

LIE ALGEBRAS AND THE (CO)HOMOLOGY OF CONFIGURATION SPACES

BEN KNUDSEN

ABSTRACT. We survey decades of research identifying the (co)homology of configuration spaces with Lie algebra (co)homology. The different routes to this one proto-theorem offer genuinely different explanations of its truth, and we attempt to convey some sense of the conceptual core of each perspective. We close with a list of problems.

*I know noble accents
And lucid, inescapable rhythms;
But I know, too,
That the blackbird is involved
In what I know.*

—Wallace Stevens

1. INTRODUCTION

Having asked *why*, a puzzle is receiving no answer; a mystery is receiving many. The mystery at hand concerns the (ordered) configuration space

$$F_k(X) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in X^k : x_i \neq x_j \text{ if } i \neq j\}$$

of k particles in the background space X , together with its close cousin the unordered configuration space. The asking is prompted by results of the following type, which, as we will see, are legion.

Proto-theorem. *(Co)homology of configuration spaces is Lie algebra (co)homology.*

This statement provokes many questions. What background space? What coefficients? What Lie algebra? What structure preserved by the isomorphism? But the fundamental question is *why*. Why are there Lie algebras here at all?

The purpose of this paper is to present three genuinely different answers to this question. As these answers represent three major streams of the modern study of configuration spaces, the paper will be something of a whirlwind tour of the beautiful ideas and profound insights held in those streams. The only originality here, if any, is curatorial.

The reader may find it useful to know that the cohomology of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} may be calculated from its Chevalley–Eilenberg complex, which is the symmetric algebra generated by a shift of \mathfrak{g} , equipped with the differential determined as a derivation by the cup product—see [Wei94], for example. The reader may also find it helpful eventually to have at least a passing familiarity with operads—see [Val14] and [LV12] for gentle and systematic options, respectively.

2. THE ARNOLD RELATION

In the study of configuration spaces of manifolds, as is so often the case, the first interesting example contains the generating principle. Recording the center of mass, distance from the center, and relative direction of particles determines a homeomorphism $F_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times S^{n-1}$; in particular, the *Gauss map*

$$F_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\gamma} S^{n-1}$$

$$(x_1, x_2) \mapsto \frac{x_1 - x_2}{|x_1 - x_2|}$$

is a homotopy equivalence. In general, we have a whole family of Gauss maps $\gamma_{ij} = \gamma \circ \pi_{ij} : F_k(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow S^{n-1}$, where π_{ij} is the projection onto the i th and j th coordinates, whence a family of cohomology classes $\alpha_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}^*(1) \in H^{n-1}(F_k(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Using the foundational fact that the restricted coordinate projection $F_k(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow F_{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a fiber bundle [FN62], together with the Leray–Hirsch theorem, it is easy to show that these classes generate the cohomology ring. In fact, as shown in [Arn69] for $n = 2$ and [Coh76] in general, they generate up to a single non-obvious relation,¹ which bears a striking resemblance to the Jacobi identity of a Lie algebra—as we will see, for good reason.

Arnold relation. $\alpha_{ij}\alpha_{j\ell} + \alpha_{j\ell}\alpha_{\ell i} + \alpha_{\ell i}\alpha_{ij} = 0$.

The remainder of this section will sketch three proofs of this relation, and, from this multiplicity, the main themes of the remainder will arise. We begin with the oldest proof and the origin of the eponym [Arn69].

Arnold’s proof. Specializing to the case $n = 2$,² we make the identification $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$. In de Rham cohomology, the class α_{ij} is represented by the 1-form $\frac{1}{2\pi i} d \log(z_i - z_j)$. A little arithmetic shows that these 1-forms themselves already satisfy the relation. \square

Since the 1-form appearing above measures the winding number around the diagonal where $z_i = z_j$, it is reasonable to think that this argument is premised on the combinatorics of diagonals. In contrast, our second argument will be premised on the combinatorics of projections [Coh76].

Cohen’s proof. The group $H^{2(n-1)}(F_3(\mathbb{R}^n))$ is free Abelian of rank 2 by the Leray–Hirsch argument alluded to above, so a relation of the form

$$x\alpha_{12}\alpha_{23} + y\alpha_{23}\alpha_{31} + z\alpha_{31}\alpha_{12} = 0$$

must obtain. Application of the transpositions τ_{23} and τ_{12} to this relation forces the equalities $x = y$ and $x = z$. Since there is no torsion, the claim follows in this case, and the general case follows via pullback along the appropriate projection $F_k(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow F_3(\mathbb{R}^n)$. \square

The third argument will make essential use of manifold topology, in the form of Poincaré duality [Sin].

