

Classical and quantum mechanics via Lie algebras

Arnold Neumaier

Dennis Westra

University of Vienna, Austria

March 2, 2019

This is the draft of a book. The manuscript has not yet full book quality.

A polished version will be published by Cambridge University Press.

Please refer to the book once it is published.

copyright © by Arnold Neumaier and Dennis Westra

Contents

Preface	vii
I An invitation to quantum mechanics	1
1 Motivation	3
1.1 Classical mechanics	3
1.2 Thermodynamics and statistical mechanics	6
1.3 Quantum mechanics	9
1.4 The Heisenberg picture	13
1.5 Rotations	16
1.6 Symmetries	21
1.7 Outline of the book	26
2 Classical oscillating systems	33
2.1 Systems of damped oscillators	33
2.2 The classical anharmonic oscillator	37
2.3 Harmonic oscillators and linear field equations	40
2.4 Alpha rays	42
2.5 Beta rays	45
2.6 Light rays and gamma rays	47
3 Spectral analysis	51
3.1 The quantum spectrum	51

3.2	Probing the spectrum of a system	55
3.3	The early history of quantum mechanics	58
3.4	The spectrum of many-particle systems	62
3.5	Black body radiation	64
3.6	Derivation of Planck's law	66
3.7	Stefan's law and Wien's displacement law	70
II	Statistical mechanics	73
4	Phenomenological thermodynamics	75
4.1	Standard thermodynamical systems	75
4.2	The laws of thermodynamics	80
4.3	Consequences of the first law	83
4.4	Consequences of the second law	84
4.5	The approach to equilibrium	88
5	Quantities, states, and statistics	93
5.1	Quantities	94
5.2	Gibbs states	101
5.3	Kubo product and generating functional	104
5.4	Limit resolution and uncertainty	109
6	The laws of thermodynamics	115
6.1	The zeroth law: Thermal states	115
6.2	The equation of state	119
6.3	The first law: Energy balance	124
6.4	The second law: Extremal principles	127
6.5	The third law: Quantization	129

7	Models, statistics, and measurements	133
7.1	Description levels	133
7.2	Local, microlocal, and quantum equilibrium	140
7.3	Statistics and probability	143
7.4	Classical measurements	147
7.5	Quantum probability	150
7.6	Entropy and unobservable complexity	153
7.7	Subjective probability	156
III	Lie algebras and Poisson algebras	159
8	Lie algebras	161
8.1	Basic definitions	162
8.2	Lie algebras from derivations	165
8.3	Linear groups and their Lie algebras	167
8.4	Classical Lie groups and their Lie algebras	170
8.5	Heisenberg algebras and Heisenberg groups	175
8.6	Lie *-algebras	180
9	Mechanics in Poisson algebras	185
9.1	Poisson algebras	185
9.2	Rotating rigid bodies	187
9.3	Rotations and angular momentum	189
9.4	Classical rigid body dynamics	192
9.5	Lie–Poisson algebras	193
9.6	Classical symplectic mechanics	197
9.7	Molecular mechanics	199
9.8	An outlook to quantum field theory	202

10 Representation and classification	203
10.1 Poisson representations	203
10.2 Linear representations	205
10.3 Finite-dimensional representations	207
10.4 Representations of Lie groups	208
10.5 Unitary representations of the Poincaré group	210
10.6 Finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras	211
10.7 Automorphisms and coadjoint orbits	215
IV Mechanics and differential geometry	217
11 Fields, forms, and derivatives	219
11.1 Scalar fields and vector fields	220
11.2 Multilinear forms	223
11.3 Exterior calculus	227
11.4 Manifolds as differential geometries	230
11.5 Manifolds as topological spaces	231
11.6 Noncommutative geometry	235
11.7 Lie groups as manifolds	236
12 Conservative mechanics on manifolds	239
12.1 Poisson algebras from closed 2-forms	239
12.2 Conservative Hamiltonian dynamics	242
12.3 Constrained Hamiltonian dynamics	245
12.4 Lagrangian mechanics	248
13 Hamiltonian quantum mechanics	253
13.1 Quantum dynamics as symplectic motion	253
13.2 Quantum-classical dynamics	255

13.3	Deformation quantization	258
13.4	The Wigner transform	261
V	Representations and spectroscopy	269
14	Harmonic oscillators and coherent states	271
14.1	The classical harmonic oscillator	272
14.2	Quantizing the harmonic oscillator	273
14.3	Representations of the Heisenberg algebra	276
14.4	Bras and Kets	278
14.5	Boson Fock space	281
14.6	Bargmann–Fock representation	283
14.7	Coherent states for the harmonic oscillator	284
14.8	Monochromatic beams and coherent states	290
15	Spin and fermions	293
15.1	Fermion Fock space	293
15.2	Extension to many degrees of freedom	296
15.3	Exterior algebra representation	299
15.4	Spin and metaplectic representation	301
15.5	Spinor representations of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $SU(2)$	304
15.6	The isomorphism $SO(3, 1)^+ \cong SL(2, \mathbb{C})/\mathbb{Z}_2$	308
16	Highest weight representations	311
16.1	Triangular decompositions	311
16.2	Triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree one	314
16.3	Unitary representations of $SU(2)$ and $SO(3)$	315
16.4	Some unitary highest weight representations	317

17 Spectroscopy and spectra	319
17.1 Introduction and historical background	319
17.2 Spectra of systems of particles	321
17.3 Examples of spectra	324
17.4 Dynamical symmetries	326
17.5 The hydrogen atom	328
17.6 Chains of subalgebras	330
Author index	351

Preface

The goal of this book is to present classical mechanics, quantum mechanics, and statistical mechanics in an almost completely algebraic setting, thereby introducing mathematicians, physicists, and engineers to the ideas relating classical and quantum mechanics with Lie algebras and Lie groups. The book should serve as an appetizer, inviting the reader to go more deeply into this fascinating, interdisciplinary fields of science.

Much of the material covered here is not part of standard textbook treatments of classical or quantum mechanics (or is only superficially treated there). For physics students who want to get a broader view of the subject, this book may therefore serve as a useful complement to standard treatments of quantum mechanics.

We motivate everything as far as possible by classical mechanics. This forced an approach to quantum mechanics close to Heisenberg's matrix mechanics, rather than the usual approach dominated by Schrödinger's wave mechanics. Indeed, although both approaches are formally equivalent, only the Heisenberg approach to quantum mechanics has any similarity with classical mechanics; and as we shall see, the similarity is quite close. Indeed, the present book emphasizes the closeness of classical and quantum mechanics, and the material is selected in a way to make this closeness as apparent as possible.

Almost without exception, this book is about precise concepts and exact results in classical mechanics, quantum mechanics, and statistical mechanics. The structural properties of mechanics are discussed independent of computational techniques for obtaining quantitatively correct numbers from the assumptions made. This allows us to focus attention on the simplicity and beauty of theoretical physics, which is often hidden in a jungle of techniques for estimating or calculating quantities of interests. The standard approximation machinery for calculating from first principles explicit thermodynamic properties of materials, or explicit cross sections for high energy experiments can be found in many textbooks and is not repeated here.

The book originated as course notes from a course given by the first author in Fall 2007, written up by the second author, and expanded and polished by combined efforts, resulting in a uniform whole that stands for itself. Part II is mainly based on earlier work by the first author (NEUMAIER [183, 184]). The second author acknowledges support by the Austrian FWF-projects START-project Y-237 and IK 1008-N. Thanks go to Roger Balian, Clemens Elster, Martin Fuchs, Johann Kim, Mihaly Markot, Mike Mowbray, Hermann Schichl, Peter Schodl, and Tapio Schneider, who contributed through their comments on earlier versions of parts of the book.

The audience of the course consisted mainly of mathematics students shortly before finishing their diploma or doctorate degree and a few postgraduates, mostly with only a limited background knowledge in physics.

Thus we assume some mathematical background knowledge, but only a superficial acquaintance with physics, at the level of what is available to readers of the *Scientific American*, say. It is assumed that the reader knows basic properties of vector spaces, linear algebra,

groups, differential equations, topology, and Hilbert spaces. No background in Lie algebras, Lie groups, or differential geometry is assumed. Rudiments of differential geometry would be helpful to expand on our somewhat terse treatment of it in Part IV; most material, however, is completely independent of differential geometry.

While we give precise definitions of all mathematical concepts encountered, and an extensive index of concepts and notation, we avoid the deeper use of functional analysis and differential geometry without being mathematically inaccurate, by concentrating on situations that have no special topological difficulties and only need a single chart. But we mention where one would have to be more careful about existence or convergence issues when generalizing to infinite dimensions.

On the physics side, we usually first present the mathematical models for a physical theory before relating the models to reality. This is adequate both for mathematically-minded readers without much physics knowledge and for physicists who know already on a more elementary level how to interpret the basic settings in terms of real life examples.

This is an open-ended book. It should whet the appetite for more, and lead the reader into going deeper into the subject.¹ Thus many topics are discussed far too short for a comprehensive treatment, and often only the surface is scratched. A term has only this many hours, and our time to extend and polish the lectures after they were given was limited, too. We added some material, and would have liked to be more complete in many respects. Nevertheless, we believe that the topics treated are the fundamental ones, whose understanding gives a solid foundation to assess the wealth of material on other topics.

We usually introduce physical concepts by means of informal historical interludes, and only discuss simple physical situations in which the relevant concepts can be illustrated. We refer to the general situation only by means of remarks; however, after reading the book, the reader should be able to go deeper into the original literature that treats these topics in greater physical depth.

Part I is an invitation to quantum mechanics, concentrating on giving motivation and background from history and from classical mechanics. Part II gives a thorough treatment of the formal part of equilibrium statistical mechanics, viewed in the present context as the common core of classical and quantum mechanics, and discusses the interpretation of the theory in terms of models, statistics and measurements. Part III introduces the basics about Lie algebras and Poisson algebras, with an emphasis on the concepts most relevant to the conceptual side of physics. Part IV introduces the relevant background from differential geometry and applies it to classical Hamiltonian and Lagrangian mechanics, to a symplectic formulation of quantum mechanics, and to Lie groups. Part V applies the concepts to the study of quantum oscillators (bosons) and spinning systems (fermions), and to the analysis

¹Some general references for further reading: BARUT & RACZKA [25], CORNWELL [60], GILMORE [92], and STERNBERG [234], for the general theory of Lie algebras, Lie groups, and their representations from a physics point of view, WYBOURNE [265] and FUCHS & SCHWEIGERT [84] for a more application oriented view of Lie algebras, KAC [130] and NEEB [179] for infinite-dimensional Lie algebras, PAPOUŠEK & ALIEV [188] for quantum mechanics and spectroscopy, VAN DER WAERDEN [249] for the history of quantum mechanics, and WEINBERG [256] for a (somewhat) Lie algebra oriented treatment of quantum field theory.

of experimental spectra, concentrating on the mathematical contents of these subjects. The book concludes with numerous references and an index of all concepts and symbols introduced. For an overview of the topics treated, see Section 1.7.

We hope that you enjoy reading this book!

Wien, March 2, 2019

Arnold Neumaier, Dennis Westra

Part I

An invitation to quantum mechanics

Chapter 1

Motivation

Part I is an invitation to quantum mechanics, concentrating on giving motivation and background from history and from classical mechanics.

The first chapter is an introduction and serves as a motivation for the following chapters. We will go over different areas of physics and give a short glimpse on the mathematical point of view. The final section of the chapter outlines the content of the whole book.

For the mathematicians most of the folklore vocabulary of physicists may not be familiar, but later on in the book, precise definitions in mathematical language will be given. Therefore, apart from the material introduced in Section 1.6, there is no need to understand everything in the first chapter on first reading; we merely introduce informal names for certain concepts from physics and try to convey the impression that these have important applications to reality and that there are many interesting solved and unsolved mathematical problems in many areas of theoretical physics.¹

1.1 Classical mechanics

Classical mechanics is the part of physics that started more or less with Isaac Newton (1642-1727). We do not dare to give a precise definition of classical mechanics, but simply describe some of its fields.

It was in the period of Newton, Leibniz, and Galileo that classical mechanics was born, mainly studying planetary motion. Newton wanted to understand why the earth seems to circle around the sun, why the moon seems to circle around the earth, and why apples (and other objects) fall down. By analyzing empirical data, he discovered a formula explaining most of the observed phenomena involving gravity. The philosophically big step Newton

¹We encourage readers to investigate for themselves some of the abundant literature to get a better feeling and more understanding that we can offer here.

made was to realize that the laws of physics here on earth are the same as the laws of physics determining the motion of the planets.

The motion of a planet is described by its position and velocity at different times. With the laws of Newton it was possible to deduce a set of differential equations involving the positions and velocities of the different constituents of the solar system. Knowing exactly all positions and velocities at a given time, one could in principle deduce the positions and velocities at any other time. Our solar system is a well-posed initial value problem (IVP). However, an initial error in position and velocities at time $t_0 = 0$ grows exponentially at time $t > 0$ by a factor of $\sim e^{\lambda t}$. The value of λ varies for different initial conditions; its maximum is called the **maximal Lyapunov exponent**. A system with maximal Lyapunov exponent $\lambda = 0$ is called **integrable**. If $\lambda < 0$ the solutions converge to each other and if $\lambda > 0$ the solutions move away from each other. The solar system is apparently not quite integrable: according to numerical simulations, the maximal Lyapunov exponent for our solar system seems to be small but positive, with λ^{-1} being about five million years (LASKAR [153, 154], LISSAUER [158]).

An important ingredient of classical mechanics is **phase space**. This is (in our context) the space in which all the positions and velocities of all relevant objects are represented as single points. Thus the motion of all planets together is a single path in phase space. For a single particle moving in space, there are three spatial directions to specify its position and three directions to specify the velocity. Hence the phase space of a (free) particle is six-dimensional; for a system of n astronomical bodies, the dimension is $6n$. Low-dimensional phase spaces are well-understood in general. Newton showed that the configuration of a single planet moving around the sun is stable (in fact, the system is integrable) and motion follows the so-called **Kepler's' law**. Higher-dimensional phase spaces tend to cause problems. Indeed, for more planets (that is, more than 2 bodies in the system), deviations from elliptic motions are predicted, and the question of stability was open for a long time. The Swedish king Oskar II was willing to reward the scientist that could prove stability of our solar system with a big amount of money. However, Poincaré showed that already three objects (one sun, two planets) caused big problems for a possible stability proof of our solar system and received the prize in 1887. The numerical studies from the end of the last century (quoted above) strongly indicate that the solar system is unstable, though a mathematical proof is missing.

We now turn from celestial mechanics, where phase space is finite-dimensional, to **continuum mechanics**, which has to cope with infinite-dimensional phase spaces. For example, to describe a fluid, one needs to give the distribution of mass and energy and the local velocity for all (infinitely many) points in the fluid. The dynamics is now governed by partial differential equations. In particular, fluid mechanics is dominated by the **Navier–Stokes equations**, which still offer a lot of difficult mathematical problems. Showing that solutions exist for all times (not only short-time solutions) is one of the Clay Millennium problems (see, e.g., LADYZHENSKAYA [149]), and will be rewarded by one million dollars.

The infinitely many dimensions of the phase space cause serious additional problems. The Lyapunov exponents now depend on where the fluid starts in phase space and for fast-flowing fluids, the maximal Lyapunov exponent is much larger than zero in most parts

of phase space. This results in a phenomenon called **turbulence**, well-known from the behavior of water. The notion of turbulence is still not well understood mathematically. Surprisingly enough, the problems encountered with turbulence are of the same kind as the problems encountered in quantum field theories (QFT's) – one of the many instances where a problem in classical mechanics has an analogue in quantum physics.

Another area of continuum mechanics is **elasticity theory**, where solids are treated as continuous, nearly rigid objects, which deform slightly under external forces. The rigidity assumption is easily verified empirically; try to swim in metal at room temperature. . . . Due to the rigidity assumption the behavior is much better understood mathematically than in the fluid counterpart. The configuration of a solid is close to equilibrium and the deviations from the equilibrium position are strongly suppressed (this *is* rigidity). Hence the rigidity assumption implies that linear Taylor approximations work well since the remaining terms of the Taylor series are small, and the Lyapunov exponent is zero.

Elasticity theory is widely applied in engineering practice. Modern bridges and high rise buildings would be impossible without the finite element analyses which determine their stability and their vibration modes. In fact, the calculations are done in finite-dimensional discretizations, where much of the physics is reducible to linear algebra. Indeed, all continuum theories are (and have to be) handled computationally in approximations with only finitely many degrees of freedom; in most areas very successfully. The mathematical difficulties are often related to establishing a valid continuum limit.

In the period 1900-1920, classical mechanics was enriched with **special relativity theory** (SRT) and **general relativity theory** (GRT). In SRT and GRT space and time merge into a four-dimensional manifold, called space-time. Space-time is in general not flat, but has curvature. That means that freely moving objects do not follow real straight lines – in fact the notion of what straight means is blurred. The trajectory that an object in a free fall, where no forces are exerted on the object, will follow is called a **geodesic**. The geodesics are determined by the geometry by means of a second-order differential equation. The preferred direction of time on a curved space-time is now no longer fixed, or as mathematicians say 'canonical', but is determined by the observer: The geodesic along the observers' 4-momentum vector defines the world line of the observer (e.g., a measuring instrument) and with it its time; the space-like surfaces orthogonal to the points on the world line define the observer's 3-dimensional space at each moment. When the observer also defines a set of spatial coordinates around its position, and a measure of time (along the observers' geodesic), one can say that a chart around the observer has been chosen.

In SRT, distances in space and time are measured with the Minkowski metric, an indefinite metric (discussed in more detail in Section 1.6) which turns space-time a pseudo-Riemannian manifold. Different observers (in SRT) all see the same speed of light. But they see the same distances only when measured with the Minkowski metric – not with the Euclidean spatial or temporal metric (which also holds for the orthogonality mentioned above). It follows that spatial separation and temporal separation between localized systems (for example a chicken laying an egg and an atom splitting) are different for different observers! But the difference is observable only when the two systems move at widely different velocities, hence Newton couldn't have noticed this deviation from his theory.

In classical mechanics, time is absolute in the sense that there exists a global time up to time shifts; the time difference between two events is the same in every coordinate system. The symmetries of classical space-time is thus the group generated by time-translations, space translations and rotations. This group is the Galilean group. Due to the experimental fact that the speed of light in vacuum is the same for all observers led Einstein to the conclusion that time is not absolute and that the Galilean group should be enlarged with transformations that rotate space and time coordinates into each other. The result was the theory of special relativity. Due to special relativistic effects in the quantum theory, the world indeed looks different; for example, without special relativity, gold would be white, and mercury would be solid at room temperature NORRBY [185].

SRT is only valid if observers move at fixed velocities with respect to each other. To handle observers whose relative velocities may vary requires the more general but also more complex GRT. The metric now depends on the space-time point; it becomes a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on the space-time manifold. The transformations (diffeomorphisms) relating the metric in one patch to the metric in another patch cannot change the signature. Hence the signature is the same for all observers.

When time becomes an observer dependent quantity, so becomes energy. Local energy conservation is still well defined, described by a conservation law for the resulting differential equations. The differential equations are covariant, meaning that they make sense in any coordinate system. For a large system in general relativity, the definition of a total energy which is conserved, i.e., time-independent, is however problematic, and well-defined only if the system satisfies appropriate boundary conditions such as asymptotic flatness, believed to hold for the universe at large. Finally, if the system is dissipative, there is energy loss, and the local conservation law is no longer valid. Not even the rate of energy loss is well defined. Dissipative general relativity has not yet found its final mathematical form.

1.2 Thermodynamics and statistical mechanics

A major area both in classical and in quantum mechanics is thermodynamics; indeed, the two realms of physics meet there very closely.

Thermodynamics was developed especially in the industrial revolution in England. Maxwell wrote many papers on a mathematical foundation of thermodynamics. With the establishment of a molecular world view the thermodynamical machinery slowly got replaced by statistical mechanics, where the macroscopic properties like heat capacity, entropy, temperature were explained through considerations of the statistical properties of a big population of particles. The first definite treatise on statistical thermodynamics is by GIBBS [90]² who also invented much of the modern mathematical notation in physics, especially the notation for vector analysis.

One can say that quantum mechanics and classical mechanics are closest when viewed in

²Today, this book from 1902 is still easily readable.

the context of statistical mechanics; indeed, Gibbs' account of statistical mechanics had to be altered very little after quantum mechanics revolutionized the whole of science. In this course, we shall always emphasize the closeness of classical and quantum reasoning, and put things in a way to make this closeness as apparent as possible.

An important ingredient in statistical mechanics is a **phase space density** ρ playing the role of a measure to calculate probabilities; the expectation value of a function f is given by

$$\langle f \rangle = \int \rho f, \quad (1.1)$$

where the integral indicates integration with respect to the so-called Liouville measure in phase space.

In the quantum version of statistical mechanics the density ρ gets replaced by a linear operator ρ on Hilbert space called the **density matrix**, the functions become linear operators, and we have again (1.1), except that the integral is now interpreted as the **quantum integral**,

$$\int f = \text{tr } f, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\text{tr } f$ denotes the trace of a trace class operator. We shall see that the algebraic properties of the classical integral and the quantum integral are so similar that using the same name and symbol is justified.

A deeper justification for the quantum integral becomes visible if we introduce the **Lie product**³

$$f \lrcorner g := \begin{cases} \{g, f\} & \text{in the classical case,} \\ \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, g] & \text{in the quantum case,} \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

unifying the classical **Poisson bracket**

$$\{f, g\} := \partial_q f \cdot \partial_p g - \partial_q g \cdot \partial_p f$$

on the algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\Omega)$ of smooth functions on phase space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{3N} \times \mathbb{R}^{3N}$, and the quantum **commutator**

$$[f, g] := fg - gf$$

on the algebra $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3N})$ of linear operators on the space of smooth functions on configuration space. (Here $i = \sqrt{-1}$ – complex numbers will figure prominently in this book! –, and \hbar is **Planck's constant** in the form introduced by DIRAC [64]. Planck had used instead the constant $h = 2\pi\hbar$ which caused many additional factors of 2π in formulas discovered later.) The Lie product is in both cases an antisymmetric bilinear map from $\mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{E}$ to \mathbb{E} and satisfies the **Jacobi identity**; see Chapter 8 for precise definitions.

In the classical case, the fact that integration and differentiation are inverse operations implies that the integral of a derivative of a function vanishing at infinity is zero. The traditional definition of the Poisson bracket therefore implies that, for functions f, g vanishing at infinity,

$$\int f \lrcorner g = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

³ The symbol \lrcorner , frequently used in the following, was created in NEUMAIER [183], explicitly for the purposes of unifying quantum mechanics and classical mechanics. It is a stylized inverted capital letter L and should be read as "Lie".

Remarkably, in the quantum case, (1.4) is valid for Hilbert–Schmidt operators f, g since then $\text{tr } fg = \text{tr } gf$, so that $\int f \triangleright g = \text{tr } \frac{i}{\hbar} [f, g] = \frac{i}{\hbar} (\text{tr } fg - \text{tr } gf) = 0$. Thus the quantum integral behaves just like the Liouville integral!

Understanding statistical physics requires the setting of **Hamiltonian mechanics**, which exists both in a classical and a quantum version.

Much of classical mechanics can be understood in both a Hamiltonian formulation and a Lagrangian formulation; cf. Chapter 12. In the Hamiltonian formulation, the basic object is the **Hamiltonian** function H on the phase space Ω , which gives the value of the energy at an arbitrary point of phase space. Specifying H essentially amounts to specifying the physical system under consideration. Often the phase space Ω is the **cotangent bundle** T^*M of a manifold M . In the Lagrangian formulation, the main object is a **Lagrangian function** L on the **tangent bundle** TM of a manifold M . The Lagrangian is thus not a function on phase space, and has no simple physical interpretation, but in some sense, it plays a more fundamental role than the Hamiltonian since it survives the transition to the currently most fundamental physical theory, quantum field theory. The passage between the Hamiltonian and the Lagrangian formulation is straightforward in simple cases but may cause problems, especially in so-called **gauge theories** (pronounced in English transcription as *gaidge*). Gauge theories are outside the scope of this book; the curious reader is referred to the vast literature.

In the Hamiltonian formulation the time-dependence of a function f on the phase space is determined by the **classical Heisenberg equation**

$$\frac{df}{dt} = H \triangleright f = \{f, H\} , \quad (1.5)$$

where H is the Hamiltonian function defined above. Important to note is that the Hamiltonian function determines the time-evolution. Suppose we can solve the differential equations, then we have an operator $U(s, t)$ that maps objects at a time s to corresponding objects at a time t . Clearly, the composition of the operators gives $U(s, s')U(s', t) = U(s, t)$. If the Hamiltonian is independent of time (this amounts to assuming that there are no external forces acting on the system) the maps U form a so-called one-parameter group, since one can write

$$U(s, t) = e^{(t-s)\text{ad}_H} ,$$

with the associated Hamiltonian vector field ad_H , which is determined by H . The vector field ad_H generates shifts in time. In terms of ad_H , the multiplication is given by

$$e^{t\text{ad}_H} e^{s\text{ad}_H} = e^{(t+s)\text{ad}_H} ,$$

and the inverse is given by

$$U(r, s)^{-1} = U(s, r) , \quad (e^{t\text{ad}_H})^{-1} = e^{-t\text{ad}_H} .$$

Given another Hamiltonian function H' we get another (Hamiltonian) vector field $\text{ad}_{H'}$ and another one-parameter group. The “time” parameter t has then a different physical

interpretation; for example, if H' is a component of the momentum vector (or the angular momentum vector) then t corresponds to a translation (or rotation) in the corresponding coordinate direction. Combining these groups for all H' , where the initial value problem determined by $\text{ad}_{H'}$ is well posed, we get an infinite-dimensional Lie group. (See Sections 8.3 and 11.7 for a definition of Lie groups.) Thus, classical mechanics can be understood in terms of infinite-dimensional groups! To avoid technical complications, we shall however mainly be concerned with the cases where we can simplify the system such that the groups are finite-dimensional. In the present case, to obtain a finite-dimensional group one either picks a nice subgroup (this involves understanding the symmetries of the system) or one makes a partial discretization of phase space.

Most of our discussions will be restricted to conservative systems, which can be described by Hamiltonians. However, these only describe systems which can be regarded as isolated from the environment, apart from influences that can be specified as external forces. Many real life systems (and strictly speaking all systems with the exception of the universe as a whole) interact with the environment – indeed, if it were not so, they would be unobservable!

