

TOPOLOGICAL QUANTUM FIELD THEORY

ARUN DEBRAY

These notes were taken in a class given by Katrin Wehrheim at UC Berkeley in Spring 2020. I live-TeXed them using vim, and as such there may be typos; please send questions, comments, complaints, and corrections to a.debray@math.utexas.edu.

CONTENTS

1. TQFT: definition and Atiyah's examples: 2/19/20	1
2. : 2/21/20	4
3. 2d TFTs from symplectic manifolds: 2/26/20	4
4. Schwarz theory and Gromov-Witten theory: 2/28/20	6

1. TQFT: DEFINITION AND ATIYAH'S EXAMPLES: 2/19/20

We begin with the definition of a topological quantum field theory due to Atiyah, now over 30 years ago.

Definition 1.1. Fix a base field k . A d -dimensional *topological quantum field theory* (TQFT) consists of data of, for every closed, oriented, smooth d -manifold, a finitely generated k -vector space $Z(\Sigma)$, and for every compact, oriented, smooth $(d+1)$ -manifold M , an element $Z(M) \in Z(\partial M)$, satisfying some axioms.

Many interrelated ideas went into this definition: Segal's mathematical formalization of two-dimensional conformal field theory, mathematical perspectives on quantum field theory (fields, Hilbert spaces, etc.).

Later, Atiyah's definition was packaged more concisely into asking for Z to be a symmetric monoidal functor

$$(1.2) \quad Z: \mathcal{Cob}_{n,n-1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Vect}_k,$$

where \mathcal{Vect}_k is the symmetric monoidal category of k -vector spaces with tensor product, and $\mathcal{Cob}_{n,n-1}$ is the cobordism category, whose objects are closed, oriented $(n-1)$ -manifolds and whose morphisms are (diffeomorphism classes of) oriented bordisms between them. Cylinders in the cobordism category can be thought of as time evolution, but the inclusion of all other bordisms has something to do with a relativistic perspective.

Remark 1.3. Atiyah used d to denote the dimension of space, i.e. the dimension of manifolds assigned vector spaces. These days, it's more common to refer to the cobordism category using the top dimension (what we just called n), the “spacetime dimension.” ◀

There are many different flavors of the cobordism category. Some of these involve technical details that we have to account for: for example, even compact 0-manifolds are too big to form a set, so to more accurately define $\mathcal{Cob}_{1,0}$ (or in any dimension) we should pick a set of representatives of oriented diffeomorphism classes of $(n-1)$ -manifolds.

Remark 1.4. There are other ways to work around set-theoretic issues: for example, the topological cobordism category of Galatius, Madsen, Tillmann, and Weiss begins with the space \mathbb{R}^∞ and works with manifolds and bordisms explicitly embedded in $\{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^\infty$, resp. $[t_1, t_2] \times \mathbb{R}^\infty$. Then one must quotient out by diffeomorphisms, just as in the abstract cobordism category, but now we don't just have the “internal diffeomorphisms” of an embedded M , but also “external diffeomorphisms” of the ambient space that carry M to something diffeomorphic, but embedded via a different map. We will not work with embedded bordisms, at least for now. ◀

There are several other generalizations we won't discuss today, but are worth mentioning.

- There’s notions of *topological conformal field theory* (TCFT) and *homological conformal field theory* (HCFT), in which $\mathcal{Cob}_{2,1}$ is upgraded to a category where bordisms carry some additional structure (e.g. a conformal structure), and we only identify conformally equivalent bordisms.
- In *fully extended* topological quantum field theory, $\mathcal{Cob}_{n,n-1}$ becomes an (∞, n) -category, by allowing manifolds in all dimensions n and below.

In both cases, we must replace the target category \mathcal{Vect}_k with something related, but different.

In these, and in any, generalizations, the overarching question is: *what kind of algebraic structure do we get from these field theories?* To address this question, we generally must first fix a target category. But there are a few “holy grail” theorems in some of these settings.

Theorem 1.5 (Cobordism hypothesis (Lurie)). *A fully extended topological field theory is determined by its value on the 0-manifold pt_+ .*

This is more of a slogan than a theorem, but one can pin it down into a precise theorem, e.g. by making precise what kinds of TQFTs one considers. Here, by “ pt_+ ” we might more generally mean looking at generators and relations of the appropriate bordism category.

