

# GENERIC PROPERTIES OF HITCHIN REPRESENTATIONS

HONGTAEK JUNG

ABSTRACT. Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint group and let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface of genus at least 2. We show that for generic  $\mathrm{PSL}_{2k-1}(\mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin representations  $\rho$ , the middle eigenvalue of  $\rho(x)$  is not equal to 1 for all non-trivial elements  $x \in \pi_1(S)$ . Using the same technique, we prove that the set of strongly dense  $G$ -Hitchin representations is generic. This generalizes the result of Long, Reid and Wolf for the  $G = \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  case.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group and let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface of genus at least 2. The  $G$ -Hitchin component, introduced in [Hit92], has been intensively studied as one of the prime examples of higher Teichmüller spaces. In this note, we explore two properties that generic  $G$ -Hitchin representations have.

The first generic property is about eigenvalues. Let  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)$  be the set of  $G$ -Hitchin representations and let  $\mathrm{Hit}_G(S) := \overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)/G$ . When  $G = \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ , we simply write  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_n(S) := \overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_{\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})}(S)$  and  $\mathrm{Hit}_n(S) := \overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_n(S)/\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ . For an element  $[\rho]$  in the Fuchsian locus of  $\mathrm{Hit}_{2k-1}(S)$ , we have  $\lambda_k(\rho(x)) = 0$  for all  $x \in \pi_1(S)$ , where  $\lambda_k$  is the log of the absolute value of the  $k$ th largest eigenvalue. On the other hand, as we move away from the Fuchsian locus, we would expect to encounter Hitchin representations  $\rho$  breaking the condition that  $\lambda_k(\rho(x)) = 0$  for all  $x \in \pi_1(S)$ . Therefore, a descent question to ask is the following:

**Question 1.1.** Is there a Hitchin representation  $[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_{2k-1}(S)$  such that  $\lambda_k(\rho(x)) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}$ ?

This is a subtle problem even for  $k = 2$ ; as observed in [LR24, Proposition 1.1], there is an infinite order element, say  $x$ , in some orbifold group  $\Delta$  such that  $\lambda_2(\rho(x)) = 0$  for all  $\rho \in \mathrm{Hit}_3(\Delta)$ . Yet, our main result answers Question 1.1 affirmative.

We will actually show a more generally statement. Recall that any element  $[\rho]$  in the Fuchsian locus of  $\mathrm{Hit}_n(S)$  satisfies the relation  $\lambda_i(\rho(x)) + \lambda_{n-i+1}(\rho(x)) = 0$  for all  $x \in \pi_1(S)$ . We prove, however, that this relation fails for most  $\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin representations.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface of genus  $> 1$ . For any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the following set*

$$\{[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_n(S) \mid \lambda_i(\rho(x)) + \lambda_{n-i+1}(\rho(x)) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}\}$$

*is generic in  $\mathrm{Hit}_n(S)$ .*

Here, we say that a subset of  $\mathrm{Hit}_G(S)$  or  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)$  is *generic* if it is the complement of the union of countably many proper analytic subvarieties.

The second property that we want to address is strong denseness in the sense of Breuillard, Green, Guralnick, and Tao. [BGGT12]. Recall that a representation  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow G$  is *strongly dense* if for any pair of non-commuting elements  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$ , the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $\rho(a)$  and  $\rho(b)$  is Zariski dense in  $G$ . Then the question is whether most  $G$ -Hitchin representations

are strongly dense. When  $G = \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ , Long, Reid, and Wolff [LRW22] recently proved that the set of strongly dense  $\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin representations is generic in  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_n(S)$ . We generalize their result to arbitrary Hitchin representations.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface of genus  $> 1$ . Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group. Then the set of strongly dense  $G$ -Hitchin representations is generic in  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)$ .*

Theorem 1.3 shows that a split real form  $G$  of a complex simple adjoint group contains plenty of strongly dense discrete surface subgroups of arbitrary genus. This result is a partial generalization of [BGGT12, Theorem 4.5], where they constructed a strongly dense non-abelian free subgroup in  $G$ .

Proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 are based on the following Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface of genus  $> 1$ . Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group. Let  $\lambda : G \rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  be the Jordan projection. Then, for an arbitrary  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^* \setminus \{0\}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following set*

$$\{[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_G(S) \mid \alpha(\lambda(\rho(x))) \neq c \text{ for all } x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}\}$$

*is generic in  $\mathrm{Hit}_G(S)$ .*

For the definition of the Jordan projection, consult Section 2.

Once we have Theorem 1.4, Theorem 1.2 immediately follows because, as illustrated in Example 2.1, the Jordan projection  $\lambda(\rho(x))$  of a  $\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin representation  $\rho$  is more or less taking the log of the diagonal matrix that is conjugate to  $\rho(x)$ .

The milestone of this paper is to use the Goldman product formula as a variation formula. Combined with the flow lifting theorem (Theorem 4.1), this new perspective paves the way to our main results.

**Organization.** Section 2 provides a quick review on Hitchin representations and relevant Lie theory. In Section 3, we introduce Goldman functions and state the Goldman product formula, which will be the key player of our proof. In Section 4, we will show that, under a finite covering, a Goldman flow along an oriented simple closed curve lifts to a Goldman flow along a multi-curves. This allows us to apply the Goldman product formula to more general situations. Then proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.3 will be given in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we discuss related problems focusing on  $\mathrm{Hit}_3(S)$ .

**Acknowledgment.** The author learned Question 1.1 from Michael Zshornack during the CIRM introductory school to the IHP program “Group Actions and Rigidity: Around the Zimmer Program” in April 2024. The author thank the organizers and CIRM for hosting the wonderful program. Also the author is grateful to Michael Zshornack, Gye-Seon Lee and Yves Benoist for helpful discussions and suggestions.

The author was supported by the BK21 SNU Mathematical Sciences Division.

## 2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we quickly review Hitchin representations and related Lie theory. Standard references for this subject are [Kna96, Ebe96]. [BQ16] also discusses Jordan projections in detail including many useful properties and applications.

Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple Lie group  $G^{\mathbb{C}}$  of adjoint type and let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be its Lie algebra. In the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  of  $G$ , we choose a regular nilpotent element  $E$ . Then, we can always complete  $E$  to a triple  $\{E, F, H\}$  satisfying the  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -relations:  $[H, E] = 2E$ ,  $[H, F] = -2F$  and  $[E, F] = H$ . Such a principal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple induces a representation  $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}$  which can

be integrated to a Lie group representation  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow G^{\mathbb{C}}$ . By taking the real points, one can find a Lie group representation  $\iota_G : \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow G$ .

We call a representation  $\pi_1(S) \rightarrow G$  a *Fuchsian representation* if it is of the form  $\iota_G \circ \rho_{hyp}$  for some discrete faithful representation  $\rho_{hyp} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ . A representation  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow G$  is a *G-Hitchin representation* if  $\rho$  can be continuously deformed to a Fuchsian one. The set of *G-Hitchin representations* will be denoted by  $\overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)$ . We also define  $\mathrm{Hit}_G(S) := \overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)/G$ , the space of conjugacy classes of *G-Hitchin representations*. We will use the square bracket  $[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_G(S)$  to denote the conjugacy class of  $\rho \in \overline{\mathrm{Hit}}_G(S)$ .

The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  of  $G$  admits a  $\mathrm{Ad}_G$ -invariant non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form  $\mathbf{B}$ . We have the Cartan involution  $\theta : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ , which makes the symmetric bilinear form  $\mathbf{B}_\theta(\cdot, \cdot) := -\mathbf{B}(\cdot, \theta(\cdot))$  positive definite on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The Cartan involution  $\theta$  decomposes  $\mathfrak{g}$  into the direct sum  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ , where  $\mathfrak{k}$  is the  $+1$  eigenspace of  $\theta$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the  $-1$  eigenspace of  $\theta$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{B}$  is positive definite on  $\mathfrak{p}$  and negative definite on  $\mathfrak{k}$ .

Choose a maximal abelian subalgebra  $\mathfrak{a}$  in  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Then we have the restricted root space decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 + \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$$

where  $\Pi \subset \mathfrak{a}^* \setminus \{0\}$  is the set of restricted roots and  $\mathfrak{g}_\beta = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [A, X] = \beta(A)X \text{ for all } A \in \mathfrak{a}\}$ . If  $G$  is real split, we have  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [A, X] = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \mathfrak{a}\} = \mathfrak{a}$ . This decomposition is orthogonal with respect to  $\mathbf{B}_\theta$ .

