

CHARACTERISATION OF THE BIG RAMSEY DEGREES OF THE GENERIC PARTIAL ORDER

MARTIN BALKO, DAVID CHODOUNSKÝ, NATASHA DOBRINEN,
JAN HUBIČKA, MATĚJ KONEČNÝ, LLUIS VENA, AND ANDY ZUCKER

ABSTRACT. As a result of 33 intercontinental Zoom calls, we characterise big Ramsey degrees of the generic partial order. This is an infinitary extension of the well known fact that finite partial orders endowed with linear extensions form a Ramsey class (this result was announced by Nešetřil and Rödl in 1984 with first published proof by Paoli, Trotter and Walker in 1985). Towards this, we refine earlier upper bounds obtained by Hubička based on a new connection of big Ramsey degrees to the Carlson–Simpson theorem and we also introduce a new technique of giving lower bounds using an iterated application of the upper-bound theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

We characterise the big Ramsey degrees of (finite substructures of) \mathbf{P} in a similar fashion as the authors did in [1] for binary finitely constrained free amalgamation classes. Similarly to that case, our characterisation is in terms of a tree-like object we call a “poset diary” where each level has exactly one critical event. It follows that any poset diary which codes the generic poset is a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{P} (Definition 1.3 of [37]).

Relative to the small Ramsey degree case (see e.g. [30, 5, 15]), there are fewer classes of structures for which big Ramsey degrees are fully understood. The following is the current state of the art:

- (1) The Ramsey theorem implies that the big Ramsey degree of every finite linear order in the linear order ω is 1.
- (2) In 1979, Devlin refined upper bounds by Laver and characterised big Ramsey degrees of the rational linear order [10, 35].
- (3) In 2006 Laflamme, Sauer and Vuksanović characterised big Ramsey degrees of the Rado (or random) graph and related random structures in binary languages [21]. Actual numbers were counted by Larson [22].
- (4) In 2008 Nguyen Van Thé characterised big Ramsey degrees of the ultrametric Urysohn spaces [29].

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 05D10, 06A07; Secondary 05C05, 05C55.

- (5) In 2010 Laflamme, Nguyen Van Thé and Sauer [20] characterised the big Ramsey degrees of the dense local order, $\mathbf{S}(2)$ and the \mathbb{Q}_n structures.
- (6) In 2020 Coulson, Dobrinen, and Patel in [7] and [8] characterised the big Ramsey degrees of homogeneous binary relational structures which satisfy SDAP^+ , recovering work in [21] and [20] and characterising the big Ramsey degrees of the ordered versions of structures in [21], the generic n -partite and generic ordered n -partite graphs, and the $(\mathbb{Q}_{\mathbb{Q}})_n$ hierarchy.
- (7) In 2020 Barbosa characterised the big Ramsey degrees of the directed circular orders $\mathbf{S}(k)$, $k \geq 2$, [4].
- (8) In 2020 a characterisation of the big Ramsey degrees of the triangle-free Henson graph was obtained by Dobrinen [12] and independently by the remaining authors of this article. Joining efforts, the authors were able to fully characterise big Ramsey degrees of free amalgamation classes in finite binary languages described by finitely many forbidden cliques [1].

If one draws an analogy to the small Ramsey results, many of the aforementioned characterisations can be seen as infinitary generalisations of special cases of the Nešetřil–Rödl theorem [26]. Small Ramsey degrees (or the *Ramsey expansions* satisfying the *expansion property*, see [30]) are known for many other classes including the class of partial orders with linear extensions [27, 31, 33, 24, 34, 28], metric spaces [25, 9, 24] and other examples satisfying rather general structural conditions [16] (see also recent surveys [15, 19]).

In this paper, we characterize the big Ramsey degrees of the generic partial order. This class represents an important new example since its finitary counterpart is not a consequence of the Nešetřil–Rödl theorem [26], nor is it of the form covered by [8]. To complete our characterisation, we further refine the proof techniques introduced in [14] used to prove finite upper bounds, which were based on the Carlson–Simpson theorem, and we also give a fundamentally different approach than in [1] to prove the lower bounds. The techniques introduced in this paper generalize to other classes as we briefly outline in the final section. However, to keep the paper simple, we did not attempt to state the results in the greatest possible generality.

Given structures \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , we denote by $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ the set of all embeddings from \mathbf{A} to \mathbf{B} . We write $\mathbf{C} \rightarrow (\mathbf{B})_{k,\ell}^{\mathbf{A}}$ to denote the following statement:

For every colouring $\chi: \text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C}) \rightarrow k$, there exists $f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ such that χ takes no more than l values on $f \circ \text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$.

For a countably infinite structure \mathbf{B} and a finite substructure \mathbf{A} , the *big Ramsey degree* of \mathbf{A} in \mathbf{B} is the least number $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such

that $\mathbf{B} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{B})_{k,\ell}^{\mathbf{A}}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, if \mathcal{K} is a class of finite structures and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, the *small Ramsey degree* of \mathbf{A} in \mathcal{K} is the least number $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that for every $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathbf{C} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{B})_{k,\ell}^{\mathbf{A}}$.

A structure is *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between two of its finite substructures extends to an automorphism. It is well known that up to isomorphism there is a unique homogeneous partial order $\mathbf{P} = (P, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$ such that every countable partial order has an embedding into \mathbf{P} . The order \mathbf{P} is called the *generic partial order* (see e.g. [23]). We refine the following recent result.

Theorem 1.1 (Hubička [14]). *The big Ramsey degree of every finite partial order in the generic partial order \mathbf{P} is finite.*

Our construction makes use of the following partial order introduced in [14]; this is closely related to the tree of 1-types within a fixed enumeration of \mathbf{P} discussed in Section 3. Let

$$\Sigma = \{\text{L, X, R}\}$$

be an *alphabet* ordered by $<_{\Sigma}$ as

$$\text{L} <_{\Sigma} \text{X} <_{\Sigma} \text{R}.$$

We denote by Σ^* the set of all finite words in the alphabet Σ , by \leq_{lex} their lexicographic order, and by $|w|$ the length of the word $w = w_0w_1 \cdots w_{|w|-1}$. We denote the empty word by \emptyset . Given words $w, w' \in \Sigma^*$, we write $w \sqsubseteq w'$ if w is an initial segment of w' .

Definition 1.2 (Partial order (Σ^*, \preceq)). For $w, w' \in \Sigma^*$, we set $w \prec w'$ if and only if there exists i such that:

- (1) $0 \leq i < \min(|w|, |w'|)$,
- (2) $(w_i, w'_i) = (\text{L}, \text{R})$, and
- (3) $w_j \leq_{\Sigma} w'_j$ for every $0 \leq j < i$.

We call the least i satisfying the condition above the *witness* of $w \prec w'$ and denote it by $i(w, w')$. We write $w \preceq w'$ if either $w \prec w'$ or $w = w'$.

Proposition 1.3 ([14]). (Σ^*, \preceq) is a partial order, and $(\Sigma^*, \leq_{\text{lex}})$ is a linear extension of (Σ^*, \preceq) .

This partial order will serve as the main tool for characterising the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} . The intuition for its definition is described in Section 3.

Proof of Proposition 1.3. It is easy to see that \preceq is reflexive and anti-symmetric. We verify transitivity. Let $w \prec w' \prec w''$ and put $i = \min(i(w, w'), i(w', w''))$.

First assume that $i = i(w, w')$. Then we have $w_i = \text{L}$ and $w'_i = \text{R}$, which implies that $w''_i = \text{R}$. For every $0 \leq j < i$, we have $w_j \leq_{\Sigma} w'_j \leq_{\Sigma}$

w_j'' . The transitivity of \leq_Σ then implies that $w \prec w''$, so $i(w, w'')$ exists with $i(w, w'') \leq i$.

Now assume that $i = i(w', w'')$. Then we have $w'_i = L$ and $w''_i = R$, and since $w'_i = L$, we also have $w_i = L$. Again, for every $0 \leq j < i$ it holds that $w_j \leq_\Sigma w'_j \leq_\Sigma w''_j$. Similarly as above, we have $w \preceq w''$ with $i(w, w'') \leq i$. \square

Given a word w and an integer $i \geq 0$, we denote by $w|_i$ the *initial segment* of w of length i . For $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we let \bar{S} be the set $\{w|_i : w \in S, 0 \leq i \leq |w|\}$. Given $\ell \geq 0$, we let $S_\ell = \{w \in S : |w| = \ell\}$ and call it the *level ℓ of S* . When writing \bar{S}_ℓ , we always mean level ℓ of \bar{S} . A word $w \in S$ is called a *leaf* of S if there is no word $w' \in S$ extending w . Given a word w and a letter $c \in \Sigma$, we denote by $w \frown c$ the word created by adding c to the end of w . We also set $S \frown c = \{w \frown c : w \in S\}$. Given $\ell \geq 0$, $\Sigma_\ell^* = (\Sigma^*)_\ell$ denotes the set of words of length ℓ in the alphabet Σ .

Definition 1.4 (Partial orders $(\Sigma_\ell^*, \trianglelefteq)$). Given $\ell \geq 0$ and words $w, w' \in \Sigma_\ell^*$, we write $w \trianglelefteq w'$ if $w_i \leq_\Sigma w'_i$ for every $0 \leq i < \ell$. We write $w \perp w'$ if w and w' are \trianglelefteq -incomparable (that is, if neither of $w \trianglelefteq w'$ nor $w' \trianglelefteq w$ holds). We call w and w' *related* if one of expressions $w \preceq w'$, $w' \preceq w$ or $w \perp w'$ holds, otherwise they are *unrelated*.

Intuitively, $s \trianglelefteq t$ describes those pairs of nodes on the same level where it is possible to extend s and t to nodes with $s' \prec t'$. However, observe that (somewhat counter-intuitively) it can happen that both \preceq and \perp hold at the same time: For example, we have both that $LR \preceq RL$ as well as $LR \perp RL$. Later, we will introduce the notion of compatibility to help us handle these situations. While it is easy to check that $(\Sigma_\ell^*, \trianglelefteq)$ is a partial order for every $\ell \geq 0$, we do not extend it to all of Σ^* .

To characterise the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} , we introduce the following technical definition. Our main theorem characterizes the big Ramsey degree of a given finite poset in \mathbf{P} as the number of *poset-diaries* of a certain kind. The intuition behind the definition will be explained in Section 3.

Definition 1.5 (Poset-diaries). A set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is called a *poset-diary* if no member of S extends any other (i.e., S is an antichain in (Σ^*, \sqsubseteq)) and precisely one of the following four conditions is satisfied for every level ℓ with $0 \leq \ell < \sup_{w \in S} |w|$:

- (1) **Leaf:** There is $w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ related to every $u \in \bar{S}_\ell \setminus \{w\}$ and

$$\bar{S}_{\ell+1} = (\bar{S}_\ell \setminus \{w\}) \frown X.$$

(2) **Splitting:** There is $w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_{\ell+1} &= \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : z <_{\text{lex}} w\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{w \wedge X, w \wedge R\} \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} z\} \wedge R. \end{aligned}$$

(3) **New \perp :** There are unrelated words $v <_{\text{lex}} w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ such that the following is satisfied.

(A) For every $u \in \bar{S}_\ell$ with $v <_{\text{lex}} u <_{\text{lex}} w$, we have $u \perp v$ or $u \perp w$.

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_{\ell+1} &= \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : z <_{\text{lex}} v\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{v \wedge R\} \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : v <_{\text{lex}} z <_{\text{lex}} w \text{ and } z \perp v\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : v <_{\text{lex}} z <_{\text{lex}} w \text{ and } z \not\perp v\} \wedge R \\ &\quad \cup \{w \wedge X\} \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} z\} \wedge R. \end{aligned}$$

(4) **New \prec :** There are unrelated words $v <_{\text{lex}} w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ such that the following is satisfied.

(B1) For every $u \in \bar{S}_\ell$ with $u <_{\text{lex}} v$, we have $u \preceq w$ or $u \perp v$.

(B2) For every $u \in \bar{S}_\ell$ with $w <_{\text{lex}} u$, we have $v \preceq u$ or $w \perp u$.

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_{\ell+1} &= \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : z <_{\text{lex}} v \text{ and } z \perp v\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : z <_{\text{lex}} v \text{ and } z \not\perp v\} \wedge L \\ &\quad \cup \{v \wedge L\} \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : v <_{\text{lex}} z <_{\text{lex}} w\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{w \wedge R\} \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} z \text{ and } w \perp z\} \wedge X \\ &\quad \cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} z \text{ and } w \not\perp z\} \wedge R. \end{aligned}$$

See also Figure 1.

Given a countable partial order \mathbf{Q} , we let $T(\mathbf{Q})$ be the set of all poset-diaries S such that (S, \preceq) is isomorphic to \mathbf{Q} .

Example 1.6. Denote by \mathbf{A}_n the anti-chain with n vertices and by \mathbf{C}_n the chain with n vertices.