¹There are also the obvious relations $\alpha_{ji} = (-1)^n \alpha_{ij}$ and $\alpha_{ij}^2 = 0$ coming from S^{n-1} .

²Arnold’s approach through de Rham cohomology admits a highly nontrivial extension to general n involving the Fulton–MacPherson compactifications [FM94, Sin04] and graph complexes [Kon99, LV13].

Sinha's proof. An equivalent formulation of the relation in question is the vanishing of the product $(\alpha_{ij} - \alpha_{i\ell})(\alpha_{j\ell} - \alpha_{ji})$. Since $F_3(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a manifold, this product is Poincaré dual to the transverse intersection of properly embedded submanifolds Poincaré dual to the factors. A little intersection theory shows that $\alpha_{ij} - \alpha_{i\ell}$ is Poincaré dual to the submanifold defined by requiring that x_i, x_j , and x_ℓ be collinear, with x_i in between x_j and x_ℓ , which is disjoint from the submanifold with x_j in between. \square

As we will see, each of these perspectives on the Arnold relation offers its own explanation for the proto-theorem of the introduction, explanations premised on three genuinely different answers to a seemingly straightforward question: *what is a Lie algebra?*

3. DIAGONALS AND PARTITIONS

The combinatorics of diagonals is the combinatorics of partitions. More specifically, for every partition of the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$ into blocks, there corresponds a generalized diagonal subspace of M^k , defined by requiring that the coordinates labeled by the elements of each block coincide. Accordingly, we may rephrase the calculation of Arnold and Cohen described in the previous section (additively) as the decomposition

$$H^*(F_k(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash k} \text{Ind}_{\Sigma_\lambda}^{\Sigma_k} \bigotimes_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} L_n(\lambda_i).$$

Here λ denotes an unordered partition of the number k of length $\ell(\lambda)$, we make the abbreviation $L_n(m) = H^{(m-1)(n-1)}(F_m(\mathbb{R}^n))$, which is spanned as a Σ_m -module by the product class $\alpha_{12}\alpha_{23} \cdots \alpha_{m-1,m}$, and Σ_λ is the product of wreath products of symmetric groups determined by λ —for example, we have $\Sigma_{(3,2,2)} = \Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_2 \wr \Sigma_2$, thought of as a subgroup of Σ_7 .

There is a powerful and influential generalization of this formula to manifolds more interesting than Euclidean space, versions of which were articulated independently by [CT78, BG91, Kri94, Tot96]. The approach of Totaro is to analyze the stalks of the pushforward of the constant sheaf at the generalized diagonal subspaces described above, thereby showing that the Leray spectral sequence for the inclusion $F_k(M) \subseteq M^k$ has the following form.

Theorem (Totaro). *Let M be an orientable manifold. There is a spectral sequence*

$$E_2^{*,*} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash k} \text{Ind}_{\Sigma_\lambda}^{\Sigma_k} \bigotimes_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} H^*(M^{\lambda_i}; L_n(\lambda_i)) \implies H^*(F_k(M)),$$

in which the first nonzero differential is determined (as a derivation) by multiplication by the diagonal class of M under the isomorphisms of $H^(M^2; L_n(2))$ and $H^*(M; L_n(1))^{\otimes 2}$ with $H^*(M^2)$.*

As first observed by Getzler [Get99, Get], this E_2 -page is the Chevalley–Eilenberg complex of a Lie algebra. In order to explain this observation, we recall that a *symmetric sequence*³ is a sequence $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathcal{X}(k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ of objects (in some background category), where the weight⁴ k object $\mathcal{X}(k)$ comes equipped with a Σ_k -action. Given

³Otherwise known as a *species* or *FB-module*.

⁴Otherwise known as *arity*.

a background monoidal structure, symmetric sequences may be tensored together via the recipe

$$(\mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y})(k) = \bigoplus_{i+j=k} \text{Ind}_{\Sigma_i \times \Sigma_j}^{\Sigma_k} \mathcal{X}(i) \otimes \mathcal{X}(j).$$

Following the current terminological trend, we will refer to algebraic structures in this setting via the (admittedly overloaded) epithet “twisted”—thus, twisted algebra, twisted commutative algebra, and so on.⁵

In this language, we may reformulate the Arnold–Cohen calculation as the isomorphism

$$H^*(F(\mathbb{R}^n)) \cong \text{Sym}(L_n)$$

of symmetric sequences of graded modules.⁶ Here one can already see the germ of Getzler’s result, which is a cochain level identification with the Chevalley–Eilenberg complex of a the differential graded (twisted) Lie algebra obtained by tensoring the de Rham forms of M with a free twisted Lie algebra.

