

## Motivic w-Knots

Thursday, August 27, 2015 11:04 AM

I have no idea what "motivic" means.  
 If I understood Alm right, what he means is "the formal object defined by the relations everybody thinks are the full set of relations, but no one can prove that".

⇒ We should call  $k^w$   
 "motivic ribbon 2-knots"  
 (and everybody will think we're smart).

---

Added Sep 21, 2015:

Reading Mazur's "What is a motive".  
 He quotes Grothendieck:  
 So is it fair to call  
 $A^u, A^v, A^w$  "motivic  
 Lie theories" (of  
 various kinds)  $\int_0$

they "give the same results". In order to express this intuition, of the kinship of these different cohomological theories, I formulated the notion of "motive" associated to an algebraic variety. By this term, I want to suggest that it is the "common motive" (or "common reason") behind this multitude of cohomological invariants attached to an algebraic variety, or indeed, behind all cohomological invariants that are a priori possible. [G]