

## ABSTRACT

### Hubbard Trees and Their Properties

Cordell Hammon, Ph.D.

Mentor: Jonathan Meddaugh, Ph.D.

A Hubbard tree is a set of points at the core of dendritic Julia sets. These trees encapsulate all the information about the larger Julia set, but in a much smaller, easier to understand structure. We discuss the structure of Hubbard trees, in particular, we provide a useful definition of branch point and endpoint. Afterwards, we demonstrate the existence of some trees that cannot be Hubbard trees in any meaningful context. Later, we turn our attention to the structure of inverse limits of Hubbard trees, making use of the definition of branch point and endpoint tenured earlier in the work and demonstrate that one Hubbard tree, with minor alterations, can generate infinitely many mutually non-homeomorphic inverse limits.

HOLD FOR SIGNATURE

Copyright © 2023 by Cordell Hammon

All rights reserved

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vi
DEDICATION .....	vii
1 Introduction and Preliminaries .....	1
1.1 Overview .....	1
1.2 Preliminary Definitions, Notation, and Concepts .....	9
2 Branch Points and The Structure of Hubbard Trees .....	18
2.1 Branch Points .....	18
2.2 The Structure of Hubbard Trees .....	20
3 Trees That Cannot Be Hubbard Trees .....	31
3.1 Two Sufficient Conditions for non-Hubbardizablity .....	33
3.2 A Full Classification of all Hubbardizable Trees with Fewer than Four Branch Points .....	40
4 Branch Points and Endpoints of Hubbard Tree Inverse Limits .....	54
5 Constructing Infinite Families with Pairwise Non-Homeomorphic Inverse Limits .....	61
5.1 Different Hubbard Tree, Same Dendrite, Different Inverse Limit .....	65
5.2 Same Hubbard tree, Same Dendritic Julia set, Different Inverse Limits ..	73
6 Further Work .....	80
6.1 Future Directions For Chapter Three .....	80
6.2 Future Directions For Chapter Five .....	80
APPENDIX .....	83
A Kneading Sequence Arguments .....	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	97

## LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	The Mandelbrot Set .....	1
1.2	A zoomed in Mandelbrot set .....	2
1.3	A QR Code for a gif zooming into the Mandelbrot Set .....	3
1.4	Multibrot sets for $f(z) = z^d + c$ for $d \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ .....	4
1.5	A QR Code for a video of multibrot sets for powers $0 \leq d \leq 8$ .....	5
1.6	Examples of Julia sets .....	6
2.1	Comparison Between Different Definitions of Endpoint .....	18
2.2	Examples of Hubbard trees .....	21
2.3	Hubbard tree with kneading sequence $\overline{*110}$ .....	26
3.1	A tree, $T$ , for which there does not exist a function $f : T \rightarrow T$ such that $(T, f)$ is a Hubbard tree .....	33
3.2	The trees $F_1^4$ , $F_2^4$ , and $F_3^4$ .....	36
3.3	$F_2^4$ with branch points labeled .....	37
5.1	Using 5.2.1 to construct a Hubbard tree with different kneading sequence .	78

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you, of course, to my loving parents without whom I would not be here. Your support through these many years of life is priceless. Many thanks as well to my pals Davis, John, and Mitch for helping form me into the man I am now. To Mylan Redfern, you were the first math professor to take an interest in me, the first who made it seem like I could be a mathematician too. You inspired me. This dissertation would not be possible without the many hours of help from Jonathan Meddaugh. Without your guidance and expertise, this may well have taken two more years. I owe much to the people on the board. Brian Raines, your introductory Topology course is what first made me interested in the subject. Thank you for taking me on as a pupil. Scott Varda, thank you for taking a step out of your comfort zone to read a Mathematics dissertation. David Ryden, thank you for putting in the time to do this.

Shout-outs to Beartown: Alden, Emily, Jacob, James, Josefina, and Sunday for the laughs, the meals, and the high spirits throughout our shared time at Baylor. Along these same lines, my dog, Mango, is always a bright spot whose boundless enthusiasm rubs off on me on particularly stressful days.

To my in-laws, Maddie, Ronnie, and Candice: thank you for making me feel like a part of the family. Nana and Papa, y'all are the coolest grandparents a boy can have.

To Ayra

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction and Preliminaries

#### *1.1 Overview*

There is an old joke that goes:

Q: What does the “B.” in Benoit B. Mandelbrot stand for?

A: Benoit B. Mandelbrot.

The black shape seen in Figure 1.1 is called the Mandelbrot set and is named after Benoit B. Mandelbrot who popularized it in 1982 [Man82], although it was likely first described by Brooks and Matelski in 1981 [BM81]. We say “likely first described” because the question of “who discovered the Mandelbrot set?” is surprisingly difficult to answer. The 1990 article by Horgan [Hor90] does a fantastic job of digging into the history of the beloved shape.




Figure 1.1. The Mandelbrot Set



The beginning joke is funny (or, at the very least, funny to some mathematicians) because the Mandelbrot set is “quasi-self-similar”. That is, when one zooms in on certain portions of the Mandelbrot set, one can find another almost exact copy of the Mandelbrot set. In fact any neighborhood of a point in the boundary of the Mandelbrot set, contains infinitely many embedded copies of the Mandelbrot set [Mil89]. Such a zoom in can be found in Figure 1.2. This figure is magnified roughly two hundred thousand times compared to Figure 1.1. Both figures were created by Wolfgang Beyer with the program Ultra Fractal 3., CC BY-SA 3.0 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>, via Wikimedia Commons.




Figure 1.2. A zoomed in Mandelbrot set centered at  $-.743643135 + .131825963i$

To see a gif zooming in on the Mandelbrot set scan the QR Code in Figure 1.3. The gif was created by Simpsons contributor at English Wikipedia, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons. For those people reading a digital version of this dissertation, you can view the gif by [clicking here](#).

The Mandelbrot set, denoted  $\mathcal{M}$ , is of primary importance in the study of iteration of complex polynomials and, not surprisingly, is constructed via iteration of complex



Figure 1.3. A QR Code for a gif zooming into the Mandelbrot Set

valued polynomials. For a given complex number,  $c$  we define  $f_c(z) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$ . The Mandelbrot set is defined as follows:

*Definition 1.1.1:*  $\mathcal{M} = \{c \in \mathbb{C} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_c^n(0) \neq \infty\}$ .

So, for example, consider  $c = i$ . Then  $f_i(z) = z^2 + i$ . Now consider the points to which 0 maps under iteration of  $f_i$ .

- $f_i(0) = 0^2 + i = i$ ,
- $f_i(i) = i^2 + i = -1 + i$ ,
- $f_i(-1 + i) = (-1 + i)^2 + i = -i$ ,
- $f_i(-i) = (-i)^2 + i = -1 + i$

From here, if we continue to iterate  $f_i$  we get repeating outputs  $-i, -1 + i, -i, -1 + i, \dots$  and so it is clear that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_i^n(0) \neq \infty$ . Thus  $i$  is in the Mandelbrot set. In this way, the Mandelbrot set is made by varying  $c$  and iterating  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$  starting with  $z = 0$ .

While there is only one set known as “The Mandelbrot Set” (the set associated with the function  $f(z) = z^2 + c$ ), there are similar sets corresponding to different functions  $f(z) = z^d + c$ . These sets are often called “multibrot sets” to distinguish them from “The” Mandelbrot set. Figure 1.4 shows the multibrot sets for the powers 3, 4, 5, and 6. All multibrot set images were created by Cuddlyable3, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons.




Figure 1.4. Multibrot sets for  $f(z) = z^d + c$  for  $d \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$

To see a video of various multibrot sets for  $f(z) = z^d + c$  as  $d$  varies from zero to eight scan the QR Code in Figure 1.5. For those people reading a digital version of this dissertation, you can view the video by [clicking here](#). The video was created by George, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons.




Figure 1.5. A QR Code for a video of various multibrot sets for  $f(z) = z^d + c$  as  $d$  varies from zero to eight

There is another structure ; similar to the Mandelbrot set and closely related but discovered nearly a half century earlier. This structure is the Julia set of a polynomial. Whereas  $\mathcal{M}$  is made by fixing  $z = 0$  and varying  $c$  in  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$ , the Julia set of  $f_c(z)$  is made by fixing  $c$  and varying the inputs  $z$ .


*Definition 1.1.2:* For a complex polynomial,  $f$ , the filled Julia set of  $f$ , denoted  $K(f)$ , is the set  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(z) \neq \infty\}$ . The Julia set of  $f$ , denoted  $J(f)$ , is the boundary of  $K(f)$ , i.e.  $J(f) = \partial K(f)$ .

If the polynomial is of the form  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$ , we write  $K_c$  and  $J_c$  for the filled Julia set of  $f_c(z)$  and the Julia set of  $f_c(z)$ .


Julia sets are named after Gaston Julia, who first described them in [Jul18]. Examples of Julia sets can be found in Figure 1.6. Figure 1.6b is cropped from the original by Morn, CC BY-SA 4.0 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>, via Wikimedia Commons. Figure 1.6c was made by Adam majewski, CC BY 3.0 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>, via Wikimedia Commons.

So, although there is only one Mandelbrot set, each complex parameter  $c$  has its own Julia set. As is evident from the definitions, the Mandelbrot sets and Julia sets are closely linked. In fact, a result from [Jul18] which states that  $K_c$  is connected if and only if  $K_c$  contains 0, gives an alternate characterization of the Mandelbrot set, equivalent to that found in Definition 1.1.1.


*Theorem 1.1.3:*  $\mathcal{M} = \{c \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \in K_c\} = \{c \in \mathbb{C} : K_c \text{ is connected}\}.$



(a) Julia set of  $c = -0.4 + 0.6i$



(b) Julia set of  $c \approx -0.5125 + 0.5213i$



(c) The Julia set of  $c = i$

Figure 1.6. Examples of Julia sets

But there is a deeper connection still. In [Tan90] it was shown that, if  $c \in \mathcal{M}$ , then sufficiently small neighborhoods of  $c$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $J_c$  are asymptotically similar [that is, they behave similarly under iteration of  $f_c$  and more visually inspiring, they neighborhoods around  $c$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $J_c$  look indistinguishable]. For some truly inspiring visualizations of the similarities between  $J_c$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  around  $c$  we point the interested reader to [Tan90], in particular Figures 9 - 12. Along these lines of connection, it has been shown that boundary of the Mandelbrot set has Hausdorff dimension 2 and, there exists a dense set of points in  $c$  in  $\partial\mathcal{M}$  for which  $J_c$  has Hausdorff dimension 2 [Shi98].

The Julia set found in Figure 1.6c is  $K_i$  [i.e. the filled Julia set for  $f_i(z) = z^2 + i$ ]. A special property of this filled Julia set is that it has no interior [i.e.  $J_i = K_i$ ]. Such Julia sets are called *dendritic Julia sets* and always arise when 0 is strictly pre-periodic under  $f_c$  but can arise when 0 is periodic under  $f_c$ . If 0 is strictly pre-periodic under  $f_c$ , then  $c$  is a *Misurewicz point* so named after Michał Misurewicz who studied pre-periodic points in [Mis81]. The name “dendritic” Julia set follows from the fact that these Julia sets are, in fact, dendrites. We fully define the term dendrite in Definition 1.2.2.

In 1984 and 1985 Adrien Douady and John Hubbard released the monumental *Étude dynamique des polynômes complexes. Partie I.* and *Étude dynamique des polynômes complexes. Partie II.* ([DH84; DH85]). These books are collectively referred to as the “Orsay Notes” since they are based on notes written by Douady for a course he taught on holomorphic dynamical systems at Paris-Sud 11 University, Orsay in 1983-84.

In the Orsay Notes, Douady and Hubbard focus on holomorphic dynamical systems and, in particular, the iteration of those polynomials  $x^2 + c$  whose Julia set is dendritic. They showed that to each dendritic Julia set,  $J_c$ , there belongs a core, called a Hubbard tree. The Hubbard tree is the the convex hull — in  $J_c$  — of the orbit of 0 under  $f_c$ . When studying dendritic Julia sets, it is often sufficient to study the Hubbard tree, a much simpler structure. In fact, the Hubbard tree captures all the dynamics of the dendritic Julia set in the sense that, if  $T_c$  is the Hubbard tree of  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$ , then  $J_c = \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \omega} f_c^{-n}(T)}$ . For more information about Hubbard trees and their relation to Julia sets, we point the interested reader to [Poi10].

Like many things in mathematics, the concept of “Hubbard tree” has been generalized. These generalized Hubbard trees — which are officially called “generalized Hubbard trees” — are trees,  $T$ , along with associated functions,  $f$ , such that the pair  $(T, f)$  shares many of the same properties that a standard Hubbard tree and its quadratic polynomial possess and are the main focus of this work. The full definition of generalized Hubbard tree is given in Definition 1.2.17.

However, Hubbard trees and Julia sets are not the only tools used to understand dynamical systems. One such useful tool is that of the inverse limit. Inverse limits originated in the field of category theory but have been quickly adopted by those studying dynamical systems. We give the dynamical systems definition here.

*Definition 1.1.4:* Given a sequence of spaces  $\langle X_i \rangle_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and functions  $f_i : X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i$ , we say the *inverse limit* of the system  $\{X_i, f_i\}$ , denoted  $\varprojlim \{X_i, f_i\}$ , is the subset of

the product space  $\prod X_i$  to which the point  $x$  belongs if and only if  $f_i(x_{i+1}) = x_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

This is especially useful if each  $X_i, f_i$  is the same (e.g. the polynomial  $f(z) = z^2 + c$  iterating on  $\mathbb{C}$ ). In this case, instead of writing  $\varprojlim \{X_i, f_i\}$  we simply write  $\varprojlim \{X, f\}$ . In this case, an inverse limit is a single object that is related to a dynamical system and that captures all the dynamics of the associated system. Each point in the inverse limit space is a thread that contains the entire history of a single point in the underlying space  $X$ . Similarly, for any point  $p \in X$ , one can consider the set of all the points in  $\varprojlim \{X, f\}$  which have  $p$  in their first coordinate. This set of points is the set of all possible paths one can take to arrive at  $p$ .

For the purposes of this paper, each space  $X_i$  is the same space and each function  $f_i$  is the same

Inverse limits of Julia sets and other closely related structures have been studied by many (e.g. [Bal07], [RŠ07], [Ing95], [Ing00]). In this paper we will study, in part, the various functions  $f$  that can be associated with a single tree  $T$  such that  $(T, f)$  is a generalized Hubbard tree, as well as the various inverse limits which arise from these different functions.

## 1.2 Preliminary Definitions, Notation, and Concepts

We will use  $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  are the sets of positive integers, integers, real numbers, and complex numbers, respectively, and we let  $\omega = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  denote the set of nonnegative integers.



For a function  $f : X \rightarrow X$ ,  $f^n$  denotes the composition of  $f$  with itself  $n$  times (with  $f^0$  being the identity function). For  $x \in X$ , the *orbit of  $x$  under  $f$*  is the set  $Orb_f(x) = \{f^n(x)\}_{n \in \omega}$ . If  $f$  is clear from context we write  $Orb(x)$  for  $Orb_f(x)$ . If  $f^n(x) = x$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $x$  is said to be a *periodic point of period  $n$* . If  $n$  is minimal in this regard, we say that  $x$  has *prime period  $n$* . If there exists a minimal  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f^n(x)$  is periodic under  $f$  but  $f^{n-1}(x)$  is not periodic under  $f$ , we say that  $x$  is *pre-periodic* with respect to  $f$ .

We adopt the following notation concerning sequences. A sequence in a space  $X$  is a function whose domain is some (possibly unbounded) interval in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . A sequence is *right-infinite* if its domain is of the form  $[n, \infty)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . A right-infinite sequence with unspecified domain will be assumed to have domain equal to  $\omega$ . Similarly, a *left-infinite sequence* is one with domain of the form  $(-\infty, n]$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a left-infinite sequence with unspecified domain will be assumed to have domain  $(-\infty, 0]$ . A *bi-infinite sequence* is one with domain equal to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . A *finite sequence* is one with domain of the form  $[n, m]$  for some  $n < m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and is said to have length  $m - n + 1$ . A finite sequence of length  $l$  and unspecified domain will be assumed to have domain equal to  $[0, l - 1]$ .

It will be useful in the development of our results to discuss the restriction of a (finite or infinite) sequence to a smaller domain. If  $[n, m]$  is a subset of the domain of a sequence  $z$ , we use  $z_{[n, m]}$  to denote the restriction of  $z$  to the domain  $[n, m]$  and  $z_n$  to denote the image of  $n$ . If  $z$  is left or right infinite, we use  $z_{(-\infty, n]}$  or  $z_{[n, \infty)}$  to denote the appropriate restricted sequence.

For clarity and convenience, it will be useful to tell whether a sequence is bi-infinite, left-infinite, or right-infinite at a quick glance. To make this distinction, we will use a bar, left-arrow, or right-arrow over a symbol to emphasize that it is bi-infinite ( $\overline{z}$ ), left infinite ( $\overleftarrow{z}$ ), or right infinite ( $\overrightarrow{z}$ ), respectively. If  $\overline{z}$  is a bi-infinite sequence and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we will use  $\overleftarrow{z}_n$  to denote the left-infinite sequence  $\overline{z}_{(-\infty, n]}$  and  $\overrightarrow{z}_n$  is the right infinite string  $\overline{z}_{[n, \infty)}$ . We will also use this system of notation for domain-restriction on left/right-infinite sequences, e.g. if  $\overrightarrow{z}$  is a right-infinite sequence, then  $\overrightarrow{z}_n = \overrightarrow{z}_{[n, \infty)}$  and  $\overleftarrow{z}_n = \overleftarrow{z}_{(-\infty, n]}$  (and similarly for left-infinite sequences).

Finally, we define the *shift map*,  $\sigma$  on the space of right- or bi-infinite sequences as follows. If  $\alpha$  is a right-infinite (or bi-infinite sequence), then the shift of  $\alpha$ , denoted  $\sigma(\alpha)$ , is the right-infinite (or bi-infinite) sequence  $\beta$  such that  $\beta_n = \alpha_{n+1}$  for all  $n$  in the domain of  $\alpha$ . So, if  $\alpha = \alpha_0\alpha_1\alpha_2\ldots$  then  $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\ldots$ . Note that  $\sigma$  is invertible on the space of bi-infinite sequences.

We end our barrage of definitions associated with sequence with an operation that helps us work with sequences.

*Definition 1.2.1:* We use  $\frown$  to notate string concatenation. For example, if  $\alpha = 110$  and  $\beta = ABC$  then  $\alpha \frown \beta = 110ABC$ . Furthermore, we use an overline to denote infinite repeating strings. So  $\overline{1} = 111111\ldots$

Our primary method for investigation of Julia sets will be through the use of *abstract dendritic Julia sets*, which we formally define in Definition 1.2.10 after the following preliminary notions which are adapted from [Bal07].

A *continuum* is a compact, connected, metric space. A continuum  $X$  is *uniquely arcwise connected* provided that, for any two distinct points  $p, q \in X$ , there is exactly one arc in  $X$  with  $p$  and  $q$  as endpoints. We will use  $[p, q]$  to denote this arc, and define  $(p, q) = [p, q] \setminus \{p, q\}$ .

*Definition 1.2.2:* A *dendrite* is a uniquely arcwise connected, locally connected continuum.

Note that finite acyclic graphs consisting of exactly one non-trivial component are dendrites. However, dendrites can also have significantly more complicated structure.

*Definition 1.2.3:* We say that a function  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is *locally one-to-one* at a point  $x \in D$  if there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  such that  $f|_U$  is one-to-one. A point at which  $f$  is not locally one-to-one will be called a *turning point* of  $f$ . A map from a dendrite into itself will be called *unimodal* if it has at most one turning point. A map  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is *locally eventually onto* (l.e.o) if for any open set  $U \subset D$  there exists  $n \in \omega$  with  $f^n(U) = D$ .

*Lemma 1.2.4:* Let  $D$  be a dendrite and  $f : D \rightarrow D$  be continuous. Then  $f$  is injective on any connected subset which does not contain a turning point.

*Proof.* Suppose  $x$  and  $y$  are distinct points of  $D$  with  $f(x) = f(y)$ . Let  $p = f(x)$  and let  $I = f([x, y])$ . If  $I$  is a singleton, then every point in  $[x, y]$  is a turning point. Otherwise, since  $I$  is a dendrite,  $I$  has at least two endpoints (one of which may be  $p$ ). Let  $q$  be an endpoint of  $I$  distinct from  $p$  and let  $r \in [x, y]$  be a preimage of  $q$ . Then  $f$  cannot be locally one-to-one at  $r$  so  $r$  is a turning point.  $\square$

*Definition 1.2.5:* Let  $f : D \rightarrow D$  be a unimodal map on a dendrite with turning point  $t$ . We define a *leg* of  $D$  (with respect to  $t$ ) to be a component of  $D - \{t\}$  and a *pseudoleg* of  $D$  to be a union of legs of  $D$  on which  $f$  is one-to-one.

*Definition 1.2.6:* Let  $f : D \rightarrow D$  be a unimodal map on a dendrite with turning point  $t$  and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a partition of  $D \setminus \{t\}$  into (pseudo)legs.

