Meta–Groups, Meta–Bicrossed–Products, and the Alexander Polynomial, 1 Dror Bar-Natan at Sheffield, February 2013. http://www.math.toronto.edu/~dro



Abstract. I will define "meta-groups" and explain how one specific Hard to categorify. meta-group, which in itself is a "meta-bicrossed-product", gives rise Idea. Given a group G and two "YB" to an "ultimate Alexander invariant" of tangles, that contains the pairs $R^{\pm} = (g_o^{\pm}, g_u^{\pm}) \in G^2$, map them Alexander polynomial (multivariable, if you wish), has extremely to xings and "multiply along", so that $\sum_{i=1}^{\pm} Z_{i}$ ingful way, and is least-wasteful in a computational sense. If you believe in categorification, that's a wonderful playground.

This work is closely related to work by Le Dimet (Comment. Math. Helv. **67** (1992) 306–315), Kirk, Livingston and Wang (arXiv:math/9806035) and Cimasoni and Turaev (arXiv:math.GT/0406269).







Alexander Issues.

- Quick to compute, but computation departs from topology • Extends to tangles, but at an exponential cost.
 - $\begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \searrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} Z \\ \downarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} Z \\ \downarrow \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} g_o^+ g_u^+ g_o^+ g_u^- g_o^- g_u^+ g_o^+ g_u^+ \\ g_o^- g_o^- g_o^- \end{array} \right)$

This Fails! R2 implies that $g_o^{\pm}g_o^{\mp} = e = g_u^{\pm}g_u^{\mp}$ and then R3 implies that g_o^+ and g_u^+ commute, so the result is a simple counting invariant.

A Group Computer. Given G, can store group elements and perform operations on them:



Also has S_x for inversion, e_x for unit insertion, d_x for register deletion, Δ_{xy}^z for element cloning, ρ_y^x for renamings, and $(D_1, D_2) \mapsto D_1 \cup D_2$ for merging, and many obvious composition axioms relat- $P = \{x : g_1, y : g_2\} \Rightarrow P = \{d_y P\} \cup \{d_x P\}$ ing those.

A Meta-Group. Is a similar "computer", only its internal structure is unknown to us. Namely it is a collection of sets $\{G_{\gamma}\}$ indexed by all finite sets γ , and a collection of operations m_z^{xy} , S_x , e_x , d_x , Δ_{xy}^z (sometimes), ρ_y^x , and \cup , satisfying the exact same *linear* properties.

Example 0. The non-meta example, $G_{\gamma} := G^{\gamma}$.

Example 1. $G_{\gamma} := M_{\gamma \times \gamma}(\mathbb{Z})$, with simultaneous row and column operations, and "block diagonal" merges. Here if $P = \begin{pmatrix} x : & a & b \\ y : & c & d \end{pmatrix} \text{ then } d_y P = (x : a) \text{ and } d_x P = (y : d) \text{ so}$ $\{d_y P\} \cup \{d_x P\} = \begin{pmatrix} x : & a & 0 \\ y : & 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \neq P. \text{ So this } G \text{ is truly meta.}$

A Standard Alexander Formula. Label the arcs 1 through Claim. From a meta-group G and YB elements $R^{\pm} \in G_2$ we

Bicrossed Products. If G = HT is a group presented as a product of two of its subgroups, with $H \cap T = \{e\}$, then also G = TH and G is determined by H, T, and the "swap" map sw^{th} : $(t,h) \mapsto (h',t')$ defined by th = h't'. The map swsatisfies (1) and (2) below; conversely, if $sw: T \times H \to H \times T$ satisfies (1) and (2) (+ lesser conditions), then (3) defines a group structure on $H \times T$, the "bicrossed product".



