

# ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION C

LORENZO J. DÍAZ

RAÚL URES

## **Persistent homoclinic tangencies and the unfolding of cycles**

*Annales de l'I. H. P., section C*, tome 11, n° 6 (1994), p. 643-659

[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPC\\_1994\\_\\_11\\_6\\_643\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPC_1994__11_6_643_0)

© Gauthier-Villars, 1994, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'I. H. P., section C » (<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/anihpc>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

## **Persistent homoclinic tangencies and the unfolding of cycles**

by

**Lorenzo J. DÍAZ <sup>(1)</sup> and Raúl URES <sup>(2)</sup>**

Departamento de Matemática,  
PUC-RJ, Brazil

and  
IMERL, Facultad de Ingeniería,  
Universidad de la República, Uruguay

---

**ABSTRACT.** – We describe a new mechanism implying the persistence of homoclinic tangencies after the unfolding of a bifurcating cycle. The cycles we consider are heterodimensional: the index of the hyperbolic points involved in the cycle are different.

*Key words* : Bifurcation, cycle, heteroclinic point, homoclinic tangency, hyperbolic

**RÉSUMÉ.** – Nous décrivons un nouveau mécanisme impliquant la persistance de tangences homocliniques après le déploiement d'un cycle. Les cycles que l'on considère sont hétérodimensionnels : l'index des points hyperboliques impliqués dans le cycle sont différents.

---

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In this paper we are concerned with the problem of describing generic (in an open set) bifurcations of one-parameter families of diffeomorphisms leading to the phenomenon of persistence of homoclinic tangencies.

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification* : 58 F 14, 58 F 10.

<sup>(1)</sup> Supported by CNPq Brazil.

<sup>(2)</sup> Partially supported by CNPq Brazil.

Since Newhouse ([8]-[9], *see* [13] for a new proof) it is known that the generic unfolding of a homoclinic (or heteroclinic) tangency in arcs of surface diffeomorphisms implies persistence of homoclinic tangencies in intervals in the parameter line. This result was extended to higher dimensions first by Palis-Viana [14], who treated the codimension 1 case. The generalization to any codimension was more recently obtained by Romero [16].

In the unfolding of homoclinic tangencies on surfaces there are, essentially, three different possibilities according to the fractional dimension (Hausdorff dimension and thickness) of the hyperbolic set involved in the creation of the tangency:

1. if the Hausdorff dimension of the hyperbolic set is less than one, the family of intervals of persistent tangencies has density zero (in the Lebesgue sense) at the bifurcation value. More precisely, hyperbolicity corresponds to a set of density one at this parameter value, *see* Palis-Takens [12],
2. if the Hausdorff dimension of the hyperbolic set is bigger than one, the parameter values corresponding to hyperbolic diffeomorphisms is not of density one at the initial bifurcation value. Indeed there are "plenty" of parameter values corresponding to diffeomorphisms exhibiting homoclinic tangencies, *see* Palis-Yoccoz [15],
3. if the hyperbolic set is a thick set, *i.e.* the product of its stable and unstable thickness is bigger than one, the bifurcation value is in the boundary of an interval of persistence of homoclinic tangencies, *see* Newhouse ([8]-[9]).

For heteroclinic tangencies in surfaces the results are similar. *See* [13] for a comprehensive information on the subject above.

In the cases quoted above ([8]-[9], [14], [16]) the concept of thick horseshoe plays a key role to get persistence of tangencies: there are parameter values arbitrarily close to the bifurcating one having a thick horseshoe with a homoclinic tangency, from which the persistence of tangencies is obtained.

We also mention that in these cases the creation of a homoclinic/heteroclinic tangency implies the appearance of a cycle in which the index of the hyperbolic sets (*i.e.* dimension of the stable bundle) are equal. Such cycles are called *equidimensional*. Otherwise the cycle is *heterodimensional*, *i.e.* there is a pair  $P, Q$  of hyperbolic periodic points in the cycle with  $\dim(W^s(P)) \neq \dim(W^s(Q))$ . Notice that on surfaces every cycle is equidimensional.

Here we deal with heterodimensional cycles. We say that an arc of

diffeomorphisms  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  defined on a  $n$ -dimensional manifold has a *heterodimensional cycle* at  $t = b$  if there are hyperbolic saddle points  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$  with different index so that  $W^u(P_b)$  meets  $W^s(Q_b)$  quasitransversely along the orbit of a point and  $W^s(P_b)$  intersects  $W^s(Q_b)$  transversely.

If  $W^s(P_b) \cap W^u(Q_b)$  has a connected component being  $f_b^i$ -invariant we say that the cycle is *connected*. When  $W^s(P_b) \cap W^u(Q_b)$  contains a connected component  $\gamma_b$  so that  $f_b^i(\gamma_b) \neq \gamma_b$  for every  $i \neq 0$  the cycle is named *nonconnected*. Observe that there are cycles being simultaneously connected and nonconnected. The weak expanding eigenvalue of  $Q_b$  and the weak contracting eigenvalue of  $P_b$  are called the *connexion eigenvalues*.

In the present paper we describe a new mechanism leading to persistence of homoclinic tangencies after the unfolding of a cycle. We prove that for a large open class of arcs of diffeomorphisms  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  unfolding a connected heterodimensional cycle having a complex connexion eigenvalue, there is an open interval in the parameter line containing the bifurcation value  $b$  in its interior where the parameter values corresponding to homoclinic tangencies are dense. In such a case we say that the persistence of homoclinic tangencies is a *persistent* phenomenon.

We point out that in this paper we do not use concepts related to fractional dimensions (namely Hausdorff dimension and thickness). The main novelty of our proof of the persistence of tangencies is that it only involves the two hyperbolic periodic points in the cycle. Let us recall that in [8] to get persistence of tangencies it is considered a thick hyperbolic set with a homoclinic tangency.

