HOMFLYPT homology for links in handlebodies

Or: All I know about Artin–Tits groups; and a filler for the remaining 59 minutes

Daniel Tubbenhauer



Joint with David Rose

January 2019


braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$



$\mathcal{b}$
links in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$



b
links in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Markov's
theorem
c
b
$=$
b
c
extra relations
for braids


algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
$\mathscr{b}$
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's theorem
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Markov's theorem
$\mathscr{c}$ $\mathscr{b}$ = $\mathscr{b}$ $\mathscr{c}$
extra relations for braids


algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
$\mathscr{b}$
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's theorem
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
$\mathscr{c}$ $\mathscr{b}$ = $\mathscr{b}$ $\mathscr{c}$
extra relations for braids
Markov's theorem
Type A Hecke algebra


links in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
extra relations
for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations
Braid
invariant
Type A He-
cke algebra



links in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
$\mathscr{c}$
$\mathscr{b}$
$=$
extra relations
for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations
Braid
invariant
Type A Hecke algebra
Markov
trace
Markov
invariant



algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
b
links in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
c
b
$=$
b
c
extra relations
for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations
Braid
invariant
Type A Hecke algebra
Markov
trace
Markov
invariant
combine
Invariant of
links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
HOMFLYPT
polynomial


Type A Hecke category
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's theorem
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Markov's theorem
extra relations for braids
Satisfies braid relations
Braid invariant
Type A Hecke algebra
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
HOMFLYPT polynomial
Markov trace
Markov invariant


Satisfies
braid relations
Braid invariant
Type A Hecke category
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Alexander's theorem
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
extra relations for braids
Markov's theorem
Satisfies
braid relations
Braid invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
Type A Hecke algebra
Markov trace
Markov invariant
HOMFLYPT polynomial



algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
extra relations for braids
Alexander's theorem
Markov's theorem
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Type A Hecke category
Satisfies braid relations
Braid invariant
Markov 2-trace
Markov invariant
Type A Hecke algebra
Satisfies braid relations
Braid invariant
Markov trace
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
HOMFLYPT polynomial



algebraic way to study braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
combine
links in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
extra relations for braids
Alexander's theorem
Markov's theorem
braids in a 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$
Type A Hecke category
Satisfies braid relations
Braid invariant
Markov 2-trace
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
HOMFLYPT homology
Type A Hecke algebra
Satisfies braid relations
Braid invariant
Markov trace
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{D}^3$
HOMFLYPT polynomial


braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$


$\mathscr{C}$
links in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$


b
links in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Markov's
theorem
c
b
=
b
c
extra relations
for braids


algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
links in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Markov's
theorem
extra relations
for braids


algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
$\mathscr{b}$
Alexander's theorem
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Markov's theorem
$\mathscr{c}$ $\mathscr{b}$ = $\mathscr{b}$ $\mathscr{c}$
extra relations for braids
Type ? Hecke algebra



links in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations
for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid
invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra



links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's theorem
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations for braids
Markov's theorem
Satisfies braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra
Markov trace?
Markov invariant


links in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's
theorem
algebraic way
to study
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
braids in
a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations
for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid
invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra
Markov
trace?
Markov
invariant
combine
Invariant of
links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT
polynomial"


Type ? Hecke category
links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's theorem
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations for braids
Markov's theorem
Satisfies braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT polynomial"
Markov trace?
Markov invariant


Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke category
links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
b
Alexander's
theorem
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
c
b
=
b
c
extra relations for braids
Markov's
theorem
Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT polynomial"
Markov
trace?
Markov invariant


Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke category
Markov
2-trace?
Markov invariant
links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Alexander's theorem
algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations for braids
Markov's theorem
Satisfies
braid relations?
Braid invariant
Type ? Hecke algebra
Markov
trace?
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT polynomial"



algebraic way to study braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
combine
links in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
extra relations for braids
c
b
$=$
Alexander's theorem
Markov's theorem
braids in a 3-mfd $\mathscr{M}^3$
Type ? Hecke category
Satisfies braid relations?
Markov 2-trace?
Braid invariant
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT homology"
Type ? Hecke algebra
Satisfies braid relations?
Markov trace?
Braid invariant
Markov invariant
combine
Invariant of links in $\mathscr{M}^3$
"HOMFLYPT polynomial"



However, this "naive" approach fails for most 3-manifolds.

Why? Because I do not know what Hecke/Soergel analog to use for an arbitrary 3-manifold.



However, this "naive" approach fails for most 3-manifolds.

Why? Because I do not know what Hecke/Soergel analog to use for an arbitrary 3-manifold.

Today. I explain what we can do.

Let $\mathrm{Br}(g,n)$ be the group defined as follows.

