

ON THE ORBITS OF NOT EXPANSIVE MAPPINGS IN METRIC SPACES

SERGIO VENTURINI

ABSTRACT. Let X be a locally compact metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map. We prove that for each $x_0 \in X$ the sequence $x_0, f(x_0), f^2(x_0), \dots$ is either relatively compact in X or compactly divergent in X . As applications we study the structure of the functions which are limits of the iterates of the map f and we prove the analyticity of the set of f -recurrent points when $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a holomorphic and X is a complex hyperbolic spaces in the sense of Kobayashi.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a metric space with distance function δ_X and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a *not expansive* map, that is a (necessarily continuous) map which satisfies

$$\delta_X(f(x), f(y)) \leq \delta_X(x, y)$$

for each pairs of points $x, y \in X$.

The iterates of the map f are $f^2 = f \circ f$, $f^3 = f \circ f \circ f$ and so on.

For each $x_0 \in X$ the *f-orbit* of x_0 is the sequence

$$x_0, f(x_0), f^2(x_0), \dots$$

A sequence of points x_1, x_2, \dots in X is said *compactly divergent* in X if each compact subset $K \subset X$ the relation $x_j \in K$ holds for a finite number of indexes j .

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a locally compact metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Then the f -orbit of each point of X is either relatively compact or compactly divergent in X .

Observe that we make no assumption on the completeness of X .

As an immediate consequence we obtain:

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a Kobayashi hyperbolic complex space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic map.*

Then the f -orbit of each point of X is either relatively compact or compactly divergent in X .

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32F45, 54E45 Secondary 32H50, 54E40.

Key words and phrases. Complex manifolds, Metric Space, Iteration Theory.

For the definition of hyperbolicity in the sense of Kobayashi for a complex space see, e.g., [Kob70], [Lan87] or section 6 below.

The paper is organized as follows.

Sections 2 and 3 contains some easy generalization of results already present in the literature that we need for the proof of our Theorem 1.1, which is given in section 4.

In section 5 we apply our main theorem to obtain a complete description of the structure of the set of all the functions which are limit of iterates of a not expansive self-map $f : X \rightarrow X$, where X is an arbitrary locally compact metric space with countable basis.

Some further application to Kobayashi hyperbolic complex spaces are given in section 6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper we denote by X a metric space with distance function δ_X and $f : X \rightarrow X$ will be a not expansive map of X in itself.

For each $x \in X$ and each $r > 0$ we denote by $B_X(x, r)$ the open ball in X of center x and radius r and for each subset $K \subset X$ we set

$$K_r = \bigcup_{z \in K} B_X(z, r)$$

that is $x \in K_r$ if, and only if, $\delta_X(x, z) < r$ for some $z \in K$.

Let us begin with the following simple observation.

Proposition 2.1. *Let X and Y be two metric space. Let $f_n : X \rightarrow Y$ be a sequence of not expansive mappings and let $x \in X$.*

If for some sequence x_n^0 converging to x we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n^0) = z$$

with $z \in Y$ then for each sequence x_n converging to x we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n) = z.$$

In particular we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = z.$$

Proof. Let denote by δ_X and δ_Y the distance functions respectively on X and Y . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n)) &\leq \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n^0)) + \delta_Y(f_n(x_n^0), f_n(x_n)) \\ &\leq \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n^0)) + \delta_X(x_n^0, x_n) \\ &\leq \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n^0)) + \delta_X(x_n^0, x) + \delta_X(x, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, observing that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n^0)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x_n^0, x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x, x_n) = 0,$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_Y(z, f_n(x_n)) = 0,$$

as desired.

□

In particular we obtain

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive self-map. Let $x, y \in X$ and let k_ν be a sequence of positive integers such that k_ν and $k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu$ are both increasing sequences. Then*

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = y \implies \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu}(y) = y.$$

In particular it follows that $y \in X$ is f -recurrent.

Proof. Indeed, by hypotheses,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) &= y, \\ \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu}(f^{k_\nu}(x)) &= \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1}}(x) = y \end{aligned}$$

and hence, by the previous proposition,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu}(y) = y,$$

as desired.

□

We shall need of a topological version of the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem. Let X and Y two topological spaces. Let us recall that a family $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X, Y)$ is *evenly continuous* if for every $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and every neighbourhood V of y in Y there are a neighbourhood U of x in X and a neighbourhood W of y in Y such that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$

$$f(x) \in W \implies f(U) \subset V.$$

Then the topological Ascoli-Arzelà theorem given in [Kel55, 7.21] is

Theorem 2.1. *Let X be a regular locally compact topological space and Y a regular Hausdorff topological space. Then a family $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X, Y)$ is relatively compact in $C(X, Y)$ if, and only if, it is evenly continuous and*

$$\{f(x) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

is relatively compact in Y for all $x \in X$.

In particular if Y is compact then $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X, Y)$ relatively compact in $C(X, Y)$ if, and only if, it is evenly continuous.

The following results are straightforward generalization of some results due to Loeb and Vigué ([LV07]).

Proposition 2.2. *Let X and Y be two metric space with distance function respectively δ_X and δ_Y .*

Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a continuous map. Assume that the image $f(X)$ is dense in Y and that

$$\delta_X(x, y) \leq \delta_Y(f(x), f(y))$$

for each pair of point $x, y \in X$.

Let $x_0 \in X$ and let $r > 0$ be given. If $\overline{B_X(x_0, r)}$ is complete (as metric space) then

$$B_Y(f(x_0), r) \subset f(B_X(x_0, r)).$$

Proof. Let $y \in B_Y(f(x_0), r)$. We need to prove that there exists $x \in B_X(x_0, r)$ such that $f(x) = y$.

Since $f(X)$ is dense in Y there exist a sequence $x_n \in X$ such that $f(x_n) \rightarrow y$. It is not restrictive to assume that $f(x_n) \in B_Y(f(x_0), r)$. We then have

$$\delta_X(x_n, x_0) \leq \delta_Y(f(x_n), f(x_0)) < r,$$

that is $x_n \in B_X(x_0, r)$. We also have

$$\delta_X(x_n, x_m) \leq \delta_Y(f(x_n), f(x_m)) \leq \delta_Y(f(x_n), y) + \delta_Y(y, f(x_m))$$

and therefore the sequence x_n is a Cauchy sequence in $B_X(x_0, r)$.

