THE CLASSIFICATION OF HOMOGENEOUS
FINITE-DIMENSIONAL PERMUTATION STRUCTURES

SAMUEL BRAUNFELD AND PIERRE SIMON

Abstract. We classify the homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structures, i.e., homogeneous structures in a language of finitely many linear orders, giving a nearly complete answer to a question of Cameron, and confirming the classification conjectured by the first author. The primitive case was proven by the second author using model-theoretic methods, and those methods continue to appear here.

1. Introduction

A countable relational structure is homogeneous if every finite partial automorphism extends to a total automorphism. This notion was introduced by Fraïssé to generalize the behavior of the rational order, which is the unique homogeneous linear order. (For the reader unfamiliar with amalgamation and Fraïssé limits, we refer to [4, §2]. For far more information, see [9].) Beginning with the case of graphs [8], a program of classifying homogeneous structures in particular languages developed, which has included partial orders [10], tournaments [7], directed graphs [5], and ongoing work on metrically homogeneous graphs [6].

Along this line, in [4] Cameron classified the homogeneous permutations, which he identified with homogeneous structures consisting of two linear orders. He then posed the problem of classifying, for each \( n \), the homogeneous structures consisting of \( n \) linear orders, which we call homogeneous \( n \)-dimensional permutation structures.

A construction producing many new imprimitive examples of such structures was introduced in [1]. The structures produced by a slight generalization of that construction, making use of the subquotient orders introduced in §2 in place of linear orders, were put forward as a conjecturally complete catalog in [2], which confirmed the case of 3 linear orders. Here, we confirm the completeness of that catalog as a whole.

Theorem 1.1. Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure. Then there is a finite distributive lattice \( \Lambda \) such that \( \Gamma \) is interdefinable with an expansion of the generic \( \Lambda \)-ultrametric space by generic subquotient orders, such that every meet-irreducible of \( \Lambda \) is the bottom relation of some subquotient order.
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The primitive case, in which there is no \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relation, is foundational for proving the completeness of the catalog. The Primitivity Conjecture of [1] conjectured that, modulo the agreement of certain orders up to reversal, a primitive homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure is the Fraïssé limit of all finite \( n \)-dimensional permutation structures, for some \( n \). In the case of \( 2 \) [4] and \( 3 \) [2] linear orders, the conjecture was proven by increasingly involved direct amalgamation arguments. A description of the ways linear orders can interact in certain \( \omega \)-categorical structures, as well as of the closed sets \( \emptyset \)-definable in products of such structures, was given in [11], and as an application of these model-theoretic results, the Primitivity Conjecture was confirmed.

After reviewing the catalog and the relevant results of [11], our proof breaks into two sections. First, we examine the lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations of a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure, and in particular prove that each meet-irreducible element is convex with respect to some linear order in the language and that the reduct to the language of equivalence relations remains homogeneous. In the next section, we complete the classification by proving a finite-dimensional permutation structure may be presented in a language in which all the subquotient orders are generic.

Despite the fact that the catalog gives a simple description of all finite-dimensional permutation structures, it is difficult to determine the corresponding catalog for a fixed number of linear orders. This is because it is not known what lattices of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations can be realized with a given number of orders, nor is it true that one needs at most \( n \) orders to represent a structure with at most \( 2^n \) 2-types. For some discussion and results regarding these problems, see [3, §4.4].

**Problem.** Given a lattice \( \Lambda \), what is the minimal \( n \) such that \( \Lambda \) is isomorphic to the lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations of some homogeneous \( n \)-dimensional permutation structure?

Given a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure \( \Gamma \) presented in a language of equivalence relations and subquotient orders, what is the minimal \( n \) such that \( \Gamma \) is quantifier-free interdefinable with an \( n \)-dimensional permutation structure?

For the following proposition, see [3, Corollary 4.4.3] for the upper bound and Corollary [4,10] for the lower bound.

**Proposition 1.2.** Let \( \Lambda \) be a finite distributive lattice, \( \Lambda_0 \) the poset of meet-irreducibles of \( \Lambda \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( \mathcal{L} \) a set of chains covering \( \Lambda_0 \), and \( \ell \) the minimum size of any such \( \mathcal{L} \). Let \( d_\Lambda \) be the minimum dimension of a homogeneous permutation structure with lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations isomorphic to \( \Lambda \). Then

\[
2\ell \leq d_\Lambda \leq |\mathcal{L}| + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \lceil \log_2(|L| + 1) \rceil.
\]
However, neither bound describes the true behavior of $d_{\Lambda}$. To exceed the lower bound, let $\Lambda$ be a chain. To beat the upper bound, the lattice consisting of the sum of the free boolean algebra on 2 atoms and a single point may be achieved using only 4 orders.

Although we use model-theoretic terminology throughout this paper, in the setting of a homogeneous structure $M$, many of these notions have equivalent presentations. In particular, an $(n)$-type is an orbit of the action of the automorphism group $Aut(M)$ on $M^n$. Equivalently (because of the homogeneity assumption), it is an isomorphism type of $n$ labeled points. A subset $X \subset M^k$ is definable over $A \subset M$ (or $A$-definable) if the pointwise stabilizer of $A$ in $Aut(M)$ fixes $X$ setwise. In particular, $\emptyset$-definability is equivalent to $Aut(M)$-invariance. An element $c \in M$ is definable from a set $A$ if the singleton $\{c\}$ is $A$-definable. If $E \subseteq M^2$ is a $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation, then those notions carry through naturally to the quotient $M/E$.
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## 2. The Catalog

For proofs and further discussion of the results presented in this section, see [3, Chap. 3].

**Definition 2.1.** Let $M$ be a structure, equipped with an equivalence relation $E$ and linear order $\leq$. Then we say that $E$ is $\leq$-convex, or sometimes that $\leq$ is $E$-convex, if every $E$-class is convex with respect to $\leq$.

The construction of the structures in the catalog proceeds roughly as follows. One starts with a finite distributive lattice $\Lambda$ and constructs the generic object with a lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations isomorphic to $\Lambda$. This structure is then expanded by linear orders so that every $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation is convex with respect to at least one $\emptyset$-definable order and the equivalence relations are then interdefinably replaced by additional linear orders.

