

PERTURBATIONS OF RATIONAL MISIUREWICZ MAPS

MAGNUS ASPENBERG

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the perturbation properties of rational Misiurewicz maps, when the Julia set is the whole sphere (the other case is treated in [1]). In particular, we show that if f is a Misiurewicz map and not a flexible Lattés map, then we can find a hyperbolic map arbitrarily close to f .

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of Misiurewicz maps has its origin from the paper [12] by M. Misiurewicz. In honor of this paper, we proceed with the following definition. First, let $J(f)$ be the Julia set of f , $F(f)$ the Fatou set of f and $Crit(f)$ the critical set of f . Let $\omega(c)$ be the omega limit set of c .

Definition 1.1. A non-hyperbolic rational map f without parabolic periodic points satisfies the *Misiurewicz condition* if for every $c \in Crit(f) \cap J(f)$, we have $\omega(c) \cap Crit(f) = \emptyset$.

In [10], McMullen showed that small Mandelbrot copies are dense in the bifurcation locus in any (non-trivial) analytic family of rational maps. An important element of the proof of this involves the fact that Misiurewicz maps create a family of polynomial-like maps nearby. From this stems the Mandelbrot copies. In this paper we consider rational Misiurewicz maps for which the Julia set is the whole sphere and show that such maps can be perturbed into a rich family of postcritically finite maps. One main ingredient is that we get control of all critical points, which enables perturbations into hyperbolic maps, for instance. We use the supremum norm on the Riemann sphere to calculate the distance between two rational functions. The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem A. *Let f be a rational Misiurewicz map and not a flexible Lattés map. Then we can find a hyperbolic rational map g arbitrarily close to f .*

Moreover, if in addition $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, then g can be chosen so that all critical points lie in superattracting cycles.

The case when $J(f) \neq \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is treated in [1]. In that paper it is shown that Misiurewicz maps for which $J(f) \neq \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ are in fact Lebesgue density points of hyperbolic maps. We therefore assume that $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ to prove the first part of Theorem A. In fact, we will only focus on the second part (which of course implies the first in the case $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$).

The proof of Theorem A works as long as the given Misiurewicz map admits no quasiconformal deformations. This is why the flexible Lattés maps have to be excluded, because they are the only Misiurewicz maps which admit quasiconformal deformations.

The author gratefully acknowledges funding from the the Research Training Network CODY of the European Commission and the Swedish Research Council.

It will be clear from the construction that in fact f (having $J(f) = \mathbb{C}$) can be perturbed into any post-critically finite map g with prescribed repelling orbits on which the critical points shall land on.

The parameter space \mathcal{R}^d of rational maps of degree d is a $2d + 1$ -dimensional complex manifold. We will mostly consider *normalised* families of rational maps, which are \mathcal{R}^d modulo conjugacy classes of Möbius transformations. The space $[\mathcal{R}^d]$ of normalised rational maps of degree $d \geq 2$ has dimension equal to $2d - 2$.

Misiurewicz maps have good expansion properties, by a Theorem by Mañé [9]. In particular, they satisfy the so called Collet-Eckmann condition, defined as follows.

Definition 1.2. A rational map f satisfies the *Collet-Eckmann* condition (CE) if there are constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that for every critical point $c \in J(f)$, not containing any other critical point in its forward orbit, we have

$$|(f^n)'(fc)| \geq Ce^{\gamma n},$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

Recently Rivera-Letelier [14] showed that one can perturb a so called backward contractive function to obtain a Misiurewicz map, provided the Julia set is not the whole Riemann sphere. The backward contraction condition is weaker than for example the Collet-Eckmann condition. Hence as a consequence of Rivera-Letelier and Theorem A (or rather [1]), every Collet-Eckmann map for which the Julia set is not the whole Riemann sphere can be approximated by a hyperbolic map. Combining this with [3] (revised version) we obtain the following characterization of rational Misiurewicz maps:

Let f be a rational Misiurewicz map. Then if f is not a flexible Lattés map it can be approximated by a hyperbolic map. Moreover,

- if $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, then f is a Lebesgue density point of CE-maps,
- if $J(f) \neq \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, then f is a Lebesgue density point of hyperbolic maps.

In the first case above, the CE-maps have their Julia set equal to the whole sphere (which is also a consequence of [3]). In view of the Fatou conjecture, flexible Lattés maps should also be approximable by hyperbolic maps but we have no proof. It seems this question is not much simpler than the Fatou conjecture itself.

Acknowledgements. Firstly, I am grateful to Jacek Graczyk for encouraging me to write this down and for many helpful comments and interesting discussions. I thank Michael Benedicks and Nicolae Mihalache for many interesting discussions and useful remarks on a preliminary version. I owe my thanks to Detlef Müller for introducing me to the theory of resolution of singularities and to Mattias Jonsson for further helpful remarks and clarifications. This helped me tackle the problem on higher order critical points.

A first version of this paper was written at Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Université Paris-Sud. The current revised version was written at Christian-Albrechts Universität zu Kiel. I gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of both these departments.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Put $f = f_0$ and assume that f is a Misiurewicz map. We assume that $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ unless otherwise stated. The idea is to start with a family f_a of rational maps parameterized by a small disk $\mathbb{B}(0, r) \subset [\mathcal{R}^d]$, or radius $r > 0$, where f_0 corresponds

to the parameter $a = 0 \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$. We then study the iterates of the corresponding critical points for parameters in certain so called Whitney subdisks in $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ (see definition below). We will also consider 1-dimensional disks $B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$, where $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ is $(2d - 2)$ -dimensional. Let $c_j(a)$ be the set of critical points for f_a . Define, for any $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$,

$$(1) \quad \xi_{n,j}(a) = f_a^n(c_j(a)) = f^n(c_j(a), a).$$

2.1. Higher order critical points. Of course some critical point might split under perturbation and in this case it is not clear how to define the functions $c_j(a)$ in (1). In this case one cannot generally hope that the critical points move analytically. If higher order critical points occur we reparameterise the family using a theorem on the resolution of singularities, which goes back to Hironaka's theorem on the resolution of singularities [7]. In fact, what we are looking for is a complex analytic version of Lemma 9.4 in [13]. Based on [4], it is shown that critical points move analytically in a "lifted parameter space" for a real polynomial where the coefficients are real-analytic. Since a direct reference to the complex analytic version of this result was not found, although it seems to be a wellknown folklore result, we outline the argument based on [13] and [4].

Put $f'(z, a) = G(z, a)$ and consider the analytic set $\{G(z, a) = 0\}$. This can be viewed as a real-analytic set of double dimension. The singularities of this set appear precisely at the points where f has a critical point of higher order. To resolve these singularities, we first write $G = u + iv$, where $u = u(x, y, a)$ and $v = v(x, y, a)$ are real-analytic in x, y and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_{4d-4})$. By the Resolution Theorem in [4] we get an analytic map $\phi_u : (y_1, \dots, y_n) \rightarrow (x, y, a_1, \dots, a_{n-2})$, such that

$$(2) \quad u \circ \phi_u = \varepsilon_u \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{k_{i,u}},$$

where ε_u is non zero and $n = 4d - 2$.

The set $\{u = 0\}$ has (real) codimension 1 and therefore there must be some $k_{i,u} > 0$. If we restrict to the set $B_i = \{y_i = 0\}$ then for $y \in B_i$ we have $u \circ \phi_u(y) = 0$. Let us identify B_i locally with the $n - 1$ (real) dimensional ball \mathbb{B}^{n-1} .

Now, consider the function $F(y) = v(\phi_u(y))$, for $y \in \mathbb{B}^{n-1}$. Using the Resolution Theorem again, we get an analytic function $\phi_v : (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{n-1}$ such that

$$F \circ \phi_v = \varepsilon_v \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{k_{i,v}}.$$

Some $k_{j,v} > 0$, so (locally) identifying the set $B_j = \{x_j = 0\}$ with the unit ball \mathbb{B}^{n-2} (of real dimension $n - 2$) we get $v(\phi_u(\phi_v(x))) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2}$. Since $\phi_v(x) \in \mathbb{B}^{n-1}$ we have, for $x \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} u \circ \phi_u \circ \phi_v(x) &= 0 \\ v \circ \phi_u \circ \phi_v(x) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Put $\phi = \phi_u \circ \phi_v$. Then we see that $G \circ \phi(x) = 0$, for $x \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2}$. Let $\phi(x) = (\psi_0(x), \psi_1(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$. Then $\psi_0(x)$ parameterises one critical point. For each choice of B_i, B_j above we get, in this way, a parameterisation of each critical point. For fixed x , the function $G(z, \psi_1(x))$ has a zero in $c_1 = c_1(x)$ (which must be a

critical point for $f(z, \psi_1(x))$. If we view G as a complex function again, we can write

$$G(z, \psi_1(x)) = (z - c_1(x))G_1(z, x),$$

where z_1 and G_1 are real-analytic in x and G_1 is complex analytic in z .

We apply the same argument to G_1 and obtain a new parameterisation (proper analytic map) $\psi_2 : x' \rightarrow x$ such that

$$G_1(z, \psi_2(x')) = (z - c_2(x'))G_2(z, x').$$

Then

$$G(z, \psi_1 \circ \psi_2(x')) = (z - c_1(\psi_2(x')))(z - c_2(x'))G_2(z, x').$$

Continuing in the same manner we obtain a proper analytic map ψ , which is a composition of finitely many proper analytic maps ψ_1, ψ_2, \dots constructed above, such that

$$G(z, \phi(a)) = E(z, a)(z - c_1(a)) \cdot \dots \cdot (z - c_{2d-2}(a)),$$

where E is non-vanishing and where $c_j = c_j(a)$ are real-analytic, $a \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2}$.