Ignoring the environment is possible in so-called reduced descriptions, where only the variables of the system under consideration are kept. This usually results in differential equations which are dissipative. In a **dissipative system**, the energy dissipates, which means that some energy is lost into the unmodelled environment. Due to the energy loss, going back in time is not well defined in infinite-dimensional spaces; the initial value problem is solvable only in the forward time direction. Hence we can not find an inverse for the translation operators $U(s, t)$, and these are defined only for $s \leq t$. Therefore, in the most general case of interest, the dissipative infinitesimal generators do not generate a group, but only a semigroup. A well-known example is heat propagation, described by the heat equation. Its solution forward in time is a well-posed initial value problem, whereas the solution backward in time suffers from uncontrollable instability. Actually, many dissipative systems are not even described by a Hamiltonian dynamics, but the semigroup property of the flow they generate still remains valid.

1.3 Quantum mechanics

A point of view on quantum mechanics is that it is a deformation of classical mechanics. The deformation parameter is Planck's constant \hbar .

Since in daily life we do not really see so much of quantum physics (try tunnelling through a wall) one requires that the so-called **correspondence principle** holds. The correspondence principle states that the formulas of quantum physics should turn into corresponding formulas of classical mechanics in the limit when $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. This limit is called the **classical limit**. However, \hbar is a constant of Nature and not a parameter that can be changed in experiments; thus this 'limit' must be properly interpreted. The **action** of a physical system is a certain functional S that gives rise to equations of motion and is measured in units of \hbar . The right way to think of the classical limit is therefore the limit when the

dimensionless quotient S/\hbar becomes arbitrarily large. The classical limit therefore amounts to considering the limiting case of very large S . Thus classical mechanics appears as the limit of quantum mechanics when all values of the action involved are huge when measured in units of \hbar , which is the case when the systems are sufficiently large.

Keeping only the linear orders of \hbar one obtains so-called **semiclassical approximations**, which is intermediate between quantum mechanics and the classical limit, and often can be used for quite small systems.

The value of Planck's constant is approximately $6.6 \cdot 10^{-34} Js$; its smallness is the reason why we do not encounter quantum phenomena on our length and time scales that often. A nice gedanken experiment, which goes under the name **Schrödinger's cat**, illustrates (though in a philosophically questionable way) quantum mechanics in terms of daily-life physics. In short the experiment goes as follows. Suppose we have put a cat in a box and in the same box we have a single radioactive nucleus. The state of the nucleus is determined by the laws of quantum physics; the nucleus can disintegrate but we don't know when. The process of disintegration is described by a probability distribution that is dictated by the laws of quantum mechanics. Now suppose we link to the nucleus a detector and a gun; if the nucleus disintegrates, the gun, which is aimed at the cat, goes off and kills the cat. The state of the cat, dead or alive, is now given by a quantum mechanical probability distribution. But common sense expects the cat to be either dead or alive. . . .

An important object in quantum mechanics is the wave function. The wave function is a complex-valued function of space and time coordinates that is square-integrable over the space coordinates for all time t . Because of the integrability one always normalizes the wave function to have total weight 1 and then the wave function is interpreted as a probability distribution. Indeed, the Uranium nucleus in the gedanken experiment above is described by a wave function. In a first course on quantum mechanics one postulates the **time-dependent Schrödinger equation**

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \psi = H\psi \quad (1.6)$$

for a single particle described by the wave function ψ , where H is the Hamiltonian – now an operator. The Schrödinger equation describes the dynamics of the wave function and thus of the particle.

In N -particle quantum mechanics, the Hamiltonian is a second-order differential operator with respect to the spatial coordinates. According to the present state of knowledge, the fundamental description of nature is, however, given not in terms of particles but in terms of fields. The quantum mechanics of fields is called **quantum field theory**; the Hamiltonian is now an expression composed of field operators rather than differential operators. While nonrelativistic quantum mechanics may be treated equivalently as N -particle mechanics or as nonrelativistic quantum field theory, the relativistic quantum mechanics of more than one particle (see, e.g., the survey by Keister & Polyzou [133]) is somewhat clumsy, and one uses almost exclusively relativistic quantum field theory for the description of multiple relativistic particles.

Although very important in physics, the mathematical theory of quantum fields is well

developed only in the case of space-time dimensions < 4 . While this covers important applications such as quantum wires (which have only one important spatial dimension), it does not cover the most important case – the 4-dimensional space-time we live in. For example, quantum electrodynamics (QED), the most accurate of all quantum theories, exists only in the form of perturbative expansions (or other approximation schemes) and provides mathematically well-defined coefficients of a series in the fine structure constant α (whose experimental value is about $1/137$), which is believed to be divergent DYSON [66]. The first few terms provide approximations to α -dependent numbers like the **magnetic moment** $g(\alpha)$ of the electron, which match experimental data to 12 digit accuracy, or the **Lamb shift** $\Delta E_{\text{Lamb}}(\alpha)$ of hydrogen, whose explanation in 1947 by Julian Schwinger ushered in the era of quantum field theory. However, the value of a divergent asymptotic series at a finite value of α is mathematically ill-defined; no consistent definition of functions such as $g(\alpha)$ or is known to which the series would be asymptotic.

Finding a mathematically consistent theory of a class of 4-dimensional quantum field theories (quantum Yang–Mills gauge theory with a compact simple, nonabelian gauge group, believed to be the most accessible case) is another of the Clay Millennium problems whose solution is worth a million dollars.

Many quantum observations, for example scattering processes, have a stochastic character, so probabilities are frequent in quantum mechanics. In particular, in case of a single particle, the probability density for observing the particle at x is $|\psi(x)|^2$. Physicists and chemists occasionally view a scaled version of the probability distribution $|\psi|$ as a charge density. The justification is that in a population of a great number of particles that are all subject to the same Schrödinger equation, the particles will distribute themselves more or less according to the probability distribution of a single particle.

In quantum mechanics, the classical functions very often go over into corresponding operators defined on a dense subspace of a suitable separable Hilbert space. For example, the momentum in the x -direction of a particle described by a wave function ψ can be described by the operator $-i\hbar\partial_x$. As we shall see, this process of **quantization** has interesting connections to the representation theory of Lie algebras. Using the correspondence between classical functions and operators one deduces the Hamiltonian for an electron of the hydrogen atom, the basis for an explanation of atomic physics and the periodic system of elements.

The hydrogen atom is the quantum version of the 2-body problem of Newton and is the simplest of a large class of problems for which one can explicitly get the solutions of the Schrödinger equation – it is integrable in a sense paralleling the classical notion. Unfortunately, integrable systems are not very frequent; they seem to exist only for problems with finitely many degrees of freedom, for quantum fields living on a 2-dimensional space-time, and for noninteracting theories in higher dimensions. (Whether there are exactly solvable interacting local 4-dimensional field theories is an unsolved problems.) Nevertheless, the hydrogen atom and other integrable systems are very important since one can study in these simple models the features which in some approximate way still hold for more complicated physical systems.

Given a solution ψ to the Schrödinger equation, normalized to satisfy $\psi^*\psi = 1$ (where ψ^* is the adjoint linear functional, in finite dimensions the conjugate transpose), one obtains a density operator $\rho = \psi\psi^*$, which is a Hermitian, positive semidefinite rank-one operator of trace $\text{tr } \rho = \psi^*\psi = 1$. This type of density operators characterizes so-called **pure states**; the nomenclature coincides here with that of the mathematical theory of **C*-algebras**.

For conservative systems, the Hamiltonian is a self-adjoint linear operator. We assume that the quantum system is confined to a large box; a frequently employed artifice in quantum mechanics, which in a rigorous treatment must be removed later by going to the so-called **thermodynamic limit** where the box contains an arbitrarily large ball. Under this circumstance the spectrum of the Hamiltonian is discrete. The eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian correspond to energy levels, but only energy differences are observable (e.g., as spectral lines), and one generally shifts the Hamiltonian operator such that the lowest eigenvalue is zero. By the **spectral theorem**, the eigenvalues

$$0 = E_0 \leq E_1 \leq E_2 \leq \dots$$

are real, and we can find a set of eigenvectors ψ_k , normalized to satisfy $\psi_k^*\psi_k = 1$, such that

$$H\psi_k = E_k\psi_k$$

and

$$H = \sum E_k\psi_k\psi_k^*. \quad (1.7)$$

ψ_0 is called a **ground state**, the E_k are the **energy levels**, and $E_1 = E_1 - E_0 \geq 0$ is called the **energy gap**. The energy gap is positive iff the smallest eigenvalue is simple, i.e., iff the ground state is unique up to a **phase**, a constant factor of absolute value 1. The eigenvectors are the solutions of the **time-independent Schrödinger equation**

$$H\psi = E\psi, \quad (1.8)$$

and the ground state is the solution of minimal energy E_0 . With our normalization of energies, $E_0 = 0$ and hence $H\psi_0 = 0$, implying that the ground state is a time-independent solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (1.6). The other eigenvectors ψ_k lead to time-dependent solutions $\psi_k(t) = e^{itE_k/\hbar}\psi_k$, which oscillate with the angular frequency $\omega_k = E_k/\hbar$. This gives PLANCK's basic relation

$$E = \hbar\omega \quad (1.9)$$

relating energy and angular frequency. (In terms of the ordinary frequency $\nu = \omega/2\pi$ and PLANCK's original constant $h = 2\pi\hbar$, this reads $E = h\nu$.) The completeness of the spectrum and the superposition principle now implies that for a **nondegenerate spectrum** (where all energy levels are distinct),

$$\psi(t) = \sum \alpha_k e^{i\omega_k t} \psi_k$$

is the general solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. (In the degenerate case, a more complicated confluent formula is available.) Thus the time-dependent Schrödinger equation is solvable in terms of the time-independent Schrödinger equation, or equivalently with the spectral analysis of the Hamiltonian. This is the reason why spectra are in the

center of attention in quantum mechanics. The relation to observed spectral lines, which gave rise to the name spectrum for the list of eigenvalues, is discussed in Chapter 17.

The spectral decomposition (1.7) also provides the connection to quantum statistical mechanics. A thorough discussion of equilibrium statistical mechanics emphasizing the quantum-classical correspondence will be given in Part II. Here we only scratch the surface. Under sufficiently idealized conditions, a thermal quantum system is represented as a so-called **canonical ensemble**, characterized by a density operator of the form

$$\rho = e^{-\beta H}, \quad \beta = (\hbar k T)^{-1},$$

with T the temperature and $\hbar k$ the **Boltzmann constant**, a tiny constant with approximate value $1.38 \cdot 10^{-23} \text{ J/K}$. Hence we get

$$\rho = \sum e^{-\beta E_k} \psi_k \psi_k^* = \psi_0 \psi_0^* + e^{-\beta E_1} \psi_1 \psi_1^* + \dots$$

At room temperature, $T \approx 300 \text{ K}$, hence $\beta \sim 5 \cdot 10^{20} \text{ J}^{-1}$. Therefore, if the energy gap $E_1 - E_0$ is not too small, it is enough to keep a single term, and we find that $\rho \approx \psi_0 \psi_0^*$. Thus the system is approximately in the ground state.

The fact that the ground state is the most relevant state is the basis for fields like **quantum chemistry**: For the calculation of electron configuration and the corresponding energies of molecules at fixed positions of the nuclei, it suffices to know the ground state. An exception is to be made for laser chemistry where a few excited states become relevant. To compute the ground state, one must solve (1.8) for the electron wave function ψ_0 , which, because of the minimality condition, is a global optimization problem in an infinite-dimensional space. The **Hartree–Fock method** and their generalizations are used to solve these in some discretization, and the various solution techniques are routinely available in modern quantum chemistry packages.

Applying the Schrödinger equation to the pure state $\rho = \psi \psi^*$ and noting that $H^* = H$, one finds that

$$i\hbar \frac{d\rho}{dt} = i\hbar(\dot{\psi} \psi^* + \psi \dot{\psi}^*) = (i\hbar \dot{\psi}) \psi^* - \psi (i\hbar \dot{\psi}^*) = H \psi \psi^* - \psi (H \psi)^* = H \rho - \rho H,$$

giving the **quantum Liouville equation**

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} (H \rho - \rho H) = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [H, \rho]. \quad (1.10)$$

1.4 The Heisenberg picture

In the beginning of quantum mechanics there were two independent formulations; the **Heisenberg picture** (discovered in 1925 by Heisenberg), and the **Schrödinger picture** (discovered in 1926 by Schrödinger). Although the formulations seem different at first sight, they were quickly shown to be completely equivalent. In the Schrödinger picture, the physical configuration is described by a time-dependent state vector in a Hilbert space, and

the observables are time-independent operators on this Hilbert space. In the Heisenberg picture this is the other way around; the vector is time-independent and the observables are time-dependent operators.

The connection between the two pictures comes from noting that everything in physics that is **objective** in the sense that it can be verified repeatedly is computable from expectation values (here representing averages over repeated observations), and that the time-dependent expectations

$$\langle f \rangle_t = \int \rho(t) f = \int f \rho(t) \quad (1.11)$$

(remember that the quantum integral (1.2) is a trace!) in the Schrödinger picture can be alternatively written in the Heisenberg picture as

$$\langle f \rangle_t = \int \rho f(t) = \int f(t) \rho. \quad (1.12)$$

The traditional view of classical mechanics corresponds to the Heisenberg picture – the observables depend on time and the density is time-independent. However, both pictures can be used in classical mechanics, too.

To transform the Heisenberg picture description to the Schrödinger picture, we note that the Heisenberg expectations (1.12) satisfy

$$\frac{d\langle f \rangle_t}{dt} = \int \rho \dot{f}(t) = \int \rho \{f(t), H\} = \langle \{f, H\} \rangle_t,$$

giving the differential equation

$$\frac{d\langle f \rangle_t}{dt} = \langle \{f, H\} \rangle_t \quad (1.13)$$

for the expectations. An equivalent description in the Schrödinger picture expresses the same dynamical law using the Schrödinger expectations (1.11). To deduce the dynamics of $\rho(t)$ we need the following formula which can be justified for concrete Poisson brackets with integration by parts,

$$\int \{f, g\} h = \int f \{g, h\}; \quad (1.14)$$

cf. (1.18) below. Using this, we find as consistency condition that $\frac{d}{dt}\langle f \rangle_t = \int f \dot{\rho}(t)$ and $\langle \{f, H\} \rangle_t = \int \{f, H\} \rho(t) = \int f \{H, \rho(t)\}$ must agree for all f . This dictates the **classical Liouville equation**

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = \{H, \rho(t)\}. \quad (1.15)$$

In the quantum case, the Heisenberg and Schrödinger formulations are equivalent if the dynamics of $f(t)$ is given by the **quantum Heisenberg equation**

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} f(t) = [H, f(t)].$$

To check this, one may proceed in the same way as we did for the classical case above. Using the Lie product notation (1.3), the dynamics for expectations takes the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle f \rangle = \langle H \triangleright f \rangle,$$

the Heisenberg equation becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}f = H \lrcorner f, \quad (1.16)$$

and the Liouville equation becomes

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = \rho(t) \lrcorner H. \quad (1.17)$$

(Note that here H appears in the opposite order!) independent of whether we consider classical or quantum mechanics.

We find the remarkable result that these equations look identical whether we consider classical or quantum mechanics; moreover, they are linear in f although they encode all the intricacies of nonlinear classical or quantum dynamics. Thus, **on the statistical level, classical and quantum mechanics look formally simple and identical in structure.** The only difference is in the definition of the Lie product and the integral.

The connection is in fact much deeper; we shall see that classical mechanics and quantum mechanics are two applications of the same mathematical formalism. At the present stage, we get additional hints for this by noting that, as we shall see later, both the classical and the quantum Lie product satisfies the **Jacobi identity**

$$f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) + g \lrcorner (h \lrcorner f) + h \lrcorner (f \lrcorner g) = 0,$$

hence define a Lie algebra structure; cf. Section 8.1. They also satisfy the **Leibniz identity**

$$g \lrcorner fh = (g \lrcorner f)h + f(g \lrcorner h)$$

characteristic of a Poisson algebra; cf. Section 9.1. Integrating the Leibniz identity and using (1.4) gives $0 = \int g \lrcorner fh = \int ((g \lrcorner f)h + f(g \lrcorner h)) = -\int (f \lrcorner g)h + \int f(g \lrcorner h)$, hence the **integration by parts** formula

$$\int f(g \lrcorner h) = \int (f \lrcorner g)h. \quad (1.18)$$

Those with some background in Lie algebras will recognize (1.18) as the property that $\int fg$ defines a bilinear form with the properties characteristic for the Killing form of a Lie algebra – again both in the classical and the quantum case. Finally, the Poisson algebra of quantities carries both in the classical case and in the quantum case an intrinsic real structure given by an involutive mapping $*$ satisfying $f^{**} = f$ and natural compatibility relations with the algebraic operations: f^* is the complex conjugate in the classical case, and the adjoint in the quantum case.

Thus the common structure of classical mechanics and quantum mechanics is encoded in the algebraic structure of a Poisson $*$ -algebra. This algebraic structure is built up in the course of the book, and is then exploited to analyze one of the characteristic quantum features of nature – the spectral lines visible in light emanating from the sun, or from some chemical compound brought into the flame of a Bunsen burner.

1.5 Rotations

The rotation group. Let us consider a general time-dependent rotation in \mathbb{R}^3 , given by a 3×3 -matrix $Q(t)$ satisfying $Q(t)Q(t)^T = Q(t)^T Q(t) = 1$ and $\det Q(t) = 1$. Differentiating we get

$$\dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^T + Q(t)\dot{Q}(t)^T = 0.$$

Calling $\Omega(t) = \dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^T = \dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^{-1}$ we thus have

$$\Omega(t)^T = -\Omega(t),$$

that is Ω is antisymmetric. We can therefore parameterize Ω as

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\omega_3 & \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 & 0 & -\omega_1 \\ -\omega_2 & \omega_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then have $\Omega \mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{v}$, where $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is the vector $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)^T$. We view $\Omega(t)$ as a matrix $X(\boldsymbol{\omega}(t))$ depending on the vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$, called the **angular velocity**.

Intuitively it is clear that a rotation is an invertible map from \mathbb{R}^3 to \mathbb{R}^3 , which is linear, preserves angles, distances and orientation. To make the intuition more precise we define the group of rotations, also called the **special orthogonal group** $SO(3)$, by

$$SO(3) := \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid Q^T Q = 1, \det Q = 1\}.$$

The group $SO(3)$ is a basic example of a Lie group; it is both a group and a smooth manifold. A general group element is a rotation and although this might seem simple enough it is still quite complicated and in fact the tangent space at the origin of the group carries enough structure for most analysis. The tangent space of a Lie group at the identity is vector space with an additional structure, which is inherited from the group structure. Such a vector space is called a Lie algebra, which we will define later in this book; the reader not familiar yet with Lie algebras can skip this part or already look up the definition. The Lie algebra of $SO(3)$ is denoted $so(3)$ and can be identified with infinitesimal rotations. So we consider $Q = 1 + A + O(\|A\|^2)$, where the Landau symbol $O(\cdot)$ is used to indicate higher order terms, and write out $Q^T Q = 1$ to get

$$1 = (1 + A^T + O(\|A\|^2))(1 + A + O(\|A\|^2)) = 1 + A + A^T + O(\|A\|^2),$$

and hence we have

$$so(3) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \mid A + A^T = 0\}.$$

The Lie product of $so(3)$ is given by the commutator; $A \triangleright B = AB - BA$. We can write any antisymmetric 3×3 -matrix as

$$X(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\omega_3 & \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 & 0 & -\omega_1 \\ -\omega_2 & \omega_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

for some $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)^T \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The parametrization is chosen such that $X(\omega)v = \omega \times v$. Geometrically, $X(\omega)$ describes an infinitesimal rotation around an axis pointing into the direction of ω ; $e^{X(\omega)}$ is the rotation around this axis by the angle $|\omega|$ in the positive (counterclockwise) direction.

Every rotation has the form e^A for some antisymmetric real 3×3 -matrix A ; this is a non-trivial result in the theory of Lie groups, where one proves that the exponential map is surjective for compact groups, and $SO(3)$ is compact. For the special orthogonal group $SO(3)$ we give the explicit formula, called the **Rodrigues formula**

$$\exp X(a) = \mathbf{1} + \frac{\sin |a|}{|a|} X(a) + \frac{1 - \cos |a|}{|a|^2} X(a)^2, \quad \text{if } a \neq 0, \quad (1.19)$$

($|a| = \sqrt{a^T a}$) for the exponential of a real, antisymmetric 3×3 -matrix $X(a)$, which can be proven by differentiating $\exp X(ta)$ with respect to t .

Above the vector product appeared in formulae involving $so(3)$, we now make this more explicit by showing that \mathbb{R}^3 equipped with the vector product is in fact isomorphic to $so(3)$ as a Lie algebra. First we check that \mathbb{R}^3 with the vector product is indeed a Lie algebra. The antisymmetry is obvious; $x \triangleright y = x \times y = -y \times x = -y \triangleright x$. For the Jacobi-identity we use the formula

$$x \times (y \times z) = y(x \cdot z) - z(x \cdot y),$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & a \times (b \times c) + b \times (c \times a) + c \times (a \times b) \\ &= b(a \cdot c) - c(b \cdot a) + c(b \cdot a) - a(c \cdot b) + a(c \cdot b) - b(c \cdot a) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

To establish the isomorphism we use the map $\mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow so(3)$ given by $\omega \mapsto X(\omega)$. We need to show $X(\omega) \triangleright X(\omega') = X(\omega \times \omega')$. This follows immediately since the commutator of $X(\omega)$ and $X(\omega')$ acts on a vector u as

$$u \mapsto \omega \times (\omega' \times u) - \omega' \times (\omega \times u),$$

and using the Jacobi identity in \mathbb{R}^3 , we see that the given map equals

$$u \mapsto (\omega \times \omega') \times u = X(\omega \times \omega')u.$$

Taking a closer look at $X(\omega)$ we see that there is a basis of $so(3)$ consisting of three elements J_i with $X(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \omega_i J_i$, corresponding to infinitesimal rotations around the coordinate axes. We assemble the three J 's in a column vector and (ab-)use the notation $X(\omega) = \omega \cdot J$. Writing out $X(\omega) \triangleright X(\omega') = X(\omega \times \omega')$ we get

$$J_k \triangleright J_l = \sum_m \epsilon_{klm} J_m, \quad (1.20)$$

where ϵ_{klm} is the **Levi-Civita symbol** given by

$$\epsilon_{klm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } klm \text{ is an even permutation of } 123, \\ -1 & \text{if } klm \text{ is an odd permutation of } 123, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

Thus ϵ_{klm} is completely antisymmetric in the indices k, l, m and $1 \leq k, l, m \leq 3$. Therefore, the summation above contains only one nonzero term. For example, $J_1 \lrcorner J_2 = J_3$ and all other Lie products can be found using a cyclic permutation.

The Pauli matrices. A discussion of the relation between $su(2)$ and $so(3)$ will be useful for later. The Lie algebra $su(2)$ is defined as the real vector space of antihermitian 2×2 -matrices equipped with the commutator as Lie product. We introduce the **Pauli matrices**

$$\sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.22)$$

Assembling the last three in the vector $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)^T$, we write for any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\mathbf{p} \cdot \sigma := p_1 \sigma_1 + p_2 \sigma_2 + p_3 \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} p_3 & p_1 + ip_2 \\ p_1 - ip_2 & -p_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.23)$$

The matrices $i\sigma_1, i\sigma_2, i\sigma_3$ form a basis for the Lie algebra $su(2)$; indeed, any traceless and antihermitian 2×2 matrix can be written as $\mathbf{p} \cdot \sigma$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The Pauli matrices satisfy

$$[\sigma_k, \sigma_l] = 2i \sum_m \epsilon_{klm} \sigma_m, \quad \sigma_k \sigma_l + \sigma_l \sigma_k = 2\delta_{kl} \sigma_0, \quad 1 \leq k, l, m \leq 3,$$

with the Levi-Civita symbol ϵ_{klm} defined in (1.21). We thus obtain

$$[\mathbf{p} \cdot \sigma, \mathbf{q} \cdot \sigma] = 2i \mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{q} \cdot \sigma, \quad \mathbf{p} \cdot \sigma \mathbf{q} \cdot \sigma + \mathbf{q} \cdot \sigma \mathbf{p} \cdot \sigma = 2\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} \sigma_0.$$

The matrices $i\sigma_0, i\sigma_1, i\sigma_2, i\sigma_3$ make up the Lie algebra $u(2)$; only $i\sigma_0$ is not traceless. Introducing

$$L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which form a basis of $so(3)$, we see that the correspondence $\frac{1}{2i}\sigma_k \mapsto L_k$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$ defines an isomorphism of Lie algebras. Clearly, $i\sigma_0$ spans the center of the Lie algebra $u(2)$. As a consequence, we can write $u(2) \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus su(2) \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus so(3)$.

The isomorphism $SO(3) \cong SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$. Recall that a real 3×3 matrix R is called special orthogonal if

$$R^T R = 1, \quad \det R = 1.$$

Note that 1 here denotes the 3×3 identity matrix in the first equation. The special orthogonal matrices form the group $SO(3)$.

If λ is an eigenvalue of $R \in SO(3)$ we see that $\lambda = \pm 1$. We want to show that there is always an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1. The characteristic polynomial of R has three roots λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 . The absolute value of the roots has to be 1, and for every nonreal eigenvalue μ , its conjugate $\bar{\mu}$ is an eigenvalue, too. If all the three eigenvalues are real, then the only possibilities are that all three are 1 or that two are -1 and the third is 1. Let

now λ_1 be imaginary and take $\lambda_2 = \bar{\lambda}_1$. Then $\lambda_3 = (\lambda_1 \bar{\lambda}_1)^{-1}$ is real and positive; and since it has absolute value one, $\lambda_3 = 1$. We see that there is always an eigenvalue 1. If R is a rotation and not the identity, there is just one eigenvector with eigenvalue one; we denote this eigenvector by e_R . We thus have $Re_R = e_R$ and if $R \neq 1$ then e_R is unique. The vector e_R determines a one-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 that is left invariant under the action of R . We call this one-dimensional invariant subspace the axis of rotation.




Figure 1.1: Rotation around e_R . Any axis is characterized by two angles φ and θ .

