

# Stone Duality for Topological Convexity Spaces

Toby Kenney

Dalhousie University

January 25, 2022

## Abstract

A convexity space is a set  $X$  with a chosen family of subsets (called convex subsets) that is closed under arbitrary intersections and directed unions. There is a lot of interest in spaces that have both a convexity space and a topological space structure. In this paper, we study the category of topological convexity spaces and extend the Stone duality between coframes and topological spaces to an adjunction between topological convexity spaces and sup-lattices. We factor this adjunction through the category of preconvexity spaces (sometimes called closure spaces).

## Keywords

Stone duality; Topological Convexity Spaces; Sup-lattices; Preconvexity Spaces; Partial Sup-lattices

## 1 Introduction

Stone duality is a contravariant equivalence of categories between categories of spaces and categories of lattices. The original Stone duality was between Stone spaces and Boolean algebras [12]. One of the most widely used extensions of Stone duality is between the categories of sober topological spaces and spatial coframes (or frames — since this is a 1-categorical duality, they are the same thing). This duality extends to an idempotent adjunction between topological spaces and coframes, given by the functors that send a topological space to its coframe of closed sets, and the functor that sends a coframe to its space of points.

In this paper, we extend this adjunction to an idempotent adjunction between topological convexity spaces and sup-lattices (the category whose objects are complete lattices, and morphisms are functions that preserve arbitrary suprema). Topological convexity spaces are sets equipped with both a chosen family of closed sets and a chosen family of convex sets. A canonical example is a metric space  $X$  with the usual metric topology, and convexity defined by convex sets are closed under the betweenness relation given by  $y$  is between  $x$  and  $z$  if  $d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ . Many of the properties

of metric spaces extend to topological convexity spaces. Homomorphisms of topological convexity spaces are continuous functions for which the inverse image of a convex set is convex.

Our approach to showing this adjunction goes via two equivalent intermediate categories. The first is the category of preconvexity spaces. A preconvexity space is a pair  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  that is closed under arbitrary intersections and empty unions. We will refer to sets  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  as *preconvex* subsets of  $X$ . A homomorphism of preconvexity spaces  $f : (X, \mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow (X', \mathcal{P}')$  is a function  $f : X \longrightarrow X'$  such that for any  $P \in \mathcal{P}'$ , we have  $f^{-1}(P) \in \mathcal{P}$ . This category of preconvexity spaces was also studied by [4], and shown to be closed under arbitrary limits and colimits.

The second intermediate category that is equivalent to the category of preconvexity spaces, is a full subcategory category of Distributive Partial Sup lattices. This category was studied in [8]. Objects of this category are complete lattices with a chosen family of suprema which distribute over arbitrary infima. Morphisms are functions that preserve all infima and the chosen suprema. The motivation for partial sup lattices was an adjunction between partial sup lattices and preconvexity spaces, which is shown in [8].

Before we begin presenting the extension of Stone duality to topological convexity spaces, Section 2 provides a review of the main ingredients needed. While these reviews do not contain substantial new results, they are presented in a with a different focus from much of the literature, so we hope that the reviews offer a new perspective on these well-studied subjects. We first recap the basics of topological convexity spaces. We then review Stone duality for topological spaces. We then review the category of distributive partial sup-lattices. This category was defined in [8], with the motivation of modelling various types of preconvexity spaces. However, the definition presented in this review is changed from the original definition in that paper to make it cleaner in a categorical sense.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Topological Convexity Spaces

**Definition 2.1.** *A topological convexity space is a triple  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$ , where  $X$  is a set;  $\mathcal{F}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  that is closed under finite unions and arbitrary intersections; and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  that is closed under directed unions and arbitrary intersections. Note that these include empty unions and intersections, so  $X$  and  $\emptyset$  are in both  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ . Sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  will be called closed subsets of  $X$  and sets in  $\mathcal{C}$  will be called convex subsets of  $X$ .*

The motivation here is that  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a topological space, while  $(X, \mathcal{C})$  is an abstract convexity space. Abstract convexity spaces are a generalisation of convex subsets of standard Euclidean spaces. Abstract convexity spaces were defined in [7], though in that paper, the definition did not require  $\mathcal{C}$  to be closed under nonempty directed unions. Closure under directed unions was an additional property, called “domain finiteness”. Later authors incorporated closure under directed unions into the definition of an abstract convexity space, and used the term *preconvexity space* for a set with a chosen

collection of subsets that is closed under arbitrary intersections and contains the empty set [4].

While the definition of an abstract convexity space captures many of the important properties of convex sets in geometry, it also allows a large number of interesting examples far beyond the original examples from classical geometry, including many examples from combinatorics and algebra. The resulting category of convexity spaces has many natural closure properties [4].

The definition above does not include any interaction between the topological and convexity structures on  $X$ . While it will be convenient to deal with such general spaces, it is also useful to include compatibility axioms between the convexity and topological structures. The following axioms from [13] are often used to ensure suitable compatibility between topology and convexity structure.

- (i) All convex sets are connected.
- (ii) All polytopes are compact.
- (iii) The hull operation is uniformly continuous relative to a metric which generates the topology.

We will modify the third condition to not require the topology to come from a metric space, giving the weaker condition that the convex closure operation preserves closed sets.

**Definition 2.2.** *We will call a topological convexity space compatible if it satisfies the two conditions*

- (i) *All convex sets are connected.*
- (ii) *The convex closure of a (topologically) compact set is (topologically) compact.*

At this point, we will introduce some notation for describing topological convexity spaces. For  $A \subseteq X$ , we will write  $[A]$  for the intersection of all convex sets containing  $A$ . To simplify notation, when  $A$  is finite, we will write  $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  instead of  $[\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}]$ .

**Examples 2.3.**

1. If  $(X, d)$  is a metric space, then setting

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ A \subseteq X \mid (\forall x \in X) \left( \bigwedge_{y \in A} d(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow x \in A \right) \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ A \subseteq X \mid (\forall x, y, z \in X) ((x, z \in A \wedge d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z)) \Rightarrow y \in A) \}$$

we have that  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$  is a topological convexity space. Finitely generated convex sets of  $(X, d)$  are closed and compact, and the convex closure operation is

uniformly continuous. For convex sets to be connected, we need some suitable interpolation property, namely that for any  $r < d(x, y)$ , there is some  $z \in [x, y]$  such that  $d(x, z) = r$ , since if this is not the case, then  $B(x, r) \cap [x, y]$  and  $B(y, d(x, y) - r)$  form a disjoint open cover of  $[x, y]$ .

2. Let  $L$  be a complete lattice. We define a topological convexity space structure by

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \bigcap_{i \in I} F_i \mid (\forall i \in I) ((\exists x_1, \dots, x_{n_i} \in X) (F_i = \downarrow(\{x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}\})) \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C} = \{I \subseteq X \mid (\forall x_1, x_2 \in I) ((\forall y \leq x_1)(y \in I) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \in I))\}$$

That is,  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of arbitrary intersections of finitely generated downsets (which are the closed sets for the weak topology [6]) and  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of ideals of  $L$ . This topological convexity space is compatible. To prove connectedness of convex sets, we want to show that an ideal cannot be covered by two disjoint weak-closed sets. Suppose  $U$  and  $V$  are disjoint weak-closed sets that cover  $I$ . Let  $a \in I \cap U$  and  $b \in I \cap V$ . Then  $a \vee b \in I$ , and if  $a \vee b \in U$ , then  $b \in U$  contradicting disjointness of  $U$  and  $V$ . Similarly if  $a \vee b \in V$  then  $a \in V$ .

3. Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  be a positive integer. Let  $S_n$  be the group of permutations on  $n$  elements. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  consist of all subsets of  $S_n$ , and for any partial order  $\leq$  on  $n$ , let  $P_{\leq} = \{\sigma \in S_n \mid (\forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\})(i \leq j \Rightarrow \sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j))\}$ , where  $\leq$  is the usual total order on  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . That is  $P_{\leq}$  is the set of permutations  $\sigma$  such that  $\leq$  is contained in  $\sigma^{-1}(\leq)$ . Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{P_{\leq} \mid \leq \text{ is a partial order on } \{1, \dots, n\} \cup \{\emptyset\}\}$ . Since  $S_n$  is finite, to prove that  $(S_n, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$  is a compatible convexity space, we just need to show that  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under intersection. This is straightforward. Since partial orders are closed under intersection, the poset of partial orders on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , with a top element adjoined, is a lattice. Thus the intersection  $P_{\leq} \cap P_{\sqsubseteq} = P_{\leq \vee \sqsubseteq}$ , so  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under intersection. This is a metric topology, with the metric given by  $d(\sigma, \tau)$  is the Cayley distance from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$ , under the Coxeter generators. That is,  $d(\sigma, \tau)$  is the length of the shortest word equal to  $\tau\sigma^{-1}$  in the generators  $\{\tau_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , where

$$\tau_i(j) = \begin{cases} i+1 & \text{if } j = i \\ i & \text{if } j = i+1 \\ j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is the transposition of  $i$  and  $i+1$ .

4. If  $G$  is a topological group, or more generally a universal algebra equipped with a suitable topology, then we can define a topological convexity space by making subgroups (or more generally subalgebras) and the empty set convex, and keeping the closed sets from the topology.

Having defined the objects in the category of topological convexity spaces, we need to define the morphisms.

**Definition 2.4.** A homomorphism  $f : (X, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow (X', \mathcal{F}', \mathcal{C}')$  between topological convexity spaces is a function  $f : X \longrightarrow X'$  such that for every  $F \in \mathbb{F}'$ ,  $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}$  and for every  $C \in \mathcal{C}'$ ,  $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{C}$ .

The condition that  $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}$  is the condition that  $f$  is continuous as a function between topological spaces. The condition that  $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{C}$  is called *monotone* by [4], by analogy with the example of endofunctions of the real numbers. This was in the context of convexity spaces without topological structure. Dawson [4] uses the term *Align* for the category of convexity spaces and monotone homomorphisms, and *Convex* for the category of convexity spaces and functions whose forward image preserves convex sets. However, this terminology has not been widely used, and later authors have all considered the monotone homomorphisms as the natural homomorphisms of abstract convexity spaces. In the case of topological convexity spaces, the monotone condition is an even more natural choice because it aligns well with the continuity condition and leads to the Stone duality extension that we show in this paper.