Here to get persistence of homoclinic tangencies we analyze the growth of the homoclinic points of  $P_t$ . In rough terms we prove the following: for  $t$  nearby  $b$  there is a subset  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t$  of the transversal homoclinic points of  $P_t$  being dense in a center-stable manifold of  $P_t$ , see Proposition. The set  $\tilde{\Lambda}_t$  plays a similar role of the thick hyperbolic set in [8], see Section 3.2.

Heterodimensional cycles were introduced by Newhouse and Palis in the seventies, see [10]. In ([2]-[4]) the connected and nonconnected cases with real connexion eigenvalues in any dimension were studied. Connected heterodimensional cycles with complex connexion eigenvalues remain so far unexplored and here we give a contribution to the understanding of the dynamics in this case.

The unfolding of homoclinic/heteroclinic tangencies leads to the relevant dynamical phenomenon of abundance of Hènon-like attractors/repellers ([1], [7], [18]). On the other hand, the unique known geometric configurations leading to prevalence of parameter values with Hènon-like attractors are the dissipative critical saddle-node cycles studied in [11], see [6]. We think

that in the sectionally dissipative cases considered in this paper our proof suggests that the heterodimensional cycles considered in this paper may be a good place to search for Hénon-like attractors with positive density at the bifurcation value.

### 2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Throughout this paper  $M$  denotes a compact  $n$ -dimensional ( $n \geq 3$ ) boundaryless manifold and  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(M)$  the space of arcs  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  of  $C^\infty$  diffeomorphisms equipped with the usual  $C^\infty$  topology.

We say that  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  exhibits a heterodimensional cycle at  $t = b$  if there are hyperbolic periodic points  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$  such that

- (1)  $W^s(P_t) \pitchfork W^u(Q_t) \neq \emptyset$ ,
- (2)  $W^u(P_b) \cap W^s(Q_b) = \{f_b^i(r_b)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and

$$\dim(T_{r_b} W^u(P_b) + T_{r_b} W^s(Q_b)) = n - 1.$$

Condition (2) means that  $x_b$  is a quasitransversal heteroclinic point and  $\dim(W^s(P_t)) + \dim(W^u(Q_t)) = n + 1$ . We lose no generality by assuming that  $r_b = f_b^{k_0}(W_{loc}^u(P_b)) \cap W_{loc}^s(Q_b)$  for some  $k_0$  and that  $b = 0$ .

We say that  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  unfolds generically the cycle above if there are a  $C^1$  curve  $(r_t)_{t \in I}$  and a  $C^1$  map  $C: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  with  $r_t \in f_t^{k_0}(W_{loc}^u(P_t))$  and  $C(0) \neq 0$  such that

- (1)  $d(r_t, W_{loc}^s(Q_t)) = |t|C(t)$ ,
- (2)  $T_{r_0}(W^s(Q_0)) \oplus T_{r_0}(W^u(P_0)) \oplus V = T_{r_0}(M)$ , where  $V$  denotes the space spanned by  $(r_t)'|_{t=0}$ .

We proceed to describe the set of arcs of diffeomorphisms we consider here. Let  $\mathcal{H}(M)$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{P}^\infty(M)$  consisting of arcs that unfolds generically a heterodimensional cycle. From now on, for simplicity, we assume that  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$  are fixed. We consider arcs  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  satisfying:

**(CI) Linearizing coordinates:** Let  $\{\lambda_i(t)\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$  and  $\{\beta_i(t)\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$  be the eigenvalues of  $Df_t(P_t)$  and  $Df_t(Q_t)$ , respectively. Assume that  $|\lambda_1(0)| \leq \dots \leq |\lambda_{n-2}(0)| < |\lambda_{n-1}(0)| < 1 < |\lambda_n(0)|$  and  $|\beta_1(0)| \leq \dots \leq |\beta_{n-2}(0)| < 1 < |\beta_{n-1}(0)| = |\beta_n(0)|$  where  $\beta_n(0) \in (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$ .

From now on write  $\lambda_s = \lambda_{n-2}$ ,  $\lambda_c = \lambda_{n-1}$  and  $\lambda_u = \lambda_n$ .

- (1)  $f_t, t \in I$ , is  $C^1$ -linearizable at  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$

and

$$(2a) \quad \frac{|\lambda_s(0)|}{|\lambda_c(0)|} > \frac{|\lambda_c(0)|}{|\lambda_u(0)|} \text{ and } |\lambda_s(0)| < |\lambda_c(0)|^2,$$




FIG. 1. – Heterodimensional cycle with a complex connexion eigenvalue.

or

$$(2b) \quad |\lambda_s(0)| < |\lambda_c(0)|^2 \text{ and } |\lambda_c(0)||\lambda_u(0)| > 1.$$

By (CI) there is strong stable foliation  $\mathcal{F}_t^{ss}$  in  $W^s(P_t)$  with  $\dim(\mathcal{F}_t^{ss}) = 1$ . From now on  $F_t^{ss}(x)$  denotes the leave of  $\mathcal{F}_t^{ss}$  containing  $x$ .

We say that a curve  $\alpha_t \subset W^s(P_t)$  does not have  $s$ -criticalities if  $\alpha_t \cap_x F_t^{ss}(x)$  in  $W^s(P_t)$  for every  $x \in \alpha_t$ .

(CII) There is an  $f_t$ -invariant connected component  $\gamma_t$  of  $W^s(P_t) \cap W^u(Q_t)$  depending continuously on  $t$  such that  $\gamma_t$  has not neither  $s$ -criticalities nor radial criticalities, *see* definition below.

Let  $\mathcal{C}(M)$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{H}(M)$  consisting of arcs  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  satisfying (CI-II).

THEOREM. – *There is an open and dense subset  $\mathcal{T}(M)$  of  $\mathcal{C}(M)$  so that for every  $(f_t)_{t \in I} \in \mathcal{T}(M)$  there is  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon((f_t)_{t \in I}) > 0$  and a dense subset  $T_\varepsilon$  in  $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$  such that  $f_s$  has a homoclinic tangency for every  $s \in T_\varepsilon$ .*

We point out that our arguments give that  $(f_t)_{t \in I}$  unfolds generically a homoclinic tangency for every  $s \in T_\varepsilon$ .

