

# A 2-Site for Continuous 2-Group Actions

Michael Lambert

November 14, 2019

## Abstract

Elmendorf’s Theorem states that the category of continuous actions of a topological group is a Grothendieck topos in the sense that it is equivalent to a category of sheaves on a site. This paper offers a 2-dimensional generalization by showing that a certain 2-category of continuous actions of a topological 2-group is 2-equivalent to a 2-category of 2-sheaves on a suitable 2-site.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	2-Categories and Bicategories . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Continuous 2-Group Actions</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	2-Groups . . . . .	4
2.2	Actions . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>The Site for Continuous Group Actions</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Grothendieck Topologies and Sheaves . . . . .	8
3.2	Review of the Site for Continuous Group Actions . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>The 2-Site for Continuous 2-Group Actions</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	2-Sites and 2-Sheaves . . . . .	11
4.2	The Underlying 2-Category . . . . .	12
4.3	Technical Results . . . . .	13
4.4	The 2-Equivalence . . . . .	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Prospectus</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1 Introduction

The main result of this paper is a 2-dimensional version of A. D. Elmendorf’s theorem in [Elm83] showing that the category of continuous actions of a topological group on discrete spaces is a Grothendieck topos. The present purpose is to show that a certain 2-category of continuous actions of a topological 2-group on discrete 2-spaces is a “Grothendieck 2-topos” essentially as in [Str82b]. Only strict versions of the definitions of 2-group, action, and stabilizer are considered here. A follow-up paper will study the possibility of giving an analogous “bicategorical” result for the more general notions of “coherent” or perhaps “weak” 2-groups as in [BL04].

The version of Elmendorf’s Theorem followed here is the account in §III.9 of [MLM92]. More precisely, this shows that the category  $\mathbf{BG}$  of continuous actions of a topological group  $G$  on discrete spaces with equivariant maps between them is equivalent to a category of sheaves on a Grothendieck site. The underlying category of the site is basically the so-called “orbit category” associated to  $G$ , consisting of

certain coset spaces taken over the open subgroups of  $G$ , together with the “atomic topology” in which covering sieves are generated by the singletons. The generalization in this paper is the following, which appears as Theorem 4.19.

**Theorem.** *For any topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ , there is a 2-category  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  as yielding a 2-equivalence*

$$\mathfrak{Sh}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G}), J_{at}) \simeq \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$$

*between the 2-category  $\mathfrak{Sh}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G}), J_{at})$  of 2-sheaves on  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  for the atomic topology and the 2-category  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$  of continuous actions of  $\mathcal{G}$  on discrete 2-spaces.*

The important contents of the paper are summarized as follows. In §2.2 there is on offer a definition of a strict continuous action of a strict topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  on a (discrete) 2-space. Also proposed is a definition of an open sub-2-group of  $\mathcal{G}$  that will fit with the rest of the account. In §4.2 the 2-site  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is constructed as a sort of orbit 2-category of  $\mathcal{G}$ . This can be provided with the atomic topology on its underlying 1-category. In §4.4 the 2-category of 2-sheaves on this 2-site is seen in the main result of the paper – namely, Theorem 4.19 – to be 2-equivalent to the 2-category of continuous  $\mathcal{G}$ -actions.

The rest of this introduction is concerned with giving some background on 2-categories and bicategories needed throughout the paper. The goal is to be fairly explicit and self-contained so as to serve the backgrounds and interests of a diverse group of potential readers.

## 1.1 2-Categories and Bicategories

Throughout  $\mathbf{Cat}$  denotes the ordinary 1-category of small categories and functors between them. The basic viewpoint is that a 2-category is a  $\mathbf{Cat}$ -category, that is, a category enriched in  $\mathbf{Cat}$  in the sense of [Kel82]. The reference [KS74] gives a more elementary description of what this means. Roughly, a 2-category  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a category with further 2-cells  $\theta: f \Rightarrow g$  between arrows  $f, g: A \rightrightarrows B$ , two operations of “vertical” and “horizontal” composition of 2-cells, and finally suitable identity 2-cells for the compositions. Horizontal composition is denoted with ‘\*’ whereas all other compositions are denoted by juxtaposition. The 2-data satisfies a number of expected axioms, including a certain interchange law relating horizontal and vertical composition of 2-cells. The basic example is  $\mathfrak{Cat}$ , the 2-category of small categories, functors between them, and natural transformations. Horizontal composition of natural transformations

is given on components  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  by the formula

$$(\beta * \alpha)_C := \beta_{GC}H(\alpha_C) = K(\alpha_C)\beta_{FC}. \quad (1.1)$$

Denote the sets of objects, arrows and 2-cells of a small 2-category by  $\mathfrak{A}_0$ ,  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{A}_2$ , respectively. Every 2-category  $\mathfrak{A}$  has an underlying 1-category  $|\mathfrak{A}|$  consisting only of the objects and arrows. Every 1-category can be viewed as a “locally discrete” 2-category with only identity 2-cells between any two morphisms with the same domain and the same codomain. For any 2-category  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the 1-dimensional opposite  $\mathfrak{A}^{op}$  is obtained by formally reversing the morphisms, but not the 2-cells.

A 2-functor  $F: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  is a morphism of 2-categories  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Roughly, it is a functor of underlying 1-categories  $|F|: |\mathfrak{A}| \rightarrow |\mathfrak{B}|$  together with an assignment on 2-cells respecting the two compositions and

their identities. A 2-natural transformation  $\theta: F \Rightarrow G$  between 2-functors  $F, G: \mathfrak{A} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$  assigns to each  $A \in \mathfrak{A}_0$  an arrow  $\theta_A: FA \rightarrow GA$  such that for each  $f: A \rightarrow A'$  the usual naturality square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{\theta_A} & GA \\ Ff \downarrow & = & \downarrow Gf \\ FA' & \xrightarrow{\theta_{A'}} & GA' \end{array}$$

commutes and the following compatibility condition is satisfied:

**2-Natural Compatibility.** There is an equality in  $\mathfrak{B}$  of composite 2-cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{\theta_A} & GA \\ \left( \begin{array}{c} Ff \downarrow \\ \text{\scriptsize } F\alpha \Rightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ FA' \end{array} \right) & & \downarrow Gg \\ & \xrightarrow{\theta_{A'}} & GA' \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{\theta_A} & GA \\ Ff \downarrow & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{\scriptsize } G\alpha \Rightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ GA' \end{array} \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{\theta_{A'}} & GA' \end{array} \end{array}$$

for each 2-cell  $\alpha: f \Rightarrow g$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$  between arrows  $f, g: A \Rightarrow A'$ .

A 2-natural transformation  $\theta$  is a 2-natural isomorphism if each component  $\theta_A$  is an isomorphism in  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

A final layer of structure is given in the notion of a modification, originating in [Bén67]. This is a morphism  $m: \theta \Rightarrow \gamma$  of 2-natural transformations consisting of, for each  $A \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ , a 2-cell  $m_A: \theta_A \Rightarrow \gamma_A$  satisfying the following compatibility condition:

**Modification Condition.** There is an equality of 2-cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\gamma_A} & \\ FA & \xrightarrow{\uparrow m_A} & GA \\ \left( \begin{array}{c} Ff \downarrow \\ \theta_A \\ \downarrow \\ FA' \end{array} \right) & & \downarrow Gf \\ & \xrightarrow{\theta_{A'}} & GA' \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\gamma_A} & \\ FA & & GA \\ Ff \downarrow & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{A'}} & \downarrow Gf \\ & \left( \begin{array}{c} \uparrow m_{A'} \\ \theta_{A'} \end{array} \right) & GA' \end{array} \end{array}$$

for each arrow  $f: A \rightarrow A'$  of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

Throughout  $[\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}]$  denotes the 2-category of 2-functors  $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ , their 2-natural transformations, and modifications between them. In particular,  $[\mathfrak{A}^{op}, \mathbf{Cat}]$  will be considered the appropriate 2-dimensional analogue of the ordinary category of presheaves on a small 1-category. Throughout adopt a notational convention of [MLM92] used for presheaves by denoting the action  $Ff(X) = X \cdot f$  and similarly on morphisms, where  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is an arrow of  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $F: \mathfrak{A}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$  is a 2-functor.

Two 2-categories  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  are considered to be 2-equivalent if they are equivalent in the sense of  $\mathbf{Cat}$ -enriched categories as in §1.11 of [Kel82]. This is spelled out more explicitly in the following statement.

**Definition 1.1.** The 2-categories  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  are **2-equivalent** if there are 2-functors  $F: \mathfrak{A} \rightleftarrows \mathfrak{B}: G$  and 2-natural isomorphisms  $\eta: 1 \cong GF$  and  $\epsilon: FG \cong 1$ .

It is worth recalling briefly the definitions of 2-limits and 2-colimits. In particular, as in §3.1 of [Kel82], the 2-colimit of a 2-functor  $F: \mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \mathfrak{K}$  weighted by a 2-functor  $W: \mathfrak{J}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$  is an object  $W \star F$  of  $\mathfrak{K}$  fitting into an isomorphism of categories

$$\mathfrak{K}(W \star F, A) \cong [\mathfrak{J}^{op}, \mathbf{Cat}](W, \mathbf{Cat}(F, A)) \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{Cat}(F, A)$  denotes the 2-functor given by  $X \mapsto \mathbf{Cat}(FX, A)$  for  $X \in \mathfrak{J}_0$  and extended suitably to morphisms and 2-cells of  $\mathfrak{J}$ . The weight  $X \mapsto \mathbf{1}$  is the “trivial weight,” denoted again by  $\mathbf{1}$ . A 2-colimit with trivial weight is a “conical” colimit – basically a “boosted up” 1-dimensional colimit with a 2-dimensional aspect to its universal property.

