

# IVO G. ROSENBERG'S WORK ON MAXIMAL CLONES AND MINIMAL CLONES

ÁGNES SZENDREI

ABSTRACT. The aim of this paper is to honor Ivo G. Rosenberg by describing some of his most influential results and their impact in logic, discrete mathematics, algebra, and computer science.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ivo Rosenberg's published work touches on a wide range of topics in mathematics, including logic and discrete mathematics, graph theory and combinatorics, algebra, geometry, topology, and computer science. A large portion of his results are concerned with *clones*, which are families  $\mathcal{C}$  of finitary operations (i.e., families of functions in finitely many variables) on a fixed set  $A$ , such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under composition and contains all *projection operations*  $\text{pr}_i^{(n)}: A^n \rightarrow A$ ,  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto a_i$  ( $n \geq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ). The largest clone on  $A$  is the clone  $\mathcal{O}_A$  of all operations, and the least clones on  $A$  is the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections.

The study of clones entered into mathematics from two independent sources: logic and algebra. In the propositional calculus of 2-valued logic, it has been known for a long time that conjunction and negation — or similarly, implication and negation — form a “complete set of logical connectives” in the sense that the corresponding Boolean functions (or truth functions), together with the projections (which are the ‘trivial’ Boolean functions that record the truth values of the variables), are sufficient to generate all Boolean functions via composition. Using the concept of a clone, we can restate the definition of completeness as follows: a set  $F$  of Boolean functions is *complete* if  $F$  generates the clone of all Boolean functions, and a set of logical connectives is *complete* if the set of the corresponding Boolean functions is complete. In 1920, Post announced his classification of all possible propositional calculi (or in modern terminology: his classification of all clones of Boolean functions), which implies the following general completeness criterion for 2-valued logic (see [97, 98]):

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 08A40; Secondary: 08B50, 08A05, 08A70, 68Q25.

*Key words and phrases*. clone, completeness, maximal clone, Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem, minimal clone, Rosenberg's Theorem on minimal clones.

A set  $F$  of Boolean functions is complete if and only if there exist not necessarily distinct functions  $f_1, \dots, f_5 \in F$  such that  $f_1$  is not monotone with respect to the order  $0 \leq 1$ ,  $f_2$  does not fix 0,  $f_3$  does not fix 1,  $f_4$  is not invariant under switching the roles of 0 and 1, and  $f_5$  is not linear when expressed as a polynomial function over the 2-element field  $\mathbf{Z}_2$ .<sup>1</sup>

In algebra, the fundamental objects of study are *algebraic structures* (briefly: *algebras*), such as groups or rings. Algebras are devices for computation, and can be formally described as pairs  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  where  $A \neq \emptyset$  is the base set of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $F$  is the set of basic operations of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Computations in  $\mathbf{A}$  that apply basic operations multiple times to elements of  $\mathbf{A}$ , can be captured by *derived operations* obtained from the basic operations of  $\mathbf{A}$  and projection operations by composition. Hence the derived operations of  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  form a clone, which is called *the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$*  and is denoted by  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  is the clone on  $A$  generated by  $F$ , that is,  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  is the least clone on  $A$  containing  $F$ . The concept of a clone was introduced by Philip Hall (cf. [17, p. 127] and [34, p. 126]), who was apparently motivated by the difficulty of doing calculations with derived operations of classical algebras, especially groups and rings.

Rosenberg was a leader in the study of clones for over 50 years. The aim of this paper is to honor him by presenting two of his most significant results — one on maximal clones on finite sets and the other on minimal clones —, and discussing their profound impact in logic, algebra, and computer science.

## 2. MAXIMAL CLONES ON FINITE SETS AND ROSENBERG'S COMPLETENESS THEOREM

In this section we present Ivo G. Rosenberg's generalization of Post's Completeness Theorem from 2-valued logic to  $k$ -valued logics for arbitrary finite  $k \geq 2$ , which is a landmark result in both logic and algebra. He announced the theorem in 1965 in [108], and the following year he submitted the result, together with its 90-page proof, for publication, which appeared in 1970 in [110].

The concept of completeness carries over in a straightforward manner from 2-valued logic to  $k$ -valued logic for any  $k \geq 2$ , as follows. In  $k$ -valued logic ( $k \geq 2$ ) the *truth functions* are the finitary operations on the  $k$ -element set  $A$  of truth values, and a set  $F$  of truth functions — that is, a set  $F$  of operations on  $A$  — is said to be *complete* if  $F$  generates the clone  $\mathcal{O}_A$  of all operations on  $A$ . A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a set  $A$  is called *maximal* if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a proper subclone of  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , and  $\mathcal{O}_A$  is the only clone on  $A$  that properly contains  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $k < 2$ , then every set of truth functions in  $k$ -valued logic is complete, and if  $|A| < 2$ , then maximal clones do not exist on  $A$ . Therefore, we will assume

---

<sup>1</sup>Post used a slightly weaker notion than the concept of a clone, which he called a *closed set of functions*. Every clone is a closed set of functions, but a closed set of functions may not contain projections. However, if we add all projections to a closed set of functions, we always get a clone.

throughout that  $k, |A| \geq 2$ , and in this section we will also assume that  $k$  and  $A$  are finite.

**2.1. Background.** To place Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem into context let us review several important results on clones that were discovered during the decades between Post’s work and the announcement of Rosenberg’s Theorem. We start with two results that reveal essential differences between 2-valued logic and  $k (> 2)$ -valued logics. In 1939, Słupecki [123] proved the following sufficient condition for completeness in  $k (> 2)$ -valued logics, which fails for  $k = 2$ :

*If  $A$  is a finite set of size  $> 2$  and  $F \subseteq \mathcal{O}_A$  contains all unary operations from  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , then  $F$  is complete if and only if some operation in  $F$  is both surjective and not essentially unary (i.e., depends on at least two of its variables).*

Another difference between 2-valued and  $k (> 2)$ -valued logics that came to light in the late 1950’s is that the lattice of subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  is much more complex for  $|A| > 2$  than for  $|A| = 2$ . Indeed, for  $|A| = 2$  Post proved in [98] — by explicitly determining all subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  — that  $\mathcal{O}_A$  has only countably many subclones. However, for finite sets  $A$  of size  $> 2$ , Yanov and Muchnik [143] proved that  $\mathcal{O}_A$  has continuum many subclones.

Nevertheless, other results that emerged in the 1950’s gave hope that on the question of completeness, the difference between 2-valued and  $k (> 2)$ -valued logics may not be insurmountable. For example, Kuznetsov [60] proved that for any finite set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ),

(2.1) *every proper subclone of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  is contained in a maximal subclone of  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , and the number of maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  is finite.*

Statement (2.1) implies that a set  $F \subseteq \mathcal{O}_A$  is complete if and only if  $F$  is not contained in any one of the finitely many maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$ . Hence, finding an ‘efficient’ completeness criterion for  $k$ -valued logics ( $k \geq 2$ ) is equivalent to finding an ‘efficient’ description for the maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  for all finite sets  $|A| \geq 2$ . For the special case  $|A| = 2$ , Post’s Completeness Theorem is ‘efficient’ in this sense, and shows that  $\mathcal{O}_A$  has five maximal subclones. For  $|A| = 3$ , Yablonskiĭ [142] presented a similar ‘efficient’ completeness criterion by finding all 18 maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  (a result announced earlier without proof in [141]).

Parallel to these developments, but largely independently of them, in the early 1950’s Foster initiated a study of those algebras  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  where either the set  $F$  of operations itself, or  $F$  together with all constant operations on  $A$ , is a complete set of operations on  $A$ . The nontrivial finite algebras<sup>2</sup>  $\mathbf{A}$  of the first kind are called *primal*<sup>3</sup> algebras, the motivating examples being the 2-element Boolean algebra and

<sup>2</sup>An algebra is *nontrivial* if it has more than one element.

<sup>3</sup>In [30, 31] Foster called these algebras *functionally strictly complete*, and he switched to the currently accepted terminology *primal* a few years later.

finite fields of prime order. The nontrivial finite algebras  $\mathbf{A}$  of the second kind are called *functionally complete* algebras, and they also include all finite fields. Foster was primarily interested in the structure of all algebras in the variety generated by a given primal or functionally complete algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ .<sup>4</sup> For example, in [31] he proved that if  $\mathbf{A}$  is a primal algebra, then every finite or infinite algebra in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  is a Boolean power<sup>5</sup> of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  is a *minimal variety*, that is, it contains no other proper subvariety than the trivial variety of one-element algebras.

The powerful, and nowadays ubiquitous, technique of using compatible relations to describe clones on finite sets — or, in a more algebraic language, the technique of using the subalgebras of finite powers of a finite algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  to determine the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  —, which is based on the Galois connection between operations and relations (see [7, 38]), was not fully developed until after Rosenberg proved his completeness theorem. However, some related terminology and notation will be useful throughout this article, therefore we introduce them here. If  $A$  is a set,  $f$  is an  $n$ -ary operation and  $\rho$  is an  $m$ -ary relation on  $A$ , we say that  $f$  *preserves*  $\rho$  (or  $\rho$  is *invariant with respect to*  $f$ , or  $\rho$  is *compatible with*  $f$ ) if  $\rho$  is closed under the operation  $f$  when  $f$  is applied coordinatewise to elements of  $\rho$ . Thus, saying that  $f$  preserves  $\rho$  is equivalent to saying that  $\rho$  is (the base set of) a subalgebra of the  $m$ -th power algebra  $(A; f)^m$ , but it is also equivalent to saying that  $f$  is an  $n$ -ary homomorphism  $(A; \rho)^n \rightarrow (A; \rho)$ , or *polymorphism*, of the relational structure  $(A; \rho)$ . It is easy to see that the set of all operations on  $A$  that preserve  $\rho$  — i.e., the set of all polymorphisms of  $\rho$  — is a clone on  $A$ , which will be denoted by  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$ .

Kuznetsov's proof of the fact (2.1) mentioned above yields that for any finite set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ),

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{every maximal clone on } A \text{ is of the form } \text{Pol}(\rho) \\ \text{for some relation } \rho \text{ of arity } \leq |A|. \end{array}$$

**2.2. Rosenberg's description of the maximal clones on finite sets.** The maximality of  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  was known before 1965 for the following familiar relations on finite sets  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ):

- (1)  $\rho$  is a partial order on  $A$  with a least element and a greatest element [80];
- (2)  $\rho$  is (the graph of) a fixed point free permutation on  $A$  such that all cycles of  $\rho$  have the same prime length [142];
- (4)  $\rho$  is a nontrivial equivalence relation on  $A$  [142];<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>A *variety* or *equational class* is a class of algebras axiomatized by a set of identities. The variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  is the class of all algebras that satisfy every identity true in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

<sup>5</sup>A Boolean power of  $\mathbf{A}$  is a special kind of subdirect product of copies of  $\mathbf{A}$ . In [30, 31] Foster called this construction *normal subdirect sum of*  $\mathbf{A}$ .

<sup>6</sup>The trivial equivalence relations on  $A$  are the equality relation and  $A \times A$ ; their polymorphism clones are  $\mathcal{O}_A$ .

(5)<sub>1</sub>  $\rho$  is a nontrivial unary relation on  $A$  [142];<sup>7</sup>

(6)<sub>\*</sub>  $\rho$  is the relation

$$\iota_A := \{(a_1, \dots, a_{|A|}) \in A^{|A|} : |\{a_1, \dots, a_{|A|}\}| < |A|\}$$

where  $|A| > 2$  [142].

In particular, if  $A$  is the set  $\mathbf{2} := \{0, 1\}$  of truth values in 2-valued logic, then Items (1), (2), and (5)<sub>1</sub> above yield four maximal subclones in  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , namely the clone  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  of all Boolean functions that are monotone with respect to the order  $0 \leq 1$ , the clone  $\text{Pol}(\neg)$  of all Boolean functions that are invariant under negation (i.e., under switching 0 and 1), and for both truth values  $v = 0$  and  $v = 1$ , the clone  $\text{Pol}(\{v\})$  of all Boolean functions that fix  $v$ . By Post's description of the maximal clones of Boolean functions, there is a fifth maximal clone: the clone of all Boolean functions that are linear, when expressed as polynomial functions over the 2-element field  $\mathbf{Z}_2$ .

Returning to the case when  $A$  is any finite set ( $|A| \geq 2$ ), notice that maximal clones of the types (4) and (6)<sub>\*</sub> exist only if  $|A| > 2$ . Moreover, the maximality of the clone  $\text{Pol}(\iota_A)$  for the relation  $\rho = \iota_A$  in (6)<sub>\*</sub> is closely related to Słupecki's Theorem. Indeed, it is easy to check that  $\text{Pol}(\iota_A)$  contains all operations on  $A$  that are either essentially unary or non-surjective. Therefore, by Słupecki's Theorem,  $\text{Pol}(\iota_A)$  cannot contain any one of the remaining operations, and hence  $\text{Pol}(\iota_A)$  is a maximal subclone of  $\mathcal{O}_A$ . For this reason,  $\iota_A$  is often referred to as *Słupecki's relation*, and  $\text{Pol}(\iota_A)$  as *Słupecki's clone* on  $A$ .

Rosenberg's celebrated completeness theorem expands the list of relations (1)–(6)<sub>\*</sub> above to a list of relations  $\rho$  on finite sets  $A$  such that the corresponding clones  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  yield the full list of maximal clones on  $A$ . The relations come in six types. Three of the of types, namely (1), (2), and (4), are exactly the relations described above. The families (5)<sub>1</sub> and (6)<sub>\*</sub> above are enlarged considerably to get Rosenberg's relations of types (5) and (6), and relations of type (3) are added to the list. This last type is not entirely new either, because the maximal clone of linear Boolean functions in Post's Theorem turns out to have the form  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  for the unique relation  $\rho$  of type (3) on  $A = \mathbf{2}$ .

**Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem** [108, 110]. *Let  $A$  be a finite set ( $|A| \geq 3$ ). The maximal clones on  $A$  are exactly the clones  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is one of the relations described in (1), (2), (4) above or (3), (5), (6) below:*

(3) *for some elementary abelian  $p$ -group  $(A; +)$ ,  $\rho$  is the 4-ary relation*

$$(2.3) \quad \alpha_+ := \{(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in A^4 : a_1 - a_2 + a_3 = a_4\},$$

*which is the graph of the 'ternary addition'  $x_1 - x_2 + x_3$ ;*

---

<sup>7</sup>The trivial unary relations on  $A$  are  $\emptyset$  and  $A$ ; their polymorphism clones are  $\mathcal{O}_A$ .

- (5) for some integer  $m$  ( $1 \leq m < |A|$ ),  $\rho$  is an  $m$ -ary totally reflexive, totally symmetric<sup>8</sup> relation on  $A$  such that  $\rho \neq A^n$  and for at least one element  $c \in A$  we have that  $\{c\} \times A^{m-1} \subseteq \rho$ ;
- (6) for some integers  $m$  and  $r$  ( $3 \leq m \leq |A|$ ,  $r \geq 1$ ), and some  $r$ -element set  $T = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r\}$  of equivalence relations on  $A$  such that
- each  $\theta_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ) has exactly  $m$  blocks, and
  - $\bigcap_{i=1}^r B_i$  is nonempty whenever  $B_i$  is a block of  $\theta_i$  for every  $i$ ,
- $\rho$  is the relation  $\lambda_T$  defined as follows:

$$(2.4) \quad \lambda_T := \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in A^m : \text{for every } i \ (1 \leq i \leq r), \text{ there exist two elements among } a_1, \dots, a_m \text{ that are in the same block of } \theta_i\}.$$

Consequently, a set  $F$  of functions on  $A$  is complete — or equivalently, an algebra  $(A; F)$  is primal — if and only if  $F \not\subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for every relation  $\rho$  in (1)–(6).

The relations  $\rho$  in (3), (5), and (6) are called *affine relations*, *central relations*, and  *$m$ -regular relations*<sup>9</sup>, respectively. It is easy to see that affine relations exist on  $A$  if and only if  $|A|$  is a prime power. Observe also that the families of relations in (5) and (6) do indeed extend the families in (5)<sub>1</sub> and (6)<sub>\*</sub>, as claimed earlier. Indeed, the relations in (5)<sub>1</sub> are exactly the unary central relations on  $A$ ; this is what the subscript <sub>1</sub> appended to (5) is intended to indicate. Furthermore, Ślupecki's relation  $\iota_{|A|}$  in (6)<sub>\*</sub> is the unique  $|A|$ -regular relation on  $A$ , namely  $\lambda_{\{=\}}$ ; here the subscript <sub>\*</sub> appended to (6) is intended to indicate that Ślupecki's relation is a distinguished member of the set of relations in (6). We will say more about the affine, central, and  $m$ -regular relations and the maximal clones they determine in Subsection 2.4.

To accompany his completeness theorem above, Rosenberg proved in [109] that almost all maximal clones  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is one of the relations in (1)–(6) are distinct. More precisely, he proved that if  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are distinct relations in (1)–(6), then  $\text{Pol}(\rho) = \text{Pol}(\sigma)$  holds if and only if either (i)  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are both of type (1) and they are inverses of each other, or else (ii)  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are both of type (2) and they are powers of each other. In [111], Rosenberg also found a formula for computing the number of maximal clones on an  $n$ -element set.

**2.3. Idea of the proof of Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem.** No easy proof is known for Rosenberg's description of all maximal clones on finite sets. Here, we will only discuss the idea and the main difficulties of the original proof in [110].<sup>10</sup> The starting point of the proof is the fact in (2.2) that every maximal clone on a finite

<sup>8</sup>An  $m$ -ary relation  $\rho$  on  $A$  is *totally reflexive* if it contains all tuples  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in A^m$  where  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  are not pairwise distinct, and *totally symmetric* if  $\rho$  is invariant under all permutations of its coordinates.

<sup>9</sup>An alternative name in the literature for  $m$ -regular relations is  *$m$ -universal relations*.

<sup>10</sup>Detailed proofs for Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem are also presented in [102], [67], and [34].

set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ) is a member of the finite family  $\{\text{Pol}(\rho) : \rho \in \mathcal{R}\}$  of clones where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the set of relations  $\rho$  of arity  $\leq |A|$  on  $A$  such that  $\text{Pol}(\rho) \neq \mathcal{O}_A$  (i.e.,  $\rho \neq \emptyset$  and  $\rho$  is not a diagonal relation<sup>11</sup>). The proof is an intricate elimination process, removing relations from  $\mathcal{R}$  step-by-step in such a way that

- a relation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$  is eliminated only if there remains a relation  $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $\text{Pol}(\rho) \supseteq \text{Pol}(\sigma)$  still to be processed — hence, no maximal clones are lost in the process —, and
- at the end, for all relations  $\rho$  that have not been eliminated,  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  is a maximal clone on  $A$ .

Throughout the proof, unless stated otherwise, when a clone is written in the form  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$ ,  $\rho$  is chosen to have minimum arity among the relations determining  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$ .

The proof has two main phases.

In Phase 1, Rosenberg isolates the maximal clones of types  $(5)_1$ , (1), (2), and (3), and proves that every maximal clone on  $A$  other than those of types  $(5)_1$ , (1), (2), and (3) are of the form  $\text{Pol}(\tau)$  for a non-diagonal totally reflexive, totally symmetric relation  $\tau$  of arity  $\geq 2$ . The difficulty in this part of the elimination process comes when Rosenberg narrows down the possibilities for  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  to the case where  $\rho$  has arity  $\geq 3$ ,  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  is not contained in any of the maximal clones of types  $(5)_1$ , (1), or (2), and  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  is not contained in  $\text{Pol}(\tau)$  for any non-diagonal totally reflexive, totally symmetric relation  $\tau$  of arity  $\geq 2$ . He proves that such a clone  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  has to be maximal of type (3), although for  $p > 2$  some ternary relations — such as the graph of the binary operation  $2x_1 - x_2 = x_1 - x_2 + x_1$  — also determine the corresponding affine maximal clone  $\text{Pol}(\alpha_+)$  in (3).

In Phase 2, it remains to consider the clones  $\text{Pol}(\tau)$  ( $\tau \in \mathcal{R}$ ) where  $\tau$  is a non-diagonal totally reflexive, totally symmetric relation of arity  $\geq 2$  on  $A$ . The maximal clones of the types (4) and (5) are isolated early on in this phase, and it is also established that for all remaining maximal clones  $\text{Pol}(\tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is a non-diagonal totally reflexive, totally symmetric relation, one can choose  $\tau$  to be a homogeneous<sup>12</sup> relation. The rest of the elimination process, which removes all homogeneous relations other than those of type (6) from consideration, takes about 25 pages, and is a real tour de force.

**2.4. More about the maximal clones of types (3), (5), and (6).** Functions and operations that are monotone with respect to a partial order, commute with a permutation, preserve an equivalence relation or preserve a subset occur in almost

---

<sup>11</sup>An  $m$ -ary relation  $\rho$  on  $A$  is *diagonal* if there exists an equivalence relation  $\varepsilon$  on the set  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  such that for all  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in A^m$ , we have  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \rho$  if and only if  $a_i = a_j$  holds whenever  $i \varepsilon j$ . In particular,  $A^m$  is an  $m$ -ary diagonal relation on  $A$  that we get when  $\varepsilon$  is the equality relation.

<sup>12</sup>An  $m$ -ary relation  $\tau$  on  $A$  is called *homogeneous* if  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \tau$  holds whenever  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$  and there exists  $u \in A$  such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, u, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m) \in \tau$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

every area of mathematics, therefore the maximal clones of types (1), (2), (4), and (5)<sub>1</sub> feel natural and familiar. So are the maximal clones of type (3) if one uses the following algebraic description of them from [110]: If  $\mathbf{V} := (\mathbf{Z}_p)^d$  is the  $d$ -dimensional vector space over the  $p$ -element field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  ( $p$  prime),  $(V; +)$  is the additive group of  $\mathbf{V}$ , and  $\alpha_+$  is the corresponding affine relation, then the members of the maximal clone  $\text{Pol}(\alpha_+)$  are exactly the operations of the form

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n M_i x_i + v \quad (n \geq 1),$$

where  $v \in V$  and the coefficients  $M_1, \dots, M_n$  are  $d \times d$  matrices over  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ . Any other maximal clone of type (3) associated to an elementary abelian  $p$ -group  $(A; +)$  of order  $p^d$  is obtained from this one by renaming the elements of the base set via an isomorphism  $(V; +) \rightarrow (A; +)$ .

