arXiv:2002.06560v1 [math.RA] 16 Feb 2020

PIGGYBACKING OVER UNBOUNDED DISTRIBUTIVE LATTICES

LEONARDO M. CABRER AND HILARY A. PRIESTLEY

Abstract. This paper fills a gap in the literature on natural duality theory. It concerns dual representations of categories of distributive-lattice-based algebras in which the lattice reducts are not assumed to have bounds. The development of theory to parallel what is known for the exhaustively-studied bounded case was initially driven by need. This arose in connection with a major investigation of Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids. The theorems in this paper apply in a systematic way to a range of examples: varieties of Sugihara type; other classes of algebras previously treated ad hoc; and further classes as required.

1. Introduction

There is a gap in the literature on duality theory for distributive-lattice-based algebras. The present paper addresses this. By doing so, it paves the way to applications to a range of classes which provide algebraic semantics for certain well-studied propositional logics. The development of the theory we present was prompted by a study by the authors of Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids [6–8]. These varieties have attracted much interest, not least because they provide algebraic semantics for classes of relevant logics with the mingle axiom; see for example [14–17]. Algebras of Sugihara type have reducts in the variety $\mathcal{D}_u$ of unbounded distributive lattices. That is, bounds 0 and 1 are not included as constants in the language.

Duality methods are very well established as a tool for studying varieties and quasivarieties of algebras whose members have reducts in the variety $\mathcal{D}$ of *bounded* distributive lattices, where constants 0 and 1 are included. Underpinning this successful endeavour have been two important dualities: Stone duality for Boolean algebras and Priestley duality for $\mathcal{D}$. These dualities exhibit extremely good behaviour: in the parlance of the now-classic text by Clark and Davey [9, Chapters 3, 4, 6] they are both 'strong' and 'good'. This makes them powerful tools for translating algebraic problems into more amenable dual formulations and for gaining benefits in terms of computational complexity. Extensive catalogues of examples exist of the successful employment of duality methods for classes of algebras with Boolean or $\mathcal{D}$ reducts for which well-behaved dualities have been devised. Hitherto,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 08C20; Secondary: 03G25, 06D50.

Key words and phrases. Distributive lattice, Priestley duality, natural duality, multi-sorted duality, piggyback method, Sugihara algebra.

the methodology has not been fully extended to cover classes with reducts in $\mathcal{D}_u$.

To provide context we summarise the approaches adopted for classes of $\mathcal{D}$-based algebras. For a given class two alternatives present themselves:

(I) setting up a restricted Priestley duality in which the additional operations are captured, usually by operations or relations, on the dual side;
(II) setting up a natural duality which emulates, as far as possible, the desirable features possessed by the Stone and Priestley dualities.

A recent paper [11] formalises (I) in categorical terms. For (II), the key result guaranteeing feasibility is the NU Strong Duality Theorem [9, 7.1.2] (and this does not require the lattice reducts to be bounded). In general, compromises will be unavoidable. Under (I), coproducts, and in particular free algebras, seldom have simple dual descriptions (whereas the Stone and Priestley functors convert coproducts into concrete (that is, cartesian) products). On the plus side, under (I), algebras can be concretely represented in terms of families of sets.

How can (I) and (II) be reconciled so as to capitalise on the merits of each? We highlight three influential developments. The first was Davey & Werner's (simple) piggyback method which, for a quasivariety $\mathscr{A}$ with a forgetful functor U into a base quasivariety $\mathscr{B}$ for which an amenable natural duality was to hand, guided the choice of a dualising alter ego for $\mathscr{A}$. The method was however limited in scope. The next major advance was the introduction by Davey & Priestley [12] of multisorted natural dualities and the extension to this setting of piggybacking. (The idea of employing categories of multisorted structures is applicable well beyond traditional duality theory and shows promise for the future—but this does not concern us here.) Multisorted piggybacking has proved very useful when the base variety is $\mathcal{D}$; see for example [1, 3, 4, 12, 18]. The third advance to be highlighted relates to that setting specifically, so $\mathbf{B} = \mathcal{D}$. The present authors [3] showed how a multisorted piggyback duality for a $\mathcal{D}$-based quasivariety $\mathscr{A}$ connects in a transparent way to Priestley duality as this applies to the $\mathcal{D}$-reducts, and, under appropriate conditions, to a restricted Priestley duality for $\mathscr{A}$ itself.

Above, the restriction to the base variety being *bounded* distributive lattices is noteworthy. Only isolated examples have been considered in the unbounded case, and general theory has not been available. We remedy this omission.

Our main results are Theorems 5.1 and 6.2. The first of these is our Multisorted Piggyback Duality Theorem for classes $\mathscr{A}$ of $\mathcal{D}_u$-based algebras. The second relates the natural duality in Theorem 5.1 to Priestley duality for the $\mathcal{D}_u$-reduct of $\mathscr{A}$. Together, these theorems do the same job in reconciling (I) and (II) as earlier papers do for the bounded case. The theorems we present find their first applications in [6,8]. The latter paper, devoted to free algebras in varieties of Sugihara type, leads to descriptions of the underlying

lattice structure of such algebras. This provides information which would be challenging to obtain using either method (I) or method (II) alone.

Theorems 5.1 and 6.2 work smoothly. But we warn that en route some subtleties emerge which need handling with due care; see Section 4. We believe that in writing this paper we do a service to those who potentially have uses for duality results in the unbounded case but who would baulk at working out the technicalities themselves. We shall assume some familiarity with duality theory, as exemplified by Priestley duality for $\mathcal{D}$. The classic text by Clark & Davey [9] is used as a primary reference for natural duality theory (our notation does not always align with that in [9] but is internally consistent). Alternative sources are available: the authors' cited papers, and Sections 2 and 3 below, outline the material we need. We are able to coordinate the proofs of Theorems 5.1 and 6.2. Note that the corresponding theorems in the bounded case were first published in 1987 [12] and 2014 [3].

In Section 7 we discuss the application of our theorems to

- **Kleene lattices**
- finitely generated varieties of **Sugihara algebras** and **Sugihara monoids**, both odd and even cases,
- **unbounded distributive bilattices**

The first and third of these examples have been considered previously, ad hoc, and our task is to bring them within the scope of our general theory. For varieties of Sugihara type, our theorems find immediate application in [8]. There is a symbiotic relationship between Section 7 and the theoretical material in preceding sections. The behaviour of our examples has motivated the theory and these are used to illustrate features of it. In the other direction our key theorems should be seen as enablers. The job of finding the piggyback relations in Theorem 5.1 and the partial order defined in Section 6 is specific to each application, and can be onerous. We mention salient points only and refer the reader to the appropriate papers for descriptions of the resulting dualities.

We issue one claimer. Our Reconciliation Theorem 6.2 describes the Priestley duals of the lattice reducts of the algebras in the class $\mathscr{A}$ under investigation. In this paper we do not seek in general to upgrade the description so as to tie together the natural duality for $\mathscr{A}$ and a restricted Priestley duality for $\mathscr{A}$. See the remarks at the end of Section 7.

Finally, in Section 8, we outline the modifications needed to encompass classes of algebras with reducts in distributive lattices with one distinguished bound. This is appropriate since we have an application pending. In connection with our on-going study of Sugihara algebras and monoids we wish to apply our methodologies to Brouwerian algebras (see [15] for their relevance and [5, 10] for related material).