More than a beautiful reformulation, this is a point of view with real teeth. First, it shows that the higher differentials in the Leray spectral sequence are essentially Massey products in M , systematizing the results of [FT04]; in particular, the spectral sequence collapses for formal manifolds but not in general. Second, it is not difficult to show that the invariant part of this twisted Lie algebra is always formal, regardless of whether M is, implying that the induced spectral sequence converging to the rational cohomology of unordered configuration spaces collapses [Knu17]. The resulting expression in terms of Lie algebra homology unifies and extends all prior rational results and permits extensive computation [BC88, BCT89, FT00, Chu12, DCK17].

Getzler’s work was later extended by Petersen to fabulous levels of generality: first, in allowing arbitrary coefficients for cohomology; second, in considering diagonal complements other than classical configuration spaces; and, third, in removing the restriction that the background space be a manifold [Pet20]. The price of this last, radical extension is working instead with compactly supported cohomology, with the old results recovered via Poincaré duality. Even at this level of generality, the key player remains the set of partitions, with its partial order by refinement.

Having taken seriously the perspective of diagonals and partitions, two conclusions now seem difficult to avoid. First, save for the intercession of Poincaré duality in the eleventh hour, it would appear that manifold topology plays essentially no role in the story. Second, in the form of the poset of partitions, it would seem that we have located the source of the incursion of Lie algebras, and hence a rationale for the proto-theorem of the introduction; indeed, a Lie algebra may be *defined* as an algebra over an operad built from partition posets [Fre04].

4. PROJECTIONS AND COMMUTATIVITY

The cohomology of a Lie algebra carries the structure of a commutative algebra; indeed, the differential in the Chevalley–Eilenberg complex is a derivation by definition. Thus, from the discussion above, we conclude that the symmetric sequence $H^*(F(M))$ carries the structure of a twisted commutative algebra, or TCA for short. Confronted with this (co)homological structure, we are bound by the

⁵Such structures are discussed elsewhere in the literature using the language of left modules over operads.

⁶In fact, as twisted commutative algebras—see Section 4.

solemn oath of all topologists to ask: can we locate a topological source for this structure?

In concrete terms, an algebra structure on the symmetric sequence \mathcal{A} consists of the data of $\Sigma_i \times \Sigma_j$ -equivariant maps $\mu_{ij} : \mathcal{A}(i) \otimes \mathcal{A}(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(k)$ for $i, j, k \geq 0$ with $i + j = k$, subject to natural associativity and unitality axioms. Commutativity in this context is the requirement that the block permutation of $\{1, \dots, i\}$ and $\{i + 1, \dots, k\}$ should intertwine μ_{ij} and μ_{ji} . Having made our confusion specific,⁷ the desired topological source is now easily identified; indeed, for *any* space X , the coordinate projections $F_k(X) \rightarrow F_i(X) \times F_j(X)$ equip the symmetric sequence $H^*(F(X))$ with the structure of a TCA.⁸

What can we learn from this extra structure? For one thing, in view of the equality $F_1(X) = X$, the unit element in $H^0(X)$ and the universal property of the free TCA produce a canonical map of TCAs of the form $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow H^*(F(X))$, where \mathcal{S} denotes the free TCA on a single generator of weight 1. In this way, we may regard the target as an \mathcal{S} -module.⁹ The crucial fact about the TCA \mathcal{S} is that, like its cousin the polynomial ring, it satisfies an analogue of the Hilbert basis theorem [Sno13, CEFN14, CEF15].

Theorem (Church–Ellenberg–Farb–Nagpal–Snowden). *The twisted commutative algebra \mathcal{S} is Noetherian.*¹⁰

The relevance of this result for our purposes is that, as the reader is encouraged to verify as an exercise, the E^2 -page in Totaro’s theorem is finitely generated over \mathcal{S} in each total degree, so Noetherianity implies that $H^*(F(M))$ is itself finitely generated in each degree. As explained in [CEF15], this fact places strong constraints on the behavior of the cohomology of $F_k(M)$ for large k . Known as *representation stability*, this phenomenon implies that the multiplicities of irreducible symmetric group representations (working rationally) must eventually be constant; in particular, the Betti numbers of the unordered configuration spaces stabilize.¹¹

Returning to our main theme, we observe that our interpretation of $H^*(F(X))$ as a TCA renders unsurprising the appearance of Lie algebras and their cohomology in the story; indeed, according to [Knu22], essentially *every* TCA¹² is quasi-isomorphic to a Chevalley–Eilenberg complex! This fact holds in such generality that it applies to the cohomology of a wide range of interconnected families of spaces, including Petersen’s generalized configuration spaces as well as many others having no connection to diagonals or partitions.

