

# A GENERALIZATION OF DE VRIES DUALITY TO CLOSED RELATIONS BETWEEN COMPACT HAUSDORFF SPACES

MARCO ABBADINI, GURAM BEZHANISHVILI, AND LUCA CARAI

**ABSTRACT.** Halmos duality generalizes Stone duality to the category of Stone spaces and continuous relations. This further generalizes to an equivalence (as well as to a dual equivalence) between the category  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  of Stone spaces and closed relations and the category  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  of boolean algebras and subordination relations. We apply the Karoubi envelope construction to this equivalence to obtain that the category  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  of compact Hausdorff spaces and closed relations is equivalent to the category  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  of de Vries algebras and compatible subordination relations. This resolves a problem recently raised in the literature.

We prove that the equivalence between  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  further restricts to an equivalence between the category  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  of compact Hausdorff spaces and continuous functions and the wide subcategory  $\mathbf{DeV}^F$  of  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  whose morphisms satisfy additional conditions. This yields an alternative to de Vries duality. One advantage of our approach is that composition of morphisms is usual relation composition.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Closed relations and subordinations	4
3. Equivalence between $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ and $\mathbf{BA}^S$	7
4. Connection to Halmos and Stone dualities	10
5. Lifting the equivalence between $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ and $\mathbf{BA}^S$ via Karoubi envelopes	14
6. Various equivalences for $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$	17
7. $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$ and $\mathbf{DeV}^S$	20
8. An alternative approach to de Vries duality	24
Acknowledgements	30
References	30

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In [9] de Vries generalized Stone duality to a duality for the category  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  of compact Hausdorff spaces and continuous functions. The objects of the dual category  $\mathbf{DeV}$  are complete boolean algebras equipped with a proximity relation, known as de Vries algebras. The morphisms of  $\mathbf{DeV}$  are functions satisfying certain conditions. One drawback of  $\mathbf{DeV}$  is that composition of morphisms is not usual function composition. In this paper we propose an

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54D30, 18F70, 06E15, 06E25.

*Key words and phrases.* Compact Hausdorff space, closed relation, subordination, de Vries algebra.

alternative approach to de Vries duality, where morphisms between de Vries algebras become certain relations and composition is usual relation composition.

For our purpose, it is more natural to start with the category  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  whose objects are compact Hausdorff spaces and morphisms are closed relations (i.e., relations  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $R$  is a closed subset of  $X \times Y$ ). This category was studied in [5], and earlier in [19] in the more general setting of stably compact spaces. The latter paper establishes a duality for  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  that generalizes Isbell duality [16] between  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  and the category of compact regular frames and frame homomorphisms. This is obtained by generalizing the notion of a frame homomorphism to that of a preframe homomorphism. However, a similar duality in the language of de Vries algebras remained problematic (see [5, Rem. 3.14]). We resolve this problem as follows.

As in de Vries duality, with each compact Hausdorff space  $X$  we associate the de Vries algebra  $(\mathbf{RO}(X), \prec)$ , where  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  is the complete boolean algebra of regular open subsets of  $X$  and  $\prec$  is a binary relation on  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  defined by  $U \prec V$  iff  $\text{cl}(U) \subseteq V$ . The key is to associate with each closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  the relation  $S_R: \mathbf{RO}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(Y)$  given by

$$U S_R V \text{ iff } R[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V$$

(here  $R[-]$  denotes the direct image under  $R$ ). This definition is motivated by the theory of subordination relations on a boolean algebra as developed in [4]. This defines a covariant functor from  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  to the category  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  of de Vries algebras and compatible subordination relations (i.e. subordination relations  $S: A \rightarrow B$  that satisfy  $S \circ \prec_A = S = \prec_B \circ S$ ). Our main result states that this functor is an equivalence. We then prove that this equivalence further restricts to an equivalence between  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  and the wide subcategory  $\mathbf{DeV}^F$  of  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  whose morphisms satisfy additional conditions. This yields an alternative to de Vries duality. The main advantage of  $\mathbf{DeV}^F$  is that composition of morphisms is the usual relation composition.

We point out that, while our main results establish that  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  and  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{DeV}^F$ , the choice of direction of morphisms is ultimately a matter of taste since morphisms in these categories are relations. In fact, both  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  are dagger (and thus self-dual) categories, and hence our results could alternatively be stated in the language of duality rather than equivalence.

Our proofs build on a generalization of Halmos duality, which in turn is a generalization of Stone duality. Let  $\mathbf{Stone}$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  consisting of Stone spaces (zero-dimensional compact Hausdorff spaces). By Stone duality,  $\mathbf{Stone}$  is dually equivalent to the category  $\mathbf{BA}$  of boolean algebras and boolean homomorphisms. Working with continuous relations instead of continuous functions results in the category  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$ . Halmos [14] proved that these correspond to functions  $f: A \rightarrow B$  between boolean algebras that preserve finite meets (equivalently, to functions  $g: A \rightarrow B$  that preserve finite joins). Such functions are known as hemimorphisms, and we denote the resulting category by  $\mathbf{BA}^H$ . Halmos duality then states that  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  is dually equivalent to  $\mathbf{BA}^H$ . A further generalization replaces continuous relations with closed relations. Let  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  consisting of Stone spaces. As was shown in [4], a closed relation on a Stone space  $X$  corresponds to a subordination relation on the boolean algebra  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$  of clopen subsets of  $X$ . The notion of

a subordination relation on a boolean algebra can be generalized to that of a subordination relation between two boolean algebras. This yields the category  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  of boolean algebras and subordination relations (identity is  $\leq$  and composition is usual composition of relations). We show that a direct generalization of Halmos' approach yields an equivalence between  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ . Although  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  are also dually equivalent, as they are both dagger categories, we prefer to work with an equivalence because it leads to more straightforward proofs in the later sections.

By working with order-enriched categories, it is shown in [20, Thm. 5.9] that Priestley duality extends to a dual equivalence between the category of bounded distributive lattices and subordination relations and the category of Priestley spaces and Priestley relations. A subordination relation between bounded distributive lattices is a direct generalization of a subordination relation between boolean algebras. A Priestley relation between Priestley spaces  $(X, \leq)$  and  $(Y, \leq)$  is a closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\leq \circ R = R = R \circ \leq$ . It is immediate to see that this duality restricts to a dual equivalence between the categories  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ . Since both categories are isomorphic to their opposites, it also follows that  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  are equivalent. However, a nontrivial amount of work is required to show that the functors of the equivalence developed in [20] coincide with the functors we work with. Therefore, we take a more direct approach in obtaining this equivalence.

Our equivalence between  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  can be obtained as a consequence of the equivalence between  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  utilizing the theory of Gleason covers and the notion of Karoubi envelopes (also known as Cauchy completions or splittings by idempotents). For a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , we denote by  $K(\mathbf{C})$  the Karoubi envelope of  $\mathbf{C}$ . We recall (see, e.g., [25]) that  $K(\mathbf{C})$  is the category whose objects are pairs  $(X, f)$  where  $X$  is an object of  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is a morphism in  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $f \circ f = f$ . Morphisms in  $K(\mathbf{C})$  from  $(X, f)$  to  $(X', f')$  are morphisms  $g: X \rightarrow X'$  in  $\mathbf{C}$  such that  $f' \circ g = g = g \circ f$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{g} & X' \\ f \downarrow & \searrow g & \downarrow f' \\ X & \xrightarrow{g} & X' \end{array}$$

The equivalence between  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  induces an equivalence between their Karoubi envelopes  $K(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  and  $K(\mathbf{BA}^S)$ . Explicitly, the objects of the category  $K(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  are pairs  $(X, R)$  where  $X$  is a Stone space and  $R$  is a closed relation on  $X$  that is dense ( $x R y$  implies there is  $z$  with  $x R z$  and  $z R y$ ) and transitive ( $x R y$  and  $y R z$  imply  $x R z$ ). The morphisms in  $K(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  are closed relations  $Q: X \rightarrow X'$  satisfying  $R' \circ Q = Q = Q \circ R$ , and composition is relation composition. The objects of  $K(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  are pairs  $(B, S)$  where  $B$  is a boolean algebra and  $S$  is a subordination relation on  $B$  that is dense and transitive. The morphisms are subordination relations  $T: B \rightarrow B'$  satisfying  $S' \circ T = T = T \circ S$ , and composition is relation composition.

The equivalence between  $K(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  and  $K(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  restricts to an equivalence between the full subcategory of  $K(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  consisting of Gleason spaces of [4] and the full subcategory of  $K(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  consisting of de Vries algebras. We denote the resulting categories by  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ , respectively. Since  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  (see [5, Thm. 3.13]), we obtain our

desired result that  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ , thus resolving the problem raised in [5, Rem. 3.14]. We then use the equivalence of  $\mathbf{KHaus}$  with the wide subcategory  $\mathbf{Gle}$  of  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  given in [5, Thm. 6.7] to obtain the wide subcategory  $\mathbf{DeV}^F$  of  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  that is equivalent to  $\mathbf{KHaus}$ , thus yielding an alternative to de Vries duality.

Parts of this paper are similar in nature to some literature on spectral and stably compact spaces. In [1, Thm. 7.2.26], join-approximable relations between bounded distributive lattices were introduced and it was shown that the resulting category is dual to the category of spectral spaces and continuous functions. In [21, Thm. 26], the category of stably compact spaces and continuous functions was shown to be equivalent to the category of strong proximity lattices and approximable relations between them (see also [25] for a proof that explicitly builds on the equivalence in [1, Thm. 7.2.26] using Karoubi envelopes). This equivalence for stably compact spaces was specialized to compact Hausdorff spaces in [22]. In this approach, to a compact Hausdorff space  $X$  is associated the set of pairs  $(U, K)$  where  $U \subseteq X$  is open,  $K \subseteq X$  is closed, and  $U \subseteq K$ . This set is then equipped with an appropriate structure. The difference between this assignment and ours (which is based on regular open sets) makes the axioms of the structures in [22] incomparable to ours.

## 2. CLOSED RELATIONS AND SUBORDINATIONS

We recall from the introduction that  $\mathbf{BA}$  is the category of boolean algebras and boolean homomorphisms, and  $\mathbf{Stone}$  is the category of Stone spaces and continuous maps. The following is a celebrated result of Stone [24]:

**Theorem 2.1** (Stone, 1936). *Stone is dually equivalent to  $\mathbf{BA}$ .*

In [14] Halmos generalized Stone duality to cover continuous relations between Stone spaces.

**Notation 2.2.** If  $R$  is a relation between sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , we write  $R: X \rightarrow Y$ . For  $U \subseteq X$  and  $V \subseteq Y$ , we let

$$R[U] = \{y \in Y \mid \exists x \in U : x R y\}$$

be the  $R$ -image of  $U$  and

$$R^{-1}[V] = \{x \in X \mid \exists y \in V : x R y\}$$

the  $R$ -preimage of  $V$ . If  $U = \{x\}$  and  $V = \{y\}$ , we simply write  $R[x]$  and  $R^{-1}[y]$ .

When  $R$  is a quasi-order on a set  $X$  (that is,  $R: X \rightarrow X$  is reflexive and transitive), we write  $\uparrow U$ ,  $\downarrow V$ ,  $\uparrow x$ , and  $\downarrow y$  in place of  $R[U]$ ,  $R^{-1}[V]$ ,  $R[x]$ , and  $R^{-1}[y]$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.3.**

- (1) We call a relation  $R$  between Stone spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  *continuous* if  $R[x]$  is closed for each  $x \in X$  and  $R^{-1}[V]$  is clopen for each clopen  $V \subseteq Y$ .
- (2) Let  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  be the category of Stone spaces and continuous relations between them. Identity morphisms in  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  are identity relations and composition in  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  is relation composition.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>That is, if  $R_1: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  and  $R_2: X_2 \rightarrow X_3$ , then  $x_1(R_2 \circ R_1)x_3 \iff \exists x_2 \in X_2 : x_1 R_1 x_2$  and  $x_2 R_3 x_3$ .

It is well known (see, e.g., [13, Thm. 3.1.2]<sup>2</sup>) that, for a relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  between Stone spaces, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i)  $R$  is continuous.
- (ii)  $F \subseteq X$  closed implies  $R[F]$  is closed,  $G \subseteq Y$  closed implies  $R^{-1}[G]$  is closed, and  $V \subseteq Y$  open implies  $R^{-1}[V]$  is open.
- (iii)  $R$  is a closed subset of  $X \times Y$ , and  $V \subseteq Y$  open implies  $R^{-1}[V]$  is open.

The dual notion of a continuous relation is that of a hemimorphism.

**Definition 2.4.**

- (1) A function  $\square: A \rightarrow B$  between boolean algebras is a *hemimorphism* if  $\square$  preserves finite meets (equivalently, if  $\square 1 = 1$  and  $\square(a \wedge b) = \square a \wedge \square b$  for all  $a, b \in A$ ).
- (2) Let  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  be the category of boolean algebras and hemimorphisms between them.

We have the following generalization of Stone duality:

**Theorem 2.5** (Halmos, 1956).  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  is dually equivalent to  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$ .

**Remark 2.6.** In [14] a hemimorphism is defined as a map between two boolean algebras preserving finite joins. This generalizes the notion of an operator on a boolean algebra [18]. We instead will work with maps that preserve finite meets, thus generalizing the notion of a dual operator on a boolean algebra. The two resulting categories are isomorphic. Indeed, if  $f: A \rightarrow B$  preserves finite meets (resp. finite joins), then the function  $g: A \rightarrow B$  given by  $g(a) = \neg f(\neg a)$  preserves finite joins (resp. finite meets).

**Definition 2.7.** We call a relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  between Stone spaces *closed* if  $R$  is a closed subset of  $X \times Y$ .

It follows from [4, Lem. 2.12] that  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  is closed iff  $F \subseteq X$  closed implies  $R[F]$  is closed and  $G \subseteq Y$  closed implies  $R^{-1}[G]$  is closed.<sup>3</sup>

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  be the category of Stone spaces and closed relations between them. Identity morphisms in  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  are identity relations and composition in  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is relation composition.