Since $\overline{B_X(x_0, r)}$ is complete there exist $x \in \overline{B_X(x_0, r)}$ such that the sequence x_n converges to x . But

$$\delta_X(x, x_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x_n, x_0)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x_n, x_0) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_Y(f(x_n), f(x_0)) = \delta_Y(y, f(x_0)) < r,$$

that is $x \in B_X(x_0, r)$ and since f is continuous

$$f(x) = f\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = y,$$

as desired.

□

We say that a metric space X with distance function δ_X is *locally complete* if for each $x \in X$ there exists $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B_X(x, r)}$ is complete (as metric space).

Of course each locally compact metric space is locally complete.

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a locally complete metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map. Assume that for an increasing sequence of positive integer k_ν the sequence f^{k_ν} converges pointwise to the identity map of X . Then f is a surjective isometry.*

Proof. Let k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that the sequence f^{k_ν} converges to the identity map of X .

Let $x, y \in X$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_X(x, y) &= \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(x), f^{k_\nu}(y)) \\ &= \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X\left(f^{k_\nu-1}(f(x)), f^{k_\nu-1}(f(y))\right) \\ &\leq \delta_X(f(x), f(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Since we also have $\delta_X(x, y) \geq \delta_X(f(x), f(y))$ then it follows that

$$\delta_X(x, y) = \delta_X(f(x), f(y)),$$

that is the map f is an isometry. By induction on k it follows that f^k is an isometry too.

It remains to show that the map f is surjective.

For each $x \in X$ and each $\nu > 0$ we have

$$0 = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x, f^{k\mu}(x)) = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \delta_X(x, f^{k\nu}(f^{k\mu - k\nu}(x))).$$

It follows that for each ν the image $f^{k\nu}(X)$ is dense in X .

Let now $x \in X$ be arbitrary. Choose $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B_X(x, r)}$ is complete. Then, by the previous proposition for each $\nu > 0$

$$B_X(f^{k\nu}(x), r) \subset f^{k\nu}(B_X(x, r)) \subset f(X).$$

But for $\nu > 0$ large enough we have $x \in B_X(f^{k\nu}(x), r)$ and hence $x \in f(X)$. Since $x \in X$ is arbitrary it follows that the map f is surjective.

□

3. A LEMMA OF CAŁKA

The main result in this section (Theorem 3.1) is a reformulation a results given by Całka in [Cał84, Lemma 3.1 pag. 222].

Let $\delta : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be a distance function on \mathbb{N} . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\rho > 0$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} B_\delta(n, \rho) &= \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \delta(k, n) < \rho\}, \\ E_\delta(n, \rho) &= \bigcup_{k=0}^n B_\delta(k, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

Of course $B_\delta(n, \rho) \subset E_\delta(n, \rho)$ and

$$E_\delta(n, \rho) \subset E_\delta(n+1, \rho) \subset E_\delta(n+2, \rho) \subset \dots$$

Theorem 3.1 (Całka lemma). *Let $\delta : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be a distance function on \mathbb{N} such that*

$$\delta(n+1, m+1) \geq \delta(n, m)$$

for each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assume that for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho > 0$ the ball $B_\delta(0, \rho)$ is infinite and

$$B_\delta(0, \rho) \subset E_\delta(N, \rho/2).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{N} = E_\delta(M, \rho)$$

for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$.

For the proof we need of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. Let $\delta : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be a distance function on \mathbb{N} as in Theorem 3.1. Let $n, \nu, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho > 0$ satisfying

$$n < \nu < m, \quad \nu \notin E_\delta(n, \rho), \quad m \in B_\delta(n, \rho).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &< m - n, \\ \delta(m - n, 0) &\leq \delta(m, n) < \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\delta(n + 1, m + 1) \geq \delta(n, m)$ for each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ it follows that the sequence

$$j \mapsto \delta(m - n + j, j)$$

is not decreasing and hence

$$\delta(m - n, 0) \leq \delta(m, n) < \rho.$$

we also have

$$0 \leq j \leq n \implies \delta(m - n + j, j) \leq \delta(m, n) < \rho,$$

and hence, when $0 \leq j \leq n$,

$$m - n + j \in B_\delta(j, \rho) \subset E_\delta(n, \rho),$$

that is

$$m - n \leq k \leq m \implies k \in E_\delta(n, \rho).$$

Being $\nu < m$ and also $\nu \notin E_\delta(M, \rho)$ necessarily $\nu < m - n$, as required.

□

Let now $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho > 0$ such that the ball $B_\delta(0, \rho)$ is infinite and $B_\delta(0, \rho) \subset E_\delta(N, \rho/2)$, that is

$$B_\delta(0, \rho) \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^n B_\delta(n, \rho/2).$$

As $B_\delta(0, \rho)$ contains infinite positive integers it follows that $B_\delta(n_0, \rho/2)$ also contains infinite positive integers for some $n_0 \leq N$.

Observe that if $k \in B_\delta(n_0, \rho/2)$ and $k \geq n_0$ then the sequence $j \mapsto \delta(k - n_0 + j, j)$ is not increasing and hence

$$\delta(k - n_0, 0) \geq \delta(k, n_0) < \rho/2,$$

that is the $B_\delta(0, \rho/2)$ contains all the infinite positive integers $k - n_0$ with $k \in B_\delta(n_0, \rho/2)$ and $k \geq n_0$.

Let now $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ and $\delta(0, M) < \rho/2$. We end the proof of Theorem 3.1 showing that $\mathbb{N} = E_\delta(M, \rho)$.

Assume by contradiction that exists $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\nu \notin E_\delta(M, \rho)$. Clearly $\nu > M$.

We have already observed that the ball $B_\delta(0, \rho/2)$ is infinite, so let m_0 be the first positive integer which satisfies $m_0 > \nu$ and $m_0 \in B_\delta(0, \rho/2)$.

