

Locally connected models for Julia sets

Alexander M. Blokh^{*,1}, Clinton P. Curry²,
Lex G. Oversteegen³

*University of Alabama at Birmingham, Department of Mathematics, Birmingham,
AL 35294-1170, USA*

Abstract

Let P be a polynomial with a connected Julia set J . We use continuum theory to show that it admits a *finest monotone map* φ onto a *locally connected continuum* $J_{\sim P}$, i.e. a monotone map $\varphi : J \rightarrow J_{\sim P}$ such that for any other monotone map $\psi : J \rightarrow J'$ there exists a monotone map h with $\psi = h \circ \varphi$. Then we extend φ onto the complex plane \mathbb{C} (keeping the same notation) and show that φ monotonically semiconjugates $P|_{\mathbb{C}}$ to a *topological polynomial* $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. If P does not have Siegel or Cremer periodic points this gives an alternative proof of Kiwi's fundamental results on locally connected models of dynamics on the Julia sets, but the results hold for all polynomials with connected Julia sets. We also give a characterization and a useful sufficient condition for the map φ not to collapse all of J into a point.

Key words: Complex dynamics, Julia set, core decomposition

1 Introduction

A major idea in the theory of dynamical systems is that of modeling an arbitrary system by one which can be better understood and treated with the help of existing tools and methods. To an extent, the entire field of symbolic dynamics is so important for the rest of dynamical systems because symbolic dynamical systems serve as an almost universal model. A different example,

* Corresponding author.

Email addresses: ablokh@math.uab.edu (Alexander M. Blokh),
clintonc@uab.edu (Clinton P. Curry), overstee@math.uab.edu (Lex G. Oversteegen).

¹ This author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0456748.

² This author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0353825.

³ This author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0405774.

7 coming from one-dimensional dynamics, is due to Milnor and Thurston who
 8 showed in [16] that any piecewise-monotone interval map f of positive en-
 9 tropy can be modeled by a piecewise-monotone interval map of constant slope
 10 h (i.e., f is *monotonically semiconjugate* to h). For us however the most in-
 11 teresting case is that of modeling complex polynomial dynamical systems on
 12 their connected Julia sets by so-called *topological polynomials* on their (topo-
 13 logical) locally connected Julia sets. Let us now describe more precisely what
 14 we mean.

15 Consider a polynomial map $P : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; denote by J_P the *Julia set* of P , by K_P
 16 its *filled-in Julia set*, and by $U_\infty(P) = \mathbb{C} \setminus K_P$ its *basin of attraction of infinity*.
 17 In this paper we *always assume that J_P is connected*. A very-well known fact
 18 from complex dynamics (see, e.g., Theorem 9.5 from [15]) shows that there
 19 exists a conformal isomorphism Ψ from the complement of the closure of the
 20 open unit disk \mathbb{D} onto $U_\infty(P)$ which conjugates $z^d|_{\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}}$ and $P|_{U_\infty(P)}$. The Ψ -
 21 image R_α of the radial line of angle α in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ is called an (*external*) *ray*. By [9]
 22 external rays with rational arguments *land* at repelling (parabolic) periodic
 23 points or their preimages (i.e., the rays compactify onto such points). If J_P is
 24 locally connected, Ψ extends to a continuous function $\overline{\Psi}$ which semiconjugates
 25 $z^d|_{\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}}$ and $P|_{\overline{U_\infty(P)}}$.

26 External rays have been extensively used in complex dynamics since the ap-
 27 pearance of the papers by Douady and Hubbard [9]. The fundamental idea of
 28 using the system of external rays in order to construct special combinatorial
 29 structures in the disk (called *laminations* or *geometric laminations*) is due
 30 to Thurston [25] (see also the paper [8] by Douady). Laminations allow one
 31 to relate the dynamics of P and the dynamics of the map $z^d|_{\mathbb{S}^1}$. Below we
 32 describe a few approaches to laminations.

33 Set $\psi = \overline{\Psi}|_{\mathbb{S}^1}$ and define an equivalence relation \sim_P on \mathbb{S}^1 by $x \sim_P y$ if and
 34 only if $\psi(x) = \psi(y)$. The equivalence \sim_P is called the (*d-invariant*) *lamination*
 35 (*generated by P*). The quotient space $\mathbb{S}^1 / \sim_P = J_{\sim_P}$ is homeomorphic to J_P
 36 and the map $f_{\sim_P} : J_{\sim_P} \rightarrow J_{\sim_P}$ induced by $z^d|_{\mathbb{S}^1} \equiv \sigma$ is topologically conjugate
 37 to $P|_{J_P}$. The set J_{\sim_P} is a topological (combinatorial) model of J_P and is often
 38 called the *topological Julia set*. On the other hand, the induced map $f_{\sim_P} : J_{\sim_P}$
 39 $J_{\sim_P} \rightarrow J_{\sim_P}$ serves as a model for $P|_{J_P}$ and is often called a *topological polynomial*.
 40 Moreover, one can extend the conjugacy between $P|_{J_P}$ and $f_{\sim_P} : J_{\sim_P} \rightarrow J_{\sim_P}$
 41 (as the identity outside J_P) to the conjugacy on the entire plane. In fact,
 42 equivalences \sim similar to \sim_P can be defined abstractly, in the absence of any
 43 polynomial. Then they are called (*d-invariant*) *laminations* and still give rise
 44 to similarly constructed *topological Julia sets* J_\sim and *topological polynomials*
 45 f_\sim .

46 In his fundamental paper [13] Kiwi extended this to *all* polynomials P with
 47 no irrational neutral periodic points (called *CS-points*), including polynomials

48 with disconnected Julia sets. In the case of a polynomial P with connected
 49 Julia set he constructed a d -invariant lamination \sim on \mathbb{S}^1 such that $P|_{J_P}$
 50 is semiconjugate to the induced map $f_\sim : J_\sim \rightarrow J_\sim$ by a monotone map
 51 $m : J_P \rightarrow J_\sim$ (*monotone* means a map with connected point preimages). Kiwi
 52 also proved that for all periodic points $p \in J_P$ the set J_P is locally connected
 53 at p and $m^{-1} \circ m(p) = \{p\}$.

54 However the results of [13] do not apply if a polynomial admits a CS-point.
 55 As an example consider the following. A *Cremer fixed point* is a neutral non-
 56 linearizable fixed point $p \in J$. A polynomial P is said to be *basic uniCremer*
 57 if it has a Cremer fixed point and no repelling/parabolic periodic point of P
 58 is bi-accessible (a point is called *bi-accessible* if at least two rays land it). In
 59 this case the only monotone map of J_P onto a locally connected continuum is
 60 a collapse of J_P to a point [4,5,6], strongly contrasting with [13].

61 The aim of this paper is to suggest a different (compared to [13]) approach to
 62 the problem of locally connected dynamical models for connected polynomial
 63 Julia sets J_P . Our approach works for *any* polynomial P , regardless of whether
 64 P has CS-points or not, and is based upon continuum theory. Accordingly,
 65 Section 3 does not deal with dynamics at all. To state its main result we
 66 need the following definitions. Let A be a continuum. Then an onto map
 67 $\varphi : A \rightarrow Y_{\varphi,A}$ is said to be a *finest (monotone) map (onto a locally connected*
 68 *continuum)* if for any other monotone map $\psi : A \rightarrow L$ onto a locally connected
 69 continuum L there exists a monotone map $h : Y_{\varphi,A} \rightarrow L$ such that $\psi = h \circ \varphi$.
 70 Observe, that in this situation the map h is automatically monotone because
 71 for $x \in L$ we have $h^{-1}(x) = \varphi(\psi^{-1}(x))$.

72 In general, it is not clear if a finest map exists. Yet if it does, it gives a
 73 finest locally connected model of A up to a homeomorphism. Suppose that
 74 $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$, $\varphi' : A \rightarrow B'$ are two finest maps. Then it follows from the
 75 definition that a map associating points $\varphi(x) \in B$ and $\varphi'(x) \in B'$ with x
 76 running over the entire A is a homeomorphism between B and B' . Hence
 77 all sets $Y_{\varphi,A}$ are homeomorphic and all finest maps φ are the same up to a
 78 homeomorphism. Thus from now on we may talk of **the finest model** $Y_A = Y$
 79 *of* A and **the finest map** $\varphi_A = \varphi$ *of* A *onto* Y . In what follows we *always* use
 80 the just introduced notation for the finest map and the finest model. Call a
 81 planar continuum $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$ *unshielded* if it coincides with the boundary of the
 82 component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus Q$ containing infinity. The following is the main result of
 83 Subsection 3.1 of Section 3.

84 **Theorem 1.** *Let Q be an unshielded continuum. Then there exist the finest*
 85 *map φ and the finest model Y of Q . Moreover, φ can be extended to a map*
 86 *$\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ which maps ∞ to ∞ , in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus Q$ collapses only those complementary*
 87 *domains to Q whose boundaries are collapsed by φ , and is a homeomorphism*
 88 *elsewhere in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus Q$.*

89 It may happen that the finest model is a point (e.g., this is so if the continuum
 90 is *indecomposable*, i.e. cannot be represented as the union of two non-trivial
 91 subcontinua). In Subsection 3.2 of Section 3 we establish a useful sufficient
 92 condition for this not to be the case. In Section 4 we apply Theorem 1 to a
 93 polynomial P with connected Julia set and prove the following theorem.

94 **Theorem 2.** *Let P be a complex polynomial with connected Julia set J_P . Then*
 95 *the finest map $\varphi_{J_P} = \varphi$ can be extended to a monotone map $\hat{\varphi} : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ so that*
 96 *$\hat{\varphi}|_{\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus J_P}$ is one-to-one in $U_\infty(P)$ and in all Fatou domains whose boundaries*
 97 *are not collapsed to points by φ and $\hat{\varphi}$ semiconjugates P and a topological*
 98 *polynomial $g : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. There is a finest lamination \sim_P such that $g|_{\varphi(J_P)}$ is*
 99 *conjugate to $f_{\sim_P}|_{J_{\sim_P}}$.*

100 In particular, φ_{J_P} semiconjugates the dynamics on J_P , so we have the following
 101 diagram which commutes. (Here Φ is the quotient map corresponding to the
 102 lamination \sim_P .)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 J_P & \xrightarrow{P|_{J_P}} & J_P & & \mathbb{S}^1 & \xrightarrow{\sigma_d} & \mathbb{S}^1 \\
 & \searrow \varphi & & \swarrow \varphi & & \searrow \Phi & \\
 & & J_{\sim} & \xrightarrow{g|_{J_{\sim}}} & J_{\sim} & & \\
 & & & & & \swarrow \Phi & \\
 & & & & & & \mathbb{S}^1
 \end{array}$$

103 Finally, in Section 5 we suggest a criterion for the fact that the finest model
 104 is non-degenerate. Given a set of angles $A \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ denote by $\text{Imp}(A)$ the union
 105 of impressions of angles in A . Also, call a set *wandering* if all its images under
 106 a specified map are pairwise disjoint. Finally, call an attracting or parabolic
 107 Fatou domain of a polynomial *parattracting*. Essentially, the criterion is that
 108 the finest model is non-degenerate if and only if one of the following properties
 109 holds:

- 110 (1) there are infinitely many bi-accessible P -periodic points;
- 111 (2) J_P has a parattracting Fatou domain;
- 112 (3) P admits a *Siegel configuration* defined later in Definition 41 — basically,
 113 it means that there are several collections of angles A_1, \dots, A_m such that
 114 for all i the eventual σ_d -image of A_i is a point and the sets $\text{Imp}(A_i)$ are
 115 wandering continua such that on the closures of their orbits the map is
 116 monotonically semiconjugate to an irrational rotation of the circle.

117 If P does not have Siegel or Cremer periodic points we deduce from our results
 118 an independent alternative proof of Kiwi's results [13]. We also obtain a few
 119 corollaries; to state them we need the following terminology. For notions which
 120 are not defined here see Subsection 3.1. By a *(pre)periodic point* we mean a
 121 point with finite orbit and by a *preperiodic point* we mean a non-periodic point
 122 with finite orbit (similarly we define preperiodic and (pre)periodic sets as well

123 as *(pre)critical* and *precritical* points). A set A is *(pre)critical* if there exists
 124 n such that $P^n|_A$ is not one-to-one and *non-(pre)critical* otherwise. Call K a
 125 *ray-continuum* if for some collection of angles, K is contained in the union of
 126 impressions of their external rays and contains the union of principal sets of
 127 their external rays; the cardinality of the set of rays whose principal sets are
 128 contained in K is said to be the *valence* of K .

129 We show that if there is a wandering non-(pre)critical ray-continuum $K \subset J_P$
 130 of valence greater than 1 then there are infinitely many repelling bi-accessible
 131 periodic points and the finest model is non-degenerate. In particular, these con-
 132 clusions hold if there exists a non-(pre)periodic non-(pre)critical bi-accessible
 133 point of J_P . We also rely upon the finest model to study for what (pre)periodic
 134 points x we can guarantee that the Julia set J_P is locally connected at x ; to
 135 this end we apply a recent result [7] about the degeneracy of certain invariant
 136 continua.

137 **Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank the referee for useful remarks
 138 and comments.

139 2 Circle laminations

140 Consider an equivalence relation \sim on the unit circle \mathbb{S}^1 . Classes of equivalence
 141 of \sim will be called *(\sim -)classes* and will be denoted by boldface letters. A \sim -
 142 class consisting of two points is called a *leaf*; a class consisting of at least three
 143 points is called a *gap* (this is more restrictive than Thurston's definition in
 144 [25]; for the moment we follow [3] in our presentation). Fix an integer $d > 1$.
 145 Then \sim is said to be a *(d -)invariant lamination* if:

146 (E1) \sim is *closed*: the graph of \sim is a closed set in $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$;

147 (E2) \sim defines a *lamination*, i.e., it is *unlinked*: if \mathbf{g}_1 and \mathbf{g}_2 are distinct \sim -
 148 classes, then their convex hulls $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{g}_1), \text{Ch}(\mathbf{g}_2)$ in the unit disk \mathbb{D} are disjoint,

149 (D1) \sim is *forward invariant*: for a class \mathbf{g} , the set $\sigma_d(\mathbf{g})$ is a class too

150 which implies that

151 (D2) \sim is *backward invariant*: for a class \mathbf{g} , its preimage $\sigma_d^{-1}(\mathbf{g}) = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 :$
 152 $\sigma_d(x) \in \mathbf{g}\}$ is a union of classes;

153 (D3) for any gap \mathbf{g} , the map $\sigma_d|_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathbf{g} \rightarrow \sigma_d(\mathbf{g})$ is a *covering map with pos-*
 154 *itive orientation*, i.e., for every connected component (s, t) of $\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \mathbf{g}$ the arc
 155 $(\sigma_d(s), \sigma_d(t))$ is a connected component of $\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \sigma_d(\mathbf{g})$.

156 The lamination in which all points of \mathbb{S}^1 are equivalent is said to be *degenerate*.
 157 It is easy to see that if a forward invariant lamination \sim has a class with
 158 non-empty interior then \sim is degenerate. Hence equivalence classes of any
 159 non-degenerate forward invariant lamination are totally disconnected.

160 Call a class \mathbf{g} *critical* if $\sigma_d|_{\mathbf{g}} : \mathbf{g} \rightarrow \sigma(\mathbf{g})$ is not one-to-one, *(pre)critical* if
 161 $\sigma_d^j(\mathbf{g})$ is critical for some $j \geq 0$, and *(pre)periodic* if $\sigma_d^i(\mathbf{g}) = \sigma_d^j(\mathbf{g})$ for some
 162 $0 \leq i < j$. Let $p : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow J_\sim = \mathbb{S}^1 / \sim$ be the quotient map of \mathbb{S}^1 onto its
 163 quotient space J_\sim , let $f_\sim : J_\sim \rightarrow J_\sim$ be the map induced by σ_d . We call J_\sim a
 164 *topological Julia set* and the induced map f_\sim a *topological polynomial*. The set
 165 J_\sim can be canonically embedded in \mathbb{C} and then the map p can be extended
 166 to the map $\hat{p} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ [8]. Radial lines from \mathbb{S}^1 are then mapped by \hat{p} onto
 167 *topological external rays* of the topological Julia set J_\sim on which the map
 168 $z \mapsto z^d$ induces a well-defined extension of f_\sim onto the union of J_\sim and the
 169 component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus J_\sim$ containing infinity.

170 We need the following theorem [12]. Given a closed set $G' \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ let the
 171 “polygon” $G = \text{Ch}(G') \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ be its convex hull, i.e., the smallest convex
 172 set in the disk containing G' . In this case we say that G' is the *basis* of
 173 G . In this situation let us call G (and G') a *wandering polygon* if the sets
 174 $G = \text{Ch}(G'), \text{Ch}(\sigma(G')), \text{Ch}(\sigma^2(G')), \dots$ are all pairwise disjoint (and so the
 175 sets $G', \sigma(G'), \dots$ are pairwise unlinked, see (E2) above). In particular, if a
 176 gap \mathbf{g} is a wandering polygon then \mathbf{g} is not (pre)periodic and we will call
 177 it a *wandering gap*. Also, call G (and G') *non-(pre)critical* if the cardinality
 178 $|\sigma^n(G')|$ of $\sigma^n(G')$ equals the cardinality $|G'|$ of G' for all n , and *(pre)critical*
 179 otherwise.

180 **Theorem 3.** *If G is a wandering polygon then $|G'| \leq 2^d$, and if G is not*
 181 *(pre)critical then $|G'| \leq d$.*

182 Consider a simple closed curve $S \subset J_\sim$. Call the bounded component $U(S) =$
 183 U of $\mathbb{C} \setminus J_\sim$ enclosed by S a *Fatou domain*. By Theorem 3 S is (pre)periodic
 184 and for some minimal k the set $f_\sim^k(S) = Q$ is periodic of some minimal period
 185 m in the sense that pairwise intersections among sets $Q, \dots, f_\sim^{m-1}(Q)$ are at
 186 most finite. We cannot completely exclude such intersections; e.g., in the case
 187 of a parabolic fixed point a in a polynomial locally connected Julia set, there
 188 will be several Fatou domains “revolving” around a and containing a in their
 189 boundaries. However, it is easy to see that $U(Q), \dots, U(f_\sim^{m-1}(Q))$ are pairwise
 190 disjoint.

191 **Lemma 4** ([3], Lemma 2.4). *There are only two types of dynamics of $f_\sim^m|_S$.*

- 192 (1) *The map $f_\sim^m|_S$ can be conjugate to an appropriate irrational rotation.*
- 193 (2) *The map $f_\sim^m|_S$ can be conjugate to $z^k|_{\mathbb{S}^1}$ with the appropriate $k > 1$.*

194 In the case (1) we call U a *(periodic) Siegel domain* and in the case (2) we

195 call U a *(periodic) parattracting domain*.

196 The map f_\sim , which above was extended onto the unbounded component of
197 $\mathbb{C} \setminus J_\sim$, can actually be extended onto the entire J_\sim -plane as a branched cov-
198 ering map. Indeed, it is enough to extend f_\sim appropriately onto any bounded
199 component V of $\mathbb{C} \setminus J_\sim$. This can be done by noticing the degree k of $f_\sim|_{\text{Bd}(V)}$
200 and extending f_\sim onto V as a branched covering map of degree k so that the
201 extension of f_\sim remains a branched covering map of degree d and behaves,
202 from the standpoint of topological dynamics, just like a complex polynomial.
203 In particular, if S is a Siegel domain of period m , we may assume that $U(S)$
204 is foliated by Jordan curves on which f_\sim^m acts as the rotation by the same
205 rotation number as that of f_\sim^m . On the other hand, if $k > 1$ then $f_\sim^m|_{U(S)}$
206 should have one attracting (in the topological sense) fixed point to which all
207 points inside $U(S)$ are attracted under f_\sim^m . Any such extension of f_\sim onto \mathbb{C}
208 will still be called a *topological polynomial* and denoted f_\sim . In Section 4 we
209 relate P and the appropriate extension of f_\sim much more precisely, however
210 here it suffices to guarantee the listed properties.

211 **Theorem 5.** [3] *The map $f_\sim|_{J_\sim}$ has no wandering continua.*

212 The collection of chords in the boundaries of the convex hulls of all equivalence
213 classes of \sim in \mathbb{D} is called a *(d -invariant) geometric lamination (of the unit*
214 *disk)*. Denote the geometric lamination obtained from the lamination \sim by
215 \mathcal{L}_\sim . In fact, geometric laminations - in what follows *geo-laminations* - can also
216 be defined abstractly (as was originally done by Thurston [25]). A *geometric*
217 *prelamination* \mathcal{L} is a collection of chords in the unit disk called *(geometric)*
218 *leaves* and such that any two leaves meet in at most a common endpoint. If in
219 addition the *union* $|\mathcal{L}|$ of all the leaves of \mathcal{L} is closed, \mathcal{L} is said to be a *geometric*
220 *lamination*. The closure of a component of $\mathbb{D} \setminus |\mathcal{L}|$ is called a *(geometric) gap*.
221 A *cell of a geometric prelamination* \mathcal{L} is either a gap of \mathcal{L} or a leaf of \mathcal{L} which
222 is not on the boundary of any gap of \mathcal{L} . If it is clear that we talk about a
223 geo-lamination we will use *leaves* and *gaps*. Gaps of a lamination understood
224 as an equivalence class of an equivalence relation are normally denoted by a
225 small boldface letter (such as \mathbf{g}) while geometric gaps of geometric laminations
226 are normally denoted by capital letters (such as G).