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{A}_1) &= T(\mathbf{C}_1) = \{\emptyset\}, \\ T(\mathbf{A}_2) &= \{\{XR, RXX\}, \{XRX, RX\}\}, \\ T(\mathbf{C}_2) &= \{\{XL, RRX\}, \{XLX, RR\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In all diaries in $T(\mathbf{A}_2) \cup T(\mathbf{C}_2)$, level 0 is splitting, level 1 adds a new






FIGURE 1. Possible levels in poset-diaries.

FIGURE 2. Diaries of \mathbf{A}_2 .FIGURE 3. Poset-diaries of \mathbf{C}_2 .

\perp or \prec , and levels 2 and 3 are leaves.

Poset-diaries of small partial orders can be determined by an exhaustive search tool.¹ We determined that $|T(\mathbf{C}_3)| = 52$, $|T(\mathbf{C}_4)| = 11000$, $|T(\mathbf{A}_3)| = 84$, and $|T(\mathbf{A}_4)| = 75642$. Overall there are:

- (1) 1 poset-diary of the (unique) partial order of size 1: $S = \{\emptyset\}$,
- (2) 4 poset-diaries of partial orders of size 2: $T(\mathbf{A}_2) \cup T(\mathbf{C}_2)$,
- (3) 464 poset-diaries of partial orders of size 3,
- (4) 1874880 poset-diaries of partial orders of size 4.

As our main result, we determine the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} and show that \mathbf{P} admits a big Ramsey structure; while we refer to [37] for the precise definition (see also [17]), a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{P} is an expansion \mathbf{P}^* of \mathbf{P} which encodes the exact big Ramsey degrees for all finite substructures simultaneously in a coherent fashion.

¹<https://github.com/janhubicka/big-ramsey>

Theorem 1.7. *For every finite partial order \mathbf{Q} , the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{Q} in the generic partial order \mathbf{P} equals $|T(\mathbf{Q})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{Q})|$. Furthermore, any $\mathbf{P}^* \in T(\mathbf{P})$ encodes a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{P} . Consequently, the topological group $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ admits a metrizable universal completion flow.*

Note that the number of poset-diaries is multiplied by the size of the automorphism group since we define big Ramsey degrees with respect to embeddings (as done, for example, in [37]). Big Ramsey degrees are often defined with respect to substructures (see, for example, [10, 21, 22, 29, 20]) and in that case the degree would be $|T(\mathbf{Q})|$.

Example 1.8.

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\mathbf{A}_1)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}_1)| &= |T(\mathbf{C}_1)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{C}_1)| = 1, \\ |T(\mathbf{A}_2)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}_2)| &= 4, \\ |T(\mathbf{C}_2)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{C}_2)| &= 2, \\ |T(\mathbf{A}_3)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}_3)| &= 504, \\ |T(\mathbf{C}_3)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{C}_3)| &= 52, \\ |T(\mathbf{A}_4)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A}_4)| &= 1816128, \\ |T(\mathbf{C}_4)| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{C}_4)| &= 11000. \end{aligned}$$

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Relational structures. We use the standard model-theoretic notion of a relational structure. Let L be a language with relational symbols $R \in L$ each equipped with a positive natural number called its *arity*. An L -structure \mathbf{A} on A is a structure with *vertex set* A and relations $R_{\mathbf{A}} \subseteq A^r$ for every symbol $R \in L$ of arity r . We typically use bold letters for structures and the corresponding unbolded letters for the underlying set unless otherwise specified. If the set A is finite, countable, countably infinite, etc., we call \mathbf{A} a *finite, countable, or countably infinite structure*, respectively. All structures that we consider are countable.

Since we work with structures in multiple languages, we will list the vertex set along with the relations of the structure, e.g., (P, \leq) for partial orders.

2.2. Trees. For us, a *tree* is a (possibly empty) partially ordered set $(T, <_T)$ such that, for every $t \in T$, the set $\{s \in T : s <_T t\}$ is finite and linearly ordered by $<_T$. All nonempty trees we consider are *rooted*, that is, they have a unique minimal element called the *root* of the tree. An element $t \in T$ of a tree T is called a *node* of T and its *level*, denoted by $|t|_T$, is the size of the set $\{s \in T : s <_T t\}$. Note that the root has level 0. Given a tree T and nodes $s, t \in T$, we say that s is a *successor*

of t in T if $t \leq_T s$. A *subtree* of a tree T is a subset T' of T viewed as a tree equipped with the induced partial ordering.

Given words $w, w' \in \Sigma^*$, we write $w \sqsubseteq w'$ if w is an initial segment of w' . With this partial order we obtain a tree (Σ^*, \sqsubseteq) and the notation on words introduced in Section 1 can be viewed as a special case of the notation introduced here.

2.3. Parameter words. To obtain upper bounds for the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} , we apply a Ramsey theorem for parameter words which we briefly review now.

Given a finite alphabet Σ and $k \in \omega \cup \{\omega\}$, a *k-parameter word* is a (possibly infinite) string W in the alphabet $\Sigma \cup \{\lambda_i: 0 \leq i < k\}$ containing all symbols λ_i , $0 \leq i < k$ such that, for every $1 \leq j < k$, the first occurrence of λ_j appears after the first occurrence of λ_{j-1} . The symbols λ_i are called *parameters*. We will use uppercase letters to denote parameter words and lowercase letters for words without parameters. Let W be an n -parameter word and let U be a parameter word of length $k \leq n$, where $k, n \in \omega \cup \{\omega\}$. Then $W(U)$ is the parameter word created by *substituting* U to W . More precisely, $W(U)$ is created from W by replacing each occurrence of λ_i , $0 \leq i < k$, by U_i and truncating it just before the first occurrence of λ_k in W .

We apply the following Ramsey theorem for parameter words, which is an easy consequence of the Carlson–Simpson theorem[6], see also [35, 18]:

Theorem 2.1. *Let Σ be a finite alphabet. If Σ^* is coloured with finitely many colours, then there exists an infinite-parameter word W such that*

$$W[\Sigma^*] = \{W(s) : s \in \Sigma^*\}$$

is monochromatic.

3. TREE OF 1-TYPES

Poset-diaries, which can be compared to *Devlin embedding types* (see Chapter 6.3 of [35]) or the *diaries* introduced in [1], have an intuitive meaning when understood in the context of the tree of 1-types of \mathbf{P} . We now introduce this tree and its enrichment to an *aged coding tree* and discuss how poset-diaries can be obtained as a suitable abstraction of the aged coding tree.

An *enumerated structure* is simply a structure \mathbf{A} with underlying set $A = |A|$. Fix a countably infinite enumerated structure \mathbf{A} . Given vertices u, v and an integer n satisfying $\min(u, v) \geq n \geq 0$, we write $u \sim_n^{\mathbf{A}} v$ and say that u and v have the same (quantifier-free) type over $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, if the structures induced by \mathbf{A} on $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1, u\}$ and $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1, v\}$ are isomorphic via the map which is the identity on $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and sends u to v . We write $[u]_n^{\mathbf{A}}$ for the $\sim_n^{\mathbf{A}}$ -equivalence class of vertex u .

Definition 3.1 (Tree of 1-types). Let \mathbf{A} be a countably infinite (relational) enumerated structure. Given $n < \omega$, write $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = \omega / \sim_n^{\mathbf{A}}$. A (quantifier-free) *1-type* is any member of the disjoint union $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}} := \bigsqcup_{n < \omega} \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}(n)$. We turn $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}$ into a tree as follows. Given $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}(m)$ and $y \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}(n)$, we declare that $x \leq_{\mathbf{A}}^{\mathbb{T}} y$ if and only if $m \leq n$ and $x \supseteq y$.

In the case that we have a Fraïssé class \mathcal{K} in mind (which for us will always be the class of finite partial orders), we can extend the definition to a finite enumerated $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ as follows. Fix an enumerated Fraïssé limit \mathbf{K} of \mathcal{K} which has \mathbf{A} as an initial segment. We then set $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{K}}(<|\mathbf{A}|)$. This does not depend on the choice of \mathbf{K} .

In the case that \mathbf{A} is a structure in a finite binary relational language, we can encode $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}$ as a subtree of $k^{<\omega}$ for some $k < \omega$ as follows. Given two enumerated structures \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} , an *ordered embedding* of \mathbf{B} into \mathbf{C} is any embedding of \mathbf{B} into \mathbf{C} which is an increasing injection of the underlying sets. Write $\text{OEmb}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ for the set of ordered embeddings of \mathbf{B} into \mathbf{C} . Fix once and for all an enumeration $\{\mathbf{B}_i : i < k\}$ of the set of enumerated structures of size 2 which admit an enumerated embedding into \mathbf{A} . Given $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}(m)$, we define $\sigma(x) \in k^m$ where given $j < m$, we set $\sigma(x)_j = i$ iff for some (equivalently every) $n \in x$ there is $f \in \text{OEmb}(\mathbf{B}_i, \mathbf{A})$ with $\text{Im}(f) = \{j, n\}$. The map $\sigma : \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}} \rightarrow k^{<\omega}$ is then an embedding of trees. We write $\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}} = \sigma[\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{A}}]$ and call this the *coding tree* of \mathbf{A} . Typically we also endow $\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}}$ with *coding nodes*, where for each n , the n^{th} coding node of $\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}}$ is defined to be $c^{\mathbf{A}}(n) := \sigma([n]_n^{\mathbf{A}})$.

The tree of 1-types of a given structure is useful for constructing unavoidable colourings as well as for proving upper bounds on big Ramsey degrees; see for instance [21, 11, 13, 7, 8, 38, 14, 2, 3, 1]. We therefore fix an enumerated generic partial order \mathbf{P} , and we put $(\mathbb{T}, \leq_{\mathbb{T}}) = (\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{P}}, \leq_{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathbb{T}})$ and $\text{CT} = \text{CT}^{\mathbf{P}}$. Noting that \mathbf{P} is a binary relational structure and that there are exactly 3 enumerated posets of size 2, we have $k = 3$; by identifying the symbols $\{\text{L}, \text{X}, \text{R}\}$ with $\{0, 1, 2\}$, we can identify CT as a subtree of (Σ^*, \sqsubseteq) . More concretely, given $x \in \mathbb{T}(m)$ and $j < m$, we have:

$$\sigma(x)_j = \begin{cases} \text{L} & \text{if } a <_{\mathbf{P}} j \text{ for every (some) } a \in x, \\ \text{R} & \text{if } j <_{\mathbf{P}} a \text{ for every (some) } a \in x, \\ \text{X} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We remark that CT is a proper subset of Σ^* , no matter the enumeration we choose. For example, if $\text{LR} \in \text{CT}$, then $\text{RL} \notin \text{CT}$, since that would imply the existence of vertices $a, b \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $a <_{\mathbf{P}} 0 <_{\mathbf{P}} b$ and $b <_{\mathbf{P}} 1 <_{\mathbf{P}} a$, contradicting the fact that \mathbf{P} is a partial order.

The relations \prec , $<_{\text{lex}}$ and \perp , introduced in Section 1, capture the following properties of types:

Proposition 3.2. Let $x \in \mathbb{T}(m)$ and $y \in \mathbb{T}(n)$ be 1-types of \mathbf{P} .




FIGURE 4. Initial part of the tree of types of an enumerated linear order $(\mathbf{Q}, \leq_{\mathbf{Q}})$ (left) and of the enumerated partial order \mathbf{P} (right). The bold node on each level corresponds to the coding node.

- (1) If there exist $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ satisfying $a <_{\mathbf{P}} b$, then for every $\ell < \min(m, n)$ it holds that $\sigma(x)_{\ell} \leq_{\Sigma} \sigma(y)_{\ell}$.
- (2) If $\sigma(x) \prec \sigma(y)$, then for every $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ it holds that $a <_{\mathbf{P}} b$.
- (3) If $\sigma(x) <_{\text{lex}} \sigma(y)$, then for every $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ it holds that $b \not<_{\mathbf{P}} a$.
- (4) If $m = n$ and $\sigma(x) \perp \sigma(y)$, then for every $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ it holds that a and b are $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$ incomparable.

Proof. We first verify (1) by contrapositive. Assume there is $\ell < \min(m, n)$ such that $\sigma(y)_{\ell} <_{\Sigma} \sigma(x)_{\ell}$. First consider the case that $(\sigma(x)_{\ell}, \sigma(y)_{\ell}) = (X, L)$. It follows for any $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ that a is $\leq_{\mathbf{P}}$ -incomparable with ℓ and $b <_{\mathbf{P}} \ell$. It follows that we cannot have $a <_{\mathbf{P}} b$. The arguments in the cases $(\sigma(x)_{\ell}, \sigma(y)_{\ell}) = (R, L)$ and $(\sigma(x)_{\ell}, \sigma(y)_{\ell}) = (R, X)$ are similar.