*Remark 1.2.* One sometimes hears murmurings that the theory of  $\mathcal{V}$ -categories is an elaboration of 1-dimensional category theory and not properly 2-dimensional. Insofar as this is the case, there is some question as to whether a proper 2-dimensional generalization of Elmendorf’s Theorem can really be achieved with the machinery of  $\mathbf{Cat}$ -enriched theory recalled so far. Not only that, but the present account applies only to strict 2-groups with their strict monoidal structure. Thus, recall that a bicategory is like a 2-category where composition of morphisms is associative up to coherent isomorphism. The precise details are not important here and the full definition can be found for example in the original source, namely, [Bén67]. Instead a fully 2-dimensional redevelopment of Elmendorf’s theorem might consider coherent 2-groups in the sense of [BL04] and construct a bicategory of “bisheaves” or stacks to which a bicategory of continuous actions in an “up-to-isomorphism” sense would be biequivalent. Some remarks in the conclusion of this paper will discuss the possibility of such a result. For the moment, the  $\mathbf{Cat}$ -enriched version of this paper certainly holds for strict 2-groups. The result seems to be of some intrinsic interest, but also shows where there arise certain well-definition problems that can be solved in the strict case but likely not in the coherent case.

## 2 Continuous 2-Group Actions

Here is recalled the notion of a strict topological 2-group and given the definition of a continuous action on a category viewed as a discrete 2-space. For undefined categorical notions see [Mac98].

### 2.1 2-Groups

Recall that a group object in a finitely-complete category is an object of the category together with a group law morphism, an identity point and an inverse morphism, all satisfying diagrammatic versions of the usual group laws. A category object in a finitely-complete category consists of an object of objects, an object of arrows, various domain, codomain, composition and inverse arrows, all satisfying diagrammatic versions of the usual category axioms.

The pithy definition of a strict 2-group is that it is a group object in the category of small categories. But there are several well-known equivalent formulations. For example, it is well-established that 2-groups are essentially the same thing as so-called “crossed modules” as introduced in [Whi49]. This is basically Theorem 1 of [BB76]. But in a more abstract vein, it follows from the pithy definition that a 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  is also a groupoid. This seems first to have been proved in [BB76] as well. So, a 2-group could be defined as a group object in groupoids. By finite-limit arguments, a 2-group could also be seen as a category object in groups, or even a groupoid object in groups. The present development has settled around the category-object perspective.

**Definition 2.1.** A **2-Group** is a category object in the category of groups.

This means that a 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  is a pair of groups  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$  organized into a category. In particular,  $\mathcal{G}$  has an underlying category and the group laws  $\otimes_0$  and  $\otimes_1$  coming with  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$  yield a tensor bifunctor  $\otimes: \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  with a distinguished unit object  $I \in \mathcal{G}_0$  with distinguished identity arrow  $1_I$ . That the tensor is a bifunctor amounts to a so-called “interchange law,” namely, that

$$(g \otimes h)(k \otimes l) = gk \otimes hl \quad (2.1)$$

holds for suitably composable morphisms  $g$  and  $k$  on the one hand and  $h$  and  $l$  on the other. The tensor and unit make  $\mathcal{G}$  a strict monoidal category as in §VII.1 of [Mac98] in which every object and arrow has an inverse under the tensor. Write the inverses of objects  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$  and arrows  $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$  as  $A^{-1}$  and  $g^{-1}$ , respectively. Given an arrow  $g: A \rightarrow B$  of a 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ , the compositional inverse is

$$\bar{g} = 1_A \otimes g^{-1} \otimes 1_B \quad (2.2)$$

as can be seen using the interchange law 2.1.

*Remark 2.2.* Definition 2.1 gives a “strict” version of the idea of a 2-dimensional group. Such  $\mathcal{G}$  is a strict monoidal category. There are various ways of weakening the axioms. One is the notion of a “coherent” 2-group as described in §3 of [BL04]. Roughly speaking, a coherent 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  is a weak monoidal category in which every morphism is invertible and such that every object  $A$  is equipped with an adjoint equivalence  $\iota_A: I \rightarrow A \otimes \bar{A}$  and  $\epsilon_A: \bar{A} \otimes A \rightarrow I$ . However, in the present account, “2-group” will always mean one in the sense of Definition 2.1.

The point of the phrasing of Definition 2.1 is that it makes it easy to define categories of 2-groups with extra structure. Recall that a topological group is a group object in topological spaces.

**Definition 2.3.** A **topological 2-group** is a category object in the category of topological groups.

Thus, a 2-topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  consists of two topological groups  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$  together with continuous group homomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & & \xrightarrow{d_0} & \\ \mathcal{G}_2 & \xrightarrow{\quad \circ \quad} & \mathcal{G}_1 & \xleftarrow{i} & \mathcal{G}_0 \\ & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & & \xrightarrow{d_1} & \end{array}$$

satisfying the usual category axioms. The group laws  $\otimes_0: \mathcal{G}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\otimes_1: \mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$  are the underlying functors of the induced monoidal tensor  $\otimes: \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ .

*Remark 2.4.* The idea of a topological coherent 2-group is made precise in §7 of [BL04]. Following Definition 26 of the reference, a topological 2-group is taken to be a “2-group object” in the 2-category of category objects in, for example, topological spaces or perhaps  $k$ -spaces. For now, however, we stick to the strict notion of Definition 2.3.

**Definition 2.5.** A **topological sub-2-group** of a topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  is a subcategory  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  that is a 2-group under the operations of  $\mathcal{G}$  and such that  $\mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_1$  are open in  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , respectively.

*Remark 2.6.* This definition of an open sub-2-group fits with the approach that a topological 2-group is two topological groups organized into a category with suitable continuous group homomorphisms. Additionally, each stabilizer as in Example 2.9 below is an open sub-2-group in this sense. However, this definition might be too strict. For example, the notion of the stabilizer of an action as defined by a *pseudo*-pullback as in Remark 2.10 below is not a sub-2-group in this sense. It seems, rather, what is needed in this case is that the “inclusion”  $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  is merely a faithful functor. This point will be addressed in future work.

The open sub-2-groups of a topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  as in Definition 2.5 comprise a poset category under inclusion. Denote this category by  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$ . Usually  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  will be viewed as a locally discrete 2-category.

## 2.2 Actions

Actions of (coherent) 2-groups on so-called (smooth) “2-spaces” were studied in Bartel’s Thesis [Bar04]. These were axiomatized in an “up-to-isomorphism” sense using a certain codescent condition. Strict actions of 2-groups on categories have been considered more recently, for example, in §3 of [MP15] and applied in [MP19]. These deal with strict 2-groups and what might be thought of a strict actions. These notions can be easily topologized using the diagrammatic phrasing of their definitions.

As set up, first recall that for an ordinary topological group  $G$ , a continuous action on a set  $X$ , provided with the discrete topology, is a continuous function  $m: X \times G \rightarrow X$  satisfying the usual associativity and unit conditions. A morphism of continuous actions  $X$  and  $Y$  is a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  that is equivariant in the sense that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times G & \xrightarrow{m} & X \\ 1 \times f \downarrow & = & \downarrow f \\ Y \times G & \xrightarrow{n} & Y \end{array}$$

commutes. Throughout use  $\mathbf{BG}$  to denote the category of continuous right  $G$ -actions.

As in, for example, §V.6 of [MLM92], the axioms for such actions make sense in any category with finite limits. So, for the following, consider a given small category  $\mathcal{X}$  as a category object in topological spaces with the sets of objects and morphisms each provided with the discrete topology. In this way, the category  $\mathcal{X}$  is viewed as a “discrete 2-space.”

**Definition 2.7.** A **right action** of a 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  on a category  $\mathcal{X}$  is a functor  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  satisfying diagrammatic versions of the usual action axioms. If  $\mathcal{G}$  is a topological 2-group, an action is continuous if each of the underlying set functions  $M_0: \mathcal{X}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_0$  and  $M_1: \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1$  is continuous.

Such actions, together with  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant morphisms and 2-cells between them satisfying a compatibility condition, form a 2-category, denoted by  $\mathfrak{BG}$ . The condition is the following:

**Action 2-Cell Compatibility.** There is an equality of 2-cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{M} & \mathcal{X} \\ H \times 1 \left( \begin{array}{c} \theta \times i \\ \Rightarrow \end{array} \right) & & \downarrow K \\ \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{N} & \mathcal{Y} \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{M} & \mathcal{X} \\ H \times 1 \downarrow & & H \left( \begin{array}{c} \theta \\ \Rightarrow \end{array} \right) \\ \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{N} & \mathcal{Y} \end{array}$$

for discrete 2-spaces  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  with given continuous actions  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  and  $N: \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  as in Definition 2.7 and  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant morphisms  $H, K: \mathcal{X} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{Y}$ .