We now define the Jordan projection. Choose an ordering on  $\Pi$  and let  $\Delta$  be the set of simple roots associated to this order. Let  $\mathfrak{a}^+ = \{A \in \mathfrak{a} \mid \beta(A) > 0 \text{ for all } \beta \in \Delta\}$  and let  $\overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  be the closure of  $\mathfrak{a}^+$ . Any element  $x \in G$  can be uniquely written as the product  $x = x_k x_h x_u$  of commuting elements where  $x_k$  is conjugate into the analytic subgroup of  $\mathfrak{k}$ ,  $x_h$  is in the conjugacy class of  $\exp \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  and  $x_u$  is unipotent. We know that the conjugacy class of  $x_h$  intersects with  $\exp \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  in a unique point. The *Jordan projection* of  $x$  is a unique element  $\lambda(x) \in \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  such that  $\exp \lambda(x)$  is conjugate to  $x_h$ . This defines a map  $\lambda : G \rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$ .

We say that an element  $x \in G$  is *loxodromic* if  $\lambda(x) \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ . Let  $Z_K(\mathfrak{a})$  be the centralizer of  $\mathfrak{a}$  in the analytic subgroup of  $\mathfrak{k}$ . Then  $x \in G$  is loxodromic if and only if  $x$  is conjugate into  $y \exp \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  for some  $y \in Z_K(\mathfrak{a})$ . We say  $x \in G$  is *purely loxodromic* if  $x$  is conjugate into  $\exp \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$ .

**Example 2.1.** As a concrete example, take  $G = \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ . Then the Cartan involution  $\theta$  and the invariant symmetric bilinear form  $\mathbf{B}$  may be taken to be  $X \mapsto -X^T$  and  $\mathbf{B}(X, Y) = \mathrm{Tr}(XY)$  respectively. An element  $x \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is loxodromic if, for some lift  $x' \in \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  of  $x$ , eigenvalues of  $x'$  are real and their absolute values are all distinct.  $x \in \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is purely loxodromic if  $x$  can be lifted to  $x' \in \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  whose eigenvalues are positive and distinct. For an element  $x \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ , let  $\varepsilon_i(x)$  be (complex) eigenvalues of  $x$  such that  $|\varepsilon_1(x)| \geq |\varepsilon_2(x)| \geq \dots \geq |\varepsilon_n(x)|$ . The Jordan projection of a loxodromic element  $x$  is  $\mathrm{diag}(\log |\varepsilon_1(x')|, \dots, \log |\varepsilon_n(x')|)$  where  $x' \in \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is a lift of  $x$ .

### 3. THE GOLDMAN PRODUCT FORMULA

In this section we introduce the the Goldman product formula which computes the Atiyah-Bott-Goldman symplectic form on Hamiltonian vector fields of a certain kind.

Let  $G$  be a real semi-simple Lie group and let  $U \subset G$  be a non-empty open set which is invariant under conjugation in the sense that  $xUx^{-1} \subset U$  for all  $x \in G$ . A differentiable function  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *invariant* if  $f(yxy^{-1}) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in U$  and  $y \in G$ . Given an invariant function  $f$  we define the *Goldman function*  $\widehat{f} : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  which associates to  $x \in U$  a unique element  $\widehat{f}(x) \in \mathfrak{g}$

satisfying

$$\mathbb{B}(\widehat{f}(x), Y) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(x \exp tY)$$

for all  $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ .

Let  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an invariant function. For a given  $x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}$ , we define the differentiable function  $f_x : \text{Hit}_G(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_x([\rho]) = f(\rho(x))$ . Since  $f$  is an invariant function, we know that  $f_x$  depends only on the conjugacy class of  $x$ . Hence, we may say that  $f_x$  is defined for an oriented essential closed curve  $x$ .

We are now ready to state the product formula by Goldman [Gol86, Theorem 3.5]. The original statement is about symplectic geometry. At this moment, however, we only need the existence of Hamiltonian vector fields, which one may take it for granted. We will explain the construct of these Hamiltonian flows, which will be called *Goldman flows* in Section 4.

**Theorem 3.1** (Goldman Product formula). *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be invariant functions. Let  $x$  and  $y$  be oriented essential simple closed curves in  $S$ . Let  $\mathbb{X}_{f_x}$  be the Hamiltonian vector field of  $f_x$  with respect to the Atiyah-Bott-Goldman symplectic form. Then, at any point  $[\rho] \in \text{Hit}_G(S)$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{X}_{f_x}(g_y)|_{[\rho]} = \sum_{p \in x \cap y} (\text{sign } p) \mathbb{B}(\widehat{f}(\rho(x_p)), \widehat{g}(\rho(y_p))),$$

where  $x_p$  and  $y_p$  are  $\pi_1(S, p)$  elements represented by  $x$  and  $y$  regarded as loops with common base-point  $p$ .

Goldman's motivation to promote Theorem 3.1 was to compute the Atiyah-Bott-Goldman symplectic form between two Hamiltonian vector fields. Besides its origin, we will focus on the aspect of Theorem 3.1 that it provides the first variation formula for functions along Hamiltonian flows. This unusual viewpoint sheds light on the way toward our main theorems.

In the remaining part of this section, we compute the Goldman function for a certain class of invariant functions.

We begin with a simple observation:

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\widehat{f} : U \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  be the Goldman function of an invariant function  $f$ . Then for any  $x \in U$  and  $y \in G$ , we have  $\widehat{f}(yxy^{-1}) = \text{Ad}_y \widehat{f}(x)$ .*

Let  $\lambda : G \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^+$  be the Jordan projection. By definition, we have  $\lambda(yxy^{-1}) = \lambda(x)$  for all  $x, y \in G$ . Hence, given a non-trivial  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ , the function  $\alpha \circ \lambda : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\alpha \circ \lambda(yxy^{-1}) = \alpha \circ \lambda(x)$  for all  $x, y \in G$ .

We are interested in the case when the domain  $U \subset G$  is give by the set of purely loxodromic elements. Then we will use  $\alpha \circ \lambda$  as an invariant function defined on  $U$ . To say that this is an invariant function, we need to verify that  $U$  is open and that  $\lambda$  is at least differentiable. We believe that these are known to experts. However, as we could not find an explicit statement from existing literature, we decide to attach their proofs in Appendix A. Here we just state the results.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group. Let  $\lambda : G \rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  be the Jordan projection and let  $U$  be the set of purely loxodromic elements. Then*

- (i)  $U$  is open,
- (ii)  $\lambda$  is real analytic on  $U$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group. Let  $U$  be the set of purely loxodromic elements in  $G$ . Let  $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be given by  $f := \alpha \circ \lambda$ . Then,*

- (i)  $f$  is real analytic,

(ii) for an element  $x \in \exp \mathfrak{a}^+$ , we have

$$\widehat{f}(x) = \alpha^\vee$$

where  $\alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{a}$  is a unique element in  $\mathfrak{a}$  satisfying  $\mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, Y) = \alpha(Y)$  for all  $Y \in \mathfrak{a}$ . In particular,  $\widehat{f}$  is constant on  $\exp \mathfrak{a}^+$ .

*Proof.* (i) This follows from Lemma 3.3.

(ii) Write  $x = \exp X$  for some  $X \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ . Let  $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ . By the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula, we have

$$(1) \quad x \exp tY = \exp X \exp tY = \exp \left( X + t \frac{\text{ad}_X}{1 - e^{-\text{ad}_X}} Y + O(t^2) \right).$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$$

be the restricted root space decomposition of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  of  $G$ . Since  $G$  is a split real form we have  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{a}$ . Decompose  $Y$  into the sum of restricted root vectors;  $Y = Y_0 + \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} Y_\beta$ . Since  $X \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ , we have  $[X, Y_\beta] = \beta(X)Y_\beta$  for any restricted root  $\beta \in \Pi$ . Hence, the argument of the rightmost exponential in (1) becomes

$$X + tY_0 + t \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} \frac{\beta(X)}{1 - e^{-\beta(X)}} Y_\beta + O(t^2).$$

Let

$$Z := X + tY_0 + t \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} \frac{\beta(X)}{1 - e^{-\beta(X)}} Y_\beta.$$

For a small enough  $t$ , (1) remains purely loxodromic. Also by Lemma 3.3, for all sufficiently small  $t$ , we can find an analytic path  $g_t \in G$  such that  $g_t(x \exp tY)g_t^{-1} \in \exp \mathfrak{a}^+$ . Because  $t \mapsto g_t$  is also analytic with  $g_0 = 1$ , we expand  $g_t$  near  $t = 0$  and write  $g_t = \exp(tQ + O(t^2))$  for some  $Q \in \mathfrak{g}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(x \exp tY)g_t^{-1} &= \exp(\text{Ad}_{g_t}(Z + O(t^2))) \\ &= \exp(Z + t[Q, X] + O(t^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $X \in \mathfrak{a}$ ,  $[Q, X]$  does not have a  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -factor in the restricted root space decomposition. By the construction of  $g_t$ , we have  $Z + t[Q, X] \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ . This forces

$$[Q, X] = - \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} \frac{\beta(X)}{1 - e^{-\beta(X)}} Y_\beta.$$

Therefore, we know that  $\lambda(x \exp tY) = X + tY_0 + O(t^2)$  and

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(x \exp tY) = \alpha(Y_0).$$

Since the decomposition  $Y = Y_0 + \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} Y_\beta$  is orthogonal with respect to the positive definite pairing  $\mathbf{B}_\theta$ , we get

$$\mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, Y) = -\mathbf{B}(\theta\alpha^\vee, Y) = \mathbf{B}_\theta(\alpha^\vee, Y) = \mathbf{B}_\theta(\alpha^\vee, Y_0) = \mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, Y_0) = \alpha(Y_0).$$

Therefore,  $\widehat{f}(x) = \alpha^\vee$ . □

## 4. LIFTING GOLDMAN FLOWS

In this section, we investigate how Goldman flows behavior under a finite covering.

