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The spectral model of particle physics

The discovery of the Higgs particle at CERN in Geneva in 2012 formed the crown on the so-called Standard Model of particle physics. Despite its enormous phenomenological success, much of the underlying mathematics remains still to be understood. Walter van Suijlekom, Assistant Professor in mathematical physics at IMAPP, here lifts the curtain of what noncommutative geometry can already say about the Standard Model, offering an intriguing perspective of what space looks like at scales analysed by particle accelerators. Van Suijlekom’s book *Noncommutative Geometry and Particle Physics* has just appeared with Springer and gives an introduction to the subject. In this article, he starts his exposition with the famous mathematical question “Can one hear the shape of a drum?”, and then moves to the noncommutative world, using not much more but matrix multiplication.

This article was written on the occasion of the workshop ‘Noncommutative Geometry and Particle Physics’, organized at the Lorentz Center in Leiden in October 2013. See www.noncommutativegeometry.nl for more information on this workshop, and on the field in general.

Spectral geometry

Noncommutative geometry [11] can be considered as a generalization of spectral geometry to the quantum world. So, let us start with a brief tour through spectral geometry. One deals with the question how the geometric structure of a Riemannian manifold $M$ — that is, a topological space that looks locally like Euclidean space — determines the spectrum of the Laplacian on $M$ (cf. [10]). The inverse problem, how the manifold $M$ is determined by the spectrum of the Laplacian leads to the famous question “Can one hear the shape of a drum?”, as posed by Mark Kac in 1966 [16]. The answer to this question is “no”, as is well known by now, e.g. through the construction of two isospectral

Figure 1 Two isospectral domains in $\mathbb{R}^2$ whose Laplacians have the same spectrum [14].
polygons in $\mathbb{R}^2$ (two ‘drums’) (cf. Figure 1). Here the
metaphoric sound of a Riemannian manifold is governed by the
Helmholtz equation satisfied by the amplitude $\psi$ of a wave on $M$,
\[
\Delta_M \psi = k^2 \psi,
\]
where $\Delta_M$ is the Laplacian and $k$ is the wave number. This wave
number can thus essentially be found by taking the ‘square-root’ of the
Laplacian. More precisely, one searches for an operator that squares
to $\Delta_M$ and analyses its spectrum of eigenvalues. It was Paul Dirac
who found such a differential operator. Even though it does not always
exist, it does so on Riemannian spin manifolds to which we will restrict.

Let us consider some examples of Dirac operators for low-dimensional
polygons.

**Dirac operators on the circle, 2-torus and 4-torus**

We parametrize the circle $S^1$ by an angle $t \in [0, 2\pi)$. The Dirac operator
on the circle then reads
\[
D_{S^1} = -i \frac{d}{dt}.
\]
The square $(D_{S^1})^2 = -\frac{d^2}{dt^2}$ is indeed the Laplacian on the circle.
Note that the eigenfunctions of $D_{S^1}$ are the complex exponential
functions
\[
e^{int} = \cos nt + i \sin nt,
\]
for any integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, with eigenvalue $n$. Hence, the spectrum of $D_{S^1}$
is given by the set of integers $\mathbb{Z}$ and we arrive at the usual circular
harmonics given by Fourier series.

Next, consider the two-dimensional torus $T^2$. It can be parametrized
by two angles $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 2\pi)$. The Laplacian then reads
\[
\Delta_{T^2} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_2^2}.
\]
At first sight it seems difficult to construct a differential operator that
squares to $\Delta_{T^2}$. In fact, squaring any linear combination of the two
partial derivatives results in cross-terms:
\[
\left( a \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + b \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \right)^2 = a^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2} + 2ab \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1 \partial t_2} + b^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_2^2}.
\]

**Figure 2** Wave function on $T^2$ corresponding to $n_1 = 2, n_2 = 4$; grey levels correspond to the
amplitude $\psi$ of the wave.

For any two complex numbers $a$ and $b$. Of course, the demands $a^2 = b^2 = -1$ and $ab = 0$
cannot hold simultaneously.