The remaining relations in Rosenberg's list, i.e., the non-unary central relations and the  $m$ -regular relations, are certainly less familiar, and when encountered for the first time, might look mysterious. Our goal here is to build some intuition for them and the maximal clones they determine. A common property of all maximal clones determined by a central relation  $\rho$  of arity  $m \geq 2$  or by an  $m$ -regular relation  $\lambda_T$  ( $m \geq 3$ ) on a finite set  $A$  is that they contain all operations on  $A$  whose range has size  $< m$ , because these relations are totally reflexive. In addition, every maximal clone determined by a central relation  $\rho$  of arity  $m$  also contains all operations on  $A$  whose range has size  $m$  and has an element from the *center*

$$C_\rho := \{c \in A : \{c\} \times A^{m-1} \subseteq \rho\}$$

of  $\rho$ .

On the other hand, if one focuses on surjective operations, the maximal clones determined by  $m$ -ary central relation ( $m \geq 2$ ) and the maximal clones determined by  $m$ -regular relations ( $m \geq 3$ ) behave quite differently. For central relations  $\rho$ , every surjective operation in  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  also preserves  $C_\rho$ , which is a unary relation in (5)<sub>1</sub>. Therefore, in this context, central relations may be thought of as higher arity variants of the unary relations in (5)<sub>1</sub>. Note, however, that for surjective operations, preserving  $\rho$  is a stronger requirement than preserving  $C_\rho$ .

Before discussing surjective operations in the maximal clones  $\text{Pol}(\lambda_T)$  determined by  $m$ -regular relations, we will present an alternative description for these relations<sup>13</sup>, which shows more explicitly how the  $m$ -regular relations  $\lambda_T$  are related to Ślupecki's relation  $\iota_B$  on an  $m$ -element set  $B$ . First, notice that the two requirements on  $T$  itemized in (6) are equivalent to requiring that there is a surjective function  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B^r$  mapping  $A$  onto the product of  $r$  copies of  $B$  in such a way that  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$  are the kernels of the  $r$  functions  $A \xrightarrow{\varphi} B^r \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_i^{(r)}} B$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ) where  $\text{pr}_i^{(r)}$  is the  $i$ -th

<sup>13</sup>This is the description that was used by Rosenberg in [110].



$r$ -ary projection operation on  $B$ . Now, it is not hard to check that if  $(\iota_B)^r$  denotes the relation on  $B^r$  which is obtained by applying  $\iota_B$  coordinatewise on  $B^r$ , then  $\lambda_T$  is the inverse image of  $(\iota_B)^r$  under  $\varphi$ .

For simplicity, we will discuss the surjective operations in  $\text{Pol}(\lambda_T)$  only in the case where  $\varphi$  is a bijection. By renaming the elements of  $A$  via the bijection  $\varphi$ , we may assume without loss of generality that  $A = B^r$  and  $\rho = (\iota_B)^r$ . Now, using the fact that  $\text{Pol}(\iota_B)$  is Shupei's clone, and hence all surjective operations in it are essentially unary, one can derive that every surjective operation<sup>14</sup> in  $\text{Pol}((\iota_B)^r)$  is a 'selector function' of the form

$$(2.6) \quad \left( \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} \\ \vdots \\ b_{r1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} b_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ b_{rn} \end{bmatrix} \right) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} g_1(b_{i_1 j_1}) \\ \vdots \\ g_r(b_{i_r j_r}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (n \geq 1),$$

where the elements of  $B^r$  are written as column vectors,  $g_1, \dots, g_r$  are unary operations on  $B$ , and the subscript  $(i_\ell, j_\ell)$  describes for each  $1 \leq \ell \leq r$  which coordinate of which of the  $n$  arguments of the operation is used to compute the  $\ell$ -th argument of the result.

### 3. THE IMPACT OF ROSENBERG'S COMPLETENESS THEOREM

Over the past 50<sup>+</sup> years, Rosenberg's theorem has had a vast impact on research within the broader topic of 'completeness' and also far beyond. Our goal here is to highlight the influence of the theorem and its proof in logic, discrete mathematics, algebra, and computer science.

**3.1. Completeness criteria for special sets of functions.** One of the first applications of Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem was Rousseau's characterization of Sheffer functions on finite sets. An operation  $f$  on a set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ) is called a *Sheffer function* if the singleton set  $\{f\}$  is complete, that is, the algebra  $(A; f)$  whose only operation is  $f$  is primal. In the special case  $A = \mathbf{2}$ , the Boolean functions NAND and NOR are well-known examples of Sheffer functions. Rousseau observed that Rosenberg's theorem simplifies considerably when applied to one-element sets of operations, and proved the following theorem in [119]:

*A function  $f$  on a finite set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ) is a Sheffer function if and only if  $f \notin \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for the Rosenberg relations  $\rho$  in (2), (4), and (5)<sub>1</sub>.*

Equivalently: A finite algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A; f)$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ) with a single operation  $f$  is primal if and only if  $\mathbf{A}$  has no nontrivial automorphisms, no proper subalgebras, and no nontrivial congruences.

---

<sup>14</sup>In fact, the requirement for the operation to be *surjective* may be weakened to *surjective in every coordinate of  $B^r$* .

It is a straightforward consequence of Rosenberg's theorem that a finite algebra  $(A; F)$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ) is functionally complete if and only if  $F \not\subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for all Rosenberg relations  $\rho$  in (1), (3), (4), (6), and all non-unary relations  $\rho$  in (5). In [114], Rosenberg gave a necessary and sufficient condition — along the lines of Rousseau's result — for the functional completeness of finite algebras  $(A; F)$  where  $F$  contains only one operation or every operation in  $F$  is surjective.

**3.2. Completeness in algebra 1: Quasi-primal algebras and the Baker–Pixley Theorem.** Until the late 1970's, there seems to have been little interaction between the research community studying completeness from the viewpoint of multiple-valued logic and discrete mathematics, and the researchers in general algebra who followed in Foster's footsteps to investigate completeness. In general algebra the emphasis was on the varieties generated by finite algebras that satisfy one of several weaker conditions of completeness than primality, and the approach was greatly influenced by Mal'tsev conditions, which describe structural properties of varieties by the existence of certain operations in the clone of a generating algebra. The most successful generalization of primality turned out to be the notion of quasi-primality, introduced by Pixley [91]. An algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  is called *quasi-primal* if  $\mathbf{A}$  is finite, nontrivial (i.e.,  $|A| \geq 2$ ), and for every operation  $f$  on  $A$ ,  $f$  belongs to the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  if and only if  $f$  preserves all isomorphisms between (not necessarily distinct) subalgebras of  $\mathbf{A}$ .<sup>15</sup> In the papers [91] and [92], Pixley presented the following characterizations of quasi-primal algebras:

*A nontrivial finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is quasi-primal*

*$\Leftrightarrow$  every nontrivial subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  is simple<sup>16</sup>, and the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  contains ternary operations  $p$  and  $m$  such that the identities*

$$(3.1) \quad p(x, x, y) = p(y, x, x) = y,$$

$$(3.2) \quad m(x, x, y) = m(x, y, x) = m(y, x, x) = x$$

*hold in  $\mathbf{A}$ ;*

*$\Leftrightarrow$  every nontrivial subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  is simple, and the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  contains a ternary operation  $q$  such that the identities*

$$(3.3) \quad q(x, x, y) = q(y, x, y) = q(y, x, x) = y$$

*hold in  $\mathbf{A}$ ;*

*$\Leftrightarrow$  the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  contains the ternary discriminator function  $t$  on  $A$  defined by  $t(a, b, c) = c$  if  $a = b$  and  $t(a, b, c) = a$  otherwise ( $a, b, c \in A$ ).*

---

<sup>15</sup>In [91], Pixley called these algebras *simple algebraic algebras*, and introduced the current terminology *quasi-primal algebras* for them in [92]. Note also that the definition of quasi-primal algebras in these papers is slightly different from the one given here, but equivalent.

<sup>16</sup>An algebra is said to be *simple* if it is nontrivial and has no nontrivial congruences.

Clearly, the discriminator function  $t$  satisfies the identities for  $q$  in (3.3).

An operation  $p$  satisfying the identities in (3.1) is called a *Mal'tsev operation*, and by [76], the existence of a Mal'tsev operation in the clone of an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is equivalent to the condition that congruences of algebras in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  permute. An operation  $m$  satisfying the identities in (3.2) is called a *majority operation*, and by results in [90] and [91], the existence of Mal'tsev as well as majority operations in the clone of an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ , and the existence of an operation  $q$  as in (3.3) in the clone of an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ , are both equivalent to the condition that congruences of algebras in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  permute and obey the distributive law.

Higher arity versions of majority operations are operations  $u$  of any arity  $n \geq 3$  which satisfy the identities

$$(3.4) \quad u(y, x, \dots, x) = \dots = u(x, \dots, x, y, x, \dots, x) = \dots = u(x, \dots, x, y) = x$$

for every position of the 'lone dissenter'  $y$ . They are called *near unanimity operations*, and they gained prominence due to the 1975 paper [1] of Baker and Pixley, from which we cite two results. The first one reveals the structural property of varieties encoded by the existence of a near unanimity operation. Namely, the existence of a  $(d+1)$ -ary near unanimity operation in the clone of an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is equivalent to the condition that the following version of the Chinese Remainder Theorem holds in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  generated by  $\mathbf{A}$ : in any algebra in  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$ , if a finite system  $x_i \equiv a_i \pmod{\Theta_i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ,  $r \geq d$ ) of congruences is solvable  $d$  at a time, then the whole system is solvable. (This result is attributed to Huhn, cf. [1, p. 169] and [52, p. 89].) The second result is about individual algebras, and is usually referred to as the Baker–Pixley Theorem:

*If  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  is a finite algebra and its clone contains a  $(d+1)$ -ary near unanimity operation, then an operation  $f$  on  $A$  is in the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  if and only if every subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}^d$  is closed under  $f$  (or equivalently,  $f$  preserves all  $d$ -ary compatible relations of  $\mathbf{A}$ ).*

Two notable immediate consequences of the Baker–Pixley Theorem are that (a) for every fixed near unanimity operation  $u$  on a finite set there are only finitely many clones on  $A$  that contain  $u$ , and hence (b) if a clone on a finite set contains a near unanimity operation, then it is finitely generated.<sup>17</sup>

**3.3. Completeness in algebra 2: Abelianness and para-primal algebras.** Another significant development in general algebra in the mid to late 1970's, which is relevant to completeness, was the emergence of commutator theory, and in particular, the isolation of the notion of abelianness for arbitrary algebras and congruences. The

---

<sup>17</sup>A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  is *finitely generated* if for some finite set  $F$  of operations on  $A$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  is the smallest clone containing  $F$ .

theory generalizes classical commutator theories (e.g., the group theoretical commutator and ideal multiplication in ring theory), and was first developed by Smith [124] for varieties which have Mal'tsev term operations. Within a few years, the theory was extended by Hagemann–Herrmann [49], Gumm [43] and Freese–McKenzie [33] to varieties where every algebra has a modular congruence lattice, and later far beyond. Typical examples of abelian algebras are (i) modules over rings (abelian groups in group theory and zero rings in ring theory), and more generally, (ii) algebras whose clone is a subclone of the clone of the constant expansion of a module, and also (iii) all subalgebras of the algebras in (ii). If the clone of such an algebra also contains a Mal'tsev operation (the only choice being the ternary addition  $x_1 - x_2 + x_3$  of the abelian group of the module), then the algebra is called an *affine algebra*. Every maximal clone of type (3) in Rosenberg's Theorem is the clone of an affine algebra. Indeed, with the notation used in Subsection 2.4, the module corresponding to this algebra is obtained by considering the vector space  $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{Z}_p)^d$  over  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  as a module over the full  $d \times d$  matrix ring with entries in  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ . The clone of this module consists of all operations in (2.5) with  $v = 0$ , and it is not hard to see that by adding all constant operations to this module we get an algebra whose clone consists exactly of the operations in (2.5). Clearly, both clones include  $x_1 - x_2 + x_3$ .

Early on in the development of commutator theory, Clark and Krauss [16] introduced a new completeness notion for algebras, which is a common generalization of quasi-primal algebras and abelian groups of prime order. They defined an algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$  to be *para-primal* if  $\mathbf{A}$  is a nontrivial finite algebra such that for every subalgebra  $\mathbf{B}$  of a finite power  $\mathbf{A}^I$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  and for every minimal subset  $J \subseteq I$  of coordinates of  $\mathbf{B}$  with the property that the map  $\text{pr}_J$  projecting  $\mathbf{B}$  onto its coordinates in  $J$  is one-to-one, we have that the image  $\text{pr}_J(\mathbf{B})$  is the full direct product  $\prod_{j \in J} \text{pr}_j(\mathbf{B})$ . One of the main results of [16] extends Pixley's first two characterizations of quasi-primal algebras mentioned above as follows:

*A nontrivial finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is para-primal*

*$\Leftrightarrow$  every nontrivial subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  is simple, and the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  contains a Mal'tsev operation.*

Simultaneously, while investigating minimal varieties with a Mal'tsev term operation, McKenzie proved in [83] the following generalization and strengthening of the theorem by Maurer and Rhodes [82] saying that every finite simple group is either functionally complete or abelian:

*If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a nontrivial finite algebra such that  $\mathbf{A}$  is strictly simple (that is,  $\mathbf{A}$  is simple and has no nontrivial proper subalgebras) and its clone contains a Mal'tsev operation, then  $\mathbf{A}$  is either quasi-primal or affine.*

A combination of these results, with further work, has revealed that, except for having some strictly simple affine subalgebras, para-primal algebras are very much

like quasi-primal algebras (see [84] and [128, Ch. 4]). For example, the following is proved in [128, p. 103]:

*If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a para-primal algebra and its affine subalgebras are  $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_r$ , then the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  contains a ternary operation  $f$  such that the restriction of  $f$  to each affine subalgebra  $\mathbf{B}_i$  is the unique Mal'tsev operation in the clone of  $\mathbf{B}_i$ , and for all other triples  $(a, b, c) \in A^3$ , the value of  $f$  is computed by the ternary discriminator function  $t$  defined earlier.*

In [102], Quackenbush used these ideas to give a new proof for Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem. This approach simplified many of the original arguments of Rosenberg, especially those in Phase 1 (see Subsection 2.3).

**3.4. Properties of maximal clones.** A lot of questions about maximal clones have been studied since Rosenberg completed his description of all maximal clones on finite sets. Here we will only mention a few of them. Following up on the result of Yanov and Muchnik on the number of all clones on finite sets  $A$  with  $|A| \geq 3$ , it was natural to wonder how this result can be refined by counting the clones below each maximal clone one-by-one. It is not hard to show that maximal clones of type (3) have only countably many subclones, finitely many if  $|A|$  is prime (Salomaa [120]) and infinitely many if  $|A|$  is a prime power that is not prime. On the other hand, all maximal clones of the remaining five types have continuumly many subclones. For the maximal clones of type (2) the proof is much more difficult than for the other types, and was found by Demetrovics and Hannák [23] and by Marchenkov [78].

The proof of (2.1) (see [60] and [110]) is based on the observation that for finite sets  $A$  with  $|A| \geq 3$ , the maximal clones  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $A$  are determined by their unary parts  $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$  consisting of all unary operations in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Clearly, the unary part of Šlupecki's clone, which is the set of all unary operations on  $A$ , properly contains the unary parts of all the other maximal clones, but are there any other proper inclusions among the unary parts of maximal clones? This question was investigated by Mašulović and Pech (née Ponjavić) in [95], [96], [81], [89], and [88]. Although some open problems still remain, especially when at least one of the relations  $\rho, \sigma$  is non-unary of type (5) or (6), the results they obtained show that proper inclusions  $\text{Pol}^{(1)}(\rho) \subsetneq \text{Pol}^{(1)}(\sigma)$  among the unary parts of maximal clones  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  and  $\text{Pol}(\sigma)$  are rare. For example,  $\sigma$  cannot be of type (1) or (2) in such an inclusion, and it can be of type (3) only if  $\rho$  is of type (2) and either  $|A|$  is prime or  $|A| = 4$ . Surprisingly, they also found that there exist long chains of proper inclusions among the unary parts of maximal clones where the relations are either all of type (5) or all of type (6). The lengths of the chains are  $|A| - 1$  and  $O(\sqrt{|A|})$ , respectively.

Which maximal clones  $\mathcal{M}$  on a finite set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ) are finitely generated? This question is significant, because it determines whether or not it is feasible to expect a Rosenberg-type description for the maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Indeed, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a finitely




FIGURE 1. The Tardos poset

generated clone on  $A$ , then the idea of proof for Statements (2.1)–(2.2) mentioned in the preceding paragraph extends<sup>18</sup> from  $\mathcal{O}_A$  to  $\mathcal{C}$  to prove that

- every proper subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$  is contained in a maximal subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,
- the number of maximal subclones of  $\mathcal{C}$  is finite, and
- every maximal subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Pol}(\rho)$  for some relation  $\rho$  on  $A$ .

Conversely, it is easy to see that the first two conditions here imply that  $\mathcal{C}$  is finitely generated.

It turns out that most maximal clones on  $A$  are finitely generated, but not all, unless the set  $A$  is small. In more detail, all maximal clones  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\rho)$  on  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ) where  $\rho$  is not of type (1) are finitely generated. For  $\rho$  of type (3) this follows from Rosenberg’s description of these clones in (2.5), and for the remaining types this follows from the results of Schofield [121] and Lau [63]. The maximal clones  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is of type (2), (4), or (5) contain near unanimity operations, therefore the Baker–Pixley Theorem also implies that these maximal clones are finitely generated. For the remaining case of type (1), that is, for the maximal clones of the form  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\leq)$  where  $\leq$  is a bounded partial order on  $A$ , the problem asking which of them are finitely generated is still open, in general. A large class of finite bounded posets  $(A; \leq)$  for which  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\leq)$  is known to be finitely generated are the posets that can be obtained from finite lattices by removing a (possibly empty) convex subset. For these posets Demetrovics, Hannák, and Rónyai [25] proved that  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  contains a near unanimity operation, so the Baker–Pixley Theorem applies. This result implies, in particular, that  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  is finitely generated for every bounded partial order on  $A$ , provided  $|A| \leq 7$ . Tardos [136] found the first example of a bounded partial order  $\leq$  on a finite set for which  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  is not finitely generated; it is the order depicted in Figure 1 on an 8-element set.

<sup>18</sup>The key is to replace the role of the unary part  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}$  of the clone by the  $m$ -ary part  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$ , where  $m$  is the maximum arity of the operations in a generating set of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Later, Zádori [144] studied series-parallel posets, a fairly large class of posets that are very far from lattices. For example, the Tardos poset is a series-parallel poset. Zádori's results imply that if  $(A; \leq)$  is a finite bounded series-parallel poset, then  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  is finitely generated if and only if the Tardos poset is not a retract of  $(A; \leq)$ , and this is the case if and only if  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  contains a 5-ary near unanimity operation. An immediate consequence of this result is that for every finite set  $A$  of size  $|A| \geq 8$  there exists a bounded partial order  $\leq$  such that the maximal clone  $\text{Pol}(\leq)$  is not finitely generated.

**3.5. Submaximal clones.** The results discussed in the last two paragraphs all point in the same direction: by continuing Rosenberg's work on the maximal clones, and using his ideas and techniques to determine the maximal subclones of (at least) the finitely generated maximal clones, we can gain a better understanding of the lattice of clones on arbitrary finite sets, at least 'near the top'. A clone on a fixed finite set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ) is called a *submaximal clone* on  $A$  if it is a maximal subclone of a maximal clone on  $A$ . The concept was introduced by Rosenberg in [112], where he proved a Słupecki-type completeness theorem for the maximal clones  $\text{Pol}(B)$  where  $B$  is a unary central relation. The collection of the submaximal clones on  $A$  may be thought of as the 'next level' in the clone lattice on  $A$  below the 'top level' of the maximal clones; however, it should be noted that not all submaximal clones on  $A$  have depth 2 below  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , because there exist submaximal clones that are contained in two maximal clones so that they are maximal in one of them and not maximal in the other.

Over the last five decades, a large body of work has been published about submaximal clones on finite sets  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ), but the project of finding all of them is far from complete. In the special case  $|A| = 3$  all submaximal clones on  $A$  are known; their description was completed by Lau [64], using earlier results by Machida [70], Demetrovics, Hannák, Marchenkov [24], and Salomaa [120] on the submaximal clones on 3-element sets that are maximal in maximal clones of types (1), (2), and (3), respectively. A complete list of all submaximal clones is not known for any finite set of size  $> 3$ , but there are a lot of maximal clones  $\mathcal{M}$  on arbitrary finite sets  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 3$ ) for which all of its maximal subclones are known. These include the following, where the numbers (1)–(6) indicate the type of the maximal clone  $\mathcal{M}$ :

- (1)  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\leq)$  where  $(A; \leq)$  is a chain and  $|A| \leq 5$ ; Larose [61].
- (2)  $\mathcal{M}$  is arbitrary of type (2); Rosenberg–Szendrei [118].
- (3)  $\mathcal{M}$  is arbitrary of type (3); Szendrei [134].
- (4)  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$  with exactly two blocks, one of which is a singleton; Lau [67, Sec. 18.3].
- (5)<sub>1</sub>  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(\{b\})$ ,  $b \in A$ ; Lau [65].

More generally, the list of maximal subclones is known also for all intersections  $\bigcap_{b \in B} \text{Pol}(\{b\})$  ( $\emptyset \subsetneq B \subseteq A$ ) of maximal clones of this form; Szendrei [131], Lau [66], cf. also [67, Ch. 16].

(5)<sub>1</sub>  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Pol}(B)$ ,  $B \subsetneq A$ ,  $|B| > 1$ ; Lau [67, Ch. 17].

(6)<sub>\*</sub>  $\mathcal{M}$  is Šlupecki's clone on  $A$ ; Szendrei [135].

In [135], the list of maximal subclones is given also for every subclone of Šlupecki's clone on  $A$ , which contains all non-surjective operations on  $A$ .