### 3. PERSISTENCE OF TANGENCIES: PROOF OF THE THEOREM

From now on we assume that  $(f_t)_{t \in I} \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ .

We begin by remarking that up to a finite number of nonresonance conditions on the eigenvalues of  $f_0$  at  $P_0$  and  $Q_0$  the linearizations of  $f_t$  at  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$ , say  $\varphi_{P_t}$  and  $\varphi_{Q_t}$ , can be taken, and we do, to depend differentially on the parameter, (*see* [17]), and defined on neighbourhoods  $\mathcal{U}_P$  and  $\mathcal{U}_Q$  of  $P_t$  and  $Q_t$  independent of  $t$ .

We take a metric in  $M$  so that  $d(x, y) = e(\varphi_{R_t}(x), \varphi_{R_t}(y))$  for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{U}_R$ , ( $R = P, Q$ ), where  $e$  denotes the euclidean metric. From now on given a curve  $I$ ,  $|I|$  means its length.

Given a set  $A$  and  $x \in A$ ,  $C(x, A)$  denotes the connected component of  $A$  containing  $x$ . Let  $W_{\text{loc}}^i(R_t) = C(R_t, W^i(R_t) \cap \mathcal{U}_R)$ ,  $i = s, u$ ,  $R = P, Q$ . We suppose that  $\varphi_{P_0}(W_{\text{loc}}^s(P_t)) = \{(x_s, x_c, 0), x_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, x_c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ,  $\varphi_{P_0}(W_{\text{loc}}^u(P_t)) = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_u), x_u \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ,  $\varphi_{Q_t}(W_{\text{loc}}^u(Q_t)) = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_c, x_u), x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and  $\varphi_{Q_t}(W_{\text{loc}}^s(Q_t)) = \{(x_s, 0, 0), x_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\}$ . By (CI-II) we can choose  $\varphi_{P_t}$  so that  $\varphi_{P_t}(\gamma_t \cap \mathcal{U}_P) = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_c, 0), x_c \in \mathbb{R}^-\}$ .

Let  $H(P_t)$  denote the set of transversal homoclinic points related with  $P_t$ . We say that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are  $\xi$ -transverse at  $x$ , denoted by  $S_1 \pitchfork_x^\xi S_2$ , if  $S_1 \cap S_2$  and  $\angle_x(S_1, S_2) \geq \xi$ , where  $\angle$  denotes the angle. Define  $H_\xi(P_t)$  as the subset of  $H(P_t)$  consisting of points  $x$  so that  $W^s(P_t) \pitchfork_x^\xi W^u(P_t)$ .

We say that  $\gamma_t$  has no radial criticalities (*see* CII) if  $\varphi_{Q_t}(\gamma_t)$  is transverse to the pencil of straightlines through  $(0, \dots, 0)$ . This definition does not depend on  $\varphi_{Q_t}$ .

The Theorem follows from the arguments in the proof of the next Proposition.

PROPOSITION. – Suppose that  $\beta_u(0) = \beta_u e^{i\theta}$  where  $\theta \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q})$ ,  $\beta_u \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\frac{d}{dt} \lambda_c(0) \neq 0$ .

Fixed  $\tau > 0$  there is  $t_0 > 0$  such that for every  $t \in (-t_0, t_0)$   $\pi_t^{ss}(H_\tau(P_t))$  is dense in  $\gamma_t$ , where  $\pi_t^{ss}$  denotes the projection from  $W^s(P_t)$  to  $\gamma_t$  along the leaves of the strong stable foliation of  $W^s(P_t)$ .

### 3.1. Proof of the Proposition

The main tool to proof the proposition is the following result that extends a previous lemma in [3].

LEMMA 1. – Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x^0, \dots, x^m \in \mathbb{R}$  so that  $x^m < x^{m-1} < \dots < x^1 < x^0$ . For any  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ ,  $i_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , (if  $n = 0$ ,  $I = \emptyset$ ), and  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ ,  $j_k \geq 1$ , consider the sequences  $\{x_{J,j}^{s,I,r}\}_{j \geq 1}$ ,  $r, s \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ , so that

- (1)  $x_{J,j}^{s,I,r} \rightarrow x_J^{s,I}$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ ,
- (2)  $x_{J,1}^{m,I,s} < x_J^{I,s+1}$  for every  $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ ,
- (3)  $\text{diam}(\{x_{J,j}^{s,I,r}\}_{j \geq 1}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|J| \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $|J| = n$  if  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ .

Let  $\Lambda = \{x_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^{i_1, \dots, i_{n+1}}, n \in \mathbb{N}, i_k \in \{0, \dots, m\}, j_k \geq 1\}$ . Then  $[x_1^{mm}, x^0] \subset \bar{\Lambda}$ .

Proof. – Take  $x \in [x_1^{mm}, x^0]$ . If  $x \in \Lambda$  there is nothing to prove. Otherwise either  $x^{i+1} < x < x^i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$  or  $x_1^{mm} < x < x^m$ . Let us assume that the first case occurs, the other one follows similarly. By (1) and (2) there  $j_1$  so that  $x_{j_1+1}^{m,i} < x < x_{j_1}^{m,i}$ . Inductively we get a sequence  $\{j_n\}$  with  $x_{j_1, \dots, j_n, j_{n+1}}^{m, \dots, m, i} < x < x_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^{m, \dots, m, i}$ . Now (3) implies that  $z_n = x_{j_1, \dots, j_n}^{m, \dots, m, i} \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This ends the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Now our target is, roughly speaking, the following:

Denote by  $\prec$  the natural ordering in  $\gamma_0$  so that  $Q_0 \prec P_0$ . Fixed  $\tau > 0$  we construct a family of sequences of  $\tau$ -transverse points  $(x_J^I)$  related with  $P_0$  so that  $\pi_0^{ss}(x_J^I)$  satisfies the hypotheses in Lemma 1.

