

THE CATEGORY OF TOPOLOGICAL SPACES AND OPEN MAPS DOES NOT HAVE PRODUCTS

GURAM BEZHANISHVILI AND ANDRE KORNEILL

ABSTRACT. We prove that the category of topological spaces and open maps does not have binary products, thus resolving the Esakia-Janelidze problem in the negative. We also prove that the categories of complete Heyting algebras and complete closure algebras do not have binary coproducts.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the category \mathbf{Top} of topological spaces and continuous maps has products and that they are described by the standard topological product construction. The situation changes when we consider the category $\mathbf{TopOpen}$ of topological spaces and *open maps*, which are the continuous maps such that the image of each open set is open. The existence of products in $\mathbf{TopOpen}$ was explicitly stated as an open problem as early as the late 1980s at the Esakia-Janelidze seminar at Tbilisi State University. More recently, the problem was revisited on MathOverflow [Eps13] with no clear resolution. We prove that $\mathbf{TopOpen}$ does not have products, thus resolving the Esakia-Janelidze problem in the negative.

Specifically, we prove that the product of the Sierpiński space \mathbb{S} with itself does not exist in $\mathbf{TopOpen}$. We argue by contradiction. We suppose that such a product does exist, and we prove that arbitrarily large posets embed into this product when it is equipped with the opposite of its specialization order. We obtain these arbitrarily large posets as subsets of the von Neumann universe V , which we order by the reflexive transitive closure of the membership relation. Throughout, we view posets, and more generally, preordered sets, as topological spaces with the convention that *downsets* are open.

We also prove that the product of \mathbb{S} with itself does not exist in the full subcategories of $\mathbf{TopOpen}$ that consist of T_0 -spaces and of sober spaces. If we view \mathbb{S} as the two-element poset with $0 < 1$, then its product with itself also fails to exist in the category $\mathbf{PreOpen}$ of preordered sets and open maps and in its full subcategories that consist of posets and of well-ordered posets.

As a consequence, we prove that the coproduct of the three-element Heyting algebra with itself does not exist in the category \mathbf{CHA} of complete Heyting algebras and complete Heyting algebra homomorphisms. From this, we derive De Jongh's theorem [dJ80] that the free complete Heyting algebra on two-generators does not exist. We also observe that our main results are not a direct corollary of De Jongh's theorem by showing that the open set functor

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18F60; 54B10; 54C10; 06D20; 06E25; 03B45.

Key words and phrases. Topological space; open map; category; product; Heyting algebra; closure algebra; Kripke frame; modal logic.

Andre Kornell was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Award No. FA9550-21-1-0041.

\mathcal{O} from **TopOpen**, as well as the subcategories that we consider in this paper, into **CHA** does not have a right adjoint.

We conclude the paper with an application of our results to modal logic by showing that the category of Kripke frames does not have binary products. From this, we derive that the category of complete BAOs, i.e., Boolean algebras with an operator, does not have binary coproducts either.

2. HEREDITARY ANTICHAINS

As usual, a preorder is a reflexive and transitive relation \leq . For a subset S of a preordered class P , we define $\downarrow S = \{p \in P : p \leq s \text{ for some } s \in S\}$, and we define $\uparrow S$ similarly. Then, S is a *downset* if $\downarrow S = S$ and an *upset* if $\uparrow S = S$.

Definition 2.1. Let P be a partially ordered class. An *antichain* of P is a set $x \subseteq P$ that satisfies $p_1 \not\leq p_2$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in x$. An antichain x is *trivial* if it is empty or a singleton; otherwise, it is *nontrivial*. A set $M \subseteq P$ is *convex* if $p \leq q \leq r$ with $p, r \in M$ implies that $q \in M$.

Definition 2.2. Let V be the class of hereditary sets, that is, the von Neumann universe. We partially order V by defining $x < y$ if x is in the transitive closure of y . Thus, $x < y$ iff $x \in x_1 \in \dots \in x_n \in y$ for some sets x_1, \dots, x_n , where n may be zero. For each convex set $M \subseteq V$, we define a cumulative hierarchy $S_\alpha(M)$ by transfinite recursion on the ordinal α :

- (1) $S_0(M) = M$,
- (2) $S_{\alpha+1}(M) = S_\alpha(M) \cup \{x : x \text{ is a nontrivial antichain of } S_\alpha(M)\}$,
- (3) $S_\alpha(M) = \bigcup \{S_\beta(M) : \beta < \alpha\}$ for each limit ordinal α .

We define $S(M) = \bigcup \{S_\alpha(M) : \alpha \text{ is an ordinal}\}$, and we refer to $S(M)$ as the class of *hereditary nontrivial antichains over M* .

Each element of $S(M)$ is either an element of M or a nontrivial antichain of $S(M)$. When M is an antichain of V , the class $S(M)$ is a subclass of $V(M)$, the class of hereditary sets over M [Jech, p. 250]. The following claims are routine to verify.

Lemma 2.3.

- (1) $S_\alpha(M)$ is a downset of $S(M)$ for each convex set $M \subseteq V$,
- (2) $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is an antichain of $S(M)$ for each convex set $M \subseteq V$,
- (3) $S_\alpha(M) = S(M) \cap S_\alpha(M')$ for all antichains $M, M' \subseteq V$ such that $M \subseteq M'$,
- (4) $S(M) \subseteq S(M')$ for all convex sets $M, M' \subseteq V$ such that $M \subseteq S_\alpha(M')$.

Lemma 2.4. Let M be a set, and let $m' \notin M$. If $M' = M \cup \{m'\}$ is an antichain of V , then

- (1) $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S(M)$,
- (2) $\{\{x, m'\} : x \in A\}$ is an antichain of $S(M')$ for all subsets $A \subseteq S(M)$.

Proof. Assume that $M' = M \cup \{m'\}$ is an antichain. We prove that $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S_\alpha(M)$ by transfinite induction on α . Assume that $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S_\beta(M)$ and all $\beta < \alpha$. If α is zero, then $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S_\alpha(M) = S_0(M) = M$ because M' is an antichain and $m' \notin M$. If α is limit, then $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S_\alpha(M)$ by the induction hypothesis because $S_\alpha(M) = \bigcup \{S_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$.