### Examples 2.5.

1. For the topological convexity space coming from a metric space, a homomorphism is a function  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  such that whenever  $d(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ , we have  $d(f(x), f(z)) = d(f(x), f(y)) + d(f(y), f(z))$ .
2. If  $L$  and  $M$  are complete lattices with the weak topology and convex sets are ideals, then topological convexity space homomorphisms from  $L$  to  $M$  are exactly sup-homomorphisms.
3. For the partial order convexity on  $S_n$ , we first consider automorphisms:

**Lemma 2.6.** *If  $i, j, k$  and  $l$  are distinct, then the only half-spaces that contain  $C_{ij} \cap C_{kl}$  are  $C_{ij}$  and  $C_{kl}$ .*

*Proof.* For any half-space  $C_{st}$ , we need to find some  $\sigma \in C_{ij} \cap C_{kl}$  with  $\sigma \notin C_{st}$ . Suppose  $s = j$  and  $t \neq i$ , then letting  $\sigma(i) < \sigma(j) < \sigma(t) < \sigma(k) < \sigma(l)$  works. Similar permutations work for all combinations.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.7.** *An automorphism  $f : (S_n, P(S_n), \mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow (S_n, P(S_n), \mathcal{C})$  is of the form  $f(\sigma) = \tau\sigma\theta$  for some  $\tau \in S_n$  and some  $\theta \in \{e, \rho\}$  where  $\rho$  is the permutation which reverses the order of all elements.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that for  $\tau \in S_n$ ,  $f_\tau$  given by  $f_\tau(\sigma) = \tau\sigma$  is an automorphism of  $(S_n, P(S_n), \mathcal{C})$ . Now we consider the stabiliser of the identity element. Since  $\{C_{i(i+1)} \mid i = 1, \dots, (n-1)\}$  is the only set of  $n-1$  half-spaces whose intersection contains only the identity permutation, any automorphism which fixes the identity permutation must fix this set. Furthermore, since  $C_{(i-1)i} \cap C_{i(i+1)} \subseteq C_{(i-1)(i+1)}$ , it follows that  $f^{-1}(C_{(i-1)i}) \cap f^{-1}(C_{i(i+1)}) \subseteq f^{-1}(C_{(i-1)(i+1)})$ . Since  $f$  is an automorphism,  $C_{(i-1)(i+1)}$  cannot be  $C_{(i-1)i}$  or  $C_{i(i+1)}$ . By Lemma 2.6, it follows that  $f^{-1}(C_{(i-1)i})$  and  $f^{-1}(C_{i(i+1)})$  are adjacent half-spaces. Since the

set of half-spaces  $\{C_{i(i+1)} \mid i = 1, \dots, (n-1)\}$  is permuted by  $f^{-1}$ , the only possible permutations are the identity and the reversal  $C_{i(i+1)} \mapsto C_{(n-i)(n+1-i)}$ . This reversal sends a permutation  $\sigma$  to  $\rho\sigma\rho$ .

We want to show that these are the only elements in the stabiliser of the identity. By applying  $\rho\sigma\rho$  if necessary, we can change an element in the stabiliser of  $e$  to one such that  $f^{-1}$  fixes every  $C_{i(i+1)}$ . Now  $C_{i(i+2)}$  is the unique half-space that contains  $C_{i(i+1)} \cap C_{(i+1)(i+2)}$  that is not equal to either  $C_{i(i+1)}$  or  $C_{(i+1)(i+2)}$ , so it is also fixed by  $f^{-1}$ . By induction, we can show that every  $C_{ij}$  is fixed by  $f^{-1}$ , and thus  $f$  is the identity. □

**Proposition 2.8.**  $f : S_n \longrightarrow S_m$  is a surjective topological convexity space homomorphism, if and only if there is an injective function  $g : m \longrightarrow n$ . Such that  $f$  is either given by  $f(\tau)(i) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \tau(g(j)) \leq \tau(g(i))\}|$  or  $f(\tau)(i) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \tau(g(j)) \geq \tau(g(i))\}|$

*Proof.* Firstly, we show that for an injective function  $g : n \longrightarrow m$ , both the functions

$$\alpha_g(\sigma)(i) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \sigma(g(j)) \leq \sigma(g(i))\}|$$

and

$$\delta_g(\sigma)(i) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \sigma(g(j)) \geq \sigma(g(i))\}|$$

are surjective homomorphisms. We see that for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,

$$\alpha_g^{-1}(C_{ij}) = \{\sigma \in S_n \mid \alpha_g(\sigma)(i) < \alpha_g(\sigma)(j)\} = \{\sigma \in S_n \mid \sigma(g(i)) < \sigma(g(j))\} = C_{g(i)g(j)}$$

and

$$\delta_g^{-1}(C_{ij}) = \{\sigma \in S_n \mid \delta_g(\sigma)(i) < \delta_g(\sigma)(j)\} = \{\sigma \in S_n \mid \sigma(g(i)) > \sigma(g(j))\} = C_{g(j)g(i)}$$

so  $\alpha_g$  and  $\delta_g$  are homomorphisms. Conversely, let  $f : S_n \longrightarrow S_m$  be a surjective homomorphism. Since  $\{e\}$  is convex, where  $e$  is the identity homomorphism,  $f^{-1}(\{e\})$  is convex. Furthermore,  $f^{-1}(\{e\}) = \bigcap_{i < j} f^{-1}(C_{ij})$ . Since  $f^{-1}$  preserves convex sets, for every  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$   $f^{-1}(C_{ij}) = C_{st}$  for some  $s, t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Furthermore,  $f^{-1}(C_{ij} \cap C_{jk}) = C_{st} \cap C_{tu}$ . Thus, we have  $f^{-1}(\{e\}) = C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m} = C_{i_1 i_2} \cap C_{i_2 i_3} \cdots \cap C_{i_{m-1} i_m}$ . If  $f^{-1}(C_{12}) = C_{i_1 i_2}$ , then we can define  $g(j) = i_j$ , and we have that  $f = \alpha_g$ . If on the other hand  $f^{-1}(C_{12}) = C_{i_{m-1} i_m}$ , then we let  $g(j) = i_{m+1-j}$  and we have  $f = \delta_g$ . □

General homomorphisms are more difficult to describe.

## 2.2 Preconvexity Spaces

**Definition 2.9.** A preconvexity space (sometimes called a closure space) is a pair  $(X, \mathcal{P})$ , where  $X$  is a set and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  that is closed under arbitrary intersections and contains the empty set (since  $X$  is an empty intersection, we also have  $X \in \mathcal{P}$ ).

This was [7]'s original definition of a convexity space. However, later authors decided that closure under directed unions should be a required property for a convexity space, and [4] introduced the term preconvexity space for these spaces that do not require closure under directed unions.

**Definition 2.10.** A homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{P}) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$  of preconvexity spaces is a function  $X \xrightarrow{f} X'$  such that for any preconvex set  $P \in \mathcal{P}'$ , the inverse image  $f^{-1}(P) \in \mathcal{P}$ .

### Examples 2.11.

If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C)$  is a topological convexity space, then  $(X, \mathcal{F} \cap C)$  is a preconvexity space.

Any topological convexity space homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{F}', C')$  is a preconvexity homomorphism. Conversely, if  $C'$  consists of directed unions from  $\mathcal{F}' \cap C'$ , and  $\mathcal{F}'$  consists of intersections of finite unions from  $\mathcal{F}' \cap C'$ , then any preconvexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{F} \cap C) \xrightarrow{g} (X', \mathcal{F}' \cap C')$  is a topological convexity homomorphism.

## 2.3 Adjunction Between Topological Convexity Spaces and Preconvexity Spaces

The example above of a preconvexity space gives a functor  $ConvexTop \xrightarrow{CC} Preconvex$  that sends every topological convexity space to the preconvexity space of closed convex sets. The action on morphisms simply reinterprets the topological convexity homomorphism as a preconvexity homomorphism.

This functor is not a fibration. Indeed some morphisms in  $Preconvex$  do not even have lifts. Consider for example

$$(\{0, 1, 2\}, \{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 1, 2\}\}) \xrightarrow{f} (\{0, 1\}, \{\emptyset, \{0, 1\}\})$$

given by  $f(0) = f(1) = 0$  and  $f(2) = 1$ . This has no lift to a topological convexity space homomorphism with codomain

$$(\{0, 1\}, \{\emptyset, \{0, 1\}\}, \{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{0, 1\}\})$$

because the preimage of  $\{0\}$  under  $f$  is  $\{0, 1\}$ , so for this to be a homomorphism, we would need  $\{0, 1\}$  to be convex. However, since  $\{0\}$  and  $\{1\}$  are both closed, it follows that  $\{0, 1\}$  must be closed, so the resulting space is no longer in the fibre above

$$(\{0, 1, 2\}, \{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 1, 2\}\})$$

The closed-convex functor does have a right adjoint,  $IS$ , which sends the preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  to  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$  where  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{P}$  under directed unions, and  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{P}$  under finite unions and arbitrary intersections.

**Lemma 2.12.** *For any preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$ , the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  is closed under directed unions and arbitrary intersections.*

*Proof.* By definition,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  is closed under directed unions, so we just need to show that it is closed under intersections. Let  $\{P_i | i \in I\}$  be a family of elements of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . By definition, for every  $i \in I$ , there is a directed  $\mathcal{D}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  with  $P_i = \bigcup \mathcal{D}_i$ . W.l.o.g. assume every  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is down-closed in  $\mathcal{P}$ . We will show that

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} P_i = \bigcup_{\substack{f: I \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \\ (\forall i \in I) f(i) \in \mathcal{D}_i}} \bigcap_{i \in I} f(i) \quad (1)$$

That is, the intersection of the family  $\{P_i | i \in I\}$  is the union over all choice functions  $f$ , of the intersection of  $\{f(i) | i \in I\}$ . Since every  $f(i) \in \mathcal{P}$ , this intersection  $\bigcap_{i \in I} f(i)$  is also in  $\mathcal{P}$ , so Equation (1) shows that  $\bigcap_{i \in I} P_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ .

To prove Equation (1), first let  $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} P_i$ . Since  $(\forall i)(x \in P_i)$ , and  $P_i = \bigcup \mathcal{D}_i$ , there is some  $D_{i,x} \in \mathcal{D}_i$  with  $x \in D_{i,x}$ . Thus, we can take the choice function  $f_x(i) = D_{i,x}$ , and deduce  $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} f_x(i)$ . Conversely, let

$$x \in \bigcup_{\substack{f: I \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \\ (\forall i \in I) f(i) \in \mathcal{D}_i}} \bigcap_{i \in I} f(i)$$

There must be some choice function  $f$  with  $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} f(i)$ . Since  $f(i) \in \mathcal{D}_i$ , it follows that  $f(i) \subseteq P_i$ , so  $x \in P_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . Thus  $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} P_i$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.13.* The proof of Lemma 2.12 does not actually require the axiom of choice, because there are canonical choices for all choice functions needed — for each  $P_i$ , we can let  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{P \in \mathcal{P} | P \subseteq P_i\}$ , and since every  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is a downset, we can set  $D_{i,x} = \{x\}$  for every  $i \in I$ , where  $\{x\}$  is the convex-closed closure of  $\{x\}$ .

