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#### Abstract

We prove that epimorphisms are surjective in certain categories of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. It then turns out that epimorphisms are also surjective in the category of all (unordered) algebras of type $\mathcal{F}$.


## 1. Motivation

Various ordered algebras appeared in different contexts in mathematics, mostly during the second half of the previous century. The monograph [4] by Fuchs, written in the early 1960's, gave an outline of the theory of ordered groups, rings, fields and semigroups. Around the same time, universal algebra and lattice theory had also started to flourish. The initial account of ordered universal algebras, to the best knowledge of the authors, was provided by Bloom in [1].

It has been recently shown in [10] that epimorphisms (briefly, epis) are preserved by the forgetful functor from the category of partially ordered monoids (briefly, pomonoids) to the category of (unordered) monoids. The aim of the present article is to pursue this line of research in the context of ordered universal algebras. Accordingly, for a type $\mathcal{F}$ of universal algebras, we prove that epis are surjective in certain categories of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras, as well as in their underlying category of all (unordered) $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. We begin by introducing basic notions in Section 2 This is followed by a discussion, in Section 3, about the ordered term algebras. In Section 4 we introduce categorical concepts and construct objects that we need. Finally, we employ a kind of term re-writing technique to prove our main result in Section 5

## 2. Preliminaries

Basic universal algebraic and category theoretic notions and definitions are adopted from [2] and [9] respectively. We denote the type of a universal algebra by $\mathcal{F}$ and for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup\{0\}$ we denote by $\mathcal{F}_{k}$ the set of all $k$-ary operation symbols.

Definition 1 (see [1]). Given a type $\mathcal{F}$, an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra is a triple $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq_{A}\right)$, where $\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}\right)$ is an $\mathcal{F}$-algebra and $\left(A, \leq_{A}\right)$ is a partially ordered set (briefly, poset), such that every $f^{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}$ is a monotone function, i.e., if $f \in \mathcal{F}_{k}$ and $a_{1}, b_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}, b_{k} \in A$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(a_{1} \leq_{A} b_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{k} \leq_{A} b_{k}\right) \Rightarrow f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) \leq_{A} f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k}\right) . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

When condition (2.1) is satisfied, we say that $\leq_{A}$ is compatible with the operations in $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}$. Every $\mathcal{F}$-algebra $\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}\right)$ can be made into an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra by endowing it with the trivial order $=$. If there is no ambiguity in dropping the index, we shall use $\leq$ instead of $\leq_{A}$.

Let $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq_{A}\right)$ and $\mathbf{B}=\left(B, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{B}}, \leq_{B}\right)$ be ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. We say that $\mathbf{B}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$ if
(i) $\left(B, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{B}}\right)$ is a subalgebra of $\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}\right)$, and
(ii) $\leq_{B}=\leq_{A} \cap(B \times B)$.
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A homomorphism $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras is a monotone function $f:\left(A, \leq_{A}\right) \longrightarrow$ $\left(B, \leq_{B}\right)$ that is also a homomorphism of the underlying $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. We call $f$ an order-embedding if it also reflects the order, i.e., $f(x) \leq_{B} f(y) \Rightarrow x \leq_{A} y$, for all $x, y \in A$. Every order-embedding is necessarily injective. The product $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbf{A}_{i}$ of a family $\mathbf{A}_{i}=\left(A_{i}, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{i}}}, \leq A_{i}\right)$ of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras is obtained by defining component-wise operations and order on $\prod_{i \in I} A_{i}$. A class $\mathcal{K}$ of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras is called a variety if it is closed under homomorphic images, subalgebras and products. According to the Birkhoff-type characterization of varieties given in [1] $\mathcal{K}$ is a variety iff it consists precisely of all ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras satisfying a given set of inequalities $s \leq t$, where $s$ and $t$ are terms of type $\mathcal{F}$. Naturally, every variety of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras gives rise to a category; indeed a 2-category enriched over the category of posets. Epimorphisms (monomorphisms) in varieties of ordered algebras are the right (left) cancelative homomorphisms. It was observed in [8] that monomorphisms (isomorphisms) in the varieties of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras are precisely the injective homomorphisms (surjective order-embeddings).

Let F denote the forgetful functor from a category $\mathfrak{C}$ of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras to its underlaying category of unordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. Then $g \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathfrak{C})$ is clearly an epimorphism if $\mathrm{F}(g)$ is such. So, epimorphisms in the varieties of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras need not be surjective, since they are not necessarily such in the varieties of unordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. In this article we prove that epimorphisms are surjective in the varieties of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras defined by the inequalities $c \leq d$, where $c, d \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$. We shall denote these varieties by $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathrm{Oalg}_{\leq}^{0}$.

Recall that a reflexive and transitive relation on a set is called a quasiorder. Given an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$, a quasiorder $\sigma$ on $A$ is called a compatible quasiorder on $\mathbf{A}$ if it is compatible with the operations in $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}$ and extends the order on $A$, i.e., $\leq \subseteq \sigma$. For a homomorphism $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras we define $\overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker} f}$, the directed kernel of $f$, by

$$
\overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker}} f=\{(a, b) \in A \times A: f(a) \leq f(b)\}
$$

The relation $\overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker} f}$ is a compatible quasiorder on $\mathbf{A}$. In fact, every compatible quasiorder on $\mathbf{A}$ turns out to be the directed kernel of some homomorphism $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, see [3]. Given an ordered $\mathcal{F}$ algebra $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ and a congruence $\theta$ of the algebra $\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}\right)$, we define the relation $\underset{\theta}{\leq} \subseteq A^{2}$ by

$$
a \leq b \Leftrightarrow(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})\left(\exists a_{1}, b_{1}, \cdots, a_{n}, b_{n} \in A\right)\left(a \leq a_{1} \theta b_{1} \leq \cdots \leq a_{n} \theta b_{n} \leq b\right)
$$

The relation $\underset{\theta}{\leq}$ is also a compatible quasiorder on $\mathbf{A}$.
An order-congruence of an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ is a congruence $\theta$ of the algebra $\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}\right)$ satisfying the following condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\forall a, b \in A)(a \underset{\theta}{\leq} b \underset{\theta}{\leq} a \Rightarrow a \theta b) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Condition (2.2) is also known as the closed chain condition. If $\sigma$ is a compatible quasiorder on $\mathbf{A}$, then $\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}$ is an order-congruence of $\mathbf{A}$. For example,

$$
\operatorname{ker} f=(\overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker} f}) \cap(\overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker} f})^{-1}
$$

The regular quotient (see [8]) of an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$, by an order-congruence $\theta$, is the ordered algebra

$$
\mathbf{A} / \theta=\left(A / \theta, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A} / \theta}, \leq_{A / \theta}\right)
$$

such that $\left(A / \theta, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A} / \theta}\right)$ is the usual algebraic quotient, and the order $\leq_{A / \theta}$ is defined by

$$
[a] \leq_{A / \theta}[b] \Leftrightarrow a \leq b .
$$

One can easily observe that $\leq_{A / \theta}$ is the coarsest compatible order on $A / \theta$ that makes the canonical homomorphism $\theta^{\natural}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A} / \theta$ monotone. Proof of the next theorem is straightforward, and is omitted.

Theorem 1. Let $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{\text { be }}$ a homomorphism of ordered algebras, and let $\theta$ be an ordercongruence on $\mathbf{A}$ such that $\underset{\theta}{\leq} \subseteq \operatorname{ker} f$. Then there exists a unique homomorphism $g: \mathbf{A} / \theta \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$, such that $g \circ \theta^{\natural}=f$.

Given an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ and a compatible quasiorder $\sigma$, we define the nonregular quotient of $\mathbf{A}$ by $\sigma$ to be the ordered algebra

$$
\mathbf{A} / \sigma=\left(A /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)}, \preccurlyeq\right),
$$

where $\left(A /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)}\right)$ is the usual algebraic quotient and the order $\preccurlyeq$ is defined by

$$
[a] \preccurlyeq[b] \Leftrightarrow a \sigma b .
$$

Note that $\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)$ denotes the regular quotient algebra

$$
\left(A /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)}, \leq_{A /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)}\right) .
$$

Both the quotients $\mathbf{A} / \sigma$ and $\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)$ have the same universe and operations, however $\mathbf{A} / \sigma$ is "more ordered" than $\mathbf{A} /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)$ in the sense that $\leq_{A /\left(\sigma \cap \sigma^{-1}\right)}$ is contained in $\preccurlyeq$. Every variety of ordered algebras is closed under both regular and non-regular quotients.

