JOURNAL OF FORMALIZED MATHEMATICS
Volume 9, Released 1997, Published 2003
Inst. of Computer Science, Univ. of Białystok

Scott Topology[1]

Andrzej Trybulec
Warsaw University
Białystok

Summary. In the article we continue the formalization in Mizar of [12, 98–105]. We work with structures of the form
$$L = \langle C, \leq, \tau \rangle,$$
where C is the carrier of the structure, $\leq$ - an ordering relation on C and τ a family of subsets of C. When $\langle C, \leq \rangle$ is a complete lattice we say that L is Scott, if τ is the Scott topology of $\langle C, \leq \rangle$. We define the Scott convergence (lim inf convergence). Following [12] we prove that in the case of a continuous lattice $\langle C, \leq \rangle$ the Scott convergence is topological, i.e. enjoys the properties: (CONSTANTS), (SUBNETS), (DIVERGENCE), (ITERATED LIMITS). We formalize the theorem, that if the Scott convergence has the (ITERATED LIMITS) property, the $\langle C, \leq \rangle$ is continuous.

MML Identifier: WAYBEL11.

WWW: http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol9/waybel11.html

The articles [23], [10], [29], [31], [11], [30], [7], [9], [8], [2], [28], [19], [21], [32], [22], [20], [34], [24], [1], [18], [27], [3], [4], [5], [13], [33], [14], [15], [16], [6], [25], [17], and [26] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

1. Preliminaries

The scheme *Irrel* deals with non empty sets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, a unary functor $\mathcal{F}$ yielding a set, a binary functor $\mathcal{F}$ yielding a set, and a unary predicate $\mathcal{P}$, and states that:

$\{\mathcal{F}(u); u$ ranges over elements of $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{P}[u]\} = \{\mathcal{F}(i,v); i$ ranges over elements of $\mathcal{B}, v$ ranges over elements of $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{P}[v]\}$

provided the following condition is met:

- For every element i of $\mathcal{B}$ and for every element u of $\mathcal{A}$ holds $\mathcal{F}(u) = \mathcal{F}(i,u)$.

We now state three propositions:

(1) For every complete lattice L and for all subsets X, Y of L such that Y is coarser than X holds $\bigsqcap_L X \leq \bigsqcap_L Y$.

(2) For every complete lattice L and for all subsets X, Y of L such that X is finer than Y holds $\bigsqcup_L X \leq \bigsqcup_L Y$.

(3) Let T be a relational structure, A be an upper subset of T, and B be a directed subset of T. Then $A \cap B$ is directed.

Let T be a reflexive non empty relational structure. One can verify that there exists a subset of T which is non empty, directed, and finite.

We now state the proposition

[1] This work was partially supported by the Office of Naval Research Grant N00014-95-1-1336.

(4) For every poset T with l.u.b.'s and for every non empty directed finite subset D of T holds $\sup D \in D$.

Let us observe that there exists a relational structure which is trivial, reflexive, transitive, non empty, antisymmetric, finite, and strict and has l.u.b.'s and g.l.b.'s.

One can check that there exists a 1-sorted structure which is finite, non empty, and strict.

Let T be a finite 1-sorted structure. Observe that every subset of T is finite.

Let R be a relational structure. One can check that $\emptyset_R$ is lower and upper.

Let R be a trivial non empty relational structure. One can verify that every subset of R is upper.

Next we state two propositions:

(5) Let T be a non empty relational structure, x be an element of T, and A be an upper subset of T. If $x \notin A$, then A misses $\downarrow x$.

(6) Let T be a non empty relational structure, x be an element of T, and A be a lower subset of T. If $x \in A$, then $\downarrow x \subseteq A$.

2. Scott Topology

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure and let S be a subset of T. We say that S is inaccessible by directed joins if and only if:

(Def. 1) For every non empty directed subset D of T such that $\sup D \in S$ holds D meets S.

We introduce S is inaccessible as a synonym of S is inaccessible by directed joins. We say that S is closed under directed sups if and only if:

(Def. 2) For every non empty directed subset D of T such that $D \subseteq S$ holds $\sup D \in S$.

We introduce S is directly closed as a synonym of S is closed under directed sups. We say that S is property(S) if and only if the condition (Def. 3) is satisfied.

(Def. 3) Let D be a non empty directed subset of T. Suppose $\sup D \in S$. Then there exists an element y of T such that $y \in D$ and for every element x of T such that $x \in D$ and $x \geq y$ holds $x \in S$.

We introduce S has the property (S) as a synonym of S is property(S).

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure. Observe that $\emptyset_T$ is property(S) and directly closed.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure. Note that there exists a subset of T which is property(S) and directly closed.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure and let S be a property(S) subset of T. Observe that $S^{\rm c}$ is directly closed.

