EXACT RATES OF CONVERGENCE TO BROWNIAN LOCAL TIME

By Davar Khoshnevisan

University of Washington

In this article we are mainly concerned with proving lower bounds on some uniform approximation schemes for the local times of one-dimensional Brownian motion. Consequently, this leads to many exact limit theorems for Brownian local times. The latter results are Paul Lévy's occupation time approximation, the downcrossing theorem and an intrinsic construction.

1. Introduction and main results. Suppose $\{Z(s); \ s \geq 0\}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion starting at 0. Let $\{L_t^x; \ x \in \mathbb{R}^1, t \geq 0\}$ denote its process of local times. In other words [see Chapter VI of Revuz and Yor (1991)], with probability 1,

$$(1.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} f(x) L_t^x \, dx = \int_0^t f(Z(s)) \, ds \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and measurable } f \colon \mathbb{R}^1 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^1.$$

That the null set in (1.1) can be chosen to be independent of the choice of f is a consequence of Trotter's theorem which states: $(t, x) \mapsto L_t^x$ is almost surely continuous (up to a modification which we shall take for granted). For the latter theorem, see Trotter (1958). A modern account appears in Theorem VI.1.7 of Revuz and Yor (1991). For instance, let $\{\Psi_\varepsilon(\cdot); \ \varepsilon > 0\}$ be an approximation to the identity, that is, $\Psi_1(x) \geq 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \Psi_1(x) \, dx = 1$ and $\Psi_\varepsilon(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \varepsilon^{-1} \Psi_1(x \varepsilon^{-1})$. Then, almost surely, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_0^t \Psi_\varepsilon(Z(s) - x) \, ds = L_t^x$, uniformly over all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. An important example is Lévy's occupation time approximation which is obtained by taking $\Psi_\varepsilon(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \varepsilon^{-1} 1_{[0, \varepsilon]}(x)$. Borodin (1986) has sharpened this by observing that

$$(1.2) \quad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left| (1/\varepsilon) \int_0^t 1_{[x, x+\varepsilon]}(Z(s)) \, ds - L_t^x \right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)}} \leq 2 \left(L_t^* \right)^{1/2}, \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

where here and throughout, $L_t^* \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} L_t^x$ and $\log x$ denotes the logarithm of x in base e. The proof of (1.2) is simple: by (1.1), $\varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t 1_{[x, x+\varepsilon]}(Z(s)) \, ds = \varepsilon^{-1} \int_x^{x+\varepsilon} L_t^u \, du$. So (1.2) follows immediately from Ray's modulus of continuity [see Ray (1963) and McKean (1962)], namely,

$$(1.3) \quad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left| L_t^{x+\varepsilon} - L_t^x \right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)}} = 2 \left(L_t^* \right)^{1/2}, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Our first theorem improves (1.2) by obtaining an exact asymptotic lower bound as well as a better upper bound. More precisely, we have the following result:

THEOREM 1.1.   *For every $t > 0$, with probability 1,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left| \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t 1_{[x, x+\varepsilon]} \big(Z(s) \big) \, ds - L_t^x \right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)}} = \left(\frac{4}{3} L_t^* \right)^{1/2}.$$

REMARK 1.1.1.   A little reflection shows that while the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 is sharp, it is the lower bound that is difficult to prove. This is due to the fact that the level sets are highly dependent. So any proof would have to exploit this dependence structure. We shall do so by using Williams' version of the Ray–Knight theorem. See Section 3.

The local version of Theorem 1.1 (i.e., without the supremum) is somewhat different. We state it as a formal theorem but omit the proof as it is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

THEOREM 1.2.   *For every $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, with probability 1,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t 1_{[x, x+\varepsilon]} \big(Z(r) \big) \, dr - L_t^x \right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log \log (1/\varepsilon)}} = \left(\frac{4}{3} L_t^x \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is worth mentioning that the above is a genuine law of the iterated logarithm in the sense that the lim inf of the left quantity in Theorem 1.2 is 0 and hence no limit could possibly exist.

To state and motivate the next theorem, define $u_\varepsilon(x, t)$ to be the total number of times before time t that Z has upcrossed the interval $[x, x + \varepsilon]$. It is a well-known result of Lévy that, with probability 1, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} 2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x, t) = L_t^x$. See Exercise XII.2.10 of Revuz and Yor (1991). For other proofs and variants, see also Williams (1977), Chung and Durrett (1976) and Maisonneuve (1981). Chacon, Le Jan, Perkins and Taylor (1981) proved that this convergence is uniform over all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. This fact is also hinted at in Williams (1979), Exercise II.62.7. In particular, the null set in question can be chosen to be independent of the "level set," x. Borodin (1986) has proven the following refinement of this development:

$$(1.4) \qquad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \left| 2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x, t) - L_t^x \right| = O\left(\varepsilon^{1/2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \right) \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. In light of Theorem 1.1, the above theorem is surprising in that the power of the logarithm has changed. Indeed, one would guess the convergence rate to be of the order $O((\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon))^{1/2})$. Theorem 1.4 below shows that this is the case, while Theorem 1.3 provides the corresponding local version.

THEOREM 1.3. *For every $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, with probability 1,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left|2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log \log(1/\varepsilon)}} = 2\left(L_t^x\right)^{1/2}.$$

REMARK 1.3.1. As is the case with the rest of the results in this paper, the more important aspect of this theorem is the lower bound. The upper bound has been anticipated to some degree in the existing literature. See Williams (1979), page 91.

Theorem 1.3 (as well as all of the subsequent theorems) is proved by means of excursion theory. However, it is interesting that we have not found truly excursion-theoretic proofs for Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

THEOREM 1.4. *For every $t > 0$, with probability 1,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0 \; x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \log(1/\varepsilon)}} = 2\left(L_t^*\right)^{1/2}.$$

To state the final pair of theorems, let $e_\varepsilon(x,t)$ denote the total number of times before time t that Z makes excursions away from x with lifetimes greater than ε. It is well known that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,t) = L_t^x$. For example, see Maisonneuve (1981) or Proposition VII.2.9 of Revuz and Yor (1991). Theorem 1.1 of Perkins (1981) states that the convergence is uniform over all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. [Due to his choice of scale function, Perkins' local time is half of ours, thus accounting for the extra factor of 2. See (1.2) of Perkins (1981).] More recently, Csörgő and Révész (1986) have proved the analogue of (1.4) for the process e_ε. Namely, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$,

$$(1.5) \qquad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2} e_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right| = O\left(\varepsilon^{1/4}\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Our next two theorems provide the exact rate of convergence to (1.5) and its local version.

THEOREM 1.5. *For every $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, with probability 1,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left|(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\varepsilon^{1/4}\sqrt{\log\log(1/\varepsilon)}} = (2\pi)^{1/4}\left(L_t^x\right)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 1.5 is a special case of Theorem 1 of Horváth (1990).

THEOREM 1.6. *For every $t > 0$, with probability 1,*

$$\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{1/4}\left(L_t^*\right)^{1/2} \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\varepsilon/2\right)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\varepsilon^{1/4}\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}}$$

$$\leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\varepsilon/2\right)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\varepsilon^{1/4}\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}} \leq (2\pi)^{1/4}\left(L_t^*\right)^{1/2}.$$

We have not been able to identify the exact constant in Theorem 1.6 (or the existence of a limit, for that matter.) However, the proof leads us to believe the following.

CONJECTURE 1.7. *For each $t > 0$, with probability 1,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\varepsilon/2\right)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,t) - L_t^x\right|}{\varepsilon^{1/4}\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}} = (2\pi)^{1/4}\left(L_t^*\right)^{1/2}.$$

REMARK 1.7.1. Many of the approximation theorems for local times are known to hold uniformly in $t \in T$, where T is an arbitrary nonrandom compact subset of $[0, \infty)$. These include (1.2) through (1.5). Our proofs can be modified to show that Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 hold uniformly over t-compacts. However, the proof of Theorem 1.1 does not extend to handle t-uniform results.

Much is now known about convergence theorems for local times at a fixed level. An umbrella method of doing this for Markov processes appears in Fristedt and Taylor (1983). Various uniform approximation theorems are also known for some Lévy processes. See Barlow, Perkins and Taylor (1986a, b) and the references therein. A host of strong limit theorems related to Brownian local time can be found in Knight (1981).

In Section 2 we demonstrate some modulus of continuity results for "smoothed" Brownian motion. These results will then be used in Section 3 to prove Theorem 1.1. Sections 4 through 7 contain proofs for Theorems 1.3 through 1.6, respectively.

Finally, some notation is in order here. Throughout, we shall think of Z as the coordinate functions in the space of continuous functions on the positive half-line, $\mathfrak{C}([0, \infty))$. This means that $Z(t)(\omega) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \omega(t)$ for all $\omega \in \mathfrak{C}([0, \infty))$. Define $T_x \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \inf\{s: Z(s) = x\}$ and let (ϑ_t) be the shifts on the paths of Z. In other words, $\vartheta_t(Z)(s) = Z(t + s)$. More generally, if $\Lambda = \Lambda(Z(r); a \leq r \leq b)$ is a measurable functional of Z, $\vartheta_t(\Lambda) = \Lambda(Z(r); t + a \leq r \leq t + b)$. Constants will be denoted by C_i, and, for the sake of rigor, their dependence on any other variable will be explicitly stated.

2. Modulus results for Brownian processes. Throughout this section, $\{Z(t);\ t \geq 0\}$ denotes a one-dimensional Brownian motion, and $\{\beta_\alpha(t);\ t \geq 0\}$ is a Bessel process of dimension $\alpha > 0$. In other words, (β_α) is a nonnegative diffusion with infinitesimal generator given by the following:

$$\mathcal{L}_\alpha(f)(x) = \frac{1}{2} f''(x) + \frac{\alpha - 1}{2x} f'(x)$$

for all twice continuously differentiable functions, $f\colon (0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^1$ which satisfy

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^{\alpha - 2} \big(f(\varepsilon) - f(0) \big) = 0.$$

We next recall Lévy's modulus of continuity for the processes (β_α) and (Z), respectively,

(2.1a)
$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in T} \frac{|\beta_\alpha(t + h) - \beta_\alpha(t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{2} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

(2.1b)
$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in T} \frac{|Z(t + h) - Z(t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{2} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where $\varphi(t) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{t(1 \vee \log(1/t))}$ for $t > 0$, and $T \subseteq [0, \infty)$ is any (nonrandom) compact set. The proof of (2.1) with lim sup instead of the limit can be found, for example, within the results of Revuz and Yor (1991), Chapter XI. Minor adjustments to the proof establish the existence of the limit; see, for example, Csörgő and Révész (1981).

Of particular interest to us is that, as $h \downarrow 0$,

(2.1c)
$$\sup_{t \in T} \left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} Z(s)\,ds - Z(t) \right| \leq \sup_{t \in T} h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} |Z(s) - Z(t)|\,ds$$
$$\leq \sqrt{2}\,\varphi(h)\big(1 + o(1)\big) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

with a similar estimate holding for (β_α). The goal of this section is to prove the exact version of (2.1c) for the processes $(Z), (\beta_\alpha)$ and (β_α^2) (the latter process will be of use in the next section on local times). More precisely, we have the following.

THEOREM 2.1.

(a) *Fix any $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and any compact $T \subseteq [0, \infty)$. Then, given $Z(0) = x$,*

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in T} \frac{\left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} Z(s)\,ds - Z(t) \right|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad a.s.$$

(b) *Fix $\alpha \geq 2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and compact $T \subseteq (0, \infty)$. Then, given $\beta_\alpha(0) = x$,*

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in T} \frac{\left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} \beta_\alpha(s)\,ds - \beta_\alpha(t) \right|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad a.s.$$

(c) *For all $\alpha \geq 2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^1_+$ and all compact $T \subseteq [0, \infty)$, given $\beta_\alpha(0) = x$,*

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in T} \frac{\left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} \beta_\alpha^2(s)\, ds - \beta_\alpha^2(t) \right|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}} \sup_{t \in T} \beta_\alpha(t) \quad a.s.$$

REMARK 2.1.1. (i) It is clear from part (a) of Theorem 2.1 that the estimate in (2.1c) is not sharp.

