

Gauge Theories
and
Non-Commutative Geometry
A Review

Orthodox Academy of Crete

Colymbari, August 2017

John Iliopoulos

ENS Paris

Motivation

- ▶ Short distance singularities.

Heisenberg → Peierls → Pauli → Oppenheimer → Snyder

Motivation

- ▶ Short distance singularities.

Heisenberg → Peierls → Pauli → Oppenheimer → Snyder

- ▶ External fluxes.

Landau (1930) ; Peierls (1933)

Motivation

- ▶ Short distance singularities.

Heisenberg → Peierls → Pauli → Oppenheimer → Snyder

- ▶ External fluxes.

Landau (1930) ; Peierls (1933)

- ▶ Seiberg-Witten map.

Motivation

- ▶ Short distance singularities.

Heisenberg → Peierls → Pauli → Oppenheimer → Snyder

- ▶ External fluxes.

Landau (1930) ; Peierls (1933)

- ▶ Seiberg-Witten map.

- ▶ Large N gauge theories and matrix models.

Motivation

- ▶ Short distance singularities.

Heisenberg → Peierls → Pauli → Oppenheimer → Snyder

- ▶ External fluxes.

Landau (1930) ; Peierls (1933)

- ▶ Seiberg-Witten map.

- ▶ Large N gauge theories and matrix models.

- ▶ The construction of gauge theories using the techniques of non-commutative geometry.

▶ $[x_\mu, x_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}$

simplest case: θ is constant (canonical, or Heisenberg case).

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}$$

simplest case: θ is constant (canonical, or Heisenberg case).

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = iF_{\mu\nu}^\rho x_\rho \text{ (Lie algebra case)}$$

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}$$

simplest case: θ is constant (canonical, or Heisenberg case).

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = iF_{\mu\nu}^\rho x_\rho \text{ (Lie algebra case)}$$

$$\blacktriangleright x_\mu x_\nu = q^{-1} R_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} x_\rho x_\sigma \text{ (quantum space case)}$$

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}$$

simplest case: θ is constant (canonical, or Heisenberg case).

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = iF_{\mu\nu}^\rho x_\rho \text{ (Lie algebra case)}$$

$$\blacktriangleright x_\mu x_\nu = q^{-1} R_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} x_\rho x_\sigma \text{ (quantum space case)}$$

\blacktriangleright Definition of the derivative:

$$\partial^\mu x_\nu = \delta_\nu^\mu \quad [x_\mu, f(x)] = i\theta_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu f(x)$$

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}$$

simplest case: θ is constant (canonical, or Heisenberg case).

$$\blacktriangleright [x_\mu, x_\nu] = iF_{\mu\nu}^\rho x_\rho \text{ (Lie algebra case)}$$

$$\blacktriangleright x_\mu x_\nu = q^{-1} R_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} x_\rho x_\sigma \text{ (quantum space case)}$$

\blacktriangleright Definition of the derivative:

$$\partial^\mu x_\nu = \delta_\nu^\mu \quad [x_\mu, f(x)] = i\theta_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu f(x)$$

\blacktriangleright Define a $*$ product

$$f * g = e^{\frac{i}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} \theta_{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\nu}} f(x) g(y) \Big|_{x=y}$$

All computations can be viewed as expansions in θ
expansions in the external field

More efficient ways?

Quantum field theory in a space with non-commutative geometry?
BRS Symmetry?

Large N field theories

► $\phi^i(x)$ $i = 1, \dots, N$; $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\phi^i(x) \rightarrow \phi(\sigma, x) \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq 2\pi$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi^i(x) \phi^i(x) \rightarrow \int_0^{2\pi} d\sigma (\phi(\sigma, x))^2$$

but

$$\phi^4 \rightarrow (f)^2$$

Large N field theories

- ▶ $\phi^i(x)$ $i = 1, \dots, N$; $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\phi^i(x) \rightarrow \phi(\sigma, x) \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq 2\pi$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi^i(x)\phi^i(x) \rightarrow \int_0^{2\pi} d\sigma (\phi(\sigma, x))^2$$

but

$$\phi^4 \rightarrow (f)^2$$

- ▶ For a Yang-Mills theory, the resulting expression is local

Gauge theories on surfaces

E.G. Floratos and J.I.

