

Finite groups, spherical 2-categories, and 4-manifold invariants

Marco Mackaay

Área Departamental de Matemática, UCEH,
Universidade do Algarve,
8000 Faro,
Portugal,
e-mail mmackaay@ualg.pt

February 28, 1999

Abstract

In this paper we define a class of state-sum invariants of compact closed oriented piece-wise linear 4-manifolds using finite groups. The definition of these state-sums follows from the general abstract construction of 4-manifold invariants using spherical 2-categories, as we defined in [32], although it requires a slight generalization of that construction. We show that the state-sum invariants of Birmingham and Rakowski [11, 12, 13], who studied Dijkgraaf-Witten type invariants in dimension 4, are special examples of the general construction that we present in this paper. They showed that their invariants are non-trivial by some explicit computations, so our construction includes interesting examples already. Finally, we indicate how our construction is related to homotopy 3-types. This connection suggests that there are many more interesting examples of our construction to be found in the work on homotopy 3-types, such as [15], for example.

1 Introduction

In [32] we defined spherical 2-categories and showed how to construct state-sum invariants of closed compact oriented PL 4-manifolds with them. Roughly speaking spherical 2-categories are monoidal 2-categories with duals, as defined by Baez and Langford [6, 5], and a trace on the 2-endomorphisms satisfying a small set of conditions that are called the 'spherical conditions'. The main point in that paper was to find a construction that would generalize Crane and Frenkel's construction [18], which uses involutory Hopf categories, and Crane and Yetter's construction [18, 19], which uses tortile categories. Conjecturally [32] the representations of an involutory Hopf category form a spherical 2-category. Furthermore we proved in [32] that a spherical 2-category with one object is nothing but a tortile category. These two observations explain how one can see our setup as a generalization of the aforementioned papers. However, we imposed one restriction on our spherical 2-categories: the category of endomorphisms of the identity object, $\text{End}(I)$, was taken to be Vect , the symmetric monoidal category of finite dimensional vector spaces over a fixed field F . This restriction should be dropped if we want to get really interesting invariants and if our construction is to be a true generalization of the aforementioned constructions. In particular we know that the Crane-Yetter invariant for Vect is trivial. Furthermore, in Section 4 we show that Birmingham and Rakowski's [11, 12, 13] results provide interesting examples of our construction in this paper. In their work $\text{End}(I)$ is more complicated than Vect . It is probably not too difficult to generalize the abstract construction that we present in [32] to the case where $\text{End}(I)$ is any semi-simple tortile category; most of our definitions and proofs in [32] remain valid, although the definition of the dimension of a spherical 2-category becomes different and therefore the proofs of the $2 \rightleftharpoons 4$ and $1 \rightleftharpoons 5$ moves and the related lemmas become different also. This generalization of the abstract construction will be carried out somewhere else. In this paper we concentrate on a specific class of examples of this more general construction. The class of examples that was worked out in [32] corresponds exactly to the case in which $\text{End}(I)$ is 'trivial'.

We summarize our results. For the rest of this paper, let G be any finite group, H any finite abelian group, R a commutative ring with unit and involution, which is denoted by $*$, and R^* its group of invertible elements. If r is an element in R , we call r^* its conjugate. In Section 2 we define $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$. Roughly speaking this is the 2-category of which the objects are finite linear

combinations of elements of G with non-negative integer coefficients, the 1-endomorphisms of an object $g \in G$ are finite linear combinations of elements of H with non-negative integer coefficients, and the 2-endomorphisms of a 1-endomorphism $h \in H$ are elements of the ring R . Composition on all levels is defined as for $2\text{Hilb}[G]$ in [32] and is induced by the group operations, which we write multiplicatively throughout this paper.

In Section 3 we define the kind of monoidal structure on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ that we are interested in.

In Section 4 we define our state-sum and indicate how we derived its definition from our construction in [32]. We do not repeat that abstract construction here, because it would increase the number of pages considerably and might confuse the less category-minded reader. We prove invariance of the state-sums that are defined in this paper directly, without going back to the abstract results in [32]. For a thorough understanding of the results in this paper it is probably better to read [32] anyway, but formally the results in this paper are self-contained. It is interesting to note that our construction yields the 'twisted' version of Yetter's [40] construction for the case of 2-simple path-connected homotopy 2-types. A 2-simple path-connected space E is a path-connected space for which the action of $\pi_1(E)$, the fundamental group, is trivial on $\pi_2(E)$, the second homotopy group. Yetter gives a construction of state-sums for arbitrary homotopy 2-types, or 'categorical groups', which is equivalent. We do not know how to 'twist' his construction for general homotopy 2-types. See for TQFT's from strict homotopy n -types, for arbitrary n , Porter's work [34]. In this section we also explain how Birmingham and Rakowski's [11, 12, 13] constructions can all be seen as special cases of the construction we present in this paper.

In Section 5 we relate our results to the theory of Postnikov systems. Unfortunately we had to base this relation on a conjecture, rather than a theorem. The reason is that, in order to establish the connection with Postnikov systems, we have to shift to another definition of monoidal 2-category and there is no formal proof that both definitions are 'equivalent'. We show why it is most probable that both definitions coincide and why we do not attempt to formally prove it anyway. This interpretation in terms of Postnikov systems provides a nice link with Freed and Quinn's work in [26, 36, 35].

2 $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$

In this section we define the semi-strict monoidal 2-category $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ exactly. First let us define the category $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$.

Definition 2.1 *$\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ is the R -linear finite semi-simple category of which the simple objects are precisely the elements of H , and for which the R -module of endomorphisms of an object $h \in H$ is defined by $\text{End}(h) = R$. The composite of two such endomorphisms, r_1 and r_2 , is defined by their product $r_1 r_2$ in R .*

Note that the objects of $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ are just finite linear combinations of elements of H with non-negative integer coefficients. Another way of saying this is that the objects are just the elements of the group rig, $N(H)$. If we choose an ordering on the elements of H , we can represent the morphisms by matrices. Let us explain this in a little more detail. Suppose H has order k . We define the degree of a finite linear combination of elements of a group with non-negative integer coefficients as the sum of the coefficients. We denote the degree of such a linear combination x by $\deg(x)$. A morphism with source $x = n_1 h_1 + \cdots + n_k h_k$ and target $y = m_1 h_1 + \cdots + m_k h_k$ can be represented by a $\deg(x) \times \deg(y)$ block diagonal matrix with coefficients in R . The i -th block has size $n_i \times m_i$. Composition is now defined by matrix multiplication. The product in H induces a monoidal structure on $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$. Note that we can take $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ to be symmetric, since H is abelian, so $h_1 h_2 = h_2 h_1$. There is also a left duality on $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$: the left dual of an element $x = n_1 h_1 + \cdots + n_k h_k$ is defined by $x^* = n_1 h_1^{-1} + \cdots + n_k h_k^{-1}$. The dual of a morphism, represented by a matrix, is defined by the conjugate transpose of that matrix. It is not hard to check that this symmetry and this duality define a tortile structure on $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$. For background information on monoidal categories with extra structures, see [30] for example.

We are now ready to define the strict 2-category $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$.

