

The Segal–Bargmann transform for unitary groups in the large- N limit

Brian C. Hall*

University of Notre Dame

June 3, 2021

Abstract

This paper describes results of the author with B. K. Driver and T. Kemp concerning the large- N limit of the Segal–Bargmann transform for the unitary group $U(N)$. We consider the transform on matrix-valued functions that are polynomials in a single variable in $U(N)$. We show that in the large- N limit, the transform maps functions of this type to single-variable polynomial functions on the complex group $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. This result was conjectured by Ph. Biane and was also proved independently by G. Cébron.

The first main ingredient in our proof of this result is an “asymptotic product rule” for the Laplacian on $U(N)$, which allows us to compute explicitly the leading-order large- N behavior of the heat operator on $U(N)$. The second main ingredient in the proof is the phenomenon of “concentration of traces,” in which the relevant heat kernel measures are concentrating onto sets where the trace of any power of the variable is constant.

1 Overview

Let $U(N)$ denote the group of $N \times N$ unitary matrices and let $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ denote the group of all invertible $N \times N$ matrices with complex entries. Then $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ is the “complexification” of $U(N)$ in the sense of [Ha1, Sect. 3]. Let ρ_t^N and μ_t^N denote the heat kernel measures on $U(N)$ and $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, respectively, based at the identity and defined with respect to certain left-invariant Riemannian metrics. Let $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$ denote the space of holomorphic functions on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ that are square integrable with respect to μ_t^N . The **Segal–Bargmann transform** B_t^N for $U(N)$, as introduced in [Ha1], is a unitary map of $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$ onto $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$. The transform itself is defined by

$$B_t^N(f) = (e^{t\Delta/2}f)_\mathbb{C},$$

*Supported in part by National Science Foundation grants DMS-1001328 and DMS-1301534.

where $e^{t\Delta/2}$ is the time- t forward heat operator and $(\cdot)_{\mathbb{C}}$ denotes analytic continuation from $U(N)$ to $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. (See [Ha2] for a survey of this and related constructions.)

We may extend the transform to act on functions on $U(N)$ with values in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, space of all $N \times N$ matrices with complex entries. The extension is accomplished by applying the scalar transform “entrywise.” We denote the resulting **boosted Segal–Bargmann transform** by $\mathbf{B}_t^N$; it maps $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))$ onto $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))$. As proposed by Philippe Biane in [Bi2], we apply $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ to **single-variable polynomial functions** on $U(N)$ that is, functions of the form

$$f(U) = c_0 I + c_1 U + c_2 U^2 + \cdots + c_N U^N, \quad U \in U(N), \quad (1)$$

where $c_0, \dots, c_N$ are constants.

If we apply $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ to such a polynomial function, the result will typically *not* be a polynomial function on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. Rather, the result will be a **trace polynomial function** on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, that is, a linear combination of functions of the form

$$Z^k \text{tr}(Z) \text{tr}(Z^2) \cdots \text{tr}(Z^M), \quad Z \in GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \quad (2)$$

where k and M are non-negative integers. Here $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ is the **normalized trace** given by

$$\text{tr}(A) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A_{jj} \quad (3)$$

for any $A \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$.

Although for any one fixed value of N , the boosted transform $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ does not map polynomial functions on $U(N)$ to polynomial functions on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, there is a sense in which **the large- N limit** of $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ does have this property. To understand how this works, let consider the example of the matrix-valued function

$$f(U) = U^2$$

on $U(N)$. Then, according to Example 3.5 of [DHK], we have

$$\mathbf{B}_t^N(f)(Z) = e^{-t} \left[\cosh(t/N) Z^2 - t \frac{\sinh(t/N)}{t/N} Z \text{tr}(Z) \right]. \quad (4)$$

If we formally let N tend to infinity in (4), we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{B}_t^N(f)(Z) = e^{-t} [Z^2 - t Z \text{tr}(Z)]. \quad (5)$$

The right-hand side of (5) is, apparently, still a trace polynomial and not a single-variable polynomial as in (1). There is, however, another limiting phenomenon that occurs when N tends to infinity, in addition to the convergence of the coefficients of Z^2 and $Z \text{tr}(Z)$ in (4), namely, the phenomenon of **concentration of trace**.

As N tends to infinity, the function $\text{tr}(U^k)$ in $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$ converges as N tends to infinity to a certain constant $\nu_k(t)$, in the sense that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{tr}(U^k) - \nu_k(t)\|_{L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)} = 0.$$

What this means, more accurately, is that the *measure* ρ_t^N on $U(N)$ is concentrating, as N tends to infinity with t fixed, onto the set where $\text{tr}(U^k) = \nu_k(t)$. A similar concentration of trace phenomenon occurs in the space $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$, except that in this case, all of the traces concentrate to the value 1:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{tr}(Z^k) - 1\|_{L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)} = 0.$$

(See Theorem 14 for a more general version of these concentration results.)

Thus, the “correct” way to evaluate the large- N limit in (4) is in two stages. First, we take the limit as N tends to infinity of the coefficients of Z^2 and $Z\text{tr}(Z)$, as in (5). Second, we replace $\text{tr}(Z)$ by the constant 1. The result is

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{B}_t^N(f)(Z) = e^{-t}[Z^2 - tZ]. \quad (6)$$

Note that the right-hand side of (6) is, for each fixed value of t , a polynomial in Z .

In [DHK], we show that a similar phenomenon occurs in general. Given any polynomial p in a single variable, let p_N denote the matrix-valued function on $U(N)$ obtained by plugging a variable $U \in U(N)$ into p , as in (1). We also allow p_N to denote the similarly defined function on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$.

Theorem 1 (Driver–Hall–Kemp) *Let p be a polynomial in a single variable. Then for each fixed $t > 0$, there exists a unique polynomial q_t in a single variable such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{B}_t^N(p_N) - (q_t)_N\|_{L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))} = 0. \quad (7)$$

If, for example, p is the polynomial $p(u) = u^2$, then q_t is the polynomial given by

$$q_t(z) = e^{-t}(z^2 - tz),$$

so that

$$(q_t)_N(Z) = e^{-t}(Z^2 - tZ), \quad Z \in GL(N; \mathbb{C}),$$

as on the right-hand side of (6).

In [DHK], we also show that the map $p \mapsto q_t$ coincides with the “free Hall transform” of Biane, denoted $\mathcal{G}^t$ in [Bi2]. Although it was conjectured in [Bi2] that $\mathcal{G}^t$ is the large- N limit of $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ as in (7), Biane actually constructs $\mathcal{G}^t$ by using a free probability version of the analysis of Gross–Malliavin [GM]. Theorem 1 was also proved independently by G. Cebrón [Ceb], using substantially different methods. Besides using very different methods from [Ceb], the paper [DHK] establishes a “two-parameter” version of Theorem 1, as described in Section 10. Section 8 gives an inductive procedure for computing the polynomials q_t in Theorem 1.

A key tool in proving the results described above is the **asymptotic product rule** for the Laplacian on $U(N)$. This rule states that—on certain classes of functions and for large values of N —the Laplacian behaves like a *first-order* differential operator. That is to say, in the usual product rule for the Laplacian, the cross terms are small compared to the other two terms. The asymptotic product rule provides the explanation for the concentration of trace phenomenon and is also the key tool we use in deriving a recursive formula for the polynomials q_t in Theorem 1.

2 The Laplacian and Segal–Bargmann transform on $U(N)$

We consider $U(N)$, the group of $N \times N$ unitary matrices. The Lie algebra $u(N)$ of $U(N)$ is the N^2 -dimensional real vector space consisting of $N \times N$ matrices X with $X^* = -X$. We use on $u(N)$ the following (real) inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_N$:

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_N = N \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{Trace}(X^*Y)), \quad (8)$$

where Trace is the ordinary trace, $\operatorname{Trace}(A) = \sum_j A_{jj}$. The motivation for the scaling by a factor of N will be explained shortly.