Generators. Braid and twist generators

$b_i \leftrightsquigarrow$ 

& $t_i \leftrightsquigarrow$ 

Relations. ▸ Reidemeister braid relations, type C relations and special relations, *e.g.*

Involves three players and inverses!



$b_1 t_2 b_1 t_2 = t_2 b_1 t_2 b_1$

&



$(b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1}) t_3 = t_3 (b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1})$

Let $\mathrm{Br}(g,n)$ be the group defined as follows.

Example.



Generators. Braid and twis





Relations. ▸ Reidemeister braid relatio d special relations, *e.g.*

Involves three players and inverses!



$$b_1 t_2 b_1 t_2 = t_2 b_1 t_2 b_1$$



$$(b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1}) t_3 = t_3 (b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1})$$

Let $\mathrm{Br}(g,n)$ be the group defined as follows.

Example.



Generators. Braid and twis

b_i 1 g 1 g 1 i g 1 2 n 1 i g 1 2 n

Relations. ▸ Reidemeister braid relatio d special relations, *e.g.*

Involves three players and inverses!

The "full wrap".



$$b_1 t_2 b_1 t_2 = t_2 b_1 t_2 b_1 \qquad (b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1}) t_3 = t_3 (b_1 t_2 b_1^{-1})$$

Let $\mathrm{Br}(g,n)$ be the group defined as follows.

Generators. Braid and twist generators

Fact (type A embedding).

$\mathrm{Br}(g,n)$ is a subgroup of the usual braid group $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g{+}n)$.



A visualization exercise.

Relatio ... $.g.$

...erses!



$\mathscr{b}_1 t_2 \mathscr{b}_1 t_2 = t_2 \mathscr{b}_1 t_2 \mathscr{b}_1$



$(\mathscr{b}_1 t_2 \mathscr{b}_1^{-1}) t_3 = t_3 (\mathscr{b}_1 t_2 \mathscr{b}_1^{-1})$

The group $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$ of braid in a g-times punctures disk $\mathscr{D}_g^2 \times [0,1]$:

Two types of braidings, the usual ones and “winding around cores”, *e.g.*



&



The

Two

Theorem (Häring-Oldenburg–Lambropoulou ∼2002, Vershinin ∼1998).

The map



is an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{Br}(g,n) \to \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$.

The group $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$ of braid in a g-times punctures disk $\mathscr{D}_g^2 \times [0,1]$:

Two types o … , *e.g.*

From this perspective the type A embedding
is just shrinking holes to points!



The group $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$ of braid in a g-times punctures disk $\mathscr{D}_g^2 \times [0,1]$:

Two types of braidings, the usual ones and "winding around cores", e.g.

Note.

For the proof it is crucial that $\mathscr{D}_g^2$ and the boundary points of the braids • are only defined up to isotopy, *e.g.*



$\Rightarrow$ one can always "conjugate cores to the left".

This is useful to define $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$.

The Alexander closure on $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ is given by merging core strands at infinity.



wrong closure

correct closure

This is different from the ▸ classical Alexander closure.

The Alexander closure on $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ is given by merging core strands at infinity.

Theorem (Lambropoulou ∼1993).

For any link ℓ in the genus g handlebody $\mathscr{H}_g$ there is a braid in $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ whose (correct!) closure is isotopic to ℓ.



wrong closure



correct closure

This is different from the ▸ classical Alexander closure.

The Alexander closure on $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ is given by merging core strands at infinity.

Theorem (Lambropoulou ∼1993).

For any link ℓ in the genus g handlebody $\mathscr{H}_g$ there is a braid in $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ whose (correct!) closure is isotopic to ℓ.

Fact.

$\mathscr{H}_g$ is given by a complement in the 3-sphere $\mathscr{S}^3$ by an open tubular neighborhood of the embedded graph obtained by gluing $g+1$ unknotted "core" edges to two vertices.



the 3-ball $\mathscr{H}_0 = \mathscr{D}^3$ | a torus $\mathscr{H}_1$ | $\mathscr{H}_2$

This is

The Markov moves on $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ are conjugation and stabilization.

Conjugation.

$$b \sim s b s^{-1}$$
for $b \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n), s \in \langle b_1, \dots, b_{n-1} \rangle$ $\Longleftrightarrow$



Stabilization.

$$(c\uparrow) b_n (b\uparrow)$$
$$\sim c b \sim (c\uparrow) b_n^{-1} (b\uparrow)$$
for $b, c \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$, $\Longleftrightarrow$



They are weaker than the ‣ classical Markov moves.

The Markov moves on $\mathscr{B}r(g,\infty)$ are conjugation and stabilization

Theorem (Häring-Oldenburg–Lambropoulou ∼2002).