The *itinerary* of a point  $x \in D$  with respect to  $f$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is the sequence  $\iota(x, f, \mathcal{S}) = \iota_0 \iota_1 \iota_2 \dots$  of labels defined by  $\iota_n = k$  if and only if  $f^n(x) \in S_k$ .

The *kneading sequence* of the function  $f$  with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ , written  $\tau(f, \mathcal{S})$ , is defined as the sequence  $\iota(t, f, \mathcal{S})$ . If  $f$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $t$  are obvious from context, we write  $\iota(x)$  for  $\iota(x, f, \mathcal{S})$  and  $\tau$  for  $\tau(f, \mathcal{S})$ .

*Definition 1.2.7:* If  $\alpha = a_0 a_1 \dots a_n$  is periodic with  $\alpha_0 = *$ , and  $\beta = b_0 b_1 \dots$  are two strings, we define the product  $\alpha \circ \beta = b_0 a_1 a_2 \dots a_n b_1 a_1 a_2 \dots a_n b_3 \dots$ .

We say a kneading sequence is a *composite sequence* if it is the product of two strings, and *prime* otherwise.

It is common in the literature to use a  $*$  in place of  $\circ$  in the definition above. We use  $\circ$  instead since for us  $*$  signifies the third symbol of our alphabet.

*Definition 1.2.8:* Let  $f : D \rightarrow D$  be a unimodal map on a dendrite with turning point  $t$  and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a partition of  $D \setminus \{t\}$  into (pseudo)legs. The map  $f$  has the *unique itinerary property* with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$  provided that if  $\iota(x) = \iota(y)$ , then  $x = y$ .

*Definition 1.2.9:* A unimodal map  $f : D \rightarrow D$  with turning point  $t$  is said to be *self-similar* if there is a partition  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $D \setminus \{t\}$  into (pseudo)legs so that for each (pseudo)leg  $M$ ,  $f(M \cup \{t\}) = D$ .

*Definition 1.2.10:* An *abstract dendritic Julia set* is a pair  $(D, f)$  where  $D$  is a dendrite and  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a unimodal map such that there is a partition  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $D \setminus \{t\}$  into (pseudo)legs with respect to which  $f$  is self-similar and has the unique itinerary property.

An abstract dendritic Julia set is said to be *quadratic* provided that no point has more than two pre-images under  $f$ . In this case, we say that the dendrite is a triple,  $(D, H, f)$  such that  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a unimodal map such that there is a partition  $\{S_1, S_0\}$  of  $D \setminus \{t\}$  into (pseudo)legs such that  $f(S_0 \cup \{t\}) = f(S_1 \cup \{t\}) = D$ .  $H$  is the Hubbard tree of  $f$  and is the convex hull of  $Orb_f(t)$  in  $D$ .

From here on, anytime we discuss an abstract dendritic Julia set, we mean a quadratic abstract dendritic Julia set.

Note that the class of quadratic abstract dendritic Julia sets contains the class of dendritic Julia sets arising from the iteration of quadratic complex polynomials [Bal10, Theorem 2.5]. In this case, for itinerary purposes, we denote the set containing the turning point with “\*”. So our partition of  $D$  is  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_0, S_1, *\}$ .

Furthermore, in this case, the kneading sequence  $\tau$  of such a Julia set satisfies the criterion set forth in the following definition.

*Definition 1.2.11:* A sequence  $\tau$  is said to be *acceptable* if it begins with  $*$ , is not constant,  $\tau_n = *$  implies  $\sigma^n(\tau) = \tau$ , and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\sigma^n(\tau) \neq \tau$ , there exists  $k \in \omega$  with  $* \neq \tau_k \neq \sigma^n(\tau)_k \neq *$ .

It will often be useful to talk about the *space* of itineraries. Let  $P = \{0, 1, *\}$  with topology given by  $\{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{0, 1, *\}\}$ . Then  $P^\omega$  (with the product topology) is called itinerary space. When considering  $\tau$  as an element of the itinerary space, acceptability simply indicates that the iterates of  $\tau$  are either equal to  $\tau$  or can be separated by open sets in  $P^\omega$ .

We can identify a quadratic abstract Julia set  $(D, H, f)$  with a subset of itinerary space defined solely in terms of its kneading sequence as follows.

*Definition 1.2.12:* Let  $\tau$  be the kneading sequence of the quadratic abstract dendritic Julia set  $(D, f)$ . An element  $\alpha \in P^\omega$  is called  $\tau$ -*admissible* provided that

1.  $\sigma^n(\alpha) = \tau$  if  $\alpha_n = *$  and,
2. for all  $i \in \omega$  with  $\sigma^i(\alpha) \neq \tau$ , there exists  $n \in \omega$  with  $* \neq \alpha_{i+n} \neq \tau_n \neq *$ .

Note that  $\tau$ -admissibility is also a condition concerned with the ability to separate a point from the kneading sequence.

*Definition 1.2.13:* Let  $\tau$  be an acceptable sequence in  $P^\omega$ . Define  $D_\tau = \{\alpha \in P^\omega : \alpha \text{ is } \tau\text{-admissible}\}$ .

With this terminology in place, the following result is a rephrasing of results of Baldwin [Bal10, Theorems 2.2 and 2.4].

*Theorem 1.2.14:*  $(D, H, f)$  is a quadratic abstract dendritic Julia set if and only if it is conjugate to  $(D_\tau, \sigma)$  for some acceptable sequence  $\tau$ . In particular, this conjugacy holds if and only if  $\tau$  is the kneading sequence of  $(D, f)$ .

It is worth noting that the family of quadratic abstract dendritic Julia sets contains the family of dendritic Julia sets that arise in complex dynamics, as is seen in the following theorem, again slightly paraphrased from [Bal10].

*Theorem 1.2.15:* Let  $f_c(z) = z^2 + c$ . If  $J_c$  is a dendrite, then there is an acceptable  $\tau$  such that  $(J_c, f_c)$  is conjugate to  $(D_\tau, \sigma)$ .

Since we will be identifying dendrites with sets of right-infinite sequences in the itinerary space, the usual notation for inverse limits becomes cumbersome. Since the bonding map that we will be using is the shift map  $\sigma$ , the following conventions are useful.

*Remark 1.2.16:* Let  $A$  be a set of right-infinite sequences in  $P^\omega$  and  $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$  the shift map. Then the inverse limit of the inverse system  $\{A, \sigma\}$  can be identified with the set of bi-infinite sequences

$$\{\bar{a} \in P^\mathbb{Z} : \bar{a}_{-n} \in A \text{ for all } n \in \omega\}$$

by identifying the point  $\langle \bar{a}_i \rangle_{i \in \omega} \in \varprojlim \{A, \sigma\}$  with the point  $\bar{a} \in P^\mathbb{Z}$  whose  $j$ -th coordinate is the 0-th coordinate of  $\bar{a}_{-j}$  if  $j$  is non-positive and is equal to the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $\bar{a}_0$  if  $j$  is non-negative.

As we have seen, for each dendritic Julia set there is an associated Hubbard tree. As we are concerned with *abstract* dendritic Julia sets, we will make use of the generalized notion of Hubbard trees.

*Definition 1.2.17:* A *generalized Hubbard tree* (hereafter referred to as “Hubbard tree”) is a pair  $(T, f)$  where  $T$  is a tree and  $f : T \rightarrow T$  is a function with a distinguished point  $t \in T$ , satisfying the following conditions:

1.  $f$  is continuous (and surjective);
2. every point in  $T$  has at most two preimages under  $f$ ;
3.  $f$  is locally one-to-one at all points other than  $t$ ;
4. all endpoints of  $T$  are in the orbit of  $t$ ;
5.  $t$  is periodic or preperiodic, but not fixed;
6. if  $x \neq y$  are branch points or in the orbit of  $t$ , then there is an integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $t \in f^n([x, y])$ .

Note that throughout the paper we will sometimes use the term “Hubbard Tree” to refer to the dynamical system  $(T, f)$  and sometimes to refer to the underlying space,  $T$ . Context will make evident what we mean.

Just like in the case of abstract dendritic Julia sets, we partition generalized Hubbard trees into three sets  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_0, *\}$  where  $*$  is the set containing the turning point  $t$ ,  $S_1$  is the component of  $T \setminus *$  which contains  $f(t)$  and  $S_0 = T \setminus (S_1 \cup *)$ .



## CHAPTER TWO

### Branch Points and The Structure of Hubbard Trees

#### 2.1 Branch Points

Branch points and endpoints are essential in the study of Hubbard trees. A common definition of endpoints comes from [Bin51] and is as follows:

*Definition 2.1.1:* We say a point  $x$  in a continuum  $X$  is an *endpoint* if for any two subcontinua,  $A, B$  of  $X$ , each of which contain  $x$ , either  $A \subseteq B$  or  $B \subseteq A$ .

The problem, though, is that under this definition, the point  $x$  in Figure 2.1 is not an endpoint since the arc from  $x$  to  $y$  and the arc from  $x$  to  $z$  both contain  $x$ , but neither contains the other.




Figure 2.1. Comparison Between Different Definitions of Endpoint

Definition 2.1.1 is useful in the context of arclike continua, but we need a definition for endpoints better suited for our purposes. It warrants mentioning, that endpoint only makes sense in the context of 1-dimensional continua. But our definition also must ensure that not all 1-dimensional continua have endpoints. Circles should not

have endpoints. So, in order to properly define *endpoint* we need to have a definition of dimension. We defer to classical notion of dimension coming from [Leb21].

*Definition 2.1.2:* We call a space  $X$  is  $n$ -dimensional if, given any open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , there exists a refinement  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  such that no point in  $X$  is contained in more than  $n + 1$  sets in  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $n$  is maximal with respect to this property.

*Definition 2.1.3:* We say a point  $x$  in a 1-dimensional continuum  $X$  is of *degree at least*  $n$  if there exist  $n$  subcontinua of  $X$ , call them  $A^1, A^2, \dots, A^n$ , such that  $\{x\} \subsetneq A^i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $A^i \cap A^j = \{x\}$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ .

We further say that  $x$  is of *degree exactly*  $n$ , if  $x$  is degree at least  $n$  and not degree at least  $n + 1$ , i.e. there is no collection of  $n + 1$  subcontinua satisfying the aforementioned criteria. Typically, instead of saying “of degree exactly  $n$ ”, we say “of degree  $n$ ”. If  $x$  is of degree  $n > 2$ , then we say  $x$  is a *branch point*, and if  $x$  is a point of degree exactly 1, then we call it an *endpoint*. If there exist infinitely many subcontinua  $A^1, A^2, \dots$  such that  $\{x\} \subsetneq A^i$  for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $A^i \cap A^j = \{x\}$  for  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we call  $x$  a branch point of degree infinity. This can be countable or uncountable infinity. An example of a branch point with uncountable degree is the vertex of the cone of the Cantor set. However, for our purposes here, every degree infinity point from hereafter will have countable degree.

We denote the degree of  $x$  in  $X$  via  $\deg_X(x)$ . If the ambient space is made clear from context, we will write  $\deg(x)$ .

This definition of branch point is consistent with the notion of saying  $x$  is the branch point of an  $n$ -od, but not of an  $(n + 1)$ -od. The definition of endpoint is

similar to the standard notion of endpoint found in [BM95; Bin51]. The difference is that under Definition 2.1.3 we would say that the point  $x$  in Figure 2.1 is an endpoint.

Armed with an understanding of branch points and endpoints, we can now discuss the structure of Hubbard trees.

## 2.2 The Structure of Hubbard Trees

Recall that when we say “Hubbard Tree” we usually mean “generalized Hubbard tree” which is a pair  $(T, f)$  where  $T$  is a tree and  $f : T \rightarrow T$  is a function with a unique “turning point”  $t$ , satisfying the following conditions:

1.  $f$  is continuous and surjective;
2. every point in  $T$  has at most two preimages under  $f$ ;
3.  $f$  is locally one-to-one at all points other than  $t$ ;
4. all endpoints of  $T$  are in the orbit of  $t$ ;
5.  $t$  is periodic or preperiodic, but not fixed;
6. if  $x \neq y$  are branch points or in the orbit of  $t$ , then there is an integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $t \in f^n([x, y])$ .

Some examples of Hubbard trees can be seen in Figure 2.2.

The following notion from [BKS09] is helpful. Let  $(T, f)$  and  $(T_0, f_0)$  be two Hubbard trees with turning points  $t$  and  $t_0$  respectively. Let  $P = \{p : p \text{ is a branch point of } T \text{ or in } Orb_f(t)\}$  and  $Q = \{q : q \text{ is a branch point of } T_0 \text{ or in } Orb_{f_0}(t_0)\}$ . We say  $(T, f)$  and  $(T_0, f_0)$  are equivalent if there is a bijection,  $g : P \rightarrow Q$  which




Figure 2.2. Examples of Hubbard trees

is respected by the dynamics, and if  $p_1, p_2 \in P$  such that  $(p_1, p_2) \cap P = \emptyset$  then  $(g(p_1), g(p_2)) \cap Q = \emptyset$ . This is weaker than a topological conjugation.

Recall that two systems  $(X, f), (Y, g)$  are topologically conjugate if there exists a homeomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f = h^{-1} \circ g \circ h$ . However, for  $(T, f)$  and  $(T_0, f_0)$  to be considered equivalent, all we need is for  $f|_P$  and  $f_0|_Q$  behave the same;  $f|_{T \setminus P}$  and  $f_0|_{T_0 \setminus Q}$  can behave very differently.

The following Lemma, rephrased from [BKS09, Lemma 2.3], details some of the basic properties of Hubbard trees.

*Lemma 2.2.1:* The turning point  $t$  divides the tree into two parts and  $f(t)$  is an endpoint. Each branch point is periodic or pre-periodic and never maps onto the critical point. If  $b$  is a periodic branch point and  $p$  is in the orbit of  $b$ , then

$\deg(p) = \deg(b)$ . Lastly, any arc which does not contain the turning point in its interior maps homeomorphically onto its image.

Also recall that we can break the  $T$  into three sets,  $*$ ,  $S_1$ , and  $S_0$  where  $*$  =  $\{t\}$ ,  $S_1$  is the component of  $T \setminus *$  which contains  $f(t)$  and  $S_0$  is the other component of  $T$ . With this in mind, we can prove the following useful fact.

*Lemma 2.2.2:*  $f|_{\overline{S_i}}, i \in \{0, 1\}$  is an embedding.

*Proof.*  $f|_{\overline{S_i}}, i \in \{0, 1\}$  is injective, surjective onto its range, and continuous. Moreover,  $\overline{S_i}$  is a continuum. The continuous image of a continuum is a continuum, so  $f(\overline{S_i})$  is a continuum. Thus  $f|_{\overline{S_i}} : \overline{S_i} \rightarrow f(\overline{S_i})$  is a homeomorphism by [Mun00, Theorem 26.6].  $\square$

Moreover, the fracturing of  $T$  into  $*$ ,  $S_1$ , and  $S_0$  allows us to, given a point  $p \in T$ , define the itinerary of  $p$  as the infinite string  $\iota(p) = p_0 p_1 p_2 \dots$  where

$$p_i = \begin{cases} * & \text{if } f^i(p) \in * \\ 1 & \text{if } f^i(p) \in S_1 \\ 0 & \text{if } f^i(p) \in S_0 \end{cases}$$

The itinerary of the turning point  $t$  is called the *kneading sequence* of  $(T, f)$  and is typically denoted  $\tau$ . Lastly, we often refer to the turning point as the *critical point* — owing to the fact that in Hubbard trees of quadratic polynomials  $f(z) = z^2 + c$ , the turning point of  $T$  is the critical point of  $f$  — and denote the critical point  $c_0$ . Further, we often write  $c_i$  to denote the  $f^i(c_0)$ . Generally speaking, a Hubbard tree can have

multiple points which each share the same itinerary, however, if there are two points  $p, p'$  with the same itinerary, than every point in  $[p, p']$  has the same itinerary [BKS09, Lemma 2.8]. If a Hubbard tree is such that no two points have the same itinerary, we say that the Hubbard tree has the *unique itinerary property*.

*Remark 2.2.3:* The language of itineraries allows a convenient rephrasing of the sixth property of Hubbard trees: Let  $(T, f)$  be a Hubbard tree and let  $I = \{p \in T : p \text{ is a branch point or in } Orb(t)\}$ . Then no two points in  $I$  have the same itinerary.

*Definition 2.2.4:* We say a kneading sequence,  $\tau$  is *acceptable* if  $\tau_0 = *$ ,  $\tau \neq \bar{*}$ , if  $\tau_n = *$  then  $\tau_{n+j} = \tau_j$  for all  $j \in \omega$ , and for all  $n \in \omega$  there exists some  $j \in \omega$  such that  $* \neq \sigma^n(\tau)_j \neq \tau_j \neq *$ .

This definition indicates that any shift of  $\tau$  can be sepeartaed from  $\tau$  in  $P^\omega$ . While this may seem random and arbitrary, it leads to the following beautiful result which is a combination of Theorem 2.29 and Proposition 3.17 of [Bal07].

*Lemma 2.2.5:* If  $\tau$  is acceptable, then there is a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$  which has the unique itinerary property.

With this in mind, for the rest of the chapter, we treat all Hubbard trees as having the unique itinerary property. If a tree has the unique itinerary property, then we refer to a point and its itinerary interchangeably. So, if a point  $p$  has itinerary  $\overline{110}$  then we refer to it as both  $p$  and  $\overline{110}$  and make no distinction.

Kneading sequences fully classify Hubbard trees, as the following Theorem from [BKS09, Proposition 3.5] says:

*Theorem 2.2.6:* Any two Hubbard trees with the same kneading sequence are equivalent.

Not only can kneading sequences be used to tell if two Hubbard trees are equivalent, a kneading sequence can be used to construct a Hubbard tree. In fact:

*Theorem 2.2.7:* Every periodic or pre-periodic kneading sequence is realized by a unique (up to equivalence) abstract Hubbard tree.

But how can we use the kneading sequence alone to build the Hubbard tree? For any three points,  $s, t, u$  in a tree  $T$ , the intersection  $[s, t] \cup [t, u] \cup [u, v]$  is a single point. If the three points are colinear, then this intersection gives the point in the middle. If they are not colinear, then this intersection is the unique branch point which separates each point in  $\{s, t, u\}$  from the other two.

We use what is called the voting sequence which, as shown in shown in [Bal07], gives the itinerary of the point at this intersection. The voting sequence is defined as follows:

*Definition 2.2.8:* Given three points  $s, t, u$  of a Hubbard tree and a critical point,  $\tau$ , the *voting sequence* of  $s, t, u$  is the infinite string  $V(s, t, u)$  where

$$V(s, t, u) = \begin{cases} s_0 \frown V(\sigma(s), \sigma(t), \sigma(u)) & \text{if } s_0 = t_0 = u_0 \\ \tau & \text{if } \{s_0, t_0, u_0\} = \{0, 1, *\} \\ s_0 \frown V(\sigma(s), \sigma(t), \sigma(\tau)) & \text{if } s_0 = t_0 \neq u_0 \\ s_0 \frown V(\sigma(s), \sigma(\tau), \sigma(u)) & \text{if } s_0 = u_0 \neq t_0 \\ t_0 \frown V(\sigma(\tau), \sigma(t), \sigma(u)) & \text{if } t_0 = u_0 \neq s_0 \end{cases}$$

Notice, then, that order of the triple does not matter. So  $V(s, t, u) = V(s, u, t) = V(t, s, u)$  etc.

*Example.* Suppose  $\tau = *11\bar{0}$ ,  $s = \bar{1}0*1$ ,  $t = \bar{1}10*$ , and  $u = \bar{0}*1\bar{1}$ . Then since  $s_0 = t_0 \neq u_0$  we have  $V(s, t, u) = 1 \frown V(\sigma(s), \sigma(t), \sigma(\tau))$ . Now, since  $\sigma(s) = u$ ,  $\sigma(t) = s$ , and  $\sigma(\tau) = t$ , we have  $V(s, t, u) = 1 \frown V(u, s, t) = 1 \frown V(s, t, u)$ . Thus  $V(s, t, u) = \bar{1}$ .

If  $|Orb(\tau)| = n$  then  $\tau$  and its shifts give us the itinerary of  $n$  different points in the Hubbard tree. Importantly, among these  $n$  itineraries are the itineraries of every endpoint. For each branch point,  $b$ ,  $T \setminus \{b\}$  has at least three components, so there exists at least three end points  $e_1, e_2, e_3$  with  $b = [e_1, e_2] \cap [e_2, e_3] \cap [e_1, e_3]$ . Thus, running the voting sequence on every possible set of three distinct shifts of  $\tau$  gives us the itinerary every branch point in the Hubbard tree. Running the voting sequence on every possible triple comprised of branch points or endpoints gives us enough information to determine where each branch point must lay in relation to each



other. This then defines the tree. With this in mind, we can use the voting sequence to build a tree from a kneading sequence.

So, in our previous example, we know there is a branch point with itinerary  $\bar{1}$  that lies between  $s, t$  and  $u$ . If we run the voting sequence on all possible sets of 3 shifts of  $\tau$  we find that there is only one branch point and its itinerary is  $\bar{1}$ .

The tree made from  $\tau = \overline{*110}$  can be found in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3. Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\overline{*110}$

A fixed branch point with itinerary  $\bar{1}$  is not unique to this kneading sequence. The following Lemma is a rephrasing of [Bal07, Theorem 1.22].