Example 1.6. In (spacetime) dimension $n = 1$, TQFTs are vacuously fully extended (with the caveat that 1-categorical and $(\infty, 1)$ -categorical TQFT aren’t quite the same). Then, the theorem is that for any symmetric monoidal category \mathcal{C} , $\mathcal{Fun}^\otimes(\mathcal{Cob}_{1,0}, \mathcal{C})$ is equivalent to the groupoid of *dualizable* objects in \mathcal{C} .¹

Exercise 1.7. For $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Vect}_k$, check that dualizability is equivalent to being finite-dimensional.²

So fixing $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Vect}_k$ for now, given a one-dimensional *unoriented* (i.e. manifolds and bordisms in $\mathcal{Cob}_{1,0}$ are not oriented) TQFT Z we get a finite-dimensional vector space $V := Z(\text{pt}_+)$, and a bilinear pairing $e: V \otimes V \rightarrow k$. This pairing must be nondegenerate, as one can show via the “ Z -diagram” being equivalent to an interval (which is the identity $\text{pt} \rightarrow \text{pt}$).

Conversely, given a finite-dimensional vector space V and an inner product $e: V \otimes V \rightarrow k$, we can build a TQFT $Z_{V,e}: \mathcal{Cob} \rightarrow \mathcal{Vect}_k$, because there aren’t that many diffeomorphism classes of 1-manifolds, so we know generators and relations: the interval, regarded as a bordism from $\text{pt} \rightarrow \text{pt}$, is sent to id_V ; the interval, regarded as a bordism from $\text{pt} \amalg \text{pt} \rightarrow \emptyset$, is sent to e ; and the interval, regarded as a bordism $\emptyset \rightarrow \text{pt} \amalg \text{pt}$, is sent to the adjoint of e . ◀

Remark 1.8. Some things change in the oriented 1-dimensional case. We don’t need the inner product: if you keep careful track of the orientations induced on a boundary, the interval is now a bordism between $\text{pt}_+ \amalg \text{pt}_-$ and \emptyset , and one can show that $\text{pt}_- \mapsto V^*$. Then these intervals are sent to the evaluation map $V \otimes V^* \rightarrow k$ and the coevaluation map $k \rightarrow V \otimes V^*$. ◀

In dimension 1, the cobordism hypothesis feels somewhat silly. But in higher dimensions things can quickly get nontrivial, and difficult. For example, for the oriented 2-dimensional cobordism category (before we extend), this is known by the classification of surfaces: the pair of pants, regarded as a bordism $S^1 \amalg S^1 \rightarrow S^1$, and, separately, regarded as a morphism $S^1 \rightarrow S^1 \amalg S^1$; the disc, both as a bordism $S^1 \rightarrow \emptyset$ and as a bordism $\emptyset \rightarrow S^1$; and the cylinder $S^1 \rightarrow S^1$. In dimension 1 we just have the circle. But if we try to extend down to points, then discovering generators is more complicated — now we have to determine generators and relations using surfaces with corners. The surface theory isn’t that bad, and this will get worse when we care about higher-dimensional manifolds.

And we do care about higher-dimensional manifolds: two key questions in this course will be:

- (1) how does this (both the axiomatic structure of TQFT and tools such as the cobordism hypothesis) help build invariants for 3- and 4-manifolds, and
- (2) how do geometric/PDE-based invariants of 3- and 4-manifolds yield TQFTs?

With regards to question (2) specifically, Atiyah gave a few examples in his original paper on TQFT.

Example 1.9. This example, built on work of Floer and Gromov, is a 2-dimensional TQFT. Fix a symplectic manifold (X, ω) ; the quantum field theory here will be about maps $S^1 \rightarrow X$. We begin with a “classical phase

¹A *priori*, the subcategory of dualizable objects in \mathcal{C} is not a groupoid, but we can make it one by throwing out the non-invertible morphisms.

²In higher dimensions, “dualizable” generalizes to “fully dualizable,” and the fact that “fully dualizable” and “finite-dimensional” have the same initials makes for a good mnemonic.

space” $\text{Map}(S^1, X)$; to a closed, oriented 2-manifold Σ , we should associate the number of pseudoholomorphic maps $u: \Sigma \rightarrow X$. There’s a lot to define here; what is a pseudoholomorphic map? Defining the number of such maps is also nontrivial; in some settings, there are infinitely many, and we must impose point constraints somehow, which makes the theory feel less topological.