Assume that α is successor, let $x \in S_\alpha(M)$, and suppose that $\{x, m'\}$ is not a nontrivial antichain. It follows that $x \leq m'$ or $m' < x$. In the former case, there exists $m \in M$ such that $m \leq x \leq m'$, contradicting that M' is an antichain and $m' \notin M$. In the latter case, $x \in M$, contradicting that M' is an antichain, or there exists $y \in x \subseteq S_{\alpha-1}(M)$ such that $m' \leq y$, contradicting the induction hypothesis. Thus, $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain. Therefore, by induction on α , $\{x, m'\}$ is a nontrivial antichain for all $x \in S_\alpha(M)$ and all ordinals α . We have proved claim (1).

Let A be a subset of $S(M)$, and suppose that $\{\{x, m'\} : x \in A\}$ is not an antichain. Then, $\{x, m'\} < \{y, m'\}$ for some $x, y \in A$, and hence, $\{x, m'\} \leq y$ or $\{x, m'\} \leq m'$. In the former case, $m' < y$, contradicting that $\{y, m'\}$ is an antichain, and in the latter case, $x < m'$, contradicting that $\{x, m'\}$ is a antichain. Therefore, $\{\{x, m'\} : x \in A\}$ is an antichain. We have proved claim (2). \square

Theorem 2.5. *Let M be an antichain of V . If M has three or more elements, then $S(M)$ is a proper class.*

Proof. First, we use transfinite induction on α to show that the antichain $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is infinite for all infinite antichains M and all ordinals α . Assume that $S_{\beta+1}(M) \setminus S_\beta(M)$ is infinite for all infinite antichains M and all ordinals $\beta < \alpha$. Let M be an infinite antichain. If α is zero, then $S_\alpha(M) = S_0(M) = M$, and all the infinite subsets of M are elements of $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M) = S_1(M) \setminus M$ because M is an antichain. Thus, $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is infinite. Similarly, if α is successor, then $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is an infinite antichain that consists of subsets of the infinite antichain $S_\alpha(M) \setminus S_{\alpha-1}(M)$.

Assume that α is limit. Let $M = M_1 \cup M_2$ be a decomposition of M into two disjoint infinite subsets M_1 and M_2 . For each $m \in M_2$, let $y_m = \{\{x, m\} : x \in S_\alpha(M_1)\}$. We find that $y_m \in S(M_1 \cup \{m\})$ by Lemma 2.4, so y_m is an antichain of $S(M)$. Since α is a limit ordinal, $\{x, m\} \in S_\alpha(M)$ for all $x \in S_\alpha(M_1)$, and hence, $y_m \in S_{\alpha+1}(M)$. If $y_m \in S_\alpha(M)$, then $y_m \in S_\beta(M)$ for some $\beta < \alpha$, and hence, $x \in S_\beta(M_1)$ for all $x \in S_\alpha(M_1)$, contradicting that $S_{\beta+1}(M_1) \setminus S_\beta(M_1)$ is infinite. Thus, $y_m \in S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$. Since $y_m \neq y_{m'}$ whenever $m \neq m'$, we conclude that $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is infinite.

Therefore, by transfinite induction on α , $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is an infinite antichain of $S(M)$ for all infinite antichains M and all ordinals α . In particular, $S(M)$ is a proper class for all infinite antichains M .

Next, we prove that $S_\omega(M)$ is an infinite set for all antichains M with at least three distinct elements. Let M be an antichain that contains distinct elements m_1, m_2 , and m_3 . By Lemma 2.3(2), $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ is an antichain for all ordinals α . We use induction on α to show that this antichain has at least three elements for all $\alpha < \omega$. If α is zero, then $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M) = S_1(M) \setminus M$ contains the antichains $\{m_1, m_2\}$, $\{m_2, m_3\}$, and $\{m_3, m_1\}$. Similarly, if α is successor, $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ contains at least three distinct doubleton subsets of $S_\alpha(M) \setminus S_{\alpha-1}(M)$. By induction on α , $S_{\alpha+1}(M) \setminus S_\alpha(M)$ has at least three elements for all $\alpha < \omega$. Therefore, $S_\omega(M)$ is infinite for all antichains M with at least three elements.

We have shown that $S_\omega(M)$ is infinite for all antichains M with three or more elements and that $S(M)$ is a proper class for all antichains M with infinitely many elements. We combine these conclusions to prove the theorem.

Let M be an antichain that contains distinct elements m_1, m_2 , and m_3 . Then, the antichain $S_1(M) \setminus M$ contains distinct elements $\{m_1, m_2\}$, $\{m_2, m_3\}$, $\{m_3, m_1\}$ and $\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$. Let $M' = \{\{m_1, m_2\}, \{m_2, m_3\}, \{m_3, m_1\}\}$. Since M' is an antichain with three or more

elements, we know that $S_\omega(M')$ is an infinite set. Applying Lemma 2.4, we find that the set $\{\{x, \{m_1, m_2, m_3\}\} : x \in S_\omega(M')\}$ is an infinite antichain of $S(M' \cup \{\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}\})$. Therefore, $S(\{\{x, \{m_1, m_2, m_3\}\} : x \in S_\omega(M')\})$ is a proper class that is contained in $S(M)$. We conclude that $S(M)$ is itself a proper class. \square

3. PRODUCTS DO NOT EXIST IN TopOpen

We view each preordered set as a topological space, whose open subsets are its *downsets*. Preordered sets are then exactly the Alexandrov spaces up to homeomorphism, and among them, posets are exactly the Alexandrov T_0 -spaces (see, e.g., [Joh82, p. 45]). It is more common to define the open subsets to be the upsets, but the opposite convention is more convenient for the construction in Section 2.

Let **PreOpen** be the category of preordered sets and open maps, let **PosOpen** be the full subcategory consisting of posets, and let **WellOpen** be the full subcategory consisting of well-founded posets. Recall that a poset P is said to be *well-founded* if it has no strictly decreasing sequences, that is, if its opposite is Noetherian. Our proof that these three categories do not have binary products relies on a key result, Lemma 3.2, which in turn requires the following characterization of open maps between preordered sets.