- ▶ Given an $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory in a d -dimensional space

$$A_\mu(x) = A_\mu^a(x) t_a$$

Gauge theories on surfaces

E.G. Floratos and J.I.

- ▶ Given an $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory in a d -dimensional space

$$A_\mu(x) = A_\mu^a(x) t_a$$

- ▶ there exists a reformulation in $d+2$ dimensions

$$A_\mu(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\mu(x, z_1, z_2) \quad F_{\mu\nu}(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}(x, z_1, z_2)$$

with

$$[z_1, z_2] = \frac{2i}{N}$$

$$[A_\mu(x), A_\nu(x)] \rightarrow \{\mathcal{A}_\mu(x, z_1, z_2), \mathcal{A}_\nu(x, z_1, z_2)\}_{Moyal}$$

$$[A_\mu(x), \Omega(x)] \rightarrow \{\mathcal{A}_\mu(x, z_1, z_2), \Omega(x, z_1, z_2)\}_{Moyal}$$

$$\int d^4x \text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}(x)F^{\mu\nu}(x)) \rightarrow \int d^4x dz_1 dz_2 \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}(x, z_1, z_2) * \mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}(x, z_1, z_2)$$

These expressions are defined for *all N!*

Not necessarily integer ???

I. Large N

-A simple algebraic result:

At large N

The $SU(N)$ algebra \rightarrow The algebra of the area preserving diffeomorphisms of a closed surface. (sphere or torus).

-The structure constants of $[SDiff(S^2)]$ are the limits for large N of those of $SU(N)$.

-Alternatively: For the sphere

$$x_1 = \cos\phi \sin\theta, \quad x_2 = \sin\phi \sin\theta, \quad x_3 = \cos\theta$$

$$Y_{l,m}(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{\substack{i_k=1,2,3 \\ k=1,\dots,l}} \alpha_{i_1\dots i_l}^{(m)} x_{i_1}\dots x_{i_l}$$

where $\alpha_{i_1\dots i_l}^{(m)}$ is a symmetric and traceless tensor.

For fixed l there are $2l + 1$ linearly independent tensors $\alpha_{i_1\dots i_l}^{(m)}$,
 $m = -l, \dots, l$.

Choose, inside $SU(N)$, an $SU(2)$ subgroup.

$$[S_i, S_j] = i\epsilon_{ijk} S_k$$

A basis for $SU(N)$:

$$S_{l,m}^{(N)} = \sum_{\substack{i_k=1,2,3 \\ k=1,\dots,l}} \alpha_{i_1\dots i_l}^{(m)} S_{i_1}\dots S_{i_l}$$

$$[S_{l,m}^{(N)}, S_{l',m'}^{(N)}] = if_{l,m;l',m'}^{(N)} S_{l'',m''}^{(N)}$$

The three $SU(2)$ generators S_i , rescaled by a factor proportional to $1/N$, will have well-defined limits as N goes to infinity.

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &\rightarrow T_i = \frac{2}{N} S_i \\ [T_i, T_j] &= \frac{2i}{N} \epsilon_{ijk} T_k \\ T^2 &= T_1^2 + T_2^2 + T_3^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{N^2} \end{aligned}$$

In other words: under the norm $\|x\|^2 = \text{Tr}x^2$, the limits as N goes to infinity of the generators T_i are three objects x_i which commute and are constrained by

$$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 1$$

$$\frac{N}{2i} [f, g] \rightarrow \epsilon_{ijk} x_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_k}$$

$$\frac{N}{2i} [T_{l,m}^{(N)}, T_{l',m'}^{(N)}] \rightarrow \{Y_{l,m}, Y_{l',m'}\}$$

$$N[A_\mu, A_\nu] \rightarrow \{A_\mu(x, \theta, \phi), A_\nu(x, \theta, \phi)\}$$

\Rightarrow The d -dim. $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory for $N \rightarrow \infty$

\equiv

A classical theory on a $d + 2$ -dim space.

The quantum theory??

II. To all orders

We can parametrise the T_i 's in terms of two operators, z_1 and z_2 .

$$T_+ = T_1 + iT_2 = e^{\frac{iz_1}{2}} (1 - z_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{iz_1}{2}}$$

$$T_- = T_1 - iT_2 = e^{-\frac{iz_1}{2}} (1 - z_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{iz_1}{2}}$$

$$T_3 = z_2$$

If we assume that z_1 and z_2 satisfy:

$$[z_1, z_2] = \frac{2i}{N}$$

The T_i 's satisfy the $SU(2)$ algebra.