Then $M < \nu < m_0$ and the triangle inequality implies

$$\delta(m_0, M) \leq \delta(m_0, 0) + \delta(0, M) < \rho/2 + \rho/2 = \rho.$$

Lemma 3.1 implies that $\nu < m_0 - M$ and

$$\delta(m_0 - M, 0) \leq \delta(m_0, M) < \rho,$$

that is $m_0 - M \in B_\delta(0, \rho)$.

By our hypotheses $B_\delta(0, \rho) \subset E_\delta(N, \rho/2)$ and hence $m_0 - M \in B_\delta(n, \rho/2)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $n \leq N$.

Clearly $n \leq N < M < \nu < m_0 - M$ and

$$\delta(m_0 - M, n) < \rho/2 < \rho.$$

We apply lemma 3.1 again and obtain that setting $m_1 = m_0 - M - n$ then $\nu < m_1$ and

$$\delta(m_1, 0) = \delta(m_0 - M - n, 0) = \delta(m_0 - M, n) < \rho/2$$

and this contradicts the choice of m_0 as the smallest positive integer which satisfies $m > \nu$ and $\delta(m, 0) < \rho/2$.

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Let us begin with the following particular case of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be a locally compact metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a surjective isometry. Then the f -orbit of each f -recurrent point is relatively compact in X .*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ be a f -recurrent point of X and let L be the f -orbit of the point x_0 .

If the map $\mathbb{N} \ni n \mapsto f^n(x_0) \in X$ is not injective L is finite and hence compact.

Assume hence that $f^n(x_0) \neq f^m(x_0)$ when $n \neq m$. Consider the distance function on \mathbb{N} defined by the formula

$$\delta(n, m) = \delta_X(f^n(x_0), f^m(x_0))$$

and choose $\rho > 0$ in such a way that the ball $B_X(x_0, \rho)$ is relatively compact in X .

Since f is an isometry we have

$$\delta(n+1, m+1) = \delta(n, m)$$

for each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let define $B_\delta(n, \rho)$ and $E_\delta(n, \rho)$ as in the previous section.

Since the point x_0 is f -recurrent the ball $B_\delta(0, \rho)$ is infinite.

Let

$$E = \{f^n(x_0) \mid n \in B_\delta(0, \rho)\}$$

and let \overline{E} be the closure of E in X . Clearly we have

$$\overline{E} \subset \bigcup_{n \in B_\delta(0, \rho)} B_X(f^n(x_0), \rho/2) \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_X(f^n(x_0), \rho/2).$$

Since $\overline{E} \subset B_X(x_0, \rho)$ it follows that \overline{E} is compact and hence there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$E \subset \overline{E} \subset \bigcup_{n=0}^N B_X(f^n(x_0), \rho/2),$$

and hence

$$B_\delta(0, \rho) \subset E_\delta(N, \rho/2).$$

Theorem 3.1 implies that for some $M > 0$

$$\mathbb{N} \subset E_\delta(M, \rho),$$

that is

$$L \subset \bigcup_{n \in B_\delta(0, \rho)}^M B_X(f^n(x_0), \rho).$$

But the map f is a surjective isometry and hence for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$B_X(f^n(x_0), \rho) = f^n(B_X(x_0, \rho))$$

is relatively compact. It follows that the orbit L is contained in a finite union of relatively compact subset of X and hence is a relatively compact subset of X , as required.

□

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be a locally compact metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map. Then the f -orbit of each f -recurrent point is relatively compact in X .*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ be a f -recurrent point and let $L \subset X$ be its f -orbit. By definition of f -recurrent point there exist an increasing sequence of positive integers k_ν such that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x_0) = x_0.$$

Define

$$E = \{x \in X \mid \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = x\}.$$

Then $E \neq \emptyset$ because $x_0 \in E$.

If $x \in E$ then

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(f(x)) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f(f^{k_\nu}(x)) = f(\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x)) = f(x),$$

and hence $f(x) \in E$, that is $f(E) \subset E$ and $L \subset E$.

We claim that E is closed in X . Indeed let $x \in \overline{E}$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $y \in E$ which satisfies $\delta_X(x, y) < \varepsilon$. If $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough we have $\delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(y), y) < \varepsilon$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(x), x) &\leq \delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(x), f^{k_\nu}(y)) + \delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(y), x) \\ &\leq \delta_X(x, y) + \delta_X(x, f^{k_\nu}(y)) \\ &\leq \delta_X(x, y) + \delta_X(x, y) + \delta_X(y, f^{k_\nu}(y)) \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small it follows that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = x,$$

that is $x \in E$.

Thus E is a locally compact because is a closed subset of the locally compact space X .

We have $f(E) \subset E$ and the sequence f^{k_ν} converges pointwise to the identity map of E . Proposition 2.3 implies that f is a surjective isometry and the previous lemma yields that the orbit L of the f -recurrent point x_0 is relatively compact in E and hence also in X .

□

We are now able to prove Theorem 1.1. Let x be a point of X . Assume that the f -orbit of x is not compactly divergent. Then there exist $y \in X$ and an increasing sequence of positive integers k_ν such that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = y.$$

It is not restrictive to assume that also the sequence $k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu$ is increasing. Then Lemma 2.1 implies that the point y is f -recurrent. Let K be the f -orbit of y . By the previous lemma K is relatively compact in X .

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough in such a way that K_ε is relatively compact in X .

Choose $\nu_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfies $\delta_X(f^{k_{\nu_0}}(x), y) < \varepsilon$. Then for each $\nu > \nu_0$ we have $f^{k_\nu - k_{\nu_0}}(y) \in K$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_X(f^{k_\nu}(x), f^{k_\nu - k_{\nu_0}}(y)) &\leq \delta_X(f^{k_\nu - k_{\nu_0}}(f^{k_{\nu_0}}(x)), f^{k_\nu - k_{\nu_0}}(y)) \\ &\leq \delta_X(f^{k_{\nu_0}}(x), (y)) < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

that is $f^{k_\nu}(x) \in K_\varepsilon$. It follows that the orbit L is relatively compact in X being contained in

$$K_\varepsilon \cup \{x\} \cup \{f(x)\} \cup \dots \cup \{f^{\nu_0}(x)\},$$

which is clearly a relatively compact subset of X .

