GEOMETRICALLY INFINITE SURFACES IN 3-MANIFOLDS WITH HYPERBOLIC FUNDAMENTAL GROUP

JOSH BARNARD

ABSTRACT. We prove a partial generalization of Bonahon's tameness result to surfaces inside irreducible 3–manifolds with hyperbolic fundamental group.

Bonahon's result states that geometrically infinite ends of freely indecomposable hyperbolic 3-manifolds are simply degenerate. It is easy to see that a geometrically infinite end gives rise to a sequence of curves on the corresponding surface whose geodesic representatives are not contained in any compact set. The main step in his proof is showing that one may assume that these curves are simple on the surface.

In this paper, we generalize the main step of Bonahon's proof, showing that a geometrically infinite end gives rise to a sequence of simple surface curves whose geodesic representatives are not contained in any compact set.

Contents

1
2
4
4
5
8
9
10
11
13
13
16
23
24

1. INTRODUCTION

In [Bon86] Bonahon shows that geometrically infinite ends of freely indecomposable hyperbolic 3-manifolds are simply degenerate. Suppose N is a closed irreducible hyperbolic 3-manifold containing a π_1 -injective closed surface S. (Bonahon's theorem covers a broader class of 3-manifolds, but this is the relevant setup for our purposes.) Let M be the cover of N corresponding to the subgroup $\pi_1(S) \leq \pi_1(N)$. If S is geometrically infinite in N, then there is a sequence of

Date: March 29, 2022.

J. BARNARD

essential curves $\{\gamma_i\}$ on S whose corresponding geodesic representatives $\{\gamma_i^*\}$ in Mare not contained in any compact set in M (i.e., they *reach out* an end of M). The most important and most technical part of Bonahon's proof is in showing that we may assume that each γ_i is simple on S. The next step is to find a sequence of pleated surfaces S_i "hanging off" these γ_i^* which, having uniformly bounded diameter in M, must exit an end of M. In particular, the simple curves γ_i have geodesic representatives γ_i^* in M which exit an end of M. This is what it means for an end of M to be simply degenerate. Moreover, with this more restrictive set-up, it is easy then to deduce that S is a virtual fiber in N. In particular, M is topologically tame (so that, in this case, M is homeomorphic to $S \times \mathbf{R}$).

In this paper we generalize the main step (of the restricted version described above) of Bonahon's proof to the case that N is not known to be hyperbolic, but rather is known only to have Gromov-hyperbolic fundamental group.

There are two important comments to be made. The first is that this result is an immediate consequence of geometrization, as any geometric N satisfying the given hypotheses must support a complete hyperbolic structure, so that Bonahon's theorem applies. On the other hand, our version (cf. Prop 4.1) of the main technical proposition of Bonahon's paper [Bon86, Prop 5.1] applies not only to 3-manifolds, but to closed surface subgroups of any torsion-free hyperbolic group G. The assumption that $G = \pi_1(N)$ is used only in the intersection lemma 2.4. In fact, almost all the novelty of this paper can be found in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Second, we note that the pleated surface portion of Bonahon's proof is relatively simple, especially when compared to the subtle arguments contained elsewhere in his paper. In contrast, generalizing this argument to obtain a corresponding statement about hyperbolic groups seems less than straightforward. We will say more about this issue in the next subsection, once the appropriate notation is introduced.

1.1. **Definitions and Notation.** We introduce some notation and terminology that will hold throughout this paper.

Suppose (Z, d_Z) is a path-metric space. If A and B are two subsets of Z, the distance between A and B is defined to be

$$d_Z(A,B) = \inf\{d_Z(a,b) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

A geodesic in Z is a path that minimizes distance globally. A geodesic segment between two points x and y is denoted [xy]. A geodesic triangle $\Delta(xyz)$ is a union of three geodesic segments of the form [xy], [yz], and [xz]. A geodesic triangle $\Delta(xyz)$ in Z is said to be δ -slim if for any point w on [xy] we have

$$\min\{d_Z(w, [xz]), d_Z(w, [yz])\} \le \delta.$$

Suppose Z has a cell-structure. The induced path-metric on the k-skeleton $Z^{(k)}$ of Z is denoted d_Z^k . If Y is any topological manifold, we will assume (by homotopy) that any map $f: Y \to Z$ induces via pullback a locally-finite cell structure on Y.

An edge-path in Z is a map $\sigma : [0,n] \to Z$ so that the restriction to each open interval (i, i + 1) is an isometry onto an open edge in $Z^{(1)}$. The length of an edge-path $\sigma : [0,n] \to Z$, denoted $\ell(\sigma)$, is n. If σ is an edge-path in Z with $\sigma((i-1,i]) \cap \sigma([i,i+1)) = \sigma(i)$ for all i, then σ is non-backtracking. If $\sigma(0) = \sigma(n)$, then σ is an edge-loop. A minimal edge-loop is an edge-loop minimizing length among other edge-loops in its free homotopy class in Z. Throughout this paper, we let N denote a closed irreducible (topological) 3– manifold with hyperbolic fundamental group G containing a nontrivial closed surface subgroup $H \simeq \pi_1(S)$. Let X denote the universal cover of N. Fix a 1–vertex triangulation of N and let d_N be the metric obtained by requiring all simplices of this triangulation to be isometric to standard regular Euclidean simplices. From this triangulation, one obtains a finite triangular presentation for G with generators in 1–1 correspondence with the edges of the 1–skeleton $N^{(1)}$. This 1–skeleton lifts to $X^{(1)}$, which we identify with the Cayley graph for this presentation of G. The induced path-metric d_X^1 on $X^{(1)}$ is the standard Cayley-graph metric where all edges have length one.

The fact that the group G is Gromov-hyperbolic is reflected in the fact that $(X^{(1)}, d_X^1)$ has δ -slim geodesic triangles, for some $\delta \geq 0$. The hyperbolicity of G also implies that S has genus $g \geq 2$.

Let M denote the cover of N with $\pi_1(M) = H \simeq \pi_1(S)$, and endow M with the induced cell structure and metric. Equivalently, we have M = X/H, where H acts in the usual way by left (say) translation. Note that M is homotopy equivalent to S(because closed hyperbolic surfaces are Eilenberg–Mac Lane spaces). We henceforth fix a homotopy equivalence $\phi : S \to M$, which provides a fixed isomorphism $\phi_* :$ $\pi_1(S) \to H = \pi_1(M)$. This identification of H as both a subgroup of G and as the fundamental group of S will often be tacitly assumed, especially with respect to notation. Suppose σ is an essential closed curve on S. We let σ^* denote a choice of minimal edge-loop in M in the free homotopy class (in M) of $\phi(\sigma)$.

We say that H is geometrically finite in G if there is some compact set $K \subset M$ so that, for all essential closed curves σ on S, we have that $\sigma^* \subset K$. We say that H is geometrically infinite in G if it is not geometrically finite.

Let M_c be a compact core for M. An end of M is a non-precompact component of the complement $M - M_c$. A simple homological argument shows that M has two ends. Note that if K is any compact set containing M_c , there is a natural identification between the non-precompact components of M - K with the ends of M. Such a component is called a *neighborhood* of the corresponding end.

Thus H is geometrically infinite in G if and only if one may find a sequence $\{\sigma_i\}$ of essential curves on S and a corresponding sequence of minimal edge-loops $\{\sigma_i^*\}$ in M having the property that each neighborhood U_b of some end b intersects some σ_i^* nontrivially. The sequence $\{\sigma_i^*\}$ is said to reach into the end b. We say that H is simply geometrically infinite it is geometrically infinite, and if one may choose the σ_i to be simple on S.

We now state our main theorem.

Theorem 1.1. Let N be a closed irreducible 3-manifold with fundamental group G containing a closed surface subgroup H. The H is geometrically infinite in G if and only if H is simply geometrically infinite in G.

Remark 1.2. In the Kleinian groups context, one applies the terms "geometrically finite" and "geometrically infinite" to the *ends* of the manifold M. It is more convenient in our context to apply these terms directly to the subgroup H. If one is thinking in terms of ends, however, our notion of simply geometrically infinite lies between those of a geometrically infinite end and a *simply degenerate* end, for which one may choose the σ_i not only to be simple on S but also to have corresponding minimal edge-loops σ_i^* that *exit* the end (i.e., they leave compact sets while reaching deeper into the end). (In this case, we would say that H is a simply degenerate subgroup of G.) In this sense, the theorem above is a weaker version of the main result of [Bon86], which says essentially that geometrically infinite ends of hyperbolic 3-manifolds are simply degenerate. Here is a sketch of the argument that simply geometrically infinite implies simply degenerate in the hyperbolic 3-manifold case.