If we assume that the T_i 's satisfy the $SU(2)$ algebra, the z_i 's satisfy the Heisenberg algebra

For the torus

Choose, inside $SU(N)$, a quantum $U(1) \times U(1)$

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \omega^{N-1} \end{pmatrix} ; \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

(N odd), $\omega = e^{4\pi i/N}$

$$g^N = h^N = 1 \quad ; \quad hg = \omega gh$$

For the torus

We can use the integer mod N powers of these matrices to express the $SU(N)$ generators:

$$S_{m_1, m_2} = \omega^{m_1 m_2 / 2} g^{m_1} h^{m_2} \quad ; \quad S_{m_1, m_2}^\dagger = S_{-m_1, -m_2}$$

$$[S_{\mathbf{m}}, S_{\mathbf{n}}] = 2i \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{N} \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{n}\right) S_{\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n}}$$

$\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ and $\mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{m} = n_1 m_2 - m_1 n_2$

$$SU(N)|_{N \rightarrow \infty} = \text{SDiff}(T^2)$$

z_1, z_2 the two angular variables:

$$h = e^{iz_1} \quad g = e^{-2i\pi z_2} \Rightarrow [z_1, z_2] = \frac{2i}{N} \rightarrow hg = \omega gh$$

For the torus

The generators of the Heisenberg algebra z_1 and z_2 ,
as well as the group elements $h = e^{iz_1}$ and $g = e^{-2i\pi z_2}$

are infinite dimensional operators

but we can represent the $SU(N)$ algebra by the finite dimensional
matrices g , h and S_{m_1, m_2}

They form a discrete subgroup of the Heisenberg group

\Rightarrow

quantum mechanics on a discrete phase space

We can define two new operators

\hat{q} ("position" in the discrete space) and \hat{p} (its FFT):

They are represented by finite matrices but, obviously, they do not
satisfy the Heisenberg algebra.

The techniques of non-com. geometry

- ▶ Gauge transformations are:

The techniques of non-com. geometry

- ▶ Gauge transformations are:
- ▶ Diffeomorphisms *space-time*

The techniques of non-com. geometry

- ▶ Gauge transformations are:
- ▶ Diffeomorphisms *space-time*
- ▶ Internal symmetries

The techniques of non-com. geometry

- ▶ Gauge transformations are:
- ▶ Diffeomorphisms *space-time*
- ▶ Internal symmetries
- ▶ Question: Is there a space on which Internal symmetry transformations act as Diffeomorphisms?

The techniques of non-com. geometry

- ▶ Gauge transformations are:
- ▶ Diffeomorphisms *space-time*
- ▶ Internal symmetries
- ▶ Question: Is there a space on which Internal symmetry transformations act as Diffeomorphisms?
- ▶ Answer: Yes, but it is a space with non-commutative geometry.
A space defined by an algebra of matrix-valued functions

Some useful references:

- Ali H. Chamseddine and Alain Connes ;

Why the Standard Model, [arXiv:0706.3688](https://arxiv.org/abs/0706.3688) [hep-th]

- Ali H. Chamseddine, Alain Connes, and Viatcheslav Mukhanov ;

Geometry and the Quantum: Basics, [arXiv:1411.0977](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.0977) [hep-th]

- Ali H. Chamseddine, Alain Connes, and Viatcheslav Mukhanov ;

Quanta of Geometry: Noncommutative Aspects, [arXiv:1409.2471](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.2471) [hep-th]

The construction involves **A fundamental spectral triplet** :

Given a spin manifold M , the triplet consists of:

1. A Hilbert space \mathcal{H}
2. An algebra of functions \mathcal{A} which are $C^\infty(M)$
3. The Dirac operator \mathcal{D}

(If we ignore gravity, \mathcal{D} can be replaced by the chirality operator)

▶ SO WHAT?

▶ **SO WHAT?**

- ▶ A possible way to unify gauge theories and Gravity???