**3.6. Minimal varieties generated by finite algebras.** Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem has also been instrumental in solving some problems that are apparently unrelated to completeness. One of these is the problem to characterize the minimal varieties that contain a nontrivial finite algebra. Each such variety is of the form  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  for a nontrivial finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ , and by choosing a generator  $\mathbf{A}$  of minimal cardinality, we get that the variety has the form  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  for a finite, strictly simple algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ . Thus, the problem may be rephrased as stated in Problem 10 in [50, p. 192]: describe all finite, strictly simple algebras that generate minimal varieties. Most strictly simple algebras  $\mathbf{A}$  that are 'complete' in one of the senses we discussed (e.g., primal, quasi-primal, or para-primal) are known to generate minimal varieties; the only exceptions are the strictly simple affine algebras that have no trivial subalgebras (see [31, 91, 16, 83, 84]). At the other extreme, the 2-element algebras  $\mathbf{A} = (A; \emptyset)$  with no operations (essentially, just 2-element sets) and the 2-element algebras  $\mathbf{A} = (A; c_a)$  with a single constant operation  $c_a$  with value  $a \in A$  (pointed sets), are also strictly simple and generate minimal varieties, but their clones are too small to consider them 'complete' in any reasonable sense.

The problem stated in the preceding paragraph was solved by Kearnes and Szendrei in [58] by the following theorem:

*A finite, strictly simple algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  generates a minimal variety if and only if*

(i)  $\mathbf{A}$  is either non-abelian or has a trivial subalgebra, and

(ii) for any (equivalently, for some) unary operation  $e$  in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad e = e^2, \quad e \text{ is not constant, but } |e(A)| \text{ is as small as possible,}$$

*there exist operations  $f_0, \dots, f_n$  in  $\text{Clo}^{(2)}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $g_0, \dots, g_n, h_0, \dots, h_n$  in  $\text{Clo}^{(1)}(\mathbf{A})$ , for some  $n \geq 1$ , such that  $\mathbf{A}$  satisfies the following identities:*

$$x = f_0(x, eg_0(x)), \quad f_{i-1}(x, eh_{i-1}(x)) = f_i(x, eg_i(x)) \quad (1 \leq i \leq n),$$

$$f_n(x, eh_n(x)) = e(x).$$

It follows also from this characterization that in every minimal variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  where  $\mathbf{A}$  is a finite, strictly simple algebra, the generating algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  embeds in every nontrivial member of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  and hence  $\mathbf{A}$  is the only strictly simple algebra in  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$ , up to isomorphism. In the proof, the operation  $e \in \text{Clo}^{(1)}(\mathbf{A})$  is used to construct from  $\mathbf{A}$  its *induced algebra*  $e(\mathbf{A}) = (e(A); \{ef|_{e(A)} : f \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})\})$ , an algebra on the range



$e(A)$  of  $e$  whose operations are the restrictions to  $e(A)$  of all operations in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  that map into  $e(A)$ . It is not hard to check that  $\mathbf{M} := e(\mathbf{A})$  inherits many relevant properties of  $\mathbf{A}$ : for example, (a) since  $\mathbf{A}$  is strictly simple, so is  $\mathbf{M}$ , (b)  $\mathbf{M}$  is abelian if and only if  $\mathbf{A}$  is, and (c)  $\mathbf{M}$  has the same trivial subalgebras as  $\mathbf{A}$ . Furthermore, by the choice of  $e$  described in (3.5), (d) every unary operation in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M})$  is either a permutation or a constant. A finite algebra  $\mathbf{M}$  with property (d) is called *term minimal*. The main idea of the proof of the characterization above is to establish first that for a strictly simple, term minimal algebra  $\mathbf{M}$ , the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{M})$  is minimal if and only if condition (i) holds for  $\mathbf{M}$  (in place of  $\mathbf{A}$ ), and then to determine the exact relationship between  $\mathbf{A}$  and its induced term minimal algebra  $\mathbf{M} = e(\mathbf{A})$  that allows the minimality of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{M})$  to be pulled back to yield the minimality of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$ . The first step here relies on a detailed analysis of all the possibilities for the clones  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M})$  of strictly simple, term minimal algebras  $\mathbf{M}$ . This analysis was completed in [133], relying heavily on earlier results from [98] for the case  $|M| = 2$  and from [86, 129, 130] for the case  $|M| \geq 3$ .

A strengthening of Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem from [132] plays a crucial role in this analysis in the case where  $\mathbf{M}$  is a strictly simple, term minimal algebra such that  $\text{Clo}^{(1)}(\mathbf{M})$  is a transitive permutation group on  $M$  ( $|M| \geq 3$ ). If, for the time being, we let  $\mathbf{M}$  be an arbitrary finite, strictly simple algebra, then we have that  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M}) \not\subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for the Rosenberg relations  $\rho$  on  $M$  of type (4) and (5)<sub>1</sub>. Therefore, for such algebras  $\mathbf{M}$ , Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem can be restated as follows: either  $\mathbf{M}$  is primal or  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for one of the Rosenberg relations  $\rho$  on  $M$  of type (1), (2), (3), non-unary (5), or (6). The strengthening of this theorem in [132] replaces the condition “ $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  for  $\rho$  of type (2) or (3)” by the following, more restrictive condition: either the algebra

- (i)  $\mathbf{M}$  is quasi-primal (but not primal) or affine, or
- (ii)  $\mathbf{M}$  is isomorphic to an algebra  $\mathbf{M}' = (\mathbf{2}^r; F')$  where  $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , and  $F'$  — and hence also  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M}')$  — consists entirely of ‘selector functions’, that is, operations of the form described in (2.6) where  $g_1, \dots, g_r$  are unary operations on the set  $\mathbf{2}$ .

Note that if  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M})$  satisfies this last condition, then  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{M}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for a Rosenberg relation  $\rho$  on  $M$  of type (3). In the special case when  $\mathbf{M}$  also has the property that  $\text{Clo}^{(1)}(\mathbf{M})$  is a transitive permutation group on  $M$ , then it follows (see [130]) that  $\mathbf{M}$  is quasi-primal or affine or essentially unary.

**3.7. The Dichotomy Theorem for Constraint Satisfaction Problems.** To conclude this section, we will discuss a problem from theoretical computer science where Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem was key to a solution. The problem is the Dichotomy Conjecture for nonuniform, finite domain constraint satisfaction problems (briefly: CSPs), and the solution we will discuss is Zhuk’s proof of the conjecture in

[145, 146].<sup>19</sup> Nonuniform, finite domain CSPs form a large class of combinatorial decision problems, with a vast literature in computer science, which includes many familiar problems, such as Boolean satisfiability,  $k$ -colorability of graphs, scheduling problems, and solving systems of linear equations over finite fields. They are parameterized by finite relational structures  $\mathbb{A} = (A; \rho_1, \dots, \rho_m)$ , where the relations  $\rho_i$  are nonempty, and the size of the domain  $A$  as well as the number of relations  $\rho_i$  are finite. The decision problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is the following: given any finite relational structure  $\mathbb{X} = (X; \rho_1^{\mathbb{X}}, \dots, \rho_m^{\mathbb{X}})$  as an input, where for each  $i$  the relation  $\rho_i^{\mathbb{X}}$  has the same arity  $k_i$  as the corresponding relation  $\rho_i$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ , the task is to determine whether or not there exists a homomorphism  $v: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ . Here, a homomorphism  $v: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  is a map  $v: X \rightarrow A$  such that whenever a tuple  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k_i}) \in X^{k_i}$  is in  $\rho_i^{\mathbb{X}}$  then the image tuple  $(v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{k_i})) \in A^{k_i}$  is in  $\rho_i$ . For applications, one should think of the elements of  $X$  as ‘variables’, to which we want to assign ‘values’ from the set  $A$  via  $v: X \rightarrow A$ ; however,  $v$  has to satisfy some ‘constraints’: each pair  $((x_1, \dots, x_{k_i}), \rho_i)$  with  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k_i}) \in \rho_i^{\mathbb{X}}$  is a constraint which requires that the values assigned to these variables have to satisfy the condition  $(v(x_1), \dots, v(x_{k_i})) \in \rho_i$ . The Dichotomy Conjecture, due to Feder and Vardi [28, 29], states that for every finite relational structure  $\mathbb{A}$ , the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is either in P (i.e., solvable by a deterministic algorithm in polynomial time) or is NP-complete.<sup>20</sup>

Let  $\mathbb{A} = (A; \rho_1, \dots, \rho_m)$  be a finite relational structure, and define the *polymorphism clone*  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  to be the clone  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m \text{Pol}(\rho_i)$  consisting of all operations on  $A$  that preserve every relation of  $\mathbb{A}$ . It was noticed by Jeavons, Cohen, and Gyssens (see [54, 53]) that if  $\mathbb{A} = (A; \rho_1, \dots, \rho_m)$  and  $\mathbb{A}' = (A; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$  are finite relational structures on the same set  $A$  such that, under the Galois correspondence between operations and relations on  $A$  (see [7, 38]), the Galois-closed set of relations generated by the relations of  $\mathbb{A}$  contains the relations of  $\mathbb{A}'$ , then the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A}')$  is log-space (hence polynomial-time) reducible to  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ . Thus, up to log-space equivalence, the computational complexity of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  depends only on the clone  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ . Bulatov, Jeavons, and Krokhin showed (see [14, 13, 15]) that if  $e$  is a unary operation in  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  satisfying the conditions in (3.5), except that we allow  $e$  to be constant, then the relational structure  $e(\mathbb{A}) = (e(A); e(\rho_1), \dots, e(\rho_m))$  obtained from  $\mathbb{A}$  by restricting the base set as well as all the relations to the range  $e(A)$  of  $e$  has the following properties:

- (a)  $e(\mathbb{A})$  is a *core structure*, meaning that every homomorphism  $e(\mathbb{A}) \rightarrow e(\mathbb{A})$  (i.e., every unary operation in  $\text{Pol}(e(\mathbb{A}))$ ) is a permutation, and

---

<sup>19</sup>Simultaneously and independently, Bulatov also proved the Dichotomy Conjecture, see [12]. His approach is quite different from Zhuk’s, and does not use Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem.

<sup>20</sup>It is easy to see that each such problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in NP, the point of the conjecture is that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  cannot be of intermediate complexity.

- (b)  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  and  $\text{CSP}(e(\mathbb{A}))$  are essentially the same problem, that is, they have the same ‘YES/NO’ answer for every input, because  $\mathbb{A} \xrightarrow{e} e(\mathbb{A})$  and the inclusion map  $e(\mathbb{A}) \xrightarrow{\text{incl}} \mathbb{A}$  are both homomorphisms.

Therefore, to prove or disprove the Dichotomy Conjecture, no generality is lost by restricting to problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  where  $\mathbb{A}$  is a core structure. We can also assume  $|A| \geq 2$ , because in the case  $A = \{a\}$  each relation  $\rho_i$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  is a singleton  $\{(a, \dots, a)\}$ , and the answer to the decision problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is ‘YES’ for every input  $\mathbb{X}$ , as witnessed by the constant homomorphism  $v: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  with value  $a$ . Bulatov, Jeavons, and Krokhin also showed that

- (c) if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a core structure with  $|A| \geq 2$ , then the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is log-space equivalent to the problem  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A}^*)$  where  $\mathbb{A}^*$  is the relational structure obtained from  $\mathbb{A}$  via expanding it by all singleton relations  $\{a\}$  ( $a \in A$ ).

The effect of the construction  $\mathbb{A} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{A}^*$  on the polymorphism clones is that  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A}^*)$  is the subclone of  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  consisting of all *idempotent* operations  $f \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$ , that is, all operations  $f \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  which satisfy the identity  $f(x, \dots, x) = x$ .

By analyzing the cases for which the complexity of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  was known at the time, Bulatov, Jeavons, and Krokhin strengthened the Dichotomy Conjecture of Feder and Vardi to a conjecture that also predicts the dividing line between the problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  that are in P and those that are NP-complete (assuming  $P \neq NP$ ). This conjecture became known as the Algebraic Dichotomy Conjecture. It has a number of equivalent formulations, one of which is the following:

- (3.6) *If  $\mathbb{A}$  is a finite relational structure with at least two elements and  $\mathbb{A}$  is a core, then*
- ( $\diamond$ )  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in P if  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a Taylor operation, and
  - ( $\blacklozenge$ )  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is NP-complete otherwise.

A *Taylor operation* (named after Taylor [137]) on a set  $A$  is an idempotent operation  $f$  on  $A$ , which satisfies strong enough identities that prevent  $f$  from being a projection operation. For example, Mal’tsev operations, majority operations, and near unanimity operations are Taylor operations by their defining identities in (3.1), (3.2), (3.4), and so are all binary operations  $f$  satisfying the identity  $f(x, y) = f(y, x)$ . The easy part, ( $\blacklozenge$ ), of the conjecture was established in [14, 13, 15]. To prove ( $\diamond$ ), it is useful to strengthen the condition “ $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a Taylor operation” in ( $\diamond$ ) to “ $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a specific type of Taylor operation” where the identities ensuring the Taylor property are more manageable. Several such strengthenings emerged over the years. The one Zhuk uses relies on the following theorem due to Maróti and McKenzie [79]:

*If a clone on a finite set contains a Taylor operation, then it also contains a special weak near unanimity operation (briefly: special WNU operation)  $u$ , which is an*

idempotent operation  $u$  that satisfies (i) the identities obtained from the near unanimity identities in (3.4) by deleting “ $= x$ ”, and (ii) the identity

$$u(x, \dots, x, u(x, \dots, x, y)) = u(x, \dots, x, y).$$

These preparations show that to prove  $(\diamond)$ , it suffices to produce a polynomial time algorithm for solving  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  for any fixed finite structure  $\mathbb{A}$  such that  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a special WNU operation  $u$ , and the relations of  $\mathbb{A}$  are all relations on its base set  $A$  that are preserved by  $u$  and have arity  $\leq k$  for some fixed integer  $k \geq 2$ . Zhuk proved the Algebraic Dichotomy Conjecture in [145, 146] by presenting such an algorithm. The main algorithm is recursive, with recursive calls applied to instances that are in some well-defined sense ‘smaller’ or ‘simpler’ than the instances at hand. The main algorithm starts with some combinatorial preprocessing of the input structure  $\mathbb{X}$ , which has one of the following outcomes: (a) it is decided that no homomorphism  $\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  exists, or (b) a ‘smaller’ or ‘simpler’, but equivalent input structure  $\mathbb{X}'$  is produced (where ‘equivalent’ means: a homomorphism  $\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  exists if and only if a homomorphism  $\mathbb{X}' \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  exists), which allows the main algorithm to be called recursively for  $\mathbb{X}'$  in place of  $\mathbb{X}$ , or (c) we know that  $\mathbb{X}$  has strong consistency and irreducibility properties. From this point on the main algorithm continues by assuming that  $\mathbb{X}$  is as in case (c), and performs further reductions that form the main body of the algorithm. These reductions are algebraic in nature, and are based on the following consequence of Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem:

*If  $\mathbf{D} = (D; w)$  is a finite algebra where  $w$  is an  $m$ -ary special WNU operation, then one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i) *there exists a proper subalgebra  $\mathbf{B}$  of  $\mathbf{D}$  and a binary operation  $t \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{D})$  such that  $t(D, B) \cup t(B, D) \subseteq B$ ;*
- (ii) *there exists a proper subalgebra  $\mathbf{C}$  of  $\mathbf{D}$ , another algebra  $\mathbf{H} = (H; w_H)$  with an  $m$ -ary special WNU operation  $w_H$ , and a subdirect subalgebra  $\mathbf{R}$  of  $\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{H}$  such that condition (i) fails for  $\mathbf{H}$  (in place of  $\mathbf{D}$ ), and*

$$C = \{c \in D : \{c\} \times H \subseteq R\};$$

- (iii) *there exists a maximal congruence  $\sigma$  on  $\mathbf{D}$  such that  $\mathbf{D}/\sigma$  is functionally complete;*
- (iv) *there exists a maximal congruence  $\sigma$  on  $\mathbf{D}$  such that  $\mathbf{D}/\sigma$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{Z}_p; x_1 + \dots + x_m)$  for some prime divisor  $p$  of  $m - 1$ .*

Applying this theorem to the subalgebras  $\mathbf{D}_x$  of  $(A; u)$  associated to each element  $x$  of the current input  $\mathbb{X}$  (where the value  $v(x)$  of a potential homomorphism  $v: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  may lie), Zhuk proves that in each one of the cases (i)–(iii), a ‘smaller’, but equivalent input structure  $\mathbb{X}''$  can be produced from  $\mathbb{X}$ , which again allows the main algorithm to be called recursively for  $\mathbb{X}''$  in place of  $\mathbb{X}$ . Handling the remaining case, when each subalgebra  $\mathbf{D}_x$  ( $x \in X$ ) of  $(A; u)$  is as in case (iv) for some prime  $p_x$ , is the most

difficult part of the main algorithm, and requires developing and using new algebraic tools, some akin to results in commutator theory.

#### 4. MAXIMAL CLONES IN OTHER CONTEXTS

Rosenberg pioneered the work on maximal clones in several other contexts.

**4.1. Maximal clones on infinite sets.** Rosenberg proved in [113] that there are  $2^{2^{|A|}}$  maximal clones on any infinite set  $A$ . This is equal to the number of all clones on  $A$ , which is in sharp contrast to what is true on finite base sets. The proof follows the basic idea of Gavrilov’s paper [37] on the number of maximal clones on countably infinite sets  $A$ , and demonstrates the existence of  $2^{2^{|A|}}$  maximal clones on arbitrary infinite sets  $A$ , without exhibiting any maximal clone. Later, Goldstern and Shelah [40] found a transparent explicit construction, which produces different maximal clones from different ultrafilters on infinite sets  $A$ , yielding a simpler proof of Rosenberg’s result.

In [113], Rosenberg also brought up the following question about clones on infinite sets  $A$ :

Question: Is it true that

$$(4.1) \quad \text{every proper subclone of } \mathcal{O}_A \text{ is contained in a maximal clone on } A?$$

We saw that for finite sets  $A$ , the answer is ‘yes’. In contrast, for infinite sets  $A$ , this turned out to be a surprisingly difficult problem: to this day, no infinite set  $A$  is known for which a final answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ has been found. Note that by saying that the answer is ‘yes’ we mean that the statement in (4.1) can be proved in  $\text{ZFC}^{21}$ , the usual axiom system for set theory, while by saying the answer is ‘no’ we mean that the negation of the statement in (4.1) can be proved in  $\text{ZFC}$ . It is easy to see that the answer to this question depends only on the cardinality of the set  $A$ , since the clone lattices on sets of the same cardinality are isomorphic. The strongest result concerning this question was obtained by Goldstern and Shelah in [41] and [42], where the authors proved the following theorem first for the case when the cardinality,  $\kappa$ , of  $A$  is  $\aleph_0$  (i.e.,  $A$  is countably infinite) and more recently for the case when  $\kappa$  is an uncountable regular cardinal:

*The negation of the statement in (4.1) for sets  $A$  of regular cardinality  $\kappa$  is a consequence of the axiom system where  $\text{ZFC}$  is expanded by the assumption  $\kappa^+ = 2^\kappa$ .*

The assumption  $\kappa^+ = 2^\kappa$  here means that the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis is assumed to hold at the cardinal  $\kappa$ . The proof of the theorem proceeds by constructing a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$ , and a subfamily  $\mathbf{F}$  of the interval  $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}_A]$  (containing  $\mathcal{C}$  but not containing  $\mathcal{O}_A$ ) such that (a)  $\mathbf{F}$  has no maximal elements, but (b)  $\mathbf{F}$  is *cofinal* in  $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}_A]$  (with respect to inclusion), that is, every clone in  $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}_A]$  is a subclone of a

---

<sup>21</sup>ZFC is the abbreviation for “Zermelo–Fraenkel axioms, together with the Axiom of Choice”.

member of  $\mathbf{F}$ . Since ZFC<sup>22</sup> has models where  $\kappa^+ = 2^\kappa$  holds for every infinite cardinal  $\kappa$ , this theorem shows that for infinite sets  $A$  of regular cardinality,

- the negation of (4.1) holds in some models of set theory, and hence
- the statement in (4.1) is not provable in ZFC.

For infinite sets  $A$  of singular cardinality, the problem is completely open.<sup>23</sup>

**4.2. Completeness for locally closed clones on infinite sets.** If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a clone on a set  $A$ , an operation  $f$  on  $A$  is said to be *locally in  $\mathcal{C}$*  if on any finite subset of its domain,  $f$  agrees with, i.e.,  $f$  can be *interpolated by*, some member of  $\mathcal{C}$  (of the same arity as  $f$ ). Furthermore,  $\mathcal{C}$  is called *locally closed* if it contains every operation on  $A$  that is locally in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Of course, if  $A$  is finite, then every clone on  $A$  is locally closed, so these notions are interesting only if the base set  $A$  is infinite. It is easy to see that a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  is locally closed if and only if for every  $n \geq 1$ , the  $n$ -ary part  $\mathcal{C}^{(n)}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed in the product topology of  $A^{A^n}$  where  $A$  is equipped with the discrete topology. For every clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  there exists a least locally closed clone containing  $\mathcal{C}$ , which is called the *local closure of  $\mathcal{C}$* , and consists exactly of those operations on  $A$  that are locally in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The local closure of the clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  of an algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A; F)$ , that is, the least locally closed clone on  $A$  containing  $F$ , is called the *locally closed clone of  $\mathbf{A}$* . For a classical example, consider the clone  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{R}}$  of all polynomial functions with real coefficients in finitely many variables on the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers. By Lagrange’s Interpolation Theorem, the local closure of this clone is the clone  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$  of all functions  $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $n \geq 1$ ). This example also shows that on an infinite base set, the local closure of a clone may be much bigger than the clone itself. For example, by looking at the cardinalities of the clone  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{R}}$  of polynomial functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  and its local closure  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$ , we see that  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{R}}$  has cardinality  $|\mathbb{R}| = 2^{\aleph_0}$ , while  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}}$  has cardinality  $2^{|\mathbb{R}|} = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$ .