Definition 2.2 *$\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ is the $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ -linear finite semi-simple 2-category of which the simple objects are precisely the elements of G , and for which the $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ -module category of endomorphisms on $g \in G$ is defined by $\text{End}(g) = \mathbf{N}(H, R)$.*

For background information on linear 2-categories, see [29] and [32]. Let us explain this definition. The objects of $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ are elements of $\mathbf{N}(G)$.

Choose an ordering on the elements of G and H . We can now represent 1- and 2-morphisms by matrices. Let l be the order of G . A 1-morphism between two objects $x = n_1 g_{i_1} + \dots + n_l g_{i_l}$ and $y = m_1 g_{j_1} + \dots + m_l g_{j_l}$ is a $\deg(x) \times \deg(y)$ block diagonal matrix, A , with coefficients being elements of $\mathbf{N}(H)$. The size of the i -th block is equal to $n_i \times m_i$. The composition is given by matrix multiplication, where the operations on the coefficients are the multiplication and the addition in $\mathbf{N}(H)$. A 2-morphism between two such 1-morphisms, A and B , is represented by a $\deg(x) \times \deg(y)$ block diagonal matrix, (α_j^i) , where the coefficient α_j^i is a $\deg(A_j^i) \times \deg(B_j^i)$ matrix with coefficients in R . The horizontal composite of two 2-morphisms α and β , which we denote by $\alpha \circ \beta$, is defined by matrix multiplication, but the operations on the coefficients are more complicated than in the case of the 1-morphisms. We define $(\alpha \circ \beta)_j^i = \oplus_k (\alpha_k^i \otimes \beta_j^k)$. Note that the coefficients α_k^i and β_j^k are matrices themselves with coefficients in R . In general the tensor product of two matrices, X and Y , is defined by $(XY)_{kl}^{ij} = X_k^i Y_l^j$, and the direct sum is defined by

$$X \oplus Y = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix}.$$

The vertical composite of two 2-morphisms, α and β , which we denote by $\alpha \cdot \beta$, is defined by coefficientwise multiplication, i.e., $(\alpha \cdot \beta)_j^i = \alpha_j^i \beta_j^i$. Note that the coefficients of the 2-morphisms are matrices themselves, so their multiplication is given by matrix multiplication. Note also that this multiplication is well defined for any pair of composable 2-morphisms: for any $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$ and $\beta: B \rightarrow C$, the matrix α_j^i has size $A_j^i \times B_j^i$ and β_j^i has size $B_j^i \times C_j^i$. We always write the composites of 1- and 2-morphisms in the diagrammatic order. It is easy to check that all compositions are strictly associative.

The semi-strict monoidal structure on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ is induced by the multiplication in G , H , and R . For the definition of semi-strict monoidal 2-categories, see [29]. The tensor product of two objects x and y is simply their product xy . The tensor product of a 1-morphism A and an object y is given by the tensor product of the two matrices $A \otimes 1_y$, where 1_y is the identity on y . In terms of coefficients this becomes $(A \otimes 1_y)_{kl}^{ij} = A_k^i \delta_l^j$, with δ being the Kronecker delta. The tensor product of a 2-morphism α and an object y is given by the tensor product of the two matrices $\alpha \otimes 1_y$, where 1_y is the identity 2-morphism of the identity 1-morphism on y . In terms of coefficients this becomes $(\alpha \otimes 1_y)_{kl}^{ij} = \alpha_k^i (1_y)_l^j$. Note that α and 1_y are

matrices themselves, so that their tensor product differs from their product in general. Likewise we define $1_y \otimes A$ and $1_{1_y} \otimes \alpha$. It is easy to check that these tensor products are strictly associative. The tensorator

$$\bigotimes_{A,B} : (A \otimes y)(x' \otimes B) \Rightarrow (x \otimes B)(A \otimes y')$$

of two 1-morphisms $A: x \rightarrow x'$ and $B: y \rightarrow y'$ is defined by the operator that interchanges the two tensor factors. Concretely, we have

$$[(A \otimes y)(x' \otimes B)]_{kl}^{ij} = A_k^i B_l^j$$

and

$$[(x \otimes B)(A \otimes y')]_{kl}^{ij} = B_k^i A_l^j,$$

so the tensorator becomes

$$(\bigotimes_{A,B})_{kl}^{ij} = P_{A_k^i B_l^j},$$

where $P_{A_k^i B_l^j}$ is the $\deg(A_k^i) \times \deg(B_l^j)$ matrix with coefficients $(P_{A_k^i B_l^j})_{rs}^{mn} = \delta_s^m \delta_r^n$. This defines a semi-strict monoidal structure on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$. As remarked in the introduction, $\mathbf{N}(G, \{1\}, \mathbf{C})$ is equal to $2\text{Hilb}[G]$, which we defined in [32]. If $G = \{1\}$ also, then we recover the definition of the completely coordinatized version of the monoidal 2-category of 2-vector spaces, 2Vect_{cc} , in [29].

We can now define the left-duality on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ in terms of matrices. For the definition of monoidal 2-categories with duals and some basic properties of them, see [31, 6, 5, 32]. The dual of an object $x = n_1 g_1 + \dots + n_l g_l$ is defined by $x^* = n_1 g^{-1} + \dots + n_l g^{-1}$. The dual of a 1-morphism, represented by a matrix A , is defined by the transpose of A with dual coefficients. The dual of a 2-morphism, α , is defined by the matrix α^* , where $(\alpha^*)_j^i$ is the conjugate transpose of α_j^i . It is not hard to show that this duality satisfies the 'spherical conditions', as defined in [32]. We do not prove this, because we do not need it explicitly in this paper. In section 4 we show invariance of our construction directly.

3 Monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$

We follow the usual definition of a weak monoidal 2-category as defined by Gordon, Power and Street [27].

Definition 3.1 *A weak monoidal 2-category is a tri-category with one object.*

Let us first give a short explanation of this definition. Given a tri-category with one object, one can take the n -morphisms of the tri-category to be the $(n - 1)$ -morphisms of the monoidal 2-category for all n greater than 0. The monoidal structure on the 2-category corresponds to the 'horizontal' composition of the morphisms in the tri-category. This is called 'delooping'; for more information see [3, 4, 2]. An alternative way of arriving at the same definition is by 'weakening' the definition of a monoidal 2-category given by Kapranov and Voevodsky [29]. The coherence diagrams in that definition are almost the same as those in [27]: the only difference is that one has to keep in account the non-associativity of the composition of the 1-morphisms, i.e., the edges, in the diagrams in [29]. Since this non-associativity is controlled by a coherent associator it does not matter how we choose to parenthesize the boundary 1-morphisms in the diagrams. We just make one choice and work out the diagrams. Any other choice will lead to equivalent diagrams. In the following definition we use Kapranov and Voevodsky's hieroglyphic notation to indicate these diagrams.

Definition 3.2 *A semi-weak monoidal 2-category structure on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ consists of the following maps:*

0-associator $\alpha^0: G \times G \times G \rightarrow H$.

pentagonator $\pi: G \times G \times G \times G \rightarrow R^*$.

1-associator $\alpha^1: H \times H \times H \rightarrow R^*$.

tensorator $\tau: H \times H \rightarrow R^*$.

interchanger1 $\iota^1: H \times G \times G \rightarrow R^*$.

interchanger2 $\iota^2: G \times H \times G \rightarrow R^*$.

interchanger3 $\iota^3: G \times G \times H \rightarrow R^*$.