This puzzle was solved by Dirac, who considered the possibility that
$a$ and $b$ be complex matrices. Namely, if
\[
a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]
then with $i^2 = -1$ we do have $a^2 = b^2 = -1$ and $ab + ba = 0$, as one
can readily check.

Hence the Dirac operator on the torus is
\[
D_{T^2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + i \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \\ -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \end{pmatrix},
\]
which indeed satisfies $(D_{T^2})^2 = \Delta_{T^2}$. Since the eigenvalues of the
Laplacian on the torus are given by $n_1^2 + n_2^2$ for integers $n_1$ and $n_2$, it
follows that the spectrum of the Dirac operator $D_{T^2}$ is
\[
\left\{ \frac{n_1^2 + n_2^2}{4} : n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \right\},
\]
and is depicted in Figure 3. A typical eigenfunction of the Dirac operator
on the torus is given in Figure 2.

Let us jump to four dimensions — of direct relevance to physics — and
consider as a final example the Dirac operator on the 4-torus $T^4$.
We now have four angles $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$, and the Laplacian is
\[
\Delta_{T^4} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_1^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_2^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_3^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_4^2}.
\]

The same problem as above arises in the search for a differential op-
erator that squares to $\Delta_{T^4}$. Again, allowing for matrices solves the
problem, but we need more as there are now four matrices that must
square to $-1$ and mutually multiply to $0$. Here, there is a beautiful
appearance of Hamilton’s *quaternions*. Recall that besides the complex
$i$, the field of quaternions contains elements $j$ and $k$ that satisfy
\[
i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = ijk = -1.
\]
From this one can derive that $ij = -ji$, $ik = -ki$, et cetera. The Dirac
counting function, to wit

\[ N(f) = \sum \frac{1}{e^{\pi^2 n^2} + k^2}, \]

where \( f \) is a smooth version of a cutoff function, \( \operatorname{Tr} \) is the trace, and the sum on the right-hand side is over all eigenvalues of \( D_M \).

For illustrational purposes, we will restrict in this article to the exponential cut-off function, that is to say, a Gaussian function (cf. Figure 5):

\[ f(x) = e^{-x^2}. \]

The main reason for doing so is that \( \operatorname{Tr} e^{-D_M^2/\Lambda^2} \) is the so-called heat kernel for the Laplacian \( D_M \), whose asymptotics as \( \Lambda \to \infty \) is well-known [2]. As a matter of fact, asymptotically we have

\[ \operatorname{Tr} e^{-D_M^2/\Lambda^2} \sim \frac{\operatorname{Vol}(M) \Lambda^n}{(4\pi)^{n/2}}, \]

in concordance with Weyl's estimate above.

As should be clear by now, the spectrum of \( D_M \) does not capture all of the geometry of \( M \). This can be improved by considering besides \( D_M \) also the space of smooth complex-valued functions on \( M \), denoted by \( C^\infty(M) \). For instance, the distance function on \( M \) can be written as

\[ d(p,q) = \sup_{f \in C^\infty(M)} \{|f(p) - f(q)| : \text{gradient } f \leq 1\}, \]

where the gradient of \( f \) can be controlled with the commutator \( [D_M, f] = D_M f - f D_M \). For instance, on the circle we have \([D_\mathbb{T}^1, f] = -i f' \). The translation of distances between points via functions on that space is illustrated in Figure 6.

**Finite noncommutative spaces**

Let us consider finite spaces \( F \), equipped with the discrete topology. That is, consider the space \( F \) consisting of \( N \) points:

\[ 1 \cdot 2 \cdot \cdots \cdot N \cdot \]

The space \( C^\infty(F) \) of smooth functions on such a finite space is simply given by \( \mathbb{C}^N \): one complex number for each of the function values at the points of \( F \). An element \( f \in C^\infty(F) \) can be conveniently written as a diagonal matrix:
Figure 6: The distance between the points \( x \) and \( y \) can be translated to the distance between \( f(x) \) and \( f(y) \) for functions with gradient equal to 1.

\[
f \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} f(1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & f(2) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & f(N) \end{pmatrix},
\]

and the matrix product corresponds to the pointwise product of functions: \( f \circ g = f(p)g(p) \) for two functions \( f, g \) at any point \( p \) in \( F \).

