COMPARISON OF QUENCHED AND ANNEALED INVARIANCE PRINCIPLES FOR RANDOM CONDUCTANCE MODEL

MARTIN BARLOW, KRZYSZTOF BURDZY AND ÁDÁM TIMÁR

ABSTRACT. We show that there exists an ergodic conductance environment such that the weak (annealed) invariance principle holds for the corresponding continuous time random walk but the quenched invariance principle does not hold.

1. Introduction

Let $d \geq 2$ and let E_d be the set of all non oriented edges in the d-dimensional integer lattice, that is, $E_d = \{e = \{x, y\} : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |x - y| = 1\}$. Let $\{\mu_e\}_{e \in E_d}$ be a random process with non-negative values, defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The process $\{\mu_e\}_{e \in E_d}$ represents random conductances. We write $\mu_{xy} = \mu_{yx} = \mu_{\{x,y\}}$ and set $\mu_{xy} = 0$ if $\{x, y\} \notin E_d$. Set

$$\mu_x = \sum_y \mu_{xy}, \qquad P(x, y) = \frac{\mu_{xy}}{\mu_x},$$

with the convention that $0/0 = 0$ and $P(x, y) = 0$ if $\{x, y\} \notin E_d$. For a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, let $X = \{X_t, t \geq 0, P^x_\omega, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ be the continuous time random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, with transition probabilities $P(x, y) = P_\omega(x, y)$, and exponential waiting times with mean $1/\mu_x$. The corresponding expectation will be denoted E^x_ω. For a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, the generator $\mathcal{L}$ of X is given by

$$\mathcal{L} f(x) = \sum_y \mu_{xy}(f(y) - f(x)). \tag{1.1}$$

In [BD] this is called the *variable speed random walk* (VSRW) among the conductances μ_e. This model, of a reversible (or symmetric) random walk in a random environment, is often called the Random Conductance Model (RCM).

We are interested in functional Central Limit Theorems (CLTs) for the process X. Given any process X, for $\varepsilon > 0$, set $X^{(\varepsilon)}_t = \varepsilon X_{t/\varepsilon^2}$, $t \geq 0$. Let $\mathcal{D}_T = D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the Skorokhod space, and let $\mathcal{D}_\infty = D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d)$. Write d_S for the Skorokhod metric and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T)$ for the σ-field of Borel sets in the corresponding topology. Let X be the canonical process on $\mathcal{D}_\infty$ or $\mathcal{D}_T$, P_{BM} be Wiener measure on $(\mathcal{D}_\infty, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_\infty))$ and let E_{BM} be the corresponding expectation. We will write W for a standard Brownian motion. It will be convenient to assume that $\{\mu_e\}_{e \in E_d}$ are defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and that X is defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \times (\mathcal{D}_\infty, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_\infty))$ or $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \times (\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T))$. We also define the averaged or annealed measure $\mathbf{P}$ on $(\mathcal{D}_\infty, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_\infty))$ or $(\mathcal{D}_T, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_T))$ by

$$\mathbf{P}(G) = \mathbb{E}\, P^0_\omega(G).$$

Research supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-1206276, by NSERC, Canada, and Trinity College, Cambridge, and by MTA Rényi "Lendulet" Groups and Graphs Research Group.

Definition 1.1. For a bounded function F on $\mathcal{D}_T$ and a constant matrix Σ, let $\Psi_\varepsilon^F = E_\omega^0 F(X^{(\varepsilon)})$ and $\Psi_\Sigma^F = E_{\rm BM} F(\Sigma W)$. In the remaining part of the definition we assume that Σ is not identically zero.

(i) We say that the *Quenched Functional CLT* (QFCLT) holds for X with limit ΣW if for every $T > 0$ and every bounded continuous function F on $\mathcal{D}_T$ we have $\Psi_\varepsilon^F \to \Psi_\Sigma^F$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, with $\mathbb{P}$-probability 1.

(ii) We say that the *Weak Functional CLT* (WFCLT) holds for X with limit ΣW if for every $T > 0$ and every bounded continuous function F on $\mathcal{D}_T$ we have $\Psi_\varepsilon^F \to \Psi_\Sigma^F$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, in $\mathbb{P}$-probability.

(iii) We say that the *Averaged (or Annealed) Functional CLT* (AFCLT) holds for X with limit ΣW if for every $T > 0$ and every bounded continuous function F on $\mathcal{D}_T$ we have $\mathbb{E}\, \Psi_\varepsilon^F \to \Psi_\Sigma^F$. This is the same as standard weak convergence with respect to the probability measure $\mathbf{P}$.

Since F is bounded, it is immediate that QFCLT $\Rightarrow$ WFCLT $\Rightarrow$ AFCLT. One could consider a more general form of the WFCLT and QFCLT in which one allows the matrix Σ to depend on the environment $\mu_\cdot(\omega)$. However, if the environment is stationary and ergodic, then Σ is a shift invariant function of the environment, so must be $\mathbb{P}$–a.s. constant.

In [DFGW] it is proved that if μ_e is a stationary ergodic environment with $\mathbb{E}\, \mu_e < \infty$ then the WFCLT holds (here $\Sigma \equiv 0$ is allowed). It is an open question as to whether the QFLCT holds under these hypotheses. For the QFCLT in the case of percolation see [BeB, MP, SS], and for the Random Conductance Model with μ_e i.i.d see [BP, M1, BD, ABDH]. In the i.i.d. case the QFCLT holds (with $\Sigma \not\equiv 0$) for any distribution of μ_e provided $p_+ = \mathbb{P}(\mu_e > 0) > p_c$, where p_c is the critical probability for bond percolation in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Definition 1.2. For $1 \le i < j \le d$ let T_{ij} be the isometry of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ defined by interchanging the ith and jth coordinates. We say an environment (μ_e) on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is *symmetric* if the law of (μ_e) is invariant under $\{T_{ij}, 1 \le i < j \le d\}$.

If (μ_e) is stationary, ergodic and symmetric, and the WFCLT holds with limit ΣW then the limiting covariance matrix $\Sigma^T \Sigma$ must also be invariant under symmetries of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, so must be a constant $\sigma \ge 0$ times the identity.

Our first result concerns the relation between the weak and averaged FCLT. In general, of course, for a sequence of random variables ξ_n, convergence of $\mathbb{E}\, \xi_n$ does not imply convergence in probability. However, in the context of the RCM, the AFCLT and WFCLT are equivalent.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose the AFCLT holds. Then the WFCLT holds.*

A slightly more general result is given in Theorem 2.13 below.

Our second result concerns the relation between the weak and quenched FCLT.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $d = 2$ and $p < 1$. There exists a symmetric stationary ergodic environment $\{\mu_e\}_{e \in E_2}$ with $\mathbb{E}(\mu_e^p \vee \mu_e^{-p}) < \infty$ and a sequence $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ such that*
(a) the WFCLT holds for $X^{(\varepsilon_n)}$ with limit W,
but
(b) the QFCLT does not hold for $X^{(\varepsilon_n)}$ with limit ΣW for any $\Sigma(\omega)$.

Remark 1.5. (1) Under the weaker condition that $\mathbb{E}\, \mu_e^p < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\, \mu_e^{-q} < \infty$ with $p < 1$, $q < 1/2$ we have the full WFCLT for $X^{(\varepsilon)}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, i.e., not just along a sequence ε_n. However, the proof of this is very much harder and longer than that of Theorem 1.4(a).

A sketch argument will be posted on the arxiv – see [BBTA]. (Since our environment has $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e = \infty$ we cannot use the results of [DFGW].) We have chosen to use in this paper essentially the same environment as in [BBTA], although for Theorem 1.4 a slightly simpler environment would have been sufficient.
(2) Biskup [Bis] has proved that the QFCLT holds with $\sigma > 0$ if $d = 2$ and (μ_e) are symmetric and ergodic with $\mathbb{E}(\mu_e \vee \mu_e^{-1}) < \infty$.
(3) See Remark 6.4 for how our example can be adapted to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 3$; in that case we have the same moment conditions as in Theorem 1.4.
(4) In [ADS] it is proved that the QFCLT holds (in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$) for stationary symmetric ergodic environments (μ_e) under the conditions $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^p < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^{-q} < \infty$, with $p^{-1} + q^{-1} < 2/d$.

The remainder of the paper after Section 2 constitutes the proof of Theorem 1.4. The argument is split into several sections. In the proof, we will discuss the conditions listed in Definition 1.1 for $T = 1$ only, as it is clear that the same argument works for general $T > 0$.

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to Emmanuel Rio for very helpful advice, and Pierre Mathieu Jean-Dominique Deuschel and Marek Biskup for some very useful discussions.

2. Averaged and weak invariance principles

The basic setup will be slightly more general in this section than in the introduction. As in the Introduction, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, fix some $T > 0$ and let $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_T$ in this section (although we will also use $\mathcal{D}_{2T}$). Recall that X is the coordinate/identity process on $\mathcal{D}$. Let $C(\mathcal{D})$ be the family of all functions $F : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{R}$ which are continuous in the Skorokhod topology. In the following definition, P_n^ω will stand for a probability measure (not necessarily arising from an RCM) on $\mathcal{D}$ for $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \geq 1$. We will also refer to a probability measure P_0 on $\mathcal{D}$. The corresponding expectations will be denoted E_n^ω and E_0. The following definition was first introduced in [KV], see also [DFGW].

Definition 2.1. We will say that P_n^ω *converge weakly in measure* to P_0 if for each bounded $F \in C(\mathcal{D})$,

$$E_n^\omega F(X) \to E_0 F(X) \text{ in } \mathbb{P} \text{ probability.} \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\delta_n \to 0$, let $\Lambda_n = \delta_n \mathbb{Z}^d$, and let λ_n be counting measure on Λ_n normalized so that $\lambda_n \to dx$ weakly, where dx is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose that for each ω and $n \geq 1$ we have Markov processes $X^{(n)} = (X_t, t \geq 0, P_{\omega,n}^x, x \in \Lambda_n)$ with values in Λ_n. The corresponding expectations will be denoted $E_{\omega,n}^x$. Write

$$T_t^{(\omega,n)} f(x) = E_{\omega,n}^x f(X_t)$$

for the semigroup of $X^{(n)}$. Since we are discussing weak convergence, it is natural to put the index n in the probability measures $P_{\omega,n}^x$ rather than the process; however we will sometimes abuse notation and refer to $X^{(n)}$ rather than X under the laws $(P_{\omega,n}^x)$. Recall that W denotes a standard Brownian motion.