We think of the Lie algebra $u(N)$ as being the tangent space at the identity of the manifold $U(N)$. We can then extend the inner product (8) on $u(N)$ uniquely to a left-invariant Riemannian structure on $U(N)$. Actually, since the inner product in (8) is invariant under the adjoint action of $U(N)$, this Riemannian structure is bi-invariant, that is, invariant under both the left and right actions of $U(N)$ on itself.

Associated to the Riemannian structure on $U(N)$ there is the Laplacian Δ_N , which we take to be a *negative* operator. Let me emphasize that Δ_N is always defined with respect to the Riemannian structure whose value at the identity is given by (8), with the scaling by a factor of N . For any $X \in u(N)$, we can define a left-invariant vector field $\tilde{X}$ on $U(N)$ by the formula

$$(\tilde{X}f)(U) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} f(Ue^{tX}) \right|_{t=0}. \quad (9)$$

If $\{X_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $u(N)$ with respect to the inner product (8), then Δ_N may be computed as

$$\Delta_N = \sum_{j=1}^{N^2} \tilde{X}_j^2.$$

As a simple example, we may consider the action of Δ_N on the matrix entries for the standard representation of $U(N)$, that is, functions of the form $f_{jk}(U) = U_{jk}$. It follows from the $k = 1$ case of Proposition 5 below that

$$\Delta_N(U_{jk}) = -U_{jk}. \quad (10)$$

That is, the functions f_{jk} are eigenvalues for Δ_N with eigenvalue -1 , for all N and all j, k . In particular, the normalization of the inner product in (8) has the result that the eigenvalues of Δ_N in the standard representation are *independent of N* . By contrast, if we had omitted the factor of N in (8), we would have had $\Delta_N(U_{jk}) = -NU_{jk}$, which would not bode well for trying to take the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Note that the inner product and the Laplacian scale oppositely; the factor of N in (8) produces a factor of $1/N$ in the formula for Δ_N , which scales the eigenvalues from $-N$ to -1 .

For any $t > 0$, let $e^{t\Delta_N/2}$ denote the time- t (forward) heat operator. If P_t^N denotes the **heat kernel** at the identity on $U(N)$, then we may compute the heat operator as

$$(e^{t\Delta_N/2}f)(U) = \int_{U(N)} P_t^N(UV^{-1})f(V) dV,$$

where dV is the Riemannian volume measure on $U(N)$, which is a bi-invariant Haar measure. It is shown in Section 4 of [Ha1] that for each fixed $t > 0$, the function P_t^N admits a unique holomorphic extension from $U(N)$ to the complex group $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. Here, $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ is the complexification of $U(N)$ in the sense of Section 3 of [Ha1].

The paper [Ha1] considers, more generally, any connected compact Lie group with a bi-invariant Riemannian metric. In particular, we could replace the inner product (8) on $u(N)$ by any other multiple of the real Hilbert–Schmidt inner product. The particular scaling of the inner product in (8) turns out, however, to be the right one for taking the large- N limit. We will explore this matter further in Section 3.

We consider also the **heat kernel measure** ρ_t^N (based at the identity) on $U(N)$, given by

$$d\rho_t^N(U) = P_t^N(U) dU,$$

where dU is the Riemannian volume measure on $U(N)$, and the associated Hilbert space, $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$. Let $\mathcal{H}(GL(N; \mathbb{C}))$ denote the space of holomorphic functions on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. For each fixed $t > 0$, the **Segal–Bargmann transform** is then linear map

$$B_t^N : L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(GL(N; \mathbb{C}))$$

given by

$$(B_t^N f)(Z) = \int_{U(N)} P_t^N(ZV^{-1})f(V) dV, \quad Z \in GL(N; \mathbb{C}),$$

where $P_t^N(ZV^{-1})$ refers to the holomorphic extension of P_t^N from $U(N)$ to $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. Equivalently, we may write $B_t^N f$ as

$$B_t^N f = (e^{t\Delta_N/2}f)_\mathbb{C}$$

where $(\cdot)_\mathbb{C}$ denotes the analytic continuation of a function from $U(N)$ to $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$.

The expression (8) also defines a real-valued inner product on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{gl}(N; \mathbb{C})$ of $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. This inner product then determines a left-invariant Riemannian metric on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. We let μ_t^N denote the associated heat kernel measure on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, based at the identity.

Theorem 2 *For each $t > 0$, the map B_t^N is a unitary map of $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$ onto $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$, where $\mathcal{HL}^2$ denotes the space of square-integrable holomorphic functions.*

This result is Theorem 1' in [Hal]. The result holds more generally for an arbitrary compact Lie group K together with its complexification $K_{\mathbb{C}}$. If one performs the analogous construction on the commutative Lie group $\mathbb{R}^n$, one obtains (modulo minor differences of normalization) the classical Segal–Bargmann considered by Segal [Se1, Se2] and Bargmann [Bar]. Actually, one can construct a unitary Segal–Bargmann transform for connected Lie groups of “compact type,” a class that includes both $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $U(N)$. (See [Dr] and [Ha3].)

We may extend the transform to a “boosted” transform $\mathbf{B}_t^N$, acting on functions $f : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$, by applying the scalar transform B_t^N “componentwise.” That is, $\mathbf{B}_t^N f$ is the holomorphic function $F : GL(N; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ whose (j, k) entry is $B_t^N(f_{jk})$. We define the norm of matrix-valued functions on $U(N)$ or $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ as follows:

$$\|f\|_{L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))}^2 = \int_{U(N)} \text{tr}(f(U)^* f(U)) d\rho_t^N(U) \quad (11)$$

$$\|f\|_{L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))}^2 = \int_{GL(N; \mathbb{C})} \text{tr}(f(Z)^* f(Z)) d\mu_t^N(Z), \quad (12)$$

where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ is the normalized trace defined in (3). Note that the normalization of the Hilbert–Schmidt norm in (11) and (12) is different from the one we use in (8) to define the Laplacian Δ_N . The normalizations in (11) and (12) ensure that the norm of the constant function $f(U) = I$ is 1 in either Hilbert space.

3 The large- N limit

Since Segal’s work on the Segal–Bargmann transform was for an infinite-dimensional Euclidean space, it is natural to try for a version of the transform for infinite-dimensional Lie groups. In [HS1], Sengupta and I construct one example of such a transform, for the path group over a compact Lie group. The results in [HS1] are motivated by earlier results of Gross [Gr] and Gross–Malliavin [GM].

One could also attempt to take the limit of the Segal–Bargmann transform on a nested family of compact Lie groups, such as $U(N)$. Indeed, the study of the large- N limit of the heat kernel on $U(N)$ also arises in the study of the “master field” on the plane, which is the large- N limit of (Euclidean) Yang–Mills theory with structure group $U(N)$. (See [Sin], [Sen], [AS], [Lev] for mathematical results concerning the master field in the plane.) Although the Segal–Bargmann

transform is not typically part of this analysis (but see [AHS]), some of the same methods that we use in [DHK] are employed in the study of the master field.

The most obvious approach to the large- N limit for the Segal–Bargmann transform on $U(N)$ would be to use the real Hilbert–Schmidt inner product on each Lie algebra $u(N)$:

$$\langle X, Y \rangle = \operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{Trace}(X^*Y)], \quad (13)$$

This approach is natural in that the inner product on $u(N)$ agrees with the restriction to $u(N) \subset u(N+1)$ of the inner product on $u(N+1)$.

