

↓ **Lecture 13** [23.01.24]

iii | < Non-relativistic limit:

$$\text{Eq. (6.34)} \xrightarrow{\gamma \approx 1} \begin{cases} \vec{E}(\vec{x}) \approx \vec{E}(x) + \frac{1}{c} \vec{v} \times \vec{B}(x) \\ \vec{B}(\vec{x}) \approx \vec{B}(x) - \frac{1}{c} \vec{v} \times \vec{E}(x) \end{cases} \quad (6.35)$$

- The interconversion between magnetic and electric fields happens already in linear order of v/c .
- The separation of the electromagnetic field into “electric” and “magnetic” components is observer dependent!
- Example: A charge at rest has a non-zero electric field, but a vanishing magnetic field. The *same* charge as seen from an inertial system in relative motion gives rise to a current that is accompanied by a non-vanishing magnetic field perpendicular to the direction of motion and the electric field. This is a direct consequence of Eq. (6.35): $\vec{B}(\vec{x}) \approx -\frac{1}{c} \vec{v} \times \vec{E}(x) \neq \vec{0}$.

iv | < Special case: Boost Λ_{v_x} in x -direction: Eq. (6.34) $\xrightarrow{\vec{v} = (v_x, 0, 0)}$

$$\vec{E}_x = E_x, \quad \vec{E}_y = \gamma \left[E_y - \frac{v}{c} B_z \right], \quad \vec{E}_z = \gamma \left[E_z + \frac{v}{c} B_y \right], \quad (6.36a)$$

$$\vec{B}_x = B_x, \quad \vec{B}_y = \gamma \left[B_y + \frac{v}{c} E_z \right], \quad \vec{B}_z = \gamma \left[B_z - \frac{v}{c} E_y \right], \quad (6.36b)$$

(Here the fields in \vec{K} on the left-hand side are functions of \vec{x} whereas the fields in K on the right-hand side are functions of x .)

→

- The field components *parallel* to the boost remain unchanged.
- The *perpendicular* components mix and get enhanced by a Lorentz factor $\gamma > 1$.
- Einstein derived this transformation directly (without using gauge fields and tensor notation) in his 1905 paper “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper” [9]; you follow this path in ↻ Problemset 7.

v | Lorentz scalars:

The electric and magnetic field components transform in a complicated way under Lorentz transformations. Is it possible to combine them into scalar quantities? Thanks to our knowledge of tensor calculus and the field strength tensor, this question is easy to answer:

- a | We can construct a scalar by contracting the FST with itself:

$$F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\alpha} \eta^{\nu\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} \stackrel{\circ}{=} 2(\vec{B}^2 - \vec{E}^2) \quad (6.37)$$

→ If $|\vec{E}| \geq |\vec{B}|$ is true in one IS, it is true in all IS.

- b | We can construct a *pseudo* scalar by contracting the FST with the DFST:

$$\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} F_{\mu\nu} \stackrel{\circ}{=} -4(\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B}) \quad (6.38)$$

→ If $\vec{E} \perp \vec{B}$ is true in one IS, it is true in all IS.

Some comments:

- Note that $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \doteq -F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$ (use contraction identities for Levi-Civita symbols to show this, ↻ Problemset 7); i.e., the two quantities above exhaust all elementary gauge-invariant scalar fields that we can construct ($A^\mu A_\mu$ is of course also a scalar, but not a gauge-invariant one).
- The combination of Eq. (6.37) and Eq. (6.38) can be used to infer whether inertial systems exist in which either the electric or magnetic field vanishes. For example: If $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and $F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} > 0$, it is possible to find an inertial system where $\vec{E} = 0$ and $\vec{B} \neq 0$ (but not the other way around). If $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \neq 0$ there is no inertial system in which one of the fields vanishes.

8 | Manifest covariant form of the Maxwell equations:

Using the FST and the DFST, we can write the Maxwell equations manifestly covariant without using the gauge field and/or fixing a gauge (cf. Eq. (6.19)):

- i | The equations we look for must be ...
- ...manifestly covariant (→ tensor equations).
 - ...linear in the FST or the DFST (the ME are linear in \vec{E} and \vec{B}).
 - ...use one 4-divergence ∂_μ (the ME are first-order PDEs).