For the remainder of this section, we will suppose that the following Assumption holds.

Assumption 2.2. (1) For each ω, the semigroup $T_t^{(\omega,n)}$ is self adjoint on $L^2(\Lambda_n, \lambda_n)$.
(2) The $\mathbb{P}$ law of the 'environment' for $X^{(n)}$ is stationary. More precisely, for $x \in \Lambda_n$ there

exist measure preserving maps $T_x : \Omega \to \Omega$ such that for all bounded measurable F on $\mathcal{D}_T$,

$$E^x_{\omega,n} F(X) = E^0_{T_x\omega,n} F(X + x), \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\, E^0_{T_x\omega,n} F(X) = \mathbb{E}\, E^0_{\omega,n} F(X). \tag{2.3}$$

(3) The AFCLT holds, that is for all $T > 0$ and bounded continuous F on $\mathcal{D}_T$,

$$\mathbb{E}\, E^0_{\omega,n} F(X) \to E_{\mathrm{BM}} F(X).$$

Given a function F from $\mathcal{D}_T$ to $\mathbb{R}$ set

$$F_x(w) = F(x + w), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, w \in \mathcal{D}_T.$$

Note that combining (2.2) and (2.3) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\, E^x_{\omega,n} F(X) = \mathbb{E}\, E^0_{\omega,n} F_x(X), \quad x \in \Lambda_n.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{T}^n_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}\, T^{(\omega,n)}_t f(x).$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}_t$ is not in general a semigroup. Write K_t for the semigroup of Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We also need notation for expectation of general functions F on $\mathcal{D}_T$, so we define

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(\omega,n)} F(x) &= E^x_{\omega,n} F(X), \\ \mathcal{T}^{(n)} F(x) &= \mathbb{E}\, E^x_{\omega,n} F(X), \\ \mathcal{K} F(x) &= E_{BM} F(x + W), \\ U^{(\omega,n)} F(x) &= T^{(\omega,n)} F(x) - \mathcal{K} F(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using this notation, the AFCLT states that for $F \in C(\mathcal{D}_T)$

$$\mathcal{T}^{(n)} F(0) \to \mathcal{K} F(0). \tag{2.4}$$

Definition 2.3. Fix $T > 0$ and recall that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_T$. Write d_U for the uniform norm, i.e.,

$$d_U(w, w') = \sup_{0 \le s \le T} |w(s) - w'(s)|.$$

We have $d_S(w, w') \le d_U(w, w')$, but the topologies given by the two metrics are distinct. Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$ be the set of measurable F on $\mathcal{D}$. A function $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$ is uniformly continuous in the uniform norm on $\mathcal{D}$ if there exists $\rho(\varepsilon)$ with $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho(\varepsilon) = 0$ such that if $w, w' \in \mathcal{D}_T$ with $d_U(w, w') \le \varepsilon$ then

$$|F(w) - F(w')| \le \rho(\varepsilon). \tag{2.5}$$

Write $C_U(\mathcal{D})$ for the set of F in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$ which are uniformly continuous in the uniform norm. Note that we do not have $C_U(\mathcal{D}) \subset C(\mathcal{D})$.

Let $C^1_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the set of continuously differentiable functions with compact support. Let $\mathcal{A}_m$ be the set of F such that

$$F(w) = \prod_{i=1}^m f_i(w(t_i)), \tag{2.6}$$

where $0 \le t_1 \le \dots t_m \le T$, $f_i \in C^1_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and let $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_m \mathcal{A}_m$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $F \in C_U(\mathcal{D})$, and $\mathcal{K} F \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{A}_m$. Choose $C \geq 2$ so that $||f_i||_\infty \leq C$ and $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \leq C|x-y|$ for all x, y, i. Then

$$|F(w) - F(w')| \leq mC^m d_U(w, w').$$

Since f_i are bounded and continuous, so is $\mathcal{K}F$. Also, $F \leq C|f(w(t_1))|$, so

$$\int \mathcal{K}F(x)dx \leq C\langle K_{t_1}|f_1|, 1\rangle = C\langle |f_1|, 1\rangle = C||f_1||_1 < \infty.$$

□

Lemma 2.5. *For all $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D})$,*

$$T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) \overset{(d)}{=} T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0), \tag{2.7}$$

$$U^{(\omega,n)}F(x) \overset{(d)}{=} U^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0).$$

Proof. By the stationarity of the environment,

$$T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) = E^x_{\omega,n}F(X) = E^0_{T_x\omega,n}F(X+x) =^{(d)} E^0_{\omega,n}F(X+x) = T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0).$$

The result for $U^{(\omega,n)}$ is then immediate. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let $F \in C_U(\mathcal{D}_T)$. Then $T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$, $U^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$, and $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}F(x)$ are uniformly continuous on Λ_n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with a modulus of continuity which is independent of n.*

Proof. If $|x-y| \leq \varepsilon$ then $d_U(w+x, w+y) \leq \varepsilon$, so if $F \in C_U(\mathcal{D}_T)$ and ρ is such that (2.5) holds, then $|F_x(w) - F_y(w)| \leq \rho(\varepsilon)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}|T_t^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0) - T_t^{(\omega,n)}F_y(0)| &= |E^0_{\omega,n}F(x+X) - E^0_{\omega,n}F(y+X)| \\ &\leq E^0_{\omega,n}|F(x+X) - F(y+X)| \leq \rho(\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

This implies the uniform continuity of $T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$ and $U^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$. By (2.7),

$$\mathcal{T}^{(n)}F(x) = \mathbb{E}\, T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) = \mathbb{E}\, T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0),$$

so the uniform continuity of $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}F(x)$ follows from that of $T^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{T}^{(n)}F(x) \to \mathcal{K}F(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. The AFCLT (in 2.2) implies that $\mathbb{E}\, P^0_{\omega,n}$ converge weakly to P_{BM}. Hence the finite dimensional distributions of $X^{(n)}$ converge to those of W, and this is equivalent to (2.8). □

Let $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the space of bounded continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$, and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then*

$$\int h(x)\mathcal{T}^{(n)}F(x)\lambda_n(dx) \to \int h(x)\mathcal{K}F(x)dx. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. This is immediate from (2.8) and the uniform continuity proved in Lemma 2.6. □

The next Lemma gives the key construction in this section: using the self-adjointness of $T_t^{(\omega,n)}$ we can linearise expectations of products. A similar idea is used in [ZP] in the context of transition densities.

Let $F \in \mathcal{A}_m$ be given by (2.6). Set $s_j = t_m - t_{m-j}$, and let

$$\widehat{F}(w) = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} f_{m-j}(w_{s_j}) \prod_{j=1}^{m} f_j(w_{t_m+t_j}).$$

Note that $\widehat{F}$ is defined on functions $w \in \mathcal{D}_{2T}$ (not $\mathcal{D}_T$). Write $\langle f, g\rangle_n$ for the inner product in $L^2(\lambda_n)$ and $\langle f, g\rangle$ for the inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 2.9. *With F and $\widehat{F}$ as above,*

$$\int (T^{(\omega,n)}F(x))^2 \lambda_n(dx) = \int (T^{(\omega,n)}\widehat{F}(x)) f_m(x) \lambda_n(dx), \tag{2.10}$$

$$\int (\mathcal{K}F(x))^2 dx = \int (\mathcal{K}\widehat{F}(x)) f_m(x) dx. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. Using the Markov property of $X^{(n)}$

$$T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) = E^x_{\omega,n} \prod_{j=1}^{m} f_j(w_{t_j}) = E^x_{\omega,n}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} f_j(w_{t_j}) T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m(X_{t_{m-1}})\Big).$$

Hence we obtain

$$T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) = T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1}\left(f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_2-t_1}\left(f_2 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m(x)\dots\right)\right).$$

Using the self-adjointness of $T^{(\omega,n)}_t$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, T^{(\omega,n)}F\rangle_n &= \langle T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_2-t_1} f_2 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m, T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_2-t_1} f_2 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m\rangle_n \\ &= \langle f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_2-t_1} f_2 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m, T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_2-t_1} f_2 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m\rangle_n.\end{aligned}$$

Continuing in this way we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, T^{(\omega,n)}F\rangle_n \\ &= \langle T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_{m-1} T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_{m-1}-t_{m-2}} f_{m-2} \dots f_1 T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_1} f_1 \dots T^{(\omega,n)}_{t_m-t_{m-1}} f_m, f_m\rangle_n \\ &= \langle T^{(\omega,n)}\widehat{F}, f_m\rangle_n.\end{aligned}$$

The proof for $\mathcal{K}$ is exactly the same. ∎

Lemma 2.10. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\int (T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) - \mathcal{K}F(x))^2 \lambda_n(dx) \to 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int (T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) - \mathcal{K}F(x))^2 \lambda_n(dx) &= \langle (T^{(\omega,n)}F - \mathcal{K}F), (T^{(\omega,n)}F - \mathcal{K}F)\rangle_n \\ &= \langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, T^{(\omega,n)}F\rangle_n - 2\langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n + \langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int (T^{(\omega,n)}F(x) - \mathcal{K}F(x))^2 \lambda_n(dx) \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\,\langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, T^{(\omega,n)}F\rangle_n - 2\langle \mathcal{T}^{(n)}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n + \langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n.\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Since $\mathcal{K}F$ is continuous we have

$$\langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n \to \langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle.$$

Taking $h = \mathcal{K}F$ and using Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.8 gives that

$$\langle \mathcal{T}^{(n)}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle_n \to \langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle.$$

Let f_m and $\widehat{F}$ be as in the the previous lemma. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\,\langle T^{(\omega,n)}F, T^{(\omega,n)}F\rangle_n = \mathbb{E}\,\langle T^{(\omega,n)}\widehat{F}, f_m\rangle_n = \langle \mathcal{T}^{(n)}\widehat{F}, f_m\rangle_n.$$

Again by Lemma 2.8 and (2.11),

$$\langle \mathcal{T}^{(n)}\widehat{F}, f_m\rangle_n \to \langle \mathcal{K}\widehat{F}, f_m\rangle = \langle \mathcal{K}F, \mathcal{K}F\rangle.$$

Adding the limits of the three terms in (2.13), we obtain (2.12). □

Lemma 2.11. *Let $F \in \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$T^{(\omega,n)}F(0) \to \mathcal{K}F(0) \text{ in } \mathbb{P}\text{-probability.} \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. The previous lemma gives

$$\mathbb{E}\int (U^{(\omega,n)}F(x))^2\lambda_n(dx) \to 0.$$

Using Lemma 2.5 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int (U^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0))^2\lambda_n(dx) \to 0, \tag{2.15}$$

and using the uniform continuity of $U^{(\omega,n)}F_x(0)$ gives (2.14). □

Write $\mathbb{D}$ for the set of dyadic rationals.