*Lemma 2.2.9:* In every Hubbard tree, there exists a fixed point with itinerary  $\bar{1}$ . Moreover, if the tree's kneading sequence  $\tau$  begins  $*1^n0\dots$  then the fixed branch point will be degree  $n + 1$ .

We always call this point *the fixed branch point* even though its degree may be only two.

Knowing that every Hubbard tree has a fixed point in  $S_1$  begs the question, do they all have a fixed point in  $S_0$ ?

*Theorem 2.2.10:* If  $(H, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with a fixed point in  $S_0$ , then that point must be an endpoint.

*Proof.* Suppose  $(H, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$  and a point  $p$  with  $p = \bar{0}$ . By way of contradiction, suppose that no endpoint has itinerary  $\bar{0}$ . Then, since  $p$  is not an endpoint of  $H$ , there exists an endpoint  $e$  such that  $p \in [c_0, e]$ . Then  $V(p, \tau, e)$  gives the itinerary of  $[c_0, p] \cap [p, e] \cap [c_0, e] = p$ . Since  $e \neq \bar{0}$ , there is some minimal  $n$  such that  $f^n(e) \notin S_0$ . Then  $V(\bar{0}, \tau, e) = 0^{n-1}1 \frown V(\bar{0}, \sigma(\tau), f^n(e))$ . Since  $\sigma(\tau)$  and  $f^n(e)$  both do not start with a 1, we get

$$V(\bar{0}, \tau, e) = 0^{n-1}1 \frown V(\sigma(\tau), \sigma^2(\tau), f^{n+1}(e))$$

or  $0^{n-1}\tau$ . Neither of these sequences are the itinerary of  $p$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $p$  is an endpoint.  $\square$

*Corollary 2.2.11:* If a Hubbard tree has a fixed point in  $S_0$ , then the kneading sequence terminates in  $\bar{0}$ .

*Proof.* As previously seen, if there is a point with itinerary  $\bar{0}$  then it is an endpoint. The kneading sequence must contain the itineraries of each endpoint and thus must contain  $\bar{0}$ .  $\square$

So if we know an endpoint has itinerary  $\bar{0}$ , then we know something about the kneading sequence. This works in reverse too. If we know something about the longest block of 0s in the kneading sequence, then we know something about the endpoints.

*Theorem 2.2.12:* Let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  be such that  $\tau_{[n,k)}$  is a string of all 0s and  $k - n$  is maximal with respect to this property (note that since the turning point of a Hubbard tree must be (pre)periodic, this is well defined). If there are multiple blocks of the same length, let  $n$  be minimal. Then  $c_n$  is an endpoint of  $H$ . If  $\tau_k = *$  then  $c_{n+1}$  is not an endpoint.

*Proof.* Let  $n$  and  $k$  be as stated. If  $k = \infty$ , then from Theorem 2.2.10 we know that  $c_n$  is an endpoint of  $H$ . So, suppose  $k < \infty$ . If  $c_n$  were not an endpoint, then there would be some endpoint  $e$  with  $c_n \in (c_0, e)$  which means  $[c_0, e] \cap [c_n, e] \cap [c_0, c_n] = c_n$ . With this in mind, we can demonstrate that  $c_n$  is an endpoint by verifying  $V(c_0, c_n, e) \neq c_n$  for all endpoints  $e$ .

Furthermore, instead of running the voting sequence  $V(c_0, c_n, c_j)$  for all  $j \in \omega$ , we are able to restrict to  $V(c_0, c_n, c_j)$  for all  $j < n$ . This is because  $f$  is locally injective at all points except  $c_0$ . So the only non-endpoint that can map to an endpoint is  $c_0$ . So, if there is some  $t > 0$  such that  $c_{n+t}$  is an endpoint, then there must be some  $m < t$  such that  $c_{n+m} = c_0$ . So if there is some  $j > n$  such that  $c_j$  is an endpoint satisfying  $c_n \in (c_0, c_j)$ , then there is some  $j' < n$  with  $c_{j'} = c_j$ .

With all this in mind, fix  $0 < j < n$ . If  $c_j \in S_1$  then  $V(\tau, c_j, c_n) = \tau \neq c_n$ . If, on the other hand,  $c_j \in S_0$ , let  $m$  be minimal so that  $f^m(c_j) \notin S_0$ . By assumption,  $m < k - n$  so  $f^m(c_n) \in S_0$ . Thus  $V(\tau, c_j, c_n) = 0^{m-1} \frown V(\sigma(\tau), f^m(c_j), f^m(c_n)) =$

$0^{m-1}1 \cap V(\sigma^2(\tau), f^{m+1}(c_j), \sigma(\tau)) \neq c_n$ . Thus there is no endpoint  $e$  such that  $c_n \in (c_0, e)$ . Therefore,  $c_n$  is an endpoint.

Now, we show  $c_{n+1}$  is not an endpoint if  $\tau_k = *$  that is, if the block of 0's is the last block before  $\tau$  repeats. Notice that  $f^{k-n-1}(c_n) \in S_0$  and  $f^{k-n-1}(c_{n+1}) = c_0$ . So  $V(\tau, c_n, c_{n+1}) = 0^{k-n-1} \cap V(\sigma(\tau), f^{k-n-1}(c_n), \tau) = 0^{k-n-1}\tau$ .  $\square$

We end our discussion on the structure of Hubbard trees with a demonstration that these trees can have a variety of forms.

*Theorem 2.2.13:* Hubbard trees can have arbitrarily many branch points of arbitrarily large degree.

*Proof.* To construct a Hubbard Tree with  $n$  colinear branch points of degree  $m$  in  $S_0$ , a fixed branch point of degree  $x$  in  $S_1$ ,  $x$  many branch points of degree  $m$  in  $S_1$ , and no other branch points, one can use the following kneading sequence:

$$\tau = \overline{*(1^x 0^n)^{m-1}}.$$

(See [A.0.1](#)).

An example of such a Hubbard tree with 4 branch points of degree 6 can be found in Subfigure [2.2b](#) which has kneading sequence

$$\tau = \overline{*(110000)^5}.$$

Moreover, to construct a Hubbard Tree with exactly  $n$  branch points, each of degree  $m$  one can let  $x = 1$ . In this case we get the following kneading sequence:

$$\tau = \overline{*(10^{n-1})^{m-1}}.$$

(See [A.0.2](#)).

An example of a Hubbard tree with exactly 4 branch points each of degree 6 can be found in Subfigure [2.2c](#). This tree has kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*(1000)^5}$ .  $\square$

## CHAPTER THREE

### Trees That Cannot Be Hubbard Trees

Results like those in Section 2.2 may lead one to believe that any tree can be a Hubbard tree if it is equipped with the right function. But this is not true. In order to see why, we first introduce a few notions.

*Definition 3.0.1:* We say two points  $p, q$  from a tree,  $T$ , are in a *free arc* if  $(p, q)$  contains no branch points of  $T$ .

*Definition 3.0.2:* We say a tree  $T$  is *Hubbardizable* if there exists a function  $f : T \rightarrow T$  such that  $(T, f)$  is a generalized Hubbard tree.

*Definition 3.0.3:* Given a point  $p$  in a tree  $T$ , the *trees emanating from  $p$*  are the closures of the components of  $T \setminus \{p\}$ .

*Definition 3.0.4:* For a tree,  $T$  we use  $\text{end}(T)$  to denote the set of endpoints of  $T$ .

*Lemma 3.0.5:* If  $T, W$  are trees with  $W \subset T$ , then  $|\text{end}(W)| \leq |\text{end}(T)|$ .

*Proof.* Let  $b$  be a branch point in  $W$ . Since  $W \subset T$ ,  $b$  is also a branch point of  $T$ . For each endpoint,  $e \in \text{end}(W)$  there is at least one endpoint  $e' \in \text{end}(T)$  such that  $e \in [b, e']$ .

So, for each endpoint  $e$  in  $W$  choose such a corresponding endpoint  $e'$  in  $T$ . This gives an injection from  $\text{end}(W)$  to  $\text{end}(T)$  proving the claim.  $\square$

*Definition 3.0.6:* Given a Hubbard Tree,  $(H, f)$ , let  $b$  be the fixed point in  $S_1$ .

The existence of such a point is guaranteed by Lemma 2.2.1. We define  $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n$  be the trees emanating from  $b$  enumerated in the order which the critical point travels to them, i.e.  $S_0 \subset T_0$ . For simplicity of notation, we define  $T_{n+1} = T_0$  and we use  $T_0^*$  to denote  $T_0 \cap S_1$ .

*Lemma 3.0.7:* For all  $0 < i \leq n$ ,  $f(T_i) \subseteq T_{i+1}$  and  $f(T_0^*) \subseteq T_1$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . If  $0 = i$  let  $T_i = T_0^*$ . Then  $T_i \subset S_1$  and  $T_i$  has  $\bar{1}$  as an endpoint. By definition of  $T_{i+1}$  we have  $f(T_i) \cap T_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose there exists a point  $p \in T_i$  with  $f(p) \notin T_{i+1}$ . Let  $q \in T_i \setminus \{\bar{1}\}$  be such that  $f(q) \in T_{i+1}$ . Then,  $f([p, q])$  meets two different trees  $T_j$  and  $T_{i+1}$  where  $j \neq i+1$  and thus  $\bar{1} \in (f(p), f(q))$ . So there exists a point  $c \in (p, q)$  with  $f(c) = b$ . But  $f(b) = b$  and  $f|_{T_i}$  is injective, a contradiction.  $\square$

*Lemma 3.0.8:* Let  $T, W$  be two trees. If  $|\text{end}(T)| > |\text{end}(W)|$  then  $T$  cannot map injectively into  $W$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $f : T \rightarrow W$  is injective. Let  $W' = f(T)$ . Then  $f$  is a bijection between the continua  $T$  and  $W'$  and is thus a homeomorphism between the two. So  $T$  and  $W'$  must have the same number of endpoints. But, by Lemma 3.0.5,  $|\text{end}(W')| \leq |\text{end}(W)| < |\text{end}(T)|$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

This immediately leads to a nice corollary:

*Corollary 3.0.9:* For  $0 < i \leq n$ ,  $|\text{end}(T_i)| \leq |\text{end}(T_{i+1})|$  and  $|\text{end}(T_0^*)| \leq |\text{end}(T_1)|$ .

We are now ready to see some trees that are not Hubbardizable.

### 3.1 Two Sufficient Conditions for non-Hubbardizability

*Lemma 3.1.1:* Let  $T$  be a tree such that  $T$  has at least two branch points and there exists a branch point  $b$  with  $\deg(b)$  strictly larger than that of all other branch points. Let  $p$  be a branch point in a free arc with  $b$ . Then  $T \setminus (p, b)$  has two components. Let  $A_1$  be the component which contains  $b$  and let  $A_2$  be the other component. Lastly, suppose that there are two subtrees of  $A_2$  emanating from  $p$  which have more end points than every subtree of  $A_1$  emanating from  $b$ . Then  $T$  is not Hubbardizable.

An example of such a tree can be found in Figure 3.1.




Figure 3.1. A tree,  $T$ , for which there does not exist a function  $f : T \rightarrow T$  such that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree

*Proof.* Assume hypotheses as stated. Let  $k = \deg(b)$  and let  $V, W$  be two trees in  $A_2$  emanating from  $p$  that have more endpoints than any tree in  $A_1$  emanating from  $p$ . By way of contradiction, suppose there exists an associated function  $f$  such that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree. As shown in Lemma 2.2.9, every Hubbard tree has a fixed



point with itinerary  $\bar{1}$ . Here, the fixed point must be  $b$  since no neighborhood of  $b$  can map injectively to any neighborhood of a point of lower degree.

Recall that  $T_0$  is the tree emanating from  $\bar{1}$  which contains  $c_0$  and by Corollary 3.0.9,  $|\text{end}(T_i)| \leq |\text{end}(T_{i+1 \bmod k})|$  and  $|\text{end}(T_0^*)| \leq |\text{end}(T_1)|$ . With this in mind,  $c_0$  cannot lie in  $A_1$  since otherwise the tree emanating from  $b$  which contains  $p$  would be some  $T_i$  with more end points than  $T_0$ . Moreover,  $c_0$  cannot lie in  $A_2$  since in this case  $T_0^*$  must contain one of the trees emanating from  $p$  that has more end points than any subtree of  $A_1$  emanating from  $b$ . But then,  $|\text{end}(T_0^*)| > |\text{end}(T_1)|$ , a contradiction. Thus  $c_0 \in (b, p)$ . Since  $f(c_0) \in S_1$ , we also have  $f(c_0) \in A_1$ .

Now that we have determined the locations of  $c_0$  and  $f(c_0)$ , we aim to find the location of  $f(p)$ . Suppose  $f(p) = b$ . Then, since  $f|_{S_0}$  is an embedding by Lemma 2.2.2, at most one tree emanating from  $p$  has a point which maps to  $c_0$ , and thus there is at most one tree in  $A_2$  emanating from  $p$  whose image under  $f$  meets  $S_0$ . But, that means that at least one of  $W, V$  maps injectively into  $S_1$ , and more specifically, maps injectively into a subtree of  $A_1$  emanating from  $b = f(p)$ . But, by Lemma 3.0.8, no such injection can exist. So  $f(p)$  cannot be  $b$ .

Suppose  $f(p)$  is a branch point in  $A_1 \setminus \{b\}$ . Then  $f(p) \in T_i$  for some  $0 < i \leq k-1$ . By similar reasoning to the above, all of the subtrees in  $A_2$  emanating from  $p$  (with possibly one exception) must then map injectively into  $T_i$ . But, this means at least one of  $W, V$  must map injectively into  $T_i$  contradicting Lemma 3.0.8.

Lastly, suppose  $f(p)$  is some other branch point in  $A_2$ . Call this point  $q$ . Let  $T_p^q$  be the tree emanating from  $p$  which contains  $q$ . Then, since  $T_p^q \subset S_0$  and  $f|_{S_0}$  is a

homeomorphism, we have  $f|_{T_p^q}$  is a homeomorphism. So no point in  $T_p^q$  except  $p$  can map to  $q$ .

By way of contradiction, suppose  $f(T_p^q) \not\subseteq T_p^q$ . Then there is a point in  $T_p^q$ , that maps outside of  $T_p^q$  which means there must be a point  $w \in T_p^q$  such that  $f(w) = p$ . Then, since  $p \in (c_0, w)$  we have  $q = f(p) \in (c_1, f(w)) = (c_1, p)$ . But then  $q \notin T_p^q$ , a contradiction. So  $f(T_p^q) \subseteq T_p^q$  and, in particular,  $f(T_p^q)$  contains fewer branch points of  $S_0$  than  $T_p^q$  does meaning  $f$  cannot be injective, a contradiction.

Thus the only point to which  $p$  can map is itself, and so  $p$  is a branch point with itinerary  $\bar{0}$ , contradicting Theorem 2.2.10.

Thus, there can be no function associated with  $T$  that satisfies all the condition to be a Hubbard Tree, so  $T$  is not Hubbardizable.  $\square$

Although the hypotheses in Lemma 3.1.1 are sufficient to tell that a tree is not Hubbardizable, they are not necessary as we will see in the following.

*Definition 3.1.2:* For  $k \geq 3$ , let  $F_0^k$  be a tree with a single branch point of degree  $k$ . Continuing recursively, for  $n \geq 1$  let  $F_n^k$  be obtained by taking  $F_{n-1}^k$  and adding  $k - 1$  arcs to each endpoint, thus turning every endpoint in  $F_{n-1}^k$  into a branch point of degree  $k$  in  $F_n^k$ . Figure 3.2 shows  $F_1^4$ ,  $F_2^4$ , and  $F_3^4$ .

*Lemma 3.1.3:*  $F_i^k$  is Hubbardizable if and only if  $i < 2$ .

*Proof.* We first prove  $F_i^k$  is not Hubbardizable for  $i \geq 2$ . In order to do so, fix  $k > 2, i \geq 2$  and suppose that there is a function,  $f$  such that  $(F_i^k, f)$  is a Hubbard




Figure 3.2. The trees  $F_1^4$ ,  $F_2^4$ , and  $F_3^4$

tree. Figure 3.3 is a labelled diagram accompanying the proof. While the tree pictured is  $F_2^4$ , the proof is sufficiently general.

Let  $B_0$  denote the central branch point of  $F_0^k$  and let  $B_j$  denote the set of branch points in  $F_j^k$  that are not branch points of  $F_{j-1}^k$ . In this way, the points in Figure 3.3 labeled  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  comprise  $B_1$ .

*Claim:*  $B_0$  must be fixed.

*Proof of claim:* By way of contradiction, suppose  $f(B_0) \neq B_0$ . Notice that every tree emanating from  $B_0$  has the same number of endpoints. Call this number  $E$ . As such, the injective images of these trees must have at least  $E$  endpoints. Let  $W$  denote the tree emanating from  $f(B_0)$  which contains  $B_0$ .

$W$  is only one tree emanating from  $f(B_0)$  with at least  $n$  endpoints. So  $W$  is the only tree with enough endpoints to contain the injective images of the trees emanating from  $B_0$  and as such, by Lemma 3.0.5, all trees emanating from  $B_0$  (except possibly the tree containing  $c_0$ ) must map into  $W$ . Let  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in B_1$ . Then these three branch points are in a free arc with  $B_0$ .




Figure 3.3.  $F_2^4$  with branch points labeled

Let  $z$  be the branch point in  $W$  closest to  $f(B_0)$ . Note that  $z$  may be one of  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ . So, we must have that at least two of  $f((B_0, \alpha))$ ,  $f((B_0, \beta))$ , and  $f((B_0, \gamma))$  meet  $(f(B_0), z)$ . But then  $f$  is not locally injective at  $B_0$ , so  $B_0$  is both a branch point and the critical point, contradicting Lemma 2.2.1. This proves the claim.

*Claim:*  $f(B_1) = B_1$ .

*Proof of claim:* As we have already seen,  $f(B_0) = B_0$ . Observe that, for  $j > 0$ , a point  $z \in B_j$  if and only if there are  $j - 1$  many branch points between  $z$  and  $B_0$ .

Let  $z$  be a point in  $B_1$ . If  $z \in S_1$  then  $z \in T_n$  for some  $n > 0$ . As such, by Lemma 3.0.7,  $T_n$  embeds into  $T_{n+1}$ . So the number of branch points in  $[z, B_0]$  must equal the number of branch points in  $[f(z), B_0]$ . Thus both  $z$  and  $f(z)$  belong to  $B_1$ .

If  $z \in S_0$ , then we have two possibilities, either  $c_0$  is in  $(B_0, z)$  or  $c_0$  is not in  $(B_0, z)$ . If  $c_0 \notin (B_0, z)$  then  $f|_{[B_0, z]}$  is an embedding and by similar reasoning to the above, both  $z$  and  $f(z)$  are in  $B_0$ .

If, on the other hand,  $c_0 \in (B_0, z)$  then  $f|_{[B_0, z]}$  is not injective.  $f([B_0, c_0]) = [B_0, c_1]$  and  $f([c_0, z]) = [c_1, f(z)]$ .

By definition of  $F_i^k$  every branch point has degree  $k$  so the number of trees emanating from  $z$  is  $k$ . Exactly  $k - 1$  of the trees have the same number of endpoints (the only exception is the tree containing  $c_0$  and  $B_0$  since this tree contains all of  $S_1$ ). The number of endpoints is  $(k - 1)^{i-1}$ , but for the sake of conciseness, let  $r = (k - 1)^{i-1}$ .

Let  $\kappa$  denote the union of these  $k - 1$  trees. Then  $f|_\kappa$  is an embedding, so  $f(z)$  must be a branch point from which exactly  $k$  trees emanate. Among these,  $k - 1$  must have at least  $r$  endpoints, so  $f(z)$  is either in  $B_0$  or  $B_1$ .

If  $f(z) \neq T_1 \cap B_1$  then no points in  $\kappa$  can map into  $T_1$ . Then the only endpoint in  $T_1$  that has a preimage is  $c_1$ , a contradiction. So, if  $z \in B_1 \cap S_0$ , then  $f(z) \in B_1 \cap T_1$ .

Thus,  $f(B_1) = B_1$ .

Then, since no two branch points can share the same itinerary, there must be a branch point  $b_1 \in B_1$  such that  $c_0 \in (B_0, b_1)$ . Otherwise, every branch point in  $B_1$  would have the same itinerary,  $\bar{1}$ .

We have that  $T_1$  is the tree emanating from  $B_0$  which contains  $c_1$ . Let  $p \in T_1 \cap B_1$ . Note that  $p$  is unique and  $f(b_1) = p$ . Let  $q$  be a branch point in  $B_2$  such that

$q \in (p, c_1)$ . Such a  $q$  exists by definition of  $F_i^k$  since  $i > 2$ . Since  $q \in T_1$  all of  $q$ 's preimages must be in  $T_0$  by Lemma 3.0.7. Moreover, since  $q \in (p, c_1)$ , the preimage of  $q$  under  $f|_{S_0}$  must be in  $(c_0, b_1)$ . Similarly, the preimage of  $q$  under  $f|_{S_1}$  must be in  $(c_0, B_0)$ . However, neither of these arcs contain branch points and  $f([c_0, B_0]) = [c_1, B_0]$  and  $f([c_0, b_1]) = [c_1, p]$ . So none of the branch points (or endpoints) in a free arc with  $q$  other than those in  $[B_0, c_1]$  have preimages, so  $f$  is not surjective. Thus,  $F_i^k$  is not a Hubbard tree for  $i > 2$ .