Consider an arbitrary $SO(3)$ element R with axis of rotation determined by e_R over an angle ψ and denote the rotation by $R(e_R, \psi)$. Let θ be the angle between the plane spanned by e_R and the z -axis and the xz -plane, and let φ be the angle between e_R and the z -axis; cf. Figure 1.5. The rotation can be broken down into three rotations. First we use two rotations to go to a coordinate system with coordinates x' , y' and z' in which the e_R points in the z' -direction, and then we rotate around the z' -axis over an angle ψ . The two rotations to go to the new coordinate system are: (a) a rotation around the z -axis over an angle θ to align the x -axis with the projection of e_R onto the xy -plane, (b) a rotation over an angle φ around the image of the y -axis under the first rotation. Hence we can write $R(e_R, \psi)$ as a product

$$R(e_R, \psi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi & 0 & \sin \varphi \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin \varphi & 0 & \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi & -\sin \psi & 0 \\ \sin \psi & \cos \psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this way we obtain a system of coordinates on the manifold $SO(3)$. The three angles are then called the Euler angles.

We note in particular the following: The group $SO(3)$ is generated by all elementary rotations $R_x(\alpha)$, $R_y(\beta)$ and $R_z(\gamma)$ given by

$$R_x(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ 0 & \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_y(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & 0 & \sin \beta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & 0 & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R_z(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \gamma & -\sin \gamma & 0 \\ \sin \gamma & \cos \gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now show that $SU(2)$ is a real manifold that is isomorphic to the three sphere S^3 . We do this by finding an explicit parametrization of $SU(2)$ in terms of two complex numbers x and y satisfying $|x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1$, which defines the three-sphere.

We write an element $g \in SU(2)$ as

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}.$$

Writing out the equation $g^\dagger g = 1$ and $\det g = 1$ one finds the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} |a|^2 + |c|^2 &= 1, & |b|^2 + |d|^2 &= 1, \\ \bar{a}b + \bar{c}d &= 0, & ad - bc &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

We first assume $b = 0$ and find then that $ad = 1$ and $\bar{c}d = 0$, implying that $c = 0$ and U is diagonal with $a = \bar{d}$. Next we suppose $b \neq 0$ and use $a = -\frac{c\bar{d}}{b}$ to deduce that $|b| = |c|$ and $|a| = |d|$; we thus have $b \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow c \neq 0$. We also see that we can use the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} a &= e^{i\alpha} \cos \theta, & b &= e^{i\beta} \sin \theta, \\ c &= -e^{i\gamma} \sin \theta, & d &= e^{i\delta} \cos \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Using again $a = -\frac{c\bar{d}}{b}$ we see $\alpha + \delta = \beta + \gamma$ and writing out $ad - bc = 1$ we find $\alpha = -\delta$ and $\beta = -\gamma$. We thus see $a = \bar{d}$ and $b = -\bar{c}$. Hence the most general element of $SU(2)$ can be written as

$$g(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ -\bar{y} & \bar{x} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with } |x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1.$$

The map $S^3 \rightarrow SU(2)$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto g(x, y)$ is clearly injective, and from the above analysis bijective. Furthermore the map is smooth. Hence we conclude that $SU(2) \cong S^3$ as a real manifold.

The Pauli matrices (1.22) satisfy

$$\sigma^i \sigma^j = \delta^{ij} + i\epsilon^{ijk} \sigma^k.$$

and

$$\text{tr}(\sigma^i) = 0, \quad \text{tr}(\sigma^i \sigma^j) = 2\delta^{ij}, \quad \text{tr}([\sigma^i, \sigma^j] \sigma^k) = 4i\epsilon^{ijk}.$$

Every vector $\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we identify with the element $p = \sigma^1 p_1 + \sigma^2 p_2 + \sigma^3 p_3$ of $su(2)$. We see that $\vec{p} \times \vec{q}$ corresponds to the element $\frac{1}{2i}[p, q]$ and similarly we find

$$\vec{p} \cdot \vec{q} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(pq), \quad \vec{p} \times \vec{q} \cdot \vec{r} = \frac{1}{4i} \text{tr}([p, q]r).$$

If g is an element of $SU(2)$ and $p \in su(2) \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ we see that

$$\text{tr}(gpg^{-1}) = 0, \quad (gpg^{-1})^\dagger = (g^{-1})^\dagger pg^\dagger = gpg^{-1},$$

and we conclude that g induces a map $\mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. Since

$$\text{tr}(gpg^{-1}gqg^{-1}) = \text{tr}(pq),$$

the map induced by $g \in SU(2)$ defines an element of $O(3)$. But also $\vec{p} \times \vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}$ is invariant under the action of g and thus we found a map $R : SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$, whereby $g \in SU(2)$ gets mapped to the element $R(g)$ in $SO(3)$ corresponding to $p \mapsto gpg^{-1}$. The map $g \rightarrow R(g)$ is a group homomorphism; that is, $R(g_1g_2) = R(g_1)R(g_2)$. Explicitly we find

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y)\sigma^1g(x, y)^{-1} &= \operatorname{Re}(x^2 - y^2)\sigma^1 - \operatorname{Im}(x^2 - y^2)\sigma^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}(x\bar{y})\sigma^3, \\ g(x, y)\sigma^2g(x, y)^{-1} &= \operatorname{Im}(x^2 + y^2)\sigma^1 + \operatorname{Re}(x^2 + y^2)\sigma^2 + 2\operatorname{Im}(x\bar{y})\sigma^3, \\ g(x, y)\sigma^3g(x, y)^{-1} &= -2\operatorname{Re}(xy)\sigma^1 + 2\operatorname{Im}(xy)\sigma^2 + (|x|^2 - |y|^2)\sigma^3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$R(g(x, y)) = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(x^2 - y^2) & \operatorname{Im}(x^2 + y^2) & -2\operatorname{Re}(xy) \\ -\operatorname{Im}(x^2 - y^2) & \operatorname{Re}(x^2 + y^2) & 2\operatorname{Im}(xy) \\ 2\operatorname{Re}(x\bar{y}) & 2\operatorname{Im}(x\bar{y}) & |x|^2 - |y|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned} R(g(\cos \alpha/2, -i \sin \alpha/2)) &= R_x(\alpha), \\ R(g(\cos \beta/2, -\sin \beta/2)) &= R_y(\beta), \\ R(g(e^{-i\gamma/2}, 0)) &= R_z(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

and hence the map $R : SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$ is surjective. Suppose now that $g(x, y)$ is mapped to the identity element in $SO(3)$. The kernel of $R : SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$ is easily checked to consist of $\{\pm 1\}$, which is the central \mathbb{Z}_2 subgroup of $SU(2)$. (Easy exercise: Prove that \mathbb{Z}_2 is the center of $SU(2)$.) As any kernel of group homomorphisms, the kernel is a normal subgroup. All in all we have shown

$$SO(3) \cong SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2.$$

1.6 Symmetries

Galilean spacetime. Before the start of the twentieth century, one thought that time for all observers was the same in the following sense: if two events take place at two different places in space, then the question whether the events took place at the same time has an observer independent answer. Space was thought of as a grid on which the motions of all objects took place and time was completely independent from space. The ‘distance’ between two events therefore consists of two numbers: a difference in time and a spatial distance. For example, the distance between when I woke up and when I took the subway to work is characterized by saying that from the moment I woke up it took me half an hour to reach the subway station, which is 500 meter from my bed. We call the spacetime described in this manner, the Galilean spacetime.

There are three important kinds of symmetries in the Galilean spacetime and the group that these symmetries generate is called the **Galilean symmetry group**⁴. If we shift the

⁴The group is also called the **Galilei group** or the **Galileo group**. We follow the tradition which proceeds in analogy with the use of Euclidean metric or Hermitian matrices.

clock an hour globally, which is possible in Galilean spacetime, the laws of nature cannot alter. Hence one symmetry generator is the time-shift: $t \mapsto t + a$ for some fixed number a . Likewise, the laws of nature should not change if we shift the origin of our coordinate system; hence a second symmetry is the shift symmetry $(x^1, x^2, x^3) \mapsto (x^1 + b^1, x^2 + b^2, x^3 + b^3)$ for some fixed vector (b^1, b^2, b^3) . The third kind of symmetries are rotations, that is, the group $SO(3)$, which we have seen before. There are some additional discrete symmetries, like space reflection, where a vector (x^1, x^2, x^3) is mapped to $(-x^1, -x^2, -x^3)$. We however focus on the connected part of the Galilean symmetrygroup. The subgroup of the Galilean symmetrygroup obtained by discarding the time translations is the group $ISO(3)$. Below, when we discuss the Poincaré group, we give more details on the group $ISO(3)$ as it is a subgroup of the Poincaré group.

Minkowski spacetime. With the advent of special relativity, the classical spacetime view altered in the sense that time and space made up one spacetime, called **Minkowski spacetime**. As a topological vector space Minkowski spacetime is nothing more than \mathbb{R}^4 , but it is equipped with the **Minkowski metric**⁵ (also see Section 2.6 and Example 8.4.5):

$$(x - y)^2 = -(x^0 - y^0)^2 + (x^1 - y^1)^2 + (x^2 - y^2)^2 + (x^3 - y^3)^2 = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^2 - (x^0 - y^0)^2.$$

The time component of the **four-vectors** is the zeroth component. We write a general four-vector as

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} v^0 \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v} = \begin{pmatrix} v^1 \\ v^2 \\ v^3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{v} is the space-like part of v and v^0 is the time-like component of v . With the introduced notation we see that the Minkowski metric can be written as $v^2 = -(v^0)^2 + \mathbf{v}^2$, where \mathbf{v}^2 is the usual Euclidean norm for three-vectors. The Minkowski inner product is derived from the Minkowski metric and given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} v^0 \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w^0 \\ \mathbf{w} \end{pmatrix} = -v^0 w^0 + \mathbf{v} \mathbf{w}.$$

Note that in a strict sense the Minkowski inner product, the Minkowski norm and the Minkowski metric are not an inner product, norm and metric respectively as the positivity condition is clearly not satisfied.

The **Poincaré group** is a subgroup of the group of all symmetries that leave the Minkowski metric invariant. The Poincaré group is often denoted as $ISO(3, 1)$. On a four-vector v the Poincaré group acts as $v \mapsto Av + b$, where A is an element of $SO(3, 1)$ and b is some four-vector. Hence the Poincaré group consists of rotations and translations. An explicit representation of $ISO(3, 1)$ can be given in terms of the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

⁵We choose units such that $c = 1$, and work with the signature $(-, +, +, +)$.

where A is an 4×4 -matrix in $SO(3, 1)$ and b is a four-vector. Recall that A is in $SO(3, 1)$ if A satisfies

$$A^T \eta A = \eta, \quad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The affine linear transformations contain the translations and $SO(3, 1)$ -rotations. The generators of the translations we call the momenta, and since they have four components, we sometimes refer to them as four-momenta.

The (real) Lie algebra of $ISO(3, 1)$ is described by the matrices of the form

$$(A, b) := \begin{pmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $A \in so(3, 1)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The Lie product is given by the commutator of matrices, and takes the form

$$(A, b) \triangleright (A', b') = ([A, A'], Ab' - A'b),$$

where Ab' is the usual matrix action of A on b' . In particular, we have

$$(0, b) \triangleright (0, b') = 0, \quad (A, 0) \triangleright (0, b') = (0, Ab'),$$

from which we read off that the translations form a commutative subalgebra. The translations form an ideal such that the momenta form the standard representation of $so(3, 1)$, that is, the defining representation. More general, the standard representation of $so(p, q)$ is the one that defines $so(p, q)$ and is thus given by $(p + q) \times (p + q)$ -matrices that leave a metric of signature (p, q) invariant; in Lie algebra theory the standard representation is called the **fundamental representation**. In the fundamental representation of $so(3, 1)$ (which is not unitary), the Minkowski inner product is invariant.

The group $SO(3)$ is a subgroup of $SO(3, 1)$ and consists of all those $SO(3, 1)$ -rotations that act trivially on the time-component of four-vectors. The Galilean symmetry group is the subgroup of $ISO(3, 1)$ consisting of the $SO(3)$ -rotations together with the time translations.

An element of $SO(3, 1)$ is called a Lorentz boost if the element acts nontrivially on the zeroth component of four-vectors. By multiplying with an appropriate element of the $SO(3)$ subgroup we may assume that a Lorentz boost only mixes the zeroth and first component of four-vectors. Then a Lorentz boost L takes the following form (recall $c = 1$):

$$L(v)^0 = \frac{x^0 - vx^1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}}, \quad L(v)^1 = \frac{x^1 - vx^0}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}}, \quad (1.24)$$

and $L(v)^2 = v^2$, $L(v)^3 = v^3$. Physically the Lorentz boost (1.24) describes how coordinates transform when one goes from one coordinate system to another coordinate system that moves with respect to the first system in the positive x^1 -direction with velocity v . Since v has to be smaller than one, as is apparent from (1.24), one concludes that special relativity excludes superluminal velocities. The number

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}}, \quad (1.25)$$

is called the γ -**factor**. The γ -factor gives an indication whether we should treat a physical situation with special relativity or whether a nonrelativistic treatment would suffice. The **Lorentz contraction** factor is the inverse of γ and measures how distances shrink when measured in another coordinate system, moving at a velocity v with respect to the original coordinate system. For α -particles, with a typical speed of 15,000 kilometers per second, we have $v = 0.05$ and so $\gamma \sim 1.03$ and $\gamma^{-1} \sim 0.97$, which implies that if we take a rod of 100 meter and let an α -particle fly along the rod, it measures only $97m$ (assuming that α -particles can measure). The γ -factor thus tells us that if we want accuracy of more than 3%, we need to treat the α -particle relativistically.

The nonrelativistic limit. In order to discuss the nonrelativistic limit, we restore the presence of the velocity of light c in the formulas. For a particle at rest, the space momentum \mathbf{p} vanishes. The formula $p^2 = -(mc)^2$ therefore implies that, at rest, $p_0 = mc$ and the **rest energy** is seen to be $E = mc^2$. This suggests to define the **kinetic energy** (which vanishes at rest) by the formula

$$H := p_0c - mc^2.$$

Introducing **velocity** \mathbf{v} and **speed** v by

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{p}/m, \quad v = |\mathbf{v}| = \sqrt{\mathbf{v}^2},$$

we find from $\mathbf{p}^2 - p_0^2 = -(mc)^2$ that $p_0 = \sqrt{(mc)^2 + \mathbf{p}^2} = mc\sqrt{1 + (v/c)^2}$, so that

$$H = mc^2(\sqrt{1 + (v/c)^2} - 1) = mc^2 \frac{1 + (v/c)^2 - 1}{\sqrt{1 + (v/c)^2} + 1} = \frac{mv^2}{\sqrt{1 + (v/c)^2} + 1}.$$

Similarly, the energy becomes

$$E = p_0c = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2}}.$$

Taking the limit $c \rightarrow \infty$ we find that H becomes the kinetic energy $\frac{1}{2}mv^2$ of a nonrelativistic particle of mass m . The **nonrelativistic approximation** $H \approx \frac{1}{2}mv^2$ for the kinetic energy is valid for small velocities $v = |\mathbf{p}/m| \ll c$, where we may neglect the term $(v/c)^2$ in the square root of the denominator.

General spacetime. The generalization of Minkowski spacetime is a manifold with a **pseudo-Riemannian metric** g that is locally like a Minkowski spacetime. Thus around every point there is a chart and a coordinate system such that g takes the form of a Minkowski metric. It is clear that a proper description of general relativity requires differential geometry and the development of tensor calculus.

In general relativity but also already in special relativity physicists use some conventions that are worth explaining. Spacetime indices indicating components of four-vectors are indicated by Greek letters μ, ν, \dots . To denote a four-vector $x = (x^\mu)$ one writes simply x^μ . If an index appears once upstairs and once downstairs, it is to be summed over; this is called the **Einstein convention**. Derivatives are objects with indices downstairs; $\partial_\mu = \partial/\partial x^\mu$.

The **Kronecker delta** δ_ν^μ is an invariant tensor and we have $\partial_\mu x^\nu = \delta_\nu^\mu$ and $\partial_\mu x^\mu = 4$. The Minkowski metric is usually denoted by the Greek letter η and again one usually just writes $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ to denote the metric and not just the $\mu\nu$ -component; as a matrix the Minkowski metric is given by:

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

The Minkowski inner product is now written as $v \cdot w = v^\mu w^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}$. If v and w are two elements of the tangent space at a point x their inner product is in general relativity given by $v^\mu w^\nu g_{\mu\nu}(x)$, from which it is clear that general relativity is the curved generalization of special relativity. To denote the metric g physicists often describe a line element, which is to mean the distance of an infinitesimal displacement $ds = (dx^\mu)$;

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu dx^\nu.$$

The metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and its pointwise inverse $g^{\mu\nu}$ are used to lower and to raise indices; indeed, as the metric gives an isomorphism between the tangent space and the cotangent space. Hence ∂^μ is defined as $g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu$, and a check of consistency gives $g^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\lambda} g^{\nu\rho} g_{\rho\lambda}$. As a further exercise in the conventions the reader might verify $g^{\mu\lambda} g_{\lambda\nu} = \delta_\nu^\mu$, $g^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} = 4$. The described conventions are used a lot in physics literature and more on its nature and why it works can be found in many text books on relativity, e.g., in the nice introductory textbook by D'INVERNO [62]).

The symmetry group of a manifold M with a pseudo-Riemannian metric g is huge; it consists of all diffeomorphisms of the manifold, as any diffeomorphism preserves a metric. The vector fields on M describe the infinitesimal generators of the group of diffeomorphisms.

The reason that one uses the integration measure

$$\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega(k)}, \quad \omega(k) = \sqrt{c^2 \mathbf{k}^2 + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}}. \quad (1.26)$$

is due to Lorentz covariance. The integration measure is clearly rotation invariant. Hence to study the behavior under a general Lorentz transformation L we may assume that L only mixes the x -direction and the time-direction. In that case we have, using the γ -factor (1.25)

$$\begin{aligned} L(k_x) &= \frac{k_x - vk_t}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} = \gamma(k_x - vk_t), \\ L(k_y) &= k_y, \quad L(k_z) = k_z, \\ L(k_t) &= \frac{k_t - \frac{v}{c^2} k_x}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} = \gamma(k_t - \frac{v}{c^2} k_x). \end{aligned}$$

One easily checks that $L(k)^2 = k^2$. Since $\omega(k)$ is the zeroth component of the wave vector k , we see that the factors $\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$ cancel out. Another way to see the covariance is to note the equality

$$\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega(k)} = \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta\left(k^2 + \frac{m^2c^2}{\hbar^2}\right) \theta(k_0), \quad (1.27)$$

where θ is the **Heaviside function** defined by $\theta(x) = 1$ if $x \geq 0$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ if $x < 0$. The Heaviside function selects the positive root of the equation (2.17). The equality of the two integration measures in (1.27) is proven by integration of both sides. It is clear that the expression (1.27) is invariant under Lorentz transformations.

1.7 Outline of the book

The goal of this book is to introduce the ideas relating quantum mechanics, Lie algebras and Lie groups, motivating everything as far as possible by classical mechanics. We shall mostly be concerned with systems with finite-dimensional phase spaces; the infinite-dimensional case is too difficult for a presentation at the level of this book. However, we present the concepts in such a way that they are valid even in infinite dimensions, and select the material so that it provides some insight into the infinite-dimensional case.

Chapter 2 discusses systems of classical oscillators, starting with ordinary differential equations modeling nonlinearly coupled, damped oscillators, and introducing some notions from classical mechanics – the Hamiltonian (energy), the notion of conservative and dissipative dynamics, and the notion of phase space. We then look in more detail into the single oscillator case, the classical anharmonic oscillator, and show that the phase space dynamics can be represented both in terms of Hamilton’s equations, or in terms of Poisson brackets and the classical Heisenberg equation of motion. Since the Poisson bracket satisfies the Jacobi identity, this gives the first link to Lie algebras. Considering the special case of harmonic oscillators, we show that they naturally arise from eigenmodes of linear partial differential equations describing important classical fields: The Maxwell equations for beams of light and gamma rays, the Schrödinger equation and the Klein–Gordon equation for nonrelativistic and relativistic beams of alpha rays, respectively, and the Dirac equation for beams of beta rays.

Chapter 3 relates the dynamics of arbitrary systems to those of oscillators by coupling the latter to the system, and exploring the resulting frequency spectrum. The observation that experimental spectra often have a pronounced discrete structure (analyzed in more detail in Chapter 11) is found to be explained by the fact that the discrete spectrum of a quantum Hamiltonian is directly related to the observed spectrum via the quantum Heisenberg equation of motion. Indeed, the observed spectral lines have frequencies corresponding to differences of eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian, multiplied by Planck’s constant. This naturally explains the Rydberg–Ritz combination principle that had been established about 30 years before the birth of modern quantum theory. An excursion into the early history of quantum mechanics paints a colorful picture of this exciting time when the modern world

view got its nearly definite shape. We then discuss general properties of the spectrum of a system consisting of several particles, and how it reflects the bound state and scattering structure of the multiparticle dynamics. Finally, we show how black body radiation, the phenomenon whose explanation by Planck initiated the quantum era, is related to the spectrum via elementary statistical mechanics.

Part II discusses statistical mechanics from an algebraic perspective, concentrating on thermal equilibrium but discussing basic things in a more general framework. A treatment of equilibrium statistical mechanics and the kinematic part of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics is given. From a single basic assumption (Definition 6.1.1) the full structure of phenomenological thermodynamics and of statistical mechanics is derived, except for the third law which requires an additional quantization assumption.

Chapter 4 gives a description of standard phenomenological equilibrium thermodynamics for single-phase systems in the absence of chemical reactions and electromagnetic fields. Section 4.1 states the assumptions needed in an axiomatic way that allows an easy comparison with the statistical mechanics approach discussed in later chapters, and derives the basic formulas for the thermodynamic observables. Section 4.2 then discusses the three fundamental laws of thermodynamics; their implications are discussed in the remainder of the chapter. In particular, we derive the conventional formulas that express the thermodynamic observables in terms of the Helmholtz and Gibbs potentials and the associated extremal principles.

Chapter 5 introduces the technical machinery of statistical mechanics, Gibbs states and the partition function, in a uniform way common to classical mechanics and quantum mechanics. Section 5.1 introduces the algebra of quantities and their basic realizations in classical and quantum mechanics. Section 5.2 defines Gibbs states, their partition functions, and the related KMS condition, and illustrates the concepts by means of the canonical ensemble and harmonic oscillators. The abstract properties of Gibbs states are studied in Section 5.3, using the Kubo product and the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality. These are the basis of approximation methods, starting with mean field theory, and we indicate the connections. However, since approximation methods are treated abundantly in common texts, we discuss elsewhere in the present book only exact results. The final Section 5.4 discusses limit resolutions for the values of quantities, and the associated uncertainty relations.

Chapter 6 rederives the laws of thermodynamics from statistical mechanics, thus putting the phenomenological discussion of Chapter 4 on more basic foundations. Section 6.1 defines thermal states and discusses their relevance for global, local, and microlocal equilibrium. Section 6.2 deduces the existence of an equation of state and connects the results to the phenomenological exposition in Section 4.1. Section 6.3 proves the first law of thermodynamics. In Section 6.4, we compare thermal states with arbitrary Gibbs states and deduce the extremal principles of the second law. Section 6.5 shows that the third law is related to a simple quantization condition for the entropy and relates it to the time-independent Schrodinger equation.

In Chapter 7 we discuss in more detail the relation between mathematical models of physical systems and reality. Through a discussion of the meaning of uncertainty, statistics, and probability, the abstract setting introduced in the previous chapters is given both a

deterministic and a statistical interpretation. Section 7.1 discusses questions relating to different thermal models constructed on the basis of the same Euclidean $*$ -algebra by selecting different lists of extensive quantities. Section 7.2 discusses the hierarchy of equilibrium descriptions and how they relate to each other. Section 7.3 reviews the role of statistics in the algebraic approach to statistical mechanics. Section 7.4 gives an operational meaning to classical instruments for measuring the value of uncertain quantities, and to statistical instruments whose measurement results are only statistically correlated to properties of the measured system. Section 7.5 extends the discussion to quantum systems, and discusses the deterministic and statistical features of quantum mechanics. Section 7.6 relates the subject to information theory, and recovers the usual interpretation of the value of the entropy as a measure of unobservable internal complexity (lack of information). The final Section 7.7 discusses the extent to which an interpretation in terms of subjective probability makes sense, and clarifies the relations with the maximum entropy principle.

Part III introduces the basics about Lie algebras and Lie groups, with an emphasis on the concepts most relevant to the conceptual side of physics.

Chapter 8 introduces Lie algebras. We introduce in Section 8.1 the basic definitions and tools for verifying the Jacobi identity, and establish the latter for the Poisson bracket of a single harmonic oscillator and in Section 8.2 for algebras of derivations in associative algebras. Noncommutative associative algebras give rise to Lie algebras in a different way – via commutators, discussed in Section 8.3. The fact that linear operators on a vector space form a Lie algebra brings quantum mechanics into the picture. Differential equations in associative algebras defining exponentials naturally produce Lie groups and the exponential map, which relates Lie groups and Lie algebras. In Section 8.4, we discuss classical groups and their Lie algebras. Taking as the vector space the space of n -dimensional column vectors gives as basic examples the Lie algebra of $n \times n$ matrices and its most important Lie subalgebras, the orthogonal, symplectic, and unitary Lie algebras. Many finite-dimensional Lie groups arise as groups of square invertible matrices, and we discuss the most important families, in particular the unitary, orthogonal, and symplectic groups. We then discuss Heisenberg algebras and Heisenberg groups and their relation to the Poisson bracket of harmonic oscillators via the canonical commutation relations. The product law in Heisenberg groups is given by the famous Weyl relations, which are an exactly representable case of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula valid for many other Lie groups, in particular for arbitrary finite-dimensional ones. We end the Chapter with a treatment of the slightly richer structure of a Lie $*$ -algebra usually encountered in the mechanical applications. In traditional terms, Lie $*$ -algebras are equivalent to complexifications of real Lie algebras, but the $*$ -formulation is often more suitable for discussing physics.

