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Compact Riemann surface endowed with a non-vanishing holomorphic closed 1-form (Abelian differential) $\omega = f(z)dz$. 

Translation Surfaces
Compact Riemann surface endowed with a non-vanishing holomorphic closed 1-form (Abelian differential) \( \omega = f(z)dz \).

Compact orientable surface endowed with a flat metric \( g \) with finitely many conical singularities and a unit parallel vector field \( X \).
Translation Surfaces

Compact Riemann surface endowed with a non-vanishing holomorphic closed 1-form (Abelian differential) \( \omega = f(z)dz \).

\[ g = |\omega| \]

singularities = zeros of \( \omega \)

\( X \) such that \( \omega \cdot X = 1 \)

Compact orientable surface endowed with a flat metric \( g \) with finitely many conical singularities and a unit parallel vector field \( X \).
Consider a planar polygon whose sides can be grouped in pairs of (non-adjacent) segments that are parallel and have the same length.

Identifying the two sides in the same pair, by translation, one obtains a translation surface.

\[ \omega = dz \quad g = \text{Euclidean} \quad X = (0, 1) \]

singularities \( \subset \) vertices
We want to understand the behavior of geodesics with a given direction. In particular,

- When are the geodesics closed?
- When are they dense in the surface?
A foliation on a surface is **measured** if it is defined by some 1-form $\alpha$ with isolated zeros: the leaves are tangent to the kernel of $\alpha$ at every non-singular point.

Example: parallel foliations on translation surfaces.

$$\alpha = dx$$

**singularities** $\subset$ **vertices**
Maier 43: Given a measured foliation, the ambient splits into

- periodic components: all leaves are closed;
- minimal components: all leaves are dense;
- separated by saddle-connections or homoclinic loops.
Measured Foliations

Maier 43: Given a measured foliation, the ambient splits into
- periodic components: all leaves are closed;
- minimal components: all leaves are dense;
- separated by saddle-connections or homoclinic loops.

Calabi 69, Katok 73: Every measured foliation $\mathcal{F}$ without saddle-connections is the vertical foliation with respect to some flat translation metric.

Necessary and sufficient: no closed paths homologous to zero formed by positively oriented saddle-connections.
Interval Exchange Transformations

Associated to the vertical foliation on a translation surface there is an interval exchange transformation: the return map to some section transverse to the foliation.
Interval Exchange Transformations

Associated to the vertical foliation on a translation surface there is an interval exchange transformation: the return map to some section transverse to the foliation.

Conversely, every interval exchange transformation may be suspended to the vertical flow on some translation surface (not unique).
Let $c_1 = (v_1, v_2)$ define the direction of the geodesics.

- If $v_1/v_2$ is rational then every geodesic is closed.
- If $v_1/v_2$ is irrational then the flow is uniquely ergodic.
Geodesic Flows on the Flat Torus

Let $c_1 = (v_1, v_2)$ define the direction of the geodesics.

- If $v_1/v_2$ is rational then every geodesic is closed.
- If $v_1/v_2$ is irrational then the flow is uniquely ergodic.

Given a geodesic segment of length $\ell$, “close” it to get

$$h(\ell) = (h_1(\ell), h_2(\ell)) \in H_1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Then $h(\ell) - c_1 \ell$ is bounded.
Given any geodesic segment of length $\ell$, close it to get an element $h(\ell) = (h_1(\ell), \ldots, h_d(\ell))$ of $H_1(S, \mathbb{Z})$. 

$(h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4) = (3, 5, 4, 2)$
Asymptotic Cycles

Schwartzmann 57:
The asymptotic cycle of a pair (surface, direction) is the limit

$$ c_1 = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} h(\ell) \in H_1(S, \mathbb{R}). $$

Kerckhoff, Masur, Smillie 86: For every translation surface and for almost every direction, the geodesic flow is uniquely ergodic. In particular, the asymptotic cycle is well defined, and every geodesic is dense.
Zorich discovered that the deviation of the vector $h(\ell)$ from the direction of $c_1$ distributes itself along a favorite direction $c_2$, with amplitude $\ell^{\nu_2}$ for some $\nu_2 < 1$: 

![Diagram showing the deviation of the vector from the direction of $c_1$ along $c_2$ with amplitude $\ell^{\nu_2}$]
Deviations from the Limit Direction

The same phenomenon is observed in higher orders: the component of \( h(\ell) \) orthogonal to \( \mathbb{R}c_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}c_2 \) has a favorite direction \( c_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d \), and amplitude \( \ell^{\nu_3} \) for some \( \nu_3 < \nu_2 \), and so on.
Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich). There are numbers $1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0$ and subspaces $L_1 \subset L_2 \subset \cdots \subset L_g$ with $c_1 \in L_1$ and $\dim L_i = i$ for every $i$, such that

- the deviation of $h(\ell)$ from $L_i$ has amplitude $\ell^{\nu_i+1}$ for all $i < g$.
- the deviation of $h(\ell)$ from $L_g$ is bounded.