To see (2), observe that $\sigma(x) \prec \sigma(y)$ implies the existence of a vertex $\ell \in \mathbf{P}$ satisfying $\ell < \min(m, n)$ and $(\sigma(x)_{\ell}, \sigma(y)_{\ell}) = (L, R)$. It follows that for any $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ we have $a <_{\mathbf{P}} \ell <_{\mathbf{P}} b$.

To verify (3), observe that there exists $\ell < \min(m, n)$ such that $\sigma(x)_{\ell} <_{\Sigma} \sigma(y)_{\ell}$. Thus we cannot have $a \in x$, $b \in y$ such that $b <_{\mathbf{P}} a$, as this would contradict (1).

Finally to verify (4), observe that $\sigma(x) \perp \sigma(y)$ implies the existence of vertices $k, \ell \in \mathbf{P}$ satisfying $\max(k, \ell) < \min(m, n)$, $\sigma(x)_k <_{\Sigma} \sigma(y)_k$ and $\sigma(y)_{\ell} <_{\Sigma} \sigma(x)_{\ell}$. Hence the existence of $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ with either $a <_{\mathbf{P}} b$ or $b <_{\mathbf{P}} a$ contradicts (1). \square

The main difficulty in working with the tree $(\mathbb{T}, \leq_{\mathbb{T}})$ is the fact that it depends on the choice of an enumeration of \mathbf{P} . For this reason we will focus on the tree (Σ^*, \sqsubseteq) which can be seen as an amalgamation of all possible trees $(\mathbb{T}, \leq_{\mathbb{T}})$ constructed using all possible enumerations of \mathbf{P} . The next definition captures the main properties of words in CT which are independent of the choice of enumeration of \mathbf{P} .

Definition 3.3 (Compatibility). Words $u \leq_{\text{lex}} v \in \Sigma^*$ are *compatible* if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (1) there is no $\ell < \min(|u|, |v|)$ such that $(u_{\ell}, v_{\ell}) = (\text{R}, \text{L})$, and
- (2) if there exists $\ell' < \min(|u|, |v|)$ such that $(u_{\ell'}, v_{\ell'}) = (\text{L}, \text{R})$, then for every $\ell'' < \min(|u|, |v|)$ it holds that $u_{\ell''} \leq_{\Sigma} v_{\ell''}$.

Proposition 3.4. Every $s, t \in \text{CT}$ are compatible.

Proof. Suppose $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$ are such that $\sigma(x) <_{\text{lex}} \sigma(y)$. To see property (1) of Definition 3.3, suppose there were $\ell < \min(i, j)$ such that $(\sigma(x)_{\ell}, \sigma(y)_{\ell}) = (\text{R}, \text{L})$. This implies that $b <_{\mathbf{P}} \ell \leq_{\mathbf{P}} a$ for every $a \in x$ and $b \in y$ which contradicts Proposition 3.2 (3).

Property (2) of Definition 3.3 is a consequence of Proposition 3.2 (1) and the fact that the existence of ℓ' such that $(\sigma(x)_{\ell'}, \sigma(y)_{\ell'}) = (\text{L}, \text{R})$ implies that $a <_{\mathbf{P}} \ell' <_{\mathbf{P}} b$ for every $a \in x$ and $b \in y$. \square

In [38], using ideas implicit in the parallel 1's of [11, 32] and pre-*a*-cliques of [13], levels of coding trees are endowed with the structure of *aged sets*. This means that for every $m < \omega$, every set $S \subseteq \text{CT}(m)$ is equipped with a class of finite $|S|$ -labeled structures describing exactly which finite structures can be coded by coding nodes above the members of S . For the generic partial order, it will be useful to encode this information slightly differently than in [38, 1], in particular since we want to do this on all of Σ^* , not just on CT.

Definition 3.5 (Level structure). Given $\ell \geq 0$ and $S \subseteq \Sigma_{\ell}^*$, the *level structure of S* is the structure $\mathbf{S} = (S, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$.

Proposition 3.6. For every $\ell > 0$ and $S \subseteq \Sigma_{\ell}^*$, the level structure $\mathbf{S} = (S, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ satisfies the following properties:

- (P1) (S, \preceq) is a partial order.
- (P2) (S, \trianglelefteq) is a partial order.
- (P3) (S, \leq_{lex}) is a linear order.
- (P4) For every $u, v \in S$ it holds that $u \preceq v \implies u \leq_{\text{lex}} v$.
(\leq_{lex} is a linear extension of \preceq).
- (P5) For every $u, v \in S$ it holds that $u \trianglelefteq v \implies u \leq_{\text{lex}} v$.
(\leq_{lex} is a linear extension of \trianglelefteq).
- (P6) For every $u, v, w \in S$ it holds that $u \preceq v \trianglelefteq w \implies u \preceq w$ and $u \trianglelefteq v \preceq w \implies u \preceq w$.

Moreover if all words in S are compatible then

- (P7) For every $u, v \in S$ it holds that $u \preceq v \implies u \trianglelefteq v$.

Proof. Properties (P1) and (P4) are Proposition 1.3. (P2), (P3) (P5) and (P6) follow directly from the definitions. (P7) is Definition 3.3 (2). \square

Level structures can be understood as approximations of a given partial order with a given linear extension from below (using order \preceq) and from above (using \trianglelefteq). This is a natural analog of the age-set structure in CT.

Remark 3.7. One can, perhaps surprisingly, prove that the class \mathcal{K} of all finite structures satisfying properties (P1), (P2), \dots , (P7) is an amalgamation class. As a consequence of the construction from Section 5 one gets that for each structure $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ there exists $\ell > 0$ and $S \subseteq \Sigma_\ell^*$ such that $\mathbf{S} = (S, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{A} .

Remark 3.8. This interesting phenomenon of constructing a class of approximations (or, using the terminology of [38, 1], the class of all possible aged sets that can appear on some level of the coding tree) of a given amalgamation class exists in other cases. For binary free amalgamation classes, this approximation class corresponds to the union $\bigcup_\rho P(\rho)$, where the union is taken over all possible *sorts* ρ (see [1] for the definitions). However, the theory of aged coding trees and the sets $P(\rho)$ can be defined for any strong amalgamation class in a finite binary language. Note that while for free amalgamation classes the set $P(\rho)$ is always closed under intersections, this need not be the case in general (indeed, it fails for posets).

Another key difference between the free amalgamation case and partial orders is that for free amalgamation classes, we can enumerate the Fraïssé limit in such a way so that going up and left (that is, by a non-relation) in the coding tree is a safe move, i.e., is an embedding of the level structure from one level to another. Indeed, if this were true for the generic partial order and the coding tree CT we fixed earlier, one could prove upper bounds for the big Ramsey degrees using forcing arguments much as is done for the free amalgamation case in [38]. However, while a weakening of the idea of a “safe direction” does hold for partial orders (see Proposition 6.7), the proof of Lemma 3.4 from [38] breaks in the setting of the generic partial order. However, it is possible that the coding tree Milliken theorem still holds. Below, $\text{AEmb}(\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}}, \text{CT})$ refers to the set of *aged embeddings* of the coding tree $\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}}$ into CT, the strong similarity maps that respect coding nodes and level structures (see Definition 2.3 of [38]).

Question 3.9. Fix a finite partial order \mathbf{A} . Let $r < \omega$ and let $\gamma: \text{AEmb}(\text{CT}^{\mathbf{A}}, \text{CT}) \rightarrow r$ be a colouring. Is there $h \in \text{AEmb}(\text{CT}, \text{CT})$ such that $h \circ \gamma$ is monochromatic?

4. POSET-DIARIES AND LEVEL STRUCTURES

Given a poset-diary S , one can view \bar{S} as a binary branching tree and each level \bar{S}_ℓ as a structure $\mathbf{S}_\ell = (\bar{S}_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$ where the structure $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$ is constructed from the structure \mathbf{S}_ℓ as described in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. Let S be a poset-diary. Then all words in \bar{S} are mutually compatible, and for each $\ell \leq \sup_{w \in S} |w|$ the structures $\mathbf{S}_\ell = (\bar{S}_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1} = (\bar{S}_{\ell+1}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$ are related as follows:

- (1) If \bar{S}_ℓ introduces a new leaf, then $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{S}_ℓ with one vertex removed.
- (2) If \bar{S}_ℓ is splitting, then $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{S}_ℓ with one vertex v duplicated to v', v'' with $v' <_{\text{lex}} v'', v' \not\preceq v'', v'' \not\preceq v'$, and $v' \triangleleft v''$.
- (3) If \bar{S}_ℓ has a new \perp , then $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{S}_ℓ with one pair removed from relation \triangleleft (and thus one pair added to \perp).
- (4) If \bar{S}_ℓ has a new \preceq , then $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{S}_ℓ extended by one pair in relation \prec .

To prove Proposition 4.1, we note the following easy observation.

Observation 4.2. Let $u <_\Sigma v \in \Sigma_i^*$ for some $i \geq 0$ and $c, c' \in \Sigma$ such that $c \leq_\Sigma c'$ and $(c, c') \neq (\text{L}, \text{R})$. Then:

- (1) $u \preceq v \iff v \frown c \preceq u \frown c'$,
- (2) $u \perp v \iff u \frown c \perp v \frown c'$,
- (3) If u and v are compatible then $u \frown c$ and $v \frown c'$ are compatible.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Fix a poset-diary S and level $\ell < \sup_{w \in S} |w|$. We consider individual cases.

- (1) Leaf vertex w : We have that $|\mathbf{S}_\ell| = |\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}| + 1$ since w is the only vertex of \mathbf{S}_ℓ not extended to a vertex in $\mathbf{S}_{\ell+1}$. The desired isomorphism and mutual compatibility follows by Observation 4.2.
- (2) Splitting of vertex w : Here w is the only vertex with two extensions. The desired isomorphism and mutual compatibility follows again by Observation 4.2.
- (3) New $v \perp w$: Since $v <_{\text{lex}} w$ are unrelated and thus $v \triangleleft w$, we know that $v \frown \text{R}$ and $w \frown \text{X}$ are compatible and that $v \frown \text{R} \perp w \frown \text{X}$ holds. Since we extended by letters X and R we know that there are no new pairs in relation \preceq .

Now assume, for contradiction, that there is $u \in \bar{S}_\ell \setminus \{v, w\}$ unrelated to v such that the extension of u in $\bar{S}_{\ell+1}$ is related to $v \frown \text{R} \in \bar{S}_{\ell+1}$. Since all words lexicographically before v are extended by X and all words lexicographically after w by R, by Observation 4.2, we conclude that $v <_{\text{lex}} u <_{\text{lex}} w$ and u extends by X. Mutual compatibility follows by analogous argument.

- (4) New $v \preceq w$: Since $v <_{\text{lex}} w$ are unrelated, we know that $v \frown \text{L}$ and $w \frown \text{R}$ are compatible and $v \frown \text{L} \preceq w \frown \text{R}$ holds. To see that

no additional pair to relation \preceq was introduced, observe that for $u, u' \in \overline{S}_\ell$, $(u, u') \neq (v, w)$ to be extended to $u \frown L$, $u' \frown R$ we have, by assumptions (B1) and (B2), $u \preceq v$ and $w \preceq u'$. Since $v <_{\text{lex}} w$ is unrelated we also have $v \preceq v$. By Proposition 3.6 (P6) $u \preceq v <_{\text{lex}} w \implies u \preceq v$ and thus also $u \preceq u'$.

It remains to consider the possibility that new pairs are added to relation \perp . We again consider individual cases.

First consider the case that u is unrelated to v but their extensions are newly in \perp . Since v extends by L we know that $u <_{\text{lex}} v$ and v extends by X. This contradicts construction of \overline{S}_{i+1} .

The case that u is unrelated to w but their extensions are newly in \perp follows by symmetry.

It thus remains to consider the case where $u <_{\text{lex}} u'$, $u, u' \notin \{v, w\}$, are unrelated in \overline{S}_i , however their extensions are related in \overline{S}_{i+1} . It is not possible for u to extend by R and u' by L. So assume that u extends by X and v extends by L (the remaining case follows by symmetry). From this we conclude that $u <_{\text{lex}} u' <_{\text{lex}} v$, $u \perp v$ and $u' \not\preceq v$. Since $u \not\preceq u'$ we again obtain a contradiction with Proposition 3.6 (P4) or (P6).

Mutual compatibility follows by analogous argument. \square

5. A POSET-DIARY CODING \mathbf{P}

Recall that $\mathbf{P} = (\omega, \leq_{\mathbf{P}})$ denotes a fixed enumerated generic poset. We define a function $\varphi: \omega \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ by mapping $j < \omega$ to a word w of length $2j + 2$ defined by putting $(w_{2j}, w_{2j+1}) = (L, R)$ and, for every $i < j$, (w_{2i}, w_{2i+1}) to (L, L) if $j \leq_{\mathbf{P}} i$, (R, R) if $i \leq_{\mathbf{P}} j$, and (X, X) otherwise. We set $T = \overline{\varphi[\omega]}$. The following result is easy to prove by induction.