This is the pleated surface argument. Suppose b is a simply geometrically infinite end of $M = \mathbf{H}^3/H$ with $H \simeq \pi_1(S)$. Let $\{\sigma_i\}$ be a sequence of essential simple closed curves on S so that the corresponding sequence of geodesics $\{\sigma_i^*\}$ in Mreaches into the end b of M. Following an argument of Thurston, one can construct a sequence of pleated surfaces $\phi_i : S \to M$ so that $\phi_i(\sigma_i) = \sigma_i^*$. (Note that the existence of a map extending $\sigma_i \mapsto \sigma_i^*$ to all of S depends crucially on the fact that σ_i is simple on S.) Now each $\phi_i(S)$ is a union of totally geodesic triangles in M, with the number of triangles depending on the genus of S. Each of these triangles has area bounded above by π , so that the $\phi_i(S)$ have uniformly bounded area. Combining this fact with a uniform injectivity radius lower bound (in this set-up, this follows from the assumption that M covers the compact manifold N), we deduce that each $\phi_i(S)$ has uniformly bounded diameter in M. In particular, the diameters of the σ_i^* are uniformly bounded. The fact that they reach into btherefore implies that they exit b. Thus b is simply degenerate.

If one tries to trace through the argument just sketched assuming only that $\pi_1(N)$ is hyperbolic, the difficulty becomes obvious: geodesic triangles in arbitrary δ -hyperbolic spaces need not have uniformly bounded areas. While there are a handful of obvious first steps around this difficulty, none have led so far to a proof. Nonetheless, it should be true that simply geometrically infinite surface subgroups of any torsion-free hyperbolic group are simply degenerate (the presence of an ambient 3-manifold should not be required for this).

1.2. Structure of the paper. Here is an outline of the paper. In Section 2 we cover some basic results we need about δ -hyperbolic spaces. In particular, we show that minimal edge-loops are coarsely unique, so that their coarse behavior depends only on the free homotopy class. We also prove the intersection number lemma. In Section 3 we give some background on geodesic currents and laminations, and we fix the train-track notation that we will use in the remainder. In Section 4 we describe our version of Bonahon's splitting and straightening process, which is then used to prove Proposition 4.1, which contains most of the heavy lifting in proving Theorem 1.1. This section is the most technical part of the paper, and also is where most of the novelty of this paper is to be found. Finally in Section 5 we put the pieces together to prove Theorem 1.1.

As mentioned, both the basic outline of the proof and many of the detailed steps closely follow Bonahon's proof. Some of his techniques extend directly, and many are well-known, even in detail. As a result, some steps of our proof are presented as sketches, or simply with indications as to the changes required for our setting. To our knowledge, however, the details of Bonahon's intricate splitting and straightening argument appear only in the original (French) paper. Moreover, many of the details of this argument must be changed substantially in our setting. This section of the proof is therefore presented in full detail.

1.3. Acknowledgements. This paper began life as my doctoral thesis at the University of California, Santa Barbara. I am thus especially grateful to my thesis advisor Daryl Cooper for innumerable discussions and immeasurable help. I am

also grateful to Sergio Fenley for pointing out an error in an earlier version of an attempt to show that simply geometrically infinite implies simply degenerate.

2. Intersection Number

The following two results are well-known. We will prove the first, in part for the benefit of the reader unfamiliar with δ -hyperbolic spaces, and in part because the techniques used in the proof will be invoked to justify a small step in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Lemma 2.1. Let σ^* be a minimal edge-loop in $M^{(1)}$, and suppose σ is an edgeloop freely homotopic in M to σ^* with $d_M^1(\sigma, \sigma^*) = D$. Then there is a constant c_1 , depending only on δ , so that

$$\ell(\sigma) \ge c_1 2^D \,\ell(\sigma^*).$$

Proof. The goal of the proof is to show that there is a coarse version of a nearest point retraction from σ to σ^* which is exponentially length increasing. The first step is to show that nearest point retraction is coarsely onto.

Let $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ be a lift of σ^* to X, and note that $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ is a geodesic in $X^{(1)}$. Now lift a homotopy between σ^* and σ to X to obtain a corresponding lift $\tilde{\sigma}$ of σ .

Let $T \subset X^{(0)}$ be those vertices $t \in \tilde{\sigma}^*$ so that there exists a vertex $s \in \tilde{\sigma}$ with $d_X^1(s, \tilde{\sigma}^*) = d_X^1(s, t)$. We will show that the components of $\tilde{\sigma}^* - T$ are no longer than 7δ .

Choose two adjacent vertices s and s' on $\tilde{\sigma}$, and suppose t and t' are vertices on $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ nearest to s and s', respectively (see Figure 1). Suppose $d_X^1(t,t') \geq 7\delta$. Then we may choose a vertex z_0 on [tt'] with $d_X^1(z_0,t) > 2\delta$ and $d_X^1(z_0,t') > 4\delta$. Because the geodesic triangle $\Delta(tst')$ is δ -slim, there is a vertex $z_1 \in [ts] \cup [st']$ with $d_X^1(z_0, z_1) \leq \delta$. If z_1 were on [ts], however, then joining z_0 to z_1 and z_1 to t would produce a path with length no more than 2δ joining z_0 to t, contradicting that $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ is a minimal edge-path.



FIGURE 1. Nearest point retraction is coarsely onto

Thus z_1 is contained on [st']. Now the triangle $\Delta(t'ss')$ is δ -slim, so we find $z_2 \in [ss'] \cup [s't']$ with $d_X^1(z_1, z_2) \leq \delta$. As above, we deduce from the minimality of

 $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ and the choice of z_0 that z_2 lies on [ss']. But this implies that either $z_2 = s$ or $z_2 = s'$, each of which contradicts the assumption that $d^1_X(\sigma, \sigma^*) \ge D > 2\delta$. Thus the components of $\tilde{\sigma}^* - T$ are no longer than 7δ .

Now fix a vertex $\tilde{p}_0 \in T \subset \tilde{\sigma}^*$, and let \tilde{p}'_0 be a vertex on $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ with $d^1_X(\tilde{p}_0, \tilde{p}'_0) = 12\delta$. Then there is some vertex $\tilde{p}_1 \in T$ with $d^1_X(\tilde{p}'_0, \tilde{p}_1) \leq 4\delta$, and so in particular, we have $d^1_X(\tilde{p}_0, \tilde{p}_1) \geq 8\delta$. Let \tilde{q}_0 be a vertex on $\tilde{\sigma}$ with $d^1_X(\tilde{q}_0, \tilde{p}_0) = d^1_X(\tilde{q}_0, \tilde{\sigma}^*)$, and similarly choose \tilde{q}_1 corresponding to \tilde{p}_1 .

Consider the "quadrilateral" in $X^{(1)}$ formed by that portion of $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ between \tilde{p}_0 and \tilde{p}_1 , that portion of $\tilde{\sigma}$ between \tilde{q}_0 and \tilde{q}_1 , and minimal edge-paths $[\tilde{p}_0\tilde{q}_0]$ and $[\tilde{p}_1\tilde{q}_1]$ (see Figure 2). Let L be the length of the portion of $\tilde{\sigma}$ between \tilde{q}_0 and \tilde{q}_1 . PSfrag replacements



FIGURE 2. Exponential growth of curves

Because $D > 2\delta$, there is a vertex $z_0 \in [\tilde{p}_0 \tilde{q}_0]$ with $\delta < d_X^1(z_0, [\tilde{p}_0 \tilde{p}_1]) < 2\delta$. Using arguments similar to those above, there is a vertex $z_1 \in [\tilde{p}_1 \tilde{q}_0]$ with $d(z_0, z_1) \leq \delta$. Similarly, there is a vertex z_2 on $[\tilde{q}_0 \tilde{q}_1] \cup [\tilde{q}_1 \tilde{p}_1]$ with $d_X^1(z_1, z_2) \leq \delta$. If $z_2 \in [\tilde{q}_1 \tilde{p}_1]$, however, then

contradicting the assumption that $d_X^1(\tilde{p}_0, \tilde{p}_1) \ge 8\delta$. It follows that $z_2 \in [\tilde{q}_0 \tilde{q}_1]$.

In order now to show that the length of that part of $\tilde{\sigma}$ between \tilde{q}_0 and \tilde{q}_1 depends exponentially on D, we mimic the procedure used in the proof of [ABC⁺91, Theorem 2.19]. By a *midpoint* of a subarc of $\tilde{\sigma}$ we mean the vertex on $\tilde{\sigma}$ which divides the subarc into two pieces whose lengths differ by no more than one. We let k be a minimal edge-path between \tilde{q}_0 and \tilde{q}_1 . Let m be the midpoint of the arc of $\tilde{\sigma}$ between \tilde{q}_i and \tilde{q}_1 , with k_0 a minimal edge-path from \tilde{q}_0 to m and k_1 a minimal edge-path between m and \tilde{q}_1 .