(ii) With extra effort, one can improve part (b) to all compacts $T \subseteq [0, \infty)$. However, as this extension is unnecessary for our purposes, we shall not present a proof here.

(iii) One can extend this theorem to the α-dimensional Bessel processes with $\alpha < 2$, by adapting the proof of part (b) using a localization argument.

(iv) Theorem 2.1 (as well as the corresponding Theorems 1.1 and 1.2) has recently been extended by Marcus and Rosen (1993) to a class of symmetric (nearly stable) Lévy processes using a striking isomorphism theorem of Dynkin (1984).

There is also a local version of Theorem 2.1. To this end, let us define

$$\psi(h) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{h\left(1 \vee \log\log\left(1/h\right)\right)}$$

for all $h > 0$. The local version of Theorem 2.1 is as follows:

THEOREM 2.2. (a) *Fix $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Then, given $Z(0) = x$,*

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} Z(r)\, dr - Z(t) \right|}{\psi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad a.s.$$

(b) *For all $\alpha \geq 2, t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, given $\beta_\alpha(0) = x$,*

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} \beta_\alpha^2(r)\, dr - \beta_\alpha^2(t) \right|}{\psi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}} \beta_\alpha(t) \quad a.s.$$

The remainder of this section contains a proof of Theorem 2.1. This is patterned after Lévy's proof of the uniform modulus of continuity of Brownian motion mixed togther with some interpolation ideas. We omit the proof of Theorem 2.2 since it contains no new ideas.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1(a). Without loss of generality, suppose $T = [0, 1]$ and $x = 0$; the necessary modifications in the general case are easy to make. For any h and $t > 0$, define

$$I(h; t) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} Z(s)\, ds - Z(t) = h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} \left(Z(s) - Z(t) \right) ds.$$

Therefore, $I(h;t)$ is a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance given by

$$\mathbb{E}\big(I(h;T)\big)^2 = 2h^{-2} \int_t^{t+h} \int_t^s \mathbb{E}\Big(\big(Z(s) - Z(t)\big)\big(Z(u) - Z(t)\big)\Big)\, du\, ds$$

$$= 2h^{-2} \int_t^{t+h} \int_t^s (u - t)\, du\, ds = \frac{h}{3}.$$

In particular, by elementary facts about Gaussian distributions,

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} x^{-2} \log \mathbb{P}\Big(|I(h;t)| \geq x\sqrt{\frac{h}{3}} \Big) = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

Moreover, since the distribution of $h^{-1/2}I(h;t)$ is independent of h and t, the limit is uniform over all h and $t > 0$. In particular, fixing $\theta > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, it follows that there exist finite positive constants, $C_1(\theta, \varepsilon) \leq C_2(\theta, \varepsilon)$, such that, for all $t, h > 0$,

$$(2.2) \qquad C_1(\theta, \varepsilon)h^{\theta(1+\varepsilon)} \leq \mathbb{P}\Big(|I(h;t)| \geq \varphi(h)\sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}} \Big) \leq C_2(\theta, \varepsilon)h^{\theta(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Now a Borel–Cantelli argument is in order. Indeed, by (2.2), for any fixed $\rho > 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|I(\rho^{-n}; k\rho^{-n})| \geq \varphi(\rho^{-n})\sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}} \Big) \geq C_1(\theta, \varepsilon)\rho^{-n\theta(1+\varepsilon)}$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq [\rho^n]$ and all $n \geq 1$. Since $\{I(\rho^{-n}, k\rho^{-n}); 0 \leq k \leq [\rho^n]\}$ is an independent sequence, for all n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{k \leq [\rho^n]} |I(\rho^{-n}, k\rho^{-n})| \leq \varphi(\rho^{-n})\sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}} \Big) \leq \big(1 - C_1(\theta, \varepsilon)\rho^{-n\theta(1+\varepsilon)}\big)^{[\rho^n]}$$

$$\leq \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}C_1(\theta, \varepsilon)\rho^{-n\theta(1+\varepsilon)+n} \Big),$$

which sums if $0 < \theta < (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1}$. Therefore, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \max_{k \leq [\rho^n]} \frac{|I(\rho^{-n}; k\rho^{-n})|}{\varphi(\rho^{-n})} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all $\theta \in (0, (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1})$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta < (1 + \varepsilon)^{-1}$ are arbitrary, letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and $\theta \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence, it follows that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - \rho^{-n}} \frac{|I(\rho^{-n};t)|}{\varphi(\rho^{-n})} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \cdot \text{a.s.}$$

Now for each $h > 0$ there exists a unique integer, N_h, such that $\rho^{-(N_h+1)} \leq h < \rho^{-N_h}$. Writing

$$I(h;t) = \big(\rho^{N_h+1}h\big)^{-1}I\big(\rho^{-(N_h+1)};t\big) + h^{-1}\int_{t+\rho^{-(N_h+1)}}^{t+h} \big(Z(s) - Z(t)\big)\, ds,$$

it follows that

$$\liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1-h} \frac{|I(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)}$$

$$\geq \liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1-h} \left(\rho^{N_h+1}h\right)^{-1} \frac{\left|I\left(\rho^{-N_h+1};t\right)\right|}{\varphi(h)}$$

$$- \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1-h} \left(h\varphi(h)\right)^{-1} \int_{t+\rho^{-(N_h+1)}}^{t+h} |Z(s) - Z(t)| \, ds$$

$$\geq \rho^{-3/2}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} - \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\substack{0 \leq s,t \leq 1 \\ |s-t| \leq \rho^{-N_h}}} \left(\frac{h - \rho^{-(N_h+1)}}{h}\right) \frac{|Z(s) - Z(t)|}{\varphi(\rho^{-N_h})} \quad .$$

$$\geq \rho^{-3/2}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} - \sqrt{2}(\rho - 1)$$

by (2.1b). In the above, we have used the elementary inequality

$$\varphi(h) \leq \varphi\left(\rho^{-N_h}\right) = \left(1 + o(1)\right)\sqrt{\rho}\varphi\left(\rho^{-(N_h+1)}\right)$$

as $h \downarrow 0$. Since $\rho > 1$ is arbitrary, the lower bound follows by taking $\rho \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence; that is, we have

$$\liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1-h} \frac{|I(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The proof of the upper bound uses an entropy argument together with the upper estimate in (2.2). To this end, fix $\rho > 1$ and define

$$T_n \overset{\text{df}}{=} T_n(\theta, \varepsilon, \rho) = \{t \geq 0: t = j\rho^{-n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}n^2 \text{ for some integer } 0 \leq j \leq \rho^{n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}n^{-2}\}.$$

Notice that $\#T_n \leq C_3(\theta, \varepsilon)n^{-2}\rho^{n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}$, for some finite positive constant $C_3(\theta, \varepsilon)$. Therefore, by (2.2),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{t \in T_n} |I(\rho^{-n};t)| \geq \varphi(\rho^{-n})\sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}}\right) \leq C_2(\theta, \varepsilon)\#T_n\rho^{-n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}$$

$$\leq C_3(\theta, \varepsilon)C_2(\theta, \varepsilon)n^{-2},$$

which sums in n. So, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma, for each $\rho > 1$, $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and all $\theta > 0$,

(2.3) $$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \max_{t \in T_n} \frac{|I(\rho^{-n};t)|}{\varphi(\rho^{-n})} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}}.$$

Now

(2.4) $$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |I(\rho^{-n};t)| \leq \max_{t \in T_n} |I(\rho^{-n};t)| + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left|I(\rho^{-n};t) - I\left(\rho^{-n};f_n(t)\right)\right|,$$

where $f_n(t)$ is the point in T_n nearest to t (with some convention about breaking ties). We note that

$$\sup_{t \in T_n} |t - f_n(t)| = \rho^{-n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}n^2.$$

Therefore, by (2.1b),

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le 1} \left| I(\rho^{-n}; t) - I\left(\rho^{-n}; f_n(t)\right) \right| \le 2 \sup_{0 \le t \le 2} \left| Z(t) - Z\left(f_n(t)\right) \right|$$

$$= 2^{3/2}\left(1 + o(1)\right) \sqrt{\rho^{-n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}n^2 \log(\rho^{n\theta(1-\varepsilon)}n^{-2})}$$

$$= 2^{3/2}\left(1 + o(1)\right) \left(\theta(1-\varepsilon)\log\rho\right)^{1/2} \rho^{-n\theta(1-\varepsilon)/2}n^{3/2}$$

$$= o\left(\varphi(\rho^{-n})\right)$$

if $\theta > (1-\varepsilon)^{-1}$. Therefore, for all $\theta > (1-\varepsilon)^{-1}$, by (2.3) and (2.4), almost surely,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{0 \le t \le 1} \frac{|I(\rho^{-n}; t)|}{\varphi(\rho^{-n})} \le \sqrt{\frac{2\theta}{3}}.$$

Since $\theta > (1-\varepsilon)^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ are arbitrary, we have

$$(2.5) \qquad \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{0 \le t \le 1} \frac{|I(\rho^{-n}; t)|}{\varphi(\rho^{-n})} \le \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

It remains to show that the behavior of the lim sup in question is the same along any subsequence. To this end, fix $\rho > 1$ as above. For each $h > 0$ (small), there exists a unique integer, $N_h \ge 1$, such tht $\rho^{-(N_h+1)} \le h < \rho^{-N_h}$. Proceeding as in the proof of the lower bound,

$$I(h; t) = h^{-1} \int_t^{t+h} \left(Z(s) - Z(t) \right) ds$$

$$= h^{-1} \int_t^{t+\rho^{-(N_h+1)}} \left(Z(s) - Z(t)\right) ds + h^{-1} \int_{t+\rho^{-(N_h+1)}}^{t+h} \left(Z(s) - Z(t)\right) ds$$

$$= \left(\rho^{N_h+1}h\right)^{-1} I\left(\rho^{(N_h+1)}; t\right) + h^{-1} \int_{t+\rho^{-(N_h+1)}}^{t+h} \left(Z(s) - Z(t)\right) ds.$$

Therefore, by (2.1b), as $h \downarrow 0$ (and hence $N_h \uparrow \infty$), the following holds uniformly in $0 \le t \le 1$:

$$|I(h; t)| \le \left| I\left(\rho^{-(N_h+1)}; t\right) \right| + \rho(\rho - 1) \sup_{\substack{|s - t| \le \rho^{-N_h} \\ 0 \le s, t \le 1}} |Z(s) - Z(t)|$$

$$\le \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\left(1 + o(1)\right)\varphi\left(\rho^{-(N_h+1)}\right) + \sqrt{2}\rho(\rho - 1)\left(1 + o(1)\right)\varphi\left(\rho^{-N_h}\right).$$

Note that as $h \downarrow 0$, $\varphi(h) \geq \varphi(\rho^{-(N_h + 1)}) = (1 + o(1))\rho^{-1/2}\varphi(\rho^{-N_h})$. This implies that, for all $\rho > 1$,

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \frac{|I(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + \sqrt{2}\rho^{3/2}(\rho - 1).$$

Since $\rho > 1$ is arbitrary, the proof of Theorem 2.1(a) is complete upon taking $\rho \downarrow 1$ along a countable sequence. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1(b).   Fix $\alpha \geq 2$. Without loss of much generality, suppose that $T = [\varepsilon, 1]$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. For any $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1_+$, let $\mathcal{C}(E)$ denote the collection of all continuous functions from E into $\mathbb{R}^1$. As usual, we endow $\mathcal{C}(E)$ with the compact open topology. An application of Girsanov's theorem [see Revuz and Yor (1991), page 419, exercise (1.22)] reveals that for any $s, x > 0$ and for all measurable $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}([0, s])$,

$$(2.6) \qquad \mathbb{P}\big(\pi_s(\beta_\alpha) \in A \mid \beta_\alpha(0) = x\big) = x^{-(\alpha - 1)/2}\mathbb{E}\Big(D_s 1_A\big(\pi_s(X)\big) \mid Z(0) = x\Big),$$

where $T_0 \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \inf\{s \colon Z(s) = 0\}$,

$$D_s \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} Z(s \wedge T_0)^{(\alpha - 1)/2} \exp\bigg(-\frac{1}{8}(\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 3) \int_0^s Z(r)^{-2}\, dr\bigg),$$

and for any $s > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$, $\pi_s(f)$ denotes the element of $\mathcal{C}([0, s])$ given by

$$\pi_s(f)(r) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} f(r) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq r \leq s.$$

Taking A^c to be the collection of all elements, f, of $\mathcal{C}([0, 1])$ which satisfy:

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \frac{\big|h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} f(r)\, dr - f(t)\big|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}},$$

part (b) follows for $x > 0$ as a consequence of (2.6). It is therefore enough to prove part (b) when $x = 0$.