2. Duality for unbounded distributive lattices

We begin by recalling the duality between $\mathcal{D}_u$ and the category $\mathcal{P}_u$ of doubly-pointed Priestley spaces. The class $\mathcal{D}_u$ may be defined to be the quasivariety (in fact a variety) $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{2})$, where $\mathbf{2}$ is the lattice $(\{0,1\};\vee,\wedge)$ in which the underlying order is given by $0<1$. This class is made into a category by taking the morphisms to be all homomorphisms. On the dual side, we take $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}}$ to be the ordered topological space $(\{0,1\};\leqslant,\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0},\mathcal{T})$, where $\leqslant$ is the partial order for which $0<1$ and $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ are 1 and 0 now regarded as nullary operations, and $\mathcal{T}$ is the discrete topology. Then we can realise the objects of $\mathcal{P}_u$ as the class $\mathbb{IS}_{\mathrm{c}}\mathbb{P}(\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}})$, consisting of all isomorphic copies of closed substructures of non-empty powers of $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}}$. Morphisms are the continuous order-preserving maps which preserve the pointwise liftings of the nullary operations. A self-contained account can be found in [9, Chapter 1].

Theorem 2.1 (Priestley duality for $\mathcal{D}_u$)**.** *There exist well-defined contravariant hom-functors $\mathsf{H}_u\colon \mathcal{D}_u \to \mathcal{P}_u$ and $\mathsf{K}_u\colon \mathcal{P}_u \to \mathcal{D}_u$ which set up a dual equivalence between $\mathcal{D}_u$ and $\mathcal{P}_u$. The functors are given as follows, where $\leq$ is to be interpreted as 'regarded as a substructure of'.*
On objects,

$$\forall \mathbf{B}\in\mathcal{D}_u\ \big(\mathsf{H}_u(\mathbf{B})=\mathcal{D}_u(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{2})\leq \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}}^B\big),$$
$$\forall \mathbf{Y}\in\mathcal{P}_u\ \big(\mathsf{K}_u(\mathbf{Y})=\mathcal{P}_u(\mathbf{Y},\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}})\leq \mathbf{2}^Y\big);$$

on morphisms

$$\forall f\in\mathcal{D}_u(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C})\ \big(\mathsf{H}_u(f)=-\circ f\big),$$
$$\forall \varphi\in\mathcal{P}_u(\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{Y})\ \big(\mathsf{K}_u(\varphi)=-\circ\varphi\big)$$

(here $\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C}\in\mathcal{D}_u$ and $\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{Y}\in\mathcal{P}_u$).

Moreover, a $\mathcal{P}_u$-morphism φ is surjective if and only if $\mathsf{K}_u(\varphi)$ is injective.

See for example [9, Subsection 1.2.5] where the result is proved directly and used as an appetiser for the general theory developed in subsequent chapters. The final assertion is needed in the proof of Lemma 4.1. It is a consequence of the duality being strong; see [9, Chapters 3, 4]. However it is easy to construct a direct proof which bypasses the notion of strongness.

Note that the distinguished upper and lower bounds in $\mathsf{H}_u(\mathbf{B})$ are given by the constant maps to 1 and to 0.

We adopt the following notation for the natural evaluation maps: for $\mathbf{B}\in\mathcal{D}_u$ we write $k_{\mathbf{B}}$ for the map $b\mapsto \mathsf{K}_u\mathsf{H}_u(b)$ $(b\in\mathbf{B})$. We shall make explicit use of the fact that these evaluation maps are surjective.

3. Multisorted dualities and piggybacking

In this section we give a summary of the rudiments of multisorted duality theory and the idea behind the piggybacking method. Any reader conversant with [9, Chapter 7] or other sources describing piggybacking over bounded distributive lattices will find little here that is conceptually novel.

We shall, as needed, make use of basic facts and standard notation from universal algebra. Usually the classes of algebras we consider will be finitely generated varieties which are also quasivarieties. We will be working in a setting in which Jónsson's Lemma applies, so that any finitely generated variety is expressible as $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$ for some finite set $\mathcal{M}$ of finite algebras.

Unless indicated otherwise we shall restrict attention to a class $\mathscr{A}$ satisfying the following assumptions (we shall add to this list as we proceed).

(A1) There is a forgetful functor $\mathsf{U}\colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathcal{D}_u$.
(A2) $\mathscr{A}$ is a finitely generated quasivariety or variety expressed in the form $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is a finite set of pairwise disjoint (formally, disjointified) finite algebras in $\mathscr{A}$.

We refer to the members of $\mathcal{M}$ as *sorts*. We may have distinct sorts which are isomorphic.

The definition of a *compatible alter ego* $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ *for* $\mathcal{M}$ can be found in [9, Section 7.1] (or see [6, Section 3]). The universe of the alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ is $N := \dot{\bigcup}\{ M \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M} \}$, the union of the universes of the sorts. We shall equip the universe N of $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ with the union topology $\mathcal{T}$ obtained when each M (for $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$) is discretely topologised. For the purposes of the theory developed in this paper, it will be sufficient to consider an alter ego which takes the form $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}} = (N; G, R \cup S, \mathcal{T})$ where

- $G \subseteq \bigcup\{ \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \mid \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M} \}$ is a set of homomorphisms between sorts;
- R is a set of relations of arity 2, each of which is the universe of a subalgebra of some $\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{M}'$, where $\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, and S is a set of unary relations each of which is the universe of a 1-element subalgebra of some $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$.

We refer to [9, Section 7.1] for a full discussion of how $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{IS}_{\mathrm{c}}\mathbb{P}(\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}})$, the topological quasivariety generated by $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$, is defined. Here we recall only that the objects of $\mathcal{X}$ are isomorphic copies of closed substructures of powers of $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ (with a non-empty index set); the key feature is that powers are formed 'by sorts'. A member $\mathbf{X}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is a multisorted structure of the same type as $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$, and we denote its M-sort by $\mathbf{X}_M$. Members of G and $R \cup S$ are lifted pointwise to $\mathbf{X}$. We shall write $r^{\mathbf{X}}$ for the lifting of a relation r to $\mathbf{X}$, and similarly for elements of S and G.

We then set up hom-functors $\mathsf{D}\colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathsf{E}\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathscr{A}$ using $\mathcal{M}$ and its alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A}) &= \dot{\bigcup}\{ \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M} \}, & \mathsf{D}(f) &= - \circ f; \\ \mathsf{E}(\mathbf{X}) &= \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{X}, \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}), & \mathsf{E}(\varphi) &= - \circ \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Here the disjoint union of the hom-sets is a (necessarily closed) substructure of $\dot{\bigcup}\{ M^A \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M} \}$, and so a member of $\mathbb{IS}_{\mathrm{c}}\mathbb{P}(\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}})$. As a set, $\mathsf{E}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{X}, \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}})$ is the collection of continuous structure-preserving maps $\varphi\colon \mathbf{X} \to \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ which are such that $\varphi(\mathbf{X}_M) \subseteq M$ for each sort $\mathbf{M}$. This set acquires the

structure of a member of $\mathscr{A}$ by virtue of viewing it as a subalgebra of the power $\prod\{\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{X}_M} \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

General theory ensures that for any compatible alter ego these functors are well defined and set up a dual adjunction for which the unit and co-unit maps are given by evaluation maps which are embeddings. We have a *duality* if for each $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ the evaluation $e_{\mathbf{A}}\colon \mathbf{A} \to \mathsf{ED}(\mathbf{A})$ is surjective, and hence an isomorphism. In this situation we shall say that *the alter ego* $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ *dualises* $\mathscr{A}$. A duality is *full*, and so a dual equivalence, if the co-unit maps are also surjections. (Fullness, when needed, is usually obtained by showing the duality in question is strong.)

We stress a point about our objectives. We are not seeking a duality which is strong (and hence full). Strongness may be crucial for certain applications. This is the case when natural duality methods are employed to study admissible rules for propositional logics, as in [2, 7], and [6] also exploits strong dualities. In our paper [8], on free Sugihara algebras and free Sugihara monoids, we do not need strong dualities, and this paper does not seek such dualities.