Chapter 9 brings more physics into play by introducing Poisson algebras, the algebras in which it is possible to define Hamiltonian mechanics. Poisson algebras abstract the algebraic features of both Poisson brackets and commutators, and hence serve as a unifying tool relating classical and quantum mechanics. After defining the basic concepts in Section 9.1, we discuss in Section 9.2 rotating rigid bodies, in Section 9.3 the concept of angular momentum, and the commutative Poisson algebra of smooth functions of angular momentum. It is directly related to the group $SO(3)$ of 3-dimensional rotations and the corresponding

Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ of infinitesimal rotations, which is generated by the components of the angular momentum. In particular, we obtain in Section 9.4 the Euler equations for the classical spinning top from a Hamiltonian quadratic in the angular momentum. This example shows how the quantities of a classical Poisson algebra are naturally interpreted as physical observables. The angular momentum Poisson algebra is a simple instance of Lie–Poisson algebras, a class of commutative Poisson algebras canonically associated with any Lie algebra and constructed in Section 9.5. The Poisson bracket for the harmonic oscillator is another instance, arising in this way from the Heisenberg algebra. Thus Hamiltonian mechanics on Lie–Poisson algebras generalizes the classical anharmonic oscillator, and gives for $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ the dynamics of spinning rigid bodies. Sections on classical symplectic mechanics and its application to the dynamics of molecules and an outlook to quantum field theory conclude the chapter.

Chapter 10 introduces representations of Lie algebras and Lie groups in associative algebras and in Poisson algebras. A general physical system can be characterized in terms of a Poisson representation of the kinematical Lie algebra of distinguished quantities of interest, a Hamiltonian, a distinguished Hermitian quantity in the Poisson algebra defining the dynamics, and a state defining a particular system at a particular time. We also introduce Lie algebra and Lie group representations in associative algebras, which relate Lie algebras and Lie groups of matrices or linear operators to abstract Lie algebras and Lie groups. These linear representations turn out to be most important for understanding the spectrum of quantum systems, as discussed later in Section 17.6. We then discuss unitary representations of the Poincaré group, the basis for relativistic quantum field theory. An overview over semisimple Lie algebras and their classification concludes the chapter.

Part IV gives an introduction to differential geometry from an algebraic perspective.

Chapter 11 starts with an introduction to basic concepts of differential geometry. We define (smooth, infinitely often differentiable) manifolds and the associated algebra of scalar fields. Its derivations define vector fields, which form important examples of Lie algebras. The exterior calculus on alternating forms is developed. Finally, Lie groups are interpreted as manifolds.

Chapter 12 discusses the construction of Poisson algebras related to manifolds, and associated Poisson manifolds, the arena for the most general classical dynamics. We show how classical symplectic mechanics (in flat phase space) and constrained Hamiltonian mechanics fit into the general abstract picture. We end the chapter with a discussion of the Lagrangian approach to classical mechanics.

Chapter 13 is about Hamiltonian quantum mechanics. We discuss a classical symplectic framework for the Schrödinger equation. This is then generalized to a framework for quantum-classical dynamics, including important models such as the Born-Oppenheimer approximation for the quantum motion of molecules. A section on deformation quantization relates classical and quantum descriptions of a system, and the Wigner transform makes the connection quantitatively useful in the special case of a canonical system with finitely many degrees of freedom.

The final Part V applies these concepts to the study of the dominant kinds of elementary motion in a bound system, vibrations (described by oscillators, Poisson representations of the Heisenberg group), rotations (described by a spinning top, Poisson representations of the rotation group), and their interaction. On the quantum level, quantum oscillators are always bosonic systems, while spinning systems may be bosonic or fermionic depending on whether or not the spin is integral. The analysis of experimental spectra, concentrating on the mathematical contents of the subject, concludes our discussion.

Chapter 14 is a study of harmonic oscillators (bosons, elementary vibrations), both from the classical and the quantum point of view. We introduce raising and lowering operators in the symplectic Poisson algebra, and show that the classical case is the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ of the quantum harmonic oscillator. The representation theory of the single-mode Heisenberg algebra is particularly simple since by the Stone–von Neumann theorem, all unitary representations are equivalent. We find that the quantum spectrum of a harmonic oscillator is discrete and consists of the classical frequency (multiplied by \hbar) and its nonnegative integral multiples (overtones, excited states). For discussing the representation where the harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian is diagonal, we introduce Dirac’s bra-ket notation, and deduce the basic properties of the bosonic Fock spaces, first for a single harmonic oscillator and then for a system of finitely many harmonic modes. We then introduce coherent states, an overcomplete basis representation in which not only the Heisenberg algebra, but the action of the Heisenberg group is explicitly visible. The coherent state representation is particularly relevant for the study of quantum optics, but we only indicate its connection to the modes of the electromagnetic field.

Chapter 15 discusses spinning systems, again from the classical and the quantum perspective. Starting with the Lie-Poisson algebra for the rotation group and a Hamiltonian quadratic in the angular momentum, we obtain the Euler equations for the classical spinning top. The quantum version can be obtained by looking for canonical anticommutation relations, which naturally produce the Lie algebra of a spinning top. As for oscillators, the canonical anticommutation relations have a unique irreducible unitary representation, which corresponds to a spin 1/2 representation of the rotation group. The multimode version gives rise to fermionic Fock spaces; in contrast to the bosonic case, these are finite-dimensional when the number of modes is finite. In particular, the single mode fermionic Fock space is 2-dimensional. Many constructions for bosons and fermions only differ in the signs of certain terms, such as commutators versus anticommutators. For example, quadratic expressions in bosonic or fermionic Fock spaces form Lie algebras, which give natural representations of the universal covering groups of the Lie algebras $so(n)$ in the fermionic case and $sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$ in the bosonic case, the so-called spin groups and metaplectic groups, respectively. In fact, the analogies apart from sign lead to a common generalization of bosonic and fermionic objects in form of super Lie algebras, which are, however, outside the scope of the book. Apart from the Fock representation, the rotation group has a unique irreducible unitary representation of each finite dimension. We derive these spinor representations by restriction of corresponding nonunitary representations of the general linear group $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ on homogeneous polynomials in two variables, and find corresponding spin coherent states.

Chapter 16 discusses highest weight representations, providing tools for classifying many irreducible representations of interest. The basic ingredient is a triangular decomposition, which exists for all finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras, but also in other cases of interest such as the oscillator algebra, the Heisenberg algebra with the harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian adjoined. We look at detail at 4-dimensional Lie algebras with a nontrivial triangular decomposition (among them the oscillator algebra and $so(3)$), which behave almost like the oscillator algebra. As a result, the analysis leading to Fock spaces generalizes without problems, and we are able to classify all irreducible unitary representations of the rotation group.

The final Chapter 17 applies the Lie theoretic structure to the analysis of quantum spectra. After a short history of some aspects of spectroscopy, we look at the spectrum of bound systems of particles. We show how to obtain from a measured spectrum the spectrum of the associated Hamiltonian, and discuss qualitative results on vibrations (giving discrete spectra) and chemical reactions (giving continuous spectra) that come from the consideration of simple systems and the consideration of approximate symmetries. The latter are shown to result in a clustering of spectral values. The structure of the clusters is determined by how the irreducible representations of a dynamical Lie algebra split when the algebra is reduced to a subalgebra of generating symmetries. The clustering can also occur in a hierarchical fashion with fine splitting and hyperfine splitting, corresponding to a chain of subgroups. As an example, we discuss the spectrum of the hydrogen atom.

Chapter 2

Classical oscillating systems

This chapter starts the mathematical part of the book. We discuss in detail an important classical physical system, the harmonic or anharmonic oscillator, and their multivariate generalization, which describe systems of coupled oscillators such as macromolecules or planetary systems.

Understanding classical oscillators is of great importance in understanding many other physical systems. The reason is that an arbitrary classical system behaves close to equilibrium like a system of coupled linear oscillators. The equations we deduce are therefore approximately valid in many other systems. For example, a nearly rigid mechanical structure such as a high-rise building always remains close enough to equilibrium so that it can be approximately treated as a linear oscillating system for the elements into which it is decomposed for computational purposes via the finite element method.

We shall see that the equations of motion of coupled oscillators can be cast in a form that suggest a Lie algebra structure behind the formalism. This will provide the connection to Part III of the book, where Lie algebras are in the center of our attention.

Besides the (an-)harmonic oscillators we discuss some basic linear partial differential equations of physics: the Maxwell equations describing (among others) light and gamma rays, the Schrödinger equation and the Klein–Gordon equation (describing alpha rays), and the Dirac equation (describing beta rays). The solutions of these equations can be represented in terms of infinitely many harmonic oscillators, whose quantization (not treated in this book) leads to quantum field theory.

2.1 Systems of damped oscillators

For any quantity x depending on time t , differentiation with respect to time is denoted by \dot{x} :

$$\dot{x} = \frac{d}{dt}x.$$

Analogously, n dots over a quantity represents differentiating this quantity n times with respect to time.

The **configuration space** is the space of possible positions that a physical system may attain, including external constraints. For the moment, we think of it as a subset in \mathbb{R}^n . A point in configuration space is generally denoted q . For example, for a system of N point masses, q is an N -tuple of vectors $\mathbf{q}_k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ arranged below each other; each \mathbf{q}_k denotes the spatial coordinates of the k th moving point (planet, atom, node in a triangulation of the body of a car or building, etc.), so that $n = 3N$.

A **system of damped oscillators** is defined by the differential equation

$$M\ddot{q} + C\dot{q} + \nabla V(q) = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

The reader wishing to see simple examples should turn to Section 2.2; here we explain the contents of equation (2.1) in general terms. As before, q is the configuration space point $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The M and C are real $n \times n$ -matrices, called the **mass matrix** and the **friction matrix**, respectively. The mass matrix is always symmetric and positive definite (and often diagonal, the diagonal entries being the masses of the components). The friction matrix need not be symmetric but is always positive semidefinite. The **potential** V is a smooth function from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R} , i.e., $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$, and ∇V is the gradient of V ,

$$\nabla V = \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial q_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial V}{\partial q_n} \right)^T.$$

Here the **gradient operator** ∇ is considered as a vector whose components are the differential operators $\partial/\partial q_k$. In finite-element applications in structural mechanics, the mass matrix is created by the discretization procedure for a corresponding partial differential equation. In general, the mass may here be distributed by the discretization over all adjacent degrees of freedom. However, in many applications the mass matrix is diagonal;

$$M_{ij} = m_i \delta_{ij},$$

where m_i is the mass corresponding to the coordinate q_i , and δ_{ij} is the **Kronecker symbol** (or Kronecker delta), which is 1 if $i = j$ and zero otherwise. In the example where \mathbf{q}_k is a three-vector denoting the position of an object, then i is a multi-index $i = (k, j)$ where k denotes an object index and $j = 1, 2, 3$ is the index of the coordinate of the k th object which sits in position i of the vector q . Then m_i is the mass of the k th object.

The quantity F defined by

$$F(q) := -\nabla V(q),$$

is the **force** on the system at the point q due to the potential $V(q)$. We define the **velocity** v of the oscillating system by

$$v := \dot{q}.$$

The **Hamiltonian energy** H is then defined by

$$H := \frac{1}{2} v^T M v + V(q). \quad (2.2)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is called the **kinetic energy** since it depends solely on the velocity of the system. The second term on the right-hand side is called the **potential energy** and it depends on the position of the system. For more complex systems the potential energy can also depend on the velocities. Calculating the time-derivative of the Hamiltonian energy H we get

$$\dot{H} = v^T M \dot{v} + \nabla V(q) \cdot \dot{q} = \dot{q}^T (M \ddot{q} + \nabla V(q)) = -\dot{q}^T C \dot{q} \leq 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where the last equality follows from the differential equation (2.1) and the final inequality follows since C is assumed to be positive semidefinite. If $C = 0$ (the idealized case of no friction) then the Hamiltonian energy is constant, $\dot{H} = 0$, and in this case we speak of **conservative dynamics** (the Hamiltonian H is conserved). If C is positive definite we have $\dot{H} < 0$ unless $\dot{q} = 0$ and there is energy loss. This is called **dissipative dynamics**. In the dissipative case, the sum of the kinetic and potential energy has to decrease.

If the potential V is unbounded from below, it might happen that the system starts falling in a direction in which the potential is unbounded from below and the system becomes unphysical; the velocity could increase without limits. Thus, in a realistic and manageable physical system, the potential is always bounded from below, and we shall make this assumption throughout. It follows that the Hamiltonian is bounded from below.

Since in the dissipative case the Hamiltonian energy is decreasing and is bounded below, it will approach a limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $\dot{H} \rightarrow 0$, and by (2.3), $\dot{q}^T C \dot{q} \rightarrow 0$. Since C is positive definite for a dissipative system, this forces $\dot{q} \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the velocities will get smaller and smaller, and asymptotically the system will approach the configuration of being in a state with $\dot{q} = 0$, at the level of the accuracy of the model. Typically this implies that q tends to some constant value q_0 . Note that it does not follow rigorously that q tends to a constant value; it is possible that $q \rightarrow \infty$. Nevertheless we assume that q does not walk away to infinity and then it follows from $\dot{q} = 0$ that $\ddot{q} = 0$, so that (2.1) implies $\nabla V(q_0) = 0$, and we conclude that q tends to a stationary point q_0 of the potential. If this is a saddle point, small perturbations can (and will) cause the system to move towards another stationary point. Because of such stability reasons, the system ultimately moves towards a local minimum.

In practice, the perturbations come from imperfections in the model. Remember that the deterministic equation (2.1) is a mathematical idealization of the real world situation. A more appropriate model (but still an approximation) is the equation

$$M \ddot{q} + C \dot{q} + \nabla V(q) = \varepsilon,$$

where ε is a stochastic force, describing the imperfections of the model. Typically, these are already sufficient to guarantee with probability 1 that the system will not end up in a saddle point. Usually, imperfections are small, irregular jumps due to friction, see, e.g., BOWDEN & LEBEN [44], or Brownian motion due to kicks by molecules of a solvent. See, e.g., BROWN [47], EINSTEIN & BROWN [69], GARCIA & PALACIOS [87], HANGGI & MARCHESONI [108], for an overview on Brownian motion with lots of historical references and citations DUPLANTIER [65], and for a discussion in the context of protein folding NEUMAIER [182, Section 4].

In many cases, the potential $V(q)$ has several local minima. Our argument so far says that the state of the system will usually move towards one of these local minima. Around the local minimum it can oscillate for a while, and in the absence of stochastic forces it will ultimately get into one of the local minima. If we assume that there are stochastic imperfections, we can say even more!

Suppose that the local minimum where the system tends to is not a global minimum, then occasional stochastic perturbations may suffice to push (or kick) the system over a barrier separating the local minimum from a valley leading to a different minimum. Such a barrier is characterized by a **saddle point**, a stationary point where the Hessian of the potential has exactly one negative eigenvalue. The energy needed to pass the barrier, called the **activation energy**, is simply the difference between the potential energy of the separating saddle point and the potential energy of the minimum. In a simple, frequently used approximation, the negative logarithm of the probability of exceeding the activation energy in a given time span is proportional to the activation energy. This implies that small barriers are easy to cross, while high barriers are difficult to cross. In particular, if a system can cross a barrier between a high-lying minimum to a much lower lying minimum, it is much more likely to cross it in the direction of the lower minimum than in the other direction. This means that (averaged over a population of many similar systems) most systems will spend most of their time near low minima, and if the energy barriers between the different minima are not too high, most systems will be most of the time close to the global minimum. Thus a global minimum characterizes an **absolutely stable** equilibrium, while other local minima are only **metastable** equilibrium positions, which can become unstable under sufficiently large stochastic perturbations.

There are famous relations called **fluctuation-dissipation theorems** that assert (in a quantitative way) that friction is related to stochastic (i.e., not directly modeled high frequency) interactions with the environment. In particular, if a system is sufficiently well isolated, both friction and stochastic forces become negligible, and the system can be described as a conservative system. Of course, from a fundamental point of view, the only truly isolated system is the universe as a whole, since at least electromagnetic radiation escapes from all systems not enclosed in an opaque container, and systems confined to a container interact quite strongly with the walls of the container (or else the wall would not be able to confine the system).

Thus on a fundamental level, a conservative system describes the whole universe from the tiniest microscopic details to the largest cosmological facts. Such a system would have to be described by a quantum field theory that combines the successful standard model of particle physics with general relativity. At present, no such theory is available.

On the other hand, conservative systems form a good first approximation to many small and practically relevant systems, which justifies that we spend most of the book with looking at the conservative case only.

The phase space formulation. So far, our discussion was framed in terms of position and velocity. As we shall see, the Hamiltonian description is most powerful in phase space coordinates. Here everything is expressed in terms of the phase space observables q and p ,

where

$$p := Mv,$$

is called the **momentum** p of the oscillating system. The **phase space** for a system of oscillators is the space of points $(q, p) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. A **state** (in the classical sense) is a point (p, q) in phase space. The **Hamiltonian function** (or simply the **Hamiltonian**) is the function defining the Hamiltonian energy in terms of the phase space observables p and q . In our case, since a positive definite matrix is always invertible, we can express v in terms of p as $v = M^{-1}p$, and find that

$$H(p, q) = \frac{1}{2}p^T M^{-1}p + V(q). \quad (2.4)$$

Note that H does not depend explicitly on time. (In this book, we only treat such cases; but in problems with time-dependent external fields, an explicit time dependence would be unavoidable.)

2.2 The classical anharmonic oscillator

To keep things simple, we concentrate on the case of a single degree of freedom. Everything said has a corresponding generalization to systems of coupled oscillators, but the essentials are easier to see in the simplest case.

The **simple anharmonic oscillator** is obtained by taking $n = 1$. The differential equation (2.1) reduces to a scalar equation

$$m\ddot{q} + c\dot{q} + V'(q) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect q . This describes for example the behavior of an object attached to a spring; then q is the length of the spring, $m = M$ is the mass of the object, $c = C$ is the friction constant (collective of the air, some friction in the spring itself, or of a surface if the object is lying on a surface) and $V(q)$ describes the potential energy (see below) the spring has when extended or contracted to length q . Note that a constant shift in the potential does not alter the equations of motion of an anharmonic oscillator; hence the potential is determined only up to a constant shift.

The **harmonic oscillator** is the special case of the anharmonic oscillator defined by a potential of the form

$$V(q) = \frac{k}{2}(q - q_0)^2, \quad k > 0,$$

where q_0 is the equilibrium position of the spring. (Strictly speaking, only oscillators that are not harmonic should be called anharmonic, but we follow the mathematical practice where limiting cases are taken to be special cases of the generic concept: A linear function is also nonlinear, and a real number is also complex.) In this case, the force becomes

$$F(q) = -\nabla V(q) = -k(q - q_0) \quad (2.6)$$

The equation (2.6) is sometimes called **Hooke's law**, which asserts that the force needed to pull a spring from equilibrium is linear in the deviation $q - q_0$ from equilibrium, a valid approximation when $q - q_0$ is small. Since the force is minus the gradient of the potential, the potential has to be quadratic to reproduce Hooke's law. It is customary to shift the potential such that it vanishes in global equilibrium; then one gets the above form, and stability of the equilibrium position dictates the sign of k . Note that the shift does not change the force, hence has no physical effect.

The **mathematical pendulum** is described by the equation

$$V(q) = -k(1 - \cos q), \quad k > 0, \quad (2.7)$$

where q is now the angle of deviation from the equilibrium, measured in radians. Looking at small q we can approximate as follows:

$$V(q) = \frac{k}{2}q^2 + O(q^2),$$

and after dropping the error term, we end up with a harmonic oscillator. The same argument allows one to approximate an arbitrary anharmonic oscillator by a harmonic oscillator as long as the oscillations around a stable equilibrium position are small enough.

For q not small the mathematical pendulum is far from harmonic. Physically this is clear; stretching a (good) spring further and further is harder and harder, but pushing the one-dimensional pendulum 'far' from its equilibrium position is really different. After rotating it over π radians the pendulum is upside down and pushing it further no longer costs energy.

Dynamics in phase space. We now restrict to conservative systems and analyze the conservative anharmonic oscillator ($\dot{H} = 0$) a bit more. Since $c = 0$, the differential equation (2.5) simplifies to

$$m\ddot{q} + V'(q) = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

The Hamiltonian energy is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + V(q).$$

Note the form of the kinetic energy familiar from school. Expressed in terms of the phase space observables p and q (which are now scalar variables, not vectors), we have

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(q),$$

$$\dot{q} = v = \frac{p}{m}, \quad \dot{p} = m\dot{v} = m\ddot{q} = -V'(q). \quad (2.9)$$

An observable is something you can calculate from the state; simple examples are the velocity and the kinetic, potential, or Hamiltonian energy. Thus arbitrary observables

can be written as smooth functions $f(p, q)$ of the phase space observables. In precise terms, an **observable** is (for an anharmonic oscillator) a function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$. The required amount of smoothness can be reduced in practical applications; on the fundamental theoretical level, it pays to require infinite differentiability to get rid of troubling exceptions.

Introducing the shorthand notation

$$f_p := \frac{\partial f}{\partial p}, \quad f_q := \frac{\partial f}{\partial q},$$

for partial derivatives, we can write the equations (2.9) in the form

$$\dot{q} = H_p, \quad \dot{p} = -H_q. \quad (2.10)$$

The equations (2.10) are called the **Hamilton equations in state form**. Although derived here only for the anharmonic oscillator, the Hamilton equations are of great generality; the equations of motions of many (unconstrained) conservative physical systems can be cast in this form, with more complicated objects in place of p and q , and more complex Hamiltonians $H(p, q)$. A dynamical system governed by the Hamilton equations is called an **isolated Hamiltonian system**. If there are external forces, the system is not truly isolated, but the Hamilton equations are still valid in many cases, provided one allows the Hamiltonian to depend explicitly on time, $H = H(p, q, t)$; in this case, there would appear additional partial derivatives with respect to time in various of our formulas.

Calculating the time-dependence of an arbitrary observable f we get

$$\dot{f} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial p} \dot{p} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \dot{q} = f_p \dot{p} + f_q \dot{q},$$

hence

$$\dot{f} = H_p f_q - H_q f_p. \quad (2.11)$$

In particular for $f = q$ or $f = p$ we recover (2.10). Thus this formulation is equivalent to the Hamilton equations. We call (2.11) the Hamilton equations in **general form**. Let us apply (2.11) to $f = H$ and calculate the change of the Hamiltonian:

$$\dot{H} = H_p H_q - H_q H_p = 0,$$

which is consistent since we knew from the start that energy is conserved, $\dot{H} = 0$. But now this relation has been derived for arbitrary isolated Hamiltonian systems!

When external forces are present, we have to consider time-dependent observables $f(p, q, t)$. In this case, we have in place of (2.11)

$$\dot{f} = f_p \dot{p} + f_q \dot{q} + f_t \dot{t} = H_p f_q - H_q f_p + f_t, \quad (2.12)$$

and in particular for the Hamiltonian,

$$\dot{H} = H_t = \partial H / \partial t.$$

However, we restrict the subsequent discussion to the isolated case.

The Hamiltonian equations can be cast in a form that turns out to be even more general and very useful. It brings us directly to the heart of the subject of the present book. We define a binary operation \lrcorner on $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ as follows:

$$f \lrcorner g := f_p g_q - g_p f_q.$$

Physicists write $\{g, f\}$ for $f \lrcorner g$ and call it the **Poisson bracket**. Our alternative notation will turn out to be very useful, and generalizes in many unexpected ways. The equation (2.11) can then be written in form of a **classical Heisenberg equation**

$$\dot{f} = H \lrcorner f. \tag{2.13}$$

It turns out that this equation, appropriately interpreted, is extremely general. It covers virtually *all* conservative systems of classical and quantum mechanics.

A basic and most remarkable fact, which we shall make precise in the following chapter, is that the vector space $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the binary operation \lrcorner is a Lie algebra. We shall take this up systematically in Section 9.1.

2.3 Harmonic oscillators and linear field equations

Historically, radiating substances which produce rays of α -, β - or γ -particles were fundamental for gaining an understanding of the structure of matter. Even today, many experiments in physics are performed by rays (or beams, which is essentially the same) generated by some source and then manipulated in the experiments.

The oldest, most familiar rays are light rays, α -rays, β -rays, and γ -rays. (Nowadays, we also have neutron rays, etc., and cosmic rays contain all sorts of particles.)

All kinds of rays are described by certain quantum fields, obtained by quantizing corresponding classical field equations, linear partial differential equations whose time-periodic solutions provide the possible **single-particle modes** of the quantum fields. In the following sections we look at these field equations in some detail; here we just make some introductory comments.

α -rays are modes (realizations) of the field of doubly ionized helium, He^{++} , which is modeled on the classical level by a Schrödinger wave equation or a Klein–Gordon wave equation. β -rays are modes of a charged field of electrons or positrons, modeled on the classical level by a Dirac wave equation. For radiation of only positrons one uses the notation β^+ , and for rays with only electrons one uses β^- . Both light rays and γ -rays are modes of the electromagnetic field which are modeled on the classical level by the Maxwell wave equations. Their quantization (which we do not treat in this book) produces the corresponding quantum fields.

In the present context, the Schrödinger, Klein–Gordon, Dirac, and Maxwell equations are all regarded as classical field equations for waves in $3 + 1$ dimensions, though they can also

be regarded as the equations for a single quantum particle (a nonrelativistic or relativistic scalar particle, an electron, or a photon, respectively). This dual use is responsible for calling **second quantization** the quantum field theory, the quantum version of the classical theory of these equations. It also accounts for the **particle-wave duality**, the puzzling property that rays sometimes (e.g., in photodetection or a Geiger counter) behave like a beam of particles, sometimes (in diffraction experiments, of which the double slit experiments are the most famous ones) like a wave – in the case of light a century-old conflict dating back to the times of Newton and Huygens.

In the quantum field setting, quantum particles arise as eigenstates of an operator N called the **number operator**. This operator has a discrete spectrum with nonnegative integer eigenvalues, counting the number of particles in an eigenstate. The ground state, with zero eigenvalue, is essentially unique, and defines the **vacuum**; a quantum particle has an eigenstate corresponding to the eigenvalue 1 of N , and eigenstates with eigenvalue n correspond to systems of n particles. If a quantum system contains particles of different types, each particle type has its own number operator.

