

Introduction to 2-dimensional Topological Quantum Field Theory

Leon Geiger

Abstract

Mostly self-contained script on functorial topological quantum field theories. These notes give a slow introduction to the basic notions of category theory which serve a closer investigation of cobordisms and (commutative) Frobenius algebras. In the fourth chapter the axiomatic definition of TQFTs is motivated and some folklore results about the equivalence of (symmetric) monoidal functors and (commutative) Frobenius algebras are proven. The script can serve as material for an introductory course.

Contents

0	Introduction	3
1	Categorical Preliminaries	4
1.1	Introduction to Category Theory	4
1.2	Monoidal Categories and Functors	13
1.3	Braided and Symmetric Monoidal Categories	21
2	The Category of Cobordisms	25
2.1	Cobordisms	25
2.2	Morse Functions and Gluing	28
2.3	The Category \mathbf{cob}_n	32
2.4	Cobordisms in two Dimensions	37
3	The Category of Commutative Frobenius Algebras	44
3.1	Algebraic Preliminaries	44
3.2	Frobenius Algebras	51
3.3	The Category $\mathbf{comFrob}_k$	56

Date: 19.07.2021

Supervisor: Prof. Will J. Merry

4	Topological Quantum Field Theory	59
4.1	Motivation, Definition and properties	59
4.2	2-dimensional TQFTs	63
4.2.1	Free Monoidal Categories over a Frobenius Algebra	64
4.2.2	Functor Categories	65
4.2.3	Equivalence Theorems	66
4.3	TQFTs in Physics	68
4.3.1	TQFT vs. Path Integral Formalism	69
4.3.2	Examples	70
5	Outlook	73
	References	74
	Index	74

0 Introduction

This project is a manifest to my current standing in my master studies in physics. During my studies at ETH I could further delve into this feeling that it is were physics and mathematics are closest that I want to learn more. One of the topics that sparked my interest during my self-studies was category theory which seemed to provide a sheer endless amount of applications, a new language to generalise and abstract existing structures. For me the most fascinating part about category theory is the natural way in which previously loosely related or seemingly unrelated fields smoothly join hands on this common mathematical background describing their innate structure. Once one is familiar with the basics, category theory is guaranteed to transform ones approach to working in or with mathematics.

Will Merry, whom I got to know as the lecturer of Differential Geometry *I* during the first Corona-semester, included bits and pieces of category theory to provide a more general version of many topics. He did so while making very clear he'd like for this language to be more well-known. It was him who gave me a brief overview of the basic concepts of TQFTs. The topic immediately grabbed my attention since I grew more and more interested in the mathematical background of physical field theories over the course of my physical studies. Using this as a perfect opportunity to both lean more towards mathematical physics and get a better grip on category theory we decided on the format of a script aiming to be compact but as self-contained as sensibly possible. One could argue that this got a bit out of hand, however I hope I could adhere at least to the second point.

Functorial TQFT is a stunning field of mathematical physics. It provides an abstract description of actual physical field theories in a purely mathematical setting and allows to derive certain properties of such theories without ever needing to investigate a particular one. Next to the extensive use of category theory whose fundamentals will be provided in (Section 1) and the subsequent applications of those concepts to cobordisms (Section 2) and Frobenius Algebras (Section 3) the main attraction of this project is found in the section on TQFTs (Section 4). It provides many interesting detours into and discussions of the physical analogies of the axioms, properties and even two popular examples of TQFTs. Particularly enlightening for these considerations were related discussions of Atiyah [2] and Witten [15], the interested reader is wholeheartedly referred to those great texts for further insights.

I hope this script can convey even a part of the fun I had while working on it and possibly get a few students more interested in the beauty and elegance of category theory. Before the script begins I want to express my sincerest gratitude to Will Merry for his enlightening introduction to the topic and endorsing my interest in mathematical physics, to Maarten for listening to my excited explanations and the enlightening discussions about physical analogies, to Bryan for the honest reality checks on the dojo matt and to Laura for bearing with my absorbed self.

1 Categorical Preliminaries

The goal of this chapter is to give a compact and insightful, yet not extensive introduction to *Category Theory*. While traces of the terminology and concepts of category theory can be found in most modern mathematics, it will be used in a very concrete manner in this project. Thus the presented preliminaries do not only serve to construct the mathematical setting but directly contribute some of the ideas of *Topological Quantum Field Theory*.

We will begin by giving a basic introduction to *categories*, *functors* and *natural transformations*, discussing their definitions and highlighting some of their main properties, branching off where needed. Next we introduce the notion of *monoidal* categories which allow for concatenation of their elements and thus qualify for a description of many interesting categories. After discussing *monoidal functors* and *monoidal natural transformations*, we turn towards *braidings*, which can be thought of as “swap” or “twist” operations with respect to the product of a monoidal category, and adapt functors to braidings by defining *braided monoidal functors*. We conclude by giving the definition of a *symmetric monoidal category* which will turn out to be the fitting setting for the categories involved in *Topological Quantum Field Theory*.

This chapter mainly draws from *Categories for the Working Mathematician* by Saunders Mac Lane [10] which poses an invaluable introduction to the topic. When treating monoidal categories, braided monoidal categories and symmetric monoidal categories, we will make use of the technical review on *Tensor Categories* by P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik [6].

1.1 Introduction to Category Theory

Category Theory might be best described as an effective theory that aims at generalizing and unifying different mathematical concepts. Serving as a type of “Metatheory”, it succeeds at modelling, in a very abstract fashion, collections of objects, maps between them and even mappings between such systems. While not the most concrete piece of mathematics, its stunning simplicity allows for a description of a myriad of mathematical structure. As mentioned before, this project will work with a very concrete application of category theory that showcases both its remarkable flexibility and its inspiring efficiency.

While we will give the commonly used definition of a category using Set-theoretic notions, we will, for the sake of completeness and deeper insight into the structure of the field, start by giving the more abstract definition seen in [10].

DEFINITION 1.1 (Metagraphs) A **metagraph** consists of the following data: A collection of objects a, b, c, \dots , a collection of arrows f, g, h, \dots and two operations

- *Domain*, which assigns to each arrow f an object $a = \text{dom}(f)$.
- *Codomain* (or *Target*), which assigns to each arrow f an object $b = \text{cod}(f)$.

This definition of a metagraph can be visualised using the suggestive namescheme. We indicate

an arrow f by an actual arrow and write

$$f : \text{dom}(f) \longrightarrow \text{cod}(f) \quad \text{or} \quad a \xrightarrow{f} b \quad \text{where} \quad a = \text{dom}(f), \quad b = \text{cod}(f).$$

While this justifies the name, it also allows for a representation of finite metagraphs. Expanding the notion of a metagraph with additional structure brings us to the definition of a

DEFINITION 1.2 (Metacategory) A **metacategory** is a metagraph equipped with the following two additional operations:

- The *Identity* operation, which assigns to each object a an arrow $\text{id}_a = 1_a : a \longrightarrow a$ called the **identity arrow**.
- The *Composition* operation, which assigns to a pair of arrows (f, g) with $\text{cod}(f) = \text{dom}(g)$ their **composite arrow** denoted by $g \circ f : \text{dom}(f) \longrightarrow \text{cod}(g)$.

Those operations are subject to the following two axioms:

- **Associativity**: given three arrows f, g, h such that

$$a \xrightarrow{f} b \xrightarrow{g} c \xrightarrow{h} d$$

implies:

$$h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f.$$

- The **Identity Law**: For $a \xrightarrow{f} b$ and $b \xrightarrow{g} c$ we have

$$\text{id}_b \circ f = f \quad g \circ \text{id}_a = g.$$

This extension to a metacategory hints at some common mathematical operations like the composition of smooth functions between manifolds or continuous functions between topological spaces. Moving on to concrete categories, we further expand upon the notion of categories being defined by their arrows. Note that while this definition already uses set theory, it is not yet the promised “Set-version” of a category.

DEFINITION 1.3 (Category - Abstract Version) Let A be a set of arrows and \mathcal{O} be a class of objects. Let there be two functions cod and dom as before that form a special metagraph (sometimes called *directed graph*):

$$A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{dom}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{cod}} \end{array} B$$

In this metagraph the set of composable pairs of arrows in A can be denoted as

$$A \times_{\mathcal{O}} A := \{(f, g) \mid f, g \in A \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \text{cod}(f) = \text{dom}(g)\}.$$

Comparing this to the definition of a metacategory, we aim to implement similar properties on the

above metagraph. Thus a **category** is a graph as constructed above together with two operations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O} &\xrightarrow{\text{id}} A, & c &\longmapsto \text{id}_c \\ A \times_{\mathcal{O}} A &\longrightarrow A, & (f, g) &\longmapsto g \circ f. \end{aligned}$$

again called **identity** and **composition** such that

$$\text{dom}(\text{id}_a) = a = \text{cod}(\text{id}_a), \quad \text{dom}(g \circ f) = \text{dom}(f), \quad \text{cod}(g \circ f) = \text{cod}(g)$$

and such that the axioms of *Associativity* and the *Identity Law* hold.

NOTATION 1.4 Let \mathcal{C} be a category. From now on we will not explicitly mention the sets A and \mathcal{O} by writing $c \in \mathcal{C}$ to denote that c is an object of the category \mathcal{C} and $f \in \mathcal{C}$ to denote that f is an arrow of \mathcal{C} . Instead of A we write the set of arrows between two objects $a, b \in \mathcal{C}$ as

$$\text{Hom}(a, b) = \{f \mid f \in \mathcal{C}, \text{dom}(f) = a, \text{cod}(f) = b\}.$$

As we from here on work with the more concrete notion of categories in a set theory context, arrows will often be called “morphisms” hinting at the generalization of the notion of a homomorphisms.

As promised, we move to the definition involving Set theory. Note that this amounts to defining composition acting on the Hom-sets rather than the set of arrows:

DEFINITION 1.5 (Category - Set Version) A **category** \mathcal{C} consists of the following data: A class of objects denoted by $\text{obj}(\mathcal{C})$, for each ordered pair of objects (a, b) a set $\text{Hom}(a, b)$ of morphisms from a to b (defined as above) and a composition rule which associates to an ordered triple of objects (a, b, c) a map

$$\text{Hom}(a, b) \times \text{Hom}(b, c) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(a, c)$$

such that for $a \xrightarrow{f} b$ and $b \xrightarrow{g} c$ the map is denoted as

$$(f, g) \longmapsto g \circ f.$$

This data is subject to the following three axioms:

- i) The sets Hom are pairwise disjoint, thus every $f \in \text{Hom}(a, b)$ has unique domain a and codomain b .
- ii) Composition is associative if well-defined, thus

$$a \xrightarrow{f} b \xrightarrow{g} c \xrightarrow{h} d \implies h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f.$$

- iii) For each $a \in \text{obj}(\mathcal{C})$ there exists a unique morphism $\text{id}_a \in \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C})$ called the **identity morphism**. For every $a \xrightarrow{f} b$ it satisfies

$$\text{id}_b \circ f = f = f \circ \text{id}_a.$$

REMARK 1.6 In some books (see [10]), one also considers the situation where $\text{Hom}(a, b)$ is allowed to be a class for any a, b in the set of objects which allows for a more general definition of a category. Such categories are called **large categories**. One considers **small categories** to be those where both the collection of objects and the collection of arrows turn out to be sets. While for the scope of this project, usual categories will suffice, some sidenotes will make use of the notion of large categories. A brief discussion and directions towards further material using classes can be found in [10, page 23].

To illuminate the definition of a category as defined in 1.5, we give some examples that also show how widely applicable the notion of a category is.

EXAMPLE 1.7

- Taking topological spaces as objects and the set of continuous functions $C(X, Y)$ as $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ for two topological spaces X, Y forms the category **Top** using the usual composition of functions.
- We define the category of groups **Grp** using groups as objects. Given two groups G, H we define $\text{Hom}(G, H)$ to be the set of group homomorphisms from G to H and use the usual composition to obtain a category.
- Smooth manifolds form a category **Man**: To see this, take as objects smooth manifolds and, using the usual composition of smooth maps, define for any two smooth manifolds M, N the set $\text{Hom}(M, N)$ to be $C^\infty(M, N)$.
- The most important example for later will be the category of vector spaces over a field \mathbb{k} denoted by $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Its objects are \mathbb{k} -vector spaces and its morphisms are the \mathbb{k} -linear maps. In many ways, $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a special category: Since for $V, W \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ the set $\text{Hom}(V, W)$ naturally is a vector space, it is also an element of the category. As will be apparent after 1.2, $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is also an example of a **monoidal** category. Due to its importance in TQFT, we will continue to investigate its properties.

Looking at the above examples the question arises, how the arrows of a category can capture concepts like *bijections*, *diffeomorphisms* or *invertible linear transformations*. Each of these allowed for *isomorphism* in their respective category in the form of a two-sided inverse:

DEFINITION 1.8 (Isomorphisms) Let \mathcal{C} be a category and $f: a \rightarrow b$ an arrow in \mathcal{C} . We call f an **isomorphism of objects** or just **isomorphism** if there exists an arrow $g: b \rightarrow a$ such that

$$f \circ g = \text{id}_a \quad \text{and} \quad g \circ f = \text{id}_b.$$

Given two objects $a, b \in \mathcal{C}$ we call them **isomorphic** if there exists an isomorphism between them.

We define special types of categories which will turn out to be deeply tied to groups:

DEFINITION 1.9 (Monoids and Groups)

- A **discrete category** is a category which only has identity arrows. Thus it is uniquely characterised by its set of objects, hence discrete categories are sets.
- A category with only one object a is called a **monoid**. It is uniquely characterised by its arrows, the identity arrow and its composition law. Since every arrow has domain and codomain a , any two arrows have a composite. Thus a monoid can be described as a set M with a binary associative operation $M \times M \rightarrow M$ and a unit. Hence a monoid is a **semigroup** with unit. For any category \mathcal{C} and any object $c \in \mathcal{C}$ the set of **endomorphisms** $\text{End}(c) = \text{Hom}(c, c)$ forms a monoid under composition.
- A monoid where every arrow has a two-sided inverse under the given composition law expands to and is thus called a **group**.

The next natural step would be to investigate arrows between categories, leading to the notion of a *functor*. As such it will need to send objects in the domain category to objects in the codomain category and likewise with functions. While one can define a functor purely using arrows, we follow the definition of [10] which uses objects and arrows.

DEFINITION 1.10 (Functors) Let \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} be two categories. A **covariant functor** of categories \mathbf{F} is a morphism of categories $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ consisting of two functions, which, by an abuse of notation, are both denoted by \mathbf{F} :

1. An **arrow function** assigning to every morphism $f : a \rightarrow a'$ in \mathbf{A} a morphism $\mathbf{F}f : \mathbf{F}a \rightarrow \mathbf{F}a'$ in \mathbf{B} such that for $a \xrightarrow{f} b \xrightarrow{g} c$

$$\mathbf{F}(g \circ f) = \mathbf{F}(g) \circ \mathbf{F}(f).$$

2. An **object function** assigning to every $a \in \mathbf{A}$ an object $\mathbf{F}a \in \mathbf{B}$ such that

$$\mathbf{F}(\text{id}_a) = \text{id}_{\mathbf{F}(a)} \quad \forall a \in \mathbf{A}.$$

We call a functor as above “covariant” because it preserves the direction of the morphisms. A “contravariant” functor reverses the order. In this material a functor refers to a covariant functor unless stated otherwise.

EXAMPLE 1.11 In $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, the tensor product is a covariant functor: The product $\otimes : (\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ assigns $(V, W) \mapsto V \otimes W$ and functions alike. This product is associative up to isomorphism, which will later enable us to define the category $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as a monoidal category.

An interesting class of functors are **forgetful** functors which, as the name implies, forget part of the structure of the domain category. A simple example is the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ which assigns to a topological space X the respective set it is defined on and to a continuous function the same function viewed as a function between sets. A similar forgetful functor can be constructed as $\mathbf{Man} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$. It “forgets” the manifold structure of the underlying topological space and sends the smooth maps of \mathbf{Man} to the same maps viewed as continuous maps of topological spaces.

Like morphisms can be composed to provide new morphisms, we can consider the composition of functors. Given the categories \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} and two functors

$$\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{C}$$

let us consider the composition of two functor using the induced object and arrow function. On objects $a \in \mathbf{A}$ and morphisms in \mathbf{A} they are defined as

$$a \longmapsto \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}(a)) \qquad f \longmapsto \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{F}(f)).$$

Thus they define a **composite functor** denoted by $\mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ and called the composition of \mathbf{G} with \mathbf{F} . The composition functor for contravariant functors is built accordingly. To every category \mathbf{A} , one can construct the identity functor $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{A}}: \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}$ that acts as an identity for functor composition. Comparing this data with the definition of a category leads to the notion of a “*category of categories*”. Indeed, using small categories as objects (compare 1.6) one can form the category \mathbf{Cat} with functors as arrows between its objects. It uses the composition constructed above as composition of its arrows.

We turn towards functors that allow comparing two categories. Mainly we want to assess if “two categories are the same”, thus we need a well-defined form of isomorphisms.

DEFINITION 1.12 (Isomorphism of categories) A functor between two categories $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ is an **isomorphism of categories** if and only if there exists a functor $\mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{A}$ such that the composition functors satisfy

$$\mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{A}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{B}}.$$

We call \mathbf{G} the **two-sided inverse** of \mathbf{F} and denote it as $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{F}^{-1}$. Note that the composition of two isomorphisms is again an isomorphism.

There are two important notions *weaker* than that of an isomorphism of categories. They can be read as more general but weaker forms of *surjectivity* and *injectivity*:

DEFINITION 1.13 (Full and faithful functors)

- A functor $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ is a **full functor** if for every pair of objects $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$ and every morphism $g: \mathbf{F}a \longrightarrow \mathbf{F}a'$ of the codomain category \mathbf{B} there exists a morphism $f: a \longrightarrow a'$ in \mathbf{A} such that $\mathbf{F}f = g$.
- A functor $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ is a **faithful functor** if for every pair of objects $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$ and any pair of morphisms $f_1, f_2: a \longrightarrow b$ the equality $\mathbf{F}f_1 = \mathbf{F}f_2$ implies $f_1 = f_2$.

REMARK 1.14 Full functors portray a weaker form of surjectivity because not all objects in \mathbf{B} need to be of the form $\mathbf{F}a$ for some $a \in \mathbf{A}$, thus there may exist morphisms not covered by a full functor. The composition of full functors is again a full functor.

Faithful functors, sometimes called “*embeddings*”, represent a weaker form of injectivity: Since two morphisms in the domain category may be mapped to the same morphism in the codomain

category, a faithful functor need not be injective on morphisms. Again, the composition of faithful functors is again a faithful functor.

Being able to describe mappings inside or between categories and their composition, may they be defined on sets, topological spaces, groups, manifolds or something completely different, we seek for an elevated concept to that of a subset, subspace, subgroup or submanifold.

DEFINITION 1.15 (Subcategories) Given a category B , a **subcategory** $A \subseteq B$ is a collection of objects and morphisms of B such that for each object a the respective identity morphism, for each morphism f both $\text{dom}(f), \text{cod}(f) \in A$ and for each pair of composable arrows their composite arrow also lies in A .

Since these properties make A a category, we can use the inclusion functor $A \hookrightarrow B$ that sends both objects and morphisms of A to themselves in B to classify certain subcategories using 1.13.

DEFINITION 1.16 Let A be a subcategory of B . We call A a **full subcategory** of B , if the inclusion functor $A \hookrightarrow B$ is a full functor. A full subcategory is uniquely defined by its class of objects, since it contains every arrow between these objects.

The last fundamental concept of category theory we will introduce in this section is that of a *natural transformation*. A natural transformation transforms between functors thus posing a tool to compare them. One might think about natural transformations being “functors between functors”. And indeed, in the category \mathbf{Cat} of small categories, natural transformations act like functors do in our usual categories. Note that one can define higher-order categories and regard \mathbf{Cat} as a 2-category where natural transformations pose the respective 2-morphisms. Additional material on this interpretation of \mathbf{Cat} can be found in *chapter II.5* of [10].

DEFINITION 1.17 (Natural Transformations) Given two categories A, B and two functors $F, G : A \rightarrow B$ between them, a **natural transformation** $\tau : F \rightarrow G$ is a function that assigns to each object $a \in A$ an arrow $\tau_a = \tau a : Fa \rightarrow Ga$ and, for each arrow $f : a \rightarrow a'$ in A makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a & & Fa \xrightarrow{\tau_a} Ga \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow F(f) \quad \downarrow G(f) \\
 a' & & Fa' \xrightarrow{\tau_{a'}} Ga'
 \end{array}$$

We can extend the notion of isomorphisms of categories (see 1.12) to natural transformations.

DEFINITION 1.18 (Natural isomorphisms) Given two categories A, B , two functors $F, G : A \rightarrow B$ between them and a natural transformation $\tau : F \rightarrow G$, we call τ a **natural isomorphism**, if for every $a \in A$ the map τ_a is invertible in B . We denote this by $\tau : A \cong B$ and observe that the inverses $(\tau_a)^{-1}$ define a natural isomorphism $\tau^{-1} : B \rightarrow A$ or rather $\tau^{-1} : B \cong A$.

Natural transformations make precise statements about “natural” or “canonical” isomorphisms aris-

ing both in physics and pure mathematics. When saying that two objects are naturally isomorphic, what one means to say is that there exists a natural isomorphism between the respective categories. Taking $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we show that this is the case for the double dual functor:

LEMMA 1.19 Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over the field \mathbb{k} and denote the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over \mathbb{k} by $\mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Then the double dual V^{**} is naturally isomorphic to V .

Proof. Let $F: \mathbf{Vect} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ be the functor that acts on objects $V \in \mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as

$$F(V) := V^{**} = \text{Hom}(\text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{k}), \mathbb{k}).$$

For an arrow of $\mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, that is a linear map $l: V \rightarrow W$ for $V, W \in \mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, the arrow functor of F acts via

$$\begin{aligned} F(l): F(V) &\rightarrow F(W), \\ l &\rightarrow l^{**} (: V^{**} \rightarrow W^{**}) \end{aligned}$$

with l^{**} defined for $\alpha \in V^{**}$ and $\beta \in W^*$ as

$$l^{**}(\alpha)(\beta) = \alpha(\beta \circ l).$$

This is a valid functor representing the double dual acting on a vector space. To conclude the proof, we need to build a natural isomorphism between this functor and the evident identity functor. One candidate is the function that assigns to each $V \in \mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ the arrow

$$\text{eval}_V: \text{id}(V) \rightarrow F(V) = V^{**}, \quad \text{eval}_V(v)(\zeta) := \zeta(v) \quad \text{for } v \in V, \zeta \in V^*.$$

Note that the eval_V is only an isomorphism if V is finite. Now all that's left to show is that for any $l: V \rightarrow W$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{\text{eval}_V} & V^{**} \\ \downarrow l & & \downarrow l^{**} \\ W & \xrightarrow{\text{eval}_W} & W^{**} \end{array}$$

Thus let $v \in V$ and $\zeta \in W^*$. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} l^{**}(\text{eval}_V(v))(\zeta) &= \text{eval}_V(v)(\zeta \circ l) = (\zeta \circ l)(v) \\ &= \zeta(lv) = \text{eval}_W(lv)(\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

We are now in a position to introduce the *equivalence of categories* without having to suppress natural transformations.