Proposition 5.1 (Proposition 4.7 of [14]). *The function φ is an embedding $\mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$. Moreover, $\varphi(v)$ is a leaf of T for every $v \in \mathbf{P}$, all words in T are mutually compatible, and if $v, w \in \mathbf{P}$ are incomparable, we have $\varphi(v) \perp \varphi(w)$.*

We will need the following refinement of this embedding.

Theorem 5.2. *There exists an embedding $\psi: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ such that $\psi[\omega]$ is a poset-diary.*

Proof. Fix the embedding φ as above and put $T = \overline{\varphi[\omega]}$. We proceed by induction on levels of T . For every ℓ , we define an integer N_ℓ and a function $\psi_\ell: T_\ell \rightarrow \Sigma_{N_\ell}^*$. We will maintain the following conditions:

- (1) The set $\overline{\psi_\ell[T_\ell]}$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 1.5 for all levels with the exception of $N_\ell - 1$.

- (2) If $\ell > 0$, then, for every $u \in T_\ell$, the word $\psi_\ell(u)$ extends $\psi_{\ell-1}(u|_{\ell-1})$.

We let $N_0 = 0$ and put ψ_0 to map the empty word to the empty word. Now, assume that $N_{\ell-1}$ and $\psi_{\ell-1}$ are already defined. We inductively define a sequence of functions $\psi_\ell^j: T_\ell \rightarrow \Sigma_{N_{\ell-1}+i}^*$. Put $\psi_\ell^0(u) = \psi_{\ell-1}(u|_{\ell-1})$. Now, we proceed in steps. At step j , apply the first of the following constructions that can be applied and terminate the procedure if none of them applies:

- (1) If ψ_ℓ^{j-1} is not injective, let $w \in T_\ell$ be lexicographically least so that $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w) = \psi_\ell^{j-1}(x)$ for some $x \in T_\ell \setminus \{w\}$. Given $u \in T_\ell$, set $\psi_\ell^j(u) = \psi_\ell^{j-1}(u) \frown X$ if $u \leq_{\text{lex}} w$, and set $\psi_\ell^j(u) = \psi_\ell^{j-1}(u) \frown R$ if $w <_{\text{lex}} u$. Then this satisfies the conditions on new splitting at $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w)$ as given in Definition 1.5.
- (2) If there are words w and w' from T_ℓ with $w <_{\text{lex}} w'$ such that $w \perp w'$ and $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w) \not\perp \psi_\ell^{j-1}(w')$ and condition (A) of Definition 1.5 is satisfied for the value range of ψ_ℓ^{j-1} , we construct ψ_ℓ^j to satisfy the conditions on new \perp for $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w)$ and $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w')$ as given by Definition 1.5.
- (3) If there are words w and w' from T_ℓ with $w <_{\text{lex}} w'$ such that $w \prec w'$ and $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w) \not\prec \psi_\ell^{j-1}(w')$ and conditions (B1) and (B2) of Definition 1.5 are satisfied for the value range of ψ_ℓ^{j-1} , we construct ψ_ℓ^j to satisfy the conditions on new \prec for $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w)$ and $\psi_\ell^{j-1}(w')$ as given by Definition 1.5.

Let J be the largest index for which for which ψ_ℓ^J is defined.

Claim. ψ_ℓ^J is an isomorphism $(T_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \rightarrow (\psi_\ell^J[T_\ell], \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$.

Proof of claim. Suppose, to the contrary, that this is not true. If ψ_ℓ^J is not a bijection, this means that there are $w, w' \in T_\ell$ such that $\psi_\ell^J(w) = \psi_\ell^J(w')$. But then the conditions in (1) are satisfied, a contradiction with maximality of J . So ψ_ℓ^J is a bijection. Note that the steps of the construction ensure that ψ_ℓ^J respects $<_{\text{lex}}$. We also have $\psi_\ell^J(w) \perp \psi_\ell^J(w') \implies w \perp w'$ and $\psi_\ell^J(w) \preceq \psi_\ell^J(w') \implies w \preceq w'$ for $w, w' \in T_\ell$.

If there are $w, w' \in T_\ell$ such that $w <_{\text{lex}} w'$, $w \perp w'$ and $\psi_\ell^J(w) \not\perp \psi_\ell^J(w')$, pick among all such pairs (w, w') one minimizing $|\{u \in T_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} u \leq_{\text{lex}} w'\}|$. Proposition 3.6 implies that the conditions in (2) are satisfied, again a contradiction with maximality of J .

So there are $w, w' \in T_\ell$ such that $w <_{\text{lex}} w'$, $w \prec w'$ and $\psi_\ell^J(w) \not\prec \psi_\ell^J(w')$, and we can assume that w, w' maximize $|\{u \in T_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} u \leq_{\text{lex}} w'\}|$. Proposition 3.6 implies that the conditions in (2) are satisfied, again a contradiction with maximality of J . Hence indeed ψ_ℓ^J is an isomorphism $(T_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \rightarrow (\psi_\ell^J[T_\ell], \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$. \square

Finally, we put $N_\ell = |\psi_\ell^J(w)|$ for some $w \in T_\ell$ and $\psi_\ell = \psi_\ell^J$. Once all the functions ψ_ℓ are constructed, we can set $\psi(i) = \psi_{2i+2}(\varphi(i))$. It is

easy to verify that this is an embedding $\mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ such that $\psi[\omega]$ is a poset-diary; if not, it fails at some finite level ℓ , but the construction ensures that every level adheres to the conditions of Definition 1.5. \square

6. INTERESTING LEVELS AND SUB-DIARIES

We now aim to prove upper bounds for the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} . To do this, we need to define a notion of sub-diary which corresponds to a subtree of Σ^* which preserves all important features of a given subset. Given $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ we first determine which levels contain interesting changes and then define a sub-tree by removing the remaining ‘‘boring’’ levels from the tree. This is related to the notion of parameter-space envelopes used in [14], but more versatile, making it possible to get exact upper bounds.

Definition 6.1 (Interesting levels). Given $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $i \leq \max\{|s| : s \in S\}$, we call i *interesting for S* , or simply *interesting* if S is understood, if

- (1) the structure $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_i = (\bar{S}_i, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ is not isomorphic to $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{i+1} = (\bar{S}_{i+1}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$, or
- (2) there exist incompatible $u, v \in \bar{S}_{i+1}$ such that $u|_i$ and $v|_i$ are compatible, or
- (3) there is $u \in S$ with $|u| = i$.

Remark 6.2. Interesting levels are the analog for subsets of Σ^* of the notion of *critical level* for a subset of coding nodes in CT; see for instance Definition 5.1 of [38] or Definition 5.1.3 of [1] (we note that the two definitions are slightly different).

Given $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and levels $\ell < \ell'$, we call a level ℓ' a *duplicate of ℓ* if S contains no word of length ℓ or ℓ' and moreover for every $u \in S$ of length greater than ℓ' it holds that $u_\ell = u_{\ell'}$. By checking definitions of \leq_{lex} , \preceq and \trianglelefteq one can derive the following simple result.

Observation 6.3. For every $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and every $\ell < \ell'$ where level ℓ' is a duplicate of level ℓ , it holds that ℓ' is not interesting for S .

Definition 6.4 (Embedding types). Let $I(S)$ be the set of all interesting levels in S . Let $\tau_S: S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ be the mapping assigning to each $w \in S$ the word created from w by deleting all letters with indices not in $I(S)$. Define $\tau(S) = \tau_S[S]$, and call this the *embedding type of S* .

The following observation is a direct consequence of Definition 1.5.

Observation 6.5. For a poset-diary S and $S' \subseteq S$, $\tau(S')$ is a poset-diary. \square

We therefore call $\tau(S')$ the *sub-diary* induced by $S' \subseteq S$.

Definition 6.6. Recall that for a set $A = \{u^0 <_{\text{lex}} u^1 <_{\text{lex}} \cdots <_{\text{lex}} u^{n-1}\} \subseteq \Sigma_\ell^*$ (for some $\ell > 0$) and word $e \in \Sigma_n^*$, we put $A \frown e = \{u^i \frown e_i : 0 \leq i < n\}$. We call $e \in \Sigma_n^*$ a *boring extension* of A if ℓ is not interesting for $A \frown e$. We will denote by Π_A the set of all boring extensions of A and by Π_A^* the set of all finite words over the alphabet Π_A . That is, a member of Π_A^* is a sequence $w = (w^0, w^1, \dots, w^{|w|-1})$ such that for every i we have that $w^i \in \Pi_A$. Here we use superscripts instead of subscripts since the “letters” of w are themselves words.

We first prove two properties of boring extensions.

Proposition 6.7. For every $\ell \geq 0$, set $S \subseteq \Sigma_\ell^*$ of mutually compatible words, and boring extension e of S , there exists a boring extension e' of Σ_ℓ^* such that $S \frown e \subseteq \Sigma_\ell^* \frown e'$.

Proof. Fix $\ell \geq 0$, $S = \{u^0 <_{\text{lex}} u^1 <_{\text{lex}} \cdots <_{\text{lex}} u^{n-1}\}$, $\Sigma_\ell^* = \{v^0 <_{\text{lex}} v^1 <_{\text{lex}} \cdots <_{\text{lex}} v^{m-1}\}$, and a boring extension e of S . For $u \in S$ denote by $i(u)$ the integer i satisfying $u^i = u$. For $v \in \Sigma_\ell^* \setminus S$ we say that letter $c \in \Sigma$ is *safe for v* if for every $0 \leq j < n$ such that u^j is compatible with v , it holds that $(\{u^j, v\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ is isomorphic to $(\{u^j \frown e_j, v \frown c\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$.

First we check that for every $v \in \Sigma^* \setminus S$, the set of safe letters for v is non-empty. To see this, consider some vertex $v \in \Sigma^* \setminus S$ such that X is not safe for v . In this case there are two options:

- (1) There is $u \in S$ compatible with v such that $u <_{\text{lex}} v$, $u \not\perp v$, and $e_{i(u)} = R$. In this case we argue that R is safe for v (in fact, it is the only safe letter for v). For this we need to check:
 - (a) For every $w \in S$ compatible with v satisfying $v <_{\text{lex}} w$ and $v \not\perp w$, we have $e_{i(w)} = R$. This follows from the fact that $v \trianglelefteq w$, and this needs to be preserved by the extension.
 - (b) For every $w \in S$ compatible with v satisfying $v <_{\text{lex}} w$, it holds that $e_{i(w)} \neq L$. From the condition on S , we know that u and w are compatible and that $u <_{\text{lex}} v <_{\text{lex}} w$. But then $u \frown R$ and $w \frown R$ are incompatible, which contradicts the definition of boring extension.
 - (c) For every $w \in S$ compatible with v satisfying $w <_{\text{lex}} v$ and $v \not\perp w$, we have that $e_{i(w)} \neq L$. Suppose for a contradiction that $e_{i(w)} = L$. As w and u are compatible and e is boring, we know that $w \prec u$. But, by Proposition 3.6 (P4) and (P6), we know that $w \prec u$, $w \not\perp v$, and $u \perp v$ cannot be all satisfied at the same time, a contradiction.
- (2) There is $u \in S$ compatible with v such that $v <_{\text{lex}} u$, $v \not\perp u$ and $e_{i(u)} = L$. In this case we can argue similarly to show that L is the only safe letter for v .

Now we define e'_j to be $e_{i(v^j)}$ whenever $v^j \in S$; otherwise choose the first letter from X, L, R that is safe for v^j .