## 3. Ordered Term Algebra

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a type of algebras and let $X$ be a set such that $X \cap \mathcal{F}=\emptyset$. We call $X$ the set of variables and we assume that either $X$ or $\mathcal{F}_{0}$ is nonempty. Whenever $X\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}\right)$ is nonempty we also assume that it is equipped with a partial order which we denote by $\leq_{X}\left(\leq_{\mathcal{F}_{0}}\right)$. A word on $X \cup \mathcal{F}$ is a nonempty finite sequence of elements of $X \cup \mathcal{F}$. We concatenate sequences by simple juxtaposition.
Definition 2. Given a type $\mathcal{F}$ of algebras and a set $X$ of variables we define, by recursion on $n$, the sets $T_{n}$ of words on $X \cup \mathcal{F}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{0} & =\left\{w \mid w \in X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}\right\} \\
T_{n+1} & =T_{n} \cup\left\{f s_{1} s_{2} \ldots s_{k} \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_{k}, s_{1}, s_{2}, \ldots, s_{k} \in T_{n}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We, then, define $T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)=\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_{n}$, called the set of terms of type $\mathcal{F}$ over $X$.
Although, in algebra we write more often $f\left(s_{1}, s_{2}, \ldots, s_{k}\right)$ instead of $f s_{1} s_{2} \ldots s_{k}$, we shall be using both notations interchangeably. The set $T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ of all terms of type $\mathcal{F}$ over the set of variables $X$ is the universe of the term algebra $\mathbf{T}(X)=\left(T_{\mathcal{F}}(X), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{T}(X)}\right)$, where for $f \in \mathcal{F}_{k}$ the operation $f^{\mathbf{T}(X)}$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\mathbf{T}(X)}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}\right)=f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}\right), \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k} \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$. A constant free term is a term of type $\mathcal{F}$ over $X$ that contains no constant symbols. We use $t\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ to denote a term whose variables are among $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$.

Recall that a tree comprises a set of points, called nodes, and a set of lines, called edges. The edges connect the nodes so that there is exactly one path between any two different nodes. A rooted tree is a tree in which a node is designated as the root. Formally, we define rooted trees inductively as follows.
(i) A single node $n$ is a tree. In this case $n$ is the root of this one-node tree.
(ii) If $T_{1}, T_{2}, \ldots, T_{k}$ are trees with the roots $c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{k}$ respectively and $r$ is a new node, then we form a new tree $T$ from $r$ and $T_{1}, T_{2}, \ldots, T_{k}$ in the following way.
(a) $r$ becomes the root of $T$.
(b) We add an edge from $r$ to each of the nodes $c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{k}$.

From now on, by a tree we shall always mean a rooted tree. A node $a$ in a tree is called the parent of a node $b$ if $a$ is adjecent to $b$ on the path between $b$ and the root. In this case, we also call $b$ a child of $a$. A leaf is a node of a tree that has no children. A labelled tree is a tree with a label attached to each node. An ordered labeled tree is a labeled tree in which all children of each non-leaf node are ordered linearly first to last (left to right). Let $T$ be an ordered labeled tree. By removing all leaf labels from $T$ we get its skeleton, which we shall denote by $\operatorname{skelt}(T)$. Let us further agree that the trees we consider will all be ordered labeled trees.

Definition 3. Given a term $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$, we define the tree of $t$, denoted by $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$ as follows.
(1) If $t \in X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$, then $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$ is just one-node:
(2) $\operatorname{Tree}\left(f s_{1} s_{2} \ldots s_{k}\right)$ is depicted in Figure 1


Figure 1

It is easy to see that the tree of a term always satisfies the following conditions:
(1) Each leaf is labelled by an element from $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$.
(2) If $n$ is a non-leaf node with $k$ children then $n$ is labelled by an operation symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}_{k}$.

Conversely, every tree satisfying (1) and (2) is the tree of some term $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$. The correspondence between isomorphism types of such trees and their terms is a bijection.

Definition 4. Let $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$, such that $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$ has $n$ leaves. We define a function leaf $(t)$ : $\{1, \ldots, n\} \longrightarrow X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ by

$$
\text { leaf }(t)(i)=l_{i},
$$

where $l_{i}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$ leaf label of $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$.
Example 1. If $t=f g x_{2} x_{1} c f x_{1} x_{4}$ where $g \in \mathcal{F}_{3}, f \in \mathcal{F}_{2}$ and $c \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$, then $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$ has five leaves as shown in Figure 2. We have leaf $(t)(1)=x_{2}$, leaf $(t)(2)=\operatorname{leaf}(t)(4)=x_{1}, \operatorname{leaf}(t)(3)=c$ and $\operatorname{leaf}(t)(5)=x_{4}$. The skeleton of $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$ is given in Figure 3,


Figure 2. $\operatorname{Tree}(t)$


Figure 3. $\operatorname{skelt}(t)$

Note that the tree of $s=f g x_{2} x_{1} x_{1} f x_{4} c$ has the same skeleton as Tree $(t)$.
Definition 5. Given $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$, we denote by $\operatorname{var}(t)$ the sequence of variables of $t$, written in the same order as they appear on the leaves of Tree $(t)$.

If $\operatorname{var}(t)=\left(x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{k}}\right)$, we shall write $t\left[x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{k}}\right]$ to specify the variables that are explicitly occurring in $t$ and their order of occurrence. If $t$ is a term built from constants only, we let $\operatorname{var}(t)=()$ and we write $t[]$. This notation will be used when an additional precision about the variables explicitly occurring in $t$ and their order is needed.

For the tree given in Figure 2, we have $\operatorname{var}(t)=\left(x_{2}, x_{1}, x_{1}, x_{4}\right)$. We may also denote this tree by $t\left[x_{2}, x_{1}, x_{1}, x_{4}\right]$. Observe that $\operatorname{var}(r)=\operatorname{var}(t)$, for $r\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right)=g c f x_{2} x_{1} f x_{1} x_{4}$, however $\operatorname{skelt}(r) \neq \operatorname{skelt}(t)$.

From now on, we fix a countably infinite sequence $z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{n}, \ldots$ of formal variables, and we let $V=\left\{z_{n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$. We shall also consider the terms of type $\mathcal{F}$ over $V$.

Definition 6. A term $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(V)$ is called regular if for some $n \geq 1, \operatorname{var}(t)=\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)$. We call $n$ the arity of the regular term $t$ and write $\operatorname{ar}(t)=n$. The set of all regular terms of type $\mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text {reg }}(V)$.
The following two lemmas provide some useful facts about regular terms.
Lemma 1. Let $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}(X)$ be such that Tree( $(t)$ has $n$ leafs and $\operatorname{var}(t)=\left(x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{k}}\right)$, for some $k \leq n$. Then there exist a constant free term $\bar{t}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text {reg }}(V)$ of arity $n$, such that
(i) $t\left[x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{k}}\right]=\bar{t}\left(\bar{x}_{1}, \bar{x}_{2}, \ldots, \bar{x}_{n}\right)$ where $\bar{x}_{i} \in\left\{x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{k}}\right\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$,
(ii) $o(t)=o(\bar{t})$.

Proof. By induction on the number $o(t)$ of operation symbols in $t$.
Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{T}(X)$ be the term algebra of the type $\mathcal{F}$ over $X$. Let $t_{1}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right), t_{2}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{m}\right) \in$ $T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text {reg }}(V)$ be constant free, such that $\operatorname{var}\left(t_{1}\right)=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)$, $\operatorname{var}\left(t_{2}\right)=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{m}\right)$. If

$$
t_{1}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)=t_{2}\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m}\right)
$$

for some $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m} \in X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$, then $n=m$ and we have
(i) $t_{1}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)=t_{2}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{m}\right)$,
(ii) $\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)=\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m}\right)$.

Proof. Straightforward.
Definition 7. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an $\mathcal{F}$-algebra, and let $X \subseteq A$. The $X$-translations of $\mathbf{A}$ are the unary polynomials of $\mathbf{A}$ of the form

$$
p(u)=t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{i-1}, u, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right) \text { for all } u \in A,
$$

where $t \in T_{\mathcal{F}}^{r e g}(V)$ is of arity $n$ and $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in X$.

A translation of $\mathbf{A}$ is any $A$-translation of $\mathbf{A}$. The $X$-translations induced by the constant free regular terms will be called $X$-cfr translations. Clearly, if $\mathbf{A}$ is an $\mathcal{F}$ algebra generated by $X$, then the translations of $\mathbf{A}$ coincide with the $X$-translations of $\mathbf{A}$. Lemma 1 further implies that the $X$-translations of $\mathbf{A}$ coincide with the $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}}$ - cfr translations of $\mathbf{A}$. Let $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ be an ordered algebra generated by $X \subseteq A$, and let H be a binary relation on $A$. We define a new relation $\xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} \subseteq A^{2}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}}=\left\{(p(u), p(v)) \mid(u, v) \in H \text { and } p \text { is an } X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}}-\text { cfr translation }\right\} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the generating set $X$ is not mentioned, $p$ will be assumed to denote an $A$-cfr translation. The following lemma gives a useful description of the compatible quasiorder generated by H which we shall denote by $\Sigma_{\mathrm{H}}$.
Lemma 3 (Cf. Lemma 4 of [7]). Let $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ be an ordered algebra and $\mathrm{H} \subseteq A^{2}$. For $c, c^{\prime} \in A$ we have $c \Sigma_{\mathrm{H}} c^{\prime}$ iff either $c \leq c^{\prime}$ or there exists a scheme

$$
c \leq p_{1}\left(a_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{1}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}\right) \leq p_{2}\left(a_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{2}\left(a_{2}^{\prime}\right) \leq \cdots \leq p_{n}\left(a_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{n}\left(a_{n}^{\prime}\right) \leq c^{\prime} .
$$

Because $(a, b) \in \mathrm{H}$ implies that $a \Sigma_{\mathrm{H}} b$, we have $[a] \preccurlyeq[b]$ in $\mathbf{A} / \Sigma_{\mathrm{H}}$ whenever $(a, b) \in \mathrm{H}$. The following proposition follows easily from Lemma 3
Proposition 1. Let $\theta$ be an order-congruence on $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ and $\mathbf{H} \subseteq A^{2}$. If for every $a, b \in A$, $(a, b) \in \mathrm{H} \Rightarrow a \underset{\theta}{\leq} b$, then $\Sigma_{\mathrm{H}} \cap \Sigma_{\mathrm{H}}^{-1} \subseteq \theta$.

