COHERENCE WITHOUT COMMUTATIVE DIAGRAMS, LIE-HEDRA AND OTHER CURIOSITIES

MARTIN MARKL^{*} and STEVE SHNIDER

ABSTRACT. The paper is devoted to the coherence problem for algebraic structures on a category. We describe coherence constraints in terms of the cohomology of the corresponding operad. Our approach enables us to introduce the concept of coherence even for structures which are not given by commutative diagrams.

In the second part of the paper we discuss 'quantizations' of various algebraic structures. We prove that there always exists the 'canonical quantization' and show that the two prominent examples – Drinfel'd's quasi-Hopf algebras and Gurevich's generalized Lie algebras – are canonical quantizations of their 'classical limits.' The second part (sections 6,7,8) can be read independently, though the abstract theory of the first part is necessary for the full understanding of the results.

KEYWORDS: Tel Aviv, coherence constraints, cohomology of operad, Lie-hedron

CLASSIFICATION: 57P99, 18C10

PLAN OF THE PAPER:	1. Introduction	page	1
	2. Operads and coherence constraints	page	5
	3. A homological description of coherence constraints	page	9
	4. TA-structures	page	11
	5. Back to the classical form of coherence theorems	page	14
	6. Quantum algebras	page	14
	7. Canonical quantization	page	25
	8. The Lie-hedron	page	29

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us recall some definitions and results of [12]. A category with a multiplication is a category \mathcal{C} together with a covariant bifunctor $\Box : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$. An associativity isomorphism for (\mathcal{C}, \Box) is then a natural transformation

(1 denotes the identity functor) such that each $a(A, B, C) : A \Box (B \Box C) \to (A \Box B) \Box C$ has a twosided inverse in \mathcal{C} , for $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}$; here we denote, as usual, $\Box (1 \times \Box)(A, B, C)$ by $A \Box (B \Box C)$, etc. Having such an associativity isomorphism, we can consider diagrams whose vertices are iterates of \Box and edges expansions of instances of a. The category \mathcal{C} is called *coherent*, if all these diagrams commute. The easiest of these diagrams is the pentagon (see Figure 1).

^{*}Partially supported by the grant AV $\check{C}R \# 201/96/0310$



Figure 1: The Pentagon

There are, of course, more complex diagrams, one of these being depicted in Figure 2.



Figure 2: An example of a more complex diagram

There is no a priori reason for the commutativity of these diagrams (see Example 5.4), but the celebrated Mac Lane's coherence theorem [12, Theorem 3.1] says that the commutativity of the pentagon implies the commutativity of all these diagrams. A category with multiplication is called a *monoidal* category if it is coherent and there is an object which is a two sided identity for the multiplication. In addition there are some obvious axioms relating the associativity isomorphism to the identity. For more details see [12]. An extremely important special case is when the transformation a of (1) is the identity, i.e. the functors $\Box(\mathbb{1} \times \Box)$ and $\Box(\Box \times \mathbb{1})$ are equal. In this case we say that the monoidal category is *strict*.

Recall that an associative algebra in a strict monoidal category $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}, \odot)$ is an object $V \in \mathcal{M}$ together with a map $\mu : V \odot V \to V$ (a product) which is associative in the sense that

(2)
$$\mu(\mathbb{1} \odot \mu) = \mu(\mu \odot \mathbb{1});$$

here 1 denotes the identity map. The monoidal category $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \Box, a)$ above can be then inter-

preted as a (nonunital) *associative algebra* in the strict monoidal category of (small) categories, with morphisms given by equivalence classes of functors and monoidal structure by the cartesian product.

Observe that the Mac Lane's coherence theorem does not refer to any special property of the category $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \Box, a)$. This suggest that the theorem speaks directly about *associative algebras* and that the categories involved play a similar rôle as test functions in the theory of distributions. The aim of this paper is to discuss coherence-type statements for *arbitrary* types of algebras.

Associative algebras have one very special feature – the axiom (=associativity) can be naturally expressed as a commutative diagram:



This implies that the corresponding coherence problem leads to the study of commutative diagrams, as explained above. This is a well-understood situation from category theory [9] where the general coherence problem can be loosely formulated as follows:

'Given a set \mathcal{D} of commutative diagrams, find a subset C of \mathcal{D} , as small as possible, such that the commutativity of diagrams from C implies the commutativity of all diagrams from \mathcal{D} .'

We call the elements of the set \mathcal{D} coherence relations and the elements of C coherence constraints. Mac Lane's coherence theorem can be then formulated as saying that there exists exactly one coherence constraint for associative algebras, namely the pentagon of Figure 1.

The approach based on commutative diagrams has an obvious drawback – it cannot be applied even to so popular and omnipresent algebraic structures as Lie algebras, because the Jacobi identity

$$[a, [b, c]] + [b, [c, a]] + [c, [a, b]] = 0$$

cannot be expressed by a commutative diagram involving only the basic operation [-, -] and natural transformations such as association and permutation. So, the first thing we do is show that there is a well defined coherence problem for any type of algebra (including, of course, Lie algebras).

Here we shall pause a little and say that by an algebra we mean an algebra over an *operad* (see, for example, [18]), i.e. an element of an algebraic equationally given category. This notion is broad enough to cover all interesting examples of algebraic structures. So, let \mathcal{P} be an operad. We show that \mathcal{P} defines a set $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of coherence relations which can also be understood as the set of relations between the axioms of \mathcal{P} -algebras, or the set of 2nd syzygies. We then show that

4

the set $C = C_{\mathcal{P}}$ of coherence constraints is a well-defined homological invariant of the operad \mathcal{P} , namely it coincides with the space Z^2 of generators of Tate-Jozefiak degree two of the bigraded model of \mathcal{P} , constructed by the first author in [16].

As was proven again in [16], for so-called *Koszul operads* [6, page 259] the space Z^2 coincides, up to an innocuous degree shift, with the fourth piece $\mathcal{P}^!(4)$ of the *Koszul dual* $\mathcal{P}^!$ [6, page 229] of the operad \mathcal{P} . We thus have the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1. For a Koszul operad \mathcal{P} , there is an one-to-one correspondence between the space $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ of coherence constraints and the space $\mathcal{P}^!(4)$.

Observe that Mac Lane's result is an immediate consequence of the statement above. Indeed, the (non- Σ) operad Ass for associative algebras is Koszul and Koszul self-dual, meaning that $Ass = Ass^{!}$ [6, page 229]. Thus $Z^{2} = Ass(4)$, which is an one dimensional vector space. This implies, by Theorem 1.1, that there is exactly one coherence constraint, namely the pentagon of Figure 1.

As we have already observed, a nice feature of the associative algebra case is that the coherence relations can be represented by diagrams, which are in this case nothing but the closed edge-paths in the famous Stasheff's associahedra [19]. We show that for any type of algebra there exists a bipartite graph, encoding the coherence relations for each degree $n \ge 4$. In many cases these relations can be described by a simple graph which we call the *Tel-A-graph* (Tel-A= Tel Aviv, the place where the discovery was made). This can be thought of as a generalization of the associahedra for other types of algebras.

We discuss in details the Lie-algebra case. The Lie algebra operad *Lie* is Koszul [6, page 229] and $Lie^{!} = Comm$, therefore, by Theorem 1.1, C = Comm(4), which is an one dimensional vector space. Thus there is only one coherence constraint, as in the associative algebra case. The Tel-A-graph L_4 (the promised Lie-hedron from the title) turns out to be the famous Peterson graph, depicted on Figure 3. Observe that our choice of the name 'Lie-hedron' is based on the connotation with the word 'associahedron;' it does not mean that it is a solid body.



Figure 3: The Peterson graph.

We apply our approach to the problem of 'quantization' of algebraic structures, i.e. to the

problem of finding their ' Φ -versions' in the same sense in which Drinfel'd (or quasi-Hopf) algebras of [3] are ' Φ -versions' of associative bialgebras.

The paper supplies the 'missing link' between the Koszulness and the coherence whose existence was indicated in the last paragraph of the first version [13] of [14].

The machinery described in the paper applies to the coherence problem with *strict* commutativity relations. The absolutely general theory which would apply not only to the case with relaxed commutativity, but even to non-algebraic objects such as bialgebras, would need the machinery of cotangent cohomology for PROPs developed in [14]. As there is no concept of Koszulness available for this general situation yet, and consequently no effective way to describe the coherence constraints, we will not discuss this general setting in the paper and postpone the discussion to better times.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. The authors would like to express their thanks to Jim Stasheff for carefull reading the manuscript and many useful comments.

2. Operads and coherence constraints

The notion of an operad and of an algebra over an operad is classical and well known (see [18], or more recent sources [6, 5, 16]). We thus recall only briefly the definitions and notation. We will need also some results on homology and presentations of operads; this part of the paper relies on the paper [16].

By an *operad* we mean an operad in the symmetric monoidal category **k**-Vect of **k**-vector spaces, where **k** is a field of characteristic zero, i.e. a sequence $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}(n); n \geq 1\}$ of vector spaces such that:

- (i) Each $\mathcal{P}(n)$ is equipped with a k-linear (right) action of the symmetric group Σ_n on n elements, $n \ge 1$.
- (ii) For any $m_1, \ldots, m_l \ge 1$ we have degree zero linear maps (called the *composition maps*)

$$\gamma = \gamma_{m_1,\dots,m_l} : \mathcal{P}(l) \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_l) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(m_1 + \dots + m_l)$$

These data have to satisfy the usual axioms including the existence of a unit $1 \in \mathcal{P}(1)$, for which we refer to [18]. We sometimes write $\mu(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_l)$, $\mu(\nu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \nu_l)$ or $\gamma(\mu; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_l)$ instead of $\gamma(\mu \otimes \nu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \nu_l)$.

A collection is a sequence $E = \{E(n); n \ge 2\}$ of vector spaces such that each E(n) is equipped with an action of the symmetric group Σ_n . The obvious forgetful functor \Box : **Oper** \rightarrow **Coll** from the category of operads to the category of collections has a left adjoint \mathcal{F} : **Coll** \rightarrow **Oper** and we call $\mathcal{F}(E)$ the *free operad* on the collection E.

The notions above, as well as all the results which follow, have obvious $non-\Sigma$ (also called *nonsymmetric*) analogs which we obtain by forgetting everything related to the symmetric group

action. We thus have non- Σ operads, non- Σ collections, etc. The reason for considering these objects is that the non- Σ versions are much simpler while there are still many examples which live in a non- Σ world, the most prominent being the associative algebra case.

By a module over an operad \mathcal{P} we mean an abelian group object in the slice category **Oper**/ \mathcal{P} . The axioms were explicitly given for modules over a so-called *pseudo-operad* in [16], in the standard case the axioms are quite analogous. Namely, a module over \mathcal{P} is a collection $M = \{M(n); n \geq 1\}$ together with a map

$$m: \bigoplus_{1 \le i \le l} \{ \mathcal{P}(l) \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes M(m_i) \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_l) \} \oplus \{ M(l) \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{P}(m_l) \} \longrightarrow M(m_1 + \cdots + m_l)$$

given for any $m_1, \ldots, m_l \ge 1$. This map is supposed to satisfy obvious axioms given by the linearization of the axioms of operads. Just as for the operadic composition map, we sometimes write $a(b_1, \ldots, b_l), a(b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_l)$ instead of $m(a \otimes b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_l)$.

Let us give some examples of \mathcal{P} -modules which we will need in the sequel. The operad \mathcal{P} itself is a \mathcal{P} -module. If $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{S}$ is an operad map, then α induces a \mathcal{P} -module structure on \mathcal{S} . Finally, if $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{P}$ is an ideal in \mathcal{P} (see [16]), then \mathcal{I} is naturally a \mathcal{P} -module, as well as the quotient \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .

The forgetful functor $\Box : \mathcal{P}\text{-}Mod \to \text{Coll}$ from the category of $\mathcal{P}\text{-}$ modules to the category of collections has a left adjoint $\mathcal{P}\langle - \rangle : \text{Coll} \to \mathcal{P}\text{-}Mod$, and we call the $\mathcal{P}\text{-}$ module $\mathcal{P}\langle E \rangle$ the free $\mathcal{P}\text{-}module$ on the collection E.

From now on we suppose that our operads always have $\mathcal{P}(1) = \mathbf{k}$. Let $\mathcal{P}^+ \subset \mathcal{P}$ be the ideal defined by $\mathcal{P}^+(1) := 0$ and $\mathcal{P}^+(n) := \mathcal{P}(n)$ for $n \geq 2$. For a \mathcal{P} -module (M, m) define the *decomposables* of M to be the collection $D(M) = D_{\mathcal{P}}(M)$ generated by elements of the form $m(n; p_1, \ldots, p_l)$ and $m(p; p_1, \ldots, n, \ldots, p_l)$, where $n \in M, p, p_1, \ldots, p_l \in \mathcal{P}$ and at least one of $p, p_1, \ldots, p_l \in \mathcal{P}$ belongs to \mathcal{P}^+ . Define the *indecomposables* of M as the collection $Q(M) = Q_{\mathcal{P}}(M) := M/D_{\mathcal{P}}(M)$.

Each operad can be represented as $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{F}(E)/(R)$, where E and R are collections and (R)is the ideal generated by R; we write $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$. Because $\mathcal{P}(1) = \mathbf{k}$, we can always suppose that the presentation is minimal [16]. This means, by definition, that $E \cong Q_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^+)$ and that the collection R is isomorphic to the indecomposables of the kernel of the canonical map $\mathcal{F}(E) \to \mathcal{P}$, $R \cong Q_{\mathcal{F}(E)} \{ \operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{F}(E) \to \mathcal{P}) \}.$

Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$. Let $J := \mathcal{F}(E) \langle R \rangle$ be the free $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -module on R and let $\pi : J \to (R)$ be the obvious natural epimorphism of $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -modules. For $x \in \mathcal{F}(E) \langle R \rangle(l), y \in \mathcal{F}(E) \langle R \rangle$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_l \in \mathcal{F}(E)$ the element

$$o' := x(a_1, \dots, a_{s-1}, \pi(y), a_{s+1}, \dots, a_l) - \pi(x)(a_1, \dots, a_{s-1}, y, a_{s+1}, \dots, a_l)$$

belongs to Ker(π), for any $1 \leq s \leq l$. Similarly, for $b \in \mathcal{F}(E)(l), a_1, \ldots, a_l \in \mathcal{F}(E)$ and

 $x, y \in \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle$, the element

$$o'' := b(a_1, \dots, a_{s-1}, \pi(x), a_{s+1}, \dots, a_{t-1}, y, a_{t+1}, \dots, a_l) - b(a_1, \dots, a_{s-1}, x, a_{s+1}, \dots, a_{t-1}, \pi(y), a_{t+1}, \dots, a_l)$$

belongs to $\operatorname{Ker}(\pi)$, for any $1 \leq s < t \leq l$. In the spirit of the definition of the cotangent cohomology we call the $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -module generated by elements of the above two types the *module* of obvious relations and denote it by $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}$. To understand better the meaning of this module we recommend looking at the definition of the module U_0 on page 44 of [10] in the classical commutative algebra situation or to the definition in 2.2 of [13].

DEFINITION 2.1. The collection of coherence relations of the operad \mathcal{P} is the $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -module $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{P}} := \operatorname{Ker}(\pi : J \to (R))/\mathcal{O}$. The collection of coherence constraints of the operad \mathcal{P} is the collection of indecomposables of the $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -module \mathcal{D} , $\mathsf{C} = \mathsf{C}_{\mathcal{P}} := Q_{\mathcal{F}(E)}(\mathcal{D})$.

EXAMPLE 2.2. Let ξ be an independent symbol and let E be the non- Σ collection defined by

$$E(n) := \begin{cases} \text{Span}(\xi), & \text{for } n = 2, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $r := \xi(1,\xi) - \xi(\xi,1) \in \mathcal{F}(E)(3)$ and let R be the (non- Σ) collection generated by r, i.e.

$$R(n) := \begin{cases} \text{Span}(r), & \text{for } n = 3, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Associative algebras are then the algebras over the non- Σ operad $Ass := \langle E; R \rangle$. Consider the element $p \in J = \mathcal{F}(E) \langle R \rangle$ defined by

$$p := \xi(r, 1) - r(\xi, 1, 1) + r(1, \xi, 1) - r(1, 1, \xi) + \xi(1, r).$$

Let us verify that $p \in \text{Ker}(\pi)$, i.e. that $p \in \mathcal{D}$. To this end, recall that the vector space $\mathcal{F}(E)(n)$ has a (natural, under the choice of $\xi \in E$) basis given by the set \mathcal{B}_n of full bracketings of the string $12 \dots n$. Using this basis, we have

$$\pi(\xi(r,1)) = (1(23))4 - ((12)3)4, \ \pi(r(\xi,1,1)) = (12)(34) - ((12)3)4$$
$$\pi(r(1,\xi,1)) = 1((23)4) - (1(23))4, \ \pi(r(1,1,\xi)) = 1(2(34)) - (12)(34)$$
$$\pi(\xi(1,r)) = 1(2(34)) - 1((23)4)$$

This implies that

$$\pi(p) = [(1(23))4 - ((12)3)4] - [(12)(34) - ((12)3)4] + [1((23)4) - (1(23))4] - [1(2(34)) - (12)(34)] + [1(2(34)) - 1(2(34))] = 0$$

A 'pictorial' description of this equality is given in [13, Example 3.12].

We will see later that p corresponds to the pentagon. We may prove, by a step-by-step repeating the arguments of the proof of [12, Theorem 3.1], that p generates the collection of coherence constraints C, as was in fact done in the last section of [13], but we derive this statement using the more sophisticated approach, as formulated in Theorem 1.1.

EXAMPLE 2.3. Let ζ be an independent variable and let E be the symmetric collection defined by

$$E(n) := \begin{cases} \operatorname{Span}(\zeta), & \text{for } n = 2, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

with the sign representation of Σ_2 on E(2). Let B_n be the free nonassociative anticommutative algebra on the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let B'_n denote the subset of B_n spanned by monomials in which each element of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ appears exactly once. Then $\mathcal{F}(E)(n) \cong B'_n$ for any $n \ge 1$, where $\mathcal{F}(E)$ is now the free symmetric operad on the collection E.

Let $\iota := [1[23]] + [2[31]] + [3[12]] \in \mathcal{F}(E)(3)$ and R be the symmetric collection generated by ι . Then $Lie := \langle E; R \rangle$ is the operad describing Lie algebras. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle$ be the element defined as

$$\ell := \iota(\zeta, 1, 1) + \iota(1, 1, \zeta) - \zeta(1, \iota) + \iota(1, 1, \zeta) \cdot T_{1342} + \zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2341} - \iota(\zeta, 1, 1) \cdot T_{1324} - \iota(1, 1, \zeta) \cdot T_{1324} + \zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2134} - \zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2314} + \iota(\zeta, 1, 1) \cdot T_{1342},$$

where $T_{i_1i_2i_3i_4} \in \Sigma_4$ denotes the permutation which sends (1234) to $(i_1i_2i_3i_4)$. Let us verify that $\ell \in \operatorname{Ker}(\pi)$. We have

$$(3) \begin{cases} \pi(\iota(\zeta,1,1)) &= [[12][34]] + [3[4[12]]] + [4[[12]3]] \\ \pi(\iota(1,1,\zeta)) &= [1[2[34]]] + [2[[34]1]] + [[34][12]] \\ \pi(\zeta(1,\iota)) &= [1[2[34]]] + [1[3[42]]] + [1[4[23]]] \\ \pi(\iota(1,1,\zeta) \cdot T_{1342}) &= [1[4[23]]] + [4[[23]1]] + [1[23][14]] \\ \pi(\zeta(1,\iota) \cdot T_{2341}) &= [4[1[23]]] + [4[2[31]]] + [4[3[12]]] \\ \pi(\iota(\zeta,1,1) \cdot T_{1324}) &= [[13][24]] + [2[4[13]]] + [4[[13]2]] \\ \pi(\iota(1,1,\zeta) \cdot T_{1324}) &= [1[3[24]]] + [3[[24]1]] + [4[[13]2]] \\ \pi(\iota(1,\iota) \cdot T_{2134}) &= [2[1[34]]] + [2[3[41]]] + [2[4[13]]] \\ \pi(\zeta(1,\iota) \cdot T_{2314}) &= [3[1[24]]] + [3[2[41]]] + [3[4[12]]] \\ \pi(\iota(\zeta,1,1) \cdot T_{1342}) &= [1[4][23]] + [2[3[14]]] + [3[4[12]]] \\ \pi(\iota(\zeta,1,1) \cdot T_{1342}) &= [1[4][23]] + [2[3[14]]] + [3[14]2]] \end{cases}$$

1

Observe that each monomial of B'_4 appears in the above equations exactly twice; the signs in the formula for ℓ are then chosen in such a way that the terms cancel with each other. This proves that $\pi(\ell) = 0$. We will see later that ℓ is the only coherence constraint for Lie algebras.

3. A homological description of coherence constraints

In this section we work with *graded* operads, i.e. with operads in the monoidal category of graded vector spaces. Let us recall some notions and results of [16, Section 3].

Let S be an operad. By a *differential* on S we mean a degree $-1 \mod d : S \to S$ of collections having the expected Leibniz property and satisfying $d^2 = 0$. As usual, a differential on the free operad $\mathcal{F}(E)$ is uniquely determined by its restriction to the space of generators E.

Suppose that we have a collection Z which decomposes as $Z = Z^0 \oplus Z^1 \oplus \cdots$ (meaning, of course, that for each $n \ge 2$ we have a Σ_n -invariant decomposition $Z(n) = Z^0(n) \oplus Z^1(n) \oplus \cdots$). This induces on $\mathcal{F}(Z)$ a grading, $\mathcal{F}(Z) = \bigoplus_{k\ge 0} \mathcal{F}(Z)^k$. We call this grading the *TJ-grading* (from Tate-Jozefiak) here; the reason will became obvious below.

In this situation the free operad $\mathcal{F}(Z)$ is naturally bigraded, $\mathcal{F}(Z) = \bigoplus \mathcal{F}(Z)_j^k$, where k refers to the TJ-grading introduced above and j indicates the 'inner' grading given by the grading of the underlying vector space.

Suppose that d is an (inner) degree -1 differential on $\mathcal{F}(Z)$ such that

(4)
$$d(Z^k) \subset \mathcal{F}(Z)^{k-1}, \text{ for all } k \ge 1$$

(meaning, of course, that $d(Z^k)(n) \subset \mathcal{F}(Z)^{k-1}(n)$ for all $n \geq 2$), i.e. that d is homogeneous degree -1 with respect to the TJ-grading. Then the homology operad $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}(Z), d)$ is naturally bigraded,

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}(Z), d) = \bigoplus \mathcal{H}_i^k(\mathcal{F}(Z), d)$$

the upper grading being induced by the TJ-grading and the lower one by the inner grading. In [16] the first author proved the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1. Let S be an operad. Then there exists a collection $Z = Z^0 \oplus Z^1 \oplus \cdots$, a differential d on $\mathcal{F}(Z)$ satisfying (4) and a map $\rho : (\mathcal{F}(Z), d) \to (S, 0)$ of differential operads such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) d is minimal in the sense that d(Z) consists of decomposable elements of the operad $\mathcal{F}(Z)$,
- (ii) $\rho|_{Z^{\geq 1}} = 0$ and ρ induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}^0(\rho) : \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(Z), d) \cong \mathcal{S}$, and (iii) $\mathcal{H}^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{F}(Z), d) = 0$.

