

FREE ALGEBRAS AND COPRODUCTS IN VARIETIES OF GÖDEL ALGEBRAS

L. CARAI

ABSTRACT. Gödel algebras are the Heyting algebras satisfying the axiom $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x) = 1$. We utilize Priestley and Esakia dualities to dually describe free Gödel algebras and coproducts of Gödel algebras. In particular, we realize the Esakia space dual to a Gödel algebra free over a distributive lattice as the, suitably topologized and ordered, collection of all nonempty closed chains of the Priestley dual of the lattice. This provides a tangible dual description of free Gödel algebras without any restriction on the number of free generators, which generalizes known results for the finitely generated case. A similar approach allows us to characterize the Esakia spaces dual to coproducts of arbitrary families of Gödel algebras. We also establish analogous dual descriptions of free algebras and coproducts in every variety of Gödel algebras. As consequences of these results, we obtain a formula to compute the depth of coproducts of Gödel algebras and show that all free Gödel algebras are bi-Heyting algebras.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries on Priestley and Esakia dualities	3
3. Free Gödel algebras	5
4. Coproducts of Gödel algebras	14
5. Free Gödel algebras as bi-Heyting algebras	19
6. Comparison with the step-by-step method	25
Acknowledgements	27
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

Free Heyting algebras play a fundamental role in the study of intuitionistic propositional logic as they are, up to isomorphism, Lindenbaum-Tarski algebras, whose elements are equivalence classes of propositional formulas over a fixed set of variables modulo intuitionistic logical equivalence. The notoriously intricate structure of free Heyting algebras can be investigated using the powerful tool of Esakia duality, which establishes a dual equivalence between the category of Heyting algebras and a category of ordered topological spaces known as Esakia spaces (see, e.g., [Esa19]). Different methods to study the Esakia spaces dual to free Heyting algebras have been developed. Universal models, introduced independently by Shehtman [She78] and Bellissima [Bel86], constitute the upper part of the Esakia duals of finitely generated free Heyting algebras. The coloring technique due to Esakia and Grigolia [EG77] is one of the main tools to construct universal models (see, e.g.,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 06D20, 08B20, 08B25, 03B55, 06E15, 06D05.

Key words and phrases. Gödel algebra, free algebra, coproduct, distributive lattice, Esakia duality, Priestley duality, Gödel-Dummett logic, bi-Heyting algebra.

[Bez06, Sec. 3]). A different approach, developed by Ghilardi [Ghi92] generalizing some results of Urquhart [Urq73], builds the Esakia duals of finitely generated free Heyting algebras as the inverse limits of systems of finite posets (see also [BG11]). This is known as the step-by-step method and it has recently been generalized beyond the finitely generated setting by Almeida [Alm24].

Due to the complexity of free Heyting algebras, it is natural to restrict the attention to free algebras in smaller varieties of Heyting algebras. A particularly well-behaved variety of Heyting algebras is the variety **GA** of Gödel algebras, which are the Heyting algebras satisfying the pre-linearity axiom $(x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x) = 1$. The variety **GA** provides the algebraic semantics for the intermediate propositional logic known as the Gödel-Dummett logic or linear calculus, introduced by Dummett [Dum59] and often denoted by **LC**. The Gödel-Dummett logic can also be thought of as a propositional fuzzy logic (see, e.g., [BP11] and [Há98, Sec. 4.2]).

Free Gödel algebras were first studied by Horn [Hor69], who proved that **GA** is locally finite, meaning that finitely generated free Gödel algebras are finite. Grigolia [Gri87] described the Esakia duals of finitely generated free Gödel algebras, while Aguzzoli, Gerla, and Marra [AGM08] described the Esakia duals of Gödel algebras free over finite distributive lattices. A Gödel algebra G is said to be free over a distributive lattice L via a lattice homomorphism $e: L \rightarrow G$ when the following holds: for every Gödel algebra H and lattice homomorphism $f: L \rightarrow H$, there is a unique Heyting algebra homomorphism $g: G \rightarrow H$ such that $g \circ e = f$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 G & \overset{\exists! g}{\dashrightarrow} & H \\
 \uparrow e & \nearrow f & \\
 L & &
 \end{array}$$

By Priestley duality, the category of distributive lattices is dually equivalent to the category of the ordered topological spaces known as Priestley spaces (see, e.g., [GvG24]). The main result of Section 3 generalizes the results of [AGM08] from the finite to the infinite setting, by providing a dual description of Gödel algebras free over distributive lattices, without any restriction on the cardinality of the lattice. We show that the Esakia dual of the Gödel algebra free over a distributive lattice L is isomorphic to the Esakia space whose points are all the nonempty closed chains (i.e., nonempty totally ordered closed subsets) of the Priestley space dual to L . As a consequence, we obtain that the Gödel algebra free over a set S is dual to the Esakia space of all nonempty closed chains of 2^S , where 2 is the 2-element chain with the discrete topology. This result is noteworthy because it offers a tangible dual description of free Gödel algebras, contrasting with the sparsity of concrete descriptions available for the duals of free algebras in varieties of Heyting algebras, especially in the infinitely generated setting.

Coproducts of Heyting algebras, and hence products in the category of Esakia spaces, are notoriously difficult to describe. A generalization of the construction of universal models was employed by Grigolia [Gri06] to study the upper part of the Esakia duals of binary coproducts of finite Heyting algebras. An algorithm to compute binary coproducts of finite Gödel algebras was presented by D'Antona and Marra in [DM06]. The step-by-step method has been employed in [Alm24, Sec. 4.2] to obtain a dual description of binary coproducts of Heyting algebras. In Section 4, we utilize the machinery developed in Section 3 to obtain a dual description of coproducts of any family of Gödel algebras. We prove that the Esakia dual of a coproduct is realized as a particular collection of nonempty closed chains of the cartesian product of the Esakia duals of the factors. Notably, this result does not require any restrictions on the cardinalities of the family and of its members.

Dunn and Meyer [DM71] and Hecht and Katriňák [HK72] showed that there are countably many proper subvarieties (i.e., equationally definable subclasses) of \mathbf{GA} , and each of them is axiomatized over \mathbf{GA} by the bounded depth axiom $\mathbf{bd}_n = 1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where \mathbf{bd}_n is the n -ary term defined recursively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{bd}_0 &:= 0, \\ \mathbf{bd}_n &:= x_n \vee (x_n \rightarrow \mathbf{bd}_{n-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We denote by \mathbf{GA}_n the subvariety of \mathbf{GA} consisting of all the Gödel algebras validating \mathbf{bd}_n , and we refer to its members as \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras. In particular, \mathbf{GA}_0 contains only the trivial algebra and \mathbf{GA}_1 coincides with the variety of boolean algebras. Since $\mathbf{GA}_n \subseteq \mathbf{GA}_m$ iff $n \leq m$, the subvarieties of \mathbf{GA} form a countable chain of order type $\omega + 1$. This description of the subvarieties of \mathbf{GA} is the algebraic counterpart of Hosi's characterization of the extensions of the Gödel-Dummett logic (see [Hos67]). In Sections 3 and 4 we also adapt the dual descriptions of free Gödel algebras and coproducts of Gödel algebras mentioned above to obtain dual descriptions of free \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras over distributive lattices and of coproducts in \mathbf{GA}_n . The concreteness of the dual description of coproducts allows us to obtain in Section 4 a formula to calculate the depth of a coproduct in \mathbf{GA} from the depths of its factors.

It is shown in [Ghi92] that the step-by-step method allows to conclude that every Heyting algebra free over a finite distributive lattice is a bi-Heyting algebra, where a Heyting algebra is called a bi-Heyting algebra if its order dual is also a Heyting algebra. The Gödel algebras that are bi-Heyting algebras are also known as bi-Gödel algebras and have been studied in [BMM22]. In Section 5 we show that a Gödel algebra free over a distributive lattice L is a bi-Heyting algebra iff the order dual of L is a Heyting algebra. As a consequence, we deduce that free Gödel algebras are always bi-Heyting algebras. Surprisingly, the situation is very different for free \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras. In fact, we prove that free \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras are never bi-Heyting algebras, except when they are finitely generated.

We end the paper with Section 6 in which we compare our approach with the description of free Gödel algebras provided by the step-by-step method. We also investigate the dual description of some particular sublattices of free Gödel algebras that play an important role in the step-by-step construction.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON PRIESTLEY AND ESAKIA DUALITIES

In this section we recall the basics of Priestley duality for distributive lattices and of Esakia duality for Heyting algebras. We also describe how Esakia duality restricts to varieties of Gödel algebras. For more details see, e.g., [GvG24, Esa19].

If X is a poset and $A \subseteq X$, we let

$$\uparrow A := \{x \in X \mid y \leq x \text{ for some } y \in A\} \quad \text{and} \quad \downarrow A := \{x \in X \mid x \leq y \text{ for some } y \in A\}.$$

When $A = \{x\}$, we simply write $\uparrow x$ and $\downarrow x$. We call A an *upset* when $A = \uparrow A$ and a *downset* when $A = \downarrow A$.

Definition 2.1. A *Priestley space* is a compact space X equipped with a partial order \leq satisfying the *Priestley separation axiom*: if $x, y \in X$ with $x \not\leq y$, then there is a clopen upset U such that $x \in U$ and $y \notin U$.

Each Priestley space is a Stone space (compact, Hausdorff, and zero-dimensional space), and the topology on finite Priestley spaces is always discrete. So, finite Priestley spaces can be identified

with finite posets. We denote by **Pries** the category of Priestley spaces and continuous order-preserving maps. Throughout the paper, we will assume that all distributive lattices are bounded and all lattice homomorphisms preserve the bounds. Let **DL** be the category of distributive lattices and lattice homomorphisms. If X is a Priestley space, then the set X^* of clopen upsets of X ordered by inclusion forms a distributive lattice. We then have a contravariant functor $(-)^*: \mathbf{Pries} \rightarrow \mathbf{DL}$ which sends X to X^* and a Pries-morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ to the DL-morphism $f^{-1}: Y^* \rightarrow X^*$. If L is a distributive lattice, we denote by L_* the set of all prime filters of L ordered by inclusion and equipped with the topology generated by the subbasis $\{\sigma_L(a), L_* \setminus \sigma_L(a) \mid a \in L\}$, where $\sigma_L(a) = \{P \in L_* \mid a \in P\}$. It turns out that L_* is a Priestley space and there is a contravariant functor $(-)_*: \mathbf{DL} \rightarrow \mathbf{Pries}$ which maps L to L_* and a DL-morphism $\alpha: L \rightarrow M$ to the Pries-morphism $\alpha^{-1}: M_* \rightarrow L_*$. These two functors are quasi-inverses of each other and establish Priestley duality.

Theorem 2.2 (Priestley duality). *Pries is dually equivalent to DL.*

On the one hand, the map $\sigma_L: L \rightarrow (L_*)^*$ is an isomorphism for every $L \in \mathbf{DL}$, and yields a natural isomorphism $\sigma: \text{id}_{\mathbf{DL}} \rightarrow (-)^* \circ (-)_*$. On the other hand, for every $X \in \mathbf{Pries}$ the map $\varepsilon_X: X \rightarrow (X^*)_*$ sending x to $\{U \in X^* \mid x \in U\}$ is an isomorphism of Priestley spaces and yields a natural isomorphism $\varepsilon: \text{id}_{\mathbf{Pries}} \rightarrow (-)_* \circ (-)^*$.

Recall that a distributive lattice H is called a *Heyting algebra* when it is equipped with a binary operation \rightarrow called *implication* such that $a \wedge b \leq c$ iff $a \leq b \rightarrow c$ for every $a, b, c \in H$. Let **HA** be the category of Heyting algebras and Heyting homomorphisms; that is, lattice homomorphisms preserving implications. We now turn to Esakia duality for Heyting algebras.

Definition 2.3. A Priestley space X is called an *Esakia space* when $\downarrow V$ is clopen for every clopen subset V of X .

A map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between posets is called a *p-morphism* if $f[\uparrow x] = \uparrow f(x)$ for every $x \in X$. Equivalently, a p-morphism is an order-preserving map such that $f(x) \leq y$ implies the existence of $z \geq x$ such that $f(z) = y$. Esakia spaces and continuous p-morphisms form a category that we denote by **Esa**. To help the reader, we will usually denote Priestley spaces with the letter X and Esakia spaces with Y . If Y is an Esakia space, then Y^* forms a Heyting algebra with implication given by $U \rightarrow V = Y \setminus \downarrow(U \setminus V)$ for every $U, V \in Y^*$. In fact, the functors $(-)^*$ and $(-)_*$ of Priestley duality restrict to **HA** and **Esa** and yield Esakia duality.

Theorem 2.4 (Esakia duality). *Esa is dually equivalent to HA.*

As mentioned in the introduction, a Heyting algebra G is called a *Gödel algebra* if the identity $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) = 1$ holds for every $a, b \in G$, where 1 denotes the greatest element of G . We think of the variety **GA** of Gödel algebras as a full subcategory of **HA** and consider the restriction of Esakia duality to **GA**. Recall that a totally ordered subset of a poset X is called a *chain* of X , and X is a *root system* if $\uparrow x$ is a chain for every $x \in X$. The following is a consequence of [Hor69, Thm. 2.4].

Theorem 2.5. *Let Y be an Esakia space. Then Y^* is a Gödel algebra iff Y is a root system.*

We call an Esakia space that is a root system an *Esakia root system*. Let **ERS** be the full subcategory of **Esa** consisting of Esakia root systems and continuous p-morphisms. It is a straightforward consequence of the previous theorem that Esakia duality restricts to a duality for Gödel algebras.

Theorem 2.6 (Esakia duality for Gödel algebras). *ERS is dually equivalent to GA.*

We end the section with some considerations on the restrictions of Esakia duality to subvarieties of \mathbf{GA} . We first recall the notion of *depth* of an Esakia space, specialized to the setting of Esakia root systems.

Definition 2.7. Let Y be an Esakia root system. If $\uparrow y$ is finite, then we denote by $d(y)$ the cardinality of $\uparrow y$. Otherwise, we write $d(y) = \infty$. We call $d(y)$ the *depth* of y . We write $d(Y)$ for the supremum of the depths of elements of Y , and call $d(Y)$ the depth of Y .

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathbf{ERS}_n be the full subcategory of \mathbf{ERS} consisting of the Esakia root systems of depth smaller or equal to n . It follows from well-known facts (see, e.g., [BBMS21, Sec. 2.2] and the references therein) that a Gödel algebra G is in \mathbf{GA}_n iff $G_* \in \mathbf{ERS}_n$. We then have the following restriction of Esakia duality.