Given $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ and $\mathbf{H} \subseteq A^{2}$ one can also consider the order-congruence $\Theta_{\mathbf{H}}$ on $\mathbf{A}$ generated by H . The following lemma gives a practical description of $\underset{\Theta_{\mathrm{H}}}{\leq}$.

Lemma 4 (Cf. Lemma 1.2 of [6]). Let $\mathbf{A}=\left(A, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{A}}, \leq\right)$ be an ordered algebra and $\mathrm{H} \subseteq A^{2}$. For $c, c^{\prime} \in A$, we have $c \leq \Theta_{\Theta_{\mathrm{H}}} c^{\prime}$ iff either $c \leq c^{\prime}$ or there exists a scheme

$$
c \leq p_{1}\left(a_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H U H}}{ }^{-1} p_{1}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}\right) \leq p_{2}\left(a_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H U H ^ { - 1 }}} p_{2}\left(a_{2}^{\prime}\right) \leq \cdots \leq p_{n}\left(a_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H U H ^ { - 1 }}} p_{n}\left(a_{n}^{\prime}\right) \leq c^{\prime},
$$

where $\mathrm{H}^{-1}$ is the inverse relation of H .
Remark 1. If H is reflexive then the inequality $a \leq b$ gives rise to the scheme $a \leq b \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} b \leq b$, whence $a \Sigma_{H} b$.

Consider next the ordered algebra $\overline{\mathbf{T}(X)}=\left(T(X), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{T}(X)},=\right)$. Clearly $\leq=\leq_{X} \dot{\cup} \leq_{\mathcal{F}_{0}}$ is a relation on $T(X) \times T(X)$.

Definition 8. We call the quotient $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}=\overline{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Sigma_{\leq}$the ordered term algebra of type $\mathcal{F}$ over $\left(X, \leq_{X}\right)$, where $\Sigma_{\leq}$is the compatible quasiorder on $\overline{\mathbf{T}(X)}$ generated by $\leq$.

In the following theorem we prove that $\Sigma_{\leq}$is actually an order on $T(X)$. Notations introduced in Definition 9 will be instrumental in the proof.
Definition 9. Let $t\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{k}\right) \in T_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text {reg }}(V)$ be constant free such that Tree $(t)$ has $k$ leaves and $\operatorname{var}(t)=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$. For $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k} \in V \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{j}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)[j] & =a_{j} \\
t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{j}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\langle l\rangle & =\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{l}\right) ; \quad l \leq k \\
t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{j}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)[j, u] & =t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{j-1}, u, a_{j+1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 2. $\Sigma_{\leq} \cap \Sigma_{\leq}^{-1}=\triangle_{T(X)}$.
Proof. Let $(f, g) \in \Sigma_{\leq} \cap \Sigma_{\leq}^{-1}$. Then, because $\leq$ is reflexive, we have, by Lemma 3 and Remark 11 the following possibilities.
(i) $f=g$, in which case $(f, g) \in \triangle_{T(X)}$.
(ii) There exist schemes

$$
\begin{equation*}
f=p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\leq} p_{1}\left(y_{1}^{\prime}\right)=p_{2}\left(y_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\leq} p_{2}\left(y_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\cdots=p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\leq} p_{n}\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right)=g, \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
g=p_{n+1}\left(y_{n+1}\right) \xrightarrow{\leq} p_{n+1}\left(y_{n+1}^{\prime}\right)=\cdots=p_{m}\left(y_{m}\right) \xrightarrow{\leq} p_{m}\left(y_{m}^{\prime}\right)=f, \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p_{i}$ are $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ - cfr translations and $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \leq$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$. One may also assume by Lemma 2 that the $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ - cfr translations $p_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq m$, are all induced by the same constant free regular term, say $t\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{k}\right)$. Using Definition 9, we can rewrite (3.3) and (3.4) as

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
f=t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) & \\
\xrightarrow{\leq} t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] & ; t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}\right]=y_{1} \\
\stackrel{\leq}{\longrightarrow} t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right]\left[k_{2}, y_{2}^{\prime}\right] & ; t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right]\left[k_{2}\right]=y_{2} \\
\ldots &  \tag{3.5}\\
\stackrel{\leq}{\longrightarrow} t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] \ldots\left[k_{n}, y_{n}^{\prime}\right]=g & ; t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] \ldots\left[k_{n-1}, y_{n-1}^{\prime}\right]\left[k_{n}\right]=y_{n} \\
\ldots \\
\xrightarrow{\leq} t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] \ldots\left[k_{m}, y_{m}^{\prime}\right]=f & ; t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] \ldots\left[k_{m-1}, y_{m-1}^{\prime}\right]\left[k_{m}\right]=y_{m} .
\end{array}
$$

But then, by Lemma 2, we must have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)=t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\left[k_{1}, y_{1}^{\prime}\right] \ldots\left[k_{m}, y_{m}^{\prime}\right]\langle k\rangle \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that every occurence of $\xrightarrow{\leq}$ in (3.5) may be replaced by $=$, whence we get $f=g$. This also implies that $\Sigma_{\leq}$is indeed an order on $T(X)$.

We can therefore identify $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}=\overline{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Sigma_{\leq}$with $\left(T(X), \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{T}(X)}, \Sigma_{\leq}\right)$. For practical reasons we shall use $\preccurlyeq$ instead of $\Sigma_{\leq}$to denote the order of $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}$. Also, note that for $t_{1}, t_{2} \in T(X)$ we have

$$
t_{1} \preccurlyeq t_{2} \quad \text { iff } \quad \operatorname{skelt}\left(t_{1}\right)=\operatorname{skelt}\left(t_{2}\right) \text { and leaf }\left(t_{1}\right)[i] \leq \operatorname{leaf}\left(t_{2}\right)[i] \text {, }
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $n=$ the number of leaves of $t_{1}=$ the number of leaves of $t_{2}$.
The following theorem shows that the ordered term algebra $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}$ has the universal mapping property for $\mathcal{F}$-Oalg ${ }_{\leq}^{0}$ over $X$.
Theorem 3 (Cf. Theorem 10.8 of [2]). Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a type and $\left(X, \leq_{X}\right)$ a poset such that $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0} \neq \emptyset$. For every ordered algebra $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{F}$-Oalg ${ }_{\leq}^{0}$ and every monotone mapping $\alpha:\left(X, \leq_{X}\right) \longrightarrow\left(D, \leq_{D}\right)$ there is a unique homomorphism $\beta: \widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}$, such that the diagram in Figure $母$ commutes.


Figure 4. $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}$ has the universal mapping property for $\mathcal{F}$-Oalg ${ }_{\leq}^{0}$ over $X$
Proof. A straightforward adaptation to the ordered context of Theorem 10.8 in [2].

## 4. Amalgamation in $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathrm{OALG}_{\leq}^{0}$

The idea of the dominion of a subalgebra $\mathbf{B}$ of an algebra $\mathbf{A}$ goes back to Isbell [5]. In this section we consider, in the context of ordered algebras, an order theoretic analogue of the relation between dominions and the special amalgamation property.

Definition 10. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety of ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras. An amalgam in $\mathcal{V}$ is a $\mathcal{V}$-diagram given in Figure 5. such that $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{V}$ are pairwise disjoint, and $\phi_{1}, \phi_{2} \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{V})$, are order-embeddings.


Figure 5. Amalgam in $\mathcal{V}$

We denote an amalgam by $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ or by an even shorter list $(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ if no explicit mention of $\phi_{1}$ and $\phi_{2}$ was required. If $\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathbf{O a l g}_{\leq}^{0}$, then we show that the diagram in Figure 5 can be completed to a pushout (see [9] for definition).

Because $A \cap B=\emptyset$, we can consider the poset $\left(X, \leq_{X}\right)$ where $X=A \dot{\cup} B$ and $\leq_{X}=\leq_{A} \dot{\cup} \leq_{B}$. We first define the following relations on $T(X)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{R}_{A} & =\left\{\left(t\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right), t^{\mathbf{A}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \mid t\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \in T(A)\right\} \\
\mathrm{R}_{B} & =\left\{\left(t\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l}\right), t^{\mathbf{B}}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l}\right)\right) \mid t\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l}\right) \in T(B)\right\} \\
\mathbf{H}^{\prime} & =\left\{\left(\phi_{1}(c), \phi_{2}(c) \mid c \in C\right\}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where $t^{\mathbf{A}}, t^{\mathbf{B}}$ are the term functions induced by the term $t$ on $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$ respectively. We let

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{H} & =\mathrm{R}_{A} \dot{\cup} \mathrm{R}_{B} \\
\widehat{\mathrm{H}} & =\mathrm{H} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 4. If $\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{F}$-Oalg ${ }_{\leq}^{0}$, then the diagram in Figure 5 can be completed to a pushout.
Proof. Let $\Phi$ be the order-congruence on $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}$ generated by the relation $\widehat{\mathrm{H}}$. We denote the quotient algebra $\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Phi=\left(T(X) / \Phi, \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{T}(X) / \Phi}, \preccurlyeq \mathbf{T}(X) / \Phi\right)$ by $\mathbf{A} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{B}$, where we have for $s, t \in T(X)$

$$
[s]_{\Phi} \preccurlyeq \mathbf{T}(X) / \Phi[t]_{\Phi} \text { iff } s \underset{\Phi}{\preccurlyeq} t
$$

