

BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS AS CLONES

ARTURO DE FAVERI

ABSTRACT. Clones are many-sorted algebraic structures abstracting the composition of finitary operations, and play a central role in universal algebra and theoretical computer science. In this paper, we investigate the variety of clones generated by the clone whose only elements are the projections. Inspired by the algebraic studies of conditional statements in programming, we provide an equational axiomatisation of this class of clones, which we call partition clones. We prove that every partition clone is a subdirect product of the clone of projections. Partition clones arise from Boolean algebras via a natural construction, and we show that every partition clone can be actually constructed in this way. Finally, we investigate the algebras associated with partition clones; we prove that they correspond precisely to sets equipped with an action of a Boolean algebra, aligning with a well-known definition due to Bergman.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Clones	3
2.2. Varieties	4
3. Partition clones	5
4. Hypervarieties	9
5. Algebras for a partition clone	10
5.1. Boolean algebras acting on sets	10
References	13

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Antonio Bucciarelli, Pierre-Louis Curien, and Antonino Salibra for their useful comments and their thorough proofreading of preliminary versions of this work. We also thank Vincent Moreau for interesting discussions.

1. INTRODUCTION

A clone on a set A is a family of finitary operations on A that is closed under composition and contains the projections. Abstract clones (which, in what follows, are referred to simply as clones) are the algebras for the many-sorted equational presentation that axiomatises this structure [24]. Precisely as monoids are the algebraic structures that serve to represent the composition of functions from a set to itself, clones are structures that aim at modelling the composition of functions of arbitrary finite arity. Clones hold significant importance in universal algebra, enabling the study of varieties in a way independent of their presentation (i.e. of their signature and equations): despite having different presentations, two varieties having the same clone of term-operations can be essentially regarded as the same. Thanks to a landmark observation due to Lawvere [16], clones can be exploited to lay the foundations of categorical universal algebra.

In addition to their foundational significance, clones have more recently gained attention in theoretical computer science. Specifically, a broad spectrum of decision problems, known as constraint satisfaction problems (CSP, for short), can have their computational complexity entirely classified thanks to a clone associated

with them. A specific finite relational structure \mathcal{A} is fixed, and the problem $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ consists in deciding whether a given conjunction of atomic formulas over the relational signature of \mathcal{A} is satisfiable in \mathcal{A} . The polymorphism clone of \mathcal{A} is constituted by all the finitary operations that preserve the structure of \mathcal{A} , and Jeavons' groundbreaking discovery [15] states that the computational complexity of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is completely determined by the polymorphism clone associated with \mathcal{A} .

Already from the beginning some evidence pointed at the fact that the class of CSPs exhibits a dichotomic behaviour: it was conjectured by Feder and Vardi [12] that for every finite structure \mathcal{A} , $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is polynomial-time solvable or NP-complete. This conjecture was recently proved by Bulatov [9] and, independently, by Zhuk [26]. The following theorem offers a neat account of the result, making transparent the role played by clones, and in particular by the clone \mathbf{N} whose only elements are the projections (see Definition 2.3 and Example 2.4). The following formulation can be found in the introduction of [5].

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be a finite relational structure and $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{A})$ its polymorphism clone. Then $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is NP-complete if there is a homomorphism $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$, and polynomial-time solvable otherwise.*

Motivated by the significance of the clone \mathbf{N} of projections in these considerations, this paper aims to investigate the variety of clones generated by \mathbf{N} . We begin by reviewing the notion of a clone as an ω -sorted algebra – namely, a sequence $\{T(n) : n \in \omega\}$ of sets whose elements are to be interpreted as functions or term-operations, along with operators that compose a function of arity n with n functions of arity m . We emphasise that this concrete and syntactic formulation of clones conforms to Lawvere's foundational perspective while also enabling the application of tools from classical universal algebra and equational logic. Next, we recall the notion of an algebra for a clone: a \mathbf{T} -algebra for a clone \mathbf{T} is a natural generalisation of a set equipped with a monoid action. Since the class of \mathbf{T} -algebras forms a variety of one-sorted algebras, this concept gives rise to a fundamental duality between clones and varieties of one-sorted algebras.

We then turn our attention to an equationally defined class of clones that we refer to as ‘partition clones’, for reasons that will become evident later. The axiomatisation of this class was inspired by recent works in algebraic logic aimed at generalising classical propositional logic to the case of an arbitrary finite number of symmetric truth values [8, 21, 7]. These studies draw heavily on the analysis of the if-then-else operator in programming, first initiated in [18] and further developed in e.g. [13, 17]. A precursor to this line of research is, of course, the axiomatisation of Boolean algebras using the if-then-else operator as primitive [11].

An important class of partition clones arises as follows: given a Boolean algebra B , the set of finite sequences of elements of B that are pairwise disjoint and whose join equals the top element of B forms a partition clone. For example, when B is the two-element Boolean algebra, this construction precisely yields the clone \mathbf{N} . The main contribution of this paper is a completeness result: every partition clone $\mathbf{P} = \{P(n) : n \in \omega\}$ can be obtained by applying the above construction to $P(2)$, which we show to have the structure of a Boolean algebra. This result follows as a consequence of a theorem establishing an equivalence of categories between Boolean algebras and partition clones. A key ingredient in proving this equivalence is the idea of associating to each $x \in P(n)$ a sequence $(x[1], \dots, x[n]) \in P(2)$, the coordinates of x , to represent x in the Boolean algebra $P(2)$.

Besides the categorical equivalence, partition clones also share key algebraic and structural properties with Boolean algebras. By adapting and generalising the well-known argument that establishes that the two-element Boolean algebra is the only subdirectly irreducible one, we show that \mathbf{N} is the only subdirectly irreducible partition clone. Applying a celebrated result of Birkhoff, we conclude that every partition clone is a subdirect product of \mathbf{N} , and consequently, that the variety of partition clones is generated by \mathbf{N} . This result allows for a reformulation of Theorem 1.1: since \mathbf{N} is the only subdirectly irreducible partition clone, Birkhoff's theorem implies that every partition clone embeds into some power of \mathbf{N} . Thus, Theorem 1.1 can be restated as follows: let $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{A})$ be the polymorphism clone of a finite relational structure \mathcal{A} . Then, $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{A})$ is NP-complete if there exists a homomorphism $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ for some partition clone \mathbf{P} , and polynomial-time solvable otherwise.

Since \mathbf{N} is the minimal nondegenerate clone, the variety generated by \mathbf{N} is the unique atom in the lattice of subvarieties of clones. Varieties of clones are an interesting object of study in their own right, as they naturally model the concept of an “equationally defined class of varieties”, and they are indeed known as hypervarieties

(a detailed discussion of this concept can be found in the paragraphs following Theorem 4.2). It follows immediately that the variety of partition clones is the unique atom in the lattice of hypervarieties.

