

Hearing Shape from Spectrum

— Connes’ Non-Commutative Geometry, Kac’s Inverse Spectral Problem, and the Highway Linking Geometry
and Inverse Problems — [Paper 102]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan

September 2026 (2nd Edition)

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

Two lineages run through the corpus — the **geometric mainstream** (Riemann $\rightarrow \dots \rightarrow$ Hopf, Paper 91) and the **integral-brain / inverse problem** (reading the cause from the effect, Papers 89 and 99). This paper **links the two, for the first time, by a single road**. The key is the question “**can shape be heard from the spectrum (the eigen-vibrations)?**” Mark Kac’s famous question “**Can one hear the shape of a drum?**” (1966) — can the collection of eigenvalues of the Laplacian (the spectrum) recover the shape (geometry) of the drum? — is exactly an **inverse problem**. The answer is **in general “no”** (there exist **isospectral non-isometric** shapes: different shapes with the same spectrum = non-unique). Meanwhile Alain Connes’ **non-commutative geometry** rewrites geometry in terms of the spectrum of the **Dirac operator D** (a spectral triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D)$), defining even the distance between two points as $d(x, y) = \sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| : \|[D, f]\| \leq 1\}$ — using the **operator alone**. Here two disciplines of the corpus apply. (1) **Separation of distinct roots**: “**distance from the metric**” (Riemann, Paper 91) and “**distance from the spectrum**” (Connes) coincide on a Riemannian manifold, yet **are distinct roots** with different starting points. And the **family of inverse problems** — scattering (GLM, Paper 89) / boundary-value (Calderón, Paper 99) / spectral (Kac, this paper) — share the stance but are **different mathematics = distinct roots**. (2) **An honest nuance**: the Connes–Chamseddine non-commutative Standard Model predicted a Higgs mass that was ruled out, then adjusted by adding a field afterward — **even a rigorous program brushes the cliff of Paper 101 (Eddington’s caution)**. The keystone of the bridge is **Paper 70 (the index theorem = the home of the Dirac operator)**, where geometry (91) and inverse problems (99) meet on the spectrum of D .

Scope of this paper (scope note): This paper is a **structural interpretation** (Layer 2) of established mathematics (Connes' non-commutative geometry, spectral triples, Kac's inverse spectral problem, Weyl's law and the heat kernel). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. NCG is a heavy theory, so it is kept to a **structural introduction, and it is not said that the Standard Model was derived**. That two lineages are linked by one road does not mean that they are identical. "Universe OS" is a Layer-3 non-science lens, not a claim of mechanism. Relation to earlier papers: the corpus's map comes from Paper 100, the geometric mainstream from Paper 91, the inverse-problem stance from Papers 89 and 99, the index theorem and the Dirac operator from Paper 70, the distinct instances of dimension from Papers 69 and 94, the discipline of distinct roots from Papers 48 and 58, Eddington's caution from Paper 101, and the gauge principle from Paper 96. **What this paper adds** is to link the corpus's two lineages — the **geometric mainstream** and **inverse problems** — at the single point "hearing shape from the spectrum", and, at that seam, to **sort the distinct roots (distance from the metric / distance from the spectrum; the family of inverse problems = scattering, boundary-value, spectral)**.

1. Introduction: Linking Two Lineages by a Single Road for the First Time

The corpus's map (Paper 100) shows two great lineages. One is the **geometric mainstream** — from Riemann's intrinsic curvature (Paper 91) to Cartan's forms (92) and Hopf's fibration (67, 68). The other is the **integral-brain / inverse problem** — from the Zero-Tension stance (89) to Calderón's boundary-value problem (99). Until now these were separate mountain ranges and river systems. This paper **links them by a single highway**.

The name of that road is "**can shape be heard from the spectrum?**" Reading the geometry of an object (its shape, curvature, dimension) from its eigen-vibrations (spectrum) is an **inverse problem** (recovering the cause = geometry from the effect = spectrum) and, at the same time, a **pure question of geometry**. The two lineages meet here. This paper builds no new theorem. It visits two masters — Mark Kac and Alain Connes — and grafts the corpus's two lineages together, with the correct separation of distinct roots.

2. Connes' Non-Commutative Geometry: Writing Geometry in the Spectrum of an Operator

Standard Fact 2.1 (The spectral triple and the distance formula)

Alain Connes' **non-commutative geometry (NCG)** represents a space not as a “set of points” but as a **spectral triple** $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D)$: an algebra of functions $\mathcal{A}$, a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and the **Dirac operator** D (which carries the geometric information — metric, dimension, curvature). Remarkably, even the **distance** between two points can be written using D alone:

$$d(x, y) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}} \{ |f(x) - f(y)| : \|[D, f]\| \leq 1 \}.$$

Moreover **Connes' reconstruction theorem** guarantees that a commutative spectral triple satisfying the axioms is **an ordinary Riemannian manifold**. That is, geometry can be fully rewritten in the **spectrum** of D .