**Lemma 2.14.** *Every  $F \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}$  is of the form  $\bigcap \mathcal{F}$ , where*

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n | P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \{P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n | P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}\}$  be the set of finite unions from  $\mathcal{P}$ . We need to show that the set  $\{\bigcap \mathcal{F} | \mathcal{F} \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{P}}\}$  is closed under finite unions. (By definition, it is closed under arbitrary intersections.) Let  $F_1 = \bigcap \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $F_2 = \bigcap \mathcal{F}_2$  for  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{P}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_{12} = \{P_1 \cup P_2 | P_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2\}$ . We will show that  $F_1 \cup F_2 = \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{12}$ . Clearly, for every  $P_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ , and  $P_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ , we have  $F_1 \subseteq P_1$  and  $F_2 \subseteq P_2$ , so  $F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq P_1 \cup P_2$ . Conversely, suppose  $x \notin F_1 \cup F_2$ . Then there is some  $P_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$  and some  $P_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  with  $x \notin P_1$  and  $x \notin P_2$ . It follows that  $x \notin P_1 \cup P_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{12}$ , so  $x \notin \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{12}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.15.** *1. For a set  $X$ , the identity function on  $X$  is a preconvexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{P}) \longrightarrow (X, \mathcal{P}')$  if and only if  $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ .*



2. For a set  $X$ , the identity function on  $X$  is a topological convexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C) \longrightarrow (X, \mathcal{F}', C')$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  and  $C' \subseteq C$ .

**Proposition 2.16.** *The assignment  $IS$  that sends the preconexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  to the topological convexity space  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$  and the preconexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{P}) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$  to  $f$  considered as a topological convexity homomorphism, is a functor, and is right adjoint to the functor  $CC : \text{ConvexTop} \longrightarrow \text{Preconvex}$ .*

*Proof.* Because the forgetful functor to **Set** sends  $IS$  to the identity functor, the functoriality of  $IS$  is automatic provided it is well-defined. That is, if any preconexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{P}) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$  is a topological convexity homomorphism from  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$  to  $(X', \overline{\mathcal{P}'}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}'})$ . For the adjunction, we need to demonstrate that for any topological convexity space  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C)$  and any preconexity space  $(X', \mathcal{P}')$ , a function  $f : X \longrightarrow X'$  is a topological convexity space homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \overline{\mathcal{P}'}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}'})$  if and only if it is a preconexity homomorphism  $(X, \mathcal{F} \cap C) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$ .

Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{F} \cap C) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$  is a preconexity homomorphism. Let  $F \in \overline{\mathcal{P}'}$ . We want to show that  $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Now  $F \in \overline{\mathcal{P}'}$  means  $F = \bigcap \mathcal{U}$  where  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{P}'}$ . Now if  $P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n \in \hat{\mathcal{P}'}$ , then  $f^{-1}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) = f^{-1}(P_1) \cup \dots \cup f^{-1}(P_n)$  is a finite union of sets from  $\mathcal{F} \cap C$ , so since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under finite unions,  $f^{-1}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore  $f^{-1}(F) = \bigcap \{f^{-1}U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  and  $\{f^{-1}U \mid U \in \mathcal{U}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , so as  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under arbitrary intersections,  $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Similarly, let  $C = \bigcup \mathcal{D}$ , where  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$  is a directed downset. For every  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , we have  $f^{-1}(D) \in C$ , and for any  $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ , there is some  $D_{12} \in \mathcal{D}$  with  $D_1 \subseteq D_{12}$  and  $D_2 \subseteq D_{12}$ . It follows that  $f^{-1}(D_1) \subseteq f^{-1}(D_{12})$  and  $f^{-1}(D_2) \subseteq f^{-1}(D_{12})$ . Therefore,  $\{f^{-1}(D) \mid D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  is directed. Now  $f^{-1}(C) = f^{-1}(\bigcup \mathcal{D}) = \bigcup \{f^{-1}(D) \mid D \in \mathcal{D}\}$ . Since  $\{f^{-1}(D) \mid D \in \mathcal{D}\} \subseteq C$ , and  $C$  is closed under directed unions, it follows that  $f^{-1}(C) \in C$ . Thus  $f$  is a homomorphism of topological convexity spaces.

Well-definedness of the functor  $IS$  also follows from the adjunction, because  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ , so the identity function on  $X$  is always a preconexity homomorphism  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{i} (X, \mathcal{P})$ . Thus the composite

$$(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{i} (X, \mathcal{P}) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \mathcal{P}')$$

is a preconexity homomorphism, so by the adjunction, it is a topological convexity space homomorphism  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{f} (X', \overline{\mathcal{P}'}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}'})$

□

**Corollary 2.17.** *The adjunction  $CC \dashv IS$  is idempotent.*

*Proof.* The counit and unit of the adjunction are both the identity function viewed as a homomorphism in the relevant category. The triangle identities for the adjunction therefore give an isomorphism of spaces, showing that the adjunction is idempotent.

□

For an idempotent adjunction, a natural question is what are the fixed points?

**Proposition 2.18.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$  is a topological convexity space satisfying the conditions*

1. *Every convex set is a directed union of closed convex sets.*
2. *For every  $V \in \mathcal{F}$  and any  $x \in X \setminus V$ , there are sets  $C_1, \dots, C_n \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$  such that  $V \subseteq C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$  and  $x \notin C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$ .*

*Then  $IS \circ CC(X) = X$ .*

*Proof.* The counit of the adjunction is the identity function on the underlying sets. Thus  $\overline{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  and  $\widehat{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  be convex in  $X$ . By Condition 1,  $A$  is a directed union of sets in  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$ . By definition, this is in  $\widehat{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})}$ .

Now let  $V \in \mathcal{F}$ . For any  $W = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$  with  $C_i \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$ ,  $W \in \overline{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})}$  by definition. Thus, by Condition 2, for every  $x \in X \setminus V$ , there is some  $W \in \overline{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})}$  with  $V \subseteq W$  and  $x \notin W$ . Since  $\overline{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})}$  is closed under arbitrary intersections, this implies  $V \in \overline{(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C})}$ .  $\square$

We will call a topological convexity space *teetotal* if the conditions of Proposition 2.18 hold. The teetotal conditions are closely related to the compatible conditions from Definition 2.2. However, there are compatible spaces which are not teetotal.

**Example 2.19.**  $l^2$  is the vector-space of square-summable sequences of real numbers, with the  $l^2$  norm. Since  $l^2$  is a metric space, it is easy to check that it is a compatible topological convexity space.

Let  $F$  be the unit sphere, which is a closed set, and let  $x = 0$ . In order for  $l^2$  to be teetotal, we need to find a finite family of closed convex subsets  $C_1, \dots, C_n$  such that  $F \subseteq C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$  and  $x \notin C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$ . For closed convex  $C_i$  and  $x \notin C_i$ , since  $C_i$  is closed, there is an open ball containing  $x$  disjoint from  $C_i$ . Let  $d = \sup\{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid B(x, r) \cap C_i = \emptyset\}$  be the distance from  $x$  to  $C_i$ . Since  $B(x, d)$  is the directed union of  $\{B(x, r) \mid r < d\}$ , it follows that  $B(x, d) \cap C_i = \emptyset$ .

We first show that if  $C$  is a closed convex set that does not contain 0, then there is a unique  $x \in C$  that minimises  $\|x\|$ . If not, then there must be a sequence  $a_1, a_2, \dots \in C$  such that  $\|a_i\|$  is strictly decreasing and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|a_n\| = \inf_{y \in C} \|y\|$$

Since  $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is compact for every  $n$ , there is a point  $b_n \in [a_1, \dots, a_n]$  that minimises  $\|b\|$ . In particular, this means that for any  $i < n$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\|b_n + \epsilon(b_i - b_n)\| > \|b_n\|$ . Squaring both sides gives

$$2\epsilon \langle b_i, b_n \rangle - 2\epsilon \langle b_n, b_n \rangle + \epsilon^2 \langle b_i - b_n, b_i - b_n \rangle > 0$$

Taking the limit as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  gives  $\langle b_i, b_n \rangle > \langle b_n, b_n \rangle$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|b_i - b_n\|^2 &= \|b_i\|^2 + \|b_n\|^2 - 2\langle b_i, b_n \rangle \\ &\leq \|b_i\|^2 - \|b_n\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|b_n\|^2$  is a decreasing sequence, bounded below by 0, it converges to some limit  $r$ . Thus  $\|b_i - b_n\|^2 \leq \|b_i\|^2 - r$  for any  $i < n$ . Thus  $b_n$  is a Cauchy sequence, so it converges to some limit  $b_\infty$ . Now since  $C$  is closed,  $b_\infty \in C$ , and

$$\|b_\infty\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b_n\| = \inf_{y \in C} \|y\|$$

Thus  $b_\infty$  is a nearest point in  $C$  to 0. If  $x$  is another point with minimal norm, then  $\frac{x+b_\infty}{2}$  must have smaller norm. Thus  $b_\infty$  is the unique point with smallest norm.

Now for any  $y \in C$ , since  $C$  is convex, we have that  $\|b_\infty + \epsilon(y - b_\infty)\| > \|b_\infty\|$ , and by the above argument,  $\langle y, b_\infty \rangle \geq \langle b_\infty, b_\infty \rangle$ . Thus  $C \subseteq \{x \in \ell^2 \mid \langle x, b_\infty \rangle > \frac{1}{2}\|b_\infty\|^2\}$ . That is, every closed convex set is contained in a half-space.

We can therefore find half-spaces  $H_1, \dots, H_n$  with  $x \notin H_i$  and  $C_i \subseteq H_i$ . Thus, we may assume that  $F \subseteq H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_n$ . Half-spaces that do not contain the origin are sets of the form  $H_{w,a} = \{v \in \ell^2 \mid \langle v, w \rangle > a\}$  for some  $w \in \ell^2$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Given a finite family  $H_1, \dots, H_n = H_{w_1, a_1}, \dots, H_{w_n, a_n}$ , we can find a unit vector  $w$  that is orthogonal to all of  $w_1, \dots, w_n$ . This means that  $w \notin H_i$  for all  $i$ , and  $w \in F$ , contradicting the assumption that  $F \subseteq H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_n$ . Therefore,  $\ell^2$  does not satisfy the teetotal axioms.

The teetotal interior  $CF(\ell^2)$  has the same convex sets, but closed sets are intersections of finite unions of closed half-spaces. We can check that this is the product topology on  $\ell^2$  as a real vector space.