The natural question of determining what are the algebra for a partition clone arises. To answer this, we first take a brief detour to introduce some concepts and results from Bergman's well-known paper [4]. In this work, Bergman provides axioms for the action of a Boolean algebra B on a set, called a B -set, and establishes a sheaf representation of these structures. We prove that for any partition clone \mathbf{P} , the \mathbf{P} -algebras are precisely sets equipped with an action of the Boolean algebra $P(2)$. We note that Bergman had already shown that the class of B -sets, as B ranges over Boolean algebras, forms a minimal nontrivial hypervariety, and therefore our results give an alternative proof of this fact.

Content of the paper. In Section 2 we provide preliminary material on many-sorted algebras and the theory of clones. In Section 3 we introduce our equational definition of partition clones (Definition 3.1), which is central to the development of the paper and serves as the basis for most of the results. Then, we present the main example of a partition clone – namely, the partitions of the top element of a Boolean algebra – and define the Boolean algebra associated with a partition clone. This association is functorial and leads to an equivalence of categories (Theorem 3.11). In Section 4 we introduce the concept of hypervariety and establish two results: (i) the variety of partition clones is generated by \mathbf{N} (Theorem 4.2), and (ii) the variety of partition clones forms an atom in the lattice of hypervarieties (Theorem 4.4). In the final section we show that the algebras for a partition clone are precisely sets equipped with an action of a Boolean algebra (see Definition 5.1 and Theorem 5.8).

2. PRELIMINARIES

For background material on universal algebra, the reader is referred to [10]. We quickly fix notations and definitions on many-sorted algebras. For further details the interested reader can consult the survey [22]. Let I be a set; a I -sorted set is a family of sets $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ indexed by I . The notions of function, subset, relation and product are defined componentwise. An I -sorted signature Φ is an $(I^{<\omega} \times I)$ -sorted set whose components are pairwise disjoint (observe that we denote by $I^{<\omega}$ the set of all finite sequences of elements of I). We say that $f \in \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_n, i}$ is an operation symbol of arity (i_1, \dots, i_n) and type i . Given an I -sorted signature Φ , a Φ -algebra is an I -sorted set A together with an $(I^{<\omega} \times I)$ -indexed family of functions such that for every operation symbol $f \in \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_n, i}$ there is a function $f^A : A_{i_1} \times \dots \times A_{i_n} \rightarrow A_i$. Homomorphisms, subalgebras, congruences and products of Φ -algebras are defined as expected. We recall two important adaptations to the many-sorted case of classic results due to Birkhoff that will play a prominent role in what follows; for the terminology of Theorem 2.1 see [25].

Theorem 2.1 (Birkhoff's Theorem, [25]). *Let Φ be an I -sorted signature. Every Φ -algebra is isomorphic to a subdirect product of a family of subdirectly irreducible Φ -algebras.*

Theorem 2.2 (Birkhoff's Variety Theorem, [3]). *Let Φ be an I -sorted signature. The equational classes of Φ -algebras are precisely the classes of Φ -algebras closed under products, subalgebras, surjective homomorphisms, and directed unions.*

2.1. Clones. In what follows we will be exclusively interested in the following example of many-sorted, in fact ω -sorted, algebra.

Definition 2.3. A *clone* is a family of sets $\{T(n) : n \in \omega\}$ together with distinguished elements $e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n \in T(n)$ for $n \geq 1$, and a family of operations $q_m^n : T(n) \times T(m)^n \rightarrow T(m)$ obeying the following identities:

C1: $q_m^n(x, e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n) = x$ for all $n \geq 1$;

C2: $q_m^n(e_i^n, x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$;

C3: $q_m^n(q_n^k(x, y_1, \dots, y_k), z_1, \dots, z_n) = q_m^k(x, q_m^n(y_1, z_1, \dots, z_n), \dots, q_m^n(y_k, z_1, \dots, z_n))$.

As a matter of notation, we shall denote a clone by a boldface capital letter, e.g. \mathbf{T} .

A clone is a Φ -algebra where $\Phi := \{q_m^n : n, m \in \omega\} \cup \{e_i^n : n \geq 1, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$; each q_m^n has arity (n, m, \dots, m) and type m , and each e_i^n has arity \emptyset and type n . As the class of clones is described by a set of equations, by Theorem 2.2, this class forms a variety of Φ -algebras that we will denote by \mathcal{C} .

Example 2.4. Consider the clone \mathbf{I} such that $I(n) = \{*\}$ for each $n \in \omega$. This is terminal in the variety \mathcal{C} , and is one of the two degenerate clones, the other being the subclone \mathbf{I}' of \mathbf{I} given by

$$I'(n) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \{*\} & \text{if } n \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

The simplest example of a nondegenerate clone is the clone of projections, i.e. the clone where $T(0) = \emptyset$ and $T(n) = \{e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n\}$, for each $n \geq 1$. This clone, denoted by \mathbf{N} , is initial in the variety \mathcal{C} .

Remark 2.5. The category of clones is equivalent to the category of (finitary, one-sorted) algebraic theories. An algebraic theory is a category \mathbb{T} with a countable set of objects $\{x^n : n \in \omega\}$ such that x^n is the n -th power of an object x . Given an algebraic theory \mathbb{T} , let $T(n) := \mathbb{T}(x^n, x)$. Then $\{T(n) : n \in \omega\}$ is a clone with e_i^n given by the projections $\pi_i^n : x^n \rightarrow x$ and $q_m^n : \mathbb{T}(x^n, x) \times \mathbb{T}(x^m, x)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(x^m, x)$ given by composition, modulo the identification $\mathbb{T}(x^m, x^n) \simeq \mathbb{T}(x^m, x)^n$. Every algebraic theory arises in this way.

Standard references for the categorical approach to universal algebra through algebraic theories are [6, Chapter 2] and [2].

Definition 2.6. Let \mathbf{T} be a clone. A \mathbf{T} -algebra is a set A together with, for each $n \in \omega$, a left action $\alpha_n : T(n) \times A^n \rightarrow A$ such that $\alpha_n(e_i^n, a_1, \dots, a_n) = a_i$ when $n \geq 1$, and such that for each $x \in T(n), x_1, \dots, x_n \in T(m)$ and for each $\bar{a} \in A^m$

$$(\alpha) \quad \alpha_m(q_m^n(x, x_1, \dots, x_n), \bar{a}) = \alpha_n(x, \alpha_m(x_1, \bar{a}), \dots, \alpha_m(x_n, \bar{a})).$$

Otherwise stated, the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(n) \times T(m)^n \times A^m & \longrightarrow & T(n) \times A^n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T(m) \times A^m & \longrightarrow & A \end{array}$$

For each m , the set $T(m)$ is a \mathbf{T} -algebra with the action α_n given by q_m^n , $n \in \omega$. We call $T(m)$ the *free \mathbf{T} -algebra on m generators*.

Example 2.7. Referring to Example 2.4, a \mathbf{N} -algebra is just a set. The only algebra for the clone \mathbf{I} is the singleton, while an \mathbf{I}' -algebra can be either empty or a singleton.

