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## 1. Introduction.

In [1] Haken has shown that if a closed, connected 3-manifold $M$ is not irreducible, then there exists such an essential 2 -sphere in $M$ that intersects a fixed Heegaard surface of $M$ in a circle. Ochiai [4] has extended this result for a 2 -sided projective plane in $M$. In this direction, we shall show that for a 2 -sided, non-separating, incompressible torus and a genus two Heegaard splitting of $M$, the same result holds.

Theorem 1. Let $M$ be a closed, connected (possibly, non-orientable) 3-manifold with a Heegaard splitting ( $V_{1}, V_{2} ; F$ ) of genus two. Assume that $M$ contains a 2 -sided, non-separating, incompressible torus $T$. Then there exists a 2 -sided, nonseparating, incompressible torus $T^{\prime}$ which intersects $F$ in a circle.

As an application, we shall show that any orientable, closed 3-manifold which has a Heegaard splitting of genus two and contains a non-separating, incompressible torus is obtained by pasting boundary components of two bridge link space by a certain type of homeomorphism and performing a Dehn surgery along the two meridian loops of this link (Theorem 2).

As a consequence of Theorem 2, we have
Corollary. If an orientable, closed 3 -manifold $M$ with a Heegaard splitting of genus two contains a non-separating, incompressible torus, then $M$ is a 2-fold branched covering space of $S^{2} \times S^{1}$ branched along a 1-manifold.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. M. Ochiai for helpful conversations.

## 2. Preliminaries.

Throughout this paper, we will work in the piecewise linear category. A Heegaard splitting of a closed, connected 3 -manifold $M$ is a pair ( $V_{1}, V_{2} ; F$ ), where $V_{i}(i=1,2)$ is a three dimensional orientable or nonorientable handlebody such that $M=V_{1} \cup V_{2}$ and $V_{1} \cap V_{2}=\partial V_{1}=\partial V_{2}=F$. Then $F$ is called a Heegaard surface of $M$. The first Betti number of $V_{1}$ is called the genus of the splitting.

It is known that any closed, connected 3 -manifold has a Heegaard splitting.
For the definition of standard terms in three dimensional topology and link theory, we refer to [2], [6]. For the definition of a hierarchy for a 2 -manifold and an isotopy of type A, we refer to [3].

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.

Let $T_{i}=T \cap V_{i}(i=1,2)$. Since $T$ is incompressible in $M$, we may suppose that $T_{i}$ is incompressible in $V_{i}$. Furthermore, by moving $T$ by a sequence of isotopies of type A, we may suppose that each component of $T_{1}$ is a disk. Then as in [3] we have the hierarchy $\left(T_{2}^{(0)}, \alpha_{0}\right), \cdots,\left(T_{2}^{(m)}, \alpha_{m}\right)$ for $T_{2}$ which gives rise to a sequence of isotopies of $T$ in $M$ where the first isotopy is of type A at $\alpha_{0}, \cdots$, and the ( $m+1$ )-st isotopy is of type A at $\alpha_{m}$. In addition, we may suppose that $\alpha_{i} \cap \alpha_{j}=\varnothing(i \neq j)$. So, we consider each $\alpha_{i}$ to be an $\operatorname{arc}$ on $T_{2}$.

We say that $\alpha_{i}$ is of type 1 if $\alpha_{i}$ joins distinct components of $\partial T_{2}, \alpha_{i}$ is of type 2 if $\alpha_{i}$ joins one component $S$ of $\partial T_{2}$ and there is an $\operatorname{arc} \beta$ in $S$ such that $\partial \beta=\partial \alpha_{i}, \beta \cup \alpha_{i}$ bounds a disk on $T, \alpha_{i}$ is of type 3 if $\alpha_{i}$ joins one component $S$ of $\partial T_{2}$ and there is an arc $\beta$ in $S$ such that $\partial \beta=\partial \alpha_{i}, \beta \cup \alpha_{i}$ cuts $T$ into an annulus. We easily see that each $\alpha_{i}$ must be one of type 1 , type 2 , or type 3 .

