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Abstract

We establish a functional limit theorem for joint laws of occupation time processes of infinite ergodic transformations, in the sense of strong distributional convergence. Our limit theorem is a functional and joint-distributional extension both of Aaronson’s limit theorem of Darling–Kac type, and of Thaler’s generalized arcsine laws of Lamperti type, at the same time. We apply it to obtain a functional limit theorem for joint laws of sojourns of interval maps near and away from indifferent fixed points. For the proof, we represent occupation times in terms of excursion lengths, and show a functional convergence of excursion lengths to stable Lévy processes.

1 Introduction

In probability theory, there have been many studies of distributional limit theorems for null-recurrent Markov processes, such as a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion \( B = (B(t) : t \geq 0) \) and a one-dimensional simple symmetric random walk \( R = (R(n) : n \geq 0) \). On the one hand, Lévy’s arcsine law \([22]\) for occupation time is well-known. Let us denote by \( Z_I(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_I(B(s)) \, ds \) the amount of time which \( B \) spends on \( I \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \) up to time \( t \). He showed that

\[
\mathbb{P}\left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{(R(k)>0)} \leq u \right] \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[Z_{(0,\infty)}(1) \leq u] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\sqrt{u}), \quad u \in [0,1].
\]

The law of \( Z_{(0,\infty)}(1) \) is called the arcsine distribution. The following dynamically-separating property is one of key factors which lead to the arcsine law: the processes \( B \) and \( R \) cannot pass from \((-\infty,0)\) to \((0,\infty)\) (or from \((0,\infty)\) to \((-\infty,0)\)) without visiting 0. Lamperti \([21]\), Barlow–Pitman–Yor \([8]\), Watanabe \([37]\) and Yano \([38]\) focused on it and extended the arcsine law to more general cases. Furthermore, Fujihara–Kawamura–Yano \([16]\) obtained a functional extension of \([21]\). On the other hand, distributions of local times are also well-studied. Let us denote by \( L(t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} (\sqrt{2\varepsilon})^{-1} Z_{(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}(t) \) the local time of \( B \) at 0 in the Blumenthal–Getoor normalization. Then, it holds that

\[
\mathbb{P}\left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{R(k)=0} \leq u \right] \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[L(1) \leq u] = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^u e^{-s^2} \, ds, \quad u \geq 0.
\]

The law of \( L(1) \) is called a Mittag-Leffler distribution of order 1/2. See for instance Feller \([15]\), Darling–Kac \([13]\) and Barlow–Pitman–Yor \([8]\). Furthermore, Bingham \([9]\) obtained a functional extension of \([13]\).
In infinite ergodic theory, there have also been many results of statistical limit theorems for dynamical systems with an infinite invariant measure. They have been motivated by studies of null-recurrent Markov processes explained above. One of the most important results is Aaronson’s limit theorem [2] of Darling–Kac [13] type, and another is Thaler’s generalized arcsine laws [33] of Lamperti [21] type. The former (respectively, the latter) concerns occupation times for a subset of finite (respectively, infinite) volume with respect to the invariant measure; scaling limits of them are Mittag-Leffler (respectively, Lamperti’s generalized arcsine) distributions. These results have been further refined by [34, 40, 24, 29]. In the present paper, we establish a functional and joint-distriutional extension of them at the same time. It is motivated particularly by [8] and [16]. We remark that Owada–Samorodnitsky [24] obtained a functional extension only of [2] motivated by [9].

Furthermore, we apply our functional limit theorem to obtain that for joint laws of sojourns of interval maps near and away from indifferent fixed points. In statistical physics, interval maps with indifferent fixed points have been studied as models of intermittent phenomena, such as intermittent transitions to turbulence in convective fluids (see for instance Pomeau–Manneville [26] or Manneville [23]). In this context, sojourns away from (respectively, near) indifferent fixed points correspond to short irregular or turbulent bursts (respectively, long regular or laminar phases). Therefore our limit theorem is significant not only in probability theory and infinite ergodic theory but also in statistical physics.

Let us illustrate earlier results by giving an example. Following [33 Examples], we define an interval map $T : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$T x = \begin{cases} 
  x(1 - x), & x \in [0, 1/2], \\
  1 - T(1 - x), & x \in (1/2, 1]. 
\end{cases}$$

See Figure 1. This map is conjugate to Boole’s transformation. Note that 0 and 1 are indifferent fixed points of $T$, that is, $T0 = 0$, $T1 = 1$ and $T0 = T1 = 1$. Moreover, it holds that $Tx = x + x^3 + o(x^3)$, as $x \rightarrow 0$. The map $T$ has the unique (up to multiplication of constant) absolutely continuous ergodic invariant measure $\mu$ given by

$$\mu(dx) = \frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{1}{(1 - x)^2} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(x) dx.$$

![Figure 1: graphs of $T$ and of $(T^k x_0 : k \geq 0)$ for $x_0 = 1/10$](image)
For $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, set $A_0 := [0, \delta)$, $Y := [\delta, 1 - \delta]$ and $A_1 := (1 - \delta, 1]$. Note that $\mu(Y) < \infty$ and $\mu(A_0) = \mu(A_1) = \infty$. Let us denote by $(S_A(t, x) : t \geq 0, x \in [0, 1])$ a linear interpolation of an occupation time process for $A \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$:

$$S_A(t, x) := \sum_{k=0}^{[t]-1} 1_A(T^k x) + (t - [t]) 1_A(T^{[t]} x), \quad t \geq 0, x \in [0, 1],$$

where $[t]$ denotes the greatest integer which is less than or equal to $t$. We are interested in scaling limits of $S_A(t, x)$ as $t \to \infty$, for $A = A_0$, $Y$ or $A_1$. Unfortunately, in the sense of a.e.$x$ convergence, we cannot obtain non-trivial limits except for a convergence $t^{-1} S_Y(t, x) \to 0$. For more details, see [1] and [6]. Instead, Aaronson [2, Theorem 1 and Example 4] obtained a non-trivial scaling limit of $S_Y(t, x)$ in the sense of strong distributional convergence: for any $[0, 1]$-valued random variable $\vartheta$ whose distribution $\mathbb{P}[\vartheta \in \cdot]$ is absolutely continuous, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{2\pi}{n} S_Y(n, \vartheta) \leq u\right] \to_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[\mu(Y)L(1) \leq u] = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{u/\mu(Y)} e^{-s^2} ds, \quad u \geq 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Furthermore, Owada–Samorodnitsky [24, Theorem 6.1] showed that

$$\left(\frac{2\pi}{n} S_Y(nt, \vartheta) : t \geq 0\right) \xrightarrow{d} (\mu(Y)L(t) : t \geq 0), \quad \text{in } C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\xrightarrow{d}$ means the convergence in distribution, and $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ denotes the space of all continuous functions $w : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$. The convergence (1.2) is stronger than (1.1), since the distributional convergence in $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ implies the convergence of finite-dimensional distributions. On the other hand, Thaler [33, Theorem] obtained arcsine laws for $S_{A_0}(t, x)$ and $S_{A_1}(t, x)$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{n} S_{A_i}(n, \vartheta) \leq u\right] \to_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[Z_{(0,\infty)}(1) \leq u] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\sqrt{u}), \quad u \in [0, 1], i = 0, 1. \quad (1.3)$$

We now explain one of our main results. It is the following functional limit theorem (Theorem 4.4):

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} S_{A_0}(nt, \vartheta), \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{n}} S_Y(nt, \vartheta), \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1}(nt, \vartheta) : t \geq 0\right) \xrightarrow{d} \left(Z_{(-\infty,0)}(t), \mu(Y)L(t), Z_{(0,\infty)}(t) : t \geq 0\right), \quad \text{in } C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^3), \quad (1.4)$$

that is, the joint laws of time-scaled occupation time processes for $A_0$, $A_1$ and $Y$ converge to that of Brownian occupation time processes for the negative and positive sides, and of Brownian local time process at 0. Needless to say, our result (1.4) generalizes the earlier results (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3) at the same time.

