

THE CANONICAL LAMINATION CALIBRATED BY A COHOMOLOGY CLASS

AIDAN BACKUS

ABSTRACT. Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension d , and let $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ have unit norm. We construct a lamination λ_ρ whose leaves are exactly the minimal hypersurfaces which are calibrated by every calibration in ρ . The geometry of λ_ρ is closely related to the geometry of the unit ball of the stable norm on $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$, and so we deduce several results constraining the geometry of the stable norm ball in terms of the topology of M . These results establish a close analogy between the stable norm on $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ and the earthquake norm on the tangent space to Teichmüller space.

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to more tightly connect the geometry of the Teichmüller space of a closed surface M to hyperbolic geometry on M , Thurston [Thu98] defined a new metric on Teichmüller space: Given hyperbolic structures ρ, σ on M , let $L \geq 1$ be the infimum of Lipschitz constants of maps $(M, \rho) \rightarrow (M, \sigma)$ homotopic to id_M ; then, the *Thurston stretch distance* between ρ and σ is $\log L$. The Thurston stretch distance induces a *canonical maximally-stretched geodesic lamination* λ on (M, ρ) [GK17]. This is a closed subset of M , which admits a foliation into geodesics (called the *leaves* of λ), such that for every minimizing Lipschitz map $f : (M, \rho) \rightarrow (M, \sigma)$ homotopic to id_M , f stretches every leaf of λ by a factor of L . Daskalopoulos and Uhlenbeck [DU22; DU24a] have shown that one can use the extremal Lipschitz maps to construct transverse measures on sublaminations of λ .

Independently of the Thurston school, Auer and Bangert [AB01] proposed to study codimension-1 measured oriented laminations λ of a closed oriented Riemannian manifold M which minimize their mass in their homology class $[\lambda] \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. The *stable norm* of the homology class $[\lambda]$, $\|[\lambda]\|_1$, is the mass of the mass-minimizing lamination λ . This norm was introduced by Federer [Fed74], and Gromov studied it further for its applications to systolic geometry [Gro07]; the stable norm is also of interest because of its connection to the Thurston–Gromov simplicial norm [BD17]. Though they deferred many of the proofs to the work [AB12], which is unfinished and not publicly available, already in the research announcement [AB01], Auer and Bangert realized that the study of laminations provides a deep connection between the intersection theory of M and the geometry of the unit ball of the stable norm on $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. The point is that in codimension 1, every homology class contains a mass-minimizing lamination λ , and the leaves of λ cannot intersect.

For any mass-minimizing lamination λ in a d -dimensional manifold M , there is a *calibration*, a closed $d - 1$ -form F which restricts to the area form on the leaves of λ . A calibration for λ can be thought of as “maximally stretching” the leaves of λ , or that “certifying” that λ is actually mass-minimizing.

Thus, in both of the above situations, we have the problem \mathcal{P} , of finding a mass-minimizing measured lamination, and the “dual problem” of \mathcal{P} , the problem of finding a certificate that the measure is actually mass-minimizing. The picture which seems to be emerging is that *there is an*

Date: January 3, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. primary: 49Q20; secondary: 37F34, 49N15, 53C38.

Key words and phrases. laminations, minimal hypersurfaces, calibrations, functions of least gradient, stable norm, Thurston asymmetric metric.

analogy between extremal Lipschitz maps between hyperbolic surfaces and codimension-1 calibrations on Riemannian manifolds, and the purpose of this paper is to flesh this analogy out. We shall construct a canonical lamination calibrated by a cohomology class. As a corollary, we shall obtain some of the unproven results of [AB01]; we shall see that these results have analogues in Teichmüller theory.

1.1. Existence of the canonical lamination. We recall the formal statement of the existence of Thurston's canonical lamination.

Theorem 1.1 ([GK17]). *Let M, N be closed hyperbolic surfaces, and let $\psi : M \rightarrow N$ be a homeomorphism. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of all Lipschitz maps $f : M \rightarrow N$ which minimize the Lipschitz constant $\text{Lip}(f)$, subject to the constraint that f is homotopic to ψ . Let E be the set of all $x \in M$ such that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, f attains its Lipschitz constant at x . Then E is the support of a (nonempty) geodesic lamination, the canonical lamination maximally stretched by the homotopy class of ψ .*

Our first theorem, which we prove in §4, establishes that in the setting of the stable norm, there is also a canonical lamination. To state it, we need some definitions.

Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension d , and let $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. The *costable norm* of ρ is

$$\|\rho\|_\infty := \inf_{[F]=\rho} \|F\|_{L^\infty}$$

(where the infimum ranges over all closed $d-1$ -forms of cohomology class ρ). By the local compactness of the weakstar topology of L^∞ , this infimum is attained.

A *calibration* (of codimension 1) is a closed $d-1$ -form F such that $\|F\|_{L^\infty} = 1$. For any calibration F , a hypersurface N is *F -calibrated* if the pullback of F to N is the area form on N . If N is F -calibrated, then the mean curvature of N is 0 and the costable norm of $[F]$ is 1. Furthermore, if N is a closed F -calibrated hypersurface, then N minimizes its area in its (real) homology class.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$, and let $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ satisfy $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$. Consider the set \mathcal{S} of all complete immersed hypersurfaces N such that for every calibration F representing ρ , N is F -calibrated. Then \mathcal{S} is the (nonempty) set of leaves of a Lipschitz lamination λ_ρ , the canonical lamination calibrated by ρ .*

In §8.1 we explain why one cannot construct a canonical calibration lamination in higher codimension.

1.2. The stable unit sphere of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. The analogue of the stable norm in the setting of Teichmüller theory is a norm on the tangent space to Teichmüller space, called the *earthquake norm*, studied in [Hua+24] (see §8.3). The unit ball of the earthquake norm is not strictly convex; in fact, if some canonical maximally-stretched lamination is not uniquely ergodic, then it induces a flat subset of the earthquake unit sphere which is not a point.

The unit ball of the stable norm can also fail to be strictly convex. In fact, we shall see that if there is a nontrivial flat subset of the stable unit sphere, then there is a canonical calibrated lamination which is not uniquely ergodic.

Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$. If λ is a lamination in M , a *transverse measure* to λ is a finite Borel measure on M , with support $\text{supp } \lambda$, which is invariant under deformations which preserve the leaves of λ (see §2.4). A transverse measure μ is *ergodic* if every invariant Borel set $E \subset \text{supp } \lambda$ either is μ -almost all or μ -almost none of $\text{supp } \lambda$. The lamination λ is *uniquely ergodic*, if there is a unique ergodic measure which is transverse to λ .

For general $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ such that $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, the canonical lamination λ_ρ may not admit a transverse measure, but there must exist a sublamination of λ_ρ which admits an ergodic measure. Let

$$B := \{\alpha \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R}) : \|\alpha\|_1 \leq 1\}$$

be the stable unit ball, and let

$$\rho^* := \{\alpha \in \partial B : \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = 1\}$$

be the dual flat to ρ . Note that ρ^* need not be singleton, because the stable ball B need not be strictly convex. As a byproduct of the proof of Theorem 1.2, we prove:

Corollary 1.3. *For every $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ with $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, ρ^* is the set of homology classes which are represented by probability measures which are transverse to sublaminations of the canonical lamination λ_ρ . Every extreme point of ρ^* is represented by an ergodic measure on a sublamination of λ_ρ .*

In particular, ρ^* is singleton iff there is a uniquely ergodic sublamination $\kappa \subseteq \lambda_\rho$ such that κ is the only sublamination of λ_ρ which admits a transverse measure.

Auer and Bangert proposed without proof [AB01] that one could bound the number of irrational vertices that a flat in the stable unit ball B has, by estimating the number of ergodic measures on a lamination without closed leaves using a lemma of [AL86]. We now provide a proof.

A class $\alpha \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ has *rational direction* if there exists $c > 0$ such that $c\alpha$ is in the image of the map $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. Otherwise α has *irrational direction*. In §5, we prove:

Theorem 1.4. *Let F be a maximal flat of the stable unit sphere ∂B . Then:*

- (1) *F is a convex polytope.*
- (2) *The number of vertices of F with irrational direction is at most $\max(0, \dim H_1(M, \mathbf{R}) - 1)$.*
- (3) *A vertex α of F has rational direction iff α is represented by a closed leaf of λ_ρ .*

In the case that M is a surface of genus $g \geq 2$, Theorem 1.4 complements a theorem of Massart [Mas97] which asserts that if F has a point of rational direction, then it only has vertices of rational direction, and it has at most $3g - 3$ vertices. Theorem 1.4 says that if F has no points of rational direction, then it has at most $2g - 1$ vertices.

In §6, we use Corollary 1.3 to prove two criteria for strict convexity of the stable ball B , which were proposed without proof by Auer and Bangert [AB01, Theorems 6 and 7]. Given a group Γ , let

$$\Gamma = \Gamma^{(0)} \supseteq \Gamma^{(1)} \supseteq \dots$$

denote the derived series of Γ , thus $\Gamma^{(n+1)}$ is the commutator subgroup of $\Gamma^{(n)}$.

Theorem 1.5. *One has:*

- (1) *If there is a line segment $[\alpha, \beta]$ in the stable sphere ∂B , then the intersection product $\alpha \cdot \beta$ is 0.*
- (2) *Let $\Gamma := \pi_1(M)$. If $\Gamma^{(1)}/\Gamma^{(2)}$ is a torsion group, then B is strictly convex.*

Thus, for example, the stable ball of any homotopy torus is strictly convex. The point is that, if ρ^* is a flat which is not a singleton, then one can obtain topological information (either the vanishing of an intersection product, or the nonvanishing of a homomorphism $\Gamma^{(1)}/\Gamma^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$) by examining the canonical lamination λ_ρ . An analogous statement to Theorem 1.5(1) concerning the tangent space to Teichmüller space was recently proven in [Hua+24], see Proposition 8.10.

In §8.2 we have carefully laid out how our results correspond to the predictions of [AB01], and which ideas are theirs, versus which are ours. For now we just remark that [AB12] does not work with the canonical lamination or the costable norm; combined with certain technical difficulties, the proofs which were completed in [AB12] can be, at times, more complex than the proofs here.

As we discuss in §8.3, analogous results to the above are available for the earthquake sphere, and they suggest some conjectures about the nature of geodesics in Thurston's stretch metric.

1.3. The canonical lamination on a surface. So far we have only assumed that $2 \leq d \leq 7$. However, when $d = 2$, the L^∞ variational problem implicit in the above theorems reduces to the ∞ -Laplacian, a well-understood PDE, and the canonical lamination is a geodesic lamination. Thus we expect to be able to prove more in this setting, and that the canonical calibrated lamination will behave more closely to a canonical maximally-stretched lamination.

Since λ_ρ is uniquely determined by ρ , it is natural to look for a transverse measure which is also determined uniquely by ρ . Daskalopoulos and Uhlenbeck [DU24b; DU22] constructed a privileged class of measures, both in the present setting and in the setting of Thurston's canonical lamination. Roughly speaking, one approximates a calibration dv , where v is ∞ -harmonic, by p -harmonic functions v_p . These p -harmonic functions have q -harmonic conjugates u_q , where $1/p + 1/q = 1$. In the limit $q \rightarrow 1$, du_q converges in the weakstar topology to a transverse measure. We can construct the analogue of such measures in our setting, and we call them 1^+ -harmonic measures; we defer their precise definition to the body of the text. In §7 we use ideas of Daskalopoulos and Uhlenbeck to prove that under suitable hypotheses, there is a canonical 1^+ -harmonic measure:

Theorem 1.6. *Let M be a closed hyperbolic surface, let $\rho \in H^1(M, \mathbf{R})$ satisfy $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, and assume that λ_ρ is the sum of finitely many closed geodesics $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ of lengths ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n . Then there is a unique 1^+ -harmonic measure μ . Moreover, μ assigns γ_i weight $\ell_i / \sum_j \ell_j$.*

By Massart's theorem, the hypothesis of Theorem 1.6 is met whenever M is a closed hyperbolic surface and ρ^* has a point of rational direction. Since M only has finitely many closed geodesics, it follows that λ_ρ is the sum of finitely many closed geodesics. So, Theorem 1.6 answers [DU24b, Conjecture 9.3] positively in the case that ρ^* has a point of rational direction. Furthermore, the proof of Theorem 1.6 extends to the Teichmüller-theoretic case, and it is possible that it can be extended to obtain information about 1^+ -harmonic measures on a more general class of geodesic laminations, see Conjecture 8.5.

1.4. Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Georgios Daskalopoulos and Karen Uhlenbeck for helpful discussions and for providing me with a draft copy of [DU24a]. I would also like to thank Victor Bangert for providing me with a draft copy of [AB12], and James Farre, Yi Huang, and Zhenhua Liu for helpful comments on an earlier draft. This work has additionally benefitted from conversations with Aaron Kennon, Haram Ko, Trent Lucas, and Eduardo Sodre.

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-2040433.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. Unless otherwise noted, M always denotes a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$. The operator \star is the Hodge star on M . We denote the musical isomorphisms by \sharp, \flat . To avoid confusion, we write H^ℓ for de Rham cohomology, but never a Sobolev space, which we instead denote $W^{\ell,p}$.

The sheaf of ℓ -forms is denoted Ω^ℓ , and the sheaf of closed ℓ -forms is denoted Ω_{cl}^ℓ . We assume that ℓ -forms are L^1_{loc} , but *not* that they are continuous; hence d must be meant in the sense of distributions.

We write $A \lesssim_\theta B$ to mean that $A \leq CB$, where $C > 0$ is a constant that only depends on θ . We write $A \ll_\theta B$ to mean that, as $B \rightarrow 0$, $A \rightarrow 0$, where the rate of convergence only depends on θ .

If K is a closed convex set, let $\mathcal{E}(K)$ be the set of extreme points of K .

Let \mathbb{I}_N denote the second fundamental form of a submanifold N .

2.2. Differential forms in L^∞ . In this section, one can allow M to be an arbitrary complete Riemannian manifold; compactness is unnecessary.

One of the main technical difficulties that we shall have to deal with is that we cannot prove the existence of continuous calibrations in general, and so we shall need to study differential forms

which are merely in L^∞ . Such a form F does not need to be well-defined on a set of zero measure, so in general, it does not make sense to integrate F along a submanifold of M .

Theorem 2.1 (L^∞ Poincaré lemma). *Let $x \in M$, and $0 \leq k \leq d - 1$. Then there exists $r_* > 0$ which depends only on Riem_M near x and the injectivity radius of x , such that for every $0 < r \leq r_*$ and $F \in L^\infty(B(x, r), \Omega_{\text{cl}}^{k+1})$, there exists a Hölder continuous k -form A such that $F = \text{d}A$.*

Proof. We may choose r_* so that the exponential map $B_{\mathbf{R}^d}(0, r_*) \rightarrow B(x, r_*)$ is a diffeomorphism which induces topological isomorphisms for every function space under consideration. Thus it is no loss to replace $B(x, r)$ with the unit euclidean ball \mathbf{B}^d . By the main theorem of [CM10], for every $1 < p < \infty$ there is a continuous right inverse to the exterior derivative

$$W^{1,p}(\mathbf{B}^d, \Omega^{\ell-1}) \xrightarrow{\text{d}} L^p(\mathbf{B}^d, \Omega_{\text{cl}}^\ell) .$$

The result now follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem if we take $p > d$. \square

The next result is a rephrasing of [Anz83, Theorem 1.2], and asserts that closed L^∞ $d - 1$ -forms can be integrated along Lipschitz hypersurfaces.

Theorem 2.2 (normal trace theorem). *Let $\iota : N \rightarrow M$ be the inclusion of an oriented Lipschitz hypersurface. Let \mathcal{X} be the space of $F \in L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-1})$ such that the components of $\text{d}F$ are Radon measures. Then the pullback ι^* of $d - 1$ -forms extends to a bounded linear map*

$$\iota^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow L^\infty(N, \Omega^{d-1})$$

satisfying the estimate

$$\|\iota^* F\|_{L^\infty(N)} \leq \|F\|_{L^\infty(M)} . \quad (2.1)$$

The *comass* of a differential k -form F is defined by

$$\mathbf{L}(F) := \sup_{\Sigma \subset M} \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\Sigma)} \int_{\Sigma} F,$$

where the supremum ranges over all oriented k -dimensional submanifolds Σ . It is clear that $\mathbf{L}(F) \leq \|F\|_{L^\infty}$, but if F is a $d - 1$ -form, then the converse holds as well. Indeed, we can view F as the vector field $X := \star F^\sharp$, and then

$$\mathbf{L}(F) = \sup_{\Sigma \subset M} \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\Sigma)} \int_{\Sigma} X \cdot \mathbf{n}_\Sigma \, \text{d}\mathcal{H}^{d-1}.$$

By taking Σ to be a small disk on which $|F|$ nearly attains its maximum, and such that \mathbf{n}_Σ nearly points in the same direction as X , we see that $\mathbf{L}(F) \geq \|F\|_{L^\infty} - \varepsilon$ for any ε .

A *k-current of finite mass* is a continuous linear functional on the space

$$C^0(M, \Omega^{d-k}) \cap L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-k})$$

of bounded continuous $d - k$ -forms. We denote the action of a current T on a form φ by $\int_M T \wedge \varphi$. Note carefully that this convention agrees with currents in algebraic geometry, where currents are viewed as generalizations of forms, but not geometric measure theory, where currents are viewed as generalizations of submanifolds.

