

# On spectral decomposition of Smale-Vietoris axiom A diffeomorphisms <sup>\*†</sup>

N. Isaenkova<sup>1</sup>

E. Zhuzhoma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nizhny Novgorod Academy MVD of Russia, RUSSIA, nisaenkova@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics, RUSSIA, zhuzhoma@mail.ru

## Absrtact

We introduce Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphisms that include the classical DE-mappings with Smale solenoids. We describe the correspondence between basic sets of axiom A Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphisms and basic sets of nonsingular axiom A endomorphisms. For Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphisms of 3-manifolds, we prove the uniqueness of nontrivial solenoidal basic set. We construct a bifurcation between different types of solenoidal basic sets which can be considered as a destruction (or birth) of Smale solenoid.

## Introduction

Stephen Smale, in his celebrated paper [20], introduced so-called DE-maps which arise from expanding maps (the abbreviation DE is formed by first letters of *Derived* from *Expanding* map). Let  $T$  be a closed manifold of dimension at least 1, and  $N$  an  $n$ -disk of dimension  $n \geq 2$ . Omitting details, one can say that a DE map is the skew map

$$f : T \times N \rightarrow T \times N, \quad (x; y) \mapsto (g_1(x); g_2(x, y)), \quad (1)$$

where  $g_1 : T \rightarrow T$  is an expanding map of degree  $d \geq 2$ , and

$$g_2|_{\{x\} \times N} : \{x\} \times N \rightarrow \{g_1(x)\} \times N$$

an uniformly attracting map of  $n$ -disk  $\{x\} \times N$  into  $n$ -disk  $\{g_1(x)\} \times N$  for every  $x \in T$ . In addition,  $f$  must be a diffeomorphism onto its image  $T \times N \rightarrow f(T \times N)$ . In the particular case, when  $T = S^1$  is a circle and  $N = D^2$  is a 2-disk with the uniformly attracting  $g_2$ , one gets a classical Smale solenoid  $\bigcap_{l \geq 0} f^l(\mathbb{T} \times D^2) = \mathfrak{S}$ , see Fig. 1, that is a topological solenoid.

Recall that a topological solenoid was introduced by Vietoris [22] in 1927 (independently, a solenoid was introduced by van Danzig [7] in 1930, see review in [21]). Smale [20] proved that  $\mathfrak{S}(f)$  is a hyperbolic expanding attractor. This construction was generalized by Williams [23, 24] who defined  $g_1$  to be expansion mappings of branch manifolds (this allows to Williams to classify interior dynamics of expanding attractors) and by Block [2] who defined  $g_1$  to be an axiom A endomorphism. The last paper concerns to the  $\Omega$ -stability and the proving of

<sup>\*</sup>2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 37D20; Secondary 37G30

<sup>†</sup>*Key words and phrases*: axiom A endomorphisms, basic sets, nonlocal bifurcations




Fig. 1: DE-map by S. Smale

decomposition of non-wandering set into so-called basic sets (Spectral Decomposition Theorem for A-endomorphisms). Ideologically, our paper is a continuation of [2], where it was proved the following result (Theorem A). Let  $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$  be a Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphism of closed  $n$ -manifold  $M^n$  and  $\mathfrak{B} \subset M^n$  the support of Smale skew-mapping  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}}$  (see the notations below). Then  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}}$  satisfies axiom A on  $\mathfrak{B}$  if and only if  $g$  does on  $T$ .

Let us mention that in the frame of Smale-Williams construction the interesting examples of expanding attractors was obtained in [4, 8, 10, 13, 18]. Bothe [3] classified the purely Smale solenoids on 3-manifolds. He was first who also proved that a DE map  $S^1 \times D^2 \rightarrow S^1 \times D^2$  can be extended to a diffeomorphism of some closed 3-manifold  $M^3 \supset S^1 \times D^2$  (see also [5, 11, 12]). Ya. Zeldovich and others (see [6]) conjectured that Smale type mappings could be responsible for so-called fast dynamos. Therefore, it is natural to consider various generalizations of classical Smale mapping.

In a spirit of Smale construction of DE-maps, we here introduce diffeomorphisms called Smale-Vietoris that are derived from nonsingular endomorphisms. A non-wandering set of Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphisms belongs to an attractive invariant set of solenoidal type. In the classical case, the invariant set coincides with the non-wandering set consisting of a unique basic set. In general, the non-wandering set does not coincide with the invariant set, and divides into basic sets provided the nonsingular endomorphism is an A-endomorphism.

Let  $N$  be  $(n - k)$ -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold with a non-empty boundary where  $n - k \geq 1$ . For a subset  $N_1 \subset N$ , we define the diameter  $diam N_1 = \max_{a,b \in N_1} \{\rho_N(a, b)\}$  of  $N_1$  where  $\rho_N$  is the metric on  $N$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{T}^k = \underbrace{S^1 \times \dots \times S^1}_k$  the  $k$ -dimensional torus,

$k \in \mathbb{N}$ . A surjective mapping  $g : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  is called a  $d$ -cover if  $g$  is a preserving orientation local homeomorphism of degree  $d$ . A good example is the preserving orientation linear expanding mapping  $E_d : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  defined by an integer  $k \times k$  matrix with the determinant equals  $d$ . Certainly,  $E_d$  is a  $d$ -cover.

A skew-mapping

$$F : \mathbb{T}^k \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k \times N, \quad (t, z) \mapsto ((g(t); \omega(t, z))) \quad (2)$$

is called a *Smale skew-mapping* if the following conditions hold:

- $F : \mathbb{T}^k \times N \rightarrow F(\mathbb{T}^k \times N)$  is a diffeomorphism on its image;
- $g : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  is a  $d$ -cover,  $d \geq 2$ ;
- given any  $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$ , the restriction  $w|_{\{t\} \times N} : \{t\} \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k \times N$  is the uniformly attracting embedding

$$\{t\} \times N \rightarrow int(\{g(t)\} \times N) \quad (3)$$

i.e., there are  $0 < \lambda < 1$ ,  $C > 0$  such that

$$\text{diam} (F^n(\{t\} \times N)) \leq C\lambda^n \text{diam} (\{t\} \times N), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4)$$

When  $g = E_d$ , Smale skew-mapping is a  $DE$  mapping (1) introduced by Smale [20].

A diffeomorphism  $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$  is called a *Smale-Vietoris* diffeomorphism if there is the  $n$ -submanifold  $\mathbb{T}^k \times N \subset M^n$  such that the restriction  $f|_{\mathbb{T}^k \times N} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F$  is a Smale skew-mapping. The submanifold  $\mathbb{T}^k \times N \subset M^n$  is called a *support of Smale skew-mapping*.