**Remark 2.9.** For a relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$ , let  $R^{\smile}: Y \rightarrow X$  be its converse defined by

$$y R^{\smile} x \iff x R y.$$

If  $R$  is a closed relation, then  $R^{\smile}$  is also closed. It follows that  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  has the structure of a *dagger category* (see, e.g., [15, Sec. 2.3]). Indeed, there is an isomorphism of categories between  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and its opposite category that is the identity on objects and maps each relation  $R$  to its converse  $R^{\smile}$ . This feature of  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is due to the symmetric nature of closed relations.

<sup>2</sup>This reference assumes that  $R$  is a quasi-order, but the same proof works for an arbitrary  $R$ .

<sup>3</sup>This result is stated in [4, Lem. 2.12] for binary relations on the same space, but it easily generalizes to relations between two spaces.

**Remark 2.10.** A closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  iff it is a homeomorphism. Indeed, its inverse in  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  is a closed relation  $Q: Y \rightarrow X$  such that  $Q \circ R = \text{id}_X$  and  $R \circ Q = \text{id}_Y$ . It follows that  $R$  is a bijective function and  $Q$  is its inverse. Since a function that is closed as a relation is a continuous function, it follows that  $R$  is a homeomorphism.

Clearly,  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  is a wide subcategory of  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  (that is,  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  have the same objects). For a Stone space  $X$ , let  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$  be the boolean algebra of clopen subsets of  $X$ . If  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous relation, by Halmos duality, the function  $\square_R: \mathbf{Clop}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(X)$  given by  $\square_R(V) = X \setminus R^{-1}[Y \setminus V]$  is a well-defined hemimorphism. If  $R$  is a closed relation, then  $\square_R$  may fail to be well defined. However,  $R$  gives rise to a relation from  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$  to  $\mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ .

**Definition 2.11.** For a closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  between Stone spaces, define the relation  $S_R: \mathbf{Clop}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$  by  $U S_R V$  iff  $U \subseteq \square_R(V)$  iff  $R[U] \subseteq V$ .

Such relations are characterized by the axioms defining subordination relations of [4, Def. 2.3], the main difference being that, while subordinations of [4] are relations on the same boolean algebra, the subordinations that we consider are relations from one boolean algebra to another.

**Definition 2.12.**

- (1) A *subordination relation* from a boolean algebra  $A$  to a boolean algebra  $B$  is a relation  $S: A \rightarrow B$  satisfying, for  $a, b \in A$  and  $c, d \in B$ :
  - (S1)  $0 S 0$  and  $1 S 1$ ;
  - (S2)  $a, b S c$  implies  $(a \vee b) S c$ ;
  - (S3)  $a S c, d$  implies  $a S (c \wedge d)$ ;
  - (S4)  $a \leq b S c \leq d$  implies  $a S d$ .
- (2) Let  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  be the category of boolean algebras and subordination relations. The identity morphism on  $B$  is the order relation  $\leq$  on  $B$ , and composition in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  is relation composition.

**Remark 2.13.**

- (1) It is easy to see that, under (S4), axiom (S1) is equivalent to  $0 S b$  and  $a S 1$  for each  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ .
- (2) Subordinations can equivalently be defined as relations  $S: A \rightarrow B$  satisfying the following strengthening of (S2) and (S3) for each finite  $F \subseteq A$  and  $G \subseteq B$ :
  - (S2')  $(\bigvee F) S c$  iff  $a S c$  for every  $a \in F$ ;
  - (S3')  $a S (\bigwedge G)$  iff  $a S c$  for every  $c \in G$ .

**Remark 2.14.** We will see in Theorem 3.6 that the categories  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  are equivalent. Since  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  is a dagger category (see Remark 2.9), so is  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ . In fact, as we will see in Remark 3.7, the dagger of a subordination  $S: A \rightarrow B$  is given by the subordination  $\widehat{S}: B \rightarrow A$  defined by

$$b \widehat{S} a \iff \neg a S \neg b.$$

We conclude the section by characterizing isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ .

**Proposition 2.15.** *Let  $A, B$  be boolean algebras and  $S: A \rightarrow B$  a relation.*

- (1)  *$S$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  iff there is a boolean isomorphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  such that  $a S b$  iff  $f(a) \leq b$ .*
- (2)  *$A$  and  $B$  are isomorphic in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  iff they are isomorphic in  $\mathbf{BA}$ .*
- (3) *If  $S$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ , then its inverse is  $\widehat{S}: B \rightarrow A$ .*

*Proof.* (1). If  $S$  is an isomorphism, then there is a subordination  $T: B \rightarrow A$  such that

$$a (T \circ S) a' \text{ iff } a \leq a' \quad \text{and} \quad b (S \circ T) b' \text{ iff } b \leq b'.$$

For each  $a \in A$  we have  $a \leq a$ , so there is  $b \in B$  such that  $a S b$  and  $b T a$ . We show that  $b$  is unique. If  $b' \in B$  is another such, then  $b T a$  and  $a S b'$  imply  $b \leq b'$ . Similarly,  $b' \leq b$ , and hence  $b = b'$ . Analogously, for each  $b \in B$  there is a unique  $a \in A$  such that  $a S b$  and  $b T a$ . Thus, the map  $f: A \rightarrow B$  that sends each  $a \in A$  to the unique  $b \in B$  such that  $a S b$  and  $b T a$  is a well-defined bijection. To prove that  $f$  is a boolean isomorphism, it is sufficient to show that  $f$  preserves and reflects the order. Let  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ . By the definition of  $f$ , we have  $f(a_1) T a_1$  and  $a_2 S f(a_2)$ . If  $a_1 \leq a_2$ , then  $a_1 S f(a_2)$  because  $S$  is a subordination. Thus,  $f(a_1) (S \circ T) f(a_2)$  which yields  $f(a_1) \leq f(a_2)$ . An analogous argument shows that  $f$  reflects the order.

Conversely, suppose that there is a boolean isomorphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  such that  $a S b$  iff  $f(a) \leq b$ . It is straightforward to see that  $S$  is a subordination. Similarly, the relation  $T: B \rightarrow A$  given by  $b T a$  iff  $f^{-1}(b) \leq a$  is a subordination. It remains to prove that  $T$  is the inverse of  $S$  in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ . We only show that  $a (T \circ S) a'$  iff  $a \leq a'$  since the proof for the other composition is analogous. If  $a (T \circ S) a'$ , then there is  $b \in B$  such that  $f(a) \leq b$  and  $f^{-1}(b) \leq a'$ . Thus,  $a \leq f^{-1}(b)$ , and so  $a \leq a'$ . Conversely, suppose that  $a \leq a'$ . We have  $a S f(a)$  and  $f(a) T a$  by the definition of  $S$  and  $T$ . Consequently,  $a (T \circ S) a'$ .

(2) is an immediate consequence of (1).

(3). If  $S$  is an isomorphism, by (1) there is a boolean isomorphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  such that  $a S b$  iff  $f(a) \leq b$ . In the proof of (1) we have shown that the inverse  $T$  of  $S$  is given by  $b T a$  iff  $f^{-1}(b) \leq a$ . Consequently,

$$b T a \iff f^{-1}(b) \leq a \iff b \leq f(a) \iff f(\neg a) \leq \neg b \iff \neg a S \neg b \iff b \widehat{S} a. \quad \square$$

### 3. EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ AND $\mathbf{BA}^S$

In this section we give a direct proof of an equivalence between  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ . We start by recalling the contravariant functors  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{Stone} \rightarrow \mathbf{BA}$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}: \mathbf{BA} \rightarrow \mathbf{Stone}$  establishing Stone duality. The functor  $\mathbf{Clop}$  associates with each Stone space  $X$  the boolean algebra  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$  of clopen subsets of  $X$ , and with each continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  the boolean homomorphism  $\mathbf{Clop}(f) = f^{-1}$ . The functor  $\mathbf{Ult}$  associates with each boolean algebra  $B$  the Stone space  $\mathbf{Ult}(B)$  of ultrafilters of  $B$ , which is topologized by the basis  $\varphi_B[B] = \{\varphi_B(a) \mid a \in B\}$ , where

$$\varphi_B(a) = \{x \in \mathbf{Ult}(B) \mid a \in x\}.$$

Also,  $\mathbf{Ult}$  associates with each boolean homomorphism  $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$  the continuous map  $\mathbf{Ult}(\alpha) = \alpha^{-1}$ . The Stone map  $\varphi_B: B \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(B))$  is a boolean isomorphism for each

$B \in \mathbf{BA}$ , and the map  $\varepsilon_X: X \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(X))$  given by

$$\varepsilon_X(x) = \{U \in \mathbf{Clop}(X) \mid x \in U\}$$

is a homeomorphism for each  $X \in \mathbf{Stone}$ . Moreover,  $\varphi: \mathbf{Id}_{\mathbf{BA}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop} \circ \mathbf{Ult}$  and  $\varepsilon: \mathbf{Id}_{\mathbf{Stone}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult} \circ \mathbf{Clop}$  are natural isomorphisms yielding Stone duality. We adjust  $\mathbf{Clop}$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}$  accordingly to obtain an equivalence between  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Define  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$  by sending a Stone space  $X$  to the boolean algebra  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$  and a closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  to the relation  $S_R: \mathbf{Clop}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ . Then  $\mathbf{Clop}$  is a well-defined covariant functor.*

*Proof.* Checking that  $S_R$  is a subordination relation is straightforward. We only verify (S2). Suppose that  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathbf{Clop}(X)$ ,  $V \in \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ , and  $U_1, U_2 S_R V$ . Then  $R[U_1], R[U_2] \subseteq V$ . Since  $R$  commutes with unions,  $R[U_1 \cup U_2] \subseteq V$ . Thus,  $(U_1 \cup U_2) S_R V$ .

To see that  $\mathbf{Clop}$  preserves composition, let  $R_1: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  and  $R_2: X_2 \rightarrow X_3$  be closed relations. For each  $U \in \mathbf{Clop}(X_1)$  and  $V \in \mathbf{Clop}(X_3)$  we have

$$U S_{R_2 \circ R_1} V \iff (R_2 \circ R_1)[U] \subseteq V \iff R_2 R_1[U] \subseteq V.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} U (S_{R_2} \circ S_{R_1}) V &\iff \exists W \in \mathbf{Clop}(X_2) : U S_{R_1} W \text{ and } W S_{R_2} V \\ &\iff \exists W \in \mathbf{Clop}(X_2) : R_1[U] \subseteq W \text{ and } R_2[W] \subseteq V. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the latter condition implies  $R_2 R_1[U] \subseteq V$ . Conversely, if  $R_2 R_1[U] \subseteq V$ , then  $R_1[U] \subseteq \square_{R_2}(V)$ . Since  $R_1, R_2$  are closed relations and  $U, V$  are clopen,  $R_1[U]$  is closed and  $\square_{R_2}(V)$  is open. Therefore, since  $X_2$  is a Stone space, there is  $W \in \mathbf{Clop}(X_2)$  such that  $R_1[U] \subseteq W$  and  $W \subseteq \square_{R_2}(V)$ . Thus,  $R_1[U] \subseteq W$  and  $R_2[W] \subseteq V$ , as required.

Finally, for  $U, V \in \mathbf{Clop}(X)$ , we have

$$U S_= V \iff U \subseteq V,$$

so  $\mathbf{Clop}$  preserves identity morphisms, and hence  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$  is a well-defined covariant functor.  $\square$

**Definition 3.2.** For a subordination relation  $S: A \rightarrow B$  define the relation  $R_S: \mathbf{Ult}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult}(B)$  by  $x R_S y$  iff  $S[x] \subseteq y$ .

**Lemma 3.3.**

- (1) Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a subordination relation,  $F$  a filter of  $A$ , and  $I$  an ideal of  $B$ . Then  $S[F]$  is a filter of  $B$  and  $S^{-1}[I]$  is an ideal of  $A$ .
- (2) Let  $S \in \mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}}(A, B)$ ,  $a \in A$ , and  $b \in B$ . Then  $a S b$  iff  $\varphi_A(a) S_{R_S} \varphi_B(b)$ .
- (3) Let  $S_1: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  and  $S_2: B_2 \rightarrow B_3$  be two subordination relations. For each  $x \in \mathbf{Ult}(B_1)$  and  $y \in \mathbf{Ult}(B_3)$  we have  $S_2 S_1[x] \subseteq y$  iff there is  $z \in \mathbf{Ult}(B_2)$  such that  $S_1[x] \subseteq z$  and  $S_2[z] \subseteq y$ .
- (4) Let  $R \in \mathbf{hom}_{\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}}(X, Y)$ ,  $x \in X$ , and  $y \in Y$ . Then  $x R y$  iff  $\varepsilon_X(x) R_{S_R} \varepsilon_Y(y)$ .



*Proof.* (1). Since  $1 \in F$  and  $1 S 1$ , we have  $1 \in S[F]$ . Let  $c, d \in S[F]$ . Then there are  $a, b \in F$  with  $a S c$  and  $b S d$ . Therefore,  $a \wedge b \in F$ . Moreover,  $a \wedge b \leq a S c$  and  $a \wedge b \leq b S d$ , so  $(a \wedge b) S c, d$ , and hence  $(a \wedge b) S (c \wedge d)$ . Thus,  $c \wedge d \in S[F]$ . Also, if  $c \in S[F]$  and  $c \leq d$ , then there is  $a \in F$  with  $a S c \leq d$ , so  $a S d$ , and hence  $d \in S[F]$ . Consequently,  $S[F]$  is a filter of  $B$ . A similar argument yields that  $S^{-1}[I]$  is an ideal of  $A$ .