Proposition 2.12. *Given any subsequence (n_k) there exists a subsequence (n'_k) of (n_k) and a set Ω_0 with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = 1$, such that for any $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and $q_1 \le q_2 \le \cdots \le q_m$ with $q_i \in \mathbb{D}$, the r.v. $(X_{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m)$ under P^0_{ω,n'_k} converge in distribution to $(W_{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{D}_T = [0,T] \cap \mathbb{D}$. Fix a finite set $q_1 \le \cdots \le q_m$ with $q_i \in \mathbb{D}_T$. Then convergence of $(X_{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m, P^0_{\omega,n})$ is determined by a countable set of functions $F_i \in \mathcal{A}_m$. So by Lemma 2.11 we can find nested subsequences $(n^{(i)}_k)$ of (n_k) such that for each i

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} P^0_{(\omega,n^{(i)}_k)}F_j(0) = \mathcal{K}F_j(0) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s., for } 1 \le j \le i.$$

A diagonalization argument then implies that there exists a subsequence n''_k such that $(X_{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m, P^0_{\omega,n''_k})$ converge in distribution to $(W_{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, m)$. Since the set of the finite sets $\{q_1, \ldots, q_m\}$ is countable, an additional diagonalization argument then implies that there exists a subsequence (n'_k) such that this convergence holds for all such finite sets. □

Theorem 2.13. *If Assumption 2.2 holds then $P^0_{\omega,n}$ converge weakly in measure to P_{BM}.*

Proof. Fix any $T > 0$, an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$ and any bounded function $F \in C(\mathcal{D}_T)$. Let W denote Brownian motion and suppose that processes Y and W are defined on the same probability space, for which we use the generic notation P and E. It is easy to see that one can find $\delta > 0$ so small that if the process Y satisfies

$$P\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T} |Y_t - W_t| \ge 4\delta\right) < \sqrt{2\delta} + 2\delta, \tag{2.16}$$

then

$$|EF(Y) - EF(W)| < \varepsilon. \tag{2.17}$$

We make $\delta > 0$ smaller, if necessary, so that $\sqrt{2\delta} + \delta < \varepsilon$.

There exists $\delta_1 > 0$ (depending on δ) such that

$$P_{BM}\left(\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T, t-s\le\delta_1} |W_s - W_t| \ge \delta\right) < \delta. \tag{2.18}$$

Suppose that $0 = q_1 \le q_2 \le \dots \le q_m = T$ are dyadic rationals and $q_k - q_{k-1} \le \delta_1$ for all k (note that we can assume that T is a dyadic rational without loss of generality). By Proposition 2.12, we can find a sequence n_k such that the joint distributions of the random variables $(X_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ under P^0_{ω,n_k} converge to the distribution of $(W_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$, as $k\to\infty$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. By the Skorokhod Lemma, we can construct $(X^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ and $(W^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ on the same probability space $(\Omega_\omega, \mathcal{F}_\omega, P_\omega)$ so that

$$(X^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m) \to (W^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m), \qquad P_\omega\text{-a.s.}, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \tag{2.19}$$

$(X^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ has the same distribution under P_ω as $(X_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ under P^0_{ω,n_k}, and $(W^{\omega,n_k}_{q_i}, i = 1,\dots,m)$ has the same distribution under P_ω as Brownian motion (sampled at a finite number of times).

Using conditional probabilities and enlarging the probability space, if necessary, we can assume that there exist processes $(X^{\omega,n_k}_t, 0\le t\le T)$ and $(W^{\omega,n_k}_t, 0\le t\le T)$ on the same probability space $(\Omega_\omega, \mathcal{F}_\omega, P_\omega)$ such that $(X^{\omega,n_k}_t, 0\le t\le T)$ has the same distribution under P_ω as $(X_t, 0\le t\le T)$ under P^0_{ω,n_k}, $(W^{\omega,n_k}_t, 0\le t\le T)$ is Brownian motion, and all the conditions stated in the previous paragraph hold for these processes sampled at $q_i, i = 1,\dots,m$; in particular, (2.19) holds.

It follows from (2.19) that there exist an event F with $\mathbb{P}(F) > 1-\delta$ and k_1 such that for $k\ge k_1$ and each $\omega\in F$,

$$P_\omega(|X^{\omega,n_k}_{q_k} - W^{\omega,n_k}_{q_k}| < \delta, \forall\ k = 1,\dots,m) \ge 1-\delta. \tag{2.20}$$

Let $\mathbb{P}_n = \mathbb{E}\, P^0_{\omega,n}$. We have assumed that the AFCLT holds so, by the Skorokhod Lemma, we can construct $X^{(n)}$ and W on a common probability space, in such a way that each $X^{(n)}$ has the distribution $\mathbb{P}_n$ and $X^{(n)} \to W$ in the Skorokhod topology, a.s. If a sequence of processes converges in the Skorokhod topology to a continuous process then it converges also in the uniform sense. Hence, in view of (2.18), there exists k_2 such that for $k\ge k_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{n_k}\left(\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T, t-s\le\delta_1} |X^{(n_k)}_s - X^{(n_k)}_t| \ge 2\delta\right) < 2\delta.$$

This implies that for $k\ge k_2$, there is a set A_k of ω with $\mathbb{P}(A_k) \ge 1-\sqrt{2\delta}$, such that for $\omega\in A_k$,

$$P^0_{\omega,n_k}\left(\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T, t-s\le\delta_1} |X^{(n_k)}_s - X^{(n_k)}_t| \ge 2\delta\right) < \sqrt{2\delta}. \tag{2.21}$$

Recall that $(X_t^{\omega,n_k}, 0 \le t \le T)$ has the same distribution under P_ω as $(X_t^{(n_k)}, 0 \le t \le T)$ under P^0_{ω,n_k}. It follows from this and (2.21) that for $k \ge k_2$, there is a set A_k of ω with $\mathbb{P}(A_k) \ge 1 - \sqrt{2\delta}$, such that for $\omega \in A_k$,

$$P_\omega\left(\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T, t-s\le\delta_1} |X_s^{\omega,n_k} - X_t^{\omega,n_k}| \ge 2\delta\right) < \sqrt{2\delta}. \tag{2.22}$$

For similar reasons, (2.18) implies that

$$P_\omega\left(\sup_{0\le s\le t\le T, t-s\le\delta_1} |W_s^{\omega,n_k} - W_t^{\omega,n_k}| \ge \delta\right) < \delta. \tag{2.23}$$

We now combine (2.20), (2.22) and (2.23) to conclude that for $k \ge k_1 \vee k_2$, there is a set $F \cap A_k$ of ω with $\mathbb{P}(F \cap A_k) \ge 1 - \sqrt{2\delta} - \delta$, such that for $\omega \in F \cap A_k$,

$$P_\omega\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T} |X_t^{\omega,n_k} - W_t^{\omega,n_k}| \ge 4\delta\right) < \sqrt{2\delta} + 2\delta.$$

In view of (2.16)-(2.17) this implies that for $k \ge k_1 \vee k_2$, there is a set $F \cap A_k$ of ω with $\mathbb{P}(F \cap A_k) \ge 1 - \sqrt{2\delta} - \delta$, such that for $\omega \in F \cap A_k$,

$$|E^0_{\omega,n_k} F(X) - EF(W)| = |E_\omega F(X^{\omega,n_k}) - EF(W^{\omega,n_k})| < \varepsilon. \tag{2.24}$$

Set $\xi_n = |E^0_{\omega,n} F(X) - EF(W)|$; since $\sqrt{2\delta} + \delta < \varepsilon$, (2.24) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n_k} > \varepsilon) < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \ge k_1 \vee k_2. \tag{2.25}$$

We now extend this result to the whole sequence, and claim that there exists n_1 such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_n > \varepsilon) < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } n \ge n_1. \tag{2.26}$$

Suppose not: then there exists a subsequence n_k^* with $\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n_k^*} > \varepsilon) \ge \varepsilon$ for all k. However, by Proposition 2.12, we can find a subsequence n_k of n_k^* such that the joint distributions of the random variables $(X_{q_i}, i = 1, \dots, m)$ under P^0_{ω,n_k} converge to the distribution of $(W_{q_i}, i = 1, \dots, m)$, as $k \to \infty$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Applying the argument above to this subsequence, we have a contradiction to (2.25). Thus (2.26) holds, and this completes the proof of the theorem. □

3. Construction of the environment

The remainder of this paper is concerned with the proof of Theorem 1.4. The main idea of the proof as as follows. We choose a sequence a_n of integers, with $a_n \gg a_{n-1}$, and $a_n/a_{n-1} = m_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For each n we define an ergodic tiling of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ into (disjoint) squares, each with a_n^2 points. Write $\mathcal{S}_n$ for the collection of these squares; they are defined so that each square in $\mathcal{S}_n$ is the union of m_n^2 squares in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$. In each square in $\mathcal{S}_n$ we place 4 obstacles of diameter $O(b_n)$, where $b_n \simeq n^{-1/2} a_n$. The obstacles are chosen so that the resulting environment is symmetric. Let F_n be the event that 0 is within a distance $O(b_n)$ of an obstacle at scale n. The obstacles are such that if F_n holds then the rescaled process $Z_n = (b_n^{-1} X_{b_n^2 t}, 0 \le t \le 1)$ will be far from a Brownian motion. Thus if F_n holds i.o. then the QFCLT will fail. On the other hand, if $\mathbb{P}(F_n) \to 0$ then with high probability Z_n will be close to BM, and (after some work) we do have the WFCLT.