By the Markov property and the case $x > 0$ proved above, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1 - h} \frac{\big|h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} \beta_\alpha(r)\, dr - \beta_\alpha(t)\big|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This proves part (b). $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1(c).   Fix $\alpha \geq 2$. Suppose, without loss of much generality, that $T = [0, 1]$ and $x = 0$. Define

$$J(h;t) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} \beta_\alpha^2(r)\, dr,$$

$$\widetilde{J}(h;t) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} \big(\beta_\alpha(r) - \beta_\alpha(t)\big)\, dr.$$

Then, for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $h > 0$,

$$\frac{\left|J(h;t) - \beta_\alpha^2(t)\right|}{\varphi(h)} = 2\beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} + R(h;t),$$

where, by (2.1a), as $h \downarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} |R(h;t)| \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \frac{h^{-1}\int_t^{t+h} |\beta_\alpha(r) - \beta_\alpha(t)|^2\, dr}{\varphi(h)}$$

$$\leq 2\big(1 + o(1)\big)\varphi(h) \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

It is therefore enough to prove:

$$(2.7) \qquad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \beta_\alpha(t),$$

almost surely. Suppose, instead, that we could prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability 1,

$$(2.8) \qquad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1} \beta_\alpha(t).$$

It is not hard to see that (2.8) implies (2.7). Indeed, (2.8) would imply that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1} \beta_\alpha(t) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

which proves the lower bound in (2.7) by taking $\varepsilon \to 0$ along a countable sequence. [Recall that $t \mapsto \beta_\alpha(t)$ is almost surely continuous.] To see the upper bound in (2.7), note that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} \leq \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon} + \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1 - h}\right)\beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)}.$$

Therefore, by (2.8),

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} \leq \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon} \beta_\alpha(t)\frac{|\widetilde{J}(h;t)|}{\varphi(h)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1} \beta_\alpha(t)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon} \beta_\alpha(t) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \beta_\alpha(t),$$

by (2.1a). Since the left-hand side of the above inequalities is independent of ε and $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (2.7) follows by sample path continuity of $t \mapsto \beta_\alpha(t)$. Hence it is sufficient to prove (2.8) for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Recall that the compact set mentioned in part (b) is an arbitrary compact subset of $[\varepsilon, 1]$. As a result, by part (b) of Theorem 2.1, with probability 1,

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{a \le t \le b} \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \quad \text{for all rational } a, b: \varepsilon \le a < b \le 1.$$

By a condensation argument, this implies that the (random) set, $\widetilde{T}$, defined by

$$\widetilde{T} \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ \varepsilon \le t \le 1 \colon \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t)|}{\varphi(h)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \right\},$$

has a dense trace on $[\varepsilon, 1]$, with probability 1. (In other words, $\overline{\widetilde{T} \cap [\varepsilon, 1]} = [\varepsilon, 1]$, a.s.) Evidently, with probability 1,

$$\liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \le t \le 1 - h} \beta_\alpha(t) \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t_0)|}{\varphi(h)} \le \liminf_{h \downarrow 0} \beta_\alpha(t_0) \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t)|}{\varphi(h)}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \beta_\alpha(t_0)$$

for all $t_0 \in \widetilde{T} \cap [\varepsilon, 1]$. Here we have only used the definition of $\widetilde{T}$. Therefore, by the (a.s.) density of $\widetilde{T} \cap [\varepsilon, 1]$ in $[\varepsilon, 1]$ and the (a.s.) path continuity for $t \mapsto \beta_\alpha(t)$, the lower bound in (2.8) holds. The upper bound in (2.8) is even simpler, for

$$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \le t \le 1} \beta_\alpha(t) \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t)|}{\varphi(h)} \le \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \le t \le 1} \beta_\alpha(t) \sup_{\varepsilon \le t \le 1} \frac{|\widetilde{J}(h; t)|}{\varphi(h)}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sup_{\varepsilon \le t \le 1} \beta_\alpha(t),$$

by part (b). This completes the proof of (2.8) and hence part (c) of Theorem 2.1. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us enlarge the probability space so that it includes an exponential random variable, λ, which is independent of Z and whose mean is 2. Define,

$$m \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \inf_{0 \le r \le \lambda} Z(r) \quad \text{and} \quad M \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sup_{0 \le r \le \lambda} Z(r).$$

Let $x_0 > 0$ be fixed. Moreover, suppose we have enlarged the probability space even further so that it includes independent Bessel processes, $\beta_4, \widetilde{\beta}_4$ and β_2, with dimensions $4, 4$ and 2, respectively. The point is that these processes are totally independent of Z and λ as well as each other, except that they are conditioned to satisfy

$$\widetilde{\beta}_4(0) = \beta_4(0) = 0,$$
$$\beta_2(1) = \beta_4\left(1 - e^{2m}\right),$$
$$\widetilde{\beta}_4\left(e^{-2x_0} - e^{-2M}\right) = \beta_2\left(e^{2x_0}\right).$$

Then, according to Ray's description of $L_\lambda^{\cdot}$ [see Itô and McKean (1965) and Williams (1974)], one can construct a version of $L_\lambda^{\cdot}$ (which we shall continue to write as $L_\lambda^{\cdot}$, with the following realization:

$$(3.1) \qquad 2L_\lambda^x = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \le m \text{ or } x \ge M, \\ a(x) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} e^{-2x}\beta_4^2\big(e^{2x} - e^{2m}\big), & \text{if } m \le x \le 0, \\ b(x) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} e^{-2x}\beta_2^2\big(e^{2x}\big), & \text{if } 0 \le x \le x_0, \\ c(x) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} e^{2x}\widetilde{\beta}_4^2\big(e^{-2x} - e^{-2M}\big), & \text{if } x_0 \le x \le M, \end{cases}$$

conditioned on the event $\{Z(0) = x_0\}$. (We note here that our speed measure is half of that of Itô and McKean and hence their $4L_\lambda^{\cdot}$ is replaced by our $2L_\lambda^{\cdot}$.) Applying Theorem 2.1(c) to this version of $L_\lambda^{\cdot}$, we see that for any compact set $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1$, conditioned on $Z(0) = x_0 > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}\sup_{x \in T} \frac{\big|\varepsilon^{-1}\int_x^{x+\varepsilon} 2L_\lambda^x\, dx - 2L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi(\varepsilon)}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{8}{3}}\max\Big\{\sup_{m \le z \le 0} a^{1/2}(z),\ \sup_{0 \le z \le x_0} b^{1/2}(z),\ \sup_{x_0 \le z \le M} c^{1/2}(z)\Big\}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{16}{3}}\Big(\sup_{x \in T} L_\lambda^x\Big)^{1/2}.$$

By considering $-Z(\cdot)$ instead, since $\mathbb{P}(Z(\lambda) = 0) = 0$, we see from (1.3) that for all compact $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^1$, almost surely,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}\sup_{x \in T} \frac{\big|\varepsilon^{-1}\int_0^\lambda 1_{[x,x+\varepsilon]}\big(Z(r)\big)\, dr - L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi(\varepsilon)} = \Big(\frac{4}{3}\sup_{x \in T} L_\lambda^x\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}\sup_{|x| \le n} \frac{\big|\varepsilon^{-1}\int_0^\lambda 1_{[x,x+\varepsilon]}\big(Z(r)\big)\, dr - L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi(\varepsilon)} = \Big(\frac{4}{3}\sup_{|x| \le n} L_\lambda^x\Big)^{1/2} \text{ for all } n \ge 1\bigg) = 1.$$

Taking $n = n(\omega) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} M(\omega) \vee (-m(\omega))$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\sup_{|x| > n} L_\lambda^x = \sup_{|x| > n}\int_0^\lambda 1_{[x,x+\varepsilon]}\big(Z(r)\big)\, dr = 0,$$

almost surely. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(A(\lambda)) = 1$, where for all $t \ge 0$,

$$A(t) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \bigg\{\omega: \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0}\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|\varepsilon^{-1}\int_0^t 1_{[x,x+\varepsilon]}\big(Z(r)(\omega)\big)\, dr - L_t^x(\omega)\big|}{\varphi(\varepsilon)} = \Big(\frac{4}{3}L_t^*(\omega)\Big)^{1/2}\bigg\}.$$

By independence,

$$1 = \mathbb{P}\big(A(\lambda)\big) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\big(A(t)\big)\mathbb{P}(\lambda \in dt)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\big(A(t)\big)e^{-t/2}\,dt.$$

Let $u > 0$ be any positive real number. By considering $u\lambda$ instead of λ, the above analysis together with Brownian scaling shows that, for all $u > 0$,

$$1 = \frac{1}{2u}\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\big(A(t)\big)e^{-t/(2u)}\,dt.$$

Therefore, by the inversion theorem for Laplace transforms, $\mathbb{P}(A(t)) = 1$ for all $t > 0$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3. By Brownian scaling, it suffices to consider only the case $t = 1$. Furthermore, since, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$L_t^x = u_\varepsilon(x,t) = 0 \quad \text{on } \{t \le T_x\},$$

by considering the Brownian motion $\{\vartheta_{T_x}(Z)(t); \ t \ge 0\}$, it suffices to prove the theorem when $x = 0$.

For every $w > 0$, define $\mathbb{Q}_w(\cdots)$ to be a nice version of the regular conditional probability, $\mathbb{P}(\cdots \mid L_1^0 = w)$. In light of the above discussion, it is evidently sufficient to prove that, for all $w > 0$,

$$(4.1) \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{|2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(0,1) - w|}{\psi(\varepsilon)} = 2w^{1/2}, \quad \mathbb{Q}_w\text{-a.s.,}$$

where $\psi(h) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{h(1 \vee \log\log(1/h))}$, as in Section 3.

Define the inverse local times by

$$(4.2\mathrm{a}) \qquad\qquad \tau_t^x \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \inf\big\{s > 0 \colon L_s^x = t\big\},$$

$$(4.2\mathrm{b}) \qquad\qquad \tau(t) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \tau_t^0.$$

Also define the excursion process, $\{e_s^x(\,\cdot\,); \ s \ge 0\}$ of (Z) from x as follows:

$$e_s^x(r) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \begin{cases} Z\big(\tau_{s-}^x + r\big), & \text{if } 0 < r \le \tau_s^x - \tau_{s-}^x, \\ x, & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \delta, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where δ is the "coffin state." The reader will note that $\{e_s^x(\,\cdot\,); \ s \ge 0\}$ is a stochastic process whose state space is $U_x \cup \{\delta\}$, where

$$U_x \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \Big\{f \in \mathfrak{C}\big([0,\infty)\big) \colon f(0) = x \text{ and } f(u) = x \text{ for all } u \ge R_x^f \text{ for some } R_x^f\Big\}.$$

The σ-field on U_x is the one inherited from $\mathfrak{C}([0, \infty))$. For any $t \geq 0$ and all measurable $A \subseteq U_x$, define $N_t^x(A) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sum_{s \leq t} 1_A(e_s^x)$. We note that $N_t^x(A)$ is at most a countable sum and hence well defined. Define the corresponding Itô measure, n^x, by $n^x(A) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \mathbb{E} N_1^x(A)$. It is not hard to see that $\{N_t^x(A);\ t \geq 0\}$ is a Poisson process with intensity $n^x(A)$, if the latter is finite. In this case, $\{N_t^x(A) - n^x(A)t;\ t \geq 0\}$ is a mean-zero martingale and hence a monotone class argument implies the following "exit system formula" for all $t > 0$:

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{s \leq t} Y(s) f(e_s^0) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t Y(s) n^{Z(s)}(f) L_{ds}^0,$$

for all bounded (say) predictable processes, (Y), and all bounded measurable functions, $f: \cup_x U_x \cup \{\delta\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^1$, such that $f(\delta) = 0$. Here, as is customary, $n^x(f) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \int_{U_x \cup \{\delta\}} f(e) n^x(de)$. One can write a similar equation for excursions from any other $x \neq 0$. Moreover, by the exit system formula, under $\mathbb{Q}_w$, $N_w^0(A)$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $n^0(A)w$.