However, we do not work directly with linear orders, but rather with certain partial orders which we call subquotient orders, which allow our expansion to be fully generic in a natural sense.

**Definition 2.2.** Let $X$ be a structure, and $E \leq F$ equivalence relations on $X$. A subquotient order from $E$ to $F$ is a partial order on $X/E$ in which two $E$-classes are comparable if and only if they lie in the same $F$-class (note, this pulls back to a partial order on $X$). Thus, this partial order provides a linear order of $C/E$ for each $C \in X/F$. We call $E$ the bottom relation and $F$ the top relation of the subquotient order.
We say that a subquotient order $<_G$ from $E$ to $F$ is $G$-convex if $E$ refines $G$ and the projection to $X/E$ of any $G$-class is $<_G$-convex.

Note a linear order is a subquotient order from $0$ (equality) to $1$ (the trivial relation). Starting with a linear order $\leq$ convex with respect to $E$ and possibly additional equivalence relations, it can be interdefinably exchanged for its restriction within $E$-classes, a subquotient order from $0$ to $E$, and the order it induces between $E$-classes, a subquotient order from $E$ to $1$. This process may then be iterated on the resulting subquotient orders until all convexity conditions are removed.

Further, instead of working directly in the language of equivalence relations, we find it convenient to work in the language of $\Lambda$-ultrametric spaces.

**Definition 2.3.** Let $\Lambda$ be a lattice. A $\Lambda$-ultrametric space is a metric space where the metric takes values in $\Lambda$ and the triangle inequality uses the join rather than addition.

The following proposition shows that $\Lambda$-ultrametric spaces are equivalent to structures equipped with a lattice of equivalence relations isomorphic to $\Lambda$, or to substructures of such structures. While the lattice of equivalence relations may collapse when passing to a substructure, such as a single point, $\Lambda$-ultrametric spaces have the benefit of keeping $\Lambda$ fixed under passing to substructures.

**Proposition 2.4** ([3, Theorem 3.3.2]). Fix a finite lattice $\Lambda$. Let $\mathcal{M}_\Lambda$ be the category of $\Lambda$-ultrametric spaces, with isometries as morphisms. Let $\mathcal{EQ}_\Lambda$ be the category of structures consisting of a set equipped with a family of not-necessarily-distinct equivalence relations $\{ E_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda \}$ satisfying the following conditions, with embeddings as morphisms.

1. $\{ E_\lambda \}$ forms a lattice.
2. The map $L : \lambda \mapsto E_\lambda$ is meet-preserving. In particular, if $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$, then $E_{\lambda_1} \leq E_{\lambda_2}$.
3. $E_0$ is equality and $E_1$ is the trivial relation.

Then $\mathcal{EQ}_\Lambda$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}_\Lambda$. Furthermore, the functors of this isomorphism preserve homogeneity.

Given a system of equivalence relations as specified above, we get the corresponding $\Lambda$-ultrametric space by taking the same universe and defining $d(x, y) = \bigwedge \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid x E_\lambda y \}$. In the reverse direction, given a $\Lambda$-ultrametric space, we get the corresponding structure of equivalence relations by taking the same universe and defining $E_\lambda = \{ (x, y) \mid d(x, y) \leq \lambda \}$.

The next proposition explains the special status of distributive lattices.

**Proposition 2.5** ([3 Proposition 3.3.5, Corollary 5.2.6]). Let $\Lambda$ be a finite lattice. Then the class of all finite $\Lambda$-ultrametric spaces forms an amalgamation class if and only if $\Lambda$ is distributive.
The following theorem states that we may take the generic $\Lambda$-ultrametric space and expand it by the natural analogue for subquotient orders of generic linear orders.

**Theorem 2.6 (\cite{3} Theorem 4.2.3).** Let $\Lambda$ be a finite distributive lattice. Let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be the class of finite structures $(A, d, \{<_{E_i}\}_{i=1}^n)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $(A, d)$ is a $\Lambda$-ultrametric space;
- $<_{E_i}$ is a subquotient order with bottom relation $E_i$, for some meet-irreducible $E_i \in \Lambda$, and top relation $F_i \in \Lambda$.

Then $\mathcal{A}^*$ is an amalgamation class.

**Definition 2.7.** Let $\Lambda$ be a finite distributive lattice, and $\Gamma$ the fully generic $\Lambda$-ultrametric space equipped with some subquotient orders. We will say those subquotient orders are **generic** if $\Gamma$ may be constructed as a Fraïssé limit of a class $\mathcal{A}^*$ as from Theorem 2.6.

**Remark 2.8.** The condition that the bottom relation of a generic subquotient order be meet-irreducible is analogous to the condition that for a Fraïssé class to be expandable by a generic linear order, it must have strong amalgamation. For if $E$ is meet-irreducible, then our amalgamation procedure from Proposition 2.5 never forces the identification of $E$-classes. However, if $E = F \land F'$, then any $E$-class is the unique intersection of some $F$-class with some $F'$-class, so amalgamation may force the identification of $E$-classes.

Although the structures produced by Theorem 2.6 are presented in the language of equivalence relations and subquotient orders, we now give a sufficient condition for them to be representable in a language of linear orders.

**Proposition 2.9 (\cite{3} Proposition 3.4.13).** Let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be a class as from Theorem 2.6 such that every meet-irreducible of $\Lambda$ is the bottom relation of some subquotient order. Then the Fraïssé limit of $\mathcal{A}^*$ is interdefinable with a finite-dimensional permutation structure.

Finally, the structures in our catalog are constructed as follows. Let $\Lambda$ be a finite distributive lattice. Take the generic $\Lambda$-ultrametric space, and expand by generic subquotient orders with meet-irreducible bottom relation, such that every meet-irreducible of $\Lambda$ is the bottom relation of at least one subquotient order.

### 3. Linear orders in $\omega$-categorical structures

In this section, we review material from \cite{1} leading to the proof of the Primitivity Conjecture, as well as introducing definitions and results that will be used later. For proofs and further discussion of the results presented in this section, see \cite{1}, particularly §3.
Notation 3.1. Throughout this section, we will assume that $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ is a $\emptyset$-definable substructure of an $\omega$-categorical structure, equipped with a distinguished $\emptyset$-definable linear order $\leq$, and possibly other $\emptyset$-definable structure. Similarly for $(W; \leq, \cdots)$.