We say that $\alpha_{i}$ is a d-arc if $\alpha_{i}$ is of type 1 and there is a component $S$ of $\partial T_{2}$ such that $\alpha_{i}$ is an only arc that joins $S$ (see Figure 1).


Figure 1.
Now, suppose that $T_{1}$ has more than one components.
Lemma 3.1. If some $\alpha_{i}$ is a d-arc, then there is an ambient isotopy $h_{t}(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ of $M$ such that each component of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is a disk and the number of the components of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is less than that of $T \cap V_{1}$.

Proof. This can be proved by using the argument of the inverse operation of an isotopy of type A defined in [4].

Lemma 3.2. If $\alpha_{0}$ is of type 1 or type 2, then there is an ambient isotopy $h_{t}(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ of $M$ such that each component of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is a disk and the number of the components of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is less than that of $T \cap V_{1}$.

Proof. If $\alpha_{0}$ is of type 1 , then the conclusion follows immediately by performing an isotopy of type A at $\alpha_{0}$. Assume that $\alpha_{0}$ is of type 2. Then there is an $\operatorname{arc} \beta$ in $\partial T_{2}$ such that $\partial \beta=\partial \alpha_{0}, \alpha_{0} \cup \beta$ bounds a planar surface $P$ in $T_{2}$. Since each $\alpha_{i}$ is an essential arc of $T_{2}$, some $\alpha_{j}$ on $P$ is a $d$-arc. Hence, the conclusion follows by Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $\alpha_{0}$ is of type 3 and one of the following conditions is satisfied:
(i) $\alpha_{1}$ is of type 1 ,
(ii) $\alpha_{1}$ is of type 2,
(iii) $\alpha_{1}$ is of type 3 and $\alpha_{1}$ intersects the same component of $\partial T_{2}$ that $\alpha_{0}$ intersects. Then there is an ambient isotopy $h_{t}(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ of $M$ such that each component of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is a disk and the number of the components of $h_{1}(T) \cap V_{1}$ is less than that of $T \cap V_{1}$.

Proof. If (i) holds, then the Lemma can be proved using the argument of the inverse operation of an isotopy of type A defined in [4]. If (ii) holds, then the conclusion follows by the same argument of the proof of Lemma 3.2. If (iii) holds, then $\alpha_{0} \cup \alpha_{1}$ cuts $T_{2}$ into two planar surfaces or one planar surface. In either case, we see that some $\alpha_{i}$ is a $d$-arc. Hence, the conclusion follows by Lemma 3.1.

REmark. There exists an example of a hierarchy $\left(T_{2}^{(0)}, \alpha_{0}\right), \cdots,\left(T_{2}^{(m)}, \alpha_{m}\right)$ such that each $\alpha_{i}$ is not a $d$-arc (see Figure 2).
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Now, let $T^{\prime}$ be a 2 -sided, non-separating, incompressible torus in $M$ such that among all 2-sided, non-separating, incompressible tori in $M$ which intersect $V_{1}$ in disks the number of the components of $T^{\prime} \cap V_{1}$ is minimum.

Let $T_{i}^{\prime}=T^{\prime} \cap V_{i}(i=1,2)$. Assume that $T_{1}^{\prime}$ has more than one component. Then $T_{1}^{\prime}=D_{1} \cup \cdots \cup D_{n}(n \geqq 2)$, where $D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}$ are mutually disjoint, properly embedded disks in $V_{1}$. We have the hierarchy $\left(T_{2}^{\prime(0)}, \alpha_{0}^{\prime}\right), \cdots,\left(T_{2}^{\prime(l)}, \alpha_{l}^{\prime}\right)$ for $T_{2}^{\prime}$ as above. By Lemmas 3.2 and $3.3, \alpha_{0}^{\prime}$ and $\alpha_{1}^{\prime}$ are of type 3 and we may suppose that $\alpha_{0}^{\prime}$ joins points on $\partial D_{1}$ and $\alpha_{1}^{\prime}$ joins points on $\partial D_{2}$.

LEMMA 3.4. For any $i, j(1 \leqq i<j \leqq n),\left\{D_{i}, D_{j}\right\}$ is not a complete system of meridian disks of $V_{1}$.

