

# WOLFF–DENJOY THEOREMS IN GEODESIC SPACES

ALEKSANDRA HUCZEK AND ANDRZEJ WIŚNICKI

ABSTRACT. We show a Wolff–Denjoy type theorem in complete geodesic spaces in the spirit of Beardon’s framework that unifies several results in this area. In particular, it applies to strictly convex bounded domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  or  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with respect to a large class of metrics including Hilbert’s and Kobayashi’s metrics. The results are generalized to 1-Lipschitz compact mappings in infinite-dimensional Banach spaces.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Wolff–Denjoy theorem asserts that if  $f : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$  is a holomorphic map of the unit disc  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$  without a fixed point, then there is a point  $\xi \in \partial\Delta$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  converge locally uniformly to  $\xi$  on  $\Delta$ . There is a wide literature concerning various generalizations of this theorem. In complex variables, the first results are due to Hervé [19] and Abate [1]. Wolff–Denjoy type theorems for fixed-point free 1-Lipschitz maps on Hilbert’s metric spaces were studied by Beardon [5] and were further developed by Karlsson [21, 22], Karlsson and Noskov [24], Nussbaum [30], and recently by Lemmens et al. [28], to mention only a few papers.

Beardon argued in [4] that the Wolff–Denjoy theorem is a purely geometric result depending essentially only on the hyperbolic properties of a metric and showed its counterpart for a large class of negatively curved Riemannian spaces. In [5], he proposed a general approach that avoided any smoothness assumptions on the metric space under consideration. In particular, he proved a Wolff–Denjoy type theorem for contractive maps on a strictly convex bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with Hilbert’s metric. The contractivity assumption was relaxed later by Karlsson [21]. In the case of a convex bounded domain  $D$ , it was proved in [24] that the attractor (in the norm topology)  $\Omega_f = \bigcup_{x \in D} \omega_f(x)$  of a fixed point free nonexpansive (i.e., 1-Lipschitz) mapping  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a star-shaped subset of  $\partial D$ . This has led to a conjecture formulated by Karlsson and Nussbaum that  $\text{co}\Omega_f \subset \partial D$  (see [23, 30]).

In 2012, Budzyńska [8] (see also [9, 11, 12] for infinite dimensional generalizations) obtained the Wolff–Denjoy theorem for nonexpansive maps on a strictly convex bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kobayashi distance. Budzyńska’s arguments were sharpened by Abate and Raissy in [3]. The question naturally arises, to what

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 32H50; Secondary 37D40, 46T25, 47H09, 51M10, 53C23.

*Key words and phrases*. Wolff–Denjoy theorem, Geodesic space, Picard iteration, Holomorphic dynamics, Kobayashi’s distance, Hilbert’s projective metric.

extent can Beardon–Karlsson’s and Budzyńska–Abate–Raissy’s arguments interact with each other to gain a deeper insight into this problem.

The central observation in [5] is that a Wolff–Denjoy type theorem holds for any proper metric space  $(Y, d)$  satisfying the following condition:

$$d(x_n, y_n) - \max\{d(x_n, w), d(y_n, w)\} \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{B})$$

for any sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  in  $Y$  converging to distinct points in  $\partial Y$  and any  $w \in Y$  (see Section 2 for more details). The classical Wolff–Denjoy theorem follows then as a particular case of a general theorem by using the cosine formula in hyperbolic geometry. Condition (B) is also satisfied for bounded strictly convex domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the Hilbert metric as a consequence of (a variant of) the intersecting chord theorem (see [5]). In Hilbert’s geometry, the geodesics are straight-line segments and we cannot expect such a regular behaviour for strictly convex domains of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kobayashi distance. The arguments in the complex case in [3, 8] are more intricate, and it is natural to try to refine their basic features in the spirit of Beardon’s work.

This is what we do in this paper. We extend Beardon’s framework and show, in particular, that in proper geodesic spaces condition (B) can be relaxed to the following:

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \not\rightarrow -\infty \quad (\text{B}')$$

for any sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  in  $Y$  converging to distinct points in  $\partial Y$  and any  $w \in Y$  (see Theorem 3.5). Section 3 contains a few variations on this theme, giving general results of Wolff–Denjoy type in geodesic spaces.

Section 4 is devoted to the study of bounded strictly convex domains in finite dimensional spaces. It follows from Proposition 4.3 that condition (B’) is much less restrictive than Beardon’s condition (B), and holds for any Euclidean metric for which balls are (linearly) convex. Consequently, Theorem 4.5 shows a general Wolff–Denjoy type theorem for bounded strictly convex domains in a finite dimensional space that, in particular, unifies Beardon’s and Budzyńska’s results regarding Hilbert’s and Kobayashi’s metrics. Quite surprisingly, it holds for any complete geodesic space with convex balls whose topology coincides with the norm topology, and any ‘hyperbolic’ property of a metric is not needed. In Section 5 we extend the foregoing results to the case of 1-Lipschitz compact mappings in infinite dimensional spaces.

Section 6 discusses the recent characterization of geodesic boundedness of spaces of negative curvature (see [31]). We apply Karlsson’s Wolff–Denjoy type theorem for Gromov hyperbolic spaces to give a more direct proof of this interesting result.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $(Y, d)$  be a metric space. If  $x \in Y$  and  $r > 0$ , then  $B(x, r)$  and  $\bar{B}(x, r)$  denote the open and closed balls with midpoint  $x$  and radius  $r$ . A curve  $\sigma : [a, b] \rightarrow Y$  is a *geodesic (segment)* if  $d(\sigma(t_1), \sigma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$  for all  $t_1, t_2 \in [a, b]$ . By abuse of notation, the same name is used for the image  $\sigma([a, b]) \subset Y$  of  $\sigma$ , denoted by  $[\sigma(a), \sigma(b)]$ . We say that  $Y$  is a *geodesic space* if every two points of  $Y$  can be joined

by a geodesic.  $Y$  is *proper* if every closed ball  $\bar{B}(x, r)$  is compact. It follows from the Hopf-Rinow theorem that every locally compact complete geodesic space is proper.

We are interested in the iteration of nonexpansive mappings acting on geodesic spaces. A map  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is called *nonexpansive* if for any  $x, y \in Y$ ,  $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq d(x, y)$ . A map  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is called *contractive* if for any distinct  $x, y \in Y$ ,  $d(f(x), f(y)) < d(x, y)$ .

Following Beardon [5] and Karlsson [21] we consider the following properties of a metric space  $(Y, d)$  that A. Karlsson called axioms:

**Axiom 1.** The metric space  $(Y, d)$  is an open dense subset of a compact metric space  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{d})$ , whose relative topology coincides with the topology of  $Y$ . For any  $w \in Y$ , if  $\{x_n\}$  is a sequence in  $Y$  converging to  $\xi \in \partial Y = \bar{Y} \setminus Y$ , then

$$d(x_n, w) \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Axiom 2.** If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$  converging to distinct points in  $\partial Y$  then, for every  $w \in Y$ ,

$$d(x_n, y_n) - \max\{d(x_n, w), d(y_n, w)\} \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Axiom 3.** If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial Y$  and if for some  $w \in Y$ ,

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

then  $y_n \rightarrow \xi$ .

**Axiom 4.** If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial Y$ , and if for all  $n$ ,

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq c$$

for some constant  $c$ , then  $y_n \rightarrow \xi$ .

Notice that Axiom 1 implies that  $Y$  is proper, i.e., closed bounded sets are compact. Note that proper spaces are complete. Furthermore, Axioms 1, 2 imply Axiom 3 and Axioms 1, 3 imply Axiom 4. For simplicity, we assume that the compactification of  $Y$  is metrizable but most results are valid for any sequentially compact Hausdorff topological space  $\bar{Y}$  (for example, Prop. 2.2 is then a little narrower). We note that if  $w \in Y$ , then  $x_n \rightarrow w$  in  $Y$  iff  $x_n \rightarrow w$  in  $\bar{Y}$  but if  $x_n \rightarrow w \in \partial Y$  (in  $\bar{Y}$ ), then from Axiom 1,  $d(x_n, w) \rightarrow \infty$ . For simplicity of notation, we do not usually distinguish between these two types of convergence.