5. LIMITS OF ITERATES

In this section we assume that X is a locally compact metric space with countable basis.

The main result of this section, Theorem 5.1, is a complete description of the structure of the maps which are limit of sequences of iterates of a not expansive map $f : X \rightarrow X$ and is inspired to the results of Abate on the study of the limit points of the iterates of an holomorphic map on taut complex manifolds: see [Aba89, Theorem 2.1.29 pag. 143].

We denote by $\hat{X} = X \cup \{\infty\}$ the Alexandroff compactification of the locally compact but not compact space X and we set $\hat{X} = X$ if X is compact.

If Y is an other metric space we denote by $C(X, Y)$ the set of all the continuous maps from X to Y endowed with the compact open topology. Then it is straightforward to prove that the composition map

$$C(X, Y) \times C(X, Y) \ni (u, v) \mapsto u \circ v \in C(X, Y)$$

is continuous.

The proof of the theorem above follows the same lines of [Aba93, Lemma 1.2 pag. 791].

Proposition 5.1. *Let X and Y be two locally compact metric space with countable base. Then the family $\mathcal{F} \subset C(X, Y)$ of all not expansive maps from X to Y is relatively compact in $C(X, \hat{Y})$.*

Proof. Since \hat{Y} is compact, by Theorem 2.1 it suffices to prove that the family \mathcal{F} is evenly continuous in $C(X, \hat{Y})$.

Let denote by δ_X and δ_Y the distance functions respectively on X and Y .

Let $x \in X$, $y \in \hat{Y}$ and V a neighbourhood of y in Y .

Suppose first that $x \neq \infty$, that is $x \in Y$. Then choose $\rho > 0$ small enough satisfying $B_Y(y, 2\rho) \subset V$ and set $U = B_X(x, \rho)$ and $W = B_Y(y, \rho)$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and suppose that $f(x) \in W$, that is $\delta_Y(f(x), y) < \rho$. If $z \in U$ then $\delta_Y(z, x) < \rho$ and

$$\delta_Y(f(z), y) \leq \delta_Y(f(z), f(x)) + \delta_Y(f(x), y) < \delta_Y(z, x) + \rho < 2\rho,$$

that is $f(z) \in V$. Since $z \in U$ is arbitrary we have $f(U) \subset V$.

If Y is compact we are done. Assume hence that Y is not compact and $y = \infty$. Let $K \subset Y$ a compact set such that $Y \setminus K \subset V$.

Choose $\rho > 0$ in such a way that K_ρ is relatively compact in Y and set $U = B_X(x, \rho)$ and $W = Y \setminus \overline{K_\rho} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and suppose that $f(x) \in W$. If $y \in K$ and $z \in U$ then $\delta_Y(f(x), y) \geq \rho$, $\delta_Y(x, z) < \rho$ and

$$\delta_Y(f(x), y) \leq \delta_Y(f(x), f(z)) + \delta_Y(f(z), y) \leq \delta_Y(x, z) + \delta_Y(f(z), y)$$

and hence

$$\delta_Y(f(z), y) \geq \delta_Y(f(x), y) - \delta_Y(x, z) > \rho - \rho = 0,$$

that is $f(z) \neq y$.

Since $y \in K$ and $z \in U$ are arbitrary then $f(U) \cap K = \emptyset$ and hence $f(U) \subset Y \setminus K \subset V$.

□

It is an immediate consequence of the theorem above that the topology of the pointwise convergence and the compact open topology coincide on $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$.

Let G be a topological group. Following [vD30] (see also [HR79, Definition 9.2 pag. 85]) we say that G is a *monothetic* group generated by g if $g \in G$ and the subgroup generated by g is dense in G . Of course if G is monothetic generated by some element g then G is an abelian group.

We now recall a simple algebraic characterization of groups.

Proposition 5.2. *Let G be a not empty semigroup. Assume that for each $g, h \in G$ there exist $u, v \in G$ such that $h = ug = gv$. Then G is a group.*

Proof. Let $g_0 \in G$ be an arbitrarily chosen element of G . Then we have $g_0 = eg_0$ and $g_0 = g_0f$ for some $e, f \in G$. We claim that for each $g \in G$ we have $g = eg$ and $g = gf$.

Indeed, given $g \in G$ there exists $u, v \in G$ such that $g = g_0u = vg_0$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} eg &= e(g_0u) = (eg_0)u = g_0u = g \\ gf &= (vg_0)f = v(g_0f) = vg_0 = g. \end{aligned}$$

In particular we have $ef = f$ and $ef = e$, and hence $e = f$.

It follows that the element e is the unique element of G which satisfies $fg = gf = g$ for each $g \in G$, that is e is a neutral element for the semigroup G .

We end the proof showing that for each $g \in G$ there exists $h \in G$ such that $gh = hg = e$.

Given $g \in G$ there exist $h, k \in G$ such that $hg = gk = e$. It suffices to prove that $h = k$. Indeed we have

$$h = he = h(gk) = (hg)k = ek = k,$$

as desired.

□

Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.

We denote by $\mathcal{G}_f(X)$ (resp. $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$) the set of all continuous maps $u : X \rightarrow X$ (resp. $u : X \rightarrow \hat{X}$) which are limit of a sequence of the iterates of the map f , that is there exist an increasing sequence of positive numbers $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ such that the sequence

$$f^{k_1}, f^{k_2}, \dots$$

converges uniformly on the compact subsets of X to the map u .

We begin with the following easy lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let X be a metric space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map. Then the set of f -recurrent points of X is closed in X .*

Proof. Let δ_X be the distance function of X .

Let $x_n \in S_f$ be a sequence of points converging to a point $x \in X$. We need to prove that then also $x \in S_f$.