DEFINITION 1.20 (Equivalence of categories) Let \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} be categories and $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ a functor between them. \mathbf{F} is an **equivalence of categories** (thus \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are equivalent), if there exists a functor $\mathbf{G}: \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ such that the two evident compositions

$$\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G}: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F}: \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$$

are naturally isomorphic to the identity functor $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{B}}$. This makes \mathbf{G} an equivalence of categories.

Looking back at full and faithful functors, it seems natural to make precise the idea of a bijective functor being an equivalence of categories.

THEOREM 1.21 Let $\mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{B}$ be a functor between categories. Then \mathbf{F} is an equivalence of categories if and only if \mathbf{F} is full, faithful and every object in \mathbf{B} is isomorphic to $\mathbf{F}a$ for some $a \in \mathbf{A}$.

Proof. Assume \mathbf{F} is an equivalence of categories. Let \mathbf{G} be an “inverse” functor as in 1.20 and $\tau: \mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F} \cong \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\tau^{-1}: \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{G} \cong \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{B}}$ the respective natural isomorphisms. Since for every element $b \in \mathbf{B}$, $b \cong \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{G}(b))$ holds true, we have $b \cong \mathbf{F}(a)$ for $a = \mathbf{G}(b) \in \mathbf{A}$. Using τ , we take any arrow $f: a \rightarrow a'$ in \mathbf{A} to obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} a & & \mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F}(a) & \xrightarrow{\tau_a} & a \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow \mathbf{GF}(f) & & \downarrow f \\ a' & & \mathbf{G} \circ \mathbf{F}(a') & \xrightarrow{\tau_{a'}} & a' \end{array}$$

We obtain $f = \tau_{a'} \circ \mathbf{GF}(f) \circ \tau_a^{-1}$. Thus, if for some arrow $g: a \rightarrow a'$ the equation $\mathbf{F}(f) = \mathbf{F}(g)$ holds true, the arrows must agree, which proves that \mathbf{F} is faithful. An identical consideration shows that \mathbf{G} is faithful. To show that \mathbf{F} is full, consider any arrow in \mathbf{B} of the form $h: \mathbf{F}a \rightarrow \mathbf{F}a'$ for some $a, a' \in \mathbf{A}$. Setting $f = \tau_{a'} \circ \mathbf{G}(h) \circ \tau_a^{-1}$ leaves us with $\mathbf{GF}f = \mathbf{G}(h)$ and since we know that \mathbf{G} is faithful, $\mathbf{F}f = h$ which makes \mathbf{F} a full functor.

The converse statement is easier to prove: Since the object function of \mathbf{F} is by construction surjective and a full faithful functor is (up to isomorphism) injective on objects, it is bijective on objects. Since \mathbf{F} is full and faithful, its arrow function is bijective on all arrows of the form $g: \mathbf{F}a \rightarrow \mathbf{F}a'$ for some $a, a' \in \mathbf{A}$. Since all arrows are necessarily of this form, \mathbf{F} has a two-sided inverse and thus, by rule of 1.12 and 1.20, is an equivalence of categories. \square

Considering full subcategories one might ask, if they can “capture” the full structure of the ambient category. Indeed subcategories can drastically simplify the investigation of the full category.

DEFINITION 1.22 (Skeleton of a Category) Given a category \mathbf{C} a **skeleton** \mathbf{S} of \mathbf{C} is a full subcategory such that every object $c \in \mathbf{C}$ is isomorphic to exactly one object in \mathbf{S} . Thus the inclusion functor $\mathbf{S} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is an equivalence of categories. We call a category **skeletal** when it is its own skeleton.

A similar concept can be defined for morphisms of a category.

DEFINITION 1.23 (Generating Set of a Category) For a category \mathbf{C} , a **generating set** or **set of generators** is a set A of arrows such that any arrow of \mathbf{C} can be obtained by composing arrows of A .

Both the *skeleton* and the *generating* set of a category are very helpful when dealing with concrete categories: Identifying the skeleton and then finding a set of generators allows for strongly simplified treatment of categories since only a subset of objects and arrows has to be considered. While it is in general not trivial to find a skeleton or prove that a certain set of arrows is a set of generators, we will encounter cases where both can be done with manageable effort.

Note that one of the founding fathers of category theory, *Saunders Mac Lane*, stated that “[...] ‘category’ has been defined in order to be able to define ‘functor’ and ‘functor’ has been defined in order to be able to define ‘natural transformation’.” [11]. After finding certain assignments that naturally arise in physics to be functors, thus applying the framework of category theory to a physical setting, the main point of interest will indeed be the comparison of such functors and the underlying categories using natural transformations. That being said, the most important type of natural transformations will be natural isomorphisms, which allow for a precise formulation of “canonical” identification.

1.2 Monoidal Categories and Functors

Vector spaces and their morphisms play an important role in theoretical physics. We will see that $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a fitting candidate ingredient for the notion of a *Topological Quantum Field Theory*. To make $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ tangible, this subchapter will generalise many of the properties it inherits from its objects. After this subchapter we will be able to identify $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as a *monoidal category* and understand morphisms within and natural transformations between such categories.

First we make precise expressions of the form $U \times V$ for two sets $U, V \in \mathbf{Set}$ or $V \times W$ for two vector spaces $V, W \in \mathbf{Vect}$. This direct product is widely used in mathematical and physical notation. While its use is clear by informal arguments, it stems from a rigorous categorial concept:

DEFINITION 1.24 (Product categories) Let \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} be two categories. The **product category** denoted by $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ is the category whose objects are pairs of the form $\langle a, b \rangle$ for $a \in \mathbf{A}$ and $b \in \mathbf{B}$. An arrow $\langle a, b \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a', b' \rangle$ of $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ is a pair $\langle f, g \rangle$ of arrows $f : a \longrightarrow a'$ and $g : b \longrightarrow b'$, the composite of two such arrows is defined by

$$\langle f', g' \rangle \circ \langle f, g \rangle = \langle f' \circ f, g' \circ g \rangle.$$

The two functors defined on objects and arrows by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{\mathbf{P}} & \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Q}} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{P}\langle f, g \rangle & = & f, & & \mathbf{Q}\langle f, g \rangle = g \end{array}$$

are called **projection functors**.

REMARK 1.25 Note that for any category \mathbf{C} equipped with two functors

$$\mathbf{A} \xleftarrow{L} \mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{R} \mathbf{B}$$

there exists a unique functor $F: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ defined on arrows h in \mathbf{C} as $Fh = \langle Lh, Rh \rangle$ thus satisfying $PF = L, QF = R$. This can be visualised in the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbf{C} & & \\ & \swarrow L & \vdots F & \searrow R & \\ \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{P} & \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{Q} & \mathbf{B} \end{array}$$

Properties like this can be generalised to the notion of **universal properties** or **universal arrows**. The pair of projection functors is universal among pairs of functors to \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} .

Above we see a functor mapping a category to a product category. So-called **bifunctors** that map a product category to a usual category will be indispensable for the discussion of *monoidal categories*. A bifunctor can be read as a functor whose object and arrow function depend on two instances respectively. Taking the cartesian product $X \times Y$ of two sets $X, Y \in \mathbf{Set}$ as an example, we see that it denotes the object function of the bifunctor $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

We aim to show that the product \times can be understood as a bifunctor itself. Note that while we discuss this using the functor on the product category

$$\times: \mathbf{Cat} \times \mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat},$$

there are functors $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathbf{Top} \times \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$, $\mathbf{Man} \times \mathbf{Man} \rightarrow \mathbf{Man}$ etc., which, in an abuse of notation, are often collectively referred to as *the product functor* \times . To identify the product functor, take two functors $F: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ and $G: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ and note that the “product functor” $F \times G: \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{D}$ is uniquely defined on arrows and objects as

$$(F \times G)\langle f, g \rangle = \langle Ff, Gg \rangle, \quad (F \times G)\langle a, c \rangle = \langle Fa, Gc \rangle.$$

Thus we can identify the product \times as a bifunctor carrying the product of categories as its object function and the product functors as its arrow function. Hence it is a bifunctor $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. With a clear understanding of the product of categories, we can use \times unambiguously.

As the title of this subchapter suggests, our main goal is to approach *monoidal categories* which are categories that carry an internal product between objects and arrows that is associative up to isomorphism. Their construction will make use of bifunctors and product categories.

REMARK 1.26 Thinking back to *Monoids* 1.9, we aim to generalise the idea of a category equipped with an associative binary operation and a unit to categories with more than one object. This concept is parallel to that of a *monoid* in set theory. While this roughly explains the name

of *monoidal categories*, another explanation comes from higher category theory (again, see *chapter II.5* of 10). Here a monoidal 1-category can be considered as a 2-category with only one object, satisfying the properties of a monoid for 2-categories.

DEFINITION 1.27 (Monoidal categories) A **monoidal category** $\mathbf{M} = \langle \mathbf{M}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ consists of a category \mathbf{M} , a bifunctor $\otimes: \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$, an object $e \in \mathbf{M}$ acting as a unit of the product and three natural isomorphisms α, λ, ρ on \mathbf{M} subject to the following conditions:

- For any $a \in \mathbf{A}$ the natural isomorphisms λ, ρ satisfy

$$\lambda_a: a \otimes e \cong a, \quad \rho_a: e \otimes a \cong a, \quad \lambda_e = \rho_e: e \otimes e \rightarrow e.$$

- For any $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{M}$ the following commuting diagram, called the **pentagon identity** or **pentagon equation**, arises from $\alpha_{a,b,c}: a \otimes (b \otimes c) \cong (a \otimes b) \otimes c$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (a \otimes b) \otimes (c \otimes d) & \\
 \alpha_{a,b,c \otimes d} \nearrow & & \searrow \alpha_{a \otimes b, c, d} \\
 a \otimes (b \otimes (c \otimes d)) & & ((a \otimes b) \otimes c) \otimes d \\
 \text{id}_a \otimes \alpha_{b,c,d} \downarrow & & \uparrow \alpha_{a,b,c} \otimes \text{id}_d \\
 a \otimes ((b \otimes c) \otimes d) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{a,b \otimes c, d}} & (a \otimes (b \otimes c)) \otimes d
 \end{array}$$

- For any $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$ the following diagram, called the **triangle identity**, commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & a \otimes b & \\
 \text{id}_a \otimes \rho_b \nearrow & & \nwarrow \lambda_a \otimes \text{id}_b \\
 a \otimes (e \otimes b) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{a,e,b}} & (a \otimes e) \otimes b
 \end{array}$$

Note that the bifunctor is denoted by \otimes which hints at one of its popular names, the “*tensor product*”. Some authors (see [10]) denote the defining bifunctor using “ \square ” or “ \times ” and refrain from calling it the tensor product to avoid any terms that hint towards special applications. The name “tensor product” won’t be used unless fitting the context, but the bifunctor will continue to be denoted by “ \otimes ”.

To show how widespread monoidal categories are, we present some common examples:

EXAMPLE 1.28

- Taking the category of abelian groups \mathbf{Ab} , one can use the tensor product of its objects A, B defined by the mapping

$$A \times B \rightarrow A \otimes B, \quad (a, b) \mapsto a \otimes b$$

together with the unique natural isomorphism $\alpha_{ABC}: A \otimes (B \otimes C) \longrightarrow A \otimes (B \otimes C)$ and the two natural isomorphisms $\lambda_A: A \otimes \mathbb{Z} \cong A$ and $\rho_A: \mathbb{Z} \otimes A \cong A$ to form the monoidal category of abelian groups $\langle \mathbf{Ab}, \otimes, \mathbb{Z}, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$. \mathbb{Z} acts as the unit of the tensor product.

- \times is a bifunctor on \mathbf{Set} . As a unit for this bifunctor, we can use a singleton set $\{*\}$. Together with the identifications $\alpha: U \times (V \times W) \cong (U \times V) \times W$ and $\rho: \{*\} \times V \cong V \cong V \times \{*\}$: λ for any $U, V, W \in \mathbf{Set}$, we obtain the monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Set}, \times, \{*\}, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$.
- For $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we can use the tensor product of vector spaces. The field \mathbb{k} acts as a unit which allows for the following natural isomorphisms for \mathbb{k} -vector spaces U, V, W :

$$\alpha_{UVW}: U \otimes (V \otimes W) \longrightarrow U \otimes (V \otimes W), \quad \rho_V: \mathbb{k} \otimes V \cong V \cong V \otimes \mathbb{k}: \lambda_V.$$

We obtain the monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \otimes, \mathbb{k}, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$.

While monoidal categories provide a powerful tool to identify categories equipped with an “almost associative” bifunctor, we can restrict to categories whose tensor product is “completely associative”:

DEFINITION 1.29 (Strict monoidal categories) A monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ is a **strict monoidal category** if the three natural isomorphisms α, λ, ρ are naturally isomorphic to the identity isomorphisms. We usually omit them from our notation and denote a strict monoidal category by $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$.

In fact one can treat monoidal categories like their strict counterparts. To formulate such an equivalence we need to adapt functors and natural transformations to the monoidal context.

DEFINITION 1.30 ((Strict) monoidal functors) Given (strict) monoidal categories $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{D}, \tilde{\otimes}, \tilde{e}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\rho} \rangle$ we call a functor $F: \mathbf{C} \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}$ a **(strict) monoidal functor** and denote it by

$$F: \langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \mathbf{D}, \tilde{\otimes}, \tilde{e}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\rho} \rangle$$

if it satisfies the following properties for any objects $a, b, c \in \mathbf{C}$ and arrows f, g in \mathbf{C} :

$$\begin{aligned} F(a \otimes b) &\cong Fa \tilde{\otimes} Fb, & F(f \otimes g) &\cong Ff \tilde{\otimes} Fg, & Fe &= \tilde{e} \\ F\alpha_{abc} &= \tilde{\alpha}_{FaFbFc}, & F\lambda_a &= \tilde{\lambda}_{Fa}, & F\rho_a &= \tilde{\rho}_{Fa}. \end{aligned}$$

If a monoidal functor is an equivalence of categories, we call it an **equivalence of monoidal categories** and the respective categories **monoidally equivalent**. The composition of monoidal functors is again monoidal.

The above definition shows that a monoidal functor respects the monoidal structure in that it commutes with the bifunctor \otimes and maps its unit and the respective natural isomorphisms onto one another. Using monoidal functors, we build the category of small monoidal categories, \mathbf{Moncat} . This category includes the full subcategory 1.16 of strict monoidal categories denoted by \mathbf{Moncat}^S . For strict monoidal categories, we can omit the second row of conditions in the definition of a monoidal functor and replace all occurrences of “ \cong ” by “ $=$ ”.

The definition of monoidal natural transformations adapts the one given in [6, chapter 2.4.] to the structure of monoidal categories:

DEFINITION 1.31 (Monoidal natural transformation) Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{D}, \tilde{\otimes}, \tilde{e}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\rho} \rangle$ be two monoidal categories and $F, G: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ two monoidal functors between them. We call a natural transformation $\eta: F \rightarrow G$ a **morphism of monoidal functors** or a **monoidal natural transformation**, if $\eta_e = \tilde{e}$ and the following diagram commutes for all $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(a \otimes b) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & Fa \tilde{\otimes} Fb \\ \eta_{a \otimes b} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_a \tilde{\otimes} \eta_b \\ G(a \otimes b) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & Ga \tilde{\otimes} Gb \end{array}$$

For a natural transformation of strict monoidal functors, we can reduce these conditions to $\eta_e = \tilde{e}$ and $\eta_{a \otimes b} = \eta_a \tilde{\otimes} \eta_b$.

REMARK 1.32 For an equivalence of monoidal categories $F: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ there exists an inverse equivalence of monoidal categories $F^{-1}: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ such that $F \circ F^{-1}$ and $F^{-1} \circ F$ are naturally monoidally isomorphic to the monoidal identity functors $I_{\mathbf{C}}$ and $I_{\mathbf{D}}$ respectively.

The following theorem strongly simplifies the treatment of monoidal categories:

THEOREM 1.33 (Strictification Theorem) Every monoidal category is monoidally equivalent to a strict monoidal category.

Proof. This proof adapts the one of *Theorem 2.8.5.* in [6] to the given definition of a monoidal category 1.27. Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ be a monoidal category. Our goal is to construct a strict monoidal category using \mathbf{C} and show that there exists a monoidal equivalence of categories between them.

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ be the category defined as follows: Its objects are pairs $\langle F, \eta \rangle$ where $F: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is a functor and for any $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$

$$\eta_{ab}: F(a \otimes b) \cong F(a) \otimes b$$

is a natural isomorphism such that the following diagram commutes for all $a, b, c \in \mathbf{C}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & (F(a) \otimes b) \otimes c & & \\ & \nearrow \eta_{ab} \otimes \text{id}_c & & \nwarrow \alpha_{F(a), b, c} & \\ F(a \otimes b) \otimes c & & & & F(a) \otimes (b \otimes c) \\ \eta_{a \otimes bc} \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \eta_{ab \otimes c} \\ F((a \otimes b) \otimes c) & \xleftarrow{F(\alpha_{abc})} & & & F(a \otimes (b \otimes c)) \end{array}$$

We define the arrows of $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$, denoted as $\tau: (F_1, \eta^1) \rightarrow (F_2, \eta^2)$, to be natural transformations $\tau: F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ which make the following diagram commute for any $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{F}_1(a \otimes b) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{ab}^1} & \mathbf{F}_1(a) \otimes b \\
 \tau_{a \otimes b} \downarrow & & \downarrow \tau_a \otimes \text{id}_b \\
 \mathbf{F}_2(a \otimes b) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{ab}^1} & \mathbf{F}_2(a) \otimes b
 \end{array}$$

To make $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ a category we need a composition of arrows. Since we defined its arrows to be natural transformations, we can make use of their composition. The next step is to show that $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ is a monoidal category:

Let (\mathbf{F}_1, η^1) and (\mathbf{F}_2, η^2) be two objects in $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$. We define a bifunctor $\otimes: \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \times \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ with an object function $(\mathbf{F}_1, \eta^1) \otimes (\mathbf{F}_2, \eta^2) = (\mathbf{F}_1\mathbf{F}_2, \eta)$ where η is defined by the following composition for any $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$:

$$\mathbf{F}_1\mathbf{F}_2(a \otimes b) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}_1(\eta_{ab}^2)} \mathbf{F}_1(\mathbf{F}_2(a) \otimes b) \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathbf{F}_2(a)b}^1} \mathbf{F}_1\mathbf{F}_2(a) \otimes b.$$

The tensor product for arrows is, again, the usual composition of natural transformations. This shows that $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ is a *strict monoidal category* with unit $(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{C}}, \text{id})$. Now we need to construct a monoidal equivalence between \mathbf{C} and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$. To this end, define a functor

$$\mathbf{L}: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \quad a \mapsto (a \otimes -, \alpha_{a--}), \quad f \mapsto (f \otimes -)$$

where $(-)$ denotes an argument. Writing the above pentagon diagram for \mathbf{L} amounts to writing the pentagon equation 1.27 for \mathbf{C} . Since for any $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$

$$e \otimes a \cong a, \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{eab}: e \otimes (a \otimes b) \cong (e \otimes a) \otimes b$$

any (\mathbf{F}, η) in $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{F}(e))$. Now let $\tau: \mathbf{L}(a) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}(b)$ be a morphism in $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ and define an arrow of \mathbf{C} , $f: a \rightarrow b$ by the composition

$$a \xrightarrow{\lambda_a^{-1}} a \otimes e \xrightarrow{\tau_e} b \otimes e \xrightarrow{\lambda_b} b.$$

To show that \mathbf{L} is full, we need to prove that for all $c \in \mathbf{C}$ one has $\tau_c = f \otimes \text{id}_c$. Since $\mathbf{L}(f) = (f \otimes -)$ this would prove $\tau = \mathbf{L}(f)$ and thus τ would be full by definition 1.13. Indeed, the following diagram commutes for any $c \in \mathbf{C}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 a \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_a \otimes \rho_c^{-1}} & a \otimes (e \otimes c) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{aec}} & (a \otimes e) \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\lambda_a \otimes \text{id}_c} & a \otimes c \\
 \tau_c \downarrow & & \tau_{e \otimes c} \downarrow & & \tau_e \otimes \text{id}_c \downarrow & & f \otimes \text{id}_c \downarrow \\
 b \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_b \otimes \rho_c^{-1}} & b \otimes (e \otimes c) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{bec}} & (b \otimes e) \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\lambda_b \otimes \text{id}_c} & b \otimes c
 \end{array}$$

This can be seen as follows: The rows commute by rule of the triangle identity 1.27. The left square commutes since τ is a natural transformation 1.17, the right square by definition of f . For the remaining square note that τ is an arrow in $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ and thus a natural transformation.

To show that \mathbf{L} is faithful we take two arrows f, g in \mathbf{C} . Now if $\mathbf{L}(f) = \mathbf{L}(g)$ we have $f \otimes \text{id}_e = g \otimes \text{id}_e$

and by rule of the natural isomorphism λ , $f = g$. Thus L is faithful. Putting all this together, L satisfies the requirements of 1.21, forming an equivalence of categories.

The last part of the proof is to show that L is a monoidal functor. $L(e)$ is isomorphic to the identity in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Also, for any two arrows $f, g \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$L(f \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} g) = ((f \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} g) \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} -) \cong (f \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} (g \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} -)) = Lf \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} Lg.$$

For $L(\alpha_{abc}) \cong \tilde{\alpha}_{L(a)L(b)L(c)}$ we the respective commuting hexagon diagram reduces to the *pentagon identity* in \mathcal{C} . To show $L(\lambda_a) \cong \tilde{\lambda}_{L(a)}$ (the same goes for ρ_a) consider the commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & (a \otimes e) \otimes b & \\ \lambda_a \otimes \text{id}_b \swarrow & & \nwarrow \alpha_{aeb} \\ a \otimes b & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_a \otimes \lambda_b^{-1}} & a \otimes (e \otimes b) \end{array}$$

Last we need to prove $L(a \otimes b) \cong L(a) \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} L(b)$ which again reduces to composition of functors. This concludes the proof. \square

Using 1.33 we omit the distinction between strict and “relaxed” monoidal categories and use the term “monoidal” category for the equivalent strict monoidal category. We denote a monoidal category by $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ while still using α, λ, ρ occasionally. We find that monoidal categories harbour monoids in a natural manner:

DEFINITION 1.34 (Monoids of a monoidal categories) Let $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ be a monoidal category. A **monoid** in \mathcal{C} is a triple $\langle c, \mu, \eta \rangle$ where $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is an object, $\mu: c \otimes c \rightarrow c$ a bifunctor called “multiplication” and $\eta: e \rightarrow c$ an arrow called “unit” such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} c \otimes (c \otimes c) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{ccc}} & (c \otimes c) \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}_c} & c \otimes c \\ \text{id}_c \otimes \mu \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \mu \\ c \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\mu} & c & & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} e \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\eta \otimes \text{id}_c} & c \otimes c & \xleftarrow{\text{id}_c \otimes \eta} & c \otimes e \\ & \searrow \rho & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow \lambda & \\ & & c & & \end{array}$$

Closely related to monoids are comonoids which are the dual construction and will be used in chapter 3.