Let  $S$  be a closed orientable surface  $S$  of genus  $> 1$  and let  $f : U \rightarrow G$  be an invariant function. Let  $x$  be an oriented essential simple closed curve in  $S$ .

Goldman [Gol86] constructed an explicit Hamiltonian flow, called a *Goldman flow*, for a given Hamiltonian vector field of the form  $\mathbb{X}_{f_x}$ . In [CJK20], the author studied a multi-curve generalization of Goldman flows using graph of groups. As we need Goldman flows along a multi-curve, let us quickly recall them. One may refer to [Ser80] for more details on graph of groups.

Let  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  be a set of pairwise disjoint oriented essential simple closed curves in  $S$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_d$  be the completions of connected components of  $S \setminus \mathbf{x}$ . We first construct a graph of groups  $\mathcal{G}$ . As a directed graph,  $\mathcal{G}$  has the vertex set  $V(\mathcal{G}) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d\}$  where  $v_i \in S_i$  are random points in  $S_i$ . We join  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  (possibly  $i = j$ ) by an edge  $e_k$  if and only if  $S_i$  and  $S_j$  are glued along some  $x_k$ . We orient  $e_k$  so that it emanates from the left-side of  $x_k$  and terminates at the right-side of  $x_k$ . Note that we can distinguish the left-side and the right-side of  $x_k$  since  $x_k$  is oriented and  $S$  is orientable. Assign to each vertex  $v_i$  the group  $\pi_1(S_i, v_i)$ . For each edge  $e_k$ , we give the group  $\langle x_k \rangle$ . We regard  $\langle x_k \rangle$  as a subgroup of  $\pi_1(S_i, v_i)$  by conjugating  $x_k$  with the arc  $e_k \cap S_i$  if  $v_i$  is the head of the edge  $e_k$ .

Choose a maximal tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $v_1 \in V(\mathcal{T})$ . Then it is a standard fact that  $\pi_1(S, v_1)$  is isomorphic to the fundamental group  $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$  of the graph of groups. Recall that  $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$  is generated by  $\pi_1(S_1, v_1), \dots, \pi_1(S_k, v_k)$  together with edges in  $E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) := E(\mathcal{G}) \setminus E(\mathcal{T})$ . The isomorphism  $\phi : \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \pi_1(S, v_1)$  maps  $\gamma \in \pi_1(S_i, v_i) \subset \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$  to the element  $\phi(\gamma) = e\gamma\bar{e}$  where  $e$  is a unique edge path in  $\mathcal{T}$  joining  $v_1$  and  $v_i$  with its reversal  $\bar{e}$ . Also it maps  $c \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$  to the element  $gch$  where  $g$  is an edge path in  $\mathcal{T}$  from  $v_1$  to the tail of  $c$  and  $h$  is an edge path in  $\mathcal{T}$  from the head of  $c$  to  $v_1$ .

To define the Goldman flow, we use the following notations. For  $e \in E(\mathcal{T})$ , let  $H(e)$  be the head segment of  $e$  defined by the connected component of  $\mathcal{T} \setminus e$  containing the head vertex of  $e$ . The tail segment  $T(e)$  of  $e$  is defined similarly. Now given  $e_i \in E(\mathcal{T})$ , the Goldman flow  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_i}(\rho)$  along  $x_i$  is defined for  $\rho \in \overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S)$  by the conjugacy class of representation  $\pi_1(S) \rightarrow G$  induced from the map on the generators

$$\gamma \mapsto \begin{cases} \rho(\phi(\gamma)) & \gamma \in \pi_1(S_j, v_j) \text{ and } v_j \in V(T(e_i)) \\ \exp(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i))))\rho(\phi(\gamma))\exp(t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i)))) & \gamma \in \pi_1(S_j, v_j) \text{ and } v_j \in V(H(e_i)) \\ \exp(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i))))\rho(\phi(e))\exp(t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i)))) & \gamma = e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ joining two vertices of } H(e_i) \\ \rho(\phi(e)) & \gamma = e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ joining two vertices of } T(e_i) \\ \exp(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i))))\rho(\phi(e)) & \gamma = e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ directing from } H(e_i) \text{ to } T(e_i) \\ \rho(\phi(e))\exp(t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i)))) & \gamma = e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ directing from } T(e_i) \text{ to } H(e_i) \end{cases}$$

using the universal property of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$ . When  $e_i \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$ , we similarly define  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_i}(\rho)$  by the representation extending the map on the generators

$$\gamma \mapsto \begin{cases} \rho(\phi(e_i))\exp(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(\phi(x_i)))) & \text{if } \gamma = e_i \\ \rho(\phi(\gamma)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We have defined a flow on  $\overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S)$ . The actual flow, also denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_i}$ , on  $\text{Hit}_G(S)$  is given by  $[\rho] \mapsto [\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_i}(\rho')]$  where  $\rho'$  is a representative of  $[\rho]$ . One can check that this is well-defined.

Since  $x_i$  are pairwise disjoint,  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_i}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x_j}$  commute whenever  $i \neq j$ . Therefore, for  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$ , the  $k$ -parameter family of representations,  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{t}}^{f, \mathbf{x}}([\rho]) := \mathcal{F}_{t_1}^{f, x_1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t_k}^{f, x_k}([\rho])$

is well-defined and gives a smooth flow on  $\text{Hit}_G(S)$ . We call  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f,x}$  the *Goldman flow* along  $\mathbf{x}$ . Indeed it is the Hamiltonian flow of the Hamiltonian vector field  $\mathbb{X}_{f_{x_1}} + \cdots + \mathbb{X}_{f_{x_k}}$ .

Now we state the main result of this section. Let  $S$  be an orientable closed surface with genus  $> 1$  and let  $x$  be an essential simple closed curve in  $S$ . Let  $q : \tilde{S} \rightarrow S$  be a finite covering. The covering map  $q$  induces the inclusion  $q_* : \pi_1(\tilde{S}, \tilde{p}) \rightarrow \pi_1(S, q(\tilde{p}))$  as well as the smooth map, denoted by the same letter  $q : \text{Hit}_G(S) \rightarrow \text{Hit}_G(\tilde{S})$ , defined by  $[\rho] \mapsto [\rho \circ q_*]$ . Choose a connected component  $\tilde{x}$  of  $q^{-1}(x)$ . Let  $\Delta$  be the deck group of  $\tilde{S} \rightarrow S$  and let  $\text{Stab}(\tilde{x})$  be the stabilizer of  $\tilde{x}$  in  $\Delta$ . Write  $m := |\text{Stab}(\tilde{x})|$  and  $\Delta/\text{Stab}(\tilde{x}) := \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_d\}$ . Let  $\tilde{x}_i := \gamma_i \tilde{x}$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *In the above situation, we have*

$$(2) \quad q(\mathcal{F}_t^{f,x}([\rho])) = \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_d}(q([\rho])).$$

The main part of the proof is to construct a nice graph of groups for  $\pi_1(\tilde{S})$ . Once we have done this, we just carefully read off the definition of the Goldman flow to show that the actions of both sides of (2) agree on generators of  $\pi_1(\tilde{S})$ . The proof is, by nature, tedious and repetitive. We split the proof into two cases depending on whether  $x$  is separating or not, and omit some repeating computations.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1: Non-Separating case.* Assume that  $x$  is non-separating. We know that the connected components of  $q^{-1}(x)$  are  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_d$ . Let  $\tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2, \dots, \tilde{S}_n$  be the connected components of  $\tilde{S} \setminus q^{-1}(x)$ . Each  $\tilde{S}_i$  is a covering space over  $S_0 := S \setminus x$ .

