

Soviet-era science, translated into English

# ON A CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE TEICHMÜLLER METRIC

MATHEMATICS

1969

SovietRxiv

---

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196901.52382>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

**Abstract**

**Full Text**

UDC 517.5

*MATHEMATICS*

M. A. EVGRAFOV, M. M. POSTNIKOV

## ON A CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE TEICHMÜLLER METRIC

*(Presented by Academician P. S. Aleksandrov on 20 I 1969)*

Let  $\mathcal{T}_p$  be the Teichmüller space of marked Riemann surfaces of genus  $p > 0$  (see, for example, (1-3)). The points of this space are closed Riemann surfaces  $S$  of genus  $p > 0$  with a fixed system of canonical cuts

$$a_1, \dots, a_p; \quad b_1, \dots, b_p.$$

Let  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p$  be a basis of Abelian differentials of the first kind on the surface  $S$ , normalized by the conditions  $\langle \omega_i, a_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ . The matrix with elements

$$\beta_{ij} = \langle \omega_i, b_j \rangle, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, p,$$

will be denoted by  $\chi S$ . This matrix is uniquely determined by the surface  $S$  and belongs to the Siegel upper half-plane  $\mathfrak{Z}_p$  (the space of symmetric complex matrices  $Z$  with positive definite imaginary part).

The **Teichmüller distance**  $d(S_1, S_2)$  between points  $S_1 \in \mathcal{T}_p$  and  $S_2 \in \mathcal{T}_p$  is called the infimum of all numbers  $d$  for which there exists an  $e^d$ -quasiconformal mapping  $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  taking the system of canonical cuts of the surface  $S_1$  into the system of canonical cuts of the surface  $S_2$ .

It is known (see (3)) that for  $p = 1$  the mapping  $\chi$  is an isometric mapping of the space  $\mathcal{T}_1$  onto the Siegel upper half-plane  $\mathfrak{Z}_1$  (which in this case is the ordinary upper half-plane), endowed with the standard non-Euclidean Poincaré metric. For  $p > 1$  the analogue of the Poincaré metric is the invariant (with respect to analytic automorphisms) Siegel Riemannian metric  $\rho$ , for which

$$ds^2 = \text{Tr}(dZ \cdot Y^{-1} \cdot d\bar{Z} \cdot Y^{-1}),$$

where  $Y = \text{Im } Z$ . However, since for  $p > 1$  the mapping  $\chi$  is certainly not one-to-one, there is no question of its being isometric. (Moreover, as can be shown without difficulty, for  $p > 1$  the mapping  $\chi$  will not even be locally isometric,

and not only with respect to the metric  $\rho$ , but also with respect to an arbitrary invariant Finsler metric on the space  $\mathfrak{Z}_p$  that is projectively equivalent to the metric  $\rho$ .) Nevertheless, it turns out that the metric  $\rho$  estimates the metric  $d$  from below, i.e., for any points  $S_1 \in \mathcal{T}_p$  and  $S_2 \in \mathcal{T}_p$  the inequality

$$\rho(\chi S_1, \chi S_2) \leq d(S_1, S_2)$$

holds.

Moreover, an analogous inequality holds for any invariant normalized Finsler metric on the space  $\mathfrak{Z}_p$ . The maximal one among such metrics is the Finsler metric  $\rho_{\max}$ , the square of whose line element is equal to the spectral radius of the matrix

$$dZ \cdot Y^{-1} \cdot d\bar{Z} \cdot Y^{-1}.$$

The metric  $\rho_{\max}$  is related to the metric  $\rho$  by the inequalities

$$\rho \leq \rho_{\max} \leq \sqrt{p} \rho,$$

so that for  $p = 1$  both of these metrics coincide.

Thus the following is true.

**Theorem.** For any points  $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_p$  and  $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}_p$  the inequality

$$\rho_{\max}(\varkappa S_1, \varkappa S_2) \leq d(S_1, S_2)$$

holds.