Let $\chi_{A}:\left(A, \leq_{A}\right) \longrightarrow(T(X), \preccurlyeq)$ and $\chi_{B}:\left(B, \leq_{B}\right) \longrightarrow(T(X), \preccurlyeq)$ be the order-embeddings that identify elements of $A$ and $B$ with their terms in $T(X)$. Also, let $\Phi^{\natural}: \widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Phi$ be the canonical homomorphism. We define,

$$
\mu_{1}=\Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{A}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{B} \text { and } \mu_{2}=\Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{B}: \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{B} .
$$

Now for $f \in \mathcal{F}_{k}$ and $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k} \in A$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
f^{\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Phi}\left(\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, \mu_{1}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) & =f^{\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} / \Phi}\left(\Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{A}\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, \Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{A}\left(x_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural}\left(f^{\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}}\left(\chi_{A}\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, \chi_{A}\left(x_{k}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural}\left(f^{\widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural}\left(f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural}\left(f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural}\left(\chi_{A}\left(f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{A}\left(f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \\
& =\mu_{1}\left(f^{\mathbf{A}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that $\mu_{1}$ is a homomorphism of ordered algebras. By a similar token $\mu_{2}$ also is a homomorphism of ordered algebras. Furthermore, for any $c \in C$ we have $\mu_{1} \circ \phi_{1}=\mu_{2} \circ \phi_{2}$, because $\left[\phi_{1}(c)\right]_{\Phi}=\left[\phi_{2}(c)\right]_{\Phi}$. So, the object $\mathbf{A} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{B}$, together with the morphisms $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$, extends the $\mathcal{V}$-diagram in Figure 5 to the following commutative square.


Figure 6
Next, let $\mathbf{D}$ be an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra admitting homomorphisms $\gamma_{A}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}$ and $\gamma_{B}: \mathbf{B} \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}$, such that $\gamma_{A} \circ \phi_{1}=\gamma_{B} \circ \phi_{2}$. Then considering the monotone map

$$
\alpha=\gamma_{A} \dot{\cup} \gamma_{B}:\left(X, \leq_{X}\right) \longrightarrow\left(D, \leq_{D}\right),
$$

there exists, by Theorem 3, a unique homomorphism $\beta: \widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}$ such that the diagram in Figure 4 commutes. This also implies that $\left.\beta\right|_{A}=\gamma_{A},\left.\beta\right|_{B}=\gamma_{B}$. Let us first prove that $\underset{\Phi}{\preceq} \overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker}} \beta$.

Suppose $s \underset{\Phi}{\preccurlyeq} t$, for $s, t \in T(X)$. Then by Lemma 4 either $s \preccurlyeq t$, in which case $\beta(s) \leq_{D} \beta(t)$ and we are done, or there exists a scheme

$$
\begin{equation*}
s \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\boldsymbol{H}}-1} p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(x_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \stackrel{\hat{H}^{-1}}{ }} p_{2}\left(y_{2}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\mathrm{U}}^{-1}} p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right) \preccurlyeq t . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the monotonicity of $\beta$, the inequalities $s \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(x_{1}\right), p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{i+1}\left(x_{i+1}\right)$, where $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right) \preccurlyeq t$ imply that $\beta(s) \leq_{D} \beta\left(p_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)\right), \beta\left(p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right)\right) \leq_{D} \beta\left(p_{i+1}\left(x_{i+1}\right)\right)$ and $\beta\left(p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right)\right) \leq_{D} \beta(t)$, respectively. Also, observe that every pair $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right) \in \mathbf{H} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{H}^{-1}$ comprises a term and its value, either in $\mathbf{A}$ or in $\mathbf{B}$. This implies that $\beta\left(x_{i}\right)=\beta\left(y_{i}\right)$. On the other hand, if $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right) \in \mathbf{H}^{\prime}$, then $x_{i}=\phi_{1}(c)$, $y_{i}=\phi_{2}(c)$ for some $c \in C$ and we have

$$
\beta\left(x_{i}\right)=\beta\left(\phi_{1}(c)\right)=\gamma_{A}\left(\phi_{1}(c)\right)=\gamma_{B}\left(\phi_{2}(c)\right)=\beta\left(\phi_{2}(c)\right)=\beta\left(y_{i}\right) .
$$

Similarly, $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}$ implies $\beta\left(x_{i}\right)=\beta\left(y_{i}\right)$. So, for any $\left(x_{i}, y_{i}\right) \in \widehat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\cup} \widehat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}$ we have $\beta\left(x_{i}\right)=\beta\left(y_{i}\right)$. The relation $p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}} p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right), 1 \leq i \leq n$, therefore implies that $\beta\left(p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right)\right)=\beta\left(p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right)\right)$. Summing up the discussion, we can write $\beta(s) \leq_{D} \beta(t)$ from scheme (4.1). Hence $\underset{\Phi}{\preccurlyeq} \subseteq \overrightarrow{\operatorname{ker} \beta}$.

Now, by Theorem [1] there exists a unique homomorphism $\delta$ such that the diagram in Figure 7 commutes.


## Figure 7

Let us next consider the diagram in Figure 8


Figure 8
For $x \in A$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta \circ \mu_{1}(x) & =\delta \circ\left(\Phi^{\natural} \circ \chi_{A}\right)(x) \\
& =\left(\left(\delta \circ \Phi^{\natural}\right) \circ \chi_{A}\right)(x) \\
& =\beta \circ \chi_{A}(x) \\
& =\gamma_{A}(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly for $y \in B$ one can show that

$$
\delta \circ \mu_{2}(x)=\gamma_{B}(x) .
$$

This implies that the diagram in Figure 8 commutes and the proof is completed.
An amalgam $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ is said to be embeddable if the following conditions are satisfied.
(1) $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ in Figure 6 are order-embeddings.
(2) $\mu_{1}(x)=\mu_{2}(y)$, for $x \in A, y \in B$, implies $x=\phi_{1}(c), y=\phi_{2}(c)$, for some $c \in C$.

If only condition (1) is satisfied, then we say that $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ is weakly embeddable.
Definition 11. We call $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ a special amalgam if $\mathbf{A}_{1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{A}_{2}$ via, say, $\nu: \mathbf{A}_{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{2}$, such that $\phi_{2}=\nu \circ \phi_{1}$.

One can easily verify that every special amalgam $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}\right)$ is weakly embeddable.
We shall say that a variety $\mathcal{V}$ of ordered algebras (with pushouts) has the (weak) amalgamation property if every amalgam in $\mathcal{V}$ is (weakly) embeddable. We say that $\mathcal{V}$ has the special amalgamation property if every special amalgam in $\mathcal{V}$ is embeddable.

Definition 12. Let $\mathbf{B}$ be a subalgebra of an ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebra $\mathbf{A}$. The dominion of $\mathbf{B}$ in $\mathbf{A}$,
 ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras $f, g: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ satifying $\left.f\right|_{B}=\left.g\right|_{B}$ we have $f(d)=g(d)$.

Clearly, $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B}$ contains $B$ and it is actually a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$. We say that $\mathbf{B}$ is closed in $\mathbf{A}$ if $\widehat{D o m}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B}=\mathbf{B}$. We call $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{V}$ absolutely closed if $\widehat{D o m}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B}=\mathbf{B}$ for every order-embedding $\mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$. A variety $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be closed if every $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$ is absolutely closed. Dominions are related to epimorphisms: $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ is an epimorphism iff $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{B}} \operatorname{Im}(f)=\mathbf{B}$. By disregarding the ordering of algebras one can also consider the algebraic dominion of $\mathbf{B}$ in $\mathbf{A}$, which we shall denote by $\operatorname{Dom}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B}$. One can easily verify that

$$
B \subseteq \operatorname{Dom}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B} \subseteq \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B} \subseteq A
$$

It was shown in [10] that in the categories of all pomonoids and all posemigroups $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B} \subseteq$ $D_{o m}^{A} \mathbf{B}$. In our main result, Theorem [5, we generalize this fact to the categories $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathrm{Oalg}_{\leq}^{0}$.

If $\mathbf{C}$ is a subalgebra of an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A}$, and if $\mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}$ are disjoint isomorphic copies of $\mathbf{A}$ via isomorphisms $\alpha_{i}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{i}$ for $i=1,2$, then $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ is a special amalgam, where $\phi_{i}=\left.\alpha_{i}\right|_{C}$ and $\nu=\alpha_{2} \circ \alpha_{1}^{-1}: \mathbf{A}_{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{2}$. So, we have a commutative diagram given in Figure 9 ,


Figure 9

Let $X=A_{1} \cup A_{2}$, and consider the monotone map $\nu_{0}: X \longrightarrow A_{1}$ given by

$$
\nu_{0}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
x & \text { if } x \in A_{1} \\
\nu^{-1}(x) & \text { if } x \in A_{2}
\end{array} .\right.
$$

By Theorem [3, there exists a unique homomorphism $\bar{\nu}_{0}: \widehat{\mathbf{T}(X)} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{1}$ such that $\left.\bar{\nu}_{0}\right|_{X}=\nu_{0}$.
Proposition 2. Let $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ be a special amalgam as defined by Figure 9. If $\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)=$ $\mu_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)$ for some $x_{1} \in A_{1}, x_{2} \in A_{2}$, then $x_{1}=\alpha_{1}(x)$, and $x_{2}=\alpha_{2}(x)$ for some $x \in A$.

