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is an isomorphism, then we could have replaced item (3) of Proposition 2.14 with a formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Here, the notion of bi-spatiality is exactly what is required.

Definition 2.16. A positive topology \mathcal{S} is *bi-spatial* if the canonical formal map $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{S}}: \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is an isomorphism, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}p} U &\rightarrow a \triangleleft U && \text{(spatiality)} \\ a \times U &\rightarrow a \times_{\mathcal{I}p} U && \text{(reducibility)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$. A positive topology is *spatial* if it satisfies spatiality.

The following proposition corresponds to the embedding of the category of sober topological spaces into that of spatial locales (Johnstone [13, Chapter II, 1.7]).

Proposition 2.17. *Every representable topology is bi-spatial.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that in any concrete space \mathcal{X} , the subset $\diamond x$ is an ideal point of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ for each $x \in X$. \square

From Definition 2.16 and Proposition 2.12, we obtain our second continuity theorem:

Theorem 2.18. *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies, and $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation. If \mathcal{S} is bi-spatial, then s is a formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ if and only if $s_*(\alpha): \text{IPt}(\mathcal{T})$ for all $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{S})$.*

Our new principle of continuity is then obtained by omitting the assumption of bi-spatiality from Theorem 2.18.

Definition 2.19. Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies. The *principle of pointfree continuity* for \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} is the statement:

(PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$): For any relation $s \subseteq S \times T$, if s_* is a mapping from $\text{IPt}(\mathcal{S})$ to $\text{IPt}(\mathcal{T})$, then s is a formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

After this definition, the content of Theorem 2.18 may be expressed by: PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ holds whenever \mathcal{S} is bi-spatial.

Remark 2.20. PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ is concerned with the property of a relation $s \subseteq S \times T$, and not with the property of the operation $s_*: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{IPt}(\mathcal{T})$. Another possible formulation of the continuity principle would be to say that every continuous operation $(g, s): \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{T})$ is induced by a formal map $s': \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, namely $g = s'_*$, or equivalently $s_* = s'_*$. This formulation of continuity principle is analogous to the uniform continuity theorem for the Cantor space, saying that every pointwise continuous function from the Cantor space to the discrete space of natural numbers is uniformly continuous. This latter form is weaker than the one given in Definition 2.19 (cf. Theorem 3.21).

With no restriction on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , the principle PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ is false. The following examples are not surprising, given the fact that PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ is a kind of completeness principle.

Example 2.21 (Non-spatial topologies).

- (1) Consider a positive topology \mathcal{S} with $S = \{*\}$, and $a \triangleleft U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in U$ and $a \times U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \perp$ for all $a \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$. The topology \mathcal{S} has no points, i.e. $\text{IPt}(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$. For any positive topology \mathcal{T} , if the principle PoPC $_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ holds, then any relation $s \subseteq S \times T$ is a formal map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} . But the empty relation cannot be a formal map since it does not satisfy (FM1).
- (2) There is a counterexample which is more natural than the previous one, the geometric theory of surjective functions between sets (cf. Fox [10, Section 4.1.4]). This topology, call it \mathcal{S} , is a positive topology with no points, but there exists $a \in S$ such that $a \times S$. Then, the same argument as in the first example leads to a contradiction.

In the light of the counterexamples above, we give some sufficient conditions on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} under which $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ holds. Note that by Theorem 2.18 if \mathcal{S} is bi-spatial then $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ holds. For example, $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{T}}$ holds whenever \mathcal{S} is representable (cf. Proposition 2.17).

Let $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation between the underlying bases of positive topologies \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . Define relations \triangleleft_s and \bowtie_s from T to $\mathcal{P}(T)$ as

$$b \triangleleft_s V \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} s^{-}b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}V \qquad b \bowtie_s V \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} s^{-}b \bowtie_{\mathcal{S}} s^{*}V. \quad (2.5)$$

We write $\text{Im}[s]$ for the structure $(T, \triangleleft_s, \bowtie_s)$.

Lemma 2.22.

- (1) $\text{Im}[s]$ satisfies all the properties of positive topology except (\downarrow -right).
- (2) If s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3), then $\text{Im}[s]$ is a positive topology.
- (3) If s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3), then the relation s is a formal map from \mathcal{S} to $\text{Im}[s]$ if and only if s satisfies (FM1).
- (4) If s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3), then the identity relation id_T on T is a formal map from $\text{Im}[s]$ to \mathcal{T} if and only if s satisfies (FM4).

Proof. (1) It is straightforward to show that $\text{Im}[s]$ satisfies all the properties of positive topology except (\downarrow -right) using the corresponding properties of \mathcal{S} . For example, to see that \triangleleft_s and \bowtie_s satisfy (compatibility), suppose we have $b \triangleleft_s V$ and $b \bowtie_s W$. Then there exists $a \in s^{-}b$ such that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{*}W$. Since $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}V$, we have $s^{-}V \bowtie_{\mathcal{S}} s^{*}W$ by (compatibility) of \mathcal{S} . Hence $V \bowtie_s W$.

(2) Assume that s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3). By (1), it suffices to show that $\text{Im}[s]$ satisfies (\downarrow -right). Suppose that $b \triangleleft_s V$ and $b \triangleleft_s W$. By (\downarrow -right) of \mathcal{S} , we have $s^{-}b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}V \downarrow_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}W$. Then $s^{-}V \downarrow_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}W \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}(V \downarrow_{\mathcal{T}} W)$ by (FM2). Hence by (FM3) and (transitivity) of \triangleleft_s , we have $b \triangleleft_s V \downarrow_{\text{Im}[s]} W$.

(3) Assume that s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3). It is easy to see that s (as a formal map from \mathcal{S} to $\text{Im}[s]$) satisfies (FM2), (FM3), and (FM4). Then condition (FM1) is equivalent to that of s (as a formal map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T}).