Put by definition,

$$\bigcap_{l \geq 0} F^l(\mathbb{T}^k \times N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{S}(f).$$

One can easy to see that the set  $\mathfrak{S}(f) = \mathfrak{S}$  is attractive, invariant and closed, so that the restriction

$$f|_{\mathfrak{S}} : \mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$$

is a homeomorphism.

The following theorem shows that there is an intimate correspondens between basic sets of  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}}$  and basic sets of the A-endomorphism  $g$ .

**Theorem 1** *Let  $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$  be a Smale-Vietoris A-diffeomorphism of closed  $n$ -manifold  $M^n$  and  $\mathbb{T}^k \times N = \mathfrak{B} \subset M^n$  the support of Smale skew-mapping  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}} = F$ , see (2). Let  $\Omega$  be a basic set of  $g : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  and  $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcap_{l \geq 0} F^l(\mathbb{T}^k \times N)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$  contains a unique basic set  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{S}}$  of  $f$ . Here,  $p_1 : \mathbb{T}^k \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  is the natural projection on the first factor. Moreover,*

1. *If  $\Omega$  is a trivial basic set (isolated periodic orbit) of  $g$  then  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{S}}$  is also trivial basic set.*
2. *If  $\Omega$  is a nontrivial basic set of  $g$  then  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{S}}$  is also nontrivial basic set.*
3. *If  $\Omega$  is a backward  $g$ -invariant basic set of  $g$ ,  $\Omega = g^{-1}(\Omega)$ , (hence,  $\Omega$  is nontrivial) then  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{S}} = \mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$ .*

For  $k = 1$ , when  $\mathbb{T}^1 = S^1$  is a circle, the following result says that  $NW(F)$  contains a unique nontrivial basic set that is either Smale (one-dimensional) solenoid or a nontrivial zero-dimensional basic set.

**Theorem 2** *Let  $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$  be a Smale-Vietoris A-diffeomorphism of closed  $n$ -manifold  $M^n$  and  $\mathbb{T}^1 \times N = \mathfrak{B} \subset M^n$  the support of Smale skew-mapping  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}} = F$ . Then the non-wandering set  $NW(F)$  of  $F$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcap_{l \geq 0} F^l(\mathbb{T}^1 \times N)$ , and  $NW(F)$  contains a unique nontrivial basic set  $\Lambda(f)$  that is either*

- *a one-dimensional expanding attractor, and  $\Lambda(f) = \mathfrak{S}$ , or*
- *a zero-dimensional basic set, and  $NW(F)$  consists of  $\Lambda(f)$  and finitely many (nonzero) isolated attracting periodic points plus finitely many (possibly, zero) saddle type isolated periodic points of codimension one stable Morse index.*

*The both possibilities hold.*

It is natural to consider bifurcations from one type of dynamics to another which can be thought of as a destruction (or, a birth) of Smale solenoid. For simplicity, we represent two such bifurcations for  $n = 3$  and  $M^3 = S^3$  a 3-sphere. Recall that a diffeomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow M$  is  $\Omega$ -stable if there is a neighborhood  $U(f)$  of  $f$  in the space of  $C^1$  diffeomorphisms  $Dif f^1(M)$  such that  $f|_{NW(f)}$  conjugate to every  $g|_{NW(g)}$  provided  $g \in U(f)$ .

**Theorem 3** *There is the family of  $\Omega$ -stable Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphisms  $f_\mu : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ ,  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ , continuously depending on the parameter  $\mu$  such that the non-wandering set  $NW(f_\mu)$  of  $f_\mu$  is the following:*

- $NW(f_0)$  consists of a one-dimensional expanding attractor (Smale solenoid attractor) and one-dimensional contracting repeller (Smale solenoid repeller);
- for  $\mu > 0$ ,  $NW(f_\mu)$  consists of two nontrivial zero-dimensional basic sets and finitely many isolated periodic orbits.

*Acknowledgments.* The authors are grateful to V. Grines, O. Pochinka and S. Gonchenko for useful discussions. Research partially supported by Russian Fund of Fundamental Investigations, 13-01-12452 офн-м, 15-01-03687, 13-01-00589. This work was supported by the Basic Research Programs at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (“Topological methods in the dynamics”, project 98) in 2016.

## 1 Definitions

A mapping  $F : M \times N \rightarrow M \times N$  of the type  $F(x; y) = (g(x); h(x, y))$  is called a *skew-mapping*. One says also a *skew product transformation* over  $g$  or simply, a *skew product*. Denote by  $End(M)$  the space of  $C^1$  endomorphisms  $M \rightarrow M$  i.e., the  $C^1$  maps of  $M$  onto itself. An endomorphism  $g$  is *nonsingular* if the Jacobian  $|Dg| \neq 0$ . This means that  $g$  is a local diffeomorphism. In particular,  $g$  is a  $d$ -cover. In this paper, we consider nonsingular  $g \in End(M)$ ,  $Dg \neq 0$ , that are not a diffeomorphism.

Fix  $g \in End(M)$ . A point  $x \in M$  is said to be *non-wandering* if given any neighborhood  $U(x) = U$  of  $x$ , there is  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $g^m(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ . Denote by  $NW(g)$  the set of non-wandering points. Clearly,  $NW(g)$  is a closed set and  $g(NW(g)) \subset NW(g)$  i.e.,  $NW(g)$  is a forward  $g$ -invariant set. The set  $\{x_i\}_{-\infty}^{\infty}$  denoted by  $O(x_0)$  is called a  $g$ -orbit of  $x_0$  if  $g(x_i) = x_{i+1}$  for every integer  $i$ . A subset  $\{x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+r}\} \subset O(x_0)$  consisting of a finitely many points of  $O(x_0)$  is called a *compact part* of  $O(x_0)$ . A  $g$ -orbit  $\{x_i\}_{-\infty}^{\infty}$  is *periodic* if there is an integer  $p \geq 0$  such that  $g^p(x_i) = x_{i+p}$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Certainly,  $NW(g)$  contains all periodic  $g$ -orbits.

The orbit  $O(x_0)$  is said to be *hyperbolic* if there is a continuous splitting of the tangent bundle

$$\mathbb{T}_{O(x_0)}M = \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{T}_{x_i}M = \mathbb{E}^s \oplus \mathbb{E}^u = \bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{x_i}^s \oplus \mathbb{E}_{x_i}^u$$

which is preserved by the derivative  $Dg$  such that

$$\|Dg^m(v)\| \leq c\mu^m\|v\|, \|Dg^m(w)\| \geq c^{-1}\mu^{-m}\|w\| \quad \text{for } v \in \mathbb{E}^s, w \in \mathbb{E}^u, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$$

for some constants  $c > 0$ ,  $0 < \mu < 1$  and a Riemannian metric on  $\mathbb{T}M$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}^u(x_0)$  depends on the negative semi-orbit  $\{x_i\}_{i=-\infty}^0$ . It may happen that  $\mathbb{E}^u(x_0) \neq \mathbb{E}^u(y_0)$  though  $x_0 = y_0$  but  $O(x_0) \neq O(y_0)$ . Such a phenomenon is impossible for  $\mathbb{E}^s(x_0)$ , it depends only on  $x_0$  [16].