Proof. Let $\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)=\mu_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)$. Then $\left[x_{1}\right]_{\Phi}=\left[x_{2}\right]_{\Phi}$ (refer to the proof of Theorem (4) , and by Lemma 4 we have the schemes

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{1} \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \cup \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{1}\left(y_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(y_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{H} \cup \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{2}\left(y_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \cup \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{n}\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq x_{2},  \tag{4.2}\\
& x_{2} \preccurlyeq p_{n+1}\left(y_{n+1}^{\prime}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{H} \cup \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{n+1}\left(y_{n+1}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n+k}\left(y_{n+k}^{\prime}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{H} \cup \widehat{H}^{-1}} p_{n+k}\left(y_{n+k}\right) \preccurlyeq x_{1} . \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Let us consider scheme (4.2). By the monotonicity of $\bar{\nu}_{0}$, the inequalities $x_{1} \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right), p_{i}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq$ $p_{i+1}\left(y_{i+1}\right)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $p_{n}\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq x_{2}$ imply $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{1}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right)\right)$, $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{i}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq A_{A_{1}}$ $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{i+1}\left(y_{i+1}\right)\right)$, and $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{n}\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{2}\right)$ respectively. For an arbitrary $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \widehat{\mathrm{H}} \cup \widehat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}$ we consider two cases.

Case 1: $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{H}^{-1}$. Suppose $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbf{H}$, then $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right)=\left(t\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right), t^{\mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)\right)$, where $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l} \in A_{j}$ and $j \in\{1,2\}$. If $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l} \in A_{1}$, then $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$. If $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l} \in A_{2}$, then

$$
\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(t\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(z_{1}\right), \ldots, \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(z_{l}\right)\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\nu^{-1}\left(z_{1}\right), \ldots, \nu^{-1}\left(z_{l}\right)\right),
$$

and $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)=\nu^{-1}\left(t^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)\right)$. Since $\nu^{-1}$ is an isomorphism we have

$$
\nu^{-1}\left(t^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\nu^{-1}\left(z_{1}\right), \ldots, \nu^{-1}\left(z_{l}\right)\right)
$$

and therefore $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$. If $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{-1}$, then $\left(y_{i}^{\prime}, y_{i}\right) \in \mathrm{H}$ and the above argument applies.
Case 2: $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}$. If $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime}$, then $y_{i}=\phi_{1}(c), y_{i}^{\prime}=\phi_{2}(c)$ for some $c \in C$, and we have $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(\phi_{1}(c)\right)=\phi_{1}(c), \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(\phi_{2}(c)\right)=\nu^{-1} \phi_{2}(c)=\phi_{1}(c)$, i.e., $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$. Similarly, $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}$ implies $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$.

So, we conclude that the relations $p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \cup \hat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}} p_{i}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ imply $\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{i}\left(y_{i}\right)\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{i}\left(y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right)$. One may therefore write the following sequence from scheme (4.2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1} \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{1}\left(y_{1}\right)\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{1}\left(y_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \cdots \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{n}\left(y_{n}\right)\right)=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(p_{n}\left(y_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{2}\right) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the same reasoning, one gets

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{2}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{1}\right)=x_{1}, \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

from scheme (4.3). Combining (4.4) and (4.5) we have $x_{1}=\bar{\nu}_{0}\left(x_{2}\right)$. Finally, taking $x_{1}=\alpha_{1}(x)$, $x \in A$, we get

$$
x_{2}=\nu\left(x_{1}\right)=\nu \alpha_{1}(x)=\alpha_{2}(x),
$$

as required.
Proposition 3. Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a subalgebra of an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A}$. Let $\alpha_{i}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{i}$ for $i=1,2$ be isomorphisms and let $\left.\alpha_{i}\right|_{C}=\phi_{i}: \mathbf{C} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{i}$. Then considering the special amalgam $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ we have

$$
\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \cong \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})=\mu_{i}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right],
$$

were $\mu_{i}$ for $i=1,2$ are as defined in the proof of Theorem 4 .
Proof. Obviously $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \cong \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$. Also, it suffices to prove that

$$
\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{1}} \phi_{1}(\mathbf{C})=\mu_{1}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right] .
$$

Consider $\nu: \mathbf{A}_{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{2}$, as defined in Figure 9 Let $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{1}} \phi_{1}(\mathbf{C})$ and let $y \in \mathbf{C}$. Observe that

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\mu_{1}\left(\phi_{1}(y)\right) & =\mu_{1} \circ \phi_{1}(y) & & \\
& =\mu_{2} \circ \phi_{2}(y) & & \text { by commutativity of the diagram (9) } \\
& =\mu_{2}\left(\nu \circ \phi_{1}(y)\right) & \text { because } \phi_{2}=\nu \circ \phi_{1} \\
& =\mu_{2} \circ \nu\left(\phi_{1}(y)\right) . &
\end{array}
$$

So, $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2} \circ \nu$ agree on $\phi_{1}(\mathbf{C})$. This implies that $\mu_{1}(x)=\mu_{2}(\nu(x))$, whence $\mu_{1}(x) \in \mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap$ $\mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
x \in \mu_{1}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right] .
$$

Now, suppose that $x_{1} \in \mu_{1}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right]$. This implies that

$$
\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) \in \mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right) .
$$

Let $\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)=\mu_{2}\left(x_{2}\right), x_{2} \in A_{2}$. Then by Proposition 2 we have $x \in A$ such that $x_{1}=\alpha_{1}(x)$, $x_{2}=\alpha_{2}(x)$. This yields,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) & =\mu_{1}\left(\alpha_{1}(x)\right) \\
& =\mu_{2}\left(\alpha_{2}(x)\right) \\
& =\mu_{2} \circ \alpha_{2}(x) \\
& =\mu_{2}\left(\nu \circ \alpha_{1}(x)\right) \\
& =\mu_{2} \circ \nu\left(x_{1}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)=\mu_{2} \circ \nu\left(x_{1}\right) \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, let $\mathbf{B}$ be an arbitrary ordered algebra admitting homomorphisms $f, g: \mathbf{A}_{1} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ such that $f \circ \phi_{1}=g \circ \phi_{1}$ Define $g^{\prime}: \mathbf{A}_{2} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ by $g^{\prime}=g \circ \nu^{-1}$, and consider the commutative diagram in Figure [10, where $\psi$ is the unique homomorphism given by the pushout $\mathbf{A}_{1} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A}_{2}$.


Figure 10
Now calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
f\left(x_{1}\right) & =\psi \circ \mu_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) \\
& =\psi \circ\left(\mu_{2} \circ \nu\left(x_{1}\right)\right) \quad \text { using (4.6) } \\
& =g^{\prime} \circ \nu\left(x_{1}\right) \\
& =g\left(x_{1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

whence $x_{1} \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{1}} \phi_{1}(\mathbf{C})$, as required.
Corollary 1. The following conditions are equivalent:

1) a special amalgam $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ is embeddable,
2) $\mu_{i}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right]=\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, where $\mu_{i}, \phi_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq 2$, are as given in Figure 9 .
3) $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \cong \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})=\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}) \cong \mathbf{C}$, where both of the isomorphisms are the restrictions of $\alpha_{i}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}_{i}$ as defined in Figure $\mathbf{9}$
4) $\mathbf{C}$ is closed in $\mathbf{A}$.

Proof. (1) $\Longleftrightarrow(2)$ is obvious.
(2) $\Longleftrightarrow(3)$ follows from Proposition 3,
$(3) \Longrightarrow(4)$ Let $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \cong \mathbf{C}$. Suppose that there exists $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \backslash \mathbf{C}$. Then, because $\alpha_{i}(x) \notin$ $\alpha_{i}(\mathbf{C})=\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, we have by $(3) \alpha_{i}(x) \notin \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$. This implies that $x \notin \alpha_{i}^{-1}\left[\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})\right]=$ $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}$, contradiction. Thus, $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}=\mathbf{C}$.
$(4) \Longrightarrow(3)$ If $\mathbf{C}$ is closed in $\mathbf{A}$, then $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}=\mathbf{C} \cong \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$. Since $\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, the proof will be accomplished if we show that

$$
\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}) \text { for } i=1,2 .
$$

To this end, let $\alpha_{i}(x) \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, where $x \in \mathbf{A}$. Now, if $f, g: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ are homomorphisms of ordered algebras, with $\left.f\right|_{\mathbf{C}}=\left.g\right|_{\mathbf{C}}$, then for

$$
f \circ \alpha_{i}^{-1}, g \circ \alpha_{i}^{-1}: \mathbf{A}_{i} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}, \quad(\text { as defined in Figures (19) and (10)) }
$$

we have $f \circ \phi_{i}^{-1}\left(\phi_{i}(c)\right)=g \circ \phi_{i}^{-1}\left(\phi_{i}(c)\right)$, where $c \in \mathbf{C}$. Because $\alpha_{i}(x) \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, we have $f \circ \alpha_{i}^{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}(x)\right)=g \circ \alpha_{i}^{-1}\left(\alpha_{i}(x)\right)$, whence $f(x)=g(x)$. This implies that $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}=\mathbf{C}$ and so $\alpha_{i}(x) \in \alpha_{i}(\mathbf{C})=\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, as required.
The following two propositions relate special amalgamation, epis and absolute closure in varieties of ordered algebras.
Proposition 4. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety of ordered algebras. Then epis are surjective in $\mathcal{V}$ iff $\mathcal{V}$ is closed. Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let epis be surjective in $\mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a subalgebra of an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{V}$. Consider the embedding $\chi: \mathbf{C} \hookrightarrow \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}$, that is clealry an epi and hence surjective. But then $\widehat{\mathrm{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}=\mathbf{C}$, as required.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{V}$ be closed. If $f: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ is an epi in $\mathcal{V}$, then $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{B}} \operatorname{Im} f=\mathbf{B}$. But, because $\mathcal{V}$ is closed, we also have $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{B}} \operatorname{Imf}=\operatorname{Imf}$. So, $\operatorname{Imf}=\mathbf{B}$.
Proposition 5. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety of ordered algebras. Then $\mathcal{V}$ is closed iff $\mathcal{V}$ has the special amalgamation property.
Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{V}$ be closed, and let $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}\right)$ be a special amalgam in $\mathcal{V}$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu_{i}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right] & =\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}), & & \text { by Proposition } 3  \tag{4.7}\\
& =\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}), & & \text { because } \mathcal{V} \text { is closed. } \tag{4.8}
\end{align*}
$$