The *mass* of a k -current T is

$$\mathbf{M}(T) := \sup_{\mathbf{L}(F) \leq 1} \int_M T \wedge F.$$

If T represents a $d - k$ -dimensional submanifold Σ , in the sense that $\int_M T \wedge F = \int_\Sigma F$, then $\mathbf{M}(T) = \text{vol}(\Sigma)$. A function $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(M)$ has *bounded variation*, denoted $u \in BV(M)$, if $\text{d}u$ is a 1-current of finite mass, in which case $\mathbf{M}(\text{d}u)$ is the *total variation* of u , and we write $\int_M \star |du|$ to mean $\mathbf{M}(\text{d}u)$.

Theorem 2.3 (*BV Sobolev embedding theorem, [EG15, §5.6]*). *For any $1 \leq p \leq \frac{d}{d-1}$, we have an embedding*

$$BV(M, \Omega^k) \subseteq L_{\text{loc}}^p(M, \Omega^k).$$

This embedding is compact if $p < \frac{d}{d-1}$.

One cannot multiply two arbitrary distributions, but one can define $du \wedge F$ when $u \in BV$, $F \in L^\infty$, and $dF = 0$. More precisely, we have:

Definition 2.4. Let $u \in BV(M, \Omega^k)$ and $F \in L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-k-1})$. Assume that $dF \in L^d(M, \Omega^{d-k})$. Then the *Anzellotti wedge product* of du and F is the distribution $du \wedge F$, such that for every test function $\chi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^\infty(M, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\langle du \wedge F, \chi \rangle := - \int_M \chi u \wedge dF - \int_M d\chi \wedge u \wedge F.$$

The next theorem is essentially [Anz83, Theorem 1.5], but we sketch the argument because Anzellotti did not formulate it in such generality.

Theorem 2.5 (*Anzellotti's theorem*). *Let $u \in BV(M, \Omega^k)$, $F \in L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-k-1})$, and $dF \in L^d(M, \Omega^{d-k})$. Then the Anzellotti wedge product $du \wedge F$ is well-defined as a distribution. In fact, $du \wedge F$ is a signed Radon measure, and*

$$\mathbf{M}(du \wedge F) \leq \mathbf{M}(du)\mathbf{L}(F).$$

In particular, if $k = 0$,

$$\mathbf{M}(du \wedge F) \leq \|F\|_{L^\infty} \int_M \star |du|. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. By the *BV Sobolev embedding theorem*, Theorem 2.3, for every $\chi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^\infty(M)$, χu belongs to the dual space of $L^d(M, \Omega^{d-k})$. Therefore for every $\chi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^\infty(M)$, $\langle du \wedge F, \chi \rangle$ is finite, so $du \wedge F$ is well-defined as a distribution.

Suppose that $\text{supp } \chi \Subset U$ for some $U \Subset M$. If u is sufficiently smooth, then an integration by parts gives

$$|\langle du \wedge F, \chi \rangle| = \left| \int_M \chi du \wedge F \right| \leq \mathbf{L}(F) \|\chi\|_{C^0} \mathbf{M}(1_U du).$$

In general, we can find a sequence $(u_n) \subset C^\infty$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup^* u$ in *BV*. Then $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $L^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$ and $du_n \rightharpoonup^* du$ as currents of locally finite mass. Since we are testing du against the L^d form χF ,

$$|\langle du \wedge F, \chi \rangle| \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle du_n \wedge F, \chi \rangle| \leq \mathbf{L}(F) \|\chi\|_{C^0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{M}(1_U du_n).$$

But, by the portmanteau theorem [Kec12, Theorem 17.20],

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{M}(1_U du_n) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{M}(1_{\overline{U}} du_n) \leq \mathbf{M}(du)$$

which gives the desired estimate (2.2), since we only used the C^0 norm of χ . \square

We also shall need the generalization of the div-curl lemma to *BV*. This is a rephrasing of [Anz83, Theorem 4.1].

Lemma 2.6 (*BV div-curl lemma*). *Let $u, u_n \in BV(M)$ and $F, F_n \in L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-1})$. Assume that:*

- (1) $dF, dF_n \in L^d(M, \Omega^{d-1})$.
- (2) *There exists $C \geq 1$ such that for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$,*

$$\mathbf{M}(du_n) + \|F_n\|_{L^\infty} + \|dF_n\|_{L^d} \leq C.$$

- (3) $F_n \rightharpoonup^* F$ in L^∞ and $u_n \rightharpoonup^* u$ in *BV*.

Then for every $\chi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^0(M)$,

$$\int_M \chi \, du \wedge F = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_M \chi \, du_n \wedge F_n.$$

2.3. Calibrated geometry. We recall calibrated geometry, which was developed by Harvey and Lawson [HL82].

Definition 2.7. A *calibration* is a k -form F such that $dF = 0$ and $\mathbf{L}(F) = 1$. If Σ is a k -dimensional submanifold, and F pulls back to the Riemannian volume form of Σ , we say that Σ is *F -calibrated*.

If Σ is F -calibrated, then for any $k - 1$ -dimensional submanifold Λ ,

$$\text{vol}(\Sigma) = \int_{\Sigma} F = \int_{\Sigma + \partial\Lambda} F \leq \text{vol}(\Sigma + \partial\Lambda),$$

so that Σ is area-minimizing. On the other hand, if $A \in W^{1,\infty}(M, \Omega^{k-1})$, and Σ is a closed F -calibrated submanifold, then

$$\mathbf{L}(F) = 1 = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\Sigma)} \int_{\Sigma} F = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\Sigma)} \int_{\Sigma} F + dA \leq \mathbf{L}(F + dA),$$

so F minimizes its comass in its cohomology class if it calibrates a closed hypersurface.

The definition of F -calibration extends to currents. If F is a calibration k -form, a $d - k$ -current T is *F -calibrated* if

$$\int_M T \wedge F = \mathbf{M}(T).$$

By Anzellotti's theorem, Theorem 2.5, this definition makes sense as long as T has locally finite mass. If T is F -calibrated, then for any $d - k - 1$ -current S , $\mathbf{M}(T) \leq \mathbf{M}(T + dS)$.

The comass and mass induce norms on cohomology and homology. The *stable norm* $\|\cdot\|_1$ on $H_k(M, \mathbf{R})$ is defined by

$$\|\theta\|_1 := \inf_{\text{PD}([T])=\theta} \mathbf{M}(T),$$

where $\text{PD}(\omega)$ is the Poincaré dual of the class ω , and T ranges over $d - k$ -currents. The *costable norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ is the dual norm of $\|\cdot\|_1$ on $H^k(M, \mathbf{R})$. The following theorem is a special case of the main theorem of [Fed74, §4] but it is essential to us, so we sketch the proof.

Theorem 2.8. For every $\rho \in H^k(M, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\|\rho\|_{\infty} = \min_{[F]=\rho} \mathbf{L}(F),$$

where F ranges over closed measurable k -forms of class ρ .

Proof. For each representative F of ρ , and with T ranging over all $d - k$ -currents,

$$\|\rho\|_{\infty} = \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{M}(T) \leq 1 \\ dT=0}} \int_M T \wedge F,$$

so in particular $\|\rho\|_{\infty} \leq \mathbf{L}(F)$. Conversely, for each $\kappa \in L^1(M, \Omega^{d-k})$ such that $d\kappa = 0$, let

$$\Psi(\kappa) := \langle \rho, \text{PD}([\kappa]) \rangle.$$

Then

$$|\Psi(\kappa)| \leq \|\rho\|_{\infty} \|\text{PD}([\kappa])\|_1 \leq \|\rho\|_{\infty} \mathbf{M}(\kappa)$$

so by the Hanh-Banach theorem, there exists $F \in L^{\infty}(M, \Omega^k)$ such that $\mathbf{L}(F) \leq \|\rho\|_{\infty}$ and for every $\kappa \in L^1(M, \Omega^{d-k})$ such that $d\kappa = 0$,

$$\int_M \kappa \wedge F = \langle \rho, \text{PD}([\kappa]) \rangle.$$

This implies that $dF = 0$ and $[F] = \rho$. □

2.4. Laminations. We use roughly the same formalism for laminations as in [MS88], which we also used in [Bac24]. Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Fix an interval $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ and a box $J \subset \mathbf{R}^{d-1}$. A (codimension-1, Lipschitz) *laminar flow box* is a Lipschitz coordinate chart $\Psi : I \times J \rightarrow M$ and a compact set $K \subseteq I$, called the *local leaf space*, such that for each $k \in K$, $\Psi|_{\{k\} \times J}$ is a C^1 embedding, and the *leaf* $\Psi(\{k\} \times J)$ is a C^1 complete hypersurface in $\Psi(I \times J)$. Two laminar flow boxes belong to the same *laminar atlas* if the transition map preserves the local leaf spaces.

Definition 2.9. A (codimension-1, Lipschitz) *lamination* λ is a closed nonempty set $\text{supp } \lambda$ and a maximal laminar atlas $\{(\Psi_\alpha, K_\alpha) : \alpha \in A\}$ such that

$$\text{supp } \lambda \cap \Psi_\alpha(I \times J) = \Psi_\alpha(K_\alpha \times J).$$

Note carefully that the leaves of a lamination will typically not be embedded, but merely injectively immersed. The following theorem allows us to construct laminations without explicitly constructing their flow boxes, provided that the leaves are minimal hypersurfaces.

Theorem 2.10 ([Bac24, Theorem A]). *Let \mathcal{S} be a set of disjoint minimal hypersurfaces in M , such that $\bigcup_{N \in \mathcal{S}} N$ is a closed set, and $\sup_{N \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mathbb{I}_N\|_{C^0} < \infty$. Then \mathcal{S} is the set of leaves of a Lipschitz lamination λ , such that the normal vector to the leaves of λ extends to a Lipschitz section of a line bundle on M .*

An arbitrary lamination cannot be viewed as a current, but following Ruelle and Sullivan [RS75], we view laminations which have been equipped with transverse measures and orientations as currents, so our next task is to define the Ruelle-Sullivan current.

Definition 2.11. Let λ be a lamination with laminar atlas $\{(\Psi_\alpha, K_\alpha) : \alpha \in A\}$. Then:

- (1) λ is equipped with an *orientation* if the transition maps $\Psi_\alpha^{-1} \circ \Psi_\beta$ are orientation-preserving.
- (2) A *transverse measure* μ to λ consists of Radon measures μ_α on each local leaf space K_α , such that the transition maps $\Psi_\alpha^{-1} \circ \Psi_\beta$ send μ_β to μ_α , and $\text{supp } \mu_\alpha = K_\alpha$. The pair (λ, μ) is a *measured lamination*.
- (3) Suppose that λ is oriented, μ is a transverse measure to λ , and $\{\chi_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ is a partition of unity subordinate to $\{\Psi_\alpha(I \times J) : \alpha \in A\}$. The *Ruelle-Sullivan current* T_μ acts on $\varphi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^0(M, \Omega^{d-1})$ by

$$\int_M T_\mu \wedge \varphi := \sum_{\alpha \in A} \int_{K_\alpha} \left[\int_{\{k\} \times J} (\Psi_\alpha^{-1})^*(\chi_\alpha \varphi) \right] d\mu_\alpha(k).$$

It bears repeating that in our convention, a lamination λ is nonempty, and if μ is a transverse measure to λ , then $\text{supp } \mu = \text{supp } \lambda$.

Let (λ, μ) be a measured oriented lamination. It is a straightforward modification of the arguments of [DU24b, §8] to show that the Ruelle-Sullivan current T_μ is a closed 1-current which is well-defined, in the sense that T_μ does not depend on the choice of laminar atlas. Furthermore, by [Bac24, Lemma 3.1],

$$T_\mu = \mathbf{n}_\lambda^\flat \mu \tag{2.3}$$

where \mathbf{n}_λ^\flat is the conormal 1-form to λ and $\mu(U) := \int_U \star |T_\mu|$ for every open set U . Often we leave μ implicit and just write T_λ for T_μ .

Let λ be a lamination. A Borel set $E \subseteq \text{supp } \lambda$ is *saturated* if, for every leaf N of λ such that $N \cap E$ is nonempty, $N \subseteq E$. Every leaf of λ is Borel, and therefore saturated. A *sublamination* of λ is a closed saturated set. Every sublamination of λ the flow boxes of λ and therefore is itself a lamination.

Lemma 2.12. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty set of laminations. Suppose that there exists a hypersurface which is a leaf of every lamination in \mathcal{S} . Then there exists a lamination whose set of leaves is the intersection of the sets of leaves of the laminations in \mathcal{S} .*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}$, and let $(\Psi_\alpha, K_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ be a laminar atlas for λ . Let K'_α be the set of $k \in K_\alpha$ such that for every $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists a leaf N of κ such that

$$(\Psi_\alpha)_*(\{k\} \times J) \subseteq N.$$

It is clear that this property is preserved by transition maps. Then K'_α is an intersection of compact sets (since the local leaf space of each $\kappa \in \mathcal{S}$ is compact), so K'_α is compact. The hypersurface which is a common leaf of every lamination in \mathcal{S} witnesses that for some α , K'_α is nonempty. Therefore $(\Psi_\alpha, K'_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ is a laminar atlas. The fact that K'_α is compact for every α implies that the supposed lamination whose atlas is $(\Psi_\alpha, K'_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ has a closed support. \square

We shall also need a form of the *Morgan–Shelan decomposition*, [MS88, Theorem I.3.2], of a measured lamination. To formulate it, let us say that a lamination λ is *exceptional*¹ if every leaf of λ is dense in $\text{supp } \lambda$, and λ is not a single closed leaf. A lamination λ is a *parallel family of closed leaves* if there exists a closed leaf N of λ with trivial normal bundle, such that every leaf of λ is a section of the normal bundle of N .

Theorem 2.13 (Morgan–Shelan decomposition). *For every measured oriented lamination λ , one of the following holds:*

- (1) λ is a foliation with a dense leaf.
- (2) λ is the disjoint union of finitely many clopen sublaminations κ , such that either κ is exceptional, or κ is a parallel family of closed leaves.

Proof. First observe that the proof of [MS88, Theorem I.3.2] goes through for any lamination λ such that no leaf of λ is dense in M , even if λ is a foliation. It then remains to rule out the case that κ is a family of sections of a nontrivial normal bundle of a closed leaf: this holds because λ is oriented. \square

3. CALIBRATED LAMINATIONS AND FUNCTIONS OF LEAST GRADIENT

3.1. Calibrated laminations. Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold. Let F be a calibration on M , and λ a measured oriented lamination in M . There are two things that one could conceivably mean by saying that λ is F -calibrated: that every leaf of λ is F -calibrated, or that the Ruelle-Sullivan current, T_λ , is F -calibrated. The purpose of this section is to show that these two notions are equivalent.

Definition 3.1. Let $F \in L^\infty(M, \Omega^{d-1})$ be a calibration. A lamination λ is *F -calibrated* if every leaf of λ is F -calibrated.

By the normal trace theorem, Theorem 2.2, this definition makes sense. Of course, one is only really interested in calibrated laminations if they are mass-minimizing, so now we recall that the *mass* of a measured oriented lamination λ is

$$\mathbf{M}(\lambda) := \mathbf{M}(T_\lambda).$$

Since a current can be approximated by smooth 1-forms in the weakstar topology on currents, every current has a cohomology class $[T] \in H^1(M, \mathbf{R})$. Thus, the *homology class* $[\lambda] \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ is the Poincaré dual of $[T_\lambda]$.

¹Exceptional laminations are often called *minimal*, but that clashes with the use of the word “minimal” to refer to vanishing mean curvature, so we have not adopted this terminology.

Definition 3.2. Let λ be a measured oriented lamination, and assume that M is compact. Then λ is *homologically minimizing*, if for every measured oriented lamination κ such that $[\lambda] = [\kappa]$,

$$\mathbf{M}(\lambda) \leq \mathbf{M}(\kappa).$$

Let (λ, μ) be a measured oriented lamination. Let (χ_α) be a locally finite partition of unity subordinate to a laminar atlas (U_α, K_α) for λ . If $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$ denotes the leaf in U_α corresponding to the real number $k \in K_\alpha$, then the definition of the Ruelle-Sullivan current unpacks as

$$\int_M T_\lambda \wedge F = \sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F \, d\mu_\alpha(k). \quad (3.1)$$

Since T_λ and F are closed, if M is closed, then the left-hand side of (3.1) is a homological invariant:

$$\int_M T_\lambda \wedge F = \langle [F], [\lambda] \rangle. \quad (3.2)$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let F be a calibration. Let T_λ be the Ruelle-Sullivan current of a measured oriented lamination λ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) T_λ is F -calibrated.
- (2) λ is F -calibrated.