Results of M. Gordina [Go1, Go2], however, show that this approach does not work. Let γ_t^N denote the heat kernel measure on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ with respect to the metric determined by (13). (We reserve the notation μ_t^N for the heat kernel with respect to the metric determined by (8).) Gordina’s approach is to study the target space for the Segal–Bargmann transform, $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \gamma_t^N)$. Let us assume, for the moment, that the measures γ_t^N on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ have a reasonable large- N limit γ_t^∞ on some “version” of $GL(\infty; \mathbb{C})$. (We might interpret $GL(\infty; \mathbb{C})$ as being, for example, the group of all bounded, invertible operators on a Hilbert space.) One would then expect to be able to compute the norm of elements of $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(\infty; \mathbb{C}), \gamma_t^\infty)$ by the Taylor expansion method of Driver and Gross [Dr, DG]. This method expresses the L^2 norm of a holomorphic function F on a complex Lie group, with respect to a heat kernel measure, as a certain sum of squares of left-invariant derivatives of F , evaluated at the identity. Gordina shows that if one uses the Hilbert–Schmidt norm on the Lie algebra $gl(\infty; \mathbb{C})$, then the relevant sum of squares of derivatives is always infinite, unless the holomorphic function in question is constant. (See Theorem 8.1 in [Go1].)

We see, then, that there cannot be any nonconstant holomorphic functions on $GL(\infty; \mathbb{C})$ that have finite L^2 norm with respect to the hypothetical limiting measure γ_t^∞ . This result is presumably telling us that there is, in fact, no limiting measure γ_t^∞ in the first place. Thus, the target space of the hoped-for Segal–Bargmann transform for $U(\infty)$ is not well defined.

The preceding discussion shows that if we use the *un-normalized* Hilbert–Schmidt inner product (13) on $u(N)$ —and thus also on $gl(N; \mathbb{C})$ —then we do not obtain a well-defined Segal–Bargmann transform in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. This fact motivates the introduction of the *normalized* Hilbert–Schmidt inner product (8) that we will use throughout the remainder of the paper. Recall that with the normalization of the inner product in (8), we have $\Delta_N(U_{jk}) = -U_{jk}$. That is, the factor of N in (8) (which translates into a factor of $1/N$ in the associated Laplacian) keeps the eigenvalues of Δ_N in the matrix entries from blowing up as N tends to infinity, which gives us some hope of obtaining a well-defined transform in the limit.

4 Concentration properties of the heat kernel measures

In [Bi2], Biane proposed studying the large- N behavior of the Segal–Bargmann transform on $U(N)$ using the normalization of the inner product in (8). Biane also introduced in [Bi2] the idea of studying the transform on a certain very special class of matrix-valued functions on $U(N)$, namely the single-variable polynomial functions in (1). A main result of [DHK], which was conjectured in [Bi2], is that *in the large- N limit*, such functions map to single-variable polynomial functions on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. (See Theorem 1 in the overview.) In this section, we try to understand this result from a conceptual standpoint, by looking into the large- N behavior of the heat kernel measures ρ_t^N on $U(N)$ and μ_t^N on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. With Biane’s scaling of the metrics, these measures have interesting concentration properties for large N , which help explain the large- N behavior of the Segal–Bargmann transform. Although the results of this section are not actually used in the proof of Theorem 1, they provide a helpful way of thinking about *why* that theorem should hold.

Recall that rescaling the inner product on $u(N)$ by a factor of N (as in (8)) has the effect of rescaling the Laplacian by a factor of $1/N$. This rescaling is designed to keep the Laplacian and heat operator from blowing up as N tends to infinity. In some sense, however, the rescaling does *too* good a job of controlling things, in that the limiting transform is well defined but, on certain classes of functions, trivial. Biane’s passage to matrix-valued functions allows the large- N limit to be both well defined and interesting.

Let us now look more closely into these issues. Results of Biane [Bi1], E. Rains [Rai], and T. Kemp [Kem] may be interpreted as saying that, in the large- N limit, the heat kernel measure ρ_t^N on $U(N)$ *concentrates onto a single conjugacy class*. To make this claim more precise, let us note that the conjugacy class of a matrix $U \in U(N)$ is determined by the list $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ of its eigenvalues, where $|\lambda_j| = 1$. This list of eigenvalues can be encoded into the *empirical eigenvalue distribution* of U , which is the probability measure χ^U on S^1 given by

$$\chi^U = \frac{1}{N}(\delta_{\lambda_1} + \dots + \delta_{\lambda_n}).$$

If U is chosen randomly from $U(N)$ with distribution ρ_t^N , then the empirical eigenvalue measure χ^U is a random measure on S^1 . In the large- N limit, however, the empirical eigenvalue distribution ceases to be random. Rather, χ^U becomes *constant almost surely* with respect to ρ_t^N , and equal to a certain probability measure ν_t on S^1 . The measure ν_t was introduced by Biane in [Bi1] and various forms of convergence of χ^U to the constant measure ν_t were established in [Bi1], [Rai], and [Kem]. (See also work of T. Lévy [Lev] for similar results in the case of the other families of compact classical groups.)

What this means is that for large N , most of the mass of the heat kernel measure ρ_t^N is concentrated on matrices U for which χ^U is very close (in the weak topology) to the measure ν_t . Thus, most of the mass of ρ_t^N is concentrated

in a small region in the set of conjugacy classes, namely the region where the empirical eigenvalue distributions are close to ν_t .

Suppose we consider the transform B_t^N on class functions, that is, functions $f : U(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that are constant on each conjugacy class, i.e.,

$$f(VUV^{-1}) = f(U),$$

for all $U, V \in U(N)$. The concentration behavior of ρ_t^N means that in the large- N limit, all class functions in $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$ are simply constants. (For example, the class function $f(U) := \text{tr}(U^3)$ becomes equal in the limit to the constant value $\nu_3(t)$, where $\nu_3(t)$ is the third moment of Biane's measure ν_t .) Thus, at least on class functions, the scalar transform B_t^N becomes uninteresting in the limit.

Although one could conceivably get something interesting by considering complex-valued functions that are not class functions, one could instead retain simple behavior under conjugation, but extend the transform to matrix-valued functions. We consider, then, **conjugation-equivariant functions**, that is, functions $f : U(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfying

$$f(VUV^{-1}) = Vf(U)V^{-1}$$

for $U, V \in U(N)$. Although the boosted transform $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ does not—for any one fixed N —preserve the space of single-variable polynomial functions (see (4)), it does preserve the space of conjugation equivariant functions.

Proposition 3 *The boosted Segal–Bargmann transform $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ maps every conjugation-equivariant function on the group $U(N)$ to a conjugation-equivariant holomorphic function on the group $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$.*

See Theorem 2.3 in [DHK]. One may now ask what happens to such conjugation-equivariant functions as the measure ρ_t^N concentrates onto a single conjugacy class. This question is answered by the following result.

Proposition 4 *Suppose C is a conjugacy class in either $U(N)$ or $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ and that $f : C \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is a conjugation equivariant function. Then there exists a polynomial p in a single variable such that*

$$f(A) = p(A)$$

for all $A \in C$.

See Proposition 2.5 in [DHK]. In general, the polynomial p in the proposition will have degree $N - 1$. In the large- N limit, then, a conjugation-equivariant function might not be a polynomial, but some sort of limit of single-variable polynomial functions.

Now, it is not known whether the empirical eigenvalue distribution with respect to the measures μ_t^N on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ becomes deterministic in the large- N limit. (But see related results in [Kem].) Nevertheless, it is shown in Section

4.1 of [DHK] that traces in $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$ become constant in the limit. Thus, it seems reasonable to expect that the measures μ_t^N also concentrate onto a single conjugacy class for large N .

We have, then, a simple conceptual explanation for Theorem 1, which asserts that in the large- N limit, $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ maps single-variable polynomial functions on $U(N)$ to functions of the same sort on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. If p is a polynomial and p_N is the function on $U(N)$ obtained by plugging a variable $U \in U(N)$ into p , then p_N is certainly conjugation equivariant. Thus, $\mathbf{B}_t^N(p_N)$ is a conjugation-equivariant function on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$. But in the large- N limit, we expect—based on the concentration behavior of the heat kernel measure μ_t^N —that *every* conjugation-equivariant function in $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))$ is at least a limit of single-variable polynomial functions.