We now begin by giving the construction of the sets $\mathcal{S}_n$ and the associated environment. Let $\Omega = (0, \infty)^{E_2}$, and $\mathcal{F}$ be the Borel σ-algebra defined using the usual product topology. Then every $t \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ defines a translation T_t of the environment by t. Stationarity and ergodicity of the measures defined below will be understood with respect to these transformations.

All constants (often denoted c_1, c_2, etc.) are assumed to be strictly positive and finite. For a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ let $E(A)$ be the set of edges in A regarded as a subgraph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $E_h(A)$ and $E_v(A)$ respectively be the set of horizontal and vertical edges in $E(A)$. Write $x \sim y$ if $\{x, y\}$ is an edge in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Define the exterior boundary of A by

$$\partial A = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - A : y \sim x \text{ for some } x \in A\}.$$

Let also

$$\partial_i A = \partial(\mathbb{Z}^2 - A).$$

Finally define balls in the ℓ^∞ norm by $B_\infty(x, r) = \{y : ||x - y||_\infty \le r\}$; of course this is just the square with center x and side $2r$.

Let $\{a_n\}_{n\ge0}$, $\{\beta_n\}_{n\ge1}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n\ge1}$ be strictly increasing sequences of positive integers growing to infinity with n, with

$$1 = a_0 < b_1 < \beta_1 < a_1 \ll b_2 < \beta_2 < a_2 \ll b_3 \dots$$

We will impose a number of conditions on these sequences in the course of the paper. We collect these conditions here so that the reader can check that all conditions can be satisfied simultaneously. There is some redundancy in the conditions, for easy reference. (Some additional conditions on b_n/a_{n-1} are needed for the proof in [BBTA] of the full WFCLT for $(X^{(\varepsilon)})$.)

(i) a_n is even for all n.
(ii) For each $n \ge 1$, a_{n-1} divides b_n, and b_n divides β_n and a_n.
(iii) $b_1 \ge 10^{10}$.
(iv) $a_n/\sqrt{2n} \le b_n \le a_n/\sqrt{n}$ for all n, and $b_n \sim a_n/\sqrt{n}$.
(v) $b_{n+1} \ge 2^n b_n$ for all n.
(vi) $b_n > 40a_{n-1}$ for all n.
(vii) b_n is large enough so that (5.1) and (6.1) hold.
(viii) $100b_n < \beta_n \le b_n n^{1/4} < 3\beta_n < a_n/10$ for all n.

These conditions do not define a_n's and b_n's uniquely. It is easy to check that there exist constants that satisfy all the conditions: if a_i, b_i, β_i have been chosen for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, then if b_n is chosen large enough (with care on respecting the divisibility condition in (ii)), it will satisfy all the conditions imposed on it with respect to constants of smaller indices. Then one can choose a_n and β_n so that the remaining conditions are satisfied.

We set

$$m_n = \frac{a_n}{a_{n-1}}, \qquad \ell_n = \frac{a_n}{b_n}. \tag{3.1}$$

We begin our construction by defining a collection of squares in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let

$$B_n = [0, a_n]^2,$$
$$B'_n = [0, a_n - 1]^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^2,$$
$$\mathcal{S}_n(x) = \{x + a_n y + B'_n : y \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{S}_n(x)$ gives a tiling of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ by disjoint squares of side $a_n - 1$ and period a_n. We say that the tiling $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(x_{n-1})$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{S}_n(x_n)$ if every square $Q \in \mathcal{S}_n(x_n)$ is a finite union of squares in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(x_{n-1})$. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(x_{n-1})$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{S}_n(x_n)$ if and only if $x_n = x_{n-1} + a_{n-1}y$ for some $y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.



FIGURE 1. The set $D_n^{00} \cup D_n^{01}$ resembles the letter I. Blue edges have very low conductance. The red line represents edges with very high conductance. Drawing not to scale.

Take $\mathcal{O}_1$ uniform in B_1', and for $n \geq 2$ take $\mathcal{O}_n$, conditional on $(\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_{n-1})$, to be uniform in $B_n' \cap (\mathcal{O}_{n-1} + a_{n-1}\mathbb{Z}^2)$. We now define random tilings by letting

$$\mathcal{S}_n = \mathcal{S}_n(\mathcal{O}_n),\ n \geq 1.$$

Let η_n, K_n be positive constants; we will have $\eta_n \ll 1 \ll K_n$. We define conductances on E_2 as a limit of conductances for $n = 1, 2 \dots$, as follows. For each n, conductances on a tile of $\mathcal{S}_n$ will be the same for each tile. Recall that a_n is even, and let $a_n' = \frac{1}{2}a_n$. Let

$$C_n = \{(x, y) \in B_n \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 : y \geq x, x + y \leq a_n\}.$$

We first define conductances $\nu_e^{0,n}$ for $e \in E(C_n)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} D_n^{00} &= \big\{(a_n' - \beta_n, y), a_n' - 10b_n \leq y \leq a_n' + 10b_n\big\}, \\ D_n^{01} &= \big\{(x, a_n' + 10b_n), (x, a_n' + 10b_n + 1), (x, a_n' - 10b_n), (x, a_n' - 10b_n - 1), \\ &\qquad a_n' - \beta_n - b_n \leq x \leq a_n' - \beta_n + b_n\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the set $D_n^{00} \cup D_n^{01}$ resembles the letter I (see Fig. 1).

For an edge $e \in E(C_n)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_e^{n,0} &= \eta_n \quad \text{if } e \in E_v(D_n^{01}), \\ \nu_e^{n,0} &= K_n \quad \text{if } e \in E(D_n^{00}), \\ \nu_e^{n,0} &= 1 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

We then extend $\nu^{n,0}$ by symmetry to $E(B_n)$. More precisely, for $z = (x, y) \in B_n$, let $R_1 z = (y, x)$ and $R_2 z = (a_n - y, a_n - x)$, so that R_1 and R_2 are reflections in the lines $y = x$ and $x + y = a_n$. We define R_i on edges by $R_i(\{x, y\}) = \{R_i x, R_i y\}$ for $x, y \in B_n$. We then extend $\nu^{0,n}$ to $E(B_n)$ so that $\nu_e^{0,n} = \nu_{R_1 e}^{0,n} = \nu_{R_2 e}^{0,n}$ for $e \in E(B_n)$. We define the *obstacle* set D_n^0 by setting (see Fig. 2),



FIGURE 2. The obstacle set D_n^0. Blue lines represent "ladders" consisting of parallel edges with very low conductance. Each red line represents a sequence of adjacent edges with very high conductance. Drawing not to scale.

$$D_n^0 = \bigcup_{i=0}^{1} \big(D_n^{0,i} \cup R_1(D_n^{0,i}) \cup R_2(D_n^{0,i}) \cup R_1 R_2 (D_n^{0,i}) \big).$$

Note that $\nu_e^{n,0} = 1$ for every edge adjacent to the boundary of B_n, or indeed within a distance $a_n/4$ of this boundary. If $e = (x, y)$, we will write $e - z = (x - z, y - z)$. Next we extend $\nu^{n,0}$ to E_2 by periodicity, i.e., $\nu_e^{n,0} = \nu_{e+a_n x}^{n,0}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Finally, we define the conductances ν^n by translation by $\mathcal{O}_n$, so that

$$\nu_e^n = \nu_{e-\mathcal{O}_n}^{n,0},\ e \in E_2.$$

We also define the obstacle set at scale n by

$$D_n = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (a_n x + \mathcal{O}_n + D_n^0).$$

We illustrate two levels of construction in Fig. 3.

We define the environment μ_e^n inductively by

$$\mu_e^n = \nu_e^n \quad \text{if } \nu_e^n \neq 1,$$
$$\mu_e^n = \mu_e^{n-1} \quad \text{if } \nu_e^n = 1.$$

Once we have proved the limit exists, we will set

$$\mu_e = \lim_n \mu_e^n. \tag{3.2}$$

Theorem 3.1. *(a) For each n the environments $(\nu_e^n, e \in E_2)$, $(\mu_e^n, e \in E_2)$ are stationary, symmetric and ergodic.*
(b) The limit (3.2) exists $\mathbb{P}$–a.s.
(c) The environment $(\mu_e, e \in E_2)$ is stationary, symmetric in the sense of Definition 1.2, and ergodic with respect to the group of translations of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.



FIGURE 3. Two levels of the obstacle set. Drawing not to scale.

Proof. (a) For $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ define the modulo a value of x as the unique $(y_1, y_2) \in [0, a-1]^2$ such that $x_1 \equiv y_1 \pmod a$ and $x_2 \equiv y_2 \pmod a$. We say that $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ are equivalent modulo a if their modulo a values are the same, and denote it by $x \equiv y \bmod a$.

Let $\mathcal{K}_n$ be the set of n-tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $x_i \in (x_{i-1} + a_{i-1}\mathbb{Z}^2) \cap [0, a_i - 1]^2$ (with the convention $a_0 = 1, x_0 = 0$). Denote the uniform measure on $\mathcal{K}_n$ by $\mathbb{P}_n$. Note that $(\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n)$ is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}_n$.