We will construct a particular graph of groups for  $\pi_1(\tilde{S})$  that is compatible with the covering structure. We first define an underlying graph of  $\mathcal{G}$  embedded in  $\tilde{S}$ . Fix a base-point  $v \in S \setminus x$  and an oriented loop  $c$  based at  $v$  with the algebraic intersection  $i(c, x) = 1$  so that  $\pi_1(S, v)$  is decomposed into the HNN-extension  $\pi_1(S_0, v) *_{c_1}$ . We choose a point  $v_i \in \tilde{S}_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $q(v_i) = v$ . They are vertices for  $\mathcal{G}$ . Suppose that  $\tilde{S}_i$  and  $\tilde{S}_j$  share a boundary  $\tilde{x}_k$  for some  $k$  and  $\tilde{S}_i$  is on the left-side of  $\tilde{x}_k$ . Then there is a unique oriented arc  $e_k$  from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  such that  $q(e_k) = \eta_k c \xi_k$  for some  $\eta_k, \xi_k \in \pi_1(S_0)$ . We join  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  by using this  $\alpha_k$  as the oriented edge. We give the vertex group  $\pi_1(\tilde{S}_i, v_i)$  to  $v_i$  and the edge group  $\langle \tilde{x}_k \rangle$  to an edge  $e_k$ . We implicitly understand  $\tilde{x}_k$  as the element  $\bar{\alpha} \tilde{x}_k \alpha$  in  $\pi_1(\tilde{S}_i, v_i)$ , where  $v_i$  is the head of  $e_k$  and where  $\alpha$  denotes the oriented arc  $e_k \cap \tilde{S}_i$ .

*Claim 4.2.* The underlying directed graph of  $\mathcal{G}$  admits a maximal *rooted* tree, namely a maximal tree  $\mathcal{T}$  such that each vertex of  $\mathcal{T}$  has at most one inbound edge.

*Proof.* Take any rooted tree  $\mathcal{T}_0$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . If  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is not maximal, there is a vertex  $w$  not in  $V(\mathcal{T}_0)$  but has an edge  $e_w$  to a vertex in  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . If this edge is inbound to  $w$ , we just add  $w$  and  $e_w$  enlarging  $\mathcal{T}_0$  to a bigger rooted tree. Hence assume that the edge  $e_w$  is outbound from  $w$ . By the construction of  $\mathcal{G}$ , the numbers of inbound and outbound edges are equal at each vertex. Therefore, we can find a longest directed trail terminating at  $w$  and, since there are only finitely many vertices and edges, this trail must pass through a vertex in  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . Hence we find another vertex  $w'$  and an edge  $e_{w'}$  from some vertex of  $\mathcal{T}_0$  into  $w'$ . Therefore, we can enlarge  $\mathcal{T}_0$  by adding  $w'$  and  $e_{w'}$  as we did in the above case. By repeating this procedure, we obtain a maximal rooted tree  $\mathcal{T}$ .  $\square$

By Claim 4.2, we may find a maximal rooted tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . By renumbering if necessary, we assume that  $v_1 \in V(\mathcal{T})$  is the root.

As mentioned above,  $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$  is generated by  $\pi_1(\tilde{S}_1, v_1), \dots, \pi_1(\tilde{S}_n, v_n)$  together with edges  $E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$ . Let  $\phi : \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \pi_1(\tilde{S}, v_1)$  be the isomorphism. As described above,  $\phi$  maps  $z \in \pi_1(\tilde{S}_i, v_i)$  to  $ez\bar{e}$  where  $e$  is a unique edge path from  $v_1$  to  $v_i$ .

We will see both sides of (2) act identically on these generators. For instance let  $z \in \pi_1(\tilde{S}_i, v_i)$  for some  $i$ . Since  $v_\ell \in V(\mathcal{T})$ , there is a unique directed path, say,  $e := e_1 e_2 \cdots e_\ell$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  from  $v_1$  to  $v_i$ . We know that  $q_*(\phi(z)) = q(e)q(z)q(\bar{e})$ . Moreover,  $q(e_i) = \eta_i c \xi_i$  for some  $\eta_i, \xi_i \in \pi_1(S_0)$ . Following the definition of the Goldman flow, we know that  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f,x}(\rho)(q_*(\phi(z)))$  is the conjugation of  $\rho(q(z))$  by the element

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\eta_1)\rho(c) \exp\left(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_1)\rho(\eta_2)\rho(c) \exp\left(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_2) \cdots \\ \cdots \rho(\eta_\ell)\rho(c) \exp\left(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $x_v$  is defined as follow. Take a sub-arc  $\gamma$  of  $c$  joining the point  $c \cap x$  and  $v$ . Then we define  $x_v := \bar{\gamma}x\gamma$  and regard it as an element of  $\pi_1(S, v)$ .

Now we investigate how the right-hand-side of (2) acts on  $z$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is rooted, we only need to compute,

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_2} \cdots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_\ell}(\rho \circ q_*)(\phi(z)),$$

where (by renumbering if necessary) the curve  $\tilde{x}_i$  the one that the edge  $e_i$  crosses. Observe that for  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_r)) &= q_*(e_1 e_2 \cdots e_r \bar{\alpha} \tilde{x}_r \alpha \bar{e}_r \cdots \bar{e}_1) \\ &= (q(e_1) \cdots q(e_{r-1}) \eta_r c) x_v^m (q(e_1) \cdots q(e_{r-1}) \eta_r c)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Remember that we are interpreting  $\tilde{x}_r$  as the element  $\bar{\alpha} \tilde{x}_k \alpha$  in  $\pi_1(\tilde{S}_j, v_j)$ , where  $v_j$  is the head of  $e_r$  and where  $\alpha$  denotes the oriented arc  $e_r \cap \tilde{S}_j$ . Hence,

$$(4) \quad \exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \widehat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_r)))\right) = \rho(q(e_1) \cdots q(e_{r-1}) \eta_r c) \exp\left(-t\widehat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(q(e_1) \cdots q(e_{r-1}) \eta_r c)^{-1}.$$

By following the definition of the Goldman flow, we know that (3) is the conjugation of  $\rho(q(z))$  by the element

$$\exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \widehat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_1)))\right) \cdots \exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \widehat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_\ell)))\right).$$

Combining (4) and

$$\rho(q_*(z_{v_i})) = \rho(q(e_1) \cdots q(e_\ell)) \rho(z_v) \rho(q(e_1) \cdots q(e_\ell))^{-1},$$

we know that (3) is the same as  $q(\mathcal{F}^{f,x}(\rho))(z_{v_i})$ .

For a generator  $e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$ , a similar computation yields  $q(\mathcal{F}^{f,x}(\rho))(\phi(e)) = \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_1} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f,\tilde{x}_\ell}(\rho \circ q_*)(\phi(e))$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1: Separating case.* We construct graph of groups for  $\pi_1(\tilde{S})$  as we did in the non-separating case. Denote by  $L$  and  $R$  the subsurfaces of  $S$  in the left- and the right-side of  $S$  respectively. First we take base points  $v$  and  $w$  on  $L$  and  $R$  respectively and choose an oriented simple path  $c$  from  $v$  to  $w$  that crosses  $x$  transversely once. In the covering let  $\{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_d\}$  be the set of connected components of  $q^{-1}(x)$  and  $\tilde{S} \setminus q^{-1}(x) = \tilde{L}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \tilde{L}_{n_L} \cup \tilde{R}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \tilde{R}_{n_R}$  where  $\tilde{L}_i$  are covering over  $L$  and  $\tilde{R}_i$  are covering over  $R$ . We let  $V(\mathcal{G}) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{n_L}, w_1, \dots, w_{n_R}\}$  be the vertex set where  $v_i \in \tilde{L}_i$  and  $w_i \in \tilde{R}_i$ . We join an oriented arc  $e_k$  from  $v_i$  to  $w_j$  if  $\tilde{L}_i$  and  $\tilde{R}_j$  share a boundary  $\tilde{x}_k$ . The arc  $e_k$  requires  $q(e_k) = \eta c \xi$  for some  $\eta \in \pi_1(L, v)$  and  $\xi \in \pi_1(R, w)$ . The vertex groups and edge groups are defined in the obvious manner.



Choose any maximal tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $v_1 \in V(\mathcal{T})$  and let  $\phi : \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \pi_1(\tilde{S}, v_1)$  be the isomorphism. Recall that for  $z \in \pi_1(\tilde{L}_i, v_i)$ ,  $\phi(z) = ez_v\bar{e}$ , where  $e$  is a path in  $\mathcal{T}$  joining  $v_1$  and  $w_i$  and similarly for  $v \in \pi_1(\tilde{R}_i, w_i)$ .

When  $x$  is separating, we do not have Claim 4.2 which significantly slashed the amount of computation. Instead, we do some trick to detour this issue.