(where $g =$ genus of the flat surface).
Conjecture and Main Result

**Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich).** There are numbers \( 1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0 \) and subspaces \( L_1 \subset L_2 \subset \cdots \subset L_g \) with \( c_1 \in L_1 \) and \( \dim L_i = i \) for every \( i \), such that

- the deviation of \( h(\ell) \) from \( L_i \) has amplitude \( \ell^{\nu_i + 1} \) for all \( i < g \)
- the deviation of \( h(\ell) \) from \( L_g \) is bounded.

(where \( g = \) genus of the flat surface).

**Theorem (Avila, Viana 04).** The Z-K conjecture is true.

There was fundamental previous work by Forni 02. Our argument contains another proof of Forni’s result \( \nu_g > 0 \).
Conjecture and Main Result

Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich). There are numbers $1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0$ and subspaces $L_1 \subset L_2 \subset \cdots \subset L_g$ with $c_1 \in L_1$ and $\dim L_i = i$ for every $i$, such that

- the deviation of $h(\ell)$ from $L_i$ has amplitude $\ell^{\nu_i+1}$ for all $i < g$
- the deviation of $h(\ell)$ from $L_g$ is bounded.

(where $g =$ genus of the flat surface).

Theorem (Avila, Viana 04). The Z-K conjecture is true.

There was fundamental previous work by Forni 02. Our argument contains another proof of Forni’s result $\nu_g > 0$.

Work of Kontsevich and Zorich translated the claim of the conjecture into a statement in Dynamics:
To analyze the behavior of longer and longer geodesics, we consider return maps to shorter and shorter cross-sections.

One way to do this is the Rauzy renormalization algorithm in the space of interval exchange transformations. We describe the algorithm through an example.
Each interval exchange transformation is replaced by the corresponding return map to a certain subinterval. Above is a “bottom” case: of the two rightmost intervals, the bottom one is longest.
The Rauzy transformation is defined by

\[
R : (\pi, \lambda) \mapsto (\pi', \lambda').
\]

It admits an invariant measure \( \nu \) absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure in the \( \lambda \)-space.
The Rauzy Cocycle

Now we analyze the effect of this algorithm on the return map (suspension of the interval exchange transformation):

Consider a geodesic segment that leaves from the $i$’th interval and returns to the cross-section. “Close” it by joining the endpoints to some chosen point. This defines some $v_i \in H_1(S, \mathbb{Z})$. 
The Rauzy Cocycle

Now we analyze the effect of this algorithm on the return map (suspension of the interval exchange transformation):

\[ v_1' = v_1 \quad v_2' = v_2 \quad v_3' = v_3 \quad v_4' = v_1 + v_4 \]

This corresponds to a linear cocycle \( R(\pi, \lambda, v) = (\pi', \lambda', v') \) over the Rauzy map \( R(\pi, \lambda) = (\pi', \lambda') \).
The Zorich Cocycles

The invariant measure $\nu$ of $R$ is infinite... Zorich introduced an accelerated algorithm

$$Z(\pi, \lambda) = R^n(\pi, \lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z}(\pi, \lambda, \nu) = \mathcal{R}^n(\pi, \lambda, \nu),$$

where $n = n(\pi, \lambda)$ is smallest such that the Rauzy iteration changes from “top” to “bottom” or vice-versa.
The Zorich Cocycles

The invariant measure $\nu$ of $R$ is infinite... Zorich introduced an accelerated algorithm

$$Z(\pi, \lambda) = R^n(\pi, \lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad Z(\pi, \lambda, \nu) = R^n(\pi, \lambda, \nu),$$

where $n = n(\pi, \lambda)$ is smallest such that the Rauzy iteration changes from “top” to “bottom” or vice-versa.

- The transformation $Z$ admits an absolutely continuous invariant ergodic probability $\mu$ over every Rauzy class $= \text{smallest invariant subset of the set of permutations } \pi$
- the cocycle $Z$ acts symplectically on $\nu \in H_1(S, \mathbb{R}) \approx \mathbb{R}^{2g}$.

This brings us to the setting of the Oseledets theorem:
Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich).

The Lyapunov exponents of every Zorich cocycle are non-zero and distinct:

\[ 1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0 > -\nu_g > \cdots > -\nu_2 > -\nu_1 = -1 \]

(then the asymptotic flag corresponds to the Oseledets decomposition).
Conjecture and Main Result

Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich). The Lyapunov exponents of every Zorich cocycle are non-zero and distinct:

\[ 1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0 > -\nu_g > \cdots > -\nu_2 > -\nu_1 = -1 \]

(then the asymptotic flag corresponds to the Oseledets decomposition).

Theorem (Veech 84). \( \nu_2 < 1 \).

Theorem (Forni 02). \( \nu_g > 0 \).
Conjecture and Main Result

**Conjecture (Zorich, Kontsevich).** The Lyapunov exponents of every Zorich cocycle are non-zero and distinct:

\[ 1 = \nu_1 > \nu_2 > \cdots > \nu_g > 0 > -\nu_g > \cdots > -\nu_2 > -\nu_1 = -1 \]

(then the asymptotic flag corresponds to the Oseledets decomposition).

