

Eikonal formulation of large dynamical random matrix models

Jacek Grela¹, Maciej A. Nowak^{1,2} and Wojciech Tarnowski^{1*}

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Cracow, Poland*

²*Mark Kac Complex Systems Research Center, Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Cracow, Poland*

(Dated: October 20, 2020)

Standard approach to dynamical random matrix models relies on the description of trajectories of eigenvalues. Using the analogy from optics, based on the duality between the Fermat principle (trajectories) and the Huygens principle (wavefronts), we formulate the Hamilton-Jacobi dynamics for large random matrix models. The resulting equations describe a broad class of random matrix models in a unified way, including normal (Hermitian or unitary) as well as strictly non-normal dynamics. HJ formalism applied to Brownian bridge dynamics allows one for calculations of the asymptotics of the Harish-Chandra-Itzykson-Zuber integrals.

Introduction. Dynamical random matrix models [1] appear in multiple branches of physics and applications. An external parameter, causing the flow of the eigenvalues, could be real time, length of the mesoscopic wire [2], size of the lattice [3], area of the string [4] or depth of a neural network [5], just to mention few examples. The standard approach to dynamical random matrix models relies on tracing the trajectories of individual eigenvalues via stochastic differential equations of the Langevin type or by the corresponding Smoluchowski-Fokker-Planck (SFP) equations for joint eigenvalue probability distribution functions. Their dynamics simplifies considerably for large matrix size N , where it attains a hydrodynamical description with the viscosity $1/N$ [6, 7]. In the simplest case of Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE), the resolvent evolves according to the complex Burgers equation. It can be easily solved by the method of complex characteristics, in analogy to real characteristics method applied to the Euler equation. This immediately brings connotations with geometric optics, where rays of light play the role of characteristics. Moreover, fold and cusp diffractive catastrophes in optics [8] seem to have their counterparts in random matrix models, in terms of Airy [9] and Pearcey [6] microscopic universalities. On the other hand, rays obeying the Fermat principle in geometric optics are dual to wavefronts obeying the Huygens principle in wave optics. This particular correspondence prompted Hamilton to reformulate classical mechanics in terms of the Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) equation. In this Letter, we follow the same philosophy in the dynamical random matrix models.

Simplest case of Gaussian diffusion. Before we present the full formalism for the HJ equation in Random Matrix Theory, we explain the main concept on the basis of a matricial additive Brownian walk. We consider the process $Y_t = Y_{t-1} + X_t$, where X_t are independent large ($N \rightarrow \infty$) N by N matrices drawn from the GUE. When interested only in the average spectral density, one studies the evolution of the averaged resolvent $G(z, t) = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{z - Y_t} \right\rangle$, with the large N limit taken implicitly. The averaging $\langle \dots \rangle$ is taken with respect to the random process

Y_t . In the above-mentioned limit, the resulting differential equation is the complex inviscid Burgers equation $\partial_t G + G \partial_z G = 0$ [10]. Using the method of complex characteristics, the solution is given implicitly by the Pastur formula [11] $G = G_0(z - tG)$, where G_0 is the initial resolvent. For a trivial initial condition $X_0 = 0$, $G_0(z) = 1/z$ and the Pastur formula reduces to a quadratic equation for which one of the solutions $G_-(z, t) = \frac{1}{2t}(z - \sqrt{z^2 - 4t})$ results in the eigenvalue density given by the Wigner semicircle law. We stress that, since Burgers equation is non-linear, it admits shocks corresponding to the wavefronts. These singularities appear at the edges of the expanding semicircle and signal breakdown of the $1/N$ expansion of the spectral density around these points.

This problem will now be recast in the HJ form. The role of the principal Hamilton function is played by a potential-like function of the form $\left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \ln(z - Y_t)(\bar{z} - Y_t^\dagger) \right\rangle$ with large N limit taken implicitly. Since Y_t is Hermitian, the proposed principal Hamilton function is decomposed as a sum of holomorphic $\phi(z, t) = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \ln(z - Y_t) \right\rangle$ and its (trivial) anti-holomorphic copy $\bar{\phi} = \phi(\bar{z}, t)$, which we omit in what follows. Moreover, the function ϕ is basically a logarithm of the characteristic determinant, since $\langle \text{Tr} \ln(z - Y_t) \rangle = \langle \ln \det(z - Y_t) \rangle = \ln \langle \det(z - Y_t) \rangle$, where the last equality holds *only* in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. The HJ equation for the principal Hamilton function (modulo its trivial, decoupled anti-holomorphic copy) reads

$$\partial_t \phi + H(p = \partial_z \phi, z, t) = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $H(p, z, t) = p^2/2$ is the Hamiltonian. The role of the canonical coordinate q is played by a complex variable z , while the role of the canonical momentum p is the derivative of the principal Hamilton function wrt. coordinate z , i.e. $p = \partial_z \phi$. Note that the momentum p is, by definition, the resolvent G ! Surprisingly from the random matrix point of view, the HJ formalism treats the canonical pair $(q, p) \leftrightarrow (z, G)$ as completely *independent*. As we will see in the next section, GUE is the random matrix analog of free, 1-dimensional particle in classical mechanics.

Using the formalism of classical mechanics, we write down the pair of Hamilton equations $\dot{z} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} = p$, $\dot{p} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial z} = 0$, which, together with the initial conditions $z(0) = z_0$ and $p(0) = p_0$, lead to the solutions $p(t) = p_0$ and $z(t) = p_0 t + z_0$. If initial conditions are represented by a set of N points x_i corresponding to the eigenvalues of X_0 , then $p_0 = \partial_z \phi(z, t = 0)|_{z=z_0} = \frac{1}{N} \sum \frac{1}{z_0 - x_i}$ and eliminating z_0 from equations of motion reproduces the Pastur formula $p = p_0(z - pt)$. Alternatively, one can differentiate the HJ equation with respect to z , again recovering the inviscid Burgers equation $\partial_t p + p \partial_z p = 0$. This elementary example represents the duality between the Euler-Lagrange and Hamilton pictures in the context of the simplest random matrix model.

The main result of this Letter is an extension of the above duality to broader class of dynamical random matrix models, not necessarily Hermitian or Gaussian.

General Hamilton-Jacobi construction. We now continue to outline the HJ formalism in the general case when the matrix additive dynamics Y_t does not have symmetry constraints. The principal Hamilton function resembles an electrostatic potential

$$\Phi(z, w, t) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \text{Tr} \ln[(z - Y_t)(\bar{z} - Y_t^\dagger) + |w|^2] \right\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Now, complex variables z, w and their conjugates play the role of coordinates, which can be elegantly encoded in a 2 by 2 matrix \mathbb{Q} forming a representation of the real quaternion

$$\mathbb{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} z & -\bar{w} \\ w & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Similarly, taking a quaternionic derivative $(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{ij} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbb{Q}_{ji}}$ ($i, j = 1, 2$) of the potential Φ forms a 2 by 2 resolvent matrix $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi$, which also obeys the algebra of quaternions. Note the reverse order of indices in the definition of \mathbb{G} . Such a generalized resolvent was proposed to solve non-Hermitian problems in the past [12–15] although without any link to the underlying Hamilton dynamics.

Under a general matrix process Y_t we find the HJ equation for the potential function Φ (see [16] for details):

$$\partial_t \Phi + H(\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi)^T, \mathbb{Q}, t) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where the form of the Hamiltonian depends on the imposed dynamics. In particular, for an additive process $Y_t = Y_{t-1} + X_t$, the Hamiltonian is an integral of the quaternionic \mathbb{R} -transform [16]:

$$H = \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} \text{Tr} [\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) d\mathbb{Q}]. \quad (5)$$

The function \mathbb{R} , modulo a shift, is the functional inverse of the quaternionic resolvent $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) + \mathbb{Q}^{-1} =$

$\mathbb{G}^{(-1)}(\mathbb{Q})$ [13]. As both \mathbb{R} and $d\mathbb{Q}$ are 2 by 2 matrices, the trace operator is taken wrt. both terms $\text{Tr} \mathbb{R} d\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{R}_{11} d\mathbb{Q}_{11} + \mathbb{R}_{21} d\mathbb{Q}_{12} + \mathbb{R}_{12} d\mathbb{Q}_{21} + \mathbb{R}_{22} d\mathbb{Q}_{22}$. In such formulation, \mathbb{Q} constitutes the position variable, while the quaternionic resolvent $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{P}^T$ is formed by canonically paired momenta. In less geometric language, a complex pair (z, w) of positions is associated with a pair of momenta given by the (eigenvalue-related) resolvent $p_z = \mathbb{G}_{11} = \partial_z \Phi$ and eigenvector-related resolvent $p_w = \mathbb{G}_{12} = \partial_w \Phi$. Equations (4) and (5) comprise the first main result of this Letter.

Lastly, we note that the differentiation of HJ equation (4) with respect to z and w variables gives the Burgers-like description of the process

$$\partial_t \mathbb{G}_{ab} + \sum_{c,d=1,2} \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{G})_{cd} \frac{\partial \mathbb{G}_{ab}}{\partial \mathbb{Q}_{cd}} = 0, \quad (a, b = 1, 2). \quad (6)$$

Hermitian matrices. In the case of Hermitian matrices, the quaternionic embedding is redundant and one can set w to zero from the very beginning, projecting the quaternion to a complex number. In this way, both the potential $\Phi \rightarrow \phi + \bar{\phi}$ and the quaternion $\mathbb{R} = \text{diag}(R(z), \overline{R(z)})$ decouple into holomorphic and anti-holomorphic copy. The Hamiltonian (5) reads

$$H = \int_0^p R(z) dz + \int_0^{\bar{p}} \overline{R(z)} d\bar{z}, \quad (7)$$

so the dynamics of each part separately is equivalent; from now on we focus on the holomorphic part only. Resulting HJ equation reads:

$$\partial_t \phi + \int_0^p R(z) dz = 0. \quad (8)$$

After differentiation wrt. coordinate z and since momenta are interpreted as the resolvent $p = G$, eq. (8) leads to the Voiculescu equation $\partial_t G + R(G) \partial_z G = 0$ [17], where R is the (complex-valued) R -transform, generating cumulants in free probability [18]. In the case of Gaussian diffusion discussed in the introduction, only the second cumulant is non-vanishing (which we set to 1), so $R(z) = z$. Therefore, the Hamiltonian reads $H = \frac{1}{2} p^2$ and the evolution equation is given by the aforementioned complex Burgers equation.

Although Hamiltonians expressed via the \mathbb{R} -transform (5) are functions of momenta only, the HJ equation (4) holds beyond such cases. Perhaps the simplest instance is the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{OU}} = \frac{1}{2} p^2 + a(1 - zp), \quad (9)$$

where the coupling between coordinate z and momentum p reproduces the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with a drift proportional to a [19].

Non-normal matrix X. The crucial difference between Hermitian and non-Hermitian models comes from the fact, that the holomorphic/anti-holomorphic separability breaks down, since the support of the spectra represents the non-holomorphic region. This was known in the literature [20], and the variable $|w|^2 \equiv \epsilon$ was kept non-zero before the large N limit was taken. In such a case, the spectral density follow from the 2D Gauss law $\rho = \frac{1}{\pi} \partial_{\bar{z}} g$, where $g = \partial_z \Phi$ plays the role of the electric field. Considering ϵ only as an infinitesimal regularizer is too reductive, as it is responsible for the crucial dynamics of eigenvectors, which, contrary to the Hermitian case, do not decouple from the eigenvalues during the evolution. This is perhaps best visible when we diagonalize Y_t in terms of left and right eigenvectors $Y_t = \sum_i |R_i\rangle \lambda_i \langle L_i| = R \Lambda L^\dagger$. Then the potential Φ reads explicitly

$$\Phi(z, w, t) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \ln \det \begin{pmatrix} z - \Lambda & -\bar{w} L^\dagger L \\ w R^\dagger R & \bar{z} - \Lambda^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle. \quad (10)$$

Since the N by N blocks in the determinant do not commute, eigenvalues are entangled with eigenvectors. In the large N limit the off-diagonal momenta in \mathbb{G} are responsible for the diagonal part of the Chalker-Mehlig correlator [21–23]

$$O(z, t) = \frac{1}{N^2} \left\langle \sum_i O_{ii} \delta^{(2)}(z - \lambda_i) \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{\pi} |p_w|_{w=0}^2,$$

where O_{ii} is the diagonal part of the overlap matrix [23] $O_{ij} = \langle L_i | L_j \rangle \langle R_j | R_i \rangle$ (see also [24]). This quantity is also related to the Petermann factor [25] and the eigenvalue condition number in the stability theory [26]. One can therefore see that during the evolution parameters z and w need to be treated *on an equal footing*.

It is useful to illustrate this democracy of dynamics of eigenvalues and eigenvectors in the case of the elliptic ensemble [27], corresponding to the matricial measure $P(X) \sim \exp \left[-\frac{N}{1-\tau^2} (\text{Tr} X X^\dagger - \frac{\tau}{2} \text{Tr} (X^2 + (X^\dagger)^2)) \right]$. Parameter τ allows for continuous interpolation between GUE ($\tau = 1$) and the Ginibre ensemble ($\tau = 0$). The generalized \mathbb{R} -transform for the elliptic ensemble reads [21, 22]

$$\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau z & -\bar{w} \\ w & \tau \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

The application of the HJ formula (5) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{elliptic}} &= \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} (\tau z dz + \tau \bar{z} d\bar{z} - w d\bar{w} - \bar{w} dw) \\ &= \frac{\tau}{2} (p_z^2 + p_{\bar{z}}^2) - |p_w|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with a pair of momenta $p_z = \mathbb{G}_{11}, p_w = \mathbb{G}_{12}$ comprising the quaternionic resolvent \mathbb{G} . Indeed, setting $\tau = 1$ reproduces the GUE case as the "eigenvector part" vanishes in the large N limit. Although eigenvector and

eigenvalue parts in the Hamiltonian are decoupled, they are coupled by the initial condition. The presence of the τ part is actually spoiling the rotational symmetry of the Ginibre ensemble and reproduces the ellipse, as easily seen from solving the corresponding HJ equations. The signs in front of the "kinetic" terms are also important. In the Hermitian limit $\tau = 1$, the positive kinetic term in the Hamiltonian is responsible for the Airy oscillations at the wavefront. When Hermiticity is broken, the term $-|p_w|^2$ shapes the critical behavior at the edge and is the source of smooth decay of Erfc type [28, 29].

In the Ginibre case $\tau = 0$, the entire evolution of eigenvalues and eigenvectors is solely driven by the w dynamics, and in this simplest non-normal case, by the Chalker-Mehlig eigenvector correlator. Explicitly, the HJ equations read $\dot{p}_w = 0, \dot{w} = -\bar{p}_w$ and form equations along characteristic lines reproducing recent result [28].

Along the solution of the HJ equation, $H, \frac{\tau}{2} p_z^2, \frac{\tau}{2} p_{\bar{z}}^2$ and $|p_w|^2$ are constants of motion, since the corresponding Poisson brackets vanish. We stress here the crucial dynamics of eigenvectors, which is a generic feature of non-normal random matrix models. In our opinion, an attempt to understand the dynamics of non-normal matrix models solely on the basis of the evolution of (complex) eigenvalues resembles the Plato's cave allegory. Studies of eigenvalues of non-normal matrix models are like the studies of the shadows on the wall (z -plane), whereas the true dynamics takes place in a broader space (z, w). In this aspect we challenge the traditional spectral paradigm of random matrix models. This observation explains perhaps the puzzle, why even in the simplest case of the complex Ginibre ensemble, *exact* Langevin equations were written only very recently [30, 31], in contrast to the Hermitian case, where they were formulated by Dyson [32] already in the 60's. Ironically, the crucial left-right eigenvector correlator for the case of Ginibre ensemble, which, as shown above, drives the evolution of the ensemble, was explicitly calculated by Chalker and Mehlig almost half a century after the seminal, spectral result by Ginibre [33].

The special class of non-normal operators is represented by the so-called bi-unitary ensembles, the spectrum of which is symmetric with respect to the angular variable on the complex plane and is described by the single-ring theorem [34–36]. In such a case the generic form of the \mathbb{R} -transform simplifies to [37]

$$\mathbb{R} = A(-|w|^2) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\bar{w} \\ w & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where the scalar function A is a generating function for cumulants in bi-unitary models. The generic form of the Hamiltonian reads therefore [16]

$$H_{\text{bi-unitary}} = \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} \text{Tr} (\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) d\mathbb{Q}) = \int_0^{-|p_w|^2} A(x) dx. \quad (14)$$

The explicit form of A is known for several ensembles, including product of Ginibre's, induced Ginibre or trun-

cated unitaries [37]. Before mentioned Ginibre ensemble is the simplest bi-unitary ensemble, since $A = 1$ and $\int Adx = x$, reproducing previous formula.

HJ equations for multiplicative evolution. Interestingly, similar concepts of HJ evolution can be applied to the multiplicative matricial random walks. The simplest case is the unitary diffusion $U_t = \prod_{j=1}^M \exp i\sqrt{\delta t} H_j$, where H_j are independent large Hermitian matrices with second moment finite and put here for simplicity to 1. Continuous version of such random walk is defined in the limit $\sqrt{\delta t} \rightarrow 0$, $M \rightarrow \infty$, $M\delta t = t$ fixed. Since unitary matrices are normal, eigenvectors and eigenvalues decouple. As eigenvalues of U_t lie on the unit circle, it is convenient to investigate their phases $\lambda_i(t) = \exp i\theta_i(t)$ and consider a potential which respects the 2π periodicity of the phase

$$\phi(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \ln(\theta - \theta_i(t) + 2k\pi) \right\rangle. \quad (15)$$

In this case, the evolution resembles an additive case, modulo that the principal Hamilton function has to take into account the periodicity of the angular variable. The conjugate momentum $\partial_\theta \phi \equiv J$, is obtained by noticing the series expansion of the cotangent

$$J(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cot \frac{(\theta - \varphi)}{2} \rho(\varphi) d\varphi. \quad (16)$$

The Burgers equation reads $\partial_t J + J\partial_\theta J = 0$ [38]. Equivalently, $\phi(\theta, t)$ evolves according to the HJ equation with the Hamiltonian $H = \frac{J^2}{2}$. This example, where the unitary evolution is represented by the canonical pair (angle θ , angular momentum J) for free rotator is not academic. In the case when time is represented by the area of the string, such evolution is equivalent to Migdal-Makeenko loop equations in two-dimensional, large N Yang-Mills theory [39]. The collision of the wavefronts corresponds to the weak-strong coupling (order-disorder) phase transition in large N Yang-Mills theory [6, 7]. Interestingly, the same problem can be formulated in $z = e^{i\theta}$ variable [40] where the principal Hamilton function is given again by the log of the characteristic determinant, but the resulting Hamiltonian is less trivial and reads $H = -\frac{1}{2}z^2 p^2 + \frac{1}{2}zp$. Likewise, multiplicative evolution is investigated in pure mathematics [41].

The generalization of the above process to the non-normal evolution $Z_t = \prod_{j=1}^M \exp \sqrt{\delta t} X_j$ is highly nontrivial, since the product of two Hermitian matrices is usually non-Hermitian, so eigenvectors enter non-trivially into the evolution process. Again, such a problem is not academic, since, first, it represents the archetype of multiplicative Brownian random walks of large non-commuting matrices [42]; second, represents a generalization of the Wilson loop to the case of supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories [43]. Like its unitary analogue,

such evolution also develops a structural phase transition manifested by the change of topology in the support of complex eigenvalues [42–44]. This topological phase transition does not depend on the type of X_j and appears in both Hermitian (GUE) and non-Hermitian (Ginibre) cases. Despite that the shape of the boundary was explicitly calculated for Ginibre case in [42, 43], understanding of the spectral density was beyond the reach of mathematical methods available at that time. Only very recently, explicit spectral formulae were calculated by [45, 46], using the formalism of the partial differential equations of the HJ type. Somehow conservatively, the authors concentrated on the spectral evolution, but their Hamiltonian, when rephrased in our language of (z, w) variables, reads explicitly

$$H = \frac{r}{2} p_r \left(1 + \frac{|z|^2 - r^2}{2r} p_r - zp - \bar{z}\bar{p} \right), \quad (17)$$

where $r = |w|$ is the radial coordinate and p_r its conjugate momentum. Clearly, the dynamics is driven primarily by the w -evolution (eigenvectors), coupled non-trivially to the z -evolution (eigenvalues). The fact that such a complicated system was able to be integrated exactly [45, 46], gives strong credit to Arnold's statement, that HJ formalism *is perhaps the most powerful method known for the exact integration of Hamilton equations* [47]. Interestingly, the HJ equation can be applied to the singular value problem of the above evolution, where spectra are real and decoupled from the eigenvectors, with the result $H_{Z_t Z_t^\dagger} = z^2 p^2 - zp$, i.e. identical to the Hamiltonian for the unitary diffusion, modulo factor $-1/2$. The corresponding HJ equations for both ensembles are related by replacing time t in unitary diffusion by $t \rightarrow -t/2$ for singular values evolution, pointing at some *a priori* unexpected dualities between these two models. Such model has also practical applications, in particular in the study of trainability of residual neural networks [48].

Asymptotics of Harish-Chandra-Itzykson-Zuber (HCIZ) integral. Finally, presented formalism offers an appealing way to study the asymptotics of the celebrated HCIZ [49, 50] integral:

$$I_{\text{HCIZ}} = \int dU e^{\frac{\beta}{2} N \text{Tr} U A U^\dagger B}, \quad (18)$$

for fixed matrices A, B and parameter β encoding whether integral is taken over unitary $\beta = 2$ or orthogonal matrices $\beta = 1$. Main contribution to large N asymptotic integral [52] is the Euler-type action $S = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dt \int dx \rho \left[\mu^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{3} \rho^2 \right]$ with "fluid" density ρ and momentum profile μ evaluated at a solution with specified both initial $t = 0$ and final $t = 1$ densities ρ_A, ρ_B of matrices A, B . By varying action S we find a recurring Burgers' equation $\partial_t h + h\partial_z h = 0$ for complex function $h = \mu + i\pi\rho$ combining both density ρ and profile μ .

Contrary to previous examples, we now look for solutions h obeying boundary conditions $\text{Im}h(t=0) = \pi\rho_A$ and $\text{Im}h(t=1) = \pi\rho_B$. Such an approach, while elegant, was of limited use to solve either special cases [51] or as a method of indirect generation of solutions [52].

Our approach of finding proper solutions h has two parts – first find the density ρ , then solve for a matching velocity μ . The first step is described as a HJ problem where the dynamics Y_t is a matricial Brownian bridge with both initial $Y_0 = A$ and final matrices $Y_1 = B$ specified. For an effective potential $\phi(z, \alpha, t) = \frac{1}{N} (\ln \det(z - Y_t + \alpha B))$, where the $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ limit recreates the usual principal Hamilton function, the Hamiltonian reads [16]

$$H_{\text{br}} = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + \frac{1}{1-t} [1 - zp - (\alpha - 1)p_\alpha], \quad (19)$$

where, besides the usual z, p pair, an auxiliary coordinate α and momentum p_α is present. Moreover, H_{br} is no longer conserved along the motion due to explicit time-dependence. Hamilton equations, after $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ limit, result in an implicit equation for the resolvent $G = G_{\text{br}}(z - t(1-t)G)$ with $G_{\text{br}}(z) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{z - (1-t)A - tB}$ [16]. While, by construction, the limits $t \rightarrow 0, 1$ recreate correct densities, resolvent G is not a solution to the Burgers equation for h where the mismatch begins in a non-physical velocity profile. The resolvent G is decomposed into real and imaginary parts $G = i\pi\rho + \mathcal{H}\rho$ related by the Hilbert transform and dependent only on density ρ . The resolvent h consists in turn of two arbitrary functions which points toward the second step of our approach – use one of the Euler equations to find the velocity profile μ matching to the density ρ found by solving Hamiltonian system (19):

$$\partial_t \mu + \mu \partial_x \mu = \frac{\pi^2}{2} \partial_x (\rho_{\text{br}}^2). \quad (20)$$

Once μ is found, action S is evaluated on matched pair μ, ρ resulting in asymptotics of the HCIZ integral.

We demonstrate the method on the simplest example of zero matrices $A = B = 0$. Boundary resolvent reads $G_{\text{br}}(z_0) = 1/z_0$ and the density is simply a semicircle law $\rho_{\text{br}}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t(1-t)} \sqrt{4t(1-t) - x^2}$. Plugging it into (20) results in an external field term $\frac{\pi^2}{2} \partial_x (\rho_{\text{br}}^2) = -\frac{x}{4t^2(1-t)^2}$. Solving (20) for μ with the method of characteristics results in $\mu(x, t) = \frac{2t-1}{2t(1-t)}x$ [16]. Although the above example only recreates the results of [51], approach by the HJ equation is general and does not require any guess-work. It provides a principled way of studying asymptotics of Berezin-Karpelevich integrals where similar hydrodynamic description was found [53] and non-Hermitian analogues of (generally unknown) HCIZ-type integrals.

Summary. We have proposed to apply the Hamilton-Jacobi dualism between the Lagrange-Euler description

(based on trajectories) and the Hamilton description (based on wavefronts) in the context of large N dynamical random matrix models. We have transferred the optical analogy between the Fermat principle and the Huygens principle to the realm of large random matrices. Such a scheme offers an inspiring perspective for merging several physical concepts from classical mechanics, optics, hydrodynamics and statistical physics with advanced mathematical methods of random matrix theory. Since the most interesting phenomena in random matrix models (e.g. new classes of universalities) occur mostly at the wavefronts (boundaries of the spectral support, corresponding to gradient catastrophes), the formalism which focuses on such objects, is promising. The real advantage of this formulation is visible at the level of non-normal models, where the proper identification of canonical "coordinates" and "momenta" leads to complete treatment of the evolution of both eigenvalues and the eigenvectors. The resulting HJ equations represent a dimensional reduction of large N problems. The proposed formalism allows also for rephrasing several open questions, like the issue of large deviations in non-normal matrix models, which we plan to expose in the sequel to this work.

Acknowledgments. The authors are indebted to Todd Kemp and Brian Hall (whose research have triggered our interest in the physical foundations of the HJ dynamics) for discussions and correspondence. The authors also thank Romuald Janik for helpful remarks. The research was supported by the TEAMNET POIR.04.04.00-00-14DE/18-00 grant of the Foundation for Polish Science. WT was also supported by ETIUDA scholarship UMO2018/28/T/ST1/00470 from National Science Center.

* Electronic address: jacek.grela@uj.edu.pl; Electronic address: maciej.a.nowak@uj.edu.pl; Electronic address: wojciech.tarnowski@doctoral.uj.edu.pl

- [1] L. Erdős and H-T. Yau, *A dynamical approach to random matrix theory* (AMS 2017).
- [2] C.W.J. Beenakker, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 69, 731 (1997).
- [3] R. Gopakumar and D.J. Gross, *Nucl.Phys. B* 451, 379 (1995).
- [4] B. Eynard, *Counting surfaces*, (Birkhäuser 2016).
- [5] J. Pennington, S. Schoenholz and S. Ganguli, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 2017, 4785 (2017).
- [6] J.-P. Blaizot and M.A. Nowak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 101, 100102 (2008).
- [7] H. Neuberger, *Phys. Lett. B* 666, 106 (2008).
- [8] M.V. Berry and S. Klein, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 93, 2614 (1996).
- [9] J.-P. Blaizot and M.A. Nowak, *Phys. Rev. E* 82, 051115 (2010).
- [10] D.V. Voiculescu, *J. Func. Analysis* 66, 323 (1986).
- [11] L.A. Pastur, *Theo. Math. Phys.* 10, 67 (1972).
- [12] R.A. Janik, M.A. Nowak, G. Papp and I. Zahed, *Nucl.*

- Phys. B 501 (3) 603 (1997).
- [13] A. Jarosz and M.A. Nowak, J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen. 39 (32) 10107 (2006). The generalized Blue's function defined in this paper is related to quaternionic R-transform as $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{Q}) - \mathbb{Q}^{-1}$.
- [14] J. Feinberg and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. B 504 (3), 579 (1997).
- [15] J.T. Chalker and Z. Jane Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1797 (1997).
- [16] See Supplementary Material for more detailed derivations.
- [17] D.V. Voiculescu, Comm. Math. Phys., 155, 71 (1993).
- [18] D.V. Voiculescu, K.J. Dykema and A. Nica. *Free random variables* American Mathematical Soc., (1992).
- [19] J.-P. Blaizot et al., J. Stat. Mech. 2016, 054037 (2016).
- [20] H. Sompolinsky, A. Crisanti and H.-J. Sommers, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (3) 259 (1988).
- [21] R.A. Janik et al., Phys. Rev. E 60(3) 2699 (1999).
- [22] S. Belinschi, M.A. Nowak, R. Speicher and W. Tarnowski, J. Phys. A: Math. Th. 50 (10) 105204 (2017).
- [23] J.T. Chalker and B. Mehlig, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81(6), 3367 (1998).
- [24] J.S. Bell and J. Steinberger, in Proceedings of the Oxford International Conference on Elementary Particles 1965, (Rutherford Laboratory, United Kingdom) (1966).
- [25] K.M. Frahm, H. Schomerus, M. Patra and C.W.J. Beenakker, Europhysics Lett. 49 (1) 48 (2000).
- [26] J.H. Wilkinson, *Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem*, Oxford University Press (1965).
- [27] V. Girko, Theor. Prob. and its Applications 30(4) 677 (1986).
- [28] Z. Burda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 104102 (2014).
- [29] Z. Burda et al., Nucl. Phys. B 897, 421 (2015).
- [30] J. Grella and P. Warchoł, J. Phys. A: Math. and Theor. 51 (42) 425203 (2018).
- [31] P. Bourgade and G. Dubach, arXiv:1801.01219, to appear in Prob. Theory and Related Fields.
- [32] F.J. Dyson, J. Math. Phys. 3(6), 1191 (1962).
- [33] J. Ginibre, J. Math. Phys. 6(3), 440 (1965).
- [34] J. Feinberg, R. Scalettar and A. Zee, J. Math. Phys. 42 (12) 5718 (2001).
- [35] U. Haagerup and F. Larsen, J. Func. Analysis 176, 331-397 (2000).
- [36] A. Guionnet, M. Krishnapur and O. Zeitouni, Annals of Math. 174, 1189 (2011).
- [37] M.A. Nowak and W. Tarnowski, Phys. Rev. E 96, 042149 (2017).
- [38] E. Cépa and D. Lépingle, ESAIM: Probability and Statistics 5, 203-224 (2001).
- [39] B. Durhuus and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B 184, 461 (1981).
- [40] R.A. Janik and W. Wiecek, J. Phys. A 37, 6521 (2004).
- [41] N. Demni, T. Hamdi arXiv:2002.04585; C.-W. Ho and P. Zhong arXiv:1908.08150.
- [42] E. Gudowska-Nowak, R.A. Janik, M.A. Nowak and J. Jurkiewicz, Nucl. Phys. B 670, 479 (2003).
- [43] R. Lohmayer, H. Neuberger, and T. Wettig, J. High Energy Physics 11, 053 (2008).
- [44] P. Biane, J. Funct. Anal. 144, 232 (1997).
- [45] B.K. Driver, B.C. Hall and T. Kemp, arXiv:1903.11015, submitted to Adv. Math.
- [46] B. C. Hall, arXiv:1910.09274, submitted to Springer Volume: Harmonic Analysis and Applications.
- [47] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Springer (1989).
- [48] W. Tarnowski et al., AISTATS 2019, 2221 (2019).
- [49] Harish-Chandra, American Journal of Mathematics 79, 87-120 (1957).
- [50] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, J. Math. Phys. 21, 411 (1980).
- [51] J. Bun, J.P. Bouchaud, S.N. Majumdar and M. Potters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 070201 (2014).
- [52] A. Matytsin, Nucl.Phys. B 411, 805 (1994).
- [53] P.J. Forrester and J. Grella, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 49, 085203 (2016).

Supplementary material: Eikonal formulation of large dynamical random matrix models

DYNAMICAL SETUP

A dynamical matrix Y_t is constructed by an addition of n random matrices:

$$Y_t = X_0 + X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + \dots + X_n, \quad (1)$$

where matrices $X_{i>0}$ are independent and mutually free (in the sense of free-probability [1]). We denote $t = n\delta t$ where δt is the variance of each matrix and take limits $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\delta t \rightarrow 0$ while keeping t fixed. First matrix X_0 serves as the initial condition.

HERMITIAN HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATION

We look at case when matrices X_i are Hermitian (or, more generally, their eigenvalues occupy one-dimensional manifolds). In what follows we work in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. To derive the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we introduce several well-known results of free probability.

Free probability

The one-point spectral density $\rho(\lambda) = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\lambda - \lambda_i) \right\rangle$ is uniquely given by its Stieltjes (Cauchy) transform, also known in physics literature as Green's function $G(z) = \int \rho(\lambda)(z - \lambda)^{-1} d\lambda = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(z - X)^{-1} \right\rangle$, which encodes all its moments. One recovers the spectral density by the Sochocki-Plemelj formula:

$$\rho(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{Im} G(\lambda + i\epsilon). \quad (2)$$

Free probability offers several operational tools to deal with spectra of asymptotically large matrices. In particular, with the use of freeness (a counterpart of independence in non-commuting random variables), one is able to find an eigenvalue density of a sum of two matrices by knowing their separate densities.

One introduces a functional inverse of the Green's function, called Blue's function, satisfying

$$B(G(z)) = z, \quad G(B(z)) = z, \quad (3)$$

which is an intermediate step to calculate the R -transform $R(z) = B(z) - 1/z$. Remarkably, R -transform is additive for two mutually free random variables X and Y , that is [1]

$$R_{X+Y}(z) = R_X(z) + R_Y(z). \quad (4)$$

HJ equation

By the additivity property of R -transform (4), we rewrite the dynamics (1) as follows:

$$R_{Y_t}(z, t) = R_{X_0}(z) + tR_X(z). \quad (5)$$

where $R_{Y_t}(z, t)$ is the R -transform of the matrix and it depends on time by construction. By adding $1/z$ to both sides of the equation we arrive at

$$B(z, t) = B_{X_0}(z) + tR_X(z). \quad (6)$$

Hence, we immediately obtain

$$\partial_t B(z, t) = R_X(z). \quad (7)$$

Since the matrix evolves in time, both Green's and Blue's functions depend on time, but the relation (3) is satisfied at *any* time:

$$B_{Y_t}(G_{Y_t}(z, t), t) = z. \quad (8)$$

From now on we skip the subscripts $B_{Y_t} \rightarrow B, G_{Y_t} \rightarrow G$. Differentiating the above definition with respect to t , we get

$$\partial_t B(z, t)|_{z=G} + \left. \frac{\partial B(z, t)}{\partial z} \right|_{z=G} \partial_t G(z, t) = 0 \quad (9)$$

On the other hand, we differentiate (8) wrt. variable z :

$$\left. \frac{\partial B(z, t)}{\partial z} \right|_{z=G} \frac{\partial G(z, t)}{\partial z} = 1. \quad (10)$$

We first substitute $\left. \frac{\partial B(z, t)}{\partial z} \right|_{z=G}$ to (9):

$$\partial_t B(z, t)|_{z=G} + \left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \right)^{-1} \partial_t G(z, t) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Knowing the time derivative of the Blue's function (7), we finally arrive at

$$\partial_t G(z, t) + R_X(G) \partial_z G(z, t) = 0. \quad (12)$$

which is the Voiculescu equation. We proceed to formally solve the equation by the method of characteristics. The result are two equations:

$$\partial_t z = R_X(G), \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_t G = 0, \quad (14)$$

which we interpret as Hamilton equations $\dot{q} = \partial_p H, \dot{p} = -\partial_q H$ where pair (z, G) becomes the coordinate-momentum pair (q, p) . Then the Hamiltonian is specified by $\partial_G H = R_X(G), \partial_z H = 0$ which gives $H(G, z) = \int_0^G dz R_X(z)$. Lower integration limit is a convention introduced to fix a constant term in the Hamiltonian. Knowing the Hamiltonian, we write down the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equation for Hamilton's principal function S :

$$\partial_t S = -H(\partial_z S, z). \quad (15)$$

Taking the derivative wrt. z results in the Voiculescu equation (12) with identification $\partial_z S = G$. Hence, the principal function S is the electrostatic potential

$$\phi(z, t) = \frac{1}{N} \langle \text{Tr} \ln(z - Y_t) \rangle \quad (16)$$

as $\partial_z \phi = G$. As a result, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the electrostatic potential reads

$$\partial_t \phi + H(p = \partial_z \phi, z) = 0. \quad (17)$$

NON-HERMITIAN HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATION

We turn to dynamics where the increment matrix X_i is non-Hermitian. We first describe free probability theory in this case and then derive the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

Free probability

Eigenvalues of diagonalizable (not necessarily normal) random matrices form a subset of the complex plane. In order to work with such objects we use the following representation of the Dirac delta [2-5]:

$$\delta^{(2)}(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\epsilon^2}{(z\bar{z} + \epsilon^2)^2}. \quad (18)$$

In the spirit of the electrostatic analogy, one introduces the potential:

$$\Phi(z, w, t) = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \ln \left[(z - Y_t)(\bar{z} - Y_t^\dagger) + |w|^2 \right] \right\rangle. \quad (19)$$

The limiting spectral density can be recovered from the Poisson law:

$$\rho(z) = \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \partial_{z\bar{z}} \Phi(z, w, t). \quad (20)$$

Using known identity $\text{Tr} \ln = \ln \det$, the determinant in (19) can be rewritten in block form:

$$\Phi(z, w, t) = \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \ln \det(\mathbb{Q} - \mathbb{X}) \right\rangle, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\mathbb{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} z & -\bar{w} \\ w & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbb{X} = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & X^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

\mathbb{Q} is a 2×2 matrix representation of a Hamilton quaternion. In direct analogy to Hermitian matrices, one constructs the Green's function of a quaternion argument which is now a 2×2 matrix:

$$\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_z \Phi & \partial_w \Phi \\ -\partial_{\bar{w}} \Phi & \partial_{\bar{z}} \Phi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Quaternionic Green's function inverse is the non-Hermitian analog of the Blue's function $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q})) = \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{Q}))$. This directly leads to the quaternionic \mathbb{R} -transform $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{Q}) - \mathbb{Q}^{-1}$. As previously, it is additive under addition of free non-Hermitian matrices [6]:

$$\mathbb{R}_{X+Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{R}_X(\mathbb{Q}) + \mathbb{R}_Y(\mathbb{Q}). \quad (24)$$

HJ equation

We use indices $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ to specify matrix elements. Freeness of increments in the dynamics (1) allows us to write a non-Hermitian counterpart of (6) where the \mathbb{R} -transform now is defined in the quaternionic space

$$\mathbb{B}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbb{Q}, t) = \mathbb{B}_{\alpha\beta}^0(\mathbb{Q}) + t \mathbb{R}_{\alpha\beta}^X(\mathbb{Q}) \quad (25)$$

where $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{B}^{Y_t}$ is the Blue's function for the matrix Y_t while \mathbb{R}^X is the \mathbb{R} -transform of the increment matrix X with standard variance. We again calculate the time derivative

$$\partial_t \mathbb{B}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbb{Q}, t) = \mathbb{R}_{\alpha\beta}^X(\mathbb{Q}). \quad (26)$$

It is convenient to treat quaternionic objects not as 2×2 matrices but as column vectors with 4 components in, let us say, lexicographic order: $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = (\mathbb{Q}_{11}, \mathbb{Q}_{12}, \mathbb{Q}_{21}, \mathbb{Q}_{22})^T$. Now $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Such vector representation makes derivation less convoluted. The quaternionic Blue's $\mathbb{B}_\alpha(\mathbb{Q}, t)$ and Green's $\mathbb{G}_\alpha(\mathbb{Q}, t)$ functions are, by definition, related as:

$$\mathbb{B}_\alpha(\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{Q}, t), t) = \mathbb{Q}_\alpha. \quad (27)$$

As previously, we differentiate above definition wrt. time to get

$$\partial_t \mathbb{B}_\alpha(\mathbb{Q}, t) \Big|_{\mathbb{Q}=\mathbb{G}} + \sum_{\beta=1}^4 \frac{\partial \mathbb{B}_\alpha(\mathbb{Q}, t)}{\partial \mathbb{Q}_\beta} \Big|_{\mathbb{Q}=\mathbb{G}} \frac{\partial \mathbb{G}_\beta(\mathbb{Q}, t)}{\partial t} = 0, \quad (28)$$

and with respect to the quaternionic element \mathbb{Q}_β :

$$\sum_{\beta=1}^4 \frac{\partial \mathbb{B}_\alpha(\mathbb{Q}, t)}{\partial \mathbb{Q}_\beta} \Big|_{\mathbb{Q}=\mathbb{G}} \frac{\partial \mathbb{G}_\beta(\mathbb{Q}, t)}{\partial \mathbb{Q}_\gamma} = \delta_{\alpha\gamma}. \quad (29)$$

We see that the above matrices of derivatives are mutual inverses. Multiplying (28) on the left by $\partial\mathbb{G}_\gamma/\partial\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$, summing over repeated indices and substituting the expression (26) we are led to

$$\partial_t\mathbb{G}_\alpha + \sum_{\beta=1}^4 \mathbb{R}_\beta^X(\mathbb{G}) \frac{\partial\mathbb{G}_\alpha}{\partial\mathbb{Q}_\beta} = 0. \quad (30)$$

Finally, we restore the quaternionic structure to arrive at generalized Voiculescu-type equation:

$$\partial_t\mathbb{G}_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^2 \mathbb{R}_{\mu\nu}^X(\mathbb{G}) \frac{\partial\mathbb{G}_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial\mathbb{Q}_{\mu\nu}} = 0. \quad (31)$$

As previously, equation is amenable to method of characteristics which result in first order ODEs:

$$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_{\mu\nu} = \mathbb{R}_{\mu\nu}^X(\mathbb{G}), \quad (32)$$

$$\dot{\mathbb{G}}_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (33)$$

where $\mu, \nu = 1, 2$. Above equations are again in Hamilton form, where the pair (\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{G}) is identified with a set of coordinate-momentum pairs $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}^T)$. Transposition is indispensable to align the Green's function (23) as a derivative of potential wrt. quaternion \mathbb{Q} . As a consequence, first equation reads $\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_{\mu\nu} = \mathbb{R}_{\nu\mu}^X(\mathbb{P})$ following from $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{P}^T) = \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{P})^T$. Hamiltonian $H(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q})$ is found from equations $\partial_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu\mu}} H = \mathbb{R}_{\mu\nu}^X(\mathbb{P})$ and $\partial_{\mathbb{Q}_{\mu\nu}} H = 0$. We integrate out each one separately so the result is a sum of integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) &= \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} d\mathbb{Q}_{11} \mathbb{R}_{11}^X(\mathbb{Q}) + \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} d\mathbb{Q}_{12} \mathbb{R}_{21}^X(\mathbb{Q}) + \\ &+ \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} d\mathbb{Q}_{21} \mathbb{R}_{12}^X(\mathbb{Q}) + \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} d\mathbb{Q}_{22} \mathbb{R}_{22}^X(\mathbb{Q}), \end{aligned}$$

where the lower limit is again introduced to fix an additive constant in the Hamiltonian. In what follows we introduce a succinct notation $H(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} \text{Tr} [\mathbb{R}^X(\mathbb{Q})d\mathbb{Q}]$. Newfound Hamiltonian admits the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation for Hamilton's principal function

$$\partial_t S + H(\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} S)^T, \mathbb{Q}) = 0. \quad (34)$$

Lastly we take the derivative $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ so that $(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} H(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \sum_{ij} \mathbb{R}^X(\mathbb{P})_{ij} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} \mathbb{P}_{ji}$ and

$$\partial_t (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} S + \sum_{ij} \mathbb{R}^X(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} S^T)_{ij} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{ij} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} S = 0. \quad (35)$$

We use again $\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{P}^T) = \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{P})^T$ so that

$$\partial_t (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} S + \sum_{ij} \mathbb{R}^X(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} S)_{ji} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{ij} (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{kl} S = 0. \quad (36)$$

Since $(\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}})_{ij} = \partial_{\mathbb{Q}_{ji}}$, we recreate the Voiculescu-type equation (31) when the principal function S is identified with electrostatic potential Φ so that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} S = \mathbb{G}$. As a result, we have shown that Hamilton-Jacobi equation:

$$\partial_t \Phi + H(\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi)^T, \mathbb{Q}) = 0 \quad (37)$$

matches eq. (31). Hamilton equations are readily solved $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0(\mathbb{Q} - t\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{P})^T)$ with initial condition $\mathbb{P}_0 = \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi^T$. Coordinates \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P} comprise a set of action-angle variables casting the problem as fully integrable and stable wrt. small perturbations according to the seminal KAM theorem [13].

EXAMPLES OF HAMILTONIANS

We describe several examples of Hamiltonians.

Wishart ensemble

Wishart [7] process is described by the Hamilton-Jacobi equations with Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{Wishart}}(p, z) = (1 - r)p + rzp^2,$$

where parameter r is the rectangularity parameter.

Jacobi ensemble

Jacobi [8] process is described by the Hamilton-Jacobi equations with Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{Jacobi}} = \lambda\theta z(1 - z)p^2 + p[\theta(1 - \lambda) - (1 - 2\lambda\theta)z],$$

where parameters θ, λ are defined in [8].

R-diagonal matrices

If we consider a random complex number, its probability distribution function can take in general a complicated form. One can consider a simplified pdfs which are effectively one-dimensional. One of the examples are the isotropic random variables, defined as follows. Any complex number can be written in a polar form $z = re^{i\varphi}$. A complex random variable is said to be isotropic if its pdf depends only on r . In such a case the pdf for a phase φ is uniform on a unit circle, yet r and φ are independent.

In the analogy to isotropic complex random variables one considers a class of non-Hermitian random matrices which we call isotropic. Any matrix X possesses a polar decomposition $X = HU$, where H is Hermitian positive definite and U is unitary. U plays a role of the 'phase' of a matrix, therefore if X was to be isotropic, U has to be distributed uniformly on $U(N)$ group. Such a probability distribution function exists and is called the Haar measure. Moreover, U and H have to be mutually free. In the literature such matrices belong to the bi-unitary ensembles, because the probability density for their elements is invariant under multiplication by two independent unitary matrices from both sides. Mathematically, $P(X) = P(UXV)$ for $U, V \in U(N)$.

In this case the spectral properties of the isotropic matrix are completely determined by the spectral distribution of the 'squared modulus' XX^\dagger . The precise relation is given by the Haagerup-Larsen theorem [9]. Recently this theorem was extended to describe also the eigenvector correlation function [10].

The only non-vanishing cumulants are of the form $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(XX^\dagger)^k$. Let us define a generating function for all cumulant of such matrices

$$A(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k x^{k-1}, \quad (38)$$

which is also known under the name of generating sequence. The quaternionic \mathbb{R} -transform of such matrices assumes a remarkably simple form [11]

$$\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q}) = A(-|w|^2) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\bar{w} \\ w & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

By explicit calculation we find corresponding Hamiltonian as

$$H_{\text{R-diag}} = \int_0^{\mathbb{P}} \text{Tr}(\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Q})d\mathbb{Q}) = \int_0^{-|p_w|^2} A(x)dx. \quad (40)$$

ASYMPTOTICS OF HCIZ INTEGRAL

We study the asymptotics of the celebrated HCIZ integral:

$$I_{\text{HCIZ}} = \int dU e^{\frac{\beta}{2} N \text{Tr} U A U^\dagger B}, \quad (41)$$

for fixed matrices A, B and parameter β encoding whether integral is over unitary $\beta = 2$ or orthogonal matrices $\beta = 1$.

Following [12], the main asymptotic contribution in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit reads

$$I_{\text{HCIZ}} \sim e^{-\frac{\beta}{2} N^2 S}, \quad (42)$$

with Euler-type hydrodynamic action

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dt \int dx \rho \left[\mu^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{3} \rho^2 \right], \quad (43)$$

with "fluid" density ρ and momentum profile μ . Action is evaluated on fluid trajectory such that initial $\rho(x, t = 0) = \rho_A(x)$ and final densities $\rho(x, t = 1) = \rho_B(x)$ are specified by matrices A and B . Solution can be found by solving Euler equations:

$$\partial_t \mu + \mu \partial_x \mu = \frac{\pi^2}{2} \partial_x (\rho^2), \quad (44)$$

$$\partial_t \rho + \partial_x (\rho \mu) = 0. \quad (45)$$

For complex solution $h = \mu + i\pi\rho$ we find a Burgers' equation:

$$\partial_t h + h \partial_x h = 0. \quad (46)$$

We look for solutions h obeying boundary conditions $\text{Im } h(t = 0) = \pi\rho_A$ and $\text{Im } h(t = 1) = \pi\rho_B$.

Our approach of finding proper solutions h has two parts – first find a proper density ρ and then match a velocity function μ .

Matrix Brownian bridge

Finding a proper density consists of constructing matrix dynamics Y_t starting at $Y_0 = A$ and reaching matrix $Y_1 = B$. We start from Brownian bridge dynamics for single variable [14] for which Smoluchowski-Fokker-Planck equation starting at $x_0, t = 0$ and ending in $x = x_f, t = t_f$ reads:

$$\partial_t P(x, t) = D \partial_x [\partial_x P - 2 \partial_x \ln Q(x, t) P],$$

where Q is a solution to inverse SFP equation $\partial_t Q = -D \partial_{xx} P$ with $x = x_f$ for $t = t_f$ and reads $Q(x, t) = (4\pi D(t_f - t))^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{(x_f - x)^2}{4D(t_f - t)}}$. Therefore, SFP equation for the Brownian bridge reads

$$\partial_t P = D \partial_{xx} P - \partial_x \left(\frac{x_f - x}{t_f - t} P \right).$$

We decompose Hermitian matrix $Y_{kl} = x_{kl} + iy_{kl}$ for $k \neq l$, $Y_{kk} = x_{kk}$ and from above equation form a set of SFP formulas for each matrix element:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t P(x_{ii}, t) &= \frac{1}{2N} \partial_{x_{ii}}^2 P(x_{ii}, t) - \partial_{x_{ii}} \left(\frac{x_{ii}^f - x_{ii}}{t_f - t} P(x_{ii}, t) \right), \\ \partial_t P(v_{ij}, t) &= \frac{1}{4N} \partial_{v_{ij}}^2 P(v_{ij}, t) - \partial_{v_{ij}} \left(\frac{v_{ij}^f - v_{ij}}{t_f - t} P(v_{ij}, t) \right), \quad i \neq j \end{aligned}$$

where $v = x, y$ and v^f denote final matrix elements. Joint PDF $\mathcal{P}(Y, t) = \prod_i P(x_{ii}, t) \prod_{i < j} P(x_{ij}, t) P(y_{ij}, t)$ satisfies a joint SFP equation $\partial_t \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{A} \mathcal{P}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{2N} \partial_{x_{kk}}^2 P(x_{kk}, t) - \partial_{x_{kk}} \frac{x_{kk}^f - x_{kk}}{t_f - t} \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{4N} \sum_{i < j} \left(\partial_{x_{ij}}^2 + \partial_{y_{ij}}^2 \right) - \sum_{i < j} \left(\partial_{x_{ij}} \frac{x_{ij}^f - x_{ij}}{t_f - t} + \partial_{y_{ij}} \frac{y_{ij}^f - y_{ij}}{t_f - t} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Dynamics of the characteristic polynomial

We define a deformed characteristic polynomial

$$\hat{U}(z, \alpha, t) = \langle \det(z - Y_t + \alpha B) \rangle. \quad (47)$$

Using a standard approach of [15, 16] we derive an exact dynamical equation for \hat{U} :

$$\partial_t \hat{U} = \frac{1}{t_f - t} \left[z \partial_z \hat{U} + (\alpha - 1) \partial_\alpha \hat{U} - N \hat{U} \right] - \frac{1}{2N} \partial_{zz} \hat{U}. \quad (48)$$

We transform it through half of the Cole-Hopf transform $\hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{N} \ln \hat{U}$ and take the large N limit

$$\partial_t \hat{\phi} = -\frac{1}{2} (\partial_z \hat{\phi})^2 - \frac{1}{t_f - t} \left[1 - z \partial_z \hat{\phi} - (\alpha - 1) \partial_\alpha \hat{\phi} \right]. \quad (49)$$

By the self-averaging property of the large N limit, $\ln \hat{U} = \ln \langle \det(\dots) \rangle \sim \langle \ln \det(\dots) \rangle$, thus $\hat{\phi}$ becomes an effective potential $\hat{\phi}(z, \alpha, t) = \frac{1}{N} \langle \ln \det(z - Y_t + \alpha B) \rangle$. Equation (49) is in the Hamilton-Jacobi form from which we read down the Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{bridge}} = \frac{1}{2} p^2 + \frac{1}{t_f - t} [1 - zp - (\alpha - 1)p_\alpha], \quad (50)$$

where, besides the $z, p = \partial_z \hat{\phi}$ pair, an auxiliary coordinate α and momentum $p_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \hat{\phi}$ is present. Hamilton equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= p - \frac{z}{t_f - t}, & \dot{\alpha} &= -\frac{\alpha - 1}{t_f - t}, \\ \dot{p} &= \frac{p}{t_f - t}, & \dot{p}_\alpha &= \frac{p_\alpha}{t_f - t}. \end{aligned}$$

To continue, we first set $t_f - t = e^{-\tau}$ so that $(t_f - t) \frac{d}{dt} = \frac{d}{d\tau}$ and $t = 0$ corresponds to $\tau = -\ln t_f$ while $t = t_f$ is transformed to $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. Hamilton equations are then

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= e^{-\tau} p - z, & \dot{\alpha} &= 1 - \alpha, \\ \dot{p} &= p, & \dot{p}_\alpha &= p_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

with the overdot denoting now $d/d\tau$. In the newly introduced time variable, the latter two equations for momenta are readily solved:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= t_f e^\tau p_0 = \frac{t_f}{t_f - t} p_0, \\ p_\alpha &= t_f e^\tau p_{\alpha,0} = \frac{t_f}{t_f - t} p_{\alpha,0}. \end{aligned}$$

where $p_0 = p(\tau = -\ln t_f) = p(t = 0)$, $p_{\alpha,0} = p_\alpha(\tau = -\ln t_f) = p_\alpha(t = 0)$. We plug above solutions to the remaining Hamilton equations for z, α :

$$\frac{dz}{t_f p_0 - z} = d\tau, \quad \frac{d\alpha}{1 - \alpha} = d\tau, \quad (51)$$

and find the remaining solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} z &= p_0(t_f - e^{-\tau}) + \frac{z_0}{t_f} e^{-\tau} = p_0 t + z_0 \frac{t_f - t}{t_f}, \\ \alpha &= 1 - \frac{1}{t_f} e^{-\tau} + \frac{\alpha_0}{t_f} e^{-\tau} = \frac{t}{t_f} + \alpha_0 \frac{t_f - t}{t_f}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we introduce an initial condition $p_0(z_0, \alpha_0) = \left[\partial_z \hat{\phi} \right]_{\alpha=\alpha_0, z=z_0} = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{z_0 - A + \alpha_0 B}$ which couples together α_0, p_0 and z_0 . We invert $p_0 = p(t_f - t)/t_f$ and calculate $\alpha_0 = 1 + (\alpha - 1)t_f/(t_f - t)$, $z_0 = z t_f/(t_f - t) - p t$ so that the solution is given by

$$p = t_f e^\tau p_0(z_0 = z t_f/(t_f - t) - p t, \alpha_0 = 1 + (\alpha - 1)t_f/(t_f - t)). \quad (52)$$

or with explicitly plugged initial condition

$$p = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{z - p \frac{t(t_f - t)}{t_f} - \frac{t_f - t}{t_f} A + \left(\alpha - \frac{t}{t_f} \right) B}. \quad (53)$$

In what follows we set $t_f = 1, \alpha = 0$ and reintroduce Green's function $G = p$. Define bridge function $G_{\text{Br}}(z, t) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{z - (1-t)A - tB}$ and the resolvent is implicitly given by:

$$G = G_{\text{Br}}(z - t(1-t)G, t). \quad (54)$$

By construction the limits $t \rightarrow 0, 1$ recreate correct limiting Green's functions $G(z, t = 0) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(z - A)^{-1}$ and $G(z, t = 1) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(z - B)^{-1}$. At the same time, one can check explicitly that G is itself not the sought solution to Burgers' equation (46). This discrepancy can be understood by decomposing G into real and imaginary parts $G = i\pi\rho + \mathcal{H}\rho$ related by the Hilbert transform and ultimately dependent on single function ρ . On the other hand, h a priori consists of two independent functions ρ, μ . We therefore assume that the densities are calculated correctly ρ while the velocity profile needs further specification. Hence, in the second step we plug the density found from (54) into Euler equation (44) and calculate a matching velocity profile μ . Once both ρ and μ are identified, we evaluate the corresponding action (43) and find the asymptotics of the HCIZ integral.

Example. As a demonstration of the method we calculate the simplest example of vanishing matrices $A = B = 0$. Boundary resolvent reads $G_{\text{Br}}(z_0) = 1/z_0$ and the density is simply a semicircle law $\rho_{\text{sem}}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t(1-t)} \sqrt{4t(1-t) - x^2}$ with appropriately rescaled size vanishing at both $t = 0, 1$. Plugging it into (44) results in:

$$\partial_t \mu + \mu \partial_x \mu = -\frac{x}{4t^2(1-t)^2}, \quad (55)$$

since $\frac{\pi^2}{2} \partial_x (\rho_{\text{sem}}^2) = -\frac{x}{4t^2(1-t)^2}$. We solve (55) using method of characteristics

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\beta} \mu(\alpha, \beta) &= -\frac{x}{4t^2(1-t)^2}, \\ \frac{d}{d\beta} x(\alpha, \beta) &= \mu, \\ \frac{d}{d\beta} t(\alpha, \beta) &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

with initial conditions $t(\alpha, 0) = 1/2, x(\alpha, 0) = \alpha$ and $v(\alpha, 0) = 0$. We readily find $t = \beta + 1/2$, plug into the remaining equations and combine them in matrix form

$$\frac{d}{d\beta} \begin{pmatrix} \mu \\ x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2(1-4\beta^2)^2} \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu \\ x \end{pmatrix}. \quad (56)$$

Solution is found by diagonalization:

$$\mu(x, t) = \frac{2t - 1}{2t(1-t)} x. \quad (57)$$

This example recreates the results of [17],

[1] D.V. Voiculescu, K.J. Dykema and A. Nica. *Free random variables* American Mathematical Soc., (1992).

- [2] H.-J. Sommers, A. Crisanti, H. Sompolinsky and Y. Stein Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1895 (1988).
- [3] R.A. Janik, M.A. Nowak, G. Papp and I. Zahed Nucl. Phys. B 501, 603 (1997).
- [4] J. Feinberg and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. B 504 (3), 579 (1997)
- [5] J.T. Chalker and Z. Jane Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1797 (1997).
- [6] A. Jarosz and M.A. Nowak J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39, 10107 (2006).
- [7] J.-P. Blaizot, M.A. Nowak and P. Warchoł, Phys. Rev. E 87, 052134 (2013).
- [8] N. Demni, J. Theor. Prob. 21, 118 (2008).
- [9] U. Haagerup and F. Larsen J. Funct. Anal. 176, 331 (2000)
- [10] S. Belinschi, M.A. Nowak, R. Speicher and W. Tarnowski J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 50, 105204 (2017).
- [11] M.A. Nowak and W. Tarnowski, Phys. Rev. E 96, 042149 (2017).
- [12] A. Matytsin, Nucl.Phys. B 411, 805 (1994).
- [13] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Springer (1989).
- [14] S. N. Majumdar and H. Orland, J. Stat. Mech. P06039 (2015).
- [15] J. P. Blaizot, J. Grela, M. A. Nowak, W. Tarnowski and P. Warchoł, J. Stat. Mech. 5, 054037 (2016).
- [16] J. Grela, J. Phys. A 49, 015201 (2015).
- [17] J. Bun, J.P. Bouchaud, S.N. Majumdar and M. Potters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 070201 (2014).