Throughout write  $X \cdot A = M(X, A)$  and similarly on arrows to cut down on notation. Notice that, with  $X \in \mathcal{X}_0$  fixed, there is an induced functor

$$X \cdot (-): \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$$

given by  $A \mapsto X \cdot A$  on objects and by  $f \mapsto 1_X \cdot f$  on morphisms. This is continuous at the level of objects and at the level of morphisms. Similarly, for each morphism  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  of  $\mathcal{X}$ , there is a functor

$$m \cdot (-): \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^2$$

where  $\mathcal{X}^2$  denotes the arrow category of  $\mathcal{X}$ . This functor is given by  $A \mapsto m \cdot 1_A$  on objects and by  $g \mapsto m \cdot g$  viewed as a square in the arrow category using the bifunctor condition for the action.

*Remark 2.8.* The appropriate “up to isomorphism” version of the definition, roughly speaking, will be the following. An action of a coherent 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$  on a category  $\mathcal{X}$  is a functor  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  together with an isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{M \times 1} & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \\ \downarrow 1 \times \otimes & \cong & \downarrow M \\ \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{M} & \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

satisfying a “codescent” coherence condition for associativity and a unit condition, formally resembling the pseudo-algebra coherence laws of [Lac02]. This is basically the approach taken in Bartel’s Thesis [Bar04] for actions on 2-spaces axiomatized as category objects in smooth manifolds.

**Example 2.9** (Stabilizer Sub-2-Groups). The first pass on the definition of the stabilizer of a morphism  $m \in \mathcal{X}_1$  under a (continuous) action  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is that it is the category with objects  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$  such that  $m \cdot 1_A = m$  holds and arrows those  $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$  such that  $m \cdot g = m$  holds. Note that this computes the (strict) pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Stab}(m) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow m \\ \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{m \cdot -} & \mathcal{X}^2 \end{array}$$

taken in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ . The stabilizer of an object  $X \in \mathcal{X}_0$  has as objects those  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$  such that  $X \cdot A = X$  holds and as arrows those  $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$  with  $1_X \cdot g = 1_X$ . This computes the strict pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Stab}(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow X \\ \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{X \cdot -} & \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

taken in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ . Each stabilizer is an open sub-2-group in the sense of Definition 2.5 if the action is continuous. Notice that  $\mathbf{Stab}(X) \cong \mathbf{Stab}(1_X)$  holds for each object  $X \in \mathcal{X}_0$ .

*Remark 2.10.* For the present purposes, the definition above is fine. However, the correct version for coherent 2-groups will need to be given in the “up to isomorphism” sense. The following is inspired by the discussion at [Cor09]. The stabilizer of an object  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  under the action  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  of a coherent 2-group will be given by the pseudo-pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Stab}(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow & \cong & \downarrow X \\ \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{X \cdot -} & \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

taken in  $\mathbf{Cat}$ . Since  $X: \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is faithful and faithful functors are stable under pseudo-pullback, the induced functor from the stabilizer to  $\mathcal{G}$  is faithful. Additionally, the images of the underlying sets of objects and of morphisms in the stabilizer are open in  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , respectively. Thus,  $\mathbf{Stab}(X)$  will be an open sub-2-group in a sense modifying slightly that of Definition 2.5.

**Example 2.11** (Fixed Points of Action of Open Sub-2-Group). Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  acts continuously on the right of  $\mathcal{X}$  viewed as a discrete 2-space. Let  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  denote an open sub-2-group as in Definition 2.5. Let  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}}$  denote the subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}$  having objects those  $X \in \mathcal{X}_0$  such that  $X \cdot U = X$  for all  $U \in \mathcal{U}_0$  and  $1_X \cdot g = 1_X$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$  and with arrows those  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $f \cdot 1_U = f$  for all  $U \in \mathcal{U}_0$ .

**Lemma 2.12.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  acts continuously on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The correspondence*

$$\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}}$$

*extends to a functor  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ .*

*Proof.* The assignment on arrows is given by restriction since whatever is fixed by the action of an open sub-2-group is certainly fixed by any open sub-2-group contained it it.  $\square$

### 3 The Site for Continuous Group Actions

Here we review Elmendorf’s Theorem in [Elm83] showing that continuous group actions can be organized into a Grothendieck topos. The reference used for sheaf theory and toposes is Chapter III of [MLM92].

#### 3.1 Grothendieck Topologies and Sheaves

A sieve on an object  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  is a set of arrows  $S$  with codomain  $C$  satisfying the closure condition that if  $f \in S$  and  $fg$  is defined, then  $fg \in S$  holds too. Equivalently, a sieve  $S$  on  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  is a subfunctor of the canonical representable functor  $\mathbf{y}C: \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ .

**Definition 3.1.** A **Grothendieck topology**  $J$  assigns to each object  $U \in \mathcal{C}$  a set of sieves  $J(U)$  on  $U$  in such a way that

1. the total sieve  $\{f \in \mathcal{C}_1 \mid d_1 f = U\}$  on  $U$  is in  $J(U)$ ;
2. if  $S$  is in  $J(U)$  and  $h: V \rightarrow W$  is any arrow, then the pullback  $h^*S$  sieve is in  $J(d_0 h)$ ;
3. if  $S$  is in  $J(U)$  and  $R$  is any sieve on  $U$  such that  $h^*R \in J(W)$  holds for any arrow  $h: V \rightarrow U$  of  $S$ , then  $R$  is in  $J(U)$  too.

The objects of  $J(U)$  are called “covering sieves” or just “coverings” or even “covers.” A site is a pair  $(\mathcal{C}, J)$  for a small category  $\mathcal{C}$  and a topology  $J$ .

Every set of arrows with codomain  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  generates a sieve on  $C$ . Grothendieck topologies are often defined by giving certain distinguished “basis subsets” of arrows whose generated sieves then generate a topology under appropriate conditions.

**Example 3.2.** The atomic topology is that given by

$$JC = \{S \mid S \text{ is a nonempty sieve on } C\}.$$

For this definition to satisfy the axioms of Definition 3.1, any cospan of  $\mathcal{C}$  must admit a span making a commutative square as indicated by the dashed arrows in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \overset{\text{-----}}{\longrightarrow} & \cdot \\ & \text{=} & \downarrow \\ \cdot & \overset{\text{-----}}{\longrightarrow} & \cdot \end{array}$$

This is called the “Right Ore Condition” in [Joh01] and [Joh02]. Evidently this condition holds, for example, if  $\mathcal{C}$  has pullbacks. The atomic topology has as a basis the sieves generated by singletons.



**Definition 3.3.** Let  $F: \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  denote a presheaf. A **matching family** for  $F$  on a cover  $S$  of  $C \in \mathcal{C}_0$  is a natural transformation  $\theta: S \rightarrow F$  viewing  $S$  as a subfunctor of  $\mathbf{y}C$ . Denote the image of the arrow  $f: B \rightarrow C$  in  $S$  under  $\theta_C: SC \rightarrow FC$  by  $x_f$ .

**Definition 3.4.** A presheaf  $F: \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a **sheaf** for  $J$ , or a  $J$ -sheaf, if every matching family on any object  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  has a unique amalgamation, namely, a unique element  $x \in FC$  such that  $Ff(x) = x_f$  for each covering arrow  $f: B \rightarrow C$ . A Grothendieck topos is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equivalent to a category of sheaves on a site  $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, J)$ .

*Remark 3.5.* The statement of the sheaf condition in Definition 3.4 is just that pullback by  $m: S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$ , a covering sieve, induces an bijection of hom-sets

$$[\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathbf{Set}](\mathbf{y}C, F) \cong [\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathbf{Set}](S, F) \quad (3.1)$$

where  $[\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathbf{Set}]$  denotes the 1-category of presheaves on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *A presheaf  $F: \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a sheaf for the atomic topology on  $\mathcal{C}$  if, and only if, for any  $x \in FC$  and any arrow  $f: C \rightarrow D$  such that  $Fh(x) = Fk(x)$  holds for all diagrams*

$$B \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{h} \\ \xrightarrow{k} \end{array} C \xrightarrow{f} D$$

*satisfying  $fh = fk$ , there is a unique  $y \in FD$  such that  $Ff(y) = x$ .*

*Proof.* See III.4.2 of [MLM92]. □

*Remark 3.7.* The condition of Lemma 3.6 is a well-definition condition as is seen in the proof in the reference. This will reappear in dimension 2 in the proofs of Propositions 4.16 and 4.18.

### 3.2 Review of the Site for Continuous Group Actions

A textbook account of Elmendorf’s result with some simplifications appears, for example, in §III.9 of [MLM92]. The development here points out a few subtleties for the 2-group generalization.

Throughout let  $G$  denote a topological group with  $e \in \mathcal{G}$  its unit element; and  $\mathbf{BG}$ , the category of continuous right  $G$ -actions on discrete topological spaces  $X$  and  $G$ -equivariant maps between them. Call the objects of  $\mathbf{BG}$  “continuous (right)  $G$ -sets.”

For such a  $G$ -set  $X$  and an open subgroup  $U \subset G$ , let  $X^U$  denote the set of  $U$ -fixed points, namely,

$$X^U = \{x \in X \mid xg = x \text{ for all } g \in U\}. \quad (3.2)$$

The right cosets of  $U$  are sets of the form

$$Ug = \{ug \mid u \in U\}$$

for  $g \in G$ . Cosets  $Ux$  and  $Uy$  are equal if, and only if,  $xy^{-1} \in U$  holds. Now, the “orbit space of right cosets” is  $G/U = \{Ug \mid g \in G\}$ . This is characterized in the following way.