We are ready to head for our piggyback duality theorem. The idea is to exploit to maximum advantage the forgetful functor $\mathsf{U}\colon \mathscr{A} \to \mathcal{D}_u$ in order to align as closely as possible the natural dual $\mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ of each $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and the Priestley dual $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ of the reduct of $\mathbf{A}$. We first establish links between $\mathscr{A}$ and its image under U. In particular, for each $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ we consider maps in $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{M})$, the first dual of $\mathbf{M}$ under the duality in Theorem 2.1. Maps of this type are central to the piggybacking method. We refer to them as *carrier maps*, or *carriers* for short. We add a further assumption:

(A3) Associated to each $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ is a chosen non-empty set $\Omega_{\mathbf{M}} \subseteq \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{M})$ of carriers and $\Omega := \bigcup \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$.

Together, (A1)–(A3) may be seen as setting out the framework within which we shall work, with $\mathscr{A}$ and U as givens, and scope to impose conditions on the choices of $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω as we proceed; see Remarks 4.3. Unless indicated otherwise, (A1)–(A3) are henceforth assumed to hold.

We observe that, by changing $\mathcal{D}_u$ to $\mathcal{D}$ in (A1) and making the obvious consequential changes to (A2) and (A3), we obtain the framework assumptions for piggybacking over $\mathcal{D}$. In other words, only the base variety changes.

The piggyback method points the way to a choice of alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ which we hope will dualise $\mathscr{A}$. Our strategy builds on that of [9, Theorem 7.2.1], which originated in [12]. In both bounded and unbounded cases it depends on proving that, for each algebra $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$, the natural evaluation map $e_{\mathbf{A}}\colon \mathbf{A} \to \mathsf{ED}(\mathbf{A})$ is surjective. To achieve this, one exploits the surjectivity of the corresponding evaluation maps for the base duality, *viz.* that for $\mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{D}_u$, respectively.

We now provide the key diagrams on which our piggybacking theorem will rest. These mimic the corresponding diagrams for the bounded case given for the proof of [9, Theorem 7.2.1]. In what follows, $\mathbf{A}$ is a fixed

but arbitrary algebra in $\mathscr{A}$. It is a set-theoretic triviality that the diagram in Figure 1(a) yields surjectivity of the evaluation $e_{\mathbf{A}}$ once the diagrams in Figure 1(b) have been constructed so that the map Δ can be defined. Here it is essential that $\mathsf{K}_u\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}) \cong \mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ and this tacitly demands that the domain of K_u is the *whole* of the first dual $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$.




FIGURE 1. Seeking to define Δ

Let us spell out how Figure 1(b) is required to work. Take $\alpha \in \mathsf{ED}(\mathbf{A})$. That is, α is a multisorted morphism from $\mathbf{X} := \mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ to $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$. Thus α is a sort-preserving, continuous and structure-preserving map. So α_M, the M-component of α, maps the M-sort $\mathbf{X}_M$ of $\mathbf{X}$ into the M-sort of $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$. Figure 1(b) represents a family of diagrams, one for each choice of sort $\mathbf{M}$ and each carrier $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$. The map $\Phi_\omega := \omega \circ -$ takes the M-sort of $\mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$, that is, $\mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$, into $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$, the dual of $\mathbf{A}$'s reduct in $\mathcal{D}_u$ for the base duality as given in Theorem 2.1. Each individual diagram must commute, and, jointly, they must fit together to yield a well-defined map Δ. For the commutativity we need, for each $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$,

$$\Delta(\alpha)(\omega \circ x) = \omega(\alpha_M(x)).$$

We shall attempt to use this as a definition, but being duly mindful that well-definedness has to be considered.

Also, as noted above, the success of the piggyback strategy relies on $\Delta(\alpha)$ being defined on the whole of $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$. For this we require

$$\bigcup\{\, \operatorname{im} \Phi_\omega \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M},\ \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}} \,\} = \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}).$$

This condition is known as *joint surjectivity*.

In the bounded case the corresponding requirement is shown to be equivalent to a separation condition involving the sorts, the carriers and the endomorphisms of sorts and the homomorphisms between them [9, Lemma 7.2.2]. It turns out that in the unbounded case obtaining conditions for joint surjectivity is more delicate. We devote the next section to these issues.

4. Joint surjectivity and separation

In this short section we deal with technical matters. It might be tempting to think that the unbounded case would involve making only routine amendments to results for piggybacking over $\mathcal{D}$. This would be misguided.

We stress once again that it will be crucial for the proof of Theorem 5.1 that, for each $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$, the family of maps $\{\, \Phi_\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega \,\}$ is jointly surjective, that is, for each $y \in \mathcal{D}_u(\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}), \mathbf{2})$ there exist $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ such that $y = \Phi_\omega(x) := \omega \circ x$. We seek conditions for this to hold. These should be global, meaning that they should not involve arbitrary algebras $\mathbf{A}$. Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 together achieve our objective. The first of these is an adaptation of [9, Lemma 7.2.2]. Our framework assumptions (A1)–(A3) from the previous section are still in force, but for ease of reference we include these in the statements of our lemmas.

We introduce the following separation condition, for given $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω:

$\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ For all $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, given $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$ with $a \neq b$, then either there exists $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $\omega(a) \neq \omega(b)$ or there exist $\mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$ and $u \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}')$ such that $\omega'(u(a)) \neq \omega'(u(b))$.

Later we shall consider a more refined separation condition which parallels that used in [9, Lemma 7.2.2], but we do not need that yet.

Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_u(\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}), \mathbf{2})$ will always contain the constant maps from $\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ to $\mathbf{2}$. We denote these by $\overline{\mathbf{0}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$; the domain $\mathbf{A}$ will be dictated by the context.

Lemma 4.1 (Restricted Joint Surjectivity)**.** *Assume* (A1)–(A3)*. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ *is satisfied;*

(2) *for every* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ *and every* $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$ *with* $a \neq b$ *there exist* $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ *and* $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ *such that* $\omega(x(a)) \neq \omega(x(b))$*;*

(3) *for every* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ *and each* $y \in \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}) \setminus \{\overline{\mathbf{0}}, \overline{\mathbf{1}}\}$ *there exist* $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ *and* $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ *such that* $y = \omega \circ x$*.*

Proof. For a given $\mathbf{A}$, consider $Z := \bigcup\!\!\!\cdot \{\, \mathrm{im}\, \Phi_\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega \,\} \cup \{\overline{\mathbf{0}}, \overline{\mathbf{1}}\}$. Since Ω is finite, Z is a closed substructure of $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$. Let $\mu\colon Z \to \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ be the inclusion map. Then (3) is satisfied if and only if μ is surjective. The final statement in Theorem 2.1 implies that this holds if and only if $\mathsf{K}_u(\mu)$ is injective, which in turn holds if and only if $\mathsf{K}_u(\mu) \circ k_{\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})}\colon \mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}) \to \mathsf{K}_u(Z)$ is injective. This is exactly what (2) asserts. We have proved the equivalence of (2) and (3).

Now assume (1). Since $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, the homomorphisms from any given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ into the members of $\mathcal{M}$ separate the points of $\mathbf{A}$. It follows that for any $a \neq b$ in $\mathbf{A}$ there exist $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ such that $x(a) \neq x(b)$. By (1), either there exists $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $\omega(x(a)) \neq \omega(x(b))$ or there exists $\mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$ and a homomorphism $u \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}')$ for

which $\omega'(u(x(a))) \neq \omega'(u(x(b)))$. This implies that (2) holds. The converse is easy to check. □

We now present conditions which ensure that, for any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$, each of the 'missing' constant maps can be represented in the form $\Phi_\omega(x) = \omega \circ x$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume* (A1)–(A3). *Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *there exist a sort* $\mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}$, *an element* $d_1 \in \mathbf{M}_1$, *and a carrier* $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}_1}$ *such that* $\{d_1\}$ *is a subalgebra of* $\mathbf{M}_1$ *and* $\omega(d_1) = 1$;

(2) *for every* $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ *there exist* $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ *and* $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ *such that* $\omega \circ x = \overline{\mathbf{1}} \in \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$.