DEFINITION 1.35 (Comonoids of a monoidal categories) Let $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ be a monoidal category. A **comonoid** in \mathcal{C} is a triple $\langle c, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ where $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is an object, $\delta: c \rightarrow c \otimes c$ a morphism called “comultiplication” and $\varepsilon: c \rightarrow e$ an arrow called “counit” such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} c \otimes (c \otimes c) & \xleftarrow{\cong} & (c \otimes c) \otimes c & \xleftarrow{\delta \otimes \text{id}_c} & c \otimes c \\ \text{id}_c \otimes \delta \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \delta \\ c \otimes c & \xleftarrow{\delta} & c & & c \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} e \otimes c & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_c} & c \otimes c & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_c \otimes \varepsilon} & c \otimes e \\ & \swarrow \cong & \uparrow \delta & \searrow \cong & \\ & & c & & \end{array}$$

REMARK 1.36 Every category \mathbf{C} has a so-called “opposite category” \mathbf{C}^{op} whose objects are the same as those of \mathbf{C} but a morphism $f: a \rightarrow b$ in \mathbf{C} is an arrow $f: b \rightarrow a$ in \mathbf{C}^{op} . The composite of arrows $f \circ g$ in \mathbf{C} is defined to be the composite $g \circ f$ in \mathbf{C}^{op} . While we won’t use opposite categories, note that the opposite of a monoidal category inherits a monoidal structure and comonoids are the monoids of the opposite category.

DEFINITION 1.37 (Morphism of Monoids) Given two monoids $\langle c, \mu, \eta \rangle$ and $\langle d, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\eta} \rangle$ and an arrow $f: c \rightarrow d$ in the monoidal category, we call f a **morphism of monoids** and denote it by $f: \langle c, \mu, \eta \rangle \rightarrow \langle d, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\eta} \rangle$ if f satisfies

$$f\mu = \tilde{\mu}(f \otimes f): c \otimes c \rightarrow d, \quad f\eta = \tilde{\eta}: e \rightarrow d.$$

We can define a morphism of comonoids $\langle c, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ and $\langle d, \tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\varepsilon} \rangle$ as an arrow $f: c \rightarrow d$ such that

$$(f \otimes f)(\delta) = \tilde{\delta}(f): c \rightarrow d \otimes d, \quad \eta = \tilde{\eta}(f): c \rightarrow e.$$

Using the morphisms of monoids as arrows, one can define the category of monoids of a monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ denoted by $\mathbf{Mon}_{\mathbf{C}}$. The same works for comonoids resulting in $\mathbf{coMon}_{\mathbf{C}}$. The forgetful functor $F: \mathbf{Mon}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ maps $\langle c, \mu, \eta \rangle \mapsto c$ and thus “forgets” the monoid structure defined on “ c ”. Again, we provide some examples:

EXAMPLE 1.38

- Monoids in the monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Ab}, \otimes, \mathbb{Z} \rangle$ are rings.
- A monoid in the monoidal category of small sets $\langle \mathbf{Set}, \times, \{*\} \rangle$ is a set equipped with an associative multiplication and an identity element. A monoid in \mathbf{Set} agrees with the previous notion of a monoid 1.9.
- In $\langle \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \otimes, \mathbb{k} \rangle$, the monoids are vector spaces equipped with a ring structure that respects the \mathbb{k} -vector space structure. Those are \mathbb{k} -algebras, which we will encounter in 3.2.

Generalizing left- and right-modules as actions of a ring on an abelian group, we define bifunctors that utilise monoids:

DEFINITION 1.39 (Action of a Monoid) Given a monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ and a monoid $\langle c, \mu, \eta \rangle$ therein, a **left action of a monoid** on an object $a \in \mathbf{C}$ is an arrow $\sigma: c \otimes a \rightarrow a$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} c \otimes (c \otimes a) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{cca}} & (c \otimes c) \otimes a & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}_a} & c \otimes a & \xleftarrow{\eta \otimes \text{id}_a} & e \otimes a \\ \text{id}_c \otimes \sigma \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \sigma & \swarrow \lambda & \\ c \otimes a & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & & & a & & \end{array}$$

A **right action of a monoid** is defined in a similar fashion.

There are some interesting examples of left/right actions using the presented monoids:

EXAMPLE 1.40

- The monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Ab}, \otimes, \mathbb{Z} \rangle$ has rings as its monoids. Taking a ring \mathcal{R} and an abelian group $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{Ab}$, the left (or right) action of \mathcal{R} on \mathcal{A} gives it a left (or right) \mathcal{R} -module structure.
- For a monoid $\langle M, \mu, \eta \rangle$ in $\langle \mathbf{Set}, \times, \{*\} \rangle$, the left (or right) action of M on a set $U \in \mathbf{Set}$ is given by the left (or right) M -action of a monoid on a set.
- For a monoid $\langle M, \mu, \eta \rangle$ and an object V in $\langle \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \otimes, \mathbb{k} \rangle$, the left (or right) action of M on V defines the structure of a left (or right) \mathbb{k} -algebra module.

DEFINITION 1.41 (Morphisms of Actions of Monoids) Given a monoidal category $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$, three elements $a, b, c \in \mathcal{C}$, a monoid $\langle a, \mu, \eta \rangle$, a left action of a on b and one on c , denoted by σ and λ respectively, a **morphism of left actions** $f: \sigma \rightarrow \lambda$ is an arrow $f: b \rightarrow c$ in \mathcal{C} such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a \otimes b & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_a \otimes f} & a \otimes c \\
 \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow \lambda \\
 b & \xrightarrow{f} & c
 \end{array}$$

A **morphism of right actions** is defined analogously.

These morphisms enable a definition of the categories of left and right actions for a given monoid a . We will denote them by \mathbf{Ract}_a and \mathbf{Lact}_a respectively.

Note that up until here, we worked with categories equipped with a bifunctor of varying associativity. Starting with the notion of product categories, we saw that monoidal categories embody “associativity up to isomorphism”. However they are equivalent to their strict counterparts which embody full associativity. We also saw that the concept of monoids from 1.1 occurs within monoidal categories. The most important takeaway is that $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a monoidal category which we will use in the categorial formulation of chapter 3.

1.3 Braided and Symmetric Monoidal Categories

The previous chapter explored *monoidal categories* which are categories equipped with an internal product of varying associativity providing a categorial version of a commutative *monoid*. Next we investigate its *distributivity* which leads to *braided monoidal categories*. Full distributivity is described by *symmetric monoidal categories* like $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ making it a fitting candidate for *TQFTs* from both a mathematical and physical perspective.

This chapter again makes use of [10] and [6] while adapting to previous notation. Some of the comments on *TQFTs* will refer to discussions found in *chapter 2* of [3] and [2].

DEFINITION 1.42 (Braiding) Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho \rangle$ be a monoidal category. A **braiding** of \mathbf{C} is a collection of natural isomorphisms, natural in all $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$

$$\gamma_{ab}: a \otimes b \cong b \otimes a$$

that satisfy the following “coherence” properties with respect to the isomorphisms α, λ, ρ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (ab)c & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{(ab)c}} & c(ab) & & a(bc) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{a(bc)}} & (bc)a & & a & \xleftarrow{=} & a \\
 \alpha_{abc}^{-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_{cab} & & \alpha_{abc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_{bca}^{-1} & & \uparrow \lambda & & \uparrow \rho \\
 a(bc) & & (ca)b & & (ab)c & & b(ca) & & a \otimes e & & e \otimes a \\
 \text{id}_a \otimes \gamma_{bc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_{ca} \otimes \text{id}_b & & \gamma_{ab} \otimes \text{id}_c \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id}_b \otimes \gamma_{ca} & & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{ae}} & & \\
 a(cb) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{acb}} & (ac)b & & (ba)c & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{bac}^{-1}} & b(ac) & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Above we suppressed many instances of “ \otimes ” to shorten notation. We usually denote a *braiding* (namely the collection of isomorphisms) by its respective greek letter without an index.

REMARK 1.43 The naturality of the braiding in its two factors is a strong statement. For any two arrows $f: a \rightarrow b$ and $g: c \rightarrow d$ in \mathbf{C} we have $(g \otimes f) \circ \gamma_{ac} \cong \gamma_{bd} \circ (f \otimes g)$. This property will be used in chapters 2 and 3.

Equipping a monoidal category with a braiding we implement distributivity up to isomorphism:

DEFINITION 1.44 (Braided monoidal category) A **braided monoidal category** is a monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ equipped with a braiding γ . We denote it by $\langle \mathbf{C}, \gamma \rangle$.

The same monoidal category can be used to form different braided monoidal categories depending on the choice of braiding. To compare and identify them, we need to adapt functors and natural transformations. Before that, we provide two examples of braided monoidal categories:

EXAMPLE 1.45

- $\langle \mathbf{Set}, \times, \{*\} \rangle$, can be equipped with the family of transposition isomorphism $\gamma_{UV}: U \times V \cong V \times U$ for any $U, V \in \mathbf{Set}$. They define a braiding, forming the braided monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Set}, \gamma \rangle$.
- $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ can be endowed with a braiding induced by the natural isomorphism of the tensor product of any two objects V, W :

$$\gamma_{VW}: V \otimes W \xrightarrow{\sim} W \otimes V, \quad v \otimes w \mapsto w \otimes v.$$

We obtain the braided monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \gamma \rangle$.

DEFINITION 1.46 (Braided monoidal functors) Given two braided monoidal categories $\langle \mathbf{A}, \gamma \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{B}, \tilde{\gamma} \rangle$, we call a monoidal functor $F: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ a **braided monoidal functor** if the following diagram commutes for any $a, b \in \mathbf{A}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Fa \otimes Fb & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\gamma}} & Fb \otimes Fa \\
 \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\
 F(a \otimes b) & \xrightarrow{F(\gamma)} & F(b \otimes a)
 \end{array}$$

A braided monoidal functor “commutes” with the involved braidings. Again the composition of two braided functors is braided.

Using these as arrows, one can define the category of braided monoidal categories $\mathbf{BrMonCat}$. Considering the idea of a strict monoidal category 1.29 embodying full associativity of the tensor product, we consider a “fully distributive” braiding.

DEFINITION 1.47 (Symmetric monoidal categories) Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \gamma \rangle$ be a braided monoidal category. We call it a **symmetric monoidal category**, if for every $a, b \in \mathbf{C}$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & b \otimes a & \\
 \gamma_{ab} \nearrow & & \searrow \gamma_{ba} \\
 a \otimes b & \xleftarrow{\text{id}_{a \otimes b}} & a \otimes b
 \end{array}$$

This can be read as $\gamma_{ab} \circ \gamma_{ba} = \text{id}_{a \otimes b}$.

Both examples we gave for braided monoidal categories are symmetric monoidal categories. The definition of a braided monoidal functor extends to that of a **symmetric monoidal functor**. Their composition is also a symmetric monoidal functor.

A symmetric braiding can be undone by applying the naive inverse braiding morphism. Meanwhile a general braiding can behave like a “twist” operation that is not involutive. Both types of braidings have applications in Quantum Mechanics [10, page 251], but we will work with symmetric monoidal categories. At this point, we will take a short detour and investigate dual objects. This provides an interesting result for $\mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{K}}$.

DEFINITION 1.48 (Dualisable object) Given $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbf{MonCat}$ denoted by $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ an object A is **left dualisable** if there exists an object $A^* \in \mathbf{C}$ and two morphisms:

1. The **evaluation map**

$$\text{ev}_A: A^* \otimes A \longrightarrow e. \quad (1)$$

2. The **coevaluation map**

$$\iota_A: e \longrightarrow A \otimes A^*. \quad (2)$$

such that the following two diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A^* \otimes (A \otimes A^*) & \xleftarrow{\text{id} \otimes \iota_A} & A^* \otimes e \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
 (A^* \otimes A) \otimes A^* & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_A \otimes \text{id}} & e \otimes A^*
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 (A \otimes A^*) \otimes A & \xleftarrow{\iota_A \otimes \text{id}} & e \otimes A \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
 A \otimes (A^* \otimes A) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{ev}_A} & A \otimes e
 \end{array}$$

Right dualisability follows analogously.

LEMMA 1.49 Let there be a monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ and a monoid/comonoid $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ therein. If for A there also exists a comonoid/monoid structure, the object A is its own left and right dual.

Proof. The results is immediate when comparing the diagrams for the multiplication in 1.34 and for the comultiplication in 1.35 with the above for left and right dualisability. \square

DEFINITION 1.50 (Invertible Object) If A is a left or right dualisable object for which ev_A and ι_A are isomorphisms, it is called **invertible**.

REMARK 1.51 For a symmetric monoidal category like $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ there is no difference between a left and a right dual. This is immediate for the example since both the left and the right dual for $V \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ are indeed $V^* = \text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{k})$.

DEFINITION 1.52 (Rigid Monoidal Category) If every $A \in \mathbf{C}$ for $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbf{MonCat}$ has a left and right dual, we call \mathbf{C} a **rigid monoidal category**. If it is symmetric, every object is invertible and we call it a **compact closed category**. We call objects **rigid** if they have a left and a right dual.

The following results follows from 1.49:

COROLLARY 1.53 If every $A \in \mathbf{C}$ for $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbf{MonCat}$ admits the structure of a monoid and a comonoid, \mathbf{C} is rigid.

EXAMPLE 1.54 In $\mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, every object is rigid. The evaluation and coevaluation morphisms are isomorphisms to the unit element \mathbb{k} . The restriction to the full subcategory of finite objects is needed for most applications.

2 The Category of Cobordisms

This chapter introduces the category of *cobordisms*, \mathbf{cob}_n , whose objects are smooth oriented compact $(n-1)$ -dimensional real manifolds without boundary. It is named after its arrows, equivalence classes of n -dimensional manifolds whose boundary is the disjoint union of two objects. \mathbf{cob}_n can be seen as a toy model for spacetime: Its objects represent slices through an equivalence class of spacetimes and the arrows function as the (time-)evolution of these slices. This hints at a rich geometric structure, however we are interested in Topological Quantum Field Theory, which will not make use of any local geometric properties.

The following presentation and discussion of \mathbf{cob}_n will in most parts follow *chapter 1* of *Joachim Kock's* book on *Frobenius Algebras and 2D Topological Quantum Field Theories* [8] and some interesting comments in [3].


2.1 Cobordisms

We first introduce unoriented cobordisms as they display the main ideas and motivate oriented cobordisms.


DEFINITION 2.1 (Unoriented cobordism) Let Σ_1 and Σ_2 be two smooth compact $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifolds without boundary for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A **cobordism** between Σ_1 and Σ_2 is a smooth compact n -dimensional manifold M with boundary the disjoint union $\Sigma_1 \amalg \Sigma_2$. The manifolds Σ_1 and Σ_2 are then called **cobordant**.

As mentioned in [8], the prefix “co-” does not hint at duality but stems from its reading as “together”. A *bordism* was first defined to be a manifold that is the boundary of another manifold. A *cobordism* expands this concept to two boundaries. One can represent cobordisms in low dimensions using diagrams:

EXAMPLE 2.2 Some examples in dimension $n = 2$ include



The rightmost example represents a cobordism between a simply connected and a disconnected manifold. Other visualizations arise when one or both boundaries are the empty manifold \emptyset :



This style of visualization will permeate the project since it allows for a graphic representation of most operations on cob_2 and when working with TQFTs 4. The examples will prevalently live in $n = 2$ or $n = 1$. This is due to the fact that a compact 1-dimensional manifold is either a circle or the disjoint union of circles (if without boundary) or a closed interval or the disjoint union of closed intervals (if with boundaries). The case $n = 1$ only hosts points and their disjoint unions as manifolds.

LEMMA 2.3 Two compact 0-manifolds without boundary are cobordant iff they have the same number of points mod 2. Furthermore, any two compact 1-manifolds without boundary are cobordant.

Proof. We begin with $n = 1$, thus 0-manifolds:

Taking two such manifolds with the same number of points mod 2, there are two cases. If both have an even number of points, we can join those in pairs by smooth curves. If both have an odd number of points, we progress as before until one point is left on each side. Then we connect the two remaining points. For the other direction note that any compact oriented 1-manifold with boundary has an even number of boundary components due to them being disjoint unions of closed intervals. Thus the two boundary manifolds together have an even number of points which proves the statement for $n = 1$.

Next we turn to $n = 2$, thus 1-manifolds:

Any compact 1-dimensional manifold without boundary is a disjoint union of circles. Consider the two cobordisms from the circle to the empty manifold or from the empty manifold to the circle:



By “attaching” the fitting cobordism to all circles on each side, we obtain a trivial cobordism which proves the statement. □

Next we give meaning to the “left” and “right” side of the diagrams. This allows for parallels to time evolution as well as the direction of arrows in a category.

DEFINITION 2.4 Let M be a smooth oriented manifold and N a smooth compact $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifold without boundary inheriting the orientation of M . Given some $p \in N$ and an element $v \in T_p N$ we call v a **positive normal** if for any positive basis $[v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}]$ of $T_p N$ one obtains a positive basis of $T_p M$ via $[v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, v]$.

DEFINITION 2.5 (In- and Out-Boundaries) In the same setting as above, let N be a connected component of ∂M . We call N an **out-boundary** if a positive normal of N points outwards relative to M and an **in-boundary** if it points inwards relative to M .

The above definition is invariant under orientation-reversal. We unambiguously define

DEFINITION 2.6 ((Oriented) Cobordisms) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Sigma_{in}, \Sigma_{out}$ be compact $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifolds without boundary. An **(oriented) cobordism** between them is a tuple (M, ι_i, ι_o) where M is a smooth compact oriented n -dimensional manifold and the maps

$$\Sigma_{in} \xrightarrow{\iota_{in}} M \xleftarrow{\iota_{out}} \Sigma_{out}$$


are smooth orientation preserving diffeomorphisms onto the in- and out-boundary of M respectively. When the diffeomorphisms are understood, we denote a cobordism by M or $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$.

A *cobordism* always refers to an oriented cobordism unless stated otherwise. The above definition preserves the idea of a unoriented cobordism and gives us more freedom than the naive extension where Σ_{in} and Σ_{out} are the in- and out-boundary. Among other things one can construct a cobordism from a manifold to itself.

EXAMPLE 2.7 (The Unit Interval) Let $I = [0, 1]$ be the unit interval equipped with its standard orientation “+”, which is passed down to the boundary points (and 0-manifolds). 0 is the in-boundary and 1 an out-boundary. However this works for any two positively oriented points p_0, p_1 since mapping p_0 to 0 and p_1 to 1 is an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism onto the boundary of I . This forms the cobordism

$$p_0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow p_1.$$

The same construction works for any path-manifold M . Thus there exists an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism $I \xrightarrow{\sim} M$. Using the other orientation of I denoted by “-” gives us four possible diagrams for cobordisms:



A special type of cobordisms in any dimension is that of a cylinder.


EXAMPLE 2.8 (Cylinder Cobordism) Let Σ be a compact oriented $(n - 1)$ -manifold without boundary and I the unit interval. The product manifold $\Sigma \times I$ has one in- and one out-boundary, namely $\Sigma \times \{0\}$ and $\Sigma \times \{1\}$. Taking the maps

$$\iota_{in} : \Sigma \xrightarrow{\sim} \Sigma \times \{0\} \subset \Sigma \times I \supset \Sigma \times \{1\} \xleftarrow{\sim} \Sigma : \iota_{out}$$

we obtain a cobordism $(\Sigma \times I, \iota_{in}, \iota_{out})$ from Σ to Σ . The same construction can be generalised to a cobordism between two $(n - 1)$ -manifolds Σ_0 and Σ_1 diffeomorphic to Σ . Using a path-manifold $M \cong I$ we can build a general cylinder cobordism between Σ_0 and Σ_1 .

For two compact oriented $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifolds without boundary there can be a multitude of cobordisms between them. Collecting equivalence classes of cobordisms will be a cornerstone on our way to a category of cobordisms:

DEFINITION 2.9 (Equivalence of Cobordisms) Let Σ_0 and Σ_1 be two compact $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifolds without boundary for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let further be M and N be two cobordisms between them. We call M and N **equivalent cobordisms** or just **equivalent**, if there exists an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism $\varphi : M \longrightarrow N$ such that the following diagram commutes:




Naively constructing a category of cobordisms, one would take compact oriented $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifolds without boundary as objects and cobordisms between them as arrows. This leads to an ill-defined composition of cobordisms which prohibits a categorical treatment. The next chapter will attempt to solve this issue.

2.2 Morse Functions and Gluing

This chapter introduces *Morse Functions* and the *gluing* of cobordisms. Both are crucial to define the *category of cobordisms* in the subsequent chapter. While it is possible to work with cobordisms without Morse functions or explicitly constructing the gluing, this route offers rewarding insights. The chapter roughly follows the lines of [8]:

We previously discussed the cylinder construction using the unit interval $I = [0, 1]$ 2.8. It became clear, that for a smooth manifold Σ functions of the form $\Sigma \times I \rightarrow I$ respecting the boundaries can play an important role. Generalizing this idea to general manifolds M yields maps of the form



Many of the topological characteristics of the manifold M can be found within such maps resulting in *Morse theory*. The reader is referred to [7] for further material. Now recall some notions of differential geometry:

DEFINITION 2.10 Let M be a compact smooth manifold of dimension m and $f: M \rightarrow I$ a smooth map for $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ a closed interval. A point $p \in M$ is called a **critical point** if $Df(p) = 0$. If a point is not critical, it is called **regular**. The image p under f is called a **critical value** or **regular value** if p is critical or regular.

In the above picture p is a critical point with corresponding critical value t_0 . q is a regular point and t_1 a regular value.

DEFINITION 2.11 Let M be a smooth manifold, $f: M \rightarrow I$ a smooth map onto a closed interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and p a critical point of f . We call p **nondegenerate** if for some coordinate chart (U, x) about p the Hessian of f is nonsingular. We define the **index** of f at p to be the number of negative eigenvalues of the Hessian.