Foster noticed in [32] — much before the concept of locally closed clones was isolated and studied — that many of the results he proved earlier about the structure of algebras in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A})$  generated by a primal or functionally complete algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  carry over to infinite algebras that are primal or functionally complete ‘locally’.<sup>24</sup> In [92], Pixley considered locally quasi-primal algebras along with quasi-primal algebras, and carried over his characterizations of quasi-primal algebras (see Subsection 3.2) to locally quasi-primal algebras. The Baker–Pixley Theorem was also proved in [1] for infinite algebras  $\mathbf{A}$  as well. In all these extensions from the finite to the infinite case, the only change needed in both the definitions and the theorems was that the clone of  $\mathbf{A}$  had to be replaced by the locally closed clone of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

<sup>22</sup>Assuming, as usual, that ZFC is consistent.

<sup>23</sup>For more details about clones on infinite sets, the reader is referred to the survey paper [39].

<sup>24</sup>He used the phrase primal or functionally complete ‘in the small’.

Why do these completeness-type results for finite algebras carry over so smoothly to infinite algebras in a ‘local version’? The reason was revealed in the late 1970’s by studying the Galois connection between (finitary) operations on infinite sets  $A$  and finitary relations on  $A$ . Extending the results of [7], Romov announced in [105] that in this Galois connection the Galois-closed sets of operations are exactly the locally closed clones.<sup>25</sup> Hence, every locally closed clone on any set  $A$  is of the form  $\text{Pol}(\mathbf{R}) := \bigcap_{\rho \in \mathbf{R}} \text{Pol}(\rho)$  for some set  $\mathbf{R}$  of finitary relations on  $A$ .

In particular, every clone that is maximal among the locally closed clones on any set  $A$  has the form  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  for some finitary relation  $\rho$  on  $A$ . Rosenberg and Schweigert were the first to study these clones, which they called *locally maximal clones*, in [116]. They proved that  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  is locally maximal on  $A$  for each one of the following relations, which are recognizably very close to some of the relations familiar from Rosenberg’s Completeness Theorem:

- (1)’  $\rho$  is a locally bounded partial order on  $A$ ;
- (2)  $\rho$  is (the graph of) a fixed point free permutation on  $A$  such that all cycles of  $\rho$  have the same prime length;
- (3)’  $\rho$  is the affine relation  $\alpha^+$  obtained from an abelian group  $(A; +)$ , as described in (2.3), provided  $(A; +)$  is either an elementary abelian  $p$ -group for some prime  $p$  or torsion-free and divisible;
- (4)  $\rho$  is a nontrivial equivalence relation on  $A$ ;
- (5)’  $\rho$  is a locally central relation on  $A$ .

Let  $\mathbf{R}_1$  denote the set of all these relations on  $A$ .

It was also proved in [116] that the analog of Statement (4.1) is false for locally closed clones on infinite sets  $A$ . For example, if  $\rho$  is (the graph of) a fixed point free permutation on  $A$  such that all cycles of  $\rho$  are infinite, then  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  is not contained in any locally maximal clone on  $A$ . Therefore, to obtain a completeness criterion for  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , as a locally closed clone on an infinite set  $A$ , it is not enough to find all locally maximal clones on  $A$ . In [117], Rosenberg and Szabó isolated several other types of finitary relations — one of the types being the graphs of fixed point free permutations where all cycles are infinite —, and proved that for the set  $\mathbf{R}_2$  of all these relations, the family  $\{\text{Pol}(\rho) : \rho \in \mathbf{R}_1 \cup \mathbf{R}_2\}$  of locally closed clones on  $A$  is cofinal in the set of all proper, locally closed subclones of  $\mathcal{O}_A$  (ordered by inclusion). This implies the following completeness theorem:

*A set  $F$  of functions on  $A$  is locally complete, that is, the local closure of the clone generated by  $F$  is  $\mathcal{O}_A$ , if and only if  $F \not\subseteq \text{Pol}(\rho)$  holds for all relations  $\rho \in \mathbf{R}_1 \cup \mathbf{R}_2$ .*

---

<sup>25</sup>For more about this Galois connection, including the description of the Galois-closed sets of relations, and its applications to concrete representations of related structures of algebraic structures, see Szabó [127] and Pöschel [99, 100].

**4.3. Maximal clones of partial operations.** Clones can be formed from partial operations just as well as from total operations: a set  $\mathcal{U}$  of partial operations on a fixed base set  $A$  is a *clone of partial operations* on  $A$ , or briefly a *partial clone* on  $A$ , if  $\mathcal{U}$  is closed under composition and contains the (total) projection operations. A *strong partial clone* on  $A$  is a partial clone on  $A$  that is closed under the process of restricting its members to arbitrary subsets of their domain. It follows that every partial clone  $\mathcal{U}$  is contained in a least strong partial clone, its *strong closure*, which consists of all restrictions of the members of  $\mathcal{U}$  to arbitrary subsets of their domain. Hence, a maximal partial clone  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $A$  is a strong partial clone, unless its strong closure is the clone  $p\mathcal{O}_A$  of all partial operations on  $A$ . Haddad, Rosenberg, and Schweigert proved in [48] that on any base set  $A$ , there is a unique maximal partial clone whose strong closure is  $p\mathcal{O}_A$ , namely the partial clone  $\mathcal{M}_0 := \mathcal{O}_A \cup \{\emptyset\}$  consisting of all totally defined operations on  $A$  and the partial operation with empty domain. As a consequence, they obtained a Słupecki-type completeness theorem for partial operations on finite sets  $A$ .

A Rosenberg-type completeness theorem for partial operations on finite sets was obtained by Haddad and Rosenberg. The results were first announced in [45], and then published with detailed proofs in [44], [46], and [47]. For the special cases when  $|A| = 2$  or  $|A| = 3$  these results were proved earlier by Freivald [35], and by Lau [62] and Romov [106]<sup>26</sup>, respectively. Haddad and Rosenberg showed that if  $A$  is a finite set ( $|A| \geq 2$ ), then Statement (4.1) remains true for the maximal subclones of the clone  $p\mathcal{O}_A$  of all partial operations on  $A$ , and they determined all maximal partial clones on  $A$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is the only maximal partial clone that is not a strong partial clone, the main task was to describe the maximal partial clones that are strong partial clones. For this, they used Romov's result in [107] that strong partial clones can be described by relations, that is, every strong partial clone on a finite set  $A$  is of the form  $\text{pPol}(\mathbf{R}) := \bigcap_{\rho \in \mathbf{R}} \text{pPol}(\rho)$  for some set  $\mathbf{R}$  of finitary relations on  $A$ , where  $\text{pPol}(\rho)$  is the partial clone consisting of all partial operations that preserve the relation  $\rho$ . In particular, maximal partial clones are of the form  $\text{pPol}(\rho)$  for a single relation  $\rho$ . Haddad and Rosenberg described four types of relations  $\rho$  on finite sets  $A$ , all of arity  $\leq \max(4, |A|)$ , such that the strong maximal partial clones on  $A$  are exactly the partial clones  $\text{pPol}(\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is a relation of one of the four types. The relations that occur in this list are quite different (but not disjoint) from the list of relations in Rosenberg's Completeness Theorem. For example, for 2-element sets  $A$  there are 5 maximal clones in  $\mathcal{O}_A$  and 7 maximal partial clones in  $p\mathcal{O}_A$  (see [98, 35]), while the corresponding numbers for 3-element sets are 18 and 58, respectively (see [142, 62]).

---

<sup>26</sup>Three maximal partial clones are missing from the list of maximal partial clones in this paper.



## 5. ROSENBERG'S THEOREM ON MINIMAL CLONES

The aim of this section is to present Rosenberg's theorem on minimal clones, which was announced at a conference in 1983, and appeared in [115] in 1986. While Rosenberg's theorem on maximal clones on finite sets solved a central problem of its time, his theorem on minimal clones opened up decades of research that is still ongoing.

**5.1. Background.** When we say that a clone is 'minimal', we mean that the clone is minimal for the property of being nontrivial. More formally, a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a set  $A$  is called *minimal* if it has exactly one proper subclone: the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections on  $A$ . Equivalently,  $\mathcal{C}$  is minimal if and only if it contains a non-projection and for every operation  $f \in \mathcal{C}$  that is not a projection,  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by  $f$ . Saying that  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by  $f$  is equivalent to saying that  $\mathcal{C}$  coincides with the clone of the algebra  $\mathbf{A}_f := (A; f)$ . From now on, we will often use the notation  $\mathbf{A}_f$  for the algebra  $(A; f)$  where  $f$  is an arbitrary operation on  $A$ .

Since a minimal clone is required to contain a non-projection, a minimal clone on  $A$  does not exist if  $|A| < 2$ . Therefore we will assume from now on that  $|A| \geq 2$ . However, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we won't assume that  $A$  is finite.

A systematic study of minimal clones on finite sets was initiated by Pöschel and Kalužnin in their book [101]. In Section 4.4 of the book the authors discussed some of the fundamental facts about minimal clones on finite sets, and in Problem 12 on page 120, they posed the problem of classifying all minimal clones on finite sets. To summarize some basic facts about minimal clones here, we will start with a list of examples of minimal clones. In the examples,  $\mathbf{Z}_n$  denotes the set (or the ring) of integers modulo  $n$ . We continue to use the notation  $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$  for the common base set of all clones of Boolean functions, but when convenient, we may also consider clones on the set  $\mathbf{Z}_2$  as clones of Boolean functions. For most examples of minimal clones below we cite the paper or book where the minimality of the given clone was proved.

Examples of minimal clones:

- (i) The three clones generated by the unary Boolean functions  $c_0, c_1$  (constants), and  $\neg$  (negation), respectively, on  $\mathbf{2}$ .
- (ii) The clone generated by the ternary addition  $x_1 - x_2 + x_3$  of the additive group  $(\mathbf{Z}_p; +)$  (Płonka [93]).
- (iii) The clone generated by the binary operation  $(1 - p)x_1 + px_2$  in the clone of the group  $(\mathbf{Z}_{p^2}; +)$  (Płonka [93]).
- (iv) The clone of a *rectangular band*<sup>27</sup> that is not a left or right zero semigroup. For example,  $(\mathbf{Z}_6; 3x_1 + 4x_2)$  is a rectangular band.

---

<sup>27</sup>A *rectangular band* is a semigroup  $(S; \cdot)$  satisfying the identities  $x^2 = x$  and  $xyx = x$ .  $(S; \cdot)$  is a *left* [or *right*] *zero semigroup* if it satisfies the identity  $xy = z$  [or  $xy = y$ , respectively], i.e., its operation  $\cdot$  is projection onto the first [second] variable.

- (v) The two clones generated by the Boolean functions  $\wedge$  (conjunction) and  $\vee$  (disjunction), respectively, on  $\mathbf{2}$ .
- (vi) The clone generated by the median operation  $(x_1 \wedge x_2) \vee (x_1 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_3)$  of a lattice (Pöschel–Kalužnin [101]).
- (vii) The clone generated by the ternary dual discriminator operation<sup>28</sup>  $d$  defined by  $d(a, b, c) = a$  if  $a = b$  and  $d(a, b, c) = c$  otherwise ( $a, b, c \in A$ ) on any set  $A$  of size  $\geq 2$  (Csákány–Gavalcová [22]).
- (viii) The clone generated by the following  $k$ -ary operation  $\ell_k$  on a  $k$ -element set  $A$  ( $k \geq 3$ ):  $\ell_k(a_1, \dots, a_k) = a_k$  if  $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} = A$  and  $\ell_k(a_1, \dots, a_k) = a_1$  otherwise ( $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$ ) (Csákány–Gavalcová [22]).

By inspecting Post’s description of all clones of Boolean functions in [98], one can see that the list above contains all the 7 minimal clones of Boolean functions, namely: the clones in Examples (i), (v), (ii) for  $p = 2$ , and (vi) for the 2-element lattice  $(\mathbf{2}; \wedge, \vee)$  (which coincides with the clone (vii) for the 2-element set  $A = \mathbf{2}$ ).

Since every minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a set  $A$  is generated by a single operation, in most cases it is convenient to fix a generating operation  $f$  for  $\mathcal{C}$ , and study when such a clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is minimal. For this, it is useful to choose  $f \in \mathcal{C}$  so that  $f$  has minimal arity among the non-projections in  $\mathcal{C}$  (see e.g., [101], [19], and [115]). This choice has the effect that

$$(5.1) \quad \text{upon identifying any two variables in } f \text{ we get a projection.}$$

In particular, if the arity of  $f$  is  $n \geq 2$ , then  $f$  is idempotent. In [125], Świerczkowski observed the following fact<sup>29</sup> (cf. also [101, Thm. 4.4.6]):

*If an operation  $f$  of arity  $n \geq 4$  has property (5.1), then for some  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ),  $f$  satisfies all identities*

$$(5.2) \quad f(y_1, \dots, y_n) = y_i \quad \text{where two of the variables } y_1, \dots, y_n \text{ are equal.}$$

These identities express that upon identifying any two variables in  $f$ ,  $f$  always turns into a projection onto the same variable  $x_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) of  $f$ . An  $n$ -ary operation satisfying the identities in (5.2) is called an  *$n$ -ary semiprojection onto the  $i$ -th variable* if  $n \geq 3$  and  $f$  is not a projection.

If  $f$  has property (5.1) and arity  $n = 3$ , then there are four possibilities for  $f$ : (a)  $f$  is a semiprojection onto one of its variables, or (b)  $f$  is a majority operation, that is, the identities in (3.2) hold for  $m = f$ , or (c)  $f$  is a *minority operation*, that is, it satisfies the identities

$$(5.3) \quad f(x, y, y) = f(y, x, y) = f(y, y, x) = x,$$

<sup>28</sup>The dual discriminator operation was introduced by Fried and Pixley in [36].

<sup>29</sup>The statement in [125] uses a different terminology.

or (d) the identities in (3.3) hold either for  $q = f$  or for an operation  $q$  obtained from  $f$  by permuting variables. In case (d),  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  also contains a majority operation, namely the operation  $q(x_1, q(x_1, x_2, x_3), x_3)$ .

Thus, every clone on  $A$  other than the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections, contains one of the following five types of operations  $f$ :<sup>30</sup>

- (I)  $f$  is a unary operation,  $f \notin \mathcal{I}_A$ ;
- (II)  $f$  is a binary idempotent operation,  $f \notin \mathcal{I}_A$ ;
- (III)  $f$  is a semiprojection onto its first variable;
- (IV)  $f$  is a majority operation;
- (V)  $f$  is a minority operation.

From now on, we will refer to an operation satisfying condition (X) above, where  $X \in \{\text{I, II, III, IV, V}\}$ , as an *operation of type (X)*.

The statement in the preceding paragraph can be restated as follows: the set of all clones  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  where  $f$  is an operation listed in (I)–(V), is coinitial (with respect to inclusion) in the interval  $(\mathcal{I}_A, \mathcal{O}_A]$  of clones (containing  $\mathcal{O}_A$  but not containing  $\mathcal{I}_A$ ). This implies, in particular, that

(5.4) every minimal clone on any set  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ) is generated by one of the operations  $f$  in (I)–(V).

If  $A$  is finite, then a semiprojection on  $A$  (which is not a projection, by definition) cannot have arity  $> |A|$ , and hence there are only finitely many operations of each type (I)–(V) on  $A$ . Thus, the conclusion in the preceding paragraph implies that the analog of (2.1) holds for minimal clones on finite sets  $A$  ( $|A| \geq 2$ ):

(5.5) for  $A$  finite, every clone on  $A$ , except the clone of projections, has a minimal subclone, and the number of minimal clones on  $A$  is finite.

Problem 12 in [101, p. 120], which we mentioned earlier, stated the task: Describe all minimal clones on finite sets, and determine their number. In [115] Rosenberg noted that analogously to the way a description of all maximal clones on finite sets  $A$  yields an efficient criterion for checking if a set of operations on  $A$  is complete (i.e., generates the clone  $\mathcal{O}_A$  of all operations), a description of all minimal clones on finite sets  $A$  would yield an efficient criterion for checking if a relation  $\rho$  on  $A$  is *rigid*, that is, the polymorphism clone  $\text{Pol}(\rho)$  of  $\rho$  is the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections.

It is not hard to see that Statement (5.5) is false if the set  $A$  is infinite. For example, if  $f$  is a unary operation on  $A$  which is a permutation of infinite order, then the clone generated by  $f$  has no minimal subclones. In the second to last paragraph of Subsection 7.2 we will give another example: we describe a minority operation  $s$  on any infinite set  $A$  such that the clone generated by  $s$  has no minimal subclones.

---

<sup>30</sup>The numbering of these types is not as consistent in the literature as the numbering (1) through (6) of the types of maximal clones. We chose a numbering that follows closely the order in which these cases are listed in [115, Thm. 2.9].

Let us return now to Statement (5.4) saying that every minimal clone on  $A$  has a generator of one of the types (I)–(V), whether the base set  $A$  is finite or infinite. When we listed Examples (i)–(viii) of minimal clones earlier, we described most of them by generators of types (I)–(V); the only exceptions were the clones in Example (ii) for  $p > 2$ , where the minimum arity of a non-projection is 2. These examples show that each type of operation listed in (I)–(V) does indeed occur as a generator of a minimal clone. A question that is left open by these examples is the following: do there exist minimal clones generated by  $k$ -ary semiprojections on sets of size  $> k$  ( $k \geq 3$ )? Such examples were constructed by Pálffy in [87]. A nonconstructive proof that such minimal clones exist was given by Lengvárszky [68].

Pálffy’s construction in [87] yields semiprojections that satisfy strong identities which make it fairly easy to check that the generated clones are minimal. Rosenberg’s paper [115] and Pálffy’s paper [87] are the first papers in the literature that advocated the use of identities in classifying minimal clones. The paper [87] also emphasized that — unlike the maximality of a clone — the minimality of a clone is an internal and abstract property. It is internal in the sense that if we fix a non-projection operation  $f$  on some set  $A$ , then the requirement that the clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  generated by  $f$  be minimal is equivalent to the requirement that for every non-projection operation  $g \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ , the algebra  $\mathbf{A}_f$  satisfies an identity of the form

$$(5.6) \quad \mathbf{T}_2(\mathbf{T}_1(f))(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

where  $n$  is the arity of  $f$ ,  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are distinct variables,  $\mathbf{T}_1(f)$  is a well-formed expression representing  $g$  as a composition of copies of  $f$  and projections, and similarly,  $\mathbf{T}_2(g)$  is a well-formed expression representing  $f$  as a composition of copies of  $g$  and projections. This also shows that minimality for clones is an abstract property, that is, if  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are isomorphic clones, then one of them is minimal if and only if the other one is minimal.

In fact, more is true: if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a homomorphic image<sup>31</sup> of  $\mathcal{C}$  that is not the clone of projections, then  $\mathcal{D}$  is also a minimal clone. In other words:

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{If an algebra } \mathbf{A}_f = (A; f) \text{ has a minimal clone, then} \\ \text{so does every algebra } (A'; f') \text{ in the variety } \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_f) \text{ generated by } \mathbf{A}_f, \\ \text{whose operation } f' \text{ is not a projection.} \end{array}$$

If we apply (5.7) to the 2-element algebras  $(\mathbf{2}, c_0)$ ,  $(\mathbf{2}; \neg)$ , and  $(\mathbf{2}; \wedge)$  with minimal clones in Examples (i) and (v), then we get that every pointed set with at least 2 elements, every  $\mathbf{Z}_2$ -set with a nontrivial action of the group  $(\mathbf{Z}_2; +)$ , and every nontrivial semilattice has a minimal clone. Similarly, if we apply (5.7) to the ‘ternary group’  $(\mathbf{Z}_p; x_1 - x_2 + x_3)$  ( $p$  prime) obtained from the additive group  $(\mathbf{Z}_p; +)$  in

---

<sup>31</sup>A clone homomorphism  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is an arity preserving map which commutes with all compositions and maps the  $i$ -th  $n$ -ary projection in  $\mathcal{C}$  to the  $i$ -th  $n$ -ary projection in  $\mathcal{D}$  for every  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Example (ii), then we get that every nontrivial ternary group  $(A; x_1 - x_2 + x_3)$  obtained from an elementary abelian  $p$ -group  $(A; +)$  has a minimal clone. Since the clone of an affine space over the field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  is the same as the clone of its ternary group reduct, these minimal clones are often referred to as the clones of nontrivial affine spaces over  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ . In [94], Płonka investigated the variety generated by an algebra  $(\mathbf{Z}_{p^2}; (1-p)x_1 + px_2)$  ( $p$  prime) with minimal clone in Example (iii), found a set of defining identities for this variety, and called this variety the variety of *p-cyclic groupoids*.<sup>32</sup> By (5.7), every groupoid in this variety, whose operation is not a projection, has a minimal clone.

An important consequence of (5.7) is that for each type  $(X)$  with  $X \in \{\text{I, II, III, IV, V}\}$ , if  $\mathcal{W}_{(X)}$  denotes the variety in one operation symbol  $f$  (of the appropriate arity) defined by the identities for  $f$  specified in  $(X)$  — e.g., no identity in type (I), the identity  $f(x, x) = x$  in type (II), and the majority identities in type (IV) —, then the subvarieties  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{W}_{(X)}$  with the property that every algebra  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  with a non-projection operation  $f$  has a minimal clone, form a downward closed subset of the lattice of subvarieties of  $\mathcal{W}_{(X)}$ . A classification of these subvarieties  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{W}_{(X)}$  for each type  $(X)$  would yield a classification of all minimal clones with a fixed generating operation  $f$  of type  $(X)$ .

This approach to classifying minimal clones depends on a choice of the generating operation, and there seems to be no easy way for translating between the identities if the same clone is given in terms of another generator. Another difficulty with this approach is that if a clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is not minimal, i.e., if we know that the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is not in the downset we are looking for, then we might want to replace  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  by a proper subclone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_g)$  for some non-projection  $g \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ . However, it may happen that  $g$  is not of the same type as  $f$ ; the possible type changes will be discussed at the end of the next subsection. Furthermore, even if  $g$  has the same type as  $f$ , it is not clear what the relationship is between the varieties  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  and  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_g)$ . These difficulties might be part of the reason why the classification of minimal clones — even on finite sets — has turned out to be much more difficult than the classification of maximal clones on finite sets.