We have to prove that in fact $c_j(a)$ are complex-analytic. Let K be the set of parameters in the original parameter space such that there are exactly $2d-2$ distinct critical points. Then since ψ is proper, $K' = \psi^{-1}(K)$ has full measure in \mathbb{B}^{n-2} . Since the critical points are simple in K , we have $2d-2$ analytic functions c_j on \mathbb{B}^{n-2} which are analytic on K and continuous on \mathbb{B}^{n-2} . Since K has full measure, the functions c_j can be continued analytically to the whole set \mathbb{B}^{n-2} by Rado's Theorem (p. 301-302 in [5]). Hence the critical points c_j move analytically as functions of the new variables in \mathbb{B}^{n-2} .

However, the new space \mathbb{B}^{n-2} is not necessarily normalised in the sense described in the Introduction; the function ψ need not be injective. This may cause some problems regarding transversality. We will deal with this in the section on Transversality.

2.2. Holomorphic motions and the parameter functions x_j . Let us state the following Theorems by Mañé [9]:

Theorem 2.1 (Mañé's Theorem I). *Let $f : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \mapsto \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a rational map and $\Lambda \subset J(f)$ a compact invariant set not containing critical points or parabolic points. Then either Λ is a hyperbolic set or $\Lambda \cap \omega(c) \neq \emptyset$ for some recurrent critical point c of f .*

Theorem 2.2 (Mañé's Theorem II). *If $x \in J(f)$ is not a parabolic periodic point and does not intersect $\omega(c)$ for some recurrent critical point c , then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a neighborhood U of x such that*

- For all $n \geq 0$, every connected component of $f^{-n}(U)$ has diameter $\leq \varepsilon$.
- There exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 0$ and every connected component V of $f^{-n}(U)$, the degree of $f^n|_V$ is $\leq N$.
- For all $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ there exists $n_0 > 0$, such that every connected component of $f^{-n}(U)$, with $n \geq n_0$, has diameter $\leq \varepsilon_1$.

An alternative proof of Mañé's Theorem can also be found by L. Tan and M. Shishikura in [16]. Let us also note that a corollary of Mañé's Theorem II is that a Misiurewicz map cannot have any Siegel disks, Herman rings or Cremer points (see [9] or [16]).

Since f is a Misiurewicz map, there is some $k \geq 0$ such that the set

$$P^k(f) = \overline{\bigcup_{n>k, c \in \text{Crit}(f) \cap J(f)} f^n(c)}$$

is compact, forward invariant and does not contain any critical or parabolic points. Let us put $\Lambda = P^k(f)$ for the smallest such k . By Mañé's Theorem I it follows that Λ is a hyperbolic set. Hence, there exists a holomorphic motion $h : \mathbb{B}(0, r) \times \Lambda \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, such that h_a is an injection for each $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ and $h_a : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_a$, where $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$ and the following holds for $z \in \Lambda$:

$$f_a \circ h_a(z) = h_a \circ f_0(z).$$

Put $v_j(a) = f_a(c_j(a))$ for each marked critical point $c_j(a)$ and $v_j(0) = v_j$.

For $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$, let us introduce the *parameter functions* x_j

$$x_j(a) = v_j(a) - h_a(v(0)).$$

Let us define $\mu_{n,j}(a) = h_a(f_0^n(v_j(0)))$.

Definition 2.3. Given a set E and $\delta > 0$, we call the set $\{x : \text{dist}(x, E) \leq \delta, \}$, a δ -neighbourhood of E .

2.3. Some constants. We define the constant λ to the minimum over $|f'_a(z)|$ over all $(z, a) \in \Lambda_a \times \overline{B}(0, r)$. Since $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$ is hyperbolic, in general there is some $N > 0$ such that $|(f^N)'(z, a)| \geq \lambda_0 > 1$ for all $(z, a) \in \Lambda_a \times \overline{B}(0, r)$ for some small $r > 0$, but for simplicity assume that $N = 1$ so that $\lambda > 1$.

Let \mathcal{N} be a δ' -neighbourhood around Λ , such that $|f'_a(z)| \geq \lambda/2$, for all $z \in \mathcal{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$. Moreover, let U be a δ -neighbourhood around the critical points of f so that $U \cap \mathcal{N} = \emptyset$ and $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Choose $r > 0$ such that every $c_j(a)$ belongs to a δ^{10} -neighbourhood around $\text{Crit}(f_0)$ for every $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$. Moreover, let U_l be a δ_l -neighbourhood around $\text{Crit}(f)$, for some $\delta_l \leq \delta$. These U_l will be defined inductively later.

3. TRANSVERSALITY

We will in this section study the functions $x_j(a)$. First, note that $x_j(0) = 0$ for all j . We cannot have $x_j(a) \equiv 0$ for all j by Theorem E in [8] (see also Theorem A in [2]), because then all maps in $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ would be Misiurewicz maps. Hence we may assume that at least one j has that $x_j(a)$ is not identically equal to zero, i.e. x_j has *finite order contact* (see definition below). In $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ the function x_j is an analytic function in several variables and has a power series expansion

$$(3) \quad x_j(a) = \sum_{|\alpha| \geq 1} b_\alpha a^\alpha$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2d-2})$ is a multi-index, $\alpha_j \geq 0$ and $|\alpha| = \sum \alpha_j$.

Definition 3.1. If $B(0, r)$ is a 1-dimensional disk we say that the critical point $c_j(a)$ has contact of order k if

$$x_j(a) = v_j(a) - h_a(v(0)) = K_1 a^K + \dots,$$

for some $K_1 \neq 0$. If $x_j(a)$ is identically equal to zero we say that $c_j(a)$ has contact of infinite order in $B(0, r)$.

If we consider $x_j(a)$ as a function of $a \in \mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ (where \mathbb{B} is an open set of dimension $\leq 2d - 2$), then we say that c_j has finite order contact in \mathbb{B} if x_j is not identically equal to zero in \mathbb{B} .

If it is evident in which set x_j has finite order contact in, we just say x_j has finite order contact. Dropping the index and writing $x(a), v(a)$ we mean $x_j(a), v_j(a)$ respectively for some index j . This index is chosen so that $x_j(a)$ has finite order contact unless otherwise stated. Also, we write $v_a = v(a)$.

3.1. Tangent cones. We want to restrict to parameters where $x(a) \neq 0$ and $x'(a) \neq 0$. To this end, we construct a cone-like set of the form $V_0 \times \mathbb{C}$, where $V_0 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{2d-3})$ is an open ball of directions, such that $x'(a) \neq 0$ and $x(a) \neq 0$ for all $a \in V_0 \times B(0, r) \setminus \{0\}$ and for all $x(a) = x_i(a)$ which have finite order contact in $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ (here $B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$). Let us assume that $x_i(a)$ has finite order contact for the set of indices $i \in I$. Each equation from the the set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} x'_i(a) &= 0, & i \in I \\ x_i(a) &= 0, & i \in I \end{aligned}$$

defines an analytic set. Let us number these analytic sets as A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n . We now use the standard theory of analytic sets (see e.g. [5]); if A is an analytic set, then the tangent cone $C(A, 0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2d-2}$ to A at 0 is defined as set of vectors $v \in \mathbb{C}^{2d-2}$ such that there exists $a_j \rightarrow 0$, $a_j \in A$ and real numbers $t_j > 0$ such that $t_j a_j \rightarrow v$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By [5] p.83, the set $C(A, 0)$ is an algebraic subset in \mathbb{C}^{2d-2} . Let $p(v)$ be the projection of \mathbb{C}^{2d-2} onto $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{2d-3})$. Now, applying this to the sets A_j , we see that since $p(C(A_j, 0)) \neq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{2d-3})$ and $C(A_j, 0)$ is closed there must be an open ball $V_0 \subset p(\cap_j C(A_j, 0))^c$.

Moreover, any 1-dimensional disk $B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ is determined by a direction vector $v \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{2d-3})$. Let us pick a for v representative direction vector $v_0 = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{2d-2})$ (i.e. so that v_0 has direction v). Then the plane in which $B(0, r)$ lies can be parameterised by

$$\{a \in \mathbb{C}^{2d-2} : a = (\alpha_1 t, \alpha_2 t, \dots, \alpha_{2d-2} t), t \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

The expansion of θ in $B(0, r)$, where θ is either some $x_j(a)$ or a component of $x'_j(a)$, becomes

$$(4) \quad \theta(t) = \sum_{k \geq k_0} p_k t^k + \dots,$$

where each $p_k = p_k(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2d-2})$ is a polynomial in the variables $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2d-2})$. By Proposition 1 p. 83 in [5], we have $\{p_{k_0} = 0\} = C(A_j, 0)$. Since $\cap_j C(A_j, 0) \supset C(\cap_j A_j, 0)$ we have that for any 1-dimensional disk $B(0, r)$ with direction $v \in V_0$, the expansion of any x_j or component of x'_j becomes

$$(5) \quad \theta(t) = K_1 t^k + \dots,$$

where K_1 is continuous function of the direction and k is constant for all $v \in V_0$. We say that k is the order of f in the cone $W = V_0 \times B(0, r)$. This W is the starting *good cone* where the x_j behaves nicely. The importance of W is that x_j has bounded distortion on so called dyadic disks defined as follows.