Now let b be a binary sequence and suppose k_b to have been chosen, joining $k_b(0)$ to $k_b(1)$. Let m_b be the midpoint of the portion of $\tilde{\sigma}$ between the endpoints

of k_b . Then we let k_{b0} denote a minimal edge-path between $k_b(0)$ and m_b , while k_{b1} denotes a minimal edge-path between m_b and k_{b1} . We continue this construction until all k_b have length one, and thus are edges in $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Note that there is some vertex z_3 on either k_0 or k_1 with $d_X^1(z_2, z_3) \leq \delta$. More generally, if z_j lies on k_b , there is some vertex z_{j+1} on either k_{b0} or k_{b1} with $d_X^1(z_j, z_{j+1}) \leq \delta$. The z_j then provide a path from $z_0 \in \tilde{\sigma}^*$ to $z_t \in \tilde{\sigma}$, where $t \leq \log_2(L) + 2$. Thus the length of the path is no more than $\delta(\log_2(L) + 2)$. On the other hand, this path must have length at least D, so we deduce that

$$D \le \delta(\log_2(L) + 2),$$

and so

$$L \ge \frac{2^{D/\delta}}{4}.$$

Now let *n* be the greatest integer in $\ell(\sigma^*)/12\delta$. If $n \ge 1$, then by repeating this analysis on *n* segments of σ^* of length 12δ , we find that $\ell(\sigma) \ge n\frac{2^{D/\delta}}{4}$. But $\ell(\sigma^*)/12\delta \le n+1$, and then because $n \ge 1$ we have $(n+1)/2 \le n$, so $\ell(\sigma^*)/24\delta < n$. Thus we obtain

$$\ell(\sigma) \ge \frac{2^{D/\delta}}{96\delta} \,\ell(\sigma^*)$$

If, on the other hand, we have that n = 0, then we set m to be the greatest integer in $12\delta/\ell(\sigma^*)$. Then the segment of $\tilde{\sigma}^*$ between \tilde{p}_0 and \tilde{p}_1 contains an m-fold lift of σ^* . Thus each lift contributes to at least a portion of 1/m to the expansion of $\ell(\sigma^*)$ to $L \geq \frac{2^{D/\delta}}{4}$. In other words, we have $\ell(\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{m} \frac{2^{D/\delta}}{4}$. But then $\ell(\sigma^*)/12\delta \leq \frac{1}{m}$, and so we have

$$\ell(\sigma) \ge \frac{2^{D/\delta}}{48\delta} \ell(\sigma^*).$$

The second result we require is the following (cf. [Bon86, Lemma 2.1]).

Lemma 2.2. Let $\sigma^* \subset M^{(1)}$ be a minimal edge-loop and suppose σ is an edge-loop freely homotopic to σ^* in M formed of n geodesic segments in $M^{(1)}$. Then there is a constant c_2 , depending only on δ , so that σ^* is contained in the nc_2 -neighborhood of σ .

Note that this lemma implies (by choosing n = 1) that the choice of minimal edge-loop σ^* corresponding to σ described above is coarsely unique, in the sense that any two such choices must have Hausdorff distance bounded above by c_2 .

We also require the following annular version of the linear isoperimetric inequality (cf. [Gro87, §7.4.B]).

Lemma 2.3. There is a constant K, depending only on $\delta \geq 1$, with the following property: if σ is an essential edge-loop in M, σ^* is a corresponding minimal edge-loop, and A: $S^1 \times [0,1] \to M^{(2)}$ is a minimal-area annulus with boundary $\sigma \cup \sigma^*$, then

$$area(A) \le K(\ell(\sigma) + \ell(\sigma^*)).$$

The first application of the preceeding results is the proof of the intersection number lemma, Lemma 2.4 below. Our statement is the same as that of [Bon86, Prop 3.4], and the proof is actually simplified somewhat by the combinatorial setting.

Lemma 2.4. Let α_1^* and α_2^* be two minimal edge-loops of M homotopic to two curves α_1 and α_2 on S by two homotopies not otherwise hitting S and arriving on the same side of S. Then there exists a constant C, depending only on δ , so that if $d_M^1(\alpha_i^*, S) \geq D$ for i = 1, 2, then

$$\operatorname{int}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \le C\ell(\alpha_1)\ell(\alpha_2)2^{-D},$$

where int(,) and $\ell($) denote respectively intersection number in S and length in M.

Proof. Let $A_2: S^1 \times [0,1] \to M^{(2)}$ be an annular homotopy between α_2 and α_2^* which minimizes area in its homotopy class in M (relative to its boundary). We abuse notation in the usual way by letting A_2 denote the image of the annulus in M, just as we let α_1^* denote the image of the edge-path in M.

Note that by pushing the interiors of the 1-cells of α_1^* into the interiors of the 3cells of M, while fixing the vertices, we may ensure that all intersections of α_1^* with A_2 lie on vertices in M. Thus the geometric intersection number of A_2 with α_1^* is bounded above by the number of vertices in the abstract product $S^1 \times (S^1 \times [0, 1])$ of the domains (with the induced combinatorial structures). But the number of vertices in A_2 is bounded above by

$$\frac{\operatorname{area}(A_2)}{2} + \ell(\alpha_2) + \ell(\alpha_2^*) \le \frac{\operatorname{area}(A_2)}{2} + 2\ell(\alpha_2).$$

Also we have from Lemma 2.3 that

i

$$\operatorname{area}(A_2) \le K(\ell(\alpha_2^*) + \ell(\alpha_2)) \le 2K\ell(\alpha_2).$$

Thus we have

$$\operatorname{nt}(\alpha_1^*, A_2) \le \ell(\alpha_1^*)\operatorname{area}(A_2) \le (K+2)\ell(\alpha_1^*)\ell(\alpha_2).$$

On the other hand, we have from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\ell(\alpha_1^*) \le c_1^{-1} 2^{-D} \ell(\alpha_1).$$

The preceding two inequalities together imply that

$$int(\alpha_1^*, A_2) \le (K+2)c_1^{-1}\ell(\alpha_1)\ell(\alpha_2) 2^{-D}.$$

By symmetry, $int(\alpha_2^*, A_1)$ is bounded in the same way.

We now use the fact (cf. [Bon86], Lemma 3.2) that

$$\operatorname{int}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \le \operatorname{int}(\alpha_1^*, A_2) + \operatorname{int}(\alpha_2^*, A_1)$$

to deduce that

$$\operatorname{int}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \le 2(K+2)c_1^{-1}\ell(\alpha_1)\ell(\alpha_2)2^{-D}$$

3. Geodesic Currents & Train Tracks

In this section we discuss briefly the tools necessary to apply Bonahon's laminationstraightening argument. Other than some minor adjustments to account for the change is setting, this is primarily a review of the material in [Bon86, §§3.1–5.1]. 3.1. Geodesic Currents. A concise account of the necessary facts about geodesic currents may be found in [Bon86, §IV], on which the following discussion is based. More details may be found in [Bon88].

Given a closed Riemannian surface S we consider the projective tangent bundle PT(S), which is the quotient of the unit tangent bundle

$$UT(S) = \{(p, v) \mid p \in S, v \in T_p(S), \|v\| = 1\}$$

obtained by identifying (p, v) and (p, -v). Thus a point in PT(S) is a pair (p, [v]), where $[v] = \{v, -v\}$. A point $(p, v) \in UT(S)$ uniquely determines a unit speed geodesic $\gamma(t)$ on S with $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$. We define a flow Φ on UT(S), called the *geodesic flow*, by setting $\Phi((p, v), t) = (\gamma(t), \gamma'(t))$. The quotient of the flow lines under the involution sending $v \in T_p(S)$ to -v forms a 1-dimensional foliation \mathcal{F} of PT(S).

A geodesic current on a surface S is a positive transverse measure μ invariant under the geodesic foliation \mathcal{F} . In other words, given a codimension–1 submanifold V of PT(S) which is transverse to the foliation, we require that $\mu(V) = \mu(\Phi(V,t))$ for all t. For the most basic example, suppose α is a closed (not necessarily simple) geodesic on S. Then α lifts to a leaf $\tilde{\alpha}$ of PT(S). We may thus define a geodesic current, also denoted by α , by declaring that $\alpha(V)$ equals the number of times V intersects the lift $\tilde{\alpha}$ of α to PT(S).

We let $\mathcal{C}(S)$ denote the space of geodesic currents on S with topology defined as follows. Consider an elongated letter H on S, with the horizontal bar a geodesic arc transverse to the vertical bars, and with the vertical bars short enough so that all geodesic arcs joining the two vertical bars and homotopic to a path in the Hintersect the vertical bars transversely (see Figure 3). A flow box $B \subset PT(S)$ for \mathcal{F} is formed by lifting all geodesic arcs on S joining the vertical bars of the Hand homotopic to a path in H. If we let Q denote the abstract product of the two vertical arcs of H, then there is a diffeomorphism $B \cong Q \times [0, 1]$ so that the leaves of $B \cap \mathcal{F}$ correspond to (point) $\times [0, 1]$. We let $\partial_{\mathcal{F}} B$ denote that portion of B corresponding to $\partial Q \times [0, 1]$.

FIGURE 3. An elongated H defining a flow box.

Given a geodesic current $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ and a flow box B, we define the measure $\alpha(B) \in \mathbf{R}^+$ to be the measure under α of $Q \times (\text{point})$ under the identification $B \cong Q \times [0, 1]$. Thus if α is a geodesic current corresponding to a closed geodesic on S as above, then $\alpha(B)$ is exactly the number of subarcs of α which lift to leaves of $B \cap \mathcal{F}$.