Fix $w > 0$ throughout and define

$$A(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ f \in U_0 \colon \sup_{0 \leq r \leq R_0^f} f(r) \geq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Since $|u_\varepsilon(0, 1) - N_{L_1^0}^0(A(\varepsilon))| \leq 1$, it is sufficient [by (4.1) and the preceding discussion] to prove that

$$(4.3) \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{|2\varepsilon N_w^0(A(\varepsilon)) - w|}{\psi(w)} = 2w^{1/2}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

It is (4.3) that we shall prove; but first, we next need two technical lemmas.

LEMMA 4.1. *Suppose $\{X(\alpha);\ \alpha \geq 0\}$ is an $\mathbb{R}_+^1$-valued stochastic process satisfying the following for every $\alpha \geq 0$:*

(a) $\mathbb{E} X(\alpha) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \mu(\alpha) < \infty$;

(b) $\operatorname{Var} X(\alpha) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sigma^2(\alpha) < \infty$;

(c) *For all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E} \exp(itX(\alpha)) = (f(t))^\alpha$, where f is a characteristic function (independent of α).*

Then, uniformly over $x = o(\alpha^{1/6})$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(|X(\alpha) - \mu(\alpha)| \geq x\sigma(\alpha)\big) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} x^{-1} \exp\left(\frac{-x^2}{2}\right) \big(1 + o(1)\big).$$

PROOF. This lemma is a trivial modification of a large deviations theorem of Cramér. See theorem 8.1.1. of Ibragimov and Linnik (1971) for Petrov's refinement of this result. □

LEMMA 4.2. *Fix $w > 0$ and $\theta > 0$. Then, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\big|2\varepsilon N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w\big| \geq 2\sqrt{\theta w}\psi(\varepsilon)\Big) = \frac{\sqrt{2/\pi}}{\big(2\theta \log\log(1/\varepsilon)\big)^{1/2}\big(\log(1/\varepsilon)\big)^{\theta}}\big(1 + o(1)\big).$$

PROOF. Fix $\theta > 0$ and let $X(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} N_w^0(A(\varepsilon))$. Then, by the discussion preceding Lemma 4.1, $\{X(\varepsilon);\ \varepsilon > 0\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 with $\mu(\varepsilon) = \sigma^2(\varepsilon) = n^0(A(\varepsilon))$, which is equal to $(2\varepsilon)^{-1}$ by Proposition XII.3.6 of Revuz and Yor (1991). Hence, by Lemma 4.1, uniformly over all $x = o(\varepsilon^{-1/12})$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\big|N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - (w/2\varepsilon)\big| \geq \sqrt{w/(2\varepsilon)}x\Big) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}x^{-1}\exp\Big(\frac{-x^2}{2}\Big)\big(1 + o(1)\big)$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. The lemma follows upon letting $x \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{2\theta \log\log(1/\varepsilon)}$. □

Now we can complete the proof of (4.3) and hence Theorem 1.3. As in the proof of the law of the iterated logarithm for Brownian motion, the proof consists of establishing an upper bound as well as a lower bound. We shall start by proving the former.

Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and let $\rho(n) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^n$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, for any $\theta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Big|2\rho(n)N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n)\big)\Big) - w\Big| \geq 2\sqrt{\theta w}\,\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)\Bigg)$$

$$= (\theta\pi \log n)^{-1/2}\Bigg(n \log\Big(\frac{1}{\rho}\Big)\Bigg)^{-\theta}\big(1 + o(1)\big)$$

as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma, for all $\theta > 1$,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\Big|2\rho(n)N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n)\big)\Big) - w\Big|}{\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)} \leq 2\sqrt{\theta w} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Taking $\theta \downarrow 1$ along a countable sequence, it follows that

(4.4)
$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\Big|2\rho(n)N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n)\big)\Big) - w\Big|}{\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)} \leq 2\sqrt{w} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Now, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists an integer N_ε such that $\rho(N_\varepsilon + 1) \leq \varepsilon \leq \rho(N_\varepsilon)$. By sample path continuity, every time Z upcrosses $[0, \varepsilon]$, it has also upcrossed $[0, \rho(N_\varepsilon + 1)]$. Therefore, $N_w^0(A(\varepsilon)) \leq N_w^0(A(\rho(N_\varepsilon + 1)))$. Likewise, $N_w^0(A(\varepsilon)) \geq N_w^0(A(\rho(N_\varepsilon)))$. Hence, by (4.4) and some arithmetic,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\big|2\varepsilon N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w\big|}{\psi(\varepsilon)} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{w}{\rho}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary, we can take $p \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence to arrive at the desired upper bound in (4.3):

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| 2\varepsilon N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w \right|}{\psi(\varepsilon)} \leq 2\sqrt{w} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Next we prove the lower bound, thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.3. Throughout the rest of this proof, let us redefine $\rho(n)$ by $\rho(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} n^{-n}$. The key lemma is the following.

LEMMA 4.3. *With probability* 1,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left| \rho(n+1) N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n+1)\big) \Big) - \rho(n) N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n)\big) \Big) \right|}{\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)} = \sqrt{w}.$$

Assuming the truth of this lemma for the time being, (4.3) and hence Theorem 1.3 follow from the following inequalities:

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| 2\varepsilon N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w \right|}{\psi(w)}$$

(4.6)
$$\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left| 2\rho(n) N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n)\big) \Big) - w \right|}{\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)}$$

$$\geq 2\sqrt{w} - 2 \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left| \rho(n+1) N_w^0\Big(A\big(\rho(n+1)\big) \Big) - w \right|}{\psi\big(\rho(n)\big)}$$

$$= 2\sqrt{w}.$$

In proving (4.6), we have used Lemma 4.3 together with the proven upper bound in (4.3) as well as the fact that $\psi(\rho(n+1))/\psi(\rho(n)) = (en)^{-1/2}(1 + o(1)) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.3. Recall that $\rho(n) = n^{-n}$ and $w > 0$ is fixed. To simplify the notation, let us define $N(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} N_w^0(A(\rho(n)))$ and $\psi_n \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \psi(\rho(n))$. From the exit system formula, it follows that, conditioned on $\{ N(n) = k \}$,

$$N(n+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Delta_{j,n},$$

where $\{\Delta_{j,n}; \ j \geq 1\}$ are i.i.d. geometric random variables with distribution given by

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_{1,n} = j) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \dfrac{\rho(n+1)}{\rho(n)} \right)^{j-1} \left(\dfrac{\rho(n+1)}{\rho(n)} \right), & \text{if } j = 1, 2, \ldots, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, in particular,

$$(4.6a) \qquad\qquad \mathbb{E}\Delta_{1,n} = \frac{\rho(n)}{\rho(n+1)},$$

$$(4.6b) \qquad\qquad \operatorname{Var}\Delta_{1,n} = \frac{(\rho(n) - \rho(n+1))\rho(n)}{\rho^2(n+1)}.$$

Let $\widetilde{\Delta}_{j,n} \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \Delta_{j,n} - \mathbb{E}\Delta_{j,n}$. For $\theta > 0$, define

$$(4.7a) \qquad E_\theta(n) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ \omega : \frac{|\rho(n+1)N(n+1) - \rho(n)N(n)|(\omega)}{\psi_n} \geq \theta\sqrt{w} \right\},$$

$$(4.7b) \qquad \widetilde{E}(n) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^1 : |2k\rho(n) - w| \geq 2\sqrt{2w\rho(n)\log n} \right\}.$$

Since $N(n)$ is Poisson with mean $w(2\rho(n))^{-1}$, Lemma 4.2 implies that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(N(n) \notin \widetilde{E}(n)\big) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}}(\log n)^{-1/2}n^{-2}(1 + o(1))$$

$$(4.7c)$$

$$= o\big(n^{-2}\big).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n)\big) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n) \mid N(n) = k\big)\mathbb{P}\big(N(n) = k\big)$$

$$= \sum_{k \notin \widetilde{E}(n)} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\Delta}_{j,n} \right| \geq \frac{\theta\sqrt{w}\psi_n}{\rho(n+1)}\right)\mathbb{P}\big(N(n) = k\big) + o\big(n^{-2}\big).$$

Now fix $\theta \in (1, \sqrt{2})$. Next we will prove that, uniformly over all $k \notin \widetilde{E}(n)$,

$$(4.8) \qquad \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\Delta}_{j,n} \right| \geq \frac{\theta\sqrt{w}}{\rho(n+1)}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}\theta}(\log n)^{-1/2}n^{-\theta^2}(1 + o(1)).$$

Indeed, by (4.6b), for all $k \notin \widetilde{E}(n)$,

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta_{j,n} \right) = \frac{w\rho(n)}{2\rho^2(n+1)}(1 + o(\alpha_n)),$$

where $\alpha_n \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} n^{-(n-1)/2}(\log n)^{1/2}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\Delta}_{j,n} \right| \geq \frac{\theta\sqrt{w}\psi_n}{\rho(n+1)}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|S_{k,n}| \geq \theta\sqrt{2(1 + o(\alpha_n))\log n}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(|S_{k,n}| \geq \theta\sqrt{2}\frac{\psi_n}{\sqrt{\rho(n)}}\right)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\theta}}(\log n)^{-1/2}n^{-\theta^2}(1 + o(1)),$$

proving (4.8). In the above, we have applied Lemma 4.1 to the normalized sum

$$S_{k,n} \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left(\mathrm{Var} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\Delta}_{i,n} \right)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\Delta}_{j,n}.$$

As a result, (4.7c) and (4.9) together imply the following:

$$(4.9) \qquad \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n) \big) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}} (\log n)^{-1/2} n^{-\theta^2} \big(1 + o(1) \big).$$

In particular, picking $\theta \in (1, \sqrt{2})$, we see that $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(E_\theta(n)) < \infty$, and hence by the Borel–Cantelli lemma—letting $\theta \downarrow 1$ along a countable sequence—it follows that, with probability 1,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\rho(n+1) N(n+1) - \rho(n) N(n)|}{\psi_n} \leq \sqrt{w},$$

which proves the upper half of Lemma 4.3.