(2). We must show that  $a S b$  iff  $R_S[\varphi_A(a)] \subseteq \varphi_B(b)$ . First, suppose that  $a S b$  and  $y \in R_S[\varphi_A(a)]$ . Then there is  $x \in \varphi_A(a)$  with  $x R_S y$ . Therefore,  $a \in x$  and  $S[x] \subseteq y$ . Since  $a S b$ , this implies that  $b \in y$ , so  $y \in \varphi_B(b)$ . Thus,  $R_S[\varphi_A(a)] \subseteq \varphi_B(b)$ . Next, suppose that  $a \not S b$ . Then  $a \notin S^{-1}[b]$ . By (1),  $S^{-1}[b] = S^{-1}[\downarrow b]$  is an ideal, so by the ultrafilter lemma there is  $x \in \text{Ult}(A)$  such that  $a \in x$  and  $x \cap S^{-1}[\downarrow b] = \emptyset$ . Therefore,  $S[x] \cap \downarrow b = \emptyset$ . Using the ultrafilter lemma again, there is  $y \in \text{Ult}(B)$  such that  $S[x] \subseteq y$  and  $y \cap \downarrow b = \emptyset$ . Thus,  $x \in \varphi_A(a)$ ,  $y \notin \varphi_B(b)$ , and  $x R_S y$ . Consequently,  $R_S[\varphi_A(a)] \not\subseteq \varphi_B(b)$ .

(3). The right-to-left implication is clear. For the left-to-right implication, from  $S_2 S_1[x] \subseteq y$  it follows that  $S_1[x] \cap S_2^{-1}[B \setminus y] = \emptyset$ . By (1),  $S_1[x]$  is a filter and  $S_2^{-1}[B \setminus y]$  is an ideal. Therefore, by the ultrafilter lemma, there is  $z \in \text{Ult}(B_2)$  such that  $S_1[x] \subseteq z$  and  $S_2[z] \subseteq y$ .

(4). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_X(x) R_{S_R} \varepsilon_Y(y) &\iff S_R[\varepsilon_X(x)] \subseteq \varepsilon_Y(y) \\ &\iff (\forall U \in \text{Clop}(X), \forall V \in \text{Clop}(Y))(x \in U \text{ and } R[U] \subseteq V \Rightarrow y \in V). \end{aligned}$$

First suppose that  $x R y$ . If  $U \in \text{Clop}(X)$  and  $V \in \text{Clop}(Y)$  are such that  $x \in U$  and  $R[U] \subseteq V$ , then  $y \in R[U] \subseteq V$ , so  $y \in V$ . Conversely, suppose that  $x \not R y$ . Then  $y \notin R[x]$  and  $R[x]$  is closed. Since  $Y$  is a Stone space, there is  $V \in \text{Clop}(Y)$  such that  $R[x] \subseteq V$  and  $y \notin V$ . Therefore,  $\square_R(V)$  is an open subset of  $X$  containing  $x$ , so there is  $U \in \text{Clop}(X)$  such that  $x \in U \subseteq \square_R(V)$ . Thus,  $x \in U$ ,  $R[U] \subseteq V$ , but  $y \notin V$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Define  $\text{Ult}: \text{BA}^S \rightarrow \text{Stone}^R$  by sending a boolean algebra  $B$  to the Stone space  $\text{Ult}(B)$  of ultrafilters of  $B$  and a subordination relation  $S: A \rightarrow B$  to the relation  $R_S: \text{Ult}(A) \rightarrow \text{Ult}(B)$ . Then  $\text{Ult}$  is a well-defined covariant functor.*

*Proof.* To see that  $R_S$  is a closed relation, by [4, Lem. 2.12] it is enough to see that, if  $x \not R_S y$ , then there are an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  and an open neighborhood  $V$  of  $y$  such that  $R_S[U] \cap V = \emptyset$ . Since  $x \not R_S y$ , we have  $S[x] \not\subseteq y$ . Therefore, there are  $a \in x$  and  $b \notin y$  such that  $a S b$ . We let  $U = \varphi_A(a)$  and  $V = \text{Ult}(B) \setminus \varphi_B(b)$ . Then  $U$  is an open neighborhood of  $x$ ,  $V$  is an open neighborhood of  $y$ , and it follows from Lemma 3.3(2) that  $R_S[U] \subseteq \text{Ult}(B) \setminus V$ . Therefore,  $R_S[U] \cap V = \emptyset$ , yielding that  $R_S$  is a closed relation.

To see that  $\text{Ult}$  preserves composition, let  $S_1: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  and  $S_2: B_2 \rightarrow B_3$  be two subordination relations. By Lemma 3.3(3), for each  $x \in \text{Ult}(B_1)$  and  $y \in \text{Ult}(B_3)$  we have

$$x R_{S_2 \circ S_1} y \iff S_2 S_1[x] \subseteq y \iff x (R_{S_2} \circ R_{S_1}) y.$$

Thus,  $\text{Ult}(S_2 \circ S_1) = \text{Ult}(S_2) \circ \text{Ult}(S_1)$ . Finally, for  $x, y \in \text{Ult}(B)$ , we have

$$x R_{\leq} y \iff \uparrow x \subseteq y \iff x \subseteq y \iff x = y.$$

Consequently,  $\text{Ult}$  preserves identity morphisms, and hence  $\text{Ult}: \text{BA}^S \rightarrow \text{Stone}^R$  is a well-defined covariant functor.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *For each  $B \in \mathbf{BA}^S$  the relation  $\psi_B: B \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(B))$  given by*

$$b \psi_B U \iff \varphi_B(b) \subseteq U$$

*is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ . For each  $X \in \mathbf{Stone}$  the homeomorphism  $\varepsilon_X: X \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(X))$  thought of as a relation is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ . These maps give rise to natural isomorphisms  $\psi: \mathbf{Id}_{\mathbf{BA}^S} \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop} \circ \mathbf{Ult}$  and  $\varepsilon: \mathbf{Id}_{\mathbf{Stone}^R} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult} \circ \mathbf{Clop}$ .*

*Proof.* That  $\psi_B$  is an isomorphism follows from Proposition 2.15(1) and the fact that  $\varphi_B$  is a boolean isomorphism. Since  $\varepsilon_X$  is a homeomorphism, it follows from Remark 2.10 that  $\varepsilon_X$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ . For each  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ -morphism  $S: A \rightarrow B$  we have  $S = \widehat{\psi}_B \circ \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(S)) \circ \psi_A$ . Indeed, Lemma 3.3(2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} a S b &\iff \varphi_A(a) S_{R_S} \varphi_B(b) \iff a \psi_A \varphi_A(a) S_{R_S} \varphi_B(b) \widehat{\psi}_B b \\ &\iff a \left( \widehat{\psi}_B \circ \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(S)) \circ \psi_A \right) b. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ -morphism  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  we have  $R = (\varepsilon_Y)^\smile \circ \mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(R)) \circ \varepsilon_X$ . Indeed, Lemma 3.3(4) implies

$$\begin{aligned} x R y &\iff \varepsilon_X(x) R_{S_R} \varepsilon_Y(y) \iff x \varepsilon_X \varepsilon_X(x) R_{S_R} \varepsilon_Y(y) (\varepsilon_Y)^\smile y \\ &\iff x ((\varepsilon_Y)^\smile \circ \mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(R)) \circ \varepsilon_X) y. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\psi_B \circ S = \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(S)) \circ \psi_A$  and  $\varepsilon_Y \circ R = \mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(R)) \circ \varepsilon_X$ . Thus,  $\psi$  and  $\varepsilon$  are natural isomorphisms.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence, we obtain:

**Theorem 3.6.**  *$\mathbf{Stone}^R$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ .*

**Remark 3.7.** Let  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism in  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$ ,  $U \in \mathbf{Clop}(X)$ , and  $V \in \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ . Then  $R^\smile[V] \subseteq U$  iff  $R[X \setminus U] \subseteq Y \setminus V$ . Therefore,  $S_{R^\smile} = \widehat{S}_R$ . Thus, as we mentioned in Remark 2.14, the dagger of a subordination  $S$  is given by  $\widehat{S}$ . Also, let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\mathbf{BA}^S$ ,  $x \in \mathbf{Ult}(A)$ , and  $y \in \mathbf{Ult}(B)$ . Then  $\widehat{S}[y] \subseteq x$  iff  $S[x] \subseteq y$ . Consequently,  $R_{\widehat{S}} = (R_S)^\smile$ .

#### 4. CONNECTION TO HALMOS AND STONE DUALITIES

In this section we show that Halmos duality between  $\mathbf{BA}^H$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^C$  and Stone duality between  $\mathbf{BA}$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}$  are consequences of Theorem 3.6.

**Definition 4.1.** We say that a subordination  $S: A \rightarrow B$  is a *Halmos subordination* if  $S^{-1}[b]$  has a maximum for every  $b \in B$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{BA}^{HS}$  the wide subcategory of  $\mathbf{BA}^S$  whose morphisms are Halmos subordinations.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a Halmos subordination and  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  a continuous relation.*

- (1) *If  $b \in B$ , then  $R_S^{-1}[\varphi_B(b)] = \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[\neg b])$ .*
- (2)  *$R_S$  is a continuous relation.*
- (3) *If  $V \in \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ , then  $\max S_R^{-1}[V] = \square_R(V)$ .*

(4)  $S_R$  is a Halmos subordination.

*Proof.* (1). By the definition of  $R_S$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} R_S^{-1}[\varphi_B(b)] &= \{x \in \text{Ult}(A) \mid \exists y \in \text{Ult}(B) : x R_S y \text{ and } b \in y\} \\ &= \{x \in \text{Ult}(A) \mid \exists y \in \text{Ult}(B) : S[x] \subseteq y \text{ and } b \in y\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $S[x] \subseteq y$  for some  $y \in \text{Ult}(B)$  with  $b \in y$ , then  $\neg b \notin S[x]$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\neg b \notin S[x]$ . By Lemma 3.3(1),  $S[x]$  is a filter. Therefore, the ultrafilter lemma implies that there is  $y \in \text{Ult}(B)$  such that  $S[x] \subseteq y$  and  $b \in y$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in \text{Ult}(A) \mid \exists y \in \text{Ult}(B) : S[x] \subseteq y \text{ and } b \in y\} &= \{x \in \text{Ult}(A) \mid \neg b \notin S[x]\} \\ &= \{x \in \text{Ult}(A) \mid \max S^{-1}[\neg b] \notin x\} = \varphi(\neg \max S^{-1}[\neg b]). \end{aligned}$$

(2). Since  $R_S$  is a closed relation, it is sufficient to show that if  $V$  is a clopen subset of  $\text{Ult}(B)$ , then  $R_S^{-1}[V]$  is clopen in  $\text{Ult}(A)$ . But this follows from (1) because every clopen subset of  $\text{Ult}(B)$  is of the form  $\varphi_B(b)$  for some  $b \in B$ .

(3). Since  $\square_R(V)$  is clopen in  $X$ , the definition of  $S_R$  yields that

$$\max S_R^{-1}[V] = \max\{U \in \text{Clop}(X) \mid U \subseteq \square_R(V)\} = \square_R(V).$$

(4). This follows from (3). □

We show that Halmos subordinations are in one-to-one correspondence with hemimorphisms.

**Definition 4.3.**

(1) For a hemimorphism  $\square: A \rightarrow B$ , define  $S_\square: B \rightarrow A$  by setting

$$a S_\square b \iff a \leq \square b.$$

(2) For a Halmos subordination  $S: A \rightarrow B$ , define  $\square_S: B \rightarrow A$  by setting

$$\square_S b = \max S^{-1}[b].$$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\square: A \rightarrow B$  be a hemimorphism and  $S: A \rightarrow B$  a Halmos subordination.*

(1)  $S_\square$  is a Halmos subordination.

(2)  $\square_S$  is a hemimorphism.

(3)  $S = S_{\square_S}$  and  $\square = \square_{S_\square}$ .

*Proof.* (1). That  $0 S_\square 0$  is obvious, and  $1 S_\square 1$  follows from  $\square 1 = 1$ . If  $a, b S_\square c$ , then  $a, b \leq \square c$ , which implies  $a \vee b \leq \square c$ . Thus,  $(a \vee b) S_\square c$ . If  $a S_\square c, d$ , then  $a \leq \square c, \square d$ . Since  $\square$  is a hemimorphism, we have  $a \leq \square c \wedge \square d = \square(c \wedge d)$ , which means that  $a S_\square (c \wedge d)$ . Finally, suppose that  $a \leq b S_\square c \leq d$ . Then  $a \leq b \leq \square c$  and  $c \leq d$ . Since  $\square$  is a hemimorphism,  $\square c \leq \square d$ . Therefore,  $a \leq \square d$ , and so  $a S_\square d$ . This proves that  $S_\square$  is a subordination. Moreover, it is immediate from the definition of  $S_\square$  that the greatest element of  $S_\square^{-1}[b]$  is  $\square b$ . Thus,  $S_\square$  is a Halmos subordination.

(2). Let  $F$  be a finite subset of  $B$ . Since  $S$  is a subordination,  $a S (\bigwedge F)$  iff  $a S b$  for each  $b \in F$  (see Remark 2.13(2)). Therefore,

$$\square_S \left( \bigwedge F \right) = \max S^{-1} \left[ \bigwedge F \right] = \bigwedge \{ \max S^{-1}[b] \mid b \in F \} = \bigwedge \{ \square_S b \mid b \in F \}.$$

This shows that  $\square_S$  is a hemimorphism.

(3). Since  $S$  is a Halmos subordination, we have

$$a S_{\square_S} b \iff a \leq \square_S b \iff a \leq \max S^{-1}[b] \iff a S b.$$

Also,

$$\square_{S_{\square_S}} b = \max S_{\square_S}^{-1}[b] = \max \{ a \mid a S_{\square_S} b \} = \max \{ a \mid a \leq \square_S b \} = \square_S b.$$

Thus,  $S = S_{\square_S}$  and  $\square = \square_{S_{\square_S}}$ . □

By Halmos duality, hemimorphisms between boolean algebras correspond to continuous relations between Stone spaces. We recall that if  $\square: A \rightarrow B$  is a hemimorphism, then the continuous relation  $R_{\square}: \mathbf{Ult}(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ult}(A)$  is defined by

$$y R_{\square} x \iff (\forall a \in A)(\square a \in y \Rightarrow a \in x) \iff \square^{-1}[y] \subseteq x.$$

Conversely, if  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous relation between Stone spaces, then we define the hemimorphism  $\square_R: \mathbf{Clop}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(X)$  by

$$\square_R V = X \setminus R^{-1}[Y \setminus V].$$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\square: A \rightarrow B$  be a hemimorphism and  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  a continuous relation.*

- (1)  $R_{\square} = R_{S_{\square}}$ .
- (2)  $\square_R = \square_{S_R}$ .