We say that a nonsingular  $g \in \text{End}(M)$  satisfies axiom A, in short,  $f$  is an A-endomorphism if

- the periodic  $g$ -orbits are dense in  $NW(g)$  (it follows that  $g(NW(g)) = NW(g)$ );
- all  $g$ -orbits of  $NW(g)$  are hyperbolic, and the corresponding splitting of the tangent bundle  $\mathbb{T}_{NW(g)}$  depends continuously on the compact parts of the  $g$ -orbits.

Recall that Smale's Spectral Decomposition Theorem says that for Axiom A diffeomorphisms the non-wandering set partitions into nonempty closed invariant sets each of which is transitive. Similar theorem for A-endomorphisms was probed in [2] (Theorem C), [16] (Theorem 3.11 and Proposition 3.13). Thus, if  $g$  is a nonsingular A-endomorphism then the non-wandering set  $NW(g)$  is the disjoint union  $\Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_k$  such that each  $\Omega_i$  is closed and invariant,  $g(\Omega_i) = \Omega_i$ , and  $\Omega_i$  contains a point whose  $g$ -orbit is dense in  $\Omega_i$ . The  $\Omega_i$  are called *basic sets*.

Following Williams [23, 24], we introduce an inverse limit for  $g : T \rightarrow T$  as follows. Put by definition,  $\prod_g = \{(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots) \in T^{\mathbb{N}} : g(t_{i+1}) = t_i, i \geq 0\}$ . This set is endowed by the product topology of countable factors. This topology has a basis generating by  $(\varepsilon, r)$ -neighborhoods

$$U = \{ \{x_i\}_0^\infty \in \prod_g : x_i \in U_\varepsilon(t_i), 0 \leq i \leq r \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0, r \in \mathbb{N} \}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\} \in \prod_g$ . Define the shift map

$$\hat{g} : \prod_g \rightarrow \prod_g, \quad \hat{g}(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots) = (g(t_0), t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots), \quad (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots) \in \prod_g.$$

This map  $\hat{g} : \prod_g \rightarrow \prod_g$  is called the *inverse limit* of  $g$  is a homeomorphism [17, 24].

## 2 Proofs of main results

We denote by  $p_1 : \mathbb{T}^k \times N \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$ ,  $p_2 : \mathbb{T}^k \times N \rightarrow N$  the natural projections  $p_1(t, z) = t$  and  $p_2(t, z) = z$ . A fiber  $\{t\} \times N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_t$  of the trivial fiber bundle  $p_1$  is called a  $t$ -leaf. It follows from (2) that  $F = f|_{\mathfrak{B}}$  takes a  $t$ -leaf into  $g(t)$ -leaf.

Let  $t \in \mathbb{T}^k$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We denote by  $U_\varepsilon(t)$  the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of the point  $t$  i.e.,  $U_\varepsilon(t) = \{x \in \mathbb{T}^k : \varrho(x, t) < \varepsilon\}$  where  $\varrho$  is a metric on  $\mathbb{T}^k$ .

The following technical lemma describes the symbolic model of the restriction  $f|_{\mathfrak{S}}$ . This lemma is a generalization of the similar classical result by Williams [23, 24].

**Lemma 1** *Let  $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$  be a Smale-Vietoris diffeomorphism of closed  $n$ -manifold  $M^n$  and  $\mathbb{T}^k \times N = \mathfrak{B} \subset M^n$  the support of Smale skew-mapping  $f|_{\mathfrak{B}} = F$ . Then the restriction  $f|_{\mathfrak{S}}$  is conjugate to the inverse limit of the mapping  $g : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$ , where  $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcap_{l \geq 0} F^l(\mathbb{T}^k \times N)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that given any point  $t_0 \in \mathbb{T}^k$ ,  $g^{-1}(t_0)$  consists of  $d$  points, one says  $t_0^1, t_0^2, \dots, t_0^d \in \mathbb{T}^k$ . Since  $F$  is a diffeomorphism on its image, the sets  $F(N_{t_0^1}), \dots, F(N_{t_0^d})$  are pairwise disjoint,

$$F(N_{t_0^i}) \cap F(N_{t_0^j}) = \emptyset, \quad i \neq j, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d, \quad (6)$$

Now, for the sake of simplicity, we divide the proof into several steps. The end of the proof of each step will be denoted by  $\diamond$ .

**Step 1** Given any point  $p \in \mathfrak{S}$ , there is a unique sequence of points  $\{t_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ ,  $t_i \in \mathbb{T}^k$ , and the corresponding sequence of the leaves  $\{N_{t_i}\}_{i=0}^\infty$  such that

- $p \in \cdots \subset F^i(N_{t_i}) \subset F^{i-1}(N_{t_{i-1}}) \cdots \subset F(N_{t_1}) \subset N_{t_0}$ ,  $p = \bigcap_{i \geq 0} F^i(N_{t_i})$ ;
- $t_i = g(t_{i+1})$ ,  $i \geq 0$ .

*Proof of Step 1.* Put  $t_0 = p_1(p) \in \mathbb{T}^k$ . Let  $g^{-1}(t_0) = \{t_0^1, t_0^2, \dots, t_0^d\}$ . By (6), there is a unique  $t_0^j$  such that  $p \in F(N_{t_0^j})$ . Put by definition  $t_0^j = t_1$ . Note that  $F(N_{t_1}) \subset N_{t_0}$ . Similarly,  $g^{-1}(t_1)$  consists of  $d$  points  $t_1^1, t_1^2, \dots, t_1^d$ . By (6), the sets  $F(N_{t_1^1}), \dots, F(N_{t_1^d})$  are pairwise disjoint. Since  $p \in F^2(\mathbb{T}^k \times N)$ , there is a unique  $t_1^i$  such that  $p \in F^2(N_{t_1^i})$ . Put by definition  $t_1^i = t_2$ . Note that  $p \in F^2(N_{t_2}) \subset F(N_{t_1}) \subset N_{t_0}$ . Continuing by this way, one gets the sequences  $\{t_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ ,  $\{N_{t_i}\}_{i=0}^\infty$  desired. It follows from (4) that  $\text{diam } F^i(N_{t_i}) = \text{diam } (F^i(\{t_i\} \times N)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $p = \bigcap_{i \geq 0} F^i(N_{t_i})$ .  $\diamond$