In our proof in [DHK] of Theorem 1, we use the concentration properties of the heat kernel measures in a more concrete way. We show that, as will be explained in the remainder of this paper, that the transform of a single-variable polynomial function on $U(N)$ is a *trace polynomial* on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, that is, a linear combination of functions of the form in (2). As N tends to infinity, the heat kernel measure μ_t^N concentrates onto the set where $\text{tr}(Z^l) = 1$ for all l . (See Theorem 14 for precise statement of this claim.) Thus, in the large- N limit, trace polynomials are indistinguishable from single-variable polynomial functions.

5 The action of the Laplacian on trace polynomials

We will be interested in the action of Δ_N on **trace polynomials**, that is, on matrix-valued functions that are linear combinations of functions of the form

$$U^k \text{tr}(U) \text{tr}(U^2) \cdots \text{tr}(U^n) \quad (14)$$

for some k and n . (Actually, we should really consider a more generally trace *Laurent* polynomials, where we allow negative powers of U and traces thereof. Nevertheless, for simplicity, I will consider in this paper only positive powers, which are all that are strictly necessary for the main results of [DHK].) The formula the action of Δ_N on such functions was originally worked out by Sen-gupta; see Definition 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 in [Sen]. We begin by recording the formula for the Laplacian of a single power of U .

Proposition 5 *For each positive integer k , we have*

$$\Delta_N(U^k) = -kU^k - 2 \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} mU^m \text{tr}(U^{k-m}), \quad (15)$$

and

$$\Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^k)) = -k\text{tr}(U^k) - 2 \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m\text{tr}(U^m) \text{tr}(U^{k-m}). \quad (16)$$

See Theorem 3.3 in [DHK]. Note that when $k = 1$, the sums on the right-hand sides of (15) and (16) are empty. Thus, actually, $\Delta_N(U) = -U$ and $\Delta_N(\text{tr}(U)) = -\text{tr}(U)$. Since, by definition, Δ_N acts “entrywise” on matrix-valued functions, the assertion that $\Delta_N(U) = -U$ is equivalent to the assertion that $\Delta_N(U_{jk}) = -U_{jk}$ for all j and k . A sketch of the proof of this result is given in Section 9.

Let us make a few observations about the formulas in Proposition 5. First, since we are supposed to be considering matrix-valued functions, we should really think of $\text{tr}(U^k)$ as the matrix-valued function $U \mapsto \text{tr}(U^k)I$. Nevertheless, if we chose to think of $\text{tr}(U^k)$ as a scalar-valued function, the formula in (16) would continue to hold. Second, the Laplacian Δ_N commutes with applying the trace, so the right-hand side of (16) is what one obtains by applying the normalized trace to the right-hand side of (15). Third, the formulas for $\Delta_N(U^k)$ and $\Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^k))$ are “independent of N ,” meaning that the coefficients of the various terms on the right-hand side of (15) and (16) do not depend on N . This independence holds only because we have chosen to express things in terms of the *normalized* trace; if we used the ordinary trace, there would be a factor of $1/N$ in the second term on the right-hand side of both equations.

Suppose, now, that we wish to apply Δ_N to a product, such as the function $f(U) = U^k \text{tr}(U^l)$. As usual with the Laplacian, there is a product rule that involves three terms, two “Laplacian terms”—namely $\Delta_N(U^k) \text{tr}(U^l)$ and $U^k \Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^l))$ —along with a cross term. The Laplacian terms can, of course, be computed using (15) and (16). The cross term, meanwhile, turns out to be

$$-\frac{2kl}{N^2} U^{k+l}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\Delta_N(U^k \text{tr}(U^l)) = \Delta(U^k) \text{tr}(U^l) + U^k \Delta(\text{tr}(U^l)) - \frac{2kl}{N^2} U^{k+l}.$$

Again, a sketch of the proof of this result is given in Section 9.

The behavior in the preceding example turns out to be typical: *The cross term is always of order $1/N^2$.* Thus, to leading order in N , we may compute the Laplacian of a function of the form (14) as the sum of $n + 1$ terms, where each term applies the Laplacian to one of the factors (using (15) or (16)) and leaves the other factors unchanged.

It should be emphasized that this leading-order behavior applies only if (as in (14)) we have collected together all of the untraced powers of U . Thus, for example, if we chose to write U^5 as $U^3 U^2$, it would *not* be correct to say that $\Delta_N(U^5)$ is $\Delta_N(U^3) U^2 + U^3 \Delta_N(U^2)$ plus a term of order $1/N^2$.

The smallness of the cross terms leads to the following “asymptotic product rule” for the action of Δ_N on trace polynomials.

Proposition 6 (Asymptotic product rule) *Suppose that f and g are trace polynomials and that either f or g is “scalar,” meaning that it contains no*

untraced powers of U . Then

$$\Delta_N(fg) = \Delta_N(f)g + f\Delta_N(g) + O(1/N^2),$$

where $O(1/N^2)$ denotes a fixed trace polynomial multiplied by $1/N^2$.

The meaning of the expression “fixed trace polynomial” will be made more precise in the next section. The assumption that one of the trace polynomials be scalar is essential; if $f(U) = U^3$ and $g(U) = U^2$, then the asymptotic product rule does not apply.

The asymptotic product rule may be interpreted as saying that in the situation of Proposition 6, the Laplacian *behaves like a first-order differential operator*. Furthermore, if, say, f is scalar, then it turns out that $\Delta_N^n(f)$ is scalar for all n , which means that we can apply the asymptotic product rule repeatedly. Thus, by a standard power series argument, together with some simple estimates (Section 4 of [DHK]), we conclude that

$$e^{t\Delta_N/2}(fg) = e^{t\Delta_N/2}(f)e^{t\Delta_N/2}(g) + O(1/N^2). \quad (17)$$

The asymptotic product rule, along with its exponentiated form (17), is the key to many of the results in [DHK].

If we restrict our attention to scalar trace polynomials, then the asymptotic product rule in Proposition 6 will always apply. It is thus natural to expect that the large- N limit of the action of Δ_N on scalar trace polynomials can be described by a first-order differential operator. This expectation is fulfilled in the next section; see Proposition 11.

Using the asymptotic product rule, along with Proposition 5, we can readily compute—to leading order in N —the Laplacian of any trace polynomial.

Proposition 7 *For any non-negative integers k and $l_1, \dots, l_M$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_N(U^k \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M})) &= \Delta_N(U^k) \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}) \\ &\quad + U^k \Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^{l_1})) \text{tr}(U^{l_2}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}) \\ &\quad + \cdots \\ &\quad + U^k \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_{M-1}}) \Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^{l_M})) \\ &\quad + O(1/N^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $O(1/N^2)$ denotes a fixed trace polynomial multiplied by $1/N^2$.

6 Polynomials and trace polynomials

We now give a more precise meaning to the phrase “fixed trace polynomial” in Propositions 6 and 7, and thus to the notion of $O(1/N^2)$ occurring in those propositions. Along the way, we will explore a subtle distinction between polynomials and trace polynomials.

Definition 8 Let $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ denote the space of polynomials in u and $\mathbf{v}$, where u is a single indeterminate and where $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots)$ denotes an infinite list of indeterminates. An element p of $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is said to be **scalar** if $p(u, \mathbf{v})$ is independent of u .

Note that by definition of the term “polynomial,” any given element of $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ depends on only finitely many of the variables $v_1, v_2, \dots$.

Definition 9 Suppose p is an element of $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$. Then for each $N \geq 1$, define the function $p_N : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ by

$$p_N(U) = p(U, \text{tr}(U), \text{tr}(U^2), \text{tr}(U^3), \dots).$$

That is, p_N is obtained by making the substitution $u = U$ and $v_j = \text{tr}(U^j)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Functions of the form p_N on $U(N)$ are called **trace polynomial functions**, or simply **trace polynomials**.

