

The lattice of clones of self-dual operations collapsed

Manuel Bodirsky, Albert Vucaj and Dmitriy Zhuk

Abstract. There are continuum many clones on a three-element set even if they are considered up to *homomorphic equivalence*. The clones we use to prove this fact are clones consisting of *self-dual operations*, i.e., operations that preserve the relation $\{(0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0)\}$. However, there are only countably many such clones when considered up to equivalence with respect to *minor-preserving maps* instead of clone homomorphisms. We give a full description of the set of clones of self-dual operations, ordered by the existence of minor-preserving maps. Our result can also be phrased as a statement about structures on a three-element set, ordered by primitive positive constructability, because there is a minor-preserving map from the polymorphism clone of a finite structure \mathfrak{A} to the polymorphism clone of a finite structure \mathfrak{B} if and only if there is a primitive positive construction of \mathfrak{B} in \mathfrak{A} .

Mathematics Subject Classification. 03B50, 08A70, 08B05.

Keywords. Clone, clone homomorphism, minor-preserving map, primitive positive construction, linear Mal'cev condition, three-valued logic.

1. Introduction

Post [18] classified all clones of operations over the Boolean domain $\{0, 1\}$; there are only countably many. By the famous result of Geiger [14] and Bodnarčuk, Kalužnin, Kotov and Romov [6], Post's result might also be viewed as a classification of all structures with domain $\{0, 1\}$ up to *primitive positive interdefinability*. Yanov and Muchnik [21] showed that already over the three-element set $\{0, 1, 2\}$ there are 2^ω many operation clones. Subsequent research in universal algebra therefore focussed on understanding particular aspects of clone lattices on finite domains, for example on the description of maximal clones [19] or minimal clones [11, 10, 20].

The first two authors have received funding from the European Research Council (ERC Grant Agreement no. 681988, CSP-Infinity).

One might still hope to classify all operation clones on finite domains up to some equivalence relation so that equivalent clones share many of the properties that are of interest in universal algebra. Perhaps the most important equivalence relation on clones is *homomorphic equivalence*: two clones \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} are called *homomorphically equivalent* if there exists a clone homomorphism from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} and vice versa. An attractive feature of homomorphic equivalence is that it also relates clones on different domains. The homomorphism order on clones has been studied intensively by Garcia and Taylor [13]; it is essentially the study of Mal'cev conditions and therefore at the heart of universal algebra.

Every operation clone on a finite domain B is the *polymorphism clone* of some relational structure \mathfrak{B} with domain B , denoted $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$. If \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are finite structures, then there is a clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ to $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$ if and only if \mathfrak{A} has a *primitive positive interpretation* in \mathfrak{B} . Note that homomorphic equivalence of clones is strictly coarser than *clone isomorphism*: for example the two clones $\text{Pol}(\{0, 1\}; \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0)\})$ and $\text{Pol}(\{0, 1\}; \{0, 1\}^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1)\})$ are homomorphically equivalent, but not isomorphic (the first clone has only one unary operation, while the latter has two).

We will prove that already over a three-element set, there are 2^ω many clones up to homomorphic equivalence (Corollary 3.3); we are not aware of a reference in the literature for this fundamental fact. In our proof we use results about clones of *self-dual operations*, i.e., operations that preserve the relation

$$C_3 := \{(0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0)\}.$$

Marchenkov [17] proved that there are uncountably many clones of self-dual operations, and Zhuk [22] presented a complete description of their lattice. This lattice has a remarkably rich structure (see Figure 2) and is large in the sense that $\mathbf{C}_3 := \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3)$ is one of the 18 *maximal* clones on three elements [15]. The cardinality of the lattice of clones containing a fixed maximal clone on three elements is uncountable with the exception of one maximal clone (see Section 14.10 in [12]). To the best of our knowledge \mathbf{C}_3 is the only maximal clone on three elements so that the lattice of its subclones is uncountable and completely described.

Motivated by research on the complexity of constraint satisfaction problems, a coarser equivalence relation on the class of clones on a finite set has been introduced recently [3]. We call two clones \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} *minor equivalent* if there exists a minor-preserving map¹ from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} and vice versa. Informally, a minor-preserving map from \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} is a function that preserves arities and composition with projections; unlike clone homomorphisms, it need not preserve the projections and general composition; a formal definition can be found in Section 2.3. If \mathbf{D} is a clone on a finite domain, then it is easy to see that there is a minor-preserving map from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} if and only if every finite

¹Minor-preserving maps are also called *minion homomorphisms*; since we do not define minions here, we stick with minor-preserving maps.

set of height-one identities (also called *minor condition*; see Section 2.4) that holds in \mathbf{C} also holds in \mathbf{D} . We will see that in the context of classifying clones on finite sets up to minor equivalence we may even focus on *idempotent* minor conditions (also known as *idempotent strong linear Mal'cev conditions*).

If \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are finite structures and $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ has a minor-preserving map to $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$, then there exists a so-called *primitive positive construction* of \mathfrak{A} in \mathfrak{B} [3]. The application in constraint satisfaction is that if \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} additionally have finite relational signatures then there is a (linear-time, logarithmic space) reduction from $\text{CSP}(\mathfrak{A})$ to $\text{CSP}(\mathfrak{B})$. Indeed, the recently proven complexity dichotomy for finite-domain constraint satisfaction problems can be expressed using primitive positive constructions as follows: $\text{CSP}(\mathfrak{B})$ is NP-complete if the structure $(\{0, 1\}; \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\})$ has a primitive positive construction in \mathfrak{B} , and is in P otherwise [9, 23]. Note that primitive positive constructions can be used to study unresolved open questions in finite-domain constraint satisfaction, such as the question which finite-domain CSPs are in the complexity classes L, NL, or NC [16].

Our main result is a complete description of the clones of self-dual operations on three elements up to minor equivalence (Theorem 5.6). There are only countably many equivalence classes (Corollary 4.4). Our proof is based on the description of these clones by Zhuk [22]. For any two clones of self-dual operations that are not minor equivalent we specify an idempotent strong linear Mal'cev condition that holds in one clone but not the other. Interestingly, all but one of the conditions that we use are well known and play an important role in universal algebra, such as the existence of *minority operations*, *majority operations*, *Mal'cev operations*, *near unanimity operations of arity k* , *Jónsson chains*, *Hagemann-Mitschke chains*, *binary symmetric operations*, and ternary *weak near unanimity operations*. The only new minor condition that we need to separate clones of self-dual operations is

$$\begin{aligned} r(x, x, x, y) &\approx r(x, x, x, x) && \text{and} && (1) \\ r(x_1, x_2, x_3, y) &\approx r(x_2, x_3, x_1, y) \end{aligned}$$

which we call the *guarded 3-cyclic condition*. See Figure 1.

Bulatov [9] in his proof of the Feder-Vardi CSP dichotomy conjecture used graphs whose edges have three different colours; in the simpler case where every 2-element subset of the domain is primitive positive definable [8], *red edges* stand for 2-element substructures with a binary symmetric polymorphism, *yellow edges* stand for 2-element substructures with a majority polymorphism but no binary symmetric polymorphism, and *blue edges* stand for 2-element substructures with a Mal'cev polymorphism, but no binary symmetric and no majority polymorphism. We are inspired by this colour convention when assigning colours to the elements of the lattice drawn in Figure 1.

clones can be characterised in terms of *primitive positive interpretations* of structures.

Definition 2.1. *Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be structures. An primitive positive (pp) interpretation of \mathfrak{A} in \mathfrak{B} of dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is a partial surjective map Γ from B^d to A such that for every relation R defined by an atomic formula over \mathfrak{A} the relation $\Gamma^{-1}(R)$ is pp definable in \mathfrak{B} (a k -ary relation on B^n is regarded as a kn -ary relation on B).*

The following theorem is based on Birkhoff's theorem.

Theorem 2.1 (see, e.g., Corollary 6.5.16 in [4]). *Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be relational structures with finite domains. Then the following are equivalent.*

- *there is a clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ to $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$.*
- *\mathfrak{A} has a primitive positive interpretation in \mathfrak{B} .*

2.3. Minor-Preserving Maps

If $f: A^n \rightarrow A$ and $\pi: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$, then $f_\pi: A^r \rightarrow A$ is given by

$$f_\pi(a_1, \dots, a_r) := f(a_{\pi(1)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n)}).$$

Let \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{D} be clones and let $\xi: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ be a function that preserves arities. We say that ξ is *minor-preserving* if for every n -ary operation $f \in \mathbf{C}$ and $\pi: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$

$$\xi(f_\pi) = \xi(f)_\pi.$$

The existence of minor-preserving maps between polymorphism clones can be characterised in terms of *primitive positive (pp) constructions*. Let τ be a relational signature. Two relational τ -structures \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are *homomorphically equivalent* if there exists a homomorphism from \mathfrak{A} to \mathfrak{B} and vice-versa. We say that \mathfrak{A} is a *pp power (of dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$)* of \mathfrak{B} if it is isomorphic to a structure with domain B^d whose relations are pp definable from \mathfrak{B} . We say that \mathfrak{A} has a *pp construction* in \mathfrak{B} if \mathfrak{A} is homomorphically equivalent to a pp power of \mathfrak{B} . The connection between pp constructability and minor-preserving maps is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 ([3]). *Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be finite relational structures. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *\mathfrak{A} has a pp construction in \mathfrak{B} .*
- (2) *there exists a minor-preserving map from $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ to $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$.*

If \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} are clones, we write $\mathbf{C} \leq_{\text{minor}} \mathbf{D}$ if there exists a minor-preserving map from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} . Clearly, the relation \leq_{minor} is transitive; it follows from Theorem 2.2 that pp constructability is transitive as well.

2.4. Minor conditions

A *minor condition* is a finite set of expressions of the form $s \approx t$ where s and t are terms with exactly one function symbol (sometimes, such expressions are also called *height one identities*). For example,

$$\{f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)\}$$

(sometimes just written $f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)$ without brackets) is a minor condition while $\{f(x, f(y, x)) \approx f(x, y)\}$ is not since the term on the left contains two function symbols. More examples of concrete minor conditions can be found in Section 5.1. A clone \mathbf{C} *satisfies* a minor condition if every function symbol can be instantiated by a function from \mathbf{C} such that the resulting identities hold for every assignment of values from the domain of \mathbf{C} to the variables in the terms. Clearly, if \mathbf{C} satisfies a minor condition, and $\xi: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ is a minor-preserving map, then \mathbf{D} satisfies the same minor condition. Conversely, a simple compactness argument shows that if every minor condition that holds in \mathbf{C} also holds in \mathbf{D} and \mathbf{D} is a clone on a finite domain then there exists a minor-preserving map from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} (see, e.g., [4]).