Proof. Suppose that for some $i, j,\left\{D_{i}, D_{j}\right\}$ is a complete system of meridian disks of $V_{1}$ (i.e. $D_{i} \cup D_{j}$ cuts $V_{1}$ into a 3-cell $D^{3}$ ). Let $T^{(1)}$ be the image of $T^{\prime}$ after an isotopy of type A at $\alpha_{0}^{\prime}$. Then $T^{(1)} \cap V_{1}=A_{1} \cup D_{2} \cup \cdots \cup D_{n}$, where $A_{1}$ is an annulus properly embedded in $V_{1}$.

We claim that $A_{1}$ can be pushed into $D^{3}$. By the definition of an isotopy of type A, there is a disk $D$ in $V_{2}$ such that $D \cap T_{2}=\alpha_{0}^{\prime}, D \cap \partial V_{2}=\beta$ where $\alpha_{0}^{\prime} \cap \beta$ $=\partial \alpha_{0}^{\prime}=\partial \beta \subset \partial D_{1}, \alpha_{0}^{\prime} \cup \beta=\partial D$. Then $\beta$ must join $D_{1}$ from one side of $D_{1}$, for otherwise there exists a simple loop which is contained in a regular neighborhood of $A_{1}$ in $V_{1}$ and intersects $A_{1}$ transversely in a single point (see Figure 3) and this contradicts the fact that $T^{(1)}$ is 2 -sided in $M$. Hence, by moving $T^{(1)}$ by a small isotopy we may suppose that $A_{1} \cap D_{k}=\varnothing(1 \leqq k \leqq n)$ and this establishes the claim.
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On the other hand $A_{1}$ is incompressible in $V_{1}$ for $\alpha_{0}^{\prime}$ is of type 3 . This is a contradiction.

By Lemma 3.4 there are following three possible cases.
Case 1. $\left\{D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}\right\}$ has only one parallel class in $V_{1}$, and each $D_{i}$ cuts $V_{1}$ into two solid tori.
Case 2. $\left\{D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}\right\}$ has two parallel classes in $V_{1}$, and one of them is
represented by a meridian disk of $V_{1}$, the other is represented by a disk which cuts $V_{1}$ into two solid tori.
Case 3. $\left\{D_{1}, \cdots, D_{n}\right\}$ has only one parallel class in $V_{1}$, and each $D_{i}$ is a meridian disk of $V_{1}$.
Let $T^{(1)}, A_{1}$ be those defined in the proof of Lemma 3.4, $A_{1}$ is an incompressible annulus properly embedded in $V_{1}$. By Haken's theorem (see Corollary II. 10 of [3]) and the fact that $M$ has a Heegaard splitting of genus two, we see that $M$ is irreducible. Hence, each 2-sided, nonseparating torus in $M$ is incompressible.

Now, we shall derive a contradiction in each of above cases. Then we complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Case 1. In this case, there is an annulus $A_{1}^{\prime}$ in $F$ such that $A_{1}^{\prime} \cap T^{(1)}=A_{1}^{\prime} \cap A_{1}$ $=\partial A_{1}^{\prime}=\partial A_{1}$ (see Figure 4). We get a 2 -sided, non-separating torus $\bar{T}$ by exchanging $A_{1}$ on $T^{(1)}$ for $A_{1}^{\prime}$. We can move $\bar{T}$ by a small isotopy so that each component of $\bar{T} \cap V_{1}$ is a disk and the number of components of $\bar{T} \cap V_{1}$ is less than that of $T^{\prime} \cap V_{1}$. This contradicts the minimality of $T^{\prime}$.
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Case 2. Since $A_{1}$ is an incompressible annulus in $V_{1}, D_{1}$ must separate $V_{1}$ into two solid tori. So we have a contradiction as in Case 1.

Case 3. Let $T^{(2)}$ be the image of $T^{(1)}$ after an isotopy of type A at $\alpha_{1}^{\prime}$. Then $T^{(2)} \cap V_{1}=A_{1} \cup A_{2} \cup D_{3} \cup \cdots \cup D_{n}$, where $A_{2}$ is an incompressible annulus properly embedded in $V_{1}$. We have two subcases.