All these maps are required to be normalized, i.e., equal to 1 whenever one of the factors of the domain is equal to 1. Furthermore these maps are required to satisfy the following identities:

$$(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\alpha_{g_2, g_3, g_4}^0 (\alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4}^0)^{-1} \alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4}^0 (\alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4}^0)^{-1} \alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3}^0 = 1.$$

$$(\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow)$$

$$\alpha_{h_2, h_3, h_4}^1 (\alpha_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4}^1)^{-1} \alpha_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4}^1 (\alpha_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4}^1)^{-1} \alpha_{h_1, h_2, h_3}^1 = 1.$$

In the following identities we avoid writing α^1 constantly and bracket the remaining maps with $\lceil \rceil$ following Crane and Yetter's [20] notation. As explained in [20] this notation means that the source and target 1-morphisms are assumed to be parenthesized from left to right. The brackets denote the strings of 1-associators that are required to make the 2-morphisms composable under this assumption. The usage of these brackets is unambiguous by the coherence relation of the 1-associator, which corresponds to $(\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow)$.

$$(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\lceil \tau_{h_1 h_2, h_3} \rceil = \lceil \tau_{h_2, h_3} \rceil \lceil \tau_{h_1, h_3} \rceil,$$

and

$$\lceil \tau_{h_1, h_2 h_3} \rceil = \lceil \tau_{h_1, h_2} \rceil \lceil \tau_{h_1, h_3} \rceil.$$

$$(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\lceil \pi_{g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5} \rceil \lceil \pi_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5} \rceil \lceil \iota_{\alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3}^0; g_4, g_5}^1 \rceil \lceil \pi_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5} \rceil =$$

$$\lceil \iota_{g_1; \alpha_{g_2, g_3, g_4}^0; g_5}^2 \rceil \lceil \pi_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4} \rceil \lceil \pi_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5} \rceil \lceil (\iota_{g_1, g_2; \alpha_{g_3, g_4, g_5}^0}^3)^{-1} \rceil \lceil \pi_{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5} \rceil.$$

$$(\rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\lceil \iota_{h, g_2, g_3}^1 \rceil \lceil \iota_{h, g_2, g_3, g_4}^1 \rceil \lceil \tau_{h; \alpha_{g_2, g_3, g_4}^0} \rceil = \lceil \iota_{h, g_3, g_4}^1 \rceil \lceil \iota_{h, g_2, g_3, g_4}^1 \rceil.$$

$$(\bullet \otimes \rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\lceil \iota_{g_1, h, g_3}^2 \rceil \lceil \iota_{g_1, h, g_4}^2 \rceil = \lceil \iota_{g_1, h, g_3, g_4}^2 \rceil.$$

$$(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \rightarrow \otimes \bullet)$$

$$\lceil \iota_{g_1, h, g_4}^2 \rceil \lceil \iota_{g_2, h, g_4}^2 \rceil = \lceil \iota_{g_1, g_2, h, g_4}^2 \rceil.$$

$$(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \rightarrow)$$

$$\lceil \tau_{\alpha_{g_1, g_2, g_3}^0; h}^{-1} \rceil \lceil \iota_{g_1, g_2, g_3, h}^3 \rceil \lceil \iota_{g_2, g_3, h}^3 \rceil = \lceil \iota_{g_1, g_2, g_3, h}^3 \rceil \lceil \iota_{g_1, g_2, h}^3 \rceil.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rightarrow \rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet) \quad & [\iota_{h_1, g_2, g_3}^1] [\iota_{h_2, g_2, g_3}^1] = [\iota_{h_1 h_2, g_2, g_3}^1]. \\
(\bullet \otimes \rightarrow \rightarrow \otimes \bullet) \quad & [\iota_{g_1, h_1 h_2, g_3}^2] = [\iota_{g_1, h_1, g_3}^2] [\iota_{g_1, h_2, g_3}^2]. \\
(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \rightarrow \rightarrow) \quad & [\iota_{g_1, g_2, h_1 h_2}^3] = [\iota_{g_1, g_2, h_1}^3] [\iota_{g_1, g_2, h_2}^3].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us briefly explain how one derives these maps and relations from Kapranov and Voevodsky's definitions. There is only one structural 1-morphism: the 0-associator, α^0 . It controls the non-associativity of the tensor product. This is a family of invertible 1-morphisms indexed by triples of objects. It suffices to define α^0 on simple objects, i.e., elements of G . We assume in our definition that all structural 1- and 2-morphisms are simple. Therefore we define α^0 to take values in H . It is now easy to derive the cocycle condition in $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ from the corresponding diagram in [29]. All other maps in Definition 3.2 are structural 2-morphisms. Since they are also assumed to be invertible and simple, they take values in R^* . It suffices to index them by simple objects, i.e., elements in G , and simple 1-morphisms, i.e., elements in H . The list of maps and relations now follows easily from Kapranov and Voevodsky's definitions. The pentagonator, π , controls the non-commutativity of the pentagon diagram for the 0-associator. The pentagon diagram corresponds to $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$. The 1-associator, α^1 , controls the non-associativity of the composition of the 1-morphisms. The tensorator, τ , controls the non-distributivity of the tensor product. Finally, the interchangers, ι^i for $i = 1, 2, 3$, define the pseudo-naturality of α^0 . All relations are coherence relations that ensure that the composites of any two strings of structural maps with the same source and target are equal. The assumption that all maps are simple is restrictive, but is inspired by the relation with homotopy theory, as explained in Section 5. A second reason for this assumption is that the calculations, which are not easy anyway, become much simpler under this assumption. We call these structures semi-weak, because we assume the units to be strict and the tensor product of an object with a 1- or 2-morphism to be trivial. Therefore some of the structural 1- and 2-morphisms in [29] become identities. This also explains why we have less coherence relations than Kapranov and Voevodsky have in [29]. Note that $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ and $(\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow)$ are cocycle conditions. The relations

in $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ are called the 'hexagon relations' and together with the co-cycle relation in $(\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow)$ they define the structure of a braided monoidal category on $\text{End}(I)$. This is a special case of the general theorem that says that $\text{End}(I)$ is a braided monoidal category for any monoidal 2-category [29]. The coherence cube $(\rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ in Kapranov and Voevodsky's paper becomes a consequence of the hexagon relations in our context. This only happens because we are working with maps on groups with values in commutative groups. In general relation $(\rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ does not follow from the hexagon relations.

The duality on the semi-strict $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ is compatible with any semi-weak monoidal structure. Note that, by definition, all structural 2-morphisms are taken to be 'unital'. A 2-morphism, α , is called unital if it is invertible and if its dual equals its inverse. As remarked already, we do not want to go into more details of the duality on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$. Since we only consider a specific class of state-sums in this paper, there is no advantage in defining a general theory first. The invariance of our state-sum can be proved directly, as we show in the sequel.

At the end of the next section we give some examples of semi-weak monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$, for $G = \{1\}$, $H = \mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$, $R = \mathbf{C}$, respectively, and $G = H = \mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$, $R = \mathbf{C}$, respectively. These examples are due to Birmingham and Rakowski [11, 12, 13]. Since they also did some calculations of the related state-sums, we prefer to explain their results, which fit nicely into our setup, after defining our general state-sum and showing that it is invariant.