**Lemma 3.8.** *The orbit of cosets  $G/U$  as above is the coequalizer*

$$U \times G \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\pi} \\ \xrightarrow{- \otimes -} \end{array} G \dashrightarrow G/U$$

*taken in  $\mathbf{Set}$  where the group law is restricted to  $U$  via the inclusion  $U \subset G$ .*

*Remark 3.9.* The quotient topology on  $G/U$  turns out to be discrete since  $U$  is open in  $G$ . Each orbit space of cosets admits a continuous right action of  $G$ , making it an object of  $\mathbf{BG}$ . The action is given by right multiplication on representatives  $(Ux) \cdot g = Uxg$ .

Now it is appropriate to introduce the underlying category of the site for  $\mathbf{BG}$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}(G)$  denote the following category. Objects are coset spaces  $G/U$  for  $U \subset G$  open subgroups. Arrows  $G/U \rightarrow G/V$  are objects  $g \in G$  for which the inclusion  $U \subset g^{-1}Vg$  holds. This inclusion is equivalent to the statement that the map  $G/U \rightarrow G/V$  given by  $Ux \mapsto Vgx$  is well-defined. Identities are thus represented by the neutral element  $e \in G$ . Composition is  $G$ -multiplication.

Equip  $\mathbf{S}(G)$  with the atomic topology as in Example 3.2. The main result is the following.

**Theorem 3.10** (Elmendorf [Elm83]). *There is an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathbf{BG} \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(\mathbf{S}(G), J_{at})$$

where  $J_{at}$  denotes the atomic topology on  $\mathbf{S}(G)$ .

The full proof followed here appears in §III.9 of [MLM92]. However, some comments are in order to guide the categorification in §4. The functor

$$\Phi: \mathbf{BG} \rightarrow [\mathbf{S}(G)^{op}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

takes a continuous  $G$ -set  $X$  to the representable presheaf  $\mathbf{BG}(-, X): \mathbf{S}(G)^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ . On the other hand, the functor

$$\Psi: [\mathbf{S}(G)^{op}, \mathbf{Set}] \rightarrow \mathbf{BG}$$

takes a presheaf  $F$  on  $\mathbf{S}(G)$  to the colimit

$$\lim_{\rightarrow U} F(G/U)$$

taken in  $\mathbf{Set}$  over all open subgroups  $U \subset G$ . This is well-defined because the colimit admits a continuous right action of  $G$ . For the colimit is filtered, hence computable (as in §2.13 of [Bor94a]) as a set of germ-like equivalence classes  $[U, x]$  for  $x \in F(G/U)$  under the relation  $(U, x) \sim (V, y)$  if, and only if, there is an open subgroup  $W \subset U \cap V$  such that  $x \cdot e = y \cdot e$  holds in  $F(G/W)$ . The action is then given by declaring  $[U, x] \cdot g = [g^{-1}Ug, x \cdot g]$ .

Now, let us consider an outline of the equivalence. For each continuous  $G$ -set  $X$ , there is always a  $G$ -equivariant isomorphism

$$X \cong \lim_{\rightarrow} \mathbf{BG}(-, X) \tag{3.3}$$

since  $\mathbf{BG}(-, X)$  can be computed as the set of  $U$ -fixed points, namely, as

$$\mathbf{BG}(G/U, X) \cong X^U \tag{3.4}$$

naturally in  $U$ . The isomorphism 3.3 is natural in  $X$  and thus yields one half of the equivalence. On the other hand, if  $F$  is a sheaf for the atomic topology, then there are natural isomorphisms

$$F(G/U) \cong \mathbf{BG}(G/U, \lim_{\rightarrow V} F(G/V)). \tag{3.5}$$

This follows first by using the isomorphism in Equation 3.4. From the colimit computation, the induced map can be seen to be always injective, and to be surjective whenever  $F$  is a sheaf by the criterion of Lemma 3.6. Thus, restricting to the presheaves that are sheaves, the desired equivalence is obtained.

## 4 The 2-Site for Continuous 2-Group Actions

This section gives three preliminary subsections of definitions and results necessary to prove the main theorem of the paper, namely, Theorem 4.19. First in §4.1 is reviewed the appropriate notion of “2-dimensional sheaf.” Following this in §4.2 is the construction of the underlying 2-category of the 2-site for  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ . And §4.3 includes the necessary technical preliminaries for the main theorem.

### 4.1 2-Sites and 2-Sheaves

Topologies and sites in dimension 2 were probably first considered in Street’s papers [Str82b] and [Str82a]. Here we nearly follow the presentation of the former, as it gives the correct setting for the strict 2-groups considered here. Development for coherent 2-groups will be based on the account of 2- and bisites in terms of “coverages” as in §C2 of [Joh02] and their “up to isomorphism” generalization at [nLa19].

**Definition 4.1** (Cf. §3.1 [Str82b]). A **sieve** on an object  $C \in \mathfrak{C}_0$  is a pointwise injective-on-objects and faithful 2-natural transformation  $S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$ . A **topology** on a 2-category  $\mathfrak{C}$  is a collection of such sieves that constitute a Grothendieck topology, as in Definition 3.1, on 1-category  $|\mathfrak{C}|$  underlying  $\mathfrak{C}$ . A 2-site is a 2-category  $\mathfrak{C}$  together with a topology  $J$ , displayed as  $(\mathfrak{C}, J)$ .

*Remark 4.2.* In the reference, Street defines a sieve on such an object  $C$  to be an chronic arrow  $S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$  in  $[\mathfrak{C}^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}]$ , that is, a pointwise injective-on-objects and fully faithful 2-natural transformation  $S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$ . This definition, however, does not work for the present example of the site for continuous 2-group actions. For requiring “full” as a part of the definition would rule out the following example as a topology. Additionally, the requirement would cause the proof of the technical result Proposition 4.16 to fail.

**Example 4.3.** The **atomic topology** on a 2-category  $\mathfrak{C}$  is given by taking as basis families on  $C \in \mathfrak{C}_0$  the singletons  $\{f: D \rightarrow C\}$  over all arrows  $f: D \rightarrow C$  with codomain  $C$ . For this it must be supposed that each cospan completes to a commutative square as in Example 3.2. Thus, in this case, covering sieves are those generated by singletons. That is, if  $C \in \mathfrak{C}_0$  is an object, the covering sieve generated by  $f: D \rightarrow C$  consists of all arrows  $g: B \rightarrow C$  factoring through  $f$  by some  $k: B \rightarrow D$ . A morphism of such arrows  $g$  and  $h$  is a 2-cell  $\alpha: g \Rightarrow h$  that factors through  $f$  via another 2-cell say  $\beta: k \rightarrow l$  in the sense that  $f * \beta = \alpha$  holds where  $k$  and  $l$  factor  $g$  and  $h$  through  $f$ , respectively. A 2-category equipped with the atomic topology is called an atomic 2-site. Notice that requiring “full” would not work here because not every 2-cell with codomain  $C$  will factor through  $f$  unless  $f$  is representably full.

The notion of “2-sheaf” used here is essentially that of §3.1 of [Str82b]. It is a “2-ified,” or more specifically “enriched,” version of 3.1.

**Definition 4.4** (Cf. §3.1 [Str82b]). A **2-sheaf** for 2-site  $(\mathfrak{C}, J)$  is a 2-functor  $F: \mathfrak{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$  such that for any covering sieve  $S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$  on any object  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ , there is induced an isomorphism of categories

$$[\mathfrak{C}^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}](\mathbf{y}C, F) \cong [\mathfrak{C}^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}](S, F) \quad (4.1)$$

given by pulling back along  $S \rightarrow \mathbf{y}C$ . Let  $\mathfrak{Sh}(\mathfrak{C}, J)$  denote the 2-category of 2-sheaves on the 2-site  $(\mathfrak{C}, J)$  together with 2-natural transformations and their modifications.

Think of the 2-natural transformations on the right side of 4.1 as “compatible data on the cover  $S$ .” Note that if  $(\mathfrak{C}, J)$  is any site, then each  $X \in FC$  for  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  determines compatible object data on any covering sieve  $S$  on  $C$ . This is given by taking  $X_f$  to be  $Ff(X)$  for each  $f \in S$ . Similarly for arrows of  $FC$ . A crucial technical result to be used later is the following.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(\mathfrak{C}, J)$  denote an atomic 2-site and  $F$  a 2-sheaf. For each  $f: C \rightarrow D$ , the induced functor  $Ff: FD \rightarrow FC$  is injective-on-objects and faithful.*

*Proof.* Any two  $X, Y \in F(D)_0$  for which  $X \cdot f = Y \cdot f$  holds determine the same data on the covering sieve generated by  $\{f: C \rightarrow D\}$ . Thus,  $X = Y$  holds. A similar argument shows that  $Ff$  is faithful.  $\square$

## 4.2 The Underlying 2-Category

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  denote a topological 2-group as in Definition 2.3. The goal is to define the underlying 2-category  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  of a proposed 2-site for  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  denote an open sub-2-group of  $\mathcal{G}$  as in Definition 2.5. The groups  $A^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0A$  and  $1_{A^{-1}}\mathcal{U}_11_A$  with operations inherited from  $\mathcal{G}$  yield an open sub-2-group denoted simply by  $A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A$ .*

*Proof.* The conjugate subgroups  $A^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0A$  and  $1_{A^{-1}}\mathcal{U}_11_A$  are open in  $\mathcal{G}_0$  and in  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , respectively. The subgroup and 2-group structure of  $A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A$  is inherited from that of  $\mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