Two links in $\mathscr{H}_g$ are equivalent if and only if they are equal in $\mathscr{B}r(g,\infty)$ up to conjugation and stabilization.

Conjugat

$$b \sim s b s^{-1}$$

for $b \in \mathscr{B}r(g,n), s \in \langle b_1,\dots,b_{n-1}\rangle$ $\iff$



Stabilization.

$$(c\uparrow) b_n (b\uparrow) \sim cb \sim (c\uparrow) b_n^{-1} (b\uparrow)$$

for $b, c \in \mathscr{B}r(g,n)$, $\iff$



They are weaker than the classical Markov moves.

The Markov moves on $\mathscr{B}r(g,\infty)$ are conjugation and stabilization

Theorem (Häring-Oldenburg–Lambropoulou ∼2002).

Two links in $\mathscr{H}_g$ are equivalent if and only if they are equal in $\mathscr{B}r(g,\infty)$ up to conjugation and stabilization.

Conjuga

for $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}$



Stabilization

$(\mathscr{c}\uparrow)\mathscr{b}$

$\sim \mathscr{c}\mathscr{b} \sim (\mathscr{c}$

for $\mathscr{b}, \mathscr{c} \in$



They are wea

Example.



wrong closure

correct closure



not stuck

stuck

The Markov moves on $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,\infty)$ are conjugation and stabilization.

Conjugation.

$$b \sim s b s^{-1}$$

for $b \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$,



The upshot.

Together with Alexander's theorem, this gives a way to algebraically study links in $\mathscr{H}_g$.

Stabilization.

$$(c\uparrow) b_n (b\uparrow) \sim cb \sim (c\uparrow) b_n^{-1} (b\uparrow) \iff$$

for $b, c \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$,



They are weaker than the classical Markov moves.

Conjugation.

$$\mathscr{b} \sim \mathscr{s}\mathscr{b}\mathscr{s}^{-1}$$

for $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$,



The upshot.

Together with Alexander's theorem, this gives a way to algebraically study links in $\mathscr{H}_g$.

Stabilization.

Let me explain what we can do.

$$(\mathscr{c}\uparrow)\mathscr{b}_n(\mathscr{b}\uparrow)$$
$$\sim \mathscr{c}\mathscr{b} \sim (\mathscr{c}\uparrow)\mathscr{b}_n^{-1}(\mathscr{b}\uparrow) \iff$$

for $\mathscr{b}, \mathscr{c} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$,



They are weaker than the classical Markov moves.

Let Γ be a Coxeter graph.

Artin $\sim$1925, Tits $\sim$1961$++$. The Artin–Tits group and its Coxeter group quotient are given by generators-relations:

$$\mathrm{AT}(\Gamma) = \langle b_i \mid \underbrace{\cdots b_i b_j b_i}_{m_{ij} \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{\cdots b_j b_i b_j}_{m_{ij} \text{ factors}} \rangle$$

$$\mathrm{W}(\Gamma) = \langle \sigma_i \mid \sigma_i^2 = 1, \underbrace{\cdots \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_i}_{m_{ij} \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{\cdots \sigma_j \sigma_i \sigma_j}_{m_{ij} \text{ factors}} \rangle$$

Artin–Tits groups generalize classical braid groups, Coxeter groups generalize polyhedron groups.

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a line:

$$\text{type } \mathsf{A}_{n-1}\colon\quad \mathtt{1} - \mathtt{2} - \ldots - \mathtt{n{-}2} - \mathtt{n{-}1}$$

The classical case. Consider the map

$\beta_i \mapsto$ 

braid rel.: 

Artin ∼1925. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{A}_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(0,n)$.

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a line:

Jones ∼1987.

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type A

$\rightsquigarrow$ two variable $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

The clas

$\beta_i \mapsto$ 

braid rel.: 

Artin ∼1925. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{A}_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(0, n)$.

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a line:

Jones ∼1987.

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type A

⇝ two variable $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

The clas

Khovanov ∼2005; categorification.

Hochschild homology on complexes of the Hecke category of type A

⇝ "three variable $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{a}$ homological invariant" (HOMFLYPT homology).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{t}$=homological parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=Hochschild parameter .

Artin ∼1925. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(A_{n-1}) \to \mathcal{B}\mathrm{r}(0, n)$.

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a circle.

type $\tilde{\mathsf{A}}_{n-1}$:



Affine adds genus. Consider the map

$\beta_0 \mapsto$



& $\beta_i \mapsto$



braid rel.:



tom Dieck ∼1998. (Earlier reference?) This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{A}}_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)$.

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a circle.

Orellana–Ram ∼2004. (Earlier reference?)