4 The state-sum

Fix a semi-weak monoidal structure on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$. Let M be a closed compact oriented PL manifold of dimension 4 and \mathcal{T} a triangulation of M . As in [32] we assume that there is a total ordering on the vertices of T . At the end of this section we show that the state-sum does not depend on the choice of this ordering. We label the edges of \mathcal{T} with elements of G and label the faces, i.e., triangles, with elements of H . We impose the conditions that the product of the labels of the edges in the boundary of one face be equal to 1, the unit in G , and the product of the labels of the faces in the boundary of one 3-simplex, i.e. tetrahedron, be equal to 1, the unit in H . For these products one has to take in account the relative orientation of the boundary

components, i.e. the orientation induced by the boundary operator, and take the inverse of the label of a boundary component with a negative orientation. The ordering of the boundary components of the face (ijk) is defined to be the one induced by the boundary operator: $\partial(ijk) = (ij) - (ik) + (jk)$. These conditions can be called the 'local flatness' conditions, following [23]. Let $(ijklm)$ be a 4-simplex with positive orientation. We now define the partition function on $(ijklm)$, which we denote by $Z((ijklm))$.

Definition 4.1

$$\begin{aligned} Z((ijklm)) = & \\ & [(\iota_{g_{lm}, g_{kl}, h_{ijk}}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_{klm}, h_{ijk}}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_{klm}, g_{jk}, g_{ij}}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_{lm}, h_{jkl}, g_{ij}}^2] \\ & \times [\pi_{g_{lm}, g_{kl}, g_{jk}, g_{ij}}]. \end{aligned}$$

We derived this partition function from the abstract one defined in [32] by keeping track of the parentheses around the objects and the 1-morphisms that are involved. Note that the 'funny brackets' $[\]$ are very helpful here; without them the definition of the partition function would contain at least 22 factors. Note also that h_3 does not show up in our notation of the partition function; it is hidden by the brackets. The advantages of our notation for the proof of invariance of our state-sum outweighs this minor drawback.

There are two interesting special cases:

1. $\#H=1$. In this case $Z((ijklm)) = \pi_{g_{lm}, g_{kl}, g_{jk}, g_{ij}}$. As already remarked, this is the example given in [32].
2. $\#G=1$. In this case

$$\begin{aligned} Z((ijklm)) = & \\ & (\alpha_{h_{ikm}, h_{klm}, h_{ijk}}^1)^{-1} \tau_{h_{klm}, h_{ijk}}^{-1} \alpha_{h_{ikm}, h_{ijk}, h_{klm}}^1 (\alpha_{h_{ijm}, h_{jkm}, h_{klm}}^1)^{-1} \\ & \times \alpha_{h_{ijm}, h_{jlm}, h_{jkl}}^1 (\alpha_{h_{ilm}, h_{ijl}, h_{jkl}}^1)^{-1} \alpha_{h_{ilm}, h_{ikl}, h_{ijk}}^1 \end{aligned}$$

This is the Crane-Yetter partition function [21, 19], which they call the $15J$ symbol, for a finite group instead of a quantum group.

We also need to define a weight on each tetrahedron. Recall that each tetrahedron is contained in the boundary of exactly two different 4-simplices. The weight on a tetrahedron depends on its position in the boundary of the two 4-simplices.

Definition 4.2 For the definition of the weight, $W(T)$, on a tetrahedron, T , we have to distinguish four cases:

1. The tetrahedron $(iklm)$ is contained in the boundary of the two 4-simplices $(ijklm)$ and $(iklmn)$. In this case the weight on $(iklm)$, $W(iklm)$, is defined to be

$$W(iklm) = \iota_{g_{mn}; g_{lm}; \alpha_{g_{kl}, g_{jk}, g_{ij}}^0}^3 \tau_{h_{lmn}; \alpha_{g_{kl}, g_{jk}, g_{ij}}^0}.$$

2. The tetrahedron $(jlmn)$ is contained in the boundary of $(jklmn)$ and $(ijlmn)$. In this case we have

$$W(jlmn) = \iota_{g_{mn}; \alpha_{g_{lm}, g_{kl}, g_{jk}}^0; g_{ij}}^2.$$

3. The tetrahedron $(ijkm)$ is contained in the boundary of $(ijklm)$ and $(ijkmn)$. In this case we have

$$W(ijkm) = \iota_{\alpha_{g_{mn}, g_{lm}, g_{kl}}^0; g_{jk}; g_{ij}}^1 \tau_{\alpha_{g_{mn}, g_{lm}, g_{kl}}^0; h_{ijk}}.$$

4. In all other case the weight on a tetrahedron is defined to be 1.

Note that in the two special cases above, the cases in which $\#G = 1$ and $\#H = 1$, respectively, the weights on the tetrahedra are all equal to 1.

We are now ready to define the state-sum, $Z(M, \mathcal{T})$. Let v_0 be the number of vertices in \mathcal{T} , and v_1 the number of edges in \mathcal{T} . In the following definition the sum is taken over all possible labellings and the products over all 4-simplices and tetrahedra in \mathcal{T} , respectively. If the orientation of a 4-simplex S induced by the ordering on its vertices is equal to its orientation induced by the global orientation of M , then we take $\epsilon(S) = 1$. Otherwise we take $\epsilon(S) = -1$. The sign of each tetrahedron we define to be equal to the sign of the 4-simplex in whose boundary the tetrahedron appears with relative positive orientation. Thus in the four cases that we distinguish in Definition 4.2 we define $\epsilon((iklm)) = \epsilon((iklmn))$ in the first case, $\epsilon((jlmn)) = \epsilon((ijlmn))$ in the second, and $\epsilon((ijkm)) = \epsilon((ijkmn))$ in the third.

Definition 4.3

$$Z(M, \mathcal{T}) = (\#G)^{-v_0} (\#H)^{(v_0-v_1)} \sum_{\ell} \prod_S Z(S, \ell)^{\epsilon(S)} \prod_T W(T, \ell)^{\epsilon(T)}.$$

Here $Z(S, \ell)$ is defined to be $Z((ijklm))$ for any 4-simplex $S = (ijklm)$ in \mathcal{T} , and $W(T, \ell)$ is defined to be $W((ijkl))$ for any tetrahedron $T = (ijkl)$. Let us now show that this defines an invariant.

As is well known, any two equivalent triangulations of a compact closed oriented PL 4-manifold can be obtained from one another by a finite sequence of the so called 4D Pachner moves [33]. Therefore showing invariance of our state-sum reduces to showing invariance under each of these moves. We have depicted the 4D Pachner moves in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

Each side of a 4D Pachner move is represented by a simplicial 4-complex and, together, the two sides of each move form the boundary of a 5-simplex. A single diagram on one side of a move represents the boundary of a part of the simplicial 4-complex. An arrow between two such diagrams indicates the glueing. Thus one can 'read' each side of a move as a film, in which the various diagrams on that side are glued together to form the simplicial 4-complex. This interpretation of the Pachner moves as 'films' and the corresponding figures are due to Carter, Kauffman, and Saito [17]. In order to prove invariance of our state-sum under a 4D Pachner move, we have to show that the part of the state-sum corresponding to the simplicial 4-complex on one side of the move can be substituted by the part corresponding to the 4-complex on the other side without changing the value of the state-sum. We are now ready to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4 *The state-sum $Z(M, \mathcal{T})$ is independent of the chosen triangulation \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. Recall that we have to prove two things: invariance under the 4D Pachner moves and invariance under permutation of the vertices of \mathcal{T} .