To better understand this definition consider the following example:

EXAMPLE 2.12 Let M be a surface (2-dimensional smooth manifold) and $f: M \rightarrow I$ a smooth function. In this case, a nondegenerate critical point p has index 0 iff it is a local minimum. It has index 1 iff it is a saddle point and index 2 if it is a local maximum.

DEFINITION 2.13 (Morse functions) Let M be a smooth manifold and I an interval. We call a smooth map $f: M \rightarrow I$ a **Morse function** if all its critical points are nondegenerate. If M is a manifold with boundary, we further require

$$f^{-1}(\partial I) = \partial M$$

and that both boundary points of I are regular values of f .

REMARK 2.14 If M is compact the number of critical points of a Morse function is finite. Thus we can rearrange the function such that all those critical points have disjoint images under f . We will always assume that this is the case.

The following theorem presented by *Hirsch*, [7, chapter 6.1.2], states that “most” functions are Morse functions:

THEOREM 2.15 (Existence of Morse Functions) For any manifold M , Morse functions form a dense subset of $C^s(M, I)$ where $2 \leq s \leq \infty$.


For our purposes the above theorem states “Morse functions always exist”. We will use them to define *gluing* and investigate the glued factors.

DEFINITION 2.16 (Gluing of Topological spaces) Let X, Y and Z be topological spaces and $f: X \rightarrow Y$, $g: X \rightarrow Z$ be continuous maps between them. The **gluing of Y and Z along X** , denoted by $Y \amalg_X Z$ is the quotient space


$$Y \amalg_X Z / \sim \quad \text{where } y \sim z \quad \text{iff } \exists x \in X \quad \text{s.t. } f(x) = y \quad \& \quad g(x) = z.$$

The topology on $Y \amalg_X Z$ is defined using f, g : A set in $Y \amalg_X Z$ is open if its inverse image under f and g is open in Y or Z respectively. If the common boundary is understood, we will denote the gluing $Y \amalg_X Z$ by YZ . This notation will be adapted to smooth manifolds.

The above construction, sometimes called the “pushout”, is “unique” in a categorical sense: It is the colimit of the system $Y \longleftarrow X \longrightarrow Z$. Using the maps $Y \longrightarrow Y \coprod_X Z \longleftarrow Z$ the unique property can be expressed as follows: For any commuting diagram of the form



there exists a unique continuous map $\varphi: Y \coprod_X Z \longrightarrow P$ such that the following diagram commutes:



This unique map can be read as gluing the maps f' and g' . Thus any two continuous maps that agree on the border of their domains can be glued together. For further material see [8, A.3.7].

“Gluing” can be extended to topological manifolds using a C^0 -atlas on $Y \coprod_X Z$ built from C^0 -atlases of Y and Z . Note that any point of $Y \coprod_X Z$ that is not on X is trivially covered by one of the two C^0 -atlases. Choosing a point in X and an open neighbourhood U around it, we need a C^0 -chart $U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ about p . Thus use the two intersections $U \cap Y$ and $U \cap Z$ to construct a glued topological manifold. Then define two charts

$$f_0: U \cap Y \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^n, \quad f_1: U \cap Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_-^n$$

to construct a chart $f: U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ using the universal property. Using this property one can also show that f is invariant under the choice of f_0 and f_1 . A detailed discussion of this can be found in [8, 1.3.2].

Next we generalise gluing to smooth manifolds and cobordisms. Again a compact summary of the constructions is provided. A more extensive version can be found in [8, 1.3.4 - 1.3.6]:

To glue smooth manifolds we investigate some “toy model” examples. For 1-manifolds one can show that the resulting gluing structure is not unique. Since given manifolds M_0, M_1 we want to define *one* smooth structure on $M = M_0 M_1$, we consider manifolds X homeomorphic to M via some map $\varphi: M \xrightarrow{\sim} X$ which restricts to a diffeomorphism on M_0, M_1 . One then uses φ to pull the maximal atlas of X to M .


This process can be applied to cylinder cobordisms [8, 1.3.6]: Let $M_0: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $M_1: \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_2$ be two cobordisms of dimension $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which are equivalent to cylinders along Σ_1 in the sense of 2.8. Thus there exist two homeomorphisms

$$\varphi_0: M_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} \Sigma_1 \times [0, 1], \quad \varphi_1: M_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} \Sigma_2 \times [1, 2].$$

Again we need a smooth n -manifold X and a homeomorphism $\varphi: M_0 \amalg_{\Sigma_1} M_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} X$ restricting to a diffeomorphism on M_0 and M_1 . Using the cylinder $\Sigma_1 \times [0, 2]$ and the universal property we glue φ_0 and φ_1 to define

$$\varphi := \varphi_0 \amalg_{\Sigma_1} \varphi_1: M_0 \amalg_{\Sigma_1} M_1 \longrightarrow \Sigma_1 \times [0, 2].$$

This glued map can be visualised in the following diagram:



Since $\Sigma_1 \times [0, 2]$ has a smooth structure agreeing with those of $\Sigma_1 \times [0, 1]$ and $\Sigma_1 \times [1, 2]$, pull them back by φ to a smooth structure on $M = M_0 M_2$. This discussion peaks in the following theorem:

THEOREM 2.17 (Regular Interval Theorem) Let $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be an n -cobordism and $f: M \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ a Morse function without critical points such that $f^{-1}(0) = \Sigma_0$ and $f^{-1}(1) = \Sigma_1$. Let further $\pi: \Sigma_0 \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ be the projection. Then there exists a diffeomorphism $\varphi: \Sigma_0 \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_0 \times [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & M \\ & \searrow \pi & \downarrow f \\ & & [0, 1] \end{array}$$

The corresponding maps can be constructed for the cylinder $\Sigma_1 \times [0, 1]$.

Proof. A detailed proof of this statement is presented in [7, 6.2.2]. \square

Using the *Regular Interval Theorem* we investigate the splitting of a cobordism:

LEMMA 2.18 Let $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be an n -cobordism and $f: M \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ a Morse function such that $f^{-1}(0) = \Sigma_0$ and $f^{-1}(1) = \Sigma_1$. By definition 2.13 f has no critical points on the boundary

components Σ_0, Σ_1 . Then there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ and a decomposition $M = f^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])f^{-1}([\varepsilon, 1])$ such that $M_0 := f^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$ is diffeomorphic to the cylinder $\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1]$. Similarly there exists another such decomposition for the boundary component Σ_1 .

Proof. f has no critical points on the boundary components. Thus there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that f has no critical values on the interval $[0, \varepsilon]$. The restriction of f to $M_0 := f^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$ is a Morse function without any critical points thus meeting the requirements of 2.17. Thus M_0 is diffeomorphic to the cylinder $\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1]$ and we decompose M into $M = M_0M_1$. The composition for Σ_1 follows from the same argument. \square

Taking two cobordisms $M_0: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $M_1: \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_2$ and two Morse functions $f_0: M_0 \longrightarrow [0, 1]$, $f_1: M_1 \longrightarrow [1, 2]$ we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the intervals $[1 - \varepsilon, 1]$ and $[1, 1 + \varepsilon]$ contain no critical values of either Morse function. Thus the inverse images $f^{-1}([1 - \varepsilon, 1])$ and $f^{-1}([1, 1 + \varepsilon])$ are diffeomorphic to cylinders by rule of 2.17. Reduced to gluing cylinders, we obtain a “gluing cobordism” $M = M_0M_1$. However the smooth structure need not be unique. The following theorem and its proof, both found in [7, 8.2.1], makes use of isotopes, hence we omit the proof:

THEOREM 2.19 Let M_0 and M_1 be two cobordisms and Σ the out-boundary of M_0 and the in-boundary of M_1 . Let $M_0M_1 = M_0 \coprod_{\Sigma} M_1$ be the gluing cobordism and α, β two smooth structures on M_0M_1 respecting the smooth structures of the cobordisms. Then there exists a diffeomorphism

$$\varphi: (M_0M_1, \alpha) \longrightarrow (M_0M_1, \beta) \quad \text{such that} \quad \varphi_{\Sigma} = \text{id}_{\Sigma}.$$


Thus for any two cobordisms there exists a well-defined diffeomorphism class of gluing cobordisms. This construction of gluing cobordisms shows why we *need* to use equivalence classes of cobordisms as arrows for a category of cobordisms. We are now in a position to construct the symmetric monoidal category of n -cobordisms, \mathbf{cob}_n .

2.3 The Category \mathbf{cob}_n


In this chapter we construct and classify the category of n -cobordisms, \mathbf{cob}_n . This is only possible due to the gluing defines in the previous chapter. We will see that \mathbf{cob}_n is a symmetric monoidal category carrying a rich algebraic structure. Again we roughly follow [8] and comments of [3].

Consider two cobordisms M_0 and M_1 such that Σ is the out-boundary of M_0 and the in-boundary of M_1 . By rule of 2.19 there exists a smooth structure on their gluing unique up to diffeomorphism. We need to show that this smooth structure does not depend on the choice of a representant of the diffeomorphism classes of M_0 and M_1 :

CONSTRUCTION 2.20 Let $M_0: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $M_1: \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_2$ be two cobordisms. Let $\varphi_0: M_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} M'_0$ and $\varphi_1: M_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} M'_1$ be two diffeomorphisms respecting the boundary such that we obtain the following diagram:



For the gluings M_0M_1 and $M'_0M'_1$ utilise the universal property of gluings adapted to the category of continuous maps to obtain a gluing of φ_0 and φ_1 denoted by φ . This is a homeomorphism restricting to a diffeomorphism on each factor. We obtain the following commuting diagram:



Both M_0M_1 and $M'_0M'_1$ are cobordisms with smooth structures. Using the unique homeomorphism φ we can define a smooth structure on $M'_0M'_1$ using that of M_0M_1 . By *Theorem 2.19* it is diffeomorphic to the initial one. Thus the gluing cobordism does not depend on the choice of representants.

DEFINITION 2.21 (Composition cobordism) Let $M_0: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $M_1: \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_2$ be two cobordism classes. Define their **composition cobordism** as the equivalence class of cobordisms $M_0M_1: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_2$ defined by the gluing of cobordism classes.

For a category this composition needs to be associative:

LEMMA 2.22 Given three cobordism classes and respective representants denoted by

$$\Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{M_0} \Sigma_1 \xrightarrow{M_1} \Sigma_2 \xrightarrow{M_2} \Sigma_3$$

the order of composition does not matter, i.e. $(M_0M_1)M_2 = M_0(M_1M_2)$ in terms of equivalence classes of cobordisms.

Proof. There exists a natural isomorphism for the gluing of topological manifolds such that

$$\left(M_0 \amalg_{\Sigma_1} M_1 \right) \amalg_{\Sigma_2} M_2 \cong M_0 \amalg_{\Sigma_1} \left(M_1 \amalg_{\Sigma_2} M_2 \right).$$

Details on this can be found in the discussion of gluings in [8]. We defined a smooth structure on such gluings by taking the smooth structure on the cobordisms and appropriately replacing

it around the connecting boundaries. This used the *Regular Interval Theorem* 2.17 to grab the smooth structure of a cylinder in a small neighbourhood of the boundaries Σ_1 and Σ_2 . These neighbourhoods are necessarily disjoint and the smooth structure is unaffected elsewhere, thus the order of replacement does not matter. This proves the statement. \square

The cylinder cobordism 2.8 turns out to function as an identity morphism:

LEMMA 2.23 Let $M_0 : \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be a cobordism and denote by C_0 and C_1 cylinder cobordisms over Σ_0 and Σ_1 respectively. Then C_0M_0 and M_0C_1 belong to the same cobordism class as M_0 .

Proof. We conduct the proof for C_0 . Any cobordism can be decomposed into a cylinder composed with the remainder 2.18. Thus decompose M_0 into the cobordism $M_{[0,\varepsilon]}M_{[\varepsilon,1]}$ where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a fitting constant for the construction in 2.18 and $M_{[0,\varepsilon]}$ is diffeomorphic to a cylinder over Σ_0 . By associativity 2.22

$$C_0M_0 = C_0(M_{[0,\varepsilon]}M_{[\varepsilon,1]}) \cong (C_0M_{[0,\varepsilon]})M_{[\varepsilon,1]} \cong M_{[0,\varepsilon]}M_{[\varepsilon,1]} = M_0.$$

This equation holds up to diffeomorphism, hence C_0M_0 and M_0 belong to the same diffeomorphism class. In the second step, we used the fact that composed cylinders again form a cylinder diffeomorphic to $M_{[0,\varepsilon]}$. The proof for C_1 follows the same arguments. \square

DEFINITION 2.24 (Invertible Cobordisms) Let $M : \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be a cobordism. We call M an **invertible cobordism** if there exists a cobordism $M^{-1} : \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_0$ such that MM^{-1} is a cylinder cobordism over Σ_1 and $M^{-1}M$ is a cylinder cobordism over Σ_0 .

We can now define the *category of cobordisms*:

DEFINITION 2.25 (Category of Cobordisms) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by cob_n the **category of n -dimensional cobordisms** using $(n - 1)$ -dimensional compact oriented manifolds without boundary as objects and diffeomorphism classes of cobordisms between them as arrows. The composition of cobordisms 2.21 serves as the composition of arrows with associativity ensured by 2.22. For any object we obtain an identity arrow by forming the cylinder cobordism 2.23.

cob_n is named after its arrows since they are of major interest. The objects are “plain” $(n - 1)$ -manifolds and a lot of work was needed to make cobordisms behave like categorial arrows. cob_2 will turn out to be completely classified by a generating set of cobordisms which underlines their significance.

The definition of an invertible cobordism can be used to draw a first connection to topological properties of the involved manifolds:

LEMMA 2.26 Let $M : \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be an invertible cobordism in cob_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If the manifold M is connected, so are Σ_0 and Σ_1 .

Proof. Since M is invertible, the composition of cobordisms MM^{-1} is diffeomorphic to the cylinder $\Sigma_0 \times I$ with I the unit interval. In a cylinder every point lies in the same connected component as

some point of the in-boundary of I and thus M . Since M is connected, all points lie in the same connected component, hence $\Sigma_0 \times I$ and thus Σ_0 are connected. Repeating the same argument for $M^{-1}M \cong \Sigma_1 \times I$ proves the statement. \square

LEMMA 2.27 Let $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $N: \Theta_0 \implies \Theta_1$ be two cobordisms in \mathbf{cob}_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If their disjoint union $L := M \coprod N: \Sigma_0 \coprod \Theta_0 \implies \Sigma_1 \coprod \Theta_1$ is invertible, then so are M and N .

Proof. Since L is invertible, there exists a cobordism L^{-1} such that LL^{-1} is diffeomorphic to the cylinder cobordism over $\Sigma_0 \coprod \Theta_0$ which is diffeomorphic to $(\Sigma_0 \times I) \coprod (\Theta_0 \times I)$. Thus LL^{-1} has multiple connected components and cannot be a connected manifold by 2.26. Thus split

$$L^{-1} = M' \coprod N' \quad \text{where} \quad M': \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_0 \quad \text{and} \quad N': \Theta_1 \implies \Theta_0.$$

Consider $MM': \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_0$. This cobordism is diffeomorphic to the cylinder over Σ_0 since

$$LL^{-1} = MM' \coprod NN' \cong (\Sigma_0 \times I) \coprod (\Theta_0 \times I).$$

The same argument shows that NN' is diffeomorphic to the cylinder over Θ_0 . Repeating this process for $L^{-1}L$ proves that M' and N' are two-sided inverses of M and N respectively proving that they are invertible cobordisms. \square

Next we define a monoidal structure on \mathbf{cob}_n , restricting to a strict monoidal structure by rule of the **Strictification Theorem** 1.33: Given two oriented manifolds M_0, M_1 take the disjoint union $M_0 \coprod M_1$. For this ‘‘coproduct’’ manifold there exists a unique orientation such that both evident inclusion maps are orientation preserving. The empty manifold \emptyset is a ‘‘unity’’ for the coproduct since for any manifold M_0 we have $M_0 \coprod \emptyset \cong M_0$.

This product can be extended to \mathbf{cob}_n : Given two n -cobordisms $M_0: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ and $N_0: \Theta_0 \implies \Theta_1$ we can form a cobordism using the disjoint union (i.e. coproduct)

$$M_0 \coprod N_0: \Sigma_0 \coprod \Theta_0 \implies \Sigma_1 \coprod \Theta_1.$$

Again the ‘‘empty cobordism’’ $\emptyset_n: \emptyset_{n-1} \implies \emptyset_{n-1}$ acts as a unit for this product. Since the union is disjoint, choosing different representatives of a cobordism class yields a diffeomorphic cobordism. Thus the product is well-defined and we obtain a strict monoidal category:

DEFINITION 2.28 (Monoidal Category of Cobordisms) The category \mathbf{cob}_n is a monoidal category by taking the coproduct \coprod as its tensor product and the empty $(n-1)$ -dimensional manifold as a unit element. We obtain $\langle \mathbf{cob}_n, \coprod, \emptyset_{n-1} \rangle$.

EXAMPLE 2.29 (Cylinder Construction) Given two compact $(n-1)$ -manifolds without boundary Σ_0 and Σ_1 and a diffeomorphism $\varphi: \Sigma_0 \longrightarrow \Sigma_1$ between them, we want to construct a cylinder cobordism from Σ_0 to Σ_1 . This assignment directly relates to the categorial setting.

Consider the category of $(n-1)$ -dimensional smooth manifolds denoted by \mathbf{Man}_{n-1} with arrows diffeomorphisms between them. Given an arrow $f: \Sigma_0 \longrightarrow \Sigma_1$ we build the cylinder $\Sigma_0 \times I$, where I denoted the unit interval and map Σ_0 onto its in-boundary via the identity map and Σ_1 into its

out-boundary using f^{-1} . The analogous construction is valid for $\Sigma_1 \times I$ yielding two equivalent cobordisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \Sigma_1 \times I & & \\
 & f \nearrow & \uparrow & \nwarrow \text{id} & \\
 \Sigma_0 & & & & \Sigma_1 \\
 & \searrow \text{id} & \uparrow f \times \text{id} & \swarrow f^{-1} & \\
 & & \Sigma_0 \times I & &
 \end{array}$$

We denote such a cylinder cobordism by C_f . Since f is a diffeomorphism, C_f is an invertible cobordism in the sense of 2.24. For any object Σ of Man_{n-1} the identity diffeomorphism $\text{id}_\Sigma: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ induces the identity cobordism over Σ . Remembering 1.10 we investigate the composition of such cylinder cobordisms:

Given two arrows in Man_{n-1} with $\Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{f} \Sigma_1 \xrightarrow{g} \Sigma_2$ consider the composition of C_f and C_g :

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_f C_g &= (\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1], \text{id}, f^{-1}) (\Sigma_1 \times [0, 1], \text{id}, g^{-1}) \\
 &\cong (\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1], \text{id}, f^{-1}) (\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1], f^{-1}, f^{-1} \circ g^{-1}) \\
 &= (\Sigma_0 \times [0, 1], \text{id}, f^{-1} \circ g^{-1}) = C_{g \circ f}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining the results of the *cylinder construction* we obtain a contravariant functor $\mathbf{C}_n: \text{Man}_{n-1} \rightarrow \text{cob}_n$ that assigns to each diffeomorphism a cylinder cobordism.

It is important to understand which diffeomorphisms \mathbf{C}_n maps to the same object in cob_n . The following result follows [8, 1.3.23]:

PROPOSITION 2.30 Two diffeomorphisms $\varphi: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ and $\psi: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ induce the same cobordism $\Sigma_0 \Rightarrow \Sigma_1$ iff they are smoothly homotopic.

Proof. If φ and ψ induce the same cobordism class, there exists an equivalence of cobordisms $M: \Sigma_0 \times I \rightarrow \Sigma_1 \times I$ which can be composed with pr_{Σ_1} to obtain a homotopy between φ and ψ . The converse direction requires more work: φ, ψ being homotopic means that there exists a smooth map $\Phi: \Sigma_0 \times I \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ such that $\varphi = \Phi(\cdot, 0)$ and $\psi = \Phi(\cdot, 1)$. This amounts to saying that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \Sigma_0 \times I & & \\
 & \text{id} \nearrow & \downarrow \Phi \times \text{pr}_I & \nwarrow \text{id} & \\
 \Sigma_0 & & & & \Sigma_0 \\
 & \searrow \varphi & \downarrow & \swarrow \psi & \\
 & & \Sigma_1 \times I & &
 \end{array}$$

where all maps but Φ are diffeomorphisms onto the respective in- or out-boundary. To see that this diagram induces equivalent cobordisms for φ and ψ , compose the right part with $\psi^{-1}: \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_0$ to obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \Sigma_0 \times I & & \\
 & \nearrow \text{id}_{\Sigma_0} & \downarrow \Phi \times \text{pr}_I & \nwarrow \psi^{-1} & \\
 \Sigma_0 & & & & \Sigma_1 \\
 & \searrow \varphi & & \swarrow \text{id}_{\Sigma_1} & \\
 & & \Sigma_1 \times I & &
 \end{array}$$

Thus $\Phi \times \text{pr}_I$ is an equivalence of the two resulting cobordisms $(\Sigma_0 \times I, \varphi, \text{id}_{\Sigma_1})$ and $(\Sigma_1 \times I, \text{id}_{\Sigma_0}, \psi^{-1})$ which proves the statement. \square


Currently we work with the monoidal category $\langle \text{cob}_n, \coprod, \emptyset_n \rangle$. Taking one step back and working with smooth $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifolds Σ, Θ we see that there exists a “twist” map

$$\gamma_{\Sigma\Theta} : \Sigma \coprod \Theta \longrightarrow \Theta \coprod \Sigma$$

defined by swapping the two factors of the coproduct. It clearly defines a diffeomorphism and via the cylinder construction 2.29 we assign an n -cobordism to it denoted by

$$\mathbf{T}_{\Sigma\Theta} := \mathbf{C}_{\gamma_{\Sigma\Theta}} : \Sigma \coprod \Theta \implies \Theta \coprod \Sigma.$$

Usually we write \mathbf{T} for the **twist cobordism**. In two dimensions the twist cobordism can be visualised as



The crossing of the two cylinders avoids any resemblance of cylinders passing under or over each other. The twist gives us a braided structure 1.44 $\langle \text{cob}_n, \coprod, \emptyset_n, \mathbf{T} \rangle$. Since all cobordisms defined via the cylinder construction are invertible, \mathbf{T} is a symmetric braiding 1.47:

DEFINITION 2.31 (Symmetric Monoidal Category of Cobordisms) The twist cobordism can be used to define the symmetric monoidal category of cobordisms $\langle \text{cob}_n, \mathbf{T} \rangle$.