Lemma 3.1. *Let P and Q be preordered sets, and let $f: P \rightarrow Q$ be a function. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) f is an open map,
- (2) $f[\downarrow p] = \downarrow f(p)$ for all $p \in P$,
- (3) $f^{-1}[\uparrow q] = \uparrow f^{-1}(q)$ for all $q \in Q$.

Proof. Since closure in Alexandrov spaces is \uparrow , (1) is equivalent to $f^{-1}\uparrow S = \uparrow f^{-1}(S)$ for all $S \subseteq Q$ by [RS63, pp. 98–100]. Since \uparrow commutes with unions, the latter condition is equivalent to (3). Thus, (1) is equivalent to (3). The equivalence between (2) and (3) follows from [Esa19, Prop. 1.4.12] (where the author works with the topologies of upsets rather than downsets, so the order in the statement is flipped everywhere). \square

For the following lemma, we recall that a *chain* of a partially ordered class P is a set $x \subseteq P$ that satisfies $p_1 \leq p_2$ or $p_2 \leq p_1$ for all $p_1, p_2 \in x$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a convex subset of V , and let P be a preordered set. Assume that $M \cap \downarrow m$ is a chain for each $m \in M$. For all ordinals α and all open maps $f: S_\alpha(M) \rightarrow P$, if f is injective on M , then f is injective on $S_\alpha(M)$.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by transfinite induction on α . For brevity, let $T_\alpha = S_\alpha(M)$. In particular, $T_0 = M$. Assume that for all $\beta < \alpha$ and all open maps $g: T_\beta \rightarrow P$, if g is injective on T_0 , then g is injective on T_β . If α is zero, then the conclusion of the theorem is tautological. If α is limit, then the conclusion of the theorem follows immediately because $T_\alpha = \bigcup\{T_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and T_β is a downset of T_α for all $\beta < \alpha$. The set T_β is a downset of T_α by Lemma 2.3(1) because M is convex. Only the successor case remains.

Assume that α is a successor ordinal. Let $f: T_\alpha \rightarrow P$ be an open map, and assume that it is injective on T_0 . By the induction hypothesis, f is injective on $T_{\alpha-1}$. Let $x, y \in T_\alpha$ be such that $f(x) = f(y)$. Because f is an open map, we have that

$$f[\downarrow x] = \downarrow f(x) = \downarrow f(y) = f[\downarrow y] \tag{*}$$

by Lemma 3.1. We observe that $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$ is the intersection of $S(M)$ and the transitive closure of x , and it is likewise for $\downarrow y \setminus \{y\}$.

Suppose that exactly one of x or y is in $T_{\alpha-1}$. Without loss of generality, $x \notin T_{\alpha-1}$ and $y \in T_{\alpha-1}$. We apply (*). For all $x' \in \downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$, there exists an element $y' \in \downarrow y$ such that $f(x') = f(y')$ and, hence, $x' = y'$ because $x', y' \in T_{\alpha-1}$ and f is injective on $T_{\alpha-1}$. It follows that $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\} \subseteq \downarrow y$, and in particular, $x \subseteq \downarrow y$. We find that $y \notin M$ because $\downarrow y$ is a chain for all $y \in M$. If $y \notin x$, then $x \subseteq \downarrow y \setminus \{y\} \subseteq T_\beta$ for some $\beta < \alpha - 1$, so $x \in T_{\beta+1} \subseteq T_{\alpha-1}$, contradicting our assumption that $x \notin T_{\alpha-1}$. If $y \in x$, then x is not a nontrivial antichain of $T_{\alpha-1}$, contradicting that $x \in T_\alpha \setminus T_{\alpha-1}$. We conclude that, for all $x, y \in T_\alpha$ such that $f(x) = f(y)$, either $x, y \in T_{\alpha-1}$ or $x, y \notin T_{\alpha-1}$.

If $x, y \in T_{\alpha-1}$, then $x = y$ because f is injective on $T_{\alpha-1}$. Assume that $x, y \notin T_{\alpha-1}$. We apply (*). For all $x' \in \downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$, there exists an element $y' \in \downarrow y$ such that $f(x') = f(y')$. Since $x' \in T_{\alpha-1}$, this equality implies that $y' \in T_{\alpha-1}$ by the conclusion of the preceding paragraph. It follows that $x' = y'$ because f is an injection on $T_{\alpha-1}$. Thus, $x' = y' \in \downarrow y \setminus \{y\}$. Overall, we conclude that $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\} \subseteq \downarrow y \setminus \{y\}$, and symmetrically, $\downarrow y \setminus \{y\} \subseteq \downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$. Thus, $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\} = \downarrow y \setminus \{y\}$. This implies that $x = y$ because x is the set of maximal elements of $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$, and it is likewise for y . Indeed, $x \subseteq T_{\alpha-1}$, and each element of $\downarrow x \setminus \{x\}$ is either an element of x or strictly below an element of x . Therefore, $x = y$ whether $x, y \in T_{\alpha-1}$ or $x, y \notin T_{\alpha-1}$, and the other cases are impossible.

We have proved that the induction hypothesis implies the conclusion of the theorem when α is a successor ordinal. Therefore, by transfinite induction on α , every open map $f: T_\alpha \rightarrow P$ is an injection if it is an injection on T_0 . \square

Theorem 3.3. *The following categories do not have binary products:*

- (1) PreOpen,
- (2) PosOpen,
- (3) WellOpen.

Proof. Suppose that PreOpen has binary products, and let $\mathbb{S} = \{0, 1\}$ be ordered by $0 < 1$. Let the preordered set P , together with open maps $p_1, p_2: P \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, be a product of \mathbb{S} with itself. Let $0, 1, 2, \dots$ be the finite ordinals. Let

- (1) $m_0 = \{\{0\}\}$,
- (2) $m_1 = \{m_0, 1\}$,
- (3) $m_2 = \{m_0, 2\}$,
- (4) $m_3 = \{m_0, 3\}$,

and let $M = \{m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3\}$. We observe that $m_0 < m_1, m_2, m_3$ and that $\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$ is an antichain because m_0 is not in the transitive closure of any ordinal. For the same reason, we have that M is a convex set, and it is obvious that $M \cap \downarrow m$ is a chain for each $m \in M$.