A function $f : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is a **scalar trace polynomial** if it can be represented as $f = p_N$ where $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is independent of u .

In [DHK], we consider a more general class, in which we allow both negative powers of U and traces of negative powers of U . For simplicity, we limit ourselves here to non-negative powers.

It is important to distinguish between the “abstract” polynomial p , which is an element of $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, and the associated trace polynomial *function* $p_N : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$. As it turns out, it is possible to have a nonzero polynomial p for which $p_N = 0$ for certain values of N . In the $N = 2$ case, for example, the Cayley–Hamilton theorem tells us that for all $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, we have

$$A^2 - \text{Trace}(A)A + \det(A)I = 0.$$

Meanwhile, in $M_2(\mathbb{C})$, we have the easily verified identity

$$\det(A) = \frac{1}{2}((\text{Trace}(A))^2 - \text{Trace}(A^2)).$$

Thus, restricting to $U(2)$ and writing things in terms of the normalized trace $\text{tr}(\cdot)$, we have that

$$U^2 - 2\text{tr}(U)U + 2(\text{tr}(U))^2I - \text{tr}(U^2)I = 0$$

for all $U \in U(2)$.

We see, then, that if $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is given by

$$p(u, \mathbf{v}) = u^2 - 2uv_1 + 2v_1^2 - v_2,$$

then the function p_2 on $U(2)$ is identically zero. There is, however, no reason that p_N should be zero for $N > 2$. Indeed, we show in Section 2.4 of [DHK] that for any $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, if p_N is identically zero for *all* N , then p must be the zero polynomial.

Although there is not a one-to-one correspondence between polynomials p and trace polynomial functions p_N , it turns out that there is a well-defined linear operator $\mathcal{D}_N$ on $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ that “intertwines” with the action of Δ_N on functions.

Theorem 10 For each $N \geq 1$, there exists a linear operator $\mathcal{D}_N : \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, we have

$$\Delta_N(p_N) = (\mathcal{D}_N p)_N.$$

The operator $\mathcal{D}_N$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{D}_N = \mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{N^2} \mathcal{L}, \quad (18)$$

for two linear operators $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ mapping $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ to itself.

The operator $\mathcal{D}$ is uniquely determined by the following properties.

1. $\mathcal{D}(u^k) = -ku^k - 2 \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} mu^m v_{k-m}.$
2. $\mathcal{D}(v_k) = -kv_k - 2 \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} mv_m v_{k-m}.$
3. For all p and q in $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, if either p or q is scalar, then

$$\mathcal{D}(pq) = \mathcal{D}(p)q + p\mathcal{D}(q).$$

This result follows from Theorem 1.18 in [DHK]. Recall that the variable u is a stand-in for the variable U in a trace polynomial, whereas the variable v_k is a stand-in for $\text{tr}(U^k)$. Thus, Points 1 and 2 are simply the polynomial counterparts to Proposition 5. Point 3, meanwhile, is simply the polynomial counterpart to the asymptotic product rule in Proposition 6.

Proposition 11 Suppose $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is scalar, that is, independent of u . Then the action of $\mathcal{D}$ on p is given by

$$\mathcal{D}p = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kv_k \frac{\partial p}{\partial v_k} - 2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} jv_j v_{k-j} \right) \frac{\partial p}{\partial v_k}$$

and the action of $\mathcal{L}$ on p is given by

$$\mathcal{L}p = \sum_{j,k=1}^{\infty} jkv_{k+j} \frac{\partial^2 p}{\partial v_j \partial v_k}.$$

This result follows, again, from Theorem 1.18 in [DHK]. Note that the actions of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ on scalar polynomials are described by *differential* operators, and that the leading-order term $\mathcal{D}$ acts as a *first-order* differential operator. Since the scalar polynomial p depends on only finitely many of the variables v_j , only finitely many of the terms in each sum is nonzero. There is also a formula in that theorem for the action of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ on nonscalar polynomials (i.e., those polynomials $p(u, \mathbf{v})$ that depend nontrivially on u). The “full” operators $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ are not, however, differential operators. See Theorem 1.18 in [DHK] for the exact expression.

We may now express the asymptotic product rule more precisely as follows.

Proposition 12 (Asymptotic product rule, Version 2) *Suppose p and q are polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ and that p is scalar (Definition 8). Then there exists a polynomial r such that*

$$\Delta_N(p_N q_N) = \Delta_N(p_N) q_N + p_N \Delta_N(q_N) + \frac{1}{N^2} r_N.$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 10 and set $r = -\mathcal{L}(pq)$. ■

7 The product rule and concentration of traces

Recall that a key idea underlying Theorem 1 is the phenomenon of *concentration of trace*. Concentration of trace means that both of the relevant heat kernel measures, ρ_t^N on $U(N)$ and μ_t^N on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, concentrate in the large- N limit on the set where the trace of a power is constant. Thus, the function $\text{tr}(U^k)$, as an element of $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$, becomes equal to a certain constant $\nu_k(t)$ in the limit, and similarly for the function $\text{tr}(Z^k)$ in $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$. In this section, we trace the origin of the concentration-of-trace phenomenon to the asymptotic product rule.

On, say, the $U(N)$ side, the measure ρ_t^N is the heat kernel measure at the identity, which means that

$$\int_{U(N)} f(U) \rho_t^N(U) dU = e^{t\Delta/2}(f)(I). \quad (19)$$

Suppose now that f belongs to some algebra of real-valued functions to which the asymptotic product rule applies. (For example, f might be the real or imaginary part of $\text{tr}(U^k)$.) Then applying the exponentiated form (17) of the product rule with $f = g$, we obtain

$$e^{t\Delta_N/2}(f^2) = e^{t\Delta_N/2}(f) e^{t\Delta_N/2}(f) + O(1/N^2). \quad (20)$$

In light of (19), (20) reduces to

$$\int_{U(N)} f^2 d\rho_t^N = \left(\int_{U(N)} f d\rho_t^N \right)^2 + O(1/N^2).$$

In probabilistic language, this says that

$$E(f^2) = (E(f))^2 + O(1/N^2), \quad (21)$$

where E denotes expectation value with respect to the measure ρ_t^N .

Recall that the *variance* of f is defined as

$$\text{Var}(f) := E((f - E(f))^2),$$

and may be computed as $\text{Var}(f) = E(f^2) - (E(f))^2$. Thus, (21) is telling us that

$$\text{Var}(f) = O(1/N^2).$$

Thus, when N is large, $f(U)$ is close to the constant value $E(f)$ for most values of U .

Conclusion 13 *Suppose f belongs to some algebra of real-valued functions on $U(N)$ for which the asymptotic product rule applies. Then the variance of f with respect to the heat kernel measure ρ_t^N is small for large N .*

We may apply Conclusion 13 with f being the real or imaginary part of $\text{tr}(U^k)$. We conclude that $\text{tr}(U^k)$ —as an element of $L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N)$ —is concentrating onto its expectation value for large N . A similar argument shows that $\text{tr}(Z^k)$ —as an element of $\mathcal{HL}^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$ —is concentrating onto the value 1 for large N . In [DHK], we prove the following more general result.

Theorem 14 (Concentration of Traces) *For any polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, let $\pi_t : \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[u]$ be the **trace evaluation map** obtained by setting each of the variables v_j equal to the constant value $\nu_k(t)$, where $\nu_k(t)$ is the k th moment of Biane’s measure ν_t on S^1 . That is,*

$$(\pi_t p)(u) = p(u, \nu_1(t), \nu_2(t), \dots).$$

Since $\nu_k(0) = 1$, the map π_0 corresponds to evaluating each of the variables v_j to the value 1. Then we have the following results:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|p_N - (\pi_t p)_N\|_{L^2(U(N), \rho_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))} &= 0 \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|p_N - (\pi_0 p)_N\|_{L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the notation p_N is as in Definition 9.