We called the object $\rho : (\mathcal{F}(Z), d) \to (\mathcal{S}, 0)$ the *TJ-model* (or the *bigraded model*) of the operad \mathcal{S} . This object is an analog of the bigraded model of a commutative graded algebra constructed in [8, Section 3].

Let us recall that the suspension of a graded vector space $V = \bigoplus V_i$ is the graded vector space $\uparrow V$ defined by $(\uparrow V)_i = V_{i-1}$. The following proposition is obvious from the construction of the bigraded model described in [16]. PROPOSITION 3.2. Let \mathcal{P} be an operad and let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ be a minimal presentation. Let $(\mathcal{F}(Z), d)$ be a bigraded model of \mathcal{P} . Then there are the following isomorphisms of collections:

(5)
$$Z^0 \cong E, \ Z^1 \cong \uparrow R, \ Z^2 \cong \uparrow^2 \mathsf{C}$$

The most important for our purpose is, of course, the third equation of (5). We formulate the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.3. The collection $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ of coherence constraints of an operad \mathcal{P} is isomorphic to the double desuspension $\downarrow^2 Z^2$ of the collection of TJ-degree two indecomposables of the bigraded model of \mathcal{P} .

We say than an operad \mathcal{P} is *quadratic* if it has a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ such that E(n) = 0 for $n \neq 2$ and R(n) = 0 for $n \neq 3$. For a quadratic operad, there is a well defined notion of the Koszul quadratic dual [6], which is another operad, denoted by $\mathcal{P}^!$, constructed very explicitly from the presentation of \mathcal{P} . V. Ginzburg and M.M. Kapranov defined in [6] an extremely important notion of the Koszulness of an operad. It is a certain homological property analogous to the Koszulness of commutative algebras; operads sharing this property are called Koszul operads. The following proposition appeared in [16] as Proposition 2.6.

PROPOSITION 3.4. Let \mathcal{P} be a quadratic operad and suppose that \mathcal{P} is Koszul. Denote by $\mathcal{P}^!$ its Koszul dual. Then we have, for each $n \geq 1$, the following isomorphism of Σ_n -modules:

$$Z^{i}(n) \cong \begin{cases} 0, & n \neq i+2\\ \operatorname{sgn} \otimes \uparrow^{(n-2)}(\mathcal{P}^{!}(n))^{*}, & n=i+2 \end{cases}$$

where sgn denotes the one-dimensional signum representation and $(-)^*$ the vector space dual, with the transposed action.

Combining Proposition 3.4 with Corollary 3.3 we get, for Koszul operads, a Σ_4 -equivariant isomorphism

$$\mathsf{C}_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathsf{C}_{P}(4) \cong \operatorname{sgn} \otimes \mathcal{P}^{!}(4)$$

which proves Theorem 1.1 from the introduction.

Define the generating function $g_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ of an operad \mathcal{P} to be the formal power series

$$g_{\mathcal{P}}(x) := \sum_{n \ge 1} \frac{\dim(\mathcal{P}(n))}{n!} x^n$$

As it follows from [6], if \mathcal{P} is Koszul, then

$$g_{\mathcal{P}}(-g_{\mathcal{P}^!}(-x)) = x$$

It is easy to verify that the same formula holds also for a non- $\Sigma \mathcal{P}$ if we drop the n! from the definition of the generating function. The formula above enables one to express, for a Koszul operad \mathcal{P} , the dimension dim($\mathcal{P}^{!}(4)$) via dim($\mathcal{P}(2)$), dim($\mathcal{P}(3)$) and dim($\mathcal{P}(4)$). We formulate the following easy, but very useful proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.5. Suppose that \mathcal{P} is a non- Σ Koszul operad. Then

$$\dim(\mathsf{C}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \dim(\mathcal{P}(4)) + 5\dim(\mathcal{P}(2))[\dim(\mathcal{P}(2))^2 - \dim(\mathcal{P}(3))]$$

If \mathcal{P} is symmetric, then

$$\dim(\mathsf{C}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \dim(\mathcal{P}(4)) + 5\dim(\mathcal{P}(2))[3\dim(\mathcal{P}(2))^2 - 2\dim(\mathcal{P}(3))].$$

The proposition enables one to determine the number of coherence constraints without having explicit description of the Koszul dual operad; this will be helpful in Example 5.6.

4. TA-STRUCTURES

As we already observed in the introduction, it is not always true that the coherence relations can be presented by a nice (ordinary) graph, such as the associahedron in the associative case, but there always exists a *bipartite* graph, related to the governing operad.

A bipartite graph with at most one edge connecting any two vertices can be described by a quadruple, $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}', \omega, \omega')$, where \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' partition the set of vertices and $\omega : \mathcal{V}' \to 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\omega' : \mathcal{V} \to 2^{\mathcal{V}'}$ are maps such that, for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v' \in \mathcal{V}'$,

$$v \in \omega(v') \iff v' \in \omega'(v).$$

The meaning of the above equivalence becomes clear if we interpret $\omega(v')$ (resp. $\omega'(v)$) as the set of vertices in \mathcal{V} (resp. \mathcal{V}') which are connected with v' (resp. v) by an edge.

Associated to any quadratic operad $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ there is a series of naturally defined bipartite graphs, $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}} = \{\mathcal{T}(n)\}_{n \geq 4}$. Recall that J denoted the free $\mathcal{F}(E)$ -module on $R, \pi: J \to (R)$ was the canonical epimorphism and $\mathcal{D} := \operatorname{Ker}(\pi)/\mathcal{O}$, see Section 2. Let $n \geq 4$. Fix a basis (v_1, \ldots, v_b) (resp. (r_1, \ldots, r_s)) of $\mathcal{F}(E)(n)$ (resp. of $J(n) = \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(n)$). Then let $\mathcal{V}(n) :=$ $\{1, \ldots, b\}$ and $\mathcal{V}'(n) := \{1, \ldots, s\}$. The choice of the basis (v_1, \ldots, v_b) induces on \mathcal{V} an obvious scalar product $\langle -|-\rangle$ with respect to which it is orthonormal. For $i \in \mathcal{V}(n)$ and $j \in \mathcal{V}'(n)$, let

$$\omega_n(j) := \{i \in \mathcal{V}(n); \langle v_i | \pi(r_j) \rangle \neq 0\}$$

$$\omega'_n(i) := \{j \in \mathcal{V}'(n); \langle v_i | \pi(r_j) \rangle \neq 0\}$$

Then $\mathcal{T}(n) := (\mathcal{V}(n), \mathcal{V}'(n), \omega_n, \omega'_n)$ is a bipartite graph and the sequence $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}} = {\mathcal{T}(n)}_{n \ge 4}$ is called the *TA-structure* of \mathcal{P} . Observe that, strictly speaking, the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}$ depends on the choice of the bases.

The TA-structure $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}', \omega, \omega')$ may be described by a simple graph if $\operatorname{card}(\omega(v')) = 2$ for any $v' \in \mathcal{V}'$ or conversely if $\operatorname{card}(\omega'(v)) = 2$ for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$. In the first case we can define a new graph with edges labeled by the elements of \mathcal{V}' , and vertices labeled by the elements of \mathcal{V} and conversely in the second case. When this occurs we say that the TA-structure is graphlike and call the graph corresponding graph $G(\mathcal{T})$ the *Tel-A-graph*.

We formulate now a statement claiming that TA-structures of algebras whose axioms are given by commutative diagrams are always graph-like. We need first to formalize the notion of 'being given by commutative diagrams' in terms of operads. In our approach, an operad is given by commutative diagrams if and only if it is a **k**-linearization of an operad defined over the category of sets. This works fine in the non- Σ situation, otherwise one should be careful about the action of the symmetric group. Thus speaking about operads defined by commutative diagrams, we always mean non- Σ operads. As all interesting examples we know are non- Σ (except for the operad *Comm* for commutative algebras which can be handled separately), this restriction is not really serious.

The notion of an operad makes sense in any symmetric monoidal category. While we considered our operads in the category **k-Vect** of (graded) vector spaces, we may as well consider operads in the monoidal category **Sets** of sets, with the multiplication given by the cartesian product. If \mathcal{L} is such a **Sets**-operad, we can form the collection $\mathbf{k}[\mathcal{L}] = {\mathbf{k}[\mathcal{L}](n)}_{n\geq 1}$, where $\mathbf{k}[\mathcal{L}](n) := \mathbf{k}[\mathcal{L}(n)]$ is the **k**-vector space spanned by $\mathcal{L}(n)$. This collection has an obvious **k-Vect**-operad structure induced by the **Sets**-operad structure of \mathcal{L} . The following definition is due to Tom Fox.

DEFINITION 4.1. Let \mathcal{P} be a non- Σ operad. We say that \mathcal{P} is defined by commutative diagrams if there exists a **Sets**-operad \mathcal{L} and an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{k}[\mathcal{L}] \cong \mathcal{P}$$

of k-Vect-operads.

The intuitive meaning of the definition is the following. The operad \mathcal{L} can be presented as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{S}}/\sim$; here $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{S}}$ is a free **Sets**-operad and \sim is an equivalence relation. The relation \sim is given by a list of couples of elements which are identified by it. Each such an identification corresponds to a commutative diagram of the corresponding maps. Alternatively, we might say that the possibility of a reduction to **Sets** derived from the choice of a special basis, a generating set such that all relations are equivalences of elements in the 'tree component' of the free operad. This is essentially the same as the equivalence of two paths in a diagram.

Suppose that $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ is a quadratic operad defined by commutative diagrams and suppose that the operad \mathcal{L} and the isomorphism of (6) is fixed once for all. Define a **Sets**-collection L by

$$L(n) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(2), & \text{for } n = 2, \text{ and} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $M := \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{S}}(L)$ is the free **Sets**-operad on L, then obviously $\mathcal{F}(E) = \mathbf{k}[M]$ and M(n) forms a basis for $\mathcal{F}(E)(n)$, for each $n \geq 2$. It also follows from our hypothesis that there exists a basis N(3) of R such that each $r \in N(3)$ is of the form p - q, for some $p, q \in M(3)$. Let $N \subset \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle$ be the **Sets**-*M*-submodule generated by N(3). The set N(n) obviously forms a basis of $\mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(n)$ for each $n \geq 3$.

Readers familiar with the description of free operads via trees [15] may observe that M(n)is the set of planar connected rooted *n*-trees whose vertices are 'colored' by elements of $\mathcal{L}(2)$. Similarly, N(n) can be understood as the set of *n*-trees with vertices colored by elements of $\mathcal{L}(2)$ except exactly one which is colored by an element of N(3).

PROPOSITION 4.2. Suppose that \mathcal{P} is a quadratic operad defined by commutative diagrams in the sense of Definition 4.1. Then the TA-structures $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ are graphlike, for any $n \geq 4$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.2. The fact that \mathcal{P} is defined by commutative diagrams means that each $\pi(r)$, for $r \in N(3)$, is of the form p - q for some $p, q \in M(3)$. By an easy induction, for each $n \geq 3$ and $r \in N(n)$, $\pi(r)$ is of the form p - q for some $p, q \in M(n)$. If we choose $\mathcal{V}(n) := M(n)$ and $\mathcal{V}'(n) := N(n)$ in the definition of $\mathcal{T}(n) = (\mathcal{V}(n), \mathcal{V}'(n), \omega_n, \omega'_n)$, then $\mathcal{T}(n)$ is obviously graphlike. Q.E.D.