2.5. Notation

Let A be a set and $t \in A^k$. For $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ we write $\text{pr}_I(t)$ for the tuple $(t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_n})$. For $R \subseteq A^k$ we write $\text{pr}_I(R) := \{\text{pr}_I(t) \mid t \in R\}$ for the projection of R to the indices from I . If $I = \{i\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ then $\text{pr}_i(R)$ denotes $\text{pr}_I(R)$. A relation $R \subseteq A^k$ is called *subdirect* if $\text{pr}_i(R) = A$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. We use the symbol $+_3$ for addition modulo 3 and $+_2$ for addition modulo 2.

An important notational convention in this article is that if $f: A^k \rightarrow A$ is an operation on A and $t_1, \dots, t_k \in A^m$, then $f(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ denotes the tuple in A^m obtained from applying f componentwise. We also use the convention that if $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a function and $S \subseteq A$, then $f(S)$ denotes the set $\{f(a) \mid a \in S\}$ and $f^{-1}(S)$ denotes the set $\{f^{-1}(a) \mid a \in S\}$. Note that the two conventions can be combined.

3. A continuum of clones on three elements up to homomorphic equivalence

The following relations are defined on the set $\{0, 1, 2\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} C_3 &:= \{(0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0)\} \\ R_3^- &:= \{(x, y, z) \mid x \in \{0, 1\} \wedge x = 0 \Rightarrow y = z\} \\ B_2 &:= \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\} \end{aligned}$$

Marchenkov [17] proved that there are 2^ω many distinct operation clones between

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W} &:= \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_3^-) \\ \text{and } \mathbf{B}_2 &:= \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, B_2); \end{aligned}$$

our terminology is a simplified version of the terminology used in [22]. We prove that there are 2^ω many of these clones even when considered up to homomorphic equivalence (Corollary 3.3). Using the facts from Section 2, this follows from the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be structures such that $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ contain $\text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_3^-)$ and are contained in $\text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, B_2)$. If there is a clone homomorphism from $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B})$ to $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$, then $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$.*

In the proof of this theorem we need the fact that \mathbf{W} contains the so-called *paper-scissor-stone operation*, which we denote by \vee_3 , defined by

$$\vee_3(x, y) := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x = y \\ 1 & \text{if } \{x, y\} = \{0, 1\} \\ 2 & \text{if } \{x, y\} = \{1, 2\} \\ 0 & \text{if } \{x, y\} = \{0, 2\}. \end{cases}$$

We also need the following lemma which states that if a subdirect relation has a pp definition in $(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_3^-)$, then we can also find a pp definition without existential quantifiers and without using R_3^- .

Lemma 3.2 (Lemma 3.3 in [22]). *Suppose that $R \subseteq \{0, 1, 2\}^n$ is a subdirect relation which is preserved by \vee_3 . Then R can be defined by a conjunction of atomic formulas over $\mathfrak{C}_3 := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3)$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Theorem 2.1, the structure \mathfrak{A} has a d -dimensional pp interpretation Γ in \mathfrak{B} ; choose Γ such that d is smallest possible. Let $S := \Gamma^{-1}(C_3) \subseteq B^{2d}$. Let $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2d\}$ be the set of all i such that $\text{pr}_i(S) = \{0, 1, 2\}$. Note that $S' := \text{pr}_I(S)$ is subdirect. By Lemma 3.2 the relation S' can be defined by a conjunction of atomic formulas over $(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3)$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. $S' = \{0, 1, 2\}^{|I|}$. We will prove that this case is impossible. Choose $t = (t_1, \dots, t_{2d}) \in S$ such that $\text{pr}_I(t) = (0, \dots, 0)$. We know that $\Gamma(t) \in C_3$; assume that $\Gamma(t) = (0, 1)$. Choose $s = (s_1, \dots, s_d) \in \{0, 1, 2\}^d$ such that $\Gamma(s) = 2$. Note that

$$t' := (t_{d+1}, \dots, t_{2d}, s_1, \dots, s_d) \in S \\ \text{and } t'' := (s_1, \dots, s_d, t_1, \dots, t_d) \in S.$$

Then for every $i \in \{1, \dots, 2d\}$ we have $|\{\text{pr}_i(t), \text{pr}_i(t'), \text{pr}_i(t'')\}| < 3$:

- if $i \notin I$, then this holds by the definition of I ;
- if $i \in I$, then the choice of t implies that $\text{pr}_i(t) = t_i = 0$. Also note that $i + d \in I$, too, since $\text{pr}_i(S) = \text{pr}_{i+d}(S)$. Hence, $\text{pr}_i(t') = t_{i+d} = 0$.

Let $r := \vee_3(\vee_3(t, t'), t'')$. We claim that $\Gamma(r)$ is of the form (a, a) for some $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, which is a contradiction since $r \in S$ and therefore $\Gamma(r) \in C_3$. To see this, note that the operation \vee_3 is associative and commutative when restricted to sets of size two, and hence

$$\vee_3(\vee_3((t_1, \dots, t_d), (t_{d+1}, \dots, t_{2d})), s) = \vee_3(\vee_3((t_{d+1}, \dots, t_{2d}), s), (t_1, \dots, t_d)).$$

The case that $\Gamma(\alpha) = (1, 2)$ or $\Gamma(\alpha) = (2, 0)$ can be treated analogously.

Case 2. $S' \neq \{0, 1, 2\}^{|I|}$. Then there are $i, j \in I$ such that $S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ implies $\psi(x_i, x_j)$ where ψ is either of the form $C_3(x_i, x_j)$ or of the form $x_i = x_j$. If $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ or if $i, j \in \{d+1, \dots, 2d\}$, then we obtain a contradiction

to the assumption that the interpretation Γ has a smallest possible dimension. We may assume without loss of generality that $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and that $j \in \{d+1, \dots, 2d\}$. We claim that for every $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ we have $|\text{pr}_i(\Gamma^{-1}(a))| = 1$. To see this, let $c, d \in B^d$ be such that $\Gamma(c) = \Gamma(d) = a$. Choose e from $\text{pr}_j(\Gamma^{-1}(a, a+3 \ 1))$. Then $\psi(c_i, e)$ and $\psi(d_i, e)$ imply that $c_i = d_i$. We write $f(a)$ for the element of $\text{pr}_i(\Gamma^{-1}(a))$.

Note that f cannot be a transposition: Indeed, by assumption, the relation B_2 is pp definable in \mathfrak{A} , and hence $T := \Gamma^{-1}(B_2)$ has a pp definition in \mathfrak{B} . But if f is a transposition, then $\text{pr}_i(T) = f(B_2)$ is not preserved by \vee_3 , a contradiction.

Otherwise, f is cyclic and in this case $f(x) = y$ has a definition by an atomic formula $\pi(x, y)$ over \mathfrak{B} . By assumption, every relation R of \mathfrak{A} of arity k has a pp definition $\chi(x_1^1, \dots, x_d^1, \dots, x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k)$ in \mathfrak{B} . We claim that the primitive positive formula $\eta(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ given by

$$\exists x_1^1, \dots, x_d^1, \dots, x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k (\chi \wedge \bigwedge_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \pi(x_\ell, x_i^\ell))$$

is a primitive positive definition of R in \mathfrak{B} . Suppose that $\eta(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ holds for $a_1, \dots, a_k \in B$. Let a_1^1, \dots, a_d^k be witnesses for the existentially quantified variables x_1^1, \dots, x_d^k in η . Then

$$(\Gamma(a_1^1, \dots, a_d^1), \dots, \Gamma(a_1^k, \dots, a_d^k)) \in R$$

by the definition of interpretations, and equals the tuple (a_1^1, \dots, a_d^k) by the conjuncts that involve π . This shows that $(a_1^1, \dots, a_d^k) \in R$. These implications can be reversed, which proves the claim. This shows that every relation of \mathfrak{A} is pp definable in \mathfrak{B} , and hence $\text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{A})$. \square

We have already mentioned that there are 2^ω many clones of self-dual operations [17]. However, they still have a useful description from [22] which is displayed in Figure 2 for the convenience of the reader.

Corollary 3.3. *There are 2^ω many clones of self-dual operations with respect to homomorphic equivalence.*

4. The Collapse

We now describe clones of self-dual operations with respect to \leq_{minor} . The lattice of such clones with respect to inclusion is drawn in Figure 2; the clones that appear in this picture will be explained in this section. If two clones in the picture have the same colour then this indicates that the two clones are minor equivalent.

4.1. The Idempotent Reduct

A finite structure \mathfrak{A} is called a *core* if every endomorphism of \mathfrak{A} is an automorphism of \mathfrak{A} . Every finite core structure \mathfrak{A} pp constructs the expansion of \mathfrak{A} by all constant unary relations [3]. Note that every expansion of $(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3)$




FIGURE 2. The lattice of clones of self-dual operators ordered by inclusion.

is a core. We may therefore assume in the following that all such structures contain the relations $\{0\}$, $\{1\}$, and $\{2\}$, and for the same reason we also allow the constants 0, 1, and 2 in primitive positive formulas over such formulas. Phrased in terms of clones, this means that every clone \mathbf{C} on a finite set is minor-equivalent to its *idempotent reduct*, i.e., to the subclone of \mathbf{C} consisting of all operations f in \mathbf{C} that satisfy $f(x, \dots, x) \approx x$.

4.2. Duals

Let π be a permutation of $\{0, 1, 2\}$. Then $f^{(\pi)}$ is called *dual with respect to* π if

$$f^{(\pi)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \pi^{-1}(f(\pi(x_1), \dots, \pi(x_n))),$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}^{(\pi)} := \{f^{(\pi)} \mid f \in \mathbf{C}\}.$$

Note that if π is a cyclic permutation, then every operation in

$$\mathbf{C}_3 := \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3)$$

is *self-dual with respect to* π , i.e., $\mathbf{C}^{(\pi)} = \mathbf{C}$. Throughout the text, let $\sigma: \{0, 1, 2\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be the transposition defined by $\sigma(0, 1, 2) = (1, 0, 2)$. In the following we write f^* instead of $f^{(\sigma)}$ and \mathbf{C}^* instead of $\mathbf{C}^{(\sigma)}$. For example, the dual $(\vee_3)^*$ of the paper-scissor-stone operation \vee_3 is the operation \wedge_3 whose composition table can be found below.