We emerge from this contemplation of projections and commutativity with our understanding and our confusion augmented in equal measure. While our previous

⁷In the immortal words of Paul Goerss.

⁸At the level of unordered configuration spaces, this structure has a Poincaré dual description in terms of “superposition” of configurations, which provides yet another approach to the proto-theorem [RW24].

⁹The structure of an \mathcal{S} -module is equivalent to that of a functor from the category of finite sets and injections [SS], denoted FI in the literature on stability phenomena.

¹⁰The reader should not be fooled by the plausibility of this statement. Noetherianity results for TCAs are extremely difficult and, consequently, quite rare [NSS16].

¹¹This account is ahistorical, as it was the study of homological stability, begun in [McD75] and continued in [Chu12, RW13], that led to the discovery of representation stability. The investigation of these and related stability phenomena has since become a thriving mathematical field of its own [RWW17, GRW17, Gad17, MW19, GKRW19, ADCK20, PR22, KMT22, BG23].

¹²Reduced, of finite type.

conviction that manifold topology is ancillary is bolstered, our belief in the primacy of partitions is shaken. With Lie algebras arising where no partition is in view, surely we must conclude that their true origin in our story lies in commutativity; indeed, a Lie algebra may be *defined* as an algebra over the Koszul dual of the commutative operad [GK94].

5. POINCARÉ DUALITY AND EMBEDDINGS

We come now to our third version of the narrative, which, far from downplaying the role of manifold topology, views it as central. The story begins with the observation that the space $F_k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is homotopy equivalent to the subspace $\mathcal{E}_n(k) \subseteq \text{Emb}(\sqcup_k \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ of so-called rectilinear embeddings or *little cubes*—viewing \mathbb{R}^n as the interior of an n -dimensional cube, we allow only translation and scaling of sides [May72]. Since embeddings compose, the symmetric sequence \mathcal{E}_n carries the structure of an operad, which is inherited by its homology $e_n := H_*(\mathcal{E}_n) \cong H_*(F(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Theorem (Cohen). *The operad e_n is isomorphic to the n -shifted Poisson operad.*¹³

In other words, an e_n -algebra has a commutative product and a Lie bracket of degree $n - 1$ that is a derivation of the product. Plainly, then, this operad contains within it a shifted copy of the Lie operad, which, under the identification with the homology of configuration spaces, is nothing other than the dual of the symmetric sequence L_n considered above. From this perspective, the Arnold relation is not merely reminiscent of the Jacobi identity; the two are equivalent.¹⁴

The discovery of \mathcal{E}_n was motivated by the study of n -fold loop spaces, on which it acts. From this perspective, the configuration spaces of \mathbb{R}^n together form a free algebra (up to homotopy), and this universal property leads to an approximation of $\Omega^n \Sigma^n X$ by the configuration space $F_X(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of particles labeled by the pointed space X , in which a particle labeled by the basepoint disappears. This relationship is globalized in the so-called *scanning* or *electric field map*

$$F_X(M) \rightarrow \Gamma_c(E_X)$$

of Segal [Seg74] and McDuff [McD75], whose target is the space of compactly supported sections of the $\Sigma^n X$ -bundle associated to the frame bundle of M (when M is parallelizable, this space of sections is simply $\text{Map}_c(M, \Sigma^n X)$).

Theorem (McDuff). *If X is a connected, then the scanning map is a weak equivalence.*

It was recognized early on that the source of this map is a kind of homology theory for manifolds, being equipped with covariant functoriality, monoidality, and an analogue of the long exact sequence of a pair. The target, on the other hand, is clearly a form of “nonabelian” compactly supported cohomology, so it is difficult to avoid thinking of this result as a form of Poincaré or Atiyah duality.¹⁵ Indeed, its proof follows a local-to-global blueprint entirely parallel to that of Poincaré duality.

¹³This interpretation of Cohen’s calculation is given in [GJ].

¹⁴See [Sin] for a beautiful geometric description of the perfect pairing identifying the two relations.

¹⁵More recently, these ideas have been given systematic treatment in the theories of factorization homology [AF15] and nonabelian Poincaré duality [Sal01, Lur].