It can be shown that this estimate cannot be improved further, i.e., for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist distinct points  $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}_p$  and  $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}_p$  such that

$$\rho_{\max}(\varkappa S_1, \varkappa S_2) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)d(S_1, S_2).$$

Before passing to the proof of the theorem just formulated, let us define the notion of the extremal length of a canonical cut.

Let  $\Gamma$  be some family of curves on a Riemann surface  $S$ , and let  $\sigma = \sigma(z)|dz|$  (where  $z$  is a local uniformizing parameter) be a nonnegative conformally invariant piecewise smooth metric given on  $S$ . By the symbols  $l_\sigma(\gamma)$  and  $A_\sigma$  we shall denote the length of the curve  $\gamma$  and the area of the surface  $S$  in the metric  $\sigma$ . By definition,

$$l_\sigma(\gamma) = \int_\gamma \sigma, \quad A_\sigma = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_S \sigma^2(z) dz d\bar{z}.$$

Next, put

$$L_\sigma(\Gamma) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} l_\sigma(\gamma), \quad \lambda(\Gamma) = \sup_\sigma \frac{L_\sigma^2(\Gamma)}{A_\sigma}.$$

The quantity  $\lambda(\Gamma)$  is called the **extremal length of the family**  $\Gamma$ , and a metric  $\sigma$  for which the last supremum is attained is called an **extremal metric**.

By the **extremal length**  $\lambda(a)$  of the **canonical cut**  $a$  of the Riemann surface  $S$  we shall mean the extremal length of the family  $\Gamma$  consisting of curves homotopic to the cut  $a$ .

Jenkins' theorem (see [4]) asserts that, for a fairly broad class of families  $\Gamma$ , the extremal metric  $\sigma$  has the form  $\sigma = \sqrt{|Q|}$ , where  $Q = Q(z)(dz)^2$  is a certain quadratic differential on the surface  $S$ . In the case that interests us, it is easy to see from Jenkins' proof that this quadratic differential must be the square of some abelian differential of the first kind.

**Lemma.** For any point  $S$  of the Teichmüller space  $\mathcal{S}_p$ , the extremal length  $\lambda(a_1)$  of the canonical cut  $a_1$  is expressed by the formula

$$\lambda(a_1) = 1/\operatorname{Im} \beta_{11}.$$

**Proof.** According to what was said above, we may restrict ourselves to considering metrics  $\sigma$  of the form

$$\sigma = \left| \sum_{j=1}^p c_j \omega_j \right|,$$

where  $c_1, \dots, c_p$  are complex constants. In this case

$$A_\sigma = \frac{1}{2i} \iint_S \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p c_j \bar{c}_k \omega_j \bar{\omega}_k = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p c_j \bar{c}_k \operatorname{Im} \beta_{jk},$$

and for any curve  $\gamma$  homotopic to the cut  $a_1$ ,

$$l_\sigma(\gamma) = \int_\gamma \left| \sum_{j=1}^p c_j \omega_j \right| \geq \left| \int_\gamma \sum_{j=1}^p c_j \omega_j \right| = |c_1|.$$

Therefore  $L_\sigma(a_1) \geq |c_1|$ , and

$$\lambda(a_1) \geq \max_{c_1, \dots, c_p} \frac{|c_1|^2}{\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p c_j \bar{c}_k \operatorname{Im} \beta_{jk}}.$$

Computing this maximum, we obtain  $\lambda(a_1) \geq (\operatorname{Im} \beta_{11})^{-1}$ . To obtain the reverse inequality, note that the geodesics in the metric  $\sigma = |\omega_1|$  are the lines  $\arg \omega_1 = \text{const}$ , and that on these lines

$$\int_{\gamma} |\omega_1| = \left| \int_{\gamma} \omega_1 \right|.$$

Taking the curve  $\gamma_1$  to be a geodesic homotopic to the cut  $a_1$ , we obtain, consequently, that

$$L_{|\omega_1|}(a_1) \leq l_{|\omega_1|}(\gamma_1) = \left| \int_{\gamma_1} \omega_1 \right| = 1,$$

and therefore

$$\lambda(a_1) \geq 1/A_{|\omega_1|} = 1/\operatorname{Im} \beta_{11}.$$

Thus the lemma is completely proved.