→ <

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\nu (\partial_\rho A_\sigma - \partial_\sigma A_\rho) = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\nu \partial_\rho A_\sigma = 0 \quad (6.39a)$$

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu (\partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu) = \partial^\mu (\partial A) - \partial^2 A^\mu \quad (6.39b)$$

- ii | The homogeneous ME Eqs. (6.10a) and (6.10b) must be *identically* true if the fields are given in terms of gauge fields. Eq. (6.39a) then suggests that the homogeneous ME are:

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{Homogeneous ME (?)} \quad (6.40)$$

To check this evaluate:

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} \quad (6.41a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\partial_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} + \partial_\sigma F_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}) \quad (6.41b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu < \rho < \sigma} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\partial_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} + \partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\sigma F_{\nu\rho}) \quad (6.41c)$$

Here we used that the Levi-Civita symbol is invariant under cyclic permutations of (subsets) of indices and that the FST (and the Levi-Civita symbol) is antisymmetric in its indices. Note that for every fixed μ there are $3! = 6$ non-vanishing assignments of indices $\nu\rho\sigma$. However, pairs of terms like $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} \partial_\nu F_{\sigma\rho}$ are identical, so that only 3 distinct terms remain. These can be w.l.o.g. written like cyclic permutations as in Eq. (6.41c). Note that for a fixed index μ , the sum contains only one non-vanishing summand.

→

$$\underbrace{\forall_{\nu < \rho < \sigma} : \partial_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} + \partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\sigma F_{\nu\rho} = 0}_{\uparrow \text{ Bianchi identity (4 equations)}} \Leftrightarrow \underbrace{\forall_\mu : \partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0}_{(4 \text{ equations})} \quad (6.42)$$

It is straightforward to check by hand, using Eq. (6.30), that the four Bianchi identities correspond to the four homogeneous Maxwell Eqs. (6.10a) and (6.10b). For example:

$$\partial_1 F_{23} + \partial_2 F_{31} + \partial_3 F_{12} \stackrel{\circ}{=} -\nabla \cdot \vec{B} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{Eq. (6.10a)} \quad (6.43)$$

Details: → Problemset 7

- As shown in Eq. (6.39a), the homogeneous ME are *identities* if the FST is expressed in terms of gauge fields.
- By contrast, if the FST is expressed in terms of physical fields \vec{E} and \vec{B} [as given in Eq. (6.30)], the equation $\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0$ becomes a non-trivial constraint on the field configurations.

iii | ◁ Lorenz gauge Eq. (6.23) →

$$\text{Eq. (6.39b)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = -\partial^2 A^\mu \quad (6.44)$$

Compare Eq. (6.19) (inhomogeneous ME in Lorenz gauge):

$$-\partial^2 A^\mu = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu \quad (6.45)$$

This suggests that the inhomogeneous ME are:

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu \quad \text{Inhomogeneous ME (?)} \quad (6.46)$$

It is straightforward to check by hand that these four equations are equivalent to the four inhomogeneous ME Eqs. (6.10c) and (6.10d) using Eq. (6.30). For example for $\mu = 0$:

$$\partial_1 F^{01} + \partial_2 F^{02} + \partial_3 F^{03} \stackrel{\circ}{=} -\nabla \cdot \vec{E} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^0 = -4\pi\rho \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{Eq. (6.10c)} \quad (6.47)$$

Details: → Problemset 7

- In this form, the continuity equation Eq. (6.24) follows trivially from the antisymmetry of the FST:

$$\partial_\mu j^\mu = -\frac{c}{4\pi} \partial_\nu \partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (6.48)$$

- If you express the FST in terms of the gauge field, the inhomogeneous ME read (without fixing a gauge!):

$$\partial^2 A^\mu - \partial^\mu (\partial A) = \frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu \quad (6.49)$$

This equation becomes Eq. (6.19) in the Lorenz gauge Eq. (6.23). It is easy to check that this equation is still gauge symmetric under the transformation Eq. (6.25).

iv | In summary, the 8 (=1+3+1+3=4+4) Maxwell equations can be written in the covariant form:

$$\text{Homogeneous ME: } \partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (6.50a)$$

$$\text{Inhomogeneous ME: } \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu \quad (6.50b)$$

- ¡! Using Eqs. (6.30) and (6.32), these equations make sense without introducing the gauge field.
- Note that these equations show that under Lorentz transformations the four homogeneous (inhomogeneous) Maxwell equations mix among each other. You show this explicitly in → Problemset 7 for a boost in z -direction.
- In particular, this means that the Maxwell equations written in their conventional form Eq. (6.10) (i.e., as two scalar and two vector equations) remain *not* invariant under Lorentz transformations for each equation separately, rather the magnetic Gauss law mixes with the Maxwell-Faraday law, and the electric Gauss law mixes with Ampère’s law. This explains why showing the Lorentz covariance of the PDE system Eq. (6.10) is quite messy and complicated without using the tensor formalism. This is why we say that its Lorentz covariance *is not manifest*. By contrast, the Lorentz covariance of the formulation Eq. (6.50) *is manifest* as these are tensor equations.