EXAMPLE 2.32 Consider cob_n and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k < n$. Let Σ be a compact oriented manifold without boundary of dimension k . The cartesian product of manifolds given by $(\cdot) \times \Sigma$ induces a symmetric monoidal functor

$$(\cdot) \times \Sigma : \text{cob}_{n-k} \longrightarrow \text{cob}_n.$$

This can be verified by checking the properties given in 1.46.


2.4 Cobordisms in two Dimensions

Looking at “small” dimensions is a frequently used and powerful tool to learn about higher, often more complex dimensions. As an example, it is very hard to classify cob_n for $n \geq 3$ since there is an infinite amount of 2-dimensional compact oriented diffeomorphism classes of manifolds without

boundary, that is oriented surfaces. However compact 2-dimensional surfaces without boundary can be completely classified; higher dimensions did not yet reveal similar properties. We want to use this property to classify \mathbf{cob}_2 using a finite number of generator cobordisms. This amounts to finding a set of generators 1.23.

Another advantage of \mathbf{cob}_2 is that all of its objects are diffeomorphic to disjoint unions of the circle. This will enable a powerful visualisation machinery using the *skeleton* 1.22 of \mathbf{cob}_2 . Again we roughly follow [8] and state the central theorem of this chapter:

THEOREM 2.33 (Classification of \mathbf{cob}_2) Using the composition of cobordisms and the coproduct, the following six cobordisms form a set of generators 1.23 for the (skeleton of the) symmetric monoidal category \mathbf{cob}_2 :



These cobordisms will further be called, by order of appearance in the above picture, the **cup**, **cap**, **cylinder** or **identity**, **copants**, **pants** and **twist** cobordism.

We have already proved that any cobordism can be decomposed into two pieces, one diffeomorphic to a cylinder cobordism 2.18. This is not a strong statement in the categorial context since the identity arrow is trivially included; strictly speaking one could exclude it from the above theorem. However for convenience we will include it.

The proof of the Classification Theorem has two popular approaches, both of which can be found in [8, 1.4]. In this chapter we use *Morse Theory* and rely on results like 2.17 and 2.18. From here on, we refer to objects and arrows of \mathbf{cob}_2 if not stated otherwise.

In the Morse-theoretic proof we assign to every cobordism a Morse-function, split its codomain into pieces with at most one critical value and then investigate the inverse image of these pieces. Similar to 2.17 the critical points on the cobordisms together with their index 2.11 will uniquely determine the cobordism at hand.

LEMMA 2.34 Let $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be an arrow of \mathbf{cob}_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If M is invertible, Σ_0 and Σ_1 have the same number of connected components.

Proof. If M is connected, we can use 2.26 to prove the claim. If M is not connected, we aim to “reorder” its boundaries such that it is a disjoint union of cobordisms to make use of 2.27 to prove that every factor is invertible. Inductively repeating this process, using 2.26 for connected cobordisms, would prove that Σ_0 and Σ_1 have the same number of connected components. However to reorder boundaries is just a repeated application of the twist cobordisms T . \square

Cobordisms composed of identities and twist cobordisms will be called **permutation cobordisms**.

In \mathbf{cob}_2 we can apply this result to obtain:


PROPOSITION 2.35 Any two compact oriented 1-manifold without boundary Σ_0 and Σ_1 are diffeomorphic iff there is an invertible cobordism between them.

Proof. Let $\varphi: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ be a diffeomorphism made into a cobordism by 2.29. The same construction is valid for φ^{-1} , thus we obtain an invertible cobordism in \mathbf{cob}_2 . If we have an invertible cobordism $M: \Sigma_0 \Rightarrow \Sigma_1$, remember that $\Sigma_0 \cong \Sigma_1$ amounts to both having the same number of connected components since compact oriented 1-manifolds without boundary are formed by disjoint unions of circles. This holds true due to the previously proven lemma 2.34. \square


Thus two objects of \mathbf{cob}_2 lie in the same isomorphism class of objects 1.8, iff they have the same number of connected components. Using this, we define the skeleton of \mathbf{cob}_2 :

NOTATION 2.36 One can uniquely classify an isomorphism (diffeomorphism) class of objects in \mathbf{cob}_2 by an integer $n \geq 0$ indicating the number of connected components, i.e. the number of disjoint circles. Thus define a **skeleton** of \mathbf{cob}_2 by the full subcategory $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with arrows all arrows between these objects. We will, by an abuse of notation, denote it by \mathbf{cob}_2 . The set of generators in the *Classification Theorem 2.33* refers to the skeleton of \mathbf{cob}_2 which we use from here on out.

Invertibility makes intuitive sense when looking at visualised examples in \mathbf{cob}_2 . The following is clearly invertible:



Meanwhile this cobordism clearly doesn't invert with a "naive inverse":



We can prove that only disjoint unions of the twist T and the identity cobordism form invertible cobordisms:

LEMMA 2.37 The only invertible cobordisms in \mathbf{cob}_2 are *permutation cobordisms* and induced by diffeomorphisms.

Proof. Combining 2.34 and 2.35 on given $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \in \mathbf{cob}_2$ we see: If there exists an invertible cobordism between them, Σ_0 and Σ_1 have the same number of connected components. Thus they are diffeomorphic since all compact oriented 1-manifolds without boundary are disjoint unions of a

number of circles equal to their connected components. This diffeomorphism leads back to an invertible cobordism between them. Thus all invertible cobordisms are induced by diffeomorphisms.

using homotopy 2.30 we can classify the possible types of cobordisms: Every orientation-preserving diffeomorphism between circles is smoothly homotopic to the identity. Thus, up to homotopy, every diffeomorphism between objects of Σ_0 and Σ_1 needs to be a permutation of their respective connected components. Such diffeomorphisms induce the invertible *permutation cobordisms*, hence every invertible cobordism is of this type. This includes the identity cobordism that is induced by the identity permutation. \square


We combine 2.17 and 2.37 to state the following:

COROLLARY 2.38 If a cobordism in cob_2 admits a Morse function without critical points, it is equivalent to a *permutation cobordism*.

Another tool from Morse theory is the following classification result:

LEMMA 2.39 (Hirsch 7, 9.3.3) Let M be a compact connected orientable surface admitting a Morse function having only one critical point of index 1. Then M is a disk with two holes.

The above lemma can be rephrased and visualised for our setting. A connected cobordism in cob_2 admitting a Morse function with exactly one critical point p of index 1 is diffeomorphic to one of the following two cobordisms:



Combining these result we prove the *Classification Theorem*:

PROOF (Classification Theorem, 2.33) Let $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ be a cobordism in cob_2 and $f: M \longrightarrow I$ a Morse function such that $f^{-1}(0) = \Sigma_0$ and $f^{-1}(1) = \Sigma_1$. In 2.13 we required that both boundary points of I are regular values of f and that all critical points of f have disjoint images under f . The number of critical points of f is a finite number n . Let $k \geq n$. Now divide the interval I into subintervals using $k + 1$ strictly increasing regular values x_0, \dots, x_k such that for any $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$ the subinterval $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$ contains *at most* one critical value. Now decompose M into

$$M = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} M_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} := \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} f^{-1}([x_i, x_{i+1}]).$$

We inspect M piecewise: For j arbitrary, consider $M_{[x_j, x_{j+1}]}$ which contains at most one critical

point p contained one of the connected components of M . All other components have no critical points, thus they are permutation cobordisms by rule of 2.38.


Now assume there is a critical point p . We denote the connected component it lives on C_p . Using 2.12 we see that if p has index 0 it is a local minimum, thus C_p is diffeomorphic to



If it has index 2, p is a local maximum and C_p is diffeomorphic to



The Index 1, using 2.39, corresponds to C_p being diffeomorphic to



Since j was arbitrary, we have decomposed any element of \mathbf{cob}_2 into the generators given in 2.33 which proves the statement. \square

With the Classification Theorem proven, we investigate the relations between the arrows emerging from the symmetric monoidal structure of \mathbf{cob}_2 . Again we will represent them pictorially to simplify notation and support intuition.

THEOREM 2.40 (Generator relations) The following relations hold true:

• **The identity relations**

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cylinder} = \text{Circle} \qquad \text{Circle} = \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder}
 \end{array} \tag{3}$$

• **Unit and Counit relations**

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder}
 \end{array} \tag{4}$$

• **Associativity and Coassociativity relations**

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cylinder} \cup (\text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder}) = (\text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder}) \cup \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cap (\text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder}) = (\text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder}) \cap \text{Cylinder}
 \end{array} \tag{5}$$

• **Commutativity and Cocommutativity relations**

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder}
 \end{array} \tag{6}$$

• **The Frobenius relations**


$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cup \text{Cylinder} \\
 \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder} = \text{Cylinder} \cap \text{Cylinder}
 \end{array} \tag{7}$$

Proof. All relations follow from 2.34 combined with 2.35: In every relation, the cobordisms have the same number of in- and out-boundaries and genus 0. \square


The choice of relations is convenient but not unique or minimal. In fact, there is no unique minimal set of relations. We will show this using the Frobenius relation (7), the Unit/Counit relations (4) and the Associativity/Coassociativity relations (5):

LEMMA 2.41 The Frobenius relation (7) together with the Unit/Counit relations (4) imply the Associativity/Coassociativity relations (5).

Proof. We will show this for the Associativity relation. To make every step clear, changes will be highlighted in green colour:



We used the Counit relation in the first step to apply the Frobenius relation in the second step. The third step just inserted and deleted some identity cobordisms again use the Frobenius relation, this time in the upper branch of the cobordism. Now we proceed as follows:



Which is the Associativity relation. Coassociativity follows using similar arguments. □

The reason to include “superfluous” relations is that each reflects a previous and/or upcoming algebraic property: The *Identity relations* (3) embodies the idea of the cylinder cobordism serving as an identity, hence the name. The *Unit/Counit relations* (4) show that the **cup cobordism** $\emptyset \implies 1$ and the **cap cobordism** $1 \implies \emptyset$ act as unit and counit. This corresponds to the empty manifold being the unit/counit of the tensor product. The *Associativity and Coassociativity relations* (5) shows the associativity of the tensor product in a monoidal category. Meanwhile the *Commutativity and Cocommutativity relations* represent the invariance of the tensor product and the coproduct under the twist cobordism. The *Frobenius relations* (7) will be discussed in 3.3 where a first link between $\text{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and cob_2 is presented.

3 The Category of Commutative Frobenius Algebras

So far we have mainly been concerned with general category theory and its application in \mathbf{cob}_n . The latter relates to a geometric formulation of physics because we can “read” the objects of \mathbf{cob}_n as slices in spacetime and cobordisms between them their evolution. Introducing a special type of algebra does not have an adhoc analogy in physics.

We will see that Frobenius Algebras over a field \mathbb{k} form a symmetric monoidal category and resemble \mathbf{cob}_2 . This resemblance will be made into a theorem 4.19 in the next section and provides deep link between 2-dimensional TQFTs and the category $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$. It is due to this theorem that we introduce Frobenius Algebras and give a first visual link 3.3.

The interested reader is referred to [8, Chapter 2] where a far more extensive introduction using linear algebra is provided. This project will take a strongly categorial point of view.

3.1 Algebraic Preliminaries

To introduce Frobenius Algebras, we need some background on vector spaces and algebras in general. Frobenius Algebras are algebras over a field equipped with extra structure in the form of so-called *nondegenerate pairings*, maps that preserve certain algebraic properties of the involved vector spaces. In this script, vector spaces refer to objects of the symmetric monoidal category $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

DEFINITION 3.1 (Pairings) Let V, W be two vector spaces. A **pairing** of V and W is a linear map $\beta: V \otimes W \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$. We denote its action on elements of the two spaces by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta: V \otimes W &\longrightarrow \mathbb{k}, \\ v \otimes w &\longrightarrow \langle v, w \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Pairings can be classified using a form of invertibility.

DEFINITION 3.2 (Non-degenerate pairings) A pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ for two vector spaces $V, W \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is called **nondegenerate in V** , if there exists a map $\gamma_V: \mathbb{k} \rightarrow W \otimes V$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V \otimes (W \otimes V) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & (V \otimes W) \otimes V \\ \text{id}_V \otimes \gamma_V \uparrow & & \downarrow \beta \otimes \text{id}_V \\ V = V \otimes \mathbb{k} & \xleftarrow{\text{id}_V} & V = \mathbb{k} \otimes V \end{array}$$

γ is called a **copairing in V** . We call β **nondegenerate in W** if there exists a γ_W that the respective diagram for W commutes. Accordingly, γ_W would be called a **copairing in W** . β is simply called **nondegenerate** if it is nondegenerate in both variables.

REMARK 3.3 The definition of a nondegenerate pairing coincides with its usual meaning

1. $\langle v, w \rangle = 0 \ \forall v \in V \implies w = 0.$
2. $\langle v, w \rangle = 0 \ \forall w \in W \implies v = 0.$

if the vector spaces are of the same *finite* dimension. In this case we recover injectivity and formulate nondegeneracy in the usual way. The interested reader is referred to [8, Lemma 2.1.15] for a deeper analysis.

The copairing of a nondegenerate pairing turns out to be unique. Thus we can talk about “the copairing” to a nondegenerate pairing.

LEMMA 3.4 If a pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ is nondegenerate then $\gamma_V = \gamma_W$ and thus the copairing is unique.

Proof. By nondegeneracy of β , we can factor the identities on V and W as

$$\text{id}_V = (\beta \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ (\text{id}_V \otimes \gamma_V) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{id}_W = (\text{id}_W \otimes \beta) \circ (\gamma_W \otimes \text{id}_W).$$

Using this we write the copairings as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_V &= (\text{id}_W \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ \gamma_V = (\text{id}_W \otimes \beta \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ (\gamma_W \otimes \text{id}_W \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ \gamma_V \\ &= (\text{id}_W \otimes \beta \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ (\gamma_W \otimes \gamma_V) \\ &= (\text{id}_W \otimes \beta \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ (\text{id}_W \otimes \text{id}_V \otimes \gamma_V) \circ \gamma_W = (\text{id}_W \otimes \text{id}_V) \circ \gamma_W = \gamma_W. \end{aligned}$$

This proves $\gamma_V = \gamma_W$. Since we choose arbitrary copairings, this holds for any such pair proving that the copairing is unique. \square

For any pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ we define two maps onto the dual vector spaces by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_l: W &\longrightarrow V^*, & w &\longmapsto \langle \cdot, w \rangle \\ \beta_r: V &\longrightarrow W^*, & v &\longmapsto \langle v, \cdot \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

They denote the left and right insertion respectively.

LEMMA 3.5 A pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ of vector spaces is nondegenerate in $V \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ iff V is finite dimensional and the map β_l is injective. Accordingly it is nondegenerate in W iff W is finite dimensional and the map β_r is injective.

Proof. See [8, Lemma 2.1.12]. \square

For finite-dimensional vector spaces these maps are closely related via the dual functor:

LEMMA 3.6 For a pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ of two finite dimensional vector spaces in $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, the two maps β_l and β_r are the dual of each other.

Proof. The dual of β_l is given by

$$\text{Hom}(V^*, \mathbb{k}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(W, \mathbb{k}), \quad T \longmapsto T \circ \beta_l.$$

Identifying $V \cong \text{Hom}(V^*, \mathbb{k})$ by mapping $v \in V$ to $T_v := [\lambda \longmapsto \lambda(v)]$, we inspect the dual of β_l given by

$$V \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(W, \mathbb{k}), \quad v \longmapsto T_v \circ \beta_l.$$

The action of $T_v \circ \beta_l$ on an element $w \in W$ is given by

$$T_v \circ \beta_l(w) = T_v(\langle \cdot, w \rangle) = \langle v, w \rangle = \beta_r(v).(w)$$

This shows that the dual map is the same as β_r . □

Combining these results the nondegeneracy of a pairing implies injectivity of β_l and β_r and that both underlying vector spaces are finite dimensional. In this case the existence of the two isomorphisms uniquely determines β by setting $\beta := \beta_r(\cdot)(\cdot) = \beta_r(\cdot)(\cdot)$. Using duality we obtain:

LEMMA 3.7 Given a pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ between finite-dimensional vector spaces, the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) β is nondegenerate.
- (ii) β_l is an isomorphism between W and V^* .
- (iii) β_r is an isomorphism between V and W^* .

Note that this also shows that V and W are of the same dimension, once there exists a nondegenerate pairing between them.

Proof. For (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) note that the dual functor is an equivalence of categories and thus preserves invertibility. Further, each of the two statements leads to (i). Starting with (i): If β is nondegenerate, both β_l and β_r are injective. Thus their duals are surjective which amounts to saying that both are bijective and hence isomorphisms of their respective domain and codomain. □

Next we define \mathbb{k} -algebras in $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. They will turn out to stem from a more general concept in category theory.

DEFINITION 3.8 (\mathbb{k} -Algebras – Vector Space Version) A \mathbb{k} -vector space A together with two \mathbb{k} -linear maps

$$\mu: A \otimes A \longrightarrow A, \quad \eta: \mathbb{k} \longrightarrow A$$

such that the following diagrams commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes (A \otimes A) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & (A \otimes A) \otimes A \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}_A} A \otimes A \\ \text{id}_A \otimes \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{k} \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\eta \otimes \text{id}_A} & A \otimes A \xleftarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \eta} A \otimes \mathbb{k} \\ & \searrow \sim & \downarrow \mu \\ & & A \end{array}$$

is called a **k-algebra**. We call μ the **multiplication map** and η the **unit map**. We denote the action of the multiplication map by

$$\mu: A \otimes A \longrightarrow A, \quad x \otimes y \longmapsto xy.$$

Looking at the commuting diagrams above, we see that they resemble those of a monoid 1.34. We already know that \mathbf{Vect}_k is a monoidal category $(\mathbf{Vect}_k, \otimes, k)$. Thus there is a compact categorical definition of k-algebras:

DEFINITION 3.9 (k-Algebras – Categorical Version) A k-algebra is a monoid in \mathbf{Vect}_k . *Comonoids* in \mathbf{Vect}_k correspond to k-Coalgebras.

The monoids of a category form a category themselves. Thus denote $\mathbf{Mon}_{\mathbf{Vect}_k}$ by \mathbf{Alg}_k where the arrows are k-algebra morphisms defined as in 1.37. Using this, we deviate from the usual formulation and choose a more categorical vocabulary. The evident next step is to look at the left and right actions 1.39 of \mathbf{Alg}_k on \mathbf{Vect}_k :

DEFINITION 3.10 (Left and Right Modules) Given $A \in \mathbf{Alg}_k$ and $V \in \mathbf{Vect}_k$, we call the tuple of V and a right action of A on V a **right A-module**, for left actions we use the term **left A-module**. By an abuse of notation we call V itself a left or right A-module if there is a left or right action.

In terms of vector spaces a right A -module is a vector space V together with a k-linear map

$$\rho: V \otimes A \longrightarrow V, \quad x \otimes a \longmapsto \rho(x, a)$$

such that for arbitrary $x \in V$ and $a, b \in A$

$$\rho(\rho(x, a), b) = \rho(x, ab) \quad \& \quad \rho(x, e) = x.$$

Accordingly a left A -module for V is the tuple (V, λ) where λ is k-linear and maps

$$\lambda: A \otimes V \longrightarrow V, \quad a \otimes x \longmapsto \lambda(a, x)$$

such that

$$\lambda(a, \lambda(b, x)) = \lambda(ab, x).$$

Every element of \mathbf{Alg}_k forms a right module with itself, i.e. every $A \in \mathbf{Alg}_k$ is a right A -module with the right action given by the multiplication map. Next we formulate morphisms of left and right actions 1.41 in the context of algebra modules.

DEFINITION 3.11 (A-Module Homomorphisms) Given $A \in \mathbf{Alg}_k$ and two left or two right A -modules V, W we call a morphism of their respective left or right actions a **left** or **right A-homomorphism**. We call such an homomorphism **left** or **right A-linear**, a name stemming from the commuting diagrams in 1.41.

For k-algebras, we denote the category left and right modules by \mathbf{lMod}_A and \mathbf{rMod}_A . The two are

just adapted names for \mathbf{Lact}_A and \mathbf{Ract}_A in the monoidal category $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

LEMMA 3.12 (Duals of Module Homomorphisms) Given $A \in \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{k}}$ the natural dual operation on left or right modules and their homomorphisms is a contravariant functor $\mathbf{lMod}_A \rightarrow \mathbf{rMod}_A$ or $\mathbf{rMod}_A \rightarrow \mathbf{lMod}_A$ respectively.

Proof. We will prove the result only for left actions. Let $V, W \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ be two left A -modules and $\varphi: V \rightarrow W$ be a morphism of their left actions σ, λ . We aim to construct a natural right A -module structure on V^* . Note that $V^* = \text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{k})$ and define

$$\sigma^*: V^* \otimes A \rightarrow V^*, \quad \chi \otimes a \mapsto \sigma^*(\chi, a) := [x \in V \mapsto \chi(\sigma(a, x))].$$

For arbitrary $\chi \in V^*$, $x \in V$ and $a, b \in A$

$$\sigma^*(\sigma^*(\chi, a), b)(x) = \sigma^*(\chi, a)(\sigma(b, x)) = \chi(\sigma(a, \sigma(b, x))) = \chi(\sigma(ab, x)) = \sigma^*(\chi, ab)(x).$$

Thus the constructed map is a right action making (V^*, σ^*) a right A -module. This shows that the dualisation works on objects. For a left A -module homomorphism φ , define its dual morphism as

$$\varphi^*: W^* \rightarrow V^*, \quad \theta \mapsto \theta(\varphi(\cdot)).$$

If the following diagram commutes, φ^* is a right A -module homomorphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W^* \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\varphi^* \otimes \text{id}_A} & V^* \otimes A \\ \lambda^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma^* \\ W^* & \xrightarrow{\varphi^*} & V^* \end{array}$$

However for arbitrary $a \in A$, $\theta \in W^*$ and $x \in V$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(\varphi^* \otimes \text{id}_A(\theta \otimes a)) &= \sigma^*(\theta(\varphi(\cdot)), a) = \theta(\varphi(\sigma(a, \cdot))) \\ &= \theta(\lambda(a, \varphi(\cdot))) = \varphi^*(\theta(\lambda(a, \cdot))) = \varphi^*(\lambda^*(\theta, a)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the dual mappings act like a functor between \mathbf{lMod}_A and \mathbf{rMod}_A . The statement for right action follows by the same arguments. \square

The double dual of a finite-dimensional vector space turned out to be isomorphic to the object itself. We recover a similar statement for finite-dimensional modules:

LEMMA 3.13 If for any $A \in \mathbf{Alg}_{\mathbb{k}}$ we restrict to modules in the full subcategory of finite-dimensional vector spaces, $\mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, the dual functor is an equivalence of categories between the full subcategories $\mathbf{FinlMod}_A$ of \mathbf{lMod}_A and $\mathbf{FinrMod}_A$ of \mathbf{rMod}_A .