Via the filtration of $F_X(M)$ by cardinality, McDuff’s theorem permits another avenue of attack on the ordinary (unordered) configuration spaces of general manifolds [BC88, BCT89, FT00]. This last reference contains yet another version of the proto-theorem on Lie algebra cohomology; here it is obtained by applying rational homotopy theory [Qui69, FHT00] to the target of the scanning map using results of Haefliger on rational models for mapping spaces [Hae82]. In this way, we see the Chevalley–Eilenberg complex arising through a blending of Poincaré duality and Koszul duality,¹⁶ the latter being the heart of rational homotopy theory.

This blending of dualities was first articulated at the level of operads in the following influential result [GJ].

Theorem (Getzler–Jones). *The Koszul dual of e_n is $s^{-n}e_n$.*

Here we write s^{-1} for the operadic desuspension, defined so that an $s^{-1}\mathcal{O}$ -algebra structure on X is simply an \mathcal{O} -algebra structure on the suspension of X .

As a consequence of this theorem, the obvious map of operads $e_n \rightarrow e_{n+1}$, induced by the standard inclusion between Euclidean spaces, gives rise to a map $s^{-n}e_{n+1} \rightarrow s^{-n+1}e_n$. In practical terms, the effect of these shifts is to place the top degree homology, which we earlier saw identified with the Lie operad, in degree 0, independent of n . We now see that this manifestation of Poincaré duality is a perfectly viable explanation for the presence of Lie algebras in our study; indeed, a Lie algebra may be *defined* as an algebra over the inverse limit operad

$$\varprojlim (\cdots \rightarrow s^{-n}e_{n+1} \rightarrow s^{-n+1}e_n \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow e_1).$$

6. THE VIEW FROM THE SPHERE

The self-duality theorem of Getzler–Jones was subsequently lifted to the level of operads in chain complexes by Fresse [Fre10], then to the level of operads in spectra by Ching–Salvatore [CS22], permitting the following definition.

Definition. The *spectral Lie operad*¹⁷ is the operad in spectra given by the inverse limit

$$\mathcal{L} = \varprojlim (\cdots \rightarrow s^{-n}\Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{E}_{n+1} \rightarrow s^{-n+1}\Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{E}_n \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{E}_1).$$

Definitionally, then, there is a map of operads from the (shifted) spectral Lie operad to $\Sigma_+^\infty \mathcal{E}_n$, which results in an adjunction at the level of their categories of algebras, the left adjoint of which should be thought of as a higher enveloping algebra functor. The author studied these algebras in [Knu18], in particular establishing their satisfaction of an analogue of the Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt theorem.¹⁸ Combining this result with the local-to-global philosophy of factorization homology [AF15] yields the following result.

¹⁶See [AF19] for a systematic development of this idea.

¹⁷This definition is ahistorical—see [Chi05] for the original approach. Note that we adopt the grading convention in which the Lie bracket has degree 0.

¹⁸Our account here is highly ahistorical. At the time of the writing of [Knu18], spectral self-duality was still conjectural, and the author was forced to resort to a rather convoluted workaround inspired by the theory of chiral algebras [BD69], as interpreted in [FG12]. The equivalence of these two approaches to defining higher enveloping algebras has not yet been established rigorously.

Theorem (K). *Let M be a smooth¹⁹ n -manifold of finite type. There is a weak equivalence*

$$\Sigma_+^\infty F(M) \simeq \Sigma_+ \text{Bar} \left(\text{id}, \mathcal{L}, \text{Map}_c^{O(n)} (\text{Fr}_M, \mathcal{L}(\Sigma^{-1} S^n)) \right),$$

of symmetric sequences of spectra, where Bar denotes the geometric realization of the simplicial two-sided bar construction and Fr_M the frame bundle of M , and we view S^n as a symmetric sequence concentrated in weight 1.

The bar construction being a spectral form of Lie algebra homology, this formula should be viewed as an articulation of the proto-theorem over the sphere spectrum, simultaneously recovering and expanding all prior (additive) results on the (co)homology of configuration spaces. By inspecting the formula, we may in particular conclude that the stable homotopy types of configuration spaces (ordered or unordered) of manifolds of fixed dimension are proper homotopy invariants.²⁰

The computational import of the theorem derives from the spectral sequence resulting from smashing with a (co)homology theory E and filtering the bar construction by its skeleta. Converging to the E -(co)homology of configuration spaces,²¹ the initial page of this spectral sequence is a form of Lie algebra (co)homology taking into account the extra information of power operations for spectral Lie algebras over E .

In this way, each choice of E gives rise to a different, typically quite intricate, computational problem, the solution to which lies in incorporating the earlier views of the Lie operad through partitions and Koszul duality. This study of power operations has been undertaken for ordinary mod p homology [AM99, Kja18, AC20] and Morava E -theory [Bra17], and the corresponding spectral sequence calculations begun in [Zha21, CZ22] and [BHK24], respectively, but there is much more to be done.

