

MAXIMA OF LINEAR PROCESSES WITH HEAVY-TAILED INNOVATIONS AND RANDOM COEFFICIENTS

DANIJEL KRIZMANIĆ

ABSTRACT. We investigate maxima of linear processes with i.i.d. heavy-tailed innovations and random coefficients. Using the point process approach we derive functional convergence of the partial maxima stochastic process in the space of càdlàg functions on $[0, 1]$ with the Skorohod M_1 topology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a strictly stationary sequence of random variables (X_i) and denote by $M_n = \max\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$, $n \geq 1$, its accompanying sequence of partial maxima. The principal concern of classical extreme value theory is with asymptotic distributional properties of the maximum M_n . It is well known that in the i.i.d. case if there exist normalizing constants $a_n > 0$ and b_n such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{M_n - b_n}{a_n} \leq x\right) \rightarrow G(x) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.1)$$

where G is assumed non-degenerate, then G necessarily belongs to the class of extreme value distributions (see for instance Gnedenko [6] and Resnick [15]). In particular, (1.1) holds with $G(x) = \exp\{-x^{-\alpha}\}$, $x > 0$, for some $\alpha > 0$, i.e. the distribution of X_1 is in the domain of attraction of the Fréchet distribution, if and only if $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X_1 > x)$ is regularly varying at infinity with index α , i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > tx)}{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t)} = x^{-\alpha}$$

for every $x > 0$ (see Proposition 1.11 in Resnick [15]). A functional version of this is known to be true as well, the limit process being an extremal process, and the convergence takes place in the space of càdlàg functions endowed with the Skorohod J_1 topology. More precisely, relation (1.1) is equivalent to

$$M_n(\cdot) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor} \frac{X_i}{a_n} \xrightarrow{d} Y(\cdot) \quad (1.2)$$

in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$, the space of real-valued càdlàg functions on $[0, 1]$, with the Skorohod J_1 topology, where $Y(\cdot)$ is an extremal process generated by G . If G is the Fréchet distribution, then Y has marginal distributions

$$\mathbb{P}(Y(t) \leq x) = e^{-tx^{-\alpha}}, \quad x \geq 0, t \in [0, 1].$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60F17; Secondary 60G70.

Key words and phrases. Functional limit theorem, Regular variation, Extremal process, M_2 topology, Linear process.

This result was first proved by Lamperti [12] (see also Resnick [15], Proposition 4.20). For convenience we can put $M_n(t) = X_1/a_n$ (or $M_n(t) = 0$) for $t \in [0, 1/n)$.

In the dependent case, Adler [1] obtained J_1 extremal functional convergence with the weak dependence condition similar to "asymptotic independence" condition introduced by Leadbetter [14]. For stationary sequences of jointly regularly varying random variables Basrak and Tafro [3] showed the invariance principle for the partial maximum process $M_n(\cdot)$ in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ with the Skorohod M_1 topology (cf. Krizmanić [8]).

For a special class of weakly dependent random variables, the linear processes or moving averages processes with i.i.d. heavy-tailed innovations (and deterministic coefficients), it is known that (1.2) holds, see for instance Resnick [15], Proposition 4.28. In this paper we aim to obtain the functional convergence as in (1.2) for linear processes with random coefficients. Due to possible clustering of large values, the J_1 topology becomes inappropriate, and hence we will use the weaker Skorohod M_1 topology. In the proofs of our results we will use some methods and results which appear in Basrak and Krizmanić [2], where they obtained functional convergence of partial sum processes with respect to Skorohod M_2 topology; Krizmanić [9], where joint functional convergence of partial sums and maxima for linear processes was investigated and Krizmanić [10], where a functional limit theorem for sums of linear processes with heavy-tailed innovations and random coefficients was established. For some related results on limit theory for sums of moving averages with random coefficients see Kulik [11].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce basic notions about linear processes, regular variation and Skorohod topologies. In Section 3 we derive functional convergence of the partial maxima stochastic process for finite order linear processes with i.i.d. heavy-tailed innovations and random coefficients, and then we extend this result to infinite order linear processes. In Appendix we prove a technical result about the M_1 continuity of maximum of two nondecreasing functions from $D[0, 1]$ with no common discontinuity points.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Linear processes. Let $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with regularly varying balanced tails, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_i| > x) = x^{-\alpha}L(x), \quad x > 0, \quad (2.1)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and slowly varying function L , and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i > x)}{\mathbb{P}(|Z_i| > x)} = p, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i < -x)}{\mathbb{P}(|Z_i| > x)} = r, \quad (2.2)$$

where $p \in [0, 1]$ and $p + r = 1$. Let (a_n) be a sequence of positive real numbers such that

$$n \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > a_n) \rightarrow 1, \quad (2.3)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then regular variation of Z_i can be expressed in terms of vague convergence of measures on $\mathbb{E} = \overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$:

$$n \mathbb{P}(a_n^{-1} Z_i \in \cdot) \xrightarrow{v} \mu(\cdot) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.4)$$

where μ is a measure on \mathbb{E} given by

$$\mu(dx) = (p 1_{(0, \infty)}(x) + r 1_{(-\infty, 0)}(x)) \alpha |x|^{-\alpha-1} dx. \quad (2.5)$$

We study linear processes with random coefficients, defined by

$$X_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} C_j Z_{i-j}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $(C_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a sequence of random variables independent of (Z_i) such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta < \infty \quad \text{for some } \delta < \alpha, 0 < \delta \leq 1. \quad (2.7)$$

The regular variation property and Karamata's theorem imply $\mathbb{E}|Z_1|^\beta < \infty$ for every $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$ (cf. Bingham et al. [5], Proposition 1.5.10), which together with the moment condition (2.7) yield the a.s. convergence of the series in (2.6):

$$\mathbb{E}|X_i|^\delta \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta \mathbb{E}|Z_{i-j}|^\delta = \mathbb{E}|Z_1|^\delta \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta < \infty.$$

Skorohod topologies. We start by considering $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of all right-continuous \mathbb{R}^d -valued functions on $[0, 1]$ with left limits. For $x \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ the completed (thick) graph of x is the set

$$G_x = \{(t, z) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d : z \in [[x(t-), x(t)]]\},$$

where $x(t-)$ is the left limit of x at t and $[[a, b]]$ is the product segment, i.e. $[[a, b]] = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \dots \times [a_d, b_d]$ for $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d), b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $[a_i, b_i]$ coincides with the closed interval $[a_i \wedge b_i, a_i \vee b_i]$, with $c \wedge d = \min\{c, d\}$ and $c \vee d = \max\{c, d\}$ for $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$. We define an order on the graph G_x by saying that $(t_1, z_1) \leq (t_2, z_2)$ if either (i) $t_1 < t_2$ or (ii) $t_1 = t_2$ and $|x_j(t_1-) - z_{1j}| \leq |x_j(t_2-) - z_{2j}|$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. A weak parametric representation of the graph G_x is a continuous nondecreasing function (r, u) mapping $[0, 1]$ into G_x , with r being the time component and u being the spatial component, such that $r(0) = 0, r(1) = 1$ and $u(1) = x(1)$. Let $\Pi_w(x)$ denote the set of weak parametric representations of the graph G_x . For $x_1, x_2 \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ define

$$d_w(x_1, x_2) = \inf\{\|r_1 - r_2\|_{[0,1]} \vee \|u_1 - u_2\|_{[0,1]} : (r_i, u_i) \in \Pi_w(x_i), i = 1, 2\},$$

where $\|x\|_{[0,1]} = \sup\{\|x(t)\| : t \in [0, 1]\}$. Now we say that $x_n \rightarrow x$ in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ for a sequence (x_n) in the weak Skorohod M_1 (or shortly WM_1) topology if $d_w(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

If we replace above the graph G_x with the completed (thin) graph

$$\Gamma_x = \{(t, z) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d : z = \lambda x(t-) + (1 - \lambda)x(t) \text{ for some } \lambda \in [0, 1]\},$$

and weak parametric representations with strong parametric representations (i.e. continuous nondecreasing functions (r, u) mapping $[0, 1]$ onto Γ_x), then we obtain the standard (or strong) Skorohod M_1 topology. This topology is induced by the metric

$$d_{M_1}(x_1, x_2) = \inf\{\|r_1 - r_2\|_{[0,1]} \vee \|u_1 - u_2\|_{[0,1]} : (r_i, u_i) \in \Pi_s(x_i), i = 1, 2\},$$

where $\Pi_s(x)$ is the set of strong parametric representations of the graph Γ_x . The standard M_1 topology is stronger than the weak M_1 topology on $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$, but they coincide for $d = 1$.

The WM_1 topology coincides with the topology induced by the metric

$$d_p(x_1, x_2) = \max\{d_{M_1}(x_{1j}, x_{2j}) : j = 1, \dots, d\} \quad (2.8)$$

for $x_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{id}) \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $i = 1, 2$. The metric d_p induces the product topology on $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$.

In the sequel we will need the following characterizations of M_1 convergence from Theorem 12.5.1 in Whitt [18] in terms of oscillation and uniform-distance functions

$$\omega(x, t, \delta) = \sup_{0 \vee (t-\delta) \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq (t+\delta) \wedge 1} \|x(t_2) - [x(t_1), x(t_3)]\| \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$v(x, y, t, \delta) = \sup_{0 \vee (t-\delta) \leq t_1, t_2 \leq (t+\delta) \wedge 1} |x(t_1) - y(t_2)|$$

for $x, y \in D[0, 1] := D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$, $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta > 0$, where $\|z - A\|$ denotes the distance between a point z and a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Denote by $\text{Disc}(x)$ the set of discontinuity points of $x \in D[0, 1]$.