A corresponding statement can be obtained for the map $\overline{\mathbf{0}}$ *by replacing* 1 *by* 0 *in* (1) *and* (2) *above.*

Proof. Since every algebra $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ has a unique map into any 1-element algebra in $\mathscr{A}$, it is straightforward that (1) implies (2).

For the converse, consider a trivial (1-element) algebra $\mathbf{B}$ in $\mathscr{A}$. By (2), there exist $\mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}_1}$ and $x \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{M}_1)$ such that $\omega \circ x = \overline{\mathbf{1}} \in \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{B})$. Hence the image of x is a 1-element subalgebra $\{d_1\}$ of $\mathbf{M}_1$ and $\omega(x(\mathbf{B})) = \omega(\{d_1\}) = \{1\} = \overline{\mathbf{1}}(\mathbf{B})$, which concludes the proof. □

Remarks 4.3 (Joint surjectivity and ways to achieve it)**.** We assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is given and (A1) holds. We discuss how we might vary $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω, at the same time ensuring that joint surjectivity holds. We have seen that restricted joint surjectivity is equivalent to the separation condition $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ and that joint surjectivity holds if in addition there exist 1-element subalgebras as demanded in Lemma 4.2.

When the piggyback method was first devised the aim was to obtain workable dualities in circumstances where, for example, use of the NU Duality Theorem, aided by hand calculations to streamline the resulting alter ego, was not feasible. The quest for simple alter egos can be seen as part of the philosophy behind piggybacking and this has influenced the formulations of piggyback theorems in the past. This accounts in particular for the set G of operations in an alter ego often being reduced as much as possible.

Our perspective is a little different. We are interested in choosing a dualising alter ego which makes Theorem 6.2 work as transparently as possible. We shall postpone discussion of how this relates to the admissible choices of $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$; see Remarks 5.2 and the examples in Section 7. But it is appropriate already here to consider separation alongside options for varying $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω which explicitly take account of homomorphisms between sorts. For a given subset G of $\bigcup\{\, \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \mid \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M} \,\}$ we consider the condition:

$\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ For all $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, given $a, b \in \mathbf{M}$ with $a \neq b$, then either there exists $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $\omega(a) \neq \omega(b)$ or there exist $\mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$ and $u \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \cap G$ such that $\omega'(u(a)) \neq \omega'(u(b))$.

For any choice of G obviously $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ implies $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ and hence implies restricted joint surjectivity.

We may explore the interplay between the sets which feature in $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$, and possible tradeoffs. Loosely, the larger G is, the fewer sorts and/or carriers we are likely to need. At the extremes, we may seek to minimise the number of sorts, allowing multiple carrier maps on the sorts as needed, or to maximise the number of sorts and minimise the number of carrier maps on each.

Taking $\mathcal{M}$ as given, we can always satisfy $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ by letting $\Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ contain all non-constant maps in $\mathcal{D}_u(\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{M}), \mathbf{2})$ for each $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$. However our aim will often be to use as few sorts as possible, so that it is expedient to include endomorphisms in the alter ego insofar as these are available.

Of course, the choice of $\mathcal{M}$ will be constrained by the need for the class $\mathscr{A}$ we wish to study to he expressible as $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, for which it is necessary and sufficient that the homomorphisms from any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ into the members of $\mathcal{M}$ separate the points of $\mathbf{A}$. Regarding the choice of $\mathcal{M}$ we make some technical comments to justify the assumption in (A3) that each sort $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ has a *non-empty* set of carriers. Assume that $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ holds. Suppose $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ were such that $\Omega_{\mathbf{M}} = \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{M}^* = \mathcal{M} \setminus \{\mathbf{M}\}$ and let G^* be obtained from G by deleting all maps which have $\mathbf{M}$ as their domain or codomain. Then $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M}^*,G^*,\Omega}$ holds. We claim that $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M}^*)$. Take $a \neq b$ in $\mathbf{M}$. Then $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ implies there exist $\mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}^*$, $u \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}')$ and $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$ such that $\omega'(u(a)) \neq \omega'(u(b))$. Then $u(a) \neq u(b)$. Hence $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M}^*)$. Finally, $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M}^*)$, as claimed. We deduce that $\mathbf{M}$ can be deleted from $\mathcal{M}$.

We conclude these remarks with comments stemming from Lemma 4.2. Typically, the sorts we choose to satisfy (A2), (A3) and $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M}.G,\Omega}$ will provide the required 1-element subalgebras and carrier maps. Failing this, we can add trivial algebras to $\mathcal{M}$ and corresponding maps to Ω; this will leave $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$ unchanged. It might appear from its proof that Lemma 4.2 is concerned with handling a degenerate case. However we shall see in Example 7.2 that condition (2) in the lemma can fail on non-trivial algebras. The same example illustrates that adding trivial sorts can sometimes not be avoided.

To summarise, we bring together, and label for future use, conditions which ensure joint surjectivity holds and which will feature in our main theorems.

- (G) The set $G \subseteq \bigcup\{\, \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \mid \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M} \,\}$ is such that $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ is satisfied.
- (S1) There exist a sort $\mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ which has a 1-element subalgebra $\{d_1\} \subseteq \mathbf{M}_1$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}_1}$ such that $\omega(d_1) = 1$.
- (S0) there exist a sort $\mathbf{M}_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ which has a 1-element subalgebra $\{d_0\} \subseteq \mathbf{M}_0$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}_0}$ such that $\omega(d_0) = 0$.

The statement of Theorem 5.1 will incorporate the set G and the 1-element subalgebras into the alter ego. Their preservation by $\mathcal{X}$-morphisms will play a central role in the proof of the theorem.

This is an opportune point at which to contrast the approach in this paper with that we used in [6, 7]. It has long been known that, for quasivarieties of lattice-based algebras in particular, dualities can be upgraded to strong dualities by enriching the alter ego by adding suitable partial operations; see [9, Section 7.1] and [6, Section 2]. In the latter paper, this resulted, *inter alia*, in the 1-element subalgebras of the sorts being included in the alter ego as nullary operations. In this paper we avoid working with operations and partial operations, except for the operations that appear in (G), and (S1) and (S0) will reveal very clearly the role of 1-element subalgebras in multisorted piggybacking over $\mathcal{D}_u$ and in the process of reconciliation that follows from it.

5. Implementing the piggyback strategy

The hard work has now been done. We are armed with conditions for joint surjectivity to feed in to the statement of our multisorted piggyback theorem with base variety $\mathcal{D}_u$. Assumptions (A1)–(A3) remain in force, and (S1) and (S0) are also required. As proposed in Section 3, the alter ego will take the form $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}} := (N; G, R \cup S, \mathcal{T})$. With one exception we have assembled the assumptions we need to impose on $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$. We have not yet introduced the binary piggyback relations which we shall include. For $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$, define $R_{\omega,\omega'}$ to be the set of relations which are universes of maximal subalgebras of the lattice

$$(\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant) := \{\, (a, b) \in \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{M}' \mid \omega(a) \leqslant \omega'(b) \,\}.$$

We do not claim that $R_{\omega,\omega'}$ is always non-empty or, when it is, that it contains a single element. For further comments, see Section 7.

Theorem 5.1 (Multisorted Piggyback Duality Theorem, over $\mathcal{D}_u$)**.** *Assume $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, U, and $\Omega = \bigcup_{\mathbf{M}\in\mathcal{M}} \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ are as in* (A1)–(A3)*.*

Let the alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}} = (N; G, R \cup S, \mathcal{T})$ be constructed as follows.