(4) Assume that s satisfies (FM2) and (FM3). Then id_T trivially satisfies (FM1). For (FM2), let $d \in \text{id}_T^{-}b \downarrow_{\text{Im}[s]} \text{id}_T^{-}c$. Then $s^{-}d \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}b$ and $s^{-}d \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}c$. By (FM2) of s , we have $s^{-}d \triangleleft_{\mathcal{S}} s^{-}(b \downarrow_{\mathcal{T}} c)$, i.e. $d \triangleleft_s \text{id}_T^{-}(b \downarrow_{\mathcal{T}} c)$. Therefore $\text{id}_T^{-}b \downarrow_{\text{Im}[s]} \text{id}_T^{-}c \triangleleft_s \text{id}_T^{-}(b \downarrow_{\mathcal{T}} c)$. Lastly, conditions (FM3) and (FM4) for id_T is equivalent to the corresponding conditions of s . \square

Definition 2.23. The *image* of a formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is the positive topology $\text{Im}[s] = (T, \triangleleft_s, \bowtie_s)$.

As a corollary of Lemma 2.22, we have an image factorisation.

Proposition 2.24. Any formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ between positive topologies factors as $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{Im}[s]$ and $\text{id}_T: \text{Im}[s] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Proposition 2.25. For any formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and a positive topology \mathcal{S}' , the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{S}'}$ implies $\text{PoPC}_{\text{Im}[s],\mathcal{S}'}$.

Proof. Fix a formal map $s: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and a positive topology \mathcal{S}' . It is easy to see that a relation $s' \subseteq T \times S'$ is a formal map from $\text{Im}[s]$ to \mathcal{S}' if and only if the composition $s' \circ s$ is a formal map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' .

Let $s' \subseteq T \times S'$ be a relation such that s'_* is a mapping from $Ipt(\text{Im}[s])$ to $Ipt(S')$. Since s_* is a mapping from $Ipt(\mathcal{S})$ to $Ipt(\text{Im}[s])$, we have that $(s' \circ s)_*$ is a mapping from $Ipt(\mathcal{S})$ to $Ipt(S')$. Thus s is a formal map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' by $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'}$. Therefore s' is a formal map from $\text{Im}[s]$ to \mathcal{S}' . \square

Given a cover \triangleleft on a set S , we can impredicatively define a positivity \times_{\triangleleft} which is compatible with \triangleleft as follows:

$$a \times_{\triangleleft} U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\exists V : \mathcal{P}(S)) [a \in V \subseteq U \ \& \ (\forall W : \mathcal{P}(S)) V \not\bowtie \mathcal{A}W \rightarrow V \not\bowtie W] \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{A}W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in S \mid a \triangleleft W\}$. It is easy to see that \times_{\triangleleft} is the greatest positivity compatible with \triangleleft . If a cover \triangleleft is generated inductively (cf. Coquand et al. [6]), then the positivity \times_{\triangleleft} can be constructed by coinduction [25], and hence its construction can be done predicatively. This is the case for the positive topologies treated in Section 3 and Section 4, whose covers are generated inductively.

Lemma 2.26. *Let \triangleleft and \triangleleft' be two covers on a set S , and let \times be a positivity on S . If $\triangleleft' \subseteq \triangleleft$ and \times is compatible with \triangleleft , then \times is compatible with \triangleleft' .*

Proof. Obvious from the definition of compatibility. \square

Corollary 2.27. *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies, and $s \subseteq S \times T$ be a relation which satisfies (FM1), (FM2), and (FM3). If $\times_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the greatest positivity compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}}$, then s is a formal map from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. Condition (FM4) is equivalent to saying that the positivity \times_s is smaller than $\times_{\mathcal{T}}$. By (FM3), we have $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \triangleleft_s$. Thus \times_s is compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{T}}$ by Lemma 2.26. Therefore $\times_s \subseteq \times_{\mathcal{T}}$. \square

Proposition 2.28. *Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be positive topologies. If \mathcal{S} is spatial and \mathcal{T} has the greatest positivity compatible with its cover, then $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}}$ holds.*

Proof. Immediate from Corollary 2.27 and Proposition 2.14. \square

Most of the positive topologies which arise in practice have greatest compatible positivities, so the assumption on the topology \mathcal{T} in Proposition 2.28 is often satisfied. Thus, it is the spatiality of \mathcal{S} that is crucial for the continuity principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}}$ to hold.

At this point, it is natural to ask whether (bi-)spatiality of \mathcal{S} is actually necessary for the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}}$ to hold. In the following sections, we answer this question in some specific cases which occupy a central place in Brouwer's intuitionism.

3. CONTINUITY ON THE BAIRE SPACE

The continuity principle for the Baire space deserves special attention. Since this is the context in which Brouwer introduced his principle of continuity, it is of our particular interest to see in what sense our continuity principle is related to the principles of intuitionism.

3.1. Formal Baire space. We recall the pointfree definition of the Baire space, whose ideal points can be considered as free choice sequences. Let \mathbb{N}^* denote the set of finite sequences of natural numbers. We write $a * b$ for the concatenation of finite sequences a and b . By an abuse of notation, we write $a * n$ for the concatenation of a finite sequence a and the singleton sequence of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The order $\leq_{\mathcal{B}}$ on \mathbb{N}^* is defined by the reverse prefix ordering:

$$a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} b \text{ is an initial segment of } a.$$

In particular, we have $a * n \leq_{\mathcal{B}} a$.

Definition 3.1. The *formal Baire space* is a positive topology $\mathcal{B} = (\mathbb{N}^*, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{B}})$ where the cover $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$ is inductively generated by the following rules

$$\frac{a \in U}{a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U} (\eta) \quad \frac{a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U}{a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U} (\zeta) \quad \frac{(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) a * n \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U}{a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U} (F)$$

and $\bowtie_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the greatest positivity compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$.

We recall some well-known properties of \mathcal{B} that we shall use in this section. Let $\downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$ denote the downward closure of a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{B}}$:

$$\downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid (\exists b \in U) a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b\}.$$

The ζ -inference can be eliminated in the following sense; see e.g. Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Chapter 4, Exercise 4.8.10].

Lemma 3.2. Let $\blacktriangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$ be the relation from \mathbb{N}^* to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^*)$ inductively defined by η and F -rules. Then

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \leftrightarrow a \blacktriangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. By induction on $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\blacktriangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$. □

Using Lemma 3.2, it is straightforward to show

$$a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \leftrightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \{b\} \tag{3.1}$$

for all $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$. From Lemma 3.2 and (3.1), we can obtain the following elementary characterisation of an ideal point of \mathcal{B} .