For each pair of positive integers n, m we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_X(x, f^m(x)) &\leq \delta_X(x, x_n) + \delta_X(x_n, f^m(x_n)) + \delta_X(f^m(x_n), f^m(x)) \\ &\leq 2\delta_X(x, x_n) + \delta_X(x_n, f^m(x_n)). \end{aligned}$$

The quantities $\delta_X(x, x_n)$ and $\delta_X(x_n, f^m(x_n))$ can be made arbitrarily small by suitable values of n and m with m arbitrarily large and hence the quantity $\delta_X(x, f^m(x))$ can be made arbitrarily small with a suitable value of m arbitrarily large, that is, by definition, $x \in S_f$, as required.

□

The following proposition gives the basic properties of the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let X be a locally compact metric space with countable basis and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Let E_f be the set of the points $x \in X$ having the f -orbit compactly divergent and let S_f be the set of f -recurrent points of X .

Let $h \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ be given.

Then the following assertions hold:

- (1) $h^{-1}(\infty) = E_f$;
- (2) $h(X \setminus E_f) = h(S_f) = S_f$.

Proof. Let k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive numbers such that the sequence f^{k_ν} converges (pointwise) to h .

Let $x \in E_f$. Then the sequence $f^{k_\nu}(x)$ is compactly divergent and hence $h(x) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = \infty$, that is $E_f \subset h^{-1}(\infty)$. Conversely let $x \in h^{-1}(\infty)$. Then the sequence $f^{k_\nu}(x)$ is not relatively compact in X because $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = \infty$. Theorem 1.1 implies that the sequence $f^{k_\nu}(x)$ is compactly divergent, that is $x \in E_f$.

This proves the first assertion of the Proposition.

Let us prove the second one.

From $S_f \subset X \setminus E_f$ it follows that $h(S_f) \subset h(X \setminus E_f)$.

We end the proof showing that $h(X \setminus E_f) \subset S_f$ and $S_f \subset h(S_f)$.

Let $x \in X \setminus E_f$. It is not restrictive to assume that the sequence $k_{\nu+1} - k_\nu$ is increasing. We have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = h(x)$$

and

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1}-k_\nu}(f^{k_\nu}(x)) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1}}(x) = h(x).$$

Proposition 2.1 then implies

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_{\nu+1}-k_\nu}(h(x)) = h(x),$$

that is $h(x) \in S_f$.

Since $x \in X \setminus E_f$ is arbitrary it follows that $h(X \setminus E_f) \subset S_f$.

Let now $y \in S_f$. We need to prove that there exists $x \in S_f$ such that $h(x) = y$.

First observe that there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers l_ν such that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu}(y) = y.$$

We may assume that the sequence $l_\nu - k_\nu$ is increasing too.

We observe that the sequence $f^{k_\nu}(y)$ is not compactly divergent and hence, by Theorem 1.1, is relatively compact in X . Then we may assume that there exist $x \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu - k_\nu}(y) = x.$$

Lemma 2.1 implies that $x \in S_f$ and we also have

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(f^{l_\nu - k_\nu}(y)) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu}(y) = y$$

and hence, by Proposition 2.1,

$$h(x) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = y.$$

as required.

□

As immediate consequence of the Proposition above is that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X \setminus E_f) &= \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f), \\ \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(S_f) &= \mathcal{G}_f(S_f). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to prove that $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ are commutative semigroups under the composition of maps.

The main result of this section is

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a locally compact metric space with countable basis and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Let denote by S_f and E_f the set of points $x \in X$ such that the f -orbit of x is respectively relatively compact and compactly divergent.

Then the following assertions hold:

- (1) S_f and E_f are closed disjoint f -invariant subset of X and the open set $X \setminus E_f$ also is f -invariant; moreover we have $S_f \neq \emptyset$ if, and only if, $E_f \neq X$;
- (2) $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ is a not empty compact subset of $C(X, \hat{X})$;
- (3) we have $E_f = X$ if, and only if, $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ contain the single map sending all X to ∞ .

If $E_f \neq X$ then:

- (i) *the restriction map*

$$C(X, \hat{X}) \ni u \mapsto u|_{X \setminus E_f} \in C(X \setminus E_f, \hat{X})$$

induces a homeomorphism between $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ onto $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$;

- (ii) $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a compact monothetic (abelian) topological group with respect to the composition of maps generated by $f \circ \rho$, where ρ denotes the identity element of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$;
- (iii) the identity element $\rho \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a retraction of $X \setminus E_f$ onto the set of the recurrent points S_f ;
- (iv) the restriction map

$$\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f) \ni u \mapsto u|_{S_f} \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$$

induces an isomorphism of topological groups between the group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ onto the group $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$;

- (v) $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ is a subgroup of the group of the surjective isometries of S_f and is a compact monothetic topological group generated by the restriction of f to S_f . In particular the restriction of f to S_f is a surjective isometry of S_f ;
- (vi) the composition map

$$\mathcal{G}_f(S_f) \times \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f) \ni (u, v) \mapsto u \circ v \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$$

is well defined and induces a (left) group action of $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ on $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ which is free and transitive, that is $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a principal homogeneous space for $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$;

- (vii) for each $x \in X \setminus E_f$ the set of all the accumulation points of the f -orbit of x coincides with the $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ -orbit of the point $\rho(x)$.
- (viii) for each $x, y \in X \setminus E_f$ we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(x) = y$$

if, and only if, $y = \rho(x)$ and $f(y) = y$.

Proof. Let denote by δ_X the distance function on X .

(1): The invariance of the subseta S_f , E_f and $X \setminus E_f$ is straightforward.

We already observed in lemma 5.1 that S_f is closed in X . We prove that E_f is closed showing that $X \setminus E_f$ is open.

Let $x_0 \in X \setminus E_f$. By Theorem 1.1 the orbit L of x_0 is relatively compact in X . Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ in such a way that L_ε is relatively compact in X . Since the map f is not expansive it follows that the orbit of each $x \in B_\delta(x_0, \varepsilon)$ is contained in L_ε and hence $B_\delta(x_0, \varepsilon) \subset X \setminus E_f$. Since $x_0 \in X \setminus E_f$ is arbitrary it follows that $X \setminus E_f$ is open.