Theorem 2.8 (Esakia duality for \mathbf{GA}_n). *\mathbf{ERS}_n is dually equivalent to \mathbf{GA}_n .*

Since \mathbf{GA}_n is a subvariety of \mathbf{GA} , the inclusion functor $\mathbf{GA}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{GA}$ has a left adjoint (see, e.g., [ML71, Sec. V.6]). It then follows from Esakia duality that the inclusion $\mathbf{ERS}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{ERS}$ has a right adjoint. We provide a description of such right adjoint. If $Y \in \mathbf{ERS}$, let $Y_n = \{y \in Y \mid d(y) \leq n\}$, and if $f: Y \rightarrow Z$ is an \mathbf{ERS} -morphism, let $f_n: Y_n \rightarrow Z_n$ be the restriction of f .

Theorem 2.9. $(-)_n: \mathbf{ERS} \rightarrow \mathbf{ERS}_n$ is a well-defined functor that is right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathbf{ERS}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{ERS}$.

Proof. It follows from [Bez00, Lem. 7]¹ that Y_n is a closed upset in Y . So, [Esa19, Lem. 3.4.11] yields that Y_n is an Esakia space with the subspace topology and order induced by Y . It is then clear that $Y_n \in \mathbf{ERS}_n$. Since Y_n is a closed upset of Y , the inclusion $e: Y_n \hookrightarrow Y$ is an \mathbf{ERS} -morphism. Let $f: Z \rightarrow Y$ be an \mathbf{ERS} -morphism with $Z \in \mathbf{ERS}_n$. We show that there is a unique continuous p-morphism $g: Z \rightarrow Y_n$ such that $e \circ g = f$. If $z \in Z$, then $d(z) \leq n$, and so $\uparrow f(z) = f[\uparrow z]$ has cardinality smaller or equal to n . Thus, $f[Z] \subseteq Y_n$. Take $g: Z \rightarrow Y_n$ to be the restriction of f . Then g is the unique continuous p-morphism such that $e \circ g = f$. It follows from [ML71, Thm. IV.1.2] that $(-)_n$ is a well-defined functor that is right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathbf{ERS}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{ERS}$. \square

Since $(-)_n$ is a right adjoint, the following is immediate.

Corollary 2.10. $(-)_n: \mathbf{ERS} \rightarrow \mathbf{ERS}_n$ preserves all products.

3. FREE GÖDEL ALGEBRAS

In this section we employ Priestley and Esakia dualities to establish a dual description of the Gödel algebra free over a given distributive lattice. We begin by introducing the notion of closed chain, which will play a fundamental role in this investigation.

Definition 3.1. Let X be a Priestley space. A subset of X is called a *chain* if it is totally ordered with respect to the order on X . A chain is said to be *closed* when it is closed in the topology on X . We denote by $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ the set of all nonempty closed chains of X .

Our first goal is to equip $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ with a structure of Esakia root system and show that $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is dual to the Gödel algebra free on the distributive lattice X^* . We start by putting a topology on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$.

¹The lemma in the reference is stated for an Esakia space of finite depth, but that assumption is never used in the proof.

If X is a Stone space, let $\mathbf{V}(X)$ be the set of all nonempty closed subsets of X . It is well known (see [Mic51, Thm. 4.9]) that $\mathbf{V}(X)$ becomes a Stone space once equipped with the topology generated by the subbasis $\{\square V, \diamond V \mid V \text{ clopen of } X\}$, where

$$\square V := \{F \in \mathbf{V}(X) \mid F \subseteq V\} \quad \text{and} \quad \diamond V := \{F \in \mathbf{V}(X) \mid F \cap V \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Moreover, $\square V$ and $\diamond V$ are clopen subsets of $\mathbf{V}(X)$ for any V clopen of X . The space $\mathbf{V}(X)$ is known as the *Vietoris space* of X .

Theorem 3.2. *Let X be a Priestley space. Then $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is a closed subset of $\mathbf{V}(X)$.*

Proof. As the elements of $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ are closed chains, it is clear that $\mathbf{CC}(X) \subseteq \mathbf{V}(X)$. To show that $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is closed, let $F \in \mathbf{V}(X) \setminus \mathbf{CC}(X)$. Our goal is to exhibit an open neighborhood of F in $\mathbf{V}(X)$ that is disjoint from $\mathbf{CC}(X)$. Since $F \in \mathbf{V}(X) \setminus \mathbf{CC}(X)$, it is a nonempty closed subset of X that is not totally ordered with respect to the order on X . Thus, there are $x_1, x_2 \in F$ such that $x_1 \not\leq x_2$ and $x_2 \not\leq x_1$. Since X is a Priestley space, there are clopen upsets U_1, U_2 of X such that $x_1 \in U_1 \setminus U_2$ and $x_2 \in U_2 \setminus U_1$. Consider $\mathcal{V} := \diamond(U_1 \setminus U_2) \cap \diamond(U_2 \setminus U_1)$, which is a clopen subset of $\mathbf{V}(X)$ because $U_1 \setminus U_2$ and $U_2 \setminus U_1$ are clopen in X . Moreover, $F \in \mathcal{V}$ because $x_1 \in F \cap (U_1 \setminus U_2)$ and $x_2 \in F \cap (U_2 \setminus U_1)$. It remains to show that \mathcal{V} is disjoint from $\mathbf{CC}(X)$. Assume that there is $C \in \mathbf{CC}(X) \cap \mathcal{V}$. Then $C \in \diamond(U_1 \setminus U_2) \cap \diamond(U_2 \setminus U_1)$, and so there are $y_1, y_2 \in C$ such that $y_1 \in C \cap (U_1 \setminus U_2)$ and $y_2 \in C \cap (U_2 \setminus U_1)$. Since C is a chain, $y_1 \leq y_2$ or $y_2 \leq y_1$. If $y_1 \leq y_2$, it follows that $y_2 \in U_1$ because $y_1 \in U_1$ and U_1 is an upset. This contradicts that $y_2 \in U_2 \setminus U_1$. If $y_2 \leq y_1$, we also obtain a contradiction with a similar argument. Therefore, \mathcal{V} is an open neighborhood of F in $\mathbf{V}(X)$ that is disjoint from $\mathbf{CC}(X)$. As F was an arbitrary element of $\mathbf{V}(X) \setminus \mathbf{CC}(X)$, we have shown that $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is a closed subset of $\mathbf{V}(X)$. \square

From now on, we fix a Priestley space X and will always assume that $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is equipped with the subspace topology induced by the Vietoris topology on $\mathbf{V}(X)$. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of the fact that a closed subspace of a Stone space is a Stone space (see, e.g., [GH09, Lem. 32.2]).

Corollary 3.3. *$\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is a Stone space.*

Since $\mathbf{V}(X)$ is leaving the scene and the spotlight will be on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$, with a slight abuse of notation we set

$$\square A := \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(X) \mid C \subseteq A\} \quad \text{and} \quad \diamond A := \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(X) \mid C \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$$

for any subset A of X . In the following lemma we gather some useful facts about the topology on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ that will be used throughout the paper.

Lemma 3.4.

- (1) *If $A, B \subseteq X$, then $\square(A \cap B) = \square A \cap \square B$ and $\diamond(A \cup B) = \diamond A \cup \diamond B$.*
- (2) *If $A \subseteq X$, then $\mathbf{CC}(X) \setminus \square A = \diamond(X \setminus A)$ and $\mathbf{CC}(X) \setminus \diamond A = \square(X \setminus A)$.*
- (3) *If V is clopen in X , then $\square V, \diamond V$ are clopen in $\mathbf{CC}(X)$.*
- (4) *$\{\square V, \diamond V \mid V \text{ is clopen in } X\}$ is a subbasis for the topology on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$.*
- (5) *A basis for the topology on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is given by the clopen subsets of $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ of the form $\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \cdots \cap \diamond W_n$ with V, W_1, \dots, W_n clopen in X and $W_1, \dots, W_n \subseteq V$.*

Proof. (1) and (2) are straightforward consequences of the definitions of $\square A$ and $\diamond A$.

(3) and (4) follow immediately from the definition of the topology on $\mathbf{CC}(X)$.

To verify (5), observe that it follows from (4) that every open subset of $\text{CC}(X)$ is a union of subsets of the form $\square V_1 \cap \cdots \cap \square V_m \cap \diamond V'_1 \cap \cdots \cap \diamond V'_n$ with each V_i and V'_j clopen subsets of X . By (1), we obtain that $\square V_1 \cap \cdots \cap \square V_m = \square V$, where $V := V_1 \cap \cdots \cap V_m$ is clopen in X . Finally, it follows from the definition of $\square A$ and $\diamond B$ that $\square A \cap \diamond B = \square A \cap \diamond(A \cap B)$ for every $A, B \subseteq X$, and hence

$$\square V \cap \diamond V'_1 \cap \cdots \cap \diamond V'_n = \square V \cap \diamond(V \cap V'_1) \cap \cdots \cap \diamond(V \cap V'_n).$$

This yields the claim because each $V \cap V'_j$ is a clopen subset of X contained in V . \square

We now define a partial order on $\text{CC}(X)$ that will make it into an Esakia root system.

Definition 3.5. Let $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$. We write $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ iff $C_2 \subseteq C_1$ and C_2 is an upset in C_1 .

If $X \in \text{Pries}$, then $\uparrow x$ and $\downarrow x$ are closed for every $x \in X$ (see, e.g., [Pri84, Prop. 2.6(ii)]). In particular, if $Y \in \text{ERS}$, then $\uparrow y$ is a closed chain for every $y \in Y$. The definition of \trianglelefteq is inspired by the fact that when Y is an Esakia root system and $y_1, y_2 \in Y$, we have $\uparrow y_1 \trianglelefteq \uparrow y_2$ iff $y_1 \leq y_2$.

It is well known that any nonempty closed subset F of a Priestley space contains elements that are minimal and elements that are maximal in F with respect to \leq (see, e.g., [Pri84, Prop. 2.6]²). As an immediate consequence of this fact, we obtain:

Proposition 3.6. *Every $C \in \text{CC}(X)$ has a least and a greatest element.*

Proposition 3.6 yields the following alternative description of \trianglelefteq .

Lemma 3.7. $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ iff there is $x \in C_1$ such that $C_2 = \uparrow x \cap C_1$.

Proof. If $C_2 = \uparrow x \cap C_1$, then C_2 is an upset of C_1 , and hence $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$. To show the other implication, assume $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ and let x be the least element of C_2 , which exists by Proposition 3.6. Since $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$, it follows that $C_2 \subseteq C_1$, and hence $C_2 \subseteq \uparrow x \cap C_1$. Conversely, if $y \in \uparrow x \cap C_1$, then $y \in C_2$ because C_2 is an upset in C_1 and $x \in C_2$. Thus, $\uparrow x \cap C_1 \subseteq C_2$. \square

Theorem 3.8. $(\text{CC}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ is a root system.

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of its definition that \trianglelefteq is reflexive and antisymmetric. To show that \trianglelefteq is transitive, let $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in \text{CC}(X)$ such that $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ and $C_2 \trianglelefteq C_3$. Then $C_3 \subseteq C_2 \subseteq C_1$ and C_3 is an upset in C_2 , which is an upset in C_1 . Thus, C_3 is an upset in C_1 , and hence $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_3$. Thus, \trianglelefteq is a partial order. Consider $C, C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$ with $C \trianglelefteq C_1, C_2$. We need to show that $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ or $C_2 \trianglelefteq C_1$. By Lemma 3.7, there are $x_1, x_2 \in C$ such that $C_1 = \uparrow x_1 \cap C$ and $C_2 = \uparrow x_2 \cap C$. Since C is a chain, $x_1 \leq x_2$ or $x_2 \leq x_1$. Therefore, $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ or $C_2 \trianglelefteq C_1$. This proves that $(\text{CC}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ is a root system. \square

Notation 3.9. To avoid confusion, subsets of $\text{CC}(X)$ will be denoted with calligraphic capital letters and we will write $\uparrow \mathcal{A}$ and $\downarrow \mathcal{A}$ to denote the downset and upset in $(\text{CC}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ generated by a subset \mathcal{A} of $\text{CC}(X)$. As usual, if $C \in \text{CC}(X)$, we will simply write $\uparrow C$ and $\downarrow C$ instead of $\uparrow\{C\}$ and $\downarrow\{C\}$.

From now on, we will always assume that $\text{CC}(X)$ is equipped with \trianglelefteq . To show that $\text{CC}(X)$ is an Esakia root system, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *Let A, B_1, \dots, B_n be subsets of X .*

²A proof can be found in [Esa19, Cor. 3.2.2], where this fact is stated for Esakia spaces, but the proof works verbatim for Priestley spaces.

- (1) $\Box A$ is an upset of $\text{CC}(X)$.
- (2) $\Diamond A$ is a downset of $\text{CC}(X)$.
- (3) $\Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Diamond B_n) = \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_n)$.

Let also D be a downset of X and U an upset of X .

- (4) $\Box D$ is a downset of $\text{CC}(X)$.
- (5) $\Diamond U$ is an upset of $\text{CC}(X)$.
- (6) If $U \cap D \subseteq A$, then

$$\Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)) = \Box(A \cup D) \cap \Diamond(U \cap D).$$

- (7) If $D \subseteq A$, then $\Box A \cap \Diamond D$ is a downset of $\text{CC}(X)$.

Proof. (1). Let $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$ such that $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ and $C_1 \in \Box A$. Then $C_2 \subseteq C_1$ and $C_1 \subseteq A$. Thus, $C_2 \subseteq A$, and hence $C_2 \in \Box A$. This shows that $\Box A$ is an upset.

(2). It follows from (1) that $\Box(X \setminus A)$ is an upset. By Lemma 3.4(2), we have that $\Diamond A = \text{CC}(X) \setminus \Box(X \setminus A)$, and so $\Diamond A$ is a downset because it is the complement of an upset.

(3). The left-to-right inclusion is an immediate consequence of the fact that taking the downset of a subset preserves inclusions. To prove the other inclusion, let

$$C \in \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_1) \cap \cdots \cap \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_n).$$

Then there are $C_1, \dots, C_n \in \text{CC}(X)$ such that $C \trianglelefteq C_i$ and $C_i \in \Box A \cap \Diamond B_i$ for each i . By Theorem 3.8, $\text{CC}(X)$ is a root system, and hence $\uparrow C$ is totally ordered with respect to \trianglelefteq . Since $C_1, \dots, C_n \in \uparrow C$, there is j such that $C_j \trianglelefteq C_i$ for every i . By (2), $\Diamond B_i$ is a downset, and so $C_j \in \Diamond B_i$ for every i because $C_i \in \Diamond B_i$ and $C_j \trianglelefteq C_i$. Then $C_j \in \Box A \cap \Diamond B_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Diamond B_n$. Therefore, $C \in \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond B_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Diamond B_n)$ since $C \trianglelefteq C_j$.

(4). Let $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$ with $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$ and $C_2 \in \Box D$. We want to show that $C_1 \in \Box D$. Since $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$, there is $x \in C_1$ such that $C_2 = \uparrow x \cap C_1$ by Lemma 3.7. Let $y \in C_1$. Then $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ because $x, y \in C_1$ and C_1 is a chain. If $x \leq y$, we have $y \in \uparrow x \cap C_1 = C_2 \subseteq D$. Otherwise, $y \leq x \in C_1 \subseteq D$, and hence $y \in D$ because D is a downset. In either case, $y \in D$. This shows that $C_1 \subseteq D$, and so we have proved that $C_1 \in \Box D$.