227 Denote a leaf $\ell = ab \in \mathcal{L}$ by its two endpoints. Given a geometric gap (leaf)
228 G , set $G' = G \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ and call G' the *basis of G* . Clearly the boundary of each
229 geometric gap is a simple closed curve S consisting of leaves of \mathcal{L} and points
230 of \mathbb{S}^1 . As in [25] one can define the linear extension σ^* of σ over the leaves
231 of \mathcal{L} which can then be extended over the entire unit disk (using, e.g., the
232 barycenters) so that not only is $\sigma^*(ab) = \sigma(ab)$ the chord (or point) in \mathbb{D} with
233 endpoints $\sigma(a)$ and $\sigma(b)$ but also for any geometric gap G we have that $\sigma^*(G)$
234 is the convex hull of the set $\sigma(G')$. Even though we denote this extension of
235 σ by σ^* , sometimes (if it does not cause ambiguity) we use the notation σ for

236 σ^* (e.g., when we apply σ^* to leaves).

237 A geometric prelamination \mathcal{L} is *d-invariant* if

- 238 (1) (forward leaf invariance) for each $\ell = ab \in \mathcal{L}$, either $\sigma(\ell) \in \mathcal{L}$ or $\sigma(a) =$
 239 $\sigma(b)$,
 240 (2) (backward leaf invariance) for each leaf $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ there exist d **disjoint** leaves
 241 $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in \mathcal{L}$ such that for each i , $\sigma(\ell_i) = \ell$,
 242 (3) (gap invariance) for each gap G of \mathcal{L} , if $G' = G \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ is the basis of G
 243 and H is the convex hull of $\sigma(G')$ then either $H \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is a point, or
 244 $H \in \mathcal{L}$ is a leaf, or H is also a gap of \mathcal{L} . Moreover, in the last case
 245 $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(G)} : \text{Bd}(G) \rightarrow \text{Bd}(H)$ is a positively oriented composition of a
 246 monotone map $m : \text{Bd}(G) \rightarrow S$, where S is a simple closed curve, and a
 247 covering map $g : S \rightarrow \text{Bd}(H)$.

248 Clearly, \mathcal{L}_\sim is a geometric lamination and \sim -gaps are bases of geometric gaps
 249 of \mathcal{L}_\sim . In general, the situation with leaves and geometric leaves is more com-
 250 plicated (e.g., the basis of a geometric leaf on the boundary of a finite gap
 251 of \mathcal{L}_\sim is not a \sim -leaf). Thus in what follows speaking of leaves we will make
 252 careful distinction between the two cases (that of a geometric leaf and that of
 253 a leaf as a class of a lamination). Note that Theorem 3 applies to wandering
 254 (geometric) gaps of (geometric) laminations.

255 Slightly abusing the language, we sometimes use for gaps terminology applica-
 256 ble to their bases. Thus, speaking of a *finite/infinite* gap G we actually mean
 257 that G' is finite/infinite. Now we study infinite gaps (of geometric laminations)
 258 and establish some of their properties. We begin with a series of useful gen-
 259 eral lemmas in which we establish some properties of geometric laminations.
 260 Given two points $x, y \in \mathbb{S}^1$, set $\rho(x, y)$ to be the length of the smallest arc in
 261 \mathbb{S}^1 , containing x and y . There exists $\varepsilon_d > 0$ such that $\rho(\sigma_d(x), \sigma_d(y)) > \rho(x, y)$
 262 whenever $0 < \rho(x, y) < \varepsilon_d$.

263 **Lemma 6.** *If $K \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ and $k > 0$ are such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(\sigma_d^{ik}(K)) = 0$,*
 264 *then there exists i_0 such that $\text{diam}(\sigma_d^{i_0k}(K)) = 0$.*

265 *Proof.* If $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(\sigma_d^{ik}(K)) = 0$, there exists i_0 such that $\text{diam}(\sigma_d^{ik}(K)) <$
 266 ε_{kd} for all $i \geq i_0$. If $\text{diam}(\sigma_d^{i_0k}(K)) \neq 0$ then $(\text{diam}(\sigma_d^{ik}(K)))_{i=i_0}^\infty$ is an in-
 267 creasing sequence of positive numbers converging to 0, a contradiction. So
 268 $\text{diam}(\sigma_d^{i_0k}(K)) = 0$. \square

269 Let us study geometric leaves on the boundary of a periodic gap.

270 **Lemma 7.** *Suppose that G is a (pre)periodic gap of a geometric lamination.*
 271 *Then every leaf in $\text{Bd}(G)$ is either (pre)periodic from a finite collection of*

272 *grand orbits of periodic leaves, or (pre)critical from a finite collection of grand*
 273 *orbits of critical leaves.*

274 *Proof.* We may assume that the gap G is fixed. Let ℓ be a leaf which is not
 275 (pre)periodic. Since $\text{Bd}(G)$ is a simple closed curve and $\sigma^i(\ell) \cap \sigma^j(\ell)$ may
 276 consist of at most a point, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(\sigma^i(\ell)) = 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 6,
 277 there exists i_0 such that $\text{diam}(\sigma^{i_0}(\ell)) = 0$, meaning that ℓ is (pre)critical.
 278 Now, there are only finitely many leaves $\alpha\beta$ in $\text{Bd}(G)$ such that $\rho(\alpha, \beta) \geq \varepsilon_d$,
 279 and there are only finitely many critical leaves in any geometric lamination.
 280 Since by the properties of ε_d any non-degenerate leaf in $\text{Bd}(G)$ maps to one
 281 of them, the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

282 In what follows a geometric leaf of a geometric lamination is called *isolated* if
 283 it is the intersection of two distinct gaps of the lamination. It is called *isolated*
 284 *from one side* if it is a boundary leaf of exactly one gap of the lamination. A
 285 leaf is said to be a *limit leaf* if it is not an isolated leaf. Let us study critical
 286 leaves of geometric laminations. The following terminology is quite useful:
 287 a leaf is said to be *separate* if it is disjoint from all other leaves and gaps.
 288 Observe that if ℓ is a separate leaf then ℓ is a limit leaf from both sides. Also,
 289 if a gap or a separate leaf is such that its image is a point we call it *all-critical*.
 290 Clearly, a gap is all-critical if and only if all its boundary leaves are critical.
 291 It may happen that two all-critical gaps are adjacent (have a common leaf).
 292 Moreover, there may exist several all-critical gaps whose union coincides with
 293 their convex hull. In other words, their union looks like a “big” all-critical gap
 294 inside which some leaves are added. Then we call this union an *all-critical*
 295 *union of gaps*. Clearly we can talk about boundary leaves of all-critical unions
 296 of gaps. Moreover, each all-critical gap is a part of an all-critical union of gaps,
 297 and there are only finitely many all-critical gaps.

298 **Lemma 8.** *Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a d -invariant geo-lamination and ℓ is one of its*
 299 *critical leaves. Then one of the following holds:*

- 300 (1) ℓ is isolated in \mathcal{L} ;
 301 (2) ℓ is a separate leaf;
 302 (3) ℓ is a boundary leaf of a union of all-critical gaps all boundary leaves of
 303 which are limit leaves.

304 *In particular, if \mathcal{L} is the closure of a d -invariant prelamination \mathcal{L}' and ℓ lies*
 305 *on the boundary of a geometric gap G of \mathcal{L} then either $\ell \in \mathcal{L}'$, or $\sigma(G)$ is a*
 306 *point.*

307 *Proof.* Suppose that neither (1) nor (2) holds. Then $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ is a critical leaf
 308 lying on the boundary of a gap G which is the limit of a sequence of leaves ℓ_i
 309 approaching ℓ from outside of G . If $\sigma(G)$ is not a point, then $\sigma(\ell_i)$ must cross

310 $\sigma(G)$, a contradiction. Hence $\sigma(G)$ is a point and all leaves in the boundary of
 311 G are critical. Take the all-critical union of gaps H containing G . If all other
 312 boundary leaves of H are limit leaves we are done. Otherwise there must exist
 313 a boundary leaf ℓ of H and a gap T to whose boundary ℓ belongs. Then the
 314 leaves $\sigma(\ell_i)$ will cross the image $\sigma(T)$, a contradiction. This completes the
 315 proof.

316

□

317 The next lemma gives a useful condition for an infinite gap to have nice proper-
 318 ties. By two *concatenated* leaves we mean two leaves with a common endpoint,
 319 and by a *chain of concatenated leaves* we mean a (two-sided) sequence of leaves
 320 such that any consecutive leaves in the chain are concatenated (such chains
 321 might be both finite and infinite). For brevity we often speak of just *chains*
 322 instead of “chains of concatenated leaves”.

323 **Lemma 9.** *Let G be an infinite gap and on its boundary there are no leaves*
 324 *ℓ such that for some n, m we have that $\sigma^m(\ell)$ is a leaf while $\sigma^{m+n}(\ell)$ is an*
 325 *endpoint of $\sigma^m(\ell)$. Then the following claims hold.*

- 326 (1) *There exists a number N such that any chain of concatenated leaves in*
 327 *$\text{Bd}(G)$ consists of no more than N leaves.*
- 328 (2) *All non-isolated points of G' form a Cantor set G'_c , and so for any arc*
 329 *$[a, b] \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $[a, b] \cap G'$ is not contained in one chain, the set*
 330 *$G' \cap [a, b]$ is uncountable (in particular, the basis G' of G is uncountable).*
- 331 (3) *If G is σ^n -periodic then $\sigma^n|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is semiconjugate to $\sigma_k : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ with*
 332 *the appropriate $k > 0$ by the conjugacy which collapses to points all arcs*
 333 *in $\text{Bd}(G)$ complementary to G'_c . If $k = 1$ the map to which $\sigma^n|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is*
 334 *semiconjugate is an irrational rotation of the circle.*

335 *Proof.* By Theorem 3, G is (pre)periodic. Since there are only finitely many
 336 gaps in the grand orbit of G on which the map σ is not one-to-one, we see
 337 that it is enough to prove the lemma with the assumption that G is fixed.
 338 Moreover, by Lemma 7 we may assume that all periodic leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$
 339 are fixed with fixed endpoints. Consider a chain of concatenated leaves from
 340 $\text{Bd}(G)$. By Lemma 7 under some power of σ this chain maps onto one of
 341 finitely many chains containing a critical or a fixed leaf. Thus, it remains
 342 to prove the lemma for chains containing a critical and/or a fixed leaf. By
 343 way of contradiction we may assume that L is a maximal infinite chain of
 344 concatenated leaves (it may be one-sided or two-sided).

345 First let $\ell \in L$ be a fixed leaf with fixed endpoints. By the assumptions of the
 346 lemma and by the properties of laminations each leaf concatenated to ℓ also
 347 has fixed endpoints. Repeating this argument we see that the chain consists
 348 of fixed leaves with fixed endpoints, hence L is a finite chain of fixed leaves

349 with fixed endpoints. Second, consider the case when $\ell \in L$ is a critical leaf.
 350 Consider the points $a, b \in \mathbb{S}^1$ with $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ the smallest arc whose convex
 351 hull contains L . Then by Theorem 3 the convex hull $\text{Ch}(L)$ of L cannot be a
 352 wandering polygon. It follows that for some m we have that $\sigma^m(L) \subset \sigma^{m+n}(L)$.
 353 Since by the above there are no leaves with periodic endpoints in L and by
 354 the assumptions of the lemma no leaf of L can map into its endpoint, we see
 355 that all leaves of $\sigma^m(L)$ map under σ^n in the same direction, say, towards
 356 the point a so that every leaf has an infinite orbit converging to a . However
 357 then a is σ^n -fixed and must repel close points under σ^n , a contradiction. Since
 358 there exist only finitely many distinct chains containing a critical or periodic
 359 leaf, there exists a number N such that any chain of concatenated leaves in
 360 $\text{Bd}(G)$ consists of no more than N leaves. This immediately implies that any
 361 non-isolated point of G' is a limit point of other non-isolated points. Hence
 362 the set G'_c of all non-isolated points of G' is a Cantor set, and the claims (1)
 363 and (2) of the lemma are proven.

364 To prove (3) define $m : \text{Bd}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ by collapsing to points all complementary
 365 arcs to G'_c in $\text{Bd}(G)$. It follows that $(\sigma^*)^n|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is monotonically semiconjugate
 366 by the map m to a covering map f of the circle of a positive degree. It follows
 367 that for any non-degenerate arc $I \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ the set $m^{-1}(I) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ is uncountable.
 368 Let us show that I is not wandering, i.e. the intervals $\{f^k(I) \mid k > 0\}$ are not
 369 pairwise disjoint. Indeed, if I wanders under f then so does $m^{-1}(I)$ under σ_d^* .
 370 Since $\text{Bd}(G)$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^1 , then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}((\sigma_d^*)^k(m^{-1}(I))) = 0$,
 371 contradicting Lemma 6.

372 Also, let us show that I is not periodic. Suppose that $f^q(I) \subset I$. Then $f^m|_I$
 373 is monotone preserving orientation and all points of I converge to an f^q -
 374 fixed point under $(\sigma^*)^q$. On the other hand, only countably many points of an
 375 uncountable set $m^{-1}(I) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ map into a σ -periodic point. Thus, there exists
 376 a *non-(pre)periodic* point $y \in m^{-1}(I) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $m(y)$ converges under
 377 $(\sigma^*)^q$ to an f^q -fixed point z . Since m is monotone this implies that the orbit
 378 of y approaches the interval $m^{-1}(z)$ but does not map into it (because y is
 379 non-(pre)periodic). Thus, y must converge to an endpoint of $m^{-1}(z)$, which is
 380 impossible (e.g., it contradicts Lemma 6). A standard argument now implies
 381 that f is an irrational rotation or a map σ_k with appropriately chosen k , still
 382 we sketch it for the sake of completeness. Consider two cases.

383 **Case 1:** $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is monotone.

384 Let us show that f has no periodic points. By way of contradiction, suppose
 385 $f^q(x) = x$, choose a point $y \neq x$ with $f^q(y) \neq y$, and let I be the component
 386 of $\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \{x, y\}$ containing $f^q(y)$. Since $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is monotone, it follows that I
 387 is a periodic interval, a contradiction. Therefore, $f : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ is a positively
 388 oriented map with no periodic points and no wandering intervals, and is there-
 389 fore conjugate to an irrational rotation by [14, Theorem 1.1]. By Lemma 7 all

390 leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$ are (pre)critical.

391 **Case 2:** $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is not monotone.

392 Since f is a covering map of degree $k > 1$ without periodic and wandering
393 intervals, f is conjugate to $z \mapsto z^k$ for some k . Indeed, that there is a monotone
394 semiconjugacy between f and σ_k is well-known (see, e.g., [17] for the case
395 $k = 2$). However if there are no wandering intervals and periodic intervals, then
396 the semiconjugacy cannot collapse any intervals and is therefore a conjugacy.
397 In what follows the semiconjugacy which we have just defined in both cases
398 will be denoted ψ .

399

□

400 Given a geo-lamination \mathcal{L} , a periodic geometric gap G satisfying conditions
401 of Lemma 9 is called a *Fatou gap (domain) of \mathcal{L}* . If G is a Fatou domain,
402 then by Theorem 3 G' is (pre)periodic. A Fatou domain G is called *periodic*
403 (*preperiodic*, (*pre*)*periodic*) if so is G' . A periodic Fatou domain G of period
404 m is called *parattracting* if $(\sigma^*)^m|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ is not monotone (in the topological
405 sense introduced earlier in the paper) and *Siegel* otherwise. Equivalently, G
406 is parattracting (resp. Siegel) if $(\sigma^*)^m|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ can be represented as the com-
407 position of a covering map of degree greater than 1 (resp. equal to 1) and a
408 monotone map. The *degree of $\sigma^m|_G$* is then defined as the degree of the model
409 map f defined in Lemma 9. Thus, the terms “parattracting Fatou domain”
410 and “Siegel domain” are used both for the geometric laminations and for the
411 topological polynomials. Since it will always be clear from the context which
412 situation is considered, this will not cause any ambiguity in what follows.

413 There are several cases in which Lemma 9 applies. The first one is considered in
414 Lemma 10. Recall, that given a lamination \sim we denote by p the corresponding
415 quotient map $p : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow J_\sim$. Recall also, that for a lamination understood as
416 an equivalence relation we denote its gaps (i.e., classes with more than two
417 elements) by small bold letters (such as \mathbf{g}).

418 **Lemma 10.** *Suppose that \mathbf{g} is an infinite gap of a non-degenerate lamination*
419 *\sim . Then $B = \text{Bd}(\text{Ch}(\mathbf{g}))$ contains no geometric (pre)critical leaves and there-*
420 *fore is a Fatou gap. In addition to that, any chain of concatenated geometric*
421 *leaves in B eventually homeomorphically maps to a periodic chain, and if \mathbf{g} is*
422 *periodic of period n then the degree of $(\sigma^*)^n|_B$ is greater than 1.*

423 *Proof.* By Theorem 3 \mathbf{g} is (pre)periodic. Suppose that $\ell = \alpha\beta \subset B$ is a critical
424 geometric leaf and that $\mathbf{g} \subset [\alpha, \beta]$. By Lemma 8 ℓ cannot be a limit leaf of
425 \mathcal{L}_\sim . Hence there is a geometric gap H of \mathcal{L}_\sim on the side of ℓ opposite to B
426 (so that $H' \subset [\beta, \alpha]$). The points α, β are limit points of H' for otherwise

427 there must exist a geometric leaf $\beta\gamma$ or $\theta\alpha$ and hence γ must be added to \mathbf{g} , a
428 contradiction. By the gap invariance then $\sigma(H) = \sigma(\text{Ch}(\mathbf{g}))$. Now, since H is a
429 gap of \mathcal{L}_\sim , either H' is a class itself, or there are uncountably many distinct \sim -
430 classes among points of H' . However the latter is impossible because all these
431 classes map into one \sim -class \mathbf{g} . Thus, H' is one \sim -class which implies that it
432 had to be united with \mathbf{g} in the first place, a contradiction. Hence Lemma 9
433 applies to \mathbf{g} . Clearly, it follows also that any chain of concatenated geometric
434 leaves in B eventually homeomorphically maps to a periodic chain.

435 Let us now prove the last claim of the lemma. Since there are no critical
436 leaves in B , $(\sigma^*)^n|_B$ is a covering map. If the degree of $(\sigma^*)^n|_B$ is 1, then $\sigma^n|_{\mathbf{g}}$
437 is one-to-one. By a well-known result from the topological dynamics (see, e.g.,
438 Lemma 18.8 from [15]) \mathbf{g} must be finite, a contradiction. \square

439 Lemma 10 shows that if \sim is a lamination, then there are two types of Fa-
440 tou domains of \mathcal{L}_\sim : 1) Fatou domains whose basis (the intersection of the
441 boundary with \mathbb{S}^1) is one \sim -class (one \sim -gap), in which case the Fatou do-
442 main corresponds to a cutpoint in the quotient space; or 2) Fatou domains
443 for which this is not true (and which correspond to a Fatou domain in the
444 J_\sim -plane). However this distinction cannot always be made if we just look at
445 the geometric lamination.

446 For a lamination \sim the induced geo-lamination \mathcal{L}_\sim has the property that every
447 geometric leaf is either disjoint from all other geometric leaves and gaps, or
448 contained in the boundary of a unique geometric gap G . For an arbitrary
449 geometric lamination, this is no longer the case. Hence, in general distinct
450 geometric gaps may intersect. If, given a geo-lamination \mathcal{L} , \sim is a lamination
451 such that $a \sim b$ whenever $ab = \ell \in \mathcal{L}$, we say that the lamination \sim *respects*
452 *the geo-lamination* \mathcal{L} . Given a d -invariant geo-lamination \mathcal{L} , let $\approx = \approx_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the
453 *finest lamination which respects* \mathcal{L} . It is not difficult to see that \approx is unique
454 and d -invariant. Let $\pi : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow J_\approx$ be the corresponding quotient map. It may
455 well be the case that \mathbb{S}^1 / \approx is a single point (see [2] for a characterization of
456 quadratic geometric laminations \mathcal{L} with non-degenerate $J_{\approx_{\mathcal{L}}}$).

457 Let us discuss the properties of \approx . It is shown in [2] that \approx can be defined as
458 follows: $a \approx b$ if and only if there exists a continuum $K \subset \mathbb{S}^1 \cup |\mathcal{L}|$ containing a
459 and b such that $K \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ is countable. By Lemma 9 if G is a Fatou domain of \mathcal{L} ,
460 then G / \approx is a simple closed curve. In particular, whenever a d -invariant geo-
461 lamination \mathcal{L} contains a Fatou gap, then $J / \approx_{\mathcal{L}}$ is non-degenerate. Moreover,
462 if F is an invariant Fatou domain, then the restricted map $f_\approx : \pi(\text{Bd}(F)) \rightarrow$
463 $\pi(\text{Bd}(F))$ coincides with the map f from Lemma 9 and is conjugate to a either
464 an irrational rotation of a circle (if F is Siegel) or to the map σ_m for m equal
465 to the degree of $\sigma|_F$ (in the paratracting case). The case of a periodic Fatou
466 domain is similar.

467 Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a forward invariant family of pairwise disjoint periodic or
468 non-(pre)critical wandering gaps/leaves with a given family of their preimages
469 so that together they form a collection $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ of sets (basically, this is a collection
470 of sets from the grand orbits of elements of \mathcal{A}). The leaves from the boundaries
471 of sets of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ form a d -invariant geometric prelamination $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Clearly, the sets
472 from the collection $\Gamma_{\mathcal{A}}$ are cells of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The prelamination $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and its closure
473 $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ (which is a geo-lamination [25]) are said to be *generated* by \mathcal{A} (then \mathcal{A}
474 is called a *generating family*). The following important natural case of this
475 situation was studied by Kiwi in [13].