Let  $\hat{g} : \prod_g \rightarrow \prod_g$  be the inverse limit of  $g : \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k$  where  $\prod_g = \{(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots) \in \mathbb{T}^\mathbb{N} : g(t_{i+1}) = t_i, i \geq 0\}$ . For a point  $p \in \mathfrak{S}$ , denote by  $P(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots)$ ,  $t_i \in \mathbb{T}^k$ , the sequence due to Step 1. Define the mapping

$$\theta : \mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \prod_g, \quad p \mapsto P(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots), \quad p \in \mathfrak{S}.$$

**Step 2** The mapping  $\theta$  is a homeomorphism.

*Proof of Step 2.* It follows from (4) that  $\theta$  is injective. Since the intersection of nested sequence of closed subsets is non empty,  $\theta$  is surjective. One remains to prove that  $\theta$  and  $\theta^{-1}$  are continuous. Take a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\theta(p)$ ,  $p \in \mathfrak{S}$ . We can assume that  $U$  is an  $(\varepsilon, r)$ -neighborhood (5), where  $\theta(p) = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\} \in \prod_g$ . Moreover, one can assume that  $g^{-1}(U_\varepsilon(t_i))$  consists of  $d$  pairwise disjoint domains for every  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . Recall that  $t_i = g(t_{i+1})$ ,  $i \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $t_{r-j} = g^j(t_r)$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Similarly,  $x_{r-j} = g^j(x_r)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Since  $g$  is continuous, there exists  $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon$  such that the inclusion  $x_r \in U_\delta(t_r)$  implies  $x_i \in U_\varepsilon(t_i)$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, r$ . The restriction  $F|_{\mathfrak{S}} : \mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$  is a diffeomorphism. Therefore, there is a (relative) neighborhood  $U(p)$  of  $p$  in  $\mathfrak{S}$  such that  $p_1(F^{-i}(U(p))) \subset U_\delta(t_i)$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . Taking in mind that  $g^{-1}(U_\varepsilon(t_i))$  consists of  $d$  pairwise disjoint domains,  $0 \leq i \leq r$ , we see that that  $\theta(U(p)) \subset U$ . Thus,  $\theta$  is continuous. Since  $\prod_g$  is compact,  $\theta^{-1}$  is also continuous.  $\diamond$

**Step 3** One holds  $\theta \circ F|_{\mathfrak{S}} = \hat{g} \circ \theta|_{\mathfrak{S}}$ .

*Proof of Step 3.* Take  $p \in \mathfrak{S}$  and  $\theta(p) = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\}$  where  $t_i = g(t_{i+1})$ ,  $i \geq 0$ . By definition of  $\hat{g} : \prod_g \rightarrow \prod_g$ , one holds  $\hat{g} \circ \theta(p) = \hat{g}(\theta(p)) = \hat{g}(\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\}) = \{g(t_0), t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\}$ . It follows from (3) that  $F(p) \in F(\{t_0\} \times N) \subset N_{g(t_0)}$ . Hence, by Step 1, the sequence of points  $\{g(t_0), t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\}$  corresponds to  $\theta(F(p))$ , since

$$\begin{aligned} F(p) &= F\left(\bigcap_{i \geq 0} F^i(\{t_i\} \times N)\right) = \bigcap_{i \geq 0} F^{i+1}(\{t_i\} \times N) = \bigcap_{i \geq 0} F^{i+1}(\{t_i\} \times N) \cap N_{g(t_0)} = \\ &= N_{g(t_0)} \cap F(N_{t_0}) \cap F^2(N_{t_1}) \cap \dots \cap F^{i+1}(N_{t_i}) \cap \dots. \diamond \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Steps 2, 3 that the mapping  $\theta$  is a conjugacy between  $F|_{\mathfrak{S}}$  and  $\hat{g}$ . Lemma 1 is proved.  $\square$

To prove Theorem 1 we need some previous results.

**Lemma 2** Let  $\bar{t} = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\} \in \prod_g$ ,  $g(t_{i+1}) = t_i$ ,  $i \geq 0$ . Suppose that  $t_i \in NW(g)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . Then  $\bar{t} \in NW(\hat{g})$  and  $\theta^{-1}(\bar{t}) \in NW(F)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\bar{t} = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\} = \{g^r(t_r), g^{r-1}(t_r), \dots, t_r, \dots\}$ , we can take the  $(\varepsilon, r)$ -neighborhood  $V$  as follows

$$V = \{ \{g^r(x_r), g^{r-1}(x_r), \dots, x_r, \dots\} : g^i(x_r) \in U_\varepsilon(g^i(t_r)), 0 \leq i \leq r \}.$$

Since  $g, g^2, \dots, g^r$  are uniformly continuous, there is  $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon$  such that  $x \in U_\delta(y)$  implies  $g^i(x) \in U_\varepsilon(g^i(y))$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . By condition,  $t_r \in NW(g)$ . Hence, there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $g^{n_0}(V_\delta(t_r)) \cap V_\delta(t_r) \neq \emptyset$ . It follows that there is a point  $x_0 \in V_\delta(t_r)$  such that  $g^{n_0}(x_0) \in V_\delta(t_r)$ .

Take  $\bar{x}_0 = \{g^r(x_0), g^{r-1}(x_0), \dots, x_0, \dots\} \in \prod_g$ . Since  $x_0 \in V_\delta(t_r)$ ,  $g^i(x_0) \in U_\varepsilon(g^i(t_r))$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . Therefore,  $\bar{x}_0 \in V$ . Since  $g^{n_0}(x_0) \in V_\delta(t_r)$ ,  $g^{n_0+i}(x_0) \in U_\varepsilon(g^i(t_r))$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . Therefore,

$$\hat{g}^{n_0}(\bar{x}_0) = \{g^{n_0+r}(x_0), g^{n_0+r-1}(x_0), \dots, g^{n_0}(x_0), \dots\} \in V.$$

As a consequence,  $\hat{g}^{n_0}(V) \cap V \neq \emptyset$  and  $\bar{t} \in NW(\bar{g})$ . A conjugacy map takes a non-wandering set onto non-wandering set. By Lemma 1,  $\theta^{-1}(\bar{t}) \in NW(F)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1** The following qualities hold  $p_1[NW(f_{\mathfrak{B}})] = p_1[NW(F)] = NW(g)$ .