What remains to be show is that  $F_i^k$  is Hubbardizable for  $i < 2$ . We demonstrate this by defining the function  $f$  such that  $(F_i^k, f)$  is a Hubbard tree.  $F_0^k$  is a  $k$ -od. To find a function  $f$  that makes  $(F_0^k, f)$  a Hubbard tree, let  $B_0$  be the branch point and arbitrarily label the arcs emanating from  $B_0$  as  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}$ . Pick a point in the interior of  $a_0$  to be  $c_0$  and let  $q$  be the endpoint of  $a_0 \setminus \{B_0\}$ . For  $0 < j \leq k-1$  let  $f$  map  $a_j$  linearly over  $a_{j+1 \bmod k}$  fixing  $B_0$ . Let  $f$  map  $[B_0, c_0]$  linearly over  $a_1$  and map  $[c_0, q]$  linearly over  $[c_1, c_0]$ . Then  $(F_0^k, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}0}$ . Such a Hubbard tree can be seen in Figure 2.3.

To define a function  $f$  for which  $(F_1^k, f)$  is a Hubbard tree, we follow a process similar to the one used in the case of  $F_0^k$ . Let  $B_0$  be the central branch point, and arbitrarily label the trees emanating from  $B_0$  as  $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}$ . For  $j > 0$ , let  $f$  map  $T_j$  homeomorphically over  $T_{j+1 \bmod k}$ . Let  $z$  be the branch point in  $T_0$ . Pick some point in  $(B_0, z)$  to be the critical point,  $c_0$ . Pick some endpoint in  $T_1$  to be  $c_1 = f(c_0)$  and pick some endpoint,  $e$ , in  $T_{k-1}$  to map to  $c_0$ . Lastly, let  $f$  map  $[B_0, c_0]$  linearly over  $[B_0, c_1]$  and let  $f$  map the tree emanating from  $c_0$  which contains  $z$

homeomorphically of the tree  $T_1 \cup [B_0, c_0]$ . Then  $(F_1^k, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{* (1^{k-1}0)^{k-1}}$ . An example of  $F_1^3$  can be found in Figure 2.2a.

For an explanation of how to build  $F_0^k$  and  $F_1^k$  from the respective kneading sequences,  $\overline{*1^{k-1}0}$  and  $\overline{* (1^{k-1}0)^{k-1}}$ , see A.0.3.  $\square$

We have now seen two examples of trees that are not Hubbardizable, and while the author longs for the discovery of a necessary and sufficient condition for Hubbardizability, he contents himself with what follows: a full classification of all Hubbardizable trees with fewer than four branch points.

### *3.2 A Full Classification of all Hubbardizable Trees with Fewer than Four Branch Points*

Before we fully classify all such trees, we make note of a convenient theorem.

*Theorem 3.2.1:* Let  $T$  be a tree whose branch points are all of the same degree and such that there is some arc  $[a, b]$  in  $T$  which contains every branch point. Then  $T$  is Hubbardizable

*Proof.* As seen in the proof of Theorem 2.2.13, to construct a Hubbard tree with exactly  $n$  branch points, each of degree  $d$ , one can use the kneading sequence

$$\tau = \overline{* (10^{n-1})^{d-1}}.$$

Each of these branch points has the itinerary  $\overline{0^j 10^{n-1-j}}$  for some  $0 \leq j \leq n-1$ . To see that these are co-linear, first observe that if  $1 \leq w < j$ , then

$V(\tau, \overline{0^j 10^{n-1-j}}, \overline{0^w 10^{n-1-w}}) = \overline{0^w 10^{n-1-w}}$ . So, if  $p$  is the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^j 10^{n-1-j}}$  and  $q$  is the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^w 10^{n-1-w}}$  then  $q \in (c_0, p)$ . Thus, if  $r$  is the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^{n-1}1}$  then all branch points in  $S_0$  are contained in  $(c_0, r]$ .

Finally, since there is only one branch point in  $S_1$ , call it  $b$ , all branch points are contained in  $[b, r]$ .  $\square$

### *Zero Branch Points*

*Theorem 3.2.2:* Let  $T$  be a non-degenerate tree with zero branch points. Then  $T$  is Hubbardizable.

*Proof.* The only non-degenerate tree with 0 branch points is the arc. It can be made, as a Hubbard tree, with the kneading sequence  $\tau = *1\bar{0}$ . This is the Hubbard tree of the polynomial  $f(z) = z^2 - 2$  as shown in [Dev03, Example 5.11].

Moreover, it can be made a Hubbard tree with a different kneading sequence:  $\tau = \overline{*10}$ . To do this, label the end points of the arc  $a, b$  and define some point in  $(a, b)$  to be the critical point  $c_0$ . Define a function  $f$  such that  $f(c_0) = a, f(a) = b$ , and  $f(b) = c_0$ . Moreover, define it so  $f$  maps  $[a, c_0]$  linearly over  $[b, a]$  and  $f$  maps  $[c_0, b]$  linearly over  $[a, b]$ .

In this way, the arc is a single tree, which can be paired with multiple functions each of which yields a dynamically distinct generalized Hubbard tree.  $\square$



### *One Branch Point*

*Theorem 3.2.3:* Let  $T$  be a tree with only one branch point. Then  $T$  is Hubbardizable

*Proof.* The only Hubbard trees with one branch points are  $n$ -ods. As we have previously seen in Lemma 3.1.3, these are Hubbardizable.  $\square$

## Two Branch Points

*Theorem 3.2.4:* Let  $T$  be a tree with exactly two branch points  $a, b$ . Let  $D = \{\deg(a), \deg(b)\}$ . Then  $T$  is Hubbardizable if and only if  $|D| = 1$  or  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$ .

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a tree with exactly two branch points  $a, b$ . Begin by supposing that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree. We show that if  $|D| = 2$  then  $\min(D) = 3$ . This then proves the claim that if  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with two branch points, then they are the same degree or the smaller degree is 3. So suppose  $|D| = 2$ . Without loss of generality, let  $\deg(a) > \deg(b)$ . Since  $f$  is locally injective at all but one point, no point (except the critical point) can map to a point of lower degree. Since  $a$  has higher degree than  $b$ , we must have  $f(a) = a$ . By Lemma 2.2.9 there is only one fixed branch point in any Hubbard tree, so we have  $f(b) \neq b$  and thus  $f(b) = a$ .

Since  $a$  is the fixed branch point in  $S_1$ , the kneading sequence must begin  $*1^n0$  where  $n = \deg(a) - 1$ . Thus every endpoint in  $\overline{S_1}$  is visited by the orbit of  $c_0$  before it ever gets to  $S_0$ . So if an endpoint in a free arc with  $b$  maps into  $S_1$ , then it must be the last endpoint visited by  $c_0$ .

So if an endpoint in a free arc with  $b$  is not be the last endpoint visited by  $c_0$  then it must map into  $S_0$ . By way of contradiction, suppose there are two endpoints,  $p, q$  from  $S_0$  that mapp into  $S_0$ . Then  $[b, p]$  and  $[b, q]$  are two arcs in  $S_0$  that cover  $[a, c_0]$ , a contradiction.

So, there are at most two endpoints in a free arc with  $b$ , one that maps into  $S_1$  and one that maps into  $S_0$  and thus  $\deg(b) = 3$ .

To complete the proof we show that if  $|D| = 1$  or  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  that  $T$  is Hubbardizable. As shown in Theorem 3.2.1, if  $|D| = 1$  then there is a kneading sequence which gives rise to  $T$ . If  $|D| = 2$  with  $\min(D) = 3, \max(D) = k$  then  $T$  can be realized by the kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}001}$ . See A.0.4 □

### *Three Branch Points*

*Lemma 3.2.5:* Suppose that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with exactly three branch points,  $a, b, c$  such that  $b \in (a, c)$  and  $c_0$  in  $(a, b)$ . If  $b, c \in S_0$  then  $f(b) = a, f(c) = b$ . If  $b, c \in S_1$ , then  $c \neq \bar{1}$  and if  $b = \bar{1}$  then  $f(c) = a$ .

*Proof.* Assume hypotheses as stated. Since  $f$  is locally injective at the branch points,  $f(\{a, b, c\}) \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$ . If  $b, c \in S_0$ , then  $b$  cannot map to  $c$  else  $f([c_0, b]) = [c_1, c] \supset [c_0, b]$  and thus there is a fixed point in  $(c_0, b)$ . But, by Theorem 2.2.10, if there is a fixed point in  $S_0$ , then it must be an endpoint. Thus,  $f(b) = a$ .

Since branch points in  $S_0$  cannot be fixed,  $f(c) \neq c$ . Furthermore, we cannot have  $f(c) = a$  otherwise  $b$  and  $c$  share the same itinerary, a contradiction. Thus  $f(c) = b$ .

If  $b, c \in S_1$  then we cannot have  $c = \bar{1}$  because otherwise,  $c_1$  would be in a free arc with  $c$ . But then  $f([c, c_0]) = [c, c_1]$  would contain  $f(b)$ , a contradiction. If  $b = \bar{1}$  then  $f(c) = a$  otherwise  $b$  and  $c$  would share an itinerary. □

*Lemma 3.2.6:* Suppose that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with exactly three branch points,  $a, b, c$  such that  $b \in (a, c)$  and  $c_0$  in  $(a, b)$ . If  $b \neq \bar{1}$  and  $f(b) = \bar{1}$ , then  $\deg(b) = 3$ .

*Proof.* If  $f(b) = \bar{1}$  then  $\bar{1}$  must be a branch point and  $b$  must not be in  $S_1$ . Thus, there is only one branch point in  $S_1$ . Without loss of generality, assume that this branch point is  $a$ . Since  $b \in (a, c)$  we must have  $c \in S_0$  as well and because  $c$ 's itinerary must be different than that of  $b$ ,  $f(c) \neq a$ . So  $f(c) \in S_0$ .

Then the kneading sequence must begin  $*1^{k-1}0$  where  $k = \deg(a)$ . In this way, every endpoint in  $S_1$  is visited by  $c_0$  before it ever maps into  $S_0$ . So if an endpoint in  $S_0$  maps into  $S_1$ , it either maps to an endpoint already visited by  $c_0$  or a non-endpoint. Thus, if an endpoint in  $S_0$  maps into  $S_1$ , it must be the last endpoint visited by  $c_0$ .

By way of contradiction, suppose there are at least two endpoints  $p$  and  $q$  in a free arc with  $b$ . Because  $f|_{S_0}$  is injective and  $c_0, p, q, c$  are all in different trees emanating from  $b$ , we must have that  $f(c_0), f(p), f(q), f(c)$  are all in different trees emanating from  $f(b)$ . Since  $f(c) \in S_0$ , we must have  $f(c_0), f(p), f(q)$  all in  $S_1$ . But then  $p$  and  $q$  are both the last endpoint visited by  $c_0$ , a contradiction. Thus, there is at most one endpoint in a free arc with  $b$ , so  $\deg(b) = 3$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 3.2.7:* Suppose that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree with exactly three branch points,  $a, b, c$  such that  $b \in (a, c)$ ,  $c_0 \in (b, c)$ , and  $b = \bar{1}$ . Then  $f(a) = c$ ,  $\deg(a) = 3$  and  $\deg(c) \in \{3, 4\}$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $a \in S_1$  so  $f(a) \neq a$  and  $f(a) \neq b$  otherwise  $a$  and  $b$  would have the same itinerary. So  $f(a) = c$ .

Since  $f(a) \in S_0$ ,  $a$  must be in  $T_k$  where  $k = \deg(b)$ . Recall that  $T_k$  is the only tree in  $S_1$  emanating from  $b$  whose image can meet  $S_0$ . By Lemma 3.0.7,  $T_{k-1}$  is the only tree in  $S_1$  emanating from  $b$  that can map into  $T_k$ . By assumption,  $T_{k-1}$  is an

arc. Every endpoint in  $T_k$  is in a free arc with  $a$ , so there is at most one endpoint in a free arc with  $a$  whose preimage is in  $S_1$ .

Since  $f$  is injective on  $\overline{S_0}$ , then endpoints in a free arc with  $c$  must map into different trees emanating from  $f(c) = b$ . So at most one such endpoint can map to an endpoint in a free arc with  $a$ . Thus, there is at most one endpoint in a free arc with  $a$  whose preimage is in  $S_0$ . So there are at most two endpoints in a free arc with  $a$ , so  $\deg(a) = 3$ .

These are the only endpoints in  $S_1$  that can map into  $S_0$ . So there are at most two endpoints in a free arc with  $c$  whose preimage is in  $S_1$ . Again, since  $f$  is locally injective at  $c$ , each endpoint in a free arc with  $c$  must map into different trees emanating from  $b$ , so there can be only one such endpoint which maps into  $T_0$ , there is at most one such endpoint that maps to an endpoint in  $S_0$ . Thus, there are at most three endpoints in a free arc with  $c$  so  $\deg(c) \leq 4$ .  $\square$

*Theorem 3.2.8:* Suppose that  $T$  is a tree with exactly three branch points,  $a, b, c$  such that  $c_0$  in  $(a, b)$ . Let  $D = \{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\}$ . Then  $T$  is Hubbardizable if and only if one of the following conditions holds:

1.  $|D| = 1$ ,
2.  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  or,
3.  $D = \{3, 4, k\}$  for some  $k > 4$  and  $\deg(b) = k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a tree with three branch points  $a, b, c$  with  $b \in (a, c)$ . Suppose that there is a function  $f$  such that  $(T, f)$  is a Hubbard tree. We have multiple cases in which not all the degrees are the same:

- $\deg(a) = \deg(c) > \deg(b)$ ,
- $\deg(a) = \deg(b) > \deg(c)$  [or by symmetry  $\deg(c) = \deg(b) > \deg(a)$ ],
- $\deg(a) > \max\{\deg(b), \deg(c)\}$  [or by symmetry  $\deg(c) > \max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\}$ ]  
and,
- $\deg(b) > \max\{\deg(a), \deg(c)\}$ ,

We will go through these one-by-one and find out what restrictions the Hubbardizability of  $T$  puts on the degrees of the branch points in each case.

1. If  $\deg(a) = \deg(c) > \deg(b)$ , then we have two possibilities. Either one of  $a$  or  $c$  is fixed and both points map to the fixed point — without loss of generality  $f(a) = a = f(c)$  — or  $a$  and  $c$  map to each other —  $f(a) = c$  and  $f(c) = a$ .

If  $a$  is fixed, then since  $f(a) = f(c)$  we have  $c_0 \in (a, c)$  and so  $f([a, c]) = [a, c_1]$  and so  $b$  maps injectively into  $[a, c_1]$ , but  $b$  is a branch point, and there are no branch points in  $[a, c_1]$ , a contradiction.

Thus,  $f(a) = c, f(c) = a$ . Then  $c_0$  is either in  $(a, b)$  or  $(b, c)$ , but by symmetry, we can assume  $c_0 \in (b, c)$ .

Then  $f(b) \neq c$  or else  $a$  and  $b$  would have the same itinerary, contradicting the unique itinerary property of Hubbard trees. So, either  $f(b) = b$  or  $f(b) = a$ .

Suppose  $b$  is fixed. Every endpoint in a free arc with  $a$  must map into different trees emanating from  $c$  and, since  $[a, b]$  maps over  $[c, b]$ , these endpoints cannot map into the tree emanating from  $c$  containing  $b$ . Similarly, since  $f([c_0, c]) = [c_1, a] \ni b$  every endpoint in a free arc with  $c$  must map into different trees emanating from  $a$  which do not contain  $b$ . But then all of the end points in a free arc with  $a$  would have the same itinerary, again violating the unique itinerary property of Hubbard trees.

So  $f(b)$  must equal  $a$ . Then, since  $f([a, b]) = [a, c] \supset [a, b]$ , the fixed point in  $S_1$  must be in  $(a, b)$ . Since  $\bar{1} \in (c_0, c_1)$ , we have  $c_1$  is an endpoint in a free arc with  $a$ . Again, since  $f([c_0, a]) = [c_1, c]$ , we have that every endpoint in a free arc with  $a$  must map into different trees emanating from  $c$  which do not contain  $b$ .

Let  $e$  be an endpoint in a free arc with  $b$ . Since  $f$  is locally injective at  $b$ , and the points  $\bar{1}, c_0, e$  are all on opposite sides  $b$ , we have  $f(\bar{1}), f(c_0)$ , and  $f(e)$  must all be on opposite sides of  $f(b)$ . Since  $b$  and  $\bar{1}$  are in the same tree emanating from  $f(b)$ , we have that no endpoint in a free arc with  $b$  can map to an endpoint in a free arc with  $b$ . Thus, any endpoint in a free arc with  $b$  must have a preimage in  $S_0$ .

But, since  $f([c_0, c]) = [c_1, a]$  we have every endpoint on opposite sides of  $c$  must map to the opposite sides of  $a$  (and not the side containing  $c_1$ ). So there can be only one endpoint in a free arc with  $c$  that can map to an endpoint in a free arc with  $b$ . So, of all the endpoints in a free arc with  $b$ , at most one can have a preimage in  $S_0$ .

Thus, there can be at most one endpoint in a free arc with  $b$ . Thus  $\deg(b) = 3$ .

So if  $T$  is Hubbardizable and  $\deg(a) = \deg(c) > b$ , then  $\deg(b) = 3$ , so  $|D| = 2$  with  $\min(D) = 3$ .

2. If  $\deg(b) = \deg(a) > \deg(c)$  then we must have  $f(\{a, b\}) \subseteq \{a, b\}$ . Thus  $c_0 \in (a, b)$  else  $a$  and  $b$  would share the same itinerary. We now work through a few possibilities.

(a)  $f(a) = a$ . By Lemma 3.2.5, we have  $f(b) = a$  and  $f(c) = b$ . By Lemma 3.2.6 we have  $\deg(b) = 3$  and thus  $\deg(a) = 3$  but by assumption, this means  $\deg(c) < 3$ , a contradiction.

(b)  $f(b) = b$ . We must have  $b \in S_1$  and so  $a \in S_0, c \in S_1$ . By Lemma 3.2.5, we must have  $f(c) = a$ . This is exactly the same as the hypotheses in Lemma 3.2.7 but with the labels of  $a$  and  $c$  reversed. So we find  $\deg(c) = 3$  and  $\deg(a) \in \{3, 4\}$ . However, to be consistent with our assumption  $\deg(b) = \deg(a) > \deg(c)$  we have  $\deg(a) = 4, \deg(b) = 4, \deg(c) = 3$ .

(c)  $f(a) = b, f(b) = a$ . In this case the fixed branch point is actually degree two and lies in  $(a, b)$ . Since  $c$  cannot map to  $a$  without having the same itinerary as  $b$  we must have  $f(c) = b$ . In order to get a picture of this Hubbard tree, we now try to find out which of  $a, b$  belongs to  $S_1$ . There exists a unique point,  $p$  whose itinerary begins  $1^*$ . Since there is only one point in  $S_1$  that maps to  $c_0$ , every point in  $[c_0, p)$  must map to a point in  $S_1$ . If there were a branch point in  $[c_0, p]$  then one of  $a, b$  must be in  $[c_0, p]$ , but since they map to each other, this branch point would map into  $S_0$ ,



so  $[c_0, p]$  is a free arc. Every point in  $S_1 \setminus [p, c_0]$  must map into  $S_0$ . So, if  $b \in S_1$  (and by extension  $c \in S_1$ , then  $f(c) \in S_0$ . But  $f(c) = b \in S_1$ , a contradiction. Thus  $b \in S_0$  and  $a \in S_1$ . So  $c_1$  is in a free arc with  $a$ .

Since each endpoint in a free arc with  $a$  must map into different trees emanating from  $b$ , there can be at most one such endpoint that maps to an endpoint in a free arc with  $c$ . Every endpoint in a free arc with  $b$  must map into different trees emanating from  $a$ , but since  $[b, c]$  maps onto  $[a, b]$ , there are no endpoints in a free arc with  $b$  that map to endpoints in a free arc with  $c$ . Lastly, since each endpoint in a free arc with  $c$  must themselves map into different trees emanating from  $b$ . So there is at most one endpoint in a free arc with  $c$  whose preimage is in  $S_0$ . Thus  $\deg(c) = 3$ .

So if  $\deg(a) = \deg(b) > \deg(c)$  then  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$ .

3. If  $\deg(a) > \max\{\deg(b), \deg(c)\}$ , then  $a = \bar{1}$  and so  $c_1$  is an endpoint in a free arc with  $a$ . Since the branch points must have different itineraries and  $\{f(a), f(b), f(c)\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$ , the branch points cannot all be on the same side of  $c_0$ . So  $c_0 \in (a, b)$  or  $c_0 \in (b, c)$ . By way of contradiction, suppose  $c_0 \in (b, c)$ . Then  $b \in (a, c_0)$  so  $f(b) \in (f(a), f(c_0)) = (a, c_1)$ . But  $[a, c_1]$  is a free arc, a contradiction. So  $c_0 \in (a, b)$ .

Now we figure out where  $b$  and  $c$  map under  $f$ . Since both branch points are in  $S_0$ , they cannot be fixed. So  $f(c) = b$  or  $f(c) = a$ . Suppose  $f(c) = a$ . Then, since  $b \in (c_0, c)$ ,  $f(b) \in (f(c_0), f(c)) = (c_1, a)$ . But, again,  $[a, c_1]$  is a free arc, a

contradiction. So  $f(c) = b$ . Thus  $f(b)$  must be  $a$  since, if  $f(b) = c$  then both branch points would have itinerary  $\bar{0}$ .