Case 3.1. $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ are parallel in $V_{1}$.
In this case, there is an annulus $A$ such that $A$ is contained in the interior of $V_{1}, A \cap T^{(2)}=\partial A$ and one component of $\partial A$ is in $A_{1}$ and the other is in $A_{2}$
(see Figure 5). The annulus $A$ cuts $T^{(2)}$ into two annuli $A^{1}$ and $A^{2}$. By pasting $A^{i}(i=1,2)$ and $A$ along its boundary, we get a 2 -sided torus $T^{i}$ in $M$. Then either $T^{1}$ or $T^{2}$, say $T^{1}$, is nonseparating in $M$. Then $T^{1} \cap V_{1}=A^{1} \cup D_{i 1} \cup \cdots \cup D_{i k}$, where $A^{1}$ is an annulus and $\left\{D_{i 1}, \cdots, D_{i k}\right\}(k \leqq n-2)$ is a subset of $\left\{D_{3}, \cdots, D_{n}\right\}$. We easily see that by moving $T^{1}$ by an isotopy of type A there is a 2 -sided, non-separating torus which intersects $V_{1}$ in $k+1$ disks. This contradicts the minimality of $T^{\prime}$.
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Case 3.2. $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$ are not parallel in $V_{1}$.
In this case, there is an annulus $A^{\prime}$ in $F$ such that $A^{\prime} \cap T^{(2)}=A^{\prime} \cap\left(A_{1} \cup A_{2}\right)$ $=\partial A^{\prime}$ (see Figure 6). Then by pushing $A^{\prime}$ slightly into the interior of $V_{1}$, we have an annulus which has the same property as $A$ in Case 3.1. So we have a contradiction as in Case 3.1.

## 4. Statement and proof of Theorem 2.

We can construct a closed, connected, orientable 3-manifold $M$ as follows.
(*) Let $L=k_{1} \cup k_{2}$ be a two bridge link in $S^{3}, M(L)$ be the manifold obtained by removing the interior of the regular neighborhood of $L$ from $S^{3}$. Let $\bar{m}_{i}$ ( $i=1,2$ ) be a meridian of the regular neighborhood of $k_{i}, m_{i}^{\prime}$ be a simple loop obtained by pushing $\bar{m}_{i}$ slightly into $M(L)$. Let $M_{1}$ be a closed, orientable 3manifold obtained by pasting the two boundary components of $M(L)$ by a homeomorphism which takes $\bar{m}_{1}$ to $\bar{m}_{2}, m_{i}(i=1,2)$ be the image of $m_{i}^{\prime}$ in $M_{1}$. Then we get $M$ by performing Dehn surgery on $M_{1}$ along $m_{1} \cup m_{2}$.

Then we have
Lemma 4.1. If $M$ is obtained by the construction (*) then $M$ has a Heegaard splitting of genus two.

Proof. We use the notations and symbols in the construction (*). Since $L$ is a two bridge link, $L$ is obtained as the union of the two trivial tangles. This is shown for the two bridge knot in 115p of [6]. And the argument holds for the two bridge link. Hence there is a disk with three holes $B$ properly embedded in $M(L)$ such that each component of $\partial B$ is homotopic to $\bar{m}_{i}(i=1$ or 2$)$ in $\partial M(L)$ and such that the closures of the components of $M(L)-B$ are two handlebodies. We denote them by $V_{1}^{\prime}$ and $V_{2}^{\prime}$. Then $V_{i}^{\prime} \cap \partial M(L)$ consists of two annuli $A_{1}^{i}, A_{2}^{i}(i=1,2)$. Since $\bar{m}_{1}$ and $\bar{m}_{2}$ are identified in $M$, we may suppose that $A_{1}^{i}$ and $A_{2}^{i}$ are identified in $M$. Moreover, we may suppose that $m_{i}^{\prime} \subset V_{i}^{\prime}$. If we identify $A_{1}^{i}$ with $A_{2}^{i}$ on $\partial V_{i}^{\prime}$ then we get a genus two handlebody $V_{i}^{\prime \prime}$. And if we perform a Dehn surgery on $V_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ along $\bar{m}_{i}$ then we get a genus two handlebody $V_{i}$. Then $M=V_{1} \cup V_{2}$ and $V_{1} \cap V_{2}=\partial V_{1}=\partial V_{2}$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.
Let $\theta_{1}$ be the collection of all 3 -manifolds which are given by the construction (*), and $\theta_{2}$ be the collection of all orientable 3-manifolds which have Heegaard splittings of genus two and contain non-separating, incompressible tori. Then