Proof. First suppose that T_λ is F -calibrated. Let (χ_α) be a locally finite partition of unity subordinate to an open cover (U_α) of flow boxes for λ , let (K_α) be the local leaf spaces, and let (μ_α) be the transverse measure. After refining (U_α) we may assume that U_α is a ball which satisfies the hypotheses of the L^∞ Poincaré lemma, Theorem 2.1. After shrinking U_α we may assume that $\chi_\alpha > 0$ on U_α . Then for leaves $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$, we rewrite (3.1) as

$$\mathbf{M}(\lambda) = \int_M T_\lambda \wedge F = \sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F \, d\mu_\alpha(k).$$

Let $dS_{\alpha,k}$ be the surface measure on $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$. Then

$$\int_M \chi_\alpha \star |T_\lambda| = \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha \, dS_{\alpha,k} \, d\mu_\alpha(k),$$

so summing in α , we obtain

$$\sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F \, d\mu_\alpha(k) = \mathbf{M}(\lambda) = \sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha \, dS_{\alpha,k} \, d\mu_\alpha(k). \quad (3.3)$$

We claim that λ is *almost calibrated* in the sense that for every α and μ_α -almost every k , $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$ is calibrated. If this is not true, then we may select β and $K \subseteq K_\beta$ with $\mu_\beta(K) > 0$, such that for every $k \in K$, $\int_{\sigma_{\beta,k}} F < \text{vol}(\sigma_{\beta,k})$. Since $0 < \chi_\beta \leq 1$ and $F/dS_{\beta,k} \leq 1$ on $\sigma_{\beta,k}$, this is only possible if

$$\int_{\sigma_{\beta,k}} \chi_\beta F < \int_{\sigma_{\beta,k}} \chi_\beta \, dS_{\beta,k}.$$

Integrating over K , and using the fact that in general we have $\int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F \leq \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha \, dS_{\alpha,k}$, we conclude that

$$\sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F \, d\mu_\alpha(k) < \sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha \, dS_{\alpha,k} \, d\mu_\alpha(k)$$

which contradicts (3.3).

To upgrade λ from an almost calibrated lamination to a calibrated lamination, we first, given $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$, choose k_j such that σ_{α,k_j} is calibrated and $k_j \rightarrow k$. By Theorem 2.1, we can find a continuous

$d - 2$ -form A defined near $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$ with $F = dA$. This justifies the following application of Stokes' theorem:

$$\int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} F = \int_{\partial\sigma_{\alpha,k}} A.$$

Since $k_j \rightarrow k$, and A is continuous,

$$\text{vol}(\sigma_{\alpha,k}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}(\sigma_{\alpha,k_j}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k_j}} F = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial\sigma_{\alpha,k_j}} A = \int_{\partial\sigma_{\alpha,k}} A = \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} F.$$

To establish the converse, suppose that λ is F -calibrated, and let notation be as above. Since λ is F -calibrated, for every α and every k , the area form on $\sigma_{\alpha,k}$ is F . Therefore

$$\int_M T_\lambda \wedge F = \sum_\alpha \int_{K_\alpha} \int_{\sigma_{\alpha,k}} \chi_\alpha F d\mu_\alpha(k) = \mathbf{M}(T_\lambda). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that M is closed. Let F be a calibration, and let λ be a measured oriented F -calibrated lamination. Then:*

- (1) λ is homologically minimizing.
- (2) If G is a calibration and cohomologous to F , then λ is G -calibrated.

Proof. Every leaf of λ is F -calibrated, hence minimal. Since λ is F -calibrated, so is T_λ by Lemma 3.3, but then by (3.2), it follows that T_λ is G -calibrated, and hence λ is G -calibrated. Moreover, since T_λ is F -calibrated, a calibration argument shows that λ is homologically minimizing. \square

3.2. Functions of least gradient. The natural “dual objects” to calibrations are functions of least gradient, which we now define.

We begin with some topological preliminaries. Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension d , and let $\tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ be the universal covering map. Any homomorphism

$$\alpha : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

induces a homomorphism $\alpha : H_1(M, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Thus α is an element of $H^1(M, \mathbf{R})$ and by Poincaré duality, we view it as an element of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$. Concretely, the following are equivalent for a function $u \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$:

- (1) u is α -equivariant, meaning that for every deck transformation $c \in \pi_1(M)$, and every $x \in \tilde{M}$,

$$u(cx) = u(x) + \alpha(c).$$

- (2) du descends to a 1-current on M whose cohomology class is the Poincaré dual of α .

In either case we write $[du] = \alpha$, and write $\int_M \star |du|$ or $\mathbf{M}(du)$ to refer to the mass of the 1-current that du induces on M . If $[du] = 0$ then we identify u with the function that it induces on M .

Definition 3.5. Let $u \in BV(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$ be a $\pi_1(M)$ -equivariant function. Suppose that, for every $v \in BV(M, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\int_M \star |du| \leq \int_M \star |du + dv|.$$

Then u has *least gradient*.

An α -equivariant function u has least gradient iff $\int_M \star |du|$ is the stable norm, $\|\alpha\|_1$, of α , which we defined in §2.3.

Lemma 3.6. *For each $\alpha \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$, there exists an α -equivariant function of least gradient on \tilde{M} .*

Proof. The argument here is a standard application of the direct method of the calculus of variations, so we just sketch the proof. Let (u_n) be a sequence of α -equivariant functions such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_M \star |du_n| = \|\alpha\|_1.$$

This sequence is bounded in $BV_{\text{loc}}(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$, so by Alaoglu's theorem, it has a subsequence which converges in the weakstar topology of BV_{loc} to some function u . By the BV Sobolev embedding theorem, Theorem 2.3, $u_n \rightarrow u$ strongly in L^1_{loc} . By testing du_n against smooth $d-1$ -forms on M , we see that $[du] = \alpha$. The total variation functional $v \mapsto \int_M \star |dv|$ is lower-semicontinuous in L^1_{loc} [Giu84, Theorem 1.9], so $\int_M \star |du| = \|\alpha\|_1$. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that $d \leq 7$. Let $u \in BV(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$ be a $\pi_1(M)$ -equivariant function which is nonconstant. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) u has least gradient.
- (2) There is a homologically minimizing lamination λ_u on M such that:
 - (a) $T_{\lambda_u} = du$.
 - (b) Every leaf of λ_u is a minimal hypersurface.
 - (c) Every leaf of λ_u pulls back to a union of subsets of \tilde{M} of the form $\partial\{u > y\}$ or $\partial\{u < y\}$ for some $y \in \mathbf{R}$.

Proof. If u has least gradient, then [Bac24, Theorem B] implies that there is a measured oriented lamination $\tilde{\lambda}_u$ of minimal hypersurfaces on \tilde{M} whose leaves are level sets of u , and whose Ruelle-Sullivan current is du . Since u is equivariant, $\tilde{\lambda}_u$ descends to a lamination λ_u on M such that $\mathbf{M}(\lambda_u) = \mathbf{M}(du)$. Since u has least gradient, λ_u is homologically minimizing.

Conversely, if such a lamination exists, [Bac24, Theorem B] implies that u locally has least gradient and $\mathbf{M}(du) = \mathbf{M}(\lambda_u)$, so u has least gradient. \square

Combining the above two results, we see that if $d \leq 7$, every nonzero class in $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ contains a homologically minimizing lamination.

3.3. Duality of calibrations and laminations. Recall from §2.3 the definition of the costable norm, $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$. If F is a calibration in a cohomology class ρ , then either $\|\rho\|_{\infty} = 1$ (because F minimizes its L^{∞} norm in ρ , and $\|F\|_{L^{\infty}} = 1$), or F calibrates no currents whatsoever. Conversely, if $\|\rho\|_{\infty} = 1$, then by Alaoglu's theorem, there is a calibration in ρ .

It is natural to ask if there is a *continuous* calibration in ρ , as was assumed in [BC17; FH16]. If $d = 2$ one might try to generalize the argument of [ES08] to obtain a Hölder continuous calibration, but if $d \geq 8$ then continuous calibrations need not exist [Liu23]. The situation that $3 \leq d \leq 7$ remains unclear. If $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$, then the Bochner argument shows that the harmonic representative of ρ is a calibration; however, the Bochner argument actually shows that $M = \mathbf{S}^1 \times N$ where N is the calibrated hypersurface, so this is not very interesting.

In the setting of the Dirichlet problem for a domain on euclidean space, Mazón, Rossi, and Segura de León [MRL14] proved that a BV function has least gradient iff it is calibrated by some calibration. In fact, the same duality holds here, but in the equivariant setting the proof is trivial.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $u \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$ be an equivariant function. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) u has least gradient.
- (2) There exists a calibration F on M such that du is F -calibrated.

Proof. If du is F -calibrated, then we have by Stokes' theorem and (2.2) that for any $v \in BV(M, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\int_M \star |du| = \int_M du \wedge F = \int_M (du + dv) \wedge F \leq \int_M \star |du + dv|,$$

so u has least gradient.

Conversely, if u has least gradient, then let $\alpha := [du]$ and choose $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ such that $\langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = \|\alpha\|_1$ and $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$. In particular, there exists a calibration F such that $[F] = \rho$, and

$$\int_M du \wedge F = \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = \|\alpha\|_1 = \int_M \star |du|,$$

so that u has least gradient. \square

The above proof motivates the introduction of the following terminology from convex geometry. A *flat* in the stable unit sphere ∂B is the intersection of ∂B with a hyperplane. In particular, every flat is convex. If $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, its *dual flat* is

$$\rho^* := \{\alpha \in \partial B : \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = 1\}.$$

This set is convex, compact, and nonempty. Every hyperplane in $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ takes the form $\{\alpha \in H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R}) : \langle \rho, \alpha \rangle = t\}$ for some ρ in the costable unit sphere and some $t \in \mathbf{R}$, so every flat in ∂B is contained in ρ^* for some $\rho \in \partial B^*$.

The stable unit ball B need not be strictly convex. In fact, if M is a closed surface of genus ≥ 2 , then B will never be strictly convex [Mas97]. So the flats of ∂B need not be singletons.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose that M is a closed Riemannian manifold of dimension $d \leq 7$. Let $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ satisfy $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, and let F be a calibration in ρ . Then there exists an F -calibrated measured oriented lamination.*

Proof. Choose $\alpha \in \rho^*$, and let u be an α -equivariant function of least gradient. Then du is F -calibrated, so the measured oriented lamination κ given by Theorem 3.7 is F -calibrated by Lemma 3.3. \square

In view of the Mazón–Rossi–Segura de León theorem and Lemma 3.9, it is natural to conjecture that if F minimizes its L^∞ norm subject to a boundary condition on a domain U in euclidean space and $\|F\|_{L^\infty} = 1$, then F calibrates some function on U . The following example shows that this conjecture is false.

Example 3.10. Let

$$v(x + iy) := \arctan\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)$$

defined on the open disk U bounded by the circle $(x-2)^2 + y^2 = 1$. Then v is ∞ -harmonic, meaning that

$$\langle \nabla^2 v, \nabla v \otimes \nabla v \rangle = 0.$$

To see this, it is best to work in polar coordinates, $x + iy = re^{i\theta}$. Then $v(re^{i\theta}) = \theta$, so $dv = d\theta$. The euclidean metric is

$$g = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2,$$

so the Christoffel symbol $\Gamma^\theta_{\theta\theta}$ vanishes. Then we compute

$$\langle \nabla d\theta, d\theta \otimes d\theta \rangle = \langle \nabla d\theta, \partial_\theta \otimes \partial_\theta \rangle r^{-4} = r^{-4} \Gamma^\theta_{\theta\theta} = 0.$$

Also, $|d\theta| = r^{-1}$, which only attains its maximum at the boundary point $x + iy = 1$. In particular, $\|dv\|_{L^\infty} = 1$ and dv is a calibration on U . Since v is ∞ -harmonic, v minimizes its Lipschitz constant, $\|dv\|_{L^\infty}$, among all functions with the same boundary data [Cra08]. But if u is a function on U such that du is dv -calibrated, then

$$\text{supp } du \subseteq \{|dv| = 1\} \subset \partial U$$

so u is constant away from the boundary, hence is constant.

A more geometric way to visualize this phenomenon is to notice that the streamlines of v – that is, the integral curves of the gradient of v – are the circles centered on 0. If u was dv -calibrated, then the level sets of u would correspond to the streamlines of v . However, since any dv -calibrated function u has least gradient, the level sets of u must be straight lines.

4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE CANONICAL LAMINATION

Throughout this section, we fix a closed oriented Riemannian manifold M of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$, and a cohomology class $\rho \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ in the costable unit sphere: $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$. We prove Theorem 1.2: *the set of complete immersed hypersurfaces, which are calibrated by every calibration in ρ , is the set of leaves of a lamination with Lipschitz regularity.*

Let F be a calibration in ρ . The set $S := \{|F| = 1\}$ is closed,² but need not be the support of a lamination, since S may have isolated points. Even if S was the support of a lamination λ , we would not conclude that F calibrates λ . For example, if $d \geq 3$, then one can exploit the possible nonintegrability of $\star F$ to produce counterexamples [BC17, §4]. More starkly, if $d = 2$, then the main theorem of [DU24b] then implies that S contains a geodesic lamination λ ; on the other hand, the main theorem of [BZA24] implies that any closed set containing $\text{supp } \lambda$ can be realized as the set $\{|G| = 1\}$ for some calibration G in ρ . If M is hyperbolic, then λ has Hausdorff dimension 1 [BS85], so “almost every” closed subset of M is $\{|G| = 1\}$ for some G .

We shall construct a lamination λ_F whose support is contained in S , such that every F -calibrated hypersurface is a leaf of λ_F . By Theorem 2.10, we must establish the following:

- (1) There is an F -calibrated hypersurface.
- (2) There is a uniform bound on the curvatures of the F -calibrated hypersurfaces.
- (3) Any two F -calibrated hypersurfaces are disjoint.
- (4) The limit of a sequence of F -calibrated hypersurfaces is a F -calibrated hypersurface.

The nontriviality condition (1) is nothing more than Lemma 3.9. The hypersurface furnished by that lemma is actually calibrated by *every* calibration in ρ , so the intersection of all laminations λ_F is nonempty; this intersection shall be the canonical calibrated lamination.

We now show that the leaves of the putative canonical lamination satisfy the necessary curvature bounds; this is a little subtle because the leaves are injectively immersed but not embedded. In the below lemmata, let r_* be the minimum of the injectivity radius of M and $\delta \|\text{Riem}_M\|_{C^0}^{-1/2}$, where $\delta > 0$ is a dimensional constant to be determined later. Let \mathbf{S}^{d-1} be the round sphere of dimension $d - 1$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let*

$$U := \bigcup_{x \in M} \{\xi \in T_x M : 0 < |\xi| < r_*\},$$

and let $F : U \rightarrow M$ be the exponential map. Then for every injectively immersed hypersurface $N \subset M$, F is transverse to N .

Proof. We must show that for every $(x, \xi) \in U$ such that $F(x, \xi) \in N$, the image of

$$dF(x, \xi) : T_{(x, \xi)} T_x M \rightarrow T_{F(x, \xi)} M$$

contains a vector not tangent to N . Let η be the unit normal to N at $F(x, \xi)$, and let $\bar{\eta}$ be the parallel transport of η along the unique geodesic γ from $F(x, \xi)$ to x . Viewing $\bar{\eta}$ as an element of $T_{F(x, \xi)} T_x M$, we see that if δ was chosen small enough, then $dF(x, \xi)\bar{\eta}$ lies in a small neighborhood of η . Indeed, if δ was chosen small enough, then γ is much shorter than the curvature scale $\|\text{Riem}_M\|_{C^0}^{-1/2}$. In particular, $dF(x, \xi)\bar{\eta}$ is not tangent to N . \square

Lemma 4.2. *For every calibration F , every complete injectively immersed F -calibrated hypersurface $N \subset M$, every $x \in M$, every $0 < r \leq r_*$, and every component N' of $N \cap B(x, r)$,*

$$\text{vol}(\mathbf{B}^{d-1}) \leq \text{vol}(N') \leq 2\text{vol}(\mathbf{S}^{d-1})r^{d-1}. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. If δ was chosen small enough, then

$$\text{vol}(\partial B(x, r)) < 2\text{vol}(\mathbf{S}^{d-1})r^{d-1}.$$

²We define S more precisely in §7.1.

Let $F : U \rightarrow M$ be the exponential map as in Lemma 4.1, so that F is transverse to N . By putting polar coordinates on each tangent space, we may view U as a fiber bundle,

$$M \times (0, r_*) \rightarrow U \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^{d-1}.$$

By the Thom transversality theorem, for almost every $(x, r) \in M \times (0, r_*)$, the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} f_{x,r} : \mathbf{S}^{d-1} &\rightarrow M \\ \omega &\mapsto F(x, r\omega) \end{aligned}$$

is transverse to N . But $f_{x,r}$ is the embedding $\mathbf{S}^{d-1} \rightarrow \partial B(x, r)$. The estimate (4.1) is preserved by slight perturbations of r , so we may use the above considerations to reduce to the case that N is transverse to $\partial B(x, r)$.