J. BARNARD

A neighborhood basis of $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}(S)$ is formed of open sets in $\mathcal{C}(S)$ of the form

$$u(\alpha; B_1, \dots, B_n; \epsilon) = \{\beta \in \mathcal{C}(S) \mid \forall i, |\alpha(B_i) - \beta(B_i)| < \epsilon\},\$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ and the B_i are a collection of flow boxes so that $\alpha(\partial_{\mathcal{F}}(B)) = 0$.

Geodesic currents are a generalization of measured geodesic laminations (see [CB88, FLP79]). One may think of geodesic currents as the non-simple analogues of measured geodesic laminations. In particular, Bonahon shows that the intersection number function defined on the set of closed geodesics on S extends to a continuous bilinear function int: $\mathcal{C}(S) \times \mathcal{C}(S) \to \mathbf{R}^+$, and that geodesic measured laminations are exactly those geodesic currents with zero self-intersection number.

The length function defined on closed weighted geodesics on S also extends to a linear continuous non-negative function on the space of geodesic currents. What is of interest to us is the projective class of a current (in $\mathcal{PC}(S)$), so we will work primarily with unit-length currents. Given a closed geodesic γ on S, we let $\overline{\gamma}$ denote the unit length current represented geometrically by γ , and we write $\overline{\gamma} = \gamma/\ell(\gamma)$.

It is possible to put a metric on $\mathcal{PC}(S)$ making it into a complete space containing collections of closed (projective) weighted geodesics as a dense subset. In particular, after subsequencing, any infinite sequence $\{\gamma_i\}$ of closed geodesics on S gives rise to a convergent sequence $\{\overline{\gamma}_i\}$ of unit-length geodesic currents.

3.2. Train tracks. Following [Bon86], we define a train track τ on a surface S to be a closed subset of S which can be written as a finite union of rectangles R_i with disjoint interiors, each of which carries a vertical foliation by arcs, called *ties*. These rectangles are glued together along their vertical ("short") boundaries $\partial_v R_i$ so that the boundary of τ is the union of the horizontal ("long") boundaries $\partial_h R_i$ (see Figure 4). We also insist that the boundary of τ be smooth except at a finite number of points, called *corners*, where $\partial_h R_i$ meets the interior of $\partial_v R_j$ for some $i \neq j$. Finally, we will assume that no connected component of $-\tau$ has closure a disk with two or fewer corners, or an annulus with no corners.

FIGURE 4. A train track on a surface

The vertical components of the boundaries of the rectangles are called the *switches* of τ , and the *branches* are the closures of the connected components of the complement of the switches.

A train path is a path in the interior of a train track τ which is transverse to the ties. We say that α is carried by τ if α is isotopic to a train path. If α is isotopic to a train path intersecting all ties of τ , then we say that α is fully carried by τ .

Every lamination α on S is fully carried by some train track, as, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, the ϵ -neighborhood of α on S is a traintrack.

For a measured lamination α fully carried by τ , we obtain a *weighted train track* where the *weight* of a branch b is exactly the measure $\alpha(b)$ under α of one of its ties. Note that τ may have annular components corresponding to compact leaves of α .

Given a train track τ fully carrying a lamination α , Bonahon shows that we may cover PT(S) by a finite collection of flow boxes B_1, \ldots, B_q with disjoint interiors so that for $1 \leq i \leq p$, the arcs of $B_i \cap \mathcal{F}$ project into S as train paths in τ properly embedded in the branches, while the lift of α to PT(S) is disjoint from the boxes B_j for $p < j \leq q$. To do this, we first cover the support of α by boxes B_1, \ldots, B_p with the required property. These are defined by elongated H's whose horizontal bars are contained in the support of α and whose vertical bars are (non-overlapping) portions of switches of τ . We extend this collection to a cover of PT(S) by adding boxes $B'_{p+1} \ldots, B'_r$ so that all arcs of $B'_j \cap \mathcal{F}$ project to arcs disjoint from α . We further suppose that the vertical bars of the H's defining the B'_j are disjoint from the H's defining the B_i with $i \leq p$, and are pairwise disjoint. We finally observe that each of $B'_j \cap B'_k$, $\overline{B'_j - B'_k}$ and $\overline{B'_j - B_i}$ is the union of a finite number of flow boxes with disjoint interiors.

Thus if b is a branch of a train track τ carrying a lamination α , the measure $\alpha(b)$ is equal to the sum of the measures under α of those boxes of the B_1, \ldots, B_p the arcs of which project to train paths in b.

We will need the following standard fact about train tracks, which follows immediately from the lack of disks, monogons, digons, or annuli in the complement of τ .

Lemma 3.1. In a train track τ on a surface S, two curves transverse to the ties and homotopic in S (with endpoints fixed) are homotopic in τ by a homotopy preserving the ties.

A splitting of τ on S is a train track $\tau' \subset \tau$ whose ties are contained in ties of τ . Note that any splitting of τ may be further split so as to have the same number of branches as τ . Also note that all laminations carried by any splitting of τ are carried by τ . Given a train track τ carrying a lamination α , we may obtain a splitting τ' of τ which also carries α by cutting along a finite collection of pairwise disjoint arcs in τ which are disjoint from α and transverse to the ties, and each of which has one endpoint on a corner of τ (see Figure 5). Note that there is a bound on the possible number of annular components of any train track τ which fully carries a lamination α on S. In particular, any such train track has a splitting which already has as many annular components as any further splitting.

4. Shortening Laminations

In perhaps the most technical section of [Bon86], a train track τ fully carrying a geodesic measured lamination α is repeatedly split, and these splittings are mapped into the 3-manifold, where the length of its image can be compared to its length on the surface. By carefully choosing the splittings of τ and the corresponding maps, one deduces ([Bon86, Thm 5.1]) that either the length of $\phi(\alpha)$ is tending to zero, or $\phi(\alpha)$ is becoming very straight. More precisely, if for any map $\phi : S \to M$ we have that the length of $\phi'(\alpha)$ over all ϕ' homotopic to ϕ is bounded away from zero,

FIGURE 5. Splitting a train track

then by proceeding far enough along in the straightening process, one may ensure that closed curves sufficiently close (as currents) to α have images which run along their geodesic representatives at an arbitrarily small distance for an arbitrarily large percentage of their length.

There is a corresponding, although slightly weaker, statement to be made in this context, the proof of which is similar to that of [Bon86, Thm 5.1]. Recall that, given an essential closed curve γ on S, γ^* denotes a (coarsely unique) choice of minimal edge-loop freely homotopic in M to $\phi(\gamma)$, where $\phi: S \to M$ is a fixed homotopy equivalence.

Proposition 4.1. Let α be a unit length geodesic measured lamination on S. Fix a number t < 1. There is a constant ϵ , depending only on t and the hyperbolicity constant δ , so that either:

- (1) there exists a map $\phi' \colon S \to M$ homotopic to ϕ so that for any closed curve γ on S, the ratio, to the total length of $\phi'(\gamma)$, of the length of that portion of $\phi'(\gamma)$ running along γ^* at a distance less than ϵ , is greater than t when $\overline{\gamma}$ is sufficiently close to α in $\mathcal{PC}(S)$, or
- (2) we may homotope ϕ to make $\ell(\phi(\alpha))$ arbitrarily small.

In the following sections, we first discuss the types of maps we will be considering, and explain exactly what is meant by the length $\ell(\phi(\alpha))$. We then define the splitting procedure and identify its salient properties. Finally we prove the proposition by repeated application of the procedure.

This conclusion of this theorem is essentially the same as that used by Bonahon except that ϵ depends on t. Given that minimal edge-paths are not unique (and, in particular, do not always have Hausdorff distance zero), one does not expect to be able to vary ϵ freely.

Remark 4.2. As mentioned in the introduction, the proof of this proposition makes no use of the fact that G is assumed to be a 3-manifold group. In particular, given a torsion-free hyperbolic group G, we may take N to be a finite K(G, 1), and let M be the cover of N corresponding to $H = \pi_1(S)$. The conclusion of the proposition will hold in this case.

4.1. Adapted Maps. We say a map $\phi: S \to M^{(2)}$ is *adapted* to a train track τ if it sends each branch of τ to a non-backtracking edge-path in M, so that the preimage of a point $x \in \phi(\tau)$ is a union of ties, and so that ϕ is locally injective on any path in τ transverse to the ties. We say that ϕ is *tightly adapted* to τ if it is adapted to τ so that each branch is sent to a minimal edge-path in M. In particular, if ϕ is tightly adapted to τ , then ϕ maps any compact leaves of α carried by annular components of τ to minimal edge-loops in M.

