Jump processes on leaves of multibranching trees

Sergio Albeverio
Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn, D 53115, Bonn, Germany

Witold Karwowski
Institute of Physics, Opole University, Opole, Poland

July 13, 2021

Abstract

The p-adic numbers have found applications in a wide range of diverse fields of scientific research. In some applications the algebraic properties of p-adics enter as an indispensable ingredient of the theory. Another class of applications has to do with hierarchical tree like systems. In this context the applications are based on the well known correspondence between p-adics and the trees with p branches emerging from every branching point. Then the algebraic structure does not enter and p-adics are used merely as a labeling system for the tree branches. We introduce a space of sequences denoted by $S_B$ suitable for labeling the trees with varying number of branches emerging from the branching points. We introduce a non Archimedean metric in $S_B$ and describe the basic topological properties of $S_B$. We also demonstrate that the known constructions of the stochastic processes on p-adics carry over to the stochastic processes on $S_B$ and hence on the corresponding trees.
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1 Introduction

Over the last twenty years a growing interest in p-adic numbers, see, e.g. [21] and more generally in local fields can be observed also in connection with various applications beside those in number theory where they originated. In fact there is intensive research using p-adics in physics [28, 24, 31, 20], neural networks [9], cognitive systems [21, 22] and in the theory of stochastic processes [19, 19, 32, 18, 33, 18] and other fields involving hierarchical systems [8, 23]. When analysing different lines of investigations one realizes that some of them like for instance applications in string theory [31], and in theory of p-adic distributions [19, 19, 20, 21, 7] rely on algebraic and topological properties of the local fields. On the other hand in such applications
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as the study of spin glasses [29], neural networks [9], and turbulence [28] the
p-adic numbers appear as a well elaborated simple framework for describing a
hierarchical structure. The algebraic properties of p-adics either do not enter
into consideration at all, or play rather the role of a convenient but dispensable
technical assumption.
There is a well known relation between the p-adics and a class of tree like
graphs. Given a prime number $p$ the tree corresponding to the p-adic field $\mathbb{Q}_p
has exactly $p$ branches emerging from every branching point. If a system under
consideration displays a hierarchical structure, then it is natural to represent
it by a tree, and then the trees related to p-adics appear as handy candidates.
In such a situation p-adic numbers merely serve as labels for the tree branches.
The advantage of using p-adics as the labels is that the distances between the
ends of the branches are given by the p-adic metric.
In reality the structure of a hierarchical system may correspond to a tree which
is more complicated than those labeled by p-adics. The number of branches
emerging from branching points of the suitable tree may vary, and does not
have to be a prime number. In order to carry over the investigations originally
based on p-adic trees to the more complicated cases one needs an appropriate labeling system.
In this note we introduce such a system and argue that the results obtained
for p-adics which do not rely on the algebraic structure of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ can indeed be
extended to the more general class of trees. To support our claim we extend
the results of [2] to the case of general trees. It is remarkable that although the
procedure is more complicated the main line of reasoning carry over without
major changes, yielding essentially the same output of "rather explicit results"
which was the main advantage of the approach presented in [2] for the p-adics case.
Let us remark that chaotic processes on trees have been studied by other means (e.g. as particular cases of stochastic processes on metric spaces [1], [16],
[17], [20], [30], and in connection with statistical mechanical problems like in
percolation theory [11]). Our approach is more direct and permits e.g. to compute spectra of the generators.
The paper is organized as follows: In section 2. we introduce a class of se-
quence spaces denoted by $S_B$. The subscript $B$ stands for a numerical function
defined on sequences. A non Archimedean metric is defined on every $S_B$ and
basic topological properties of $S_B$ are proved. We also establish a one to one
correspondence between the spaces $S_B$ and the trees with a finite number of
branches emerging from the branching points.
In section 3. we formulate and solve the Chapman-Kolmogorov equations and
find the transition functions for a class of stochastic processes on $S_B$. In section
4. we consider the corresponding Markovian semigroup and provide a complete
spectral description of their generators. We also give explicit formulae for the
corresponding Dirichlet form.

2 The state space

As usual we denote by $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0$ the set of integers, positive integers and
non-negative integers respectively. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $S_k$ be the family of all
sequences $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k}$ such that $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i \leq N$ for some $N \leq k$,
$N \in \mathbb{Z}$. Put
\[ S = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} S_k. \]

Let $\alpha_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then the product $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k} \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\}$ can be identified with $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k+1}$.
\[ \{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k} \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\} = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k+1}. \quad (2.1) \]

To simplify notations we put
\[ \{\alpha\}_k := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq k}. \]

If $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i \leq k$ then we write $\{\alpha\}_k = \{0\}_k$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $B_{\{\alpha\}}$ be a function defined on $S$ with values in $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$.

1. We say that $\{\alpha\}_{k+1}$ is the $B$-product of $\{\alpha\}_k$ and $\{\alpha_{k+1}\}$ iff
\[ \{\alpha\}_{k+1} = \{\alpha\}_k \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\} \quad (2.2) \]
and
\[ 0 \leq \alpha_{k+1} \leq B_{\{\alpha\}} - 1. \quad (2.3) \]

2. We say that $\{\alpha\}_{k+l}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ is the $B$-product of $\{\alpha\}_k$ and the ordered $l$-tuple $\{\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k+l}\}$
\[ \{\alpha\}_{k+l} = \{\alpha\}_k \times \{\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{k+l}\} \]
iff
\[ \{\alpha\}_{k+l} = (\ldots (\{\alpha\}_k \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\}) \times \{\alpha_{k+2}\}) \times \cdots \times \{\alpha_{k+l}\}), \quad (2.4) \]
where all products are $B$-products in the sense of 1. We then write
\[ \{\alpha\}_{k+l} = \{\alpha\}_k \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\} \times \cdots \times \{\alpha_{k+l}\}. \quad (2.5) \]

**Remark 2.2.** Whenever we write a formula like the right side of (2.5) we always mean the $B$-product.

**Definition 2.3.** Given a function $B_{\{\alpha\}}$ as in Def. 2.1, we define $S_B \subset S$ by

1. $\{0\}_k \in S_B$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,
2. $\{\alpha\}_{k+1} \in S_B$ iff $\{\alpha\}_{k+1} = \{\alpha\}_k \times \{\alpha_{k+1}\}$, where $\{\alpha\}_k \in S_B$.

It is easy to see that the following proposition holds:

**Proposition 2.4.** $\{\alpha\}_k \in S_B$ iff there is $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
\[ \{\alpha\}_k = \{0\}_{k-l} \times \{\alpha_{k-l+1}\} \times \cdots \times \{\alpha_{k}\}. \]
Definition 2.5. We say that a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ belongs to the set $\mathbb{S}_B$ iff $\{a\}_k \in \mathbb{S}_B$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

To simplify notations we write

$$\alpha := \{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Let $q$ be a real number, $q > 1$. For any pair $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_B$ we define

$$\rho_q(\alpha, \alpha) = 0$$

$$\rho_q(\alpha, \beta) = q^{-i_0}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $i_0$ is such that $\alpha_{i_0} \neq \beta_{i_0}$ and $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ if $i < i_0$. It is easy to see that the following proposition holds:

Proposition 2.6. $\rho_q$ is a metric on $\mathbb{S}_B$ satisfying the non-Archimedean triangle inequality

$$\rho_q(\alpha, \beta) \leq \max\{\rho_q(\alpha, \gamma), \rho_q(\gamma, \beta)\}. \quad (2.8)$$

It is clear that for any $q, q' > 1$ the metrics $\rho_q$ and $\rho_{q'}$ are equivalent. Thus we fix a real number $q > 1$ throughout the paper and drop the subscript $q$. Set

$$\mathbb{S}^k_B := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_B; \alpha_i = 0 \text{ for } i \geq k\}, \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{S}_{B,0} := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{S}^k_B. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.7. Since $(\mathbb{S}_B, \rho)$ are going to constitute the basic state space of our stochastic processes it might be useful to have in mind an intuitive picture of it. $\mathbb{S}_B$ is a space of sequences $\{a_k\}$, which can be thought of as leaves at the ends of branches of a tree. The distance $\rho(\alpha, \beta)$ between two leaves $\alpha$ and $\beta$ can be thought of as the length of the branch from $\alpha$ to the nearest branching point connecting $\alpha$ and $\beta$ and then down to $\beta$ (where the tree is visualized vertically with its origin at the top). Precise relations between $\mathbb{S}_B$'s and the trees will be provided later in this section.