Let T be a reflexive non empty FR-structure. We say that T is Scott if and only if:

(Def. 4) For every subset S of T holds S is open iff S is inaccessible and upper.

Let T be a reflexive transitive antisymmetric non empty finite relational structure with l.u.b.'s. One can verify that every subset of T is inaccessible.

Let T be a reflexive transitive antisymmetric non empty finite FR-structure with l.u.b.'s. Let us observe that T is Scott if and only if:

(Def. 5) For every subset S of T holds S is open iff S is upper.

One can check that there exists a top-lattice which is trivial, complete, strict, non empty, and Scott.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure. One can verify that Ω_T is directly closed and inaccessible.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure. Note that there exists a subset of T which is directly closed, lower, inaccessible, and upper.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure and let S be an inaccessible subset of T. Note that S^{c} is directly closed.

Let T be a non empty reflexive relational structure and let S be a directly closed subset of T. Note that S^{c} is inaccessible.

Next we state several propositions:

(7) Let T be an up-complete Scott non empty reflexive transitive FR-structure and S be a subset of T. Then S is closed if and only if S is directly closed and lower.

(8) Let T be an up-complete non empty reflexive transitive antisymmetric FR-structure and x be an element of T. Then $\downarrow x$ is directly closed.

(9) For every complete Scott top-lattice T and for every element x of T holds $\overline{\{x\}} = \downarrow x$.

(10) Every complete Scott top-lattice is a T_0-space.

(11) Let T be a Scott up-complete non empty reflexive transitive antisymmetric FR-structure and x be an element of T. Then $\downarrow x$ is closed.

(12) For every up-complete Scott top-lattice T and for every element x of T holds $(\downarrow x)^{\mathrm{c}}$ is open.

(13) Let T be an up-complete Scott top-lattice, x be an element of T, and A be an upper subset of T. If $x \notin A$, then $(\downarrow x)^{\mathrm{c}}$ is a neighbourhood of A.

(14) Let T be a complete Scott top-lattice and S be an upper subset of T. Then there exists a family F of subsets of T such that $S = \bigcap F$ and for every subset X of T such that $X \in F$ holds X is a neighbourhood of S.

(15) Let T be a Scott top-lattice and S be a subset of T. Then S is open if and only if S is upper and property(S).

Let T be a complete top-lattice. One can verify that every subset of T which is lower is also property(S).

We now state the proposition

(16) Let T be a non empty transitive reflexive FR-structure. Suppose the topology of $T = \{S; S$ ranges over subsets of T: S has the property (S)$\}$. Then T is topological space-like.

3. Scott Convergence

In the sequel R denotes a non empty relational structure, N denotes a net in R, and i denotes an element of N.

Let us consider R, N. The functor $\liminf N$ yielding an element of R is defined as follows:

(Def. 6) $\liminf N = \bigsqcup_R \{\bigsqcap_R \{N(i) : i \geq j\} : j$ ranges over elements of $N\}$.

Let R be a reflexive non empty relational structure, let N be a net in R, and let p be an element of R. We say that p is S-limit of N if and only if:

(Def. 7) $p \leq \liminf N$.

Let R be a reflexive non empty relational structure. The Scott convergence of R yields a convergence class of R and is defined by the condition (Def. 8).

(Def. 8) Let N be a strict net in R. Suppose $N \in \mathrm{NetUniv}(R)$. Let p be an element of R. Then $\langle N, p\rangle \in$ the Scott convergence of R if and only if p is S-limit of N.

Next we state two propositions:

(17) Let R be a complete lattice, N be a net in R, and p, q be elements of R. If p is S-limit of N and N is eventually in $\downarrow q$, then $p \leq q$.

(18) Let R be a complete lattice, N be a net in R, and p, q be elements of R. If N is eventually in $\uparrow q$, then $\liminf N \geq q$.

Let R be a reflexive non empty relational structure and let N be a non empty net structure over R. Let us observe that N is monotone if and only if:

(Def. 9) For all elements i, j of N such that $i \leq j$ holds $N(i) \leq N(j)$.

Let R be a non empty relational structure, let S be a non empty set, and let f be a function from S into the carrier of R. The functor $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ yielding a strict non empty net structure over R is defined by the conditions (Def. 10).

(Def. 10)(i) The carrier of $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f) = S$,

(ii) the mapping of $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f) = f$, and

(iii) for all elements i, j of $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ holds $i \leq j$ iff $(\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f))(i) \leq (\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f))(j)$.

The following propositions are true:

(19) Let L be a non empty 1-sorted structure and N be a non empty net structure over L. Then $\mathrm{rng}(\text{the mapping of } N) = \{N(i) : i \text{ ranges over elements of } N\}$.