Let N' be a component of $N \cap B(x, r)$, so that N' is embedded (not just injectively immersed). By transversality, $N' \cap \partial B(x, r)$ is diffeomorphic to a closed $d-2$ -dimensional submanifold of \mathbf{S}^{d-1} . Since $H_{d-2}(\mathbf{S}^{d-1}, \mathbf{R}) = 0$, there exists a relatively open set $V \subseteq \partial B(x, r)$ which is bounded by $N \cap \partial B(x, r)$. Because of how we chose r_* , we may use the L^∞ Poincaré lemma, Theorem 2.1, to find a continuous $d-2$ -form A on a neighborhood of the closure of $B(x, r)$, such that $F = dA$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(N \cap B(x, r)) &= \int_{N \cap B(x, r)} F = \int_{N \cap \partial B(x, r)} A = \int_V F \leq \text{vol}(V) \leq \text{vol}(\partial B(x, r)) \\ &< 2\text{vol}(\mathbf{S}^{d-1})r^{d-1}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$, only depending on M , such that for every calibration F and complete injectively immersed F -calibrated hypersurface N , we have the curvature bound*

$$\|\mathbf{I}_N\|_{C^0} \leq C. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Let $x \in N$ and let $r > 0$ be small enough depending on M . Then each component N' of $N \cap B(x, r)$ is F -calibrated, and therefore a stable minimal hypersurface. By (4.1), $\text{vol}(N') \lesssim r^{d-1}$. So by [SS81, pg785, Corollary 1] (see also [CM11, Chapter 2, §§4-5]),

$$\|\mathbf{I}_{N'}\|_{C^0(B(x, r/2))} \lesssim_{d, \|\text{Riem}_g\|_{C^0(B(x, 2r))}} \frac{1}{r}.$$

Since N' was an arbitrary component, the same estimate holds for N . Using the compactness of M , we may cover it by finitely many balls in which estimates of this form hold to conclude (4.2). \square

The next lemma shows that any two F -calibrated hypersurfaces are disjoint.

Lemma 4.4. *Let F be a calibration, and let N, N' be immersed F -calibrated hypersurfaces. Then:*

- (1) *If $N \cap N'$ is nonempty, then for each $x \in N \cap N'$ there is an open neighborhood U of x such that $N \cap U = N' \cap U$.*
- (2) *If $N \cap N'$ is nonempty, and N, N' are complete and connected, then $N = N'$.*
- (3) *N is injectively immersed.*

Proof. We first observe that for each $x \in N$, $(\star F(x))^\sharp$ is the (unique) normal vector to N at x (and similarly for N'), and so if $x \in N \cap N'$ then N, N' have the same tangent space at x . So for each $x \in N \cap N'$, there exists $r > 0$ and normal coordinates $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbf{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbf{R}$ on $B(x, r)$ based at x , such that for each pair of sheets $N_* \subseteq N \cap B(x, r)$, $N'_* \subseteq N' \cap B(x, r)$ which contain x , there exists a relatively open set $V \subseteq \{\eta = 0\}$, an open set $U \subseteq B(x, r)$ containing x , and functions $u, u' : V \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that:

- (1-1) $N_* \cap U = \{(\xi, u(\xi)) : \xi \in V\}$.
- (1-2) $N'_* \cap U = \{(\xi, u'(\xi)) : \xi \in V\}$.
- (1-3) $u(0) = u'(0) = 0$.
- (1-4) If $u(\xi) = u'(\xi)$ then $du(\xi) = du'(\xi)$.

Let $v := u - u'$. Then:

(2-1) $v(0) = 0$.

(2-2) v satisfies a linear elliptic PDE on V [CM11, Proof of Theorem 7.3].

(2-3) If $v(\xi) = 0$ then $dv(\xi) = 0$.

We claim that v is identically 0. If this is not true, the set $\{v = 0\} = \{v = dv = 0\}$ is $d-3$ -rectifiable [HS89, Lemma 1.9], but $\dim V = d - 1$, so $\{v \neq 0\}$ is connected. So either $v \geq 0$ or $v \leq 0$, and v has a zero; this contradicts the maximum principle.

The above discussion shows that $N_* \cap U = N'_* \cap U$. Taking $N = N'$ we see that N only has one sheet in $B(x, r)$ which contains x , so (3) holds. So running the same argument, without assuming that $N = N'$, yields (1). A continuity argument then implies (2). \square

Finally, we show that a limit of F -calibrated hypersurfaces is F -calibrated, and to make this precise we shall need the notion of a *Vietoris limit superior* of a sequence of closed sets, [Kec12, §4.F]. If (K_n) is a sequence of closed subsets of M , then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n$ is the set of all x such that for every open set $U \ni x$, there exist infinitely many $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $U \cap K_n \neq \emptyset$; one easily checks that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n$ is closed.

Lemma 4.5. *Let F be a calibration, let (N_n) be a sequence of F -calibrated complete connected immersed hypersurfaces, and let $K := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{N_n}$. For every $x \in K$ there exists a F -calibrated complete connected immersed hypersurface $N \subseteq K$ such that $x \in N$.*

Proof. By taking a subsequence, we may assume that there exist $x_n \in N_n$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$. By Lemma 4.4, we may also assume that if $N_n \cap N_m$ is nonempty then $n = m$. Combining this with the curvature bound (4.2), we obtain the hypotheses of [Bac24, Lemma 2.4]. The conclusion of that lemma is that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $r > 0$ only depending on M , and normal coordinates $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbf{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbf{R}$ on $B(x, r)$ based at x such that for every n ,

$$\|\mathbf{n}_{N_n} - \partial_\eta\|_{C^0(B(x,r))} \leq \delta. \quad (4.3)$$

If δ was chosen small enough, depending only on M , then by the vertical line test, there exists a relatively open set $V \subseteq \{\eta = 0\}$ and a sequence of functions u_n on V , such that:

(1-1) $x \in V$.

(1-2) There exists $c_0 > 0$ which only depends on M such that $\text{diam}(V) \geq c_0$.

(1-3) For every n , $N_n \cap \{(\xi, \eta) \in B(x, r) : \xi \in V\} = \{(\xi, u_n(\xi)) : \xi \in V\}$.

The functions u_n solve the minimal surface equation,

$$Pu(\xi) := F(\xi, u(\xi), du(\xi), \nabla^2 u(\xi)) = 0$$

where one can use [CM11, (7.21)] to show that F has the form

$$F(\xi, \eta, A, B) := \text{tr } B + O((|\xi| + |\eta| + |A|)(1 + |B|))$$

where the implied constant only depends on M . But $|\xi| + |u_n(\xi)| \lesssim r$ and, if

$$\|\mathbf{n}_{N_n} - \partial_\eta\|_{C^0(B(x,r))} \leq \frac{1}{10},$$

then one may show that

$$|du_n(\xi)| \leq \|du_n\|_{C^0} \lesssim \|\mathbf{n}_{N_n} - \partial_\eta\|_{C^0(B(x,r))}.$$

So by (4.3), we can first choose δ small enough depending on M , and then choose r small enough depending on δ , so that for every n large enough depending on r , the equation $Pu_n = 0$ is uniformly elliptic. In particular, by the interior Schauder estimate [GT15, Theorem 6.2], we may choose δ small enough, depending only on M , that there exists a connected, relatively open set $W \subseteq V$ such that:

(2-1) $x \in W$.

(2-2) There exists $c_1 > 0$ which only depends on M such that $\text{diam}(W) \geq c_1$.

(2-3) For every sufficiently large n , $\|u_n\|_{C^3(W)} \leq 1$.

Therefore there exists $u \in C^2(W)$ such that:

(3-1) After passing to a subsequence, $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(W)$.

(3-2) $N^x := \{(\xi, u(\xi)) : \xi \in W\}$ contains x .

(3-3) $N^x \subseteq K$.

We moreover claim that, possibly after shrinking W (while preserving (2-1) and (2-2)):

(4-1) N^x is F -calibrated.

(4-2) N^x is geodesically convex.

(4-3) There exists $c_2 > 0$ which only depends on M such that $\text{dist}_{N^x}(x, \partial N^x) \geq c_2$.

To prove this, let $N_n^x := \{(\xi, u_n(\xi)) : \xi \in W\}$. If $\text{diam}(W)$ was chosen small enough (depending only on M), then we can use the L^∞ Poincaré lemma, 2.1, to find a continuous $d-2$ -form A on W such that $dA = F$. Since $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C^2(W)$, we can compute using Stokes' theorem

$$\int_{N^x} F = \int_{\partial N^x} A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial N_n^x} A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{N_n^x} F = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}(N_n^x) = \text{vol}(N^x),$$

which proves (4-1). By shrinking W slightly more, we can impose (4-2). Moreover, since $\partial N^x \subset \partial W$, and the curvature bound (4.2) allows us to compare distances in M and distances in N^x , (4-3) follows from (2-2).

Let N be the union of all F -calibrated connected immersed hypersurfaces contained in K which extend N^x . If N is incomplete, then there exists $y \in N$ such that $\text{dist}_N(y, \partial N) < c_2$. Then $y \in K$, so there exists a F -calibrated connected immersed hypersurface $N^y \subseteq K$ such that $y \in N^y$ and (4-2) and (4-3) hold. But $N^y \subseteq N$, so by (4-2) and (4-3),

$$\text{dist}_N(y, \partial N^y) \geq \text{dist}_N(y, \partial N^y) \geq c_2,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore N is complete. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let F be a calibration in ρ . Then the set of F -calibrated connected complete immersed hypersurfaces is the set of leaves of a lamination λ_F , which contains every measured oriented F -calibrated lamination.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{L}_F be the set of connected complete immersed F -calibrated hypersurfaces. By Lemma 4.4, \mathcal{L}_F consists of pairwise disjoint injectively immersed minimal hypersurfaces. The curvature bound (4.2) only depends on M , and implies that the elements of \mathcal{L}_F have curvatures bounded uniformly in C^0 . By Lemma 3.9, \mathcal{L}_F is nonempty.

Let E be the union of all elements of \mathcal{L}_F . If (x_n) is a sequence in E , say $x_n \in N_n$ for some $N_n \in \mathcal{L}_F$, and $x_n \rightarrow x$, then $x \in \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{N_n}$. So by Lemma 4.5, there exists $N \in \mathcal{L}_F$ such that $x \in N$. In particular, $x \in E$, so E is closed.

By the above discussion and Theorem 2.10, \mathcal{L}_F is the set of leaves of some lamination λ_F . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let S be the set of calibrations in ρ , which is nonempty since $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$. Then there is a lamination which is F -calibrated by every $F \in S$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.9, there is a measured oriented lamination κ which is F -calibrated for some $F \in S$, and by Lemma 3.4, κ is F -calibrated for every $F \in S$.

For every $F \in S$, let λ_F be the calibrated lamination produced by Lemma 4.6. By Lemma 2.12, there is a lamination λ_ρ whose set of leaves is the intersection over $F \in S$ of the sets of leaves of λ_F . Then λ_ρ has all desired properties. \square

5. TRANSVERSE MEASURES ON THE CANONICAL LAMINATION

Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$. For each oriented lamination λ in M , let $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ be the set of transverse probability measures to sublaminations of λ . This set inherits the vague topology on the space of Borel probability measures on $\text{supp } \lambda$; in view of (2.3), this topology is the same as the topology on the space of measured laminations (see

[Bac24]) restricted to $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is convex, and one may use the compactness of the space of Borel probability measures on the compact metrizable space $\text{supp } \lambda$ [Kec12, Theorem 17.23] to show that $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is compact. By the Krein-Milman theorem, if $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is nonempty, then so is its set of extreme points, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$.

Definition 5.1. A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is *ergodic* if, for every saturated set E , either $\mu(E) = 0$ or $\mu(E) = 1$.

Lemma 5.2. *Every extreme point of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is ergodic, and the set of ergodic measures is linearly independent in the space of signed Borel measures on $\text{supp } \lambda$.*

Proof. The first claim is an easy modification of the proof of [EW10, Theorem 4.4], and the second is essentially the proof that every ultrafilter on a finite set is principal. To be more precise, let S be a finite set of ergodic measures, and choose $c_\mu \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sum_{\mu \in S} c_\mu \mu = 0$. The measures in S are determined by their values on saturated sets, so if some coefficient c_ν is nonzero, then there exists a saturated set E and a proper subset $T \subset S$ such that:

- (1-1) $\nu \in T$.
- (1-2) For every $\mu \in T$, $\mu(E) = 1$.
- (1-3) For every $\mu \in S \setminus T$, $\mu(E) = 0$.

Then $S' := \{1_E \mu : \mu \in T\}$ satisfies:

- (2-1) For every $\mu \in S'$, μ is ergodic.
- (2-2) $\sum_{\mu \in S'} c_\mu \mu = 0$.
- (2-3) There exists $\nu \in S'$ such that c_ν is nonzero.
- (2-4) $\text{card } S' < \text{card } S$.

Therefore we can repeat the argument with S replaced by S' . After finitely many iterations, we reduce to the case that $\text{card } S \leq 1$, in which case we have a contradiction. \square

Now let B be the stable unit ball of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ and B^* be the costable unit ball. For each $\rho \in B^*$, we consider the set $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$ of transverse probability measures to the canonical lamination, λ_ρ . By Lemma 3.4, $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$ is the set of measured oriented laminations which are calibrated by some calibration in ρ . The map which sends a measured oriented lamination to its homology class restricts to an affine map $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho) \rightarrow \rho^*$, which is surjective by Lemma 3.9. In particular, if α is an extreme point of the dual flat, ρ^* , then α is the homology class of an ergodic measure.

We summarize the above discussion as Corollary 1.3.

Let $b_1 := \dim H_1(M, \mathbf{R})$ be the first Betti number of M , and let $\rho \in \partial B^*$ be a costable unit class. In the remainder of this section, we prove Theorem 1.4: *ρ^* is a polytope, vertices of ρ^* have rational direction iff they are represented by closed leaves of λ_ρ , and ρ^* has at most $b_1 - 1$ vertices of irrational direction.*

We first handle the vertices of rational direction. Towards this end, it will be useful to recall that Poincaré duality preserves integrality: if α has rational direction, then there exists $c > 0$ such that, under the identification $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R}) \cong \text{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbf{R})$, $c\alpha$ corresponds to a homomorphism in $\text{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbf{Z})$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let F be a calibration and let λ be an ergodic, F -calibrated, measured oriented lamination. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $[\lambda]$ has rational direction.
- (2) λ is a closed hypersurface.

Proof. If λ is a closed hypersurface N , then $[\lambda]$ is a rescaling of $[N]$, and $[N]$ is the image of the class of N in $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{Z})$.

Conversely, assume that $[\lambda]$ has rational direction. Since Γ is finitely generated, we may rescale M suitably so that $[\lambda]$ is a representation $\alpha : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$. Since such representations are identified with

homotopy classes of maps $M \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1$, the Ruelle-Sullivan current T_λ takes the form du for some map $u : M \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^1$. Let $\tilde{u} \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$ be the universal cover of u .

Towards contradiction, let N be a leaf of λ which is not closed, and let $\tilde{N} \subset \tilde{M}$ be the preimage of N . Since N is not closed and M is compact, there exists $x \in N$ such that N accumulates on itself at x , in the sense that for every sufficiently small $r > 0$, $N \cap B(x, r)$ has infinitely many connected components. Let $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{M}$ be a point in the preimage of x . Thus the set T of $t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\partial\{\tilde{u} > t\}$ intersects $B(\tilde{x}, r/2)$ is infinite.

We claim that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $t \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\partial\{\tilde{u} > t\}$ intersects $B(\tilde{x}, r/2)$,

$$\text{vol}(\partial\{\tilde{u} > t\} \cap B(\tilde{x}, r)) \geq c.$$

To see this, let $\tilde{y} \in \partial\{u > t\} \cap B(\tilde{x}, r/2)$. Since $\partial\{\tilde{u} > t\}$ is smooth, its density θ (in the sense of rectifiable sets) at \tilde{y} is the volume of the unit ball of \mathbf{R}^{d-1} . By the monotonicity formula for minimal hypersurfaces [Mar, Theorem 7.11], there exists $A \geq 0$ which only depends on M such that for any $\rho > 0$,

$$\text{vol}(\partial\{\tilde{u} > t\} \cap B(\tilde{y}, \rho)) \geq e^{-A\rho^2} \theta \rho^{d-1}$$

and the claim follows by taking $c := e^{-Ar^2/4} \theta$ and $\rho := r/2$.

The image of T in \mathbf{S}^1 is a point, so for any $t, s \in T$, either $t = s$ or $|t - s| \geq 1$. We may assume that there is an infinite increasing sequence (t_n) in T . By the coarea formula [Giu84, Theorem 1.23],

$$\int_{B(x, r)} \star |d\tilde{u}| \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \text{vol}(\partial\{u > t\}) dt \geq c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t_{n+1} - t_n) = \infty,$$

which is a contradiction, since $\tilde{u} \in BV_{\text{loc}}(\tilde{M}, \mathbf{R})$.

So if $[\lambda]$ has rational direction, then every leaf of λ is closed. Since λ is ergodic, it follows that λ is a single closed leaf. \square

We next need a mild generalization of a result from [AL86, Proposition 3.1]; though the proof is not terribly different, we include it because [AL86] is in French. Let us identify transverse measures with positive transverse cocycles (cocycles which act on curves transverse to the lamination and are cooriented with the lamination); this is standard, and we refer to [DU24b, §7.2] for a justification of this identification.

Lemma 5.4. *Let λ be an oriented lamination which admits transverse measures μ, ν , and let $U \subseteq M$ be an open set. Assume that:*

- (1) λ is not a closed hypersurface, and there is a leaf of λ which is dense in $\text{supp } \lambda \cap U$.
- (2) $\text{supp } \mu \cup \text{supp } \nu \subseteq U$.
- (3) There exists $b \geq 0$ such that for every 1-cycle $C \subset U$ which is transverse to λ , $\mu(C) - \nu(C) \in b\mathbf{Z}$.