- (U) *The universe N of $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ is $\biguplus \{\, M \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M} \,\}$, the disjoint(ified) union of the universes of the members of $\mathcal{M}$;*
- (G) *the set $G \subseteq \bigcup\{\, \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \mid \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M} \,\}$ is such that* $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$ *is satisfied;*
- (R) *the set R is $\bigcup_{\omega,\omega'\in\Omega} R_{\omega,\omega'}$, where $R_{\omega,\omega'}$ is the set of all maximal subalgebras of $(\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant)$;*
- (T) *N is equipped with the union topology $\mathcal{T}$ obtained when each M (for $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$) is discretely topologised;*

and, assuming also that (S1) *and* (S0) *hold,*

- (S) *the members of S are the universes of* 1*-element subalgebras $\{d_1\}$ and $\{d_0\}$ of sorts $\mathbf{M}_1$ and $\mathbf{M}_0$, respectively.*

Then $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ yields a duality on $\mathscr{A}$.

Proof. We refer to our discussion in Section 3 and in particular to Figure 1.

Fix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$ and let $\alpha\colon \mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A}) \to \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-morphism. We must now show that putting $\Delta(\alpha)(\omega\circ x) := \omega(\alpha_M(x))$, whenever $x \in \mathbf{X}_M$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$, gives a *well-defined* map. For this we can proceed as in the bounded case. The order $\leqslant$ on $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is the pointwise lifting of the partial order in $\mathbf{2}$ and so $=$ is $\leqslant \cap \geqslant$. For each $\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, each $x \in \mathbf{X}_M$ and $x' \in \mathbf{X}_{M'}$, and each $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ and $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_\omega(x) \leqslant \Phi_{\omega'}(x') &\iff \omega \circ x \leqslant \omega' \circ x' \text{ in } \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}) \\
&\iff (\omega \circ x)(a) \leqslant (\omega' \circ x')(a) \text{ for each } a \in \mathbf{A} \\
&\iff \{\, (x(a), x'(a)) \mid a \in \mathbf{A} \,\} \subseteq (\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant) \\
&\iff \{\, (x(a), x'(a)) \mid a \in \mathbf{A} \,\} \subseteq r \text{ for some } r \in R_{\omega,\omega'} \\
&\iff (x, x') \in r^{\mathbf{X}} \text{ for some } r \in R_{\omega,\omega'} \\
&\implies (\alpha_{\mathbf{M}}(x), \alpha_{\mathbf{M}'}(x')) \in r \text{ for some } r \in R_{\omega,\omega'} \\
&\implies \omega(\alpha_{\mathbf{M}}(x)) \leqslant \omega'(\alpha_{\mathbf{M}'}(x')).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields well-definedness and also proves that $\Delta(\alpha)$ is order-preserving. Joint surjectivity of the maps Φ_ω, for $\omega \in \Omega$, has been engineered (by (G), (S1) and (S0)). It implies that $\Delta(\alpha)$ is defined on the whole of $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$.

We want $\Delta(\alpha)$ to be a $\mathcal{P}_u$-morphism. We claim that $\Delta(\alpha)(\overline{\mathbf{1}}) = 1$. We can realise $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$ as $\omega_1 \circ x_1$, where $\mathbf{M}_1$ has the 1-element subalgebra $\{d_1\}$ and there exists $x_1 \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}_1)$ which is the constant map with image $\{d_1\}$. By (S), $\{d_1\}^{\mathbf{X}}$ is preserved by α_{M_1}. Now $\omega_1 \circ x_1 = \overline{\mathbf{1}}$. Moreover

$$\Delta(\alpha)(\overline{\mathbf{1}})(a) = \omega_1(\alpha_{M_1}(x_1)))(a) = \omega_1(\alpha_{M_1}(x_1(a))) = \omega_1(d_1) = 1,$$

for all $a \in \mathbf{A}$. A similar argument proves that $\Delta(\alpha)(\overline{\mathbf{0}}) = 0$.

Finally we need $\Delta(\alpha)$ to be continuous. It suffices to prove that $\Delta(\alpha)^{-1}(V)$ is closed whenever V is closed in $\{0, 1\}$. This is proved as in the bounded case [9, Theorem 7.2.1, proof of item (5)]. Finally we require Δ to be injective.

Suppose α and β are morphisms from $\mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ to $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$. Then there exists $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\alpha_M \neq \beta_M$ and this implies there exists $x \in \mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$ for which $\alpha_M(x) \neq \beta_M(x)$. By (G) and the definition of $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},G,\Omega}$, either there exists $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ such that $\omega(\alpha_M(x)) \neq \omega(\beta_M(x))$ or there exists $\mathbf{M}' \in \mathcal{M}$, $\omega' \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}'}$ and $u \in \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{M}') \cap G$ such that $\omega'(u(\alpha_M(x))) \neq \omega'(u(\beta_M(x)))$. Since α and β preserve u, the latter implies $\omega'(\alpha_M(u(x))) \neq \omega'(\beta_M(u((x)))$. Hence $\Delta(\alpha)(\omega\circ x) \neq \Delta(\beta)(\omega\circ x)$ or $\Delta(\alpha)(\omega\circ u(x)) \neq \Delta(\beta)(\omega\circ u(x))$. Either way, $\Delta(\alpha) \neq \Delta(\beta)$. □

Remarks 5.2 (Varying the alter ego)**.** Now we have Theorem 5.1 in place, we comment briefly on minor variants of it. We may sometimes wish to use an alter ego which is not the 'standard' one, but for which the piggyback strategy still goes through. (Such comments are equally relevant to the

bounded setting, but have usually been made for individual varieties as these have arisen.)

With $\mathcal{M}$ and Ω fixed, there may be scope to change the relational structure $(N; G, R \cup S)$. In particular, $G \cup R \cup S$ may be enlarged without destroying the duality. We included in R the *maximal* subalgebras of sublattices $(\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant)$ and these suffice in the proof of the duality theorem because the sorts are finite, so any subalgebra of this type will be contained in some maximal one. As always with piggybacking, we could equally well have put *all* subalgebras of $(\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant)$ into $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$. In the other direction, entailment techniques may allow redundant relations to be deleted from $G \cup R \cup S$ [9, Chapters 2 and 8].

6. Reconciliation achieved

In this section we shall show how to construct the Priestley dual of the $\mathcal{D}_u$-reduct of each algebra in a quasivariety $\mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, under the same assumptions as in Theorem 5.1. In particular we carry forward our framework assumptions (A1)–(A3), and also (S1) and (S0), concerning the existence of sorts having 1-element subalgebras.

Topology has played no active part in our arguments so far. In this section it comes to the fore, in the proof of Theorem 6.2. By contrast, the order-theoretic proofs in this section are elementary. If one is interested only in studying finite algebras, a finite-level duality should suffice and topology can be suppressed. Our paper [8] illustrates the point.

We first set up some additional notation. This echoes that in [3, Section 2]. For a fixed algebra $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathbf{X} = \mathsf{D}(\mathbf{A})$, we form an ancillary structure as follows. Let

$$Y = \bigcup \{ \mathbf{X}_M \times \Omega_{\mathbf{M}} \mid \mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M} \}.$$

We equip Y with the binary relation $\preccurlyeq \subseteq Y^2$ defined by

$$(x, \omega) \preccurlyeq (x', \omega') \text{ if there exists } r \in R_{\omega,\omega'} \text{ such that } (x, x') \in r^{\mathbf{X}}.$$

We shall see that $\preccurlyeq$ is a pre-order. We denote the equivalence relation $\preccurlyeq \cap \succcurlyeq$ by $\approx$ and denote the equivalence class of $y \in Y$ by $[y]$. Assuming that $\preccurlyeq$ is indeed a pre-order, we obtain a well-defined quotient partial order $\sqsubseteq$ on $Y/\!\approx$ given, equivalently, by

$$[y] \sqsubseteq [y'] \iff u \preccurlyeq u' \text{ for all } u \approx y \text{ and } u' \approx y',$$
$$[y] \sqsubseteq [y'] \iff y \preccurlyeq y'.$$

We equip Y with the topology $\mathcal{T}_Y$ having as a base of open sets

$$\{ U \times \{\omega\} \mid U \text{ open in } \mathbf{X}_M \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}} \}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the quotient topology on $Y/\!\approx$ derived from $\mathcal{T}_Y$.