Let U_n be a uniformly chosen element of $[0, a_n - 1]^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then since each a_{i-1} divides a_i, the distribution of $(U_n + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, U_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2)$ is stationary, symmetric and ergodic with respect to the isometries $(\hat{T}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}^2)$ defined by

$$\hat{T}_t : (U_n + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, U_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2) \to (t + U_n + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, t + U_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2).$$

Let β be the bijection between $[0, a_n - 1]^2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\mathcal{K}_n$ defined as $\beta(t) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, where x_i is the mod a_i value of t. The push-forward of the uniform measure for U_n is then the uniform measure on $\mathcal{K}_n$. Furthermore, β commutes with translations in the sense that if $\beta(t) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\beta(t+\tau) = (x_1 + \tau, \dots, x_n + \tau)$, where addition in the i'th coordinate is understood modulo a_i. Similarly, β commutes with rotations and reflections. Hence symmetry, stationarity and ergodicity of $(O_1 + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, O_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2)$ follows from that of $(U_n + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, U_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2)$. Symmetry, stationarity and ergodicity of $(\nu_e^n, e \in E_2)$ and $(\mu_e^n, e \in E_2)$ follows from the fact that $(\nu_e^n, e \in E_2)$ and $(\mu_e^n, e \in E_2)$ are deterministic functions of $(O_1 + a_1\mathbb{Z}^2, \dots, O_n + a_n\mathbb{Z}^2)$, and these functions commute with graph isomorphisms of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

(b) B_n contains more than $2a_n^2$ edges, of which less than $100b_n$ are such that $\nu_e^{n,0} \neq 1$. So by the stationarity of ν^n,

$$\mathbb{P}(\nu_e^n \neq 1) \leq \frac{50b_n}{a_n^2} \leq \frac{c}{2^n}.$$

The convergence in (3.2) then follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

(c) The definition (3.2) and (a) show that $(\mu_e, e \in E_2)$ is stationary and symmetric, so all that remains to be proved is ergodicity.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ the family of sequences $(x_1, x_2, \ldots)$, satisfying $x_i \in (x_{i-1}+a_{i-1}\mathbb{Z}^2)\cap[0,a_i-1]^2$ for every i. Let $\mathcal{G}_\infty$ be the σ-field generated by $(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \ldots)$, and (by a slight abuse of notation) for the rest of this proof let $\mathbb{P}$ be the law of $(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \ldots)$. Let $\mathcal{G}_n$ be the sub-σ-field of $\mathcal{G}_\infty$ generated by $(\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_n)$.

If $(x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, define the $\mathbb{P}$-preserving transformation $t + (x_1, x_2, \ldots)$ as $(t+x_1, t+x_2, \ldots)$, where in the i'th coordinate is modulo a_i. To show ergodicity of $(\mu_e, e \in E_2)$, it is enough to prove ergodicity of $(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \ldots)$, because $(\mu_e, e \in E_2)$ is a deterministic function of it, and this function commutes with graph isomorphisms of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Now let $A \in \mathcal{G}_\infty$ be invariant, and suppose by contradiction that there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \mathbb{P}(A) < 1 - \varepsilon$. There exists some n and $B \in \mathcal{G}_n$ with the property that $\mathbb{P}(A \triangle B) < \varepsilon/4$ (where $\triangle$ is the symmetric difference operator). This also implies that $3\varepsilon/4 < \mathbb{P}(B) < 1 - 3\varepsilon/4$. We have for $t \in \mathbb{Z}^2$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(B \triangle (B+t)) &\le \mathbb{P}(A\triangle B) + \mathbb{P}(A \triangle (B+t)) = \mathbb{P}(A\triangle B) + \mathbb{P}((A+t)\triangle(B+t)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(A\triangle B) + \mathbb{P}((A\triangle B)+t) = 2\,\mathbb{P}(A\triangle B) < \varepsilon/2.\end{aligned}$$

We now show that we can choose t so that $\mathbb{P}(B\triangle(B+t)) \ge 2\,\mathbb{P}(B)\,\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_\infty \setminus B) \ge \varepsilon/2$, giving a contradiction.

For an $E \in \mathcal{G}_n$ denote by E_n the subset of $\mathcal{K}_n$ such that $(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \ldots) \in E$ if and only if $(\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_n) \in E_n$. Note that $\mathbb{P}(E) = \mathbb{P}_n(E_n)$. So we want to show that for any $B \in \mathcal{G}_n$ there exists a t such that $\mathbb{P}_n(B_n \triangle (B_n+t)) \ge 2\,\mathbb{P}_n(B_n)\,\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{K}_n \setminus B_n)$.

Consider the following average:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\sum_{t\in[0,a_n-1]^2} \mathbb{P}_n(B_n\triangle(B_n+t)) &= \frac{2}{a_n^2}\sum_{t\in[0,a_n-1]^2}\mathbb{P}_n(B_n\setminus(B_n+t)) \\ &= \frac{2}{a_n^4}\sum_{t\in[0,a_n-1]^2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{K}_n}\mathbb{1}(x\in B_n\setminus(B_n+t)).\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Use

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{K}_n}\mathbb{1}(x\in B_n\setminus(B_n+t)) = \sum_{x\in B_n}\mathbb{1}(x\in B_n\setminus(B_n+t)) = \sum_{x\in B_n}\mathbb{1}(x-t\notin B_n)$$

and change the order of summation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2}{a_n^4}\sum_{t\in[0,a_n-1]^2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{K}_n}\mathbb{1}(x\in B_n\setminus(B_n+t)) &= \frac{2}{a_n^4}\sum_{x\in B_n}\sum_{t\in[0,a_n-1]^2}\mathbb{1}(x-t\notin B_n) \\ = \frac{2}{a_n^4}\sum_{x\in B_n}(a_n^2-|B_n|) &= \frac{2}{a_n^4}|B_n|(a_n^2-|B_n|) = 2\,\mathbb{P}_n(B_n)\,\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{K}_n\setminus B_n).\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

It follows from (3.3)–(3.4) that there exists a $t \in [0, a_n-1]^2$ such that $\mathbb{P}_n(B_n\triangle(B_n+t)) \ge 2\,\mathbb{P}_n(B_n)\,\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{K}_n\setminus B_n)$.

□

4. Choice of K_n and η_n

Let

$$\mathcal{L}_n f(x) = \sum_y \mu^n_{xy}(f(y)-f(x)), \tag{4.1}$$

and X^n be the associated Markov process.

Proposition 4.1. *For each $n \geq 1$ there exists a constant σ_n, depending only on η_i, K_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that the QFCLT holds for X^n with limit $\sigma_n W$.*

Proof. Since μ_e^n is stationary, symmetric and ergodic, and μ_e^n is uniformly bounded and bounded away from 0, the result follows from [BD, Theorem 6.1] (see also Remarks 6.2 and 6.5 in that paper). $\square$

We now set

$$\eta_n = b_n^{-(1+1/n)},\ n \geq 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Remark 4.2. For the full WFCLT proved in [BBTA] we take $\eta_n = O(a_n^2)$.

Theorem 4.3. *There exist constants K_n such that $\sigma_n = 1$ for all n.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 1$; we can assume that $K_i, 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ have been chosen so that $\sigma_i = 1$ for $i \leq n-1$. The environment μ^n is periodic, so we can use the theory of homogenization in periodic environments (see [BLP]) to calculate σ_n.

Since σ_n is non-random, we can simplify our notation and avoid the need for translations by assuming that $\mathcal{O}_k = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots n$; note that this event has strictly positive probability.

Let $k \in \{a_{n-1}, b_n, a_n\}$, and let

$$\mathcal{Q}_k = \{[0,k]^2 + z, z \in k\mathbb{Z}^2\}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{Q}_k$ gives a tiling of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ by squares of side k which are disjoint except for their boundaries. To avoid double counting of the borders, given $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ and $m \in \{n-1, n\}$ set

$$\widetilde{\mu}_{xy}^{Q,m} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\mu_{xy}^m & \text{if } (x,y) \in \partial_i(Q), \\ \mu_{xy}^m & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $f : Q \to \mathbb{R}$ set

$$\mathcal{E}_Q^m(f,f) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y \in Q} \widetilde{\mu}_{xy}^{Q,m}(f(y) - f(x))^2.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_n = \{f : B_n \to \mathbb{R} \text{ s.t. } f(x,0) = 0, f(x,a_n) = 1, 0 \leq x \leq a_n\}$. Then

$$\sigma_n^2 = \inf\{\mathcal{E}_{B_n}^n(f,f) : f \in \mathcal{H}_n\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Thus σ_n^{-2} is just the effective resistance across the square B_n. (Note that this would be 1 if one had $\mu_e^n \equiv 1$). For $K \in [0,\infty)$ let $\sigma_n^2(K)$ be the effective conductance across B_n if we take $K_n = K$. Since B_n is finite, $\sigma_n^2(K)$ is a continuous non-decreasing function of K. We will show that $\sigma_n^2(1) \leq 1$ and $\sigma_n^2(K) > 1$ for sufficiently large K; by continuity it follows that there exists a K_n such that $\sigma_n^2(K_n) = 1$.

Let h_{n-1} be the function which attains the minimum in (4.3) for $n-1$. Note that h_{n-1} is harmonic in the interior of B_{n-1}. By the inductive hypothesis we have $\mathcal{E}_{B_{n-1}}^{n-1}(h_{n-1}, h_{n-1}) = 1$. Further, since μ_e^{n-1} is symmetric with respect to reflection in the axis $x_1 = a'_{n-1}$, we have $h_{n-1}(0,x_2) = h_{n-1}(a_{n-1},x_2)$ for $0 \leq x_2 \leq a_{n-1}$. Let $f : B_n \to [0,1]$ be the function obtained by pasting together shifted copies of h_{n-1} in each of the squares in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ contained in B_n. More precisely, extend h_{n-1} by periodicity to $\mathbb{Z} \times \{0, \dots a_{n-1}\}$, recall that $a_n = m_n a_{n-1}$, and for $k a_{n-1} \leq x_2 \leq (k+1)a_{n-1}$, with $0 \leq k \leq m_n - 1$, set

$$f(x_1,x_2) = \frac{k + h_{n-1}(x_1, x_2 - k a_{n-1})}{m_n}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{E}^{n-1}_{B_n}(f,f) = \sum_{Q\in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1}, Q\subset B_n} \mathcal{E}^{n-1}_Q(f,f) = m_n^2 \mathcal{E}^{n-1}_{B_{n-1}}(h_{n-1},h_{n-1}) m_n^{-2} = 1. \tag{4.4}$$

We remark that if we allow $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ then (4.4) defines a harmonic function f on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ which on each line $\{x : x_2 = ka_{n-1}\}$ is equal to ka_{n-1}.

If $K=1$ then we have $\mu^n_e \le \mu^{n-1}_e$, with strict inequality for the edges in D_n. We thus have $\sigma_n^2(1)\le 1$.

To obtain a lower bound on $\sigma_n^2(K)$, we use the dual characterization of effective resistance in terms of flows of minimal energy – see [DS], and [BaB] for use in a similar context to this one.