(5). Since U is an upset of X , we have that $X \setminus U$ is a downset, and so $\Box(X \setminus U)$ is a downset of $\text{CC}(X)$ by (4). Lemma 3.4(2) implies that $\Diamond U = \text{CC}(X) \setminus \Box(X \setminus U)$. Thus, $\Diamond U$ is an upset because it is the complement of a downset.

(6). To show the left-to-right inclusion, assume that $C \in \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D))$. Then there is $K \in \text{CC}(X)$ such that $C \trianglelefteq K$ and $K \in \Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$. Since $\Diamond(U \cap D)$ is a downset by (2), we have that $C \in \Diamond(U \cap D)$. It then remains to show that $C \in \Box(A \cup D)$. From $K \in \Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$ it follows that $K \subseteq A$ and $K \cap U \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in K \cap U \cap D$. Since $C \trianglelefteq K$ and $x \in K$, we obtain $\uparrow x \cap C \subseteq K$. So, $\uparrow x \cap C \subseteq A$ because $K \subseteq A$. We also have that $\downarrow x \cap C \subseteq D$ because D is a downset and $x \in D$. That C is a chain implies $C = (\uparrow x \cap C) \cup (\downarrow x \cap C)$. Therefore, $C = (\uparrow x \cap C) \cup (\downarrow x \cap C) \subseteq A \cup D$, and hence $C \in \Box(A \cup D)$. This shows that $C \in \Box(A \cup D) \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$.

We now prove the other inclusion. Suppose that $C \in \Box(A \cup D) \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$. Then $C \subseteq A \cup D$ and $C \cap U \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Take $x \in C \cap U \cap D$ and let $K = \uparrow x \cap C$. Thus, $K \in \text{CC}(X)$ and $C \trianglelefteq K$. We show that $K \in \Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$. Since $x \in K \cap U \cap D$, we have that $K \in \Diamond(U \cap D)$. By (1), $\Box(A \cup D)$ is an upset. Then $C \trianglelefteq K$ implies $K \in \Box(A \cup D)$, and so $K \subseteq A \cup D$. Because $x \in U$ and U is an upset, we have $K \subseteq \uparrow x \subseteq U$. Then the hypothesis that $U \cap D \subseteq A$ yields

$$K \subseteq (A \cup D) \cap U \subseteq A \cup (U \cap D) = A,$$

which implies that $K \in \Box A$. Therefore, $K \in \Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D)$, and so $C \in \Downarrow(\Box A \cap \Diamond(U \cap D))$ because $C \trianglelefteq K$.

(7). It immediately follows from (6) by taking $U = X$. \square

We will also need the following well-known property of Priestley spaces.

Lemma 3.11. [DP02, Lem. 11.22] *Every clopen subset of a Priestley space X is a finite union of subsets of the form $U \cap D$, where U is a clopen upset and D a clopen downset.*

Theorem 3.12. $\text{CC}(X)$ is an Esakia root system.

Proof. Corollary 3.3 and Theorem 3.8 yield that $\text{CC}(X)$ is a Stone space and a root system. It remains to show that it is an Esakia space. We first prove that $\text{CC}(X)$ is a Priestley space. Let $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$ with $C_1 \not\trianglelefteq C_2$. First, consider the case in which $C_2 \not\subseteq C_1$. Then there is $x \in C_2 \setminus C_1$. Since X is a Stone space and C_1 is closed, we can find a clopen subset V of X such that $C_1 \subseteq V$ and $x \notin V$. Thus, $C_1 \in \Box V$ and $C_2 \notin \Box V$. By Lemma 3.10(1), $\Box V$ is a clopen upset of $\text{CC}(X)$ containing C_1 and not C_2 . Let us now assume that $C_2 \subseteq C_1$. By Proposition 3.6, there exist the greatest elements x_1 and x_2 of C_1 and C_2 , respectively. Since $C_2 \subseteq C_1$, it must be that $x_2 < x_1$ or $x_1 = x_2$. If $x_2 < x_1$, then there is a clopen upset U of X such that $x_1 \in U$ and $x_2 \notin U$ because X is a Priestley space. Then $x_1 \in C_1 \cap U$ and $C_2 \cap U = \emptyset$ because x_2 is the greatest element of C_2 and U is an upset. By Lemma 3.10(5), $\Diamond U$ is a clopen upset of $\text{CC}(X)$ such that $C_1 \in \Diamond U$ and $C_2 \notin \Diamond U$. It then remains to consider the case in which $x_1 = x_2$. Since $C_2 \subseteq C_1$ and $C_1 \not\trianglelefteq C_2$, there is $y \in C_1 \setminus C_2$ such that $\Downarrow y \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then $x_2 \in \Uparrow y \cap C_2$ because $y \in C_1$ and x_2 coincides with the greatest element of C_1 . Thus, $\Downarrow y \cap C_2$ and $\Uparrow y \cap C_2$ are nonempty closed chains in X . Let z_1 and z_2 be the greatest and least elements of $\Downarrow y \cap C_2$ and $\Uparrow y \cap C_2$, respectively. Since $y \notin C_2$, we have $y \not\trianglelefteq z_1$ and $z_2 \not\trianglelefteq y$. Thus, there is a clopen downset D such that $z_1 \in D$ and $y \notin D$ and there is a clopen upset U such that $z_2 \in U$ and $y \notin U$. Then $C_1 \notin \Box(U \cup D) \cap \Diamond D$ because $y \in C_1$ and $y \notin U \cup D$. Since C_2 is a chain and z_1, z_2 are the greatest and least elements of $\Downarrow y \cap C_2$ and $\Uparrow y \cap C_2$, we have that $C_2 \subseteq (\Uparrow y \cap C_2) \cup (\Downarrow y \cap C_2) \subseteq \Uparrow z_2 \cup \Downarrow z_1$. So, $C_2 \in \Box(U \cup D) \cap \Diamond D$ because $C_2 \subseteq \Uparrow z_2 \cup \Downarrow z_1 \subseteq U \cup D$ and $z_1 \in C_2 \cap D$. By Lemma 3.10(7), $\mathcal{U} := \text{CC}(X) \setminus (\Box(U \cup D) \cap \Diamond D)$ is a clopen upset of $\text{CC}(X)$ such that $C_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ and $C_2 \notin \mathcal{U}$. We have proved that $\text{CC}(X)$ is a Priestley space

To prove that $\text{CC}(X)$ is an Esakia space, we need to show that the downset of any clopen subset of $\text{CC}(X)$ is clopen. By Lemma 3.4(5), any clopen of $\text{CC}(X)$ can be written as a finite union of clopens of the form $\Box V \cap \Diamond W_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Diamond W_n$ with V, W_1, \dots, W_n clopen subsets of X . Since taking the downset commutes with unions, it is enough to show that $\Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond W_1 \cap \cdots \cap \Diamond W_n)$ is clopen for every V, W_1, \dots, W_n clopens of X . Lemma 3.10(3) implies that it is sufficient to show that $\Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond W)$ is clopen for any V, W clopens of X . By Lemma 3.11, if V and W are clopens, then the clopen $V \cap W$ can be written as

$$V \cap W = (U_1 \cap D_1) \cup \cdots \cup (U_m \cap D_m), \quad (1)$$

where U_i and D_i are a clopen upset and a clopen downset of X for each i . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Box V \cap \Diamond W &= \Box V \cap \Diamond(V \cap W) = \Box V \cap \Diamond((U_1 \cap D_1) \cup \cdots \cup (U_m \cap D_m)) \\ &= \Box V \cap (\Diamond(U_1 \cap D_1) \cup \cdots \cup \Diamond(U_m \cap D_m)) \\ &= (\Box V \cap \Diamond(U_1 \cap D_1)) \cup \cdots \cup (\Box V \cap \Diamond(U_m \cap D_m)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $\Box A \cap \Diamond B = \Box A \cap \Diamond(A \cap B)$ for every $A, B \subseteq X$, the second from Equation (1), the third from Lemma 3.4(1), and the fourth is straightforward.

Therefore,

$$\Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond W) = \Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond(U_1 \cap D_1)) \cup \cdots \cup \Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond(U_m \cap D_m)),$$

Since $U_i \cap D_i \subseteq V$ for every i , Lemma 3.10(6) yields that

$$\Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond(U_i \cap D_i)) = \Box(V \cup D_i) \cap \Diamond(U_i \cap D_i),$$

which is a clopen subset of $\text{CC}(X)$. Thus, $\Downarrow(\Box V \cap \Diamond W)$ is clopen. We have shown that the downset of any clopen of $\text{CC}(X)$ is clopen, and hence that $\text{CC}(X)$ is an Esakia space. \square

We have seen that $\text{CC}(X)$ is an Esakia root system. Our next goal is to prove that its dual Gödel algebra $\text{CC}(X)^*$ is free over the distributive lattice X^* . This we achieve by showing that $\text{CC}(X)$ satisfies the universal property dual to the universal property of free Gödel algebras. Let $m: \text{CC}(X) \rightarrow X$ be the map that sends each $C \in \text{CC}(X)$ to its least element, which exists by Proposition 3.6.

Lemma 3.13.

- (1) If $U \subseteq X$ is an upset, then $m^{-1}[U] = \Box U$.
- (2) If $D \subseteq X$ is a downset, then $m^{-1}[D] = \Diamond D$.

Proof. (1). Let U be an upset of X and $C \in \text{CC}(X)$. Since $C \subseteq \uparrow m(C)$, we have that $m(C) \in U$ iff $C \subseteq U$. Thus, $m^{-1}[U] = \Box U$.

(2). Let D be a downset of X and $C \in \text{CC}(X)$. Since $m(C) \in \downarrow x$ for every $x \in C$, we have that $m(C) \in D$ iff $C \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $m^{-1}[D] = \Diamond D$. \square

Lemma 3.14. *The map $m: \text{CC}(X) \rightarrow X$ is continuous and order preserving.*

Proof. We first show that m is continuous. Since X is a Stone space, it is enough to prove that $m^{-1}[V]$ is clopen for each clopen subset V of X . Since m^{-1} commutes with unions and intersections, Lemma 3.11 implies that it is sufficient to show that $m^{-1}[U]$ and $m^{-1}[D]$ is clopen in $\text{CC}(X)$ for each U clopen upset and D clopen downset of X . By Lemma 3.13, if U is a clopen upset and D a clopen downset, then $m^{-1}[U] = \Box U$ and $m^{-1}[D] = \Diamond D$, which are clopen in $\text{CC}(X)$. Thus, m is continuous.

It remains to show that m is order preserving. Let $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(X)$ with $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$. Then there is $x \in C_1$ such that $C_2 = \uparrow x \cap C_1$. Thus, $m(C_2) = x \in C_1$, and hence $m(C_1) \leq m(C_2)$. Therefore, m is order preserving. \square

Since every continuous map between Stone spaces is a closed map and the image of a chain under an order-preserving map is a chain, the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 3.15. *If $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is a continuous order-preserving map between Priestley spaces and $C \in \text{CC}(X_1)$, then $f[C] \in \text{CC}(X_2)$.*

We are finally ready to prove the universal property of $\text{CC}(X)$.

Theorem 3.16. *Let Y be an Esakia root system and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ an order-preserving continuous map. Then there is a unique continuous p -morphism $g: Y \rightarrow \text{CC}(X)$ such that $m \circ g = f$.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{CC}(X) & \xleftarrow{\exists! g} & Y \\ \downarrow m & \swarrow f & \\ X & & \end{array}$$

Proof. Define $g: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ by mapping $y \in Y$ to $f[\uparrow y]$. Since Y is an Esakia root system, $\uparrow y$ is a closed chain in Y for every $y \in Y$. By Lemma 3.15, $f[\uparrow y] \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ because f is continuous and order preserving. So, g is well defined.

We show that g is continuous. By Lemma 3.4(5), the clopen subsets of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ of the form $\square V$ and $\diamond V$, with V clopen in X , form a subbasis for the topology on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. So, it is sufficient to show that $g^{-1}[\square V]$ and $g^{-1}[\diamond V]$ is clopen for every clopen subset V of X . The definitions of g and $\diamond V$ imply that for every $y \in Y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} y \in g^{-1}[\diamond V] &\iff g(y) \in \diamond V \iff f[\uparrow y] \in \diamond V \iff f[\uparrow y] \cap V \neq \emptyset \\ &\iff \uparrow y \cap f^{-1}[V] \neq \emptyset \iff y \in \downarrow f^{-1}[V]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$g^{-1}[\diamond V] = \downarrow f^{-1}[V]. \quad (2)$$

The continuity of f yields that $f^{-1}[V]$ is clopen, and hence $g^{-1}[\diamond V] = \downarrow f^{-1}[V]$ is clopen because Y is an Esakia space. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}[\square V] &= g^{-1}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \setminus \diamond(X \setminus V)] = Y \setminus g^{-1}[\diamond(X \setminus V)] \\ &= Y \setminus \downarrow f^{-1}[X \setminus V] = Y \setminus \downarrow(Y \setminus f^{-1}[V]), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 3.4(2), the third from Equation (2), and the remaining are consequences of the fact that preimages commute with complements. Since V is clopen, f is continuous, and Y is an Esakia space, we obtain that $g^{-1}[\square V]$ is clopen. This shows that g is continuous.

To show that g is a p-morphism, we first need to prove that

$$f[\uparrow y_2] = \uparrow f(y_2) \cap f[\uparrow y_1], \text{ for every } y_1, y_2 \in Y \text{ with } y_1 \leq y_2. \quad (3)$$

From $y_1 \leq y_2$ it follows that $\uparrow y_2 \subseteq \uparrow y_1$, and so $f[\uparrow y_2] \subseteq \uparrow f(y_2) \cap f[\uparrow y_1]$ because f is order preserving. If $x \in \uparrow f(y_2) \cap f[\uparrow y_1]$, then $f(y_2) \leq x$ and there is $y_3 \in \uparrow y_1$ such that $f(y_3) = x$. Since $\uparrow y_1$ is a chain and $y_2, y_3 \in \uparrow y_1$, we have $y_2 \leq y_3$ or $y_3 \leq y_2$. If $y_2 \leq y_3$, then $y_3 \in \uparrow y_2$, and so $x = f(y_3) \in f[\uparrow y_2]$. If $y_3 \leq y_2$, then $x = f(y_3) \leq f(y_2) \leq x$, and hence $x = f(y_2) \in f[\uparrow y_2]$. In either case, $x \in f[\uparrow y_2]$. Thus, Equation (3) holds. It immediately follows that $y_1 \leq y_2$ implies $f[\uparrow y_1] \trianglelefteq f[\uparrow y_2]$, and hence $g(y_1) \trianglelefteq g(y_2)$. Therefore, g is order preserving. Let $y \in Y$ and $C \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ such that $g(y) \trianglelefteq C$. Then $C = \uparrow x \cap g(y)$ for some $x \in g(y) = f[\uparrow y]$. Thus, $x = f(z)$ with $y \leq z$, and so $C = \uparrow f(z) \cap f[\uparrow y]$. By Equation (3), $C = f[\uparrow z] = g(z)$. This shows that g is a p-morphism.