**Theorem (Veech 84).** \( \nu_2 < 1 \).

**Theorem (Forni 02).** \( \nu_g > 0 \).

**Theorem (Avila, Viana 04).** All exponents are non-zero and distinct.
Main Steps of the Proof

1. A general criterium for multiplicity 1 of the Lyapunov exponents of linear cocycles.
2. Checking that this criterium applies to every Zorich cocycle.

Multiplicity of a Lyapunov exponent = dimension of the corresponding invariant subbundle in the Oseledets decomposition.
Linear Cocycles

Let $f : M \to M$ be a measurable transformation and $A : M \to GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ be a measurable function.

They define a linear cocycle $F$, through

$$F : M \times \mathbb{R}^d \to M \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad F(x, v) = (f(x), A(x)v).$$

Assume:

1. The map $f$ has a finite or countable Markov partition.
2. $A$ is constant on each element of the partition.
3. A bounded distortion condition (inverse branches of iterates of $f$ and their Jacobians are equicontinuous).
The Criterium

We call the cocycle simple if the map $f$ has

1. (pinching) Some periodic point $p \in M$, with period $\kappa \geq 1$, such that all the eigenvalues of $A^\kappa(p)$ have distinct norms.

2. (twisting) Some homoclinic point $z \in \text{supp} \mu$

\[ z \in W_{loc}^u(p) \quad \text{and} \quad f^m(z) \in W_{loc}^s(p) \]

such that $A^m(z)E \oplus F = \mathbb{R}^d$ for any invariant subspaces $E$ and $F$ of $A^\kappa(p)$ with $\dim E + \dim F = d$.

Twisting $\Leftrightarrow$ the algebraic minors of the matrix of $A^m(z)$ in an eigenbasis of $A^\kappa(p)$ are all different from zero.
The Criterium

**Theorem 0.** *If the cocycle is simple then all its Lyapunov exponents have multiplicity 1.*

Previous results were obtained by Guivarc’h, Raugi and Gol’dsheid, Margulis, for products of independent random matrices, and Bonatti, Viana, for cocycles over subshifts of finite type.
Theorem 1. Every Zorich cocycle is simple.
Checking the Criterium

**Theorem 1.** *Every Zorich cocycle is simple.*

The proof is by induction on the number of intervals. We consider combinatorial operations of reduction/extension:

\[
\pi = \begin{pmatrix}
  a_1 & \cdots & a_{i-1} & c & a_{i+1} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & a_d \\
  b_1 & \cdots & \cdots & b_{j-1} & c & b_{j+1} & \cdots & b_d \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
\updownarrow
\]

\[
\pi' = \begin{pmatrix}
  a_1 & \cdots & a_{i-1} & a_{i+1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_d \\
  b_1 & \cdots & \cdots & b_{j-1} & b_{j+1} & \cdots & b_d \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

This has a topological and geometric counterpart for the corresponding surfaces:
Given $\pi$ with $d$ symbols, there exists $\pi'$ with $d - 1$ symbols such that $\pi$ is an extension of $\pi'$. Then, either $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ or $g(\pi) = g(\pi') + 1$.

1. If $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ then the corresponding Zorich actions are (symplectically) conjugate.

Pinching also requires a careful combinatorial analysis.
Checking the Criterium

Given $\pi$ with $d$ symbols, there exists $\pi'$ with $d - 1$ symbols such that $\pi$ is an extension of $\pi'$. Then, either $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ or $g(\pi) = g(\pi') + 1$.

1. If $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ then the corresponding Zorich actions are (symplectically) conjugate.

2. If $g(\pi) = g(\pi') + 1$ then $H_1(S(\pi'), \mathbb{R})$ may be seen as a symplectic reduction of $H_1(S(\pi), \mathbb{R})$

$$= \text{symplectic orthogonal of } v_c \text{ inside } H_1(S(\pi), \mathbb{R})/v_c$$

and the Zorich action on $H_1(S(\pi'), \mathbb{R})$ is conjugate to the natural action on the symplectic reduction.

Pinching also requires a careful combinatorial analysis.
Given $\pi$ with $d$ symbols, there exists $\pi'$ with $d - 1$ symbols such that $\pi$ is an extension of $\pi'$. Then, either $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ or $g(\pi) = g(\pi') + 1$.

1. If $g(\pi) = g(\pi')$ then the corresponding Zorich actions are (symplectically) conjugate.

2. If $g(\pi) = g(\pi') + 1$ then $H_1(S(\pi'), \mathbb{R})$ may be seen as a symplectic reduction of $H_1(S(\pi), \mathbb{R})$ and the Zorich action on $H_1(S(\pi'), \mathbb{R})$ is conjugate to the natural action on the symplectic reduction.

In this way one can prove twisting for $\pi$ from twisting for $\pi'$. Pinching also requires a careful combinatorial analysis.