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type $\tilde{\mathrm{A}}$

$\rightsquigarrow$ two variable $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

Affine a

$\beta_0 \mapsto$ 

& $\beta_i \mapsto$ 

braid rel.:  $=$ 

tom Dieck ∼1998. (Earlier reference?) This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathrm{A}}_{n}$

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a circle.

Affine a

Orellana–Ram $\sim$2004. (Earlier reference?)

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type $\tilde{\mathrm{A}}$

$\rightsquigarrow$ two variable $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

???; categorification.

Hochschild homology on complexes of the Hecke category of type $\tilde{\mathrm{A}}$

$\rightsquigarrow$ "three variable $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{t},\mathbf{a}$ homological invariant" (HOMFLYPT homology).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{t}$=homological parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=Hochschild parameter .

tom Dieck $\sim$1998. (Earlier reference?) This gives an isomorphism of groups
$\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathrm{A}}_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}r(1,n)$

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/3)$ on a circle.

Affine adds

$\beta_0 \mapsto$  $=$ 

tom Dieck $\rightsquigarrow$ m of groups $\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{A}}_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)$.

Fact. One can recover the (missing) generator of $\mathbb{Z}$ if one works with extended affine type A.

"extended, extra generator" $\mapsto$ 



and


give


$\cos(\pi/4)$ on a line:

$$\text{type } \mathsf{C}_n: \quad 0 \overset{4}{=\!=} 1 - 2 - \ldots - \mathtt{n}{-}1 - \mathtt{n}$$

The semi-classical case. Consider the map

$\beta_0 \mapsto$ 

& $\beta_i \mapsto$ 

braid rel.:  = 

Brieskorn ∼1973. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{C}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1, n)$.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ on a line:

Geck–Lambropoulou ∼1997.

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type C

⇝ two variable $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

The sen

$\beta_0 \mapsto$ 

& $\beta_i \mapsto$ 

braid rel.: 

Brieskorn ∼1973. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathrm{C}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)$.

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/4)$ on a line:

Geck–Lambropoulou ∼1997.

Markov trace on the Hecke algebra of type C

$\rightsquigarrow$ two variable $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{a}$ polynomial invariant (HOMFLYPT polynomial).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=trace parameter .

The sen

1 2 n   1 i i+1 n

β_0



Rouquier ∼2012, Webster–Williamson ∼2009; categorification.

Hochschild homology on complexes of the Hecke category of type C

$\rightsquigarrow$ "three variable $\mathbf{q},\mathbf{t},\mathbf{a}$ homological invariant" (HOMFLYPT homology).

$\mathbf{q}$=Hecke parameter ; $\mathbf{t}$=homological parameter ; $\mathbf{a}$=Hochschild parameter .

Brieskorn ∼1975. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathrm{C}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{B}\mathrm{T}(1,n)$.

I will come back to this with more details for general genus g.
For the time being: This works quite well!

$\cos(\pi/4)$ on a line:

Fact. (Not true in type A.)

There is a whole infinite family of Markov traces,
one for each choice of a value for essential unlinks.

 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ extra parameter and  $\leftrightsquigarrow$ extra parameter *etc.*

However, I only know the categorification of one of these.

The

$\beta_0 \mapsto$



Brieskorn ∼1973. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{C}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)$.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ on a line:

The

$\beta_0 \mapsto$

Fact. (Not true in type A.**)**

There is a whole infinite family of Markov traces,
one for each choice of a value for essential unlinks.

 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ extra parameter and  $\leftrightsquigarrow$ extra parameter *etc.*

However, I only know the categorification of one of these.

Brieskorn ∼1973. $\ldots\mathbb{C}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)$.

Fact. (Not true in type A.**)**

There is also a second Hecke parameter,
which we do not know how to categorify yet.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ twice on a line:

$$\text{type } \tilde{\mathsf{C}}_n: \quad 0^1 \overset{4}{=\!=} 1 - 2 - \ldots - n{-}1 - n \overset{4}{=\!=} 0^2$$

Affine adds genus. Consider the map

$\beta_{0^1} \mapsto$ 

& $\beta_i \mapsto$ 

& $\beta_{0^2} \mapsto$ 

Allcock ∼1999. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{C}}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2, n)$.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ twice

This case is strange – it only arises under conjugation:



By a miracle, one can avoid the special relation



This relation involves three players and inverses. Bad!

Affine adds ge

$\beta_{0^1} \mapsto$ (



Allcock ∼1999. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{C}}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2,n)$.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ twice

This case is strange – it only arises under conjugation:



By a miracle, one can avoid the special relation



This relation involves three players and inverses. Bad!

Affine adds ge

$\beta_{0^1} \mapsto$ (



Currently, not much seems to be known, but I think the same story works.

