

Poisson kernels of half-spaces in real hyperbolic spaces

T. Byczkowski

Institute of Mathematics, Wrocław University of Technology, Poland

and

P. Graczyk

Département de Mathématiques, Université d'Angers, France

and

A. Stós

Institute of Mathematics, Wrocław University of Technology

Laboratoire de Mathématique, UMR 6620, Université Blaise Pascal

Clermont-Ferrand, France

Abstract

We provide an integral formula for the Poisson kernel of half-spaces for Brownian motion in real hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^n . This enables us to find asymptotic properties of the kernel. Our starting point is the formula for its Fourier transform. When $n = 3, 4$ or 6 we give an explicit formula for the Poisson kernel itself. In the general case we give various asymptotics and show convergence to the Poisson kernel of \mathbb{H}^n .

1 Introduction

Investigation of the hiperbolic Brownian motion is an important and intensely developed topic in recent years(cf. [Y3], [BJ]). On the other hand, it is well known that the Poisson kernel for a region is a fundamental tool in harmonic analysis or probabilistic potential theory. In the classical situation of the Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^n , the exact formula for the kernel leads to many important results concerning behaviour of harmonic functions. Moreover, probabilistic potential theory uses Poisson kernel techniques to give solutions to the Schrödinger equation ([ChZ]). Availability of the exact formula for the kernel is always of crucial importance for the argument.

The aim of this paper is to give a representation formula for the Poisson kernel of a half-space in the real hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^n , i.e. for the probability distribution of the hiperbolic Brownian motion stopped when leaving a half-space, and to use it in order to prove exact asymptotics of the kernel. Note that the boundary of the considered half-space is a horocycle in \mathbb{H}^n .

The Poisson kernel of a half-space is closely related to stable laws and functionals of the Brownian motion ([BCF], [BCFY], [Y1],[Y2]). Another motivation comes from the risk theory in financial mathematics ([D]). Our kernel, up to a passage from the dimension 2 to the dimension n , was identified in terms of its Fourier transform in [BCF]. It turns out, however, that it is not sufficient for most (mentioned above) applications. Unfortunately, a formula for the kernel itself or its asymptotical behaviour were not identified (cf. [BCFY], p. 589).

From the technical point of view, the main difficulty is that the inverse Fourier transform (or the Hankel transform) leads to an integral containing Bessel functions which has oscillatory character, see (5) below. Moreover, for integrals like (5), Lebesgue's bounded convergence theorem is often not applicable (for example when $|y| \rightarrow \infty$) and we are left with a nontrivial problem of obtaining the asymptotics of the kernel.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, after some preliminaries, we furnish a new proof of the formula for the Fourier transform of the Poisson kernel of a half-space in \mathbb{H}^n . Our proof, in contrast to the proof in [BCF], does not use the result of Dufresne ([D]) on the limiting law of an exponential functional of the hyperbolic Brownian motion. Finally, we give a first integral formula (5) for the Poisson kernel of a half-space, based on the inverse Fourier transform.

In Section 3, in Theorem 3.2 we obtain a second integral formula for the Poisson kernel of a half-space. This is our main representation formula. It is much more suitable for further applications than (5). Section 3 ends with explicit integral formulas for the Poisson kernel of a half-space, that arise in lower dimensions.

In Section 4 we study the above mentioned asymptotics of the Poisson kernel of a half-space in \mathbb{H}^n . We use our main representation formula from Theorem 3.2 as well as the semigroup and homogeneity properties of the Poisson kernel.

2 Preliminaries

Consider the half-space model of the n -dimensional real hyperbolic space

$$\mathbb{H}^n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} : x_n > 0\}.$$

The Riemannian metric, the volume element and the Laplace-Beltrami operator are given by

$$ds^2 = \frac{dx_1^2 + \dots + dx_{n-1}^2 + dx_n^2}{x_n^2},$$

$$dV = \frac{dx_1 \dots dx_{n-1} dx_n}{x_n^n},$$

$$\Delta = x_n^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i^2 \right) - (n-2)x_n \partial_n,$$

respectively (here $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$).

Let $(B_i(t))_{i=1 \dots n}$ be a family of independent classical Brownian motions on \mathbb{R} with the generator $\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ (and not $\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}$) i.e. the variance $E^0 B_i^2(t) = 2t$. Then the Brownian motion on \mathbb{H}^n , $X = (X_i)_{i=1 \dots n}$, can be described by the following system of stochastic differential equations

$$\begin{cases} dX_1(t) = & X_n(t) dB_1(t) \\ dX_2(t) = & X_n(t) dB_2(t) \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ dX_n(t) = & X_n(t) dB_n(t) - (n-2)X_n(t) dt. \end{cases}$$

By the Itô formula one verifies that the generator of the solution of this system is Δ . Moreover, it can be easily verified that the solution is given by

$$\begin{cases} X_1(t) = X_1(0) + \int_0^t X_n(s) \exp(B_n(s) - (n-1)s) dB_1(s) \\ X_2(t) = X_2(0) + \int_0^t X_n(s) \exp(B_n(s) - (n-1)s) dB_2(s) \\ \vdots \\ X_n(t) = X_n(0) \exp(B_n(t) - (n-1)t) \end{cases}$$

Convention: by c (or C) we always denote a general constant that depends on n and other constant parameters only. The value of these constants may change in the same string of estimates.

Below we identify the Poisson kernel (the function $y \rightarrow P_a(x, y)$) in terms of its Fourier transform. Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 cover facts that are essentially known. Similar results can be found in both [BCF] and [BCFY], in a slightly different setting of more general generators on the space \mathbb{H}^2 . In order to make our paper self-contained, we include these facts here, in the present setting of \mathbb{H}^n and with a different short proof of the formula (5).

Define the projection $\tilde{\cdot} : \mathbb{R}^n \ni u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \rightarrow \tilde{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. In particular, $\tilde{X}(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_{n-1}(t))$.

Consider a half-space $D = \{x \in \mathbb{H}^n : x_n > a\}$ for some fixed $a > 0$. Define

$$\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) \notin D\} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_n(t) = a\}.$$

By $P_a(x, dy)$, $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in D$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n-1}, a) \in \partial D$ we denote the Poisson kernel of D , i.e. the distribution of $X(\tau)$ starting at x (since $X_n(\tau) = a$ it is enough to consider the distribution of $\tilde{X}(\tau)$).

Theorem 2.1.

$$\mathcal{F}[P_a(x, \cdot)](u) = E^x \exp(i\langle u, \tilde{X}_\tau \rangle) = \exp(i\langle \tilde{x}, u \rangle) \left(\frac{x_n}{a} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \frac{K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|x_n)}{K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|a)}, \quad x \in D, u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$$

where K_ν , $\nu > 0$, is the modified Bessel function of the third kind, called also Macdonald function.

Proof. Since $B_i(t)$ are independent and τ depends only on X_n (i.e. B_n) we obtain

$$E^x \exp(i\langle u, \tilde{X}(\tau) \rangle) = E^{x_n} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} E^{\tilde{x}} \exp(iu_j X_j(\tau)). \quad (1)$$

We adopt here a useful notation $E^{x_j} Y = E(Y|X_i, i \neq j)$, $E^{\tilde{x}} Y = E(Y|X_n)$ for the conditional expectation. We compute the integral $\int_0^\tau X_n(s) dB_j(s)$ by approximation of $\mathbf{1}_{\{s < \tau\}}(s) X_n(s)$ by simple processes of the form $\sum_k f_k \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}$, where $f_k \in \mathcal{F}(B_n(t_k))$. Using independence of the increments of B_j and the fact that the function under the integral below is independent of B_j , we get

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\tilde{x}} \exp(iu_j X_j(\tau)) &= E^{x_j} \exp(iu_j X_j(\tau)) \\ &= E^{x_j} \exp\left(iu_j (X_j(0) + \int_0^\tau X_n dB_j)\right) \\ &= \lim e^{iu_j x_j} E^{x_j} \exp\left(iu_j \sum_k f_k (B_j(t_{k+1}) - B_j(t_k))\right) \\ &= e^{iu_j x_j} \lim \prod_k \exp(-u_j^2 f_k^2 (t_{k+1} - t_k)) \\ &= e^{iu_j x_j} \exp\left(-u_j^2 \int_0^\tau X_n^2(s) ds\right). \end{aligned}$$

This and (1) imply that

$$E^x \exp(i\langle u, \tilde{X}(\tau) \rangle) = \exp(i\langle \tilde{x}, u \rangle) E^{x_n} \exp\left(-|u|^2 \int_0^\tau X_n^2(s) ds\right) = \exp(i\langle \tilde{x}, u \rangle) E^{x_n} e_q(\tau),$$

where $e_q(\tau) = \exp(\int_0^\tau q(X_n(s)) ds)$ with $q(y) = -(|u|y)^2$. Observe that the function $\varphi(y) = E^y e_q(\tau)$ is by definition the *gauge* for the Schrödinger operator $L + q$ based on the generator L of X_n and the potential q . By general theory (see e.g. [ChZ], Prop.4.13, p.119) it is a solution for the Schrödinger equation. Since $dX_n(t) = X_n(t) dB_n(t) - (n-2)X_n(t) dt$, by a standard argument based on the Itô formula, we get the generator of X_n

$$L = x_n^2 \frac{d^2}{dx_n^2} - (n-2)x_n \frac{d}{dx_n}.$$

Consequently, φ satisfies the following equation

$$y^2 \varphi''(y) - (n-2)y \varphi'(y) - |u|^2 y^2 \varphi(y) = 0 \quad (2)$$

on the positive half-line. Let $\varphi(y) = y^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(y)$. Then $\varphi'(y) = \frac{n-1}{2} y^{\frac{n-3}{2}} g(y) + y^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g'(y)$, $\varphi''(y) = \frac{(n-1)(n-3)}{4} y^{\frac{n-5}{2}} g(y) + (n-1)y^{\frac{n-3}{2}} g'(y) + y^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g''(y)$ and consequently (2) reads as

$$y^2 g''(y) + y g'(y) - (|u|^2 y^2 + ((n-1)/2)^2) g(y) = 0.$$

Substituting $|u|y = z$ and $g(y) = h(z)$ we get

$$z^2 h''(z) + z h'(z) - (z^2 + ((n-1)/2)^2) h(z) = 0. \quad (3)$$

This is the modified Bessel equation of order $\nu = (n - 1)/2$. Taking into account the form of the general solution of (3) we infer that

$$\varphi(y) = y^{\frac{n-1}{2}}(c_1 I_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|y) + c_2 K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|y)),$$

for an appropriate choice of c_1 and c_2 , where $I_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(\cdot)$ and $K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(\cdot)$ are the modified Bessel function of the first and third kind, respectively. Observe that by definition $\varphi(y)$ is bounded in y and $\varphi(a) = 1$. Since $I_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|y)$ is unbounded and $K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|y)$ is bounded when $y \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $c_1 = 0$. From the other condition we get the normalizing constant

$$c_2 = \frac{1}{a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(|u|a)}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark. As $K_\nu(x) \sim x^{-1/2}e^{-x}$ when $x \rightarrow \infty$, the Fourier transform of our kernel is in L^1 . Thus there exists the corresponding density which we denote by $P_a(x, y)$.