The states that are easy to prepare correspond to beams. The fact that beams have a fairly well-defined direction translates into the formal fact that beams are approximate eigenstates of the momentum operator. Indeed, often beams are well approximated by exact eigenstates of the momentum operator, which describe so-called **monochromatic beams**. (Real beams are at best quasi-monochromatic, a term we shall not explain.) Since the states of beams are not eigenstates of the number operator N , they contain an indefinite number of particles.

All equations mentioned are linear partial differential equations, and behave just like a set of infinitely many coupled harmonic oscillators, one at each space position. They describe non-interacting fields in a homogeneous medium. The definition of interacting fields leaves the linear regime and leads into the heart of nonlinear field theory, both in a classical and a quantum version. This is outside the scope of the present book. However, when position space (or momentum space) is discretized so that only a finite number of degrees of freedom remain to describe a field, one is back to nonlinear oscillators, which can be understood completely on the basis of the treatment given here, and indeed, number operator will play a prominent role in Part V of this book.

Fortunately, for understanding beam experiments, it usually suffices to quantize a few modes of the classical field, and these are harmonic oscillators. Indeed, by separation of variables, the linear field equations can be decoupled in time, leading to a system of uncoupled harmonic oscillator forming the Fourier modes. Beams correspond to solutions which have a significant intensity only in a small neighborhood of a line in 3-space. (Quasi-)monochromatic beams are the beams corresponding to solutions which have an (almost) constant frequency. Thus interactions with beams can often be modelled as interactions with a few harmonic oscillators.

On the other hand, when a beam containing all frequencies interacts with a system which oscillates only with certain frequencies, the beam will resonate with these frequencies. This allows the detection of a system's eigenfrequencies by observing its interaction with light

or other radiation. This is the basis of spectroscopy, and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 and Chapter 17.

Note that, just as the free Maxwell equations describe both classical electromagnetic waves (in particular light and γ -rays) or single photons (particles of the corresponding quantum field), so the Schrödinger equation, the Klein–Gordon equation, and the Dirac equation describe both classical fields for α - and β -rays, or single α -particles or electrons and positrons (particles of the corresponding quantum field), respectively.

In the following, we consider four kinds of classical fields and their associated quantum particles, differing in spin and hence in the way rotations and Lorentz transformations affect the fields.

- Slow bosons of spin zero, such as slow α -particles. The equation describing them is the Schrödinger equation.
- Fast bosons of spin zero, such as fast α -particles. The equation describing them is the Klein–Gordon equation.
- Fermionic particles of spin $1/2$, like electrons, positrons and neutrinos. The dynamical equation in this case is the Dirac equation.
- Light and γ -rays; electromagnetic radiation. The corresponding particles are photons, which have spin 1. The field describing these particles is the electromagnetic field. The equations governing their dynamics are the Maxwell equations.

Because of the differing spin, there is a significant difference between β -rays and the others: α -particles and photons have integral spin and are therefore so-called **bosons**, while electrons and positrons have non-integral spin and are therefore so-called **fermions**. Only fermions are subject to the so-called **Pauli exclusion principle** which is responsible for the extensivity of matter. This difference is reflected by the fundamental requirement that the fields of bosons, in particular of α -particles and photons, are quantized by imposing **canonical commutation relations** (discussed in Section 14.2), while fermions, and hence positrons and electrons, are quantized by imposing **canonical anticommutation relations** (discussed in Section 15.1).

2.4 Alpha rays

We first consider rays consisting of α -**particles**, helium atoms stripped of their two electrons, and consist of two protons and two neutrons. α -particles are released by other heavier nuclei during certain processes in the nucleus. For example, some elements are α -radioactive, which means that a nucleus of type A will want to go to a lower energy level, which can then be done by emitting two of its protons and two of its neutrons. The result is thus two nuclei, a Helium nucleus and a nucleus of type $A' \neq A$; schematically

$A \rightarrow A' + \alpha$. But also during nuclear splitting α -particles are released. Yet even more, the sun is emitting α -particles all the time; the sun produces heat by means of a chain of nuclear fusion reactions, during which some α -particles are produced. If the atmosphere would not be there, life on earth would be impossible due to the bombardment of α -particles. That α -particles are not healthy has been in the news lately (in 2007), since the former Russian spy Litvinenko is said to have been killed by a small amount of polonium, which is an α -emitter.

An α -particle emitted from a radioactive nucleus typically has a speed of 15,000 kilometers per second. Although this might look very fast, it is only 5% of the speed of light, which means that for a lot of calculations α -particles can be considered **nonrelativistically**, that is, without using special relativity. For some more accurate calculations though, special relativity is required.

For the nonrelativistic α -particle we have to use the Schrödinger equation. For a particle of mass m moving in a potential $V(x, y, z)$ the Schrödinger equation is given by

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(x, y, z, t) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi(x, y, z, t) + V(x, y, z) \psi(x, y, z, t)$$

where ψ is the wave function of the particle, and $\nabla^2 = \nabla \cdot \nabla$ is the **Laplace operator**. The wave function contains the information about the particle. The quantity $|\psi(x, y, z, t)|^2$ is the probability density for finding the particle at time t in a given position (x, y, z) . For beam considerations, we take $V(x, y, z) = 0$. Since we shoot the α -particles just in one direction, we assume $\psi(x, y, z, t) = \phi(t)\chi(x)$. We obtain

$$\frac{i\dot{\phi}(t)}{\phi(t)} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\chi''(x)}{\chi(x)}, \quad (2.14)$$

where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to time t and the prime ' the derivative with respect to the coordinate x . The left-hand side of (2.14) only depends on time t and the right-hand side only on x , which implies that both sides are a constant (with the dimensions of time^{-1}) independent of t and x . We denote this constant by ω and obtain two linear ordinary differential equations for ϕ and χ with the solutions

$$\phi(t) = e^{-i\omega t}, \quad \chi(x) = ae^{ikx} + b^* e^{-ikx}, \quad k = \sqrt{\frac{2m\omega}{\hbar}},$$

where a and b are some constants; we have normalized the constant in front of ϕ to 1 since we are only interested in the product of ϕ and χ . Note that we wrote the solution suggestively as if $\omega \geq 0$ and in fact, on physical grounds it is; the solutions with $\omega < 0$ are not integrable and hence cannot determine a probability distribution.

We can express E in terms of k , which plays the role of the inverse wavelength, getting $\omega(k) = \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}$. Reintroducing an arbitrary direction unit vector \mathbf{n} and the wave vector $\mathbf{k} = k\mathbf{n}$, we obtain the **dispersion relation** of the Schrödinger equation,

$$\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\hbar \mathbf{k}^2}{2m}.$$

Therefore the general solution can be expanded as

$$\psi(x, t) = \int d\mathbf{k} \left(a(\mathbf{k}) e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + b(\mathbf{k})^* e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \right).$$

As explained before, the quantity $|\psi(x, y, z, t)|^2$ gives the probability density for finding the particle at position (x, y, z) at time t . If we have an experiment with a great number of non-interacting particles, all of which have the same wave function ψ , the quantity $|\psi(x, y, z, t)|^2$ is proportional to the particle density. However, α -particles interact and thus the Hamiltonian is different. If we assume the particle density is not too high we can still assume that the α -particles move as if there were no other α -particles. Under this assumption we may again take $|\psi(x, y, z, t)|^2$ as the particle density. The energy density is then proportional to $|\psi(x, y, z, t)|^2$. Putting as before the whole experiment in a box of finite volume V one can again arrive at a Hamiltonian corresponding to a collection of independent harmonic oscillators.

Now we look at relativistic α -particles, and remind the reader of the notation introduced in Section 1.6. The dynamics of relativistic α -particles of mass m is described by a real-valued function $\psi(x^\mu)$ whose evolution is governed by the **Klein–Gordon equation**, which is given by

$$\left(\square - \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} \right) \psi = 0 \quad (2.15)$$

with the second order differential operator

$$\square := -\frac{\partial^2}{c^2 \partial t^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2},$$

called the **d'Alembertian**. Here c is the speed of light. We look for wave like solutions $\psi \sim e^{ik \cdot x}$ for some vector \mathbf{k}^μ . Note that $\partial_\mu e^{ik \cdot x} = ik_\mu e^{ik \cdot x}$ and hence $\square e^{ik \cdot x} = \mp k^2 e^{ik \cdot x}$, where $k^2 = k \cdot k$. Hence we obtain the condition on k

$$\pm k^2 + \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Writing $k^0 = \omega$ and denoting the spatial parts of k with bold \mathbf{k} we thus get the dispersion relation

$$\omega = \pm \sqrt{c^2 \mathbf{k}^2 + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}}. \quad (2.17)$$

We see that $\hbar|\omega| = E = mc^2$, combining Einstein's famous formula $E = mc^2$ and Planck's law $E = \hbar\omega$. The solution for a given choice of sign of ω is expanded in Fourier terms and most often written as

$$\psi(x, t) = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega(k)} \left(a(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\omega(k)t - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + a(\mathbf{k})^* e^{-i\omega(k)t + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \right),$$

where we used the Lorentz-invariant measure (1.26) involving $\omega(k) = \sqrt{c^2 \mathbf{k}^2 + \frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}}$.

2.5 Beta rays

We now discuss beams composed of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles, the β -particles. β -radiation is emitted by radioactive material. Unstable nuclei can lose some of their energy and go to a more stable nucleus under the emission of β -particles. There are two kinds of β -particles; positively charged and negatively charged. The negatively charged version is consisting of nothing more than **electrons**. The positively charged counterpart consists of the antiparticles of the electrons, the so-called **positrons**.

Other examples of fermions are neutrinos. The sun emits a stream of neutrinos; in each second, there are approximately 10^{13} neutrinos flying through your body (it depends on which latitude you are, how big you are and whether you are standing or lying down, making a difference of a factor of 100 perhaps). Neutrinos fly very fast; the solar neutrinos travel at the speed of light (or very close). The reason they travel that fast is that neutrinos have a zero or very tiny mass, and massless particles (such as photons) always travel at the speed of light. For a long time, neutrinos were believed to be massless; only recently it became an established fact that at least one of the three generations of neutrinos must have a tiny positive mass. We do not feel anything of the many neutrinos coming from the sun and steadily passing through our body, because – unlike protons and electrons – they hardly interact with matter; for example, to absorb half of the solar neutrinos, one would need a solid lead wall of around 10^{16} meters thick! The reason is that they do not have charge: they are neutral.

To discuss the case that the particles shot by the beam are fermions, we have to use the Dirac equation. It is convenient to use the same conventions for dealing with relativistic particles. In addition to the previously introduced symbols, we now introduce the so-called γ -matrices. In four dimensions there are four of them, called $\gamma^0, \dots, \gamma^3$, and they satisfy

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu = 2\eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.18)$$

The associative algebra generated by the γ -matrices subject to the above relation is a **Clifford algebra**. There are several possibilities to find a representation for the γ -matrices in terms of 4×4 -matrices; a frequently made choice is

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^0 &= i\sigma_1 \otimes 1, & \gamma^1 &= \sigma_2 \otimes 1 \\ \gamma^2 &= \sigma^3 \otimes \sigma^1, & \gamma^3 &= \sigma^3 \otimes \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the σ_k are the Pauli matrices (1.22). However, we only need the defining relation (2.18). We assemble the γ -matrices in a vector $(\gamma^0, \gamma^1, \gamma^2, \gamma^3)$ and inner products with vectors p^μ are given by $\gamma \cdot p = \gamma^\mu p_\mu = \gamma^\mu p^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}$.

A fermion is described by a vector-like object ψ , which takes values in the spinor representation of the Lie algebra $so(3, 1)$. Hence we can think of ψ as a vector with four-components. In this case, the γ -matrices are 4×4 -matrices; that such a representation exists is shown by the explicit construction above. We need a property of the γ -matrices, namely that they are traceless (in any representation). To prove this, take any γ^μ and choose another γ -matrix γ^ν , $\mu \neq \nu$. Then we have

$$\text{tr } \gamma^\mu = \text{tr} \left(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu (\gamma^\nu)^{-1} \right) = - \text{tr} \left(\gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu (\gamma^\nu)^{-1} \right) = - \text{tr } \gamma^\mu.$$

Hence $\text{tr } \gamma^\mu = 0$.

With these preliminaries the Dirac equation is given by

$$\left(\gamma \cdot \partial + \frac{mc}{\hbar} \right) \psi = 0.$$

Acting on the Dirac equation with $(\gamma \cdot \partial - \frac{mc}{\hbar})$ and using $\gamma \cdot p \gamma \cdot p = p^2$ for any four-vector p^μ , we see that each component of the spinor obeys the Klein–Gordon equation (2.15).

We look for solutions of the form $\psi = ue^{ik \cdot x}$. Putting this ansatz in the Dirac equation we obtain

$$\left(i\gamma \cdot k - \frac{mc}{\hbar} \right) u = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

and the additional constraint $k^2 + \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} = 0$ follows from the Klein–Gordon equation. Equation (2.19) can be written as

$$\left(1 - i \frac{\hbar}{mc} \gamma \cdot k \right) u = 0,$$

and it is easy to see that

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - i \frac{\hbar}{mc} \gamma \cdot k \right)$$

satisfies $P^2 = P$. Hence P is a projection operator and \mathbb{C}^4 splits as $V \oplus V'$ with $V = P\mathbb{C}^4$ and $V' = (1 - P)\mathbb{C}^4$. The Dirac equation thus tells us that u has to be in V' . Denote $p^\mu = \frac{mc}{\hbar} k^\mu$, then $p^2 = -1$. We now choose a frame moving along with the particle, so that in that frame the particle is not moving, hence we may choose $p^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ in the chosen frame. It follows that $2P = 1 + i\gamma^0$. The eigenvalues of $i\gamma^0$ are ± 1 since $(i\gamma^0)^2 = 1$. But the γ -matrices are traceless, and hence the eigenvalues add up to 0. Therefore the eigenvalues of $i\gamma^0$ are $-1, -1, +1, +1$. Thus P can be cast in the form

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We conclude that there are two independent degrees of freedom for a fermion; similar to the case of light one speaks of two polarizations. For a particular choice of the sign of ω_k we can thus specialise the expansion of the fermion to

$$\psi = \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left(v_+(k) e^{i\omega_k t - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} + v_-(k) e^{-i\omega_k t + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \right),$$

where $\omega_k = \sqrt{\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k} + m^2 c^2 / \hbar^2}$ and where the $v_\pm(k)$ are linear combinations of the two basis polarization vectors u_1 and u_2 :

$$v_\pm(k) = \alpha_\pm(k) u_1 + \beta_\pm(k) u_2.$$

2.6 Light rays and gamma rays

Lasers produce light of a high intensity and with almost only one frequency. That is, the light of a laser is almost **monochromatic**. We assume that the laser is perfect and thus emits only radiation of one particular wavelength. Also we consider ‘general lasers’, which can radiate electrons, α -particles, β^\pm -radiation and so on. We shortly comment on the nature of the different kinds of radiation and see how the modes come into play. To make life easy for us, we imagine the laser is placed such that the medium through which the beam is shot, is the vacuum.

First, the common situation where the radiation is light. Light waves are particular solutions to the **Maxwell equations** in vacuum, or any other homogeneous medium. The Maxwell equations in vacuum are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} &= 0, & \nabla \times \mathbf{E} &= -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= 0, & \nabla \times \mathbf{B} &= \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t},\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{E} is the electric field strength, \mathbf{B} is the magnetic field strength and t is the time, and c is again the speed of light. As usual in physics, boldface symbols denote 3-dimensional vectors, while their components are not written in bold;

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{A} := \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial x_3}$$

and

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \operatorname{rot} \mathbf{A} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial x_2} - \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x_3} \\ \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial x_3} - \frac{\partial A_3}{\partial x_1} \\ \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial x_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

denote the **divergence** and **curl** of a vector field A , respectively. Using the generally valid relation

$$\nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{X}) = \nabla(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{X}) - \nabla^2 \mathbf{X}$$

and the fact that the divergence of \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{E} vanishes we obtain from the Maxwell equations the wave equations

$$\nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \mathbf{E}, \quad \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \mathbf{B}.$$

To solve we use the ansatz

$$\mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) = \mathbf{E} e^{i\omega t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{B}(x, y, z, t) = \mathbf{B} e^{i\omega t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}},$$

where \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} are now fixed vectors. The ansatz represents waves propagating in the \mathbf{k} -direction and at any fixed point in space the measured frequency is ω . From the wave equations we immediately find the **dispersion relations** for the Maxwell equations that relate ω and $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)^T$;

$$\omega = c|\mathbf{k}|,$$




Figure 2.1: An image of a solution of the electromagnetic wave equations. The Poynting vector gives the direction of the wave and is perpendicular to the electric and the magnetic field.

where

$$|\mathbf{k}| := \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k} = k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2.$$

We compute

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0,$$

and similarly $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. Thus \mathbf{k} is perpendicular to both \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} . We find for the outer products

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) = -i\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t), \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{B}(x, y, z, t) = -i\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{B}(x, y, z, t),$$

and thus it follows

$$\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E} = \omega \mathbf{B}, \quad \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{B} = -\frac{\omega}{c^2} \mathbf{E}.$$

We see that \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} are perpendicular to each other, and \mathbf{k} is perpendicular to \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} , hence \mathbf{k} is parallel to the so-called **Poynting vector** $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}$. Figure 2.1 displays an image of a solution.

Without loss of generality we may change the coordinates so that \mathbf{k} points into the z -direction; then $k_x = k_y = 0$ and only k_z is nonzero. Then, since $\omega \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E}$ and \mathbf{E} is orthogonal to \mathbf{k} , light is completely determined by giving the x - and y -components of \mathbf{E} . Thus light has two degrees of freedom; put in other words, light has two **polarizations**. Linearly polarized light is light where \mathbf{E} oscillates in a constant direction orthogonal to the light ray. Circularly polarized light is light where \mathbf{E} rotates along the path of light; this can be achieved by superimposing two linearly polarized light beams. Since the Maxwell equations are linear, any sum of solutions is again a solution. Note that to actually get the solution for $\mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t)$, one has to take the real part.

So we have seen that a light beam is determined by giving two polarizations. These polarizations can be interpreted as modes of an oscillator. One can write the general solution in

terms of coefficient functions $a(\mathbf{k})$ as¹

$$\mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) = \int d\mathbf{k} \left(a(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} t} + a^*(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})^* e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} t} \right), \quad (2.20)$$

where the frequency is given by the dispersion relation $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = c|\mathbf{k}|$, and

$$\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = \varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} + \varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}},$$

where $\varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k})$ and $\varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k})$ are **polarization vectors** chosen to satisfy

$$\varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k}) = \varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{k} = \varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0, \quad \varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k})^2 = \varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k})^2 = 1.$$

Note the similarity with the Maxwell equation. The main difference is in the dispersion relation. In addition, since now the fields function are real, the coefficients of the positive frequency part and the negative frequency part are related. The positive frequency part

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}} := \int d\mathbf{k} a^*(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})^* e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}} t}$$

of the solution (2.20) is called the **analytic signal** of \mathbf{E} ; clearly $\mathbf{E} = \overline{\widehat{\mathbf{E}}} + \widehat{\mathbf{E}} = 2 \operatorname{Re} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}$.

In the quantum theory one promotes the modes $a(\mathbf{k})$ and $a^*(\mathbf{k})$ to operators. We treat the transition from the classical theory to the quantum theory in detail only for the harmonic oscillator, corresponding to a single monochromatic mode; see Chapter 14.

To motivate the connection, we rewrite the Hamiltonian into a specific form that we will later recognize as the Hamiltonian of a harmonic oscillator, thereby showing that the Maxwell equations give rise to (an infinite set of) harmonic oscillators.

First we consider the system in a finite volume V to avoid some questions of finiteness. In that case (since one has to impose appropriate boundary conditions), the integral over wave vectors \mathbf{k} for the electric field becomes a sum over a discrete (but infinite) set of wave vectors. To get a sum over finitely many terms, one also has to remove wave vectors with very large momentum; this corresponds to discretizing space. Getting a proper limit is the subject of renormalization theory, which is beyond the scope of our presentation. The mathematical details for interactive fields are still obscure; indeed, whether **quantum electrodynamics** (QED) exists as a mathematically well-defined theory is one of the big open questions in mathematical physics. The functions $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ can then be normalized as

$$\int_V d\mathbf{x} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})^* \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}.$$

The energy density of the electromagnetic field is proportional to $\mathbf{E}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2$. Hence classically the Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_V d\mathbf{x} (\mathbf{E}^2 + \mathbf{B}^2).$$

¹We are not taking all details into account here, since we only want to convey the general picture of what is happening and don't use the material outside this section.

Inserting the expansions (2.20) of \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} into the expression for the Hamiltonian and taking into account the normalization of the $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{k}}$ one obtains after shifting the ground state energy to zero and performing the so-called thermodynamic limit $V \rightarrow \infty$ a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}} (a_{\mathbf{k}}^* a_{\mathbf{k}} + a_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^*) .$$

In Chapter 14 we will show that the quantum mechanical Hamiltonian of the harmonic oscillator is given by $H = \hbar \omega a^* a$ for some constant ω and operators a and a^* . For light we thus obtain for each possible \mathbf{k} -vector a quantum oscillator. In practice, a laser admits only a selection of possible \mathbf{k} -vectors. In the ideal case that there is only one possible \mathbf{k} -vector, that is, the Poynting vector can only point in one direction and only one wavelength is allowed, the Hamiltonian reduces to the Hamiltonian of one harmonic oscillator.

Chapter 3

Spectral analysis

In this chapter we show that the spectrum of a quantum Hamiltonian (defining the admissible energy levels) contains very useful information about a conservative quantum system. It not only allows one to solve the Heisenberg equations of motion but also has a direct link to experiment, in that the differences of the energy levels are directly observable, since they can be probed by coupling the system to a harmonic oscillator with adjustable frequency.

3.1 The quantum spectrum

In quantum mechanics the classical Hamiltonian becomes an operator on some Hilbert space. Formally, instead of a formal expression $H(qp)$ defining a classical N -particle Hamiltonian as a function of position q and momentum p , one has a similar expression where now q and p are vectors whose components are linear operators on the Hilbert space \mathbb{R}^{3N} depending on the representation used. In the **position representation**, the components of q act as multiplication by position coordinates, while the components of p are multiples of the differentiation operators with respect to the position coordinates; in the **momentum representation**, this also holds but with position and momentum interchanged. Both representations are equivalent.

The collection of eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian H of a quantum system is referred to as the spectrum of H (or of the system). Formally, the **spectrum** of a linear operator H is the set of all $E \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $H - E$ is *not* invertible. In finite dimensions, this implies the nontrivial solvability of the equation $(H - E)\psi = 0$, and hence of the existence of an eigenvector $\psi \neq 0$ satisfying the **time-independent Schrödinger equation**

$$H\psi = E\psi. \tag{3.1}$$

In infinite dimensions, things are a bit more complicated and require the spectral theorem from functional analysis. If the spectrum of H is, however, discrete then (3.1) remains valid.

As we shall show in Section 14.3, the Hamiltonian of a quantum harmonic oscillator in normal mode form is given by $H = E_0 + \hbar\omega n$, where n is the so-called **number operator** whose spectrum consists of the nonnegative integers. Hence the eigenvectors of H (also called **eigenfunctions** if, as here, the Hilbert space consists of functions) are eigenvectors of n , and the eigenvalues E_k of H are related to the eigenvalues $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of n by the formula

$$E_k = E_0 + k\hbar\omega.$$

This shows that the eigenvalues of the quantum harmonic oscillator are quantized, and the eigenvalue differences are integral multiples of the energy quantum $\hbar\omega$. That the spectrum of the Hamiltonian is discrete is sometimes rephrased as ‘ H is quantized’.

In this and the next section we investigate the experimental meaning of the spectrum of the Hamiltonian of an arbitrary quantum system. Since the Hamiltonian describes the evolution of the system via the quantum Heisenberg equation (1.16), i.e.,

$$\dot{f} = H \triangleright f = \frac{i}{\hbar}[H, f],$$

one expects that the spectrum will be related to the time dependence of $f(t)$. To solve the Heisenberg equation, we need to find a representation where the Hamiltonian acts diagonally.

In the case where the Hilbert space \mathbb{H} is finite-dimensional, we can always diagonalize H , since H is Hermitian. There is an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of H , and fixing such a basis we may represent all $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ by their components ψ_k in this basis, thus identifying \mathbb{H} with \mathbb{C}^n with the standard inner product. In this representation, H acts as a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are the eigenvalues corresponding to the basis of eigenvectors;

$$(H\psi)_k = E_k\psi_k.$$

In the case where the Hilbert space is infinite-dimensional and H is self-adjoint, an analogous representation is possible, using the **Gel'fand–Maurin theorem**, also known under the name **nuclear spectral theorem**. The theorem asserts that if H is self-adjoint, then H can be extended into the dual space of the domain of definition of H ; there it has a complete family of eigenfunctions, which can be used to coordinatize the Hilbert space. The situation is slightly complicated by the fact that the spectrum may be partially or fully continuous, in which case the concept of a basis of eigenvectors no longer makes sense since the eigenvectors corresponding to points in the continuous spectrum are no longer square integrable and hence lie outside the Hilbert space.

In the physics literature, the rigorous mathematical exposition is usually abandoned at this stage, and one simply proceeds by analogy, choosing a set Ω of labels of the eigenstates and treating them “formally” as if they form a discrete set. Often, the discreteness of the spectrum is enforced verbally by artificially “putting the particles in a finite box” and going to an infinite volume limit at the very end of the computations. The justification for the approach is that most experiments are indeed very well localized; in letting two protons collide in CERN we do not take interaction with particles on Jupiter into account.

Mathematically we thus put our system in a box. Since we do not want our system to interact too much with the walls of the box we take the box large enough. Having met the final requirement one observes that the physical quantities do not depend on the precise form and size of the box. To simplify the equations one then takes the size of the box to infinity. Making this mathematically precise is quite difficult, though well-understood for nonrelativistic systems. In particular, for the part of the spectrum that becomes continuous in this limit, the limits of the eigenvectors become **generalized eigenvectors** lying no longer in the Hilbert space itself but in a distributional extension of the Hilbert space which must be discussed in the setting of a so-called **Gelfand triple** or **rigged Hilbert space**; cf. Sections.braket.