Since f is order preserving, $mg(y) = m(f[\uparrow y]) = f(y)$ for every $y \in Y$. Thus, $m \circ g = f$. It remains to show the uniqueness of g . Let $h: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ be a continuous p-morphism such that $m \circ h = f$. We show that $h(y) = g(y)$ for every $y \in Y$. By the definition of m , we have that $h(y)$ is a closed chain in X whose last element is $f(y)$. To prove $h(y) \subseteq g(y)$, consider $x \in h(y)$ and let $C = \uparrow x \cap h(y) \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Then $h(y) \trianglelefteq C$. Since h is a p-morphism, there is $z \in \uparrow y$ such that $C = h(z)$. Therefore, $x = m(C) = mh(z) = f(z)$, and so $x \in f[\uparrow y] = g(y)$. Thus, $h(y) \subseteq g(y)$. To show that $g(y) \subseteq h(y)$, let $x \in g(y)$. By definition of g , we have $x \in f[\uparrow y]$, and so $x = f(z)$ with $y \leq z$. Since h is order preserving, $h(y) \trianglelefteq h(z)$, which implies $h(z) \subseteq h(y)$. From $f = m \circ h$ it follows that $x = f(z) = mh(z)$. Thus, x is the least element of $h(z)$, and hence $x \in h(z) \subseteq h(y)$. Thus, $g(y) \subseteq h(y)$. We have shown that $g = h$. Therefore, g is the unique continuous p-morphism such that $m \circ g = f$. \square

Example 3.17. Let $X = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be equipped with the topology generated by the subbasis $\{\{n\}, X \setminus \{n\} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then X is the one-point compactification of \mathbb{N} with the discrete topology,

and X becomes a Priestley space once ordered as follows: $x_1 \leq x_2$ iff $x_1 = x_2$ or $x_1 = \infty$. Figure 1 depicts X and $\text{CC}(X)$. All the points of $\text{CC}(X)$ are isolated except for $\{\infty\}$ and the topology on $\text{CC}(X)$ is the one-point compactification of $\text{CC}(X) \setminus \{\infty\}$. Note that the map $m: \text{CC}(X) \rightarrow X$ sends $\{x\}$ to x for every $x \in X$ and sends $\{\infty, n\}$ to ∞ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.




FIGURE 1. The Priestley space X and the Esakia root system $\text{CC}(X)$.

Remark 3.18. A straightforward argument using Theorem 3.16 shows that each Pries-morphism $f: X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ yields an ERS-morphism $\text{CC}(f): \text{CC}(X_1) \rightarrow \text{CC}(X_2)$ mapping $C \in \text{CC}(X_1)$ to $f[C] \in \text{CC}(X_2)$. It is immediate to verify that $\text{CC}: \text{Pries} \rightarrow \text{ERS}$ is a functor, and [ML71, Thm. IV.1.2] implies that CC is right adjoint to the inclusion $\text{ERS} \hookrightarrow \text{Pries}$.

We are now ready to state the main result of the section, which provides a concrete dual description of the Gödel algebra free over a given distributive lattice. In a nutshell, the following theorem states that if L is a distributive lattice dual to a Priestley space X , then $\text{CC}(X)$ is the Esakia root system dual to the Gödel algebra free over L . Recall that if L is a distributive lattice and $X = L_*$ its dual Priestley space, then $\sigma_L: L \rightarrow X^*$ is the isomorphism that sends $a \in L$ to $\{P \in X \mid a \in P\} \in X^*$. In particular, $\sigma_L(a)$ is a clopen upset of X for every $a \in L$.

Theorem 3.19. *Let L be a distributive lattice and $X = L_*$ its dual Priestley space. The Gödel algebra $\text{CC}(X)^*$ is free over L via the map $e: L \rightarrow \text{CC}(X)^*$ given by $e(a) = \square_{\sigma_L(a)}$.*

Proof. As we recalled in Section 2, $(-)^*: \text{Pries} \rightarrow \text{DL}$ is a dual equivalence that restricts to a dual equivalence between ERS and HA. It then follows from Theorem 3.16 that for every $H \in \text{GA}$ and lattice homomorphism $f: X^* \rightarrow H$ there is a unique Heyting homomorphism $g: \text{CC}(X)^* \rightarrow H$ such that $g \circ m^* = f$. Therefore, the Gödel algebra $\text{CC}(X)^*$ is free over the distributive lattice X^* via the map $m^*: X^* \rightarrow \text{CC}(X)^*$. Since $\sigma_L: L \rightarrow X^*$ is a lattice isomorphism, it is straightforward to verify that $\text{CC}(X)^*$ is free over L via the map $m^* \circ \sigma_L$. It remains to observe that $m^* \circ \sigma_L = e$. Since $\sigma_L(a)$ is a clopen upset of X and m^* is the inverse image under m , Lemma 3.13(1) yields that $m^*(\sigma_L(a)) = m^{-1}[\sigma_L(a)] = \square_{\sigma_L(a)} = e(a)$. \square

Theorem 3.19 directly generalizes the dual description of Gödel algebras free over finite distributive lattices due to Aguzzoli, Gerla, and Marra by removing any restriction on the cardinality of the distributive lattices. Indeed, when L is a finite distributive lattice, the statement of Theorem 3.19 essentially coincides with [AGM08, Thm. I]. In their setting, both X and $\text{CC}(X)$ are finite, so the topology does not play any role in their considerations, while it is fundamental when we deal with the infinite case.

We end the section with a dual description of free Gödel algebras. Recall that a Gödel algebra G is said to be free over a set S via a function $q: S \rightarrow G$ if for every Gödel algebra H and function

$f: G \rightarrow H$ there is a unique Heyting homomorphism $g: G \rightarrow H$ such that $g \circ q = f$. A free distributive lattice over a set S is defined similarly. We will exploit the fact that the Gödel algebra free over a set S is isomorphic to the Gödel algebra free over the distributive lattice that is free over S . For this reason, we first recall the description of the Priestley spaces dual to free distributive lattices.

Definition 3.20. We denote by $\mathbf{2}$ the Priestley space consisting of the 2-element chain $\{0 < 1\}$ with the discrete topology. For a set S , let 2^S denote the set of all S -indexed sequences $(a_i)_{i \in S}$ of elements of $\mathbf{2}$. Then 2^S becomes a Priestley space once equipped with the product topology and componentwise order; i.e., $(a_i)_{i \in S} \leq (b_i)_{i \in S}$ iff $a_i \leq b_i$ for every $i \in S$.

Let $q: S \rightarrow (2^S)^*$ be the map sending each $s \in S$ to the clopen upset $U_s := \{(a_i)_{i \in S} \mid a_s = 1\}$ of 2^S . The following fact is well known (see, e.g., [GvG24, Prop. 4.8]).

Proposition 3.21. *Let S be a set. Then the distributive lattice $(2^S)^*$ is free over S via the map $q: S \rightarrow (2^S)^*$.*

The following theorem provides a dual description of free Gödel algebras and states that the Gödel algebra free over a set S is dual to the Esakia root system $\mathbf{CC}(2^S)$.

Theorem 3.22. *Let S be a set. Then the Gödel algebra $\mathbf{CC}(2^S)^*$ is free over S via the map $r: S \rightarrow \mathbf{CC}(2^S)^*$ given by $r(s) = \square U_s$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.21, the distributive lattice $(2^S)^*$ is free over S via the map q . Let $X = ((2^S)^*)^*$ be the double dual of 2^S . Then it is straightforward to verify that the Gödel algebra $\mathbf{CC}(X)^*$ is free over S via the map $e \circ q$, where $q: S \rightarrow (2^S)^*$ and $e: (2^S)^* \rightarrow \mathbf{CC}(X)^*$ are the maps appearing in Proposition 3.21 and Theorem 3.19. To show that $\mathbf{CC}(2^S)^*$ is free over S via r , it is then sufficient to exhibit an isomorphism of Gödel algebras $\varphi: \mathbf{CC}(X)^* \rightarrow \mathbf{CC}(2^S)^*$ such that $\varphi \circ (e \circ q) = r$. Let $\varepsilon: 2^S \rightarrow X$ be the isomorphism of Priestley spaces described in Section 2, where we omitted the subscript 2^S from ε for ease of readability. Define φ to be $\mathbf{CC}(\varepsilon)^*$. Since ε is an isomorphism in Pries, and \mathbf{CC} and $(-)^*$ are functors, it follows that φ is an isomorphism in ERS. It then remains to show that $\varphi \circ (e \circ q) = r$. The definitions of e and q imply that $e q(s) = \square \sigma q(s) = \square \sigma(U_s)$ for every $s \in S$, where we omitted the subscript $(2^S)^*$ from the isomorphism $\sigma_{(2^S)^*}: (2^S)^* \rightarrow X^*$. If $s \in S$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(e q(s)) &= \varphi(\square \sigma q(s)) = \mathbf{CC}(\varepsilon)^{-1}(\square \sigma q(s)) = \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(2^S) \mid \varepsilon[C] \in \square \sigma q(s)\} \\ &= \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(2^S) \mid \varepsilon[C] \subseteq \sigma q(s)\} = \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(2^S) \mid C \subseteq \varepsilon^{-1}[\sigma q(s)]\} \\ &= \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(2^S) \mid C \subseteq \varepsilon^* \sigma q(s)\} = \{C \in \mathbf{CC}(2^S) \mid C \subseteq q(s)\} \\ &= \square q(s) = r(s). \end{aligned}$$

In the above display, the first three, the sixth, and the last equalities follow from the definitions of e , φ , $\mathbf{CC}(\varepsilon)$, ε^* , and r , respectively. The fourth and the eighth equalities are a consequence of the definition of $\square A$ for a subset A of a Priestley space. The fifth equality is straightforward, and the seventh is an instance of the triangle identity $\varepsilon^* \circ \sigma = \text{id}_{(2^S)^*}$, where $\text{id}_{(2^S)^*}$ is the identity on $(2^S)^*$ (see, e.g., [ML71, Thm. IV.1.1(ii)]). Therefore, $\varphi \circ (e \circ q) = r$, and this concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.23. Let L be a distributive lattice. In general, it is extremely difficult to provide a tangible description of the Esakia dual H_* of the Heyting algebra H free over L . Our results allow to better understand a part of H_* . Indeed, since \mathbf{GA} is a subvariety of \mathbf{HA} , the Gödel algebra G free over L is isomorphic to a quotient of H . This dually correspond to the fact that the Esakia

root system G_* is isomorphic to the closed upset of H_* given by $\{y \in H_* \mid \uparrow y \text{ is a chain}\}$. It then follows from Theorem 3.19 that such closed upset of H_* is an Esakia root system isomorphic to $\text{CC}(L_*)$. Moreover, if H is the Heyting algebra free over a set S , then it follows from Theorem 3.22 that $\{y \in H_* \mid \uparrow y \text{ is a chain}\}$ is an Esakia root system isomorphic to $\text{CC}(2^S)$.

We end the section with the analogues of Theorems 3.19 and 3.22, which provide a dual description of free algebras in GA_n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 3.24. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\text{CC}_n(X)$ the subset of $\text{CC}(X)$ consisting of all the points of $\text{CC}(X)$ of depth less or equal to n . By Theorem 2.9, $\text{CC}_n(X)$ is an Esakia root system of depth less or equal to n with the order and topology induced by $\text{CC}(X)$.

The following proposition states that the elements of $\text{CC}_n(X)$ are exactly all nonempty chains of X of size (i.e., cardinality) at most n .

Proposition 3.25. *Let C be a nonempty subset of X . Then $C \in \text{CC}_n(X)$ iff C is a chain of size less or equal to n .*

Proof. Note that, since every finite subset of a Stone space is closed, every finite chain of X is closed in X . The definition of \triangleleft on $\text{CC}(X)$ yields that $\uparrow C = \{\uparrow x \cap C \mid x \in C\}$, which is a set in bijection with C . Thus, C has depth n iff it has size n . \square

The following theorems show that if L is a distributive lattice dual to $X = L_*$ and S is a set, then $\text{CC}_n(X)$ and $\text{CC}_n(2^S)$ are the GA_n -algebras free over L and S . Their proof is a straightforward adaptation of the proofs of Theorems 3.19 and 3.22.

Theorem 3.26. *Let L be a distributive lattice and $X = L_*$. The GA_n -algebra $\text{CC}_n(X)^*$ is free over L via the map $e_n: L \rightarrow \text{CC}_n(X)^*$ given by $e_n(a) = \square_{\sigma_L}(a) \cap \text{CC}_n(X)$.*

Theorem 3.27. *Let S be a set. Then the GA_n -algebra $\text{CC}_n(2^S)^*$ is free over S via the map $r_n: S \rightarrow \text{CC}_n(2^S)^*$ given by $r_n(s) = \square_{U_s} \cap \text{CC}_n(2^S)$.*

4. COPRODUCTS OF GÖDEL ALGEBRAS

In [DM06] the authors describe a procedure to compute the duals of binary coproducts of finite Gödel algebras. In this section we utilize the machinery developed in Section 3 to provide a dual description of arbitrary coproducts of Gödel algebras without any restriction on the number of factors nor on the cardinality of the factors. Our first goal is then to study products in the category ERS of Esakia root systems. Products in the category of Esakia spaces are notoriously complicated. We show that products in ERS can be easily described in terms of collections of closed chains in the cartesian product of the factors.

We first recall the description of products in the category of Priestley spaces. Let $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of Priestley spaces and denote by $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ their cartesian product equipped with the product topology and the product order. To simplify the notation, we will denote the product by $\prod_i X_i$ when the set I of indexes is clear from the context. For each $i \in I$, we denote by $\pi_i: \prod_i X_i \rightarrow X_i$ the projection onto X_i . The following proposition is well known and is an immediate consequence of the fact that products in the categories of topological spaces and posets coincide with cartesian products.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of Priestley spaces. Then $\prod_i X_i$ together with the maps $\pi_i: \prod_i X_i \rightarrow X_i$ is the product of $\{X_i \mid i \in I\}$ in Pries .*

We now introduce the main construction of this section. Our first goal is to show that it gives the products in the category of Esakia root systems.

Definition 4.2. Let $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of Esakia root systems. We define

$$\bigotimes_{i \in I} Y_i := \{C \in \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i) \mid \pi_i[C] \text{ is an upset of } Y_i \text{ for every } i \in I\}$$

and equip it with the subspace topology and order induced by $\text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$.