From Theorem 2.1 it follows that nonzero \tilde{x} gives rise just to a translation of $P_a(x, y)$ as a function of y . Therefore, in what follows we may and do assume $\tilde{x} = 0$. Consequently, we may simplify the notation by identifying $P_a(x, y) = P_a((0, \dots, 0, x), y)$, $x > 0$.

For notational convenience, let $s = \frac{n}{2} - 1$ and $\nu = (n - 1)/2$. For $z > 0$ we define ([GR], 8.432.8)

$$m_s(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-u} u^s (u + 2z)^s du = d_n e^z z^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}(z), \quad (4)$$

where $d_n = \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2^{s+\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n}{2})$. Observe that for $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ the function m_s is just a polynomial of the degree s . In this case we regard $m_s(z)$ as defined for all complex numbers. By [GR], (8.468, p. 915), for $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ we get

$$m_s(z) = d_n \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sum_{j=0}^s \frac{(2s-j)! 2^{j-s}}{j!(s-j)!} z^j.$$

In particular, $m_0(z) = 1$, $m_1(z) = 2(1+z)$ and $m_2(z) = 8(z^2 + 3z + 3)$.

Theorem 2.2 (Poisson kernel formula). *Let $a > 0$, $x > a$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. If $|y| > 0$ then*

$$P_a(x, y) = \left(\frac{x}{2\pi a}\right)^\nu |y|^{-\frac{n-3}{2}} \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} J_{\frac{n-3}{2}}(r|y|) r^{\frac{n-1}{2}} dr, \quad \nu = \frac{n-1}{2} \quad (5)$$

and when $|y| = 0$ it is understood in the limiting sense, i.e.

$$P_a(x, 0) = \frac{2^{2-n}}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(\frac{x}{\pi a}\right)^\nu \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} r^{n-2} dr. \quad (6)$$

Denoting $s = \frac{n}{2} - 1$ we have

$$P_a(x, y) = (2\pi)^{-\nu} |y|^{-\frac{n-3}{2}} \int_0^\infty e^{-r(x-a)} \frac{m_s(rx)}{m_s(ra)} r^{\frac{n-1}{2}} J_{\frac{n-3}{2}}(r|y|) dr, \quad |y| > 0. \quad (7)$$

The special case $|y| = 0$ reads as

$$P_a(x, 0) = \frac{2^{2-n} \pi^{-\nu}}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \int_0^\infty e^{-r(x-a)} \frac{m_s(rx)}{m_s(ra)} r^{n-2} dr.$$

Proof. Recall that if f is a radial function, $f(y) = f_o(|y|)$, then so is $\mathcal{F}f$ and the Fourier inversion formula in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} reads, up to a factor $(2\pi)^{-(n-1)}$, as the Hankel transform of order $(n-3)/2$ ([F], (7.38), p. 247):

$$f_o(|y|) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{F}f)_o(r) (r|y|)^{1-\frac{n-1}{2}} J_{\frac{n-1}{2}-1}(r|y|) r^{n-2} dr.$$

This gives (5). Now, (7) is immediate and the special cases $y = 0$ follow from the asymptotics of the Bessel function (see e.g. [GR], 8.440 or [F], (5.10), p.130)

$$J_\nu(z) \sim \frac{1}{2^\nu \Gamma(1+\nu)} z^\nu, \quad z \rightarrow 0. \quad (8)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 2.3. *The Poisson kernel $P_a(x, y)$, as a function of three variables (a, x, y) , is a homogeneous function of order $-n + 1$:*

$$P_{ta}(tx, ty) = t^{-n+1} P_a(x, y), \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. This is obvious by a change of variables $\tilde{r} = tr$ in the formula (5) written for $P_{ta}(tx, ty)$. \square

Remark. Certainly, when $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ then also $J_{\frac{n-3}{2}}(r|y|)$ simplifies to an elementary function. This fact, however, is not very useful in what follows and we will not pursue this further.

3 Poisson kernel of half-space

In this section we give a representation formula for the Poisson kernel. For $n = 2$ the resulting formula coincides with the one of \mathbb{R}^2 , so that below we shall always tacitly assume $n \geq 3$ (note, however, that a great part of our argument remains valid also for $n = 2$).

From now on we use the following notation, partially introduced in the preceding Section:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= \frac{n-1}{2}, & s &= \frac{n}{2} - 1 \\ \lambda &= x - a, & \rho &= |y| \end{aligned}$$

and with a little abuse of language we identify $P_a(x, y) = P_a(x, \rho)$.

The following technical lemma is essential in what follows.

Lemma 3.1. *Let*

$$Q(z) = z - (\nu^2 - 1/4) \frac{\lambda}{2ax}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Define $F_\lambda(z)$ by the following formula:

$$\lambda F_\lambda(z) = \frac{(z/a)e^{\lambda z/a} (x/a)^\nu K_\nu(xz/a) - (x/a)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} Q(z/a) K_\nu(z)}{K_\nu(z)}. \quad (9)$$

Then

$$F_\lambda(z) = O(z^{-1}), \quad z \rightarrow \infty. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Using the asymptotic expansions for the modified Bessel function $K_\nu(z)$ ([GR], 8.451.6, p. 910) we get

$$e^z z^\nu K_\nu(z) = z^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}(c_0 + \frac{c_1}{2z} + R_2), \quad (11)$$

where

$$c_k = c_k^{(n)} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(n/2 + k)}{k! \Gamma(n/2 - k)}, \quad k = 0, 1,$$

$R_2 = O(z^{-2})$ and $|z|$ is large enough. Hence, it is enough to show

$$(z/a)e^{xz/a}(xz/a)^\nu K_\nu(xz/a) - (x/a)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}Q(z/a)e^z z^\nu K_\nu(z) = O(z^{\nu-\frac{3}{2}}), \quad z \rightarrow \infty. \quad (12)$$

From (11) it follows that on one hand we have

$$(z/a)e^{xz/a}(xz/a)^\nu K_\nu(xz/a) = c_0 (x/a)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} (z^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}/a) + (c_1/(2x)) (x/a)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} z^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} + O(z^{\nu-\frac{3}{2}}).$$

On the other hand, using $\frac{n(n-2)}{4}c_0 = c_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} Q\left(\frac{z}{a}\right) e^z z^\nu K_\nu(z) &= \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{z}{a} - \frac{n(n-2)}{8} \frac{\lambda}{ax}\right) (c_0 z^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} c_1 z^{\nu-\frac{3}{2}} + O(z^{\nu-5/2})) \\ &= \frac{c_0}{a} \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} z^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{c_1}{2a} - \frac{n(n-2)}{4} c_0 \frac{\lambda}{2ax}\right) z^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} + O(z^{\nu-\frac{3}{2}}) \\ &= \frac{c_0}{a} \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} z^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{c_1}{2x} z^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} + O(z^{\nu-\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then (12) is obviously satisfied and the assertion follows. \square

Remark. The advantage of this lemma is due to the fact that we may and do use it for $z \in \mathbb{C}$. This fact is exploited below.

Observe that the function $K_\nu(z)$ has no zeros in $\{\Re(z) \geq 0\}$ (cf. [E1], p. 62) and hence $F_\lambda(z)$ is analytic in this half-plane. Moreover, by the inverse Laplace transform theorem ([F], Theorem 8.5) together with (10) we get that F_λ is the Laplace transform of some function w_λ , i.e.

$$F_\lambda(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-zv} w_\lambda(v) dv, \quad (13)$$

under the additional condition that for some $b > 0$ the following limit

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b-ir}^{b+ir} F_\lambda(z) e^{vz} dz \quad (14)$$

exists for all $v > 0$ and it is a piecewise continuous function of v admitting the Laplace transform. Then the limit is equal to $w_\lambda(v)$.

The existence of the above limit is shown in Theorem 3.3, together with an explicit formula for the function w_λ itself.

We are ready to state our representation formula.