For the lower half, fix any $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Then, by (4.9),

$$(4.10) \qquad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n) \big) = \infty.$$

By the strong Markov property (or by using the exit system formula), conditioned on $N(n+m)$, $E_\theta(n+m)$ and $E_\theta(n)$ are independent. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n+m) \cap E_\theta(n) \big)$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n+m) \,|\, N(n+m) = k \big)$$

$$(4.11) \qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n) \,|\, N(n+m) = k \big) \mathbb{P}\big(N(n+m) = k \big)$$

$$= \sum_{k \notin \tilde{E}(n+m)} (\cdots) + o\big((n+m)^{-2} \big),$$

by (4.7c). By (4.8), however, uniformly over all $k \notin \widetilde{E}(n+m)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n+m) \,|\, N(n+m) = k \big) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}} \big(\log(n+m) \big)^{-1/2} (n+m)^{-\theta^2} \big(1 + o(1) \big).$$

Therefore, by (4.11), (4.9) and (4.7c),

$$\mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n+m) \cap E_\theta(n) \big) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\theta}} \big(\log(n+m) \big)^{-1/2} (n+m)^{-\theta^2}$$

$$(4.12) \qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n);\ N(n+m) \notin \widetilde{E}(n+m) \big) \big(1 + o(1) \big)$$

$$= \big(1 + o(1) \big) \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n+m) \big) \mathbb{P}\big(E_\theta(n) \big).$$

Hence, by Kochen and Stone (1964), (4.10) and (4.12) imply that $\mathbb{P}(E_\theta(n), \text{i.o.}) = 1$. Taking $\theta \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence, we arrive at the lower bound in Lemma 4.3. This completes the proof. $\square$

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let λ be an exponential holding time—independent of the process Z—such that $\mathbb{E}\lambda = 1$. We shall start with some technical lemmas.

LEMMA 5.1. *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $\mathbb{P}(T_x < \lambda) = \exp\left(-\sqrt{2}|x|\right)$.*

PROOF. Since $\mathbb{P}(T_0 = 0) = 1$, it suffices to prove the lemma for $x > 0$. By the independence of T_x and λ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda > T_x) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\lambda > a)\mathbb{P}(T_x \in da) = \mathbb{E}\exp(-T_x).$$

Now, from Itô's formula [see Theorem IV.3.3 of Revuz and Yor (1991)],

$$\left\{ \exp\left(\sqrt{2}Z(t \wedge T_x) - T_x \wedge t\right); \ t \geq 0 \right\}$$

is a positive bounded martingale. Therefore, by the Doob optional stopping theorem, $\mathbb{E}\exp(-T_x) = \exp(-\sqrt{2}x)$. The result follows. $\square$

LEMMA 5.2. *For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x > a) = \exp\left(-\sqrt{2}(|x| + a)\right)1_{(0,\infty)}(a) + \left(1 - \exp(-\sqrt{2}|x|)\right)1_{\{0\}}(a).$$

PROOF. We first write

$$(5.1) \qquad \mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x > a) = \mathbb{E}\left(1_{[0,\lambda)}(T_x)\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x > a \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_x})\right).$$

However, on $\{\omega: T_x(\omega) < \lambda(\omega)\}$: $\lambda = T_x + \vartheta_{T_x}(\lambda)$, almost surely (the notation being obvious). Since $t \mapsto L_t^x$ is an additive functional, it follows that on $\{\omega: T_x(\omega) < \lambda(\omega)\}$: $L_\lambda^x = L_{T_x}^x + \vartheta_{T_x}(L_{\lambda - T_x}^x) = \vartheta_{T_x}(L_\lambda^x)$. Therefore, if $a > 0$, by (5.1),

$$(5.2) \qquad \mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x > a) = \mathbb{P}(T_x < \lambda)\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a).$$

It remains to compute $\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a)$. First off, for any $a, b > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a + b) = \mathbb{P}(\tau(b) \leq \lambda, \ L_\lambda^0 > a + b),$$

where $\tau(\cdot)$ is the inverse local time at 0 as defined in (4.2b). But, by independence, on $\{\omega: \tau(b)(\omega) \leq \lambda\}$: $\lambda = \tau(b) + \vartheta_{\tau(b)}(\lambda)$, almost surely. Therefore, on $\{\tau(b) \leq \lambda\}$: $L_\lambda^0 = L_{\tau(b)}^0 + \vartheta_{\tau(b)}(L_\lambda^0) = b + \vartheta_{\tau(b)}(L_\lambda^0)$. Since $Z(\tau(b)) = 0$, a.s., we see from the strong Markov property that

$$\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a + b) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(b) \leq \lambda, \ \vartheta_{\tau(b)}(L_\lambda^0) > a\right) = \mathbb{P}(\tau(b) \leq \lambda)\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 \geq b)\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a).$$

Evidently, $\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 = \infty) = 0$. From this fact, it follows that L_λ^0 has an exponential distribution. To compute its mean, we recall that, by Tanaka's formula [see Theorem VI.1.2 of Revuz and Yor (1991)],

$$|Z(\lambda)| = \int_0^\lambda \mathrm{sgn}(Z(s)) \, dZ(s) + L_\lambda^0.$$

Since the stochastic integral in question has mean 0,

$$\mathbb{E}L_\lambda^0 = \mathbb{E}|Z(\lambda)| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \mathbb{E}\sqrt{\lambda} = 2^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 > a) = \exp(-\sqrt{2}a)1_{[0,\infty)}(a)$. If $x \neq 0$ and $a > 0$, by (5.2) and Lemma 5.1,

$$\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x > a) = \exp\left(-\sqrt{2}(a + |x|)\right).$$

If $a = 0$, $\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^x = 0) = \mathbb{P}(T_x \geq \lambda) = 1 - \exp(-\sqrt{2}|x|)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $\theta > 0$ be fixed. Then, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x}, \, T_x < \lambda\right)$$

$$= \left(\theta\pi \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^\theta \exp(-\sqrt{2}|x|)(1 + o(1)),$$

where the $o(1)$ term is independent of $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$.

PROOF. Using the excursion theory notation [cf. the paragraph following (4.2)], let us define

(5.3) $$A(\varepsilon) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \left\{ f \in U_x: \sup_{0 \leq r \leq R_x^f} f(r) \geq x + \varepsilon \right\}.$$

(One can alternatively take the union over the rationals to avoid measurability problems.) As noted earlier, almost surely, $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} |N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(A(\varepsilon)) - u_\varepsilon(x, \lambda)| \leq 1$. Therefore, by increasing θ a little bit, we see that it suffices to prove the lemma with $N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(A(\varepsilon))$ replacing $u_\varepsilon(x, \lambda)$. Since $N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(A(\varepsilon)) = \vartheta_{T_x}(N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(A(\varepsilon)))$ and

$L_\lambda^x = \vartheta_{T_x}(L_\lambda^x)$, an application of the strong Markov property shows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|2\varepsilon N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - L_\lambda^x\right| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x},\ T_x < \lambda\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(T_x < \lambda)\mathbb{P}\left(\left|2\varepsilon N_{L_\lambda^0}^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - L_\lambda^0\right| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^0}\right)$$

$$= e^{-\sqrt{2}|x|}\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\left|2\varepsilon N_w^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - w\right| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{w\theta}\right)\mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 \in dw)$$
$$\text{(by Lemma 5.1)}$$

$$= e^{-\sqrt{2}|x|}\left(\int_0^{\theta\log(1/\varepsilon)} + \int_{\theta\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty\right)$$
$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|2\varepsilon N_w^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - w\right| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{w\theta}\right)\sqrt{2}e^{-\sqrt{2}w}\,dw$$
$$\text{(by Lemma 5.2)}$$

$$\stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{2}e^{-\sqrt{2}|x|}\int_0^{\theta\log(1/\varepsilon)}\mathbb{P}(\cdots)e^{-\sqrt{2}w}\,dw + R(x,\varepsilon),$$

where $R(x,\varepsilon) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and satisfies

$$(5.4) \qquad \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^1} R(x,\varepsilon) \leq \sqrt{2}\int_{\theta\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \exp(-\sqrt{2}w)\,dw = \varepsilon^{\sqrt{2}\theta}.$$

On the other hand, as pointed out in Section 4, $N_w^0(A(\varepsilon))$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $w/2\varepsilon$. Therefore, proceeding as in Lemma 4.2, by Lemma 4.1, uniformly over all $w \in (0, \theta\log(1/\varepsilon))$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|2\varepsilon N_w^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - w\right| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{w\theta}\right) = \left(\theta\pi\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^\theta\left(1 + o(1)\right)$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. This and (5.4) together completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

We are ready to prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.5. Fix $R, \eta, \theta > 0$ and define

$$K(\varepsilon,\eta,R) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{s \in \mathbb{R}^1\colon s \in \varepsilon^\eta\left(\mathbb{Z}^1 \cap [-R,R]\right)\right\},$$

$$G(x;\theta,\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{\omega\colon |2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x,\lambda)(\omega) - L_\lambda^x(\omega)| \geq 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x(\omega)}\right\}.$$

It is clear that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/10)$, $\#K(\varepsilon,\eta,R) \leq C_4(\eta,R)\varepsilon^{-\eta}$, where $C_4(\eta,R)$ is a positive finite constant. Lemma 5.3 guarantees the existence of a positive

finite constant $C_5(\theta, \eta, R)$, such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/10)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{x \in K(\varepsilon, \eta, R)} G(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \cap \{T_x < \lambda\}\right)$$

$$\leq \#K(\varepsilon, \eta, R) \max_{x \in K(\varepsilon, \eta, R)} \mathbb{P}\left(G(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \cap \{T_x < \lambda\}\right)$$

$$\leq C_5(\theta, \eta, R)\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{\theta - \eta}.$$

Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\eta > 1$ and $\theta > \eta$. Replacing ε by $\rho(n) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^n$ in the above, it follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{x \in K(\rho(n), \eta, R)} G(x; \theta, \rho(n)) \cap \{T_x < \lambda\}\right)$$

$$\leq C_6(\theta, \eta, R, \rho) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho^{n(\theta - n)}(\log n)^{-1/2} < \infty$$

for some positive finite constant $C_6(\theta, \eta, R, \rho)$. However, on the set $\{T_x \geq \lambda\}$, $e_\varepsilon(x, \lambda) = L_\lambda^x = 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the null set being independent of $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Moreover, it is trivial that, for all ω, $\sup_{x \in K(\varepsilon, \eta, R)} L_\lambda^x(\omega) \leq L_\lambda^*(\omega)$. Therefore, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma, the following holds with probability 1:

$$(5.5) \qquad \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in K(\rho(n), \eta, R)} \frac{\left|2\rho(n)u_{\rho(n)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right|}{\varphi(\rho(n))} \leq 2\left(\theta \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} L_\lambda^x\right)^{1/2}.$$

Let $x \in [-R, R]$. By $f_n(x)$ we shall mean the element of $K(\rho(n), \eta, R)$ which is the closest to x. To make this choice unique, we shall require that $f_n(x) \leq x$. We further point out that $\sup_{x \in [-R, R]} |x - f_n(x)| = \rho^{\eta n}$. By (1.3), the uniform modulus of continuity of $x \mapsto L_\lambda^x$ implies that, with probability 1,

$$(5.6) \qquad \begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [-R, R]} \left|L_\lambda^x - L_\lambda^{f_n(x)}\right| &= O\left(\sqrt{|x - f_n(x)| \log|x - f_n(x)|^{-1}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\rho^{n\eta/2}\sqrt{\log n}\right) \\ &= o\left(\varphi(\rho(n))\right) \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$. On the other hand, since $K(\varepsilon, \rho(n), R) \subseteq K(\varepsilon, \rho(n+1), R)$ and $t \mapsto Z(t)$ is continuous (a.s.),

$$u_{\rho(n)}\left(f_n(x), \lambda\right) \leq u_{\rho(n+1)}(x, \lambda) \leq u_{\rho(n+1)}\left(f_n\left(x + \rho(n)^\eta\right), \lambda\right).$$

The above, together with (5.5) and (5.6), implies that, almost surely,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in [-R, R]} \frac{\left|2\rho(n)u_{\rho(n)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right|}{\varphi(\rho(n))} \leq 2\left(\theta L_\lambda^*\right)^{1/2}.$$

We recall that $\eta, R > 0$, $\theta > \eta$ and $\rho \in (0,1)$ were arbitrary. Arguing as in the previous section, it follows that

$$(5.7) \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left| 2\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x \right|}{\varphi(\varepsilon)} \leq 2 \left(L_\lambda^* \right)^{1/2}.$$

By scaling, the above still holds if λ is an exponential holding time with mean u, for any $u > 0$. Therefore, by considering inverse Laplace transforms, as in the end of Section 3, the upper bound follows; that is, (5.7) holds with λ replaced by any fixed $t > 0$.