Allcock ∼1999. This gives an isomorphism of groups $\mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{C}}_n) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2,n)$.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ twice

This case is strange – it only arises under conjugation:



By a miracle, one can avoid the special relation



This relation involves three players and inverses. Bad!

Affine adds ge

$\beta_{0^1} \mapsto$ (



Currently, not much seems to be known, but I think the same story works.

Allcock $n)$.

However, this is where it seems to end, *e.g.* genus $g = 3$ wants to be



But the special relation makes it a mere quotient.

So: In the remaining time I tell you what works.

$\cos(\pi/4)$ twice on a line:

Currently known (to the best of my knowledge).

Genus	type A	type C
$g=0$	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(n) \cong \mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{A}_{n-1})$	
$g=1$	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n) \cong \mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{A}}_{n-1}) \cong \mathrm{AT}(\hat{\mathsf{A}}_{n-1})$	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n) \cong \mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{C}_n)$
$g=2$		$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2,n) \cong \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{C}}_n)$
$g \geq 3$		

And some $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-orbifolds ($\mathbb{Z}/\infty\mathbb{Z}$ =puncture):

Genus	type D	type B
g=0		
g=1	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{D}_n)$	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(1,n)_{\mathbb{Z}/\infty\mathbb{Z}} \cong \mathrm{AT}(\mathsf{B}_n)$
g=2	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2,n)_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2 \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{D}}_n)$	$\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(2,n)_{\mathbb{Z}/\infty\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \ltimes \mathrm{AT}(\tilde{\mathsf{B}}_n)$
$g \geq 3$		

(For orbifolds "genus" is just an analogy.)

Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with “huge” colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.

"tiny" (think $\mathbb{C}^k$)



"huge" (think $\mathfrak{gl}_k$-Verma)

Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshetikhin–Turaev with "huge" colors.



Philosophy 1: Reshe

Note that the type A embedding guarantees that any usual invariant of braids produces an invariant of braids in $\mathscr{H}_g$.



Philosophy 1: Reshe

Note that the type A embedding guarantees that any usual invariant of braids produces an invariant of braids in $\mathscr{H}_g$.



Genus $g = 0, 1$.

Works quite well (*e.g.* use Naisse–Vaz’s ideas on the categorified level).

Note that the type A embedding guarantees that any usual invariant of braids produces an invariant of braids in $\mathscr{H}_g$.



Genus $g = 0, 1$.

Works quite well (*e.g.* use Naisse–Vaz's ideas on the categorified level).

We mimic this for M being "huge, but finite".

Singular Soergel bimodules $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ for $\mathrm{W} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{N-1})$.

Tuples $\mathtt{I} = (k_1, \dots, k_N) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^{N}$ with $k_1 + \cdots + k_N = N$ $\leftrightsquigarrow$ parabolic subgroups

$$\mathrm{W}_{\mathtt{I}} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_1-1}) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_N-1}) \subset \mathrm{W}.$$

W acts on $\mathrm{R} = \mathrm{R}_N = \Bbbk[\mathtt{x}_1, \dots, \mathtt{x}_N]$ via permutation $\rightsquigarrow$ rings of invariants $\mathrm{R}^{\mathtt{I}}$.

Bimodules. Identities, restriction ("merge") and induction ("split"), *e.g.*



$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(1,1,1)} = \mathrm{R},$


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(2,1)} = \mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1} = \Bbbk[\mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_1\mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_3].$

$\leftrightsquigarrow \text{shift}\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)},$


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}.$

Define $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ as the full 2-subcategory of the rings&bimodules 2-category.

Singular Soergel bimodules $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ for $\mathrm{W} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{N-1})$.

Tuples $\mathtt{I} = (k_1, \dots, k_N) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^N$ with $k_1 + \dots + k_N = N \leftrightsquigarrow$ parabolic subgroups

$$\mathrm{W}_{\mathtt{I}} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_1-1}) \times \dots \times \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_N-1}) \subset \mathrm{W}.$$

W acts on $\mathrm{R} = \mathrm{R}_N$ = ... gs of invariants $\mathrm{R}^{\mathtt{I}}$.

Everything is $\mathbb{Z}$-graded, called $\mathbf{q}$-grading. I just omit this for simplicity.

Bimodules. Identities, restriction ("merge") and induction ("split"), *e.g.*



$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(1,1,1)} = \mathrm{R}$,


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(2,1)} = \mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1} = \mathbb{k}[\mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_1\mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_3]$.

$\leftrightsquigarrow$ shift$\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)}$,


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}$.

Define $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ as the full 2-subcategory of the rings&bimodules 2-category.

A monoidal structure is given by

$=$


$\leftarrow$ glue $\rightarrow$


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1}} \mathrm{R} \cong \mathrm{R} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1}} \mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1}} \mathrm{R}.$

This gives a way to define bimodules associated to any web built out of merge and split.