Theorem 3.2.

$$P_a(x, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(s)}{2\pi^{n/2}} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{s+1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)L(\lambda, \rho, v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s} dv, \quad (15)$$

where $L(\lambda, \rho, v)$ is the following function

$$L(\lambda, \rho, v) = s((\lambda + av)^2 - \lambda^2)((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s - (\lambda^2 + \rho^2)[((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s - (\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^s].$$

Proof. Recall that ([E], vol I, (7) and (8) p. 182 or [GR], 17.13.43,44)

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} r^\nu J_{\nu-1}(r\rho) dr = 2^\nu \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma(\nu + \frac{1}{2}) \rho^{\nu-1} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} r^{\nu-1} J_{\nu-1}(r\rho) dr = 2^{\nu-1} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma(\nu - \frac{1}{2}) \rho^{\nu-1} \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

For $z = ra$ we have

$$\lambda F_\lambda(ra) = \frac{rm_s(rx) - (x/a)^s Q(r)m_s(ra)}{m_s(ra)}, \quad (16)$$

so

$$\frac{rm_s(rx)}{m_s(ra)} = \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^s Q(r) + \lambda F_\lambda(ra)$$

and hence by (4)

$$\left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^\nu \frac{rK_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} = e^{-\lambda r} \left[\left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^s Q(r) + \lambda F_\lambda(ra) \right].$$

Putting this into the Hankel transform formula (5) and using (13) we get

$$2\pi^{n/2} \Gamma(s)^{-1} P_a(x, \rho) = \lambda s \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^s \left[\frac{2}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{s+1}} - \frac{1}{2xa} \frac{s+1}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^s} \right] + \lambda \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s} dv.$$

Putting $r = 0$ in (16) we get

$$\lambda F_\lambda(0) = \lambda \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) dv = -(x/a)^s Q(0) = s(s+1) (x/a)^s \frac{\lambda}{2xa} \quad (17)$$

so that

$$\lambda(F_\lambda(ra) - F_\lambda(0))m_s(ra) = rm_s(rx) - (x/a)^s rm_s(ra).$$

Dividing both sides by r and taking the limit $r \rightarrow 0$ we obtain

$$\lambda a F'_\lambda(0) = -\lambda a \int_0^\infty v w_\lambda(v) dv = 1 - (x/a)^s.$$

We used the fact that $vw_\lambda(v)$ allows the Laplace transform which is evident from Theorem 3.3. Hence

$$(x/a)^s = 1 + \lambda a \int_0^\infty vw_\lambda(v)dv$$

Moreover,

$$\lambda[(F_\lambda(ra) - F_\lambda(0)) - raF'_\lambda(0)]m_s(ra) = rm_s(rx) - rm_s(ra). \quad (18)$$

Again, dividing both sides by $(ra)^2$, letting $r \rightarrow 0$ and using $m_s(0) = m'_s(0)$ we get

$$\lambda F''_\lambda(0)/2 = \lambda/a^2$$

so that

$$1 = \frac{a^2}{2} \int_0^\infty v^2 w_\lambda(v)dv. \quad (19)$$

The facts that $F''_\lambda(0)$ exists and that the function $v^2 w_\lambda(v)$ admits the Laplace transform follow from Theorem 3.3. Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^s &= 1 + \lambda a \int_0^\infty vw_\lambda(v)dv \\ &= \frac{a^2}{2} \int_0^\infty v^2 w_\lambda(v)dv + \lambda a \int_0^\infty vw_\lambda(v)dv \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty av(2\lambda + av)w_\lambda(v)dv. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $2\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(s)^{-1}P_a(x, \rho)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda s \int_0^\infty \frac{av(2\lambda + av)w_\lambda(v)}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{s+1}}dv - \lambda \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^s}dv + \lambda \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s}dv \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{s+1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)L(\lambda, \rho, v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^s}dv, \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows. \square

Below we give a description of the function w_λ . The formula depends on the zeros of the function $K_\nu(z)$. Even if in general the values of these zeros are not given explicitly, we are able to prove some important properties (as boundedness or asymptotics) of w_λ , which are essential in applications. Moreover, in lower dimensions we provide explicit formulas as well (see Section 3).

The function $K_\nu(z)$ extends to an entire function when n is even and has a holomorphic extension to $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ when n is odd. Denote the set of zeros of the function $K_\nu(z)$ by $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{k_\nu}\}$. We give some needed information about these zeros (cf. [E1], p.62). Recall that in the case of even dimensions, the functions $m_s(z)$, $s = \nu - 1/2$, are polynomials of degree s . They always have the same zeros as K_ν , so $k_\nu = (n/2) - 1$ when $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$. For $n = 2k + 1$, k_ν is the even number closest to $(n/2) - 1$. In particular, for $n = 3$ we have $k_\nu = k_{1/2} = 0$, for $n = 5$ and 7 we have $k_\nu = 2$. The functions K_ν and $K_{\nu-1}$ have no common zeros.

In order to describe the function w_λ we introduce additional notation. Let, as before $\nu = (n - 1)/2$ and define

$$w_{1,\lambda}(v) = -\frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} \frac{z_i e^{\lambda z_i/a} K_\nu(x z_i/a)}{K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} e^{z_i v}, \quad (20)$$

and $w_1^*(v) = \sup_{0 < \lambda \leq a} |w_{1,\lambda}(v)|$

Using the functions m_s , the formula (20) reads as follows:

$$w_{1,\lambda}(v) = \frac{-1}{(n-2)\lambda a} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} \frac{m_s(x z_i/a)}{m_{s-1}(z_i)} e^{z_i v}.$$

We define additionally in the case of n odd (so $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$)

$$w_{2,\lambda}(v) = (-1)^{\nu+1} \frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} \int_0^\infty \frac{I_\nu(xu/a) K_\nu(u) - I_\nu(u) K_\nu(xu/a)}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^{-\lambda u/a} e^{-\nu u} u du, \quad (21)$$

and, as before $w_2^*(v) = \sup_{0 < \lambda \leq a} |w_{2,\lambda}(v)|$.

We also need the following asymptotic formulas for the modified Bessel functions I_ν , K_ν : For $u \geq 1$ we have ([F],[GR])

$$I_\nu(u) = (2\pi u)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^u [1 + E_1(u)], \quad K_\nu(u) = \pi^{\frac{1}{2}} (2u)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-u} [1 + E_2(u)], \quad (22)$$

where $E_1(u), E_2(u) = O(u^{-1})$, $u \rightarrow \infty$.

When $u \rightarrow 0$ we have for $\nu > 0$:

$$I_\nu(u) \sim c_\nu u^\nu, \quad K_\nu(u) \sim c'_\nu u^{-\nu} \quad (23)$$

with $c_\nu = 2^{-\nu}/\Gamma(\nu+1)$ and $c'_\nu = 2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu)$. Whenever $\nu = 0$ one has $I_0(u) \sim 1$, $K_0(u) \sim \log(2/u)$. We now formulate and prove our representation theorem for the function w_λ .

Theorem 3.3. *In the even dimensions*

$$w_\lambda(v) = w_{1,\lambda}(v);$$

while, in the odd dimensions

$$w_\lambda(v) = w_{1,\lambda}(v) + w_{2,\lambda}(v).$$

Moreover, we have $|w_i^*(v)| \leq C_i(\nu, a)$, $i = 1, 2$ and

$$w_1(v) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} w_{1,\lambda}(v) = \frac{1}{a^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} z_i^2 e^{z_i v};$$

$$(-1)^{\nu+1} w_{2,\lambda}(v) \geq 0, \quad v \geq 0, \quad (n \text{ odd});$$

$$w_2(v) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = \frac{(-1)^{\nu+1}}{a^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{u e^{-\nu u} du}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)}, \quad (n \text{ odd});$$

$$\int_0^\infty v^k w_1^*(v) dv < \infty, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots; \quad \int_0^\infty v^{n-1} w_2^*(v) dv < \infty;$$

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^k w_{1,\lambda}(v) = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots;$$

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{n+1} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = \frac{(-1)^{\nu+1} n!}{2^{n-2} \Gamma(\nu) \Gamma(\nu+1)} \frac{(x/a)^{n-1} - 1}{\lambda a}, \quad (n \text{ odd}).$$

Proof. We recall the basic formula (9)

$$\lambda F_\lambda(z) = \frac{(z/a)e^{\lambda z/a}(x/a)^\nu K_\nu(xz/a) - (x/a)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}}Q(z/a)K_\nu(z)}{K_\nu(z)}$$

By standard rules for computing residues of meromorphic functions and using the following formula for derivatives of Bessel functions (cf. [E1], 7.11(22) p.79)

$$\frac{d}{dz}(z^\nu K_\nu(z)) = -z^\nu K_{\nu-1}(z),$$

we obtain

$$\text{Res}_{z_i} F_\lambda = -\frac{(x/a)^\nu z_i e^{\lambda z_i/a} K_\nu(xz_i/a)}{\lambda a K_{\nu-1}(z_i)}. \quad (24)$$

Using the functions m_s , we obtain

$$\text{Res}_{z_i} F_\lambda = \frac{-1}{(n-2)\lambda a} \frac{m_s(xz_i/a)}{m_{s-1}(z_i)}. \quad (25)$$

As mentioned before (see (13) and (14)), by the inversion theorem for the Laplace transform we have


$$w_\lambda(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{b-ir}^{b+ir} F_\lambda(z) e^{zv} dz$$

for some $b > 0$. We show the existence of the above limit together with computing formula for the function w_λ .

The technique of integration is different in even and odd dimensions. This is due to the fact that in the first case the function under the integral extends to a meromorphic one while in the odd dimension we have to deal with a branch cut.

For $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ we choose any $b > 0$. All the zeros of $m_s(z)$ satisfy $\Re(z_i) < b$ (actually, we have in general $\Re(z_i) < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, cf. [E1], p. 62). To calculate w_λ we integrate over the rectangular contour with corners at $b - ir$, $b + ir$, $-r - ir$, $-r + ir$. By (10) we infer that integrals over the upper, left, and bottom side of the rectangle tend to 0 as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by the residue theorem, the limit in (14) exists and is equal to the sum of all residues of the function $F_\lambda(z)e^{z\lambda}$. Thus, we have $w_\lambda = w_{1,\lambda}$ and the assertion follows.

In the odd dimensions, however, the function under integral is no longer meromorphic. We make the branch cut along the negative real axis $(-\infty, 0]$ and change the contour of integration to wrap around this line (see the picture).