Then $\mu = \nu$.

Proof. We follow [AL86, §3, Lemme] which is a similar result when λ is a minimal component of a foliation.

Let $C \subset U$ be a transverse curve to λ , which is cooriented with λ , and such that $\mu(C) > 0$ and $\nu(C) > 0$. Let N be a leaf which is dense in $\text{supp } \lambda \cap U$. By assumptions (1) and (2), $N \cap C$ is infinite and dense in $\text{supp } \lambda \cap U \cap C$.

If we prove that $\mu(C) = \nu(C)$ for every sufficiently short cooriented transverse curve C , then the result follows for all curves by σ -additivity. Therefore we may shorten C so that:

- (1-1) C begins and ends on N .
- (1-2) If $b > 0$ then $\mu(C) + \nu(C) < b$.

Let $\sigma \subset N$ be a curve from the beginning of C to the end of C , and let C' be a deformation of $C \cup \sigma$ through homotopies which leave $\lambda \setminus N$ fixed, so that C' is a transverse cycle to λ . Then, by (3), for some $k \in \mathbf{Z}$,

$$\mu(C) = \mu(C') = \nu(C') + kb = \nu(C) + kb.$$

If $b = 0$ then we are done; otherwise, since $\mu(C) + \nu(C) < b$, it follows that $k = 0$. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let λ be an oriented lamination, and let $\mathcal{I}(\lambda)$ be the number of ergodic probability measures transverse to sublaminations $\kappa \subseteq \lambda$ such that:*

- (1) κ is not a closed hypersurface.
- (2) There exists a leaf of κ which is dense in $\text{supp } \kappa$.

Then the homology classes of measures in $\mathcal{I}(\lambda)$ are linearly independent, and if they span $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$, then $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R}) = 0$.

Proof. Let $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_q$ be distinct sublaminations of λ , such that for each $1 \leq i \leq q$:

- (1-1) There exists $m_i \geq 1$ and distinct probability measures $\mu_i^1, \dots, \mu_i^{m_i}$ such that for each $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, μ_i^j is ergodic and transverse to κ_i .
- (1-2) κ_i is not a closed hypersurface.
- (1-3) There exists a leaf N_i of κ_i which is dense in $\text{supp } \kappa_i$.

Notice that if $q > 0$ then $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R}) \neq 0$. We define open sets U_i , breaking into cases:

- (2-1) Suppose that $\kappa_i \neq \lambda$. Therefore κ_i is not a foliation and is not a closed hypersurface, so by the Morgan–Shelan decomposition (Theorem 2.13) and the ergodicity of μ_i^1 , κ_i is exceptional. In this case, let U_i be a small neighborhood of $\text{supp } \kappa_i$.
- (2-2) Suppose that $\kappa_i = \lambda$. Then for any j and any $i' \neq i$, μ_i^j is ergodic and $\text{supp } \kappa_{i'}$ is saturated, so $\mu_i^j(\text{supp } \kappa_{i'}) = 0$. In this case, let $U_i := M \setminus \bigcup_{i' \neq i} \text{supp } \kappa_{i'}$.

We claim that $N_i \subset U_i$. In fact, as the complement of the union of supports of sublaminations of λ , $U_i \cap \text{supp } \lambda$ is saturated, so either $N_i \subset U_i$ or N_i is disjoint from U_i . In the latter case, N_i is a leaf of some exceptional lamination κ_k by the above argument, so N_i cannot be dense in $M = \text{supp } \kappa_i$.

Next we show:

- (3-1) For every i , $([\mu_i^j])_j$ is linearly independent.

Suppose that there are $a_j \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sum_j a_j [\mu_i^j] = 0$, let μ be the sum of $a_j \mu_i^j$ over j such that $a_j > 0$, and let ν be the sum of $-a_j \mu_i^j$ over j such that $a_j < 0$. Then $[\mu] - [\nu] = 0$, so by Lemma 5.4 with $b = 0$ and $U = M$, $\mu - \nu = 0$, hence $\sum_j a_j \mu_i^j = 0$. By ergodicity, $(\mu_i^j)_j$ is linearly independent, so $a_j = 0$, establishing (3-1).

We claim there are 1-cocycles t_i such that:

- (4-1) There exists a 1-cycle $C_i \subset U_i$ such that $t_i(C_i) \neq 0$.
- (4-2) For every $j \neq i$, and every 1-cycle $C \subset U_j$, $t_i(C) = 0$.
- (4-3) There exists $q_i \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that for every 1-cycle C , $t_i(C) \in q_i \mathbf{Z}$.

By composing with the natural homomorphism $H_1(M, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(M, \mathbf{R})$, we can think of the cohomology class of μ_i^1 as a homomorphism

$$[\mu_i^1] : H_1(M, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}.$$

Since M is compact, $H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ is finitely generated and so we can slightly perturb the value of $[\mu_i^1]$ on the generators to obtain t_i with the desired properties.

To complete the proof it is enough to show that

- (5-1) $(t_i, [\mu_i^j])_{i,j}$ is linearly independent.

Suppose that there are $a_i^j, a_i \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j} a_i^j [\mu_i^j] + \sum_i a_i t_i = 0.$$

Then for every 1-cycle C in U_i ,

$$\sum_j a_i^j \mu_i^j(C) = -a_i t_i(C) \in a_i q_i \mathbf{Z}.$$

Let μ_i^+ be the sum of $a_i^j \mu_i^j$ taken over j such that $a_i^j > 0$, and let μ_i^- be the sum of $a_i^j \mu_i^j$ taken over j such that $a_i^j < 0$. Then $\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^- \in a_i q_i \mathbf{Z}$, so by Lemma 5.4, $\mu_i^+ = \mu_i^-$, or in other words $\sum_j a_i^j [\mu_i^j] = 0$. So by (3-1), $a_i^j = 0$, so $\sum_i a_i t_i = 0$. By (4-2) and (4-3), $(t_i)_i$ is linearly independent, so $a_i = 0$, establishing (5-1). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 5.3, the map $\Pi : \mathcal{M}(\lambda) \rightarrow \{\|\cdot\|_1 = 1\}$ which takes a transverse probability measure to its homology class sends closed hypersurfaces to rational vertices, and measures on sublaminations which are not closed hypersurfaces to irrational vertices. By Corollary 1.3, Π is surjective, so in order to bound the number of irrational vertices, we need to bound the number m of measures on sublaminations which are not closed hypersurfaces. Since every ergodic measure is supported on a sublamination with a dense leaf, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that $m \leq b_1 - 1$.

We must show that $\mathcal{E}(\rho^*)$ is finite. If $\mathcal{E}(\rho^*)$ is infinite, then by the above, ρ^* has infinitely many rational vertices, and so there is an infinite set \mathcal{S} of closed leaves of M such that $\Pi|_{\mathcal{S}}$ is injective. Choose a sequence (N_n) of distinct leaves in \mathcal{S} , and let μ be the measure which assigns N_n weight 2^{-n} . Then the closure of $\bigcup_n N_n$ is the support of a sublamination κ of λ , to which μ is transverse. By the Morgan–Shelan decomposition, Theorem 2.13, there are only finitely many maximal parallel families of closed leaves which are sublaminations of κ , say $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\ell$. Then all of the leaves in each ζ_i are homologous, so there are only finitely many homology classes represented by the N_n s, a contradiction. \square

6. STRICT CONVEXITY OF THE STABLE UNIT BALL

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5, the Auer–Bangert criteria for strict convexity of the stable unit ball. It naturally breaks up into Theorems 6.1 and 6.7.

Throughout this section, M is a closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension $2 \leq d \leq 7$, and B is the stable unit ball of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$.

6.1. Intersection theory. The *intersection product* on homology is defined as follows: for any $\alpha, \beta \in H_\bullet(M, \mathbf{R})$,

$$\alpha \cdot \beta := \text{PD}(\text{PD}(\alpha) \wedge \text{PD}(\beta)).$$

By identifying $H_0(M, \mathbf{R})$ with \mathbf{R} , we recover the intersection number when $\alpha \cdot \beta \in H_0(M, \mathbf{R})$.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that $S \subset \partial B$ is a flat, and $\alpha, \beta \in S$. Then $\alpha \cdot \beta = 0$.*

Proof. There exists $\rho \in \partial B^*$ such that $S \subseteq \rho^*$. By Lemma 3.9, there exist measured sublaminations $\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_\beta$ of λ_ρ , of classes α, β . Let du_α, du_β be their Ruelle–Sullivan currents, and suppose that x is in the union of their supports. If N denotes the leaf of λ_ρ containing x , then for $\sigma = \alpha, \beta$,

$$du_\sigma(x) = \mathbf{n}_N^b(x) \mu_\sigma(x)$$

where μ_σ is given by (2.3). In particular, $du_\alpha|_{\text{supp } du_\beta}$ is a (possibly distributional) scalar field times du_β , so $du_\alpha \wedge du_\beta = 0$, hence $\alpha \cdot \beta = 0$. \square

Corollary 6.2. *Let M be a homotopy torus. The stable unit ball of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ is strictly convex.*

6.2. Perimeter-minimizing sets. We recall an estimate on sets which minimize their perimeters. See [Giu84, Chapter 5] for the proof when M is an open subset of euclidean space. In this section only, we shall not assume that M is closed, or $d \leq 7$.

A Borel set $U \subseteq M$ is *perimeter-minimizing* if 1_U is a function of least gradient.

Lemma 6.3. *There are constants $\delta, c > 0$ which only depend on d such that the following holds: Suppose that M is a Riemannian manifold of bounded curvature, and U is a perimeter-minimizing set. Suppose that $0 < r \leq \delta \|\text{Riem}_M\|_{C^0}^{-1/2}$ and $\text{dist}(x, \partial M) > r$. Then*

$$\text{vol}(U \cap B(x, r)) \geq cr^d. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. If we take δ small enough, then we can approximate $B(x, r)$ by a euclidean ball so well that, by the euclidean isoperimetric inequality, for every $0 < \rho \leq r$,

$$\text{vol}(\partial(U \cap B(x, \rho))) \geq \frac{1}{2c_d} \text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho))^{\frac{d-1}{d}},$$

where $c_d > 0$ is the euclidean isoperimetric constant. We can reason as in the proof of [Giu84, Proposition 5.14] to see that for almost every $0 < \rho < r$,

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} \text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}(\partial(U \cap B(x, \rho))) \geq \frac{1}{4c_d} \text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho))^{\frac{d-1}{d}}.$$

Let $f(\rho) := \text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho))^{1/d}$, so that

$$f'(\rho) = \frac{\text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho))^{\frac{d-1}{d}}}{d} \frac{d}{d\rho} \text{vol}(U \cap B(x, \rho)) \geq \frac{1}{4dc_d}.$$

Therefore $f(\rho) \geq \rho/(4dc_d)$, as desired. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that M is a complete Riemannian manifold of bounded curvature. For every unbounded perimeter-minimizing set $U \subseteq M$, $\text{vol}(U) = \infty$.*

Proof. Let $r := \min(1, \delta \|\text{Riem}_M\|_{C^0}^{-1/2})$ where δ is as in the previous lemma. Since U is unbounded, there is an infinite $2r$ -separated set $S \subset U$. Then the set $U \cap \bigcup_{x \in S} B(x, r)$ has infinite volume by (6.1). \square

6.3. The universal abelian cover. Let $\Gamma := \pi_1(M)$. If $\hat{M} \rightarrow M$ is a Galois covering space, let $\text{Gal}(\hat{M}, M)$ be the Galois group of deck transformations of $\hat{M} \rightarrow M$, so $\Gamma = \text{Gal}(\hat{M}, M)$, and let $(\Gamma^{(n)})$ be the derived series of Γ . Thus $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is a normal subgroup of Γ , and $\Gamma/\Gamma^{(1)}$ is the universal abelian quotient of Γ . The *universal abelian covering space* of M , $\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}} \rightarrow M$, is the Galois covering space such that

$$\text{Gal}(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, M) = \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma^{(1)}} = H_1(M, \mathbf{Z}). \quad (6.2)$$

Since $\Gamma/\Gamma^{(1)}$ is the universal abelian quotient of Γ and \mathbf{R} is abelian, for every $\alpha \in \text{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbf{R})$, α factors uniquely through a homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathbf{R} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \alpha^{\text{ab}} & \\ \Gamma/\Gamma^{(1)} & & \end{array}$$

Therefore every α -equivariant function u on \tilde{M} descends to an α^{ab} -equivariant function on \tilde{M}^{ab}

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{M} & \xrightarrow{u} & \mathbf{R} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow u^{\text{ab}} & \\ \tilde{M}^{\text{ab}} & & \end{array}$$

We shall be interested in the case that $\Gamma^{(1)}/\Gamma^{(2)}$ is a torsion group; in other words, $\text{Hom}(\Gamma^{(1)}, \mathbf{R}) = 0$. But $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is the fundamental group of \tilde{M}^{ab} , so this condition just means that $H^1(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, \mathbf{R}) = 0$.

The next two lemmata appeared in the draft of Auer and Bangert [AB12]. Since this draft is not publicly available, or complete, we reproduce them here with full credit to the original authors.

Lemma 6.5 ([AB12]). *Let u be an α -equivariant function of least gradient on \tilde{M} . Then the set $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ is connected.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ is disconnected. Then α is nonzero: if $\alpha = 0$, then u descends to a function of least gradient on M , which is constant since M is closed, and then $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ is either empty or M , a contradiction.

Let F be a fundamental domain of M in \tilde{M}^{ab} . Since $u^{\text{ab}} \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty$ [G620, Theorem 4.3] and F is compact, there exists $t_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $u > t_0$ on F . Using (6.2) to interpret $H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ as the group of deck transformations of \tilde{M}^{ab} , let

$$H := \bigcup_{\substack{\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > t - t_0}} \rho(F).$$

For every $x \in H$, there exists $\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ and $y \in F$, $x = \rho(y)$, and then

$$u^{\text{ab}}(x) = u^{\text{ab}}(y) + \langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > t_0 + t - t_0 = t$$

so $H \subseteq \{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$.

Since H is the set of translations of the connected fundamental domain F by a half-space in the deck group, H is connected. But $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ is disconnected, so there must be a connected component X of $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ which is disjoint from H . For any $\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ such that $\langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > 0$, ρ sends $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ into itself, since for every $x \in \{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$,

$$u^{\text{ab}}(\rho(x)) = u^{\text{ab}}(x) + \langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > t + 0 = t.$$

In particular, ρ sends X into a component of $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$. Thus there are two cases to consider:

(1-1) There exists $\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ such that $\langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > 0$, but $\rho(X) \subseteq X$.

(1-2) For every $\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ such that $\langle \alpha, \rho \rangle > 0$, $\rho(X)$ is a subset of a component of $\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ which is not X .

In case (1-1), there exists $x \in X$ and $\theta \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ such that $\theta(x) \in F$; then, for m large,

$$\langle \alpha, m\rho - \theta \rangle > t - t_0,$$

so $m\rho(x) \in H$. Therefore $m\rho(X)$ meets H , so X meets H , a contradiction.

In case (1-2), let \hat{M} be the minimal covering space on which u descends to a function $\hat{u} : \hat{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, thus $\text{Gal}(\hat{M}, M) = \Gamma/\ker(\alpha)$. Then \hat{u} has least gradient, and X descends to a component \hat{X} of $\{\hat{u} > y\}$. Then the projection $\psi : \hat{M} \rightarrow M$ restricts to an injective map $\hat{X} \rightarrow M$. Indeed, if $x_1, x_2 \in \hat{X}$ and $\psi(x_1) = \psi(x_2)$, then there exists $\rho \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})/\ker(\alpha)$ such that $\psi(x_1) = x_2$. If ρ is nonzero, then after switching the roles of x_1, x_2 as necessary, we may assume that ρ is represented by some $\bar{\rho} \in H_1(M, \mathbf{Z})$ such that $\langle \alpha, \bar{\rho} \rangle > 0$, a contradiction.

By a straightforward generalization of [BGG69, Theorem 1], \hat{X} is perimeter-minimizing. If \hat{X} is bounded, then $\partial\hat{X}$ is competing with the empty set and hence is empty, a contradiction; so \hat{X} is unbounded and therefore has infinite volume by Lemma 6.4. But ψ is an isometry, so $\psi_*(\hat{X})$ is an infinite-volume subset of the closed manifold M , a contradiction. \square

Lemma 6.6 ([AB12]). *Let u be an α -equivariant function of least gradient on \tilde{M} , and let \mathcal{G} be a set of curves in \tilde{M}^{ab} which spans $H_1(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, \mathbf{R})$. If $\partial\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ misses every curve in \mathcal{G} , then $\partial\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ is connected.*

Proof. We reason by contrapositive. Let N_1, N_2 be two distinct components of $\partial\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$. By Lemma 6.5 (and the analogous result for sublevel sets), $\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}} \setminus \partial\{u^{\text{ab}} > t\}$ has two components E_1, E_2 . We construct a curve γ , transverse to N_1 , which starts at a point $x \in N_1$, passes through E_1 , crosses N_2 into E_2 , and then returns to x . In particular γ meets N_1 at a single point, so their intersection number $[\gamma] \cdot [N_1] = 1$ (possibly after reorienting). Therefore $[\gamma]$ is a nontrivial class in $H_1(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, \mathbf{R})$. \square

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose that $H^1(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, \mathbf{R}) = 0$. Then the stable unit ball of $H_{d-1}(M, \mathbf{R})$ is strictly convex.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Let B be the stable unit ball. If B is not strictly convex, then there exists $\rho \in \partial B^*$ such that ρ^* is not singleton. In particular, there are two distinct extreme points $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{E}(\rho^*)$, and by Corollary 1.3, we can find distinct ergodic measured oriented sublaminations $\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_\beta$ of λ_ρ . Let u_α, u_β be primitives of the Ruelle-Sullivan currents on \tilde{M} ; by equivariance, they drop to functions $u_\alpha^{\text{ab}}, u_\beta^{\text{ab}}$ on the universal abelian cover \tilde{M}^{ab} .