To prove the proposition we need some technical definitions and constructions. Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\lambda_c(0) > 0$ , otherwise it is enough to replace  $f_t$  by  $f_t^2$ , and  $C(0) > 0$ . From now on we write  $\lambda_i$  instead of  $\lambda_i(0)$ .

Let  $B = f_0^{k_0}(\mathcal{U}_Q)$ . Consider the extension of  $\mathcal{F}_0^{uu}$  to the whole  $B$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_0^u$ , defined by  $\mathcal{F}_0^u = f_0^{k_0}(\varphi_{P_0}^{-1}(\{(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, x), x \in \mathbb{R}\}))$ . Write  $F(r_0) = C(r_0, W^u(P_0) \cap \mathcal{U}_Q)$ .



We extend  $\mathcal{F}_t^{ss}$  to the whole  $W^s(P_t)$ . By (CI-II),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C(f_t^{-n}(x), F_t^{ss}(f_t^{-n}(x) \cap \mathcal{U}_Q)) \rightarrow W_{loc}^s(Q_t)$$

for every  $x \in \gamma_t$ , where the convergence turns out to be  $C^1$  on compacta. Now consider a  $C^1$ -extension of  $F_0^{ss}$  to  $\mathcal{U}_Q$ , say  $\mathcal{F}_0^s$ . Let  $\pi_0^s$  be the projection along the leaves of  $\mathcal{F}_0^s$  from  $\mathcal{U}_Q$  to  $W_{loc}^u(Q_0)$ .

Define  $F^i = \pi_0^s(F(r_0)) \cap (\varphi_{Q_0}^{-1}(\{(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n), x_n \in \mathbb{R}^i\}))$ ,  $i = +, -$ . We can choose  $\varphi_{P_0}$  in such a way that  $\varphi_{P_0}(F^+)$  is tangent to  $(0, \dots, 0, x_u)$  at  $(0, \dots, 0)$ . For simplicity let us suppose that  $\varphi_{P_0}(F^+) = (0, \dots, 0, x_u)$ .

Let us assume that  $\gamma_0$  spirals anti-clockwise. Let  $F^+ \cap \gamma_0 = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \hat{x}_i$ , where  $d(\hat{x}_{i+1}, Q_0) < d(\hat{x}_i, Q_0)$ . Otherwise the proof follows similarly by considering the intersections between  $F^-$  and  $\gamma_0$ .

Pick the fundamental domain  $D$  of  $\gamma_0$  in  $\mathcal{U}_P$  so that  $\varphi_{P_0}(D) = \{(0, \dots, 0, x, 0), x \in [-1, -\lambda_c]\}$ .

Given  $x \in \gamma_t$  and a curve  $\alpha \subset \gamma_t$ , let

$$n(x) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } f_0^i(x) \in D\}, \quad n(\alpha) = \min\{n(x), x \in \alpha\}.$$

Let  $E$  be the fundamental domain of  $\gamma_0$  bounded by  $\hat{x}_0$  and  $f_0^{-1}(\hat{x}_0)$ . Without loss of generality we can assume, and we do, that  $f_0^{n(\hat{x}_0)}(E) = D$ . Write  $n(\hat{x}_0) = k_1$ .

Define  $\kappa(i)$  by the natural number so that  $f_0^{\kappa(i)}(\hat{x}_i) \in (f_0^{-1}(\hat{x}_0), \hat{x}_0) \subset \gamma_0$ . Remark that  $\kappa$  is strictly increasing.

Let  $\gamma^i$  be the arc in  $\gamma_0$  bounded by  $\hat{x}_i$  and  $\hat{x}_{i+1}$ . There are  $\Delta$  and  $\delta$  so that

$$(2.0) \quad \delta \beta_u^{\kappa(i)} < |D_x(f_0^{n(\alpha)} / \gamma_0)| < \Delta \beta_u^{\kappa(i)}, \quad \forall x \in \alpha \subset \gamma^i.$$

Define  $\Sigma(x, \delta) \subset \gamma_0$  by the curve of length  $2\delta$  centered at  $x$  and  $\Sigma_i(\delta) = \Sigma(\hat{x}_i, \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \delta)$ . Remark that there is  $\delta_0$  such that  $\Sigma_i(\delta)$  is  $\frac{\tau}{2}$ -transversal to  $\mathcal{F}^v$  for every  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ , here  $\mathcal{F}^v$  is the foliation given by vertical lines in the linearizing coordinates.

Take a small neighbourhood  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\gamma_0$  containing  $r_0$ . Fixed  $A \subset (\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{V})$  let  $A^s = \bigcup_{x \in A} C(x, F_0^{ss}(x) \cap \mathcal{V})$ .

Let  $\bar{x}^i = \Sigma_i^s(\delta) \cap f_0^{k_0}(W_{loc}^u(P_0))$ ,  $W^u = W^u(P_0) \cup W^u(Q_0)$  and  $\Gamma^i(\delta) = C(\bar{x}^i, \Sigma_i^s(\delta) \cap W^u)$ . For each  $i \geq 0$  define projections along the leaves of  $\mathcal{F}_0^{ss}$ ,

$$\pi_i^s: \Gamma^i(\delta) \rightarrow \Sigma_i(\delta), \quad x \mapsto F_0^{ss} \cap \Sigma_i(\delta).$$




FIG. 2.