First, we examine behaviour of our function near the negative axis $(-\infty, 0)$. For $z = -y$ ($y > 0$) we have (see [E1], (45), p. 80)

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} K_\nu(-y + i\epsilon) = e^{-i\pi\nu} K_\nu(y) - i\pi I_\nu(y),$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} K_\nu(-y - i\epsilon) = e^{i\pi\nu} K_\nu(y) + i\pi I_\nu(y).$$

Now, observe that, similarly as before, the integrals over the left, upper and bottom side of our rectangular contour vanish as $r \rightarrow \infty$ by (10). The same holds true for the half-circle with radius $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ around the origin. Note that the branch cut and the residues for $F_\lambda(z)$ are due to the term

$$\tilde{F}_\lambda(z) = \frac{z(x/a)^\nu e^{\lambda z/a} K_\nu(xz/a)}{\lambda a K_\nu(z)},$$

the rest of the function $F_\lambda(z)$ being holomorphic in \mathbb{C} . Therefore

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{b-ir}^{b+ir} F_\lambda(z) e^{zv} dz = w_{1,\lambda}(v) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\gamma_1} + \int_{\gamma_2} \right) \tilde{F}_\lambda(z) e^{zv} dz.$$

After taking the limits $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\gamma_1} + \int_{\gamma_2} \right) \tilde{F}_\lambda(z) e^{zv} dz &= \frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} \left(- \int_0^\infty \frac{u(e^{-i\pi\nu} K_\nu(xu/a) - i\pi I_\nu(xu/a))}{e^{-i\pi\nu} K_\nu(u) - i\pi I_\nu(u)} e^{-\lambda u/a} e^{-vu} du \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^\infty \frac{u(e^{i\pi\nu} K_\nu(xu/a) + i\pi I_\nu(xu/a))}{e^{i\pi\nu} K_\nu(u) + i\pi I_\nu(u)} e^{-\lambda u/a} e^{-vu} du \right) \\ &= (-1)^{\nu+1} \frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} 2\pi i \int_0^\infty \frac{u[I_\nu(u)K_\nu(xu/a) - I_\nu(xu/a)K_\nu(u)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^{-\lambda u/a} e^{-vu} du. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of the first part of the Theorem.

All that remains is to show the corresponding properties of the functions $w_{i,\lambda}$, $i = 1, 2$. We begin with $w_{1,\lambda}$, which is easier to analyze. First of all, observe that $\Re(z_i) < 0$, so for fixed $\lambda > 0$ the function $w_{1,\lambda}$ is bounded and $\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^k w_{1,\lambda}(v) = 0$, for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. To see what happens when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ we use the formula for the residue of F_λ (see (24)), together with the Lagrange formula. Since $K_\nu(z_i) = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z_i} F_\lambda &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{(z_i/a) e^{\lambda z_i/a} (x z_i/a)^\nu K_\nu(x z_i/a)}{-z_i^\nu K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} \\ &= \frac{-e^{\lambda z_i/a}}{a^2} \frac{z_i}{z_i^{\nu-1} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} \frac{(x z_i/a)^\nu K_\nu(x z_i/a) - z_i^\nu K_\nu(z_i)}{(x z_i/a) - z_i} \\ &= \frac{e^{\lambda z_i/a}}{a^2} \frac{z_i}{z_i^{\nu-1} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} (\xi z_i)^\nu K_{\nu-1}(\xi z_i) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{z_i z_i^\nu K_{\nu-1}(z_i)}{a^2 z_i^{\nu-1} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} = \left(\frac{z_i}{a}\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

because $1 < \xi < x/a$ and $\xi \rightarrow 1$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Furthermore, for $0 < \lambda \leq a$ we have

$$|\text{Res}_{z_i} F_\lambda| \leq \left(\frac{|z_i|}{a}\right)^2 2^\nu \sup_{1 \leq \xi \leq 2} \left| \frac{K_{\nu-1}(\xi z_i)}{K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} \right|.$$

Since $\Re(z_i) < 0$, we have obtained that $|w_1^*(v)|$ is bounded by a constant $C_1(\nu, a)$ and that w_1^* integrates all powers of v .

We now prove the corresponding statements for $w_{2,\lambda}$. Observe that the numerator in (21) is equal to

$$K_\nu(u) K_\nu(xu/a) \left(\frac{I_\nu(xu/a)}{K_\nu(xu/a)} - \frac{I_\nu(u)}{K_\nu(u)} \right)$$

and hence is positive, because the function $I_\nu(u)/K_\nu(u)$, $u > 0$, is obviously increasing.

Using the Lagrange formula once again and taking into account $(z^\nu I_\nu(z))' = z^\nu I_{\nu-1}(z)$ (see [E1] 7.11(19) p.79) we obtain for $0 < \lambda \leq a$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[I_\nu(xu/a) K_\nu(u) - I_\nu(u) K_\nu(xu/a)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} \\ &= \frac{\lambda u}{a} \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[(xu/a)^\nu I_\nu(xu/a) - u^\nu I_\nu(u)]}{(xu/a) - u} \frac{K_\nu(u)}{(xu/a)^\nu [K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)]} \\ & - \frac{\lambda u}{a} \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[(xu/a)^\nu K_\nu(xu/a) - u^\nu K_\nu(u)]}{(xu/a) - u} \frac{I_\nu(u)}{(xu/a)^\nu [K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)]} \\ &= \frac{u}{a} \frac{(\xi_1 u)^\nu I_{\nu-1}(\xi_1 u) K_\nu(u) + (\xi_2 u)^\nu I_\nu(u) K_{\nu-1}(\xi_2 u)}{(xu/a)^\nu [K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)]} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{u}{a} \frac{[I_{\nu-1}(u) K_\nu(u) + I_\nu(u) K_{\nu-1}(u)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} = \frac{1}{a} \frac{1}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we used [E1] 7.11(39) p.80. Here the convergence takes place when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and $0 < \xi_1, \xi_2 \leq x/a \leq 2$ and $\xi_1, \xi_2 \rightarrow 1$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Thus, we have obtained

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = \frac{(-1)^{\nu+1}}{a^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{u e^{-vu} du}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)},$$

since the passage to the limit under the integral sign is justified by (27) below.

Moreover, using the above equations and the asymptotic behavior (22) of I_ν and K_ν , we obtain for $u \geq 1$ and $0 < \lambda \leq a$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[I_\nu(xu/a)K_\nu(u) - I_\nu(u)K_\nu(xu/a)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^{-xu/a} e^u \\
& \leq \frac{u 2^\nu [e^{-xu/a} I_{\nu-1}(xu/a) e^u K_\nu(u) + e^{-u} I_\nu(u) e^u K_{\nu-1}(u)]}{a (x/a)^\nu (K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u))} \\
& \leq cu^2 \frac{[1 + E_1(xu/a)][1 + E_2(u)] + [1 + E_1(u)][1 + E_2(u)]}{a \cosh(2u)} \leq \frac{Cu^2}{\cosh(2u)}. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

For $u \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[I_\nu(xu/a)K_\nu(u) - I_\nu(u)K_\nu(xu/a)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^{-xu/a} e^u \\
& \leq 2^\nu \frac{u}{a} \frac{I_{\nu-1}(2u)K_\nu(u) + I_\nu(u)K_{\nu-1}(u)}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^u
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if $\nu - 1 > 0$ (i.e. $n > 3$), using the asymptotics (23) we obtain that the above expression is bounded from above by

$$Cu^{2\nu} \frac{1 + u^2}{1 + \pi^2 u^{4\nu}} \leq \tilde{C}u^{2\nu}, \quad u \in (0, 1).$$

For $\nu = 1$ (i.e. $n = 3$) one obtains in fact the same bound

$$Cu^2 \frac{1 + u^2 \log(2/u)}{1 + u^4} \leq Cu^2, \quad u \in (0, 1).$$

Thus, we finally get for $\nu \geq 1$

$$w_2^*(v) = \sup_{0 < \lambda \leq a} |w_{2,\lambda}(v)| \leq C_1 \int_0^1 u^{2\nu+1} e^{-vu} du + C_2 \int_1^\infty \frac{u^3 e^{-vu} du}{\cosh(2u)}.$$

Now, one easily obtains

$$w_2^*(v) \leq C(\nu, a) \quad \text{and} \quad w_2^*(v) \leq C_1/v^{2\nu+2} + C_2 e^{-v}, \tag{27}$$

and the conclusions concerning the function $w_2^*(v)$ follow.

To finish the proof we show the existence and compute the limit

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{2\nu+2} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{n+1} w_{2,\lambda}(v).$$

As before, we take into account the expression under the integral sign in (21) multiplied by $v^{2\nu+2} = v^{n+1}$ and, after changing variables $t = vu$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{v^{2\nu+2} u [I_\nu(xu/a)K_\nu(u) - I_\nu(u)K_\nu(xu/a)]}{K_\nu^2(u) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(u)} e^{-\lambda u/a} e^{-vu} du \\
& = \frac{v^{2\nu} t [I_\nu(xt/av)K_\nu(t/v) - I_\nu(t/v)K_\nu(xt/av)]}{K_\nu^2(t/v) + \pi^2 I_\nu^2(t/v)} e^{-\lambda t/av} e^{-t} dt. \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same formulas (23) as before, we obtain that for any fixed $t > 0$ the expression above has the following asymptotics when $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{v^{2\nu} t c_\nu c'_\nu [(xt/av)^\nu (t/v)^{-\nu} - (xt/av)^{-\nu} (t/v)^\nu]}{(c'_\nu)^2 (t/v)^{-2\nu} + \pi^2 c_\nu^2 (t/v)^{2\nu}} e^{-\lambda t/av} e^{-t} \\ &= \frac{(x/a)^{n-1} - 1}{(x/a)^\nu} \frac{c_\nu c'_\nu t^n}{(c'_\nu)^2 + \pi^2 c_\nu^2 (t/v)^{4\nu}} e^{-\lambda t/av} e^{-t} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{(x/a)^{n-1} - 1}{(x/a)^\nu} \left(\frac{c_\nu}{c'_\nu} \right) t^n e^{-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any fixed $t > 0$ and v such that $t < v$ we get that (28) is bounded by $c(x, a, \nu) t^n e^{-t}$.

Now, we write

$$v^{2\nu+2} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = (-1)^{\nu+1} \frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} \left(\int_0^v \dots + \int_v^\infty \dots \right).$$

We use (26) with $t/v = u \geq 1$ and we observe that the expression in the second integral is bounded from above by

$$t^2 (x/a)^\nu v^{2\nu-1} \frac{\exp(xt/av - t/v)}{\cosh(2t/v)} e^{-\lambda t/av} e^{-t} \leq v^{2\nu-1} (x/a)^{-\nu} t^2 e^{-t}.$$

Since $v \rightarrow \infty$, the second integral tends to 0, while the first one converges to the following limit

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{n+1} w_{2,\lambda}(v) = (-1)^{\nu+1} \frac{(x/a)^\nu}{\lambda a} \frac{(x/a)^{n-1} - 1}{(x/a)^\nu} \left(\frac{c_\nu}{c'_\nu} \right) \int_0^\infty t^n e^{-t} dt = (-1)^{\nu+1} n! \frac{(x/a)^{n-1} - 1}{\lambda a} \frac{c_\nu}{c'_\nu}.$$

This ends the proof of the theorem. \square

Examples. We finish this Section by writing down explicit integral formulas for some special cases. Observe that in \mathbb{H}^2 our Poisson kernel is identical with the Euclidean one. Thus, the simplest nontrivial situation arises in \mathbb{H}^3 . Recall that $\lambda = x - a$, $\rho = |y|$.