Theorem 2.1. *The following are equivalent characterizations of convergence $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $(D[0, 1], d_{M_1})$:*

- (a) $x_n(t) \rightarrow x(t)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each t in a dense subset of $[0, 1]$ including 0 and 1, and

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x_n, \delta) = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\omega(y, \delta) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} w(y, t, \delta).$$

- (b) $x_n(1) \rightarrow x(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; for each $t \notin \text{Disc}(x)$,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n, x, t, \delta) = 0; \quad (2.11)$$

and for each $t \in \text{Disc}(x)$,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(x_n, t, \delta) = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Using completed graphs and their parametric representations the Skorohod M_2 topology can also be defined. Here we give only its characterization by the Hausdorff metric on the space of graphs: for $x_1, x_2 \in D[0, 1]$ the M_2 distance between x_1 and x_2 is given by

$$d_{M_2}(x_1, x_2) = \left(\sup_{a \in \Gamma_{x_1}} \inf_{b \in \Gamma_{x_2}} d(a, b) \right) \vee \left(\sup_{a \in \Gamma_{x_2}} \inf_{b \in \Gamma_{x_1}} d(a, b) \right),$$

where d is the metric on \mathbb{R}^2 defined by $d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = |x_1 - x_2| \vee |y_1 - y_2|$ for $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $i = 1, 2$. The metric d_{M_2} induces the M_2 topology, which is weaker than the more frequently used M_1 topology. For more details and discussion on the M_1 and M_2 topologies we refer to Whitt [18], sections 12.3-12.5.

In the next section we will use the following two lemmas about the M_1 continuity of multiplication and maximum of two càdlàg functions. The first one is based on Theorem 13.3.2 in Whitt [18], and the second one is proven in Appendix.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $y_n \rightarrow y$ in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology. If for each $t \in \text{Disc}(x) \cap \text{Disc}(y)$, $x(t)$, $x(t-)$, $y(t)$ and $y(t-)$ are all nonnegative and $[x(t) - x(t-)][y(t) - y(t-)] \geq 0$, then $x_n y_n \rightarrow xy$ in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology, where $(xy)(t) = x(t)y(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.*

Lemma 2.3. *The function $h: D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow D[0, 1]$ defined by $h(x, y) = x \vee y$, where*

$$(x \vee y)(t) = x(t) \vee y(t), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

is continuous on the set

$$\tilde{D} = \{(x, y) \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2) : x, y \text{ are nondecreasing and } \text{Disc}(x) \cap \text{Disc}(y) = \emptyset\},$$

when $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ is endowed with the weak M_1 topology and $D[0, 1]$ is endowed with the standard M_1 topology.

3. FUNCTIONAL LIMIT THEOREMS

Let $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of regularly varying random variables with index $\alpha > 0$, and $(C_i)_{i \geq 0}$ a sequence of random variables independent of (Z_i) such that (2.7) holds. Define the linear process (X_t) by

$$X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} C_i Z_{t-i}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and the corresponding partial maximum process by

$$M_n(t) = \frac{1}{a_n} \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} X_i, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad (3.1)$$

with the normalizing sequence (a_n) as in (2.3). Let

$$C_+ = \max\{C_j \vee 0 : j \geq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_- = \max\{-C_j \vee 0 : j \geq 0\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Before the main theorem we have an auxiliary result.

Proposition 3.1. *Let*

$$W_n(t) := \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{|Z_i|}{a_n} (C_+ 1_{\{Z_i > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_i < 0\}}), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$W_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} C^{(1)} W^{(1)}(\cdot) \vee C^{(2)} W^{(2)}(\cdot) \quad (3.3)$$

in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology, where $W^{(1)}$ and $W^{(2)}$ are extremal processes with exponent measures $p\alpha x^{-\alpha-1} 1_{(0, \infty)}(x) dx$ and $r\alpha x^{-\alpha-1} 1_{(0, \infty)}(x) dx$ respectively, with p and r defined in (2.2), and $(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)})$ is a random vector, independent of $(W^{(1)}, W^{(2)})$, such that $(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}) \stackrel{d}{=} (C_+, C_-)$.

Proof. Define the maximum functional

$$\Phi: \mathbf{M}_p([0, 1] \times \mathbb{E}) \rightarrow D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$$

by

$$\Phi\left(\sum_i \delta_{(t_i, x_i)}\right)(t) = \left(\bigvee_{t_i \leq t} |x_i| 1_{\{x_i > 0\}}, \bigvee_{t_i \leq t} |x_i| 1_{\{x_i < 0\}}\right)$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ (with the convention $\vee \emptyset = 0$), where the space $\mathbf{M}_p([0, 1] \times \mathbb{E})$ of Radon point measures on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{E}$ is equipped with the vague topology (see Resnick [15], Chapter 3). Let

$$\Lambda = \{\eta \in \mathbf{M}_p([0, 1] \times \mathbb{E}) : \eta(\{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{E}) = \eta([0, 1] \times \{\pm\infty\}) = 0\}.$$

The functional Φ is continuous on the set Λ , when $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ is endowed with the weak M_1 topology. Indeed, take an arbitrary $\eta \in \Lambda$ and suppose that $\eta_n \xrightarrow{v} \eta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $\mathbf{M}_p([0, 1] \times \mathbb{E})$. We need to show that $\Phi(\eta_n) \rightarrow \Phi(\eta)$ in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ according to the WM_1 topology. By Theorem 12.5.2 in Whitt [18], it suffices to prove that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$d_p(\Phi(\eta_n), \Phi(\eta)) = \max_{k=1,2} d_{M_1}(\Phi_k(\eta_n), \Phi_k(\eta)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Let

$$T = \{t \in [0, 1] : \eta(\{t\} \times \mathbb{E}) = 0\}.$$

Since η is a Radon point measure, the set T is dense in $[0, 1]$. Fix $t \in T$ and take $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\eta([0, t] \times \{\pm\epsilon\}) = 0$. Since η is a Radon point measure, we can arrange that, letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, the convergence to 0 is through a sequence of values (ϵ_j) such that $\eta([0, t] \times \{\pm\epsilon_j\}) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For $u > 0$ let $\mathbb{E}_u = \mathbb{E} \setminus (-u, u)$. Since the set $[0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon$ is relatively compact in $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{E}$, there exists a nonnegative integer $k = k(\eta)$ such that

$$\eta([0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon) = k < \infty.$$

By assumption, η does not have any atoms on the border of the set $[0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon$, and therefore by Lemma 7.1 in Resnick [16] there exists a positive integer n_0 such that

$$\eta_n([0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon) = k \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Let (t_i, x_i) for $i = 1, \dots, k$ be the atoms of η in $[0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon$. By the same lemma, the k atoms $(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)})$ of η_n in $[0, t] \times \mathbb{E}_\epsilon$ (for $n \geq n_0$) can be labeled in such a way that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have

$$(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) \rightarrow (t_i, x_i) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a positive integer $n_\delta \geq n_0$ such that for all $n \geq n_\delta$,

$$|t_i^{(n)} - t_i| < \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |x_i^{(n)} - x_i| < \delta \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k.$$

If $k = 0$, then (for large n) the atoms of η and η_n in $[0, t] \times \mathbb{E}$ are all situated in $[0, t] \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. Hence $\Phi_1(\eta)(t) \in [0, \epsilon)$ and $\Phi_1(\eta_n)(t) \in [0, \epsilon)$, which imply

$$|\Phi_1(\eta_n)(t) - \Phi_1(\eta)(t)| < \epsilon. \quad (3.4)$$

If $k \geq 1$, take $\delta = \epsilon$. Note that $|x_i^{(n)} - x_i| < \delta$ implies $x_i^{(n)} > 0$ iff $x_i > 0$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_1(\eta_n)(t) - \Phi_1(\eta)(t)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i^{(n)}| \mathbf{1}_{\{x_i^{(n)} > 0\}} - \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i| \mathbf{1}_{\{x_i > 0\}} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| (|x_i^{(n)}| - |x_i|) \mathbf{1}_{\{x_i > 0\}} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i^{(n)} - x_i| < \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where the first inequality above follows from the elementary inequality

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i - b_i|,$$

which holds for arbitrary real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$. Therefore from (3.4) and (3.5) we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\Phi_1(\eta_n)(t) - \Phi_1(\eta)(t)| \leq \epsilon,$$

and letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ it follows that $\Phi_1(\eta_n)(t) \rightarrow \Phi_1(\eta)(t)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that $\Phi_1(\eta)$ and $\Phi_1(\eta_n)$ are nondecreasing functions. By Corollary 12.5.1 in Whitt [18], M_1 convergence for monotone functions is equivalent to pointwise convergence in a dense subset of points plus convergence at the endpoints, and hence we conclude that $d_{M_1}(\Phi_1(\eta_n), \Phi_1(\eta)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the same manner we obtain $d_{M_1}(\Phi_2(\eta_n), \Phi_2(\eta)) \rightarrow 0$, and therefore we conclude that Φ is continuous at η .

Since the random variables Z_i are i.i.d. and regularly varying, Corollary 6.1 in Resnick [16] yields

$$N_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{Z_i}{a_n})} \xrightarrow{d} N := \sum_i \delta_{(t_i, j_i)} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.6)$$

in $\mathbf{M}_p([0, 1] \times \mathbb{E})$, where the limiting point process N is a Poisson process with intensity measure $Leb \times \mu$, with μ as in (2.5). Since $P(N \in \Lambda) = 1$ (cf. Resnick [16], p. 221) and the functional Φ is continuous on the set Λ , from (3.6) by an application of the continuous mapping theorem (see for instance Theorem 3.1 in Resnick [16]) we obtain $\Phi(N_n)(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} \Phi(N)(\cdot)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} (W_n^{(1)}(\cdot), W_n^{(2)}(\cdot)) &:= \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor} \frac{|Z_i|}{a_n} 1_{\{Z_i > 0\}}, \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor} \frac{|Z_i|}{a_n} 1_{\{Z_i < 0\}} \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} (W^{(1)}(\cdot), W^{(2)}(\cdot)) := \left(\bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i > 0\}}, \bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i < 0\}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ under the weak M_1 topology.