\vee_3	0	1	2
0	0	1	0
1	1	1	2
2	0	2	2

\wedge_3	0	1	2
0	0	0	2
1	0	1	1
2	2	1	2

Note that f preserves R if and only if f^* preserves

$$R^* := \{(\sigma(x_1), \dots, \sigma(x_n)) \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in R\}.$$

Also note that $g: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^*$ given by $f \mapsto f^*$ is minor preserving; this implies that \mathbf{C} is minor equivalent to \mathbf{C}^* . The clones such that $\mathbf{C}^* = \mathbf{C}$ are drawn in the middle of the diagram. We refer to the middle part as the *spine*; all clones that are not in the spine are either in a left wing or in a mirror symmetric right wing; the symmetry is given by taking the dual and clearly visible in Figure 2.

4.3. Collapsing \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q}

When discussing \leq_{minor} , we start in the lower left and work to the top. Let $\Omega := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_2^=)$ and $\mathfrak{P} := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_2^>)$, where

$$R_2^= := \{(x, y, z) \mid x \in \{0, 1\} \wedge x = 0 \Rightarrow y = z \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

$$R_2^> := \{(x, y, z) \mid x, y \in \{0, 1\} \wedge x = y = 0 \Rightarrow z = 0\}.$$

Zhuk proved that the interval between the clones $\mathbf{Q} = \text{Pol}(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{P} := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{P})$ is a countably infinite chain of clones [22]. Theorem 4.1 below implies that the entire chain from \mathbf{Q} to \mathbf{P} collapses in our poset: they are all minor equivalent (Corollary 4.4). Note the following.

- The relations defined by $y = x +_3 1$ and $y = x +_3 2$ are primitively positively definable with the relation C_3 ; so we freely use the terms $x +_3 1$, and $x +_3 2$ in primitive positive definitions over structures that contain the relation C_3 .
- For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the relation $B_n := \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ has the following pp definition in \mathfrak{P} :

$$B_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) \Leftrightarrow \exists u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} (R_2^>(x_1, x_2, u_1) \wedge C_3(u_{n-1}, x_1) \\ \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}} R_2^>(u_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, u_i)).$$

Theorem 4.1. *The structure Ω has a pp construction in the structure \mathfrak{P} .*

Proof. We first define a fourth pp power \mathfrak{P}' of \mathfrak{P} with domain $P' := \{0, 1, 2\}^4$, and then show that there exists a homomorphism $h: \mathfrak{P}' \rightarrow \Omega$ and a homomorphism $g: \Omega \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}'$. Our intuition for defining \mathfrak{P}' will be guided by the choice of g :

$$g(0) := (0, 1, 0, 0)$$

$$g(1) := (1, 0, 1, 0)$$

$$g(2) := (2, 0, 0, 1).$$

The following relations are primitively positively definable over \mathfrak{P} :

$$\begin{aligned} C_3^{\mathfrak{P}'} &:= \{(x, y) \in (P')^2 \mid C_3(x_0, y_0) \wedge x_1 = y_2 \wedge x_2 = y_3 \wedge x_3 = y_1\} \\ (R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'} &:= \{(x, y, z) \in (P')^3 \mid B_3(x_1, x_2, x_3) \wedge B_3(y_1, y_2, y_3) \wedge B_3(z_1, z_2, z_3) \\ &\quad \wedge x_3 = 0 \wedge x_0 = x_2 \wedge y_3 \leq_2 x_0 \wedge z_3 \leq_2 x_0 \\ &\quad \wedge R_2^{\rightarrow}(x_0, y_2, z_2) \wedge R_2^{\rightarrow}(x_0, y_3, z_3) \\ &\quad \wedge R_2^{\rightarrow}(x_0, z_2, y_2) \wedge R_2^{\rightarrow}(x_0, z_3, y_3)\} \end{aligned}$$

Claim. g is a homomorphism from Ω to \mathfrak{P}' .

- Suppose that $(a, b) \in C_3$. Then $(g(a)_0, g(b)_0) = (a, b) \in C_3$. Moreover, $g(a)_1 = g(b)_2$, $g(a)_2 = g(b)_3$, and $g(a)_3 = g(b)_1$. Hence $(g(a), g(b)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{P}'}$.
- Suppose that $(a, b, c) \in R_2^-$. The definition of g implies that the first three conjuncts of the definition of $(R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$ are satisfied by $g(a), g(b), g(c)$. Moreover, $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and hence $g(a)_3 = 0$.

Suppose that $a = 0$. Then $g(a)_0 = g(a)_2 = 0$ and $0 = g(b)_3 = g(c)_3 \leq_2 g(a)_0 = 0$. We have either $b = c = 0$ or $b = c = 1$ by the definition of R_2^- . In both cases, the last two conjuncts in the definition of $(R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$ hold.

Finally, suppose that $a = 1$. Then $g(a)_0 = g(a)_2 = 1$. Moreover, $g(b)_3, g(c)_3 \leq_2 1$. Since $g(a)_0 = 1$ the last two conjuncts in the definition of $(R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$ hold again. This shows that $(g(a), g(b), g(c)) \in (R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$.

Define $h: P' \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows.

$$h(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \{(1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1)\} \\ 1 & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0)\} \\ 2 & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)\} \\ x_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Claim. h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{P}' to Ω .

- Suppose that $(a, b) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{P}'}$. Note that $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}$ if and only if $(b_1, b_2, b_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}$, and in this case $(h(a), h(b)) = (a_0, b_0) \in C_3$. Otherwise, the definition of $C_3^{\mathfrak{P}'}$ and h imply that $h(a) = h(b) +_3 1$.
- Suppose that $(a, b, c) \in (R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$. Then $a_3 = 0$ and $B_3(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ implies that $a_1 = 1$ or $a_2 = 1$. Moreover, $a_0 = a_2$, and thus $h(a) \in \{0, 1\}$.

If $h(a) = 1$ then $R_2^{\rightarrow}(h(a), h(b), h(c))$ holds trivially. If $h(a) = 0$ then $(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ by the definition of h and the observations above. Hence, $b_3 = c_3 = 0$ since $b_3, c_3 \leq_2 a_0 = 0$. This implies that $h(b), h(c) \in \{0, 1\}$. The R_2^{\rightarrow} -conjuncts in the definition of $(R_2^-)^{\mathfrak{P}'}$ imply that $b_2 = 0$ if and only if $c_2 = 0$ and that $b_3 = 0$ if and only if $c_3 = 0$. This shows that $h(b) = 0$ if and only if $h(c) = 0$. \square

Corollary 4.2. *The clones \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are minor equivalent.*

Proof. An immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 2.2. \square

4.4. Collapsing $\mathbf{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ and \mathbf{M}_∞

Below we define the clones $\mathbf{B}_n\pi_\infty$ for every $n \in \{3, \dots, \infty\}$ and \mathbf{M}_n for every $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots, \infty\}$. There are 2^ω many clones between $\mathbf{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ and \mathbf{M}_∞ . In this section we prove that the clones $\mathbf{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ and \mathbf{M}_∞ (and therefore all the 2^ω many clones between them) are minor equivalent. The same proof shows that for every $n \geq 3$, the clones $\mathbf{B}_n\pi_\infty$ and \mathbf{M}_n are minor equivalent. The proof is similar to the proof of the minor equivalence of \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{P} presented in Section 4.3.

Definition 4.1. *Define*

$$\mathfrak{M}_\infty := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, \leq_2, B_2, B_3, \dots)$$

and $\mathbf{M}_\infty := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{M}_\infty)$.

To define $\mathbf{B}_n\pi_\infty$ we need to introduce new relations on $\{0, 1, 2\}$. Let

$$W := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2\}^2.$$

Note that $W(x, y)$ holds if $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x = 0$ implies $y \in \{0, 1\}$. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m = \{1, \dots, n\}$, the relation R_{A_1, \dots, A_m} consists of all tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \{0, 1, 2\}^{n+m}$ such that

- (1) $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \{0, 1\}$,
- (2) for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, if $x_i = 0$ then $y_j \in \{0, 1\}$ for every $j \in A_i$, and
- (3) not $x_1 = \dots = x_m = y_1 = \dots = y_n = 0$.

Definition 4.2. *Let $\mathfrak{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ the structure on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ with the relations C_3 , W , and the relation R_{A_1, \dots, A_m} for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $A_1, \dots, A_m \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $n \in \{3, \dots, \infty\}$, let $\mathfrak{B}_n\pi_\infty$ be the reduct of $\mathfrak{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ that contains all relations of $\mathfrak{B}_\infty\pi_\infty$ of arity at most n . For $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty\}$, let \mathfrak{B}_n be the reduct of \mathfrak{B}_∞ that contains all relations of \mathfrak{B}_∞ of arity at most n . As usual, $\mathbf{B}_n\pi_\infty := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B}_n\pi_\infty)$ and $\mathbf{M}_n := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{B}_n)$.*

It is known and easy to see that $\mathbf{B}_n\pi_\infty \subseteq \mathbf{M}_n$.

Theorem 4.3. *For every $n \in \{3, 4, \dots, \infty\}$, the structure $\mathfrak{B}_n\pi_\infty$ has a pp construction in \mathfrak{M}_n .*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we use a fourth pp power \mathfrak{M}'_n of \mathfrak{M}_n , this time with the signature of $\mathfrak{B}_n\pi_\infty$. The relation $C_3^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$ is defined as in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S_1, \dots, S_m \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ be such that $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_m = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $m + k \leq n$. Then the following relations are primitively positively definable over \mathfrak{M}_n .

$$\begin{aligned} W^{\mathfrak{M}'_n} &:= \{(x, y) \in (\{1, \dots, 4\}^4)^2 \mid B_3(x_1, x_2, x_3) \wedge B_3(y_1, y_2, y_3) \\ &\quad \wedge x_3 = 0 \wedge x_0 = x_2 \wedge y_3 \leq_2 x_0\} \\ R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}^{\mathfrak{M}'_n} &:= \{(x^1, \dots, x^m, y^1, \dots, y^k) \mid B_{m+k}(x_2^1, \dots, x_2^m, y_2^1, \dots, y_2^k) \\ &\quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \{1, \dots, m\}} (B_3(x_1^i, x_2^i, x_3^i) \wedge x_3^i = 0 \wedge x_0^i = x_2^i \\ &\quad \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in S_i} (y_3^j \leq_2 x_0^i) \wedge B_3(y_1^j, y_2^j, y_3^j))\} \end{aligned}$$

Let $g: \{0, 1, 2\}^4 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $h: \{0, 1, 2\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}^4$ be defined as in the proof of Theorem 4.1

Claim. g is a homomorphism from $\mathfrak{B}_n \pi_\infty$ to \mathfrak{M}'_n . We have already verified in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that g preserves C_3 .