For such finite space there is an analogue of a Dirac operator, which in this finite case is an arbitrary hermitian matrix \( D_F \). As before, a distance function on \( F \) can be defined as

\[
d(p, q) = \sup_{f \in C(\mathbb{C})} \{ |f(p) - f(q)| : \|D_F f\| \leq 1 \},
\]

where the ‘gradient’ \( \|D_F f\| \) is defined as the square root of the largest eigenvalue of the matrix \( \{D_F f\}^* \{D_F f\} \). In fact, \( d(p, q) \) is a generalized distance function on \( F \) as it can take the value \( \infty \).

**Example 1.** Consider the space \( F \) consisting of two points:

\[
F = \{1, 2\}
\]

Then, smooth functions are diagonal 2 \( \times \) 2-matrices, so that

\[
C^\infty(F) := \{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix} \mid \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} \}
\]

where \( \lambda_1 \) is the function value at point 1, and \( \lambda_2 \) at point 2.

We can take as a ‘finite Dirac operator’ the hermitian matrix

\[
D_F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tau \\ c & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]

for some constant \( c \in \mathbb{C} \). The distance formula 4 then becomes

\[
d(p, q) = \begin{cases} |c|^{-1}, & p \neq q, \\ 0, & p = q. \end{cases}
\]

We conclude that the distance between 1 and 2 in \( F \) is dictated by the constant \( c \) that defines \( D_F \).

The geometry of \( F \) gets much more interesting if we allow for a non-commutative structure at each point of \( F \). That is, instead of diagonal matrices, we consider block diagonal matrices

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_N \end{pmatrix},
\]

where the \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_N \) are square matrices of size \( n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_N \), respectively, associated to the \( N \) points of \( F \). Hence we will consider the vector space

\[
V_F := \mathbb{M}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathbb{M}_{n_2}(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{M}_{n_N}(\mathbb{C}),
\]

where \( \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C}) \) stands for the space of \( n \times n \)-matrices with complex entries.

We will consider the vector space \( V_F \) of such block diagonal matrices as a replacement for functions on \( F \). Since the matrix product is not commutative, we have enriched the perhaps not-so-interesting finite space \( F \) with a noncommutative structure.

As far as the finite Dirac operator is concerned, already in the commutative case this operator was given as a matrix, and its definition continues to make sense when considering block diagonal matrices in \( V_F \). Thus, in order to describe a finite noncommutative space \( F \) we consider the pair given by the vector space \( V_F \) and a hermitian matrix \( D_F \). Note that this is a purely linear-algebraic set of data, which explains the ease with which computations can be done in the context of particle physics.

**Remark 2.** For pedagogical purposes we carefully avoided the notion of an associative algebra, using only basic linear algebra concepts such as matrices and matrix multiplication. In order to connect to the usual terminology encountered in most texts on noncommutative geometry let us mention that the vector space \( V_F \) is an example of an associative \(*\)-algebra, with product given by matrix multiplication and \(*\)-structure given by hermitian conjugation.

**Example 3.** The two-point space can be given a noncommutative structure by considering the space \( V_F \) of 3 \( \times \) 3 block diagonal matrices of the following form:

\[
\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_{11} & a_{12} \\ 0 & a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix},
\]

with complex entries \( \lambda, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{22} \). Hence, point 2 in \( F \) has a noncommutative structure given by 2 \( \times \) 2 matrices.