Proposition 3.3. A subset $\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is an ideal point of \mathcal{B} if and only if

- (1) $\alpha \not\emptyset$;
- (2) $a, b \in \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \not\emptyset (a \downarrow b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$;
- (3) $a * x \in \alpha \rightarrow a \in \alpha$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (4) $a \in \alpha \rightarrow (\exists x \in \mathbb{N}) a * x \in \alpha$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

The above characterisation provides us with a geometric intuition of an ideal point of \mathcal{B} as an infinitely proceeding sequence

$$nil, x_0, x_0 * x_1, x_0 * x_1 * x_2, \dots$$

of one-step extensions of elements of \mathbb{N}^* starting from the empty sequence nil ; at each “stage” $x_0 * \dots * x_n$ of this sequence, the next step $x_0 * \dots * x_n * x$ is constructed by choosing an arbitrary element $x \in \mathbb{N}$ without any restriction (cf. condition (4) of Proposition 3.3). Thus, the notion of ideal point of \mathcal{B} can be considered as a possible manifestation of free choice sequences [8, Chapter 3]. This led us to identify choice sequences with ideal points of \mathcal{B} .

Definition 3.4. A *choice sequence* is an ideal point of \mathcal{B} .

We here leave the reader to check that in the Minimalist Foundation (in particular, without assuming any form of axiom of choice) one can prove that:

Theorem 3.5. *There is a bijective correspondence between choice sequences, i.e. ideal points of \mathcal{B} , and functions from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} , i.e. total and single-valued relations from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} .*

3.2. Continuity principles for the Baire space. The principle of bar induction and the principle of continuity for functions from choice sequences to the natural numbers are closely related. In particular, Brouwer introduced bar induction in his analysis of the computation tree of such a function. Hence, we focus on the continuity principle between the Baire space and the natural numbers in the pointfree setting, and study its connection to various forms of bar induction. The standard reference of bar induction is Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Chapter 4, Section 8].

Definition 3.6. For every set S , we define the *discrete positive topology* on S to be a positive topology $\mathcal{D}S = (S, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{D}S}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{D}S})$ where cover and positivity are defined by

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{D}S} U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in U, \quad a \bowtie_{\mathcal{D}S} U \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in U.$$

It is easy to see that $\bowtie_{\mathcal{D}S}$ is the greatest positivity compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{D}S}$, and that ideal points of $\mathcal{D}S$ are singletons of S . The *formal topology of natural numbers* is the discrete positive topology $\mathcal{D}\mathbb{N}$ on the set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers, which we denote by $\mathcal{N} = (\mathbb{N}, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{N}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{N}})$.

A relation $s \subseteq X \times Y$ from a poset (X, \leq) to a set Y is said to be *monotone* if

$$\downarrow s^- y = s^- y$$

for all $y \in Y$. The *monotonisation* of a relation $s \subseteq X \times Y$ is the composition $s \circ \leq$, which is obviously monotone.

Lemma 3.7. *Every formal map $s: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ (or $s: \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$) is equal to its monotonisation with respect to the order $\leq_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 2.27. □

Lemma 3.8. *For every monotone relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *s is single valued;*
- (2) *$s^- n \downarrow s^- m \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} s^- (n \downarrow m)$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- (3) *$s^- n \downarrow_{\mathcal{I}p} s^- m \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^- (n \downarrow m)$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. (1 \Rightarrow 2) Assume (1). Since s is monotone, we have $s^- n \downarrow s^- m = s^- n \cap s^- m$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ by (3.1). Then (2) is clear.

(2 \Rightarrow 3) For each $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define an ideal point $\alpha_a: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B})$ by

$$\alpha_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{b \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b\} \cup \{a * \underbrace{0 * \cdots * 0}_{n+1} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Now assume (2). We show that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} \{b\} \rightarrow a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b$. Suppose that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} \{b\}$. Since $a \in \alpha_{a*0} \cap \alpha_{a*1}$, we have $b \in \alpha_{a*0} \cap \alpha_{a*1}$, so we must have $a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b$. Then (3) follows from the fact that $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}}$.

(3 \Rightarrow 1) Assume (3). Suppose that $a \leq n$ and $a \leq m$. Then

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^- n \downarrow_{\mathcal{I}p} s^- m \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} s^- (n \downarrow m).$$

Since $a \in \alpha_a$, we have $\alpha_a \not\leq s^- (n \downarrow m)$. Hence $n = m$. \square

Recall from [26, Chapter 4, Section 8] that a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is a *bar* if every choice sequence has a neighbourhood which is in U . In the setting of positive topology, we can express the condition of bar as

$$(\forall \alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B})) \alpha \not\leq U.$$

The *domain* $\text{dom}(s)$ of a relation $s \subseteq X \times Y$ is the subset s^-Y of X .

Proposition 3.9. *For every monotone $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *s is a partial function whose domain is a bar;*
- (2) *s is a formal map from $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}$ to \mathcal{N} .*

Proof. Fix a monotone relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$. Then by Corollary 2.27, s is a formal map from $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}$ to \mathcal{N} if and only if (FM1), (FM2), and (FM3) hold. Condition (FM3) is trivial, while condition (FM2) is equivalent to s being single valued by Lemma 3.8. Moreover, it is easy to see that condition (FM1) is equivalent to $\text{dom}(s)$ being a bar. \square

By Lemma 2.14, Lemma 3.7, and Proposition 3.9, we can rephrase the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$ as follows:

($\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$): If $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a monotone partial function whose domain is a bar, then s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} .

We say that a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is

- *monotone* if $a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \in U \rightarrow a \in U$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$;
- *inductive* if $[(\forall x \in \mathbb{N}) a * x \in U] \rightarrow a \in U$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

The *monotone bar induction* [26, Chapter 4, Section 8] is the statement:

($\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$): For any monotone bar $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ and an inductive subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $U \subseteq V$, it holds that $\text{nil} \in V$.

Theorem 3.10. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- (2) $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$.
- (3) $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{T}}$ holds for all positive topology \mathcal{T} with the greatest positivity.
- (4) *Spatiality of \mathcal{B} :* $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \rightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (5) $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \rightarrow \text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. Obviously (3) implies (2). Moreover, (4) implies (3) by Proposition 2.28. Thus, it suffices to show (1 \Rightarrow 5), (5 \Rightarrow 4), and (2 \Rightarrow 1).

(1 \Rightarrow 5) Assume $\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$. Fix $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, and suppose that $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U$. Then $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$, i.e. $\downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$ is a monotone bar. Define a subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U\}$$

which is an inductive subset containing $\downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$. Thus by $\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$, we have $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$, and hence $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ by Lemma 3.2.