To verify that e' is boring, consider some $0 \leq i < j \leq m$. First observe that $\Sigma_\ell^* \widehat{e'}$ contains no words of length ℓ . Also, if (v^i, v^j) are incompatible, then any one-letter extensions will yield an isomorphic level structure. So we may assume that $v^i, v^j \notin S$ and that v^i, v^j are compatible. We have:

- (1) $(e'_i, e'_j) \neq (R, L)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $(e'_i, e'_j) = (R, L)$, and let $u \in S$ be the vertex that made X unsafe for v^i and $u' \in S$ be the vertex that made X unsafe for v^j . By the same analysis as above we have $u <_{\text{lex}} v^i$, $e_{i(u)} = R$, $u \not\prec v^i$, $v^j <_{\text{lex}} u'$, $e_{i(u')} = L$, $v^j \not\prec u'$. From this however we conclude that $u <_{\text{lex}} u'$, $e_{i(u)} = R$, $e_{i(u')} = L$ which contradicts the definition of boring extension and our assumption that u and u' are compatible.
- (2) $v^i \not\prec v^j \implies (e'_i, e'_j) \notin \{(X, L), (R, X)\}$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $v^i \not\prec v^j$ and $(e'_i, e'_j) = (X, L)$, and denote by $u \in S$ the vertex that made X unsafe for v^j . Clearly $v^j <_{\text{lex}} u$, $v^j \not\prec u$ and $e_{i(u)} = L$. It follows that for every $\ell' < \ell$ we have $v_{\ell'}^i \leq_\Sigma v_{\ell'}^j \leq_\Sigma u_{\ell'}$. From this we have that u and v^i are compatible and $u \not\prec v^i$ which makes X unsafe for v^i . A contradiction. A very similar argument shows that $(e'_i, e'_j) \neq (R, X)$.
- (3) $v^i \not\prec v^j \implies (e'_i, e'_j) \neq (L, R)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that $v^i \not\prec v^j$ and $(e'_i, e'_j) = (L, R)$, and let $u \in S$ be the vertex that made X unsafe for v^i and $u' \in S$ be the vertex that made X unsafe for v^j . We have $v^i <_{\text{lex}} u <_{\text{lex}} u' <_{\text{lex}} v^j$ and $e_{i(u)} = L$, $e_{i(u')} = R$. It follows that $v^i \not\prec u$, $u \preceq u'$, $u' \not\prec v^j$. Now for every $\ell' < \ell$ we also have $v_{\ell'}^i <_\Sigma u_{\ell'} <_\Sigma u'_{\ell'} <_\Sigma v_{\ell'}^j$, which implies that $v^i \preceq v^j$. A contradiction. \square

Proposition 6.8. Let $0 \leq \ell \leq \ell'$ be integers, and let e be a boring extension of $\Sigma_\ell^* = \{u^0 <_{\text{lex}} u^1 <_{\text{lex}} \dots <_{\text{lex}} u^{n-1}\}$. Put $\Sigma_{\ell'}^* = \{v^0 <_{\text{lex}} v^1 <_{\text{lex}} \dots <_{\text{lex}} v^{m-1}\}$ and create the word e' of length m by putting, for every $0 \leq i < m$, $e'_i = e_j$ where j satisfies $v^i|_\ell = u^j$. Then e' is a boring extension of $\Sigma_{\ell'}^*$.

Proof. The proof is just a verification of the fact that the relations \leq_{lex} , \preceq and \trianglelefteq are determined by the first occurrences of certain combinations of letters which this construction does not change.

If (v^i, v^j) are incompatible, then any one-letter extensions will yield an isomorphic level structure. So we may assume that (v^i, v^j) are compatible.

Let v^i, v^j be compatible words. We then check that the structure $(\{v^i, v^j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ is isomorphic to $(\{v^i \widehat{e'_i}, v^j \widehat{e'_j}\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ and that $v^i \widehat{e'_i}$ and $v^j \widehat{e'_j}$ are compatible. If $e'_i = e'_j$ (in particular, this happens whenever $v^i|_\ell = v^j|_\ell$), the result is clear.

So suppose that $e'_i \neq e'_j$; in particular, this implies that $v^i|_\ell \neq v^j|_\ell$. Note that in this case, the lexicographic order of v^i and v^j is already determined by their restrictions to level ℓ (that is, $v^i <_{\text{lex}} v^j \iff v^i|_\ell <_{\text{lex}} v^j|_\ell$), hence $(\{v^i|_\ell, v^j|_\ell\}, \leq_{\text{lex}})$, $(\{v^i, v^j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}})$, and $(\{v^i \widehat{e}'_i, v^j \widehat{e}'_j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}})$ are isomorphic. Consequently, the compatibility of $v^i \widehat{e}'_i$ and $v^j \widehat{e}'_j$ follows from the compatibility of v^i and v^j and the compatibility of $v^i|_\ell \widehat{e}'_i$ and $v^j|_\ell \widehat{e}'_j$.

The fact that e is a boring extension tells us that $(\{v^i|_\ell, v^j|_\ell\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ is isomorphic to $(\{v^i|_\ell \widehat{e}'_i, v^j|_\ell \widehat{e}'_j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$. This implies that either $(e'_i, e'_j) \notin \{(L, R), (R, L)\}$ or \preceq is already defined on $\{v^i|_\ell, v^j|_\ell\}$. In either case, $(\{v^i, v^j\}, \preceq)$ and $(\{v^i \widehat{e}'_i, v^j \widehat{e}'_j\}, \preceq)$ are isomorphic. A similar argument can be done for \sqsubseteq , and $(\{v^i, v^j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ is isomorphic to $(\{v^i \widehat{e}'_i, v^j \widehat{e}'_j\}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$, that is, e' is a boring extension of $\Sigma_{\ell'}^*$. \square

7. UPPER BOUNDS

We will prove a Ramsey-type theorem for the following kind of embeddings:

Definition 7.1 (Shape-preserving functions). Given $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ we call function $f: S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ *shape-preserving* if $\tau_S(w) = \tau_{f[S]}(f(w))$ for every $w \in S$.

We will generally consider shape-preserving functions only for those sets S satisfying $S = \tau(S)$ (that is for *embedding types*). However, the next observation follows from the definition without this extra assumption:

Observation 7.2. Let $f: S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ be shape-preserving.

- (i) For every shape-preserving $h: f[S] \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ it holds that $h \circ f$ is shape-preserving.
- (ii) For all $u, v \in S$, $|u| \leq |v|$ implies that $|f(u)| \leq |f(v)|$.
- (iii) For all $u, v \in S$, $u \sqsubseteq v$ implies that $f(u) \sqsubseteq f(v)$.
- (iv) The function f is an embedding $f: (S, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq) \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \sqsubseteq)$ and images of pairs of compatible words are also compatible.
- (v) If S is a level set (that is, all words in s have same length) and e is a boring extension of S , then e is a boring extension of $f[S]$.

Given $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $\ell > 0$ we denote by $S_{\leq \ell} = \cup_{i \leq \ell} S_i$ the set of all words in S of length at most ℓ . We also put $S_{< \ell} = S_{\leq \ell - 1}$.

Remark 7.3. If $S = \Sigma_{< \ell}^*$ for some $\ell > 0$, then the images of shape-preserving functions are always strong subtrees in the sense of Milliken's tree theorem [35]. However, the converse is not true: For example, the function $f: \Sigma_{< 2}^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ given by $f(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, $f(L) = LL$, $f(X) = XR$, and

$f(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}\mathbb{R}$ is not shape-preserving because all three levels 0, 1 and 2 of $f[\Sigma_{<2}^*]$ are interesting, while $\text{Im}(f)$ is a strong subtree.

Given $S, S' \subseteq \Sigma^*$ we denote by $\text{Shape}(S, S')$ the set of all shape-preserving functions $f: S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ such that $f[S] \subseteq S'$. Given $n < \omega$, we denote by $\text{Shape}_n(S, S')$ the set of all functions in $\text{Shape}(S, S')$ which are the identity when restricted to $S_{<n}$. For a shape-preserving function $g: S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$, Observation 7.2 (ii) tells us that the function $\tilde{g}: \{|w| : w \in S\} \rightarrow \omega$ defined by $\tilde{g}(i) = |g(w)|$ for some (equivalently any) $w \in S$ with $|w| = i$ is well defined. If S is finite, denote by $\max(S)$ the “last” level S_k where $k = \max_{w \in S} |w|$.

Observation 7.4. Let $S = \bar{S} = \tau(S)$ be a finite subset of Σ^* , and write $\max(S) = S_k = \{u^0 <_{\text{lex}} u^1 <_{\text{lex}} \dots <_{\text{lex}} u^n\}$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ and the set $\text{Shape}(S_{<k}, \Sigma^*) \times \Pi_{\max(S)}^*$ (recall Definition 6.6):

- (1) For every $g \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ there exists $w \in \Pi_{\max(S)}^*$ such that for every $0 \leq i < n$ it holds that $g(u^i) = g(u^i|_{k-1}) \frown u_{k-1}^i \frown w_i^0 \frown \dots \frown w_i^{|w|-1}$.
- (2) Conversely also for every $g^0 \in \text{Shape}(S_{<k}, \Sigma)$ and every word $w \in \Pi_{\max(S)}^*$ the function $g': S \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ defined by $g'(w) = g^0(w)$ for $|w| < k$ and

$$g'(u^i) = g^0(u^i|_{k-1}) \frown u_{k-1}^i \frown w_i^0 \frown \dots \frown w_i^{|w|-1}$$

is shape-preserving.

Proof. To see the first statement, assume the contrary, and let $g \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ be a function for which there is no $w \in \Pi_{\max(S)}^*$ as in (1). Among all such functions g choose one which minimizes $\tilde{g}(k)$.

Because $S = \bar{S}$ we know that $\tilde{g}(k-1) \in I(g[S])$. Because g is shape-preserving it follows that $g(u^i)_{\tilde{g}(k-1)} = u_{k-1}^i$ and $g(u^i)_{\tilde{g}(k-1)+1} = g(u^i|_{k-1}) \frown u_{k-1}^i$. It follows that $\tilde{g}(k) \geq \tilde{g}(k-1) + 2$.

Notice that $\tilde{g}(k) = \tilde{g}(k-1) + 2$: As g is shape-preserving, $I(g(S))$ contains no levels between $\tilde{g}(k-1)$ and $\tilde{g}(k)$ as otherwise we could remove them, getting a counter example g' with smaller $\tilde{g}(k)$. If $\tilde{g}(k) = \tilde{g}(k-1) + 1$, then we can take $w = \emptyset$, and g would not be a counterexample. But now, observe that level $\tilde{g}(k) + 1$ of $g(S)$ is not interesting and thus corresponds to a boring extension in $\Pi_{\max(S)}^*$, which gives a contradiction.

The second statement follows by Proposition 6.8. \square

The following pigeonhole lemma is a consequence of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $S = \bar{S} = \tau(S)$ be a finite non-empty subset of Σ^* of mutually compatible words containing at least one non-empty word. Put $k = \max_{w \in S} |w|$. Let $g^0 \in \text{Shape}(S_{<k}, \Sigma^*)$. Denote by G set of all $g \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ extending g^0 and put $K = \tilde{g}^0(k-1)$. Then for every*

finite colouring $\chi: G \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ there exists $f \in \text{Shape}_{K+1}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that χ restricted to $\text{Shape}(S, f[\Sigma^*]) \cap G$ is constant.

Proof. By Observation 7.4, the colouring $\chi: G \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ gives rise to a colouring $\chi': \Pi_{\max(S)}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$. Apply Theorem 2.1 to obtain W such that $W[\Pi_{\max(S)}^*]$ is monochromatic with respect to χ' . In order to avoid special cases in the upcoming construction, we will assume that W is indexed from 1 and not from 0.

For every $u \in \Sigma_{\leq K}^*$ put $f(u) = u$. We will construct the rest of f by induction on levels. Now assume that $f(\Sigma_{i-1}^*)$ is already defined for some $i > K$. Put

$$I = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = K+1, \\ \min\{I < \omega : W_I = \lambda_{i-K-2}\} & \text{if } i > K+1. \end{cases}$$

Let J be the minimal integer such that $W_J = \lambda_{i-K-1}$. Now define a sequence of functions $f^{i'}: \Sigma_i^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{K+I+i'}^*$ for every $I \leq i' < J$. Put $f^I(u) = f(u|_{i-1}) \frown u_{i-1}$ for every $u \in \Sigma_i^*$. Now proceed by induction on i' . Assume that $f^{i'-1}$ is constructed for some $I < i' < J$ and consider two cases:

- (1) $W_{i'} = \lambda_j$: Put $f^{i'}(u) = f^{i'-1}(u) \frown u_{j+k+1}$ for every $u \in \Sigma_i^*$.
- (2) $W_{i'} = e$ for some $e \in \Pi_S$: Let e' be the extension of Σ_{K+1}^* given by Proposition 6.7 for the boring extension e of $g^1(S_k)$, where g^1 is defined by putting $g^1(u) \mapsto g^0(u|_{k-1}) \frown u_{k-1}$ (by Observation 7.2 ((v)), boringness of an extension is preserved by shape-preserving functions). Now let e'' be the extension given by Proposition 6.8 for the extension e' and level i . Enumerate $\Sigma_i^* = \{u^0 <_{\text{lex}} u^1 <_{\text{lex}} \dots <_{\text{lex}} u^{m-1}\}$ and for $u^j \in S_i$, put $f^{i'}(u^j) = f^{i'-1}(u) \frown e''_j$ for every $0 \leq j < m$.

Finally put $f(u) = f^{J-1}(u)$.

Observe that all levels added by the rules 1 and 2 above are uninteresting since they are either constructed from boring extensions or they are duplicates of levels introduced earlier (in the sense of Observation 6.3). The last level is interesting because $\tau(\Sigma^*) = \Sigma^*$. From this we get $f \in \text{Shape}_{K+1}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$.