There must exist leaves N_α of κ_α , and N_β of κ_β , which are distinct. If this is not true, then both $\kappa_\alpha, \kappa_\beta$ are the same closed hypersurface, and in particular $\alpha = \beta$, a contradiction. In particular, by adding constants to u_α and u_β , we may assume that $\partial\{u_\alpha > 0\}$ and $\partial\{u_\beta > 0\}$ descend to distinct leaves of the covering lamination $\tilde{\lambda}_\rho^{\text{ab}}$. As sets, $\partial\{u_\alpha > 0\}$ and $\partial\{u_\beta > 0\}$ are boundaries and therefore are closed; they are also disjoint, since they are distinct leaves of the same lamination. Therefore they are separated by open sets.

Since $\star|du_\alpha|$ and $\star|du_\beta|$ are elements of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$, so is their mean, which can be expressed as $\star|du|$ where $u := (u_\alpha + u_\beta)/2$. In particular, u has least gradient, and

$$\partial\{u > 0\} = \partial\{u_\alpha > 0\} \cup \partial\{u_\beta > 0\}$$

and since the right hand side is separated by open sets, $\partial\{u > 0\}$ is disconnected. So by Proposition 6.6, $H_1(\tilde{M}^{\text{ab}}, \mathbf{R})$ is nonzero. \square

7. THE CANONICAL LAMINATION ON A SURFACE

In this section we assume $d = 2$. This situation is more favorable and more closely analogous to Teichmüller theory, because calibrations can be viewed as derivatives of Lipschitz functions [DU24b].

7.1. The stretch locus. Let F be an L^∞ k -form and $x \in M$. Then F is not defined pointwise, but if we set

$$|F(x)| := \inf_{r>0} \|F\|_{L^\infty(B(x,r))}$$

then $|F|$ is upper semicontinuous, and if $F = du$ where u is a Lipschitz function, then $|F(x)|$ is the *local Lipschitz constant* of u at x [Cra08, §4].

For each $\rho \in H^1(M, \mathbf{R})$ such that $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$, we construct a calibration F in ρ which satisfies $|F| = 1$ exactly on the canonical lamination λ_ρ . This is a technical fact that we shall need in the proof of Theorem 1.6. The strategy of the proof is based on that of [GK17, Lemma 5.2] which establishes a similar result where F is the derivative of a map v between hyperbolic surfaces such that $1 < \text{Lip}(v) < \infty$. However, our situation is much simpler, as we do not have to deal with considerations related to curvature comparison.

Let u be a ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function on \tilde{M} such that $\text{Lip}(u) = 1$. The *stretch locus* of u is the set $E_u := \{|du| = 1\}$. For every set F , let $\delta_F := \{(x, x) : x \in F\}$ denote the diagonal over F . The *enhanced stretch locus* of u is

$$E_u^\sharp := \delta_{E_u} \cup \{(x, y) \in M^2 \setminus \delta_M : |u(x) - u(y)| = \text{dist}(x, y)\}.$$

Since $|du|$ is upper-semicontinuous, the stretch locus is a nonempty closed set, which is the projection of the enhanced stretch locus.

Let E be the intersection of all stretch loci of ρ -equivariant functions u with $\text{Lip}(u) = 1$. Thus E is a closed set which contains the canonical lamination λ_ρ . Let E^\sharp be the intersection of the enhanced stretch loci.

Lemma 7.1 ([GK17, Lemma 4.13]). *There exists a ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function u such that $\text{Lip}(u) = 1$ and $E_u^\sharp = E^\sharp$.*

Lemma 7.2. *Let K be a nonempty closed subset of M and φ a nonconstant Lipschitz function on K . Then for every $p \in M \setminus K$ there exists $q \in \mathbf{R}$ such that:*

(1) *Among all real numbers, q minimizes*

$$C_q := \max_{k \in K} \frac{|q - \varphi(k)|}{\text{dist}(p, k)}$$

(2) *There exist $k_1, k_2 \in K$ such that $|q - \varphi(k_i)| = C_q \text{dist}(p, k_i)$ and $\varphi(k_1) < q < \varphi(k_2)$.*

Proof. Since K is compact, the maximum in the definition of $C_{q'}$ is well-defined for any $q' \in \mathbf{R}$; since $q' \mapsto C_{q'}$ is a coercive convex function, it has a minimum at some q , and since φ is nonconstant, $C_q > 0$. Let K' be the set of maxima in the definition of C_q ; then K' and so $\varphi_*(K')$ is compact. Choose $k_1, k_2 \in K'$ so that $\varphi(k_1)$ is the minimum and $\varphi(k_2)$ is the maximum. Clearly $\varphi(k_1) \leq q$, and if equality holds then $C_q = 0$, a contradiction; so $\varphi(k_1) < q$, and similarly $\varphi(k_2) > q$. \square

Lemma 7.3. *There exists a ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function u such that $\text{Lip}(u) = 1$ and*

$$E_u = E = \text{supp } \lambda_\rho.$$

Proof. First observe that $\text{supp } \lambda_\rho \subseteq E$. Let u be as in Lemma 7.1, so that $E_u^\sharp = E^\sharp$ and (since the projection of E_v^\sharp is E_v for every ρ -equivariant v with $\text{Lip}(v) = 1$) $E_u = E$.

For every $p \in E_u$, we shall find a complete geodesic γ through p such that du calibrates γ . So for any geodesic segment $[y, z]$ of γ , $(y, z) \in E_u^\sharp$. Let v be a ρ -equivariant function such that $\text{Lip}(v) = 1$. Then $(y, z) \in E_v^\sharp$; since $[y, z]$ was arbitrary, dv calibrates γ . Since v was arbitrary, we conclude that γ is a leaf of λ_ρ . So $E_u \subseteq \text{supp } \lambda_\rho$, completing the proof.

To construct the geodesic γ , let $i > 0$ be the injectivity radius of M and $r := i/10$; since r is so small, we can work inside M . Let q, C_q, k_1, k_2 be given by Lemma 7.2 with $K := \partial B(p, r)$ and $\varphi := u|_K$. By minimality of C_q ,

$$C_q \leq C_{u(p)} = \max_{k \in \partial B(p, r)} \frac{|u(p) - u(k)|}{\text{dist}(p, k)} \leq \text{Lip}(u) = 1.$$

If $C_q < 1$, then for $r' > 0$ so small that $rC_q \leq r - r'$, the extension u' of $u|_{\partial B(p, r)}$ to $B(p, r') \cup \partial B(p, r)$ which is identically q on $B(p, r')$ has Lipschitz constant ≤ 1 . To see this, observe that we already know that $\text{Lip}(u'|_{\partial B(p, r)}) \leq 1$ and $B(u'|_{B(p, r')}) = 0$, so we just have to check that for every $x \in \partial B(p, r)$ and $y \in B(p, r')$,

$$|q - u'(x)| \leq \text{dist}(y, x). \quad (7.1)$$

We only have to prove (7.1) when $\text{dist}(y, x)$ is as small as possible – that is, when y lies on the geodesic segment $[p, x]$, so that $\text{dist}(y, x) = r - r'$. This proves (7.1), since

$$|q - u'(x)| \leq rC_q \leq r - r' = \text{dist}(y, x).$$

We can extend u' to a ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function on \tilde{M} such that $\text{Lip}(u') \leq 1$. But then $p \notin E_{u'}$ and so $p \notin E_u$, a contradiction. So $C_q = 1$.

In particular, $|q - u(k_i)| = \text{dist}(p, k_i)$. Thus

$$\text{dist}(k_1, k_2) \leq \text{dist}(p, k_1) + \text{dist}(p, k_2) = u(k_2) - u(k_1) \leq \text{dist}(k_1, k_2)$$

implying that $u(k_2) - u(k_1) = \text{dist}(k_1, k_2)$, and so the geodesic segment $[k_1, k_2]$ is calibrated by du and $p \in [k_1, k_2]$. Repeating the above argument with p replaced by k_i , we continue to extend the

geodesic segment through p which is calibrated by du by length r , until we have extended it to a complete geodesic γ , as desired. \square

7.2. A canonical measure on the canonical lamination. For $1 < p < \infty$, the p -Laplacian is the PDE

$$\Delta_p u := d^*(|du|^{p-2} du) = 0$$

where u is a scalar field and the differential operator Δ_p should be understood in the weak divergence-form sense [Lin19]. If $\Delta_p u = 0$, we say that u is p -harmonic (so u is harmonic iff u is 2-harmonic). If U is a suitably regular domain and $u \in W^{1,p}(U)$, then u is p -harmonic iff u minimizes its p -energy $\int_U \star |du|^p$ among all functions in $W^{1,p}(U)$ with the same trace along ∂U .

Let $\|\rho\|_\infty = 1$. There exists a unique (up to constants) ρ -equivariant p -harmonic function v_p [DU24b, §2]. Then we have representations $\alpha_q : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and q -harmonic functions ($1/p + 1/q = 1$),

$$du_q = \star |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p,$$

which are α_q -equivariant on the universal cover \tilde{M} . After we renormalize u_q appropriately, then $u_q \xrightarrow{*} u$ in BV as $q \rightarrow 1$, where u is a function of least gradient [DU24b, Theorem 6.10]. In particular, du is a Ruelle-Sullivan current for a measure in $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$.

Definition 7.4. Let v_p be the ρ -equivariant p -harmonic function. If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$ is the total variation measure of a function u of least gradient, which is the limit of q -harmonic functions u_q , such that du_q is proportional to $|dv_p|^{p-2} \star dv_p$, then we say that μ is 1^+ -harmonic.

We are interested in characterizing 1^+ -harmonic measures. The intuition is that such a measure μ should be obtained by “averaging over the ergodic measures in a way that maximizes the entropy of μ .” Of course in general there is no good way to do this, because there may be infinitely many ergodic measures. Nevertheless we can search for uniqueness criteria in special cases, and we have the following theorem, the ideas for which appeared in [DU22].

Theorem 7.5. *Suppose that M is a closed hyperbolic surface, and λ_ρ consists of finitely many closed geodesics $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$. Let ν_i be the unique measure in $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$ supported on γ_i , let ℓ_i be the length of γ_i , and $\ell := \sum_i \ell_i$. Then there is a unique 1^+ -harmonic measure μ , which is*

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\ell_i}{\ell} \nu_i.$$

The idea behind the proof, which already appeared in [DU22], is to approximate v_p by a function w on a neighborhood V of $\text{supp } \lambda_\rho$ which is ∞ -harmonic, meaning that

$$\langle \nabla^2 w, dw \otimes dw \rangle = 0.$$

Furthermore, we shall extend w to all of \mathbf{H}^2 so that the stretch locus of w is $\text{supp } \lambda_\rho$. In order to construct w , let $\delta > 0$ be a sufficiently small parameter depending on M, ρ , let U_i be the tubular neighborhood of γ_i of radius 2δ , and let

$$\rho_i : \pi_1(U_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$$

be the representation of $\pi_1(U_i) \cong \mathbf{Z}$ which sends γ_i to $1/\ell_i$. If γ_i has length ℓ_i , then in the cylindrical coordinates³ (x, θ) on U_i with $\gamma_i = \{x = 0\}$, the Riemannian metric is

$$dx^2 + \ell_i^2 \cosh^2 x d\theta^2. \tag{7.2}$$

Now we introduce the ρ_i -equivariant function on \tilde{U}_i ,

$$w_i(x, \theta) := \frac{\theta}{\ell_i}.$$

³We take the convention that \mathbf{S}^1 has unit circumference.

Observe that

$$|dw_i|(x, \theta)^2 = \frac{|d\theta|^2}{\ell_i^2} = \operatorname{sech}^2 x \quad (7.3)$$

so in particular $\|dw_i\|_{L^\infty} = 1$ and dw_i calibrates γ_i .

Lemma 7.6. *For every $1 < p \leq \infty$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, the function w_i is the solution of the Neumann problem*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_p w = 0 \text{ on } \tilde{U}_i, & (7.4a) \\ \langle dw, \mathbf{n}_{U_i} \rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial \tilde{U}_i, & (7.4b) \\ w \text{ is } \rho_i\text{-equivariant.} & (7.4c) \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the same result holds if we decrease δ .

Proof. Since $\mathbf{n}_{U_i} = \partial_x/|\partial_x|$, w_i satisfies the boundary conditions independently of δ . By (7.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_p w_i &= (p-2)|dw_i|^{p-4} \Delta_\infty w_i + |dw_i|^2 \Delta w_i \\ &= (p-2)|dw_i|^{p-4} \frac{1}{\ell_i^3} \langle \nabla d\theta, d\theta \otimes d\theta \rangle + |dw_i|^2 \partial_\theta \left(\frac{\operatorname{sech} x}{\ell_i} \partial_\theta w \right) \\ &= \frac{p-2}{\ell_i^2} |dw_i|^{p-4} \partial_\theta (\operatorname{sech} x) + |dw_i|^2 \frac{\Gamma_{\theta\theta}}{\ell_i^3} \operatorname{sech}^4 x \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 7.7. *There exist $\varepsilon, \delta' > 0$ and a ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function w on \mathbf{H}^2 , and open sets V_i such that:*

- (1) $V_i = \{(x, \theta) \in U_i : |x| < \delta'\}$.
- (2) $w|_{\tilde{V}_i} = w_i$.
- (3) Let $V := \bigcup_i V_i$. Then

$$\|dw\|_{L^\infty(M \setminus V)} = 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. Let f be the ρ -equivariant Lipschitz function constructed in Lemma 7.3. Since there is no leaf of λ_ρ which is arbitrarily close to γ_i , $|df(x, \theta)| < 1$ for $\delta/2 \leq |x| \leq \delta$ if δ is small enough. So by the upper-semicontinuity of $|df|$, there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$, such that in the cylindrical coordinates around U_i ,

$$\sup_{\delta/2 < |x| < 2\delta} |df(x, \theta)| = 1 - \varepsilon'.$$

We can take ε' independent of i since k is finite.

There exists $\delta' > 0$, depending on δ, ε' such that $k := 1 + 2\delta'/\delta$ satisfies $k^2 \leq 1/(1 - \varepsilon')$. Let

$$\psi(x) := \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \begin{cases} 0, & |x| \leq \delta' \\ \frac{|x| - \delta'}{2}, & \delta' \leq |x| \leq 3\delta' \\ |x| - 2\delta', & 3\delta' \leq |x| \leq \delta \\ 2\delta - k(2\delta - |x|), & \delta \leq |x| \leq 2\delta, \end{cases}$$

which is a continuous function. If $(x, \theta) \in \tilde{U}_i$, define

$$(1-1) \quad w(x, \theta) := f(\psi(x), \theta).$$

$$(1-2) \quad V_i := \{(x, \theta) \in U_i : |x| < \delta'\}.$$

Since γ_i is a leaf of λ_ρ , df calibrates γ_i . But dw_i also calibrates γ_i , so up to a rotation of θ (which we apply to w_i), $w_i = f$ on γ_i . It follows easily that $w = w_i$ on V_i . Furthermore:

$$(2-1) \quad \text{If } \delta' < |x| < 3\delta' \text{ then, since } \psi'(x) = 1/2 \text{ and } |df| \leq 1, |dw| \leq 1/2.$$

$$(2-2) \quad \text{If } 3\delta' < |x| < \delta, \text{ then } (\psi(x), \theta) \in U_i \setminus V_i. \text{ Since } |df| \leq 1 - \varepsilon' \text{ on } U_i \setminus V_i \text{ and } \psi'(x) = 1, |dw| \leq 1 - \varepsilon'.$$

(2-3) If $\delta < |x| < 2\delta$, then $(\psi(x), \theta) \in U_i \setminus V_i$. Again $|df| \leq 1 - \varepsilon'$ on $U_i \setminus V_i$, but now $\psi'(x) = k \leq (1 - \varepsilon')^{-1/2}$. So $|dw| \leq (1 - \varepsilon')^{1/2}$.