This implies, by Corollary $\mathbb{1}$, that $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}\right)$ is embeddable.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ On the other hand, suppose $\mathcal{V}$ has the special amalgamation property. Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a subalgebra of an ordered algebra $\mathbf{A}$ in $\mathcal{V}$, giving rise to a special amalgam $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}\right)$ in $\mathcal{V}$ as described in Figure 9 Then, first observe that,

$$
\begin{align*}
\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}) & =\mu_{i}^{-1}\left[\mu_{1}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1}\right) \cap \mu_{2}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2}\right)\right], & & \text { by Proposition 3 }  \tag{4.9}\\
& =\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C}), & & \text { by Corollary } \mathbb{1} \tag{4.10}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, suppose $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}$. Let $f, g: \mathbf{A}_{i} \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ be such that $\left.f\right|_{\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})}=\left.g\right|_{\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})}$, i.e. $f \circ$ $\phi_{i}(y)=g \circ \phi_{i}(y)$, for all $y \in \mathbf{C}$. This implies that $f \circ \alpha_{i}(y)=f \circ \phi_{i}(y)=g \circ \phi_{i}(y)=g \circ \alpha_{i}(y)$. Because $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}$ we have $f\left(\alpha_{i}(x)\right)=g\left(\alpha_{i}(x)\right)$. Thus $x \in \widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C}$ implies that $\alpha_{i}(x) \in$ $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}_{i}} \phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})=\phi_{i}(\mathbf{C})$, whence $x \in \mathbf{C}$, and we conclude that $\widehat{\operatorname{Dom}}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.

The next result is a straightforward consequence of the previous propositions.
Corollary 2. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a variety of ordered algebras. Then epis are surjective in $\mathcal{V}$ iff $\mathcal{V}$ has the special amalgamation property.

## 5. Epis of ordered algebras

Our aim in this section is to prove that the varieties $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathbf{O a l g} \mathbf{g}_{\leq}^{0}$ have the special amalgamation property. We, however, first need to prove few technical results. Let $\mathbf{A}_{i}$ for $i=1,2$ be ordered $\mathcal{F}$-algebras such that $A_{1} \cap A_{2}=\emptyset$. As before, we consider the poset $\left(X, \leq_{X}\right)$ where $X=A_{1} \dot{\cup} A_{2}$ and $\leq_{X}=\leq_{A_{1}} \dot{\cup} \leq_{A_{2}}$. In Section 4 we defined the relations $\mathrm{R}_{A_{i}}$, for $i=1,2$, on $T(X)$ by,

$$
\mathbf{R}_{A_{i}}=\left\{\left(t\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right), t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)\right) \mid t\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \in T\left(A_{i}\right)\right\},
$$

where $t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}$ is the term function induced by the term $t$ on $\mathbf{A}_{i}$. In the following Lemma we prove an important feature of the relation $\xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{i}}^{-1}}$ on $T(X)$.

Lemma 5. A scheme $p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{i}}^{-1}} p_{1}\left(v_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right)$, for $i \in\{1,2\}$, can always be rewritten as

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{i}}^{-1}} p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right) .
$$

Proof. We shall suppose that $i=1$. The case $i=2$ is handled similarly. By the definition of the relation $\mathrm{R}_{A_{1}}$, we have $p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{1}}^{-1}} p_{1}\left(v_{1}\right)$ iff $\left(u_{1}, v_{1}\right) \in \mathrm{R}_{A_{1}}^{-1}$ and $p_{1}$ is an $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ - cfr translation. This means that

$$
\left(u_{1}, v_{1}\right)=\left(t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right), t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)\right),
$$

where $t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) \in T\left(A_{1}\right)$, and

$$
p_{1}(u)=t_{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, u, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right),
$$

where the $n$-ary term $t_{1}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in T_{\mathcal{F}}^{r e g}(V)$ is constant free, and $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in$ $X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$. Without losing generality we can assume that $\operatorname{var}(t)=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)$ and that Tree $(t)$ has $s$ leaves. Then by Lemma 1 there exist a constant free regular term $\bar{t}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{s}\right)$ such that

$$
t\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)=\bar{t}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right),
$$

where $\bar{a}_{i} \in\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ for $i=1, \ldots, s$. One may therefore write:

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) & =t_{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, \bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right), x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), \\
p_{1}\left(v_{1}\right) & =t_{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, \bar{t}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right), x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The tree of the term $t_{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, \bar{t}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right), x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ has $n+s-1$ leaves, where

$$
\operatorname{leaf}\left(p_{1}\left(v_{1}\right)\right)[i]= \begin{cases}x_{i} & , \text { if } 1 \leq i \leq l-1 \\ \bar{a}_{i-l+1} & , \text { if } l \leq i \leq l+s-1 \\ x_{i-s+1} & , \text { if } l+s \leq i \leq n+s-1 .\end{cases}
$$

Next, using the definition of $\preccurlyeq$, we may assert that

$$
p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right)=t_{1}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l-1}, \bar{t}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right), y_{l+s}, \ldots, y_{n+s-1}\right),
$$

where $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n+s-1} \in X \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}$ and

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
x_{i} \leq_{X} y_{i} & \text { for } & 1 \leq i \leq l-1 \\
\bar{a}_{i-l+1} \leq_{A_{1}} y_{i} & \text { for } & l \leq i \leq l+s-1 \\
x_{i-s+1} \leq_{X} y_{i} & \text { for } & l+s \leq i \leq n+s-1 . \tag{5.3}
\end{array}
$$

The inequalities (5.2) imply

$$
\bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right)
$$

So we can write:

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) & =t_{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{l-1}, \bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\bar{a}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{s}\right), x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \\
& \preccurlyeq t_{1}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l-1}, \bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right), y_{l+s}, \ldots, y_{n+s-1}\right)=p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}_{A_{1}}^{-1}} t_{1}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l-1}, \bar{t}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right), y_{l+s}, \ldots, y_{n+s-1}\right)=p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $u_{2}=\bar{t}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right), v_{2}=\bar{t}\left(y_{l}, \ldots, y_{l+s-1}\right)$ and $p_{2}(u)=t_{1}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{l-1}, u, y_{l+1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$. This completes the proof.

One can also prove the following lemma in a dual manner.
Lemma 6. $A$ scheme $p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{2}}} p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right), i \in\{1,2\}$, can always be rewritten as

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{A_{i}}} p_{1}\left(v_{1}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(v_{2}\right) .
$$

Next, let us consider a scheme of the form,

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{U H}^{\prime-1}} p_{2}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{\mathrm{H}}^{\prime-1}} p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right),
$$

Note that the trees of $p_{i}\left(u_{i}\right)$ and $p_{j}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right), 2 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n-1$, have the same number of leaves, say $m$. This allows a representation of the above sequence by a rectangular grid with $m$ columns $c_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq m$,

| $\begin{align*} & p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right) \\ & p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \\ & p_{2}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}\right) \tag{5.4} \end{align*}$ | $c_{1}$ | $c_{2}$ |  | $c_{\alpha}$ |  | $c_{m}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $x_{11}^{\prime}$ | $x_{12}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{1 m}^{\prime}$ |
|  | $x_{21}$ | $x_{22}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 m}$ |
|  | $x_{21}^{\prime}$ | $x_{22}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 \alpha}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 m}^{\prime}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}\right) \\ p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \\ p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $x_{n-1,1}$ | $x_{n-1,2}$ | . . | $x_{n-1, \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n-1, m}$ |
|  | $x_{n-1,1}^{\prime}$ | $x_{n-1,2}^{\prime}$ | . . | $x_{n-1, \alpha}^{\prime}$ | -•• | $x_{n-1, m}^{\prime}$ |
|  | $x_{n 1}$ | $x_{n 2}$ | . . | $x_{n \alpha}$ | . . | $x_{n m}$ |

where the sequences $\left(x_{i 1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{i m}^{\prime}\right), 1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\left(x_{j 1}, \ldots, x_{j m}\right), 2 \leq j \leq n$, that form rows of the above grid, give the labeling (first to last, left to right) of the leaves of $\operatorname{Tree}\left(p_{i}\left(u_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ and $\operatorname{Tree}\left(p_{j}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ respectively. We must also have $u_{i}^{\prime}=t_{i}^{\prime}\left(x_{i p_{i}}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{i q_{i}}^{\prime}\right)$, for some $1 \leq p_{i} \leq q_{i} \leq m$, and $u_{j}=t_{j}\left(x_{j p_{j}}, \ldots, x_{j q_{j}}\right)$, for some $1 \leq p_{j} \leq q_{j} \leq m$.