Proof. Let $V, W \in \mathbf{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ be left A -modules with actions σ, λ and $\varphi: V \rightarrow W$ a left A -module homomorphism of those actions. $\psi^*: W^* \rightarrow V^*$ is a right A -module homomorphism between the

right actions σ^* and λ^* . Using 1.19 we obtain $V^{**} \cong V$ and $W^{**} \cong W$. Thus consider

$$\varphi^{**} := (\varphi^*)^*: V \longrightarrow W, \quad x \longmapsto \varphi^*(\cdot)(x).$$

For any $\theta \in W^*$ we have

$$\theta(\varphi^{**}(x)) = \varphi^*(\theta)(x) = \theta(\varphi(x))$$

and thus $\varphi^{**} = \varphi$. For the action σ we need to show that $\sigma^{**} = \sigma$ to conclude the proof. Writing down the definition yields:

$$\sigma^{**} := (\sigma^*)^*: V \otimes A \longrightarrow V, \quad x \otimes a \longmapsto \sigma^{**}(a, x) := [\chi \in V^* \longmapsto \sigma^*(\chi, a)(x)].$$

Thus for any $a \in A$, $x \in V$ and $\chi \in V^*$ we get

$$\chi(\sigma^{**}(a, x)) = \sigma^*(\chi, a)(x) = \chi(\sigma(a, x)).$$

This proves that the dual operation is an equivalence of categories between $\mathbf{Finlmod}_A$ and $\mathbf{Finrmod}_A$. \square

For pairings $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ the field \mathbb{k} is not an A -module and thus β can not be A -linear. However if V is a right A -module and W is a left A -module, we can investigate a particular diagram:

DEFINITION 3.14 (Associative Pairings) A pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ where V is a right A -module with action ρ and W is a left A -module with action λ is called an **associative pairing** if the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V \otimes A \otimes W & \xrightarrow{\rho \otimes \text{id}_W} & V \otimes W \\ \text{id}_V \otimes \lambda \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\ V \otimes W & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \mathbb{k} \end{array}$$

The reason for the ‘‘associative’’ prefix is more apparent when writing the above diagram for arbitrary $x, y \in V$ and $a \in A$ as

$$\beta(x \otimes \lambda(a, y)) = \beta(\rho(x, a) \otimes y).$$

This definition yields an interesting result for β_l and β_r :

LEMMA 3.15 For a pairing $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ where V is a right A -module with action ρ and W is a left A -module with action λ the following three statements are equivalent:

- (i) β is associative
- (ii) $\beta_l: W \longrightarrow V^*$ is left A -linear
- (iii) $\beta_r: V \longrightarrow W^*$ is right A -linear

Proof. Left linearity of β_l can be expressed diagrammatically using the properties of morphisms of actions of monoids as

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \otimes W & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \beta_l} & A \otimes V^* \\
 \downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \rho^* \\
 W & \xrightarrow{\beta_l} & V^*
 \end{array}$$

This diagram is equivalent to the following equation being true for any $x \in V$, $t \in W$ and $a \in A$:

$$\langle x, \lambda(a, t) \rangle = \langle \cdot, \lambda(a, t) \rangle(x) = \beta_l(\lambda(a, t))(x) = \rho^*(\text{id}_A \otimes \beta_l(a \otimes t))(x) = \rho^*(a, \langle \cdot, t \rangle)(x) = \langle \rho(x, a), t \rangle.$$

This amounts to $\langle x, \lambda(a, t) \rangle = \langle \rho(x, a), t \rangle$ i.e. the associativity condition. The same arguments hold for β_r which concludes the proof. \square

3.2 Frobenius Algebras

In this chapter we introduce Frobenius Algebras and their commutative versions. Following [9] this will be done from the perspective of category theory and later be applied to $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The definition of Frobenius Algebras uses monoids 1.35 and comonoids 1.35:

DEFINITION 3.16 (Frobenius Algebra – Category Version) Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ be a monoidal category and $A \in \mathbf{C}$. A tuple $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is called a **Frobenius Algebra** if

1. $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ is a monoid,
2. $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a comonoid,
3. the following diagram, called the **Frobenius Relation**, commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (A \otimes A) \otimes A & \xleftarrow{\delta \otimes \text{id}_A} & A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \delta} & A \otimes (A \otimes A) \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \mu & & \downarrow \cong \\
 & & A & & \\
 & & \downarrow \delta & & \\
 A \otimes (A \otimes A) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \mu} & A \otimes A & \xleftarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}_A} & (A \otimes A) \otimes A
 \end{array}$$

EXAMPLE 3.17 The circle $1 \in \mathbf{cob}_2$ is a monoid. Using the generating arrows 2.33 and the relations between them 2.40 forms the above diagrams. The additional relations involving the twist make 1 a *commutative Frobenius Algebra* which will be defined later.

Due to 1.49 a Frobenius Algebra is automatically rigid and thus finite-dimensional. Further, any monoidal functor maps Frobenius Algebras to Frobenius Algebras. Using the unit and counit we can build a “pairing/copairing” morphism on Frobenius Algebras:

LEMMA 3.18 Let $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ be a Frobenius Algebra in a monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$. There exist morphisms $\beta: A \otimes A \rightarrow e$ and $\theta: e \rightarrow A \otimes A$ such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \otimes A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}_A} & A \otimes A \\
 \text{id}_A \otimes \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\
 A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\beta} & e
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 A \otimes A \otimes A & \xleftarrow{\text{id}_A \otimes \delta} & A \otimes A \\
 \delta \otimes \text{id} \uparrow & & \uparrow \theta \\
 A \otimes A & \xleftarrow{\theta} & e
 \end{array}$$

We call such morphisms **pairings** and **copairings** respectively. The diagrams mirror 3.14.

Proof. Define $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ and $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$. Now note

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) &= \varepsilon \circ \mu \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) = \varepsilon \circ \mu \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) = \beta \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \\
 (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \theta &= (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\delta \circ \eta) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ (\delta \circ \eta) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ \theta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus the above diagrams commute. \square

REMARK 3.19 Our choices for β and θ are not unique since we did not use commutation properties of ε or η . Any morphisms $A \rightarrow e$ and $e \rightarrow A$ could take their place. However we need to use μ and δ . This will lead to numerous definitions of Frobenius Algebras in $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The interested reader is referred to [8, Lemma 2.2.8] or 3.3.

We can further classify pairings/copairings in parallel to 3.2:

DEFINITION 3.20 We call a pairing $\beta: A \otimes A \rightarrow e$ **nondegenerate** iff there exists a copairing $\theta: e \rightarrow A \otimes A$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \otimes A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\beta \otimes \text{id}_A} & e \otimes A \cong A \\
 \uparrow \text{id}_A \otimes \theta & \nearrow \text{id}_A & \\
 A \cong A \otimes e & &
 \end{array}$$

The copairing to a nondegenerate pairing is also called **nondegenerate**.

These definitions allow for a uniqueness result:

LEMMA 3.21 Let β be a nondegenerate pairing and θ the respective. Any other copairing ξ is isomorphic to θ . Moreover $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ is a nondegenerate pairing with copairing $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$.

Proof. Let β, θ and ξ be as above. Then

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \theta \cong (\text{id}_A \otimes \beta \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\xi \otimes \theta) \cong (\text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \xi$$

which implies $\xi \cong \theta$. Thus the copairing to a nondegenerate pairing is unique. Since $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ and $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$ we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\beta \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \theta) &= ((\varepsilon \circ \mu) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes (\delta \circ \eta)) \\
 &= (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \eta) \\
 &= (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \delta \circ \mu \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \eta) \cong \text{id}_A.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ is a monoid and $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a comonoid, the last isomorphism holds. This proves the statement. \square

Any pairing β determines a possible counit morphism by defining $\varepsilon := \beta(e, \cdot): A \rightarrow e$. Thus we could define a Frobenius Algebra as $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta \rangle$ with a pairing $\beta: A \otimes A \rightarrow e$. The same could be done using θ and the unit morphism. For $\beta = \varepsilon \circ \mu$ we retrieve ε .

Thus $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ and $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$ take special roles: They are the unique nondegenerate pairing and copairing that utilise only the morphisms of the Frobenius Algebra and such that ε and η are recover by the previous construction. By rule of the next result, we call them *the nondegenerate pairing* and *the nondegenerate copairing*.

LEMMA 3.22 Given the counit ε of a Frobenius Algebra, δ is the unique comultiplication such that $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a comonoid and such that the Frobenius Relation in 3.16 commutes.

Proof. Let ω be another comultiplication satisfying all of the above and consider $\omega \circ \eta$. Now

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \varepsilon) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\omega \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\eta \otimes \text{id}_A) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \varepsilon) \circ \omega \circ \mu \circ (\eta \otimes \text{id}_A) \cong \text{id}_A$$

which qualifies ω as a copairing for the nondegenerate pairing β . From Lemma 3.21 we know that the copairing is unique and thus $\omega \circ \eta \cong \theta = \delta \circ \eta$. \square

Next we consider Frobenius Algebras over *braided monoidal categories* 1.44 and *symmetric monoidal categories* 1.47.

DEFINITION 3.23 (Symmetric Frobenius Algebras) A Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ in a braided monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ is **symmetric**, if the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \\ \downarrow \mu & & & & \downarrow \varepsilon \\ A & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & & & e \end{array}$$

Using $\beta = \varepsilon \circ \mu$ we can express this definition as: In a symmetric Frobenius Algebra, the “pairing” β is invariant under twist of its factors. However there is no a priori reason to prefer μ over η leading to the following result:

LEMMA 3.24 A Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ in a braided monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ is symmetric iff $\gamma^{-1} \circ \delta \circ \eta \cong \delta \circ \eta$.

Proof. Let the Frobenius Algebra be symmetric and $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ the nondegenerate pairing with copairing $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$. Note that

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A).$$

Further γ is natural in both of its factors, thus

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_A) = \gamma \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A)$$

and

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ \gamma.$$

Thus consider:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\beta \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes (\gamma^{-1} \circ \theta)) \\ &= (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma^{-1}) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \eta) \\ &= (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \eta) \\ &= (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \gamma \circ \delta \circ \mu \circ \gamma \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \eta) \cong (\text{id}_A \otimes \varepsilon) \circ \delta \circ \mu \circ (\eta \otimes \text{id}_A) \cong \text{id}_A. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\gamma^{-1} \circ \theta$ is a possible nondegenerate copairing for β , thus $\gamma^{-1} \circ \delta \circ \eta \cong \theta = \delta \circ \eta$. The reverse direction is just a rephrasing of the above chain of equations/isomorphisms. \square

This puts the multiplication and comultiplication on equal footing. In the proof, the braiding forced the use of the uniqueness of the nondegenerate pairing/copairing instead of that of the comultiplication. Next we adapt to symmetric monoidal categories:

DEFINITION 3.25 (Commutative Frobenius Algebras) A Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ in a braided monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ is **commutative**, if the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & A \otimes A \\ & \searrow \mu & \downarrow \mu \\ & & A \end{array}$$

REMARK 3.26 A commutative Frobenius Algebra always is a symmetric Frobenius Algebra, the contrary does necessarily hold. The category of commutative Frobenius Algebras is a full subcategory of the category of symmetric Frobenius Algebras which is a full subcategory of the category of Frobenius Algebras in a symmetric monoidal category.

In a commutative Frobenius Algebra, the multiplication respects the symmetric structure of the symmetric monoidal category. Again, there is no reason to prefer the multiplication over the comultiplication:

LEMMA 3.27 A Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ in a symmetric monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ is commutative iff $\delta \circ \gamma = \delta$.

Proof. Remember that

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A \otimes \text{id}_A).$$

Since γ is natural in both factors,

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\gamma \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) = \gamma \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A)$$

as well as

$$(\gamma \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) = (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ \gamma.$$

We use the symmetry of the Frobenius Algebra to show that $\gamma \circ \delta$ is a comultiplication for the counit ε . Then by 3.22 we have $\gamma \circ \delta \cong \delta$. Again, the converse follows by the same arguments. Since γ is an isomorphism, $\langle A, \gamma \circ \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a comonoid. All that's left is the Frobenius Relation, hence

$$(\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\gamma \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) = (\gamma \circ \delta) \circ \mu.$$

Thus observe

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ (\delta \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \\
&= (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\delta \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \\
&= (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \gamma) \circ (\delta \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \\
&= \gamma \circ (\mu \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \delta) \circ \gamma = \gamma \circ \delta \circ \mu \circ \gamma = \gamma \circ \delta \circ \mu.
\end{aligned}$$

First we used the commutativity of μ and inserted a double twist. In the second and third step the naturality of the braiding was used to permute them and then commute with μ and δ respectively. The fourth step used the Frobenius Relation diagram to commute μ and δ and the last step is the definition of commutativity of μ . Thus $\gamma \circ \delta$ is a comultiplication with counit ε , hence isomorphic to δ which proves the statement. \square

The last two definitions introduced Frobenius Algebras “respecting” braided or symmetric structures. The proved lemmas are “coherence” results, putting the monoid and the comonoid structure of a Frobenius Algebra on equal footing. Next we introduce Frobenius Algebra morphisms which function as arrows of the respective category:

DEFINITION 3.28 (Frobenius Algebra Morphisms) Given two Frobenius Algebras $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ and $\langle A', \mu', \nu', \delta', \varepsilon' \rangle$ in a symmetric monoidal category $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ a **Frobenius Algebra morphism** between them is a morphism $f: A \rightarrow A'$ that is both a monoid morphism (see 1.37) $f: \langle A, \mu, \nu \rangle \rightarrow \langle A', \mu', \nu' \rangle$ and a comonoid morphism $f: \langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle \rightarrow \langle A', \delta', \varepsilon' \rangle$.

There are adapted morphisms for commutative and/or symmetric Frobenius Algebras. For our purposes it is enough to note that they respect and preserve the braided/commutative structure.

DEFINITION 3.29 (Category of Frobenius Algebras) Given a symmetric monoidal category $\langle \mathcal{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ define the **Category of Frobenius Algebras** of \mathcal{C} to be the category with Frobenius Algebras in \mathcal{C} as its objects and Frobenius Algebra morphisms between them as arrows. Composition is given by the composition of arrows in \mathcal{C} . We denote this category by $\mathbf{Frob}_{\mathcal{C}}$, the full subcategory of symmetric Frobenius Algebras by $\mathbf{symFrob}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and the full subcategory of commutative Frobenius Algebras by $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathcal{C}}$.

The above definition required a *symmetric monoidal category* while we might just ask for a monoidal category. However we almost exclusively work with symmetric monoidal categories like \mathbf{cob}_n or $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The braided, symmetric or monoidal structure descends to Frobenius Algebras:

COROLLARY 3.30 $\langle \mathbf{Frob}_{\mathcal{C}}, \otimes, e \rangle$ is a symmetric monoidal category with the twist given by the twist of factors of the product. $\langle \mathbf{symFrob}_{\mathcal{C}}, \otimes, e \rangle$ is a braided monoidal category and $\langle \mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathcal{C}}, \otimes, e \rangle$ a symmetric monoidal category.

The proof of the above statements requires an excessive amount of tedious writing and is efficiently conducted in the visual formalism of [8, 2.4.6 – 2.4.8]. We will comment on this representation in the next chapter where we will apply the categorial results of this chapter to $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

3.3 The Category $\text{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$

In this chapter we apply 3.2 to the algebraic preliminaries of 3.1. Thus we define Frobenius Algebras in $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$:

DEFINITION 3.31 (Frobenius Algebras over \mathbb{k}) We call a Frobenius Algebra in the category of vector spaces over a field \mathbb{k} , namely $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, a **Frobenius Algebra over a field \mathbb{k}** . In a slight abuse of notation we denote the category of these algebras by $\text{Frob}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Its symmetric and commutative subcategories are denoted by $\text{symFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and $\text{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ respectively.

A Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ contains a monoid $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ and a comonoid $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$. Thus $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ defines a \mathbb{k} -Algebra and $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ a \mathbb{k} -Coalgebra 3.9. By rule of 3.21 there exists a nondegenerate pairing $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ with nondegenerate copairing $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$. The categorial concept of a nondegenerate pairing/copairing 3.20 generalises the definition of a nondegenerate pairing for vector spaces 3.2. Using 3.5 we conclude:

COROLLARY 3.32 The vector space A of any Frobenius Algebra in $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is finite-dimensional.

The nondegenerate pairing and copairing are by definition associative 3.14 where A is a left and right A -module. From here on, we will state different equivalent definitions of Frobenius Algebras in $\text{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ taken from [8, chapter 2] to show how they *and* their equivalence emerge from category theory:

DEFINITION 3.33 (Found in [3, 3.7], [8, 2.3.24]) A Frobenius Algebra over \mathbb{k} is a \mathbb{k} -vector space A with maps $\mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon$ such that $\langle A, \mu, \eta \rangle$ is a \mathbb{k} -Algebra, $\langle A, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a \mathbb{k} -Coalgebra and such that

$$(\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta) = \delta \circ \mu = (\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A).$$

This definition is a *literal* translation of the categorial definition 3.29 into 3.31. Next we consider:

DEFINITION 3.34 (Found in [8, 2.2.5]) A Frobenius Algebra is a \mathbb{k} -Algebra of finite dimension, equipped with an associative nondegenerate pairing $\beta: A \otimes A \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$.

For any Frobenius Algebra there exists an associative nondegenerate pairing $\beta := \varepsilon \circ \mu$ with copairing $\theta := \delta \circ \eta$ stemming from 3.31. For the reverse, by rule of 3.21 the copairing for β is unique. Since β uniquely determines the counit ε for its unique nondegenerate copairing θ , we use 3.22 and retrieve a categorial Frobenius Algebra.

DEFINITION 3.35 (Found in [8, 2.2.6]) A Frobenius Algebra is a finite-dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra A equipped with a left A -isomorphism to its dual. Equivalently A can be equipped with a right A -isomorphism to its dual.

By 3.7 these requirements are equivalent to each other and to the existence of a nondegenerate pairing β . The isomorphisms are left or right A -linear respectively, thus we use 3.15 and see that β is associative. Using 3.34 yields the categorial definition. This implies the existence of a associative nondegenerate pairing β . By 3.7, we obtain two equivalent isomorphisms as requested in 3.35, thus


the two definitions are equivalent.

Remember that $(\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \otimes, \mathbb{k})$ is a *symmetric* monoidal category and consider the full subcategories $\mathbf{symFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ which are braided/symmetric monoidal categories. In the following construction we will consider a pictorial link between \mathbf{cob}_2 and $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$:

CONSTRUCTION 3.36 [8] uses a different ansatz to discuss Frobenius Algebras. It starts in the classical setting of linear algebra and defines $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ in the very end (compare [8, chapter 2]). Further it provides a pictorial representation of most proofs and concepts starting at [8, 2.3.5].

While we won't rewrite these proofs, an investigation of the pictorial representation of the morphisms of a Frobenius Algebra in $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ provides an intriguing result: It looks like the set of generators of \mathbf{cob}_2 2.33. This is no mere coincidence but a deep result discussed in 4.2. Historically the likeness of 2D-TQFTs and $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ was first discovered by the theoretical physicist *Robbert Dijkgraaf* in his Ph.D. thesis [4] and later formally proven, without strict treatment of symmetric structures, by *Abrams* [1] and *Quinn* [12].

The following “dictionary” for the morphisms of a Frobenius Algebra $\langle A, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ within a symmetric monoidal category $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \gamma \rangle$ enables the pictorial link:



We assign to the

unit	$\varepsilon: A \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$	the cup generator	$1 \longrightarrow 0,$
counit	$\eta: \mathbb{k} \longrightarrow A$	the cocup generator	$0 \longrightarrow 1,$
identity	$\text{id}_A: A \longrightarrow A$	the identity generator	$1 \longrightarrow 1,$
multiplication	$\mu: A \otimes A \longrightarrow A$	the copair of pants generator	$2 \longrightarrow 1,$
comultiplication	$\delta: A \longrightarrow A \otimes A$	the pair of pants generator	$1 \longrightarrow 2,$
twist	$\gamma: A \otimes A \xrightarrow{\sim} A \otimes A$	the twist generator	$2 \xrightarrow{\sim} 2.$

The comparison works in terms of in- and outgoing objects. Where the cobordisms have units 0, the morphisms of the Algebra have the unit \mathbb{k} and every instance of A is matched by exactly one copy of S^1 at the cobordism level. We will strictly formulate this obvious link in the next chapter. For now consider the applications of this “pictionary” as *Kock* calls it [8, 2.3.7]. We can give a pretty representation of the nondegenerate pairing β :

$$\beta = \varepsilon \circ \mu = \text{[Diagram of a pair of pants with a cap]} \cong \text{[Diagram of a pair of pants with a cup]}$$

Using this, we explain the name of the Frobenius Relations for cobordisms (7). Using (3) we come to the following “translation”:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{[Diagram 1]} = \text{[Diagram 2]} = \text{[Diagram 3]} \\ & \quad \quad \quad \iff \\ & (\text{id}_A \otimes \mu) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}_A) = \delta \circ \mu = (\mu \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \delta). \end{aligned}$$

We see that the name “Frobenius Relations” in (7) is justified. Of course the other relations have counterparts in Frobenius Algebras as well: The Unit and Counit relations (4), Associativity and Coassociativity relations (5) represent the commutative diagrams in the definition of monoids 1.34 and comonoids 1.35. The Identity relations (3) depict the identity morphisms in a category and the symmetric structure of the ambient monoidal category is recovered in form of *commutative* Frobenius Algebras where multiplication and comultiplication are invariant under γ . The same property is depicted in the Commutativity and Cocommutativity relations (6).

Thus there is a mapping between the defining structures of the two categories. So far this is just a “hunch” with visual evidence, however we will formalise and proof this in the next section, providing the main result of this project.

4 Topological Quantum Field Theory

In this section we will define and investigate *Topological Quantum Field Theories*. While the previous sections mostly worked without physical examples and analogies, this one will try to appeal to both mathematicians and physicists. First, we discuss the ideas behind TQFTs, give their definition and consider some important properties. We will follow up with a discussion of 2-dimensional TQFTs and their equivalence to $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The last chapter discusses occurrences and applications of TQFTs in physics with a focus on $2\text{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Again we use [8] and parts of [3]. They both work with the axiomatic definition of TQFTs by Atiyah [2] which allows for direct physical parallels. When discussing $2\text{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ we use the same resources together with the categorial formulation given in 3.3.

4.1 Motivation, Definition and properties

Classical field theories like Classical Mechanics, General Relativity, Electrodynamics are administered by the theory of differential equations and their geometric formulations. They are concerned with local properties of physical systems. This is incorporated as an axiom at the heart of classical field theory, the “Principle of Locality”. It can be formulated as follows:

PRINCIPLE 4.1 (Principle of Locality) Any influence of one state on another needs to be mediated by a field traveling through the space between the two.