(20) Let R be a non empty relational structure, S be a non empty set, and f be a function from S into the carrier of R. If $\mathrm{rng}\, f$ is directed, then $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ is directed.

Let R be a non empty relational structure, let S be a non empty set, and let f be a function from S into the carrier of R. One can check that $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ is monotone.

Let R be a transitive non empty relational structure, let S be a non empty set, and let f be a function from S into the carrier of R. Note that $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ is transitive.

Let R be a reflexive non empty relational structure, let S be a non empty set, and let f be a function from S into the carrier of R. Observe that $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ is reflexive.

Next we state the proposition

(21) Let R be a non empty transitive relational structure, S be a non empty set, and f be a function from S into the carrier of R. If $S \subseteq$ the carrier of R and $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f)$ is directed, then $\mathrm{NetStr}(S, f) \in \mathrm{NetUniv}(R)$.

Let R be a lattice. Observe that there exists a net in R which is monotone, reflexive, and strict.

Next we state three propositions:

(22) For every complete lattice R and for every monotone reflexive net N in R holds $\liminf N = \sup N$.

(23) For every complete lattice R and for every constant net N in R holds the value of $N = \liminf N$.

(24) For every complete lattice R and for every constant net N in R holds the value of N is S-limit of N.

Let S be a non empty 1-sorted structure and let e be an element of S. The functor $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ yielding a strict net structure over S is defined as follows:

(Def. 11) The carrier of $\mathrm{NetStr}(e) = \{e\}$ and the internal relation of $\mathrm{NetStr}(e) = \{\langle e, e \rangle\}$ and the mapping of $\mathrm{NetStr}(e) = \mathrm{id}_{\{e\}}$.

Let S be a non empty 1-sorted structure and let e be an element of S. Note that $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ is non empty.

One can prove the following two propositions:

(25) For every non empty 1-sorted structure S and for every element e of S and for every element x of $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ holds $x = e$.

(26) For every non empty 1-sorted structure S and for every element e of S and for every element x of $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ holds $(\mathrm{NetStr}(e))(x) = e$.

Let S be a non empty 1-sorted structure and let e be an element of S. Note that $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ is reflexive, transitive, directed, and antisymmetric.

We now state several propositions:

(27) Let S be a non empty 1-sorted structure, e be an element of S, and X be a set. Then $\mathrm{NetStr}(e)$ is eventually in X if and only if $e \in X$.

(28) For every reflexive antisymmetric non empty relational structure S and for every element e of S holds $e = \liminf \mathrm{NetStr}(e)$.

(29) For every non empty reflexive relational structure S and for every element e of S holds $\mathrm{NetStr}(e) \in \mathrm{NetUniv}(S)$.

(30) Let R be a complete lattice, Z be a net in R, and D be a subset of R. Suppose $D = \{\bigsqcap_R\{Z(k); k$ ranges over elements of Z: $k \geq j\}$: j ranges over elements of $Z\}$. Then D is non empty and directed.

(31) Let L be a complete lattice and S be a subset of L. Then $S \in$ the topology of ConvergenceSpace(the Scott convergence of L) if and only if S is inaccessible and upper.

(32) For every complete Scott top-lattice T holds the topological structure of $T =$ ConvergenceSpace(the Scott convergence of T).

(33) Let T be a complete top-lattice. Suppose the topological structure of $T =$ ConvergenceSpace(the Scott convergence of T). Let S be a subset of T. Then S is open if and only if S is inaccessible and upper.

(34) Let T be a complete top-lattice. Suppose the topological structure of $T =$ ConvergenceSpace(the Scott convergence of T). Then T is Scott.

Let R be a complete lattice. Observe that the Scott convergence of R has (CONSTANTS) property.

Let R be a complete lattice. Note that the Scott convergence of R has (SUBNETS) property.

Next we state the proposition

(35) Let S be a non empty 1-sorted structure, N be a net in S, X be a set, and M be a subnet of N. If $M = N^{-1}(X)$, then for every element i of M holds $M(i) \in X$.

Let L be a non empty reflexive relational structure. The functor $\sigma(L)$ yielding a family of subsets of L is defined as follows:

(Def. 12) $\sigma(L) =$ the topology of ConvergenceSpace(the Scott convergence of L).

One can prove the following propositions:

(36) For every continuous complete Scott top-lattice L and for every element x of L holds $\twoheaduparrow x$ is open.

(37) For every complete top-lattice T such that the topology of $T = \sigma(T)$ holds T is Scott.

Let R be a continuous complete lattice. One can verify that the Scott convergence of R is topological.