Suppose α is a unit length geodesic measured lamination on S carried by the train track τ , and suppose $\phi: S \to M$ is a map adapted to τ . Pulling the path metric on $M^{(1)}$ back along ϕ , one obtains measures for the lengths of the branches of τ . With the usual abuse of notation, we let $\ell(\phi(b_i))$ denote the length of a branch b_i measured in this way, and define the *length of* $\phi(\alpha)$ in M to be

$$\ell(\phi(\alpha)) = \sum_{i} \alpha(b_i)\ell(\phi(b_i)),$$

where the sum is over all branches b_i of τ and $\alpha(b_i)$ is the measure under α of a tie of b_i .

We define a vertex tie for the pair (ϕ, τ) to be any tie t of τ with $\phi(t)$ a vertex in M. Now let $\phi: S \to M$ be adapted to a train track τ and suppose τ' is a splitting of τ on S, chosen so that each switch of τ' is contained in a vertex tie of τ . Then we may construct a new map ϕ' tightly adapted to τ' as follows: For each switch s of τ' we define $\phi'(s) = \phi(s)$. Now for each branch b in τ' we require that ϕ' map b to a minimal edge-path in $M^{(1)}$ homotopic with fixed boundary to $\phi(b)$. We then extend arbitrarily, mapping the remainder of S into $M^{(2)}$. The fact that ϕ and ϕ' are homotopic follows from the irreducibility of M. With ϕ' obtained in this way, we clearly then have that

$$\ell(\phi'(\alpha)) \le \ell(\phi(\alpha)).$$

4.2. The splitting procedure. Let $\phi: S \to M$ be a map adapted to a train track τ , and fix $\epsilon > 0$. We define an ϵ -shortcut for the pair (τ, ϕ) to be an arc $k \subset \tau$ with the following properties:

- (1) the endpoints of k are contained in vertex ties,
- (2) k is transverse to the ties
- (3) $\phi(k)$ is a non-minimal edge-path in M homotopic with endpoints fixed to an edge-path of length no more than ϵ .

We consider two shortcuts equivalent if they are homotopic by a tie-preserving homotopy. For simplicity, we will suppress reference to equivalence classes and speak only of shortcuts.

For any subset X of a train track τ , we let R(X) denote the union of those ties of τ which meet X. When τ is adorned with sub- or superscripts, we similarly adorn R. Thus, for example, R'(X) is the union of ties of τ' meeting X.

J. BARNARD

Lemma 4.3. (cf. [Bon86, Lemma 5.7]) Suppose τ is a train track carrying a lamination α . Then there is a splitting τ' of τ , still carrying α , and a finite collection $\{k_{\mu}, \ldots, k_{\nu}\}$ of ϵ -shortcuts for $\phi(\tau')$ with the following properties:

- (1) $R'(k_i)$ and $R'(k_j)$ have disjoint interiors, for $i \neq j$;
- (2) any other ϵ -shortcut for $\phi(\tau')$ has at least one endpoint in the interior of some $R'(k_i)$;
- (3) each k_i crosses at most one switch of τ' .

Before beginning the proof, we note that although the train track τ is being split to obtain τ' , the map ϕ is unchanged. It follows from the definitions that if ϕ was adapted to τ then ϕ is adapted to any splitting τ' of τ . Property (3) in the lemma allows for the construction of ϕ' , also adapted to τ' , by straightening the shortcuts k_{μ}, \ldots, k_{ν} . Properties (1) and (2) allow for an estimation in the decrease in length in passing from $\phi(\tau)$ to $\phi'(\tau')$.

Proof. We note that the proof that follows is essentially the same as that of [Bon86, Lemma 5.7]. To begin, we may assume that τ contains as many annular components as any further splitting, and that ϕ is tightly adapted to τ . In particular, any annular components of τ are mapped to minimal edge-loops in M, and thus contain no shortcuts.

Note that there are only finitely many homotopy classes of paths shorter than ϵ in M that join the images under ϕ of any two branches of τ . Because $\phi_* : \pi_1(S) \to \pi_1(M)$ is injective, there are only finitely many ϵ -shortcuts in S joining any two particular branches. In particular, there is some constant A (depending on ϕ) with the property that any ϵ -shortcut k for $\phi(\tau)$ has $\ell(\phi(k)) \leq A$.

By the lemma below, we may split τ to τ_0 so that the non-annular branches of $\phi(\tau_0)$ all have length in M greater than 2A. Thus an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi(\tau_0)$ hits at most one switch of τ_0 (but note that because we have not altered the map ϕ , some ϵ -shortcuts may not cross any switches).

We first find a finite family $\{k_1, \ldots, k_p\}$ of ϵ -shortcuts not crossing any switches of τ_0 chosen to be maximal subject to the condition that the rectangles $R_0(k_i)$ have disjoint interiors (see Figure 6). Note that all other ϵ -shortcuts not crossing any switches of τ_0 necessarily have an endpoint in the interior of some $R_0(k_i)$, as otherwise there is a collection of shortcuts including this one which contradicts the maximality condition.

FIGURE 6. Finding a maximal family of shortcuts

Let U_0 be the union of the $R_0(k)$ where k is an ϵ -shortcut with endpoints not contained in any of the $R_0(k_i)$ (in particular, any such k must cross a switch of τ_0). Note that because the branches of τ_0 have length greater than 2A, we may join each corner of τ_0 contained in U_0 to a tie in ∂U_0 by a path contained in U_0 , transverse to the ties, not crossing any switches of τ_0 , and disjoint from α . We choose these paths to be pairwise disjoint, and then split along them (see Figure 7).

FIGURE 7. Splitting to straighten shortcuts

Now let U' denote that part of U_0 contained in τ' , and note that the interior of U' does not contain any switches of τ' .

Re-index the original collection of shortcuts k_1, \ldots, k_p so that those contained in U_0 are exactly the k_i with $i < \mu$, and note that the remaining k_{μ}, \ldots, k_p are ϵ -shortcuts for $\phi(\tau')$. We then complete these by a family of shortcuts k_{p+1}, \ldots, k_{ν} for $\phi(\tau')$ contained in U' chosen so that the union of the $R'(k_j)$ is maximal with respect to the following properties:

- (1) the $R'(k_j)$ have disjoint interiors (for j > p, and thus for $j \ge \mu$),
- (2) for all $i < \mu$, each component of $R_0(k_i) \cap U'$ is contained in some $R'(k_j)$ with j > p.

We claim that the family $\{k_{\mu}, \ldots, k_{\nu}\}$ has the desired property, namely, that any other ϵ -shortcut for $\phi(\tau')$ has at least one endpoint in the interior of some $R'(k_i)$ for $\mu \leq i \leq \nu$. To see this, suppose that k is an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi(\tau')$. Then k is also an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi(\tau_0)$. Suppose ∂k avoids the interiors of the $R'(k_i)$ for $\mu \leq i \leq p$, and note that for these i we have $R'(k_i) = R_0(k_i)$. Thus by the maximality condition on the original collection k_1, \ldots, k_p of ϵ -shortcuts for τ_0 , either some endpoint of k is contained in the interior of some $R_0(k_i)$ with $i < \mu$ or k crosses a switch of τ_0 , and is therefore contained in $U_0 \cap \tau' = U'$. In either case, we deduce that some endpoint of k is contained in some $R'(k_j)$ with j > p (by property (2) in the first case and by the maximality condition in the second case).

Here is the lemma that allows for the initial splitting used in the proof above.

Lemma 4.4. Suppose τ is a weighted train track, no splitting of which cuts off an annular component. For any map ϕ adapted to τ there is a splitting τ' of τ so that $\ell(\phi(b)) > C$ for every branch b of τ' , where C is arbitrary.

Proof. We construct a splitting of τ whose minimal branch length is 3/2 times that of τ . The result then follows by repeating this procedure.

Note that any splitting τ' of τ , every switch of which is a switch of τ , has minimal branch length bounded below by that of τ . This is because every branch of τ' runs between two switches of τ , and so runs at least the length of some branch of τ .

Say a branch b of τ is *thick* if both its vertical boundary components contain corners in their interiors. If there are any homotopically nontrivial closed trainpaths carried by only thick branches (i.e., if there are any loops of thick branches), we split the branches over which such a path runs, cutting along arcs from corners of thick branches to existing switches of thick branches. By splitting far enough, we may remove all loops of thick branches (this follows from the fact that we have already assumed all annular portions of τ to have been removed). By the comment above, this does not decrease the minimum branch length.

We now assume τ has no loops of thick branches. Next, split τ along arcs from each corner to the midpoint of the first thick branch encountered. This splitting has minimal branch length at least that of τ . To see this, note first that any branch of τ that is not thick will increase in length by at least half the length of one of its adjacent branches. Second, suppose there is a connected strip of m thick branches of τ . After splitting as described, we obtain a connected strip of m-1thick branches, one for each switch between two thick branches. Each of these new thick branches has length equal to the average of the two thick branches that were adjacent to the corresponding switch. In particular, this splitting procedure does not decrease the minimum branch length. Moreover, if the longest strip of connected thick branches of τ has length m, then repeating this splitting procedure m times will produce a train track with minimal branch length at least 3/2 that of τ . The result follows.