The following theorem, proved by Calka in [7], is one of the classical arguments in this line of research. In order to be self-contained as much as possible, we present a direct proof due to Gouëzel [17, Lemma 2.6].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose that  $(Y, d)$  is a proper metric space. Let  $x_0 \in Y$  and  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  be a nonexpansive mapping. If there exists a sequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that a subsequence  $\{f^{n_k}(x_0)\}$  is bounded then the orbit  $O(x_0)$  of  $f$  is bounded.*

*Proof.* Fix  $x_0 \in Y$  and consider a nonexpansive mapping  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$ . Let  $O(x_0) = \{f^n(x_0), n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  be the orbit of  $x_0$ . By assumption, since  $Y$  is proper, there exists a subsequence  $\{f^{n_k}(x_0)\}$  converging to some  $x$ . Hence there exists  $k_0$  such

that  $f^{n_k}(x_0) \in B(x, \frac{1}{2})$  for all  $k \geq k_0$ . Consider the set  $B = \overline{O(x_0)} \cap \bar{B}(x, 1)$  and notice that  $B$  is compact since  $Y$  is proper. Hence there exists a finite number of balls  $B(x_i, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $x_i \in O(x_0)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  which cover  $B$ . Let  $x_i = f^{m_i}(x_0)$  for each  $i$  and take  $k$  large enough such that  $n_k - m_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and

$$f^{n_k}(x_0) = f^{n_k - m_i}(f^{m_i}(x_0)) = f^{n_k - m_i}(x_i) \in B\left(x, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $B_i = \overline{O(x_0)} \cap \bar{B}(x_i, \frac{1}{2})$  and choose  $y \in B_i$ . Since  $f$  is nonexpansive we have

$$d(f^{n_k - m_i}(y), x) \leq d(f^{n_k - m_i}(y), f^{n_k - m_i}(x_i)) + d(f^{n_k - m_i}(x_i), x) \leq 1.$$

Since  $y$  is arbitrary,  $f^{n_k - m_i}(B_i) \subset B$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\bar{m} = \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \{n_k - m_i\}$ . Then, for  $n > \bar{m}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f^n(B) &\subset \bigcup_i f^n(B_i) = \bigcup_i f^{n - (n_k - m_i)}(f^{n_k - m_i}(B_i)) \\ &\subset \bigcup_i f^{n - (n_k - m_i)}(B) \subset \bigcup_{m < n} f^m(B). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We now proceed by induction. We have  $f^{\bar{m}+1}(B) \subset \bigcup_{m \leq \bar{m}} f^m(B)$ . Fix  $n > \bar{m}$  and suppose that  $f^j(B) \subset \bigcup_{m \leq \bar{m}} f^m(B)$  for all  $j \leq n$ . Then (2.1) yields

$$f^{n+1}(B) \subset \bigcup_{j \leq n} f^j(B) \subset \bigcup_{m \leq \bar{m}} f^m(B).$$

Thus we obtain by induction that  $f^n(B) \subset \bigcup_{m \leq \bar{m}} f^m(B)$  for all  $n > \bar{m}$ . Since  $\bigcup_{m \leq \bar{m}} f^m(B)$  is bounded and  $f^{n_{k_0}}(x_0) \in B$  it follows that  $O(x_0)$  is bounded too.  $\square$

We note that the original Calka theorem concerns a metric space  $M$  with the property that each bounded subset is totally bounded but then the completion of  $M$  is proper and the above proof is valid also in this case. Notice that Calka's theorem implies the orbits of nonexpansive mappings acting on a proper space are either bounded or diverge to infinity. We shall use this observation repeatedly in different contexts.

Another tool needed for investigation of the dynamics of iterates of nonexpansive mappings is the notion of a horoball. We recall the general definitions introduced by Abate in [1]. Define the *small horoball* of center  $\xi \in \partial Y$ , pole  $z_0 \in Y$  and radius  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$E_{z_0}(\xi, r) = \{y \in Y : \limsup_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(y, w) - d(w, z_0) \leq r\}$$

and the *big horoball* by

$$F_{z_0}(\xi, r) = \{y \in Y : \liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(y, w) - d(w, z_0) \leq r\}.$$

Arguing as in [8, Lemma 5.1] we can show that the big horoball is always nonempty.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Suppose that  $(Y, d)$  is a proper geodesic space satisfying Axiom 1,  $z_0 \in Y$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\xi \in \partial Y$ . Then the big horoball  $F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  is nonempty.*

*Proof.* Fix  $z_0 \in Y$ ,  $\xi \in \partial Y$  and  $r > 0$ . It follows from Axiom 1 that there exists a sequence  $\{y_n\}$  in  $Y$  converging to  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that  $d(y_n, z_0) \rightarrow \infty$ . We can assume that  $d(y_n, z_0) > r$  for all  $n$ . Let  $x_n$  be a point on the geodesic segment  $[z_0, y_n]$  such that  $d(x_n, z_0) = r$ . Then

$$d(y_n, z_0) = d(y_n, x_n) + d(x_n, z_0) = d(y_n, x_n) + r.$$

Since  $Y$  is proper,  $\bar{B}(z_0, r)$  is compact and hence there exists a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{x_n\}$  converging to some  $x \in Y$  such that  $d(x_{n_k}, z_0) \rightarrow d(x, z_0) = r$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(x, w) - d(w, z_0) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x, y_{n_k}) - d(y_{n_k}, z_0) \\ &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n_k}, y_{n_k}) - d(y_{n_k}, z_0) \\ &= -r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get  $x \in F_{z_0}(\xi, -r)$ . □

The following theorem extends [1, Theorem 2.3] concerning bounded convex domains of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kobayashi distance to general metric spaces.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Suppose that  $(Y, d)$  satisfies Axioms 1 and 4 and  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a nonexpansive mapping without a bounded orbit. Then for every  $z_0 \in Y$  there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that*

$$f^k(E_{z_0}(\xi, r)) \subset F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$$

for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $y, z_0 \in Y$ . It follows from Axiom 1 that  $Y$  is proper and hence, by Całka's theorem,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f^n(y), z_0) = \infty$ . By Observation 3.1 of [21], there is a subsequence  $\{f^{n_i}(y)\}$  of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  such that  $d(f^m(y), z_0) < d(f^{n_i}(y), z_0)$  for each  $m < n_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . We can assume from Axiom 1 (by passing to another subsequence if necessary) that  $\{f^{n_i}(y)\}$  converges in  $\bar{Y}$  to some point  $\xi$ , and  $\xi \in \partial Y$  (because otherwise  $\{d(f^{n_i}(y), z_0)\}$  would be bounded). Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $z \in E_{z_0}(\xi, r)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^k(z), w) - d(w, z_0) &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(f^k(z), f^{n_i}(y)) - d(f^{n_i}(y), z_0) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{n_i-k}(y)) - d(f^{n_i}(y), z_0) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{n_i-k}(y)) - d(f^{n_i-k}(y), z_0) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{n_i-k}(y)) - d(f^{n_i-k}(y), z_0) \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$d(f^{n_i-k}(y), f^{n_i}(y)) \leq d(y, f^k(y)) = c$$

and  $f^{n_i}(y) \rightarrow \xi$  we deduce from Axiom 4 that  $f^{n_i-k}(y) \rightarrow \xi$ , too. Thus

$$\liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^k(z), w) - d(w, z_0) \leq \limsup_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(z, w) - d(w, z_0) \leq r.$$

□

Theorem 2.3 is a very useful tool in proving Wolff–Denjoy type theorems provided small horospheres  $E_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  are nonempty for every  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  (see [1]). However, it is not clear whether it is true in general, even for strictly convex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kobayashi distance. In the next section we show how to overcome this difficulty.

We conclude this section by recalling the definitions of Hilbert’s and Thompson’s metrics on a cone, and the Kobayashi distance. Let  $K$  be a closed normal cone with non-empty interior in a real Banach space  $V$ . We say that  $y \in K$  *dominates*  $x \in V$  if there exists  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\alpha y \leq x \leq \beta y$ . This notion yields on  $K$  an equivalence relation  $\sim_K$  by  $x \sim_K y$  if  $x$  dominates  $y$  and  $y$  dominates  $x$ . For all  $x, y \in K$  such that  $x \sim_K y$  and  $y \neq 0$ , define

$$M(x/y) = \inf\{\beta > 0 : x \leq \beta y\}$$

and

$$m(x/y) = \sup\{\alpha > 0 : \alpha y \leq x\}.$$

The *Hilbert (pseudo-)metric* is defined by

$$d_H(x, y) = \log \left( \frac{M(x/y)}{m(x/y)} \right),$$

and the *Thompson metric* is

$$d_T(x, y) = \log(\max\{M(x/y), M(y/x)\}).$$

Moreover, we put  $d_H(0, 0) = d_T(0, 0) = 0$  and  $d_H(x, y) = d_T(x, y) = \infty$  if  $x \not\sim_K y$ . It can be shown that  $d_T$  is a metric on each equivalence class of  $K$ , while  $d_H(x, y) = 0$  iff  $x = \lambda y$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ .

If  $\varphi \in V^*$  is a strictly positive functional, then  $\Sigma_\varphi^\circ = \{x \in \text{int } K : \varphi(x) = 1\}$  endowed with Hilbert’s metric is a complete geodesic space whose topology coincides with the norm topology (see, e.g., [27, 36]). In finite dimensional spaces, the set  $\Sigma_\varphi^\circ$  is bounded in norm but it may be unbounded in infinite dimensional spaces. If  $D$  is a bounded open convex subset of  $V$ , then there exist a closed normal cone with non-empty interior  $K$  in  $V \times \mathbb{R}$  and a strictly positive functional  $\varphi \in (V \times \mathbb{R})^*$  such that  $D$  is isometric to  $\Sigma_\varphi^\circ$  and thus it is equipped with Hilbert’s metric  $d_H$  (see, e.g., [30, p. 206]). If  $x, y \in D$ , consider the straight line passing through  $x$  and  $y$  that intersects  $\partial D$  in precisely two points  $a$  and  $b$ . Assuming that  $x$  is between  $a$  and  $y$ , and  $y$  is between  $x$  and  $b$ , we define the cross-ratio metric

$$\widehat{d}_H(x, y) = \log \left( \frac{\|y - a\| \|x - b\|}{\|x - a\| \|y - b\|} \right).$$

It is well known that  $d_H(x, y) = \widehat{d}_H(x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in D$ . The following estimation will be needed in Sections 4 and 5 (see [26, 29]).

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $K \subset V$  be a closed normal cone with non-empty interior,  $\varphi \in V^*$  a positive functional and  $\Sigma_\varphi^\circ = \{x \in \text{int } K : \varphi(x) = 1\}$ . Then  $d_H(sx + (1 - s)y, z) \leq \max\{d_H(x, z), d_H(y, z)\}$  for all  $x, y, z \in \Sigma_\varphi^\circ$  and  $s \in [0, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $x, y, z \in \Sigma_\varphi^\circ$  and let  $r = \max\{d_H(x, z), d_H(y, z)\}$ . By the definition of Hilbert's metric, we obtain that  $\alpha_1 z \leq x \leq \beta_1 z$  and  $\alpha_2 z \leq y \leq \beta_2 z$ , where  $0 \leq \frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_2} \leq e^r$ . If  $s \in [0, 1]$  then

$$\alpha_s z = (s\alpha_1 + (1-s)\alpha_2)z \leq sx + (1-s)y \leq (s\beta_1 + (1-s)\beta_2)z = \beta_s z. \quad (2.2)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta_s}{\alpha_s} &= \frac{s\beta_1 + (1-s)\beta_2}{\alpha_s} = \frac{s\alpha_1}{\alpha_s} \cdot \frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_1} + \frac{(1-s)\alpha_2}{\alpha_s} \cdot \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_2} \\ &\leq \frac{s\alpha_1}{\alpha_s} \cdot e^r + \frac{(1-s)\alpha_2}{\alpha_s} \cdot e^r = \frac{s\alpha_1 + (1-s)\alpha_2}{\alpha_s} \cdot e^r \\ &= e^{\max\{d_H(x, z), d_H(y, z)\}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above and (2.2) we have

$$d_H(sx + (1-s)y, z) \leq \max\{d_H(x, z), d_H(y, z)\}.$$

□

A similar argument works for Thompson's metric. The same estimation holds also for the Kobayashi distance (see, e.g., [2]). Recall that if  $D$  is a bounded convex domain of a complex Banach space  $V$ , then the *Kobayashi distance* between  $z, w \in D$  is given by

$$k_D(z, w) = \inf\{k_\Delta(0, \gamma) \mid \exists \varphi \in \text{Hol}(\Delta, D) : \varphi(0) = z, \varphi(\gamma) = w\},$$

where  $k_\Delta$  denotes the Poincaré metric on the unit disc  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $D \subset V$  be a bounded convex domain. Then for all  $x, y, z \in D$  and  $s \in [0, 1]$   $k_D(sx + (1-s)y, z) \leq \max\{k_D(x, z), k_D(y, z)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $x, y, z \in D$  and  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $k_D(x, z) > k_D(y, z)$ . Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist holomorphic mappings  $f, g : \Delta \rightarrow D$  and  $0 \leq \xi < \zeta < 1$  such that  $f(0) = x, g(0) = y, f(\zeta) = g(\xi) = z, k_\Delta(0, \zeta) < k_D(x, z) + \varepsilon$  and  $k_\Delta(0, \xi) < k_D(y, z) + \varepsilon$ . Since  $D$  is convex we can define a holomorphic mapping  $h : \Delta \rightarrow D$  by

$$h(\gamma) = sf(\gamma) + (1-s)g\left(\frac{\xi\gamma}{\zeta}\right), \quad \gamma \in \Delta.$$

Hence

$$h(0) = sf(0) + (1-s)g(0) = sx + (1-s)y$$

and

$$h(\zeta) = sf(\zeta) + (1-s)g(\xi) = z.$$

From the above and since, as a holomorphic, the mapping  $h$  is nonexpansive we have

$$k_D(sx + (1-s)y, z) = k_D(h(0), h(\zeta)) \leq k_\Delta(0, \zeta) < k_D(x, z) + \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary we get

$$k_D(sx + (1-s)y, z) \leq \max\{k_D(x, z), k_D(y, z)\}.$$

□

## 3. WOLFF-DENJOY THEOREMS IN PROPER SPACES

In this section,  $(Y, d)$  always denotes a complete locally compact geodesic space and we will assume that  $Y$  satisfies Axiom 1. This involves no loss of generality since the Hopf-Rinow theorem implies that  $Y$  is proper and hence admits a compactification satisfying Axiom 1. From now on we denote by  $\overline{A}$  the closure of  $A \subset Y$  with respect to the topology of  $(\overline{Y}, \overline{d})$ .

The following lemma is one of the basic tools in our consideration.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a nonexpansive mapping without a bounded orbit. Then there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that for every  $z_0 \in Y$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and a sequence of natural numbers  $\{a_n\}$ , there exists  $z \in Y$  and a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  such that  $f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, if  $Y$  satisfies Axiom 4, then  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $y \in Y$ . Since  $d_n = d(f^n(y), y)$  is not bounded, the Całka theorem 2.1 yields  $d_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By Observation 3.1 in [21], there is a sequence  $\{\varphi(i)\}$  of natural numbers such that  $d_m < d_{\varphi(i)}$  for  $m < \varphi(i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $Y$  satisfies Axiom 1, we can assume by passing to another subsequence that  $\{f^{\varphi(i)}(y)\}$  converges to some point  $\xi \in \partial Y$ . Fix  $r > 0$  and a sequence of natural numbers  $\{a_n\}$ . On each geodesic segment  $[y, f^{\varphi(i)-a_1}(y)] \subset Y$  (assuming that  $\varphi(i) > a_1$  and  $d(f^{\varphi(i)-a_1}(y), y) > r$ ) joining  $y$  to  $f^{\varphi(i)-a_1}(y)$  select a point  $z_{\varphi(i)}^1$  such that  $d(z_{\varphi(i)}^1, y) = r$ . Since  $Y$  is proper there is a subsequence  $\{\varphi_1(i)\}$  of  $\{\varphi(i)\}$  such that  $\{z_{\varphi_1(i)}^1\}$  converges to some  $z_1 \in Y$ . Hence

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z_1, f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1}(y), y) = -d(z_1, y) = -r.$$

By induction, for every  $n > 1$ , we can select on each geodesic segment  $[y, f^{\varphi_{n-1}(i)-a_n}(y)] \subset Y$  (assuming that  $\varphi_{n-1}(i) > a_n$  and  $d(f^{\varphi_{n-1}(i)-a_n}(y), y) > r$ ) a point  $z_{\varphi_{n-1}(i)}^n$  such that  $d(z_{\varphi_{n-1}(i)}^n, y) = r$  and a subsequence  $\{\varphi_n(i)\}$  of  $\{\varphi_{n-1}(i)\}$  such that  $\{z_{\varphi_n(i)}^n\}$  converges to some  $z_n \in Y$ . Hence

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z_n, f^{\varphi_n(i)-a_n}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_n(i)-a_n}(y), y) = -d(z_n, y) = -r.$$