The last assertion follows directly from Lemma 2.1.

(2): for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \{f^m \mid m \geq n\}.$$

Proposition 5.1 implies that $\overline{\mathcal{F}_n}$ is a sequence of not empty compact subset of $C(X, \hat{X})$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{F}_n} \supset \overline{\mathcal{F}_{n+1}} \supset \dots$ and

$$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\mathcal{F}_n}.$$

It follows that $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ is a non empty compact subset of $C(X, \hat{X})$ being the intersection of a decreasing family of not empty compact subset.

(3): assume that $E_f = X$. Then for each $x \in X$ the sequence $x, f(x), f^2(x), \dots$ is compactly divergent and hence if $u \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ necessarily $u(x) = \infty$ for each $x \in X$.

Conversely assume that the single map sending all X to ∞ belongs to $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$. Then there exists an increasing sequence k_ν of positive integers such that for each $x \in X$

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = \infty.$$

It follows that the orbit of each point $x \in X$ is not relatively compact and hence, by Theorem 1.1, is compactly divergent, that is $E_f = X$.

(i): Let $u \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$. Then Proposition 5.3 implies that

$$u(X \setminus E_f) = S_f \subset X \setminus E_f$$

and hence $u|_{X \setminus E_f} \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ is compact and $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is Hausdorff it suffices to prove that the restriction map $u \mapsto u|_{X \setminus E_f}$ (which is clearly continuous) is injective and surjective.

Let $u, v \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ and assume that $u|_{X \setminus E_f} = v|_{X \setminus E_f}$. Proposition 5.3 implies that for each $x \in E_f$

$$u(x) = v(x) = \infty$$

and hence $u = v$, that is the restriction map $u \mapsto u|_{X \setminus E_f}$ is injective.

Let now $v \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and let k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that for each $x \in X \setminus E_f$

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = v(x).$$

Proposition 5.3 implies that for each $x \in E_f$

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = \infty$$

and hence Proposition 5.1 implies that the function

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} v(x) & x \in X \setminus E_f \\ \infty & x \in E_f \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ and clearly we have $u|_{X \setminus E_f} = v$, that is the restriction map $u \mapsto u|_{X \setminus E_f}$ is surjective.

(ii): We already know that $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a compact subset closed under the composition of maps. We prove that $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a group using Proposition 5.2.

Let $u, v \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. It suffices to prove that there exists $w \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ such that $w \circ v = v \circ w = u$.

Let k_ν and l_ν be increasing sequences of positive integers such that f^{k_ν} and f^{l_ν} converge respectively to u and v on (the compact subset of) $X \setminus E_f$.

It is not restrictive to assume that the sequence $k_\nu - l_\nu$ is increasing and the iterates $f^{k_\nu - l_\nu}$ converge on $X \setminus E_f$ to a map $w \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$.

For each $x \in X \setminus E_f$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu}(x) &= v(x), \\ \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu - l_\nu}(f^{l_\nu}(x)) &= \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = u(x) \end{aligned}$$

and hence Proposition 2.1 implies that

$$w(v(x)) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu - l_\nu}(v(x)) = u(x),$$

that is $w \circ v = u$. Since $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is commutative semigroup we also have $v \circ w = u$, as required.

Let now k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that the sequence of the iterates f^{k_ν} converges to ρ , the unit element of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. Then the sequence $f^{k_\nu + 1}$ converges to $f \circ \rho$ and hence $f \circ \rho \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$.

Let $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ be arbitrary and let l_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that for each $x \in X \setminus E_f$

$$u(x) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu}(x).$$

Then

$$u = u \circ \rho = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu} \circ \rho = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} (f \circ \rho)^{l_\nu}.$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is arbitrary it follows that $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a monothetic group generated by $f \circ \rho$.

(iii): let $\rho \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ be the identity element. Then we have $\rho^2 = \rho$ and hence ρ is a retraction of $X \setminus E_f$ onto its image, which by Proposition 5.3 coincides with S_f .

(iv): Let denote by φ the restriction map

$$\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f) \ni u \mapsto \varphi(u) = u|_{S_f} \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f).$$

Of course φ is a homomorphism of semigroups (with identity) between the compact monothetic group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and the Hausdorff topological semigroup $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$. It suffices then to prove that φ is injective and onto.

Let us prove that φ is injective. Since $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a group it suffices to prove that the kernel of φ is trivial. Let $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and assume that $\varphi(u)$ is the identity element of $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$, that is $u(x) = x$ for each $x \in S_f$.

Let $x \in X \setminus E_f$ and let ρ be the identity element of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. Then $\rho(x) \in S_f$ and hence $u(\rho(x)) = \rho(x)$. Since $u \circ \rho = u$ in $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ we have

$$u(x) = u(\rho(x)) = \rho(x).$$

Since $x \in X \setminus E_f$ is arbitrary it follows that $u = \rho$, the identity element of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$.

Let us prove that φ is onto. Let $v \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ and let k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that f^{k_ν} converges to v on S_f . Taking a subsequence if necessary we may assume that f^{k_ν} converges to a map $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ which clearly satisfied $\varphi(u) = v$.

(v): Let ρ be the identity element of the group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. Since $\rho^2 = \rho$ and by Proposition 5.3 also $\rho(X \setminus E_f) = S_f$ it follows that the identity element of the group $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$, being the restriction of ρ to S_f , is the identity map of S_f .

Moreover $f \circ \rho$ is a generator of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and since the restriction of $f \circ \rho$ to S_f coincide with the restriction of f to S_f it follows that $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ is a compact monothetic group generated by f .

Let now $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ be arbitrary. Since $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ is a group with unit element the identity map of S_f it follows that $u^{-1} \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ and hence the image of S_f under u is all S_f .

Since u and u^{-1} are both not increasing for each $x, y \in S_f$ we have

$$\delta_X(x, y) \geq \delta_X(u(x), u(y)) \geq \delta_X(u^{-1}(u(x)), u^{-1}(u(y))) \geq \delta_X(x, y),$$

and hence u is an isometry of S_f onto S_f .