Definition 3.2. A disk $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of dimension $\leq n$ is called a *k-Whitney disk* or simply a *Whitney disk* if

$$(6) \quad \text{diam}(D) \geq k \text{dist}(D, 0).$$

We say that x' has bounded distortion in some set D if

$$(7) \quad \|x'(a) - x'(b)\| \leq \varepsilon \|x'(a)\|,$$

for all $a, b \in D$, for some small (fixed) $\varepsilon > 0$.

By compactness of \overline{V}_1 the function K_1 is uniformly continuous in V_1 . The following lemma now follows easily from (5).

Lemma 3.3. *There is some $0 < k < 1$ such that every $x_j(a)$ and every component of $x'_j(a)$ has bounded distortion on k -Whitney disks in W .*

Moreover, we will use the following folklore result which follows from [17] by S. van Strien (see also [6] by A. Epstein). In [17] the definition of Misiurewicz maps differs. However, in the case where the Julia set is the whole sphere then our definition coincides with that of van Strien.

Theorem 3.4. *If $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ is a $2d - 2$ dimensional ball of normalised rational maps, then the function $G : a \rightarrow (x_1(a), \dots, x_n(a))$ is a local immersion unless f is a flexible Lattés map.*

Hence if f is not a flexible Lattés map, the tangent vectors $x'_j(0)$ are all linearly independent. By continuity this also holds in the some small parameter ball $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$.

If critical points of higher order exist for f , then we change to the new variables described in Subsection 2.1. Although it is clear that in this new space \mathbb{B}^{n-2} , $a = 0$ is still an isolated zero of G (because ψ is proper), the new space may not be normalised.

In this case we will perturb our original function f into a new Misiurewicz map, for which every critical point is simple, and still the Julia set is the whole sphere. To do this, let c be a higher order critical point and assume that $c = c_1(0) = \dots = c_N(0)$, where the functions c_j are analytic in \mathbb{B}^{n-2} , $1 < N \leq 2d - 2$ (i.e. c has order N).

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, consider the set $Z_i = \{a \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2} : x_j(a) = 0, \text{ for all } j \neq i\}$. By Lemma 2.3 in [17], there is a locally univalent parameterisation of Z_i :

$$\Psi_i : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow Z_i,$$

where $\Psi_i(0) = 0 \in \mathbb{B}^{n-2}$. Following [17] (Lemma 3.1) we note that there is some periodic repelling point $q_i(\lambda)$ arbitrarily close to the critical value $v_i(0) = f^{k+1}(c_i(0), 0) \in \Lambda$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, put

$$X_i(\lambda) = f_{\Psi(\lambda)}^{k+1}(c_i(\lambda)) - q_i(\lambda).$$

We now note that if $(x_i \circ \Psi_i)'(0) \neq 0$, for all i , then the tangent vectors $x'_i(0)$ are linearly independent and G is an immersion as in Theorem 3.4. In this case we do not need to change our function f .

Hence suppose that $(x_i \circ \Psi_i)'(0) = 0$. That means that $(x_i \circ \Psi_i)(\lambda) = g(\lambda)\lambda^d$, where $d \geq 2$ and $g(\lambda) \neq 0$ in a neighbourhood $B(0, \delta)$ of 0. We claim that $X_i \circ \Psi_i$ has d zeros in $B(0, \delta)$ if $q_i = q_i(0)$ is chosen sufficiently close to $v_i(0)$. The proof of this claim is identical to that of [17], pp. 46-48. With $U_i(\lambda) = q_i(\lambda) - v_i(\lambda)$ we get

$$t^d g(t) + U_i \circ \Psi_i(t) = X_i \circ \Psi_i(t).$$

Hence if $u_i = U_i \circ \Psi_i$ is sufficiently close to zero (i.e. q_i is sufficiently close to v_i), the image of $\partial B(0, \delta)$ under the function $t^d \frac{g(t)}{u(t)}$ is a curve that encircles -1 d times. By the Argument Principle there is at least one solution $t_0 \in B(0, \delta)$ to

$$t^d \frac{g(t)}{u(t)} = -1.$$

For this t_0 , the function $f_{\Psi_i(t_0)}$ is a new Misiurewicz map different from f_0 and where $c_i(\Psi(t_0))$ is simple. The other critical points $c_j(\Psi(t_0))$, $j \neq i$ still coincide and form a critical point of order $N - 1$.

Repeating this argument $N - 1$ times we obtain a Misiurewicz map such that all critical points are simple.

3.2. Outline of proof of Theorem A. To prove the main result we take a full-dimensional Whitney parameter disk $\mathbb{B}_0 \subset W$. Suppose that c_1 has finite order contact in \mathbb{B}_0 . We first show that the set $\xi_{n,1}(\mathbb{B}_0)$ grows up to some definite size before it leaves \mathcal{N} (Lemma 4.6). By bounded distortion the set $\xi_{n,1}(\mathbb{B}_0)$ will contain a disk of diameter at least $S = S_0$, where S is some “large scale”.

By normality and compactness we show that for some m , $\xi_{n+m,1}(B(0, r))$ covers the whole Riemann sphere apart from at most 2 points. In particular, $c_1(a)$ and two of its pre-images cannot be omitted by $\xi_{n+m,1}(B(0, r))$. Hence $c_1(B(0, r)) \subset \xi_{n+m,1}(B(0, r))$ and there is a solution to $\xi_{n+m,1}(a) - c_1(a) = 0$ in $B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$. Next we will pass to the analytic subset $\mathbb{B}_0 \subset W$ where $\xi_{n+m,1}(a) - c_1(a) = 0$, and argue inductively.

In the next step, we consider c_2 , which also has to have finite order contact. In fact, assume that there are no more critical points than c_1 of finite order contact. Then there would be a small ball \mathbb{B} around the solution a to $\xi_{n+m,1}(a) - c_1(a) = 0$, where \mathbb{B} is a family of Misiurewicz maps. This is impossible by [2].

Now, we try to connect this c_2 with itself also in the same way as we did with c_1 . However, to continue we need to have control of the shape and size of \mathbb{B}_1 . These results are mainly dealt with in the sections 4 and 5. We show that we have good control of the geometry of \mathbb{B}_1 in Whitney disks, so that the parameter function x_2 maps \mathbb{B}_1 onto small circles, so that $\xi_{n,2}(\mathbb{B}_1)$ in turn grows to another large scale S_1 (which is typically less than S_0). Then, as in the previous case for c_1 , we can use non-normality and compactness again to get another N_1 for which $\xi_{n+m,2}(a) - c_2(a) = 0$, for some $a \in \mathbb{B}_1$ and $m \leq N_1$. A new manifold $\mathbb{B}_2 \subset \mathbb{B}_1$ is thereby formed, where $\xi_{n+m,2}(a) - c_2(a) = 0$. We continue in this manner until all critical points are in the Fatou set.

4. DISTORTION LEMMAS

In this section we state the necessary distortion lemmas that will be needed to get a Whitney parameter disk to grow to the large scale before it leaves \mathcal{N} . Many lemmas in this section are proven in [2] (and also in [3]) in a one-dimensional version. In this section assume always that $c = c_j$ is transversal, i.e. $x(a) = x_j(a) = c_j(a) - v_j(a)$ is not identically equal to zero. Recall the notation $v_j(a) = v_a$ for the critical values.

Let us start with the following lemma (see [15]).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $u_n \in \mathbb{C}$ be complex numbers for $1 \leq n \leq N$. Then*

$$(8) \quad \left| \prod_{n=1}^N (1 + u_n) - 1 \right| \leq \exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^N |u_n|\right) - 1.$$

The following lemma is a modified version of Lemma 3.2 in [2].

Lemma 4.2 (Main Distortion Lemma). *For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $r > 0$ and $\delta' > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $a, b \in W$. Then as long as $f_a^j(v_a), f_b^j(v_b) \in \mathcal{N}$*

(recall that \mathcal{N} depends on δ'), for all $0 \leq j \leq n$ we have

$$\left| \frac{(f_a^n)'(v_a)}{(f_b^n)'(v_b)} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

The same statement holds if one replaces $v(s) = \xi_0(s)$, $s = a, b$, by $\mu_0(t)$, $t = a, b$.

Proof. The proof goes in two steps. Let us first show that

$$(9) \quad \left| \frac{(f_t^n)'(\mu_0(t))}{(f_t^n)'(\xi_0(t))} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon_1,$$

where $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon(\delta')$ is close to 0. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left| \frac{f_t'(\mu_j(t)) - f_t'(\xi_j(t))}{f_t'(\xi_j(t))} \right| &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |f_t'(\mu_j(t)) - f_t'(\xi_j(t))| \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |\mu_j(t) - \xi_j(t)| \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda^{j-n} |\mu_n(t) - \xi_n(t)| \leq C(\delta'), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the hyperbolicity of the hyperbolic set Λ_t . By Lemma 4.1, (9) holds if δ' is small enough. Secondly, we show that

$$\left| \frac{(f_t^n)'(\mu_0(t))}{(f_s^n)'(\mu_0(s))} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon_2,$$

where $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(\delta')$ is close to 0. Put $\lambda_{t,j} = f_t'(\mu_j(t))$. Since $\lambda_{t,j}$ are all analytic in t we have

$$\lambda_{t,j} = \lambda_{0,j} \left(1 + \sum_{|\alpha| \geq k_j} c_{\alpha,j} t^\alpha \right),$$

where $t = t_1 \cdots t_{2d-2}$, α is a multi-index and $k_j \geq 1$. Moreover, the condition $R_a^j(v_a) \in \mathcal{N}$ implies that $n \leq -C \log |x(t)| \leq -C' \log \|t\|$ for some constant C' , where $\|t\|$ is the norm of t viewed as a vector in \mathbb{C}^{2d-2} . We have

$$\frac{(f_t^n)'(\mu_0(t))}{(f_s^n)'(\mu_0(s))} = \prod \frac{\lambda_{t,j}}{\lambda_{s,j}} = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{(1 + \sum_{|\alpha|=k_j} c_{\alpha,j} t^\alpha + \dots)}{(1 + \sum_{|\alpha|=k_j} c_{\alpha,j} s^\alpha + \dots)}.$$