4.3. **Proof of Proposition 4.1.** We are given a homotopy equivalence $\phi: S \to M$ from a closed hyperbolic surface S into M, and a unit-length geodesic measured lamination α on S. We will prove Proposition 4.1 by assuming that there is some $\kappa > 0$ so that $\ell(\phi'(\alpha)) \ge \kappa$ for all ϕ' homotopic to ϕ , and showing that conclusion (1) of the Proposition must hold.

We begin with a train track τ_0 on S fully carrying α with the property that any compact leaves of α are carried by annular components of τ_0 . We then homotope ϕ to ϕ_0 adapted to τ_0 carrying α so that these annuli are mapped to minimal edge-loops in M. Now we inductively define a sequence of splittings τ_n of τ_0 and a sequence of maps $\phi_n \colon S \to M$ adapted to τ_n , so that ϕ_n and τ_n are obtained from ϕ_{n-1} and τ_{n-1} by the procedure of straightening shortcuts described above. Note that we may do this while ensuring that the maps all agree on the compact leaves of α . In particular, if every component of α is a closed curve, then for all n we may set $\tau_n = \tau_0$ and $\phi_n = \phi_0$.

Recall that we may cover the projective tangent bundle of S with a finite number of compact flow boxes B_i , $1 \le i \le q$ with disjoint interiors so that for $1 \le i \le p$, all arcs of $B_i \cap \mathcal{F}$ project into S as arcs transverse to ties in τ_n , while for $p < i \le q$, arcs of $B_i \cap \mathcal{F}$ are disjoint from α in PT(S) (see Section 3).

As usual, for any closed geodesic $\gamma \subset S$, we let γ^* denote a minimal edge-loop in M freely homotopic in M to $\phi_n(\gamma)$. Note that because we are not assuming γ to be simple, we may not ensure that γ is entirely contained in τ_n by simply assuming $\gamma/\ell_S(\gamma)$ sufficiently close to α . In other words, we may not assume that the lift of γ to PT(S) is disjoint from the boxes B_{p+1}, \ldots, B_q , and so there is generally some portion of γ over whose image under ϕ_n we have no control. Let $\gamma \cap B$ denote that portion of γ which lifts to B in PT(S). Given a closed geodesic γ on S, we define γ_n to be an edge-loop in $M^{(1)}$ obtained by replacing the image under ϕ_n of the components of $\gamma \cap B_i$ with i > p with a minimal edge-path in M to which it is homotopic relative to its endpoints.

We will partition the 1-cells of γ_n into five classes, where the particular class in which a 1-cell sits is determined by the position of its endpoints relative to the other vertices of γ^n as well as those of γ_n^* (see Figure 8). For this we need to fix a constant $\epsilon \in \mathbf{Z}$. We will specify below the conditions that ϵ must satisfy, but for now it suffices to suppose $\epsilon > 1$.

Define γ_n^0 to be those 1–cells of γ_n either of whose endpoints is contained in

$$\phi_n\big(\gamma\cap\bigcup_{i=p+1}^q B_i\big).$$

Thus γ_n^0 is essentially that part of γ_n which differs from $\phi_n(\gamma)$, namely those parts which are pulled tight in creating γ_n .

FIGURE 8. The parts of γ_n

Define γ_n^4 to be those 1-cells of $\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0$ which are within ϵ (in $M^{(1)}$) of some vertex of γ^* .

To define γ_n^1 , consider the splitting τ_{n+1} contained in τ_n obtained in the course of applying Lemma 4.3 to straighten the shortcuts of $\phi_n(\tau_n)$. We define γ_n^1 to be all 1–cells e of $\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0 - \gamma_n^4$ for which there is some subarc k of γ with the following properties:

(1) k is an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$;

(2)
$$\phi_n(k) \subset \gamma_n - \gamma_n^0$$

(3) $e \cap \phi_n(k) \neq \emptyset$.

The third condition implies that e and $\phi_n(k)$ share an endpiont.

Define γ_n^3 to be those 1-cells in $\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0 - \gamma_n^1 - \gamma_n^4$ from which there is an edge-path λ to some edge in γ_n^0 so that $\ell(\lambda) \leq \epsilon$ and λ is homotopic with fixed endpoints to a subarc of γ_n . Essentially γ_n^3 consists of those edges from which there is, in some sense, an ϵ -shortcut into γ_n^0 .

Finally, define γ_n^2 to be all remaining unassigned edges of γ_n . Thus edges in γ_n^2 are essentially those vertices of $\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0$ which are greater than a distance ϵ from γ^* , and from which there is no ϵ -shortcut (carried by $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$) into γ_n^1 or γ_n^0 .

J. BARNARD

We aim to show that for *n* large enough and $\overline{\gamma}$ close enough to α , each of γ_n^0 , γ_n^1 , γ_n^2 , and γ_n^3 is short, relative to the length of $\phi_n(\gamma)$, forcing γ_n^4 to be most of $\phi_n(\gamma)$. In the following three lemmas, we obtain estimates on the absolute lengths of γ_n^1 , $\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0$, and γ_n^3 .

Lemma 4.5. There is a constant V_{ϵ} , depending on G and ϵ , so that

$$\ell(\gamma_n^1) \le 2V_\epsilon \Big(\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) - \ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma)) + \epsilon \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \gamma(b)\Big).$$

Proof. In order to control the length of γ_n^1 , we consider the relationship between its length and the decrease in length to be realized when straightening the shortcuts of $\phi_n(\tau_n)$ to obtain $\phi_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1})$. When applying Lemma 4.3 to straighten the shortcuts of $\phi_n(\tau_n)$, we obtain a finite maximal family of ϵ -shortcuts $\{k_{\mu}, \ldots, k_{\nu}\}$ with the property that any other ϵ -shortcut for $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$ has at least one endpoint contained in some $R'(k_i)$. Let \mathcal{I} denote the vertex ties of $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$ contained in the union of the $R'(k_i)$, and let V_{ϵ} denote the volume of an ϵ -ball in $X^{(1)}$. (Note that $V_{\epsilon} < \infty$ because G is finitely generated.)

We want to bound the length of γ_n^1 in terms of the size of \mathcal{I} and V_{ϵ} . We do this by associating each vertex in γ_n^1 to a tie of \mathcal{I} and bounding the number of such vertices associated to any particular such tie in terms of V_{ϵ} . To this end, fix a tie $t \in \mathcal{I}$. There is a collection of subarcs $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_s$ of γ_n beginning at t and forming ϵ -shortcuts for $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$, as described in the definition of γ_n^1 . We will call such arcs (γ, t) -spurs. For each i, let t_i denote the other endpoint of κ_i . We have no uniform control over the number of such κ_i issuing from t, and so no control over the number of t_i associated with t in this way. We can, however, control the number of such t_i which need to be counted as associated with t because they will not be counted as associated to any other $t' \in \mathcal{I}$.

Suppose κ_i is a (γ, t) -spur having the property that if κ_j is any other (γ, t) -spur issuing from t in the same direction as κ_i with $\phi_n(t_i) = \phi_n(t_j)$, then $\kappa_i \subset \kappa_j$. Then $\kappa_j - \kappa_i$ is a subarc of γ carried by τ_{n+1} and with $\phi_n(\kappa_j - \kappa_i)$ a non-minimal edge-path in M joining $\phi_n(t_i)$ to itself. In particular, $\kappa_j - \kappa_i$ is an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$, and thus either t_i or t_j is in \mathcal{I} .

If $t_i \in \mathcal{I}$, then we need not count t_j as associated with t, as it will be counted as associated to t_i (or perhaps some other endpoint t' of some other (γ, t) -spur κ' with $\kappa_i \subset \kappa' \subset \kappa_j$). If $t_j \in \mathcal{I}$, then we clearly need not count it as associated with t. Thus if we associate to each $t \in \mathcal{I}$ the shortest (γ, t) -spur in either direction whose endpoint is mapped to a particular vertex in the ϵ -ball about $\phi_n(t)$, we will have counted all points of γ_n involved in computing the length of γ_n^1 . We conclude that

$$\ell(\gamma_n^1) \le 2V_\epsilon \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma(t),$$

where $\gamma(t)$ denotes the number of times that γ intersects t on S.