476 Given a point $y \in J_P$, denote by $A(y)$ the set of all angles whose rays land at
477 y . If J_P is locally connected then $A(y) \neq \emptyset$ for any $y \in J_P$, however otherwise
478 this is not necessarily so. A point $y \in J_P$ is called *bi-accessible* if $|A(y)| > 1$
479 (i.e., there are at least two rays landing at y). By Douady and Hubbard [9] if
480 x is a repelling or parabolic periodic point (or a preimage of such point) then
481 $A(x)$ is always non-empty, finite, and consists of rational angles. Denote by
482 R the set of all its periodic repelling (parabolic) *bi-accessible* points and their
483 preimages. Let $x \in R$; also, given a set A denote by $\text{Ch}(A)$ its convex hull.
484 Then let $G_x = \text{Ch}(A(x))$ and let $|\mathcal{L}_{rat}|$ be the union of all the sets $G_x, x \in R$.
485 Let \mathcal{L}_{rat} be the collection of all chords contained in the boundaries of all the
486 sets G_x . Then \mathcal{L}_{rat} , called the *rational geometric prelamination*, is a d -invariant
487 geometric prelamination. By [25] the closure $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{rat}}$ of \mathcal{L}_{rat} in the unit disk is a
488 closed d -invariant geo-lamination called *rational geometric lamination*.

489 The situation described above may be considered in a more general way. Sup-
490 pose that we are given a geometric prelamination generated by (pre)periodic
491 or wandering non-(pre)critical pairwise disjoint gaps and leaves. Then any
492 result concerning its closure will serve as a tool for studying $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{rat}}$. The follow-
493 ing theorem can be such a tool. If we require that all gaps or leaves in such
494 prelamination map onto their images in a covering fashion, we can conclude
495 that there are no critical leaves in the prelamination. Indeed, such leaves can
496 only belong to gaps/leaves disjoint from other leaves and collapsing to a point
497 (*all-critical*). However we assume that the generating family consists of leaves
498 and gaps which are non-(pre)critical. Hence an all-critical cell of the prelam-
499 ination cannot come from the forward orbits of the elements of the generating
500 family. On the other hand, it cannot come from their backward orbits since the
501 generating family consists of gaps and leaves (and the image of an all-critical
502 gap/leaf is a point).

503 In Lemma 11 we deal with geometric laminations. For simplicity, in its proof
504 speaking of leaves and gaps we actually mean geometric leaves and gaps. By
505 a *separate leaf* we mean a leaf disjoint from all other leaves or gaps.

506 **Lemma 11.** *Suppose that \mathcal{L}^- is a non-empty geometric d -invariant pre-*
507 *lamination generated by a generating family \mathcal{A} such that no cell of \mathcal{L}^- contains*

508 a critical leaf on its boundary. Let \mathcal{L} be the closure of the prelamination \mathcal{L}^- .
 509 Then the following holds.

- 510 (1) If three leaves of \mathcal{L} meet at a common endpoint, then the leaf in the middle
 511 is either a leaf from \mathcal{L}^- or a boundary leaf of a gap from \mathcal{L}^- .
- 512 (2) At most four leaves of \mathcal{L} meet at a common end point, and if they do then
 513 the two in the middle are on the boundary of a gap of \mathcal{L}^- .
- 514 (3) Suppose G is a gap of \mathcal{L} and xa is a leaf of \mathcal{L} such that $xa \cap G = \{x\}$.
 515 Let $xb \subset G$ be the leaf such that xb separates $G \setminus xb$ from $xa \setminus \{x\}$. Then
 516 either xb is a leaf from \mathcal{L}^- , or G is a cell of \mathcal{L}^- , or there exists a gap H
 517 of \mathcal{L}^- such that $xa \cup xb \subset H$. In particular, if two gaps G, H of \mathcal{L} meet
 518 only in a point, then there exists a gap K of \mathcal{L}^- such that both $G \cap K$
 519 and $H \cap K$ are leaves from \mathcal{L} .
- 520 (4) Suppose that ℓ is a critical leaf of \mathcal{L} . Then either ℓ is a separate leaf
 521 and all its images are disjoint from ℓ , or ℓ is a boundary leaf of an all-
 522 critical gap H of \mathcal{L} , all boundary leaves of H are limit leaves, and $\sigma^n(H)$
 523 is disjoint from H for all $n > 0$. In particular, ℓ is a limit leaf from at
 524 least one side.
- 525 (5) If G is a gap or leaf of \mathcal{L} and $\sigma^n(G) \subset G$ then $\sigma^n(G) = G$.
- 526 (6) Any gap or leaf G of \mathcal{L} either wanders or is such that for some $m < n$
 527 we have $\sigma^m(G) = \sigma^n(G)$.
- 528 (7) If G is a gap of \mathcal{L} such that G' is infinite, then G is a Fatou gap.

529 *Proof.* (1) Suppose that ax, bx, cx are three leaves of \mathcal{L} with $x < a < b < c$ in
 530 the counterclockwise order $<$ on S^1 . Then bx is isolated. Hence bx is either a
 531 separate leaf from \mathcal{L}^- or a boundary leaf of a gap from \mathcal{L}^- .

532 (2) Suppose that \mathcal{L} contains the leaves $a_1x, a_2x, a_3x, \dots, a_nx$ with $n \geq 4$. We
 533 may assume that $a_1 < a_2 \dots < a_n < x$. Since the leaves $a_2x, a_3x, \dots, a_{n-1}x$
 534 are isolated and must come from \mathcal{L}^- . Since cells of \mathcal{L}^- are pairwise disjoint,
 535 $n = 4$ and the leaves a_2x, a_3x are on the boundary of a gap of \mathcal{L}^- .

536 (3) Suppose that a gap G and a leaf xa of \mathcal{L} meet only at x . Let $xb \subset G$ be
 537 the leaf which separates $G \setminus xb$ from $xa \setminus \{x\}$. Then xb is isolated and, hence,
 538 either a separate leaf in \mathcal{L}^- or a boundary leaf of a gap of \mathcal{L}^- . If the former
 539 holds, or if G is a gap of \mathcal{L}^- , we are done. Otherwise there exists a gap H of
 540 \mathcal{L}^- which contains xb . It now follows easily that $xa \subset H$ as desired.

541 (4) The first part immediately follows from Lemma 8 and the assumption
 542 that there are no critical leaves in the prelamination \mathcal{L}^- . This implies that the
 543 point $\sigma(H)$ is separated by leaves of \mathcal{L}^- from all other points of S^1 . Hence by
 544 the properties of geo-laminations $\sigma^n(H) \subset H$ is impossible.

545 (5) By (4) we may assume that G is a gap which contains no σ^n -critical leaves
 546 in $\text{Bd}(G)$ and $\sigma^n(G)$ is not a point. Now, if G is a gap and $\sigma^n(G) = ab$ is a

547 boundary leaf of G then $\sigma^{2n}(a) = a, \sigma^{2n}(b) = b$ and G is a finite gap. Denote
548 by ca the other leaf in $\text{Bd}(G)$ containing a . Suppose first that G is a cell of
549 \mathcal{L}^- . Then $\sigma^n(G) = ab$ is a leaf of \mathcal{L}^- strictly contained in the boundary of G ,
550 a contradiction. Hence some boundary leaves of G may come from \mathcal{L}^- , but
551 there are no two consecutive leaves like that in ∂G . Thus, if ca is a leaf of \mathcal{L}^-
552 then $\sigma^n(ca) = ab$ (because there are no critical leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$) is also a leaf
553 of \mathcal{L}^- and we get a contradiction by the above. Thus, ca is not a leaf of \mathcal{L}^-
554 which implies that ca is not on the boundary of a gap $H \neq G$ (otherwise ca is
555 isolated in \mathcal{L} and hence ca must be a leaf of \mathcal{L}^- , a contradiction). We conclude
556 that ca is a limit leaf from the outside of G . However then the σ^{2n} -images of
557 leaves converging to ca will cross G , a contradiction.

558 (6) Suppose that G is a gap or leaf from \mathcal{L} for which the conclusions of the
559 lemma do not hold. If G is infinite, then by Theorem 3 G is preperiodic. So
560 we may assume that G is finite and that $|G^i| = |\sigma^i(G)|$ for all $i > 0$. By the
561 assumption about G we may assume that for some $n > 0$, $G \cap \sigma^n(G) \neq \emptyset$ and
562 $\sigma^n(G) \neq G$ (in particular, G is not a point because otherwise we would have
563 $\sigma^n(G) = G$) and for no $i \neq j$ we have $\sigma^i(G) = \sigma^j(G)$. Since the cells of \mathcal{L}^-
564 are pairwise disjoint, G is not a cell of \mathcal{L}^- . Moreover, it is easy to see that no
565 leaf in $\text{Bd}(G)$ is periodic. Indeed, otherwise under the map, which fixes the
566 endpoints of this leaf, G will have to be mapped onto itself (see 5).

567 Suppose now that G is a leaf. If an endpoint of G is σ^n -fixed then we would
568 have more than 4 leaves of \mathcal{L} coming out of this point, contradicting (2). Hence
569 $\sigma^n(G)$ must be a leaf, “concatenated” to G , $\sigma^{2n}(G)$ is a leaf “concatenated”
570 to $\sigma^n(G)$, and so on. Since these leaves do not intersect inside \mathbb{D} , it follows
571 that they converge to a leaf or to a point $\lim_i \sigma^{ni}(G)$ which is σ^n -fixed. This
572 contradicts the fact that σ^n is locally repelling.

573 Suppose next that G is a gap such that G and $\sigma^n(G)$ meet along the (isolated)
574 leaf ℓ . By 5, $\sigma^n(G)$ is a gap. Hence the leaf ℓ is isolated in \mathcal{L} which implies that
575 $\ell \in \mathcal{L}^-$. Since there are no periodic leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$, $\sigma^n(\ell) \cap \ell = \emptyset$. Repeating
576 this argument we see that leaves $\sigma^{in}(\ell)$ are such that the gaps $\sigma^{in}(G)$ are
577 “concatenated” (attached) to each other at these leaves. This again, as in the
578 previous paragraph, implies that the limit $\lim \sigma^{ni}(\ell)$ exists and is either a σ^n -
579 fixed leaf in \mathcal{L} or a σ^n -fixed point in \mathbb{S}^1 . This contradicts the fact that σ is
580 locally repelling.

581 Hence it remains to consider the case when G and $\sigma^n(G)$ meet in a point $x \in$
582 \mathbb{S}^1 . By (2) there exist boundary leaves $xa \subset \text{Bd}(G)$ and $xb \subset \text{Bd}(\sigma^n(G))$ and
583 there exists a gap $H \in \mathcal{L}^-$ which contains both of these leaves in its boundary.
584 If H is periodic, then xa and xb are periodic too, a contradiction. Hence, H
585 is not periodic. Since $H \in \mathcal{L}^-$, H must wander and $\sigma^n(H) \cap \sigma^m(H) = \emptyset$
586 when $n \neq m$. It follows that sets $\sigma^{in}(G)$ are all “concatenated” at points
587 $x, \sigma^n(x), \dots$, the set $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \sigma^{ni}(G)$ is connected set, and $\lim \sigma^{ni}(G)$ exists and

588 is either a leaf in \mathcal{L} or point in \mathbb{S}^1 which is fixed under σ^n . As before, this
 589 contradicts the fact that σ^n is locally repelling and completes the proof of (6).

590 (7) Follows immediately from (4) and Lemma 9.(2).

591

□

592 We are ready to construct a non-degenerate lamination compatible with \mathcal{L}^-
 593 (or, equivalently, with \mathcal{L}). Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \{G_\alpha\}$ is a generating collection of
 594 finite gaps/leaves and \mathcal{L}^- is a non-empty geometric d -invariant pre-lamination
 595 generated by a generating family \mathcal{A} such that there are no critical leaves in
 596 \mathcal{L}^- . Set $\mathcal{L} = \overline{\mathcal{L}^-}$ and $\approx_{\mathcal{L}} = \approx_{\mathcal{A}}$.

597 **Theorem 12.** *We have that $\mathbb{S}^1 / \approx_{\mathcal{A}}$ is non-degenerate and any equivalence*
 598 *class of $\approx_{\mathcal{A}}$ is finite. Moreover, $\approx_{\mathcal{A}}$ has no Siegel domains. In particular, if*
 599 *$R \neq \emptyset$, then the finest lamination \approx_{rat} which respects \mathcal{L}_{rat} , is not degenerate*
 600 *and in the geometric lamination $\mathcal{L}_{\approx_{rat}}$ every leaf not contained in the boundary*
 601 *of a Fatou domain is a limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}_{rat} .*

602 *Proof.* Let \approx be the equivalence relation in \mathbb{S}^1 defined as follows: $x \approx y$ if and
 603 only if there exists a continuum $K \subset S^1 \cup |\mathcal{L}|$ such that $x, y \in K$ and $K \cap S^1$
 604 is countable (such continua are called ω -continua). Then \approx is the finest closed
 605 equivalence relation which respects \mathcal{L} ; moreover, \approx is an invariant lamination
 606 ([2]).

607 Now, suppose first that \mathcal{L} has no gaps. Then the leaves from \mathcal{L} fill the entire
 608 disk. If there are two leaves coming out of one point, then there must be
 609 infinitely many leaves coming out of the same point which is impossible by
 610 Lemma 11. Hence all leaves of \mathcal{L} are pairwise disjoint and equivalence classes
 611 of \approx are endpoints of (possibly degenerate) leaves. From now in the proof we
 612 assume that \mathcal{L} has gaps. It now follows easily that gaps of \mathcal{L} are dense in \mathbb{D}
 613 and so if an ω -continuum K meets a leaf $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathbb{D} \setminus \ell$, then K must contain
 614 one of the endpoints of ℓ .

615 In the proof below we construct so-called *super gaps* and associate them to
 616 some leaves and gaps of \mathcal{L} . If G is a leaf of \mathcal{L} disjoint from all gaps of \mathcal{L} we
 617 call it a *separate* leaf (of \mathcal{L}). In this case put $G^+ = G$ and call it a *super gap*
 618 associated with G . Clearly, G^+ is a two sided limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- . Let
 619 $\mathfrak{G} = \bigcup \{G \mid G \text{ is a finite gap of } \mathcal{L}\}$. For any gap G of \mathcal{L} , let G^+ be the closure
 620 of the convex hull of the component of \mathfrak{G} which contains G . Again, call G^+
 621 a *super gap* associated with G . By Lemma 11.(6), a gap/leaf G of \mathcal{L} either
 622 wanders or is such that $\sigma^m(G) = \sigma^n(G)$ for some $m < n$.

623 **Claim 1.** *Suppose that G is a non-(pre)critical wandering gap/leaf of \mathcal{L} . Then*
 624 *G^+ is either a separate leaf or a finite union of finite gaps whose convex hull*

625 *is a non-(pre)critical wandering polygon and every leaf in its boundary is a*
 626 *limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- .*

627 *Proof of Claim 1.* The case when G is a separate leaf immediately follows
 628 from the definition of a super gap; in this case $G^+ = G$ is a separate leaf.
 629 Suppose next that G is a leaf which meets a gap H of \mathcal{L} or G is a non-
 630 (pre)critical wandering gap. By Lemma 11.(2), there exist gaps G_0, \dots, G_n
 631 such that $G \subset G_0$, $G_i \cap G_{i+1}$ is a leaf and $G_n = H$ (if $G \cup H$ is a wandering gap,
 632 then we set $G_0 = H = G_n$). By Lemma 11.(6) G_0 is either non-(pre)critical
 633 wandering or (pre)periodic, and since G is non-(pre)critical wandering, so is
 634 G_0 .

635 Assume, by way of induction, that G' is a finite union of finite gaps which
 636 is a non-(pre)critical wandering polygon and H is a gap of \mathcal{L} which meets
 637 G' along the leaf ab . Then ab is non-(pre)critical wandering because it comes
 638 from G' . Again since by Lemma 11 H is either non-(pre)critical wandering
 639 or (pre)periodic, we see that H also wanders. In particular, by Theorem 3
 640 H is finite. We claim that $H \cup G'$ is a non-(pre)critical wandering polygon.
 641 For suppose this is not the case. Then we may assume that $\sigma(G') \cap H \neq \emptyset$.
 642 Moreover, the common leaf ab of G' and H is isolated and hence comes from
 643 \mathcal{L}^- . Therefore it is not critical and its image $\sigma(ab)$ is a leaf again. Clearly,
 644 $\sigma(ab)$ is the leaf shared by $\sigma(G')$ and $\sigma(H)$. Repeating this argument, we get
 645 a sequence of gaps of \mathcal{L} “concatenated” at images of the leaf ab . Similarly
 646 to the arguments in the proof of Lemma 11.(6) it implies that the orbit of
 647 ab converges to a point or a leaf but never maps into it which is impossible
 648 because of repelling properties of σ .

649 It follows that G^+ is a non-(pre)critical wandering polygon and, by Theorem 3,
 650 $|G^+ \cap S^1| \leq 2^d$. Hence G^+ is finite union of finite gaps. Note that every leaf
 651 on the boundary of G^+ is a limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- as desired. This completes
 652 the proof of Claim 1. \square

653 Observe that by Lemma 11.(7) for every infinite gap G of \mathcal{L} the set G' consists
 654 of a Cantor set $G'_c \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ and a countable collection of finite sets G'_1, G'_2, \dots
 655 of cardinality at most k (k depends on G) such that for every i the set G'_i is
 656 the intersection of G' and a complementary to G_c subarc U_i of \mathbb{S}^1 . If $|G'_i| > 1$
 657 we connect the endpoints of U_i with a leaf ℓ and add ℓ to the lamination
 658 \mathcal{L} . It is easy to see that the resulting extension of the geo-lamination \mathcal{L} is a
 659 geo-lamination itself. From now on we will use the notation \mathcal{L} for the new
 660 extended geo-lamination.

661 Suppose next that G is a finite (pre)periodic gap or a (pre)periodic leaf of
 662 \mathcal{L} . If some forward image of G contains a critical leaf on its boundary, then
 663 we may assume that $\sigma(G)$ is a point by Lemma 11.(4). Hence each leaf in
 664 the boundary of G is a limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- and $G^+ = G$. If no forward

665 image of G contains a critical leaf on its boundary, then from some time on
 666 $|\sigma^k(G')| > 1$ stabilizes and by Lemma 11.(6) we may assume that $\sigma^m(G) = G$
 667 for some $m > 0$ and $|G'| \geq 2$. Choose $n \geq 0$ such that $\sigma^n(G) = G$ and each
 668 leaf in the boundary of G is fixed.

669 **Claim 2.** *Suppose G is a (pre)periodic finite gap or (pre)periodic leaf of \mathcal{L} .
 670 Then G^+ is a finite polygon and any leaf in the boundary of G^+ is either a
 671 limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- or is contained in an uncountable gap of \mathcal{L} . Moreover,
 672 if G is an n -periodic gap/leaf then $G^+ \supset G$ is the convex hull of a subset of
 673 the component of the set of leaves from \mathcal{L} with σ^n -fixed endpoints.*

674 *Proof of Claim 2.* Suppose that $\sigma^n(G) = G$ and that all points of G' are fixed.
 675 If G is a separate leaf then $G^+ = G$ and we are done. If G is a non-separate
 676 leaf then it is a boundary leaf of a gap Q . Since the endpoints of G are σ^n -
 677 fixed, either $\sigma^n(Q) = G$ or, because the map $\sigma^n|_{\text{Bd}(Q)}$ is positively oriented,
 678 $\sigma^n(Q) = Q$. The former is impossible by Lemma 11.(5). Hence we find a gap
 679 $Q \supset G$ whose all vertices are σ^n -fixed. Finally, if G is a gap then we can set
 680 $Q = G$. Thus, if G is not a separate leaf, we can always find a gap $Q \supset G$
 681 whose all vertices are σ^n -fixed.

682 Suppose, by induction, that G is a finite polygon which is a finite union of
 683 gaps from \mathcal{L} . Moreover, suppose that the boundaries of the gaps consist of
 684 leaves with σ^n -fixed endpoints. Let H be any gap of \mathcal{L} which meets G along
 685 the leaf ab . By Lemma 11.(5) $\sigma^n(H)$ cannot be equal to ab , and since $\sigma^n|_{\text{Bd}(H)}$
 686 is a positively oriented covering map we see that $\sigma^n(H) = H$. If H is finite, all
 687 leaves in the boundary of H must also be fixed. Otherwise H is an infinite, and
 688 hence uncountable, gap. It follows that $G^+ \supset G$ is a finite union of σ^n -fixed
 689 gaps and that every leaf in the boundary of G^+ is either a limit of leaves from
 690 \mathcal{L}^- or is contained in an uncountable gap from \mathcal{L} .

691 Now let G be any (pre)periodic finite gap of \mathcal{L} . Then there exists n such that
 692 $\sigma^n(G) = H$ is periodic. If H is a point then by Lemma 11.(4) all leaves in
 693 the boundary of G are limit leaves and hence $G^+ = G$. Otherwise if H is a
 694 separate leaf it follows that all boundary leaves of G are limit leaves and we
 695 are done. Thus by the previous paragraph we may assume that H^+ is a finite
 696 union $H = H_1, \dots, H_n$ of gaps of \mathcal{L} . Let G^+ be the component of $\bigcup_i \sigma^{-n}(H_i)$
 697 which contains G . Then G^+ is a finite union of finite gaps and every leaf in
 698 the boundary of H^+ is either a limit of leaves from \mathcal{L}^- or on the boundary of
 699 an uncountable gap from \mathcal{L} . \square

700 We now pass on to the proof of the fact that $\approx_{\mathcal{L}} = \approx_{\mathcal{A}}$ is non-degenerate.
 701 Indeed, consider all the super gaps constructed in Claim 1 and Claim 2 (i.e.,
 702 all the sets $G^+ \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ for different gaps and leaves G of the geo-lamination \mathcal{L}).
 703 Also, if a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^1$ does not belong to any gap or leaf of \mathcal{L} we call it a
 704 *separate point* and add it to the family of sets which we construct. Clearly,

705 all sets in the just constructed family \mathcal{F} of super gaps and separate points
706 are closed. Moreover, by the definition two sets in the family \mathcal{F} are disjoint.
707 Indeed, two super gaps cannot meet over a leaf by the definition. If they meet
708 at a vertex then by Lemma 11.(1), Lemma 11.(2) and by the construction of
709 the extended lamination \mathcal{L} they again must be in one super gap. Hence all
710 elements of \mathcal{F} are pairwise disjoint.