To conclude, we next provide a proof for the lower bound corresponding to (5.7). Throughout, fix $M > 1$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ define

$$A(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \left\{ f \in U_x \colon \sup_{0 \leq r \leq R_x^f} f(r) \in [x + \varepsilon, x + M\varepsilon) \right\}.$$

Thus the excursions in $A(x, \varepsilon)$ are exactly those which have upcrossed $[x, x + \varepsilon]$ but not $[x, x + M\varepsilon]$. Let $N(x, \varepsilon)$ denote the corresponding counting measure to $A(x, \varepsilon)$, that is,

$$N(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} N_{L_\lambda^x}^x \left(A(x, \varepsilon) \right).$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and all $\varepsilon, \theta > 0$, define

$$\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \left\{ \omega \colon \left| 2\varepsilon N(x, \varepsilon)(\omega) - \left(1 - M^{-1}\right) L_\lambda^x(\omega) \right| \leq 2\varphi(\varepsilon) \sqrt{\theta \left(1 - M^{-1}\right) L_\lambda^x(\omega)} \right\}.$$

Note that:

(R1) When M is large, the collection $\widetilde{G}$ is approximately the same as the complement of G where the latter was defined earlier in this section.

(R2) For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\varepsilon, \theta > 0$, on the set $\{T_x \leq \lambda\}$, $\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon) = \vartheta_{T_x}(\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon))$, almost surely.

(R3) Fix $w > 0$. Then, given $\{L_\lambda^x = w\}$, we have $T_x \leq \lambda$, almost surely, since the support of $t \mapsto L_t^x$ is with probability 1 equal to $\{s \colon Z(s) = x\}$.

(R4) Fix $w > 0$ and $x \geq M\varepsilon$. Then, given $\{L_\lambda^x = w\}$, $N(x, \varepsilon)$ is independent of L_λ^0 and $N(0, \varepsilon)$. This is a consequence of the exit system formula and the fact that $A(x, \varepsilon) \cap A(0, \varepsilon) = \varnothing$.

Next we state and prove two lemmas which shall be of use in the proof of the lower bound.

LEMMA 5.4. *Fix* $w, x > 0$. *Then there exists an i.i.d. sequence of random variables*, $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots\}$, *which are exponentially distributed with mean* $2x$ *and an independent random variable*, N, *such that* $N - 1$ *is Poisson with mean* $w/2x$ *and that, given* $\{L_\lambda^x = w\}$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} \delta_j \leq L_\lambda^0 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N+1} \delta_j,$$

almost surely.

PROOF. Let $U_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} 0$ and iteratively define

$$U_{2j+1} \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} U_{2j} + \vartheta_{U_{2j}}(T_x), \qquad j \geq 0,$$

$$U_{2j} \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} U_{2j-1} + \vartheta_{U_{2j-1}}(T_0), \qquad j \geq 1.$$

Then the U_i's are the upcrossing times of the interval $[0,x]$. Since the support of the increasing function $t \mapsto L_\lambda^0$ is almost surely the set $\{s: Z(s) = 0\}$,

$$L_\lambda^0 = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \left(L_{U_{2j+1}}^0 - L_{U_{2j}}^0 \right) + \left(L_\lambda^0 - L_{U_{2N+1}}^0 \right)$$

$$\stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \delta_j + \left(L_\lambda^0 - L_{U_{2N+1}}^0 \right),$$

where $N \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \max\{j: U_{2j+1} \leq \lambda\}$. Note that $N-1$ is the number of downcrossings of $[0,x]$ before time λ. Therefore, by the exit system formula, given $\{L_\lambda^x = w\}$, $N-1$ is Poisson with mean $w/2x$. Moreover, given $\{L_\lambda^x = w\}$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} \delta_j \leq L_\lambda^0 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N+1} \delta_j,$$

and the δ_i's are i.i.d. exponential and are independent of N. It remains to compute the mean of δ_1. By Tanaka's formula [Theorem VI.1.2 of Revuz and Yor (1991)],

$$Z(t)^+ = \int_0^t 1_{(0,\infty)}(Z(s)) \, dZ(s) + \tfrac{1}{2} L_t^0.$$

The above and Doob's optional sampling theorem together imply that $\mathbb{E}\delta_1 = \mathbb{E}L_{T_x}^0 = 2x$. The lemma follows. $\square$

LEMMA 5.5. *With the notation of Lemma 5.4, for all* $\xi \in (0, (2x)^{-1})$,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left(\xi \sum_{j=0}^{N+1} \delta_j \right) = (1 - 2x\xi)^{-3} \exp\left(\frac{w\xi}{1 - 2x\xi} \right).$$

The proof of Lemma 5.5 is omitted as it only involves basic calculations with gamma distributions.

We are ready to proceed with the proof of the lower bound. Fix for now $\varepsilon \in (0, M^{-1})$, some $x \in [M\varepsilon, 1]$ and an arbitrary $\theta \in (0,1)$. For typographical ease, we shall suppress the θ and ε in the definition of $\widetilde{G}$; that is, we write $\widetilde{G}(x)$

for $\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon)$. We first estimate $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \cap \widetilde{G}(x) \cap \{T_x \le \lambda\})$. Indeed,

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \cap \widetilde{G}(x) \cap \{T_x \le \lambda\})$$

$$= \sqrt{2} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \cap \widetilde{G}(x) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}(x+w)) \, dw \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.2)}$$

$$= \sqrt{2} e^{-\sqrt{2}x} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(x) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw \quad \text{[by (R4)]}$$

$$\le \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^\varepsilon + \int_\varepsilon^{2\log(1/\varepsilon)} + \int_{2\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \right)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(x) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw$$

$$\le \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^\varepsilon + \int_\varepsilon^{2\log(1/\varepsilon)} + \int_{2\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \right)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw.$$

The last statement follows from the strong Markov property and (R2). Thus it suffices to estimate separately the following terms:

$$(5.8a) \quad E_1(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{2} \int_0^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw,$$

$$(5.8b) \quad E_2(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{2} \int_\varepsilon^{2\log(1/\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw,$$

$$(5.8c) \quad E_3(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \sqrt{2} \int_{2\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw.$$

Estimating E_1 and E_3 is easy. Indeed,

$$(5.9a) \qquad\qquad E_1(\varepsilon) \le \sqrt{2}\varepsilon,$$

$$(5.9b) \qquad\qquad E_3(\varepsilon) \le \sqrt{2} \int_{2\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \exp(-\sqrt{2}w) \, dw = \varepsilon^{2\sqrt{2}} \le \varepsilon.$$

We shall next estimate the terms in E_2. First, we note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left| 2\varepsilon N_w^0(A(0, \varepsilon)) - w \right| \le 2\varphi(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta(1 - M^{-1})w} \right),$$

and $N_w^0(A(0, \varepsilon))$ is Poisson with mean $n^0(A(0, \varepsilon)) = n^0(A(\varepsilon)) - n^0(A(M\varepsilon)) = (w/2\varepsilon)$ $(1 - M^{-1})$, where $A(\varepsilon)$ is given by (5.3). Therefore, as in Lemma 4.2,

$$(5.10) \qquad \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = w) = 1 - \left(\theta\pi \log(1/\varepsilon) \right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^\theta (1 + o(1)),$$

uniformly over all $w \in (0, 2\log(1/\varepsilon))$. To estimate the other terms in $E_2(\varepsilon)$, we note that, for all $w \in (0, 2\log(1/\varepsilon))$ and all $x \ge M\varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0), L_\lambda^0 \in dz \mid L_\lambda^x = w)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = z) \mathbb{P}(L_\lambda^0 \in dz \mid L_\lambda^x = w),$$

since, by the exit system formula, $\widetilde{G}(0)$ is independent of L_λ^x, conditioned on L_λ^0. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^x = w\big) =$$

(5.11)
$$\left(\int_0^{4\log(1/\varepsilon)} + \int_{4\log(1/\varepsilon)}^\infty \right) \mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = z\big) \mathbb{P}\big(L_\lambda^0 \in dz \mid L_\lambda^x = w\big)$$

$$\stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} E_4(\varepsilon, w) + E_5(\varepsilon, w).$$

By Lemma 5.4, for all $\xi \in (0, (2x)^{-1})$,

$$E_5(\varepsilon, w) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{N+1} \delta_j \geq 4\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right)$$

$$\leq (1 - 2x\xi)^{-3} \exp\left(\frac{w\xi}{1 - 2x\xi} - 4\xi\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right).$$

Pick $\xi \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} (2x)^{-1}(1 - \sqrt{w/4\log(1/\varepsilon)})$. We get the following estimate for E_5:

$$E_5(\varepsilon, w) \leq \left(\frac{4\log(1/\varepsilon)}{w} \right)^{3/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2x}\left(\sqrt{w} - \sqrt{4\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)} \right)^2 \right).$$

Since $\theta \in (0,1)$, uniformly over all $x \in [M\varepsilon, 1]$,

(5.12)
$$\sup_{\varepsilon \leq w \leq 2\log(1/\varepsilon)} E_5(\varepsilon, w) \leq \left(4\varepsilon^{-1}\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right)^{3/2} \exp\big(-(2x\varepsilon)^{-1}\big)$$

$$\leq C_7(M)\varepsilon$$

for some finite positive constant $C_7(M)$. Furthermore, as in Lemma 4.2, uniformly over all $z \in (0, 4\log(1/\varepsilon))$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0) \mid L_\lambda^0 = z\big) = 1 - \left(\theta\pi \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^\theta \big(1 + o(1)\big),$$

where the $o(1)$ term is independent of $x \geq M\varepsilon$. Hence, uniformly over all w and all $x \geq M\varepsilon$,

$$E_4(\varepsilon, w) \leq 1 - \left(\theta\pi \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^\theta \big(1 + o(1)\big)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-C_8(\theta, M) \log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \varepsilon^\theta \right)$$

for some finite positive constant $C_8(\theta,M)$. Therefore, by (5.11) and (5.12),

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0)\mid L_\lambda^x = w\big) \le \exp\left(-C_8(\theta,M)\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\varepsilon^\theta\right) + C_7(M)\varepsilon$$

$$\le C_9(\theta,M)\exp\left(-C_8(\theta,M)\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\varepsilon^\theta\right),$$

uniformly over all $x \in [M\varepsilon,1]$ and every $w \in [M\varepsilon, 2\log(1/\varepsilon)]$. Here $C_9(\theta,M)$ is some finite poositive constant. Therefore, by (5.8b) and (5.10), there exist finite positive constants $C_{10}(\theta,M)$ and $C_{11}(\theta,M)$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in[M\varepsilon,1]} E_2(\varepsilon) \le C_{10}(\theta,M)\exp\left(-C_8(\theta,M)\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\varepsilon^\theta\right)$$

$$\times \left(1 - \left(\theta\pi\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^\theta(1+o(1))\right)$$

$$\le C_{10}(\theta,M)\exp\left(-2C_{11}(\theta,M)\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\varepsilon^\theta\right).$$

Hence, from (5.9), it follows that, for some finite constant $C_{12}(\theta,M)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0)\cap\widetilde{G}(x)\cap\{T_x\le\lambda\}\big)$$

(5.13)

$$\le C_{12}(\theta,M)\exp\left(-2C_{11}(\theta,M)\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\varepsilon^\theta\right).$$

By induction, the proof of (5.13) shows the existence of positive finite constants, $C_{13} = C_{13}(\theta,M)$ and $C_{14} = C_{14}(\theta,M)$, such that, for any integer $\nu \in [2,(M\varepsilon)^{-1}]$ and all $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_\nu \in [M\varepsilon,1]$, which satisfy $x_i \ge x_{i-1} + M\varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0)\cap\widetilde{G}(x_1)\cap\cdots\cap\widetilde{G}(x_\nu)\cap\{T_{x_\nu}\le\lambda\}\big) \le C_{12}\nu\exp\left(-C_{11}\log^{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\nu\varepsilon^\theta\right)$$

$$\le C_{13}\exp\big(-C_{14}\nu\varepsilon^\theta\big).$$

We shall let $x_j \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} jM\varepsilon$, $j = 0,\ldots,[(M\varepsilon)^{-1}]$. It follows that $\nu = [(M\varepsilon)^{-1}]$ in the above. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(x;\theta,\varepsilon)\cap\{T_x\le\lambda\}\text{ for all }x\in[0,1]\big)$$