**Example 2.20.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space, where  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [n]^n$  is the set of finite lists with entries bounded by list length. The distance is given by  $d(u, v) = l(u) + l(v) - l(u \cap v)$ , where  $l(u)$  is the length of the list  $u$  and  $u \cap v$  is the longest list which is an initial sublist of both  $u$  and  $v$ . The induced topology is clearly discrete. The complement of the empty list is not contained in a finite union of convex subsets that does not contain the empty list. In particular, a convex subset of  $X$  that does not contain  $\emptyset$  must consist of lists that all start with the same first element. Since there are infinitely many possible first elements, a finite collection of convex sets that do not contain the empty list cannot cover  $X \setminus \emptyset$ .

The space  $(X, d)$  is a metric space and every closed ball is compact. However, it is not a fixed point of the adjunction between *ConvexTop* and *Preconvex*.

For a compatible topological space to be teetotal, an additional property is needed.

**Proposition 2.21.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C)$  is a topological convexity space with the following properties:*

- *There is a basis of open sets that are convex, whose closure is convex and compact.*
- *$(X, \mathcal{F})$  is Hausdorff.*
- *Every convex set is connected.*
- *If  $A$  is closed convex and  $x \notin A$ , then there is a closed convex set  $H$  such that  $H^c$  is convex, with  $A \subseteq H$  and  $x \notin H$ .*

*then  $(X, \mathcal{F}, C)$  is fixed by the adjunction.*

*Proof.* We need to show that for any closed  $C \in \mathcal{F}$ , and any  $x \notin C$ , there is a finite set of closed convex sets whose union covers  $C$  but does not contain  $x$ . Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $C^c$ , containing  $x$  such that  $U$  is convex and  $\overline{U}$  is convex and compact. Let  $A = \overline{U} \setminus U$ . For any  $a \in A$ , by the Hausdorff property, we can find an open  $U_a$  that contains  $a$ , whose closure does not contain  $x$ . Since convex open sets with convex closure form a basis of open sets, we can find a convex open  $U'_a$  with convex closure that does not contain  $x$ . Since  $A$  is compact, it is covered by a finite subset  $U'_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup U'_{a_n}$ . Now each  $\overline{U'_{a_i}}$  is contained in a closed convex  $H_{a_i}$  which does not contain  $x$ .

For any  $y \in C$ , since  $[x, y]$  is connected, it cannot be the union  $([x, y] \cap U) \cup ([x, y] \cap \overline{U}^c)$ , so  $[x, y] \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $z \in [x, y] \cap A$ . Since  $H_{a_i}$  cover  $A$ , we have  $z \in H_{a_i}$  for some  $i$ . Now if  $y \in H_{a_i}^c$ , then since  $H_{a_i}^c$  is convex and contains  $x$ , it follows that  $z \in H_{a_i}^c$  contradicting  $z \in H_{a_i}$ . Thus, we must have  $y \in H_{a_i}$ . Since  $y \in C$  is arbitrary, we have that  $C \subseteq H_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup H_{a_n}$  as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.22.** *If  $(X, d)$  is a metric space, such that every closed ball is compact, every open ball is convex, every convex set is connected and every pair of disjoint closed convex sets are separated by a closed half-space (a closed convex set with convex complement) then the induced topological convexity space is fixed by the adjunction.*

*Proof.* We will show that the conditions of Proposition 2.21 hold in this case. The only condition not given is the Hausdorff condition, which is always true for metric spaces.  $\square$

In the other direction, it is natural to ask which preconvexity spaces are fixed by the monad  $CF$ . The functor  $CF$  sends a preconvexity space,  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  to the space  $(X, \overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$ . We will call a preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  *geometric* if  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}$ .

**Proposition 2.23.** *If  $X$  is finite, then any preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  is geometric.*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is finite, then  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}$ , so  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}$  as required.  $\square$

A natural question is whether this extends to topologically discrete spaces. In fact, there are preconvexity spaces where all sets are in both  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ , but not in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Example 2.24.** Let  $X = \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  consist of all subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  whose complement is infinite or empty. Clearly every subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  is a finite union from  $\mathcal{P}$ , and also a directed union from  $\mathcal{P}$ . Thus  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  is a non-geometric example where all sets are closed and all sets are convex.

**Proposition 2.25.** *Every preconvexity space embeds in a geometric preconvexity space.*

*Proof.* For a preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$ , let  $Y = \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\{S \in \mathcal{P} \mid S \subseteq R\} \mid R \in \mathcal{P}\}$ .

Now the inclusion  $X \xrightarrow{i} Y$  given by  $i(x) = \bigcap \{P \in \mathcal{P} \mid x \in P\}$ , is an embedding of preconvexity spaces, meaning that for  $A \subseteq X$ , we have  $A \in \mathcal{P}$  if and only if  $A = i^{-1}(B)$  for some  $B \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Clearly if  $A \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $\{S \in \mathcal{P} \mid S \subseteq A\} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Now it is easy to see that  $a \in i^{-1}(\{S \in \mathcal{P} \mid S \subseteq A\})$  if and only if  $i(a) \subseteq A$ , if and only if  $a \in A$ . Thus  $A = i^{-1}(\{S \in \mathcal{P} \mid S \subseteq A\})$ . Conversely, let  $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . By definition, there is some  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\mathcal{R} = \{S \in \mathcal{P} \mid S \subseteq P\}$ . It is easy to see that  $i^{-1}(\mathcal{R}) = P$ .  $\square$

This leads to the natural question is what subspaces of a geometric preconvexity space are geometric.

**Proposition 2.26.** *If  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  is a geometric preconvexity space and  $A \in \mathcal{P}$ , then the restriction  $(A, \mathcal{P}|_A)$  is a geometric preconvexity space.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is closed under intersection,  $\mathcal{P}|_A \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . Now let  $C \subseteq A$  be both a directed union of sets from  $\mathcal{P}|_A$  and an intersection of finite unions of sets from  $\mathcal{P}|_A$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}|_A \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ ,  $C$  is both a directed union of sets from  $\mathcal{P}$  and an intersection of finite unions of sets from  $\mathcal{P}$ . Since  $(X, \mathcal{P})$  is geometric, it follows that  $C \in \mathcal{P}$ , and since  $C \subseteq A$ , we have  $C \in \mathcal{P}|_A$  as required.  $\square$

On the other hand, closed or convex subspaces of geometric preconvexity spaces are not necessarily geometric.

**Example 2.27.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ , and let

$$Y = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid (|2x - 1| - 1)(|2y - 1| - 1) = 0\}$$

be the unit square with one corner at the origin. It is straightforward to check that  $X$  and  $Y$ , with the preconvexities coming from closed convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , are geometric. However,  $X \cap Y$  is a closed subspace of  $X$ , and a convex subspace of  $Y$ , but is not geometric, since the subset  $\{(x, y) \in X \cap Y \mid x > 0 \text{ or } y = 1\}$  is both closed and convex, but is not closed convex.

## 3 Stone Duality

### 3.1 Stone Duality for Topological Spaces

In this section, we review Stone duality for topological spaces. While a lot of what we review is well-known, some parts are written from an unusual perspective, and are not as well-known as they might be.

Given a topological space, the collection of closed sets form a coframe. (Many authors refer to the frame of open sets, but for our purposes the closed sets are more natural, and since we are not considering 2-categorical aspects, it does not matter since  $\mathit{Coframe} = \mathit{Frame}^{\text{co}}$ .) Furthermore, the inverse image of a continuous function between topological spaces is by definition a coframe homomorphism between the coframes of closed spaces. This induces a functor  $C : \mathit{Top} \longrightarrow \mathit{Coframe}^{\text{op}}$ . Not every coframe arises as closed sets of a topological space. Coframes that do arise in this way are called *spatial* and are said to “have enough points”.

In some cases, there can be many topological spaces that have the same coframe of closed sets. If multiple points have the same closure, then there is no way to separate them by looking at the coframe of closed sets. Therefore, we restrict our attention to  $T_0$  spaces, where the function from  $X$  to  $C(X)$  sending a point to its closure is injective.

If we restrict to the spatial coframes, then the functor  $T_0\text{-}\mathit{Top} \xrightarrow{C} \mathit{SpatialCoframe}$  is a faithful fibration (we will show this later).

We can recover a  $T_0$  topological space from its lattice of closed sets and from the subset  $S \subset C(X)$  consisting of the closures of singletons. For a coframe  $L$ , the elements which can arise as closures of singletons are elements that cannot be written as a join of two strictly smaller elements. These are called the “points” of  $L$  since they are the bottom elements of  $f^{-1}(\top)$  for a coframe homomorphism  $f : L \longrightarrow 2$ . If we let  $P_L \subseteq L$  be the set of points, a topological space  $X$  corresponds to a coframe  $L = C(X)$  with a chosen subset  $S \subseteq P_L$  such that for every  $x \in L$ , we have  $x = \bigvee(\downarrow(x) \cap S)$ . Continuous functions  $X \xrightarrow{g} Y$  correspond to coframe homomorphisms  $C(Y) \xrightarrow{C(g)} C(X)$  such that for every  $s \in S_X$ ,  $C(g)^{-1}(\downarrow(s))$  is a principal downset in  $C(Y)$ , and the top element is in  $S_Y$ , where  $S_X \subseteq P_{C(X)}$  and  $S_Y \subseteq P_{C(Y)}$  are the chosen sets of points that correspond to elements of  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively.

More formally, let  $\mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*$  be the category of pointed spatial coframes. Objects are pairs  $(L, S)$  where  $L$  is a coframe and  $S \subseteq P_L$  is a set of points of  $L$  with the property that  $(\forall a \in L)(a = \bigvee(\downarrow(a) \cap S))$ . Morphisms  $(M, T) \xrightarrow{g} (L, S)$  are coframe homomorphisms  $M \xrightarrow{g} L$  with the property that for any  $s \in S$ ,  $\bigwedge\{m \in M \mid s \leq g(m)\} \in T$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *The category of  $T_0$  topological spaces and continuous functions is equivalent to the category  $\mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*^{\text{op}}$ .*

*Proof.* The functor  $C : T_0\text{-Top} \longrightarrow \mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*^{\text{op}}$  sends a topological space  $X$  to the pair  $(C(X), \{\overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X\})$ , where  $C(X)$  is the coframe of closed subsets of  $X$ . It sends a continuous function  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  to  $f^{-1} : C(Y) \longrightarrow C(X)$ . We need to show that this is a homomorphism in  $\mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*$ . It is clearly a coframe homomorphism, so we need to show that for any  $x \in X$ ,  $\bigwedge\{t \in \{\overline{\{y\}} \mid y \in Y\} \mid \overline{\{x\}} \leq f^{-1}(t)\} \in T$ . We will show that  $\bigwedge\{t \in \{\overline{\{y\}} \mid y \in Y\} \mid \overline{\{x\}} \leq f^{-1}(t)\} = \overline{\{f(x)\}}$ . We need to show that  $\overline{\{x\}} \subseteq f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}})$ , and if  $\overline{\{x\}} \subseteq f^{-1}(A)$  for any closed  $A \subseteq Y$ , then  $\overline{\{f(x)\}} \subseteq A$ . Clearly,  $x \in f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}})$ , so  $f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}})$  is a closed set containing  $x$ , so  $\overline{\{x\}} \leq f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}})$ . On the other hand, suppose  $\overline{\{x\}} \leq f^{-1}(A)$ . Then  $x \in f^{-1}(A)$ , so  $f(x) \in A$ , so  $\overline{\{f(x)\}} \leq A$ . Thus  $f^{-1}$  is a morphism in  $\mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*^{\text{op}}$ .