*Proof.* (1). Let  $x \in \mathbf{Ult}(A)$  and  $y \in \mathbf{Ult}(B)$ . It follows from the definition of  $S_{\square}$  that  $S_{\square}[y] = \square^{-1}[y]$ . Therefore,

$$y R_{S_{\square}} x \iff S_{\square}[y] \subseteq x \iff \square^{-1}[y] \subseteq x \iff y R_{\square} x.$$

(2). Let  $V \in \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ . Then

$$\square_{S_R}(V) = \max S_R^{-1}[V] = \max \{ U \in \mathbf{Clop}(X) \mid U \subseteq \square_R(V) \} = \square_R(V).$$

□

**Theorem 4.6.**

- (1)  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$ .
- (2)  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  is dually isomorphic to  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$ .
- (3) Composing the dual isomorphism between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  and the equivalence between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$  yields Halmos duality.

*Proof.* (1). By Lemma 4.2(2,4), the functors  $\mathbf{Clop}$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}$  yielding an equivalence between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  restrict to functors between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$ . Moreover,  $\varepsilon_X$  is clearly a continuous relation for every  $X \in \mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$  and  $\psi_B$  is a Halmos subordination for every  $B \in \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  because  $\max \psi_B^{-1}[U] = \varphi_B^{-1}[U]$  for each  $U \in \mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(B))$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$ .

(2). Lemma 4.4 yields that the contravariant functor  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}} \rightarrow \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  that fixes the objects and maps each hemimorphism  $\square$  to the Halmos subordination  $S_{\square}$  is the inverse of the contravariant functor  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}} \rightarrow \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  that fixes the objects and maps each Halmos subordination  $S$  to the hemimorphism  $\square_S$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  is dually isomorphic to  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$ .

(3). Lemma 4.5 shows that the compositions of the functors of the dual isomorphism between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  and the functors of the equivalence between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}}$  and  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}}$  are the functors of Halmos duality.  $\square$

Halmos [14, Sec. 10] derived Stone duality from his duality by observing that a hemimorphism is a boolean homomorphism iff its dual continuous relation is a function. We provide an alternative look at this result from the point of view of subordinations.

**Definition 4.7.** We say that a Halmos subordination is a *boolean subordination* if for every finite subset  $F \subseteq B$  we have

$$\max S^{-1}\left[\bigvee F\right] = \bigvee\{\max S^{-1}[b] \mid b \in F\}.$$

We denote by  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}}$  the wide subcategory of  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$  whose morphisms are boolean subordinations.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a boolean subordination and  $R: X \rightarrow Y$  a continuous function.*

- (1)  $R_S$  is a continuous function.
- (2)  $S_R$  is a boolean subordination.

*Proof.* (1). We show that for every  $x \in \mathbf{Ult}(A)$  there is a unique  $y \in \mathbf{Ult}(B)$  such that  $S[x] \subseteq y$ . By Lemma 3.3(1),  $S[x]$  is a filter. It is a proper filter since if  $0 \in S[x]$ , then there is  $a \in x$  such that  $a S 0$ . Because  $0$  is the empty join and  $S$  is a boolean subordination,  $a = 0$  and hence  $0 \in x$  which is not possible. Therefore, by the ultrafilter lemma, there is  $y \in \mathbf{Ult}(B)$  such that  $S[x] \subseteq y$ . Suppose that there are  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbf{Ult}(B)$  with  $S[x] \subseteq y_1, y_2$ . If  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , then there is  $b \in B$  such that  $b \in y_1$  and  $\neg b \in y_2$ . Since  $S$  is a boolean subordination, Lemma 4.2(1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in R_S^{-1}[\varphi_B(b)] \cap R_S^{-1}[\varphi_B(\neg b)] &= \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[\neg b]) \cap \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[b]) \\ &= \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[\neg b] \wedge \neg \max S^{-1}[b]) = \varphi_A(\neg(\max S^{-1}[\neg b] \vee \max S^{-1}[b])) \\ &= \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[\neg b \vee b]) = \varphi_A(\neg \max S^{-1}[1]) = \varphi_A(\neg 1) = \varphi_A(0) = \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $R_S$  is a function, and it is continuous because  $R_S$  is closed.

(2). It is sufficient to show that

$$\max S_R^{-1}[\emptyset] = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \max S_R^{-1}[V_1 \cup V_2] = \max S_R^{-1}[V_1] \cup \max S_R^{-1}[V_2]$$

for every  $V_1, V_2 \in \mathbf{Clop}(Y)$ . Since  $\square_R = R^{-1}$  when  $R$  is a function, Lemma 4.2(3) implies that

$$\max S_R^{-1}[\emptyset] = \square_R(\emptyset) = R^{-1}[\emptyset] = \emptyset$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max S_R^{-1}[V_1 \cup V_2] &= \square_R(V_1 \cup V_2) = R^{-1}(V_1 \cup V_2) = R^{-1}[V_1] \cup R^{-1}[V_2] \\ &= \square_R(V_1) \cup \square_R(V_2) = \max S_R^{-1}[V_1] \cup \max S_R^{-1}[V_2]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the fact that a hemimorphism is a boolean homomorphism iff it preserves finite joins.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a boolean subordination and  $\square: A \rightarrow B$  a boolean homomorphism.*

- (1)  $\square_S$  is a boolean homomorphism.
- (2)  $S_\square$  is a boolean subordination.

As a consequence of Theorem 4.6 and Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9, we obtain:

**Theorem 4.10.**

- (1)  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}}$  is equivalent to **Stone**.
- (2)  $\mathbf{BA}$  is dually isomorphic to  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}}$ .
- (3) Composing the dual isomorphism between  $\mathbf{BA}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}}$  and the equivalence between  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}}$  and **Stone** yields Stone duality.

We have thus obtained the following diagram that is commutative up to natural isomorphism. The horizontal arrows on the right represent equivalence of categories while the horizontal arrows on the left with a ‘d’ on top represent dual isomorphisms. All the vertical arrows are inclusions of wide subcategories.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}} & \longleftrightarrow & \mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}} \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{H}} & \xleftrightarrow{d} & \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{HS}} & \longleftrightarrow & \mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{C}} \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathbf{BA} & \xleftrightarrow{d} & \mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{BS}} & \longleftrightarrow & \mathbf{Stone} \end{array}$$

## 5. LIFTING THE EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$ AND $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$ VIA KAROUBI ENVELOPES

In this section we lift the equivalence of Theorem 3.6 between  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$  to an equivalence between their Karoubi envelopes. We end the section by restricting this equivalence to certain full subcategories.

We recall from the introduction that the Karoubi envelope of a category  $\mathbf{C}$  is the category  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{C})$  whose objects are pairs  $(X, f)$ , where  $X$  is an object of  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is an idempotent  $\mathbf{C}$ -morphism (i.e.  $f \circ f = f$ ). A morphism  $(X, f) \rightarrow (X', f')$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{C})$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -morphism  $g: X \rightarrow X'$  such that  $f' \circ g = g = g \circ f$ . The composition of two morphisms  $(X_0, f_0) \xrightarrow{g} (X_1, f_1) \xrightarrow{h} (X_2, f_2)$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{C})$  is the composite  $h \circ g$  in  $\mathbf{C}$ , and the identity on  $(X, f)$  is  $f$ .

**Remark 5.1.**

- (1) Let  $(X, R), (X', R')$  be objects of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$ . A morphism in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  between  $(X, R)$  and  $(X', R')$  is a closed relation  $Q: X \rightarrow X'$  satisfying  $R' \circ Q = Q = Q \circ R$ . We call such relations *compatible closed relations*.
- (2) Similarly, a morphism in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  between two objects  $(B, S)$  and  $(B', S')$  is a subordination relation  $T: B \rightarrow B'$  satisfying  $S' \circ T = T = T \circ S$ . We call such subordinations *compatible subordinations*.

A standard category theory argument yields that if two categories  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  are equivalent, then  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{C})$  and  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{D})$  are also equivalent. Thus, Theorem 3.6 yields:

**Theorem 5.2.**  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$ .

**Remark 5.3.** An explicit description of the equivalence of Theorem 5.2 is as follows. To an object  $(X, R)$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  we associate the object  $(\mathbf{Clop}(X), S_R)$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$ , and to a morphism  $Q: (X_1, R_1) \rightarrow (X_2, R_2)$  the morphism  $S_Q: (\mathbf{Clop}(X_1), S_{R_1}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Clop}(X_2), S_{R_2})$ . In analogy with Lemma 3.1, we denote this functor by  $\mathbf{Clop}$ . Conversely, to an object  $(A, S)$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  we associate the object  $(\mathbf{Ult}(A), R_S)$  in  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$ , and to a morphism  $T: (A_1, S_1) \rightarrow (A_2, S_2)$  the morphism  $R_T: (\mathbf{Ult}(A_1), R_{S_1}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Ult}(A_2), R_{S_2})$ . In analogy with Lemma 3.4, we denote this functor by  $\mathbf{Ult}$ .

Recall that a binary relation  $R$  on a set  $X$  is said to be *dense* if  $x R y$  implies that there is  $z \in X$  such that  $x R z$  and  $z R y$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** Objects of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  are pairs  $(X, R)$  where  $X$  is a Stone space and  $R: X \rightarrow X$  is a closed relation that is transitive and dense.

*Proof.* Objects of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  are pairs  $(X, R)$  where  $X$  is a Stone space and  $R: X \rightarrow X$  is a closed relation such that  $R \circ R = R$ . The inclusion  $R \circ R \subseteq R$  is equivalent to  $R$  being transitive, and the inclusion  $R \subseteq R \circ R$  to  $R$  being dense.  $\square$

Equivalence relations are always transitive and dense. Thus, we can consider the following subcategory of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$ :

**Definition 5.5.** An *S5-subordination space* is a pair  $(X, R)$  where  $X$  is a Stone space and  $R$  is a closed equivalence relation on  $X$ . We let  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  consisting of S5-subordination spaces.

**Remark 5.6.** The terminology in the above definition is motivated by a well-known result in modal logic that the modal logic **S5** is the logic of relational structures  $(X, R)$  such that  $R$  is an equivalence relation (see, e.g., [6, Table 4.1]).

Since  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  is equivalent to a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$ . In order to describe its objects, we consider the following axioms for a subordination relation  $S: B \rightarrow B$ .

- (S5)  $a S b$  implies  $a \leq b$ .
- (S6)  $a S b$  implies  $\neg b S \neg a$ .

(S7)  $a S b$  implies there is  $c \in B$  such that  $a S c$  and  $c S b$ .

The following lemma is a consequence of [7] (in the language of quasi-modal algebras) or of [10, 11] (in the language of precontact relations); see [4] for the connection between these results.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $X \in \mathbf{Stone}$ ,  $R: X \rightarrow X$  be a closed relation, and  $S_R$  the corresponding subordination on  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$ .*

- (1)  $R$  is reflexive iff  $S_R$  satisfies (S5).
- (2)  $R$  is symmetric iff  $S_R$  satisfies (S6).
- (3)  $R$  is transitive iff  $S_R$  satisfies (S7).

**Remark 5.8.** Lemma 5.7 can be seen as a particular case of a more general correspondence theory between properties of closed relations and subordinations. Indeed, a closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow X$  is reflexive iff  $\Delta \subseteq R$  (where  $\Delta \subseteq X \times X$  is the identity relation), symmetric iff  $R = R^\smile$ , and transitive iff  $R \circ R \subseteq R$ . These conditions correspond to  $S_R \subseteq \leq$  (where  $\leq$  is the order on  $\mathbf{Clop}(X)$ ),  $S_R = \widehat{S_R}$ , and  $S_R \subseteq S_R \circ S_R$ , which are exactly the axioms (S5), (S6), and (S7) applied to  $S_R$ .<sup>4</sup> More generally, any property of  $R$  that can be expressed using only inclusions, compositions, and converses can be easily translated into a property of subordinations. It is natural to view this in the context of the Sahlqvist correspondence for precontact relations (see, e.g., [2]).

We next generalize the notion of an **S5**-algebra from modal logic (see, e.g., [8, Sec. 7.5]).

**Definition 5.9.**

- (1) We say that a subordination relation  $S$  on a boolean algebra  $B$  is an **S5**-subordination if  $S$  satisfies (S5), (S6), and (S7).
- (2) An **S5**-subordination algebra is a pair  $(B, S)$  where  $B$  is a boolean algebra and  $S$  is an **S5**-subordination on  $B$ .

It is easy to see that every **S5**-subordination algebra belongs to  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$ . Let  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$  consisting of **S5**-subordination algebras. Thus, morphisms of  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$  are compatible subordination relations.

**Theorem 5.10.** *The equivalence between  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}})$  and  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$  restricts to an equivalence between  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$ .*

*Proof.* The functor  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$  restricts to a functor from  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  to  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$  by Lemma 5.7. The functor  $\mathbf{Ult}: \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}})$  restricts to a functor from  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$  to  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  by Lemma 5.7 and the fact that there exists a structure-preserving bijection between any object  $(A, S)$  of  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$  and  $\mathbf{Clop}(\mathbf{Ult}(A, S))$  (see Lemma 3.3(2)). Since  $\mathbf{Clop}$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}$  establish an equivalence between  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}})$  and  $\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}})$ , they restrict to an equivalence between  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.11.**  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{SubS5}^{\mathbf{S}}$  inherit the structure of dagger categories from  $\mathbf{Stone}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{BA}^{\mathbf{S}}$ . Indeed, if  $R: (X_1, E_1) \rightarrow (X_2, E_2)$  is a compatible closed relation between objects

<sup>4</sup>Note that (S6) is equivalent to  $a S b$  iff  $\neg b S \neg a$ .



of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$ , then  $R^\smile$  is compatible. To see this, since  $E_1$  is symmetric,  $E_1 = (E_1)^\smile$ , and hence  $E_1 \circ R^\smile = (E_1)^\smile \circ R^\smile = (R \circ E_1)^\smile = R^\smile$ . A similar argument yields  $R^\smile \circ E_2 = R^\smile$ . Also, if  $T: (A_1, S_1) \rightarrow (A_2, S_2)$  is a compatible subordination relation between  $\mathbf{S5}$ -subordination algebras, then  $\widehat{T}$  is compatible. Indeed, since  $S_1$  satisfies (S6),  $S_1 = \widehat{S}_1$ , and hence  $S_1 \circ \widehat{T} = \widehat{S}_1 \circ \widehat{T} = \widehat{T \circ S_1} = \widehat{T}$ . A similar argument gives  $\widehat{T} \circ S_2 = \widehat{T}$ .