(vi): let $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ and let $v \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. By Proposition 5.3 we have $v(X \setminus E_f) = S_f$ and hence the composition $u \circ v$ is well defined.

We need only to prove that given $v, w \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ there exists a unique $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ such that $u \circ v = w$.

Let $v, w \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ be given. If we choose u as the restriction to $w \circ v^{-1}$ to S_f (here u^{-1} stands for the inverse of u in the group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$) we clearly obtain that $u \circ v = w$.

Let now $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ and suppose $u_1 \circ v = u_2 \circ v$. Let $y \in S_f$. By Proposition 5.3 there exists $x \in X \setminus E_f$ such that $v(x) = y$ and hence

$$u_1(y) = u_1(v(x)) = u_2(v(x)) = u_2(y).$$

Since $y \in S_f$ is arbitrary then $u_1 = u_2$.

(vii): let $x \in X \setminus E_f$ and let y be an accumulation point of the f -orbit of X . Let k_ν be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that $f^{k_\nu}(x)$ converges to y . Taking a subsequence if necessary we may suppose that the sequence of functions f^{k_ν} converges to a map $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$. Since $u \circ \rho = u$ in $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ we have

$$y = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(x) = u(x) = u(\rho(x)).$$

Since $u|_{S_f} \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ and $\rho(x) \in S_f$ it follows that y is contained in the $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ -orbit of $\rho(x)$.

Conversely assume that $y = v(\rho(x))$ for some $v \in \mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$. Let $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ satisfying $u|_{S_f} = v$ and let k_ν and k_μ be two increasing

sequences of positive integers such that f^{k_ν} and f^{l_ν} converges respectively to u and ρ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{l_\nu}(x) &= \rho(x), \\ \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(\rho(x)) &= u(\rho(x)) = v(\rho(x)) = y,\end{aligned}$$

and hence, by Proposition 2.1,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu + l_\nu}(x) = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} f^{k_\nu}(f^{l_\nu}(x)) = y$$

and this implies that y is an accumulation point of the f -orbit of x .

(viii): let $x, y \in X \setminus E_f$ and suppose

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(x) = y.$$

Then y is the only accumulation point of the sequence $f^k(x)$ and hence the $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ -orbit of $\rho(x)$ contains the single element y , that is $y = \rho(x)$. Since the restriction of f to S_f belongs to $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ then necessarily $f(y) = y$.

Conversely assume $y = \rho(x)$ and $f(y) = y$. Since $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ is a monothetic group generated by f it follows that the $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ -orbit of $\rho(x)$ consists of the single element $y = \rho(x)$ and hence y is the only accumulation point of the f -orbit of x which by Theorem 1.1 is compact. It is straightforward to prove that then the whole sequence $f^k(x)$ converges to y .

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is so completed.

□

Remark 5.1. We point out that the group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is not a subgroup of the group of transformations of $X \setminus E_f$.

Remark 5.2. $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ is a compact group of surjective isometries of S_f . We point out that in general the full group of the surjective isometries of a locally compact space in general is not a locally compact topological group, unless the underlying space is connected, as asserted by van Dantzig and an der Waerden Theorem [vDvdW28]; see also [KN63, Theorem 4.7 pag. 46].

Remark 5.3. $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ and $\mathcal{G}_f(S_f)$ are (compact) monothetic topological group. It is a standard result of abstract harmonic analysis that a locally compact monothetic topological group either is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or is compact; see, e. g., [HR79, Theorem 9.1, pag 84].

Remark 5.4. The proof that $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is a group given above is a simplified adaptation of the proof of a more general result on the existence of groups in compact topological semigroups given in [Num52]; see also [HR79, Lemma 9.17, pag 100].

In analogy with [Aba89, pag. 145] we say that the unit element ρ in the group $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ is the *limit retraction* of f and we define the

extended limit retraction of f as the unique map $\hat{\rho} \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_f(X)$ which coincides with ρ on $X \setminus E_f$.

We then have the following characterization of ρ .

Proposition 5.4. *Let X be a locally compact metric space with countable basis and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Assume that X contains at least a f -recurrent point. Then the retraction limit of f is the unique element of $\mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ which leaves invariant each f -recurrent point of X .

Proof. Let ρ be the retraction limit of f . Then $\rho(x) = x$ if x is a f -recurrent point of X .

Conversely, let $u \in \mathcal{G}_f(X \setminus E_f)$ be a map which leaves invariant each f -recurrent point of X . Then $\rho(x)$ is f -recurrent for each $x \in X \setminus E_f$ and hence

$$u(x) = (u \circ \rho)(x) = u(\rho(x)) = \rho(x),$$

that is $u = \rho$.

□

Theorem 5.2. *Let X be a locally compact metric space with countable basis and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Then the sequence f^k converges on X to the extended retraction map $\hat{\rho}$ if, and only if, $f(x) = x$ for each f -recurrent point of X .

Proof. Let $E_f = \hat{\rho}^{-1}(\infty)$ and let S_f be the set of all the f -recurrent points of X .

Assume that f^k converges to $\hat{\rho}$ and let $y \in S_f$ be arbitrary. Then $\hat{\rho}(y) = y$ and by hypothesis $f^k(y)$ converges to $\hat{\rho}(y)$, that is

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(y) = \hat{\rho}(y) = y$$

and hence

$$f(y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^{k+1}(y) = y.$$

Conversely assume that $f(y) = y$ for each $y \in S_f$ and let $x \in X$ be arbitrary. If $x \in E_f$ then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(x) = \infty = \hat{\rho}(x).$$

Suppose now that $x \in X \setminus E_f$ and set $y = \hat{\rho}(x) = \rho(x)$. Then by Proposition 5.3 we have $y \in S_f$ and hence $f(y) = y$.

The statement (viii) of Theorem 5.1 implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^k(x) = y = \hat{\rho}(x)$$

and we are done.

□

We end this section with a simple consequence of the (existence of the) extended retraction.

