STRASSEN THEOREMS FOR A CLASS OF ITERATED PROCESSES

ENDRE CSÁKI, ANTÓNIA FÖLDÉS, AND PÁL RÉVÉSZ

Abstract. A general direct Strassen theorem is proved for a class of stochastic processes and applied for iterated processes such as $W(Lt)$, where $W(\cdot)$ is a standard Wiener process and $L$ is a local time of a Lévy process independent from $W(\cdot)$.

1. Introduction

Since the landmark paper of Burdzy [3] on iterated Brownian motion (IBM) the investigation of various IBM type processes became increasingly popular. To name a few: Arcones [1], Khoshnevisan and Lewis [13, 14], Hu and Shi [11], Khoshnevisan et al. [15], Shi [17, 18]. In [7] Csáki, Csörgő, Földes and Révész proved a Strassen type result for a class of iterated processes. In this paper some strongly related but at the same time markedly different Strassen type results will be proved.

2. Main results

Let $S$ be the Strassen class of functions, i.e., $S \subset C[0, 1]$ is the class of absolutely continuous functions (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) on $[0, 1]$ for which

\[(2.1) \quad f(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 f^2(x)dx \leq 1.\]

The set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ valued, absolutely continuous functions

\[(2.2) \quad \{(g(y), h(x)), 0 \leq y \leq 1, 0 \leq x \leq 1\}\]

for which $g(0) = h(0) = 0$ and

\[(2.3) \quad \int_0^1 \dot{g}^2(y)dy + \int_0^1 \dot{h}^2(x)dx \leq 1\]

will be called the Strassen class $S^2$. In [7] the following Strassen-type theorem was proved.

Let $C_0[0, 1] \subset C[0, 1]$ be the set of the continuous functions $f(\cdot)$ on $[0, 1]$ for which $f(0) = 0$. Let $A$ be an operator on $C_0[0, 1]$, satisfying
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(C.1) \(\text{Acf} = e^\rho \text{Af} \quad (\rho \geq 1, \ c > 0)\),
(C.2) \(\text{Af} \geq 0\),
(C.3) \(\text{Af} \in C_0[0,1]\),
(C.4) \(\text{A}\) is uniformly continuous on bounded subsets of \(C_0[0,1]\), i.e., \(\forall \varepsilon > 0, \ K > 0, \ \exists \delta = \delta(\varepsilon, K) > 0\) such that if \(f, g \in C_0[0,1]\), \(\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |f(x)| \leq K, \ \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |g(x)| \leq K\), and \(\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |f(x) - g(x)| < \delta\), then \(\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |Af(x) - Ag(x)| \leq \varepsilon\),
(C.5) \(\sup_{f \in S} \text{Af}(x) = \lambda(\text{A}, x) = \lambda_x \quad 0 < \lambda_x \leq 1\).

**Theorem A** ([7]). Let \(W_1(\cdot)\) and \(W_2(\cdot)\) be two independent standard Wiener processes starting from zero, and \(A\) be an operator satisfying conditions (C.1)–(C.5). Then for \(0 \leq x \leq 1, \ 0 \leq y \leq 1\), the limit set of the vector
\[
(2.4) \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} W_1(yAW_2(xT)) \\ T^{\rho/4} (2\log \log T)^{(\rho+2)/4} \cdot (2T \log \log T)^{1/2} \end{array} \right)
\]
is \((g(yAh(x)), h(x))\), where \((g, h) \in S^2\).

**Remark 2.1.** We will call this a composite (see Remark 2.2) type Strassen theorem, because of the composite structure of \(g(yAh(x))\).

A result having this composite feature for processes of \(W(L(t))\), where \(L(\cdot)\) is the local time of a (not necessarily symmetric) Lévy process was claimed in Khoshnevisan [12]. For other composite type Strassen theorem for iterated processes see Arcones [1] and Hu et al. [10].

The main source of inspiration of this work is a result of Marcus and Rosen [16] combined with a recent paper of Bertoin [2]. The following direct (as opposed to composite, see Remark 2.2) Strassen theorem was proved in [16]. Let \(Z = \{Z(t), \ t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}\) be a symmetric Lévy process and set
\[
(2.5) \quad E(e^{i\lambda Z(t)}) = \exp(-t\psi(\lambda)).
\]
Assume
\[
(2.6) \quad \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\psi(\lambda)} = \infty
\]
and
\[
(2.7) \quad \int_0^\infty \frac{\log(1 + \lambda)}{1 + \psi(\lambda)} d\lambda < \infty.
\]
Under these conditions the Lévy process \(Z(t)\) is recurrent and possesses local times \(\{L^t_y, \ (t, y) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}\}\).