Let α be an ordinal. An initial segment of the poset $S_\alpha(M)$ is depicted in Fig. 1 when α is a limit ordinal.




FIGURE 1. The poset $S_\alpha(\{m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3\})$.

For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $f_i: S_\alpha(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ be defined by

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = m_0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = m_i, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The function f_i is an open map by Lemma 3.1 because $f_i[\downarrow x] = \{0\} = \downarrow f_i(x)$ for $x \in \{m_0, m_i\}$ and $f_i[\downarrow x] = \{0, 1\} = \downarrow f_i(x)$ for all other $x \in S_\alpha(M)$. The universal property of the product yields an open map $f: S_\alpha(M) \rightarrow P$ that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & S_\alpha(M) & \\ f_1 \swarrow & \vdots & \searrow f_2 \\ \mathbb{S} & \xleftarrow{p_1} P \xrightarrow{p_2} & \mathbb{S} \end{array}$$

The function $m \mapsto (f_1(m), f_2(m)) = (p_1(f(m)), p_2(f(m)))$ is an injection $M \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$, where the codomain is the usual product of posets. It follows that f is injective on M too. By Lemma 3.2, we conclude that f is injective on $S_\alpha(M)$. Thus, the cardinality of P is no smaller than the cardinality of $S_\alpha(M)$ for all ordinals α , contradicting Theorem 2.5 because $S_\alpha(\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}) \subseteq S_\alpha(M)$. Therefore, **PreOpen** does not have binary products.

We have proved claim (1). The same proof establishes claims (2) and (3) because $S_\alpha(M)$ is a well-founded poset for each ordinal α . \square

Remark 3.4. The construction in Fig. 1 is reminiscent of the coloring technique in modal logic (see, e.g., [CZ97, Bez06]).

We now prove that the category **TopOpen** of topological spaces and open maps, the full subcategory **TopOpen**₀ of T_0 -spaces, and the full subcategory **SobOpen** of sober spaces do not have binary products. A topological space is said to be *sober* if each nonempty closed set that is not the union of two proper closed subsets is the closure of a unique point (see, e.g., [PP12, p. 2]). A poset is sober iff it is well-founded (see, e.g., [EGP07, Thm. 4.12]). Sobriety is a separation axiom that is natural to several areas of mathematics. For example, the Zariski spectrum of a commutative ring is sober but generally not Hausdorff [Hoc69].

We apply Theorem 3.3 by using the familiar fact that right adjoints preserve products. Consequently, if a category has all binary products then its coreflective subcategories also have binary products.

Proposition 3.5. *We have that*

- (1) **PreOpen** is a coreflective subcategory of **TopOpen**,
- (2) **PosOpen** is a coreflective subcategory of **TopOpen**₀,
- (3) **WellOpen** is a coreflective subcategory of **SobOpen**.

Proof. Let X be a topological space, and let \mathcal{A} be the family of all open subsets that are Alexandrov in the subspace topology. The open set $\widehat{X} = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$ is also Alexandrov in the subspace topology because a space is Alexandrov iff each point has a least open neighborhood (see, e.g., [Joh82, sec. II.1.8]). Thus, \widehat{X} is the largest open subset of X that is Alexandrov in the subspace topology.

Let P be a preordered set, and let $f: P \rightarrow X$ be an open map. Then, the range of f is open. It is also Alexandrov because $f[U_x]$ is the least open neighborhood of $f(x)$ whenever U_x is the least open neighborhood of $x \in X$. Thus, $f[P] \in \mathcal{A}$, and f factors uniquely through the inclusion $\widehat{X} \hookrightarrow X$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & & \\ \vdots \downarrow & \searrow f & \\ \widehat{X} & \hookrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

We conclude that **PreOpen** is a coreflective subcategory of **TopOpen**.

We have proved claim (1). The same proof establishes claims (2) and (3). Indeed, each subspace of a T_0 -space is T_0 , and each open subspace of a sober space is sober (see, e.g., [GHK⁺03, O-5.16(2)]). \square

Remark 3.6. The category **Pre** of preordered sets and order-preserving maps is a coreflective subcategory of **Top**, but the construction of the coreflector in the proof of Proposition 3.5 is different. Indeed, the coreflector **Top** \rightarrow **Pre** maps each topological space X to the preordered set (X, \leq) , where \leq is the dual of the specialization order. In other words, $x \leq y$ iff $y \in \overline{\{x\}}$ (we work with the dual of the specialization order because of our earlier convention that downsets are open). However, the Alexandrov topology of this preorder may be strictly finer than the topology of X , and hence the inclusion map may fail to be open.

We now complete the proof of our main result.

Theorem 3.7. *The following categories do not have binary products:*

- (1) **TopOpen**,
- (2) **TopOpen**₀,
- (3) **SobOpen**.

Proof. Assume that **TopOpen** has binary products. The category **PreOpen** is a coreflective subcategory of **TopOpen** by Proposition 3.5, and thus, it too has binary products. This conclusion contradicts Theorem 3.3. Therefore, **TopOpen** does not have binary products.

We have proved claim (1). The same proof establishes claims (2) and (3), with **PosOpen** in place of **PreOpen** in the case of claim (2) and **WellOpen** in place of **PreOpen** in the case of claim (3). \square

4. COPRODUCTS DO NOT EXIST IN CHA

A *Heyting algebra* is a bounded lattice A such that \wedge has a *residual* \rightarrow in the sense that

$$a \wedge x \leq b \iff x \leq a \rightarrow b$$

for all $a, b, x \in A$ [BD74, p. 174]. A *complete Heyting algebra* is a Heyting algebra that is complete as a lattice. It is well known that a complete lattice is a Heyting algebra iff it is a frame [PP12, p. 332]. Thus, they have been studied extensively in pointfree topology.