Bimodules. Identities, restriction (“merge”) and induction (“split”), *e.g.*

$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(1,1,1)} = \mathrm{R},$


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(2,1)} = \mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1} = \Bbbk[\mathrm{x}_1 + \mathrm{x}_2, \mathrm{x}_1\mathrm{x}_2, \mathrm{x}_3].$

$\leftrightsquigarrow \text{shift}\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)},$


$\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}.$

Define $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ as the full 2-subcategory of the rings&bimodules 2-category.

A monoidal structure is given by

 ← glue →  $\rightsquigarrow R \otimes_{R^{\sigma_1}} R \cong R \otimes_{R^{\sigma_1}} R^{\sigma_1} \otimes_{R^{\sigma_1}} R.$

This gives a way to define bimodules associated to any web built out of merge and split.

Bimodules. Identi … split"), *e.g.*

 $\rightsquigarrow R^{($ … $_1 + x_2, x_1x_2, x_3].$

 $\rightsquigarrow$ shift … $\otimes_{R^{(k+l)}} R^{(k+l)}.$

There are several bimodule isomorphisms, *e.g.*



Hence, we can unambiguously write

which one could call thick merge and split.

Define $\mathscr{S}_s^{q}(W)$ as … es 2-category.

Singular Soergel bimodules $\mathscr{S}_s^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ for $\mathrm{W} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{N-1})$.

Soergel ∼1992, Williamson ∼2010.

$\mathscr{S}_s^{\mathbf{q}}(\Gamma)$ categorifies the Hecke algebra (or rather, the algebroid).

Tuples $\mathtt{I} =$ … subgroups

$$\mathrm{W}_{\mathtt{I}} = \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_1-1}) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{W}(\mathsf{A}_{k_N-1}) \subset \mathrm{W}.$$

W acts on $\mathrm{R} = \mathrm{R}_N = \mathbb{k}[\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_N]$ via permutation $\rightsquigarrow$ rings of invariants $\mathrm{R}^{\mathtt{I}}$.

Bimodules. Identities, restriction ("merge") and induction ("split"), *e.g.*

 $\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(1,1,1)} = \mathrm{R}$,  $\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(2,1)} = \mathrm{R}^{\sigma_1} = \mathbb{k}[\mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_1\mathtt{x}_2, \mathtt{x}_3]$.

 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ shift$\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)}$,  $\leftrightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}$.

Define $\mathscr{S}_s^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ as the full 2-subcategory of the rings&bimodules 2-category.

Singular Soergel bimodules $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ for $\mathrm{W} = \mathrm{W}(\mathrm{A}_{N-1})$.

Soergel ∼1992, Williamson ∼2010.

$\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\Gamma)$ categorifies the Hecke algebra (or rather, the algebroid).

Tuples $\mathrm{I} =$ … subgroups

Rouquier ∼2004, Mackaay–Stošić–Vaz ∼2008, Webster–Williamson ∼2009, etc.

There are certain complex ("**t**-graded") of singular Soergel bimodules, *e.g.*



providing a categorical action of the Artin–Tits group of type A.




$\rightsquigarrow$ shift$\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)}$,

$\rightsquigarrow \mathrm{R}^{(k,l)} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}} \mathrm{R}^{(k+l)}$.

Define $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\mathrm{W})$ as the full 2-subcategory of the rings&bimodules 2-category.

Soergel ∼1992, Williamson ∼2010.

$\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathbf{q}}(\Gamma)$ categorifies the Hecke algebra (or rather, the algebroid).

Tuples $\mathrm{I} =$ ... subgroups

Rouquier ∼2004, Mackaay–Stošić–Vaz ∼2008, Webster–Williamson ∼2009, etc.

There are certain complex ("t-graded") of singular Soergel bimodules, *e.g.*



providing a categorical action of the Artin–Tits group of type A.

1 1 1 2 1

Hence, we are in business by taking $M \ggg n$:



Defin

This defines a fairly strong complex-valued invariant $[\![\mathscr{b}]\!]_M$ of $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$.