*Proof.* Since the projection  $p_1$  is continuous,  $p_1[NW(F)] \subset NW(g)$ . Take a point  $t_0 \in NW(g)$ . Since  $g$  is an A-endomorphism,  $g[NW(g)] = NW(g)$  [2, 16]. Therefore, there is a sequence  $t_i \in NW(g)$  such that  $g(t_{i+1}) = t_i$  for every  $i \geq 0$ . It follows from Lemma 2 that  $\bar{t} = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_i, \dots\} \in NW(\hat{g})$  and  $\theta^{-1}(\bar{t}) \in NW(F)$ . By definition of the mapping  $\theta$ ,  $\theta^{-1}(\bar{t}) \in p_1^{-1}(t_0)$ . Hence,  $NW(g) \subset p_1[NW(F)]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3** Let  $(t_0, z_0) \in \mathfrak{S}$  be a non-wandering point of  $f$ , and  $\theta(t_0, z_0) = \{t_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ . Then  $t_i \in NW(g)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* According to Corollary 1,  $p_1[NW(f_{\mathfrak{B}})] = p_1[NW(F)] = NW(g)$ . Therefore,  $t_0 \in NW(g)$ . Since  $F_{\mathfrak{S}} : \mathfrak{S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}$  is a diffeomorphism,  $F^{-1}(NW(F)) = NW(F)$  and  $F^{-1}(t_0, z_0) = (t_1, z_1) \in NW(F) = NW(f_{\mathfrak{B}})$ . Hence,  $t_1 \in NW(g)$  by Step 1. Continuing this way, one gets that  $t_i \in NW(g)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2** Let  $(t_0, z_0) \in \mathfrak{S}$  be a non-wandering point of  $f$ , and  $\theta(t_0, z_0) = \{t_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ . Suppose that  $t_0$  belongs to a basic set  $\Omega$  of  $g$ . Then  $t_i \in \Omega$  for all  $i \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3,  $t_i \in NW(g)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . Since  $\Omega$  is forward  $g$ -invariant,  $t_i \in \Omega$  for all  $i \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4** Let  $\Omega$  be a nontrivial basic set of  $g$ , and  $t_0 \in \Omega$ . Suppose that two points  $(t_0, z_1), (t_0, z_2) \in \mathfrak{S}$  are non-wandering under  $f$ . Then the both  $(t_0, z_1)$  and  $(t_0, z_2)$  belong to the same basic set of  $f$ .

*Proof.* Denote by  $\Omega_j$  the basic set of  $F$  containing the point  $(t_0, z_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . Clearly,  $\Omega_j \subset \mathfrak{S}$ . We have to prove that  $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2$ . It is sufficient to show that there is a non-wandering point  $q \in NW(F)$  such that each point  $(t_0, z_1)$  and  $(t_0, z_2)$  belongs to the  $\omega$ -limit set of  $q$ .

Let  $\bar{t}_j = \theta(t_0, z_j) = \{t_0, t_1^{(j)}, \dots, t_i^{(j)}, \dots\}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . By Corollary 2,  $t_i^{(j)} \in \Omega$  for all  $i \geq 0$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . Since the basic set  $\Omega$  is transitive, there is a point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  such that its positive semi-orbit  $O_g^+(x_0)$  is dense in  $\Omega$ ,  $\text{clos}(O_g^+(x_0)) = \Omega$ .

It follows from Corollary 1 that there is a point  $\bar{x}_0 = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots\} \in \prod_g$  such that  $x_i \in \Omega$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . Take arbitrary  $(\varepsilon, r)$ -neighborhood  $U(\bar{t}_1)$  of  $\bar{t}_1$ . Since  $g, g^2, \dots, g^r$  are uniformly continuous, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the inequality  $x \in U_\delta(y)$  implies  $g^i(x) \in U_\varepsilon(y)$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq r$ . Because of the semi-orbit  $O_g^+(x_0)$  is dense in  $\Omega$ , there is  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $g^{n_0}(x_0) \in U_\delta(t^{(1)})$ . Hence,  $\hat{g}^{n_0}(\bar{x}_0) \in U(\bar{t}_1)$ . Therefore,  $\bar{t}_1 = \theta(t_0, z_1)$  belongs to the  $\omega$ -limit set of  $\bar{x}_0$ . Similarly, one can prove that  $\bar{t}_2 = \theta(t_0, z_2)$  belongs to the  $\omega$ -limit set of  $\bar{x}_0$  as well. Since  $\theta$  is a conjugacy mapping, the points  $(t_0, z_1) = \theta^{-1}(\bar{t}_1)$  and  $(t_0, z_2) = \theta^{-1}(\bar{t}_2)$  belongs to the  $\omega$ -limit set of the point  $q = \theta^{-1}(\bar{x}_0) \in NW(F)$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** We know that  $p_1[NW(F)] = NW(g)$ . Hence,  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$  contains basic sets of  $f$ . Suppose that  $\Omega$  is trivial i.e.,  $\Omega$  is an isolated periodic orbit

$$\Omega = Orb_g(q) = \{q, g(q), \dots, g^{p-1}(q), g^p(q) = q\}, \quad \text{where } q \in \mathbb{T}^k \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{N} \text{ is a period of } q.$$

By definition of Smale skew-mapping, the restriction of  $F = f|_{\mathfrak{B}}$  on the second factor  $N$  is the uniformly attracting embedding. Therefore,

$$N_q \supset f^p(N_q) \supset \dots \supset f^{mp}(N_q) \supset \dots \quad \text{and the intersection } \bigcap_{m \geq 0} f^{mp}(N_q) \text{ is a unique point, say } Q.$$

Similarly,  $\bigcap_{m \geq 0} f^{mp}(N_{g^i(q)})$  is a unique point  $f^i(Q)$  for every  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ . It follows from (2), that  $\{Q, f(Q), \dots, f^{p-1}(Q), f^p(Q) = Q\}$  is an isolated periodic orbit  $Orb_f(Q)$  such that  $NW(F) \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega) = Orb_f(Q)$ . Therefore,  $Orb_f(Q) = \Omega_{\mathfrak{S}}$  is a unique basic set of  $F$  that belongs to  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$ .

Let  $\Omega$  be a nontrivial basic set. It follows from Lemma 4 that all basic set of  $F$  that is contained in  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$  are coincide. Hence,  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{S}}$  is a unique nontrivial basic set of  $f$  contained in  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$ .

Now let  $\Omega$  be a backward  $g$ -invariant basic set of  $g$ . Note that the equality  $\Omega = g^{-1}(\Omega)$  implies that  $\Omega$  cannot be a trivial basic set, since  $g$  is a  $d$ -cover,  $d \geq 2$ . It follows from Lemma 2 that every point of  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$  is a non-wandering point of  $f$ . By Lemma 4,  $\mathfrak{S} \cap p_1^{-1}(\Omega)$  is a unique basic set. Theorem 1 is proved.  $\square$

*Example.* Let us consider three endomorphism  $g_i : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , that are 2-covers.  $g_1$  is defined by the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Clearly,  $g_1$  is an expanding A-endomorphism, and  $\mathbb{T}^2$  is a unique basic set of  $g_1$ . The corresponding diffeomorphism  $f$  has a unique basic set, say  $\Omega_1$ , that is locally homeomorphic to the product of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and Cantor set. Thus,  $\Omega_1$  is 2-dimensional.