Moreover, define, for \(\alpha > 0\),
\[
(2.8) \quad \kappa(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\lambda}{\alpha + \psi(\lambda)}.
\]
Let \(\mathcal{A} \subset C[0,1]\) denote the set of functions \(f(x), \ 0 \leq x \leq 1, \ f(0) = 0\) and absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Define
\[
(2.9) \quad \mathcal{D}^{(\gamma)} = \{f : f \in \mathcal{A}, \ \int_0^1 |f(x)|^\gamma \ dx \leq 1\}.
\]
(Observe that \(\mathcal{D}^{(\gamma)}\) is a generalization of the usual Strassen class as \(\mathcal{D}^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}\).) Denote by \(\mathcal{D}_M^{(\gamma)}\) the class of nondecreasing functions of \(\mathcal{D}^{(\gamma)}\).
Theorem B ([16]). Let $Z$ be a symmetric Lévy process satisfying (2.5)–(2.7), and for which $\psi$ is regularly varying at zero with index $1 < \beta \leq 2$. Then the set of functions
\begin{equation}
L_t(x) = \frac{L^0_{x,t}}{\gamma(\bar{\beta})(\log \log t)^{\kappa}(\log \log t)^{\bar{\beta}}} , \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1,
\end{equation}
where
\begin{equation}
\gamma(\bar{\beta}) = \beta^{1/\beta} \bar{\beta}^{1/\bar{\beta}}
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
1/\beta + 1/\bar{\beta} = 1
\end{equation}
is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and the set of its limit points is $D^{(3)}_M$ almost surely.

In an elegant paper Bertoin [2] points out that the inverse process of the maximum of the iterated Brownian motion is a stable subordinator with index $1/4$. On the other hand the above-mentioned theorem of Marcus and Rosen, combined with the fact (see Dellacherie and Meyer [9, p. 275]) that the inverse local time process of a stable process with index $\alpha$ is also a stable process with index $1 - 1/\alpha$, tells us that if $Z(t)$ is stable with index $4/3$ then its local time has an inverse process which is a stable subordinator with index $1/4$. Combining this observation and Bertoin’s result, it suggests that the Strassen class of the supremum of IBM and the Strassen class of the local time of a stable process of index $4/3$ should be the same. However the two Strassen type theorems quoted above do not yield this conjecture. Our first result shows that the above argument is correct, the composite and the direct Strassen theorems are equivalent, subject to a natural condition, namely the monotonicity of the inner process.

Theorem 2.1. Let $W_1$ and $W_2$ be two independent standard Wiener processes. Consider
\begin{equation}
u_t(x) = \frac{W_1(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} W_2(s))}{2^{5/3} - 3/4 t^{1/4} (\log \log t)^{3/4}}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{equation}
Then the set of functions $\{\nu_t(\cdot) : 1 \leq t < \infty\}$ is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and the set of its limit points as $t \to \infty$ is $D^{(4/3)}$ a.s.

Clearly Theorem 2.1 states that for the operator $Af(x) = \max_{0 \leq s \leq x} f(s)$ the composite Strassen class of Theorem A and the direct Strassen class of Theorem 2.1 are equivalent. However we can’t expect a direct Strassen class for all the operators satisfying Theorem A. To see this observe that for instance the operator $Af(x) = |f(x)|$ is not monotone, and we will show in Example 1 that there is no direct Strassen class for $W_1(|W_2(\cdot)|)$.

However it is easy to see that the Strassen class of $\max_{0 \leq s \leq x} W(s)$ and that of $\max_{0 \leq s \leq x} |W(s)|$ are identical, both being $D^{(2)}_M = S_M$. This fact and Lemma 2.1 implies that Theorem 2.1 remains true if $W_2(s)$ is replaced by $|W_2(s)|$.

Applying the well-known result of P. Lévy
\begin{equation}
\{L_2(t), \ t \geq 0\} \overset{P}{=} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} W_2(s), \ t \geq 0 \right\},
\end{equation}
where $L_2(\cdot)$ is the local time at zero of $W_2(\cdot)$, we can rephrase Theorem 2.1 as
Theorem 2.2. Let $W_1$ be a standard Wiener process and let $L_2$ be the local time at zero of another Wiener process $W_2$ independent from $W_1$. Consider
\begin{equation}
 s_t(x) = W_1(L_2(xt)) \frac{1}{2^{4/3} - 3/4} t^{1/4} (\log \log t)^{3/4}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{equation}
Then the set of functions \{s_t(\cdot) : 1 \leq t < \infty\} is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and the set of its limit points as $t \to \infty$ is $D(4/3)$ a.s.