Partial Hochschild homology (à la Hogancamp ∼2015). $\mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$ category of (▸ bicomplexes of) **q**-graded, free R_N-bimodules. Adjoint pair $(\mathrm{Ad},\mathrm{Tr})$:

$$\mathrm{Ad}\colon \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_{N-1}^{\mathbf{atq}} \to \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$$

$$\mathrm{B}\mapsto \mathrm{B}\otimes_{\mathrm{R}_{N-1}^{\mathrm{e}}}(\mathrm{R}_N^{\mathrm{e}}/(\mathtt{x}_N\otimes 1-1\otimes\mathtt{x}_N))$$

extending scalars

$\rightsquigarrow$



$$\mathrm{Tr}\colon \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}} \to \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_{N-1}^{\mathbf{atq}}$$

$$\mathrm{B}\mapsto(\mathrm{B}\xrightarrow{\mathtt{x}_N.\mathtt{b}-\mathtt{b}.\mathtt{x}_N}\mathbf{aq}^2\mathrm{B})$$

identifying left-right action

$\rightsquigarrow$



Skein relations. One gets *e.g.*



&



Partial Hochschild homology (à la Hogancamp ∼2015). $\mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$ category of (▸ bicomplexes of) q-graded, free R_N-bimodules. Adjoint pair $(\mathrm{Ad}, \mathrm{Tr})$:

Theorem (after normalization).

We get a triply-graded invariant $\mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}(\mathscr{b}) \in \mathbb{k}\text{-}\mathcal{V}\mathrm{ect}^{\mathbf{atq}}$ for $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g,n)$, which respects Markov stabilization, *i.e.*

$\mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$  $\cong \mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$  $\cong \mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$ 

Skein relations. One gets *e.g.*



Partial Hochschild homology (à la Hogancamp ~2015). $\mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$ category of (▸ bicomplexes of) q-graded, free R_N-bimodules. Adjoint pair $(\mathrm{Ad}, \mathrm{Tr})$:

Theorem (after normalization).

We get a triply-graded invariant $\mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}(\mathscr{b}) \in \Bbbk\text{-}\mathcal{V}\mathrm{ect}^{\mathbf{atq}}$ for $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g, n)$, which respects Markov stabilization, *i.e.*

$\mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$  $\cong \mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$  $\cong \mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$ 

Skein relations. One gets e.g.



However, we are not quite there:
one gets a too strong Markov conjugation, *i.e.*

$\mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$  $\cong \mathrm{HHH}_M^{\star}$ 



Partial Hochschild homology (à la Hogancamp ∼2015). $\mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$ category of (▸ bicomplexes of) q-graded, free R_N-bimodules. Adjoint pair $(\mathrm{Ad},\mathrm{Tr})$:

$$\mathrm{Ad}\colon \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_{N-1}^{\mathbf{atq}} \to \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$$

$$\mathrm{B}\mapsto\mathrm{B}\otimes_{\mathrm{R}^e}\left(\mathrm{R}_N^e/(\mathrm{x}_N\otimes 1-1\otimes\mathrm{x}_N)\right)$$

Ad  $=$

Idea: Flank them!

 &  should be thought as  & 

and things get stuck, *e.g.*

topologically stuck:  & algebraically stuck: 

Skein re



Partial Hochschild homology (à la Hogancamp ~2015). $\mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$ category of (bicomplexes of) q-graded, free R_N-bimodules. Adjoint pair $(\mathrm{Ad}, \mathrm{Tr})$:

$$\mathrm{Ad}\colon \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_{N-1}^{\mathbf{atq}} \to \mathrm{R}\text{-}f\mathscr{B}\mathrm{im}_N^{\mathbf{atq}}$$

$$\mathrm{B} \mapsto \mathrm{B} \otimes_{\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{e}}_{N-1}} (\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{e}}_N / (\mathrm{x}_N \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \mathrm{x}_N)) \quad \rightsquigarrow$$



Theorem (after normalization and flanking).

We get a triply-graded invariant $\mathrm{HHH}^*_M(\mathscr{b}) \in \mathbb{k}\text{-}\mathcal{V}\mathrm{ect}^{\mathbf{atq}}$ for $\mathscr{b} \in \mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(g, n)$, which respects Markov conjugation and stabilization, *i.e.*









There is still much to do...



Thanks for your attention!

The Reidemeister braid relations:



These hold for usual strands only since core strands do not cross each other, *e.g.*



Back

Brunn ∼1897, Alexander ∼1923. For any link ℓ in the 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$ there is a braid in $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(\infty)$ whose closure is isotopic to ℓ.

There are various proofs of this result, are all based on the same idea: "Eliminate one by one the arcs of the diagram that have the wrong sense.".

Here is an example which works in the context of general 3-manifolds: "Mark the local maxima and minima of the link diagram with respect to some height function and cut open wrong subarcs.", *e.g.*



Back

Markov ∼1936. Two links in the 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$ are equivalent if and only if they are equal in $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(\infty)$ up to conjugation and stabilization.

Conjugation.



Stabilization.



Back

Markov ∼1936. Two links in the 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$ are equivalent if and only if they are equal in $\mathscr{B}\mathrm{r}(\infty)$ up to conjugation and stabilization.

Conjugation.



The upshot.

Together with Alexander's theorem, this gives a way to algebraically study links in the 3-ball $\mathscr{D}^3$.

Stabilization.