Remark 4.3. If $C \in \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$, then $\pi_i[C]$ is an upset of Y_i iff it is a principal upset. Indeed, C has a least element $m(C)$ by Proposition 3.6, and so $\pi_i(m(C))$ is the least element of $\pi_i[C]$ because π_i is an order preserving map. Therefore, if $\pi_i[C]$ is an upset, then $\pi_i[C] = \uparrow \pi_i(m(C))$.

Example 4.4. Let $2 = \{0 < 1\}$ be the 2-element chain with the discrete topology. Consider $C_1, C_2 \in \text{CC}(2 \times 2)$ defined as follows

$$C_1 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 = \{(0, 0), (0, 1)\}.$$

The white dots in Figure 2 represent C_1 with its projections $\pi_1[C_1], \pi_2[C_1] \in \text{CC}(2)$ on the left and C_2 with its projections $\pi_1[C_2], \pi_2[C_2] \in \text{CC}(2)$ on the right. Since both $\pi_1[C_1] = \{1\}$ and $\pi_2[C_1] = \{0, 1\}$ are upsets of 2, we have that $C_1 \in 2 \otimes 2$. However, $C_2 \notin 2 \otimes 2$ because $\pi_1[C_2] = \{0\}$ is not an upset of 2.




FIGURE 2. The chains C_1 and C_2 of 2×2 and their projections.

We will show that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is the product of $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ in the category ERS. We begin by proving that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is an Esakia root system, but we first need to recall the following technical fact.

Lemma 4.5. [Pri84, Prop. 2.6(iv)] *Let $A, B \subseteq X$ be closed subsets of a Priestley space such that $\uparrow A \cap \downarrow B = \emptyset$. Then there is a clopen upset U and a clopen downset D such that $U \cap D = \emptyset$, $A \subseteq U$, and $B \subseteq D$.*

Theorem 4.6. $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is an Esakia root system.

Proof. Since $\prod_i Y_i$ is a Priestley space, Theorem 3.12 yields that $\text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ is an Esakia root system. Since closed upsets of Esakia spaces equipped with the subspace topology and the restriction of the order are Esakia spaces (see, e.g., [Esa19, Lem. 3.4.11]), it is sufficient to show that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is a closed upset of $\text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$.

To prove that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is an upset of $\text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$, let $C_1 \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ and $C_2 \in \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ such that $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$. We show that $C_2 \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$, which means that $\uparrow \pi_i[C_2] = \pi_i[C_2]$ for every $i \in I$. Let $i \in I$ and $y \in \uparrow \pi_i[C_2]$. Since $C_2 \subseteq C_1$ and $\pi_i[C_1]$ an upset of Y_i , we obtain that $y \in \uparrow \pi_i[C_2] \subseteq \uparrow \pi_i[C_1] = \pi_i[C_1]$. So, there is $x \in C_1$ such that $\pi_i(x) = y$. Let $m(C_2)$ be the least element of C_2 . Since $x, m(C_2) \in C_1$ and C_1 is a chain, we have that $x \leq m(C_2)$ or $m(C_2) \leq x$. If $x \leq m(C_2)$, then

$y = \pi_i(x) \leq \pi_i(m(C_2))$. Then $\pi_i(m(C_2)) \leq y$ because $y \in \uparrow\pi_i[C_2]$ and π_i is order preserving. So, $y = \pi_i(m(C_2)) \in \pi_i[C_2]$. If $m(C_2) \leq x$, then $x \in C_2$ because $C_1 \trianglelefteq C_2$. Thus, $y = \pi_i(x) \in \pi_i[C_2]$. In either case, $y \in \pi_i[C_2]$. This shows that $\pi_i[C_2]$ is an upset of Y_i , and hence $C_2 \in \mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$.

It remains to show that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$. Let $C \in \mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ be such that $C \notin \bigotimes_i Y_i$. We show that C is contained in an open subset of $\mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ disjoint from $\bigotimes_i Y_i$. Since $C \notin \bigotimes_i Y_i$, there is $i \in I$ such that $\pi_i[C]$ is not an upset of Y_i . Then $\pi_i[C] \neq \uparrow\pi_i[C]$. Because $\pi_i[C] \neq \uparrow\pi_i[C]$, there is $x \in \uparrow\pi_i[C]$ that is not in $\pi_i[C]$. From $x \notin \pi_i[C]$ it follows that $\uparrow x \cap (\downarrow x \cap \pi[C]) = \emptyset$ and $\downarrow x \cap (\uparrow x \cap \pi[C]) = \emptyset$. Since $\downarrow x \cap \pi[C]$ and $\uparrow x \cap \pi[C]$ are closed subsets of Y_i , two applications of Lemma 4.5 yield a clopen upset U disjoint from $\downarrow x \cap \pi[C]$ such that $x \in U$ and a clopen downset D disjoint from $\uparrow x \cap \pi_i[C]$ such that $x \in D$. Then

$$\downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C] \subseteq \downarrow(U \cap D), \quad \downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C] \subseteq Y_i \setminus (U \cap D), \quad \text{and} \quad \uparrow x \cap \pi_i[C] \subseteq U \setminus D, \quad (4)$$

where the first inclusion holds because $x \in U \cap D$, the second because $\downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C] \subseteq Y_i \setminus U$, and the third follows from $x \in U$ and $\uparrow x \cap \pi_i[C] \subseteq Y_i \setminus D$. Since $\uparrow\pi_i[C] \subseteq \uparrow\pi_i(m(C))$ and Y_i is a root system, we have that $\uparrow\pi_i[C]$ is a chain. It then follows from $x \in \uparrow\pi_i[C]$ and $\pi_i[C] \subseteq \uparrow\pi_i[C]$ that $\pi_i[C] = (\downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C]) \cup (\uparrow x \cap \pi_i[C])$. The inclusions in (4) imply that

$$\pi_i[C] = (\downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C]) \cup (\uparrow x \cap \pi_i[C]) \subseteq (\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)) \cup (U \setminus D). \quad (5)$$

Since $x \in \uparrow\pi_i[C]$, we have that $\pi_i(m(C)) \leq x$, and hence $\pi_i(m(C)) \in \downarrow x \cap \pi_i[C]$. It then follows from the inclusions in (4) that $\pi_i(m(C)) \in \downarrow(U \cap D)$ and $\pi_i(m(C)) \notin U \cap D$. Thus,

$$\pi_i[C] \cap (\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)) \neq \emptyset. \quad (6)$$

Then (5) and (6) imply

$$C \in \mathcal{U} := \square\pi_i^{-1}[(\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)) \cup (U \setminus D)] \cap \diamond\pi_i^{-1}[\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)].$$

We show that \mathcal{U} is a clopen of $\mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ disjoint from $\bigotimes_i Y_i$. Since Y_i is an Esakia space, U and D are clopen, and π_i is continuous, we have that \mathcal{U} is clopen. To prove that each $K \in \mathcal{U}$ is not in $\bigotimes_i Y_i$, assume that $K \in \mathcal{U} \cap \bigotimes_i Y_i$. Then $K \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \diamond\pi_i^{-1}[\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)]$, and hence there is $y \in K$ such that $\pi_i(y) \in \downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)$. This implies that there is $z \in Y_i$ such that

$$z \in \uparrow\pi_i(y) \cap U \cap D \subseteq \uparrow\pi_i(m(K)) \cap U \cap D \subseteq \pi_i[K] \cap U \cap D,$$

where $\uparrow\pi_i(m(K)) \subseteq \uparrow\pi_i[K] = \pi_i[K]$ because $K \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$. However,

$$K \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \square\pi_i^{-1}[(\downarrow(U \cap D) \setminus (U \cap D)) \cup (U \setminus D)] \subseteq \square\pi_i^{-1}[Y_i \setminus (U \cap D)],$$

and so $\pi_i[K] \subseteq Y_i \setminus (U \cap D)$. This contradicts the existence of $z \in \pi_i[K] \cap U \cap D$. Therefore, \mathcal{U} is a clopen subset of $\mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ containing C that is disjoint from $\bigotimes_i Y_i$. This shows that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is closed in $\mathbb{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$, and concludes the proof that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is an Esakia root system. \square

We are now ready to show that $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is the product in ERS of the family $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$. For each $i \in I$, we let $p_i: \bigotimes_i Y_i \rightarrow Y_i$ be the map that sends $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ to $\pi_i(m(C)) \in Y_i$, where $m(C)$ is the least element of C .

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of Esakia root systems. Then $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ together with the maps $p_i: \bigotimes_i Y_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is the product of $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ in ERS.*

Proof. We first show that $p_i: \bigotimes_i Y_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is a continuous p-morphism for every $i \in I$. We have that $p_i = \pi_i \circ m$, and so it is a continuous map because every projection π_i is continuous and m is continuous by Lemma 3.14. We show that p_i is a p-morphism. Both π_i and m are order preserving, so p_i is also order preserving. Let $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ and $y \in Y_i$ such that $p_i(C) \leq y$. Then

$\pi_i(m(C)) \leq y$, and hence $y \in \uparrow\pi_i(m(C)) \subseteq \uparrow\pi_i[C]$. Since $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$, we have that $\uparrow\pi_i[C] = \pi_i[C]$. Thus, $y \in \pi_i[C]$. So, there is $x \in C$ such that $\pi_i(x) = y$. Let $K = C \cap \uparrow x$. Then $C \trianglelefteq K$, and hence $K \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ because $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ is an upset in $\text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ as shown in the proof of Theorem 4.6. Therefore, $y = \pi_i(x) = \pi_i(m(K)) = p_i(K)$. This shows that p_i is a p-morphism.

It remains to verify the universal property of products. Let Z be an Esakia root system and $f_i: Z \rightarrow Y_i$ a continuous p-morphism for each $i \in I$. By Proposition 4.1, there is a map $q: Z \rightarrow \prod_i Y_i$ sending $z \in Z$ to $(f_i(z))_{i \in I}$ that is continuous and order preserving. Thus, Theorem 3.16 yields a continuous p-morphism $g: Z \rightarrow \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ given by $g(z) = q[\uparrow z] = \{(f_i(w))_{i \in I} \mid w \in \uparrow z\}$ for every $z \in Z$. Since each f_i is a p-morphism, we have that $f_i[\uparrow z]$ is an upset of Y_i for every $z \in Z$. So, $\uparrow\pi_i[g(z)] = \uparrow f_i[\uparrow z] = f_i[\uparrow z] = \pi_i[g(z)]$. Therefore, $g(z) \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$, and hence g restricts to a continuous p-morphism $g: Z \rightarrow \bigotimes_i Y_i$. Moreover, $p_i g(z) = \pi_i m g(z) = \pi_i((f_i(z))_{i \in I}) = f_i(z)$ for every $z \in Z$. Thus, $p_i \circ g = f_i$ for each $i \in I$. We now show that g is the unique map with such properties. Suppose that $h: Z \rightarrow \bigotimes_i Y_i$ is a continuous p-morphism such that $p_i \circ h = f_i$ for every $i \in I$. Then $h: Z \rightarrow \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ is a continuous p-morphism and $\pi_i m(h(z)) = p_i(h(z)) = f_i(z)$ for every $i \in I$. Thus, $m(h(z)) = (f_i(z))_{i \in I} = m(g(z))$. Then $h: Z \rightarrow \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$ is a continuous p-morphism such that $m \circ h = m \circ g$. It follows from Theorem 3.16 that $h = g$. \square

We are now ready to describe the Esakia duals of coproducts of Gödel algebras.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of Gödel algebras and $Y_i = (G_i)_*$ their Esakia duals. Then the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in GA is given by $(\bigotimes_i Y_i)^*$ together with the maps sending $a \in G_i$ to $\square\pi_i^{-1}[\sigma_{G_i}(a)] \in (\bigotimes_i Y_i)^*$ for each $i \in I$.*

Proof. Since $(-)^*: \text{ERS} \rightarrow \text{GA}$ is a dual equivalence of categories, it sends products into coproducts. Thus, Theorem 4.7 yields that $(\bigotimes_i Y_i)^*$ together with the maps p_i^* for each $i \in I$ is the coproduct of $\{Y_i^* \mid i \in I\}$ in GA . Since $\sigma_{G_i}: G_i \rightarrow Y_i^*$ is an isomorphism of Gödel algebras for each $i \in I$, it is straightforward to verify that $(\bigotimes_i Y_i)^*$ together with the maps $p_i^* \circ \sigma_{G_i}$ is the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in GA . It remains to observe that $p_i^* \circ \sigma_{G_i}$ maps $a \in G_i$ to $\square\pi_i^{-1}[\sigma_{G_i}(a)] \in (\bigotimes_i Y_i)^*$. Since $p_i = \pi_i \circ m$, we obtain that $p_i^*(\sigma_{G_i}(a)) = m^{-1}[\pi_i^{-1}[\sigma_{G_i}(a)]]$. Because $\sigma_{G_i}(a)$ is a clopen upset of Y_i , Lemma 3.13(1) yields that $p_i^*(\sigma_{G_i}(a)) = \square\pi_i^{-1}[\sigma_{G_i}(a)]$. \square

For a Gödel algebra G , let $d(G)$ be the least $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $G \in \text{GA}_n$, and if there is no such $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $d(G) = \infty$. We call $d(G)$ the *depth* of G . It is an immediate consequence of Esakia duality for GA_n that $d(G) = d(G_*)$, where $d(G_*)$ is the depth of the Esakia root system G_* as defined in Section 2. Thanks to the dual description of coproducts we just obtained, we have a way to compute the depth of coproducts of Gödel algebras.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of nontrivial Gödel algebras. Then the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ has depth $1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1)$, where $d(G_i) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the depth of G_i for each $i \in I$.³*

Proof. Let $Y_i = (G_i)_*$ be the Esakia root system dual to G_i . Theorem 4.8 implies that the depth of the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ coincides with the depth of $\bigotimes_i Y_i$. Since $d(G_i) = d(Y_i)$ for every $i \in I$, it is sufficient to show that $d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) = 1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(Y_i) - 1)$. We first prove the following technical fact.

³We mean that the expression $1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1)$ equals ∞ when $J := \{i \in I \mid d(G_i) > 1\}$ is infinite or $d(G_i) = \infty$ for some $i \in I$, and that $1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1) = 1 + \sum_{i \in J} (d(G_i) - 1)$, otherwise.

Claim 4.10. Let $w_i \in \max Y_i$ for every $i \in I$. Let also $i_1, \dots, i_n \in I$ and $z_{i_j} \in Y_{i_j}$ such that $z_{i_j} \leq w_{i_j}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$. Define $C_j \subseteq \prod_i Y_i$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$ as follows

$$(y_i)_{i \in I} \in C_j \iff \begin{cases} y_i = z_i & \text{if } i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, \\ y_i \in \uparrow z_{i_j} & \text{if } i = i_j, \\ y_i = w_i & \text{if } i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_j\}. \end{cases}$$

Then $C := C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$ is a point of depth $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$ in $\bigotimes_i Y_i$, where $d(z_{i_j})$ is the depth of z_{i_j} in Y_{i_j} .