A hermitian 3 \( \times \) 3-matrix can then be chosen of the form

\[
D_F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tau & 0 \\ c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]

inspired by Example 1 and which turns out to be relevant for our physical
Perturbation semigroup

The approach we have sketched above to spectral (noncommutative) geometry is still static: the Dirac operator is fixed. We now make this more dynamical by perturbing the operator \( D_F \) by matrices in \( V_F \), and \( D_M \) by functions on the manifold \( M \). This naturally gives rise to the structure of a semigroup of perturbations [8]. We recall that in general a semigroup is defined as a set equipped with an associative multiplication.

**Definition 4.** Let \( V_F \) be the space defined in (5). We define the perturbation semigroup of \( V_F \) as the following subset in the tensor product \( V_F \otimes V_F \):

\[
\text{Pert}(V_F) := \left\{ \sum_j A_j \otimes B_j \middle| \sum_j A_j(B_j)_f = 1 \right\},
\]

where \( f \) denotes matrix transpose, \( 1 \) is the identity matrix in \( V_F \), and \( -\) denotes complex conjugation of the matrix entries.

The semigroup law in \( \text{Pert}(V_F) \) is given by the matrix product in \( V_F \otimes V_F \), i.e. on Kronecker products \( A \otimes B \), \( A' \otimes B' \) the semigroup multiplication is

\[
(A \otimes B)(A' \otimes B') = (AA') \otimes (BB').
\]

The two conditions in the definition of \( \text{Pert}(A) \) are called the normalization, and self-adjointness condition.

Let us check that \( \text{Pert}(V_F) \) is indeed a semigroup. The normalization condition carries over to products,

\[
\left( \sum_j A_j \otimes B_j \right) \left( \sum_k A'_k \otimes B'_k \right) = \sum_{j,k} (A_jA'_k) \otimes (B_jB'_k),
\]

for which

\[
\sum_{j,k} A_j A'_k (B_j B'_k)_f = \sum_{j,k} A_j A'_k (B'_k B_j)_f = 1,
\]

because matrix transpose reverses the order of the matrices. Similarly, one checks that the self-adjointness condition is respected when taking products of two elements in \( \text{Pert}(V_F) \).

Let us illustrate this rather abstract definition with some examples.

**Example 5.** Consider the two-point space with \( V_F = \mathbb{C}^2 \), i.e. the space of diagonal \( 2 \times 2 \) matrices as considered in Example 1. Let \( e_{11}, e_{22} \) denote the standard basis of such diagonal matrices:

\[
e_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Then we can write an arbitrary element of \( \text{Pert}(\mathbb{C}^2) \) in terms of this basis as

\[
z_1 e_{11} \otimes e_{11} + z_2 e_{11} \otimes e_{22} + z_3 e_{22} \otimes e_{11} + z_4 e_{22} \otimes e_{22},
\]

with complex coefficients \( z_1, \ldots, z_4 \). Since the matrix multiplication between \( e_{11} \) and \( e_{22} \) follows simple rules, the normalization condition becomes

\[
z_1 = 1 = z_4.
\]

Instead, the self-adjointness condition reads

\[
z_2 = \overline{z_3}.
\]

This leaves only one free complex parameter, say \( z_2 \), and we conclude that \( \text{Pert}(\mathbb{C}^2) \cong \mathbb{C} \).

More generally one can show along the same lines that the perturbation semigroup \( \text{Pert}(\mathbb{C}^N) \) for the space of \( N \) points is given by \( \mathbb{C}^{N(N-1)/2} \) with semigroup structure given by componentwise product.

**Example 6.** Let us consider a noncommutative example, to wit \( V_F = M_2(\mathbb{C}) \). We can identify \( M_2(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_2(\mathbb{C}) \) with \( M_4(\mathbb{C}) \) so that elements in \( \text{Pert}(M_2(\mathbb{C})) \) are \( 4 \times 4 \) matrices satisfying the normalization and self-adjointness condition. One can show that in a suitable basis:

\[
\text{Pert}(M_2(\mathbb{C})) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & v_1 & v_2 & iv_3 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & ix_3 \\ 0 & x_4 & x_5 & ix_6 \\ 0 & ix_7 & ix_8 & x_9 \end{pmatrix} \middle| v_1, v_2, v_3 \in \mathbb{R}, x_1, \ldots, x_9 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.
\]