A *morphism* of complete Heyting algebras is a map $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ that is a homomorphism of complete lattices such that $\varphi(a_1 \rightarrow a_2) = \varphi(a_1) \rightarrow \varphi(a_2)$ for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$. We prove that the resulting category **CHA** does not have coproducts. This also follows from a result of De Jongh [dJ80]. However, our proof also shows that even finite Heyting algebras need not have a coproduct in this category.


We begin by observing that $\mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$ is equivalent to a reflective subcategory of **CHA**. For this we utilize De Jongh-Troelstra duality [dJT66]. Let $\mathcal{O} : \mathbf{PreOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CHA}$ be the functor that maps each poset P to the complete Heyting algebra $\mathcal{O}(P)$ and each open map $f : P \rightarrow Q$ to the morphism $f^{-1}[-] : \mathcal{O}(Q) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(P)$. We use the same notation for the restriction of \mathcal{O} to the full subcategories $\mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$ and $\mathbf{WellOpen}^{\text{op}}$.

Proposition 4.1. *The functor $\mathcal{O} : \mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CHA}$ is full, faithful, and has a left adjoint $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{CHA} \rightarrow \mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}(P)) \cong P$ for each poset P .*

Proof. The functor \mathcal{O} is full and faithful by De Jongh-Troelstra duality; see Lemma 3.1 for equivalent characterizations of morphisms in $\mathbf{PosOpen}$. To show that it has a left adjoint, let A be a complete Heyting algebra. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all $a \in A$ such that $\downarrow a \cong \mathcal{O}(P)$ for some poset P . By De Jongh-Troelstra duality, $a \in \mathcal{S}$ iff each $b \leq a$ is a join of completely join-irreducible elements. Let $s = \bigvee \mathcal{S}$. We show that $s \in \mathcal{S}$, which implies that s is the largest element of \mathcal{S} . Let $x \leq s$. Since A is a complete Heyting algebra, A satisfies the join-infinite distributive law (see, e.g., [RS63, Sec. IV.7]), so $x = x \wedge s = \bigvee \{x \wedge y : y \in \mathcal{S}\}$. But each $x \wedge y$ is a join of completely join-irreducible elements because $y \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, x is a join of completely join-irreducible elements, and hence $s \in \mathcal{S}$ (in fact, $s = 1$ iff $A \cong \mathcal{O}(P)$ for some poset P).

Let $\mathcal{L}(A)$ be the poset of completely join-irreducible elements of $\downarrow s$. By De Jongh-Troelstra duality, there is an isomorphism $\varepsilon : \downarrow s \cong \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}(A))$. For each $a \in A$ let $\rho_a : A \rightarrow \downarrow a$ be given by $\rho_a(b) = a \wedge b$ for each $b \in A$, and define $\eta : A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}(A))$ as the composition $\eta = \varepsilon \circ \rho_s$. Then η is a composition of two morphisms of complete Heyting algebras, hence is a morphism of complete Heyting algebras. We show that η has the desired universal property.

Let Q be a poset, and let $\varphi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Q)$ be a morphism of complete Heyting algebras. Since complete homomorphic images are determined by principal filters and $A/\uparrow x \cong \downarrow x$ (see, e.g., [RS63, Sec. I.13]), we obtain that φ factors through the morphism $\rho_a : A \rightarrow \downarrow a$ via an injective morphism $\iota : \downarrow a \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Q)$. Thus, we obtain a morphism $\pi : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{L}(A)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(Q)$ such that $\pi \circ \eta = \varphi$.




Because \mathcal{O} is full, there exists an open map $f: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(A)$ such that $\mathcal{O}(f) = \pi$, and so $\mathcal{O}(f) \circ \eta = \varphi$. Because \mathcal{O} is faithful and η is surjective, the open map f is unique. Therefore, the assignment $A \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(A)$ extends to a functor $\mathbf{CHA} \rightarrow \mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$ that is left adjoint to \mathcal{O} . Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}(P)) \cong P$ for each poset P because \mathcal{O} is full and faithful (see, e.g., [Mac71, p. 89]). \square

Theorem 4.2. *The category \mathbf{CHA} does not have a coproduct of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ with itself.*

Proof. Assume that the coproduct $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}) \sqcup \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ exists in \mathbf{CHA} . By Proposition 4.1, the functor $\mathcal{L}: \mathbf{CHA} \rightarrow \mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$ is a left adjoint, so it preserves coproducts, and in particular, the coproduct $\mathbb{S} \sqcup \mathbb{S} \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})) \sqcup \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}) \sqcup \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}))$ exists in $\mathbf{PosOpen}^{\text{op}}$. We conclude that the product of \mathbb{S} with itself exists in $\mathbf{PosOpen}$. This conclusion contradicts the proof of Theorem 3.3. Therefore, the coproduct $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}) \sqcup \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ does not exist in \mathbf{CHA} . \square

Corollary 4.3 ([dJ80]). *The free complete Heyting algebra on two generators does not exist.*

Proof. Assume that there is a free complete Heyting algebra A on two generators p and q . Let $F \subseteq A$ be the principal filter $F = \uparrow(\neg\neg p \wedge \neg\neg q)$, and let $B = A/F$. We claim that B is a coproduct of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ with itself in \mathbf{CHA} , where the injections $i, j: \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow B$ are given by $i(\{0\}) = [p]$ and $j(\{0\}) = [q]$.



Let C be a complete Heyting algebra, and let $f, g: \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow C$ be morphisms of complete Heyting algebras. Let $h: A \rightarrow C$ be the morphism that is defined by $h(p) = f(\{0\})$ and $h(q) = g(\{0\})$. We calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} h(\neg\neg p \wedge \neg\neg q) &= \neg\neg h(p) \wedge \neg\neg h(q) = \neg\neg f(\{0\}) \wedge \neg\neg g(\{0\}) \\ &= f(\neg\neg\{0\}) \wedge g(\neg\neg\{0\}) = f(\mathbb{S}) \wedge g(\mathbb{S}) = 1 \wedge 1 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $h[F] = \{1\}$, and hence, h factors through the quotient morphism $A \rightarrow B$ via a morphism $\tilde{h}: B \rightarrow C$ (see, e.g., [RS63, Sec. I.13]).