▶ **SO WHAT?**

- ▶ A possible way to unify gauge theories and Gravity???
- ▶ A possible connection between gauge fields and scalar fields.

▶ **SO WHAT?**

- ▶ A possible way to unify gauge theories and Gravity???
- ▶ A possible connection between gauge fields and scalar fields.
- ▶ The actual implementation brings us back to flat space calculations.

▶ **SO WHAT?**

- ▶ A possible way to unify gauge theories and Gravity???
- ▶ A possible connection between gauge fields and scalar fields.
- ▶ The actual implementation brings us back to flat space calculations.
- ▶ *New predictions for the Standard Model parameters?*

- ▶ The Standard Model has 17 arbitrary parameters. They are all masses and coupling constants.

- ▶ The Standard Model has 17 arbitrary parameters. They are all masses and coupling constants.
- ▶ All of them have been determined experimentally.

- ▶ The Standard Model has 17 arbitrary parameters. They are all masses and coupling constants.
- ▶ All of them have been determined experimentally.
- ▶ Could this number be reduced?

For example, can we “predict” the value of the Higgs mass?

$$m_Z^2/m_H^2 = C = \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8\lambda}$$

- ▶ The Standard Model has 17 arbitrary parameters. They are all masses and coupling constants.
- ▶ All of them have been determined experimentally.
- ▶ Could this number be reduced?

For example, can we “predict” the value of the Higgs mass?

$$m_Z^2/m_H^2 = C = \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8\lambda}$$

- ▶ Such a relation should correspond to a fixed point of the RG

- ▶ The Standard Model has 17 arbitrary parameters. They are all masses and coupling constants.
- ▶ All of them have been determined experimentally.
- ▶ Could this number be reduced?

For example, can we “predict” the value of the Higgs mass?

$$m_Z^2/m_H^2 = C = \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8\lambda}$$

- ▶ Such a relation should correspond to a fixed point of the RG
- ▶ Answer: Compute the corresponding β -function.

$$16\pi^2\beta_{g_1} = g_1^3 \frac{1}{10}$$

$$16\pi^2\beta_{g_2} = -g_2^3 \frac{43}{6}$$

$$16\pi^2\beta_\lambda = 12\lambda^2 - \frac{9}{5}g_1^2\lambda - 9g_2^2\lambda + \frac{27}{100}g_1^4 + \frac{9}{10}g_1^2g_2^2 + \frac{9}{4}g_2^4$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta_z &= \beta_{\eta_1} + \beta_{\eta_2} = \\
 &= \frac{-\lambda w}{16\pi^2 \rho z} \left[\left(\frac{27}{100} \rho^2 + \frac{9}{10} \rho + \frac{9}{4} \right) z^2 - \left(2\rho^2 + \frac{54}{5} \rho - \frac{16}{3} \right) z \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + 12(\rho + 1)^2 \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\eta_1 = \frac{g_1^2}{\lambda} \quad ; \quad \eta_2 = \frac{g_2^2}{\lambda} \quad ; \quad z = \eta_1 + \eta_2 \quad ; \quad \rho = \frac{\eta_1}{\eta_2} \quad ; \quad w = \eta_1 \eta_2$$

- β_z has no zeroes! \Rightarrow The Standard Model is irreducible.

Related question: Is there a B.R.S. symmetry for the model on non-com. geometry?

The spectacular accuracy reached by experiments, as well as theoretical calculations, made particle physics a precision science

Example: $m_W = 80.385 \pm 0.015 \text{ GeV}$

⇒ "Approximate" theories are no more sufficient!

A discrepancy by a few percent implies that we do not have the right theory!

- ▶ **The completion of the Standard Model strongly indicates that new and exciting Physics is around the corner**

- ▶ The completion of the Standard Model strongly indicates that new and exciting Physics is around the corner
- ▶ **But, for the moment, we see no corner!**

Conclusions

- ▶ Non-Commutative Geometry has come to stay!

Conclusions

- ▶ Non-Commutative Geometry has come to stay!
- ▶ Whether it will turn out to be convenient for us to use, is still questionable.

Conclusions

- ▶ Non-Commutative Geometry has come to stay!
- ▶ Whether it will turn out to be convenient for us to use, is still questionable.
- ▶ It will depend on our ability to simplify the mathematics sufficiently, or to master them deeply, in order to get new insights