Since  $Y$  is proper there exists a subsequence  $\{z_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{z_n\}$  converging to some  $z \in Y$  such that  $d(z_{n_k}, z) < \frac{1}{2}$  for each  $k$ . By diagonalization, there is a subsequence  $\{\psi(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of any  $\{\varphi_n(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y), y) < -r + 1$$

for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \geq k$ . Hence, for every  $a_{n_k}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), w) - d(w, y) &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), f^{\psi(i)}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y), y) \\ &\leq -r + 1, \end{aligned}$$



and thus

$$\liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), w) - d(w, z_0) \leq -r + 1 + d(z_0, y)$$

for every  $z_0 \in Y$ . Since  $r > 0$  is arbitrary, this proves the first part of the lemma. To prove that  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$  notice that (taking  $a_i = \varphi(i)$ ) for every  $z_0 \in Y$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  there is  $\tilde{z} \in Y$  and a subsequence  $\{\varphi(i_k)\}$  of  $\{\varphi(i)\}$  such that  $f^{\varphi(i_k)}(\tilde{z}) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  for each  $k$ . Since

$$d(f^{\varphi(i_k)}(y), f^{\varphi(i_k)}(\tilde{z})) \leq d(y, \tilde{z}),$$

it follows from Axiom 4 that  $f^{\varphi(i_k)}(\tilde{z}) \rightarrow \xi$ . Thus  $\xi \in \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$  and from arbitrariness of  $r$ ,  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$ .  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove a general Wolff–Denjoy type theorem in proper geodesic spaces.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  satisfy Axiom 4 and suppose that for every  $\zeta \in \partial Y$  and  $z_0 \in Y$  the intersection of horoballs' closures  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)}$  consists of a single point. If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a nonexpansive mapping without bounded orbits, then there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $Y$  to  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption, there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  that satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 3.1. Hence  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)} = \{\xi\}$ . Fix  $y \in Y$  and select a subsequence  $\{f^{a_n}(y)\}$  of iterates of  $f$  converging to some  $\eta \in \partial Y$ . We show that  $\eta = \xi$ . Fix  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . From Lemma 3.1 there exists a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  and  $z \in Y$  such that

$$f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r) \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since  $d(f^{a_{n_k}}(y), f^{a_{n_k}}(z)) \leq d(y, z)$ , we obtain from Axiom 4 that  $\{f^{a_{n_k}}(z)\}$  converges to  $\eta$  too. From the above and (3.1) we have  $\eta \in \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence

$$\eta \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)} = \{\xi\}.$$

Therefore  $\eta = \xi$  and  $f^{a_n}(y) \rightarrow \xi$  for any converging subsequence  $\{f^{a_n}(y)\}$ . It follows that  $f^n(y) \rightarrow \xi$  for each  $y \in Y$ . The proof of uniform convergence on bounded sets is routine: suppose, on the contrary, that there exist an open neighbourhood  $U \subset \overline{Y}$  of  $\xi$ , a bounded set  $K \subset Y$  and a sequence  $\{y_n\} \subset K$  such that  $f^n(y_n) \notin U$  for each  $n$ . Then

$$d(f^n(y_n), f^n(y)) \leq d(y_n, y) \leq \text{diam } K$$

for any  $y \in K$  and, since  $f^n(y) \rightarrow \xi$ , we deduce from Axiom 4 that  $f^n(y_n) \rightarrow \xi \in \overline{Y} \setminus U$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  satisfy Axiom 4 and suppose that for every  $\zeta \in \partial Y$  and  $z_0 \in Y$  the intersection  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)}$  consists of a single point. If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a contractive mapping then there exists  $\xi \in \overline{Y}$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $Y$  to  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  has unbounded orbits then the conclusion follows directly from Theorem 3.2. Therefore, we suppose that  $\{f^n(y)\}$  is bounded for all  $y \in Y$ . Fix  $y \in Y$ . There exists a subsequence  $\{f^{n_i}(y)\}$  of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  converging to some  $z \in Y$ . Since  $f$  is contractive then the sequence  $d_n = d(f^n(y), f^{n+1}(y))$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , is decreasing and hence it converges to some  $\eta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Note by continuity that  $\eta = d(z, f(z)) = d(f(z), f^2(z))$ . If  $z$  and  $f(z)$  were distinct points we would have received a contradiction (with  $f$  being contractive). Hence  $f(z) = z$  and, since  $\{d(f^n(y), z)\}$  is decreasing, we obtain that  $f^n(y) \rightarrow z \in Y$  if  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $y \in Y$ .  $\square$

It is not difficult to see that Beardon's Axiom 2 implies the property that any horoball's closure  $\overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$  meets the boundary  $\partial Y$  at only one point  $\xi$ . The following lemma, combined with Theorem 3.2 shows that in proper geodesic spaces this is more than required to prove a Wolff–Denjoy type theorem.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  satisfy Axiom 3,  $z_0 \in Y$ ,  $\zeta \in \partial Y$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)} = \{\zeta\}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $z_0 \in Y$  and  $\zeta \in \partial Y$ . It follows from Proposition 2.2 that a big horoball is nonempty and hence by compactness,  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)} \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose that  $\eta \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)} \subset \partial Y$  and consider a sequence  $\{r_n\}$  of real numbers diverging to  $-\infty$ . Hence, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\eta \in \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r_n)}$  and thus there exists a sequence  $\{z_i^{r_n}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  contained in  $F_{z_0}(\zeta, r_n)$  such that  $\overline{d}(z_i^{r_n}, \eta) \rightarrow 0$  if  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $i_n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\overline{d}(z_{i_n}^{r_n}, \eta) < \frac{1}{n}$  and

$$\liminf_{w \rightarrow \zeta} d(z_{i_n}^{r_n}, w) - d(w, z_0) \leq r_n.$$

Let  $\{w_k^n\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence converging to  $\zeta \in \partial Y$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{i_n}^{r_n}, w_k^n) - d(w_k^n, z_0) \leq r_n.$$

Then, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $w_{k_n}^n$  such that  $\overline{d}(w_{k_n}^n, \zeta) \leq \frac{1}{n}$  and

$$d(z_{i_n}^{r_n}, w_{k_n}^n) - d(w_{k_n}^n, z_0) \leq r_n + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{i_n}^{r_n}, w_{k_n}^n) - d(w_{k_n}^n, z_0) = -\infty.$$

By Axiom 3,  $\overline{d}(w_{k_n}^n, \eta) \rightarrow 0$  but  $\overline{d}(w_{k_n}^n, \zeta) \rightarrow 0$ , too. This means that  $\eta = \zeta$  and therefore,  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\zeta, r)} = \{\zeta\}$ .  $\square$

Thus Axiom 3 can be regarded as an abstract formulation of the property that the intersection of closures of horoballs consists of a single point. Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.4 immediately lead to the following results.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  satisfy Axiom 3. If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a nonexpansive mapping without bounded orbits, then there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $Y$  to  $\xi$ .*

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  satisfy Axiom 3. If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a contractive mapping then there exists  $\xi \in \overline{Y}$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $Y$  to  $\xi$ .*

#### 4. STRICTLY CONVEX DOMAINS

Let  $V$  be a finite-dimensional (real or complex) vector space,  $D$  a bounded open subset of  $V$  and  $\partial D = \overline{D} \setminus D$ , where  $\overline{D}$  denotes the closure of  $D$  in the norm topology. To simplify notation, we write in this section

$$[z, w] = \{sz + (1-s)w : s \in [0, 1]\} \quad \text{and} \quad (z, w) = \{sz + (1-s)w : s \in (0, 1)\}$$

for the closed and open segments connecting  $z$  and  $w$  in  $D$ . We begin with the following simple lemma (see, e.g., [3, Lemma 1]).

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $D \subset V$  be a convex domain. Then*

- (i)  $(z, w) \subset D$  for all  $z \in D$  and  $w \in \partial D$
- (ii) if  $z, w \in \partial D$ , then either  $(z, w) \subset \partial D$  or  $(z, w) \subset D$ .

*Proof.*

- (i) Let  $z \in D, w \in \partial D$  and pick  $s \in (0, 1)$ . We show that  $sz + (1-s)w \in D$ . Since  $D$  is open and  $z \in D$ , there exists a ball  $B(z, r) \subset D$ . Let  $r' < r \frac{s}{1-s}$  and select  $w' \in D$  such that  $\|w - w'\| < r'$ . Then

$$sz + (1-s)w = sz' + (1-s)w', \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$z' = z + \frac{1-s}{s}(w - w').$$

Hence  $\|z - z'\| < \frac{1-s}{s}r' < r$  and therefore  $z' \in B(z, r) \subset D$ . It follows from (4.1) and convexity of  $D$  that  $sz' + (1-s)w' \in D$ .

- (ii) Suppose that  $(z, w) \not\subset \partial D$  so there exists  $y \in (z, w) \cap D$ . Then from (i)  $(z, y) \subset D$  and  $(y, w) \subset D$ , and consequently  $(z, w) \subset D$ . □

Recall that  $D \subset V$  is *strictly convex* if for any  $z, w \in \overline{D}$  the open segment  $(z, w)$  lies in  $D$ .

The objective of this section is to apply the general results of Section 3 to the case of a bounded strictly convex domain  $D \subset V$ . In what follows, we will always assume that  $(D, d)$  is a metric space whose topology coincides with the norm topology. Our next lemma, although formulated for subsets of a finite dimensional space, is valid for any proper space.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a bounded domain of  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  is a complete geodesic space. Then  $(D, d)$  satisfies Axiom 1.*

*Proof.* Suppose that a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to  $\xi \in \partial D$ . We show that  $d(x_n, y) \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $y \in D$ . On the contrary, suppose that there exists a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}$  such that  $d(x_{n_k}, y) \leq c$  for some  $y \in D$  and  $c > 0$ . Since  $(D, d)$  is locally compact, it follows from the Hopf–Rinow theorem that  $D$  is proper and thus there exists a

subsequence  $\{x_{n_{k_l}}\}$  that converges in  $(D, d)$  to some  $x_0 \in D$ . But the topology of  $(D, d)$  coincides with the norm topology and hence  $\{x_{n_{k_l}}\}$  tends to  $x_0 \in D$  in norm, a contradiction (since  $D$  is open and hence  $\xi = x_0 \notin \partial D$ ).  $\square$

The following proposition is valid for any metric  $d$  satisfying the following condition—equivalent to the convexity of balls in  $D$ :

$$d(sx + (1 - s)y, z) \leq \max\{d(x, z), d(y, z)\} \text{ for all } x, y, z \in D \text{ and } s \in [0, 1]. \quad (C)$$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a convex domain of  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  satisfies condition (C). If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $D$  converging to  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , respectively, in  $\partial D$  and if for some  $w \in D$ ,*

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

*then  $[\xi, \eta] \subset \partial D$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x_n \rightarrow \xi$ ,  $y_n \rightarrow \eta$ ,  $\xi, \eta \in \partial D$  and

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty$$

for some  $w \in D$ . On the contrary, suppose that  $s\xi + (1 - s)\eta \in D$  for some  $s \in (0, 1)$ . Then

$$d(sx_n + (1 - s)y_n, w) \geq d(w, y_n) - d(y_n, sx_n + (1 - s)y_n) \geq d(w, y_n) - d(y_n, x_n) \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Since

$$\|sx_n + (1 - s)y_n - (s\xi + (1 - s)\eta)\| \leq s\|x_n - \xi\| + (1 - s)\|y_n - \eta\| \rightarrow 0$$

and topologies of  $(D, d)$  and  $(\overline{D}, \|\cdot\|)$  coincide on  $D$ , we have

$$d(s\xi + (1 - s)\eta, w) \rightarrow +\infty,$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.3.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a bounded strictly convex domain of  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  satisfies condition (C). If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial D$  and if for some  $w \in D$ ,*

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

*then  $y_n \rightarrow \xi$ . In other words  $(D, d)$  satisfies Axiom 3.*

Combining Theorem 3.5, Lemmas 4.2, 4.4 and a classical argument from metric fixed point theory we obtain the main result of this section. We point out that there is no need to assume any hyperbolic property of a metric.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a bounded strictly convex domain of  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  is a complete geodesic space satisfying condition (C) whose topology coincides with the norm topology. If  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a nonexpansive mapping without fixed points, then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 4.4 that  $(D, d)$  satisfies Axiom 3. If  $f : D \rightarrow D$  has unbounded orbits then the conclusion follows directly from Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 3.5. Therefore, we can assume that  $\{f^n(y)\}$  is bounded for some (and hence for any)  $y \in D$ . Let  $r = \inf_{z \in D} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^n(y))$  denote the asymptotic radius of  $\{f^n(y)\}$ . Then, by properness of  $(D, d)$ , the asymptotic center

$$A = \{x \in D : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, f^n(y)) = r\}$$

of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  is a nonempty compact subset of  $D$  that is invariant under  $f$ , that is,  $f(A) \subset A$ . Moreover  $A$  is convex since  $D$  is convex and  $(D, d)$  satisfies condition (C). From Brouwer's theorem  $f$  has a fixed point which contradicts our assumption.  $\square$

As in Section 3, we have also a variant of the above theorem for contractive maps.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a bounded strictly convex domain of  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  is a complete geodesic space satisfying condition (C) whose topology coincides with the norm topology. If  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a contractive mapping then there exists  $\xi \in \overline{D}$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

In particular, Theorem 4.5 is valid for classical metrics discussed in Section 2 (see Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5).

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. If  $f : (D, d_H) \rightarrow (D, d_H)$  is a fixed-point free nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. If  $(D, d_T)$  is a geodesic space and  $f : (D, d_T) \rightarrow (D, d_T)$  is a fixed-point free nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

Corollary 4.7 was shown by Beardon [5, Theorems 1, 1a] who proved a variant of the classical intersecting chord theorem and then showed that bounded strictly convex domains  $(D, d_H)$  satisfy Axiom 2. Corollary 4.8 appears to be new, compare also [28, Theorem 3.2].

A similar conclusion holds true for bounded strictly convex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kobayashi metric.

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be a bounded strictly convex domain. If  $f : (D, k_D) \rightarrow (D, k_D)$  is a fixed-point free nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

Corollary 4.9 was shown by Budzyńska [8, Theorem 5.3] with the use of the Earle-Hamilton theorem and properties of horoballs.

The above results leave some room for improvements. Let  $D \subset V$  be a convex domain. Given  $\xi \in \partial D, F \subset \partial D$ , set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ch}(\xi) &= \{x \in \partial D : [x, \xi] \subset \partial D\} \\ \text{ch}(F) &= \bigcup_{\xi \in F} \text{ch}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

If  $f : D \rightarrow D$ ,  $y \in D$  then  $\omega_f(y)$  denotes the set of accumulation points of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  (in the norm topology) and  $\Omega_f = \bigcup_{y \in D} \omega_f(y)$  is the attractor of  $f$ . We conclude this section with a general version of Abate and Raissy's Theorem 6 in [3], who proved it for bounded convex domains with the Kobayashi metric.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $D$  be a bounded convex domain of  $V$  and let  $(D, d)$  be a complete geodesic space satisfying condition (C) whose topology coincides with the norm topology. If  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a fixed-point free nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that*

$$\Omega_f \subset \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \text{ch}(\overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)} \cap \partial D)$$

for some  $z_0 \in D$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $y \in Y$ . There is no loss of generality in assuming that  $d(f^n(y), y)$  diverges to  $\infty$  since otherwise, there is a fixed point of  $f$  as in the proof of Theorem 4.5. Choose  $\xi \in \partial D$  satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 3.1. Fix  $z_0, y \in D$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and select a subsequence  $\{f^{a_n}(y)\}$  of iterates of  $f$  converging to some  $\eta$ . From Lemma 3.1 there exists  $z \in D$  and a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  such that  $f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We can assume by passing to another subsequence that  $f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \rightarrow \zeta \in \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$ . Clearly,  $\eta, \zeta \in \partial D$  since the orbits of  $f$  diverge to  $\infty$ . Now Proposition 4.3 yields  $[\eta, \zeta] \subset \partial D$ , that is,  $\eta \in \text{ch}(\overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)} \cap \partial D)$ . Since  $r$  is arbitrary, this proves the theorem.  $\square$

Karlsson and Noskov showed in [24] that if a bounded convex domain  $D$  is endowed with the Hilbert metric  $d_H$ , then the attractor  $\Omega_f$  of a fixed-point free nonexpansive map  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a star-shaped subset of  $\partial D$ . This has led to a conjecture formulated by Karlsson and Nussbaum asserting that  $\text{co}\Omega_f \subset \partial D$  (see [23, 30]). It remains one of the major problems in the field.

## 5. THE CASE OF COMPACT MAPPINGS

The objective of this section is to extend the results of Section 4 to infinite dimensional spaces. Therefore, we have to modify Axiom 1 and in this section we will assume

**Axiom 1'.** The metric space  $(Y, d)$  is an open dense subset of a metric space  $(\overline{Y}, \overline{d})$ , whose relative topology coincides with the metric topology. For any  $w \in Y$ , if  $\{x_n\}$  is a sequence in  $Y$  converging to  $\xi \in \partial Y = \overline{Y} \setminus Y$ , then  $d(x_n, w) \rightarrow \infty$  (the compactness of  $\overline{Y}$  is not required).