9 | Lagrangian formulation:

Our final goal is to make a connection to the formalism introduced in Section 6.1 and obtain the Lorentz covariant Maxwell equations as the Euler-Lagrange equations of some action/Lagrangian:

- i | It is convenient to construct the Lagrangian as a function of the gauge fields A^μ because in this formulation the HME are identically satisfied:

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \equiv 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(A, \partial A) \tag{6.51}$$

→ Only the inhomogeneous ME must follow as Euler-Lagrange equations

Note that the counting matches: We have four fields A^μ and thus four Euler-Lagrange equations – just as we have four IME: $\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu$.

- ii | We have the following hints to construct a reasonable Lagrangian density:
 - The IME are Lorentz covariant. This can be ensured by a Lagrangian density that is a Lorentz (pseudo) scalar.
 - The Maxwell equations are linear (superposition principle!); thus the Lagrangian must be quadratic in the fields.
 - The IME are gauge invariant. This can be ensured by a Lagrangian density that is gauge invariant up to a total derivative (here: surface term) which does not affect the equations of motion.

→ Most general form:

$$\mathcal{L}(A, \partial A) = a_1 F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + a_2 \underbrace{\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}}_{\text{Surface term}} + a_3 \underbrace{\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}}_{\propto F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}} + a_4 \underbrace{A_\mu j^\mu}_{\text{Gauge inv. up to surface term}} \tag{6.52}$$

Details: → Problemset 7

- It is straightforward to check that

$$\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \doteq -F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \tag{6.53}$$

so that we can drop the a_3 -term without loss of generality.

- One can also check that

$$\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu) (\partial_\rho A_\sigma - \partial_\sigma A_\rho) \quad (6.54a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\partial_\mu A_\nu \partial_\rho A_\sigma + \partial_\nu A_\mu \partial_\sigma A_\rho - \partial_\nu A_\mu \partial_\rho A_\sigma - \partial_\mu A_\nu \partial_\sigma A_\rho) \quad (6.54b)$$

$$= 2 \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\partial_\mu A_\nu) (\partial_\rho A_\sigma) \quad (6.54c)$$

$$= 2 \underbrace{\partial_\mu \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (A_\nu \partial_\rho A_\sigma)}_{\substack{\uparrow \text{Chern-Simons 3-form} \\ \text{Surface term}}} \quad (6.54d)$$

so that the a_2 -term has no effect on the equations of motion and we can drop it as well.

Note: The a_2 -term is known as the \uparrow θ -term and is special because it is *topological* (it does not “feel” the *geometry* of spacetime). This is easy to see: One does not need a metric tensor to construct it because the contravariant indices of the DFST stem from the Levi-Civita symbol! Despite being a surface term, such terms are important when one quantizes the theory and/or when the gauge theory is non-Abelian (like the SU(3) gauge theory of the strong interaction). Note also that this term is a *pseudo* scalar, i.e., it breaks parity symmetry (which we know electrodynamics does not).

- The a_4 -term is *not* gauge invariant. However, the continuity equation ensures that it modifies the Lagrangian only by a surface term under gauge transformations:

$$\tilde{A}_\mu j^\mu = (A_\mu - \partial_\mu \lambda) j^\mu = A_\mu j^\mu - (\partial_\mu \lambda) j^\mu = A_\mu j^\mu - \underbrace{\partial_\mu (\lambda j^\mu)}_{\text{Surface term}} \quad (6.55)$$

(Here we used the continuity equation $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$.)

Consequently, the equations of motion must be gauge invariant despite the a_4 -term.

- It is easy to check that the quadratic Lorentz scalar $A_\mu A^\mu$ is not gauge invariant (not even up to a surface term); thus it is forbidden.

Note: Coincidentally, it is this term that would give the quantized excitations of the A -field a mass. Thus if you want massive gauge excitations (like the W^\pm - and Z -bosons of the weak interaction), you must find a way to smuggle the term $A_\mu A^\mu$ into your Lagrangian. This is what the \uparrow *Higgs mechanism* achieves.

- iii | **Thus we propose the**
Lagrangian density for Maxwell theory:

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{\text{Maxwell}}(A, \partial A) = -\frac{1}{16\pi} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{c} A_\mu j^\mu \quad (6.56)$$

The prefactors have been chosen such that the Euler-Lagrange equations match the IME (\rightarrow *next step*).

- iv | Euler-Lagrange equations:

Details: \rightarrow Problemset 7

There are four ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) Euler-Lagrange equations:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial A_\mu} - \partial_\nu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\nu A_\mu)} \right) = 0 \quad (6.57)$$

Straightforward calculations yield:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial A_\mu} = -\frac{1}{c} j^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\nu A_\mu)} \stackrel{\circ}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi} F^{\mu\nu} \quad (6.58)$$

Hence the Euler-Lagrange equations are exactly the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations:

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} j^\mu \quad (6.59)$$

→ Eq. (6.56) is the correct Lagrangian density for Maxwell theory.