Let Q be a square in $\mathcal{Q}_k$, with lower left corner $w=(w_1,w_2)$. Let Q' be the rectangle obtained by removing the top and bottom rows of Q:

$$Q' = \{(x_1,x_2) : w_1\le x_1\le w_1+k, w_1+1\le x_2\le w_1+k-1\}.$$

A *flow* on Q is an antisymmetric function I on $Q\times Q$ which satisfies $I(x,y)=0$ if $x\not\sim y$, $I(x,y)=-I(y,x)$, and

$$\sum_{y\sim x} I(x,y) = 0 \quad \text{ if } x\in Q'.$$

Let $\partial^+Q = \{(x_1, w_2+k) : w_1\le x_1\le w_1+k\}$ be the top of Q. The *flux* of a flow I is

$$F(I) = \sum_{x\in\partial^+Q}\sum_{y\sim x} I(x,y).$$

For a flow I and $m\in\{n-1,n\}$ set

$$E^m_Q(I,I) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in Q}\sum_{y\in Q} (\widetilde{\mu}^{Q,m}_{xy})^{-1} I(x,y)^2.$$

This is the energy of the flow I in the electrical network given by Q with conductances $(\widetilde{\mu}^{m,Q}_e)$. If $\mathcal{I}(Q)$ is the set of flows on Q with flux 1, then

$$\sigma_n(K)^{-2} = \inf\{E^n_{B_n}(I,I) : I\in\mathcal{I}(B_n)\}.$$

Let I_{n-1} be the optimal flow for σ^{-2}_{n-1}. The square B_n consists of m_n^2 copies of B_{n-1}; define a preliminary flow I' by placing a replica of $m_n^{-1}I_{n-1}$ in each of these copies. For each square $Q\in\mathcal{Q}_{a_{n-1}}$ with $Q\subset B_n$ we have $E^{n-1}_Q(I',I') = m_n^{-2}$, and since there are m_n^2 of these squares we have $E^{n-1}_{B_n}(I',I')=1$.

We now look at the tiling of B_n by squares in $\mathcal{Q}_{b_n}$; recall that $\ell_n = a_n/b_n$ and that ℓ_n is an integer. For each $Q\in\mathcal{Q}_{b_n}$ we have $E^{n-1}_Q(I',I') = \ell_n^{-2}$. Label these squares by (i,j) with $1\le i,j\le \ell_n$.

We now describe modifications to the flow I' in a square Q of side b_n. For simplicity, take first $Q=[0,b_n]^2$. Set $A_1 = \{x=(x_1,x_2)\in Q : x_1\ge x_2\}$, and $A_2=\{x=(x_1,x_2)\in Q : x_2\ge x_1\}$. Given any edge $e=(x,y)$ in $E(Q)$, either $x,y\in A_1$ or else $x,y\in A_2$. For $x=(x_1,x_2)\in Q$ set $r(x)=(x_2,x_1)$. Define a new flow by

$$I^*(x,y) = \begin{cases} I(x,y) & \text{if } x,y\in A_1,\\ I(r(x),r(y)) & \text{if } x,y\in A_2.\end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

The flow I' runs from bottom to top of the square, and the modified flow I^* begins at the bottom, and emerges on the left side of the square. As in [BaB, Proposition 3.2] we have



FIGURE 4. Diversion of current around an obstacle square.

$E_Q(I^*, I^*) \le E_Q(I', I') = \ell_n^{-2}$. Thus 'making a flow turn a corner' costs no more, in terms of energy, than letting it run on straight.

Suppose we now consider the flow I' in a column $(i_1, j), 1 \le j \le \ell_n$, and we wish to make the flow avoid an obstacle square (i_1, j_1). Then we can make the flow make a left turn in $(i_1, j_1 - 1)$, and then a right turn in $(i_1 - 1, j_1 - 1)$ so that it resumes its overall vertical direction. This then gives rise to two flows in $(i_1 - 1, j_1 - 1)$: the original flow I' plus the new flow: as in [BaB] the combined flow in the square $(i_1 - 1, j_1 - 1)$ has energy less than $4\ell_n^{-2}$. If we carry the combined flow vertically through the square $(i_1 - 1, j_1)$, and make the similar modifications above the obstacle, then we obtain overall a new flow J' which matches I' except on the 6 squares $(i, j), i_1 \le i \le i_1, j_1 - 1 \le j \le j_1 + 1$. The energy of the original flow in these 6 squares is $6\ell_n^{-2}$, while the new flow will have energy less than $14\ell_n^{-2}$: we have a 'cost' of at most $4\ell_n^{-2}$ in the 3 squares $(i_1 - 1, j), j_1 - 1 \le j \le j_1 + 1$, zero in (i_1, j_1) and at most ℓ_n^{-2} in the two remaining squares. Thus the overall energy cost of the diversion is at most $8\ell_n^{-2}$ (see Fig. 4).

We now use a similar procedure to construct a modification of I' in B_n with conductances (μ_e^n). We have four obstacles, two oriented vertically and resembling an I, and two horizontal ones. The crossbars on the I, that is the sets D^{01}, contain vertical edges with conductance $\eta_n \ll 1$. We therefore modify I' to avoid these edges, and the squares with side b_n which contain them.

Consider the left vertical I, which has center $(a'_n - \beta_n, a'_n)$. Let (i_1, j_1) be the square which contains at the top the bottom left branch of the I, so that this square has top right corner $(a'_n - \beta_n, a'_n - 10b_n)$. The top of this square contains vertical edges with conductance η_n, so we need to build a flow which avoids these. We therefore (as above) make the flow in the column i_1 take a left turn in square $(i_1, j_1 - 1)$, a right turn in $(i_1 - 1, j_1 - 1)$, carry it vertically through $(i_1 - 1, j_1)$, take a right turn in $(i_1 - 1, j_1 + 1)$ and carry it horizontally through $(i_1, j_1 + 1)$ into the edges of high conductance at the right side of $(i_1, j_1 + 1)$. The same pattern is then repeated on the other 3 branches of the left obstacle I, and on the other vertical obstacle.

We now bound the energy of the new flow J, and initially will make the calculations just for the change in columns $i_1 - 1$ and i_1 below and to the left of the point $(a'_n - \beta_n, a'_n)$. Write $M = 10$ for the half of the overall height of the obstacle. There are $2(M + 2)$ squares in this region where I' and J differ; these have labels (i, j) with $i = i_1 - 1, i_1$ and $j_1 - 1 \le j \le j_1 + M$. We begin by calculating the energy if $K = \infty$. In 3 of these squares the new flow J has energy at most $4\ell_n^{-2}$, in $M+1$ of them it has energy at most ℓ_n^{-2}, and in the remaining M it has zero energy. So writing R for this region we have $E_R(I',I') = (2M+4)\ell_n^{-2}$, while

$$E_R(J,J) \le (3\cdot 4 + M + 1)\ell_n^{-2} = (13+M)\ell_n^{-2}.$$

So

$$E_R(J,J) - E_R(I',I') \le (9-M)\ell_n^{-2} = -\ell_n^{-2} < 0. \tag{4.6}$$

This is if $K=\infty$. Now suppose that $K<\infty$. The vertical edge in the obstacle carries a current $2/\ell_n$ and has height Mb_n, so the energy of J on these edges is at most

$$E' = \frac{4\ell_n^{-2} M b_n}{K} \le \frac{4Mb_n}{Kn}. \tag{4.7}$$

The last inequality holds because $\ell_n \ge \sqrt{n}$. Finally it is necessary to modify I' near the 4 ends of the two horizontal obstacles. For this, we just modify I' in squares of side a_{n-1}, and arguments similar to the above show that for the new flow J in this region R', which consists of $4 + 2b_n/a_{n-1}$ squares of side a_{n-1}, we have

$$E_{R'}(J,J) - E_{R'}(I',I') \le \frac{9b_n}{a_{n-1}m_n^2} = \frac{9a_{n-1}}{b_n}\ell_n^{-2}. \tag{4.8}$$

The new flow J avoids the edges where $\mu_e^n = \eta_n$. Combining these terms we obtain for the whole square B_n, using (4.6)-(4.8),

$$\begin{aligned} E^n_{B_n}(J,J) - E^{n-1}_{B_n}(I',I') &\le -8\ell_n^{-2} + \frac{16Mb_n}{nK} + \frac{40a_{n-1}}{b_n}\ell_n^{-2} \\ &\le -7\ell_n^{-2} + \frac{16Mb_n}{nK} < -\frac{7}{2n} + \frac{160b_n}{nK}. \end{aligned}$$

So if $K' = 50b_n$, we have

$$\sigma_n^{-2}(K') \le E^n_{B_n}(J,J) \le 1 - cn^{-1} < 1.$$

Hence there exists $K_n \in [1, 50b_n)$ such that $\sigma_n^2(K_n) = 1$. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let $p<1$. Then $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^p < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^{-p} < \infty$.*

Proof. Since $\mu_e^n = \eta_n = b_n^{-1-1/n}$ on a proportion cb_n/a_n^2 of the edges in B_n, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^{-p} \le c\sum_n b_n^{p(1+1/n)}\frac{b_n}{a_n^2} \le c\sum_n b_n^{p+p/n-1} < \infty.$$

Here we used the fact that $b_n \ge 2^n$. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e^p \le c\sum_n K_n^p \frac{b_n}{a_n^2} \le c\sum_n \frac{b_n^{1+p}}{a_n^2} < \infty.$$

□

Remark 4.5. Using (4.3) and the methods of [BaB], one can show that for small enough δ $\sigma^2(\delta b_n) < 1$, so that $K_n \asymp b_n$ and consequently $\mathbb{E}\,\mu_e = \infty$. Note that we also have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} n\,\mathbb{P}(\mu_e > n) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} b_k\,\mathbb{P}(\mu_e > cb_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{b_k^2}{a_k^2} = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

From now on we take K_n to be such that $\sigma_n = 1$ for all n.

5. Weak invariance principle

Let $X = (X_t, t \in \mathbb{R}_+, P^x_\omega, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be the process with generator (1.1) associated with the environment (μ_e). Recall (4.1) and the definition of X^n, and define $X^{(n,\varepsilon)}$ by

$$X^{(n,\varepsilon)}_t = \varepsilon X^n_{\varepsilon^{-2}t},\ t \geq 0.$$

Let $P^\omega_n(\varepsilon)$ be the law of $X^{(n,\varepsilon)}$ on $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1$, and $P^\omega(\varepsilon)$ be the law of $X^{(\varepsilon)}$.