Proof of the Claim. For every j , we have

$$C_j = \bigcap \{ \pi_i^{-1}[z_i] \mid i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\} \} \cap \pi_{i_j}^{-1}[\uparrow z_{i_j}] \cap \bigcap \{ \pi_i^{-1}[w_i] \mid i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_j\} \},$$

and hence C_j is a closed subset of $\prod_i Y_i$ because $\{z_i\}$, $\uparrow z_{i_j}$, and $\{w_i\}$ are all closed and π_i is continuous for every $i \in I$. Since Y_{i_j} is a root system, $\uparrow z_{i_j}$ is a chain, and hence $C_j \in \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$. If $1 \leq j < n$, then the least element of C_j is the greatest element of C_{j+1} . Therefore, $C = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$ is a chain in $\prod_i Y_i$. Since C_1, \dots, C_n are closed in $\prod_i Y_i$, we obtain that $C \in \text{CC}(\prod_i Y_i)$. By the definition of C_1, \dots, C_n , it follows that $\pi_i[C] = \uparrow z_{i_j}$ if $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$, and $\pi_i[C] = \{w_i\}$, otherwise. Therefore, for every $i \in I$ the set $\pi_i[C]$ is an upset of Y_i , and hence $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$. By Proposition 3.25, the depth of C in $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ coincides with its size. If $d(z_{i_j}) = \infty$ for some j , then C is infinite, and so has depth $\infty = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$ in $\bigotimes_i Y_i$. Otherwise, C has size $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$. Indeed, each C_j has size $d(z_{i_j})$ and the least element of C_j coincides with the greatest element of C_{j+1} for every $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. This shows that C is an element of $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ of depth $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$. \square

We first consider the case in which there is $k \in I$ with $d(Y_k) = \infty$. Then there is an element of Y_k of infinite depth or there are elements of Y_k of arbitrary large finite depth. Suppose first that there is $z_k \in Y_k$ such that $d(z_k) = \infty$. Since every G_i is nontrivial, all the Y_i are nonempty. Then $\max Y_i$ and $\max(\uparrow z_k)$ are nonempty by [Pri84, Prop. 2.6]. So, we can pick $w_i \in \max Y_i$ for every $i \in I$ so that $z_k \leq w_k$. By Claim 4.10, there is $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ of infinite depth. Thus, $d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) = \infty$. Suppose now that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $z_k \in Y_k$ such that $d(z_k) \geq n$. By arguing as in the previous case, we obtain that there are elements of $\bigotimes_i Y_i$ of arbitrarily large finite depth, and hence $d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) = \infty$. So, we can assume that $d(Y_i) \neq \infty$ for every $i \in I$. Suppose there are infinitely many $i \in I$ such that $d(Y_i) > 1$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $i_1, \dots, i_n \in I$ and $z_{i_j} \in Y_{i_j}$ such that $d(z_{i_j}) \geq 2$. Claim 4.10 allows us to construct $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ of depth $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1) > n$. It follows that $d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) = \infty$. The last case to consider is when $d(Y_i) \neq \infty$ for every $i \in I$ and $\{i \in I \mid d(Y_i) > 1\}$ is finite. Let $\{i \in I \mid d(Y_i) > 1\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ and $z_{i_j} \in Y_{i_j}$ such that $d(z_{i_j}) = d(Y_{i_j})$. Then Claim 4.10 implies that there is $C \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$ of depth $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$, and hence

$$d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) \geq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1).$$

We now show that $d(\bigotimes_i Y_i) \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1)$. Let $K \in \bigotimes_i Y_i$. We prove that the size of K is smaller or equal to $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1)$. If $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$, then $\pi_i[K] = \{w_i\}$ with $w_i \in \max Y_i$ because $d(Y_i) = 1$. If $j = 1, \dots, n$, let $\pi_{i_j}[K] = \uparrow z_{i_j}$ for some $z_{i_j} \in Y_{i_j}$. Thus, every $\pi_i[K]$ is finite, and it is a singleton for all but finitely many $i \in I$. Then K is a finite chain because $K \subseteq \prod_i \pi_i[K]$. Let $C = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_n$ be the chain constructed as in Claim 4.10 from these w_i 's and z_{i_j} 's. For every $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $(y_i)_{i \in I} \in C_j$, the set $\pi_{i_j}^{-1}[y_{i_j}] \cap K$ is a finite nonempty chain because K is a finite chain and $\pi_{i_j}[K] = \uparrow z_{i_j}$. Let $f: C \rightarrow K$ be the map that sends $(y_i)_{i \in I} \in C_j$ to the

largest element of $\pi_{i_j}^{-1}[y_{i_j}] \cap K$. Since K is finite, for every $\bar{y} = (y_i)_{i \in I} \in K$, there is $j = 1, \dots, n$ such that \bar{y} is the greatest element of K such that $\pi_{i_j}(\bar{y}) = y_{i_j}$. So, \bar{y} is the greatest element of $\pi_{i_j}^{-1}[y_{i_j}] \cap K$. Thus, $f: C \rightarrow K$ is onto. Then the size of K is smaller or equal to the size of C , which is $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(z_{i_j}) - 1)$ by Claim 4.10. Since $d(z_{i_j}) \leq d(Y_{i_j})$ for every j , we obtain that the size of K is smaller or equal to $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1)$ for every $K \in \otimes_i Y_i$. By Proposition 3.25, the size of K coincides with its depth in $\otimes_i Y_i$, so we get $d(\otimes_i Y_i) \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1)$. We assumed that $d(Y_i) \neq \infty$ for every $i \in I$ and that $\{i \in I \mid d(Y_i) > 1\}$ is finite, so $1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (d(Y_{i_j}) - 1) = 1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(Y_i) - 1)$. It follows that $d(\otimes_i Y_i) \leq 1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(Y_i) - 1)$. This concludes the proof that $d(\otimes_i Y_i) = 1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(Y_i) - 1)$. By what we observed at the beginning of the proof, it follows that the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ has depth $1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1)$. \square

We end this section with the dual description of coproducts in \mathbf{GA}_n . If $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a family of Esakia root systems, we denote by $(\otimes_i Y_i)_n$ the set of elements of $\otimes_i Y_i$ of depth less or equal to n equipped with the subspace topology and order induced by $\otimes_i Y_i$. It is straightforward to see that

$$(\otimes_i Y_i)_n = \{C \in \mathbf{CC}_n(\prod_i Y_i) \mid \pi_i[C] \text{ is an upset of } Y_i \text{ for every } i \in I\}.$$

The following theorems are immediate consequences of Corollary 2.10 and Theorems 2.9 and 4.8.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq \mathbf{ERS}_n$. Then the product of $\{Y_i \mid i \in I\}$ in \mathbf{ERS}_n is given by $(\otimes_i Y_i)_n$ together with the maps $p_i: (\otimes_i Y_i)_n \rightarrow Y_i$ sending $C \in (\otimes_i Y_i)_n$ to $\pi_i(m(C)) \in Y_i$.*

Theorem 4.12. *Let $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras and $Y_i = (G_i)_*$ their Esakia duals. Then the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in \mathbf{GA}_n is given by $((\otimes_i Y_i)_n)^*$ together with the maps sending $a \in G_i$ to $\square \pi_i^{-1}[\sigma_{G_i}(a)] \cap (\otimes_i Y_i)_n \in ((\otimes_i Y_i)_n)^*$ for each $i \in I$.*

Since \mathbf{GA}_n is a subvariety of \mathbf{GA} , the inclusion $\mathbf{GA}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbf{GA}$ is a right adjoint (see, e.g., [ML71, Sec. V.6]), and hence all limits coincide in \mathbf{GA}_n and \mathbf{GA} . This is not true for colimits. The following corollary characterizes when coproducts in \mathbf{GA}_n and \mathbf{GA} coincide.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of nontrivial \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras with $n \geq 1$. Then the coproducts of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in \mathbf{GA} and \mathbf{GA}_n are isomorphic iff $\sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1) \leq n - 1$.*

Proof. Let $Y_i = (G_i)_*$ be the Esakia root system dual to G_i for each $i \in I$. By Theorem 4.8, the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in \mathbf{GA} is dual to $\otimes_i Y_i$, while Theorem 4.12 yields that the coproduct of $\{G_i \mid i \in I\}$ in \mathbf{GA}_n is dual to $(\otimes_i Y_i)_n$. Thus, the two coproducts are isomorphic iff $\otimes_i Y_i$ and $(\otimes_i Y_i)_n$ are isomorphic Esakia root systems, which happens exactly when $d(\otimes_i Y_i) \leq n$. Theorem 4.9 yields that $d(\otimes_i Y_i) = 1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1)$. Therefore, the two coproducts coincide when $1 + \sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1) \leq n$, which is equivalent to $\sum_{i \in I} (d(G_i) - 1) \leq n - 1$. \square

5. FREE GÖDEL ALGEBRAS AS BI-HEYTING ALGEBRAS

A distributive lattice is called a *co-Heyting algebra* when its order dual is a Heyting algebra, and a *bi-Heyting algebra* is a Heyting algebra that is also a co-Heyting algebra. It is shown in [Ghi92] that Heyting algebras free over finite distributive lattices are always bi-Heyting algebras. This result implies the surprising fact that all free Heyting algebras with finitely many free generators are bi-Heyting algebras.

In this section we provide a necessary and sufficient condition for Gödel algebras free over distributive lattices to be bi-Heyting algebras, and obtain as a consequence that any free Gödel algebra is a bi-Heyting algebra. We end the section by showing that the situation is very different in the

bounded depth setting, as every free \mathbf{GA}_n -algebra with infinitely many free generators is not a bi-Heyting algebra.

We say that a Priestley space X is a *co-Esakia space* when $\uparrow V$ is clopen for every V clopen subset of X , and that X is a *bi-Esakia space* when it is at the same time an Esakia and a co-Esakia space. Observe that the Priestley space X described in Example 3.17 is a co-Esakia space that is not an Esakia space, while $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ from the same example is a bi-Esakia space. There are analogues of Esakia duality for co-Heyting and bi-Heyting algebras. For our purposes, we only need the following well-known proposition; we sketch its proof due to the lack of a reference.

Proposition 5.1. *Let L be a distributive lattice and $X = L_*$ its dual Priestley space.*

- (1) *L is a co-Heyting algebra iff X is a co-Esakia space.*
- (2) *L is a bi-Heyting algebra iff X is a bi-Esakia space.*

Proof. Let L^∂ be the order dual to L , and X^∂ the Priestley space that is order dual to X and is equipped with the same topology. It is straightforward to check that the Priestley dual of L^∂ is X^∂ , and that X is co-Esakia iff X^∂ is Esakia. By Esakia duality, L^∂ is a Heyting algebra iff X^∂ is an Esakia space, so L is a co-Heyting algebra iff X is a co-Esakia space. It also follows that L is a bi-Heyting algebra iff X is a bi-Esakia space. \square

Our next goal is to show that X is a co-Esakia space iff $\mathbf{CC}(X)$ is a bi-Esakia space. This will provide a necessary and sufficient condition for the Gödel algebra free over a distributive lattice to be a bi-Heyting algebra. In order to accomplish this, we need to introduce an operation that will help us in computing the upsets of clopen subsets of $\mathbf{CC}(X)$.

Definition 5.2. Let X be a poset and $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ a finite collection of subsets of X . We define the subset $\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of X by induction on n . We set

$$\uparrow\emptyset := X$$

and for $n \geq 1$,

$$\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \uparrow(\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i),$$

where $\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_n\}$ denotes the set obtained from $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ by removing A_i .

Since $\uparrow\{A\} = \uparrow A$, the operation \uparrow can be thought of as an extension of the operation \uparrow of taking the upset of a subset of X . We will use \uparrow to compute upsets of clopens in $\mathbf{CC}(X)$. But first, we need to prove some properties of this operation.

Lemma 5.3. *Let X be a poset, $x \in X$, and $A_1, \dots, A_n \subseteq X$.*

- (1) *$x \in \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ iff there is a chain C in X such that $C \subseteq \downarrow x$ and $C \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.*
- (2) *If X is a co-Esakia space and A_1, \dots, A_n are clopen in X , then $\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ is clopen.*

Proof. (1). We prove the claim by induction on n . The case $n = 0$ is clear. We assume that the claim is true for $n - 1$ with $n \geq 1$ and show that it is true for n . We first prove the left-to-right implication. Let $x \in \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$. The definition of $\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ implies that there is $i \leq n$ such that $x \in \uparrow(\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i)$. Then there is $y \leq x$ with $y \in \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A}_i, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a chain K in X such that $K \subseteq \downarrow y$ and $K \cap A_j \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \neq i$. Then $C = K \cup \{y\}$ is a chain such that $C \subseteq \downarrow x$ and $C \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ for every i . To prove the other implication, suppose there is a chain C in X such that $C \subseteq \downarrow x$ and $C \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ for every i .

Choose an element $a_i \in C \cap A_i$ for every i . Since C is a chain, $K := \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a chain such that $K \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ for every i . Let a_j be the greatest element of K . Since $K \subseteq \downarrow a_j$, the induction hypothesis yields that $a_j \in \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_j}, \dots, A_n\}$. Thus, $a_j \in \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_j}, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_j$. It follows that

$$x \in \uparrow(\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_j}, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_j) \subseteq \uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}.$$

(2). We again argue by induction on n . When $n = 0$, the set $\uparrow\emptyset = X$ is clearly clopen. We assume that the claim is true for $n-1$ with $n \geq 1$ and show that it is true for n . By the induction hypothesis, $\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_i}, \dots, A_n\}$ is clopen for every i . Since each A_i is clopen, $\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_i}, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i$ is clopen for every i . Thus, $\uparrow(\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_i}, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i)$ is clopen because it is the upset of a clopen subset and X is a co-Esakia space. So,

$$\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \uparrow(\uparrow\{A_1, \dots, \widehat{A_i}, \dots, A_n\} \cap A_i)$$

is clopen since it is a finite union of clopens. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Let V, W_1, \dots, W_n be subsets of a Priestley space X such that $W_1, \dots, W_n \subseteq V$. Then*

$$\uparrow(\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n) = \bigcup_{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}} \left[\square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}) \cap \bigcap \{\diamond W_j \mid j \in I^c\} \right],$$

where in the right-hand side I ranges over all subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and $I^c := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I$.