We now let $Z := Y/\!\approx$ and consider the quotient structure $(Z; \sqsubseteq, \mathcal{T})$.

Proposition 6.1 and Theorem 6.2 have the same assumptions as Theorem 5.1 and employ the dualising alter ego $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ specified there. The results

and their proofs are adaptations of the statement and proof of [3, Theorem 2.3].

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is as in Theorem* 5.1 *and that $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ is the dualising alter ego given there. Fix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$. Let $(Y; \preccurlyeq, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ be as defined above. Then $(Y; \mathcal{T}_Y)$ is compact and the binary relation $\preccurlyeq$ is a pre-order.*

Proof. The topology of Y coincides with that of the finite disjoint union of the product spaces $\mathbf{X}_M \times \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$, where $\mathbf{X}_M$ carries the induced topology from $\mathbf{X}$ and $\Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$ the discrete topology. Then we use the fact that Ω is finite.

Now we consider the order structure. Here we need only to reinterpret a piece of the proof of Theorem 5.1: the order-preservation of the maps $\Delta(\alpha)$ can be seen as characterising $\preccurlyeq$. Let (x, ω) and (x', ω') belong to Y, and assume they are associated with sorts $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M}'$, respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \circ x \leqslant \omega' \circ x' \text{ in } \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A}) &\iff (x, x') \in r^{\mathbf{X}} \text{ for some } r \in R_{\omega,\omega'} \\ &\iff (x, \omega) \preccurlyeq (x', \omega') \text{ in } Y. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that $\preccurlyeq$ is reflexive and transitive, and therefore a pre-order. □

Theorem 6.2 (Reconciliation Theorem)**.** *Assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is as in Theorem* 5.1 *and that $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{M}}$ is the dualising alter ego given there. Fix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A}$. Let $(Z; \sqsubseteq, \mathcal{T})$ be the quotient structure obtained from $(Y; \preccurlyeq, \mathcal{T}_Y)$.*

Define $\Psi\colon Z \to \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ by $[(x, \omega)] \mapsto \Phi_\omega(x) = \omega \circ x$.

(i) *Ψ is well-defined and establishes an order-homeomorphism between Z and $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$, regarded as ordered topological spaces.*

(ii) *Take x_1 and ω_1 such that $\omega_1 \circ x_1 = \overline{\mathbf{1}}$ and x_0 and ω_0 such that $\omega_0 \circ x_0 = \overline{\mathbf{0}}$. Then the quotient structure $(Z; \sqsubseteq, \mathcal{T})$ enriched with $z_1 = [(x_1, \omega_1)]$ and $z_0 = [(x_0, \omega_0)]$ is a doubly-pointed Priestley space. Moreover, Ψ is then a $\mathcal{P}_u$-isomorphism.*

Proof. Consider (i). From the proof of Proposition 6.1 we see that $\Psi\colon Z \to \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is well-defined and is an order embedding. By joint surjectivity it is an order isomorphism and consequently a bijection.

It remains to show that Ψ is a homeomorphism. Since Z is compact and $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is Hausdorff, it suffices to show that Ψ is continuous. By definition of the quotient topology, Ψ is continuous if and only if the map $(x, \omega) \mapsto \omega \circ x$ from $(Y; \mathcal{T}_Y)$ to $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is continuous. We now prove this.

An introductory comment may be helpful. We shall be working with maps which are elements of spaces of functions from one algebra to another. Such function spaces inherit their topology from the power in which they sit and the topology is determined by the topology put on the universe of the base. This universe will always be either M (for some sort $\mathbf{M}$) or $\{0, 1\}$, and carry the discrete topology. It follows from the definition of product topology that the maps we consider are necessarily continuous. In particular let $x \in \mathbf{X}_M = \mathscr{A}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}}$. Then x and ω are continuous, and hence $\omega \circ x\colon \mathbf{A} \to \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{2}}$ is continuous.

By definition of the topology in $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$, we need to prove that for each $a \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\delta \in \{0,1\}$, the set $\{\,(x,\omega) \mid \omega(x(a)) = \delta\,\}$ is open. For each $a \in \mathbf{A}$, and each $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}$, let $\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}}\colon u \mapsto u(a)$ be the a^{th} coordinate projection from $\mathbf{M}^A \to \mathbf{M}$. Then $\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}}$ is continuous. For $x \in \mathbf{X}_M$ and $\delta \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(x(a)) = (\omega \circ x)(a) = \delta &\iff x(a) \in \omega^{-1}(\delta)\\ &\iff \pi_a^{\mathbf{M}}(x) \in \omega^{-1}(\delta)\\ &\iff x \in (\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}})^{-1}(w^{-1}(\delta)).\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\,(x,\omega) \mid \omega(x(a)) = \delta\,\}\\ &\quad= \textstyle\bigcup_{\mathbf{M}\in\mathcal{M}}\{\,(x,\omega) \mid x \in \mathbf{X}_M,\ \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}},\ (\omega \circ x)(a) = \delta\,\}\\ &\quad= \textstyle\bigcup_{\mathbf{M}\in\mathcal{M}}\{\,(x,\omega) \mid \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbf{M}},\ x \in (\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}})^{-1}(w^{-1}(\delta))\,\}\\ &\quad= \textstyle\bigcup_{\mathbf{M}\in\mathcal{M}} \bigcup_{\omega\in\Omega_{\mathbf{M}}} (\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}})^{-1}(w^{-1}(\delta)) \times \{\omega\}.\end{aligned}$$

This set is open because each $(\pi_a^{\mathbf{M}})^{-1}(w^{-1}(\delta))$ is open. This completes the proof of (i).

To prove (ii), observe that Theorem 2.1 implies that $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is a doubly-pointed Priestley space, with $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{0}}$ as its top and bottom elements, respectively. By (i), $\Psi\colon Z \to \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ is an order-homeomorphism. Therefore $(Z;\sqsubseteq,\mathcal{T})$ is a Priestley space and must possess universal bounds for its order. The statement of (ii) identifies these bounds: $(Z;\sqsubseteq,z_1,z_0,\mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{P}_u$. (Note how (S1) and (S0) have been brought into play.) □

Remarks 6.3. In applications of Theorem 6.2 we are interested in identifying the pre-order $\preccurlyeq$ on Y and the associated partial order $\sqsubseteq$ on Z. Finding $\preccurlyeq$ from the members of the sets $R_{\omega,w'}$ is not made more complicated when these sets are not singletons (see Remarks 7.4 for comments on when this does and does not happen). Indeed it may be an advantage to work with *all* piggyback relations, not just maximal ones (recall Remarks 5.2), and deliberately to look at small, and hence simple, relations. Then $\preccurlyeq$ may be pieced together from the information so obtained by taking the transitive closure.

With the insight we get from Theorem 6.2 we can make some further comments on reconciliation. The theorem obtains $\mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{A})$ as a quotient of the structure Y, in which the roles of the sorts and the carriers, and the sorts of the natural first dual, can be clearly seen.

As an example, consider a situation in which we start from a quasivariety $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{M})$ where $\mathbf{M}$ has a reduct in $\mathcal{D}_u$. Take $\Omega := \mathsf{H}_u\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{M})$ and one copy $\mathbf{M}_\omega$ of $\mathbf{M}$ for each non-constant $\omega \in \Omega$ and let $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{M}_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$. Then $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ is guaranteed to hold. This may be viewed as a brute-force approach, with the likelihood of much collapsing at the quotienting stage. (It could be necessary also to include 1-element sorts to allow for the constant maps and satisfy (S1) and (S0).) See Example 7.2 for an illustration.

There are circumstances in which it may be advantageous to approach reconciliation from both directions. If, as might be the case, we already have a restricted Priestley duality for a class $\mathscr{A}$, we will know what the quotient must look like. This may assist us in optimising the choice of sorts for a natural duality. See the examples in Section 7 for illustrations.