Recall that the Prokhorov distance d_P between probability measures on $\mathcal{D}_1$ is defined as follows (see [Bil, p. 238]). For $A \subset \mathcal{D}$, let $\mathcal{B}(A,\varepsilon) = \{x \in \mathcal{D} : d_S(x, A) < \varepsilon\}$. For probability measures P and Q on $\mathcal{D}$, $d_P(P, Q)$ is the infimum of $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $P(A) \leq Q(\mathcal{B}(A,\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon$ and $Q(A) \leq P(\mathcal{B}(A,\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon$ for all Borel sets $A \subset \mathcal{D}$. Recall that convergence in the metric d_P is equivalent to the weak convergence of measures.

To prove the WFCLT it is sufficient to prove:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\varepsilon_n = 1/b_n$. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_P(P^\omega(\varepsilon_n), P_{BM}) = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}$-probability.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 1$ and suppose that a_k, b_k have been chosen for $k \leq n-1$. By Proposition 4.1 we have for each ω that $d_P(P^\omega_{n-1}(\varepsilon), P_{\rm BM}) \to 0$. Note that the environment μ^{n-1} takes only finitely many values. So we can choose b_n large enough so that

$$d_P(P^\omega_{n-1}(\varepsilon), P_{\rm BM}) < n^{-1} \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_n \text{ and all } \omega. \tag{5.1}$$

Now for $\lambda > 1$ set

$$G(\lambda) = \{w \in \mathcal{D}_1 : \sup_{0\leq s\leq 1} |w(s)| \leq \lambda\}.$$

We have

$$P_{\rm BM}(G(\lambda)^c) \leq \exp(-c'\lambda^2).$$

We can couple the processes X^{n-1} and X so that the two processes agree up to the first time X^{n-1} hits the obstacle set $\bigcup_{k=n}^\infty D_k$. Let $\xi_n(\omega) = \min\{|x| : x \in \bigcup_{k=n}^\infty D_k(\omega)\}$, and

$$F_n = \{\xi_n > \lambda b_n\}.$$

Let $m \geq n$, and consider the probability that 0 is within a distance λb_n of D_m. Then $\mathcal{O}_m$ has to lie in a set of area $c\lambda b_n b_m$, and so

$$\mathbb{P}(\min_{x\in D_m} |x| \leq \lambda b_n) \leq \frac{cb_n b_m}{a_m^2} \leq \frac{cb_n}{mb_m}.$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(F_n^c) \leq c \sum_{m=n}^\infty \frac{b_n}{mb_m} \leq \frac{c}{n}\Big(1 + \sum_{m=n+1}^\infty \frac{b_n}{b_m}\Big) \leq \frac{c'}{n}.$$

Suppose that $\omega \in F_n$ and $n \geq 2$ so that $n^{-1} < \lambda/2$. Then using the coupling above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_P(P^\omega(\varepsilon_n), P^\omega_{n-1}(\varepsilon_n)) &\leq P^\omega_0(\sup_{0\leq s\leq b_n^2} |X^{(n-1)}_s| > \lambda b_n) \\ &\leq d_P(P^\omega_{n-1}(\varepsilon_n), P_{\rm BM}) + P_{\rm BM}(G(\lambda/2)^c). \end{aligned}$$

If now $\delta > 0$, choose $\lambda > 1$ such that $P_{\rm BM}(G(\lambda/2)^c) < \delta/2$, and then $N > 2/\delta$ large enough so that $\mathbb{P}(F_n^c) < \delta$ for $n \geq N$. Then combining the estimates above, if $n \geq N$ and $\omega \in F_n$, $d_P(P^\omega(\varepsilon_n), P_{\rm BM}) < \delta$, so for $n \geq N$, $\mathbb{P}(d_P(P^\omega(\varepsilon_n), P_{\rm BM}) > \delta) \leq \mathbb{P}(F_n^c) < \delta$, which proves the convergence in probability. ∎

FIGURE 5. The square represents $H_n^0(\frac{1}{4})$.

6. Quenched invariance principle does not hold

We will prove that the QFCLT does not hold for the processes $X^{(\varepsilon_n)}$, and will argue by contradiction. If the QFCLT holds for X with limit ΣW then since the WFCLT holds for $X^{(\varepsilon_n)}$ with diffusion constant 1 in every direction (by isotropy of the environment), Σ must be the identity matrix.

Let $w_n^0 = (a_n' - 10b_n - 1, a_n' - \beta_n)$ be the centre point on the left edge of the lowest of the four n-th level obstacles in the set D_n^0, and let $z_n^0 = w_n - (\frac{1}{2}b_n, 0)$. Thus z_n^0 is situated a distance $\frac{1}{2}b_n$ to the left of w_n^0 – see Fig. 5. Let

$$H_n^0(\lambda) = B_\infty(z_n^0, \lambda b_n), \quad H_n(\lambda) = \bigcup_{x \in a_n \mathbb{Z}^2} (x + \mathcal{O}_n + H_n^0(\lambda)).$$

Lemma 6.1. *For $\lambda > 0$ the event $\{0 \in H_n(\lambda)\}$ occurs for infinitely many n, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G}_k = \sigma(\mathcal{O}_1, \dots \mathcal{O}_k)$. Given the values of $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots \mathcal{O}_{n-1}$, the r.v. $\mathcal{O}_n$ is uniformly distributed over m_n^2 points, with spacing a_{n-1}, and has to lie in a square with side $2\lambda b_n$ in order for the event $\{0 \in H_n(\lambda)\}$ to occur. Thus approximately $(2\lambda b_n/a_{n-1})^2$ of these values of $\mathcal{O}_n$ will cause $\{0 \in H_n(\lambda)\}$ to occur. So

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \in H_n(\lambda) \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}) \geq c\frac{(2\lambda b_n/a_{n-1})^2}{(a_n/a_{n-1})^2} = c'\frac{b_n^2}{a_n^2} \geq \frac{c''}{n}.$$

The conclusion then follows from an extension of the second Borel-Cantelli Lemma. □

Lemma 6.2. *With $\mathbb{P}$-probability 1, the event $G_n(\lambda) = \{H_n(\lambda) \cap (\bigcup_{m=n+1}^\infty D_m) \neq \emptyset\}$ occurs for only finitely many n.*

Proof. Let $m > n$. Then as in the previous lemma, by considering possible positions of $\mathcal{O}_m$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(H_n(\lambda) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset) \leq c\frac{b_m b_n}{a_m^2} \leq c\frac{b_n}{b_m}.$$

Since $b_m \geq 2^m b_{m-1} > 2^m b_n$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_n(\lambda) \cap \left\{\bigcup_{m=n+1}^\infty D_m \neq \emptyset\right\}\right) \leq \sum_{m=n+1}^\infty c\frac{b_n}{b_m} \leq c2^{-n},$$

and the conclusion follows by Borel-Cantelli. □

The first two Lemmas have shown, first that 0 is close to a nth level obstacle infinitely often, and next that higher level obstacles do not interfere. Our final task is to show that in this situation, the process X is unlikely to cross the strip of low conductance edges.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that* $0 \in H_n(1/8)$ *and* $H_n(4) \cap \left(\bigcup_{m=n+1}^{\infty} D_m\right) = \emptyset$. *Write* $X_t = (X_t^1, X_t^2)$, *and let*

$$F = \{|X_t^2| \le 3b_n/4, |X_t^1| \le 2b_n, 0 \le t \le b_n^2, X^1_{b_n^2} > 3b_n/4\}.$$

Then there exists a constant $A_{n-1} = A_{n-1}(\eta_1, K_1, \dots \eta_{n-1}, K_{n-1})$ *such that*

$$P^0_\omega(F) \le c b_n^{-1/n} A_{n-1} \log A_{n-1}.$$

Proof. Let $w_n = (x_n, y_n)$ be the element of $\{w_n^0 + \mathcal{O}_n + a_n x, x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ which is closest to 0. Then, under the hypotheses of the Lemma, we have $3b_n/8 \le x_n \le 5b_n/8$, and $|y_n| \le b_n/8$. Thus the square $B_\infty(0, 2b_n)$ intersects the obstacle set D_n, but does not intersect D_m for any $m > n$. Hence if F holds then we can couple X^n and X so that $X^n_t = X_t$ for $0 \le t \le b_n^2$.

Let $\mathbb{H} = \{(x, y) : x \le x_n\}$, and $J = B \cap \partial_i \mathbb{H}$. If F holds then X^n has to cross the line J, and therefore has to cross an edge of conductance η_n. Let Y be the process with edge conductances μ'_e, where $\mu'_e = \mu_e^{n-1}$ except that $\mu'_e = 0$ if $e = \{(x_n, y), (x_n + 1, y)\}$ for $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus the line $\partial_i \mathbb{H}$ is a reflecting barrier for Y. Let

$$L_t = \int_0^t 1_{(Y_s \in J)} ds$$

be the amount of time spent by Y in J, and

$$G = \{|Y_t^2| \le 3b_n/4, |Y_t^1| \le 2b_n, 0 \le t \le b_n^2\}.$$

Assuming that G holds, let ξ_1 be a standard `exp(1)` r.v., set $T = \inf\{s : L_s > \xi_1/\eta_n\}$, and let $X^n_t = Y_t$ on $[0, T)$, and $X^n_T = Y_T + (1, 0)$. Note that one can complete the definition of X^n_t for $t \ge T$ in such a way that the process X^n has the same distribution as the process defined by (4.1). We have

$$P^0_\omega(G \cap \{X^n_s = Y^n_s, 0 \le s \le b_n^2\}) = E^0_\omega(1_G \exp(-\eta_n L_{b_n^2})).$$

So

$$P^0_\omega(G \cap \{T \le b_n^2\}) = E^0_\omega(1_G(1 - \exp(-\eta_n L_{b_n^2})) \le E^0_\omega(1_G \eta_n L_{b_n^2}) \le \eta_n E^0_\omega L_{b_n^2}.$$

The process Y has conductances bounded away from 0 and infinity on $\mathbb{H}$, so by [D1] Y has a transition probability $p_t(w, z)$ which satisfies

$$p_t(w, z) \le A t^{-1} \exp(-A^{-1}|w - z|^2/t),\ w, z \in \mathbb{H},\ t \ge |w - z|.$$