We first define the sorts of linear orders we will be concerned with, and the ways they can interact.

Definition 3.2. We say $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ is weakly transitive if it is dense and the set of realizations of any 1-type $p(x)$ concentrating on $V$ is dense in $V$.

We say $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ has topological rank 1 if it does not admit any parameter-definable $\leq$-convex equivalence relation with infinitely many infinite classes.

Finally, $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ is minimal if it is weakly transitive and has topological rank 1.

Definition 3.3. By a cut in a dense order $(V, \leq)$, we mean an initial segment of it which is neither empty nor the whole of $V$ and has no last element. We denote by $V$ the set of parameter-definable cuts of $V$.

Definition 3.4. We say two weakly transitive orders $(V; \leq_V)$ and $(W; \leq_W)$ are intertwined if there is a $\emptyset$-definable non-decreasing map $f : V \rightarrow W$.

If $(V; \leq_V)$ and $(W; \leq_W)$ are minimal, we say they are independent if $V$ is intertwined with neither $W$ nor its reverse.

The following proposition is a special case of Corollary 3.16 in [11].

Proposition 3.5. Let $(M; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n, \cdots)$ be $\omega$-categorical, transitive, with each $\leq_i$ a linear order of topological rank 1. Assume that no two distinct orders are intertwined. Then the reduct of $M$ to the language $L_0 = \{ \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n \}$ is completely determined up to isomorphism by whether, for any $i, j \leq n$, $\leq_i, \leq_j$ are equal, reverse of each other, or independent.

To use apply this proposition, we need to know that a primitive finite-dimensional permutation structure has topological rank 1.

Definition 3.6. We say an $\omega$-categorical structure is binary if it eliminates quantifiers in a finite binary relational language.

Definition 3.7. We say $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ is topologically primitive if it does not admit any non-trivial $\emptyset$-definable $\leq$-convex equivalence relation.

Lemma 3.8 ([11, Lemma 7.3]). Let $(M; \leq, \cdots)$ be a binary structure which is topologically primitive. Then $(M; \leq)$ has topological rank 1.

The proof uses the following result, which is a special case of [11, Lemma 7.1].

Lemma 3.9. Let $M$ be a binary structure. Then we cannot find a sequence $(F_k)_{k<\omega}$ of parameter-definable equivalence relations and a sequence $M \supset C_0 \supset C_1 \supset \cdots$ such that each $C_k$ is an $F_k$-class which splits into infinitely many $F_{k+1}$-classes.
From those results, one obtains the following theorem confirming the Primitivity Conjecture.

**Theorem 3.10 ([11, Theorem 7.4]).** Let \((\Gamma; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) be a primitive homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure such that no two orders are equal or opposite of each other. Then \(\Gamma\) is the Fraïssé limit of all finite sets equipped with \(n\) orders.

Finally, we close with several results that will also be used later. The first two propositions describe the closed sets \(\emptyset\)-definable in a minimal linear order and then in a product of pairwise independent linear orders.

**Proposition 3.11 ([11, Proposition 3.8]).** Let \((V; \leq, \cdot \cdot \cdot)\) be a minimal definable linear order. Let \(p(x_0, \ldots, x_n-1)\) be a type in \(V^n\) such that \(p \vdash x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_{n-1}\). Then given open intervals \(I_0 < \cdots < I_{n-1}\) of \(V\), we can find \(a_i \in I_i\) such that \((a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \models p\).

**Proposition 3.12 ([11, Proposition 3.15]).** Let \(V_0, \ldots, V_{n-1}\) be pairwise independent minimal orders. Then any \(\emptyset\)-definable closed set \(X \subseteq V_0^{k_0} \times \cdots \times V_{n-1}^{k_{n-1}}\) is a finite union of products of the form \(D_0 \times \cdots \times D_{n-1}\), where each \(D_i\) is a \(\emptyset\)-definable closed subset of \(V_i^{k_i}\).

**Lemma 3.13 ([11, Lemma 3.14]).** Let \(V_0, V_1\) be minimal independent linear orders. Let \(X_0, X_1\) be infinite \(A\)-definable subsets of \(V_0, V_1\) respectively, transitive over \(A\). Then \(X_0, X_1\) are independent over \(A\).

**Proposition 3.14 ([11, Proposition 6.1]).** Assume that \(M\) is NIP and binary. Let \(X, Y \subseteq M\) be \(\emptyset\)-definable, and let \(p(x, y)\) be a complete type in \(X \times Y\). Let \((V; \leq, \cdot \cdot \cdot)\) be a \(\emptyset\)-definable minimal linear order, and let \(f : p(X \times Y) \to V\) be a \(\emptyset\)-definable function. Then for any \((a, b) \models p, f(a, b) \in \text{dcl}(a) \cup \text{dcl}(b)\).

In particular, for any \(A \subset V, \text{dcl}(A) \cap V = A\).

For applications of Proposition 3.14 note that a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure is NIP, as it has quantifier elimination, NIP is preserved by boolean combinations, and “\(x \leq y\)” is NIP.

### 4. The lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations

In this section, we investigate the \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations of a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure. The main result for the first subsection, Lemma 4.17, is that each meet-irreducible element of the lattice is convex with respect to some linear order in the language, and that of the next subsection, Proposition 4.16, is that the reduct to the language is \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations is fully generic.

Some lemmas will be proven in a more general setting, so we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 4.1.** A structure \(M\) is order-like if for any complete type \(p(x, y)\) in two variables over \(\emptyset\), we have \(p(x, y) \land p(y, z) \rightarrow p(x, z)\).
Note that a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure is order-like. Conversely, we do not know if every transitive, order-like, binary NIP structure is (bi-definable with) a finite-dimensional permutation structure.