7. OUTLOOK

We close with a selection of open problems. Although the author hopes one day to solve them, he would not mind if the reader got there first.

The first three are computational problems. That they remain unsolved is, in the author's opinion, an embarrassment to all mathematicians (or topologists, at least).

Problem. Calculate the rational homology of the ordered configuration spaces of the torus.

Even the stable homology is unknown.²² In fact, no stable multiplicity is known for any nontrivial irreducible representation of the symmetric group.²³

Problem. Calculate the mod p homology of the unordered configuration spaces of a closed, orientable surface of positive genus.

¹⁹For simplicity.

²⁰See [AK04] for prior partial results.

²¹Using a more general version of the theorem applying to labeled configuration spaces, and invoking McDuff's theorem, we equally obtain spectral sequences converging to the E -(co)homology of various mapping and section spaces—in particular, of iterated loop spaces.

²²See [Pag22] for partial results in this direction.

²³The multiplicity of the trivial representation, stable and unstable, was calculated in [DCK17].

In contrast with the case of an open surface, treated in [BS24], almost nothing is known here.²⁴

Problem. Calculate the Morava E -theory and K -theory of $\Omega^k S^n$.²⁵

Through McDuff’s theorem, the spectral sequence described in the previous section provides one approach to this problem. Although the E^2 -page has a purely algebraic description [BHK24], the full computation seems difficult.

The final two problems are of a more conceptual leaning.

Problem. Is there an analogue of the Milnor–Moore theorem [MM65] for higher enveloping algebras?

In order to formulate the final problem, we recall that, up to homotopy, the ordered configuration spaces of a manifold carry the structure of a right module over the appropriate operad of little cubes.²⁶

Problem. Is the stable homotopy type of the operadic module of configuration spaces a proper homotopy invariant?

An affirmative answer to this problem would imply proper homotopy invariance of stable factorization homology [AF15] and stable embedding calculus [Wei99].

REFERENCES

- [AC20] O. Antolin-Camarena, *The mod 2 homology of free spectral Lie algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (2020).
- [ADCK20] B. H. An, G. C. Drummond-Cole, and B. Knudsen, *Edge stabilization in the homology of graph braid groups*, Geom. Topol. **24** (2020).
- [AF15] D. Ayala and J. Francis, *Factorization homology of topological manifolds*, J. Topol. **8** (2015), 1045–1084.
- [AF19] ———, *Poincaré/Koszul duality*, Comm. Math. Phys. **365** (2019).
- [AK04] M. Aouina and J. Klein, *On the homotopy invariance of configuration spaces*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **4** (2004), 813–827.
- [AM99] G. Arone and M. Mahowald, *The Goodwillie tower of the identity functor and the unstable periodic homotopy of spheres*, Invent. Math. **135** (1999), 743–788.
- [Arn69] V. I. Arnol’d, *The cohomology ring of the colored braid group*, Math. Notes **5** (1969), no. 2, 138–140.
- [BC88] C.-F. Bödigheimer and F. R. Cohen, *Rational cohomology of configuration spaces of surfaces*, Algebraic Topology and Transformation Groups, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1361, Springer, 1988, pp. 7–13.
- [BCT89] C.-F. Bödigheimer, F. R. Cohen, and L. R. Taylor, *On the homology of configuration spaces*, Topology **28** (1989), 111–123.
- [BD69] A. Beilinson and V. Drinfeld, *Chiral Algebras*, American Mathematical Society, 1969.
- [BG91] M. Bendersky and S. Gitler, *The cohomology of certain function spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **326** (1991).
- [BG23] C. Bibby and N. Gadish, *A generating function approach to new representation stability phenomena in orbit configuration spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **10** (2023), 241–287.
- [BHK24] L. Brantner, J. Hahn, and B. Knudsen, *The Lubin–Tate theory of configuration spaces: I*, J. Topol. (2024), to appear.
- [Bra17] L. Brantner, *The Lubin–Tate theory of spectral Lie algebras*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 2017.

²⁴See [CZ22, BHK24] for some very partial results.

²⁵See [Rav98] for some conjectures and [Yam88, Lan93, Lan96, Tam02] for partial results.

²⁶We elide issues of parallelizability.