(5 \Rightarrow 4) Assume (5). First, one can show that

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \{a * b \mid |b| = n\} \tag{3.3}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction on n . Here, $|b|$ denotes the length of a sequence b .

Next, for each $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define $C_a \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$C_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{b \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid |b| = |a| \text{ \& } a \neq b\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Since the equality on \mathbb{N}^* is decidable, i.e. $a = b$ or $\neg(a = b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we see that

$$C_a \cup \{a\} = \{b \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid |b| = |a|\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Then, for each $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, we have

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \leftrightarrow \text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \cup C_a. \quad (3.6)$$

Indeed, if $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$, then by (3.3) and (3.5), we have

$$\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \{a\} \cup C_a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \cup C_a.$$

Conversely, if $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \cup C_a$ then

$$a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} (U \cup C_a) \downarrow \{a\} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} (U \downarrow \{a\}) \cup (C_a \downarrow \{a\}) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U.$$

The equivalence (3.6) holds for the cover $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}}$ as well, and admits an analogous proof. For example, suppose that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U$. Then, for each $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B})$, we have $\alpha \not\Downarrow C_a \cup \{a\}$ by (3.3) and (3.5). If $a \in \alpha$, then $\alpha \not\Downarrow U$ because α splits $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus $\alpha \not\Downarrow (U \cup C_a)$, and hence $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \cup C_a$. The converse is also straightforward.

Now, suppose that $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U$. Then $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \cup C_a$, and thus $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U \cup C_a$ by the assumption. Hence $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$.

(2 \Rightarrow 1) Assume $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be a monotone bar and $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be an inductive subset such that $U \subseteq V$. Define $s_U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$a s_U n \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in U \text{ \& } n = 0,$$

which is a monotone partial function whose domain is a bar. Thus, s_U is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} by $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$. In particular, we have

$$\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \text{dom}(s_U) = U = \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U,$$

and so $\text{nil} \blacktriangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ by Lemma 3.2. Therefore $\text{nil} \in V$ by induction on $\blacktriangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$. \square

Remark 3.11. The equivalence between spatiality of \mathcal{B} and $\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$ is well known (cf. Schuster and Gambino [11, Proposition 4.1]; see Fourman and Grayson [9, Theorem 3.4] for an impredicative result).

3.3. Variety of continuity principles. We introduce some variants of $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ by imposing some restrictions on the relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$. We study the connections between these principles and some well-known variants of bar induction.

Definition 3.12. $\text{D-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ is a variant of $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ formulated with respect to a monotone partial function with a *decidable* domain:

($\text{D-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$): If $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a monotone partial function whose domain is a decidable bar, then s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} .

Apart from the distinction between operations and functions (total and single-valued relations) in the Minimalist Foundation, it is easy to see that monotone partial functions from \mathbb{N}^* to \mathbb{N} whose domains are decidable bars bijectively correspond to *neighbourhood functions*; see Beeson [2, Chapter 6, Section 7.3] or Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Chapter 4, Section 6.8].

The *decidable bar induction* is the statement:⁷

(BI_D): For any decidable bar $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ and an inductive subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $U \subseteq V$, it holds that $\text{nil} \in V$.

In BI_D, we may assume that a bar is monotone since the downward closure $\downarrow_{\mathcal{B}} U$ of a decidable subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is decidable (cf. Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Exercise 4.8.10]).

Proposition 3.13. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) BI_D.
- (2) D-PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} .
- (3) $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U \rightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and decidable $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (4) $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U \rightarrow \text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all decidable $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. We show $(4 \Rightarrow 2)$. Assume (4), and let $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a monotone partial function whose domain is a decidable bar. Then $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \text{dom}(s)$ by assumption; hence s is a formal map $s: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ by Corollary 2.27 and Lemma 3.8.

The proof of the other equivalences are analogous to those of Theorem 3.10. Note that for each $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and decidable $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, the union $U \cup C_a$ is decidable, where C_a is defined as in (3.4). \square

Remark 3.14. The equivalence between BI_D and D-PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} is analogous to Proposition 8.14 (i) in Troelstra and van Dalen [26, page 230], where it is shown that BI_D is equivalent to identification of the class of neighbourhood functions and that of inductively defined neighbourhood functions.

The second variant of PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} is based on the assumption that the domain of a partial function $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is recursively enumerable. The logical counterpart of this assumption is that the domain of s is a Σ_1^0 subset of \mathbb{N}^* . Here, a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is Σ_1^0 if there exists a decidable subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a \in U \leftrightarrow (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}) (a, n) \in D.$$

Definition 3.15. Σ_1^0 -PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} is a variant of PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} formulated with respect to a monotone partial function whose domain is a Σ_1^0 subset of \mathbb{N}^* :

(Σ_1^0 -PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}): If $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a monotone partial function whose domain is a Σ_1^0 bar, then s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} .

The principle Σ_1^0 -PoPC _{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}} is related to the corresponding principle of bar induction. Σ_1^0 *monotone bar induction* is the statement:

(Σ_1^0 -BI_M): For any monotone Σ_1^0 bar $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ and an inductive subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $U \subseteq V$, it holds that $\text{nil} \in V$.

In Σ_1^0 -BI_M, we cannot drop the condition of monotonicity on bars; otherwise the non-constructive principle LPO (the limited principle of omniscience) would be derivable, which

⁷Brouwer seems to have introduced bar induction in this form [3, Section 2]; see also Kleene and Vesley [16, Chapter I, Section 6].

is not acceptable in constructive mathematics (cf. Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Exercise 4.8.11]).

Proposition 3.16. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\Sigma_1^0\text{-BI}_M$.
- (2) $\Sigma_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$.
- (3) $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{Tp}} U \rightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and Σ_1^0 -subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (4) $nil \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{Tp}} U \rightarrow nil \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all Σ_1^0 -subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 3.13. Note that for each $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and Σ_1^0 subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, the union $U \cup C_a$ is also Σ_1^0 . \square

In fact, these Σ_1^0 variants are equivalent to the decidable counterparts. Ishihara [12, Proposition 16.15] already observed an analogous fact for the fan theorem. In the following, we write $\langle n, m \rangle$ for a fixed coding of pairs of numbers $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and write j_0, j_1 for the projections of pairs. Without loss of generality, we assume that the coding is surjective and satisfies $n, m \leq \langle n, m \rangle$. The proof of the following proposition is based on Ishihara [12, Proposition 16.15].