The space $D[0, 1]$ equipped with the Skorohod J_1 topology is a Polish space (i.e. metrizable as a complete separable metric space), see Billingsley [4], Section 14, and therefore the same holds for the (standard) M_1 topology, since it is topologically complete (see Whitt [18], Section 12.8) and separability remains preserved in the weaker topology. Further, the space $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ equipped with the weak M_1 topology is separable as a direct product of two separable topological spaces. It is also topologically complete since the product metric in (2.8) inherits the completeness of the component metrics. Thus we conclude that $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ with the weak M_1 topology is also a Polish space, and hence by Corollary 5.18 in Kallenberg [7], we can find a random vector $(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)})$, independent of $(W^{(1)}, W^{(2)})$, such that

$$(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}) \stackrel{d}{=} (C_+, C_-). \quad (3.8)$$

This, relation (3.7) and the fact that (C_+, C_-) is independent of $(W_n^{(1)}, W_n^{(2)})$, by an application of Theorem 3.29 in Kallenberg [7], imply that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(B^1(\cdot), B^2(\cdot), W_n^{(1)}(\cdot), W_n^{(2)}(\cdot)) \xrightarrow{d} (B^1(\cdot), B^2(\cdot), W^{(1)}(\cdot), W^{(2)}(\cdot)) \quad (3.9)$$

in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^4)$ with the product M_1 topology, where $B^1(t) = C_+$, $B^2(t) = C_-$, $B^{(1)}(t) = C^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}(t) = C^{(2)}$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.

Let $g: D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^4) \rightarrow D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a function defined by

$$g(x) = (x_1 x_3, x_2 x_4), \quad x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^4).$$

Denote by $\tilde{D}_{1,2}$ the set of all functions in $D([0,1], \mathbb{R}^4)$ for which the first two component functions have no common discontinuity points, i.e.

$$\tilde{D}_{1,2} = \{(u, v, z, w) \in D([0,1], \mathbb{R}^4) : \text{Disc}(u) = \text{Disc}(v) = \emptyset\}.$$

By Lemma 2.2 the function g is continuous on the set $\tilde{D}_{1,2}$ in the weak M_1 topology, and hence $\text{Disc}(g) \subseteq \tilde{D}_{1,2}^c$. Denoting $\tilde{D}_1 = \{u \in D[0,1] : \text{Disc}(u) = \emptyset\}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[(B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, W^{(1)}, W^{(2)}) \in \text{Disc}(g)] &\leq \mathbb{P}[(B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, W^{(1)}, W^{(2)}) \in \tilde{D}_{1,2}^c] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[\{B^{(1)} \in \tilde{D}_1^c\} \cup \{B^{(2)} \in \tilde{D}_1^c\}] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ have no discontinuity points. This allows us to apply the continuous mapping theorem to relation (3.9) yielding $g(B^1, B^2, W_n^1, W_n^2) \xrightarrow{d} g(B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, W^{(1)}, W^{(2)})$, i.e.

$$(C_+ W_n^1, C_- W_n^2) \xrightarrow{d} (C^{(1)} W^{(1)}, C^{(2)} W^{(2)}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.10)$$

in $D([0,1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ with the weak M_1 topology. The Poisson process N almost surely has no two points with the same time coordinate (see Resnick [16], Section 7.2.3), and this implies the processes $W^{(1)}(\cdot)$ and $W^{(2)}(\cdot)$ almost surely have no common discontinuity points. Therefore from (3.10) by Lemma 2.3 and the continuous mapping theorem it follows $C_+ W_n^1 \vee C_- W_n^2 \xrightarrow{d} C^{(1)} W^{(1)} \vee C^{(2)} W^{(2)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor} \frac{C_+ |Z_i|}{a_n} 1_{\{Z_i > 0\}} \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor n \cdot \rfloor} \frac{C_- |Z_i|}{a_n} 1_{\{Z_i < 0\}} \xrightarrow{d} \bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} C^{(1)} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i > 0\}} \vee \bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} C^{(2)} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i < 0\}}$$

in $D[0,1]$ with the M_1 topology. This is in fact (3.3) since the process in the converging sequence in the last relation is equal to $W_n(\cdot)$. It remains only to show that the corresponding limiting process is of the form claimed in the statement of the proposition. Denote it by $M(\cdot)$. By an application of Proposition 3.7 in Resnick [15] we obtain that the restricted processes $\sum_i \delta_{(t_i, j_i 1_{\{j_i > 0\}})}$ and $\sum_i \delta_{(t_i, -j_i 1_{\{j_i < 0\}})}$ are independent Poisson processes with intensity measures $Leb \times \mu_+$ and $Leb \times \mu_-$ respectively, where

$$\mu_+(dx) = p 1_{(0, \infty)}(x) \alpha x^{-\alpha-1} dx$$

and

$$\mu_-(dx) = r 1_{(0, \infty)}(x) \alpha x^{-\alpha-1} dx.$$

(cf. Last and Penrose [13], Theorem 5.2). From this we conclude that the processes

$$W^{(1)}(\cdot) = \bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i > 0\}} \quad \text{and} \quad W^{(2)}(\cdot) = \bigvee_{t_i \leq \cdot} |j_i| 1_{\{j_i < 0\}}$$

are extremal processes with exponent measures μ_+ and μ_- respectively (see Resnick [15], Section 4.3, and Resnick [16], p. 161), and hence

$$M(t) = C^{(1)} W^{(1)}(t) \vee C^{(2)} W^{(2)}(t), \quad t \in [0,1].$$

□

In deriving functional convergence of the partial maxima process we first deal with finite order linear processes. Fix $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$X_t = \sum_{i=0}^q C_i Z_{t-i}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

In this case C_+ and C_- reduce to $C_+ = \max\{C_j \vee 0 : j = 0, \dots, q\}$ and $C_- = \max\{-C_j \vee 0 : j = 0, \dots, q\}$. Denote by M the limiting process in Proposition 3.1, i.e.

$$M(\cdot) = C^{(1)}W^{(1)}(\cdot) \vee C^{(2)}W^{(2)}(\cdot), \quad (3.11)$$

where $W^{(1)}$ is an extremal process with exponent measure $\mu_+(dx) = p\alpha x^{-\alpha-1}dx$ for $x > 0$, $W^{(2)}$ is an extremal process with exponent measure $\mu_-(dx) = r\alpha x^{-\alpha-1}dx$ for $x > 0$, and $(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)})$ is a two dimensional random vector, independent of $(W^{(1)}, W^{(2)})$, such that $(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}) \stackrel{d}{=} (C_+, C_-)$. Taking into account the proof of Proposition 3.1 observe that

$$M(t) = \bigvee_{t_i \leq t} |j_i| (C^{(1)}1_{\{j_i > 0\}} + C^{(2)}1_{\{j_i < 0\}}), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where $\sum_i \delta_{(t_i, j_i)}$ is a Poisson process with intensity measure $Leb \times \mu$, with μ as in (2.5).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be an i.i.d. sequence of random variables satisfying (2.1) and (2.2) with $\alpha > 0$. Assume C_0, C_1, \dots, C_q are random variables independent of (Z_i) . Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$$

in $D[0, 1]$ endowed with the M_1 topology.

Proof. Our aim is to show that for every $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[d_{M_1}(W_n, M_n) > \delta] = 0,$$

since then from Proposition 3.1 by an application of Slutsky's theorem (see for instance Theorem 3.4 in Resnick [16]) we will obtain $M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $D[0, 1]$ endowed with the M_1 topology. It suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[d_{M_2}(W_n, M_n) > \delta] = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Indeed, by Remark 12.8.1 in Whitt [18] the following metric is a complete metric topologically equivalent to d_{M_1} :

$$d_{M_1}^*(x_1, x_2) = d_{M_2}(x_1, x_2) + \lambda(\widehat{\omega}(x_1, \cdot), \widehat{\omega}(x_2, \cdot)),$$

where λ is the Lévy metric on a space of distributions

$$\lambda(F_1, F_2) = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : F_2(x - \epsilon) - \epsilon \leq F_1(x) \leq F_2(x + \epsilon) + \epsilon \text{ for all } x\}$$

and

$$\widehat{\omega}(x, z) = \begin{cases} \omega(x, e^z), & z < 0, \\ \omega(x, 1), & z \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

with $\omega(x, \rho) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \omega(x, t, \rho)$ and $\omega(x, t, \rho)$ as given in (2.9). Since $W_n(\cdot)$ and $M_n(\cdot)$ are nondecreasing, for $t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ it holds that $\|W_n(t_2) - [W_n(t_1), W_n(t_3)]\| = 0$, which implies $\omega(W_n, \rho) = 0$ for all $\rho > 0$, and similarly $\omega(M_n, \rho) = 0$. Hence $\lambda(W_n, M_n) = 0$, and $d_{M_1}^*(W_n, M_n) = d_{M_2}(W_n, M_n)$.