This is the $s = t$ case of Theorem 1.16 in [DHK]. We have seen in this section that the phenomenon of concentration of trace can be understood as a consequence of the asymptotic product rule. In the next section, we will use the asymptotic product rule to compute—to leading order in N —the value of $e^{t\Delta_N/2}(U^k)$.

8 A recursive approach to the Segal–Bargmann transform on polynomials

The operator $\mathcal{D}$ in Theorem 10 describes the leading-order behavior of Δ_N on trace polynomials (see (18)). Thus, $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}$ describes the leading-order behavior of the Segal–Bargmann transform $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ on trace polynomials. In this section (following Section 5.1 of [DHK]), we construct a recursive method of computing $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u^k)$ for positive integers k . Since $\mathcal{D}(u) = -u$, our base case is $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u) = e^{-t/2}u$. The induction step will use the product rule for $\mathcal{D}$ (Point 3 of Theorem 10) in an essential way.

Given a monomial q in $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, say

$$q(u, \mathbf{v}) = u^{l_0} v_1^{l_1} \cdots v_M^{l_M},$$

for some M , we define the **trace degree** of q to be

$$\deg(q) = l_0 + l_1 + 2l_2 + \cdots + Ml_M.$$

This definition reflects the idea that v_k is a stand-in for the function $\text{tr}(U^k)$ on $U(N)$. Thus, the trace degree of q is the total number of factors of U in the associated trace polynomial $q_N(U)$. (Thus, for example, $q(u, \mathbf{v}) := u^2 v_2^2$ has trace degree 6 because the associated trace polynomial $q_N(U) = U^2(\text{tr}(U^2))^2$ has six factors of U .) We say that a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is homogeneous of trace degree k if p is a linear combination of monomials having trace degree k .

Let $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ denote the space of $p \in \mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ that are homogeneous of trace degree k , so that $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is the direct sum of the $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$'s, for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Each space $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ is easily seen to be finite dimensional, and is invariant under the operators $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ in Theorem 10. Thus, it makes sense to exponentiate any linear combination of these operators by thinking of them as operators on each of the finite-dimensional spaces $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$.

Let N be the “number operator” on $\mathbb{C}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, namely, the operator such that

$$N|_{\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]} = kI.$$

It is convenient to decompose $\mathcal{D}$ as

$$\mathcal{D} = -N + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (22)$$

Since the polynomials $p(u, \mathbf{v}) := u^k$ and $q(u, \mathbf{v}) := v_k$ both belong to $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$, if we wish to compute $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(u^k)$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(v_k)$, we simply omit the term of $-ku^k$ or $-kv_k$ in front of the sums in Points 1 and 2 of Theorem 10.

The two terms on the right-hand side of (22) commute, since they commute on $\mathbb{C}^{(k)}[u, \mathbf{v}]$ for each k . Thus,

$$e^{t\mathcal{D}/2} = e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2} e^{-tN/2}.$$

In particular,

$$e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u^k) = e^{-tk/2} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^k). \quad (23)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^k) &= \frac{1}{2} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}u^k) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2} \left(-2 \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m u^m v_{k-m} \right), \end{aligned}$$

by Point 1 of Theorem 10.

Since the polynomial $q(u, \mathbf{v}) = v_{k-m}$ is scalar, the product rule applies to the product $u^m v_{k-m}$. Since, also, $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^n(v_{k-m})$ is scalar for all n , we may apply a standard power series argument to show that $e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}$ behaves multiplicatively on the product $u^m v_{k-m}$. Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^k) = - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^m) e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_{k-m}). \quad (24)$$

A similar argument shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_k) = - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_m) e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_{k-m}). \quad (25)$$

We may then integrate either of equations (24) or (25), with initial condition determined by the fact that $e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2} = I$ when $t = 0$. This gives the following result.

Theorem 15 *For all positive integers k , we have the recursive formulas*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^k) &= u^k - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m \int_0^t e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^m) e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_{k-m}) \, ds \\ e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_k) &= v_k - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} m \int_0^t e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_m) e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_{k-m}) \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since in the sums, both m and $k - m$ are always strictly smaller than k , we can assume, recursively, that $e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^m)$, $e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_{k-m})$, and $e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_m)$ are all “known.” Let us now use the recursion to compute a simple example. It follows from Points (1) and (2) of Theorem 10 that $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(u) = \tilde{\mathcal{D}}(v_1) = 0$, so that $e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u) = u$ and $e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_1) = v_1$. Applying (26) with $k = 2$ then gives

$$\begin{aligned} e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^2) &= u^2 - \int_0^t e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u) e^{s\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(v_1) \, ds \\ &= u^2 - \int_0^t uv_1 \, ds \\ &= u^2 - tuv_1. \end{aligned}$$

By (23), we then have

$$e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u^2) = e^{-t}(u^2 - tuv_1). \quad (27)$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(v_2) = e^{-t}(v_2 - tv_1^2). \quad (28)$$

The results in (27) and (28) can then be fed into the induction procedure in (26) to compute $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u^3)$ and $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(v_3)$, and so on.

Recalling that $\mathcal{D}$ describes the leading-order behavior of Δ_N on polynomials, (27) tells us that

$$\mathbf{B}_t^N(f)(Z) \approx e^{-t}(Z^2 - tZ\text{tr}(Z)),$$

where $\approx$ indicates that the norm (in $L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))$) of the difference is small. Since, also, a concentration-of-trace phenomenon tells us that $\text{tr}(Z) \approx 1$ (Theorem 14), we have

$$\mathbf{B}_t^N(f)(Z) \approx e^{-t}(Z^2 - tZ).$$

Thus, if $p(u) = u^2$, the polynomial q_t in Theorem 1 is

$$q_t(z) = e^{-t}(z^2 - tz),$$

as claimed in the overview.

More generally, suppose that $p(u) = u^k$. We may compute the associated polynomial q_t by the following two-step process. First, we compute, inductively, $e^{t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}/2}(u^k)$ —and thus, by 23, $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}$ —using the recursion in (26). Second, we evaluate each of the variables v_k in the expression for $e^{t\mathcal{D}/2}(u^k)$ to the value 1. (Recall that v_k is a stand-in for $\text{tr}(Z^k)$ and that $\text{tr}(Z^k) \approx 1$ in $L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N)$.) We have carried out these computations in Mathematica with the result that if

$$p(u) = u^4$$

the polynomial q_t in Theorem 1 is given by

$$q_t(z) = e^{-2t} \left[z^4 - tz^3 + (4t^2 - 2t)z^2 + \left(-\frac{8}{3}t^3 + 4t^2 - t \right) z \right].$$

The recursive procedure in Theorem 15 allows us to compute the heat operator applied to any positive power of U . Using this result, we can also compute the heat operator applied to a negative power of U . It is easily seen that the heat operator (as applied to functions $f : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$) commutes with taking adjoints:

$$e^{t\Delta_N/2}(f^*) = (e^{t\Delta_N/2}f)^*.$$

Since $U^{-k} = (U^k)^*$ for $U \in U(N)$, we see that

$$e^{t\Delta_N/2}(U^{-k}) = (e^{t\Delta_N/2}U^k)^*.$$

Using this line of reasoning, we can easily prove an analog of Theorem 1 for negative powers of U . If p is a polynomial in a single variable, we can define $p^N : U(N) \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ by substituting U^{-1} , rather than U , into p . Then if q_t is the same polynomial as in Theorem 1, the theorem holds with p_N replaced by p^N :

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{B}_t^N(p^N) - (q_t)^N \right\|_{L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_t^N; M_N(\mathbb{C}))} = 0.$$

9 The magic formulas for computing the Laplacian

In this section, we explain how one can evaluate Δ_N on trace polynomial functions. In particular, we will see the origin of the asymptotic product rule.