Next we state a number of propositions:

(38) Let T be a continuous complete Scott top-lattice, x be an element of T, and N be a net in T. If $N \in \mathrm{NetUniv}(T)$, then x is S-limit of N iff $x \in \mathrm{Lim}\, N$.

(39) Let L be a complete non empty poset. Suppose the Scott convergence of L has (ITERATED LIMITS) property. Then L is continuous.

(40) For every complete Scott top-lattice T holds T is continuous iff $\mathrm{Convergence}(T) =$ the Scott convergence of T.

(41) For every complete Scott top-lattice T and for every upper subset S of T such that S is open holds S is open.

(42) Let L be a non empty relational structure, S be an upper subset of L, and x be an element of L. If $x \in S$, then $\uparrow x \subseteq S$.

(43) Let L be a complete continuous Scott top-lattice, p be an element of L, and S be a subset of L. If S is open and $p \in S$, then there exists an element q of L such that $q \ll p$ and $q \in S$.

(44) Let L be a complete continuous Scott top-lattice and p be an element of L. Then $\{\Uparrow q; q$ ranges over elements of L: $q \ll p\}$ is a basis of p.

(45) For every complete continuous Scott top-lattice T holds $\{\Uparrow x : x$ ranges over elements of $T\}$ is a basis of T.

(46) Let T be a complete continuous Scott top-lattice and S be an upper subset of T. Then S is open if and only if S is open.

(47) For every complete continuous Scott top-lattice T and for every element p of T holds $\mathrm{Int}\uparrow p = \Uparrow p$.

(48) Let T be a complete continuous Scott top-lattice and S be a subset of T. Then $\mathrm{Int} S = \bigcup\{\Uparrow x; x$ ranges over elements of T: $\Uparrow x \subseteq S\}$.

REFERENCES

[1] Grzegorz Bancerek. König's theorem. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/card_3.html.

[2] Grzegorz Bancerek. Cartesian product of functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 3, 1991. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol3/funct_6.html.

[3] Grzegorz Bancerek. Complete lattices. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 4, 1992. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol4/lattice3.html.

[4] Grzegorz Bancerek. Bounds in posets and relational substructures. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_0.html.

[5] Grzegorz Bancerek. Directed sets, nets, ideals, filters, and maps. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/waybel_0.html.

[6] Grzegorz Bancerek. The "way-below" relation. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/waybel_3.html.

[7] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_1.html.

[8] Czesław Byliński. Functions from a set to a set. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_2.html.

[9] Czesław Byliński. Partial functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/partfun1.html.

[10] Czesław Byliński. Some basic properties of sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/zfmisc_1.html.

[11] Agata Darmochwał. Finite sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finset_1.html.

[12] G. Gierz, K.H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J.D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D.S. Scott. *A Compendium of Continuous Lattices*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1980.

[13] Adam Grabowski and Robert Milewski. Boolean posets, posets under inclusion and products of relational structures. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_1.html.

[14] Artur Korniłowicz. Cartesian products of relations and relational structures. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_3.html.

[15] Artur Korniłowicz. Definitions and properties of the join and meet of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_4.html.

[16] Artur Korniłowicz. Meet – continuous lattices. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/waybel_2.html.

[17] Artur Korniłowicz. On the topological properties of meet-continuous lattices. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/waybel_9.html.

[18] Beata Madras. Product of family of universal algebras. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/pralg_1.html.

[19] Beata Madras. Irreducible and prime elements. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/waybel_6.html.

[20] Beata Padlewska. Locally connected spaces. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/connsp_2.html.

[21] Beata Padlewska and Agata Darmochwał. Topological spaces and continuous functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/pre_topc.html.

[22] Alexander Yu. Shibakov and Andrzej Trybulec. The Cantor set. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 7, 1995. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol7/cantor_1.html.

[23] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html.

[24] Andrzej Trybulec. Many-sorted sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/pboole.html.

[25] Andrzej Trybulec. Moore-Smith convergence. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_6.html.

[26] Andrzej Trybulec. Baire spaces, Sober spaces. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 9, 1997. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol9/yellow_8.html.

[27] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Partially ordered sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/orders_1.html.

[28] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Groups. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/group_1.html.

[29] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset_1.html.

[30] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_1.html.

[31] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations defined on sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relset_1.html.

[32] Mirosław Wysocki and Agata Darmochwał. Subsets of topological spaces. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/tops_1.html.

[33] Mariusz Żynel and Czesław Byliński. Properties of relational structures, posets, lattices and maps. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/yellow_2.html.

[34] Mariusz Żynel and Adam Guzowski. T_0 topological spaces. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 6, 1994. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol6/t_0topsp.html.

Received January 29, 1997

Published January 2, 2004