711 Considering elements of \mathcal{F} as equivalence classes we get a closed equivalence
712 \approx on \mathbb{S}^1 which respects \mathcal{L}^- and \mathcal{L} (it is easy to see that \approx is indeed closed). By
713 the construction and Claims 1 and 2, all \approx -classes are finite. Because of the
714 definition of a super gap, if an equivalence respects \mathcal{L}^- (and hence \mathcal{L}), it cannot
715 split a \approx -class (i.e., a set $G^+ \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ for some gap/leaf G of \mathcal{L}) into two or more
716 classes of equivalence. Therefore \approx is the finest equivalence which respects \mathcal{L}^- .
717 As was explained in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 12, by [2] there
718 always exists the finest equivalence which respects a geometric lamination,
719 and from what we have just proven it follows that this finest equivalence $\approx_{\mathcal{L}}$
720 coincides with \approx . By Claims 1 and 2 super gaps are finite, thus all \approx -classes
721 are finite and hence \approx is non-degenerate.

722 Finally assume that U is a Siegel domain of \approx . Then $\text{Bd}(U)$ must contain
723 a critical leaf because otherwise by a well-known result from the topologi-
724 cal dynamics (see, e.g., Lemma 18.8 from [15]) $\text{Bd}(U) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ must be finite, a
725 contradiction. However by Lemma 11.(4) this is impossible. The rest of Theo-
726 rem 12 which deals with the rational lamination follows immediately from the
727 construction. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

728 **3 The existence of a locally connected model for unshielded planar** 729 **continua**

730 As outlined in Section 1, in this section we prove Theorem 1 and show the
731 existence of the finest model and the finest map for any unshielded planar
732 continuum Q . We do this in Subsection 3.1. In Subsection 3.2 we suggest
733 a topological condition sufficient for an unshielded continuum Q to have a
734 non-degenerate finest model. This will be used later when in Theorem 2 we
735 establish the criterion for the connected Julia set of a polynomial to have a
736 non-degenerate finest model.

737 *3.1 The existence of the finest map φ and the finest locally connected model*

738 In what follows Q will always denote an unshielded continuum in the plane
739 and U_∞ will always denote the corresponding simply connected neighborhood

740 of infinity in the sphere, called the *basin of infinity* (so that $Q = \text{Bd}(U_\infty)$).

We begin by constructing the finest monotone map φ of Q onto a locally connected continuum. The map will be constructed in terms of impressions of the continuum Q . Since $Q = \text{Bd}(U_\infty)$, there is a unique conformal isomorphism $\Psi : U_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ which has positive real derivative at ∞ . (Note that the domain of the map is in the dynamical plane.) Define the *principal set of the external angle* $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as

$$\text{Pr}(\alpha) = Q \cap \overline{\Psi^{-1}(\{re^{2\pi i\alpha} \mid r \in [0, 1)\})}.$$

Define the *impression of the external angle* $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}^1$ as

$$\text{Imp}(\alpha) = \left\{ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \mid \{\alpha_i \mid i > 0\} \subset \mathbb{D} \text{ and } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \alpha \right\}.$$

741 The *positive wing (of an impression)* is defined as follows:

$$\text{Imp}^+(\alpha) = \left\{ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \mid \{\alpha_i \mid i > 0\} \subset \mathbb{D} \text{ and } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \alpha \text{ with } \arg(\alpha_i) \geq \arg(\alpha) \right\}.$$

Similarly, the *negative wing (of an impression)* is defined as follows:

$$\text{Imp}^-(\alpha) = \left\{ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \mid \{\alpha_i \mid i > 0\} \subset \mathbb{D} \text{ and } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \alpha \text{ with } \arg(\alpha_i) \leq \arg(\alpha) \right\}.$$

742 The differences between these sets are illustrated in Figure 1. In a lot of ap-
 743 plications it is crucial that in the above construction the map Ψ is conformal.
 744 However the construction can be carried out if instead of Ψ certain homeomor-
 745 phisms $\Psi' : U_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ are used. The definitions of the principal set, impression
 746 and wings of impression can be given in this case as well. Since some continua
 747 we construct have topological nature, we use this idea in what follows defining
 748 for them the map Ψ' in a topological way and then defining principle sets,
 749 impressions and wings of impressions accordingly.

750 Any angle's principle set, impression, wings of its impression are each sub-
 751 continua of Q . It is known that $\text{Pr}(\alpha) = \text{Imp}^+(\alpha) \cap \text{Imp}^-(\alpha) \subset \text{Imp}^+(\alpha) \cup$
 752 $\text{Imp}^-(\alpha) = \text{Imp}(\alpha)$. If Q is locally connected, the impression of every external
 753 angle is a point, and therefore impressions intersect only when they coincide.




Fig. 1. On the left is depicted a continuum with an external ray for which the impression, positive wing, negative wing, and principal sets are distinct. The positive wing is the line segment joining A and B , while the negative wing is the line segment joining B and C . On the right is depicted the quotient by \mathcal{D} defined in Lemma 13, which is locally connected.

754 Non-locally connected continua may have impressions of different external an-
 755 gles which intersect and do not coincide. Suppose that \mathcal{D} is a partition of a
 756 compactum K (i.e., a collection of pairwise disjoint subsets of K whose union
 757 is all of K). Clearly, \mathbb{D} defines an equivalence relation on K whose classes are
 758 elements of \mathbb{D} . A partition \mathbb{D} is called *upper semi-continuous* if this equivalence
 759 relation is closed (i.e., its graph is closed in $K \times K$).

760 **Lemma 13.** *There exists a partition $\mathcal{D}_Q = \mathcal{D}$ of Q which is finest among all*
 761 *upper semi-continuous partitions whose elements are unions of impressions of*
 762 *Q . Further, elements of \mathcal{D} are subcontinua of Q .*

763 *Proof.* Let Ξ be the collection of closed equivalence relations on Q such that,
 764 for any equivalence relation \approx from Ξ , $\text{Imp}(\alpha)$ is contained in one class of
 765 equivalence for any external angle α . Then the equivalence relation $\bigcap \Xi$ is also
 766 an element of Ξ (classes of equivalence of $\bigcap \Xi$ are intersections of classes of
 767 equivalence of all equivalence relations from Ξ). Let \mathcal{D} be the collection of
 768 equivalence classes of $\bigcap \Xi$.

769 To see that the elements of \mathcal{D} are connected, we can define a finer partition
 770 \mathcal{D}' whose elements are connected components of elements of \mathcal{D} . Then \mathcal{D}' is
 771 an upper semi-continuous monotone decomposition of Q [19, Lemma 13.2].
 772 Since impressions are connected subsets of Q , that each impression belongs
 773 to an element of \mathcal{D} implies that it belongs to an element of \mathcal{D}' . Therefore,
 774 $\mathcal{D}' \in \Xi$ and \mathcal{D}' is a refinement of \mathcal{D} , so $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}'$, and the elements of \mathcal{D} are
 775 connected. \square

776 We will show that Q/\mathcal{D} is locally connected, and \mathcal{D} is the finest upper semi-
 777 continuous partition of X into connected sets with that property. Thus, the
 778 finest monotone map respecting impressions turns out to be the finest mono-




Fig. 2. Here are two examples of continua for which one of the fibers of the finest map φ to a locally connected continuum is a simple closed curve. Notice that points of the simple closed curve in the figure on the left are accessible from both the bounded and unbounded complementary domains.

779 tone map producing a locally connected model. To implement our plan we
 780 study properties of monotone maps of unshielded continua. First we suggest
 781 the canonic extension of any monotone map of a planar unshielded continuum
 782 Q to a monotone map of the entire plane onto the entire plane. Given any
 783 monotone map ψ , let call sets $\psi^{-1}(y)$ ψ -fibers, or just *fibers*.

784 **Definition 14.** Let $U \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a simply connected open set containing ∞ .
 785 If A is a continuum disjoint from U , the *topological hull* $\text{TH}(A)$ of A is the
 786 union of A with the bounded components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$. Equivalently, $\text{TH}(A)$ is
 787 the complement of the unique component of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus A$ containing U . Note that
 788 $\text{TH}(A) \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a continuum which does not separate the plane.

789 Suppose that a monotone map m from an unshielded continuum Q to an ar-
 790 bitrary continuum Y is given. Then m -fibers may be separating, as indicated
 791 in Figure 2, or non-separating. Denote by $T_m(Q)$ the union of Q and the topo-
 792 logical hulls of all separating fibers. To extend our map m onto the plane as a
 793 monotone map, we must collapse topological hulls of separating fibers because
 794 otherwise the extension will not be monotone. This idea is implemented in the
 795 next lemma.

796 **Lemma 15.** *If Q is an unshielded continuum and $m : Q \rightarrow Y$ is a surjective*
 797 *monotone map onto an arbitrary continuum Y , then there exists a monotone*
 798 *map $M : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and an embedding $h : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that:*

- 799 (1) $M|_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus T_m(Q)}$ is a homeomorphism onto its image;
 800 (2) $M(U_\infty)$ is a simply connected open set whose boundary is $M(Q)$, with

801 $M(\infty) = \infty$; and
 802 (3) $M|_Q = h \circ m$.

803 *Proof.* We extend the map m by filling in its fibers. Define the collection

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}} = \{ \text{TH}(m^{-1}(y)) : y \in Y \} \cup \{ \{p\} : p \notin T_m(Q) \}.$$

804 It is immediate that $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ is an upper semi-continuous partition of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ whose ele-
 805 ments are non-separating continua. Therefore, by [18], $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}/\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ is homeomorphic
 806 to $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, and there exists a monotone map $M : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ whose fibers are sets from
 807 $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$. Observe that by the construction $M^{-1}(Y) = T_m(Q)$.

808 Further, since points of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus M^{-1}(Y)$ are elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, invariance of domain
 809 gives that $M|_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus M^{-1}(Y)}$ is a homeomorphism onto its image and that $M(U_\infty)$
 810 is an open subset of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ with $M(\infty) = \infty$. Also, $M(U_\infty) \cap M(Q) = \emptyset$, so
 811 $\text{Bd}(M(U_\infty)) = M(Q)$. Finally, notice that the fibers of $M|_Q$ are the same as
 812 the m -fibers so there exists a natural homeomorphism $h : Y \rightarrow M(Q)$. This
 813 is a homeomorphism of Y onto $M(Q)$ and an embedding of Y into \mathbb{C} since Y
 814 is compact. \square

815 Next we show that *any* monotone map of an unshielded continuum onto a
 816 locally connected continuum must collapse impressions to points. A *crosscut*
 817 of Q is a homeomorphic image $C \subset U_\infty$ of an open interval $(0, 1)$ under a
 818 homeomorphism $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\psi(0) \in Q \neq \psi(1) \in Q$. Define
 819 $\text{Sh}(C)$ (the *shadow of C*) as the closure of the bounded component of $U_\infty \setminus C$.
 820 Observe that in our definition of a crosscut and its shadow we always assume
 821 that the continuum is unshielded and that crosscuts are contained in the basin
 822 of infinity.

823 **Lemma 16.** *Suppose that $m : Q \rightarrow Y$ is a monotone map onto a locally*
 824 *connected continuum. Then $m(\text{Imp}(\alpha))$ is a point for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}^1$.*

825 *Proof.* Let M be as guaranteed in Lemma 15. Since $M|_{U_\infty}$ is one-to-one, it is
 826 then easy to see that a crosscut of Q maps by M either to a crosscut of $M(Q)$ or
 827 to an open arc in $M(U_\infty)$ whose closure is a simple closed curve meeting $M(Q)$
 828 in a single point. Because $M(\infty) = \infty$, we see that $M(\text{Sh}(C)) = \text{Sh}(M(C))$
 829 for any crosscut C whose image is a crosscut while if $\overline{M(C)}$ is a simple close
 830 curve then $M(\text{Sh}(C))$ is the interior of the Jordan disk enclosed by $\overline{M(C)}$.

831 Choose any external angle α . There exists a sequence of crosscuts $(C_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ such
 832 that their diameters converge to 0 and $\bigcap_{i=1}^\infty \text{Sh}(C_i) = \text{Imp}(\alpha)$ [15, Lemma
 833 17.9]. Since $\text{Sh}(C_i)$ are nested, we have




Fig. 3. In this continuum, constructed by joining every point of a Cantor set to a base point with a straight line segment, every pair of non-degenerate impressions intersect, and every point is contained in a non-degenerate impression. Therefore, Lemma 16 concludes that the finest locally connected model is a point.

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(\text{Imp}(\alpha)) &= M\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Sh}(C_i)\right) \\
 &= \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} M(\text{Sh}(C_i)) \\
 &= \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Sh}(M(C_i)).
 \end{aligned}$$

834 By uniform continuity, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(M(C_i)) = 0$. Since $M(Q)$ is locally con-
 835 nected, $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Sh}(M(C_i))$ is indeed a point, and so is $M(\text{Imp}(\alpha))$. \square

836 The next lemma is essentially a converse of Lemma 16.

837 **Lemma 17.** *Suppose that $m : Q \rightarrow Y$ is a monotone surjective map such that*
 838 *$m(\text{Imp}(\alpha))$ is a point for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}^1$. Then Y is locally connected. Moreover,*
 839 *the map $\Phi_m : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow Y$ defined by $\Phi_m = m \circ \text{Imp}$ is a continuous single-valued*
 840 *onto function.*

841 *Proof.* Φ_m is a single-valued function, since by assumption m maps impressions
 842 to points of Y . Also, it is surjective, since m is surjective and every point is
 843 contained in the impression of some angle. To see sequential continuity, observe
 844 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i \rightarrow \alpha &\implies \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{Imp}(\alpha_i) \subset \text{Imp}(\alpha) \\
&\implies \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} m(\text{Imp}(\alpha_i)) \subset m(\text{Imp}(\alpha)) \\
&\implies \Phi(\alpha_i) \rightarrow \Phi(\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

845 The continuous image of a locally connected continuum is locally connected,
846 so Y is locally connected as the Φ_m -image of \mathbb{S}^1 . \square

847 The picture which follows from the above lemmas is as follows. Imagine that
848 we have a monotone map m of an unshielded continuum $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$ onto a locally
849 connected continuum Y . By Lemma 15 we can think of m as the restriction
850 of a monotone map $M : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ which in fact is a homeomorphism on U_∞
851 as well as on the components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus Q$ whose boundaries are not collapsed by
852 m . To avoid confusion, we call the plane containing Q the Q -plane, and the
853 plane containing Y the Y -plane. Likewise, if there is no ambiguity we will call
854 various objects in the Q -plane Q -rays etc while calling corresponding objects
855 in the Y -plane Y rays etc.

856 Now, take external conformal Q -rays. Then the map M carries them over
857 to the Y -plane as just continuous rays (obviously, our construction is purely
858 topological and does not preserve the conformal structure in any way). The
859 construction however forces all these Y -rays to land; moreover, the family of
860 Y -rays can be used to define impressions in the sense of that family (see our
861 explanation following the definition of the impression). By Lemma 16, these
862 impressions must be degenerate.

863 We are ready to prove the existence of the finest locally connected model and
864 the finest map for unshielded continua. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_Q = \mathcal{D}$ denotes the finest
865 among all upper semi-continuous partitions of Q whose elements are unions
866 of impressions of Q (it is provided by Lemma 13).

867 **Theorem 18.** *There exists a monotone map $\varphi : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\varphi|_Q$ is*
868 *the finest monotone map of Q onto a locally connected continuum, $\varphi(Q)$ is*
869 *the finest locally connected model of Q , and φ is a homeomorphism on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus$*
870 *$\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(Q))$. Moreover, the map $\varphi|_Q$ can be defined as the quotient map $Q \rightarrow$*
871 *Q/\mathcal{D} .*

872 *Proof.* Let us show that the quotient map $m : Q \rightarrow Q/\mathcal{D}$ is the finest map
873 of Q onto a locally connected continuum. Indeed, suppose that $\psi : Q \rightarrow A$
874 is a monotone map onto a locally connected continuum A . Then ψ generates
875 an upper semi-continuous partition of Q whose elements, by Lemma 16, are
876 unions of impressions of Q . By the choice of \mathcal{D} there exists a continuous map

877 $h : Q/\mathcal{D} \rightarrow A$ which associates to an element B of \mathcal{D} the point $x \in A$ such that
 878 $\psi^{-1}(x)$ contains B . To complete the proof we let $\varphi : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the extension
 879 of m guaranteed by Lemma 15. \square

880 Define $\Phi : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \varphi(Q)$ as $\Phi = \varphi \circ \text{Imp}$. From Lemma 17, Φ is a well-defined con-
 881 tinuous function. According to the picture given after Lemma 17, Φ maps an
 882 angle α to the landing point of the corresponding $\varphi(Q)$ -ray (i.e., the φ -image
 883 of the external conformal ray to Q in the Q -plane). Then the *finest lamination*
 884 \sim_Q (corresponding to Q) is the equivalence relation \sim on \mathbb{S}^1 , defined by
 885 $\alpha_1 \sim \alpha_2$ if and only if $\Phi(\alpha_1) = \Phi(\alpha_2)$.

886 3.2 A constructive approach

887 Recall that the finest map of an unshielded continuum Q is always denoted by
 888 $\varphi = \varphi_Q$. Fibers under the finest map will be called *K-sets*. In the notation from
 889 Subsection 3.1 and Lemma 13, K-sets are exactly the elements of the partition
 890 $\mathcal{D}_Q = \mathcal{D}$, the finest among all upper semi-continuous partitions whose elements
 891 are unions of impressions of Q . Classes of equivalence in the lamination \sim_Q
 892 will be called *K-classes*. We are interested in the structure of K-sets, and will
 893 describe how to determine if two points lie in the same K-set. Given a set
 894 $A \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ let $\text{Imp}(A)$ be the union of impressions of all angles in A .

895 **Lemma 19.** *If $\{a\}$ is a degenerate K-set then Q is locally connected at a .*

896 *Proof.* Suppose that A is a K-class with a degenerate K-set $\text{Imp}(A) = \{a\}$
 897 (by the definitions, this is equivalent to $\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a)) = \{a\}$). Take the point
 898 $\varphi(a)$. Since $\varphi(Q)$ is locally connected, there is a nested sequence of open
 899 connected neighborhoods $U_1 \supset U_2 \supset \dots$ of $\varphi(a)$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i = \{\varphi(a)\}$.
 900 By the properties of φ , the sets $V_i = \varphi^{-1}(U_i)$ form a nested sequence of
 901 open connected neighborhoods of a with the intersection coinciding with $a =$
 902 $\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a))$. So, Q is locally connected at a . \square

903 Now we introduce two important notions.

Definition 20. A *ray-compactum* (or *ray-continuum*) $X \subset Q$ is a compactum
 (respectively, a continuum or a point) for which there exists a closed set of
 angles $\Theta(X) \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ such that

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta(X)} \text{Pr}(\theta) \subset X \subset \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta(X)} \text{Imp}(\theta).$$

904 Denote $X \cup \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta(X)} R_\theta$ by \widetilde{X} .

905 One of the notions defined below is fairly standard. We give two equivalent
 906 definitions of the second notion, one involving separation of sets and the other
 907 involving cutting the plane.

908 **Definition 21.** A set Y *separates* a space X between subsets A and B if
 909 $X \setminus Y = U \cup V$, where $A \subset U$, $B \subset V$, and $\overline{U} \cap V = U \cap \overline{V} = \emptyset$. We say that
 910 a ray-compactum C *ray-separates* subsets A and B of Q if \tilde{C} separates $\overline{U_\infty}$
 911 between A and B . If $X \subset Q$ is a continuum and there are at least two points
 912 of X which are ray-separated by C , we say that C *ray-separates* X .

913 The definition of ray-separation can be equivalently given as follows: (a)
 914 ray-compactum C *ray-separates* subsets A and B of Q if $C \cap (A \cup B) = \emptyset$ and
 915 there exists no component of $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \tilde{C}$ containing points of A and B . All these
 916 notions are important ingredients of the central notion of *well-slicing*.

917 **Definition 22.** A continuum $X \subset Q$ is *well-sliced* if there exists a collection
 918 \mathcal{C} of pairwise disjoint ray-compacta in Q such that

- 919 (1) each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ ray-separates X ,
- 920 (2) for every different $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ which ray-separates C_1
 921 and C_2 , and
- 922 (3) \mathcal{C} has at least two elements.

923 The family \mathcal{C} is then a *well-slicing family* for X .

924 We will also use the following combinatorial (laminational) version of well-
 925 slicing.

926 **Definition 23.** Suppose that there is a collection \mathcal{C} of at least two pairwise
 927 disjoint geometric leaves or gaps in \mathbb{D} . Suppose that for every different $C_1, C_2 \in$
 928 \mathcal{C} there exists $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ which separates \mathbb{D} between C_1 and C_2 . Then the family \mathcal{C}
 929 is then a *well-slicing family* for \mathbb{D} . Equivalently, consider the family \mathcal{C}' of closed
 930 pairwise unlinked subsets of \mathbb{S}^1 . Suppose that for every different $C'_1, C'_2 \in \mathcal{C}'$
 931 there exists $C'_3 \in \mathcal{C}'$ which separates \mathbb{S}^1 between C'_1 and C'_2 . Then we say that
 932 \mathcal{C}' is a well-slicing family of \mathbb{S}^1 . Clearly, if \mathcal{C} is a well-slicing family of \mathbb{D} then
 933 the intersections of elements of \mathcal{C} with \mathbb{S}^1 (i.e., their bases) form a well-slicing
 934 family of \mathbb{S}^1 , and vice versa.