Theorem 16 *Let $\{X_j\}$ be any orthonormal basis for $u(N)$ with respect to the inner product in (8). Then for all $A, B \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ we have*

$$\sum_j X_j^2 = -I \quad (29)$$

$$\sum_j X_j A X_j = -\text{tr}(A)I \quad (30)$$

$$\sum_j \text{tr}(X_j A) X_j = -\frac{1}{N^2} A \quad (31)$$

$$\sum_j \text{tr}(X_j A) \text{tr}(X_j B) = -\frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr}(AB), \quad (32)$$

where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ is the normalized trace in (3).

These “magic formulas” are established in Lemma 4.1 of [Sen]. One can prove the formulas by first establishing that the sums are independent of the choice of orthonormal basis and then computing by brute force in one particular basis. (See also Section 3.1 of [DHK].) Note the presence of a factor of $1/N^2$ on the right-hand sides of (31) and (32).

Proposition 17 *For any non-negative integer k and any (possibly empty) sequence $l_1, \dots, l_M$ of positive integers, we have*

$$\Delta_N(U^k \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M})) = \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= \Delta_N(U^k) \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^M \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \widehat{\text{tr}(U^{l_j})} \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}) \cdot \Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^{l_j})), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{II} = -\frac{2}{N^2} U^k \sum_{j < m} l_j l_m \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \widehat{\text{tr}(U^{l_j})} \cdots \widehat{\text{tr}(U^{l_m})} \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}) \cdot \text{tr}(U^{l_j+l_m})$$

and

$$\text{III} = -\frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^M k l_j U^{k+l_j} \text{tr}(U^{l_1}) \cdots \widehat{\text{tr}(U^{l_j})} \cdots \text{tr}(U^{l_M}).$$

Proposition 17 is a slight strengthening of Lemma 4.3 in [Sen]. This result can be combined with Proposition 5 to obtain an explicit formula for the Laplacian of any trace polynomial. In particular, from Propositions 5 and 17, we can easily obtain the operators $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ in Theorem 10.

Note that we *do not* assume the exponents $l_1, \dots, l_M$ are distinct. Term I in the proposition is the term in which Δ_N behaves like a first-order operator; that is, in Term I, we apply the Laplacian to each factor separately. Since the remaining terms have a factor of $1/N^2$ in front, the asymptotic product rule follows from the proposition. In each entry in Term II, we combine two separate traces, $\text{tr}(U^{l_j})$ and $\text{tr}(U^{l_k})$, into a single trace, $\text{tr}(U^{l_j+l_k})$. In each entry in Term III, we combine U^k and $\text{tr}(U^{l_j})$ into the factor of U^{k+l_j} . Terms II and III in Proposition 17 arise from (31) and (32) in Theorem 16.

We now illustrate the proofs of Propositions 5 and 17 by verifying one example of each proposition, using the magic formulas. It requires only a bit of combinatorics to prove the general results by the same method.

First example. We illustrate the proof of Proposition 5 by considering the function

$$f(U) = U^2.$$

Given a basis element X_j in $u(N)$, we may compute the associated left-invariant vector field $\tilde{X}_j$, as in (9), using the product rule:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{X}_j f)(U) &= \left. \frac{d}{ds} U e^{sX_j} U e^{sX_j} \right|_{s=0} \\ &= UX_j U + U^2 X_j. \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\tilde{X}_j$ again gives

$$(\tilde{X}_j^2 f)(U) = UX_j^2 U + UX_j UX_j + UX_j UX_j + U^2 X_j^2.$$

To compute $\Delta_N f$, we sum over j and use the magic formulas (29) and (30), with the result that

$$(\Delta_N f)(U) = -2U^2 - 2U \text{tr}(U).$$

Second example. We illustrate the proof of Proposition 17 by considering the function

$$f(U) = U^2 \text{tr}(U^2).$$

We apply $\tilde{X}_j$ as in the previous example, giving

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{X}_j f)(U) &= UX_j U \text{tr}(U^2) + U^2 X_j \text{tr}(U^2) \\ &\quad + U^2 \text{tr}(UX_j U) + U^2 \text{tr}(U^2 X_j). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\tilde{X}_j$ a second time gives a total of ten terms:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{X}_j^2 f)(U) &= UX_j^2 U \text{tr}(U^2) + 2UX_j UX_j \text{tr}(U^2) + U^2 X_j^2 \text{tr}(U^2) \\ &\quad + U^2 \text{tr}(UX_j^2 U) + 2U^2 \text{tr}(UX_j UX_j) + U^2 \text{tr}(U^2 X_j^2) \\ &\quad + 2UX_j U \text{tr}(UX_j U) + 2UX_j U \text{tr}(U^2 X_j) \\ &\quad + 2U^2 X_j \text{tr}(UX_j U) + 2U^2 X_j \text{tr}(U^2 X_j). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

We now sum (33) over j to obtain $\Delta_N f$. In the first line on the right-hand side of (33), all the derivatives are on the U^2 factor in front of the trace. Thus, after summing over j , the first line gives $\Delta_N(U^2)\text{tr}(U^2)$. Similarly, the second line on the right-hand side of (33) sums to $U^2\Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^2))$. In the remaining two lines, we move the scalar trace factor next to the factor of X_j outside the trace. Then we cyclically permute the matrices inside the trace to put the factor of X_j first. At that point, we can apply the magic formula (31), with the result that each of the four terms on the left-hand side of (33) sums to $-(2/N^2)U^4$. Thus,

$$(\Delta_N f)(U) = \Delta_N(U^2)\text{tr}(U^2) + U^2\Delta_N(\text{tr}(U^2)) - \frac{8}{N^2}U^4.$$

This result agrees with Proposition 17, with Term II being zero in this case.

In general, we can understand the asymptotic product rule this way. Suppose we want to apply Δ_N to a trace monomial $U^k\text{tr}(U^{l_1})\cdots\text{tr}(U^{l_M})$. If we apply the vector field $\tilde{X}_j$ twice, we get a large number of terms, each of which has two factors of X_j inserted among the various powers of U in the original function. We first consider all the terms in which both factors of X_j reside in the same power of U , either both inside the factor of U^k or both within the same trace. After summing on j , these terms will simply apply Δ_N to each one of the factors, either to U^k or to $\text{tr}(U^{l_n})$ for some n . In the remaining terms, we have the two factors of X_j in two different powers of U , either one in the U^k factor and one in one of the trace factors, or in two different trace factors. In these cases, we apply the magic formulas (31) and (32), both of which have a factor of $1/N^2$ on the right-hand side. Thus, all deviations from (first-order) product rule behavior are of order $1/N^2$.

10 The two-parameter transform and the generating function

In [DHK], we actually consider the *two-parameter* version of the Segal–Bargmann transform for $U(N)$, as introduced in [DH] and [Ha3]. This transform is the unitary map

$$B_{s,t}^N : L^2(U(N), \rho_s^N) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}L^2(GL(N; \mathbb{C}), \mu_{s,t}^N)$$

given by

$$B_{s,t}^N(f) = (e^{t\Delta_N/2}f)_{\mathbb{C}},$$

where $\mu_{s,t}^N$ is a certain heat kernel measure on $GL(N; \mathbb{C})$, and where s and t are positive numbers with $s > t/2$. Note that the formula for $B_{s,t}^N$ is the same as for B_t^N ; only the measures used on the domain and range spaces depend on the second parameter, s . We may boost the transform $B_{s,t}^N$ to a transform $\mathbf{B}_{s,t}^N$ acting on matrix-valued functions, precisely as in the case of B_t^N . In [DHK], we prove a version of Theorem 1 for the two parameter transform in which $\mathbf{B}_t^N$ is replaced by $\mathbf{B}_{s,t}^N$ and the polynomial q_t is replaced by a polynomial $q_{s,t}$.

The introduction of the second parameter in [DHK] is not merely to prove a more general result. Rather, this parameter is critical to establishing certain properties of the *one-parameter* polynomial map $p \mapsto q_t$ in Theorem 1. Specifically, we prove that this map coincides with the “free Hall transform” $\mathcal{G}^t$ of Biane [Bi2].