Let us outline the proof of (1.4). First, we note that the following dynamically-separating property: we can take $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ so small that an orbit $(T^k x : k \geq 0)$
cannot pass from $A_0$ to $A_1$ (or from $A_1$ to $A_0$) without visiting $Y$. For $i = 0, 1$, let us denote by $\eta_i(t)$ the amount of time which the orbit spent on $A_i$ up to the $\lfloor t \rfloor$-th return time for $Y$. Using the dynamically-separating property, we obtain a discrete version of Williams formulae (Lemma 5.1), which represent $S_{A_0}$, $S_Y$ and $S_{A_1}$ in terms of $\eta_0$ and $\eta_1$. Second, we show that a sequence $(\eta_0(k) - \eta_0(k - 1), \eta_1(k) - \eta_1(k - 1) : k \geq 1)$ is strictly stationary and exponentially continued fraction mixing with respect to $\mu(\cdot \cap Y)/\mu(Y)$ (Section 6). By virtue of these properties, we can use Tyran-Kamińska’s functional limit theorem of Skorokhod type, in order to show that $(\eta_0(t), \eta_1(t) : t \geq 0)$ converges to a joint of some independent stable subordinators (Lemma 5.3). Third, we recall the Williams formulae for diffusion processes (Lemma 5.2), which represent $Z_{(-\infty, 0)}$, $L$ and $Z_{(0, \infty)}$ in terms of some independent stable subordinators. Finally, combining these results, we obtain the convergence (1.4) (Theorems 4.1 and 4.4).

The present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set up notations and terminology, and state our assumptions in a general setting. In Section 3 we recall the definition and basic properties of skew Bessel diffusion processes. In Section 4 we give our main theorem in the general setting and then describe its applications to interval maps with indifferent fixed points. The proofs of our general limit theorem and of its applications are given in Sections 5 and 6 respectively. In Appendices, we recall several facts of interval maps, the Skorokhod $J_1$-topology and the topologies of weak and vague convergences for measures.
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2 Notations and assumptions

Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ be a $\sigma$-finite measure space with $\mu(X) = \infty$. Let $T : (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu) \to (X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ be a conservative, ergodic, measure preserving transformation, which is abbreviated as CEMPT. Equivalently, it holds that $\mu \circ T^{-1} = \mu$ and, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(A) > 0$,

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} 1_A(T^n x) = \infty, \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

By Hopf’s ratio ergodic theorem, we have, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(A) \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 1_A(T^k x) \to 0, \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

For more details, see [4, Chapters 1 and 2]. We always use the summation signs to denote unions of disjoint sets; for example, $A_1 + A_2$, $\sum_j A_j$ and so on. Let $d \geq 1$ be a positive
integer and \( A_1, \ldots, A_d, Y \in \mathcal{B} \) be disjoint sets. We will say that \( Y \) \textit{dynamically separates} \( A_1, \ldots, A_d \) if the condition \( [x \in A_i \text{ and } T^n x \in A_j \text{ for some } i \neq j \text{ and some } n \geq 1] \) implies the existence of some \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \) for which \( T^k x \in Y \).

**Assumption 2.1** (dynamical separation). Let \( d \geq 1 \) be a positive integer. The state space \( X \) can be decomposed into \( X = \sum_{j=1}^{d} A_j + Y \) for \( A_1, \ldots, A_d, Y \in \mathcal{B} \) with \( \mu(A_j) = \infty \) \((j = 1, \ldots, d)\) and \( \mu(Y) \in (0, \infty) \). Furthermore, \( Y \) dynamically separates \( A_1, \ldots, A_d \).

We will assume Assumption 2.1 from now on. For \( A \in \mathcal{B} \) and \( t \geq 0 \), we define a measurable function \( S_A(t) : X \to [0, \infty) \) by

\[
S_A(t)(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{[t]-1} 1_A(T^k x) + (t - [t])1_A(T^k x), \quad x \in X.
\]

I.e., \( S_A(t)(x) \) is the amount of time which an orbit \((T^k x : k \geq 0)\) spends on \( A \) up to time \( t \). Let us define measurable functions \( \varphi : Y \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \) and \( \ell_j : Y \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \) by

\[
\varphi(x) := \min\{k \geq 1 : T^k x \in Y\}, \quad x \in Y,
\]

\[
\ell_j(x) := S_{A_j}(\varphi(x))(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\varphi(x)-1} 1_{A_j}(T^k x), \quad x \in Y.
\]

In other words, \( \varphi(x) \) is the first return time for \( Y \), and \( \ell_j(x) \) is the length of time spent in \( A_j \) by the first excursion \((T^k x : 0 \leq k \leq \varphi(x))\) away from \( Y \). Since \( T \) is a CEMPT, we have \( \varphi(x), \ell_j(x) < \infty, \mu_Y\text{-a.e.} \). By virtue of Assumption 2.1, we have

\[
\{\ell_j = n\} = Y \cap T^{-1} A_j \cap \{\varphi = n+1\}
\]

\[
= \{x \in Y : T x, \ldots, T^n x \in A_j \text{ and } T^{n+1} x \in Y\}, \quad n \geq 1.
\]

Furthermore, set

\[
\ell(x) := (\ell_1(x), \ldots, \ell_d(x)), \quad x \in Y.
\]

**Example 2.2.** For example, assume that

\[
(T^k x)_{k=0}^3 \in Y \times A_1 \times A_1 \times Y, \quad \text{and} \quad (T^k y)_{k=0}^1 \in Y \times Y.
\]

Then we have \( \varphi(x) = 3, \ell(x) = (2, 0, \ldots, 0), \varphi(y) = 1 \) and \( \ell(y) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0) \).

Let \( f, g : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) be positive functions. For a constant \( c \in [0, \infty] \), we write \( f(x) \sim_{x \to x_0} c g(x) \) if it holds that \( \lim_{x \to x_0} f(x)/g(x) = c \). We note that \( c g(x) \) has only a symbolic meaning if \( c = 0 \) or \( \infty \). See [10] p. xix]. A positive and measurable function \( f : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) is called regularly varying of index \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \) at \( \infty \) (respectively, at \( 0 \)) if it holds that \( f(\lambda r) \sim_{r \to \infty} \lambda^\alpha f(r) \) (respectively, \( f(\lambda r) \sim_{r \to 0} \lambda^\alpha f(r) \)) for each \( \lambda > 0 \). We will denote by \( \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\infty) \) (respectively, \( \mathcal{R}_\alpha(0+) \)) the set of positive and measurable functions which are regularly varying of index \( \alpha \) at \( \infty \) (respectively, at \( 0 \)). For basic discussions of regular variation, we refer the reader to [10] Chapter 1.

Let us define a probability measure \( \mu_Y \) on \((X, \mathcal{B})\) by

\[
\mu_Y(A) := \mu(A \cap Y)/\mu(Y), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.
\]
**Assumption 2.3** (regular variations of tail probabilities). For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\Phi \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\infty)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d) \in [0,1]^d$ with $\sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j = 1$, it holds that

$$\mu_Y[\ell_j > r] \sim \frac{1}{\Phi(r)} \beta_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \quad (2.6)$$

**Remark 2.4.** As shown in [34, (6.6)], we have

$$\mu_n(\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} T^{-k}Y \cap A_j) \sim n \rightarrow \infty \beta_j \frac{n}{(1-\alpha)\Phi(n)}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \quad (2.7)$$

We will also assume Assumption 2.3 from now on. We will denote by $T_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$ an induced map for $Y^* : T_Y x := T_{\phi(x)} : x, x \in Y$. (2.8)

The map $T_Y$ is a CEMPT on the probability space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu_Y)$. Therefore, a sequence $(\ell \circ T^n_Y)_n \geq 0$ is strictly stationary with respect to $\mu_Y$. Note that $(\ell \circ T^n_Y)(x)$ is the length of time spent in $A_j$ by the $(n+1)$-st excursion $(T^k(T^n_Y x) : 0 \leq k < \varphi(T^n_Y x))$ away from $Y$.

**Example 2.5.** For example, assume that $(T^k_y(x))_{k=0}^{n} \in Y \times A_1 \times Y \times A_2 \times A_2 \times Y \times Y$.

Then we have $\ell(x) = (1,0,\ldots,0)$, $(\ell \circ T^n_Y)(x) = (0,2,\ldots,0)$ and $(\ell \circ T^n_Y)(x) = (0,0,\ldots,0)$.