Proof. To show the left-to-right inclusion, assume that $C \in \uparrow(\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n)$. Then there is $K \in \mathbb{CC}(X)$ such that $K \trianglelefteq C$, $K \in \square V$, and $K \in \diamond W_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ be such that $i \in I$ iff $C \notin \diamond W_i$. Then $C \in \diamond W_j$ for every $j \in I^c$. Thus, $C \in \bigcap \{\diamond W_j \mid j \in I^c\}$. It remains to show that $C \in \square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\})$. By Lemma 3.10(1), $\square V$ is an upset, and hence $C \in \square V$ because $K \trianglelefteq C$ and $K \in \square V$. Thus, $C \subseteq V$. Since $K \in \diamond W_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $C \notin \diamond W_i$ for every $i \in I$, it follows that $(K \setminus C) \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$. We have that $K \trianglelefteq C$ implies $K \setminus C \subseteq \downarrow x$ for every $x \in C$. So, for every $x \in C$ the set $K \setminus C$ is a chain in X such that $K \setminus C \subseteq \downarrow x$ and $(K \setminus C) \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$. Then Lemma 5.3(1) implies that $C \subseteq \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}$. Therefore, $C \subseteq V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}$, and hence $C \in \square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\})$. We have then found $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $C \in \square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}) \cap \bigcap \{\diamond W_j \mid j \in I^c\}$. It follows that C belongs to the right-hand side of the claimed equality.

To show the right-to-left inclusion, let $C \in \mathbb{CC}(X)$ be such that

$$C \in \square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}) \cap \bigcap \{\diamond W_j \mid j \in I^c\}$$

for some $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $C \in \square(V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\})$ and $C \in \diamond W_j$ for every $j \in I^c$. So, $C \subseteq V \cap \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $C \cap W_j \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \in I^c$. Since $C \subseteq \uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}$, we have in particular that the least element $m(C)$ of C is in $\uparrow\{W_i \mid i \in I\}$. Thus, Lemma 5.3(1) yields a chain K of X such that $K \subseteq \downarrow m(C)$ and $K \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$. By selecting one element from $K \cap W_i$ for each i , we can assume that K is finite, $K \subseteq \bigcup \{W_i \mid i \in I\}$, and $K \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$. Then K is a closed chain because it is a finite chain in X . Since $K \subseteq \downarrow m(C)$, we obtain that $K \cup C \in \mathbb{CC}(X)$ and $K \cup C \trianglelefteq C$. By hypothesis, $\bigcup \{W_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq V$. Thus, $K \cup C \subseteq V$, and hence $K \cup C \in \square V$. Since $K \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$ and $C \cap W_j \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \in I^c$, we have that $K \cup C \in \diamond W_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, $K \cup C \in \square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n$, and so $C \in \uparrow(\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n)$. \square

Before we can prove the main results of this section, we need to draw a connection between the topology of a Priestley space X and the topology of a subspace of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Let $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ denote the subset of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ consisting of the elements of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ that are maximal with respect to the order \leq . It follows from the definition of \leq that such elements are exactly the chains consisting of a single element of X . It is then clear that the map $\varphi: X \rightarrow \max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ sending x to $\{x\}$ is a bijection. We consider $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ equipped with the subspace topology induced by the topology on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let X be a Priestley space. Then $\varphi: X \rightarrow \max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. Since we know that φ is a bijection, it is sufficient to show that φ is open and continuous. Observe that if V is clopen in X , then $\varphi[V] = \{\{x\} \in \max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \mid x \in V\}$. Thus, $\varphi[V] = \max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \square V = \max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \diamond V$. Since X is a Stone space, it follows that φ is an open map. The definition of the topology on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ implies that the subsets of the form $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \square V$ and $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \diamond V$, with V clopen in X , form a subbasis for the topology on $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Then φ is a continuous map because $\varphi^{-1}[\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \square V] = \varphi^{-1}[\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \diamond V] = V$ for every clopen subset V of X . \square

We are now ready to obtain the necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ to be a bi-Esakia space.

Theorem 5.6. *Let X be a Priestley space. Then $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a bi-Esakia space iff X is a co-Esakia space.*

Proof. We first show the left-to-right implication. Assume that $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a bi-Esakia space and let V be a clopen subset of X . We first show that

$$\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \cap \uparrow \diamond V = \{\{x\} \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \mid x \in \uparrow V\}. \quad (7)$$

Recall that the elements of $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ are exactly the chains consisting of a single element of X . If $x \in X$, then $\{x\} \in \uparrow \diamond V$ iff there is $C \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ such that $C \cap V \neq \emptyset$ and $C \leq \{x\}$. Since $C \leq \{x\}$ iff x is the greatest element of C , we have that $\{x\} \in \uparrow \diamond V$ implies that $x \in \uparrow V$. Conversely, suppose $x \in \uparrow V$. Then there is $y \in V$ such that $y \leq x$, and hence $\{y, x\} \in \diamond V$ and $\{y, x\} \leq \{x\}$. Thus, $\{x\} \in \uparrow \diamond V$. This establishes Equation (7). Since $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a bi-Esakia space and V is clopen, $\uparrow \diamond V$ is clopen. It follows from Equation (7) that $\{\{x\} \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \mid x \in \uparrow V\}$ is clopen in $\max \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Then Lemma 5.5 yields that $\uparrow V = \varphi^{-1}[\{\{x\} \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \mid x \in \uparrow V\}]$ is clopen. Therefore, $\uparrow V$ is clopen in X for every clopen subset V of X , and so X is a co-Esakia space.

To prove the converse implication, assume that X is a co-Esakia space. Since $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is an Esakia space by Theorem 3.12, it remains to show that the upset of every clopen subset of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is clopen. By Lemma 3.4(5), every clopen of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a finite union of clopens of the form $\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n$ for some clopen subsets V, W_1, \dots, W_n of X such that $W_1, \dots, W_n \subseteq V$. It is then sufficient to show that if V, W_1, \dots, W_n are clopens in X with $W_1, \dots, W_n \subseteq V$, then $\uparrow(\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \dots \cap \diamond W_n)$ is clopen. By Proposition 5.4, we have to show that

$$\bigcup_{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}} \left[\square(V \cap \uparrow \{W_i \mid i \in I\}) \cap \bigcap \{\diamond W_j \mid j \in I^c\} \right]$$

is clopen in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Since W_1, \dots, W_n are clopens, Lemma 5.3(2) implies that $\uparrow \{W_i \mid i \in I\}$ is clopen for every $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$. So, $\square(V \cap \uparrow \{W_i \mid i \in I\})$ is clopen in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ because V is clopen in X . Moreover, $\diamond W_i$ is clopen in $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ because each W_i is clopen in X . This concludes the proof because finite unions and intersections of clopens are clopen. \square

As an immediate consequence of Theorems 3.19 and 5.6 and Proposition 5.1, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for a Gödel algebra free over a distributive lattice to be a bi-Heyting algebra.

Theorem 5.7. *Let L be a distributive lattice and G the Gödel algebra free over L . Then G is a bi-Heyting algebra iff L is a co-Heyting algebra.*

Remark 5.8.

- (1) Co-Heyting algebras can be equivalently defined as distributive lattices equipped with a binary operation of co-implication \leftarrow satisfying the property

$$a \leftarrow b \leq c \iff a \leq b \vee c.$$

Co-Heyting algebras form a variety in the signature $(\wedge, \vee, \leftarrow, 0, 1)$ and a lattice homomorphism between co-Heyting algebras is called a co-Heyting algebra homomorphism if it also preserves the co-implication. Co-Heyting algebra homomorphisms correspond to continuous map between co-Esakia spaces satisfying $f[\downarrow x] = \downarrow f(x)$ for every x in the domain.

Let X be a Priestley space. It is straightforward to verify that the continuous map $m: \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \rightarrow X$, that sends each $C \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ its least element $m(C)$, satisfies $m[\downarrow C] = \downarrow m(C)$. If X is a co-Esakia space, then Theorem 5.6 implies that $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ is a bi-Esakia space, and hence a co-Esakia space. Therefore, if L is a co-Heyting algebra and G the Gödel algebra free over the distributive lattice L via $e: L \rightarrow G$, then e is a co-Heyting algebra homomorphism.

- (2) Let X be a Priestley space and \preceq' the order on $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ given by $C_1 \preceq' C_2$ iff $C_1 \subseteq C_2$ and C_1 is a downset in C_2 . Then $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \preceq')$ is the order dual of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X^\partial), \preceq)$, where X^∂ is the order dual of X . Thus, Theorem 5.6 implies that $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \preceq')$ is a bi-Esakia space iff X is an Esakia space. Moreover, what we observed in (1) yields that the map $M: (\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \preceq') \rightarrow (X, \leq)$ sending each $C \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ to its greatest element $M(C)$ is a continuous p-morphism. It follows that every Esakia space X is the image under a continuous p-morphism of the bi-Esakia space $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \preceq')$, which is a forest; i.e., a disjoint union of trees. This is a natural generalization of the standard unraveling construction that “unfolds” a rooted poset into a tree (see, e.g., [CZ97, Thm. 2.19]).

The following fact is well known. Due to the lack of a reference, we provide its proof. Recall that if S is a set, then 2^S denotes the Priestley space equipped with the product topology and the pointwise order induced by the 2-element chain $\mathbf{2}$ with the discrete topology. Thus, the topology on 2^S is generated by the subbasis $\{U_s, D_s \mid s \in S\}$, where

$$U_s := \{(a_i)_{i \in S} \mid a_s = 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_s := \{(a_i)_{i \in S} \mid a_s = 0\}.$$

The subsets U_s and D_s are clopen upsets and clopen downsets of 2^S for every $s \in S$, respectively.

Lemma 5.9. *Free distributive lattices are bi-Heyting algebras.*

Proof. Let S be a set. By Proposition 3.21, the free distributive lattice over S is dual to the Priestley space 2^S . By duality, it is then sufficient to show that 2^S is a bi-Esakia space. Since $\{U_s, D_s \mid s \in S\}$ is a subbasis consisting of clopen subsets, to prove that 2^S is a bi-Esakia space, it is sufficient to show that $\downarrow(U_{s_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{s_n} \cap D_{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{t_m})$ and $\uparrow(U_{s_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{s_n} \cap D_{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{t_m})$ are clopen for every $s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1, \dots, t_m \in S$. Since $U_s \cap D_s = \emptyset$ for every $s \in S$, we can assume

that $s_i \neq t_j$ for every $i \leq n$ and $j \leq m$. It is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \downarrow(U_{s_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{s_n} \cap D_{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{t_m}) &= D_{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{t_m}, \text{ and} \\ \uparrow(U_{s_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{s_n} \cap D_{t_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{t_m}) &= U_{s_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{s_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\uparrow V$ and $\downarrow V$ are clopen for every clopen subset V of 2^S . Thus, 2^S is a bi-Esakia space. \square

Theorem 5.10. *Free Gödel algebras are bi-Heyting algebras.*

Proof. Let G be the Gödel algebra free over a set S . The G is also free over the distributive lattice L that is free over S . By Lemma 5.9, L a bi-Heyting algebra, and hence a co-Heyting algebra. Therefore, Theorem 5.7 yields that G is a bi-Heyting algebra. \square

We end the section by showing that an analogue of the previous theorem does not hold for \mathbf{GA}_n -algebras. We first need to prove the following technical fact.

Lemma 5.11. *If S is an infinite set, then every nonempty clopen subset of $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ contains a chain of 2^S of size n .*

Proof. Since $\{U_s, D_s \mid s \in S\}$ is a subbasis for 2^S , every clopen of 2^S is a finite union of finite intersections of subsets of the form U_s and D_s . Thus, for each clopen V of 2^S there is a finite subset $S_V \subseteq S$ such that $V = \pi_{S_V}^{-1}[V']$ for some $V' \subseteq 2^{S_V}$, where $\pi_{S_V}: 2^S \rightarrow 2^{S_V}$ is the projection mapping each $(a_i)_{i \in S}$ to its subsequence $(a_i)_{i \in S_V}$. It follows that if $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in S}$ and $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in S}$ are elements of 2^S such that $\pi_{S_V}(\bar{a}) = \pi_{S_V}(\bar{b})$, then $\bar{a} \in V$ iff $\bar{b} \in V$.

Let \mathcal{V} be a nonempty clopen of $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$. We show that \mathcal{V} contains a chain of size n . By Lemma 3.4(5), we can assume that $\mathcal{V} = (\square V \cap \diamond W_1 \cap \cdots \cap \diamond W_m) \cap \mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ for some V, W_1, \dots, W_m clopens of 2^S . Let $S_{\mathcal{V}} := S_V \cup S_{W_1} \cup \cdots \cup S_{W_m} \subseteq S$. Thus, if $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ are such that $\pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C_1] = \pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C_2]$, then what we observed above yields that $C_1 \in \mathcal{V}$ iff $C_2 \in \mathcal{V}$. Since \mathcal{V} is nonempty, there is $C \in \mathcal{V}$. Let $\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^k$ be the elements of C with $\bar{a}^j = (a_i^j)_{i \in S}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, k$. If $n = k$, then C is a chain of size n in \mathcal{V} and we are done. Assume $n \neq k$. Then $k < n$. We define $\bar{b}^1, \dots, \bar{b}^k \in 2^S$ with $\bar{b}^j = (b_i^j)_{i \in S}$ for every j by setting $b_i^j = a_i^j$ if $i \in S_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $b_i^j = 0$ otherwise. Since C is a chain of size k , we obtain that $C' = \{\bar{b}^1, \dots, \bar{b}^k\}$ is a chain of size smaller or equal to k . By the definition of the \bar{b}^j 's, we obtain that $\pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C] = \pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C']$. Let h be the size of C' and pick s_1, \dots, s_{n-h} distinct elements of $S \setminus S_{\mathcal{V}}$, which exist because S is infinite and $S_{\mathcal{V}}$ is finite. Define $\bar{c}^1, \dots, \bar{c}^{n-h} \in 2^S$ with $\bar{c}^j = (c_i^j)_{i \in S}$ by setting

$$c_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in \{s_1, \dots, s_j\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in \{s_{j+1}, \dots, s_{n-h}\}, \\ b_i^k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\bar{b}^k < \bar{c}^1 < \cdots < \bar{c}^{n-h}$ and $\pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}(\bar{c}^j) = \pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}(\bar{b}^k)$ for every j . Therefore, $C'' := C' \cup \{\bar{c}^1, \dots, \bar{c}^{n-h}\}$ is a chain of 2^S of size n that belongs to \mathcal{V} because $\pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C''] = \pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C'] = \pi_{S_{\mathcal{V}}}[C]$ and $C \in \mathcal{V}$. \square

Theorem 5.12. *If $n \geq 2$, then every \mathbf{GA}_n -algebra free over an infinite set is not a bi-Heyting algebra.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.27 and Proposition 5.1, it is enough to show that $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ is not a bi-Esakia space whenever S is an infinite set. So, we need to exhibit a clopen subset \mathcal{V} of $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ such that $\uparrow \mathcal{V}$ is not clopen in $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$. Note that $\uparrow \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ for every $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ because $\mathbf{CC}_n(2^S)$ is an upset of $\mathbf{CC}(2^S)$.