## 6. VARIOUS EQUIVALENCES FOR $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$

In this section we use the equivalence obtained in Theorem 5.10 between  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  and  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  to deduce various equivalences for the category of compact Hausdorff spaces and closed relations.

**Definition 6.1.** [5, Def. 3.3] Let  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  be the category whose objects are compact Hausdorff spaces and whose morphisms are closed relations between them. Identity morphisms are identity relations and composition is set-theoretic composition of relations.

**Remark 6.2.** Clearly  $\mathbf{Stone}^R$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$ . Moreover, the same reasoning as in Remarks 2.9 and 2.10 yields that  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is a dagger category, and that isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  are homeomorphisms.

For a compact Hausdorff space  $X$ , let  $g_X: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$  be the Gleason cover of  $X$  (see, e.g., [17, Ch. III.3]). Let  $E$  be the equivalence relation on  $\widehat{X}$  defined by  $x E y$  iff  $g_X(x) = g_X(y)$ . Then  $X$  is homeomorphic to the quotient space  $\widehat{X}/E$ . Thus, in a certain sense, the compact Hausdorff space  $X$  can be identified with the pair  $(\widehat{X}, E)$ . This was made precise in [5], where an equivalence is exhibited between  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  and a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$ . We recall some relevant definitions and results.

**Definition 6.3.**

- (1) [12, p. 368] A topological space is *extremally disconnected* if the closure of each open set is open.
- (2) [4, Def. 6.6] A *Gleason space* is an object  $(X, E)$  of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  such that  $X$  is extremally disconnected and  $E$  is *irreducible* (i.e., if  $F$  is a proper closed subset of  $X$ , then so is  $E[F]$ ).
- (3) [5, Def. 3.6] We let  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  denote the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  whose objects are Gleason spaces.

**Definition 6.4.** We define a functor  $\mathcal{Q}: \mathbf{Gle}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^R$  by sending each  $(X, E) \in \mathbf{Gle}^R$  to the quotient space  $X/E$ , and each morphism  $R: (X, E) \rightarrow (X', E')$  in  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  to the morphism  $\mathcal{Q}(R): \mathcal{Q}(X, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(X', E')$  in  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  given by  $\mathcal{Q}(R) = \pi' \circ R \circ \pi^\smile$ .

**Theorem 6.5** ([5, Thm. 3.13]). *The functor  $\mathcal{Q}: \mathbf{Gle}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is an equivalence.*

**Remark 6.6.** A quasi-inverse of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is given by the Gleason cover functor  $\mathcal{G}: \mathbf{KHaus}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{Gle}^R$  which associates to each compact Hausdorff space  $X$  the pair  $\mathcal{G}(X) = (\widehat{X}, E)$  where  $g_X: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$  is the Gleason cover of  $X$  and  $x E y$  iff  $g_X(x) = g_X(y)$ . The functor  $\mathcal{G}$  maps each closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow X'$  to the relation  $\mathcal{G}(R): \mathcal{G}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(X')$  given by  $\mathcal{G}(R) = (g_{X'})^\smile \circ R \circ g_X$ . We refer to [5, Prop. 3.11] for further details.

**Example 6.7.** Given two isomorphic objects  $(X, E)$  and  $(X', E')$  in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , the spaces  $X$  and  $X'$  are not necessarily homeomorphic. For example, the object  $(X, E)$ , where  $X$  is a two-element discrete space and  $E = X \times X$ , is isomorphic to the object  $(X', E')$ , where  $X'$  is a singleton and  $E' = X' \times X'$ .

**Theorem 6.8.** *Each object  $(X, E)$  of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is isomorphic (in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ ) to the Gleason space  $\mathcal{G}(X/E)$ . Thus, the inclusion of  $\mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$  into  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is an equivalence.*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, E) \in \mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and let  $(X', E') = \mathcal{G}(X/E)$ . Then  $(X', E') \in \mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$ . Define  $R: X \rightarrow X'$  and  $S: X' \rightarrow X$  by setting  $R = g^{\smile} \circ \pi$  and  $S = \pi^{\smile} \circ g$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{R} \\ \xleftarrow{S} \end{array} & X' \\ & \begin{array}{c} \searrow \pi \\ \swarrow g \end{array} & \\ & & X/E \end{array}$$

Clearly, both  $R$  and  $S$  are closed relations. To see that  $R$  is compatible, since  $E = \pi^{\smile} \circ \pi$ ,  $E' = g^{\smile} \circ g$ , and  $g \circ g^{\smile} = \pi \circ \pi^{\smile} = \text{id}_{X/E}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} R \circ E &= g^{\smile} \circ \pi \circ \pi^{\smile} \circ \pi = g^{\smile} \circ \pi = R \quad \text{and} \\ E' \circ R &= g^{\smile} \circ g \circ g^{\smile} \circ \pi = g^{\smile} \circ \pi = R. \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument yields that  $S$  is also compatible. It remains to show that  $R$  and  $S$  are inverses of each other in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} S \circ R &= \pi^{\smile} \circ g \circ g^{\smile} \circ \pi = \pi^{\smile} \circ \pi = E \quad \text{and} \\ R \circ S &= g^{\smile} \circ \pi \circ \pi^{\smile} \circ g = g^{\smile} \circ g = E'. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the (full and faithful) inclusion of  $\mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$  into  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is essentially surjective, hence an equivalence of categories.  $\square$

As suggested by the proof of Theorem 6.8, a quasi-inverse for the inclusion of  $\mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$  into  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is the composite  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{Q}$ . Combining Theorems 6.5 and 6.8, we obtain:

**Corollary 6.9.** *The categories  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , and  $\mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}}$  are equivalent.*

**Remark 6.10.** The quasi-inverse functors witnessing an equivalence of  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and  $\mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}}$  are described as follows. The functor  $\mathcal{Q}: \mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}}$  given in Definition 6.4 extends to a functor  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , which we denote by the same letter. Thus, if  $(X, E) \in \mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(X, E)$  is the quotient space  $X/E$ ; and if  $R: (X, E) \rightarrow (X', E')$  is a morphism in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(R): \mathcal{Q}(X, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(X', E')$  is the relation  $\pi' \circ R \circ \pi^{\smile}$ . The functor  $\mathcal{Q}: \mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}}$  and the composite of the functor  $\mathcal{G}: \mathbf{KHaus}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}}$  with the inclusion functor  $\mathbf{Gle}^{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  are quasi-inverses.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $(X, E), (X', E') \in \mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$ .*

- (1) *A morphism  $R: (X, E) \rightarrow (X', E')$  in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  is an isomorphism iff  $\mathcal{Q}(R)$  is a homeomorphism.*
- (2)  *$(X, E)$  and  $(X', E')$  are isomorphic in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^{\mathbf{R}}$  iff  $X/E$  and  $X'/E'$  are homeomorphic.*

- (3) If  $R: (X, E) \rightarrow (X', E')$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$ , then its inverse in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  is  $R^\smile$ .

*Proof.* (1). By Remark 6.10,  $\mathcal{Q}: \mathbf{StoneE}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is full and faithful. Therefore, a morphism  $R: (X, E) \rightarrow (X', E')$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  iff  $\mathcal{Q}(R): X/E \rightarrow X'/E'$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$ . Now apply Remark 6.2.

(2). This follows from (1).

(3). If  $R$  is an isomorphism, then  $\mathcal{Q}(R)$  is a homeomorphism, and so its inverse in  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is  $\mathcal{Q}(R)^\smile$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\mathcal{Q}(R)^\smile = \mathcal{Q}(R^\smile)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{Q}(R \circ R^\smile) = \mathcal{Q}(R) \circ \mathcal{Q}(R^\smile)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}(R \circ R^\smile) = \mathcal{Q}(R) \circ \mathcal{Q}(R^\smile)$  are identities. Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  is full and faithful, it follows that  $R^\smile$  is the inverse of  $R$  in  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$ .  $\square$

We next turn to subcategories of  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  that are equivalent to  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$ .

**Definition 6.12** ([9]). An object  $(B, S)$  of  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  is a *compingent algebra* if  $S$  satisfies the following axiom:

- (S8) If  $a \neq 0$ , then there is  $b \neq 0$  such that  $b S a$ .

A relation  $S$  on a boolean algebra  $B$  satisfying (S1)–(S8) is called a *de Vries proximity* on  $B$  and is usually denoted by  $\prec$ . When a compingent algebra is complete as a boolean algebra, it is called a *de Vries algebra* (see [3]).

**Lemma 6.13** ([4, Lem. 6.3]). Let  $B \in \mathbf{BA}$ ,  $S: B \rightarrow B$  be an  $S5$ -subordination, and  $R_S$  the corresponding closed equivalence relation on  $\mathbf{Ult}(B)$ . Then  $R_S$  is irreducible iff  $S$  satisfies (S8).

**Definition 6.14.** Let  $\mathbf{Comp}^S$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  consisting of compingent algebras and let  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{Comp}^S$  consisting of de Vries algebras.

**Theorem 6.15.**

- (1) The equivalence between  $\mathbf{StoneE}^R$  and  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  restricts to an equivalence between  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ . This equivalence is given by the restriction of  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S)$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}: \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{BA}^S) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Stone}^R)$ .
- (2) Every object in  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  is isomorphic (in  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$ ) to an object in  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ . Therefore, the inclusion of  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  into  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  is an equivalence.
- (3)  $\mathbf{Comp}^S$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ .
- (4)  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ .

*Proof.* (1). Let  $(B, S) \in \mathbf{SubS5}^S$ . By Lemma 6.13,  $(B, S) \in \mathbf{DeV}^S$  iff  $(\mathbf{Ult}(B), R_S) \in \mathbf{Gle}^R$ . Let  $(X, E) \in \mathbf{StoneE}^R$ . By Lemma 3.3(4),  $\varepsilon_X$  is a bijection between  $(X, E)$  and  $(\mathbf{Ult}(\mathbf{Clop}(X)), R_{S_E})$  that preserves and reflects the equivalence relations. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 6.13 that  $(X, E) \in \mathbf{Gle}^R$  iff  $(\mathbf{Clop}(X), S_E) \in \mathbf{DeV}^S$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{Clop}$  and  $\mathbf{Ult}$  restrict to an equivalence between  $\mathbf{Gle}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ .

(2). By Theorem 6.8 and (1), each object in  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  is isomorphic to an object in  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ . Thus, since  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$ , the inclusion of  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  into  $\mathbf{SubS5}^S$  is full, faithful, and essentially surjective, hence an equivalence.

(3). By (2), the inclusion of  $\text{DeV}^S$  into  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is an equivalence. Thus, so are the inclusions of  $\text{DeV}^S$  into  $\text{Comp}^S$  and  $\text{Comp}^S$  into  $\text{SubS5}^S$ .

(4). By Corollary 6.9,  $\text{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\text{Gle}^R$ , and it follows from (1) that  $\text{Gle}^R$  is equivalent to  $\text{DeV}^S$ . Therefore,  $\text{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\text{DeV}^S$ .  $\square$

We thus arrive at the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \text{StoneE}^R & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Clop}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Ult}} \end{array} & \text{SubS5}^S \\
 & \nearrow g & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 \text{KHaus}^R & & & & \text{Comp}^S \\
 & \searrow g & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & \text{Gle}^R & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Clop}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Ult}} \end{array} & \text{DeV}^S
 \end{array}$$

The vertical arrows are inclusions of full subcategories. The arrows between  $\text{KHaus}^R$  and  $\text{StoneE}^R$  are described in Remark 6.10, the arrows between  $\text{KHaus}^R$  and  $\text{Gle}^R$  are described in Definition 6.4 and Remark 6.6 (and are restrictions of the arrows between  $\text{KHaus}^R$  and  $\text{StoneE}^R$ ). The arrows between  $\text{StoneE}^R$  and  $\text{SubS5}^S$  (and the arrows between  $\text{Gle}^R$  and  $\text{DeV}^S$ ) are the restrictions of the arrows between  $\text{K}(\text{Stone}^R)$  and  $\text{K}(\text{BA}^S)$  described in Remark 5.3.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.5, Remark 6.10, and Theorem 6.15 we obtain:

**Theorem 6.16.** *The diagram commutes up to natural isomorphism and all its arrows represent equivalences of categories.*

**Remark 6.17.** In an upcoming paper we will give a direct and choice-free proof of the fact that the inclusion of  $\text{DeV}^S$  into  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is an equivalence by developing MacNeille completions for  $S5$ -subordination algebras.

## 7. $\text{KHaus}^R$ AND $\text{DeV}^S$

By Theorem 6.15(4),  $\text{KHaus}^R$  is equivalent to  $\text{DeV}^S$ . This resolves the problem raised in [5, Rem. 3.14] to find a generalization of the category of de Vries algebras that is (dually) equivalent to  $\text{KHaus}^R$ . The key is to work with the category  $\text{DeV}^S$  in which functions between de Vries algebras are replaced by relations. In this section we provide an explicit description of the functor from  $\text{KHaus}^R$  to  $\text{DeV}^S$  yielding the equivalence. But first we will prove that isomorphisms in  $\text{DeV}^S$  are given by structure-preserving bijections.