Proposition 2.8. $\mathbb{S}_B$ equipped with the metric $\rho$ is a complete metric space and $\mathbb{S}_{B,0}$ is a dense subset of it.

Proof. Let $\alpha^n \in \mathbb{S}_B$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a Cauchy sequence in the metric $\rho$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $N_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(\alpha^n, \alpha^m) < q^{-k}$ for all $n, m > N_k$. It follows that $\{\alpha^n\}_k = \{\alpha^m\}_k$. Without loss of generality we can assume $N_k$ to be increasing. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ choose $n_k > N_k$. Then

$$\{\alpha^{n_k}\}_k = \{\alpha^{n_{k+1}}\}_k$$

and

$$\{\alpha^{n_{k+1}}\}_{k+1} = \{\alpha^{n_k}\}_k \times \{\alpha^{n_{k+1}}\}. \quad (2.11)$$

Define $\alpha = \{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by

$$\{a\}_l = \{\alpha^{n_l}\}_l \text{ for } l \leq 1 \quad (2.12)$$
and
\[
\{\alpha\}_l = \{\alpha^1\}_1 \times \{\alpha^2\}_2 \times \cdots \times \{\alpha^n\}_l, \text{ for } l > 1. \tag{2.13}
\]
Since \(\alpha^n \in S_B\) it follows from (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) that \(\alpha \in S_B\). Let \(n > N_k\). Then \(\rho(\alpha^{n_k}, \alpha^n) < q^{-k}\) and by (2.13) \(\rho(\alpha, \alpha^{n_k}) \leq q^{-(k+1)}\). Consequently \(\rho(\alpha, \alpha^n) \leq \max\{\rho(\alpha, \alpha^{n_k}), \rho(\alpha^{n_k}, \alpha^n)\} \leq q^{-k}\), which shows that \(\alpha^n\) converges to \(\alpha\) in the metric \(\rho\). Thus \(S_B\) is complete. Let now \(\alpha \in S_B\). Define \(\alpha^n = \{\alpha\}_n \times \{0\} \times \ldots\). Clearly \(\alpha^n \in S_{B,0}\) and \(\alpha^n \to \alpha\) in the metric \(\rho\) as \(n \to \infty\), which proves that \(S_{B,0}\) is dense in \(S_B\). \(\square\)

Given \(\alpha \in S_B\) and \(N \in \mathbb{Z}\) the set
\[
K(\alpha, q^N) = \{\beta \in S_B; \rho(\alpha, \beta) \leq q^N\}
\]
will be called a ball of radius \(q^N\) centered at \(\alpha\). As consequences of (2.8) we have

1. If \(\beta \in K(\alpha, q^N)\) then \(K(\beta, q^N) = K(\alpha, q^N)\).
2. \(K(\alpha, q^N), K(\beta, q^N)\) are either disjoint or identical for any \(\alpha, \beta \in S_B\).
3. If \(\alpha \in S_B\) and \(\alpha_i = 0\) for \(i < -N\), then \(K(\alpha, q^N) = K(0, q^N)\).

It follows from (2.11) that \(K(\alpha, q^N)\) is uniquely defined by \(\{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)}\) and thus we can identify
\[
\{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} = K(\alpha, q^N). \tag{2.15}
\]
With this notation one easily sees that

4. \(K(\alpha, q^{N+1}) = \{\alpha\}_{-(N+2)} = \bigcup_{\gamma} \{\alpha\}_{-(N+2)} \times \{\gamma\}. \tag{2.16}\)

By construction the union is taken over the values of \(\gamma\) satisfying: \(0 \leq \gamma \leq B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(N+2)}} - 1\). Thus the ball \(K(\alpha, q^{(N+1)})\) is the union of \(B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(N+2)}}\) disjoint balls of radius \(q^N\). Take \(N, M \in \mathbb{Z}\), \(N > M\). Iterating formula (2.16) we find a family of disjoint balls of radius \(q^M\) such that \(K(\alpha, q^N)\) can be expressed as their union. When the function \(B_{\{\alpha\}_k}\) is defined, this family depends on \(\alpha \in S_B\) and the numbers \(N, M\). We denote this family by \(K(\alpha, N, M)\) and denote by \(n(\alpha, N, M)\) the number of balls in it. Note that \(K(\alpha, N, M) \subseteq K(\alpha, N+1, M)\).

Consequently \(n(\alpha, N, M)\) increases to infinity as \(N\) varies from \(M + 1\) to \(+\infty\). Let \(M \in \mathbb{Z}\) be given. Then according to (3) for any \(\beta \in S_B\) there is \(N > M\) such that \(\beta \in K(0, q^N)\). Thus
\[
S_B = \bigcup_{N > M} K(0, q^N) \tag{2.17}
\]
On the other hand \(\beta \in K(0, q^N)\) implies that \(\beta\) belongs to one of the balls in the family \(K(0, N, M)\). Set
\[
K(M) := \bigcup_{N > M} K(0, N, M). \tag{2.18}
\]
Then \(K(M)\) is a countable family of disjoint balls of radius \(q^M\)
\[
K(M) = \{K_i^M\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \tag{2.19}
\]
where $K^M_i$ is a ball of radius $q^M$ and $K^M_i \cap K^M_j = \emptyset$ iff $i \neq j$. As a consequence of (2.16), (2.17) we have

$$S_B = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} K^M_i. \quad (2.20)$$

We conclude this section with the following observations. Let $p$ be a prime number and define $B_{(\alpha)}k = p$ for all $\{\alpha\}_k \in S$. Then $S_B$ is identical with the set of $p$-adic numbers $\mathbb{Q}_p$. If we put $q = p$ then the $S_B$ metric coincides with the $Q_p$ metric. It is well known that any $p$-adic ball is both open and compact. The same is true for the balls in $S_B$ in general.

**Proposition 2.9.** A ball in $S_B$ is both open and compact.

**Proof.** Let $\alpha \in S_B$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} = \{\beta \in S_B; \rho(\alpha, \beta) \leq q^k\} = \{\beta \in S_B; \rho(\alpha, \beta) < q^{k+1}\}.$$ 

According to the general definition of topology in metric spaces the right hand side denotes an open ball in $S_B$. Thus $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)}$ is open.