In the opposite direction, the functor  $T : \mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow T_0\text{-Top}$  sends the pair  $(L, S)$  to the topological space with elements  $S$  and closed sets  $\{\downarrow(a) \cap S \mid a \in L\}$ .

For the morphism  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{f} (M, T)$ , we define  $T \xrightarrow{f^*} S$  by  $f^*(t) = \bigwedge\{s \in L \mid t \leq f(s)\}$ . By definition of  $\mathit{SpatialCoframe}_*$ ,  $\bigwedge\{s \in S \mid t \leq f(s)\} \in S$ , so this is a well-defined function. For any closed  $F \in L$ , we want to show that  $(f^*)^{-1}(F) = \{t \in T \mid f^*(t) \in F\} = \downarrow(x) \cap T$  for some  $x \in M$ . In particular, we will show that this is the case for  $x = f(F)$ . That is, we want to show that  $f^*(t) \in F$  if and only if  $t \leq f(F)$ , but this is exactly the definition of  $f^*$ .

Finally, we need to show that the two functors defined above form an equivalence. For a topological space  $X$ , we see that  $TCX$  has the same elements of  $X$  and closed sets

of  $TCX$  are of the form  $\downarrow(F) \cap \{\overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X\}$  for  $F \in C(X)$ . It is clear that  $\overline{\{x\}} \leq F$  if and only if  $x \in F$ , so closed sets of  $TCX$  are exactly closed sets of  $X$ , so  $TCX \cong X$ .

For a coframe  $L$  with a chosen subset  $S \subseteq L$ , we want to show that  $CT(L, S) \cong (L, S)$ . By definition, elements of  $CT(L, S)$  are  $\{\downarrow(a) \cap S \mid a \in L\}$ . Since  $(\forall a \in L)(a = \bigvee(\downarrow(a) \cap S))$ , it follows that the coframe of  $CT(L, S)$  is isomorphic to  $L$ . The chosen elements are  $\{\overline{\{s\}} \mid s \in S\}$ , where  $\overline{\{s\}}$  is the closure of  $\{s\}$  in  $T(L, S)$ . Closed sets of  $T(L, S)$  are of the form  $\downarrow(a) \cap S$  for  $a \in L$ , so in particular  $\overline{\{s\}} = \downarrow(s) \cap S$ . This clearly induces an isomorphism  $(L, S) \cong CT(L, S)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *The forgetful functor  $U : \mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_* \longrightarrow \mathcal{SpatialCoframe}$  is an op-fibration.*

*Proof.* We need to show that for any  $(M, T)$  in  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$  and any coframe homomorphism  $M \xrightarrow{f} L$ , where  $L$  is spatial, there is some  $S \subseteq P_L$  that makes  $f$  a cocartesian morphism.

Recall that  $f$  is a homomorphism in  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$  if and only if its left adjoint  $f^*$  sends  $S$  to  $T$ , or equivalently  $S \subseteq (f^*)^{-1}(T)$ . We will show that if  $S = (f^*)^{-1}(T)$  then  $f$  is cocartesian. Let  $L \xrightarrow{g} K$  be a coframe homomorphism, and let  $R \subseteq P_K$  be such that  $(M, T) \xrightarrow{gf} (K, R)$  is a homomorphism in  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$ . Then for any  $r \in R$ , we have  $f^*g^*(r) \in T$ , so  $g^*(r) \in (f^*)^{-1}(T) = S$ , as required. Conversely, if  $S \neq (f^*)^{-1}(T)$ , then the identity function is a coframe homomorphism  $S \longrightarrow S$ , and the composite  $1 \circ f$  is a pointed coframe homomorphism  $(M, T) \longrightarrow (L, (f^*)^{-1}(T))$ , but the identity coframe homomorphism is not a pointed coframe homomorphism  $(L, S) \longrightarrow (L, (f^*)^{-1}(T))$ .

Thus,  $f$  is cocartesian if and only if  $S = (f^*)^{-1}(T)$ . From this, it is clear that if  $S = (f^*)^{-1}(T)$  makes  $f$  into a morphism in  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$ , then it is the unique cocartesian lifting of  $f$ .

Recall that  $(M, T) \xrightarrow{f} (L, S)$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$  if for every  $s \in S$ ,  $f^*(s) \in T$ . This is clearly the case when  $S = (f^*)^{-1}(T)$ .  $\square$

An alternative approach to modelling the category of  $T_0$  topological spaces is via strictly zero dimensional biframes. A *biframe* [2] consists of a frame  $L_0$  with two chosen subframes  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . The biframe  $(L_0, L_1, L_2)$  is strictly zero-dimensional if every element of  $L_1$  is complemented in  $L_0$ , and the complement is in  $L_2$ . A particular example is the Skula biframe of a topological space  $X$ , where  $L_1$  is the frame of open sets,  $L_2$  is the frame of subsets generated by the closed sets, and  $L_0$  is the frame of subsets generated by  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  (which are the open sets in the Skula topology [11].) The functor that sends a topological space to the Skula biframe is one half of an equivalence between the category of  $T_0$  topological spaces and the category of strictly zero-dimensional biframes [10]. In this biframe,  $L_2$  is actually a completely distributive lattice, so also a coframe, so the whole Skula biframe can be represented by the coframe inclusion  $(L_1)^{\text{op}} \hookrightarrow L_2$ . In this case  $L_2$  is the coframe generated by the closures of all elements of  $X$ . That is, for  $(L, S)$  an object of  $\mathcal{SpatialCoframe}_*$ , this is the inclusion  $L \hookrightarrow DS$ , where  $D$  is the downset functor. The condition that  $f^*$  restricts to

a function  $S \xrightarrow{f^*} T$  means that the inverse image function  $Df^* : DT \longrightarrow DS$  is a complete lattice homomorphism. Furthermore, in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{f} & L \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ DT & \xrightarrow{Df^*} & DS \end{array}$$

For  $x \in M$ , the inclusion  $M \hookrightarrow DT$  sends  $x$  to  $\downarrow(x) \cap T$ . Then  $Df^*$  sends  $\downarrow(x) \cap T$  to

$$\{s \in S \mid f^*(s) \in \downarrow(x) \cap T\} = \{s \in S \mid f^*(s) \leq x\} = \{s \in S \mid s \leq f(x)\}$$

which is the image of  $f(x)$  in the inclusion  $L \hookrightarrow DS$ . Thus the above diagram commutes. The condition that  $S \subseteq L$  means that all totally compact elements of  $DS$  are in  $L$ , so every element of  $DS$  is the join of elements in  $L$ . We will refer to such lattice inclusions as dense. Thus the category of  $T_0$  topological spaces is equivalent to the category of dense inclusions of spatial coframes into totally compactly generated completely distributive lattices.

For all of these representations of  $T_0$  topological spaces, the fibration

$$T_0\text{-Top} \xrightarrow{C} \text{SpatialCoframe}^{\text{op}}$$

is a forgetful functor. Furthermore, we see that the fibres are additional structure on the coframe, and that they are partially ordered by inclusion of this additional structure. Furthermore, every fibre has a top element, which gives an adjoint to this fibration sending a spatial coframe to the top element of the fibre over it. (In fact, this adjoint extends to all coframes, because spatial coframes are reflective in all coframes). The top elements of the fibres are exactly the sober spaces.

Not all fibres have bottom elements. However, a large number of the fibres of the fibration  $T_0\text{-Top} \xrightarrow{C} \text{SpatialCoframe}^{\text{op}}$  do have bottom elements and are actually complete Boolean algebras. This is probably easiest to see from the representation as coframes with a chosen set of elements which are closures of points of the topological space. If  $S_0$  is the smallest such set of closed sets that can arise as closures of points, and  $S_1$  is the largest set, then any set between  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  is a valid set of points, making the poset of possible sets of points isomorphic to the Boolean algebra  $P(S_1 \setminus S_0)$ . The topological spaces that can occur as the bottom elements of fibres are spaces where the closure of every point cannot be expressed as a union of closed sets not containing that point. That is, for every  $x \in X$ ,  $\overline{\{x\} \setminus \{x\}}$  is closed. Spaces with this property are called  $T_D$  spaces [1].  $T_D$  spaces have the interesting property that the inclusion of the lattice of subspaces of a  $T_D$  space  $X$  into the lattice of coframe congruences of the coframe of closed sets of  $X$  is injective.

Clearly, all  $T_1$  spaces are  $T_D$  because in a  $T_1$  space  $\overline{\{x\} \setminus \{x\}} = \emptyset$  is closed. However, even if we restrict to  $T_1$  spaces and atomic spatial coframes, the assignment of an atomic spatial coframe to the bottom element in the corresponding fibre is not functorial, because the adjoint to a coframe homomorphism between  $T_D$  spaces does not necessarily preserve join-indecomposable elements. This is why the focus of attention in



most of the literature has been on sober spaces, rather than  $T_D$  spaces. In order to model the morphisms between  $T_D$  spaces, we need to restrict to coframe homomorphisms whose adjoint preserves join-indecomposable elements. While most of the topological spaces of interest are  $T_D$ , many of the fibres of the fibration  $T_0\text{-}\mathcal{Top} \xrightarrow{C} \text{SpatialCoframe}^{\text{op}}$  contain only a singleton  $T_0$  topological space, which is therefore both sober and  $T_D$ . Thus many important topological spaces are sober.

### 3.2 Stone Duality for Preconvexity Spaces

There is in many ways, a very similar picture for the category of preconvexity spaces. Instead of the coframe of closed sets, the structure that defines the topological convexity spaces is the complete lattice of preconvex sets  $\mathcal{P}$ . Because the inverse image function for a preconvexity space homomorphism preserves preconvex sets, it induces an inf-homomorphism between the lattices of closed convex sets. Thus, we have a functor  $\text{Preconvex} \xrightarrow{P} \text{Inf}^{\text{op}}$  sending every preconvexity space to its lattice of preconvex sets, and every homomorphism to the inverse image function. This has many of the nice properties of the Stone duality functor  $\text{Top} \xrightarrow{F} \text{Coframe}^{\text{op}}$ .