It is quite remarkable that the product of two such matrices is again of the same form, as it should be to form a semigroup. In fact, one can show that \( \text{Pert}(M_2(\mathbb{C})) \) is a semidirect product of semigroups,

\[
\text{Pert}(M_2(\mathbb{C})) = \mathbb{R}^2 \rtimes S,
\]

where \( S \) is the semigroup of \( 3 \times 3 \) matrices of the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & ix_3 \\ x_4 & x_5 & ix_6 \\ ix_7 & ix_8 & x_9 \end{pmatrix},
\]
where \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) are real numbers. More generally, one can identify a real vector space \(W\) and a semigroup \(S\) such that

\[
\text{Pert}(M_n(C)) = W \times S.
\]

This is further worked out in the thesis [18] and in [19].

**Example 7.** Even though strictly speaking Definition 4 of the perturbation semigroup applies only to (noncommutative) finite topological spaces, let us see what we can say for the case of a smooth manifold \(M\). The vector space \(V_F\) is replaced by the space of smooth complex-valued functions on \(M\), denoted \(C^\infty(M)\). Now, we can consider functions in the tensor product \(C^\infty(M) \otimes C^\infty(M)\) as functions of two-variables. In other words, they are elements in \(C^\infty(M \times M)\). The normalization and self-adjointness condition in \(\text{Pert}(C^\infty(M))\) translate accordingly and yield

\[
\text{Pert}(C^\infty(M)) = \left\{ f \in C^\infty(M \times M) \mid f(x, x) = 1, f(x, y) = f(y, x) \right\},
\]

where \(x, y \in M\).

Let us then come back to the general set-up, with \(V_F\) as in equation (5) with block diagonal matrices of arbitrary (but fixed) size. As a first result we have:

**Proposition 8.** Let \(\mathcal{U}(V_F)\) be the unitary block diagonal matrices in \(V_F\). This space forms a group which is a subgroup of the semigroup \(\text{Pert}(V_F)\).

**Proof.** The space of unitary matrices in \(V_F\) forms a group with inverse of a unitary \(U\) given by \(U^*\). If \(U\) is a unitary block diagonal matrix in \(V_F\), then we claim that the Kronecker product \(U \otimes \overline{U}\) defines an element in \(\text{Pert}(V_F)\). Indeed, the normalization condition is satisfied because of unitarity

\[
U\overline{U} = UU^* = 1,
\]

and \(U \otimes \overline{U}\) trivially satisfies the self-adjointness condition.

The significance of the perturbation semigroup becomes clear in its action on hermitian matrices. Indeed, an element \(\sum_j A_j \otimes B_j \in \text{Pert}(V_F)\) acts on a hermitian matrix \(D\) by matrix multiplication on the left and on the right as:

\[
D \rightarrow \sum_j A_j D B_j^*,
\]

which is then considered as a perturbation of \(D\). This action is compatible with the semigroup law, since

\[
\sum_{j,k} (A_j A_k^* D(B_j B_k^*)^T = \sum_j A_j \left( \sum_k A_k^* D(B_j)^T\right) (B_j)^T.
\]

and it respects hermiticity of \(D\) precisely because of the self-adjointness condition:

\[
\sum_{j,k} (A_j A_k^* D(B_j B_k^*)^T = \sum_j A_j \left( \sum_{k} A_k^* D(B_j)^T\right) (B_j)^T.
\]
\[ D_F \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c\phi \\ \tau\phi & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \]

The group of unitary diagonal \(2 \times 2\) matrices is \(U(1) \times U(1)\) and an element \((\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\) therein acts on the perturbed \(D_F\), and consequently on \(\phi\) as

\[ \phi \rightarrow \lambda_1\lambda_2\phi. \]

**Example 7.** Let us consider a noncommutative example, namely, the action of \(\text{Pert}(C \otimes M_2(C))\) on the operator \(D_F\) of Example 3. The perturbation semigroup behaves nicely with respect to direct sums and we find in this case that

\[ \text{Pert}(C \otimes M_2(C)) = M_2(C) \times \text{Pert}(M_2(C)). \]