10 | Coordinate-free notation:

Remember the coordinate-free concepts introduced in Chapter 3: All tensor fields T^I_J are the chart-dependent components of chart-independent objects T (the actual tensor fields). This formalism allows us to reformulate the Maxwell equations in the language of differential geometry, without using coordinates altogether:

i | First, write gauge field

$$A := A_\mu dx^\mu \quad (6.60)$$

and the field strength coordinate-free:

$$F := F_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} \underbrace{[dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu - dx^\nu \otimes dx^\mu]}_{=: dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \text{ ("wedge product")}. \quad (6.61)$$

We say that A is a 1-form and F is a 2-form.

ii | We can evaluate \uparrow exterior derivative of the gauge field:

$$dA \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} dA_\nu \wedge dx^\nu = \partial_\mu A_\nu dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu = F \quad (6.62)$$

The exterior derivative d maps k -forms onto $k + 1$ -forms.

iii | Now evaluate the exterior derivative of the field strength:

$$dF \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \partial_\sigma F_{\mu\nu} dx^\sigma \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\mu \quad (6.63a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{6} (\partial_\sigma F_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu F_{\sigma\mu} + \partial_\mu F_{\nu\sigma}) dx^\sigma \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\mu \quad (6.63b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma < \nu < \mu} (\partial_\sigma F_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu F_{\sigma\mu} + \partial_\mu F_{\nu\sigma}) dx^\sigma \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\mu \quad (6.63c)$$

(Here we used the antisymmetry of the wedge product in all factors.)

Thus we find:

$$dF = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \partial_\sigma F_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu F_{\sigma\mu} + \partial_\mu F_{\nu\sigma} = 0 \stackrel{6.42}{\Leftrightarrow} \partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (6.64)$$

If the field strength is expressed in terms of the gauge field, the homogeneous Maxwell equations $\partial_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0$ are identities. In the coordinate-free notation of differential geometry, this identity follows from the fact that applying an exterior derivative twice produces the zero field:

$$dF = ddA = 0 \quad \text{since} \quad d^2 = 0 \quad (6.65)$$

The relation $dF = 0$ is known as a \uparrow *Bianchi identity*.

- iv | Define the linear \uparrow *Hodge star operator* (here for a 4-dimensional Minkowski manifold):

$$\star(dx^\mu) := \frac{1}{3!} \varepsilon^{\mu}{}_{\nu\rho\sigma} (dx^\nu \wedge dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma) \quad (6.66a)$$

$$\star(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) := \frac{1}{2!} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma} (dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma) \quad (6.66b)$$

$$\star(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\rho) := \frac{1}{1!} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}{}_{\sigma} (dx^\sigma) \quad (6.66c)$$

Note that the definition makes use of the metric tensor via pulling up/down indices of the Levi-Civita symbols. This implies in particular that any equation that uses the Hodge star depends on the geometry of spacetime (here flat Minkowski space).

- v | The dual field-strength tensor (DFST) is the Hodge dual of the field-strength tensor (FST):

$$\star F = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} \star(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) \quad (6.67a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma} (dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma) \quad (6.67b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \tilde{F}_{\rho\sigma} (dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma) \equiv \tilde{F} \quad (6.67c)$$

Beware: The Hodge star \star is not a multiplication symbol (as the notation on the right-hand side might suggest) but a linear operator that acts on the differential form to the right.

- vi | The Hodge dual of the exterior derivative of the DFST yields:

$$\star d(\star F) = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma} \partial_\pi F_{\mu\nu} \star(dx^\pi \wedge dx^\rho \wedge dx^\sigma) \quad (6.68a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \varepsilon^{\pi\rho\sigma}{}_{\alpha} \partial_\pi F^{\mu\nu} (dx^\alpha) \quad (6.68b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (\delta_\mu^\pi \eta_{\nu\alpha} - \delta_\nu^\pi \eta_{\mu\alpha}) \partial_\pi F^{\mu\nu} (dx^\alpha) \quad (6.68c)$$

$$= \eta_{\nu\alpha} \partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} (dx^\alpha) \quad (6.68d)$$

$$\stackrel{6.50b}{=} \frac{4\pi}{c} j_\alpha (dx^\alpha) \quad (6.68e)$$

Here we used a contraction identity for Levi-Civita symbols (over the two red pairs of indices).