We note that

$$\tilde{h}(i(\{0\})) = \tilde{h}[p] = h(p) = f(\{0\}),$$

and similarly,

$$\tilde{h}(j(\{0\})) = \tilde{h}[q] = h(q) = g(\{0\}).$$

Thus, $h \circ i = f$, and $h \circ j = g$. Furthermore, \tilde{h} is the unique morphism that satisfies these two equations because a morphism out of B is uniquely determined by its values on $[p]$ and $[q]$. We conclude that B is indeed a coproduct of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ with itself in **CHA**. This conclusion directly contradicts Theorem 4.2. Therefore, there is no free complete Heyting algebra on two generators. \square

Remark 4.4. De Jongh [dJ80] proved that the free complete Heyting algebra on two generators does not exist. This result implies that the category **CHA** does not have binary coproducts because the free complete Heyting algebra on one generator does exist [Joh82, Sec. I.4.11], so De Jongh's theorem implies that this algebra does not have a coproduct with itself. Theorem 4.2 is a stronger result: it shows that even $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{S})$ does not have a coproduct with itself.

Neither Theorem 3.3 nor Theorem 3.7 is a direct corollary of De Jongh's theorem:

Proposition 4.5. *The following functors do not have right adjoints:*

- (1) $\mathcal{O}: \text{TopOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$,
- (2) $\mathcal{O}: \text{TopOpen}_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$,
- (3) $\mathcal{O}: \text{SobOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$,
- (4) $\mathcal{O}: \text{PreOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$,
- (5) $\mathcal{O}: \text{PosOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$,
- (6) $\mathcal{O}: \text{WellOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CHA}$.

Proof. We prove (1); the proofs of (2)–(6) are identical. Assume that \mathcal{O} has a right adjoint $\mathcal{R}: \text{CHA} \rightarrow \text{TopOpen}^{\text{op}}$. For each natural number n , let 2^n be the n -fold Cartesian power of the set $2 = \{0, 1\}$. Regarding 2^n as a discrete topological space, we have $\mathcal{O}(2^n) = \wp(2^n)$. Let 2^ω be the Cantor space, let $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)$ be its Borel σ -algebra, and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(2^\omega)$ be the set of meager Borel sets. Then, $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$ is a complete atomless Boolean algebra; indeed, it is isomorphic to the regular open subsets of 2^ω (see, e.g., [Kop89, Prop. 12.9]).

Let $f_n: \mathcal{O}(2^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$ be the morphism that maps each subset of 2^n to the corresponding clopen subset of 2^ω . Let $g_n: \mathcal{O}(2^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}))$ be the unique morphism such that $\varepsilon \circ g_n = f_n$, where ε is the counit for the adjunction $\mathcal{O} \dashv \mathcal{R}$ at $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$. Thus, the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M})) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M} \\
 \uparrow g_n & \nearrow f_n & \\
 \mathcal{O}(2^n) & &
 \end{array}$$

Hence, the range of ε contains $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n[\mathcal{O}(2^n)]$, which is a basis for the topology on 2^ω . This basis generates $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$ as a complete Boolean algebra, so $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$ is a complete homomorphic image of the complete Heyting algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}))$. Consequently, $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M} \cong \downarrow U$ for some open subset $U \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M})$ (see, e.g., [RS63, Sec. IV.8]). This yields that every open subset of U is closed, which implies that $\mathcal{O}(U)$ is atomic. Thus, $\mathcal{B}(2^\omega)/\mathcal{M}$ is both atomic and atomless, in contradiction to the Baire category theorem. Therefore, the functor \mathcal{O} does not have a right adjoint. \square

5. KRIPKE FRAMES AND BAOS

Posets and preordered sets are examples of Kripke frames, which play an important role in modal logic (see, e.g, [BdRV01]). We show that the category of Kripke frames and p-morphisms also lacks binary products. From this we derive that the category of complete BAOS (as well as its full subcategory consisting of closure algebras) lacks binary coproducts.

Definition 5.1. The category \mathbf{KrF} of *Kripke frames* and *p-morphisms* is defined as follows:

- (1) an object is a set X together with a binary relation R on X ,
- (2) a morphism from (X, R) to (Y, S) is a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f[R[x]] = S[f(x)]$ for all $x \in X$ or, equivalently, if $f^{-1}[S^{-1}(y)] = R^{-1}[f^{-1}(y)]$ for all $y \in Y$.

Remark 5.2. By Lemma 3.1, $\mathbf{PreOpen}$ is equivalent to a full subcategory of \mathbf{KrF} . This equivalence maps each preorder P to its opposite P^{op} .

Theorem 5.3. *The category $\mathbf{PreOpen}$ is equivalent to a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{KrF} . Therefore, \mathbf{KrF} does not have binary products.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{F} = (X, R)$ be a Kripke frame. A subset U of X is an *R-upset* provided $x \in U$ and $x R y$ imply $y \in U$. Let \mathcal{U} be the set of all *R-upsets* U of \mathfrak{F} such that (U, R_U) is a preorder, where $R_U := R \cap U^2$ is the restriction of R to U . Set $Y = \bigcup \mathcal{U}$. Clearly Y is an *R-upset* of \mathfrak{F} and the restriction R_Y is reflexive on Y . To see that it is transitive, let $x, y, z \in Y$ with $x R y R z$. Then $x \in U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$, and hence also $y, z \in U$ since U is an *R-upset*. But then $x R z$ since the restriction of R to U is transitive. Thus, Y is the largest *R-upset* of \mathfrak{F} that is a preorder.