We first prove invariance under the Pachner moves. As explained above, the two simplicial 4-complexes that define a 4D Pachner move form the boundary of a 5-simplex together. Let us assume that this 5-simplex is (012345). By the local flatness conditions, the labeling of (012345) is uniquely determined by the labels on

$$(01), (12), (23), (34), (45)$$

and

$$(012), (013), (014), (015), (023), (024), (025), (034), (035), (045).$$

For short, let us call these labels g_1, \dots, g_5 and h_1, \dots, h_{10} , respectively.




Figure 1: $3 \rightleftharpoons 3$ Pachner move




Figure 2: $2 \rightleftharpoons 4$ Pachner move




Figure 3: $1 \rightleftharpoons 5$ Pachner move

We first prove the $3 \rightleftharpoons 3$ move. The partition function corresponding to the left-hand side of this move is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z(01235)Z(01345)Z(12345)W(1345) = \\
& \begin{aligned} & [(\iota_{g_5, g_4, g_3, h_1}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_7^{-1} h_9 h_5, h_1}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_7^{-1} h_9 h_5, g_2, g_1}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5, g_4, h_2^{-1} h_5 h_1, g_1}^2] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] \\ & \times [(\iota_{g_5, g_4, h_2}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_2}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, g_3, g_2, g_1}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5, h_3^{-1} h_8 h_2, g_1}^2] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] \\ & \times [(\iota_{g_5, g_4, h_2^{-1} h_5 h_1}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_2^{-1} h_5 h_1}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, g_3, g_2}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5, h_6^{-1} h_8 h_5, g_2}^2] \\ & \times [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2}] [\iota_{g_5; \alpha_{g_4, g_3, g_2}^0}^2]. \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

On the right-hand side we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& Z(02345)Z(01245)Z(01234)W(0234)W(0124) = \\
& \begin{aligned} & [(\iota_{g_5, g_4, h_5}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_5}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, g_3, g_2, g_1}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5, h_6^{-1} h_8 h_5, g_2, g_1}^2] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] \\ & \times [(\iota_{g_5, g_4, g_3, h_1}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_7^{-1} h_{10} h_6, h_1}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_7^{-1} h_{10} h_6, g_2, g_1}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5, h_3^{-1} h_6 h_1, g_1}^2] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] \\ & \times [(\iota_{g_4, g_3, h_1}^3)^{-1}] [\tau_{h_6^{-1} h_8 h_5, h_1}^{-1}] [(\iota_{h_6^{-1} h_8 h_5, g_2, g_1}^1)^{-1}] [\iota_{g_4, h_2^{-1} h_5 h_1, g_1}^2] [\pi_{g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] \\ & \times [\iota_{g_5; g_4; \alpha_{g_3, g_2, g_1}^0}^3] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8; \alpha_{g_3, g_2, g_1}^0}^{-1}] [\iota_{\alpha_{g_5, g_4, g_3; g_2; g_1}^0}^1] [\tau_{\alpha_{g_5, g_4, g_3; h_1}^0}^{-1}]. \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

Take the product of the left-hand side with the inverse of the right-hand side. After applying $(\rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ and $(\rightarrow \rightarrow \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$ and the analogous identities in 3.2 we see that this product reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{aligned} & [\tau_{h_7^{-1} h_9 h_5, h_1}^{-1}] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_2}^{-1}] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_2^{-1} h_5 h_1}^{-1}] \\ & \times [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2}] [\tau_{h_9^{-1} h_{10} h_8, h_5}^{-1}] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}^{-1}] [\tau_{h_7^{-1} h_{10} h_6, h_1}^{-1}] [\pi_{g_5, g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}^{-1}] \\ & \times [\tau_{h_6^{-1} h_8 h_5, h_1}^{-1}] [\pi_{g_4, g_3, g_2, g_1}^{-1}] [\iota_{g_5; \alpha_{g_4, g_3, g_2; g_1}^0}^2] [(\iota_{g_5; g_4; \alpha_{g_3, g_2, g_1}^0}^3)^{-1}] [(\iota_{\alpha_{g_5, g_4, g_3; g_2; g_1}^0}^1)^{-1}]. \end{aligned}
\end{aligned}$$

The tensorators, i.e., the τ 's, all cancel because of the relations in $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$. Finally we are left precisely with all the terms in relation $(\bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet \otimes \bullet)$, so we see that our big product is equal to 1.

Invariance under the $2 \rightleftharpoons 4$ move follows from the same calculations. The only difference is that some of the factors on the left-hand side now appear at the other side as inverses and vice versa. On the right-hand side of the $2 \rightleftharpoons 4$ move we have one more edge and four more faces than on the left-hand side;

in our picture these are the edge (14) and the faces (014), (124), (134), (145). Any label of (14) is already determined by the the labels of the other edges and the local flatness condition. We can choose the label of one of the extra faces freely, the labels of the other faces follow from the local flatness condition. This means that the product of the factors on the right-hand side equals $\#H$ times the product of the factors on the right-hand side. Since we normalized our state-sum with the factor $\#G^{-v_0}\#H^{v_0-v_1}$, we get the desired result.

The same kind of argument applies to the $1 \rightleftharpoons 5$ move. On one side of this move, the one with five arrows, we have one more vertex, five more edges, and ten more faces, than on the other side. The labels of one of the edges, and of four of the faces, can be chosen freely. The other extra labels are completely determined by local flatness. Again the normalization factor ensures invariance.

We now prove invariance under permutation of the vertices of \mathcal{T} . Since all permutations are products of transpositions of two consecutive vertices, we only have to show invariance under the latter. Let v_i and v_{i+1} be two consecutive vertices. There are three cases:

1. Both v_i and v_{i+1} are vertices of one 4-simplex.
2. They belong to different 4-simplices, which share a tetrahedron.
3. They belong to different 4-simplices, which do not share a tetrahedron.

In the third case invariance of our state-sum under any permutation of v_i and v_{i+1} follows immediately from the definition of the state-sum.

It is easy to reduce the second case to the third, thereby proving invariance for the second case. Suppose v_i belongs to the 4-simplex S_1 and v_{i+1} to S_2 , and S_1 and S_2 share a tetrahedron. Apply $1 \rightleftharpoons 5$ Pachner moves to S_1 and S_2 . This does not alter the value of the state-sum, as we have proved already. Now v_i and v_{i+1} belong to new 4-simplices, which do not share a tetrahedron. Interchange i and $i+1$. Since we are in the third case we know that the state-sum remains invariant. Finally apply $5 \rightleftharpoons 1$ Pachner moves to the new 4-simplices. This gives us back the old triangulation, but with v_i and v_{i+1} interchanged. Also in this last step the state-sum remains invariant, because the $5 \rightleftharpoons 1$ Pachner move is the inverse of the $1 \rightleftharpoons 5$ Pachner move. This proves invariance in the second case.