- vii | This motivates the definition of the coordinate-free current:

$$J := \frac{4\pi}{c} j_\mu dx^\mu \quad (6.69)$$

- viii | In conclusion, the Maxwell equations can be written without using a coordinate system as:

$$\text{Homogeneous ME: } dF = 0 \quad (6.70a)$$

$$\text{Inhomogeneous ME: } \star d(\star F) = J \quad (6.70b)$$

- If one uses that $(\star)^2 = +1 \cdot \mathbb{1}$ on odd differential forms ($d(\star F)$ is a 3-form), Eq. (6.70b) can alternatively be written as $d(\star F) = \star J$. If one then defines the current not as a 1-form but as the dual 3-form, $J := \frac{4\pi}{c} j_\mu \star dx^\mu$, the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations take their simplest form: $d(\star F) = J$.
- Eq. (6.70) is the most general and elegant formulation of the Maxwell equations. In this form, the equations remain valid even in GENERAL RELATIVITY on curved space times. Then the Minkowski metric used in the definition of the Hodge star \star (to pull the indices of the Levi-Civita symbols up/down) must be replaced by the dynamic, potentially curved metric of GENERAL RELATIVITY.

6.3. Noether theorem and the energy-momentum tensor

In the following, we consider first a generic (classical, relativistic) field theory, and specialize to electrodynamics later. This is to emphasize that most of the results in this chapter are not specific to electrodynamics.

Details: Chapter 1 of my QFT script [19]

1 | < General transformation of field $\phi \mapsto \phi'$:

$$x \mapsto x' = x'(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(x) \mapsto \phi'(x') = \mathcal{F}(\phi(x)) \quad (6.71)$$

Two effects: coordinates and (values of the) field transformed

These are *active transformations* that change physics. $x' = x'(x)$ is *not* a (passive) coordinate transformation; the frame of reference remains fixed in the following!

⊕ Example 6.1: Homogeneous Lorentz transformations

The (active) homogeneous Lorentz transformation of a *vector field* A^μ reads

$$x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu \quad \text{and} \quad A_\nu(x) \mapsto A'_\mu(x') = \underbrace{\Lambda_\mu{}^\nu A_\nu(x)}_{\mathcal{F}(A_\mu(x))} \quad (6.72)$$

whereas the Lorentz transformation of a *scalar field* ϕ reads

$$x^\mu \mapsto x'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(x) \mapsto \phi'(x') = \underbrace{\phi(x)}_{\mathcal{F}(\phi(x))}. \quad (6.73)$$

2 | < Infinitesimal transformations (IT) ($|w_a| \ll 1$):

$$x'^\mu = x^\mu + w_a \delta^a x^\mu(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi'(x') = \phi(x) + w_a \delta^a \phi(x) \quad (6.74)$$

Here, w_a denotes infinitesimal parameters of the transformation (sum over a implied!) and we label different transformations by the labels a .

⊕ Example 6.2: Homogeneous Lorentz transformations

Infinitesimal homogeneous Lorentz transformations take the form (⊕ Problemset 4)

$$\Lambda_w = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{2} w_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{J}^{\alpha\beta}\right) \stackrel{|w_{\alpha\beta}| \ll 1}{\approx} \mathbb{1} - \frac{i}{2} w_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{J}^{\alpha\beta} \quad (6.75)$$

(note that the $a = \alpha\beta$ are labels of generators that are not required to be tensor indices) with generators

$$(\mathcal{J}^{\alpha\beta})^\mu{}_\nu = i \left(\eta^{\alpha\mu} \delta_\nu^\beta - \delta_\nu^\alpha \eta^{\beta\mu} \right). \quad (6.76)$$

With this it follows for the coordinates

$$w_{\alpha\beta} \delta^{\alpha\beta} x^\mu = x'^\mu - x^\mu = -\frac{i}{2} w_{\alpha\beta} (\mathcal{J}^{\alpha\beta})^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu = w_{\alpha\beta} \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \left(\eta^{\alpha\mu} \delta_\nu^\beta - \delta_\nu^\alpha \eta^{\beta\mu} \right)}_{\delta^{\alpha\beta} x^\mu} x^\nu \quad (6.77)$$

so that

$$\delta^{\alpha\beta} x^\mu = \frac{1}{2} (\eta^{\alpha\mu} x^\beta - \eta^{\beta\mu} x^\alpha). \quad (6.78)$$

Similar arguments yield $\delta^{\alpha\beta} A^\mu = \frac{1}{2} (\eta^{\alpha\mu} A^\beta - \eta^{\beta\mu} A^\alpha)$ for a vector field and $\delta^{\alpha\beta} \phi = 0$ for a scalar field.