We conclude this subsection by discussing a technique involving identities that has proved very useful since the early days of studying minimal clones, and is explicitly mentioned in [56] and [69]. An *absorption identity* in one operation symbol  $f$  of arity  $n$  is an identity of the form

$$(5.8) \quad T_1(f)(x_1, \dots, x_m) = x_i$$

where  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  are distinct variables and  $T_1(f)$  is a well-formed expression obtained by successive compositions from  $f$  and projections. For example, the identities defining the operations of types (II)–(V) are the simplest absorption identities. Absorption

---

<sup>32</sup>A *groupoid* is an algebra with one binary operation. Groupoids are also called *binars* in the literature.

identities are important in the study of minimal clones because of the following fact:

- (5.9) If  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$  has a minimal clone then  $\mathbf{A}_f$  satisfies every absorption identity that is true in at least one algebra  $\mathbf{B}_f \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  with a non-projection basic operation.

Otherwise, if an absorption identity, say (5.8), holds in  $\mathbf{B}_f$  but not in  $\mathbf{A}_f$ , then the operation represented by the left hand side of (5.8) is a projection in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{B}_f)$  and is not a projection in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ . Therefore, the minimality of  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  forces an identity of the form (5.6) in  $\mathbf{A}_f$  and hence also in  $\mathbf{B}_f$ . But the latter contradicts our assumption that the operation  $f$  of  $\mathbf{B}_f$  is not a projection.

**5.2. Rosenberg's theorem on minimal clones.** Let  $A$  be an arbitrary set of size  $\geq 2$ . We know from our previous discussion that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone on  $A$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by an operation  $f$  of one of the types (I)–(V). For the case when  $|A| = 2$ , say  $A = \mathbf{2}$ , the converse of this statement also holds: every Boolean function  $f$  of the types (I)–(V) on  $\mathbf{2}$  generates a minimal clone, which appears among the examples near the beginning of Subsection 5.1. However, if  $|A| \geq 3$ , then the converse statement is false. A complete description of the minimal clones would require to identify which operations of types (I)–(V) generate minimal clones. For type (I) this is fairly easy to do. Rosenberg's theorem on minimal clones completed this step for operations of type (V).

**Rosenberg's Theorem** [115]. *Let  $A$  be a set of size  $\geq 2$ . A minority operation  $f$  on  $A$  generates a minimal clone if and only if  $f$  is ternary addition  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3$  for some elementary abelian 2-group  $(A; +)$ .*

*Consequently, every minimal clone on  $A$  is generated by one of the following types of operations  $f$  on  $A$ :*

- $\sphericalangle$ (I)  $f$  is a unary operation such that either  $f = f^2$  with  $f(A) \neq A$ , or  $f$  is a permutation of prime order;
- (II)  $f$  is a binary idempotent operation that is not a projection;
- (III)  $f$  is a semiprojection onto its first variable;
- (IV)  $f$  is a majority operation;
- $\sphericalangle$ (V)  $f$  is ternary addition  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3$  for some elementary abelian 2-group  $(A; +)$ .

*The operations  $f$  in  $\sphericalangle$ (I) and  $\sphericalangle$ (V) generate minimal clones.*

The proof of the theorem in [115] shows that if  $f$  is a minority operation such that  $f$  fails to satisfy the condition in  $\sphericalangle$ (V), then the clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  generated by  $f$  contains a semiprojection of arity  $\geq 3$ . This implies that the 2-element subalgebras of  $\mathbf{A}_f$  satisfy absorption identities that fail in  $\mathbf{A}_f$ . Thus,  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is not a minimal clone by (5.9).

Rosenberg's Theorem is not concerned with the question which of the operations of types (II), (III), or (IV) generate minimal clones. If one wants to follow an elimination procedure resembling the way type (V) was narrowed down to  $\sphericalangle$ (V), the first step is

to answer the following question: Given an operation  $f$  of type (II), (III), or (IV) on a set  $A$ , what are the possible types, among (II)– $\sphericalangle$ (V), for the operations occurring in the idempotent clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ ? It turns out that type (II) is too broad to allow any restrictions; in fact, there exist binary idempotent operations  $f$  on a 3-element set  $A$  such that  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is the clone of all idempotent operations on  $A$ , and hence  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  contains all operations of types (II)– $\sphericalangle$ (V) on  $A$ . On the other hand, if  $f$  is of type (III) or (IV) (semiprojection or majority operation), then we have some restrictions (see [101, 115]). For type (III):

(5.10) If  $f$  is an  $n$ -ary semiprojection ( $n \geq 3$ ) onto its first variable on  $A$ ,  
then every operation of one of the  
types (II)– $\sphericalangle$ (V) in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  must be a semiprojection of arity  $\geq n$ .

The reason for this conclusion is that under the assumption on  $f$  in (5.10), the restriction of  $f$  to every subset  $B$  of  $A$  with  $|B| < n$  is projection onto the first variable on  $B$ . Hence, if  $g \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ , then the restriction of  $g$  to every subset  $B$  of  $A$  with  $|B| < n$  is a projection operation on  $B$ . Thus,  $g$  cannot be of type (II), (IV), or  $\sphericalangle$ (V), and  $g$  cannot be a semiprojection of arity  $< n$ .

For type (IV):

(5.11) If  $f$  is a majority operation on  $A$ , then every operation of one of the  
types (II)– $\sphericalangle$ (V) in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  must be a majority operation.

Indeed, if  $f$  is a majority operation on  $A$ , then every operation  $g \in \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is either a projection or a near unanimity operation (see [20]). Hence  $g$  cannot be of type (II), (III), or  $\sphericalangle$ (V).

These considerations also imply that a minimal clone cannot contain operations of different types (I)–(V). Therefore we may unambiguously talk about a *minimal clone of type (X)* ( $X \in \{\text{I, II, III, IV, V}\}$ ) to mean a minimal clone generated by an operation of type (X). It will often be convenient to refer to minimal clones of types  $\sphericalangle$ (I), (II), (III), (IV), and  $\sphericalangle$ (V) as *unary minimal clones*, *binary minimal clones*, *minimal clones of semiprojection type*, *minimal majority clones*, and *minimal minority clones*, respectively.

## 6. FURTHER PROGRESS ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF MINIMAL CLONES

As we mentioned in the preceding section, the classification of minimal clones — based on Rosenberg’s Theorem on the five types of minimal clones — is far from complete for three of the five types, even in the case when the base set is finite. Nevertheless, over the last 40 years or so, significant progress has been made towards understanding these minimal clones. In this section we will discuss some results that

represent several different directions of research on this topic, and the techniques developed to achieve the results.<sup>33</sup>

**6.1. Minimal clones on small sets.** We saw in the preceding section that there are seven minimal clones on  $A = \mathbf{2}$  (and hence on any 2-element set): three unary, two binary, one majority, and one minority minimal clone. This follows from Post's results in [98], but can also be derived easily from Rosenberg's Theorem (or its predecessor in Subsection 5.1). Among these minimal clones, the two clones generated by the constant operations  $c_0$  and  $c_1$ , and the two clones generated by the binary idempotent operations  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  differ only by switching the roles of the elements of the base set. In general, we will say that two clones,  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  on  $A'$ , are *similar*<sup>34</sup> if there is a bijection  $\pi: A \rightarrow A'$  such that *conjugation by  $\pi$* , which is a clone isomorphism  $\mathcal{O}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{A'}$  that sends every operation  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{O}_A$  to the operation  ${}^\pi f(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \pi(f(\pi^{-1}(x_1), \dots, \pi^{-1}(x_n))) \in \mathcal{O}_{A'}$ , maps  $\mathcal{C}$  onto  $\mathcal{C}'$ . In this terminology, we have  ${}^\tau c_0 = c_1$  and  ${}^\tau \wedge = \vee$  for the permutation  $\tau$  switching 0 and 1, so on the two-element set  $A = \mathbf{2}$ , the two minimal clones generated by constant operations and the two minimal clones generated by binary idempotent operations are similar. It is easy to see that no other pairs of clones among the minimal clones on a  $\mathbf{2}$  are similar, so up to similarity, there are five minimal clones on  $\mathbf{2}$ : two unary, one binary, one majority, and one minority.

The minimal clones on 3-element sets were determined by Csákány in [18] and [19]. He found that, up to similarity, there are 24 minimal clones on a 3-element set, 4 of them are unary, 12 of them are binary, and 3 of them are majority minimal clones, while the remaining 5 are generated by ternary semiprojections. The arguments were assisted by extensive computer search, and the final result shows, for instance, that every binary minimal clone with generating operation  $f$  on a 3-element set contains at most four binary operations: the two projections and  $f(x, y)$ ,  $f(y, x)$  (the latter two might be equal), which is not a priori obvious, and is not true on large finite sets.

Now let  $A$  be a 4-element set. The binary minimal clones on  $A$  were classified by Szczepara in his PhD thesis [126]. He found six systems of identities (in one binary operation symbol) such that a clone on a 4-element set that contains a binary non-projection is minimal if and only if it is generated by a binary operation satisfying one of the six systems of identities. He derived from these results that, up to similarity, there are exactly 120 binary minimal clones on  $A$ . The minimal majority clones on  $A$  were determined by Waldhauser in [138]. Some of these minimal clones are generated by conservative majority operations; these minimal clones were classified

---

<sup>33</sup>The reader may also be interested in the papers [103] and [21] which survey results on minimal clones.

<sup>34</sup>The well-known notion of similarity for permutation groups (see [104, p. 32]) is the special case when  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  are essentially unary clones whose unary parts are permutation groups.



by Csákány [20] on any finite set, and will be discussed in the next subsection. In [138], Waldhauser proved that, up to similarity, there are exactly 3 minimal clones on  $A$  that are generated by non-conservative majority operations. For minimal clones generated by semiprojections  $f$  on  $A$ , the arity of  $f$  can only be 3 or 4. If  $f$  is 4-ary, then  $f$  is conservative, and the classification theorem of Ježek and Quackenbush [55] — also to be discussed in the next subsection — yields an efficient necessary and sufficient condition for  $f$  to generate a minimal clone on  $A$ . However, if  $f$  is 3-ary, no such description is known (even in the special case when  $f$  is conservative). Therefore, this is the only case missing from a complete classification of all minimal clones on 4-element sets.

For finite sets  $A$  of size  $\geq 5$ , the problem of classifying all minimal clones on  $A$  is unsolved.

**6.2. Conservative minimal clones.** An operation  $f$  on a set  $A$  is called *conservative* if it preserves every nonempty subset  $B$  of  $A$ , that is, if  $f \in \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq B \subseteq A} \text{Pol}(B)$ . A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  is called *conservative* if all operations in  $\mathcal{C}$  are conservative, that is, if  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq B \subseteq A} \text{Pol}(B)$ . Thus, every clone generated by conservative operations is conservative. It is easy to see that minimal clones of type  $\sphericalangle$ (I) in Rosenberg’s Theorem are not conservative, since conservative operations are idempotent. Minimal clones of type  $\sphericalangle$ (V) are not conservative either — unless the base set has size 2 —, since 3-element subsets of the base set are not closed under the generating operation  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3$  of the clone. To discuss conservative minimal clones of the remaining three types, let  $f$  be a  $k$ -ary conservative operation on a set  $A$  satisfying one of the conditions (II)–(IV) in Rosenberg’s Theorem. The assumption that  $f$  is conservative is equivalent to saying that every nonempty subset  $B$  of  $A$  is the base set of a subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$ . Here, the subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$  with base set  $B$  is the algebra  $(B; f|_B)$  where  $f|_B$  denotes the restriction of  $f$  to  $B$ , and hence  $(B; f|_B)$  is in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}_f$ . It follows that if  $f$  generates a minimal clone, then  $f$  is the union of its restrictions  $f|_B$  to all  $k$ -element subsets  $B$  of  $A$ , and

- (6.1) for each  $f|_B$  ( $B \subseteq A$ ,  $|B| = k$ ),  
 $f|_B$  generates a minimal clone on  $B$  of the same type (II)–(IV) as  $f$ ,  
or  $f|_B$  is one of the two projection operation on  $B$  if  $f$  has type (II),  
or  $f|_B$  is projection onto the first variable on  $B$  if  $f$  has type (III).

Thus, to classify the conservative minimal clones, it suffices to determine under what additional conditions on the operations  $f|_B$  in (6.1) it is the case that the union  $f$  of the  $f|_B$ ’s generates a minimal clone on  $A$ .

In [20], Csákány found such a criterion for binary minimal clones and for minimal majority clones. First, let  $f$  be a conservative binary idempotent operation on a set  $A$ . In this case, the description of all minimal clones on 2-element sets in Subsection 6.1

implies that each operation  $f|_B$  in (6.1) is a semilattice operation or one of the two projection operations on the 2-element set  $B$ . Csákány proved that for a family of such operations  $f|_B$  ( $B \subseteq A$ ,  $|B| = 2$ ), the union  $f$  generates a minimal clone on  $A$  if and only if  $f|_B$  is a semilattice operation for at least one  $B$ , and for all projection operations  $f|_B$ , the algebras  $(B; f|_B)$  are isomorphic (i.e., all projection operations  $f|_B$  project onto the same variable). Now let  $f$  be a majority operation on  $A$ . In this case, each operation  $f|_B$  in (6.1) is a majority operation generating a minimal clone on the 3-element set  $B$ . By the description of all minimal clones on 3-element sets in Subsection 6.1, there are three minimal clones, up to similarity, which are generated by majority operations. In one similarity class, each clone has a unique majority operation, in another one each clone has three majority operations, and in the third similarity class each clone has eight majority operations. Csákány's result is that for a family of majority operations  $f|_B$  ( $B \subseteq A$ ,  $|B| = 3$ ) generating minimal clones, the union  $f$  generates a minimal clone on  $A$  if and only if for any two 3-element sets  $B_1, B_2 \subseteq A$  such that  $f|_{B_1}$  and  $f|_{B_2}$  generate similar minimal clones, we have that the algebras  $(B_1, f|_{B_1})$  and  $(B_2, f|_{B_2})$  are isomorphic.

Conservative minimal clones generated by a  $k$ -ary semiprojection ( $k \geq 3$ ) onto the first variable were studied by Ježek and Quackenbush in [55]. Following the same strategy as in the preceding paragraph, one has to complete the following two steps to obtain a classification of all such minimal clones: (a) Describe the minimal clones on  $k$ -element sets that are generated by  $k$ -ary semiprojections ( $k \geq 3$ ); and (b) Given a family of operations  $f|_B$  as in (6.1) where for each  $B \subseteq A$  ( $|B| = k$ ), either  $f|_B$  is a  $k$ -ary semiprojection onto the first variable that generates a minimal clone on  $B$ , or  $f|_B$  is the  $k$ -ary projection onto the first variable on  $B$ , find a necessary and sufficient condition for the union  $f$  of these  $f|_B$ 's to generate a minimal clone on  $A$ . To state the results of [55] on Steps (a) and (b), we call a binary relation  $\rho$  on a set  $B$  *bitransitive* if  $\rho$  is reflexive and transitive, but not the equality relation, and the automorphism group of the relational structure  $(B; \rho)$  acts transitively on the set of all pairs  $(b_1, b_2) \in \rho$  with  $b_1 \neq b_2$ . Bitransitive relations on  $B$  fall into two types: equivalence relations on  $B$  with all non-singleton blocks of the same size, and partial orders of length 1 whose automorphism group acts transitively on the set of pairs  $(b_1, b_2) \in \rho$  with  $b_1 \neq b_2$ .

Ježek and Quackenbush completed Step (a) by proving the following: If  $B$  is a  $k$ -element set and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a clone on  $B$  generated by a  $k$ -ary semiprojection, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is minimal if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by a semiprojection of the form

$$s_\rho(b_1, \dots, b_k) = \begin{cases} b_k & \text{if } b_1, \dots, b_k \text{ are distinct and } (b_1, b_k) \in \rho, \\ b_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for some bitransitive relation  $\rho$  on  $B$ . Moreover, for any two distinct bitransitive relations  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  on  $B$ , the operations  $s_{\rho_1}$  and  $s_{\rho_2}$  generate distinct minimal clones.

For Step (b), Ježek and Quackenbush proved that the following condition is necessary for a conservative clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by a  $k$ -ary semiprojection on a set  $A$  to be minimal:  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by a semiprojection  $f$  such that

- (\*) all restrictions  $f|_B$  ( $B \subseteq A$ ,  $|B| = k$ ) of  $f$  that are not projections have the form  $f|_B = s_{\rho_B}$  for isomorphic bitransitive relational structures  $(B; \rho_B)$ .

This necessary condition for  $\mathcal{C}$  to be minimal is not sufficient if  $|A| > k$ . If  $f$  generates  $\mathcal{C}$  and satisfies (\*), then the algebra  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$  and its subalgebras  $(B; f|_B)$ , where  $f|_B$  is not a projection, will satisfy the same  $k$ -variable identities, but the clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  may contain a semiprojection of arity  $> k$ , which implies by (5.9) that  $\mathcal{C}$  is not minimal. Therefore, by adding the condition “ $(A; f)$  satisfies the same absorption identities as its (isomorphic) subalgebras  $(B; f|_B)$  (with  $B$  as in (\*)) that are not projection algebras” to the necessary condition above, one can get a characterization of all conservative minimal clones of semiprojection type. However, as it was pointed out in [55], there seems to be no efficient way for checking this last condition.

### 6.3. Minimal clones with few non-projection operations of minimum arity.

The binary minimal clones that we have encountered so far don't have ‘too many’ binary non-projection operations: in Examples (ii)–(v) in Subsection 5.1 the numbers are  $p - 2$ ,  $2p - 2$ ,  $2$ , and  $1$  respectively, while for the binary minimal clones on 2- or 3-element sets and for the conservative binary minimal clones the numbers are 1 or 2 (see Subsections 6.1 and 6.2). In the mid 1990's, Lévai and Pálffy [69] started a systematic study of binary minimal clones  $\mathcal{C}$  in which the number of binary non-projections,  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| - 2 (> 1)$ , is small. Their results classify all binary minimal clones  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = 3, 4, 6$ . When combined with two theorems of Dudek for the cases  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = 5, 7$  — one in [26] and the other unpublished at the time, but published much later in [27] — these results yield a classification of all binary minimal clones  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| \leq 7$ .

Since an assumption that restricts the size of the binary part  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)}$  of a binary minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  depends only on the isomorphism type of  $\mathcal{C}$ , these classification results determine the minimal clones  $\mathcal{C}$  considered up to isomorphism. The classification is accomplished by finding, under each assumption  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = r$  ( $r = 3, \dots, 7$ ), a family  $\mathcal{F}_r$  of groupoid varieties — i.e., varieties in one binary operation symbol  $\circ$  — such that

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{a clone } \mathcal{C} \text{ on a set } A \text{ is a binary minimal clone satisfying } |\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = r \\ & \text{if and only if } \mathcal{C} \text{ contains a binary non-projection } \circ \text{ such that} \\ & \mathbf{A}_\circ = (A; \circ) \text{ is in } \mathcal{V} \text{ for some } \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{F}_r, \mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ), \text{ and } |\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| \not\leq r. \end{aligned}$$

For  $r = 3$  there are two varieties in  $\mathcal{F}_3$ :

- the variety  $\mathcal{A}_3$  of affine spaces over  $\mathbf{Z}_3$ ;
- the variety  $2\text{-}\mathcal{SL}$  defined by the 2-variable identities of the variety  $\mathcal{SL}$  of semilattices.

For  $r = 4$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_4$  consists of five varieties, which we also list here<sup>35</sup> because they will play a role later on:

- the variety  $2\text{-}\mathcal{CG}$  of 2-cyclic groupoids;
- the variety  $\mathcal{RB}$  of rectangular bands;
- the variety  $2\text{-}\mathcal{LNB}$  defined by the 2-variable identities of the variety  $\mathcal{LNB}$  of left normal bands, where  $\mathcal{LNB} = \mathcal{SL} \vee \mathcal{LZ}$  (the join of the variety of semilattices and the variety of left zero semigroups);
- the variety  $\mathcal{D}$  defined by the identities

$$(6.3) \quad x \circ (y \circ x) = (x \circ y) \circ x = (x \circ y) \circ y = x \circ y, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(6.4) \quad x \circ (\dots((x \circ y_1) \circ y_2) \dots) \circ y_m = x \quad \text{for all } m = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

- the *variety  $\mathcal{M}$  of melds*, which is defined by the identities

$$x \circ x = x, \quad x \circ ((y \circ x) \circ z) = x.$$

For  $r = 5$  and  $r = 7$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_r$  is a singleton containing the variety of affine spaces over  $\mathbf{Z}_r$ . Finally, for  $r = 6$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_6$  consists of five varieties, including the variety of 3-cyclic groupoids.

The method Lévai and Pálffy used in [69] to find the varieties in  $\mathcal{F}_r$  for  $r = 3, 4, 6$  is based on the idea that if  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  is a binary minimal clone with  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = r$ , then the  $r$ -element groupoid  $\mathbf{C}_\circ := (\mathcal{C}^{(2)}; \circ)$ , where  $\circ$  is the binary operation

$$\mathcal{C}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{C}^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{(2)}, \quad (f(x_1, x_2), g(x_1, x_2)) \mapsto f(x_1, x_2) \circ g(x_1, x_2)$$

of applying the operation  $\circ$  of  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  pointwise to the functions in  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)} (\subseteq A^{A^2})$ , has two important properties. First,

- ( $\alpha$ )  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  is the 2-generated free groupoid in the variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$ , with the two projections  $\text{pr}_1^{(2)}, \text{pr}_2^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}^{(2)}$  as free generators.

This implies that the binary parts of the clones  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{C}_\circ)$  are isomorphic. Therefore, since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone, we get the second property that

- ( $\beta$ ) the clone of  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  is *2-minimal*, that is, every binary non-projection in  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{C}_\circ)$  generates the operation  $\circ$  of  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$ .