Proposition 3.17. $\Sigma_1^0\text{-BI}_M$ and BI_D are equivalent.

Proof. It suffices to show that BI_D implies $\Sigma_1^0\text{-BI}_M$. To this end, we show that every monotone Σ_1^0 bar contains a decidable bar. Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be a monotone Σ_1^0 bar, and let $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ be a decidable subset such that $a \in U \leftrightarrow (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}) (a, n) \in D$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Define $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid (\bar{a}j_0(|a|), j_1(|a|)) \in D\}$$

where $\bar{a}n$ ($n < |a|$) is the initial segment of a of length n . Obviously, V is decidable. Moreover, since $a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} \bar{a}j_0(|a|)$ and U is monotone, V is contained in U . Lastly, to see that V is a bar, let $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B})$. Since U is a bar, there exists $a \in \alpha$ such that $a \in U$. Since U is Σ_1^0 , there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D(a, n)$. By (3.3), there exists $b \in \alpha$ such that $|b| = \langle |a|, n \rangle$. Then $b \in V$, and hence V is bar. \square

Another variant of $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$ is the following principle.

Definition 3.18. $\Pi_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$ is a variant of $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$ formulated with respect to a monotone partial function whose domain is a Π_1^0 subset of \mathbb{N}^* :

($\Pi_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{N}}$): If $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a monotone partial function whose domain is a Π_1^0 bar, then s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} .

Here a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ is Π_1^0 if there exists a decidable subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a \in U \leftrightarrow (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) (a, n) \in D.$$

A monotone partial function with a Π_1^0 domain arises as a *modulus* of a continuous map $(g, s): \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{IPt}(\mathcal{N})$. This can be made precise as follows: let $s_*: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{IPt}(\mathcal{N})$ be the continuous map induced by a relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$. Define a monotone partial function $s' \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$a s' n \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) s_*(\alpha_a) = s_*(\alpha_{a*b}) \ \& \ n \in s_*(\alpha_a),$$

where α_a is defined by (3.2). Note that

$$\text{dom}(s') = \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid (\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) s_*(\alpha_a) = s_*(\alpha_{a*b})\},$$

which is a Π_1^0 subset of \mathbb{N}^* under a suitable coding of \mathbb{N}^* in \mathbb{N} . We claim that

$$(\forall \alpha: IPt(\mathcal{B})) s'_*(\alpha) = s_*(\alpha). \quad (3.7)$$

To see this, fix $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{B})$. Let $n \in s'_*(\alpha)$, and let $a \in \alpha$ be such that $a s' n$. Let $m \in s_*(\alpha)$ be the unique element of $s_*(\alpha)$, and $b \in \alpha$ be such that $b s m$. Since α is filtering, we have either $a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b$ & $b \neq a$ or $b \leq_{\mathcal{B}} a$. In the former case, we have $m \in s_*(\alpha_a)$, and hence $n = m$ because $s_*(\alpha_a)$ is a singleton. In the latter case, we have $s_*(\alpha_a) = s_*(\alpha_b)$ because $a \in \text{dom}(s')$. Since $n \in s_*(\alpha_a)$ and $m \in s_*(\alpha_b)$, we have $n = m$. Therefore $s'_*(\alpha) \subseteq s_*(\alpha)$. The converse inclusion of (3.7) is obvious. In summary, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.19. *For every continuous map $(s_*, s): IPt(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow IPt(\mathcal{N})$, there exists a monotone partial function $s' \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ with a Π_1^0 domain such that $s_* = s'_*$.*

Note that Proposition 3.19 does not imply that $\Pi_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ is equivalent to $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ since equality of formal maps from $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}$ to \mathcal{N} is weaker than equality of formal maps from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} .

The principle of bar induction that corresponds to $\Pi_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$ is Π_1^0 *monotone bar induction*:

($\Pi_1^0\text{-BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$): For any monotone Π_1^0 bar $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ and an inductive subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $U \subseteq V$, it holds that $\text{nil} \in V$.

In $\Pi_1^0\text{-BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$, we cannot drop the condition of monotonicity on bars; otherwise the non-constructive principle LLPO (the lesser limited principle of omniscience) would be derivable (cf. Kawai [15, Proposition 7.1]).

Proposition 3.20. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\Pi_1^0\text{-BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- (2) $\Pi_1^0\text{-PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{N}}$.
- (3) $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \rightarrow a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and monotone Π_1^0 -subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (4) $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}p}} U \rightarrow \text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$ for all monotone Π_1^0 -subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 3.16. □

By Proposition 3.19 and Proposition 3.20, the principle $\Pi_1^0\text{-BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$ implies that every continuous map $(s_*, s): \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{N})$ is induced by some formal map $s': \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$. That the converse of this holds is essentially known (cf. Kawai [14, Theorem 3.9]). For the sake of completeness, we sketch the proof using our notion of continuous map.

Theorem 3.21. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\Pi_1^0\text{-BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- (2) *For any continuous map $(s_*, s): \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}p(\mathcal{N})$, there exists a formal map $s': \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ such that $s_* = s'_*$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that (2) implies (1). Assume (2). Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be a Π_1^0 monotone bar, and $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ be an inductive subset such that $U \subseteq V$. Then, there exists a decidable subset $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \in U \leftrightarrow (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) D(a, n)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Since U is monotone, the right hand side is equivalent to $(\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) D(a * b, n)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Define a decidable subset $\overline{D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$\overline{D}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} |a| > 0 \rightarrow D(\text{head}(a), \text{last}(a))$$

where $\text{head}(a)$ is obtained from a by omitting the last entry $\text{last}(a)$ of a . Furthermore, define $\overline{U} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$\overline{U}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} U(a) \ \& \ \overline{D}(a).$$

Then, it is straightforward to see that \overline{U} is a monotone bar and that

$$\overline{U}(a) \leftrightarrow (\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) \overline{D}(a * b).$$