Both the last numerator and denominator in the above equation can be estimated by $1 + C'' n \|t\|^l$ and $1 + C'' n \|s\|^l$ respectively, for some constant C'' and integer $l \geq 1$. Since $n \leq -C' \log \|t\|$ the numerator and denominator are bounded by $1 + \mathcal{O}((\log \|t\|) \|t\|^l)$ and $1 + \mathcal{O}((\log \|s\|) \|s\|^l)$ respectively, which both can be made arbitrarily close to 1 if $r > 0$ is small enough. From this the lemma follows. \square

We reformulate Lemma 3.3 in [2] in the following vector form.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. If $\delta' > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for every $0 < \delta'' < \delta'$ there exists $r > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $a \in W$ and assume that $\xi_k(a) \in \mathcal{N}$, for all $k \leq n$ and $|\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)| \geq \delta''$. Then*

$$\|\xi_n'(a) - (f_a^n)'(\mu_0(a))x'(a)\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi_n'(a)\|.$$

Proof. First we note that by Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\xi_n(a) = x(a)(f_a^n)'(\mu_0(a)) + \mu_n(a) + E_n(a),$$

where, for instance $|E_n(a)| \leq |\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)|/1000$ independently of n and a if δ' is small enough. Put $f_a'(\mu_j(a)) = \lambda_{a,j}$. Differentiating with respect to a we get

$$(10) \quad \xi_n'(a) = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{a,j} \left(x'(a) + x(a) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\lambda'_{a,j}}{\lambda_{a,j}} + \frac{\mu_n'(a) + E_n'(a)}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{a,j}} \right).$$

We claim that only the $x'(a)$ is dominant in (10) if n is large so that $\delta'' \leq |\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)| \leq \delta'$. This means that, by Lemma 4.2,

$$(1 - \varepsilon_1)\delta'' \leq |x(a)| \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} |\lambda_{a,j}| \leq (1 + \varepsilon_1)\delta' < 1,$$

where $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ is arbitrarily small provided $r > 0$ is small enough. Since $\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} |\lambda_{a,j}| \geq \lambda^n$, for some $\lambda > 1$, taking logarithms and rearranging we get

$$(11) \quad (1 - \varepsilon_1) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |\lambda_{a,j}| \leq -\log |x(a)| \leq (1 + \varepsilon_1) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |\lambda_{a,j}|,$$

if $|\log \delta''| \ll |\log |x(a)||$, which is true if the perturbation $r > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small compared to δ'' . Since $|\lambda_{a,j}| \geq \lambda > 1$, this means that

$$|x(a)| \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\|\lambda'_{a,j}\|}{|\lambda_{a,j}|} \leq |x(a)|nC \leq -C|x(a)| \log |x(a)|.$$

Finally $-|x(a)| \log |x(a)|/\|x'(a)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow 0$ inside W .

Now, $|E_n(a)|$ is uniformly bounded in W . Therefore, $\|E_n'(a)\|$ is also uniformly bounded on compact subsets of W by Cauchy's Formula. By diminishing $r > 0$ slightly we can assume that both $|E_n(a)|$ and $\|E_n'(a)\|$ are uniformly bounded on W . Hence, the last two terms in (10) tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since also $|\mu_n'(a)|$ is uniformly bounded. We have proved that

$$\left\| \xi_n'(a) - x'(a) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{a,j} \right\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi_n'(a)\|,$$

if $|\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)| \leq \delta'$ and $n \geq N$ for some N . Choose the perturbation r sufficiently small so that this N is at most the number n in (11). Since $\lambda_{a,j} = f_a'(\mu_j(a))$, the proof is finished. \square

From this we deduce the following important Proposition (see also Proposition 3.4 in [2]):

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. If $\delta' > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for every $0 < \delta'' < \delta'$, there exists $r > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $a \in W$ and assume that $\xi_k(a) \in \mathcal{N}$, for all $k \leq n$ and $|\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)| \geq \delta''$. Then*

$$(12) \quad \|\xi_n'(a) - (f_a^n)'(v(a))x'(a)\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi_n'(a)\|.$$

More generally, we have a higher-dimensional form of Proposition 4.3 in [3]. Put

$$Q_n = Q_{n,l}(a) = \xi_n'(a)/(f_a^n)'(v_l(a), a).$$

Proposition 4.5. *For every $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently small $\delta'' > 0$ there is an $r > 0$ such that the following holds. Assume that the parameter $a \neq 0$, $a \in W$, satisfies $\text{dist}(\xi_n(a), \text{Crit}(f_a)) \geq \delta$ for all $n \leq m$. Moreover, assume that $\delta'' \leq |\xi_N(a) - \mu_N(a)| \leq \delta'$ and*

$$(13) \quad |(f^n)'(\xi_N(a), a)| \geq Ce^{\gamma n}, \quad \text{for } n = 0, \dots, m,$$

$$(14) \quad |\partial_a f(\xi_n(a), a)| \leq B, \quad \forall n > 0,$$

where $\gamma \geq (3/4) \log \lambda$ (see Subsection 2.3 for definition of λ). Then we have, for $n = N, \dots, m$,

$$(15) \quad \|Q_n(a) - Q_N(a)\| \leq \|Q_N(a)\|/1000.$$

Proof. First, we prove by induction, that

$$(16) \quad \|\xi'_{N+k}(a)\| \geq e^{\gamma'(N+k)},$$

where $\gamma' = \min(\log \lambda/(2K), \gamma/2)$ and K is the order of $x(a)$ in W . From (3) it is straightforward to show that

$$\|x'(a)\| \geq C|x(a)|^{\frac{K-1}{K}},$$

for some constant C . Then we get

$$(17) \quad \|\xi'_N(a)\| \geq (1/2)|(f_a^N)'(v(a))\| \|x'(a)\| \geq (C/2)|(f_a^N)'(v(a))\| |x(a)|^{\frac{K-1}{K}}.$$

By Lemma 4.2 and since $\delta'' \leq |\xi_N(a) - \mu_N(a)| \leq \delta'$, we get

$$|(f_a^N)'(v(a))\| |x(a)| \geq \delta''/2.$$

If the perturbation $r > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, so that N becomes sufficiently large, we deduce that

$$\|\xi'_N(a)\| \geq (C/2)|(f_a^N)'(v(a))\| |x(a)|^{\frac{K-1}{K}} \geq (C\delta''/4)|(f_a^N)'(v(a))|^{1/K} \geq e^{\gamma'N},$$

where $\gamma' \geq \min(\log \lambda/(2K), \gamma/2)$.

So, assume that

$$\|\xi'_{N+j}(a)\| \geq e^{\gamma'(N+j)}, \quad \text{for all } j \leq k.$$

We want to prove that

$$\|\xi'_{N+j}(a)\| \geq e^{\gamma'(N+j)}, \quad \text{for all } j \leq k+1.$$

First note that the assumption $\text{dist}(\xi_n(a), \text{Crit}(f_a)) \geq \delta$, with $\delta = e^{-\Delta}$, implies

$$(18) \quad |f'(\xi_j(a), a)| \geq C_1^{-1}e^{-\Delta K},$$

for some $C_1 > 0$. By the Chain Rule we have the recursions

$$(19) \quad \frac{\partial f^{n+1}(v(a), a)}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial f(\xi_n(a), a)}{\partial z} \frac{\partial f^n(v(a), a)}{\partial z},$$

$$(20) \quad \frac{\partial f^{n+1}(v(a), a)}{\partial a} = \frac{\partial f(\xi_n(a), a)}{\partial z} \frac{\partial f^n(v(a), a)}{\partial a} + \frac{\partial f(\xi_n(a), a)}{\partial a}.$$

Now, the recursion formulas (19) and (20), together with (18) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi'_{N+k+1}(a)\| &\geq |f'_a(\xi_{N+k}(a))| \|\xi'_{N+k}(a)\| \left(1 - \frac{\|\partial_a f_a(\xi_{N+k}(a))\|}{|f'_a(\xi_{N+k}(a))| \|\xi'_{N+k}(a)\|}\right) \\
&\geq |(f_a^{k+1})'(\xi_N(a))| \|\xi'_N(a)\| \prod_{j=0}^k \left(1 - \frac{\|\partial_a f_a(\xi_{N+j}(a))\|}{|f'_a(\xi_{N+j}(a))| \|\xi'_{N+j}(a)\|}\right) \\
&\geq e^{\gamma(k+1)} e^{\gamma'N} \prod_{j=0}^k (1 - B' e^{K\Delta} e^{-\gamma'(N+j)}).
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B' e^{\Delta - \gamma'(N+j)} < \infty,$$

and the sum can be made arbitrarily small if N is large enough. Therefore,

$$\|\xi'_{N+k+1}(a)\| \geq e^{(\gamma - \gamma')(k+1)} e^{\gamma'(N+k+1)} \prod_{j=0}^k (1 - B' e^{K\Delta - \gamma'(N+j)}) \geq e^{\gamma'(N+k+1)},$$

if N is large enough, since $\gamma' \geq 2K\alpha$, (here $B' = BC_1$). Hence (16) follows.