In many cases of physical interest, these generalized eigenvectors come in two flavors, depending on the boundary conditions imposed, resulting in two families of **in-eigenstates** $|k\rangle_-$ and **out-eigenstates** $|k\rangle_+$ labelled by a set Ω which in the case of the harmonic oscillator is $\Omega = \mathbb{N}_0$. (The bra-ket notation used here informally is made precise in Section 14.4.) The in- and out-states are called so because they have a natural geometric interpretation in scattering experiments (see Section 3.4). In addition to these eigenstates, there is a measure $d\mu(k)$ on Ω , and a **spectral density** $\rho(k)$ with real positive values such that every vector in the Hilbert space has a unique representation in the form

$$\psi = \int_{\Omega} d\mu(k) \psi_+(k) |k\rangle_+ = \int_{\Omega} d\mu(k) \psi_-(k) |k\rangle_- .$$

For any fixed choice of the sign in $\psi(k) := \psi_{\pm}(k)$, the inner product is given by

$$\phi^* \psi = \int_{\Omega} d\mu(k) \rho(k) \bar{\phi}(k) \psi(k) . \quad (3.2)$$

The spectral measure $d\mu(k)$ may also have a discrete part corresponding to square integrable eigenstates, in which case $|k\rangle_+ = |k\rangle_-$. If all eigenvectors are square integrable, the spectrum is completely discrete. In particular, this is the case for the harmonic oscillator, for which we construct the diagonal representation explicitly in Section 14.

Since the $|k\rangle_{\pm}$ are eigenvectors with corresponding eigenvalue $E(k) = E_k$, that is, the Hamiltonian satisfies

$$(H\psi)(k) = E(k)\psi(k) , \quad (3.3)$$

we say that H **acts diagonally** in the representation defined by the $\psi(k)$. Thus one can identify the Hilbert space with the space $L^2(\Omega)$ of coefficient functions ψ_{\pm} with finite $\int_{\Omega} d\mu(k) \rho(k) |\psi_{\pm}(k)|^2$; the Hamiltonian is then determined by (3.3). The in- and out-states are related by the so-called **S-matrix**, a unitary matrix $S \in \text{Lin } L^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\psi_+(k) = (S\psi_-)(k) .$$

As a consequence of the time-symmetric nature of conservative quantum dynamics and the time-asymmetry of scattering eigenstates, the in-representation and the out-representation are both equivalent to the original representation on which the Hamiltonian is defined. In many cases of interest, one can then rigorously prove existence and uniqueness of the S-matrix.

The transformation from an arbitrary Hilbert space representation to the equivalent representation in terms of which H is diagonal, is an analogue of a Fourier transformation; the latter corresponds to the special case where $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and H is a differential operator with constant coefficients.

In general, the Gel'fand–Maurin theorem guarantees the existence of a topological space Ω and a Borel measurable spectral density function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that the original Hilbert space is $L^2(\Omega, \rho)$ with inner product (3.2) and such that (3.3) holds. Indeed, Ω can be constructed as the set of **characters**, that is, $*$ -homomorphisms into the complex numbers, of a maximal commutative C^* -algebra of bounded linear operators containing the bounded operators e^{itH} ($t \in \mathbb{R}$). (Since we don't use this construction further, the concepts involved will not be explained in detail.)

The above reasoning is completely parallel to the finite-dimensional case, where $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C}^n$. There one would write $\psi = \sum_k \psi_k |k\rangle$ and have $(H\psi)_k = E_k \psi_k$. An arbitrary quantity $f \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ would then be represented by a matrix, acting as $(f\psi)_k = \sum_l f_{kl} \psi_l$. In the infinite-dimensional setting, k takes values in the label space Ω . The quantities of primary interest are represented by integral operators defined by a kernel function

$$(f\psi)(k) := \int_{\Omega} d\mu(l) f(k, l) \psi(l);$$

the $f(k, l)$ are the analogues of the matrix entries f_{kl} .

Finding a diagonal representation for a given quantum system (i.e., given a Hilbert space and a Hamiltonian) is in general quite difficult; succeeding is virtually equivalent with “solving” the theory of the system. Indeed, in terms of the diagonal representation, we can obtain a full solution of the Heisenberg dynamics. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} d\mu(l) \dot{f}(k, l, t) \psi(l) &= \frac{i}{\hbar} \left((Hf\psi)(k) - (fH\psi)(k) \right) \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar} \left(E(k) \int_{\Omega} d\mu(l) (f\psi)(l) - \int_{\Omega} d\mu f(k, l, t) E(l) \psi(l) \right) \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{\Omega} d\mu(l) f(k, l, t) \left(E(k) - E(l) \right) \psi(l), \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\dot{f}(k, l, t) = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left(E(k) - E(l) \right) f(k, l, t). \quad (3.4)$$

In (3.4) we recognize a linear differential equation with constant coefficients, whose general solution is

$$f(k, l, t) = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(E(k)-E(l))t} f(k, l, 0).$$

Thus the kernel function of the operator f has oscillatory behavior with frequencies

$$\omega_{kl} = \frac{E(k) - E(l)}{\hbar}. \quad (3.5)$$

This relation, the modern form of the **Rydberg–Ritz combination principle** found in 1908 by Walter Ritz [211], may be expressed in the form

$$\Delta E = \hbar\omega, \quad (3.6)$$

The formula (3.6) appears first in Planck’s famous paper [197] from 1900 where he explained the radiation spectrum of a black body. Planck wrote it in the form $\Delta E = h\nu$, where $h = 2\pi\hbar$ and $\nu = \omega/2\pi$ is the linear frequency. The symbol for the quotient $\hbar = h/2\pi$, which translates this into our formula was invented much later, in 1930, by Dirac in his famous book on quantum mechanics [64]. The book contains the Dirac equation but also Dirac’s famous mistake (cf. the next section) – he had wrongly interpreted the antiparticle of the electron predicted by his equation (later named the positron) to be the proton.

3.2 Probing the spectrum of a system

All physical systems exhibit small (and sometimes large) oscillations of various frequencies, collectively referred to as the **spectrum** of the system. By observing the size of these oscillations and their dependence on the frequency, valuable information can be obtained about intrinsic properties of the system. Indeed, the resulting science of **spectroscopy** is today one of the indispensable means for obtaining experimental information on the structure of chemical materials and the presence of traces of chemical compounds.

To probe the spectrum of a quantum system, we bring it into contact with a macroscopically observable (hence classical) weakly damped harmonic oscillator. That we treat just a single harmonic oscillator is for convenience only. In practice, one often observes many oscillators simultaneously, e.g., by observing the oscillations of the electromagnetic field in the form of electromagnetic radiation – light, X-rays, or microwaves. However, the oscillators do not interact that strongly in most cases and in the case of electromagnetic radiation not at all. In that case the result of probing a system with multiple oscillators results in a linear superposition of the results of probing with a single oscillator. This is a special case of the general fact that solutions of linear differential equations depend linearly on the right hand side.

From the point of view of the macroscopically observable classical oscillator, the probed quantum system appears simply as a time-dependent external force $F(t)$ that modifies the dynamics of the free harmonic oscillator. Instead of the equation $m\ddot{q} + c\dot{q} + kq = 0$ we get the differential equation describing the **forced harmonic oscillator**, given by

$$m\ddot{q} + c\dot{q} + kq = F(t).$$

The external force F is usually the value

$$F(t) = \langle f(t) \rangle$$

of a quantity f from the algebra of quantities of the probed system, as discussed in more detail in Part II. This follows from the general principles of Section 13.2 for modeling

interactions of a quantum system with a classical, macroscopic system (only the latter are directly measurable). How classical measurements are to be interpreted in a pure quantum context will be discussed in Section 7.4.

If the measurement is done far from the probed system, such as a measurement of light (electromagnetic radiation) emitted by a far away source (e.g., a star, but also a Bunsen flame observed by the eye), the back reaction of the classical oscillator on the probed system can be neglected. Then the probed system can be considered as a Hamiltonian system and evolves according to the Heisenberg equation (1.12). In particular, the analysis of Section 3.1 applies, and since expectations are linear, the external force F evolves as a superposition of exponentials $e^{i\omega t}$, where the ω are differences of eigenvalues of H . In the quantum case the spectrum may have a discrete part, leading to a sum of different exponentials $e^{i\omega t}$ that, as we shall see, leads to conspicuous spikes in the Fourier transform of the response and a continuous part that leads to an integral over such terms which typically provide a smooth background response. In the following, we shall assume for simplicity a purely discrete spectrum, and hence an expansion of F of the form

$$F(t) = \sum_l F_l e^{i\omega_l t},$$

with distinct, real and nonzero frequencies. However, the analysis holds with obvious changes also for a (partly or fully) continuous spectrum if the sums are replaced by appropriate integrals.

The solution to the differential equation consists of a particular solution and a solution to the homogeneous equation. Due to damping, the latter is transient and decays to zero. To get a particular solution, we note that common experience shows that forced oscillations typically have the same frequency as the force. We therefore make the ansatz

$$q(t) = \sum_l q_l e^{i\omega_l t}.$$

Inserting both sums into the differential equation, we obtain the relation

$$\sum_l \left(-m\omega_l^2 + ic\omega_l + k \right) q_l e^{i\omega_l t} = \sum_l F_l e^{i\omega_l t},$$

from which we conclude that we have a solution precisely when

$$q_l = \frac{F_l}{k - m\omega_l^2 + ic\omega_l}, \quad \text{for all } l.$$

Note that due to our assumptions, the denominator cannot vanish. The energy in the l th mode is therefore proportional to

$$|q_l|^2 = \frac{|F_l|^2}{(k - m\omega_l^2)^2 + (c\omega_l)^2}. \quad (3.7)$$

Now first imagine that the system under study has only one frequency, that is, $F_l \neq 0$ for only one l . For example, the system under study is also an oscillator that is swinging




Figure 3.1: Lorentz-shape. The absorbed energy of the oscillator with varying frequency ω .

with a certain frequency. In this case the oscillator with which we probe the system will also swing with that same frequency as the probed system, but with an amplitude given by (3.7). We see that for $\omega = \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}}$ close to ω_l the oscillator responds most to the force it feels from the probed system. The frequency $\omega = \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}}$ is called the **resonance frequency** of the oscillator. The above we know from phenomena of daily (or not so daily) life, as pushing a swing (or riding a car with a defect shock absorber); if you push with the ‘right’ frequency the result will be that the swing goes higher and higher, pushing with another frequency results in a seemingly chaotic incoherent swinging.

Returning to the case that there are more F_l nonzero, we see that the oscillator will swing with the same frequencies as the probed system. But the intensity with which the oscillator swings depends on the positions of the ω_l relative to the resonance frequencies. Suppose that c is relatively small, so that we can ignore the term $c\omega$ in the denominator of (3.7). Then the q_l for which ω_l is close to ω show a higher intensity.

Looking for resonances with an oscillator that has an adjustable frequency ω therefore gives a way to experimentally find the frequencies in the force incident to the oscillator. If the frequency ω passes over one of the frequencies of the probed system, the oscillator will swing more intensively.

The resonances occur around a natural frequency but also the width of the interval in which the system shows a resonance has information. If the interval is small, one speaks of a **sharp resonance** and this corresponds to a discrete or nearly discrete spectrum of the frequencies. If the resonance is not sharp, the response corresponds to a continuous spectrum. The graph that shows the absorbed energy (which is proportional to $|q_l|^2$) as a function of the frequency ($\sim \omega_l$) for a system with one resonance frequency typically has a **Lorentz shape**, according to the formula (3.7): There is a peak around $\omega_0 = \sqrt{k/m}$ with a certain width, and on both sides of the peak the function tends to zero at plus and minus infinity. In Figure 3.1 we displayed a graph of a Lorentz shape for a harmonic oscillator with varying frequency ω in contact with a probed system that has one F_l nonzero for the

frequency ω_0 .

For general systems with more resonance frequencies, the graph is a superposition of such curves and the peaks around the resonance frequencies can have different widths and different heights. This graph is recorded by typical spectrometers, and the shapes and positions of characteristic pieces of the graph contain important information about the system. We shall assume that the peaks have already been translated into resonance frequencies (a non-trivial task in case of overlapping resonances), and concentrate on relating these frequencies to the Hamiltonian of the system. This is done in the next section.

3.3 The early history of quantum mechanics

In this section we remark on some important aspects of the history of quantum mechanics. We focus on the physics of the atom, which was one of the main reasons to develop quantum mechanics. In Section 3.5 we discuss the physics of the black body and the history of the formula of Planck, which describes black body radiation. For an interesting historical account we refer to for example VAN DER WAERDEN[249] or ZEIDLER [268].

The importance of the spectrum in quantum physics is not only due to the preceding analysis, which allows a complete solution of the dynamics, but also to the fact that the spectrum can easily be probed experimentally. Indeed, spectral data (from black body radiation and the spectral absorption and emission lines of hydrogen) were historically the trigger for the development of modern quantum theory. Even the name spectrum for the set of eigenvalues was derived from this connection to experiment.

Probing the spectrum through contact with a damped harmonic oscillator has been discussed in Section 3.2. Note that the observed frequencies give the spectrum of the force, not the spectrum of the Hamiltonian. As derived above, the spectrum of the force consists of the spectral differences of the Hamiltonian spectrum. This is in accordance with the fact that (in nonrelativistic mechanics) absolute energy is meaningless and only energy differences are observable.

In case of the harmonic oscillator, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian H is discrete (see Chapter 14 for the details and derivation), consisting of the nonnegative integral multiples $k\omega$ of the base frequency ω . Thus the set of labels for the eigenvectors $|k\rangle$ is discrete, $\Omega = \mathbb{N}_0$. The number of allowed frequencies is thus countable and the external force may be expanded into a sum of the form

$$F(t) = \sum e^{i\omega_{kl}t} F_{kl}.$$

Explicitly, the frequencies are given by $\omega_{kl} = \omega(k - l) \in \mathbb{Z}\omega$. Thus quantum mechanics produces overtones. This is not an authentic quantum mechanical feature; in classical mechanics one finds overtones in a similar setting – for example, in the pitching of a guitar string.

A historically more interesting system is the hydrogen atom, where the energies are given by an equation of the form

$$E_k = E_0 - \frac{C}{k^2},$$

for some constant C . Then the frequencies are given by the **Rydberg formula**

$$\omega_{kl} = R_H \left(\frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{l^2} \right), \quad (3.8)$$

where $R_H \sim 1.1 \cdot 10^7 m^{-1}$ is the Rydberg constant. The Rydberg formula correctly gives the observed spectral lines of the hydrogen atom. The formula was discovered by Rydberg in 1889 (MARTINSON AND CURTIS [167]) after preliminary work of Balmer, who found the formula for the **Balmer series** of spectral lines (given by $k = 2$). Schrödinger derived this formula using the theoretical framework of quantum mechanics.

Let us review the situation of the time where quantum mechanics was conceived. Around 1900 physicists were experimentally exploring the atom, which until then was (since antiquity) only a philosophically disputable part of Nature. The experiments clearly indicated that atoms existed and that matter was built up from atoms. The physicist Boltzmann had argued that atoms existed, but his point of view had not been accepted; only after his death in 1906, the existence of atoms was unarguably proved by experiments by Perrin around 1909. This led to the problem of finding the constituents of the atom and its structure. In 1897 Thompson had discovered the electron as a subatomic particle. Since the atom is electrically neutral, the atom has to contain positively charged particles. Thompson thought of a model in which the atom was a positively charged sphere with the electrons being in this “plum pudding” of positive charge. But then in 1911 Rutherford put Thompson’s model to the test; Marsden and Geiger, who were working under the supervision of Rutherford, shot α -particles at a thin foil of gold and looked at the scattering pattern [103]. The experiment is therefore called the **Geiger–Marsden experiment**. At that time, α -particles were considered a special radiation emitted by some ‘radio-active’ elements; now we know that these are the nuclei of Helium with the electrons being stripped off.

Since the α -particles are positive, they have a particular kind of interaction with the positively charged sphere of Thompson’s model. But since the electrons swim around in the positive charge, the net charge is zero and most interaction is screened off. Therefore it was expected that the α -particles would be only slightly deflected. However, the pattern was not at all like that! It rather looked as if almost all α -particles went straight through and a small percentage was deflected by a concentrated positive charge. Most α -particles that were deflected were scattered backwards, implying that they had an almost head-on collision with a positive charge.

The very small percentage of scattered α -particles indicated that the chance that an α -particle meets a positively charged nucleus on its way is very small, which implies that the nucleus is very small compared to the atom. Therefore Rutherford (who wrote a paper to explain the results of the Geiger–Marsden experiment) concluded that the nucleus of an atom is positively charged and the electrons circle around the nucleus, and furthermore, the size of the nucleus is very small compared to the radii at which the electrons circle around the atom [220]. If one imagines the atomic nucleus to have the size of a pea and one would

place it at the top of the Eiffel tower, the closest electrons would circle around in an orbit that touches the ground; the atom is merely empty.

In 1918 it was again Rutherford who performed an important experiment from which he concluded that the electric charge of the atomic nucleus was carried by little particles, called protons. The hydrogen atom was found to be the simplest atom; it consists of a proton and one electron circling around the proton. Because of this experiment the discovery of the proton is attributed to Rutherford.

Classically, if an electron circles around in an electric field it radiates and thus loses energy. The question thus arises why the hydrogen atom is stable. Again classically, an electron can circle around a positive charge with arbitrary energy. If the electron changes its orbit, this happens gradually, hence the energy changes continuously and the absorption or emission patterns of the hydrogen atom should be continuous. But experiments done by Rydberg in 1888 and Balmer in 1885 showed that hydrogen absorbed or emitted light at well-defined frequencies, visible as lines in the spectrum obtained by refraction. For the atomic model this implies that the electron can only have well-defined energies separated by gaps (forbidden energies). In 1913 Bohr wrote a series of papers [36, 37, 38, 39] in which he postulated a model to account for this. Bohr postulated that angular momentum is quantized (if p is the momentum of the electron and r the radius, then the angular momentum is $L = r \times p$, where the cross denotes the vector product) and that the electron does not lose energy continuously. With these assumptions he could explain the spectrum observed by Rydberg.

The model of Bohr did not explain the behavior of atoms, it only gave rules the atom had to obey. In 1925 Werner Heisenberg wrote a paper [110] where he tried to give a fundamental basis for the rules of quantum mechanics. Heisenberg described the dynamics of the transitions of an electron in an atom by using the ‘states’ of the electron as labels. For example, he wrote the frequency emitted by an electron jumping from a state n to a state $n - \alpha$ as $\nu(n, n - \alpha)$. Just two months later Max Born and Pascual Jordan wrote a paper [42] about the paper of Heisenberg, in which they made clear that what Heisenberg actually did was promoting observables to matrices. The three of them, Born, Jordan and Heisenberg, wrote in the same year a paper [160] where they elaborated on the formalism they developed. Also in the same year 1925 Paul Dirac wrote a paper in response to the paper of Heisenberg, in which the remarkable relation $q_r p_s - p_s q_r = \delta_{rs} i\hbar$ appeared. Dirac tried to find the relation between a classical theory and the corresponding quantum theory. In fact, Dirac postulated this equation: “we make the fundamental assumption that the difference between the Heisenberg product of two quantum quantities is equal to $i\hbar/2\pi$ times their Poisson bracket expression”.

So, in the beginning years of quantum mechanics, the dynamics of the observables was described by a kind of matrix mechanics. (A modern version of this is the view presented in the present book.) Based on work of de Broglie, Schrödinger came up with a differential equation for the nonrelativistic electron [224]. The probability interpretation for Schrödinger’s wave function was found by Born. In 1927, Pauli reformulated his exclusion principle in terms of spin and antisymmetry. In 1928, Dirac discovered the Dirac equation for the relativistic electron. In 1932, the early years concluded with the discovery of the positron by Anderson and the neutron by Chadwick, which were enough to explain the be-

havior of ordinary matter and radioactivity. But the forces that hold the nucleus together were still unknown, and already in 1934, Yukawa predicted the existence of new particles, the mesons. Since then the particle zoo has increased further and further.

A number of Nobel prizes (most of them in physics, but one in chemistry – early research on atoms was interdisciplinary) for the pioneers accompanied the early development of quantum mechanics¹:

- 1908 Ernest Rutherford, (Nobel prize in chemistry) for his investigations into the disintegration of the elements, and the chemistry of radioactive substances
- 1918 Max Planck, in recognition of the services he rendered to the advancement of physics by his discovery of energy quanta
- 1921 Albert Einstein, for his services to theoretical physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect
- 1922 Niels Bohr, for his services in the investigation of the structure of atoms and of the radiation emanating from them
- 1929 Louis de Broglie, for his discovery of the wave nature of electrons
- 1932 Werner Heisenberg for the creation of quantum mechanics, the application of which has led among others to the discovery of the allotropic forms of hydrogen
- 1933 Erwin Schrödinger and Paul A.M. Dirac, for the discovery of new productive forms of atomic theory
- 1935 James Chadwick, for the discovery of the neutron
- 1936 Carl D. Anderson, for his discovery of the positron

and belatedly, but still for work done before 1935,

- 1945 Wolfgang Pauli, for the discovery of the exclusion principle, also called the Pauli principle
- 1949 Hideki Yukawa, for his prediction of the existence of mesons on the basis of theoretical work on nuclear forces
- 1954 Max Born, for his fundamental research in quantum mechanics, especially for his statistical interpretation of the wave function

¹The remarks to each Nobel laureate are the official wordings in the announcements of the Nobel prizes. For press announcements, Nobel lectures of the laureates, and their biographies, see the web site <http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates>.

The story of the discovery of antimatter is interesting. Though Dirac called it a prediction in his Nobel lecture, “*There is one other feature of these equations which I should now like to discuss, a feature which led to the prediction of the positron*”, it was only a postdiction. Yes, he had a theory in which there were antiparticles. But before the positron was discovered, Dirac thought the antiparticles had to be protons (though there was a problem with the mass) since new particles were inconceivable at that time. Official history seems to have followed Dirac’s lead in his Nobel lecture, and tells the story as it should have happened from the point of the theorist, namely that he (i.e., theory) actually predicted the positron. The truth is a little different.

Anderson discovered and named the positron in 1932. He wrote the announcement of his discovery in *Science* [8], “with due reserve in interpretation”. The proper publication [10], where he also predicted “negative protons” (now called antiprotons), was still without any awareness of Dirac’s theory. It is in the subsequent paper [9] that Anderson relates the positron to Dirac’s theory.

Heisenberg, Dirac, and Anderson were all 31 years old when they got the Nobel prize. The fact that Anderson’s paper [10] is very rarely cited ² should cast some doubt on the relevance of citation counts for actual impact in science.

3.4 The spectrum of many-particle systems

To give a better intuition for what kind of spectra quantum systems can be expected to have, we discuss here the spectrum of many-particle systems from an informal point of view.

There are **bound states**, where all particles of the system stay together, and there are **scattering states**, where the system is broken up into several fragments moving independently but possibly influencing each other. The nomenclature comes from the scattering experiments in physics; shooting particles at each other can result in the formation of a system where the particles are bound together or where the particles scatter off from each other. In the case of a scattering process, different **arrangements**, (i.e., partitions of the set of individual particles into fragments which form a subsystem moving together) describe the combination of particles before a collision and their recombination in the debris after a collision.

The discrete spectrum of a Hamiltonian H corresponds to the bound states; each discrete eigenvalue to a different mode of the bound system. The study of the discrete spectrum of compound systems is the domain of **spectroscopy**. We shall return to this topic in Chapter 17, when the machinery to understand a spectrum is fully developed.

The continuous part of the spectrum corresponds to the scattering states. In general, the spectrum is discrete till a certain energy level, called the **dissociation threshold**, and

²<http://www.prola.aps.org/> lists only 37 citations, and only 5 before 1954. The paper [9] is cited 35 times.

after the dissociation threshold the spectrum is continuous. For the hydrogen atom, the dissociation threshold is 13.6eV . For the harmonic oscillator, the dissociation threshold is infinite. In such a case, where the dissociation threshold is infinite, there is no continuous spectrum and the system is always bound; we call this **confinement**. For example, three quarks always form a bound state, that is, they are confined. A single quark can not get loose from its partners. It may also be the case that there is no bound state; for example, the atoms in inert gases don't form bound states, hence a system consisting of more than one of such atoms has only a continuous spectrum.

In scattering experiments the ingoing particles and the outgoing particles can be different. Hence one needs to keep track of what precisely went where. After the scattering the particles separate from each other in different clusters. The constituents in cluster i form a bound state, which can be in an excited state, which we denote E_i . If the cluster i is moving with a momentum, the total kinetic energy of cluster i is $p_i^2/2m_i$, where m_i is the mass of cluster i . If there are N clusters after a collision (scattering), the resulting total energy is

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + E_i \right).$$

In scattering experiments a possible outcome of clusters and their constituents is called a **channel**. It is very common in particle physics that a single reaction – like shooting two protons at each other – has more than one channel. We see that in each channel, there is a continuous spectrum above a certain energy level Δ , which is the sum of the ground state energies of the different clusters. To theoretically disentangle the spectrum, one uses an analytic continuation of the scattering amplitudes. We thus view the spectrum as a subset of the complex plane. When multiplying the momenta with a complex phase that has a nonzero imaginary part, the continuous part of the spectrum becomes imaginary and is tilted away from the real axis. The bound states still appear on the real line as isolated points, that is, discrete. But now at each bound state with energy above Δ there is a line connected representing the continuously varying momentum of the corresponding cluster. The technique of disentangling the spectrum using analytic continuation is called **complex scaling**. For more background and rigorous mathematical arguments, see, e.g., SIMON [227], MOISEYEV [171], or BOHM [35].

Dissipation. If we admit dissipation, the Hamiltonian is no longer Hermitian, since there is typically an antihermitian contribution to the potential, generally called an **optical potential** since it was first used in optics. Also, the dynamics need no longer be governed by the Heisenberg equation, but can be both in the classical and in the quantum case of the more general form

$$\dot{f} = H \triangleright f + \sum_{j,k} L_j^* \triangleright G_{jk}(L_k \triangleright f) \quad (3.9)$$

with **Lindblad operators** L_j encoding interactions with the unmodelled environment into which the lost energy dissipates, and complex coefficients G_{jk} forming a symmetric, positive definite matrix. Remembering that \triangleright acts as a derivation, the additional terms can be viewed as generalized diffusion terms; indeed, the dynamics (3.9) describes classically for example reaction-diffusion equations, and its quantum version is the quantum equivalent of stochastic differential equations, which model systems like Brownian motion and give

microscopic models of diffusion processes. For details, see, e.g., GARDINER [88], BREUER & PETRUCCIONE [45].