Define  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  to be the category whose objects are cosets  $\mathcal{U}_0A$  for  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$  and whose arrows are cosets  $\mathcal{U}_1g$  for  $g \in \mathcal{G}_1$ . In other words, declare

$$(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_0 := \mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{U}_0 \quad (\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_1 := \mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{U}_1.$$

Thus, if  $g: A \rightarrow B$  denotes an arrow of  $\mathcal{G}$ , then the domain of  $\mathcal{U}_1g$  is  $\mathcal{U}_0A$  while the codomain is  $\mathcal{U}_0B$ . These assignments are well-defined, for if  $h: C \rightarrow D$  has  $\mathcal{U}_1g = \mathcal{U}_1h$ , then  $gh^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}_1$ , so that  $A \otimes C^{-1}, B \otimes D^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}_0$ , since  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  is a subcategory. The identity on  $\mathcal{U}_0A$  is  $\mathcal{U}_11_A$ , which is well-defined again since  $\mathcal{U}$  is a subcategory. Composition is defined to be the coset of the  $\mathcal{G}$ -composition of arbitrary representatives. This is well-defined by the interchange law 2.1 in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Now,  $\mathcal{G}$  acts continuously on the right of each coset category  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$ . For this, consider the ordinary actions on the underlying sets given by

$$\mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{U}_0 \times \mathcal{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{U}_0 \quad (\mathcal{U}_0A, B) \mapsto \mathcal{U}_0(A \otimes B) \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{U}_1 \quad (\mathcal{U}_1g, h) \mapsto \mathcal{U}_1(g \otimes h). \quad (4.3)$$

Each is a continuous action of a group on a set. So, it remains only to see that these functions are the underlying functions of a functor  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ . The domain, codomain and identity laws hold by the construction of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  as a category. That composition is preserved follows from the interchange law in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *If  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open sub-2-group of  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $\mathcal{G}$  acts continuously on the right of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  in the sense of Definition 2.7. Additionally,  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  is an object of  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement was proved in the discussion above. The topologies on each of the sets  $\mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{U}_1$  are discrete because  $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_1$  are open subgroups.  $\square$

**Construction 4.1.** Now, define the underlying 2-category. Objects of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  will be those categories  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  over the open sub-2-groups  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$ . A morphism  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$  will be an object  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$  such that the containments

$$\mathcal{U}_0 \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{V}_0A \quad \mathcal{U}_1 \subset 1_{A^{-1}}\mathcal{V}_11_A \quad (4.4)$$

both hold, i.e. that  $\mathcal{U} \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A$  holds as open sub-2-groups of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The containment is equivalent to requiring that the assignments between ordinary coset spaces

$$\mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{U}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_0/\mathcal{V}_0, \quad \mathcal{U}_0X \mapsto \mathcal{V}_0(A \otimes X) \quad (4.5)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{U}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1/\mathcal{V}_1, \quad \mathcal{U}_1g \mapsto \mathcal{V}_1(1_A \otimes g) \quad (4.6)$$

are well-defined. Each  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$  satisfying the well-definition condition  $\mathcal{U} \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A$  is indeed a functor. Accordingly, each  $g: A \rightarrow B$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  inducing a 2-cell  $g: A \Rightarrow B$  of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  ought to be a natural transformation. The definition of the  $\mathcal{U}_0X$ -component will be

$$g_{\mathcal{U}_0X} := \mathcal{V}_1g \otimes 1_X. \quad (4.7)$$

Provided this is well-defined, naturality follows by the bifunctor condition for  $\otimes: \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ . Well-definition is equivalent to the statement

$$(X \in \mathcal{U}_0) \text{ implies that } (g \otimes 1_X \otimes g^{-1} \in \mathcal{V}_1). \quad (4.8)$$

Thus, take the 2-cells of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  to be those  $g: A \Rightarrow B$  given by 4.7 and satisfying the well-definition condition 4.8. Composition of morphisms  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$  and  $B: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}$  is defined to be  $B \otimes A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}$ . Horizontal composition of 2-cells in  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is defined to be the tensor in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Well-definition follows by the bifunctor condition and the assumed well-definition conditions. Vertical composition is defined using the composition in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Well-definition follows again by the bifunctor condition and the fact that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a subcategory.

**Lemma 4.8.** *The data and operations of the discussion above make  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  a 2-category.*

*Proof.* Associativity and unit laws of each composition, as well as the interchange law relating the two 2-cell compositions, are all inherited from the corresponding properties of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Notice that if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a weak monoidal category, then  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  will be a bicategory and not a (strict) 2-category.  $\square$

Note that each morphism  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant and that each  $g: A \Rightarrow B$  satisfies the 2-cell compatibility condition 2.2. Thus, each morphism of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is a morphism of  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$  and each 2-cell of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is one of  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ .

Now, by construction, every morphism of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  is basically a pair of surjective set functions. For this reason, thinking of surjectivity as “covering,” declare those sieves on objects of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  to be covering that are generated by singletons. This is a topology on  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  because the Right Ore Condition of Example 3.2 is satisfied in a manner similar to the ordinary 1-category  $S(G)$  for a topological group  $G$ .

### 4.3 Technical Results

Throughout  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  denotes the poset of open sub-2-groups of  $\mathcal{G}$ , viewed as a locally discrete 2-category. Let  $F: \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$  denote a 2-functor with  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  as in Construction 4.1.

**Construction 4.2** (Colimit Category). Construct what will be a category

$$\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) \quad (4.9)$$

in the following way. Take as a set of objects

$$(\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}))_0 := \lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_0 \quad (4.10)$$

and as a set of arrows

$$(\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}))_1 := \lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_1 \quad (4.11)$$

with each colimit taken over  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  in the category of sets. These are filtered colimits. Thus, by the computation of §2.13 of [Bor94a], these sets are described in terms of certain equivalence relations. Objects are equivalence classes of pairs  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$  with  $X \in F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_0$  under the relation

$$(\mathcal{U}, X) \sim (\mathcal{V}, Y) \quad \text{if, and only if} \quad \exists \mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V} \text{ such that } X \cdot I = Y \cdot I. \quad (4.12)$$

Similarly, arrows are equivalence classes  $[\mathcal{U}, m]$  with  $m \in F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_1$  under the relation

$$(\mathcal{U}, m) \sim (\mathcal{V}, n) \quad \text{if, and only if} \quad \exists \mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V} \text{ such that } m \cdot I = n \cdot I. \quad (4.13)$$

Take the domain of an arrow  $[\mathcal{U}, m]$  with  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  to be  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$  and the codomain to be  $[\mathcal{U}, Y]$ . The identity on  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$  is taken to be  $[\mathcal{U}, 1_X]$ . Composition of  $[\mathcal{U}, n]$  and  $[\mathcal{V}, m]$  with  $[\mathcal{U}, \text{dom}n] = [\mathcal{V}, \text{cod}m]$  is taken to be  $[\mathcal{W}, (n \cdot I)(m \cdot I)]$  for any  $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}$ . This is independent of  $\mathcal{W}$  and the choice of representatives.

**Proposition 4.9.** *If  $F: \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$  is a 2-functor, then, with objects and arrows as in 4.10 and 4.11 and with operations as described in the discussion above,*

$$\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$$

*is a category. Additionally, it is the 2-colimit in the sense of 1.2 of the induced 2-functor  $F: \mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$  given by restricting  $F$  to the poset of open sub-2-groups.*

*Proof.* The construction of the filtered colimit of any functor valued in  $\mathbf{Cat}$  is discussed in Example 5.2.2.f of [Bor94b]. The present construction of the category in 4.9 is a special case. However, this is indeed the 2-colimit as well. For it is routine to construct functors

$$\Phi: \mathbf{Cat}(\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{A}) \rightleftarrows [\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})^{op}, \mathbf{Cat}](\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Cat}(F, \mathcal{A})): \Psi$$

and show that these are mutually inverse to give the isomorphism of 1.2.  $\square$

The next goal is to show that the colimit category of 4.9 is an object of  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ . First define correspondences at the object and arrow levels. Define an action of  $\mathcal{G}_0$  on objects of the colimit by

$$[\mathcal{U}, X] \cdot A := [A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A, X \cdot A] \quad (4.14)$$

for  $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$ . This is a well-defined, continuous action of  $\mathcal{G}_0$  by the group laws and the fact that  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  is filtered. The action at the level of arrows is more complicated. For this, take an arrow  $[\mathcal{U}, m]$  of the colimit represented by  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  and take an arrow  $g: A \rightarrow B$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}$  denote the intersection

$$\mathcal{O} := A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A \cap B^{-1}\mathcal{U}B.$$