The definition of a pseudoholomorphic map involves a PDE, which will be an interesting thing to dig into.

The theory also has a Lagrangian form. In the Lagrangian form, we instead look at paths in X , rather than loops, though we ask that they end on prescribed Lagrangian submanifolds of X . These are a kind of boundary condition. ◀

Atiyah doesn’t go into much more detail about this theory, but Schwarz did (assuming $\omega|_{\pi_2(X)}$ vanishes), and we will discuss this example in detail. Ultimately, $Z(S^1)$ will be $H_*(X)$, and the pair-of-pants is sent to a quantum deformation of the cup product which counts pseudoholomorphic curves — Schwarz proves this with Floer theory, but it also makes contact with Gromov-Witten theory.

Example 1.10 (Chern-Simons theory). There are several different flavors of this next example, a 3-dimensional theory. Pick a Lie group G , maybe compact; the classical phase space associated to a closed surface Σ is the moduli space of flat G -bundles on Σ . This isn’t infinite-dimensional, because we imposed that our connections are flat, though the space of all connections is infinite-dimensional. If G is nonabelian, this is nonlinear (i.e. not a vector space).

The Lagrangian functional for this theory is the Chern-Simons functional associated to a connection. There’s been plenty of work on this example, from different perspectives not just including TQFT, including work by Jones, Witten, Casson, Johnson, and Thurston. ◀

Example 1.11 (Floer theory/Donaldson theory). This is a 4-dimensional example, in which the invariant assigned to a closed 4-manifold X is the Donaldson polynomials on $H_2(M)$ (a tool encoding all of the Donaldson invariants). Atiyah doesn’t say what we should do with cobordisms, but for a closed 3-manifold Y , following the Hamiltonian perspective in physics, one should do Floer theory for the Chern-Simons functional on Y (for some Lie group that you have to pick — though only $G = \text{SU}_2$ and $G = \text{U}_2$ have really been worked out, which is Donaldson theory).

Unfortunately, this cannot be an oriented theory — Donaldson polynomials depend on more data. ◀

Awesomely, Atiyah ends with the question *why does the Chern-Simons functional appear in both the three- and four-dimensional cases?* There ought to be an answer in terms of extended TQFT: Chern-Simons theory really seems to be about dimensions 4, 3, and 2.

Example 1.12. After Atiyah’s paper came out, Seiberg-Witten theory appeared, as a variant of Example 1.11, and it should fit into a TQFT framework in the same way. This is again a 4-dimensional theory. ◀

We will begin by digging into Example 1.9. Pseudoholomorphic curves are a huge subject; good references include Salamon’s lecture notes and the book of Audin-Damian, which is very detailed but doesn’t illustrate the analysts’ perspective as well as Salamon. The big book of McDuff-Salamon is also good. The professor also has a survey paper, “Lagrangian boundary conditions for anti-self-dual instantons and the Atiyah-Floer conjecture,” which is a good way to get an overview of this perspective.

Before we get into pseudoholomorphic curves, here’s an important convention: *when we say “symplectic manifold,” we always mean closed* (compact and without boundary).

Definition 1.13. A *symplectic manifold* (X, ω) is a manifold X and a 2-form $\omega \in \Omega^2(X)$ which is closed and *nondegenerate*, i.e. $\omega^{\wedge n}$ is a volume form.

This immediately implies $\dim X = 2n$, and is in particular even; and $[\omega] \neq 0$ in $H_{\text{dR}}^2(X)$, which rules out, e.g., S^4 .

You can get through a good part of the course thinking of these as even-dimensional manifolds with a particular functional on them. Let $\mathcal{L}X := \text{Map}(S^1, X)$, the unbased loop space of X .

Definition 1.14. The *symplectic action functional* associated to a symplectic manifold (X, ω) is the functional $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{L}X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ sending a loop $\gamma: S^1 \rightarrow X$ to the number

$$(1.15) \quad \int_{[0,1] \times S^1} u^* \omega.$$

Here $u: [0, 1] \times S^1 \rightarrow X$ a smooth map with $u(0, -)$ a fixed reference loop u_0 and $u(1, -) = \gamma$.