PROPOSITION 4.3. Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ be a quadratic operad defined by commutative diagrams and let $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathcal{T}(n) = (\mathcal{V}(n), \mathcal{V}'(n), \omega_n, \omega'_n)\}_{n \geq 4}$ be the corresponding (graphlike) TA-structure. Then each closed path γ of the Tel-A-graph $\mathsf{G}(n) = \mathsf{G}(\mathcal{T}(n))$ determines, in a natural way, an element $\tau(\gamma) \in \mathcal{D}(n) = \operatorname{Ker}(\pi : J(n) \to \mathcal{F}(E)(n))$. If we interpret the graph G as a 1-dimensional CWcomplex, then this correspondence defines a natural isomorphism of abelian groups:

(7)
$$H_1(\mathsf{G}(n)) \cong \mathcal{D}(n)$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{V}(n) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_b\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}'(n) = \{r_1, \ldots, r_s\}$) be as in the proof of Proposition 4.2. We know that, for each $l \leq j \leq s$, we have $\pi(r_j) = v_{a_j} - v_{b_j}$ for some $1 \leq a_j, b_j \leq b$. Suppose we have a closed path γ

$$\gamma: v_{c_1} \longrightarrow v_{c_2} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow v_{c_k} = v_{c_1}$$

in G(n). This means that, for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, either $c_j = a_j$ and $c_{j+1} = b_j$ (in this case define $\epsilon_j := +1$) or $c_j = b_j$ and $c_{j+1} = a_j$ (in this case define $\epsilon_j := -1$). Then obviously $\tau(\gamma) := \epsilon_1 \cdot r_{j_1} + \cdots + \epsilon_k \cdot r_{j_k} \in \text{Ker}(\pi)$. Formula (7) then follows from an easy combinatorics. Q.E.D.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ be a quadratic operad. We have the following two useful formulas (one for the non- Σ , one for the symmetric case) computing the size of the first TA-structure $\mathcal{T}(4) = (\mathcal{V}(4), \mathcal{E}(4), \epsilon_4, \omega_4)$.

(8)
$$\dim(\mathcal{V}(4)) = 5\dim(E)^3, \ \dim(\mathcal{V}'(4)) = 5\dim(E)\dim(R) \qquad \text{(the non-}\Sigma \text{ case)}$$

(9) $\dim(\mathcal{V}(4)) = 15 \dim(E)^3$, $\dim(\mathcal{V}'(4)) = 10 \dim(E) \dim(R)$ (the symmetric case)

Summing up the above results, we see for a Koszul operad \mathcal{P} the following nice formula which relates the topological properties of the graph G(4) and the algebraic properties of the operad \mathcal{P} :

$$\dim(\mathsf{C}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \dim(\mathcal{P}^!(4)) = \dim(H_1(\mathsf{G}(4))).$$

It is possible to derive similar formulas for $\mathcal{T}(n)$ with arbitrary n, but only the case n = 4 is important for us.

5. Back to the classical form of coherence theorems

In this section we will deal with $non-\Sigma$ operads given by commutative diagrams, in the sense of Definition 4.1. All results could be easily modified to cover also the symmetric case, but we will not need this generality.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ be such an operad and let $M(2) = \{e_1, \ldots, e_g\} \subset E$ and $N(3) = \{c_1, \ldots, c_t\} \subset R$ be the preferred bases. By definition, $c_j = p_j - q_j$ for some $p_j, q_j \in M(3), 1 \leq j \leq t$. We use this notation throughout the section.

An *E*-multiplication on a category \mathcal{C} is simply a sequence $\{\Box_i = \Box(e_i) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}\}_{1 \leq i \leq g}$ of covariant bifunctors. Observe that, given an *E*-multiplication on \mathcal{C} , each element $m \in M(n)$ determines, in a natural way, a covariant *n*-functor $\Box(m) : \mathcal{C}^{\times n} \to \mathcal{C}$.

DEFINITION 5.1. Let C be a category with an E-multiplication. A \mathcal{P} -structure on C consists of a sequence of natural transformations $\{a_j = a(c_j) : \Box(p_j) \to \Box(q_j)\}_{1 \leq j \leq t}$, such that each $a_j(A, B, C) : \Box(p_j)(A, B, C) \to \Box(q_j)(A, B, C)$ has a two-sided inverse in C for any $A, B, C \in C$.

Let $m \in N(n) \subset \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(n)$. We know that $\pi(m) = p-q$ for some $p, q \in M(n)$. A \mathcal{P} -structure (\Box_i, a_j) on the category \mathcal{C} determines, in an obvious natural way, the natural transformation $a(m) : \Box(p) \to \Box(q)$. In the same manner, each closed path $\gamma \in \mathsf{G}(\mathcal{T}(n))$ determines a diagram $D(\gamma)$ of transformations of functors (compare Proposition 4.3). We say that a \mathcal{P} -structure (\Box_i, a_j) on the category \mathcal{C} is *coherent* if all these diagrams are commutative. We have the following 'classical' coherence theorem.

THEOREM 5.2. A \mathcal{P} -structure (\Box_i, a_j) on the category \mathcal{C} is coherent if and only if the diagrams $D(\gamma)$ are commutative for all γ with $\tau(\gamma) \in C_{\mathcal{P}}$. In particular, if \mathcal{P} is Koszul, then \mathcal{C} is coherent if and only if the diagrams $D(\gamma)$ are commutative for all closed paths γ in $G(\mathcal{T}(4))$.

PROPOSITION 5.3. Let $n \ge 4$ and let $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d\}$ be a sequence of closed paths of the graph G(n) forming a basis of $H_1(G(\mathcal{T}(n)))$. Then the diagram $D(\gamma)$ is commutative for any closed path γ of G(n) if and only if it is commutative for any $\gamma \in \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d\}$. In particular, coherence constraints for a Koszul operad can be represented by dim $(\mathcal{P}^!(4))$ -diagrams which correspond to a choice of a basis of $H_1(G(\mathcal{T}(4)))$.

EXAMPLE 5.4. (continuation of Example 2.2) The non- Σ operad Ass for associative algebras is Koszul and Ass = Ass[!], therefore $C_{Ass} = Ass(4) = \text{Span}(p)$, where p must be the element constructed in Example 2.2 – there is no other choice! We get from (8) that dim($\mathcal{V}(4)$) = dim($\mathcal{V}'(4)$) = 5, and $G(\mathcal{T}(4))$ is the pentagon. An Ass-structure on a category \mathcal{C} is the same as a multiplication on \mathcal{C} with an associativity isomorphism as it was discussed in the introduction. The coherence of (\mathcal{C}, \Box, a) in the sense of the above definitions coincides with Mac Lane's definition, and Theorem 5.2 gives Mac Lane's celebrated coherence result.

Let us mention a typical source of examples of categories with an Ass-structure, due to [3]. Consider a unital, associative, not necessary coassociative, bialgebra $A = (V, \cdot, \Delta)$ together with an invertible element $\Phi \in V^{\otimes 3}$ such that

(10)
$$(1 \otimes \Delta) \Delta \cdot \Phi = \Phi \cdot (\Delta \otimes 1) \Delta,$$

where we use the dot \cdot to indicate both the (associative) multiplication on V and the induced multiplication on $V^{\otimes 3}$. Let \mathcal{C} be the category of left (V, \cdot) -modules. Define a multiplication $\Box: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ by saying that $X \Box Y = X \otimes Y$ as vector spaces, with the (V, \cdot) -module structure defined by $a(x \otimes y) := \sum a_{(1)}x \otimes a_{(2)}y$, with the usual Sweedler notation $\Delta(a) = \sum a_{(1)} \otimes a_{(2)}$. The associativity isomorphism $a: \Box(\mathbb{1} \times \Box) \to \Box(\Box \times \mathbb{1})$ is then defined by $a(x \otimes y \otimes z) :=$ $\sum \Phi_1^{-1}x \otimes \Phi_2^{-1}y \otimes \Phi_3^{-1}z$, with $\Phi^{-1} = \sum \Phi_1^{-1} \otimes \Phi_2^{-1} \otimes \Phi_3^{-1}$. Generally speaking, the Ass-structure on \mathcal{C} need not be coherent. On the other hand, there is only one coherence constraint – the pentagon – whose commutativity means that

(11)
$$(\mathbb{1}^2 \otimes \Delta)(\Phi) \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^2)(\Phi) = (1 \otimes \Phi) \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Phi) \cdot (\Phi \otimes 1).$$

If the equation above is satisfied, the object $A = (V, \cdot, \Delta, \Phi)$ is a special quantum group called *quasi-Hopf algebra* or *Drinfel'd algebra*.

EXAMPLE 5.5. Let us discuss the algebraic structure consisting of a vector space V and two bilinear maps $\circ, \bullet: V \otimes V \to V$ which satisfy

$$a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c, \qquad a \circ (b \bullet c) = (a \circ b) \bullet c$$
$$a \bullet (b \circ c) = (a \bullet b) \circ c, \qquad a \bullet (b \bullet c) = (a \bullet b) \bullet c$$

These algebras were introduced in [16] and called *nonsymmetric Poisson algebras*. The corresponding operad \mathcal{K} is Koszul, Koszul self-dual (see again [16]) and it obviously has a quadratic presentation $\mathcal{K} = \langle E; R \rangle$ with $\dim(E) = 2$ and $\dim(R) = 4$. We can easily compute that $\dim(\mathcal{K}(n)) = 2^{n-1}$, therefore $\dim(C_{\mathcal{K}}) = 8$. Formula (9) then gives $\dim(\mathcal{V}(4)) = \dim(\mathcal{E}(4)) = 40$. The graph $\mathsf{G}(\mathcal{T}(4))$ consists of eight pentagons, see Figure 4.



Figure 4: The graph $G(\mathcal{T}(4))$ for nonsymmetric Poisson algebras. The triple $(*_1, *_2, *_3)$ runs through all eight possible combinations (\circ, \circ, \circ) , (\bullet, \circ, \circ) , (\circ, \bullet, \circ) , (\circ, \circ, \bullet) , (\circ, \circ, \bullet) , $(\bullet, \circ, \bullet)$, $(\bullet,$

A \mathcal{K} structure on a category \mathcal{C} consists of two covariant bifunctors $\Box_1, \Box_2 : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ and four natural transformations

$$a_{11}: \Box_1(\mathbb{1} \times \Box_1) \to \Box_1(\Box_1 \times \mathbb{1}), \qquad a_{12}: \Box_1(\mathbb{1} \times \Box_2) \to \Box_2(\Box_1 \times \mathbb{1})$$
$$a_{21}: \Box_2(\mathbb{1} \times \Box_1) \to \Box_1(\Box_2 \times \mathbb{1}), \qquad a_{22}: \Box_2(\mathbb{1} \times \Box_2) \to \Box_2(\Box_2 \times \mathbb{1})$$

This structure is a variant of a *weakly distributive category* [2, Definition 1.1]. These categories are important for linear logic; we will discuss the applications of our theory to this direction in another paper. By Theorem 5.2, such a \mathcal{K} -structure is coherent if and only if the eight pentagonal diagrams depicted on Figure 5 commute.



Figure 5: Coherence constraints for nonsymmetric Poisson algebras. The triple (a, b, c) is one of eight possible combinations (1, 1, 1), (2, 1, 1), (1, 2, 1), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 2), (2, 1, 2), (2, 2, 1) and (2, 2, 2).

The 'nonsymmetric Poisson' analog of a Drinfel'd algebra from Example 5.4 is the object $A = (V, \cdot, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Phi_{11}, \Phi_{12}, \Phi_{21}, \Phi_{22})$ such that (V, \cdot, Δ_i) is, for i = 1, 2, an associative unital Hopf algebra, $\Phi_{ij} \in V^{\otimes 3}$ and invertible element with

$$(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta_i) \Delta_j \cdot \Phi_{ij} = \Phi_{ij} \cdot (\Delta_j \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta_i,$$

 $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, and the equation

$$(\mathbb{1}^2 \otimes \Delta_c)(\Phi_{ab}) \cdot (\Delta_a \otimes \mathbb{1}^2)(\Phi_{bc}) = (1 \otimes \Phi_{bc}) \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta_b \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Phi_{ac}) \cdot (\Phi_{ab} \otimes \mathbb{1}).$$

is satisfied for $a, b, c \in \{1, 2\}$.