It turns out that only \(M_2(C) \in \text{Pert}(C \otimes M_2(C))\) acts non-trivially on the above \(D_F\). If we label the entries of the first column of such a \(2 \times 2\) matrix by \(\phi_1\) and \(\phi_2\) we arrive at

\[ D_F \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tau\phi_1 \\ \tau\phi_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \]

We will see later that the two fields \(\phi_1\) and \(\phi_2\) turn out to parametrize the famous Higgs field in physics.

The group of unitary block diagonal matrices is now \(U(1) \times U(2)\) and an element \((\lambda, u)\) therein acts as

\[ \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \lambda u \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \]

**Example 11.** Let us end with a commutative but continuous example and consider a smooth manifold \(M\). The action of \(\text{Pert}(C^\infty(M))\) (cf. Example 7 on the partial derivatives appearing in a Dirac operator \(D_M\) on a Riemannian spin manifold \(M\) is given by

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\mu} f(x, y) \bigg|_{y=x}, \quad (\mu = 1, \ldots, n), \]

where \(f \in C^\infty(M \times M)\) is such that \(f(x, x) = 1\) and \(f(x, y) = f(y, x)\). In physics, one writes

\[ A_\mu := \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\mu} f(x, y) \bigg|_{y=x}, \]

which turns out to be the electromagnetic potential giving rise to the electromagnetic field that describes the photon. We refer e.g. to [15] for more details on the theory of electrodynamics.

A unitary element \(u\) in \(C^\infty(M)\) acts by conjugation on the partial derivatives, or, which is the same, can be absorbed by the transformation

\[ A_\mu \rightarrow u A_\mu u^* + u \delta_\mu u^*, \]

which is the usual form of a gauge transformation in physics.

**Applications to particle physics**

We now combine a Riemannian spin manifold \(M\) with a finite noncommutative space \(F\), considering the latter as an internal space at each point of \(M\). In other words, we form the direct product \(M \times F\) and consider matrix-valued maps from \(M\) to \(F\) as functions on this noncommutative space. Thus, if \(F\) describes a space of \(N\) points, possibly with some noncommutative structure at each point, the product \(M \times F\) can be considered as (noncommutative) space consisting of \(N\) copies of the manifold \(M\) (see Figure 7 for \(N = 2\)).

The next ingredient is the Dirac operator on \(M \times F\) which is defined to be the product of \(D_M\) and \(D_F\). More precisely, if \(M\) is four-dimensional we can write \(D_M\) as the following block matrix:

\[ D_M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_M^\dagger \\ D_M & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \]

This was indeed the case for the four-dimensional torus, where we had in equation (3):

\[ D_M^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + f \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + j \frac{\partial}{\partial t_3} + k \frac{\partial}{\partial t_4} \end{pmatrix}. \]

We combine this with the finite Dirac operator \(D_F\) by setting as a Dirac operator on the product \(M \times F\):

\[ D_{M \times F} = \begin{pmatrix} D_F & D_M^\dagger \\ D_M & -D_F \end{pmatrix}. \]

The crucial property of this specific form is that it squares to the sum of the two Laplacians on \(M\) and \(F\):

\[ D_{M \times F}^2 = D_M^2 + D_F^2, \]

which follows from a simple matrix calculation. This is very useful in the computation of the spectral action functional. Let us carry out this computation in the simple case that \(f\) is a Gaussian function as in (2).
Then, we can expand the exponential in powers of $D_F$:

$$\text{Tr} e^{-D_{H,F}^2/\Lambda^2} = \text{Tr} \left( 1 - \frac{D_{H,F}^2}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{D_{H,F}^4}{2!\Lambda^4} - \cdots \right) e^{-D_{H,F}^2/\Lambda^2}. \quad (8)$$