Meta-Groups, Meta-Bicrossed-Products, and the Alexander Polynomial, 2

A Meta-Bicrossed-Product is a collection of sets $\beta(\eta, \tau)$ and I mean business! $\begin{aligned} \langle \mu_{-} \rangle &:= \mu / , \ \mathbf{t}_{-} \to \mathbf{1}; \\ \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{u}_{-} \underline{v}_{-} \to \underline{v}_{-}}^{-} [\beta_{-}] &:= \beta \texttt{Collect}[\beta / , \ \mathbf{t}_{u_{1}v} \to \mathbf{t}_{v}]; \end{aligned}$ operations tm_w^{uv} , hm_z^{xy} and sw_{ux}^{th} (and lesser ones), such that $\beta_{\text{BCollect}[B[\omega], 4_]]}^{\beta \text{Simp} = \text{Factor}; \text{ SetAttributes}[\beta \text{Collect}, \text{ Listable}];}$ tm and hm are "associative" and (1) and (2) hold (+ lesser collect[4, h, Collect[4, t, Bsimp] 6]]; $\mathsf{sw}_{u,x}$ [B[ω , Λ]] := Module[{ α , β , γ , δ , \in }, $\begin{aligned} & \texttt{Form}[\mathbb{B}[\omega], \Lambda] := \texttt{Module}[\{\texttt{ts}, \texttt{hs}, \texttt{M}\}, \\ & \texttt{ts} = \texttt{Union}[\texttt{Cases}[\mathbb{B}[\omega, \Lambda], \texttt{t}_u \Rightarrow \texttt{u}, \texttt{Infinity}]]; \end{aligned}$ = Coefficient[Λ , $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{u}}$]; β = D[Λ , $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{u}}$] /. = D[Λ , $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x}}$] /. $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow 0$; $\delta = \Lambda$ /. $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{u}}$
$$\begin{split} \alpha &= \text{Coefficient}[\Lambda, \mathbf{h}_{t} \mathbf{t}_{u}]; \ \beta &= \mathsf{D}[\Lambda, \mathbf{t}_{u}] \ /. \\ \gamma &= \mathsf{D}[\Lambda, \mathbf{h}_{x}] \ /. \ \mathbf{t}_{u} \to \mathsf{O}; \quad \delta &= \Lambda \ /. \ \mathbf{h}_{x} \mid \mathbf{t}_{u} \ \cdot \\ \mathbf{e} &= \mathbf{1} + \alpha; \\ \mathbf{B}[\mathscr{U} \ast \varepsilon, \ \alpha \left(\mathbf{1} + \langle \gamma \rangle / \varepsilon\right) \mathbf{h}_{x} \mathbf{t}_{u} + \beta \left(\mathbf{1} + \langle \gamma \rangle / \varepsilon\right) \mathbf{t}_{u} \end{split}$$
conditions). A meta-bicrossed-product defines a meta-group hs = Union [Cases $[B[\omega, \Lambda], h_{x_{-}} \Rightarrow x, Infinity]];$ with $G_{\gamma} := \beta(\gamma, \gamma)$ and gm as in (3).
$$\begin{split} M &= Outer[\beta Simp[Coefficient[A, h_{z1}t_{z2}]] \&, hs, ts]; \\ PrependTo[M, t_{zz} \& /@ ts]; \end{split}$$
+γ/ ∈ **h**,] // βCollect]; **Example.** Take $\beta(\eta, \tau) = M_{\tau \times \eta}(\mathbb{Z})$ with row operations for $\begin{array}{l} & j \ // \ \mu \text{collect}; \\ & \text{gm}_{\underline{b},\underline{a},\underline{c}} \left[\mathcal{A}_{\underline{c}} \right] := \ \beta \ // \ \text{sw}_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} \ // \ \text{hm}_{\underline{a}\underline{b}\underline{a}\underline{c}}; \\ & \text{B} \ /: \ & \text{B} \ \omega_{\underline{a}}, \ \Delta_{\underline{a}} \ D \ & \text{B} \ (\underline{\omega}_{\underline{c}}, \ \Delta_{\underline{c}} \) := \ & \text{B} \left[\omega \underline{1} \ast \omega_{\underline{c}}, \ \Delta \underline{1} + \Delta \underline{2} \right]; \\ & \text{Rp}_{\underline{a},\underline{b}_{\underline{c}}} := \ & \text{B} \left[1, \ (X - 1) \ \text{t}_{\underline{a}} \ \text{h}_{\underline{b}} \right]; \end{array}$ M = Prepend[Transpose[M], Prepend[h_# & /@ hs, ω]]; MatrixForm[M]]; the tails, column operations for the heads, and a trivial swap. β Form[else_] := else /. $\beta_B \Rightarrow \beta$ Form[β]; Format[β_B , StandardForm] := β Form[β]; $:= B[1, (X^{-1} - 1) t_a h_b];$ β Calculus. Let $\beta(\eta, \tau)$ be - $\{\beta = B[\omega, Sum[\alpha_{10i+j}t_ih_j, \{i, \{1, 2, 3\}\}, \{j, \{4, 5\}\}]\},\$ $(\beta // \operatorname{tm}_{12 \to 1} // \operatorname{sw}_{14}) = (\beta // \operatorname{sw}_{24} // \operatorname{sw}_{14} // \operatorname{tm}_{12 \to 1}) \}$ h_4 h_5 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha_{14} & \alpha_{15} \\ & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$, True Some testing $t_2 \alpha_{24} \alpha_{25}$ $tm_w^{uv} : \begin{array}{c|c} \frac{\omega}{t_u} & \alpha \\ t_v & \beta \\ \vdots & \gamma \end{array} \xrightarrow{\omega} \begin{array}{c|c} \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \cdots \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \alpha + \beta \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \alpha + \beta \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \alpha + \beta \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_w} & \frac{\omega}{t_w} \\ \frac{\omega}{t_$ t3 α34 α35 $\{ Rm_{51} Rm_{62} Rp_{34} // gm_{14 \rightarrow 1} // gm_{25 \rightarrow 2} // gm_{36 \rightarrow 3} , \}$ $\texttt{Rp}_{61} \texttt{Rm}_{24} \texttt{Rm}_{35} // \texttt{gm}_{14 \rightarrow 1} // \texttt{gm}_{25 \rightarrow 2} // \texttt{gm}_{36 \rightarrow 3} \}$ $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & h_1 & h_2 \\ t_2 & -\frac{-1+X}{X} & 0 \\ t_3 & \frac{-1+X}{X} & -\frac{-1+X}{X} \end{pmatrix} , \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h_1 & h_2 \\ t_2 & -\frac{-1+X}{X} & 0 \\ t_3 & \frac{-1+X}{X} & -\frac{-1+X}{X} \end{pmatrix}$ $hm_z^{xy} : \frac{\omega}{\vdots} \begin{array}{c|c} h_x & h_y & \cdots \\ \hline \alpha & \beta & \gamma \end{array} \mapsto \frac{\omega}{\vdots} \begin{array}{c|c} h_z \\ \alpha + \beta + \langle \alpha \rangle \beta \end{array}$ divide and conquer! $sw_{ux}^{th}: \begin{array}{c|c} \omega & h_x & \cdots \\ \hline t_u & \alpha & \beta \\ \vdots & \gamma & \delta \end{array} \xrightarrow{\omega\epsilon} \begin{array}{c|c} h_x & \cdots \\ t_u & \alpha(1+\langle\gamma\rangle/\epsilon) & \beta(1+\langle\gamma\rangle/\epsilon) \\ \hline \gamma/\epsilon & \delta-\gamma\beta/\epsilon \end{array}$ $\beta = Rm_{12,1} Rm_{27} Rm_{83} Rm_{4,11} Rp_{16,5} Rp_{6,13} Rp_{14,9} Rp_{10,15}$ 817 h_{15} h1 ha h_{11} h13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 where $\epsilon := 1 + \alpha$ and $\langle c \rangle := \sum_i c_i$, and let 0 0 -1 + X 0 0 $R_{ab}^{p} := \frac{1}{\begin{array}{c|ccc} t_{a} & h_{b} \\ \hline t_{a} & 0 & X-1 \\ \hline t_{b} & 0 & 0 \end{array}} \qquad R_{ab}^{m} := \frac{1}{\begin{array}{c|ccc} t_{a} & h_{b} \\ \hline t_{a} & 0 & X^{-1}-1 \\ \hline t_{b} & 0 & 0 \end{array}}.$ t₈ 0 0 0 0 t₁₀ -1 + X 0 Theorem. Z^{β} is a tangle invariant (and more). Restricted to 0 0 0 t_{16} -1 + X0 knots, the ω part is the Alexander polynomial. On braids, it $\Pr[\beta = \beta / \ell]$ $gm_{1k \rightarrow 1}, \{k, 2, 10\}]; \beta$ is equivalent to the Burau representation. A variant for links h_1 h₁₃ h_{15} contains the multivariable Alexander polynomial. $- \frac{(-1+X)(1+X)}{2} - (-1+X)(1-X+X^2) - (-1+X)(1-X+X^2) - 1 + X$ t₁ $-\frac{-1+X}{Y}$ t_{12} 0 0 Why Happy? • Applications to w-knots. • Everything that I know about the Alexander polynomial t14 -1 + X can be expressed cleanly in this language (even if without t₁₆ <u>-1+X</u> 0 $(-1 + X)^{2}$ proof), except HF, but including genus, ribbonness, cabling, $Do[\beta = \beta // gm_{1k \rightarrow 1}, \{k, 11, 16\}]; \beta$ v-knots, knotted graphs, etc., and there's potential for vast James generalizations. Waddell • The least wasteful "Alexander for tangles" Alexander I'm aware of. A Partial To Do List. 1. Where does it more • Every step along the computation is the insimply come from? variant of something. 2. Remove all the denominators. • Fits on one sheet, including implementation 3. How do determinants arise in this context? trivial & propaganda. 4. Understand links ("meta-conjugacy classes"). Further meta-monoids. II (and variants), \mathcal{A} (and quotients), 5. Find the "reality condition". 6. Do some "Algebraic Knot Theory". vT, \ldots Further meta-bicrossed-products. Π (and variants), $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ (and $\overline{7}$. Categorify. ribbon quotients), $M_0, M, \mathcal{K}^{bh}, \mathcal{K}^{rbh}, \ldots$ 8. Do the same in other natural quotients of the Meta-Lie-algebras. \mathcal{A} (and quotients), \mathcal{S}, \ldots v/w-story. Meta-Lie-bialgebras. $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ (and quotients), ... "God created the knots, all else in I don't understand the relationship between gr and H, as it topology is the work of mortals.' Leopold Kronecker (modified) example appears, for example, in braid theory. www.katlas.org The Knet