Corollary 2.1. Let \{X_n\} be a sequence of i.i.d. integer valued random variables such that $Ee^{itX_1} = 1$ if and only if $t$ is an integer multiple of $2\pi$. Assume that $E|X_1|^3 < \infty$ and $EX_1 = 0$. Let $\rho(x)$ be a real valued function on integers such that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{x = -\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{1+\delta} |\rho(x)| < \infty \text{ for some } \delta > 0.
\end{equation}
Set $S_n = X_1 + ... + X_n$ and
\begin{equation}
 A_n = \frac{\sigma^{1/2}}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho(S_i),
\end{equation}
where
\begin{equation}
 \sigma^2 = EX_1^2,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
 d^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \left| \sum_{x = -\infty}^{\infty} \rho(x)e^{ivx} \right|^2 \frac{1 + E(e^{ivX_1})}{1 - E(e^{ivX_1})} dv,
\end{equation}
and let $\bar{\rho} = \sum_{x = -\infty}^{\infty} \rho(x)$ and $\xi(n) = \#\{i : 1 \leq i \leq n, S_i = 0\}$.

Consider
\begin{equation}
 \tilde{f}_n(x) = \frac{A_{[xn]} - \bar{\rho}\xi([xn])}{2^{4/3} - 3/4} nt^{1/4} (\log \log n)^{3/4}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{equation}
Then the set of functions \{\tilde{f}_n(\cdot) : 1 \leq n < \infty\} is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and the set of its limit points as $n \to \infty$ is $D(4/3)$ a.s.

Corollary 2.2. Let $B$ be a standard Wiener process and let $\ell$ be its local time at zero. Assume that $\rho(x)$ is an integrable function on $R$ such that
\begin{equation}
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{1+\delta} |\rho(x)| dx < \infty \text{ for some } \delta > 0.
\end{equation}
Let
\begin{equation}
 \bar{\rho} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(x) dx,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
 \sigma^2 = 4 \int_{-\infty}^{0} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{x} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 + 4 \int_{0}^{\infty} \left( \int_{x}^{\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 dx,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
 A(t) = \int_0^t \rho(B(s)) ds
\end{equation}
and
\begin{equation}
 \hat{f}_t(x) = \frac{A(xt) - \bar{\rho}(xt)}{2^{4/3} - 3/4} xt^{1/4} (\log \log t)^{3/4}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{equation}
Then the set of functions \( \{ \hat{f}_t(\cdot) : 1 \leq t < \infty \} \) is relatively compact in \( C[0,1] \) and the set of its limit points as \( t \to \infty \) is \( \mathcal{D}^{(4/3)} \) a.s.

**Corollary 2.3.** Let \( B \) be a standard Wiener process and let \( \ell(z,t) \) be its local time. Put

\[
\hat{f}_t(x) = \frac{\ell(z,xt) - \ell(0,xt)}{2^{9/4}z^{3/4}x^{1/4}(\log \log t)^{3/4}}.
\]

Then for fixed \( z \) the set \( \{ \hat{f}_t(\cdot) : 1 \leq t < \infty \} \) is relatively compact in \( C[0,1] \) and its set of limit points as \( t \to \infty \) is \( \mathcal{D}^{(4/3)} \) a.s.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on the following lemma, which is interesting for its own sake as well. Put

\[
\mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} = \left\{ f : f \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \int_0^1 |\hat{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx \leq \frac{\beta^{\beta/(1+\beta)}}{1+\beta} \right\}
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)} = \left\{ f : f = g \circ h, \quad g, h \in \mathcal{A}, \quad h \text{ is nondecreasing} \right. \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 (|\dot{g}(x)|^2 + |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta) \, dx \leq 1 \}.
\]

Observe that \( h(0) = 0 \) and Lemma C (see Section 3) implies that \( h(1) \leq 1 \).

**Remark 2.2.** Strassen classes described in terms of one function and \( \mathcal{D}^{(\gamma)} \) (or \( \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} \)) are called **direct**, and Strassen classes described in terms of a pair of functions, their composition (see \( \mathcal{G}^{(\beta)} \), or Theorem A) are called **composite**.

The next lemma reveals an interesting connection between direct and composite Strassen classes.

**Lemma 2.1.** For \( \beta \geq 1 \), the classes \( \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} \) and \( \mathcal{G}^{(\beta)} \) are identical.

**Remark 2.3.** We will show in an example that the monotonicity of \( h(\cdot) \) is essential in the lemma.

Theorem 2.2 suggests that we might try to prove a direct Strassen theorem for the process \( W_1(\hat{L}_2(t)) \) where \( \hat{L}_2(t) \) is the local time process of a Lévy process independent from \( W_1(\cdot) \). In what follows we will go one step further in generalization and formulate a direct Strassen theorem for a class of stochastic processes satisfying two conditions. The first condition requires that the ordinary LIL should hold for certain linear combinations and the second condition controls the increment behaviour of the process.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( \{ X(t), t \geq 0 \} \) be a stochastic process with continuous sample paths and the following two properties

**Property 1.**

\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d c_i(X(it) - X((i-1)t))}{\chi(t)} = 1 \quad \text{a.s.},
\]

**Property 2.**

\[
\liminf_{t \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d c_i(X(it) - X((i-1)t))}{\chi(t)} = -1 \quad \text{a.s.},
\]

where \( \chi(t) \) is a function that grows to infinity as \( t \to \infty \).
with some $\chi(t) \not	o \infty$ provided that $\sum_{i=1}^{d} |c_i|^q = 1$, $q > 1$, $d = 1, 2, \ldots$.