Assuming that the terms in the sum of (3.9) are negligible, the dynamics satisfies the Heisenberg equation, and the above analysis applies with small changes. However, since H is no longer Hermitian, the energy levels typically acquire a possibly nonzero (and then positive) imaginary part. Isolated eigenvalues with positive imaginary parts are called **resonances**. The oscillation frequencies are still of the form $\hbar\omega = \Delta E$, but since the energies have a positive imaginary part, the oscillations will be damped, as can be seen by looking at the form of $e^{i\omega t}$. That this does not lead to a decay of the response of the oscillator is due to stochastic contributions modelled by the Lindblad terms and neglected in our simplified analysis.

Resonances with tiny imaginary parts behave almost like bound states, and represent **unstable particles**, which decay in a stochastic manner; the value $\Gamma = 2 \operatorname{Im}\omega$ gives their **lifetime**, defined as the time where (in a large sample of unstable particles) the number of undecayed particles left is reduced by a factor of e , the basis of the exponential function.

Thus the spectrum of a Hamiltonian contains valuable experimentally observable information about a quantum system.

3.5 Black body radiation

In the remainder of this chapter, we discuss the spectrum of a black body and some of its consequences.

In the history the ‘black body’ plays an important role. Applying some basic concepts of quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics one arrives at the distribution formula first derived by Max Planck in December 1900 [196]. According to Van der Waerden in his (partially autobiographical) book [249] the presentation of Planck in December 1900 was the birth of quantum mechanics.

What is a black body? A body that looks black does not reflect any light, it absorbs all incoming light. Hence if some radiation comes from a perfectly black body, it needs to be due to the interaction of the internal degrees of freedom with light. It is hard to experimentally construct a black body. The theoretical idea is to have a hollow box with a single little hole, through which the box can emit radiation outwards. Since the hole is assumed to be very small, no light will fall inwards and then be reflected through the hole again. Thus no light will be reflected (or at least almost no light). In practice many objects behave like black bodies above a certain temperature. The sun does not reflect a substantial amount of light (where should it come from?) compared to the amount it radiates. Therefore one of the best black bodies is the sun.

Given a black body, there is a positive integrable function $f(\omega)$ of the frequency ω , such

that the amount of energy radiated in the frequency interval $[\omega_1, \omega_2]$ is

$$E([\omega_1, \omega_2]) = \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} d\omega f(\omega).$$

The function $f(\omega)$ is the radiation-energy density. The main object of this section is the function $f(\omega)$. The importance of the black body lies in the fact that the radiation emitted is only due to its internal energy and its interaction with light. In practice a system has always interaction with the environment and light falling onto it (since we want to ‘see’ where the black body is, the latter is often inevitable). What would we expect from the radiation-energy density? First, since $\omega = 0$ means that the energy of the photons emitted is $\hbar\omega = 0$ and $\omega < 0$ is not a possibility, we have $f(0) = 0$. Second, the function f has to be integrable, hence $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} f(\omega) = 0$. The total integral $\int_0^{\infty} d\omega f(\omega)$ represents the total energy of the body. Therefore we certainly want f to be integrable, i.e., $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$.

We know from experience that black bodies (like dark metals) do not radiate any thermal energy when they are at room temperature, but heating them up makes them glow red. When we rise the temperature, the color shifts more and more in the blue direction. This phenomenon can also be seen in flames; the outer, cooler side is red while more inwards, the flame gets lighter, reaches white and goes over to blue, and then becomes invisible. Empirically one concludes that the function $f(\omega)$ has a maximum at a frequency ω_{max} , where ω_{max} is temperature dependent; the larger the temperature T , the larger ω_{max} . Before 1900 it was already found that the fraction ω_{max}/T was almost independent of the body that was heated up. In 1893 the physicist Wilhelm Wien³ used the statistical mechanics developed by Maxwell and Boltzmann to the laws of thermodynamics to derive **Wien’s displacement law** [261]

$$\frac{\omega_{max}}{T} = \frac{2\pi c}{b},$$

where c is the speed of light and b is a constant whose numerical value is approximately $2.9 \cdot 10^{-3} m \cdot K$. In 1896 Wien derived a formula, called **Wien’s approximation** for the radiation density

$$f(\omega) = a\omega^3 e^{-b\frac{\omega}{T}}, \quad (3.10)$$

for some parameters $a, b > 0$. It is clear that the proposed f is integrable and satisfies $f(0) = 0$. For large ω the radiation-energy density matches the observed densities, however, for small ω the radiation density of Wien does not match the experiments.

On the other hand, there were other radiation laws. First, there was **Stefan’s law** (or Stefan–Boltzmann law) derived on basis of empirical results in 1879 [233]. The statement of Stefan’s law is that the total energy radiated per second of a hot radiating body is proportional to the fourth power of the temperature:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \sigma AT^4,$$

where A is the area of the body and σ is a constant. In 1884 Boltzmann gave a theoretical derivation of Stefan’s law using the theoretical tools of statistical mechanics [40]. The

³His real name is rather long: Wilhelm Carl Werner Otto Fritz Franz Wien.

second radiation law known in 1900 was **Rayleigh's law**. Lord Rayleigh used classical mechanics to derive a better description of the radiation density for low values of ω [204]. He proposed

$$f(\omega) = \gamma\omega^2,$$

which is clearly wrong for large ω and is not even integrable. Later in 1905, Lord Rayleigh improved the derivation of his proposal in a collaboration with Sir James Jeans, again based on purely classical arguments. Although their discovery was interesting, it did not match the experiments for high ω . In December 1900, Max Planck had given a seminar and gave a derivation of $f(\omega)$ that resulted in a radiation-energy density that matched the experiments both for low and for high ω . Even more was true, the formula of Planck reproduced Wien's displacement law, Wien's approximation, Rayleigh's proposal and Stefan's law. The formula Planck derived was giving the energy density of a black body in thermal equilibrium, from which one obtains the radiation-energy density

$$f(\omega) = \frac{\hbar V}{\pi^2 c^3} \frac{\omega^3}{e^{\hbar\omega\beta} - 1},$$

where V is the volume of the black body (the cavity actually) and $\beta = 1/kT$, k is Boltzmann's constant. Indeed for low ω we get an expression that is quadratic in ω , for high ω we get Wien's law and integrating the expression over ω one sees that the integral is proportional to T^4 . The accordance with Wien's displacement law will be shown later – we will also remark on the agreement of Planck's law later.

So what precisely did Planck do that the others did wrong? The key ingredient in Planck's derivation is to consider the constituents of the black body as follows: the black body is just a cavity where the inner walls can have an interaction with light. The walls of the cavity are made of molecules that behave like compounds of harmonic oscillators. Planck assumed that the energies of the molecules take values in some discrete set: the states of the molecules do not vary continuously but are discrete. Hence we can put the states in bijection with the natural numbers. Furthermore he assumed that the light inside the cavity induces transitions in the molecules by absorbing or emitting radiation. A transition from a state labelled with n and with energy E_n and a state labelled with m and with energy E_m is only possible if the energy differences and the frequencies are related by $|E_n - E_m| = \hbar\omega$. Thus by discretizing the states of the interior of the black body the interaction with light varies over a discrete set of frequencies. Planck at the moment saw the discretization as a purely theoretical and mathematical tool that would bear no relation with reality. It just reproduced the correct results, which was most important: it gave a formula that fitted all experiments. Very puzzling at the time was the necessary assumption that the energy was quantized – an assumption that marked the start of the quantum era. It took some time until the derivation of Planck's law was given a clear meaning.

3.6 Derivation of Planck's law

In 1905 Einstein gave a comprehensible derivation, which we shall present below. In modern textbooks one can find a one-page-derivation and we will present such a proof below as well.

For both derivations we need a basic fact from statistical mechanics, called the Boltzmann distribution.

Suppose that we have a physical system consisting of many identical molecules (or atoms, or any other smaller subsystems). Each molecule can attain different states that are labelled with integers $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. In a modern treatment, these states are identified with the eigenstates of the quantum Hamiltonian, and we shall use this terminology, though it was not available when Einstein wrote his paper. We thus assume that the spectrum of the molecules is discrete and there is a bijection between the eigenstates of the molecule and the natural numbers. Each eigenstate n of the molecule corresponds to an eigenvalue E_n of the Hamiltonian, giving the energy the molecule has in eigenstate n . The Boltzmann distribution gives the relative frequency of eigenstates of the molecules. Writing $N(n)$ for the number of molecules in state n , the **Boltzmann distribution** dictates that

$$\frac{N(n)}{N(m)} = e^{-\frac{(E_n - E_m)}{kT}}. \quad (3.11)$$

when the system is in thermal equilibrium with itself and with the surrounding system. Thus, the temperature T has to be constant. Such a 'mixed' state, where the volume, the temperature, and the number of particles are kept constant and in thermal equilibrium with its environment is called a **canonical ensemble**. A derivation of the Boltzmann distribution can be found in many elementary textbooks on statistical physics, e.g., REICHL [205], MANDL [162], HUANG [116], or KITTEL [136].

The probability p_n of measuring an arbitrary molecule to be in state n is

$$p_n = \frac{e^{-\frac{E_n}{kT}}}{Z},$$

where Z is the **partition function**

$$Z = \sum_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{kT}}.$$

One can thus rewrite

$$p_n = e^{-\frac{(E_n - F)}{kT}},$$

where we defined the **Helmholtz free energy** F as

$$F = -kT \ln Z.$$

One often regroups the states into states that have equal energy. Then to each natural number corresponds an energy E_n , and a natural number g_n counting the number of states with energy E_n . The number g_n is called the **degeneracy** of the energy E_n . Thus we have

$$Z = \sum_n g_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{kT}},$$

and the probability p_n of measuring a molecule with energy E_n is

$$p_n = g_n e^{-\frac{(E_n - F)}{kT}}.$$

The constant $\beta = 1/kT$ is called the **inverse temperature** and plays a fundamental role; in statistical physics, it is customary to express all quantities in terms of β . The average of the energy, denoted \bar{E} , is found by

$$\bar{E} = \sum_{E_n} E_n p_n = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \ln Z(\beta).$$

Einstein's derivation. We now focus on two energies in the molecule, n and m with $E_m > E_n$ and degeneracies g_n and g_m , and assume the molecules have interaction with light. There are three types of processes that might happen: (i) A molecule in state m might decay to state n while omitting light with the frequency

$$\hbar\omega = E_m - E_n; \quad (3.12)$$

this process is called **spontaneous decay**. (ii) A molecule might jump from n to m by absorbing light with the right frequency (3.12). (iii) A molecule decays from m to n by being kicked by light having the right frequency (3.12); this process is called **induced emission**. Thus, there is one transition which happens even without the presence of light; with spontaneous emission the molecule jumps from m to n and emits light. The other two transitions take place under influence of light; they are therefore dependent of how much light is present and thus depends on the radiation-energy density $f(\omega)$.

The probabilities of transitions are given as transition rates dW/dt ; dW is the infinitesimal difference in molecules in a certain state and dt is an infinitesimal time interval. Now spontaneous emission is independent of the presence of light and only depends on the characteristics of the molecule and the number of molecules in state m . Therefore,

$$dW_1 = N(m)A_{mn}dt,$$

where dW_1 is the number of molecules undergoing spontaneous emission from m to n during a time interval dt , and where A_{mn} is some number depending on the states n and m (not on temperature in particular). We denote dW_2 the amount of molecules absorbing light and jumping from n to m during a time interval dt and dW_3 the number of molecules jumping from m to n under influence of light (getting the right kick). The probabilities are determined by some constants B_{mn} and C_{mn} , which are characteristic for the states m and n and the amount of light that has the right frequency. Thus dW_2 and dW_3 are proportional to $f(\omega)$;

$$dW_2 = N(n)B_{mn}f dt, \quad dW_3 = N(m)C_{mn}f dt.$$

Now we consider we have an enclosed system of molecules that are in equilibrium with the light in the system. Being in equilibrium means

$$dW_1 + dW_3 = dW_2.$$

Using the Boltzmann distribution we get

$$g_m e^{-\frac{E_m}{kT}} (A_{mn} + f C_{mn}) = g_n e^{-\frac{E_n}{kT}} f B_{mn}. \quad (3.13)$$

Now comes a basic assumption that Einstein does; if T becomes larger the system gets very hot and transitions will be more and more frequent. Therefore one assumes that as $T \rightarrow \infty$ that also $f \rightarrow \infty$. In this case the exponentials in (3.13) become 1 and the term with A can be neglected and we obtain

$$g_m C_{mn} = g_n B_{mn}. \quad (3.14)$$

From another point of view the assumption Einstein makes is natural. The relation $g_m C_{mn} = g_n B_{mn}$ is representing that the processes $m \rightarrow n$ under induced emission, or $n \rightarrow m$ under absorption are symmetric; the numbers C_{mn} and B_{mn} only differ by the ratio of number of states with energy E_n to the number of states with energy E_m . Indeed, taking $g_m = g_n = 1$, the process of induced emission is the time-reversed process of absorption. Since the equations in nature show a **time-reversal symmetry** (in this case) we find in this case $C_{mn} = B_{mn}$. If now g_n and g_m are not equal one has to correct for this and multiply the probabilities with the corresponding multiplicities to get (3.14). With the assumption (3.14) we find

$$f = \frac{A_{mn}/C_{mn}}{e^{(E_m - E_n)/kT} - 1}.$$

Inserting now $E_m - E_n = \hbar\omega$ and requiring that Wien's law (3.10) holds in the limit where ω is large we obtain

$$f(\omega) = \frac{a\omega^3}{e^{\hbar\omega/kT} - 1}.$$

In particular we find that $A_{mn}/C_{mn} = a\omega^3$, which relates the constants A_{mn} and C_{mn} to the energy difference $E_m - E_n$. The constant a does not depend on the frequency and the temperature.

Modern derivation. We now discuss a relatively fast derivation that in addition gives a value for the constant a in Wien's law (3.10). We consider a box with the shape of a cube with sides L . Later we then require that the precise shape of the box is not relevant in the limit where the typical sizes are much larger than the wavelength. Then the only relevant parameter is the volume $V = L^3$. We assume the walls of the box can absorb and emit light; we furthermore assume that the walls are made of a conducting material. Away from the walls light satisfies Maxwell equations, but at the walls the perpendicular components of the electric field have to vanish; if the electric field would not vanish, the electrons in the material of the wall would be accelerated, but then the system is not in equilibrium. A plane wave solution to the Maxwell equations is of the form

$$e^{i\omega t - ik_x x - ik_y y - ik_z z}, \quad \omega^2 = c^2(k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2).$$

We can always choose a coordinate system that is aligned with the box. Then the boundary conditions imply $e^{ik_x L} = 0$ and thus $k_x = \frac{\pi n_x}{L}$ for some integer n_x . The wave functions with negative n_x are identical to the corresponding wave functions with positive n_x ; they just differ by a phase. Therefore we may assume $n_x \geq 0$. For the other coordinate directions the discussion is similar.

Thus we find that for each triple of integer numbers $\mathbf{n} = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$ we have a harmonic oscillator with frequency

$$\omega_n = \frac{c\pi}{L} n, \quad n = \sqrt{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}}.$$

We now use the fact (proved below in Section 14.3) that for each harmonic oscillator the energies are $E_n(r) = \hbar\omega_n(r + \frac{1}{2})$. Since energy is defined only up to a constant shift, we subtract the zero-point energy $E_0 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_n$ and take $E_n(r) = \omega_n r$. The partition function is then

$$Z(\mathbf{n}, \beta) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} e^{r\hbar\omega_n\beta} = \frac{1}{e^{\hbar\omega_n\beta} - 1}.$$

Therefore the average energy in the mode corresponding to \mathbf{n} is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{E}_n &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \ln(1 - e^{\hbar\omega_n\beta}) \\ &= \frac{\hbar\omega_n}{e^{\hbar\omega_n\beta} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

We now have to sum up all the energies for all modes. Since we are interested in the behavior of $f(\omega)$ in the regime where the number L is much larger than the wavelength we replace the sum over \vec{n} by an integral. We have to integrate over the positive octant where $n_x \geq 0$, $n_y \geq 0$ and $n_z \geq 0$. Since all expressions are rotationally symmetric in \mathbf{n} , we can also integrate over all of \mathbb{R}^3 and divide by 8. We have not yet taken into account that light has two polarizations. Therefore, for each \mathbf{n} there are two harmonic oscillators. The total energy enclosed in the box is thus

$$E = \frac{2}{8} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} dn_x dn_y dn_z \bar{E}_n = \pi \int_0^{\infty} n^2 dn \frac{\hbar\omega_n}{e^{\hbar\omega_n\beta} - 1}.$$

Here we transformed to polar coordinates and wrote $\omega_n = \frac{c\pi}{L} \sqrt{n_x^2 + n_y^2 + n_z^2}$.

We now exchange the integral over n to an integral over ω . We have

$$\omega = \frac{c\pi n}{L} \Rightarrow n^2 dn = \left(\frac{L}{\pi c}\right)^3 \omega^2 d\omega,$$

from which we find

$$E = \frac{L^3 \hbar}{\pi^2 c^3} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\omega^3}{e^{\hbar\omega\beta} - 1} d\omega.$$

With $L^3 = V$ being the volume we thus find

$$f(\omega) = \frac{V \hbar}{\pi^2 c^3} \frac{\omega^3}{e^{\hbar\omega\beta} - 1}. \quad (3.15)$$

Of course, this f only represents the radiation-energy density inside the black body. However, up to some overall constants the above f is the radiation-energy density of a black body since the emitted radiation is proportional to the energy density.

In the following section we shall derive Stefan's law.

3.7 Stefan's law and Wien's displacement law

From the calculated density (3.15) we can draw some conclusions, which we now shortly treat.

To calculate the total radiation that is emitted, we first calculate the total energy by integrating (3.15) over all ω . We get for the total energy of the light inside the black body

$$E = \frac{Vk^4T^4}{\pi^2c^3\hbar^3} \int_0^\infty \frac{x^3 dx}{e^x - 1}.$$

But we have

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{x^3 dx}{e^x - 1} = \frac{\pi^4}{15},$$

and thus the energy density $u(T)$ is given by

$$u(T) = \frac{E}{V} = \frac{\pi^2 k^4 T^4}{15 \hbar^3 c^3}.$$

We see that the energy density is expressible by fundamental constants and the fourth power of the temperature. Since the energy density determines the total radiation emitted per time interval we see that the total energy a black body radiates per time interval is proportional to T^4 . This already explains Stefan's law, but in order to derive Stefan's law we have to be a bit more careful.

In order to see how much a black body will radiate, we pinch a small hole in the black body. Let us say that the area of the hole is dA . Now the question is how many photons will hit the hole from inside out? We fix a time t and a small time interval dt . Only the photons that are within a distance between ct and $ct + cdt$ away from the hole are eligible to pass through the hole in a time interval dt after time t . We thus consider a thin shell of a half sphere inside the black body a distance ct away from the hole and of thickness cdt . Light however spreads in all directions and so not all the photons inside the shell are going in the direction of the hole. Our task is to find the ratio of the total that does go through the hole. This is a purely geometric question.

We introduce spherical coordinates around the hole; an angle φ ranging from 0 to 2π that goes around the hole, and a polar angle θ ranging from 0 to $\pi/2$ (values below zero correspond to points outside the black body). We cut the half sphere of radius ct in little stripes by cutting for fixed θ along the angle φ ; each stripe is a thin band of thickness $ctd\theta$ and of length $2\pi \sin \theta$. Consider a little 'cube' of size $dV = (ct)^2 \sin \theta d\theta d\varphi cdt$ in the shell. The fraction of radiation going in the right direction is given by the solid angle $d\Omega$ that dA describes seen from the little cube. But $d\Omega$ is given by the projection of the surface dA onto the surface of the sphere of radius ct around the little cube:

$$d\Omega = \frac{dA \cos \theta}{4\pi c^2 t^2}.$$

The cube of volume emits all the radiation present in the cube (since the light waves just pass through), and that amounts to an energy $dE = u(T)dV$. From the little cube under consideration the amount of radiation going in the right direction is thus

$$ud\Omega dV = u(T) \frac{cdA \cos \theta \sin \theta}{4\pi} d\theta d\varphi dt.$$

Note that the amount of radiation is independent of the radius of the half sphere. Since the question is of a purely geometric nature, that is to be expected. We now get the total

amount of radiation from summing up all the $d\Omega$ contributions: Denoting by dU the energy that leaves the hole during the time interval dt , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dU}{dt} &= \int_0^{\pi/2} d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi u(T) \frac{cdA \cos\theta \sin\theta}{4\pi} \\ &= \frac{c}{4} u(T) dA.\end{aligned}$$

For a black body that radiates over all its surface, and not only through one little hole, we sum up the contributions over all little surfaces dA . In order that the above analysis still holds the shape of the black body needs to be such that radiation that exits the black body does not enter again. If the black body is convex this requirement is met, e.g., we could take a sphere. We then find Stefan's law in the form given by

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = \frac{\pi^2 k^4 T^4 A}{60 \hbar^3 c^2} = \sigma AT^4,$$

with **Stefan's constant**

$$\sigma = \frac{\pi^2 k^4}{60 \hbar^3 c^2} \sim 5.7 \cdot 10^{-8} J.s^{-1}.m^{-2}K^{-4}.$$

We now turn to Wien's displacement law. We write the radiation-energy density as

$$f(\omega) = A \frac{\omega^3}{e^{\hbar\omega\beta} - 1}.$$

Differentiation with respect to ω and putting the result to zero to obtain the position of the maximum gives the equations

$$3 - x = 3e^{-x}, \quad x = \hbar\omega_{max}\beta.$$

We discard the trivial solution $x = 0$ since this corresponds to the behavior at $\omega = 0$. One finds the other solution by solving the equation $3 - x = 3e^{-x}$ with numerical methods and finds $x \sim 2.82$. Hence we have

$$\omega_{max} \sim \frac{2.82 T}{\hbar k}.$$

Part II

Statistical mechanics

Chapter 4

Phenomenological thermodynamics

Part II discusses statistical mechanics from an algebraic perspective, concentrating on thermal equilibrium but discussing basic things in a more general framework. A treatment of equilibrium statistical mechanics and the kinematic part of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics is given which derives from a single basic assumption (Definition 6.1.1) the full structure of phenomenological thermodynamics and of statistical mechanics, except for the third law which requires an additional quantization assumption.

This chapter gives a concise description of standard phenomenological equilibrium thermodynamics for single-phase systems in the absence of chemical reactions and electromagnetic fields. From the formulas provided, it is an easy step to go to various examples and applications discussed in standard textbooks such as CALLEN [49] or REICHL [205]. A full discussion of global equilibrium would also involve the equilibrium treatment of multiple phases and chemical reactions. Since their discussion offers no new aspects compared with traditional textbook treatments, they are not treated here.

Our phenomenological approach is similar to that of CALLEN [49], who introduces the basic concepts by means of a few postulates from which everything else follows. The present setting is a modified version designed to match the more fundamental approach based on statistical mechanics. By specifying the kinematical properties of states outside equilibrium, his informal thermodynamic stability arguments (which depends on a dynamical assumption close to equilibrium) can be replaced by rigorous mathematical arguments.

4.1 Standard thermodynamical systems

We discuss here the special but very important case of thermodynamic systems describing the single-phase global equilibrium of matter composed of one or several kinds of substances in the absence of chemical reactions and electromagnetic fields. We call such systems **standard thermodynamic systems**; they are ubiquitous in applications. In particular,

a standard system is considered to be uncharged, homogeneous, and isotropic, so that each finite region looks like any other and is very large in microscopic units.

The substances of fixed chemical composition are labeled by an index $j \in J$. A standard thermodynamic system is completely characterized by¹ the **mole number** N_j of each substance j , the corresponding **chemical potential** μ_j of substance j , the **volume** V , the **pressure** P , the **temperature** T , the **entropy** S , and the **Hamilton energy** H . These variables, the **extensive** variables N_j, V, S, H and the **intensive** variables μ_j, P, T , are jointly called the **basic thermodynamic variables**. We group the N_j and the μ_j into vectors N and μ indexed by J and write $\mu \cdot N = \sum_{j \in J} \mu_j N_j$. In the special case of a **pure substance**, there is just a single kind of substance; then we drop the indices and have $\mu \cdot N = \mu N$. In this section, all numbers are real.

The mathematics of thermodynamics makes essential use of the concept of convexity. A set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is called **convex** if $tx + (1 - t)y \in X$ for all $x, y \in X$ and all $t \in [0, 1]$. A real-valued function ϕ is called **convex** in the convex set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if ϕ is defined on X and, for all $x, y \in X$,

$$\phi(tx + (1 - t)y) \leq t\phi(x) + (1 - t)\phi(y) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

Clearly, ϕ is convex iff for all $x, y \in X$, the function $\mu : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\mu(t) := \phi(x + t(y - x))$$

is convex. It is well-known that, for twice continuously differentiable ϕ , this is the case iff the second derivative $\mu''(t)$ is nonnegative for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Note that by a theorem of Aleksandrov (see ALEKSANDROV [4], ALBERTI & AMBROSIO [2], ROCKAFELLAR [213]), convex functions are almost everywhere twice continuously differentiable: For almost every $x \in X$, there exist a unique vector $\partial\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the **gradient** of ϕ at x , and a unique symmetric, positive semidefinite matrix $\partial^2\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the **Hessian** of ϕ at x , such that

$$\phi(x + h) = \phi(x) + h^T \partial\phi(x) + \frac{1}{2} h^T \partial^2\phi(x) h + o(\|h\|^2)$$

for sufficiently small $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A function ϕ is called **concave** if $-\phi$ is convex. Thus, for a twice continuously differentiable function ϕ of a single variable τ , ϕ is concave iff $\mu''(\tau) \leq 0$ for $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$.

4.1.1 Proposition. *If ϕ is convex in the convex set X then the function ψ defined by*

$$\psi(s, x) := s\phi(x/s)$$

is convex in the set $\{(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}xX \mid s > 0\}$ and concave in the set $\{(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}xX \mid s < 0\}$.

¹In the terminology, we mainly follow the IUPAC convention (ALBERTY [3, Section 7]), except that we use the letter H to denote the Hamilton energy, as customary in quantum mechanics. In equilibrium, H equals the internal energy U . The Hamilton energy should not be confused with the enthalpy which is usually denoted by H but here is given in equilibrium by $H + PV$. For a history of thermodynamics notation, see BATTINO et al. [26].