As in the topology case, there is an equivalent category of sup-lattices with a set of chosen elements. Let  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$  be the category whose objects are pairs  $(L, S)$ , where  $L$  is a complete lattice and  $S \subseteq L$  satisfies  $(\forall x \in L)(x = \bigvee(\downarrow(x) \cap S))$ . Morphisms  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{f} (M, T)$  in  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$  are sup-homomorphisms  $L \xrightarrow{f} M$  such that  $(\forall x \in S)(f(x) \in T)$ . There is a functor  $\text{Preconvex} \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$  given by  $F(X, \mathcal{P}) = \left( \mathcal{P}, \left\{ \overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X \right\} \right)$  on objects and  $F(f) \vdash f^{-1}$  on morphisms, as partial order homomorphisms, where the adjoint is as a partial order homomorphism and exists because  $f^{-1}$  is an inf-homomorphism. To show this is well-defined, since  $F(f)$  is a right adjoint, it is a sup-homomorphism, defined by  $F(f)(A) = \bigcap \{B \in \mathcal{P}' \mid A \subseteq f^{-1}(B)\}$ . In particular, if  $A = \overline{\{x\}}$ , then

$$F(f)(A) = \bigcap \{B \in \mathcal{P}' \mid x \in f^{-1}(B)\} = \bigcap \{B \in \mathcal{P}' \mid f(x) \in B\} = \overline{\{f(x)\}}$$

Thus  $F$  is well-defined, and functoriality is obvious. In the other direction, there is a functor  $G : \mathcal{TCGPartialSup} \longrightarrow \text{Preconvex}$  given by  $G(L, S) = (S, \{\downarrow(x) \cap S \mid x \in L\})$  on objects and  $G(f)(s) = f(s)$  on morphisms. To show well-definedness, we need to show that if  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{f} (M, T)$  is a morphism of  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$ , then  $G(f)$  is a preconvexity homomorphism. That is, for any  $s \in S$ , we have  $f(s) \in T$ , and for any  $m \in M$ ,  $G(f)^{-1}(\downarrow(m) \cap T) = \downarrow(x) \cap S$  for some  $x \in L$ . The first condition is by definition of a homomorphism. Since  $f$  is a sup-homomorphism, it has a right adjoint  $f^*$  given by  $f^*(m) = \bigwedge \{x \in L \mid f(x) \geq m\}$ . If we let  $x = f^*(m)$ , then

$$G(f)^{-1}(\downarrow(m) \cap T) = \{s \in S \mid f(x) \leq m\} = \{s \in S \mid x \leq f^*(m) = x\} = \downarrow(x) \cap S$$

which gives the required homomorphism property. Finally, we want to show that  $F$  and  $G$  form an equivalence of categories. For a preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$ , we have that

$$GF(X, \mathcal{P}) = G\left(\mathcal{P}, \left\{ \overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X \right\}\right) = \left(\left\{ \overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X \right\}, \left\{ \downarrow(P) \cap \left\{ \overline{\{x\}} \mid x \in X \right\} \mid P \in \mathcal{P} \right\}\right)$$

It is obvious that the function sending  $x$  to  $\overline{\{x\}}$  is a natural isomorphism of preconvexity spaces. In the other direction, for  $(L, S) \in \text{ob}(\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup})$ , we have

$$FG(L, S) = F(S, \{\downarrow(x) \cap S \mid x \in L\}) = \left( \{\downarrow(x) \cap S \mid x \in L\}, \left\{ \overline{\{s\}} \mid s \in S \right\} \right)$$

It is easy to see that for  $s \in S$ ,  $\overline{\{s\}} = \downarrow(s) \cap S$ , so the function  $L \xrightarrow{i} \{\downarrow(x) \cap S \mid x \in L\}$  given by  $i(x) = \downarrow(x) \cap S$  is easily seen to be an isomorphism in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ . Thus we have shown the equivalence of categories. Under this equivalence (and the adjoint isomorphism  $\text{Sup} \cong \text{Inf}^{\text{op}}$ ), the functor  $\text{Preconvex} \xrightarrow{P} \text{Inf}^{\text{op}}$  becomes the forgetful functor  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup} \xrightarrow{U} \text{Sup}$  sending  $(L, S)$  to  $L$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *The forgetful functor  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup} \xrightarrow{U} \text{Sup}$  is a fibration.*

*Proof.* Firstly, we show that cartesian morphisms for  $U$  are morphisms of the form  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{f} (M, T)$  such that  $S = f^{-1}(T)$ . Firstly, if  $S = f^{-1}(T)$ , then for any object  $(N, R)$  of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$  and any sup-homomorphism  $N \xrightarrow{g} L$  such that  $fg$  is a morphism of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ , we will show that  $g$  is a morphism of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ . To do this, we need to show that for any  $r \in R$ ,  $g(r) \in S$ . Since  $fg$  is a morphism of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ , we have  $fg(r) \in T$ . Thus  $g(r) \in f^{-1}(T) = S$  as required. Conversely, suppose  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{f} (M, T)$  is cartesian. We want to show that  $S = f^{-1}(T)$ . Let  $i : L \rightarrow L$  be the identity function. This is a sup-homomorphism, and the composite  $fi$  is by definition a morphism  $(L, f^{-1}(T)) \xrightarrow{fi} (M, T)$  in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ , so for  $f$  to be cartesian,  $i$  must be a morphism  $(L, f^{-1}(T)) \xrightarrow{i} (L, S)$  in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ . This gives  $f^{-1}(T) \subseteq S$ , and the fact that  $f$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$  gives  $S \subseteq f^{-1}(T)$ . Thus we have shown that  $f$  is cartesian if and only if  $S = f^{-1}(T)$ .

To show that  $U$  is a fibration, we need to show that for any sup-homomorphism  $L \xrightarrow{g} M$ , and any object  $(M, T)$  of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$  over  $M$ , there is a unique lifting of  $g$  to a cartesian homomorphism  $(L, S) \xrightarrow{\hat{g}} (M, T)$  in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ . By definition  $\hat{g}$  must be the sup-homomorphism  $g$ , and we must have  $S = g^{-1}(T)$ . It is clear that this gives a unique choice for  $S$ .  $\square$

As in the topological case, it is easy to see that the fibres of the fibration  $U$  are partial orders. Each fibre clearly has a top element setting  $S = L$ . This induces a right adjoint to  $U$ . Bottom elements of the fibres are of the form  $(L, S)$  where  $S$  is the smallest subset of  $L$  satisfying  $(\forall x \in L)(x = \bigvee \downarrow(x) \cap S)$ . For any  $x \in L$ , if we can find a downset  $D \subseteq L$  with  $\bigvee D = x$  and  $x \notin D$ , then clearly  $(L, L \setminus \{x\})$  is an object of  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ , so if there is a minimum set  $S$ , then we cannot have  $x \in S$ . Conversely, if the only downset whose supremum is  $x$  is the principal downset  $\downarrow(x)$ , then for any  $(L, S)$  in  $\mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$ , we must have  $x \in S$ . Thus, if there is a smallest element of the fibre above  $L$ , it must be given by  $(L, S)$ , where

$$S = \left\{ x \in L \mid (\forall D \subseteq L) \left( \left( \bigvee D = x \right) \Rightarrow x \in D \right) \right\}$$

This is similar to the total compactness condition on elements of a sup-lattice, but an element  $x$  is called totally compact if it satisfies

$$(\forall D \subseteq L) \left( \left( \bigvee D \geq x \right) \Rightarrow (\exists y \in D)(x \leq y) \right)$$

which is a stronger condition. As in the topological case, when bottom elements of the fibre exist, they are usually the spaces of greatest interest. For example, spaces where every singleton set is preconvex are always the bottom elements of the corresponding fibre. However, for this fibration, the fibres are very rarely singletons, so the top elements of the fibres are not of as much interest as in the topological case.

It is also worth noting that we have the chain of adjunctions

$$\text{ConvexTop} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{CC} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{IS} \end{array} \text{Preconvex} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{P} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{T} \end{array} \text{Sup}$$

which gives an adjunction between the category of topological convexity spaces and the category of sup-lattices. This adjunction sends a topological convexity space  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$  to the lattice of sets  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$  ordered by set inclusion, and a topological convexity space homomorphism to the left adjoint of its inverse image. The right adjoint sends a sup-lattice  $L$  to the topological convexity space  $(L, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{I})$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of weak-closed subsets of  $L$ , namely intersections of finitely-generated downsets in  $L$ , and  $\mathcal{I}$  is the set of ideals in  $L$ .

### 3.3 Distributive Partial-Sup Lattices

The equivalence  $\text{Preconvex} \cong \mathcal{T}CG\text{PartialSup}$  is based on previous work [8]. We present this work in a more abstract framework here. The idea is that for a preconvexity space  $(X, \mathcal{P})$ , the sets in  $\mathcal{P}$  are partially ordered by inclusion. This partial order has an infimum operation given by intersection, but union of sets only gives a partial supremum operation because a union of preconvex sets is not necessarily preconvex. (Because of the existence of arbitrary intersections, there is a supremum operation given by union followed by the induced closure operation, but this supremum is not related to the structure of the preconvexity space. Unions of preconvex sets better reflect the structure of the preconvexity space. We therefore add a partial operation to the structure to describe these unions where possible.) For a preconvexity space, the operations are union and intersection, so we have a distributivity law between the partial join operation and the infimum operation. This can be neatly expressed by saying that the partial join structure is actually a partial join structure in the category  $\mathcal{Inf}$  of complete lattices and infimum-preserving homomorphisms. We define a partial join structure as a partial algebra for the downset monad. The downset monad exists in the category of partial orders, and also in the category of inf-lattices.

We begin by recalling the following definitions:

**Definition 3.4** ([9]). *A KZ-doctrine on a 2-category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monad  $(T, \eta, \mu)$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  with a modification  $T\eta \xrightarrow{\lambda} \eta_T$  such that  $\lambda\eta$ ,  $\mu\lambda$  and  $\mu T\mu\lambda_T$  are all identity 2-cells.*

**Definition 3.5** ([3]). A 2-functor  $C \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{D}$  is sinister if for every morphism  $f$  in  $C$ ,  $Ff$  has a right adjoint in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

In particular, if  $F$  is sinister, then it acts on partial maps.

**Definition 3.6.** A lax partial algebra for a sinister KZ-doctrine in an order-enriched category is a partial map  $TX \xrightarrow{\theta} X$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\eta} & TX \\ & \searrow^{1_X} & \downarrow \theta \\ & & X \end{array}$$

commutes and there is a 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TTX & \xrightarrow{T\theta} & TX \\ \mu_X \downarrow & \Leftarrow & \downarrow \theta \\ TX & \xrightarrow{\theta} & X \end{array}$$

A homomorphism of lax partial algebras from  $(X, \theta)$  to  $(Y, \tau)$  is a morphism  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ , together with a 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TX & \xrightarrow{Tf} & TY \\ \theta \downarrow & \Rightarrow & \downarrow \tau \\ X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \end{array}$$

*Remark 3.7.* It is possible to define lax partial algebras for KZ monads in general 2-categories. However, this requires more careful consideration of coherence conditions, so to focus on the particular case of distributive partial sup-lattices, we have restricted attention to *Ord*-enriched categories.