Corollary 3.4. *If $n = 3$ then*

$$w_\lambda(v) = \frac{x}{\lambda a^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{I_1(xu/a) K_1(u) - K_1(xu/a) I_1(u)}{K_1^2(u) + \pi^2 I_1^2(u)} e^{-u\lambda/a} e^{-vu} u du$$

and

$$L(\lambda, \rho, v) = 2^{-1} av (2\lambda + av) ((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\lambda^2 + \rho^2) [((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - (\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}],$$

hence

$$P_a(x, y) = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v) L(\lambda, \rho, v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} dv.$$

If $n = 4$ then $w_\lambda(v) = a^{-2} e^{-v}$ and

$$P_a(x, y) = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi^2(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{(2\lambda + av)^2 v^2 e^{-v}}{(\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2} dv$$

If $n = 6$ then

$$w_\lambda(v) = \frac{3}{a^3} e^{-3v/2} [(2\lambda + a) \cos(\sqrt{3}v/2) + \sqrt{3}a \sin(\sqrt{3}v/2)]$$

and

$$L(\lambda, \rho, v) = (av(2\lambda + av))^2 [2av(2\lambda + av) + 3(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)],$$

hence

$$P_a(x, y) = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi^3(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^3} \int_0^\infty \frac{w_\lambda(v)L(\lambda, \rho, v)}{((\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2)^2} dv$$

Proof. In the case $n = 3$ the function $K_\nu = K_1$ has no zeros and we have $w_\lambda(v) = w_{2,\lambda}(v)$. We use the Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.

For $n = 4$ we have $m_0(x) = 1$, $m_1(x) = 2(1+x)$. Certainly, $w_\lambda(v) = w_{1,\lambda}(v)$ and $L(\lambda, \rho, v) = (av(2\lambda + av))^2$ so all we have to do is to find the function $w_\lambda(v)$. We apply the Theorem 3.3 and obtain

$$w_\lambda(v) = w_{1,\lambda}(v) = \frac{-1}{2\lambda a} \frac{m_1(-x/a)}{m_0(-1)} e^{-v} = \frac{(-1/a)2(1-x/a)}{2\lambda} e^{-v} = a^{-2} e^{-v}.$$

If $n = 6$ then $s = 2$ and $m_2(z) = 8(z^2 + 3z + 3) = 8(z - \frac{-3+i\sqrt{3}}{2})(z - \frac{-3-i\sqrt{3}}{2})$. Put $z_1 = -3/2 + i\sqrt{3}/2$. According to formula (25) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z_1} F_\lambda &= \frac{-1}{(6-2)\lambda a} \frac{m_2(xz_1/a)}{m_1(z_1)} \\ &= \frac{-1}{4\lambda a} \frac{8((xz_1/a)^2 + 3(xz_1/a) + 3)}{2(1+z_1)} \\ &= \frac{-1}{\lambda a} ((xz_1/a)^2 + 3(xz_1/a) + 3)(1 + \bar{z}_1) \\ &= \frac{-1}{\lambda a} ((xz_1/a)^2 - z_1^2 + 3(xz_1/a) - 3z_1)(1 + \bar{z}_1) \\ &= \frac{-1}{a^2} [(1+x/a)z_1^2(1 + \bar{z}_1) + 3z_1(1 + \bar{z}_1)] \\ &= \frac{3}{2a^3} [2\lambda + a - i\sqrt{3}a]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\lambda(v) &= w_{1,\lambda}(v) \\ &= \frac{3e^{-3v/2}}{a^3} \Re \left([2\lambda + a - i\sqrt{3}a] e^{i\sqrt{3}v/2} \right) \\ &= \frac{3e^{-3v/2}}{a^3} [(2\lambda + a) \cos(\sqrt{3}v/2) + \sqrt{3}a \sin(\sqrt{3}v/2)]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the case when $n = 6$. □

4 Asymptotic behavior

In this section we study the asymptotic behavior of the Poisson kernel $P_a(x, \rho)$. The hardest part is to get the asymptotics for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ (see Theorem 4.8 below). It is clear that for integrals like (5) Lebesgue's bounded convergence theorem fails. Another natural approach by a Tauberian theorem (or the Karamata theory) does not lead to the solution either. On one hand, at the Laplace transform level, in the required limit we have to deal with fine cancellations of divergent integrals. On the other hand, in the basic cases $n = 4$ or $n = 6$ our representation formula gives almost immediately the required asymptotics. This leads to the present approach.

Recall that $s = n/2 - 1$ and $v = (n - 1)/2$, $|y| = \rho$. We shall compare our results to the behaviour of the classical Poisson kernel of the upper half-space in \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$P_{\mathbb{R}^n}(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\pi^{n/2}} \frac{x}{(x^2 + |y|^2)^{n/2}}, \quad x > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1},$$

and the Poisson kernel of the *entire* hyperbolic space in half-space model,

$$P_{\mathbb{H}^n}(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(n-1)}{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(\frac{x}{x^2 + |y|^2} \right)^{n-1}, \quad x > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \quad (29)$$

see [GJT], [H]. The constant in the last formula is easily determined knowing that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_{\mathbb{H}^n}(x, y) dy = 1$ on one side and that, on the other side,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + |y|^2} \right)^{n-1} dy = \frac{2\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \int_0^\infty \frac{r^{n-2}}{(1 + r^2)^{n-1}} dr = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} B\left(\frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right)$$

according to [GR], 3.194.3. For example, in the two particular cases of Propositions 4.4 and 4.5 all the three Poisson kernels behave in the same way.

The main tools of our study of the asymptotics of $P_a(x, \rho)$ are the representation formula (15) from Theorem 3.2 and the semigroup properties of the Poisson kernel.

Semigroup properties of $P_a(x, \cdot)$. By the strong Markov property we obtain the following semigroup property of $P_a(x, y)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let b be such that $0 < a < b < x$. Then*

$$P_a(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_b(x, z) P_a(b, y - z) dz, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \quad (30)$$

Denoting $P_{a,x}(y) = P_a(x, y)$ we have

$$P_{a,x} = P_{a,b} * P_{b,x}, \quad 0 < a < b < x,$$

where $*$ is the usual convolution in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} .

Proof. Observe that $\tau_b < \tau_a$ so using the strong Markov property we obtain for an arbitrary nonnegative and bounded Borel measurable function f on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} :

$$\begin{aligned} E^x f(X_{\tau_a}) &= E^x E^{X_{\tau_b}} [f(X_{\tau_a})] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_b(x, z) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_a(z, y) f(y) dy \right\} dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f(y) \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_b(x, z) P_a(b, y - z) dz \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that almost everywhere the following holds

$$P_a(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_b(x, z) P_a((z, b), y) dz,$$

where we denote $P_a(x, y) = P_a((0, \dots, 0, x), y)$ and, according to this notation we also have $P_a((z, b), y) = P_a(b, y - z)$. Since both sides of the above equation are continuous as a function of y , the formula (30) follows. \square

Remark. The semigroup formula (30) holds also for $a = 0$, with $P_{0,x}(y) = P_{\mathbb{H}^n}(x, y)$. This follows from the fact that as in [BCF], $P_{\mathbb{H}^n}$ is the density of $\tilde{X}_\infty(x)$, and the proof of the Proposition 4.1 still works in this case.

Moreover, when $a \rightarrow b$, $a > b$ or when $b \rightarrow a$, $b > a$, then $P_{a,b} \Rightarrow \delta_0$. Consequently, $\{P_{a,b}\}$ is a 2-parameter continuous probability semigroup. It means that $P_{a,b}$ are the densities of the increments $Y_b - Y_a$ of a non-homogeneous Levy process $\{Y_x\}_{0 < x < \infty}$, with the distribution of Y_x equal to $\tilde{X}_\infty(x)$ in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} .

Asymptotics when $a \rightarrow 0$. When the boundary of the half-space in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n is moving away to $-\infty$, the Poisson kernel converges to 0. This is not the case in hyperbolic spaces. In \mathbb{H}^n we will show the uniform convergence of $P_a(x, \cdot)$ to the Poisson kernel of \mathbb{H}^n , given by (29).

Note that the weak convergence, equivalent to the pointwise convergence of Fourier transforms, is simple to see by a probabilistic argument using $X_{\tau_a} \Rightarrow X_\infty$. An easy analytic proof of the pointwise convergence of Fourier transforms is based on the Theorem 2.1, on the asymptotics $v^\nu K_\nu(v) \sim 2^{\nu-1} \Gamma(\nu)$, $v \rightarrow 0$, and on the fact that

$$\mathcal{F}[P_{\mathbb{H}^n}(x, \cdot)](u) = \frac{1}{2^{\nu-1} \Gamma(\nu)} (x|u|)^\nu K_\nu(x|u|).$$

The last formula follows e.g. from [GR] 6.576.7:

$$\int_0^\infty r^{\mu+\nu+1} J_\mu(r\rho) K_\nu(rx) dr = 2^{\mu+\nu} \rho^\mu x^\nu \Gamma(\mu + \nu + 1) (x^2 + \rho^2)^{-\mu-\nu-1}, \quad (31)$$

with $\mu > \nu - 1$, $x > 0$. Putting $\nu = \frac{n-1}{2}$, $\mu = \frac{n-3}{2} + \epsilon$ ($\epsilon > 0$), we have $\mu + \nu + 1 = n - 1 + \epsilon$. Taking limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, by dominated convergence theorem we easily extend (31) to the special case $\mu = \nu - 1$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$. Then for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $x > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} P_a(x, y) = P_{\mathbb{H}^n}(x, y)$$

and the convergence is uniform with respect to $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

Proof. We have, by elementary properties of the convolution, for any $0 < a < b < x$

$$\|P_{a,x} - P_{0,x}\|_\infty = \|P_{a,b} * P_{b,x} - P_{0,a} * P_{a,b} * P_{b,x}\|_\infty \leq \|P_{0,a} * P_{b,x} - P_{b,x}\|_\infty.$$

Note that $P_{0,a} * P_{b,x}$ is the action of a probabilistic operator $T_{0,a}$ with density $P_{0,a}$ on the continuous function $P_{b,x}$. The function $P_{b,x}$ is bounded by Theorem 2.2.