Proposition 5.5. *Let X be a locally compact metric space with countable basis and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a not expansive map.*

Let E_f be the set of the points $x \in X$ having the f -orbit compactly divergent and let S_f be the set of f -recurrent points of X .

If S_f is compact then E_f is open and closed in X .

In particular if X is (not empty and) connected and S_f is compact then either $E_f = X$ and $S_f = \emptyset$ or $E_f = \emptyset$ and S_f is not empty and connected.

Proof. We already know that $E_f = \hat{\rho}^{-1}(\infty)$ is closed. If S_f is compact then $\hat{X} \setminus S_f$ is open in \hat{X} and hence $E_f = \hat{\rho}^{-1}(\hat{X} \setminus S_f)$ is also open.

□

6. COMPLEX HYPERBOLIC SPACES

We now recall some basic fact on the theory of Kobayashi hyperbolic complex spaces. For more details and further results see, e. g. [Kob70] or [Lan87].

Let

$$\Delta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| < 1\}.$$

The *Poincaré metric* on Δ is the Riemannian metric given by

$$\frac{dzd\bar{z}}{(1 - |z|^2)^2}$$

and the associated distance is given by

$$\omega(z, w) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1 + \left| \frac{z - w}{1 - \bar{z}w} \right|}{1 - \left| \frac{z - w}{1 - \bar{z}w} \right|}, \quad z, w \in \Delta$$

It is well-known that each holomorphic map $f : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ is not increasing, that is for each $z, w \in \Delta$ we have

$$\omega(f(z), f(w)) \leq \omega(z, w).$$

Let now X be a connected complex space. An *analytic chain*

$$\alpha = \{z_0, \dots, z_m; w_0, \dots, w_m; \varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m\}$$

connecting two points x and y of X is a sequence of points $z_0, \dots, z_m, w_0, \dots, w_m \in \Delta$ and holomorphic maps $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_m : \Delta \rightarrow X$ such that $\varphi_0(z_0) = x$, $\varphi_j(w_j) = \varphi_{j+1}(z_{j+1})$ for $j = 0, \dots, m - 1$ and $\varphi_m(w_m) = y$. The *length* of the chain α is

$$\omega(\alpha) = \sum_{j=0}^m \omega(z_j, w_j).$$

The *Kobayashi (pseudo)-distance* $k_X(x, y)$ between the two points x and y is the infimum of the lengths of the analytic chains connecting the points x and y .

The complex space X is *hyperbolic* (in the sense of Kobayashi) if $k_X(x, y) > 0$ for each pair of distinct points $x, y \in X$. In this case k_X is a distance function on X which induces on X its original topology.

Moreover any holomorphic map $f : X \rightarrow X$ is not expansive with respect to the Kobayashi distance, that is, if x and y are points of X then

$$k_X(f(x), f(y)) \leq k_X(x, y).$$

It is clear that Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1.

We end this paper with the following:

Theorem 6.1. *Let X be a connected hyperbolic complex space and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be an holomorphic map.*

Then the set S_f of the f -recurrent points of X is a closed complex subspace of X and each singular point of S_f also is a singular point of X .

Proof. If $S_f = \emptyset$ there is nothing to prove. So assume that $S_f \neq \emptyset$. Let E_f be the set of points $x \in X$ such that the f -orbit of x compactly divergent. We already know that S_f and E_f are closed disjoint subset of X .

Let $\rho : X \setminus E_f \rightarrow S_f$ be the limit retraction of f . The map ρ is holomorphic being the limit of a sequence of holomorphic functions. The set $X \setminus E_f$ is open in X and

$$S_f = \{x \in X \setminus E_f \mid \rho(x) = x\}$$

and hence S_f is a complex subspace of the open set $X \setminus E_f$.

Since S_f is closed in X and contained in the open set $X \setminus E_f$ it is then a complex subspace of X .

We end the proof showing that each point of S_f which is regular point of X also is a regular point of S_f .

Let $x \in S_f$ and assume that x is a regular point of X . Then there is a suitable connected neighbourhood U of x in X such that each point of U is a regular point of X , that is U is a complex manifold, and $\rho(U) = S_f \cap U$.

By a result of Rossi ([Ros63, Theorem 7.1]) it follows that $S_f \cap U$ is a smooth sub-manifold of U , that is x is a regular point of S_f .

□

REFERENCES

- [Aba89] Marco Abate, *Iteration theory of holomorphic maps on taut manifolds*, Mediterrean Press, 1989.
- [Aba93] ———, *A characterization of hyperbolic manifolds*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **117** (1993), no. 3, 789–793.
- [Cał84] Aleksander Całka, *On conditions under which isometries have bounded orbits*, Colloq. Math. **48** (1984), no. 2, 219–227.

- [HR79] Edwin Hewitt and Kenneth A. Ross, *Abstract Harmonic Analysis I*, second ed., Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, no. 115, Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [Kel55] J. L. Kelley, *General topology*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ, 1955.
- [KN63] Kobayashi and Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry vol I*, Interscience Publisher, 1963.
- [Kob70] S. Kobayashi, *Hyperbolic manifolds and holomorphic mappings*, Dekker, 1970.
- [Lan87] Serge Lang, *Introduction to complex hyperbolic spaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [LV07] Jean-Jacques Loeb and Jean-Pierre Vigué, *Sur les automorphismes analytiques des variété hyperboliques*, Bull. Sci. Math. **131** (2007), no. 5, 469–476.
- [Num52] Katsumi Numakura, *On bicomact semigroups*, Math. J. Okayama Univ. **1** (1952), 99–108.
- [Ros63] Hugo Rossi, *Vector fields on analytic spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **78** (1963), 455–467.
- [vD30] D. van Dantzig, *Über topologisch homogene kontinua*, Fund. Math. **15** (1930), 102–125.
- [vDvdW28] D. van Dantzig and B. L. van der Waerden, *Über metrisch homogene räume*, Abh. Math. Seminar Hamburg **6** (1928), 367–376.

S. VENTURINI: DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA,
 PIAZZA DI PORTA S. DONATO 5 —I-40127 BOLOGNA, ITALY
E-mail address: `sergio.venturini@unibo.it`