**Property 2.** For $0 < c \leq 1$

\[ \limsup_{T \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T - cT} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq cT} \frac{|X(t+s) - X(t)|}{\chi(T)} \leq A = A(c) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{2.23} \]

where $\lim_{c \searrow 0} A(c) = 0$.

Let

\[ \eta(x) = \frac{X(xt)}{\chi(t)} \quad (0 \leq x \leq 1). \tag{2.24} \]

Then the set

\[ \{ \eta(x), \ 0 \leq x \leq 1 \} \quad (t \to \infty) \tag{2.25} \]

is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and its set of limit points is $D(p)$ almost surely, where $1/p + 1/q = 1$.

As an application of Theorem 2.3 we prove the following generalization of our Theorem 2.2

**Theorem 2.4.** Consider a symmetric Lévy process $\{Z(t), \ t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$ for which the conditions of Theorem B hold. Denote its local time process at zero by $L_t$. Let $Y(t) = W(L_t)$ where $W(\cdot)$ is a standard Wiener process, independent from $Z(\cdot)$ (and hence also from $L_t$). The set of functions

\[ f_t(x) = \frac{Y(xt)}{G(t)}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1, \tag{2.26} \]

with

\[ G(t) = K_\beta \log \log t \left( \kappa \left( \frac{\log \log t}{t} \right) \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.27} \]

\[ K_\beta = \frac{2^{1/2}\beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 1)/(2\beta)(\beta - 1)(\beta - 1)/(2\beta)} \tag{2.28} \]

is relatively compact in $C[0,1]$ and the set of its limit points as $t \to \infty$ is $D(\frac{2\beta}{\beta + 1})$ almost surely.

**Remark 2.4.** The process $W(L_t)$ appears as the limit process of additive functionals (see Khoshnevisan [12]).
3. Proofs of Theorems 2.1–2.3

Proof of Lemma 2.1. First assume that \( f = g \circ h \in G^{(\beta)} \). Then obviously \( f \in A \). Moreover, by Hölder’s inequality,

\[
\int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx = \int_0^1 |\dot{g}(h(x))\dot{h}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx \\
= \int_0^1 (|\dot{g}(h(x))|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} |\dot{h}(x)|^{\beta/(1+\beta)}) |\dot{h}(x)|\beta/(1+\beta) \, dx \\
\leq \left( \int_0^1 |\dot{g}(h(x))|^2 \dot{h}(x) \, dx \right)^{\beta/(1+\beta)} \left( \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx \right)^{1/(1+\beta)} \\
\leq \left( \int_0^1 |\dot{g}(u)|^2 \, du \right)^{\beta/(1+\beta)} \left( \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx \right)^{1/(1+\beta)} = A^{\beta/(1+\beta)} B^{1/(1+\beta)}.
\]

It is easy to see that under the condition \( A + B \leq 1 \), we have \( \max A^{\beta/(1+\beta)} B^{1/(1+\beta)} = \beta^{\beta/(1+\beta)}/(1 + \beta) \), i.e. \( f \in \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} \).

Now assume that \( f \in \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} \). Define

\[
h(x) = \frac{1}{\beta^{1/(1+\beta)}} \int_0^x |\dot{f}(u)|^{2/(1+\beta)} \, du, \\
g(u) = \begin{cases} f(h^{-1}(u)) & \text{for } 0 \leq u \leq h(1), \\ f(1) & \text{for } h(1) \leq u \leq 1. \end{cases}
\]

Observe that \( h(1) \leq (1 + \beta)^{-1}\beta \leq 1 \). Indeed, by Jensen’s inequality,

\[
h(1) = \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2/(1+\beta)} \, dx \leq \left( \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx \right)^{1/\beta} \leq \beta^{1/(1+\beta)}(1 + \beta)^{-1/\beta},
\]

since \( \beta \geq 1 \). Then

\[
\int_0^1 |\dot{g}(u)|^2 \, du + \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx = \int_0^1 |\dot{g}(h(x))|^2 \dot{h}(x) \, dx + \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx \\
= \beta^{1/(1+\beta)} \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx + \beta^{-\beta/(1+\beta)} \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx \\
\leq (\beta^{1/(1+\beta)} + \beta^{-\beta/(1+\beta)}) \frac{\beta^{\beta/(1+\beta)}}{1 + \beta} = 1.
\]

Hence \( f \in G^{(\beta)} \), and Lemma 2.1 is proved. \( \square \)

Remark 3.1. If \( h(\cdot) \) is not restricted to the class of nondecreasing functions, then \( \mathcal{F}^{(\beta)} \) and \( G^{(\beta)} \) are no longer equivalent.