Fix $s \in S$ and let $\mathcal{V} = (\diamond D_s) \cap \text{CC}_n(2^S)$. Assume, with a view to contradiction, that $\uparrow\mathcal{V}$ is clopen in $\text{CC}_n(2^S)$. Define two elements $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in S}$ and $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in S}$ of 2^S by setting $a_i = 0$ for every $i \in S$ and $b_i = 1$ for $i = s$ and $b_i = 0$, otherwise. Then $\bar{a} \in D_s$, $\bar{b} \notin D_s$, and $\bar{a} < \bar{b}$. Thus, $\{\bar{a}, \bar{b}\} \in \mathcal{V}$, and hence $\{\bar{b}\}$ is a closed chain in 2^S that belongs to $\uparrow\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}$. It follows that the subset $\uparrow\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}$ of $\text{CC}(2^S)$ is nonempty and it is clopen by our assumption. By Lemma 5.11, $\uparrow\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}$ must contain a chain C of size n . Because $C \in \uparrow\mathcal{V}$, there is $K \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $K \trianglelefteq C$. Since C has size n and $K \in \text{CC}_n(2^S)$, we obtain that $C = K$ because $K \trianglelefteq C$. Then $C = K \in \mathcal{V}$, but this contradicts that $C \in \uparrow\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, $\uparrow\mathcal{V}$ is not clopen. This shows that $\text{CC}_n(2^S)$ is not a bi-Esakia space. \square

6. COMPARISON WITH THE STEP-BY-STEP METHOD

In this section we compare the dual description of free Gödel algebras obtained in Section 3 with the one resulting from the step-by-step method. The step-by-step method was introduced in [Ghi92] to study Heyting algebras free over finite distributive lattices and has been extended in [Alm24] to Heyting algebras free over distributive lattices of any cardinality. We briefly recall the description of free Gödel algebras obtained in [Alm24, Sec. 5.2] utilizing the step-by-step approach.

Let X be a Priestley space. Topologize the set of nonempty closed chains $\text{CC}(X)$ of X with the Vietoris topology as we did in Section 3. However, instead of equipping $\text{CC}(X)$ with the partial order \trianglelefteq , equip it with the reverse inclusion order \supseteq . It follows from [Alm24, Prop. 32] that $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ is a Priestley space. Observe that $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ is not a root system in general. To simplify notation, in what follows we denote the Priestley space $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ by Y . To describe how to obtain an Esakia root system from Y , we need to introduce the notion of m -open element of $\text{CC}(Y)$. Note that we are now considering closed chains in Y , whose elements are themselves closed chains in X .

Definition 6.1. Let $m: Y \rightarrow X$ be the map that sends a nonempty closed chain of X to its least element. We say that $\mathcal{C} \in \text{CC}(Y)$ is m -open provided that for every $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $C_2 \in Y$ with $C_1 \supseteq C_2$, there is $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $C_1 \supseteq C_3$ and $m(C_2) = m(C_3)$.

Let $Z = \{\mathcal{C} \in \text{CC}(Y) \mid \mathcal{C} \text{ is } m\text{-open}\}$ and equip Z with the subspace topology induced by the Vietoris topology on $\text{CC}(Y)$. The following theorem, which is a consequence of [Alm24, Thms. 34 and 38]⁴, provides an alternative dual description of the free Gödel algebra over a distributive lattice.

Theorem 6.2. *The ordered space (Z, \supseteq) is an Esakia root system and $(Z, \supseteq)^*$ is a Gödel algebra free over the distributive lattice X^* .*

Since both $(\text{CC}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ and (Z, \supseteq) are dual to Gödel algebras free over X^* and free algebras are unique up to isomorphism, it follows that the two Esakia root systems must be isomorphic. We sketch a direct proof of the existence of this isomorphism.

Theorem 6.3. *The Esakia root systems $(\text{CC}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ and (Z, \supseteq) are isomorphic.*

Sketch of the proof. Recall that the elements of Z are the m -open nonempty closed chains of $Y = (\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$. It can be shown that if $C \in \text{CC}(X)$, then $\uparrow C$ is an element of Z , and that any element of Z is $\uparrow C$ for some $C \in \text{CC}(X)$. Sending each $C \in \text{CC}(X)$ to $\uparrow C \in Z$ defines a bijection between $\text{CC}(X)$ and Z . It turns out that this map is an isomorphism of Esakia root systems. \square

⁴It is mentioned in [Alm24] that, although [Alm24, Thm. 38] is stated and proved only for finite posets, it holds for arbitrary Priestley spaces.

Proving the missing steps in the sketch of the proof of Theorem 6.3 requires a nontrivial effort since the definition of Z is quite involved: Z is equipped with the Vietoris topology induced by the topology on $\text{CC}(X)$, which in turn is the Vietoris topology induced by X . It is for this reason that, instead of deriving Theorem 3.19 from the results of [Alm24] and Theorem 6.3, we opted to provide a more direct and independent proof in Section 3.

We end this final section by turning our attention to the Priestley space $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ that played a fundamental role in the step-by-step approach. When X is a finite poset, the order dual of $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ is the nerve of X , which has applications in polyhedral geometry (see, e.g., [BMMP18, p. 388] and the references therein). Figure 3 depicts the poset 2×2 , where 2 is the 2-element chain, and the two partial orders \leq and \supseteq on $\text{CC}(2 \times 2)$. The solid lines denote the partial order \leq and the dotted lines show the relations that need to be added to \leq to obtain \supseteq . Note that Theorem 3.22 yields that $(\text{CC}(2 \times 2), \leq)$ is the Esakia root system dual to the Gödel algebra free over 2 generators.




FIGURE 3. The poset 2×2 and the set $\text{CC}(2 \times 2)$ with the partial orders \leq and \supseteq .

Let G be the Gödel algebra free over $L = X^*$ via $e: L \rightarrow G$. Then $G \cong (\text{CC}(X), \leq)^*$ by Theorem 3.19. Since \supseteq extends \leq , the identity map $\text{id}_{\text{CC}(X)}: (\text{CC}(X), \leq) \rightarrow (\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ is a continuous order-preserving map between Priestley spaces. Then $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)^*$ embeds into G because onto Pries-morphisms correspond to embeddings in DL (see, e.g., [DP02, Thm. 11.31]). Let $L' \subseteq G$ be the subalgebra of G that is the image of the embedding of $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)^*$ into G . It is a consequence of [Alm24, Prop. 32] that L' is the bounded sublattice of G generated by the subset $\{e(a) \rightarrow e(b) \mid a, b \in L\}$. Intuitively, L' is the result of the first step in the step-by-step construction of G and is obtained by “freely adding” to L implications between its elements.⁵ Since $\text{id}_{\text{CC}(X)}: (\text{CC}(X), \leq) \rightarrow (\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$ is a bijection, it follows from Priestley duality that there is a bijection between the sets of prime filters of G and L' that sends a prime filter P of G to the prime filter $P \cap L'$ of L' . Note that this correspondence preserves inclusions but does not necessarily reflect them.

We end the section by characterizing the clopen upsets of $(\text{CC}(X), \supseteq)$, which correspond to the elements of the sublattice L' of $G \cong (\text{CC}(X), \leq)^*$, as we observed in the previous paragraph. By Theorem 3.19, the elements of G of the form $e(a)$ with $a \in L$ correspond to the clopen upsets of $(\text{CC}(X), \leq)$ of the form $\square U$ with U a clopen upset of X . We first describe the implications between such elements in $(\text{CC}(X), \leq)^*$.

Proposition 6.4. *If U_1, U_2 are clopen upsets of X , then $\square U_1 \rightarrow \square U_2 = \square((X \setminus U_1) \cup U_2)$.*

⁵See [Alm24, Sec. 3.1] for an intuitive explanation of the ideas behind the step-by-step construction.

Proof. Since $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \trianglelefteq)$ is an Esakia space, the implication in $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \trianglelefteq)^*$ is given by

$$\Box U_1 \rightarrow \Box U_2 = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \setminus \Downarrow(\Box U_1 \setminus \Box U_2).$$

We first show that $\Downarrow(\Box U_1 \setminus \Box U_2) = \Diamond(U_1 \setminus U_2)$. Let $C \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$. Then $C \in \Downarrow(\Box U_1 \setminus \Box U_2)$ iff there is $K \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ such that $C \trianglelefteq K$, $K \in \Box U_1$, and $K \notin \Box U_2$. The existence of such a K is equivalent to the existence of $x \in C$ such that $C \cap \uparrow x \subseteq U_1$ and $C \cap \uparrow x \not\subseteq U_2$. Since U_1 and U_2 are upsets, it follows that $C \in \Downarrow(\Box U_1 \setminus \Box U_2)$ iff there is $x \in C$ such that $x \in U_1 \setminus U_2$. Thus, $\Downarrow(\Box U_1 \setminus \Box U_2) = \Diamond(U_1 \setminus U_2)$. Then Lemma 3.4(2) implies that $\Box U_1 \rightarrow \Box U_2 = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X) \setminus \Diamond(U_1 \setminus U_2) = \Box((X \setminus U_1) \cup U_2)$. \square

We end this last section of the paper with a theorem characterizing the elements of the distributive lattice $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)^*$ isomorphic to L' .

Theorem 6.5. *The clopen upsets of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)$ are the subsets of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X)$ of the form $\Box V_1 \cup \dots \cup \Box V_n$ with V_1, \dots, V_n clopen in X .*

Proof. By what we observed before Proposition 6.4, $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)^*$ is the sublattice of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \trianglelefteq)^*$ generated by the elements of the form $\Box U_1 \rightarrow \Box U_2$ with U_1, U_2 clopen upsets of X . Thus, Proposition 6.4 implies that the elements of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)^*$ are finite unions of finite intersections of elements of the form $\Box((X \setminus U_1) \cup U_2)$, with U_1 and U_2 clopen upsets of X . Since \Box commutes with finite intersections by Lemma 3.4(1), we obtain that any clopen upset of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)$ is a finite union of subsets of the form $\Box V$ with V clopen in X . Conversely, it is straightforward to check that $\Box V$ is a clopen upset of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)$ for every clopen subset V of X . Therefore, every finite union of subsets of the form $\Box V$ with V clopen is a clopen upset of $(\mathbb{C}\mathbb{C}(X), \supseteq)$. \square

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Guram Bezhanishvili for pointing out some relevant references. I am also grateful to Vincenzo Marra and Tommaso Moraschini for their comments and insightful conversations.

REFERENCES

- [AGM08] S. Aguzzoli, B. Gerla, and V. Marra. Gödel algebras free over finite distributive lattices. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 155(3):183–193, 2008.
- [Alm24] R. N. Almeida. Colimits of Heyting algebras through Esakia duality. Available online at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.08058v2>, 2024.
- [BBMS21] G. Bezhanishvili, N. Bezhanishvili, T. Moraschini, and M. Stronkowski. Profiniteness and representability of spectra of Heyting algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 391:Paper No. 107959, 2021.
- [Bel86] F. Bellissima. Finitely generated free Heyting algebras. *J. Symb. Logic*, 51(1):152–165, 1986.
- [Bez00] G. Bezhanishvili. Varieties of monadic Heyting algebras. III. *Studia Logica*, 64(2):215–256, 2000.
- [Bez06] N. Bezhanishvili. *Lattices of Intermediate and Cylindric Modal Logics*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2006. Available at <https://eprints.illc.uva.nl/id/eprint/2049/1/DS-2006-02.text.pdf>.
- [BG11] N. Bezhanishvili and M. Gehrke. Finitely generated free Heyting algebras via Birkhoff duality and coalgebra. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 7(2):2:9, 24, 2011.
- [BMM22] N. Bezhanishvili, M. Martins, and T. Moraschini. Bi-intermediate logics of trees and co-trees. *ILLC Prepublication (PP) Series*. 2022.
- [BMMP18] N. Bezhanishvili, V. Marra, D. McNeill, and A. Pedrini. Tarski’s theorem on intuitionistic logic, for polyhedra. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 169(5):373–391, 2018.
- [BP11] M. Baaz and N. Preining. Gödel-Dummett Logics. In P. Cintula, P. Hájek, and C. Noguera, editors, *Handbook of Mathematical Fuzzy Logic*, volume 37 and 38 of *Studies in Logic, Mathematical Logic and Foundations*. College Publications, London, England, 2011.
- [CZ97] A. Chagrov and M. Zakharyashev. *Modal logic*, volume 35 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.

- [DM71] J. M. Dunn and R. K. Meyer. Algebraic completeness results for Dummett’s LC and its extensions. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math.*, 17:225–230, 1971.
- [DM06] O. M. D’Antona and V. Marra. Computing coproducts of finitely presented Gödel algebras. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 142(1-3):202–211, 2006.
- [DP02] B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley. *Introduction to lattices and order*. Cambridge University Press, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [Dum59] M. Dummett. A propositional calculus with denumerable matrix. *J. Symb. Logic*, 24:97–106, 1959.
- [EG77] L. Esakia and R. Grigolia. The criterion of Brouwerian and closure algebras to be finitely generated. *Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Philos. Sociol. Bull. Sect. Logic*, 6(2):46–52, 1977.
- [Esa19] L. Esakia. *Heyting algebras. Duality theory*, volume 50 of *Translated from the Russian by A. Evseev. Edited by G. Bezhanishvili and W. Holliday. Trends in Logic*. Springer, 2019.
- [GH09] S. Givant and P. Halmos. *Introduction to Boolean algebras*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [Ghi92] S. Ghilardi. Free Heyting algebras as bi-Heyting algebras. *C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada*, 14(6):240–244, 1992.
- [Gri87] R. Grigolia. *Free algebras of nonclassical logics* (Russian). “Metsniereba”, Tbilisi, 1987.
- [Gri06] R. Grigolia. Co-product of Heyting algebras. *Proc. A. Razmadze Math. Inst.*, 140:83–89, 2006.
- [GvG24] M. Gehrke and S. van Gool. *Topological Duality for Distributive Lattices: Theory and Applications*, volume 61 of *Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2024.
- [HK72] T. Hecht and T. Katriňák. Equational classes of relative Stone algebras. *Notre Dame J. Formal Log.*, 13:248–254, 1972.
- [Hor69] A. Horn. Logic with truth values in a linearly ordered Heyting algebra. *J. Symb. Logic*, 34:395–408, 1969.
- [Hos67] T. Hosoi. On intermediate logics. I. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I*, 14:293–312, 1967.
- [Há98] P. Hájek. *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*. Trends in Logic. Springer Netherlands, 1998.
- [Mic51] E. Michael. Topologies on spaces of subsets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 71:152–182, 1951.
- [ML71] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- [Pri84] H. A. Priestley. Ordered sets and duality for distributive lattices. In *Orders: description and roles (L’Arbresle, 1982)*, volume 99 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 39–60. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [She78] V. B. Shehtman. Reiger-Nishimura ladders. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 241(6):1288–1291, 1978.
- [Urq73] A. Urquhart. Free Heyting algebras. *Algebra Universalis*, 3:94–97, 1973.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “FEDERIGO ENRIQUES”, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO, VIA CESARE SALDINI 50, 20133 MILANO, ITALY

Email address: luca.carai.uni@gmail.com