Notice that  $\hat{x}_i = \pi_i^s(\bar{x}_i)$  (recall the choice of  $F^+$ ) and that there are constants  $K_1^s$  and  $K_2^s$  with

$$(2.1) \quad K_1^s|\alpha| < |\pi_i^s(\alpha)| < K_2^s|\alpha|, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Gamma^i(\delta), \quad i \geq 0.$$

Let  $\Pi_i(\delta) = [z_i(\delta), P_0] \subset \gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{U}_P$  be the maximal segment in  $\gamma_0$  where the function  $\pi_i$  below is well defined, see Figure 3,

$$\pi_i: \Pi_i(\delta) \rightarrow \Gamma_i(\delta), \quad x \mapsto C(x, F_0^{uu}(x) \cap B) \cap \Gamma_i(\delta).$$

Remark that  $\bar{x}^i = \pi_i(P_0)$  and that there are constants  $K_1^u$  and  $K_2^u$  with

$$(2.2) \quad K_1^u|\alpha| < |\pi_i(\alpha)| < K_2^u|\alpha|, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Pi_i(\delta), \quad i \geq 0.$$

In the sequel we take  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ . From (2.2) and (2.0) there are  $C_1$  and  $C_2$

$$(2.3) \quad |z_i(\varepsilon)| \in (C_1\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)}\varepsilon, C_2\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)}\varepsilon).$$

Let  $m_i(\varepsilon) = n_i(\varepsilon) + 2$ , where  $n_i(\varepsilon)$  is defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \lambda_c^{n_i(\varepsilon)-1} > C_1\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)}\varepsilon \geq \lambda_c^{n_i(\varepsilon)}.$$

Let  $D_{-1} = f_0^{-1}(D)$ . Define  $D_i(\varepsilon)$  by the convex hull of

$$(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)}(D_{-1}) \cup P_0), \text{ i.e.}$$




FIG. 3.

$$\varphi_{P_0}(D_i(\varepsilon)) = \{(0, \dots, x, 0), x \in [-\lambda_c^{m_i(\varepsilon)-1}, 0]\},$$

and

$$\hat{D}_i(\varepsilon) = f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)}(D_{-1} \cup D).$$

From the definition of  $m_i(\varepsilon)$ ,  $(D_i(\varepsilon) \cup \hat{D}_i(\varepsilon)) \subset \Pi_i(\varepsilon)$ . Hence we can define  $\pi_i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(y))$  for every  $y \in D_{-1} \cup D$  and  $j \geq 0$ .

By the definition of  $D_i(\varepsilon)$ ,  $|D_i(\varepsilon)| = \lambda_c^{n_i(\varepsilon)+1}$ . On the other hand, from (2.3)  $C_1\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)}\varepsilon \leq |\Pi(\varepsilon)|C_2\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)}\varepsilon$ . Now, from (2.4)

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} \lambda_c^2 \frac{C_1}{C_2} \leq \frac{|D_i(\varepsilon)|}{|\Pi_i(\varepsilon)|} \leq \lambda_c, \\ \lambda_c^3 C_1 \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon \leq d(y, P_0) \leq C_1 \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon, \quad \forall y \in \hat{D}_i(\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

From (2.2-5)

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{cases} K_1^u \lambda_c^2 \frac{C_1^2}{C_2} \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon \leq |\pi_i(D_i(\varepsilon))| \leq K_2^u \lambda_c C_2 \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon, \\ K_1^u \lambda_c^3 C_1 \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon \leq d(\pi_i(y), \bar{x}^i) \leq K_2^u C_1 \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon, \quad \forall y \in \hat{D}_i(\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

Let

$$L = \max\{|D_x f_{|\gamma_0}^{n(x_0)}|, x \in E\}, \quad \ell = \min\{|D_x f_{|\gamma_0}^{n(x_0)}|, x \in E\}.$$

From (2.6), (2.0) and the definitions of  $\Delta$  and  $\delta$

$$(2.7) \quad \ell \delta K_1^u K_1^s \lambda_c^2 \frac{C_1}{C_2} \varepsilon < |f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\pi_i^s(\pi_i(D_i(\varepsilon))))| < L \Delta K_2^u K_2^s \lambda_c C_2 \varepsilon.$$

Take

$$\varepsilon < \frac{\lambda_c^{-1} - 1}{4 \Delta L \lambda_c C_2 K_2^u K_2^s}.$$

The choice of  $\varepsilon$  and (2.7) imply that

$$d(f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\pi_i^s(\pi_i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(y))))), f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\hat{x}_i)) < \lambda_c^{-1} - 1$$

for every  $y \in D_{-1} \cup D$  and  $i \in I(\varepsilon)$ . Since by the definition of  $\kappa(i)$  and  $k_1$ ,  $f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\hat{x}_i) \in D^s$  (recall the definition of  $A^s$ ) the last inequality gives  $f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\pi_i^s(\pi_i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(y)))) \in D_{-1}^s \cup D^s$  for every  $y \in D_{-1} \cup D$  and  $j \geq 0$ .

We have proved the following

*Remark.* – Given  $y \in D_{-1} \cup D_1$  and  $j \geq 1$  let  $y_j^i = f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\pi_i^s(\pi_i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(y))))$ . Then

- (1)  $y_j^i$  is well defined for every  $i \geq 0$  and  $j \geq 1$ ,
- (2)  $y_j^i \in D_{-1}^s \cup D^s$ .

Take

$$\nu = \nu(\varepsilon) = \frac{\ell \delta \lambda_c^3 C_1 \varepsilon}{4}.$$

Since  $\theta \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q})$  there is a finite subset  $I(\varepsilon) = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{e(\varepsilon)}\}$ ,  $i_0 = 0$ ,  $i_k < i_{k+1}$ , of  $\mathbb{Z}$  such that

- (1)  $\{y_j\}_{j \in I(\varepsilon)}$  is  $\frac{\nu}{2}$ -dense in  $D$ , where  $y_k = f_0^{n(\hat{x}_k)}(\hat{x}_k)$ ,
- (2)  $y_{i_{k+1}} \prec y_{i_k}$ , where  $\prec$  means the natural ordering in  $\gamma_0$  satisfying  $Q_0 \prec P_0$ .

Now we are ready to construct the sequences  $\{y_{j,j}^{s,I,r}\}_{j \geq 1}$  in the Lemma 1.