Let $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F})$ be Y ordered by the converse of R , and let $\varepsilon: \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ be the inclusion map. Let P be a preorder, and let $f: P^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ be a p-morphism. Then $f[P]$ is an *R-upset* of \mathfrak{F} . Since $p \leq q$ implies $f(q) R f(p)$, the restriction of R to $f[P]$ is reflexive. To see that it is transitive, let $p, q, r \in P$ with $f(p) R f(q) R f(r)$. Because f is a p-morphism, there exist $q', r' \in P$ such that $r' \leq q' \leq p$, $f(q') = f(q)$, and $f(r') = f(r)$. Therefore, $r' \leq p$, and so $f(p) R f(r)$. Thus, $f[P] \in \mathcal{U}$, and hence $f[P] \subseteq Y$. We conclude that f factors through ε via g^{op} , where $g: P \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F})$ is an open map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{F})^{\text{op}} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & \mathfrak{F} \\
 \uparrow g^{\text{op}} & \nearrow f & \\
 P^{\text{op}} & &
 \end{array}$$

The open map g is unique because ε is an inclusion. Thus, we conclude that $\mathbf{PreOpen}$ is equivalent to a coreflective subcategory of \mathbf{KrF} . By Theorem 3.3, $\mathbf{PreOpen}$ does not have binary products. Therefore, neither does \mathbf{KrF} . \square

A *Boolean algebra with an operator* (BAO) is a Boolean algebra B that is equipped with a map $\diamond: B \rightarrow B$ that preserves finite joins (see [JT51, Def. 2.13] and also [BdRV01, Sec. 5.3]). A BAO *homomorphism* $(B_1, \diamond_1) \rightarrow (B_2, \diamond_2)$ is a Boolean algebra homomorphism $\varphi: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ such that $\varphi(\diamond_1 a) = \diamond_2 \varphi(a)$ for all $a \in B_1$. Furthermore, a *closure algebra* is a BAO (B, \diamond) such that $a \leq \diamond a$ and $\diamond \diamond a \leq \diamond a$ for all $a \in B$ [MT44, Def. 1.1]. Let \mathbf{CBAO} be the category of complete BAOs and complete BAO homomorphisms, and let \mathbf{CCA} be the full subcategory of \mathbf{CBAO} consisting of closure algebras.

Theorem 5.4. *The categories CBAO and CCA do not have binary coproducts.*

Proof. The proof of both statements is similar. Associating with each Kripke frame $\mathfrak{F} = (X, R)$ the BAO $(\wp(X), \diamond_R)$, where $\wp(X)$ is the powerset of X and $\diamond_R(U) = \{x \in X : xRu \text{ for some } u \in U\}$, yields a functor $\wp : \mathbf{KrF}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CBAO}$ that is full and faithful by Thomason duality [Tho75]. Furthermore, an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4.1 gives that \wp has a left adjoint. By Theorem 5.3, \mathbf{KrF} does not have binary products. Thus, an argument similar to Theorem 4.2 yields that \mathbf{CBAO} does not have binary coproducts. \square

Proof. The proof of both statements is similar. We associate with each Kripke frame $\mathfrak{F} = (X, R)$ the BAO $\wp(\mathfrak{F}) := (\wp(X), \diamond_R)$, where $\wp(X)$ is the powerset of X and

$$\diamond_R U = \{x \in X : x R u \text{ for some } u \in U\}.$$

Also, with each p-morphism f we associate the BAO homomorphism f^{-1} . This defines a functor $\wp : \mathbf{KrF}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CBAO}$. By [JT51, Thm. 3.13], R is a preorder iff the BAO $(\wp(X), \diamond_R)$ is a closure algebra. Thus, \wp restricts to a functor $\mathbf{PreOpen}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CCA}$ (see Remark 5.2).

By Thomason duality [Tho75], \wp is full and faithful. We show that it has a left adjoint $\mathcal{L} : \mathbf{CBAO} \rightarrow \mathbf{KrF}^{\text{op}}$. Let A be a complete BAO. As is customary, let $\square = \neg \diamond \neg$. Then \square is a unary function on A preserving finite meets. It is well known (see, e.g., [CZ97, Thm. 7.70]) that if $a \in A$ satisfies $a \leq \square a$, then $A/\uparrow a$ is a homomorphic image of A , which is then isomorphic to $\downarrow a$, where the corresponding operator on $\downarrow a$ is defined by $\diamond_a b = a \wedge \diamond b$ for each $b \leq a$.

Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all $a \in A$ such that $a \leq \square a$ and $\downarrow a \cong \wp(\mathfrak{F})$ for some Kripke frame \mathfrak{F} . By Thomason duality, $a \in \mathcal{S}$ iff $\downarrow a$ is complete, atomic, and \diamond_a is completely additive (that is, $\diamond_a \bigvee T = \bigvee \{\diamond_a t : t \in T\}$). Let $s = \bigvee \mathcal{S}$. We show that $s \in \mathcal{S}$, which implies that s is the largest element of \mathcal{S} . We have

$$s = \bigvee \mathcal{S} \leq \bigvee \{\square a : a \in \mathcal{S}\} \leq \square s.$$

It is clear that $\downarrow s$ is complete. To see that it is atomic, let $0 \neq b \leq s$. Since A is a complete Boolean algebra, $b = b \wedge s = \bigvee \{b \wedge a : a \in \mathcal{S}\}$, so there is $a \in \mathcal{S}$ with $b \wedge a \neq 0$. Because $\downarrow a$ is atomic, there is an atom under $b \wedge a$. Thus, $\downarrow s$ is atomic.

To show that \diamond_s is completely additive, we first observe that $\square a \wedge \diamond b \leq \diamond(a \wedge b)$ in every BAO. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \square b \wedge \diamond a \wedge \neg \diamond a = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square b \wedge \square \neg a = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square(b \wedge \neg a) = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square(b \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b)) = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square b \wedge \square \neg(a \wedge b) = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square b \wedge \neg \diamond(a \wedge b) = 0 \\ \implies & \diamond a \wedge \square b \leq \diamond(a \wedge b). \end{aligned}$$


Now, let $T \subseteq \downarrow s$ and let x be an atom in $\downarrow s$ such that $x \leq \diamond_s \bigvee T = s \wedge \diamond \bigvee T$. Since x is an atom, $x \leq a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore, by the above inequality,

$$x \leq a \wedge \diamond \bigvee T \leq \square a \wedge \diamond \bigvee T \leq \diamond(a \wedge \bigvee T) = \diamond \bigvee \{a \wedge t : t \in T\}.$$

Thus, $x \leq \diamond_a \bigvee \{a \wedge t : t \in T\}$, so $x \leq \bigvee \{\diamond_a(a \wedge t) : t \in T\}$ since \diamond_a is completely additive. But then $x \leq \bigvee \{\diamond_s t : t \in T\}$, and so \diamond_s is completely additive. Consequently, $s \in \mathcal{S}$ (in fact, $s = 1$ iff $A \cong \wp(\mathfrak{F})$ for some Kripke frame \mathfrak{F}).