In addition if $r = |w - z| \ge A$ then $p_t(w, z) \le p_r(w, z)$. Here $A = A_{n-1}$ is a possibly large constant which depends on $(\eta_i, K_i, 1 \le i \le n-1)$. We can take $A \ge 10$. For $w \in J$ we have $|w| \ge b_n/4$ and so provided $b_n \ge 8A$,

$$\begin{aligned} E^0_\omega \int_0^{b_n^2} 1_{(Y_s = w)} ds &= \int_0^{b_n^2} p_t(0, w) dt \le b_n p_{b_n}(0, w) + \int_{b_n}^{b_n^2} p_t(0, w) dt \\ &\le c A e^{-b_n/A} + A \int_0^{b_n^2} t^{-1} \exp(-b_n^2/(16At)) dt \le c A \log(A). \end{aligned}$$

So since $|J| \le 2b_n$,

$$P^0_\omega(G \cap \{T \le b_n^2\}) \le c \eta_n b_n A \log A \le c b_n^{-1/n} A \log A.$$

Finally, the construction of X^n from Y gives that $P^0_\omega(F) \le P^0_\omega(G \cap \{T \le b_n^2\})$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4(b). We now choose b_n large enough so that for all $n \geq 2$,

$$b_n^{-1/n} A_{n-1} \log A_{n-1} < n^{-1}. \tag{6.1}$$

Let $W_t = (W_t^1, W_t^2)$ denote 2-dimensional Brownian motion with $W_0 = 0$, and let P_{BM} denote its distribution. For a 2-dimensional process $Z = (Z^1, Z^2)$, define the event

$$F(Z) = \Big\{ |Z_s^2| < 3/4, |Z_s^1| \leq 2, 0 \leq s \leq 1, Z_1^1 > 1 \Big\}.$$

The support theorem implies that $p_1 := P_{\mathrm{BM}}(F(W)) > 0$. Write $F_n = F(X^{(\varepsilon_n)})$.

Let $N_1 = N_1(\omega)$ be such that the event $G_n(4)$ defined in Lemma 6.2 does not occur for $n \geq N_1$. Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(\omega)$ be the set of $n > N_1$ such that $0 \in H_n(\frac{1}{8})$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda \text{ is infinite}) = 1$ by Lemma 6.1. By Lemma 6.3 and the choice of b_n in (6.1) we have $P_\omega^0(F_n) < cn^{-1}$ for $n \in \Lambda$. So

$$P_\omega^0(F_n) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty \text{ with } n \in \Lambda.$$

Thus whenever $\Lambda(\omega)$ is infinite the sequence of processes $(X_t^{(\varepsilon_n)}, t \in [0,1], P_\omega^0)$, $n \geq 1$, cannot converge to W, and the QFCLT therefore fails. □

Remark 6.4. We can construct similar obstacle sets in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 3$, and we now outline briefly the main differences from the $d = 2$ case.

We take $b_n = a_n n^{-1/d}$, so that $\sum b_n^d / a_n^d = \infty$, and the analogue of Lemma 6.2 holds. In a cube side a_n we take $2d$ obstacle sets, arranged in symmetric fashion around the centre of the cube. Each obstacle has an associated 'direction' $i \in \{1, \dots d\}$. An obstacle of direction i consists of a $2b_n^{d-1}$ edges of low conductance η_n, arranged in two $d-1$ dimensional 'plates' a distance Mb_n apart, with each edge in the direction i. The two plates are connected by $d-1$ dimensional plates of high conductance K_n. Thus the total number of edges in the obstacles is cb_n^{d-1}, so taking a_n/a_{n-1} large enough, we have $\sum b_n^{d-1}/a_n^d < \infty$, and the same arguments as in Section 3 show that the environment is well defined, stationary and ergodic.

The conductivity across a cube side N in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is N^{d-2}. Thus if we write $\sigma_n^2(\eta_n, K_n)$ for the limiting diffusion constant of the process X^n, and $R_n = R_n(\eta_n, K_n)$ for the effective resistance across a cube side a_n, then (4.3) is replaced by:

$$\sigma_n^2(\eta_n, K_n) = a_n^{2-d} R_n^{-1}. \tag{6.2}$$

For the QFCLT to fail, we need $\eta_n = o(b_n^{-1})$, as in the two-dimensional case. With this choice we have $R_n(\eta_n, 0)^{-1} < a_n^{d-2}$, and as in Theorem 4.3 we need to show that if K_n is large enough then $R_n(\eta_n, K_n)^{-1} > a_n^{d-2}$.

Recall that $\ell_n = a_n/b_n$. Let I' be as in Theorem 4.3; then I' has flux ℓ_n^{-d+1} across each sub-cube Q' of side b_n. If the sub-cube does not intersect the obstacles at level n, then $E_{Q'}(I', I') = \ell_n^{-d} a_n^{2-d}$. The 'cost' of diverting I' around a low conductance obstacle is therefore of order $c\ell_n^{-d} a_n^{2-d} = cb_n^{-d+2} \ell_n^{-2d+2}$ – see [McG]. As in Theorem 4.3 we divert the flow onto the regions of high conductance, so as to obtain some cubes in which the new flow has zero energy. To estimate the energy in the high conductance bonds, note that we have $2(d-1)b_n^{d-2}$ sets of parallel paths of edges of high conductance, and each path is of length Mb_n, so the flow in each edge is $F_n = \ell_n^{-d+1}/b_n^{d-2}(2d-2)$. Hence the total energy dissipation in the high conductance edges is

$$K^{-1} M F_n^2 = \frac{c' K^{-1} M b_n^{d-1}}{\ell_n^{2d-2} b_n^{2d-4}} = \frac{c' K^{-1} M}{\ell_n^{2d-2} b_n^{d-3}}.$$

We therefore need
$$\frac{c' K^{-1} M}{\ell_n^{2d-2} b_n^{d-3}} < \frac{c}{b_n^{d-2} \ell_n^{2d-2}},$$
that is we need to choose $K_n > cMb_n$ for some constant c. Since
$$\mathbb{E}\, \mu_e^p \asymp \sum_n \frac{K_n^p b_n^{d-1}}{a_n^d} \asymp M \sum_n \frac{b_n^{d-1+p}}{a_n^d},$$
we find that in $d \geq 3$ our example also has $\mathbb{E}\, \mu_e^{\pm p} < \infty$ if and only if $p < 1$.

References

[ADS] S. Andres, J.-D. Deuschel, M. Slowik. Invariance principle for the random conductance model in a degenerate ergodic environment. Preprint 2013.

[ABDH] S. Andres, M.T. Barlow, J.-D. Deuschel and B.M. Hambly. Invariance principle for the random conductance model. *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields.* **156**, No. 3–4 (2013), 535–580.

[BaB] M. T. Barlow and R. F. Bass. On the resistance of the Sierpinski carpet. *Proc. R. Soc. London A.* **431** (1990) 345-360.

[BD] M.T. Barlow and J.-D. Deuschel. Invariance principle for the random conductance model with unbounded conductances. *Ann. Probab.* **38** (2010), 234-276

[BBTA] M.T. Barlow, K. Burdzy, A. Timar. Appendix to: Comparison of quenched and annealed invariance principles for random conductance model. In preparation.

[BLP] A. Bensoussan, J.-L. Lions, G. Papanicolau. *Asymptotic analysis for periodic structures.* North Holland, 1978.

[BeB] N. Berger, M. Biskup. Quenched invariance principle for simple random walk on percolation clusters. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **137** (2007), no. 1-2, 83–120.

[Bil] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures.* Second edition. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999.

[Bis] M. Biskup. Recent progress on the Random Conductance Model. *Prob. Surveys* **8** (2011) 294–373.

[BP] M. Biskup, T.M. Prescott. Functional CLT for random walk among bounded random conductances. *Elec. J. Prob.* **12** (2007), paper 49, 1323-1348.

[BK] K. Burdzy and D. Khoshnevisan, Brownian motion in a Brownian crack *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **8** (1998), 708–748.

[BTW] K. Burdzy, E. Toby and R.J. Williams, On Brownian excursions in Lipschitz domains. Part II. Local asymptotic distributions, in *Seminar on Stochastic Processes 1988* (E. Cinlar, K.L. Chung, R. Getoor, J. Glover, editors), 1989, 55–85, Birkhäuser, Boston.

[D1] T. Delmotte. Parabolic Harnack inequality and estimates of Markov chains on graphs. *Rev. Math. Iberoamericana* **15** (1999), 181–232.

[DFGW] A. De Masi, P.A. Ferrari, S. Goldstein, W.D. Wick. An invariance principle for reversible Markov processes. Applications to random motions in random environments. *J. Statist. Phys.* **55** (1989), 787–855.

[DS] P. Doyle, J.L. Snell. *Random Walks and Electrical Networks.* Math. Assoc. America, Washigton D.C. 1984. Arxiv: .PR/0001057.

[EK] S.N. Ethier, T.G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: characterization and convergence.* Wiley, 1986.

[KV] C. Kipnis, S. R. S. Varadhan. Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104** (1986), no. 1, 1–19.

[MP] P. Mathieu, A. Piatnitski. Quenched invariance principles for random walks on percolation clusters. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **463** (2007), no. 2085, 2287–2307.

[M1] P. Mathieu. Quenched invariance principles for random walks with random conductances. *J. Stat. Phys.* **130** (2008), no. 5, 1025–1046.

[McG] I. McGillivray. Resistance in higher-dimensional Sierpiński carpets. *Potential Anal.* **16** (2002), no. 3, 289–303.

[Os] H. Osada. Homogenization of diffusion processes with random stationary coefficients. In: Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics, Tbilissi, 1982. Lecture Notes in Math. **1021**, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp 507–517.

[SS] V. Sidoravicius and A.-S. Sznitman. Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances. *Probab. Theory Rel. Fields* **129** (2004), no. 2, 219–244.

[ZP] V.V. Zhikov, A.L. Piatnitskii. Homogenization of random singular structures and random measures. (Russian) *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* **70** (2006), no. 1, 23–74; translation in *Izv. Math.* **70** (2006), no. 1, 1967

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1Z2

E-mail address: barlow@math.ubc.ca

Department of Mathematics, Box 354350, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

E-mail address: burdzy@math.washington.edu

Bolyai Institute, University of Szeged, Aradi v. tere 1, 6720 Szeged, Hungary

E-mail address: madaramit@gmail.com