Let  $\{y_{j,j}^{s,I,r}\}_{j \geq 1} = \{\pi_0^s(x_{j,j}^{s,I,r})\}_{j \geq 1}$ , where  $\{x_{j,j}^{s,I,r}\}_{j \geq 1}$  is defined as follows. For  $i \in I(\varepsilon)$  take  $x^i = f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\bar{x}^i)$ . For every  $k \in I(\varepsilon)$  and  $j \geq 1$  let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_j^{k,i} &= C(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(x^k), W^u(P_0) \cap B) \cap \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon), \\ x_j^{k,i} &= f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\bar{x}_j^{k,i}). \end{aligned}$$

By construction  $x_j^{k,i} \rightarrow x^i$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $k, i \in I(\varepsilon)$ .

Given  $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m)$  write  $|I| = m$ . Suppose already defined  $\{x_j^I\}_{j \geq 1}$  for every  $|I| \leq n + 1, |J| \leq n, |I| = |J| + 1$  and that  $x_{J,j}^{k,I} \rightarrow x_J^I$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $k \in I(\varepsilon)$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_{J,j}^{r,I,i} &= C(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(x_j^{r,I}), W^u(P_0) \cap B) \pitchfork \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon), \\ x_{J,j}^{r,I,i} &= f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\bar{x}_{J,j}^{r,I,i}). \end{aligned}$$

Again by construction  $x_{J,j}^{r,I,i} \rightarrow x_J^{I,i}$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $r \in I(\varepsilon)$ .

Now we claim

**Claim:** *The sequences  $\{z_{j,j}^{r,s,I}\}_{j \geq 1}, (z = x, y)$  are well defined and  $\{y_{j,j}^{r,s,I}\}_{j \geq 1}$  satisfies the hypotheses in Lemma 1.*

*Proof of the Claim.* – Given  $x, y \in W^s(P_0)$  write  $x \prec y$  meaning  $\pi^s(x) \prec \pi^s(y)$ . Notice that  $\pi_i$  preserves the ordering  $\prec$ .

We say that  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$  is a *pair* if  $\alpha$  is a curve in  $W^s(P_0)$  and  $\mathcal{H} = \{H(x)\}_{x \in \alpha}$  is a family of 1-disks depending differentially on  $x$  with  $H(x) \pitchfork_x W^s(P_0)$ . A pair  $(\alpha', \mathcal{H}')$  is a *subpair* of  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$  if  $\alpha' \subset \alpha$  and  $H'(x) = H(x)$  for every  $x \in \alpha'$ .

Remark that there is  $\mu > 0$  such that for every pair  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$   $\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon \mu$ - $\mathcal{C}^1$ -close to a subpair of  $(\Pi_i(\varepsilon), \{F_0^{uu}(x)\}_{x \in \Pi_i(\varepsilon)})$  (where the  $\mathcal{C}^1$ -proximity is defined in the obvious way) we can define the projection  $\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}$  as follows

$$\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}: \alpha \rightarrow \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon), \quad x \mapsto H(x) \pitchfork \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon).$$

By shrinking  $\varepsilon < \delta$  we can assume that  $\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}$  preserves the ordering  $\prec$  and by (2.1-2)

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{cases} K_1^s < \frac{|\tilde{\pi}_i^s(\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}(\omega))|}{|\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}(\omega)|} < K_2^s, \\ K_1^u < \frac{|\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})}(\omega)|}{|\omega|} < K_2^u, \end{cases} \quad \forall \omega \subset \alpha,$$

where  $\tilde{\pi}_i^s$  denotes the projection along the leaves of  $\mathcal{F}_0^{ss}$  from  $\Sigma_i^s(\delta)$  to  $\Sigma_i(\delta)$ .

A pair  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$  is called  $\xi$ -pair if

- (1)  $\alpha \subset D_{-1}^s \cup D^s$ ,
- (2)  $\alpha \pitchfork^\xi \mathcal{F}_0^{ss}$ ,
- (3)  $H(x)$  is  $\xi$ - $\mathcal{C}^1$ -close to  $F_0^u(x)$  for every  $x \in \alpha$ .

For  $i \geq 0$  define  $(\alpha^i, \mathcal{H}^i)$  by  $\alpha^i = f_0^i(\alpha)$  and  $\mathcal{H}^i = \{\mathcal{H}^i(f_0^i(x))\}$ , where  $H^i(f_0^i(x)) = C(f_0^i(x), f_0^i(H(x)) \cap B)$ .

Now let us suppose that (CI(2a)) occurs, the case (CI(2b)) follows analogously, so we omit the details.

Let  $\psi = \frac{|\lambda_s|}{|\lambda_c|} > 1$  and  $\eta = \frac{\log(|\lambda_s|)}{\log(|\lambda_c|)} - 1 > 1$ . Using the linearizing coordinates one gets that  $(\alpha^j, \mathcal{H}^j)$  is  $C_3 \xi \psi^j - \mathcal{C}^1$ -close to a subpair of  $([-\lambda_c^{j-1}, P_0], \{F_0^{uu}(x)\}_{x \in [-\lambda_c^{j-1}, P_0]})$ , here  $C_3$  does not depend on  $j$ . In particular,  $(\alpha^{m_i(\varepsilon)}, \mathcal{H}^{m_i(\varepsilon)})$  is  $C_3 \xi \psi^{m_i(\varepsilon)}$ -close to a subpair of  $(\Pi_i(\varepsilon), \{F_0^{uu}(x)\}_{x \in \Pi_i(\varepsilon)})$ . From (2.4) and  $|\lambda_s| < |\lambda_c|^2$  [see CI(2a)],  $\psi^{m_i(\varepsilon)} < C_4 (\beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon)^\eta$ . By shrinking  $\varepsilon$ , then increasing  $m_i(\varepsilon)$ ,  $\psi^{m_i(\varepsilon)} < \beta_u^{-\kappa(i)} \varepsilon \mu$ , where  $\mu$  is defined as above. The choice of  $\mu$  allow us to define, for every  $i \in I(\varepsilon)$  and  $j \geq 0$ , the projection

$$(\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i: \alpha^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j} \rightarrow \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon), \quad (\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i = \rho_{(\alpha^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}, \mathcal{H}^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j})}$$

where  $(\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i$  satisfies (2.8).