To continue the proof, first note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi'_{N+k}(a) - \xi'_N(a) \prod_{j=N}^{N+k} f'_a(\xi_j(a))\| &= \left\| \sum_{j=N}^{N+k} \partial_a f_a(\xi_j(a)) \prod_{i=j}^{N+k} f'_a(\xi_{i+1}(a)) \right\| \\
(21) \quad &\leq \sum_{j=N}^{N+k} \|\partial_a f_a(\xi_j(a))\| \prod_{i=j}^{N+k} |f'_a(\xi_{i+1}(a))|.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us put $\lambda_n = f'_a(\xi_n)$, $\mu_n = \partial_a f_a(\xi_n(a))$ and $\xi'_n(a) = \xi'_n$. The first term in (21) is

$$\|\mu_N\| \prod_{i=N+1}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \leq \frac{\|\mu_N\|}{|\lambda_N| \|\xi'_N\|} \prod_{i=N}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \|\xi'_N\| \leq B' e^{\Delta K} e^{-\gamma'N} \prod_{i=N}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \|\xi'_N\|.$$

Put $C = B' e^{\Delta K}$. The n th term in (21) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_{N+n}\| \prod_{i=N+n}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| &= \frac{\|\mu_{N+n}\|}{|\lambda_{N+n-1}| \|\xi'_{N+n-1}\|} \prod_{i=N+n-1}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \|\xi'_{N+n-1}\| \\
&\leq C e^{-\gamma'(N+n-1)} \prod_{i=N+n-1}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \left(\prod_{j=N}^{N+n-2} |\lambda_j| \|\xi'_N\| + \sum_{j=N}^{N+n-2} \|\mu_j\| \prod_{i=j+1}^{N+n-2} |\lambda_i| \right) \\
&\leq C e^{-\gamma'(N+n-1)} \prod_{i=N}^{N+k-1} |\lambda_i| \|\xi'_N\| + C e^{-\gamma'(N+n-1)} \sum_{j=N}^{N+n-2} \|\mu_j\| \prod_{l=j+1}^{N+k-2} |\lambda_l|.
\end{aligned}$$

The last sum is the sum of the first $n-1$ terms in (21). As induction assumption the first $n-1$ terms in (21) is less than 1. This means that the n th term is at most $C n e^{-\gamma'(N+n-1)}$, which is again of course less than 1 if N is chosen sufficiently big.

We get finally

$$\|\xi'_{N+k}(a) - \xi'_N(a) \prod_{j=N}^{N+k} f'_a(\xi_j(a))\| \leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} C n e^{-\gamma'(N+n-1)} \|\xi'_N(a)\| \prod_{j=N}^{N+k} |f'_a(\xi_j(a))|.$$

So, if N is big enough,

$$\|Q_{N+n}(a) - Q_N(a)\| \leq \|Q_N(a)\|/1000.$$

□

From Proposition 4.5 and 4.4 we see that the space derivative and parameter derivative are comparable up to a multiplicative quantity, namely $x'(a) = x'_j(a)$ for some j . However, since $x'(a)$ generally is not constant, we want to restrict the parameters such that $x'(a)$ does not vary much. To this end it is naturally to restrict to sets where (7) holds.

If $x'(t)$ is not constant, then by Lemma 3.3 the set of parameters which satisfies the condition (7) contains a k -Whitney disk $D_0 \subset W$ for some $0 < k < 1$ only depending on the function x .

We need to know that a Whitney (parametric) disk grows to the large scale before it leaves \mathcal{N} . This is the content of the following lemma. Let the angle between vectors x and y be $\arccos(x \cdot y / (\|x\| \|y\|)) \in [0, \pi]$. Given two hyper planes H_1 and H_2 we say that the angle $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ between them is defined by

$$\cos \theta = \inf_{\bar{x} \in H_1} \sup_{\bar{y} \in H_2} \frac{\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}}{\|\bar{x}\| \|\bar{y}\|}.$$

Then we can also talk about angles between Whitney disks and hyper planes since every Whitney disk is contained in some unique hyper plane (with dimension equal to the dimension of the Whitney disk). Moreover, if D_0 is a Whitney disk and H a hyperplane, then the diameter of the orthogonal projection of D_0 onto H is $\text{diam}(D_0) \cos(\theta)$, where θ is the angle between D_0 and H .

Lemma 4.6. *If $r > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exists a number $0 < k < 1$ only depending on the function x such that the following holds. Let $D_0 = \mathbb{B}(a_0, r_0) \subset W$ be a k -Whitney disk (D_0 has dimension $\leq 2d - 2$) such that the angle θ between D_0 and $x'(a_0)$ is $\theta \neq \pi/2$: There is an $n > 0$ and a number $S = S(\delta', \theta)$, such that the set $\xi_n(D_0) \subset \mathcal{N}$ and has diameter at least S . Moreover, we have low argument distortion, i.e.*

$$(22) \quad \|\xi'_k(a) - \xi'_k(b)\| \leq \|\xi'_k(a)\|/100,$$

for all $a, b \in D_0$ and all $k \leq n$.

Proof. Choose n maximal such that $\xi_k(a_0) \in \mathcal{N}$ for all $k \leq n$ and

$$(\delta' + \delta'')/(2M_0) \leq |\xi_n(a_0) - \mu_n(a_0)| \leq (\delta' + \delta'')/2,$$

where M_0 is the supremum of $|f'_a(z)|$ over all $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ and $z \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$.

Proposition 4.4 holds for all $a \in W$ satisfying

$$(23) \quad \delta'' \leq |\xi_n(a) - \mu_n(a)| \leq \delta'.$$

Since $x'(a)$ has bounded distortion on Whitney disks by Lemma 3.3, for parameters $a, b \in D_0$ satisfying (23) we have good control of the geometry:

$$(24) \quad \|\xi'_n(a) - \xi'_n(b)\| \leq \|\xi'_n(a)\|/100.$$

Hence, ξ_n is almost linear in $D_0 = \mathbb{B}(a_0, r_0)$ if (23) is satisfied.

Assuming that (23) holds for all $a \in D_0$, we want to estimate the diameter d of the set $\xi_n(D_0)$. It is, up to very low distortion, precisely the orthogonal projection of $\xi'_n(a_0)$ onto the hyperplane where D_0 lies. The diameter d can be estimated by

$$d \geq \|\xi'_n(a_0)\| |\text{diam}(D_0) \cos(\theta)| \geq (1/2) |(f_{a_0}^n)'(\mu_0(a_0))| \|x'(a_0)\| \|k_0 a_0\| \cos(\theta),$$

where we also used Proposition 4.4. If the Whitney disk D_0 is too large such that (23) is not fulfilled, then $\xi_n(D_0)$ fails to be a subset of

$$A(\delta'', \delta', \mu_n(a_0)) = \{z : \delta'' \leq |z - \mu_n(a_0)| \leq \delta'\}$$

and we may have to diminish r_0 . However, with $r_0 = k_0 \|a_0\|$ we can choose $\delta'' > 0$ sufficiently small so that at least if $k_0 \leq 1/2$, then $\xi_n(D_0) \subset A(\delta'', \delta', \mu_n(a_0))$.

By Lemma 4.2,

$$(\delta' + \delta'')/(2M_0) \leq |\xi_n(a_0) - \mu_n(a_0)| \leq 2|(f_{a_0}^n)'(\mu_0(a_0))| |x(a_0)|.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{\delta'} \geq C \frac{|(f_{a_0}^n)'(\mu_0(a_0))| \|k_0 a_0\| \|x'(a_0)\|}{|(f_{a_0}^n)'(\mu_0(a_0))| |x(a_0)|}.$$

The number $\|k_0 a_0\| \|x'(a_0)\| / |x(a_0)|$ is bounded from below in W . Hence there is some constant C' so that $d/\delta' \geq C'$. So the diameter d of the set $\xi_n(D_0)$ is greater than some $S = S(\delta', \theta)$. Also, by (24), we have bounded argument distortion for all $a, b \in D_0$. \square

Hence, a Whitney disk $D_0 \subset W$ will grow to size S under the map ξ_n before $\xi_n(D_0)$ leaves \mathcal{N} . At the same time we have strong control over the distortion up to the scale S . Let us formalize and say that we have *strong distortion estimates in D_0 up to time n* if

$$(25) \quad \|\xi'_k(a) - \xi'_k(b)\| \leq \|\xi'_k(a)\|/100,$$

holds for all $a, b \in D_0$ and for all $k \leq n$. If it is clear what n is, we just say strong distortion estimates in D_0 .

Finally we will use the following distortion lemma for the so called free period, i.e. when $\xi_n(E)$ has left \mathcal{N} , for some set E . The following follows directly.

Lemma 4.7 (Extended Distortion Lemma). *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and neighbourhood U of $\text{Crit}(f_0)$, there exists an $r > 0$ and $S' > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ and assume that $z, w \in \mathcal{N}$ are such that $f^k(z, a), f^k(w, b) \notin U$ and $|f^k(z, a) - f^k(w, b)| \leq S'$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n$, where $n \leq N$. Then*

$$\left| \frac{(f^n)'(z, a)}{(f^n)'(w, b)} - 1 \right| < \varepsilon.$$

The bound N will come from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *There exists an $r > 0$ such that the following holds. Fix $d > 0$ and let \mathcal{S} be a family of disks with diameter d which cover the Julia set $J(f)$ of the starting function f_0 and such that each disk $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is centered at a point in $J(f)$. Then there exists some constant N such that*

$$(26) \quad \inf\{m : f_0^m(S) \supset \overline{U}\} \leq N,$$

for every disk $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. Since f^n is not normal on the Julia set, for each point $z \in J(f)$ there is some (smallest) $N(z)$ for which $f^{N(z)}(S) \supset \overline{U}$. For each z there is some neighbourhood for which $N(z)$ is constant. Since $J(f)$ is compact there is a constant N such that

$$\inf\{m : f^m(S) \supset \overline{U}\} \leq N,$$

for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$. The lemma follows. \square

Arrange the disks in the family \mathcal{S} so that any disk D of diameter d for which there exists a point $z \in D \cap J(f) \neq \emptyset$ such that $\text{dist}(z, \partial D) \geq d/4$, there exists some $S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $S \subset D$.