The operators $T_{a,x}$ form a continuous 2-parameter semigroup, so $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|T_{0,a}g - g\|_\infty = 0$ for any continuous bounded function g . Thus

$$\|P_{0,a} * P_{b,x} - P_{b,x}\|_\infty \rightarrow 0, \quad a \rightarrow 0$$

and the assertion of the Proposition follows.

A different proof of the Proposition is also possible, by justifying the passage with $a \rightarrow 0$ under the integral in (5) and by the Lebesgue bounded convergence theorem. \square

The Proposition 4.2 implies the following limit theorem for the hyperbolic Brownian motion.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i=1,\dots,n} \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and X_t be the hyperbolic Brownian motion starting at \mathbf{x} . Then X_{τ_a} , the process X_t stopped when first crossing the hyperplane $\{y_n = a\}$, converges when $a \rightarrow 0$ to a random variable X_∞ , concentrated on the border $\{y_n = 0\}$ of \mathbb{H}^n and with the density*

$$P_0(\mathbf{x}, y) = \frac{\Gamma(n-1)}{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(\frac{x_n}{x_n^2 + |y - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}|^2} \right)^{n-1}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$. The convergence of X_{τ_a} to X_∞ is in the sense of uniform convergence of the densities of their distributions, when we project the hyperplanes $\{y_n = a\}$ on the border $\{y_n = 0\}$.

Remark. By Scheffe's theorem, the distributions of \tilde{X}_{τ_a} converge to the distribution of X_∞ in the total variation norm.

Asymptotics when $x \rightarrow \infty$. The Poisson kernel $P_a(x, y)$ behaves in the same way as the Euclidean Poisson kernel and the Poisson kernel of \mathbb{H}^n :

Proposition 4.4. *We have*

$$P_a(x, y) \sim cx^{-n+1}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. First, observe that for $n \geq 2$

$$(a/x)^\nu \leq e^{r(x-a)} \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} \leq (a/x)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad r > 0. \quad (32)$$

Indeed, since (cf. [GR] 8.432.8)

$$K_\nu(z) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\nu + \frac{1}{2})} \left(\frac{z}{2} \right)^\nu e^{-z} \int_0^\infty e^{-zu} (u+2)^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} u^{\nu-\frac{1}{2}} du,$$

by the change of variable $\bar{u} = rxu$ ($\bar{u} = rau$, respectively) we get

$$e^{r(x-a)} \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} = \left(\frac{a}{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u/(rx) + 2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du}{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u/(ra) + 2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du}. \quad (33)$$

Since $x > a$ the above quotient of integrals does not exceed 1 and we get the upper bound in (32). Multiplying the left-hand side of (33) by

$$1 = \left(\frac{a}{x} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \frac{(rx)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{(ra)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}$$

we get

$$e^{r(x-a)} \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} = \left(\frac{a}{x} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \frac{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u + 2rx)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du}{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u + 2ra)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du}. \quad (34)$$

Now, $x > a$ implies that the above quotient of the integrals is greater than 1 and the lower bound in (32) is verified.

First, we deal with the special case $y = 0$. By a simple change of variable $rx = t$ in (6) and by (34) we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_a(x, 0) &= c \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \frac{1}{x^{n-1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\nu(t)}{K_\nu(ta/x)} t^{n-2} dt. \\ &= \frac{c}{x^{n-1}} \int_0^\infty e^{-t(1-a/x)} \frac{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u+2t)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du}{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u+2ta/x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du} t^{n-2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

For each $t > 0$, when x increases to infinity, the denominator decreases to $\int_0^\infty e^{-u} u^{n-2} du = \Gamma(n-1)$. Hence, for $x > 2a$ we have

$$\frac{e^{-t(1-a/x)}}{\int_0^\infty e^{-u} (u+2ta/x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^{\frac{n-2}{2}} du} \leq \frac{e^{-t/2}}{\Gamma(n-1)}.$$

Therefore, by bounded convergence theorem the assertion for $|y| = 0$ follows.

Now, assume $|y| > 0$. Recall that

$$K_\nu(z) \sim 2^{\nu-1} \Gamma(\nu) z^{-\nu}, \quad z \rightarrow 0. \quad (35)$$

By a simple change of variable $rx = z$ in (5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_a(x, y) &= c \frac{|y|^{-\frac{n-3}{2}}}{xa^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\nu(z)}{K_\nu(za/x)} J_{\frac{n-3}{2}}(z|y|/x) z^{\frac{n-1}{2}} dz \\ &= cx^{-n+1} \int_0^\infty K_\nu(z) \frac{x^\nu}{(za)^\nu K_\nu(za/x)} \frac{x^{\frac{n-3}{2}} J_{\frac{n-3}{2}}(z|y|/x)}{(z|y|)^{\frac{n-3}{2}}} z^{\frac{3n-5}{2}} dz \end{aligned}$$

By (35) and (8) the two quotients above converge to a positive constant when $x \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the second one remains uniformly bounded in $z \in (0, \infty)$ and $x > 0$. For $z < x/a$ by (35) we get

$$K_\nu(z) z^{\frac{3n-5}{2}} \frac{x^\nu}{(za)^\nu K_\nu\left(\frac{za}{x}\right)} \leq c K_\nu(z) z^{\frac{3n-5}{2}} \quad (36)$$

Using (22), for $z > x/a$ and $x > 2a$, say, we get

$$\begin{aligned} K_\nu(z) z^{\frac{3n-5}{2}} \frac{x^\nu}{(za)^\nu K_\nu\left(\frac{za}{x}\right)} &\leq c \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} z^{\frac{3n-5}{2}} \frac{z^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{z^{\frac{n-1}{2}}} \exp(-z(1-a/x)) \\ &\leq cz^{\frac{3n-4}{2}} \exp(-z/2). \end{aligned}$$

By this and (36) bounded convergence theorem applies. Consequently, the whole integral above tends to a positive constant as $x \rightarrow \infty$. The assertion follows. \square

Asymptotics when $x \rightarrow a$. The asymptotics below are easy to obtain.

Proposition 4.5.

$$P_a(x, 0) \sim \frac{2^{2-n} \Gamma(n-1) \pi^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)} (x-a)^{-n+1}, \quad x \rightarrow a^+.$$

Proof. From (32) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(n-1) (a/x)^\nu (x-a)^{-n+1} &= (a/x)^\nu \int_0^\infty e^{-r(x-a)} r^{n-2} dr \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \frac{K_\nu(rx)}{K_\nu(ra)} r^{n-2} dr \\
&\leq \left(\frac{a}{x}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\infty e^{-r(x-a)} r^{n-2} dr \\
&= \Gamma(n-1) (a/x)^{\frac{1}{2}} (x-a)^{-n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (6) completes the proof. \square

Much more is required, however, to obtain the following *Euclidean-like* asymptotics

$$P_a(x, \rho) \sim c(x-a), \quad x \rightarrow a^+, \quad \rho \neq 0.$$

The justification of this important result is postponed after the proof of Theorem 4.8.

Asymptotics when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. The most important and difficult thing to prove is what happens when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. By n we denote, as before, the dimension of the considered hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^n . We assume throughout this section that $n > 2$. Recall that $s = n/2 - 1$. Let us rewrite the basic formula for $P_a(x, \rho)$, using some notation more suitable for calculations. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
z &= \lambda^2 + \rho^2, \\
\kappa &= (\lambda + av)^2 - \lambda^2, \\
u &= \kappa/z, \\
\Phi(u) &= (1+u)^{-s} - 1 + su, \quad u \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We then have $(\lambda + av)^2 + \rho^2 = \kappa + z$, so

$$L(\lambda, \rho, v) = L(\kappa, z) = s\kappa(\kappa + z)^s - z[(\kappa + z)^s - z^s]$$

and

$$\frac{L(\kappa, z)}{z(\kappa + z)^s} = \frac{s\kappa}{z} - 1 + \left(\frac{z}{\kappa + z}\right)^s = (1+u)^{-s} - 1 + su = \Phi(u).$$

Consequently,

$$P_a(x, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(s)}{2\pi^{n/2}} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^s} \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv, \quad (37)$$

where $u = u(x, a, \rho, v)$. Writing the last formula in the form

$$P_a(x, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(s)}{2\pi^{n/2}} \rho^{-n+2} \frac{\lambda}{((\lambda/\rho)^2 + 1)^s} \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv, \quad (38)$$

we see that in order to get the asymptotics of $P_a(x, \rho)$ when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, it is sufficient to obtain the asymptotics of $\int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv$ when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$.

In the sequel we use the following standard properties of the oscillating binomial series

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j, \quad (s)_j = s(s+1)\dots(s+j-1),$$

related to the function Φ . For all $u \geq 0$ and $l \geq 2$ we have

$$\left| \Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq l-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right| \leq \frac{(s)_l}{l!} u^l. \quad (39)$$

Moreover, when $u \rightarrow 0+$,

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0+} u^{-l} \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq l-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] = (-1)^l \frac{(s)_l}{l!} \quad (40)$$

We also have for all $u \geq 0$

$$(-1)^l \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq l-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] \geq 0. \quad (41)$$

Note that for $l = 2$ the formulas above involve the function Φ alone (summation is performed over empty set of indices).

Lemma 4.6. *Let $2 \leq l \leq [n/2]$. Then*

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2l} \int_0^{\infty} w_{\lambda}(v) \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq l-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] dv = (-1)^l \frac{(s)_l}{l!} \int_0^{\infty} \kappa^l w_{\lambda}(v) dv.$$

When n is even, this is true for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \geq 2$.