Finally it is not hard to reduce the first case to the second. Suppose v_i and v_{i+1} belong to the 4-simplex $(i(i+1)jkl)$. We can now insert a new

vertex, x , on the edge $(i(i+1))$, and perform an Alexander move of type I [1]:

$$(i(i+1)jkl) \mapsto (x(i+1)jkl) - (xijkl).$$

Since any state-sum that is invariant under Pachner moves is also invariant under Alexander moves and vice versa [33], the above move does not change our state-sum. In this new, but equivalent, triangulation v_i and v_{i+1} belong to two different 4-simplices, $(xijkl)$ and $(x(i+1)jkl)$, respectively, that share a tetrahedron, $(xjkl)$. Therefore interchanging i and $i+1$ does not change the value of the state-sum, because we are now in the situation of case 2. Performing the inverse of an Alexander move of type I now gives us the 4-simplex $((i+1)ijkl)$. Therefore we have showed invariance in the first case as well. This argument, that reduces the first case to the second, we found in [12], where it was copied from [24]. \square

Let us briefly explain the relation between our results and those obtained by Birmingham and Rakowski [11, 12, 13]. One nice consequence of our approach via 2-categories is that our construction generalizes several known constructions at once. For $H = \{1\}$, and $R = \mathbf{C}$, our partition function is defined by a 4-cocycle on G . Birmingham and Rakowski [13] show that for $G = \mathbf{Z}/n\mathbf{Z}$, with n a non-negative integer, the invariant is equal to Yetter's [40] untwisted invariant, because the product of the 4-cocycles is always equal to 1 for a closed 4-manifold.

We already showed that for $\#G = 1$ we get the Crane-Yetter [21, 19] invariants for finite groups. This case has been studied by Birmingham and Rakowski in [11] for $H = \mathbf{Z}/n\mathbf{Z}$, for n a non-negative integer, and $R = \mathbf{C}$. The model that they study corresponds to the case in which only τ in Definition 3.2 is non-trivial. They show that the partition function in their case can be obtained by evaluation of the intersection form defined on the second cohomology group of the simplicial complex \mathcal{T} that defines the triangulation, with coefficients in $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$, against the fundamental homology cycle of \mathcal{T} . In our context their definition of τ becomes:

$$\tau_{h_1, h_2} = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i k}{n} [h_1 h_2]\right).$$

Here $0 < k < n-1$ is an integer and $[h_1 h_2]$ is defined to be $h_1 h_2 \bmod n$. The h_i can be defined as the integers $0, \dots, n-1$. Birmingham and Rakowski also present explicit calculations of the state-sum for the complex projective

plane, \mathbf{CP}^2 , for $n = 2, 3$. The values they obtained are:

$$Z(\pm \mathbf{CP}^2) = 0 \quad \text{for } n = 2,$$

$$Z(\pm \mathbf{CP}^2) = \mp 3\sqrt{3}i \quad \text{for } n = 3.$$

This shows that the invariant is non-trivial.

In [12] Birmingham and Rakowski present a construction of a 4-manifold invariant that corresponds to ours for the case in which $G = H = \mathbf{Z}/n\mathbf{Z}$, with n a non-negative integer, and $R = \mathbf{C}$, and only ι^1 is taken to be non-trivial in Definition 3.2. In our context their definition of ι^1 becomes:

$$\iota_{h,g_1,g_2}^1 = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i k}{n^2} h(g_1 + g_2 - [g_1 + g_2])\right).$$

Here $0 < k < n^2$ is an integer and $[g_1 + g_2]$ is defined to be $g_1 + g_2 \bmod n$. Also in this definition we take g_i and h_i to be the integers $0, \dots, n-1$. In [12] Birmingham and Rakowski calculate the state-sum for $\mathbf{RP}^3 \times S^1$, S^4 , $S^3 \times S^1$, and $L(5, 1)$, a Lens space. We recall the values they obtained:

$$Z(\mathbf{RP}^3 \times S^1) = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 2^{\delta_2(k)} & \text{for } n \text{ even} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$Z(S^4) = 1,$$

$$Z(S^3 \times S^1) = 1,$$

$$Z(L(5, 1)) = \begin{cases} 5 \cdot 5^{\delta_5(k)} & \text{for } n \equiv 0 \pmod{5} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

The mod n delta function, δ_n , is defined by

$$\delta_n(k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{n} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

These computations show that the invariant is rather non-trivial. Birmingham and Rakowski [11] mention that it would be interesting to do similar computations for the case in which one multiplies the above mentioned partition functions, i.e., ι^1 and δ . In this paper we have set everything in a more general context, thereby providing one point of view for all the different models that Birmingham and Rakowski consider. In our partition function we

also have a factor ι^2 . Looking at Birmingham and Rakowski's examples it is not hard to find an example of ι^2 in the same context. We can define

$$\iota_{g_1, h, g_3}^2 = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i k}{n}[g_1 h g_3]\right).$$

One could take the product of τ , ι^1 , and ι^2 for the partition function, as a special case of our construction.

5 Postnikov systems

The relation between semi-weak monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ and Postnikov systems, as sketched in this section, is based on the conjecture that the definition of weak monoidal 2-categories as given in Definition 3.2 and the one we use in this section are 'equivalent'. Let us explain this briefly.

Several people [38, 4, 9] have suggested a definition of weak n -categories. Unfortunately the question whether these definitions are 'equivalent' is extremely subtle and has not been settled yet. The pitfalls of this question are nicely explained in [2, 4]. In this section we adopt Tamsamani's definition [38]. The reason for our choice is that Tamsamani follows an approach via simplicial sets which stays very close to the ideas coming from homotopy theory. Since we want to relate weak monoidal structures to Postnikov systems Tamsamani's setup is convenient here. Therefore our definition of a weak monoidal 2-category, in this section, is that of a weak 3-category with one object, in the sense of Tamsamani's definition [38]. Tamsamani shows that his definition of a category corresponds to the 'ordinary' definition. He also shows that his definition of a weak 2-category is equivalent to the definition of a bi-category as defined in [10], which is the definition that underlies Gordon, Power and Street's definition of a tri-category. It is therefore very reasonable to conjecture that a weak 3-category in the sense of Tamsamani's definition yields a tri-category and vice versa. However, the verification of this conjecture would take many pages, as can be seen from the length of Tamsamani's proof of the equivalence of the definitions of weak 2-categories and bi-categories. Therefore we do not attempt to prove the conjecture here. We mean this section to be motivational for the earlier parts of the paper and are, for that reason, also a little sketchy in this section.

All definitions of weak n -categories are complicated and inductive, so we do not wish to repeat Tamsamani's definition here. As a matter of fact we

only need a consequence of his results, which we explain now. In the second part of his PhD dissertation [38] Tamsamani realizes an idea that was first sketched by Grothendieck [28]. Tamsamani defines weak n -groupoids for any $n \in \mathbf{N}$, which are weak n -categories of which all morphisms are invertible up to varying degrees of equivalence, and shows that equivalence classes of weak n -groupoids correspond bijectively to homotopy classes of n -anticonnected CW-complexes. An n -anticonnected space is one for which all homotopy groups of order greater than n vanish. Here equivalence is again a very subtle matter. Under this correspondence equivalence classes of k -morphisms, with $0 \leq k \leq n$, correspond exactly to the elements of the k th-order homotopy group. Our definition of $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ is just the 'linearized' version of the totally disconnected strict groupoid that is completely determined by G , H , and R^* . Totally disconnected just means that there are no morphisms between different elements of G . In our case the action of G on H and R^* is trivial. Therefore, the equivalence classes of the structures of a weak monoidal 2-category, i.e., a weak 3-category with one object in the sense of Tamsamani's definition, on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ correspond bijectively to homotopy classes of CW-complexes of which the only non-vanishing homotopy groups are $\pi_1 = G$, $\pi_2 = H$, and $\pi_3 = R^*$, and for which the action of π_1 on π_2 and π_3 is trivial. We call spaces with the latter property > 1 -simple. This is analogous to the results stated in [35]. The proof in Quinn's paper of the analogous result for monoidal groupoids is essentially due to [8, 25, 26]. In this paper we put more emphasis on the connection with higher dimensional algebra.