This is a reversal of viewpoint. Usually geometry begins “there are points, and between points there is distance”. Connes instead places the **eigenvalues (spectrum) of the operator D first, and reads out distance, dimension, and curvature from them**. Precisely because geometry can be spoken without points, it extends to the quantum, non-commutative world where the notion of a point breaks down (when $\mathcal{A}$ is non-commutative) — hence the name “non-commutative geometry”.

3. Kac's “Can One Hear the Shape of a Drum?”: Can Shape Be Heard from the Spectrum?

Standard Fact 3.1 (The inverse spectral problem)

In 1966 Mark Kac asked, “**Can one hear the shape of a drum?**” Can the shape (geometry) of a drum be uniquely recovered from its sound — the **collection of eigenvalues (spectrum)** of the membrane's Laplacian? This is the **inverse spectral problem** (spectrum $\rightarrow$ geometry). The answer is **in general “no”**: Milnor (1964, 16-dimensional tori) and Gordon–Webb–Wolpert (1992, planar drums) constructed **isospectral non-isometric** figures — different shapes with the same spectrum. The spectrum does **not** determine the shape uniquely.

This is the backbone of the paper. “Hearing shape from the spectrum” is an **inverse problem**, and moreover a **non-unique** one — the counterpart-with-a-different-face to Calderón's problem (Paper 99), which was “unique but severely ill-posed”. Inverse problems come in kinds: some unique but unstable (Calderón), some not even unique (Kac). “**Hearing**” **does not mean “knowing”** — the boundary between what can be heard and what cannot is to be drawn exactly.

4. What Is Heard, and What Is Not

Observation 4.1 (What the spectrum determines = what is audible)

Even if the shape is not uniquely audible, **many quantities certainly are**. From the short-time expansion of the heat kernel $\text{Tr } e^{-t\Delta} \sim (4\pi t)^{-d/2} (\text{vol}(M) + \frac{t}{6} \int_M R + \dots)$, the spectrum determines:

- the **dimension** d (the exponent in Weyl's law $N(\lambda) \sim C_d \text{vol}(M) \lambda^{d/2}$),
- the **volume** $\text{vol}(M)$ (the same coefficient),
- the **total scalar curvature** $\int_M R$ (the next term).

So **dimension, volume, and total curvature are “audible”**, while the fine details of shape (whether two are isometric) are in general “inaudible”.

That **dimension is audible from the spectrum** is especially suggestive for the corpus. The “dimension” seen in Paper 69 (why 3+1) and Paper 94 (dimension is not one concept) appears here as **yet another distinct instance — dimension as a spectral invariant** (the “one word, distinct roots” of Papers 58 and 94 again in force). Topological dimension, fractal dimension, and now **spectral dimension** are distinct faces sharing a word.

5. Separation of Distinct Roots: The Two Roots of Distance, and the Family of Inverse Problems

Observation 5.1 (Same “distance / geometry”, distinct roots)

This paper separates distinct roots twice.

(a) The two roots of distance: “distance from the metric” (Riemann, Paper 91 = integrating the metric tensor g for geodesic distance) and “distance from the spectrum” (Connes = measured via the commutator with D). On a Riemannian manifold the two **coincide**, yet they are **distinct roots with different starting points (metric vs operator spectrum)**. Coincidence is not a “proof of the same root” but a “good translation”.

(b) The family of inverse problems: **scattering** (GLM, Paper 89, scattering data $\rightarrow$ potential) / **boundary-value** (Calderón, Paper 99, DtN map $\rightarrow$ conductivity, unique but ill-posed) / **spectral** (Kac, this paper, spectrum $\rightarrow$ geometry, non-unique). The three share the stance “read the cause from the effect”, but differ in equations and in the character of uniqueness — **different mathematics = distinct roots** (Papers 48 and 58).

This separation is the point. The temptation to dissolve everything — “geometry, spectrum, and inverse problems are all one and the same in the end” — is stopped here. That **two lineages are linked by one road** is distinct from their **being**

identical. Even when a road connects them, the mountain range and the river system are different terrain.

6. An Honest Nuance: The Non-Commutative Standard Model and the Higgs After-the-Fact

In fairness, the **limit** of NCG is recorded too. Connes and Chamseddine derived the Standard Model Lagrangian **as geometry** from an **almost-commutative geometry** (spacetime times a finite non-commutative space) — a major achievement. But the model initially **predicted a Higgs mass of about 170 GeV**, which was excluded by experiment (Tevatron, 2008). To make it consistent with the observed 125 GeV, **an additional scalar field was later introduced.**

Here Paper 101 (Eddington’s caution) resonates. **Even a rigorous, principled program brushes against the situation of adding an element after the fact to fit the data.** In fairness, NCG’s adjustment differs in kind from Eddington’s number-fudging — what was added is a physical mechanism (a field), not a post-hoc digit. Still, that **“adjustment after a failed prediction touches the boundary between derivation and selection”** is one point the corpus keeps in mind. NCG is a beautiful bridge, yet even on that bridge the corpus keeps labelling (Layer 2 / distinct roots / signature $\neq$ proof).