Properties ( $\alpha$ ) and ( $\beta$ ) narrow down the isomorphism type of the groupoid  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  to 2, 7, and 6 possibilities for  $r = 3, 4$ , and 6, respectively, provided groupoids with the same clone are counted only with one choice of the generating operation  $\circ$ . (In the case  $r = 6$ , the search was done by computer.) For some of these isomorphism types,  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  does not have a minimal clone. These isomorphism types can be eliminated, because we have that  $\mathbf{C}_\circ \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  and the operation of  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  is a non-projection, hence (5.7) forces the clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{C}_\circ)$  to be minimal. Finally, for each  $r = 3, 4, 6$  and each isomorphism type, say  $i = 1, \dots, k_r$ , for an  $r$ -element  $\mathbf{C}_\circ$  with a minimal clone,

<sup>35</sup>In some cases, our description of these varieties is different from, but equivalent to, the description in [69]. The terminology ‘meld’ for the members of the last variety is due to Brady [11].

the authors of [69] found a set of identities,  $\Sigma_{r,i}$ , consisting of binary identities and absorption identities true in  $\mathbf{C}_o$  such that whenever a groupoid with a non-projection operation satisfies the identities in  $\Sigma_{r,i}$ , then the groupoid has a minimal clone. By the construction of  $\mathbf{C}_o$  and by Statement (5.9), this implies that (6.2) holds if for each  $r = 3, 4, 6$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_r$  is chosen to be the set of varieties  $\mathcal{V}_{r,i}$  defined by the identities in  $\Sigma_{r,i}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k_r$ ).

In [69], Lévai and Pálffy also constructed binary minimal clones  $\mathcal{B}_k$  and  $\mathcal{C}_k$ , for each  $k \geq 2$ , such that  $|\mathcal{B}_k^{(2)}| = 2k + 2$  and  $|\mathcal{C}_k^{(2)}| = 3k + 2$ . These examples show that there is no upper bound on the number of binary non-projections in binary minimal clones. The second sequence also shows that for infinitely many primes  $p (\geq 11)$  of the form  $3k + 2$ , the clones of nontrivial affine spaces over  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  are not the only minimal clones  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = p$ .

Now we will discuss minimal majority clones with few ternary operations. Recall from (5.11) that in a minimal majority clone, every ternary non-projection is a majority operation. The known examples of minimal majority clones  $\mathcal{C}$  exhibit very few possibilities for the number  $|\mathcal{C}^{(3)}| - 3$  of majority operations in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For Examples (vi) and (vii) in Subsection 5.1, the numbers are 1 and 3, respectively. For the majority minimal clones on 3-element sets and for the non-conservative majority minimal clones on 4-element sets the numbers are 1, 3, or 8 (see Subsection 6.1). For the conservative minimal majority clones the numbers are 1, 3, 8, or 24 (see Subsection 6.2). In the paper [140], Waldhauser classified all minimal majority clones with  $\leq 7$  ternary operations (i.e., with  $\leq 4$  majority operations). The main results are that there exist no minimal majority clones with 2 or 4 majority operations, and for each one of  $m = 1$  and 3, there exists a unique variety  $\mathcal{V}_m$  (in one ternary operation symbol  $f$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{a clone } \mathcal{C} \text{ on a set } A \text{ is a minimal majority clone satisfying } |\mathcal{C}^{(3)}| = 3 + m \\
 (6.5) \quad & \text{(i.e., } \mathcal{C} \text{ contains exactly } m \text{ majority operations)} \\
 & \text{if and only if } \mathcal{C} \text{ contains a majority operation } f \text{ such that} \\
 & \mathbf{A}_f \in \mathcal{V}_m, \mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f), \text{ and } |\mathcal{C}^{(3)}| \not\leq m.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\mathcal{V}_1$  is the variety defined by the 3-variable identities that are true for the median operation of any lattice with 2 or more elements, while  $\mathcal{V}_3$  is the variety defined by the 3-variable identities that are true for the dual discriminator operation on any set of size  $\geq 3$  (see Examples (vi) and (vii) in Subsection 5.1). Clearly,  $\mathcal{V}_1 \subset \mathcal{V}_3$ . Waldhauser also pointed out in [140] that  $\mathcal{V}_1$  has infinitely many subvarieties, and hence there are infinitely many non-isomorphic minimal majority clones that contain a single majority operation.

In the classification of minimal majority clones  $\mathcal{C}$  by identities, it is the ternary part,  $\mathcal{C}^{(3)}$ , that plays the same role as the binary part for binary minimal clones. However, there is an essential difference: for any clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  generated by a majority operation  $f$ , Statement (5.11) implies that  $\mathcal{C}$  is minimal if (and only if)

$\mathcal{C}$  is *3-minimal*, that is, every ternary non-projection  $g$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  generates  $f$ . Thus, the ternary part  $\mathcal{C}^{(3)}$  determines whether or not  $\mathcal{C}$  is minimal, or equivalently, the ternary identities true in  $\mathbf{A}_f$  determine whether or not the clone  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$  is minimal.

The main tool Waldhauser used in his classification of minimal majority clones  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}^{(3)}| \leq 7$  is the symmetries of the majority operations in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The symmetric group  $S_3$  acts on  $\mathcal{C}^{(3)}$  by permuting the variables of the operations. Call an operation  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{(3)}$  *cyclically symmetric* if it is invariant under permuting its variables by a 3-cycle in  $S_3$ . Waldhauser proved for every minimal majority clone  $\mathcal{C}$  with finitely many majority operations that if every majority operation in  $\mathcal{C}$  is cyclically symmetric, then  $\mathcal{C}$  has a unique majority operation. Consequently, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal majority clone with finitely many, but more than one majority operations, then some majority operation in  $\mathcal{C}$  has an orbit of size  $\geq 3$  under the action of  $S_3$ . This shows that the number  $m$  of majority operations in a minimal majority clone  $\mathcal{C}$  cannot be 2, and if  $m = 3$  then the three majority operations in  $\mathcal{C}$  are obtained from one another via permuting the variables by 3-cycles. Finally, were  $m = 4$ , there would be one cyclically symmetric majority operation in  $\mathcal{C}$  and three other majority operations that are obtained from one another via permuting variables by 3-cycles. This is the starting point of eliminating the case  $m = 4$ .

For a long time, the only numbers known to occur as the number of majority operations in a minimal majority clone were the numbers  $m = 1, 3, 8$ , and 24 mentioned above. However, in their paper [6] published in 2011, Behrisch and Waldhauser found minimal majority clones  $\mathcal{M}_{26}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{78}$  with  $m = 26$  and 78 majority operations, respectively. The clone  $\mathcal{M}_{26}$  is a minimal majority clone on a 5-element set, generated by a cyclically symmetric majority operation. It was found by a computer search that took several weeks on several computers to find all minimal majority clones generated by cyclically symmetric majority operations on a 5-element set, and determine the number of majority operations in them. The search revealed that, up to similarity,  $\mathcal{M}_{26}$  is the only such clone where the number of majority operations is different from 1 and 8. The clone  $\mathcal{M}_{78}$  was obtained from  $\mathcal{M}_{26}$  by a general construction in the paper [6], which produces from any minimal majority clone with  $m$  majority operations, which is generated by a cyclically symmetric majority operation  $f$  on a set  $A$ , a new minimal majority clone with  $3m$  majority operations, which is generated by the majority operation  $f^*$  on the set  $A^* = A \cup \{*\}$  that extends  $f$  so that  $f^*(a_1, a_2, a_3) = a_1$  whenever  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  is a 3-element subset of  $A^*$  containing the new element  $*$ .

**6.4. Minimal clones satisfying some algebraic restrictions.** Abelian algebras were introduced earlier in Subsection 3.3, and it was mentioned there that typical examples are the algebras whose clone is a subclone of the clone of the constant expansion of a module, and their subalgebras. In [56], Kearnes classified all minimal clones that have nontrivial abelian representations. Given a minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on some

set  $S$ , we call an algebra  $\mathbf{A}_f = (A; f)$  a *representation of  $\mathcal{C}$*  if there exists a surjective clone homomorphism  $\Phi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ , or equivalently, if for an appropriately chosen non-projection<sup>36</sup>  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}$  the algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}} = (S; \tilde{f})$ , whose clone is  $\mathcal{C}$ , generates a variety  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}})$  containing  $\mathbf{A}_f$ . A representation  $\mathbf{A}_f$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is called *faithful* if there exists a clone isomorphism  $\Phi: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_f)$ , or in the equivalent reformulation,  $\mathbf{A}_f$  is another generating algebra for  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}})$ . We say that a representation  $\mathbf{A}_f$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is *abelian* if  $\mathbf{A}_f$  is an abelian algebra, and *nontrivial* if  $f$  is a non-projection. Recall that by Statement (5.7), a nontrivial representation  $\mathbf{A}_f$  of a minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  has a minimal clone. The descriptions of the minimal clones in Examples (i)–(iv) in Subsection 5.1 show that these are clones of abelian algebras, and hence these clones have nontrivial abelian representations (where  $\Phi$  is the identity map).

The main result of [56] is that, up to isomorphism, these examples include almost all of the minimal clones with abelian representations. Using the terminology introduced right after Statement (5.7), Kearnes' theorem can be stated as follows:

*$\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone with a nontrivial abelian representation if and only if one of the following conditions holds for  $\mathcal{C}$ :*

- (o)  $\mathcal{C}$  is unary,
- (a)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of an affine space over the field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  for some prime  $p$ ,
- (b)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a rectangular band which is not a left zero or right zero semigroup, or
- (c)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a  $p$ -cyclic groupoid for some prime  $p$  which is not a left zero semigroup.

The proof starts by observing that among the five types of the minimal clones (see Rosenberg's Theorem in Subsection 5.2) those of types  $\sphericalangle$ (I) and  $\sphericalangle$ (V) are clones of abelian algebras, and those of types (III) and (IV) cannot have nontrivial abelian representations. Therefore, most of the work in the proof goes into analyzing the minimal clones of type (II), that is, the binary minimal clones. In the first phase of the proof Kearnes shows that every binary minimal clone that has a nontrivial abelian representation, is represented by one of the abelian algebras  $\mathbf{A}_f = (\mathbf{Z}_6; 3x_1 + 4x_2)$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_f = (\mathbf{Z}_p; x_1 - x_2 + x_3)$  ( $p > 2$  prime), or  $\mathbf{A}_f = (\mathbf{Z}_{p^2}; (1-p)x_1 + px_2)$  ( $p$  prime), whose clones are exactly the minimal clones in Examples (iv), (ii), and (iii) in Subsection 5.1. In the second phase he shows that each variety generated by one of these algebras  $\mathbf{A}_f$  can be axiomatized by absorption identities, and hence Statement (5.9) implies that the minimal clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}})$  represented by  $\mathbf{A}_f$  must arise from an algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}}$  that satisfies all identities of  $\mathbf{A}_f$ , implying that  $\mathbf{A}_f$  is a faithful representation of  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{f}})$ .

The classification of minimal clones with nontrivial abelian representations, in combination with some results from commutator theory, allowed the author of [56]

---

<sup>36</sup> $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}$  is one of the inverse images of  $f$  under  $\Phi$ .

to prove the following generalization of the main statement in Rosenberg's Theorem on minority minimal clones:

*If a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by a Mal'tsev operation (i.e., by a ternary operation  $p$  satisfying the identities in (3.1)), then  $\mathcal{C}$  has a nontrivial abelian representation, and hence  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of an affine space over a field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  for some prime  $p$ .*

In [139], Waldhauser proved that Kearnes' classification also holds for the minimal clones that have weakly abelian representations.

It is not hard to see from the classification of minimal clones with abelian representations that all these clones are commutative. A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a set  $A$  is called *commutative* if any two operations in  $\mathcal{C}$  commute with each other, that is, for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{C}$  (say  $f$  is  $m$ -ary and  $g$  is  $n$ -ary),  $g$  is an algebra homomorphism  $(A; f)^m \rightarrow (A; f)$ , or equivalently,  $f$  preserves the graph of  $g$  (an  $(m+1)$ -ary relation). Yet another equivalent condition is that  $f$  and  $g$  satisfy the following identity in  $mn$  variables  $x_{ij}$ :

$$(6.6) \quad g(f(x_{11}, \dots, x_{m1}), \dots, f(x_{1n}, \dots, x_{mn})) \\ = f(g(x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n}), \dots, g(x_{m1}, \dots, x_{mn})).$$

It follows from these equivalent descriptions of commutativity that  $f$  and  $g$  have symmetric roles in the definition. It follows also that the commutativity of clones is invariant under clone isomorphism, and if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone generated by  $f$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  is a commutative clone if and only if  $f$  commutes with itself. These facts are sufficient to derive from the classification of minimal clones with abelian representations that all such minimal clones are commutative.

This observation motivated the classification of all commutative minimal clones in [59] by Kearnes and Szendrei. By our discussion in the preceding paragraph, the minimal clones of types  $\surd$ (I) and  $\surd$ (V) are commutative. On the other hand, it is not hard to show that no majority operation on a set of size  $> 1$  commutes with itself, so minimal clones of types (IV) are not commutative. Therefore the main task in [59] was to classify the commutative minimal clones of types (II) and (III). We will start with the binary case. If  $\circ$  is a binary operation, then the identity expressing that  $\circ$  commutes with itself is the 4-variable identity  $(x \circ y) \circ (u \circ v) = (x \circ u) \circ (y \circ v)$ , which is known in the literature as the *entropic law* (or *medial law*). Therefore, to classify the commutative binary minimal clones, one has to classify the idempotent entropic groupoids  $\mathbf{A}_\circ = (A; \circ)$  with minimal clones. The main result of [59] for this case is that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a commutative binary minimal clone if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is one of the clones in items (a)–(c) above, or

- (d)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a *right semilattice* — i.e., an idempotent entropic groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  satisfying the identities  $x \circ (x \circ y) = x$  and  $(x \circ y) \circ y = x \circ y$  — which is not a left zero semigroup, or
- (e)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a left normal band which is not a left zero semigroup.



In both cases (d) and (e) the binary part,  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)}$ , of the clone  $\mathcal{C}$  has size 4 or 3 (the latter only in case (e) when  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a semilattice), therefore for a non-projection  $\circ$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , the algebra  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  belongs to one of the varieties in  $\mathcal{F}_4$  or  $\mathcal{F}_3$  in the classification theorem of Lévai and Pálffy in [69] (see Subsection 6.3). In case (e) the variety is clearly  $2\text{-}\mathcal{LNB} \in \mathcal{F}_4$  or  $2\text{-}\mathcal{SL} \in \mathcal{F}_3$ , respectively, while in case (d) it is not hard to check that the variety is  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{F}_4$ .

In contrast to the binary case, the classification in [59] of the commutative minimal clones generated by semiprojections produced a new class of minimal clones. Indeed, for minimal clones of type (III), we have seen so far only classification results for minimal clones generated by conservative semiprojections. However, it is not hard to show that such a clone cannot be commutative.

To present the result of [59] for the commutative minimal clones generated by semiprojections, let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a clone on a set  $A$  generated by a  $(k+1)$ -ary semiprojection  $s = s(x, \mathbf{y})$  onto the variable  $x$  (where  $k \geq 2$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is the tuple of the remaining variables), and assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is commutative, that is,  $s$  commutes with itself. The assumption that  $s$  is a semiprojection and generates  $\mathcal{C}$  implies that every operation  $g = g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{C}$  restricts to all  $k$ -element subsets of  $A$  as projection onto the same variable  $x_\ell$ , which we will call the *distinguished variable* of  $g$ . Hence, in particular, every operation in  $\mathcal{C}^{(k+1)}$  is a semiprojection or a projection. The assumption that  $s$  commutes with itself, that is, the assumption that the identity (6.6) holds with  $f = g = s$  and  $m = n = k + 1$ , implies that the  $(2k + 1)$ -variable identity  $s(s(x, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{z}) = s(s(x, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{y})$  also holds for  $s$ , and every operation  $t \in \mathcal{C}^{(k+1)}$  with distinguished variable  $x$  and non-distinguished variables  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  has the form  $s(\dots s(s(x, \mathbf{y}_{\sigma_1}), \mathbf{y}_{\sigma_2}), \dots, \mathbf{y}_{\sigma_m})$  for some  $m \geq 1$  and some permutations  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m \in S_k$ , where  $\mathbf{y}_\sigma$  denotes the tuple  $(y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(k)})$  for every permutation  $\sigma \in S_k$ . Moreover, every subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$ , except the clone  $\mathcal{L}_A$  of projections, contains a  $(k+1)$ -ary semiprojection. Thus,  $\mathcal{C}$  is completely determined by its subset  $M_{\mathcal{C}}$  consisting of all  $(k+1)$ -ary operations (semiprojection or projection operations) with a fixed distinguished variable, say  $x$ . The properties of  $\mathcal{C}$  just discussed imply that the binary operation  $\oplus$  on  $M_{\mathcal{C}}$  defined by  $(t_1 \oplus t_2)(x, \mathbf{y}) := t_2(t_1(x, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y})$  yields a commutative monoid whose neutral element  $o \in M_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the  $(k+1)$ -ary projection onto the variable  $x$ . Furthermore, the unary operations  $t(x, \mathbf{y}) \mapsto (\sigma t)(x, \mathbf{y}) := t(x, \mathbf{y}_\sigma)$  ( $\sigma \in S_k$ ) on  $M_{\mathcal{C}}$  define an action of  $S_k$  on the monoid  $(M_{\mathcal{C}}; \oplus, o)$  by automorphisms, yielding an  $S_k$ -semimodule  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}} = (M_{\mathcal{C}}; \oplus, o, S_k)$ .

It is proved in [59] that the assignment  $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the object map of a categorical equivalence between the category of commutative clones generated by a  $(k+1)$ -ary semiprojection or projection, together with all clone homomorphisms between them, and the category of 1-generated  $S_k$ -semimodules with all homomorphisms between them. This implies, in particular, that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a commutative minimal clone if and only if its associated  $S_k$ -semimodule  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is *minimal* in the sense that it is nontrivial

(i.e.,  $M_{\mathcal{C}} \neq \{o\}$ ) and every element  $f \in M_{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{o\}$  generates  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$ . The minimal  $S_k$ -semimodules are classified in [59] as follows: A minimal  $S_k$ -semimodule is either a 2-element semilattice  $(\{s, o\}; \oplus, o)$  with neutral element  $o$  and with the trivial action of  $S_k$ , or an elementary abelian  $p$ -group  $(M; \oplus, o)$  for some prime  $p$  with an action of  $S_k$  that makes it an irreducible  $S_k$ -module over the field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$ .

This yields a classification of all commutative minimal clones generated by a semiprojection as follows. Since there is a bijection between the isomorphism classes of commutative minimal clones generated by  $(k+1)$ -ary semiprojections and the isomorphism classes of minimal  $S_k$ -semimodules, it suffices to describe how to construct from each minimal semimodule  $\mathbf{M} = (M; \oplus, o, S_k)$  a commutative minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by a  $(k+1)$ -ary semiprojection such that  $\mathbf{M} \cong \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$ . Given a minimal semimodule  $\mathbf{M} = (M; \oplus, o, S_k)$ , choose any  $s_0 \in M \setminus \{o\}$  and fix a presentation of  $\mathbf{M}$  with generator  $s_0$ . The relations of this presentation yield a set of identities in one  $(k+1)$ -ary operation symbol  $s$  which, together with the semiprojection identities for  $s$  and the identity expressing that  $s$  commutes with itself, define a variety  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{M}}$  such that  $\mathbf{M} \cong \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  holds for the clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_s)$  of each algebra  $\mathbf{A}_s = (A; s)$  generating  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{M}}$ . In fact,  $\mathbf{A}_s$  will generate  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{M}}$  as long as the operation  $s$  is not a projection, as we will now show. Since  $\mathbf{M} \cong \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is a minimal  $S_k$ -semimodule,  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is a simple algebra, that is, the only proper homomorphic image of  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the trivial (one-element)  $S_k$ -semimodule. This property carries over to  $\mathcal{C}$ , since  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{C}}$  correspond to each other under the categorical equivalence discussed in the preceding paragraph. Hence, the only proper homomorphic image of  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_s)$ , for an algebra  $\mathbf{A}_s$  generating  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{M}}$ , is the clone of projections. But this fact is equivalent to the fact that the only nontrivial proper subvariety of  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{M}}$  is the variety of algebras  $\mathbf{A}_s$  where  $s$  is a projection.

Altogether this shows that commutative minimal clones generated by semiprojections are classified by irreducible representations of finite symmetric groups over fields of prime order.

**6.5. Brady’s coarse classification of the binary minimal clones on finite sets.** We discussed in Subsections 5.2 and 6.3 that one of the difficulties with classifying binary minimal clones is that a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by a binary idempotent non-projection may have minimal subclones that don’t have non-projection binary operations, and this may happen even if  $\mathcal{C}$  is 2-minimal. This is in sharp contrast to the case when  $\mathcal{M}$  is generated by a majority operation, because this family of clones is ‘stable’ under taking minimal subclones in the sense that every minimal subclone of a clone generated by a majority operation is generated by a majority operation, and hence 3-minimality implies minimality for clones generated by majority operations.

In his recent papers [9] and [11], Brady found a coarse classification for binary minimal clones on finite sets which eliminates the issue of ‘instability’ mentioned in the preceding paragraph. More precisely, Brady’s main result isolates seven disjoint

families of clones with the following properties: (1) every clone in each family is generated by a binary idempotent non-projection on a finite set, (2) every binary minimal clone on a finite set belongs to one of the seven families, (3) four of the seven families consist of binary minimal clones only, and (4) for each one of the remaining three families, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is in a given family, then every minimal subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$  is in the same family. The classification is as follows:

*Every binary minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a finite set satisfies exactly one of the following seven conditions:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of an affine space over the field  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  for some odd prime  $p$ ;
- (b)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a rectangular band which is not a left zero or right zero semigroup;
- (c)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a  $p$ -cyclic groupoid for some prime  $p$  which is not a left zero semigroup;
- (m)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a meld (see Subsection 6.3) which is not a left zero semigroup;
- (B)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a Brady groupoid<sup>37</sup> — i.e., a groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  satisfying the identities  $x \circ x = x$  and  $x \circ (x \circ y) = (x \circ y) \circ x = x \circ y$  — which is not a left zero semigroup, but has a 2-element section (i.e., quotient of a subalgebra) that is a left zero semigroup;
- (S)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a spiral — that is, a groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  satisfying the identities  $x \circ x = x$ ,  $x \circ y = y \circ x$ , and having the additional property that for any two distinct elements  $a, b \in A$ , the subgroupoid of  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  generated by  $\{a, b\}$  either contains only these two elements, or has a surjective homomorphism onto the free semilattice  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{SL}}(x, y)$  on two generators;
- (D)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of a dispersive groupoid — that is, a groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  satisfying all identities in (6.4) and having the additional property that for any two distinct elements  $a, b \in A$ , either the subgroupoid of  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  generated by  $\{a, b\}$  contains only these two elements, or the subgroupoid of  $(\mathbf{A}_\circ)^2$  generated by the pairs  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, a)$  has a surjective homomorphism onto the free groupoid  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$  with two generators in the variety  $\mathcal{D}$  from the classification results of Lévai and Pálffy [69] (see Subsection 6.3).

