## Dror Bar-Natan: Academic Pensieve: 2014-04: BF2C: http://drorbn.net/AcademicPensieve/2014-04/BF2C

Theorem 1 (with Cattaneo, Dalvit (credit, no blame)). In the ribbon case,  $e^{\zeta}$  can be computed as follows:



**Theorem 2.** Using Gauss diagrams to represent knots and T- about the  $\lor$ -invariant? component pure tangles, the above formulas define an invariant (the "true" triple linkin  $CW(FL(T)) \rightarrow CW(T)$ , "cyclic words in T".

• Agrees with BN-Dancso [BND] and with [BN2]. • In-practice computable! • Vanishes on braids. • Extends to w. • Contains Gnots. In 3D, a generic immersion of  $S^1$  is an Alexander. • The "missing factor" in Levine's factorization [Le] embedding, a knot. In 4D, a generic immersion (the rest of [Le] also fits, hence contains the MVA). • Related to of a surface has finitely-many double points (a extends Farber's [Fa]? • Should be summed and categorified.

## References

- [Ar] V. I. Arnold, Topological Invariants of Plane Curves and Caustics, Uni- invariants for 2-knots? versity Lecture Series 5, American Mathematical Society 1994.
- [BN1] D. Bar-Natan, Bracelets and the Goussarov filtration of the space of knots, Invariants of knots and 3-manifolds (Kyoto 2001), Geometry and Bubble-wrap-finite-type. Topology Monographs 4 1–12, arXiv:math.GT/0111267.
- [BN2] D. Bar-Natan, Balloons and Hoops and their Universal Finite Type Invariant, BF Theory, and an Ultimate Alexander Inhttp://www.math.toronto.edu/~drorbn/papers/KBH/, variant, arXiv:1308.1721.
- [BND] D. Bar-Natan and Z. Dancso, Finite Type Invariants of W-Knotted Objects: From Alexander to Kashiwara and Vergne, http://www.math.toronto.edu/~drorbn/papers/WKO/.
- [CKS] J. S. Carter, S. Kamada, and M. Saito, *Diagrammatic Computations for* Quandles and Cocycle Knot Invariants, Contemp. Math. 318 (2003) 51-74.
- [CS] J. S. Carter and M. Saito, Knotted surfaces and their diagrams, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 55, American Mathematical Society, Providence 1998.

[Da] E. Dalvit, http://science.unitn.it/~dalvit/.

- [CR] A. S. Cattaneo and C. A. Rossi, Wilson Surfaces and Higher Dimensional Knot Invariants, Commun. in Math. Phys. 256-3 (2005) 513-537, arXiv:math-ph/0210037.
- [Fa] M. Farber, Noncommutative Rational Functions and Boundary Links, Math. Ann. 293 (1992) 543-568.
- [Le] J. Levine, A Factorization of the Conway Polynomial, Comment. Math. Plane curves. Shouldn't we understand integral / finite Helv. 74 (1999) 27–53, arXiv:q-alg/9711007.
- [Ro] D. Roseman, Reidemeister-Type Moves for Surfaces in Four-Dimensional Space, Knot Theory, Banach Center Publications 42 (1998) 347–380.
- [Wa] T. Watanabe, Configuration Space Integrals for Long n-Knots, the Alexander Polynomial and Knot Space Cohomology, Alg. and Geom. Top. 7 (2007) 47-92, arXiv:math/0609742.

Continuing Joost Slingerland... http://youtu.be/YCA0VIExVhge http://youtu.be/mHyTOcfF99o

## A Partial Reduction of BF Theory to Combinatorics, 2

Sketch of Proof. In 4D axial gauge, only "drop down" red propagators, hence in the ribbon case, no *M*-trivalent vertices. *S* integrals are  $\pm 1$ iff "ground pieces" run on nested curves as below, and exponentials arise when several propagators compete for the same double curve. And then the combinatorics is obvious...



Musings Chern-Simons. When the domain of BF is restricted to ribbon knots, and the target of Chern-Simons is restricted to trees and wheels, they agree. Why?

is this all? What ing number)

gnot?). Perhaps we should be studying these?

Finite type. What are finite-type What would be "chord diagrams"?

There's an alternative definition of finite type in 3D, due to Goussarov (see [BN1]). The obvious parallel in 4D involves "bubble wraps". Is it any good?

Shielded tangles. In 3D, one can't zoom in and compute "the Chern-Simons invariant of a tangle". Yet there are well-defined invariants of "shielded tangles", and rules for their compositions. What would the 4D analog be?



Will the relationship with the Kashiwara-Vergne problem [BND] necessarily arise here?

type invariants of plane curves, in the style of Arnold's  $J^+$ ,  $J^-$ , and St [Ar], a bit better? Arnold



Video and more at http://www.math.toronto.edu/~drorbn/Talks/Vienna-1402/