

**A few basic definitions (5 minutes)**

**A brief sketch of the first 25 years of history of the subject  
(15 minutes)**

**A few more definitions (5 minutes)**

**Infinite Ramsey Theory (10 minutes)**

**Around the sine-principle (10 minutes)**

**About braids and graph minors (10 minutes)**

**Density** A set  $X$  is  $0$ -dense $(2, 2)$  if  $|X| > \min X + 3$ ,  $X$  is  $(n + 1)$ -dense $(2, 2)$  if for every  $f: [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$ , there is an  $n$ -dense $(2, 2)$   $f$ -homogeneous subset.

Consider a theory  $T = I\Sigma_1 + \cup_{i \in \omega} \forall a \exists b [a, b]$  is  $n$ -dense $(2, 2)$ .

**Theorem** (joint with A. Weiermann)

The set of  $\Pi_2$ -consequences of  $\text{WKL}_0 + \text{RT}_2^2$  coincides with the set of  $\Pi_2$ -consequences of  $T$ .

This result may shed some light on the strength of  $\text{RT}_2^2$  and on whether  $\text{RT}_2^2$  proves totality of the Ackermann function.

**METHOD:** inside a nonstandard model of  $T$ , we build an initial segment satisfying  $\text{WKL}_0 + \text{RT}_2^2$ .

Nonstandard chunks of first-order definable sets play the role of infinite sets.

Canonical Ramsey Theorem for pairs  $\text{CanRT}^2$  is the statement “for any function  $f: [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , there is an infinite set  $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that one of the following cases occurs:

1.  $X$  is  $f$ -homogeneous;
2.  $f$  is injective on  $X$ ;
3.  $f$  on  $[X]^2$  depends only on the first coordinate;
4.  $f$  on  $[X]^2$  depends only on the second coordinate.

Regressive Ramsey Theorem for pairs is the statement “for any  $f: [\mathbb{N}]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f(x, y) \leq x$ , there is an infinite set  $X$  such that on  $[X]^2$ ,  $f$  depends only on the first coordinate”.

With a similar definition of  $T$ , we can prove the following theorem:

**Theorem** (joint with A. Weiermann)

The  $\Pi_2$  consequences of  $T$  are the same as of  $\text{WKL}_0 + \text{CanRT}^2$  (and a similar theorem for  $\text{RegRT}^2$ ).

Density theorems have also been developed for

- Kruskal's theorem;
- binary Kruskal's theorem;
- Erdős-Moser principle;
- ascending sequences of natural numbers.

Several other attempts (e.g. to Hindman's theorem) failed.

Many other conjectures are being tried at the moment.

Using the model-theoretic machinery of J. Paris and L. Kirby (**strong cuts**), it is possible to prove that

- the first-order consequences of  $\text{RegRT}^2$  coincide with Peano Arithmetic (the recursion-theoretic approach was developed in the 1980s);
- the first-order consequences of  $\text{CanRT}^2$  coincide with Peano Arithmetic (the recursion-theoretic proof was first obtained by J. Mileti in 2004).

METHOD: show that a semi-regular initial segment is strong if and only if it satisfies  $\text{CanRT}^2$ , using a definable ultrapower construction inside a model of arithmetic.

Friedman's sine principle (proposed in the internet forum FOM):  
 "for any  $k$  there exists  $N$  such that whenever  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_N$  are  
 rational numbers, there exist  $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_{k+2}$  such that

$$|\sin(x_{p_1} \cdot x_{p_2} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{p_k}) - \sin(x_{p_1} \cdot x_{p_3} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{p_{k+1}})| < 4^{-p_1}$$

$$|\sin(x_{p_2} \cdot x_{p_3} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{p_{k+1}}) - \sin(x_{p_2} \cdot x_{p_4} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{p_{k+2}})| < 4^{-p_2}$$

is unprovable in PA.

My sharp versions are:

For every  $n \geq 1$  and every function  $F$  of one argument, we introduce the statement  $\text{SP}_F^n$ : “for all  $m$ , there is  $N$  such that for any increasing sequence  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}$  of rational numbers, there is  $H \subseteq A$  of size  $m$  such that for any two  $n$ -element subsets  $a_{i_1} < a_{i_2} < \dots < a_{i_n}$  and  $a_{k_1} < a_{k_2} < \dots < a_{k_n}$  in  $H$ , we have

$$|\sin(a_{i_1} \cdot a_{i_2} \cdots a_{i_n}) - \sin(a_{k_1} \cdot a_{k_2} \cdots a_{k_n})| < F(i_1).”$$

For  $n \geq 2$  and any function  $F(x)$  eventually dominated by  $(\frac{2}{3})^{\log^{(n-1)}(x)}$ , the principle  $\text{SP}_F^{n+1}$  is not provable in  $I\Sigma_n$ . In particular, the statement  $\forall n \text{SP}_{(\frac{2}{3})^{\log^{(n-1)}}}^n$  is not provable in PA.

METHOD: a combinatorial argument showing that the principle implies KM. I used the Rhin-Viola theorem on irrationality measure of  $\pi$ . (It is possible to use diophantine approximation instead.)

Further developments (see on the board):

- complex exponent;
- Gauss map (by Weiermann);
- zeta-function and beyond;
- dynamical system.

Threshold results for PH (model-theoretic approach):  
(see my webpage or my Logic Colloquium 2006 paper).

Braids (see on the board).

Graph Minors (see on the board).

Rainbows and max-homogeneity (see on the board).