**Remark 7.1.** Since  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is equivalent to  $\text{StoneE}^R$ , it follows from Example 6.7 that two objects of  $\text{SubS5}^S$  might be isomorphic without their underlying sets having the same cardinality. On the other hand, every structure-preserving bijection gives rise to an isomorphism in  $\text{SubS5}^S$ . Indeed, let  $(B_1, S_1), (B_2, S_2) \in \text{SubS5}^S$  and suppose there is a boolean isomorphism  $f: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  such that for all  $a, b \in B_1$  we have  $a S_1 b$  iff  $f(a) S_2 f(b)$ . An argument similar to the proof of Proposition 2.15 yields that an isomorphism between  $(B_1, S_1)$  and  $(B_2, S_2)$  is given by the relation  $T: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  defined by

$$a T b \iff f(a) S_2 b \iff a S_1 f^{-1}(b),$$

and its inverse in  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is the relation  $Q: B_2 \rightarrow B_1$  defined by

$$b Q a \iff b S_2 f(a) \iff f^{-1}(b) S_1 a.$$

By (S6), we have

$$b \widehat{T} a \iff \neg a T \neg b \iff f(\neg a) S_2 \neg b \iff b S_2 f(a) \iff b Q a.$$

Thus, every structure-preserving bijection  $f: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  gives rise to an isomorphism  $T: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$  in  $\text{SubS5}^S$  whose inverse is  $\widehat{T}: B_2 \rightarrow B_1$ .

We will show that, unlike  $\text{SubS5}^S$ , every isomorphism in  $\text{DeV}^S$  arises from a structure-preserving bijection. This requires some preparation. For a subset  $E$  of a boolean algebra  $B$ , we write  $U(E)$  and  $L(E)$  for the sets of upper and lower bounds of  $E$ , respectively. We will freely use the fact that in a compingent algebra  $(A, S)$  we have  $a = \bigwedge S[a] = \bigvee S^{-1}[a]$  for every  $a \in A$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $(A, S_A)$  and  $(B, S_B)$  be isomorphic objects in  $\text{SubS5}^S$  with  $T: A \rightarrow B$  and  $Q: B \rightarrow A$  inverses of each other. Suppose that  $(A, S_A)$  is a compingent algebra.*

(1) *For all  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ , we have*

$$a_1 \leq a_2 \iff T[a_1] \supseteq T[a_2] \iff Q^{-1}[a_1] \subseteq Q^{-1}[a_2].$$

(2) *For all  $a \in A$ , we have*

$$Q^{-1}[a] = S_B^{-1}[L(T[a])] \quad \text{and} \quad T[a] = S_B[U(Q^{-1}[a])].$$

*Proof.* (1). We only prove  $a_1 \leq a_2 \iff T[a_1] \supseteq T[a_2]$ . The equivalence  $a_1 \leq a_2 \iff Q^{-1}[a_1] \subseteq Q^{-1}[a_2]$  is proved similarly. The left-to-right implication is immediate. For the right-to-left implication, suppose that  $T[a_1] \supseteq T[a_2]$ . Then  $QT[a_1] \supseteq QT[a_2]$ . Since  $T$  and  $Q$  are inverses of each other,  $Q \circ T = S_A$ , and hence  $S_A[a_1] = QT[a_1] \supseteq QT[a_2] = S_A[a_2]$ . Thus,  $a_1 = \bigwedge S_A[a_1] \leq \bigwedge S_A[a_2] = a_2$  because  $A$  is a compingent algebra.

(2). We only prove  $Q^{-1}[a] = S_B^{-1}[L(T[a])]$ . The second equality is proved similarly. For the left-to-right inclusion, let  $b \in Q^{-1}[a]$ , so  $b Q a$ . Since  $Q$  is a compatible subordination, there is  $b' \in B$  such that  $b S_B b' Q a$ . For every  $b'' \in T[a]$  we have  $b' Q a T b''$ , so  $b' S_B b''$ , and hence  $b' \leq b''$  by (S5). Therefore,  $b' \in L(T[a])$ , and so  $b \in S_B^{-1}[L(T[a])]$ .

For the right-to-left inclusion, let  $b \in S_B^{-1}[L(T[a])]$ . Then there is  $b' \in L(T[a])$  such that  $b S_B b'$ . Since  $Q$  and  $T$  are inverses of each other, there is  $a' \in A$  such that  $b Q a' T b'$ . But then  $T[a] \subseteq T[a']$  because for every  $c \in T[a]$ , we have  $a' T b' \leq c$ , and so  $a' T c$ . Thus,  $a' \leq a$  by (1). Consequently,  $b Q a' \leq a$ , so  $b Q a$ , and hence  $b \in Q^{-1}[a]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $(A, S_A)$  and  $(B, S_B)$  be isomorphic objects in  $\text{DeV}^S$  with  $T: A \rightarrow B$  and  $Q: B \rightarrow A$  inverses of each other. For all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ ,*

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} Q^{-1}[a] &= S_B^{-1} \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right], & T[a] &= S_B \left[ \bigvee Q^{-1}[a] \right], \\ T^{-1}[b] &= S_A^{-1} \left[ \bigwedge Q[b] \right], & Q[b] &= S_A \left[ \bigvee T^{-1}[b] \right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2) \quad T[a] = S_B \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right], \quad Q[b] = S_A \left[ \bigwedge Q[b] \right].$$

*Proof.* We only prove that  $Q^{-1}[a] = S_B^{-1}[\bigwedge T[a]]$ . The other equations in (1) are proved similarly. By Lemma 7.2(2), it is sufficient to prove that  $S_B^{-1}[L(T[a])] = S_B^{-1}[\bigwedge T[a]]$ . But this is obvious because  $\bigwedge T[a] \in L(T[a])$ .

Since  $(B, S_B)$  is a de Vries algebra, for each  $c \in B$ , we have  $c = \bigvee S_B^{-1}[c]$ . Thus, it follows from (1) that

$$T[a] = S_B \left[ \bigvee Q^{-1}[a] \right] = S_B \left[ \bigvee S_B^{-1} \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right] \right] = S_B \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right].$$

The proof of the other equation in (2) is similar.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $(A, S_A)$  and  $(B, S_B)$  be isomorphic objects in  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  with  $T: A \rightarrow B$  and  $Q: B \rightarrow A$  inverses of each other. Define  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $g: B \rightarrow A$  by*

$$f(a) = \bigwedge T[a] \quad \text{and} \quad g(b) = \bigwedge Q[b].$$

*Then  $f$  and  $g$  are structure-preserving bijections that are inverses of each other. Moreover, for each  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  we have*

$$a T b \text{ iff } f(a) S_B b \quad \text{and} \quad b Q a \text{ iff } g(b) S_A a.$$

*Proof.* Let  $a \in A$ . Since  $Q$  is a compatible subordination and  $T$  is its inverse, by Lemma 7.3(2) we have

$$Q[f(a)] = Q \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right] = QS_B \left[ \bigwedge T[a] \right] = QT[a] = S_A[a].$$

Thus, since  $S_A$  is a de Vries proximity,

$$gf(a) = \bigwedge Q[f(a)] = \bigwedge S_A[a] = a.$$

A similar proof yields that  $fg(b) = b$  for each  $b \in B$ . It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.2 that  $f$  and  $g$  are order-preserving. Therefore,  $f, g$  are boolean isomorphisms that are inverses of each other.

We next show that  $f$  preserves and reflects  $S_A$ . That  $g$  preserves and reflects  $S_B$  is proved similarly. Let  $a, a' \in A$ . As we saw above,  $Q[f(a)] = S_A[a]$ . Also, by Lemma 7.3(1),  $S_B^{-1}[f(a')] = S_B^{-1}[\bigwedge T[a']] = Q^{-1}[a']$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) S_B f(a') &\iff f(a) \in S_B^{-1}[f(a')] \iff f(a) \in Q^{-1}[a'] \iff a' \in Q[f(a)] \\ &\iff a' \in S_A[a] \iff a S_A a'. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ . To see that  $a T b$  iff  $f(a) S_B b$ , it is sufficient to observe that Lemma 7.3(2) implies  $S_B[f(a)] = S_B[\bigwedge T[a]] = T[a]$ . A similar reasoning gives that  $b Q a$  iff  $g(b) S_A a$ .  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Remark 7.1 and Lemma 7.4 we obtain:

**Theorem 7.5.** *Isomorphisms in  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$  are given by structure-preserving bijections.*

**Remark 7.6.** The above theorem generalizes a similar result for the category  $\mathbf{DeV}$  of de Vries algebras (see [9, Prop. I.5.5]).

We now give an explicit description of the equivalence between  $\mathbf{KHaus}^R$  and  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ . For a compact Hausdorff space  $X$ , let  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  be the complete boolean algebra of regular open subsets of  $X$ . We recall that in  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  joins are computed as  $\bigvee_i A_i = \text{int}(\text{cl}(\bigcup_i A_i))$  and the negation is computed as  $\neg A = \text{int}(X \setminus A)$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{RC}(X)$  is the complete boolean algebra of regular closed subsets of  $X$ , then meets in  $\mathbf{RC}(X)$  are computed as  $\bigwedge_i A_i = \text{cl}(\text{int}(\bigcap_i A_i))$  and the negation is computed as  $\neg A = \text{cl}(X \setminus A)$ .

The next lemma is known, but for the reader's convenience, we briefly sketch its proof.

**Lemma 7.7.** *Let  $X$  be a compact Hausdorff space and  $g_X: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$  its Gleason cover. The boolean algebras  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$ ,  $\mathbf{RC}(X)$ , and  $\mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X})$  are isomorphic, with the isomorphisms given by*

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathbf{RO}(X) \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{RC}(X) & \mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X}) \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{RC}(X) & \mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X}) \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{RO}(X) \\ U \longmapsto \text{cl}(U) & V \longmapsto g_X[V] & V \longmapsto \text{int}(g_X[V]) \\ \text{int}(F) \longleftarrow F, & \text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[\text{int}(F)]) \longleftarrow F, & \text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U]) \longleftarrow U. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* As an immediate consequence of the definition of regular open and regular closed sets,  $\text{cl}: \mathbf{RO}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{RC}(X)$  and  $\text{int}: \mathbf{RC}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(X)$  are inverses of each other.

Since  $g_X: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$  is an onto irreducible map, the direct image function  $g_X[-]: \mathbf{RC}(\widehat{X}) \rightarrow \mathbf{RC}(X)$  that maps  $F \in \mathbf{RC}(\widehat{X})$  to  $g_X[F]$  is a boolean isomorphism (see [23, p. 454]). We note that  $\mathbf{RC}(\widehat{X}) = \mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X})$  because  $\widehat{X}$  is extremally disconnected. It follows from the proof in [23, p. 454] that the inverse of  $g_X[-]$  is given by mapping each  $F \in \mathbf{RC}(X)$  to  $\text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[\text{int}(F)])$ .

By composing the isomorphism between  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  and  $\mathbf{RC}(X)$  with the isomorphism between  $\mathbf{RC}(X)$  and  $\mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X})$ , we obtain the isomorphism between  $\mathbf{RO}(X)$  and  $\mathbf{Clop}(\widehat{X})$  described in the statement.  $\square$

**Definition 7.8.** Let  $\mathcal{R}: \mathbf{KHaus}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{DeV}^S$  be defined by associating with each compact Hausdorff space  $X$  the de Vries algebra  $(\mathbf{RO}(X), \prec)$  of regular open subsets of  $X$  (with the de Vries proximity defined by  $U \prec V$  iff  $\text{cl}(U) \subseteq V$ ) and with each closed relation  $R: X \rightarrow X'$  the subordination  $\mathcal{R}(R): \mathbf{RO}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{RO}(X')$  given by

$$U \mathcal{R}(R) V \iff R[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V.$$

An argument similar to Lemma 3.1 shows that  $\mathcal{R}$  is a well-defined functor. Recalling the functors  $\mathcal{G}: \mathbf{KHaus}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{Gle}^R$  and  $\mathbf{Clop}: \mathbf{Gle}^R \rightarrow \mathbf{DeV}^S$  from Remark 6.6 and Theorem 6.15, we have:

**Theorem 7.9.** *The functor  $\mathcal{R}$  is naturally isomorphic to  $\mathbf{Clop} \circ \mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 7.7, for every compact Hausdorff space  $X$ , the function  $\eta_X: \mathbf{RO}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X)$  that maps  $U$  to  $\text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U])$  is a boolean isomorphism.

If  $R: X \rightarrow X'$  is a closed relation, then  $\mathcal{G}R: \mathcal{G}X \rightarrow \mathcal{G}X'$  is given by  $\mathcal{G}R = (g_{X'})^\smile \circ R \circ g_X$  (see Remark 6.6), so  $x \mathcal{G}R x'$  iff  $g_X(x) R g_{X'}(x')$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{Clop}(\mathcal{G}R)$  is the  $\mathbf{DeV}^S$ -morphism  $S_{\mathcal{G}R}: \mathbf{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X')$  given by  $U S_{\mathcal{G}R} V$  iff  $(\mathcal{G}R)[U] \subseteq V$ .

For all  $U \in \text{RO}(X)$  and  $V \in \text{RO}(X')$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta_X(U) (\text{Clop } \mathcal{G}R) \eta_{X'}(V) \\
& \iff \mathcal{G}R[\text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U])] \subseteq \text{cl}(g_{X'}^{-1}[V]) \\
& \iff \neg(\exists x \in \text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U]), \exists y \in \mathcal{G}X' \setminus \text{cl}(g_{X'}^{-1}[V]))(x \mathcal{G}R y) \\
& \iff \neg(\exists x \in \text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U]), \exists y \in \text{cl}(g_{X'}^{-1}[\text{int}(X' \setminus V)]))(g_X(x) R g_{X'}(y)) \\
& \iff \neg(\exists x_0 \in g_X[\text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[U])], \exists y_0 \in g_{X'}[\text{cl}(g_{X'}^{-1}[\text{int}(X' \setminus V)])])(x_0 R y_0) \\
& \iff \neg(\exists x_0 \in g_X[\text{cl}(g_X^{-1}[\text{int}(\text{cl}(U))])], \exists y_0 \in X' \setminus V)(x_0 R y_0) \\
& \iff \neg(\exists x_0 \in \text{cl}(U), \exists y_0 \in X' \setminus V)(x_0 R y_0) \\
& \iff R[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V \\
& \iff U \mathcal{R}(R) V,
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth line is justified by Lemma 7.7 and the fact that the complement of  $V$  in  $\text{RO}(X')$  is  $\text{int}(X' \setminus V)$ , the sixth line is justified by the fact that  $U = \text{int}(\text{cl}(U))$  and by Lemma 7.7, and the seventh line is justified by Lemma 7.7.