In order to show (3.12) fix $\delta > 0$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough, i.e. $n > \max\{2q, 2q/\delta\}$. Then by the definition of the metric d_{M_2} we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{M_2}(W_n, M_n) &= \left(\sup_{v \in \Gamma_{W_n}} \inf_{z \in \Gamma_{M_n}} d(v, z) \right) \vee \left(\sup_{v \in \Gamma_{M_n}} \inf_{z \in \Gamma_{W_n}} d(v, z) \right) \\ &=: Y_n \vee T_n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}[d_{M_2}(W_n, M_n) > \delta] \leq \mathbb{P}(Y_n > \delta) + \mathbb{P}(T_n > \delta). \quad (3.13)$$

Now, we estimate the first term on the right hand side of (3.13). Let

$$D_n = \{\exists v \in \Gamma_{W_n} \text{ such that } d(v, z) > \delta \text{ for every } z \in \Gamma_{M_n}\},$$

and note that by the definition of Y_n

$$\{Y_n > \delta\} \subseteq D_n. \quad (3.14)$$

On the event D_n it holds that $d(v, \Gamma_{M_n}) > \delta$. Let $v = (t_v, x_v)$. We claim that

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| > \delta, \quad (3.15)$$

where $i^* = \lfloor nt_v \rfloor$ or $i^* = \lfloor nt_v \rfloor - 1$. To see this, observe that $t_v \in [i/n, (i+1)/n)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ (or $t_v = 1$). If $x_v = W_n(i/n)$ (i.e. v lies on a horizontal part of the completed graph), then clearly

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \right| \geq d(v, \Gamma_{M_n}) > \delta,$$

and we put $i^* = i$. On the other hand, if $x_v \in [W_n((i-1)/n), W_n(i/n))$ (i.e. v lies on a vertical part of the completed graph), one can similarly show that

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) \right| > \delta \quad \text{if } M_n\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) > x_v,$$

and

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \right| > \delta \quad \text{if } M_n\left(\frac{i-1}{n}\right) < x_v.$$

In the first case put $i^* = i-1$ and in the second $i^* = i$. Since $i = \lfloor nt_v \rfloor$ we conclude that (3.15) holds. Moreover, since $|i^*/n - (i^*+l)/n| \leq q/n < \delta$ for every $l = 1, \dots, q$ (such that $i^* + l \leq n$), from the definition of the set D_n one can similarly conclude that

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*+l}{n}\right) \right| > \delta. \quad (3.16)$$

Let $C = C_+ \vee C_-$. We claim that

$$D_n \subseteq H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2} \cup H_{n,3}, \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$H_{n,1} = \left\{ \exists l \in \{-q, \dots, q\} \cup \{n-q+1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \frac{C|Z_l|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \right\},$$

$$H_{n,2} = \left\{ \exists k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } \exists l \in \{k-q, \dots, k+q\} \setminus \{k\} \text{ such that } \frac{C|Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \text{ and } \frac{C|Z_l|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \right\},$$

$$H_{n,3} = \left\{ \exists k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \exists j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k, \dots, k+q\}, \exists l_1 \in \{0, \dots, q\} \right.$$

$$\left. \text{and } \exists l \in \{0, \dots, q\} \setminus \{l_1\} \text{ such that } \frac{C|Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, \right.$$

$$\left. \frac{C|Z_{j-l_1}|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \text{ and } \frac{C|Z_{j-l}|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \right\}.$$

Relation (3.17) will be proven if we show that

$$\widehat{D}_n := D_n \cap (H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2})^c \subseteq H_{n,3}.$$

Assume the event \widehat{D}_n occurs. Then necessarily $W_n(i^*/n) > \delta/[4(q+1)]$. Indeed, if $W_n(i^*/n) \leq \delta/[4(q+1)]$, i.e.

$$\bigvee_{j=1}^{i^*} \frac{|Z_j|}{a_n} (C_+ 1_{\{Z_j > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_j < 0\}}) = W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)},$$

then for every $s \in \{q+1, \dots, i^*\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X_s}{a_n} &= \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{C_j Z_{s-j}}{a_n} \leq \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{|Z_{s-j}|}{a_n} (C_+ 1_{\{Z_{s-j} > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_{s-j} < 0\}}) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} (q+1) = \frac{\delta}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Since the event $H_{n,1}^c$ occurs, for every $s \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ we also have

$$\frac{|X_s|}{a_n} \leq \sum_{j=0}^q |C_j| \frac{|Z_{s-j}|}{a_n} \leq \sum_{j=0}^q \frac{C |Z_{s-j}|}{a_n} \leq (q+1) \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} = \frac{\delta}{4}. \quad (3.19)$$

Combining (3.18) and (3.19) we obtain

$$-\frac{\delta}{4} \leq \frac{X_1}{a_n} \leq M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) = \bigvee_{s=1}^{i^*} \frac{X_s}{a_n} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}, \quad (3.20)$$

and hence

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| \leq \left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| + \left| M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} + \frac{\delta}{4} \leq \frac{\delta}{2},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.15).

Therefore $W_n(i^*/n) > \delta/[4(q+1)]$. This implies the existence of some $k \in \{1, \dots, i^*\}$ such that

$$W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) = \frac{|Z_k|}{a_n} (C_+ 1_{\{Z_k > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_k < 0\}}) > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, \quad (3.21)$$

and hence

$$\frac{C |Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}.$$

From this, since $H_{n,1}^c$ occurs, it follows that $q+1 \leq k \leq n-q$. Since $H_{n,2}^c$ occurs, it holds that

$$\frac{C |Z_l|}{a_n} \leq \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \quad \text{for all } l \in \{k-q, \dots, k+q\} \setminus \{k\}. \quad (3.22)$$

Now we want to show that $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, i^*\} \setminus \{k, \dots, k+q\}$. If this is not the case, then $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{k, \dots, k+q\}$ (with $j \leq i^*$). On the event $\{Z_k > 0\}$ it holds that

$$|Z_k| (C_+ 1_{\{Z_k > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_k < 0\}}) = C_+ Z_k = C_{j_0} Z_k$$

for some $j_0 \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ (with $C_{j_0} \geq 0$). Here we distinguish two cases:

(i) $k + q \leq i^*$. Since $k + j_0 \leq i^*$, we have

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} = M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \geq \frac{X_{k+j_0}}{a_n}. \quad (3.23)$$

Observe that we can write

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} = \frac{C_{j-k}Z_k}{a_n} + \sum_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq j-k}}^q \frac{C_s Z_{j-s}}{a_n} =: \frac{C_{j-k}Z_k}{a_n} + F_1,$$

and

$$\frac{X_{k+j_0}}{a_n} = \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} + \sum_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq j_0}}^q \frac{C_s Z_{k+j_0-s}}{a_n} =: \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} + F_2.$$

From relation (3.22) (similarly as in (3.19)) we obtain

$$|F_1| \leq q \cdot \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} < \frac{\delta}{4},$$

and similarly $|F_2| < \delta/4$. Since $C_{j_0} - C_{j-k} = C_+ - C_{j-k} \geq 0$, using (3.23) we obtain

$$0 \leq \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k - C_{j-k}Z_k}{a_n} \leq F_1 - F_2 \leq |F_1| + |F_2| < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

By (3.15) we have

$$\left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \right| = \left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| > \delta,$$

and hence

$$\delta < \left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{C_{j-k}Z_k}{a_n} - F_1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{C_{j-k}Z_k}{a_n} \right| + |F_1| < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{4} = \frac{3\delta}{4},$$

which is not possible.

(ii) $k + q > i^*$. Note that in this case $k \leq j \leq i^* < k + q$. Since

$$M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) = \bigvee_{s=1}^{k+q} \frac{X_s}{a_n} \geq M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) = \frac{X_j}{a_n},$$

it holds that

$$M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) = \frac{X_p}{a_n},$$

for some $p \in \{j, \dots, k+q\} \subseteq \{k, \dots, k+q\}$. Observe that we can write

$$\frac{X_p}{a_n} = \frac{C_{p-k}Z_k}{a_n} + \sum_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq p-k}}^q \frac{C_s Z_{p-s}}{a_n} =: \frac{C_{p-k}Z_k}{a_n} + F_3,$$

with $|F_3| < \delta/4$, which holds by relation (3.22). By relation (3.16) we have

$$\left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_p}{a_n} \right| = \left| W_n\left(\frac{j^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \right| > \delta,$$

and repeating the arguments as in (i), but with

$$\frac{X_p}{a_n} = M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \geq \frac{X_{k+j_0}}{a_n}$$

instead of (3.23), we arrive at

$$\delta < \left| \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{C_{p-k} Z_k}{a_n} - F_3 \right| \leq \left| \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{C_{p-k} Z_k}{a_n} \right| + |F_3| < \frac{3\delta}{4}.$$

Thus we conclude that this case also can not happen.

One can similarly handle the event $\{Z_k < 0\}$ to arrive at a contradiction. Therefore indeed $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, i^*\} \setminus \{k, \dots, k+q\}$.

Now we have three cases: (A1) all random variables Z_{j-q}, \dots, Z_j are "small", (A2) exactly one is "large" and (A3) at least two of them are "large", where we say Z is "small" if $C|Z|/a_n \leq \delta/[4(q+1)]$, otherwise it is "large". We will show that the first two cases are not possible.

(A1) $C|Z_{j-l}|/a_n \leq \delta/[4(q+1)]$ for every $l = 0, \dots, q$. This yields (as in (3.19))

$$\left| M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| = \frac{|X_j|}{a_n} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Let j_0 be as above (on the event $\{Z_k > 0\}$), i.e.

$$|Z_k|(C_+1_{\{Z_k > 0\}} + C_-1_{\{Z_k < 0\}}) = C_+Z_k = C_{j_0}Z_k.$$

If $k+q \leq i^*$, then

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} \geq \frac{X_{k+j_0}}{a_n} = \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} + F_2, \quad (3.24)$$

where F_2 is as in (i) above, with $|F_2| < \delta/4$. Hence

$$\frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} \leq \frac{X_j}{a_n} - F_2 \leq \frac{|X_j|}{a_n} + |F_2| < \frac{\delta}{4} + \frac{\delta}{4} = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

and

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \right| \leq \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} + \frac{|X_j|}{a_n} < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{4} = \frac{3\delta}{4},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.15). On the other hand, if $k+q > i^*$, we have two possibilities: $M_n((k+q)/n) = M_n(i^*/n)$ or $M_n((k+q)/n) > M_n(i^*/n)$. When $M_n((k+q)/n) = M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$, since $k+j_0 \leq k+q$ note that relation (3.24) holds, and similarly as above we obtain

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \right| < \frac{3\delta}{4},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.16). Alternatively, when $M_n((k+q)/n) > M_n(i^*/n)$, it holds that $M_n((k+q)/n) = X_p/a_n$ for some $p \in \{i^*, \dots, k+q\}$. Now in the same manner as in (ii) above we get a contradiction. We handle the event $\{Z_k < 0\}$ similarly to arrive at a contradiction, and therefore this case can not happen.