To see this consider the following example.

Example 1. Let \( \beta = 2 \) and consider for \( n = 1, 2, ... \)

\[
g_n(u) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{3}u/2 & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq 1/n^2, \\ \sqrt{3}/(2n) & \text{if } u > 1/n^2, \end{cases} \\
h_n(u) = \begin{cases} u/2 & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq 1/(2n^2), \\ 1/(2n^2) - u/2 & \text{if } 1/(2n^2) \leq u \leq 1/n^2, \end{cases}
\]

\[\int_0^1 |\dot{g}(u)|^2 \, du + \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx = \int_0^1 |\dot{g}(h(x))|^2 \dot{h}(x) \, dx + \int_0^1 |\dot{h}(x)|^\beta \, dx \]

\[= \beta^{1/(1+\beta)} \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx + \beta^{-\beta/(1+\beta)} \int_0^1 |\dot{f}(x)|^{2\beta/(1+\beta)} \, dx \]

\[\leq (\beta^{1/(1+\beta)} + \beta^{-\beta/(1+\beta)}) \frac{\beta^{\beta/(1+\beta)}}{1 + \beta} = 1.
\]

Hence \( f \in G^{(\beta)} \), and Lemma 2.1 is proved. \( \square \)
\[ h_n \left( u + \frac{1}{n^2} \right) = h_n(u). \]

It is easy to see that for these \( g_n(\cdot) \) and \( h_n(\cdot) \), the integral in (2.19) → ∞, as \( n \to \infty \), while the integral in (2.20) is always 1.

To see that there is no direct Strassen class for the process \( W_1(\cdot) \), observe that the above sequence of functions \( (g_n, h_n) \in \mathcal{S}^2 \), but for their composition \( f_n = g_n(h_n(\cdot)) \) we have \( |f_n(x)| = \frac{x^2}{4}n \), so \( \int |f_n(x)|^\alpha dx \to \infty \) with any choice of \( \alpha > 0 \).

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** It was proved in [7] that Theorem A holds for \( Af = \max f \), which amounts to saying that the limit set of
\[ u^*_t(x) = \frac{W_t(\max_{0 \leq s \leq x} W_2(s))}{t^{1/4}(2 \log \log t)^{3/4}}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1, \]
is \( \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \). Applying our Lemma 2.1 we get Theorem 2.1.

**Proof of Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2.** These follow from the strong approximation results of [6].

**Proof of Corollary 2.3.** This follows from the strong approximation theorem proved in [5].

For the proof of Theorem 2.3 we will use the following well-known result.

**Theorem C** (Riesz and Sz. Nagy [19, p. 75]). Let \( f \) be a real valued function on \([0, 1]\). The following two conditions are equivalent:

(i) \( f \) is absolutely continuous and \( \int_0^1 |f(x)|^p dx \leq 1 \)

(ii) \( f \) is continuous on \([0, 1]\) and \( \sum_{i=1}^r \left( \frac{f(\frac{i}{r}) - f(\frac{i-1}{r})}{1/ r} \right)^p \frac{1}{r} \leq 1 \) for any \( r = 1, 2, \ldots \).

Now we prove two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1.** Denote the set of the limit points of the vectors
\[ \left( X(t), X(2t) - X(t), \chi(t) \right) \]
defined in Theorem 2.3 by \( \mathcal{M}_2 : (\mathcal{M}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2) \). Then

(i) \( \mathcal{M}_2 \subset \{ (\xi_1, \xi_2) : |\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p \leq 1 \} \) (for \( p > 0 \)),

(ii) \( \{ (\xi_1, \xi_2) : \xi_1^p + \xi_2^p = 1 \} \subset \mathcal{M}_2 \).

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Consider an element \((Y_1, Y_2) \in \mathcal{M}_2 \). Let \( q \) be the conjugate exponent to \( p \) (that is \( 1/p + 1/q = 1 \)), and denote
\[ a_1 = \frac{|Y_1|^\alpha \text{sgn}(Y_1)}{(|Y_1|^{\alpha q} + |Y_2|^{\alpha q})^{1/2}}, \quad a_2 = \frac{|Y_2|^\alpha \text{sgn}(Y_2)}{(|Y_1|^{\alpha q} + |Y_2|^{\alpha q})^{1/2}}, \]
where \( \alpha = p - 1 \). Then \( |a_1|^q + |a_2|^q = 1 \). Since
\[ \alpha + 1 = \alpha q = p \]
we have
\[ a_1 Y_1 + a_2 Y_2 = \frac{|Y_1|^\alpha + |Y_2|^\alpha}{(|Y_1|^{\alpha q} + |Y_2|^{\alpha q})^{1/2}} = \frac{|Y_1|^p + |Y_2|^p}{(|Y_1|^{\alpha q} + |Y_2|^{\alpha q})^{1/2}} \leq 1 \]
by Property 1. Hence we have (i).
Let $|\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p = 1$ and introduce

\begin{equation}
(3.2) \quad a_1 = |\xi_1|^a \sgn(\xi_1), \quad a_2 = |\xi_2|^a \sgn(\xi_2).
\end{equation}