Partition the edge set  $E(\mathcal{T})$  into sets of edges

$$\begin{aligned} E_-(\mathcal{T}) &:= \{e \in E(\mathcal{T}) \mid e \text{ pointing toward } v_1\}, \\ E_+(\mathcal{T}) &:= \{e \in E(\mathcal{T}) \mid e \text{ pointing away from } v_1\}, \text{ and} \\ E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G}) &:= E(\mathcal{G}) \setminus E(\mathcal{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Define the dual flow for  $\tilde{x}_i$  intersecting an edge  $e_i \in E_-(\mathcal{T})$

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{f, -\tilde{x}_i}(\rho) := \exp\left(t\hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_i)))\right) \mathcal{F}_t^{f, \tilde{x}_i}(\rho) \exp\left(-t\hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_i)))\right)$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, -\tilde{x}_i}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, \tilde{x}_i}$  only differ by global conjugation, they behave identically on  $\text{Hit}_G(S)$ . Thus we may instead compare the left-hand side of (2) with

$$\mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f, \epsilon_1 \tilde{x}_1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f, \epsilon_2 \tilde{x}_2} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f, \epsilon_d \tilde{x}_d}([\rho])$$

where  $\epsilon_i = -1$  if the corresponding edge  $e_i$  of  $\tilde{x}_i$  belongs to  $E_-(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\epsilon_i = 1$  otherwise.

Let  $z \in \pi_1(L_i, v_i)$  be a generator of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T})$ . We have a unique edge path, say,  $e_1 e_2 \dots e_\ell$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  from  $v_1$  to  $v_i$ . Since  $q(e_j) = \eta_j c \xi_j$  for some  $\eta_j \in \pi_1(L, v)$  and  $\xi_j \in \pi_1(R, v)$ , one can write

$$q_*(\phi(z)) = (\eta_1 \xi_1 \eta_2 \xi_2 \dots \eta_\ell \xi_\ell) q(z) (\eta_1 \xi_1 \eta_2 \xi_2 \dots \eta_\ell \xi_\ell)^{-1}.$$

Here,  $\xi_i$  should be interpreted as  $c \xi_i \bar{c} \in \pi_1(S, v)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x}(\rho \circ q_*)(\phi(z))$  is the conjugate of  $\rho(q(z))$  by the element

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\eta_1) \exp\left(-t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_1) \exp\left(t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\eta_2) \exp\left(-t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_2) \exp\left(t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \dots \\ \dots \rho(\eta_\ell) \exp\left(-t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\xi_\ell) \exp\left(t\hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right). \end{aligned}$$

To compute the right-hand side of (2) evaluated at  $z$ , we observe that  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell$  alternate  $E_+(\mathcal{T})$  and  $E_-(\mathcal{T})$ . Therefore, it suffices to evaluate

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{F}_t^{f, \tilde{x}_1} \circ \mathcal{F}_t^{f, -\tilde{x}_2} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_t^{f, \tilde{x}_{\ell-1}} \circ \mathcal{F}_t^{f, -\tilde{x}_\ell}(\rho \circ q_*)(\phi(z)).$$

Because

$$q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_j)) = (\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \xi_{j-1} \eta_j) x_v^m (\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \xi_{j-1} \eta_j)^{-1}$$

for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ , we have

$$(6) \quad \exp\left(\pm \frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_j)))\right) = \rho(\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \xi_{j-1} \eta_j) \exp\left(\pm t \hat{f}(\rho(x_v))\right) \rho(\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \xi_{j-1} \eta_j)^{-1}.$$

Also we know that (5) is the conjugation of

$$\rho(\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \eta_\ell \xi_\ell) \rho(q(z)) \rho(\eta_1 \xi_1 \dots \eta_\ell \xi_\ell)^{-1}$$

by the element

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_1)))\right) \exp\left(\frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_2)))\right) \exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_3)))\right) \dots \\ \dots \exp\left(-\frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_{\ell-1})))\right) \exp\left(\frac{t}{m} \hat{f}(\rho \circ q_*(\phi(\tilde{x}_\ell)))\right). \end{aligned}$$

One can compute this element using (6) to show that (5) agrees with  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, x}(\rho \circ q_*)(\phi(z))$ .

Evaluations for generators  $z \in \pi_1(R_i, w_i)$  and  $e \in E_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{G})$  are similar hence omitted.  $\square$

## 5. PROOFS OF MAIN THEOREMS

By bringing results from the previous sections together, we can show our main theorem.

First, we observe that Theorem 3.1 can be generalized to the case when either  $x$  or  $y$  is possibly a non-simple essential closed curve.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $x$  be an oriented essential closed curve and let  $y$  be any oriented essential simple closed curve. Let  $f$  and  $g$  be invariant functions. Let  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f,y}$  be the Goldman flow of the Hamiltonian vector field  $\mathbb{X}_{f_y}$  and let  $[\rho_t] = \mathcal{F}_t^{f,y}([\rho])$ . Then we have*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} g_x([\rho_t]) = \sum_{p \in x \cap y} (\text{sign } p) \mathbf{B}(\widehat{f}(\rho(y_p)), \widehat{g}(\rho(x_p)))$$

where  $x_p$  and  $y_p$  are  $\pi_1(S, p)$  elements represented by  $x$  and  $y$  regarded as loops with common base-point  $p$ .

*Proof.* If  $x$  is also an essential simple closed curve then the lemma follows from the Goldman product formula.

Suppose that  $x$  is not simple. By Scott [Sco78], we can find a finite covering  $q : \widetilde{S} \rightarrow S$  where  $x$  is lifted to an essential simple closed curve, say  $\widetilde{x}$ . As mentioned in Section 4, the covering map  $q$  induces the smooth map  $q : \text{Hit}_G(S) \rightarrow \text{Hit}_G(\widetilde{S})$ . Choose a connected component  $\widetilde{y}$  of  $q^{-1}(y)$ . As before, let  $\Delta$  be the deck group of  $\widetilde{S} \rightarrow S$ ,  $\text{Stab}(\widetilde{y})$  be the stabilizer of  $\widetilde{y}$  in  $\Delta$ . Let  $m := |\text{Stab}(\widetilde{y})|$ ,  $\Delta / \text{Stab}(\widetilde{y}) := \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_d\}$  and let  $\widetilde{y}_i := \gamma_i \widetilde{y}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F}_t^{f, \widetilde{y}_i} : \text{Hit}_G(\widetilde{S}) \rightarrow \text{Hit}_G(\widetilde{S})$  be the Goldman flow of  $\mathbb{X}_{f_{\widetilde{y}_i}}$ . By Theorem 4.1, we have that  $q([\rho_t]) = \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f, \widetilde{y}_1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{F}_{t/m}^{f, \widetilde{y}_d}(q([\rho_0]))$ . Therefore,

$$(7) \quad dq(\mathbb{X}_{f_y}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{X}_{f_{\widetilde{y}_i}}.$$

Since  $\widetilde{x}_i$  and  $\widetilde{y}$  are all simple, we can use Theorem 3.1 to compute

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{X}_{f_{\widetilde{y}_i}}(g_{\widetilde{x}}) &= \sum_{\widetilde{p} \in \widetilde{y}_i \cap \widetilde{x}} (\text{sign } \widetilde{p}) \mathbf{B}(\widehat{f}(\rho \circ q_*((\widetilde{y}_i)_{\widetilde{p}})), \widehat{g}(\rho \circ q_*(\widetilde{x}_{\widetilde{p}}))) \\ &= m \sum_{\substack{p \in x \cap y \\ q^{-1}(p) \in \widetilde{y}_i}} (\text{sign } p) \mathbf{B}(\widehat{f}(\rho(y_p)), \widehat{g}(\rho(x_p))). \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows because we have  $q_*((\widetilde{y}_i)_{\widetilde{p}}) = (y_{q(\widetilde{p})})^m$  and  $q_*(\widetilde{x}_{\widetilde{p}}) = x_{q(\widetilde{p})}$ .