- [BS24] A. Bianchi and A. Stavrou, *Homology of configuration spaces of surfaces modulo an odd prime*, J. Reine Angew. Math. (2024).
- [CEF15] T. Church, J. S. Ellenberg, and B. Farb, *FI-modules and stability for representations of symmetric groups*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 9, 1833–1910.
- [CEFN14] T. Church, J. S. Ellenberg, B. Farb, and R. Nagpal, *FI-modules over Noetherian rings*, Geom. Topol. (2014).
- [Chi05] M. Ching, *Bar constructions for topological operads and the goodwillie derivatives of the identity*, Geom. Topol. **9** (2005), 833–934.
- [Chu12] T. Church, *Homological stability for configuration spaces of manifolds*, Invent. Math. **188** (2012), no. 465–504.
- [Coh76] F. R. Cohen, *The homology of \mathbb{C}_{n+1} -spaces, $n \geq 0$* , The Homology of Iterated Loop Spaces, Springer, 1976.
- [CS22] M. Ching and P. Salvatore, *Koszul duality for topological E_n -operads*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (2022).
- [CT78] F. R. Cohen and L. R. Taylor, *Computations of Gelfand–Fuks cohomology, the cohomology of function spaces, and the cohomology of configuration spaces*, Geometry Applications of Homotopy Theory I, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 657, Springer, 1978.
- [CZ22] M. Chen and A. Zhang, *Mod p homology of unordered configuration spaces of surfaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc (2022), to appear.
- [DCK17] G. C. Drummond-Cole and B. Knudsen, *Betti numbers of configuration spaces of surfaces*, J. London Math. Soc. **96** (2017), no. 2, 367–393.
- [FG12] J. Francis and D. Gaitsgory, *Chiral Koszul duality*, Selecta Math. **18** (2012), no. 1, 27–87.
- [FHT00] Y. Félix, S. Halperin, and J.-C. Thomas, *Rational homotopy theory*, Springer, 2000.
- [FM94] W. Fulton and R. MacPherson, *A compactification of configuration spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994), no. 1, 183–225.
- [FN62] E. Fadell and L. Neuwirth, *Configuration spaces*, Math. Scand. **10** (1962), 111–118.
- [Fre04] B. Fresse, *Koszul duality of operads and homology of partition posets*, Homotopy theory: relations with algebraic geometry, group cohomology, and algebraic K-theory, Contemp. Math., vol. 346, Amer. Math. Soc., 2004.
- [Fre10] ———, *Koszul duality of E_n -operads*, Selecta Math. **17** (2010), 363–434.
- [FT00] Y. Félix and J.-C. Thomas, *Rational Betti numbers of configuration spaces*, Topology Appl. **102** (2000), 139–149.
- [FT04] ———, *Configuration spaces and Massey products*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **33** (2004), 1685–1702.
- [Gad17] N. Gadish, *Representation stability for families of linear subspace arrangements*, Adv. Math. (2017), 341–377.
- [Get] E. Getzler, *The homology groups of some two-step nilpotent lie algebras associated to symplectic vector spaces*, arXiv:9903147.
- [Get99] ———, *Resolving mixed Hodge modules on configuration spaces*, Duke Math. J. **96** (1999), no. 1, 175–203.
- [GJ] E. Getzler and J. D. S. Jones, *Operads, homotopy algebra and iterated integrals for double loop spaces*, arXiv:hep-th/9403055v1.
- [GK94] V. Ginzburg and M. M. Kapranov, *Koszul duality for operads*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), 203–272.
- [GKRW19] S. Galatius, A. Kupers, and O. Randal-Williams, *E_2 -cells and mapping class groups*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **130** (2019), 1–61.
- [GRW17] S. Galatius and O. Randal-Williams, *Homological stability for moduli spaces of high dimensional manifolds. ii*, Ann. of Math. (2) **186** (2017).
- [Hae82] A. Haefliger, *Rational homotopy of the space of sections of a nilpotent bundle*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **273** (1982), 609–620.
- [Kja18] J. Kjaer, *On the odd primary homology of free algebras over the spectral Lie operad*, J. Homotopy Relat. Str. **13** (2018), 581–597.
- [KMT22] B. Knudsen, J. Miller, and P. Tosteson, *Extremal stability for configuration spaces*, Math. Ann. (2022).
- [Knu17] B. Knudsen, *Betti numbers and stability for configuration spaces via factorization homology*, Alg. Geom. Topol. **17** (2017), no. 5, 3137–3187.
- [Knu18] ———, *Higher enveloping algebras*, Geom. Topol. **22** (2018), no. 7.