For $0 \leq n \leq m \leq \infty$, we define a sub-$\sigma$-field $\mathcal{F}^m_n \subset \mathcal{B}$ by $\mathcal{F}^m_n := \sigma\{\ell \circ T^n_Y : n \leq k \leq m\}$. For $n \geq 0$, set

$$\phi_0(n) := \sup\{|\mu_Y(A \cap B) - \mu_Y(A)\mu_Y(B)| : k \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{F}^n_0, B \in \mathcal{F}^\infty_{k+n}\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Following [35, Theorem 1.1], we will impose the following assumption:

**Assumption 2.6** (local dependence). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\mathbb{N}$-valued sequences $(r_n)$ and $(l_n)$ such that

$$l_n, \frac{r_n}{l_n} \Phi(n) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Phi(n)}{r_n} \phi_0(l_n) \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_Y\left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq r_n} |\ell \circ T^n_Y| > \varepsilon n \mid |\ell| > \varepsilon n\right] = 0,$$

where $\mu_Y[\cdot \mid \cdot]$ denotes the conditional probability, and $| \cdot |$ denotes the Euclid norm of $\mathbb{R}^d$. 
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Remark 2.7. In earlier studies [2, 34, 40, 24, 29], Assumption 2.6 was not imposed. Instead, the assumption of pointwise dual ergodicity was imposed in [2, Theorem 1] and [24, Theorem 6.1]; the assumptions associated with asymptotic entrance densities were imposed in [34, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2], [40, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2] and [29, Theorems 2.7 and 2.8]. It is unclear whether these assumptions are weaker than Assumption 2.6 or not. Anyway, in our examples of interval maps (see Subsection 4.2), all of these assumptions are satisfied under a certain choice of $A_1, \ldots, A_d$ and $Y$. See [3, Theorem 3], [34, Theorem 8.1] and Section 6.

Remark 2.8. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Furthermore, assume that the sequence $(\ell \circ T^n_0 : n \geq 0)$ is exponentially continued fraction mixing with respect to $\mu_Y$, that is, there exist $C \in (0, \infty)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $k, n \geq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{F}_0^k$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_k^\infty$,

$$|\mu_Y(A \cap B) - \mu_Y(A)\mu_Y(B)| \leq C \theta^n \mu_Y(A)\mu_Y(B).$$

Then, by a similar argument as in the proof of [36, Corollary 4.1], we can show that the conditions of Assumption 2.6 are satisfied.

For a Polish space $U$, we will write $C([0, \infty), U)$ for the class of all continuous functions $w : [0, \infty) \to U$. The space $C([0, \infty), U)$ is endowed with the Polish topology of uniform convergence on compacts.

3 Skew Bessel diffusion processes on multiray

Following [8], we will define skew Bessel diffusion processes on multiray and give generalized arcsine laws for them. Note that a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion is a typical example of them. For the basic properties of Bessel diffusion processes reflected at 0, see for instance [8, Section 2] and [27, Chapter XI]. For a deeper discussion of diffusion processes on multiray, we refer the reader to [38, Section 2]. For basic discussions of the Itô excursion theory, see for instance [17, 27, Chapter XII] or [28, Section VI.8].

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we will denote by $R^{(\alpha)} = (R^{(\alpha)}(t) : t \geq 0)$ a Bessel diffusion process of dimension $2 - 2\alpha \in (0, 2)$, starting at 0 and instantaneously reflected at 0. In other words, $R^{(\alpha)}$ is a $[0, \infty)$-valued regular diffusion process starting at 0 with a scale function $s^{(\alpha)}(x) = x^{2\alpha}$, $x \geq 0$, and a speed measure $m^{(\alpha)}(dx) = \alpha^{-1}x^{1-2\alpha}1_{(0,\infty)}(x)dx$, $x \geq 0$. In the special case of $\alpha = 1/2$, this process is nothing else but the absolute value of a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. Let us denote by $(L^{(\alpha)}(t,x) : t,x \geq 0)$ the local time of $R^{(\alpha)}$. More specifically, a map $[0,\infty)^2 \ni (t,x) \mapsto L^{(\alpha)}(t,x) \in [0,\infty)$ is jointly continuous, and for any bounded and measurable function $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, the following occupation-time formula holds:

$$\int_0^t f(R^{(\alpha)}(s))ds = C^{(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty f(x)L^{(\alpha)}(t,x)x^{1-2\alpha}dx, \quad t \geq 0,$$
where \( C^{(\alpha)} := 2^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)/\Gamma(1 - \alpha) \) and \( \Gamma(\cdot) \) denotes the gamma function. Furthermore, we will write \( L^{(\alpha)} = (L^{(\alpha)}(t) : t \geq 0) \) for the local time of \( R^{(\alpha)} \) at 0 (in the Blumenthal–Getoor normalization in the sense of [23, VI.(45.5)]):

\[
L^{(\alpha)}(t) := L^{(\alpha)}(t, 0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{2 - 2\alpha}{C^{(\alpha)} \varepsilon^{2\alpha}} \int_0^t 1_{[0,\varepsilon]}(R^{(\alpha)}(s))ds, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{3.1}
\]

Then \( L^{(\alpha)} \) is a Mittag-Leffler process of order \( \alpha \) in the sense of [24, Section 3]. Its one-dimensional laws are characterized by

\[
\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda L^{(\alpha)}(t))] = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(-\lambda L^{(\alpha)})^n}{\Gamma(1 + n\alpha)}, \quad \lambda, t \geq 0.
\]

We will denote by \( \eta^{(\alpha)} = (\eta^{(\alpha)}(s) : s \geq 0) \) the inverse local time of \( R^{(\alpha)} \) at 0:

\[
\eta^{(\alpha)}(s) := (L^{(\alpha)})^{-1}(s) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : L^{(\alpha)}(t) > s\}, \quad s \geq 0. \tag{3.2}
\]

Then \( \eta^{(\alpha)} \) is an \( \alpha \)-stable subordinator with Laplace transform

\[
\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda \eta^{(\alpha)}(s))] = \exp(-\lambda^\alpha s), \quad \lambda, s \geq 0.
\]

We will denote by \( n^{(\alpha)} \) the Itô characteristic measure of excursions of \( R^{(\alpha)} \) away from 0 for the normalization \( L^{(\alpha)} \). For \( z \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( |z| = 1 \), we define a map \( \sigma_z : C([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}) \to C([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}) \) by

\[
(\sigma_z(w))(t) := w(t)z, \quad w = (w(t))_{t \geq 0} \in C([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}),
\]

that is, \( \sigma_z \) is a rotation about the origin. Note that an image measure \( n^{(\alpha)} \circ \sigma_z^{-1} \) is the Itô characteristic measure of excursions of \( \sigma_z(R^{(\alpha)}) \) away from 0. Let \( d \geq 1 \) be a positive integer. Set

\[
z_j := \exp(2\pi j \sqrt{-1}/d), \quad j = 1, \ldots, d,
\]
\[
I_j := \{rz_j \in \mathbb{C} : r \geq 0\}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d.
\]

**Definition 3.1.** For \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and \( \beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d) \in [0, 1]^d \) with \( \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j = 1 \), a process \( R^{(\alpha,\beta)} = (R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) : t \geq 0) \) is defined to be that pieced together from excursions away from 0 associated with an Itô characteristic measure

\[
n^{(\alpha,\beta)} := \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j n^{(\alpha)} \circ \sigma_{z_j}^{-1}.
\]

It is called a *skew Bessel diffusion process* on \( \bigcup_{j=1}^d I_j \) starting at 0 with dimension \( 2 - 2\alpha \) and skewness parameter \( \beta \).

Roughly speaking, every time the process \( R^{(\alpha,\beta)} \) reaches 0, it chooses randomly a ray \( I_j \) from rays \( I_1, \ldots, I_d \) with probability \( \beta_j \), and then it moves like the \( I_j \)-valued diffusion...
process $\sigma_j(R^{(\alpha)})$ until it returns again to 0. It is a multiray diffusion process on $\bigcup_{j=1}^d I_j$ in the sense of [38 Section 2] (see [38 Remark 2.2]). In the case of $\alpha = 1/2$, it is also called a Walsh Brownian motion or a Brownian spider. For more direct construction of Walsh Brownian motions, we refer the reader to [7]. In the special case of $d = 2$ and $\alpha = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1/2$, the process $R^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ is nothing else but a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion.