2.2. Varieties. The foregoing section is just an alternative view of the more familiar universal-algebraic concept of variety. To justify this claim, let Σ be a (one-sorted, finitary) signature of operation symbols, and consider a variety \mathcal{V} of Σ -algebras. For each $n \in \omega$, let $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(n)$ be the free algebra of \mathcal{V} generated by n generators v_1^n, \dots, v_n^n and let $\text{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V})$ be its underlying set. An element t of $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is usually called a term-operation; t is a term in the signature Σ modulo the congruence generated by the equations defining \mathcal{V} . The ω -sorted set $\text{Clo}(\mathcal{V}) := \{\text{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V}) : n \in \omega\}$ can be endowed with the structure of clone as follows: for each n, m and $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $e_i^n := v_i^n \in \text{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V})$ and define $q_m^n(t, s_1, \dots, s_n)$ to be the m -ary term-operation obtained by substituting s_1, \dots, s_n into t .

Conversely, given a clone \mathbf{T} , let Σ be the signature defined by $\Sigma_n := T(n)$, for each $n \in \omega$. Clearly, each \mathbf{T} -algebra is a Σ -algebra in the usual sense with the interpretation of the operation symbols given by the action. Let $\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})$ be the class of \mathbf{T} -algebras; as $\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})$ is closed under products, subalgebras and homomorphic images, $\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})$ is a variety. Therefore for each clone \mathbf{T} we can construct a variety of algebras over a signature in the usual universal-algebraic sense. Moreover, remark that for every $n \in \omega$ the underlying set of the free algebra $\mathbf{F}_{\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})}(n)$ generated by a finite set n of generators, coincides with $T(n)$, justifying our earlier definition.

Clearly, given a signature Σ , the class of Σ -algebras forms a category, of which a variety \mathcal{V} of Σ -algebras is a full subcategory. If \mathcal{V} is a variety of Σ -algebras and \mathcal{V}' is a variety of Σ' -algebras we define a morphism of varieties to be a *concrete functor*, i.e. an underlying-set preserving functor $H : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$.

The proof of the following result is only sketched; a deeper categorical version of this fact can be found in [2, Theorem 11.38]; cf. also [1].

Theorem 2.8. *The category \mathbf{Clone} of clones and clone homomorphisms is dually equivalent to the category \mathbf{Var} of varieties and concrete functors. In particular, there is an isomorphism $\mathbf{T}_1 \simeq \mathbf{T}_2$ iff there is a concrete equivalence between the varieties of \mathbf{T}_1 -algebras and \mathbf{T}_2 -algebras respectively.*

Proof. We already have two assignments $\mathbf{Clo}(-) : \mathbf{Var} \rightarrow \mathbf{Clone}$ and $\mathbf{Var}(-) : \mathbf{Clone} \rightarrow \mathbf{Var}$ on the objects. Given a homomorphism $\varphi : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}'$ by precomposing φ with the action we immediately get a functor $\mathbf{Var}(\varphi) : \mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{T}') \rightarrow \mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{T})$. Conversely, given a concrete functor $H : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ between a variety of Σ -algebras and a variety of Σ' -algebras, we construct a homomorphism of clones $\mathbf{Clo}(H) : \mathbf{Clo}(\mathcal{V}') \rightarrow \mathbf{Clo}(\mathcal{V})$ as follows. As H preserves carriers, the image of $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(n)$ under H is a Σ' -algebra with underlying set $\mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V})$. We define $\mathbf{Clo}(H) : \mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V}') \rightarrow \mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V})$ by induction on the complexity of $t \in \mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V}')$. We are forced to define $\mathbf{Clo}(H)(v_i^n) = v_i^n$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. For every operation symbol $f' \in \Sigma'_n$, and $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V}')$, we define $\mathbf{Clo}(H)(f'(s_1, \dots, s_n)) := f'(\mathbf{Clo}(H)(s_1), \dots, \mathbf{Clo}(H)(s_n))$, which is a well-defined term-operation of $\mathbf{Clo}_n(\mathcal{V})$. The fact that $\mathbf{Clo}(\mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{T})) \simeq \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{Clo}(\mathcal{V})) \simeq \mathcal{V}$ is left to the reader. \square

3. PARTITION CLONES

In this section we define and study a subvariety of the variety of clones; quite surprisingly, this subvariety bears strong algebraic similarities with the variety of Boolean algebras. We shall show that this subvariety satisfies all and only the identities satisfied by the clone \mathbf{N} of projections.

Definition 3.1. A *partition clone* is a clone satisfying the additional identities:

$$\mathbf{C4:} \quad q_m^n(x, y, \dots, y) = y;$$

$$\mathbf{C5:} \quad q_m^n(q_n^k(x, y_1, \dots, y_k), q_m^k(x, z_1^1, \dots, z_1^k), \dots, q_m^k(x, z_n^1, \dots, z_n^k)) = q_m^k(x, q_m^n(y_1, z_1^1, \dots, z_1^k), \dots, q_m^n(y_k, z_1^k, \dots, z_n^k)).$$

First of all, we derive a pair of useful identities.

Lemma 3.2. *In a partition clone, the following identities hold:*

$$\mathbf{C6:} \quad q_m^n(y, q_m^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_m^n(y, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^n)) = q_m^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^n);$$

$$\mathbf{C7:} \quad q_k^n(y, q_k^m(x, x_1^1, \dots, x_1^m), \dots, q_k^m(x, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^m)) = q_k^m(x, q_k^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_k^n(y, x_1^m, \dots, x_n^m)).$$

Proof. As to the first

$$\begin{aligned} & q_m^n(y, q_m^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_m^n(y, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^n)) \\ &= q_m^n(q_n^n(y, e_n^1, \dots, e_n^n), q_m^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_m^n(y, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^n)) \end{aligned} \quad (\mathbf{C1})$$

$$= q_m^n(y, q_m^n(e_n^1, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_m^n(e_n^n, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^n)) \quad (\mathbf{C5})$$

$$= q_m^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^n) \quad (\mathbf{C2})$$

and for the second

$$\begin{aligned} & q_k^n(y, q_k^m(x, x_1^1, \dots, x_1^m), \dots, q_k^m(x, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^m)) \\ &= q_k^m(q_m^n(y, x, \dots, x), q_k^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_k^n(y, x_1^m, \dots, x_n^m)) \end{aligned} \quad (\mathbf{C5})$$

$$= q_k^m(x, q_k^n(y, x_1^1, \dots, x_n^1), \dots, q_k^n(y, x_1^m, \dots, x_n^m)). \quad (\mathbf{C4}) \quad \square$$

Remark 3.3. Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone, and let $\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})$ be the variety corresponding to \mathbf{T} in the duality of Theorem 2.8. Then (C4) asserts that every term-operation t of $\text{Var}(\mathbf{T})$ is idempotent, while (C7) asserts that every two term-operations commute.