Theorem 2. Let $\theta_{1}$ and $\theta_{2}$ be as above, then $\theta_{2}$ is a subcollection of $\theta_{1}$. Moreover, the element of $\theta_{1}$ that is not an element of $\theta_{2}$ is homeomorphic to $S^{2} \times S^{1}$ or $S^{2} \times S^{1} \# S^{2} \times S^{1}$ or $S^{2} \times S^{1} \# L n$, where \# denotes a connected sum and $S^{n}$, Ln denote an $n$-sphere, a three dimensional lens space, respectively.

Now, we shall prove Theorem 2, Let $M$ be an element of $\theta_{2},\left(V_{1}, V_{2} ; F\right)$
be a Heegaard splitting of genus two of $M, T$ be a non-separating, incompressible torus in $M$. By Theorem 1, we may suppose that $T \cap V_{1}$ is a disk.

Lemma 4.2. $T \cap V_{1}$ is a meridian disk of $V_{1}$.
Proof. Since $T$ is incompressible in $M, T \cap V_{1}$ is not parallel to a disk in $\partial V_{1}$. So assume that $T \cap V_{1}$ cuts $V_{1}$ into two solid tori. Since $T$ is non-separating, there exists such a simple closed curve $l$ in $M$ that intersects $T$ transversely in a single point $p$. We may suppose that $p$ is contained in the interior of $T \cap V_{1}$. Let $l^{\prime}$ be an arc on $l$ such that $p$ is contained in the interior of $l^{\prime}$ and $l^{\prime}$ is contained in the interior of $V_{1}$. There is an ambient isotopy $h_{t}(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ of $M$ such that $h_{1}(l)$ is contained in $V_{1},\left.h_{t}\right|_{l}=\mathrm{id}_{l^{\prime}}(0 \leqq t \leqq 1)$ and $h_{1}(l)$ is in general position with respect to $T$. Since $l-l^{\prime}$ does not intersect $T$ and $\partial\left(l-l^{\prime}\right)$ is fixed by $h_{t}, h_{1}\left(l-l^{\prime}\right)$ intersects $T$ even number of times. This contradicts the fact that $h_{1}(l)$ is contained in $V_{1}$ and $T \cap V_{1}$ separates $V_{1}$.