Set
\[
Z_j^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) := \int_0^t 1_{I_j}(R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(s)) \, ds, \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d, \quad (3.3)
\]
\[
L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{2 - 2\alpha}{C(\alpha)\varepsilon^{2-2\alpha}} \int_0^t 1_{[0,\varepsilon)}(|R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(s)|) \, ds, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.4)
\]
That is, $Z_j^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t)$ denotes the amount of time which $R^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ spends on $I_j$ up to time $t$, and $L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t)$ denotes the local time of $R^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ at 0 up to time $t$. Note that $L^{(\alpha,\beta)} \overset{d}{=} L^{(\alpha)}$ in $C([0,\infty), \mathbb{R})$. Recall that $R^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ has the Brownian scaling property in the sense that
\[
\left(\frac{R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\lambda t)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} : t \geq 0\right) \overset{d}{=} (R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) : t \geq 0), \quad \text{in } C([0,\infty), \mathbb{C}), \quad \lambda > 0.
\]
Hence, its occupation times for rays and its local time at 0 have the following scaling property:
\[
\left(\frac{Z_1^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\lambda t)}{\lambda}, \ldots, \frac{Z_d^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\lambda t)}{\lambda}, \frac{L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\lambda t)}{\lambda^{\alpha}} : t \geq 0\right) \overset{d}{=} (Z_1^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t), \ldots, Z_d^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t), L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) : t \geq 0), \quad \text{in } C([0,\infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1}), \quad \lambda > 0.
\]
The following identity in joint laws was proved by [8].

**Theorem 3.2 (generalized arcsine laws for skew Bessel diffusion processes [8 Theorem 1]).** Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ with $\sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j = 1$. Then, it holds that
\[
\left(\frac{Z_1^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t)}{t}, \ldots, \frac{Z_d^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t)}{t}, \frac{L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t)}{t^{\alpha}}\right) \overset{d}{=} \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j}, \ldots, \frac{\xi_d}{\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j}, \frac{1}{(\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j)^{\alpha}}\right), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \quad t > 0, \quad (3.5)
\]
where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_d$ denote independent $[0, \infty)$-valued random variables with the one-sided $\alpha$-stable distributions characterized by
\[
\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda \xi_j)] = \exp(-\lambda^\alpha \beta_j), \quad \lambda \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \quad (3.6)
\]

Note that the joint law of $(\xi_1 / \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j, \ldots, \xi_d / \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j)$ is a multi-dimensional version of Lamperti’s generalized arcsine distributions (see for instance [29 Subsection 2.2]), and the law of $(\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j)^{-\alpha}$ is a Mittag-Leffler distribution of order $\alpha$. 

9
4 Main results

4.1 Functional limit theorem for occupation time processes

Let $U$ be a Polish space, $\nu_0$ a probability measure on $(X, \mathcal{B})$, and $(F_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ a sequence of $U$-valued measurable functions defined on $(X, \mathcal{B})$. Furthermore, let $\zeta$ be a $U$-valued random variable defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We write $F_n \Rightarrow \zeta$, in $U$ if the image probability measures $(\nu_0 \circ F_n^{-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge weakly to the law $\mathbb{P}[\zeta \in \cdot]$ of $\zeta$. We say that $F_n$ converges to $\zeta$ strongly in distribution (with respect to $\mu$) if, for any probability measure $\nu \ll \mu$ on $(X, \mathcal{B})$, the convergence $F_n \nu \Rightarrow \zeta$, in $U$ holds. We will denote this convergence by $F_n \Rightarrow \zeta$, in $U$.

We now give our general limit theorem as follows.

Theorem 4.1. Let $T$ be a CEMPT on $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ and suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6 hold. Then,

\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1}(nt), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S_{A_d}(nt), \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S_Y(nt) : t \geq 0 \right) \Rightarrow \left( Z_{1}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t), \ldots, Z_{d}^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t), L^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) : t \geq 0 \right), \text{ in } C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1}). \tag{4.1}
\]

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will be given in Section 5. Combining Theorem 4.1 with Theorem 3.2, we obtain the following corollary, since the distributional convergence in $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ implies the convergence of finite-dimensional convergence.

Corollary 4.2. Let $T$ be a CEMPT on $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ and suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.3, and 2.6 hold. Then,

\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1}(n), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S_{A_d}(n), \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S_Y(n) \right) \Rightarrow \left( \frac{\xi_1}{\sum_{j=1}^{d} \xi_j}, \ldots, \frac{\xi_d}{\sum_{j=1}^{d} \xi_j}, \frac{1}{\left( \sum_{j=1}^{d} \xi_j \right)^\alpha} \right), \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \tag{4.2}
\]

where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_d$ denote independent $[0, \infty)$-valued random variables with the one-sided $\alpha$-stable distributions characterized by $(3.6)$.

4.2 Application to interval maps with indifferent fixed points

Let $d \geq 2$ be a positive integer and $0 = a_0 = x_1 < a_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_d = a_d = 1$. Set $J_1 := [a_0, a_1), J_2 := [a_1, a_2), \ldots, J_d := [a_{d-1}, a_d]$. Suppose that an interval map $T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ satisfies the following two conditions: for each $j = 1, \ldots, d$,

1. the restriction $T|_{J_j}$ over $J_j$ can be extended to a $C^2$-bijective map $T_j : J_j \to [0, 1]$;
(2) $Tx_j = x_j$, $T'x_j = 1$ and $(x - x_j)T''x > 0$ for any $x \in J \setminus \{x_j\}$.

Therefore we have $T'x > 1$ on $J \setminus \{x_j\}$. The $x_j$’s are called *indifferent fixed points* of $T$. If the conditions above are satisfied, then $T$ has a unique (up to multiplication of positive constants) $\sigma$-finite invariant measure $\mu(dx)$ equivalent to the Lebesgue measure $dx$, and $T$ is a CEMPT on $([0,1], B([0,1]), \mu)$. Any neighborhood of $x_j$ has infinite volume with respect to $\mu$. More specifically, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds that

$$\mu((x_j - \varepsilon, x_j + \varepsilon)) = \infty,$$

and

$$\mu([0,1] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{d} (x_j - \varepsilon, x_j + \varepsilon)) < \infty.$$

The density $\mu(dx)/dx$ has the version $h(x)$ which is continuous and positive on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{d}$. For more details, we refer the reader to [31] and [32].

**Assumption 4.3.** There exist $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\Psi \in R_{1+1/\alpha}(0^+)$ and $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_d) \in (0, \infty)^d \setminus \{\infty\}^d$, such that,

$$|Tx - x| \sim c_j \Psi(|x - x_j|), \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \quad (4.3)$$

We will assume Assumption 4.3 from now on. For $j = 1, \ldots, d$, let us denote by $f_j : [0,1] \to J_j$ the inverse function of $T_j$. Set

$$v_j := \begin{cases} \sum_{i \neq j} (h \circ f_j)(x_i) f'_j(x_i), & j = 1, d, \\ 2 \sum_{i \neq j} (h \circ f_j)(x_i) f'_j(x_i), & j = 2, \ldots, d - 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

$$\beta_j := \frac{c^{-\alpha}_j v_j}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} c^{-\alpha}_i v_i}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d). \quad (4.5)$$

We may assume that $\Psi$ is an increasing function, since $|Tx - x|$ is decreasing on $(a_{j-1}, x_j)$ and increasing on $(x_j, a_j)$. Set

$$\Phi(t) := \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{d} c^{-\alpha}_i v_i} \inf \left\{ s \geq 1 : \frac{\alpha s^{-1}}{\Psi(s^{-1})} > t \right\}, \quad t > 0. \quad (4.6)$$
Using basic theory of regular variation (see [10, Theorem 1.5.12]), we have \( \Phi \in \mathcal{R}_n(\infty) \). Let \( A_1', \ldots, A_d', Y' \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \) be disjoint Borel subsets of \([0, 1]\) such that, for some \( \varepsilon > 0, \)
\[
(x_j - \varepsilon, x_j + \varepsilon) \cap [0, 1] \subset A_j', \quad j = 1, \ldots, d,
\]
and \( \sum_{j=1}^d A_j' + Y' = [0, 1] \). For \( A \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \) and \( t \geq 0 \), we define a measurable function \( S_A(t) : [0, 1] \to [0, \infty) \) by (2.1).