If we use equation (3) in this expression and ignore terms proportional to $\Lambda^{-1}$, we arrive in dimension $n = 4$ at

$$\text{Tr} e^{-D_{H,F}^2/\Lambda^2} = \frac{\text{Vol}(M)\Lambda^4}{(4\pi)^2} \text{Tr} \left( 1 - \frac{D_{H,F}^2}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{D_{H,F}^4}{2!\Lambda^4} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-1}).$$

As $\Lambda$ is supposedly large, we will ignore the terms proportional to $\Lambda^{-1}$. Hence, up to overall constants, the spectral action functional yields a potential for $D_F$, i.e.

$$V(D_F) = \Lambda^4 - \Lambda^2 \text{Tr} D_F^2 + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} D_F^4. \quad (9)$$

This potential plays a crucial role in the Higgs spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, as we will now explain.

**Noncommutative two-point space and the Higgs boson**

Let us consider the space $M \times F$ where $F$ is the two-point space introduced in Example 3. Then, the distance on the space $M \times F$ is the combination of the ordinary Riemannian distance on each copy of $M$, and the two copies are at distance $|c|^{-1}$ from each other.

If one includes the perturbations of $D_F$ analysed in Example 10, then $D_F$ becomes parametrized by the Higgs fields $\phi_1, \phi_2$, which may now vary over the points in $M$. The potential of equation (9) then becomes a potential for the complex field $\phi$:

$$V(\phi) = \Lambda^4 - 2\Lambda^2(|\phi_1|^2 + |\phi_2|^2) + (|\phi_1|^2 + |\phi_2|^2)^2. \quad (10)$$

This is the famous ‘mexican-hat’ potential depicted in Figure 8. It is the starting point of the Higgs spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism, as we will explain next.

First, note the circular symmetry in Figure 8, which in fact corresponds to the invariance of the potential under the $U(1) \times U(2)$-action of equation (7). However, in physics particles and fields tend to minimize potentials and it is already clear from the picture that any such minimum breaks this symmetry. This procedure is called spontaneous symmetry breaking. Essentially, a minimum of $V$ sets $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ to certain fixed vacuum values, say $\nu$ and $\sigma$ respectively. Accordingly, this freezes the distance between the two layers to be proportional to $|\nu|^2$, as explained in Example 1. If one takes all constants and physical units properly into account, one derives from the recently measured mass of the Higgs boson (approximately 125.5 GeV) that the distance between the two layers in Figure 7 is of the order of $10^{-18}$ m.

**Noncommutative three-point space and a new particle?**

We now consider the case that $F$ is a three-point space, with the noncommutative structure dictated by the matrices

$$V_F = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus M_2(\mathbb{C}).$$

That is to say, we consider matrices of the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_{11} & a_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

for complex numbers $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{21}, a_{22}$. We can make the following convenient choice of finite Dirac operator for this three-point space:

$$D_F := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_{11} & a_{12} \\ c & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

Even though the matrix $D_F$ contains mainly zeroes, the perturbations of it coming from the semigroup $\text{Pert}(V_F)$ are rather non-trivial and give
rise to two scalar fields $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$. The potential derived in equation (9) becomes a potential for these fields, now of the form

$$V(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \Lambda^4 - 2\Lambda^2(|\sigma_1|^2 + |\sigma_2|^2)^2 + (|\sigma_1|^2 + |\sigma_2|^2)^4.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Note that this is a polynomial expression of order 8, as opposed to the order 4 encountered before for the Higgs field (cf. [8] for the full details on this example). The resulting ‘bowler hat’ potential is depicted in Figure 9.

Again, the potential $V(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ is invariant under the group of unitary matrices in $V_F$, which in this case is $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(2)$. If the fields $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ attain a minimum, this spontaneously breaks this symmetry. A similar discussion as before for the Higgs field also applies to the $\sigma$-field, freezing the two layers to be separated by an even smaller distance of $10^{-27}$ m (corresponding to the mass of the $\sigma$-particle to be of the order of $10^{12}$ GeV).