Back



Figure: The first ever “published” braid diagram. (Page 283 from Gauß’ handwritten notes, volume seven, $\leq$1830).

Tits $\sim$1961++. Gauß’ braid group is the type A case of more general groups.

Back



Artin's approach: "Arithmetrization of braids".
However, he still needs topological arguments.

And this is one main problem why general Artin–Tits groups are so complicated:
Basically, they are "infinite groups without extra structure".

Figure: The first ever "published" braid diagram. (Page 283 from Gauß' handwritten notes, volume seven, $\leq$1830).

Tits $\sim$1961++. Gauß' braid group is the type A case of more general groups.

Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from `https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group`.)

Examples.

Type A_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ tetrahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ symmetric group S_4.
Type B_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ cube/octahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ Weyl group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \ltimes S_3$.
Type H_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ dodecahedron/icosahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ exceptional Coxeter group.
For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group.)

Examples.

Type A_3 ⇜⇝ tetrahedron ⇜⇝ symmetric group S_4.

Type B_3 ⇜⇝ cube/octahedron ⇜⇝ Weyl group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \rtimes S_3$.

Type H_3 ⇜⇝ dodecahedron/icosahedron ⇜⇝ exceptional Coxeter group.

For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Fact. The symmetries are given by exchanging flags.

Fix a flag F.

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group.)

Examples.

Type A_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ tetrahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ symmetric group S_4.
Type B_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ cube/octahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ Weyl group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \ltimes S_3$.
Type H_3 $\leftrightsquigarrow$ dodecahedron/icosahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ exceptional Coxeter group.
For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Fix a flag F.

Fix a hyperplane H_0 permuting the adjacent 0-cells of F.

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from `https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group`.)

Examples.

Type A_3 ⟿ tetrahedron ⟿ symmetric group S_4.
Type B_3 ⟿ cube/octahedron ⟿ Weyl group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \ltimes S_3$.
Type H_3 ⟿ dodecahedron/icosahedron ⟿ exceptional Coxeter group.
For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Fix a flag F.

Fix a hyperplane H_0 permuting the adjacent 0-cells of F.

Fix a hyperplane H_1 permuting the adjacent 1-cells of F, etc.

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group.)

Examples.

Type $\mathrm{A}_3 \leftrightsquigarrow$ tetrahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ symmetric group S_4.
Type $\mathrm{B}_3 \leftrightsquigarrow$ cube/octahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ Weyl group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \ltimes S_3$.
Type $\mathrm{H}_3 \leftrightsquigarrow$ dodecahedron/icosahedron $\leftrightsquigarrow$ exceptional Coxeter group.
For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Fix a flag F.

Fix a hyperplane H_0 permuting the adjacent 0-cells of F.

Fix a hyperplane H_1 permuting the adjacent 1-cells of F, etc.

Write a vertex i for each H_i.

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back



Figure: The Coxeter graphs of finite type. (Picture from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coxeter_group.)

Examples.

This gives a generator-relation presentation.

Type A_3 ⇜⇝ tetrahedron ⇜⇝ symmetric group S_4.

Type B_3 ⇜⇝ And the braid relation measures the angle between hyperplanes.

Type H_3 ⇜⇝ dodecahedron/icosahedron ⇜⇝ exceptional Coxeter group.

For I_8 we have a 4-gon:

Fix a flag F.

Fix a hyperplane H_0 permuting the adjacent 0-cells of F.

Fix a hyperplane H_1 permuting the adjacent 1-cells of F, etc.

Write a vertex i for each H_i.

Connect i, j by an n-edge for H_i, H_j having angle $\cos(\pi/n)$.

Idea (Coxeter ∼1934++).



Back

Three gradings:

$\mathbf{q} \leftrightsquigarrow$ internal & $\mathbf{t} \leftrightsquigarrow$ homological & $\mathbf{a} \leftrightsquigarrow$ Hochschild

---

Example. To compute Hochschild cohomology take the Koszul resolution

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N} \left(\mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{e}} = \mathrm{R} \otimes \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\cdot(\mathtt{x}_i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \mathtt{x}_i)} \mathbf{a}\mathbf{q}^2 \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{e}} \right),$$

Tensor it with B, gives a complex with differentials $\mathtt{x}_i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes \mathtt{x}_i$, of which we think as identifying the variables. This gives a chain complex having non-trivial chain groups in $\mathbf{a}$-degree $0, \dots, n$. Here the i^{th} chain group consists of $\binom{n}{i}$ copies of B, with differentials given by the various ways of identifying i variables. The a^{th} cohomology $= a^{\mathrm{th}}$ Hochschild cohomology.

Example. If B is already a $\mathbf{t}$-graded complex, then one can take homology of it and gets "triple H".

Back