7. Examples

Here we show how our results in Sections 5 and 6 apply to various classes of algebras.

Example 7.1 (Kleene lattices)**.** The variety $\mathcal{K}lat$ of Kleene lattices is the unbounded analogue of the variety $\mathcal{K}alg$ of Kleene algebras. The latter class has been exhaustively studied within natural duality theory since its inception and provided the original motivation for the introduction of multisorted dualities. Kleene lattices have attracted less attention, but have recently come to prominence through the study of models for many-valued logics and in particular the development of the theory of varieties of Sugihara type, whose algebras have reducts in $\mathcal{K}lat$. In [15], Fussner and Galatos establish a single-sorted strong duality for $\mathcal{K}lat$. In [6, Section 6] dualities for $\mathcal{K}alg$ were summarised, and a two-sorted strong duality for $\mathcal{K}lat$ was outlined, but without proof. Here we provide a justification for a duality based on Theorem 5.1.

We note that $\mathcal{K}lat = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{3}) = \mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{3})$, where $\mathbf{3}$ is the three-element chain in $\mathcal{D}_u$ with universe $\{0, a, 1\}$ and $0 < a < 1$ equipped with negation $\neg$ given by $\neg 0 = 1$, $\neg a = a$ and $\neg 1 = 0$. We treat $\mathcal{K}lat$ as $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$, where $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{3}^-, \mathbf{3}^+\}$ and each sort is a copy of $\mathbf{3}$. We use a single non-constant carrier map for each sort: a is sent to 1 by α^- and to 0 by α^+. The separation condition $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ is satisfied. Each sort has a 1-element subalgebra, $\{a\}$, and hence (S1) and (S0) are satisfied.

The dualising alter ego for $\mathcal{K}lat$ supplied by Theorem 5.1 contains the 1-element subalgebra in each sort as a unary relation. The set G can be taken to contain the identity maps from $\mathbf{3}^-$ to $\mathbf{3}^+$ and from $\mathbf{3}^+$ to $\mathbf{3}^-$. The alter ego also has four piggyback relations which arise as maximal subalgebras of $(\omega, \omega')^{-1}(\leqslant)$, one for each of the possible choices of ω and ω'; these are as in the bounded case. Theorem 6.2 now applies. The translation from this natural duality to a Priestley-style duality for $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{K}lat)$ operates in the way we would expect, and is illustrated in [6, Section 6].

Here we have an example, akin to that for Kleene algebras, in which there is a very tight relationship between our 2-sorted natural duality and the easy adaptation to the unbounded case of traditional Cornish–Fowler duality for Kleene algebras, whereby $\mathcal{K}lat$ is dually equivalent to doubly-pointed Kleene spaces. Having a restricted Priestley duality already to hand is valuable in two ways. First of all, we know what the first duals of the lattice reducts of our algebras look like, order-theoretically. This guides us to favour a 2-sorted duality over an equivalent piggyback duality with one sort and two carriers.

In addition we can upgrade the quotient structures supplied by Theorem 6.2 to doubly-pointed Kleene spaces, thereby obtaining dual representations for the members of $\mathcal{K}lat$ and not just those in $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{K}lat)$. For a full account of the corresponding results for Kleene algebras, see [12, Theorem 3.8].

Example 7.2 (Sugihara algebras and monoids)**.** Building on our work in [6, 7] on (strong) dualities for finitely generated quasivarieties and varieties of Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids, we have moved on to investigate free algebras [8]. For this we need Theorem 6.2, and so too Theorem 5.1. This has led to the present paper.

We refer to the cited papers for a full introduction to Sugihara algebras and for proofs of the claims we make below. Here we recall only that we are interested in classes $\mathscr{SA}_{2n+1} = \mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1}) = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1})$ (the odd case) and also $\mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n}) = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n}, \mathbf{Z}_{2n-1})$ (the even case). For k odd or even the algebra $\mathbf{Z}_k$ has a $\mathcal{D}_u$-reduct which is a sublattice of the chain of the lattice of integers $\mathbb{Z}$ which is equipped with its usual lattice operations. The universe of $\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1}$ is the interval $[-n, n] := \{\, i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -n \leqslant i \leqslant n \,\}$ and that of $\mathbf{Z}_{2n}$ is $[-n, n] \setminus \{0\}$. Each $\mathbf{Z}_k$ also carries operations $\neg$ (negation) and $\to$ (implication). These are defined by restriction of operations on $\mathbb{Z}$. The negation is given by $a \mapsto -a$. The formula for implication does not concern us here.

We consider dualities for $\mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1})$, for each $n \geqslant 1$, and $\mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$ for each $n \geqslant 2$. (We have omitted the trivial variety in the odd case and a variety term-equivalent to Boolean algebras in the even case.) We wish to apply Theorem 5.1, with our focus on ways in which this differs from [6, Theorem 2.1], whence we obtained strong dualities in [6, Section 4]. This means that we concentrate on the refined version of joint surjectivity given in Section 4.

For $\mathbb{HSP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1}) = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$, we employ two sorts, denoted $\mathbf{P}^-$ and $\mathbf{P}^+$, which are disjoint copies of $\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1}$. Each has a single carrier map, where, respectively, $\alpha^-(a) = 1$ if and only if $a \geqslant 0$ and $\alpha^+(a) = 1$ if and only if $a \geqslant 1$.

For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathscr{A} = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n+1})$, the maps from $\mathbf{A}$ into the sorts separate the points of $\mathbf{A}$. Observe that $\{0\}$ is a 1-element subalgebra of both $\mathbf{P}^-$ and $\mathbf{P}^+$ and that $\alpha^-(0) = 1$ and $\alpha^+(0) = 0$. Hence (S1) and (S0) hold.

We now consider the even case. We first review what happens for $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$. In [7, Theorem 6.4] we presented a single-sorted strong duality for this quasivariety, with all the homomorphisms from $\mathsf{U}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$ as carriers. With a small tweak this can be recast as a multisorted duality (not claimed to be strong) which comes within the scope of Theorem 5.1. We let $\mathcal{M}$ contain $2n$ sorts, each with a single carrier. Two of the sorts are 1-element algebras and the remainder are copies of $\mathbf{Z}_{2n}$, each with a different non-constant ω as carrier. This ensures, in brute-force fashion, that restricted joint surjectivity holds. Our 1-element sorts artificially engineer that the conditions of Lemma 4.2 are met. The proof of the lemma relied on a trivial algebra to witness the

failure of joint surjectivity when condition (2) in that lemma is not satisfied, even when $\mathrm{Sep}_{\mathcal{M},\Omega}$ is. However $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$ gives us the opportunity to demonstrate that joint surjectivity can fail also for non-trivial algebras. We consider $\mathbf{Z}_{2n}$ for which the only endomorphism is the identity map. For each non-constant ω, necessarily $\omega \circ \mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Z}_{2n}} = \omega \neq \overline{\mathbf{1}}$.

In general, reducing the sets of sorts or carriers may be thwarted because members of $\mathcal{M}$ are not closed under homomorphic images, and this is exemplified by [7, Theorem 6.4]. We may however be able to achieve a simpler duality by considering $\mathbb{HISP}(\mathcal{M})$ rather than $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathcal{M})$. If, as in [8], our interest is in free algebras, we have nothing to lose and much to gain from this change of perspective.

In [6, Theorem 4.8] we set up a 3-sorted duality for

$$\mathbb{HISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n}) = \mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n}, \mathbf{Z}_{2n-1}),$$

with sorts $\mathbf{P}^-$, $\mathbf{P}^+$ isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}_{2n-1}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}_{2n}$. For the sorts of odd size, the carrier maps are defined as in the odd case. The sort $\mathbf{Q}$ has a single carrier map β, with $\beta(a) = 1$ if and only if $a > 0$. Then $\mathrm{Sep}_{\{\mathbf{P}^-,\mathbf{P}^+,\mathbf{Q}\},\Omega}$ holds. The sort $\mathbf{Q}$ has no 1-element subalgebra but we can exploit the existence of 1-element subalgebras in $\mathbf{P}^-$ and $\mathbf{P}^+$ to show (S1) and (S0) hold. The duality for $\mathbb{HISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$ leads to a more transparent application of Theorem 6.2 than does the duality for $\mathbb{ISP}(\mathbf{Z}_{2n})$.