- Suppose $(a, b) \in W$. By the definition of g we have $B_3(g(a)_1, g(a)_2, g(a)_3)$ and $B_3(g(b)_1, g(b)_2, g(b)_3)$. If $a \neq 0$, then $a = 1$ and

$$g(b)_3 \leq_2 g(a)_0 = g(a)_2 = 1$$

since $g(b)_3 \in \{0, 1\}$ by the definition of g . If $a = 0$ then $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Also, $g(a)_3 = 0$ and $g(b)_3 = 0 \leq_2 g(a)_0 = g(a)_2 = 0$.

- Suppose that $(a^1, \dots, a^m, b^1, \dots, b^n) \in R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$. Then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $a^i = 1$ or $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $b^j = 1$. If $a^i = 1$ then $g(a^i) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$. If $b^j = 1$ then $g(b^j) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$. In both cases we have $B_{m+n}(g(a^1)_2, \dots, g(a^m)_2, g(b^1)_2, \dots, g(b^n)_2)$. To verify the other conjuncts in the definition of $R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$, let $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Clearly, $B_3(g(a_1^i), g(a_2^i), g(a_3^i))$. Since $a^i \in \{0, 1\}$ we have $g(a^i)_3 = 0$ and $g(a^i)_0 = g(a^i)_2$. Let $j \in A_i$. Clearly, $B_3(g(b_1^j), g(b_2^j), g(b_3^j))$. If $a^i = 1$ then $g(b^j)_3 \leq_2 g(a^i)_0 = 1$ because $g(b^j)_3 \in \{0, 1\}$. If $a^i = 0$, then $g(a^i) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$. We have $g(b^j) = 0 \leq_2 0 = g(a^i)_0$. It follows that $(g(a^i), g(b^i)) \in R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$.

Claim. h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{M}'_n to $\mathfrak{B}_n \pi_\infty$. We have already verified in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that h preserves C_3 .

- Suppose that $(a, b) \in W^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$. Since $a_3 = 0$ and $B_3(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ we have that $a_0 = a_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. If $a_0 = 1$ then $h(a) = 1$, and $(h(a), h(b)) \in W$. If $a_0 = 0$, then $b_3 = 0$ since $b_3 \leq_2 a_0$. Then $B_3(b_1, b_2, b_3)$ implies that either $(b_1, b_2, b_3) \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$ and therefore $h(b) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $(h(a), h(b)) \in W$.
- Suppose that $(a^1, \dots, a^m, b^1, \dots, b^n) \in R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}^{\mathfrak{M}'_n}$. We have to show that $(h(a^1), \dots, h(a^m), h(b^1), \dots, h(b^n))$ satisfies (1), (2), and (3) in the definition of R_{S_1, \dots, S_m} . For every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we have $B_3(a_1^i, a_2^i, a_3^i)$

and $a_3^i = 0$ and so $(a_1^i, a_2^i, a_3^i) \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$ and thus $h(a^i) \in \{0, 1\}$, showing (1).

Let $j \in S_i$. If $h(a^i) = 0$ then $b_3^j \leq_2 a_0^i = a_2^i = 0$ implies that $b_0^j \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $B_3(b_1^j, b_2^j, b_3^j)$ we have $h(b^j) \in \{0, 1\}$, showing (2).

To prove (3), suppose for contradiction that $h(a^1) = \dots = h(a^m) = h(b^1) = \dots = h(b^n) = 0$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we have $a_3^i = 0$, $B_3(a_1^i, a_2^i, a_3^i)$, and $a_0^i = a_2^i$, and hence $a^i = (0, 1, 0, 0)$. Since $b_3^j \leq_2 a_0^i$ we obtain $b_3^j = 0$ for all $j \in S_i$. Since $B_{m+n}(a_2^1, \dots, a_2^m, b_2^1, \dots, b_2^n)$ we have that $(b_1^j, b_2^j, b_3^j) \in \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$, and hence $h(b^j) \in \{0, 1\}$. This shows (3), and thus $(a^1, \dots, a^n, b^1, \dots, b^m) \in R_{S_1, \dots, S_m}$. \square

Corollary 4.4. *The minor equivalence relation has only countably many equivalence classes of clones of self-dual operations.*

4.5. A Double Collapse

In this section we study the minor equivalence class of $\mathbf{M}_2 := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{M}_2)$. Let N be the relation

$$N := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \{0, 1, 2\}^2. \quad (2)$$

Note that $N(x, y)$ holds if $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x = 0$ implies $y = 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{N}_2 &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, N, B_2) \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{M} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, \leq_2). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that there is a pp construction of \mathfrak{N}_2 in \mathfrak{M} . Note that the formula $N(x, y) \wedge N(y, y)$ is equivalent to $x \leq_2 y$, so \mathfrak{M} also has a pp construction in \mathfrak{N}_2 (even a pp definition). It follows that $\mathbf{M} := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{M})$ and $\mathbf{N}_2 := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{N}_2)$ are minor equivalent. Note that $\mathfrak{M}^* = \mathfrak{M}$, so \mathfrak{M} is already part of the spine. It follows that $\mathfrak{N}_2^* = \mathfrak{N}_2$.

Instead of directly specifying the pp construction of \mathfrak{M} in \mathfrak{N}_2 , we found it more convenient to prove this in two steps: first we show that \mathfrak{N}_2 has a pp construction in \mathfrak{M}_2 , and then we show that \mathfrak{M}_2 has a pp construction in \mathfrak{M} .

Lemma 4.5. *There is a pp construction of \mathfrak{N}_2 in \mathfrak{M}_2 .*

Proof. We again use a four-dimensional pp power \mathfrak{A} of \mathfrak{M}_2 and the maps h and g from the proof of Theorem 4.1. The structure \mathfrak{A} has domain $A := \{0, 1, 2\}^4$ and signature $\{C_3, N, B_2\}$. The relation $C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is defined as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, and

$$\begin{aligned} N^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid x_3 = 0 \wedge x_0 = x_2 \wedge B_2(x_1, x_2) \\ &\quad \wedge x_1 \leq_2 y_1 \wedge y_2 \leq_2 x_2 \wedge y_3 \leq_2 x_0\}, \\ B_2^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid B_2(x_0, y_0) \wedge x_0 = x_2 \wedge y_0 = y_2 \wedge x_3 = y_3 = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Claim. The map g is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{N}_2 to \mathfrak{A} .

We have already verified in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that g preserves C_3 .

- Suppose that $(a, b) \in N$. If $a = 0$, then $b = 0$, and hence $(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) := g(a) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ and $(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3) := g(b) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ satisfies the formula from the definition of $N^{\mathfrak{A}}$. If $a = 1$, then putting $(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) := g(a) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$ satisfies $x_3 = 0, x_0 = x_2, B_2(x_1, x_2)$. Moreover, putting $(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) := g(b)$ all the remaining conjuncts in the definition of $N^{\mathfrak{A}}$ are satisfied as well: for $x_1 \leq_2 y_1$ since $x_1 = 0$, and for $y_2 \leq_2 x_2$ and $y_3 \leq_2 x_0$ since $y_2, y_3 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x_0 = x_2 = 1$.
- Suppose that $(a, b) \in B_2$. Then $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$, and hence $(g(a), g(b))$ satisfies $x_0 = x_2, y_0 = y_2$, and $x_3 = y_3 = 0$. Moreover, $B_2(x_0, y_0)$ holds because otherwise $a = b = 0$, contrary to the assumption that $B_2(a, b)$.

Claim. The map h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{A} to \mathfrak{N}_2 .

We have already verified in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that h preserves C_3 . Now suppose that $(x, y) \in N^{\mathfrak{A}}$. We must have $x_3 = 0$ and $x_0 = x_2$ therefore $h(x) \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $x_3 = 0$ and $B_2(x_1, x_2)$ it is impossible that $x_1 = x_2 = x_3$ and therefore $x \in \{(0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0)\}$. If $x \in \{(1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0)\}$ then $h(x) = 1$ and $(h(x), h(y)) \in N$. If $x = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ then $1 = x_1 \leq_2 y_1, y_2 \leq_2 x_2 = 0$, and $y_3 \leq_2 x_0 = 0$, and hence $h(y) = 0$. Thus, $(h(x), h(y)) = (0, 0) \in N$.

Now suppose that $(x, y) \in B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Again the conjuncts $x_3 = 0$ and $x_0 = x_2$ imply that $h(x) \in \{0, 1\}$, and similarly $h(y) \in \{0, 1\}$. If $h(x) = 0$ then $x = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case the conjunct $B_2(x_0, y_0)$ implies that $y_0 \neq 0$, and hence $h(y) \neq 0$. So $(h(x), h(y)) \in B_2$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *There is a pp construction of \mathfrak{M}_2 in \mathfrak{M} .*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{A} be the structure with domain $A := \{0, 1, 2\}^2$ and signature $\{C_3, \leq_2, B_2\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} C_3^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid C_3(x_1, y_1) \wedge C_3(y_2, x_2)\}, \\ \leq_2^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid x_1 \leq_2 y_1 \wedge y_2 \leq_2 x_2\}, \\ B_2^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid x_2 \leq_2 y_1 \wedge x_1 \leq_2 x_1 \wedge y_2 \leq_2 y_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $g: \{0, 1, 2\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}^2$ be defined by $g(0) := (0, 1)$, $g(1) := (1, 0)$, and $g(2) := (2, 2)$.

Claim 1: g is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{M} to \mathfrak{A} . Let $(a, b) \in C_3$. If $(a, b) = (0, 1)$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((0, 1), (1, 0)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$. If $(a, b) = (1, 2)$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((1, 0), (2, 2)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$. If $(a, b) = (2, 0)$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((2, 2), (0, 1)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Now suppose that $a \leq_2 b$. If $a = b = 0$ then

$$(g(a), g(b)) = ((0, 1), (0, 1)) \in \leq_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$$

and similarly for $a = b = 1$. If $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((0, 1), (1, 0)) \in \leq_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Finally, suppose that $(a, b) \in B_2$. Then $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ and hence the entries of $h(a)$ and $h(b)$ are from $\{0, 1\}$ as well. Thus, the final two conjuncts in the definition of $B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ are always satisfied. If $a = b = 1$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((1, 0), (1, 0)) \in B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ since $0 \leq_2 1$. If $a = 1$ and $b = 0$ then $(g(a), g(b)) =$

$((1, 0), (0, 1)) \in B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ since $0 \leq_2 0$. And if $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ then $(g(a), g(b)) = ((0, 1), (1, 0)) \in B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ since $1 \leq_2 1$.