Now we clearly have

$$\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) = \sum_{t \notin \mathcal{I}} \gamma(t) + \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma(t),$$

and because the shortcuts k_{μ}, \ldots, k_{ν} used to define τ' are straightened in defining ϕ_{n+1} , we have that

$$\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma)) \leq \sum_{t \notin \mathcal{I}} \gamma(t) + \epsilon \sum_{\mu \leq i \leq \nu} \gamma(k_i),$$

where $\gamma(k_i)$ is the number of times γ intersects a tie of $R'(k_i)$. Subtracting, we obtain

$$\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) - \ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma)) \ge \sum_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma(t) - \epsilon \sum_{\mu \le i \le \nu} \gamma(k_i).$$

Combining this inequality with the one above, we obtain

$$\ell(\gamma_n^1) \le 2V_\epsilon \Big(\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) - \ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma)) + \epsilon \sum_{\mu \le i \le \nu} \gamma(k_i) \Big).$$

Now because ϕ_n is tightly adapted to τ_n , and because each ϵ -shortcut k_i for $\phi_n(\tau_{n+1})$ is also an ϵ -shortcut for $\phi_n(\tau_n)$, we see that each $R'(k_i)$ must cross a switch of τ_n . Thus because the $R'(k_i)$ have disjoint interiors, we have that

$$\sum_{\mu \le i \le \nu} \gamma(k_i) \le \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \gamma(b),$$

where τ'_n is the maximal subset of τ containing no annular components. (Recall that there are no shortcuts if $\tau'_n = \emptyset$.) We now have

$$\ell(\gamma_n^1) \le 2V_{\epsilon} \Big(\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) - \ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma)) + \epsilon \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \gamma(b) \Big).$$

Lemma 4.6.

$$\ell(\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0) \ge \ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) - c_n \sum_{p < j \le q} \gamma(B_j),$$

Proof. Let c_n majorize the length of the images under ϕ_n of the arcs of $B_j \cap \mathcal{F}$ with j > p. The result is immediate (recall that $\gamma(B)$ is exactly the number of subarcs of γ which lift to leaves of $B \cap \mathcal{F}$).

Lemma 4.7.

$$\ell(\gamma_n^3) \le d_n \ell(\gamma_n^0) \le c_n d_n \sum_{p < j \le q} \gamma(B_j).$$

Proof. Note that for each vertex v in γ_n^3 there is a corresponding vertex v' in γ_n^0 . There is a constant d_n depending on ϕ_n so that for any geodesic arc β on S with $\phi_n(\beta)$ homotopic with fixed endpoints to an edge-path with length no more than ϵ we must have $\ell(\beta) \leq d_n$. The result follows.

Before considering γ_n^2 , we first show that for *n* sufficiently large and $\overline{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to α , we may assume that γ_n^2 and γ_n^4 together account for an arbitrarily large percentage of the length of γ_n .

Lemma 4.8. For any t < 1, there is an n sufficiently large so that

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_n^4) + \ell(\gamma_n^2)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} > t$$

for any $\overline{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to α .

Proof. We begin with the fact that

$$\ell(\gamma_n^4) + \ell(\gamma_n^2) = \ell(\gamma_n - \gamma_n^0) - \ell(\gamma_n^1) - \ell(\gamma_n^3).$$

Using the above estimates for the lengths of γ_n^0 , γ_n^1 , and γ_n^3 , we obtain

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_n^4) + \ell(\gamma_n^2)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} \ge 1 - c_n(d_n + 1) \sum_{p < j \le q} \frac{\gamma(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))}$$
$$-2V_\epsilon \Big(1 - \frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma))}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} + \epsilon \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \frac{\gamma(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))}\Big).$$

This inequality holds for all n and for all γ . We now consider what happens to the right side of this inequality as $\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha$ with n fixed.

First note that

$$\frac{\gamma(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} = \frac{\gamma(B_j)/\ell(\gamma)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))/\ell(\gamma)} = \frac{\overline{\gamma}(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\overline{\gamma}))}$$

Thus we have for fixed n that

$$\lim_{\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha} \frac{\gamma(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} = \frac{\alpha(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))}$$

Similarly we find that

$$\lim_{\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha} \frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\gamma))}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} = \frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\alpha))}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))}$$

and

$$\lim_{\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha} \frac{\gamma(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} = \frac{\alpha(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))}$$

for each branch b of τ'_n . Thus for any fixed n, we have that

$$\lim_{\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha} \frac{\ell(\gamma_n^4) + \ell(\gamma_n^2)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} \ge 1 - c_n(d_n + 1) \sum_{p < j \le q} \frac{\alpha(B_j)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))} - 2V_\epsilon \Big(1 - \frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\alpha))}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))} + \epsilon \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \frac{\alpha(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))} \Big).$$

By definition, $\alpha(B_j) = 0$ for all $p < j \le q$, while $\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))$ is bounded away from zero for all n. The inequality thus becomes

$$\lim_{\overline{\gamma}\to\alpha}\frac{\ell(\gamma_n^4)+\ell(\gamma_n^2)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} \ge 1-2V_\epsilon\Big(1-\frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\alpha))}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))}+\epsilon\sum_{b\subset\tau'_n}\frac{\alpha(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))}\Big).$$

Moreover this inequality holds for all n.

Now set α' to be that portion of α carried by τ'_n (i.e., α' is the union of all components of α which are not simple closed curves). If $\ell(\alpha') = 0$, then because $\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))$ is assumed bounded away from zero, we have

$$\sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \frac{\alpha(b)}{\ell(\phi_n(\alpha))} = 0.$$

On the other hand, suppose $\ell(\alpha') > 0$, and set m_n to be the minimum branch length of τ'_n , so that for all n we have

$$0 < m_n \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \alpha(b) \le \sum_{b \subset \tau'_n} \ell(b) \alpha(b) = \ell(\alpha').$$

Note that because τ'_n carries no closed curves of α , m_n grows arbitrarily large with n. It follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{b\subset\tau'_n}\alpha(b)=0.$$

Finally note that for large n we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\ell(\phi_{n+1}(\alpha))}{\ell_n(\phi_n(\alpha))} = 1$$

The result follows.

We next choose t.

Let $L = \max(12\delta + 2\epsilon, 4\epsilon)$, and choose t as follows. Suppose A is a finite circularly ordered set and B is a subset of A. We denote by B_L the set of elements of B which are contained in a connected sequence of length at least L. We choose t < 1 large enough to ensure that for |A| sufficiently large, we have that $|B|/|A| \ge t$ implies that $|B_L|/|A| > 1/2$. (The choice of 1/2 is somewhat arbitrary.) Note that we necessarily have t > 1/2.

Given this choice of t, we henceforth assume that $\overline{\gamma}$ is chosen close enough to α and n is chosen large enough to ensure that

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_n^2) + \ell(\gamma_n^4)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} > t$$

We choose t in this way because, rather than bound the relative length of all of γ_n^2 , we will bound the relative length of those portions of γ_n^2 which may be connected to form segments with length at least 4ϵ .

To begin, let $A_n: S^1 \times [0, 1] \to M^{(2)}$ be a simplicial map of an annulus into $M^{(2)}$ so that $A(S^1 \times \{0\}) = \gamma^*$ and $A(S^1 \times \{1\}) = \gamma_n$. We pull back the metric from $M^{(2)}$ to $S^1 \times [0, 1]$ to produce a simplicial metric structure on the annulus, and note that the boundary components have lengths $\ell(\gamma^*)$ and $\ell(\gamma_n)$. For simplicity, we will refer to the annulus with this structure as A_n , and identify the boundary components of A_n with γ^* and γ_n (see Figure 9).

Assume that A_n is chosen to have minimal area. Let $A_{\epsilon/2}$ denote the complement in A_n of the $\epsilon/2$ -neighborhood (in A_n) of γ_n , and let $\gamma_{\epsilon/2}$ denote the boundary of this neighborhood in A_n . Let $\hat{\gamma}_n^2$ denote the union of edges in γ_n both of whose endpoints are in γ_n^2 . Let $\gamma_{\epsilon/2}^2$ denote those vertices v in $\gamma_{\epsilon/2}$ with $d(v, \gamma_n) = d(v, \gamma_n^2)$, and similarly let $\hat{\gamma}_{\epsilon/2}^2$ denote the union of the edges of $\gamma_{\epsilon/2}$ both of whose endpoints are in $\gamma_{\epsilon/2}^2$ (see Figure 9).

Let \mathcal{L} denote the union of the components of $\hat{\gamma}_n^2$ with length at least L, and let C be a component of \mathcal{L} . Note that because γ_n is piecewise geodesic, and any vertices around which γ_n is not minimal must be contained in γ_n^0 , γ_n^1 , γ_n^3 , or γ_n^4 , it must be that C corresponds to a minimal edge-path in $M^{(1)}$. Now consider the subsegment C' of C with endpoints a distance ϵ from those of C, and note then that C' has length at least max $(12\delta, 2\epsilon)$. Corresponding to C' is a subsegment $C'_{\epsilon/2}$ of $\hat{\gamma}_{\epsilon/2}^2$ consisting of those points in $\hat{\gamma}_{\epsilon/2}^2$ which are exactly a distance $\epsilon/2$ in A_n from some point in C'.

Because the length of C' is at least 12δ , it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.1 that

$$\ell(C'_{\epsilon/2}) \ge c_1 2^{\epsilon/2} \,\ell(C').$$

FIGURE 9. Using area to bound the length of γ_n^2

Moreover, if \hat{C} is another component of $\hat{\gamma}_n^2$ with length at least L, then no point of C_{ϵ} lies within $\epsilon/2$ in A_n of any point on the subsegment \hat{C}' of \hat{C} a distance ϵ from the endpoints of \hat{C} . For if $x \in C_{\epsilon}$ were such a point, lying within $\epsilon/2$ of $y \in C'$ and $z \in \hat{C}'$, then $d(y, z) \leq d(y, x) + d(x, z) \leq \epsilon$, while the subarc of γ_n joining y to z has length at least 2ϵ . Thus y and z lie either in γ_n^0 , γ_n^1 , or γ_n^4 , contradicting the choice of C and \hat{C} .