Often, u_0 is constant, in which case this is choosing a disc whose boundary is γ . There are issues defining this, so the actual target is \mathbb{R} modulo the possible values of ω on tori. If you want to study all of $\mathcal{L}X$, you need to fix a basepoint in each connected component (homotopy class), though often people only study the connected component containing the constant loops, as Floer did.

Given a nice functional, one should want to try gradient flow and Morse theory with it, even though $\mathcal{L}X$ is infinite-dimensional; we will see the definition of a pseudoholomorphic curve pop out naturally from this definition. We will also do Morse theory with the Chern-Simons functional. Doing Morse theory with a function valued in a circle is a bit different, but we'll be able to do it. And in fact, it's the reason we work with the Novikov ring.

2. : 2/21/20

3. 2D TFTs FROM SYMPLECTIC MANIFOLDS: 2/26/20

We will spend the first part of class carefully setting up a precise statement to the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (Schwarz, Floer). *Let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold such that either $\omega|_{\pi_2(M)} = 0$ or $\omega = \lambda c_1(M)$, with $\lambda > 0$. Then there is a TQFT $Z: \text{Cob}_{\langle 2,1 \rangle} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{F}_2}$ with $Z(S^1) \cong H_*(M)$.*

Here (TODO: I think) $c_1(M)$ is measured in any compatible almost complex structure for the symplectic form; the choice doesn't matter.

Remark 3.2.

- The algebra structure on $Z(S^1)$ is not just the usual intersection product; it's deformed by counting pseudoholomorphic curves.
- We can relax the niceness assumptions on the symplectic form, but then our target category is modules over some universal thing called the *Novikov ring*. We're not going to delve into this. ◀

Somehow the existence of this TQFT is not the entire point; instead, it leads us to interesting analytic and geometric questions.

Choose a map $H: S^1 \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the time-1 flow

$$(3.3) \quad \{(p_0, p_1) \mid \text{there exists a } \gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M, \dot{\gamma}(t) = X_{H_t}(\gamma(t)), \gamma(0) = p_0, \gamma(1) = p_1\} \subset M \times M$$

is transverse to the diagonal $\Delta_M := \{(p, p) \mid p \in M\}$. Such a map induces a $\mathbb{Z}/2N$ -graded complex $CF_*(H)$ generated by periodic loops of X_H , where N is the minimal positive value of $\langle c_1(TM, J), [S^2] \rangle$ over all embeddings $S^2 \hookrightarrow M$ — pseudoholomorphic or not.³

Let $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ denote the space of compatible almost complex structures on M for ω . Given the map H above, there is a comeager subset $S \subset \text{Map}(S^1, \mathcal{J}(M, \omega))$ for which each $J \in S$ induces a differential $\partial: CF_*(H) \rightarrow CF_{*-1}(H)$; in particular, $\partial^2 = 0$. Fixing these two choices, we can define $Z(S^1)$ to be the homology of this chain complex.

This differential arises by an analogue to Morse theory on an infinite-dimensional Banach manifold, though instead of counting curves, we count solutions to a PDE (only counting them in the case where there's a zero-dimensional moduli space). Specifically, we consider the space of solutions

$$(3.4) \quad \{u: \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \rightarrow M \mid u(\pm\infty, -) = \gamma_{\pm}, \bar{\partial}_J u = X_H\},$$

which \mathbb{R} acts on freely by time translations (just as in Morse theory); the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$ is the quotient of (3.4) by this \mathbb{R} -action. Here γ_{\pm} are choices of points in M , so that we are counting pseudoholomorphic strips in M which at infinity converge on γ_{\pm} .

Remark 3.5. Why is the Hamiltonian so complicated? You can build TQFTs with simpler Hamiltonians (akin to doing Morse homology with simpler Morse functions). But this example doesn't come from nowhere: Floer used these techniques to solve a piece of the Arnold conjecture. Other confusing-sounding choices sometimes also come from geometric applications. ◀

³The magic of symplectic geometry is how much we can do without actually knowing what the pseudoholomorphic curves actually are — or if there are any at all!

The local dimension of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$ is $\deg(\gamma_-) - \deg(\gamma_+) - 1$, where the degrees are in the grading of $CF_*(H)$ we discussed above; the factor of -1 arises because we quotiented by the \mathbb{R} -action. We will stick to the cases when this dimension is 0.