Let $h: \{0, 1, 2\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h(0, 1) &= h(0, 2) = h(2, 1) = 0, \\ h(0, 0) &= h(1, 0) = h(1, 1) = 1, \\ h(2, 0) &= h(1, 2) = h(2, 2) = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $h(a, b) = a$ for every $a, b \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with three exceptions: $h(2, 1) = 0$, $h(0, 0) = 1$, and $h(1, 2) = 2$; we call $(2, 1), (1, 2), (0, 0)$ the *exceptional points* and all other points *regular*.

Claim 2: h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{A} to \mathfrak{A}_2 . Let $(a, b) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Then $C_3(a_1, b_1)$ and $C_3(b_2, a_2)$. In particular, note that a equals $(2, 1)$ if and only if b equals $(0, 0)$. In this case, $(h(a), h(b)) = (0, 1) \in C_3$ and we are done. Similarly, we verify the statement if a equals $(1, 2)$ or $(0, 0)$. Also note that a is an exceptional point for h if and only if b is. If a and b are regular then $(h(a), h(b)) = (a_1, b_1) \in C_3$ and we are done.

Now let $(a, b) \in \leq_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Then by definition we have $a_1 \leq_2 b_1$ and $b_2 \leq_2 a_2$. Note that in particular, neither a nor b can be the exceptional points $(1, 2)$ or $(2, 1)$ for g . If $a = (0, 0)$ then $b_1, b_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, hence $h(b) \in \{0, 1\}$, and thus $h(b) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $h(b) \leq_2 h(a) = 1$. For the regular points the verification is again immediate.

Finally, let $(a, b) \in B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Note that then $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, hence $h(a), h(b) \in \{0, 1\}$. Suppose that $h(b) = 0$. By the definition of $B_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$, we have $a_2 \leq_2 b_1 = 0$, so we have $h(a) = h(0, 0) = 1$. This shows that $(h(a), h(b)) \in B_2$. \square

4.6. The Spine

We now discuss collapses in the spine; again, some of them can be proved by exhibiting pp constructions, while in one case it was more convenient to directly exhibit a minor-preserving map (in Proposition 4.9). The following structures are at the bottom of the spine in Figure 2; we show that they are equivalent with respect to pp constructability.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, T, L_2, \leq_2) \\ \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, L_2, \leq_2) \quad \mathfrak{R}_3 := (\{0, 1, 2\}; \neq, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 &:= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \{0, 1\}^3 \mid x_1 +_2 x_2 +_2 x_3 = 0\} \quad (3) \\ \text{and } T &:= \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 2)\}. \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.7. *The structures \mathfrak{R}_3 , \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} , and \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} pairwise pp interpret each other (and hence in particular pp construct each other).*

Proof. Every finite structure has a pp interpretation in $(\{0, 1, 2\}; \neq)$ (see, e.g., [4]). The structure \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} is an expansion of \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} . Finally, observe that \mathfrak{L}_{\leq}

interprets primitively positively the structure

$$(\{0, 1\}; L_2, \leq_2, \{0\}, \{1\})$$

and that all polymorphisms of this structure are projections [18]. Hence, \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} interprets all finite structures (see, e.g., Theorem 6.3.10 in [4]). \square

In the lattice of clones of self-dual operations (Figure 2) the clone \mathfrak{L}_{\leq} has the cover

$$\mathfrak{L}_2 := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, L_2)$$

and the clone $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_{\leq}$ has the cover

$$\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2 := (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, T, L_2).$$

Proposition 4.8. *The structures $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$ and \mathfrak{L}_2 pp construct each other.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$ is an expansion of \mathfrak{L}_2 it suffices to prove that \mathfrak{L}_2 pp constructs $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$. We consider the pp power \mathfrak{A} of \mathfrak{L}_2 with domain $\{0, 1, 2\}^2$ and the same signature as $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$ whose relations are defined as follows.

$$C_3^{\mathfrak{A}} := \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid C_3(x_1, y_1) \wedge C_3(y_2, x_2)\}$$

$$T^{\mathfrak{A}} := \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid x_1 = y_2 \wedge x_2 = y_1\}$$

$$L_2^{\mathfrak{A}} := \{(x, y, z) \in A^3 \mid L_2(x_1, y_1, z_1) \wedge L_2(x_1, x_2, 1) \\ \wedge L_2(y_1, y_2, 1) \wedge L_2(z_1, z_2, 1)\}$$

We prove that $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$ and \mathfrak{A} are homomorphically equivalent. Let $g: \{0, 1, 2\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}^2$ be defined by $g(0) := (0, 1)$, $g(1) := (1, 0)$, and $g(2) := (2, 2)$. Then g is a homomorphism from $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$ to \mathfrak{A} : the proof that g preserves C_3 we have already seen this in the proof of Lemma 4.6. Now suppose that $(x, y) \in T^{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2}$. If $(x, y) = (0, 1)$ then $(g(0), g(1)) = ((0, 1), (1, 0)) \in T^{\mathfrak{A}}$. For $(x, y) \in \{(1, 0), (2, 2)\}$ the argument is similarly straightforward. Finally, suppose that $(x, y, z) \in L_2^{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2}$. Then $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}^2$, and hence $g(x), g(y), g(z) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$. Hence, the conjuncts $L_2(x_1, x_2, 1)$, $L_2(y_1, y_2, 1)$, $L_2(z_1, z_2, 1)$ in the definition of $L_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ are satisfied. Moreover, $x +_2 y +_2 z = 0$ implies that $g(x)_1 +_2 g(y)_1 +_2 g(z)_1 = 0$, and hence $(g(x), g(y), g(z)) \in L_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Let $h: \{0, 1, 2\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be defined as

$$h(x, y) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } C_3(x, y) \\ 1 & \text{if } C_3(y, x) \\ 2 & \text{if } x = y. \end{cases}$$

We prove that h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{A} to $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2$. Let $((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$. Then $C_3(x_1, y_1)$ and $C_3(y_2, x_2)$. If $h(x_1, x_2) = 0$, then $C_3(x_1, x_2)$, and hence $C_3(y_2, y_1)$, and therefore $h(y_1, y_2) = 1$. Hence, $(h(x_1, x_2), h(y_1, y_2)) \in C_3^{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{L}_2}$. The verification if $h(x_1, x_2) \in \{1, 2\}$ is similarly straightforward. The proof that h preserves T is similar as well. Finally, suppose that

$$((a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), (a_3, b_3)) \in L_2^{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Then $L(a_i, b_i, 1)$, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, implies that $(a_i, b_i) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$, and hence $h(a_i, b_i) \in \{0, 1\}$. Note that in this case $h(a_i, b_i) = a_i$, and hence $L_2(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ implies that $(h(a_1, b_1), h(a_2, b_2), h(a_3, b_3)) \in L^{\mathfrak{L}^2}$. \square

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{TN} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, T, N, N^*) \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{DM} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, C_2, \leq_2). \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 := \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$ and $N^* = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (0, 2)\}$ is the dual of the relation $N = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$ defined in (2). Zhuk [22] (Theorem 4.16) proved that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{TN} &:= \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{TN}) = [m] \\ \text{and } \mathbf{DM} &:= \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{DM}) = [m, p] \end{aligned}$$

where the operations m and p are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m(x, y, z) &:= \begin{cases} (x \wedge_3 y) \vee_3 (x \wedge_3 z) \vee_3 (y \wedge_3 z) & \text{if } |\{x, y, z\}| \leq 2 \\ x & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5) \\ p(x, y, z) &:= \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |\{x, y, z\}| \leq 2 \\ x +_3 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

Rather than proving that \mathfrak{TN} and \mathfrak{DM} pp construct each other, we follow a different strategy and directly work with the respective clones and minor preserving maps.

Proposition 4.9. *The clones \mathbf{TN} and \mathbf{DM} are minor equivalent.*

Proof. Since \mathbf{DM} contains \mathbf{TN} , it suffices to find a minor-preserving map Ξ from \mathbf{DM} to \mathbf{TN} . We first define a minor-preserving map ξ on the operations of arity at most three in \mathbf{DM} . Then we extend ξ to a minor-preserving map Ξ from \mathbf{DM} to the clone of all operations on $\{0, 1, 2\}$, and finally we show that the image of Ξ lies in \mathbf{TN} .

Note that every binary operation of \mathbf{DM} must be a projection: this follows by induction over the generation process from the fact that $\mathbf{DM} = [m, p]$ is generated by m and p , since any operation obtained from the ternary operations m and p by identifying arguments is a projection. Moreover, every ternary operation of \mathbf{DM} must be either a projection or is the ternary majority operation; again, this is easy to show by induction over the generation process.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we define $\xi(\pi_i^2) := \pi_i^2$. Let $f \in \mathbf{DM}$ be ternary. Note that every operation in \mathbf{DM} preserves $\{0, 1\}$; if the restriction of f to $\{0, 1\}$ is a projection to the i -th argument, then we define $\xi(f) := \pi_i^3$. Suppose now that the restriction of f to $\{0, 1\}$ is a majority operation. Note that for $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $f(b_1 +_3 i, b_2 +_3 i, b_3 +_3 i) = f(b_1, b_2, b_3) +_3 i$ since f preserves C_3 . Hence, f is fully determined by its values for $(0, 1, 2)$ and on $(0, 2, 1)$.

- If $f(0, 1, 2) = f(0, 2, 1)$, then $f(x, y, z) = f(x, z, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and we define $\xi(f) := m(x, y, z)$.
- If $f(0, 1, 2) = f(0, 2, 1) +_3 1 = f(1, 0, 2)$, then $f(x, y, z) = f(y, x, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and we define $\xi(f) := m(z, x, y)$.
- If $f(0, 1, 2) = f(0, 2, 1) +_3 2 = f(2, 1, 0)$ then $f(x, y, z) = f(z, y, x)$ for all $x, y, z \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and we define $\xi(f) := m(y, x, z)$.