We have showed that the classification of the structures of a monoidal 2-category on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ boils down to the classification up to homotopy of > 1 -simple CW-complexes E with $\pi_1(E) = G$, $\pi_2(E) = H$, $\pi_3(E) = R^*$, and all the other homotopy groups trivial. It is well known [14] that such a classification is obtained by the theory of Postnikov systems. Some people may not be familiar with this theory, so let us briefly sketch its key idea. Given an > 1 -simple n -anticonnected CW-complex X with $n \geq 1$, i.e., the action of π_1 on the higher homotopy groups is trivial and all homotopy groups of order greater than n are trivial, and an abelian group A , there is a one to one correspondence between the homotopy classes of > 1 -simple $n + 1$ -anticonnected CW-complexes Y of which all homotopy groups up to order n coincide with those of X and of which $\pi_{n+1}(Y)$ is equal to A , and homotopy classes of maps $\alpha: X \rightarrow K(A, n + 2)$. Here $K(A, n + 2)$ is the so called Eilenberg-MacLane space of order $n + 2$ with group A , of which

the only non-vanishing homotopy group is $\pi_{n+2} = A$. If A is finite, then $K(A, n+2)$ is equal to B_A^{n+2} . Here we define B_A to be the classifying space of A , which is a simplicial group itself, and we define inductively $B_A^n = B_{B_A^{n-1}}$. Given such a map α , one can take Y to be a CW-approximation of the principal fibration induced by α , and, conversely, one can prove that any Y of the aforementioned type is a CW-approximation of the principal fibration induced by such a map. Thus two maps $\alpha: B_G \rightarrow B_H^3$ and $\beta: W(\alpha) \rightarrow B_{R^*}^4$, where $W(\alpha)$ is a CW-approximation of the principal fibration induced by α , correspond to a > 1 -simple connected 3-anticonnected CW-complex E with $\pi_1(E) = G$, $\pi_2(E) = H$, and $\pi_3(E) = R^*$, that is unique up to homotopy. Since homotopy classes of maps $X \rightarrow K(A, n+2)$ correspond bijectively to cohomology classes in $H^{n+2}(X, A)$ (see [39]), we arrive at the following theorem:

Theorem 5.1 *The structures of a weak monoidal 2-category on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ correspond bijectively to pairs of cohomology classes $\alpha \in H^3(B_G, H)$ and $\beta \in H^4(W(\alpha), R^*)$.*

It would be very nice if we could derive the structural maps in Definition 3.2 directly from these cohomology classes. Unfortunately we have not been able to do this completely. It is clear that α represents the 0-associator, α^0 . It is also easy to obtain the 1-associator, α^1 , and the tensorator, τ . Let $i: B_H^2 \rightarrow W(\alpha)$ be the embedding of the fibre in the fibration, then $i^*: H^4(W(\alpha), R^*) \rightarrow H^4(B_H^2, R^*)$ defines the pull-back $i^*(\beta) \in H^4(B_H^2, R^*)$. Quinn [35] shows that the cohomology classes in $H^4(B_H^2, R^*)$ correspond bijectively to the equivalence classes of weak monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$, the R -linear category of which the objects are formal finite linear combinations of elements in H with non-negative integer coefficients. In our context these are exactly the weak monoidal structures on $\text{End}(I)$, the category of endomorphisms of the identity object. Quinn also shows that a 4-cocycle representing an element in $\mathbf{N}(H, R)$ consists of a 3-cocycle and a 2-cochain on H with values in R^* that satisfy the hexagon equations in Definition 3.2. The 3-cocycle represents the 1-associator, α^1 , and the 2-cochain represents the tensorator, τ . We do not know how to obtain the remaining maps and relations in Definition 3.2.

For any $\beta \in H^4(W(\alpha), R^*)$ we can define an invariant of compact closed oriented PL 4-manifolds in the same way as Quinn does in [36]. Given $f: M \rightarrow W(\alpha)$ one can evaluate the pull-back $f^*(\beta) \in H^4(M, R^*)$ on the

fundamental homology class of the 4-manifold and take a certain weighted sum over all homotopy classes of such maps. For a precise definition see [36]. We conjecture that these invariants are equal to our state-sum invariants.

6 Final remarks

First of all let us address the question of examples. We already mentioned at the end of Section 4 that Birmingham and Rakowski's [11, 12, 13] constructions can be seen as special cases of our construction. Therefore, their computations show that there are non-trivial examples of the kind of invariant that we describe in this paper. It remains to be seen if there are more examples. Section 5 indicates that there should be many more examples, since any homotopy 3-type theoretically provides one example. In [15] Brown has computed some homotopy 3-types using the theory of crossed N -cubes of groups. Hopefully his results will provide more concrete examples of our construction.

We can ask ourselves how powerful we can expect our state-sum invariants to be. By the 'conjectural' relation with Postnikov systems and the relation with Freed and Quinn's work in [26, 36] it seems that our invariants are homotopy invariants rather than PL invariants. Depending on one's point of view one can find this disappointing or encouraging. We take the latter point of view, because the TQFT programme, as sketched in [3], for example, remains still to be developed in dimension four. Any interesting examples of four dimensional TQFT's, even of a homotopic nature, are welcome at this stage of the development of the TQFT programme. For the case $G = 1$ and $H = \mathbf{Z}/n\mathbf{Z}$ Birmingham and Rakowski [11] have shown that the partition function can be obtained by the evaluation of the intersection form defined on the second cohomology group of the triangulation against the fundamental form of the manifold. It would be interesting to know if there are any relations between our invariants and other classical homotopy invariants.

There is another construction of 4-manifold invariants with finite groups: the Crane-Frenkel [18] construction for the categorification of the quantum double of a finite group. This has been worked out in detail by Carter, Kauffman, and Saito in [16]. It would be worthwhile to figure out the precise relation between that construction and ours. In [32] we conjectured that the 2-category of representations of an involutory Hopf category is a spherical 2-category, and that the Crane-Frenkel construction using involutory Hopf

categories and our construction using the 2-categories of representations of Hopf categories yield the same invariants. However, as mentioned in the introduction of this paper, we did assume that $\text{End}(I)$ is Vect in [32]. How the two constructions relate to one another when $\text{End}(I)$ is an arbitrary tortile category we do not know. This is certainly something to be investigated and a good point to start would be the case involving only finite groups.