To see that χ restricted to $\text{Shape}(S, f[\Sigma^*]) \cap G$ is constant, pick an arbitrary $g \in \text{Shape}(S, f[\Sigma^*]) \cap G$. By Observation 7.4 we can decompose g to g^0 and a word $w \in \Pi_{\max(S)}^*$ such that $\chi(g)$ is equal to $\chi'(w)$. From our construction it follows that $w \in W(\Sigma^*)$, and so indeed χ restricted to $\text{Shape}(S, f[\Sigma^*]) \cap G$ is constant. \square

Observation 7.6. For every $S = \tau(S) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and every $f \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ there is a unique function $g \in \text{Shape}(\bar{S}, \Sigma^*)$ extending f . It is constructed by putting $g(w|_\ell) = f(w)|_{\bar{f}(\ell)}$ for every $w \in S$ and $\ell \leq |w|$. Similarly, for every $g \in \text{Shape}(\bar{S}, \Sigma^*)$ it holds that $g \upharpoonright S \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$.

Notice that g in Observation 7.6 is well defined by Observation 7.2 (iii).

Theorem 7.7. *For every finite set $S = \tau(S) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of mutually compatible words and every finite colouring $\chi: \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*) \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$, there exists $f \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that χ restricted to $\text{Shape}(S, f[\Sigma^*])$ is constant.*

Proof. By Observation 7.6 we can assume, without loss of generality, that $S = \bar{S}$. We will use induction on $k = \max_{w \in S} |w|$. For $k = 0$ we can interpret χ as a colouring of Σ^* , apply Theorem 2.1 to obtain a monochromatic infinite-parameter word W , define $f(w) = W(w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$, and observe that f is shape-preserving.

Now fix S such that $k = \max_{w \in S} |w| > 0$ and a finite colouring $\chi: \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*) \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$. We will make use of the following claim:

Claim. There exists $h \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ and a colouring $\chi': \text{Shape}(S_{<k}, \Sigma^*) \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ such that for every finite $g \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$, we have $\chi(h \circ g) = \chi'(g \upharpoonright S_{<k})$.

First we show that Theorem 7.7 follows from the claim. Let h and χ' be given by the claim. By the induction hypothesis, there exists $f' \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that χ' is constant on $f'[\Sigma^*]$. It is easy to check that $f = h \circ f'$ is shape-preserving and that χ is constant when restricted to $f[\Sigma^*]$.

It remains to prove the claim. We will obtain h as the limit of the following sequence: Pick an enumeration $\text{Shape}(S_{<k}, \Sigma^*) = \{g^0, g^1, \dots\}$ such that $0 \leq i \leq j$ implies that $\tilde{g}^i(k-1) \leq \tilde{g}^j(k-1)$. We construct a sequence of shape-preserving functions $f^0, f^1, \dots \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that for every $i > 0$ the following is satisfied:

- (1) $f^i[\Sigma^*] \subseteq f^{i-1}[\Sigma^*]$ and $f^i(u) = f^{i-1}(u)$ for every $u \in \Sigma^*_{<\tilde{g}^{i-1}(k-1)+1}$.
- (2) There exists $c^{i-1} \in \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ such that $\chi(f^i \circ g) = c^{i-1}$ for every $g \in \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*)$ extending g^{i-1} .

Put f^0 to be the identity $\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$. Now assume that f^{i-1} is already constructed. Consider the colouring $\chi^i: \text{Shape}(S, \Sigma^*) \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ defined by $\chi^i(g) = \chi(f^{i-1} \circ g)$. Obtain $h^i \in \text{Shape}_{\tilde{g}^{i-1}(k-1)+1}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ by an application of Lemma 7.5 for the colouring χ^i and the function $f^{i-1} \circ g^{i-1}$ (as g^0 in the statement), and put $f^i = f^{i-1} \circ h^i$.

Next we construct the limit shape-preserving h . For every $i \geq 1$ it holds that $f^i(u) = f^{i-1}(u)$ for all $u \in \Sigma^*$ with $|u| \leq \tilde{g}^{i-1}(k-1)$. Because $\tilde{g}^{i-1}(k-1)$ is an increasing function of i and there is no upper bound on the length of words in Σ^* , it follows that $h(u) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} f^i(u)$ is well-defined for every $u \in \Sigma^*$. Moreover, h is shape-preserving, because the failure of shape-preservation would be witnessed on a finite set. We also put $\chi'(g^i) = c^i$ for every $i \in \omega$. \square

Now we are finally ready to prove a big Ramsey result for \mathbf{P} . In the proof of the next result, it is somewhat more natural to work with colourings of *copies* rather than embeddings, where a copy is simply the image of an embedding. Given structures \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , we denote the set of copies of \mathbf{A} in \mathbf{B} by $\binom{\mathbf{B}}{\mathbf{A}}$. Note that if $\mathbf{X} \in \binom{\mathbf{B}}{\mathbf{A}}$, then there are exactly $|\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})|$ -many embeddings $f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ with $\text{Im}(f) = \mathbf{X}$. From this, it follows that if one instead defines the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{A} in \mathbf{B} in terms of copies rather than embeddings, the numbers will differ by exactly a factor of $|\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})|$ (see for instance Section 4 of [36]).

Corollary 7.8. For every finite partial order \mathbf{Q} , the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{Q} in the generic partial order \mathbf{P} is at most $|T(\mathbf{Q})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{Q})|$.

Proof. Fix a finite partial order \mathbf{Q} and a colouring χ of $\binom{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{Q}}$. Choose an arbitrary enumeration $T(\mathbf{Q}) = \{S_0, S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}\}$ and an arbitrary embedding $\eta: (\Sigma^*, \preceq) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ (which exists since \mathbf{P} is universal). Observe that for every $i \in n$, χ and η together induce a colouring χ_i of $\text{Shape}(S_i, \Sigma^*)$ by putting $\chi_i(g) = \chi(\text{Im}(\eta \circ g))$. By repeated applications of Theorem 7.7 we construct a sequence of functions $\text{Id} = f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that for every $i \in n$ the following is satisfied:

- (1) $f_{i+1}[\Sigma^*] \subseteq f_i[\Sigma^*]$, and
- (2) χ_i restricted to $\text{Shape}(S_i, f_{i+1}[\Sigma^*])$ is constant.

Let $\psi: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ be obtained by Theorem 5.2. Then $\theta := \eta \circ f_n \circ \psi \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$, and given $\mathbf{X} \in \binom{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{Q}}$, we have that $\chi(\theta[\mathbf{X}])$ depends only on $\tau(f_n \circ \psi[\mathbf{X}])$. Hence we have $|\chi[\binom{\theta[\mathbf{P}]}{\mathbf{Q}}]| \leq T(\mathbf{Q})$. \square

8. THE LOWER BOUND

Given a finite partial order \mathbf{Q} , a *labeled poset-diary* for \mathbf{Q} is a pair (S, f) , where $S \in T(\mathbf{Q})$ and $f: \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow (S, \prec)$ is an isomorphism. Let $T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{Q})$ denote the set of labeled poset-diaries coding \mathbf{A} . Note that $|T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{Q})| = |T(\mathbf{Q})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{Q})|$. Using the embedding $\psi: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ constructed in Theorem 5.2, we define a colouring $\chi_{\mathbf{Q}}: \text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P}) \rightarrow T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{Q})$ by setting

$$\chi_{\mathbf{Q}}(f) = (\tau(\psi \circ f[Q]), \tau_{\psi \circ f[Q]} \circ \psi \circ f).$$

Given any colouring $\gamma: \text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P}) \rightarrow r$ and $h \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$, we obtain a new colouring $\gamma \cdot h: \text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P}) \rightarrow r$ by setting $\gamma \cdot h(f) = \gamma(h \circ f)$. In this way, we obtain an action of the monoid $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ on the set of r -colourings of $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})$ (see Remark 8.2 for more discussion). We call γ a *recurrent* colouring if for any $h \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$, there is $\varphi \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ with $\gamma \cdot (h \circ \varphi) = \gamma$.

The main theorem of this section, Theorem 8.1, gives lower bounds for the big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{P} .

Theorem 8.1. *For every finite partial order \mathbf{Q} , the colouring $\chi_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is recurrent. In particular, for any $h \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$, we have*

$$\{\chi_{\mathbf{Q}}(h \circ g) : g \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})\} = T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{Q}).$$

Hence the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{Q} in \mathbf{P} is at least $|T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{Q})| = |T(\mathbf{Q})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{Q})|$.

Combining Theorem 8.1 with Corollary 7.8, we see that the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{Q} in \mathbf{P} is exactly $|T(\mathbf{Q})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{Q})|$, thus proving the first part of Theorem 1.7.

Remark 8.2. We briefly discuss the second part of Theorem 1.7, namely the existence of a big Ramsey structure and the connections to topological dynamics. All terminology pertaining to topological dynamics which is not defined here can be found in the introduction of [37]. As we mentioned above, the monoid $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ acts on the right on the set $r^{\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})}$. It is natural to equip both $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ and $r^{\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})}$ with topologies as follows.

- We equip $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ with the topology of pointwise convergence, where $h_n \rightarrow h$ iff for every $x \in P$, we eventually have $h_n(x) = h(x)$.
- Viewing r as a finite discrete space, we equip $r^{\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})}$ with the product topology. Thus this space is homeomorphic to Cantor space.

With these topologies, the action of $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ on $r^{\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})}$ is continuous. In particular, restricting our attention to the action of $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P}) \subseteq \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$, we have that $r^{\text{Emb}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})}$ is a (right) $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ -flow, i.e. a continuous (right) action of the topological group $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ on a compact Hausdorff space.

However, from the $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ action, we can entirely recover the $\text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$ action as follows. Any topological group G comes equipped with several interesting, compatible uniform structures, among them the *left uniformity*. When G is equipped with its left uniform structure, we can create two larger spaces which canonically embed G . One is the *left completion* of G , which we denote by \widehat{G} ; the other is the *Samuel compactification* of G with respect to the left uniformity, which we denote by $\text{Sa}(G)$. Up to canonical identifications, we have $G \subseteq \widehat{G} \subseteq \text{Sa}(G)$. The Samuel compactification is sometimes known as the *greatest G -ambit*; it is a G -flow, and whenever X is a G -flow and $x_0 \in X$, there is a (unique) G -map $\lambda_{x_0} : \text{Sa}(G) \rightarrow X$ satisfying $\lambda_{x_0}(1_G) = x_0$. This allows us to equip $\text{Sa}(G)$ with a semigroup structure; furthermore, this semigroup acts on any G -flow X in a way which extends the G action, where given $x \in X$ and $p \in \text{Sa}(G)$, we have $x \cdot p = \lambda_x(p)$. While the action $X \times \text{Sa}(G) \rightarrow X$ will not in general be continuous, its restriction to $X \times \widehat{G}$ is always continuous. For $G = \text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$, we have $\widehat{G} = \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$.

A *completion flow* for G is a G -flow X containing a *completion point*, some $x \in X$ such that for any $\eta \in \widehat{G}$, the point $x \cdot \eta \in X$ has dense G -orbit, equivalently dense \widehat{G} -orbit. One of the main theorems from [37] is that if $G = \text{Aut}(\mathbf{K})$ for \mathbf{K} a Fraïssé structure which admits a *big Ramsey structure*, then G admits a completion flow X which is *universal*, i.e. which admits a G -map onto any other completion flow Y . For G of this form, we further have that the universal completion flow is both metrizable and unique up to isomorphism.

There are a few, equivalent ways of defining big Ramsey structures. One way is as follows. Suppose \mathbf{K} is a Fraïssé structure where each finite $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ has big Ramsey degree $r_{\mathbf{A}} < \omega$. Then a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{K} is a collection of colourings $\{\gamma_{\mathbf{A}} : \mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{K} \text{ finite}\}$ where:

- (1) For each $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ finite, $\gamma_{\mathbf{A}} : \text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow r_{\mathbf{A}}$ witnesses that the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{A} in \mathbf{K} is at least $r_{\mathbf{A}}$.
- (2) The collection $\{\gamma_{\mathbf{A}} : \mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{K} \text{ finite}\}$ is *coherent*, meaning that whenever $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ are finite and $f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$, then if $x, y \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{K})$ satisfy $\gamma_{\mathbf{B}}(x) = \gamma_{\mathbf{B}}(y)$, then also $\gamma_{\mathbf{A}}(x \circ f) = \gamma_{\mathbf{A}}(y \circ f)$.

By taking a product of all the various spaces of colourings, we can view $x := (\gamma_{\mathbf{A}})_{\mathbf{A}}$ as a point in this product. Then letting $X = \overline{x \cdot \text{Aut}(\mathbf{K})}$, one has that X is the universal completion flow of $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{K})$; it is a completion flow because the point x is a completion point. In particular, for the generic partial order \mathbf{P} , the colorings $(\chi_{\mathbf{Q}})_{\mathbf{Q}}$ form a coherent collection of colourings which all witness the exact lower bounds for big Ramsey degrees, and thus we obtain a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{P} . In fact, we don't need to consider every finite $\mathbf{Q} \subseteq \mathbf{P}$; it suffices to consider a representative of each isomorphism type of partial order on a vertex set of size at most 4 (in a poset-diary, this is enough to encode the relative heights between splitting levels, new \perp levels, and new \prec levels). Thus we obtain a big Ramsey structure for \mathbf{P} in a finite relational language.