Therefore $\|dw\|_{L^\infty(U_i \setminus V_i)} < 1$. If $y \notin U$, let $w(y) := f(y)$. Again we use the upper-semicontinuity of $|df|$ to see that $\|dw\|_{L^\infty(M \setminus U)} < 1$. \square

Now we are ready to see that w is a good approximation to v_p when p is large. Since w solves the Neumann problem on \tilde{V}_i and v_p is ρ -equivariant,

$$\int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p \leq \int_{V_i} \star |dv_p|^p. \quad (7.6)$$

Since v_p solves the Neumann problem on the entirety of M ,

$$\int_M \star |dv_p|^p \leq \int_M \star |dw|^p. \quad (7.7)$$

Combining this inequality with (7.6) and (7.5), we see that

$$\int_{M \setminus V} \star |dv_p|^p \leq \int_{M \setminus V} \star |dw|^p \lesssim (1 - \varepsilon)^p. \quad (7.8)$$

Lemma 7.8. *As $p \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int_{V_i} \star |dv_p|^p = (1 + o(1)) \int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p.$$

Proof. Let $U := \bigcup_i U_i$ and $\chi \in C_{\text{cpt}}^\infty(U, \mathbf{R}_+)$ satisfy $\chi = 1$ on V . We integrate the p -Laplacian by parts against $\chi(v_p - w)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_U \star \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, d((v_p - w)\chi) \rangle \\ &= \int_U \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dv_p - dw \rangle \star \chi + \int_{U \setminus V} \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, d\chi \rangle \star (v_p - w). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this equation with the Hölder and Poincaré inequalities and (7.8), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_U \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dv_p - dw \rangle \star \chi \\ &\leq \left| \int_{U \setminus V} \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, d\chi \rangle \star (v_p - w) \right| \\ &\leq \|d\chi\|_{C^0(M)} \|v_p - w\|_{L^p(M \setminus V)} \left(\int_{M \setminus V} \star |dv_p|^p \right)^{1/q} \\ &\lesssim \|d\chi\|_{L^\infty(M)} (\|dv_p\|_{L^p(M)} + \|dw\|_{L^\infty(M)}) (1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q} \\ &\lesssim (1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}, \end{aligned}$$

where the implied constants may depend on M, δ, ρ but not p . We apply this estimate to further estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V \star |dv_p|^p &\leq \int_U |dv_p|^p \star \chi \\ &\leq \int_U \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dw \rangle \star \chi + O((1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}) \\ &\leq \int_V \star \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dw \rangle + \int_{U \setminus V} \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dw \rangle \star \chi + O((1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}). \end{aligned}$$

We deal with the integral over $U \setminus V$ first. By Hölder's inequality and (7.8), we have

$$\int_{U \setminus V} \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dw \rangle \star \chi \leq \|dv_p\|_{L^p(U \setminus V)}^{p/q} \|dw\|_{L^p(U \setminus V)} \leq \int_{M \setminus V} \star |dw|^p \lesssim (1 - \varepsilon)^p.$$

So the integral over $U \setminus V$ can be absorbed into the error term. By yet another application of Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_V \star |dv_p|^p &\leq \int_V \star \langle |dv_p|^{p-2} dv_p, dw \rangle + O((1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}) \\ &\leq \|dv_p\|_{L^p(V)}^{p/q} \|dw\|_{L^p(V)} + O((1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}). \end{aligned}$$

We rearrange this estimate to find $C > 0$ independent of p such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|dv_p\|_{L^p(V)} &\leq \|dw\|_{L^p(V)} + C \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}}{(\int_V \star |dv_p|^p)^{1/q}} \\ &= \|dw\|_{L^p(V)} \left(1 + C \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}}{(\int_V \star |dv_p|^p)^{1/q} \|dw\|_{L^p(V)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (7.6),

$$\int_V \star |dw|^p \leq \|dw\|_{L^p(U)} \left(\int_V \star |dv_p|^p \right)^{1/q}.$$

We recall that $\|dw\|_{L^\infty(V)} = 1$, so that if p is large enough, $\|dw\|_{L^p(V)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon/2$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left[\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}}{(\int_V \star |dv_p|^p)^{1/q} \|dw\|_{L^p(V)}} \right] &\leq \log \left[\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^{p/q}}{\int_V \star |dw|^p} \right] \\ &= \frac{p}{q} (1 - \varepsilon) - p \|dw\|_{L^p(V)} \\ &\leq p \left(\frac{1}{q} - 1 \right) (1 - \varepsilon) + p(1 - \varepsilon) - p \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \\ &= \varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{p}{2} \right) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking $A := e^\varepsilon > 1$, we have

$$\|dv_p\|_{L^p(V)} \leq \|dw\|_{L^p(V)} (1 + O(A^{-p/2})). \quad (7.9)$$

The estimate

$$\log((1 + O(A^{-p/2}))^p) = p \log(1 + O(A^{-p/2})) \lesssim pA^{-p/2}$$

shows that if we take p th powers in (7.9), we get

$$\int_V \star |dv_p|^p \leq \exp(O(pA^{-p/2})) \int_V \star |dw|^p = (1 + o(1)) \int_V \star |dw|^p.$$

Applying (7.6), we see that this inequality holds with V replaced by V_i , and that the converse inequality holds. \square

Lemma 7.9. *One has*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p}{\int_M \star |dw|^p} = \frac{\ell_i}{\ell}.$$

Proof. First we observe that by (7.3) and (7.2), the p -energy of w in the cylinder V_i is

$$\int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p = \int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'} \int_{\mathbf{S}^1} \operatorname{sech}^p x \ell_i \cosh x \, d\theta \, dx = \ell_i \int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'} \operatorname{sech}^{p-1} x \, dx. \quad (7.10)$$

Combining this with (7.5), we see that

$$\int_M \star |dw|^p = \ell \int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'} \operatorname{sech}^{p-1} x \, dx + O((1-\varepsilon)^p). \quad (7.11)$$

By a Taylor expansion, we see that if $x^2 < 1/p$ then $\operatorname{sech}^{p-1} x > 1/2$, so if $p > (\delta')^2$ then

$$\int_{-\delta'}^{\delta'} \operatorname{sech}^{p-1} x \, dx \geq p^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p}{\int_M \star |dw|^p} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_i}{\ell + O(p^{1/2}(1-\varepsilon)^p)} = \frac{\ell_i}{\ell}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 7.5. Let $B(p) := \int_M \star |dv_p|^p$, and let

$$du_q := B(p)^{-1} |dv_p|^{p-2} \star dv_p.$$

As $q \rightarrow 1$, $u_q \rightharpoonup^* u$ in BV along a subsequence, where $\mu := \star |du|$ is a transverse probability measure to λ_ρ [DU24b, Theorem 7.15]. Recalling that $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho)$ is a convex polytope with vertices ν_i , where ν_i are transverse probability measures to γ_i , we deduce the existence of $c_i \in [0, 1]$ with $\sum_i c_i = 1$ and

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \nu_i.$$

By the fact that dv calibrates γ_i ,

$$c_i = \mu(V_i) = \int_{V_i} \star |du| = \int_{V_i} du \wedge dv.$$

We have $\|dv_p\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2$ for p large [DU24b, Proposition 2.8], and dually, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\|du_q\|_{L^1} \lesssim \|du_q\|_{L^q} \leq 1.$$

Testing against a function which is 1 near $\gamma_i = \operatorname{supp} dv \cap V_i$ and 0 near ∂V_i , we conclude from the BV div-curl lemma, Lemma 2.6, that

$$c_i = \int_{V_i} du \wedge dv = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \int_{V_i} du_q \wedge dv_p = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{B(p)} \int_{V_i} \star |dv_p|^p.$$

Let $A(p) := \int_M \star |dw|^p$. Then by Lemma 7.8, (7.7), and (7.8), $A(p) = (1 + o(1))B(p)$. Applying Lemma 7.8 again, and then Lemma 7.9, we conclude

$$c_i = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{A(p)} \int_{V_i} \star |dw|^p = \frac{\ell_i}{\ell}. \quad \square$$

8. EPILOGUE

8.1. Higher codimensions. Let $3 \leq d \leq 7$ and $1 \leq k \leq d-2$. What about constructing a canonical calibrated lamination of a class ρ in the costable unit sphere of $H^k(M, \mathbf{R})$? The case $k=1$ was studied in [Ban99] and resolved in [DU24b]. One can find a 1-form du representing ρ such that u is a locally defined ∞ -harmonic function. Then du calibrates a geodesic lamination κ which admits an oriented sublamination κ' with a transverse measure. It is then straightforward to show that there is a canonical lamination λ_ρ , with $\kappa' \subseteq \lambda_\rho \subseteq \kappa$, and it is highly likely that $\mathcal{M}(\lambda_\rho) = \rho^*$.

On the other hand, if $k \geq 2$, then one cannot construct a canonical calibrated lamination, because calibrated submanifolds may intersect each other. This is a particularly natural phenomenon in the presence of special holonomy. To give a simple example, consider $M = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{C}}^1 \times \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{C}}^1$, with Kähler

2-form ω induced by the Fubini-Study metric on $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$. Then ω calibrates both factors of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$, but they have nontrivial intersection.

8.2. Comparison with Auer and Bangert’s work. We compare the results in the present work to those in the research announcement of Auer and Bangert [AB01], and the incomplete draft, [AB12], of the proofs of the results that they claimed. Our work was closely inspired by [AB01], but we have only used one proof from [AB12]. In any case, I would like to again express gratitude to Victor Bangert for allowing me to read [AB12].

A key distinction is that we emphasize the role of the costable norm and the canonical lamination, which do not appear in [AB01; AB12]. So Theorems 1.2 and 1.6, and Corollary 1.3, have no analogue in [AB01; AB12]. Arguably, the correct framework for thinking about the stable norm (or at least the convexity properties of its unit ball) is the canonical lamination, and so our proof of Theorem 1.5 is simpler than its analogue in [AB12], though the basic ideas are the same.

Another distinction comes from our notation of lamination. In [AB01, Theorem 1], Auer and Bangert show that codimension 1, locally mass-minimizing currents correspond to measured oriented laminations by normal currents of zero mean curvature, without any assumption on the dimension, d , of M , though this must be understood in a suitably weak sense. We proved a similar result in [Bac24], but we assumed that $d \leq 7$, and showed that the resulting laminations have no singularities, and have Lipschitz regularity, and the space of such laminations has good compactness properties. This regularity is best possible even when $d = 2$, and allows us to avoid some technical details. On the other hand, it is unlikely that codimension-8 singularities are enough to block any of the theorems of this paper, so our assumption $d \leq 7$ is probably not really necessary.

The decomposition theorem for mass-minimizing laminations, [AB01, Theorem 2], is the conjunction of the Morgan–Shelan decomposition (Theorem 2.13) with the following result from [AB12], which does not correspond to any result in this work.

Theorem 8.1. *Let M be a closed oriented Riemannian manifold, let T be a closed, locally minimizing, normal 1-current on M , let λ be a lamination for which T is a Ruelle-Sullivan current, and let N be a leaf of λ . Then either N is a closed leaf, or the closure of N is an open subset of $\text{supp } \lambda$.*

In particular, if λ is a measured oriented mass-minimizing foliation, then λ does not have a dense leaf, a fact that would simplify the proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof of Theorem 8.1 is quite difficult, and involves estimates on the area growth of leaves of the pullback $\hat{\lambda}$ of λ to a covering space $\hat{M} \rightarrow M$ whose Galois group is a free abelian group. We have chosen not to use this theorem, since its proof is not publicly available and quoting it verbatim would significantly lengthen this paper, and it would only somewhat simplify the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Estimates on the number of homology classes which can appear as classes of ergodic sublaminations of a mass-minimizing measured oriented lamination, [AB01, Theorem 3] and the discussion afterwards, do not appear in [AB12]. The only such estimate we considered in this work is Lemma 5.5, which was used in the proof of Theorem 1.4, and whose proof closely follows [AL86] and does not use minimality. The idea to use [AL86] already appears in [AB01].

The ergodic decomposition of a mass-minimizing measured oriented lamination λ , [AB01, Theorem 4], is essentially the following theorem, combined with the fact that (by Theorem 8.1) λ is not a foliation with a dense leaf.

Theorem 8.2. *Let λ be an oriented lamination which is not a foliation with a dense leaf in a closed oriented Riemannian manifold. Then $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ is the set of ergodic measures transverse to sublaminations of λ .*

Proof. We have already seen that every extreme point of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is an ergodic measure and so we just need to show the converse. By the Morgan–Shelan decomposition, Theorem 2.13, we may reduce to the case that λ either has only closed leaves, or has no closed leaves. If λ has only closed

leaves, then every ergodic sublamination is a single leaf, and in particular cannot be written as a convex combination of any other ergodic sublaminations. Otherwise, λ has no closed leaves, so by Lemma 5.5, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ is finite, say $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$. For each $i \neq j$, there exists a saturated Borel set E_{ij} such that $\mu_i(E_{ij}) = 1$ but $\mu_j(E_{ij}) = 0$. In particular, if μ is not an extreme point and we write $\mu = \sum_i d_i \mu_i$, then there exist $i \neq j$ such that $d_i, d_j > 0$. Then $d_i \leq \mu(E_{ij}) \leq 1 - d_j$, so μ is not ergodic. \square

The last part of [AB01] is concerned with the strict convexity of the stable norm ball. Neither this work nor [AB12] establishes [AB01, Theorem 5], that if $d \geq 3$ then M admits a Riemannian metric with a strictly convex stable norm ball. The next result, [AB01, Theorem 6], relates intersection theory to the strict convexity. While a proof appears in [AB12], it takes a few pages, while the corresponding result here, Theorem 6.1, is an immediate consequence of the existence of the canonical lamination. Our argument is also conceptually clearer in that it fits nicely with the results of [Thu98], as discussed in §8.3. Finally, [AB01, Theorem 7] corresponds to Theorem 6.7, and while a proof does not appear in [AB12], the key ingredient, Lemma 6.6, does; we take no credit for the proof of that lemma, which is entirely due to [AB12].

8.3. Connection with Teichmüller theory. This work was motivated by an idea that the stable norm should behave analogously to the earthquake norm on the tangent space to Teichmüller space; we now explain this point.

Let M be a closed oriented surface of genus $g \geq 2$ and \mathcal{T}_g the Teichmüller space of hyperbolic structures on M . For each $\sigma, \rho \in \mathcal{T}_g$, the *stretch distance*, $\log L(\sigma, \rho)$, is the smallest Lipschitz constant of any map $(M, \sigma) \rightarrow (M, \rho)$ homotopic to id_M ; this is an asymmetric distance function.

In each free homotopy class α of closed curves in (M, σ) , there is a unique geodesic; we denote its length by $\ell_\alpha(\sigma)$. The *stretch norm* is an asymmetric norm on the tangent space $T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$ to Teichmüller space,

$$\|v\|_\infty := \sup_\alpha \langle d \log \ell_\alpha, v \rangle.$$

The next theorem shows that the stretch norm is an infinitesimal version of the stretch distance. We note carefully, however, that the stretch distance is not a Finsler metric; the stretch norm is not strictly convex.

Theorem 8.3 ([Thu98, Theorem 8.5]). *For each $\sigma, \rho \in \mathcal{T}_g$,*

$$L(\sigma, \rho) = \sup_\alpha \frac{\ell_\alpha(\rho)}{\ell_\alpha(\sigma)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 8.3 in [Thu98] proceeds by constructing the canonical maximally-stretched lamination $\lambda_{\sigma, \rho}$, defined in Theorem 1.1. By definition, any minimizing Lipschitz map $(M, \sigma) \rightarrow (M, \rho)$ must stretch the leaves of $\lambda_{\sigma, \rho}$ by a factor of $L(\sigma, \rho)$. On the other hand, any measured sublamination of $\lambda_{\sigma, \rho}$ can be approximated by closed geodesics in (M, σ) . Thus, in view of Theorem 1.2, one should think of L , or perhaps better the stretch norm, as analogous to the costable norm: it is realized by how an L^∞ -minimizing representative acts on the canonical lamination.

Thurston predicted that Theorem 8.3 should have “a simpler proof based on more general principles – in particular, the max flow min cut principle, convexity, and $L^0 \leftrightarrow L^\infty$ duality” which “fits into a context including L^p comparisons” [Thu98, Abstract]; such a proof was recently given by Daskalopoulos and Uhlenbeck, [DU24a]. They constructed a minimizing Lipschitz map $u : (M, \sigma) \rightarrow (M, \rho)$ as a limit of a certain p -Laplacian system as $p \rightarrow \infty$; by convex duality, they obtained a 1^+ -harmonic measure on the canonical lamination which is pushed forward by u by a factor of $L(\sigma, \rho)$. In upcoming work, they will also prove an analogue of Theorem 1.6:

Theorem 8.4. *Let $\sigma, \rho \in \mathcal{T}_g$, and assume that the canonical maximally-stretched lamination $\lambda_{\sigma, \rho}$ consists of finitely many closed leaves $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$. Then there is a unique 1^+ -harmonic measure μ on*

$\lambda_{\sigma,\rho}$. If ν_i is the unique transverse probability measure on γ_i , ℓ_i is the length of γ_i , and $\ell := \sum_i \ell_i$, then

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\ell_i}{\ell} \nu_i.$$

As in Theorem 1.6, the idea is to test against a canonical ∞ -harmonic map defined near the support of the canonical lamination. We do not know how to construct a similar map in general, but if one could carry out the construction, they would presumably verify the following:

Conjecture 8.5. *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$, and let μ be a 1^+ -harmonic measure on $\lambda_{\sigma,\rho}$ and assume that λ has infinitely many leaves. If $\lambda_{\sigma,\rho}$ has infinitely many leaves, then μ assigns 0 weight to every closed leaf of $\lambda_{\sigma,\rho}$.*

For any measured geodesic lamination λ in (M, σ) , one can cut (M, σ) along the leaves of λ , twist by some *magnitude* $t \in \mathbf{R}$, and reglue along the leaves of λ , to obtain an *earthquake*,

$$(M, \sigma) \rightarrow (M, E_t(\lambda, \sigma)).$$

The *earthquake path* generated by λ is the 1-parameter family of metrics $(E_t(\lambda, \sigma))$, and the initial velocity $E'_0(\lambda, \sigma)$ is called the *infinitesimal earthquake* of σ along λ .