Proof. We multiply and divide by u^l the expression under the integral in the last formula. When $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ then $u \rightarrow 0$, so the formula (40) applies to

$$u^{-l} \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq l-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right].$$

On the other hand, $\rho^{2l} u^l \rightarrow \kappa^l$. The passage to the limit under the integral sign is justified by (39) and the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} \kappa^{[n/2]} |w_{\lambda}(v)| dv &< \infty, \quad n \text{ odd}, \\ \int_0^{\infty} \kappa^m |w_{\lambda}(v)| dv &< \infty, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n \text{ even}. \end{aligned}$$

Actually, according to Theorem 3.3, when n is even, the function w_{λ} has finite moments of all orders and when $n = 2k + 1$, $k = [n/2]$, the function $v^{n-1} w_{\lambda}(v) \sim \kappa^k w_{\lambda}(v)$ is integrable. \square

The observation contained in the next lemma is crucial for our purposes.

Lemma 4.7. For hyperbolic spaces of even dimension $n = 2k > 4$ we have for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\int_0^\infty \kappa^j w_\lambda(v) dv = 0 \quad (42)$$

when $j = 2, \dots, k-1$.

For hyperbolic spaces of odd dimension $n = 2k + 1 > 3$ we have for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\int_0^\infty \kappa^j w_\lambda(v) dv = 0 \quad (43)$$

when $j = 2, \dots, k$.

Proof. Consider first the case $n = 2k > 4$ and suppose that the assertion is false. Let $j_o \leq k-1$ be the smallest power such that (42) does not hold. By Lemma 4.6 and the formula (38), it follows that there exists

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{n-2+2j_o} P_a(x, \rho) > 0.$$

We will show that this is contradictory with the existence of a finite $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n-2} P_0(x, \rho)$. By the semigroup property proved in Proposition 4.1 (see Remark below its proof) we have

$$P_0(x, \cdot) = P_0(a, \cdot) * P_a(x, \cdot).$$

It follows that for $|y| > M > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |y|^{2n-2} P_0(x, y) &\geq \left(\frac{|y|}{|y|+1} \right)^{2n-2} \int_{|z| \leq 1} P_0(a, z) P_a(x, y-z) |y-z|^{2n-2} dz \\ &= \left(\frac{|y|}{|y|+1} \right)^{2n-2} \int_{|z| \leq 1} P_0(a, z) P_a(x, y-z) |y-z|^{n-2+2j_o} |y-z|^{n-2j_o} dz \\ &\geq c \left(\frac{|y|}{|y|+1} \right)^{2n-2} \int_{|z| \leq 1} P_0(a, z) |y-z|^{n-2j_o} dz \\ &\geq c_1 (|y|-1)^{n-2j_o} \rightarrow \infty, \quad |y| \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

because $n - 2j_o \geq 2$.

In the case $n = 2k + 1 > 3$, let us remark that Lemma 4.6 applies for $l \leq k$. We proceed exactly in the same way as in the proof in the case of n even, with the only difference that now $j_o \leq k$, so $n - 2j_o \geq 1$ and the final contradiction with $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n-2} P_0(x, \rho) < \infty$ also holds. \square

We now state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.8. We have

$$P_a(x, \rho) \sim c \rho^{-2n+2}, \quad \rho \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Case $n = 2k$. We will show that the formula (42) fails for $j = k$, i.e. that

$$\int_0^\infty \kappa^k w_\lambda(v) dv \neq 0. \quad (44)$$

The formula (44) together with Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 imply that $\int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv \sim c \rho^{-2k} = c \rho^{-n}$, $c \neq 0$, when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Taking into account the formula (38) we obtain the desired result.

Observe that when $n = 4$, the function $w_\lambda(v) = a^{-2}e^{-v}$ is positive so the formula (44) is apparent. In this case we only need Lemma 4.6 (Lemma 4.7 is not available for this case). *Proof of the formula (44).* Suppose that (44) is not true, i.e.

$$\int_0^\infty \kappa^k w_\lambda(v) dv = 0.$$

Then, using Lemma 4.6 for $l = k + 1$, it follows that there exists the limit

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2k+2} \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv = L$$

and, by (38),

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_a(x, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(s)}{2\pi^{n/2}} L < \infty. \quad (45)$$

We will show that the existence of the limit (45) leads to a contradiction with the convergence of the Poisson kernels $P_a(x, y)$ to $P_0(x, y)$, $a \rightarrow 0+$, established in Proposition 4.2.

By the homogeneity property of the kernel $P_a(x, y)$, proved in Corollary 2.3, we have

$$P_{a^2/x}(a, a\rho/x) = (x/a)^{-n+1} P_a(x, \rho),$$

so we also have

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_{a^2/x}(a, a\rho/x) < \infty. \quad (46)$$

We will prove that

$$\overline{\lim}_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_{a^2/x}(x, \rho) < \infty. \quad (47)$$

Set $a_1 = a^2/x$. As $0 < a_1 < a < x$, the semigroup property implies that

$$|y|^{2n} P_{a_1}(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} P_{a_1}(a, z) |y|^{2n} P_a(x, z - y) dz.$$

We divide the last integral into $\int_{2|z| \geq |y|} + \int_{2|z| < |y|}$ and estimate separately both integrals.

By (46), we obtain that $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_{a_1}(a, \rho) < \infty$. This is used in the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{2|z| \geq |y|} P_{a_1}(a, z) |y|^{2n} P_a(x, z - y) dz &\leq 2^{2n} \int_{2|z| \geq |y|} P_{a_1}(a, z) |z|^{2n} P_a(x, z - y) dz \\ &\leq c 2^{2n} \int_{2|z| \geq |y|} P_a(x, z - y) dz \leq c 2^{2n} \end{aligned}$$

where the constant c is common for all $|y| > M > 0$. Next, observe that if $|y| > 2|z|$ then $|y - z| > |y|/2$, so that, using (45),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{2|z| < |y|} P_{a_1}(a, z) |y|^{2n} P_a(x, z - y) dz &\leq 2^{2n} \int_{2|z| < |y|} P_{a_1}(a, z) |z - y|^{2n} P_a(x, z - y) dz \\ &\leq c 2^{2n} \int_{2|z| < |y|} P_{a_1}(a, z) dz \leq c 2^{2n} \end{aligned}$$

and (47) is proved. Note that in order to prove it, a weaker hypothesis

$$\overline{\lim}_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_a(x, \rho) < \infty.$$

is sufficient. Consequently, denoting $q = a/x$ and iterating the last argument j times we get

$$\overline{\lim}_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \rho^{2n} P_{q^j a}(x, \rho) < \infty, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (48)$$

We denote $a_j = q^j a$, $\lambda_j = x - a_j$, $\kappa_j = (\lambda_j + a_j v)^2 - \lambda_j^2$ and we denote $w_{\lambda_j}(v)$ the function appearing in the representation formula (15) for the kernel $P_{a_j}(x, \rho)$. The formula (48) implies that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\int_0^\infty \kappa_j^{n/2} w_{\lambda_j}(v) dv = 0 \quad (49)$$

(otherwise $\rho^{2n-2} P_{a_j}(x, \rho)$ converges to a positive constant when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, so $\rho^{2n} P_{a_j}(x, \rho)$ diverges to $+\infty$).

Recall that

$$w_{\lambda_j}(v) = w_{1, \lambda_j}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} (\text{Res}_{z_i} F_{\lambda_j}) e^{z_i v} = -\frac{(x/a_j)^\nu}{\lambda a} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} \frac{z_i e^{x z_i / a_j} K_\nu(x z_i / a_j)}{e^{z_i} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} e^{z_i v}.$$

Writing

$$\text{Res}_{z_i} F_{\lambda_j} = -\frac{1}{a^{n/2}} \frac{z_i^{1/2}}{\sqrt{2} \lambda_j} \frac{x^{n/2}}{e^{z_i} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} \left(2 \frac{x z_i}{a_j}\right)^{1/2} e^{x z_i / a_j} K_\nu\left(\frac{x z_i}{a_j}\right)$$

and using the asymptotics $K_\nu(u) = \pi^{1/2} (2u)^{-1/2} e^{-u} [1 + E(u)]$, $u \geq 1$, $E(u) = O(u^{-1})$ when $u \rightarrow \infty$, we get for $a \rightarrow 0+$

$$a^{n/2} \text{Res}_{z_i} F_{\lambda_j} = -\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{1/2} \frac{z_i^{1/2}}{x - a} \frac{x^{n/2}}{e^{z_i} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)} [1 + E(\frac{x z_i}{a_j})]$$

and

$$\tilde{w}(v) := \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a^{n/2} w_{\lambda_j}(v) = -\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{1/2} x^{n/2-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\nu} \frac{z_i^{1/2} e^{z_i v}}{e^{z_i} K_{\nu-1}(z_i)}.$$

Thus we get

$$\lim_j \kappa_j^{n/2} w_{\lambda_j}(v) = (2x)^{n/2} v^{n/2} \tilde{w}(v). \quad (50)$$

By the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and by (49)

$$\lim_j \int_0^\infty \kappa_j^{n/2} w_{\lambda_j}(v) dv = (2x)^{n/2} \int_0^\infty v^{n/2} \tilde{w}(v) dv = 0.$$

Now, when $j \rightarrow \infty$ and ρ is fixed, one has $\kappa_j \rightarrow 0$ and $u_j = \frac{\kappa_j}{\lambda_j^2 + \rho^2} \rightarrow 0$. By (40) and by (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_j \int_0^\infty w_{\lambda_j}(v) \Phi(u_j) dv &= \lim_j \int_0^\infty w_{\lambda_j}(v) [\Phi(u_j) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k-1} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u_j^j] dv \\ &= (-1)^{n/2} \frac{(s)_{n/2}}{(n/2)!} \left(\frac{2x}{x^2 + \rho^2}\right)^{n/2} \int_0^\infty v^{n/2} \tilde{w}(v) dv = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\lim_j P_{a_j}(x, y) = 0$ which is false because $\lim_j P_{a_j}(x, y) = P_0(x, y) \neq 0$. The proof in the case $n = 2k$ is completed.

Case $n = 2k + 1$.