Consider a sequence $\beta^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ of elements belonging to the ball $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)}$. Since $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \times \{\gamma_i\}$, where $0 \leq \gamma_i \leq B_{(\alpha)} - (k+1) - 1$, there is a value of $\gamma_i$ such that infinitely many elements of the sequence $\beta^n$ belong to the ball $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \times \{\gamma_i\}$. We choose one of these elements and denote it by $\beta^n$. Iterating this procedure we obtain a descending sequence of balls $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \times \{\gamma_1\} \times \{\gamma_2\} \times \cdots \times \{\gamma_i\}$ and a subsequence of $\beta^n$:

$$\beta^n \in \{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \times \{\gamma_1\} \times \cdots \times \{\gamma_i\}.$$ 

The intersection $\cap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \times \{\gamma_1\} \times \cdots \times \{\gamma_i\}$ contains exactly one element $\beta = \{\alpha, \beta_{(k+2)}, \alpha_{-(k+1)}, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots\}$ and clearly $\beta^n \to \beta$ as $i \to \infty$. Hence by the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem the ball $\{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)}$ is compact. \hfill \blacksquare

Put $\{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for a sequence of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$, then we have $(x^n \in \mathbb{R}^2)$. Define a family $\mathcal{X}$ of sequences by

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X \subset \mathbb{R}^2; X = \{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}, |x^{n+1} - x^n| = 2^{-(n+3)}\}. \quad (2.21)$$

If $X \in \mathcal{X}$ then the set

$$l_X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \{sx^{n+1} + (1 - s)x^n, 0 < s \leq 1\}, X = \{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \quad (2.22)$$

is a continuous planar line composed of segments with the ends $x^n, x^{n+1}$. We shall define a tree as the union of the lines $l_X$

$$\bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{T}} l_X. \quad (2.23)$$

The set $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is defined as follows. Let $X_0 = \{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $l_{X_0}$ is a vertical semi axis directed upright. Then

1. $X_0 \in \mathcal{T}$,

2. If $X \in \mathcal{T}$ then there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $x^n = x_0^n$ for all $n < N$. Moreover $x^n, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is located either on the line $l_{X_0}$ or to the right from $l_{X_0}$.
In this section we discuss random processes with $S_n$ as the state space. By the above discussion it is equivalent to say that the state space is the set of branches $L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_n$. This observation explains why in the title of the paper we used the concept of branch nodes.

(2.8) $\nu(x) = 2^{-\nu(x)}$.

If $X = L_0$ and $Y = L_1$ then $\nu(x) = \nu(y)$. Let $x$ and $y$ be the leaves of $L_0$ and $L_1$ respectively. Then \( \nu(x) = \nu(y) \).

Under conditions 1-3 the identification of a tree $\mathcal{T}$ is consistent with the intuitive picture of a tree. For any $X \in \mathcal{T}$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $y^m \neq y_n$, Conversely if $Y \in \mathcal{F}_M$ then $y^m \neq y_n$. This result is then to construct a tree $\mathcal{T}$ by extending the tree structure rather than the exact locations of its branches.

Let $a \in S_n$ be given as above. We first construct the tree $\mathcal{T}$ by defining an injection $L : S_n \rightarrow X$. It will be required that if $y^m \neq y_n$ then $y^m \neq y_n$. Conversely if $y^m \neq y_n$ then $y^m \neq y_n$.
3 Stochastic processes on $\mathbb{S}_B$

In this section we shall construct a class of stochastic processes on $\mathbb{S}_B$. The main step in this direction will be a construction of the processes on $K(M)$. Let $\alpha^i \in K^i_M$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then according to (2.15)

$$K_i^M = K(\alpha^i, q^M) = \{\alpha^i\}_{(M+1)}.$$  

(3.1)

Put $P_{\{\alpha^i\}_{(M+1)}(\alpha^j)_{(M+1)}}(t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for the transition probability from $K_i^M$ to $K_j^M$ in time $t$. Whenever possible we shall use the simplified notation

$$P_{ij}^{M,M} := P_{\{\alpha^i\}_{(M+1)}(\alpha^j)_{(M+1)}}(t).$$  

(3.2)

Thus the forward and backward Chapman-Kolmogorov equations read:

$$\dot{P}_{ij}^{M,M}(t) = -\bar{a}_{ij}P_{ij}^{M,M}(t) + \sum_{l \neq j} \bar{u}_{ij}P_{il}^{M,M},$$  

(3.3a)

$$\dot{P}_{ij}^{M,M}(t) = -\bar{a}_{ij}P_{ij}^{M,M}(t) + \sum_{l \neq j} \bar{u}_{ij}P_{il}^{M,M},$$  

(3.3b)

$i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. We impose the initial condition

$$P_{ij}^{M,M}(0) = \delta_{ij}.$$  

(3.4)

The coefficients $\bar{a}_{ij}$ and $\bar{u}_{ij}$ will be defined according to the following intuitive requirements. If the process is in the ball $K(\alpha, q^N)$ at time $t$ then, for small real positive $\Delta t$, the probability that at time $t + \Delta t > t$ the process is outside of $K(\alpha, q^N)$ is set equal to $a(\alpha, N)\Delta t$. We call $a(\alpha, N)$ the intensity of the state $K(\alpha, q^N)$ and assume

(i). The intensity of the state $K(\alpha, q^N)$ depends only on the radius of the ball, i.e. on $N$, and is independent of $\alpha$. Hence

$$P(X_{t+\Delta t} \in (\mathbb{S}_B - K(\alpha, q^N)) | X_t \in (\mathbb{S}_B - K(\alpha, q^N))) = a(N)\Delta t.$$  

(ii). The probability that during the short time $\Delta t$ the process jumps over a distance $q^N$ and reaches a state in $K(\alpha, q^N)$ is the same as the probability to reach a state in $K(\beta, q^{N'})$ where $M \leq N' < N$ and $\rho(\alpha, \beta) = q^{N'+1}$.

(iii). The coefficients $\bar{a}_{ij}$ satisfy the following relation:

$$\bar{a}_{ij} = \sum_{l \neq j} \bar{u}_{ij}.$$  

(3.5)

To meet requirement [ii] we proceed as follows. We define a sequence $a(N)$, $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$a(N) \geq a(N + 1)$$  

(3.6a)

and

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} a(N) = 0, \quad \lim_{N \to -\infty} a(N) = W,$$  

(3.6b)
where $W$ is either a positive real number or $+\infty$. Put

$$U(N + 1) = a(N) - a(N + 1).$$

Then $U(N + 1)\Delta t$ is the probability that the process leaves a ball $K(\alpha, q^N)$ but stays in the ball $K(\alpha, q^{N+1})$ i.e. it jumps to one of the balls

$$\{\alpha\}_{-(N+2)} \times \{\gamma\}, \quad \gamma = 0, \ldots, B(\alpha)_{-(N+2)} - 1, \quad \gamma \neq \alpha_{-(N+1)}.$$  
(3.8)

Let $\rho(\alpha, \alpha') = q^{N+m}, \ m \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$B(\alpha^l, m, M) = (B(\alpha^l)_{-(M+m+1)} - 1)B(\alpha^l)_{-(M+m)} \cdots B(\alpha^l)_{-(M+2)}$$

Set

$$u(\alpha^l, m, M) := B^{-1}(\alpha^l, m, M)U(M + m).$$

It follows from (1) (ii) that $u(\alpha^l, m, M)\Delta t$ is the probability that the process jumps from $\{\alpha^l\}_{-(M+1)}$ to $\{\alpha^l\}_{-(M+1)}$ during the time $\Delta t$. Thus we define

$$\tilde{u}_{ij} = u(\alpha^l, m, M).$$

To underline the fact that the elementary balls have radius $q^m$ we write

$$\tilde{a}_j = \tilde{a}_j(M).$$

(3.12)

**Lemma 3.1.**

$$\tilde{a}_j(M) = a(M).$$

(3.13)

**Proof.** According to (3.5) we have $\tilde{a}_j(M) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_{ij}$. We shall compute the right hand side with $\tilde{u}_{ij} = u(\alpha^l, m, M)$ as defined by (3.10), (3.11). We have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_{ij} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{l} u(\alpha^l, m, M) \right),$$

(3.14)

where the summation in the bracket runs over $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(\alpha^l, \alpha') = q^{M+m}$. Then

$$\{\alpha^l\}_{-(M+1)} = \{\alpha^l\}_{-(M+m+1)} \times \{\gamma_m\} \times \cdots \times \{\gamma_1\}$$

(3.15)

where the admissible $m$-tuples $\{\gamma_m, \ldots, \gamma_1\}$ are such that (3.5) is a B-product. Moreover $\gamma_m \neq \alpha^l_{-(M+m)}$. Hence by (3.9) and (3.10)

$$\sum_{l} u(\alpha^l, m, M) = \sum_{\gamma_m \neq \alpha^l_{-(M+m)}} \sum_{\gamma_{m-1}} \cdots \sum_{\gamma_1} u(\alpha^l, m, M) = U(M + m)$$

and

$$\tilde{a}_j(M) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{l} u(\alpha^l, m, M) \right) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} U(M + m) = a(M).$$

\[\square\]
Our next observation follows directly from (3.9) and (3.10). Namely if \( m \geq 2 \) then
\[
B_{(\alpha^i)-(M+2)} u(\alpha^i, m, M) = u(\alpha^i, m - 1, M + 1).
\]
(3.16)
Let us turn to the problem of solving equations (3.3). For this we need some preparations. According to (3.9) - (3.11) \( \bar{u}_{ij} \) depend explicitly on \( \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+2)} \) and thus \( \bar{u}_{ij} \) is the same for all target states \( \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+2)} \times \{\gamma\} \). The dependence on the initial state enters only via the distance \( \rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) \). Thus \( \bar{u}_{ij} = u(\alpha^j, m, M) \) is the same for all \( l \) such that
\[
\rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) = q^{M+m},
\]
and we can write (3.3a) in the form
\[
\dot{\hat{P}}_{ij}^{M,M}(t) = -a(M)\hat{P}_{ij}^{M,M} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u(\alpha^j, m, M) \sum_{l} P_{il}^{M,M},
\]
(3.18)
where the index \( l \) in \( \sum_{l} P_{il}^{M,M} \) satisfies (3.17) for the corresponding value of \( m \).
In view of (2.10) and (3.12) we have
\[
\bigcup_{l, 0 \leq \rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) \leq q^{M+m}} \{\alpha^j\} = \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+m+1)},
\]
(3.19)
which suggests the notation
\[
P_{ij}^{M,M+m} := P_{(\alpha^i)-(M+1)}^{\{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+m+1)}}
:= \sum_{l, 0 \leq \rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) \leq q^{M+m}} P_{(\alpha^i)-(M+1)}^{\{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+1)}}.
\]
(3.20)
With this notation (3.18) can be written in the form
\[
\dot{\hat{P}}_{ij}^{M,M}(t) = - (a(M) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M))\hat{P}_{ij}^{M,M}
+ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (u(\alpha^j, m, M) - u(\alpha^j, 1, M)) P_{ij}^{M,M+m}.
\]
(3.21)
Let \( i \) be fixed and set \( \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+1)} = \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M+2)} \times \{\gamma\} \). Insert \( j' \) for \( j \) in (3.21) and sum the equations over \( \gamma \). Since \( 0 \leq \gamma \leq B_{(\alpha^j)-(M+2)} = 1 \) we add \( B_{(\alpha^j)-(M+2)} \) equations. We obtain
\[
\dot{\hat{P}}_{ij}^{M,M+1}
= - \left[ a(M) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M) - B_{(\alpha^j)-(M+2)} (u(\alpha^j, 1, M) - u(\alpha^j, 2, M)) \right] P_{ij}^{M,M+2}
+ B_{(\alpha^j)-(M+2)} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (u(\alpha^j, m, M) - u(\alpha^j, m+1, M)) P_{ij}^{M,M+m}.
\]
(3.22)
In view of (3.7), (3.10) and (3.16)
\[
a(M) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M) - B_{(\alpha^j)-(M+2)} (u(\alpha^j, 1, M) - u(\alpha^j, 2, M))
= a(M + 1) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M + 1).
\]
(3.23)
Thus (3.22) becomes
\[ \hat{P}_{ij}^{M,M+1} = - (a(M + 1) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M + 1) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+1} \]
\[ + B_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+2)} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \left( u(\alpha^j, m, M) - u(\alpha^j, m + 1, M) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+m}. \] (3.24)

Iterating this procedure we obtain for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \)
\[ \hat{P}_{ij}^{M,M+k} = - (a(M + k) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M + k) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \]
\[ + B_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+2)} \cdots B_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1)} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} \left( u(\alpha^j, m, M) - u(\alpha^j, m + 1, M) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+m}. \] (3.25)

After multiple application of (3.16) this can be written as
\[ \hat{P}_{ij}^{M,M+k} = - (a(M + k) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M + k) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \]
\[ + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( u(\alpha^j, m, M + k) - u(\alpha^j, m + 1, M + k) \right) P_{ij}^{M,M+k+m}. \] (3.26)

We proved this formula for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), but it is also valid for \( k = 0 \) in the sense that for \( k = 0 \) it reduces to (3.21). As a result of (3.1) and (3.20) we have
\[ P_{ij}^{M,M+k}(0) = \delta_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1)} \cdot \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1). \] (3.27)

The coefficients \( u \) on the right side of (3.20) depend on \( \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2) \). Thus the functions
\[ P_{ij}^{M,M+k} = P_{ij}^{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+1), \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1)}, \]

where
\[ \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2) = \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2), \]
i.e.
\[ \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1) = \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2) \times \{\alpha^j\} \]
satisfy the same system of equations for every value of \( \gamma \):
\[ 0 \leq \gamma \leq B_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2)} - 1. \] This together with the initial conditions (3.27) and the uniqueness of the solution yields

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \( P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \) be the solution of (3.26) satisfying the initial conditions (3.27) and \( \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1) = \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2) \times \{\alpha^j\} \) where \( 0 \leq \gamma \leq B_{\{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+2)} - 1. \) If \( \rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) = q^{M+k+1} \) then all functions \( P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \) with \( \gamma \not\in \{\alpha^j\} - (M+k+1) \) coincide. If \( \rho(\alpha^i, \alpha^j) > q^{M+k+1} \) then all functions \( P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \) coincide and are equal to \( P_{ij}^{M,M+k} \). □

We also have
**Proposition 3.3.** Put \( N = M + k \). Then the functions \( P_{ij}^{N,N} \) satisfy the equations

\[
P_{ij}^{N,N} = - \left( a(N) + u(\alpha^j, 1, N) \right) P_{ij}^{N,N} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( u(\alpha^j, m, N) - u(\alpha^j, m + 1, N) \right) P_{ij}^{N,N,M},
\]

identical with the equations (3.26) and the initial conditions

\[
P_{ij}^{N,N}(0) = \delta_{ij}
\]

which coincide with the initial conditions (3.27). \( \square \)

It follows from (3.26) that

\[
B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} P_{ij}^{M,M+k} - B_{ij}^{M,M+k+1} = - \left( a(M + k) + u(\alpha^j, 1, M + k) \right) \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} P_{ij}^{M,M+k} - P_{ij}^{M,M+k+1} \right).
\]

Let us concentrate on the case \( i = j \). Then the solution of eq. (3.30) with the initial condition (3.27) reads

\[
B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} P_{ii}^{M,M+k} - P_{ii}^{M,M+k+1} = \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ - \left( a(M + k) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k) \right) t \right\},
\]

or

\[
P_{ii}^{M,M+k} = B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)}^{-1} P_{ii}^{M,M+k+1}
\]

\[
= B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)}^{-1} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ - \left( a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k + n) \right) t \right\}.
\]

The following formula is a direct consequence of (3.32)

\[
\left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} P_{ii}^{M,M+k+n} = \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} P_{ii}^{M,M+k+n+1}
\]

\[
= \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ - \left( a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k + n) \right) t \right\}.
\]

This formula is valid for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), but we extend it for \( n = 0 \) to be (3.32). Summing equations (3.33) over \( n \) from \( n = 0 \) to \( n = m - 1 \) we obtain

\[
P_{ii}^{M,M+k} = \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+m+1)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} P_{ii}^{M,M+k+m}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) -(M+k+n+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ - \left( a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k + n) \right) t \right\}.
\]
The right hand side is split in two parts. The splitting depends on m. Since \(B_{1(\alpha),} \geq 2\) the limit as \(m \to \infty\) yields

\[
P_{1(\alpha),}^{M, M+k} (t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+n+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ -(a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k + n)) t \right\}. \tag{3.35}
\]

Now we are ready to find the solution of (3.36) satisfying the initial conditions (3.3). The function \(P_{i+1}^{M, M}\) is given by (3.35) with \(k = 0\) i.e.

\[
P_{i+1}^{M, M}(t) = \left[ P_{ij}^{M, M+k} - P_{i+1}^{M, M+k-1} \right] - B^{-1}(\alpha^i, k, M) B^{-1}_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+1)} \left( B_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+1)} - 1 \right) \left( B_{(\alpha^i) - (M+k+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ -(a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k + n)) t \right\} - \exp \left\{ -(a(M + k - 1) + u(\alpha^i, 1, M + k - 1)) t \right\}. \tag{3.37}
\]

Formulas (3.36), (3.37) complete our task to construct transition functions \(P_{i+1}^{M, M}\) for a class of processes on \(K(M)\). The next step of our discussion will be to construct the transition functions on \(S_B\). This can be done as follows:

Let \(\alpha, \beta \in S_B\). Then \(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)} = \{\alpha^i\}_{-(M-1)}\) and \(\{\beta\}_{-(M+1)} = \{\alpha^j\}_{-(M-1)}\) for some \(i, j \in \mathbb{N}\). Set \(P_{i+1}^{(\alpha) - (M+1)}(\beta)_{-(M+1)}(t) = P_{ij}(t)\). Then by (3.36), (3.37) we have

\[
P_{i+1}^{(\alpha) - (M+1)}(\beta)_{-(M+1)}(t)
= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{(\alpha) - (M+n+2)} \cdots B_{(\alpha) - (M+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{(\alpha) - (M+n+2)} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ -(a(M + n) + u(\alpha, 1, M + n)) t \right\}, \tag{3.38}
\]

and

\[
P_{i+1}^{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}\{\beta\}_{-(M+1)}}(t) = B^{-1}(\beta, k, M) B^{-1}_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+k+1)}} \left( B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+k+1)}} - 1 \right) \left( B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+k+2)}} - 1 \right) \exp \left\{ -(a(M + k + n) + u(\alpha, 1, M + k + n)) t \right\} - \exp \left\{ -(a(M + k - 1) + u(\alpha, 1, M + k - 1)) t \right\}. \tag{3.39}
\]
when \( \rho(\alpha, \beta) = q^{M+k} \). Let \( M, N \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( M \leq N \). Then \( \{\beta\}_{-(N+1)} \) is an union of the balls of radius \( q^M \) i.e.
\[
\{\beta\}_{-(N+1)} = \bigcup_{\gamma} \{\beta\}_{-(N+1)} \times \{\gamma\}_{-(N)} \times \cdots \times \{\gamma\}_{-(M+1)} , \tag{3.40}
\]
where the union runs over all B-products of \( \{\beta\}_{-(N+1)} \) and the \( (N-M) \)-tuples \( \gamma \). Then we define
\[
P_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}(\beta)_{-(N+3)}}(t) = \sum_{\gamma} P_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}(\beta)_{-(N+1)}}(\gamma) \times \cdots \times \gamma(t).
\]
(3.41)

By prop. 3.2 the function (3.41) does not depend on \( M \) provided \( M \leq N \). Since \( \alpha = \cap_{M \leq N} \{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)} \) we set
\[
P(\alpha, \{\beta\}_{-(N+1)}, t) = P_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}}(\beta)_{-(N+1)}(t) \tag{3.42}
\]

We shall show in the next section that (3.42) defines the transition function for a stochastic process on \( S_B \).

4 Markovian Semigroup and its Generator

In this section we shall define a Borel measure on \( S_B \) and show that \( P(\alpha, \{\beta\}_{-(N+1)}, t) \) discussed in the previous section defines a Markovian semigroup. We recall that \( K(M) \) defined by (2.15) is the family of all disjoint balls of radius \( q^M \). Then
\[
K := \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{Z}} K(M)
\]
is the family of all balls in \( S_B \). We define a set function \( \mu \) on \( K \) as follows
\[
\mu(\{0\}_{-1}) = 1, \tag{4.1}
\]
and
\[
\mu(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}) = B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}}, \tag{4.2}
\]
for all \( \alpha \in S_B \) and \( M \in \mathbb{Z} \).

It follows from (4.2) that the numbers \( \mu(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)} \times \{\alpha\}) \), \( 0 \leq \gamma \leq B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)} - 1 \) are equal. By standard arguments \( \mu \) can be extended to a Borel measure on \( S_B \). Similarly for any \( \alpha \in S_B \) and \( t > 0 \), \( P(\alpha, \{\beta\}_{-(k+1)}, t) \) defines a set function on \( K \) and can be extended to a Borel measure on \( S_B \). Given a ball \( \{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \) and \( t > 0 \) then \( P(\alpha, \{\beta\}_{-(k+1)}, t) \) is a function of \( \alpha \in S_B \) and by prop. 3.2 and (3.12) it is constant on every ball \( \{\alpha\}_{-(k+1)} \). It follows that for any Borel set \( A \subset S_B \), \( P(\alpha, A, t) \) is a \( \mu \)-measurable function. Thus \( P(\alpha, A, t) \) is a family of positive integral kernels. For a real valued Borel function \( u \) on \( S_B \) put \( p_t u(\eta) = \int_{S_B} P(\eta, d\xi, t) u(\xi) \) whenever the integral makes sense.

**Proposition 4.1.** \( P(\eta, A, t) \) has following properties

(i). The integral kernel \( P(\eta, A, t) \) is \( \mu \)-symmetric in the sense of Fukushima [16,17] i.e. for any pair of nonnegative Borel functions \( u, v \)
\[
\int_{S_B} u(\eta) \left( \int_{S_B} v(\xi) P(\eta, d\xi, t) \right) \mu(d\eta) = \int_{S_B} \left( \int_{S_B} u(\eta) P(\xi, d\eta, t) \right) v(\xi) \mu(d\xi) \leq \infty. \tag{4.3}
\]
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(ii). $P(\eta, S_B, t) = 1$ for all $\eta \in S_B$ and $t > 0$.

(iii). $p_t(p_s u(\eta)) = p_{t+s} u(\eta)$ for $t, s > 0$ and $u$ any bounded Borel function.

Proof. (i). It is sufficient to prove (3.3) for $u = \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)}$, $v = \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)}$.

Then

$$
\int_{S_B} \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)}(\eta) P(\xi, d\eta, t) = P(\xi, \{\alpha^j\}-(M+1), t).
$$

If $\xi \in \{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)$ then by (3.42)

$$
P(\xi, \{\alpha^j\}-(M+1), t) = P_{\alpha^j}(t).
$$

Thus

$$
\int_{S_B} \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)}(\xi) P(\xi, \{\alpha^j\}-(M+1), t) \mu(d\xi) = \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) P_{\alpha^j}(t).
$$

Similarly

$$
\int_{S_B} \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)}(\xi) \left( \int_{S_B} \chi_{\{\alpha^j\}}(\eta) P(\xi, d\eta, t) \right) \mu(d\xi).
$$

If $\rho(\alpha^j, \alpha^j) = q^{M+k}$, $k \geq 1$, then according to (4.2) we have

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)) = B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)} \cdot \cdot \cdot B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k)}, \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)),
$$

and by (3.9) and the fact that $\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1) = \{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)$ we get

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) = B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)} - 1 \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)).
$$

Similarly

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) = B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)} - 1 \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)).
$$

Finally using (3.37) we obtain

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) P_{\alpha^j}(t) = B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) \left( \frac{B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)} - 1}{B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)}} \right)^2 A_i(t) \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)),
$$

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) P_{\alpha^j}(t) = B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) B^{-1}(\alpha^j, k, M) \left( \frac{B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)} - 1}{B(\alpha^j)_{-(M+k+1)}} \right)^2 A_j(t) \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+k+1)),
$$

where $A_i(t)$ resp. $A_j(t)$ is the time dependent factor in the square bracket in (3.37). We conclude the proof observing that $A_i(t) = A_j(t)$ and thus

$$
\mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) P_{\alpha^j}(t) = \mu(\{\alpha^j\}-(M+1)) P_{\alpha^j}(t).
$$
(ii). We have \( P(\eta, S_B, t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} P^{M,M+k}(t) \) where \( \eta \in K_i^M \). Taking into account that 
\[
u(\alpha^j, 1, N) = (B_{(\alpha^j)} - (M^{k+n+2}) - 1)^{-1} (a(N) - a(N + 1)) \leq a(N) - a(N + 1)
\] and using (3.35) we find
\[
P^{M,M+k}(0) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (B_{(\alpha^j)} - (M^{k+n+2}) \cdots B_{(\alpha^j)} - (M^{k+n+2}) - 1)^{-1}(B_{(\alpha^j)} - (M^{k+n+2}) - 1)
\]
\[
1 \geq P^{M,M+k}(t) \geq \exp \{ -2a(M + k) - a(M + k + 1))t \} \to_{k \to \infty} 1.
\]

(iii). It is sufficient to prove the statement for \( u = \chi_{(\alpha^j)} \). The functions \( P_{ij}^{M,M}(t) \) defined by (3.36), (3.37) solve the Chapman-Kolmogorov equations (3.3) and hence posses the semigroup property
\[
\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_{ij}^{M,M}(s)P_{ij}^{M,M}(t) = P_{ij}^{M,M}(s + t).
\]

In the notation of Section 3 (4.4) reads
\[
\int_{\mathbb{L}^N} P_s(\xi, d\eta)P_t(\eta, K_j^N) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{L}^N} P_s(\xi, d\eta)P(\eta, K_j^N) = P_{s+t}(\xi, K_j^N).
\]

Let \( M \leq N \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then by Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 \( P_t(\xi, K_j^N) \) can be defined equivalently either by (4.42) with the right hand side given by (4.11) or by
\[
P_t(\xi, K_j^N) = P_{ij}^{N}(t), \xi \in K_i^N,
\]
where \( P_{ij}^{N}(t) \) is a solution of the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation over the state space \( K_i^N \). Consequently (4.5) holds for any \( M \in \mathbb{Z} \).

As an immediate consequence of proposition 4.1 \( p_t \) extends uniquely to a self adjoint Markovian semigroup \( T_t, t > 0 \) acting in \( L^2(S_B, \mu) \).

**Proposition 4.2.** The Markovian semigroup \( T_t, t > 0 \) acting in \( L^2(S_B, \mu) \) defined by \( p_t, t > 0 \) is strongly continuous.

**Proof.** Due to the contractivity of \( T_t \) it will be sufficient to show that \( \lim_{t \to 0} \| T_t f - f \| = 0 \) for \( f \) of the form \( f = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i \chi_i \). But using the self-adjointness of \( T_t \) and the initial condition \( P_{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij} \) we obtain indeed
\[
\| T_t f - f \|^2 - (\sum_i f_i \chi_i, T_{2t} \sum_j f_j \chi_j) - 2(T_t \sum_i f_i \chi_i, \sum_j f_j \chi_j)
\]
\[
+ (\sum_i f_i \chi_i, \sum_j f_j \chi_j) = \sum_{i,j} f_i f_j (\mu(K_i)P_{ij}(2t) - 2\mu(K_j)P_{ij}(t)
\]
\[
+ \delta_{ij} \mu(K_j)) \to_{t \to 0} \sum_i f_i^2 (\mu(K_i) - 2\mu(K_i) + \mu(K_i)) = 0.
\]

\[\square\]
To summarize, $T_t, t > 0$ is a strongly continuous self-adjoint contraction semigroup acting in $L^2(S_B, \mu)$ and hence it has the representation

$$T_t = e^{-Ht}, t \geq 0$$

where $H$ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator acting in $L^2(S_B, \mu)$. Let $f \in L^2(S_B, \mu)$. Then by definition

$$(Hf)(\eta) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1} [f(\eta) - (T_t f)(\eta)] = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1} \left[ f(\eta) - \int_{S_B} f(\xi) P(\eta, d\xi, t) \right]$$

whenever the strong limit exists. To find the explicit formula for $H$ we proceed as follows. Take $f = \chi_{\{\alpha\} - (M+1)}$. If $\eta \in \{\alpha\} - (M+1)$ then

$$H\chi_{\{\alpha\} - (M+1)}(\eta) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1} \left[ 1 - P(\eta, \{\alpha\} - (M+1), t) \right] = a(M).$$

Indeed

$$\frac{1}{t} \left[ 1 - P(\eta, \{\alpha\} - (M+1)) \right] =$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} \cdots B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} - 1 \right) \times \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ - (a(M+n) + u(a,1,M+n)) t \right\} \right) \frac{1}{t}$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} \cdots B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} - 1 \right) \times \left[ a(M+n) + (B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} - 1)^{-1} (a(M+n) - a(M+n+1)) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} \cdots B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\} - (M+n+2)} a(M+n) - a(M+n+1) \right)$$

$$= a(M).$$

If $\rho(\eta, \alpha) = q^{M+k}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ then we have by \textbf{3.39}

$$H\chi_{\{\alpha\} - (M+1)}(\eta) = -\lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^{-1} P(\eta, \{\alpha\} - (M+1), t)$$

$$= B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M) B_{\{\eta\} - (M+k+1)}^{-1} \left( B_{\{\eta\} - (M+k+1)} - 1 \right) \times \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( B_{\{\eta\} - (M+n+k+2)} \cdots B_{\{\eta\} - (M+k+2)} \right)^{-1} \left( B_{\{\eta\} - (M+n+k+2)} - 1 \right) \times (a(M+k+n) + u(\eta,1,M+k+n)) - (a(M+k-1) + u(\eta,1,M+k-1))]$$

$$= -B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M) (a(M+k-1) - a(M+k)) .$$

Thus we have proved the formula

$$H\chi_{\{\alpha\} - (M+1)}(\eta) = \begin{cases} a(M) \text{ if } \eta \in \{\alpha\} - (M+1), \\ -B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M) (a(M+k-1) - a(M+k)) \text{ if } \rho(\eta, \alpha) = q^{M+k}. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$
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This formula is valid for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_B$ and $M \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that by (4.2)

$$\mu(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)} \setminus \{\alpha\}_{-(M+k)}) = B(\alpha, k, M)\mu(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}).$$

Thus

$$\left\|H\chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}}\right\|^2 = \mu(\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)})\left[a(M)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M)[a(M + k - 1) - a(M + k)]^2\right]$$

is finite because $B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M) \to 0$ and $a(N) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. Consequently, the characteristic functions of the balls in $\mathbb{S}_B$ belong to the domain $D(H)$ of $H$. The spectral properties of $H$ are described by

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $-H$ denote as above the generator of the strongly continuous semigroup $T_t$ with the kernel defined by (3.12).

Then

(a) For any $M \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a(M) > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}_B$ there corresponds an eigenvalue $h_{M, \alpha}$ of $H$ given by

$$h_{M, \alpha} = \left(B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1\right)^{-1} \left(B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} a(M) - a(M + 1)\right)$$

and a $B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1$ dimensional eigenspace spanned by vectors of the form

$$e_{M, \alpha} = \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_\gamma \chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)} \setminus \{\gamma\}}$$

where

$$\sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_\gamma = 0 \text{ and } s = B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.11)

If $a(M) = 0$ then $\chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}}$ is an eigenvector of $H$ to the eigenvalue $0$.

(b) The linear hull spanned by the vectors $e_{M, \alpha}, M \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_B$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{S}_B, \mu)$.

**Proof.** The proof of (a) follows the proof of an analogous statement in [2] with minor changes:

Let $a(M) > 0$ and put $e_{M, \alpha} = \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_\gamma \chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)} \setminus \{\gamma\}}$ where $b_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s = B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1$. Then $\text{supp } e_{M, \alpha} \subset \{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}$.

Let $\rho(\xi, \alpha) = q^{M+k+1}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by (4.7)

$$He_{M, \alpha}(\xi) = -B^{-1}(\alpha, k + 1, M)(a(M + k) - a(M + k + 1)) \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_\gamma.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.12)

This is zero if either $a(M + 1) = 0$ and then all $a(M + k) = 0$ or $\sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_\gamma = 0$. In either case we have $\text{supp } (He_{M, \alpha}) \subset \{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}$. The condition

$$He_{M, \alpha} = h_{M, \alpha} e_{M, \alpha}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.13)
is equivalent to the system of algebraic equations

\[ \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} a_{\beta\gamma} b_{\gamma} = 0, \beta = 0, \ldots, s \]  

(4.14)

where \( a_{\beta\gamma} = a(M) - h_{M,\alpha} \), \( \beta = 0, \ldots, s \) and \( a_{\beta\gamma} = -B^{-1}(\alpha, 1, M) (a(M) - a(M + 1)) \). If \( a(M + 1) = 0 \) then (4.14) is solved by \( b_0 = b_1 = \ldots = b_s \) with \( h_{M,\alpha} = 0 \) or by \( b_{\gamma} \) satisfying

\[ \sum_{\gamma} b_{\gamma} = 0 \]  

(4.15)

with

\[ h_{M,\alpha} = \left( B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} - 1 \right)^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} a(M) - a(M + 1) \right). \]  

(4.16)

If \( a(M + 1) > 0 \) then (4.12) vanish only if (4.15) holds. In this case (4.14) is solved with \( h_{M,\alpha} \) given by (4.16). If \( a(M) = 0 \) then \( a(M + k) = 0 \) for all \( k \in N \) and by (4.7) \( \chi_{\{\alpha\}} \) is an eigenvector of \( H \) to the eigenvalue 0. This proves part (a).

To prove (b) it is sufficient to show that for any \( \beta \in S_B \) and \( N \in Z \) the function \( \chi_{\{\beta\}} \) can be approximated by the vectors \( e_{M,\alpha} \). According to (a) any pair \( \alpha \in S_B \), \( M \in Z \) defines an eigenvalue \( h_{M,\alpha} \) and a corresponding \( B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} - 1 \) dimensional eigenspace.

For \( k = 0, 1, \ldots, B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} - 2 \) set

\[ b_{k,\alpha} = \begin{cases} 
1; & \gamma = \alpha_{-(M+1)}, \alpha_{-(M+1)} + 1, \ldots, \alpha_{-(M+1)} + k \\
-(k+1); & \gamma = k+1 + \alpha_{-(M+1)} \\
0; & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \]

\( \gamma \) is taken modulo \( B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} - 2 \). Then \( \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_{k,\alpha} = 0 \) and the vectors

\[ e_{M,\alpha}^{k} = \sum_{\gamma=0}^{s} b_{\gamma,\alpha} \chi_{\{\alpha\}} \times \chi_{\{\gamma\}} \]

are pairwise orthogonal. We then have by (4.12)

\[ \| e_{M,\alpha}^{k} \|^2 = \mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)} \right) B_{\{\alpha\}}^{-1} (k+1)(k+2) \]

and \( \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}}_{-(N+1)}, e_{M,\alpha}^{k} \right) = \mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} \right) \) for \( M \geq N \).
Thus \( \sum_{M=N}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)}}, \epsilon_{M,\alpha}^{k} \right) \|e_{M,\alpha}^{k}\|^{-1} \|^2 \)

\( = (\mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} \right))^2 \sum_{M=N}^{\infty} (\mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)} \right))^{-1} B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}}^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+1)(k+2)} B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}}^{-1} \)

\( = (\mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} \right))^2 \sum_{M=N}^{\infty} (\mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)} \right))^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1 \right) \)

\( = \mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} \right) \sum_{M=N}^{\infty} \left( B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}}, \cdots, B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} \right) ^{-1} \left( B_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+2)}} - 1 \right) \)

\( = \mu \left( \{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)} \right) = \|\chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(N+1)}}\|^2. \)

We have seen that \( \chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}} \in D(H) \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathbb{S}_B \) and \( M \in \mathbb{Z} \). Put \( D_0 \) for the linear hull spanned by all \( \chi_{\{\alpha\}_{-(M+1)}} \). Then \( D_0 \subset D(H) \). Indeed, it follows from Theorem 4.3, b) that the eigenfunctions \( \epsilon_{M,\alpha}^{k}, \|e_{M,\alpha}^{k}\|^{-1} \) of \( H \) form an orthonormal basis in \( L^2(\mathbb{S}_B, \mu) \). Since \( \epsilon_{M,\alpha}^{k} \) are defined as linear combinations of the characteristic functions for the balls we have \( \epsilon_{M,\alpha}^{k} \in D_0 \) and consequently \( D_0 \) is dense in \( D(H) \) in the graph norm. Thus we have proved

**Corollary 4.4.** \( D_0 \) is an operator core for \( H \) in \( L^2(\mathbb{S}_B, \mu) \).

Let as before \(-H\) be the generator of the strongly continuous Markov semigroup \( T_t, t > 0 \) constructed above. Then

\[ \mathcal{E}(f, g) = \left( H^\dagger f, H^\dagger g \right) \]

defined for all \( f, g \in D[\mathcal{E}] = D(H^\dagger) \) is according to [16], [17] a closed, symmetric Markovian quadratic form i.e. a Dirichlet form in \( L^2(\mathbb{S}_B, \mu) \).