**Definition 3.8.** A partial sup-lattice is a lax partial algebra for the sinister KZ doctrine  $(D, \downarrow, \bigcup)$  in *Ord*, where  $D$  is the downset functor,  $\downarrow_X$  is the function sending an element  $x \in X$  to the principal downset it generates, and  $\bigcup_X : DDX \longrightarrow DX$  sends a collection of downsets to its union.

A distributive partial sup-lattice is a lax partial algebra for the sinister KZ doctrine  $(D, \downarrow, \bigcup)$  in *Inf*, where  $D$  is the downset functor,  $\downarrow_X$  is the function sending an element  $x \in X$  to the principal downset it generates, and  $\bigcup_X : DDX \longrightarrow DX$  sends a collection of downsets to its union.

The definition given in [8] is

**Definition 3.9** ([8]). A partial sup lattice is a pair  $(L, J)$  where  $L$  is a complete lattice,  $J$  is a collection of downsets of  $L$  with the following properties:

- $J$  contains all principal downsets.
- $J$  is closed under arbitrary intersections.

- If  $A \in J$  has supremum  $x$ , then any downset  $B$  with  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \downarrow(x)$  has  $B \in J$ .
- if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq J$  is down-closed,  $Y \in J$  has  $\bigvee Y = x$  and for any  $a \in Y$ , there is some  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\bigvee A \geq a$ , then there is some  $B \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}$  with  $B \in J$  and  $\bigvee B \geq x$ .

A partial sup-lattice is distributive if for any  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq J$ , we have  $\bigwedge \{\bigwedge D \mid D \in \mathcal{D}\} = \bigvee \bigcap \mathcal{D}$ .

An inf-homomorphism  $L \xrightarrow{f} M$  is a partial sup-lattice homomorphism  $(L, J) \xrightarrow{f} (M, K)$  if for any  $A \in J$ ,  $\downarrow\{f(a) \mid a \in A\} \in K$ , and  $\bigvee \downarrow\{f(a) \mid a \in A\} = f(\bigvee A)$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** Definitions 3.8 and 3.9 give equivalent definitions of distributive partial sup lattices.

*Proof.* We need to show that if  $DL \xrightarrow{\theta} L$  is a lax partial algebra for the downset monad in  $\mathcal{Inf}$ , then there is some  $J \subseteq DL$  satisfying the conditions of Definition 3.9.

We will show that setting  $J$  as the domain of the partial algebra morphism  $DL \xrightarrow{\theta} L$  works.

From the unit condition

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L & \xrightarrow{\downarrow} & DL \longleftarrow J \\ & \searrow 1_L & \downarrow \theta \\ & & L \end{array}$$

we have that all principal downsets must be contained in  $J$ . This allows us to show that  $\theta$  is the join whenever it is defined. For  $A \in J$ , if  $x = \bigvee A$ , then  $A \leq \downarrow(x)$  in  $J$ , and for any  $a \in A$ , we have  $\downarrow(a) \leq A$  in  $J$ . Since  $\theta$  is order-preserving, this gives  $a = \theta(\downarrow(a)) \leq \theta(A) \leq \theta(\downarrow(x)) = x$ , so  $\theta(A)$  is an upper bound of  $A$ , and is below  $x = \bigvee A$ . Thus  $\theta(A) = \bigvee A$ . Since the inclusion  $J \hookrightarrow DL$  is an inf-homomorphism, we get that  $J$  is closed under arbitrary intersections. Suppose  $A \in J$  has supremum  $x$ , and  $B \in DL$  satisfies  $A \subseteq B \subseteq \downarrow(x)$ . We want to show that  $B \in J$ .

The lax partial algebra condition gives

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} DDL & \longleftarrow & DJ & \xrightarrow{D\theta} & DL \\ \downarrow \cup & & \geq & & \downarrow \theta \\ DL & \longleftarrow & J & \xrightarrow{\theta} & L \end{array}$$

In particular, since  $A \in \downarrow(B) \cap J$ , we have  $D\theta(\downarrow(B) \cap J) = \downarrow(x)$ , and since  $\theta(\downarrow(x)) = x$  is defined, we have that the upper composite partial morphism is defined on  $\downarrow(B) \cap J$ . For the lower composite, we have  $\bigcup(\downarrow(B) \cap J) = B$ , so for the lower composite to be defined, we must have  $B \in J$ .

Finally if  $\mathcal{A} \in DJ$ ,  $Y \in J$  has  $\bigvee Y = x$  and for any  $a \in Y$ , there is some  $A_a \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\bigvee A_a \geq a$ , then clearly  $A_a \cap \downarrow(a) \in J$ , and  $\bigvee(A_a \cap \downarrow(a)) = a$ . Thus, setting  $\mathcal{B} = \downarrow\{\downarrow(a) \cap A_a \mid a \in Y\}$  gives  $D\theta(\mathcal{B}) = Y$ , so the upper composite is defined for  $\mathcal{B}$ ,

and is equal to  $x$ . Thus, the lower composite gives  $B = \bigcup \mathcal{B} \in J$  with  $\theta(B) = x$ , which proves the last condition.

Conversely, suppose that  $(L, J)$  is a distributive partial sup lattice as in Definition 3.9. We want to show that  $DL \leftarrow J \xrightarrow{\vee} L$  is a lax partial algebra for the downset KZ monad. That is, we want to show that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & DX \\ & \searrow 1_x & \downarrow \theta \\ & & X \end{array}$$

commutes, and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} DDX & \xrightarrow{D\theta} & DX \\ \cup \downarrow & \geq & \downarrow \theta \\ DX & \xrightarrow{\theta} & X \end{array}$$

We expand the partial morphisms to get the following diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L & \xrightarrow{\quad} & J \\ \parallel \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ L & \xrightarrow{\quad} & DL \\ & \searrow 1_L & \downarrow \vee \\ & & L \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} DDL & \leftarrow & DJ \xrightarrow{D\vee} DL \\ \mu_L \downarrow & \geq & \downarrow J \\ DL & \leftarrow & J \xrightarrow{\vee} L \end{array}$$

The first diagram commutes because  $J$  contains all principal downsets. For the second diagram, the fourth condition in Definition 3.9 is that for  $Y \in J$  and  $\mathcal{A} \in DJ$  such that  $Y \in D\vee(\mathcal{A})$ , there is some  $B \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{A}$  with  $B \in J$  and  $\vee B = \vee Y$ . The condition  $Y \in D\vee(\mathcal{A})$  means that there is an element of the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J_2 & \longrightarrow & J \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ DJ & \xrightarrow{D\vee} & DL \end{array}$$

above  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $Y$ . Thus the condition shows that if the top-right path is defined at  $\mathcal{B}$ , then the bottom-left path is defined, as required.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** *The definition of distributive partial sup-lattice homomorphisms given in Definition 3.9 is equivalent to a lax partial algebra homomorphism between lax partial algebras.*

*Proof.* Because  $\theta$  is the restriction of the supremum operation, the partial homomorphism condition is exactly that  $J$  factors through the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
K^* & \longrightarrow & K \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
DL & \xrightarrow{Df} & DM
\end{array}$$

and for any  $A \in J$ ,  $f(\bigvee A) \leq \bigvee \downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\}$ .

The pullback is given by  $K^* = \{A \in DL | Df(A) \in K\}$ . Thus the inclusion is equivalent to the condition for any  $A \in J$ ,  $\downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\} \in K$ .

Since  $f$  is order-preserving, for  $a \in A$ , we have that  $f(a) \leq f(\bigvee A)$ , so  $f(\bigvee A)$  is an upper bound for  $\downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\}$ , and thus  $\bigvee \downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\} \leq f(\bigvee A)$ . Thus the second condition that  $\bigvee \downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\} \geq f(\bigvee A)$  is equivalent to  $\bigvee \downarrow \{f(a) | a \in A\} = f(\bigvee A)$  as required.  $\square$

**Definition 3.12.** An element  $a$  of a partial sup-lattice  $(L, J)$  is *totally compact* if for any downset  $D \in J$ ,  $\bigvee D \geq a \Rightarrow a \in D$ . A partial sup-lattice  $(L, J)$  is *totally compactly generated* if for any  $x \in L$ , there is some  $C \subseteq L$  such that every  $c \in C$  is totally compact, and so that  $\downarrow(C) \in J$  and  $\bigvee C = x$ .

The full subcategory of totally compactly generated distributive partial sup-lattices and partial sup-lattice homomorphisms is equivalent to the category  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}^{\text{op}}$  defined at the start of Section 3.2. Given a totally compactly generated distributive partial sup-lattice  $(L, J)$ , let  $K \subseteq L$  be the set of totally compact elements of  $(L, J)$ . Then  $(L, K)$  is an element of  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$ . Conversely, for  $(L, S)$  an object of  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}$ , let  $J = \{D \in DL | (\downarrow(\bigvee D)) \cap S \subseteq D\}$  be the set of downsets of  $L$  that contain all totally compact elements below their supremum. It is clear that performing these two constructions gives an isomorphic structure. To show an equivalence of categories, we need to show that  $L \xrightarrow{f} M$  is a distributive partial sup-lattice homomorphism if and only if it is a morphism in  $\mathcal{TCGPartialSup}^{\text{op}}$ . Since distributive partial sup-lattice homomorphisms preserve infima, they have left adjoints. If  $f$  is a partial sup-lattice homomorphism, and  $f^*$  is its left adjoint, then  $f^*$  is a sup-homomorphism, and for any totally compact  $a \in (M, K)$ , if  $B \in J$  has  $\bigvee B \geq f^*(a)$ , then the adjunction gives  $f(\bigvee B) \geq a$ . Since  $f$  is a partial sup-homomorphism, we have  $f(\bigvee B) = \bigvee \{f(b) | b \in B\} \geq a$ . As  $a$  is totally compact, we must have  $a \leq f(b)$  for some  $b \in B$ . By the adjunction, this gives  $f^*(a) \leq b$ . Thus we have shown that if  $B \in J$  has  $\bigvee B \geq f^*(a)$ , then  $f^*(a) \in B$ . That is,  $f^*(a)$  is totally compact.