Suppose  $\deg(b) \geq 4$ . Then there are at least two end points  $p, q$  which are in a free arc with  $b$ . Since  $f(b) = a$  we must have that  $f(p)$  and  $f(q)$  map into different  $T_i$ 's.

One of  $p$  or  $q$  has to get visited by  $c_0$  first. Without loss of generality,  $c_0$  visits  $p$  first.  $f(p)$  must be in some  $T_i, i > 0$ . That is to say,  $f(p) \in [e, a]$  for some endpoint  $e$  in a free arc with  $a$ . If  $f(p)$  is some non-endpoint, then since the only non-endpoint that can map to an endpoint is  $c_0$ , we have that  $q \notin \text{Orb}(p) \subseteq \text{Orb}(c_0)$ , a contradiction.

If, on the other hand,  $f(p) = e$ , then since  $e$  has already been visited by  $c_0$  we have that  $c_0$  is pre-periodic and only visits endpoints. But then  $\text{Orb}(c_0)$  cannot contain  $q$  since  $f(p) = e$  and so  $q \notin \text{Orb}(e)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $\deg(b) = 3$ .

Thus, since  $f(c) = b$  and  $f$  is locally injective at  $c$ ,  $\deg(c) \leq \deg(b)$  and so  $\deg(c) = 3$ . Thus, if  $T$  is Hubbardizable and  $\deg(a) > \max\{\deg(b), \deg(c)\}$  then  $\deg(b) = \deg(c) = 3$ , so  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$ .

4. If  $\deg(b) > \max\{\deg(a), \deg(c)\}$ , then we have  $b = \bar{1}$ .  $c_0$  must either be in  $(a, b)$  or in  $(b, c)$  otherwise all the branch points would be in  $S_1$  and would each have itinerary  $\bar{1}$ .

Without loss of generality  $c_0 \in [b, c]$ . Then by Lemma 3.2.7 we have  $\deg(a) = 3, \deg(c) \leq 4$ . So either  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  or  $|D| = \{3, 4, k\}$  for some  $k > 4$  and  $\deg(b) = k$ .

So, after all this case-checking we have arrived at the following: if  $T$  is a Hubbardizable tree with three branch points,  $a, b, c$  and  $D = \{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\}$  then either

1.  $|D| = 1$ ,
2.  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  or,
3.  $D = \{3, 4, k\}$  for some  $k > 4$ .

Now, let  $T$  be a tree with three branch points,  $a, b, c$  with  $b \in (a, c)$  such that either

1.  $|D| = 1$ ,
2.  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  or,
3.  $D = \{3, 4, k\}$  for some  $k > 4$  and  $\deg(b) = k$ .

We show  $T$  is Hubbardizable. We do so by providing a kneading sequence which gives rise to  $T$  and as before, we will go case-by-case and subcase-by-subcase.

1. If  $|D| = 1$  then as seen in Theorem 3.2.1,  $T$  is Hubbardizable.
2. If  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$  we have a few cases:
  - (a) If  $\deg(a) = \deg(c) > \deg(b)$  then  $T$  can be made with the kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*(10)^n 1101}$  (see A.0.5).
  - (b) If  $\deg(a) = \deg(b) > \deg(c)$  [or by symmetry  $\deg(c) = \deg(b) > \deg(a)$ ], then  $T$  can be made with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*(10)^{k-2} 100010}$  (see A.0.6).

(c)  $\deg(a) > \max\{\deg(b), \deg(c)\}$  [or by symmetry  $\deg(c) > \max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\}$ ],

then  $T$  can be made with the kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}0001}$  (see [A.0.7](#)).

(d)  $\deg(b) > \max\{\deg(a), \deg(c)\}$ , then  $T$  can be made with the kneading

sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}01011}$  (see [A.0.8](#)).

3. If  $|D| = \{3, 4, k\}$  and  $\deg(b) = k$ , then  $T$  can be made with the kneading

sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}001011}$  (see [A.0.8](#)).

Thus, if  $|D| = 1$ ,  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3$ , or  $|D| = \{3, 4, k\}$  and  $\deg(b) = k$ , then  $T$

is Hubbardizable. □

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Branch Points and Endpoints of Hubbard Tree Inverse Limits

Our goal is to eventually construct an infinite family of homeomorphic abstract dendritic Julia sets which have, at their cores, homeomorphic generalized Hubbard trees, but such that the inverse limit of each dendritic Julia set is *not* homeomorphic to any other. To show that these aforementioned inverse limits are not homeomorphic requires careful examination of branch points and endpoints. With that in mind, we now turn our attention to branch points and endpoints of inverse limits of Hubbard trees. For this chapter, let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard tree.

*Definition 4.0.1:* Define  $I_0 = \{p \in H : p \text{ is a branch point or in the critical orbit}\}$ , and for  $n > 0$ , define  $I_n = f^{-1}(I_{n-1})$ .

*Definition 4.0.2:* For  $\bar{x} \in \hat{H}$ , define

$$\varphi(\bar{x}) = \min\{D \mid \deg(\vec{x}_{-n}) = D \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \omega\}.$$

Observe that since the set  $\{D \mid \text{there exists } x \in H \text{ with } \deg(x) = D\}$  is a subset of the set of degrees of branch points in  $H$  and is thus finite,  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  is well defined.

*Lemma 4.0.3:* If  $\bar{x}$  is a point in  $\hat{H}$  such that  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is a branch point for all  $n \in \omega$ , then  $\deg(\vec{x}_{-n}) = \varphi(\bar{x})$  for all  $n \in \omega$ . Furthermore,  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is periodic for all  $n \in \omega$ .

*Proof.* Since each branch point in  $H$  is (pre)periodic, and there are finitely many such points, then there is some  $w \in \omega$  such that, for all branch points,  $b \in H$ ,  $\sigma^w(b)$  is periodic.

With this in mind, if  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is a pre-periodic branch point, then  $\vec{x}_{-(n+w)}$  must not be a branch point. So if  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is a branch point for all  $n \in \omega$ , then  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  must be periodic for all  $n \in \omega$ .

Moreover, since  $\sigma$  is locally injective at all branch points (since it is locally injective at all non-critical points), the degree of a periodic branch point must be the same as the degree of all points in its orbit. Thus, if  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is a branch point for all  $n \in \omega$  then  $\deg(\vec{x}_{-n}) = \deg(\vec{x}_{-m})$  for all  $n, m \in \omega$ . This degree, by definition, is  $\varphi(\bar{x})$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 4.0.4:* Let  $[a, b] \subset H$ . Then  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  has at most two components.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  has three or more components. Then there is an  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $S_i \cap f^{-1}([a, b])$  has at least two components. Call these two components  $W, Y$ . Then, since  $f|_{S_i}$  is an embedding by Lemma 2.2.1,  $f(W \cup Y)$  is a disconnected subset of  $[a, b]$ . So there is some  $z \in (a, b)$  such that  $z$  separates  $f(W)$  and  $f(Y)$  and  $f^{-1}(z) \cap S_i = \emptyset$ .

Let  $w$  be a point in  $f(W)$  and let  $w' \in W$  such that  $f(w') = w$ . Define  $y$  and  $y'$  similarly. Then by the intermediate value theorem, there is some  $z' \in (w', y')$  such that  $f(z') = z$ . But since  $w', y' \in S_i$  we must have  $z' \in S_i$ , contradicting the fact that  $f^{-1}(z) \cap S_i = \emptyset$ . Thus  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  has at most two components, and at most one component in each of  $S_1, S_0$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 4.0.5:* Let  $[a, b] \subset H$  be an arc such that no point of  $(a, b)$  is in  $I_0$ . If  $a \neq c_1$  and  $b \neq c_1$ , then  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  is either homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$  or is the union of two disjoint sets each of which is homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$ , or made of two disjoint sets — one of which is homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$  while the other is a singleton.

If  $c_1 \in \{a, b\}$ , then  $f^{-1}([a, b]) \setminus \{c_0\}$  is made of two disjoint sets,  $U, V$  such that  $U \cup \{c_0\}$  and  $V \cup \{c_0\}$  are both homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$ .

*Proof.* To start, suppose  $c_1 \notin [a, b]$ . If  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  has only one component then we are done, so suppose there are two nonempty components  $U, V$ .

Suppose  $V$  is not a singleton and  $f(V) \neq [a, b]$ . The set  $V$  must be closed, since  $V$  is the preimage of a closed set under the continuous function  $f|_V$ . So  $f(V) \subset [a, b]$  is closed, and is thus an arc. Then, since  $f(V) \neq [a, b]$ , at least one of the endpoints must not have a preimage in  $V$ . We have two cases. Either:

1. neither end point has a preimage in  $V$  or,
2. without loss of generality,  $b$  does not have a preimage in  $V$ , but  $a$  does.

As we will see, both of these lead to contradictions. In case 1, let  $z \in V$ . Then  $f(z) \in [a, b]$ . Then, since  $[c_0, z] \subseteq S_i$  for some  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we have  $f|_{[c_0, z]}$  is an embedding, so  $f([c_0, z])$  is an arc. Moreover,  $f([c_0, z]) \cap [a, b] = [c_1, f(z)] \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset$ . Then either  $a \in [c_1, z] \cap [a, b]$ ,  $b \in [c_1, z] \cap [a, b]$  or  $[c_1, z] \cap [a, b] = \{z\}$ . In the first two cases we arrive at a contradiction because one of  $a$  or  $b$  has a preimage in  $V$ , and in the latter case we find  $f(z)$  is a branch point, but  $(a, b)$  misses  $I_0$ .

If we are in case 2, then  $a \in f(V)$  and  $b \notin f(V)$ . Since  $V$  is an arc,  $f(V)$  must also be an arc. So, let  $p$  be such that  $f(V) = [a, p]$ . Let  $p' \in V$  be the point that maps to  $p$ . Since  $V$  misses  $I_0$  we have  $p'$  is neither a branch point, nor an end point of  $H$ . But, since  $f|_V$  is an embedding, and  $p$  is an endpoint of  $f(V)$ , we must have  $p'$  is an endpoint of  $V$ . So we can find an arc  $[d, p']$  such that  $[d, p'] \cap V = \{p'\}$ . By definition of  $V$  we must have  $f([d, p']) \cap [a, b] = \{p\}$ , but this implies  $p$  is a branch point. Thus, either  $p$  is in  $(a, b)$  and is a branch point or  $p = a$ . But both cases lead to a contradiction. Thus, if  $V$  is not a singleton, then  $f(V) = [a, b]$ .

At least one of  $U, V$  must not be a singleton, so either both  $U, V$  are homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$  or one of them is homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$  and the other is a singleton.

Now, suppose  $a = c_1$ . Then  $f^{-1}([a, b])$  is an arc containing  $c_0$ . In  $S_1$  we have  $f([\bar{1}, c_0]) = [\bar{1}, c_1] \supseteq [a, b]$ . So  $b$  has a preimage in  $S_1$ . Moreover,  $b$  must have a preimage in  $S_0$  since  $(a, b)$  misses  $I_0$ . If  $b$  had no preimage in  $S_0$ , then  $f(S_0) \subset (a, b)$ . But  $S_0$  contains points on the critical orbit, so then  $(a, b)$  would also contains points in the critical orbit. Then  $f^{-1}([a, b]) \setminus \{c_0\}$  is the union of two sets  $U, V$  such that  $U \cup \{c_0\}$  and  $V \cup \{c_0\}$  are both homeomorphic to  $[a, b]$  under  $f$ .  $\square$

*Theorem 4.0.6:* For each  $\bar{x} \in \hat{H}$ ,  $\deg(\bar{x}) = \varphi(\bar{x})$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\bar{x} \in \hat{H}$  and let  $d = \varphi(\bar{x})$ . We first show that  $\deg(\bar{x}) \geq d$  by building subcontinua  $A^1, \dots, A^d \subset \hat{H}$  with  $\{\bar{x}\} \subsetneq A^i$  and  $A^i \cap A^j = \{\bar{x}\}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq d$ .

Fix  $n \in \omega$  such that  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is point of degree  $d$ . So there exists  $d$  many subcontinua of  $H$ , call them  $K_{-n}^1, \dots, K_{-n}^d$ , such that each contains  $\{\vec{x}_{-n}\}$  as a proper subset and,



$K_{-n}^i \cap K_{-n}^j = \{\vec{x}_{-n}\}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq d$ . What's more, without loss of generality, each  $K_{-n}^i$  can be chosen so that each  $K_{-n}^i$  is an arc and  $K_{-n}^i \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n}\}$  misses  $I_0$ .

Now, for  $m < n$  define  $K_{-m}^i := f^{n-m}(K_{-n}^i)$ . For  $m > n$  define  $K_{-m}^i$  to be the component of  $f^{-(m-n)}(K_{-n}^i)$  which contains  $\vec{x}_{-m}$ . This component is homeomorphic to  $K_{-n}^i$  by Lemma 4.0.5. Define  $A^i = \varprojlim \{K_{-n}^i, f\}$ . By construction,  $\langle A^i \rangle_{i \leq d}$  is a set of  $d$  nondegenerate subcontinua of  $\hat{H}$  whose pairwise intersection is  $\bar{x}$ . Thus  $\deg(\bar{x}) \geq d$ .

All that is left to show is that  $\bar{x}$  is point of degree exactly  $d$ . With this in mind, suppose  $\bar{x}$  is degree at least  $d+1$  and let  $A^i, i \leq d+1$  be a set of proper subcontinua of  $\hat{H}$  each of which properly contain  $\bar{x}$  and  $A^i \cap A^j = \{\bar{x}\}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq d+1$ .

Let  $(n_k)_{k \in \omega}$  be a sequence of indices such that  $\deg(\vec{x}_{-n_k}) = d$  for all  $k \in \omega$  and  $\pi_{-n_k}(A^i) \neq H$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq d+1, k \in \omega$ . Note that since each  $A^i$  is a proper subcontinuum of  $\hat{H}$ , for each  $i \leq d+1$  there must be some  $i_j \in \omega$  such that for all  $m > i_j, \pi_m(A^i) \neq H$ , else  $A^i$  would be  $\hat{H}$ . Moreover, since  $A^i$  is not a singleton,  $\pi_{-m}(A^i)$  is not a singleton for all  $m \in \omega$ . To see why, notice that if  $\pi_{-m}(A^i)$  were a singleton and  $\pi_{-(m+1)}(A^i)$  were not, then since each point in  $H$  has at most two preimages,  $\pi_{-(m+1)}(A^i)$  would have at most two points. But  $\pi_{-(m+1)}(A^i)$  is a continuum and thus, must be a singleton. So, if  $\pi_{-m}(A^i)$  is a singleton for any  $m$ , then it is a singleton for every  $m$ . But  $A^i$  is not a singleton, so  $\pi_{-m}(A^i)$  is not a singleton for any  $m$ .

Then, for all  $k$ , since  $\deg(\vec{x}_{-n_k}) = d$ , there must be a pair  $A^{i_k}, A^{j_k}$  from our set of continua in  $\hat{H}$  such that  $(\pi_{-n_k}(A^{i_k}) \cap \pi_{-n_k}(A^{j_k})) \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n_k}\} \neq \emptyset$ . But, since there are infinitely many indices and only finitely many pairs of continua, there

must be a pair of continua  $A^i, A^j$  such that  $(\pi_{-n_k}(A^i) \cap \pi_{-n_k}(A^j)) \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n_k}\} \neq \emptyset$  for infinitely many  $k$ . But, if  $(\pi_{-n_k}(A^i) \cap \pi_{-n_k}(A^j)) \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n_k}\} \neq \emptyset$  for some  $k$ , then  $(\pi_{-n_r}(A^i) \cap \pi_{-n_r}(A^j)) \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n_r}\} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $r < k$ .

Thus, for all  $r \in \omega$ ,  $(\pi_{-n_r}(A^i) \cap \pi_{-n_r}(A^j)) \setminus \{\vec{x}_{-n_r}\} \neq \emptyset$ . But this would mean that  $A^i \cap A^j \setminus \{\bar{x}\} \neq \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $\deg(\bar{x}) = \varphi(\bar{x})$ .  $\square$

*Corollary 4.0.7:*  $\bar{x}$  is an endpoint of  $\hat{H}$  if and only if  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  is an endpoint of  $H$  for infinitely many  $n \in \omega$ .

*Corollary 4.0.8:* The number of branch points in  $\hat{H}$  is exactly the number of periodic branch points in  $H$ , and the degree of a branch point in  $\hat{H}$  is exactly the degree of all of its projections.

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{b} \in \hat{H}$  be a branch point. Then  $\deg(\bar{b}) \geq 3$ . As such, by Lemma 4.0.3 and Theorem 4.0.6 this must mean that  $\vec{b}_{-n}$  is a periodic branch point in  $H$  with  $\deg_H(\vec{b}_{-n}) = \deg_{\hat{H}}(\bar{b})$  for all  $n \in \omega$ .

Each branch point in  $\hat{H}$  can be uniquely identified by its zeroth projection. To see why, suppose  $\bar{b}, \bar{x}$  are two branch points in  $\hat{H}$  with  $\vec{b}_0 = \vec{x}_0$ . Then for all  $n \in \omega$ ,  $\vec{b}_{-n}$  and  $\vec{x}_{-n}$  are both periodic points in the orbit of  $\vec{b}_0$  which map to  $\vec{b}_0$  in exactly  $n$  iterates, and thus must be the same point. So, for every branch point  $\bar{b} \in \hat{H}$ , there exists a unique periodic branch point  $\beta \in H$  such that  $\bar{b}_0 = \beta$ .

Moreover, by the construction of inverse limits, for every periodic branch point  $\beta$  in  $H$ , there must be some  $\bar{b} \in \hat{H}$  whose projections are all the periodic preimages of  $\beta$ . In particular, for each  $\beta \in H$ , there is some  $\bar{b} \in \hat{H}$  such that  $\bar{b}_0 = \beta$ .

Thus, the number of branch points in  $\hat{H}$  is exactly the number of periodic branch points in  $H$  and the degree of a branch point in  $\hat{H}$  is the same as the degree of all of its projections.  $\square$

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Constructing Infinite Families with Pairwise Non-Homeomorphic Inverse Limits

Recall that an abstract dendritic Julia set is a triple,  $(D, H, f)$  where  $f$  is the associated function and  $H$  is the associated Hubbard tree. In this chapter our goal is to, given a dendritic Julia set,  $(D, H, f)$ , construct two infinite families. Each element in the first family will have the form  $(D_i, H_i, f_i)$  and the family will have the property  $D_i \cong D$  for all  $i$ , but  $H_i \cong H_j$  if and only if  $i = j$  and  $\varprojlim \{D_i, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{D_j, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ . As a bonus, each member  $(D_i, H_i, f_i)$  of this constructed family is an actual dendritic Julia set and Hubbard tree of some complex quadratic polynomial.

Each element in the second family will, again, have the form  $(D_i, H_i, f_i)$ , but, perhaps more surprisingly, both  $D_i \cong D$  and  $H_i \cong H$  for all  $i$ , but  $\varprojlim \{D_i, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{D_j, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ .

To this end we need four things. The first is a rephrasing of [Bal12, Theorem 4.2]:

*Theorem 5.0.1:* If  $(D_1, H_1, f_1)$  and  $(D_2, H_2, f_2)$  are two dendritic Julia sets such that  $\varprojlim \{D_1, f_1\} \cong \varprojlim \{D_2, f_2\}$ , then  $\varprojlim \{H_1, f_1\} \cong \varprojlim \{H_2, f_2\}$ .

The second and third things we need are lemmas that help prove the fourth.

*Lemma 5.0.2:* In an dendritic Julia set  $D$ ,  $f$  is locally two-to-one at  $c_0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $D$  is self-similar under  $f$  we have  $f(S_1 \cup \{c_0\}) = f(S_2 \cup \{c_0\}) = D$ . So every point in  $D \setminus \{c_1\}$  has exactly two preimages, one in  $S_0$  and one in  $S_1$ . So

any point in a neighborhood of  $c_1$  has two preimages in a neighborhood of  $c_0$ , so  $f$  is locally two-to-one at  $c_0$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 5.0.3:* If  $(H, f)$  has prime kneading sequence, then for any point  $p \in H$  the set of points that eventually map to  $p$  is arc-dense in  $D$ .

*Proof.* As shown in [BKS11],  $D = \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \omega} f^{-n}(H)}$ . So the set of points in  $D$  that eventually map into  $H$  is dense in  $D$ . Moreover,  $f^{-1}(H)$  is the union of the preimage of  $H$  in  $\overline{S_0}$  together with the preimage of  $H$  in  $\overline{S_1}$ . Both of these are connected and contain  $c_0$  so  $f^{-1}(H)$  is connected.