(A2) There exists $l_1 \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ such that $C|Z_{j-l_1}|/a_n > \delta/[4(q+1)]$ and $C|Z_{j-l}|/a_n \leq \delta/[4(q+1)]$ for every $l \in \{0, \dots, q\} \setminus \{l_1\}$. Here we analyze only what happens on the event $\{Z_k > 0\}$ (the event $\{Z_k < 0\}$ can be treated analogously and is therefore omitted). Assume first $k+q \leq i^*$. Then

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} \geq \frac{X_{k+j_0}}{a_n} = \frac{C_{j_0}Z_k}{a_n} + F_2, \quad (3.25)$$

where j_0 and F_2 are as in (i) above, with $|F_2| < \delta/4$. Write

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} = \frac{C_{l_1} Z_{j-l_1}}{a_n} + \sum_{\substack{s=0 \\ s \neq l_1}}^q \frac{C_s Z_{j-s}}{a_n} =: \frac{C_{l_1} Z_{j-l_1}}{a_n} + F_4.$$

Similarly as before we obtain $|F_4| < \delta/4$. Since $j - l_1 \leq j \leq i^*$, by the definition of the process $W_n(\cdot)$ we have

$$W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \geq \frac{|Z_{j-l_1}|}{a_n} (C_{+1_{\{Z_{j-l_1} > 0\}}} + C_{-1_{\{Z_{j-l_1} < 0\}}}) \geq \frac{C_{l_1} Z_{j-l_1}}{a_n}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} = \frac{|Z_k|}{a_n} (C_{+1_{\{Z_k > 0\}}} + C_{-1_{\{Z_k < 0\}}}) = W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \geq \frac{C_{l_1} Z_{j-l_1}}{a_n},$$

which yields

$$\frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \geq \frac{C_{l_1} Z_{j-l_1}}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} = -F_4. \quad (3.26)$$

Relations (3.25) and (3.26) yield

$$-(|F_2| + |F_4|) \leq -F_4 \leq \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \leq -F_2 \leq |F_2| + |F_4|,$$

i.e.

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \right| \leq |F_2| + |F_4| < \frac{\delta}{4} + \frac{\delta}{4} = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.15). Assume now $k + q > i^*$. If $M_n((k + q)/n) = M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$, relation (3.25) still holds and this leads to

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_j}{a_n} \right| < \frac{\delta}{2},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.16). On the other hand, if $M_n((k+q)/n) > M_n(i^*/n)$, then $M_n((k+q)/n) = X_p/a_n$ for some $p \in \{i^*, \dots, k+q\}$. With the same arguments as in (ii) above we obtain

$$\left| W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{C_{j_0} Z_k}{a_n} - \frac{X_p}{a_n} \right| < \frac{3\delta}{4},$$

i.e. a contradiction with (3.16). Hence this case also can not happen.

- (A3) There exist $l_1 \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ and $l \in \{0, \dots, q\} \setminus \{l_1\}$ such that $C|Z_{j-l_1}|/a_n > \delta/[4(q+1)]$ and $CZ_{j-l}/a_n > \delta/[4(q+1)]$. In this case the event $H_{n,3}$ occurs.

Therefore only case (A3) is possible, and this yields $\widehat{D}_n \subseteq H_{n,3}$. Hence (3.17) holds. By stationarity we have

$$\mathbb{P}(H_{n,1}) \leq (3q+1) \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{C|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}\right). \quad (3.27)$$

For an arbitrary $M > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{C|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{C|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, C > M\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{C|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, C \leq M\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(C > M) + \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the regular variation property we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right) = 0,$$

and therefore from (3.27) we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,1}) \leq (3q+1) \mathbb{P}(C > M).$$

Letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,1}) = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

Since Z_k and Z_l that appear in the formulation of $H_{n,2}$ are independent, for an arbitrary $M > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(H_{n,2} \cap \{C \leq M\}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{l=k-q \\ l \neq k}}^{k+q} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{C|Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, \frac{C|Z_l|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)}, C \leq M\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{l=k-q \\ l \neq k}}^{k+q} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}, \frac{|Z_l|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\substack{l=k-q \\ l \neq k}}^{k+q} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_k|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right) \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_l|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right) \\ &= \frac{2q}{n} \left[n \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M}\right) \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

and an application of the regular variation property yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,2} \cap \{C \leq M\}) = 0.$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,2}) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,2} \cap \{C > M\}) \leq \mathbb{P}(C > M),$$

and letting again $M \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,2}) = 0. \quad (3.29)$$

From the definition of the set $H_{n,3}$ it follows that $k, j - l_1, j - l$ are all different, which implies that the random variables Z_k, Z_{j-l_1} and Z_{j-l} are independent. Using this and stationarity we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(H_{n,3} \cap \{C \leq M\}) \leq \frac{q(q+1)}{n} \left[n \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{|Z_1|}{a_n} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)M} \right) \right]^3$$

for arbitrary $M > 0$, and hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(H_{n,3}) = 0. \quad (3.30)$$

Now from (3.17) and (3.28)–(3.30) we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(D_n) = 0,$$

and hence (3.14) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Y_n > \delta) = 0. \quad (3.31)$$

It remains to estimate the second term on the right hand side of (3.13). Let

$$E_n = \{\exists v \in \Gamma_{M_n} \text{ such that } d(v, z) > \delta \text{ for every } z \in \Gamma_{W_n}\}.$$

Then by the definition of T_n

$$\{T_n > \delta\} \subseteq E_n. \quad (3.32)$$

On the event E_n it holds that $d(v, \Gamma_{W_n}) > \delta$. Interchanging the roles of the processes $M_n(\cdot)$ and $W_n(\cdot)$, in the same way as before for the event D_n it can be shown that

$$\left| W_n \left(\frac{i^* - l}{n} \right) - M_n \left(\frac{i^*}{n} \right) \right| > \delta \quad (3.33)$$

for all $l = 0, \dots, q$ (such that $i^* - l \geq 0$), where $i^* = \lfloor nt_v \rfloor$ or $i^* = \lfloor nt_v \rfloor - 1$, and $v = (t_v, x_v)$.

Now we want to show that $E_n \cap (H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2})^c \subseteq H_{n,3}$, and hence assume the event $E_n \cap (H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2})^c$ occurs. Since (3.33) (for $l = 0$) is in fact (3.15), repeating the arguments used for D_n we conclude that (3.21) holds. Here we also claim that $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, i^*\} \setminus \{k, \dots, k+q\}$. Hence assume this is not the case, i.e. $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{k, \dots, k+q\}$ (with $j \leq i^*$). We can repeat the arguments from (i) above to conclude that $k+q \leq i^*$ is not possible. It remains to see what happens when $k+q > i^*$. Let

$$W_n \left(\frac{i^* - q}{n} \right) = \frac{|Z_s|}{a_n} (C_+ 1_{\{Z_s > 0\}} + C_- 1_{\{Z_s < 0\}})$$

for some $s \in \{1, \dots, i^* - q\}$. Note that $i^* - q \geq 1$ since $q+1 \leq k \leq i^*$. We distinguish two cases:

- (a) $W_n(i^*/n) > M_n(i^*/n)$. In this case the definition of i^* implies that $M_n(i^*/n) \leq x_v \leq W_n(i^*/n)$. Since $|t_v - (i^* - q)/n| < (q+1)/n \leq \delta$, from $d(v, \Gamma_{W_n}) > \delta$ we conclude

$$\tilde{d} \left((x_v, \left[W_n \left(\frac{i^* - q}{n} \right), W_n \left(\frac{i^*}{n} \right) \right]) \right) > \delta,$$

where \tilde{d} is the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R} . This yields

$$W_n \left(\frac{i^* - q}{n} \right) > M_n \left(\frac{i^*}{n} \right),$$

and from (3.33) we obtain

$$W_n\left(\frac{i^* - q}{n}\right) > M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) + \delta. \quad (3.34)$$

From this, taking into account relation (3.20), we obtain

$$\frac{C|Z_s|}{a_n} \geq W_n\left(\frac{i^* - q}{n}\right) > -\frac{\delta}{4} + \delta = \frac{3\delta}{4} > \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)},$$

and since $H_{n,2}^c$ occurs it follows that

$$\frac{C|Z_l|}{a_n} \leq \frac{\delta}{4(q+1)} \quad \text{for every } l \in \{s - q, \dots, s + q\} \setminus \{s\}. \quad (3.35)$$

Let $p_0 \in \{0, \dots, q\}$ be such that $C_{p_0}Z_s = |Z_s|(C_{+1}\{Z_s > 0\} + C_{-1}\{Z_s < 0\})$. Since $s + p_0 \leq i^*$, it holds that

$$\frac{X_j}{a_n} = M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \geq \frac{X_{s+p_0}}{a_n} = \frac{C_{p_0}Z_s}{a_n} + F_5, \quad (3.36)$$

where

$$F_5 = \sum_{\substack{m=0 \\ m \neq p_0}}^q \frac{C_m Z_{s+p_0-m}}{a_n}.$$

From (3.34) and (3.36) we obtain

$$\frac{C_{p_0}Z_s}{a_n} > \frac{X_j}{a_n} + \delta \geq \frac{C_{p_0}Z_s}{a_n} + F_5 + \delta,$$

i.e. $F_5 < -\delta$. But this is not possible since by (3.35)

$$|F_5| \leq \frac{\delta}{4},$$

and we conclude that this case can not happen.