Then

\begin{equation}
(3.3) \quad |a_1|^q + |a_2|^q = 1.
\end{equation}

Hence by Hölder’s inequality and (i)

\begin{equation}
(3.4) \quad a_1Y_1 + a_2Y_2 \leq |a_1Y_1| + |a_2Y_2| \leq (|\xi_1|^{aq} + |\xi_2|^{aq})^{\frac{1}{q}} (|Y_1|^p + |Y_2|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= (|\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p)^{\frac{1}{q}} (|Y_1|^p + |Y_2|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 1.
\end{equation}

By Property 1 there exists a sequence of time points such that for the corresponding limit vector $(Y_1, Y_2)$

\begin{equation}
(3.5) \quad a_1Y_1 + a_2Y_2 = 1.
\end{equation}

Hence for such a $(Y_1, Y_2)$ we have equality everywhere in (3.4). By Hölder’s inequality if we have equality in the second place in (3.4), then $|a_1|^q = |\xi_1|^{aq} = |Y_1|^p$ and $|a_2|^q = |\xi_2|^{aq} = |Y_2|^p$. Since $aq = p$, this implies $|\xi_1| = |Y_1|$, $|\xi_2| = |Y_2|$. As we have equality in the first place of (3.4) as well, and as (3.2) implies that $\sgn(\xi_1) = \sgn(a_1)$, $\sgn(\xi_2) = \sgn(a_2)$, we get that $\xi_1 = Y_1$, $\xi_2 = Y_2$, proving (ii). \qed

Clearly Lemma 3.1 can be proved for $(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$, where

$$Y_3 = \frac{X(3t) - X(2t)}{\chi(t)}.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** Denote the set of the limit points of the vectors

$$
\left( \frac{X(t)}{\chi(t)}, \frac{X(2t) - X(t)}{\chi(t)}, \frac{X(3t) - X(2t)}{\chi(t)} \right)
\end{equation}

by $\mathcal{M}_3$ ($\mathcal{M}_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$). Then

(i) $\mathcal{M}_3 \subset \{(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) : |\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p + |\xi_3|^p \leq 1\}$ \quad (p > 0),

(ii) $\{(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) : |\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p + |\xi_3|^p = 1\} \subset \mathcal{M}_3$.

**Lemma 3.3.** In the notation of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_2 = \{(\xi_1, \xi_2) : |\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p \leq 1\}.$$

**Proof of Lemma 3.3.** Let

$$|\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p \leq 1$$

and select a $\xi_3$ satisfying

$$|\xi_1|^p + |\xi_2|^p + |\xi_3|^p = 1.$$

Then by Lemma 3.2 there exists a sequence of time points such that for the corresponding limit point $(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)$ we have

$$(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3).$$

Hence

$$(Y_1, Y_2) = (\xi_1, \xi_2),$$

and we have Lemma 3.3. \qed
Let \( f \in C[0,1] \) and define
\[
f^{(d)}(x) = f\left(\frac{i-1}{d}\right) + d\left(f\left(\frac{i}{d}\right) - f\left(\frac{i-1}{d}\right)\right)\left(x - \frac{i-1}{d}\right)
\]
if \( \frac{i-1}{d} \leq x \leq \frac{i}{d}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, d, \)
\[
C_d = \{f^{(d)} : f \in C[0,1]\},
\]
\[
D^{(p)}_d = \{f^{(d)} : f \in D^{(p)}\},
\]
where \( D^{(p)} \) was defined in (2.9).

Lemma 3.3 can be reformulated as follows: The limit set of \( \eta^{(2)}_t(x) \) is \( D^{(p)}_2 \).

Similarly we have

**Lemma 3.4.** For any \( d = 1, 2, \ldots \) the limit set of \( \eta^{(d)}_t(x) \) is \( D^{(p)}_d \).

**Proof of Theorem 2.3.** Clearly
\[
\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\eta_t(x) - \eta^{(d)}_t(x)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1/4} |\eta_t(x+s) - \eta_t(x)|.
\]
By Property 2
\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |\eta_t(x) - \eta^{(d)}_t(x)| \leq A(1/d).
\]
In order to complete the proof of Theorem 2.3 we need to show that
\[
\lim_{d \to \infty} D^{(p)}_d = D^{(p)}.
\]
But this clearly follows from Lemma C.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