Remark 3.4. Observe that (C3) is a consequence of (C4) and (C5):

$$\begin{aligned} q_m^n(q_n^k(x, y_1, \dots, y_k), z_1, \dots, z_n) \\ = q_m^n(q_n^k(x, y_1, \dots, y_k), q_m^k(x, z_1, \dots, z_1), \dots, q_m^k(x, z_n, \dots, z_n)) \end{aligned} \quad (C4)$$

$$= q_m^k(x, q_m^n(y_1, z_1, \dots, z_n), \dots, q_m^n(y_k, z_1, \dots, z_n)). \quad (C5)$$

The prototypical example of a partition clone.

Lemma 3.5. *Let B be a Boolean algebra, and let*

$$B(n) = \{(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B^n : b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_n = 1, b_i \wedge b_j = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j\}.$$

Then $\mathbf{P}_B := \{B(n) : n \in \omega\}$ is a partition clone with $e_1^n = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, e_n^n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and

$$q_m^n \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} y_1^1 \\ \vdots \\ y_m^1 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} y_1^n \\ \vdots \\ y_m^n \end{bmatrix} \right) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n (x_i \wedge y_1^i), \dots, \bigvee_{i=1}^n (x_i \wedge y_m^i) \right).$$

We call \mathbf{P}_B the *partition-of-unity* clone of B . If 2 is the two-element Boolean algebra, then the partition-of-unity clone of 2 is isomorphic to the clone of projections \mathbf{N} . In particular, \mathbf{N} is a partition clone. The Boolean algebra associated with a partition clone.

Lemma 3.6. *Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone, then the set $T(2)$ with the operations:*

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &:= e_1^2; & x \wedge y &:= q_2^2(x, y, 0); & \neg x &:= q_2^2(x, 0, 1); \\ 0 &:= e_2^2; & x \vee y &:= q_2^2(x, 1, y) \end{aligned}$$

is a Boolean algebra.

Proof. We shall write q in place of q_2^2 . We derive the following identities:

$$(x \wedge y) \wedge z = x \wedge (y \wedge z) : \quad q(q(x, y, 0), z, 0) = q(x, q(y, z, 0), q(0, z, 0)) \quad (C3)$$

$$= q(x, q(y, z, 0), 0) \quad (C2)$$

$$x \wedge y = y \wedge x : \quad q(x, y, 0) = q(x, q(y, 1, 0), q(y, 0, 0)) \quad (C1), (C4)$$

$$= q(y, q(x, 1, 0), q(x, 0, 0)) \quad (C7)$$

$$= q(y, x, 0) \quad (C1), (C4)$$

$$x \wedge x = x : \quad q(x, x, 0) = q(x, q(x, 1, 0), q(x, 0, 0)) \quad (C1), (C4)$$

$$= q(x, 1, 0) \quad (C6)$$

$$= x \quad (C1)$$

$$x \vee (x \wedge y) = x : \quad q(x, 1, q(x, y, 0)) = q(x, q(x, 1, 1), q(x, y, 0)) \quad (C4)$$

$$= q(x, 1, 0) \quad (C6)$$

$$= x \quad (C1)$$

$$(x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z) = x \wedge (y \vee z) : \quad q(q(x, y, 0), 1, q(x, z, 0)) = q(q(x, y, 0), q(x, 1, 1), q(x, z, 0)) \quad (C4)$$

$$= q(x, q(y, 1, z), q(0, 1, 0)) \quad (C5)$$

$$= q(x, q(y, 1, z), 0) \quad (C1)$$

$$x \wedge 0 = 0 : \quad q(x, 0, 0) = 0 \quad (C4)$$

$$x \wedge \neg x = 0 : \quad q(x, q(x, 0, 1), 0) = q(x, q(x, 0, 1), q(x, 0, 0)) \quad (C4)$$

$$= q(x, 0, 0) \quad (C6)$$

$$= 0 \quad (C4)$$

The other identities defining Boolean algebras are derived completely analogously. \square

In [11] it is shown that the variety of Boolean algebras can be presented using two nullary operations, 0 and 1, and a ternary operation q called ‘if-then-else operator’ or ‘conditional disjunction’. Expressed in terms of the Boolean operators, conditional disjunction is the following ternary function: $q(a, x, y) = (a \wedge x) \vee (\neg a \wedge y)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Identities (C1) to (C5), restricted to $k = n = m = 2$, constitute an axiomatisation of Boolean algebras in the signature $(q, 0, 1)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. \square

The representation theorem. We have shown in Lemma 3.6 that a partition clone induces a Boolean algebra; we now show a completeness result: every partition clone arises as the partition-of-unity clone of a Boolean algebra B .

Definition 3.8. Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone, and let $x \in T(n)$. The following elements of $T(2)$ are called the *coordinates* of x :

$$x[1] := q_2^n(x, e_1^2, e_2^2, \dots, e_2^2), x[2] := q_2^n(x, e_2^2, e_1^2, e_2^2, \dots, e_2^2), \dots, x[n] := q_2^n(x, e_2^2, \dots, e_2^2, e_1^2).$$

Trivially, in the partition-of-unity clone of a Boolean algebra B , the i -th coordinate of (b_1, \dots, b_n) is $(b_i, \neg b_i)$.

The next proposition shows in particular the fact that any element of a partition clone is completely determined by its coordinates.

Proposition 3.9. *Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone and let B be the Boolean algebra $T(2)$. The following hold:*

- (1) *if $x \in T(n)$, then $(x[1], \dots, x[n]) \in B(n)$;*
- (2) *for $x, y \in T(n)$, if $x[i] = y[i]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $x = y$;*
- (3) *for every $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B(n)$, there is $x \in T(n)$ such that $x[i] = b_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. Regarding the first item, the fact that $x[i] \wedge x[j] = 0$ for each $i \neq j$ follows applying (C4) and (C5); that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n x[i] = 1$$

follows from associating the disjunction to the right and repeatedly applying (C5). For the second item, assume that $x[i] = y[i]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We show that this assumption is enough to derive that $x = y$. We start by rewriting x as $q_n^n(x, e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n)$. Now, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, e_i^n can be rewritten as follows (for the sake of simplicity we perform this calculation with $i = 1$):

$$e_1^n = q_n^n(y, e_1^n, \dots, e_1^n) \tag{C4}$$

$$= q_n^n(y, q_n^2(e_1^2, e_1^n, e_1^n), q_n^2(e_2^2, e_2^n, e_1^n), \dots, q_n^2(e_n^2, e_n^n, e_1^n)) \tag{C2}$$

$$= q_n^2(y[1], q_n^n(y, e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n), q_n^n(y, e_1^n, \dots, e_1^n)) \tag{C5}$$

$$= q_n^2(y[1], y, e_1^n) \tag{(C1), (C4)}$$

$$= q_n^2(x[1], y, e_1^n) \tag{(C3)}$$

$$= q_n^n(x, q_n^2(e_1^2, y, e_1^n), q_n^2(e_2^2, y, e_1^n), \dots, q_n^2(e_n^2, y, e_1^n)) \tag{(C3)}$$

$$= q_n^n(x, y, e_1^n, \dots, e_1^n) \tag{(C2)}$$

and therefore substituting each e_i^n in $q_n^n(x, e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n)$ we see that

$$x = q_n^n(x, q_n^n(x, y, e_1^n, \dots, e_1^n), \dots, q_n^n(x, e_n^n, \dots, e_n^n, y)) = q_n^n(x, y, \dots, y) = y$$

by virtue of (C6) and (C4).