**Theorem 4.4.** Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Then, it holds that
\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1'}(nt), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S_{A_d'}(nt), \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S_{Y'}(nt) : t \geq 0 \right)
\]
\[
\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}(\mu)} \left( Z_1^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t), \ldots, Z_d^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t), L^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) \mu(Y') : t \geq 0 \right), \quad \text{in } C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1}). \tag{4.8}
\]

The proof of Theorem 4.4 will be given in Section 6.

**Corollary 4.5.** Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Then, it holds that
\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1'}(n), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S_{A_d'}(n), \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S_{Y'}(n) \right)
\]
\[
\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}(\mu)} \left( \frac{\xi_1}{\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j}, \ldots, \frac{\xi_d}{\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j}, \frac{\mu(Y')}{(\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j)^{\alpha}} \right), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{d+1}. \tag{4.9}
\]
where \( \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_d \) denote independent \([0, \infty)\)-valued random variables with the one-sided \( \alpha \)-stable distributions characterized by (3.6).

Furthermore, Theorem 4.4 implies a certain functional limit theorem for the occupation measure of the orbit. In the following, we will explain it.

Let \( \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{[0, 1]} \) denote the class of all finite measures on \([0, 1]\). We endow \( \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{[0, 1]} \) with the Polish topology of weak convergence. Let \( \mathcal{M}_{[0, 1]\backslash \{x_j\}_{j=1}^d} \) denote the class of all Radon measures (equivalently, locally finite measures) on \([0, 1]\backslash \{x_j\}_{j=1}^d\). Note that \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{[0, 1]\backslash \{x_j\}_{j=1}^d} \).

We endow \( \mathcal{M}_{[0, 1]\backslash \{x_j\}_{j=1}^d} \) with the Polish topology of vague convergence. For more details of these topologies, see Appendix D.

For \( t \geq 0 \), we define a measurable map \( S(t) : [0, 1] \to \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{[0, 1]} \) by
\[
S(t)(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor t \rfloor - 1} \delta_{T^k x} + (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \delta_{T^\lfloor t \rfloor x}, \quad x \in [0, 1], \tag{4.10}
\]
where \( \delta_y \) denotes the Dirac measure at \( y \). In other words, \( S(t) \) denotes the occupation measure of the orbit up to time \( t \).

**Theorem 4.6.** Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Then, it holds that
\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S(nt), \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S(nt) : t \geq 0 \right)
\]
\[
\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}(\mu)} \left( Z_1^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) \delta_{x_1} + \cdots + Z_d^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) \delta_{x_d}, L^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t) \mu : t \geq 0 \right), \quad \text{in } C([0, \infty), \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{[0, 1]} \times \mathcal{M}_{[0, 1]\backslash \{x_j\}_{j=1}^d}). \tag{4.11}
\]
Proof. This convergence is easily deduced from Theorem 4.1, Proposition D.1 and Hopf’s ratio ergodic theorem.

5 Proof of Theorem 4.1

For the proof of Theorem 4.1, we mimic the method of [16].

5.1 Williams formulae

Following [16, Proposition 2.1], we will introduce the discrete Williams formulae, which are representation formulae for occupation times of an orbit in terms of excursion lengths.

Let us denote by $D_0$ the collection of all non-decreasing càdlàg functions $w : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ with $w(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \to \infty} w(t) = \infty$. For $w = (w(t))_{t \geq 0} \in D_0$, we will denote by $w^{-1} = (w^{-1}(s))_{s \geq 0}$ the right-continuous inverse of $w$, that is,

$$w^{-1}(s) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : w(t) > s\}, \quad s \geq 0.$$ 

Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Set

$$\eta_j(t) := \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor t \rfloor} \ell_j \circ T_k^{Y,-1}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d,$$

that is, $\eta_j(t)$ denotes the amount of time spent on $A_j$ by the first to $\lfloor t \rfloor$-th excursions of the orbit away from $Y$. In other words, $\eta_j(t)$ is the amount of time which the orbit spends on $A_j$ up to the $\lfloor t \rfloor$-th return time for $Y$. Here zeroth return time for $Y$ means the time $0$.

**Lemma 5.1** (discrete Williams formulae). Suppose that $T$ is a CEMPT on $(X, B, \mu)$ and Assumption 2.1 holds. Then,

$$S_{A_j}^{-1}(t) = t + \sum_{i=1, \ldots, d, i \neq j} \eta_i(\eta_j^{-1}(t)) + \eta_j^{-1}(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d,$$

$$S_Y^{-1}(t) = t + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \eta_i(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$  

**Proof.** Set $n := \eta_j^{-1}(t)$, which is a positive integer. Then the occupation time processes for $A_j$ exceeds the quantity $t$ between the $(n - 1)$-st and $n$-th return times for $Y$. Moreover, by Assumption 2.1, the occupation time processes for $A_i (i \neq j)$ does not increase between these times. Therefore,

$$S_{A_i}(S_{A_j}^{-1}(t)) = \begin{cases} t, & i = j, \\ \eta_i(n), & i \neq j \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad S_Y(S_{A_j}^{-1}(t)) = n.$$  


By Assumption 2.1, we have
\[ u = \sum_{i=1}^{d} S_{A_{i}}(u) + S_{Y}(u), \quad u \geq 0. \] (5.5)
Substituting \( u = S_{A_{j}}^{-1}(t) \) in (5.5), we obtain (5.2). By a similar argument, we may easily obtain (5.3).

Furthermore, following [38], we will introduce Williams formulae for skew Bessel diffusion processes. Recall that \( R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \), \( Z_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) and \( L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) have been defined in Definition 3.1 (3.3) and (3.4), respectively. We will denote by \( \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) the inverse local time of \( R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) at 0:
\[ \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t) := \left( L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \right)^{-1}(t), \quad t \geq 0. \] (5.6)
Furthermore, set
\[ \eta_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t) := Z_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(\eta_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t)), \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \] (5.7)
The \( \eta_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t) \) denotes the amount of time spent on \( A_{j} \) by the excursions of \( R^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) away from 0 up to time \( \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t) \). By the Itô excursion theory, we know that \( \eta_{1}^{(\alpha,\beta)}, \ldots, \eta_{d}^{(\alpha,\beta)} \) are independent \( \alpha \)-stable subordinators with Laplace transforms
\[ \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda \eta_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t))] = \exp(-\lambda^{\alpha} \beta_{j} t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \] (5.8)

**Lemma 5.2** (Williams formulae). Let \( d \geq 1 \) be a positive integer, \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) and \( \beta = (\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{d}) \) with \( \sum_{j=1}^{d} \beta_{j} = 1 \). Then, it holds that
\[ \left( Z_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \right)^{-1}(t) = t + \sum_{i=1,\ldots,d, i \neq j}^{d} \eta_{i}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\eta_{j}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t))^{-1}(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \] (5.9)
\[ \left( L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \right)^{-1}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \eta_{i}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t) = \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(t), \quad t \geq 0. \] (5.10)

For the proof, we refer the reader to [38, Theorem 3.1]. See also [37, Proposition 1].

### 5.2 Functional convergence of excursion lengths

We see at once that a stochastic process
\[ \left( \eta_{1}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\Gamma(1 - \alpha)t), \ldots, \eta_{d}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\Gamma(1 - \alpha)t) : t \geq 0 \right) \]
is an \( \mathbb{R}^{d} \)-valued \( \alpha \)-stable Lévy process with the Lévy measure \( \Pi^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta) \) given by
\[ \Pi^{(\alpha,\beta)}(\alpha, \beta)(A) := \sum_{j=1}^{d} \beta_{j} \int_{0}^{\infty} 1_{A}(re^{(j)}) \alpha r^{-\alpha - 1} dr, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d}), \]
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where \( e^{(j)} := (1_{i=j})_{d=1}^d \in \mathbb{R}^d \). We will denote by \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) the space of \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued càdlàg functions defined on \([0, \infty)\). We equip \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) with the Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology, which is a Polish topology. For more details, see Appendix B.