First we prove the following

**Lemma 4.1.** In the notations of Theorem 2.4, let \( \alpha_i, \ i = 1, \ldots, k, \) be real numbers with \( \sum_{i=1}^k |\alpha_i|^{2\beta} = 1, \) where \( 1/\beta + 1/\bar{\beta} = 1. \) Then
\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (Y(it) - Y((i-1)t)) / G(t) = 1 \quad a.s.
\]
and
\[
\liminf_{t \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (Y(it) - Y((i-1)t)) / G(t) = -1 \quad a.s.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 4.1.** Our proof relies on the results of Marcus and Rosen [16] (see Theorem B above). Under our conditions \( \kappa \) is regularly varying with index \(-1/\bar{\beta}\) (see [16]). Put
\[
S_t = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (Y(it) - Y((i-1)t)).
\]
First we show that
\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} S_t / G(t) \leq 1.
\]
Given \( \{ L_{it}, \ i = 1, \ldots, k \} \), we see that \( \{ Y(it) - Y((i-1)t) = W(L_{it}) - W(L_{i(t-1)}), \ i = 1, \ldots, k \} \) are independent normal random variables with mean zero and variances \( \{ L_{it} - L_{i(t-1)}, \ i = 1, \ldots, k \} \); hence we have

\[
E(\exp(\lambda S_t)) = E\left( \exp\left( \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i^2 (L_{it} - L_{i(t-1)}) \right) \right)
\]

and by (2.9) and (4.2) of [16]

\[
P(S_t \geq z) \leq \exp(-\lambda z) \prod_{i=1}^{k} E\left( \exp\left( \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \alpha_i^2 L_t \right) \right)
\]

\[
\leq C^k \exp(-\lambda z) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \exp\left( \kappa^{-1}\left( \frac{2}{\lambda^2 \alpha_i^2} \right) t \right)
\]

\[
= C^k \exp\left( -\lambda z + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \kappa^{-1}\left( \frac{2}{\lambda^2 \alpha_i^2} \right) t \right)
\]

with some constant \( C \).

Now put \( z = (1 + \varepsilon)G(t) \) and

\[
\lambda = \frac{\bar{K}_\beta}{(\kappa(\log \log t)^{1/2})}\text{,} \quad \bar{K}_\beta = 2^{1/2}\left(\frac{\beta - 1}{\beta + 1}\right)^{(\beta - 1)/(2\beta)}.
\]

Using the regular variation of \( \kappa \) at zero, we have for large enough \( t \),

\[
P(S_t \geq (1 + \varepsilon)G(t)) \leq C^k \exp\left( -(1 + \varepsilon)\bar{K}_\beta \log \log t + (1 + \varepsilon)\kappa^{-1}\left( \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right) 2^{-\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\alpha_i|^{2\beta} t \right)
\]

\[
\leq C^k \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)(\bar{K}_\beta 2^{-\beta} \bar{K}_\beta^{2\beta}) \log \log t)
\]

\[
= C^k \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon) \log \log t).
\]

By taking \( t = t_n = \theta^n, \ \theta > 1 \), it follows that,

\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{S_{t_n}}{G(t_n)} \leq 1 \text{ a.s.}
\]

If \( t_{n-1} < t \leq t_n \), then

\[
|S_t - S_{t_{n-1}}| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i (Y(it) - Y((i-1)t) - Y((i-1)t) + Y((i-1)t_{n-1})) \right|
\]

\[
\leq 2k \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \max_{t_{n-1} < t \leq t_n} |Y(it) - Y((i-1)t)|.
\]

But since (see [16])

\[
L_{it_n} - L_{i(t_n-1)} = O\left( (\log \log t_n)\kappa \left( \frac{\log \log t_n}{t_n - t_{n-1}} \right) \right) \text{ a.s.}
\]

it follows from the increment results of Csörgő and Révész [8, Theorem 1.2.1, p.30], that

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \max_{t_{n-1} < t \leq t_n} |Y(it) - Y((i-1)t)| = O\left( (\log \log t_n)^{\kappa^{1/2}} \left( \frac{\log \log t_n}{t_n - t_{n-1}} \right) \right) \text{ a.s.}
\]
which can be made arbitrary small compared to $G(t_n)$ by choosing $\theta$ close to 1. This proves (4.3).

Now we prove

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{S_t}{G(t)} \geq 1 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.4)$$

Put

$$V_t = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i^2(L_{it} - L_{(i-1)t}).$$

Then $S_t/V_t^{1/2}$ and $V_t$ are independent random variables, the first one being standard normal. Consider the events

$$A_t = \{ S_t \geq (c_1 V_t \log \log t)^{1/2}, \quad V_t \geq (1 - \varepsilon)c_2(\log \log t)\kappa\left(\frac{\log log t}{t}\right) \}$$

with $\varepsilon > 0$ and

$$\frac{c_1}{2} + (\bar{\beta} - 1) \left(\frac{c_2}{\beta}\right)^{\bar{\beta}/(\bar{\beta} - 1)} \leq 1. \quad (4.5)$$