By the construction of the 2-category  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ , the arrow  $g$  induces a 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{G}/A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A & & \\ & \nearrow I & & \searrow A & \\ \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{O} & & & & \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \\ & \searrow I & \downarrow g & \nearrow B & \\ & & \mathcal{G}/B^{-1}\mathcal{U}B & & \end{array}$$

hence a natural transformation  $Fg: FA \Rightarrow FB$ . For simplicity, denote the component of  $Fg$  at an object  $Z \in F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$  by  $g_Z: Z \cdot A \rightarrow Z \cdot B$ . Now, define

$$[\mathcal{U}, m] \cdot g := [\mathcal{O}, \xi] \quad (4.15)$$

where  $\xi$  is either side of the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \cdot A & \xrightarrow{m \cdot A} & Y \cdot A \\ g_X \downarrow & = & \downarrow g_Y \\ X \cdot B & \xrightarrow{m \cdot B} & Y \cdot B \end{array}$$

of  $F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{O})$ . The assignment of 4.15 is well-defined by the 2-functoriality of  $F$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *The assignments of 4.14 and 4.15 give a continuous action of  $\mathcal{G}_1$  on the arrows of the category*

$$\varinjlim_{\mathcal{U}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$$

*compatible with the action of  $\mathcal{G}_0$  on the objects in the sense that the two together yield a functor*

$$\varinjlim_{\mathcal{U}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \varinjlim_{\mathcal{U}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$$

*satisfying the properties of a continuous action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on the colimit.*

*Proof.* That the assignments constitute a functor satisfying the axioms for an action is a tedious but ultimately straightforward check using the definition of the actions and the relation forming the colimit. Continuity of the action at the arrow-level requires some discussion, however. It suffices to see that the inverse image of a point  $[\mathcal{U}, m]$  is an open subset of the domain. Let  $g: A \rightarrow B$  be any arrow of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Consider the class  $[\mathcal{O}, \xi]$  with  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\xi$  as in the discussion above. By the properties of  $F$  as a 2-functor, it follows that

$$[\mathcal{O}, \xi] \cdot g = [\mathcal{U}, m]$$

holds, meaning that the inverse image of the action is some subset of the arrows of the colimit crossed by direct product with  $\mathcal{G}_1$  itself. Since the arrows of the colimit have the discrete topology, this is an open subset of the domain. Thus, the action is continuous.  $\square$

Now, let  $\mathcal{X}$  denote a discrete 2-space on which  $\mathcal{G}$  acts continuously on the right. Let  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  denote an open sub-2-group. The claim is that there is an isomorphism of categories

$$\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}) \cong \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}} \tag{4.16}$$

that is, the 2-dimensional analogue of 3.4 for the fixed point open sub-2-group of Example 3.2. On the one hand, given a  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant functor  $F: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  as on the left side of 4.16, define  $\Phi(F)$  to be  $F(\mathcal{U}I)$ . This is well-defined by  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariance. On an arrow  $\theta: F \rightarrow G$  on the left side of 4.16, define  $\Phi(\theta)$  to be the component

$$\theta_{\mathcal{U}I}: F(\mathcal{U}I) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{U}I).$$

This is well-defined by the compatibility condition assumed for  $\theta$ . This  $\Phi$  is a functor by the definition of composition of natural transformations and since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a strict 2-group. On the other hand, starting with  $X \in \mathcal{X}_0$  fixed by  $\mathcal{U}$ , take  $\Psi$  to be the functor  $F_X: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  given by

$$F_X(\mathcal{U}_0A) := X \cdot A$$

on objects and on arrows by

$$F_X(\mathcal{U}_1g) := 1_X \cdot g.$$

These assignments for  $F_X$  are well-defined by the assumption that  $X$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed. Moreover,  $F_X$  is a functor by the fact that the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is a bifunctor. For an arrow  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  fixed by  $\mathcal{U}$ , define what will be a transformation  $m: F_X \rightarrow F_Y$  by taking the component at  $\mathcal{U}_0A$  to be

$$m_{\mathcal{U}_0A} = m \cdot 1_A.$$

This is well-defined again because  $m$  is assumed to be  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed. Naturality follows since the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a bifunctor. Finally,  $\Psi$  is a functor by the bifunctor condition and the definition of composition of natural transformations.

Finally, the functors  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are mutually inverse. This is a straightforward computation from the definitions. For example, at the object-level, consider

$$\Psi\Phi(F) = \Psi(F(\mathcal{U}_0I)) = F_X$$

with  $X = F(\mathcal{U}_0 I)$ . But compute that

$$F_X(\mathcal{U}_0 A) = X \cdot A = F(\mathcal{U}_0 I)A = F(\mathcal{U}_0 I \otimes A) = F(\mathcal{U}_0 A)$$

by definition and equivariance of  $F$ . A similar argument shows that  $F$  and  $F_X$  agree on arrows of  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$ . Thus,  $\Psi\Phi$  is identity on objects. The compatibility condition for transformations of equivariant functors shows that it is also identity on morphisms. That is, if  $\theta$  is a transformation of  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant functors  $F, G: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{X}$ , then by the definition of the induced transformation and the compatibility condition, it follows that

$$(\theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I})_{\mathcal{U}_0 A} = \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot 1_{\mathcal{U}_1 A} = \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I \otimes A} = \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 A}$$

as required. On the other hand, the argument that  $\Phi\Psi = 1$  is similar but easier. The result is now asserted formally in the following

**Proposition 4.11.** *For a topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ , open sub-2-group  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$ , and a discrete 2-space  $\mathcal{X}$  on which  $\mathcal{G}$  acts on the right, there is an isomorphism of categories*

$$\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}) \cong \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}}$$

where  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$  denotes the 2-category of continuous right actions of  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}}$  denotes the category of  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed points under the continuous action on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

For each  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ , the assignment  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X})$  extends to a 2-functor  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$ .

**Corollary 4.12.** *The assignment on objects*

$$\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \mapsto (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{U}} \quad (4.17)$$

extends to a well-defined contravariant 2-functor on the orbit 2-category  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ . Additionally, the fixed point isomorphism of Proposition 4.11, namely,

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})) \cong (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{U}} \quad (4.18)$$

is a 2-natural isomorphism of 2-functors  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$ . In other words, the colimit 2-functor given by 4.17 is representable.

*Proof.* For a given morphism  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}$  in  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ , define the transition functor

$$[-] \cdot A: (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{U}}$$

by taking  $[\mathcal{V}, X] \mapsto [A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A, X \cdot A]$  on objects and analogously on arrows. This is well-defined by the containment  $\mathcal{U} \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A$ . It is a functor by the 2-functor axioms for  $F$  and the definition of composition in the colimit. For a 2-cell  $g: A \Rightarrow B$  in  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ , define what will be a natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & [-] \cdot A & \\ \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowleft \\ (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{W}} & \downarrow [-] \cdot g & (\varinjlim_{\mathcal{V}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}))^{\mathcal{U}} \\ \curvearrowleft & & \curvearrowright \\ & [-] \cdot B & \end{array}$$



by taking the component at  $[\mathcal{V}, X]$  to be the morphism

$$[\mathcal{O}, g_X]: [A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A, X \cdot A] \longrightarrow [B^{-1}\mathcal{V}B, X \cdot B]$$

where  $\mathcal{O} = A^{-1}\mathcal{V}A \cap B^{-1}\mathcal{V}B$  and  $g_X$  is the  $X$ -component of the transformation  $Fg: FA \Rightarrow FB$  associated to  $g$  under  $F$ . This is natural by the functoriality of  $F$  at the level of 2-cells. The rest of the 2-functor axioms follow by the fact that  $F$  is a 2-functor.

The isomorphism in 4.18 is 2-natural in  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  by the definition of the transition morphisms and 2-cell assignment for the colimit 2-functor and  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariance.  $\square$

Recall that  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  denotes the poset category of open sub-2-groups of  $\mathcal{G}$ . The last technical result is an analogue of 3.3, namely, an isomorphism

$$\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}} \cong \mathcal{X} \quad (4.19)$$

whenever  $\mathcal{X}$  admits a continuous right action of  $\mathcal{G}$ . On the one hand, given an object  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$  in the colimit on the left of 4.19, declare  $\Phi[\mathcal{U}, X] = X$ . This is well-defined by the definition of  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}}$  as a functor on  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$ . If  $[\mathcal{W}, m]$  is a morphism of the colimit, take its image under  $\Phi$  to be  $m$ . Well-definition follows for the same reason. Evidently  $\Phi$  is a functor. On the other hand, given  $X$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , take the image under  $\Psi$  to be  $[\mathbf{Stab}(X), X]$ . Given a morphism  $m: X \rightarrow Y$ , take  $\Phi(m)$  to be  $[\mathbf{Stab}(m), X]$ . This is well-defined by the definition of the equivalence classes. Again  $\Psi$  is a functor.