It follows from the discussion above, along with the fact that $\ell(C') \geq \ell(C)/2,$ that

$$\ell(\gamma_{\epsilon}) \ge (c_1/2)\ell(\mathcal{L})2^{\epsilon/2}.$$

From Lemma 2.3 we find that

$$\ell(\gamma_{\epsilon}) \leq \operatorname{area}(N_1(\gamma_{\epsilon})) \leq \operatorname{area}(A) \leq K(\ell(\gamma_n) + \ell(\gamma^*)) \leq 2K\ell(\gamma_n),$$

where $N_1(\gamma_{\epsilon})$ denotes the combinatorial 1-neighborhood of γ_{ϵ} . Combining this with the inequality above, we find that

$$\ell(\mathcal{L}) \leq \frac{4K}{c_1} \ell(\gamma_n) 2^{-\epsilon/2}.$$

Now recall we are assuming t fixed, n large enough, and $\overline{\gamma}$ close enough to α so that

$$\ell(\gamma_n^2) + \ell(\gamma_n^4) > t\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)).$$

By our choice of t, we also have

$$\ell(\mathcal{L}) > \frac{1}{2}\,\ell(\gamma_n^2).$$

Combining these with the inequality obtained above for $\ell(\mathcal{L})$, we find that

$$t\,\ell(\phi_n(\gamma)) < \frac{8K}{c_1}\,\ell(\gamma_n)2^{-\epsilon/2} + \ell(\gamma_n^4).$$

Note that as $\overline{\gamma} \to \alpha$, we have $\frac{\ell(\gamma_n)}{\ell(\phi(\gamma))} \to 1$. It follows that for $\overline{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to α , we have

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_n^4)}{\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))} > t - \frac{8K}{c_1} 2^{-\epsilon/2}.$$

Thus by choosing t sufficiently close to 1 and ϵ sufficiently large, we can ensure that, for n sufficiently large, the ratio $\ell(\gamma_n^4)/\ell(\phi_n(\gamma))$ is arbitrarily close to 1 for $\overline{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to α . This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

As outlined in the introduction, the first step in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the following lemma (cf. [Bon86, Prop 2.3]).

Lemma 5.1. Suppose b is a geometrically infinite end of M. Then there is a sequence of closed curves α_i in M so that $\alpha_i^* \to b$.

Proof. All distances will be measured in the 1–skeleton of the appropriate space.

Let U be a neighborhood of b and choose a neighborhood U_0 of b contained in U and a distance at least $2c_2$ from the complement of U in M, where c_2 is the constant from Lemma 2.2. We may assume (cf. Section 1.1) that U_0 is connected and has compact boundary $\partial U_0 \subset M^{(2)}$. To prove the lemma, it suffices to find a curve α in M with $\alpha^* \subset U$.

Because b is geometrically infinite, there are infinitely many minimal edge-loops σ_i^* intersecting U_0 nontrivially. If any one of these is contained in U_0 , we are finished. If not, these geodesics give rise to an infinite family of locally minimal arcs $\{\overline{\sigma}_i\}$ contained in U_0 and with endpoints on vertices in ∂U_0 (see Figure 10). Because ∂U_0 is compact, we may subsequence so that $\partial \overline{\sigma}_i = \partial \overline{\sigma}_j$ for all i, j. Because the $\overline{\sigma}_i$ intersect arbitrary neighborhoods of b, we may further assume that at least one point of $\overline{\sigma}_j$ is a distance at least 3δ from all $\overline{\sigma}_i$ with i < j.

FIGURE 10. Finding curves exiting an end

Fix *i* and *j* and define the closed curve α to be the composition $\overline{\sigma}_i \circ \overline{\sigma}_j$. Note that α is not null-homotopic in M, since if it were, then $\overline{\sigma}_i$ and $\overline{\sigma}_j$ would lift to $X^{(1)}$ to two minimal edge-paths with the same endpoints, one of which contains a point a distance at least 3δ from the other, contradicting the fact that geodesic triangles in $X^{(1)}$ are δ -thin.

Applying Lemma 2.2, we see that any minimal edge-loop α^* corresponding to α must lie within a $2c_2$ neighborhood of α , and thus lie within U, as required. \Box

We may choose the α_i to be geodesics on S with respect to some arbitrary hyperbolic metric, and then subsequence so that $\alpha_i/\ell_S(\alpha_i) \to \alpha_\infty$ for some unit length geodesic current α_∞ .

Lemma 5.2. Suppose α_i is a sequence of geodesics on S with $\alpha_i/\ell_S(\alpha_i)$ converging in $\mathcal{C}(S)$ to a geodesic current α_{∞} . If the minimal edge-loops α_i^* corresponding to $\phi(\alpha_i)$ leave compact sets, then α_{∞} is in fact a measured lamination on S.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4 we have that if $D_i = d(\phi(\alpha_i), \alpha_i^*)$, then

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \operatorname{int}\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{\ell(\phi(\alpha_i))}, \frac{\alpha_i}{\ell(\phi(\alpha_i))}\right) \le \lim_{i \to \infty} C \, 2^{-D_i} = 0.$$

Because S is compact and ϕ is proper, the ratio $\ell(\phi(\alpha_i))/\ell_S(\alpha_i)$ is bounded above by a constant independent of *i*. Thus

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{int}(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{\ell_S(\alpha_i)^2} \to 0$$

By continuity of intersection number, it follows that

$$\operatorname{int}(\alpha_{\infty}, \alpha_{\infty}) = 0$$

By Lemma 5.2, α_{∞} is a lamination.

Now because α_{∞} is a lamination, there is a sequence of simple closed geodesics γ_j on S with $\gamma_j/\ell_S(\gamma_j) \to \alpha_{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{C}(S)$. As the α_i^* leave compact sets of M, we know that α_{∞} does not satisfy conclusion (1) of Proposition 4.1. It follows that as ϕ varies over its homotopy class, $\ell(\phi(\alpha_{\infty}))$ may be made arbitrarily small. We now show that because the α_i^* leave compact sets of M, the γ_j^* at least are not contained in any compact set of M.

Lemma 5.3. With notation as above, suppose γ_j are simple closed geodesics on S with $\gamma_j/\ell_S(\gamma_j) \to \alpha_\infty$ for some unit length measured lamination α_∞ satisfying conclusion (2) of Proposition 4.1. Then there is no compact set of M containing all the minimal edge-loops γ_i^* corresponding to the $\phi(\gamma_j)$.

Proof. This is the argument of $[Bon86, \S6.3]$.

Suppose otherwise, so that the γ_i^* are all entirely contained in some compact set K. Because K is compact the ratio $\ell(\gamma_i^*)/\ell_S(\gamma_i)$ is bounded below by some constant c depending only on K and δ . Thus the ratio $\ell(\gamma_i')/\ell_S(\gamma_i)$ is similarly bounded for all edge-loops γ_i' homotopic to γ_i in M.

In particular, for any map ϕ' homotopic to ϕ , we have that for all i,

$$\ell(\phi'(\gamma_i))/\ell_S(\gamma_i) \ge c.$$

By letting *i* tend to ∞ , we find that

$$\ell(\phi'(\alpha)) \ge c^{-1} > 0.$$

That this is true for any ϕ' contradicts the assumption that α_{∞} satisfies conclusion (2) of Proposition 4.1. Thus there is no compact set of M containing γ_i^* for all i.

References

- [ABC⁺91] J. M. Alonso, T. Brady, D. Cooper, V. Ferlini, M. Lustig, M. Mihalik, M. Shapiro, and H. Short (editor). Notes on word hyperbolic groups. In E. Ghys, A. Haefliger, and A. Verjovsky, editors, *Group Theory from a Geometrical Viewpoint*, Proc. ICTP Trieste 1990, pages 3–63. World Scientific, 1991.
- [Bon86] F. Bonahon. Bouts des varietes hyperboliques de dimension 3. Ann. of Math. (2), 124:71–158, 1986.

- [Bon88] F. Bonahon. The geometry of Teichmüller space via geodesic currents. Invent. Math., 92(1):139–162, 1988.
- [CB88] A. Casson and S. Bleiler. Automorphisms of surfaces after Nielsen and Thurston. Number 9 in London Math. Soc. Student Texts. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [FLP79] A. Fathi, F. Laudenbach, and V. Poénaru. Travaux de Thurston sur les surfaces. Astérisque, 66–67, 1979.
- [Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In S. M. Gersten, editor, Essays in Group Theory, number 8 in M.S.R.I. Publ., pages 75–263. Springer Verlag, 1987.
- [Thu77] W. Thurston. The geometry and topology of three-manifolds, 1977. Princeton lecture notes.

Dept. of Mathematics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019 $E\text{-}mail\ address:\ \texttt{jbarnard@math.ou.edu}$