Moreover, all clones in (a), (b), (c), and (m) are minimal.

The proof makes essential use of the restriction that the binary minimal clones considered have finite base sets. One of the main ways this finiteness assumption was exploited in [9, 11] is the following. Brady used several constructions to produce better-behaved binary operations in a clone  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  than the generating operation  $\circ$ . Many of these constructions rely on sequences of iterated compositions — like  $x, x \circ y, (x \circ y) \circ y, ((x \circ y) \circ y) \circ y, \dots$  — which stabilize after finitely many steps if

---

<sup>37</sup>In [11], Brady called these groupoids ‘partial semilattices’. Since we discuss partial operations and partial clones in Subsections 4.3 and 7.3 of this paper, it seemed safer to avoid this name.

the base set is finite, and hence produce a new operation in  $\mathcal{C}$ . However, if the base set is infinite, then the same conclusions are not necessarily true.

Concerning the types (B), (S), and (D) in the classification theorem, which may contain non-minimal clones, Brady also proved in [9, 11] that if  $\mathcal{X}$  is the class  $\mathcal{BG}_{\text{fin}}$  of finite Brady groupoids, the class  $\mathcal{SP}_{\text{fin}}$  of finite spirals, or the class  $\mathcal{DG}_{\text{fin}}$  of finite dispersive groupoids, then  $\mathcal{X}$  has the following properties:

- (i) (Stability under taking subclones)

If  $\mathbf{A}_\circ \in \mathcal{X}$  then every subclone of  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$ , except the clone of projections, contains a binary operation  $*$  such that  $\mathbf{A}_* = (A; *) \in \mathcal{X}$ ; in particular, every minimal subclone of  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  is of the form  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_*)$  for some  $\mathbf{A}_* \in \mathcal{X}$ .

- (ii) (Smallest witnessing variety)

There exists a finite groupoid  $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{X})$  is a subvariety of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  for every  $\mathbf{A}_\circ \in \mathcal{X}$ . The groupoid  $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{X}$  can be chosen to be the 2-generated free algebra  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{LNB}}(x, y)$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{SL}}(x, y)$ , and  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{D}}(x, y)$  for  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{BG}_{\text{fin}}$ ,  $\mathcal{SP}_{\text{fin}}$ , and  $\mathcal{DG}_{\text{fin}}$ , respectively.

- (iii) (Membership can be decided efficiently)

There exists a polynomial time algorithm that, upon inputting a finite groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$ , decides whether or not  $\mathbf{A}_\circ \in \mathcal{X}$ .

In fact, analogous properties (ii)–(iii) hold for the classes  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{fin}}$  of finite members of the varieties  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{A}_p$  and  $p\text{-CG}$  (for each prime  $p$  separately) determining the clones in (a) and (c), and  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{RB}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  determining the clones in (b) and (m). In these cases property (i) holds trivially, because the clones are minimal.

Property (i) above is the crucial new feature of Brady’s broad classification, which eliminates the ‘unpredictability’ of the types of minimal subclones of a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by a binary non-projection  $\circ$  on a finite set  $A$ , provided the clone  $\mathcal{C}$  is ‘close enough to being minimal’ in the sense that  $\mathbf{A}_\circ = (A; \circ)$  belongs to one of the classes  $\mathcal{BG}_{\text{fin}}$ ,  $\mathcal{SP}_{\text{fin}}$ , or  $\mathcal{DG}_{\text{fin}}$  (which is ‘easy’ to check by condition (iii)). In [9, 11], Brady also investigated the structure of the groupoids in the classes  $\mathcal{BG}_{\text{fin}}$ ,  $\mathcal{SP}_{\text{fin}}$ , and  $\mathcal{DG}_{\text{fin}}$ .

Brady’s property (ii) suffices to imply that the seven families of clones in the classification are pairwise disjoint, and also helps to compare the earlier classification theorems for binary minimal clones with Brady’s coarse classification. For example, if we look at the classification of minimal clones  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  with  $r := |\mathcal{C}^{(2)}| = 3$  or 4 by Lévai and Pálffy [69] (see Subsection 6.3), we see that for the two varieties in  $\mathcal{F}_3$ , the clone of a finite groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  with non-projection operation  $\circ$  is of type (a) for  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  in  $\mathcal{A}_3$  and of type (S) for  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  in  $2\text{-}\mathcal{SL}$ . For the five varieties in  $\mathcal{F}_4$ , the clone of a finite groupoid  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  with non-projection operation  $\circ$  is of type (c), (b), (B), (D), and (m) for  $\mathbf{A}_\circ$  in  $2\text{-}\mathcal{CG}$ ,  $\mathcal{RB}$ ,  $2\text{-}\mathcal{LNB}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$ , respectively. The conservative minimal clones classified by Csákány [20] (see Subsection 6.2) are all of the form  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  for a groupoid in the variety  $2\text{-}\mathcal{SL}$  or  $2\text{-}\mathcal{LNB}$ , so — if the base set is finite — they are of type (S) or (D). Among the commutative binary minimal clones classified in [59] (see

Subsection 6.4), those on a finite base set belong to Brady’s type (a), (b), or (c) in case the clones have abelian representations [56], and otherwise they are of the form  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}_\circ)$  for a groupoid in the variety  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $2\text{-}\mathcal{SL}$  or  $2\text{-}\mathcal{LNB}$ , so belong to type (D), (S), or (B).

## 7. MINIMAL CLONES IN OTHER CONTEXTS

Rosenberg, jointly with Machida, made significant contributions to the study of ‘essentially minimal’ clones, which are close relatives of minimal clones. Along with some of their results we will also discuss another variation on the notion of minimality for clones, which is motivated by the Dichotomy Theorem for Constraint Satisfaction problems (see Subsection 3.7), and a classification of minimal partial clones.

**7.1. Essentially minimal clones.** The minimal clones on a given set  $A$  can be thought of as the minimal members of the family of all ‘interesting’ clones on  $A$ , provided the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections is the only clone on  $A$  that is considered ‘uninteresting’. The concept of an essentially minimal clone is obtained the same way if the family of ‘uninteresting clones’ is enlarged to consist of all essentially unary clones on  $A$ . Here, a clone is called *essentially unary* if all operations in it are essentially unary, and an operation is essentially unary (see Subsection 2.1) if it depends on at most one of its variables. An operation is called *essential* if it depends on at least two of its variables, i.e., if it is not essentially unary.

So, more formally, the *essentially minimal clones* on a set  $A$  can be defined as the clones  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains an essential operation, but all proper subclones of  $\mathcal{C}$  are essentially unary. It is clear from this definition that a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  is essentially minimal if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is generated by every essential operation in it. Another immediate consequence of the definition is that there is a large overlap between minimal and essentially minimal clones: all minimal clones, except the unary minimal clones, are also essentially minimal, and an essentially minimal clone is minimal if and only if it is an idempotent clone. Therefore, to separate the study of essentially minimal clones from the study of minimal clones, the focus in the study of essentially minimal clones has been on the non-idempotent essentially minimal clones<sup>38</sup>, that is, on the essentially minimal clones generated by non-idempotent essential operations.

The concept of essentially minimal clones was introduced and first studied by Machida in [71], and was partly motivated by the hope that the non-idempotent essentially minimal clones are easier to classify than the minimal clones, due to the presence of a nontrivial unary operation in the clone.

In [72], Machida and Rosenberg split the non-idempotent essentially minimal clones on finite sets  $A$  into two types, (A) and (B), and fully classified those of type (A).

---

<sup>38</sup>In the literature, an “essentially minimal clone” is often defined to be what we call here a non-idempotent essentially minimal clone, and in some papers (e.g. [74]) the name “essentially minimal clone in the broad sense” is used for the clones that we call essentially minimal.

To state the classification we will use the following notation. For an  $n$ -ary operation  $f$  on  $A$ ,  $f^*$  denotes the unary operation  $f^*(x) := f(x, \dots, x)$ ,  $\Gamma(f)$  denotes the largest subset of  $A$  to which  $f^*$  restricts as a permutation, and  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  denotes the  $n$ -ary function  $(\Gamma(f))^n \rightarrow A$  obtained from  $f$  by restricting the domain to  $(\Gamma(f))^n$ . Note that since  $A$  is finite, the set  $\Gamma(f)$  is nonempty. A non-idempotent essentially minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined to be of type (A) if  $\mathcal{C}$  has a generator  $f$  such that the function  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  depends on at least two of its variables; otherwise, the type of  $\mathcal{C}$  is (B). The following theorem of Machida and Rosenberg [72] classifies the non-idempotent essentially minimal clones of type (A) on finite sets. In the theorem statement a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by a single operation  $f$  is called a *lazy clone* if  $\mathcal{C}$  has no other members than the projections and the operations obtained from  $f$  by variable manipulations (i.e., by permuting variables, identifying variables, and adding fictitious variables).

*If  $f$  is a non-idempotent  $n$ -ary operation on a finite set  $A$  such that the function  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  depends on at least two variables, then the clone  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by  $f$  is essentially minimal if and only if  $f$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) *the identity  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(f^*(x_1), \dots, f^*(x_n))$  holds for  $f$ , and*
- (ii) *either*
  - (a) *the range of  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  is contained in  $\Gamma(f)$  (i.e.,  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  is an operation on  $\Gamma(f)$ ) and  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  generates a minimal clone on  $\Gamma(f)$ ;*
  - or*
  - (b) *the range of  $f|_{\Gamma(f)}$  is not contained in  $\Gamma(f)$ , the  $n$ -ary operation  $f^*(f(x_1, \dots, x_n))$  on  $A$  is essentially unary,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a lazy clone, and  $\mathcal{C}$  is minimal among the nontrivial lazy clones on  $A$ .*

Notice that the identity in (i) implies that  $f^*$  satisfies the identity  $f^*(f^*(x)) = f^*(x)$ , and since  $f$  is not idempotent (that is,  $f^*$  is not the identity map on  $A$ ), we also have that  $\Gamma(f) \subsetneq A$ ,  $\Gamma(f)$  is the range of  $f^*$ , and  $f^*|_{\Gamma(f)}$  is the identity map on  $\Gamma(f)$ .

The non-idempotent essentially minimal clones of type (B) on finite sets are not yet classified, but in [73], Machida and Rosenberg classified all such clones with binary generators. In [74] and [75] they also proved that every non-idempotent essentially minimal clone on a finite set  $A$  is generated by an operation of arity at most  $|A|$ , and found all non-idempotent essentially minimal clones on 3-element sets, up to similarity.

**7.2. Taylor-minimal clones.** This notion of minimality for clones is motivated by the Dichotomy Theorem for constraint satisfaction problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$ , which we discussed in Subsection 3.7. Therefore, we will only consider clones on finite sets, and will use the terminology and notation introduced in Subsection 3.7 without further reference. In the Dichotomy Theorem — which proves the Algebraic Dichotomy Conjecture stated in (3.6) for the problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  where  $\mathbb{A} = (A; \rho_1, \dots, \rho_m)$  is a finite relational structure with at least two elements and is a core — the dividing

line between the problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  that are in P and the problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  that are NP-complete is whether or not the clone  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a Taylor operation. The difficult case of the proof is showing that  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  is in P if  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  contains a Taylor operation. Since the complexity of  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  can only increase if  $\text{Pol}(\mathbb{A})$  gets smaller, the clones on  $A$  that are minimal for the property that they contain a Taylor operation play a crucial role.

We will call a clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a set  $A$  a *Taylor clone* if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a Taylor operation, and a *Taylor-minimal clone* if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Taylor clone, but no proper subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a Taylor clone. In other words,  $\mathcal{C}$  is Taylor-minimal if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  is Taylor and is generated by any Taylor operation in it.

Now let  $A$  be a finite set. It is not obvious from the definition of Taylor clones on  $A$  — or from their equivalent characterization (see Subsection 3.7) as the clones on  $A$  that contain a special weak near unanimity operation (briefly: special WNU operation) of some arity — that every Taylor clone on  $A$  has a Taylor-minimal subclone. However, this fact is an easy consequence of another characterization of Taylor clones on finite sets, due to Kearnes, Marković and McKenzie [57]:

*A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a finite set  $A$  is Taylor if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 4-ary idempotent operation  $t$  satisfying the following “rare area” identity in the variables  $a, e, r$ :*

$$t(r, a, r, e) = t(a, r, e, a).$$

(Such a  $t$  is a Taylor operation, so the sufficiency of the condition is clear.)

A systematic study of Taylor-minimal clones was started very recently, and focused so far mainly on how Taylor-minimal clones can be used to simplify and unify the two algebraic theories developed by Bulatov [12] and by Zhuk [145, 146] for their proofs of the Dichotomy Theorem, and a third theory concerning absorption, which was developed earlier by Barto and Kozik [4, 5] and played a crucial role in understanding which problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  can be solved by a specific type of polynomial time algorithm based on local consistency checking. All three algebraic theories mentioned here focus on finite idempotent algebras  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}} := (A; \mathcal{C})$  where  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  is a Taylor clone on  $A$ , and develop results about the clones  $\mathcal{C}$  themselves and/or about the subalgebras of finite powers of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Given a cointial family in the set of all Taylor clones on  $A$ ,<sup>39</sup> the hard part of the Dichotomy Theorem can be proved by finding a polynomial time algorithm for solving  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A})$  for each structure  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{C},k}$  whose relations are all relations of arity  $\leq k$  preserving the operations in  $\mathcal{C}$  where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a clone in the cointial family and  $k \geq 2$ . Beyond these common basics, Bulatov’s and Zhuk’s algebraic theories don’t seem to have much in common; for example, they use very different cointial families of Taylor clones, and while Zhuk’s theory does use some concepts from absorption theory, Bulatov’s does not. Nevertheless, Barto, Brady, Bulatov,

---

<sup>39</sup>In Zhuk’s algorithm that we discussed in Subsection 3.7, the family consists of the clones of all algebras  $\mathbf{A} = (A; u)$  where  $u$  is a special WNU operation on  $A$ .

Kozik, and Zhuk discovered in [2, 3] that by choosing the cointial family of clones to be the family of Taylor-minimal clones, a number of connections between the three theories become apparent. In fact, they say in [2]: “The authors find the extent, to which the notions of the three theories simplify and unify in minimal Taylor algebras, truly striking.”

We have seen two characterizations of Taylor clones on finite sets: one by the existence of a (special) WNU operation in the clone, and the other by the existence of an idempotent “rare area” operation. There are a number of other, similar characterizations of Taylor clones on finite sets, by the existence of a special kind of Taylor operation in the clone (e.g., Siggers’ 6-ary operation, see [122], or a cyclic operation, see Barto–Kozik [4]). In [85], Olšák proved a similar characterization for Taylor clones on arbitrary (possibly infinite) sets:

*A clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on an arbitrary set  $A$  is Taylor if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  contains a 6-ary idempotent operation  $f$  satisfying the identities*

$$f(x, y, y, y, x, x) = f(y, x, y, x, y, x) = f(y, y, x, x, x, y).$$

It follows that Taylor-minimal clones on finite sets contain each of these types of Taylor operations. The idempotent “rare area” operations are optimal among these in terms of their arity, because it was proved in [57] that Taylor clones on finite sets cannot be characterized by the existence of a ternary Taylor operation satisfying a fixed set of Taylor identities. In spite of this fact, Barto, Brady, Bulatov, Kozik, and Zhuk were able to prove in [2, 3] that every Taylor-minimal clone on a finite set  $A$  is generated by a ternary operation.

By inspecting Post’s lattice [98], it is easy to see that on a 2-element set the Taylor-minimal clones are exactly the non-unary minimal clones. In [10, Sec. 4.4], Brady classified all conservative Taylor-minimal clones on finite sets and gave a formula for their number. He then used this result to classify all Taylor-minimal clones on a 3-element set. He found that, up to similarity, there are 24 Taylor-minimal clones on a 3-element set, and 19 of them are conservative clones.

On finite sets of size  $> 2$ , there exist Taylor-minimal clones that are not minimal clones. In fact, there is no upper bound on the height of the subclone lattices of Taylor-minimal clones on finite sets. For example, the *switching operation*  $s$  on a set  $A$ , which is defined to be the minority operation on  $A$  such that  $s(a, b, c) = a$  whenever  $a, b, c \in A$  are distinct, generates a Taylor-minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on  $A$  whose subclone lattice is a chain of height  $|A|$  if  $A$  is finite (a descending  $\omega$ -chain if  $A$  is infinite), and the unique maximal subclone of  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of projections if  $|A| = 2$ , and is generated by a ternary semiprojection if  $|A| > 2$  (see [77, 128]).

Nevertheless, there is some overlap between minimal clones and Taylor-minimal clones. Clearly, a minimal clone is Taylor-minimal if and only if it is a Taylor clone. The results we discussed earlier about minimal clones yield that a minimal clone  $\mathcal{C}$  on a finite set is Taylor-minimal if and only if (i)  $\mathcal{C}$  is the clone of an affine module



over  $\mathbf{Z}_p$  for some prime  $p$ , or (ii)  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone in class (S) of Brady’s coarse classification of binary minimal clones, or (iii)  $\mathcal{C}$  is a minimal clone generated by a majority operation. Indeed, it is easy to see that the unary minimal clones and the minimal clones generated by semiprojections (i.e., the minimal clones of types  $\sphericalangle$ (I) and (III)) are not Taylor clones, while the majority minimal clones and the minority minimal clones (i.e., the minimal clones of types (IV) and  $\sphericalangle$ (V)) are Taylor clones. Therefore, the only question that remains is this: Which binary minimal clones contain Taylor operations? Brady’s coarse classification gives a (coarse) answer to this question. In fact, Brady’s coarse classification of binary minimal clones started in [9] with a broader goal, namely to understand the structure of the finite algebras  $\mathbf{A} = (A; \mathcal{C})$  whose clones  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Clo}(\mathbf{A})$  are minimal for the property that the corresponding Constraint Satisfaction Problems  $\text{CSP}(\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{C},k})$  (as described earlier in this subsection) can be solved by local consistency checking. This property of  $\mathcal{C}$  is closely related to — though somewhat stronger than — the requirement for  $\mathcal{C}$  to be a Taylor-minimal clone.

**7.3. Minimal clones of partial operations.** Recall from Subsection 4.3 that a set  $\mathcal{U}$  of partial operations on a fixed base set  $A$  is called a *clone of partial operations* on  $A$ , or briefly a *partial clone* on  $A$  if  $\mathcal{U}$  is closed under composition and contains the (total) projection operations. Analogously to the definition of a minimal clone (of total operations), a partial clone  $\mathcal{U}$  on  $A$  is called *minimal* if  $\mathcal{U}$  has exactly one proper partial subclone: the (partial) clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections. It follows from these definitions that every clone of (total) operations is also a partial clone. In particular, every minimal clone of total operations is a minimal partial clone.

In [8], Börner, Haddad, and Pöschel proved that Statement (5.5) extends to partial clones, that is, on a finite base set  $A$ , every partial clone other than the clone  $\mathcal{I}_A$  of projections contains a minimal partial clone, and the number of minimal partial clones is finite. They also reduced the classification of all minimal partial clones on finite sets to the classification of all minimal clones of total operations by proving the following theorem:

*A partial clone  $\mathcal{U}$  on a finite set  $A$  is minimal if and only if either  $\mathcal{U}$  is a minimal clone of total operations, or  $\mathcal{U}$  is generated by a partial projection operation  $\text{pr}_i^{(n)}|_D$  where  $n \geq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and  $D \subsetneq A^n$  is an  $n$ -ary totally reflexive, totally symmetric relation on  $A$ .*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, Kirby A.; Pixley, Alden F. Polynomial interpolation and the Chinese remainder theorem for algebraic systems. *Math. Z.* **143** (1975), no. 2, 165–174.
- [2] Barto, Libor; Brady, Zarathustra; Bulatov, Andrei; Kozik, Marcin; Zhuk, Dmitriy Minimal Taylor algebras as a common framework for the three algebraic approaches to the CSP. in: 2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), 13 pp., IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, 2021.

- [3] Barto, Libor; Brady, Zarathustra; Bulatov, Andrei; Kozik, Marcin; Zhuk, Dmitriy Unifying the Three Algebraic Approaches to the CSP via Minimal Taylor Algebras. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2104.11808>, 57 pp., 2023
- [4] Barto, Libor; Kozik, Marcin Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms, and the constraint satisfaction problem. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **8** (2012), no. 1, 1:07, 27 pp.
- [5] Barto, Libor; Kozik, Marcin Constraint satisfaction problems solvable by local consistency methods. *J. ACM* **61** (2014), no. 1, Art. 3, 19 pp.
- [6] Behrisch, Mike; Waldhauser, Tamás Minimal clones with many majority operations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **77** (2011), no. 3–4, 389–402.
- [7] Bodnarchuk, V. G.; Kaluzhnin, L. A.; Kotov, V. N.; Romov, B. A. Galois theory for Post algebras I–II. (Russian) *Kibernetika (Kiev)* No. 3, 1–10 (1969), No. 5, 1–9 (1969).
- [8] Börner, F.; Haddad, L.; Pöschel, R. Minimal partial clones. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **44** (1991), no. 3, 405–415.
- [9] Brady, Zarathustra Examples, counterexamples, and structure in bounded width algebras. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1909.05901>, 45 pp., 2020
- [10] Brady, Zarathustra Notes on CSPs and Polymorphisms. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.07383>, 407 pp., 2022.
- [11] Brady, Zarathustra Coarse classification of binary minimal clones. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.12631>, 55 pp., 2023.
- [12] Bulatov, Andrei A. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. 58th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science—FOCS 2017, 319–330, IEEE Computer Soc., Los Alamitos, CA, 2017.
- [13] Bulatov, A. A.; Jeavons, P. G. Algebraic structures in combinatorial problems. Technical report, Technische Universität Dresden, 2001, 32 pages.
- [14] Bulatov, Andrei A.; Krokhin, Andrei A.; Jeavons, Peter Constraint satisfaction problems and finite algebras. *Automata, languages and programming (Geneva, 2000)*, 272–282, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, **1853**, Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [15] Bulatov, Andrei; Jeavons, Peter; Krokhin, Andrei Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM J. Comput.* **34** (2005), no. 3, 720–742.
- [16] Clark, David M.; Krauss, Peter H. Para primal algebras. *Algebra Universalis* **6** (1976), no. 2, 165–192
- [17] Cohn, P. M. *Universal algebra*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York-London, 1965. xv+333 pp.
- [18] Csákány, B. Three-element groupoids with minimal clones. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **45** (1983), no. 1–4, 111–117.
- [19] Csákány, B. All minimal clones on the three-element set. *Acta Cybernet.* **6** (1983), no. 3, 227–238.
- [20] Csákány, B. On conservative minimal operations. *Lectures in universal algebra (Szeged, 1983)*, 49–60, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, 43, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [21] Csákány, Béla Minimal clones — a minicourse. *Algebra Universalis* **54** (2005), no. 1, 73–89.
- [22] Csákány, Béla; Gavalcová, Tat’jana Finite homogeneous algebras. I. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **42** (1980), no. 1–2, 57–65.
- [23] Demetrovics, J.; Hannák, L. The number of reducts of a preprimal algebra. *Algebra Universalis* **16** (1983), no. 2, 178–185.
- [24] Demetrovics, J.; Hannák, L.; Marchenkov, S. S. Some remarks on the structure of  $P_3$ . *C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada* **2** (1980), no. 4, 215–219.