Note that the function ξ is closed under taking minors: if f is a ternary operation in **DM** and $\pi: \{1, 2, 3\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ is a cyclic permutation, then $\xi(f_\pi) = \xi(f)_\pi$ since f preserves C_3 . If π is a transposition, say $\pi(1, 2, 3) = (1, 3, 2)$, then $\xi(f_\pi) = m(x, z, y) = \xi(f)_\pi$; the argument for the other transpositions is similar. We finally consider the case that π is non-injective, say $\pi(1) = \pi(2) = 1$ and $\pi(3) = 2$. If the restriction of f to $\{0, 1\}$ is a projection to the i -th argument, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then $\xi(f_\pi) = \pi_{\pi(i)}^2 = \xi(f)_\pi$. If the restriction of f to $\{0, 1\}$ is the Boolean majority operation, then $\xi(f_\pi) = \pi_1^2 = \xi(f)_\pi$; the argument for the other non-injective operations is similar.

Since **DM** is defined on a set of cardinality three, the map ξ naturally extends to a map Ξ from **DM** to the set of all operations on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ as follows: for every $f \in \mathbf{DM}$ of arity n and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let f' be the ternary map in **DM** defined by $f'(x_0, x_1, x_2) := f(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_n})$. Then let $\Xi(f)$ be the n -ary operation on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ that maps (a_1, \dots, a_n) to $\xi(f')(0, 1, 2)$.

The map Ξ is minor-preserving by definition, so we are left with showing that $\Xi(f) \in \mathbf{TN}$ for every $f \in \mathbf{DM}$. The operation $\Xi(f)$ preserves C_3 and T , because $|C_3| = |T| = 3$. To show that $\Xi(f)$ preserves N , it suffices to show that every four-variable minor of f preserves N , because $|N| = 4$. Let $g \in \mathbf{DM}$ be of arity 4 and let $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), (a_3, b_3), (a_4, b_4) \in N$. We may suppose that if $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ are distinct, then $(a_i, b_i) \neq (a_j, b_j)$. Indeed, suppose that for $i = 1$ and $j = 2$ we have $(a_i, b_i) = (a_j, b_j)$. Then let g' be the ternary minor of g defined by $g'(x, y, z) := g(x, x, y, z)$, and note that

$$(\xi(g)(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4), \xi(g)(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)) = (\xi(g')(a_1, a_3, a_4), \xi(g')(b_1, b_3, b_4))$$

and the statement follows since $\xi(g') \in \mathbf{TN}$. The argument for different pairs of distinct elements $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ is similar. By permuting arguments of g , we may therefore assume without loss of generality that

$$((a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), (a_3, b_3), (a_4, b_4)) = ((0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2)).$$

Let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{DM}$ be the ternary operations given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x_0, x_1, x_2) &:= g(x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}, x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}) = g(x_0, x_1, x_1, x_1) \\ \text{and } g_2(x_0, x_1, x_2) &:= g(x_{b_1}, x_{b_2}, x_{b_3}, x_{b_4}) = g(x_0, x_0, x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since g_1 must be a projection to the first or second argument we obtain

$$\Xi(g)(0, 1, 1, 1) = \xi(g_1)(0, 1, 2) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

To show that $(\Xi(g)(0, 1, 1, 1), \Xi(g)(0, 0, 1, 2)) \in N$ it therefore suffices to show that if $\Xi(g)(0, 1, 1, 1) = 0$, then $\Xi(g)(0, 0, 1, 2) = 0$. Suppose that

$\Xi(g)(0, 1, 1, 1) = 0$. Since $\Xi(g)(0, 1, 1, 1) = \xi(g_1)(0, 1, 2)$ and $\xi(g_1)$ is a projection, we then must have $\xi(g_1) = \pi_1^3$. By the definition of ξ , this implies that $g_1 = \pi_1^3$, and hence $g(0, 1, 1, 1) = 0$.

Note that the restriction g'_2 of g_2 to $\{0, 1\}$ is a projection or a majority operation. Suppose for contradiction that g'_2 is the second projection. Then $g(0, 0, 1, 0) = g'_2(0, 1, 0) = 1$, but $g(0, 1, 1, 1) = 0$, a contradiction to the assumption that g preserves \leq . If g'_2 is the third projection then $g(0, 0, 0, 1) = g'_2(0, 0, 1) = 1$, which similarly leads to a contradiction. If g'_2 is the majority operation then $g(0, 0, 1, 1) = g'_2(0, 1, 1) = 1$, again leading to a contradiction. Hence, g'_2 must be the first projection. It follows that $\Xi(g)(0, 0, 1, 2) = \xi(g_2)(0, 1, 2) = \pi_1^3(0, 1, 2) = 0$.

The proof for N^* is analogous. \square

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{D} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, C_2, T) \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{D} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, C_2). \end{aligned}$$

The following can be shown similarly as Proposition 4.8.

Proposition 4.10. *The structures $\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{D}$ and \mathfrak{D} pp construct each other.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{D} is an expansion of $\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{D}$, it suffices to prove that $\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{D}$ pp constructs \mathfrak{D} . Let \mathfrak{A} be the pp power of \mathfrak{L} with domain $\{0, 1, 2\}^2$ and the same signature as \mathfrak{D} ; the relations $C_3^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $T^{\mathfrak{A}}$ are defined as in the proof of Proposition 4.8, and

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{\mathfrak{A}} &:= \{(x, y) \in A^2 \mid C_2(x_1, x_2) \wedge C_2(x_1, y_1) \wedge C_2(x_2, y_2)\} \\ &= \{((0, 1), (1, 0)), ((1, 0), (0, 1))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $g: \{0, 1, 2\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}^2$ and $h: \{0, 1, 2\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be as in the proof of Proposition 4.8. To verify that h is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{A} to \mathfrak{D} , it suffices to prove that h maps tuples in $C_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ to tuples in C_2 , which is straightforward since $(0, 1, 1, 0) \in C_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is mapped to $(0, 1) \in C_2$ and $(1, 0, 0, 1) \in C_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is mapped to $(1, 0) \in C_2$. Conversely, g is a homomorphism from \mathfrak{D} to \mathfrak{A} . We have already shown that g preserves C_3 and T (see the proof of Proposition 4.8). Finally, $(g(0), g(1)) = ((0, 1), (1, 0)) \in C_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $(g(1), g(0)) = ((1, 0), (0, 1)) \in C_2^{\mathfrak{A}}$. \square

We conclude this section with a description of the clones of self-dual operations that collapse with the clone of all self-dual operations \mathfrak{C}_3 . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_3^0 &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, \{0\}) \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{I} &:= (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, T). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.11. *The structures \mathfrak{C}_3^0 , \mathfrak{C}_3 , and \mathfrak{I} pp construct each other.*

Proof. We have already shown in Section 4.1 that \mathfrak{C}_3^0 and \mathfrak{C}_3 pp construct each other. Since every relation of \mathfrak{C}_3^0 has a pp definition in \mathfrak{I} , it suffices to show that \mathfrak{C}_3^0 pp constructs \mathfrak{I} . This can be shown as in Proposition 4.8. \square

5. Separations

In this section we prove that any two clones of self-dual operations whose minor-equivalence was not proved in the previous section are in fact not minor equivalent; for every pair (\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}) such that $\mathbf{C} \not\leq_{\text{minor}} \mathbf{D}$ we present a minor condition that hold in \mathbf{C} but not in \mathbf{D} . Similarly as in Section 4, we proceed bottom-up in the lattice of clones of self-dual operations (Figure 2). We first recall important minor conditions that we then use in later sections.

5.1. Some Important Minor Conditions

Unlike the guarded 3-cyclic condition from (1), the following minor conditions are well-known and omnipresent in universal algebra. The minor condition

$$f(x, y) \approx f(y, x)$$

is called *2-cyclic condition* and denoted by Σ_2 . The minor condition

$$f(x, y, y) \approx f(y, y, x) \approx f(x, x, x)$$

is called *quasi Mal'cev condition* and the minor condition

$$f(x, y, y) \approx f(y, x, y) \approx f(y, y, x) \approx f(x, x, x)$$

is called *quasi minority condition*. Let f be a k -ary function symbol. The minor condition

$$f(x, \dots, x, y) \approx f(x, \dots, y, x) \approx \dots \approx f(y, x, \dots, x)$$

is called *weak near-unanimity condition* ($\text{WNU}(k)$). If we add to $(\text{WNU}(k))$ the minor identity $f(x, \dots, x, y) \approx f(x, \dots, x)$ then the resulting condition is called *quasi near-unanimity condition* ($\text{QNU}(k)$). The $\text{QNU}(3)$ condition is also called *quasi majority condition*. A k -ary operation f is a *quasi near-unanimity operation* if it satisfies the quasi near-unanimity condition $\text{QNU}(k)$; we adopt an analogous convention for all other conditions introduced so far. Now we define minor conditions with more than one operation symbol.

Definition 5.1. Let $n \geq 2$. The minor condition

$$\begin{aligned} t_0(x, y, z) &\approx t_0(x, x, x) \\ t_n(x, y, z) &\approx t_n(z, z, z) \\ t_i(x, y, x) &\approx t_i(x, x, x) && \text{for } i \in \{0, \dots, n\} \\ t_i(x, x, z) &\approx t_{i+1}(x, x, z) && \text{for even } i \in \{0, \dots, n\} \\ t_i(x, z, z) &\approx t_{i+1}(x, z, z) && \text{for odd } i \in \{0, \dots, n\} \end{aligned}$$

is called *quasi Jónsson condition* of length 2, $\text{QJ}(n)$.

Note that $\text{QJ}(2)$ is the quasi majority condition.

	$\mathbf{L}_3 \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{TL}_2 \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{TN} \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{W} \not\equiv$
$\mathbf{L}_3 \models$		Σ_2	Σ_2	Mal'cev
$\mathbf{TL}_2 \models$	minority		minority	minority
$\mathbf{TN} \models$	majority	majority		majority
$\mathbf{W} \models$	WNU(3)	Σ_2	Σ_2	

FIGURE 3. The minor conditions that show that the clones \mathbf{L}_3 , \mathbf{TL}_3 , \mathbf{TN} , and \mathbf{W} are pairwise incomparable.

Definition 5.2. *Let $n \geq 2$. The minor condition*

$$p_0(x, y, z) \approx p_0(x, x, x)$$

$$p_n(x, y, z) \approx p_n(z, z, z), \text{ and}$$

$$p_i(x, x, y) \approx p_{i+1}(x, y, y) \text{ for every } i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$$

is called quasi Hagemann-Mitschke condition of length n , $\text{QHM}(n)$.

Note that $\text{QHM}(2)$ is the quasi Mal'cev condition.