Finally, we prove the third item. The proof is by induction on n . If $n = 1$, then the set of partitions is $\{e_1^1\}$ and therefore $x = e_1^1$. Assume that the result holds for $n - 1$, and let $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B(n)$. By inductive assumption there is $y \in T(n - 1)$ such that $y[1] = b_1 \vee b_2$ and $y[i] = b_{i+1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Let $x := q_n^2(b_1, e_1^n, q_n^{n-1}(y, e_2^n, \dots, e_n^n))$. We prove that $x[i] = b_i$; we separate the case $i = 1$, which does not depend on the inductive assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} x[1] &= q_2^n(q_n^2(b_1, e_1^n, q_n^{n-1}(y, e_2^n, \dots, e_n^n)), e_1^2, \dots, e_2^2) && \text{by def.} \\ &= q_2^2(b_1, e_1^n[1], q_2^n(q_n^{n-1}(y, e_2^n, \dots, e_n^n), e_1^2, \dots, e_2^2)) && (C3) \\ &= q_2^2(b_1, e_1^2, q_2^{n-1}(y, e_2^2, \dots, e_2^2)) && (C2), (C3) \\ &= q_2^2(b_1, e_1^2, e_2^2) && (C4) \\ &= b_1 && (C1) \end{aligned}$$

from the case $i \neq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} x[i] &= q_2^n(q_n^2(b_1, e_1^n, q_n^{n-1}(y, e_2^n, \dots, e_n^n)), e_2^2, \dots, e_1^2, \dots, e_2^2) && \text{by def.} \\ &= q_2^2(b_1, e_1^n[i], q_2^n(q_n^{n-1}(y, e_2^n, \dots, e_n^n), e_2^2, \dots, e_1^2, \dots, e_2^2)) && (C3) \\ &= q_2^2(b_1, e_2^2, y[i - 1]) && (C2), (C3) \\ &= \neg b_1 \wedge y[i - 1] \\ &= \neg b_1 \wedge b_i && \text{by ind.} \end{aligned}$$

for all $2 \leq i \leq n$, but $\neg b_1 \wedge b_i = b_i$ as $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B(n)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.10. Explicitly, the element $x \in T(n)$ whose coordinates are (b_1, \dots, b_n) is given by

$$q_n^2(b_1, e_1^n, q_n^2(b_2, \dots, q_n^2(b_{n-1}, e_{n-1}^n, e_n^n))).$$

Theorem 3.11. *The category of partition clones is equivalent to the category of Boolean algebras.*

Proof. We have all the ingredients to explicitly construct the equivalence. With a Boolean algebra B , we associate the partition-of-unity clone $\mathbf{P}_B = \{B(n) : n \in \omega\}$ of B . Conversely, with a partition clone \mathbf{T} , we associate the Boolean algebra $B_T := T(2)$ of Lemma 3.6. These assignments extend naturally to homomorphisms of Boolean algebras and clones, respectively. Given a Boolean algebra B , the map $B \rightarrow B(2)$, $b \mapsto (b, \neg b)$, is an isomorphism. Conversely, given a partition clone \mathbf{T} , we define, for each $n \in \omega$, the function $\varphi : T(n) \rightarrow B_T(n)$, $\varphi(x) = (x[1], \dots, x[n])$, associating to x its coordinates. First observe that φ is well-defined by Lemma 3.9 (a) and bijective by Lemma 3.9 (b), (c). We prove that φ is a homomorphism. First of all, letting $0 := e_2^2$ and $1 := e_1^2$,

$$(\star) \quad q_m^n(\varphi(x), \varphi(y_1), \dots, \varphi(y_n)) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n (\varphi(x)_i \wedge \varphi(y_i)_1), \dots, \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\varphi(x)_i \wedge \varphi(y_i)_m) \right)$$

and, consequently, using the definition of φ and the definition of \wedge :

$$q_m^n(\varphi(x), \varphi(y_1), \dots, \varphi(y_n)) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n q_2^2(x[i], y_i[1], 0), \dots, \bigvee_{i=1}^n q_2^2(x[i], y_i[m], 0) \right).$$

Applying (C3) and (C2) it is not difficult to see that the first component of (\star) is equal to $Y_1 \vee Y_2 \vee \dots \vee Y_n$, where

$$Y_1 := q_2^n(x, y_1[1], 0, \dots, 0), Y_2 := q_2^n(x, 0, y_2[1], \dots, 0), \dots, Y_n := q_2^n(x, 0, \dots, 0, y_n[1]).$$

Associating the disjunction on the right, we immediately see that

$$Y_1 \vee (\dots \vee (Y_{n-1} \vee Y_n)) = q_2^2(Y_1, 1, q_2^2(\dots q_2^2(Y_{n-1}, 1, Y_n))).$$

We rewrite the rightmost disjunction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} q_2^2(Y_{n-1}, 1, Y_n) &= q_2^2(q_2^n(x, 0, \dots, y_{n-1}[1], 0), q_2^n(x, 1, \dots, 1), q_2^n(x, 0, \dots, 0, y_n[1])) \\ &= q_2^2(x, q_2^2(0, 1, 0), \dots, q_2^2(0, 1, 0), q_2^2(y_{n-1}[1], 1, 0), q_2^2(0, 1, y_n[1])) \\ &= q_2^n(x, 0, \dots, 0, y_{n-1}[1], y_n[1]). \end{aligned}$$

Repeatedly applying the same trick from right to left we obtain that

$$Y_1 \vee (\cdots (Y_{n-1} \vee Y_n)) = q_2^n(x, y_1[1], \dots, y_n[1]).$$

Proceeding similarly for every component of (\star) , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} q_m^n(\varphi(x), \varphi(y_1), \dots, \varphi(y_n)) &= (q_2^n(x, y_1[1], \dots, y_n[1]), \dots, q_2^n(x, y_1[m], \dots, y_n[m])) \\ &= (q_m^n(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)[1], \dots, q_m^n(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)[m]) \\ &= \varphi(q_m^n(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

As a consequence the following representation theorem holds.

Corollary 3.12. *Every partition clone \mathbf{T} is isomorphic to the partition-of-unity clone of the Boolean algebra $T(2)$.*

4. HYPERVARIETIES

We recall the following definitions for an algebra \mathbf{A} :

- \mathbf{A} is *directly indecomposable* if it cannot be expressed as an isomorphic product of two nontrivial algebras;
- \mathbf{A} is *subdirectly irreducible* if its lattice of congruences possesses a unique nontrivial minimal element;
- \mathbf{A} is *simple* if its lattice of congruences is isomorphic of the two-element chain $\{\Delta < \nabla\}$.