The way we prove this is as follows. In Section 5.3 of [DHK] we consider the polynomial $p_k^{s,t}$ for which the associated polynomial $q_{s,t}$ is simply z^k , and we then consider the generating function for this family of polynomials:

$$\phi^{s,u}(z, t) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k^{s,t}(u) z^k. \quad (34)$$

This generating function “encodes” polynomials $p_k^{s,t}$, in the sense that those polynomials can be computed by evaluating the Taylor coefficients of $\phi^{s,u}(z, t)$ in the z variable. It is actually necessary to consider two additional generating functions,

$$\psi^s(t, z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{tr}(p_k^{s,t}(u)) z^k \quad (35)$$

and

$$\rho(s, z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{tr}(u^k) z^k. \quad (36)$$

In (35) and (36), the trace is evaluated using the large- N limit of the expectation value of $\text{tr}(U^k)$ with respect to the measure ρ_s ; these limiting expectation values were computed explicitly by Biane [Bi1].

In Proposition 5.10 of [DHK], we use (the two-parameter version of) the recursion in Section 8 to obtain the following set of partial differential equations for the generating functions in the previous paragraph, together with the appropriate initial conditions.

Proposition 18 *The generating functions in (34), (35), and (36) satisfy the following holomorphic PDE’s, for sufficiently small z :*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho(s, z)}{\partial s} &= -s\rho \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z}, & \rho(0, z) &= \frac{z}{1-z} \\ \frac{\partial \psi^s(t, z)}{\partial t} &= z\psi^s \frac{\partial \psi^s}{\partial z}, & \psi^s(0, z) &= \rho(s, e^{-s/2}z) \\ \frac{\partial \phi^{s,u}(t, z)}{\partial t} &= z\psi^s \frac{\partial \phi^{s,u}}{\partial z}, & \phi^{s,u}(0, z) &= \frac{uz}{1-uz}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second and third equations involve the derivatives of ϕ and ψ with respect to t with s fixed, an approach that would not make sense if we considered only the $s = t$ case. We solve this system of differential equation

by the method of characteristics, with the result (Theorem 1.17 of [DHK]) that $\phi^{s,u}$ is given by the following implicit formula:

$$\phi^{s,u} \left(t, ze^{\frac{1}{2}(s-t)\frac{1+z}{1-z}} \right) = \left(1 - uze^{\frac{s}{2}\frac{1+z}{1-z}} \right)^{-1} - 1.$$

In particular, when $s = t$, we obtain the explicit formula

$$\phi^{t,u}(t, z) = \left(1 - uze^{\frac{t}{2}\frac{1+z}{1-z}} \right)^{-1} - 1. \quad (37)$$

The expression in (37) is precisely the generating function for Biane's transform $(\mathcal{G}^t)^{-1}$ (after correcting a typographical error in [Bi2]).

References

- [AHS] S. Albeverio, B. C. Hall, and A. N. Sengupta, The Segal-Bargmann transform for two-dimensional Euclidean quantum Yang-Mills., *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **2** (1999), 27–49.
- [AS] M. Anshelevich and A. N. Sengupta, Quantum free Yang-Mills on the plane, *J. Geom. Phys.* **62** (2012), 330–343.
- [Bar] V. Bargmann, On a Hilbert space of analytic functions and an associated integral transform, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **14** (1961), 187–214.
- [Bi1] P. Biane, Free Brownian motion, free stochastic calculus and random matrices. *In*: Free probability theory (D. Voiculescu, Ed.), 1–19, Fields Inst. Commun., **12**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [Bi2] P. Biane, Segal-Bargmann transform, functional calculus on matrix spaces and the theory of semi-circular and circular systems, *J. Funct. Anal.* **144** (1997), 232–286.
- [Ceb] G. Cébron, Free convolution operators and free Hall transform, preprint arXiv:1304.1713v3 [math.PR].
- [Dr] B. K. Driver, On the Kakutani-Itô-Segal-Gross and Segal-Bargmann-Hall isomorphisms, *J. Funct. Anal.* **133** (1995), 69–128.
- [DH] B. K. Driver and B. C. Hall, Yang-Mills theory and the Segal-Bargmann transform, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **201** (1999), 249–290.
- [DG] B. K. Driver and L. Gross, Hilbert spaces of holomorphic functions on complex Lie groups. *In*: New trends in stochastic analysis (K. Elworthy, S. Kusuoka, and I. Shigekawa, Eds.), pp. 76–106, World Scientific, Singapore, 1997.
- [DHK] B. K. Driver, B. C. Hall, and T. Kemp, The large- N limit of the Segal-Bargmann transform on $\mathbb{U}_N$, to appear in *J. Funct. Anal.*, preprint arXiv:1305.2406v2 [math.FA].

- [Go1] M. Gordina, Holomorphic functions and the heat kernel measure on an infinite-dimensional complex orthogonal group, *Potential Anal.* **12** (2000), 325–357.
- [Go2] M. Gordina, Heat kernel analysis and Cameron-Martin subgroup for infinite dimensional groups, *J. Funct. Anal.* **171** (2000), 192–232.
- [Gr] L. Gross, Uniqueness of ground states for Schrödinger operators over loop groups, *J. Funct. Anal.* **112** (1993), 373–441.
- [GM] L. Gross and P. Malliavin, Hall’s transform and the Segal-Bargmann map. *In: Itô’s stochastic calculus and probability theory* (M. Fukushima, N. Ikeda, H. Kunita, and S. Watanabe, Eds.), pp. 73–116, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/New York, 1996.
- [Ha1] B. C. Hall, The Segal-Bargmann “coherent state” transform for compact Lie groups, *J. Funct. Anal.* **122** (1994), 103–151.
- [Ha2] B. C. Hall, Harmonic analysis with respect to heat kernel measure, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **38** (2001), 43–78.
- [Ha3] B. C. Hall, A new form of the Segal-Bargmann transform for Lie groups of compact type, *Canad. J. Math.* **51** (1999), 816–834.
- [HS1] B. C. Hall and A. N. Sengupta, The Segal-Bargmann transform for path-groups, *J. Funct. Anal.* **152** (1998), 220–254.
- [Kem] T. Kemp, Heat kernel empirical laws on $\mathbb{U}_N$ and $\mathbb{GL}_N$, preprint arXiv:1306.2140v1 [math.PR].
- [Lev] T. Lévy, The master field on the plane, preprint arXiv:1112.2452v2 [math-ph].
- [Rai] E. M. Rains, Combinatorial properties of Brownian motion on the compact classical groups, *J. Theoret. Probab.* **10** (1997), 659–679.
- [Se1] I. E. Segal, Mathematical problems of relativistic physics. With an appendix by George W. Mackey. *In: Lectures in Applied Mathematics, Proceedings of the Summer Seminar, Boulder, Colorado, 1960, Vol. II.* (M. Kac, Ed.), pp. 1–131, American Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1963.
- [Se2] I. E. Segal, The complex-wave representation of the free boson field. *In: Topics in functional analysis: Essays dedicated to M.G. Krein on the occasion of his 70th birthday* (I. Gohberg and M. Kac, Eds.) pp. 321–343, Advances in Mathematics Supplementary Studies, Vol. 3, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

- [Sen] A. N. Sengupta, Traces in two-dimensional QCD: the large-N limit. *In*: Traces in number theory, geometry and quantum fields (S. Albeverio, M. Marcolli, S. Paycha and J. Plazas, Eds.), pp. 193–212, Aspects Math., E38, Friedr. Vieweg, Wiesbaden, 2008.
- [Sin] I. M. Singer, On the master field in two dimensions. *In*: Functional Analysis on the Eve of the 21st Century, Volume I (S. Gindikin et al., Eds.) pp. 263–281, Birkhäuser 1995.