The proof that the differential squares to zero follows the same line of reasoning as in ordinary Morse theory, though it looks fancier in this setting. In Morse theory, a flow line can break into two. Here, we consider the moduli space of pseudoholomorphic strips from γ_- to γ_+ , where $\deg(\gamma_-) - \deg(\gamma_+) = 2$. A great deal of analysis goes into showing this is a smooth 1-manifold with ends, and some of the assumptions we made in the theorem statement eliminate some unsavory possibilities (e.g. bubbling). Anyways, we compactify, to obtain a 1-manifold with boundary, and show that it factors as

$$(3.6) \quad \coprod_{\gamma: |\gamma| = |\gamma_-| - 1} \mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma) \times \mathcal{M}(\gamma, \gamma_+).$$

The high-level idea for what's happening is that the pseudoholomorphic strip breaks into two. There are many other situations in gauge theory or infinite-dimensional Morse theory where breaking (and sometimes bubbling) can happen.

Compactness is another important ingredient, and it's also fundamentally analytic. Given a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$, there is a subsequence that converges in C_{loc}^∞ , unless the energy of the sequence behaves badly. The energy is a functional

$$(3.7) \quad E(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_s \times S^1} |\partial_s u|^2 = \mathcal{A}(\gamma_-) - \mathcal{A}(\gamma_+).$$

The Morse-theoretic version of this is

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla(f(\gamma))|^2 = f(p_-) - f(p_+),$$

provided $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ is a gradient flow line for the Morse function; in Floer theory, $\partial_s u = -\nabla \mathcal{A}_H u$.

The name “energy” is because $|\partial_s u|^2$ is always locally positive, so we can think of it as an energy density. So before we even ask about convergence of a subsequence, we can ask how the energy behaves. It can concentrate near a point in the cylinder, or it can separate, piling up near the ends of \mathbb{R} . Separating is good, in that it leads to breaking, which we thought about in the differential. But concentration is often trickier to deal with: it leads to bubbling, which is a PDE effect, and which we'll largely sweep under the rug.

The next big theorem we need is a gluing theorem. This will rule out pathological broken trajectories in which the ends aren't actually different (**TODO**: I think?). There is a gluing map

$$(3.9) \quad g: \coprod_{\gamma} \mathcal{M}(\gamma_{-1}, \gamma) \times \mathcal{M}(\gamma, \gamma_+) \times (R_0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma_+).$$

where the disjoint union is over the γ for which these moduli spaces are zero-dimensional, and R_0 is some number. The idea is that for every broken trajectory, we embed an interval into the manifold, which chooses which end you converge to.

Theorem 3.10 (Gluing theorem (Schwarz)). *The gluing map g is an homeomorphism onto its image, and $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_-, \gamma_+) \setminus \text{Im}(g)$ is compact.*

So the moduli space without these bad examples is nice. This is a key result from Schwarz's thesis.

Often, papers will only think about one of compactness or gluing, and sketch the proof of the other; this is where the mistakes creep in, so be careful.

Anyways, now we have the Floer complex. Choose $a, b, g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and consider any Riemann surface $\Sigma := \Sigma_{g, a+b}$ (i.e. genus g , $a + b$ boundary components), regarded as a bordism with a incoming circles and b outgoing circles. This Σ induces a chain map

$$(3.11) \quad \Phi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{J}): \bigotimes_{i=1}^a CF_*(H_i) \longrightarrow \bigotimes_{j=1}^b CF_*(H_j),$$

where H_i, H_j, \tilde{X} , and \tilde{J} are data we haven't discussed yet, but will induces the same map when we take homology. This chain map has degree $(\dim M)/2(2g - 2 + a + b)$, and will be what the TQFT assigns to the bordism Σ .

How do we define this chain map? Again, it counts something, which is the number of points in a zero-dimensional moduli space of pseudoholomorphic maps $\Sigma \rightarrow M$, such that the boundary circles of Σ map to specified loops γ_i^-, γ_j^+ in M . There are again choices to make, including disjoint embeddings $\varphi_i: (-\infty, 0) \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ and $\varphi_j: (0, \infty) \hookrightarrow \Sigma$, which give us cylindrical coordinates near each boundary circle; and a choice of a complex structure on the interior of Σ which is the standard (cylinder) complex structure on the ends $\mathbb{R} \times S^1 \cong \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}$. We also choose (H_i, J_i) on each end, and \tilde{X}, \tilde{J} are generic (comeager subset) of a certain 1-form \tilde{X} with $\varphi_i^* \tilde{X} = X_{H_i} dt$, and \tilde{J} a map from the interior of Σ into $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$, such that $\varphi_i^* \tilde{J} = J_i$. All of these are contractible choices, which is reassuring. Some thought has to go into ensuring this is a well-posed PDE.