Definition 13. Let $u_{1}^{\prime}=t_{1}^{\prime}\left(x_{1 p_{1}}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{1 q_{1}}^{\prime}\right)$ and $u_{n}=t_{n}\left(x_{n p_{n}}, \ldots, x_{n q_{n}}\right)$. We say that $u_{n}$ covers $u_{1}^{\prime}$ if $p_{n} \leq p_{1}, q_{1} \leq q_{n}$. Dually, one can say that $u_{1}^{\prime}$ covers $u_{n}$. If $p_{1}=p_{n}, q_{1}=q_{n}$, then $u_{1}^{\prime}, u_{n}$ are said to cover each other properly.

Remark 2. Because $p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)$ have the same skeleton, we cannot have $u_{1}^{\prime}$ and $u_{n}$ partially overlap, i.e., the case $p_{1}<p_{n}, q_{1}<q_{n}$ and its dual cannot arise.

Definition 14. Let the $k$-ary term $q\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots z_{k}\right) \in T_{\mathcal{F}}^{r e g}(V)$ be constant free. Then we write

$$
q\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots u_{k}\right) \stackrel{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathbf{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \cup_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} q\left(u_{1}^{\prime}, u_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots u_{k}^{\prime}\right),
$$

if $\left(u_{i}, u_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \dot{\cup} \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \dot{U}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $\mathbf{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}$ is the diagonal relation.
Lemma 7. Given a scheme

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{H}^{\prime-1}} p_{2}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{U^{\prime}-1}} p_{n-1}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right),
$$

one may always rewrite it as

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}\right) \stackrel{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{H}^{\prime-1} \dot{\mathrm{U}}_{A_{1} \dot{\cup} A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right) .
$$

Proof. Considering a column $c_{\alpha}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, in grid (5.4), we have three possibilities.
(i) If $\left(x_{j \alpha}, x_{j \alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}$ for all $2 \leq j \leq n-1$, then $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime} \leq x_{n \alpha}$ and we can rewrite grid (15.4) as

|  | $c_{1}$ | $c_{2}$ | $\cdots$ | $c_{\alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $c_{m}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ | $x_{11}^{\prime}$ | $x_{12}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{1 m}^{\prime}$ |
| $p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}\right)$ | $x_{21}$ | $x_{22}$ | $\ldots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 m}$ |
| $p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ | $x_{21}^{\prime}$ | $x_{22}^{\prime}$ | $\ldots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 m}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  |  | : |  |  |
| $p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}\right)$ | $x_{n-1,1}$ | $x_{n-1,2}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n-1, m}$ |
| $p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right)$ | $x_{n-1,1}^{\prime}$ | $x_{n-1,2}^{\prime}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n-1, m}^{\prime}$ |
| $p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)$ | $x_{n 1}$ | $x_{n 2}$ | $\ldots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{n m}$ |

where $p_{j}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}\right)$ and $p_{j}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ in (5.5), for $2 \leq j \leq n-1$, are the translations obtained from $p_{j}\left(u_{j}\right)$ and $p_{j}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ in (5.4) respectively, by relabeling the leaves in column $c_{\alpha}$.
(ii) If we have an even number of relations $x_{j \alpha} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}} x_{j \alpha}^{\prime}, j=2, \ldots, n-1$, in column $c_{\alpha}$, then both $x_{1 \alpha}$ and $x_{n \alpha}$ in grid (5.4) are in the same $A_{i}, i \in\{1,2\}$. If $x_{1 \alpha}$ and $x_{n \alpha}$ are in $A_{1}$, then we may apply $\nu^{-1}$ across the inequalities $x_{j \alpha}^{\prime} \leq_{A_{2}} x_{j+1, \alpha}$, where $j \in\{2, \ldots, n-1\}$. And if $x_{1 \alpha}$ and $x_{n \alpha}$ are in $A_{2}$, then we can apply $\nu$ across the inequalities $x_{j \alpha}^{\prime} \leq_{A_{1}} x_{j+1, \alpha}, k \in\{2, \ldots, n-1\}$. As a result $c_{\alpha}$ is transformed into column that we considered in case (i).
(iii) If we have an odd number of relations $x_{j \alpha} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{UH}^{-1}} x_{j \alpha}^{\prime}, j=2, \ldots, n-1$, in column $c_{\alpha}$, then $x_{1 \alpha}$ and $x_{n \alpha}$ belong to different $A_{i}, i \in\{1,2\}$. Take

$$
k=\max \left\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid\left(x_{j \alpha}, x_{j \alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}\right\} .
$$

Now, if $\left(x_{k \alpha}, x_{k \alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime}$, then we apply $\nu^{-1}$ across the inequalities $x_{j \alpha} \leq_{A_{2}} x_{j+1, \alpha}^{\prime}, j<k$. By the argument used in case (i), this gives $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime} \leq_{A_{1}} x_{k \alpha} \mathrm{H}^{\prime} x_{k \alpha}^{\prime} \leq_{A_{2}} x_{n \alpha}$. Dually, if ( $x_{k \alpha}, x_{k \alpha}^{\prime}$ ) $\in \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}$, then applying $\nu$ across the inequalities $x_{j \alpha}^{\prime} \leq_{1} x_{j+1, \alpha}, j<k$, we get $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime} \leq A_{2} x_{k \alpha} \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} x_{k \alpha}^{\prime} \leq A_{1} x_{n \alpha}$. In either cases grid (5.4) may be rewritten as
where $p_{j}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}\right)$ and $p_{j}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ in (5.6), for $2 \leq j \leq n-1$, are the translations obtained from $p_{j}\left(u_{j}\right)$ and $p_{j}\left(u_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ in (5.4) respectively, by relabeling the leaves in column $c_{\alpha}$.

Applying one of the processes used in cases (i), (ii) and (iii), as applicable, to each of its columns, we can clearly contract grid (5.4) to,

| $p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ | $c_{1}$ | $c_{2}$ |  | $c_{\alpha}$ |  | $c_{m}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $x_{11}^{\prime}$ | $x_{12}^{\prime}$ | . | $x_{1 \alpha}^{\prime}$ | - | $x_{1 m}^{\prime}$ |
| $p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}\right)$ | $x_{21}$ | $x_{22}$ | -•• | $x_{2 \alpha}$ | $\cdots$ | $x_{2 m}$ |
| $p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right)$ | $x_{n-1,1}^{\prime}$ | $x_{n-1,2}^{\prime}$ | . . | $x_{n-1, \alpha}^{\prime}$ | . . | $x_{n-1, m}^{\prime}$ |
| $p_{n}\left(u_{n}\right)$ | $x_{n 1}$ | $x_{n 2}$ | $\ldots$ | $x_{n \alpha}$ | . . | $x_{n m}$ |

where $p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}\right) \stackrel{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{U}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right)$. So, we can write

$$
p_{1}\left(u_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}^{\prime}\left(u_{2}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{n-1}^{\prime}\left(u_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right) .
$$

This completes the proof.

Theorem 5. $\mathcal{F}$-Oalg $g_{\leq}^{0}$ have special amalgamation property.
Proof. Let $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ be a special amalgam in a variety $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathbf{O a l g}_{\leq}^{0}$. Let $x \in A_{1}, y \in A_{2}$ be such that $\mu_{1}(x)=\mu_{2}(y)$ in $\mathbf{A}_{1} \amalg_{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A}_{2}$. Then there exist schemes

$$
\begin{align*}
& x \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\mathrm{U}} \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{1}\left(x_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(x_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\mathrm{U}} \mathrm{H}^{-1}} p_{2}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\mathrm{H}} \hat{H}^{-1}} p_{n}\left(x_{n}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq y  \tag{5.7}\\
& y \preccurlyeq q_{1}\left(y_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\mathrm{U}} \hat{H}^{-1}} q_{1}\left(y_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq q_{2}\left(y_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{H} \dot{U} \hat{H}^{-1}} q_{2}\left(y_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq q_{m}\left(y_{m}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{H} \dot{U} \hat{H}^{-1}} q_{m}\left(y_{m}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq x .
\end{align*}
$$

Case 1. Let all the trees representing the terms $p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right), p_{i}\left(x_{i}^{\prime}\right), q_{j}\left(y_{j}\right), q_{j}\left(y_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ in (55.7) have only one node. Then these nodes must belong to $A_{1} \cup A_{2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}} \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}$, and therefore $\xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\hat{H}}{ }^{-1}}=\xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1}} \cup A_{2}}$. Consequently, we have from (5.7)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime}} \phi_{2}\left(u_{1}\right) \leq_{A_{2}} \phi_{2}\left(u_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{2}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \cdots \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime}} \phi_{2}\left(u_{n}\right) \leq_{A_{2}} y, \\
& y \leq_{A_{2}} \phi_{2}\left(v_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{1}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime}} \phi_{2}\left(v_{2}\right) \leq_{A_{2}} \cdots \leq_{A_{2}} \phi_{2}\left(v_{m}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{m}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} x,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $u_{i}, v_{j} \in C, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m$. Applying $\nu^{-1}$ across the inequalities in $\mathbf{A}_{2}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{1}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{2}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \cdots \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(u_{n}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \nu^{-1}(y) \\
& \nu^{-1}(y) \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{1}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{2}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} \cdots \leq_{A_{1}} \phi_{1}\left(v_{m}\right) \leq_{A_{1}} x .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that $x=\phi_{1}\left(u_{1}\right)=\phi_{1}\left(u_{2}\right)=\cdots=\phi_{1}\left(u_{n}\right)=\nu^{-1}(y)=\phi_{1}\left(v_{1}\right)=\phi_{1}\left(v_{2}\right)=\cdots=\phi_{1}\left(v_{m}\right)$. Since $\phi_{1}$ is an order-embedding we can further assert that $u_{1}=u_{2}=\cdots=u_{n}=v_{1}=v_{2}=\cdots=$ $v_{m}=z \in C$, say. So, we have

$$
x=\phi_{1}(z), y=\phi_{2}(z) .
$$

Thus $\left(\mathbf{C} ; \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2} ; \phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right)$ is embeddable.
Case 2. Let some of the trees representing the terms $p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right), p_{i}\left(x_{i}^{\prime}\right), q_{j}\left(y_{j}\right), q_{j}\left(y_{j}^{\prime}\right), 1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, in (5.7) have more than one node. We show that this case can be reduced to Case 1 . To this end, we shall only consider the scheme from $x$ to $y$, viz.