On the other hand, we have

$$(9) \quad dq(\mathbb{X}_{f_y})(g_{\widetilde{x}}) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} g_{\widetilde{x}}([\rho_t \circ q_*]) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} g_x([\rho_t]).$$

Combining (7), (8) and (9) yields the conclusion.  $\square$

For a fixed  $x \in \pi_1(S)$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , the condition  $\alpha \circ \lambda(\rho(x)) = c$  is not algebraic. In spite of this, we still expect that the set  $\{[\rho] \in \text{Hit}_G(S) \mid \alpha(\lambda(\rho(x))) = c\}$  is almost negligible.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}$ . Define*

$$U_{x, \alpha, c} := \{[\rho] \in \text{Hit}_G(S) \mid \alpha(\lambda(\rho(x))) \neq c\}.$$

*Then for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ ,  $U_{x, \alpha, c}$  is generic provided it is non-empty.*

*Proof.* It is well-known [FG06, Theorem 1.13] that for a Hitchin representation  $\rho$ ,  $\rho(x)$  is purely loxodromic for any  $x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}$ . Thus, if  $U_{x,\alpha,c}$  is not empty, then it is the complement of the zero locus of the non-constant real analytic function  $\rho \mapsto \alpha(\lambda(\rho(x)))$ , which is a measure 0 set [Mit20]. Since Hitchin components are analytic connected manifold,  $U_{x,\alpha,c}$  is open and dense in  $\text{Hit}_G(S)$ .  $\square$

The following result was essentially observed by Goldman in his own proof for Wolpert's cosine formula [Gol86, Theorem 3.9]. For readers' convenience, we reformulate it as a lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$  be a Fuchsian representation and let  $x, y$  be essential closed curves. Represent  $x, y$  as geodesics in  $\mathbb{H}^2/\rho(\pi_1(S))$ . For each intersection  $p \in x \cap y$ , let  $\varphi_p([\rho])$  be the counter-clock angle from  $x$  to  $y$  at  $p$ . As above let  $f := \alpha \circ \lambda$ . Then*

$$(\text{sign } p) \mathbf{B}(\widehat{f}(\iota_G \circ \rho(x_p)), \widehat{f}(\iota_G \circ \rho(y_p))) = \mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, \text{Ad}_{R(\varphi_p([\rho]))} \alpha^\vee)$$

where

$$R(\varphi_p([\rho])) = \iota_G \left( \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\varphi_p([\rho])/2) & \sin(\varphi_p([\rho])/2) \\ -\sin(\varphi_p([\rho])/2) & \cos(\varphi_p([\rho])/2) \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

*Proof.* Identify  $x$  and  $y$  with geodesics in  $\mathbb{H}^2/\rho(\pi_1(S))$  and take their lifts  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{y}$  in the upper-half plane model  $\mathbb{H}^2$  such that  $\tilde{x} \cap \tilde{y}$  descends to  $p$ . By taking a suitable  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -conjugation, we may assume that  $\tilde{x}$  is the ray from 0 to  $\infty$  and the intersection  $\tilde{x} \cap \tilde{y}$  happens at  $\sqrt{-1}$ . Then we know that  $\rho(x_p) = \text{diag}(\exp(\ell), \exp(-\ell))$ ,  $\ell > 0$ , and that the axis of  $\rho(y_p)$  passes through  $\sqrt{-1}$ . Hence,  $\iota_G \circ \rho(x_p) \in \exp \mathfrak{a}^+$ . Moreover, conjugating  $\rho(y_p)$  by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\varphi_p([\rho])}{2} & -\sin \frac{\varphi_p([\rho])}{2} \\ \sin \frac{\varphi_p([\rho])}{2} & \cos \frac{\varphi_p([\rho])}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

brings  $\rho(y_p)$  into  $\text{diag}(\exp(\ell'), \exp(-\ell'))$  if  $\text{sign } p = 1$  and into  $\text{diag}(\exp(-\ell'), \exp(\ell'))$  if  $\text{sign } p = -1$  for some  $\ell' > 0$ . Therefore,  $\text{Ad}_{R(\varphi_p([\rho]))} \iota_G \circ \rho(y_p)$  is in  $\mathfrak{a}^+$  if  $\text{sign } p = 1$  and in  $-\mathfrak{a}^+$  if  $\text{sign } p = -1$ . Therefore, the conclusion follows from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

Now we can show the main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}$  and let  $f := \alpha \circ \lambda$ . As before, we define  $f_x : \text{Hit}_G(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_x([\rho]) := f(\rho(x))$ .

We first show that the set  $U_{x,\alpha,c}$  in Lemma 5.2 is not empty. If  $\alpha(\lambda(\rho(x))) \neq c$  for some Fuchsian  $\rho$ , there is nothing to prove. Hence, we assume that  $\alpha(\lambda(\rho(x))) = c$  for all Fuchsian  $\rho$ .

Take an essential simple closed curve  $y$  that intersects essentially with  $x$  at least once. Let  $\rho$  be any Fuchsian representation. Let  $\rho_t$  be the 1-parameter family of Fuchsian representations obtained by applying the twisting flow along  $y$ . For each intersection  $p \in x \cap y$ , denote by  $\varphi_p(\rho)$  the counter-clock angle from geodesic representative of  $y$  to that of  $x$  at  $p$ .

The following claim is a folklore but it seems that it has never been explicitly stated.

*Claim 5.4.* For each  $p$ , the angle  $\varphi_p([\rho_t])$  converges to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We can prove it in a finite covering  $\tilde{S}$  where  $y$  lifts to a simple closed curve say  $\tilde{y}$ . Take a connected component  $\tilde{x}$  of the preimage of  $x$  under the covering.

Let  $\tilde{X}_t$  be a hyperbolic structure on  $\tilde{S}$  with holonomy  $\tilde{\rho}_t := \rho_t|_{\pi_1(\tilde{S})}$ . Let  $\tilde{x}_t$  be the geodesic representative of  $\tilde{x}$  and let  $\tilde{y}_t$  be the geodesic representative of  $\tilde{y}$  with respect to  $\tilde{X}_t$ . Choose an arbitrary  $p \in \tilde{x} \cap \tilde{y}$ .

Kerckhoff [Ker83, Proposition 3.5] showed that, along the path  $[\tilde{\rho}_t]$ , the angle  $\varphi_p([\tilde{\rho}_t])$  at each intersection point  $p \in \tilde{x} \cap \tilde{y}$  is strictly decreasing. Hence, it suffices to show that for positive integers  $k$ ,  $\varphi_p([\rho_{k\ell}]) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  where  $\ell$  is the hyperbolic length of  $\tilde{x}$  in  $\tilde{X}_0$ . Since the time

$\ell$  map of the twist flow along  $\tilde{x}$  is the same as the action of the Dehn twist along  $\tilde{x}$ , it is enough to show that iterated Dehn twist actions decrease the angle.

Take a pants-decomposition of  $\tilde{S}$  extending  $\tilde{x}$ . Let  $P$  be the pants containing  $\tilde{x}$  and is in the right-side of  $\tilde{x}$ . Choose a hyperbolic pair-of-pants  $Y$  with an isometry  $f_t : Y \rightarrow \tilde{X}_t$  such that  $f_t(Y) = P$  and  $f_t(\partial_1) = \tilde{x}$  for a geodesic boundary component  $\partial_1$  of  $Y$ . We have a simple geodesic segment  $\gamma_t \subset \tilde{y}_t \cap P$  containing the intersection point  $p$ . For a positive integer  $k$ , the preimage  $\eta_k := f_{k\ell}^{-1}(\gamma_{k\ell})$  in  $Y$  is the  $k$  times peripheral twists applied to the geodesic segment  $f_0^{-1}(\gamma_0)$ . In this setting, we need to show that the counter-clock angle  $\varphi_k$  from  $\partial_1$  to  $\eta_k$  converges to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

We assume that  $\eta_k$  joins  $\partial_1$  and another boundary  $\partial_2$  of  $Y$ . Take two simple geodesics segments  $\alpha_k$  joining  $\partial_1$  and  $\partial_3$  and  $\beta_k$  joining  $\partial_2$  and  $\partial_3$  in such a way that  $Y \setminus (\eta_k \cup \alpha_k \cup \beta_k)$  consists of two hyperbolic hexagons. We choose one of them that takes up a longer  $\partial_1$  segment than the other as featured in Figure 1. We know that the length of  $\eta_k$  diverges to  $\infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . If there were




FIGURE 1. A hyperbolic hexagon.  $\theta_k$  is either  $\varphi_k$  or  $\pi - \varphi_k$ . We also have  $\text{length}_Y(\partial'_1) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{length}_Y(\partial_1) = \frac{1}{2} \text{length}_{\tilde{X}_t}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{length}_{\tilde{X}_0}(\tilde{x})$ .