Notice that Axiom 1' implies that if  $A \subset Y$  is bounded, then the  $\overline{d}$ -closure of  $A$  does not intersect the boundary  $\partial Y$  and hence coincides with the  $d$ -closure of  $A$ .

Since in general, there are sequences without convergent subsequences, we also need a slight modification of Axioms 3 and 4:

**Axiom 3'.** If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial Y$ ,  $y_n \rightarrow \eta \in \partial Y$ , and if for some  $w \in Y$ ,

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

then  $\xi = \eta$ .

**Axiom 4'**. If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial Y$ ,  $y_n \rightarrow \eta \in \partial Y$ , and if for all  $n$ ,

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq c$$

for some constant  $c$ , then  $\xi = \eta$ .

We will also consider a wider class of quasi-geodesic metric spaces. Recall that a curve  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow Y$  is called  $(\lambda, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic if there exists  $\lambda \geq 1, \kappa \geq 0$  such that for all  $t_1, t_2 \in [a, b]$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} |t_1 - t_2| - \kappa \leq d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) \leq \lambda |t_1 - t_2| + \kappa.$$

A metric space  $Y$  is called  $(\lambda, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic if every pair of points in  $Y$  can be connected by a  $(\lambda, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic. We say that a mapping  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is compact if  $\overline{f(Y)}$ , the  $\bar{d}$ -closure of  $f(Y)$ , is compact in  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{d})$ . We will need the following counterpart of Lemma 3.1. The proof is a little more subtle.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose that  $Y$  is a  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic space satisfying Axiom 1' and  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a compact nonexpansive mapping without a bounded orbit. Then there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that for every  $z_0 \in Y$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and a sequence of natural numbers  $\{a_n\}$ , there exists  $z \in Y$  and a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  such that  $f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r)$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, if  $Y$  satisfies Axiom 4', then  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $y \in Y$ . Since  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is compact, the  $\bar{d}$ -closure  $\overline{O(y)}$  of the orbit  $\{f^n(y) : n \geq 1\}$  is compact in  $\bar{Y}$  and hence, from Axiom 1',  $\overline{O(y)} \cap B = O(y) \cap B \subset Y$  is compact in  $Y$  for any  $d$ -closed and bounded set  $B \subset Y$ . Thus  $(O(y), d)$  is proper and from Calka's theorem and nonexpansivity of  $f$  we conclude that  $d_n = d(f^n(y), y) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . As in Lemma 3.1, there is a sequence  $\{\varphi(i)\}$  of natural numbers such that  $d_m < d_{\varphi(i)}$  for  $m < \varphi(i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $f$  is compact, we can assume without loss of generality that  $\{f^{\varphi(i)}(y)\}$  converges to some point  $\xi \in \partial Y$ . Fix  $r > 0$  and a sequence of natural numbers  $\{a_n\}$ . On each  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic segment  $[y, f^{\varphi(i)-a_1-1}(y)] \subset Y$  (assuming that  $\varphi(i) > a_1 + 1$  and  $d(f^{\varphi(i)-a_1-1}(y), y) > r$ ) joining  $y$  to  $f^{\varphi(i)-a_1-1}(y)$  select a point  $z_{\varphi(i)}^1$  such that  $d(z_{\varphi(i)}^1, y) = r$ . Since  $Y$  is  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic we have

$$d(f^{\varphi(i)-a_1-1}(y), z_{\varphi(i)}^1) + d(z_{\varphi(i)}^1, y) \leq d(f^{\varphi(i)-a_1-1}(y), y) + 3\kappa$$

for each  $i$ . By assumption,  $f(Y)$  is compact in  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{d})$  and hence there is a subsequence  $\{\varphi_1(i)\}$  of  $\{\varphi(i)\}$  such that  $\{f(z_{\varphi_1(i)}^1)\}$  converges to some  $z_1 \in f(Y)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z_1, f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1-1}(y), y) \\ &= \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(f(z_{\varphi_1(i)}^1), f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1-1}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{\varphi_1(i)}^1, f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1-1}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_1(i)-a_1-1}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} -d(z_{\varphi_1(i)}^1, y) + 3\kappa = -r + 3\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, for every  $n > 1$ , we can select on each  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic segment  $[y, f^{\varphi_{n-1}(i)-a_{n-1}}(y)] \subset Y$  (assuming that  $\varphi_{n-1}(i) > a_{n-1}$  and  $d(f^{\varphi_{n-1}(i)-a_{n-1}}(y), y) > r$ ) a point  $z_{\varphi_{n-1}(i)}^n$  such that  $d(z_{\varphi_{n-1}(i)}^n, y) = r$  and a subsequence  $\{\varphi_n(i)\}$  of  $\{\varphi_{n-1}(i)\}$  such that  $\{f(z_{\varphi_n(i)}^n)\}$  converges to some  $z_n \in f(Y)$ . Hence

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z_n, f^{\varphi_n(i)-a_n}(y)) - d(f^{\varphi_n(i)-a_n-1}(y), y) \leq -r + 3\kappa$$

and since  $\{z_n\}$  is contained in the compact set  $\overline{f(Y)} \cap \bar{B}(y, r) \subset Y$  there is a subsequence  $\{z_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{z_n\}$  converging to some  $z \in Y$  with  $d(z_{n_k}, y) < \frac{1}{2}$  for each  $k$ . By diagonalization, there is a subsequence  $\{\psi(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of any  $\{\varphi_n(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}-1}(y), y) < -r + 1 + 3\kappa$$

for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \geq k$ . Hence, for every  $a_{n_k}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), w) - d(w, y) &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), f^{\psi(i)}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)}(y), y) \\ &\leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}}(y)) - d(f^{\psi(i)-a_{n_k}-1}(y), y) \\ &\leq -r + 1 + 3\kappa \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\liminf_{w \rightarrow \xi} d(f^{a_{n_k}}(z), w) - d(w, z_0) \leq -r + 1 + 3\kappa + d(z_0, y)$$

for every  $z_0 \in Y$ . Since  $r > 0$  is arbitrary, this proves the first part of the lemma. As in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we show that  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$ .  $\square$

Having Lemma 5.1 in hand, we can prove counterparts of the previous results.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $(Y, d)$  be a  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic space satisfying Axioms 1' and 3'. If  $f : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a compact nonexpansive mapping without bounded orbits, then there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $Y$  to  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption, there exists  $\xi \in \partial Y$  satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 5.1. Hence  $\xi \in \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)}$  and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.4,  $\bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \overline{F_{z_0}(\xi, r)} = \{\xi\}$ . Fix  $y \in Y$ . Since  $f$  is compact there exists a subsequence  $\{f^{a_n}(y)\}$  of iterates of  $f$  converging to some  $\eta \in \partial Y$ . We show that  $\eta = \xi$  for any converging subsequence  $\{f^{a_n}(y)\}$ . Fix  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . From Lemma 5.1 there exists a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  and  $z \in Y$  such that

$$f^{a_{n_k}}(z) \in F_{z_0}(\xi, r) \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5.1)$$

The remaining part of the proof is essentially the same as the proof of Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

Notice that Proposition 4.3 in Section 4 is valid for a convex domain of any Banach space and thus we have the following counterpart of Lemma 4.4.



**Lemma 5.3.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a strictly convex domain of a Banach space  $V$  and  $(D, d)$  is a metric space satisfying condition (C) whose topology coincides with the norm topology. Then  $(D, d)$  satisfies Axiom 3'.*

Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 now yields the following extension of Theorem 4.5.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose that  $D$  is a strictly convex domain of a Banach space and  $(D, d)$  is a  $(1, \kappa)$ -quasi-geodesic space satisfying Axiom 1' (with respect to the norm closure  $(\overline{D}, \|\cdot\|)$ ) and condition (C). If  $f : D \rightarrow D$  is a compact nonexpansive mapping without fixed points, then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\{f^n(y)\}$  is bounded for some  $y \in D$ . Let

$$r = \inf_{z \in D} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^n(y))$$

and notice that the asymptotic center

$$A = \{x \in D : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, f^n(y)) = r\}$$

of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  is nonempty. Indeed,  $A = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} A_\varepsilon$ , where

$$A_\varepsilon = \{x \in D : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, f^n(y)) \leq r + \varepsilon\}$$

and since  $f$  is nonexpansive,  $f(A_\varepsilon) \subset A_\varepsilon$ . Hence  $\overline{f(A_\varepsilon)} \subset \overline{A_\varepsilon} = A_\varepsilon$  since  $A_\varepsilon$  is bounded,  $d$ -closed and, therefore, also  $\|\cdot\|$ -closed from Axiom 1'. Thus

$$\emptyset \neq \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} \overline{f(A_\varepsilon)} \subset \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} A_\varepsilon = A$$

since  $f$  is compact. Moreover,  $A$  is bounded closed and convex,  $f(A) \subset A$  and  $\overline{f(A)}$  is compact. It follows from the Schauder fixed-point theorem that  $f$  has a fixed point which is a contradiction.