3 | Generator of IT:

$$\delta_w \phi(x) := \phi'(x) - \phi(x) \equiv -i w^a G_a \phi(x) \quad (6.79)$$

With (omit first line and refer to previous equation)

$$\phi'(x') = \phi(x) + w^a \delta_a \phi(x) \quad (6.80a)$$

$$= \phi(x') - w^a (\delta_a x^\mu) \partial_\mu \phi(x') + w^a \delta_a \phi(x') + \mathcal{O}(w^2) \quad (6.80b)$$

(Here we replaced x by x' in the last term because this is a $\mathcal{O}(w^2)$ modification.)

it follows (replace x' by x ; these are just labels!)

$$i G_a \phi = (\delta_a x^\mu) \partial_\mu \phi - \delta_a \phi \quad (6.81)$$

This function describes the infinitesimal change of the field at the same point.

⊖ **Example 6.3: Translations**

- i | $x'^\mu := x^\mu + w^\mu \equiv x^\mu + w^\nu \delta_\nu x^\mu$ with $\delta_\nu x^\mu = \delta_\nu^\mu$
- ii | $\delta_\nu \phi = 0$ (This is true for scalar and vector fields.)
- iii | $i G_\mu \phi = \delta_\mu^\nu \partial_\nu \phi - 0$ and therefore

$$G_\mu = -i \partial_\mu \equiv P_\mu \quad (6.82)$$

→ The “momentum operator” generates translations.

4 | So far the continuous transformations $\phi \mapsto \phi'$ were arbitrary.

< Continuous transformation [with infinitesimal form Eq. (6.74)] which is a

$$\text{Symmetry of the action} \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad S[\phi] = S[\phi'] \quad (6.83)$$

In principle, the action can vary by a surface term – equivalently, the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L} can vary by a 4-divergence $\partial_\mu K^\mu(\phi, x)$ – under the symmetry transformation (because such modifications do not affect the equations of motion). Here we consider for simplicity only the case where no such terms exist and the action is strictly invariant.

Then one can prove (see Chapter 1 of my QFT script [19] or Refs. [1, 77]): →*

5 | ** Noether's (first) theorem:

For solutions ϕ of the equations of motion, the ** (canonical) (Noether) currents

$$j_a^\mu \equiv \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\nu \phi - \delta_\nu^\mu \mathcal{L} \right\} \delta_a x^\nu - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \delta_a \phi \quad (6.84)$$

(associated to the infinitesimal transformations of coordinates $\delta_a x^\nu$ and fields $\delta_a \phi$)

satisfy the continuity equations

$$\forall_a : \quad \partial_\mu j_a^\mu = 0. \quad (6.85)$$

This means there is one conserved current j_a^μ for each generator a of the continuous symmetry.

6 | Conserved charge:

The currents Eq. (6.84) are called “conserved” because they describe the flow of a conserved ...

$$Q_a := \int_{\text{Space}} d^{D-1}x j_a^0 \quad \text{** (Noether) charge} \quad (6.86)$$

There is one conserved charge Q_a for each generator a of the continuous symmetry.

Indeed:

$$\frac{1}{c} \frac{dQ_a}{dt} = \int_{\text{Space}} d^{D-1}x \partial_0 j_a^0 \stackrel{6.85}{=} - \int_{\text{Space}} d^{D-1}x \partial_k j_a^k \stackrel{\text{Gauss}}{=} - \int_{\text{Surface}} d\sigma_k j_a^k = 0 \quad (6.87)$$

Here we assume that $j_a^k \equiv 0$ on the spatial boundaries—typically at infinity, i.e., the universe is closed. $k = 1, 2, 3$ denotes the spatial coordinates.

🔗 **Note 6.1**

The current Eq. (6.84) is called canonical current because it is not unique:

$$\tilde{j}_a^\mu := j_a^\mu + \partial_\nu B_a^{\mu\nu} \quad \text{with} \quad B_a^{\mu\nu} = -B_a^{\nu\mu} \quad \text{arbitrary} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \partial_\mu \tilde{j}_a^\mu = 0 \quad (6.88)$$

This is particularly important for the energy-momentum tensor (→ below).

6.3.1. Application: The Energy-Momentum Tensor (EMT)

Details: ➔ [Problemset 7](#)

7 | ◀ Infinitesimal spacetime translations:

$$x'^\mu = x^\mu + w^\mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad \delta_\nu x^\mu = \delta_\nu^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_\nu \phi = 0 \quad (6.89)$$

& Translation-invariant action: $S' = S$ (This includes translations in time!)