It is immediate that  $\Phi\Psi = 1$  holds, as can be seen by just chasing objects and arrows through the definitions. On the other hand,  $\Psi\Phi = 1$  holds essentially by the fact that if  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed, then  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbf{Stab}(X)$  as sub-2-groups, which implies that  $[\mathbf{Stab}(X), X] = [\mathcal{U}, X]$  holds too. A similar argument works at the level of morphisms. Each of the isomorphisms is natural in  $\mathcal{X}$ , as can be seen directly by computation from the definitions. The result, then, is stated formally as

**Proposition 4.13.** *Whenever  $\mathcal{X}$  is a category admitting a continuous right action of a topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ , there is an isomorphism of categories*

$$\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}} \cong \mathcal{X}$$

where the colimit on the left is taken over  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$ , the poset of open sub-2-groups of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Additionally the isomorphism is natural in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

## 4.4 The 2-Equivalence

A 2-functor

$$\Phi: \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G} \rightarrow [\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}] \quad (4.20)$$

is given by taking  $\mathcal{X}$  with continuous right action  $M: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  to the representable 2-functor

$$\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(-, \mathcal{X}): \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}.$$

The assignments on morphisms and 2-cells are given by pushing forward. Well-definition of each assignment follows by the associativity of composition of functors and transformations. On the other hand, a 2-functor

$$\Psi: [\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}] \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G} \quad (4.21)$$

can be given by taking a 2-functor  $F$  to the pseudo-colimit

$$\lim_{\substack{\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{U}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$$

taken over the poset  $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{G})$  of open sub-2-groups  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{G}$  as in Proposition 4.9. Lemma 4.10 shows that  $\Psi$  is well-defined. If  $\theta: F \Rightarrow G$  is a 2-natural transformation of 2-functors  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ , then take  $\Psi(\theta)$  to be the functor

$$\Psi(\theta): \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} G(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$$

given by

$$\Psi(\theta)([\mathcal{U}, X]) := [\mathcal{U}, \theta_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}}(X)]$$

on objects and on morphisms by

$$\Psi(\theta)([\mathcal{U}, m]) := [\mathcal{U}, \theta_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}}(m)].$$

These assignments are well-defined by the 2-naturality of  $\theta$ . And  $\Psi(\theta)$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant by the definition of the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on the colimits and 2-naturality of  $\theta$ . Finally, the colimit definition of  $\Psi$  on objects has enough structure to handle a 2-cell assignment as well. For a modification  $m: \theta \Rightarrow \gamma$  of 2-natural transformations  $\theta$  and  $\gamma$ , take  $\Psi(m)$  to have components

$$[\mathcal{U}, m_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, X}]: [\mathcal{U}, \theta_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}}(X)] \rightarrow [\mathcal{U}, \gamma_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}}(X)].$$

Indexed over all such  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$ , this definition comprises a natural transformation since each  $m_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}}$  is natural. The compatibility condition for 2-cells in  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{G})$  follows by the modification condition for  $m$ . From the definitions of the assignments and the definition of composition, it follows that  $\Psi$  is a 2-functor.

The goal is to show that  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  of 4.20 and 4.21 are mutually pseudo-inverse when restricted to 2-sheaves. This will exhibit the desired 2-equivalence yielding the main result of the paper. First develop the counit. This is always an isomorphism.

**Proposition 4.14.** *In the notation of the discussion above,  $1 \cong \Psi\Phi$  holds 2-naturally in  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* By combining Propositions 4.11 and 4.13, already established is that there is such an isomorphism of categories for each  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ , namely,

$$\Psi\Phi(\mathcal{X}) = \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}) \cong \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{U}} \cong \mathcal{X}.$$

But additionally this is a 2-natural isomorphism in  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ . That it is 2-natural is easy to see since the value of  $\Psi\Phi(\mathcal{X})$  is just the colimit over a family of representable 2-functors. The 2-cell condition for 2-naturality in particular follows by the definition of horizontal composition of natural transformations 1.1. The work consists in showing that the isomorphism above is  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant. That is, to be established is that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{G} \\ \text{act} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{act} \\ \lim_{\rightarrow \mathcal{U}} \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

commutes. At the level of objects, this follows because a representative  $H: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  of a class in the colimit is itself  $\mathcal{G}$ -equivariant. On the other hand, let  $(\theta: H \Rightarrow K, g: A \Rightarrow B)$  denote any arrow of the upper-left corner of the square. Chasing it around each side of the square and comparing, it follows that we want to show there is an equality

$$(\theta * g)_{\partial_0 I} = \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot g$$

where the ‘\*’ denotes horizontal composition of natural transformations 1.1 and  $\mathcal{O}$  denotes the intersection  $A^{-1}\mathcal{U}A \cap B^{-1}\mathcal{U}B$  arising in the definition of the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on the colimit. But that this equality holds is established by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta * g)_{\mathcal{O}_0 I} &= \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 B} \circ Hg_{\mathcal{O}_0 I} && \text{(def'n horiz comp 1.1)} \\
&= \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 B} \circ H\mathcal{U}_1 g && \text{(def'n components of } g \text{ 4.7)} \\
&= (\theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot 1_B) \circ H\mathcal{U}_1 g && \text{(compat for } \theta \text{ 2.2)} \\
&= (\theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot 1_B) \circ H(1_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot g) && \text{(def'n action of } g \text{ 4.3)} \\
&= (\theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot 1_B) \circ (1_{H\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot g) && \text{(} H \text{ is } \mathcal{G}\text{-equivariant)} \\
&= \theta_{\mathcal{U}_0 I} \cdot g && \text{(action of } \mathcal{G} \text{ on } \mathcal{X} \text{ is a bifunctor)}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $1 \cong \Psi\Phi$  holds 2-naturally in  $\mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ , as asserted.  $\square$

Now, we shall see that  $F \cong \Phi\Psi(F)$  holds 2-naturally for 2-sheaves  $F$ . First a preliminary result that constructs the unit. In the statement, note that Proposition 4.11 has been used in calculating  $\Phi\Psi(F)$ .

**Lemma 4.15.** *For each 2-presheaf  $F$  on  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ , there is a 2-natural transformation  $\eta: F \Rightarrow \Phi\Psi(F)$  with components*

$$\eta: F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) \longrightarrow \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{U}}$$

given on objects by sending  $X \mapsto [\mathcal{U}, X]$ . These assemble into a 2-natural transformation  $\eta: 1 \Rightarrow \Phi\Psi$ .

*Proof.* Notice that the arrow assignment  $X \mapsto [\mathcal{U}, X]$  is well-defined since  $[\mathcal{U}, X]$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed under the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on the colimit. The arrow assignment sends  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  to  $[\mathcal{U}, m]$  and is similarly well-defined and functorial. Now, to verify 2-naturality, let  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}$  denote a morphism of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ . Thus, in particular  $\mathcal{U} \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{W}A$  holds as in 4.5 and 4.6. The square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{W}} \\
\downarrow A & & \downarrow [-] \cdot A \\
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{U}}
\end{array}$$

commutes by the assumption that  $\mathcal{U} \subset A^{-1}\mathcal{W}A$  holds. The one compatibility condition for a 2-natural transformation also holds. For this let  $g: A \Rightarrow B$  denote a 2-cell of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  as in 4.7 and 4.8. The equality of the composite 2-cells on the left and right sides

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{ccc}
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{W}} \\
\downarrow \left( \begin{array}{c} A \\ \left( \begin{array}{c} g \\ \Rightarrow \end{array} \right) \\ B \end{array} \right) & & \downarrow [-] \cdot B \\
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{U}}
\end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc}
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{W}} \\
\downarrow A & & \downarrow [-] \cdot A \left( \begin{array}{c} - \cdot g \\ \Rightarrow \end{array} \right) [-] \cdot B \\
F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}) & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \left(\lim_{\vec{\mathcal{V}}} F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})\right)^{\mathcal{U}}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

follows by the constructions of Lemma 4.12, the functoriality of  $F$ , and finally the definition of horizontal composition of 2-cells in  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ .  $\square$

The map  $\eta$  of Lemma 4.15 is one-to-one on objects and faithful whenever  $F$  is a 2-sheaf for the atomic topology. This follows by the definition of the relations forming the colimit and by Lemma 4.5 showing that each  $FI$  is one-to-one on objects and faithful. But in this case  $\eta$  is a 2-natural isomorphism as well. The proof of the following formal statement of the result shows surjectivity on objects and hom-wise on arrows. This will suffice since a fully faithful and bijective-on-objects functor is an isomorphism of categories. The argument in §III.9 on p.154 of [MLM92] can be adapted for the proof.

**Lemma 4.16.** *If  $F: \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$  is a 2-sheaf for the atomic topology, then  $\eta$  of Lemma 4.15 is surjective on objects.*

*Proof.* To show surjectivity on objects, take  $[\mathcal{V}, X]$  fixed by  $\mathcal{U}$  under the action of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$  holds, so that the singleton

$$\{I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}\}$$

generates a covering sieve  $S$  on  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  in the atomic topology as in Example 4.3. The claim is that  $X \in F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})_0$  defines compatible data  $X: S \Rightarrow F$ . For  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  in  $S$  factoring through  $I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  by say  $B: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$ , take the component

$$X_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}}(A) := X \cdot B \tag{4.22}$$

On a morphism  $g: A \Rightarrow A'$  factoring through  $I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  by some  $h: B \Rightarrow B'$ , take

$$X_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}}(g) := h_X: X \cdot B \rightarrow X \cdot B' \tag{4.23}$$

where  $h_X$  denotes  $F(h)_X$ . These assignments are functorial and will give a 2-natural transformation  $X: S \Rightarrow F$  by the definition of horizontal composition of natural transformations 1.1.

However, 4.22 and 4.23 need to be seen to be well-defined. So, assume that  $A$  factors through  $I$  by another map say  $C: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$ . The question is whether  $X \cdot B = X \cdot C$  holds. For this, note that the assumption means that  $C$  and  $B$  define the same map  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$ , which implies that  $C^{-1} \otimes B \in \mathcal{U}_0$ . Since  $[\mathcal{V}, X]$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed, this means – writing  $D = C^{-1} \otimes B$  for readability – that

$$[D^{-1}\mathcal{V}D, X \cdot D] = [\mathcal{V}, X]$$

holds in the colimit. But now from the definition of the relation and the fact that each  $FI$  is one-to-one on objects by Lemma 4.5, it follows that  $X \cdot B = X \cdot C$  does hold, proving well-definition. The argument that 4.23 is well-defined is similar.