Using the “speed of light” denoted by c which is introduced in Special Relativity further determines such influences since it poses a limit the possible speed of interaction. This limits the distance from which a state can be influenced within a certain timeframe. With the advent of Quantum Mechanics and the subsequent verification of its principles, a seemingly nonlocal theory was established next to classical theories. Quantum Mechanics exhibits a close connection to low-dimensional topology showing a link to global properties of physical systems rather than local ones. According to Atiyah, this is no surprise since “both quantum theory and topology are characterised by discrete phenomena emerging from a continuous background” [2, p. 175]. One can establish this connection in rigorous terms, however we are concerned with the following problem: How can we unify classical theories, which are inherently local, with quantum theories exhibiting clearly nonlocal properties?

Quantum Field Theory is an attempt to solve this problem on a topological level. In Quantum Field Theory one usually starts with classical mechanics, prominently using jet bundles and either infinite-dimensional manifolds or a multisymplectic formalism, to then “quantise” the classical theory. Such theories come in with different approaches and requirements. We will only be concerned with so-called “functorial” QFTs, which are formulated as functors between fitting categories:

The idea is to formulate the Quantisation in a functorial prescription between certain categories. QFTs describe the transition from a classical theory to a quantised version of the same and usually take some cobordism category as their “base”; Cobordisms can, allowing a vague analogy, be seen as “evolving slices of a spacetime” and allow the formulation of classical geometric theories using

further restrictions. The domain should host a quantum theory, usually formulated on hilbert spaces. $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, usually with $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{R}$, allows for such a description.

REMARK 4.2 In this project oriented and compact manifolds were used to describe cobordisms 2.6. However they could be endowed with additional structures. For example they could have a conformal structure, a spin structure, a framing or work with homotopy classes of maps into some classifying space. This results in conformal QFT (CFT), spin, framed or homotopy TQFT [3, 2.3]. The prefix “topological” stems from the absence of a metric or a conformal structure. We are thus working with so-called “oriented closed TQFTs” which we will, in a slight abuse of notation, only call “TQFTs”.

The idea of the following definition and the “axioms” (i.e. requirements) are taken from [2], however the presented version is closer to the one in [8, 1.2.23] for physical discussions:

DEFINITION 4.3 (Topological Quantum Field Theory) An n -dimensional **Topological Quantum Field Theory** over a field \mathbb{k} is a prescription \mathcal{Z} that associates to each compact oriented $(n - 1)$ -manifold without boundary Σ a vector space $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma) \in \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and to each $M \in \mathbf{cob}_n$ with $M: \Sigma_0 \implies \Sigma_1$ a linear map $\mathcal{Z}(M): \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_1)$. This prescription is subject to the following “axioms”:

- a) The image of two equivalent cobordisms $M \cong N$ is the same, namely $\mathcal{Z}(M) = \mathcal{Z}(N)$.
- b) Any cylinder cobordism $\Sigma \times I: \Sigma \implies \Sigma$ is mapped to the identity

$$\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma \times I) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)}: \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma).$$

- c) If a cobordism $M \in \mathbf{cob}_n$ has a decomposition of the form $M = M_0 M_1$, \mathcal{Z} acts as follows:

$$\mathcal{Z}(M) = \mathcal{Z}(M_1) \circ \mathcal{Z}(M_0).$$

- d) The disjoint union of $(n - 1)$ -manifolds Σ_0, Σ_1 is sent to the tensor product of their vector spaces, namely

$$\mathcal{Z}\left(\Sigma_0 \amalg \Sigma_1\right) = \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_0) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma_1).$$

In the same manner if $M = M_0 \amalg M_1$ for $M_0, M_1 \in \mathbf{cob}_n$, we get

$$\mathcal{Z}(M) = \mathcal{Z}(M_0) \otimes \mathcal{Z}(M_1).$$

- e) The empty manifold, namely \emptyset_{n-1} , is sent to the unit of $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, namely \mathbb{k} . Thus $\mathcal{Z}(\emptyset_{n-1}) = \mathbb{k}$.

The first three properties state that \mathcal{Z} is a functor in the sense of 1.10. Adding the last two properties, this functor is monoidal. Additionally it respects the symmetric structures, allowing for the following equivalent definition:

DEFINITION 4.4 (Topological Quantum Field Theory) An n -dimensional **TQFT** over a field \mathbb{k}

is a symmetric monoidal functor between \mathbf{cob}_n and $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$

$$\mathcal{Z}: \mathbf{cob}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}.$$

As usual in physical theories, we are working with manifolds of fixed dimension. Properties *a)* and *b)* express its “topological” nature since we work with diffeomorphism classes of cobordisms not minding curvature, metric or other structures. Further they embody “relativistic invariance” since TQFTs are blind to the precise form the transition between “spacetime slices” takes.

Property *c)* encapsulates locality by stating that the “evolution”, if decomposable on the level of cobordisms, is also decomposable on the level of linear maps. We obtain an “independence on the history” on the quantum level since previous evolution does not explicitly influence the next apart from the output slice it creates.

Properties *d)* and *e)* are linked to a quantum property of our theory: Independent physical systems are described by the tensor product of Hilbert spaces, thus in our theory the coproduct of cobordisms is sent to the tensor product of their respective vector spaces.

e) also describes a quantum systems invariance under global (complex) phases. This is a rewriting of the fact that \mathbb{k} acts as a unit, but we can also read it as the “vacuum” \emptyset_{n-1} being mapped to \mathbb{k} , which expresses the fact that the vacuum of a quantum theory is invariant under complex phases.

We will mostly work with the functorial definition of a TQFT 4.4. However keeping the interpretation of 4.3 in mind will be crucial to understand the physical implications the properties and examples. The first result shows why TQFTs are “manageable” regarding the involved dimensions:

THEOREM 4.5 Given an n -dimensional TQFT \mathcal{Z} over a field \mathbb{k} , any vector space in its image is equipped with a nondegenerate pairing and thus of finite dimension.

Proof. Let $\Sigma \in \mathbf{cob}_n$ and denote by $V := \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)$ its image under the TQFT. Take Σ with the opposite orientation, denote it by $\bar{\Sigma}$ and its image by $W := \mathcal{Z}(\bar{\Sigma})$. Using these, we define a “pairing-like” and a “copairing-like” cobordism

$$M: \Sigma \amalg \bar{\Sigma} \Longrightarrow \emptyset_{n-1}, \quad N: \emptyset_{n-1} \Longrightarrow \bar{\Sigma} \amalg \Sigma.$$

Denote the induced linear maps by $\beta: V \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$ and $\gamma: \mathbb{k} \longrightarrow W \otimes V$. The cylinder cobordism $\Sigma \times I$ is diffeomorphic to the composition cobordism

$$\left(\Sigma \times I \amalg N \right) \left(M \amalg \Sigma \times I \right) \cong \Sigma \times I.$$

Applying the TQFT leads to

$$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)} = (\beta \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)}) \circ (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)} \otimes \gamma)$$

which is the condition for β to be a nondegenerate pairing 3.2 with copairing γ . By 3.5 V and W are finite-dimensional. Since we did not make any particular choice for Σ , any image vector space

of a TQFT is necessarily finite-dimensional and comes with a nondegenerate pairing. \square

The following corollary applies 3.7 to the above result. In Atiyah's definition of a TQFT [2, p.178] it is listed as an axiom:

COROLLARY 4.6 For any $\Sigma \in \text{cob}_n$ one has $\mathcal{Z}(\overline{\Sigma}) = \mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)^*$.

From here on out, denote by \mathcal{Z} an n -dimensional TQFT over \mathbb{k} . We now know that any TQFT restricts to a functor onto $\text{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ simplifying many constructions.

REMARK 4.7 Finite-dimensional vector spaces suffice for *some* physical applications like the effective theory of Quantum Computation. However there are other models that demand infinite-dimensional vector spaces. Deviating from TQFTs and introducing metric dependencies or other geometric structures can solve this issue.


Next we combine property *b*) and *e*) in 4.3: If M is a compact n -dimensional manifold without boundary and \mathcal{Z} an n -dimensional TQFT over \mathbb{k} , we read M as the cobordism

$$M: \emptyset_{n-1} \implies \emptyset_{n-1}.$$

Thus its image under \mathcal{Z} is a linear map $\mathcal{Z}(M): \mathbb{k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}$, namely a constant. This is another reason why TQFTs are interesting for both mathematicians and physicists. They produce constants of manifolds, i.e. topological invariants, hence they are an analytic tool in mathematics and physics. In a highly perturbative QFT, one could construct its "topological skeleton", i.e. a TQFT, compute such invariants and compare them to experimental or numeric data.

LEMMA 4.8 For any $\Sigma \in \text{cob}_n$ one has $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma \times S^1) = \dim(\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma))$.

Proof. $\Sigma \times S^1$ does not have a boundary. Thus the induced cobordism has a constant as its image under \mathcal{Z} . To find this constant, we decompose the "donut" $\Sigma \times S^1$ into the "copairing cobordism" $N: \emptyset_{n-1} \implies \overline{\Sigma} \amalg \Sigma$, the twist cobordism $T: \overline{\Sigma} \amalg \Sigma \implies \Sigma \amalg \overline{\Sigma}$ and the "pairing cobordism" $M: \Sigma \amalg \overline{\Sigma} \implies \emptyset_{n-1}$. A pictorial representation in 2 dimensions is given by:



Applying \mathcal{Z} yields $\beta \circ \gamma = \text{tr}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)}) = \dim(\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma))$. \square

Thus we can calculate the dimension of the involved vector spaces (or Hilbert spaces). The following result allows the descend of an n -dimensional TQFT to lower dimensions:

LEMMA 4.9 Let Θ be a compact oriented manifold without boundary of dimension k where

$k < n$. The functor

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-k}: \mathbf{cob}_{n-k} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}, \quad \left(\Sigma_0 \xrightarrow{M} \Sigma_1 \right) \longmapsto \mathcal{Z} \left(\Sigma_0 \times \Theta \xrightarrow{M \times \Theta} \Sigma_1 \times \Theta \right)$$

is an $(n - k)$ -dimensional TQFT over \mathbb{k} .

Proof. Note that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n-k} = \mathcal{Z} \circ ((\cdot) \times \Theta).$$

Both \mathcal{Z} and $(\cdot) \times \Theta$ are symmetric monoidal functors, thus their composite is too. Hence \mathcal{Z}_{n-k} is an $(n - k)$ -dimensional TQFT. \square

Given a TQFT of any dimension n , we can restrict it to a TQFT of lower dimension by fixing compact oriented manifolds without boundary. In physics this behaviour is used in the compactification process in Bosonic String Theory- Here one restricts the $(25 + 1)$ -dimensional spacetime by imposing restrictions on some dimensions. A common example is the compactification using a circle where one considers $\mathbb{R}^{24+1} \times S^1$ to observe the implications on the dynamics in \mathbb{R}^{24+1} .

Another physical example arises when looking at 1-dimensional cobordisms seen in 2.7, namely Quantum Computing. Indeed the pictorial representation looks like 1-dimensional TQFT. There exists an entire field of studies dedicated to harnessing the stability of topological properties of quantum systems using TQFT. The approach provides an alternative to stabilize the error prone implementations of Quantum Computing. A comprehensible survey on the field of Topological Quantum Computing is given in [13].

Since TQFTs are functors between categories, we use natural transformations as arrows between them to form a new category:

DEFINITION 4.10 (The Category $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$) The **category of n -dimensional TQFTs over a field \mathbb{k}** , denoted by $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$, is the category whose objects are n -dimensional TQFTs over \mathbb{k} and whose arrows are monoidal natural transformations 1.31. The composition of arrows is given by the composition of natural transformations.

This definition enables a comparison between $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and other categories using natural transformations.

4.2 2-dimensional TQFTs

In this chapter we investigate 2-dimensional TQFTs. A pictorial link between 2-dimensional TQFTs and Frobenius Algebras was given in 3.36. This will be the base for a rigorous formulation and proof of the *Equivalence Theorem* which is the main result of this project. We start by considering elements of $2\mathbf{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Since S^1 generates the skeleton of \mathbf{cob}_2 , the action of TQFTs on it inspires a new perspective on TQFTs applied to “generated” monoidal categories. This view allows for a formulation of the equivalence of categories $2\mathbf{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}} \cong \mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as well as its proof. We will prove a more general version and then restrict to \mathbf{cob}_2 and $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

We roughly follow [8] and [3], however the text will deviate from the usual form of the proof/sketch and use 3.2. This approach is a concrete version of [8, chapter 3.6].

4.2.1 Free Monoidal Categories over a Frobenius Algebra

Any element of cob_2 is uniquely determined by a positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since we can write it as $\coprod^n S^1$ 2.36. Take any $\mathcal{Z} \in \text{2TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and consider its action on such an element: Since \mathcal{Z} is a symmetric monoidal functor,

$$\mathcal{Z}\left(\coprod^n S^1\right) = \bigotimes^n \mathcal{Z}(S^1).$$

Thus understanding $\mathcal{Z}(S^1)$ means understanding the image of any element of cob_2 .

LEMMA 4.11 For any $\mathcal{Z} \in \text{2TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$, $\mathcal{Z}(S^1)$ is a commutative Frobenius Algebra over \mathbb{k} .

Proof. Denote $\mathcal{Z}(S^1)$ by F . We know that $F \in \text{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and that there exists a nondegenerate pairing induced by the cobordism $1 \coprod 1 \implies 0$ with a copairing introduced by $0 \implies 1 \coprod 1$. Using 3.34, any image of any TQFT in any dimension 4.5, is *close* to a Frobenius Algebra.

However in cob_2 the above cobordisms satisfy the *Associativity and Coassociativity relations* (5) and thus induce an associative/coassociative pairing/copairing. Together with 3.27 we see that F is commutative since the pairing and copairing also satisfy (6). \square

Since cob_2 is generated by S^1 we could try to prove the equivalence of cob_2 and $\text{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$. However we aim for a more general result. To this end, let us review the proof:

We started with the general fact that every cobordism is mapped onto an element of $\text{FinVect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and that there exists a nondegenerate pairing with copairing. Since cob_2 is generated by S^1 , the pairing and copairing included only copies of S^1 and thus images of objects only copies of F . The Associativity/Coassociativity relations induced the associativity of the nondegenerate pairing and made F a Frobenius Algebra. The Commutativity/Cocommutativity relations made F commutative.

Looking at these properties, we try to reconstruct these generators and relations The following definition is a rewriting of the one given in [8, 3.6.16]:

DEFINITION 4.12 (Free monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra) Let $\langle \chi, \otimes, 0 \rangle$ be a monoidal category whose skeleton is generated by 1 and \otimes . Namely all of its objects are given by an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and are of the form

$$n := 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \dots \otimes 1 = \bigotimes^n 1.$$

Further its set of arrows is generated by the following four arrows

$$\mu: 2 \longrightarrow 1, \quad \delta: 1 \longrightarrow 2, \quad \eta: 0 \longrightarrow 1, \quad \varepsilon: 1 \longrightarrow 0$$

which satisfy the following relations:

$$\text{a) } \mu \circ (\text{id} \otimes \eta) = \text{id} = \mu \circ (\eta \otimes \text{id}). \quad (\text{Commutativity})$$

$$\text{b) } (\text{id} \otimes \varepsilon) \circ \delta = \text{id} = (\varepsilon \otimes \text{id}) \circ \delta. \quad (\text{Cocommutativity})$$

$$\text{c) } (\text{id} \otimes \mu) \circ (\delta \otimes \text{id}) = \delta \circ \mu = (\mu \otimes \text{id}) \circ (\text{id} \otimes \delta). \quad (\text{Frobenius})$$

This makes $1 \in \chi$ a Frobenius Algebra in the sense of 3.16. Accordingly we call χ a **free monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra**.

Thus a subset of the relations in cob_2 2.40 holds true and the object $1 \in \chi$ takes the same role as S^1 in cob_2 . Like in cob_2 , we could give a pictorial representation of the above objects and arrows and repeat the pictorial proof of 2.41 to derive the following:

COROLLARY 4.13 The three relations in 4.12 imply the following relations:

$$\mu \circ (\text{id} \otimes \mu) = \mu \circ (\mu \otimes \text{id}), \quad (\delta \otimes \text{id}) \circ \delta = (\text{id} \otimes \delta) \circ \delta.$$

They correspond to the Associativity/Coassociativity relations (5).

Thus 4.12 recovers the properties of S^1 in cob_2 . However we have no analogy for the twist morphism.

DEFINITION 4.14 (Free Symmetric Monoidal Categories over a Frobenius Algebra) Let $\langle \chi, \otimes, 0 \rangle$ be a free monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra. Let γ be a braiding and element of the generators of the set of arrows such that $\langle \chi, \otimes, 0, \gamma \rangle$ is a symmetric monoidal category and the following additional relations hold:

$$\mu \circ \gamma = \mu, \quad \delta = \gamma \circ \delta.$$

We call χ a **free symmetric monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra**. 1 is a commutative Frobenius Algebra.

This is essentially equivalent to the skeleton of cob_2 2.36. Whenever working with a free symmetric monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra, one can equivalently work with cob_2 . This establishes an equivalence of categories, which will not be formalised in this project.

4.2.2 Functor Categories

$\text{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ is a functor category. Its objects are symmetric monoidal functors and its arrows monoidal natural transformations between them.

DEFINITION 4.15 (The Category of Symmetric Monoidal Functors) Let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{D}, \tilde{\otimes}, i \rangle$ be two monoidal categories. We define the **category of monoidal functors** as the category whose objects are monoidal functors from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} and whose arrows are monoidal natural transformations between them. We denote it by $\text{Mon}(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$.

If the two categories carry symmetric structures, we define the **category of symmetric monoidal functors** by taking symmetric monoidal functors from \mathbf{C} to \mathbf{D} as objects and monoidal natural transformations as arrows between them.

The following equivalence is a helpful example:

$$\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}} \cong \mathbf{SymMon}(\mathbf{cob}_n, \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}).$$

Thus for any two symmetric monoidal categories \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} the category $\mathbf{SymMon}(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$ generalises the idea of TQFTs. However $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ allows for physical analogies while others might not be of any physical interest.

As shown for S^1 in \mathbf{cob}_2 we can take $1 \in \chi$, a Frobenius Algebra, and remember that monoidal functors map Frobenius Algebras onto Frobenius Algebras and respect commutativity. This proves the following result:

LEMMA 4.16 Let χ be a free monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra 1 and let $\langle \mathbf{C}, \tilde{\otimes}, e \rangle$ be any monoidal category. The image of 1 under any object in $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$ is a Frobenius Algebra. Should χ be symmetric, then the image of 1 , a commutative Frobenius Algebra, is commutative.

This makes 4.11 obsolete.

4.2.3 Equivalence Theorems

In this chapter we formulate and prove the deep connection between certain functor categories and Frobenius Algebras. The first result doesn't use symmetric structure:

THEOREM 4.17 (Equivalence Theorem – Monoidal Functor Categories) Let χ be a free monoidal category over the Frobenius Algebra 1 and $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e \rangle$ any monoidal category. There exists a natural isomorphism

$$\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C}) \cong \mathbf{Frob}_{\mathbf{C}}.$$

Proof. We start with the objects of $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$:

\implies The skeleton of χ is generated by a finite set of objects and arrows. Thus we can determine any functor by its values on them. Take any monoidal functor let F , a Frobenius Algebra, be the image of $1 \in \chi$. Further, the image of n is $\otimes^n F$. The identity arrow $\text{id}: 1 \rightarrow 1$ is sent to the identity $\text{id}_F: F \rightarrow F$. Looking at 4.12 the functor maps μ to $F \otimes F \rightarrow F$, δ to $F \rightarrow F \otimes F$, η to $e \rightarrow F$ and ε to $F \rightarrow e$. Using the relations these arrows satisfy in χ , we see that their images satisfy the relations for a monoid/comonoid such that $\langle F, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$ is a Frobenius Algebra 3.29. This also ensures the uniqueness of the relevant arrows. To prove all this, one could cite 4.16 however the constructed mapping will be used in the reverse direction of the proof and captures the functorial properties of the equivalence.

\impliedby Take a Frobenius Algebra in \mathbf{C} denoted by $\langle F, \mu, \eta, \delta, \varepsilon \rangle$. We construct a monoidal functor by taking the above prescription as its definition. By rule of the relations the arrows in χ satisfy, this mapping is well-defined since it respects the relations of a Frobenius Algebra.

Starting with an arbitrary monoidal functor \mathbf{M} , constructing the Frobenius Algebra F using the first direction and then using F to form a monoidal functor, we recover \mathbf{M} by definition. Next we investigate the arrows of $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$, namely monoidal natural transformations.

Let \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} be two monoidal functors in $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$ and $\tau: \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ a monoidal natural transformation between them. Denote the images of $1 \in \chi$ under \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} by F and G . For any element $n \in \chi$ the natural transformation maps $\tau_n: \bigotimes^n F \rightarrow \bigotimes^n G$, namely it is the n -fold tensor product of the arrow $F \rightarrow G$. Thus we restrict its investigation to this simple case.

\implies By 1.17 every induced map τ_n is compatible with arrows in χ which are generated by a finite set of arrows. Thus we translate the definition reduced to the generating maps to the following four diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F \otimes F & \xrightarrow{\tau_2} & G \otimes G \\
 \downarrow \mu_F & & \downarrow \mu_G \\
 F & \xrightarrow{\tau_2} & G \\
 F & \xrightarrow{\tau_2} & G \\
 \downarrow \delta_F & & \downarrow \delta_G \\
 F \otimes F & \xrightarrow{\tau_2} & G \otimes G
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 F & \xrightarrow{\tau} & G \\
 \uparrow \eta_F & & \uparrow \eta_G \\
 e & \xleftarrow{=} & e \\
 e & \xleftarrow{=} & e \\
 \uparrow \varepsilon_F & & \uparrow \varepsilon_G \\
 F & \xrightarrow{\tau} & G
 \end{array}$$

The first two diagrams show that τ is a monoid morphism 1.37. The second pair is just the respective statement for comonoids. By 3.28 $\tau := \tau_1$ classifies as a Frobenius Algebra morphism.

\Leftarrow Given a Frobenius Algebra morphism, we use its action on the generating arrows to define a monoidal natural transformation using the four diagrams. By definition his construction is the inverse of the previous: Starting with a monoidal natural transformation τ and using (\implies) to form a Frobenius Algebra morphism, which we use to construct a monoidal natural transformation, we arrive at τ .