By Lemma 4.7, for $n > 3$

$$\int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v)\Phi(u)dv = \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v)[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j]dv.$$

This formula is also trivially true for $n = 3$ (there is no sum on the right-hand side). We want to show that $\int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v)\Phi(u)dv \sim C\rho^{-n}$ when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, for a positive constant C . We divide the last integral into the sum of three integrals

$$\int_0^\infty = \int_0^A + \int_A^{\epsilon z^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \int_{\epsilon z^{\frac{1}{2}}}^\infty,$$

where $A > 0$ is so big that $(-1)^{\nu+1}w_{2,\lambda}(v) > \frac{c}{v^{n+1}}$ for a constant $c > 0$; this is possible because, by Theorem 3.3, $(-1)^{\nu+1}v^{n+1}w_{2,\lambda}(v)$ converges when $v \rightarrow \infty$ to a positive constant. The value of ϵ will be chosen in the sequel. Recall that $\nu = \frac{n-1}{2} = k$.

We estimate the integral \int_0^A using the bound (39) for $l = k + 1$ and $|w_\lambda(v)| \leq c/v^{n+1}$. We obtain

$$\int_0^A \left| w_\lambda(v) \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] \right| dv \leq \frac{c}{z^{k+1}} \int_0^A \frac{\kappa^{k+1}}{v^{n+1}} dv \leq \frac{c_1}{\rho^{2(k+1)}} \int_0^A \frac{v^{2(k+1)}}{v^{n+1}} dv = \frac{c_1 A}{\rho^{n+1}}.$$

Next, observe that, again by (39) for $l = k + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A^\infty \left| w_{1,\lambda}(v) \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] \right| dv &\leq \frac{c}{z^{k+1}} \int_A^\infty |w_{1,\lambda}(v)| \kappa^{k+1} dv \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\rho^{n+1}} \int_A^\infty |w_{1,\lambda}(v)| v^{n+1} dv \leq \frac{c_2}{\rho^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

since the function $|w_{1,\lambda}(v)|$ decreases exponentially when $v \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, in order to show that $\int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v)\Phi(u)dv \sim C\rho^{-n}$ when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, it suffices to prove that

$$\int_A^\infty w_{2,\lambda}(v) \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right] dv \sim C\rho^{-n}.$$

Note that by (41) with $l = k + 1$ and by the fact that $(-1)^{\nu+1}w_{2,\lambda} \geq 0$, proved in Theorem 3.3, the integrand

$$w_{2,\lambda}(v) \left[\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right]$$

is non-negative. Moreover, by (40), for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $v < \epsilon z^{1/2}$, so that $v^2/z < \epsilon^2$, $v/z \leq v/\sqrt{z} < \epsilon$ and $u < b(x, a)\epsilon$, we have

$$\left| \Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{(s)_j}{j!} u^j \right| > cu^{k+1},$$

for a positive constant c . On the other hand, by (39), we have for all $u \geq 0$

$$|\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j| < c' u^{k+1}.$$

We consider ρ so big that $A < \epsilon z^{1/2}$. The last two estimates imply

$$\frac{c}{z^{k+1}} \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} \frac{\kappa^{k+1}}{v^{n+1}} dv \leq \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq \frac{c'}{z^{k+1}} \int_0^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} \frac{\kappa^{k+1}}{v^{n+1}} dv,$$

which, using $\kappa = av(2\lambda + av)$, implies

$$\frac{c_1}{z^{k+1}} \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} dv \leq \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq \frac{c_2}{z^{k+1}} \int_0^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} dv$$

and

$$\frac{c_1 \epsilon}{z^{k+(1/2)}} - \frac{c_1 A}{z^{k+1}} \leq \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq \frac{c_2 \epsilon}{z^{k+(1/2)}}$$

$$\frac{c_3}{\rho^n} - \frac{c_4}{\rho^{n+1}} \leq \int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq \frac{c_5}{\rho^n}.$$

Thus

$$\int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \sim C \rho^{-n},$$

for $C > 0$, $\rho \rightarrow \infty$.

In the last integral $\int_{\epsilon z^{1/2}}^{\infty} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv$, the variable u is separated from 0, so the expression $|\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j|$ is estimated from above, up to a positive factor, by the highest level term u^k . Consequently

$$0 < \int_{\epsilon z^{1/2}}^{\infty} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq \frac{c}{z^k} \int_{\epsilon z^{1/2}}^{\infty} \frac{\kappa^k}{v^{n+1}} dv$$

$$\leq \frac{c'}{z^k} \int_{\epsilon z^{1/2}}^{\infty} \frac{v^{n-1}}{v^{n+1}} dv = \frac{c''}{z^k} z^{-1/2} \sim \frac{C_1}{\rho^n}.$$

Since both integrals

$$\int_A^{\epsilon z^{1/2}} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \sim C \rho^{-n}$$

$$\int_{\epsilon z^{1/2}}^{\infty} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \leq C_1 \rho^{-n}$$

are positive, we conclude that

$$\int_A^{\infty} w_{2,\lambda}(v) [\Phi(u) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq k} (-1)^j \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{j!} u^j] dv \sim C \rho^{-n}$$

and the proof in the case $n = 2k + 1$ is finished. \square

We now deal with the remaining asymptotics of $P_a(x, \rho)$ near the boundary: $x \rightarrow a^+$, $\rho \neq 0$.

Theorem 4.9. *We have*

$$P_a(x, \rho) \sim c(x - a), \quad x \rightarrow a^+, \quad \rho \neq 0.$$

Proof. We recall the basic formula (37) for $P_a(x, \rho)$

$$P_a(x, \rho) = \frac{\Gamma(s)}{2\pi^{n/2}} \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + \rho^2)^s} \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) \Phi(u) dv,$$

We apply here notation and terminology introduced before the formulation of Theorem 4.8. In particular, we have for $0 < \lambda \leq a$

$$0 \leq \Phi(u) \leq s \frac{\kappa}{z} = s \frac{av(2\lambda + av)}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2} \leq \left(\frac{a}{v}\right)^2 v(2 + v).$$

We also have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} \Phi(u) = s \left(\frac{av}{\rho}\right)^2 - 1 + \left(\frac{\rho^2}{\rho^2 + (av)^2}\right)^s,$$

and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} w_\lambda(v) = w(v) = w_1(v) + w_2(v)$.

Using properties of $w_{i,\lambda}$ stated in Theorem 3.3 one obtains

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} \frac{P_a(x, \rho)}{\lambda} = \frac{(4\pi)^s \Gamma(s)}{\rho^{2s}} \int_0^\infty w(v) \left[s \left(\frac{av}{\rho}\right)^2 - 1 + \left(\frac{\rho^2}{\rho^2 + (av)^2}\right)^s \right] dv.$$

Using formulas (17) and (19) from the proof of Theorem 3.2 one computes

$$1 = \frac{a^2}{2} \int_0^\infty v^2 w_\lambda(v) dv \rightarrow \frac{a^2}{2} \int_0^\infty v^2 w(v) dv$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty w(v) dv = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} \int_0^\infty w_\lambda(v) dv = \lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} s(s+1)(x/a)^s \frac{1}{2xa} = \frac{s(s+1)}{2a^2}.$$

We thus obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a^+} \frac{P_a(x, \rho)}{\lambda} = C \left[\frac{2s}{\rho^{2s+2}} - \frac{s(s+1)}{2a^2 \rho^{2s}} + \int_0^\infty \frac{w(v) dv}{(\rho^2 + (av)^2)^s} \right].$$

Observe now that when we multiply the right-hand side of the above equation by ρ^{2s} and let $\rho \rightarrow 0$ then the first term tends to infinity while the second one is constant and the third one converges to 0:

$$\rho^{2s} \int_0^\infty \frac{w(v) dv}{(\rho^2 + (av)^2)^s} dv = \int_0^\infty \frac{w(v) dv}{(1 + (av/\rho)^2)^s} dv \rightarrow 0.$$

This observation completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, M. Ryznar and T. Zak for stimulating conversations on the subject. Moreover, the first and the third named authors acknowledge the hospitality of Université d'Angers where a substantial part of the work was done. The third named author wishes to express his gratitude to the MAPMO laboratory at Orléans for giving the opportunity to work further on this subject during his post-doctoral fellowship.

References

- [BCF] P. Baldi, E. Casadio Tarabusi, A. Figá-Talamanca, *Stable laws arising from hitting distributions of processes on homogeneous trees and the hyperbolic half-plane*, Pacific J. Math. 197(2)(2001), 257-273.
- [BCFY] P. Baldi, E. Casadio Tarabusi, A. Figá-Talamanca, M. Yor *Non-symmetric hitting distributions on the hyperbolic half-plane and subordinated perpetuities*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., 17(2001), 587-605.
- [BJ] P. Bougerol, T. Jeulin, *Brownian bridge on hyperbolic spaces and on homogeneous trees*, Probab. Theory Related Fields 115 (1999), 95–120.
- [ChZ] K. L. Chung, Z. Zhao, *From Brownian motion to Schrödinger's equation*, Springer-Verlag, New York 1995.
- [D] D. Dufresne, *The distribution of a perpetuity, with application to risk theory and pension funding*, Scand. Actuarial J., (1990), 39-79.
- [E] Erdelyi et al., eds., *Tables of integral transforms*, vol. I, II, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954.
- [E1] Erdelyi et al., eds., *Higher Transcendental Functions*, vol. II, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953-1955.
- [F] G. B. Folland, *Fourier Analysis and its applications*, Wadsworth and Brooks, Pacific Grove (California), 1992.
- [GR] I. S. Gradshteyn, I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of integrals, series and products*, 6th edition, Academic Press (London), 2000.
- [GJT] Y. Guivarc'h, L. Ji, J.C. Taylor, *Compactifications of Symmetric Spaces*, Progress in Mathematics 156, Birkhäuser, 1998.
- [H] S. Helgason, *Groups and Geometric Analysis*, 2nd edition, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 83, AMS, 2000.
- [Y1] M. Yor, *Sur certaines fonctionnelles du mouvement Brownien réel*, J. Appl. Prob. 29(1992), 202-208.
- [Y2] M. Yor, *On some exponential functionals of Brownian Motion*, Adv. Appl. Prob. 24(1992), 509-531.
- [Y3] *Exponential functionals and principal values related to Brownian motion*. A collection of research papers. Edited by Marc Yor. Biblioteca de la Revista Matemática Iberoamericana, Madrid, 1997.