(b) $W_n(i^*/n) \leq M_n(i^*/n)$. Then from (3.33) we get

$$M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right) \geq M_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) \geq W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) + \delta. \quad (3.37)$$

Therefore

$$\left|W_n\left(\frac{i^*}{n}\right) - M_n\left(\frac{k+q}{n}\right)\right| > \delta,$$

and repeating the arguments from (ii) above we conclude that this case also can not happen.

Thus we have proved that $M_n(i^*/n) = X_j/a_n$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, i^*\} \setminus \{k, \dots, k+q\}$. Similar as before one can prove now that Cases (A1) and (A2) can not happen (when $k+q > i^*$ we use also the arguments from (a) and (b)), which means that only Case (A3) is possible. In that case the event $H_{n,3}$ occurs, and thus we have proved that $E_n \cap (H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2})^c \subseteq H_{n,3}$. Hence

$$E_n \subseteq H_{n,1} \cup H_{n,2} \cup H_{n,3},$$

and from (3.28)–(3.30) we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(E_n) = 0.$$

Therefore (3.32) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(T_n > \delta) = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

Now from (3.13), (3.31) and (3.38) we obtain (3.12), which means that $M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$ in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology. This proves the theorem. \square

Now we turn our attention to infinite order linear processes. The idea is to approximate them by a sequence of finite order linear processes, for which Theorem 3.2 holds, and to show that the error of approximation is negligible in the limit. To accomplish this in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we will use the arguments from Krizmanić [10], and in the case $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ the arguments from the proof of Lemma 2 in Tyran-Kamińska [17] adapted to linear processes with random coefficients instead of deterministic.

Theorem 3.3. *Let (X_i) be a linear process defined by*

$$X_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} C_j Z_{i-j}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables satisfying (2.1) and (2.2) with $\alpha > 0$. Assume $(C_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a sequence of random variables independent of (Z_i) that satisfy (2.7). If $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ suppose further

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_i|^\gamma < \infty \quad \text{for some } \gamma \in (\alpha, 1), \quad (3.39)$$

while if $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$ suppose

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j| < \infty. \quad (3.40)$$

Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$$

in $D[0, 1]$ endowed with the M_1 topology, with M as defined in (3.11).

Proof. For $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \geq 2$, define

$$X_i^q = \sum_{j=0}^{q-2} C_j Z_{i-j} + C^{q, \max} Z_{i-q+1} + C^{q, \min} Z_{i-q}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and

$$M_{n,q}(t) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{X_i^q}{a_n}, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where $C^{q, \max} = \max\{C_j : j \geq q-1\}$, $C^{q, \min} = \min\{C_j : j \geq q-1\}$. Observe that

$$\max\{C_j \vee 0 : j = 0, \dots, q-1\} \vee (C^{q, \max} \vee 0) \vee (C^{q, \min} \vee 0) = C_+$$

and

$$\max\{-C_j \vee 0 : j = 0, \dots, q-1\} \vee (-C^{q, \max} \vee 0) \vee (-C^{q, \min} \vee 0) = C_-,$$

and therefore for the finite order moving average process $(X_i^q)_i$ by Theorem 3.2 we obtain

$$M_{n,q}(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology. If we show that for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[d_{M_1}(M_n, M_{n,q}) > \epsilon] = 0, \quad (3.41)$$

then by a generalization of Slutsky's theorem (see Theorem 3.5 in Resnick [16]) it will follow $M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$ in $D[0, 1]$ with the M_1 topology. Since the metric d_{M_1} on $D[0, 1]$ is bounded above by the uniform metric on $D[0, 1]$, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |M_n(t) - M_{n,q}(t)| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Now we treat separately the cases $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$.

Case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Recalling the definitions, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |M_n(t) - M_{n,q}(t)| > \epsilon \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{|X_i - X_i^q|}{a_n} > \epsilon \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|X_i - X_i^q|}{a_n} > \epsilon \right).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i - X_i^q| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} C_j Z_{i-j} - \sum_{j=0}^{q-2} C_j Z_{i-j} - C^{q,\max} Z_{i-q+1} - C^{q,\min} Z_{i-q} \right| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (C_{q-1} - C^{q,\max}) Z_{i-q+1} + (C_q - C^{q,\min}) Z_{i-q} + \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} C_j Z_{i-j} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[|(C_{q-1} - C^{q,\max}) Z_{i-q+1}| + |(C_q - C^{q,\min}) Z_{i-q}| + \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j Z_{i-j}| \right] \\ &\leq \left(2 \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j| \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (|Z_{i-q+1}| + |Z_{i-q}|) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j| |Z_{i-j}| \\ &\leq \left(5 \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j| \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |Z_{i-q}| + \sum_{i=-\infty}^0 |Z_{i-q}| \sum_{j=1}^n |C_{q-i+j}|, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality above we used the simple fact that $|C_{q-1} - C^{q,\max}| \leq 2 \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j|$ (and analogously if $C^{q,\max}$ is replaced by $C^{q,\min}$), and a change of variables and rearrangement of sums in the third inequality. Since conditions (2.7) and (3.39) by Lemma 3.2 in Krizmanić [10] imply

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\left(5 \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} |C_j| \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{|Z_{i-q}|}{a_n} + \sum_{i=-\infty}^0 \frac{|Z_{i-q}|}{a_n} \sum_{j=1}^n |C_{q-i+j}| > \epsilon \right] = 0,$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |M_n(t) - M_{n,q}(t)| > \epsilon \right) = 0,$$

which means that $M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $(D[0, 1], d_{M_1})$.

Case $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$. Define $Z_{n,j}^{\leq} = a_n^{-1} Z_j 1_{\{|Z_j| \leq a_n\}}$ and $Z_{n,j}^{\geq} = a_n^{-1} Z_j 1_{\{|Z_j| > a_n\}}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{C}_j = \begin{cases} C_j, & \text{if } j > q, \\ C_q - C^{q,\min}, & \text{if } j = q, \\ C_{q-1} - C^{q,\max}, & \text{if } j = q-1, \end{cases}$$

and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|M_n(t) - M_{n,q}(t)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{X_i}{a_n} - \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{X_i^q}{a_n} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{|X_i - X_i^q|}{a_n} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}}{a_n} \right| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} + \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{>} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using again the fact that the M_1 metric on $D[0, 1]$ is bounded above by the uniform metric we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[d_{M_1}(M_n, M_{n,q}) > \epsilon] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |M_n(t) - M_{n,q}(t)| > \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{>} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \\
&=: I_1 + I_2. \tag{3.42}
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate I_1 note that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| > 1\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \leq 1\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| > 1\right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \leq 1\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \leq 1\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by Markov's inequality. Take some $\varphi > \alpha$ and let ψ be such that $1/\varphi + 1/\psi = 1$. Then by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|\right)^{\varphi} &= \left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j|^{1/\psi} \cdot |\tilde{C}_j|^{1/\varphi} |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|\right)^{\varphi} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j|\right)^{\varphi/\psi} \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi},
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq} \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \leq 1 \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \right)^{\varphi/\psi} \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} > \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^{\varphi}, \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \leq 1 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} > \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^{\varphi} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This together with the Markov's inequality, the fact that the sequence (C_i) is independent of (Z_i) and stationarity of the sequence (Z_i) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & \leq \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} > \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^{\varphi} \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^{-\varphi} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot |Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} \right) \\
& = \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| + \frac{2^{\varphi}}{\epsilon^{\varphi}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| \mathbb{E}|Z_{n,i-j}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} \\
& = \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| + \frac{2^{\varphi}}{\epsilon^{\varphi}} \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| \cdot n \mathbb{E}|Z_{n,1}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} \\
& = \left(1 + \frac{2^{\varphi}}{\epsilon^{\varphi}} n \mathbb{E}|Z_{n,1}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} \right) \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j|. \tag{3.43}
\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of \tilde{C}_j it follows $\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j| \leq 5 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|$, and by Karata's theorem and (2.3), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \mathbb{E}|Z_{n,1}^{\leq}|^{\varphi} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(|Z_1|^{\varphi} 1_{\{|Z_1| \leq a_n\}})}{a_n^{\varphi} \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > a_n)} \cdot n \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > a_n) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\varphi - \alpha} < \infty.$$

Hence from (3.43) we conclude that there exists a positive constant D_1 such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_1 \leq D_1 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|. \tag{3.44}$$

In order to estimate I_2 assume first $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$. Applying again Markov's inequality, the fact that the sequence (C_i) is independent of (Z_i) and stationarity of (Z_i) we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^> \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^>| \\
&= \frac{2}{\epsilon} \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{C}_j| \cdot n \mathbb{E} |Z_{n,1}^>|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Karamata's theorem and relation (2.3), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n \mathbb{E} |Z_{n,1}^>| = \frac{\mathbb{E}(|Z_1| 1_{\{|Z_1| > a_n\}})}{a_n \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > a_n)} \cdot n \mathbb{P}(|Z_1| > a_n) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} < \infty,$$

and hence we see that there exists a positive constant D_2 such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_2 \leq D_2 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} |C_j| \quad (3.45)$$