- [Knu22] ———, *Projection spaces and twisted Lie algebras*, Contemp. Math. (2022), To appear.
- [Kon99] M. Kontsevich, *Operads and motives in deformation quantization*, Lett. Math. Phys. **48** (1999), 35–72.
- [Kri94] I. Kriz, *On the rational homotopy type of configuration spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994).
- [Lan93] L. Langsetmo, *The K-theory localization of loops on an odd sphere and applications*, Topology **32** (1993).
- [Lan96] ———, *Further structure in $K(1)_*\Omega^k S^{2n+1}$* , Algebraic Topology: New Trends in Localization and Periodicity, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 136, Springer, 1996.
- [Lur] J. Lurie, *Higher algebra*, <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/papers/higheralgebra.pdf>.
- [LV12] J.-L. Loday and B. Vallette, *Algebraic operads*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., vol. 346, Springer Verlag, 2012.
- [LV13] P. Lambrechts and I. Volić, *Formality of the little N -disks operad*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, Amer. Math. Soc., 2013.
- [May72] J. P. May, *The Geometry of Iterated Loop Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 271, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1972.
- [McD75] D. McDuff, *Configuration spaces of positive and negative particles*, Topology **14** (1975), 91–107.
- [MM65] J. Milnor and J. C. Moore, *On the structure of Hopf algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) **81** (1965), no. 2, 211–264.
- [MW19] J. Miller and J. Wilson, *Higher order representation stability and ordered configuration spaces of manifolds*, Geom. Topol. **23** (2019).
- [NSS16] R. Nagpal, S. V. Sam, and A. Snowden, *Noetherianity of some degree two twisted commutative algebras*, Selecta Math. **22** (2016), no. 2, 913–937.
- [Pag22] R. Pagaria, *Asymptotic growth of Betti numbers of ordered configuration spaces of an elliptic curve*, Eur. J. Math. **8** (2022), 427–445.
- [Pet20] D. Petersen, *Cohomology of generalized configuration spaces*, Compos. Math. **156** (2020), no. 2, 251–298.
- [PR22] N. Proudfoot and E. Ramos, *The contraction category of graphs*, Represent. Theory (2022).
- [Qui69] D. Quillen, *Rational homotopy theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **90** (1969), 205–295.
- [Rav98] D. Ravenel, *What we still don't know about loop spaces of spheres*, Homotopy theory via algebraic geometry and group representations, Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 220, Amer. Math. Soc., 1998.
- [RW13] O. Randal-Williams, *Homological stability for unordered configuration spaces*, Q. J. Math. **64** (2013), 303–326.
- [RW24] ———, *Configuration spaces as commutative monoids*, Bull. London Math. Soc. (2024).
- [RWW17] O. Randal-Williams and N. Wahl, *Homological stability for automorphism groups*, Adv. Math. (2017), no. 534–626.
- [Sal01] P. Salvatore, *Configuration spaces with summable labels*, Cohomological Methods in Homotopy Theory, Progr. Math., vol. 196, Birkhäuser, 2001.
- [Seg74] G. Segal, *Categories and cohomology theories*, Topology **13** (1974), no. 3, 293–312.
- [Sin] D. Sinha, *The homology of the little disks operad*, arXiv:0610236.
- [Sin04] ———, *Manifold-theoretic compactifications of configuration spaces*, Selecta Math. **10** (2004), no. 3, 391–428.
- [Sno13] A. Snowden, *Szygies of Segre embeddings and Δ -modules*, Duke Math. J. **162** (2013), 225–277.
- [SS] S. V. Sam and A. Snowden, *Introduction to twisted commutative algebras*, arXiv:1209.5122.
- [Ste54] W. Stevens, *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens*, Random House, 1954.
- [Tam02] D. Tamaki, *The fiber of iterated freudenthal suspension and Morava K-theory of $\Omega^k S^{2\ell+1}$* , Contemp. Math. **293** (2002).
- [Tot96] B. Totaro, *Configuration spaces of algebraic varieties*, Topology **35** (1996), no. 4, 1057–1067.
- [Val14] B. Vallette, *Algebra + homotopy = operad*, Symplectic, Poisson and Noncommutative Geometry, vol. 62, MSRI Publications, 2014.

- [Wei94] C. Weibel, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [Wei99] M. Weiss, *Embeddings from the point of view of immersion theory: part I*, *Geom. Topol.* **3** (1999), 67–101.
- [Yam88] A. Yamaguchi, *Morava K -theory of iterated loop spaces of spheres*, *Math. Z.* **199** (1988).
- [Zha21] A. Zhang, *Quillen homology of spectral Lie algebras with application to mod p homology of labeled configuration spaces*, *Alg. Geom. Topol.* (2021), to appear.

Email address: `b.knudsen@northeastern.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MA 02115, USA