5.2. The Atoms

We show that there are four smallest clones of self-dual operations with respect to \leq_{minor} that are larger than $\text{Pol}(K_3)$ (see Figure 1). To describe these clones, let

$$R_3^- := \{(x, y, z) \mid x \in \{0, 1\} \wedge x = 0 \Rightarrow y = z\}$$

$$L_3 := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_1 +_3 x_2 +_3 x_3 = 0\}$$

and define

$$\mathbf{L}_3 := \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, L_3)$$

$$\mathbf{TL}_2 := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{TL}_2) = \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, T, L_2) \quad (\text{see (4) and (3)})$$

$$\mathbf{W} := \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_3^-).$$

The minority operation that returns x whenever $|\{x, y, z\}| = 3$ is denoted by ‘plus’. The binary operation \oplus is defined to be $(x, y) \mapsto 2(x + y) \bmod 3$. It is known that $\mathbf{TL}_2 = [\text{plus}]$ and that $\mathbf{L}_3 = [\oplus]$ (Theorem 4.16 in [22]).

Proposition 5.1. *The clones \mathbf{L}_3 , \mathbf{TL}_2 , \mathbf{TN} , and \mathbf{W} are pairwise incomparable with respect to \leq_{minor} .*

Proof. We use the minor conditions as specified in Figure 3. We claim that Σ_2 holds in \mathbf{L}_3 and in \mathbf{W} but not in \mathbf{TL}_2 and \mathbf{TN} . Clearly, the operation \oplus in \mathbf{L}_3 and the operation \vee_3 in \mathbf{W} are 2-cyclic. Every 2-cyclic operation f does not preserve the relation T , because $f(0, 1) = f(1, 0) = a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $(a, a) \notin T$.

It is easy to check that the operation $(x, y, z) \mapsto x \oplus (y \oplus z) \in \mathbf{L}_3$ is a Mal'cev operation. But any Mal'cev operation f does not preserve the

relation R_3^- because

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 1, 1) \\ f(1, 1, 1) \\ f(1, 1, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin R_3^- \in \text{Inv}(\mathbf{W}).$$

which shows that \mathbf{W} does not satisfy the Mal'cev condition.

Note that $\mathbf{TL}_2 = [\text{plus}]$ satisfies the quasi minority conditions but \mathbf{L}_3 , \mathbf{TN} , and \mathbf{W} do not. To see this, let f be a minority operation f . Then f does not preserve L_3 because

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 0, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 0) \\ f(0, 2, 2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin L_3.$$

Moreover, f does not preserve N because

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 1, 1) \\ f(0, 0, 2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \notin N \in \text{Inv}(\mathbf{TN}).$$

Finally, we have already seen that \mathbf{W} does not have a minority operation because every minority operation is in particular a Mal'cev operation.

The clone $\mathbf{TN} = [m]$ (see (5)) satisfies QNU(3) since m is a majority operation. However, any majority operation f does not preserve L_3

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 0, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 0) \\ f(0, 2, 2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \notin L_3$$

does not preserve L_2

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 0, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin L_2$$

and does not preserve R_3^-

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(0, 0, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 1) \\ f(0, 1, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin R_3^-$$

which shows that \mathbf{L}_3 , \mathbf{TL}_2 , and \mathbf{W} do not satisfy majority. Note that WNU(3) holds in \mathbf{W} since \mathbf{W} contains $(x, y, z) \mapsto x \vee_3 (y \vee_3 z)$. Suppose that there exists a ternary weak near unanimity operation $w \in \mathbf{L}_3$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(0, 1, 1) \\ w(1, 0, 1) \\ w(2, 2, 1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \\ b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $(a, a, b) \in L_3$ implies that $a = b$. It follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} w(0, 1, 1) \\ w(1, 2, 2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \notin C_3$$

which is a contradiction. \square

5.3. Separations in the Wings

In the lattice of clones of self-dual operations the clone \mathbf{W} is the smallest clone in the left wing. The clone $\mathbf{Q} := \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{Q})$, where $\mathfrak{Q} = (\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, R_2^-)$ is the structure introduced in Section 4.3, is the unique smallest clone that contains \mathbf{W} and also lies in the left wing (see Figure 2).

Theorem 5.2. *There is no minor-preserving map from \mathbf{Q} to \mathbf{W} .*

Proof. It is known that \mathbf{Q} contains the operation r_4 defined as follows [22] (Theorem 4.17).

$$r_4(x, y, z, t) := \begin{cases} x \wedge_3 y \wedge_3 z & \text{if } |\{x, y, z, t\}| \leq 2 \\ t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that r_4 satisfies the minor condition, which we call *guarded 3-cyclic* ($g\Sigma_3$)

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3, y) \approx f(x_2, x_3, x_1, y) \quad (7)$$

$$\text{and } f(x, x, x, y) \approx f(x, x, x, x). \quad (8)$$

Suppose for contradiction that these identities can be satisfied by an operation $f \in \text{Pol}(\mathfrak{W})$. Let $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ be such that $f(0, 1, 2, 0) = a$. Since f preserves C_3 we have $f(1, 2, 0, 1) = a + 1$. By (7) we have $f(0, 1, 2, 1) = a + 1$. But then f does not preserve R_3^- , because

$$f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \\ a + 1 \end{pmatrix} \notin R_3^-. \quad \square$$

The clone $\mathbf{B}_\infty \pi_\infty$ is the unique smallest clone that strictly contains \mathbf{Q} (Figure 2). Recall from Section 4.4 that $\mathbf{B}_\infty \pi_\infty$ collapses with \mathbf{M}_∞ .

Proposition 5.3. *The minor condition QJ(4) holds in \mathbf{M}_∞ but not in \mathbf{Q} .*

Proof. Zhuk [22] (Theorem 4.18) proved that \mathbf{M}_∞ contains the operation f_π^∞ defined by

$$f_\pi^\infty(x, y, z) := \begin{cases} x \vee_3 (y \wedge_3 z) & \text{if } |\{x, y, z\}| \leq 2 \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the operations t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 given by

$$t_0(x, y, z) := f_\pi^\infty(x, x, x)$$

$$t_1(x, y, z) := f_\pi^\infty(x, y, z)$$

$$t_2(x, y, z) := f_\pi^\infty(x, z, z)$$

$$t_3(x, y, z) := f_\pi^\infty(z, x, y)$$

$$t_4(x, y, z) := f_\pi^\infty(z, z, z)$$

witness that \mathbf{M}_∞ satisfies QJ(4); in particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(x, y, x) &= f_\pi^\infty(x, y, x) = x \vee_3 (y \wedge_3 x) = x \\ t_2(x, y, x) &= f_\pi^\infty(x, x, x) = x \\ t_3(x, y, x) &= f_\pi^\infty(x, x, y) = x \vee_3 (x \wedge_3 y) = x \\ t_1(x, z, z) &= f_\pi^\infty(x, z, z) = f_\pi^\infty(x, z, z) = t_2(x, z, z) \\ t_2(x, x, z) &= f_\pi^\infty(x, z, z) = f_\pi^\infty(z, x, x) = t_3(x, x, z). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that \mathbf{Q} does not satisfy QJ(4). Since \mathfrak{Q} has a minor-preserving map to \mathfrak{P} , it suffices to prove that the clone \mathfrak{P} does not satisfy QJ(4). Barto [2] proved that every finite structure with a finite relational signature whose polymorphism clone satisfies QJ(n) for some n also satisfies QNU(n) for some $n \geq 3$. Suppose for contradiction that \mathfrak{P} contains a quasi near unanimity operation t of arity $n \geq 3$. If $n = 3$ we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} t(0, 1, 0) \\ t(1, 0, 0) \\ t(1, 1, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \notin R_2^{\vec{}}.$$

For $k > 3$, note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} t(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0) \\ t(1, \dots, 1, 0, 0) \\ t(1, \dots, 1, 1, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a_1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since we assumed that $t \in \text{Pol}(\mathbb{P})$, we obtain that $a_1 = 1$. We repeat the same reasoning $k - 4$ times: each time we consider the matrix M_i , for $2 \leq i \leq k - 3$, where the first $k - i - 1$ columns are equal to $(0, 1, 1)$, the $(k - i)$ -th column is equal to $(1, 0, 1)$, and the last i columns are equal to $(0, 0, 0)$. Note that every column of M_i is an element of $R_2^{\vec{}}$. By letting t act row-wise in M_i , we get the chain of equalities $a_2 = \dots = a_{k-3} = 1$. Finally we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} t(0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \\ t(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \\ t(1, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ a_{k-3} \end{pmatrix} \notin R_2^{\vec{}},$$

a contradiction. □

We will now show all the clones \mathbf{B}_k and \mathbf{M}_k , for $k \geq 2$, are pairwise distinct. If $t \in A^n$, we denote by $\text{Two}(t)$ the set of all entries of t that appear at least twice. For $n \geq 3$, let $f_\pi^n: \{0, 1, 2\}^{n+1} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be the operation defined as follows

$$f_\pi^n(x_1, \dots, x_{x+1}) := \begin{cases} x_1 & \text{if } \text{Two}(x_1, \dots, x_{x+1}) = \{0, 1, 2\}, \\ a \vee_3 b & \text{if } \text{Two}(x_1, \dots, x_{x+1}) = \{a, b\}, \\ a & \text{if } \text{Two}(x_1, \dots, x_{x+1}) = \{a\}. \end{cases}$$

It is known that $f_\pi^n \in \mathbf{B}_n$ and $f_\pi^n \in \mathbf{M}_n$ (Zhuk [22], Theorem 4.17).

Proposition 5.4. *Let $n \geq 2$. The condition QNU($n + 1$) holds in \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{M}_n , but not in \mathbf{B}_{n+1} and \mathbf{M}_{n+1} .*

	$\mathbf{L}_3 \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{TL}_2 \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{TN} \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{W} \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{D} \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{Q} \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{M}_n \not\equiv$	$\mathbf{B}_n \not\equiv$
$\mathbf{L}_3 \models$		Σ_2	Σ_2	Mal'cev	Σ_2	Mal'cev	Mal'cev	Mal'cev
$\mathbf{TL}_2 \models$	minority		minority	minority		minority	minority	minority
$\mathbf{TN} \models$	majority	majority		majority		majority	majority	majority
$\mathbf{W} \models$	WNU(3)	Σ_2	Σ_2		Σ_2			
$\mathbf{D} \models$	majority	majority	minority	minority		minority	minority	minority
$\mathbf{Q} \models$	WNU(3)	Σ_2	Σ_2	$g\Sigma_3$	Σ_2			
$\mathbf{M}_n \models$	WNU(3)	Σ_2	Σ_2	$g\Sigma_3$	Σ_2	QJ(4)		
$\mathbf{B}_n \models$	WNU(3)	Σ_2	Σ_2	$g\Sigma_3$	Σ_2	QJ(4)	QHM(3)	
$\mathbf{C}_3 \models$	minority	Σ_2	minority	minority	Σ_2	minority	minority	minority

FIGURE 4. The minor conditions that justify that the existence of a minor-preserving map orders the clones of self-dual operations as depicted in Figure 1.