We define the  $i$ - $j$ -successor of  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$ , denoted by  $(\alpha_j^i, \mathcal{H}_j^i)$ , as follows

$$\alpha_j^i = f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(\alpha)),$$

$$\begin{aligned} & H_j^i(f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(x)))) \\ &= f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(C((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(x)), f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(H(x)) \cap B)). \end{aligned}$$

The choice of  $\varepsilon$  implies straightforwardly that  $\alpha_j^i \subset D_{-1}^s \cup D^s$ .

From (2.8), (2.4) and the definitions of  $\Delta$  and  $L$

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_0^s(\alpha_j^i)| &= |f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(\pi_i^s((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i(f_0^{m_i(\varepsilon)+j}(\alpha)))| \\ &\leq \Delta L \beta_u^{\kappa(i)} K_2^u K_2^s \lambda_c^{m_i(\varepsilon)} |\alpha| \leq \Delta L K_2^u K_2^s C_5 \varepsilon |\alpha|. \end{aligned}$$

By shrinking  $\varepsilon$  one gets

$$(2.9) \quad \max\{|\pi_0^s(\alpha_j^i)|, |\alpha_j^i|\} < \frac{|\alpha|}{2}, \quad \forall i \in I(\varepsilon), \quad j \geq 1.$$

By hypothesis,  $f_0^{k_0}(W_{loc}^u(P_0)) \pitchfork_{x^i}^\tau \Sigma_i^s(\varepsilon)$ , for every  $i \in I(\varepsilon)$ . Hence there is  $C_6$  so that  $f_0^{\kappa(i)+k_1}(W_{loc}^u(P_0)) \pitchfork_{x^i}^{C_6 \tau} (D_1 \cup D)^s$ .

Consider any  $C_6 \tau$ -pair  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$ . From the arguments above, by shrinking  $\varepsilon$ , we can assume that the  $i$ - $j$ -successor of  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$  is also a  $C_6 \tau$ -pair. Arguing inductively, suppose that for every  $I = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$ ,  $i_k \in I(\varepsilon)$  and  $J = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n)$ ,  $j_k \geq 1$ ,  $(\alpha_J^I, \mathcal{H}_J^I)$  is a  $C_6 \tau$ -pair.

We define  $(\alpha_{J,j_{n+1}}^{I,i_{n+1}}, \mathcal{H}_{J,j_{n+1}}^{I,i_{n+1}})$  as the  $i_{n+1}-j_{n+1}$ -successor of  $(\alpha_J^I, \mathcal{H}_J^I)$ . From the construction above,  $(\alpha_{J,j_{n+1}}^{I,i_{n+1}}, \mathcal{H}_{J,j_{n+1}}^{I,i_{n+1}})$  is a  $C_6\tau$ -pair and  $(\rho_{(\alpha_J^I, \mathcal{H}_J^I)}^{i_{n+1}})_{j_{n+1}}$  satisfies (2.8) and  $\max\{|\pi_0^s(\alpha_J^I)|, |\alpha_J^I|\} < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|I|} |\alpha|$ .

Now we are ready to finish the proof of the Claim. For simplicity let us assume that  $I(\varepsilon) = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, e\}$ . Take the  $C_6\tau$ -pair  $(\alpha, \mathcal{H})$ , where  $\alpha$  is a curve joining  $x_1^{e,i}$  and  $x^{i+1}$ ,  $H(x_1^{e,i}) = C(x_1^{e,i}, W^u(P_0) \cap \mathcal{V})$  and  $H(x^{i+1}) = C(x^{i+1}, W^u(P_0) \cap \mathcal{V})$ . From the arguments above

$$x_{1,j}^{e,i,r} = f_0^{m_r(\varepsilon)+k_1}((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^r)(x_1^{e,i}),$$

$$x_j^{i+1,r} = f_0^{m_r(\varepsilon)+k_1}((\rho_{(\alpha, \mathcal{H})})_j^i)(x_j^{i+1}).$$




FIG. 4.

where  $x_{1,j}^{e,i,r} \prec x_j^{i+1,r}$ . Now the inductive pattern to get (2) in Lemma 1 is obvious, so we omit the details.

Finally,  $\text{diam}(\{y_J^I\}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $|I| \rightarrow \infty$  follows from the arguments in the proof of (2.9) by reducing  $\varepsilon$ . Now the proof of our claim is complete.  $\square$

Now we prove the Proposition. Our construction allow us to define  $z_J^I(t)$ ,  $z = x, y$ , for every  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n, i_{n+1})$ ,  $i_k \in \{0, \dots, e\}$  and  $n \geq 0$ , and  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ ,  $j_k \geq 1$ ,  $n \geq 0$  in the natural way for every  $t \in [-t_0, t_0]$ ,  $t_0$  is small. Moreover these sequences satisfy Lemma 1.

Fix  $I$  and  $J$ , now the definition of  $z_J^I(t)$ ,  $z = x, y$ , only involves compact parts of the invariant manifolds of  $P_t$ , hence  $z_J^I : [-t_0, t_0] \rightarrow M$ ,  $t \mapsto z_J^I(t)$  depends  $C^1$  on  $t$ . Moreover, by construction,  $(y_1^{ee}(t), y^0(t))$  contains a fundamental domain of  $\gamma_t$  for every  $t \in [-t_0, t_0]$ .

From the  $\lambda$ -lemma estimates with eigenvalue depending differentially on  $t$  one gets that if  $\varepsilon$  is taken small enough

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_J^I(s) < C_7, \quad \forall s \in [-t_0, t_0].$$

Let  $W_-^u(t) = \bigcup_{x \in \gamma_t \cap \mathcal{U}_P} C(x, F_t^{uu}(x) \cap \mathcal{U}_P)$ . Observe that  $W_-^u(0) \cap W^s(P_0)$  contains a family of curves  $\zeta_i(0)$  as in Figure 5. Fixed  $i$  there is  $t(i) \in (0, t_0]$




FIG. 5.



such that we can define the continuation  $\zeta_i(t)$  of  $\zeta_i(0)$  depending differentially on  $t$  for every  $t \in (-t(i), t(i))$ . Let  $w_i(t)$  be the point of quadratic contact between  $\zeta_i(t)$  and the  $\mathcal{F}_t^{uu}$ . Write  $\bar{w}_i(t) = F_t^{uu}(w_i(t)) \cap \gamma_t$ , see Figure 5.