EXAMPLE 5.6. Let us discuss the following rather peculiar objects introduced by Loday in [11]. The importance of this example is that some coherence constraints *will not be the pentagons*.

By a *digebra* we mean a vector space V together with two bilinear operations \circ and \bullet which are supposed to satisfy the following axioms:

$$x \circ (y \circ z) = (x \circ y) \circ z = x \circ (y \bullet z)$$
$$(x \bullet y) \circ z = x \bullet (y \circ z)$$
$$(x \circ y) \bullet z = x \bullet (y \bullet z) = (x \bullet y) \bullet z$$

Let \mathcal{D} be the corresponding non- Σ operad. It has obviously a quadratic presentation $\mathcal{D} = \langle E; R \rangle$ with dim(E) = 2 and dim(R) = 5, and formula (9) gives that dim $(\mathcal{V}(4)) = 40$ and dim $(\mathcal{V}'(4)) =$ 50. As it was proven in [11], the operad \mathcal{D} is Koszul. It is also easy to compute dim $(\mathcal{D}(n)) = n$, and Proposition 3.5 says that dim $(C_{\mathcal{D}}) = 14$. The graph = G(4) is rather complicated (it has 40 vertices and 50 edges!), but we know, by Proposition 5.3, that there exist 14 closed cycles in G(4) which generate the coherence constraints. These cycles are shown on Figure 6.

We leave to the reader to formulate explicitly what a \mathcal{D} -structure on a category is and to describe, using Figure 6, the coherence constraints. The reader may also try to derive the axioms of a 'digebraic' analog of Drinfel'd algebra. Especially the equations corresponding to squares and hexagons are quite picturesque.

6. Quantum Algebras

Recall that a \mathcal{P} -algebra structure on a vector space U is an operad map $A : \mathcal{P} \to \operatorname{End}(U)$, where End(U) is the ordinary endomorphism operad of U [18], and all structures are considered in the category of **k**-vector spaces. We want to investigate extensions of these structures assuming that U is a left module over an algebra $V = (V, \cdot)$, by decorating the axioms with coefficients from (tensor powers of) V. This includes the possibility of "quantizing" the \mathcal{P} -algebra when the coefficient algebra V is deformed to a quantized version.

EXAMPLE 6.1. Suppose that U has a k-linear multiplication $*: U \otimes U \to U$. We want to consider a relaxed form of the usual associativity

(12)
$$a * (b * c) = (a * b) * c.$$



Figure 6: The graph $G(\mathcal{T}(4))$ for digebras. It consists of four pentagons (the triple $(*_1, *_2, *_3)$ runs through (\circ, \circ, \circ) , (\bullet, \circ, \circ) , (\bullet, \circ, \circ) and $(\bullet, \bullet, \bullet)$), four squares and six hexagons.

Suppose that U is a left $V = (V, \cdot)$ -module and replace (12) by

(13)
$$\Psi(a * (b * c)) = \Xi((a * b) * c)$$

where $\Psi, \Xi \in V^{\otimes 3}$ are invertible elements and $\Psi(a * (b * c)) := \sum (\Psi_1 a * (\Psi_2 b * \Psi_3 c))$, if $\Psi = \sum \Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2 \otimes \Psi_3$; similarly for $\Xi((a * b) * c)$. Since we assume the invertibility of Ψ and Ξ , we may multiply (13) from the left by Ξ^{-1} and write it in the *normalized form* as

(14)
$$\Phi(a * (b * c)) = ((a * b) * c),$$

with $\Phi = \Xi^{-1} \cdot \Psi$. We also need a rule to expand higher instances of the axiom (14). For example, we need to know what to do with $\Phi_2(b_1 * b_2)$ in the expression

$$\Phi(a * ((b_1 * b_2) * c)) = \sum \Phi_1 a * (\Phi_2(b_1 * b_2) * \Phi_3 c) = ((a * (b_1 * b_2)) * c) * c)$$

The most natural way to describe such identities is to assume that we have a 'comultiplication' $\Delta: V \to V \otimes V$ and write

(15)
$$\Phi_2(b_1 * b_2) := \Delta(\Phi_2)(b_1 * b_2),$$

where, of course, $\Delta(\Phi_2)(b_1 * b_2)$ is an abbreviation for $\sum \Phi_{2(1)}b_1 * \Phi_{2(2)}b_2$ in the Sweedler notation $\Delta(\Phi_2) = \sum \Phi_{2(1)} \otimes \Phi_{2(2)}$. The map Δ must induce a V-module structure on higher tensor powers of U, thus Δ must be *compatible with the multiplication* \cdot on V. This means that $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta)$ is a (not necessary coassociative) bialgebra. Equation (15) forces the V-linearity of the operation * on U:

(16)
$$v(a * b) = \Delta(v)(a * b) (:= \sum (v_{(1)}a * v_{(2)}b)), \text{ for } v \in V \text{ and } a, b \in U.$$

If we act on both sides of (14) by a $v \in V$, an iterated use of the V-linearity of * gives

$$(\mathbbm{1}\otimes\Delta)\Delta(v)\cdot\Phi(a\ast(b\ast c))=(\Delta\otimes\mathbbm{1})\Delta(v)\cdot((a\ast b)\ast c),$$

while (14) applied on $(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})\Delta(v) \cdot ((a * b) * c)$ gives

$$\Phi^{-1} \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta(v)((a * b) * c) = (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta(v)(a * (b * c)).$$

These two equations imply that, for each $a, b, c \in U$ and $v \in V$,

$$(\Phi^{-1} \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta) \Delta(v) \cdot \Phi)(a \ast (b \ast c)) = (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta(v)(a \ast (b \ast c))$$

In order not to introduce completely new relations (which is necessary for flatness in the case of deformations), we assume that,

(17)
$$\Phi^{-1} \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta) \Delta \cdot \Phi = (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta,$$

which is (10). In length 4, we get from (14) that, for $x, y, z, u \in U$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} ((x*y)*z)*u &=& (\Delta \otimes 1\!\!1^2)(\Phi) \cdot ((x*y)*(z*u)) \\ (x*y)*(z*u) &=& (1\!\!1^2 \otimes \Delta)(\Phi) \cdot (x*(y*(z*u))) \\ ((x*y)*z)*u &=& (\Phi \otimes 1) \cdot (((x*(y*z))*u)) \\ (x*(y*z))*u &=& (1\!\!1 \otimes \Delta \otimes 1\!\!1)(\Phi) \cdot (x*((y*z)*u)) \\ x*((y*z)*u) &=& (1 \otimes \Phi) \cdot (x*(y*(z*u))). \end{array}$$

These equations imply, for example, that

(18)
$$P \cdot (x * (y * (z * u))) = (x * (y * (z * u))) \text{ for any } x, y, z, u \in U,$$

where

$$P = \{(\Phi \otimes 1) \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Phi) \cdot (1 \otimes \Phi)\}^{-1} \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^2)(\Phi) \cdot (\mathbb{1}^2 \otimes \Delta)(\Phi).$$

To avoid the unexpected axiom, we must assume that P = 1, which is the pentagon identity (11). We are thus led back to a Drinfel'd algebra (V, \cdot, Δ, Φ) .

Our general strategy of relaxing axioms is the following. Heuristically, axioms of an algebraic structure are given by a system of equations

(19)
$$0 = T_1^i + \dots + T_{k_i}^i, \ 1 \le N,$$

which has to be satisfied for any algebra of this type. We would like to 'perturb' the axioms, introducing coefficients from $V^{\otimes *}$, i.e. replacing (19) by

(20)
$$0 = v_i^1 \cdot T_1^i + \dots + v_i^{k_i} \cdot T_{k_i}^i, \ 1 \le N_i$$

for some coefficient system $\mathbf{v} = (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_N)$. There are two obvious conditions which reduce the freedom of the choice of the coefficients \mathbf{v} . First, assuming that all v_i^1 's are invertible, we may normalize the axioms (20) so that $v_i^1 = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. This we already saw in Example 6.1. Second, in the symmetric case, it is reasonably to assume that the ideal generated by equations (20) is invariant under the action of the symmetric group. We will see how this reduction works in Example 6.2.

EXAMPLE 6.2. Suppose we have, as in Example 6.1, a left module U over a unital, not necessarily coassociative bialgebra $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta)$. We would like to have a 'quantized' form of a Lie algebra structure on U. First, we replace the strict anticommutativity

$$[x,y] = -[y,x]$$

by introducing an 'R-matrix' $\mathcal{R} = \sum \mathcal{R}_1 \otimes \mathcal{R}_2 \in V^{\otimes 2}$ and postulating that

(21)
$$[x,y] = -\mathcal{R}_{21}[y,x],$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{21} = \sum \mathcal{R}_2 \otimes \mathcal{R}_1$. Using (21) twice we get that

$$[x,y] = (\mathcal{R}_{21} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{12})[x,y].$$

To avoid this unexpected axiom, we must assume the 'triangularity'

$$\mathcal{R}_{21} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{12} = 1.$$

Let us decorate the Jacobi identity by introducing invertible coefficient $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3 \in V^{\otimes 3}$ and requiring that

$$0 = \Psi_1[x, [y, z]] + \Psi_2[y, [z, x]] + \Psi_3[z, [x, y]].$$

Lengthy, but straightforward calculation show that the Σ_3 -invariance of this axiom means that we may assume that, after a normalization,

$$\Psi_1 = 1, \ \Psi_2 = \Phi \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathcal{R}_{21}) \text{ and } \Psi_3 = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta)(\mathcal{R}_{21})\Phi_{312}^{-1},$$

for some invertible $\Phi \in V^{\otimes 3}$. Here, as usual, $\Phi = \sum \Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2 \otimes \Phi_3$ and we accept the convention that, for $\sigma \in \Sigma_3$, $\Phi_{\sigma(1)\sigma(2)\sigma(3)}$ means $\sum \Phi_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \Phi_{\sigma(2)} \otimes \Phi_{\sigma(3)}$. Another, very explicit way to write this identity is

(22)
$$[x, [y, z]] + [y', [z', x']] + [z'', [x'', y'']] = 0$$

for any $x, y, z \in U$, where

$$(x', y', z') := \Phi_{312}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta)(\mathcal{R}) \cdot (x, y, z) = ((\Phi_3 R_1) \cdot x, (\Phi_1 R_{2(1)}) \cdot y, (\Phi_2 R_{2(2)}) \cdot z), \text{ and} (x'', y'', z'') := (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathcal{R}) \Phi_{123}^{-1} \cdot (x, y, z) = ((R_{1(1)}(\Phi_1^{-1})) \cdot x, (R_{1(2)}(\Phi_2^{-1})) \cdot y, (R_2(\Phi_3^{-1})) \cdot z).$$

By further analyzing the axioms we infer that $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta, \Phi, \mathcal{R})$ must be a triangular quasi-Hopf algebra, except, maybe, the pentagon. These quantized Lie algebras were introduced under the name generalized Lie algebras by D.I. Gurevich [7]. We will see later that the pentagon identity for Φ is a consequence of some natural coherence requirements for this structure.

In the rest of this section we suppose that $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta)$ is a fixed unital, associative, not necessarily coassociative bialgebra. Let us try to formalize our procedure a bit. For a quadratic operad $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ and $n \geq 1$ we have the basic exact sequence of **k**-vector spaces, which defines \mathcal{P} as a quotient of the free operad generated by E,

(23)
$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker}(\pi)(n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(n) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{F}(E)(n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(n) \longrightarrow 0.$$

This identifies $\mathcal{P}(n)$ to $\operatorname{Coker}(\pi)(n)$.

We now define an analog of this sequence which brings V into play and allows us to consider generalized coherence conditions. Let us discuss the non- Σ case first. [December 5, 1997]

We already observed in Section 4 that elements of $\mathcal{F}(E)(n)$ are represented by a sum of planar rooted binary trees with vertices labeled by elements of E. Such a labeled binary tree t determines uniquely a bracketing $b = b_t$ of n indeterminates or, equivalently, a particular non-associative n-fold tensor product which is the codomain of an iterated comultiplication denoted $\Delta^{n,b}$. Form the V-relative free operad $\mathcal{F}_V(E)$ as follows:

(24)
$$\mathcal{F}_{V}(E) = \bigoplus_{n \ge 1} \mathcal{F}_{V}(E)(n), \text{ with } \mathcal{F}_{V}(E)(n) := \mathcal{F}(E)(n) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} V^{\otimes n}.$$

Each $\mathcal{F}_V(E)(n)$ has an obvious right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module structure. We give it a left V-module structure by defining

(25)
$$v \cdot (t \otimes \vec{u}) = t \otimes \Delta^{n, b_t}(v) \vec{u}, \ \vec{u} = u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n \in V^{\otimes n}$$

Given $t \otimes \vec{v} \in \mathcal{F}_V(E)(n)$, where $\vec{v} = v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n$, the 'operadic' composition of this element with the tensor product of *n* elements $t_i \otimes \vec{v}_i \in \mathcal{F}_V(E)(a_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots n$, is defined as

$$\gamma((t \otimes \vec{v}); (t_1 \otimes \vec{v}_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (t_n \otimes \vec{v}_n)) := t(t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n) \otimes \Delta^{a_1, b_{t_1}}(v_1) \vec{v}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \Delta^{a_n, b_{t_n}}(v_n) \vec{v}_n,$$

where $t(t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n)$ is the composition of trees by "grafting". Heuristically, we can say that the composition moves the interior coefficients v_i across the tree t_i using the comultiplication $\Delta^{a_i,b_{t_i}}$. Clearly this defines on $\mathcal{F}_V(E)$ the structure of a non- Σ operad. In degree n it is a free right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module on the **k**-linear space $\mathcal{F}(E)(n)$.

In the symmetric case we define the right action of the symmetric group on $\mathcal{F}_V(E)$ by

$$[t \otimes (u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_n)]\sigma = t\sigma \otimes (u_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes u_{\sigma(n)}),$$

for $t \otimes \vec{u} \in \mathcal{F}_V(E)(n)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$. This should be compared to the construction of [6, pages 212-213], where the free operad on a collection $\{E(n), n \geq 2\}$ is defined under the assumption that each E(n) is a left K- right $K^{\otimes n}$ -module satisfying the compatibility condition (which we write in the form compatible with our conventions)

$$(a \otimes (\lambda_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \lambda_n))\sigma = a \cdot \sigma \otimes (\lambda_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \lambda_{\sigma(n)}), \text{ for } \sigma \in \Sigma_n, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in K.$$

The tensor products in the Ginzburg-Kapranov definition are taken over K, using the right $K^{\otimes n}$ structure and the compatibility condition. The difference here is that we use the comultiplication
to move coefficients across the tree so that the internal tensor products can be considered over **k** and the coefficients in V occur only on the inputs, in contrast to Figure 4 on page 213 of [6].

We want to consider changing the relations R defining \mathcal{P} by introducing coefficients from $V^{\otimes 3}$. The particular choice of coefficients might involve the associator Φ as in (14) of Example 6.1 or also an 'R-matrix' \mathcal{R} as in Example 6.2, but not necessarily. We use the symbol $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ to indicate the new relations depending on the tuple of coefficients $\mathbf{v} = (\vec{v}_1, \ldots, \vec{v}_N), \ \vec{v}_i \in V^{\otimes 3}$. We have the following V-relative analog of (23), which has to be understood as defining the V-relative version $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ of the operad \mathcal{P} :

(26)
$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker}(\pi_{\mathbf{v}})(n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{V}(E)\langle R_{\mathbf{v}}\rangle(n) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathbf{v}}} \mathcal{F}_{V}(E)(n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}(n) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Suppose that the algebra V is augmented over **k** and that $\epsilon^{\otimes 3}(v_j^i) = 1$ for all components of the coefficient vector **v**. The augmentation map $\epsilon : V \to \mathbf{k}$ has natural extensions (denoted by the same symbol) to maps $\epsilon : \mathcal{F}_V(E)(n) \to \mathcal{F}(E)(n)$ and $\epsilon : \mathcal{F}_V(E)\langle R_{\mathbf{v}} \rangle \to \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(n)$, and clearly $\epsilon(\pi_{\mathbf{v}}) = \pi$. Applying ϵ is equivalent to taking the tensor product over V with **k**, thus the right exactness of the tensor product gives the exact sequence

$$\mathcal{F}(E)\langle R\rangle(n) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{F}(E)(n) \longrightarrow \epsilon(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}) \longrightarrow 0$$

This implies the existence of the canonical isomorphism $\epsilon(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}(n)) \cong \mathcal{P}(n)$. The universal property of the kernel gives the canonical map $\epsilon : (\operatorname{Ker}(\pi_{\mathbf{v}})(n)) \to \operatorname{Ker}(\pi(n))$.

Let $F: X \to Y$ be a map of two $V^{\otimes n}$ -modules and let $f: \epsilon(X) \to \epsilon(Y)$ be a map of **k**-vector spaces. We say that $F: X \to Y$ is a *map over* f if $\epsilon(F) = f$.

DEFINITION 6.3. Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle E; R \rangle$ be a quadratic operad and $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta, \epsilon)$ as above. Define $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ by the sequence (26). We say that the relations $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ are \mathcal{P} -coherent if the V-relative operad $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}(n)$ in degree n is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}(n) \otimes V^{\otimes n}$ as a right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module over the canonical isomorphism $\epsilon(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}) \cong \mathcal{P}(n)$, for all n.

To formulate the concept of an operad algebra from this point of view we use the usual endomorphism operad with $\operatorname{End}(U)(n) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(U^{\otimes n}, U)$ considered as a left V- and right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module in the standard way:

$$(v \cdot \alpha)(u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_n) = v \cdot (\alpha(u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_n),$$

$$(\alpha \cdot (v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n))(u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_n) = \alpha(v_1 \cdot u_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n \cdot u_n),$$

for $\alpha \in \text{End}(U)(n)$, $u_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes u_n \in U^{\otimes n}$, $v \in V$ and $v_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes v_n \in V^{\otimes n}$. A $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ -algebra structure on the V-module U is given in either of two ways. By a 'V-relative' operad map, i.e. a family of left V- right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module maps

 $A(n): \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}(n) \longrightarrow \operatorname{End}(U)(n), \ n \ge 1,$

or, which is the same, as a left V-module map

(27)
$$\bigoplus_{n\geq 2} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}(n) \otimes_{V^{\otimes n}} U^{\otimes n} \longrightarrow U.$$

In the symmetric case, we require A(n) to be a Σ_n -equivariant map, which means that the tensor product in (27) must be taken over $[\Sigma_n]V^{\otimes n}$, the 'twisted group algebra' of Σ_n with coefficients in $V^{\otimes n}$, which is $\mathbf{k}[\Sigma_n] \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} V^{\otimes n}$ as left Σ_n - right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module, and the product is defined by

$$(\sigma(v_1\otimes\cdots\otimes v_n))\cdot(\tau(u_1\otimes\cdots\otimes u_n))=\sigma\tau(v_{\tau(1)}u_1\otimes\cdots\otimes v_{\tau(n)}u_n).$$

Note that the direct sum appearing in (27) is also the definition of the free $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ algebra on U. If the relations $R_{\mathbf{v}}$ are \mathcal{P} -coherent then clearly the free $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ algebra on V is isomorphic to the free \mathcal{P} algebra on V.

EXAMPLE 6.4. Let us discuss the coherence of Φ -associative algebras of Example 6.1 in the light of our Definition 6.3. We use the notation introduced in Example 2.2. Let $R_{\mathbf{v}} = R_{Ass,\Phi}$ be generated by

$$r_{Ass,\Phi} = (1(23)) \cdot \Phi - ((12)3) \in \mathcal{F}_V(E)(3)$$

and let Ass_{Φ} be the corresponding V-relative operad $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$. Clearly $Ass_{\Phi}(n) = Ass(n) \otimes V^{\otimes n}$ for n = 1, 2. For n = 3 we have the following relations modulo $R_{Ass,\Phi}$:

$$((12)3) \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})\Delta(v) = (1(23)) \cdot \Phi \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})\Delta(v)$$

and

$$((12)3) \cdot (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})\Delta(v) = v \cdot ((12)3) = (1(23)) \cdot (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta)\Delta(v) \cdot \Phi.$$

This means that we must have, for each $v \in V$,

$$((12)3)[(\mathbb{1}\otimes\Delta)\Delta(v)\cdot\Phi] = (1(23))\cdot[\Phi\cdot(\Delta\otimes\mathbb{1})\Delta(v)]$$

modulo $R_{Ass,\Phi}$, and similarly for ((12)3). So we easily see that for n = 3 the coherence imply

$$(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta) \Delta(v) \cdot \Phi = \Phi \cdot \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}) \Delta(v),$$

which is (10).

Let us discuss the case n = 4. We know that $\dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle)(4) = \dim_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{F}(E)(4)) = 5$. Choose the basic elements

$$\mathbf{a} := ((12)3)4, \ \mathbf{b} := (12)(34), \ \mathbf{c} := 1(2(34)), \ \mathbf{d} := 1((23)4), \ \mathbf{e} := (1(23))4 \in \mathcal{F}(E)(4)$$

for $\mathcal{F}(E)(4)$ and

$$\mathbf{1} := r(\xi, 1, 1), \ \mathbf{2} := r(1, 1, \xi), \ \mathbf{3} := \xi(1, r), \ \mathbf{4} := r(1, \xi, 1), \ \mathbf{5} := \xi(r, 1) \in \mathcal{F}(E) \langle R \rangle,$$

for $\mathcal{F}(E)\langle R\rangle(4)$. The map $\pi: \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R\rangle(4) \to (R)(4)$ has the following matrix description:

	a	b	С	d	e
$\pi(1)$	-1	1	0	0	0
$\pi(2)$	0	-1	1	0	0
$\pi(3)$	0	0	-1	1	0
$\pi(4)$	0	0	0	1	-1
$\pi(5)$	-1	0	0	0	+1

We know that $\dim(\text{Ker}(\pi)) = 1$; the generator of the kernel being described in Example 2.2. The determinant of the above matrix is obviously zero.

[December 5, 1997]

The 'quantized' map $\pi_{Ass,\Phi} : \mathcal{F}_V(E)\langle R_{Ass,\Phi}\rangle(4) \to (R_{Ass,\Phi})(4)$ is described by the following matrix with entries in $B = V^{\otimes 4}$:

		a	b	с	\mathbf{d}	e
	$\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(1)$	-1	$(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^2)(\Phi)$	0	0	0
(28)	$\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(2)$	0	-1	$(1\!\!1^2 \otimes \Delta)(\Phi)$	0	0
(28)	$\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(3)$	0	0	$(1 \otimes \Phi)$	-1	0
	$\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(4)$	0	0	0	$(1 \otimes \Delta \otimes 1)\Phi$	-1
	$\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(5)$	-1	0	0	0	$(\Phi \otimes 1)$

The structure of $(R_{Ass,\Phi})(4)$ is determined by $\operatorname{Ker}(\pi_{Ass,\Phi})(4)$ which we now describe. It follows from a very special form of the matrix for $\pi_{Ass,\Phi}$ that $\pi_{Ass,\Phi}(\mathbf{1} \cdot x_0 + \mathbf{2} \cdot x_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{5} \cdot x_4) = 0$ can be expanded to the following system of equations for $x_0, \ldots, x_4 \in B$:

$$\alpha_i x_{\overline{i}} = x_{\overline{i}+1} \quad \text{for } \overline{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_5,$$

with $\alpha_0 = (\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^2)(\Phi)$, $\alpha_1 = (1 \otimes \Phi)^{-1}(\mathbb{1}^2 \otimes \Delta)(\Phi)$, $\alpha_2 = (\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Phi^{-1})$, $\alpha_3 = (\Phi \otimes 1)^{-1}$ and $\alpha_4 = 1$. There is one consistency condition: that there is a non-zero solution to

$$(\alpha_4 \cdots \alpha_0)x = x, \ x \in B.$$

If we assume that B is an integral domain, then the product $\alpha_4 \cdots \alpha_0$ must equal 1, which gives the standard pentagon identity for Φ . When the pentagon identity is satisfied, $\text{Ker}(\pi_{Ass,\Phi})$ is a free B-module of rank one, generated by

$$(\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{2}\alpha_0 + \mathbf{3}\alpha_1\alpha_0 + 4\alpha_2\alpha_1\alpha_0 + \mathbf{5}\alpha_3\alpha_2\alpha_1\alpha_0).$$

Thus $R_{Ass,\Phi}(4)$ is a free *B*-module of rank four, and therefore, Ass_{Φ} is a free *B*-module of rank one. That is $Ass_{\Phi}(4) \cong Ass \otimes V^{\otimes 4}$. The fact that the isomorphism at level 4 implies all the higher isomorphisms is one way of formulating the Mac Lane coherence theorem. Thus our general notion of coherence coincides with the naïve one of Example 6.1 based on ruling out 'unexpected axioms.' Compare also Theorem 7.3.

We end this section by stating, without proof, the following theorem generalizing the result of Drinfel'd [4], which says that if \mathcal{P} is a quadratic Koszul operad, then it is enough to check the isomorphism of Definition 6.3 for n = 3, 4 only.

THEOREM 6.5. Let \mathcal{P} be a quadratic Koszul operad. Then $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$ is coherent if and only if the condition of Definition 6.3 is satisfied for n = 3, 4.

7. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION

If $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta, \Phi)$ is a Drinfel'd algebra (involving, in the symmetric case, some R-matrix \mathcal{R} such that $(V, \cdot, \Delta, \Phi, \mathcal{R})$ is a *triangular* quasi-Hopf algebra) and U is a left module, there is a

canonical procedure to 'quantize' algebraic structures on U. Both structures of Example 6.1 and Example 6.2 are of this type. The 'canonical quantization' of an algebraic structure has the property that it is always coherent in the sense of our Definition 6.3, see Theorem 7.3. At the end of this section we give two examples which are not of this type. To avoid an over-use of the word 'quantization' we will rather call the process of canonical quantization a Φ -relativization.

The Φ -relativization is based on a generalization of the definition of the endomorphism operad using the \bigcirc -construction on a left V-module U [17, par. 3], whose definition we now briefly recall. Let $F(U)^* = \bigoplus_{n \ge 0} F^n(U)$ be the free unitary nonassociative **k**-algebra on U, graded by length of words. The algebra $F^*(U)$ admits a natural left action, $(a, f) \mapsto a \cdot f$, of V given by the rules:

(i) on $F^1(U) = U$, the action coincides with the action of V on U, and

(ii)
$$a \cdot (f \star g) = \sum (a_{(1)} \cdot f) \star (a_{(2)} \cdot g),$$

where \star denotes the multiplication in $F^*(U)$ and $\Delta(a) = \sum a_{(1)} \otimes a_{(2)}$ in Sweedler notation. Let \sim be the relation, \star -multiplicatively generated on F^* by the expressions of the form

(29)
$$\Phi(x \star (y \star z)) \sim ((x \star y) \star z), \text{ for } x, y, z \in F^*(U),$$

where the meaning of the left-hand side is, of course, $\sum (\Phi_1 x \star (\Phi_2 y \star \Phi_3 z))$. Put $\bigcirc^*(U) := F^*(U)/\sim$. Just as in [17, Proposition 3.2] (where the corresponding construction is done for bimodules), the V-action on $F^*(U)$ induces on $\bigcirc(U)$ the structure of a left V-module and \star induces on $\bigcirc^*(U)$ the nonassociative multiplication denoted by \odot . In the symmetric case, there exists on $\bigcirc^*(U)$ the left action of the symmetric group characterized by the property that

$$T_{21}(u \odot w) = \mathcal{R}_{21}(w \odot u)$$
, for $u, w \in U$ and T_{21} the generator of Σ_2

The pentagon identity on Φ then implies that there exists a canonical isomorphism $J : \bigcirc^*(U) \to \bigotimes^*(U)$ of graded vector spaces [17, Proposition 3.3].

The Φ -relative endomorphism operad $\operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)$ is defined by analogy with the usual endomorphism operad, only replacing \otimes with \bigcirc and restricting to V-module maps. Namely, we define

$$\operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)(n) := \operatorname{Hom}_{V}(\bigcirc^{n} U, U),$$

the space of V-module maps from $\bigcirc^n(U)$ to U.

This construction can still be considered as defining an operad in the category of **k**-vector spaces with the operad composition maps are defined relative to the tensor product over **k**. To see this, consider $\alpha \in \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)(l)$, $\beta_i \in \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)(m_i)$, and $x_i \in U^{\odot m_i}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. The composition $\gamma(\alpha; \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_l) \in \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)(m_1 + \cdots + m_l)$, acts on elements of type $\odot_b(x_1, \ldots, x_l)$, the nonassociative \odot -product of x_1, \ldots, x_l with bracketing given by b, by the rule

(30)
$$\gamma(\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_l)(\odot_b(x_1,\ldots,x_l)) = \alpha(\odot_b(\beta(x_1),\ldots,\beta_l(x_l)).$$

The fact that this composition is well defined and associative in the usual operadic sense follows from the fact that the β_i 's are V-module maps, the associators on higher products are induced by formula (29), and Φ satisfies the pentagon identity, so we have the usual coherence property for associators.

DEFINITION 7.1. (Canonical quantization) $A \Phi$ -relative \mathcal{P} -algebra structure on U is an operad map $A_{\Phi} : \mathcal{P} \to \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)$.

Note that in this approach, although $\operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)$ is defined using the $\operatorname{Hom}_{V}(-,-)$ bifunctor on the category of V-modules, both operads in Definition 7.1 are of the standard type in the category of **k**-vector spaces. We use the standard definition of an operad algebra but with the standard endomorphism operad replaced by the Φ -relative endomorphism operad.

EXAMPLE 7.2. Let $Ass = \langle \xi; r \rangle$, $r = \xi(1 \otimes \xi) - \xi(\xi \otimes 1)$, be the (non- Σ) operad for associative algebras introduced in Example 2.2. An operad map $A_{\Phi} : Ass \to \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)$ is determined by $A_{\Phi}(\xi) = \mu \in \operatorname{End}_{\Phi}(U)(2)$, satisfying the 'V-linearity'

(31)
$$a \cdot \mu(x, y) = \sum \mu(a_{(1)} \cdot x, a_{(2)} \cdot y) \text{ for any } a \in V, x, y \in U, \text{ and}$$

(32)
$$A_{\Phi}(r) = \mu(1 \otimes \mu) - \mu(\mu \otimes 1) = 0.$$

Let us analyze the meaning of this last condition. By (30) have

$$\mu(1\otimes\mu)(x\odot(y\odot z))=\mu(x\odot\mu(y\odot z)) \ \text{ and } \ \mu(\mu\otimes1)((x\odot y)\odot z)=\mu(\mu(x\odot y)\odot z),$$

for $x, y, z \in U$, while, by the definition of the \odot -construction,

$$\sum (\Phi_1 \cdot x) \odot ((\Phi_1 \cdot y) \odot (\Phi_3 \cdot z)) = (x \odot y) \odot z.$$

for $x, y, z \in U$. These two conditions imply that μ is ' Φ -associative' in the sense that

$$\sum \mu((\Phi_1 \cdot x) \odot \mu((\Phi_1 \cdot y) \odot (\Phi_3 \cdot z))) = \mu(\mu(x \odot y) \odot z).$$

If we write x * y instead of $\mu(x \odot y)$ we see that our Φ -relative associative algebra is exactly the structure introduced in Example 6.1. Observe that $\odot(U)$ itself is an example of such an algebra.

We leave to the reader to verify that the 'generalized Lie algebra' from Example 6.2 is the Φ -relative Lie algebra in the sense of Definition 7.1. We have the following important theorem.

THEOREM 7.3. The Φ -relativization gives rise to coherent algebraic structures.

Proof. Consider V as a left module over itself. We may form $\bigcirc^*(V) = \bigoplus \bigcirc^n(V)$, which is again a left V-module. For each $n \ge 1$, $\bigcirc^n(V)$ is also a right $V^{\otimes n}$ -module. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} = \{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(n)\}_{n\ge 1}$ be defined by $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(n) := \mathcal{P}(n) \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \bigcirc^n(V)$, for $n \ge 1$. Define an operadic composition on $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ as

follows. Let $\alpha = p \otimes v \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(l)$ and $\alpha_i = p_i \otimes v_i \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(m_i), 1 \leq i \leq l$. Represent $v \in \bigcirc^l (V)$ as a nonassociative product $\bigcirc_b (w_1, \ldots, w_l), w_i \in V$. Then put

$$\gamma_{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}}(\alpha;\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_l) := \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(p;p_1,\ldots,p_l) \otimes \odot_b(w_1(v_1),\ldots,w_l(v_l)),$$

where $w_i(v_i) \in \bigcirc^{m_i}(V)$ denotes $v_i \in \bigcirc^{m_i}(V)$ acted upon from the left by $w_i \in V$. It is easy to verify that this operad structure is well-defined and that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cong \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{v}}$, as V-relative operads. The theorem now follows from the existence of the isomorphism J. Q.E.D.

Let us give two examples of algebraic structures which are not canonical quantizations of 'classical' algebras.

EXAMPLE 7.4. Let $V = (V, \cdot, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Phi_{11}, \Phi_{12}, \Phi_{21}, \Phi_{22})$ be a 'nonsymmetric Poisson Drinfel'd algebra' introduced in Example 5.5. We may consider a left $V = (V, \cdot)$ -module U with two bilinear operations $*, \bullet : U \otimes U \to U$ satisfying

$$\Phi_{11} \cdot (a \ast (b \ast c)) = (a \ast b) \ast c, \qquad \Phi_{21} \cdot (a \ast (b \blacklozenge c)) = (a \ast b) \blacklozenge c$$

$$\Phi_{12} \cdot (a \blacklozenge (b \ast c)) = (a \blacklozenge b) \ast c, \qquad \Phi_{22} \cdot (a \blacklozenge (b \blacklozenge c)) = (a \blacklozenge b) \blacklozenge c.$$

This structure can be interpreted as an algebra version of a weakly distributive category (compare the micro/macro cosmological principle of [1]!). It is not a canonical quantization, though it is very close to it. In the following example we give a structure which in not an algebra version of any categorial structure.

EXAMPLE 7.5. Recall that a Poisson algebra structure consists of a Lie algebra product [-, -], a commutative associative product *, and these structures are tied by a distributive law

$$[x * y, z] = x * [y, z] + [x, z] * y.$$

Suppose that, as usual, U is a left $V = (V, \cdot)$ module. Define a 'quantization' of a Poisson structure on U as follows (for simplicity, we restrict to the case of the trivial 'R-matrix' $\mathcal{R} = 1$). Suppose that $\Phi, \Psi, \Lambda \in V^{\otimes 3}$ are invertible elements. Then we postulate the 'quantum Jacobi identity' of [-, -]:

(33)
$$0 = [x, [y, z]] + \Phi_{123}[y, [z, x]] + \Phi_{312}^{-1}[z, [x, y]],$$

which is (22) with $\mathcal{R} = 1$, the 'quantum associativity' of *:

(34)
$$\Psi \cdot (x * (y * z)) = ((x * y) * z),$$

which is (14) with Ψ instead of Φ , and the 'quantized' distributive law

(35)
$$[x * y, z] = \Lambda_{123} \cdot (x * [y, z]) + \Lambda_{231} \cdot ([x, z] * y)$$

A coherent choice is provided by taking $\Psi := \Phi$ with Φ 'triangular,' $\Phi^{-1} = \Phi_{321}$, and satisfying the pentagon identity, and Λ satisfying

$$(\mathbb{1}^{2} \otimes \Delta)(\Lambda)(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^{2})(\Phi) = (1 \otimes \Phi)(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Lambda)(\Lambda \otimes 1)$$
$$(\mathbb{1}^{2} \otimes \Delta)(\Phi)(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^{2})(\Lambda) = (1 \otimes \Lambda)(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Lambda)(\Phi \otimes 1)$$
$$(\mathbb{1}^{2} \otimes \Delta)(\Lambda_{321}^{-1})(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1}^{2})(\Lambda) = (1 \otimes \Lambda)(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\Phi)(\Lambda_{321}^{-1} \otimes 1).$$

There is, of course, an obvious choice $\Lambda = \Phi$, in which case our structure is just a canonical quantization of a Poisson algebra.

8. The Lie-Hedron

This section is devoted to the example of the Lie operad and the conditions for Lie coherence. Let E and ξ has the same meaning as in Example 2.3 and let $t \in \mathcal{F}(E)(3)$ be the element $\xi(1 \otimes \xi)$, corresponding to the bracketing [1[23]]. The relation defining a Φ -relative version of the Lie operad is given by translating (22) into our formalism of V-operads. The basic relation is

$$(36) \qquad R_{Lie,\Phi} := t \otimes 1 + t \circ T_{231} \otimes [\Phi_{312}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta)(\mathcal{R})] + t \circ T_{312} \otimes [(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathcal{R})\Phi_{123}^{-1}] \\ = t \otimes 1 + t \otimes [\Phi_{123}(\Delta \otimes \mathbb{1})(\mathcal{R}_{21}) \cdot T_{231}] + t \otimes [(\mathbb{1} \otimes \Delta)(\mathcal{R}_{21})\Phi_{312}^{-1} \cdot T_{312}].$$

We want to determine the conditions on $R_{Lie,\Phi}$ which guarantee the coherence in the sense of Definition 6.3.

For notation we refer back to Example 2.3. As we saw in (3), at degree 4, there are 10 relations involving 15 monomials which form a basis of $\mathcal{F}(E)(4)$, [[ij][kl]], [i[j[kl]]]. As with Example 6.4, the coefficients of the system of relations can be displayed in matrix form, see Figure 7. In this case it is a 10×15 matrix, which can also be considered as the matrix of the map π : $\mathcal{F}(E)\langle R\rangle(4) \to (R)(4) \subset \mathcal{F}(E)(4)$. Each relation has 3 terms so each row of the matrix has 3 non-zero entries, and each term appears in 2 equations, so each column has 2 non-zero entries. We also represent the system by a "Tel-A-graph" with edges corresponding to monomials, or, equivalently, matrix columns, and vertices corresponding to relations, or, equivalently, matrix rows. The adjacency matrix for the graph is given by replacing a non-zero in the coefficient matrix with 1. The resulting graph is the famous Peterson graph, see Figure 8.

After determining the appropriate coefficients in $V^{\otimes 4}$ given by extending the relation (36) to brackets with four terms, we obtain a ' Φ -matrix' representing the map

$$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}: \mathcal{F}_V(E)\langle R_{Lie,\Phi}\rangle(4) \to (R_{Lie,\Phi}) \subset \mathcal{F}_V(E)(4).$$

We will not write the full Φ -matrix here since it is to big to fit on a page; for our purposes it is

	a	b	С	\mathbf{d}	e	\mathbf{f}	\mathbf{g}	\mathbf{h}	i	j	k	1	m	n	0
$\pi(1)$	+1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0
$\pi(2)$	0	+1	-1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\pi(3)$	0	0	-1	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\pi(4)$	0	0	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1
$\pi(5)$	+1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0
$\pi(6)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	+1	-1	0
$\pi(7)$	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	0
$\pi(8)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	+1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\pi(9)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	+1	+1	0	0	0
$\pi(10)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	-1

The basis elements are chosen as:

$$\mathbf{a} := [[[12]3]4] \quad \mathbf{b} := [[12][34]] \quad \mathbf{c} := [1[2[34]]] \quad \mathbf{d} := [1[[23]4]] \quad \mathbf{e} := [[1[23]]4]$$

$$\mathbf{f} := [1[3[24]]] \quad \mathbf{g} := [2[1[34]]] \quad \mathbf{h} := [2[3[14]]] \quad \mathbf{i} := [2[4[13]]] \quad \mathbf{j} := [3[1[24]]]$$

$$\mathbf{k} := [3[2[14]]] \quad \mathbf{l} := [3[[12]4]] \quad \mathbf{m} := [4[2[13]]] \quad \mathbf{n} := [[13][24]] \quad \mathbf{o} := [[14][23]]$$

and:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1} &:= -\iota(\zeta, 1, 1) & \mathbf{2} &:= -\iota(1, 1, \zeta) & \mathbf{3} &:= -\zeta(1, \iota) \\ \mathbf{4} &:= -\iota(1, 1, \zeta) \cdot T_{1342} & \mathbf{5} &:= -\zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2341} & \mathbf{6} &:= -\iota(\zeta, 1, 1) \cdot T_{1324} \\ \mathbf{7} &:= -\iota(1, 1, \zeta) \cdot T_{1324} & \mathbf{8} &:= -\zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2134} & \mathbf{9} &:= -\zeta(1, \iota) \cdot T_{2314} \\ \mathbf{10} &:= -\iota(\zeta, 1, 1) \cdot T_{1342} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 7: Matrix of the map $\pi : \mathcal{F}(E)\langle R \rangle(4) \to (R)(4)$. Observe that the upper left 5×5-submatrix coincides to the corresponding matrix for the associative algebra operad.

enough to observe that the upper left 5×5 submatrix of this Φ -matrix is:

		а	b	С	d	e
(37)	$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}(1)$	1	$-(\Delta\otimes 1\!\!1^2)(\Phi)$	0	0	0
	$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}(2)$	0	1	$-(1\!\!1^2\otimes\Delta)(\Phi)$	0	0
	$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}(3)$	0	0	$-(1\otimes\Phi)$	1	0
	$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}(4)$	0	0	0	$-(1\!\!1\otimes\Delta\otimes)(\Phi)$	1
	$\pi_{Lie,\Phi}(5)$	1	0	0	0	$-(\Phi\otimes 1)$

Observe that this matrix coincides, up to the sign reversal, with the matrix (28).

The next step is to describe $\operatorname{Ker}(\pi_{Lie,\Phi})(4)$ as a $V^{\otimes 4}$ -module. It is clear from the form of the matrix that, as in the Example 6.4, the system of equations for $\operatorname{Ker}(\pi_{Lie,\Phi})(4)$ has the form

$$\alpha_j x_{i(j)} = x_{i'(j)}, \ 1 \le j \le 15,$$

where j is the index for a column, i.e. an edge of the graph, and i(j), i'(j) are the two vertices adjacent to that edge, i.e., the two rows with non-zero entries in that column. The consistency



Figure 8: The Lie-hedron.

conditions have the form

 $\beta_i x_i = x_i$

where β_i is a product of the α 's going around a closed path with initial and terminal vertex *i*. There is an alternative representation of the Peterson graph given in Figure 9. It is clear from this



Figure 9: Another presentation of the Lie-hedron.

alternative representation that all closed paths can be decomposed into a sequence of pentagons, and, moreover, it is enough to consider the following six pentagons,

1-2-3-4-5, 1-2-8-10-9, 1-2-3-7-9, 3-4-5-6-7, 4-5-6-8-10 and 6-7-9-10-8.

Assuming that $B = V^{\otimes 4}$ is an integral domain, the pentagon **1-2-3-4-5** corresponding to the matrix (37) gives the standard pentagon identity, and the remaining pentagons give the pentagon identity with the four tensor components permuted according to the following pattern:

1-2-8-10-9 is1-2-3-4-5 permuted by (2143),
1-2-3-7-9 is1-2-3-4-5 permuted by (1243),
3-4-5-6-7 is1-2-3-4-5 permuted by (1324),
4-5-6-8-10 is1-2-3-4-5 permuted by (4132), and
6-7-9-10-8 is1-2-3-4-5 permuted by (3142).

Once the pentagon identity is satisfied, the consistency conditions for all these pentagonal paths are satisfied and the kernel is a free rank one B-module. We may sum the results of this section as:

THEOREM 8.1. The relation $R_{Lie,\Phi}$ is coherent of and only if Φ satisfies the pentagon identity (11).

Proof. We already saw that the coherence implies the pentagon identity. On the other hand, if the pentagon identity is satisfied, then our structure is the canonical quantization of the Lie algebra structure in the sense of Definition 7.1, and the coherence follows from Theorem 7.3. Q.E.D.

References

- J. C. Baez and J. Dolan. Higher-dimensional algebra III: n-categories and the algebra of opetopes. Preprint, 1997.
- [2] R. F. Blute, J. R. B. Cockett, R. A. G. Seely, and T. H. Trimble. Natural deduction and coherence for weakly distributive categories. *Journal of Pure and Appl. Algebra*, 113:229– 296, 1996.
- [3] V.G. Drinfel'd. Kvazichopfovy algebry. Algebra i Analiz, 1,6:114–148, 1989. In Russian.
- [4] V. G. Drinfel'd. On quadratic commutator relations in the quasiclassical case. Math. Phys. and Fun. An., 1986 Kiev, Naukova Dumka. In Russian.
- [5] E. Getzler and J.D.S. Jones. Operads, homotopy algebra, and iterated integrals for double loop spaces. Preprint, 1993.
- [6] V. Ginzburg and M. Kapranov. Koszul duality for operads. Duke Math. Journal, 76(1):203– 272, 1994.
- [7] D.I. Gurevich. Algebraic aspects of the quantum Yang-Baxter equation. Leningrad Math. Journal, 2(4):801–828, 1991.
- [8] S. Halperin and J. Stasheff. Obstructions to homotopy equivalences. Advances in Math., 32:233–279, 1979.
- [9] G.M. Kelly, M. Laplaza, G. Lewis, and S. Mac Lane. Coherence in Categories. Lecture Notes in Math. 281. Springer-Verlag, 1972.
- [10] S. Lichtenbaum and M. Schlessinger. The cotangent complex of a morphism. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 128:41–70, 1967.
- [11] J.-L. Loday. Algèbres ayant deux opérations associatives (digèbres). Preprint, 1994.
- [12] S. Mac Lane. Natural associativity and commutativity. *Rice Univ. Studies*, 49.1:28–46, 1963.
- [13] M. Markl. Deformations and the coherence. Proc. of the Winter School 'Geometry and Physics,' Zdikov, Bohemia, January 1993, Supplemento ai Rend. Circ. Matem. Palermo, Serie II, 37:121–151, 1994.
- [14] M. Markl. Cotangent cohomology of a category and deformations. Journal of Pure and Appl. Algebra, 113:195–218, 1996.
- [15] M. Markl. Distributive laws and Koszulness. Annales de l'Institut Fourier, 46(4):307–323, 1996.
- [16] M. Markl. Models for operads. Communications in Algebra, 24(4):1471-1500, 1996.
- [17] M. Markl and J. D. Stasheff. Deformation theory via deviations. Journal of Algebra, 171(1):122–155, November 1994.
- [18] J.P. May. The Geometry of Iterated Loop Spaces, volume 271 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1972.

- [19] J.D. Stasheff. Homotopy associativity of H-spaces I., II. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 108:275– 312, 1963.
- M. M.: Mathematical Institute of the Academy, Žitná 25, 115 67 Praha 1, Czech Republic, email: markl@math.cas.cz
- S. S.: Department of Mathematics, University of Bar Ilan, Israel, email: shnider@bimacs.cs.biu.ac.il