Stone famously proved that $2 = \{0, 1\}$ is the unique nontrivial directly indecomposable Boolean algebra. Consequently, 2 is also the only subdirectly irreducible Boolean algebra (and, incidentally, the only simple Boolean algebra). By Theorem 2.1, this implies that every Boolean algebra is isomorphic to a subdirect power of 2 . As a consequence, the variety of Boolean algebras is generated by 2 .

The first purpose of this section is to lift these considerations to the theory of partition clones. Here the role of the Boolean algebra 2 is played by the clone of projections, which corresponds to 2 in the equivalence of Theorem 3.11.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbf{T} is simple;
- (2) \mathbf{T} is subdirectly irreducible;
- (3) \mathbf{T} is directly indecomposable;
- (4) $\mathbf{T} \simeq \mathbf{N}$.

Proof. The implications (1) \implies (2) and (2) \implies (3) are standard. (It is easy to see that the argument for single-sorted algebras lifts to the many-sorted case; at any rate, cf. [25, Proposition 4.8]). We now prove that $\neg(4) \implies \neg(3)$. Up to passing to coordinates, we can assume that the clone \mathbf{T} is the partition-of-unity clone of a Boolean algebra B . Let $a := (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in T(n)$, with a different from e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n . This implies that there exists i such that $b_i \notin \{0, 1\}$. Letting $c := b_i$, and consequently having $\neg c = \bigvee \{a_k : k \neq i\}$, it is a standard fact regarding Boolean algebras that $B \simeq B/\theta(c, 1) \times B/\theta(c, 0)$, where $\theta(c, 1)$ (resp. $\theta(c, 0)$) is the smallest congruence identifying c and 1 (resp. c and 0). To conclude the argument, observe that if $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in T(n)$, then, $(b_1, \dots, b_n, 0, \dots, 0) \in T(m)$ for all $m > n$. Therefore, for each n we have a decomposition of $T(n)$ in (at least) two factors and \mathbf{T} is not directly indecomposable. To prove that (4) \implies (1), assume that $\mathbf{T} \simeq \mathbf{N}$, and let θ be a congruence of \mathbf{T} different than Δ . Then there is $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ such that $(e_i^n, e_j^n) \in \theta$. But then for all $m \in \omega$ and all $x, y \in T(m)$

$$(q_m^n(e_i^n, z_1, \dots, z_n), q_m^n(e_j^n, z_1, \dots, z_n)) \in \theta$$

where z_1, \dots, z_n are any elements of $T(m)$ such that $z_i = x$ and $z_j = y$, so that, in light of (C2), $(x, y) \in \theta$, i.e. $\theta = \nabla$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *The variety of partition clones is generated by the clone of projections \mathbf{N} .*

Proof. By the previous lemma the only directly indecomposable, and *a fortiori* (by [25, Proposition 4.8]) the only subdirectly irreducible partition clone is \mathbf{N} . By Theorem 2.1, a variety is generated by its subdirectly irreducible algebras. \square

Let \mathcal{V} be a variety over some single-sorted signature Σ . A subclass \mathcal{W} of \mathcal{V} is called a *subvariety* if it is a variety in its own right. The family of all subvarieties of a given variety \mathcal{V} forms a lattice under set-theoretical inclusion, and the examination of such lattices is an entrancing matter. This lattice is always bounded, with \mathcal{V} as the top element and the subvariety of degenerate algebras as the bottom element. The bottom element consists of $\{\emptyset, 1\}$ if there are no nullary operations, or $\{1\}$ if such operations exist. For example, the lattice of varieties of monoids exhibits a rich and intricate structure, which is comprehensively described in [14]. In contrast, the lattice of varieties of Boolean algebras is much simpler: directly above the degenerate variety lies the entire variety of Boolean algebras, since it is generated by the initial algebra $\mathbf{2}$.

Some of these considerations also apply to varieties of many-sorted algebras. In particular, subvarieties of the many-sorted variety of clones are of special interest.

Definition 4.3. A subvariety of the variety \mathcal{C} of clones is called a *hypervariety*.

Through Theorem 2.2 and the duality of Theorem 2.8, we can view a hypervariety as an “equational class of varieties” or, equivalently, a “variety of varieties”. Explicitly, a variety of one-sorted algebras \mathcal{V} “belongs to” a hypervariety \mathcal{H} if $\text{Clo}(\mathcal{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$. The concept of a “variety of varieties” was first introduced by Neumann in 1978 [20], albeit in a slightly different form. We refer the reader to [23] for a proof that Neumann’s original definition and the one presented here are equivalent, as well as for other useful results.

As an example, keeping in mind Remark 3.3, we note that the variety of clones satisfying (C4) is the class of all varieties in which every term-operation t is idempotent. Since the join and meet operations are idempotent, lattices belong to the hypervariety of idempotent algebras (i.e. algebras in which every term-operation is idempotent). Similarly, the variety of clones satisfying (C7) represents the class of all varieties in which every term-operation commutes with every other term-operation. These are referred to as commutative varieties. Examples of commutative varieties include Abelian groups and, more generally, modules over a commutative ring.

We have all the ingredients to present the next result.

Theorem 4.4. *The least nontrivial element in the lattice of hypervarieties is the variety of partition clones.*

Proof. The variety of partition clones is nontrivial; as it is generated by the initial clone \mathbf{N} , it lies below every nondegenerate variety. \square

5. ALGEBRAS FOR A PARTITION CLONE

This section answers the following question: let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone, what is a \mathbf{T} -algebra? We answer in Theorem 5.8. We first recall and revise the essential properties of a variety of algebras introduced by George M. Bergman in 1991 [4].

5.1. Boolean algebras acting on sets.

Definition 5.1 ([4], Definition 7). Let B be a Boolean algebra. A *B-set* is a set X together with a function $B \times X^2 \rightarrow X$ satisfying the following requirements:

$$\mathbf{B1:} \quad b(x, x) = x;$$

$$\mathbf{B2:} \quad b(b(x, y), z) = b(x, z);$$

$$\mathbf{B3:} \quad b(x, b(y, z)) = b(x, z);$$

B4: $1(x, y) = x;$

B5: $\neg b(x, y) = b(y, x);$

B6: $(b \wedge c)(x, y) = b(c(x, y), y).$

Let Σ be the signature with $\Sigma_2 := B$ and $\Sigma_n := \emptyset$ for each $n \neq 2$. Then the class of B -sets is a variety of algebras over Σ presented by the equations (B1)-(B6).