Again, we want to make a count of a zero-dimensional moduli space, so the same questions come up: is this space zero-dimensional? Is it compact? And so on. Then, to verify that it's a chain map, we need to know that it commutes with the differentials. This again arises by studying the ends of the one-dimensional moduli spaces – this should correspond to breaking of pseudoholomorphic strips, caused by energy running out at the ends. Breaking can happen at each boundary circle of Σ , incoming or outgoing, and these give you the different components of the boundary of the moduli space.

This TFT involves a whole bunch of choices — we will continue with three more theorems that imply the TFT, on homology, is independent of choices. This is a common method of proof in this area, and it's difficult to avoid. Find your way of understanding how these diagrams and pictures work.

4. SCHWARZ THEORY AND GROMOV-WITTEN THEORY: 2/28/20

Today, we continued discussing the 2d TFT from yesterday's discussion, built from an input data of a (nice) symplectic manifold (M, ω) by counting pseudoholomorphic curves. One important point is that the reason this works is really because the pseudoholomorphic curve equation is a very nice PDE: in particular, it's elliptic, which severely constrains the places where energy can pile up, and limits the ways in which things go wrong. For example, this rules out bubbling when you define the map assigned to a bordism Σ (which, roughly, is determined by a count of pseudoholomorphic curves $\Sigma \rightarrow M$ with prescribed image of $\partial\Sigma$). Making this work involves a whole bunch of analysis.

This is not to say that nothing can go wrong! We'll see some examples in a bit.

Remark 4.1. We made a lot of choices in defining the data assigned to a surface in this TFT. One must check this is independent of choices, and it probably isn't yet clear why that should be true. ◀

When Σ is closed, we're counting pseudoholomorphic maps $u: \Sigma \rightarrow M$ such that $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{J}} u = \tilde{X}$. In this case, $\tilde{X} = 0$ is a reasonable choice, probably; maybe we have to move it slightly to satisfy a genericity assumption.

This looks very similar to the definition of Gromov-Witten moduli spaces, but there are a few differences. In Gromov-Witten theory, J is fixed on M , and can't vary with the domain. This means that if Σ has any holomorphic automorphisms, we can reparameterize the space of pseudoholomorphic maps $\Sigma \rightarrow M$. In Gromov-Witten theory, we quotient out by these automorphisms, so we have a space of curves in M , rather than a space of maps. In general, one also varies the (almost) complex structure j on Σ , so we begin with the space of data $(\Sigma, j, u: \Sigma \rightarrow M)$ and cut out the subspace with $\bar{\partial}_{J,j} u = 0$, then quotient out by automorphisms $\varphi: \Sigma' \rightarrow \Sigma$ with $\varphi^* j = j'$. In genus 0, this additional varying direction doesn't change anything, because uniformization relates all complex structures, but it can be different in higher genus.⁴

As always, when we say “count,” we mean that we consider only the zero-dimensional part (so we're considering spaces of solutions, rather than moduli spaces *per se*). For example, if $\Sigma = S^2$, then the automorphism group is the Möbius group, which is six-dimensional, and therefore the difference between the dimensions of the Schwarz moduli space and the Gromov-Witten moduli space is equal to 6. In some sense, for Schwarz, symmetries are not a problem, but a computational tool: $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ sometimes allows us to explicitly determine the map assigned to Σ in the TFT.

Example 4.2. Say $\Sigma = T^2$. In this case, the space of solutions is zero-dimensional when $c_1(u^* TM) = 0$, e.g. if $u_*[\Sigma] = 0$ in $H_2(M)$. This in particular means the energy of u is zero, so $\int |du|^2 = 0$, so u is constant!

Assuming for now that all of these constructions are independent of choices (they are, but we haven't discussed why yet), choose $H: S^1 \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $J = \tilde{J}: S^1 \times TM \rightarrow TM$, which are “regular” in that

⁴This has been a *very* quick introduction to Gromov-Witten theory; there are long books going into more detail!

the space of solutions is actually zero-dimensional (this is true for generic choices of H and J). Assume $\tilde{X} = X_H dt + \dots ds$, where s and t are the coordinates on the torus. Now the pseudoholomorphic curve equations $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{J}} u = \tilde{X}$ simplifies slightly to

$$(4.3) \quad \partial_s u + J \partial_t u = J X_H(u).$$

This space has an S^1 -symmetry by reparameterizing the first coordinate. This is an example of a general truism in PDE: if the solutions of a PDE doesn't depend on some parameter in the input data, we pick up a symmetry given by reparameterizing that parameter.

So given a solution, either it's constant in the first factor, or it comes with a whole S^1 -orbit of solutions. The latter case is not zero-dimensional, so $Z(T^2)$ is the number of fixed points of the S^1 -action, which is precisely the number of pseudoholomorphic curves u with $\partial_s u = 0$. This also counts the periodic orbits of X_H .

Since periodic orbits generate $HF_*(H, J)$, this counts the Euler characteristic of $HF_*(H, J)$ (we don't need to worry about signs because this was defined over \mathbb{F}_2 from the start). \blacktriangleleft

This is a reassuring sanity check, because for any 2d TFT, $Z(T^2) = \chi(Z(S^1))$: factor $Z(T^2)$ as two cylinders, the first with two outgoing components and zero incoming components, and the second with two incoming components and zero outgoing components.⁵

Exercise 4.4. The axioms of TFT ensure that for the cylinder C , $Z(C) = \text{id}$. Can you show that directly for this Schwarz-Floer TFT? Hint: use symmetries to compute things, both by translation in the \mathbb{R} direction and by rotation in the S^1 direction.

Before we discuss why things are independent of choices, let's briefly discuss Gromov-Witten invariants, at the level of an executive summary; this is also useful towards understanding Donaldson invariants.

The Gromov-Witten moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{g,k}(M, A, J)$ has a lot of decorations (which are mostly discrete parameters). This space is a moduli space for pseudoholomorphic maps $u: \Sigma \rightarrow M$, where Σ has genus g and k marked points (and where the marked points are constrained to hit certain points of M), $A \in H_2(M)$ is $u_*[\Sigma]$, and $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \infty)$.

Precisely, this moduli space is the space of data $(\Sigma, j, m_1, \dots, m_k, u)$, where Σ is a genus g surface with k marked points z_1, \dots, z_k , $u: \Sigma \rightarrow M$ satisfies $\bar{\partial}_{(j,j)} u = 0$, and $u_*[\Sigma] = A$. This has symmetries, so we quotient out by these symmetries; then there is a nice compactification $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J)$ in which we also allow nodal curves.

This space has expected dimension

$$(4.5) \quad 2c_1(A) + (\dim M - 6)(1 - g) + 2k,$$

which is to say that we hope $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J)$ is an orbifold of this dimension for generic J (generic in some suitable sense), and that we get a fundamental class. The truth is more complicated in general, but this or something close to it works in a good variety of situations.

To define numerical invariants, we begin with the *evaluation maps*

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} ev_i: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J) &\longrightarrow M \\ (\Sigma, j, z_1, \dots, z_k, u) &\longmapsto u(z_i) \end{aligned}$$

and the *forgetful map* $f: \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$, which forgets the map u to M ; here $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}$ is the (compactification of the) moduli space of (genus- g , k -marked) Riemannian surfaces, which has dimension $6g - 6 + 2k$. For small g, k , this space has negative expected dimension, and so f is not well-defined there.

Anyways, we can now pull back cohomology classes and define the *Gromov-Witten invariant* of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in H^*(M)$ and $\beta \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k})$ to be

$$(4.7) \quad GW_{g,k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta) := \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J)} ev_1^* \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge ev_k^* \alpha_k \wedge f^* \beta.$$

In order for this to be nonzero, the sum of the degrees of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta$ must equal the expected dimension (4.5) of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,k}(M, A, J)$. Moreover, in the case where it's not actually that dimension, workarounds are taken to define this integration map, and hopefully they apply to the case you care about.