$\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon < \theta_k < \pi - \varepsilon$  for all  $k$ , the hyperbolic triangle  $\Delta(a, b, c)$  would have arbitrary large area as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , a contradiction. This shows that  $\varphi_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

If  $\eta_k$  comes back to  $\partial_1$ , the complement  $Y \setminus \eta_k$  consists of two annuli. We choose one, say  $A$ , that occupies a longer  $\partial_1$  segment. Without loss of generality assume that  $\partial_2$  is one of the boundary of  $A$ . Choose a shortest geodesic arc  $\alpha_k$  joining  $\eta_k$  and  $\partial_2$ . Then  $\alpha_k$  splits  $A$  into a hyperbolic hexagon as in Figure 2. Since the lengths of  $\alpha_k$  and  $\partial_2$  are bounded, both lengths of  $\eta_{k,1}$  and  $\eta_{k,2}$  diverge as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, by the same argument used in the first case,  $\theta_k$  converges to either  $\pi$  or 0.  $\square$

Due to Claim 5.4,  $R(\varphi_p([\rho_t]))$  converges to the identity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus we can take a sufficiently large  $t_0$  such that

$$\mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, \text{Ad}_{R(\varphi_p([\rho_{t_0}]))} \alpha^\vee) > 0$$

for all  $p \in x \cap y$ . Let  $\rho' := \rho_{t_0}$  and let  $[\rho'_s]$  be the Goldman flow of the vector field  $\mathbb{X}_{f_y}$  with  $[\rho'_0] = [\rho']$ . By Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.3 we have

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} f_x([\rho'_s]) = \sum_{p \in x \cap y} \mathbf{B}(\alpha^\vee, \text{Ad}_{R(\varphi_p([\rho'_s]))} \alpha^\vee).$$

By our choice of  $\rho'$ , we have

$$\left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} f_x([\rho'_s]) > 0.$$




FIGURE 2. Another hyperbolic hexagon. Again  $\theta_k$  is either  $\varphi_k$  or  $\pi - \varphi_k$ ,  $\text{length}_Y(\partial_1') \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{length}_Y(\partial_1)$ .  $\eta_k$  splits into  $\eta_{k,1}$  and  $\eta_{k,2}$ .

Therefore, one can find a sufficiently small  $s > 0$  so that  $f_x([\rho'_s]) = f(\rho'_s(x)) > f(\rho'(x)) = c$ . This shows that  $U_{x,\alpha,c} \neq \emptyset$ .

Since

$$\{[\rho] \in \text{Hit}_G(S) \mid \alpha \circ \lambda(\rho(x)) \neq c \text{ for all } x \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}\} = \bigcap_{w \in \pi_1(S) \setminus \{1\}} U_{w,\alpha,c},$$

the theorem follows from Lemma 5.2.  $\square$

The idea of the proof for Theorem 1.4 carries over to the proof for Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Following [LRW22], let  $\text{Bad}(x, y)$  be the set of  $G$ -Hitchin representations  $\rho$  such that  $\rho(x)$  and  $\rho(y)$  do not generate a Zariski dense subgroup of  $G$ . Since  $\text{Bad}(x, y)$  is Zariski closed in  $\overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S)$  [BGGT12, Theorem 4.1], it suffices to show that  $\text{Bad}(x, y)$  is proper for every non-commuting pair  $\{x, y\}$ .

By mean of contradiction, suppose that there are non-commuting  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  such that  $\text{Bad}(x, y) = \overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S)$ .

Take a covering  $\tilde{S}$  of  $S$  corresponding to  $\langle x, y \rangle$ . Let  $\eta$  be in the Fuchsian locus of  $\overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S)$ . Because  $\eta|_{\langle x, y \rangle} = \eta|_{\pi_1(\tilde{S})}$  is the holonomy of the lifted hyperbolic structure on  $\tilde{S}$ , we know that  $\eta|_{\langle x, y \rangle}$  is a positive representation in the sense of Fock and Goncharov [FG06]. Since positivity is an open condition, we can take a small open set  $V \subset \text{Hit}_G(S)$  around  $[\eta]$  such that for any  $[\rho] \in V$ ,  $[\rho|_{\langle x, y \rangle}]$  is positive. Let  $\overline{V}$  be the preimage of  $V$  under the projection  $\overline{\text{Hit}}_G(S) \rightarrow \text{Hit}_G(S)$ .

For  $\rho \in \overline{V}$ , let  $\rho_{x,y} := \rho|_{\langle x, y \rangle} : \langle x, y \rangle \rightarrow G$  and let  $H_{\rho_{x,y}}$  be the Zariski closure of  $\langle \rho(x), \rho(y) \rangle$ . By assumption, we know that  $H_{\rho_{x,y}} \neq G$  for all  $\rho \in \overline{V}$ .

Consider the semisimplification  $\rho_{x,y}^{ss} : \langle x, y \rangle \rightarrow H_{\rho_{x,y}}^{ss}$  of the representation  $\rho_{x,y}$ . Note that  $H_{\rho_{x,y}}^{ss}$  is a proper semi-simple Lie subgroup of  $G$ . It is known [GGKW17, Lemma 2.40] that  $\lambda(\rho_{x,y}^{ss}(z)) = \lambda(\rho_{x,y}(z)) = \lambda(\rho(z))$  for all  $z \in \langle x, y \rangle$ .

By Sambarino [Sam23, Theorem B], there are only finitely many semi-simple subalgebras  $\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{h}_k$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  whose real ranks are strictly smaller than the real rank of  $G$  such that, apart from the Zariski dense case, the Lie algebra of  $H_{\rho_{x,y}}^{ss}$  is conjugate to one of  $\mathfrak{h}_i$ . Therefore, one can find finitely many elements  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m$  in  $\mathfrak{a}^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that for any  $\rho \in \overline{V}$ , we have  $\alpha_i(\lambda(\rho_{x,y}^{ss}(x))) = \alpha_i(\lambda(\rho_{x,y}(x))) = \alpha_i(\lambda(\rho(x))) = 0$  for some  $i$ . This means that the set  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m U_{x,\alpha_i,0}$  avoids the non-empty open set  $V$ .

On the other hand, by the proof of Theorem 1.4, we know that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m U_{x,\alpha_i,0}$  is an open dense subspace of  $\text{Hit}_G(S)$ . This leads us to a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS AND QUESTIONS

In this section, we focus on the  $G = \mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})$  case and present explicit formulas computing the first variation of eigenvalues along Fuchsian locus. In what follows we abbreviate  $\mathrm{Hit}_3(S) := \mathrm{Hit}_{\mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})}(S)$ . We also use the trace as our non-degenerate invariant symmetric bilinear form  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Let  $c$  be an oriented essential simple closed curve  $c$ . In  $\mathrm{Hit}_3(S)$ , we write  $\ell := \lambda_1 - \lambda_3$ . As before,  $\lambda_i$  denotes the logarithm of the  $i$ th largest eigenvalue. The quantity  $\ell_c([\rho]) = \lambda_1(\rho(c)) - \lambda_3(\rho(c))$ ,  $[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_3(S)$  records the Hilbert length of  $c$  with respect to the convex real projective geometry corresponding to  $[\rho]$ .

There are two types of fundamental Hamiltonian flows. One is the twisting flow  $\mathcal{T}_t^c$  along  $c$  which is the same as the classical twisting flow on the Teichmüller space. The other flow is so-called the bulging flow  $\mathcal{B}_t^c$  along  $c$ . The bulging flow allows us to move away from the Fuchsian locus. It is known that  $\mathcal{T}_t^c$  and  $\mathcal{B}_t^c$  are Hamiltonian flows corresponding to the vector fields  $\mathbb{X}_{\ell_c}$  and  $\mathbb{X}_{(\lambda_2)_c}$  respectively.

Recall that one possible embedding  $\iota_{\mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})} : \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})$  is given by

$$(10) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a^2 & ab & b^2 \\ 2ac & ad+bc & 2bd \\ c^2 & cd & d^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A straightforward computation using (10) and Lemma 5.3 yields the following.

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $x$  be an oriented essential closed curve and let  $y$  be an oriented essential simple closed curve. Let  $[\rho] \in \mathrm{Hit}_3(S)$  be a Fuchsian representation. Then we have*

$$(11) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \ell_x(\mathcal{T}_t^y([\rho])) = \sum_{p \in x \cap y} 2 \cos \varphi_p([\rho])$$

$$(12) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (\lambda_2)_x(\mathcal{B}_t^y([\rho])) = \sum_{p \in x \cap y} \frac{3}{2} (1 + 3 \cos 2\varphi_p([\rho]))$$

$$(13) \quad \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \ell_x(\mathcal{B}_t^y([\rho])) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (\lambda_2)_x(\mathcal{T}_t^y([\rho])) = 0,$$

where  $\varphi_p([\rho])$  is the counter-clock angle at  $p$  from geodesic representatives of  $x$  to  $y$  measured in the hyperbolic structure corresponding to  $[\rho]$ .

In Corollary 6.1, (11) is nothing but Wolpert's cosine formula, also featured in Kerckhoff's work [Wol83, Ker83]. When  $x$  is simple, (13) was manifested in [LW18, Lemma 5.1.1].

Given a closed orientable surface  $S$  with genus  $> 1$ , there are infinitely many pairs of non-conjugate elements  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  such that  $\mathrm{length}_X(x) = \mathrm{length}_X(y)$  for all hyperbolic structures  $X$  on  $S$  [Ran80]. By (11) we have an immediate but rather surprising consequence:

**Corollary 6.2.** *There are infinitely many pairs  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  of non-conjugating elements such that*

$$\sum_{p \in c \cap x} \cos \varphi_p([\rho]) = \sum_{q \in c \cap y} \cos \varphi_q([\rho])$$

for all essential simple closed curve  $c$  and all  $[\rho]$  in the Teichmüller space.