Proof. If $n \geq 3$, then \mathbf{B}_n and \mathbf{M}_n contain the quasi near unanimity operation note that f_π^n . If $n = 2$, then note that $m \in \mathbf{B}_n$ and $m \in \mathbf{M}_n$ (where m is defined in (5)) and that m is a majority operation. It is easy to see that every quasi near unanimity operation of arity $n \geq 2$ does not preserve B_n , so QNU(n) does not hold in \mathbf{B}_n and in \mathbf{M}_n . \square

Let $f_0^\infty: \{0, 1, 2\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ be defined by $f_0^\infty(x, y, x) = x \vee_3 y$, and by $f_0^\infty(x, y, z) = x$ otherwise. It is known that $f_0^\infty \in \mathbf{B}_n$ for every $n \geq 2$ (Theorem 4.17 in [22]).

Proposition 5.5. QHM(3) holds in \mathbf{B}_∞ , but not in \mathbf{M}_2 .

Proof. For $x, y, z \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_0(x, y, z) &:= f_0^\infty(x, x, x) & p_1(x, y, z) &:= f_0^\infty(x, z, y) \\
 p_2(x, y, z) &:= f_0^\infty(z, x, y) & p_3(x, y, z) &:= f_0^\infty(z, z, z).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 witness that \mathbf{B}_∞ satisfies QHM(3): in particular, we have

$$p_1(x, x, y) = f_0^\infty(x, y, x) = \vee_3(x, y) = f_0^\infty(y, x, y) = p_2(x, y, y).$$

Suppose for contradiction that \mathbf{M}_2 has operations p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 that witness QHM(3). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 &= p_0(1, 1, 0) = p_1(1, 0, 0) \\
 &\leq_2 p_1(1, 1, 0) = p_2(1, 0, 0) \\
 &\leq_2 p_2(1, 1, 0) = p_3(1, 0, 0) = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. \square

This implies that for all $k, l \geq 2$, there is no minor-preserving map from \mathbf{B}_k to \mathbf{M}_l , because $\mathbf{B}_k \subseteq \mathbf{B}_\infty$ and $\mathbf{M}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{M}_l$.

5.4. The Final Picture

In this section we complete the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 5.6. *The lattice of clones of self-dual operations factored by minor equivalence and ordered by the existence of minor-preserving maps, is a countably infinite lattice, and is exactly of the form as described in Figure 1.*

Proof. We use the minor conditions as indicated in the table of Figure 4. In Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 5.5 we proved that the clones \mathbf{M}_n and \mathbf{B}_n , for $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty\}$, for two descending chains as displayed in Figure 4. The restriction of this table to the clones \mathbf{L}_3 , \mathbf{TL}_2 , \mathbf{T} , and \mathbf{T} has already been described in Figure 3. We now describe how to extend this table to the remaining clones \mathbf{W} , $\mathbf{D} := \text{Pol}(\mathcal{D})$, \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{M}_n , \mathbf{B}_n , and \mathbf{C}_3 .

The clone $\mathbf{D} = \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; C_3, C_2)$ contains \mathbf{TN} and \mathbf{TL}_2 , and therefore contains the minority operation plus and the majority operation m . It does not satisfy Σ_2 because idempotent operations on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ that satisfy Σ_2 cannot preserve C_2 .

The clone \mathbf{Q} contains \mathbf{W} and therefore contains a binary symmetric operation and a ternary weak near unanimity operation. Moreover, the proof of Theorem 5.2 shows that \mathbf{Q} satisfies $g\Sigma_3$, which is not satisfied by \mathbf{W} . Moreover, \mathbf{Q} does not satisfy $\text{QJ}(4)$, which is satisfied by \mathbf{M}_n and \mathbf{B}_n for all $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty\}$ (Proposition 5.3).

The clone \mathbf{M}_n , for each $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty\}$, contains \mathbf{Q} and therefore satisfies $\text{QNU}(3)$, Σ_2 , and $g\Sigma_3$. It does not satisfy $\text{QHM}(3)$ as we have seen in Proposition 5.5. For each $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty\}$, the clone \mathbf{B}_n contains \mathbf{M}_n , but satisfies the additional minor condition $\text{QHM}(3)$. It is straightforward to verify that any minority operation on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ does not preserve the relation B_2 , so \mathbf{B}_n does not satisfy the minority condition. The clone \mathbf{C}_3 contains all the clones discussed so far; since each of these clones does not satisfy some minor condition discussed so far, it follows that \mathbf{C}_3 does not have a minor-preserving map to any of these clones. \square

6. Concluding Remarks

There are 2^ω many clones of self-dual operations; we showed that there is an equally large set of clones of self-dual operations that are pairwise homomorphically incomparable. However, when considered up to minor equivalence the self-dual clones fall into countably many classes, and the resulting lattice can be described completely. Our work illustrates the potential of minor equivalence for a systematic study of clones on finite domains. We make the following provocative conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *The minor equivalence relation on clones on finite domains has only countably many classes.*

An interesting first step towards proving this conjecture would be the verification that there are only countably many clones on a three-element set up to minor equivalence.

All clones that contain an operation with an image of size at most two are minor equivalent to a clone on a two-element set (these clones comprise the uncountable set of clones described by Yanov and Muchnik [21]), and it is known that there are only countably many of those by Post's classification. By the discussion in Section 4.1, it therefore suffices to classify *idempotent* clones on three elements with respect to minor equivalence.

Conjecture 2. *Every clone on three elements that does not admit a minor-preserving map from the clone \mathbf{I} of all idempotent operations on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ has a minor-preserving map to one of the following three clones on $\{0, 1, 2\}$:*

- (1) *the clone \mathbf{C}_3 , whose subclones were studied in this article,*
- (2) *$\mathbf{T}_3 := \text{Pol}(\{0, 1, 2\}; <)$.*

The three clones in Conjecture 2 also appear as polymorphism clones of directed graphs that are maximal with respect to pp constructability in the class of all finite directed graphs [5]. If Conjecture 2 is true, then the results of the present article show that in order to classify all clones on three elements it suffices to study the clones that have a minor-preserving map to \mathbf{C}_2 or to \mathbf{T}_3 . If we are only interested in proving that there are countably many such clones, we can even focus on the clones with a minor-preserving map to \mathbf{T}_3 , because all other clones have a Mal'cev operation [5] and because Bulatov [7] proved that there are only finitely many clones on $\{0, 1, 2\}$ containing a Malt'sev operation.²

References

- [1] E. Aichinger, P. Mayr, and R. McKenzie. On the number of finite algebraic structures. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 16(8):1673–1686, 2014.
- [2] L. Barto. Finitely related algebras in congruence distributive varieties have near unanimity terms. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 65(1):3–21, 2013.
- [3] L. Barto, J. Opršal, and M. Pinsker. The wonderland of reflections. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 223(1):363–398, 2018.
- [4] M. Bodirsky. *Complexity of Infinite-Domain Constraint Satisfaction*. Lecture Notes in Logic (52). Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [5] M. Bodirsky and F. Starke. Maximal digraphs with respect to primitive positive constructability. *Submitted*, 2021.
- [6] V. G. Bodnarčuk, L. A. Kalužnin, V. N. Kotov, and B. A. Romov. Galois theory for Post algebras, part I and II. *Cybernetics*, 5:243–539, 1969.
- [7] A. Bulatov. On the number of finite mal'tsev algebras. *Contr. Gen. Alg.*, 13:41–54, 2001. Proceedings of the Dresden Conference 2000 (AAA 60) and the Summer School 1999.
- [8] A. A. Bulatov. Conservative constraint satisfaction re-revisited. *Journal Computer and System Sciences*, 82(2):347–356, 2016. ArXiv:1408.3690.
- [9] A. A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17*, pages 319–330, 2017.
- [10] B. Csákány. All minimal clones on the three-element set. *Acta Cybern.*, 6:227–238, 1984.
- [11] B. Csákány. Minimal clones. *Algebra Universalis*, 54(1):73–89, 2005.

²Aichinger, Mayr, and McKenzie [1] proved more recently that there are only countably many clones on sets of the form $\{0, \dots, n - 1\}$.

- [12] L. Dietlinde. *Function algebras on finite sets : a basic course on many-valued logic and clone theory / Dietlinde Lau*. Springer monographs in mathematics. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, cop. 2006.
- [13] O. C. Garcia and W. Taylor. *The Lattice of Interpretability Types of Varieties*. Memoirs of the AMS, 1984.
- [14] D. Geiger. Closed systems of functions and predicates. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 27:95–100, 1968.
- [15] S. V. Jablonskij. On functional completeness in the three-valued calculus. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 95(2):1153–1155, 1954.
- [16] B. Larose and L. Zádori. Bounded width problems and algebras. *Algebra Universalis*, 56(3-4):439–466, 2007.
- [17] S. S. Marchenkov. On closed classes of self-dual functions of many-valued logic. *Probl. Kibernetiki*, 40:261–266, 1983. (in Russian).
- [18] E. L. Post. *The two-valued iterative systems of mathematical logic*, volume 5. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1941.
- [19] I. G. Rosenberg. La structure des fonctions de plusieurs variables sur un ensemble fini. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris*, 260:3817–3819, 1965.
- [20] I. G. Rosenberg. Minimal clones I: the five types. *Lectures in Universal Algebra (Proc. Conf. Szeged, 1983), Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai*, 43:405–427, 1986.
- [21] Y. I. Yanov and A. A. Muchnik. On the existence of k -valued closed classes without a finite basis. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 127:44–46, 1959. in Russian.
- [22] D. N. Zhuk. The lattice of all clones of self-dual functions in three-valued logic. *Multiple-Valued Logic and Soft Computing*, 24(1-4):251–316, 2015.
- [23] D. N. Zhuk. A proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17*, pages 331–342, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.01914>.

Manuel Bodirsky
Institute of Algebra
Technische Universität Dresden
Dresden
Germany
e-mail: manuel.bodirsky@tu-dresden.de

Albert Vucaj
Institute of Algebra
Technische Universität Dresden
Dresden
Germany
e-mail: albert.vucaj@tu-dresden.de

Dmitriy Zhuk
Department of Mechanics and Mathematics
Lomonosov Moscow State University
Moscow
Russia
e-mail: Zhuk@intsys.msu.ru