Furthermore, it is known (see, for example, <sup>(1, 3)</sup>) that the extremal lengths of families of curves possess the property of quasi-invariance under quasiconformal mappings. In our case this means that, under any  $K$ -quasiconformal mapping  $S \rightarrow S'$  for which the canonical cut  $a$  passes into the canonical cut  $a'$ , the inequality  $\lambda(a') \leq K\lambda(a)$  holds. Hence, from the lemma proved above, the following immediately follows.

**Corollary.** *For any two points  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of Teichmüller space that are at distance  $d = d(S_1, S_2)$ , the inequality*

$$\operatorname{Im}(\chi S_2)_{11} \leq e^d \operatorname{Im}(\chi S_1)_{11}$$

*holds (by the symbol  $A_{ij}$  we denote here the element of the matrix  $A$  located at the intersection of the  $i$ -th row and the  $j$ -th column).*

Let us now proceed to the proof of the theorem. As is known (see, for example, <sup>(1)</sup>), the automorphism group of the fundamental group of Riemann surfaces of genus  $p$  acts isometrically on the space  $\mathcal{S}_p$ . Therefore, according to the corollary, for any such automorphism  $\varphi$  the inequality

$$\operatorname{Im}(\chi(\varphi S_2))_{11} \leq e^d \operatorname{Im}(\chi(\varphi S_1))_{11}. \quad (1)$$

will hold.

On the other hand, it is clear that each automorphism  $\varphi$  determines a certain modular automorphism of the Siegel upper half-plane  $\mathfrak{H}_p$  (we shall denote it by the same symbol  $\varphi$ ); moreover, for any Riemann surface  $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$  the equality

$$\chi(\varphi S) = \varphi(\chi S)$$

holds.

According to the approximation theorem proved by the authors of this note (see <sup>(5)</sup>), the automorphism  $\varphi$  can be chosen so that the matrix  $\chi(\varphi S_1)$  has the form  $(X + iE + U)\mu$ , while the matrix  $\chi(\varphi S_2)$  has the form  $(X + iT + V)\mu$ , where  $\mu$  is a certain positive number;  $X$  is a certain real matrix;  $U$  and  $V$  are matrices (generally speaking, complex) all of whose elements do not exceed in absolute value an arbitrary preassigned number  $\delta > 0$ , and  $T$  is a diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(T_{11}, \dots, T_{pp})$ , where  $1 \leq T_{pp} \leq \dots \leq T_{11}$ . Here the matrix  $T$  is determined only by the surfaces  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  (does not depend on the automorphism  $\varphi$ ), and the quantity  $\ln T_{11}$  is equal to the distance between the matrices  $\chi S_1$  and  $\chi S_2$  in the metric  $\rho_{\max}$ . Thus, for this automorphism  $\varphi$ , inequality (1) can be rewritten in the form  $\rho_{\max} \leq d + \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Consequently,  $\rho_{\max} \geq d$ , as was asserted.

Steklov Mathematical Institute  
Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Received  
9 I 1969

## CITED LITERATURE

1. L. Ahlfors, L. Bers, *Spaces of Riemann Surfaces and Quasiconformal Mappings*, II, 1961.
2. A. Borel, *Sem. Bourbaki*, 1958, exp. 168.
3. L. Ahlfors, *Lectures on Quasiconformal Mappings*, 1969.
4. J. A. Jenkins, *Ann. Math.*, **66**, No. 3, 440 (1957).
5. M. A. Evgrafov, M. M. Postnikov, *Matem. sbornik*, **76** (1969).

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.*