The Standard Model of particle physics
We now sketch how the above toy models extend and combine to give a noncommutative geometrical description of the Standard Model of particle physics. First, recall that the latter model is the result of decades of experimental and theoretical work in physics, explaining the dynamics and interactions of all existing elementary particles. Let us summarize the particle content (cf. Figure 10):

- **leptons**: electron ($e$), muon ($\mu$), tauon ($\tau$) and three neutrinos ($\nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau$).
- **quarks**: up ($u$), charm ($c$) and top ($t$), and down ($d$), strange ($s$) and bottom ($b$), all coming in three colours.
- **force carriers**: photon (electromagnetic force), $Z$ and $W$-boson (weak nuclear force) and gluons (strong nuclear force).
- **Higgs boson**: giving mass to the $Z$ and $W$-boson via the Higgs spontaneous symmetry breaking.

These particles are the building blocks of well-known particles such as the proton (built from two up quarks and one down quark), neutron (built from two down quarks and one up quark), pion, et cetera.

We will not describe the full dynamics and interactions of the Standard Model, as this can easily fill a textbook; we refer to [13] for a physicist’s overview and to [5] for a mathematician-friendly introduction. Instead, we single out a typical decay process described by the Standard Model, and explain how it leads to a noncommutative structure.

We consider $\beta^-$ and $\beta^+$-decay, which are two types of radioactive decay. The first, $\beta^-$-decay, is the emission of an electron (and an electron-neutrino) by a neutron to form a proton (see Figure 11). This process is a weak interaction process, replacing a down quark in the neutron by an up quark to form a proton, at the same time emitting a $W$-boson. Subsequently, this $W$-boson decays into an electron and neutrino. Let us simplify this process by only considering what happens to neutron and proton:

$$\beta^- : n \rightarrow p,$$
$$\beta^- : p \rightarrow n.$$

The second line simply states that $\beta^-$-decay is not concerned with decay of the proton, and leaves it as it is. Such a process calls for a representation by matrices: if we denote the basis vectors in $\mathbb{C}^2$ by $p$ and $n$,

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

then we can represent

$$\beta^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

![Figure 10](The particle content of the Standard Model.)
The photon, $W$, is an improvement over the usual formulation of the Standard Model, where more particles appear, as in the toy model of the previous section. More precisely, was obtained in Example 11 by acting with the perturbation semigroup of Definition 4. In fact, much as the photon data alone all bosons can now be derived, with a key role played by the perturbation. The noncommutative approach is that from this geometrical description of the noncommutative finite spaces is that the replacement of the standard model by a lattice is very similar to analysing the structure of the discrete spaces $F$ using matrix algebra. In [7] we present a first exploration of this exciting interplay between noncommutative geometry, lattice gauge theory and quantization.

Quantization of the theory on a lattice

In the previous sections we have sketched how the full Standard Model of particle physics can be derived from a noncommutative space, using not more than basic linear algebra. Even though this is quite an achievement, there is still the formidable problem to give a mathematically rigorous description of the quantization of the above system. At present, the derivation of the spectral action functional for the Standard Model, including e.g. the Higgs potential, is a mathematical derivation. However, the translation of it to realistic quantum particles and fields follows a more physics-style approach. It is clear that in order to have a proper understanding of the Standard Model of particle physics this aspect should be improved. It is the goal of my Vidi-research project to take a step in this direction.

We will analyse the quantization of gauge fields — such as the electromagnetic field — on a discrete space instead of in the continuum. That is, we replace $M$ by a lattice, construct the quantum theory there, and then analyse the limit of small lattice spacing (Figure 13). The main challenge is to do this in a mathematically rigorous way, for which we intend to exploit the powerful functional analytical techniques coming from noncommutative geometry. One of the intriguing links with the above description of noncommutative finite spaces is that the replacement of $M$ by a lattice is very similar to analysing the structure of the discrete spaces $F$ using matrix algebra. In [7] we present a first exploration of this exciting interplay between noncommutative geometry, lattice gauge theory and quantization.
References