Now, let us consider the case when  $\mathbb{T}^1 = S^1$  is a circle, and  $d$ -cover  $g : \mathbb{T}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  is a nonsingular endomorphism of  $S^1$ . The crucial step of the proof of Theorem 2 is the following result.

**Lemma 5** *Let  $g : \mathbb{T}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  be a nonsingular A-endomorphism, and  $NW(g)$  a non-wandering set of  $g$ . Then  $NW(g)$  is either  $\mathbb{T}^1$  or  $NW(g)$  is the union of the Cantor type set  $\Sigma$  and finitely many (nonzero) isolated attracting periodic orbits plus finitely many (possibly, zero) repelling isolated periodic orbits. Moreover, in the last case,  $\Sigma$  is backward  $g$ -invariant.*



*Proof.* Suppose that  $NW(g) \neq \mathbb{T}^1$ . By [19],  $g$  is semi-conjugate to the expanding linear mapping  $E_d$ ,  $E_d(t) = dt \bmod 1$ , i.e., there is a continuous map  $h : \mathbb{T}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  such that  $g \circ h = h \circ E_d$ . Moreover,  $h$  is monotone [14]. As a consequence, given any point  $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$ ,  $h^{-1}(t)$  is either a point or a closed segment. Since  $NW(g) \neq \mathbb{T}^1$ ,  $h$  is not a homeomorphism. Hence, there are points  $t \in \mathbb{T}^1$  for which  $h^{-1}(t)$  is a (nontrivial) closed segment. Denote the set of such points by  $\chi$ . The set  $\chi$  is countable and invariant under  $E_d$ ,  $E_d(\chi) = E_d^{-1}(\chi) = \chi$  [1, 14]. Therefore,  $h^{-1}(\chi)$  is also invariant under  $g$ . As a consequence,  $\Sigma = \mathbb{T}^1 \setminus \text{clos}(h^{-1}(\chi))$  is the Cantor set consisting on non-wandering points of  $g$ . Moreover,  $\Sigma$  is invariant under  $g$  (in particular, backward  $g$ -invariant). It follows from [15] that the part of  $NW(g)$  that different from  $\Sigma$  consists of finitely many (nonzero) isolated attracting periodic orbits and finitely many (possibly, zero) repelling isolated periodic orbits.  $\square$

Now, Theorem 2 except the realization part immediately follows from Theorem 1 and Lemma 5. It remains to construct a Smale-Vietoris A-diffeomorphism the non-wandering set of whose consists of a nontrivial zero-dimensional basic set and a finitely many (nonzero) isolated periodic orbits. It follows from [3, 5] for  $n = 3$  and [2, 23] for  $n \geq 4$  that it is sufficient to construct Smale skew-mapping  $F : S^1 \times D^{n-1} \rightarrow S^1 \times D^{n-1}$  with the non-wandering set desired because of Smale skew-mapping can be extended to a diffeomorphism of some closed  $n$ -manifold. Moreover, according to Robinson-Williams [18] construction of classical Smale solenoid, we can suppose  $n = 3$ .

Let  $g : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$  be a  $C^\infty$  nonsingular A-endomorphism that is a  $d$ -cover ( $d \geq 2$ ) with the non-wandering set  $NW(g)$  consisting of a unique attracting fixed point  $x_0$  and a Cantor set  $\Omega$ . Moreover, one can assume that  $Dg|_\Omega = 2d - 1$ ,  $Dg(x_0) = \lambda < 1$  where  $\lambda$  will be specified below. Such endomorphism was constructed by Shub [19]. Hirsch [9] has noticed that such endomorphism can be smoothed to be analytical. Now, the circle  $S^1$  is endowed with the parameter inducing by the natural projection  $[0; 1] \rightarrow [0; 1]/(0 \sim 1) = S^1$ . We can assume that the restriction  $g|_{[0; \frac{1}{2}]}$  is a diffeomorphism  $[0; \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow [0; \frac{1}{2}]$  with the attracting fixed point  $x_0 = \frac{1}{4}$  and two repelling fixed points  $0, \frac{1}{2}$ . Without loss of generality, one can also assume that  $g|_{[\frac{1}{2}; 1]}(x) = (2d - 1)x \bmod 1$ . By construction,  $\cup_{n \geq 0} g_d^{-n}(0; \frac{1}{2})$  is the stable manifold  $W^s(x_0)$  of  $x_0$ , and  $\Omega = S^1 \setminus W^s(x_0)$  is Cantor set belonging to  $NW(g)$ . Clearly, given any  $y \in S^1$ ,  $\min_{t_k, t_j} \{|t_k - t_j| = \frac{1}{2d-1}$  where  $t_k \neq t_j$  and  $g(t_k) = g(t_j) = y$ . We take  $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{\pi}{2d-1}$ . After this specification, we denote  $g$  by  $g_d$ . Put by definition

$$F(t, z) = \left( g_d(t), \lambda z + \frac{1}{2} \exp 2\pi i t \right), \quad F : \mathcal{B} = S^1 \times D^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, \quad (7)$$

where  $D^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is the unit disk, and  $z = x + iy$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a support of Smale skew-mapping. Since  $\lambda < \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $F(\mathcal{B}) \subset \text{int } \mathcal{B}$ . The Jacobian of  $F$  equals

$$DF(t, z) = \begin{pmatrix} Dg_d(t) & 0 \\ \pi i \exp 2\pi i t & \lambda Id_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where  $Id_2$  is the identity matrix on  $\mathbb{C}$  or  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Since  $Dg_d > 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $F$  is a local diffeomorphism. It follows from  $\lambda < \frac{1}{4} \sin \frac{\pi}{2d-1}$  that  $F$  is a (global) diffeomorphism on its image.