Theorem 8.6 ([Ker85, Proposition 2.6]). *For every tangent vector $\alpha \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$, there is a unique measured geodesic lamination in (M, σ) whose infinitesimal earthquake is α .*

We identify measured geodesic laminations in (M, σ) with their infinitesimal earthquakes when no confusion can result. With this convention, the *earthquake norm* of $\alpha \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$, $\|\alpha\|_1$, is the mass⁴ $\mathbf{M}_\sigma(\alpha)$. Thus the earthquake norm is essentially a stable norm; in particular, if λ is a closed geodesic on (M, σ) , then $\|\alpha\|_1 = \ell_\alpha(\sigma)$. We abuse notation slightly and write $\ell_\alpha(\sigma) := \mathbf{M}_\sigma(\alpha)$ even if α is not a closed geodesic.

Let ω be the Weil-Petersson 2-form on \mathcal{T}_g . In view of the above discussion and the duality of the stable and costable norms, one should expect that the earthquake and stretch norms are dual, and this follows from the following theorem:

Theorem 8.7 ([Wol82, Theorem 2.10]). *For any $\alpha, v \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$,*

$$\omega(\alpha, v) = \langle d\ell_\alpha, v \rangle.$$

Viewing the hyperbolic structure σ as a homomorphism $\pi_1(M) \rightarrow SO(2, 1)$, we obtain the adjoint representation

$$\text{Ad}(\sigma) : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(2, 1).$$

Thus we obtain a flat Lie algebra bundle $\mathfrak{g}_\sigma \rightarrow M$ which is locally modeled on $\mathfrak{so}(2, 1)$ but twisted by $\text{Ad}(\sigma)$. Let ϖ be the Killing form on $\mathfrak{so}(2, 1)$. There is a canonical embedding $TM \subset \mathfrak{g}_\sigma$ such that for every $v \in T_x M$, $|v|^2 = \varpi(v, v)$ [DU22, Proposition 3.6].

Definition 8.8 ([DU24a, §3]). Let (λ, μ) be an (unoriented) measured geodesic lamination in (M, σ) . Let $(\Psi_a)_{a \in A}$ be a laminar atlas for λ , with local leaf spaces $(K_a)_{a \in A}$ and subordinate partition of unity $(\chi_a)_{a \in A}$. For each $x \in \text{supp } \lambda$, let $B_\lambda(x) \in (\mathfrak{g}_\sigma)_x$ be the image of the unit tangent vector to λ at x . Then, the *Lie-valued Ruelle-Sullivan current* of (λ, μ) , T , acts on $\varphi \in C^0(M, \Omega^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_\sigma)$ by

$$\int_M T \wedge \varphi := \sum_{a \in A} \int_{K_a} \int_{\{k\} \times [0, 1]} \Psi_a^*(\chi_a \varpi(\varphi, B_\lambda)) d\mu_a(k).$$

⁴Since mass is a sum of nonnegative locally defined quantities, it is well-defined even if α is unorientable.

Thus a Lie-valued Ruelle-Sullivan current is a \mathfrak{g}_σ -valued 1-current of finite mass, and is well-defined independently of a choice of orientation. Since $\mathfrak{g}_\sigma \rightarrow M$ is a flat bundle, it has a well-defined sheaf cohomology, $H^\bullet(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma)$. There is a canonical isomorphism $H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma) = T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$ which preserves measured geodesic laminations in the following sense. which has a well-defined cup product

$$\wedge : H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma) \times H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma) \rightarrow H^2(M, \mathbf{R})$$

thanks to ϖ . There is a canonical isomorphism $H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma) = T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$ which identifies the cup product with the Weil-Petersson 2-form ω , and preserves measured geodesic laminations in the following sense.

Theorem 8.9 ([DU24a, Theorem 1.6]). *Let (λ, μ) be a measured geodesic lamination in (M, σ) . Then the cohomology class of the Lie-valued Ruelle-Sullivan current of (λ, μ) in $H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma)$ is the infinitesimal earthquake along (λ, μ) in $T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$.*

Since taking cohomology classes preserves linear combinations, it follows that for every geodesic lamination λ in (M, σ) , the natural map $\mathcal{M}(\lambda) \rightarrow H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma)$ is an affine embedding of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ into the earthquake sphere. Therefore $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is a flat of the earthquake sphere. It follows from the proof of Theorem 8.2 that $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ is the set of ergodic measures transverse to sublaminations of λ .⁵

The flats of the earthquake sphere satisfy an analogue of Theorem 1.5:

Theorem 8.10 ([Hua+24, Theorem 6.1]). *Let $\alpha, \beta \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$ satisfy $\|\alpha\|_1 = \|\beta\|_1 = 1$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) α, β are contained in the same maximal flat of the earthquake unit sphere.
- (2) As measured geodesic laminations, α, β do not intersect transversely.

It is also true, but boring, that if $(\Gamma^{(n)})$ is the derived series of $\pi_1(M)$, and $\Gamma^{(1)}/\Gamma^{(2)}$ is a torsion group, then the earthquake sphere is strictly convex. Indeed, $\Gamma^{(1)}$ is a nonabelian free group! And sure enough, by Theorem 8.10, the earthquake sphere is not strictly convex.

If α, β do not intersect transversely, then $\alpha \wedge \beta = 0$ as Lie-valued currents, so $\omega(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. So by Theorem 8.10 and the fact that ω is symplectic, every earthquake flat F is contained in a $3g - 3$ -dimensional subspace of $T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$. We thus have an analogue of Theorem 1.4:

Corollary 8.11. *Let $F \subset T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$ be a maximal flat of the earthquake unit sphere. Then:*

- (1) There exists a geodesic lamination λ such that $F = \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$.
- (2) F has at most $3g - 3$ vertices.

Proof. Let (α_i) be a dense sequence in F . By Theorem 8.10, if we let $\lambda_i := \bigcup_{j \leq i} \text{supp } \alpha_j$, then λ_i is (the support of) a geodesic lamination such that $\lambda_i \subseteq \lambda_{i+1}$. Taking the limit (say, in the Vietoris topology), λ_i converges to a lamination λ for which $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. Since $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is compact, $F \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$, and since F is maximal, $\mathcal{M}(\lambda) \subseteq F$. Since $\mathcal{E}(F) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ is a linearly independent subset of a $3g - 3$ -dimensional vector space, it follows that its cardinality is at most $3g - 3$. \square

The analogy between the stable and earthquake norms motivates a conjecture. Suppose that $v \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g$, $\|v\|_\infty = 1$, and

$$v^* := \{\alpha \in T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g : \omega(\alpha, v) = \|\alpha\|_1 = 1\}.$$

Assuming for a second that the stretch metric has an exponential map

$$\exp_\sigma : T_\sigma \mathcal{T}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g, \tag{8.1}$$

which is smooth away from 0, and recalling Corollary 1.3, we would like to prove that

$$v^* = \mathcal{M}(\lambda_{\sigma, \exp_\sigma(v)}). \tag{8.2}$$

⁵In Theorem 8.2 it was assumed that λ is orientable, but since $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ embeds in the finite-dimensional space $H^1(M, \mathfrak{g}_\sigma)$, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda))$ is finite, which is all one really needs.

Informally, this would assert that a measured geodesic lamination α is stretched by an extremal Lipschitz map “in the direction v ” iff α is “infinitesimally stretched in the direction v ”. However, as we have already observed, the stretch metric is not a Finsler metric, and it is not clear that there is a unique smooth unit-speed geodesic $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_g$ such that $\gamma(0) = \sigma$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$. In particular, \exp_σ is possibly ill-defined.

We conjecture that there is a way to define the exponential map (8.1) of the stretch metric in such a way that (8.2) holds, and that \exp_σ is surjective. One possibility is that it may be possible to define \exp_σ to have these properties, and in addition impose that $t \mapsto \exp_\sigma(tv)$ is a *harmonic stretch line* in the sense of Pan and Wolf [PW22]. If so, this is strong evidence that the harmonic stretch lines are the “natural” choices of geodesic for the stretch metric. But at this stage we do not know enough about the structure of harmonic stretch lines to prove this conjecture.

REFERENCES

- [AB01] F. Auer and V. Bangert. “Minimising currents and the stable norm in codimension one”. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences - Series I - Mathematics* 333.12 (2001), 1095–1100. ISSN: 0764-4442. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4442\(01\)02188-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4442(01)02188-7). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0764444201021887>.
- [AB12] F. Auer and V. Bangert. “The structure of minimizing closed normal currents of codimension 1”. Unpublished manuscript. 2012.
- [AL86] P. Arnoux and G. Levitt. “Sur l’unique ergodicité des 1-formes fermées singulières.” *Inventiones mathematicae* 84 (1986), 141–156. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/143337>.
- [Anz83] G. Anzellotti. “Pairings between measures and bounded functions and compensated compactness”. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata* 135.1 (Dec. 1983), 293–318. ISSN: 1618-1891. DOI: [10.1007/BF01781073](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01781073). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01781073>.
- [Bac24] A. Backus. “Minimal Laminations and Level Sets of 1-Harmonic Functions”. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis* 34.10 (Aug. 2024), 309. ISSN: 1559-002X. DOI: [10.1007/s12220-024-01758-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-024-01758-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-024-01758-8>.
- [Ban99] V. Bangert. “Minimal Measures and Minimizing Closed Normal One-currents”. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA* 9.3 (Aug. 1999), 413–427. ISSN: 1420-8970. DOI: [10.1007/s000390050093](https://doi.org/10.1007/s000390050093). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s000390050093>.
- [BC17] V. Bangert and X. Cui. “Calibrations and laminations”. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 162.1 (2017), 151–171. DOI: [10.1017/S0305004116000475](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305004116000475).
- [BD17] J. F. Brock and N. M. Dunfield. “Norms on the cohomology of hyperbolic 3-manifolds”. *Inventiones mathematicae* 210.2 (Nov. 2017), 531–558. ISSN: 1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/s00222-017-0735-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-017-0735-3). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-017-0735-3>.
- [BGG69] E. Bombieri, E. de Giorgi, and E. Giusti. “Minimal Cones and the Bernstein Problem”. *Inventiones mathematicae* 7 (1969), 243–268. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/141966>.
- [BS85] J. S. Birman and C. Series. “Geodesics with bounded intersection number on surfaces are sparsely distributed”. *Topology* 24.2 (1985), 217–225. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383\(85\)90056-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(85)90056-4). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0040938385900564>.
- [BZA24] A. Backus and N. Ze-An. *Lipschitz maps with prescribed local Lipschitz constants*. 2024. arXiv: [2403.07702](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07702) [math.DG].
- [CM10] M. Costabel and A. McIntosh. “On Bogovskii and regularized Poincaré integral operators for de Rham complexes on Lipschitz domains”. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 265.2 (June 2010), 297–320. ISSN: 1432-1823. DOI: [10.1007/s00209-009-0517-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-009-0517-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-009-0517-8>.
- [CM11] T. Colding and W. Minicozzi. *A Course in Minimal Surfaces*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2011. ISBN: 9780821853238. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=k40DAwAAQBAJ>.
- [Cra08] M. G. Crandall. “A Visit with the ∞ -Laplace Equation”. *Calculus of Variations and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations: With a historical overview by Elvira Mascolo*. Ed. by B. Dacorogna and P. Marcellini. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, 75–122. ISBN: 978-3-540-75914-0. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-75914-0_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-75914-0_3). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-75914-0_3.
- [DU22] G. Daskalopoulos and K. Uhlenbeck. *Analytic properties of Stretch maps and geodesic laminations*. May 2022. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2205.08250](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2205.08250). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.08250>.
- [DU24a] G. Daskalopoulos and K. Uhlenbeck. *Best Lipschitz maps and Earthquakes*. 2024. arXiv: [2410.08296](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08296) [math.DG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08296>.
- [DU24b] G. Daskalopoulos and K. Uhlenbeck. “Transverse measures and best Lipschitz and least gradient maps”. *Journal of Differential Geometry* 127.3 (2024), 969–1018. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1721071495](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1721071495). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1721071495>.
- [EG15] L. Evans and R. Gariepy. *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions, Revised Edition*. Textbooks in Mathematics. CRC Press, 2015. ISBN: 9781482242393. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=e3R3CAAQBAJ>.

- [ES08] L. Evans and O. Savin. “ $C^{1,\alpha}$ -regularity for infinity harmonic functions on two dimensions”. *Calculus of Variations* 32 (2008), 325–347.
- [EW10] M. Einsiedler and T. Ward. *Ergodic Theory: with a view towards Number Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer London, 2010. ISBN: 9780857290212. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=PiDET2fS7H4C>.
- [Fed74] H. Federer. “Real Flat Chains, Cochains and Variational Problems”. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 24.4 (1974), 351–407. ISSN: 00222518, 19435258. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24890827> (visited on 05/19/2023).
- [FH16] M. Freedman and M. Headrick. “Bit Threads and Holographic Entanglement”. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 352.1 (Nov. 2016), 407–438. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-016-2796-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-016-2796-3). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-016-2796-3>.
- [Giu84] E. Giusti. *Minimal Surfaces and Functions of Bounded Variation*. Monographs in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston, 1984. ISBN: 9780817631536. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=dNgsmArDoeQC>.
- [GK17] F. Guéritaud and F. Kassel. “Maximally stretched laminations on geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds”. *Geometry and Topology* 21.2 (2017), 693–840. DOI: [10.2140/gt.2017.21.693](https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2017.21.693). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2017.21.693>.
- [Gro07] M. Gromov. *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, 2007. ISBN: 9780817645830. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=QEJVUVJ9tMcC>.
- [GT15] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015. ISBN: 9783642617980. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=19L6CAAQAQBAJ>.
- [Gó20] W. Górny. “ L^p regularity of least gradient functions”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 148.7 (2020), 3009–3019. ISSN: 0002-9939,1088-6826. DOI: [10.1090/proc/15031](https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/15031). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/15031>.
- [HL82] R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson. “Calibrated geometries”. *Acta Mathematica* 148.none (1982), 47–157. DOI: [10.1007/BF02392726](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02392726). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02392726>.
- [HS89] R. Hardt and L. Simon. “Nodal sets for solutions of elliptic equations”. *Journal of Differential Geometry* 30.2 (1989), 505–522. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1214443599](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1214443599). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1214443599>.
- [Hua+24] Y. Huang et al. *The earthquake metric on Teichmüller space*. 2024. arXiv: [2404.19515](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.19515) [math.GT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.19515>.
- [Kec12] A. Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2012. ISBN: 9781461241904. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=WR3SBwAAQBAJ>.
- [Ker85] S. P. Kerckhoff. “Earthquakes are analytic.” *Commentarii mathematici Helvetici* 60 (1985), 17–30. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/139997>.
- [Lin19] P. Lindqvist. *Notes on the Stationary p -Laplace Equation*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer International Publishing, 2019. ISBN: 9783030145019. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=YwQVDwAAQBAJ>.
- [Liu23] Z. Liu. *Homologically area-minimizing surfaces that cannot be calibrated*. 2023. arXiv: [2310.19860](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.19860) [math.DG].
- [Mar] F. C. Marques. *Surfaces minimales: Théorie variationnelle et applications*.
- [Mas97] D. Massart. “Stable Norms of Surfaces: Local Structure of the Unit Ball at Rational Directions”. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA* 7 (1997), 996–1010. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119954418>.
- [MRL14] J. M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi, and S. S. de León. “Functions of Least Gradient and 1-Harmonic Functions”. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 63.4 (2014), 1067–1084. ISSN: 00222518, 19435258. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24904253> (visited on 01/25/2023).
- [MS88] J. W. Morgan and P. B. Shalen. “Degenerations of Hyperbolic Structures, II: Measured Laminations in 3-Manifolds”. *Annals of Mathematics* 127.2 (1988), 403–456. ISSN: 0003486X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2007061> (visited on 08/11/2022).
- [PW22] H. Pan and M. Wolf. *Ray structures on Teichmüller Space*. 2022. arXiv: [2206.01371](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01371) [math.GT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01371>.
- [RS75] D. Ruelle and D. Sullivan. “Currents, flows and diffeomorphisms”. *Topology* 14.4 (1975), 319–327. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383\(75\)90016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(75)90016-6). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0040938375900166>.
- [SS81] R. Schoen and L. Simon. “Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces”. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 34.6 (1981), 741–797. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160340603>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpa.3160340603>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpa.3160340603>.
- [Thu98] W. P. Thurston. *Minimal stretch maps between hyperbolic surfaces*. 1998. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.MATH/9801039](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9801039). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9801039>.
- [Wol82] S. Wolpert. “The Fenchel-Nielsen Deformation”. *Annals of Mathematics* 115.3 (1982), 501–528. ISSN: 0003486X, 19398980. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2007011> (visited on 10/28/2024).