



ELSEVIER

Journal of Geometry and Physics 17 (1995) 261–282

JOURNAL OF
GEOMETRY AND
PHYSICS

Theta functions, root systems and 3-manifold invariants

Louis Funar

Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania

Mathématiques, Bat. 425, Univ. Paris-Sud, France

*Institut Fourier, BP 74, Univ. Grenoble I, 38402 Saint-Martin-d'Hères cedex, France*¹

Received 19 July 1993; revised 28 October 1994

Abstract

We describe a semi-abelian version of Witten's theory using the quantization of dimension g tori for a general gauge group G . We derive a family of invariants for closed oriented 3-manifolds which coincide with those defined by Witten for lens spaces and torus bundles.

Keywords: Quantization; 3-manifolds; Theta functions; Chern–Simons–Witten invariants
1991 MSC: 57N10, 57R65, 14K25, 32G20, 81E13, 53C57

1. Introduction

The motivation of this paper is the attempt of understanding a semi-abelian version of Chern–Simons–Witten invariants using representations of mapping class groups. This has been done in the case when the gauge group G is $U(1)$ in [8,11,14] and for general G but only in genus 1 case in [19].

We follow the program outlined by Witten in [30] but we replace the Teichmüller space with the Siegel space. He associates vector spaces $Z(\Sigma_g, k)$ to every Riemann surface of genus g obtained from the quantization of M_{Σ_g} the space of representations of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)$ in G , modulo conjugation. If $G = U(l)$ then a theorem of Narasimhan–Seshadri [28] identifies M_{Σ_g} with the moduli space of rank l semi-stable holomorphic bundles of degree 0 over Σ_g . The Picard group of M_{Σ_g} is generated by an ample line bundle L_{Σ_g} and it turns that $Z(\Sigma_g, k) = H^0(M_{\Sigma_g}, L_{\Sigma_g}^k)$ are the fibres of a projectively flat holomorphic vector bundle over the Teichmüller space using the HADW

¹ Permanent address.

connection (see [17,2]). It is clear (see [12]) that the (projective) representation of the mapping class group \mathcal{M}_g arising as the monodromy of the natural action on this flat bundle will determine the topological field theory we are looking for. One way to understand $Z(\Sigma_g, k)$ was opened in [4,5] where it is identified with some space of theta functions on the jacobian variety $Jac(\Sigma_g)$ in the case when $G = SU(2)$ and $k = 1, 2$.

Our aim is to use a semi-abelian quantization in general gauge. Namely, instead of quantizing the Chern–Simons action on $\Sigma_g \times \mathbb{R}$ we shall quantize the Chern–Simons type action on the higher-dimensional jacobian tori $Jac(\Sigma_g) \times \mathbb{R}$. Since $\pi_1(Jac(\Sigma_g))$ is abelian the space of interest $N_{\Sigma_g} = Hom(\pi_1(Jac(\Sigma_g)), G)/G$ of the representations of $\pi_1(Jac(\Sigma_g))$ has a simple description. The associated bundle may be extended to a projectively flat bundle over the moduli space of principally polarized abelian varieties. This way a representation of the symplectic group $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ will be obtained.

One then obtains 3-manifold invariants by considering Heegaard decompositions as is done in [22] using also the p_1 -structures from [6].

This is a reasonable “abelian” approximation of Witten’s theory which can be viewed as a study of a simplified (but non-trivial) model mathematically justified. Notice that as an alternative for circumvent the problems with functional integration one may use the technique of quantum groups developed in [29].

2. The quantization of N_{Σ_g}

We choose G a compact Lie group which is assumed to be simple and connected. It has maximal torus T and Weyl group W . The usual alternating character on W is denoted by det and the rank of G (the dimension of T) is denoted by l . Let R be a reduced irreducible root system in the dual t^* of the Lie algebra t and let $R^\vee \subset t$ denote its dual. We write Q and Q^\vee for the lattices generated by R and R^\vee respectively. We denote their dual lattices by $P^\vee \subset t$ and $P \subset t^*$ and we have $Q \subset P$ and $Q^\vee \subset P^\vee$. We fix a basis $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_l$ for R and then $\check{\alpha}_1, \check{\alpha}_2, \dots, \check{\alpha}_l$ is a basis for R^\vee . Let $\check{\alpha}$ be the highest root. We write

$$\check{\alpha}^\vee = \sum_{i=1}^l s_i \check{\alpha}_i$$

and we put $h = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^l s_i$. If G is simply laced (all the roots have the same length) then h will be the Coxeter number of G . We consider the positive definite, symmetric bilinear form I on t given by

$$I(x, y) = (2g)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^l \langle \alpha_i, x \rangle \langle \alpha_i, y \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the basic inner product. If $S^2 Q^\vee$ denotes the lattice of integral symmetric bilinear forms on Q^\vee then $(S^2 Q^\vee)^W$ is infinite cyclic generated by I unless R is of type C_l ($l \geq 3$) in which case $\frac{1}{2}I$ is a generator. Now I determines a homomorphism $t \rightarrow t^*$ which we also denote by I . We set $M = I^{-1}(P)$.

We return now to the moduli space of representations N_{Σ_g} . Any representation will map the whole group \mathbb{Z}^{2g} into a maximal torus of G and therefore the only conjugation freedom left is the diagonal action of W . Hence

$$N_{\Sigma_g} = T \times T \times \cdots \times T / W.$$

The tangent space to T^{2g} is $A = t \oplus t \oplus \cdots \oplus t$ and

$$T^{2g} = A / (Q^\vee)^{2g}.$$

The basic symplectic form ω on A is

$$\omega((\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{2g})(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_{2g})) = -2\pi I((\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{2g}), S(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_{2g})),$$

where I denotes the extension of the above considered bilinear form to $t \oplus t \oplus \cdots \oplus t$ by direct sum, and

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1_g \\ 1_g & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}).$$

It is known that a connection ∇ on the trivial line bundle $A \times \mathbb{C}$ over the symplectic affine space (A, ω) with curvature $-i\omega$ is given by

$$\nabla_X(a) = -\frac{1}{2}i\omega(X - X_0, a)$$

for any $X_0 \in A$. Our task will be the construction of a line bundle \mathcal{L} on T^{2g} , the prequantum line bundle, such that $c_1(\mathcal{L}) = (1/2\pi)\omega$, which must support a lift of the W action. In order to proceed we need to introduce a holomorphic structure on T^{2g} . As in the genus 1 case [2] a holomorphic structure on T^{2g} will be specified by a modular parameter Ω in the Siegel space S_g (of complex symmetric matrices of dimension g whose imaginary part is positive definite). To each such Ω there is a principally polarized abelian variety $Ab(\Omega)$ associated, namely the quotient of \mathbb{C}^g by the lattice $L(\Omega)$ generated by the columns of the matrix $[1_g \ \Omega]$ with the Kähler polarization $\eta = \sum_{i=1}^g dx_i \wedge dx_{i+g}$. Here x_i are the coordinates on \mathbb{C}^g duals to $L(\Omega)$. Now the product $J(\Omega) = Q^\vee \otimes Ab(\Omega)$ is an abelian variety of dimension g which is diffeomorphic to T^{2g} . Also the action of the Weyl group W is naturally extended to a diagonal action on $J(\Omega)$. We set for brevity $E = Ab(\Omega)$ and $J = J(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.1. *The fixed point locus J^W is a finite subgroup of J , naturally isomorphic to $P^\vee / Q^\vee \otimes H_1(E, \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. We know that E is isomorphic as a group with $H_1(E, \mathbb{R}) / H_1(E, \mathbb{Z})$. Then $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_g) \in Q^\vee \otimes H_1(E, \mathbb{R})$ maps to J^W iff

$$z - t_j z = ((\alpha_j, z_i) \alpha_j^\vee)_{i=1, \dots, g} \in Q^\vee \otimes H_1(E, \mathbb{Z})$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, l$. Here t_j stands for the reflection of W which sends α_j to $-\alpha_j$. But this is equivalent to $z \in P^\vee \otimes H_1(E, \mathbb{Z})$, hence the lemma. □

This implies that the geometric quotient J/W is a Cohen–Macaulay variety with a finite number of singular points. We may identify therefore $Pic(J/W)$ with $(Pic(J))^W$. We regard the last group as being the set Λ of isomorphism classes of holomorphic line bundle L over J with the property that w^*L and L are isomorphic for all $w \in W$.

Proposition 2.2. *The exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow Pic^0(J) \xrightarrow{i} Pic(J) \xrightarrow{c} H^2(J, \mathbb{Z})$$

restricts to the following exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow P/Q \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{i} \Lambda \xrightarrow{c} (S^2 Q^\vee)^W \otimes H^2(E, \mathbb{Z}) \cap H^{1,1}(E).$$

Proof. The proof goes as in the genus 1 case (see [24]): The theorem of Appell–Humbert [26] identifies $Pic^0(J)$ in a natural way with

$$Hom(H_1(J, \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}).$$

On the other hand, we have canonical isomorphisms

$$H^2(J, \mathbb{C}) \cong \Lambda^2 Hom_{\mathbb{R}}(H_1(J, \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{C}) \cong \Lambda^2 Hom_{\mathbb{R}}(Q^\vee \otimes H_1(E, \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{C})$$

and the last term contains

$$S^2 Q^\vee \otimes \Lambda^2 Hom_{\mathbb{R}}(H_1(E, \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{C}) \cong S^2 Q^\vee \otimes H^2(E, \mathbb{C})$$

as a subspace. Another application of the theorem of Appell–Humbert shows that $c(Pic(J)) = S^2 Q^\vee \otimes H^2(E, \mathbb{Z}) \cap H^{1,1}(E)$. Next an element $z \in P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{R})$ projects onto a W -invariant element of $P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ iff as in the previous lemma $z - t_j z \in P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{Z})$ for all $j = 1, l$. Therefore the map

$$z \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^l (z - t_i z)$$

induces an isomorphism between $(P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}))^W$ and $(P/Q) \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{Z})$. Since W acts transitively on the set of bases of the root system R and trivially on P/Q this isomorphism is canonical. We have now the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow P \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{i} Pic(J) \xrightarrow{c} (S^2 Q^\vee) \otimes H^2(E, \mathbb{Z}) \cap H^{1,1}(E),$$

which will be (non-canonically) split as an exact sequence of W -modules because W is finite. Therefore, by taking the W -invariants the sequence remains exact and we are done. \square

Now let \mathcal{L} be a holomorphic line bundle over J whose isomorphism class belongs to Λ and $c(\mathcal{L}) = I \otimes \eta$. This will be the prequantum line bundle which we wanted.

We remark that there is also a natural product action of W^g on J . We may state the following proposition.

Proposition 2.3.

- (1) The prequantum line bundle \mathcal{L} is ample.
- (2) For any $w \in W^g$ the line bundles $w^* \mathcal{L}$ and \mathcal{L} are isomorphic.

Proof. We remark that the line bundle \mathcal{L} is well defined modulo a translation in J . Now since I and η are positive definite the Lefschetz theorem on theta functions implies that \mathcal{L} is ample ([15], p.317).

Secondly, we remark that the set Λ_g of isomorphisms classes of line bundles L over J which satisfy the condition stated at the second point may be inserted into an exact sequence similar to that appearing in Proposition 2.2, namely

$$0 \rightarrow P/Q \otimes H^1(E, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{i} \Lambda_g \xrightarrow{c} \bigoplus_{i=1}^g (S^2 Q^\vee)^W \otimes \mathbb{C}(\eta_i),$$

where η_i is the cohomology class of $dx_i \wedge dx_{i+g}$. The proof is quite similar. Since

$$I \otimes \eta \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^g ((S^2 Q^\vee)^W \otimes \mathbb{C}(\eta_i))$$

and \mathcal{L} is uniquely defined up to a translation the claim will follow. □

We wish to construct explicitly such a line bundle \mathcal{L} . Remember that $E = Ab(\Omega)$. Let $e : Q^\vee \otimes L(\Omega) \times t_{\mathbb{C}}^g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ be defined by

$$e(u + \Omega v, z) = \exp(\pi i I(2z + \Omega u, v)), \quad \text{where } u, v \in Q^\vee$$

and I is extended to the complexification $t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$. We have an induced action F of $Q^\vee \otimes L(\Omega)$ on $\mathbb{C} \times t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$ given by

$$F(x)(a, z) = (a/e(x, z), z + x).$$

The orbit space of this action is in a natural way a line bundle which we call \mathcal{L} over $t_{\mathbb{C}}^g/Q^\vee \otimes L(\Omega) \cong J$. Since I is W -invariant we have $F(wx)(a, wz) = (a, w(z + x))$ for any $w \in W$. Therefore, the action of W on $\mathbb{C} \times t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$ defined by $w(a, z) = (a, wz)$ induces one on \mathcal{L} , so $\mathcal{L} \in \Lambda$. Much more I is also W^g -invariant and we see that $\mathcal{L} \in \Lambda_g$. Following the theorem of Appell–Humbert we have $c(\mathcal{L}) = I \otimes \eta$, so that \mathcal{L} is the required prequantum line bundle.

Now the orbit space of the action F_k defined by

$$F_k(x)(a, z) = (ae(x, z)^{-k}, z + x)$$

determines a line bundle over J which is naturally isomorphic to \mathcal{L}^k . The sections of \mathcal{L}^k correspond to the level k theta functions on $J(\Omega)$ hence they are holomorphic functions θ on $t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$ satisfying

$$\theta(z + x) = e(x, z)^{-k} \theta(z).$$

We denote by $Th(k, g, R, \Omega) = H^0(J, \mathcal{L}^k)$. This space will support the W^g action coming from the action on \mathcal{L} , and in particular the diagonal W -action. The quantization space (in level k) for $J(\Omega)$ will be therefore the space of W -invariant sections $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$.

3. Theta functions and Coxeter groups

The purpose of this section is to define some representations of the symplectic group arising from the study of W -invariant theta functions. Let $\Gamma(1, 2)$ be the so-called theta group consisting of elements $\gamma \in Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ which preserve the orthogonal form

$$Q(n, m) = n^\top \cdot m \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$

We represent any element $\gamma \in Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$$

where A, B, C, D are $g \times g$ matrices. Then $\Gamma(1, 2)$ may be alternatively described as the set of those elements γ having the property that the diagonals of $A^\top C$ and $B^\top D$ are even.

The classical theta function in dimension g is defined by the formula (see [7,18,27]):

$$\theta(z, \Omega) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^g} \exp(\pi i(l, \Omega l) + 2\pi i(l, z))$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^g, \Omega \in \mathcal{S}_g$, where \langle, \rangle is the usual hermitian product on \mathbb{C}^g . There is a natural $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ action on $\mathbb{C}^g \times \mathcal{S}_g$ given by

$$\gamma \cdot (z, \Omega) = (((C\Omega + D)^{\top -1} z, (A\Omega + B)(C\Omega + D)^{-1}). \tag{1}$$

The behaviour of the theta function under this action is described by the following functional equation (going back to Jacobi):

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta((C\Omega + D)^{\top -1} z, (A\Omega + B)(C\Omega + D)^{-1}) \\ &= \zeta_\gamma \det(C\Omega + D)^{1/2} \exp(\pi \langle iz, (C\Omega + D)^{-1} Cz \rangle) \theta(z, \Omega), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\gamma \in \Gamma(1, 2)$, and ζ_γ is an 8th root of unity.

For $g = 1$ we suppose that $c > 0$ or $c = 0$ and $d > 0$ so the imaginary part $\text{Im}(c\Omega + d) \geq 0$ for Ω in the upper half plane. Then we shall choose the square root $(c\Omega + d)^{1/2}$ in the first quadrant. Now we can express the dependence of ζ_γ on γ as follows:

- (1) for even c and odd $d \ \zeta_\gamma = i^{(d-1)/2} (c/|d|)$,
- (2) for odd c and even $d \ \zeta_\gamma = \exp(-\pi ic/4) (d/c)$,

where (x/y) is the usual Jacobi symbol [16].

For $g > 1$ we suppose that D is invertible. Firstly, we fix the choice of the square root of $\det(C\Omega + D)$ in the following manner: Let $\det^{1/2}(Z/i)$ be the unique holomorphic function on \mathcal{S}_g satisfying

$$(\det^{1/2}(Z/i))^2 = \det(Z/i)$$

and taking in $i1_g$ the value 1. Next define

$$\det^{1/2}(C\Omega + D) = \det^{1/2}(D)\det^{1/2}\left(\frac{\Omega}{i}\right)\det^{1/2}\left(\frac{-\Omega^{-1} - D^{-1}C}{i}\right),$$

where the square root of $\det(D)$ is taken to lie in the first quadrant. Using this convention we may express ζ_γ as a Gauss sum:

$$\zeta_\gamma = \det^{-1/2}(D) \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^g / D\mathbb{Z}^g} \exp(\pi i \langle l, BD^{-1}l \rangle)$$

and in particular we recover the formula from above for $g = 1$.

There is also an interesting connection between the multiplier system ζ_γ and the Maslov index for lagrangian subspaces. Let \mathbb{R}^{2g} be endowed with the usual symplectic structure $s = \sum_{i=1}^g dx_i \wedge dx_{i+g}$, and let $l_i, i = 1, 3$ be lagrangian subspaces of dimension g . We may define a quadratic form on $l_1 \oplus l_2 \oplus l_3$ by

$$B(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) = s(x_1, x_2) + s(x_2, x_3) + s(x_3, x_1)$$

for $x_i \in l_i, i = 1, 3$. The signature of this quadratic form is the so-called Maslov index of the triple (l_1, l_2, l_3) and is denoted by $m(l_1, l_2, l_3)$. The failure of the multiplier system ζ_γ to be a homomorphism is expressed via a 2-cocycle. Specifically set $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = m(l, \gamma_1 l, \gamma_1 \gamma_2 l)$, where l is the lagrangian space $l = \{x_{i+g} = 0, \text{ for } i = 1, g\}$. Therefore we have [23]:

$$\zeta_{\gamma_1 \gamma_2} = \exp(-\frac{1}{4} \pi i \mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)) \zeta_{\gamma_1} \zeta_{\gamma_2}.$$

We come back now to level k theta functions which are defined by

$$\theta_m(z, \Omega) = \sum_{l \in m+k\mathbb{Z}^g} \exp\left(\frac{\pi i}{k} \langle l, \Omega l \rangle + 2\pi i \langle l, z \rangle\right) \tag{3}$$

for $m \in (\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^g$. The functional equation above stated is generalized to level k theta functions (see [8, 11]) as follows: Let

$$\Theta_k(z, \Omega) = (\theta_m(z, \Omega))_{m \in (\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^g}$$

be the theta vector of level k . Then the following equation is fulfilled:

$$\Theta(\gamma \cdot (z, \Omega)) = \zeta_\gamma \det(C\Omega + D)^{1/2} \times \exp(k\pi i \langle z, (C\Omega + D)^{-1}Cz \rangle) \rho_k(\gamma)(\Theta_k(z, \Omega)), \tag{4}$$

where

- (1) γ belongs to the theta group $\Gamma(1, 2)$ if k is odd and to $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ elsewhere.
- (2) $\zeta_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_g$ is the multiplier system from above.
- (3) $\rho_k : Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow U(k^g)$ is a mapping which becomes a group homomorphism (denoted also by ρ_k when no confusion arises) when passing to the quotient $U(k^g)/R_g$ for even k (or equivalently it gives rise to a representation of the central extension of $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ determined by the 2-cocycle $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} \pi i \mu(*, *))$; a similar assertion holds for odd k when $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ is replaced by $\Gamma(1, 2)$).

We computed explicitly ρ_k for a system of generators:

$$(1) \quad \rho_k \begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \text{diag} \left(\exp \left(\frac{\pi i}{k} \langle m, Bm \rangle \right) \right) \tag{5}$$

for $B = B^T$ a matrix with integer entries.

$$(2) \quad \rho_k \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & (A^T)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = (\delta_{A^T m, n})_{m, n \in (\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^g} \tag{6}$$

for $A \in GL(g, \mathbb{Z})$

$$(3) \quad \rho_k \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = k^{-g/2} \exp(2\pi i k^{-1} \langle m, l \rangle)_{m, l \in (\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})^g}, \tag{7}$$

where \langle , \rangle is the inner product on \mathbb{R}^g .

We wish now that a Coxeter group enter in our picture. Remember that the sections of the prequantum line bundle are theta functions which may be given explicitly. For $\Omega \in S_g$ and $x \in t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$ we put $\Omega x = (\sum_{j=1}^g \Omega_{ij} x_j)_{i=1, \dots, g} \in t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$. Consider

$$\theta_{\lambda}(z, \Omega) = \sum_{x \in Q^g + k^{-1}\lambda} \exp(k\pi i \langle x, \Omega x \rangle + 2k\pi i \langle x, z \rangle), \tag{8}$$

where $\lambda \in M^g = (I^{-1}(P))^g$, $z \in t_{\mathbb{C}}^g$. It is clear that $\theta_{\lambda}(z, \Omega)$ lies in $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$. We may extract moreover a \mathbb{C} -basis of theta functions:

Proposition 3.1. *Consider $X \subset M^g$ be a set of representatives for M^g / kQ^g . Therefore $\{\theta_{\lambda}(z, \Omega); \lambda \in X\}$ is a \mathbb{C} -basis for $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$.*

The proof is analogous to the classical case (see [20,27,26,24]).

Thus $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$ are the fibres of a vector bundle, say $Th(k, g, R)$ over the Siegel space S_g . We have moreover a hermitian structure on this bundle given by

$$\langle \theta_{\lambda}(z, \Omega), \theta_{\mu}(z, \Omega) \rangle = 2k^{-l g/2} \det^{1/2}(\text{Im}(\Omega_R)) \delta_{\lambda, \mu},$$

where Ω_R states for the matrix with each $\Omega_{i,j}$ replaced by a block $\Omega_{i,j} 1_l$. Obviously $\Omega_R \in S_{lg}$ and $J(\Omega) \cong Ab(\Omega_R)$.

We can get this hermitian structure geometrically using the construction of Gocho [14]. Specifically set $j_R : S_g \rightarrow S_{lg}$ for the holomorphic embedding $j_R(\Omega) = \Omega_R$. Then $Th(k, g, R)$ is a subbundle of the trivial bundle $L^2\Theta$ of L^2 -sections:

$$L^2(H^0(Ab(\Omega_R), \mathcal{L}^k)) \times S_g \rightarrow S_g.$$

Proposition 3.2. *The L^2 -metric and the trivial connection on the trivial L^2 -bundle induce the above hermitian structure and a projectively flat connection on $Th(k, g, R)$.*

The proof is essentially contained in [14].

Moreover $\{\theta_{\lambda}(z, \Omega); \lambda \in X\}$ will be a basis of covariant constant sections with respect to the induced connection.

We remark further that the W^g -action on $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$ takes a particularly simple form, namely

$$w\theta_\lambda(z, \Omega) = \theta_{w\lambda}(z, \Omega),$$

where $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_g) \in W^g$, $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_g) \in M^g/kQ^g$ and $w\lambda = (w_1\lambda_1, w_2\lambda_2, \dots, w_g\lambda_g) \in M^g/kQ^g$. The diagonal action of W is the induced one.

We shall consider now the anti-invariant theta functions with respect to these two actions, namely

$$\psi_{\lambda,k}^-(z, \Omega) = \sum_{w \in W^g} \det(w)\theta_{w\lambda}(z, \Omega),$$

where $\det(w) = \det(w_1)\det(w_2) \cdots \det(w_g)$ and $\det : W \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is the usual alternating character of the Coxeter group W , and

$$\varphi_{\lambda,k}^-(z, \Omega) = \sum_{w \in W} \det(w)\theta_{w\lambda}(z, \Omega).$$

Set

$$P_k = \{\lambda \in M, \text{ such that } 0 < \langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \leq k, \text{ for all positive roots } \alpha\}.$$

We may describe therefore the anti-invariant subspace $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g}$.

Proposition 3.3. *We have:*

- (1) $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g} = 0$, for $k < h$.
- (2) $Th(h, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g} = \mathbb{C}\langle \psi_{r_g,h}^-(z, \Omega) \rangle$, where

$$r_g = \underbrace{(r, r, \dots, r)}_g$$

and r is determined as follows: set $f_j \in t$ such that $I(f_j, \alpha_i^\vee) = \delta_{i,j}$. Then $r = h^{-1}(d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_i)$. If G is simply laced then r is the half sum of the positive roots.

- (3) $Th(k+h, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g} = \mathbb{C}\langle \psi_{\lambda+r_g,k+h}^-(z, \Omega); \lambda \in P_k^g \rangle$.

Proof. The W^g -action splits into g copies of independent W -actions, so

$$Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g} \cong (Th(k, 1, R, \Omega)^{-W})^{\otimes g}$$

and the case when $g = 1$ is treated in [24] (see also [2,20]). □

Now we can deal with the spaces of W^g -invariant theta functions $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{W^g}$ which will be naturally a subspace of the quantization space $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$. We state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *The following theta functions*

$$\psi_{\lambda,k}(z, \Omega) = \psi_{\lambda+r_g,k+h}^-(z, \Omega) / \psi_{r_g,h}^-(z, \Omega)$$

with $\lambda \in P_k^g$ form a \mathbb{C} -basis of the space $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{W^g}$ of invariant theta functions.

Proof. We have an injective homomorphism

$$Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{W^g} \rightarrow Th(k + h, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g}$$

given by $\theta \rightarrow \theta \psi_{r_g, h}^-$. The inverse of this homomorphism will associate to $\theta \in Th(k + h, g, R, \Omega)^{-W^g}$ the meromorphic theta function $\theta / \psi_{r_g, h}^-$. What remains to be proved is that $\theta / \psi_{r_g, h}^-$ is actually an holomorphic function.

To every root α there is an associated morphism of abelian varieties

$$r_\alpha : J \cong Q^\vee \otimes E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \otimes E \cong E.$$

Consider Θ the theta divisor on E which passes through zero. Therefore, $c_1(\mathcal{O}(\Theta)) = \eta$. Next we consider the divisor Δ on J defined as $\Delta = \sum_{\alpha \in R^+} r_\alpha^*(\Theta)$, the sum being taken over the positive roots. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *The divisor $(\psi_{r_g, h}^-)$ associated to the section $\psi_{r_g, h}^-$ is Δ .*

Proof. Observe first that $(\psi_{r_g, h}) \geq \Delta$. Indeed if $z \in r_{\alpha_j}^* \Theta$ then the element

$$w_\alpha = \begin{cases} (t_j, t_j, \dots, t_j) \in W^g & \text{for odd } g, \\ (t_j, \dots, t_j, 1) \in W^g & \text{for even } g, \end{cases}$$

leaves the fibre over z fixed so that

$$\psi_{r_g, h}^-(wz, \Omega) = w \psi_{r_g, h}^-(z, \Omega) = -\psi_{r_g, h}^-(z, \Omega)$$

because $\psi_{r_g, h}^-$ is an anti-invariant theta function. Furthermore, $\psi_{r_g, h}^-$ is a section of \mathcal{L}^h hence the Chern class $c_1(\mathcal{O}(\psi_{r_g, h}^-)) = hI \otimes \eta$. Next the Chern class of $r_\alpha(\Theta)$ is

$$\alpha \otimes \alpha \otimes \eta \in S^2 Q^\vee \otimes H^2(E),$$

so that

$$c_1(\Delta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^l \alpha_j \otimes \alpha_j \otimes \eta = hI \otimes \eta.$$

Therefore, $(\psi_{r_g, h}^-) - \Delta$ is a non-negative divisor of vanishing Chern class so our claim follows.

Next we remark that the same proof as above will give

$$(\psi_{\lambda+r_g, k+h}^-) \geq \Delta,$$

which implies that $\psi_{\lambda+r_g, k+h}^- / \psi_{r_g, h}^-(z, *)$ is a holomorphic function on z and we are done. □

Now the projectively flat connection ∇ on $Th(k, g, R)$ will induce a projectively flat connection on the subbundle of anti-invariant sections $Th(k, g, R)^{-W^g}$. We identify the vector bundle of invariant sections $Th(k, g, R)^{W^g}$ with $Th(k+h, g, R)^{-W^g} \otimes (Th(h, g, R)^{-W^g})^*$ and we shall derive an induced connection ∇^{W^g} on $Th(k, g, R)^{W^g}$. Our aim is to compute the monodromy of the symplectic action with respect to this connection. We set

$$\Psi_k(z, \Omega) = (\psi_{\lambda,k}(z, \Omega))_{\lambda \in P_k^g}$$

for the (k, W^g) -theta vector.

Theorem 3.6. *The (k, W^g) -theta vector satisfies the functional equation:*

$$\Psi_k(\gamma(z, \Omega)) = \exp(ik\pi i \langle z, (C\Omega + D)^{-1}Cz \rangle) \rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma) \Psi_k(z, \Omega), \tag{9}$$

where, for even k

$$\rho_k^{W^g} : Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow U(Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{W^g})$$

is a representation of the symplectic group given by

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \rho_k^{W^g} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \text{diag} \left(\exp \left(\frac{\pi i}{k+h} \langle \lambda + r_g, B(\lambda + r_g) \rangle - \frac{\pi i}{k} \langle r_g, Br_g \rangle \right) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

for $B = B^T$ a matrix with integer entries.

$$(2) \quad \rho_k^{W^g} \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & (A^T)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = (\delta_{A^T \lambda, \mu})_{\lambda, \mu \in M^g/kQ^g \supseteq W^g} \tag{11}$$

for $A \in GL(g, \mathbb{Z})$.

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad & \rho_k^{W^g} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = i^{gp} (k+h)^{-lg/2} \left(\frac{\text{vol}(M)}{\text{vol}(Q)} \right)^{g/2} \\ & \times \sum_{w \in W^g} \det(w) \exp \left(\frac{2\pi i}{k+h} \langle w(\lambda + r_g), \mu + r_g \rangle \right), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where p is the number of positive roots;

where \langle, \rangle is the natural extension of the inner product I on $R^{gl} \cong \mathfrak{t}^g$.

For odd k the same formulas define a representation of the theta group $\Gamma(1, 2)$.

Proof. We consider first the symplectic action on anti-invariant theta functions

$$\psi_{\lambda,k}^-(\gamma(z, \Omega)) = \sum_{w \in W^g} \theta_{w\lambda}(\gamma(z, \Omega)).$$

But we may write

$$\theta_{w\lambda}(\gamma(z, \Omega)) = \zeta_{\gamma R} \det(C_R + \Omega_R D_R)^{1/2} \exp(ik\pi i(z, (C + \Omega D)^{-1}Cz)) \times \sum_{\lambda \in M^g/kQ^{-g}} \rho_k(\gamma R)_{w\lambda}^\mu \theta_\mu(z, \Omega),$$

since $\theta_\lambda(z, \Omega)$ are theta functions for $Ab(\Omega_R)$. Because the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is W^g -invariant it can be checked on the generators that

$$\rho_k(\gamma R)_{w\lambda}^{w\mu} = \rho_k(\gamma R)_\lambda^\mu.$$

It follows

$$\psi_{\lambda,k}^-(\gamma(z, \Omega)) = \zeta_{\gamma R} \det(C_R + \Omega_R D_R)^{1/2} \exp(ik\pi i(z, (C + \Omega D)^{-1}Cz)) \times \sum_{\mu \in P_{k-h}^g} \left(\sum_{w \in W^g} \det(w) \rho_k(\gamma R)_{w\lambda}^\mu \right) \psi_{\mu,k}^-(z, \Omega).$$

We derive

$$\rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma)_\lambda^\mu = \left(\sum_{w \in W^g} \det(w) \rho_h(\gamma R)_{wr_g}^{r_g} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{w \in W^g} \det(w) \rho_{k+h}(\gamma R)_{w(\lambda+r_g)}^{\mu+r_g} \right).$$

Using the calculations performed in [19,20] for the transformation rules of $\psi_{r_g,h}^-$ we get our claim for the generators considered. Finally, we remark that the map

$$\gamma \rightarrow \exp(ik\pi i(z, (C + \Omega D)^{-1}Cz))$$

is a character for $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ which implies that $\rho_k^{W^g}$ is a group representation and our claim follows. □

Remark 3.7. It is interesting to note that in the non-abelian case $W \neq 1$ the messy factor ζ_γ is cancelled out. This comes from the fact that the connection ∇^{W^g} is actually flat not only projectively flat.

We come back now to the invariant theta functions arising from the diagonal W -action. This time we do not have such an explicit description for the space $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$. However, we can state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.8.

- (1) Consider $B_{k,g}^0$ be a set of representatives for $M^g/kQ^{-G} \rtimes W$. Set $B_{k,g} \subset B_{k,g}^0$ be the subset of those λ having an even isotropy group $Stab(\lambda) = \{w \in W; w\lambda = \lambda\}$ (i.e. the character \det on $Stab(\lambda)$ is identically one for $\lambda \in B_{k,g}$). Therefore, we have

$$Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{-W} = \mathbb{C}\langle \varphi_{\lambda,k}^-(z, \Omega); \lambda \in B_{k,g} \rangle.$$

(2) *The W-invariant theta functions*

$$\{\varphi_{\lambda-r_g, k}(z, \Omega) = \varphi_{\lambda, k+h}^-(z, \Omega) / \varphi_{r_g, h}(z, \Omega)\}, \quad \text{with } \lambda \in B_{k+h, g}$$

form a \mathbb{C} -basis for the space $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$.

Proof. It is clear that $\varphi_{\lambda, k}^-$ are W -anti-invariant. These theta functions will generate the space $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$ from the general theory of invariants of finite group actions. It remains to prove the linear independence. We make first a little digression on formal theta functions (see [24]). Let F denote the lattice of affine linear functions on $V = \mathbb{R}^g$ which takes integral values on Q^{-g} and let $e(F)$ denote the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^F whose elements are of the form

$$\xi = \sum_{f(\Omega r_g) \geq n} c_f e(f)$$

for some real number n . Here $e(f)$ stands for the element of \mathbb{Z}^F which is one on f and zero on $F - \{f\}$. The order of ξ is $o(\xi) = \inf\{f(\Omega r_g); c_f \neq 0\}$ and the initial part of ξ is by definition

$$in(\xi) = \sum_{f(\Omega r_g) = o(\xi)} c_f e(f).$$

Now V acts on F by translation and hence on \mathbb{Z}^F . We call $\xi \in e(F)$ a formal theta function of level k if for any $v \in Q^{-g} \otimes L(\Omega)$ we have

$$(u + \Omega v)^* \xi = e(-kI(v) - \frac{1}{2}I(\Omega v, v))\xi.$$

The set of theta functions of level k will be denoted by Th^k . Any element of Th^0 has the form

$$\sum_{n \geq n_0} c_n e(n), \quad \text{with } n, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $e(n)$ is the constant function n . We put for any $\lambda \in M^g$

$$\theta_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \in k^{-1}\lambda + Q^{-g}} e(-kI(v) + \frac{1}{2}k(I(\Omega v, v) - I(\Omega \lambda, \lambda))).$$

It follows that $\{\theta_\lambda; \lambda \in S\}$, for S a system of representatives for M^g/kQ^{-g} is a Th^0 -basis for Th^k . Next we take into account the diagonal W -action which is given by

$$w\theta_\lambda = \theta_{w\lambda}.$$

Define the anti-invariant (formal) theta functions by

$$\theta_\lambda^- = \sum_{w \in W} \det(w)\theta_{w\lambda}.$$

To any $\lambda \in B_{k, g}$ we associate some $\tilde{\lambda} \in (Q^{-g} \rtimes W)\lambda$ with the property that the (convex) function $I(\Omega(x - r_g), x - r_g)$ for $x \in (Q^{-g} \rtimes W)\lambda$ has a minimum in $x = \tilde{\lambda}$. Therefore, it will follow that, for real and positive definite Ω

$$in(\theta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^-) = \text{card}(Stab(\lambda))e(-kI(\tilde{\lambda})).$$

Indeed we have for $w \in Q^{-g} \bowtie W$, and $m = \tilde{\lambda}$ the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} & -kI(wm, \Omega r_g) + \frac{1}{2}k(I(\Omega wm, wm) - I(\Omega m, m)) \\ & = \frac{1}{2}k(I(\Omega(wm - r_g), wm - r_g) - I(\Omega(m - r_g), m - r_g)) - kI(m, \Omega r_g) \\ & \geq -kI(m, \Omega r_g). \end{aligned}$$

But now for generic Ω the convex function $I(\Omega(x - r_g), x - r_g)$ has exactly one minimum on the orbit of λ under the affine Weyl group. Therefore equality can hold before only if $wm = m$. If $\lambda \in B_{k,g}$ then our claim follows. Otherwise there exists some $w \in Stab(\lambda)$ with $\det(w) = -1$. Then

$$\theta_{\lambda}^{-} = -\theta_{w\lambda}^{-} = -\theta_{\lambda}^{-},$$

hence $\theta_{\lambda}^{-} = 0$.

Now we remark that the initial parts we obtained $in(\theta^{-}\tilde{\lambda})$ will be linear independent over Th^0 since the family $e(-kI(\lambda))$ fulfills this property. This will prove the linear independence of the corresponding family of formal theta functions. The same proof will work if we take $e(If)$ in the place of $e(f)$ and $i\Omega$ in place of Ω . But if we replace $e(f)$ by $\exp(2\pi if)$ and Ω by $i\Omega$ we derive some multiples of the usual theta functions. Therefore for generic and purely imaginary $\Omega \in S_g$ the usual anti-invariant theta functions which we considered will be linear independent over \mathbb{C} . Since the independence is an open condition this will be true for Ω in a Zariski open subset of S_g . Since $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{-W} \subset Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$ and the second family of spaces is a vector bundle endowed with a W -invariant projectively flat connection we obtain that the dimension of $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)$ is constant. This will prove our first claim.

We consider first the case of odd g . Then $\psi_{r_{g,h}}^{-}(z, \Omega)$ is a W -anti-invariant theta function. Then for any $k \geq 0$ we have

$$(\varphi_{\lambda, k+h}^{-}) \geq (\Delta)$$

as in the proof of Lemma 3.5. It will follow that

$$\{\varphi_{\lambda, k+h}^{-}(z, \Omega) / \psi_{r_{g,h}}^{-}(z, \Omega); \lambda \in B_{k,g}\}$$

is a basis for $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$. The proof is similar. We may consider the induced $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -action on the associated vector bundle $Th(k, g, R)^W$. Essentially, the same computation as in Theorem 3.6 (remark that $\mathbb{C}\langle\psi_{r_{g,h}}^{-}\rangle$ is $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -invariant !) will give that

$$\gamma(\varphi_{r_{g,k+h}}^{-} / \psi_{r_{g,h}}^{-}) = \chi(\gamma)\varphi_{r_{g,k+h}}^{-} / \psi_{r_{g,h}}^{-},$$

where $\gamma \in Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ and χ is a character for $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Moreover, this vector is the only (projectively) invariant vector of $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. On the other hand, $\psi_{0_g, k+h} \in Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$ and has the same property. We derive that

$$\varphi_{r_{g,k+h}}^{-}(z, \Omega) = s(\Omega)\psi_{r_{g,k+h}}^{-}(z, \Omega),$$

where $s : S_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a holomorphic $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -invariant function. This will prove the claim in case of odd g .

Further, we have

$$\varphi_{r_g, h}^-(z, \Omega) = \varphi_{r_{g+1}, h}^-((z, 0), (\Omega \oplus i1))$$

so $\varphi_{r_g, h}^-(z, \Omega)$ is $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -invariant also for even g . Next the proof proceeds as in Theorem 3.6 and we are done. \square

Denote now by $\Phi_k(z, \Omega) = (\varphi_{\lambda, k}(z, \Omega))_{\lambda \in B_{k, g}}$ the (k, W) -theta vector. Then we may compute the monodromy of the symplectic action actually using the connection ∇^W on the vector bundle $Th(k, g, R)^W$ which comes from its identification with $Th(k+h, g, R)^{-W} \otimes \mathbb{C}(\varphi_{r_g, h}^-)^*$.

Theorem 3.9. *The (k, W) -theta vector satisfies the functional equation*

$$\Phi_k(\gamma(z, \Omega)) = \exp(ik\pi i(z, (C\Omega + D)^{-1}Cz))\rho_k^W(\gamma)\Phi_k(z, \Omega),$$

where for even k

$$\rho_k^W : Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow U(Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W)$$

is a group representation determined by

$$(1) \quad \rho_k^W \begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \text{diag} \left(\exp \left(\frac{\pi i}{k+h} \langle \lambda + r_g, B(\lambda + r_g) \rangle - \frac{\pi i}{k} \langle r_g, Br_g \rangle \right) \right) \tag{13}$$

for $B = B^T$ a matrix with integer entries.

$$(2) \quad \rho_k^W \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & (A^T)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = (\delta_{A^T \lambda, \mu})_{\lambda, \mu \in B_{k+h, g}} \tag{14}$$

for $A \in GL(g, \mathbb{Z})$.

$$(3) \quad \rho_k^W \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = i^{sp} (k+h)^{-lg/2} \left(\frac{\text{vol}(M)}{\text{vol}(Q^*)} \right)^{g/2} \times \sum_{w \in W} \det(w) \exp \left(\frac{2\pi i}{k+h} \langle w(\lambda + r_g), \mu + r_g \rangle \right), \tag{15}$$

where p is the number of positive roots.

For odd k the same formulas define a representation of the theta group $\Gamma(1, 2)$.

Proof. Since $\varphi_{r_g, h}^-$ is $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -invariant the proof goes as in the previous theorem. \square

We remark that the natural map induced by $A \in GL(g, \mathbb{Z})$:

$$A : M^g / Q^{\sim g} \rtimes W \rightarrow M^g / Q^{\sim g} \rtimes W$$

maps $B_{k, g}$ onto itself so that formula 2 makes sense.

4. Invariants for framed 3-manifolds

We wish to define some invariants for closed orientable 3-manifolds using the method of [8] for the representations ρ_k^W .

We start with the $\rho_k^{W^g}$ which parallels the $W = 1$ case. We identify $Th(k, g_1 + g_2, R, \Omega_1 \oplus \Omega_2)^{W^g}$ with $Th(k, g_1, R, \Omega_1)^{W^{g_1}} \otimes Th(k, g_2, R, \Omega_2)^{W^{g_2}}$ via the map

$$\psi_{\lambda_1, k} \otimes \psi_{\lambda_2, k} \rightarrow \psi_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2), k}.$$

Set $c_k = k(r, r) / h(k + h)$ for the central charge in level k , and $\zeta_k = \exp(2\pi i c_k)$. We define the symplectic sum of two matrices

$$\oplus_c : Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \times Sp(2h, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow Sp(2(g + h), \mathbb{Z})$$

by the formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} A' & B' \\ C' & D' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \oplus A' & B \oplus B' \\ C \oplus C' & D \oplus D' \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore we can state the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1.

(1) The representation $\rho_k^{W^g}$ is a tensor representation, i.e.

$$\rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma_1 \oplus_c \gamma_2) = \rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma_1) \otimes \rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma_2)$$

holds.

(2) If $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ denotes the subgroup of symplectic matrices of the form $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$ then $\phi_{0_g, k}$ is a projective weight vector for $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$, i.e.

$$\rho_k^{W^g}(\gamma) \psi_{0_g, k} = \chi(\gamma) \psi_{0_g, k}$$

for $\gamma \in Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$, where $\chi : Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow U_W$ is a character taking values in the group of roots of unity generated by ζ_k . This character is determined by

$$\chi \left(\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & (A^T)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) = 1, \quad \chi \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = (\zeta_k)^{(\sum_{i,j} B_{i,j})}.$$

Proof. It is known that ρ_k is tensorial (see [8]). Now the W^g -action being split we can pass to the W^g -anti-invariant part and we are done. Otherwise this property can be checked directly on the generators. The second part is a corollary of Theorem 3.6. □

So we obtained a tensor representation of $(Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}), Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z}))$ in the terminology of [8,11]. Now there is a standard way to derive invariants for closed 3-manifolds: Let M^3 be a closed orientable 3-manifold and $M^3 = T_g \cup \bar{T}_g$ be a Heegaard splitting into two handlebodies of genus g . The gluing homeomorphism induces an automorphism in homology $H_1(\partial T_g)$ which we may identify with an element $h(M) \in Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. This

identification corresponds to the choice of a canonical basis in the homology of a genus g surface. We set

$$I_W(M^3, k) = (k + h)^{-lg/2} \langle \rho_k^{Wg}(h(M^3)) \psi_{0g,k}, \psi_{0g,k} \rangle.$$

We have then the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2.

- (1) *The class of equivalence $I_W(M^3, k) \in \mathbb{C}/U_W$ does not depend upon the various choices made and defines therefore a topological invariant of M^3 .*
- (2) *The invariant $I_W(*, k)$ behaves multiplicatively under connected sums.*

Proof. The proof is standard (see also [8]): the ambiguities in the choices of $h(M^3)$ come from the non-uniqueness of a canonical basis in homology and that of the Heegaard splitting. But choosing another canonical basis in the homology $h(M^3)$ changes into $ch(M^3)d$ with $c, d \in Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Since $\psi_{0g,k}$ is a projective weight vector the invariant I_W is not affected. Also by stabilizing an Heegaard splitting changes $h(M^3)$ into $h(M^3) \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and I_W takes the same value. But any two Heegaard splittings are stably equivalent by Reidemester–Singer theorem and our claim follows. □

We wish now to pass to the representation ρ_k^W . The only point here is that $Th(k, g_1, R, \Omega)^W \otimes Th(k, g_2, R, \Omega)^W$ is a proper subspace of $Th(k, g_1 + g_2, R\Omega)$. Also there is no canonical inclusion mapping

$$Th(k, g_1, R, \Omega)^W \otimes Th(k, g_2, R, \Omega)^W \rightarrow Th(k, g_1 + g_2, R, \Omega)$$

as for the usual tensor structures (see [9,13]) but a surjective mapping:

$$\pi : Th(k, g_1 + g_2, R\Omega) \rightarrow Th(k, g_1, R, \Omega)^W \otimes Th(k, g_2, R, \Omega)^W,$$

which is defined as follows: we take

$$\pi_i : M^{g_1+g_2}/kQ^{\vee g_1+g_2} \rtimes W \rightarrow M^{g_i}/kQ^{\vee g_i} \rtimes W$$

be the canonical projections and set also π_i for the induced maps

$$\tilde{\pi}_i : B_{k,g_1+g_2} \rightarrow B_{k,g_i} \cup \{\phi\},$$

which are given by

$$\tilde{\pi}_i(x) = \begin{cases} \pi_i(x) & \text{if } \pi_i(x) \in B_{k,g_i}, \\ \phi & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We put formally $\theta_\phi = 0$. Therefore the mapping π is given by

$$\pi(\varphi_\lambda) = \varphi_{\pi_1(\lambda)} \otimes \varphi_{\pi_2(\lambda)}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\theta_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}((z_1, z_2), \Omega_1 \oplus \Omega_2) = \theta_{\lambda_1}(z_1, \Omega_1) \otimes \theta_{\lambda_2}(z_2, \Omega_2).$$

If ρ denotes the symplectic action on $Th^-(k, g, R, \Omega)$ then it follows that

$$\rho(\gamma_1 \oplus_s \gamma_2)\varphi_\lambda^- = \sum_{\mu_1=\pi_1(\mu), \mu_2=\pi_2(\mu)} \rho(\gamma_1)_{\pi_1(\lambda)}^{\pi_1(\mu)} \rho(\gamma_2)_{\pi_2(\lambda)}^{\pi_2(\mu)} \varphi_\mu^-$$

where \oplus_s denotes the symplectic direct sum of matrices and the coefficients of the matrices on the right-hand side are zero if some index is ϕ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \rho_k^W(\gamma_1 \oplus \gamma_2)\varphi_{k,\lambda}, \varphi_{k,\mu} \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho_k^W(\gamma_1)\varphi_{\pi_1(\lambda)}, \varphi_{k,\pi_1(\mu)} \rangle \langle \rho_k^W(\gamma_2)\varphi_{k,\pi_2(\lambda)}, \varphi_{k,\pi_2(\mu)} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then if we define

$$I'_W(M^3, k) = (k + h)^{-lg/2} \langle \rho_k^W(h(M^3))\varphi_{0_g,k}, \varphi_{0_g,k} \rangle$$

it will follow that I'_W is a topological invariant as above. Since $\varphi_{0_g,k}$ is the only one projective weight vector associated to the character χ and $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^{W^g}$ is a $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ -submodule of $Th(k, g, R, \Omega)^W$ we find that in fact

$$I'_W(M^3, k) = I_W(M^3, k),$$

so nothing new appears. This is a particular case of the following more general principle which is used in [9,13] for mapping class groups: if we have a tensor representation of $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ in the unitary automorphisms of the hermitian vector space V_g which define topological invariants for 3-manifolds then we may restrict to the subrepresentations on $V' = Span(Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})v_g)$ where v_g is the projective $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ weight vector. This implies that we may restrict ourselves to the full symplectic submodule, i.e. of type $V_g = V_1^{\otimes g}$.

We want now to remove the ambiguity U_W in the definition of our invariants. This will be done by adding some structure on the manifold M^3 , namely a framing. For technical reasons we shall consider a p_1 -structure on M^3 (see [6]) which is a notion equivalent to Atiyah's [1] 2-framings. Let X denote the homotopy fibre of the map $p_1 : BO \rightarrow K(\mathbb{Z}, 4)$ corresponding to the first Pontryagin class of the tautological bundle τ of BO . Then a p_1 -structure on a manifold M is fibre map from τ_M the stable tangent bundle of M^3 to $p_1^*\tau$ the pull-back of τ over X . Actually, we shall consider only homotopy classes of p_1 -structures. If M^3 is an oriented closed 3-manifold then M^3 bounds a 4-manifold Y . If α is a p_1 -structure on M^3 then let $p_1(Y, \alpha) \in H^4(Y, M, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the obstruction to extending it to Y . Set

$$\sigma(\alpha) = 3signature(Y) - \langle p_1(Y, \alpha), [Y] \rangle \in \mathbb{Z},$$

which does not depend on Y according to Hirzebruch's signature theorem and is equal to 3 times Atiyah's σ . It is known that the set of homotopy classes of p_1 -structures on M^3 is affine isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , the isomorphism being given by σ . A similar statement holds for the set of homotopy classes of p_1 -structures on an oriented, compact, connected 3-manifold with boundary which restrict to a given p_1 -structure on the boundary. We shall be concerned only with homotopy classes of p_1 -structures below. The canonical p_1 -structure on M^3 is that on which σ vanishes.

We come back to our representation $\rho_k^{W^g}$. The ambiguity comes from the fact that $\psi_{0_g, k}$ is only a projective weight vector for $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Now we consider the central extension of $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ corresponding to the 2-cocycle signature (or cocycle de Meyer [3]) $c : Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \times Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. This may be constructed as follows [1]. Let Γ_g be the mapping class group of genus g surfaces and set $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$ for the set of isomorphism classes of fibrations $Y \rightarrow S^1$ with fibre a surface of genus g , which are endowed with a p_1 -structure. There is a natural group law on $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$. For $f, g \in \tilde{\Gamma}_g$ we construct a 4-manifold T which is fibred (with fibre the genus g surface) over the pants $D^2 - D_1^2 - D_2^2$ and has the monodromies fg, f, g on the circles $\partial D^2, \partial D_1^2, \partial D_2^2$ respectively. Set X_f for the boundary component which fibres over ∂D_1^2 . Given two p_1 -structures α, β on X_f, X_g respectively, then there is a unique p_1 -structure γ on X_{fg} which extends the p_1 -structure on boundary to T . Since $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$ is essentially the set of pairs (f, α) with α a p_1 -structure on X_f we may define the group law on $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$ by

$$(f, \alpha)(g, \beta) = (fg, \gamma).$$

We obtain this way a central extension of Γ_g

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}_g \rightarrow \Gamma_g \rightarrow 0$$

with a canonical section s given by

$$s(f) = (f, \alpha), \quad \text{where } \sigma(\alpha) = 0.$$

The canonical 2-cocycle for this extension will be therefore

$$c(f, g) = s(f)s(g)s(fg)^{-1} = \text{signature}(T).$$

Now the cohomology of T depends only on the elements f_*, g_* in $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ induced by the action of f, g in the homology of the fibre (see [1,25]) therefore we have an induced central extension of the symplectic group

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 0,$$

which is also endowed with a canonical section denoted also by s . Then Meyer's function $\Phi : \tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ which lifts to $\tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{R})$ is the quasi-morphism defined by the equation $c(f, g) = \Phi(s(fg)) - \Phi(s(f)) - \Phi(s(g))$. There exists exactly one quasi-morphism on $\tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ which satisfies the previous relation (see [3]). We shall consider now the associated homogeneous quasi-morphism, namely

$$\Psi(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Phi((s(f))^n)$$

on $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ and also

$$\Psi(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Phi((f)^n)$$

for $f \in \tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Then set

$$\rho_{k, w} : \tilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow U(Th(k, g, \mathbb{R}, \Omega)^{W^g})$$

defined by

$$\rho_{k,W}(s(f) + m) = (\zeta_k)^{(\Psi(f)+m)} \rho_k^{W^8}(f).$$

Here $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ makes sense since we may alter a p_1 -structure with an integer. It is clear that $\rho_{k,W}$ is a projective representation of $\widetilde{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Consider now an oriented closed 3-manifold M^3 presented by a Heegaard splitting $M^3 = T_g \cup \bar{T}_g$ with gluing homeomorphism $h(M^3)$. Set $h_*(M)$ for the corresponding element of $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Suppose that a p_1 -structure α is chosen on M^3 . Then α differs from the canonical p_1 -structure by an integer m . We define

$$Z_W((M^3, \alpha), k) = \langle \rho_{k,W}(s(h_*(M)) + m) \psi_{0_g,k}, \psi_{0_g,k} \rangle.$$

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *The complex number $Z_W(*, k)$ is a topological invariant for closed 3-manifolds with p_1 -structure which behaves multiplicatively under connected sums and pass to the conjugate when the orientation is changed. If the p_1 -structure is altered by an integer m then the invariant is multiplied by ζ_k^m .*

Proof. We remark that it is sufficient to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *We have:*

(1) *The 2-cocycle \tilde{c} associated to Ψ satisfies*

$$\tilde{c}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = 0 \quad \text{if } \gamma_1 \in Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z}).$$

(2) $\chi(f) = \exp(2\pi i c_k \Psi(f))$ if $f \in Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$.

In fact \tilde{c} could be obtained as follows:

$$\tilde{c}(f_1, f_2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mu(f_1^n, f_2^n),$$

where μ is the Maslov 2-cocycle from the 3rd paragraph (see [3]). Therefore the first claim follows since the Maslov cocycle verifies the required relation.

In particular Ψ is a character on $Sp^+(2g, \mathbb{Z})$. Also Ψ is constant on conjugation classes hence

$$\Psi \left(\begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & (A^\top)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\Psi(ab) = \Psi(a) + \Psi(b)$$

if a and b commute according to [3]. Thus it remains to compute

$$\Psi \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

in the case when B has only one non-zero entry. But

$$\Psi \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = 1$$

and Ψ is constant under direct sum with identity. Every concerned element is conjugate to a stabilization of $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and therefore

$$\Psi \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & B \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij}.$$

This proves our lemma. □

Since Ψ takes integer values on $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ the claim of the theorem follows.

We can do something also in the case when $G = U(1)$ (hence $W = 1$) by taking into account the spin structures. Let us consider that M^3 has a spin structure α . Then the Heegaard splitting will be one in the context of spin manifolds. But the spin structure on the surface ∂T_g induces a quadratic form

$$q_\alpha : H_1(\partial T_g, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

defined as follows. Let $x \in H_1(\partial T_g, \mathbb{Z})$ and x' be a circle representing the homology class x . If the spin structure induced on x' is the bounding spin structure of the circle then we set $q_\alpha(x) = 0$ otherwise q_α equals one (see [21]). Now the gluing homeomorphism $h(M)$ will be compatible with q_α so $h_*(M)$ may be identified with an element of $\Gamma(1, 2)$. It follows that $Z_W(M, \alpha) \in \mathbb{C}$ is well defined.

Remark 4.5. If we should use the quantization procedure for the space $Hom(\pi_1(\Sigma_g), T)/T$ (which amounts to consider a space of sections of a line bundle directly over T^{2g}) we should obtain in a very similar manner some numerical invariant I_T .

Now even if our starting point was a simple Lie group G , all computations may be carried out for a semi-simple Lie group. Furthermore, the invariant associated to the Lie group $G \times H$ is nothing but the product of the two invariants associated to G and H . In particular, I_T is a power of the abelian invariant for $W = 1$ considered in [8], hence a homotopical invariant. However for general W the invariants Z_W are no more homotopical invariants from the computations carried by Jeffrey [19] in the case of lens spaces.

Acknowledgements

These results have been announced in [10] and represent part of the author's Ph.D. thesis at University of Paris-Sud. I wish to express my gratitude to V. Poenaru, V. Turaev and L. Guillou for their useful comments and suggestions they gave me for the different versions of this paper.

References

- [1] M. Atiyah, On framings of 3-manifolds, *Topology* 29 (1990) 1–7.
- [2] S. Axelrod, S. Dellapietra and E. Witten, Geometric quantization of Chern–Simons gauge theory, *J. Differential Geom.* 33 (1991) 787–902.
- [3] J. Barge and E. Ghys, Cocycles d’Euler et de Maslov, *Math. Ann.* 294 (1992) 235–265.
- [4] A. Beauville, Fibrés de rang 2 sur une courbe, fibré déterminant et fonctions theta, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* 116 (1988) 431–448.
- [5] A. Beauville, Fibrés de rang 2 sur une courbe, fibré déterminant et fonctions theta II, preprint (1990).
- [6] C. Blanchet, N. Habegger, G. Masbaum and P. Vogel, Topological quantum field theories derived from the Kauffman bracket, preprint (1992).
- [7] J. Freitag, *Theta Functions*, Lecture Notes in Math. (1987).
- [8] L. Funar, Invariants for closed orientable 3-manifolds and theta functions, preprint Orsay 91-28 (1991).
- [9] L. Funar, 2 + 1-D Topological quantum field theory and 2-D conformal field theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 171 (1995) 405–458.
- [10] L. Funar, Quantification des tores et variétés de dimension 3, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 317 (1993) 1179–1184.
- [11] L. Funar, Représentations du groupe symplectique et variétés de dimension 3, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 316 (1993) 1067–1072.
- [12] L. Funar, Theta functions, root systems and 3-manifold invariants, preprint Orsay 93-54 (1993).
- [13] L. Funar, Théories quantiques du champs topologiques en dimension 3 et théories conformes du champs en dimension 2, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 318 (1994) 1021–1026.
- [14] T. Gocho, The topological invariant of three manifolds based on the $U(1)$ gauge theory, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect. 1A, Math.* 39 (1992) 169–184.
- [15] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of Algebraic Geometry* (Wiley, New York, 1978).
- [16] G. Hardy and E. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1979).
- [17] N. Hitchin, Flat connections and geometric quantization, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 131 (1990) 347–380.
- [18] J.-i. Igusa, *Theta Functions*, Band 194 (Springer, Berlin, 1972).
- [19] L. Jeffrey, Chern–Simons–Witten invariants of lens spaces and torus bundles and the semi-classical approximation, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 147 (1992) 563–604.
- [20] V. Kac, *Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras*, Progress in Math. (1983).
- [21] R. Kirby, *Topology of 4-Manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1374 (1989).
- [22] T. Kohno, Topological invariants of 3-manifolds using representations of mapping class group, *Topology* 31 (1992) 203–230.
- [23] G. Lion and M. Vergne, *The Weil Representation, Maslov Index and Theta Series*, Progress in Math. (1980).
- [24] E. Looijenga, Root systems and elliptic curves, *Invent. Math.* 38 (1976) 17–32.
- [25] W. Meyer, Die Signatur von Flächenbündeln, *Math. Ann.* 201 (1973) 239–264.
- [26] D. Mumford, *Abelian Varieties* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1970).
- [27] D. Mumford, *Tata Lectures on Theta I, II*, Progress in Math. (1984).
- [28] M. Narasimhan and C. Seshadri, Stable and unitary vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface, *Ann. Math.* 61 (1965) 540–567.
- [29] N. Reshetkykin and V. Turaev, Invariants of three-manifolds via link polynomials and quantum groups, *Invent. Math.* 103 (1991) 547–597.
- [30] E. Witten, Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 121 (1989) 351–399.