When  $X = X'$ , taking  $R$  to be the identity on  $X$ , we have  $\eta_X(U) S_{\mathcal{G}R} \eta_X(V)$  iff  $\text{cl}(U) \subseteq V$  for all  $U, V \in \text{RO}(X)$ . Thus,  $\text{RO}(X)$  and  $\text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X)$  are isomorphic in  $\text{DeV}^S$  by Theorem 7.5. The isomorphism is given by the relation  $S_X: \text{RO}(X) \rightarrow \text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X)$  defined by  $U S_X V$  iff  $\eta_X(U) (\text{Clop } \mathcal{G}1_X) V$  iff  $U \prec \eta_X^{-1}(V)$  (see Remark 7.1).

To prove naturality, we show that the following diagram commutes for every morphism  $R: X \rightarrow X'$  in  $\text{KHaus}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{RO}(X) & \xrightarrow{S_X} & \text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X) \\
\mathcal{R}(R) \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Clop } \mathcal{G}R \\
\text{RO}(X') & \xrightarrow{S_{X'}} & \text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X')
\end{array}$$

Let  $U \in \text{RO}(X)$  and  $V \in \text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X')$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
U (S_{X'} \circ \mathcal{R}(R)) V & \iff \exists C \in \text{RO}(X') : U \mathcal{R}(R) C S_{X'} V \\
& \iff U \mathcal{R}(R) V \\
& \iff \exists D \in \text{Clop}(\mathcal{G}X) : U S_X D \mathcal{R}(R) V \\
& \iff U ((\text{Clop } \mathcal{G}R) \circ S_X) V. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

We thus obtain:

**Corollary 7.10.** *The functor  $\mathcal{R}: \text{KHaus}^R \rightarrow \text{DeV}^S$  is an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 7.9,  $\mathcal{R}$  is naturally isomorphic to the composition  $\text{Clop} \circ \mathcal{G}$ , each of which is an equivalence of categories (see Remark 6.6 and Theorem 6.15(1)).  $\square$

## 8. AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO DE VRIES DUALITY

In this final section we show that the equivalence between  $\text{KHaus}^R$  and  $\text{DeV}^S$  restricts to an equivalence between  $\text{KHaus}$  and the wide subcategory  $\text{DeV}^F$  of  $\text{DeV}^S$  whose morphisms



satisfy two additional conditions. This provides an alternative of de Vries duality. We finish the paper by giving a direct proof that  $\text{DeV}$  is dually isomorphic to  $\text{DeV}^F$ . An advantage of  $\text{DeV}^F$  over  $\text{DeV}$  is that composition in  $\text{DeV}^F$  is usual relation composition.

We start with the following definition which generalizes [5, Def. 6.3].

**Definition 8.1.** Let  $R: (X_1, E_1) \rightarrow (X_2, E_2)$  be a morphism in  $\text{StoneE}^R$ . We say that  $R$  is *functional* if  $E_1 \subseteq R^\circ \circ R$  and  $R \circ R^\circ \subseteq E_2$ .

**Proposition 8.2.** A morphism  $R: (X_1, E_1) \rightarrow (X_2, E_2)$  in  $\text{StoneE}^R$  is functional iff  $\mathcal{Q}(R): \mathcal{Q}(X_1, E_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(X_2, E_2)$  is a function.

*Proof.* The proof is a direct generalization of the proof of [5, Rem. 6.8].  $\square$

**Definition 8.3.** Let  $\text{StoneE}^F$  be the wide subcategory of  $\text{StoneE}^R$  whose morphisms are closed relations that are functional, and let  $\text{Gle}$  be the full subcategory of  $\text{StoneE}^F$  whose objects are Gleason spaces.

**Lemma 8.4.** A morphism  $R: (X_1, E_1) \rightarrow (X_2, E_2)$  in  $\text{StoneE}^R$  is functional iff

$$\widehat{S}_R \circ S_R \subseteq S_{E_1} \text{ and } S_{E_2} \subseteq S_R \circ \widehat{S}_R.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.1, Remark 3.7, and the fact that  $R_1 \subseteq R_2$  iff  $S_{R_2} \subseteq S_{R_1}$  we have

$$E_1 \subseteq R^\circ \circ R \iff S_{R^\circ \circ R} \subseteq S_{E_1} \iff S_{R^\circ} \circ S_R \subseteq S_{E_1} \iff \widehat{S}_R \circ S_R \subseteq S_{E_1}.$$

Similarly,

$$R \circ R^\circ \subseteq E_2 \iff S_{E_2} \subseteq S_R \circ \widehat{S}_R.$$

Thus,  $R$  is functional iff  $\widehat{S}_R \circ S_R \subseteq S_{E_1}$  and  $S_{E_2} \subseteq S_R \circ \widehat{S}_R$ .  $\square$

Lemma 8.4 suggests the following definition.

**Definition 8.5.** A morphism  $T: (B_1, S_1) \rightarrow (B_2, S_2)$  in  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is *functional* if

$$\widehat{T} \circ T \subseteq S_1 \text{ and } S_2 \subseteq T \circ \widehat{T}.$$

**Lemma 8.6.** A morphism  $T: (B_1, S_1) \rightarrow (B_2, S_2)$  in  $\text{SubS5}^S$  is functional iff the following two conditions hold.

- (1)  $\forall a \in B_1 (a T 0 \Rightarrow a = 0)$ .
- (2)  $\forall b_1, b_2 \in B_2 (b_1 S_2 b_2 \Rightarrow \exists a \in B_1 : \neg a T \neg b_1 \text{ and } a T b_2)$ .

*Proof.* It is immediate that (2) is equivalent to  $S_2 \subseteq T \circ \widehat{T}$ . Moreover,  $\widehat{T} \circ T \subseteq S_1$  is equivalent to the following condition:

$$(\dagger) \quad \forall a_1, a_2 \in B_1 \forall b \in B_2 ((a_1 T b \text{ and } \neg a_2 T \neg b) \Rightarrow a_1 S_1 a_2).$$


We show that  $(\dagger)$  is equivalent to (1). Suppose that  $(\dagger)$  holds,  $a \in B_1$ , and  $a T 0$ . Letting  $a_1 = a$ ,  $a_2 = 0$ , and  $b = 0$  in  $(\dagger)$  yields  $a S_1 0$ . Therefore,  $a = 0$  by (S5). Conversely, suppose that (1) holds. Let  $a_1, a_2 \in B_1$  and  $b \in B_2$  such that  $a_1 T b$  and  $\neg a_2 T \neg b$ . Since  $T$  is a compatible subordination, from  $a_1 T b$  it follows that there is  $a \in B_1$  such that  $a_1 S_1 a T b$ . From  $\neg a_2 T \neg b$  and  $a T b$  it follows that  $(\neg a_2 \wedge a) T (\neg b \wedge b) = 0$ . Therefore, (1) implies  $\neg a_2 \wedge a = 0$ , so  $a \leq a_2$ . Thus,  $a_1 S_1 a \leq a_2$ , and hence  $a_1 S_1 a_2$ .  $\square$

**Definition 8.7.**

- (1) Let  $\text{SubS5}^F$  be the wide subcategory of  $\text{SubS5}^S$  consisting of functional morphisms.
- (2) Let  $\text{Comp}^F$  be the full subcategory of  $\text{SubS5}^F$  consisting of compingent algebras, and  $\text{DeV}^F$  the full subcategory of  $\text{Comp}^F$  consisting of de Vries algebras.

Since the isomorphisms in  $\text{KHaus}^R$ ,  $\text{StoneE}^R$ ,  $\text{Gle}^R$ ,  $\text{SubS5}^S$ ,  $\text{Comp}^S$  and  $\text{DeV}^S$  are functional, by Proposition 8.2 and Lemma 8.4, the equivalences between these categories described in Theorem 6.15 restrict to the wide subcategories  $\text{KHaus}$ ,  $\text{StoneE}^F$ ,  $\text{Gle}$ ,  $\text{SubS5}^F$ ,  $\text{Comp}^F$  and  $\text{DeV}^F$ , thus leading to the following result.

**Theorem 8.8.** *The categories  $\text{KHaus}$ ,  $\text{StoneE}^F$ ,  $\text{Gle}$ ,  $\text{SubS5}^F$ ,  $\text{Comp}^F$  and  $\text{DeV}^F$  are equivalent.*



In particular, the equivalence between  $\text{KHaus}$  and  $\text{DeV}^F$  provides an alternative of de Vries duality. In the rest of the paper we will show how to derive de Vries duality from this result. We start by recalling the definition of a de Vries morphism.

**Definition 8.9.** A function  $f: A \rightarrow B$  between de Vries algebras  $(A, \prec)$  and  $(B, \prec)$  is a *de Vries morphism* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (M1)  $f(0) = 0$ ;
- (M2)  $f(a \wedge b) = f(a) \wedge f(b)$ ;
- (M3)  $a \prec b$  implies  $\neg f(\neg a) \prec f(b)$ ;
- (M4)  $f(a) = \bigvee \{f(b) \mid b \prec a\}$ .

The composition of two de Vries morphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $g: B \rightarrow C$  is the de Vries morphism  $g * f: A \rightarrow C$  given by

$$(g * f)(a) = \bigvee \{gf(b) \mid b \prec a\}$$

for each  $a \in A$ . Let  $\text{DeV}$  be the category of de Vries algebras and de Vries morphisms, where identity morphisms are identity functions and composition is defined as above.

**Remark 8.10.** Each de Vries morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  satisfies that  $a \prec b$  implies  $f(a) \prec f(b)$  for each  $a, b \in A$ . This will be used in what follows.

**Remark 8.11.** De Vries duality is induced by the contravariant functor  $\text{RO}: \text{KHaus} \rightarrow \text{DeV}$  that associates to each  $X \in \text{KHaus}$  the de Vries algebra  $(\text{RO}(X), \prec)$  of regular opens of  $X$  where  $U \prec V$  iff  $\text{cl}(U) \subseteq V$ . The functor  $\text{RO}$  sends each continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  between compact Hausdorff spaces to the de Vries morphism  $f^*: \text{RO}(Y) \rightarrow \text{RO}(X)$  given by  $f^*(V) = \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V]))$  for each  $V \in \text{RO}(Y)$ .

We next show that  $\text{DeV}$  is dually isomorphic to  $\text{DeV}^F$ . The definition of contravariant functors between  $\text{DeV}$  and  $\text{DeV}^F$  is motivated by the following result.

**Proposition 8.12.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous function between compact Hausdorff spaces.*

(1) *For every  $V \in \text{RO}(Y)$ , we have*

$$\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V])) = \bigvee \{U \in \text{RO}(X) \mid f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V\},$$

*where the join is computed in  $\text{RO}(X)$ .*

(2) *For every  $U \in \text{RO}(X)$  and  $V \in \text{RO}(Y)$ , we have*

$$f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V \iff \exists V' \in \text{RO}(Y) : \text{cl}(V') \subseteq V \text{ and } U \subseteq \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V'])).$$

*Proof.* (1). Since  $f^{-1}[V]$  is open, we have

$$f^{-1}[V] = \bigcup \{U \in \text{RO}(X) \mid \text{cl}(U) \subseteq f^{-1}[V]\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V])) = \bigvee \{U \in \text{RO}(X) \mid \text{cl}(U) \subseteq f^{-1}[V]\} = \bigvee \{U \in \text{RO}(X) \mid f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V\}.$$

(2). To prove the left-to-right implication, suppose  $f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V$ . Since  $f[\text{cl}(U)]$  is closed and  $V = \bigcup \{V' \in \text{RO}(Y) \mid \text{cl}(V') \subseteq V\}$ , there exists  $V' \in \text{RO}(Y)$  such that  $f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V' \subseteq \text{cl}(V') \subseteq V$ . Therefore,  $U \subseteq \text{cl}(U) \subseteq f^{-1}[V'] \subseteq \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V']))$ .

To prove the right-to-left implication, suppose there exists  $V' \in \text{RO}(Y)$  such that  $\text{cl}(V') \subseteq V$  and  $U \subseteq \text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V']))$ . Then

$$\text{cl}(U) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{int}(\text{cl}(f^{-1}[V']))) = \text{cl}(f^{-1}[V']) \subseteq \text{cl}(f^{-1}[\text{cl}(V')]) = f^{-1}[\text{cl}(V')] \subseteq f^{-1}[V],$$

which implies  $f[\text{cl}(U)] \subseteq V$ . □

Proposition 8.12 suggests the following definition of two contravariant functors providing a dual isomorphism between  $\text{DeV}$  and  $\text{DeV}^F$ .

**Definition 8.13.**

(1) The contravariant functor from  $\text{DeV}^F$  to  $\text{DeV}$  is the identity on objects and maps a morphism  $S: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\text{DeV}^F$  to the function  $f_S: B \rightarrow A$  given by

$$f_S(b) = \bigvee \{a \in A \mid a S b\}.$$

(2) The contravariant functor from  $\text{DeV}$  to  $\text{DeV}^F$  is the identity on objects and maps a de Vries morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  to the relation  $S_f: B \rightarrow A$  given by

$$b S_f a \iff \exists a' \in A : a' \prec a \text{ and } b \leq f(a').$$

To show that the above functors are well-defined, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.14.** *Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\text{DeV}^F$  and let  $b_1, b_2 \in B$  be such that  $b_1 \prec b_2$ . Then  $\bigvee \{a \in A \mid a S b_1\} S b_2$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 8.6, from  $b_1 \prec b_2$  it follows that there is  $a_0 \in A$  such that  $\neg a_0 S \neg b_1$  and  $a_0 S b_2$ . We show that  $c S b_1$  implies  $c \leq a_0$ . From  $c S b_1$  and  $\neg a_0 S \neg b_1$  it follows that  $(c \wedge \neg a_0) S (b_1 \wedge \neg b_1) = 0$ . Since  $S$  is functional,  $c \wedge \neg a_0 = 0$ , hence  $c \leq a_0$ . Therefore,  $\bigvee \{c \in A \mid c S b_1\} \leq a_0$ . Thus,  $\bigvee \{c \in A \mid c S b_1\} \leq a_0 S b_2$ , which gives  $\bigvee \{a \in A \mid a S b_1\} S b_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.15.** *The assignment in Definition 8.13(1) is a well-defined contravariant functor from  $\text{DeV}^F$  to  $\text{DeV}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\text{DeV}^F$ . We show that  $f_S$  is a de Vries morphism. Since  $S$  is functional, it satisfies Lemma 8.6(1) which implies (M1). The proof of (M2) is straightforward and (M4) follows from the fact that  $S$  is a compatible subordination. We prove (M3). Suppose  $b_1 \prec b_2$ . We must prove that  $\neg f(\neg b_1) \prec f(b_2)$ , i.e.  $\neg \bigvee S^{-1}[\neg b_1] \prec \bigvee S^{-1}[b_2]$ , which is equivalent to  $\bigwedge \{\neg c \mid c \in S^{-1}[\neg b_1]\} \prec \bigvee S^{-1}[b_2]$ . By Lemma 8.6(2), there is  $a \in A$  such that  $a S b_2$  and  $\neg a S \neg b_1$ . Since  $S$  is compatible, there exists  $a' \in A$  such that  $a \prec a' S b_2$ . Because  $\neg a \in S^{-1}[\neg b_1]$  and  $a' \in S^{-1}[b_2]$ , we have  $\bigwedge \{\neg c \mid c \in S^{-1}[\neg b_1]\} \leq a \prec a' \leq \bigvee S^{-1}[b_2]$ . This proves that  $f_S$  is a de Vries morphism.