5. CLOSING THE CRITICAL ORBITS

Although we have shown that we have strong distortion estimates on small Whitney disks, we start with a full-dimensional disk $\mathbb{B}_0 \subset W$. By Lemma 4.6, $\xi_n(\mathbb{B}_0)$ grows to some large scale size $S = S_0$ under strong distortion estimates, for some $n > 0$.

Assume that $x_1(a)$ has finite order contact and assume that we have found a solution $\xi_{n+m,1}(a_0) = c_1(a_0)$ for some $a_0 \in \mathbb{B}_0$. Let \mathbb{B}'_1 be the connected component of the set $\{a \in W : \xi_{n+m,1}(a) = c_1(a)\}$ containing a_0 . In order to get good geometry control of this manifold, we need to restrict to a set $\mathbb{B}_1 = D \cap \mathbb{B}'_1$, where D is a Whitney disk.

A proof of the following general result can be found in [11] p. 11, for instance.

Lemma 5.1. *Given an analytic function F from \mathbb{C}^n to \mathbb{C} , where $F(z_0) = w_0$. Then a relatively open subset $E \subset F^{-1}(w_0)$ is a submanifold if for all $z \in E$ we have $F'(z) \neq 0$.*

Hence, set of parameters $a \in W$ satisfying $F_1(a) = \xi_{n+m,1}(a) - c_1(a) = 0$ is a submanifold, apart from a set of singularities. In the next lemma we deal the problem of singularities.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that $A \subset W$ is a connected manifold, such that $\xi_{k,l}(A) \in \mathcal{N}$, for all $k \leq n$. Assume that $F_l(a) = \xi_{m+n,l}(a) - c_l(a) = 0$ for some $a \in A$ and that $\xi_{k,l}(a) \cap U_l = \emptyset$, for all $k \leq n + m - 1$, where U_l is a δ_l -neighbourhood of $\text{Crit}(f)$, $\delta_l \leq \delta$. Assume moreover that U_l has the property that the first return time into itself is at least $2m$ and that every $c_j(a)$ belongs to a δ_l^{10} -neighbourhood of $\text{Crit}(f)$, for $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$.*

Then if $r > 0$ is sufficiently small, then $\|\xi'_{n+m,l}(a)\| > 100\|c'_l(a)\|$ for all zeros of F_l inside A . In particular, there are no singularities of F_l on its set of zeros inside A .

Proof. The condition on U_l means that any solution to $F_l(a) = 0$ for $a \in A$ must have that $\xi_{k,l}(a) \cap U_l = \emptyset$ for all $k \leq n + m - 1$.

We have $|(f_a^n)'(v_a)| \geq e^{\gamma n}$, for some $\gamma \geq 2\underline{\gamma}$, by the definition of \mathcal{N} . We can choose r so that m/n is arbitrarily small, i.e. during the iterates $n + 1, \dots, n + m$ we do not lose much in derivative. In other words,

$$|(f_a^{n+m})'(v(a))| \geq e^{\gamma m} |(f_a^m)'(f_a^n(v(a)))| \geq e^{\gamma_1 n},$$

where $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma$. Indeed, we can get γ_1 as close to γ as we want. Choose γ_1 so that $\gamma_1 \geq \underline{\gamma}$. By Proposition 4.5,

$$\|\xi'_{n+m,l}(a)\| \geq e^{\gamma_1(n+m)} \|x'(a)\| \geq e^{\gamma'(n+m)},$$

for some $\gamma' \geq (1/k)\gamma_1$ (see proof of Proposition 4.5). Choosing n sufficiently large (i.e. $r > 0$ sufficiently small), we can therefore ensure that

$$\|\xi'_{n+m,l}(a)\| > 100\|c'_l(a)\|,$$

for all $a \in V \cap A$, where V is a neighbourhood the solution set $\xi_{n+m,l}(a) - c_l(a) = 0$. Hence $F'(a) \neq 0$ for all $a \in V \cap A$. \square

Passing on to a certain subset of $\mathbb{B}'_1 \subset W$, we want to show that this set has low curvature viewed as a surface embedded in W . To see what conditions are imposed on such a set, we begin with showing that $\xi_{n+m,1}(a)$ has bounded distortion in \mathbb{B}'_1 if $|\xi_{k,1}(a) - \xi_{k,1}(b)| \leq T$ for all $k \leq n+m$ all $a, b \in \mathbb{B}'_1$ and some number $T > 0$, depending on $U = U$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $U' \supset U$ be a 10δ -neighbourhood of $\text{Crit}(f) \cap J(f)$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist $r > 0$, $T > 0$ where T only depends on U and ε , such that the following holds. Assume that $a_0 \in W \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$, $\xi_{n,i}(a_0) = c_j(a_0)$ and $\xi_{k,i}(a_0) \cap U' = \emptyset$ for all $k \leq n-1$. Then we have*

$$(27) \quad \|\xi'_{n,i}(a_0) - \xi'_{n,i}(a)\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi'_{n,i}(a)\|,$$

if $|\xi_{k,i}(a_0) - \xi_{k,i}(a)| \leq T$ for all $k \leq n$. Moreover, for each such a , we have that $\xi_{k,i}(a) \cap U = \emptyset$, for all $k \leq n-1$.

Proof. Write $\xi_{k,i} = \xi_k$. Let $S > 0$ and $0 < k < 1$ be from Lemma 4.6. Assume that n_1 is maximal such that

$$\text{diam}(\xi_{n_1}(D_0)) \leq S, \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{n_1}(D_0) \subset \mathcal{N},$$

where $D_0 \subset W$ is a full-dimensional k -Whitney disk with center at a_0 . Lemma 4.6 implies that (27) holds if n is replaced by n_1 for $T = S$ and when $a \in D_0$. We will show that (27) holds after n iterates for some $T \leq S$.

Let $S' > 0$ be the constant in Lemma 4.7, given by $N = n - n_1$, U and some suitable sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $T \leq S'$ maximal such that the condition $|\xi_k(a_0) - \xi_k(a)| \leq T$ for all $k \leq n$, implies that $\xi_k(a) \cap U = \emptyset$ for all $k \leq n-1$. Note that T only depends on U . Then Lemma 4.7 together with Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$\left| \frac{(f_{a_0}^n)'(v_{a_0})}{(f_a^n)'(v_a)} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon_1,$$

where ε_1 is some suitable sufficiently small positive number (ε_1 depends on ε). Moreover, by the same argument as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 4.5, we have $|(f_x^k)'(v_x)| \geq e^{\gamma'k}$, for $x = a, a_0$ and all $k \leq n$ and some $\gamma' \geq \underline{\gamma}$. Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 3.3 imply that (27) holds since $a \in D_0$. The lemma is proved. \square

Let us assume that $\xi_{n+m,l}(a) - c_l(a) = 0$ and that $\xi_{n+m,l}(a)$ satisfies the assumptions in the above lemma. Put $F(a) = \xi_{n+m,l}(a) - c_l(a)$. Lemma 5.3 implies immediately that $\|\nabla F(b) - \nabla F(a)\|$ is small if b satisfies $|\xi_k(a) - \xi_k(b)| \leq T$ for all $k \leq m+n-1$. Hence if that holds for all parameters a in some submanifold in W , it means this manifold has low curvature.

Definition 5.4. Suppose that E is an open n -dimensional connected manifold parameterised by some open set $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, where $\phi : D \rightarrow E$ is a diffeomorphism and $E = \phi(D)$ and $\phi(\partial D) = \overline{E} \setminus E$. We say that E is *almost planar* if

$$\|\phi'(x) - \phi'(y)\| \leq 1/100,$$

for all $x, y \in D$.

If, in addition, D is a disk and

$$\text{diam}(E) \geq k \text{dist}(E, 0),$$

then we say that E is an almost planar k -Whitney disk. Moreover, if $d = \text{diam}(E)$, then we say that the radius of E is $r = d/2$. For any $0 < r' < r$ by $d \text{dist}(x, \partial E) \geq r'$ we mean the set $\{x \in E : \text{dist}(x, \overline{E} \setminus E) \geq r'\}$.