By using the lower estimation (4.10) in Marcus and Rosen [16], one can see similarly to the proof of their Lemma 3.2 that

$$P^x \left( V_t \geq (1 - \varepsilon)c_2(\log \log t)\kappa\left(\frac{\log log t}{t}\right) \right) \geq Ca_\nu(x,t) \exp \left( - \lambda(1 - \varepsilon)c_2(\log \log t)\kappa\left(\frac{\log log t}{t}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \kappa^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda \alpha_i^2}\right) t \right)$$

with sufficiently small $\nu$, where $P^x$ denotes the conditional probability under $Z(0) = x$,

$$a_\nu(x,t) = \int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{p_{\nu}(x) dv}{\kappa\left(\frac{\log \log t}{t}\right)}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} = \left(\frac{\bar{\beta}}{c_2}\right)^{1/(\bar{\beta} - 1)} \kappa\left(\frac{\log log t}{t}\right).$$

By the independence of $S_t/V_t^{1/2}$ and $V_t$ we obtain

$$P^x(A_t) \geq Ca_\nu(x,t) \exp \left( - \left(\frac{c_1}{2} + (\bar{\beta} - 1) \left(\frac{c_2}{\beta}\right)^{\bar{\beta}/(\bar{\beta} - 1)} \right) \log log t \right)$$

$$\geq Ca_\nu(x,t) \exp(- \log log t)$$

provided that (4.5) holds.

Now let $\theta$ be large enough, $t_n = \theta^n$, put

$$S^*_n = \alpha_1(Y(t_n) - Y(kt_{n-1})) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \alpha_i(Y(it_n) - Y((i-1)t_n))$$
and
\[ V_n^* = \alpha_1^2(L_{t_n} - L_{k_{t_n-1}}) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \alpha_i^2(L_{it_n} - L_{(i-1)t_n}) \]
and consider the events
\[ A_n^* = \{ S_n^* \geq (c_1 V_n^* \log \log t_n)^{1/2}, \quad V_n^* \geq (1 - \varepsilon) c_2 (\log \log t_n) \kappa \left( \log \log t_n / t_n \right) \} . \]

By using the above estimations and the argument of Marcus and Rosen [16] to prove their lower bound, similarly to their (3.32) one can see that
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P^Z(t_{n-1}) (A_n^*) = \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \]
implying
\[ P(A_n^* \text{ i.o.}) = 1. \]

Upon choosing
\[ c_1 = \frac{2\beta}{\beta + 1}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\beta}{(\beta - 1) / (\beta + 1)^{1/\beta}}, \]
we can see that
\[ \limsup_{n \to \infty} S_n^* / G(t_n) \geq 1 \quad \text{a.s.} \]

Since
\[ Y(kt_{n-1}) = O(G(t_{n-1})) \quad \text{a.s} \]
and this can be made arbitrary small compared to \( G(t_n) \) by choosing \( \theta \) large enough, we have (4.4). This completes the proof of (4.1). The proof of (4.2) is similar.

**Lemma 4.2.** Under the conditions of Theorem 2.4
\[ (4.6) \quad \limsup_{T \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq T - cT} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq cT} \frac{|Y(t + s) - Y(t)|}{G(T)} = O \left( c^{1/(2\beta)} \right) \]

**Proof.** As \( Y(t) = W(L_t) \), according to the previously mentioned increment result in Csörgő and Révész [8, Theorem 1.2.1, p.30]
\[ \limsup_{T \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq L_T} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq cT} \frac{|W(L_{t+s}) - W(L_t)|}{G(T)} \]
\[ \leq \limsup_{T \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq L_T} \sup_{0 \leq y \leq a_c(T)} \frac{|W(u) - W(u - y)|}{G(T)} \]
\[ \leq O(1) \limsup_{T \to \infty} \left( \frac{a_c(T) \log \frac{L_T}{a_c(T)} + \log \log L_T}{G(T)} \right)^{1/2}, \]
\[ a_c(T) = \sup_{0 \leq u \leq T - cT} (L_{t+cT} - L_t). \]

From [16, Theorem 1.1 and (4.17)] we obtain
Combining (4.6)–(4.8) gives the result of the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. In Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 it was proved that the process \( Y(t) \) possesses the two properties required by Theorem 2.3. Hence the theorem follows.

Acknowledgement

The authors are indebted to Jay Rosen for his inspiration and useful suggestions and to the referee for helpful remarks.

References


MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BUDAPEST, P.O.B. 127, H-1364, HUNGARY
E-mail address: csaki@novell.math-inst.hu

COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND, CUNY, 2800 VICTORY BLVD., STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK 10314
E-mail address: foldes@postbox.csi.cuny.edu

INSTITUT FÜR STATISTIK UND WARScheinlichkeitstheorie, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, A-1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: revesz@ci.tuwien.ac.at