So, since  $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} f^{-n}(H)$  is a connected dense subset of  $D$ , we have that  $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} f^{-n}(H)$  contains every point in  $D$  except possibly some endpoint. So any arc in  $D$  that does not contain an endpoint of  $D$  must map into  $H$  in finitely many iterations. Since the kneading sequence is prime, the system  $(H, f)$  is locally eventually onto so any arc in  $H$  eventually covers  $H$ . The result follows.  $\square$

The fourth thing we need allows us to determine the structure of the dendrite from the Hubbard tree:

*Theorem 5.0.4:* Let  $D$  be an abstract dendritic Julia set with associated function  $f$ , Hubbard Tree,  $H$ , and critical point  $c_0$ . Let  $\Delta = \{d : \text{there is a cyclic branch point } b \in H \text{ with } \deg_H(b) = d\}$ . Then  $D$  will have an arc dense set of branch points of degree  $d$  for each  $d \in \Delta$ . Moreover, if  $c_0$  is periodic then  $D$  will have an arc dense set of branch points of degree infinity. If  $c_0$  is pre-periodic, let  $j = \max\{\deg_H(f^i(c_0))\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

Then  $D$  will have an arc dense set of branch points of degree  $2j$ .  $D$  will contain no branch points other than those that are previously mentioned.

*Proof.* Let us first consider  $Orb(c_0)$ . Let  $c_i$  be the endpoint of  $H$  last visited by  $c_0$ . If  $c_0$  is periodic, then let  $n$  be minimal such that  $f^n(c_i) = c_0$ . Then  $f^n$  is a homeomorphism on a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $c_i$  in  $D$ . Thus, since  $D$  is self-similar under  $f$ ,  $\deg_D(c_i) = \deg_D(c_0)$ . However, by Lemma 5.0.2,  $f$  is locally two-to-one at  $c_0$ . So we have  $\deg_D(c_0) = 2 \deg_D(c_1) = 2 \deg_D(c_i) = 2 \deg_D(c_0)$  and so  $\deg_D(c_0) = \infty$ .

If  $c_0$  is pre-periodic, let  $j = \max\{\deg_H(f^i(c_0))\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and let  $m$  be maximal so that  $c_m \neq c_i$  for all  $i < m$  but  $c_{m+1} = c_i$  for some  $i < m + 1$ , i.e. let  $c_m$  be the point in  $Orb(c_0)$  last visited by  $c_0$ . Because  $f$  is locally injective for all  $x \in H \setminus \{c_0\}$ ,  $\deg_H(x) \leq \deg_H(f(x))$  for all  $x \in H \setminus \{c_0\}$ . Then the degree of  $c_m$  in  $H$  must be maximal among  $Orb(c_0)$  so  $c_m$  is a point degree  $j$ . Since  $f$  is a local homeomorphism at all points except  $c_0$ , we have  $\deg_D(c_i) = j$  for all  $i > 0$ . But since  $f$  is locally 2-1 at  $c_0$  and  $f$  is locally 1-1 on  $D - \{c_0\}$  we must have that  $c_0$  is a branch point in  $D$  of degree  $2j$ .

Since the set of precritical points is arc dense in  $D$  [Bal07, Proposition 1.17] we have that there is an arc dense set of degree infinity points (if  $c_0$  is periodic) or degree  $2j$  points (if  $c_0$  is pre-periodic).

Let us now consider the branch points of  $H$ . Fix a branch point  $b \in H$  let  $d = \max\{\deg_H(f^j(b)) : j \in \omega\}$ . (Note: every branch point is either periodic or pre-periodic, so this maximum is well defined). Let  $p$  be a periodic branch point in  $Orb(b)$ . Then  $\deg_H(p) = d$ . Since  $f$  is self similar on  $D$ , we have  $\deg_D(b) = \deg_D(p)$ . We want

to show that  $\deg_D(b) = \deg_H(p)$ . Since  $H \subseteq D$  we must have  $\deg_H(p) \leq \deg_D(p)$ . Suppose  $\deg_D(p) > \deg_H(p)$ . Let  $a \in D \setminus H$  be such that  $[p, a]$  is an arc emanating from  $p$ . Then  $[p, a] \cap H = p$ .

Since the set of precritical points is dense in  $D$ , there is a minimal  $n$  such that  $f^n([a, p])$  contains  $c_0$ . As such, there is a minimal  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f^m([a, p]) \cap H \neq \emptyset$ . But, on a sufficiently small neighborhood of  $p$ ,  $f^m$  is injective. So, if  $f^{m-1}([p, a])$  maps into  $H$  under  $f$ , then there must be an arc emanating from  $f^{m-1}(p)$  in  $H$  that maps out of  $H$  under  $f$ . But  $H$  is closed under  $f$ , a contradiction. So,  $\deg_D(p) = \deg_H(p)$ . Thus  $\deg_D(b) = \max\{\deg_H(f^j(b)) : j \in \omega\}$ .

By Lemma 5.0.3 we must have that for all  $x \in D$  that eventually map to  $b$  (except for those that are pre-critical, mapping to  $c_0$  before eventually mapping to  $b$ ),  $\deg_D(x) = d$ . The self-similarity of  $D$  ensures that this set is arc-dense. So  $D$  contains an arc dense set of branch points of degree  $d$  for each  $d \in \Delta$ .

Suppose  $D$  had branch points of some other degree not in  $\Delta \cup \{\deg_D(c_0)\}$ . Then since  $D$  is self similar, we would know that these branch points are arc dense in  $D$  and so are also arc dense in  $H$ , though their degree in  $H$  would have to be two, because the degrees of all the branch points in  $H$  have already been taken into consideration during construction of  $\Delta$ . Similarly, these branch points in  $D$  cannot not be precritical, since we have already covered the degrees of the precritical points. The arcs in  $D \setminus H$  emanating from these branch points in  $H$  could never map into  $H$  (since  $f$  is 1-1 everywhere except  $c_0$  and the points are not precritical), and so the itinerary of every point on these arcs would be the same as the itinerary of the branch point, contradicting the arc-density of precritical points in  $D$ .  $\square$

*Corollary 5.0.5:* In any dendritic Julia set  $D$ , the set  $\{d : \exists b \in D \text{ with } \deg_D(b) = d\}$  is finite.

*Proof.* Suppose the set is infinite. Then by Theorem 5.0.4, the set  $\Delta = \{d : \text{there is a cyclic branch point } b \in H \text{ with } \deg_H(b) = d\}$  must be infinite. But there are only finitely many branch points in  $H$ .  $\square$

So now, given a Hubbard tree  $(H, f)$  we can determine the structure of the dendrite. We now seek to construct Hubbard trees whose dendrites will be homeomorphic to some given dendrite. This task breaks into two cases: if the given dendrite has degree infinity points, then the turning point in our Hubbard tree must be periodic, and otherwise the turning point must be pre-periodic. This gives us two cases, periodic kneading sequences, and pre-periodic kneading sequences. We are now ready to construct the first family.

### 5.1 Different Hubbard Tree, Same Dendrite, Different Inverse Limit

In order to achieve our goal of constructing an infinite family of pairwise homeomorphic abstract dendritic Julia sets with pairwise non-homeomorphic Hubbard trees, we rely heavily on internal addresses introduced in [BS08] which is defined as follows:

*Definition 5.1.1:* For a kneading sequence  $\tau$  define

$$\rho_\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad \rho_\tau(n) = \inf\{k > n : \tau_k \neq \tau_{k-n}\}.$$



If the kneading sequence  $\tau$  is made clear from context, we typically write  $\rho$  instead of  $\rho_\tau$ . For  $k \geq 1$  we call  $Orb_\rho(k) = k \rightarrow \rho(k) \rightarrow \rho^2(k) \rightarrow \dots$  the  $\rho$ -orbit of  $k$ . The *internal address* of a kneading sequence  $\tau$  is the  $\rho$ -orbit of 1.

If there exists  $j$  for which  $\rho^j(1) = \infty$  then we say that the internal address is finite  $1 \rightarrow \rho(1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \rho^{j-1}(1)$ . As a result  $Orb_\rho$  is a finite or infinite sequence that never contains  $\infty$ .

Notice that if  $\tau$  is a periodic kneading sequence with prime period  $k$  then  $Orb_\rho(\tau)$  is finite.

Along with the definition of an internal address comes a notion of an internal address and its associated kneading sequence being admissible.

*Definition 5.1.2:* An internal address  $\varrho$  is admissible if, for each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  at least one of the following is false:

1.  $\varrho$  contains  $m$ ,
2. there exists some  $k < m$  such that  $k$  divides  $m$  and  $\rho(k) > m$ ,
3.  $\rho(m) = \infty$  or if  $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  is congruent to  $\rho(m) \pmod{m}$ , then  $m \notin Orb_\rho(r)$ .

If an internal address is admissible, we also say that the associated kneading sequence is admissible.

The reason we bring this up is that we aim to, given a set,  $\Delta$ , of degrees of branch points, construct an admissible internal address whose associated abstract dendritic Julia set has periodic branch points of degree  $d$  for each  $d \in \Delta$ .

*Algorithm 5.1.3:* Let  $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  be a list of (not necessarily unique) natural numbers such that  $d_i \geq 3$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We define a function

$$IA : \{\text{finite lists of finite numbers greater than two}\} \rightarrow \{\text{finite internal addresses}\}$$

by  $IA(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) = k_0 \rightarrow k_1 \rightarrow k_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow k_n$  where  $k_j$  is defined by the sequence  $k_0 = 1, k_j = k_{j-1}(d_j - 1) + 1$ .

*Example 5.1.4:* Suppose our list of numbers is  $(5, 4, 3)$ . Then  $IA(5, 4, 3) = 1 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 16 \rightarrow 33$ . We can then convert this, if we so desired, to a kneading sequence as in Algorithm 2.3 of [BKS11]. To do so we start with the string “1”, and we repeat this string until we reach character number  $k_1 = 5$ . Here we flip the character to its opposite (i.e. if regular repetition would make the  $5^{th}$  character a 1, we make the  $5^{th}$  character a 0 and vice-versa). So our new string is “11110”. We now copy and paste this string until we reach the  $k_2 = 16^{th}$  character, at which point we flip the  $16^{th}$  character to its opposite. So our string is now “1111011110111100”. We now repeat this string until we reach the  $k_3 = 33^{rd}$  character, but since 33 is the largest number in the internal address, and must correspond to the period of the critical point we write a \* for the  $33^{rd}$  character. We make the whole sequence repeat, and we have our kneading sequence,  $\tau = \overline{*11110111101111001111011110111100}$ .

*Lemma 5.1.5:* In a kneading sequence made from any internal address in the range of  $IA$  every block of 1’s is of length  $k_1 - 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be the kneading sequence associated with an internal address  $k_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow k_n$  in the range of  $IA$ . By definition,  $k_j \cong 1 \pmod{k_{j-1}}$  so we are guaranteed to iterate through the sequence  $\tau_1\tau_2, \dots, \tau_{k_{j-1}}$  a whole number of times before flipping character  $k_j$ . This means that each block of 1's is an exact copy of the very first block of 1's which is of length  $k_1 - 1$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 5.1.6:* Any tree whose internal address is in the range of  $IA$  will have  $k_n - n + 1$  endpoints where  $n$  is the index of the last element in the internal address.

*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be the kneading sequence associated with the given internal address. By construction of  $\tau$ , the last block of 0s before repetition has length  $n$  and is longer than any other block of 0s. Let  $w$  be the index of the first 0 in this block. Thus, by Theorem 2.2.12,  $\sigma^w(\tau)$  is the itinerary of an endpoint of  $H$  and  $\sigma^{w-1}(\tau)$  is not the itinerary of an endpoint of  $H$ .

The kneading sequence has prime period  $k_n$ , and each shift of the critical point is an endpoint except for those shifts whose itineraries begin  $0^{n-m}*$  for some  $1 \leq m < n$ , i.e.  $f^j(c_0)$  is an endpoint if and only if  $0 < j \leq k_n - n + 1$ , so there are exactly  $k_n - n + 1$  many endpoints.  $\square$

*Lemma 5.1.7:* In any tree whose internal address is in the range of  $IA$ , for any endpoint,  $p'$ , in  $S_0$  with itinerary  $p$  that maps into  $S_1$  we have  $V(\sigma(\tau), \tau, \sigma(p)) \neq \bar{1}$ . That is to say,  $f(p') \in T_1$  (the tree emanating from  $\bar{1}$  containing  $c_1$ ).

*Proof.* Any endpoint in  $S_0$  that maps into  $S_1$  must map to an endpoint by the same reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 5.1.6. But every block of 0's is followed by a \*

or  $k_1 - 1$  many 1s. So if we map to an endpoint in  $S_1$ , the itinerary of that endpoint must begin with exactly  $k_1$  many 1s.

So,  $\sigma(p)$  begins  $1^{k_1-1}0\dots$ . Thus,

$$V(\sigma(\tau), \tau, \sigma(p)) = 1^{k_1-1}0 \frown V(\sigma^{k_1+1}(\tau), \sigma^{k_1}(\tau), \sigma^{k_1+1}(p)) \neq \bar{1}.$$

Thus,  $[c_1, f(p')] \cap [c_1, c_0] \cap [c_0, f(p')]$  is not the fixed branch point, so  $f(p')$  is either in  $T_1$  or  $T_0^*$ ? But, since  $\sigma(p)$  begins  $1^{k_1-1}0\dots$ , we have that  $f(p'), f^2(p'), \dots, f^{k_1-1}(p')$  are all in  $S_1$ , but  $f^{k_1}(p')$  is in  $S_0$ . By Lemma 3.0.7  $T_0^*$  maps injectively into  $T_1$  which maps injectively into  $T_2$  and, continuing in this manner,  $T_{k_1}$  maps injectively into  $T_0$ . So, any point in  $T_0^*$  requires at least  $k_1$  many iterations of  $f$  to map into  $S_0$ . Since  $p'$  maps into  $S_0$  in fewer iterates,  $p'$  must be in  $T_1$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 5.1.8:* Any internal address in the range of  $IA$  is admissible.

*Proof.* Let  $\tau$  be the kneading sequence associated with an internal address  $k_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow k_n$  in the range of  $IA$ . It has been shown (6.5, 6.6, [Sch17]) that the internal address associated with  $\tau$  is admissible if no shift  $\sigma^k(\tau)$  exceeds  $\tau$  (without  $*$ ) with respect to lexicographic ordering.

To see that  $\sigma^0(\tau)$  is indeed maximal, lexicographical speaking, we begin by recalling that every string of 1s in  $\tau$  is exactly  $k_1 - 1$  characters long by Lemma 5.1.5. So the largest lexicographic shift of  $\tau$  we must start with  $k_1 - 1$  many 1s. So the first 0 is at position  $k_1$  and there is a 0 at every whole number multiple of  $k_1$ .

Similarly, in  $\tau$  each block of two 0s are such that the last 0 in the block is a whole number multiple of  $k_2$  apart from one another. That is, there is a 0 at every whole number multiple of  $k_2$ . So, in order for a shift of  $\tau$  to be the largest lexicographic shift possible it must have the first occurrence of a second 0 to be at position  $k_2$ . Similarly there are 0s at every multiple of  $k_3$ , and these 0s come at the end of a block of length 3, so the maximal shift will be such that the first occurrence of a third 0 is at position  $k_3$ . Continuing in this way, there is a 0 at every multiple of  $k_j$  and these 0s come at the end of a block of length  $j$ , so the furthest such a 0 can be from the start of the string is at position  $k_j$ . There is only one shift that can accomplish all of these, and that is the zeroth shift. Thus  $\sigma^0(\tau) = \max\{\sigma^i(\tau)\}$  with respect to lexicographical ordering, so  $\tau$  and its internal address are admissible.  $\square$

Now that we know that the kneading sequence is admissible, we introduce a nifty fact, proven in the the same paper that originally defined internal addresses:

*Theorem 5.1.9:* A Hubbard tree can be realized by a quadratic polynomial if and only if the associated kneading sequence does not fail the admissibility condition for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Theorem 5.1.10:* Let  $D$  be a dendritic Julia set with associated Hubbard tree  $(H, f)$  such that  $D$  has a branch point of infinite degree (i.e.  $c_0$  is periodic under  $f$ ). Let  $\Delta = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$  be the set of finite degrees of branch points in  $D$ . Then  $IA(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  is the internal address of a Hubbard tree  $(H', f')$  whose associated dendrite  $D'$  is homeomorphic to  $D$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 5.1.8 shows that the internal address is admissible.

In [BS08, Proposition 4.19], it is shown that if for any  $m \geq 1$ , we let  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  be congruent to  $\rho(m)$  modulo  $m$ , and define

$$q(m) = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho(m)-r}{m} + 1 & \text{if } m \in \text{Orb}_\rho(r) \\ \frac{\rho(m)-r}{m} + 2 & \text{if } m \notin \text{Orb}_\rho(r) \end{cases}$$

then, for any entry  $m$  in the internal address with  $q(m) \geq 3$ , there is a branch point of exact period  $m$  whose degree is  $q(m)$  (unless  $m$  is the period of the critical point). Moreover, if  $z$  is a branch point of exact period  $m$ , then  $m$  is in the internal address.

In this way, the internal address contains a substantial portion of the dynamical information about the periodic branch points of the tree.

The internal address constructed by this algorithm creates a Hubbard tree  $(H', f')$  that contains periodic branch points of the appropriate degrees since, by construction  $q(k_{j-1}) = d_j$ .

Hence,  $H'$  is such that, for each  $d_j \in \Delta$ , there is a periodic branch point,  $p \in H$  whose degree is  $d_j$ .

Let  $D'$  be the dendritic Julia set associated with  $(H', f')$ . By Theorem 5.0.4,  $D'$  will have an arc-dense set of branch points of degree  $d_j$  for each  $d_j \in \Delta$  and, since the critical point of  $H'$  is periodic under  $f'$ , an arc dense set of degree infinity branch points.

In [CD94, Theorem 6.2], it is shown that if two abstract dendritic Julia sets,  $J, L$  are such that  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{there exists an arc dense set of branch points in } J \text{ with degree}$

$n\} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{there exists an arc dense set of branch points in } L \text{ with degree } n\}$ , then  $J$  and  $L$  are homeomorphic. Thus, since they share the same set of degrees of arc dense branch points,  $D' \cong D$ .  $\square$

*Corollary 5.1.11:* Every abstract dendritic Julia set with an arc dense set of degree infinity branch points is homeomorphic to the Julia set of some quadratic polynomial.

*Proof.* Let  $D$  be an abstract dendritic Julia set with an arc dense set of degree infinity branch points. Note that dendritic Julia sets have a finite set of degrees its branch points can take, so we can apply Theorem 5.1.10 to the finite list of finite degree branch points in  $D$  to make an admissible internal address of a Hubbard tree whose associated dendrite is homeomorphic to  $D$ . Since the internal address is admissible, the Hubbard tree can be realized by a quadratic polynomial by Theorem 5.1.9.  $\square$

*Theorem 5.1.12:* Let  $(D, H, f)$  be an abstract dendritic Julia set with Hubbard tree  $H$  and function  $f$  with a periodic critical point. Then there is an infinite family  $\langle (D_i, H_i, f_i) \rangle_{i \in \omega}$  all of which have a critical point that is periodic under  $f_i$ , and  $H_i \cong H_j$  if, and only if,  $i = j$  and  $D_i \cong D$  for all  $i$ .

Moreover,  $\varprojlim \{D_i, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{D_j, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ .

*Proof.* If the set of finite degrees of arc-dense branch points in  $D$  is  $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$ , then we can get homeomorphic dendrites by using Algorithm 5.1.3 on  $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  or  $(d_1, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ , or  $(d_1, d_1, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ , etc. But, by construction, each of these Hubbard trees will have sets of periodic branch points of degree  $d_1$  with distinct

cardinalities and since these are the only branch points of degree  $d_1$  in the Hubbard tree, the underlying trees will be non-homeomorphic.

Furthermore, for the family of Hubbard trees  $(H_i, f_i)$  let  $B_i$  be the set of periodic branch points in  $(H_i, f_i)$ . Then we have  $|B_i| = |B_j|$  if and only if  $i = j$ . But by Theorem 4.0.6 this must mean  $\varprojlim \{H_i, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{H_j, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ , and so, by Theorem 5.0.1 we have  $\varprojlim \{D_i, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{D_j, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ .  $\square$

### 5.2 Same Hubbard tree, Same Dendritic Julia set, Different Inverse Limits

In this section we demonstrate that for each dendritic Julia set  $D$ , there is a countable collection of distinct kneading sequences whose associated dendrites are homeomorphic to  $D$  but which have mutually non-homeomorphic inverse limits. In order to do so, we first prove that each Hubbard tree is compatible with a countable family of dynamically distinct unimodal maps. In particular, the postcritical periods of this family are not bounded, which will be crucial to our main result.

We first we recall Lemma 2.2.5 which says that if  $\tau$  is acceptable, then there is a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$  which has the unique itinerary property.

*Lemma 5.2.1:* Let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard Tree with a prime kneading sequence. Then there exist infinitely many unimodal maps  $g : H \rightarrow H$  sharing the same critical point as  $f$  such that  $(H, g)$  is a Hubbard tree with the unique itinerary property.

*Proof.* Let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard Tree with prime kneading sequence,  $\tau$ . Since prime kneading sequences are acceptable [Bal07, Theorem 3.10]  $(H, f)$  is equivalent to a Hubbard tree with the unique itinerary property, so we may assume that it has the



unique itinerary property. Let  $c_0$  be the critical point of  $(H, f)$  and let  $c_i$  be the last endpoint visited by its orbit. Let  $b$  be the point in  $I_0$  nearest  $c_i$ . Since  $f(b)$  and  $f(c_i)$  have different itineraries, we can choose a point  $q \in (f(b), f(c_i))$  which is not on the critical orbit but which is precritical. Moreover, since Hubbard trees with prime kneading sequences are locally eventually onto, we can choose a precritical  $q$  that maps near the fixed branch point before it maps to  $c_0$ . In particular, we can choose a  $q$  whose precritical itinerary contains arbitrarily many 1's. Note that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a neighborhood near  $\bar{1}$  such that all points in the neighborhood have an itinerary that starts with at least  $n$  many 1's.