Remark 5.2. A *rectangular band* is a set endowed with a binary operation \cdot satisfying the following identities: $x \cdot x = x, x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z, (x \cdot y) \cdot (z \cdot w) = x \cdot w$. These equations are readily seen to be equivalent to $x \cdot x = x, x \cdot (y \cdot z) = x \cdot z, (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot z$. In particular, if X is endowed with a B -set structure, then each $b \in \Sigma_2$ makes X into a rectangular band. An example of rectangular band operation is the following: let $X := A^2$ for some set A and let $(a, b) \cdot (c, d) = (a, d)$. Every rectangular band operation arises in this way (cf. [4, Proposition 4]).

Lemma 5.3. *Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone, and let $B := T(2)$ be the Boolean algebra of Lemma 3.6. Then a \mathbf{T} -algebra is a B -set.*

Proof. Let $\Sigma_n := T(n)$ be the one-sorted signature associated with the clone \mathbf{T} . Let \mathcal{K} be the variety of \mathbf{T} -algebras seen as a class of algebras over the signature Σ . Let Σ' be the signature of B -sets, i.e. $\Sigma'_2 = B$ and $\Sigma'_i = \emptyset$ for $i \neq 2$. Consider the reduct \mathcal{K}' of \mathcal{K} to the signature $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$. We prove that \mathcal{K}' satisfies the identities (B1)-(B6). To do this it is enough to prove that the free \mathcal{K} -algebra $T(2)$ satisfies (B1), (B4)-(B6), which is obvious; and that $T(3)$ satisfies (B2), (B3). We only prove (B2), leaving the verification of (B3) to the reader:

$$q_3^2(b, q_3^2(b, x, y), z) = q_3^2(b, q_3^2(b, x, y), q_3^2(b, z, z)) = q_3^2(b, x, z)$$

thanks to (C6), as desired. □

We now embark on the proof of the converse statement. This goes via Bergman's main result in [4], which we place under the appropriate light (Theorem 5.6 below). We first need some auxiliary concepts. We denote by $\text{Eq}(X)$ the set of equivalence relations on a set X .

Definition 5.4. An equivalence relation $\theta \in \text{Eq}(X)$ is called a *factor relation* if there is $\neg\theta \in \text{Eq}(X)$ such that $\theta \cap \neg\theta = \Delta, \theta \circ \neg\theta = \nabla$.

The non-trivial bits of the following observation can be found e.g. in [19, Section 4.4].

Lemma 5.5. *For a set X , there is a bijection between*

- (1) *functions $f : X^2 \rightarrow X$ such that*
 - (i) $f(x, x) = x;$
 - (ii) $f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, z);$
 - (iii) $f(x, f(y, z)) = f(x, z)$
- (2) *the structures of rectangular band with which X can be endowed;*
- (3) *factor relations on X ;*
- (4) *the decompositions of X into two factors: $X \simeq A \times B$.*

The next result was established in essence by Bergman in [4]. It can be seen as an enrichment of Lemma 5.5. The proof is only sketched as it can be reconstructed putting together Lemma 10, Theorem 12, Lemma 16 of *op. cit.*

Theorem 5.6. *For a set X , there is a bijection between:*

- (1) the sets F of functions from X^2 to X such that for each $f, g \in F$
- (i) $f(x, x) = x$;
 - (ii) $f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, z)$;
 - (iii) $f(x, f(y, z)) = f(x, z)$;
 - (iv) $f(g(x, y), g(z, w)) = g(f(x, z), f(y, w))$
- (2) the structures of B -set, B ranging over Boolean algebras, with which X can be endowed;
- (3) families of equivalence relations $\{\theta_b : b \in B\} \subseteq \text{Eq}(X)$, B ranging over Boolean algebras, satisfying:
- (a) $\theta_b \circ \theta_{\neg b} = \nabla$;
 - (b) $b \leq c \implies \theta_c \subseteq \theta_b$;
 - (c) $\theta_b \cap \theta_c \subseteq \theta_{b \vee c}$;
 - (d) $\theta_1 = \Delta$
- (4) sheaves $S : O(\text{Stone}(B))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$, B ranging over Boolean algebras, such that $X \simeq S(\text{Stone}(B))$.

Proof. Given a set F of functions satisfying the properties in (1), if we define $\neg f(x, y) := f(y, x)$ and $(f \wedge g)(x, y) := f(g(x, y), y)$ for every $f, g \in F$ we get a Boolean algebra structure on F . If B is a Boolean algebra acting on X , define $\theta_b := \{(x, y) : b(x, y) = y\}$ to obtain the desired family of equivalence relations. If B is a Boolean algebra, and $\{\theta_b : b \in B\}$ is a set of equivalence relations indexed by B satisfying the properties (a)-(d), construct $S : O(\text{Stone}(B))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ as follows. Recall that a basis for $\text{Stone}(B)$ is given by $\{U_b : b \in B\}$ where $U_b := \{U \in \text{Stone}(B) : b \in U\}$. Then define $S(U_b) := X/\theta_b$. Finally, let $S : O(\text{Stone}(B))^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ be a sheaf such that X is the set of global sections of S . Then for each U_b , the restriction maps $X \rightarrow S(U_b)$, $X \rightarrow S(U_{\neg b})$ constitute the projection maps of a product decomposition: $X \simeq S(U_b) \times S(U_{\neg b})$. For each $b \in B$ we define the function $b : X^2 \rightarrow X$ to be the rectangular band operation associated with this decomposition (cf. Remark 5.2). \square

Remark 5.7. Observe that by (c) and by induction we immediately get that for every $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$, $\theta_{b_1} \cap \dots \cap \theta_{b_n} \subseteq \theta_{b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_n}$. Moreover, by (b) and by $\theta_b \circ \theta_c \subseteq \theta_b \vee \theta_c$ (which is a general fact concerning equivalence relations) we immediately obtain $\theta_b \circ \theta_c \subseteq \theta_{b \wedge c}$.

The next result answers the question asked at the beginning of this section.

Theorem 5.8. *Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone. Then the class of \mathbf{T} -algebras is precisely the class of B -sets, where B is the Boolean algebra $T(2)$.*

Proof. One direction has already been proved in Lemma 5.3. For the other direction, let X be a B -set, and consider the partition-of-unity clone $\mathbf{P}_B = \{B(n) : n \in \omega\}$ of B . Now let $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B(n)$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X^n$. We define

$$\alpha_n \left(\begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{bmatrix}, x_1, \dots, x_n \right)$$

as the element z such that $(z, x_i) \in \theta_{b_i}$. By the constructions given in the proof of Theorem 5.6 z is such that $b_i(z, x_i) = x_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. First of all, observe that z is well-defined. Assume that there is another z' with $(z', x_i) \in \theta_{b_i}$ for every i . Then $(z', z) \in \theta_{b_i}$ for every i , so that $(z', z) \in \theta_{b_1} \cap \dots \cap \theta_{b_n} = \theta_{b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_n}$ by Remark 5.7, and $\theta_{b_1 \vee \dots \vee b_n} = \Delta$ by Theorem 5.6 3(d), proving that $z = z'$. As the unitality of this

action is trivial, it remains to prove that this definition satisfies (α) , i.e. for every $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B(n)$ and matrix $A = (a_j^i) \in B(m)^n$

$$\alpha_m \left(q_m^n \left(\begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{bmatrix}, A \right), \bar{x} \right) = \alpha_n \left(\begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{bmatrix}, \alpha_m \left(\begin{bmatrix} a_1^1 \\ \vdots \\ a_m^1 \end{bmatrix}, \bar{x} \right), \dots, \alpha_m \left(\begin{bmatrix} a_1^n \\ \vdots \\ a_m^n \end{bmatrix}, \bar{x} \right) \right).$$