Conversely, if  $g$  is a sup-homomorphism between totally compactly generated distributive partial sup-lattices, that preserves totally compact elements, then its right adjoint is a partial sup-homomorphism, since if  $B \in J$  has  $\bigvee B = x$ , then if  $a \leq g^*(x)$  is totally compact, then  $g(a) \leq x$  is also totally compact, so  $g(a) \in B$ . It follows that  $a \in \downarrow \{g^*(b) | b \in B\}$ , so  $\bigvee \downarrow \{g^*(b) | b \in B\} = g^*(x)$  as required.

## 4 Final Remarks and Future Work

Given the enormous impact of Stone duality for topological spaces on the field, it might seem that the current work should lead to similarly monumental advances in topolog-

ical convexity spaces. However, there are subtle differences between the cases that may make using this Stone duality more challenging. Firstly, in the topological case, most interesting topological spaces are sober, so there is a full and faithful functor from sober topological spaces to coframes. Many interesting topological convexity spaces are fixed by the adjunction between topological convexity spaces and preconvexity spaces. However, many are not. Furthermore, very few preconvexity spaces are fixed by the adjunction with sup-lattices. Therefore, for most interesting spaces, the functor to *Sup* is not full.

Another difference is that for topological spaces, not all locales are spatial, whereas every complete lattice arises as the lattice of closed convex sets of a topological convexity space. While this may seem a better property of the Stone duality in this case, it may reduce its usefulness. In topology, the non-spatial locales provide a natural extension of sober topological spaces to produce a category with better closure properties. For topological convexity spaces, this construction does not generate any new spaces to improve the properties of the category of spaces. As a result, it provides fewer benefits as a tool for studying these spaces categorically.

## 4.1 Future Work

In this section we discuss a number of further problems that should be studied about this Stone duality, and about the category of topological convexity spaces.

### 4.1.1 Restricting this to a Duality

In topology, it is often convenient to restrict Stone duality to an isomorphism of categories between sober topological spaces and spatial locales. Sober topological spaces can be described in a number of topologically natural ways. Similarly, spatial locales can be easily described. It is easy to describe the topological convexity spaces from this adjunction, as they come directly from lattices. However, for the intermediate adjunction between topological convexity spaces and preconvexity spaces, the conditions for fixed points are less clear. Proposition 2.18 characterises the teetotal topological convexity spaces, but the conditions are not particularly natural. More work could be done describing teetotal spaces in a better way. Proposition 2.21 is a good step in this direction — showing that a collection of natural or commonly assumed properties of topological convexity spaces are sufficient for the teetotal property. However, it does exclude a number of discrete examples, so there is potential for improvement. In the other direction, describing the geometric preconvexity spaces is more challenging.

### 4.1.2 Euclidean Spaces

The motivating examples for topological convexity spaces are real vector spaces, particularly finite ones. The author has nearly completed a characterisation of these spaces within the category of topological convexity spaces, which will be presented in another paper.



### 4.1.3 Convexity Manifolds

In differential geometry, a manifold is a space which has a local differential structure. That is, the space is covered by a family of open sets, each of which has a local differential structure. There are examples of spaces with a cover by open subsets with a local convexity structure. The motivating example here is real projective space. We cannot assign a global convexity structure to projective space, but if we remove a line from the projective plane, then the remaining space is isomorphic to the Euclidean plane, and so has a canonical convexity space. Furthermore, these convexity spaces have a certain compatibility condition — given a subset  $C$  of the intersection which is convex in both convexity spaces, the convex subsets of  $C$  are the same in both spaces. This gives us the outline for a definition of convexity manifolds. Further work is needed to identify the Euclidean projective spaces within the category of convexity manifolds, and to determine what geometric structure is retained at this level of generality.

### 4.1.4 Metrics and Measures

There are connections between metrics and measures. For example, on the real line, any metric that induces the usual convexity space structure corresponds to a monotone function  $\mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{R}$  with 0 as a fixed point. Such a function naturally induces a measure on the Lebesgue sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Conversely, for every measure on the Lebesgue sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we obtain a monotone endofunction of  $\mathbb{R}$  by integrating. Thus, for the real numbers, there is a bijective correspondence between metrics that induce the usual topological convexity structure and measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . This property is specific to  $\mathbb{R}$ , and does not generalise to other spaces like  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

There is a more general connection between topological convexity spaces, sigma algebras, measures and metrics.

**Example 4.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  be a  $\Sigma$ -algebra. There is a topological convexity space  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{I})$  where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the set of intervals in the lattice  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of collections of measurable sets closed under limits of characteristic functions. That is, for  $B_1, B_2, \dots \in \mathcal{B}$ , say  $B$  is the *limit* of  $B_1, B_2, \dots$  if for any  $x \in B$ , there is some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $x \notin B_i \Rightarrow i < k$ , and for any  $x \notin B$ , there is some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $x \in B_i \Rightarrow i < k$ .  $\mathcal{F}$  is the collection of subsets  $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that for any  $B_1, B_2, \dots \in F$ , if  $B$  is the limit of  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , then  $B \in F$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *If  $\mu$  is a finite measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  then  $d : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $d(A, B) = \mu(A \Delta B)$ , is a metric and induces this topological convexity space structure or a finer topology. Furthermore, all metrics inducing this topological convexity space structure on  $\mathcal{B}$  are of this form.*

*Proof.* We have  $d(A, A) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $d(A, B) = d(B, A)$ , so we need to prove the triangle inequality. That is, for  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $d(A, C) \leq d(A, B) + d(B, C)$ . This is clear because  $A \Delta C \subseteq A \Delta B \cup B \Delta C$ . Thus  $d$  is a metric. To prove that it induces this topological convexity structure, we note that  $d(A, C) = d(A, B) + d(B, C)$  if and only if  $A \Delta C = A \Delta B \sqcup B \Delta C$ . This only happens if  $A \cap C \subseteq B \subseteq A \cup C$ , which means that convex sets must be intervals. Finally, we need to show the topology from the metric is

finer than  $\mathcal{F}$ . That is, if  $B$  is the limit of  $B_1, B_2, \dots$ , then  $d(B_i, B) \rightarrow 0$ . By definition,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \Delta B = \emptyset$ . Thus, we need to show that for a sequence  $A_i = B_i \Delta B$  of measurable sets with empty intersection,  $\mu(A_i) \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $C_i = \bigcup_{j \geq i} A_j$ . Since  $A_i \rightarrow \emptyset$ , we get  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i = \emptyset$ . Since the  $C_i$  are nested, we have  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(C_i) = \mu(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i) = 0$ .

To show that every metric is of that form, let  $d : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a metric on  $\mathcal{B}$  whose induced topology and convexity are finer than  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  respectively. We want to show that there is a finite measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $d(A, B) = \mu(A \Delta B)$ . By the convexity, whenever  $A = B \sqcup C$  is a disjoint union, we have  $d(A, B) + d(B, \emptyset) = d(\emptyset, A) = d(\emptyset, C) + d(C, A)$  and  $d(B, \emptyset) + d(\emptyset, C) = d(B, C) = d(B, A) + d(A, C)$ . It follows that

$$2d(A, B) + d(B, \emptyset) + d(A, C) = d(A, C) + d(B, \emptyset) + 2d(\emptyset, C)$$

so  $d(A, B) = d(C, \emptyset)$ . For general  $B$ , we have  $A \cap B$  is between  $A$  and  $B$ , so

$$d(A, B) = d(A, A \cap B) + d(A \cap B, B) = d(\emptyset, A \setminus B) + d(\emptyset, B \setminus A) = d(\emptyset, A \Delta B)$$

Thus, if we define  $\mu(B) = d(\emptyset, B)$ , then  $d$  is defined by  $d(A, B) = \mu(A \Delta B)$ . We need to show that  $\mu$  is a measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, that if  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint, we have  $\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B)$  and if  $B_1 \subseteq B_2 \subseteq \dots$ , then  $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_i)$ . We have already shown that the first of these comes from the convexity. The second comes from the topology. Consider the sequence  $A_i = \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j\right) \setminus B_i$ . By the convexity, we have  $\mu(A_i) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j\right) - \mu(B_i)$ , so it is sufficient to show that  $\mu(A_i) \rightarrow 0$ , when  $(A_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a decreasing sequence with empty intersection. If  $(A_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a decreasing sequence with empty intersection, then for any  $x \in X$ , we have  $(\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^+)(x \notin A_k)$ . Thus  $\emptyset$  is a limit of  $(A_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ . Thus we have  $\mu(A_i) \rightarrow \mu(\emptyset) = 0$  as required.  $\square$

#### 4.1.5 Sheaves

A lot of information about topological spaces can be obtained by studying their categories of sheaves. A natural question is whether a similar category of sheaves can be constructed for a topological convexity space. Part of the difficulty here is that the usual construction of the sheaf category is described in terms of open sets. However, for topological convexity spaces, closed sets are more fundamental, so it is necessary to redefine sheaves in terms of closed sets. This is conceptually strange. One interpretation of sheaves is as sets with truth values given by open sets. In this interpretation, closed sets correspond to the truth values of negated statements, such as inequality. [5] argues that inequality is a more fundamental concept for studying lattices of equivalence relations as a form of logical statement, so a definition of sheaves in terms of closed sets could be linked to this work.

## References

- [1] C.E. Aull and W.J. Thron. Separation axioms between  $T_0$  and  $T_1$ . *Indag. Math.*, pages 26–37, 1963.

- [2] B. Banaschewski, G. C. L. Brümmer, and K. A. Hardie. Biframes and bispaces. *Quaest. Math.*, 6:13–25, 1983.
- [3] R. Dawson, R. Paré, and D. Pronk. Adjoining adjoints. *Advances in Mathematics*, 178:99–140, 2003.
- [4] R. J. M. Dawson. Limits and colimits of convexity spaces. *Cahiers de Topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques*, 28:307–328, 1987.
- [5] D. Ellerman. The logic of partitions: Introduction to the dual of the logic of subsets. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 3:287–350, 2010.
- [6] R.-E. Hoffmann. Essentially complete  $T_0$ -spaces. *Manuscripta Math.*, 27:401–431, 1979.
- [7] D. C. Kay and E. W. Womble. Axiomatic convexity theory and relationships between the caratheodory, helly, and radon numbers. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 38:471–485, 1971.
- [8] T. Kenney. Partial-sup lattices. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 30:305–331, 2015.
- [9] A. Kock. Monads for which structures are adjoint to units. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 104:41–59, 1995.
- [10] G. Manuell. Strictly zero-dimensional biframes and a characterisation of congruence frames. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 26:645–655, 2018.
- [11] L. Skula. On a reflective subcategory of the category of all topological spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, pages 37–41, 1969.
- [12] M. H. Stone. The theory of representations for boolean algebras. *Trans. AMS*, 40:37–111, 1936.
- [13] M. Van De Vel. A selection theorem for topological convex structures. *Trans. AMS*, 336:463–496, 1993.