In the case $\alpha = 1$ Markov's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^> \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2^\delta}{\epsilon^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^> \right|^\delta
\end{aligned}$$

with δ as in relation (2.7). Since $\delta < 1$, an application of the triangle inequality $|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i|^s \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|^s$ with $s \in (0, 1]$ yields

$$I_2 \leq \frac{2^\delta}{\epsilon^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{C}_j Z_{n,i-j}^>|^\delta,$$

and hence

$$I_2 \leq \frac{2^\delta}{\epsilon^\delta} \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{C}_j|^\delta \cdot n \mathbb{E} |Z_{n,1}^>|^\delta.$$

From this, since by Karamata's theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{E} |Z_{n,1}^>|^\delta = \frac{n}{a_n^\delta} \mathbb{E} \left(|Z_1|^\delta 1_{\{|Z_1| > a_n\}} \right) = \frac{1}{1 - \delta} < \infty,$$

and by a new application of the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j|^\delta &= \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_{q-1}|^\delta + \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_q|^\delta + \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{C}_j|^\delta \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(2 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |C_j|\right)^\delta + \mathbb{E}\left(2 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} |C_j|\right)^\delta + \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta \\
&\leq 2^\delta \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta + 2^\delta \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta + \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta \\
&\leq (2^{\delta+1} + 1) \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that there exists a positive constant D_3 such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_2 \leq D_3 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^\delta.$$

This together with (3.42), (3.44) and (3.45) yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[d_{M_1}(M_n, M_{n,q}) > \epsilon] \leq D_1 \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j| + (D_2 + D_3) \sum_{j=q-1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|C_j|^s,$$

where

$$s = \begin{cases} \delta, & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\ 1, & \text{if } \alpha \in (1, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Now, conditions (2.7) and (3.40) yield (3.41), and hence we again obtain $M_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} M(\cdot)$ in $(D[0, 1], d_{M_1})$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.1. If the sequence (C_j) is deterministic, conditions (3.39) and (3.40) can be dropped since they are implied by (2.7). Note that condition (2.7) implies $|C_j|^\delta < 1$ for large j , and since $|C_j|^{\delta x}$ is decreasing in x , it follows that for large j

$$|C_j|^\gamma = (|C_j|^\delta)^{\gamma/\delta} \leq |C_j|^\delta,$$

and similarly $|C_j| \leq |C_j|^\delta$. This suffice to conclude that (3.39) and (3.40) hold. In general this does not hold when the coefficients are random (see Krizmanić [10], p. 739).

4. APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Take $(x, y) \in \tilde{D}$ and suppose that $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x, y)$ in $D([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^2)$ according to the WM_1 topology, i.e. $d_p((x_n, y_n), (x, y)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From the definition of the metric d_p in (2.8) it follows that

$$d_{M_1}(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d_{M_1}(y_n, y) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

If we show that $d_{M_1}(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then h will be continuous on the set \tilde{D} . According to Theorem 2.1 (b) it suffices to show:

- (i) $(x_n \vee y_n)(1) \rightarrow (x \vee y)(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$;

(ii) $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) = 0$ for every $t \notin \text{Disc}(x \vee y)$;

(iii) $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(x_n \vee y_n, t, \delta) = 0$ for every $t \in \text{Disc}(x \vee y)$.

Since $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $y_n \rightarrow y$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $(D[0, 1], d_{M_1})$, by Theorem 2.1 (b) we have $x_n(1) \rightarrow x(1)$ and $y_n(1) \rightarrow y(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and hence (i) follows immediately.

In order to show (ii) take $t \notin \text{Disc}(x \vee y)$. Without loss of generality assume $(x \vee y)(t) = x(t)$. This implies $x(t) \geq y(t)$. Take an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. Since the function $x \vee y$ is continuous at t , there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$t' \in [0, 1], |t' - t| < \delta_1 \Rightarrow |(x \vee y)(t') - x(t)| < \epsilon. \quad (4.2)$$

Now we have three possibilities: $t \notin \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \notin \text{Disc}(y)$; $t \notin \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \in \text{Disc}(y)$; $t \in \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \notin \text{Disc}(y)$ (note that the case $t \in \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \in \text{Disc}(y)$ is not possible since $(x, y) \in \tilde{D}$). We treat every possibility separately.

(ii-1) $t \notin \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \notin \text{Disc}(y)$. From (4.1), by Theorem 2.1 (b), it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n, x, t, \delta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(y_n, y, t, \delta) = 0,$$

and hence there exists $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon.$$

This further implies the existence of $n_1 = n_1(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ and $v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_1$.

Take $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ and t_1 such that $0 \vee (t - \delta) \leq t_1 \leq (t + \delta) \wedge 1$. We claim that for $n \geq n_1$ it necessarily holds $\theta := |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| < \epsilon$. Indeed, if $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, then $\theta = |x_n(t_1) - x(t)| \leq v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon$, while on the other hand, if $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1) \geq x_n(t_1)$, then

$$\theta = |y_n(t_1) - x(t)| \leq \begin{cases} |y_n(t_1) - y(t)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon, & \text{if } y_n(t_1) \geq x(t), \\ |x_n(t_1) - x(t)| \leq v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon, & \text{if } y_n(t_1) < x(t). \end{cases}$$

Therefore $\theta < \epsilon$ for all $t_1 \in [0 \vee (t - \delta), (t + \delta) \wedge 1]$. Using this and (4.2), for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ and $t_1, t_2 \in [0 \vee (t - \delta), (t + \delta) \wedge 1]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - (x \vee y)(t_2)| \\ &\leq |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| + |x(t) - (x \vee y)(t_2)| \\ &< \epsilon + \epsilon = 2\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

for $n \geq n_1$, i.e.

$$v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) = \sup_{0 \vee (t - \delta) \leq t_1, t_2 \leq (t + \delta) \wedge 1} |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - (x \vee y)(t_2)| \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Letting first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\delta \downarrow 0$ we arrive at

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) \leq 2\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, from this we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

(ii-2) $t \notin \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \in \text{Disc}(y)$. Relation (4.1) and Theorem 2.1 (b) imply

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n, x, t, \delta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(y_n, t, \delta) = 0.$$

Thus there exists $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_2)$ there exists $n_1 = n_1(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ with $v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ and $w(y_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_1$. Since y is right continuous at t there exists $\delta_3 \in (0, \delta_2)$ such that

$$t' > t, |t' - t| < \delta_3 \Rightarrow |y(t') - y(t)| < \epsilon. \quad (4.5)$$

Take $\delta \in (0, \delta_3)$. Since $y_n \rightarrow y$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $(D[0, 1], d_{M_1})$, Theorem 2.1 (a) yields $y_n(t') \rightarrow y(t')$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each t' in a dense subset of $[0, 1]$, and thus we can find $t_*, t^* \in (t - \delta, t + \delta) \setminus (t - \delta/2, t + \delta/2)$, $t_* < t < t^*$, such that $y_n(t_*) \rightarrow y(t_*)$ and $y_n(t^*) \rightarrow y(t^*)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence there exists $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|y_n(t_*) - y(t_*)| < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |y_n(t^*) - y(t^*)| < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_2. \quad (4.6)$$

Take t_1 such that $0 \vee (t - \delta/2) \leq t_1 \leq (t + \delta/2) \wedge 1$. Now we claim that for $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$ it holds that $|(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| < 3\epsilon$. Indeed, if $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, then

$$|(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| = |x_n(t_1) - x(t)| \leq v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, if $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1) \geq x_n(t_1)$, observe first that $\|y_n(t_1) - [y_n(t_*), y_n(t^*)]\| \leq w(y_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$. This and (4.6) imply

$$y_n(t_1) < \max\{y_n(t_*), y_n(t^*)\} + \epsilon < \max\{y(t_*), y(t^*)\} + 2\epsilon = y(t^*) + 2\epsilon,$$

where the last equation holds since y is nondecreasing. Similarly $y_n(t_1) > y(t_*) - 2\epsilon$. By (4.5) we have $|y(t^*) - y(t)| < \epsilon$, yielding

$$y_n(t_1) < y(t^*) + 2\epsilon < y(t) + 3\epsilon \leq x(t) + 3\epsilon.$$

Further, $|x_n(t_1) - x(t)| \leq v(x_n, x, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ implies

$$x(t) - \epsilon < x_n(t_1) \leq y_n(t_1).$$

Therefore $-\epsilon < y_n(t_1) - x(t) < 3\epsilon$, i.e.

$$|(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| = |y_n(t_1) - x(t)| < 3\epsilon.$$

In a similar manner as in (4.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - (x \vee y)(t_2)| \\ & \leq |(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) - x(t)| + |x(t) - (x \vee y)(t_2)| \\ & < 3\epsilon + \epsilon = 4\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for $t_1, t_2 \in [0 \vee (t - \delta/2), (t + \delta/2) \wedge 1]$, which as in (ii-1) leads to

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) \leq 4\epsilon,$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

(ii-3) $t \in \text{Disc}(x)$ and $t \notin \text{Disc}(y)$. Since x and y are nondecreasing, observe that in this case $x(t-) < x(t)$. This yields $y(t-) = x(t)$. Indeed, $y(t-) \neq x(t)$ implies $y(t-) < x(t)$, and this yields $(x \vee y)(t-) < x(t) = (x \vee y)(t)$, which is not possible since $t \notin \text{Disc}(x \vee y)$. Therefore $y(t) = y(t-) = x(t)$. Now, following the same arguments as in (ii-2), but substituting the roles of x and y , we arrive at

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(x_n \vee y_n, x \vee y, t, \delta) = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Taking into consideration relations (4.4), (4.7) and (4.8) we conclude that (ii) holds.