To this end, we prove that the right-hand side satisfies the uniqueness condition of the left-hand side. To simplify the notation, let, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $a^i := (a_1^i, \dots, a_m^i)$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, by definition of the action we have

$$\alpha_n(b, \alpha_m(a^1, \bar{x}), \dots, \alpha_m(a^n, \bar{x})) \theta_{b_i} \alpha_m(a^i, \bar{x}) \theta_{a_j^i} x_j.$$

Fixing j and letting i vary, this, combined with Remark 5.7, implies that

$$(\alpha_n(b, \alpha_m(a^1, \bar{x}), \dots, \alpha_m(a^n, \bar{x})), x_j) \in \theta_{b_1 \wedge a_1^1} \cap \dots \cap \theta_{b_n \wedge a_n^1} \subseteq \theta_{\bigvee_{i=1}^n b_i \wedge a_j^i}.$$

Finally, letting j vary and remembering that $q_m^n(b, a^1, \dots, a^n)[j] = \bigvee_{i=1}^n b_i \wedge a_j^i$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Remark 5.9. Let \mathbf{T} be a partition clone and let $B := T(2)$ its associated Boolean algebra. By definition and by Theorem 5.8, $T(n)$ is the free B -set on n generators. Precisely as $T(2)$ has the structure of Boolean algebra, the set $T(n)$, with the $(n+1)$ -ary operation $q_m^n : T(n) \times T(n)^n \rightarrow T(n)$ and nullary operations e_1^n, \dots, e_n^n is a n BA (see [21, Definition 14] and subsequent discussion). On n BAs and the study of its many-valued logic the interested reader can consult [7].

Theorem 5.8 yields as a corollary a theorem of Bergman’s 1991 paper [4, Theorem 17].

Corollary 5.10. *The class of B -sets, where B ranges over Boolean algebras, is a hypervariety and is the least nontrivial hypervariety.*

Proof. Immediate putting together Theorem 4.4 and 5.8, and Theorem 2.8. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. ADÁMEK, F. W. LAWVERE, AND J. ROSICKÝ, *On the duality between varieties and algebraic theories*, Algebra Universalis, 49 (2003), pp. 35–49.
- [2] J. ADÁMEK, J. ROSICKÝ, AND E. M. VITALE, *Algebraic Theories: A Categorical Introduction to General Algebra*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [3] J. ADÁMEK, J. ROSICKÝ, AND E. M. VITALE, *Birkhoff’s variety theorem in many sorts*, Algebra Universalis, 68 (2012), pp. 39–42.
- [4] G. M. BERGMAN, *Actions of Boolean rings on sets*, Algebra Universalis, 28 (1991), pp. 153–187.
- [5] M. BODIRSKY, M. PINSKER, AND A. PONGRÁCZ, *Projective clone homomorphisms*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 86 (2021), pp. 148–161.
- [6] F. BORCEUX, *Handbook of Categorical Algebra. Volume 2: Categories and Structures*, vol. 51 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [7] A. BUCCIARELLI, P.-L. CURIEN, A. LEDDA, F. PAOLI, AND A. SALIBRA, *The higher dimensional propositional calculus*, Logic Journal of the IGPL, (2024).
- [8] A. BUCCIARELLI, A. LEDDA, F. PAOLI, AND A. SALIBRA, *Boolean-like algebras of finite dimension: From boolean products to semiring products*, in Janusz Czelakowski on Logical Consequence. Outstanding Contributions to Logic, J. Malinowski and R. Palczewski, eds., vol. 27, Springer-Verlag, 2024.
- [9] A. A. BULATOV, *A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs*, in 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2017, pp. 319–330.
- [10] S. BURRIS AND H. P. SANKAPPANAVAR, *A Course in Universal Algebra*, vol. 78 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [11] R. M. DICKER, *A set of independent axioms for Boolean algebra*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 1 (1963), pp. 20–30.
- [12] T. FEDER AND M. Y. VARDI, *The computational structure of monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction: A study through datalog and group theory*, SIAM Journal on Computing, 28 (1998), pp. 57–104.
- [13] I. GUESSARIAN AND J. MESEGUER, *On the axiomatization of “If-Then-Else”*, SIAM Journal on Computing, 16 (1987), pp. 332–357.

- [14] S. V. GUSEV, E. W. LEE, AND B. M. VERNIKOV, *The lattice of varieties of monoids*, Japanese Journal of Mathematics, 17 (2022), pp. 117–183.
- [15] P. JEAVONS, *On the algebraic structure of combinatorial problems*, Theoretical Computer Science, 200 (1998), pp. 185–204.
- [16] F. W. LAWVERE, *Functorial semantics of algebraic theories*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 50 (1963), pp. 869–872.
- [17] E. G. MANES, *Equations for if-then-else*, in Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, S. Brookes, M. Main, A. Melton, M. Mislove, and D. Schmidt, eds., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992, pp. 446–456.
- [18] J. MCCARTHY, *A basis for a mathematical theory of computation*, in Computer Programming and Formal Systems, P. Braffort and D. Hirschberg, eds., vol. 35 of Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Elsevier, 1963, pp. 33–70.
- [19] R. N. MCKENZIE, G. F. McNULTY, AND W. F. TAYLOR, *Algebras, Lattices, Varieties: Volume I*, vol. 383 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 1987.
- [20] W. D. NEUMANN, *Mal'cev conditions, spectra and Kronecker product*, Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, 25 (1978), pp. 103–117.
- [21] A. SALIBRA, A. BUCCIARELLI, A. LEDDA, AND F. PAOLI, *Classical logic with n truth values as a symmetric many-valued logic*, Foundations of Science, 28 (2023), pp. 115–142.
- [22] A. TARLECKI, *Some nuances of many-sorted universal algebra: a review*, Bulletin of EATCS, 104 (2011).
- [23] W. TAYLOR, *Hyperidentities and hypervarieties*, Aequationes Mathematicae, 23 (1981), pp. 30–49.
- [24] ———, *Abstract clone theory*, in Algebras and Orders, I. G. Rosenberg and G. Sabidussi, eds., Kuwer Academic Publisher, 1993, pp. 507–530.
- [25] C. J. VIDAL AND S. J. TUR, *On the directly and subdirectly irreducible many-sorted algebras*, Demonstratio Mathematica, 48 (2015), pp. 1–12.
- [26] D. ZHUK, *A proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture*, in 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2017, pp. 331–342.

IRIF, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ, 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE