

DOUBLE BRAIDINGS, TWISTS AND TANGLE INVARIANTS

A. BRUGUIÈRES

ABSTRACT. A tortile (or ribbon) category defines invariants of ribbon (framed) links and tangles. We observe that these invariants, when restricted to links, string links, and more general tangles which we call *turbans*, do not actually depend on the braiding of the tortile category. Besides duality, the only pertinent data for such tangles are the double braiding and twist. We introduce the general notions of twine, which is meant to play the rôle of the double braiding (in the absence of a braiding), and the corresponding notion of twist. We show that the category of (ribbon) pure braids is the free category with a twine (a twist). We show that a category with duals and a self-dual twist defines invariants of stringlinks. We introduce the notion of *turban* category, so that the category of turban tangles is the free turban category. Lastly we give a few examples and a tannaka dictionary for twines and twists.

‘Just the place for a Snark!’, the Bellman cried,
As he landed his crew with care;
Supporting each man at the top of the tide
With a finger entwined in his hair.

Lewis Carrol, *The Hunting of the Snark*

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Conventions and notations	3
2. Twines and pure links	5
3. Twists and ribbon pure braids	9
4. Twists, duality, and invariants of string links	10
5. Turban categories	15
6. Construction of twisted categories	19
References	20

INTRODUCTION

It is now well understood that certain categorical notions are very closely related to low dimensional topology. For instance, braids form a braided monoidal category, and the category of braids is the free braided category. The category **Tang** of oriented ribbon tangles is a tortile (or ribbon) category [JS93], and indeed, it has been proved by Shum [Shu94] (also [Tur94]) that **Tang** is the free tortile category. This theorem is a powerful tool for constructing invariants of ribbon links in S^3 , since ribbon links up to isotopy are

the endomorphisms of the unit object in **Tang**. Via Kirby calculus, Shum's theorem underlies the construction of the Reshetikhin-Turaev invariants of closed 3-manifolds. Kirby calculus can also be used to describe cobordisms of 3-manifolds in terms of certain tangles, and this allowed Turaev to construct a TQFT associated with a modular category [Tur94].

The present work explores certain consequences of the following observation. Let \mathcal{C} be a tortile category. Recall that \mathcal{C} is a braided category with duals, and a (self-dual) twist θ . Denoting $c_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\sim} Y \otimes X$ the braiding, define the *double braiding* by $D_{X,Y} = c_{Y,X}c_{X,Y}$. Notice that θ satisfies certain axioms where c appears only in the form of its double D , and conversely, θ determines D . It turns out that many significant notions apparently related to c actually depend only on D or θ . The S -matrix, and the subcategory of transparent objects [Bru00], which play an important role in the construction of invariants of 3-manifolds, are defined purely in terms of the double braiding D . More surprisingly, the invariants of ribbon links defined by \mathcal{C} via Sum's Theorem do not depend on the actual braiding, but only on D (see Proposition 1, and section 5); and this result extends to a much larger class of ribbon tangles, namely those whose linking matrix is diagonal **mod**2. Since these tangles play an important role here, we give them a name: we call them *turban* tangles.

All this suggests that the double braiding and the twist deserve to be studied for their own sake, and that the universal property of the category of tangles, that is, Shum's Theorem, should have an analogue for the category of turban tangles.

The first step is to axiomatize the notion of double braiding. We observe that a double braiding satisfies certain formal properties (TW0)-(TW2). An operator D satisfying these properties will be called a *twine*. An *entwined* category is a monoidal category with a twine. The category of pure braids is the free entwined category (section 2, Theorem 1). We also introduce a general notion of twist, in such a way that the category of ribbon pure braids is the free category with twist (section 3, Theorem 2).

In section 4, we bring duality into the picture, and find out that a category with duals and (self-dual) twist defines invariants of ribbon string links (theorem 3).

The heart of the matter is to extend these constructions to the largest possible subcategory of the category of tangles. The natural candidate is the subcategory generated by the twist and duality: this is precisely the category of turban tangles (proposition 1). In section 5, we define a *turban category* to be a category with a twist and good duals (sovereign structure), satisfying certain additional conditions. We show that the category of turban tangles is the free turban category (theorem 4).

Section 6 gives a few examples of twines, twists and turban categories, as well as the tannaka dictionary for twines and twists.

The definition of a turban category proposed in this paper is certainly not definitive, but I believe that this notion could lead to new topological invariants, including 3-manifold invariants and related TQFT's. The land of twines and twists is 'full of crags and chasms', and exploring it sometimes

feels like snark hunting. For instance, the fact that if c, c' are braidings, then $c'_{Y,X}c_{X,Y}$ is a twine, came to me as a real surprise! While so far I have few examples of twines or twists, there are many indications that the class of entwined category is much larger than the class of braided category.

I must mention the fact that, after completion of this work, I was informed that M. Staic recently obtained similar results in [Sta04], where he constructs representations for the pure braid group, and invariants of knots using Hopf algebra techniques which correspond to the same categorical notions. Still, I hope, the overlap is not so complete that one must conclude ‘the Snark *was* a Boojum, you see!’.

I wish to thank Alexis Virelizier for many enlightening discussions.

1. CONVENTIONS AND NOTATIONS

1.1. Monoidal categories. Unless otherwise specified, all categories will be small and all monoidal categories will be strict. We will use Penrose Graphical calculus, with the ascending convention: diagrams are to be read from bottom to top, *e. g.* given $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$, we represent gf as



If \mathcal{C} is a monoidal category, with tensor product \otimes and unit object I , we denote \otimes^n the n -uple tensor product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^n &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}, \\ (X_1, \dots, X_n) &\mapsto X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_n. \end{aligned}$$

In particular $\otimes^0 = I$, $\otimes^1 = 1_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\otimes^2 = \otimes$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category. A *duality* of \mathcal{C} is a data (X, Y, e, h) , where X, Y are objects, and $e : X \otimes Y \rightarrow I$, $h : I \rightarrow Y \otimes X$ morphisms of \mathcal{C} , satisfying:

$$(e \otimes 1_X)(1_X \otimes h) = 1_X \text{ and } (1_Y \otimes e)(h \otimes 1_Y) = 1_Y.$$

If (X, Y, e, h) is a duality, we say that (Y, e, h) is a right dual of X , and (X, e, h) is a left dual of X . If a right or left dual of an object exists, it is unique up to unique isomorphism.

By *monoidal category with right duals (resp. left duals, resp. duals)*, we mean a monoidal category \mathcal{C} where each object X admits a right dual (resp. a left dual, resp. both a right and a left dual).

If \mathcal{C} has right duals, we may pick a right dual (X^\vee, e_X, h_X) for each object X (the actual choice is innocuous, in that a right dual is unique up to unique isomorphism). This defines a monoidal functor

$${}^\vee : \mathcal{C}^o \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

where \mathcal{C}^o denotes the category with opposite composition and tensor product.

Similarly a choice of left duals $({}^\vee X, \varepsilon_X, \eta_X)$ for all $X \in \mathbf{Ob} \mathcal{C}$ defines a monoidal functor ${}^\vee : \mathcal{C}^o \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

A *(strict) sovereign structure* on \mathcal{C} is the choice, for each object X , of a right dual (X^*, e_X, h_X) and a left dual $(X^*, \varepsilon_X, \eta_X)$, with same underlying object X^* , in such a way that ${}^\vee? = ?^\vee$ as monoidal functors. Essentially, left duals and right duals coincide. By *sovereign category*, we mean a monoidal category with a sovereign structure. This is an appropriate categorical setting for a good notion of trace; however one must distinguish a left- and a right trace tr_l and tr_r . If X is an object of \mathcal{C} and $f \in \mathrm{End}(X)$,

$$\mathrm{tr}_l(f) = \varepsilon_X(1_{X^*} \otimes f)h_X, \quad \mathrm{tr}_r(f) = e_X(f \otimes 1_{X^*})\eta_X \quad \text{in } \mathrm{End}(I).$$

DEFINITION. Let \mathcal{C} be a braided category, with braiding c ; the *double braiding* is the functorial isomorphism

$$D_{X,Y} = c_{Y,X}c_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\sim} X \otimes Y.$$

A *tortile category* is a monoidal braided category with duals, equipped with a *twist*, that is, a functorial isomorphism $\theta_X : X \xrightarrow{\sim} X$ ($X \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) such that $\theta_X \otimes \theta_Y = \theta_{X \otimes Y} D_{X,Y}$ and $\theta_I = 1_I$. Moreover the twist is assumed to be *self-dual*, i. e. $\theta_{X^\vee} = \theta_X^\vee$.

If \mathcal{C} is a tortile category, and if one makes the (inocuous) choice of right duals $(X^\vee = X^*, e_X, h_X)$, there is a canonical choice of left duals $(X^*, \varepsilon_X, \eta_X)$ which defines a sovereign structure. The self-duality of the twist implies that the left- and right trace coincide (a property often referred to as *sphericity*).

1.2. Tangles. We will often represent tangles by tangle diagrams, which we view as drawings made up of the following pictograms:

$$\times, \times, \cap, \cup,$$

called positive crossing, negative crossing, local max and local min respectively (linked up by smooth arcs without horizontal tangents).

Two tangle diagrams represent the same isotopy class of ribbon tangles (also called framed tangles) if and only if one may be obtained from the other by deformation and a finite number of ribbon Reidemeister moves:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(R0)} \quad \cap &= | = \cup, & \text{(R1)} \quad \text{⋈} &= | = \text{⋈}^{\vee}, \\ \text{(R2)} \quad \text{⋈} &= | \quad | = \text{⋈}^{\vee}, & \text{⋈} &= \text{⋈} = \text{⋈}, & \text{(R3)} \quad \text{⋈} &= \text{⋈}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that isotopy of non-ribbon tangles is obtained by adding the Reidemeister move $\text{⋈} = |$ to this list.

We will denote $\{D\}$ (and sometimes just D) the isotopy class of ribbon tangles represented by a tangle diagram D .

Let D be a tangle diagram, C a component of D . We denote $\Delta_C D$ the tangle diagram obtained from D replacing C by 2 parallel copies of D .

A tangle may be oriented, and/or coloured by elements of a set.

We denote **Tang** the category of isotopy classes of oriented ribbon tangles. This is a tortile category, whose objects are words on the letters $[+]$ and $[-]$. We denote **Tang** $[\Lambda]$ the category of isotopy classes of oriented ribbon tangles coloured by elements of the set Λ , which is another tortile category. In **Tang** $[\Lambda]$, we denote $[+]_\lambda$ (resp. $[-]_\lambda$) the object $[+]$ (resp. $[-]$) coloured by the element $\lambda \in \Lambda$. In the oriented case, the point will be denoted $[0]$.

1.3. Ribbon Tangles and Turbans Tangles. Recall that the braiding c and the twist θ of the category of ribbon tangles are defined by

$$c_{m,p} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} p & m \\ \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \text{---} & \text{---} \\ m & p \end{array} \end{array}, \quad \theta_n = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ n \end{array} \end{array}.$$

evaluation and coevaluation morphisms e_n and h_n being given by

$$e_n = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ n \end{array}, \quad h_n = \begin{array}{c} n \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ n \end{array};$$

the ribbon structure on **Tang** $[\Lambda]$ is defined by the same tangles, with appropriate orientation and Λ -colouring.

DEFINITION. A ribbon tangle T is *turban* (resp. *even*) if its linking matrix is diagonal **mod2** (resp. zero **mod2**).

Turban tangles (resp. even tangles) form a monoidal subcategory of **Tang** which we denote **Turb** (resp. **eTang**).

The following proposition is the main motivation for the rest of this work.

Proposition 1. *The category **Turb** (resp. **eTang**) is the smallest monoidal subcategory of **Tang** having the same objects as **Tang**, and containing all evaluations, coevaluations and twists (resp. double braidings).*

We will prove proposition 1 in section 5.

2. TWINES AND PURE LINKS

DEFINITION. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category. A *twine* of \mathcal{C} is an automorphism D of \otimes , that is, a functorial isomorphism

$$D_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\sim} X \otimes Y \quad (X, Y \in \mathcal{C})$$

satisfying the following axioms:

$$(DB0) \quad D_{I,I} = 1_I;$$

$$(DB1) \quad (D_{X,Y} \otimes 1_Z) D_{X \otimes Y, Z} = (1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}) D_{X, Y \otimes Z};$$

$$(DB2) \quad (D_{X \otimes Y, Z} \otimes 1_T)(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1} \otimes 1_T)(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z \otimes T}) \\ = (1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z \otimes T})(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1} \otimes 1_T)(D_{X \otimes Y, Z} \otimes 1_T).$$

An *entwined category* is a monoidal category equipped with a twine.

If $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'$ are two entwined categories, with twines D, D' , a strict entwined functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a strict monoidal functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ such that for all $X, Y \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$,

$$F(D_{X,Y}) = D'_{FX,FY}.$$

EXAMPLE. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category, and c a braiding of \mathcal{C} . Then $D_{X,Y} = c_{Y,X}c_{X,Y}$ (the double of c) is a twine of \mathcal{C} . In particular, let B be the category of braids, with its canonical braiding c . Recall that the canonical braiding c is characterised by the fact that $c_{1,1}$ is the standard generator of B_2 . Let D be the double of c . Let \mathbf{PB} be the category of pure braids. Then for any integers m, p , $D_{m,p}$ is a morphism of P and this defines a twine of \mathbf{PB} . We will therefore consider \mathbf{PB} as an entwined category.

REMARK. The examples admits of the following surprising generalization, which was pointed out to me by A. Virelizier: if c, c' are two braidings in \mathcal{C} , then $D_{X,Y} = c'_{Y,X}c_{X,Y}$ is a twine.

Here are a few comments on the axioms.

The first two axioms (DB0) and (DB1) imply the following:

(a) $D_{X,I} = 1_X = D_{I,X}$.

(b) $(D_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_Z)D_{X,Y \otimes Z} = D_{X \otimes Y,Z}(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1})$ and $(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1})D_{X \otimes Y,Z} = D_{X,Y \otimes Z}(D_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_Z)$.

It will be very convenient to depict $D_{X,Y}, D_{X,Y}^{-1}$ as follows:

$$D_{X,Y} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \end{array} \quad , \quad D_{X,Y}^{-1} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \end{array} \quad .$$

Similarly, let

$$D_{X,Y,Z}^f = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \quad Z \end{array} = (D_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_Z)D_{X,Y \otimes Z} = D_{X \otimes Y,Z}(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1}),$$

$$D_{X,Y,Z}^b = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \quad Z \end{array} = (1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1})D_{X \otimes Y,Z} = (1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1})D_{X \otimes Y,Z}.$$

Now (DB2) can be re-interpreted in a nice way. Indeed, composing each side of (DB2) on the right by $(1_X \otimes D_{Y,Z}^{-1} \otimes 1_T)$ and using (b), we obtain the

sliding property: $\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \quad Z \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \quad Z \end{array}.$

Notice that the notion of twine is invariant under left-right symmetry (tensor product reversal) and under top-bottom symmetry (composition reversal).

In both cases front and back (i. e. $\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \\ X \quad Y \end{array}$) are exchanged. In particular central symmetry preserves front and back.

The following theorem justifies, in a sense, the axioms for a twine.

Theorem 1. *The category of pure braids is the universal entwined category. More precisely, let \mathcal{C} be an entwined category, $\Lambda = \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, and denote $\text{PB}(\Lambda)$ the category of Λ -coloured pure braids. There exists a unique strict entwined functor $\text{PB}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ sending $[0]_X$ ($X \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) to the object X itself.*

Proof of Theorem 1. The proof relies on a presentation of the group of pure braids P_n by generators and relations, due to Markov [Mar45]. (See also [Ver03]). Let $\sigma_i \in B_n$ ($1 \leq i < n$) be the standard generator:

$$\sigma_i = \begin{array}{c} \left| \cdots \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| \left| \cdots \right| \\ \begin{array}{cccc} 1 & \dots & i & i+1 & \dots & n \end{array} \end{array} .$$

For $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, let $s_{i,j} = \sigma_{j-1} \dots \sigma_i \sigma_i \dots \sigma_{j-1}$; pictorially:

$$s_{i,j} = \begin{array}{c} \left| \cdots \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right| \left| \cdots \right| \left| \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right| \left| \cdots \right| \\ \begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & n \end{array} \end{array} .$$

Then the $s_{i,j}$'s generate P_n , subject to the Burau relations:

- (Bu1) $s_{i,j}s_{k,l} = s_{k,l}s_{i,j}$ for $i < j < k < l$ or $i < k < j < l$;
- (Bu2) $s_{i,j}s_{i,k}s_{j,k} = s_{i,k}s_{j,k}s_{i,j} = s_{j,k}s_{i,j}s_{i,k}$ for $i < j < k$;
- (Bu3) $s_{i,k}s_{j,k}s_{j,l}s_{j,k}^{-1} = s_{j,k}s_{j,l}s_{j,k}^{-1}s_{i,k}$ for $i < j < k < l$.

In the entwined category PB of pure braids, $s_{i,j} = 1_{i-1} \otimes D_{1,j-i-1,1}^f \otimes 1_{n-j}$.

Proposition 2. *Let \mathcal{C} be an entwined category. There exists a unique group morphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PB}_n &\rightarrow \text{Aut}(\otimes^n) \\ P &\mapsto [P] \end{aligned}$$

such that for all $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq n$,

$$[\sigma_{i,j}]_{X_1, \dots, X_n} = 1_{X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i-1}} \otimes D_{X_i, X_{i+1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_{j-1}, X_j}^f \otimes 1_{X_{j+1} \otimes \dots \otimes X_n} .$$

PROOF. Since the $s_{i,j}$'s generate P_n , we only have to check compatibility with the Burau relations.

Now the first case of (Bu1) is functoriality of the tensor product, and the second case of (Bu2) is functoriality of $D_{X,Y,Z}^f$ with respect to Y .

In order to check the other relations, we will have to perform certain computations in an entwined category. Let us adopt the notation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} .$$

It is understood that each strand is coloured by an object of \mathcal{C} , so this is an identity of morphisms of \mathcal{C} .

Lemma 1. *The following identities hold in an entwined category:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 a) \quad & \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \\ \text{Diagram 4} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \text{Diagram 6} \end{array} ; \quad b) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 7} \\ \text{Diagram 8} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 9} \\ \text{Diagram 10} \end{array} ; \quad c) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 11} \\ \text{Diagram 12} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 13} \\ \text{Diagram 14} \end{array} ; \\
 d) \quad & \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 15} \\ \text{Diagram 16} \\ \text{Diagram 17} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 18} \\ \text{Diagram 19} \\ \text{Diagram 20} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 21} \\ \text{Diagram 22} \\ \text{Diagram 23} \end{array} ; \quad e) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 24} \\ \text{Diagram 25} \\ \text{Diagram 26} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 27} \\ \text{Diagram 28} \\ \text{Diagram 29} \end{array} .
 \end{aligned}$$

N. B.: strings which are drawn very close represent one entry coloured by the tensor product of the colours of the strings.

PROOF. The computations would be very awkward in algebraic form; they are much easier to conduct using Penrose graphical calculus. Here is a sketch of the proof.

Assertions a) and b): the first identity of a) holds by definition; the second results from the definition of $\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 5} \\ \text{Diagram 6} \end{array}$ by straightforward computation, and

implies b) by definition of $\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 7} \\ \text{Diagram 8} \end{array}$.

Consider assertion e), and denote X, A, Y, B, Z, C, T the objects of \mathcal{C} used to colour the seven strands, listed from left to right. Then the case $A = B = C = I$ is just the sliding property, which is a consequence of the twine axioms. Now using a), we deduce e) in the case $B = C = I$.

c) Using the definitions and elementary manipulations, assertion c) can be easily reduced to assertion e) in the case $B = C = I$, which we just proved,

and the identity $\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 11} \\ \text{Diagram 12} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 13} \\ \text{Diagram 14} \end{array}$, analogous to the second identity of a).

Assertion e): the case $C = I$ can now be deduced from the case $B = C = I$ using b). Hence the general case, using a) and c).

Let us prove assertion d). By reason of symmetry, it is enough to check the first identity. Now one computes easily

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 15} \\ \text{Diagram 16} \\ \text{Diagram 17} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 18} \\ \text{Diagram 19} \\ \text{Diagram 20} \end{array}$$

and one concludes using e) and functoriality of the twine. Thus ends the proof of the lemma. \square

Relations (Bu2) and (Bu3) are direct consequences of assertions d) and e) of the lemma, hence the proposition. \square

Now the lemma clearly defines a monoidal functor $\mathbf{PB}[\Lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ which sends $[X]$ to X ($X \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$), the pure braid on n strands coloured by X_1, \dots, X_n to $[P]_{X_1, \dots, X_n}$, and preserves the twine. Uniqueness results from the fact that the $s_{i,j}$'s generate \mathbf{PB} .

3. TWISTS AND RIBBON PURE BRAIDS

DEFINITION. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category. A *twist* of \mathcal{C} is an automorphism θ of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, a functorial isomorphism

$$\theta_X : X \xrightarrow{\sim} X \quad (X \in \mathcal{C})$$

satisfying the following axioms:

$$(TW0) \quad \theta_I = 1_I;$$

$$(TW1) \quad (\theta_{X \otimes Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_{Z \otimes T})(\theta_{X \otimes Y \otimes Z} \otimes 1_T)(1_X \otimes \theta_{Y \otimes Z}^{-1} \otimes 1_T) \\ (1_X \otimes \theta_{Y \otimes Z \otimes T})(1_{X \otimes Y} \otimes \theta_{Z \otimes T}^{-1}) = (1_{X \otimes Y} \otimes \theta_{Z \otimes T}^{-1})(1_X \otimes \theta_{Y \otimes Z \otimes T}) \\ (1_X \otimes \theta_{Y \otimes Z}^{-1} \otimes 1_T)(\theta_{X \otimes Y \otimes Z} \otimes 1_T)(\theta_{X \otimes Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_{Z \otimes T}).$$

Graphically, axiom (TW1) may be represented as

A *twisted category* is a monoidal category equipped with a twist.

If $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}'$ are two twisted categories, with twists θ, θ' , a strict twisted functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a strict monoidal functor satisfying for all $X \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$:

$$F(\theta_X) = \theta_{FX}.$$

Proposition 3. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category and θ an automorphism of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$. Define an automorphism D of \otimes by

$$D_{X,Y} = (\theta_X^{-1} \otimes \theta_Y^{-1})\theta_{X \otimes Y}.$$

Then θ is a twist if and only if D is a twine.

PROOF. By its very form, D satisfies (DB1), and one checks easily that (DB0) and (DB2) are equivalent respectively to (TW0) and (TW1). \square

As a result, a twisted category is canonically entwined, and a strict twisted functor is entwined.

EXAMPLE. Let \mathcal{C} be a braided category, and let θ be a balanced structure, that is an automorphism of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ satisfying

$$\theta_{X \otimes Y} = (\theta_X \otimes \theta_Y)R_{Y,X}R_{X,Y}.$$

Then θ is a twist.

In particular, the category of ribbon braids is twisted, and so is the category of ribbon pure braids. Moreover we have a canonical group isomorphism

$$(u, t_1, \dots, t_n) : \text{RPB}_n \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{PB}_n \times \mathbb{Z}^n,$$

where u denotes the forgetful morphism $\text{RPB}_n \rightarrow \text{PB}_n$, and t_i the self-linking number of the i -th component.

REMARK. Let \mathcal{C} be an entwined category, with twine D . Just like in the braided case, there is a canonical way of adjoining a twist to \mathcal{C} . Indeed, define a category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ as follows. The objects of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ are data (X, t) , with $X \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ and $t \in \text{Aut}(X)$. Morphisms from (X, t) to (X', t') are morphisms $f : X \rightarrow X'$ in \mathcal{C} such that $t'f = ft$. Define a tensor product on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, on objects, by

$$(X, t) \otimes (X', t') = (X \otimes X', (t \otimes t')D_{X, X'}),$$

and on morphisms, by the tensor product of \mathcal{C} . One checks easily that this makes $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ a strict monoidal category (using axioms TW0 and TW1), and that setting $\theta_{(X, t)} = t$ defines a twist θ on $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ (using TW2). The forgetful functor $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is entwined, and this construction is universal.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a twisted category, $\Lambda = \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, and $\text{RPB}(\Lambda)$ be the category of Λ -coloured ribbon pure braids. There exists a unique strict twisted functor*

$$[\cdot] : \text{RPB}[\Lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

sending $[0]_X$ ($X \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) to the object X itself.

PROOF. Clearly the image of the coloured ribbon pure braid $P[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ can be no other than $(\theta_{X_1}^{t_1(P)} \otimes \dots \otimes \theta_{X_n}^{t_n(P)})[u(P)]_{X_1, \dots, X_n}$, and this defines indeed a strict twisted functor. \square

NOTATION. Let \mathcal{C} be a twisted category; for $P \in \text{RPB}_n$, we let $[P] = (\theta^{t_1(P)} \otimes \dots \otimes \theta^{t_n(P)})[u(P)] \in \text{End}(\otimes^n)$.

4. TWISTS, DUALITY, AND INVARIANTS OF STRING LINKS

DEFINITION. Let n be a non-negative integer. A (ribbon) string link on n strands is an oriented (ribbon) tangle from $n[+]$ to $n[+]$, without closed components, and such that the i -th input is connected to the i -th output.

We denote **RStL** the monoidal subcategory of **Tang** whose morphisms are isotopy classes of ribbon string links.

The category of ribbon pure braids **RPB** is naturally embedded as a monoidal subcategory of **RStL**.

DEFINITION. Let P be a ribbon string link on n strands, and $1 < i < n$. We define the i -th right contraction of P to be the ribbon string link on $n - 2$

strands $c_i(P)$ defined by

$$c_i(P) = \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\quad \quad \quad}^{i-2} \quad \quad \quad \overbrace{\quad \quad \quad}^{n-i-1} \\ \begin{array}{c} \cdots \quad | \quad \text{cap} \quad | \quad \cdots \\ \hline P \\ \hline \cdots \quad | \quad \text{cup} \quad | \quad \cdots \\ \underbrace{\quad \quad \quad}_{i-2} \quad \quad \quad \underbrace{\quad \quad \quad}_{n-i-1} \end{array} \end{array}.$$

We will now mimick this construction in a categorical setting, using the notion of duality.

Proposition 4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category, and let θ be a twist of \mathcal{C} . Let X be an object of \mathcal{C} and (Y, e, h) be a right dual of X .*

The following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) θ_X and θ_Y are dual morphisms;
- (ii) $\theta_X^2 = (eD_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1_X)(1_X \otimes h)$;
- (ii') $\theta_Y^2 = (1_Y \otimes eD_{Y,X}^{-1})(h \otimes 1_Y)$;

Moreover if they hold for one right dual of X , they hold for all.

DEFINITION. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category with right duals. Let θ be a twist of \mathcal{C} . We say that θ is *self-dual* if for any object X of \mathcal{C} the equivalent assertions of the previous proposition hold.

Let \mathcal{C} be a twisted with right duals and a self-dual twist. Assume that right duals are chosen.

NOTATION. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category with right duals. Let X, Y, Z be objects of \mathcal{C} . For $f \in \text{End}(X \otimes Y \otimes Y^\vee \otimes Y \otimes Z)$, let

$$c_{X,Y,Z}(f) = (1_X \otimes e \otimes 1_Y \otimes 1_Z)f(1_X \otimes 1_Y \otimes h \otimes 1_Z).$$

Now let $\phi \in \text{End}(\otimes^n)$ and $1 < i < n$. Define $c_i\phi \in \text{End}(\otimes^{n-2})$ by

$$(c_i\phi)_{X_1, \dots, X_{n-2}} = c_{X_1, \dots, X_{i-2}, X_{i-1}, X_i, \dots, X_{n-2}} \phi_{X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i-1}^\vee, X_{i-1}, \dots, X_n}.$$

Pictorially,

$$(c_i\phi)_{X_1, \dots, X_{n-2}} = \begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\quad \quad \quad}^{X_1 \dots X_{i-2}} \quad \quad \quad \overbrace{\quad \quad \quad}^{X_{i-1} \dots X_{n-2}} \\ \begin{array}{c} \cdots \quad | \quad \text{cap} \quad | \quad \cdots \\ \hline \phi \\ \hline \cdots \quad | \quad \text{cup} \quad | \quad \cdots \\ \underbrace{\quad \quad \quad}_{X_1 \dots X_{i-1}} \quad \quad \quad \underbrace{\quad \quad \quad}_{X_i \dots X_{n-2}} \end{array} \end{array}.$$

Notice that $c_i\phi$ is in fact independent of the choice of a right dual for X_{i-1} .

Theorem 3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category with right duals and a self-dual twist. There exists a unique way of associating to each isotopy class of ribbon string link $P \in \text{RStL}_n$ a functorial endomorphism $\vec{P} \in \text{End}(\otimes^n)$ in such a way that:*

- (i) $\vec{P} = [P]$ for any ribbon pure braid P ;

- (ii) $c_i \vec{P} = \overleftarrow{c_i P}$ for any $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_n$ and $1 < i < n$ such that the i -th component of P is trivial.

Corollary 1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category with right duals and a self-dual twist. Let $\Lambda = \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$ be a set and denote $\mathbf{RStL}[\Lambda] \subset \mathbf{Tang}[\Lambda]$ the category of Λ -coloured ribbon string links. There exists a canonical twisted functor*

$$\vec{\cdot} : \mathbf{RStL}[\Lambda] \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

which sends a coloured ribbon string link $P[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ to $\vec{P}_{X_1, \dots, X_n}$.

If \mathcal{C} is a twisted category with left duals, one may (by left-right symmetry) associate with any ribbon string link $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_n$ an element $\overleftarrow{P} \in \mathbf{End}(\otimes^n)$. If both right- and left duals exist, it is not at all clear whether $\overleftarrow{P} = \vec{P}$. This suggests the following definition.

DEFINITION. Let \mathcal{C} be a monoidal category with left and right duals, and θ a twist of \mathcal{C} . We say that θ is *ambidextrous* if it is self-dual, and we have

$$\forall P \in \mathbf{RStL}, \overleftarrow{P} = \vec{P}.$$

If such is the case, we set $[P] = \overleftarrow{P} = \vec{P}$.

When the twist is ambidextrous, we have $[c_i P] = c_i [P]$ for any $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_n$ and any $1 < i < n$.

REMARK. Theorem 3, while it provides a means of constructing invariants of ribbon string links, has a serious drawback : it is not a universal property, because the category of ribbon string links has no duals. The aim of section 5 will be to mend this matter.

Proof of Theorem 3. If P is a ribbon pure braid, $\vec{P} = [P]$ is already well-defined. The point is now to see that a string link can be obtained from a pure braid by a sequence of ‘nice’ contractions. This will at least show that $\vec{\cdot}$ is unique, and suggest a construction for it. We then must check the coherence of this construction, *i. e.* its independence from the choices made.

The main trick we use consists in ‘pulling a max to the top line’. Let D be a tangle diagram with a local max m , with p outputs. We may write

$$D = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & | & \dots \\ \hline T & & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & m & \dots \\ \hline U & & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array},$$

where T, U are tangle diagrams.

Let i be an integer, $1 \leq i \leq n+1$. Let j be the number of strands to the left of m on the same horizontal line, plus 1. Let T' be a tangle diagram obtained from T by inserting a new component C going from a point between the $(j-1)$ -th and j -th inputs of T to a point between the $(i-1)$ -th and i -th outputs of T . We assume also that C has no local extrema. Note that we

have $T = T' - C$. Let $T'' = \Delta_C T'$ be the tangle diagram obtained from T' by doubling C . Set

$$D' = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array}.$$

We say that D' is obtained from D by pulling m to the top in the i -th position (along the path C).

One defines similarly the action of pulling a local min to the bottom.

Now let D be a n -string link diagram, oriented from bottom to top. We say that D is *right-handed* if all local extrema point to the right.

Assume D is right-handed. Pulling all local max to the top and all local min to the bottom, one may obtain a pure braid diagram. Here is an algorithm. Denote m_i the number of local max (which is equal to the number of local min) on the i -th component of D . Let $m = m(D) = m_1 + \dots + m_n$ be the number of local max of D . If $m(D) = 0$, we are already done. Otherwise, chose i minimal so that $m_i > 0$. Denote c the i -th component, and let m be the first max, and m' the first min you meet on c , going from bottom to top. Pull m to the top, in the i -th position (just to the left of c), and m' to the bottom, in the $i+1$ -th position (just to the right of c). Let D' be the diagram so constructed. Then D' is a string link diagram, with $m(D') = m(D) - 1$. Moreover, $\{D\} = c_{i+1}\{D'\}$, and the $(i+1)$ -th component of D' is unknotted. Repeated m times, this transformation yields a pure braid diagram P with $n + 2m$ threads, and we have

$$\{D\} = c_{j_m} \dots c_{j_1} P,$$

where $1 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_m \leq n$, and j_k takes m_i times the value $i + 1$.

We therefore set

$$\vec{D} = c_{j_m} \dots c_{j_1} [P],$$

and we now proceed to show that this is independent of the choice made in the construction of P , that is, the actual paths along which the local extrema are being pulled.

Lemma 2. *Let P, P' be two pure braid diagrams:*

$$P = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array}, \quad P' = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array},$$

which differ only inside a circle. Inside the circle, the i -th and $i+1$ strands pass respectively to the front and the back of the k -th strand; above the circle, the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th strands run parallel. Let \mathcal{C} be a entwined category, X_1, \dots, X_n objects of \mathcal{C} , and let $e : X_i \otimes X_{i+1} \rightarrow I$ be any morphism. Let $E = 1_{X_1 \otimes \dots \otimes X_{i-1}} \otimes e \otimes 1_{X_{i+2} \otimes \dots \otimes X_n}$. Then $E[P]_{X_1, \dots, X_n} = E[P']_{X_1, \dots, X_n}$.

PROOF. We will use the following fact, which is an immediate consequence of Proposition 1. If $A \in \mathbf{PB}_n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, construct $\Delta_i P \in \mathbf{PB}_{n+1}$ by doubling the i -th strand of P . Given $n+1$ objects $X_1, \dots, X_i, X'_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n$ in \mathcal{C} , we have:

$$[\Delta_i P]_{X_1, \dots, X_i, X'_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n} = [P]_{X_1, \dots, X_i \otimes X'_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n}.$$

Now let us prove the lemma, and assume for instance $k < i$. One may represent P and P' as

$$P = \Delta_i A \Delta_i s_{k,i} B, \quad P' = \Delta_i AB,$$

with $A \in \mathbf{PB}_{n-1}$, $B \in \mathbf{PB}_n$, and $s_{k,i}$ is the Burau generator. Using the above-mentioned fact, we may assume A and B trivial. The lemma then results from elementary properties of the twine. The case $k > i+1$ can be treated in a similar way. \square

From the lemma, we see not only that $\vec{D}_{X_1, \dots, X_n}$ is independent of the choices made, but also that it is invariant under Reidemeister moves of type 2 and 3. In addition, it is invariant under ‘right-handed moves of type 0’, namely

$$\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ \uparrow \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \downarrow \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \uparrow \end{array},$$

In the first case, it is an easy consequence of the identity

$$c_{i+1}[\Delta_i^3 P] = [P],$$

where P is a pure braid diagram and $\Delta_i^3 P$ is obtained by tripling the i -th strand of P . The second case is deduced from the first, using type 2 moves.

Now let D be an arbitrary n -string link diagram. For each local extremum pointing to the left, modify D in the following way :

$$(1) \quad \curvearrowright \rightarrow \text{crossing}, \quad (2) \quad \cup \rightarrow \text{crossing}.$$

This operation yields a right-handed diagram D^r .

For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let t_i be the algebraic number of modifications made on the i -th component, with (1) counting as -1 and (2) as $+1$.

Set $\vec{D} = (\theta^{t_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \theta^{t_n}) D^r$.

Clearly this is invariant under Reidemeister moves of type 2 and 3. As for invariance under type 0 moves, the case when the extrema point to the left reduces to the right-handed case (already proved) via:

$$\begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{crossing} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array} \stackrel{(R2-3)}{=} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \curvearrowright \end{array}.$$

Moreover, we have $\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array}^{+1}$ (where the $+1$ denotes the twist), and $\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array}^{+1} = \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{twist} \end{array}^{-1}$ by self-duality of the twist, hence invariance under moves of type 1.

Let us summarize: given $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_n$, we have constructed $\vec{P} \in \mathbf{End}(\otimes^n)$. Now notice that when one forms the i -th contraction $c_i D$ of a string link diagram D , the orientation of its i -th component is reversed; in particular, if D is right-handed, $c_i D$ is not, unless there are no local extrema on the i -th component, that is, the i -th component is unknotted. In that case, we

do have $c_i \overrightarrow{P} = \overrightarrow{c_i P}$. Indeed, we may represent P by a diagram whose i -th component has no local extrema, hence $P = c_{j_m} \dots c_{j_1} Q$, with Q ribbon pure braid, $j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_m$, and $j_k \neq i+1$ for all k .

Lemma 3. *The contraction operators c_i satisfy the following relations :*

- (a) for $i \leq j-2$, $c_i c_j = c_{j-2} c_i$;
- (b) for $i \geq j$, $c_i c_j = c_j c_{i+2}$.

Assume $j_{k-1} \leq i \leq j_k - 2$. By the lemma, $c_i P = c_{j_m-2} \dots c_{j_k-2} c_i c_{j_{k-1}} \dots c_1 Q$, so $\overrightarrow{c_i P} = c_{j_m-2} \dots c_{j_k-2} c_i c_{j_{k-1}} \dots c_1 [Q] = c_i c_{j_m} \dots c_{j_1} [Q] = c_i \overrightarrow{P}$, hence the theorem.

5. TURBAN CATEGORIES

By virtue of Shum's theorem, the category of ribbon oriented tangles is the universal tortile category. On the other hand, we have just seen that any category with right duals and a self-dual twist defines invariants of ribbon string links. Recall proposition 1:

Proposition 1. *The category \mathbf{Turb} (resp. \mathbf{eTang}) is the smallest monoidal subcategory of \mathbf{Tang} having the same objects as \mathbf{Tang} , and containing all evaluations, coevaluations and twists (resp. double braidings).*

This suggests strongly that Shum's theorem has an analogue for turbans. In other words, one should be able to define a notion of 'turban category', in such a way that \mathbf{Turb} is the universal turban category. Before we proceed to do so, let us prove proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. We denote \mathcal{E} the monoidal subcategory of \mathbf{Tang} generated by the evaluation morphisms. A tangle in \mathcal{E} may be represented by a diagram with $2n+k$ input and k output, without crossings and local min. Here is a typical example:




Dually, we denote \mathcal{E}^* the monoidal subcategory of \mathbf{Tang} generated by the coevaluation morphisms.

Lemma 4. *Any turban tangle T may be factorized as $T = EPH$, where P is a ribbon pure braid and $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $H \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Moreover, if T is even, we may assume that each component of P has trivial self-linking number.*

PROOF. Let T be an (oriented) turban tangle, that is, an oriented ribbon tangle whose linking matrix has only even entries outside the diagonal.

We may write T as



where T' is a turban with $2n$ input and no output. Assume T' has k closed component. Pulling a local min down to the bottom line on the right-hand

side, we may represent T' as

$$T' = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} H \\ \vdots \end{array}} \cup \dots \cup \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \end{array}},$$

where H is a turban with $2N = 2n + 2k$ input, no output and no closed components.

Now the turban condition on H excludes a configuration of four legs $i < j < k < l$ with (i, j) and (k, l) connected in H .

By pulling one local max per component to the top line, we may therefore write H as

$$H = EQ,$$

where $Q \in \mathbf{RStL}_{2N}$, and E is an element of \mathcal{E} with $2N$ input and 0 output.

So we may write $P = E'QH'$, with $Q \in \mathbf{RStL}$, $E' \in \mathcal{E}$, $H' \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Now any ribbon string link may be obtained from a ribbon pure braid by a finite number of contractions, so we may write $Q = E''PH''$, with $P \in \mathbf{RPB}$, $E'' \in \mathcal{E}$ and $H'' \in \mathcal{E}^*$. Setting $E = E'E''$, $H = H''H'$, we have $T = EPH$.

If T is even, Q be assumed even. Now by self-duality of the twist we have $\overline{\overline{\mathfrak{P}}} = \mathfrak{P}$ so we may factor Q as $E'PH'$, with $E' \in \mathcal{E}$, $H' \in \mathcal{E}^*$ and P a ribbon pure braid with trivial self-linking numbers. \square

Clearly, the lemma implies proposition 1. Indeed, we know that the category of ribbon pure braids is generated (as a monoidal category) by the twist, and the subcategory of ribbon pure braids with trivial self-linking numbers is generated by the double braiding.

REMARK. Proposition 1 has the following straightforward consequences.


1) *Any invariant of ribbon links or turban tangle arising from a tortile category \mathcal{C} is independent of the braiding:* it depends only on the twist and the duality.

2) If \mathcal{C} is a twisted category with chosen right and left duals, and $\mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C} = \Lambda$, there exists at most one twisted, dual-preserving functor $F_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathbf{Turb}[\Lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ sending $[+]_X$ ($X \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) to the object X itself.


Naturally, one could define a turban category to be a twisted category with chosen left and right duals, and such that the functor $F_{\mathcal{C}}$ exists. We would have the universal property for free! However, such a definition would not be of great practical use: we need a more concrete criterium. Also, it seems reasonable to assume that the choices of left and right duals define a sovereign structure on \mathcal{C} (indeed, such is the case in \mathbf{Turb}).

Let \mathcal{C} be a sovereign category with ambidextrous twist. For any ribbon stringlink P , denote $[P] = \overrightarrow{P} = \overleftarrow{P}$. Pictorially, we will represent $[P]$ as \boxed{P} . We say that the *strong sphericity condition* is satisfied if for any $P \in$

\mathbf{RStL}_{n+2} , $1 \leq i \leq n+1$, $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, and $f \in \mathbf{End}(Y)$, we have

(Sph) 

where e, h, ε, η denote the evaluation and coevaluation morphisms for Y . We say that the *strong interchange condition* is satisfied if for any $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_{n+2}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, and $f \in \mathbf{End}(Y)$, we have

(Int) 

We say that the *weak sphericity condition* (resp. the *weak interchange condition*) holds when we have (Sph) (resp. (Int)) whenever $f = 1_Y$.

DEFINITION. A turban category is a twisted sovereign category with ambidextrous twist satisfying the strong sphericity and the strong interchange conditions.

EXAMPLE. 1) For any set Λ , $\mathbf{Turb}[\Lambda]$ is a turban category.

2) Any tortile category is a turban category.

3) If \mathcal{C} is a turban category, and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$ is a twisted sovereign subcategory of \mathcal{C} , then \mathcal{D} is a turban category.

We can now state the analogue of Shum's theorem.

Theorem 4. *The category of oriented turban tangles is the universal turban category. In other words, if \mathcal{C} is a turban category and $\Lambda = \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$, there exists a unique turban functor*

$$F_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathbf{Turb}[\Lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

sending $[+]_X$ ($X \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) to the object X itself.

PROOF.


We must construct a twisted, dual-preserving functor

$$F : \mathbf{Turb}[\Lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$$

sending $[+]_X$ ($X \in \mathbf{Ob}\mathcal{C}$) to the object X itself. The proof of proposition 1 gives us a construction for F , and we have to check that it is unambiguous. We will now outline the proof.

1) The assumption that the twist is ambidextrous tells us that the functor F is well-defined on ribbon string links. It is also well-defined on \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{E}^* .

2) We check that F is well-defined on a turban tangle T with $2n$ input, no output, and no closed component. Such a T may be factorized as $T = EP$, with $P \in \mathbf{RStL}_{2n}$ and $E \in \mathcal{E}$, so we should set $F(T) = F(E)F(P)$. We have to check that this is independent of the actual factorization. The proof of this fact is similar to that of Theorem 3: starting from a suitable diagram representing T , a factorization is obtained by pulling certain local max to the top line in the right order. Just as in the proof of theorem 3, each of these local max may have to be modified so as to point in the appropriate direction. We need an analogue of lemma 2, graphically:



this is easy to check using theorem 3. This tells us that $F(E)F(P)$ is independent of the choices of pathes, and it is then easy to check that it depends only on the isotopy class of the tangle.

3) We now define F on turban tangles T with $2n$ input, no output, and closed components L_1, \dots, L_k . Such a tangle may be factorized as

$$T = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} H \\ \dots \\ \cup \dots \cup \end{array}},$$

where H is a turban with $2N = 2n + 2k$ input, no output and no closed components. Such a factorization is obtained by pulling a local min of each of the L_i to the bottom line, and to the right. This defines $F(T)$ with possibly two types of ambiguities: we use an numbering of closed components, and for each closed component we must decide whether the local minimum points to the right or to the left. However, the (weak) exchange and sphericity conditions say precisely that the value for $F(T)$ is independent of the numbering of components, and the direction of each min.

4) We may write an arbitrary turban tangle T as

$$T = \boxed{\begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \cup \\ T' \\ \dots \end{array}},$$

where T' is a turban with $2n$ input and no output, and this defines F on T in an unambiguous way.

This defines a monoidal functor which has the required properties. \square

REMARK. Theorem 4 remains true if we replace the strong sphericity and strong interchange condition by their weak counterparts. However the strong version will probably prove more useful.

6. CONSTRUCTION OF TWISTED CATEGORIES

6.1. Toy example: the group-like case. Let G be a group and $\mathcal{C} = G\text{-vect}$ the category of G -graded vector spaces over a field k . Denote k_g the simple object consisting of one copy of k in degree g . The dual of k_g is $k_{g^{-1}}$, and the canonical evaluation and coevaluation morphisms define a sovereign structure on \mathcal{C} . Each simple object has left and right dimension equal to 1.

An automorphism of \otimes is characterized by its values on simple objects, that is, a map $\delta : G \otimes G \rightarrow k^*$. It is a twine if and only if $\delta(e, e) = 1$ and $\delta(g, h)\delta(gh, k) = \delta(h, k)\delta(g, hg)$ (in other words, δ is a 2-cocycle).

Notice that if G is not commutative, \mathcal{C} is not braided; and if G is commutative, a braiding on \mathcal{C} corresponds to a bicharacter $c : G \times G \rightarrow k^*$. The double braiding, $c(h, g)c(g, h)$, is a symmetric bicharacter. Twines are far more numerous than double braidings.

An automorphism of $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ is given by a map $\theta : G \rightarrow k^*$. It is a twist if and only if $\theta(e) = 1$. Self-duality is equivalent to $\theta(g^{-1}) = \theta(g)$. Now any self-dual twist actually defines a turban structure on \mathcal{C} .

The invariants of ribbon links and turban tangles associated with such turban categories contain no more information than the linking matrix.

6.2. Toy example: the infinitesimal case. Let \mathcal{C} be a k -monoidal category, where k is a field, and define $\mathcal{C}[\varepsilon] = \mathcal{C} \otimes_k k[\varepsilon]$ by extending the scalars of \mathcal{C} to the ring of dual numbers $k[\varepsilon] = k[X]/(X^2)$.

Let $d_{X,Y} : X \otimes Y \rightarrow X \otimes Y$ be a functorial morphism, $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$. Set $D_{X,Y} = 1_{X \otimes Y} + \varepsilon d_{X,Y}$. Then D is a twine on $\mathcal{C}[\varepsilon]$ if and only if d satisfies the following conditions :

- (a) $d_{I,I} = 0$;
- (b) $d_{X,Y} + d_{X \otimes Y, Z} = d_{Y, Z} + d_{X, Y \otimes Z}$.

Let $t_X : X \rightarrow X$ be a functorial morphism, $X \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{C}$. Set $\theta_X = 1_X + \varepsilon t_X$. Then θ is a twist if and only if t satisfies the condition $t_I = 0$. If \mathcal{C} has duals, θ is self-dual if and only if $t_{X^\vee} = -t_X$.

Infinitesimal twists are expected to define turban invariants of finite type (in this case, of degree ≤ 1).

6.3. Tannaka theory for twined and twisted categories. Let k be a field, and H a bialgebra over k , with coproduct Δ , counit ε , product μ and unit η . Denote $\text{comod}H$ the monoidal category of finite dimensional right H -comodules.

DEFINITION. A *cotwinor* of H is a linear form $d : H \otimes H \rightarrow K$ satisfying the following axioms :

- (**codt-1**) d is invertible (for the convolution product on $H \otimes H$), and $d * \mu = \mu * d$ in $\text{Hom}(H^{\otimes 2}, H)$;
- (**codt0**) $d(\eta \otimes \eta) = 1$;
- (**codt1**) $(d \otimes \varepsilon) * d(\mu \otimes 1_H) = (\varepsilon \otimes d) * d(1_H \otimes \mu)$;
- (**codt2**) $d_{1,3}d_{3,4}^{-1}d_{2,4}d_{3,4} = d_{3,4}^{-1}d_{2,4}d_{3,4}d_{1,3}$ in $\text{Hom}(H^{\otimes 4}, k)$.

DEFINITION. A *cotwistor* of H is a linear form $\theta : H \rightarrow k$ satisfying the following axioms:

- (cotw-1) θ is invertible (for the convolution product on H), and $(\theta \otimes 1_H)\Delta = (1_H \otimes \theta)\Delta$;
(cotw0) $\theta\eta = 1$;
(cotw1) $(\theta^{-1}\mu)_{12}(\theta\mu^3)_{123}(\theta^{-1}\mu)_{23}(\theta\mu^3)_{234}(\theta^{-1}\mu)_{34} = (\theta^{-1}\mu)_{34}(\theta\mu^3)_{234}(\theta^{-1}\mu)_{23}(\theta\mu^3)_{123}(\theta^{-1}\mu)_{12}$.

Theorem 5. *The set of twines (resp twists) of $\text{comod}H$ is in 1—1 correspondence with the set of cotwinors (resp. cotwistors) on H . Moreover, when H admits an antipode S (that is, when $\text{comod}H$ has right duals) self-dual twists of $\text{comod}H$ correspond exactly with cotwistors θ such that $\theta S = \theta$.*

PROOF. This is straightforward tannakan translation. Given $d : H \otimes H \rightarrow k$, and two H -comodules V, V' , with coactions ∂, ∂' , define $D_{V,V'} = (1_{V \otimes V'} \otimes d)(1_X \otimes \sigma_{H,X'} \otimes 1_H)(\partial \otimes \partial')$. Axiom (codt-1) means that $D_{V,V'}$ is an isomorphism of comodules, and (codt0)-(codt2) translate axioms (DT0)-(DT2) of twines. Similarly, given $\theta : H \rightarrow k$, and a H -comodule V , define $\theta_V = (1_H \otimes \theta)\partial$. Axiom (cotw-1) means that θ_V is an isomorphism of comodules, and (cotw0), (cotw1) translate axioms (TW0), (TW1) of twists. \square

Should the reader prefers modules to comodules, here are the dual notions.

DEFINITION. A *twino* of H is an element $d \in H \otimes H$ satisfying the following axioms :

- (dt-1) d is invertible, and $\forall x \in H, d\Delta(x) = \Delta(x)d$;
(dt0) $(\varepsilon \otimes \varepsilon)d = 1$;
(dt1) $(d \otimes \eta)(\Delta \otimes 1_H)d = (\eta \otimes d)(1_H \otimes \Delta)d$;
(dt2) $d_{1,3}d_{3,4}^{-1}d_{2,4}d_{3,4} = d_{3,4}^{-1}d_{2,4}d_{3,4}d_{1,3}$ in $H^{\otimes 4}$.

DEFINITION. A *twistor* of H is an element $\theta \in H$ satisfying the following axioms:

- (tw-1) θ is invertible and central;
(tw0) $\varepsilon\theta = 1$;
(tw1) $(\Delta\theta^{-1})_{12}(\Delta^3\theta)_{123}(\Delta\theta^{-1})_{23}(\Delta^3\theta)_{234}(\Delta\theta^{-1})_{34} = (\Delta\theta^{-1})_{34}(\Delta^3\theta)_{234}(\Delta\theta^{-1})_{23}(\Delta^3\theta)_{123}(\Delta\theta^{-1})_{12}$.

If d is a twino (resp. twistor) of H , the monoidal category $H\text{-mod}$ of finite dimensional left H -modules is entwined (resp. twisted).

REFERENCES

- [Bru00] A. Bruguières, *Catégories prémodulaires, modularisation et invariants de variétés de dimension 3*, Math. Ann. **316** (2000), no. 2, 215—236.
[JS93] A. Joyal and R. Street, *Braided tensor categories*, Adv. Math. **102** (1993), no. 1, 20—78.
[Mar45] A. Markoff, *Foundations of the algebraic theory of tresses*, Trav. Inst. Math. Stekloff **16** (1945), 53.
[Shu94] M. C. Shum, *Tortile tensor categories*, J. of Pure and Appl. Alg. **93** (1994), no. 1, 57—110.
[Sta04] M. D. Staic, *Pure-braided hopf algebras and knot invariants*, Jour. of Knot Theory and its Ramifications **13** (2004), no. 3, 385—400.
[Tur94] V. G. Turaev, *Quantum invariants of knots and 3-manifolds*, de Gruyter, 1994.
[Ver03] V. Vershinin, *Survey on braids*, Preprint MPIM1998-53, 2003.

ALAIN BRUGUIÈRES,
INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET MODÉLISATION DE MONTPELLIER (I3M) -
UMR C.N.R.S. 5149
DÉPARTEMENT DES SCIENCES MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ MONTPELLIER II,
CASE COURRIER 051, PLACE EUGÈNE BATAILLON, 34095 MONTPELLIER CEDEX
5, FRANCE
E-MAIL ADDRESS: bruguier@math.univ-montp2.fr