$$
\begin{equation*}
x \preccurlyeq p_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}} p_{1}\left(x_{1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{2}\left(x_{2}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}} p_{2}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq \cdots \preccurlyeq p_{n}\left(x_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathrm{H}} \dot{\mathrm{H}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}} p_{n}\left(x_{n}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq y . \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By analogy our argument will also work for the scheme from $y$ to $x$. Because $x$ and $y$ both have trees with just one node, between $\xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}}$ and $\xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{-1}}$ we shall first encounter relations of type

$$
p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{-1}} p_{i}\left(x_{i}^{\prime}\right),
$$

while writing scheme (5.8); note that $p_{j}\left(x_{j}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{j}\left(x_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ reduces to $p_{j}\left(x_{j}\right)=p_{j}\left(x_{j}\right)$ if $x_{j} \in \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}_{1}} \cup \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}$.
By a similar token, moving backwards from $y$ to $x$ in (5.8) we shall first encounter relations of type

$$
p_{i}\left(x_{i}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{i}\left(x_{i}^{\prime}\right) .
$$

This implies that there exists a segment of the following type in the scheme under consideration,

$$
\begin{align*}
& p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{-1}} p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{s+1}\left(x_{s+1}\right) \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{UH}^{\prime-1}} p_{s+1}\left(x_{s+1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{s+2}\left(x_{s+2}\right)  \tag{5.9}\\
& \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1}}{ }^{\prime} p_{s+t-1}\left(x_{s+t-1}^{\prime-1}\right) \\
& \preccurlyeq p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) \\
& \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

such that for all $j<s$, we have no relations of the form $p_{j}\left(x_{j}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{j}\left(x_{j}^{\prime}\right)$.
Using Lemma (7) we can rewrite the segment (5.9) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{-1}} p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{s+1}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+1}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \boldsymbol{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t-1}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+t-1}^{\prime}\right) \preccurlyeq p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) . \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

By exhausting all the possibilities we shall first show that it is always possible to replace segment (5.10) by one in which either $\mathrm{H}^{-1}$ and H are either swapped or at least one of the symbols $\mathrm{H}^{-1}$ and H vanishes.

Case 2a. Assume that

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r+s}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r+s}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $i, j \in\{1,2\},\left(a_{\alpha}, a_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{s} & =t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right) \\
x_{s}^{\prime} & =t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right) \\
x_{s+t} & =t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \\
x_{s+t}^{\prime} & =t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case we take,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+t}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
p_{s+t}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r+s}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So, we can re-write segment (5.10) as,

$$
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathbf{U}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+t}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}} p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right)=p_{s+t}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}^{-1}} p_{s+t}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathbf{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right),
$$

The dual case when $p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right)=t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{r^{\prime}}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}+s^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r+s}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right)$ can be dealt with in a similar way.
Case 2b. If in (5.10) $x_{s}^{\prime}$ properly covers $x_{s+t}$, then we we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r} \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $i, j \in\{1,2\}$ and where

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{s} & =t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r} \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \\
x_{s}^{\prime} & =t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \\
x_{s+t} & =t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \\
x_{s+t}^{\prime} & =t^{\mathbf{A}_{j}}\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, if $i=j$ then $a_{l}=a_{l}^{\prime}, r \leq l \leq r^{\prime}$, and we can write a sequence

$$
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathbf{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) .
$$

On the contrary, if $i \neq j$, then we may assume without losing generality that $i=1$ and $j=2$. Then $a_{l}=\phi_{1}\left(c_{l}\right)$ and $a_{l}^{\prime}=\phi_{2}\left(c_{l}\right)$, for all $r \leq l \leq r^{\prime}$. This implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(\phi_{2}\left(c_{r}\right), \ldots, \phi_{2}\left(c_{r^{\prime}}\right)\right)=\phi_{2} t^{\mathbf{C}}\left(c_{r}, \ldots, c_{r^{\prime}}\right) \\
& t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right)=t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\phi_{1}\left(c_{r}\right), \ldots, \phi_{1}\left(c_{r^{\prime}}\right)\right)=\phi_{1} t^{\mathbf{C}}\left(c_{r}, \ldots, c_{r^{\prime}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and we can again write

$$
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathbf{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) .
$$

Case 2c. If in (5.10) $x_{s}^{\prime}$ covers $x_{s+t}$, then we have the following subcases.
(i) Let $x_{s}$ and $x_{s+t}^{\prime}$ be both in $A_{i}, i \in\{1,2\}$. Assume that

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t+}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\prime} \mathbf{A}_{i}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $i \in\{1,2\},\left(a_{\alpha}, a_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{s} & =t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \in A_{i} \\
x_{s}^{\prime} & =t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \in T\left(A_{i}\right) \\
x_{s+t} & =t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \in T\left(A_{i}\right) \\
x_{s+t}^{\prime} & =t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \in A_{i} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r-1}^{\prime}, t^{\mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), a_{r^{\prime}+1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r-1}^{\prime}, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), a_{r^{\prime}+1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k-1}^{\prime}, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{i}}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), a_{k^{\prime}+1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

one may write:

$$
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{-1}}{\longrightarrow} p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) \stackrel{\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \cup_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) .
$$

(ii) If $x_{s}$ and $x_{s+t}^{\prime}$ are not in the same $A_{i}, i \in\{1,2\}$, then we may assume without loss of generality that $x_{s} \in A_{1}$ and $x_{s+t}^{\prime} \in A_{2}$. Let us suppose that in (5.10),

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left(a_{\alpha}, a_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right) \in \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}, 1 \leq \alpha \leq m$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{s} & =t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \in A_{1} \\
x_{s}^{\prime} & =t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right) \in T\left(A_{1}\right) \\
x_{s+t} & =t^{\prime}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \in T\left(A_{2}\right) \\
x_{s+t}^{\prime} & =t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \in A_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Again, as in Case 2b, we have $a_{l}=\phi_{1}\left(c_{l}\right)$ and $a_{l}^{\prime}=\phi_{2}\left(c_{l}\right)$, for all $k \leq l \leq k^{\prime}$. This implies that

$$
t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(a_{k}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)=t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{2}}\left(\phi_{2}\left(c_{k}\right), \ldots, \phi_{2}\left(k_{r^{\prime}}\right)\right)=\phi_{2} t^{\prime \mathbf{C}}\left(c_{k}, \ldots, c_{k^{\prime}}\right)
$$

$$
t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{k}, \ldots, a_{k^{\prime}}\right)=t^{\prime \mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(\phi_{1}\left(c_{k}\right), \ldots, \phi_{1}\left(c_{k^{\prime}}\right)\right)=\phi_{1} t^{\prime \mathbf{C}}\left(c_{k}, \ldots, c_{k^{\prime}}\right)
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t^{\mathbf{A}_{1}}\left(a_{r}, \ldots, \phi_{1} t^{\mathbf{C}}\left(c_{k}, \ldots, c_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}, \ldots, \phi_{1} t^{\prime \mathbf{C}}\left(c_{k}, \ldots, c_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{m}\right) \\
p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right) & =t_{s}\left(a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t\left(a_{r}^{\prime}, \ldots, \phi_{2} t^{\prime \mathbf{C}}\left(c_{k}, \ldots, c_{k^{\prime}}\right), \ldots, a_{r^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right), \ldots, a_{m}^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This allows us to write

$$
p_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{H}^{-1}} p_{s}^{\prime}\left(x_{s}^{\prime}\right) \stackrel{\mathrm{H}^{\prime} \cup \mathrm{H}^{\prime-1} \cup \mathrm{I}_{A_{1} \cup A_{2}}}{\rightrightarrows} p_{s+t}\left(x_{s+t}^{\prime}\right)
$$

Case 2d. When $x_{s+t}$ covers $x_{s}^{\prime}$. This case can be handled in a similar way as Case 2c.
Iterating the procedures mentioned in different subcases of Case 2 we can remove all occurrences of $H$ and $H^{-1}$ in (5.8). This implies that Case 2 can be reduced to Case 1. Hence, the theorem is proved.
Corollary 3. Epis are surjective in $\mathcal{F}$ - Oalg ${ }_{\leq}^{0}$.
Proof. Follows from Theorem 5 and Corollary 2 ,
Corollary 4. Epis are surjective in $\mathcal{F}$ - $\boldsymbol{A l g}$, the variety of all unordered algebras of type $\mathcal{F}$.
Proof. Let $f$ be an epi in $\mathcal{F}$-Alg. Then, $f$ is also an epi in $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathbf{O a l g}_{=}^{0}$. This implies, by Theorem (5), that $f$ is surjective.
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