If the orbit of  $q$  meets  $[b, c_i]$ , choose  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  minimal such that  $f^j(q)$  is the point in  $Orb(q) \cap [b, c_i]$  closest to  $c_i$  and let  $w = f^j(q)$ . Otherwise let  $w = b$ . Since  $f([b, c_i])$  contains  $q$ , there is a point,  $s \in (b, c_i)$  that maps to  $q$ . We have two cases. If  $s \in (w, c_i)$  then let  $r = w$ . Otherwise, if  $w \in (s, c_i)$ , then we find a point  $t \in (w, c_i)$  such that  $t$  eventually maps to  $q$ . Such a  $t$  must exist by LEO. Let  $r = t$ . Then  $[f(r), q]$  is a non-degenerate arc in  $H$ .

Define  $f_q : H \rightarrow H$  as follows. First, fix a linear map  $l : [r, c_i] \rightarrow [f(r), q]$  with  $l(r) = f(r)$  and  $l(c_i) = q$ . Then we define

$$f_q(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) : & x \in H \setminus (r, c_i] \\ l(x) : & x \in [r, c_i] \end{cases}$$

We now show  $(H, f_q)$  is a Hubbard Tree by verifying conditions (1)-(6) in Definition 1.2.17.

1. (continuous and surjective) Notice that for  $0 \leq j \leq i$ ,  $f_q(c_j) = f(c_j)$ , and thus  $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_i\} \in f_q(H)$ . Since this is the collection of endpoints of  $H$ , it follows that  $f_q(H) = H$ , i.e.  $f_q$  is surjective. What's more, the function  $f_q$  is continuous and well-defined as it is piecewise continuous and  $f(r) = l(r)$ .
2. (every point has at most two preimages) Fix  $p \in H$ . Observe that  $f_q^{-1}(p) = (f^{-1}(p) \setminus [r, c_i]) \cup l^{-1}(p)$ . Notice that  $f^{-1}(p) \setminus [r, c_i]$  has at most two elements and  $l^{-1}(p)$  at most one. Indeed, if  $f^{-1}(p) \setminus [r, c_i]$  has two elements, then  $p \notin [f(r), f(c_i)]$  (else  $p$  has three preimages under  $f$ ), and thus  $l^{-1}(p)$  is empty. Thus  $f_q^{-1}(p)$  consists of at most two elements.
3. (locally 1-1 at all points except  $c_0$ ) Observe that  $c_0 \notin (r, c_i]$  and thus  $f_q(c_0) = f(c_0)$  is an endpoint of  $H$ . Since  $c_0$  is *not* an endpoint, it follows that  $f_q$  is not locally one-to-one at  $c_0$ .

Now, consider  $p \in H \setminus \{c_0\}$ .

If  $p \notin [r, c_i]$  then, since  $[r, c_i]$  is closed in  $H$  and does not contain  $p$ , it follows that there is a neighborhood of  $p$  on which  $f_q = f$ . Thus  $f_q$  is locally one-to-one at  $p$  if and only if  $f$  is. Since  $p \neq c_0$ ,  $f_q$  is indeed locally one-to-one at  $p$ .

If  $p \in (r, c_i]$  then, since  $(r, c_i]$  contains no branch points of  $H$  by construction, it follows that there is a neighborhood of  $p$  on which  $f_q$  is equal to  $l$ , and thus  $f_q$  is locally one-to-one at  $p$ .

Finally, if  $p = r$  then, we can choose a neighborhood  $U$  of  $r$  that does not include any other branch points, endpoints, or  $c_0$ . Suppose  $x, y \in U$  with

$x \neq y$ , and  $f_q(x) = f_q(y)$ . Then at least one of  $x, y$  is in  $[r, c_i]$  because otherwise,  $f(x) = f_q(x) = f_q(y) = f(y)$  but  $f$  is one-to-one on  $U$ . They cannot both be in  $[r, c_i]$  since  $f_q|_{[r, c_i]} = l$  is linear, and thus one-to-one. Without loss of generality,  $x \in [r, c_i]$  and  $y \notin [r, c_i]$ . But then  $f_q(y) = f(y)$  and since  $x \in [r, c_i]$ ,  $f_q(x) \in [f(r), q]$  and thus  $f(y) \in [f(r), q] \subseteq f([r, c_i])$ . Thus  $f$  is not one-to-one on  $[y, c_i]$ , and thus  $c_0 \in (y, c_i)$ . Since  $c_0 \notin (r, c_i]$ , we see that  $c_0 \in (y, r) \subseteq (y, x) \subseteq U$ , a contradiction.

4. (all endpoints are in  $Orb(c_0)$ )  $f^k(c_0) = f_q^k(c_0)$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq i$  and after  $i$  iterates,  $c_0$  has visited every endpoint.
5. ( $c_0$  is periodic or pre-periodic, but not fixed) Notice that  $f_q(c_0) = f(c_0)$ , and thus  $c_0$  is not fixed. Since, for  $k > i$ ,  $f_q^k(c_0) = f_q^{k-i-1}(q)$  and  $f_q$  is equal to  $f$  on the orbit of  $q$ , it follows that  $c_0$  is either periodic (if  $q$  is precritical) or pre-periodic (if  $q$  is (pre-)periodic).
6. (weak unique itinerary property) Let  $x, y$  be distinct points, each of which is a branch point or a point on the critical orbit under  $f_q$ . If they are both branch points, then  $f^k(x) = f_q^k(x)$  and  $f^k(y) = f_q^k(y)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and so there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $c_0 \in f_q^n([x, y])$ .

If at least one of  $x, y$  is not a branch point, (say  $x$ ), then  $x$  is in the critical orbit, and so there is some  $n \in \omega$  so that  $f^n([x, y])$  contains  $c_0$ .


Thus,  $(H, f_q)$  is a Hubbard Tree and since  $q$ 's itinerary under  $f$  (and thus under  $f_q$ ) is different than the itinerary of  $f(c_i)$  under  $f$ ,  $(H, f_q)$  is a Hubbard tree, homeomorphic to  $(H, f)$  with the same critical point but with a different kneading sequence.

Since Hubbard trees with prime kneading sequences are locally eventually onto [Bal07, Theorems 4.10, 4.13], we can choose our point  $q$  so that the pre-critical itinerary of  $q$  contains an arbitrarily long block of 1's. In particular,  $q$  can be chosen so that the longest block of 1's in pre-critical itinerary of  $q$  is longer than the longest block of 1's and  $*$  appearing in  $\tau$ . So, for example, if  $\tau = \overline{*110111111}$ , then the longest block of 1's and  $*$  is 9 characters long. Then, since the new kneading sequence under  $f_q$  is periodic, in any shift of the new kneading sequences, this longer block of 1's must overlap a zero. So the new kneading sequence is acceptable.


Since any tree with an acceptable kneading sequence is equivalent to a tree with the same kneading sequence and the unique itinerary property. Thus, there exists a Hubbard Tree  $(H, g)$ , homeomorphic to  $(H, f)$ , with the same kneading sequence and same critical point as  $(H, f_q)$  that has the unique itinerary property.

The choice of  $q$  is arbitrary so there exist infinitely many such kneading sequences giving rise to infinitely many such trees.  $\square$

Figure 5.1 provides a concrete example of Lemma 5.2.1 in action. It starts with a Hubbard tree whose kneading sequence is  $\overline{*110110}$  and alters the function  $f$  by mapping  $c_6$  to a precritical point  $q$ . This new Hubbard tree  $(H, f_q)$  has kneading sequence  $\overline{*11011011111}$ .



(a) A Hubbard Tree with kneading sequence  $*110110$



(b) A Hubbard Tree with kneading sequence  $*1101101111$

Figure 5.1. Using 5.2.1 to construct a Hubbard tree with different kneading sequence

Knowing that we can get an infinite family of kneading sequences that each give rise to a homeomorphic tree with the same critical point leads to a natural question: what can we say about the dendrites?

*Corollary 5.2.2:* Let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\nu$ . Let  $\tau$  be a different kneading sequence for  $H$  as constructed in Lemma 5.2.1, giving rise to  $(H, g)$ . Then the associated dendrites  $D_\nu$  and  $D_\tau$  are homeomorphic.

*Proof.* Under both  $\tau$  and  $\nu$  we have that  $c_0$  is periodic or pre-periodic with the same eventual orbit period. Moreover, the orbit of each branch point is unaffected by the change from  $\nu$  to  $\tau$  since the process of altering the function in Lemma 5.2.1 only alters the orbits of points whose orbits intersect the arc  $(r, c_i]$  which does not contain any branch points. So by Theorem 5.0.4 we have that the dendrites  $D_\tau$  and  $D_\nu$

will both contain the same sets of arc dense branch point degrees and will thus be homeomorphic by [CD94, Theorem 6.2].  $\square$

*Theorem 5.2.3:* Let  $D$  be a dendritic Julia set with acceptable, periodic kneading sequence,  $\tau$ . Then there are countably many other acceptable kneading sequences  $\langle \tau_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$  with associated dendrites,  $\langle D_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ , such that each  $D_i$  is homeomorphic to  $D$  and the associated Hubbard trees,  $\langle H_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ , are also homeomorphic with the same critical point, but the inverse limit spaces,  $\varprojlim \{D_i, \sigma_i\}$  are mutually non-homeomorphic.

*Proof.* Assume hypotheses as stated. Then  $D$  contains a periodic Hubbard tree,  $H_\tau$ . Theorem 5.2.1 shows that there are countably many periodic kneading sequences  $\langle \tau_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$  that give rise to the same tree, and thus, by Corollary 5.2.2, to the same dendrite.

Moreover, we can make it so that the period of  $\tau_i$  is less than the period of  $\tau_{i+1}$  for all  $i$ . Recall that Corollary 4.0.7 says that a point  $\bar{x} \in \hat{H}_\tau$  is an endpoint if and only if it projects to an endpoint infinitely often. So then  $|\text{end}(\hat{H}_{\tau_i})| < |\text{end}(\hat{H}_{\tau_{i+1}})|$  for all  $i$ . and thus  $\varprojlim \{H, f_i\} \not\cong \varprojlim \{H, f_j\}$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Since the Hubbard tree inverse limit is a topological invariant of the dendrite inverse limit, the same dendrite can have countably many non-homeomorphic inverse limits.  $\square$

## CHAPTER SIX

### Further Work

#### *6.1 Future Directions For Chapter Three*

Much of Chapter Three is concerned with fully describing all Hubbardizable trees with fewer than four branch points. While methods similar to those found in Chapter Three can be used to fully describe all Hubbardizable trees with four, five, six branch points, etc. to do so would require a staggering amount of case-checking.

It would be remarkable to see a relatively simple necessary and sufficient condition for Hubbardizability, although the author can provide no useful direction.

#### *6.2 Future Directions For Chapter Five*

In Chapter Five we learned a process to take a given Hubbard tree  $(H, f)$ , slightly alter the function to make a new function  $g$  such that  $(H, g)$  is also a Hubbard tree. Along these lines, we present a conjecture that seems true based on empirical evidence, but we have been unable to prove.

Much like the “altering of  $f$ ” done in Chapter Five, this conjecture (if true) provides a step by step method to start with a Hubbard tree  $(H, f)$  and create infinitely many Hubbard trees  $(H, f_i)$  such that  $\varprojlim \{H, f_i\} \cong \varprojlim \{H, f_j\}$  if and only if  $i = j$ . The only stipulation, is that under the original function  $f$ , the critical point must be periodic. The full conjecture is as follows:

*Conjecture 6.2.1:* Let  $(H, f)$  be a Hubbard tree such that the critical point is pre-periodic under  $f$ . Based on Definition 5.1.1, the internal address of  $(H, f)$  is an infinite list of increasing integers

$$\langle I_k \rangle_{k \in \omega} = 1, \rho(1), \rho^2(1), \rho^3(1), \dots$$

There exists an  $n \in \omega$  such that for all  $m \geq n$  there exists a Hubbard tree  $(H_m, f_m)$  such that  $H_m \cong H$  and the internal address of  $(H_m, f_m)$  is  $\langle I_k \rangle_{k=0}^m$  (that is, we truncate the internal address of  $(H, f)$  after the first  $m$  entries). Moreover,  $\varprojlim \{H_m, f_m\} \cong \varprojlim \{H_r, f_r\}$  if and only if  $r = m$  and  $\varprojlim \{H_m, f_m\} \not\cong \varprojlim \{H, f\}$  for all  $m$ .

Along these lines, we would love to prove a pre-periodic counter part to Theorem 5.2.3. It might look something like the following:

*Conjecture 6.2.2:* Let  $(D, H, \tau)$  be a dendritic Julia set with pre-periodic kneading sequence. Then there are countably many other dendritic Julia sets  $\langle (D_i, H_i, \tau_i) \rangle_{i \in \omega}$  such that for all  $i \in \omega$  we have  $\tau_i$  is pre-periodic,  $H_i \cong H$ ,  $D_i \cong D$  and the inverse limit spaces,  $\varprojlim \{D_i, \sigma_i\}$  are mutually non-homeomorphic.

The difficult part of the proof is to show that the inverse limits of the Hubbard trees (and thereby the inverse limits of the dendrites) are non-homeomorphic. In Theorem 5.2.3 we could distinguish inverse limits by the number of endpoints, this technique will not work to distinguish inverse limits of Hubbard trees with pre-periodic kneading sequences since many of these inverse limits will have no endpoints at all.



We believe that any method of distinguishing these inverse limits will rely on folding points; an idea that was first introduced by Raines in [Rai04] and is defined as follows:

*Definition 6.2.3:* We say  $x \in X$  is a *folding point* if for all open covers  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , there exists an open cover  $\mathcal{C} \prec \mathcal{U}$  and a pair of sets  $C_0, C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$  with  $x \in C_1$  and there exists an open cover  $\mathcal{V} \prec \mathcal{C}$  such that for all open covers  $\mathcal{D} \prec \mathcal{V}$  there exists a chain  $D_1, \dots, D_m \in \mathcal{D}$  and a number  $1 < j < m$  with

- $D_p \cap D_q \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $|p - q| \leq 1$ ,
- $\bigcup_{i=1}^m D_i \subseteq C_0 \cup C_1$ ,
- $D_1 \cup D_m \subseteq C_0 \setminus C_1$  and  $D_j \subseteq C_1 \setminus C_0$ .

We believe that folding points will be key because we also believe the following.

*Conjecture 6.2.4:* A point  $\bar{x} \in \hat{H}$  is a folding point if and only if  $\vec{x}_{-n} \in \text{Orb}(c_0)$  for infinitely many  $n \in \omega$ .

We have made many attempts to prove this conjecture, and while this *should* be true (morally speaking) it has proven difficult to fully demonstrate outright. But any young, enterprising topologist should be able to make some progress on the claim. This claim, together with methods similar to those found in the proof of Lemma 5.2.1 should be sufficient to prove Conjecture 6.2.2.

## APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A

### Kneading Sequence Arguments

This appendix contains many arguments about creating a tree from a given kneading sequence. If you would like to play with kneading sequences yourself and discover which sequences give rise to which trees, [click this link](#).

This links to a web page in which you can enter a periodic kneading sequence and generate the tree. The way this is done is by implementing the voting sequence on all possible triples of distinct shifts of the kneading sequence. This generates a list of all the itineraries of branch points of  $T$ . It then runs the voting sequence on all possible triples of distinct points from the critical orbit and branch points to find out which points are in a free arc with each other. If two points  $p, q$  are in a free arc then  $V(p, q, x) \in \{p, q\}$  for all  $x$  that are either branch points or in the critical orbit. Once it is known which points are in free arcs with one another, it builds the appropriate tree. The source code can be found by [clicking here](#). But we walk through some psuedo code below. While the itineraries of every point is infinitely long, every branch point or point in the critical orbit is (pre-)periodic so we can compute the itineraries in finite time.

#### *Psuedo-code*

1. Fix  $n = |\text{Orb}(\tau)|$
2. Make a list, “orbTau” of the  $n$  shifts of  $\tau$

3. Make a list, “BranchPoints”, which is a copy of orbTau
4. for i in range[0, n-2):
  - for j in range[i+1, n-1):
    - for k in range[j+1, n):
      - compute  $V(\text{orbTau}[i], \text{orbTau}[j], \text{orbTau}[k])$
      - If  $V(\text{orbTau}[i], \text{orbTau}[j], \text{orbTau}[k])$  not in BranchPoints, add it to BranchPoints
5. Make a list called “freeArcs”
6. for i in range[0, len(BranchPoints)-2):
  - for j in range[i+1, len(BranchPoints)-1):
    - compute  $V(\text{BranchPoints}[i], \text{BranchPoints}[j], \text{BranchPoints}[k])$  for all k
    - If  $V(\text{BranchPoints}[i], \text{BranchPoints}[j], \text{BranchPoints}[k]) = \text{BranchPoints}[i]$  or  $\text{BranchPoints}[j]$  for all k, then  $\text{BranchPoints}[i], \text{BranchPoints}[j]$  are in a free arc so add the tuple  $(\text{BranchPoints}[i], \text{BranchPoints}[j])$  to freeArcs
7. Use the list of edges in freeArcs to construct the tree

What follows is proofs of various claims about certain trees being generated from various kneading sequences throughout the work.

*Claim A.0.1:* (From Theorem 2.2.13) To construct a Hubbard Tree with  $n$  colinear branch points of degree  $m$  in  $S_0$ , a fixed branch point of degree  $x$  in  $S_1$ ,  $x$  many branch points of degree  $m$  in  $S_1$ , and no other branch points, one can use the following

kneading sequence:

$$\tau = \overline{* (1^x 0^n)^{m-1}}.$$

*Proof.* For every branch point  $b \in S_0$ , there exists at least two endpoints  $e_1, e_2$  in  $S_0$  such that  $\{b\} = [c_0, e_1] \cap [c_0, e_2] \cap [e_1, e_2]$ . As such, to verify claims about branch points in  $S_0$  we need only concern ourselves with voting sequences of the form  $V(\tau, e_1, e_2)$  where  $e_1, e_2$  are endpoint in  $S_0$ .

Let  $\tau = \overline{* (1^x 0^n)^{m-1}}$  for some  $n, x, m$ . By Theorem 2.2.12, we have that the sequence  $\overline{0^n \tau}$  is the itinerary of an endpoint and the sequence  $\overline{0^{n-1} \tau}$  is the itinerary of some non-endpoint in the critical orbit. So, we have  $(n)(m-2) + 1$  many endpoints in  $S_0$ .

Let  $p(k, i)$  denote the itinerary of the point in the critical orbit whose itinerary starts with the  $i^{\text{th}}$  0 in the  $k^{\text{th}}$  block of 0s. So, for example, if  $\tau = \overline{* 1100011000}$  then  $p(1, 1) = \overline{00011000 * 11}$  and  $p(2, 3) = \overline{0 * 110001100}$ .

Fix  $1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$  and let  $p(k, j), p(w, i)$  be the itineraries of two distinct endpoints in  $S_0$ . By inspection,  $V(\tau, p(k, j), p(w, i)) = \overline{0^{n-i+1} 1^x 0^{i-1}}$ . In the case where  $j = i = 1$ ,  $V(\tau, p(k, j), p(w, i)) = \overline{0^n 1^x}$ .

By the unique itinerary property of branch points, this gives the itinerary of  $n$  distinct branch points in  $S_0$ . To show these all must have degree  $m$ , it suffices to show that  $\deg(\overline{0^n 1^x}) = m$  since the branch points are periodic. There are  $m-1$  many endpoints in  $S_0$  whose itineraries also begin with  $0^n$ . Let  $e$  be such an endpoint (then  $\iota(e) = p(w, 1)$  for some  $w$ , and let  $q$  be another end point in  $T$ . We have two cases:

1.  $q \in S_1$ . By inspection,  $V(\iota(e), \iota(q), \overline{0^n 1^x}) = \overline{0^n 1^x}$  and so the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^n 1^x}$  is in  $[e, q]$ .
2.  $q \in S_0$ . Then  $\iota(q) = p(k, i)$  for some  $i$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . By inspection,  $V(p(w, 1), p(k, j), \overline{0^n 1^x}) = \overline{0^n 1^x}$  so the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^n 1^x}$  is in  $[q, e]$

Thus, for any endpoint whose itinerary starts with  $n$  copies of 0, and any endpoint  $q \in \text{orb}(\tau)$  we have  $\overline{0^n 1^x} \in [e, q]$ . So there are no branch points between  $\overline{0^n 1^x}$  and  $e$ . Thus there are  $m$  arcs emanating from  $\overline{0^n 1^x}$  (to the  $m - 1$  end points and to  $\tau$ ). So the degree of the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{0^n 1^x}$  is  $m$ , and thus the degree all branch points of the form  $\overline{0^{n-i+1} 1^x 0^{i-1}} = m$ . But these are all the branch points in  $S_0$ . □

*Claim A.0.2:* (From Theorem 2.2.13) Moreover, to construct a Hubbard Tree with exactly  $n$  branch points, each of degree  $m$  one can let  $x = 1$ . In this case we get the following kneading sequence:

$$\tau = \overline{* (10^{n-1})^{m-1}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$ . Since the kneading sequence begins  $*10\dots$ , the fixed point in  $S_1$  must have degree 2 by Lemma 2.2.9. Moreover, by Theorem 2.2.12, the last block of 0s in  $\tau$  corresponds to an endpoint of  $T$ . I.e. the point in the orbit of  $\tau$  with itinerary  $0^{n-1}\tau$  is an endpoint. Thus, every preceding shift of  $\tau$  is an endpoint.