**Lemma 5.3.** Suppose that \( T \) is a CEMP on \((X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)\) and that Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6 hold. Then,

\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} \eta_1(\frac{\Phi(n)t}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} \eta_d(\frac{\Phi(n)t}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}) : t \geq 0 \right)
\xrightarrow{\mu, Y_{BD}} \left( \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_1(t), \ldots, \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_d(t) : t \geq 0 \right), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d). \tag{5.11}
\]

**Proof.** By the assumptions and Proposition C.3, we obtain the convergence (5.11).

Before entering into the proof of Theorem 4.1, we will recall the following sufficient condition for strong distributional convergence:

**Lemma 5.4 ([11], Theorem 1).** Let \( T \) be a CEMP on \((X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)\), let \( \nu_0 \ll \mu \) be a probability measure on \( X \), and let \((U, \rho)\) be a separable and complete metric space. Assume that measurable functions \( F_n : X \to U \ (n \in \mathbb{N}) \) satisfy the following two conditions:

(i) \( F_n \xrightarrow{\nu_0} \zeta \) for some \( U \)-valued random variable \( \zeta \);

(ii) for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and for any probability measure \( \nu \ll \mu \) on \( X \), it holds that

\[
\nu \left[ \rho(F_n \circ T, F_n) > \varepsilon \right] \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.
\]

Then, it holds that \( F_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}(\nu)} \zeta \).

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** We see at once that

\[
\frac{1}{n} \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_i(\left( \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_j \right)^{-1}(nt)) = \frac{1}{n} \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_i \left( \frac{\Phi(n)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \left( \frac{1}{n} \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}_j \left( \frac{\Phi(n)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \right) \right)^{-1}(t) \right).
\tag{5.12}
\]

Combining Lemmas 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 we have

\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S^{-1}_{A_1}(nt), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S^{-1}_{A_d}(nt), \frac{1}{n} S^{-1}_{Y} \left( \frac{\Phi(n)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \right) : t \geq 0 \right)
\xrightarrow{\mu, Y_{BD}} \left( Z^{(\alpha,\beta)}_1(t), \ldots, Z^{(\alpha,\beta)}_d(t), \eta^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) : t \geq 0 \right), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1}). \tag{5.13}
\]

Using Lemmas 5.4 and 5.4 we have

\[
\left( \frac{1}{n} S_{A_1}(nt), \ldots, \frac{1}{n} S_{A_d}(nt), \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{\Phi(n)} S_{Y}(nt) : t \geq 0 \right)
\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}(\mu)} \left( Z^{(\alpha,\beta)}_1(t), \ldots, Z^{(\alpha,\beta)}_d(t), L^{(\alpha,\beta)}(t) : t \geq 0 \right), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d+1}). \tag{5.14}
\]

By Remark B.1, we obtain the convergence (4.11). \qed
6 Proof of Theorem 4.4

In the following, we will choose \( A_1, \ldots, A_d, Y \in B([0, 1]) \) suitably so that all of the conditions of Assumptions 2.1, 2.3 and 2.6 will be satisfied. Then, we will apply Theorem 4.1 to obtain Theorem 4.4. We need to break the proof up into cases \( d = 2 \) and \( d \geq 3 \) for a certain reason. See Remark 6.5.

6.1 Case \( d = 2 \)

Let us consider the case \( d = 2 \). Following [33] and [39], we take a point \( \gamma \in J_1 \) such that

\[ T\gamma \in J_2 \quad \text{and} \quad T^2\gamma = \gamma. \]

Hence \( \gamma \) is a 2-periodic point of \( T \). Set

\[ A_1 := [0, \gamma), \quad Y := [\gamma, T\gamma] \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 := (T\gamma, 1). \]

Then we have

\[ T(A_1) = A_2, \quad T(A_2) = A_1, \quad T(Y \cap J_1) = A_2, \quad T(Y \cap J_2) = A_1, \quad \text{a.e.} \]

Therefore Assumption 2.1 holds for \( d = 2 \). Let us define \( \varphi, \ell \equiv (\ell_1, \ell_2), \mu_Y \) and \( T_Y \) as in Section 2. For \( n \geq 1 \), we define subsets \( P_{1,n} \) and \( P_{2,n} \subset Y \) by

\[ P_{1,n} := \{ \ell_1 = n \} = \{ \varphi = n + 1 \} \cap J_2, \]

\[ P_{2,n} := \{ \ell_2 = n \} = \{ \varphi = n + 1 \} \cap J_1. \]

Then we have

\[ P_{1,n} = (f_2 \circ f_1^n)(Y) = \left( (f_2 \circ f_1^n)\gamma, (f_2 \circ f_1^{n-1})\gamma \right), \]

\[ P_{2,n} = (f_1 \circ f_2^n)(Y) = \left( (f_1 \circ f_2^n)\gamma, (f_1 \circ f_2^{n+1})\gamma \right). \]

Here we used the fact that \( T\gamma = f_1^{-1}\gamma = f_2\gamma \). Furthermore, we have \( Y = \sum_{j,n} P_{j,n}, \) a.e.

Lemma 6.1 ([33 Lemma 5]). Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Then,

\[ \mu_Y[\ell_j > r] \sim \frac{1}{\mu(Y)\Phi(r)}, \quad j = 1, 2. \]

where \( \beta_j \) and \( \Phi \) have been (4.5) and (4.6), respectively.

Lemma 6.2 ([39 Lemma 2]). The map \( T_Y \) satisfies the following conditions:

1. For each \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( n \geq 1 \), the restriction \( T|_{P_{j,n}} \) can be extended to a \( C^2 \)-bijective map from \( P_{j,n} \) to \( Y \);
2. \( \inf\{T_Y x : x \in \sum_{j,n} P_{j,n}\} > 1 \);
3. \( \sup\{|T_Y^n x|/|T_Y x|^2 : x \in \sum_{j,n} P_{j,n}\} < \infty \).

Combining Lemma 6.2 with Lemma A.3 and Remark 2.8 we see that Assumption 2.6 is satisfied. Therefore, combining Theorem 4.1 with Hopf’s ratio ergodic theorem, we obtain Theorem 4.4 for \( d = 2 \).
6.2 Case \( d \geq 3 \)

Let us consider the case \( d \geq 3 \). Set

\[
A_j := f_j(J_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, d, \quad \text{and} \quad Y := [0, 1] \setminus \sum_{j=1}^{d} A_j. \tag{6.8}
\]

Then Assumption 2.1 holds. Let us define \( \varphi, \ell = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_d), \mu_Y \) and \( T_Y \) as in Section 2.

The following lemma is a slight modification of Lemma 6.1.

**Lemma 6.3.** Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Then,

\[
\mu_Y[\ell_j > r] \sim \beta_j \frac{1}{\mu(Y)\Phi(r)}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, d, \tag{6.9}
\]

where \( \beta_j \) and \( \Phi \) have been defined in (4.5) and (4.6), respectively.

Set

\[
J_{j,-} := Y \cap (a_{j-1}, x_j) \quad \text{and} \quad J_{j,+} := Y \cap (x_j, a_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, d. \tag{6.10}
\]

For \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}, \sigma \in \{+, -\} \) and \( n \geq 0 \), we define a subset \( P_{i,j,\sigma,n} \subset Y \) by

\[
P_{i,j,\sigma,n} := Y \cap J_i \cap T_{i-1}^{-1}(J_{j,\sigma}) \cap \{\ell_j = n\}
= Y \cap J_i \cap T_{i-1}^{-1}(J_{j,\sigma}) \cap \{\varphi = n + 1\}. \tag{6.11}
\]

We see at once that

\[
J_{i_0,\sigma_0} = \begin{cases}
\sum_{j<i_0, \sigma=\pm, n\geq 0} P_{i_0,j,\sigma,n}, & \text{if } \sigma_0 = -, \\
\sum_{j>i_0, \sigma=\pm, n\geq 0} P_{i_0,j,\sigma,n} & \text{if } \sigma_0 = +,
\end{cases} \quad \text{a.e.,} \tag{6.12}
\]

and hence \( Y = \sum_{i,j,\sigma,n} P_{i,j,\sigma,n}, \text{ a.e.} \). Set

\[
\Theta := \{(i, j, \sigma, n) : P_{i,j,\sigma,n} \neq \emptyset\} = \{(i, j, \sigma, n) : i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad (j, \sigma) \neq (1, -), (d, +)\}.
\]