Note that \overline{U} is a Π_1^0 subset of \mathbb{N}^* . Define a relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$a \ s \ n \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \overline{U}(a) \ \& \ \left[(n < |a| \ \& \ \neg \overline{D}(\overline{a}n) \ \& \ (\forall m < |a|) [n < m \rightarrow \overline{D}(\overline{a}m)]) \right. \\ \left. \vee ((\forall m < |a|) \overline{D}(\overline{a}m) \ \& \ n = 1) \right].$$

It is easy to see that s is a monotone partial function with domain \overline{U} . By the assumption, there exists a formal map $s': \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ such that $s'_* = s_*$. Define a relation $\overline{s'} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$a \ \overline{s'} \ n \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} n < |a| \ \& \ (\exists b \geq_{\mathcal{B}} a) b \ s' \ n.$$

By (3.3), we see that $\overline{s'}$ and s' are equal as formal maps from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{N} . Thus $\overline{s'}_* = s'_*$. Then, it is straightforward to show that $\text{dom}(\overline{s'}) \subseteq \overline{U}$. Hence $\text{nil} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} U$, and therefore $\text{nil} \in V$ by Lemma 3.2. \square

3.4. Relativisation to spreads. In this section, we relativise our continuity principle to spreads. This is in accord with Brouwer [3], who considered continuity of functions on choice sequences which belong to a fixed spread.

Definition 3.22. A *spread* is a decidable tree of natural numbers in which every node has an extension. Specifically, a spread is an inhabited decidable subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ such that

- (1) $a \in U \ \& \ a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \rightarrow b \in U$,
- (2) $a \in U \rightarrow (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}) a * n \in U$

for all $a, b \in S$ and $U \subseteq S$. Note that every spread enters $\times_{\mathcal{B}}$. We say that a choice sequence $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B})$ belongs to a spread U if $\alpha \subseteq U$, i.e. every choice made by α is in the spread.

Every spread U determines a cover \triangleleft_U and a positivity \times_U on \mathbb{N}^* by

$$a \triangleleft_U V \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \neg U \cup V \qquad a \times_U V \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \times_{\mathcal{B}} U \cap V \tag{3.8}$$

where $\neg U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid \neg(a \in U)\}$.

Lemma 3.23. Let U be a spread.

- (1) $\mathcal{B}_U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbb{N}^*, \triangleleft_U, \times_U)$ is a positive topology.
- (2) \times_U is the greatest positivity that is compatible with \triangleleft_U .
- (3) $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B}_U)$ if and only if α is a choice sequence belonging to U .

Proof. (1) We leave the reader to check that \triangleleft_U is a cover and \times_U is a positivity. We show that \triangleleft_U and \times_U are compatible. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $V, W \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. Suppose that $a \triangleleft_U V$ and $a \times_U W$. Since $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\times_{\mathcal{B}}$ are compatible, we have $(\neg U \cup V) \times_{\mathcal{B}} U \cap W$. Either $\neg U \times_{\mathcal{B}} U \cap W$ or $V \times_{\mathcal{B}} U \cap W$. The former case leads to a contradiction. Hence $V \times_{\mathcal{B}} U \cap W$, i.e. $V \times_U W$, as required.

(2) Let \ltimes' be a positivity on \mathbb{N}^* which is compatible with \triangleleft_U . We show that

$$\frac{a \ltimes' V \quad (\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) (b \ltimes' V \rightarrow b \in W)}{a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} W}$$

for all $V, W \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. To this end, fix $V, W \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, and put $V' = \{a \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid a \ltimes' V\}$. Suppose that $a \ltimes' V$ and $(\forall b \in \mathbb{N}^*) b \ltimes' V \rightarrow b \in W$. This is equivalent to $a \in V'$ and $V' \subseteq W$. Since $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \triangleleft_U$, \ltimes' is compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus $\ltimes' \subseteq \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}}$. Since $a \in V'$ implies $a \ltimes' V'$, we have $a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} V'$. Hence $a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} W$.

Now, to see that $\ltimes' \subseteq \ltimes_U$, it suffices to show that $a \ltimes' V \rightarrow a \in U \cap V$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. Suppose that $a \ltimes' V$. Then, trivially $a \in V$. Moreover, either $a \in U$ or $a \in \neg U$. If $a \in \neg U$, then $a \triangleleft_U \emptyset$, and by compatibility we obtain $\emptyset \ltimes' V$, a contradiction. Hence $a \in U$, and therefore $a \in U \cap V$.

(3) First, suppose that $\alpha: \text{IPt}(\mathcal{B}_U)$. It is straightforward to show that α is an ideal point of \mathcal{B} . Moreover, since $\neg U \triangleleft_U \emptyset$, we have $\alpha \cap \neg U = \emptyset$. As U is decidable, we obtain $\alpha \subseteq \neg \neg U = U$. Conversely, suppose that α belongs to U . We show that α enters \ltimes_U . Let $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$, and suppose that $a \in \alpha \subseteq V$. Then, $a \in \alpha \subseteq V \cap U$. Since α enters $\ltimes_{\mathcal{B}}$, we have $a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} V \cap U$, i.e. $a \ltimes_U V$, as required. The other properties of ideal points are easily checked. \square

We often identify a spread $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$ with the topology \mathcal{B}_U .

Lemma 3.24. *Every spread is a retract of \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. This is well known in point-set topology (cf. Troelstra and van Dalen [26, Chapter 4, Lemma 1.4]). Here, we give a pointfree proof.

Fix a spread $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. Clearly, the identity relation $\text{id}_{\mathbb{N}^*}$ on \mathbb{N}^* is a formal map from \mathcal{B}_U to \mathcal{B} . Its retraction $s: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_U$ is inductively defined as follows:

$$\frac{}{\text{nil } s \text{ nil}} \quad \frac{a \ s \ b \quad b * n \in U}{a * n \ s \ b * n} \quad \frac{a \ s \ b \quad \neg(b * n \in U)}{a * n \ s \ b * l}$$

In the last rule, l is the least number such that $b * l \in U$. The following properties of s directly follow from the definition:

- (1) s is a function.
- (2) $a \in U \leftrightarrow a \ s \ a$.
- (3) $a \ s \ b \rightarrow |a| = |b|$.
- (4) $a * n \ s \ b * m \rightarrow a \ s \ b$.
- (5) $a \leq_{\mathcal{B}} b \ \& \ a \ s \ c \ \& \ b \ s \ d \rightarrow c \leq_{\mathcal{B}} d$.