⁵The Euler characteristic really only makes sense when this TFT is valued in graded vector spaces; for ungraded vector spaces, we get $Z(T^2) = \dim Z(S^1)$.

Remark 4.8. When you just care about closed surfaces, compactification is most interesting to the enumerative geometers: we need it to define counts, but it doesn't make the analysis or algebraic structure more interesting. On surfaces with boundary, both of these get considerably more interesting when we compactify. ◀

A key word you might've heard: the *quantum cup product* $H^*(M) \otimes HJ^*(M) \rightarrow H^*(M)$ sends

$$(4.9) \quad \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \longmapsto GW_{0,3}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, -)$$

This is a functional on cohomology classes, which we identify with a cohomology class by Poincaré duality. We can think about it as dealing with two curves with homology classes α_1 and α_2 .

Hidden in this is the interesting question *how does this quantum cup product relate to what Schwarz' TFT assigns to the pair of pants?* This is known as the *PSS isomorphism*.

Finally, we should say something about why this TFT, and all the data that goes into it, does not depend on the choices we made. First, all of the choices we made are contractible (i.e. the space of possible choices is contractible). So given $a, b, g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, any isotopy of data $(\tilde{X}_\lambda, \tilde{J}_\lambda, j_\lambda, \varphi_\lambda)$ (where φ is the data on the ends), for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, will induce a chain homotopy equivalence $\Psi: \bigotimes_a CF_* \rightarrow \bigotimes_b CF_*$, which suffices when we pass to homology — but we also need to check that what we assign to bordisms doesn't depend on choices. Here, the statement is that the difference

$$(4.10) \quad \Phi(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{J}_1, \dots) - \Phi(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{J}_0, \dots) = \sum_{j=1}^b \partial_j \circ \Psi + \sum_{i=1}^a \Psi \circ \partial_i,$$

which means the induced maps on homology are equal. Actually proving this involves a lot of PDE, of course, but the idea is similar to the proofs we sketched last lecture: Ψ counts pairs (λ, u) with $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and u a solution for $(\tilde{X}_\lambda, \tilde{J}_\lambda, \dots)$. The boundary of this space corresponds to $\lambda = 0, 1$; one has to think about breaking. If you'd like to read the proof, you can find it in Schwarz's thesis.

There is yet more data in the TFT: the composition/gluing identity

$$(4.11) \quad Z(\Sigma \cup_{S^1} \Sigma') = Z(\Sigma) \circ Z(\Sigma').$$

So we need to start with two sets of data of complex structure, ends, collars, ... which induce composable chain maps

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \bigotimes_i CF_*(H_i) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_\Sigma(\tilde{X}, \tilde{J})} & \bigotimes_j CF_*(H_j) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\Sigma'}(\tilde{X}', \tilde{J}')} & \bigotimes_k CF_*(H_k). \\ & \searrow & \text{ } & \nearrow & \\ & \Phi_{\Sigma \cup_{S^1} \Sigma'}(\tilde{X} \#_R \tilde{X}', \tilde{J} \#_R \tilde{J}') & & & \end{array}$$

We would like this to be a commutative diagram, at least for R (the radius of the circles we're gluing along) sufficiently large. This is also due to Schwarz.

Here's a final fact due to Floer: if H is time-independent and small in the C^2 -norm, and if J is also S^1 -independent, then (CF_*, ∂) is the Morse complex of H . This in particular means that we can replace $Z(S^1) = HF_*(H_t) = HF_*(H)$, the homology of the Morse complex for H , which is the standard homology of M (we've done everything in the mod 2 case, so we get $H_*(M; \mathbb{Z}/2)$). This is not an easy theorem.

Corollary 4.13 (Weak Arnold conjecture). *The number of generators of $HF_*(H_t)$ is at least the sum of the (mod 2) Betti numbers of M . Said generators are the periodic orbits of H_t .*

This is why Floer worked with S^1 -time-varying Hamiltonians; you don't need that to do TFT, though, but Arnold's conjecture is a really great conjecture; important in dynamics, but also fostering the development of symplectic topology and Floer theory, leading people to investigate the rich algebraic structures in place. There's plenty more than periodic orbits — they're a relatively simple beginning subject, and it's a little curious that we bounded them in topological quantities, albeit using a massive PDE! This is why symplectic geometers are interested in algebraic structures that come from J -holomorphic curves: they give us direct geometric insights.