**Lemma 6.4.** The map \( T_Y \) satisfies the following conditions:

1. for each \( (i, j, \sigma, n) \in \Theta \), the restriction \( T_Y|_{P_{i,j,\sigma,n}} \) can be extended to a \( C^2 \)-bijective map from \( P_{i,j,\sigma,n} \) to \( J_{j,\sigma} \);
2. \( \inf \{T_Y'x : x \in \sum_{i,j,\sigma,n} P_{i,j,\sigma,n}\} > 1 \);
3. \( \sup \{|T_Y''x|/|T_Y'x|^2 : x \in \sum_{i,j,\sigma,n} P_{i,j,\sigma,n}\} < \infty \);
4. for each \( (i, j, \sigma, n) \in \Theta \), it holds that \( T_Y^4(J_{i,j,\sigma,n}) = Y, \text{ a.e.} \).
Proof. The proofs of (1), (2) and (3) are almost the same as those of Lemma 6.2. So we omit them. Let $(i, j, n) \in \Theta$. Then, we have $T_Y(P_{i,j, -, n}) = J_{j, -}$, a.e. Using (6.12), we have $T_Y(J_{j, -}) \supset J_{i, +}$, a.e. We see at once that

$$T_Y(J_{i, +}) = Y \setminus J_{1, +} \quad \text{and} \quad T_Y(Y \setminus J_{1, +}) = Y,$$

a.e. Using (6.12), we have $T_Y(J_{j, -}) \supset J_{1, +}$, a.e. We see at once that

$$T_Y(J_{1, +}) = Y \setminus J_{1, +} \quad \text{and} \quad T_Y(Y \setminus J_{1, +}) = Y,$$

a.e., for $(i', j', +, n') \in \Theta$.

Hence, we can obtain Theorem 4.4 in the cases $d \geq 3$, as in the case $d = 2$.

Remark 6.5. Let us consider the case $d = 2$ and define $A_j$, $Y$, $J_{i, \sigma}$ and $P_{i,j, \sigma,n}$ by (6.8), (6.10) and (6.11), respectively. Then we have

$$T_Y(J_{1, +}) = J_{2, -} \quad \text{and} \quad T_Y(J_{2, -}) = J_{1, +}, \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Hence $T_Y^m(P_{i,j, \sigma,n}) \neq Y$, a.e., for any $m \geq 1$.

A Mixing property of uniformly expanding Markov interval map

We will recall some mixing properties of uniformly expanding Markov interval maps. For basic discussions of Markov interval maps, see for instance Bowen [11], Bowen–Series [12] or Pollicott–Yuri [25, Sections 4 and 12].

Let $(P_i : i \geq 1)$ be a countable family of disjoint open subintervals of $(0, 1)$, and let $Y = \sum_{i \geq 1} P_i$, a.e. Suppose that a map $F : Y \to Y$ satisfies the following conditions:

1. $(C^2$-extension) for each $i \geq 1$, the restriction $F|_{P_i}$ can be extended to a $C^2$-function on $P_i$;
2. (Markov map) if $F(P_i) \cap P_j \neq \emptyset$ for some $i, j \geq 1$, then $F(P_i) \supset P_j$;
3. (aperiodicity) there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that, for any $i \geq 1$, it holds that $F^{n_0}(P_i) = Y$, a.e;
4. (finite image) a collection $\{F(P_i) : i \geq 1\}$ of image sets is finite;
5. (uniformly expanding) $\inf\{|F'(x)| : x \in \sum_i P_i\} > 1$;
6. (Adler’s condition) $\sup\{|F'(x)|/|F'(x)|^2 : x \in \sum_i P_i\} < \infty$.

The following two lemmas are slight modifications of [12 Theorem (I.2)] and [25 Theorem 12.5], respectively. So we omit the proofs of them.

Lemma A.1. Assume that the conditions (1)–(6) hold. Then the map $F$ has a unique invariant probability measure $\nu_0$ equivalent to the Lebesgue measure on $Y$. 
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**Lemma A.2.** Assume that the conditions (1)–(6) hold. Let \( \nu_0 \) be the \( F \)-invariant probability measure given by Lemma [A.1]. Then the map \( F \) is exact with respect to \( \nu_0 \), that is, \( \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \{ F^{-n}A : A \in \mathcal{B}(Y) \} = \{ \emptyset, Y \} \), \( \nu_0 \)-a.e.

Let us define a sub-\( \sigma \)-field \( \mathcal{F}^m_n \subset \mathcal{B}(Y) \) by \( \mathcal{F}^m_n := \sigma \{ F^{-k}P_i : n \leq k \leq m \text{ and } i \geq 1 \} \). Combining Lemmas [A.1] and [A.2] with [3] Theorem 1.(b) or [4] Corollary 4.7.8, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma A.3.** Assume that the conditions (1)–(6) hold. Let \( \nu_0 \) be the \( F \)-invariant probability measure given by Lemma [A.1]. Then there exist \( C \in (0, \infty) \) and \( \theta \in (0, 1) \) such that, for any \( k, n \geq 0 \), \( A \in \mathcal{F}^k_0 \) and \( B \in \mathcal{B}(Y) \),

\[
|\nu_0(A \cap F^{-(k+n)}(B)) - \nu_0(A)\nu_0(B)| \leq C\theta^n \nu_0(A)\nu_0(B). \tag{A.1}
\]

**B  Space of càdlàg functions and Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology**

We will recall the space of càdlàg functions and the Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology. For more details, see Ethier–Kurtz [14] and Jacod–Shiryaev [18].

Let \( d \geq 1 \) be a positive integer. We will denote by \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) the space of \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued càdlàg functions defined on \([0, \infty)\), that is,

\[
D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) := \{ w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d : w(t+) = w(t) \text{ and } w(t-) \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}^d \text{ for each } t \geq 0 \}.
\]

Here, for \( t \geq 0 \),

\[
w(t+) := \lim_{s \downarrow t} w(s) \quad \text{and} \quad w(t-) := \begin{cases} 
\lim_{s \uparrow t} w(s), & t > 0, \\
w(0), & t = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

We equip \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) with the Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology, which is a Polish topology. Let \( \{w_n\}_{n \geq 1} \cup \{w_\infty\} \subset D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \). It holds that \( w_n \rightarrow w_\infty \) in \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) (with respect to the Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology) if and only if, there exists a sequence \( \{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 1} \) of continuous and strictly increasing functions mapping \([0, \infty)\) onto \([0, \infty)\), such that, for any \( t_0 > 0 \),

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} |\lambda_n(t) - t| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} |w_n(\lambda_n(t)) - w_\infty(t)| \rightarrow 0.
\]

**Remark B.1.** The relative topology on \( C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) induced by \( D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d) \) (with respect to the Skorokhod \( J_1 \)-topology) coincides with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets.

Let \( D_0 \subset D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) \) be the space of non-decreasing càdlàg functions \( w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) with \( w(0) = 0 \) and \( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t) = \infty \). Let \( w = (w(t) : t \geq 0) \in D_0 \). Recall that \( w^{-1} = (w^{-1}(s) : s \geq 0) \) denotes the right-continuous inverse of \( w \), i.e., \( w^{-1}(s) := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : w(t) > s \} \).
Lemma B.2 ([16 Lemma 2.3]). Assume that \((x_n : 0 \leq n \leq \infty)\) and \((y_n : 0 \leq n \leq \infty)\) \(\subset D_0\) satisfy the following conditions:

(i) \(x_\infty\) is a strictly increasing function;
(ii) \((x_n, y_n) \underset{n \to \infty}{\to} (x_\infty, y_\infty)\), in \(D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^2)\).

Then, it holds that
\[
y_n(x_n^{-1}(t)) \underset{n \to \infty}{\to} y_\infty(x_\infty^{-1}(t)), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R},
\]
at every \(t \geq 0\) for which \(x_\infty^{-1}(t)\) is a continuity point of \(y_\infty\).

Let \(Z = (Z(t) : t \geq 0)\) be a \(D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d)\)-valued random variable. We say that \(Z\) is stochastically continuous if \(\mathbb{P}[Z(t) = Z(t^-)] = 1\), for any \(t \geq 0\). The following lemma is a slight modification of [9] Theorem 3. The proof is almost the same and so we omit it.