Leininger [Lei03, Theorem 1.4] proved that for such a pair  $x, y$  in Corollary 6.2, the following also holds:

**Theorem 6.3** ([Lei03]). *There are infinitely many pairs of non-conjugate elements  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  such that  $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho(x)) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho(y))$  for all quasi-Fuchsian  $\rho : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ .*

Motivated by Theorem 6.3, we may ask the following question regarding Hitchin representations.

**Question 6.4.** Is there a pair of non-conjugate elements  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  such that  $\text{Tr}(\rho(x)) = \text{Tr}(\rho(y))$  for all  $[\rho] \in \text{Hit}_3(S)$ ? What if we replace  $\text{Tr}$  with  $\lambda_2$ ?

In view of Corollary 6.1, some questions regarding generic properties of  $\text{Hit}_3(S)$  boil down to hyperbolic geometry problems on  $S$ . For instance, the following question is very closely related to Question 6.4 via (12).

**Question 6.5.** Let  $x, y \in \pi_1(S)$  be a non-conjugate pair. Is there a hyperbolic structure  $[\rho]$  and an oriented essential simple closed curve  $c$  such that

$$\sum_{p \in c \cap x} \cos 2\varphi_p([\rho]) \neq \sum_{q \in c \cap y} \cos 2\varphi_q([\rho])$$

holds?

At first glance, the answer to Question 6.5 should be easy yes. However, given Corollary 6.2, resolving Question 6.5 might not be as completely obvious as it looks.

#### APPENDIX A. ANALYTICITY OF THE JORDAN PROJECTION

In this appendix we prove Lemma 3.3. We restate it first.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $G$  be a split real form of a complex simple adjoint Lie group. Let  $\lambda : G \rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{a}^+}$  be the Jordan projection and let  $U$  be the set of purely loxodromic elements. Then,*

- (i)  $U$  is open,
- (ii)  $\lambda$  is real analytic on  $U$ .

*Proof.* (i) Consider the adjoint representation  $\text{Ad} : G \rightarrow \text{SL}(\mathfrak{g})$ . The Jordan projection is equivariant in the sense that  $\lambda(\text{Ad}_x) = \text{ad}_{\lambda(x)}$  for all  $x \in G$ . The image  $C$  of  $\overline{\partial\mathfrak{a}^+}$  under the representation  $\text{ad}$  is a linear subspace of

$$\{\text{diag}(0, 0, \dots, 0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \mid \beta_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \beta_1\beta_2 \cdots \beta_d = 0\}$$

where  $d = \dim \mathfrak{g} - \dim \mathfrak{a}$ . In particular,  $C$  is a closed set. Therefore we only need to show that

$$D := \{x \in \text{SL}(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \lambda(x) \in C\}$$

is closed. This can be proven by using the fact that the roots of a polynomial depend continuously on the coefficients. In particular, if  $g_i$  is a given sequence converging to  $g$  with  $\lambda(g_i) \in C$ , then because the eigenvalues of  $g_i$  converges to that of  $g$ , we have  $\lambda(g_i) \rightarrow \lambda(g)$  as described in Example 2.1. Since  $C$  is closed, we know that  $\lambda(g) \in C$ . Thus,  $D$  is closed. Since  $U$  is the complement of the closed set  $\text{Ad}^{-1}(D)$ ,  $U$  is open.

(ii) Let  $A^+ = \exp \mathfrak{a}^+$ . It is enough to show that  $\lambda$  is analytic at a neighborhood of each point of  $A^+$ . Consider the analytic map  $F : A^+ \times G \rightarrow U$  defined by

$$(a, x) \mapsto xax^{-1}.$$

Let  $a_0 := \exp A_0 \in A^+ \subset U$  be arbitrary. Take exponential charts containing  $(a_0, 1) \in A^+ \times G$  and  $a_0 \in U$ . If we express  $F$  in these charts, we would get

$$F : (A, X) \mapsto e^{\text{ad}_X} A$$

where  $A \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ ,  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  and  $e^{\text{ad}_X} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} (\text{ad}_X)^k$ . Recall that we have the restricted root space decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Pi} \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ . Let  $\Delta = \{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$  be simple coroots in  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Write

$\Pi = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d\}$  and choose a non-zero element  $E_i$  from each  $\mathfrak{g}_{\beta_i}$ . Then  $\Delta \cup \{E_i\}_{i=1,2,\dots,d}$  forms a basis for  $\mathfrak{g}$ . With respect to this basis, we write  $A$  and  $X$  as coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r y_i H_i, \\ X &= \sum_{i=1}^r x_i H_i + \sum_{i=1}^d z_i E_i, \\ F(A, X) &= \sum_{i=1}^r f_i(A, X) H_i + \sum_{i=1}^d g_i(A, X) E_i. \end{aligned}$$

Now we compute the Jacobian of  $F$  at  $(a_0, 1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_j} &= \delta_{ij}, & \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial y_j} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} &= 0, & \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x_j} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_j} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial z_j} = -\delta_{ij} \beta_i(A_0),$$

where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta. Since  $A_0 \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ , we have  $\beta_i(A_0) \neq 0$  for all  $i$ . Therefore,  $F$  has the full rank at  $(a_0, 1)$  and by the analytic implicit function theorem, we can find an analytic local section  $s : O \rightarrow A^+ \times G$  of  $F$  in a neighborhood  $O$  of  $a_0$ . The logarithm of the  $A^+$ -factor of  $s(a)$  is precisely the Jordan projection of  $a \in O$ . Thus  $\lambda$  is analytic.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [BGGT12] Emmanuel Breuillard, Ben Green, Robert Guralnick, and Terence Tao. Strongly dense free subgroups of semisimple algebraic groups. *Israel J. Math.*, 192(1):347–379, 2012. [1](#), [1](#), [5](#)
- [BQ16] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. *Random walks on reductive groups*, volume 62 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Cham, 2016. [2](#)
- [CJK20] Suhyoung Choi, Hongtaek Jung, and Hong Chan Kim. Symplectic coordinates on  $\mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -Hitchin components. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 16(5):1321–1386, 2020. [4](#)
- [Ebe96] Patrick B. Eberlein. *Geometry of nonpositively curved manifolds*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1996. [2](#)
- [FG06] Vladimir Fock and Alexander Goncharov. Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 103:1–211, 2006. [5](#), [5](#)
- [GGKW17] François Guéritaud, Olivier Guichard, Fanny Kassel, and Anna Wienhard. Anosov representations and proper actions. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(1):485–584, 2017. [5](#)
- [Gol86] William M. Goldman. Invariant functions on Lie groups and Hamiltonian flows of surface group representations. *Invent. Math.*, 85(2):263–302, 1986. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)
- [Hit92] N. J. Hitchin. Lie groups and Teichmüller space. *Topology*, 31(3):449–473, 1992. [1](#)
- [Ker83] Steven P. Kerckhoff. The Nielsen realization problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 117(2):235–265, 1983. [5](#), [6](#)
- [Kna96] Anthony W. Kna. *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, volume 140 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996. [2](#)
- [Lei03] Christopher J. Leininger. Equivalent curves in surfaces. *Geom. Dedicata*, 102:151–177, 2003. [6](#), [6.3](#)
- [LR24] D. D. Long and A. W. Reid. Strongly dense representations of surface groups, 2024. Preprint. [1](#)
- [LRW22] D. D. Long, A. W. Reid, and M. Wolff. Most Hitchin representations are strongly dense, 2022. arXiv 2202.09306, To appear in Michigan J. Math. [1](#), [5](#)
- [LW18] François Labourie and Richard Wentworth. Variations a the Fuchsian locus. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(2):487–547, 2018. [6](#)
- [Mit20] B. S. Mityagin. The zero set of a real analytic function. *Mat. Zametki*, 107(3):473–475, 2020. [5](#)



- [Ran80] Burton Randol. The length spectrum of a Riemann surface is always of unbounded multiplicity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 78(3):455–456, 1980. [6](#)
- [Sam23] Andrés Sambarino. Infinitesimal Zariski closures of positive representations, 2023. arXiv 2012.10276, To appear in *J. Diff. Geom.* [5](#)
- [Sco78] Peter Scott. Subgroups of surface groups are almost geometric. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 17(3):555–565, 1978. [5](#)
- [Ser80] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Trees*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1980. Translated from the French by John Stillwell. [4](#)
- [Wol83] Scott Wolpert. On the symplectic geometry of deformations of a hyperbolic surface. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 117(2):207–234, 1983. [6](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL