

ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION B

CRISTINA GZYL

HENRYK GZYL

Occupation time sets of supports of continuous additive functionals

Annales de l'I. H. P., section B, tome 15, n° 1 (1979), p. 41-50

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPB_1979__15_1_41_0

© Gauthier-Villars, 1979, tous droits réservés.

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

NUMDAM

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

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

Occupation time sets of supports of continuous additive functionals

by

Cristina GZYL and Henryk GZYL

Escuela de Física y Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias,
Universidad Central de Venezuela

ABSTRACT. — It Φ is the support of a continuous additive functional (A_t) of a Markov process (X_t) , we use results on the structure of the processes (τ_t) and (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) (where τ_t is the right continuous inverse of A_t) to describe the set $\mathcal{H} = \{t : X_t \in \Phi\}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $X = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, X_t, \theta_t, P^x)$ be a standard process with state space (E, \mathcal{E}) . $(A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a continuous additive functional of X and Φ its fine support (see [1] for definitions and notation).

Define $(\tau_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to be the right continuous inverse of (A_t) , that is,

$$\tau_t = \inf \{s : A_s > t\},$$

and consider the random sets

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \{t : A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_t > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\} \\ J &= \{t : A_{t+\varepsilon} - A_{t-\varepsilon} > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\} \\ \mathcal{H} &= \{t : X_t \in \Phi\} \\ Q &= \{t < \infty : \tau_u = t \text{ for some } u\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is well known (see [1], Ch. V) that a. s. $Q = IC\mathcal{H}CJ$. Moreover, $J - 1 = \{ \tau_{t-} : \tau_{t-} \neq \tau_t ; t > 0 \}$ and hence

$$\mathcal{H} = \{ \tau_t ; t \geq 0 \} \cup \{ \tau_{t-} : \tau_{t-} \neq \tau_t ; X_{\tau_{t-}} \in \Phi \}$$

These remarks show that \mathcal{H} is essentially the range of (τ_t) and so it is quite natural to try to describe the set \mathcal{H} in terms of the process $(\tau_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

In the case $\Phi = \{ x_0 \}$, with x_0 regular for itself, the sections of \mathcal{H} can be described as follows (see [7], [8] and [9]).

i) a. s. $P^{x_0}\mathcal{H}$ is bounded or unbounded. We will say that \mathcal{H} , or x_0 , is a. s. P^{x_0} transient or recurrent ;

ii) a. s. $P^{x_0}\mathcal{H}$ has Lebesgue measure zero or a. s. $P^{x_0}\mathcal{H}$ has positive Lebesgue measure. In the first case one calls \mathcal{H} light and in the second case \mathcal{H} is called heavy ;

iii) We will call \mathcal{H} stable if its complement intersects every finite interval $(0, T)$ in a finite union of intervals, and unstable otherwise. Observe that \mathcal{H} is stable if there are finitely many excursions from $\{ x_0 \}$ in every finite interval. One has that a. s. $P^{x_0}\mathcal{H}$ is stable or a. s. $P^{x_0}\mathcal{H}$ is unstable.

The process $(\tau_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is, in the present case, essentially a subordinator with respect to the law P^{x_0} , and, using the structure of (τ_t) one can give criteria for when is \mathcal{H} going to be transient, recurrent, stable, etc. In fact, in [7] and [8] it is proved that if one considers the exponent

$$S(\theta) = \varepsilon\theta + \int_{(0, \infty)} (1 - e^{-\theta x})\mu(dx)$$

in the Lévy representation of the distribution of (τ_t) (i. e. $e^{-tS(\theta)} = E^{x_0}[e^{-\theta\tau_t}]$) then

i) \mathcal{H} is recurrent $\Leftrightarrow \mu\{ \infty \} = 0$,

ii) \mathcal{H} is heavy $\Leftrightarrow \varepsilon > 0$,

iii) \mathcal{H} is stable $\Leftrightarrow \mu$ is a finite measure.

In the next sections, we intend to use some of the results proved by Cinlar in [2], [3] and [4], and Rolin in [10], about the structure of the processes (τ_t) and (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) in the case Φ is a more general set (Φ the support of (A_t)) to study the set \mathcal{H} . Our results will extend those in [7] and [8] for the case $\Phi = \{ x_0 \}$. To be more specific: in section 3 we study the set \mathcal{H} with respect to the measures P^x , $x \in \Phi$, by using the results of Cinlar on Lévy systems for (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) , and, in section 4, we describe \mathcal{H} conditional on the paths of the time changed process X_{τ_t} . We begin by stating some preliminary results that will be needed in these sections.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Consider, as in the introduction, a standard process X , a continuous additive functional (A_t) of X , with fine support Φ , and let (τ_t) be the right continuous inverse of (A_t) . Let $\Phi_\Delta = \Phi \cup \{ \Delta \}$.

Denote by $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$ the Borel subsets of Φ , $b\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$ the bounded Borel measurable functions on Φ , $\underline{\underline{R}}_+$ the Borel subsets of R_+ , and $b\underline{\underline{R}}_+$ the bounded Borel functions on R_+ . $\overline{\underline{\underline{R}}}_+$, $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}_\Delta$, etc. have similar meanings.

The joint process (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) is a Markov additive process (see [2]). We assume Φ to be projective, in which case X_{τ_t} will be a Hunt process (see [1], Ch. V) and so it follows from the results in [3] (*) that there is a Lévy system (H, L) for (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) with H a continuous additive functional of (X_{τ_t}) , L a kernel from $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}_\Delta \times \overline{\underline{\underline{R}}}_+$ into $\underline{\underline{\Phi}}$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad E^x \sum_{s \leq t} f(X_{\tau_s^-}, X_{\tau_s}, \tau_s - \tau_s^-) \cdot 1_{\{X_{\tau_s} \neq X_{\tau_s^-}\}} \cup \{ \tau_s \neq \tau_{s^-} \} \\ = E^x \int_0^t dH_s \int_{\underline{\underline{\Phi}}_\Delta \times \overline{\underline{\underline{R}}}_+} L(X_{\tau_s}, dy, du) f(X_{\tau_s}, y, u)$$

for each f in $b\underline{\underline{\Phi}} \times \underline{\underline{\Phi}}_\Delta \times \overline{\underline{\underline{R}}}_+$.

The process (τ_t) can be decomposed as $\tau_t = \tau_t^c + \tau_t^d$ where τ_t^c (the continuous part of τ_t) is a continuous additive functional of (X_{τ_t}) and τ_t^d is a pure jump increasing additive process (see [2] or [4]).

Let us put $C_t = H_t + \tau_t^c + t$; (C_t) is a strictly increasing continuous additive functional of X_{τ_t} .

It is proved in [4] that if we let $\sigma_t = \inf \{ s : C_s > t \}$, then the process $(\widehat{X}_t, \widehat{\tau}_t) = (X_{\tau_{\sigma_t}}, \tau_{\sigma_t})$ is again a Markov additive process and its Lévy system is such that the corresponding additive functional \widehat{H}_t is equal to $t \wedge \zeta$.

Now, we observe that if one defines $B_t = C_{A_t}$ then we obtain.

(2.2) LEMMA. — *i)* (B_t) is a continuous additive functional of X .

ii) The right continuous inverse of B_t coincides with τ_{σ_t} .

iii) (A_t) and (B_t) have the same support Φ .

(*) See note at the end of the paper.

Proof. — *i*) To prove that (B_t) is adapted see [6] section 2, Lemma 14. The additivity of (B_t) follows from the fact that (C_t) is a continuous additive functional of (X_{τ_t}) and A_t is a stopping time relative to (\mathcal{F}_{τ_t}) .

$$ii) \inf \{ u : C_{A_u} > s \} = \inf \{ u : A_u > \sigma_s \} = \tau_{\sigma_s}.$$

iii) This last assertion follows from the fact that $\sigma_0 \equiv 0$, and so

$$\Phi = \{ x : P^x(\tau_0 = 0) = 1 \} = \{ x : P^x(\tau_{\sigma_0} = 0) = 1 \} = \text{support } (B_t).$$

In view of Lemma (2.2) we will assume that the Lévy system for (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) is such that $H_t = t \wedge \zeta$, so that (2.1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(2.3) \quad E^x \sum_{s \leq t} f(X_{\tau_{s-}}, X_{\tau_s}, \tau_s - \tau_{s-}) 1_{\{X_{\tau_{s-}} \neq X_{\tau_s}\} \cup \{\tau_{s-} \neq \tau_s\}} \\ = E^x \int_0^t d(s \wedge \zeta) \int_{\Phi_{\Delta} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+} L(X_{\tau_s}, dy, du) f(X_{\tau_s}, y, u).$$

By means of an approximation argument one can get a more general relation than (2.3), namely, one can show that if Z_s is adapted to (\mathcal{F}_{τ_t}) positive and left continuous, then one has for f in $b\Phi \times \underline{\Phi}_{\Delta} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$

$$(2.4) \quad E^x \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} Z_s f(X_{\tau_{s-}}, X_{\tau_s}, \tau_s - \tau_{s-}) 1_{\{X_{\tau_{s-}} \neq X_{\tau_s}\} \cup \{\tau_{s-} \neq \tau_s\}} \\ = E^x \int_0^t Z_s d(s \wedge \zeta) \int_{\Phi_{\Delta} \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+} L(X_{\tau_s}, dy, du) f(X_{\tau_s}, y, u)$$

Finally, observe that since $t = C_{\sigma_t} = H_{\sigma_t} + \tau_{\sigma_t}^c + \sigma_t$, $\tau_{\sigma_t}^c$ is absolutely continuous with respect to t , so we may also assume that

$$(2.5) \quad \tau_t^c = \int_0^t a(X_{\tau_s}) ds \text{ where } a \text{ is positive and } \underline{\Phi} \text{ measurable.}$$

3. THE SET \mathcal{H}

We will now study the set \mathcal{H} with respect to the laws P^x for $x \in \Phi$. The notations and definitions will be the ones introduced in the preceding sections.

Weight

It follows from the fact that $\{s : X_s \in \Phi\}$ differs from $\{s : \Delta\tau_{A_s} = 0\}$ by countably many points, that the « occupation time » of Φ is related to τ_t^c as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \tau_t^c = \int_0^{\tau_t} 1_{\Phi}(X_s) ds \text{ a. s. } P^x, x \in \Phi \text{ (see [10], chap. IV).}$$

From (3.1), one gets that \mathcal{H} is heavy a. s. $\mathbf{P}^x \Leftrightarrow \tau_\infty^c$ is positive a. s. \mathbf{P}^x .

It is clear that if a. s. \mathbf{P}^x , the process spends a positive time in a given subset of Φ , then \mathcal{H} will be heavy a. s. \mathbf{P}^x .

By writing τ_i^c in terms of the time changed process X_{τ_s} as in (2.5) namely

$$\tau_i^c = \int_0^t a(X_{\tau_s}) ds$$

one gets that \mathcal{H} is light a. s. $\mathbf{P}^x \forall x \in \Phi$ if $a \equiv 0$. On the other hand, if we let $D = \{a > 0\}$ then it is easy to see that

$$\int_0^\infty a(X_{\tau_s}) ds = \int_0^\infty 1_D(X_s) ds$$

(a is defined to be zero outside of Φ), and hence \mathcal{H} will be heavy a. s. \mathbf{P}^x for $x \in D$ if D is finely open.

Observe that in the case $\Phi = \{x_0\}$ (x_0 regular), for all t , one has $X_{\tau_t} = x_0$, $\tau_i^c = \varepsilon t$, $a(X_{\tau_t}) = \varepsilon$; so it is clear from (3.1) and (2.5) that a. s. $\mathbf{P}^{x_0} \mathcal{H}$ is heavy or light, and, \mathcal{H} is heavy $\Leftrightarrow \varepsilon > 0$, which coincides with the results given in [7] and [8].

If Φ is a finite set, $\Phi = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, with all the x_i being regular, then, if we let $a(x_i) = \varepsilon_i$, we see that x_i is heavy a. s. $\mathbf{P}^{x_i} \Leftrightarrow \varepsilon_i > 0$.

Recurrence

We observe that a. s. $\mathbf{P}^x \tau_{A_t^-} = \sup \{s \leq t : X_s \in \Phi\}$ from which it follows that the last exit from Φ coincides with $\tau_{A_\infty^-}$, i. e. $\tau_{A_\infty^-} = \sup \{s \geq 0 : X_s \in \Phi\}$.

Thus, if we say that Φ is transient for x if \mathcal{H} is bounded a. s. \mathbf{P}^x , and recurrent for x if \mathcal{H} is unbounded a. s. \mathbf{P}^x , we get that Φ is transient for x if $\tau_{A_\infty^-} < \infty$ a. s. \mathbf{P}^x .

In terms of the Lévy system for (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) one has the following results.

(3.2) PROPOSITION. — For all $x \in \Phi$ the following equality holds

$$\mathbf{E}^x [e^{-\tau_{A_\infty^-}}] = \mathbf{E}^x \int_0^\infty e^{-s} L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s$$

Proof.

$$\mathbf{E}^x [e^{-\tau_{A_\infty^-}}] = \mathbf{E}^x \sum_{s>0} e^{-\tau_s^-} 1_{\{\infty\}}(\Delta\tau_s)$$

by (2.4) this last term equals

$$\begin{aligned} &= E^x \int_0^\infty ds \int_{\Phi_\Delta \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}^+} L(X_{t_s}, dy, du) e^{-\tau_s} 1_{\{\infty\}}(u) \\ &= E^x \int_0^\infty L(X_{t_s}, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) e^{-\tau_s} ds \\ &= E^x \int_0^\infty e^{-s} L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from a well known time change formula (see [1], Ch. V).

It follows from proposition (3.2) that $\tau_{A_\infty^-} = \infty$ a. s. $P^x \Leftrightarrow L(X_{t_s}, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\})$ is P^x indistinguishable from 0. Or, equivalently

$$\tau_{A_\infty^-} = \infty \text{ a. s. } P^x \Leftrightarrow L((\cdot), \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) = 0 \text{ A a. s. } P^x$$

Observe that in the case $\Phi = \{x_0\}$ these conditions reduce to the condition for recurrence given in [7] and [8] namely that $\mu\{\infty\} = 0$.

Let us denote by \bar{X}_t the left limit X_{t-} , then, when Φ is transient for x , one has the following expression for the joint distribution of

$$\tau_{A_\infty^-}, \bar{X}_{\tau_{A_\infty^-}}.$$

(3.3) PROPOSITION. — Let Φ be transient for x , then, if $g \in \underline{b}\Phi$ and $b > 0$, one has

$$(3.4) \quad E^x[g(\bar{X}_{\tau_{A_\infty^-}}), b < \tau_{A_\infty^-}] = E^x \int_b^\infty g(X_s) L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} E^x[g(\bar{X}_{\tau_{A_\infty^-}}); b < \tau_{A_\infty^-}] &= E^x \sum_{s>0} g(\bar{X}_{\tau_s^-}) 1_{(b, \infty)}(\tau_s^-) 1_{\{\infty\}}(\Delta\tau_s) \\ &= E^x \int_0^\infty g(X_{t_s}) 1_{(b, \infty)}(\tau_s) ds \int_{\Phi_\Delta \times \bar{\mathbb{R}}^+} L(X_{t_s}, dy, du) 1_{\{\infty\}}(u) \\ &= E^x \int_0^\infty g(X_{t_s}) 1_{(b, \infty)}(\tau_s) L(X_{t_s}, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) ds = E^x \int_b^\infty g(X_s) L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s \end{aligned}$$

(3.5) REMARK. — One may check that proposition (3.3) also holds if $x \in E - \Phi$.

(3.6) REMARK. — By taking $b = 0$ and $g = 1$ in (3.4) one gets that

$$P^x(\tau_{A_\infty^-} > 0) = u_C(x)$$

where

$C_t = \int_0^t L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s$ is a natural potential. Hence, if $\tau_{A_\infty^-} < a. s.$,

Φ is transient in the usual sense (see [5]).

We observe that the fact that the condition for transience is simpler in this case is due to the fact that Φ is the support of a continuous additive functional.

Moreover, with the notation we just introduced, one can rewrite (3.4) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E^x[g(\bar{X}_{\tau_{A_\infty^-}}); \tau_{A_\infty^-} > b] &= E^x \int_b^\infty g(X_s) L(X_s, \Phi_\Delta, \{\infty\}) dA_s = E^x \int_b^\infty g(X_s) dC_s \\ &= E^x \left\{ E^x \left[\left(\int_0^\infty g(X_s) dC_s \right) \circ \theta_b \mid \mathcal{F}_b \right] \right\} = \int P_b(x, dy) U_C g(y) \end{aligned}$$

where $U_C g(y) = E^y \int g(X_t) dC_t$, which provides another proof of proposition (3.3) in Gettoor-Sharpe's [5], plus an explicit representation of the additive functional (C_t) in terms of probabilistic objects.