4.1. **Convexity.** We first establish an analogue of Lemma 3.8 when working in the quotient of a binary structure.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \((V; \leq, \cdots)\) be binary. Let \(E\) be the coarsest non-trivial \(\emptyset\)-definable \(\leq\)-convex equivalence relation. Then \((V/E; \leq)\) has topological rank 1.

**Proof.** The proof is an adaptation of that of [11, Lemma 7.3]. Assume that there is a non-trivial parameter-definable \(\leq\)-convex equivalence relation \(F\) on \((V/E; \leq, \cdots)\). Let \(F\) be defined over \(\bar{a}\) and write \(F = F_{\bar{a}}\). Let \(R(x,y)\) be the relation on \(V/E\) which holds of a pair \((c,d)\) if for every \(b\) having the same type as \(\bar{a}\) over \(\emptyset\), there are finitely many \(F_b\)-equivalence classes between \(c\) and \(d\). Then \(R\) is \(\emptyset\)-definable and \(\leq\)-convex. By the maximality assumption on \(E\), \(R\) is equality. Then for any \(F_{\bar{a}}\)-class \(C\), there is \(b \equiv \bar{a}\) such that \(C\) splits into infinitely many \(F_{\bar{b}}\)-classes. Let \(F_0 = F\), \(C_0 = C\), \(F_1 = F_{\bar{b}}\), and let \(C_1\) be any \(F_1\)-class inside \(C_0\). We can iterate the construction to obtain a sequence \((F_k)_{k<\omega}\) of equivalence relations on \(V/E\) and a decreasing sequence \((C_k)_{k<\omega}\) such that each \(C_k\) is an \(F_k\)-class that splits into infinitely many \(F_{k+1}\)-classes. This entire situation lifts to \(V\) and contradicts Lemma 3.9.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let \((V; \leq, \cdots)\) be order-like, transitive, and binary. Let \(E\) be the coarsest non-trivial \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relation. Then given \(a \in V\), for any \(a\)-definable cut \(c\) of \((V, \leq)\), we have \(\inf(a/E) \leq c \leq \sup(a/E)\).

**Proof.** We write \(a \ll b\) for \(a/E < b/E\), equivalently \(a < b\) and \(a/E \neq b/E\). If \(c\) is a cut, then \(a \ll c\) means that \(c\) is greater than the supremum of the \(E\)-class of \(a\).

Assume that there is a cut \(c\) definable from \(a\), with \(a \ll c\). Let \(c(a)\) be the minimal such cut. Consider the cut \(c_\ast := \sup\{c(a') : a' Ea\}\). Note that \(c_\ast\) depends only on the \(E\)-class of \(a\), so we can write \(c_\ast = f_\ast(a/E)\) for some function \(f_\ast\). Assume \(c_\ast\) is not \(+\infty\) and let \(g_\ast(a/E)\) be the image of \(f_\ast(a/E)\) in the quotient \(V/E\). Then \(g_\ast\) is a function from \((V/E, \leq)\) to its Dedekind completion with \(x < y\). By Lemma 4.2 \(V/E\) has topological rank 1. Therefore by Proposition 3.11 the graph of \(g_\ast\) must be dense in \(\{(x,y) : x < y\}\). We can then find \(b \in V\) such that \(a \ll b \ll c(a) \ll c(b)\). Then as \(c(b)\) is the minimal cut definable from \(b\) above \(b/E\), there is \(d \in V\) such that \(\text{tp}(a,b) = \text{tp}(b,d)\) and \(a \ll b \ll c(a) \ll d \ll c(b)\). So \(\text{tp}(a,d) \neq \text{tp}(a,b)\) and this is a contradiction to \(V\) being order-like.

If \(c_\ast\) is \(+\infty\), then we can also find \(b\) as above, just by definition of \(c_\ast\). □

**Corollary 4.4.** Let \((V; \leq, \cdots)\) be order-like, transitive, and binary. Let \(E\) be the coarsest non-trivial \(\leq\)-convex \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relation. Let \(F\)
be a $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation not refining $E$. Then no $F$-class defines a cut in $(V; \leq, \cdots)$.

In particular:

1. Every $F$-class intersects a dense set of $E$-classes.
2. Suppose $F$ is the coarsest non-trivial $\leq'$-convex $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation. Then $(V/E; \leq, \cdots)$ and $(V/F; \leq', \cdots)$ are independent.

Proof. Let $C$ be an $F$-class, and suppose that a cut in $(V; \leq, \cdots)$ is definable from $C$. Then that cut is definable from any $a \in C$. Let $a_1, a_2 \in C$ lie in distinct $E$-classes. By Lemma 4.3 the only cut of $V/E$ definable from $a_i$ is that of $a_i/E$. As these cuts are distinct, $C$ can define neither.

For (1), let $C$ be an $F$-class, and let $\sim$ be the $\leq$-convex equivalence relation on $V/E$ defined by:

$$x \sim y \iff \text{the interval } [x, y] \text{ lies in the complement of } C.$$  

As $V/E$ has topological rank 1 by Lemma 4.2, $\sim$ has finitely many classes. There must be multiple $\sim$-classes, but then their endpoints would be $C$-definable cuts.

For (2), note that an intertwining map would require each $F$-class to define a cut in $(V/E; \leq, \cdots)$, which we ruled out above. \hfill \Box

**Definition 4.5.** Let $(\Gamma, \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)$ be homogeneous, and $E$ a $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation. We say $E$ is convex if it is $\leq_i$-convex for some $i$.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let $(\Gamma, \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)$ be homogeneous. Then any maximal $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation $F$ is convex with respect to at least two linear orders in the language.

Proof. For each $i \leq n$, let $E_i$ denote the maximal $\leq_i$-convex $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation, let $V_i = (\Gamma/E_i; \leq_i, \cdots)$, and let $W_1, \ldots, W_k$ be representatives of the $V_i$'s up to $\emptyset$-definable monotonic bijection. Then by Corollary 4.3 the $W_i$'s are pairwise independent topological rank 1 ordered sets.

First, suppose $F$ is not convex. Then by Corollary 4.4 each $F$-class projects densely on each $W_i$. Expand the language by a unary predicate $C$ naming an $F$-class. Each resulting $W_i$ is still minimal, as $C$ can define no cuts. Thus by Proposition 3.12 each $F$-class is dense in the product $\prod W_i$. By quantifier elimination, those formulas must imply $\neg F(x, y)$. However, by density this type is consistent both with $F(x, y)$ and $\neg F(x, y)$.