Let  $S_1: A \rightarrow B$  and  $S_2: B \rightarrow C$  be morphisms in  $\text{DeV}^F$ . We prove that  $f_{S_2 \circ S_1} = f_{S_1} * f_{S_2}$ .

**Claim 8.16.** *For every  $a \in A$  and  $c \in C$ ,*

$$a (S_2 \circ S_1) c \iff \exists c' \in C : c' \prec c \text{ and } a \leq f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c').$$

*Proof of claim.* For the left-to-right implication, suppose  $a (S_2 \circ S_1) c$ . Then there is  $b \in B$  such that  $a S_1 b S_2 c$ . From  $a S_1 b$  and the definition of  $f_{S_1}$  it follows that  $a \leq f_{S_1}(b)$ . From  $b S_2 c$  it follows that there is  $c' \in C$  such that  $b S_2 c' \prec c$ . Therefore,  $b \leq f_{S_2}(c')$ . Thus,  $a \leq f_{S_1}(b) \leq f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c')$ .

For the right-to-left implication, suppose that there is  $c' \in C$  such that  $c' \prec c$  and  $a \leq f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c')$ . By Lemma 8.14,  $f_{S_2}(c') S_2 c$ . Therefore, there exists  $b \in B$  such that  $f_{S_2}(c') \prec b S_2 c$ . Applying Lemma 8.14 again,  $a \leq f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c') = \bigvee \{a \in A \mid a S_1 f_{S_2}(c')\} S_1 b S_2 c$ , which implies  $a S_1 b S_2 c$ . Thus,  $a (S_2 \circ S_1) c$ .  $\square$

For every  $c \in C$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f_{S_1} * f_{S_2})(c) &= \bigvee \{f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c') \mid c' \prec c\} \\ &= \bigvee \{a \in A \mid \exists c' \in C : c' \prec c \text{ and } a \leq f_{S_1} f_{S_2}(c')\} \\ &= \bigvee \{a \in A \mid a (S_2 \circ S_1) c\} && \text{(by Claim 8.16)} \\ &= f_{S_2 \circ S_1}(c). \end{aligned}$$

This proves  $f_{S_2 \circ S_1} = f_{S_1} * f_{S_2}$ .

Let  $(A, \prec)$  be a de Vries algebra. Since for every  $a \in A$ , we have  $a = \bigvee \{b \in A \mid b \prec a\}$ , the identity on  $(A, \prec)$  in  $\text{DeV}^F$  is mapped to the identity on  $(A, \prec)$  in  $\text{DeV}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.17.** *The assignment in Definition 8.13(2) is a well-defined contravariant functor from  $\text{DeV}$  to  $\text{DeV}^F$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f: A \rightarrow B$  be a de Vries morphism. We show that  $S_f: B \rightarrow A$  is a morphism in  $\text{DeV}^F$ . It is straightforward to see that  $S_f$  is a subordination. We only verify (S2). Suppose that  $b_1, b_2 S_f a$ . Then there exist  $a_1, a_2 \prec a$  such that  $b_1 \leq f(a_1)$  and  $b_2 \leq f(a_2)$ . Therefore,  $(a_1 \vee a_2) \prec a$  and  $b_1 \vee b_2 \leq f(a_1) \vee f(a_2) \leq f(a_1 \vee a_2)$  because  $f$  is order-preserving. Thus,  $(b_1 \vee b_2) S_f a$ . We next show that  $S_f$  is compatible. For this we need to show that  $S_f \circ \prec = S_f = \prec \circ S_f$ . To see that  $S_f \subseteq S_f \circ \prec$ , let  $b S_f a$ . Then there exists  $a' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a$  and  $b \leq f(a')$ . By (S7), there is  $a'' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a'' \prec a$ . Set  $b' = f(a'')$ . Then  $b \leq f(a') \prec b'$ , so  $b \prec b'$  and  $b' S_f a$ . Thus,  $S_f \subseteq S_f \circ \prec$ . The other inclusions are proved similarly. Finally, we show that  $S_f$  is functional. For this it is sufficient to verify (1) and (2) of Lemma 8.6. Condition (1) is immediate from the definition of  $S_f$  and the fact that  $f(0) = 0$ . For (2), let  $a_1 \prec a_2$ . By (S7), there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $a_1 \prec a \prec a_2$ . By (M3),  $\neg f(\neg a_1) \prec f(a)$ . Set  $b = f(a)$ . It is left to show that  $\neg b S_f \neg a_1$  and  $b S_f a_2$ . The latter is obvious because  $a \prec a_2$  and  $b = f(a)$ . We prove the former. By (S7), there is  $c \in A$  such that  $a_1 \prec c \prec a$ . Then  $\neg b = \neg f(a) \prec f(\neg c)$ , and hence  $\neg b \leq f(\neg c)$ . Moreover,  $\neg c \prec \neg a_1$  by (S6). Thus,  $\neg b S_f \neg a_1$ . This proves that  $S_f$  is a morphism in  $\text{DeV}^F$ .

Let  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $g: B \rightarrow C$  be de Vries morphisms. We prove that  $S_{g*f} = S_f \circ S_g$ . For the right-to-left inclusion, let  $a \in A$  and  $c \in C$  be such that  $c (S_f \circ S_g) a$ . Then there is  $b \in B$  such that  $c S_g b S_f a$ . Since  $c S_g b$ , it follows from the definition of  $S_g$  that there is  $b' \in B$  such that  $b' \prec b$  and  $c \leq g(b')$ . Also, since  $b S_f a$ , there is  $a' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a$  and  $b \leq f(a')$ . By (S7), there is  $a'' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a'' \prec a$ . Therefore,  $c \leq g(b') \leq g(b) \leq gf(a') \leq (g*f)(a'')$ . This proves  $c S_{g*f} a$ . For the left-to-right inclusion, let  $a \in A$  and  $c \in C$  be such that  $c S_{g*f} a$ . Then there is  $a' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a$  and  $c \leq (g*f)(a') \leq gf(a')$ . By (S7), there is  $a'' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a'' \prec a$ . Therefore,  $f(a') \prec f(a'')$ . Thus,  $c S_g f(a'') S_f a$ . Consequently,  $c (S_f \circ S_g) a$ .

Let  $(A, \prec)$  be a de Vries algebra. If  $f$  is the identity on  $(A, \prec)$  in  $\text{DeV}$ , then  $S_f = \prec$ , and hence it is the identity on  $(A, \prec)$  in  $\text{DeV}^F$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 8.18.** *The contravariant functors described in Definition 8.13 establish a dual isomorphism between  $\text{DeV}^F$  and  $\text{DeV}$ .*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that for each morphism  $S: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\text{DeV}^F$  we have  $S_{f_S} = S$ , and that for each morphism  $f: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\text{DeV}$  we have  $f_{S_f} = f$ .

Let  $S: A \rightarrow B$  be a morphism in  $\text{DeV}^F$ . Suppose  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$ , and  $a S_{f_S} b$ . Then there is  $b' \in B$  such that  $b' \prec b$  and  $a \leq f_S(b')$ . By Lemma 8.14,

$$a \leq f_S(b') = \bigvee \{c \in A \mid c S b'\} S b,$$

so  $a S b$ . This proves  $S_{f_S} \subseteq S$ . For the other inclusion, suppose  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$ , and  $a S b$ . Then there is  $b' \in B$  such that  $a S b' \prec b$ . We have  $a \leq \bigvee \{c \in A \mid c S b'\} = f_S(b')$ . Therefore, the element  $b'$  witnesses that we have  $a S_{f_S} b$ . Thus,  $S \subseteq S_{f_S}$ , and hence  $S_{f_S} = S$ .

Let  $f: A \rightarrow B$  be a de Vries morphism. For  $a \in A$  we have  $f_{S_f}(a) = \bigvee \{b \in B \mid b S_f a\}$  and  $f(a) = \bigvee \{f(a') \mid a' \prec a\}$ . If  $a' \prec a$ , then  $f(a') \prec f(a)$ , so  $f(a') S_f a$ . Therefore,  $f(a')$  is one of the  $b \in B$  such that  $b S_f a$ , and hence  $f(a) \leq f_{S_f}(a)$ . On the other hand, if  $b S_f a$ , then there is  $a' \in A$  such that  $a' \prec a$  and  $b \leq f(a')$ . Therefore,  $b \leq f(a') \prec f(a)$ , and so  $f_{S_f}(a) \leq f(a)$ . Thus,  $f_{S_f}(a) = f(a)$ , and hence  $f_{S_f} = f$ .  $\square$

**Remark 8.19.** Combining Theorems 8.8 and 8.18 yields de Vries duality. Consequently, all the categories that appear in Theorem 8.8 are dually equivalent to DeV.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Marco Abbadini and Luca Carai were supported by the Italian Ministry of University and Research through the PRIN project n. 20173WKCM5 *Theory and applications of resource sensitive logics*.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Abramsky and A. Jung, *Domain theory*, Handbook of Logic in Computer Science, vol. 3, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1994, pp. 1–168.
- [2] P. Balbiani and S. Kikot, *Sahlqvist theorems for precontact logics*, Advances in Modal Logic, vol. 9, Coll. Publ., London, 2012, pp. 55–70.
- [3] G. Bezhanishvili, *Stone duality and Gleason covers through de Vries duality*, Topology Appl. **157** (2010), no. 6, 1064–1080.
- [4] G. Bezhanishvili, N. Bezhanishvili, S. Sourabh, and Y. Venema, *Irreducible equivalence relations, Gleason spaces, and de Vries duality*, Appl. Categ. Structures **25** (2017), no. 3, 381–401.
- [5] G. Bezhanishvili, D. Gabelaia, J. Harding, and M. Jibladze, *Compact Hausdorff spaces with relations and Gleason spaces*, Appl. Categ. Structures **27** (2019), no. 6, 663–686.
- [6] P. Blackburn, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema, *Modal logic*, Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 53, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [7] S. Celani, *Quasi-modal algebras*, Math. Bohem. **126** (2001), no. 4, 721–736.
- [8] A. Chagrov and M. Zakharyashev, *Modal logic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 35, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
- [9] H. de Vries, *Compact spaces and compactifications. An algebraic approach*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, 1962.
- [10] G. Dimov and D. Vakarelov, *Topological representation of precontact algebras*, Relational Methods in Computer Science, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 3929, Springer, Berlin, 2006, pp. 1–16.
- [11] I. Düntsch and D. Vakarelov, *Region-based theory of discrete spaces: A proximity approach*, Ann. Math. Artif. Intell. **49** (2007), no. 1-4, 5–14.
- [12] R. Engelking, *General topology*, second ed., Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, vol. 6, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [13] L. Esakia, *Heyting algebras. Duality theory*, Trends in Logic, vol. 50, Springer, 2019, Translated from the Russian by A. Evseev. Edited by G. Bezhanishvili and W. Holliday.
- [14] P. R. Halmos, *Algebraic logic. I. Monadic Boolean algebras*, Compositio Math. **12** (1956), 217–249.
- [15] C. Heunen and J. Vicary, *Categories for quantum theory*, Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 28, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2019.
- [16] J. Isbell, *Atomless parts of spaces*, Math. Scand. **31** (1972), 5–32.
- [17] P. T. Johnstone, *Stone spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- [18] B. Jónsson and A. Tarski, *Boolean algebras with operators. I*, Amer. J. Math. **73** (1951), 891–939.
- [19] A. Jung, M. Kegelman, and M. A. Moshier, *Stably compact spaces and closed relations*, MFPS 2001. Papers from the 17th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark, May 23–26, 2001, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001, pp. 209–231.
- [20] A. Jung, A. Kurz, and M. A. Moshier, *Stone duality for relations*, 2019, arXiv:1912.08418.
- [21] A. Jung and P. Sünderhauf, *On the duality of compact vs. open*, Papers on General Topology and Applications (Gorham, ME, 1995), Ann. New York Acad. Sci., vol. 806, New York, 1996, pp. 214–230.

- [22] M. A. Moshier, *On the relationship between compact regularity and Gentzen's cut rule*, Theor. Comput. Sci. **316** (2004), no. 1-3, 113–136.
- [23] J. R. Porter and R. G. Woods, *Extensions and absolutes of Hausdorff spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [24] M. H. Stone, *The theory of representations for Boolean algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **40** (1936), no. 1, 37–111.
- [25] S. J. van Gool, *Duality and canonical extensions for stably compact spaces*, Topology Appl. **159** (2012), no. 1, 341–359.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO, 84084 FISCIANO (SA), ITALY  
*Email address:* mabbadini@unisa.it

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, LAS CRUCES NM  
88003, USA  
*Email address:* guram@nmsu.edu

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO, 84084 FISCIANO (SA), ITALY  
*Email address:* luca.carai.uni@gmail.com