Thus, by the 2-sheaf condition 4.1, there is an extension of the data  $X: S \Rightarrow F$  along the inclusion  $S \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})(-, \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$ . Its value at  $I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  is the required element of  $F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})$  mapping to  $[\mathcal{V}, X]$  under  $\eta$ . Consequently,  $\eta$  is a bijection on objects.  $\square$

*Remark 4.17.* Notice that there is no reason to believe that  $I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  is full. This is why the atomic topology was defined the way it was in Example 4.3 and thus why the definition of a 2-sieve (i.e. Definition 4.1) dropped Street’s requirement of “full.” See Remark 4.2.

**Lemma 4.18.** *If  $F: \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$  is a 2-sheaf for the atomic topology, then  $\eta$  of Lemma 4.15 is full.*

*Proof.* This argument follows a similar pattern. That is, suppose that

$$[\mathcal{V}, m]: [\mathcal{V}, X] \rightarrow [\mathcal{V}, Y]$$

is a morphism of the colimit,  $\mathcal{U}$ -fixed by the action of  $\mathcal{G}$ , and represented by  $m: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V})_1$ . The goal is to show that  $m$  induces a morphism of compatible data  $m: X \Rightarrow Y: S \Rightarrow F$  where  $X$  and  $Y$  are viewed as data  $S \rightarrow F$  as in 4.22 and 4.23 above. The 2-dimensional aspect of the 2-sheaf condition 4.1 will

then guarantee an extension of  $m$  between the extensions of  $X$  and  $Y$ , yielding the element of  $F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U})_1$  mapping to  $[\mathcal{V}, m]$  under  $\eta$ . So, the definition of the morphism  $m: X \Rightarrow Y$  at say  $A: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  factoring through  $I: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{U}$  by say  $B: \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{V}$  is given on components by

$$m_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}, B} := m \cdot B: X \cdot B \rightarrow Y \cdot B$$

in  $F(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W})_1$ . Naturality in  $B$  follows because  $F(h)$  is natural for each 2-cell  $h: B \Rightarrow B'$  of  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$ . Additionally, the collection of all  $m_{\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{W}}$  will be a modification as in 1.1 by the axioms of the action of  $\mathcal{G}$ . However, again the assignment needs to be shown to be well-defined, that is, independent of  $B$  factoring  $A$  through  $I$ . But this part of the proof follows the pattern of the well-definition argument in the surjective-on-objects proof in Lemma 4.16 above using “faithful” instead of “injective on objects” from Lemma 4.5.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.19.** *With  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  as in Construction 4.1, there is a 2-equivalence*

$$\mathfrak{Sh}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G}), J_{at}) \simeq \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$$

*in the sense of Definition 1.1 for any topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

*Proof.* All that remains is to check that the isomorphism  $\Phi\Psi(F) \cong F$  of Propositions 4.16 and 4.18 is 2-natural in  $F$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  respectively. But this follows from the definitions of the 2-functors.  $\square$

## 5 Prospectus

There are two ways in which Theorem 4.19 is only a preliminary result. The first is that it holds only for strict topological 2-groups. Many interesting examples of 2-groups are the so-called “coherent” 2-groups of [BL04]. The second is that the result depends upon very strict definitions coming from enriched category theory. Insofar as this is the case, the result is not very “bicategorical” and seems somewhat out of tune with the spirit of 2-dimensional category theory.

Trying to address either one of these two deficiencies in Theorem 4.19 seems to help with the other, however. For in switching to a coherent topological 2-group  $\mathcal{G}$ , the weak monoidal structure on  $\mathcal{G}$  will make the 2-orbit category  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  into a bicategory since the operations are defined in terms of the monoidal structure. This seems to necessitate a move to a more relaxed notion of a topology, namely, a “bicovering” or a “bitopology” rephrasing the notion of §C2 in [Joh02] in an “up-to-isomorphism” sense as detailed on the nLab [nLa19]. Of course this necessitates a move to so-called “stacks” or “bisheaves” instead of the 2-sheaves of [Str82b] used in this paper.

On the other hand, certainly a 2-category is already a strict bicategory and there is nothing *a priori* stopping a move to bicoverings and bisheaves on  $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})$  even in the case that  $\mathcal{G}$  remains a strict 2-group. The point of Lemma 3.6 is that it is a well-definition criterion. And this problem reappears in Propositions 4.16 and 4.18 whose proofs show that the preimage objects and arrows are constructed through defining coherence data whose well-definition is guaranteed by the facts that the  $F: \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Cat}$  is a 2-sheaf and that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a strict monoidal category. Importantly, it seems that these well-definition problems are in fact posed by built-in strictness in the notions of sheaf and 2-sheaf. It is not yet clear that stacks or bisheaves would pose the same, or at least same kind of, problem. Insofar as this is the case, it might thus be possible to relax the monoidal structure on  $\mathcal{G}$  as it might not be needed for this purpose.

As a final note, it appears that the real heart of the constructions in the classical result and the main result of the present paper are the colimit characterizations giving the object assignments of the functor  $\mathbf{BG} \rightarrow [\mathbf{S}(G)^{op}, \mathbf{Set}]$  and of the 2-functor  $[\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{G})^{op}, \mathfrak{Cat}] \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}\mathcal{G}$ . In particular these are so-called “filtered” colimits which have a nice description in terms of germ-like equivalence classes under a tractable relation. These characterizations are vital in showing that each colimit admits a continuous action of the group or 2-group, as the case may be. Now, the colimit in the 2-case is actually just the 1-colimit of a category-valued functor, but it happens to have nice properties at the 2-cell level so that it gives a boosted up strict

2-colimit as well. In switching to the bicategorical class of results for coherent 2-groups, it is expected that such boosted up 1-colimits will no longer be appropriate. Rather it is expected that pseudo- or bi-colimits will have to be used. And an explicit characterization of 2- or bi-filtered pseudo- and bi-colimits will be needed to canonically construct a well-defined continuous action. For this purpose, however, there is the work of Descotte, Dubuc, and Szyld in [DDS18] and the work of the author's thesis [Lam19], which computes all weighted pseudo- and bi-colimits of categories and shows that those that are 2-filtered are formed by the process of the right calculus of fractions.

## References

- [Bar04] T. Bartels. *Higher Gauge Theory I: 2-bundles*. PhD thesis, U.C.-Riverside, 2004. [arxiv.org/abs/math/0410328](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0410328).
- [BB76] R. Brown and Spencer C. B.  $\mathcal{G}$ -groupoids, crossed modules, and the classifying space of a topological group. *Proc. Kon. Akad. v. Wet.*, 79:296–302, 1976.
- [Bén67] J. Bénabou. Introduction to bicategories. In *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar I*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 47, pages 1–77. 1967.
- [BL04] J. Baez and A. Lauda. Higher-dimensional algebra V: 2-groups. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 12:423–491, 2004.
- [Bor94a] F. Borceux. *Handbook of Categorical Algebra 1: Basic Category Theory*, volume 50 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [Bor94b] F. Borceux. *Handbook of Categorical Algebra 2: Categories and Structures*, volume 51 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [Cor09] D. Cornfield. The stabilizer of a subcategory. [https://golem.ph.utexas.edu/category/2009/03/the\\_stabilizer\\_of\\_a\\_subcategory](https://golem.ph.utexas.edu/category/2009/03/the_stabilizer_of_a_subcategory) 2009. Accessed: 2019-04-01.
- [DDS18] M.E. Descotte, E. J. Dubuc, and M. Szyld. Sigma colimits in 2-categories and flat pseudofunctors. *Advances in Mathematics*, 333:266–313, 2018.
- [Elm83] A. D. Elmendorf. Systems of fixed point sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277:275–284, 1983.
- [Joh01] P. T. Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium, Volume 1*, volume 43 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Clarendon Press, London, 2001.
- [Joh02] P. T. Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium, Volume 2*, volume 44 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Clarendon Press, London, 2002.
- [Kel82] G. M. Kelly. *Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory*, volume 64 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- [KS74] G. M. Kelly and R. Street. Review of the elements of 2-categories. In G. M. Kelly, editor, *Category Seminar: Proceedings Sydney Category Theory Seminar 1972 /1973*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 420, pages 75–103. 1974.
- [Lac02] S. Lack. Codescent objects and coherence. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 175:223–241, 2002.
- [Lam19] M. Lambert. *An Elementary Account of Flat 2-Functors*. PhD thesis, Dalhousie University, 2019.
- [Mac98] S. Mac Lane. *Category Theory for the Working Mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2nd edition, 1998.

- [MLM92] S. Mac Lane and I. Moerdijk. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [MP15] J. C. Morton and R. Picken. Transformation double categories associated to 2-group actions. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 30:1429–1468, 2015.
- [MP19] Jeffrey C. Morton and Roger Picken. 2-Group Actions and Moduli Spaces of Higher Gauge Theory. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1904.10865, Apr 2019.
- [nLa19] nLab authors. 2-sheaf. <http://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/2-sheaf>, 2019. Revision 18.
- [Str82a] R. Street. Characterization of bicategories of stacks. In K. H. Kamps, editor, *Category Theory: Applications to Algebra, Logic and Topology*, volume 962 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 282–291. Springer, 1982.
- [Str82b] R. Street. Two-dimensional sheaf theory. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 23:251–270, 1982.
- [Whi49] J. H. C. Whitehead. Combinatorial homotopy. ii. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 55:453–496, 1949.