Then, it is straightforward to show that s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{B} . We show that $\text{Im}[s] = \mathcal{B}_U$, i.e. $\triangleleft_s = \triangleleft_U$ and $\ltimes_s = \ltimes_U$ (cf. (2.5) and (3.8)).

$\triangleleft_s = \triangleleft_U$: Fix $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. First, suppose that $a \triangleleft_s V$, i.e. $s^- a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} s^- V$. Either $a \in U$ or $a \in \neg U$. In the latter case, we have $a \triangleleft_U V$. In the former case, we have $a \ s \ a$. Thus, $a \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} s^- V$. Let $b \in s^- V$. Either $b \in U$ or $b \in \neg U$. If $b \in U$, then $b \in V$. Hence $s^- V \subseteq \neg U \cup V$, and so $a \triangleleft_U V$.

The converse is proved by induction on $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}}$. Suppose that $a \triangleleft_U V$ is derived by η -rule. Then either $a \in \neg U$ or $a \in V$. If $a \in \neg U$, then $s^- a = \emptyset \triangleleft_{\mathcal{B}} s^- V$, and thus $a \triangleleft_s V$. If $a \in V$, then trivially $a \triangleleft_s V$. The proof for the other rules follow easily from induction hypothesis and the above mentioned properties of s .

$\ltimes_s = \ltimes_U$: Since $\triangleleft_s = \triangleleft_U$ and \ltimes_U is the greatest positivity compatible with \triangleleft_U , it suffices to show that $\ltimes_U \subseteq \ltimes_s$. Suppose that $a \ltimes_U V$. We must show that $a \ltimes_s V$, i.e. $s^- a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} s^- V$. But $a \in U$, and so $a \ s \ a$. Since $U \cap V \subseteq s^* V$, we have $a \ltimes_{\mathcal{B}} s^* V$.

Therefore, s is a formal map from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{B}_U . Then, it is straightforward to show that the composition of $\text{id}_{\mathbb{N}^*}: \mathcal{B}_U \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $s: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_U$ is the identity. \square

Proposition 3.25. *For every spread U and a positive topology \mathcal{T} , the principle $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{T}}$ implies $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}_U, \mathcal{T}}$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 3.24 and Proposition 2.25. \square

In particular, by Lemma 3.23, Proposition 3.25, and Theorem 3.10, $\text{BI}_{\mathbf{M}}$ implies that any relation $s \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*$ which maps every choice sequence belonging to a spread U to another spread V is a formal map from \mathcal{B}_U to \mathcal{B}_V .

The proof of the following is analogous to that of Theorem 3.10.

Proposition 3.26. *$\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{B}_U, \mathcal{N}}$ is equivalent to spatiality of \mathcal{B}_U .*

The *formal Cantor space* is the binary spread $\{0, 1\}^*$. It is well known that the fan theorem and spatiality of the formal Cantor space are equivalent (cf. Schuster and Gambino [11, Proposition 4.3]; see Fourman and Grayson [9, Theorem 3.4] for an impredicative result). Thus, the fan theorem and the principle of continuity for the formal Cantor space and the formal topology of natural numbers are equivalent.

4. CONTINUITY ON REAL NUMBERS

We consider the continuity principle for the formal unit interval $\mathcal{I}[0, 1]$.

Definition 4.1. Let \mathbb{Q} be the set of rational numbers, and let

$$S_{\mathcal{R}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(p, q) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q} \mid p < q\}.$$

Define a preorder $\leq_{\mathcal{R}}$ and a strict order $<_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $S_{\mathcal{R}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (p, q) \leq_{\mathcal{R}} (p', q') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} p' \leq p \text{ \& } q \leq q', \\ (p, q) <_{\mathcal{R}} (p', q') &\stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} p' < p \text{ \& } q < q'. \end{aligned}$$

The *formal topology of real numbers* \mathcal{R} is a positive topology $\mathcal{R} = (S_{\mathcal{R}}, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{R}})$ where $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}}$ is inductively generated by the following rules

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{(p, q) \in U}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U} \quad \frac{(p, q) \leq_{\mathcal{R}} (p', q') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U} \quad \frac{(\forall (p', q') <_{\mathcal{R}} (p, q)) (p', q') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U} \\[10pt] \frac{p < p' < q' < q \quad (p, q') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U \quad (p', q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U} \end{array}$$

and $\bowtie_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the greatest positivity compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}}$. The *formal unit interval* $\mathcal{I}[0, 1] = (S_{\mathcal{R}}, \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]}, \bowtie_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]})$ is a positive topology where $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]}$ is generated by the rules of $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}}$ together with the following rules:

$$\frac{p < q < 0}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]} \emptyset} \quad \frac{1 < p < q}{(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]} \emptyset}$$

The positivity $\bowtie_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]}$ is again the greatest one compatible with $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0, 1]}$.

The collection of ideal points of \mathcal{R} is isomorphic to the Dedekind reals (Negri and Soravia [20, Proposition 9.2]; see also Fourman and Grayson [9, Example 1.2 (4)]). Similarly, $IPt(\mathcal{I}[0, 1])$ is isomorphic to the unit interval of the Dedekind reals, which is denoted by $[0, 1]$. It is well known that $\mathcal{I}[0, 1]$ is compact: every cover has a finite subcover (cf. Cederquist and Negri [4, Theorem 23]).⁸

Finite covers of $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_p}}$ and $\triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}}$ coincide as in the following lemma (cf. Palmgren [21, Lemma 10.6]).

Lemma 4.2. *For any $(p, q) \in S_{\mathcal{R}}$ and a finite subset $U \subseteq S_{\mathcal{R}}$, we have*

$$(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U \leftrightarrow (p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U.$$

Proof. By induction on the size of U . □

Let $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]}$ be the statement: $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1], \mathcal{T}}$ holds for all positive topology \mathcal{T} equipped with the greatest positivity compatible with its cover.

Theorem 4.3. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]}$.
- (2) $[0, 1]$ is a compact subset of $IPt(\mathcal{R})$, i.e. every open cover has a finite subcover (Heine–Borel covering theorem).
- (3) \mathcal{R} is spatial.
- (4) $\mathcal{I}[0, 1]$ is spatial.

Proof. The equivalence between (2), (3), and (4) are well known in locale theory (cf. Fourman and Grayson [9, Theorem 4.10]). We give a predicative proof below.