We have proven that every object in $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$ is in direct correspondence to an object in $\mathbf{Frob}_{\mathbf{C}}$ and that every arrow of $\mathbf{Mon}(\chi, \mathbf{C})$ is in direct correspondence to an arrow in $\mathbf{Frob}_{\mathbf{C}}$. This correspondence defines an equivalence of categories 1.20 which proves the theorem. \square

In particular, $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is equivalent to a *subcategory* of all of $\mathbf{Frob}_{\mathbf{k}}$. However 4.17 doesn't capture symmetric structure making it impossible to precisely pinpoint TQFT counterparts in Frobenius Algebras. However we introduced free symmetric monoidal categories over Frobenius Algebras:

THEOREM 4.18 (Equivalence Theorem – Symmetric Monoidal Functor Categories) Let χ be a free symmetric monoidal category over the commutative Frobenius Algebra 1 with braiding γ and $\langle \mathbf{C}, \otimes, e, \sigma \rangle$ any symmetric monoidal category. There exists a natural isomorphism

$$\mathbf{SymMon}(\chi, \mathbf{C}) \cong \mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbf{C}}.$$

Proof. We need to extend the constructions of 4.17 to the symmetric structures of χ and \mathbf{C} . We are now working with *symmetric* monoidal functors, thus the image of 1 is a Frobenius Algebra

in \mathcal{C} and the twist map γ is mapped to the twist of the tensor product in \mathcal{C} , namely σ . Using the relations involving the twist 4.14 the image of 1 is a commutative Frobenius Algebra.

If we take a commutative Frobenius Algebra in \mathcal{C} we can construct a monoidal functor which is well-defined due to the relations the arrows in χ satisfy. Using the relations involving γ , we recover the symmetric structure defining a symmetric monoidal functor. Again the two constructions are inverse to each other.

Since any symmetric monoidal functor maps twist map to twist map, the diagram for σ_F and σ_G trivially commutes. This determines the definition of a monoidal natural transformation given an arrow in $\mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Altogether we can incorporate symmetric structures into the equivalence theorem 4.17 by making a transition to commutative Frobenius Algebras. This again forms an equivalence of categories, thus proving the theorem. \square

This result finally can be applied to $\mathbf{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ to state the following theorem:

THEOREM 4.19 (Equivalence Theorem – TQFTs) $2\mathbf{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}} \cong \mathbf{comFrob}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Note that the proof of 4.18 used the same “dictionary” as in 3.36, however the abstraction from \mathbf{cob}_2 and TQFTs brought a few new challenges. Still, the specialisation to $2\mathbf{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$ allows physical implications:

Every 2-dimensional TQFT is uniquely determined by a commutative Frobenius Algebra capturing the topological structure of a Quantum Field Theory. On the other hand, every commutative Frobenius Algebra uniquely determines a 2-dimensional TQFT. Thus if a theoretical physicist, in his ongoing considerations of certain algebraic relations between say fields, antifields, their pairwise or individual destruction and creation, recovers the structure of a commutative Frobenius Algebra over a field \mathbb{k} , he can deduce a 2-dimensional TQFT and thus the topological skeleton of the theory. This allows for the calculation of topological invariants, thus analytic values which can be invaluable goods in increasingly complex and often perturbative field theories.

Together with (4.18) we can also state some results about functorial theory: Every functorial theory comprised of symmetric monoidal functors that has a free symmetric monoidal category over a Frobenius Algebra as its source category is equivalent to the commutative Frobenius Algebras in its domain category. If the domain category is $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ the theory is necessarily equivalent to $2\mathbf{TQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$. This is completely invariant under the form of the source category as long as it is a free symmetric monoidal category.

4.3 TQFTs in Physics

In this chapter a small exposition of physical applications of TQFT will be presented. Physical quantum field theories, even TQFTs, are commonly formulated using action functionals, Lagrangians and observables; the so-called *path integral formalism* is the predominant language for physical quantum field theories. Since this project is focused on TQFTs as functorial theories, the exposition will be rather qualitative not considering the well-definedness of many notions. A brief

and insightful introduction to the motivation of TQFTs from a path integral perspective is given in [3, chapter 2.1] which is compared to the axiomatic definition in [3, chapter 2.3].

After discussing the relation between the presented TQFT formalism and the usual path integral formulation following the lines of [3, 2.3], introductions to *Chern-Simons* and *Dijkgraaf-Witten theories* will be given. They follow the lines of [14, chapter 3.2] and will illuminate the role of TQFTs in physics.

4.3.1 TQFT vs. Path Integral Formalism

There are a few ambiguous terms in the path integral formulation, however note that the choices in this section are based on convenience regarding the comparison to functorial TQFTs. We begin with an overview of the ingredients for a physical quantum field theory and compare them to TQFTs.

First we need to introduce the notions of fields. Note that we will restrict to one field to simplify notation. Mathematically they are maps $\varphi: M \rightarrow X$ between two (riemannian) manifolds (M, g) and (X, h) . M takes the role of the spacetime and X that of the target. For $X = \mathbb{R}$, φ is called a scalar field. Classically we consider the action of the field φ , thus a functional of the form

$$S[\varphi] = \int_M \mathcal{L}(\varphi, \partial_\mu \varphi) \sqrt{\det(g)} d^n x.$$

Here \mathcal{L} is the so-called **Lagrangian** or **Lagrange function** which depends on x via φ and g is the metric on M . The Lagrangian depends on the field and its first derivative. For a quantum field theory however, we need to go one step further. Capturing the quantum nature of the theory, we investigate a formalised weighted sum over *all possible fields on M* . This takes the form of an integral over the **space of fields** $\mathcal{F}(M)$ called **partition function**. These spaces of fields are usually infinite-dimensional and require silk gloves when it comes to geometry and analysis. However such considerations are far beyond the scope of this project. A partition function has the following form:

$$\mathcal{Z}_M(\Phi) := \int_{\mathcal{F}(M) \text{ s.t. } \varphi|_{\partial M} = \Phi} e^{-S[\varphi]} D\varphi. \quad (\diamond)$$

We integrate over the space of fields to express a weighted sum with respect to the value of the respective classical action functional. The measure and the integral itself are not easily made sense of, however we only require qualitative insights. Note that the above equation only treats special partition function for which the fields restrict to a fixed field Φ on the boundaries. The last object we need to introduce is the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} . In a quantum theory it governs the time evolution of the physical system and is closely related to any non-topological system dependence.

Note that the letter \mathcal{Z} for the partition function stems from the german word “Zustandssumme” which literally means “sum of states”. This represents the idea behind the integral and resembles the sign we chose for TQFTs $\mathcal{Z} \in \text{nTQFT}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Indeed the axioms for a TQFT 4.3 translate into physically “reasonable” properties for a partition function:

- The partition function generates all possible correlation functionals. Thus it generalises the

partition function from statistical mechanics and encodes the entire information about the theory, just as a TQFT does.

- Partition functions on disconnected manifolds can be calculated separately for each component. This mirrors axiom *d*) for TQFTs. It can also be adapted to partition functions respecting certain boundary conditions (see (\diamond)).
- Given a manifold Σ axiom *b*) tells us that the cylinder cobordism $\Sigma \times I$ is mapped to the identity on $\mathcal{Z}(\Sigma)$. This corresponds to the “time evolution” being independent of non-topological factors and translates to path integrals by setting $\mathcal{H} = 0$.
- By axiom *e*) any compact oriented n -dimensional manifold without boundary M , is sent to an element of \mathbb{k} . In the same manner, the partition function evaluated on M produces an element of \mathbb{k} .

The strength of the path integral formalism lies in its direct link to geometry and physical applications. Meanwhile the functorial formulation provides tools to classify low-dimensional theories (compare 4.19).

4.3.2 Examples

We will give a brief introduction to Chern-Simons theory and Dijkgraaf-Witten theory. Both are famous examples of topological quantum field theories. While the latter can be used to formulate a 2-dimensional TQFT, the former directly motivates functorial TQFTs. The exposition of both theories draws from [15], [5], [14, chapter 3.2] and some comments of [2, chapter 3]. Note that this exposition is not meant to be extensive, it rather serves to embed previous results and discussions into actual applications.

Chern-Simons Theory

Chern-Simons Theory can be used to motivate an axiomatic and functorial approach to TQFTs. We will give a short introduction to the theory and then discuss this statement. The physically most intriguing property of Chern-Simons theory is the following:

When considering a “topologic” theory one usually, especially in physics, thinks of a theory constructed and working without fixing a metric. Thus it describes only observables, hence physical properties, that are topologic invariants of the underlying spacetime. In physics this is expressed using **general covariance** stating that all derived physical laws are invariant under *any* possible coordinate transformation. General Relativity achieves this by choosing a metric and then integrating over all possible metrics to obtain a metric that is an evolving quantity. This interpretation had a tremendous impact on the perspective of modern physics; a generally covariant, i.e. topologic, theory is almost synonymous with a theory in which the metric is dynamic.

Unlike in General Relativity, Chern-Simons theory does *not* fix a metric and then integrate over all possible metrics. It is formulated without any metric-dependent terms to begin with. Thus it “breaks the mold” when it comes to forming a physical TQFT.

Chern-Simons Theory is a 3-dimensional theory using compact 3-dimensional manifold without boundary, denoted by M . One further needs a simply connected Lie group G with corresponding Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and denotes by tr an invariant trace map on \mathfrak{g} . Denote the space of connections on the trivial G -principal bundle over M by $\Omega^1(M; \mathfrak{g})$. Thus define the following action functional called the **Chern-Simons functional**:

$$S_M^k : \Omega^1(M; \mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

$$A \longmapsto \frac{k}{4\pi} \int_M \text{tr} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right).$$

$k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is called the “level” of the action. In this action A takes the role of a field and S_M that of a classical action functional. “Integrating over all connections” results in a partition function of the following form:

$$Z_k(M) \cong \int_{\Omega^1(M; \mathfrak{g})/\sim} e^{ikS_M^k(A)} DA.$$

\sim denotes gauge-equivalence and DA is supposed to be a measure on the modulo space. An integral of this form should produce an element of \mathbb{R} which only depends on the topological properties of M . Since M is compact and without boundary, this relates to property *e*) in the definition of a TQFT. However the measure DA does not need to exist and the above equation is only a sketch, hence the use of “ \cong ”. One instead turns to the properties an object like $Z_k(M)$ needs to satisfy.

Consider M compact with boundary ∂M and define for $\alpha \in \Omega^1(M; \mathfrak{g})$ the subspace of connections that are gauge-equivalent to α on the boundary of M , denoted by $\Omega_\alpha^1(M; \mathfrak{g})$. Like in (\diamond) we restrict to such equivalences and calculate

$$Z_k(M)(\alpha) \cong \int_{\Omega_\alpha^1(M; \mathfrak{g})/\sim} e^{ikS_M^k(A)} DA.$$

This marks $Z_k(M)$ as a function $\Omega^1(\partial M; \mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which can be read as a vector space element. Thus it has values in objects of $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{R}}$. We also recover property *d*) from 4.3: Given a disconnected manifold $M = M_1 \amalg M_2$ we obtain a tuple of two vectors, one associated to M_1 and one to M_2 . We then recover property *c*) as we “cut” a manifold by restricting the integration and separately integrate on the two parts. Property *a*) is included since we consider only the topological properties of the underlying manifold, thus the theory is indifferent to the representant of the diffeomorphism class of a manifold.

Altogether Chern-Simons theory displays similarities to the axiomatic properties of TQFTs and is purely topological. However the strict formulation of Chern-Simons Theory as a functorial TQFT is still not entirely clear. A short remark on contemporary approaches to this issue can be found in [14] who also provides further material on the well-definedness of the theory.

Dijkgraaf-Witten Theory

Dijkgraaf-Witten Theory is formulated in the functorial framework. Since some notions and categories were not defined in this project, the reader is referred to [5] and [14] for further sources.

Let G be a group with cardinality c , \mathbb{k} a field whose characteristic is coprime to c and $n > 0$ a positive integer. Given any compact $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifold without boundary Σ denote its grupoid of G -bundles by $BG(\Sigma)$ and define the following prescription:

$$\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}[\pi_0(BG(\Sigma))] =: V_\Sigma.$$

π_0 stands for the 0-th homotopy group and $\mathbb{k}[a]$ for the smallest ring that contains \mathbb{k} and a . This can be read as a vector space with coefficients in \mathbb{k} , thus an object of $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Moreover this vector space is finite due to the compactness of Σ and the finiteness of G . Taking two such manifold Σ_1 and Σ_2 and considering their disjoint union we obtain $V_{\Sigma_1 \amalg \Sigma_2} \cong V_{\Sigma_1} \otimes V_{\Sigma_2}$. This relates to property d).

Next, consider an n -dimensional cobordism $M: \Sigma_1 \implies \Sigma_2$. Using the grupoids of the three manifolds and the restricting inclusion functors i_1^*, i_2^* we assign to M a linear map by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_M: V_{\Sigma_1} &\longrightarrow V_{\Sigma_2} \\ [y] &\longmapsto \sum_{[x] \text{ s.t. } [x]=[i_1^*y]} \frac{i_2^*[x]}{|\text{Aut}(x)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $x \in BG(M)$ and $\text{Aut}(x)$ denotes its automorphism group. Since gluing cobordisms together allows for a decomposition of their grupoids of G -bundles, we recover property c) as

$$\varphi_{MN} = \varphi_N \circ \varphi_M$$

This construction does not depend on the representant of diffeomorphism classes, thus satisfying property a). Further $\Sigma \times I: \Sigma \implies \Sigma$ is mapped to the identity on V_Σ . If M is compact and without boundary, we recover property e) as $V_\emptyset = \mathbb{k}$. Altogether this defines a symmetric monoidal functor

$$\mathcal{Z}_G: \mathbf{cob}_n \longrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}.$$

This procedure constructs a TQFT for any dimension, thus 2-dimensional Dijkgraaf-Witten Theory is equivalent to a commutative Frobenius Algebra 4.19. Note that for a compact n -dimensional manifold without boundary M we obtain an element of \mathbb{k} via the partition function

$$\mathcal{Z}_G(M) = \sum_{[x] \in BG(M)} \frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(x)|}.$$

$BG(M)$ takes the role of the space of fields while the sum can be seen as the integral of 1 using the gauge-invariant measure $\frac{1}{|\text{Aut}(x)|}$. For $M = S^n$ this yields $\mathcal{Z}_G(S^n) = \frac{1}{|G|}$.

5 Outlook

Probably the first remarkable point is the abstract treatment of Frobenius Algebras in 3.2. While not the standard approach to deal with Frobenius Algebras in $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we provided quite a handful of results that directly mirror common proofs in a more general formulation. This peaked in the simple descent to the special case of $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ in 3.3. Next steps would be to investigate further properties of Frobenius Algebras outside of $\mathbf{Vect}_{\mathbb{k}}$ using the tools of category theory. One could incorporate rigid categories into further proofs or consider the descent of left and right actions of monoids in category theory. Inspired from the usual formulation of these actions, one could ask if in a compact closed category there exists an equivalence of categories between left and right actions and how this affects TQFTs over such categories.

We provided another abstraction step by incorporating tensor categories and proving the first two TQFT equivalence theorems 4.17 using free (symmetric) monoidal categories over a Frobenius Algebra. One could pick up here and further investigate this abstraction. This is already done in parts in a bonus section of [8], however a more extensive discussion of those generalisations could prove beneficial for the understanding of QFTs.

The last point I want to mention here is the physical application and interpretation of TQFTs. While certainly not without drawbacks, I tried to focus on a consistent discussion of the physical interpretation of the axiomatic definition of TQFTs, its general properties and popular examples like Chern-Simons Theory. Many texts on the matter seem to lack depth by just quoting or slightly altering the correct but brief statements given in [2]. Another related topic is the translation of TQFTs from the path integrals to the functorial setting. As mentioned before, many theories, e.g. Chern-Simons Theory, are still not fully understood in the latter setting. To use the advantages and tools of both formulations, an increased focus on their translation is mandatory.

References

- [1] Lowell Abrams (1996). **Two-dimensional topological quantum field theories and Frobenius algebras**. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* 5, 569-587, <http://home.gwu.edu/~labrams/docs/tqft.ps>
- [2] Michael F. Atiyah. **Topological quantum field theory**, Publications mathématiques de l'I.H.É.S., tome 68 (1988), p. 175-186
- [3] Nils Carqueville, Ingo Runkel. **Introductory lectures on topological quantum field theory**, lecture notes
- [4] Robbert Dijkgraaf (1989). **A geometric approach to two dimensional conformal field theory**. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Utrecht, <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/210872>
- [5] Robbert Dijkgraaf, Edward Witten (1990). **Topological Gauge Theories and Group Cohomology**. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, Springer-Verlag, 393-429
- [6] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, **Tensor categories**, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs* 22, American Mathematical Society, 2015.
- [7] Morris Hirsch. **Differential Topology**, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
- [8] Joachim Kock. **Frobenius Algebras and 2D Topological Quantum Field Theories**, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [9] Aaron Lauda, Hendryk Pfeiffer (2005). **Open-closed strings: two-dimensional extended TQFTs and Frobenius algebras**, *Topology Appl.* 155, 623-666. (arXiv:0510664)
- [10] Saunders Mac Lane. **Categories for the Working Mathematician**, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, second edition
- [11] Saunders MacLane. **Categorical algebra**, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 71(1), S. (1965), p. 48.
- [12] Frank Quinn (1991). **Lectures on axiomatic topological quantum field theory**. In **Geometry and Quantum Field Theory**. (Park City, UT), pp. 323-453. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.
- [13] Eric C. Rowell, Zhenghan Wang. **Mathematics of Topological Quantum Computing**. Survey paper, 2017 (arXiv:1705.06206v2). <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.06206.pdf>
- [14] Alessandro Valentino. **Higher Structures in Topological Quantum Field Theory**. Habilitation, University of Zürich, 2017. http://user.math.uzh.ch/cattaneo/valentino_h.pdf
- [15] Edward Witten (1989). **Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial**. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, Springer-Verlag, 351-399

Index

- k-Algebra
 - k-Coalgebra, 47
 - action, 47
 - module, 47
 - module morphism, 47
 - left/right linear, 47
 - multiplication, 47
 - unit, 47
- Braiding, 22
 - braided functor, 22
 - braided monoidal category, 22
 - coherence, 22
 - naturality, 22
 - symmetric, 23
- Category, 6
 - abstract, 6
 - discrete, 8
 - equivalence, 12
 - group, 8
 - isomorphism, 9
 - large, 7
 - meta-, 5
 - monoid, 8
 - opposite, 20
 - product category, 13
 - small, 7
 - subcategory, 10
 - full, 10
- Cobordism, 25
 - 1-cobordisms, 27
 - 2-cobordisms, 38
 - Frobenius relations, 42
 - generator relations, 42
 - generators, 38
 - permutation, 38
 - skeleton, 39
 - braided monoidal category, 37
 - category, 34
 - composition, 33
 - coproduct, 35
 - cylinder, 36
 - decomposition, 32
 - equivalence, 27
 - gluing cobordism, 32
 - in-boundary, 26
 - invertible, 34
 - monoidal category, 35
 - oriented, 26
 - out-boundary, 26
 - Regular Interval Theorem, 31
 - symmetric monoidal category, 37
 - twist, 37
 - unity, 34
- Frobenius Algebra, 51
 - category, 55
 - commutative, 54
 - commutative subcategory, 55
 - copairing, 51
 - Frobenius Relation, 51
 - morphisms, 55
 - nondegenerate pairing/copairing, 52
 - over a field, 56
 - pairing, 51
 - pictorial representation, 57
 - symmetric, 53
 - symmetric subcategory, 55
 - unique comultiplication, 53
 - unique pairing/copairing, 52
- Functor, 8
 - bi-, 14
 - braided monoidal, 22
 - composition, 9
 - contravariant, 8
 - covariant, 8
 - equivalence of categories, 12
 - faithful, 9
 - forgetful, 8
 - full, 9
 - isomorphism, 9
 - monoidal, 16
 - monoidal functor category, 65
 - Equivalence Theorem, 66

- projection, 14
 - strict monoidal, 16
 - symmetric monoidal, 23
 - symmetric monoidal functor category, 65
 - Equivalence Theorem, 67
- Generators of a category, 13
- Gluing, 29
 - gluing cobordism, 32
 - pushout, 30
 - uniqueness, 30
- Metagraph, 4
- Monoidal category, 15
 - action of a monoid, 20
 - morphism, 21
 - braided, 22
 - comonoid, 19
 - morphism, 20
 - equivalence, 16
 - free, 65
 - free symmetric, 65
 - monoid, 19
 - in \mathbf{Vect}_k , 20
 - in \mathbf{Ab} , 20
 - in \mathbf{Set} , 20
 - morphism, 20
 - pentagon equation, 15
 - strict, 16
 - Strictification Theorem, 17
 - symmetric, 23
 - tensor product, 15
 - triangle identity, 15
- Morphism, 6
 - arrow, 4
 - codomain, 4
 - composition, 6
 - domain, 4
 - Hom set, 6
 - identity, 6
 - universal, 14
- Natural transformation, 10
 - monoidal, 17
 - natural isomorphism, 10
- Object, 4
 - isomorphism, 7
- Pairing, 44
 - associative, 49
 - copairing, 44
 - nondegenerate, 44
- Skeleton of a category, 12
- Smooth map
 - critical point, 28
 - critical value, 28
 - Existence of Morse functions, 29
 - index, 29
 - Morse function, 29
 - nondegenerate point, 29
 - regular value, 28
- The braided monoidal category of
 - n-cobordisms, 37
 - small sets, 22
 - symmetric Frobenius Algebras, 55
 - vector spaces, 22
- The category of
 - abelian groups, 15
 - braided monoidal categories, 23
 - categories, 9
 - commutative Frobenius Algebras, 55
 - comonoids of a monoidal category, 20
 - Frobenius Algebras, 55
 - groups, 7
 - left actions, 21
 - monoidal functors, 65
 - monoids of a monoidal category, 20
 - n-cobordisms, 34
 - n-dimensional TQFTs over k , 63
 - right actions, 21
 - small monoidal categories, 16
 - small sets, 8
 - small strict monoidal categories, 16
 - smooth manifolds, 7
 - symmetric Frobenius Algebras, 55
 - symmetric monoidal functors, 65
 - topological spaces, 7
 - vector spaces, 7
- The monoidal category of

- abelian groups, 16
- Frobenius Algebras, 55
- n-cobordisms, 35
- small sets, 16
- vector spaces, 16
- The symmetric monoidal category of
 - commutative Frobenius Algebras, 55
 - n-cobordisms, 37
 - small sets, 22
- TQFT, 60
 - as a functor, 60
 - category, 63
 - Chern-Simons, 71
 - comparison to path integrals, 69
 - Dijkgraaf-Witten, 72
 - dimensional reduction, 63
 - Equivalence Theorem, 68