As in [3] we have a hierarchy $\left(T_{2}^{(0)}, \alpha_{0}\right),\left(T_{2}^{(1)}, \alpha_{1}\right)$ for $T \cap V_{2}$ which gives rise to a sequence of isotopies of type A at $\alpha_{0}$ and $\alpha_{1}$. Note that $\alpha_{i}(i=0,1)$ is of type 3 defined in Section 3. Let $T^{\prime}$ be the image of $T$ after an isotopy of type A at $\alpha_{0}$, and $A_{i}=T^{\prime} \cap V_{i}(i=1,2)$. Then $A_{i}$ is a non-separating, incompressible annulus properly embedded in $V_{i}$. By cutting $V_{i}$ along $A_{i}$ we get a genus two solid torus $V_{i}^{\prime}$ (see Figure 7). Let $A_{i}^{\prime}$ and $A_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ be the copies of $A_{i}$ on $\partial V_{i}^{\prime}$.
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Now, we will show that $M$ can be given by the construction (*).
Let $c_{i}=c_{i 1} \cup c_{i 2}(i=1,2)$ be two disjoint trivial arcs properly embedded in a 3 -cell $B_{i}, U_{i}=\operatorname{cl}\left(B_{i}-N\left(c_{i 1} \cup c_{i 2} ; B_{i}\right)\right), A^{i j}=U_{i} \cap N\left(c_{i j} ; B_{i}\right)(j=1,2)$, where $N\left(c ; B_{i}\right)$ denotes the regular neighborhood of a polyhedron $c$ in $B_{i} . A^{i j}$ is an annulus on
$\partial U_{i}$. Let $m_{i}^{\prime}$ be a simple closed curve obtained by pushing the core of $A^{i 2}$ into $U_{i}$. If we perform a proper Dehn surgery on $U_{i}$ along $m_{i}^{\prime}$ then we get such a genus two handlebody $U_{i}^{\prime}$ that there exists a homeomorphism from $U_{i}^{\prime}$ to $V_{i}^{\prime}$ which takes the image of $A^{i 1}$ to $A_{i}^{\prime}$ and the image of $A^{i 2}$ to $A_{i}^{\prime \prime}$. Hence, the attaching homeomorphism $\partial V_{1} \rightarrow \partial V_{2}$ of the Heegaard splitting ( $V_{1}, V_{2} ; F$ ) induces a homeomorphism $\operatorname{cl}\left(\partial U_{1}-\left(A^{11} \cup A^{12}\right)\right) \rightarrow \operatorname{cl}\left(\partial U_{2}-\left(A^{21} \cup A^{22}\right)\right)$. If we paste $U_{1}$ and $U_{2}$ by this homeomorphism then we get a link space $M(L)$ where $L=k_{1} \cup k_{2}$ is a two bridge link (see [6] 115p). Let $m_{i}(i=1,2)$ be the image of $m_{i}^{\prime}$ in $M(L)$. Then $m_{i}$ is isotopic to the meridians of $L$. Since $A^{i 1}$ and $A^{i 2}$ are identified in $M$, we may suppose that $m_{i}$ is isotopic to the meridian of $k_{i}$. Then by tracing the above procedure conversely we see that $M$ can be given by the construction (*). This completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.

Let $M$ be an element of $\theta_{1}$ and not an element of $\theta_{2}$. By the construction of $M$, there exists a non-separating torus $T$ in $M$. Then by the loop theorem [2] there exists a non-separating 2 -sphere in $M$. By Lemma 3.8 of [2], Haken's theorem ([3]) and Lemma $4.1 ~ M=S^{2} \times S^{1} \# M^{\prime}$, where $M^{\prime}$ has a Heegaard splitting of genus one. Hence, the second part of Theorem 2 follows.

Remark. By Theorem 2 and the fact that a torus bundle over $S^{1}$ contains a non-separating, incompressible torus, we have the following relations of inclusion.

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { closed orientable 3-manifolds } \\
\text { with Heegaard splittings of } \\
\text { genus two }
\end{array}\right\} \supset \theta_{2} \supset \theta_{1} \supset\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { torus bundles with } \\
\text { Heegaard splittings } \\
\text { of genus two }
\end{array}\right\}
$$

It is known that there exists infinitely many topologically distinct torus bundles with Heegaard splittings of genus two [5].

We note that there is an element of $\theta_{1}$ which is not a torus bundle. We claim that if $M$ is a torus bundle and $T$ is a non-separating, incompressible torus in $M$ then $T$ cuts $M$ into $T^{2} \times I$, where $T^{2}, I$ denote the two dimensional torus, the unit interval $[0,1]$, respectively. Since $M$ is a torus bundle, there exists a non-separating, incompressible torus $T^{\prime}$ which cuts $M$ into a $T^{2} \times I$, say $M^{\prime}$. Since $T$ and $T^{\prime}$ are incompressible and $M$ is irreducible, by the standard arguments of the three dimensional topology we may suppose that $T \cap T^{\prime}=\varnothing$ or $T$ and $T^{\prime}$ intersect transversely, each component of $T \cap T^{\prime}$ is an essential loop in $T^{\prime}$ (hence $T$ ) and each component of $T \cap M^{\prime}$ is not boundary parallel in $M^{\prime}$. If $T \cap T^{\prime}=\varnothing$ then $T \subset M^{\prime}$ and by [1] $T$ and $T^{\prime}$ are parallel in $M$. Hence $T$ cuts $M$ into $T^{2} \times I$. If $T \cap T^{\prime} \neq \varnothing$ then the image of $T$ in $M^{\prime}$ is a system of parallel annuli $A_{1}, \cdots, A_{r}(r \geqq 1)$. On the other hand, the closures of components of $T^{\prime}-\left(T \cap T^{\prime}\right)$ are annuli $A_{1}^{\prime}, \cdots, A_{r}^{\prime}$. By cutting $M^{\prime}$ along $A_{1} \cup \cdots \cup A_{r}$ we get $r$ solid tori. If we paste these solid tori along $A_{i}^{\prime}(1 \leqq i \leqq r)$ then we get $T^{2} \times I$. Hence $M$ cut along $T$ is $T^{2} \times I$ and we establish the claim.