(5.14)

$$\le \mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(0)\cap\widetilde{G}(x_1)\cap\cdots\cap\widetilde{G}(x_\nu)\cap\{T_x\le\lambda\}\big)$$

$$\le C_{13}(\theta,M)\exp\big(-C_{14}(\theta,M)M^{-1}[\varepsilon]^{\theta-1}\big).$$

With no essential changes, the proof of (5.14) can be extended to show that, for all real-valued $a \le b$, there exist positive finite constants $C_{15}(\theta,M,a,b)$ and

$C_{16}(\theta, M, a, b)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \cap \{T_x \leq \lambda\} \text{ for all } x \in [a, b]\big)$$

$$\leq C_{16}(\theta, M, a, b)\exp\big(-C_{15}(\theta, M, a, b)[\varepsilon]^{\theta - 1}\big).$$

Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and define $\rho(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^n$. Since we had fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$, it follows at once that, for all $a \leq b$,

$$\sum_n \mathbb{P}\big(\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \rho(n)) \cap \{T_x \leq \lambda\} \text{ for all } x \in [a, b]\big) < \infty.$$

The Borel–Cantelli lemma and a sample path argument together show that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)N\big(x, \rho(n)\big) - \big(1 - M^{-1}\big)L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)} \geq 2 \inf_{a \leq x \leq b} \sqrt{\theta\big(1 - M^{-1}\big)L_\lambda^x}.$$

Letting $\theta \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence, since $a \leq b$ is arbitrary and $x \mapsto L_\lambda^x$ is continuous,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)N\big(x, \rho(n)\big) - \big(1 - M^{-1}\big)L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)} \geq 2\sqrt{L_\lambda^*\big(1 - M^{-1}\big)}.$$

However, as pointed out earlier,

$$N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\big(A\big(\rho(n)\big)\big) = N\big(x, \rho(n)\big) + N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\big(A\big(M\rho(n)\big)\big)$$

and $|u_\varepsilon(x, \lambda) - N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(A(\varepsilon))| \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)u_{\rho(n)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)}$$

$$\geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)N\big(x, \rho(n)\big) - \big(1 - M^{-1}\big)L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)}$$

$$- \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\big(A\big(M\rho(n)\big)\big) - M^{-1}L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)}$$

$$\geq 2\sqrt{L_\lambda^*}\big(\sqrt{1 - M^{-1}} - \sqrt{M^{-1}}\big).$$

The last inequality holds because of the (already proven) upper bound, (5.7). Since $M > 1$ is arbitrary, letting $M \uparrow \infty$ along a countable sequence, we see that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\big|2\rho(n)u_{\rho(n)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\big|}{\varphi\big(\rho(n)\big)} \geq 2\sqrt{L_\lambda^*}.$$

By a monotonicity argument and taking inverse Laplace transforms as in the previous section, the lower bound follows. $\square$

6. Proof of Theorem 1.5. As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we can reduce the problem to the case where $x = 0$ and $t = 1$. Moreover, much as in the derivation of (4.1), one can argue that it is sufficient to show that, for all $w > 0$,

$$(6.1) \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| (\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2} e_\varepsilon(0, 1) - w \right|}{\kappa(\varepsilon)} = (2\pi)^{1/4} w^{1/2} \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

where $\kappa(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \varepsilon^{1/4}\sqrt{1 \vee \log\log(1/\varepsilon)}$. Therefore, from now on we shall hold fixed a $w > 0$.

Recall the process of excursions from 0, $\{e_s^0; \ s \geq 0\}$, and the associated counting process, $\{N_t^0(A); \ t \geq 0\}$, for measurable $A \subseteq U_0 \cup \{\delta\}$. Define

$$A(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ f \in U_0 \cup \{\delta\}: R_0^f \geq \varepsilon \right\}.$$

We recall that R_0^f was the lifetime of the excursion, f, from 0. Since $\mathbb{Q}_w$-almost surely,

$$\left| N_w\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - e_\varepsilon(0, 1) \right| \leq 1$$

(where $\mathbb{Q}_w$ is defined in Section 4), by (6.1) it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left| (\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2} N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w \right|}{\kappa(\varepsilon)} = (2\pi)^{1/4} w^{1/2}.$$

However, by the exit system formula, $N_w^0(A(\varepsilon))$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $n^0(A(\varepsilon)) = (2/\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2} w$. The calculation of the latter excursion law can be found, for example, in Proposition XII.2.8 of Revuz and Yor (1991). Therefore, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.2, for all $\theta > 0$,

$$(6.2) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left| \left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2} N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big) - w \right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}(w\theta)^{1/2}\kappa(\varepsilon) \right) \\ &\qquad = \frac{\sqrt{2/\pi}}{\left(2\theta \log\log(1/\varepsilon)\right)^{1/2} \left(\log(1/\varepsilon)\right)^{\theta}} \big(1 + o(1)\big) \end{aligned}$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Define for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta > 0$,

$$S_\theta(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{ \omega: \left| (\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2} N_w^0\big(A(\varepsilon)\big)(\omega) - w \right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}(\theta w)^{1/2}\kappa(\varepsilon) \right\}.$$

First, we will prove the upper bound for the lim sup. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > 1$ and define $\rho(n) \stackrel{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^n$. Then, by (6.2),

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\big(S_\theta(n)\big) \leq C_{17}(\theta) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\log n)^{-1/2} n^{-\theta} < \infty$$

for some finite constant $C_{17}(\theta)$. Therefore, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma (and letting $\theta \uparrow 1$), it follows that

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\rho(n)/2\right)^{1/2} N_w^0\left(\rho(n)\right) - w\right|}{\kappa\left(\rho(n)\right)} \leq (2\pi)^{1/4} w^{1/2},$$

almost surely. However, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, there are integers, N_ε, for which $\rho(N_\varepsilon + 1) \leq \varepsilon \leq \rho(N_\varepsilon)$. Since $A(\rho(N_\varepsilon)) \subseteq A(\varepsilon) \subseteq A(\rho(N_\varepsilon + 1))$, it follows that

$$N_w^0\left(A\left(\rho(N_\varepsilon)\right)\right) \leq N_w^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) \leq N_w^0\left(A\left(\rho(N_\varepsilon + 1)\right)\right).$$

Hence, using some arithmetic,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\varepsilon/2\right)^{1/2} N_w^0\left(A(\varepsilon)\right) - 2\right|}{\kappa(\varepsilon)} \leq (2\pi)^{1/4} \left(\frac{w}{\rho}\right)^{1/2},$$

almost surely. Letting $\rho \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence, we arrive at the desired upper bound.

For the proof of the lower bound, define $\rho(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} n^{-n}$ and let

$$B(n + 1) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} A\left(\rho(n + 1)\right) \backslash A\left(\rho(n)\right),$$

$$N(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} N_w^0\left(B(n)\right).$$

Let us note that $N(n) = N_w^0(A(\rho(n + 1))) - N_w^0(A(\rho(n)))$. Since $\{B(n); \, n \geq 0\}$ is a disjoint sequence of sets in $U_0 \cup \{\delta\}$, by the exit system formula, $\{N(n); \, n \geq 0\}$ are independent Poisson random variables with mean

$$n^0\left(A\left(\rho(n + 1)\right) \backslash A\left(\rho(n)\right)\right) = n^0\left(A\left(\rho(n + 1)\right)\right) - n^0\left(A\left(\rho(n)\right)\right)$$

$$= \left(\frac{\pi\rho(n + 1)}{2}\right)^{-1/2} w\left(1 + O\left(n^{-1/2}\right)\right).$$

Let

$$\widetilde{S}_\theta(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{\omega: \left|\left(\frac{\pi\rho(n + 1)}{2}\right)^{1/2} N(n)(\omega) - w\right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4} (w\theta)^{1/2} \kappa\left(\rho(n + 1)\right)\right\},$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Then, arguing as in (6.2),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{S}_\theta(n)\right) = (\pi\theta \log n)^{-1/2} n^{-\theta}\left(1 + o(1)\right).$$

Therefore, since $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{S}_\theta(n)) = \infty$. By the independence half of the Borel–Cantelli lemma, $\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{S}_\theta(n), \text{ i.o.}) = 1$. In other words, letting $\theta \uparrow 1$ along a countable sequence,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left|\left(\pi\varepsilon/2\right)^{1/2} N(n) - w\right|}{\kappa\left(\rho(n + 1)\right)} \geq (2\pi)^{1/4} w^{1/2},$$

almost surely. Therefore,

$$
\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\left|(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2}N_w^0(A(\varepsilon)) - w\right|}{\kappa(\varepsilon)}
$$

$$
\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left|(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2}N_w^0\big(A(\rho(n+1))\big) - w\right|}{\kappa\big(\rho(n+1)\big)}
$$

$$
\geq (2\pi)^{1/4}w^{1/2} - \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left|(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2}N_w^0\big(A(\rho(n+1))\big) - w\right|}{\kappa\big(\rho(n+1)\big)}
$$

$$
= (2\pi)^{1/4}w^{1/2},
$$

by the upper bound half (which we have already proven) together with the fact that $\kappa(\rho(n)) = \kappa(\rho(n+1))(en)^{-1/4}(1+o(1)) = o(\kappa(\rho(n+1)))$, as $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof. □

7. Proof of Theorem 1.6. Theorem 1.6 is proved much like Theorem 1.4. Therefore, for the sake of brevity, we shall point out the differences in proofs. As in Section 5, we start with the proof of the upper bound. The first result is the analogue of Lemma 5.3.

LEMMA 7.1. *Let $\theta > 0$, be fixed. Then, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$,*

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2}e_\varepsilon(x,\lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right| \geq 2\kappa(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x},\ T_x < \lambda\right)
$$

$$
= \left(\theta\pi\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^\theta e^{-\sqrt{2}|x|}\big(1+o(1)\big),
$$

where the $o(1)$ term is independent of $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$.