Let  $p', q'$  be distinct endpoints in  $S_1$  with itineraries  $p, q$  respectively. Then  $p, q$  both begin  $10^{n-1} \dots$ . By inspection,  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{10^{n-1}}$ . Since this is the only itinerary that one can get as a result of applying the voting sequence to two endpoints in  $S_1$  and  $c_0$ , we must have that  $S_1$  has only one branch point. Since there are  $m - 1$  many endpoints in  $S_1$ , this branch point must have degree  $m$  (since it is in a free arc with the  $m - 1$  endpoints and  $c_0$ ).

Now, let us consider branch points in  $S_0$ . Let  $p', q'$  be distinct endpoints in  $S_0$  with itineraries  $p, q$  respectively. Then  $p$  begins  $0^{j_p}1 \dots$  or  $0^{j_p} * \dots$  and  $q$  begins  $0^{j_q}1 \dots$  or  $0^{j_q} * \dots$ . We cannot have both  $p$  and  $q$  begin  $0^{j_p} * \dots$  and  $0^{j_q} * \dots$  since we require  $p'$  and  $q'$  to be endpoints. (Note that any point in the orbit of  $\tau$  whose itinerary begins  $0^k *$  for  $k < n - 1$  is not an endpoint).

Let  $j = \min\{j_p, j_q\}$ . Then, by inspection  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{0^j 10^{n-1-j}}$ . As such, every branch point in  $S_0$  has itinerary  $\overline{0^j 10^{n-1-j}}$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$ . Each of these branch points must be in the orbit of the branch point from  $S_1$  (since the itineraries are shifts of the itinerary of the branch point in  $S_1$ ). Since the branch point in  $S_1$  is periodic of degree  $m$ , we have that every branch point in  $S_0$  is periodic of degree  $m$ .

Thus,  $T$  has exactly  $n$  branch points, each of degree  $m$ .  $\square$

*Claim A.0.3:* (From Lemma 3.1.3)  $F_0^k$  can be made by  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}0}$  and  $F_1^k$  can be made by  $\tau = \overline{*(1^{k-1}0)^{k-1}}$ .

*Proof.* We begin by letting  $T$  be a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}0}$ . We show that this kneading sequence yields a  $k$ -od. By Theorem 2.2.12, the point in the critical orbit with itinerary  $0\tau$  is an endpoint, and as such, there is only one

endpoint in  $S_0$ , and thus no endpoints in  $S_0$ . Moreover, since the preimage of an endpoint is either an endpoint or the critical point, this means that every point in the critical orbit (except the critical point itself) is an endpoint. So, the Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$  must have exactly  $k$  endpoint.

By Lemma 2.2.9 we know that there is a branch point in  $S_1$  whose degree is  $k$ . But since there are only  $k$  endpoints, every endpoint must be in a free arc with this point. So there is only one branch point and it is of degree  $k$ . Thus, any Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau$  must be a  $k$ -od.

Now, let  $T$  be a Hubbard tree with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{* (1^{k-1}0)^{k-1}}$ . Again, by Theorem 2.2.12 we have that the point in the critical orbit with itinerary  $0\tau$  is an endpoint. So we find that every point in the critical orbit (except  $c_0$  itself) is an endpoint. So there are exactly  $k(k-1)$  endpoints in  $T$ . Note that this is the same number of endpoints in  $F_1^k$ .

By Theorem 2.2.9, there is a fixed branch point in  $S_1$  whose degree is  $k$ . By inspection, if  $p, q$  are itineraries of distinct endpoints in  $S_0$ , then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{01^{k-1}}$ . As such, there is exactly one branch point in  $S_0$  and its itinerary is  $\overline{01^{k-1}}$ . This branch point is degree  $k$  (since there are  $k-1$  endpoints in  $S_0$  and this branch point is in a free arc with each of them, and in a free arc with  $c_0$ ).

Now, let  $p, q$  be itineraries of distinct endpoints in  $S_1$ . Notice, then, that  $p$  and  $q$  must both start with a block of 1s. These blocks can either be the same length, or different lengths. If they are the same length, say length  $j$ , then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{1^j 0 1^{k-1-j}}$ . Since each of these branch points is in the periodic orbit of the branch



point with itinerary  $\overline{01^{k-1}}$ , we have that each of these branch points is degree  $k$ . If the starting blocks of 1s are differing lengths, then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \bar{1}$ .

Lastly, to truly verify that  $T \cong F_1^k$  we show that the branch point  $\bar{1}$  is the “central branch point”. With this in mind, let  $p, q$  be itineraries of distinct branch points in the orbit of  $\overline{01^{k-1}}$ . Then  $V(p, q, \bar{1}) = \bar{1}$ . Thus, if  $p', q'$  are the branch points with itineraries  $p, q$  and  $b$  is the branch point with itinerary  $\bar{1}$ , then  $b \in [p', q']$ . In this way,  $b$  is the central branch point of  $T$  and thus  $T \cong F_1^k$ .  $\square$

*Claim A.0.4: (From Theorem 3.2.4)* If  $|D| = 2$  and  $\min(D) = 3, \max(D) = k$ , then  $T$  can be realized by the kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}001}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\tau$  being  $*1^{k-1}0$  the fixed branch point has degree  $k$ . By Theorem 2.2.12 the point  $001\tau$  is an endpoint. We can determine if the point  $01\tau$  is an endpoint by running  $V(\tau, 001\tau, 01\tau) = 0\bar{1}$ . Since  $01\tau \notin [\tau, 001\tau]$  we have that  $01\tau$  must be an endpoint. Thus there are only two endpoints in  $S_0$  and so the branch point between them,  $0\bar{1}$  must have degree 3.

To verify that there are no other branch points notice that if  $p, q$  are two points in the critical orbit whose itineraries start with 1 then  $V(\tau, p, q) = \bar{1}$ . Thus there is only one branch point in  $S_1$ . So the tree has only two branch points, one of degree  $k$  and one of degree 3.  $\square$

*Claim A.0.5: (From Theorem 3.2.8, Case 2a)* This tree can be made with  $\tau = \overline{*(10)^n 1101}$ .

*Proof.* To prove the claim we need to show that there are only three branch points. two in  $S_1$  and one in  $S_0$ , one of the branch points in  $S_1$  has degree three, and the other two branch points have degree  $n + 1$ .

The fixed point in  $S_1$  has degree two. Let  $p$  be a shift of  $\tau$  proceeding  $1101\tau$ . Then  $V(\tau, p, 1101\tau) = 1\overline{10}$ . So  $1101\tau$  is the itinerary of an endpoint in a free arc with the branch point whose itinerary is  $1\overline{10}$ . Thus any shift of  $\tau$  proceeding  $1101\tau$  is the itinerary of an endpoint.

But,  $V(101\tau, 101101\tau, \tau) = 101\tau$  so  $101\tau$  is *not* the itinerary of an endpoint. Thus, there are exactly  $2n + 1$  many endpoints in the tree,  $n$  in  $S_0$  and  $n + 1$  in  $S_1$ . If  $p, q$  are the itineraries of two distinct endpoints in  $S_0$ , then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{01}$ . There are  $n$  endpoints in  $S_0$  and so the branch point in  $S_2$  must have degree  $n + 1$ . Since this branch point is periodic, any branch point in its orbit must also have degree  $n + 1$ , so if  $a$  is the branch point with itinerary  $\overline{10}$ , then  $\deg(a) = n + 1$ .

Lastly, to see that  $b$ , the branch point with itinerary  $1\overline{10}$ , has degree three, one can run the voting sequence and verify that  $b$  is in a free arc with  $c_0, a$ , the endpoint whose itinerary is  $1101\tau$  and no other points. Thus  $\deg(b) = 3$ .  $\square$

*Claim A.0.6:* (From Theorem 3.2.8, Case 2b) If  $\deg(a) = \deg(b) > \deg(c)$  [or by symmetry  $\deg(c) = \deg(b) > \deg(a)$ ], then  $T$  can be made with kneading sequence  $\tau = \overline{*(10)^{k-1}0010}$ .

*Proof.* The fixed branch point has degree two. The longest block of 0s in  $\tau$  occurs at  $00010\tau$ . By Theorem 2.2.12 we have that this point must be an endpoint. Thus every proceeding shift of  $\tau$  (except  $\tau$  itself) is also an endpoint.  $V(100010\tau, 10\tau, \tau) = 10\tau$ .

Thus  $10\tau \in (100010\tau, \tau)$  and so  $10\tau$  is not an endpoint. Thus, there are  $k - 1$  many endpoints in  $S_1$ . Let  $p, q$  be two such endpoints, then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{10}$ . Therefore,  $\overline{10}$  is the only branch point in  $S_1$  and it has degree  $k$ . Since it is periodic, there must be a branch point  $\overline{01}$  in  $S_0$  with degree  $k$ .

We now turn our attention to finding all the branch points in  $S_0$ . By computing  $V(0010\tau, s, \tau)$  for any  $s$ , a proceeding shift of  $\tau$  which starts with 0, we find  $0010\tau \notin (\tau, s)$ , so  $0010\tau$  is an endpoint. But,  $V(010\tau, 0100010\tau, \tau) = 010\tau$  so  $010\tau$  is not an endpoint. Thus, the number of endpoints in  $S_0$  is  $k$ .

$V(00010\tau, 0010\tau, \tau) = \overline{001}$  so  $\overline{001}$  is a branch point in  $S_0$ .  $\overline{10}, \overline{01}$ , and  $\overline{001}$  are the only branch points in  $T$ . Moreover, if  $p$  is some shift of  $\tau$  other than  $00010\tau$  or  $0010\tau$ , then  $V(00010\tau, \overline{001}, p) = \overline{001}$  and  $V(0010\tau, \tau, p) = \overline{001}$ . Thus,  $\overline{001}$  is in a free arc with the endpoints  $00010\tau$  and  $0010\tau$ . Similarly,  $\overline{001}$  is in a free arc with  $\overline{01}$ . These are the only endpoints or branch points with which  $\overline{001}$  is in a free arc, so  $\deg(\overline{001}) = 3$ .  $\square$

*Claim A.0.7:* From Theorem 3.2.8, Case 2c (From Theorem 3.2.8, Case 2c) Such a tree can be made by  $\overline{*1^{k-1}0001}$ .

*Proof.* In any tree with this kneading sequence. there is a fixed branch point in  $S_1$  with degree  $k$  by Lemma 2.2.9. Let  $p, q$  be two distinct shifts of  $\tau$  which start with 1. Then  $V(p, q, \tau) = \overline{1}$  and so there is only one branch point in  $S_1$ .

Moreover, running the voting sequence on  $\tau$  along with any two shifts thereof which begin with 0 yield the following:

$$V(0001\tau, 001\tau, \tau) = 00\bar{1}, \quad V(001\tau, 01\tau, \tau) = 0\bar{1}, \quad V(0001\tau, 01\tau, \tau) = 0\bar{1}.$$

From this we gather that no shift of  $\tau$  starting with 0 corresponds to an endpoint and that the branch point with itinerary  $0\bar{1}$  separates the endpoint with itinerary  $01\tau$  from the other two endpoints in  $S_2$ . Similarly, the branch point with itinerary  $00\bar{1}$  separates the end points with itineraries  $000\tau$  and  $00\tau$ . Lastly,  $V(00\bar{1}, 0\bar{1}, \tau) = 0\bar{1}$ . From here it follows that both branch points in  $S_0$  have degree three.  $\square$

*Claim A.0.8:* (From Theorem 3.2.8, Item 2d and Item 3) A kneading sequence of the form  $\overline{*1^{k-1}001011}$  yields  $\deg(a) = 3, \deg(b) = k, \deg(c) = 4$ . And  $\overline{*1^{k-1}01011}$  yields  $\deg(a) = 3, \deg(b) = k, \deg(c) = 3$

*Proof.* We start by investigating  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}001011}$ . By Lemma 2.2.9 there is a fixed branch point in  $S_1$  of degree  $k$ . All that remains is to verify that there is a branch point in  $S_1$  of degree 3 and a branch point in  $S_0$  of degree 4. We can run the voting sequence on  $\tau$  along with any two shifts thereof which begin with 0. Doing so yields the following:

$$V(001011\tau, 01011\tau, \tau) = 0\bar{1}, \quad V(01011\tau, 011\tau, \tau) = 0\bar{1}, \quad V(001011\tau, 011\tau, \tau) = 0\bar{1}.$$

From this we gather every shift of  $\tau$  starting with 0 corresponds to an endpoint and there is only one branch point in  $S_2$ . This branch point must be degree 4 as desired.

Since  $011\tau$  is the itinerary of an endpoint, any proceeding shift of  $\tau$  must also correspond to an endpoint. Notice, however, that  $V(11001011\tau, 11\tau, \tau) = 11\tau$  so the shift of  $\tau$  which begins  $11\tau$  does not correspond to an endpoint. Thus there are  $k$  many endpoints in  $S_1$ . Finally,  $V(1011\tau, 1001011\tau, \tau) = 10\bar{1}$ . For every other possible choice of two shifts of  $\tau$ ,  $p, q$ ,  $V(p, q, \tau) \neq 10\bar{1}$ . Thus the branch point with itinerary  $101\bar{1}$  is degree three, thus proving the claim.

We now consider  $\tau = \overline{*1^{k-1}01011}$ . The exact same analysis as in the previous yields a fixed branch point in  $S_1$  of degree  $k$ , a branch point in  $S_1$  with itinerary  $10\bar{1}$  of degree three, and a branch point in  $S_0$  with itinerary  $0\bar{1}$  of degree three.  $\square$

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [Bal07] S. Baldwin. “Continuous itinerary functions and dendrite maps”. In: *Topology Appl.* 154.16 (2007), pp. 2889–2938. ISSN: 0166-8641. DOI: [10.1016/j.topol.2007.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2007.04.001). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2007.04.001>.
- [Bal10] S. Baldwin. “Julia sets and periodic kneading sequences”. In: *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 7.1 (2010), pp. 201–222. ISSN: 1661-7738. DOI: [10.1007/s11784-010-0007-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11784-010-0007-y). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11784-010-0007-y>.
- [Bal12] Stewart Baldwin. “Inverse limits and Julia sets”. In: *Topology Proc.* 39 (2012), pp. 149–166. ISSN: 0146-4124.
- [Bin51] R. H. Bing. “Snake-like continua”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 18 (1951), pp. 653–663. ISSN: 0012-7094. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.dmj/1077476763>.
- [BKS09] Henk Bruin, Alexandra Kaffl, and Dierk Schleicher. “Existence of quadratic Hubbard trees”. In: *Fund. Math.* 202.3 (2009), pp. 251–279. ISSN: 0016-2736. DOI: [10.4064/fm202-3-4](https://doi.org/10.4064/fm202-3-4). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4064/fm202-3-4>.
- [BKS11] Henk Bruin, Alexandra Kaffl, and Dierk Schleicher. “Symbolic Dynamics of Quadratic Polynomials”. In: (2011). URL: <https://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~bruin/talks/TreesBook.pdf>.
- [BM81] Robert Brooks and J. Peter Matelski. “The dynamics of 2-generator subgroups of  $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbf{C})$ ”. In: *Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference (State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978)*. Vol. 97. Ann. of Math. Stud. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981, pp. 65–71.
- [BM95] Marcy Barge and Joe Martin. “Endpoints of inverse limit spaces and dynamics”. In: *Continua (Cincinnati, OH, 1994)*. Vol. 170. Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. Dekker, New York, 1995, pp. 165–182.
- [BS08] Henk Bruin and Dierk Schleicher. “Admissibility of kneading sequences and structure of Hubbard trees for quadratic polynomials”. In: *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 78.2 (2008), pp. 502–522. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/jdn033](https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/jdn033). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/jdn033>.

- [CD94] Włodzimierz J. Charatonik and Anne Dilks. “On self-homeomorphic spaces”. In: *Topology Appl.* 55.3 (1994), pp. 215–238. ISSN: 0166-8641. DOI: [10.1016/0166-8641\(94\)90038-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-8641(94)90038-8). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-8641\(94\)90038-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-8641(94)90038-8).
- [Dev03] Robert L. Devaney. *An introduction to chaotic dynamical systems*. Studies in Nonlinearity. Reprint of the second (1989) edition. Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2003, pp. xvi+335. ISBN: 0-8133-4085-3.
- [DH84] A. Douady and J. H. Hubbard. *Étude dynamique des polynômes complexes. Partie I*. Vol. 84. Publications Mathématiques d’Orsay [Mathematical Publications of Orsay]. Université de Paris-Sud, Département de Mathématiques, Orsay, 1984, p. 75.
- [DH85] A. Douady and J. H. Hubbard. *Étude dynamique des polynômes complexes. Partie II*. Vol. 85. Publications Mathématiques d’Orsay [Mathematical Publications of Orsay]. With the collaboration of P. Lavaurs, Tan Lei and P. Sentenac. Université de Paris-Sud, Département de Mathématiques, Orsay, 1985, pp. v+154.
- [Hor90] John Horgan. “Mandelbrot Set-To”. In: *Scientific American* 262.4 (1990), pp. 30–35. ISSN: 00368733, 19467087. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24996710> (visited on 12/02/2022).
- [Ing00] W. T. Ingram. *Inverse limits*. Vol. 15. Aportaciones Matemáticas: Investigación [Mathematical Contributions: Research]. Sociedad Matemática Mexicana, México, 2000, p. 80. ISBN: 968-36-7701-0.
- [Ing95] W. T. Ingram. “Inverse limits on  $[0, 1]$  using tent maps and certain other piecewise linear bonding maps”. In: *Continua (Cincinnati, OH, 1994)*. Vol. 170. Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. Dekker, New York, 1995, pp. 253–258.
- [Jul18] Gastón Julia. “Mémoire sur l’itération des fonctions rationnelles”. In: *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 1 (1918), pp. 47–246.
- [Leb21] Henri Lebesgue. “Sur les correspondances entre les points de deux espaces”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 2 (1921), pp. 256–285. DOI: [10.4064/fm-2-1-256-285](https://doi.org/10.4064/fm-2-1-256-285).
- [Man82] Benoit B. Mandelbrot. *The fractal geometry of nature*. Schriftenreihe für den Referenten. [Series for the Referee]. W. H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, Calif., 1982, pp. v+460. ISBN: 0-7167-1186-9.

- [Mil89] John Milnor. “Self-similarity and hairiness in the Mandelbrot set”. In: *Computers in geometry and topology (Chicago, IL, 1986)*. Vol. 114. Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. Dekker, New York, 1989, pp. 211–257.
- [Mis81] Michał Misiurewicz. “Absolutely continuous measures for certain maps of an interval”. In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 53 (1981), pp. 17–51. ISSN: 0073-8301. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=PMIHES\\_1981\\_\\_53\\_\\_17\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=PMIHES_1981__53__17_0).
- [Mun00] James R. Munkres. *Topology*. Second edition of [MR0464128]. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000, pp. xvi+537. ISBN: 0-13-181629-2.
- [Poi10] Alfredo Poirier. “Hubbard trees”. In: *Fund. Math.* 208.3 (2010), pp. 193–248. ISSN: 0016-2736. DOI: [10.4064/fm208-3-1](https://doi.org/10.4064/fm208-3-1). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4064/fm208-3-1>.
- [Rai04] Brian E. Raines. “Inhomogeneities in non-hyperbolic one-dimensional invariant sets”. In: *Fund. Math.* 182.3 (2004), pp. 241–268. ISSN: 0016-2736. DOI: [10.4064/fm182-3-4](https://doi.org/10.4064/fm182-3-4). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4064/fm182-3-4>.
- [RŠ07] Brian Raines and Sonja Štimac. “Structure of inverse limit spaces of tent maps with nonrecurrent critical points”. In: *Glas. Mat. Ser. III* 42(62).1 (2007), pp. 43–56. ISSN: 0017-095X. DOI: [10.3336/gm.42.1.03](https://doi.org/10.3336/gm.42.1.03). URL: <https://doi.org/10.3336/gm.42.1.03>.
- [Sch17] Dierk Schleicher. “Internal addresses of the Mandelbrot set and Galois groups of polynomials”. In: *Arnold Math. J.* 3.1 (2017), pp. 1–35. ISSN: 2199-6792. DOI: [10.1007/s40598-016-0042-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40598-016-0042-x). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40598-016-0042-x>.
- [Shi98] Mitsuhiro Shishikura. “The Hausdorff dimension of the boundary of the Mandelbrot set and Julia sets”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 147.2 (1998), pp. 225–267. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: [10.2307/121009](https://doi.org/10.2307/121009). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/121009>.
- [Tan90] Lei Tan. “Similarity between the Mandelbrot set and Julia sets”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 134.3 (1990), pp. 587–617. ISSN: 0010-3616. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.cmp/1104201823>.