Lemma B.3. Let \(d \geq 1\) be a positive integer. For each \(n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty\) and \(i = 1, \ldots, d\), let \(Z_{n,i} = (Z_{n,i}(t))_{t \geq 0}\) be a \(D_0\)-valued random variable. Assume that

(i) \(Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d}\) are stochastically continuous;
(ii) the finite-dimensional laws of \((Z_{n,1}, \ldots, Z_{n,d})\) converge as \(n \to \infty\) to those of \((Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d})\).

Then, it holds that
\[
(Z_{n,1}, \ldots, Z_{n,d}) \underset{n \to \infty}{\Rightarrow} (Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d}), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d). \tag{B.1}
\]

Lemma B.4. Let \(d \geq 2\) be a positive integer. For each \(n = 1, 2, \ldots, \infty\) and \(i = 1, \ldots, d\), let \(Z_{n,i} = (Z_{n,i}(t))_{t \geq 0}\) be a \(D_0\)-valued random variable. Assume that

(i) \(Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d}\) are strictly increasing, stochastically continuous and independent;
(ii) \((Z_{n,1}, \ldots, Z_{n,d}) \underset{n \to \infty}{\Rightarrow} (Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d}), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d).\)

Then, it holds that
\[
\left(Z_{n,i}(Z_{n,j}^{-1}(t)) : i \neq j, \ t \geq 0\right) \underset{n \to \infty}{\Rightarrow} \left(Z_{\infty,i}(Z_{\infty,j}^{-1}(t)) : i \neq j, \ t \geq 0\right),
\]
\[
\text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{d(d-1)}). \tag{B.2}
\]

Proof. By the Skorokhod coupling (see for example [19] Theorem 4.30), we may assume that
\[
(Z_{n,1}, \ldots, Z_{n,d}) \underset{n \to \infty}{\Rightarrow} (Z_{\infty,1}, \ldots, Z_{\infty,d}), \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d), \ a.s. \tag{B.3}
\]
Then, by the assumptions and Lemma B.2, we have, for each \(i \neq j\) and \(t \geq 0\),
\[
Z_{n,i}(Z_{n,j}^{-1}(t)) \underset{n \to \infty}{\Rightarrow} Z_{\infty,i}(Z_{\infty,j}^{-1}(t)), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \ a.s. \tag{B.4}
\]
Therefore, by Lemma B.3 we obtain (B.2). \(\square\)
C Convergence to $\alpha$-stable Lévy processes

Following [35], we will give a functional limit theorem for the processes which have stationary increments and local dependence in a certain sense.

Let $d \geq 1$ be a positive integer, and $(Z_n : n \geq 1)$ a strictly stationary sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables. Set $S^{d-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We will denote by $\mathcal{P}_{S^{d-1}}$ the class of probability measures on $S^{d-1}$. We endow $\mathcal{P}_{S^{d-1}}$ with the Polish topology of the weak convergence.

**Assumption C.1** (regular variation). The $Z_1$ is regular varying with index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and spectral measure $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(S^{d-1})$, that is, it holds that

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left[|Z_1| > \lambda r \mid |Z_1| > r\right] = \lambda^{-\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{Z_1}{|Z_1|} \in \cdot \mid |Z_1| > r\right] \to \rho(\cdot), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{P}_{S^{d-1}},$$

where $\mathbb{P}[\cdot]$ denotes the conditional probability.

We will assume Assumption C.1 from now on. For $n \geq 1$, set

$$b_n := \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > n)} \in (0, \infty). \quad \text{(C.1)}$$

We define a sub-$\sigma$-field $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma\{Z_k : n \leq k \leq m\}$. For $n \geq 0$, set

$$\phi_0(n) := \sup\{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B) : k \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{F}_k, B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+n}\}. \quad \text{(C.2)}$$

**Assumption C.2** (local dependence). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\mathbb{N}$-valued sequences $(r_n)$ and $(l_n)$ such that

$$l_n, r_n, b_n \to \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{r_n}{l_n} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left[\max_{2 \leq k \leq r_n} |Z_k| > \varepsilon n \mid |Z_1| > \varepsilon n\right] = 0.$$

For $n \geq 1$, we define an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued càdlàg process $X_n = (X_n(t) : t \geq 0)$ by

$$X_n(t) := \frac{b_n}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{[bt]} Z_k, \quad t \geq 0. \quad \text{(C.3)}$$

We will denote by $X_{(\alpha, \rho)} = (X_{(\alpha, \rho)}(t) : t \geq 0)$ an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued $\alpha$-stable Lévy process with a Lévy measure $\Pi_{(\alpha, \rho)}$ given by

$$\Pi_{(\alpha, \rho)}(A) := \int_0^\infty dr \int_{S^{d-1}} \rho(dx)1_A(rx)\alpha r^{-\alpha-1}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad \text{(C.4)}$$

The following proposition is a slight modification of [35, Theorem 1.1]. So we omit its proof.

**Proposition C.3.** Suppose that Assumptions C.1 and C.2 hold. Then, it holds that

$$X_n \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha, \rho)}, \quad \text{in } D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d). \quad \text{(C.5)}$$
D Topologies of weak convergence and of vague convergence

We will recall the topology of weak convergence for finite measures and that of vague convergence for Radon measures. For more details, see Kallenberg [19, Chapter 16 and Appendix A.2] and [20, Chapter 4].

Let $U$ be a Polish space. Let $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_U$ denote the class of finite measures on $U$. We will denote by $\mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R})$ the family of bounded and continuous functions $f : U \to \mathbb{R}$. For $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R})$, we will write $\pi_f$ for the mapping $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_U \ni \mu \mapsto \int f(x) \mu(dx) \in \mathbb{R}$. The topology of weak convergence is defined to be a Polish topology on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_U$ generated by the maps $\pi_f$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R})$.

Let $V$ be a locally compact, second countable Hausdorff space. The space $V$ is known to be Polish. Recall that any locally finite measures on $V$ are Radon measures. Let $\mathcal{M}_V$ denote the class of Radon measures on $V$. We will denote by $\mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R})$ the family of continuous functions $f : V \to \mathbb{R}$ with compact support. For $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R})$, we will write $\pi_f$ for the mapping $\mathcal{M}_V \ni \mu \mapsto \int f(x) \mu(dx) \in \mathbb{R}$. The topology of vague convergence is defined to be the Polish topology on $\mathcal{M}_V$ generated by the maps $\pi_f$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R})$.

Let $G = (G(t, dx) : t \geq 0)$ be a $C([0, \infty), \hat{\mathcal{M}}_U \times \mathcal{M}_V)$-valued random variable and let $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_m) \in \mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R}^m)$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R}^m)$). We will define a $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m)$-valued random variable $Gf = ((Gf)(t) : t \geq 0)$ by

$$(Gf)(t) := \left( \int f_1(x)G(t, dx), \ldots, \int f_m(x)G(t, dx) \right), \quad t \geq 0$$

**Proposition D.1.** Let $(G_1, H_1), \ldots, (G_\infty, H_\infty)$ be $C([0, \infty), \hat{\mathcal{M}}_U \times \mathcal{M}_V)$-valued random variables. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $(G_n, H_n) \xrightarrow{d} (G_\infty, H_\infty)$ in $C([0, \infty), \hat{\mathcal{M}}_U \times \mathcal{M}_V)$.

(ii) For any $m \geq 1$, $g \in \mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R}^m)$,

$$(G_n g, H_n h) \xrightarrow{d} (G_\infty g, H_\infty h), \quad \text{in } C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{2m}).$$

**Proof.** The implication [(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii)] is trivial. Conversely, assume that the condition (ii) is satisfied. Then the finite-dimensional laws of $(G_n, H_n)$ converge as $n \to \infty$ to those of $(G_\infty, H_\infty)$ (see [19, Theorem 16.16]). Furthermore, for any $g \in \mathcal{C}_b(U, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}_c(V, \mathbb{R})$, the sequence $((G_n g, H_n h))_{n \geq 0}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. Hence the sequence $((G_n, H_n))_{n \geq 0}$ is tight in $C([0, \infty), \hat{\mathcal{M}}_U \times \mathcal{M}_V)$ (see [19, Theorem 16.27]). Therefore we obtain (i).  
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