7. Connection to the Corpus

This paper **ties several threads at one point.** (a) **The home of the index theorem (Paper 70) = the keystone of the bridge:** the Atiyah–Singer index theorem lives **on the Dirac operator D** , and NCG **builds** geometry from that **D** . So Paper 70 is the **confluence** where the geometric mainstream and inverse problems meet. (b) **Inverse problems (Papers 89 and 99):** Kac’s inverse spectral problem joins the corpus’s family of inverse problems as a **third member** (scattering, boundary-value, spectral = distinct roots). (c) **Curvature (Paper 91):** the total scalar curvature $\int \mathcal{R}$ is audible from the heat kernel — Riemann’s intrinsic curvature is imprinted in the spectrum too (a reunion at a different root). (d) **Dimension (Papers 69 and 94):** spectral dimension is a new distinct instance of “dimension”. (e) **The Standard Model (Paper 96):** reading gauge fields as geometry, NCG is a relative of the non-commutative version of Weyl’s gauge principle (96) — though a different framework, a distinct root.

The author's personal reflection (Layer 3; labelled non-scientific / not a claim of mechanism)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), the Universe OS feels not like a stage made of points but like **one chord played by countless eigen-vibrations (a spectrum)** — shape rises from sound, and we recover the geometry of the world by “hearing”. A distant echo of Wheeler's “it from bit” and Pythagoras' “all is number (harmony)”. But **this carries the non-science label**. “The world = a chord” is a metaphor that carries intuition, not a mechanism or a prediction. **What is certain here is the mathematical point that reading geometry from the spectrum is an inverse problem, and not uniquely determined**. And it is worth keeping in mind — the moment one believes that hearing reveals even the fine details of shape, one falls onto Kac's counterexample (isospectral non-isometric) and Eddington's cliff (101). Separate exactly what hearing reveals from what it does not. It is precisely on the bridge linking two lineages that one labels most carefully. To geometry and the inverse problem, to the two masters Connes and Kac, quiet respect is recorded.

8. Conclusion

“Can shape be heard from the spectrum?” — this one question linked the corpus's two lineages by a single road for the first time. Connes' non-commutative geometry rewrites geometry in the spectrum of an operator, and Kac's inverse spectral problem takes it up as an “inverse problem”. The answer is not unique (isospectral non-isometric). Audible are dimension, volume, and total curvature; inaudible are the fine details of shape. The geometric mainstream (91) and inverse problems (89, 99) meet at the home of the Dirac operator (70).

Yet even when a road connects them, mountain range and river system are different. Distance from the metric and distance from the spectrum coincide but are distinct roots, and the scattering, boundary-value, and spectral inverse problems are different mathematics. And even the rigorous NCG Standard Model touched adjustment after a failed prediction — on the bridge, too, Eddington's caution (101) is alive. What this paper did is to graft the two lineages correctly at one point (the spectrum), and, at that seam, to separate distinct roots with care. Separating what hearing reveals from what it does not — at the entrance of the highway linking geometry and the inverse problem, the hundred-and-second address is returned.

Revision Record

2nd edition (September 2026): brought the format into line with the current template (the positioning and scope are gathered in the scope note directly after the abstract, and the section “Scope (what is shown, and what is not)” is removed). The references are split into one entry per paper with actual titles and DOIs (an entry without a DOI that bundled three papers is removed), and external references are given as author, year, title and journal. The year of Chamseddine–Connes, “Why the Standard Model”, is corrected to 2008, the year of journal publication. Milnor (1964), cited in the text, is added to the references.

References

1. Connes, A. (1994). *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press.
2. Connes, A. (2013). *On the spectral characterization of manifolds*. J. Noncommut. Geom.
3. Kac, M. (1966). *Can One Hear the Shape of a Drum?*. Amer. Math. Monthly.
4. Milnor, J. (1964). *Eigenvalues of the Laplace operator on certain manifolds*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.
5. Gordon, C., Webb, D., Wolpert, S. (1992). *Isospectral plane domains and surfaces via Riemannian orbifolds*. Invent. Math.
6. Chamseddine, A. H., Connes, A. (2008). *Why the Standard Model*. J. Geom. Phys.
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Pfaffian's $2^n n!$ Is One Block* [Paper 48]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21602525
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Agreement of the Factors 2 Is a Case of Distinct Roots* [Paper 58]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21597747
9. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Euler-Characteristic Origin of the 4π Patch* [Paper 67]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21642170
10. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Qubit as a Hopf Fibration* [Paper 68]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21642238
11. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Dimension Census* [Paper 69]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21650011
12. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Home of the Constants* [Paper 70]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21650347
13. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Zero-Tension and the Inverse Problem* [Paper 89]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21748664
14. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Curvature Is Intrinsic* [Paper 91]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758406
15. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Shared Alphabet* [Paper 92]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758486
16. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *"Dimension" Is Not One Thing* [Paper 94]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758581
17. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Gauge Principle* [Paper 96]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758671
18. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Reading the Interior from the Boundary* [Paper 99]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758790
19. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Crossing of Royal Roads* [Paper 100]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758864
20. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Admiration and Caution* [Paper 101]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21836382

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)