Stability

It follows from the fact that (A_t) increases when $X_t \in \Phi$ and the definition of (τ_t) , that, in order to study the excursions from the set Φ in $[0, t]$, one can examine the jumps of τ_s up to A_t , that is

$$(3.7) \quad \sum_{s>0} 1_{(0, A_t]}(s) 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Delta\tau_s) = \sum_{s>0} 1_{(0, t]}(\tau_s) 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Delta\tau_s).$$

Taking expectations in (3.7) and using (2.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E^x \sum_{s>0} 1_{(0, t]}(\tau_s - + \Delta\tau_s) 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Delta\tau_s) &= E^x \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^\infty L(X_{\tau_s}, \Phi_\Delta, du) 1_{(0, t]}(\tau_s + u) \\ &= E^x \int_0^\infty ds 1_{(0, t]}(\tau_s) L(X_{\tau_s}, \Phi_\Delta, (0, t - \tau_s]) = E^x \int_0^{A_t} L(X_{\tau_s}, \Phi_\Delta, (0, t - \tau_s]) ds \\ &= \int \int_0^t U(x, dy, du) L(y, \Phi_\Delta, (0, t - u]) \end{aligned}$$

where $U(x, f, g) = E^x \int_0^\infty f(X_{\tau_t}) g(\tau_t) dt$.

This last calculation shows that the excursions from Φ can also be studied in terms of the Lévy system for (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) . There are some obvious remarks that we can make, namely (3.7) will be finite for all t if

$L(x, \Phi_\Delta, (0, \infty))$ is bounded for all $x \in \Phi$, and infinite for $t = \infty$ if $L(x, \Phi_\Delta, (0, \infty)) = \infty$ for all $x \in \Phi$. However, since (X_{τ_t}, τ_t) may behave differently for different points in Φ , and $L(x, \Phi, (0, \infty))$ varies with $x \in \Phi$, we will give a definition of stability that takes into account this local behaviour.

For $F, G \in \underline{\Phi}$, consider

$$R_t = \sum_s 1_G(X_{\tau_s-}) 1_F(X_{\tau_s}) 1_{(0,t]}(\tau_s) 1_{(0,\infty)}(\Delta\tau_s)$$

then

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} E^x(R_t) &= E^x \int_0^\infty 1_{(0,t]}(\tau_s) 1_G(X_{\tau_s}) L(X_{\tau_s}, F, (0, t - \tau_s]) ds \\ &= \int_G \int_0^t U(x, dy, du) L(X_{\tau_s}, F, (0, t - u]) \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION. — We will say that \mathcal{H} is stable for (x, F, G) if the right hand side of (3.8) is finite. Otherwise we will say that it is unstable.

Remark. — It is clear that when $\Phi = \{x_0\}$ we get the criteria in [7].

4. DESCRIPTION OF \mathcal{H} IN TERMS OF CONDITIONAL PROBABILITIES

We will now briefly discuss the weight, recurrence and stability of \mathcal{H} given the paths of the time changed process (X_{τ_t}) .

It is proved in [2] and [10] that if we let \mathcal{H} denote the σ -algebra generated by $(X_{\tau_t})_{t \geq 0}$ completed with respect to the family of measures P^μ (μ a finite measure on Φ), and \mathcal{L} the same σ -algebra but with respect to the process $(X_{\tau_t}, \tau_t)_{t \geq 0}$, then there is a regular version of the conditional probability $P^x[\cdot | \mathcal{H}]$ on \mathcal{L} , which is independent of $x \in \Phi$. Denote this version by $P^\omega(\cdot)$ when evaluated at $\omega \in \Omega$, and let E^ω denote expectation with respect to P^ω .

The process (τ_t) is a process with independent increments on $(\Omega, \mathcal{L}, P^\omega)$ and, one has the following representation

$$(4.1) \quad E^\omega[e^{-\alpha\tau_t}] = \exp \left[-\alpha\tau_t^c(\omega) - \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-\alpha u}) \nu_t^\omega(du) \right]$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad \nu_t^\omega(A) = E^\omega \sum_{s \leq t} 1_A(\Delta\tau_s)$$

for A , a Borel set in \mathbb{R}^+ (see [9] and [2] for proof).

Just as in the case $\Phi = \{x_0\}$, ν_t enables us to study the recurrence and stability as follows:

Let

$\widehat{\zeta} = \inf \{t : X_{\tau_t} = \Delta\}$, then, $A_\infty = \widehat{\zeta}$, from which it follows that

$$P^\omega(\tau_{\widehat{\zeta}}^- < \infty) = P^\omega(\Delta\tau_{\widehat{\zeta}} = \infty) = E^\omega[1_{\{\infty\}}(\Delta\tau_{\widehat{\zeta}})] = E^\omega \sum_{0 < s \leq \widehat{\zeta}} 1_{\{\infty\}}(\Delta\tau_s) = \nu_{\widehat{\zeta}}^\omega\{\infty\}$$

Hence, \mathcal{H} is transient or recurrent with respect to P^ω according as to $\nu_{\widehat{\zeta}}^\omega\{\infty\}$ is zero or one.

On the other hand, it follows from (4.2) that

$$\nu_t^\omega(0, \infty)1_{\{t < \widehat{\zeta}\}} = E^\omega \left[\sum_{0 < s \leq t} 1_{(0, \infty)}(\Delta\tau_s) ; t < \widehat{\zeta} \right]$$

hence, \mathcal{H} is stable or unstable for P^ω according as to $\nu_t^\omega(0, \infty)$ is finite or infinite for all t .

With regards to the weight of \mathcal{H} one has that a. s. P^ω (for each ω) \mathcal{H} is heavy or light, in fact:

$$P^\omega(\tau_\infty^c > 0) = E^x[1_{\{\tau_\infty^c > 0\}} | \mathcal{H}] = 1_{\{\tau_\infty^c > 0\}}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that τ_t^c is a continuous additive functional of (X_t) .

Finally, we observe that in the case $\Phi = \{x_0\}$, $P^\omega = P^{x_0}$ for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ (see [10]) and we obtain the criteria in [7] and [8].

Note. — We wish to thank Prof. B. Maisonneuve for the following remark: In order to apply Cinlar's results on the existence of a Lévy system one has to prove that (τ_t) is quasileft continuous with respect to the family (\mathcal{F}_{τ_t}) . Let $D_t = \inf \{s > t : X_s \in \Phi\}$ and let T_n be an increasing sequence of stopping times of (\mathcal{F}_{τ_t}) with limit T .

Then, $\tau_{T_n^-}$ and τ_{T^-} are stopping times of (\mathcal{F}_{D_t}) and $\tau_{T_n^-} \uparrow \tau_{T^-}$. Note now that $\tau_t = D_{\tau_t^-}$ and use the quasileft continuity of the process (D_t) with respect to (\mathcal{F}_{D_t}) , which is proved in B. Maisonneuve's, *Systèmes régénératifs*, Astérisque, 1974, vol. 15, p. 27.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. M. BLUMENTHAL and R. K. GETTOOR, *Markov Processes and Potential Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1968.

- [2] E. CINLAR, Markov Additive Processes II. *Z. Wahrsch.*, t. **24**, 1972, p. 95-121.
- [3] E. CINLAR, Levy Systems of Markov Additive Processes. *Z. Wahrsch.*, t. **31**, 1975, p. 175-185.
- [4] E. CINLAR, Entrance exit distributions for Markov Additive Processes. *Stochastic Systems: Modeling, Identification and Optimization I*. Ed. R. Wets, North-Holland Co., 1976.
- [5] R. K. GETOOR and M. J. SHARPE, Last Exit Times and Additive Functionals. *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 1, n° 4, 1973, p. 550-569.
- [6] N. KAROUI and P. A. MEYER, Les changements de temps en théorie générale des processus. In *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, t. **581**, 1977, p. 65-78.
- [7] J. F. C. KINGMAN, Home comings of Markov Processes. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, t. **5**, 1973, p. 66-102.
- [8] B. MAISONNEUVE, Ensembles régénératifs, temps locaux et subordinateurs. In *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, t. **191**, 1971, p. 147-169.
- [9] P. A. MEYER, Ensembles régénératifs d'après Hoffman Jorgensen. In *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, t. **124**, 1970, p. 133-150.
- [10] J. M. ROLIN, *The Inverse of a Continuous Additive Functional*, Ph. D. Thesis, Univ. of California, San Diego, 1973.

(Manuscrit reçu le 21 septembre 1978).