As an example of a well-slicing family, take $Q = \mathbb{S}^1$. We define the family of
 subsets

$$C_\alpha = \{e^{2\pi i\alpha}, e^{-2\pi i\alpha}\}$$

935 with α taking a rational value in $[0, 1/2)$. Each C_α is then a ray-compactum
 936 with the set of angles $\Theta(C_\alpha) = \{\alpha, -\alpha\}$. Then for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$, we see that
 937 C_α and C_β are ray-separated by $C_{(\alpha+\beta)/2}$. Hence, \mathcal{C} is a well-slicing family for
 938 \mathbb{S}^1 . Set $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{S}^1} = \mathcal{C}$ and call this collection the *vertical collection*.

939 Suppose that a collection \mathcal{C}' of closed pairwise unlinked subsets of \mathbb{S}^1 is a
 940 well-slicing family of \mathbb{S}^1 . Moreover, suppose that for each set $C' \in \mathcal{C}'$ the set
 941 $\text{Imp}(C')$ is a continuum in Q , and for distinct sets C'_1, C'_2 their impressions are
 942 disjoint. Then it follows from the definitions that the sets $\text{Imp}(C'), C' \in \mathcal{C}'$
 943 form a well-slicing family of the entire Q . If $X \subset Q$ is such that all sets A
 944 from this collection cut X (i.e., $X \setminus A$ is disconnected) then it follows that this
 945 is a well-slicing family for X .

946 **Lemma 24.** *Suppose that C_1, C_2 are disjoint ray-compacta each of which ray-*
 947 *separates $A, B \subset Q$. If C_3 is a ray-compactum disjoint from $A \cup B$ which*
 948 *ray-separates C_1 and C_2 , then C_3 also ray-separates A and B .*

949 *Proof.* Suppose that C_3 does not ray-separate A and B . Then there exists a
 950 component V of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{C}_3$ containing points of both A and B . Since C_3 ray-
 951 separates C_1 and C_2 , one of these sets (say, C_1) is disjoint from V . Then V is
 952 contained in a component W of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{C}_1$. Hence W contains points of both A
 953 and B and so \tilde{C}_1 does not separate X between A and B , a contradiction. \square

954 The next lemma is close in spirit to Lemma 24.

955 **Lemma 25.** *Let $A, B \subset Q$. Suppose that K_1 is a ray-compactum which ray-*
 956 *separates A and B , and K_2 is a ray-compactum disjoint from B which ray-*
 957 *separates A and K_1 . Then K_2 ray-separates A and B .*

958 *Proof.* Suppose that K_2 does not ray-separate A and B . Then there exists a
 959 component V of $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \tilde{K}_2$ containing points of both A and B . Since K_1 ray-
 960 separates A and B , there must be points of K_1 in V too. However this implies
 961 that K_2 does not ray-separate A and K_1 , a contradiction. \square

962 The next lemma shows that elements of a well-slicing family are separated by
 963 infinitely many elements of the same family.

964 **Lemma 26.** *If \mathcal{C} is a well-slicing family of a continuum $X \subset Q$ then, for any*
 965 *two elements C_1 and C_2 , infinitely many different elements of \mathcal{C} separate C_1*
 966 *and C_2 .*

967 *Proof.* Choose $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$ which ray-separates C_1 and C_2 . Then choose $C_4 \in \mathcal{C}$
 968 which ray-separates C_3 and C_2 . It is easy to see that $C_4 \neq C_1$. By Lemma 25
 969 C_3 ray-separates C_1 and C_2 . Inductively applying this argument, we will find
 970 a sequence of pairwise distinct elements of \mathcal{C} each of which ray-separates C_1
 971 and C_2 as desired. \square

972 Now we prove the first theorem of this subsection which implies that in a few
 973 cases certain subcontinua of Q do not collapse under the finest map φ .

974 **Theorem 27.** *Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a well-slicing family of a continuum $X \subset Q$.*
 975 *Then $\varphi(X)$ is not a point.*

976 *Proof.* Define $x \approx y$ whenever only finitely many elements of \mathcal{C} ray-separate
 977 x and y . Clearly, such a relation is symmetric and reflexive. To see that it is
 978 transitive, suppose $x \approx y$ and $x \not\approx z$. Then infinitely many elements of \mathcal{C} ray-
 979 separate x and z . However, only finitely many of these elements ray-separate
 980 x from y , and the rest then ray-separate y from z , so $y \not\approx z$.

981 Therefore, \approx is an equivalence relation. We will now show that \approx is a closed
 982 equivalence relation by showing that $\{(x, y) \in Q^2 \mid x \not\approx y\}$ is open. Suppose
 983 that $x \not\approx y$. In particular, there are two elements C_1 and C_2 which ray-separate
 984 x and y . Every subspace of \mathbb{C} is a normal space, so it is easy to see that sets \widetilde{C}_1
 985 and \widetilde{C}_2 separate $\overline{U_\infty}$ between every point y in a neighborhood V of x and every
 986 point z in a neighborhood W of y . Then by Lemma 26 we can find infinitely
 987 many elements of \mathcal{C} which do not contain y or z and separate X between C_1
 988 and C_2 . Each such element of \mathcal{C} separates X between y and z by Lemma 24.
 989 Hence no point in V is \approx -equivalent to any point in W , and \approx is closed. In
 990 particular, the partition of Q into \approx -classes is upper semi-continuous.

991 Now we show that, for any external angle α , the impression $\text{Imp}(\alpha)$ is con-
 992 tained in a \approx -class. To see this, suppose that $x, y \in \text{Imp}(\alpha)$ are ray-separated
 993 by two elements B, C of \mathcal{C} . Since $B \cap C = \emptyset$, we see that the set $\Theta(B)$ of
 994 angles associated with B is disjoint from $\Theta(C)$. Hence at most one of these
 995 sets of angles contains α , and we may assume that $\alpha \notin \Theta(C)$. Now, since C
 996 is a ray-compactum, then each component W of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \widetilde{C}$ corresponds to a well-
 997 defined open set of angles in \mathbb{S}^1 whose external rays are contained in W . Since
 998 $\alpha \notin \Theta(C)$, one such component V contains R_α together with rays of close to α
 999 angles. Hence $\text{Imp}(\alpha) \subset \overline{V}$ which means that $\text{Imp}(\alpha)$ is disjoint from all other
 1000 components of $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \widetilde{C}$ but V . However, by the assumption C ray-separates X
 1001 between x and y , hence the points $x \in \text{Imp}(\alpha)$ and $y \in \text{Imp}(\alpha)$ must belong
 1002 to distinct components of $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \widetilde{C}$, a contradiction.

1003 Finally, we show that $\varphi(X)$ is not a point. First we refine \approx to get an equiv-
 1004 alence \approx' with connected classes. Indeed, as in the proof of Lemma 13 we
 1005 can define a finer partition than that into \approx -classes whose elements are con-
 1006 nected components of \approx -classes. Then the new partition is an upper semi-
 1007 continuous monotone decomposition of Q [19, Lemma 13.2]. By the previous
 1008 paragraph any impression is still contained in an \approx' -class. Thus the quotient
 1009 map $m : Q \rightarrow Q/\approx'$ is a monotone surjective map collapsing impressions. By
 1010 Lemma 17 Q/\approx' is locally connected. Now, let $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ be different. For
 1011 all $x \in C_1 \cap X$ and $y \in C_2 \cap X$, we see that $x \not\approx y$ by Lemma 26 and hence
 1012 $m(x) \neq m(y)$. Since φ is the finest monotone map, we see that $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(y)$,
 1013 and so $\varphi(X)$ is not a point. \square

1014 Now we prove a related criterion: If an unshielded continuum $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$ has
 1015 an uncountable family of disjoint ray-continua, each of which ray-separate Q ,
 1016 then there is a sub-family which is well-sliced, and therefore the finest model
 1017 is non-degenerate.

1018 **Lemma 28.** *Let \mathcal{C} be an uncountable collection of disjoint ray-continua of an*
 1019 *unshielded continuum $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$, each of which ray-separates Q . Then there exist*
 1020 *elements $C_0, C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that uncountably many elements of \mathcal{C} ray-separate*
 1021 *C_0 and C_1 .*

1022 *Proof.* Assume by way of contradiction that this is not the case. For $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$,
 1023 let Y_{AB} denote the set of points $x \in X \setminus (A \cup B)$ which are not ray-separated
 1024 from A by B , nor vice-versa. We see that Y_{AB} is an open subset of X , each Y_{AB}
 1025 contains every element of \mathcal{C} that it intersects, and by assumption each Y_{AB} may
 1026 contain only countably many elements of \mathcal{C} . Then the open set $U = \bigcup_{A, B \in \mathcal{C}} Y_{AB}$
 1027 is an open subset of Q of which $\{Y_{AB}\}_{A, B \in \mathcal{C}}$ forms an open cover. Since Q is
 1028 second countable, countably many Y_{AB} cover U . We therefore conclude that
 1029 the set of elements of \mathcal{C} contained in (or intersecting) U is countable.

1030 Consider now any $D \in \mathcal{C}$ contained in $Q \setminus U$. By the definition of U , D does
 1031 not ray-separate any pair of elements in \mathcal{C} , so U must lie in a component
 1032 of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \widetilde{D}$. Let V_D denote a different component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \widetilde{D}$. Notice that, for
 1033 any $D, E \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $D \cup E \subset Q \setminus U$, $V_D \cap V_E = \emptyset$, since any point in
 1034 their intersection by definition belongs to $Y_{DE} \subset U$ while $V_D \cup V_E \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus U$.
 1035 Therefore, $\{V_A \mid A \in \mathcal{C}, A \not\subset U\}$ is an uncountable collection of disjoint open
 1036 subsets of X , contradicting that X is a metric continuum. \square

1037 **Theorem 29.** *Suppose that \mathcal{C} is an uncountable collection of pairwise-disjoint*
 1038 *ray-continua in an unshielded continuum $Q \subset \mathbb{C}$, each of which ray-separates*
 1039 *Q . Then a subcollection of \mathcal{C} forms a well-slicing family of Q , and the finest*
 1040 *model of Q is non-degenerate.*

1041 *Proof.* By Lemma 28, without loss of generality we may assume that there
 1042 are elements $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that all other elements of \mathcal{C} ray-separate α_0 and
 1043 α_1 . Clearly, a linear order \prec is induced on \mathcal{C} , where $\beta \prec \gamma$ whenever β ray-
 1044 separates α_0 and γ (for if neither ray-separates the other from α_0 , one of them
 1045 does not ray-separate α_0 and α_1).

1046 To each element $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ we can associate a chord ℓ_α so that this collection of
 1047 chords in the unit disk is uncountable and also linearly ordered. Hence there
 1048 exists an element $\alpha_{1/2}$ such that both intervals $(\alpha_0, \alpha_{1/2})_\prec$ and $(\alpha_{1/2}, \alpha_1)_\prec$ in
 1049 \mathcal{C} are uncountable. By induction we can define α_q for any dyadic rational
 1050 $q, 0 < q < 1$. Then the collection $\{\alpha_q\}$ with q dyadic rational is a well-slicing
 1051 family. By Theorem 27, the finest model of Q is non-degenerate. \square

1052 **4 The finest model for polynomial Julia sets is dynamical**

1053 Now we show that if $Q = J_P$ is a connected polynomial Julia set then the
 1054 finest map φ (which we always canonically extend onto the entire plane as
 1055 explained above) semiconjugates P to a branched covering map $g : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$,
 1056 which we call the *topological polynomial*. Call $\varphi(J_P)$ the *topological Julia set*
 1057 (see the diagram on page 4). In Section 1 by a topological polynomial we
 1058 understood the map f_{\sim} induced by \sim on the quotient space of a lamination
 1059 \sim ; since it will always be clear whether we deal with a topological polynomial
 1060 considered on J_{\sim} or we deal with its canonic extension on the entire plane, our
 1061 terminology will not cause ambiguity. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_Q = \mathcal{D}$ is the finest among
 1062 all upper semi-continuous partitions whose elements are unions of impressions
 1063 of Q , or, as we have shown above, the family of all fibers of the finest map φ
 1064 (K-sets).

1065 We now give a transfinite method for constructing the finest closed equivalence
 1066 relation \sim respecting a given collection of continua \mathcal{A} . To begin, let \sim_0 denote
 1067 the equivalence relation such that $x \sim_0 y$ if and only if x and y are contained in
 1068 a connected finite union of elements of \mathcal{A} . Typically, \sim_0 does not have closed
 1069 classes, so \sim makes more identifications. If an ordinal α has an immediate
 1070 predecessor β for which \sim_β is defined, we define $x \sim_\alpha y$ if there exist finitely
 1071 many sequences of \sim_β classes whose limits comprise a continuum containing
 1072 x and y . (Here, the limit of non-closed sets is considered to be the same as
 1073 the limit of their closures.) In the case that α is a limit ordinal, we say $x \sim_\alpha y$
 1074 whenever there exists $\beta < \alpha$ such that $x \sim_\beta y$. Notice that the sequence of
 1075 \sim_α -classes of a point x (as α increases) is an increasing nest of connected
 1076 sets, with the closure of each being a subcontinuum of its successor. It is also
 1077 apparent that \sim_α -classes are contained in \sim -classes for all ordinals α .

1078 Let us now show that $\sim = \sim_\Omega$ where Ω is the smallest uncountable ordinal. To
 1079 see this, we first note that $\sim_\Omega = \sim_{(\Omega+1)}$. This is because the sequence of closures
 1080 of \sim_α -classes containing a point x forms an increasing nest of subcontinua,
 1081 no uncountable subchain of which can be strictly increasing. Therefore, all
 1082 \sim_α -classes have stabilized when $\alpha = \Omega$. This implies that \sim_Ω is a closed
 1083 equivalence relation, since the limit of \sim_Ω -classes is a $\sim_{(\Omega+1)}$ -class, which we
 1084 have shown is a \sim_Ω -class again. Finally, \sim_Ω identifies elements of \mathcal{A} to points
 1085 and \sim_Ω -classes are contained in \sim -classes, so \sim and \sim_Ω coincide.

1086 **Theorem 30.** *For any $D \in \mathcal{D}$, $P(D) \in \mathcal{D}$.*

1087 *Proof.* We prove by transfinite induction that, for any ordinal α , the image of
 1088 a \sim_α -class is again a \sim_α -class. It is the case that the image of a \sim_0 -class is
 1089 again a \sim_0 -class. For instance, if $x \sim_0 y$ there is a finite chain of impressions
 1090 containing them, and the image is a finite chain of impressions containing

1091 $P(x)$ and $P(y)$. Furthermore, if $P(x)$ is contained in the class of y , there is
1092 a finite union K of impressions connecting them. Since P is an open map,
1093 the component of the $P^{-1}(K)$ containing x is a finite union of impressions
1094 containing a preimage of y .

1095 Now assume for induction that, for every $\beta < \alpha$, that \sim_β -classes map to other
1096 \sim_β -classes. We will show that this is also true for \sim_α -classes. This is easy to see
1097 if α is a limit ordinal, so we will concentrate on proving this fact when α has an
1098 immediate predecessor β . Suppose first that $x \sim_\alpha y$. Then there are sequences
1099 $(K_i^1)_{i=1}^\infty \rightarrow K_1, \dots, (K_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty \rightarrow K_n$ of \sim_β -classes such that K_1, \dots, K_n form a
1100 chain from x to y (i.e., so K_1 contains x , K_n contains y , and $K_i \cap K_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for
1101 $1 \leq i < n$). The image sequences $(P(K_i^1))_{i=1}^\infty \rightarrow P(K_1), \dots, (P(K_i^n))_{i=1}^\infty \rightarrow K_n$
1102 are also sequences of \sim_β -classes by the inductive hypothesis, which converge
1103 onto the chain $K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_n$. This illustrates that $P(x) \sim_\alpha P(y)$.

1104 On the other hand, say $P(x) \sim_\alpha y$; we will show that $x \sim_\alpha z$ for some
1105 $z \in P^{-1}(y)$, so that the \sim_α -class of x maps onto to \sim_α -class of $P(x)$. Again
1106 find sequences $(K_i^j)_{i=1}^\infty$ of \sim_β -classes with $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ whose limits $K_1, \dots,$
1107 K_n form a chain from $P(x)$ to y . Because P is open, there is a sequence of
1108 preimages of $(K_i^1)_{i=1}^\infty$, (whose members are \sim_β -classes by hypothesis) that limit
1109 to a continuum K'_1 containing x . By continuity, $P(K'_1) = K_1$ intersects K_2 , so
1110 we can proceed by inductively choosing limits K'_{i+1} of \sim_β -classes intersecting
1111 K'_i and mapping onto K_{i+1} . The resulting chain $K'_1 \cup \dots \cup K'_n$ maps onto
1112 $K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_n$, which shows that x is \sim_α -equivalent to some preimage of y .
1113 We therefore see that \sim_α -classes map onto \sim_α -classes, by letting $\alpha = \Omega$ that
1114 elements of \mathcal{D} map onto elements of \mathcal{D} . \square

1115 The next theorem follows from Theorem 30.

1116 **Theorem 31.** *The map φ semiconjugates P to a branched covering map*
1117 $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

1118 *Proof.* Let $m : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the quotient map corresponding to \mathcal{D} as constructed
1119 in Lemma 15. The map $m \circ P : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is continuous, and is constant on
1120 elements of \mathcal{D} by Theorem 30. Therefore, there is an induced function $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow$
1121 \mathbb{C} such that $m \circ P = g \circ m$. Also, it is easy to see that g is continuous. Indeed,
1122 let $x_i \rightarrow x$. Then $\varphi^{-1}(x_i)$ converge into $\varphi^{-1}(x)$ and $P(\varphi^{-1}(x_i))$ converge into
1123 $P(\varphi^{-1}(x))$. Applying φ to this, we see that $g(x_i) = \varphi(P(\varphi^{-1}(x_i)))$ converge
1124 to $g(x) = \varphi(P(\varphi^{-1}(x)))$, and so g is continuous.

1125 To see that g is open, let $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open set. Then $m^{-1}(U)$ is an open set.
1126 By the previous paragraph, $P(m^{-1}(U)) = m^{-1}(g(U))$. Now by Theorem 30
1127 and by the definition of a quotient map $m(P(m^{-1}(U))) = g(U)$ is open. Since
1128 U was arbitrary, g is an open map. By the Stoilow Theorem [24] g is branched
1129 covering. \square

1130 In what follows we always denote by g the topological polynomial to which P
 1131 is semiconjugate; the φ -image of J_P is denoted by J_{\sim_P} . Define $\Phi : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow J_{\sim_P}$
 1132 as $\Phi = \varphi \circ \text{Imp}$. From Lemma 17, Φ is a well-defined continuous function.

1133 **Theorem 32.** *The map Φ semiconjugates $z \mapsto z^d$ to $g|_{J_{\sim_P}}$.*

1134 *Proof.* Define $\sigma_d = z \mapsto z^d$. Recall that g is defined so that (1) $g \circ \varphi = \varphi \circ P$
 1135 and also that the Böttcher uniformization gives that (2) $P \circ \text{Imp} = \text{Imp} \circ \sigma_d$.
 1136 We then see that, as desired,

$$\begin{aligned}
 g \circ \Phi &= g \circ \varphi \circ \text{Imp} \\
 &= \varphi \circ P \circ \text{Imp} && \text{(by (1))} \\
 &= \varphi \circ \text{Imp} \circ \sigma_d && \text{(by (2))} \\
 &= \Phi \circ \sigma_d.
 \end{aligned}$$

1137

□

1138 Then, as in the previous section, the *finest lamination* corresponding to J_{\sim_P}
 1139 is the equivalence relation \sim_P on \mathbb{S}^1 , defined by $\alpha_1 \sim_P \alpha_2$ if and only if
 1140 $\Phi(\alpha_1) = \Phi(\alpha_2)$.

1141 5 A criterion for the polynomial Julia set to have a non-degenerate 1142 finest monotone model

1143 Here we obtain the remaining main results of the paper. We give a necessary
 1144 and sufficient condition for the existence of a non-degenerate locally connected
 1145 model of the connected Julia set of a polynomial P . We give this criterion in
 1146 terms of its rational lamination as well as the existence of specific wandering
 1147 continua in the Julia set behaving in the fashion reminiscent of the irrational
 1148 rotation on the unit circle.

1149 5.1 Topological and laminational preliminaries

1150 Let us recall the following definitions. A finite set A is said to be *all-critical*
 1151 if $\sigma(A)$ is a singleton. A finite set B is said to be *eventually all-critical* if
 1152 there exists a number n such that $\sigma^n(B)$ is a singleton. The following result
 1153 is obtained in [7], Theorem 7.2.7.

1154 **Theorem 33.** *Suppose that J_P is the connected Julia set of a polynomial*
 1155 *P such that its locally connected model J_\sim corresponding to the lamination*
 1156 *$\sim = \sim_P$ is a dendrite. Then there are infinitely many periodic cutpoints of J_\sim*
 1157 *and, respectively, \sim -classes, each of which consists of more than one point.*

1158 We will also need another result from [7]; recall that by K_P we denote the
 1159 filled-in Julia set of a polynomial P .

1160 **Theorem 34.** *Suppose that $P : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a polynomial, $X \subset K_P$ is a non-*
 1161 *separating continuum or a point such that $P(X) \subset X$, all fixed points in X*
 1162 *are repelling or parabolic, for every Fatou domain U of P either $U \subset X$ or*
 1163 *$U \cap X = \emptyset$, and for each fixed point $x_i \in X$ there exists an external ray R_i of*
 1164 *X , landing at x_i , such that $P(R_i) = R_i$. Then X is a single point.*

1165 Theorem 33 applies in the proof of Theorem 35. Define an *all-critical* point
 1166 as a cutpoint of J_\sim whose image is an endpoint of J_\sim .

1167 **Theorem 35.** *Suppose \sim is a lamination. Then at least one of the following*
 1168 *properties must be satisfied:*

- 1169 (1) J_\sim contains the boundary of a paratracting Fatou domain;
- 1170 (2) there are infinitely many periodic \sim -classes each of which consists of more
 1171 than one angle;
- 1172 (3) there exists a finite collection of all-critical \sim -classes with pairwise dis-
 1173 joint grand orbits whose images under the quotient map form the set of
 1174 all-critical points on the boundaries of Siegel domains from one cycle of
 1175 Siegel domains so that all cutpoints of J_\sim on the boundaries of these
 1176 Siegel domains belong to the grand orbits of these all-critical points.

1177 *Proof.* Suppose that J_\sim is a dendrite. Then the result follows from Theorem 33.
 1178 Suppose now that J_\sim is not a dendrite. Then J_\sim contains a simple closed curve
 1179 S . By Lemma 4, there are two cases possible. First, we may assume that S is
 1180 the boundary of a periodic paratracting Fatou domain. Then (1) holds.

1181 Consider the case when S is of period 1 and $f_\sim|_S$ is conjugate to an irrational
 1182 rotation (the case of higher period is similar). Consider a point $x \in S$ which
 1183 is a cutpoint of J_\sim (x must exist since $S \neq J_\sim$). Then x is not (pre)periodic.
 1184 Hence by Theorem 3 the \sim -class corresponding to x is finite. This implies that
 1185 the number of components of $J_\sim \setminus \{x\}$ is finite. One such component contains
 1186 $S \setminus \{x\}$ while all others have closures intersecting S exactly at x . Denote by
 1187 B_x the union of x and all such components not containing points of S . Clearly
 1188 the set B_x is closed and connected.

1189 Let us show that x is eventually mapped into a point which is not a cutpoint
 1190 of J_\sim . Indeed, otherwise all points $f_\sim^i(x)$ are cutpoints of J_\sim . Since there are

1191 finitely many critical points of f_{\sim} , we can then choose N such that no set
 1192 $B_{f_{\sim}^m(x)}$ contains a critical point for $m \geq N$. On the other hand, $f_{\sim}^N(x)$ is
 1193 a cutpoint of J_{\sim} by the above. Hence $B_{f_{\sim}^N(x)}$ is a wandering continuum in
 1194 J_{\sim} , a contradiction with Theorem 5. Now the connection between \sim -classes
 1195 and points of J_{\sim} implies that the \sim -class corresponding to x is eventually
 1196 all-critical. Clearly, any all-critical point $y \in S$ corresponds to an all-critical
 1197 \sim -class which meets the boundary of the corresponding Siegel domain U of
 1198 \sim in a leaf (since \sim -classes are convex). Moreover, an all-critical point in
 1199 S is a cutpoint of J_{\sim} whereas all forward images of an all-critical point are
 1200 endpoints of J_{\sim} . Hence the all-critical classes which are non-disjoint from \overline{U}
 1201 have pairwise disjoint grand orbits. Clearly, this implies the properties listed
 1202 in the case (3) of the theorem. Similar arguments go through if S is periodic
 1203 rather than fixed. \square

1204 By Theorem 2, if the finest model is not degenerate then it gives rise to a
 1205 non-degenerate lamination \sim_P . Hence one of the three phenomena described
 1206 in Theorem 35 will have to take place in J_{\sim_P} . Thanks to the existence of the
 1207 finest map, this implies that corresponding phenomena will be present in the
 1208 Julia set J_P . In other words, the presence of at least one of the phenomena is
 1209 a *necessary* condition for the existence of a non-degenerate finest model (we
 1210 will formalize this observation later on in Theorem 44). However now our main
 1211 aim is to show that the presence of at least one of the phenomena is *sufficient*
 1212 for the existence of a non-degenerate finest model. The main tool here is well-
 1213 slicing studied in Subsection 3.2. We will describe three cases in which we
 1214 establish sufficient conditions for the existence of well-slicing for the Julia set
 1215 (and hence, by the results from Subsection 3.2, for the non-degeneracy of its
 1216 finest model). The sufficient conditions are stated in a step by step fashion in
 1217 a series of lemmas and propositions.

1218 5.2 *The case of infinitely many periodic cutpoints*

1219 Next we want to suggest a sufficient condition for the non-collapse of the entire
 1220 J_P corresponding to the case (2) of Theorem 35. However this time we need a
 1221 lot of preparatory work. First we study CS-points and CS-cycles (recall that
 1222 a *CS-point* is a Siegel or Cremer periodic point and a *CS-cycle* is a cycle of
 1223 CS-points). Call a set X *periodic (of period m)* if $X, \dots, P^{m-1}(X)$ are pairwise
 1224 disjoint while $P^m(X) \subset X$. Then the union $\cup_{i=0}^{m-1} P^i(X)$ is said to be a *cycle*
 1225 *of sets* (we can then talk about *cycles of continua* and the like).

1226 **Lemma 36.** *If Y is a cycle of continua containing a CS-cycle and a periodic*
 1227 *point not from this CS-cycle then it contains a critical point of P .*

1228 *Proof.* We only consider the case when Y is an invariant continuum; the case

1229 of the cycle of continua can be dealt with similarly. Suppose that Y contains
1230 no critical points. Choose a neighborhood U of Y such that no critical points
1231 belong to \overline{U} , consider the set of all points never exiting \overline{U} , and then the
1232 component K of this set containing the given CS-point p ; clearly, $Y \subset K$. Such
1233 sets are called *hedgehogs* (see [20,21]) and have a lot of important properties.
1234 In particular, K cannot contain any other periodic points. On the other hand,
1235 $Y \subset K$, a contradiction with the assumption that there is a periodic point in
1236 Y , distinct from p . \square

1237 Next we prove a few lemmas which discuss properties of J_P at (pre)periodic
1238 points. We need them for two reasons. First of all, they help us establish
1239 the next sufficient condition for the non-collapse of J_P under the finest map.
1240 Second, they give sufficient conditions on a (pre)periodic point to be a point of
1241 local connectivity of the Julia set. In that sense they generalize Kiwi's theorem
1242 [13] where he proves (using different methods) that in the absence of CS-points
1243 the Julia set is locally connected at its (pre)periodic points.

1244 There are two competing laminations which both reflect the structure of J_P ,
1245 the rational lamination \approx_{rat} and the finest lamination \sim_P . We use both of them
1246 to suggest sufficient conditions for J_P to be locally connected at a (pre)periodic
1247 point p . Recall that $A(y)$ is the set of all angles whose rays land at a point
1248 $y \in J_P$.

1249 **Lemma 37.** *Suppose that $K = Imp(A)$ is the union of impressions of a*
1250 *finite set of periodic angles A which is periodic, connected and disjoint from*
1251 *impressions of all other angles. Then K is a repelling or parabolic periodic*
1252 *point. Thus, if p is a (pre)periodic point of P and $\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(p))$ is finite then*
1253 *$\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(p)) = \{p\}$ (i.e., $\{p\}$ is a K -set) and J_P is locally connected at p .*

1254 *Proof.* It is easy to see that if K contains a point of a Fatou domain in its
1255 topological hull, then the entire Fatou domain is contained in this topological
1256 hull. Now, if K contains a paratracting Fatou domain in its topological hull,
1257 then infinitely many periodic repelling points on its boundary (which exist
1258 by [22]) would give rise to infinitely many impressions non-disjoint from K ,
1259 a contradiction. Let us show that the topological hull $TH(K)$ of K cannot
1260 contain a CS-point either. Indeed, otherwise by Lemma 36 it has to contain a
1261 critical point c . Moreover, since $TH(K)$ does not contain paratracting Fatou
1262 domains, $c \in J_P$. Then the symmetry around critical points implies that there
1263 are two angles in A which map into one (recall that the only angles whose
1264 impressions may contain c are the angles of A), in contradiction with the
1265 fact that angles in A were periodic. Thus K is an invariant non-separating
1266 subcontinuum of J_P which contains no CS-points. On the other hand, by the
1267 assumptions, there are only finitely many periodic points in K (because K is
1268 disjoint from impressions of all angles except for finitely many). Hence all of

1269 these points are repelling or parabolic and together with the rays landing at
 1270 them may be assumed to be fixed. By Theorem 34 this implies that K is a
 1271 repelling or parabolic periodic point.

1272 To establish the next implication of the lemma, assume that p is a P -periodic
 1273 point and $\varphi(p) = x$. We may assume that x is g -fixed. Set $A = \Phi^{-1}(x)$. By the
 1274 assumptions of the lemma $\Phi^{-1}(\varphi(p))$ is finite. Hence we may assume that all
 1275 angles in A are fixed. Clearly, $B = \varphi^{-1}(x)$ is an invariant continuum. By the
 1276 assumptions only angles of A can have impressions non-disjoint from B , and
 1277 there are finitely many of them. Hence by the first part of the lemma B is a
 1278 repelling or parabolic periodic point. The remaining claim that J_P is locally
 1279 connected at p now follows from Lemma 19. \square

1280 The next lemma relies upon Lemma 37. Recall, that by \approx_{rat} we denote the
 1281 finest lamination which respects the geometric lamination \mathcal{L}_{rat} . Properties of
 1282 \approx_{rat} are studied in Theorem 12 (in particular, it is shown there that \approx_{rat} is not
 1283 degenerate). Recall that gaps of a lamination understood as an equivalence
 1284 class of an equivalence relation are normally denoted by a small boldface
 1285 letter (such as \mathbf{g}) while geometric gaps of geometric laminations are normally
 1286 denoted by capital letters (such as G). Also, recall that R is the set of all
 1287 periodic repelling (parabolic) bi-accessible points and their preimages.

1288 **Lemma 38.** *Suppose that \mathbf{g} is a (pre)periodic finite gap or leaf of \approx_{rat} disjoint*
 1289 *from boundaries of Fatou domains of \approx_{rat} . Then $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{g})$ is a gap or leaf of \mathcal{L}_{rat} ,*
 1290 *coinciding with the set $A(p)$ for a point $p \in R$, and J_P is locally connected at*
 1291 *p .*

1292 *Proof.* Assume that \mathbf{g} is invariant. Since no leaf of $B = \text{Bd}(\text{Ch}(\mathbf{g}))$ can come
 1293 from the boundary of a Fatou domain of \approx_{rat} , all leaves in B are limit leaves of
 1294 \mathcal{L}_{rat} . The upper semi-continuity of impressions now implies that the union of
 1295 impressions $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{g})$ of angles of \mathbf{g} is a continuum itself. Moreover, it is disjoint
 1296 from impressions of all angles not in \mathbf{g} because for any such angle γ we can
 1297 find a leaf of \mathcal{L}_{rat} which cuts $\text{Imp}(\gamma)$ off $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{g})$. Now the lemma follows from
 1298 Lemma 37. \square

1299 We need another preparatory result, dealing with laminations generated by
 1300 collections of periodic gaps and leaves. If we fix a set A , then a set $B \subset A$ is
 1301 said to be *cofinite (in A)* if $|A \setminus B|$ is finite. Given a generating (and hence
 1302 invariant) family A of pairwise disjoint periodic gaps or leaves we then consider
 1303 a geometric prelamination \mathcal{L}_A consisting of A and preimages of elements of A .
 1304 By Theorem 12 we can construct the corresponding lamination \approx_A ; given a
 1305 finite gap or leaf G from \mathcal{L}_A , there exists a finite \approx_A -class $\text{Cl}_A(G)$ containing
 1306 G and called the \approx_A -class *generated* by G . Denote by p_A the quotient map
 1307 from \mathbb{S}^1 to J_{\approx_A} .

1308 **Lemma 39.** *Suppose that A is an infinite generating family of periodic gaps or*
 1309 *leaves under the map σ_d . Then there exists a cofinite invariant subset $D' \subset A$*
 1310 *such that any cofinite invariant set $E \subset D'$ has the following properties.*

- 1311 (1) *If G is a leaf or finite gap of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} then $\text{Cl}_E(G) \cap \text{Bd}(U) = \emptyset$ for any Fatou*
 1312 *domain U in \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} or \mathcal{L}_{\approx_A} .*
 1313 (2) *The family of \approx_E -classes generated by the elements of \mathcal{L}_E is a well-slicing*
 1314 *family of \mathbb{S}^1 .*

1315 *Proof.* To prove claim (1) suppose that there is a finite invariant collection Q
 1316 of elements of A for which there exists a leaf $\ell = ab$ of \mathcal{L}_A or a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^1$
 1317 with the following properties:

- 1318 (1) ℓ (resp., x) is a limit leaf for a sequence of leaves of \mathcal{L}_A with endpoints
 1319 in the positively oriented arc (a, b) (resp., with endpoints on both sides
 1320 of x);
 1321 (2) there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that any leaf of \mathcal{L}_A with endpoints in $(a, a + \epsilon)$ and
 1322 $(b - \epsilon, b)$ (resp., in $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$) is a preimage of a boundary leaf of a
 1323 set from Q .

1324 Then we call Q a *finite limiting collection* (of elements of A).

1325 Let us proceed as follows. Suppose that there exist no finite limiting collections.
 1326 Take a cofinite invariant set $E \subset A$. Let us show that the Fatou gaps of \approx_E
 1327 coincide with the Fatou gaps of \approx_A . Indeed, otherwise there is a Fatou gap G
 1328 of \approx_E which was not a Fatou gap of \approx_A .

1329 Clearly, gaps from the orbit of G contain no sets from E . However, gaps from
 1330 the orbit of G must contain some sets from $A \setminus E$ (otherwise these gaps would
 1331 be gaps of \approx_A as well). Denote the sets from $A \setminus E$ contained in gaps from the
 1332 orbit of G by T_1, \dots, T_r . There must exist a leaf ℓ of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_A} or a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such
 1333 that the leaves from the grand orbits of sets T_1, \dots, T_r contained inside gaps
 1334 from the orbit of G accumulate on one side of ℓ (resp., at the point x while
 1335 separating \mathbb{D} in two components the smaller of which contains x). Moreover,
 1336 only sets T_1, \dots, T_r can have leaves accumulating upon ℓ (resp., x) in this way
 1337 (because only these sets from A are contained in gaps from the orbit of G).
 1338 This implies that T_1, \dots, T_r is a finite limiting collection, a contradiction.

1339 Now, suppose that there exists a finite limiting collection Q_1 and ℓ is a limit
 1340 leaf of Q_1 existing by the definition (the case of a point x is considered simi-
 1341 larly). Remove Q_1 from A and consider a generating set $E_1 = A \setminus Q_1$ and
 1342 the corresponding laminations \approx_1 and \mathcal{L}_{\approx_1} . It follows that there is a gap G_1
 1343 of \mathcal{L}_1 with the boundary leaf ℓ located on the same side of ℓ from which the
 1344 pullbacks of leaves of sets from Q_1 approach ℓ in \mathcal{L}_A . Clearly, G_1 cannot have
 1345 boundary leaves concatenated to ℓ at ℓ 's endpoints for if such boundary leaves

1346 exist, they will have to be leaves of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_A} too which is impossible because then
 1347 they would intersect the leaves from the grand orbits of sets from Q_1 which
 1348 converge to ℓ from the appropriate side by the assumption. Hence, G_1 is a
 1349 Fatou gap of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_1} which did not exist in \mathcal{L}_{\approx_A} .

1350 We repeat this construction over and over until, after finitely many steps, we
 1351 will find a cofinite invariant subset of A which has no finite limiting collections.
 1352 Indeed, in the process of finding sets $E_1 \supset E_2 \supset \dots$, on each step at least
 1353 one new Fatou gap G_1, G_2, \dots appears. Clearly, at each step all the Fatou
 1354 gaps of the current lamination \mathcal{L}_k allow us to draw a maximal collection of
 1355 pairwise disjoint critical leaves inside them, and the number of critical leaves
 1356 in such a collection is bounded by $d - 1$. Hence the number of such critical
 1357 leaves eventually stabilizes which implies that from this moment on the new
 1358 Fatou gaps will have to contain the previously existing ones. This implies that
 1359 the periods of the new Fatou gaps can only be smaller than the periods of the
 1360 ones which had existed before. Therefore, from some time on the appearance
 1361 of new infinite gaps becomes impossible.

1362 Denote the corresponding cofinite invariant subset E_m of A by D . By the con-
 1363 struction D has no finite limiting collections, hence by the first paragraph of
 1364 the proof all its cofinite invariant subsets S generate a lamination \approx_S which
 1365 has the same Fatou gaps as \approx_D . Each periodic Fatou domain of \approx_D has finitely
 1366 many \approx_D -gaps/leaves non-disjoint from its boundary. Denote by $D' \subset D$ the
 1367 family of all *other* \approx_D -gaps/leaves (observe that D' is cofinite and hence infi-
 1368 nite). Suppose now that $E \subset D'$ is cofinite. Then by the above the Fatou gaps
 1369 of \approx_E coincide with Fatou gaps of \approx_D , and by the choice of E no element of
 1370 \mathcal{L}_E intersects $\text{Bd}(U)$ where U is a Fatou gap of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} . Moreover, since $E \subset A$,
 1371 $\overline{\mathcal{L}_E} \subset \overline{\mathcal{L}_A}$. Hence, Fatou domains of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_A} are contained in Fatou domains of
 1372 \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} . This proves claim (1) of the lemma.

1373 To prove claim (2), let $G, H \in \mathcal{L}_E$ are such that $\text{Cl}_E(G)$ and $\text{Cl}_E(H)$ are
 1374 distinct. Suppose that there are no \approx_E -classes, generated by elements of \mathcal{L}_E ,
 1375 separating \mathbb{S}^1 between $\text{Cl}_E(G)$ and $\text{Cl}_E(H)$. Since by the construction \approx_E -
 1376 classes generated by elements of \mathcal{L}_E are dense in \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} , there must be a Fatou
 1377 gap of \mathcal{L}_{\approx_E} on whose boundary both $\text{Cl}_E(G)$ and $\text{Cl}_E(H)$ lie which is impos-
 1378 sible by the above. This completes the proof of (2). \square

1379 **Proposition 40.** *Suppose that $p \in J_{\sim_P} = \varphi(J_P)$ is a periodic point such*
 1380 *that $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ is infinite. Then there are no more than finitely many periodic*
 1381 *leaves of the rational geometric lamination \mathcal{L}_{rat} connecting angles of $\Phi^{-1}(p)$.*
 1382 *In particular, (1) the set of all bi-accessible periodic repelling or parabolic*
 1383 *points in $\varphi^{-1}(p)$ must be finite, and (2) if the set of **all** repelling bi-accessible*
 1384 *periodic points of P is infinite then the finest model is non-degenerate.*

1385 *Proof.* We may assume that p is a fixed point of g ; then $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ is an infinite

1386 gap of \sim_P . Set $G = \text{int}(\text{Ch}(\Phi^{-1}(p)))$; by Lemma 10 G is a Fatou gap of \mathcal{L}_{\sim_P}
 1387 and hence by Lemma 9 there is a monotone semiconjugacy ψ of $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(G)}$ and a
 1388 map $\sigma_k : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ with the appropriately chosen $k > 1$. The map ψ collapses all
 1389 chains of concatenated leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$ to points; by Lemma 7 all leaves in the
 1390 chains are (pre)periodic and by Lemma 9 and Lemma 10 each chain consists
 1391 of at most N leaves (N depends on G). By way of contradiction suppose
 1392 that there are infinitely many periodic leaves of the rational prelamination
 1393 \mathcal{L}_{rat} connecting angles of $\Phi^{-1}(p)$. The idea is to use the map ψ in order to
 1394 transport the restriction of \mathcal{L}_{rat} onto $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ to the entire circle \mathbb{S}^1 , then to
 1395 use Lemma 39 to find a well-slicing family of \mathbb{S}^1 consisting of (pre)periodic
 1396 geometric gaps and leaves of \mathbb{S}^1 corresponding to elements of \mathcal{L}_{rat} , and then
 1397 to show that ray-continua corresponding to those elements of \mathcal{L}_{rat} form a
 1398 well-slicing family of $\varphi^{-1}(p)$. By Theorem 27 then $\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(p))$ is not a point, a
 1399 contradiction.

1400 The leaves of \mathcal{L}_{rat} which lie in the boundary of $\text{Ch}(\Phi^{-1}(p)) = G$ will produce
 1401 just points under ψ . However, by Lemma 7 there are only finitely many peri-
 1402 odic leaves in $\text{Bd}(G)$. Hence by the assumptions of the proposition there are
 1403 infinitely many periodic geometric leaves or gaps of \mathcal{L}_{rat} contained in G and
 1404 such that ψ does not identify points of their bases with other points at all.
 1405 Denote their family by A ; also, denote the family of all their preimages under
 1406 all powers of σ contained in G by $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_A$ (recall, that the notation \mathcal{L}_A is reserved
 1407 for the collection of *all* preimages of elements of A). Thus, $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_A$ is the family
 1408 of all (pre)periodic geometric leaves and gaps of \mathcal{L}_{rat} contained in G and not
 1409 in $\text{Bd}(G)$. Define the geometric prelamination $\mathcal{L}' = \psi(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_A)$ on the entire circle
 1410 \mathbb{S}^1 as the family of convex hulls of ψ -images of bases of elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_A$ (recall
 1411 that ψ is defined only on $\text{Bd}(G)$). It is easy to see that this indeed creates a
 1412 geometric prelamination whose all leaves are (pre)periodic. By the choice of A
 1413 in this way each gap/leaf of $\mathcal{L} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_A$ is transported by ψ to the corresponding
 1414 gap/leaf of \mathcal{L}' in a one-to-one fashion. Then $\psi(A)$ is the family of periodic
 1415 geometric leaves and gaps of \mathcal{L}' . Clearly, $\psi(A)$ is infinite and the lamination
 1416 \mathcal{L}' is the same as the lamination $\mathcal{L}_{\psi(A)}$ introduced right before Lemma 39 in
 1417 which appropriate preimages of elements of $\psi(A)$ are used.

1418 By Lemma 39 there exists a cofinite family $B \subset A$ satisfying both properties
 1419 listed in Lemma 39. In particular, as in Lemma 39 for B the prelamination \mathcal{L}_B
 1420 and the corresponding lamination \approx_B can be constructed. By the choice of A
 1421 the map ψ then allows us to pull them back to G in a one-to-one fashion and
 1422 without changing the order. Now, by claim (1) of Lemma 39 if $h \in \mathcal{L}_B$ then
 1423 $\text{Cl}(h) \cap \text{Bd}(U) = \emptyset$ for any Fatou domain U in \mathcal{L}_{\approx_B} (here $\text{Cl}(h)$ is understood
 1424 in the sense of the lamination \approx_B , i.e. $\text{Cl}(h)$ is the \approx_B -class containing h).
 1425 Let us show that then in fact $h = \text{Cl}(h)$ and $\psi^{-1}(h) \in \mathcal{L}_{rat}$. Indeed, consider
 1426 leaves on the boundary of $\text{Cl}(h)$. By Theorem 12 they all are limits of leaves of
 1427 elements of \mathcal{L}_B . It follows that then leaves on the boundary of $\psi^{-1}(\text{Cl}(h))$ are
 1428 limit leaves for leaves of ψ -preimages of elements of \mathcal{L}_B . Thus, leaves on the

1429 boundary of $\psi^{-1}(\text{Cl}(h))$ are limit leaves for leaves of \mathcal{L}_{rat} . This implies that
 1430 the impression of any angle not from $\psi^{-1}(\text{Cl}(h))$ is cut off $\text{Imp}(\psi^{-1}(\text{Cl}(h)))$ by
 1431 tails of the appropriate points of R and hence is disjoint from $\text{Imp}(\psi^{-1}(\text{Cl}(h)))$.
 1432 By Lemma 37 then $h = \text{Cl}(h)$ and $\psi^{-1}(h) \in \mathcal{L}_{rat}$.

1433 Now, by Lemma 39 \mathcal{L}_B is a well-slicing family of \mathbb{S}^1 . By the previous paragraph
 1434 and by the properties of the map ψ it follows that the family of degenerate
 1435 ray-continua $\text{Imp}(\psi^{-1}(h)), h \in \mathcal{L}_B$ is a well-slicing family of $\varphi^{-1}(p)$ and hence
 1436 by Theorem 27 $\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(p))$ is not a point, a contradiction. This proves (1).
 1437 Now, if the finest model is degenerate then the degenerate topological Julia
 1438 set can play the role of the point p , the entire circle \mathbb{S}^1 plays the role of the
 1439 \approx_P -class $\Phi^{-1}(p)$, and (1) implies that R is finite. Hence, (2) follows and the
 1440 proof is completed. \square

1441 5.3 The Siegel case

1442 Now we establish the third sufficient condition for the non-degeneracy of the
 1443 finest model, this time corresponding to the case (3) of Theorem 35. However
 1444 first we need to introduce the appropriate terminology.

1445 As was explained in Section 2, the closure of any invariant geometric prelamina-
 1446 tion is a geometric lamination. This idea was used when the geo-lamination
 1447 $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{rat}}$ was constructed. However it can also be used in other situations. Sup-
 1448 pose that there exists a finite collection \mathcal{K} of wandering ray-continua $K_i, i =$
 1449 $1, \dots, m$. We will call \mathcal{K} a *wandering collection* if distinct forward images of
 1450 continua K_i are all pairwise disjoint. By the arguments similar those from
 1451 Theorem 4.2 [6] one can associate to \mathcal{K} a geometric prelamination $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ *gen-*
 1452 *erated by* \mathcal{K} , and then its closure - a geo-lamination $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}}$ *generated by* \mathcal{K} . For
 1453 completeness we will briefly explain the main ideas of this theorem.

1454 First we need to construct the grand orbit of sets from \mathcal{K} . However it may
 1455 happen that simply taking pullbacks of the forward images of these sets will
 1456 lead to their growth. Indeed, suppose, for example, that K_1 contains a critical
 1457 point c . Then already the first pullback of $P(K_1)$ may well be bigger than
 1458 K_1 . If as we iterate the map K_1 hits several critical points, the same can take
 1459 place several times. However since \mathcal{K} is a wandering collection we can choose
 1460 a big N so that the continua $P^N(K_i), i = 1, \dots, m$ are non-precritical.

1461 If we now take these continua, all their forward images, and then all pullbacks
 1462 of these forward images we will get a “consistent” grand orbit of several sets
 1463 meaning that for every set Q from the grand orbit in question the P^i -pullback
 1464 of $P^i(Q)$ containing Q coincides with Q . As a result of the construction the ini-
 1465 tially given ray-continua may have grown, however they will have (eventually)
 1466 the same images as the originally given continua. In particular, the continua K_i

1467 may have grown to new continua K'_i , and we can think of the just constructed
 1468 grand orbit Γ as the grand orbit of the family of continua K'_1, \dots, K'_m . Observe
 1469 that $\mathcal{K}' = \{K'_1, \dots, K'_m\}$ is still a wandering collection. Hence, since all Fatou
 1470 domains are (pre)periodic, any set from Γ is a non-separating subcontinuum
 1471 of J_P .

1472 Since each K_i is a ray-continuum, by Definition 20 there is a set of angles asso-
 1473 ciated to K_i in that the union of the principal sets of these angles is contained
 1474 in K_i while the union of their impressions contains K_i . The new continuum K'_i
 1475 is obtained as the union of K_i with some pullbacks of its images. Hence and
 1476 because the collection of all principal sets and impressions is invariant we see
 1477 that K'_i is also a ray-continuum. It follows that in fact any continuum $K' \in \mathcal{K}'$
 1478 is a ray-continuum, and if we define the set of angles $\Theta(K') = H_{K'}$ as the set
 1479 of all angles whose principal sets are contained in K' then we will have

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in H_{K'}} \text{Pr}(\theta) \subset K' \subset \bigcup_{\theta \in H_{K'}} \text{Imp}(\theta)$$

1480 which means that the set of angles $H_{K'}$ is associated with the continuum K'
 1481 in the sense of the Definition 20. Observe that by Theorem 3 the sets of angles
 1482 $H_{K'}, K' \in \mathcal{K}'$ cannot have more than 2^d angles (and therefore they are closed).

1483 Now it is not hard to show (see Theorem 4.2 [6]) that the family of convex
 1484 hulls of so defined sets of angles $H_{K'}, K' \in \Gamma$ form a geometric prelamination
 1485 which we denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$. By the definition each original ray-continuum K_i has
 1486 the associated to it set of angles A_i , and it follows that $A_i \subset H_{K'_i} = H_i$.
 1487 Therefore each A_i is contained in a leaf or gap of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$. Then the closure $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}}$
 1488 of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is a geo-lamination. We are especially interested in collections of angles
 1489 which give rise, through the above construction, to specific geo-laminations
 1490 reminiscent of the case (3) of Theorem 35.

1491 **Definition 41.** Suppose that \mathcal{H} is a collection of finite sets of angles $H_i, i =$
 1492 $1, \dots, m$ such that the following holds.

- 1493 (1) Each set H_i is mapped into a one-angle set (i.e., is an *all-critical set*).
- 1494 (2) For each i the set $\text{Imp}(H_i)$ is a continuum disjoint from impressions of
 1495 any angle not belonging to H_i .
- 1496 (3) The continua $\text{Imp}(H_i), i = 1, \dots, m$ form a wandering collection.
- 1497 (4) Consider the geo-lamination $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}}$. Then there is a cycle of Siegel domains
 1498 in $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ such that \mathcal{H} is the family of all-critical gaps/leaves on the bound-
 1499 aries of domains from the cycle. Moreover, each $\text{Ch}(H_i)$ meets the corre-
 1500 sponding Siegel domain of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ in a leaf and sets H_i have pairwise disjoint
 1501 orbits.

1502 In that case we say that the collection of sets of angles \mathcal{H} with their impressions
 1503 and *all* their pullbacks form a *Siegel configuration*; the collection of sets of

1504 angles \mathcal{H} is said to *generate* the corresponding Siegel configuration. We will
 1505 also say in this case that P *admits a Siegel configuration*.

1506 The next proposition shows that such Siegel configuration cannot be admitted
 1507 by the polynomial inside a periodic infinite K-class; in particular, if P admits
 1508 a Siegel configuration, it implies that the finest model is non-degenerate.

1509 **Proposition 42.** *Suppose that $p \in J_{\sim P} = \varphi(J_P)$ is a periodic point such that*
 1510 *$\Phi^{-1}(p) = \mathbf{g}$ is infinite. Then no collection of subsets of \mathbf{g} generates a Siegel*
 1511 *configuration. In particular, if P admits a Siegel configuration, then the finest*
 1512 *model is non-degenerate.*

1513 *Proof.* By way of contradiction let us assume that P admits a Siegel con-
 1514 figuration, and the corresponding generating collection of sets of angles is
 1515 $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$. Set $\text{Imp}(H_i) = T_i$. First we simply analyze the corollar-
 1516 ies of this assumption without assuming that sets from \mathcal{H} are contained in a
 1517 periodic K-class.

1518 We may assume that all sets H_i have common leaves with an *invariant* Siegel
 1519 domain S . By Lemma 9 the map $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(S)}$ is semiconjugate with an irrational
 1520 rotation of the circle. Then there are no periodic leaves/points in $\text{Bd}(S)$ and
 1521 by Lemma 7 every leaf $\ell \subset \text{Bd}(S)$ is (pre)critical. By Lemma 8 ℓ is not a limit
 1522 leaf, hence ℓ belongs to an element Q of the grand orbit of \mathcal{H} . From part (4)
 1523 of Definition 41 $Q \cap \text{Bd}(S) = \ell$. Since grand orbits of sets H_i are pairwise
 1524 disjoint, all images of ℓ are two-sided limit points of $\text{Bd}(S) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$. Observe that
 1525 there might exist chains of concatenated leaves in $\text{Bd}(S)$ (they may arise as
 1526 a result of pulling back a set H_i through a critical gap on the boundary of
 1527 S). However by Lemma 9 any maximal chain of leaves in $\text{Bd}(S)$ consists of
 1528 no more than N leaves with some uniform N . Points of $\text{Bd}(S)$ which are not
 1529 contained in any leaf are angles whose impressions are also continua. Let us
 1530 denote by \mathcal{A} the collection of elements of the grand orbit of \mathcal{H} non-disjoint
 1531 from $\text{Bd}(S)$ as well as points in $\text{Bd}(S)$ which do not belong to leaves. Then
 1532 all elements of \mathcal{A} have connected impressions.

1533 Suppose now that $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. Choose the arc $I \subset \text{Bd}(S)$ which contains
 1534 $A \cap \text{Bd}(S), B \cap \text{Bd}(S)$ and runs in a counterclockwise direction from $A \cap \text{Bd}(S)$
 1535 to $B \cap \text{Bd}(S)$. Consider the union $T = T(A, B)$ of all elements of \mathcal{A} non-disjoint
 1536 from I . Clearly, T is connected.

1537 **Claim A.** *The set $\text{Imp}(T)$ is a continuum.*

1538 It follows from the upper semi-continuity of impressions that $\text{Imp}(T)$ is closed.
 1539 By way of contradiction suppose that $\text{Imp}(T) = X \cup Y$ where X, Y are disjoint
 1540 non-empty closed sets. Since for every $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Q \subset T$ we have that
 1541 the set $\text{Imp}(Q)$ is a continuum, every such Q has its impression either in X

1542 or in Y . Denote by X' the union of all elements of \mathcal{A} contained in T whose
1543 impressions are contained in X ; then X' is well-defined and disjoint from the
1544 union Y' of all elements of \mathcal{A} contained in T whose impressions are contained
1545 in Y . Now, by the upper semi-continuity of impressions the sets X', Y' are
1546 closed (every limit set of X' still comes from T and has its impression in X),
1547 and by the above they are disjoint and non-empty. However $X' \cup Y' = T$ is
1548 connected, a contradiction. This implies that $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$ is a continuum.

1549 **Claim B.** *Impressions of two distinct elements A, B of \mathcal{A} do not meet. The*
1550 *continuum $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$ separates the plane.*

1551 Indeed, suppose otherwise. Choose a set $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $H_1 \cap \text{Bd}(S)$ is a leaf.
1552 By Lemma 9, there exists a sequence m_i such that $\sigma^{m_i}(A)$ will approach an
1553 endpoint of $H_1 \cap \text{Bd}(S)$ while $\sigma^{m_i}(B)$ will approach a point $y \in S'$. Now, $y \notin H_1$
1554 because A is distinct from B and because the map σ on $\text{Bd}(S)$ acts like an
1555 irrational rotation. On the other hand, by the assumption $\text{Imp}(A) \cap \text{Imp}(B) \neq$
1556 \emptyset , hence by the upper semi-continuity of impressions $\text{Imp}(y) \cap \text{Imp}(H_1) \neq$
1557 \emptyset , a contradiction with the part (2) of Definition 41. Hence elements of \mathcal{A}
1558 have pairwise disjoint impressions. It implies that $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$ separates the plane
1559 because otherwise by [1,7] $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$ would contain a fixed point, and then an
1560 element of \mathcal{A} containing it and its image would have non-disjoint impressions,
1561 a contradiction.

1562 **Claim C.** *The union of two impressions of distinct angles - images of elements*
1563 *of \mathcal{H} - ray-separates $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$.*

1564 Consider $\{\alpha\}, \{\beta\} \in \mathcal{A}$, $\alpha \neq \beta$, both α and β images of sets from \mathcal{H} which
1565 are non-isolated from either side in $\text{Bd}(S) \cap \mathbb{S}^1$ (we can do this by what we
1566 showed in the second paragraph of the proof). We need to show that if $Q =$
1567 $\text{Imp}(\alpha) \cup \text{Imp}(\beta)$ then $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$ meets two distinct components of $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \tilde{Q}$ (U_∞
1568 is the basin of attraction of infinity, Q is a ray-compactum with the associated
1569 set of angles $\{\alpha, \beta\}$, and by \tilde{Q} we denote the union of Q and rays R_α, R_β , see
1570 Section 3 where this notation is introduced). Consider the union V of rays of
1571 all angles from $[\alpha, \beta]$ and the union W of rays of all angles from $[\beta, \alpha]$. Clearly,
1572 $V \cap W = R_\alpha \cup R_\beta$ and $V \cup W = U_\infty$. Also, it follows that $\overline{V} = V \cup \text{Imp}([\alpha, \beta])$
1573 and $\overline{W} = W \cup \text{Imp}([\beta, \alpha])$.

1574 Let us show that $\overline{V} \cap \overline{W} = \tilde{Q}$. It suffices to show that if $T' = \text{Imp}([\alpha, \beta]) \setminus Q$
1575 and $T'' = \text{Imp}([\beta, \alpha]) \setminus Q$ then $T' \cap T'' = \emptyset$. Observe that by Claim B and
1576 by the choice of α, β we have that $\text{Imp}(\alpha)$ is disjoint from impressions of all
1577 angles not equal to α , and $\text{Imp}(\beta)$ is disjoint from impressions of all angles not
1578 equal to β . Hence it suffices to show that if $\gamma' \in (\alpha, \beta)$ and $\gamma'' \in (\beta, \alpha)$ then
1579 $\text{Imp}(\gamma') \cap \text{Imp}(\gamma'') = \emptyset$. By Claim B we may assume that at least one of the
1580 angles γ', γ'' (say, γ') does not belong to an element of \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a

1581 non-degenerate element L of \mathcal{A} such that $L \cap \mathbb{S}^1 \subset (\alpha, \beta)$ and γ' is contained in
 1582 an arc $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \subset (\alpha, \beta)$ where $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in L$. This implies that $\text{Imp}(\gamma')$ is contained
 1583 in the union of rays $R_{\theta_1}, R_{\theta_2}$ and the impression $\text{Imp}(L)$ of L . If γ'' belongs to
 1584 $H \in \mathcal{A}$, put $M = H$ and $\theta_3 = \theta_4 = \gamma''$. Otherwise, there exists a set $M \in \mathcal{A}$
 1585 such that $M \cap \mathbb{S}^1 \subset (\beta, \alpha)$ and γ'' is contained in an arc $(\theta_3, \theta_4) \subset (\beta, \alpha)$ where
 1586 $\theta_3, \theta_4 \in L$. Then $\text{Imp}(\gamma'')$ is contained in the union of rays $R_{\theta_3}, R_{\theta_4}$ and the
 1587 impression $\text{Imp}(M)$ of M . Since by Claim B $\text{Imp}(L) \cap \text{Imp}(M) = \emptyset$, it follows
 1588 that $\text{Imp}(\gamma') \cap \text{Imp}(\gamma'') = \emptyset$ as desired. Observe that $\overline{U_\infty} \setminus \tilde{Q} = (\overline{V} \setminus \tilde{Q}) \cup (\overline{W} \setminus \tilde{Q})$
 1589 where sets $\overline{V} \setminus \tilde{Q}$ and $\overline{W} \setminus \tilde{Q}$ are open in $\overline{U_\infty}$ and disjoint which proves the
 1590 claim.

1591 Let us now prove the theorem. Observe that by Claim A the set $\text{Imp}(A)$ is a
 1592 continuum. Denote by \mathcal{Z} the family of impressions of singletons from \mathcal{A} which
 1593 are angles-images of elements of \mathcal{H} . By Lemma 9 the map ψ semiconjugates
 1594 $\sigma^*|_{\text{Bd}(S)}$ to an irrational rotation τ of \mathbb{S}^1 . This map allows us to associate to
 1595 elements of \mathcal{Z} their ψ -images which are angles in \mathbb{S}^1 coming from a finite
 1596 collection of orbits under τ . Choose pairs of angles from $\psi(\mathcal{Z})$ so that \mathbb{S}^1 with
 1597 them is homeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^1 with the vertical collection of pairs $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{S}^1}$. This gives
 1598 rise to the corresponding family of pairs of impression from \mathcal{Z} . By Claim C
 1599 and by the construction these pairs of impressions form a well-slicing family
 1600 of $\text{Imp}(\mathcal{A})$. Therefore by Theorem 27 $\varphi(\text{Imp}(A))$ is not a point. On the other
 1601 hand, by the construction $\text{Imp}(A) \subset \varphi^{-1}(p)$, a contradiction. \square

1602 5.4 The criterion

1603 First we deal with paratracting Fatou domains. This sufficient condition for
 1604 the non-collapse of a subset of J_P corresponds to case (1) of Theorem 35.
 1605 Let us recall that by R we denote the set of all periodic repelling (parabolic)
 1606 *bi-accessible* points and their preimages.

1607 **Proposition 43.** *Suppose that U is paratracting Fatou domain of P . Then*
 1608 *$\text{Bd}(U)$ is well-sliced in J_P and hence is not collapsed under the finest map φ .*
 1609 *In particular, suppose that $p \in J_{\sim P}$ is a periodic point. Then $\varphi^{-1}(p)$ cannot*
 1610 *contain the boundary of a paratracting Fatou domain of P .*

1611 *Proof.* By [22], $R \cap \text{Bd}(U) = A$ is dense in $\text{Bd}(U) \subset X$ and each point of A
 1612 is accessible from within and from without U . This implies that any pair of
 1613 points of A ray-separates $\text{Bd}(U)$. Since A consists of points accessible from
 1614 within U we can use the canonic Riemann map for U and parameterize points
 1615 of A by the corresponding angles; denote the corresponding set of angles by \mathcal{A} .
 1616 Since all points of A are accessible from outside U and A is dense in $\text{Bd}(U)$,
 1617 it follows that \mathcal{A} is dense in \mathbb{S}^1 . Since R is countable, so is \mathcal{A} , and it is easy
 1618 to see that we can choose pairwise disjoint pairs of angles from A so that \mathbb{S}^1

1619 with this collection of pairs is homeomorphic to \mathbb{S}^1 with the vertical collection
 1620 of pairs $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{S}^1}$ defined in the end of Section 3. Then the corresponding to these
 1621 pairs of angles pairs of points from A form a well-slicing family of $\text{Bd}(U)$ and
 1622 by Theorem 27 $\text{Bd}(U)$ is not collapsed under the finest φ as desired. \square

1623 We are ready to state the main result of this section which gives a criterion of
 1624 the finest model not be degenerate. It lists three conditions, and for the finest
 1625 model to be non-degenerate it is necessary and sufficient that at least one of
 1626 them must be satisfied. In a descriptive form it was given in Section 1.

1627 **Theorem 44.** *The finest model of the Julia set of a polynomial P is not*
 1628 *degenerate if and only if at least one of the following properties is satisfied.*

- 1629 (1) *The filled-in Julia set K_P contains a paratracting Fatou domain.*
- 1630 (2) *The set of all repelling bi-accessible periodic points is infinite.*
- 1631 (3) *The polynomial P admits a Siegel configuration.*

1632 *Proof.* First we show that the fact that at least one of properties (1) - (3)
 1633 holds is necessary for the non-degeneracy of $J_{\sim_P} = \varphi(J_P)$. In other words, we
 1634 assume that J_{\sim_P} is non-degenerate and deduce the appropriate properties of
 1635 J_P using Theorem 35. Consider the cases (1) - (3) one by one.

1636 (1) Suppose that, according to Theorem 35.(1), J_{\sim_P} contains a simple closed
 1637 curve S which is the boundary of a paratracting Fatou domain. Then $\varphi^{-1}(S)$
 1638 is a continuum which separates the plane and encloses an open set U comple-
 1639 mentary to J_P . Moreover, for a dense in S subset of g -periodic points their
 1640 Φ -preimages are finite (there are no more than finitely many periodic points
 1641 of $\varphi(J_P)$ whose Φ -preimages are infinite). By Lemma 37 this implies that full
 1642 φ -preimages of these g -periodic points are P -periodic points at which J_P is
 1643 locally connected. Thus, U is a Fatou domain of P whose boundary contains
 1644 periodic points. This implies that U is a paratracting domain, and case (1)
 1645 holds.

1646 (2) Assume now that J_{\sim_P} does not contain simple closed curves, that is, that
 1647 J_{\sim_P} is a dendrite. Consider the lamination \sim_P . Since J_{\sim_P} is a dendrite, \sim_P
 1648 does not have Fatou domains. Hence by Theorem 35 there are infinitely many
 1649 periodic \sim_P -classes each of which consists of more than one point. Moreover,
 1650 we may assume that they are all finite (because there can only be finitely
 1651 many infinite periodic classes of a lamination). Finally, by the construction
 1652 the impression of each such class is disjoint from impressions of all angles not
 1653 belonging to the class. Hence by Lemma 37 all their impressions are points. We
 1654 conclude that there are infinitely many repelling bi-accessible periodic points
 1655 as desired and case (2) holds.

1656 (3) By Lemma 4 we may now assume that $\varphi(J_P)$ contains the boundary S of

1657 an invariant Siegel domain. By Theorem 35.(3), there exists a finite collection
 1658 of all-critical \sim_P -classes $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$ with pairwise disjoint grand orbits
 1659 whose images x_1, \dots, x_m under the quotient map $\Phi : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \varphi(J_P) = J_{\sim_P}$ form
 1660 the set of all-critical points in S so that *all* cutpoints of $\varphi(J_P)$ in S belong to
 1661 the grand orbits of these all-critical points. Observe that by the construction
 1662 for every i we have that $\text{Imp}(H_i) = \varphi^{-1}(x_i)$ is a continuum.

1663 We want to show that this implies that P admits a Siegel configuration. As
 1664 the collection of sets of angles needed to define a Siegel configuration we take
 1665 exactly \mathcal{H} . Moreover, as in the definition of a Siegel configuration we take the
 1666 grand orbit of \mathcal{H} then the corresponding sets of angles to form the geometric
 1667 prelamination $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Observe that this will bring back *all* the leaves and gaps
 1668 from the set $\Phi^{-1}(S)$ because all leaves and gaps in this set correspond to
 1669 cutpoints of J_{\sim_P} in S and, by Theorem 35.(3), come from the grand orbits of
 1670 all-critical points from S . Finally, by the construction the impressions $\text{Imp}(H_i)$
 1671 are disjoint from impressions of all angles not belonging to H_i . All this implies
 1672 that P admits a Siegel configuration and completes the consideration of the
 1673 case (3).

1674 Now we consider the sufficiency of conditions (1) - (3). If (1) holds, then the
 1675 finest map is not degenerate by Proposition 43. If (2) holds, then the finest
 1676 map is not degenerate by Proposition 40. If (3) holds, then the finest map is
 1677 not degenerate by Proposition 42. This completes the proof. \square

1678 By Theorem 44 the finest model of a polynomial Julia set is degenerate if
 1679 and only if there are no paratracting Fatou domains, the set of all repelling
 1680 bi-accessible periodic points is finite, and there is no Siegel configuration. As
 1681 an application let us first prove a sufficient condition for the finest model
 1682 to be non-degenerate. Recall that the valence of a ray-continuum K is the
 1683 cardinality of the set of all rays whose principal sets are contained in K .

1684 **Theorem 45.** *Suppose that K' is a wandering ray-continuum such that the*
 1685 *valence of $P^n(K')$ is greater than 1 for all $n \geq 0$. Then there are infinitely*
 1686 *many repelling bi-accessible periodic points of J and the finest model is non-*
 1687 *degenerate. In particular, these conclusions hold if there exists a bi-accessible*
 1688 *point of J which is non-(pre)periodic and non-(pre)critical.*

1689 *Proof.* As explained in Subsection 5.3, the construction and the arguments
 1690 similar to those from Theorem 4.2 [6] imply that there is a (possibly) bigger
 1691 than K' but still wandering ray-continuum K (with the same eventual images
 1692 as K') whose grand orbit Γ (i.e. the collection of pullbacks of its forward
 1693 images) is well-defined. Moreover, to each element Q of Γ we can associate
 1694 the set $\Theta(Q) = H_Q$ of all angles whose principal sets are contained in Q (by
 1695 Theorem 3 the set H_Q is finite). Then all elements of Γ are non-separating

1696 and wandering ray-continua. Moreover, convex hulls of sets $H_Q, Q \in \Gamma$ form a
 1697 prelamination which we denote \mathcal{L}_K . By the properties

1698 By Theorem 12 we can consider its closure $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$ which is the geo-lamination
 1699 generated by K and then the lamination \approx_K generated by K . By Theorem 12
 1700 $\approx_K = \approx$ has no Siegel domains. However it may have several paratracting
 1701 Fatou domains.

1702 Let us show that closures of Fatou domains of \approx are pairwise disjoint. Let U
 1703 be a Fatou domain of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$. By the construction from Theorem 12, U remains
 1704 a Fatou domain of \approx . Let us study $\text{Bd}(U)$ in detail. By Theorem 12 in the
 1705 geo-lamination $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$ and in the refined geo-lamination \mathcal{L}_\approx there are no critical
 1706 leaves. Therefore by Lemma 7 all leaves in $\text{Bd}(U)$ are (pre)periodic. Thus, they
 1707 do not come from \mathcal{L}_K and must be the limit leaves of \mathcal{L}_K . Choose a geometric
 1708 leaf ℓ in $\text{Bd}(U)$. By Theorem 12 elements of \mathcal{L}_K cannot be contained in \overline{U} ,
 1709 hence they approach ℓ from outside of U . Moreover, we may assume that these
 1710 elements of \mathcal{L}_K are contained in convex hulls of distinct \approx -classes. Therefore
 1711 ℓ cannot lie on the boundary of any other gap of \mathcal{L}_\approx or on the boundary of
 1712 another Fatou domain of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$ (or, equivalently, of \approx), as desired.

1713 Consider a new lamination $\approx'_K = \approx'$ obtained by identifying the boundary of
 1714 each Fatou domain of \approx_K and show that $J_{\approx'}$ is a non-degenerate dendrite.
 1715 It is easy to see that \approx' is a well-defined lamination. Then the corresponding
 1716 topological Julia set $J_{\approx'}$ can be obtained from J_\approx by collapsing closures of all
 1717 its Fatou domains into points. Clearly, there are no more than countably many
 1718 Fatou domains of \approx , their boundaries are continua, and these continua are
 1719 pairwise disjoint by the previous paragraph. Then by the Sierpiński Theorem
 1720 [23] the resulting (after this collapse) quotient space $J_{\approx'}$ is not degenerate.
 1721 Hence the lamination \approx' is not degenerate. Moreover, since it no longer has
 1722 Fatou domains, $J_{\approx'}$ is a dendrite.

1723 By Theorem 7.2.7 of [7] any dendritic topological Julia set has infinitely many
 1724 periodic cutpoints. Hence there are infinitely many periodic cutpoints in $J_{\approx'}$.
 1725 We now want to show that this implies that there are infinitely many periodic
 1726 cutpoints of J . Let \mathbf{h} be a finite periodic class of \approx' which does not belong to
 1727 the boundary of a Fatou domain of \approx . Then geometric leaves from $\text{Bd}(\text{Ch}(\mathbf{h}))$
 1728 cannot come from elements of \mathcal{L}_K (who are all wandering). Let us show that
 1729 all geometric leaves on the boundary of \mathbf{h} are limit leaves of \mathcal{L}_K . Indeed,
 1730 suppose that ℓ' is a boundary geometric leaf of $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{h})$ which is not such a
 1731 limit leaf. Then there is a geometric gap \mathbf{g}' of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$ on the side of ℓ' opposite
 1732 to \mathbf{g} . By the choice of \mathbf{h} , the gap \mathbf{g}' cannot be a Fatou domain of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_K}$ which
 1733 implies that it has a finite basis which should have been united with \mathbf{h} into
 1734 one \approx -class, a contradiction. Thus, the set $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ is disjoint from impressions
 1735 of all angles not in \mathbf{h} because these other impressions are cut off $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ by
 1736 the ray-continua from the grand orbit of K corresponding to the appropriate

1737 elements of \mathcal{L}_K .

1738 Consider now the set $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ and show that $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ is a continuum itself. If
1739 a geometric leaf ℓ'' belongs to the boundary of $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{h})$ then by the previous
1740 paragraph ℓ'' is the limit of a sequence of elements of \mathcal{L}_Θ . Taking the Hausdorff
1741 limit of a subsequence we see that the corresponding continua on the plane
1742 converge to a continuum. By the semi-continuity of impressions this continuum
1743 is contained in $\text{Imp}(\ell'')$. Hence $\text{Imp}(\ell'')$ is a continuum itself. Since the union
1744 of impressions of leaves ℓ'' from the boundary of $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{h})$ is in fact $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$, the
1745 set $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ is a continuum. By Lemma 37 $\text{Imp}(\mathbf{h})$ is a repelling or parabolic
1746 periodic point, and since \mathbf{h} is a gap or leaf, it is a repelling or parabolic point
1747 of J at which at least two rays land, as desired. By Theorem 44 this implies
1748 that the finest model is non-degenerate. Clearly, the case when there exists
1749 a non-(pre)periodic bi-accessible point of J is a particular case of the above.
1750 This completes the proof. \square

1751 Let us show how one can deduce Kiwi's results [13] from our results. Say that
1752 two angles α, β are *K-equivalent* if there exists a finite collection of angles
1753 $\alpha_0 = \alpha, \dots, \alpha_k = \beta$ such that $\text{Imp}(\alpha_i) \cap \text{Imp}(\alpha_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for each $i = 0, \dots, k-1$.
1754 The notion (but not the terminology!) is due to Jan Kiwi [13] and is instru-
1755 mental in his construction of locally connected models for connected Julia sets
1756 of polynomials without CS-points. Clearly, if two angles are K-equivalent, they
1757 must belong to the same K-class. Suppose that P does not have CS-points.
1758 Let us show first that the finest model is non-degenerate. Indeed, by the as-
1759 sumption P has no Siegel domains. If P has a paratracting domain then by
1760 Theorem 44 the finest model is non-degenerate. It remains to consider the case
1761 when P has no Fatou domains (i.e., J_P is non-separating) and no CS-points.
1762 Then by [10,11] P has infinitely many repelling periodic bi-accessible points.
1763 Hence in this case the finest model is non-degenerate either.

1764 Now, take any point p of P , consider the corresponding K-class $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ and
1765 show that it is finite. Indeed, suppose first that p is non-(pre)periodic. Then
1766 by Theorem 3 the corresponding K-class is finite. Now suppose that p is
1767 (pre)periodic; we may assume that it is periodic of period 1. Consider the
1768 set $Q = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(p))$ and show that it is non-separating. Indeed, otherwise there
1769 is a paratracting domain U contained in the topological hull $\text{TH}(Q)$ (since P
1770 does not have CS-points it cannot be a Siegel domain). However by Lemma 43
1771 the boundary $\text{Bd}(U)$ is not collapsed under φ , a contradiction. Hence Q is non-
1772 separating. Let us show that then it must contain infinitely many repelling
1773 periodic bi-accessible points. Indeed, suppose otherwise. Then replacing P by
1774 an appropriate power we may assume that all periodic points in Q and all
1775 the rays landing at them are invariant. By Theorem 34 this implies, that Q
1776 is a point, a contradiction to $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ being infinite by the assumption (at any
1777 repelling periodic point only finitely many rays land). So, if P has no CS-
1778 points then there are no infinite K-classes which implies that K-equivalence

1779 in fact coincides with the lamination \sim_P and thus produces the finest locally
 1780 connected model of J_P .

1781 Let us compare our approach and results with those of [13]. Kiwi uses direct
 1782 arguments to construct the finest model for polynomials without CS-points.
 1783 He also relies more upon combinatorial and related to symbolic dynamics
 1784 arguments. Our approach, based upon continuum theory, is different. It allows
 1785 us to show that Kiwi's locally connected model of a connected Julia set without
 1786 CS-points is actually the *finest locally connected model of J_P* , the finest from
 1787 the purely topological point of view. It also allows us to extend Kiwi's results
 1788 [13] onto *all* polynomials with connected Julia sets. However we only tackle
 1789 the case of connected Julia sets while in [13] disconnected Julia sets are also
 1790 considered.

1791 To conclude the paper we want to specify K-equivalence a little more. Namely,
 1792 in the next theorem we obtain additional information about the way impres-
 1793 sions of angles from finite K-classes can intersect. The theorem holds regardless
 1794 of whether a polynomial has CS-points or not. However in the case when P
 1795 has no CS-points it applies to *all* K-classes.

1796 **Theorem 46.** *Suppose that $A = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ is a finite K-class. Then im-*
 1797 *pressions of angles of A which are adjacent on the circle meet. Moreover, any*
 1798 *subset of A in which only adjacent angles have meeting impressions consists*
 1799 *of no more than 3 elements.*

1800 *Proof.* In the case when A is a (pre)periodic K-class (equivalently, \sim_P -class) it
 1801 follows from Lemma 37 that $\text{Imp}(A)$ is a point which implies the conclusions
 1802 of the lemma. Also, if A consists of two angles the conclusions of the lemma
 1803 are obvious. Hence the remaining case is when $n \geq 3$ and A is a wandering
 1804 polygon. Consider this case by way of contradiction. Assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$
 1805 circularly ordered and $\text{Imp}(\alpha_1) \cap \text{Imp}(\alpha_2) = \emptyset$. Denote the open arc between
 1806 α_1, α_2 which is complementary to A by I .

1807 Let us show that there exists a Fatou domain U and a point of $x \in [\text{Imp}(A) \setminus$
 1808 $(\text{Imp}(\alpha_1) \cup \text{Imp}(\alpha_n))] \cap \text{Bd}(U)$. Draw a curve L which starts at a point of a
 1809 ray of an angle from I and ends at a point of a ray of an angle from $\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \bar{I}$.
 1810 Clearly, L separates $\text{Imp}(\alpha_1)$ from $\text{Imp}(\alpha_2)$. Since $\text{Imp}(A)$ is a continuum, L
 1811 will have to intersect $\text{Imp}(A)$. Denote by x the first on L point of intersection
 1812 between L and $\text{Imp}(A)$. Let us show that a sufficiently small open subarc T
 1813 of L with one endpoint x and disjoint from $\text{Imp}(A)$ is in fact disjoint from
 1814 J_P . Indeed, since α_1 and α_n are adjacent elements of A , the set $\cup_{\gamma \in I} \text{Imp}(\gamma)$
 1815 is disjoint from $\text{Imp}(A)$, and hence does not contain x . On the other hand,
 1816 $x \notin \text{Imp}(\alpha_1) \cup \text{Imp}(\alpha_2)$ by the choice of L . Hence $x \notin \cup_{\gamma \in \bar{I}} \text{Imp}(\gamma) = Q$, and
 1817 since Q is compact, we can find the desired arc T . On the other hand, the
 1818 intersection $\text{Imp}(A) \cap Q = \text{Imp}(\alpha_1) \cup \text{Imp}(\alpha_n)$ is disconnected which implies

1819 that Q separates the plane. By the construction T must be contained in a
 1820 bounded component U of $\mathbb{C} \setminus Q$. Since $Q \subset J_P$, it follows that U is a Fatou
 1821 domain, and hence $x \in \text{Bd}(U)$.

1822 Take a small ball B centered at x . By [22] there exists a (pre)periodic point
 1823 $y \in B \cap \text{Bd}(U)$. Also, choose a (pre)periodic point $y' \in \text{Bd}(U)$ so that a ray of
 1824 an angle belonging to I lands at Y' . Since $\text{Imp}(A)$ is wandering, $y, y' \notin \text{Imp}(A)$.
 1825 As in the proof of Lemma 43, connect a point $z \in U$ with infinity by a curve E
 1826 which intersects J_P only at y and y' . Then L' separates $\text{Imp}(\alpha_1)$ from $\text{Imp}(\alpha_2)$
 1827 on the plane and is disjoint from the continuum $\text{Imp}(A)$ which contains both
 1828 $\text{Imp}(\alpha_1)$ and $\text{Imp}(\alpha_n)$, a contradiction. Thus, adjacent angles in A must have
 1829 non-disjoint impressions.

1830 To prove the rest, assume that there exist angles $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \in A, r \geq 4$ which
 1831 are circularly ordered and such that all adjacent angles have non-disjoint im-
 1832 pressions while otherwise the impressions of angles are disjoint. Consider two
 1833 continua, $Y = \text{Imp}(\beta_1) \cup \text{Imp}(\beta_2)$ and $Z = \cup_{i=3}^r \text{Imp}(\beta_i)$. Then it follows that

$$Y \cap Z = [\text{Imp}(\beta_1) \cap \text{Imp}(\beta_r)] \cup [\text{Imp}(\beta_2) \cap \text{Imp}(\beta_3)]$$

1834 which is disconnected because $\text{Imp}(\beta_1) \cap \text{Imp}(\beta_3) = \emptyset$ (recall that $r > 3$). Hence
 1835 $\text{Imp}(A)$ separates the plane which is impossible. Indeed, if $\text{Imp}(A)$ separates
 1836 the plane then its topological hull contains a Fatou domain and $\text{Imp}(A)$ is
 1837 (pre)periodic. Assume that $\text{Imp}(A)$ (and A) are periodic of period 1. If $\text{Imp}(A)$
 1838 contains the boundary of an paratracting Fatou domain then by [22] $\text{Imp}(A)$
 1839 will have to intersect infinitely many impressions, a contradiction. If $\text{Imp}(A)$
 1840 contains the boundary of a Siegel domain then by Lemma 36 it contains a
 1841 critical point $c \in J_P$ and A contains at least two angles with the same σ -
 1842 image. However, as A is a finite invariant K-class, the map σ maps A onto
 1843 itself in a one-to-one fashion, a contradiction. \square

1844 References

- 1845 [1] V. Akis, *On the plane fixed point problem*, Topology Proc., **24** (1999), 15–31.
- 1846 [2] A. Blokh, D. Childers, J. Mayer, L. Oversteegen, *Non-degeneracy of*
 1847 *laminations*, preprint, arXiv:0809.2019 (2008)
- 1848 [3] A. Blokh and G. Levin, *An inequality for laminations, Julia sets and ‘growing*
 1849 *trees’*, Erg. Th. and Dyn. Sys., **22** (2002), pp. 63–97.
- 1850 [4] A. Blokh and L. Oversteegen, *The Julia sets of quadratic Cremer polynomials*,
 1851 Topology and its Applications, **153** (2006), pp. 3038–3050.

- 1852 [5] A. Blokh and L. Oversteegen, *Monotone images of Cremer Julia sets*, Houston
1853 Journal of Mathematics, **36** (2010), pp. 469–476.
- 1854 [6] A. Blokh, L. Oversteegen, *The Julia sets of basic uniCremer polynomials of*
1855 *arbitrary degree*, Conformal Geometry and Dynamics, **13** (2009), pp. 139–159.
- 1856 [7] A. Blokh, R. Fokkink, J. Mayer, L. Oversteegen, E. D. Tymchatyn, *Fixed point*
1857 *theorems in plane continua with applications*, preprint, arXiv:1004.0214 (2010).
- 1858 [8] A. Douady, *Descriptions of compact sets in \mathbb{C}* , Topological Methods in Modern
1859 Mathematics, Publish or Perish (1993), pp. 429–465.
- 1860 [9] A. Douady and J. H. Hubbard, *Étude dynamique des polynômes complexes I,*
1861 *II* Publications Mathématiques d’Orsay **84-02** (1984), **85-04** (1985).
- 1862 [10] L. Goldberg and J. Milnor, *Fixed points of polynomial maps, Part II. Fixed*
1863 *point portraits*, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup., 4^e série **26** (1993), pp. 51–98.
- 1864 [11] J. Kiwi, *Non-accessible critical points of Cremer polynomials*, Erg. Theory and
1865 Dyn. Sys. **20**, (2000), pp. 1391–1403.
- 1866 [12] J. Kiwi, *Wandering orbit portraits*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **254** (2002), pp.
1867 1473–1485.
- 1868 [13] J. Kiwi, *Real laminations and the topological dynamics of complex polynomials*,
1869 Advances in Math. **184** (2004), no. 2, pp. 207–267.
- 1870 [14] W. de Melo and S. van Strien. *One-dimensional dynamics*, **25**, *Ergebnisse der*
1871 *Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related*
1872 *Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- 1873 [15] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in one complex variable*, **160**, Princeton University Press,
1874 Princeton, 3rd ed edition, 2006.
- 1875 [16] J. Milnor, W. Thurston, *On iterated maps of the interval*, in: Dynamical systems
1876 (College Park, MD, 1986–87), Lecture Notes in Math., **1342**, Springer-Verlag,
1877 Berlin, 1988.
- 1878 [17] M. Misiurewicz, A. Rodrigues, *Double standard maps*, Commun. Math. Phys.
1879 **273** (2007), 37-65.
- 1880 [18] R. L. Moore, *Concerning upper semi-continuous collection of continua*, Trans.
1881 Amer. Math. Soc., **27** (1925), 416–428
- 1882 [19] S. Nadler, Jr, *Continuum theory. An introduction*. Monographs and Textbooks
1883 in Pure and Applied Mathematics **158**, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York (1992).
- 1884 [20] R. Perez-Marco, *Topology of Julia sets and hedgehogs*, Publications
1885 Mathématiques d’Orsay **94-48** (1994).
- 1886 [21] R. Perez-Marco, *Fixed points and circle maps*, Acta Math. **179** (1997), pp.
1887 243–294.

- 1888 [22] F. Przytycki, A. Zdunik, *Density of periodic sources in the boundary of a basin of*
1889 *attraction for iteration of holomorphic maps: geometric coding trees techniques,*
1890 *Fund. Math.* **145**, no. 1, 65–77.
- 1891 [23] W. Sierpiński, *Un théorème sur les continus*, *Tôhoku Math. J.*, **13** (1918), pp.
1892 300–303.
- 1893 [24] S. Stoilow, *Leçons sur les principes topologiques de la théorie des fonctions*
1894 *analytiques*, 2ième ed. (1956), p. 121, Gauthier-Villars, Paris
- 1895 [25] W. P. Thurston, *On the geometry and dynamics of iterated rational maps*, in:
1896 “Complex dynamics: families and friends”, A K Peters (2008), pp. 1–108.