Since  $g_d$  is an A-endomorphism, the periodic points of  $g_d$  are dense in  $NW(g_d)$ . By Lemma 2, the periodic points of  $F$  are dense in  $NW(F)$ . Thus, it remains to prove the  $NW(F)$  has a hyperbolic structure. We follow [17], Proposition 8.7.5. Clearly, the tangent bundle  $T(\mathcal{B}) = T(S^1 \times D^2)$  is the sum  $T(\mathcal{B}) = T(S^1) \oplus T(D^2)$ , and the fiber  $T_{(t,z)}(\mathcal{B})$  at each point  $(t, z) \in \mathcal{B}$  is the

sum of one-dimensional and two-dimensional tangent spaces  $T_t(S^1) = \mathbb{E}^1 \cong \mathbb{R}$ ,  $T_z(T^2) = \mathbb{E}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^2$  respectively. It follows from (8) that  $\mathbb{E}^2$  is invariant under  $DF$ :

$$DF_p \begin{pmatrix} \vec{0} \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{0} \\ \lambda \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{v}_{23} \in \mathbb{E}^2.$$

Moreover, since  $|\lambda| < 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^2$  is the stable bundle,  $E^s = \mathbb{E}^2$ .

Take  $q = (t, z) \in NW(F)$ . Then  $p_1(q) = t \in NW(g_d)$ . If  $t = x_0$ , then  $q$  is a hyperbolic (attractive) fixed point of  $F$ . For  $t \in \Omega$ , we consider the cones

$$C_q^u = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1 \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix} : \vec{v}_1 \in T_t(S^1), \vec{v}_{23} \in \mathbb{E}_z^2, \quad |\vec{v}_1| \geq \frac{2d-1}{4} |\vec{v}_{23}| \right\} \subset T(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{E}^1 \oplus \mathbb{E}^2.$$

For  $\begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1 \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix} \in C_q^u$ , it follows from (8) that

$$DF \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1 \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}'_1 \\ \vec{v}'_{23} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (2d-1)\vec{v}_1 \\ \pi i \vec{v}_1 \exp 2\pi i t + \lambda \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence,  $|\vec{v}'_{23}| \leq |\pi i \exp 2\pi i t \vec{v}_1| + \lambda |\vec{v}_{23}| = \pi |\vec{v}_1| + \lambda |\vec{v}_{23}|$ . Taking in mind  $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} |\vec{v}'_1| &= (2d-1)|\vec{v}_1| = \frac{2d-1}{4}(4|\vec{v}_1|) \geq \frac{2d-1}{4} \left( \pi |\vec{v}_1| + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{v}_1| \right) \geq \\ &\geq \frac{2d-1}{4} \left( \pi |\vec{v}_1| + \frac{2d-1}{8} |\vec{v}_{23}| \right) \geq \frac{2d-1}{4} (\pi |\vec{v}_1| + \lambda |\vec{v}_{23}|) \geq \frac{2d-1}{4} |\vec{v}'_{23}|, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\frac{2d-1}{8} \geq \frac{1}{4}$ . Therefore,  $\begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}'_1 \\ \vec{v}'_{23} \end{pmatrix} \in C_{F(q)}^u$  and  $DF(C_q^u) \subset C_{F(q)}^u$ . As a consequence,

$$DF^k(C_{F^{-k}(q)}^u) \subset DF^{k-1}(C_{F^{-k+1}(q)}^u) \subset \cdots \subset DF(C_{F^{-1}(q)}^u) \subset C_q^u \quad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To prove that the intersection of this nested cones is a line, take

$$\begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1 \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \vec{w}_1 \\ \vec{w}_{23} \end{pmatrix} \in C_{F^{-k}(q)}^u, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1^k \\ \vec{v}_{23}^k \end{pmatrix} = DF^k \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_1 \\ \vec{v}_{23} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \vec{w}_1^k \\ \vec{w}_{23}^k \end{pmatrix} = DF^k \begin{pmatrix} \vec{w}_1 \\ \vec{w}_{23} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Put by definition,  $|\vec{v}_1^j| = v_1^j$ ,  $|\vec{w}_1^j| = w_1^j$ ,  $\vec{v}_1 = (v_1, 0)$ ,  $\vec{w}_1 = (w_1, 0)$ ,  $v_1 > 0$ ,  $w_1 > 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\vec{v}_{23}^1}{v_1^1} - \frac{\vec{w}_{23}^1}{w_1^1} \right| &= \left| \frac{\pi i \vec{v}_1 \exp 2\pi i t + \lambda \vec{v}_{23}}{(2d-1)v_1} - \frac{\pi i \vec{w}_1 \exp 2\pi i t + \lambda \vec{w}_{23}}{w_1} \right| = \\ &= \left| \frac{\pi i \exp 2\pi i t (w_1 \vec{v}_1 - v_1 \vec{w}_1)}{(2d-1)v_1 w_1} + \frac{\lambda}{2d-1} \left( \frac{\vec{v}_{23}}{v_1} - \frac{\vec{w}_{23}}{w_1} \right) \right| = \frac{\lambda}{2d-1} \left| \frac{\vec{v}_{23}}{v_1} - \frac{\vec{w}_{23}}{w_1} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

since  $w_1 \vec{v}_1 - v_1 \vec{w}_1 = |\vec{w}_1| \vec{v}_1 - |\vec{v}_1| \vec{w}_1 = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{\vec{v}_{23}^k}{v_1^k} - \frac{\vec{w}_{23}^k}{w_1^k} \right| = \left( \frac{\lambda}{2d-1} \right)^k \left| \frac{\vec{v}_{23}}{v_1} - \frac{\vec{w}_{23}}{w_1} \right|,$$

which goes to 0 as  $k$  goes to  $\infty$ . Since the difference of slopes goes to 0, the cones converge to a line, say  $\mathbb{E}^u$ . The calculation gives that the restriction of the derivative  $DF$  on  $\mathbb{E}^u$  is an expansion.  $\square$

Taking in mind the realization part of the proof of Theorem 2, we see that it is sufficient to construct the corresponding family of  $d$ -endomorphisms  $S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ ,  $d \geq 2$ . First, we represent the two parameter family of circle endomorphisms  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  continuously depending on the parameters  $\varepsilon \in (0; 1)$  and  $\delta \in [0; \frac{1}{4}]$ .

Let  $U_\delta(x)$  be the bump-function such that

- $U_\delta(x) = 1$  for  $x \in [-\frac{\delta}{2}; +\frac{\delta}{2}]$ ,  $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ ;
- $U_\delta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq \delta$ ;
- $U'_\delta(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in [-\delta; -\frac{\delta}{2}]$ , and  $U'_\delta(x) \leq 0$  for  $x \in [\frac{\delta}{2}; \delta]$ .