Consider the Kripke frame $\mathcal{L}(A) = (X, R)$, where X is the set of atoms of $\downarrow s$ and $x R y$ iff $x \leq \diamond_s y$. By Thomason duality, there is an isomorphism $\varepsilon : \downarrow s \cong \wp(\mathcal{L}(A))$. Define $\eta : A \rightarrow \wp(\mathcal{L}(A))$ as the composition $\eta = \varepsilon \circ \rho_s$, where we recall that $\rho_s(a) = s \wedge a$. Since η is a composition of two morphisms of complete BAOs, η is a morphism of BAOs. We show that η has the desired universal property.

Let \mathfrak{F} be a Kripke frame, and let $\varphi : A \rightarrow \wp(\mathfrak{F})$ be a morphism of complete BAOs. Since complete homomorphic images of BAOs are determined by principal filters $\uparrow x$ such that $x \leq \Box x$ and $A/\uparrow x \cong \downarrow x$, we obtain that φ factors through the morphism $\rho_a : A \rightarrow \downarrow a$ via an injective morphism $\iota : \downarrow a \rightarrow \wp(\mathfrak{F})$. Thus, we obtain a morphism $\pi : \wp(\mathcal{L}(A)) \rightarrow \wp(\mathfrak{F})$ such that $\pi \circ \eta = \varphi$.



Because \wp is full, there exists a p-morphism $f : \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(A)$ such that $\wp(f) = \pi$, and so $\wp(f) \circ \eta = \varphi$. Because \wp is faithful and η is surjective, the p-morphism f is unique. Therefore, the assignment $A \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(A)$ extends to a functor $\mathbf{CBAO} \rightarrow \mathbf{KrF}^{\text{op}}$ that is left adjoint to \wp . Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}(\wp(\mathfrak{F})) \cong \mathfrak{F}$ for each Kripke frame \mathfrak{F} because \wp is full and faithful.

By Theorem 5.3, there exist Kripke frames \mathfrak{F} and \mathfrak{G} whose product does not exist in \mathbf{KrF} . Assume that a binary coproduct $\wp(\mathfrak{F}) \sqcup \wp(\mathfrak{G})$ exists in \mathbf{CBAO} . Since \mathcal{L} is left adjoint to \wp , it preserves coproducts, and in particular, the coproduct

$$\mathfrak{F} \sqcup \mathfrak{G} \cong \mathcal{L}(\wp(\mathfrak{F})) \sqcup \mathcal{L}(\wp(\mathfrak{G})) \cong \mathcal{L}(\wp(\mathfrak{F}) \sqcup \wp(\mathfrak{G}))$$

exists in \mathbf{KrF}^{op} , so the product $\mathfrak{F} \times \mathfrak{G}$ exists in \mathbf{KrF} . The obtained contradiction proves that the coproduct $\wp(\mathfrak{F}) \sqcup \wp(\mathfrak{G})$ does not exist in \mathbf{CBAO} . \square

REFERENCES

- [BD74] R. Balbes and P. Dwinger. *Distributive lattices*. University of Missouri Press, Columbia, MO, 1974.
- [BdRV01] P. Blackburn, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema. *Modal logic*, volume 53 of *Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [Bez06] N. Bezhanishvili. *Lattices of Intermediate and Cylindric Modal Logics*. PhD thesis, ILLC, University of Amsterdam, 2006.
- [CZ97] A. Chagrov and M. Zakharyashev. *Modal logic*, volume 35 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
- [dJ80] D. H. J. de Jongh. A class of intuitionistic connectives. In *The Kleene Symposium (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., 1978)*, volume 101 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, pages 103–111. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1980.

- [dJT66] D. H. J. de Jongh and A. S. Troelstra. On the connection of partially ordered sets with some pseudo-Boolean algebras. *Indag. Math.*, 28:317–329, 1966.
- [EGP07] M. Ern e, M. Gehrke, and A. Pultr. Complete congruences on topologies and down-set lattices. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 15(1-2):163–184, 2007.
- [Eps13] A. Epstein. Category of topological spaces with open or closed maps. MathOverflow, 2013. URL:mathoverflow.net/q/117174 (version: 2013-01-08).
- [Esa19] L. Esakia. *Heyting algebras*, volume 50 of *Trends in Logic—Studia Logica Library*. Springer, Cham, 2019. Translated from the original 1985 Russian edition by A. Evseev. Edited by G. Bezhanishvili and W. H. Holliday.
- [GHK⁺03] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *Continuous lattices and domains*, volume 93 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [Hoc69] M. Hochster. Prime ideal structure in commutative rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142:43–60, 1969.
- [Joh82] P. T. Johnstone. *Stone spaces*, volume 3 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- [JT51] B. J nsson and A. Tarski. Boolean algebras with operators. I. *Amer. J. Math.*, 73:891–939, 1951.
- [Kop89] S. Koppelberg. *Handbook of Boolean algebras. Vol. 1*. Edited by J. D. Monk and R. Bonnet. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.
- [Mac71] S. MacLane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume Vol. 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1971.
- [MT44] J. C. C. McKinsey and A. Tarski. The algebra of topology. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 45:141–191, 1944.
- [PP12] J. Picado and A. Pultr. *Frames and locales*. Frontiers in Mathematics. Birkh user/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2012.
- [RS63] H. Rasiowa and R. Sikorski. *The mathematics of metamathematics*. Pa stwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, 1963.
- [Tho75] S. K. Thomason. Categories of frames for modal logic. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 40(3):439–442, 1975.

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
 Email address: guram@nmsu.edu

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
 Email address: akornell@dal.ca