This concludes the discussion of Remark 8.2.

The rest of this section proves Theorem 8.1 and concludes the proof of Theorem 1.7. First we show, by a repeated application of Lemma 7.5, that for every $f \in \text{Emb}((\Sigma^*, \preceq), (\Sigma^*, \preceq))$ (not necessarily shape-preserving), there exists $g \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ such that f preserves some features of the tree structure on $g[\Sigma^*]$.

Lemma 8.3. *For every $f \in \text{Emb}((\Sigma^*, \preceq), (\Sigma^*, \preceq))$, there exists $g \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ and a sequence $(N_i)_{i \in \omega}$ satisfying:*

- (1) $N_0 = 0$,
- (2) for every $u \in \Sigma^*$ it holds that $N_{|u|} \leq |f(g(u))| < N_{|u|+1}$, and,
- (3) for every $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ and ℓ such that $u|_{\ell} = v|_{\ell}$, it holds that $f(g(u))|_{N_{\ell}} = f(g(v))|_{N_{\ell}}$.

See Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. Function $f \circ g$.

Proof. Fix $f \in \text{Emb}((\Sigma^*, \preceq), (\Sigma^*, \preceq))$. We define a sequence of shape-preserving functions $(g_i)_{i \in \omega}$ and a sequence $(N_i)_{i \in \omega}$ of integers satisfying, for every $i > 0$, the following three conditions:

- (A) $g_i \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ and $g_{i-1} \upharpoonright \Sigma_{<i}^* = g_i \upharpoonright \Sigma_{<i}^*$.
- (B) For every $u \in \Sigma_{<i}^*$ it holds that $N_{|u|} \leq f(g_i(u)) < N_{|u|+1}$.
- (C) For every $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ and $\ell \leq \min(i, |u|, |v|)$ with $u|_\ell = v|_\ell$, we have $f(g_i(u))|_{N_\ell} = f(g_i(v))|_{N_\ell}$.

Put g_0 to be identity and $N_0 = 0$. Proceeding by induction, assume that g_{i-1} and N_{i-1} have been constructed for some $i > 0$. Put

$$N_i = \max \{ |f(g_{i-1}(u))| : u \in \Sigma_{i-1}^* \} + 1.$$

Enumerate $\Sigma_i^* = \{w^0, w^1, \dots, w^{m-1}\}$. By induction we will construct a sequence of functions $g_{i-1} = g_i^0, g_i^1, \dots, g_i^m \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$. Assume that g_i^j is constructed. Put $S_i^j = \overline{\{w^j\}}$ and define a colouring χ_i^j of $\text{Shape}_i(S_i^j, \Sigma^*)$ by putting $\chi_i^j(h) = g_i^j(h(w^j))|_{N_i}$. Apply Lemma 7.5 on χ_i^j and obtain h_i^j . Put $g_i^{j+1} = h_i^j \circ g_i^j$. Finally, put $g_i = g_i^m$.

To see that g_i satisfies (A), note that all h_i^j 's are shape-preserving functions and that they are the identity when restricted to $\Sigma_{<i}^*$. Property (B) follows directly from the choice of N_i . It remains to verify that (C) is satisfied. By (A) it is enough to verify this for $\ell = i$. Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ be such that $u|_i = v|_i$ and let c_i^m be the constant value of χ_i^m for m satisfying $w^m = u|_i = v|_i$ on h_i^m . Notice that $|c_i^m| = N_i$ because there are infinitely many images of words extending w^m . It follows that $g_i(u)|_{N_i} = g_i(v)|_{N_i} = c_i^m$.

It remains to put g to be the limit of sequence $(g_i)_{i \in \omega}$. \square

We denote by $d: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ the function that repeats every letter 3 times. That is, for every $u \in \Sigma^*$ we put $d(u) = u'$ where $|u'| = 3|u|$ and for every $\ell < |u|$ it holds that $u'_{3\ell} = u'_{3\ell+1} = u'_{3\ell+2} = u_\ell$. Note that d is a shape-preserving function.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $f \in \text{Emb}((\Sigma^*, \preceq), (\Sigma^*, \preceq))$. Let $g \in \text{Shape}(\Sigma^*, \Sigma^*)$ and sequence $(N_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be given by Lemma 8.3. Put $f' = f \circ g \circ d$. Then for every poset-diary S and every $\ell < \sup_{u \in S} |u|$, we have that $(\overline{S}_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft) \cong (f'[S]_{N_{3\ell}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on ℓ . Since $|\overline{S}_0| = 1$ we have:

$$(\overline{S}_0, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft) = (f'[S]_{N_0}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft).$$

Now assume that $(\overline{S}_\ell, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$ is isomorphic to $(f'[S]_{N_{3\ell}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$. We define the function μ on $\overline{S}_{\ell+1}$ via

$$\mu(u) = f'(u)|_{N_{3\ell+3}}.$$

We claim that $\mu: (\overline{S}_{\ell+1}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft) \rightarrow (f'[S]_{N_{3\ell+3}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \triangleleft)$ is an isomorphism:

- (1) $\mu[\overline{S}_{\ell+1}] \subseteq f'[S]_{N_{3\ell+3}}$: Recall that $f' = f \circ g \circ d$. For every $u \in \overline{S}_{\ell+1}$, we have $|d(u)| = 3\ell + 3$. Let $v \in S$ be a successor of u . Notice that $d(v)$ is a successor of $d(u)$. Now because g is given by Lemma 8.3, we know that both $f'(v)$ and $f'(u)$ are successors of $f'(u)|_{N_{3\ell+3}}$.
- (2) For every $u \in S$ with $|u| \geq \ell + 1$, we have that $\mu(u|_{\ell+1}) \sqsubseteq f'(u)$: This follows directly from the fact that g is constructed using Lemma 8.3.
- (3) $\mu[\overline{S}_{\ell+1}] \supseteq f'[S]_{N_{3\ell+3}}$: Let $v \in f'[S]_{N_{3\ell+3}}$ and choose $u \in S$ such that $v \sqsubseteq f'(u)$. It follows from Lemma 8.3 that $|u| \geq \ell + 1$ and $\mu(u|_{\ell+1}) = v$.
- (4) μ is injective: Assume that there are $u <_{\text{lex}} v$ in $\overline{S}_{\ell+1}$ such that $\mu(u) = \mu(v)$. The induction hypothesis then implies that level ℓ is splitting and that $u|_\ell = v|_\ell := w$ is the splitting node. It follows that $u = w \frown X$ and $v = w \frown R$. Put $w' = d(w) \frown L$, and observe that $d(u) \perp w'$ and $w' \prec d(v)$. Since $N_{3\ell} \leq |f \circ g(w')| < N_{3\ell+1}$ and $f \circ g$ is an embedding, we know that there is a level ℓ' satisfying $N_{3\ell} \leq \ell' < N_{3\ell+1}$ satisfying $f'(u)_{\ell'} = X$ and $f'(v)_{\ell'} = R$, which gives a contradiction with $\mu(u) = \mu(v)$, as $\mu(u) \sqsubseteq f'(u)$ and $\mu(v) \sqsubseteq f'(v)$.
- (5) $u \leq_{\text{lex}} v \implies \mu(u) \leq_{\text{lex}} \mu(v)$: By the induction hypothesis we only need to consider the case where $u|_\ell = v|_\ell := w$. We must have $u = w \frown X$ and $v = w \frown R$. Let $u' = w \frown XL$ and $v' = w \frown RR$. Since $u' \prec v'$ and thus also $f'(u') \prec f'(v')$, and since $\mu(u) \sqsubseteq f'(u')$ and $\mu(v) \sqsubseteq f'(v')$, we have $\mu(u) \leq_{\text{lex}} \mu(v)$.

- (6) $\mu(u) \leq_{\text{lex}} \mu(v) \implies u \leq_{\text{lex}} v$: This follows from the previous point and the fact that \leq_{lex} is a linear order.
- (7) $u \prec v \implies \mu(u) \prec \mu(v)$: Let ℓ' be the minimal level such that $u_{\ell'} = \text{L}$ and $v_{\ell'} = \text{R}$. Put $w = d(u|_{\ell'}) \frown \text{LR}$. Observe that $d(u) \prec w \prec d(v)$, that is, w is a *witness* of the fact that $d(u) \prec d(v)$. Observe also that $f'(u) = f(g(d(u))) \preceq f(g(w)) \preceq f(g(d(v))) = f'(v)$. Because $\ell' \leq \ell$ we have $|w| \leq 3\ell + 2$ and thus $|f(g(w))| < N_{3\ell+3}$. It follows that $\mu(u) \prec \mu(v)$.
- (8) $\mu(u) \prec \mu(v) \implies u \prec v$: Assume that $\mu(u) \prec \mu(v)$ and $u \not\prec v$. Because $\mu(u) <_{\text{lex}} \mu(v)$, we also have $u <_{\text{lex}} v$. Consequently, $u \frown \text{LX} \not\prec v \frown \text{XL}$, and so $f'(u \frown \text{LX}) \not\prec f'(v \frown \text{XL})$. This is a contradiction with $\mu(u) \sqsubseteq f'(u \frown \text{LX})$ and $\mu(v) \sqsubseteq f'(v \frown \text{XL})$.
- (9) $u \trianglelefteq v \implies \mu(u) \trianglelefteq \mu(v)$: Since $u' \prec v' \implies u' \triangleleft v'$, we only need to consider the case where $u \triangleleft v$ and $u \not\prec v$, and so $f'(u) \not\prec f'(v)$. We have $f'(u \frown \text{L}) \prec f'(v \frown \text{R})$, and because $\mu(u) \sqsubseteq f'(u) \sqsubseteq f'(u \frown \text{L})$ and $\mu(v) \sqsubseteq f'(v) \sqsubseteq f'(v \frown \text{R})$, it follows that $\mu(u) \trianglelefteq \mu(v)$.
- (10) $\mu(u) \trianglelefteq \mu(v) \implies u \trianglelefteq v$: If $u \not\trianglelefteq v$ then there exists a level $\ell' < \ell + 1$ such that $v_{\ell'} <_{\Sigma} u_{\ell'}$. Similarly as in the previous cases, we can produce a witness of this fact and contradict that $\mu(u) \trianglelefteq \mu(v)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Fix $f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P})$. Let $\psi: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ be obtained by Theorem 5.2. Let $\eta: (\Sigma^*, \preceq) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ be an embedding (which exists since \mathbf{P} is universal). Now $\psi \circ f \circ \eta$ is an embedding $(\Sigma^*, \preceq) \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$. Let $g: (\Sigma^*, \preceq) \rightarrow (\Sigma^*, \preceq)$ and $(N_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be obtained by the application of Lemma 8.3 on $\psi \circ f \circ \eta$. Put $f' = \psi \circ f \circ \eta \circ g \circ d$. We claim that for every poset-diary S , we have that $\tau(f'[S]) = S$. By Lemma 8.4, we know that for every $\ell < \sup_{u \in S} |u|$, we have that $(\overline{S}_{\ell}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \cong (\overline{f'[S]}_{N_{3\ell}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$. By Proposition 4.1, for every $0 < \ell < \sup_{u \in S} |u|$, there is exactly one difference between $(\overline{S}_{\ell-1}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ and $(\overline{S}_{\ell}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$. Consequently there is only one interesting level ℓ' of $\overline{f'[S]}$ between $N_{3\ell}$ and $N_{3\ell+3}$, and $(\overline{f'[S]}_{N_{\ell'}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \cong (\overline{S}_{\ell}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$ while $(\overline{f'[S]}_{N_{\ell'+1}}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq) \cong (\overline{S}_{\ell+1}, \leq_{\text{lex}}, \preceq, \trianglelefteq)$. We further note that by the construction of g , the map $\tau_{f'[S]} \circ f'$ must be the identity on S . We can thus put $\varphi = \eta \circ g \circ d$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Given a finite poset \mathbf{A} , the fact that the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{A} is exactly $|T^{\text{lab}}(\mathbf{A})| = |T(\mathbf{A})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})|$ follows from Corollary 7.8 and Theorem 8.1. To conclude that \mathbf{P} admits a big Ramsey structure, we observe that the colourings $\chi_{\mathbf{A}}$ as \mathbf{A} ranges over all finite posets satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 7.1 from [37]. Theorem 1.6 from [37] then shows that $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ admits a metrizable universal completion flow. \square




FIGURE 6. Possible levels in Devlin embedding types.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

9.1. Comparison to big Ramsey degrees of the order of rationals. It is natural to ask how the characterisation of big Ramsey degrees of partial orders compares to that of linear orders. The big Ramsey degrees of the linear order correspond to *Devlin embedding types* which, in our setting, can be defined as follows:

Definition 9.1 (Devlin embedding type [10], see also [35], Definition 6.9). A set $S \subseteq \{L, R\}^*$ is called a *Devlin embedding type*, if no member of S extends any other and precisely one of the following four conditions is satisfied for every level ℓ with $0 \leq \ell < \sup_{w \in S} |w|$:

- (1) **Leaf:** There is $w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ and

$$\bar{S}_{\ell+1} = (\bar{S}_\ell \setminus \{w\}) \frown L.$$

- (2) **Splitting:** There is $w \in \bar{S}_\ell$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_{\ell+1} &= \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : z <_{\text{lex}} w\} \frown L \\ &\cup \{w \frown L, w \frown R\} \\ &\cup \{z \in \bar{S}_\ell : w <_{\text{lex}} z\} \frown R. \end{aligned}$$

See also Figure 6.

When S is a Devlin embedding type, we call \bar{S} a *Devlin tree*. Given $n \in \omega$, we let $T'(n)$ be the set of all Devlin embedding types of size n .

Theorem 9.2 (Devlin [10], see also [35]). *For every $n \in \omega$, the big Ramsey degree of (n, \leq) in the order of rationals equals $|T'(n)|$.*

Any infinite Devlin tree whose leaves code the rational order is a big Ramsey structure for the rationals [37].

Comparing Devlin trees to poset-diaries is thus relatively natural. In a Devlin tree, only two types of events happen: splitting and leaf. In a poset-diary, the splitting event is different. If w splits on its level then $w \frown X$ and $w \frown L$ are incomparable in \preceq . This adds a need for additional

two events: new \prec and new \perp , deciding the poset structure between the successors of w .

9.2. The triangle-free graph. We outline how the techniques introduced in this paper can yield a particularly compact characterisation of the big Ramsey degrees of the generic triangle-free graph. This is a special case of the main result of [1] (see Example 6.2.10). However, we now give a more compact description which is similar to Definition 1.5.

We fix an alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ and denote by Σ^* the set of all finite words in the alphabet Σ , by \leq_{lex} their lexicographic order, and by $|w|$ the length of the word w (whose letters are indexed by natural numbers starting at 0). We will denote the empty word by \emptyset .

We consider the following triangle-free graph \mathbf{G}^Δ introduced in [14].

Definition 9.3 (Graph \mathbf{G}^Δ).

- (1) The vertex set G of \mathbf{G}^Δ is Σ^* .
- (2) Given $u, v \in G$ satisfying $|u| < |v|$, we make u and v adjacent if and only if $v_{|u|} = 1$ and there is no i satisfying $0 \leq i < |u|$ and $u_i = v_i = 1$.
- (3) There are no other edges in \mathbf{G}^Δ .

Definition 9.4 (Relation \perp). Given $u, v \in G$ with $|u| \leq |v|$, we write $u \perp v$ if one of the following is satisfied:

- (1) There exists i satisfying $0 \leq i < |u|$ and $u_i = v_i = 1$.
- (2) There is no i satisfying $0 \leq i < |u|$ and $v_i = 1$.
- (3) There is no i satisfying $0 \leq i < |v|$ and $u_i = 1$.

Let \mathbf{R}_3 denote the generic triangle-free graph. To characterise big Ramsey degrees of \mathbf{R}_3 , we introduce the following technical definition.

Definition 9.5 (Triangle-free diaries). A set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is called a *triangle-free-type* if no member of S extends any other and precisely one of the following four conditions is satisfied for every i with $0 \leq i < \sup_{w \in S} |w|$:

- (1) **Leaf:** There is $w \in \overline{S}_i$ with $w \neq 0^i$ such that for every distinct $u, v \in \{z \in \overline{S}_i \setminus \{w\} : z \not\perp w\}$ it holds that $u \perp v$. Moreover:

$$\overline{S}_{i+1} = \{z \in S_i \setminus \{w\} : z \perp w\} \widehat{\ } 0 \cup \{z \in S_i \setminus \{w\} : z \not\perp w\} \widehat{\ } 1.$$

- (2) **Splitting:** There is $w \in \overline{S}_i$ such that

$$\overline{S}_{i+1} = \overline{S}_i \widehat{\ } 0 \cup \{w\} \widehat{\ } 1.$$

- (3) **Non-splitting first neighbour:** $0^i \in \overline{S}_i$ and

$$\overline{S}_{i+1} = (S_i \setminus \{0^i\}) \widehat{\ } 0 \cup \{0^i\} \widehat{\ } 1.$$

- (4) **New \perp :** There are distinct words $v, w \in \overline{S}_i$ with $0^i \notin \{v, w\}$, $v \not\perp w$ such that

$$\overline{S}_{i+1} = (\overline{S}_i \setminus \{v, w\}) \widehat{\ } 0 \cup \{v, w\} \widehat{\ } 1.$$

See also Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. Possible levels in triangle-free diaries.

Given a triangle-free graph \mathbf{H} , we let $T^\Delta(\mathbf{H})$ be the set of all triangle-free-types S such that the structure induced by \mathbf{G}^Δ on $L(S)$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{H} . We can now recover the following result of [1].

Theorem 9.6 ([1]). *For every finite triangle-free graph \mathbf{H} , the big Ramsey degree of \mathbf{H} in the generic triangle-free graph \mathbf{R}_3 equals $|T^\Delta(\mathbf{H})| \cdot |\text{Aut}(\mathbf{H})|$.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank to the anonymous referee for remarks which improved clarity of this paper and to Štěpán Vodsedalek for pointing out important typo in Definition 1.5.

D. Ch., J. H. and M. K. were supported by the project 21-10775S of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR). This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 810115). M. B. and J. H. were supported by the Center for Foundations of Modern Computer Science (Charles University project UNCE/SCI/004). N. D. was supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1901753. L. V. was supported by Beatriu de Pinós BP2018, funded by the AGAUR (Government of Catalonia) and by the Horizon 2020 programme No 801370. A. Z. was supported by NSF grant DMS-2054302 and NSERC grants RGPIN-2023-03269 and DGEGR-2023-00412.

REFERENCES

1. Martin Balko, David Chodounský, Natasha Dobrinen, Jan Hubička, Matěj Konečný, Lluís Vena, and Andy Zucker, *Exact big Ramsey degrees for finitely constrained binary free amalgamation classes*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (2024), to appear, arXiv:2110.08409.

2. Martin Balko, David Chodounský, Jan Hubička, Matěj Konečný, and Lluís Vena, *Big Ramsey degrees of 3-uniform hypergraphs*, Acta Mathematica Universitatis Comenianae **88** (2019), no. 3, 415–422, Extended abstract for Eurocomb 2019.
3. Martin Balko, David Chodounský, Jan Hubička, Matěj Konečný, and Lluís Vena, *Big Ramsey degrees of 3-uniform hypergraphs are finite*, Combinatorica **42** (2022), no. 2, 659–672.
4. Keegan Dasilva Barbosa, *A categorical notion of precompact expansion*, arXiv:2002.11751 (2020).
5. Manuel Bodirsky, *Ramsey classes: Examples and constructions*, Surveys in Combinatorics 2015 **424** (2015), 1.
6. Timothy J. Carlson and Stephen G. Simpson, *A dual form of Ramsey’s theorem*, Advances in Mathematics **53** (1984), no. 3, 265–290.
7. Rebecca Coulson, Natasha Dobrinen, and Rehana Patel, *Fraïssé structures with SDAP+, Part I: Indivisibility*, arXiv:2207.06393 (2022).
8. ———, *Fraïssé structures with SDAP+, Part II: Simply characterized big Ramsey structures*, arXiv:2207.06505 (2022).
9. Domingos Dellamonica and Vojtěch Rödl, *Distance preserving Ramsey graphs*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **21** (2012), no. 04, 554–581.
10. Denis Devlin, *Some partition theorems and ultrafilters on ω* , Ph.D. thesis, Dartmouth College, 1979.
11. Natasha Dobrinen, *The Ramsey theory of the universal homogeneous triangle-free graph*, Journal of Mathematical Logic **20** (2020), no. 02, 2050012, 75pp.
12. ———, *The Ramsey theory of the universal homogeneous triangle-free graph part II: Exact big Ramsey degrees*, arXiv:2009.01985 (2020).
13. ———, *The Ramsey theory of Henson graphs*, Journal of Mathematical Logic **23** (2023), no. 1, 2250018.
14. Jan Hubička, *Big Ramsey degrees using parameter spaces*, arXiv:2009.00967, submitted (2020).
15. ———, *Structural Ramsey theory and the extension property for partial automorphisms*, habilitation, Charles University, 2020, arXiv:2010.05041.
16. Jan Hubička and Jaroslav Nešetřil, *All those Ramsey classes (Ramsey classes with closures and forbidden homomorphisms)*, Advances in Mathematics **356C** (2019), 106791.
17. J. Hubička and A. Zucker, *A survey on big Ramsey structures*.
18. Nikolaos Karagiannis, *A combinatorial proof of an infinite version of the Hales–Jewett theorem*, Journal of Combinatorics **4** (2013), no. 2, 273–291.
19. Matěj Konečný, *Model theory and extremal combinatorics*, Ph.D. thesis, Charles University, 2023.
20. Claude Laflamme, Lionel Nguyen Van Thé, and Norbert W. Sauer, *Partition properties of the dense local order and a colored version of Milliken’s theorem*, Combinatorica **30** (2010), no. 1, 83–104.
21. Claude Laflamme, Norbert W. Sauer, and Vojkan Vuksanovic, *Canonical partitions of universal structures*, Combinatorica **26** (2006), no. 2, 183–205.
22. Jean A. Larson, *Counting canonical partitions in the random graph*, Combinatorica **28** (2008), no. 6, 659–678.
23. Dugald Macpherson, *A survey of homogeneous structures*, Discrete Mathematics **311** (2011), no. 15, 1599–1634, Infinite Graphs: Introductions, Connections, Surveys.
24. Dragan Mašulović, *Pre-adjunctions and the Ramsey property*, European Journal of Combinatorics **70** (2018), 268–283.

25. Jaroslav Nešetřil, *Metric spaces are Ramsey*, European Journal of Combinatorics **28** (2007), no. 1, 457–468.
26. Jaroslav Nešetřil and Vojtěch Rödl, *A structural generalization of the Ramsey theorem*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **83** (1977), no. 1, 127–128.
27. ———, *Combinatorial partitions of finite posets and lattices—Ramsey lattices*, Algebra Universalis **19** (1984), no. 1, 106–119.
28. ———, *Ramsey partial orders from acyclic graphs*, Order **35** (2018), no. 2, 293–300.
29. Lionel Nguyen Van Thé, *Big Ramsey degrees and divisibility in classes of ultrametric spaces*, Canadian Mathematical Bulletin **51** (2008), no. 3, 413–423.
30. ———, *A survey on structural Ramsey theory and topological dynamics with the Kechris-Pestov-Todorćevic correspondence in mind*, Selected Topics in Combinatorial Analysis **17** (2015), no. 25, 189–207.
31. Madeleine Paoli, William T. Trotter, and James W. Walker, *Graphs and orders in Ramsey theory and in dimension theory*, Graphs and Order (Ivan Rival, ed.), NATO AST series, vol. 147, Springer, 1985, pp. 351–394.
32. Norbert W. Sauer, *Edge partitions of the countable triangle free homogeneous graph*, Discrete Mathematics **185** (1998), no. 1-3, 137–181.
33. Miodrag Sokić, *Ramsey properties of finite posets*, Order **29** (2012), no. 1, 1–30.
34. Sławomir Solecki and Min Zhao, *A Ramsey theorem for partial orders with linear extensions*, European Journal of Combinatorics **60** (2017), 21–30.
35. Stevo Todorćevic, *Introduction to Ramsey spaces*, vol. 174, Princeton University Press, 2010.
36. Andy Zucker, *Topological dynamics of automorphism groups, ultrafilter combinatorics, and the Generic Point Problem*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **368** (2016), no. 9, 6715–6740.
37. ———, *Big Ramsey degrees and topological dynamics*, Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics **13** (2019), no. 1, 235–276.
38. ———, *On big Ramsey degrees for binary free amalgamation classes*, Advances in Mathematics **408** (2022), 108585.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS (KAM), CHARLES UNIVERSITY,
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ 25, PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC
Email address: balko@kam.mff.cuni.cz

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS (KAM), CHARLES UNIVERSITY,
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ 25, PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŽITNÁ 25,
PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Email address: chodounsky@math.cas.cz

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, 255 HURLEY
BLDG, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556 USA

Email address: ndobrine@nd.edu

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS (KAM), CHARLES UNIVERSITY,
MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ 25, PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Email address: hubicka@kam.mff.cuni.cz

INSTITUTE OF ALGEBRA, TU DRESDEN, HELMHOLTZSTRASSE 10, 01069 DRES-
DEN, GERMANY, AND DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS (KAM), CHARLES
UNIVERSITY, MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁMĚSTÍ 25, PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Email address: matej.konecny@tu-dresden.de

UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA, BARCELONA, SPAIN

Email address: lluis.vena@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, 200 UNI-
VERSITY AVE W, WATERLOO, ON N2L 3G1, CANADA

Email address: a3zucker@uwaterloo.ca