Let us now assume that we are in the l th step so that we have constructed a nested sequence of almost planar disks $\mathbb{B}_{k+1} \subset \mathbb{B}_k$, $0 \leq k \leq l-1$, such that each \mathbb{B}_k has that $F = F_k(a) = \xi_{n_k+m_k, k}(a) - c_k(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{B}_k$. In fact, since the sequence is nested, $F_k(a) = 0$ holds for all $1 \leq k \leq l$ in \mathbb{B}_l . Moreover, note that the normal vectors to the solution sets are $F'_k(a) = \xi'_{n_k+m_k, k}(a) - c'_k(a)$. These vectors are arbitrarily close to $\xi'_{n_k+m_k, k}(a)$ because $\|\xi'_{n_k+m_k, k}(a)\|$ is much larger than $\|c'_k(a)\|$, which follows from Lemma 5.2. Also, $\xi'_{n_k+m_k, k}(a)$ is well approximated by $(f_a^{n_k+m_k})'(v_k(a))x'_k(a)$ by Proposition 4.4. Hence we have the following important fact:

Fact. *The normal vectors to the solution sets $F_k(a) = 0$ are, up to arbitrary low distortion, parallel to $x'_k(a)$.*

A priori, Lemma 3.3 only applies to Whitney disks rather than almost planar Whitney disks. However, since \mathbb{B}_l is almost planar, it is uniformly well approximated by a hyperplane, i.e. the tangent space at points on \mathbb{B}_l does not vary much on \mathbb{B}_l . By Lemma 4.6 it then follows that if c_{l+1} has finite order contact, and if $x'_{l+1}(a)$ is not perpendicular to \mathbb{B}_l for $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$, the set $x_{l+1}(\mathbb{B}_l)$ will then grow to the large scale $S = S_l$ before leaving \mathcal{N} , i.e. $\xi_{n, l+1}(\mathbb{B}_l) \subset \mathcal{N}$ contains a disk of diameter S_l . By Lemma 4.8 there is some $N = N_l$ depending on S_l such that $\xi_{n+m, l+1}(\mathbb{B}_l)$ covers \overline{U} for some $m \leq N_l$. Clearly, if \mathbb{B}_l is an almost planar k_l -Whitney disk, then N_l depends only on k_l .

We now prove that if a given solution is found to $F_l(a) = 0$, then the parameters satisfying the conditions in Lemma 5.3 will contain a k_{l+1} -Whitney disk. Recall that the sets U_l are δ_l -neighbourhoods around the critical points on the Julia set for f . Let $U'_l \supset U_l$ be $10\delta_l$ -neighbourhoods around these critical points. Let $M_0 = \max |f'_a(z)|$ where the maximum is taken over all $(z, a) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}} \times \overline{\mathbb{B}}(0, r)$.

Lemma 5.5 (Inductive Lemma I). *Assume that $\mathbb{B}_l \subset \mathbb{B}_0 \subset W$ is an almost planar Whitney disk of diameter $2r_l \geq k_l \text{dist}(\mathbb{B}_l, 0)$ and for which every $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$ has that $\xi_{n_k+m_k, k}(a) - c_k(a) = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq l$ (if $l = 0$ we have no solutions so far). Assume that we have found a solution to*

$$\xi_{n_{l+1}+m_{l+1}, l+1}(a_0) - c_{l+1}(a_0) = 0$$

for some $a_0 \in \mathbb{B}_l$, such that $d \text{dist}(a_0, \partial \mathbb{B}_l) \geq r_l/2$ and such that $\xi_{n_{l+1}}(\mathbb{B}_l) \subset \mathcal{N}$ and $m_{l+1} \leq N_l$, where N_l only depends on k_l .

Then if $r > 0$ is sufficiently small, and if $\dim(\mathbb{B}_l) > 1$, there exists an almost planar k_{l+1} -Whitney disk $\mathbb{B}_{l+1} \subset \mathbb{B}_l$ of codimension 1 (in \mathbb{B}_l), where k_{l+1} only depends on k_l . For every $a \in \mathbb{B}_{l+1}$ we have $\xi_{n_{l+1}+m_{l+1}, l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0$. If $\dim(\mathbb{B}_l) = 1$, the set \mathbb{B}_{l+1} might reduce to a single point.

Proof. We can without loss of generality assume that n_{l+1} is the largest integer such that $\xi_{n_{l+1}}(\mathbb{B}_l) \subset \mathcal{N}$ and such that $\xi_{n_{l+1}}(\mathbb{B}_l)$ contains a disk of diameter S_l , where

$S_l > 0$ is the large scale from Lemma 4.6. Now choose U'_l such that $\xi_{k,l+1}(a_0) \cap U'_l = \emptyset$ for all $k \leq m_{l+1} + n_{l+1} - 1$ and that the first return time from U'_l to itself is at least $2N_l$. Hence U_l (which is a δ_l neighbourhood of $\text{Crit}(f_0)$) depends only on $m_{l+1} \leq N_l$, given that $r > 0$ is sufficiently small. The condition on $r > 0$ is that $c(a) \in U(c(0), \delta_l^{10})$ for all critical points $c(a)$, $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$.

Put $E = \{a \in W : \xi_{m+n,l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0\}$. By assumption, the set $E \cap \mathbb{B}_l$ is non empty. Since $\dim(\mathbb{B}_l) > 1$ and E has codimension 1, using Lemma 5.2 with $A = \mathbb{B}_l$, we see that the set $E \cap \mathbb{B}_l$ is a smooth manifold. Moreover, we must have $\dim(E \cap \mathbb{B}_l) \geq 1$. If $\dim(\mathbb{B}_l) = 1$ then $E \cap \mathbb{B}_l$ might reduce to a single point.

Let $\xi_{k,l+1} = \xi_k$ and put $m_{l+1} = m$ and $n_{l+1} = n$. According to Lemma 5.3, to have good geometry control of a manifold in W , any parameter b in this manifold must satisfy

$$(28) \quad |\xi_k(a_0) - \xi_k(b)| \leq T_l$$

for some $T_l > 0$ depending on U_l for all $k \leq n + m$. We will show that the set of such parameters b satisfying (28) contains a k_{l+1} -Whitney disk \mathbb{B}' , centered at a_0 , where k_{l+1} only depends on k_l .

Since $m \leq N_l$, the expansion $|(f_a^m)'(z)| \leq C_l = C_l(N_l)$ is bounded and depends only on N_l . Hence, $|\xi_k(a_0) - \xi_k(b)| \leq T_l$ for all $k \leq n + m$ if $|\xi_k(a_0) - \xi_k(b)| \leq S'_{l+1}$ for all $k \leq n$, where $S'_{l+1} \leq T_l / (2C_l)$. Now put $S_{l+1} = S'_{l+1} / (2M_0)$ (then S_{l+1} will be the new large scale). We get that (28) holds for a k_{l+1} -Whitney \mathbb{B}' disk centered at a_0 , where k_{l+1} is minimal such that $\xi_n(\mathbb{B}')$ contains a disk of diameter S_{l+1} (then $\text{diam}(\xi_n(\mathbb{B}')) \leq S'_{l+1}$). Since ξ_n is almost linear on k -Whitney disks according to Lemma 4.6 (where also $k_{j+1} \leq k_j$, $k = k_0$), we get that $k_{l+1}/k_l - S_{l+1}/S_l$ is arbitrarily close to zero (hence $k_{l+1} \approx k_l S_{l+1}/S_l$).

Moreover, the set $E \cap \mathbb{B}'$ must be almost planar in \mathbb{B}' . It follows that $\mathbb{B}_{l+1} = \mathbb{B}' \cap (E \cap \mathbb{B}_l)$ is an almost planar k_{l+1} -Whitney disk in \mathbb{B}_l . Finally, we see that k_{l+1} only depends on S_{l+1} , k_l and S_l . Clearly, S_{l+1} depends only on T_l and C_l . Now T_l depends on U_l which in turn depends on N_l and moreover C_l depends clearly on N_l . Finally, N_l depends only on S_l (the previous large scale) which in turn depends on k_l . Hence k_{l+1} depends only on k_l . The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 5.6 (Inductive Lemma II). *Assume that we have found an almost planar k_l -Whitney disk \mathbb{B}_l (of diameter $2r_l$) and a list of critical points $C_l = \{c_1, \dots, c_l\}$ depending on the parameter a such that for each $c_k \in C_l$ we have $\xi_{n_k+m_k,k}(a) - c_k(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$ and all $1 \leq k \leq l$. Assume that n_{l+1} is maximal such that $\xi_{n_{l+1},l+1}(\mathbb{B}_l) \subset \mathcal{N}$.*

Then if $r > 0$ is sufficiently small there exists a solution to

$$\xi_{n_{l+1}+m_{l+1},l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$, such that $\text{ddist}(a, \partial\mathbb{B}_l) \geq r_l/2$, where $m_{l+1} \leq N_l$, and N_l is an integer which only depends on k_l .

Proof. Put $\xi_{n_{l+1},l+1} = \xi_n$. It follows from Lemma 4.6 that $\xi_n(\mathbb{B}_l)$ contains a disk of diameter at least S_l before leaving \mathcal{N} (where S_l depends only on k_l). Indeed, the disk \mathbb{B}_l is an intersection of small manifolds determined by $F_j(a) = \xi_{n_j,j}(a) - c_j(a) = 0$. Each of these manifolds has normal vectors equal to $F'(a) = \xi_{n_j,j}(a) - c'_j(a)$. By the Fact on p. 15, we have that $F'_j(a)$ is almost parallel to $x'_j(a)$. The vectors $x'_j(0)$ are all linearly independent by Theorem 3.4. This implies that if θ is the angle between a tangent hyper-plane to \mathbb{B}_l and a tangent hyper-plane to $x'_{l+1}(a_0)$ (see before Lemma

4.6 for definition) then $\cos(\theta)$ is bounded away from 0 (since both these surfaces are almost planar their tangent hyper-planes do not vary much).

Since $\xi_n(a) \in J(f_0)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$ where $d\text{dist}(a, \partial\mathbb{B}_l) \geq (3/4)r_l$, there is some (maximal) almost planar disk $\mathbb{B}'_l \subset \mathbb{B}_l$ centered at a such that $d\text{dist}(b, \partial\mathbb{B}_l) \geq r_l/2$, for all $b \in \mathbb{B}'_l$. The set $\xi_{n_{l+1}}(\mathbb{B}'_l)$ will contain a disk of diameter $S_l/8$ centered at the Julia set of $J(f_0)$. By Lemma 4.8 there is an integer N_l , where $N_l = N_l(S_l)$ only depends on S_l , such that $f_0^m(\xi_n(\mathbb{B}'_l)) \supset \overline{U}_l$, $m \leq N_l$. Let m be defined by

$$m = \inf\{k > 0 : f_0^k(\xi_n(\mathbb{B}'_l)) \supset \overline{U}_l\}.$$

Since the parameter dependence can be made arbitrarily small under N_l iterates, by choosing $r > 0$ sufficiently small, we can also ensure that $f_a^m(\xi_n(\mathbb{B}'_l)) = \xi_{n+m}(\mathbb{B}'_l) \supset c_{l+1}(\mathbb{B}'_l)$. Hence there is a solution to $\xi_{n_{l+1}+m_{l+1}, l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0$ inside \mathbb{B}'_l . By the definition of \mathbb{B}'_l , we have $d\text{dist}(a, \partial\mathbb{B}_l) \geq r_l/2$. \square

Remark 5.7. The dependence of the constants U_l, T_l, S_l, N_l and $r > 0$ might seem intricate. Let us clarify the feasibility of choosing these constants in a consistent way. Put $S = S_0$ and $k = k_0$ in Lemma 4.6. The constants N_j, T_j, S_j, U_j depend on each other as follows. The number T_0 depends on U_0 , since the existence of T_0 follows from a given $U = U_0$ in Lemma 5.3. From T_0 we get some new large scale S_1 and its corresponding new Whitney number k_1 (see proof of Lemma 5.5). Obviously, N_l depends on S_l . The neighbourhood U_1 depends on N_1 since U_1 is defined in terms of the first return time from U_1 into itself is at least $2N_l$. Then again T_1 depends on U_1 and so on. One can write this as a scheme as follows. We write $X \rightarrow Y$ if Y depends on X but not the converse.

$$f \rightarrow S_0 \rightarrow N_0 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow S_1 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow \dots$$

Since there are no loops in this scheme, i.e. there are no two distinct elements X, Y for which both $X \rightarrow Y$ and $Y \rightarrow X$, there is no problem of choosing S_j, U_j, N_j .

Moreover, they are independent of $r > 0$, for all $r \leq R$, for some fixed (sufficiently small) $R > 0$.

Lemma 5.8. *Assume that f_0 is a Misiurewicz map. Then to any compact subset K of the Fatou set $F(f_0)$ there is some $r > 0$ such that $K \subset F(f_a)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$.*

Proof. Recall that the only Fatou components for Misiurewicz maps are those corresponding to attracting cycles. Assume first that K belongs to a given basin of attraction. That means that in the geometrically attracting case (where the corresponding attracting fixed point is not super-attracting) the conjugating function φ can be extended to the whole basin. In the super-attracting case there is a Greens function φ arising from the conjugating function. In both cases there are level lines when $|\varphi(z)|$ is constant. Since K is compact there is some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ so that for any $z \in K$, $|\varphi(z)| < \alpha$. Let $N_0 = \{z : |\varphi(z)| < \alpha\}$. Then N_0 is open and contains K . We have $f(N_0) = N_1 \subset N_0$. Put $N_k = f^k(N_0)$. Therefore,

$$N_0 \supset N_1 \supset \dots,$$

and $\cap_k N_k$ is the attracting fixed point. Since $\varphi = \varphi_0$ is continuous with respect to the parameter, for some $r > 0$ the set N_0 moves continuously in a , such that for any $a \in \mathbb{B}(0, r)$, putting $N'_0 = \{z : |\varphi_a(z)| < \alpha\}$, we have $N'_0 \supset K$ and $f_a(N'_0) \subset N'_0$. Again we get a nested sequence of sets $N'_0 \supset N'_1 \dots$. The intersection $I = \cap_k N'_k$ is an invariant topologically attracting set. It cannot intersect the Julia set since the Julia set is topologically repelling. Hence I is an invariant subset of the Fatou set

$F(f_a)$ of f_a , compactly contained in $F(f_a)$. It follows that I must be a fixed point. From this the lemma follows. \square

6. CONCLUSION AND PROOF OF THEOREM A

We prove Theorem A by induction finitely many times. Let us start with the given Misiurewicz map $f = f_0$ (not flexible Lattés map) for which $J(f) = \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. In the end we will find a hyperbolic map arbitrarily close to f .

Choose some (sufficiently small) $r > 0$ and some k_0 -Whitney full dimensional disk $\mathbb{B}_0 \subset W$ (where $k = k_0 \leq 1/2$ from Lemma 4.6). Let us now argue inductively. Assume that we have found solutions to the following equation for $1 \leq k \leq l$ (if $l = 0$ no solution is yet found):

$$(29) \quad \xi_{n_k+m_k,k}(a) - c_k(a) = 0.$$

Assume that (29) holds for all $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$ and for all $1 \leq k \leq l$, and that \mathbb{B}_l is an almost planar k_l -Whitney disk of radius r_l . Let us now proceed as follows.

Consider the critical point c_{l+1} which has finite order contact (in \mathbb{B}_l). Indeed, if no more critical points would have finite order contact, then there would be a small ball \mathbb{B} around any point in \mathbb{B}_l such that all \mathbb{B} are Misiurewicz maps. This is impossible unless $l = 2d - 2$, and then we are done.

Hence assume $l < 2d - 2$. In this case, by Lemma 5.6 there is a solution to $\xi_{n+m,l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0$ for some $a \in \mathbb{B}_l$ such that $d\text{dist}(a, \partial\mathbb{B}_l) \geq r_l/2$. By Lemma 5.5 there is a new almost planar k_{l+1} -Whitney disk $\mathbb{B}_{l+1} \subset \mathbb{B}_l$, where $\xi_{n+m,l+1}(a) - c_{l+1}(a) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{B}_{l+1}$.

Now, we continue in the same way with l replaced by $l + 1$.

Since the dimension drops 1 in each step, the set of parameters satisfying

$$\xi_{n_k+m_k,k}(a) - c_k(a) = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq l,$$

is a manifold of codimension l . Hence \mathbb{B}_l has dimension equal to $2d - 2 - l$. (In the last step, when $l = 2d - 2$ the set \mathbb{B}_{2d-2} might reduce to a single point).

Recall that the parameter space of rational maps of degree d up to conjugacy by a Möbius transformation is equal to $2d - 2$. Hence we can repeat the argument above finitely many times until every critical point lies in the orbit of a super-attracting cycle. Hence, we find a function f_a for some $a \in W \subset \mathbb{B}(0, r)$ which is hyperbolic. In fact every critical point lies in a super-attracting cycle. Since $r > 0$ was arbitrarily small, Theorem A follows.

REFERENCES

- [1] Magnus Aspenberg. Misiurewicz maps for which the Julia set is not the whole Riemann sphere. To appear in *Fund. Math.* (M. Misiurewicz 60th birthday festschrift).
- [2] Magnus Aspenberg. Rational Misiurewicz maps are rare II. Preprint, math.DS/0703306. To appear in *Comm. Math. Phys.*
- [3] Magnus Aspenberg. The Collet-Eckmann condition for rational maps on the Riemann sphere. Ph. D. thesis, Stockholm, 2004. <http://www.diva-portal.org/kth/abstract.xsql?dbid=3788>. To appear in *Math. Z.*
- [4] M. F. Atiyah. Resolution of singularities and division of distributions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 23:145–150, 1970.
- [5] E. M. Chirka. *Complex analytic sets*, volume 46 of *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989. Translated from the Russian by R. A. M. Hoksbergen.

- [6] Adam Epstein. Infinitesimal Thurston Rigidity and the Fatou-Shishikura Inequality. Preprint, arXiv:math.DS/9902158.
- [7] Heisuke Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I, II. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 79 (1964), 109–203; *ibid. (2)*, 79:205–326, 1964.
- [8] Ricardo Mañé, Paulo Sad, and Dennis Sullivan. On the dynamics of rational maps. *Ann. Scient. de l'Ec. Norm. Sup.*, 16(2):193–217, 1983.
- [9] Ricardo Mañé. On a theorem of Fatou. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.)*, 24(1):1–11, 1993.
- [10] Curtis T. McMullen. The Mandelbrot set is universal. In *The Mandelbrot set, theme and variations*, volume 274 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 1–17. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [11] John W. Milnor. *Topology from the differentiable viewpoint*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. Based on notes by David W. Weaver, Revised reprint of the 1965 original.
- [12] Michal Misiurewicz. Absolutely continuous invariant measures for certain maps of an interval. *Publ. Math. de l' IHÉS*, 53:17–51, 1981.
- [13] Detlef Müller and Fulvio Ricci. Solvability for a class of doubly characteristic differential operators on 2-step nilpotent groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 143(1):1–49, 1996.
- [14] Juan Rivera-Letelier. A connecting lemma for rational maps satisfying a no-growth condition. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 27(2):595–636, 2007.
- [15] Walter Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.
- [16] Mitsuhiro Shishikura and Tan Lei. An alternative proof of Mañé's theorem on non-expanding Julia sets. In *The Mandelbrot set, theme and variations*, volume 274 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 265–279. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [17] Sebastian van Strien. Misiurewicz maps unfold generically (even if they are critically non-finite). *Fund. Math.*, 163(1):39–54, 2000.