Since  $(y_1^{ee}(0), y^0(0))$  contains a fundamental domain of  $\gamma_0$  there is  $N_i$  so that  $f_0^{N_i}(\bar{w}_i(0)) \in (y_1^{ee}(0), y^0(0))$ . Observe that  $N_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . By shrinking  $t(i)$ ,  $f_t^{-N_i}(\bar{w}_i(t)) \in (y_1^{ee}(t), y^0(t))$  for every  $t \in (-t(i), t(i))$ .

Let  $\tilde{w}_i(t) = f_t^{-N_i}(\bar{w}_i(t))$ . From  $\frac{d}{dt}\lambda_c(0) \neq 0$  follows

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{w}_i(s) > C_8\lambda_c(0)^{-N_i}, \quad \forall s \in [-t(i), t(i)],$$

where  $C_8$  does not depend on  $t$  and  $i$ .

Take  $i$  so that  $C_8\lambda_c(0)^{-N_i} \gg C_7$  for every  $t \in (-t(i), t(i))$ . Given  $\nabla > 0$  we get  $I$  and  $J$  as above and  $s \in (t - \nabla, t + \nabla)$  such that  $\tilde{w}_i(s) = y_J^I(s)$ . Now it is not hard to see that fixed  $t \in (-t(i), t(i))$  and  $\nabla > 0$  there is  $s \in (t - \nabla, t + \nabla)$  such that  $W^u(P_s)$  is tangent to  $C(x_J^I(s), W^u(P_s) \cap \mathcal{U}_P)$ . Now the proof of the Proposition is complete.  $\square$

### 3.2 Proof of the Theorem

To get the Theorem just observe that in the proof of the Proposition the hypothesis  $\theta \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q})$  is only used to obtain the  $\frac{\nu}{2}$ -dense subset  $\{\tilde{y}_i\}_{i \in I(\varepsilon)}$  in  $D$  for suitable  $\nu$ . However, if  $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}$  is close enough to  $\theta$  we can define continuations  $\{\tilde{y}_{i_0}, \dots, \tilde{y}_{i_\varepsilon}\}$  being a  $\frac{\nu}{2}$ -dense subset of  $D$ . Now the Theorem follows from the arguments in the proof of the Proposition.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to J. Palis for useful conversations and encouragement. Both authors acknowledge the warm hospitality of IMPA. The first author thanks M. I. Camacho and M. J. Pacifico for their kind hospitality during his stay at the Dto. de Matemática Aplicada of IM-UFRJ from August 1991 to July 1993 when this work was done.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. BENEDICKS and L. CARLESON, The dynamic of the Hénon map, *Ann. of Math.*, Vol. **133**, 1991, pp. 73-169.

- [2] L. J. DIAZ, Robust nonhyperbolic dynamics and the creation of heterodimensional cycles, *Erg. Th. and Dyn. Sys.* (to appear).
- [3] L. J. DIAZ, *Persistence of heteroclinic cycles and nonhyperbolic dynamics at the unfolding of heteroclinic bifurcations*, preprint.
- [4] L. J. DIAZ, and J. ROCHA, *Non-connected heterodimensional cycles: bifurcation and stability*, *Nonlinearity*, Vol. **5**, 1992, pp. 1315-1341.
- [5] L. J. DIAZ, *Hyperbolicity and the creation of heterodimensional cycles*, in preparation.
- [6] L. J. DIAZ, J. ROCHA and M. VIANA, *Prevalence of strange attractors and critical saddle-node cycles*, preprint.
- [7] L. MORA and M. VIANA, The abundance of strange attractors, *Acta Math.*, Vol. **171**, 1993, pp. 1-72.
- [8] S. NEWHOUSE, Nondensity of Axiom  $A(a)$  on  $S^2$ , *Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Am. Math. Soc.*, Vol. **14**, 1970.
- [9] S. NEWHOUSE, The abundance of wild hyperbolic sets and non smooth stable sets for diffeomorphisms, *Publ. I.H.E.S.*, Vol. **50**, 1979, pp. 101-151.
- [10] S. NEWHOUSE and J. PALIS, Cycles and bifurcation theory, *Publ. Asterisque*, Vol. **31**, 1976 pp. 44-140.
- [11] S. NEWHOUSE, J. PALIS and F. TAKENS, Bifurcations and stability of families of diffeomorphisms, *Publ. I.H.E.S.*, Vol. **57**, 1983, pp. 5-71.
- [12] J. PALIS and F. TAKENS, Hyperbolicity and the creation of homoclinic orbits, *Ann. of Math.*, Vol. **125**, 1987, pp. 337-374.
- [13] J. PALIS and F. TAKENS, *Hyperbolicity and Sensitive-Chaotic Dynamics at Homoclinic Bifurcations, Fractal Dimensions and Infinitely Many Attractors*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [14] J. PALIS and M. VIANA, High dimension diffeomorphisms displaying infinitely many sinks, *Ann. of Math.* (to appear).
- [15] J. PALIS and J. C. YOCCOZ, Homoclinic bifurcations: Large Hausdorff dimension and non-hyperbolic behaviour, *Acta Math.*, Vol. **172**, 1994, pp. 91-136.
- [16] N. ROMERO, Persistence of homoclinic tangencies in higher dimension, *Erg. Th. and Dyn. Sys.* (to appear).
- [17] F. TAKENS, Partially hyperbolic fixed points, *Topology*, Vol. **8**, 1971, pp. 133-147.
- [18] M. VIANA, Strange attractors in higher dimensions, *Bol. Soc. Bras. Mat.*, Vol. **24**, 1993, pp. 13-62.

*(Manuscript received September 30, 1993;  
accepted January, 1994.)*