Since \( D_0 \) is a core for \( H \) it is also a core for \( H^\dagger \) i.e.

(a). \( D_0 \) is dense in \( D[\mathcal{E}] \) in the norm \( (\mathcal{E}_1(\cdot, \cdot))^\dagger = [\mathcal{E}(\cdot, \cdot) + (\cdot, \cdot)]^\dagger \).

Put \( C_0(\mathbb{S}_B) \) for the space of real valued continuous functions of compact support on \( \mathbb{S}_B \). Then by the Weierstrass-Stone theorem

(b). \( D_0 \) is dense in \( C_0(\mathbb{S}_B) \) in the uniform norm topology.

In the Fukushima terminology a set \( D_0 \subset D[\mathcal{E}] \cap C_0(\mathbb{S}_B) \) enjoying properties \( [a] \) and \( [b] \) is called a core for \( \mathcal{E} \) and a Dirichlet form which has such a core is called regular. The regular Dirichlet forms can be expressed uniquely in terms of the Beurling-Deny representation. Thus we have the representation

\[ \mathcal{E}(u, v) = \mathcal{E}^{(c)}(u, v) + \int \int_{\mathbb{S}_B \times \mathbb{S}_B \setminus d} (u(\eta) - u(\xi))(v(\eta) - v(\xi)) J(d\eta, d\xi) \]

\[ + \int_{\mathbb{S}_B} u(\xi)v(\xi)k(d\xi) \quad (4.17) \]
for \( u, v \in D[E] \cap C_0(\mathbb{S}_B) \).

Here \( E^{(c)} \) is a symmetric form satisfying \( E^{(c)}(u, v) = 0 \) if \( v \) is constant on a neighborhood of \( \text{supp} \; u \). \( J(d\eta, d\xi) \) is a symmetric positive Borel measure on \( \mathbb{S}_B \times \mathbb{S}_B \) off the diagonal \( d \) and \( k \) a positive Borel measure on \( \mathbb{S}_B \). It turns out however that in our case \( E^{(c)} \) and \( k \) vanish identically. Indeed put \( u = \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)} \) and \( v = \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \). Then for all \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_B \) and \( M \in \mathbb{Z} \) the function \( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)} \) is constant on \( \{\alpha\}-(M+1) = \text{supp} \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)} \). By Proposition 2.9, \( \{\alpha\}-(M+1) \) is open and thus a neighborhood of itself. Accordingly

\[
E^{(c)} \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \right) = 0
\]

and consequently \( E^{(c)} \) vanishes identically.

Let \( \rho(\alpha, \beta) = q^{d+k}, \quad M \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \). Then

\[
\text{supp} \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)} \cup \text{supp} \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} = \emptyset
\]

and

\[
E \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{S}_B \times \mathbb{S}_B} \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}(\xi) - \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}(\eta) \right) \left( \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)}(\xi) - \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)}(\eta) \right) J(d\xi, d\eta)
\]

\[
= -2 \int_{\mathbb{S}_B \times \mathbb{S}_B} \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}(\xi) \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)}(\eta) J(d\xi, d\eta)
\]

\[
= -2J(\{\alpha\}-(M+1), \{\beta\}-(M+1)).
\]

On the other hand by (4.7)

\[
E \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \right) = \left( H^\dagger \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, H^\dagger \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \right)
\]

\[
= \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, H \chi_{\{\beta\}-(M+1)} \right) = -\mu(\{\alpha\}-(M+1)) B^{-1}(\beta, k, M) (a(M + k + 1) - a(M + k))
\]

Thus

\[
J(\{\alpha\}-(M+1), \{\beta\}-(M+1)) = \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{\alpha\}-(M+1)) B^{-1}(\beta, k, M) (a(M + k + 1) - a(M + k))
\]

(4.18)

which determines the measure \( J \) uniquely.

**Remark.** The formula (4.18) seems to contradict the symmetry of \( J \). However a direct computation shows that

\[
\mu(\{\alpha\}-(M+1)) B^{-1}(\beta, k, M) = \mu(\{\beta\}-(M+1)) B^{-1}(\alpha, k, M)
\]

so that after all \( J \) is symmetric.\qed

To see that \( k = 0 \) observe that by (4.7)

\[
E \left( \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)}, \chi_{\{\alpha\}-(M+1)} \right) = a(M) \mu(\{\alpha\}-(M+1)).
\]
Since $E^{(c)} = 0$ it follows from (4.17) that
\[
\int_{S_B} \chi_{(\alpha)-(M+1)}(\xi)k(d\xi) = k \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right) = a(M)\mu \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right)
\]
\[
- \int \int_{S_B \times S_B} \left| \chi_{(\alpha)-(M+1)}(\xi) - \chi_{(\alpha)-(M+1)}(\eta) \right|^2 J(d\xi, d\eta)
\] (4.19)

To compute the latter integral we observe that the integrand is different from zero (and then equals 1) only if either $\xi \in \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}$ and $\eta \notin \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}$ or $\eta \in \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}$ and $\xi \notin \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}$. Thus
\[
\int \int_{S_B \times S_B} \left| \chi_{(\alpha)-(M+1)}(\xi) - \chi_{(\alpha)-(M+1)}(\eta) \right|^2 J(d\xi, d\eta)
\]
\[
= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\beta} J \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}, \left\{ \beta \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right),
\] (4.20)

where the second sum runs over all the balls $\left\{ \beta \right\}_{-(M+1)}$ such that $\rho(\alpha, \beta) = q^{M+k}$. We have then
\[
\sum_{\beta} J \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)}, \left\{ \beta \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right) = \sum_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \mu \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right)
\times \mathcal{B}^{-1}(\beta, M) \left( a(M + k + 1) - a(M + k) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \mu \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right) \left( a(M + k + 1) - a(M + k) \right).
\]

and (4.20) equals
\[
\mu \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( a(M + k + 1) - a(m + k) \right) = a(M)\mu \left( \left\{ \alpha \right\}_{-(M+1)} \right),
\]

and by (4.19) the measure $k$ must vanish. As is well known the three terms in the Beurling-Deny representation have an interpretation in terms of corresponding stochastic process. Namely, $E^{(c)}$ is associated with a diffusion process, $J$ the jump measure for a jump process and $k$ the killing measure. Our discussion shows that the process defined by the transition function (3.12) constructed in section 3 is a purely jump process. The fact that the killing measure vanish is a result of the construction we applied. For similar construction on $p$-adics yielding also the killing measure see [27]. The absence of the diffusion part is a consequence of the fact that $S_B$ is totally disconnected.
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