- [25] Demetrovics, J.; Hannák, L.; Rónyai, L. Near unanimity functions and partial orderings. Proc. 14th ISMVL, Manitoba, 1984; pp. 52–56.
- [26] Dudek, J. The unique minimal clone with three essentially binary operations. *Algebra Universalis* **27** (1990), no. 2, 261–269.
- [27] Dudek, J.; Gałuszka, J. Theorems of idempotent commutative groupoids. (English summary) *Algebra Colloq.* **12** (2005), no. 1, 11–30.
- [28] Feder, T.; Vardi, M. Monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction. In: Proceedings of the 25th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC) (San Diego, Calif., May 16–18, 1993). ACM, New York, 1993, pp. 612–622.
- [29] Feder, Tomás; Vardi, Moshe Y. The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: A study through datalog and group theory. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **28** (1) (1998), 57–104.
- [30] Foster, Alfred L. Generalized “Boolean” theory of universal algebras. I. Subdirect sums and normal representation theorem. *Math. Z.* **58** (1953), 306–336.
- [31] Foster, Alfred L. Generalized “Boolean” theory of universal algebras. II. Identities and subdirect sums of functionally complete algebras. *Math. Z.* **59** (1953), 191–199.
- [32] Foster, Alfred L. Functional completeness in the small. Algebraic structure theorems and identities. *Math. Ann.* **143** (1961), 29–58.
- [33] Freese, Ralph; McKenzie, Ralph Residually small varieties with modular congruence lattices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **264** (1981), no. 2, 419–430.
- [34] Freese, Ralph S.; McKenzie, Ralph N.; McNulty, George F.; Taylor, Walter F. Algebras, lattices, varieties. Vol. III. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 269. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2022. xvii+430 pp.
- [35] Freivald, R. V. Functional completeness for not everywhere defined functions of the algebra of logic. (Russian) *Diskret. Analiz* 1966, no. 8, 55–68.
- [36] Fried, E.; Pixley, A. F. The dual discriminator function in universal algebra. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **41** (1979), no. 1–2, 83–100.
- [37] Gavrilov, G. P. On functional completeness in countably-valued logic. (Russian) *Problemy Kibernet.* **15** (1965), 5–64.
- [38] Geiger, David Closed systems of functions and predicates *Pacific J. Math.* **27** (1968), 95–100.
- [39] Goldstern, Martin; Pinsker, Michael A survey of clones on infinite sets. *Algebra Universalis* **59** (2008), no. 3–4, 365–403.
- [40] Goldstern, Martin; Shelah, Saharon Clones on regular cardinals. *Fund. Math.* **173** (2002), no. 1, 1–20.
- [41] Goldstern, Martin; Shelah, Saharon Clones from creatures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **357** (2005), no. 9, 3525–3551.
- [42] Goldstern, Martin; Shelah, Saharon All creatures great and small. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **368** (2016), no. 11, 7551–7577.
- [43] Gumm, H.-Peter An easy way to the commutator in modular varieties. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **34** (1980), no. 3, 220–228.
- [44] Haddad, Lucien Maximal partial clones determined by quasi-diagonal relations. (German, Russian summary) *J. Inform. Process. Cybernet.* **24** (1988), no. 7–8, 355–366.
- [45] Haddad, Lucien; Rosenberg, Ivo G. Critère général de complétude pour les algèbres partielles finies. (French) [General completeness criterion for finite partial algebras] *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **304** (1987), no. 17, 507–509.

- [46] Haddad, Lucien; Rosenberg, I. G. Maximal partial clones determined by the areflexive relations. First Montreal Conference on Combinatorics and Computer Science, 1987. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **24** (1989), no. 1–3, 133–143.
- [47] Haddad, Lucien; Rosenberg, I. G. Completeness theory for finite partial algebras. *Algebra Universalis* **29** (1992), no. 3, 378–401.
- [48] Haddad, L.; Rosenberg, I. G.; Schweigert, D. A maximal partial clone and a Slupecki-type criterion. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **54** (1990), no. 1–2, 89–98.
- [49] Hagemann, Joachim; Herrmann, Christian A concrete ideal multiplication for algebraic systems and its relation to congruence distributivity. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **32** (1979), no. 3, 234–245.
- [50] Hobby, David; McKenzie, Ralph The structure of finite algebras. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 76. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988. xii+203 pp.
- [51] Hu, Tah-kai On the fundamental subdirect factorization theorems of primal algebra theory. *Math. Z.* **112** (1969), 154–162.
- [52] Huhn, A. P. Schwach distributive Verbände. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **46** (1983), no. 1–2, 85–98.
- [53] Jeavons, Peter On the algebraic structure of combinatorial problems. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **200** (1998), no. 1-2, 185–204.
- [54] Jeavons, Peter; Cohen, David; Gyssens, Marc Closure properties of constraints. *J. ACM* **44** (1997), no. 4, 527–548.
- [55] Ježek, J.; Quackenbush, R. Minimal clones of conservative functions. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **5** (1995), no. 6, 615–630.
- [56] Kearnes, Keith A. Minimal clones with abelian representations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **61** (1995), no. 1–4, 59–76.
- [57] Kearnes, Keith; Marković, Petar; McKenzie, Ralph Optimal strong Mal'cev conditions for omitting type **1** in locally finite varieties. (English summary) *Algebra Universalis* **72** (2014), no. 1, 91–100.
- [58] Kearnes, Keith A.; Szendrei, Ágnes A characterization of minimal locally finite varieties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **349** (1997), no. 5, 1749–1768.
- [59] Kearnes, Keith A.; Szendrei, Ágnes The classification of commutative minimal clones. Modes, modals, related structures and applications (Warsaw, 1997). *Discuss. Math. Algebra Stochastic Methods* **19** (1999), no. 1, 147–178.
- [60] Kuznetsov, A. V. Ch. 13: The algebra of logic and its generalizations. *Mathematics in the USSR over 40 years, vol. I*, Moscow, 1959; pp. 102–115.
- [61] Larose, Benoit A completeness criterion for isotone operations on a finite chain. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **59** (1994), no. 3–4, 319–356.
- [62] Lau, D. Eigenschaften gewisser abgeschlossener Klassen in Postschen Algebren. *Dissertation A*, Universität Rostock, 1977.
- [63] Lau, Dietlinde Bestimmung der Ordnung maximaler Klassen von Funktionen der  $k$ -wertigen Logik. (German) *Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math.* **24** (1978), no. 1, 79–96.
- [64] Lau, Dietlinde Submaximale Klassen von  $P_3$ . (German) [Submaximal classes of  $P_3$ ] *Elektron. Informationsverarb. Kybernet.* **18** (1982), no. 4–5, 227–243.
- [65] Lau, Dietlinde Die maximalen Klassen von  $\text{Pol}_k(0)$ . (German) [The maximal classes of  $\text{Pol}_k(0)$ ] *Rostock. Math. Kolloq.* **19** (1982), 29–47.
- [66] Lau, Dietlinde Die maximalen Klassen von  $\bigcap_{a \in Q} \text{Pol}_k a$  für  $Q \subseteq E_k$  (ein Kriterium für endliche semi-primale Algebren mit nur trivialen Unteralgebren). (German) [The maximal classes of  $\bigcap_{a \in Q} \text{Pol}_k a$  for  $Q \subseteq E_k$  (a criterion for finite semiprimal algebras with only trivial subalgebras)] *Rostock. Math. Kolloq.* **48** (1995), 27–46.

- [67] Lau, Dietlinde Function algebras on finite sets. A basic course on many-valued logic and clone theory. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. xiv+668 pp.
- [68] Lengvárszky, Zs. A note on minimal clones. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **50** (1986), no. 3–4, 335–336.
- [69] Lévai, L.; Pálffy, P. P. On binary minimal clones. *Acta Cybernet.* **12** (1996), no. 3, 279–294.
- [70] Machida, H. On closed sets of three-valued monotone logical functions. Finite algebra and multiple-valued logic (Szeged, 1979), pp. 441–467, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, 28, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1981.
- [71] Machida, H. Essentially minimal closed sets in multiple-valued logic. *Trans. I.E.C.E. of Japan*, **E64** (1981), 243–245.
- [72] Machida, H.; Rosenberg, I. G. Classifying essentially minimal clones. in: *ISMVL 1984 (Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic)*, IEEE 1984; pp. 4–7.
- [73] Machida, H.; Rosenberg, I. G. Essentially Minimal Groupoids. in: *Algebras and Orders* (Edited by I. G. Rosenberg and G. Sabidussi), NATO ASI Series C, vol. 389, Springer, 1993; pp. 287–316.
- [74] Machida, H.; Rosenberg, I. G. A study on essentially minimal clones. in: *ISMVL 2013 (Proceedings of the 43rd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic held in Toyama, Japan, May 22–24, 2013)*, IEEE 2013; pp. 117–122.
- [75] Machida, H.; Rosenberg, I. G. Essentially minimal clones of rank 3 on a three-element set. in: *ISMVL 2014 (Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic held in Bremen, Germany, May 19–21, 2014)*, IEEE 2014; pp. 97–102.
- [76] Mal'tsev, A. I. On the general theory of algebraic systems. (Russian) *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* **35**(77) (1954), 3–20.
- [77] Marchenkov, S. S. Homogeneous algebras. (Russian) *Problemy Kibernet.* No. **39** (1982), 85–106.
- [78] Marchenkov, S. S. Closed classes of self-dual functions of many-valued logic. II. (Russian) *Problemy Kibernet.* No. **40** (1983), 261–266.
- [79] Maróti, Miklós; McKenzie, Ralph Existence theorems for weakly symmetric operations. *Algebra Universalis* **59** (2008), no. 3–4, 463–489.
- [80] Martynyuk, V. V. Investigation of some classes in many-valued logics *Probl. Kibernetiki* **3** (1960), 49–60.
- [81] Mašulović, Dragan; Pech, Maja On traces of maximal clones. *Novi Sad J. Math.* **35** (2005), no. 1, 161–185.
- [82] Maurer, W. D.; Rhodes, John L. A property of finite simple non-abelian groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (1965), 552–554.
- [83] McKenzie, R. On minimal, locally finite varieties with permuting congruence relations. Preprint 1976.
- [84] McKenzie, Ralph Para primal varieties: A study of finite axiomatizability and definable principal congruences in locally finite varieties. *Algebra Universalis* **8** (1978), no. 3, 336–348.
- [85] Olšák, Miroslav The weakest nontrivial idempotent equations. (English summary) *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **49** (2017), no. 6, 1028–1047.
- [86] Pálffy, P. P. Unary polynomials in algebras. I. *Algebra Universalis* **18** (1984), no. 3, 262–273.
- [87] Pálffy, P. P. The arity of minimal clones. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **50** (1986), no. 3–4, 331–333.
- [88] Pech, Maja Local methods for Rosenberg relations. *Algebra Universalis* **63** (2010), no. 1, 65–82.
- [89] Pech, Maja; Mašulović, Dragan On the height of the poset of endomorphism monoids of regular relations. *J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput.* **15** (2009), no. 1, 81–94.

- [90] Pixley, A. F. Distributivity and permutability of congruence relations in equational classes of algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **14** (1963), 105–109.
- [91] Pixley, Alden F. Functionally complete algebras generating distributive and permutable classes. *Math. Z.* **114** (1970), 361–372.
- [92] Pixley, Alden F. The ternary discriminator function in universal algebra. *Math. Ann.* **191** (1971), 167–180.
- [93] Płonka, J. On groups in which idempotent reducts form a chain. *Colloq. Math.* **29** (1974), 87–91.
- [94] Płonka, J. On  $k$ -cyclic groupoids. *Math. Japon.* **30** (1985), no. 3, 371–382.
- [95] Ponjavić, Maja; Mašulović, Dragan On chains and antichains in the partially ordered set of traces of maximal clones. *Contributions to general algebra*. 15, 119–134, Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2004.
- [96] Ponjavić, Maja On the structure of the poset of endomorphism monoids of central relations. (English summary) *Contributions to general algebra*. 16, 189–197, Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2005.
- [97] Post, Emil L. Determination of all closed systems of truth tables *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (1920), 427.
- [98] Post, Emil L. *The Two-Valued Iterative Systems of Mathematical Logic*. *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, No. 5, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941. viii+122 pp.
- [99] Pöschel, Reinhard Concrete representation of algebraic structures and a general Galois theory. *Contributions to general algebra (Proc. Klagenfurt Conf., Klagenfurt, 1978)*, pp. 249–272, Heyn, Klagenfurt, 1979.
- [100] Pöschel, Reinhard A general Galois theory for operations and relations and concrete characterization of related algebraic structures. With German and Russian summaries. Report 1980, 1. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Institut für Mathematik, Berlin, 1980. 101 pp.
- [101] Pöschel, R.; Kalužnin, L. A. Funktionen- und Relationenalgebren. (German) [Function and relation algebras] Ein Kapitel der diskreten Mathematik. [A chapter in discrete mathematics] *Mathematische Monographien [Mathematical Monographs]*, 15. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1979. 259 pp.
- [102] Quackenbush, R. W. A new proof of Rosenberg’s primal algebra characterization theorem. *Finite algebra and multiple-valued logic (Szeged, 1979)*, pp. 603–634, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, 28, North-Holland, Amsterdam–New York, 1981.
- [103] Quackenbush, Robert W. A survey of minimal clones. *Aequationes Math.* **50** (1995), no. 1–2, 3–16.
- [104] Robinson, Derek J. S. *A course in the theory of groups*. Second edition. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 80. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. xviii+499 pp.
- [105] Romov, B. A. Galois correspondence between iterative Post algebras and relations on infinite sets. (Russian) *Kibernetika (Kiev)* 1977, no. 3, 62–64.
- [106] Romov, B. A. Maximal subalgebras of algebras of partial multivalued logic functions. *Cybernetics* **16** (1980), no.1, 31–41; translated from *Kibernetika (Kiev)* 1980, no. 1, ii, 28–36, 150 (Russian).
- [107] Romov, B. A. The algebras of partial functions and their invariants. *Cybernetics* **17** (1981), no. 2, 157–167; translated from *Kibernetika (Kiev)* 1981, no. 2, i, 1–11, 149 (Russian. English summary).
- [108] Rosenberg, Ivo La structure des fonctions de plusieurs variables sur un ensemble fini. (French) *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **260** (1965), 3817–3819.
- [109] Rosenberg, Ivo Über die Verschiedenheit maximaler Klassen in  $P_k$ . (German) *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.* **14** (1969), 431–438.

- [110] Rosenberg, Ivo Über die funktionale Vollständigkeit in den mehrwertigen Logiken. Struktur der Funktionen von mehreren Veränderlichen auf endlichen Mengen. (German) Rozprawy Československé Akad. Věd Řada Mat. Přírod. Věd **80** (1970), no. 4, 93 pp.
- [111] Rosenberg, Ivo, The number of maximal closed classes in the set of functions over a finite domain. J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **14** (1973), 1–7.
- [112] Rosenberg, I. G. Completeness, closed classes and relations in multiple-valued logics. in: IS-MVL 1974 (Proceedings of the International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic held in Morgantown, May 29–31, 1974), IEEE 1974; pp. 1–26.
- [113] Rosenberg, I. G. The set of maximal closed classes of operations on an infinite set  $A$  has cardinality  $2^{2^{|A|}}$ . Arch. Math. (Basel) **27** (1976), no. 6, 561–568.
- [114] Rosenberg, I. G. Functional completeness of single generated or surjective algebras. Finite algebra and multiple-valued logic (Szeged, 1979), pp. 635–652, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 28, North-Holland, Amsterdam–New York, 1981.
- [115] Rosenberg, I. G. Minimal clones. I. The five types. Lectures in universal algebra (Szeged, 1983), 405–427, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 43, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [116] Rosenberg, Ivo G.; Schweigert, Dietmar Locally maximal clones. Elektron. Informationsverarb. Kybernet. **18** (1982), no. 7–8, 389–401.
- [117] Rosenberg, I. G.; Szabó, L. Local completeness. I. Algebra Universalis **18** (1984), no. 3, 308–326.
- [118] Rosenberg, I. G.; Szendrei, Á. Submaximal clones with a prime order automorphism. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **49** (1985), no. 1–4, 29–48.
- [119] Rousseau, G. Completeness in finite algebras with a single operation. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (1967), 1009–1013.
- [120] Salomaa, Arto On infinitely generated sets of operations in finite algebras. Ann. Univ. Turku. Ser. A I **74** (1964), 13 pp.
- [121] Schofield, Peter Independent conditions for completeness of finite algebras with a single generator. J. London Math. Soc. **44** (1969), 413–423.
- [122] Siggers, Mark H. A strong Mal'cev condition for locally finite varieties omitting the unary type. (English summary) Algebra Universalis **64** (2010), no. 1–2, 15–20.
- [123] Ślupecki, Jerzy Kryterium pełności wielo-wartościowych systemów logiki zdań, Comptes Rendus des Séances de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, Classe III, **32** (1939), 102–109. [English translation: A criterion of fullness of many-valued systems of propositional logic, Studia Logica **30** (1972), 153–157.]
- [124] Smith, Jonathan D. H. Mal'cev varieties. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 554. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976. viii+158 pp.
- [125] Świerczkowski, S. Algebras which are independently generated by every  $n$  elements. Fund. Math. **49** (1960/61), 93–104.
- [126] Szczepara, Bogdan Minimal clones generated by groupoids. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Université de Montréal (Canada). 1996. 225 pp.
- [127] Szabó, L. Concrete representation of related structures of universal algebras. I. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **40** (1978), no. 1–2, 175–184.
- [128] Szendrei, Ágnes *Clones in universal algebra*. Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures [Seminar on Higher Mathematics], **99**. Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, 1986.
- [129] Szendrei, Ágnes Idempotent algebras with restrictions on subalgebras. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **51** (1987), no. 1–2, 251–268.
- [130] Szendrei, Ágnes Simple surjective algebras having no proper subalgebras. J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **48** (1990), no. 3, 434–454.

- [131] Szendrei, Ágnes A classification of strictly simple algebras with trivial subalgebras. *Universal algebra, quasigroups and related systems* (Jadwisin, 1989). *Demonstratio Math.* **24** (1991), no. 1–2, 149–173.
- [132] Szendrei, Ágnes The primal algebra characterization theorem revisited. *Algebra Universalis* **29** (1992), no. 1, 41–60.
- [133] Szendrei, Á. Term minimal algebras. *Algebra Universalis* **32** (1994), no. 4, 439–477.
- [134] Szendrei, Á. Maximal non-affine reducts of simple affine algebras. *Algebra Universalis* **34** (1995), no. 1, 144–174.
- [135] Szendrei, Á Rosenberg-type completeness criteria for subclones of Slupecki’s clone, in: *ISMVL 2012 (Proceedings of the 42nd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic held in Victoria, BC, Canada, May 14–16, 2012)*, (Edited by D. M. Miller and V. C. Gaudet) *IEEE 2012*; pp. 349–354.
- [136] Tardos, Gábor A maximal clone of monotone operations which is not finitely generated. *Order* **3** (1986), no. 3, 211–218.
- [137] Taylor, Walter Varieties obeying homotopy laws. *Canadian J. Math.* **29** (1977), no. 3, 498–527.
- [138] Waldhauser, Tamás Minimal clones generated by majority operations. *Algebra Universalis* **44** (2000), no. 1–2, 15–26.
- [139] Waldhauser, Tamás Minimal clones with weakly abelian representations. (English summary) *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **69** (2003), no. 3–4, 505–521.
- [140] Waldhauser, Tamás Minimal clones with few majority operations. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **73** (2007), no. 3–4, 471–486.
- [141] Yablonskiĭ, S. V. On functional completeness in a three-valued calculus. (Russian) *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* **95** (1954), 1153–1155.
- [142] Yablonskiĭ, S. V. Functional constructions in a  $k$ -valued logic. (Russian) *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov.* **51** (1958), 5–142.
- [143] Yanov, Yu. I.; Muchnik, A. A. Existence of  $k$ -valued closed classes without a finite basis. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **127** (1959), 44–46.
- [144] Zádori, László Series parallel posets with non-finitely generated clones. *Order* **10** (1993), no. 4, 305–316.
- [145] Zhuk, Dmitriy A proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture. *58th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science—FOCS 2017*, 331–342, *IEEE Computer Soc.*, Los Alamitos, CA, 2017.
- [146] Zhuk, Dmitriy A proof of the CSP dichotomy conjecture. *J. ACM* **67** (2020), no. 5, Art. 30, 78 pp.

(Ágnes Szendrei) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER, CO 80309-0395, USA

*Email address:* szendrei@colorado.edu