Therefore,  $f : D \rightarrow D$  has unbounded orbits and then the conclusion immediately follows from Theorem 5.2.  $\square$

As discussed in Section 2, every bounded convex domain  $D$  of a Banach space can be equipped with the Hilbert metric  $d_H$  under which it becomes a complete geodesic space. Moreover,  $(D, d_H)$  satisfies Axiom 1' (see, e.g., [30, Theorem 4.13]) and condition (C). Therefore, the following corollary, which is a special case of [30, Theorem 4.17], is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.4.

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $D$  be a bounded strictly convex domain of a Banach space. If  $f : (D, d_H) \rightarrow (D, d_H)$  is a fixed-point-free compact nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

The case of the Kobayashi metric  $k_D$  is more delicate. It is well known that if  $D$  is a bounded convex domain of a complex Banach space then  $(D, k_D)$  is a complete metric space that satisfies Axiom 1' (see [18, 25]) but, in general, it is not a geodesic space. However, it directly follows from the Lempert characterization

of the Kobayashi distance (presented in Section 2) that  $(D, k_D)$  is a  $(1, \varepsilon)$ -quasi-geodesic space for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Thus we have the following consequence of Theorem 5.4.

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let  $D$  be a bounded strictly convex domain of a complex Banach space. If  $f : (D, k_D) \rightarrow (D, k_D)$  is a fixed-point-free compact nonexpansive map then there exists  $\xi \in \partial D$  such that the iterates  $f^n$  of  $f$  converge uniformly on bounded sets of  $D$  to  $\xi$ .*

Compact holomorphic fixed-point-free mappings of the open unit ball of a Hilbert space were studied in [14]. Then the above result was proved in [20, Theorem 4.4], in the case of the open unit ball of a uniformly convex space, in [10, Theorem 4.2], in the case of a bounded strictly convex domain of a reflexive space, and finally in [11, Theorem 4.1].

## 6. THE FIXED POINT PROPERTY AND UNBOUNDED SETS

Let  $(Y, d)$  be a metric space and fix  $w \in Y$ . The *Gromov product* of  $x, y \in Y$  at  $w$  is defined to be

$$(x, y)_w = \frac{1}{2}(d(x, w) + d(y, w) - d(x, y)).$$

Let  $\delta \geq 0$ . A metric space  $Y$  is said to be  $\delta$ -hyperbolic if

$$(x, y)_w \geq \min\{(x, z)_w, (y, z)_w\} - \delta$$

for every  $x, y, z, w \in Y$ . If  $Y$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic for some  $\delta \geq 0$  then  $Y$  is called *Gromov hyperbolic*. The Gromov product is used to define an abstract boundary  $Y(\infty)$  called the *ideal* (or *Gromov*) *boundary*. We say that a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to infinity if  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n, x_m)_w = \infty$  for some (and hence any)  $w \in Y$ . Define  $Y(\infty)$  as the set of the equivalence classes of sequences converging to infinity, where two such sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are equivalent if  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} (x_n, y_m)_w = \infty$ . If  $Y$  is a proper geodesic and Gromov hyperbolic space, then there is a natural metrizable topology on  $\bar{Y} = Y \cup Y(\infty)$  that makes it a compactification of  $Y$ , and  $Y$  is open in  $\bar{Y}$  (see e.g., [6, Prop. III.3.7]).

**Lemma 6.1.** *If  $Y$  is Gromov hyperbolic then it satisfies Axiom 3 with respect to the Gromov boundary.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  are sequences in  $Y$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \xi \in Y(\infty)$  and

$$d(x_n, y_n) - d(y_n, w) \rightarrow -\infty$$

for some  $w \in Y$ . Then  $(x_n, x_m)_w \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$(x_m, y_m)_w = \frac{1}{2}(d(x_m, w) + d(y_m, w) - d(x_m, y_m)) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence

$$(x_n, y_m)_w \geq \min\{(x_n, x_m)_w, (y_m, x_m)_w\} - \delta \rightarrow \infty$$

which means that  $y_n \rightarrow \xi$ . □

Therefore, if we recall Theorem 3.5, we see at once that the Wolff–Denjoy theorem holds for any complete locally compact geodesic space  $Y$  which is Gromov hyperbolic. It was Karlsson who observed that properness of  $Y$  is in fact not needed (see [21, Prop. 5.1]).

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $Y$  be a Gromov hyperbolic space and suppose that  $f$  is a nonexpansive mapping such that  $d(y, f^n(y)) \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $y \in Y$ . Then for every  $x \in Y$  the orbit  $\{f^n(x)\}$  converges to a point  $\xi$  on the Gromov boundary  $Y(\infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\{f^{\varphi(i)}(y)\}$  be a subsequence of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  such that  $d(y, f^k(y)) \leq d(y, f^{\varphi(i)}(y))$  for  $k \leq \varphi(i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (f^k(y), f^{\varphi(i)}(y))_y &= \frac{1}{2}(d(f^k(y), y) + d(f^{\varphi(i)}(y), y) - d(f^k(y), f^{\varphi(i)}(y))) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(d(f^k(y), y) + d(f^{\varphi(i)}(y), y) - d(y, f^{\varphi(i)-k}(y))) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}d(f^k(y), y) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $k \leq \varphi(i)$ . In particular,

$$(f^{\varphi(i)}(y), f^{\varphi(j)}(y))_y \geq \frac{1}{2} \min\{d(f^{\varphi(i)}(y), y), d(f^{\varphi(j)}(y), y)\} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } i, j \rightarrow \infty,$$

and hence there exists  $\xi \in Y(\infty)$  such that  $f^{\varphi(i)}(y) \rightarrow \xi$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (f^i(x), f^{\varphi(i)}(y))_y &\geq (f^i(y), f^{\varphi(i)}(y))_y - 2d(x, y) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}d(f^i(y), y) - 2d(x, y) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in Y$ . Therefore,  $f^n(x) \rightarrow \xi \in Y(\infty)$ .  $\square$

If  $Y$  is a geodesic and  $\delta$ -hyperbolic then, given three points  $x, y, z \in Y$  and  $y' \in [x, y]$ ,  $z' \in [x, z]$  such that  $d(x, y') = d(x, z') \leq (y, z)_x$ , then  $d(y', z') \leq 4\delta$  (see, e.g., [13, Prop. 2.1.3]). A subset  $K$  of a geodesic space  $Y$  is said to be *geodesically bounded* if it does not contain any geodesic ray, that is, there does not exist a map  $\sigma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$  such that  $d(\sigma(t_1), \sigma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$  for all  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \infty)$ . A subset  $K$  of  $Y$  is said to be *geodesically convex* if a geodesic  $[x, y] \subset K$  for any  $x, y \in K$ . In 2015, Piątek [31] obtained an interesting characterization of geodesic boundedness in spaces of negative curvature  $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$  (see [6] for a thorough treatment of these spaces). We show how to apply Karlsson’s theorem 6.2 to simplify the arguments a little bit.

Recall that a geodesic space  $(Y, d)$  is called *Busemann convex* if  $d(z_\alpha, z'_\alpha) \leq (1 - \alpha)d(x, x') + \alpha d(y, y')$  for every  $x, y, x', y' \in Y$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , where  $z_\alpha, z'_\alpha$  are points on geodesic segments  $[x, y], [x', y']$ , respectively, such that  $d(x, z_\alpha) = \alpha d(x, y)$  and  $d(x', z'_\alpha) = \alpha d(x', y')$ . The following lemma was proved in [32, Lemma 2.3].

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $Y$  be a complete Busemann convex and  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space for some  $\delta \geq 0$ . Then for each  $w \in Y$  and a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of  $Y$  such that  $(x_n, x_m)_w \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ , the geodesics  $\sigma_n : [0, d(w, x_n)] \rightarrow Y$  joining  $w$  and  $x_n$  converge to some geodesic ray  $\sigma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow Y$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $r > 0$  and select on each geodesic segment  $[w, x_n]$  such that  $d(w, x_n) > r$  a point  $u_n$  such that  $d(w, u_n) = r$ . We show that  $\{u_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. If  $\delta = 0$  then from 0-hyperbolicity  $\{u_n\}$  is constant so we can assume that  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $(x_n, x_m)_w > \frac{4\delta r}{\varepsilon}$  for sufficiently large  $n, m \geq n_0$  and since  $(x_n, x_m)_w \leq \max\{d(x_n, w), d(x_m, w)\}$  there exist points  $z_n \in [w, x_n]$ ,  $z_m \in [w, x_m]$  such that  $d(z_n, w) = d(z_m, w) = (x_n, x_m)_w$ . It follows from  $\delta$ -hyperbolicity that  $d(z_n, z_m) \leq 4\delta$  and since  $Y$  is Busemann convex we have

$$d(u_n, u_m) \leq \frac{d(w, u_n)}{d(w, z_n)} d(z_n, z_m) \leq \frac{r}{(x_n, x_m)_w} 4\delta < \varepsilon$$

for  $n, m \geq n_0$ . It follows that  $\{u_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence and thus for every  $r > 0$  there exists a limit  $\sigma(r) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n(r)$ . Clearly,

$$d(\sigma(t_1), \sigma(t_2)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\sigma_n(t_1), \sigma_n(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$$

for  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \infty)$  and hence  $\sigma$  is a geodesic ray.  $\square$

Combining Theorem 6.2 with Lemma 6.3 gives a simpler proof of [31, Theorem 4.1] (see also [32, 33] for more general results).

**Theorem 6.4.** *Suppose that  $K$  is a nonempty closed and geodesically convex subset of a complete  $CAT(\kappa)$  space with  $\kappa < 0$ . Then  $K$  has the fixed point property for nonexpansive mappings if and only if  $K$  is geodesically bounded.*

*Proof.* If  $K$  is not geodesically bounded then there exists a geodesic ray  $\sigma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$  and hence the composition of the metric projection  $\pi$  of  $K$  onto  $\sigma([0, \infty))$  with the shift operator is a fixed-point-free nonexpansive mapping (see, e.g., [6, Prop. II.2.4]).

To prove the converse, suppose on the contrary that there is a fixed point free nonexpansive map  $f : K \rightarrow K$ . Fix  $y \in K$  and notice that  $d(f^n(y), y)$  is unbounded since otherwise, the asymptotic center

$$A = \{x \in K : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, f^n(y)) = \inf_{z \in K} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z, f^n(y))\}$$

of a sequence  $\{f^n(y)\}$  consists of a single point that is fixed under  $f$ , see e.g., [15, Proposition 7]. Therefore, there is a subsequence  $\{f^{n_i}(y)\}$  of  $\{f^n(y)\}$  such that  $d(f^{n_i}(y), y) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 6.2 (with  $f^{n_i}$  instead of  $f^n$ ) we conclude that  $(f^{n_i}(y), f^{n_j}(y))_y \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i, j \rightarrow \infty$ . Since for every  $\kappa < 0$ ,  $CAT(\kappa)$  is Busemann convex and Gromov hyperbolic (see, e.g., [6, Prop. III.1.2]), it follows from Lemma 6.3 that there is a geodesic ray  $\sigma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abate, Horospheres and iterates of holomorphic maps, *Math. Z.* 198 (1988), 225–238.
- [2] M. Abate, Invariant distances, in *Metrical and dynamical aspects in complex analysis*, L. Blanc-Centi (ed.), Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 1–24.
- [3] M. Abate and J. Raissy, Wolff–Denjoy theorems in nonsmooth convex domains, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* 193 (2014), 1503–1518.

- [4] A.F. Beardon, Iteration of contractions and analytic maps, *J. London Math. Soc.* 41 (1990), 141–150.
- [5] A.F. Beardon, The dynamics of contractions, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* 17 (1997), 1257–1266.
- [6] M.R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [7] A. Całka, On conditions under which isometries have bounded orbits, *Colloq. Math.* 48(2) (1984) 219–227.
- [8] M. Budzyńska, A Denjoy–Wolff theorem in  $C^n$ , *Nonlinear Anal.* 75 (2012), 22–29.
- [9] M. Budzyńska, The Denjoy–Wolff theorem for condensing mappings in a bounded and strictly convex domain in a complex Banach space, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 39 (2015), 919–940.
- [10] M. Budzyńska, T. Kuczumow and S. Reich, The Denjoy–Wolff theorem for compact holomorphic mappings in reflexive Banach spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 396 (2012), 504–512.
- [11] M. Budzyńska, T. Kuczumow and S. Reich, The Denjoy–Wolff theorem for compact holomorphic mappings in complex Banach spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 38 (2013), 747–756.
- [12] M. Budzyńska, T. Kuczumow and S. Reich, Theorems of Denjoy–Wolff type, *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* 192 (2013), 621–648.
- [13] S. Buyalo and V. Schroeder *Elements of asymptotic geometry*, (European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2007).
- [14] C.-H. Chu and P. Mellon, Iteration of compact holomorphic maps on a Hilbert ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125 (1997), 1771–1777.
- [15] S. Dhompongsa, W. A. Kirk, B. Sims, Fixed points of uniformly lipschitzian mappings, *Nonlinear Anal.* 65 (2006) 762–772.
- [16] M. Edelstein, On non-expansive mappings of Banach spaces, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 60 (1964), 439–447.
- [17] S. Gouëzel, Subadditive cocycles and horofunctions, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians–Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. III. Invited lectures*, B. Sirakov, P.N. de Souza and M. Viana (eds.), World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 1933–1947.
- [18] L.A. Harris, Schwarz–Pick systems of pseudometrics for domains in normed linear spaces, in: *Advances in holomorphy*, J.A. Barroso (ed.), North Holland, 1979, pp. 345–406.
- [19] M. Hervé, Quelques propriétés des applications analytiques d’une boule à  $m$  dimensions dans elle-même, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 42, 117–147 (1963).
- [20] J. Kapeluszny, T. Kuczumow and S. Reich, The Denjoy–Wolff theorem in the open unit ball of a strictly convex Banach space, *Adv. Math.* 143 (1999), 111–123.
- [21] A. Karlsson, Nonexpanding maps and Busemann functions, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 21, (2001) 1447–57.
- [22] A. Karlsson, On the dynamics of isometries, *Geom. Topol.* 9 (2005), 2359–2394.
- [23] A. Karlsson, Dynamics of Hilbert nonexpansive maps, in *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, A. Papadopoulos and M. Troyanov (eds.), European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2014, pp. 263–273.
- [24] A. Karlsson and G.A. Noskov, The Hilbert metric and Gromov hyperbolicity, *Enseign. Math.* (2) 48 (2002), 73–89.
- [25] T. Kuczumow, S. Reich and D. Shoikhet, Fixed points of holomorphic mappings: a metric approach, in *Handbook of Metric Fixed Point Theory*, W. A. Kirk and B. Sims (eds.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001, pp. 437–515.
- [26] M. Lemmens and R. Nussbaum, *Nonlinear Perron–Frobenius theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [27] B. Lemmens and R.D. Nussbaum, Birkhoff’s version of Hilbert’s metric and its applications in analysis, in *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, A. Papadopoulos and M. Troyanov (eds.), European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2014, pp. 275–306.
- [28] B. Lemmens et al., Denjoy–Wolff theorems for Hilbert’s and Thompson’s metric spaces, *J. Anal. Math.* 134 (2018), 671–718.

- [29] R.D. Nussbaum, Hilbert's projective metric and iterated nonlinear maps, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 391 (1988), 1–137.
- [30] R.D. Nussbaum, Fixed point theorems and Denjoy–Wolff theorems for Hilbert's projective metric in infinite dimensions, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 29 (2007), 199–250.
- [31] B. Piątek, The fixed point property and unbounded sets in spaces of negative curvature, *Israel J. Math.* 209 (2015) 323–334.
- [32] B. Piątek, Bożena The behavior of fixed point free nonexpansive mappings in geodesic spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 445 (2017), 1071–1083.
- [33] B. Piątek, On the fixed point property for nonexpansive mappings in hyperbolic geodesic spaces, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.* 19 (2018), 571–582.
- [34] S. Reich and D. Shoikhet, *Nonlinear semigroups, fixed points and geometry of domains in Banach spaces*, Imperial College Press, London, 2005.
- [35] A. Stachura, Iterates of holomorphic self-maps of the unit ball in Hilbert spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 93 (1985), 88–90.
- [36] A.C. Thompson, On certain contraction mappings in a partially ordered vector space, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 14 (1963), 438–443.
- [37] J. Wolff, 'Sur une généralisation dun théorème de Schwarz', *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris* 182 (1926), 918–920.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY OF KRAKOW, PL-30-084 CRAWCOW, POLAND

*Email address:* `aleksandra.huczek2@doktorant.up.krakow.pl`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY OF KRAKOW, PL-30-084 CRAWCOW, POLAND

*Email address:* `andrzej.wisnicki@up.krakow.pl`