8 | Conserved currents: Eq. (6.84) →

$$\Theta^\mu_\nu := \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\nu \phi - \delta_\nu^\mu \mathcal{L} \right\} \underbrace{\delta_\nu x^\rho}_{\delta_\nu^\rho} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\nu \phi - \delta_\nu^\mu \mathcal{L} \quad (6.90)$$

Note that the generator index a is in this case a proper Lorentz index ν so that we can pull it up, $\Theta^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\nu\rho} \Theta^\mu_\rho$, and obtain:

* (Canonical) Energy-Momentum Tensor:

$$\Theta^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial^\nu \phi - \eta^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L} \quad (6.91)$$

with

$$\partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{and four conserved charges} \quad P^\nu := \frac{1}{c} \int d^3x \Theta^{0\nu}. \quad (6.92)$$

- Note that these quantities are only conserved for *solutions* of the Euler-Lagrange equations.
- P^ν is a 4-vector (show this!). Note that this is a non-trivial statement because d^3x is not a Lorentz scalar and $\Theta^{0\nu}$ not a 4-vector.
- The prefactor $1/c$ ensures that P^0 has the same dimension as a conventional 4-momentum with $p^0 = E/c$; note that Θ^{00} has the dimension of an *energy density* because \mathcal{L} has this dimension.

9 | Interpretation:

i | *Energy* ($\nu = 0$):

$$cP^0 = \int d^3x \Theta^{00} = \int d^3x \underbrace{\left\{ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} \dot{\phi} - \mathcal{L} \right\}}_{\text{Hamiltonian density}} = \underbrace{\int d^3x \mathcal{H}(\phi, \pi)}_{\text{Hamiltonian}} = H \quad (6.93)$$

→ The Hamiltonian is the component of a 4-vector and not Lorentz invariant!
 By contrast, the Lagrangian *is* Lorentz invariant (for relativistic field theories).

ii | *Kinetic momentum* ($\nu = i$):

$$P^i = \int d^3x \Theta^{0i} = \int d^3x \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} (-\partial_i \phi) = - \int d^3x \pi \partial_i \phi \quad (6.94)$$

π is the *canonical* momentum conjugate to the field ϕ .

10 | The canonical EMT of electrodynamics:

i | < Free ($j^\mu = 0$) electromagnetic field: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{em}} = -\frac{1}{16\pi} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}$

→ Invariant under spacetime translations

Indeed, with $x'^\mu = x^\mu + w^\mu$ and the field transformation $A'_\mu(x) := A_\mu(x - w)$ it is

$$S_{\text{em}}[A'] = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_{\text{em}}(A'(x), \partial A'(x)) = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_{\text{em}}(A(x - w), \partial A(x - w)) \quad (6.95a)$$

$$= \int d^4y \mathcal{L}_{\text{em}}(A(y), \partial A(y)) = S_{\text{em}}[A] \quad (6.95b)$$

where we integrate over the full Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, substituted $y^\mu = x^\mu - w^\mu$ and used $d^4x = d^4y$.

ii | → Canonical EMT conserved: $\partial_\mu \Theta_{\text{em}}^{\mu\nu} = 0$ with

$$\Theta_{\text{em}}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{em}}}{\partial(\partial_\mu A_\sigma)} \partial^\nu A_\sigma - \eta^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}_{\text{em}} \stackrel{6.58}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi} F^{\sigma\mu} \partial^\nu A_\sigma + \frac{\eta^{\mu\nu}}{16\pi} F_{\sigma\rho} F^{\sigma\rho} \quad (6.96)$$

Note that because the gauge field has multiple components A_μ , there is now an additional summation in the first term over these components (marked indices). This follows directly from a generalization of the proof of Noether's theorem for fields with multiple components.

Details: → Problemset 7

iii | Problems:

The canonical EMT $\Theta_{\text{em}}^{\mu\nu}$ has two problematic properties:

- Because of the term $\partial^\nu A_\sigma$, $\Theta_{\text{em}}^{\mu\nu}$ is gauge-dependent!

This is problematic because it means that we cannot hope to identify physical quantities like the energy density or the momentum density of the electromagnetic field with (the components) of this tensor.

- The canonical EMT is non-symmetric: $\Theta_{\text{em}}^{\mu\nu} \neq \Theta_{\text{em}}^{\nu\mu}$!

In GENERAL RELATIVITY, we will find that the right-hand side of the → *Einstein field equations* (which determine how spacetime curves and evolves)

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} R g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu} \quad (6.97)$$

is given by the → *Hilbert energy-momentum tensor*

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta(\mathcal{L}_{\text{Matter}})}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \quad (6.98)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Matter}}$ describes the Lagrangian density of all fields in the universe (except the metric tensor field). For example, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Matter}}$ contains the Maxwell Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{em} (“matter” here includes every degree of freedom that has energy & momentum, i.e., also electromagnetic radiation).

Note that $T^{\mu\nu}$ is *symmetric* because the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is. Hence it cannot be identified with the canonical EMT $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ in general (here for the example of Maxwell theory).

! These problems are not specific to electrodynamics but typically affect all theories that are gauge theories and/or include non-scalar fields.

→ How to solve these issues?

6.3.2. The Belinfante-Rosenfeld energy-momentum tensor (BRT)

We consider again first a generic field theory, and specialize to electrodynamics later.

Details: → Problemset 7

11 | Remember (Note 6.1) that the canonical EMT is not the only conserved EMT because

$$\tilde{\Theta}^{\mu\nu} := \Theta^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\rho K^{\rho\mu\nu} \quad \text{with} \quad K^{\rho\mu\nu} = -K^{\mu\rho\nu} \quad (6.99)$$

yields another EMT $\tilde{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$ for any suitable tensor $K^{\rho\mu\nu}$.

→ *Idea*: Find $K^{\rho\mu\nu}$ such that $\tilde{\Theta}^{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\Theta}^{\nu\mu}$ is symmetric (and hopefully gauge-invariant).

- 12 | Let us assume that our theory is also invariant under homogeneous Lorentz transformations (in addition to the spacetime translations needed for the conservation of the EMT).

◁ Generators of homogeneous LTs for coordinates:

$$\text{Eq. (6.78)} \rightarrow \delta^{\alpha\beta} x^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta^{\alpha\mu} x^\beta - \eta^{\beta\mu} x^\alpha \right). \quad (6.100)$$

Assume that fields transform as $\delta^{\alpha\beta} \phi$.

For the following arguments, we do not need to fix whether our fields transform as scalar, vector, or even → *spinor fields*.

Eq. (6.84) & Eq. (6.91) & Eq. (6.100) →

Noether currents for homogeneous LTs:

$$L^{\mu\alpha\beta} \doteq \frac{1}{2} \left(\Theta^{\mu\alpha} x^\beta - \Theta^{\mu\beta} x^\alpha \right) + \frac{1}{2} S^{\mu\alpha\beta} \quad (6.101)$$

with

$$** \text{ Spin current: } S^{\mu\alpha\beta} := -2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \phi \quad (6.102)$$

which satisfies $S^{\mu\alpha\beta} = -S^{\mu\beta\alpha}$.

(This follows because $\delta^{\alpha\beta} \phi = -\delta^{\beta\alpha} \phi$ as the generators of homogeneous LTs are antisymmetric.)

The continuity equation reads

$$\partial_\mu L^{\mu\alpha\beta} = 0. \quad (6.103)$$

Because homogeneous LTs describe *rotations* in space and time, the conserved current $L^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ can be identified as ↑ (canonical) *angular momentum current*. The first part in Eq. (6.101) corresponds to the (canonical) *orbital angular momentum* while the second part $S^{\mu\alpha\beta}$ encodes the *intrinsic angular momentum* of the field (= its ↓ *spin*). This immediately explains why for a scalar field with $\delta^{\alpha\beta} \phi = 0$, the spin current vanishes $S^{\mu\alpha\beta} = 0$.

- 13 | Eq. (6.92) & Eq. (6.103) →

$$\partial_\mu S^{\mu\alpha\beta} \doteq \Theta^{\alpha\beta} - \Theta^{\beta\alpha} \quad (6.104)$$

This means that a non-vanishing divergence in the spin current is responsible for the “non-symmetry” of the canonical EMT!

- 14 | Now define

$$K^{\rho\mu\nu} := -\frac{1}{2} (S^{\mu\nu\rho} + S^{\nu\mu\rho} - S^{\rho\nu\mu}) \quad (6.105)$$

→ $K^{\rho\mu\nu} = -K^{\mu\rho\nu}$ (This follows from $S^{\mu\alpha\beta} = -S^{\mu\beta\alpha}$.)

With this we can finally define the ...

** *Belinfante-Rosenfeld energy-momentum tensor (BRT):*

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \Theta^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\rho K^{\rho\mu\nu} := \Theta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\rho (S^{\mu\nu\rho} + S^{\nu\mu\rho} - S^{\rho\nu\mu}) \quad (6.106)$$

15 | It remains to be shown that $T^{\mu\nu}$ is always symmetric:

$$T^{\mu\nu} - T^{\nu\mu} \stackrel{6.104}{=} 0 \quad \text{☺} \quad (6.107)$$

It can be rigorously shown that the BRT is identical to the Hilbert EMT that shows up in GENERAL RELATIVITY as the source of gravity [78]. This is why the BRT gets its own symbol $T^{\mu\nu}$.