Sugihara monoids exhibit the same features as we have noted above for Sugihara algebras and we give no details here. We refer the reader to [6, 15] for the definitions. In [6, Theorem 5.2] we set up a 2-sorted duality for each finitely generated quasivariety of odd Sugihara monoids, with a single carrier map for each sort, as for Sugihara algebras. As in that scenario, there is a 1-element subalgebra, $\{0\}$. We could likewise adapt our treatment in [6, Section 5] of the even case to fit the theorems in this paper.

Example 7.3 (Unbounded distributive bilattices)**.** Our paper [4] considered dualities for distributive bilattices, with the emphasis on the bounded case. We refer the reader to [4] for all definitions.

We comment briefly on the relationship between our duality in Section 5 and the duality presented for the variety $\mathcal{DB}_u$ of unbounded distributive bilattices in [4, Theorem 3.2 and Section 5].

The treatment in [4], like that in [6] for classes of Sugihara type, focuses on strong dualities and is based on the NU Strong Duality Theorem. In the case of $\mathcal{DB}_u$, therefore, the proof relies on the single-sorted version of [6, Theorem 2.1].

We can now see that Theorems 5.1 and 6.2, in single-sorted form, apply to $\mathcal{DB}_u$, making use of the calculations performed in [4, Section 5] for the identification of the piggyback relations to be used. At the end of [4, Section 5] only minimal comments are made about how to transition from the natural duality setting to the Priestley-style duality for the $\mathcal{D}_u$ reducts. A full justification is provided by Theorem 6.2.

In [4, Section 6] (in the bounded case) we went to some lengths to upgrade our duality so as to obtain a fully-fledged restricted Priestley duality for $\mathcal{DB}$ tied to our quotienting construction. Corresponding results can be expected for $\mathcal{DB}_u$.

Similar remarks can be made about unbounded distributive pre-bilattices, for which strong multisorted dualities are discussed in [4, Section 10].

Remarks 7.4. We make a few concluding remarks on what our examples have revealed.

First of all we note that only in the Kleene lattices case do we get sets $R_{\omega,\omega'}$ of maximal piggyback relations with just a single element. This phenomenon should be seen as the exception rather than the norm. It occurs when the non-constant, non-lattice operations are endomorphisms or dual endomorphisms, and for some mild generalisations of this.

For non-lattice operations of arity greater than 1, a plethora of maximal subalgebras may exist for any given pair of carriers. This happens in particular when a (non-classical) implication is present. For Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids, for example, the members of a set $R_{\omega,\omega}$ of piggyback relations, modulo converses, are certain graphs of endomorphisms and of non-extendable partial endomorphisms (see [7, Sections 4 and 6] and [6, Section 5]).

It will not go unnoticed by anyone with an interest in algebras of Sugihara type that we have not discussed upgrading the quotient structures we get from Theorem 6.2 by using these structures to host a restricted Priestley duality taking account of the implication. This is not a straightforward matter, as one may surmise from [15, Section 2]. Capturing the Kleene negation on the other hand is a triviality.

8. The case of one bound

We have focused our paper on piggybacking over $\mathcal{D}_u$, distributive lattices without bounds. Here we note the corresponding results when the base variety $\mathcal{D}_u$ is replaced by $\mathcal{D}^1$, distributive lattices with a top element included in the language as a constant 1. The results are needed as part of our on-going structural analysis of Sugihara algebras and monoids and it is expedient to record them in this paper.

We state the analogue of Theorem 2.1 in abbreviated form.

Theorem 8.1 (Priestley duality for $\mathcal{D}^1$)**.** *There exists a dual equivalence between $\mathcal{D}^1$ and the category $\mathcal{P}^1$ of upper-pointed Priestley spaces. This is given by hom-functors into $(\{0,1\};\wedge,\vee,1)$ and the alter ego $(\{0,1\};\leqslant,\mathbf{1},\mathcal{T})$.*

Moreover, a $\mathcal{P}^1$-morphism is surjective if and only if its dual is injective.

Thereafter we modify our framework assumptions so that $\mathscr{A}$ now has a forgetful functor U into $\mathcal{D}^1$ and adapt Sections 3–6 for the new scenario by deleting all references to the distinguished role that was played by 0. In particular, the constant map $\overline{\mathbf{0}}$ does not arise. Assumption (S0) is omitted

and in the alter ego condition (S) now takes S to contain only $\{d_1\}$, as supplied by (S1). No new arguments are needed in the proofs of the $\mathcal{D}^1$-variants of Theorems 5.1 and 6.2. We have already seen that (S1) and (S0) operate independently and in like fashion. To align with this section we gave proofs for the case that (S1) is present.

.

By reversing the roles of 1 and 0 corresponding statements hold when the case variety is the class of distributive lattices with a lower bound which is included in the language.

References

[1] Cabrer, L.M., Craig, A.P.K., Priestley, H.A., Product representation for default bilattices: an application of natural duality theory. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **219**, 2962–2988 (2015)

[2] Cabrer, L.M., Freisberg, B., Metcalfe, G., Priestley, H.A., Checking admissibility using natural dualities. ACM Trans. Comput. Log., **20**, no.1, (2018) (preprint available at `www.arXiv:1801.02046`)

[3] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Coproducts of distributive lattice-based algebras. Algebra Universalis **72**, 251–286 (2014)

[4] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Distributive bilattices from the perspective of natural duality theory. Algebra Universalis **73**, 103–141 (2015)

[5] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Gödel algebras: interactive dualities and their applications. Algebra Universalis **74**, 87–116 (2015)

[6] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids: multisorted dualities. Math. Slovaca **70**, 5–28 (2020)

[7] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Sugihara algebras: admissibility algebras via the test spaces Method. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **224**, no.5 (May 2020) (preprint available at `www/arxiv.org/abs/1809.07816v2`)

[8] Cabrer, L.M., Priestley, H.A., Sugihara algebras and Sugihara monoids: free algebras. (manuscript)

[9] Clark, D.M., Davey, B.A., Natural Dualities for the Working Algebraist. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1998)

[10] Davey, B.A., Dualities for equational classes of Brouwerian algebras and Heyting algebras. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **221**, 119–146 (1976)

[11] Davey, B.A., Gair, A., Restricted Priestley dualities and discriminator varieties. Studia Logica **105**, 843–872 (2017)

[12] Davey, B.A., Priestley, H.A., Generalised piggyback dualities and applications to Ockham algebras, Houston J. Math. **13**, 151–198 (1987)

[13] Davey, B.A., Talukder, M.R., Functor category dualities for varieties of Heyting algebras. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **178**, 49–71 (2003)

[14] Dunn, J.M., Algebraic completeness for R-mingle and its extensions, J. Symbolic Logic **35**, 1–13 (1970)

[15] Fussner, W., Galatos, N., Categories of models of R-mingle, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **170**, 1188–1242 (2019)

[16] Metcalfe, G., An Avron rule for fragments of R-mingle. J. Logic Comput. **26**, 381-393 (2016)

[17] Olson, J.S., Raftery, J.G., Positive Sugihara monoids. Algebra Universalis **57**, 75–99 (2007)

[18] Priestley, H.A., Natural dualities for varieties of n-valued Łukasiewicz algebras. Studia Logica **54**, 333–370 (1995)

E-mail address: lmcabrer@yahoo.com.ar

London, UK

E-mail address: hap@maths.ox.ac.uk

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, UK