PROOF. We proceed almost exactly as in the proof of Lemma 5.3 with some minor adjustments. Let

$$
(7.1) \qquad D(\varepsilon) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \{f \in U_x \colon R_x^f \geq \varepsilon\}.
$$

Following the argument in Lemma 5.3,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2}N_{L_\lambda^x}^x(D(\varepsilon)) - L_\lambda^x\right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}\kappa(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x},\ T_x < \lambda\right)
$$

$$
= \sqrt{2}e^{-\sqrt{2}|x|}\int_0^{\theta\log(1/\varepsilon)}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2}N_w^0(D(\varepsilon)) - w\right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}\kappa(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta w}\right)
$$

$$
\times e^{-\sqrt{2}w}\,dw + R(x,\varepsilon),
$$

where $R(x, \varepsilon) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$; moreover,

$$(7.2) \qquad\qquad\qquad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} R(x, \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{\sqrt{2\theta}}.$$

From Section 6, $N_w^0(D(\varepsilon))$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $(2/\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2}w$. Therefore, as in Lemma 5.3,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2} N_w^0(D(\varepsilon)) - w\right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}\kappa(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta w}\right)$$
$$= \left(\theta\pi \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{\theta}(1 + o(1)),$$

uniformly over all $w \in (0, \theta\log(1/\varepsilon))$. The lemma follows from (7.2). $\square$

Fix $R, \eta, \theta > 0$ and define, as in Section 5,

$$K(\varepsilon, \eta, R) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{s \in \mathbb{R}^1 \colon s \in \varepsilon^{\eta}(\mathbb{Z}^1 \cap [-R, R])\right\},$$
$$V(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \left\{\omega \colon \left|\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{1/2} e_\varepsilon(x, \lambda)(\omega) - L_\lambda^x(\omega)\right| \geq (2\pi)^{1/4}\kappa(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^x(\omega)}\right\}.$$

Then, exactly as in Section 5 (using Lemma 7.1 instead of Lemma 5.3),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{x \in K(\varepsilon, \eta, R)} V(x; \theta, R) \cap \{T_x < \lambda\}\right) \leq C_{18}(\theta, \eta, R)\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{\theta - \eta}.$$

Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\eta > 1$ and $\theta > \eta$. Replace ε by $\rho(n) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^n$ to see that

$$\sum_n \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{x \in K(\rho(n), \eta, R)} V(x; \theta, \rho(n)) \cap \{T_x < \lambda\}\right) < \infty.$$

Therefore, as in the argument leading to (5.5),

$$(7.3) \quad \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{x \in K(\rho(n), \theta, R)} \frac{\left|(\pi\rho(n)/2)^{1/2} e_{\rho(n)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right|}{\kappa(\rho(n))} \leq (2\pi)^{1/4}\sqrt{\theta L_\lambda^*}.$$

Temporarily fix some $\zeta \in (0, 1/2)$. By the modulus of continuity of $t \mapsto Z(t)$ [see (2.1b)], a sample path argument reveals that, uniformly over all $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $t \in [0, 1]$,s

$$e_{\varepsilon_0}(x - \delta, t) \wedge e_{\varepsilon_0}(x + \delta, t) \leq e_\varepsilon(x, t) \leq e_{\varepsilon_1}(x - \delta, t) \vee e_{\varepsilon_1}(x + \delta, t),$$

where $\varepsilon_0 \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \varepsilon + \delta^{\zeta}$, $\varepsilon_1 \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \varepsilon - \delta^{\zeta}$, and $\varepsilon > \delta > 0$ are small. Arguing as in the proof of (5.7), we are led to the following:

$$(7.4) \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|(\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2} e_\varepsilon(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right|}{\kappa(\varepsilon)} = (2\pi)^{1/4}\sqrt{L_\lambda^*},$$

which is the desired upper bound. To get the lower bound, the ideas are again similar to those appearing in Section 5. Fix $M > 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, M^{-1})$. Define

$$D(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \left\{ f \in U_x : R_x^f \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } \sup_{0 \leq r \leq R_x^f} |f(r)| \leq x + (M\varepsilon)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Also define

$$W(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \left\{ f \in U_x : \sup_{0 \leq r \leq R_x^f} |f(r)| \geq x + (M\varepsilon)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Let $\widetilde{N}$ be the counting process associated with $D(x, \varepsilon)$, that is, $\widetilde{N}(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} N_{L_\lambda^x}^x$ $(D(x, \varepsilon))$. Define $n(\varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} (\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2} n^0(D(0, \varepsilon))$ and $\overline{n}(\varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} (\pi\varepsilon/2)^{1/2} [n^0(D(0, \varepsilon)) - n^0(D(0, \varepsilon))]$. Based on the above definitions, we define

$$\widetilde{D}(x; \theta, \varepsilon) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \left\{ \omega : \left| \left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2} \right)^{1/2} \widetilde{N}(x, \varepsilon)(\omega) - n(\varepsilon) L_\lambda^x(\omega) \right| \leq (2\pi)^{1/4} \kappa(\varepsilon) \sqrt{\theta n(\varepsilon) L_\lambda^x(\omega)} \right\}.$$

The event $\widetilde{D}(x; \theta, \varepsilon)$ is this section's analogue of $\widetilde{G}(x; \theta, \varepsilon)$ of Section 5. The following lemma estimates $n(\varepsilon)$.

LEMMA 7.2.   *For all* $\varepsilon \in (0, M^{-1})$,

$$\overline{n}(\varepsilon) \in \left[0, \left(\frac{2}{M\pi} \right)^{1/2} \right],$$

$$\overline{n}(\varepsilon) \in \left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{M\pi} \right)^{1/2}, 1 \right].$$

PROOF.   Recall the definition of $D(\varepsilon)$ from (7.1). Then, for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$N_w^0(D(\varepsilon)) \geq N_w^0(D(0, \varepsilon)) \geq N_w^0(D(\varepsilon)) - N_w^0(W(0, \varepsilon)).$$

Letting $w = 1$ and taking expectations,

$$\left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2} \right)^{1/2} n^0(D(\varepsilon)) \geq n(\varepsilon) \geq \left(\frac{\pi\varepsilon}{2} \right)^{1/2} \left[n^0(D(\varepsilon)) - n^0(W(0, \varepsilon)) \right].$$

The lemma follows since, from Section 6, $n^0(D(\varepsilon)) = (2/\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2}$ and, from Section 5 and the exit system formula, $n^0(W(0, \varepsilon)) = (M\varepsilon)^{-1/2}$. $\square$

Let $x_j \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} j(M\varepsilon)^{1/2}$ for $j = 0, \ldots, \nu \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} [(M\varepsilon)^{-1/2}]$. Writing $\widetilde{D}(x)$ for $\widetilde{D}(x)(x; \theta, \varepsilon)$, as in Section 5, we obtain

$$
\mathbb{P}\Big(\widetilde{D}(0) \cap \widetilde{D}(x_1) \cap \cdots \cap \widetilde{D}(x_\nu) \cap \{T_{x_\nu} \leq \lambda\}\Big)
$$

$$
\leq C_{19}\varepsilon^{-1/2} \exp\left(-C_{20}\nu\left(\log\Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big)\right)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^\theta\right)
$$

$$
\leq C_{21}\exp\big(-C_{22}\varepsilon^{\theta-1/2}\big)
$$

for some positive finite constants, $C_j \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} C_j(\theta, M)$, $j = 19, \ldots, 22$. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and define $\rho(m) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \rho^m$ for $m \geq 1$. By Lemma 7.2 and the Borel–Cantelli arguments of Section 5, since $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ is arbitrary,

$$
(7.5) \quad \liminf_{m \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|\big(\pi\rho(m)/2\big)^{1/2}\widetilde{N}\big(x, \rho(m)\big) - n\big(\rho(m)\big)L_\lambda^x\right|}{\kappa\big(\rho(m)\big)} \geq \Big(\frac{\pi}{2}\Big)^{1/4}\sqrt{\beta_M L_\lambda^*},
$$

where $\beta_M \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} (1 - (2/M_\pi)^{1/2})$. On the other hand, let us define

$$
\overset{\approx}{N}(x, \varepsilon) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\big(D(\varepsilon)\backslash D(x, \varepsilon)\big) = N_{L_\lambda^x}^x\big(D(\varepsilon)\big) - \widetilde{N}(x, \varepsilon).
$$

Then, as in (7.3), we see that, for all $\theta_0 > 1$,

$$
\limsup_{m \to \infty} \sup_{x \in K(\rho(m), \theta_0, \infty)} \frac{\left|\big(\pi\rho(m)/2\big)^{1/2}\overset{\approx}{N}\big(x, \rho(m)\big) - \overline{n}\big(\rho(m)\big)L_\lambda^x\right|}{\kappa\big(\rho(m)\big)}
$$

$$
(7.6) \qquad \leq (2\pi)^{1/4}\sqrt{\Big(\frac{2}{M\pi}\Big)\theta_0 L_\lambda^*}
$$

$$
= 2^{3/4}\pi^{-1/4}M^{-1/2}\sqrt{\theta_0 L_\lambda^*}.
$$

Since $\overset{\approx}{N}(x, \varepsilon) + \widetilde{N}(x, \varepsilon)$ differs from $e_\varepsilon(x, \lambda)$ by at most 1, (7.5) and (7.6) together yield the following:

$$
\liminf_{m \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^1} \frac{\left|\big(\pi\rho(m)/2\big)^{1/2}e_{\rho(m)}(x, \lambda) - L_\lambda^x\right|}{\kappa\big(\rho(m)\big)} \geq \Big(\frac{\pi}{2}\Big)^{1/4}\alpha_M\sqrt{L_\lambda^*},
$$

where $\alpha_M = \alpha_M(\theta_0) \overset{\mathrm{df}}{=} \beta_M^{1/2} - 2(\theta_0/M\pi)^{1/2}$. But $M > 1$ is arbitrary. Therefore, we can let $M \uparrow \infty$ along a countable sequence. Since $\lim_{M \to \infty} \beta_M = 1$, $\lim_{M \to \infty} \alpha_M = 1$ as well. Hence the desired lower bound follows from the monotonicity argument of the previous sections. $\square$

Many thanks are also due to an anonymous referee for some very useful suggestions to improve the presentation of the paper.

REFERENCES

BARLOW, M. T., PERKINS, E. A. and TAYLOR, S. J. (1986a). The behavior and construction of local times for Lévy processes. In *Seminar on Stochastic Processes 1984* 151–164. Birkhäuser, Boston.

BARLOW, M. T., PERKINS, E. A. and TAYLOR, S. J. (1986b). Two uniform intrinsic constructions for the local time of a class of lévy processes. *Illinois J. Math.* **30** 19–65.

BORODIN, A. N. (1986). On the character of convergence to Brownian local time. *Z. Wahrch. Verw. Gebiete* **72** 231–250.

CHACON, R. V., LEJAN, Y., PERKINS, E. and TAYLOR, S. J. (1981). Generalized arc length for Brownian motion and Lévy processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **57** 197–211.

CHUNG, K. L. and DURRETT, R. (1976). Downcrossings and local time. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **35** 147–149.

CSÖRGŐ, M. and RÉVÉSZ, P. (1981). *Strong Approximations in Probability and Statistics.* Academic Press, New York.

CSÖRGŐ, M. and RÉVÉSZ, P. (1986). Mesure de voisinage and occupation density. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **73** 211–226.

DYNKIN, E. B. (1984). Gaussian and non-Gaussian random fields associated with Markov processes. *J. Funct. Anal.* **55** 344–376.

FRISTEDT, B. E. and TAYLOR, S. J. (1983). Construction of local time for a Markov process. *Z. Wahrsch Verw. Gebiete* **62** 73–112.

HORVÁTH, L. (1990). Strong laws and limit theorems for local time of Markov processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **85** 413–424.

IBRAGIMOV, I. A. and LINNIK, YU. V. (1971). *Independent and Stationary Sequences of Random Variables,* 1st ed. Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen.

ITÔ, K. and MCKEAN, H. P. (1965). *Diffusion Processes and Their Sample Paths.* Springer, Berlin.

KNIGHT, F. B. (1981). *Essentials of Brownian Motion and Diffusion.* Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.

KOCHEN, S. B. and STONE, C. J. (1964). A note on the Borel–Cantelli problem. *Illinois J. Math.* **8** 248–251.

MCKEAN, H. P. (1962). A Hölder condition for Brownian local time. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **1–2** 195–201.

MAISONNEUVE, B. (1981). On Lévy's downcrossing theorem and various extensions. *Séminaire de Probabilités XV. Lecture Notes in Math.* **850** 191–205. Springer, Berlin.

MARCUS, M. B. and ROSEN, J. (1993). Exact rates of convergence to the local times of symmetric Lévy processes. Preprint.

PERKINS, E. (1981). A global intrinsic characterization of Brownian local time. *Ann. Probab.* **9** 800–817.

RAY, D. B. (1963). Sojourn times of a diffusion process. *Illinois J. Math.* **7** 615–630.

REVUZ, D. and YOR, M. (1991). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion.* Springer, Berlin.

TROTTER, H. F. (1958). A property of Brownian motion paths. *Illinois J. Math.* **2** 425–433.

WILLIAMS, D. (1974). Path decomposition and continuity of local time for one dimensional diffusions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **28** 738–768.

WILLIAMS, D. (1977). On Lévy's downcrossing theorem. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **40** 157–158.

WILLIAMS, D. (1979). *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales. Foundations* **1.** Wiley, New York.

CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706