**Lemma 6** *Let*

$$f_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) = \begin{cases} dx + (-d + \varepsilon)xU_\delta(x) \bmod 1 & \text{for } \varepsilon \in (0; 1), \delta \in (0; \frac{1}{4}) \\ dx \bmod 1 & \text{for } \varepsilon = 0, \delta = 0 \end{cases}$$

*Then  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  is a structurally stable nonsingular circle  $d$ -endomorphism such that the non-wandering set  $NW(f_{\varepsilon, \delta})$  is the union of a unique hyperbolic attracting point  $x = 0$  and a Cantor set provided  $\varepsilon \neq 0$  and  $\delta \neq 0$ . Moreover,  $NW(f_{0,0}) = S^1$ . In addition,  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta} \rightarrow E_d$  as  $\varepsilon \neq 0$  is fixed and  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in the  $C^0$  topology.*

*Proof.* For  $\varepsilon \neq 0$  and  $\delta \neq 0$ , we see

$$f'_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) = d + (-d + \varepsilon)[xU'_\delta(x) + U_\delta(x)] = d + (-d + \varepsilon)xU'_\delta(x) + (-d + \varepsilon)U_\delta(x).$$

Clearly,  $d + (-d + \varepsilon)U_\delta(x) \geq \varepsilon$ . Since  $xU'_\delta(x) \leq 0$ ,  $f'_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) \geq \varepsilon$ . Because of outside of the  $\delta$ -neighborhood  $V_\delta(0)$  of  $x_0 = 0$  the mapping  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  coincides with the linear  $d$ -endomorphism  $E_d(x) = dx \bmod 1$ ,  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  is a nonsingular  $d$ -endomorphism. Since  $f'_{\varepsilon, \delta}(0) = \varepsilon \in (0; 1)$ ,  $x = 0$  is a hyperbolic attracting point. Solving the equation  $dx + (-d + \varepsilon)xU_\delta(x) = x$ , one gets two fixed points  $\pm x_* \in V_\delta(0)$  such that  $U_\delta(\pm x_*) = \frac{d-1}{d-\varepsilon}$ , where  $\frac{\delta}{2} < x_* < \delta$ . Moreover, the  $\omega$ -limit set of any point from  $(-x_*; x_*)$  is  $x_0 = 0$ . Hence,  $NW(f_{\varepsilon, \delta})$  equals

$$NW(f_{\varepsilon, \delta}) = \{x_0\} \bigcup (S^1 \setminus \bigcup_{k \geq 0} f_{\varepsilon, \delta}^{-k}(-x_*; x_*)),$$

where  $C = S^1 \setminus \bigcup_{k \geq 0} f_{\varepsilon, \delta}^{-k}(-x_*; x_*)$  is Cantor set. For any  $x \in C$ , one can prove that

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) &= d + (-d + \varepsilon)xU'_\delta(x) + (-d + \varepsilon)U_\delta(x) \geq d + (-d + \varepsilon)U_\delta(x_*) + (-d + \varepsilon)xU'_\delta(x) = \\ &= 1 + (-d + \varepsilon)xU'_\delta(x) > 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from [15] that  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta}$  is structurally stable. At last, for  $x \in V_\delta(0)$ , one gets

$$|f_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) - E_d(x)| = |(-d + \varepsilon)xU_\delta(x)| \leq \delta d \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

As a consequence,  $f_{\varepsilon, \delta} \rightarrow E_d$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in the  $C^0$  topology.  $\square$

Taking in mind Lemma 6 and using the technics developed in [5] (see also [2, 3, 11, 23]), one can prove Theorem 3.

## References

- [1] **Aranson S.Kh., Belitsky G., Zhuzhoma E.** *Introduction to Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems on Closed Surfaces*. Translations of Math. Monographs, Amer. Math. Soc., **153**(1996).
- [2] **Block L.** Diffeomorphisms obtained from endomorphisms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **214**(1975), 403-413.
- [3] **Bothe H.** The ambient structure of expanding attractors, II. Solenoids in 3-manifolds. *Math. Nachr.*, **112**(1983), 69-102.
- [4] **Bothe H.** Transversally wild expanding attractors. *Math. Nachr.*, **157**(1992), 25-49.
- [5] **Boju Jiang, Yi Ni, Shicheng Wang.** 3-manifolds that admit knotted solenoids as attractors. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **356**(2004), 4371-43-82.
- [6] **Childress S., Gilbert A.** *Stretch, twist and fold: the fast dynamo*. Lecture Notes in Physics, **37**, Springer-Verlag, **1995**.
- [7] **van Danzig D.** Über topologisch homogene Kontinua. *Fund. Math.*, **14**(1930), 102-105.
- [8] **Farrell F., Jones L.** New attractors in hyperbolic dynamics. *Jour. Diff. Geom.*, **15**(1980), 107-133.
- [9] **Hirsch M.W.** A stable analytic foliation with only exceptional minimal sets. *Lect. Notes in Math.*, **468**(1975), 9-10.
- [10] **Isaenkova N., Zhuzhoma E.** On classification of one-dimensional expanding attractors. *Math. Notes*, **86**(2009), no 3, 333-341.
- [11] **Jiming Ma, Bin Yu.** The realization of Smale solenoid type attractors in 3-manifolds. *Topology and its Appl.*, **154**(2007), 3021-3031.
- [12] **Jiming Ma, Bin Yu.** Genus two Smale-Williams solenoids in 3-manifolds. *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, **20**(2011), 909-926.
- [13] **Jones L.** Locally strange hyperbolic sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **275**(1983), no 1, 153-162.
- [14] **de Melo W., van Strien S.** *One-Dimensional Dynamics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, NY, **1993**.
- [15] **Nitecki Z.** Nonsingular endomorphisms of the circle. *Proc. Symp. Pure Math.*, **14**(1970), 203-220.
- [16] **Przytycki F.** Anosov endomorphisms. *Studia Math.*, **58**(1977), 3, 249-285.
- [17] **Robinson C.** *Dynamical Systems: stability, symbolic dynamics, and chaos*. Studies in Adv. Math., Sec. edition, CRC Press, **1999**.

- [18] **Robinson C., Williams R.** Classification of expanding attractors: an example. *Topology*, **15**(1976), 321-323.
- [19] **Shub M.** Endomorphisms of compact differentiable manifolds. *Amer. Journ. Math.*, **91**(1969), 175-199.
- [20] **Smale S.** Differentiable dynamical systems. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **73**(1967), 747-817.
- [21] **Takens F.** Multiplications in solenoids as hyperbolic attractors. *Topology and Appl.*, **152**(2005), 219-225.
- [22] **Vietoris L.** Über den höheren Zusammenhahg kompakter Räume und Klasse von zusammenhangstreuen Abbildungen. *Math. Ann.*, **97**(1927), 454-472.
- [23] **Williams R.F.** One-dimensional non-wandering sets. *Topology*, **6**(1967), 473-487.
- [24] **Williams R.** Expanding attractors. *Publ. Math. IHES*, **43**(1974), 169-203.

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Nizhny Novgorod Academy MVD of Russia

*E-mail:* zhuzhoma@mail.ru, nisaenkova@mail.ru