Finally let us point out that there should be results, that are analogous to our results in this paper, for braided monoidal 2-categories. The general definition of these 2-categorical structures was first given by Kapranov and Voevodsky [29]. Later Baez and Neuchl [7] and Crans [22] corrected some flaws in that definition. In [3] Baez and Dolan conjecture that braided monoidal 2-categories are 4-categories with one object and one 1-morphism. Let us assume that this is true for a moment. In that case we see, from Tam-samani's [38, 37] results, that braided monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$ correspond to connected CW-complexes of which $\pi_2 = G$, $\pi_3 = H$, $\pi_4 = R^*$ are the only non-vanishing homotopy groups. By the theory of Postnikov systems we see that these CW-complexes are classified up to homotopy equivalence by two cohomology classes, $\alpha \in H^4(B_G, H)$ and $\beta \in H^5(W(\alpha), R^*)$. Note the shift in the order of the cohomology groups. It would be nice to work out concretely all the maps and relations that define braided monoidal structures on $\mathbf{N}(G, H, R)$, analogously to what we do in this paper, and write down the invariants that Baez and Langford [6, 5] defined. Also in that case it would be desirable to find arguments by which one can extract all these maps and relations directly from the cohomology classes.

7 Acknowledgements

First of all I want to thank my supervisor, Prof. L. Crane, for the many discussions we have had about the results that I present in this paper and his encouragement. I also want to thank Prof. D. Yetter and Prof. F. Quinn for helpful e-mail discussions. Prof. J. Baez I thank for his information about results in the theory of n -categories that are relevant to my work and Prof. T. Porter I thank for his information about relevant results in homotopy theory.

References

- [1] J.W. Alexander. The combinatorial theory of complexes. *Ann. Math.*, 31:292–, 1930.
- [2] J. Baez. An introduction to n -categories. In E. Moggi and G. Rosolini, editors, *7th Conference on Category Theory and Computer Science*, volume 1290 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Berlin, 1997. Springer-Verlag.
- [3] J. Baez and J. Dolan. Higher-dimensional algebra and topological quantum field theory. *J. of Math. Phys.*, 36:6073–6105, 1995.
- [4] J. Baez and J. Dolan. Higher-dimensional algebra III: n -Categories and the algebra of opetopes. *Adv. Math.*, 135:145–206, 1998.
- [5] J. Baez and L. Langford. Higher-dimensional algebra IV: 2-Tangles. to appear in *Adv. Math.*
- [6] J. Baez and L. Langford. 2-tangles. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 43:187–197, 1998.
- [7] J. Baez and M. Neuchl. Higher-dimensional algebra I: Braided monoidal 2-categories. *Adv. Math.*, 121:196–244, 1996.
- [8] C. Balteany, Z. Fiedorowicz, R. Schwänzl, and R. Vogt. Iterated monoidal categories. preprint 1998.
- [9] M. Batanin. Monoidal globular categories as a natural environment for the theory of weak n -categories. to appear in *Adv. Math.*
- [10] J. Bénabou. *Introduction to Bicategories*, volume 47 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 1–77. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
- [11] D. Birmingham and M. Rakowski. Discrete quantum field theories and the intersection form. *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, A9:2265–2271, 1994.
- [12] D. Birmingham and M. Rakowski. State sum models and simplicial cohomology. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 173:135–, 1995.
- [13] D. Birmingham and M. Rakowski. On Dijkgraaf-Witten type invariants. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 37:363–374, 1996.

- [14] G. E. Bredon. *Topology and Geometry*. Number 139 in Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 1993.
- [15] R. Brown. Computing homotopy types using crossed n -cubes of groups. In N. Ray and G. Walker, editors, *Proc. Adams Memorial Symposium on Algebraic Topology, Manchester 1990*, volume I, of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series 175*, pages 187–210. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [16] J. S. Carter, L. H. Kauffman, and M. Saito. Structures and diagrammatics of four dimensional topological lattice field theories. to appear in Adv. Math. preprint available as GT/9806023.
- [17] J. S. Carter, L. H. Kauffman, and M. Saito. Diagrammatics, singularities, and their algebraic interpretations. In *10th Brazilian Topology Meeting, São Carlos, July, 1996*, volume 13 of *Matemática Contemporânea*. Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática, 1997.
- [18] L. Crane and I. Frenkel. Four dimensional topological quantum field theory, hopf categories, and the canonical bases. *J. Math. Phys.*, 35:5136–5154, 1994.
- [19] L. Crane, L. H. Kauffman, and D. N. Yetter. State-sum invariants of 4-manifolds. *JKTR*, 6(2):177–234, 1997.
- [20] L. Crane and D. N. Yetter. Deformations of (bi)tensor categories. to appear in Cah. Top. Geom. Diff. Cat.
- [21] L. Crane and D. N. Yetter. A categorical construction of 4d topological quantum field theories. In L. H. Kauffman and R. A. Baadhio, editors, *Quantum Topology*, pages 131–138. World Scientific Press, 1993.
- [22] S. Crans. Generalized centers of braided and sylleptic monoidal 2-categories. to appear in Adv. Math., preprint available at <http://www-math.mpce.mq.edu.au/~crans/papers/papers.html>.
- [23] R. Dijkgraaf and E. Witten. Topological gauge theories and group cohomology. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 129(2):393–429, 1990.
- [24] G. Felder and O. Grandjean. On combinatorial three-manifold invariants. In H. Osborn, editor, *Low-Dimensional Topology and Quantum Field Theory*. Plenum Press, New York, 1993.

- [25] Z. Fiedorowicz. The symmetric bar construction. preprint.
- [26] Q. Freed and F. Quinn. Chern-Simons theory with finite gauge group. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 156:435–472, 1993.
- [27] R. Gordon, A. Powers, and R. Street. Coherence for tricategories. *Memoirs of the AMS*, 117(558):1–81, 1995.
- [28] A. Grothendieck. Pursuing stacks. unpublished manuscript, distributed from UCNW, Bangor, United Kingdom, 1983.
- [29] M. M Kapranov and V. A. Voevodsky. 2-Categories and Zamolodchikov tetrahedra equations. In *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, volume 56, Part 2, pages 177–260. AMS, Providence, 1994.
- [30] C. Kassel. *Quantum Groups*, volume 155 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [31] L. Langford. *2-Tangles as a Free Braided Monoidal 2-Category with Duals*. PhD thesis, UCR, 1997.
- [32] M. A. Mackaay. Spherical 2-categories and 4-manifold invariants. to appear in *Adv. Math.*
- [33] U. Pachner. P.L. homeomorphic manifolds are equivalent by elementary shellings. *Eu. J. Comb.*, 12:129–145, 1991.
- [34] T. Porter. TQFT’s from homotopy n -types. to appear in *J. Lon. Math. Soc.*, preprint available at <http://www.bangor.ac.uk/~mas013/publist.html>.
- [35] F. Quinn. Group categories and their field theories. preprint available as GT/9811047.
- [36] F. Quinn. *Lectures on Axiomatic Topological Quantum Field Theory*, volume 1 of *IAS/Park City Math. Series*, pages 325–453. AMS, 1995.
- [37] Z. Tamsamani. Equivalence de la théorie homotopique des n - groupoïdes et celle des espaces topologique n -tronqué. preprint available as alg-geom/9607010.

- [38] Z. Tamsamani. *Sur des Notions de n -Categorie et n -Groupoïde Non-Strictes Via des Ensembles Multi-Simpliciaux*. PhD thesis, Lab. de Top. Geom., Univ. P. Sabatier, Toulouse, 1995.
- [39] G. W. Whitehead. *Elements of Homotopy Theory*, volume 61 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1978.
- [40] D. N. Yetter. TQFT's from homotopy 2-types. *JKTR*, 2(1):113–123, 1993.