It remains to show (iii). Let $t \in \text{Disc}(x \vee y)$ and without loss of generality assume again $(x \vee y)(t) = x(t)$, i.e. $x(t) \geq y(t)$. The fact that the functions x and $x \vee y$ are nondecreasing yields

$$x(t-) \leq (x \vee y)(t-) < (x \vee y)(t) = x(t),$$

which implies $t \in \text{Disc}(x)$. Since $(x, y) \in \tilde{D}$, i.e. x and y have no common discontinuity point, it necessarily holds that $t \notin \text{Disc}(y)$. Take an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. By (4.1) and Theorem 2.1 (b) we have

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(x_n, t, \delta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v(y_n, y, t, \delta) = 0,$$

and hence there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ there exists $n_1 = n_1(\delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ and $v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq n_1$.

Take $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$ and t_1, t_2, t_3 such that $0 \vee (t - \delta) \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq (t + \delta) \wedge 1$. Let $n \geq n_1$. Denote by A

$$A = A(x_n, y_n, t_1, t_2, t_3) := \|(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) - [(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1), (x_n \vee y_n)(t_3)]\|.$$

Now we distinguish eight cases according to the values that the function $x_n \vee y_n$ takes at t_1, t_2 and t_3 :

(iii-1) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = x_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = x_n(t_3)$.
Recalling the definition of the M_1 oscillation function w we have

$$A = \|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| \leq w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon.$$

(iii-2) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = y_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = x_n(t_3)$.
Assume without loss of generality that $x_n(t_1) \leq x_n(t_3)$ (the same arguments given below apply in the case $x_n(t_3) < x_n(t_1)$). From $\|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| \leq w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ we obtain $x_n(t_1) - \epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_3) + \epsilon$, which further implies

$$y_n(t_2) = (x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) \geq x_n(t_2) > x_n(t_1) - \epsilon. \quad (4.9)$$

On the other hand, since $|y_n(t_3) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ and analogously $|y_n(t_2) - y(t_2)| < \epsilon$, observe that

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon \leq (x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) + 2\epsilon = x_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

Combining relations (4.9) and (4.10) we get

$$x_n(t_1) - \epsilon < y_n(t_2) < x_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon,$$

and this implies

$$A = \|y_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

- (iii-3) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = y_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = y_n(t_3)$. In this case assume first $x_n(t_1) \leq x_n(t_3)$. As in the previous case, $\|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| \leq w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ yields

$$y_n(t_2) > x_n(t_1) - \epsilon,$$

while $|y_n(t_i) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for $i = 2, 3$, gives

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore $x_n(t_1) - \epsilon < y_n(t_2) < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon$, i.e.

$$A = \|y_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), y_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

Assume now $x_n(t_1) > x_n(t_3)$. Since $|y_n(t_i) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we obtain

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_1) + 2\epsilon \leq (x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) + 2\epsilon = x_n(t_1) + 2\epsilon,$$

and

$$y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$y_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon < y_n(t_2) < x_n(t_1) + 2\epsilon,$$

which implies $A < 2\epsilon$ if $y_n(t_3) \leq x_n(t_1)$. Alternatively, if $y_n(t_3) > x_n(t_1)$, we have

$$y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon > x_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon,$$

and

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon,$$

i.e.

$$x_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon < y_n(t_2) < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon.$$

This implies $A < 2\epsilon$.

- (iii-4) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = y_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = y_n(t_3)$. Assume without loss of generality that $y_n(t_1) \leq y_n(t_3)$ (the case $y_n(t_3) < y_n(t_1)$ can be treated analogously and thus is omitted). From $|y_n(t_i) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we deduce

$$y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon,$$

and

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon.$$

Hence

$$y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon < y_n(t_2) < y_n(t_3) + 2\epsilon,$$

which implies

$$A = \|y_n(t_2) - [y_n(t_1), y_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

- (iii-5) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = y_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = x_n(t_3)$. This case can be treated analogously as (iii-3), hence it follows

$$A = \|y_n(t_2) - [y_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

- (iii-6) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = x_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = x_n(t_3)$. Assume first $x_n(t_1) \leq x_n(t_3)$. As before, $\|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| \leq w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ implies

$$x_n(t_1) - \epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_3) + \epsilon.$$

If $y_n(t_1) \leq x_n(t_3)$, we have

$$x_n(t_2) = (x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) \geq y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon,$$

where the last two inequalities once again follow from $|y_n(t_i) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Therefore

$$y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_3) + \epsilon,$$

yielding

$$A = \|x_n(t_2) - [y_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

On the other hand, if $y_n(t_1) > x_n(t_3)$, we have

$$y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon > x_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon,$$

and

$$y_n(t_2) < y(t_2) + \epsilon < y_n(t_1) + 2\epsilon.$$

Hence

$$x_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon < y_n(t_2) < y_n(t_1) + 2\epsilon,$$

and this again yields $A < 2\epsilon$.

Assume now $x_n(t_1) > x_n(t_3)$. Then $\|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| < \epsilon$ implies

$$x_n(t_3) - \epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_1) + \epsilon,$$

and hence we have

$$x_n(t_3) - \epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_1) + \epsilon \leq (x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) + \epsilon = y_n(t_1) + \epsilon,$$

which immediately yields $A < \epsilon$.

- (iii-7) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = x_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = x_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = y_n(t_3)$. This case can be treated analogously as (iii-6), hence it follows

$$A = \|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), y_n(t_3)]\| < 2\epsilon.$$

- (iii-8) $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1) = y_n(t_1)$, $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) = x_n(t_2)$ and $(x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) = y_n(t_3)$. Assume without loss of generality that $x_n(t_1) \leq x_n(t_3)$ (the same arguments given below apply in the case $x_n(t_3) < x_n(t_1)$). As before, from $|y_n(t_i) - y(t_2)| \leq v(y_n, y, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we obtain

$$x_n(t_2) = (x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) \geq y_n(t_2) > y(t_2) - \epsilon > y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon, \quad (4.11)$$

and analogously

$$x_n(t_2) > y_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon. \quad (4.12)$$

From $\|x_n(t_2) - [x_n(t_1), x_n(t_3)]\| \leq w(x_n, t, \delta) < \epsilon$ we get $x_n(t_1) - \epsilon < x_n(t_2) < x_n(t_3) + \epsilon$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} x_n(t_2) &< x_n(t_3) + \epsilon \leq (x_n \vee y_n)(t_3) + \epsilon = y_n(t_3) + \epsilon \\ &< y(t_2) + 2\epsilon < y_n(t_1) + 3\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

From (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13) immediately follows

$$y_n(t_1) - 2\epsilon < x_n(t_2) < y_n(t_3) + \epsilon$$

and

$$y_n(t_3) - 2\epsilon < x_n(t_2) < y_n(t_1) + 3\epsilon,$$

which imply

$$A = \|x_n(t_2) - [y_n(t_1), y_n(t_3)]\| < 3\epsilon.$$

Finally, taking into account all eight cases (iii-1)-(iii-8) we conclude that for $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$, t_1, t_2, t_3 such that $0 \vee (t - \delta) \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq (t + \delta) \wedge 1$ and $n \geq n_1$ it holds that

$$A = \|(x_n \vee y_n)(t_2) - [(x_n \vee y_n)(t_1), (x_n \vee y_n)(t_3)]\| < 3\epsilon,$$

and hence $w(x_n \vee y_n, t, \delta) \leq 3\epsilon$. Letting first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\delta \downarrow 0$ we arrive at

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(x_n \vee y_n, t, \delta) \leq 3\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, from this we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(x_n \vee y_n, t, \delta) = 0.$$

Therefore (iii) also holds, and this completes the proof. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported in part by University of Rijeka research grants uniri-prirod-18-9 and uniri-pr-prirod-19-16 and by Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2019-04-1239.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. J. Adler, Weak convergence results for extremal processes generated by dependent random variables, *Ann. Probab.* **6** (1983), 660–667.
- [2] B. Basrak and D. Krizmanić, A limit theorem for moving averages in the α -stable domain of attraction, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** (2014), 1070–1083.
- [3] B. Basrak and A. Tafro, A complete convergence theorem for stationary regularly varying multivariate time series, *Extremes* **19** (2016), 549–560.
- [4] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1968.
- [5] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie and J. L. Teugels, *Regular variation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [6] B. V. Gnedenko, Sur la distribution limite du terme maximum d’une série aléatoire, *Ann. Math.* **44** (1943), 423–453.
- [7] O. Kallenberg, *Foundations of Modern Probability*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [8] D. Krizmanić, Weak convergence of partial maxima processes in the M_1 topology, *Extremes* **17** (2014), 447–465.
- [9] D. Krizmanić, Joint functional convergence of partial sums and maxima for linear processes, *Lith. Math. J.* **58** (2018), 457–479.
- [10] D. Krizmanić, Functional convergence for moving averages with heavy tails and random coefficients, *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **16** (2019), 729–757.
- [11] R. Kulik, Limit Theorems for Moving Averages with Random Coefficients and Heavy-Tailed Noise, *J. Appl. Prob.* **43** (2006), 245–256.
- [12] J. Lamperti, On extreme order statistics, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **35** (1964), 1726–1737.
- [13] G. Last and M. Penrose, *Lectures on the Poisson Process*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.
- [14] M. R. Leadbetter, On extreme values in stationary sequences, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **28** (1974), 289–303.
- [15] S. I. Resnick, *Extreme Values, Regular Variation, and Point Processes*, Springer Science+Business Media LLC, New York, 1987.
- [16] S. I. Resnick, *Heavy-Tail Phenomena: Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling*, Springer Science+Business Media LLC, New York, 2007.

- [17] M. Tyran-Kamińska, Limit theorems for linear processes in the domain of attraction of stable laws, *Stat. Probab. Lett.* **80** (2010), 975–981.
- [18] W. Whitt, *Stochastic-Process Limits*, Springer-Verlag LLC, New York, 2002.

DANIJEL KRIZMANIĆ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, RADMILE MATEJČIĆ
2, 51000 RIJEKA, CROATIA
E-mail address: `dkrizmanic@math.uniri.hr`