If $L$ is a non-trivial two bridge link, which is not the Hopf link, then the image of $\partial M(L)$ in $M$, say $T$, is a non-separating, incompressible torus and $M$ cut along $T$ is not a $T^{2} \times I$. Hence $M$ is not a torus bundle.

two bridge link $L$
(i)

genus two surface normally embedded in $S^{3}$
(ii)

Figure 8.

Let $L=k_{1} \cup \cdots \cup k_{n}$ be an $n$ component link. $L$ is called strongly invertible if there is an orientation preserving involution $g$ of $S^{3}$ which satisfies
(i) Fix $(g)$, the fixed point set of $g$, is a circle,
(ii) $g\left(k_{i}\right)=k_{i}(1 \leqq i \leqq n)$ and
(iii) $\left.g\right|_{k_{i}}$ reverses the orientation of $k_{i}$ for each $i$.

Then we have
Lemma 4.3. Every two bridge link is strongly invertible.
Proof. Let $L=k_{1} \cup k_{2}$ be a two bridge link and let ( $V_{1}, V_{2} ; F$ ) be a genus two Heegaard splitting of $S^{3}$. Then by the definition of the two bridge link ([6]) we may suppose that $L \subset F$ and that $L$ does not separate $F$ (see Figure 8).

In [7] it is shown that if ( $V_{1}^{\prime}, V_{2}^{\prime} ; F^{\prime}$ ) is the genus two Heegaard splitting of a 3-manifold $M^{\prime}$ and $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}$ are pairwise disjoint simple closed curves such that $\alpha_{1} \cup \alpha_{2}$ does not separate $F$ then there is an orientation preserving involution $h$ of $M^{\prime}$ such that $h\left(V_{i}\right)=V_{i}(i=1,2), \operatorname{Fix}(h)$ is a 1-manifold, $h\left(\alpha_{j}\right)=\alpha_{j}$ and $\left.h\right|_{\alpha_{j}}$ reverses the orientation of $\alpha_{j}(j=1,2)$. Hence there is an orientation preserving involution $g$ of $S^{3}$ such that Fix $(g)$ is a 1-manifold, $g\left(k_{i}\right)=k_{i}(i=1,2)$ and $\left.g\right|_{k_{i}}$ reverses the orientation of $k_{i}$. By the Smith theory $\operatorname{Fix}(g)$ is a circle. Hence $L$ is strongly invertible.

Proof of Corollary. By Theorem 2 an orientable, closed 3-manifold $M$ which has a Heegaard splitting of genus two and contains a non-separating, incompressible torus is given by the construction (*). By Lemma 4.3 there is an involution $h$ on $M(L)$ whose fixed point set $K$ is a 1 -manifold which intersects


Figure 9.
each boundary component of $M(L)$ in four points. Moreover, we may suppose that each of $m_{i}^{\prime}$ and $\bar{m}_{i}(i=1,2)$ intersects $K$ in two points and is invariant under $h$ (see Figure 9). Then $h$ induces an involution $h^{\prime}$ on $M$, and the quotient space of $M$ under $h^{\prime}$ is $S^{2} \times S^{1}$. This completes the proof of Corollary.
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