Now suppose $F$ is only $\leq_i$-convex. Then we carry out the same argument, omitting $W_j$. Again, each $F$-class is dense in the product $\prod_{i \neq j} W_i$. Let $C_1 \subset C_2$ be two $F$-classes. By density, we can find $a, a' \in C_1$ and $b, b' \in C_2$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \neq j} a <_i b$ and $\bigwedge_{i \neq j} b' <_i a'$. It follows, both $x <_j y \land \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x <_i y$ and $y <_j x \land \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x <_i y$ are consistent with $\neg F(x, y)$. By quantifier elimination, those formulas must imply $\neg F(x, y)$. However, by density of
we can find \((c, d) \in C_1^2\) satisfying one of those formulas. This is a contradiction. □

**Lemma 4.7.** Let \((\Gamma; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) be homogeneous, with lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations \(\Lambda\). Then any meet-irreducible \(E \in \Lambda\) is convex with respect to at least two linear orders in the language.

**Proof.** Let \(E \in \Lambda\) be meet-irreducible, and \(E^+\) the cover of \(E\). Fix an \(E^+\)-class \(C^+\), and \(C \subset C^+\) an \(E\)-class. By Lemma 4.6, there are \(i, j \leq n\) such that \(C\) is \(\leq_i\)-convex and \(\leq_j\)-convex in \(C^+\).

If \(E^+\) is both \(\leq_i\)-convex and \(\leq_j\)-convex, we are finished, so assume it is not \(\leq_i\)-convex. Let \(\overline{C^+}\) be the \(\leq_i\)-convex closure of \(C^+\). The structure \((\overline{C^+}; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) is homogeneous. Let \(G\) be the maximal \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relation that is \(\leq_i\)-convex in \(\overline{C^+}\). Then \(E\) does not refine \(G\). By Corollary 4.4, the projections of both \(C\) and \(C^+\) are dense in \((\overline{C^+/G}; \leq_i)\). As \(C\) is \(\leq_i\)-convex in \(C^+\), these projections must be equal. As \((\overline{C^+/G}; \leq_i)\) is without endpoints, applying \(\leq_i\)-convexity again gives \(C = C^+\), which is a contradiction. □

**Corollary 4.8.** Let \((\Gamma; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) be homogeneous, then any \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relation is an intersection of convex \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations.

**Remark 4.9.** By the proof of \([3, Lemma 3.4.10]\), any intersection of convex equivalence relations is convex for some \(\emptyset\)-definable order (not necessarily one of \(\leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n\)).

**Corollary 4.10.** Let \(\Lambda\) be a finite distributive lattice, \(\Lambda_0\) the poset of meet-irreducibles of \(\Lambda\) \(\setminus\) \(\{0, 1\}\), and \(\ell\) the minimum number of chains needed to cover \(\Lambda_0\). Let \(d_\Lambda\) be the minimum dimension of a homogeneous permutation structure with lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations isomorphic to \(\Lambda\). Then \(2\ell \leq d_\Lambda\).

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.7, every element of \(\Lambda_0\) must be convex for at least two linear orders in the language. However, if \(E, F \in \Lambda\) are incomparable, then they cannot be convex with respect to the same order. □

**4.2. Distributivity and genericity.** We now prove distributivity of the lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations and genericity of the reduct to the language of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations. Distributivity is proven first, although by Proposition 2.5 it follows from genericity, as we will use Proposition 2.5 to prove genericity.

**Definition 4.11.** Two equivalence relations \(E\) and \(F\) are *cross-cutting* if every \(E\)-class intersects every \(F\)-class.

We now prove that two \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations are cross-cutting if their join is \(1\). Note this would be immediate if we already knew the genericity of the reduct.
Lemma 4.12. Let \((V; E, F, \cdots)\) be \(\omega\)-categorical, transitive, and order-like, where \(E\) and \(F\) are \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations. Let \(a, a', b \in V\) such that \(aEa'\) and \(aFb\), then there is \(b' \in V\) with \(bEb'\) and \(a'Fb'\).

Proof. Let \(e_1\) be the \(E\)-class of \(a\) and \(e_2\) the \(E\)-class of \(b\). Take \(e_3\) so that \(\text{tp}(b, e_3) = \text{tp}(a', e_2)\). Next take \(c \in e_2\) such that \(\text{tp}(c, e_3) = \text{tp}(a, e_2)\) (this is possible as \(\text{tp}(e_1, e_2) = \text{tp}(e_2, e_3)\)). Finally let \(d \in e_3\) be such that \(\text{tp}(a, c) = \text{tp}(c, d)\). Then, as \(V\) is order-like, \(\text{tp}(a, d) = \text{tp}(a, c)\). Let \(d'\) be such that \(\text{tp}(a, d', d') = \text{tp}(a, c, b)\). Then we have \(aFb\) and \(dFd'\). So \(d' \in e_3\) and \(bFd'\). Since \(\text{tp}(b, e_3) = \text{tp}(a', e_2)\), there is \(b' \in e_2\) such that \(a'Fb'\). \(\square\)

Corollary 4.13. Let \((V; E, F, \cdots)\) be \(\omega\)-categorical, transitive, and order-like, with lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations \(\Lambda\). Let \(E, F \in \Lambda\) such that \(E \vee F = 1\). Then \(E\) and \(F\) are cross-cutting.

Proof. We first show that Lemma 4.12 implies that given two \(E\)-classes \(e_1\) and \(e_2\), either \(e_1\) and \(e_2\) intersect the same \(F\)-classes, or they intersect disjoint sets of \(F\)-classes. Let \(f\) be an \(F\)-class such that \(e_1\) and \(e_2\) intersect \(f\). Let \(a \in e_1 \cap f\) and \(b \in e_2 \cap f\). Given any \(a' \in e_1\), let \(f' = a'/F\). Then by Lemma 4.12 we may find some \(b' \in e_2 \cap f'\).

Now, let \(G\) be the equivalence relation on \(V\) which holds for \((a, b)\) if the \(E\)-class of \(a\) and the \(E\)-class of \(b\) intersect the same \(F\)-classes. Then \(G\) is definable and is coarser than both \(E\) and \(F\), and in fact \(G = E \vee F\). As \(E \vee F = 1\), \(E\) and \(F\) must be cross-cutting. \(\square\)

Lemma 4.14. Let \((\Gamma; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) be homogeneous. Let \(E, F, G\) be \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations such that \(E\) is maximal and neither \(F\) nor \(G\) refines \(E\). Then \(F \wedge G\) does not refine \(E\).

Proof. Assume that \(F \wedge G\) refines \(E\). Let \(a \in \Gamma\) and let \(p(x, y)\) be the type of \((a/F, a/G)\). We then have a function \(f : p(\Gamma/F, \Gamma/G) \rightarrow \Gamma/E\), given by \(f(a/F, a/G) = a/E\). This is well-defined as \(F \wedge G \leq E\). By Proposition 3.13 \(a/E \in \text{dcl}(a/F) \cup \text{dcl}(a/G)\). Assume say \(a/E \in \text{dcl}(a/F)\), then the \(F\)-class of \(a\) is included in an \(E\)-class (by transitivity of \(\Gamma\)), so \(F\) refines \(E\). \(\square\)

Proposition 4.15. Let \((\Gamma; \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)\) be homogeneous, with lattice of \(\emptyset\)-definable equivalence relations \(\Lambda\). Then \(\Lambda\) is distributive.

Proof. We must prove the lattices \(M_3\) and \(N_5\) (see Figure 1) do not appear as sublattices of \(\Lambda\).

Suppose \(M_3\) appears as a sublattice. Let \(E\) be the minimum element, \(G\) the maximum element, and \(F_1, F_2, F_3\) the non-trivial elements. We pick a \(G\)-class and work within it, so we may assume \(G = 1\). Let \(F' \geq F_1\) be maximal below \(G\). Then neither \(F_2\) nor \(F_3\) refines \(F'\), so by Lemma 4.14 neither does \(F_2 \wedge F_3\). But this is a contradiction.

Now suppose \(N_5\) appears as a sublattice. Let \(E\) be the minimum element, \(G\) the maximum element, and \(F_1, F_2, F_3\) the non-trivial elements, with \(F_2 > F_3\). We pick a \(G\)-class and work within it, so we may assume \(G = 1\). Then \(F_1\) and \(F_3\) are cross-cutting by Corollary 4.13 as \(F_1 \vee F_3 = 1\). As there are
infinitely many $F_3$-classes in each $F_2$-class (see Lemma 5.2.2), we cannot have that $F_1 \land F_3 = F_1 \land F_2$. □

**Proposition 4.16.** Let $(\Gamma, \leq_1, \ldots, \leq_n)$ be homogeneous. Then the reduct of $\Gamma$ to the language of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations is fully generic.

**Proof.** Let $\Lambda$ be the lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations of $\Gamma$. Let $A \subset \Gamma$ be finite. We must realize any maximal quantifier-free type $p(x/A)$, in the language of equivalence relations, that is consistent with the $\Lambda$-triangle inequality. We proceed by induction on the height of $\Lambda$. The statement is trivial if $\Lambda$ has 2 elements.

Let $a \in A$ such that $p \vdash xFa$ for some maximal $F \in \Lambda$, and let $C = a/F$. We now wish to inductively continue inside $C$, but might not have $A \subset C$. For every $E_i \in \Lambda$ such that $F$ and $E_i$ are incomparable and every $a_i$ such that $p \vdash d(x, a_i) = E_i$, we will find some $a'_i \in \Gamma$ such that $a'_i \in C \cap a_i/E_i$. Let $A'$ be $A$ with each $a_i$ replaced by $a'_i$. We then create a new type $p'(x/A')$ by choosing distances $d_i = d(a'_i, x) \leq E_i$ such that $p'$ is still consistent with the $\Lambda$-triangle inequality. By induction, there will be some element realizing $p'$, which will then also realize $p$. □

For each $E_i$ incomparable to $F$, we have that $E_i$ and $F$ are cross-cutting by Corollary 4.13. Thus for each $a_i$ such that $p \vdash d(x, a_i) = E_i$, we have that $C \cap a_i/E_i \neq \emptyset$. We may pick any element of this intersection to be $a'_i$.

We view the assignment of the distances $d_i$ as an amalgamation problem. The base is $A$, the first factor is $A \cup \{x\}$, and the second factor is $A \cup A'$. As $\Lambda$ is distributive by Proposition 4.15 we can apply Proposition 2.3 to complete the amalgamation diagram while respecting the $\Lambda$-triangle inequality. This forces $d_i \leq d(a'_i, a_i) \lor d(a_i, x) = E_i$. □

**5. Classification**

All homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structures are assumed to be presented in a language of equivalence relations and subquotient orders.
It is not immediate that the quotient of a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure by a \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relation is again homogeneous. However, the next few results establish the Primitivity Conjecture (or actually something slightly stronger) when working in the quotient.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous permutation structure with lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations \( \Lambda \). Let \( E, F \in \Lambda \) with \( E < F \). Let \( C \) be an \( F \)-class, and let \( \leq_1, ..., \leq_n \) be \( \emptyset \)-definable topologically primitive linear orders on \( C/E \). Then \( \leq_1, ..., \leq_n \) are fully generic, modulo the agreement of certain orders up to reversal.

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.2, \( C/E \) has topological rank 1 with respect to each \( \leq_i \). By Proposition 3.5, it suffices to show that no order is intertwined with another, or its reverse.

Suppose \( \leq_i \) is intertwined with \( \leq_j \) via some intertwining map \( f \). Then, given any \( a \in C/E \), \( f \) produces an \( a \)-definable cut in \( \leq_j \). If \( \leq_i, \leq_j \) are not equal, there must be some \( a \in C/E \) for which \( f(a) \neq a \). But this contradicts Lemma 4.3. \( \square \)

**Definition 5.2.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure, \( < \) a subquotient order on \( \Gamma \), and \( E \) a \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relation. Then the restriction of \( < \) to \( E \), when defined, is the subquotient order \( < \mid E \) with top relation \( E \) given by \( x < y \iff (xEy) \land (x < y) \).

**Lemma 5.3.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure. Let \( <_i, <_j \) be subquotient orders with bottom relation \( E \) and top relations \( F_i, F_j \), respectively, with \( F_i \leq F_j \). Assume \( <_i, <_j \) are convex with respect to no \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations between \( E \) and \( F_i \).

Let \( E < G < F_i \). If \( <_i \mid G = <_j \mid G \), then \( <_i = <_j \mid F_i \).

**Proof.** Suppose not. Let \( C \) be an \( F_i \)-class. By Lemma 5.1, \( <_i \) and \( <_j \) are independent on \( C/E \). Let \( a \in C/E \) and \( A = a/G \). Let \( b \in C/E \cap (A \setminus \{ a \}) \), \( p = \text{tp}(b/a) \), and \( P \subset C/E \) the realizations of \( p \). Then \( P \) is infinite, as \( \text{acl}(a) = \{ a \} \), and by Lemma 5.1, \( <_i \) and \( <_j \) are independent on \( P \). However, this is a contradiction as \( P \) lies within a single \( G \)-class, so \( <_i = <_j \) on \( P \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 5.4.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure, with lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations \( \Lambda \). Let \( E \) be meet-irreducible in \( \Lambda \) and \( E^+ \) its unique cover. Let \( C \) be an \( E^+ \)-class, and consider \( C/E \) equipped with the restriction to \( E^+ \) of every subquotient order with bottom relation \( E \). If none of the original subquotient orders are equal up to reversal to any restriction of another, then \( C/E \) is fully generic.

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.1, \( C/E \) is fully generic modulo the agreement of certain orders up to reversal. By Lemma 5.3, as none of the original subquotient orders were equal up to reversal, none of the restricted subquotient orders are either. \( \square \)
The structures in the catalog have subquotient orders with only meet-irreducible bottom relations. The next few results show we may ignore the possibility of subquotient orders with meet-reducible bottom relations.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let $\Gamma$ be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure with lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations $\Lambda$. Let $<\subseteq$ be a subquotient order from $E$ to $F$, convex with respect to no intermediate $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation. Let $E = G_1 \wedge G_2$. Then $F \not\geq G_1 \vee G_2$.

*Proof.* Define $\Gamma'$ to be $\Gamma/E$ restricted to a single $F$-class. Then $<$ is a transitive linear order on $\Gamma'$, and by Lemma 4.2 has topological rank 1, and thus is minimal. Assume that $G_1 \vee G_2 \leq F$ and choose $a_1, a_2 \in \Gamma'$ such that $d(a_1, a_2) = G_1 \vee G_2$. Then $a_1/G_1 \cap a_2/G_2 \in dcl(a_1, a_2)$, contradicting Proposition 3.14.$\quad\square$

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $\Gamma$ be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure, $E$ a $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation, and $C_1, C_2 \subseteq \Gamma$ two $E$-classes. Then $C_1$ remains homogeneous after naming $C_2$.

*Proof.* Let $A \subseteq C_1$ be finite. It suffices to find some $c \in C_2$ such that $c$ has the same type over every $a \in A$, as we may then always extend any finite partial isomorphism of $C_1$ to one fixing $c$.

Let $F \geq E$ be maximal such that $C_1, C_2$ lie in distinct $F$-classes. Note $F$ must be meet-irreducible, so let $F^+$ be its cover. Let $C$ be the $F^+$-class of $C_1$, which is also the $F^+$-class of $C_2$ and we now work in $C$. So we may assume $F^+ = 1$. Let $C'_2$ be the $F$-class of $C_2$.

We now move to the language of linear orders. If $\leq_i$ is an order for which there is $E \leq G \leq F$ such that $G$ is $\leq_i$-convex, then any $x \in C'_2$ has the same $\leq_i$-type over every $a \in A$. Enumerate the remaining orders—those for which there is no such $G$—as $\leq_1, \ldots, \leq_m$. For each $i \leq m$, let $E_i \subseteq \Lambda$ be maximal $\leq_i$-convex below $F^+$ and let $V_i = (C/E_i; \leq_i)$. By Corollary 4.3 $C'_2$ projects densely onto each $V_i$.

We now work inside $C'_2$. Let $F_i \subseteq \Lambda$ be the maximal $\leq_i$-convex relation below $F$. Then $E$ does not refine $F_i$, as we ignored orders where that would be the case. Now let $W_i = (C'_2/F_i; \leq_i)$, and $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ representatives of the $W_i$’s up to monotonic bijection. Then the same argument as in Lemma 4.6 gives that $C_2$ is dense in the product $\prod_i X_i$. By the previous paragraph, each $W_i$ contains a point $\leq_i$-greater than all of $A$. Thus we may find some $c \in C_2$ that is $\leq_i$-greater than all of $A$ for each $i$.$\quad\square$

For the next lemma, note that if $<\prime$ is a subquotient order in a generic $\Lambda$-ultrametric space from $F$ to $F \vee G$, then $<\prime|_G$ is a subquotient order from $F \wedge G$ to $G$ (see 3. Lemma 3.4.7)).

**Lemma 5.7.** Let $\Gamma$ be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure with lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations $\Lambda$. Let $E \subseteq \Lambda$ be meet-reducible, and $<\subseteq$ be a subquotient order from $E$ to $F$, convex with respect to no intermediate $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations. Then there exists some $F > E$ and subquotient order $<\prime$ from $F$ to $F \vee G$ such that $\leq = <\prime|_G$. 

Furthermore, $<$ and $<'$ are interdefinable.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, $G$ cannot be above two covers of $E$, so we can find $F \in \Lambda$ such that $E = F \land G$. Suppose the first part of the lemma is false. Then there exist $F$-classes $C_1, C_2$ and $x_i, y_i \in C_i$ such that $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_1 > y_2$. In particular, $x_1 G x_2$ and $y_1 G y_2$, so $x_1, y_1$, and $C_2$ determine $x_2/E$ and $y_2/E$. We wish to produce an automorphism of $C_1$ sending $(x_1/E, x_2/E)$ to $(y_1/E, y_2/E)$, which will yield a contradiction. It suffices to produce an automorphism sending $x_1$ to $y_1$ and leaving $C_2$ invariant. By Lemma 5.6 there is such an automorphism, and we are finished.

For the last part, first note any projection of $<'$ is $\emptyset$-definable from $<$. For the other direction, as $F$ and $G$-classes within the same $(F \lor G)$-class are cross-cutting, we may define $x <' y \iff \exists z ((xFz) \land (z < y))$. □

Corollary 5.8. Let $\Gamma$ be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure with lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations $\Lambda$. Let $<$ a subquotient order with a meet-reducible bottom relation, convex with respect to no intermediate $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations. Then $<$ is interdefinable with some subquotient order $<'$ with a meet-irreducible bottom relation.

Proof. Starting with $<$, iteratively apply Lemma 5.7 until a subquotient order with meet-irreducible bottom relation is produced. This must eventually happen, as at each step the bottom relation moves upward in $\Lambda$, and the maximal elements of $\Lambda$ are meet-irreducible. □

Finally, we establish that the subquotient orders are generic by proving a suitable 1-point extension property.

Lemma 5.9. Let $\Gamma$ be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure. Suppose every subquotient order of $\Gamma$ has a meet-irreducible bottom relation, and that no one is equal up to reversal to the restriction of another. Then the subquotient orders of $\Gamma$ are generic.

Proof. We assume that no subquotient orders are convex with respect to any intermediate $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relation. Let $\Lambda$ be the lattice of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations of $\Gamma$. Enumerate its meet-irreducible elements as $E_1, \ldots, E_m$.

Let $A \subset \Gamma$ be finite, and $p(x)$ a quantifier-free 1-type over $A$ in the language of equivalence relations and subquotient orders, such that its restriction to the language of equivalence relations and any single subquotient order is consistent. Then it suffices to show $p(x)$ is realized.

Claim. Suppose that for every $i \leq m$, there is an $a_i \in A$ such that $p \vdash a_i E_i x$. Then $p$ is realized.

Proof of Claim. As the reduct of $\Gamma$ to the language of $\emptyset$-definable equivalence relations is fully generic, there is some $x$ realizing the restriction of $p$ to this language. In particular, $xE_i a_i$ for each $i$. Let $<_{i,j}$ enumerate the subquotient orders with bottom relation $E_i$. As $xE_i a_i$, for any $b \in A$ and any $j$, we have
\[ x_{i,j} < b \iff a_i <_{i,j} b. \] By the consistency assumptions on \( p \), we have that \( x \) realizes \( p \).

Our goal now is to extend \( A \) in order to apply the claim. Let \( E_1, ..., E_\ell \) be the meet-irreducibles of \( \Lambda \) such that there is no \( a_i \in A \) such that \( p \vdash a_i E_i x \), ordered such that if \( i < j \) then \( E_i \not< E_j \). We will, by downward induction through \( \Lambda \), find a suitable \( a_i \) for each.

Suppose we have found suitable \( a_i \) for \( E_1, ..., E_{k-1} \). Let \( A_{k-1} = A \cup \{ a_1, ..., a_{k-1} \} \), and let \( p_{k-1}(x) = p(x) \cup \{ x E_i a_i \mid i < k \} \). Let \( E_k^+ \) be the unique cover of \( E_k \). Enumerate the subquotient orders with bottom relation \( E_k \) as \( <_i \) for \( i \leq n \), and let \( F_i \) be the top relation of \( <_i \).

As the reduct of \( \Gamma \) to the language of equivalence relations is fully generic, the corresponding reduct of \( p_{k-1}(x) \) is realized. Pick a realization, and let \( C \) be its \( E_k^+ \)-class. As \( C \) is homogeneous, \( C/E_k \) is generic by Corollary 5.3.

For each \( i \leq n \), \( p_{k-1}(x) \) restricts \( x/E_k \) to a \( <_i \)-interval \( J_i \) with endpoints in \( A \cup \{ \pm \infty \} \). It may restrict \( x \) to lie in a given \( F_i \)-class \( C_i' \) containing \( J_i \) (so long as \( J_i \neq (-\infty, \infty) \)). By the consistency condition on \( p(x) \), we have \( C_i' = C/F_i \) when \( C_i' \) is defined, and we may define it as such when it is not already defined by \( p(x) \).

Let \( I_i = C/E_k \cap J_i \). By Corollary 4.4 (where \( E \) and \( F \) there are \( E_k \) and \( E_k^+ \) here, respectively), \( C/E_k \) is \( <_i \)-dense in \( C_i'/E_k \), and so \( I_i \) is non-empty. By genericity of \( C/E_k \), \( \cap I_i \) is non-empty. Let \( y \in \cap I_i \) be an \( E_k \)-class not among those \( p(x) \) specifies are to be avoided. Then we may take \( a_k \) to be any element of \( y \).

\[ \square \]

\textbf{Theorem 5.10.} Let \( \Gamma \) be a homogeneous finite-dimensional permutation structure. Then there is a finite distributive lattice \( \Lambda \) such that \( \Gamma \) is interdefinable with an expansion of the generic \( \Lambda \)-ultrametric space by generic subquotient orders, such that every meet-irreducible of \( \Lambda \) is the bottom relation of some subquotient order.

\textbf{Proof.} Let \( \Lambda \) be the lattice of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations of \( \Gamma \). Then \( \Lambda \) is distributive by Proposition 1.13, and the reduct of \( \Gamma \) to the language of \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relations gives the fully generic \( \Lambda \)-ultrametric space by Proposition 1.16.

We may assume \( \Gamma \) is presented in a language such that no subquotient order is equal up to reversal to the restriction of another, nor convex with respect to any intermediate \( \emptyset \)-definable equivalence relation. By Corollary 5.8, we may also assume every subquotient order has a meet-irreducible bottom relation. By Lemma 1.17, every meet-irreducible is the bottom relation of some subquotient order. By Lemma 5.9 all subquotient orders are generic.

\[ \square \]
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