(1 \Rightarrow 2) Let $U \subseteq S_{\mathcal{R}}$ be a cover of $[0, 1]$, i.e. $S_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U$. Define $s \subseteq S_{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathbb{N}$ by

$$a \text{ s } n \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} a \in \downarrow_{\leq_{\mathcal{R}}} U \text{ \& } n = 0,$$

where $\downarrow_{\leq_{\mathcal{R}}} U$ is the downward closure of U with respect to $\leq_{\mathcal{R}}$. Note that s is a monotone partial function with domain $\downarrow_{\leq_{\mathcal{R}}} U$. By the similar argument as in Lemma 3.8, we see that s is a formal map $s: \mathcal{I}[0, 1]_{\mathcal{I}_p} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$. By $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]}$, s is a formal map $s: \mathcal{I}[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ as well. Hence $S_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]} U$. Since $\mathcal{I}[0, 1]$ is compact, there exists a finite $V \subseteq U$ such that $S_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]} V$. Therefore $S_{\mathcal{R}} \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]_{\mathcal{I}_p}} V$.

(2 \Rightarrow 3) Assume that $[0, 1]$ is compact, and suppose that $(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U$. Let $(p', q') <_{\mathcal{R}} (p, q)$. Then $[p', q'] \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in U} \text{Ext}(a)$, so there exists a finite $V \subseteq U$ such that $[p', q'] \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in V} \text{Ext}(a)$. Thus $(p', q') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} V$ by Lemma 4.2. Hence $(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U$.

(3 \Rightarrow 4) Assume that \mathcal{R} is spatial, and suppose that $(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]_{\mathcal{I}_p}} U$. Let $(p', q') <_{\mathcal{R}} (p, q)$. Put $(u, v) = (\max(0, p'), \min(1, q'))$. Then $[u, v] \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in U} \text{Ext}(a)$, so there exists $(u', v') >_{\mathcal{R}} (u, v)$ such that $(u', v') \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in U} \text{Ext}(a)$. Since \mathcal{R} is spatial, we have $(u', v') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{R}} U$. Moreover, it is straightforward to show that $(p', q') \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]} \{(u', v')\}$. Therefore $(p, q) \triangleleft_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]} U$.

(4 \Rightarrow 1) Immediate from Proposition 2.28. □

Corollary 4.4. $\text{PoPC}_{\mathcal{I}[0,1]}$ implies that any relation $s \subseteq S_{\mathcal{R}} \times S_{\mathcal{R}}$ which maps every $\alpha: IPt(\mathcal{R})$ to $s_*(\alpha): IPt(\mathcal{R})$ is a formal map $s: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 2.28. □

⁸These results about the formal topology of real numbers are based on the notion of formal topology [22], but they carry over to our setting because the cover of \mathcal{R} is inductively generated and the positivity is the greatest one compatible with the cover.

Acknowledgements. We thank the anonymous referees for numerous suggestions, which helped us improve our exposition in an essential way. The first author was funded as a Marie Curie fellow of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aczel and C. Fox. Separation properties in constructive topology. In Crosilla and Schuster [7], pages 176–192.
- [2] M. J. Beeson. *Foundations of Constructive Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.
- [3] L. E. J. Brouwer. Über Definitionsbereiche von Funktionen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 97:60–75, 1927. English translation of sections 1–3 in van Heijenoort [27] pages 457–463.
- [4] J. Cederquist and S. Negri. A constructive proof of the Heine–Borel covering theorem for formal reals. In S. Berardi and M. Coppo, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs*, volume 1158 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 62–75. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
- [5] F. Ciraulo and G. Sambin. Embedding locales and formal topologies into positive topologies. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 57(7):755–768, 2018.
- [6] T. Coquand, G. Sambin, J. Smith, and S. Valentini. Inductively generated formal topologies. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 124(1-3):71–106, 2003.
- [7] L. Crosilla and P. Schuster, editors. *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis: Towards Practicable Foundations for Constructive Mathematics*. Number 48 in Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, 2005.
- [8] M. Dummett. *Elements of Intuitionism*. Number 39 in Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, second edition, 2000.
- [9] M. P. Fourman and R. J. Grayson. Formal spaces. In A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, editors, *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, pages 107–122. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [10] C. Fox. *Point-set and Point-free Topology in Constructive Set Theory*. PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2005.
- [11] N. Gambino and P. Schuster. Spatiality for formal topologies. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.*, 17(1):65–80, 2007.
- [12] H. Ishihara. Constructive reverse mathematics: compactness properties. In Crosilla and Schuster [7], pages 245–267.
- [13] P. T. Johnstone. *Stone Spaces*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [14] T. Kawai. Formally continuous functions on Baire space. *Math. Log. Quart.*, 64(3):192–200, 2018.
- [15] T. Kawai. Principles of bar induction and continuity on Baire space. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2018. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.04082>.
- [16] S. C. Kleene and R. E. Vesley. *The foundations of intuitionistic mathematics, especially in relation to recursive functions*. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [17] G. Kreisel and A. S. Troelstra. Formal systems for some branches of intuitionistic analysis. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 1(3):229–387, 1970.
- [18] M. E. Maietti. A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 160(3):319–354, 2009.
- [19] M. E. Maietti and G. Sambin. Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics. In Crosilla and Schuster [7], pages 91–114.
- [20] S. Negri and D. Soravia. The continuum as a formal space. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 38(7):423–447, 1999.
- [21] E. Palmgren. Continuity on the real line and in formal spaces. In Crosilla and Schuster [7], pages 165–175.
- [22] G. Sambin. Intuitionistic formal spaces — a first communication. In D. G. Skordev, editor, *Mathematical Logic and its Applications*, volume 305, pages 187–204. Plenum Press, New York, 1987.
- [23] G. Sambin. Formal topology and domains. *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 35:177–190, 2000.
- [24] G. Sambin. Some points in formal topology. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 305(1-3):347–408, 2003.
- [25] G. Sambin. *Positive Topology and the Basic Picture. New structures emerging from constructive mathematics*. Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, to appear.
- [26] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen. *Constructivism in Mathematics: An Introduction. Volume I*, volume 121 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.

- [27] J. van Heijenoort. *From Frege to Gödel. A source book in mathematical logic, 1879–1931*. Harvard University Press, 1967.
- [28] S. Vickers. *Topology via Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [29] S. Vickers. Information systems for continuous posets. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 114:201–229, 1993.