Proof. It suffices to show that $\mu(t) := \psi(s + tk, x + th)$ is convex (concave) for all s, x, h, k such that $s + tk > 0$ (resp. < 0). Let $z(t) := (x + th)/(s + tk)$ and $c := sh - kx$. Then

$$z'(t) = \frac{c}{(s + tk)^2}, \quad \mu(t) = (s + tk)\phi(z(t)),$$

hence

$$\mu'(t) = k\phi(z(t)) + \phi'(z(t))\frac{c}{s + tk},$$

$$\mu''(t) = k\phi'(z(t))\frac{c}{(s + tk)^2} + \frac{c^T}{(s + tk)^2}\phi''(z(t))\frac{c}{s + tk} + \phi'(z(t))\frac{-ck}{(s + tk)^2} = \frac{c^T\phi''(z(t))c}{(s + tk)^3},$$

which has the required sign. \square

Equilibrium thermodynamics is about characterizing so-called equilibrium states in terms of intensive and extensive variables and their relations, and comparing them with similar nonequilibrium states. In a nonequilibrium state, only extensive variables have a well-defined meaning; but these are not sufficient to characterize system behavior completely.

All valid statements in the equilibrium thermodynamics of standard systems can be deduced from the following definition.

4.1.2 Definition. (Phenomenological thermodynamics)

(i) Temperature T , pressure P , and volume V are positive, mole numbers N_j are nonnegative. The extensive variables H, S, V, N are additive under the composition of disjoint subsystems.

(ii) There is a convex **system function** Δ of the intensive variables T, P, μ which is monotone increasing in T and monotone decreasing in P , such that the intensive variables are related by the **equation of state**

$$\Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

The set of (T, P, μ) satisfying $T > 0$, $P > 0$ and the equation of state is called the **state space**.

(iii) The Hamilton energy H satisfies the **Euler inequality**

$$H \geq TS - PV + \mu \cdot N \quad (4.2)$$

for all (T, P, μ) in the state space. **Equilibrium states** have well-defined intensive and extensive variables satisfying equality in (4.2). A system is in **equilibrium** if it is completely described by an equilibrium state.

This is the complete list of assumptions defining phenomenological equilibrium thermodynamics; the system function Δ can be determined either by fitting to experimental data, or by calculation from a more fundamental description, cf. Theorem 6.2.1. All other properties follow from the system function. Thus, all equilibrium properties of a material are characterized by the system function Δ .

Surfaces of nondifferentiability of the system function correspond to so-called **phase transitions**. The equation of state shows that, apart from possible phase transitions, the state space has the structure of an $(s - 1)$ -dimensional manifold in \mathbb{R}^s , where s is the number of intensive variables; in case of a standard system, the dimension is therefore one higher than the number of kinds of substances.

Thermodynamic systems with multiple phases are only piecewise homogeneous; each phase separately may be described as a standard thermodynamic system, but discussing the equilibrium at interfaces needs some additional effort, described in all textbooks on thermodynamics. Therefore, we consider only regions of state space where the system function Δ is twice continuously differentiable.

Each equilibrium instance of the material is characterized by a particular state (T, P, N) , from which all equilibrium properties can be computed:

4.1.3 Theorem.

(i) In any equilibrium state, the extensive variables are given by

$$S = \Omega \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial T}(T, P, \mu), \quad V = -\Omega \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial P}(T, P, \mu), \quad N = \Omega \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial \mu}(T, P, \mu), \quad (4.3)$$

and the **Euler equation**

$$H = TS - PV + \mu \cdot N. \quad (4.4)$$

Here Ω is a positive number called the **system size**.

(ii) In equilibrium, we have the **Maxwell reciprocity relations**

$$-\frac{\partial V}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial P}, \quad \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial \mu_j}, \quad \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial P} = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial \mu_j}, \quad \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial \mu_k} = \frac{\partial N_k}{\partial \mu_j} \quad (4.5)$$

and the **stability conditions**

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial P} \leq 0, \quad \frac{\partial N_j}{\partial \mu_j} \geq 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. At fixed S, V, N , inequality (4.2) holds in equilibrium with equality. Therefore the triple (T, P, μ) is a maximizer of $TS - PV + \mu \cdot N$ under the constraints $\Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0$, $T > 0$, $P > 0$. A necessary condition for a maximizer is the stationarity of the Lagrangian

$$L(T, P, \mu) = TS - PV + \mu \cdot N - \Omega \Delta(T, P, \mu)$$

for some Lagrange multiplier Ω . Setting the partial derivatives to zero gives (4.3), and since the maximum is attained in equilibrium, the Euler equation (4.4) follows. The system size Ω is positive since $V > 0$ and Δ is decreasing in P . Since the Hessian matrix of Δ ,

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial T^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial P \partial T} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial \mu \partial T} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial T \partial P} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial P^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial \mu \partial P} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial T \partial \mu} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial P \partial \mu} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial \mu^2} \end{pmatrix} = \Omega^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial S}{\partial P} & \frac{\partial S}{\partial \mu} \\ -\frac{\partial T}{\partial V} & -\frac{\partial P}{\partial V} & -\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial V} \\ \frac{\partial N}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial N}{\partial P} & \frac{\partial N}{\partial \mu} \end{pmatrix},$$

is symmetric, the Maxwell reciprocity relations follow. Since Δ is convex, Σ is positive semidefinite; hence the diagonal elements of Σ are nonnegative, giving the stability conditions. \square

Note that there are further stability conditions since the determinants of all principal submatrices of Σ must be nonnegative. In addition, $N_j \geq 0$ implies that Δ is monotone increasing in each μ_j .

4.1.4 Example. The equilibrium behavior of electrically neutral gases at sufficiently low pressure can be modelled as ideal gases. An **ideal gas** is defined by a system function of the form

$$\Delta(T, P, \mu) = \sum_{j \in J} \pi_j(T) e^{\mu_j/RT} - P, \quad (4.7)$$

where the $\pi_j(T)$ are positive functions of the temperature,

$$R \approx 8.31447 \text{ JK}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \quad (4.8)$$

is the **universal gas constant**², and we use the bracketing convention $\mu_j/RT = \mu_j/(RT)$. Differentiation with respect to P shows that $\Omega = V$ is the system size, and from (4.1), (4.3), and equality in (4.2), we find that, in equilibrium,

$$P = \sum_j \pi_j(T) e^{\mu_j/RT}, \quad S = V \sum_j \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial T} \pi_j(T) - \frac{\mu_j \pi_j(T)}{RT^2} \right) e^{\mu_j/RT},$$

$$N_j = \frac{V \pi_j(T)}{RT} e^{\mu_j/RT}, \quad H = V \sum_j \left(T \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \pi_j(T) - \pi_j(T) \right) e^{\mu_j/RT}.$$

Expressed in terms of T, V, N , we have

$$PV = RT \sum_j N_j, \quad \mu_j = RT \log \frac{RT N_j}{V \pi_j(T)},$$

$$H = \sum_j h_j(T) N_j, \quad h_j(T) = RT \left(T \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \log \pi_j(T) - 1 \right),$$

from which S can be computed by means of the Euler equation (4.4). In particular, for one **mole** of a single substance, defined by $N = 1$, we get the **ideal gas law**

$$PV = RT \quad (4.9)$$

discovered by CLAPEYRON [56]; cf. JENSEN [126].

In general, the difference $h_j(T) - h_j(T')$ can be found experimentally by measuring the energy needed for raising or lowering the temperature of pure substance j from T' to T while keeping the N_j constant. In terms of infinitesimal increments, the **heat capacities**

$$C_j(T) = dh_j(T)/dT,$$

²For the internationally recommended values of this and other constants, their accuracy, determination, and history, see CODATA [59].

we have

$$h_j(T) = h_j(T') + \int_{T'}^T dT C_j(T).$$

From the definition of $h_j(T)$, we find that

$$\pi_j(T) = \pi_j(T') \exp \int_{T'}^T \frac{dT}{T} \left(1 + \frac{h_j(T)}{RT} \right).$$

Thus there are two undetermined integration constants for each kind of substance. These cannot be determined experimentally as long as we are in the range of validity of the ideal gas approximation. Indeed, if we pick arbitrary constants α_j and γ_j and replace $\pi_j(T)$, μ_j , H , and S by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_j(T) &:= e^{\alpha_j - \gamma_j/RT} \pi_j(T), & \mu'_j &= \mu_j + \gamma_j - RT\alpha_j, \\ H' &= H + \sum_j \alpha_j N_j, & S' &= S + R \sum_j \gamma_j N_j, \end{aligned}$$

all relations remain unchanged. Thus, the Hamilton energy and the entropy of an ideal gas are only determined up to an arbitrary linear combination of the mole numbers. This is an instance of the deeper problem to determine under which conditions thermodynamic variables are controllable; cf. the discussion in the context of Example 7.1.1 below.

The gauge freedom (present only in the ideal gas) can be fixed by choosing a particular **standard temperature** T_0 and setting arbitrarily $h_j(T_0) = 0$, $\mu_j(T_0) = 0$. Alternatively, at sufficiently large temperature T , heat capacities are usually nearly constant, and making use of the gauge freedom, we may simply assume that

$$h_j(T) = h_{j0}T, \quad \pi_j(T) = \pi_{j0}T \quad \text{for large } T.$$

Note that this gauge freedom is present only for ideal gases.

4.2 The laws of thermodynamics

The possibility of measuring temperature is sometimes called the **zeroth law of thermodynamics** (FOWLER & GUGGENHEIM [80]). For the history of temperature, see ROLLER [215] and TRUESDELL [243]. The ideal gas law (4.9) is the basis for the construction of a **gas thermometer**: The amount of expansion of volume in a long, thin tube can easily be read off from a scale along the tube. We have $V = aL$, where a is the cross section area and L is the length of the filled part of the tube, hence $T = (aP/R)L$. Thus, at constant pressure, the temperature of the gas is proportional to L .

We say that two thermodynamic systems are brought in good **thermal contact** if the joint system tends after a short time to an equilibrium state. To measure the temperature of a system, one brings it in thermal contact with a thermometer and waits until equilibrium is established. The system and the thermometer will then have the same temperature, which

can be read off from the thermometer. If the system is much larger than the thermometer, this temperature will be essentially the same as the temperature of the system before the measurement. For a survey of the problems involved in defining and measuring temperature outside equilibrium, see CASAS-VÁSQUEZ & JOU [52].

To be able to formulate the first law of thermodynamics we need the concept of a reversible change of states, i.e., changes preserving the equilibrium condition. For use in later sections, we define the concept in a slightly more general form, writing α for P and μ jointly.

4.2.1 Definition. A **state variable** is an almost everywhere continuously differentiable function $\phi(T, \alpha)$ defined on the state space (or a subset of it). Temporal changes in a state variable that occur when the boundary conditions are kept fixed are called **spontaneous changes**. A **reversible transformation** is a continuously differentiable mapping

$$\lambda \rightarrow (T(\lambda), \alpha(\lambda))$$

from a real interval into the state space; thus $\Delta(T(\lambda), \alpha(\lambda)) = 0$. The **differential**

$$d\phi = \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial T}dT + \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\alpha} \cdot d\alpha, \quad (4.10)$$

obtained by multiplying the chain rule by $d\lambda$, describes the change of a state variable ϕ under arbitrary (infinitesimal) reversible transformations. In formal mathematical terms, differentials are exact linear forms on the state space manifold; cf. Chapter 11.

Reversible changes per se have nothing to do with changes in time. However, by sufficiently slow, quasistatic changes of the boundary conditions, reversible changes can often be realized approximately as temporal changes. The degree to which this is possible determines the efficiency of thermodynamic machines. The analysis of the efficiency by means of the so-called **Carnot cycle** was the historical origin of thermodynamics.

The state space is often parameterized by different sets of state variables, as required by the application. If $T = T(\kappa, \lambda)$, $\alpha = \alpha(\kappa, \lambda)$ is such a parameterization then the state variable $g(T, \alpha)$ can be written as a function of (κ, λ) ,

$$g(\kappa, \lambda) = g(T(\kappa, \lambda), \alpha(\kappa, \lambda)). \quad (4.11)$$

This notation, while mathematically ambiguous, is common in the literature; the names of the argument decide which function is intended. When writing partial derivatives without arguments, this leads to serious ambiguities. These can be resolved by writing $\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{\kappa}$ for the partial derivative of (4.11) with respect to λ ; it can be evaluated using (4.10), giving the **chain rule**

$$\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{\kappa} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial T} \left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{\kappa} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \alpha} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda}\right)_{\kappa}. \quad (4.12)$$

Here the partial derivatives in the original parameterization by the intensive variables are written without parentheses.

Differentiating the equation of state (4.1), using the chain rule (4.10), and simplifying using (4.3) gives the **Gibbs-Duhem equation**

$$0 = SdT - VdP + N \cdot d\mu \quad (4.13)$$

for reversible changes. If we differentiate the Euler equation (4.4), we obtain

$$dH = TdS + SdT - PdV - VdP + \mu \cdot dN + N \cdot d\mu,$$

and using (4.13), this simplifies to the **first law of thermodynamics**

$$dH = TdS - PdV + \mu \cdot dN. \quad (4.14)$$

Historically, the first law of thermodynamics took on this form only gradually, through work by MAYER [168], JOULE[128], HELMHOLTZ[112], and CLAUSIUS [57].

Considering global equilibrium from a fundamental point of view, the extensive variables are the variables that are conserved or at least change so slowly that they may be regarded as time independent on the time scale of interest. In the absence of chemical reactions, the mole numbers, the entropy, and the Hamilton energy are conserved; the volume is a system size variable which, in the fundamental view, must be taken as infinite (thermodynamic limit) to exclude the unavoidable interaction with the environment. However, real systems are always in contact with their environment, and the conservation laws are approximate only. In thermodynamics, the description of the system boundary is generally reduced to the degrees of freedom observable at a given resolution.

The result of this reduced description (for derivations, see, e.g., BALIAN [17], GRABERT [97], RAU & MÜLLER [203]) is a dynamical effect called **dissipation** (THOMSON [241]). It is described by the **second law of thermodynamics**, which was discovered by (CLAUSIUS [58]). The Euler inequality (4.2) together with the Euler equation (4.4) only express the nondynamical part of the second law since, in equilibrium thermodynamics, dynamical questions are ignored: Axiom (ii) says that if S, V, N are conserved (thermal, mechanical and chemical isolation) then the **internal energy**,

$$U := TS - PV + \mu \cdot N \quad (4.15)$$

is minimal in equilibrium; if T, V, N are conserved (mechanical and chemical isolation of a system at constant temperature T) then the **Helmholtz (free) energy**,

$$A := U - TS = -PV + \mu \cdot N$$

is minimal in equilibrium; and if T, P, N are conserved (chemical isolation of a system at constant temperature T and pressure P) then the **Gibbs (free) energy**,

$$G := A + PV = \mu \cdot N$$

is minimal in equilibrium.

The **third law of thermodynamics**, due to NERNST [181], says that entropy is nonnegative. In view of (4.3), this is equivalent to the monotonicity of $\Delta(T, P, \mu)$.

4.3 Consequences of the first law

The first law of thermodynamics describes the observable energy balance in a reversible process. The total energy flux dH into the system is composed of the **thermal energy flux** or **heat flux** TdS , the **mechanical energy flux** $-PdV$, and the **chemical energy flux** $\mu \cdot dN$.

The Gibbs-Duhem equation (4.13) describes the energy balance necessary to compensate the changes $d(TS) = TdS + SdT$ of thermal energy, $d(PV) = PdV + VdP$ of mechanical energy, and $d(\mu \cdot N) = \mu \cdot dN + N \cdot d\mu$ of chemical energy in the energy contributions to the Euler equation to ensure that the Euler equation remains valid during a reversible transformation. Indeed, both equations together imply that $d(TdS - PdV + \mu \cdot N - H)$ vanishes, which expresses the preservation of the Euler equation.

Related to the various energy fluxes are the **thermal work**

$$Q = \int T(\lambda)dS(\lambda),$$

the **mechanical work**

$$W_{\text{mech}} = - \int P(\lambda)dV(\lambda),$$

and the **chemical work**

$$W_{\text{chem}} = \int \mu(\lambda) \cdot dN(\lambda)$$

performed in a reversible transformation. The various kinds of work generally depend on the path through the state space; however, the mechanical work depends only on the end points if the associated process is conservative.

As is apparent from the formulas given, thermal work is done by changing the entropy of the system, mechanical work by changing the volume, and chemical work by changing the mole numbers. In particular, in case of thermal, mechanical, or chemical **isolation**, the corresponding fluxes vanish identically. Thus, constant S characterizes thermally isolated, **adiabatic** systems, constant V characterizes mechanically isolated, **closed**³ systems, and constant N characterizes chemically isolated, **impermeable** systems. Note that this constancy only holds when all assumptions for a standard system are valid: global equilibrium, a single phase, and the absence of chemical reactions. Of course, these boundary conditions are somewhat idealized situations, which, however, can be approximately realized in practice and are of immense scientific and technological importance.

The first law shows that, in appropriate units, the temperature T is the amount of energy needed to increase in a mechanically and chemically isolated system the entropy S by one unit. The pressure P is, in appropriate units, the amount of energy needed to decrease in a thermally and chemically isolated system the volume V by one unit. In particular, increasing pressure decreases the volume; this explains the minus sign in the definition of P .

³Note that the terms 'closed system' has also a much more general interpretation – which we do *not* use in this chapter –, namely as a conservative dynamical system.

The chemical potential μ_j is, in appropriate units, the amount of energy needed to increase in a thermally and mechanically isolated system the mole number N_j by one. With the traditional units, temperature, pressure, and chemical potentials are no longer energies.

We see that the entropy and the volume behave just like the mole number. This analogy can be deepened by observing that mole numbers are the natural measure of the amounts of "matter" of each kind in a system, and chemical energy flux is accompanied by adding or removing matter. Similarly, volume is the natural measure of the amount of "space" a system occupies, and mechanical energy flux in a standard system is accompanied by adding or removing space. Thus we may regard entropy as the natural measure of the amount of "heat" contained in a system⁴, since thermal energy flux is accompanied by adding or removing heat. Looking at other extensive quantities, we also recognize energy as the natural measure of the amount of "power", momentum as the natural measure of the amount of "force", and mass as the natural measure of the amount of "inertia" of a system. In each case, the notions in quotation marks are the colloquial terms which are associated in ordinary life with the more precise, formally defined physical quantities. For historical reasons, the words heat, power, and force are used in physics with a meaning different from the colloquial terms "heat", "power", and "force".

4.4 Consequences of the second law

The second law is centered around the impossibility of perpetual motion machines due to the inevitable loss of energy by dissipation such as friction (see, e.g., BOWDEN & LEBEN [44]), uncontrolled radiation, etc.. This means that – unless continually provided from the outside – energy is lost with time until a metastable state is attained, which usually is an equilibrium state. Therefore, the energy at equilibrium is minimal under the circumstances dictated by the boundary conditions. In a purely kinematic setting as in our treatment, the approach to equilibrium cannot be studied, and only the minimal energy principles – one for each set of boundary conditions – remain.

Traditionally, the second law is often expressed in the form of an extremal principle for some thermodynamic potential. We derive here the extremal principles for the Hamilton energy, the Helmholtz energy, and the Gibbs energy⁵, which give rise to the **Hamilton**

⁴Thus, entropy is the modern replacement for the historical concepts of **phlogiston** and **caloric**, which failed to give a correct account of heat phenomena. Phlogiston turned out to be 'missing oxygen', an early analogue of the picture of positrons as holes, or 'missing electrons', in the Dirac sea. Caloric was a massless substance of heat which had almost the right properties, explained many effects correctly, and fell out of favor only after it became known that caloric could be generated in arbitrarily large amounts from mechanical energy, thus discrediting the idea of heat being a substance. (For the precise relation of entropy and caloric, see KUHN [145, 146], WALTER [255], and the references quoted there.) In the modern picture, the extensivity of entropy models the substance-like properties of heat. But as there are no particles of space whose mole number is proportional to the volume, so there are no particles of heat whose mole number is proportional to the entropy. Nevertheless, the introduction of heat particles on a formal level has some uses; see, e.g., STREATER [236].

⁵The different potentials are related by so-called Legendre transforms; cf. ROCKAFELLAR [214] for the mathematical properties of Legendre transforms, ARNOLD [13] for their application in mechanics, and

potential

$$U(S, V, N) := \max_{T, P, \mu} \{TS - PV + \mu \cdot N \mid \Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0; T > 0; P > 0\},$$

the **Helmholtz potential**

$$A(T, V, N) := \max_{P, \mu} \{-PV + \mu \cdot N \mid \Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0; T > 0; P > 0\},$$

and the **Gibbs potential**

$$G(T, P, N) := \max_{\mu} \{\mu \cdot N \mid \Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0; T > 0; P > 0\}.$$

The Gibbs potential is of particular importance for everyday processes since the latter frequently happen at approximately constant temperature, pressure, and mole number. (For other thermodynamic potentials used in practice, see ALBERTY [3]; for the maximum entropy principle, see Section 7.7.)

4.4.1 Theorem. (Extremal principles)

(i) In an arbitrary state,

$$H \geq U(S, V, N), \quad (4.16)$$

with equality iff the state is an equilibrium state. The remaining thermodynamic variables are then given by

$$T = \frac{\partial}{\partial S}U(S, V, N), \quad P = -\frac{\partial}{\partial V}U(S, V, N), \quad \mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial N}U(S, V, N), \quad H = U(S, V, N).$$

In particular, an equilibrium state is uniquely determined by the values of S , V , and N .

(ii) In an arbitrary state,

$$H - TS \geq A(T, V, N), \quad (4.17)$$

with equality iff the state is an equilibrium state. The remaining thermodynamic variables are then given by

$$S = -\frac{\partial A}{\partial T}(T, V, N), \quad P = -\frac{\partial A}{\partial V}(T, V, N), \quad \mu = \frac{\partial A}{\partial N}(T, V, N),$$

$$H = A(T, V, N) + TS.$$

In particular, an equilibrium state is uniquely determined by the values of T , V , and N .

(iii) In an arbitrary state,

$$H - TS + PV \geq G(T, P, N), \quad (4.18)$$

with equality iff the state is an equilibrium state. The remaining thermodynamic variables are then given by

$$S = -\frac{\partial G}{\partial T}(T, P, N), \quad V = \frac{\partial G}{\partial P}(T, P, N), \quad \mu = \frac{\partial G}{\partial N}(T, P, N),$$

$$H = G(T, P, N) + TS - PV.$$

In particular, an equilibrium state is uniquely determined by the values of T , P , and N .

ALBERTY [3] for their application in chemistry.

Proof. We prove (ii); the other two cases are entirely similar. (4.17) and the statement about equality is a direct consequence of Axiom 4.1.2(ii). Thus, the difference $H - TS - A(T, V, N)$ takes its minimum value zero at the equilibrium value of T . Therefore, the derivative with respect to T vanishes, which gives the formula for S . To get the formulas for P and μ , we note that for constant T , the first law (4.14) implies

$$dA = d(H - TS) = dH - TdS = -PdV + \mu \cdot dN.$$

For the reversible transformation which only changes P or μ_j , we conclude that $dA = -PdV$ and $dA = \mu \cdot dN$, respectively. Solving for P and μ_j , respectively, implies the formulas for P and μ_j . \square

The above results imply that one can regard each thermodynamic potential as a complete alternative way to describe the manifold of thermal states and hence all equilibrium properties. This is very important in practice, where one usually describes thermodynamic material properties in terms of the Helmholtz or Gibbs potential, using models like NRTL (RENON & PRAUSNITZ [206], PRAUSNITZ et al. [199]) or SAFT (CHAPMAN et al. [53, 54]).

The additivity of extensive quantities is reflected in corresponding properties of the thermodynamic potentials:

4.4.2 Theorem. *The potentials $U(S, V, N)$, $A(T, V, N)$, and $G(T, P, N)$ satisfy, for real $\lambda, \lambda^1, \lambda^2 \geq 0$,*

$$U(\lambda S, \lambda V, \lambda N) = \lambda U(S, V, N), \quad (4.19)$$

$$A(T, \lambda V, \lambda N) = \lambda A(T, V, N), \quad (4.20)$$

$$G(T, P, \lambda N) = \lambda G(T, P, N), \quad (4.21)$$

$$U(\lambda^1 S^1 + \lambda^2 S^2, \lambda^1 V^1 + \lambda^2 V^2, \lambda^1 N^1 + \lambda^2 N^2) \leq \lambda^1 U(S^1, V^1, N^1) + \lambda^2 U(S^2, V^2, N^2), \quad (4.22)$$

$$A(T, \lambda^1 V^1 + \lambda^2 V^2, \lambda^1 N^1 + \lambda^2 N^2) \leq \lambda^1 A(T, V^1, N^1) + \lambda^2 A(T, V^2, N^2), \quad (4.23)$$

$$G(T, P, \lambda^1 N^1 + \lambda^2 N^2) \leq \lambda^1 G(T, P, N^1) + \lambda^2 G(T, P, N^2). \quad (4.24)$$

In particular, these potentials are convex in S , V , and N .

Proof. The first three equations express homogeneity and are a direct consequence of the definitions. Inequality (4.23) holds since, for suitable P and μ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A(T, \lambda^1 V^1 + \lambda^2 V^2, \lambda^1 N^1 + \lambda^2 N^2) &= -P(\lambda^1 V^1 + \lambda^2 V^2) + \mu \cdot (\lambda^1 N^1 + \lambda^2 N^2) \\ &= \lambda^1 (-PV^1 + \mu \cdot N^1) + \lambda^2 (-PV^2 + \mu \cdot N^2) \\ &\leq \lambda^1 A(T, V^1, N^1) + \lambda^2 A(T, V^2, N^2); \end{aligned}$$

and the others follow in the same way. Specialized to $\lambda^1 + \lambda^2 = 1$, the inequalities express the claimed convexity. \square

For a system at constant temperature T , pressure P , and mole number N , consisting of a number of parts labeled by a superscript k which are separately in equilibrium, the Gibbs energy is extensive, since

$$\begin{aligned} G &= H - TS + PV = \sum H^k - T \sum S^k + P \sum V^k \\ &= \sum (H^k - TS^k + PV^k) = \sum G^k. \end{aligned}$$

Equilibrium requires that $\sum G^k$ is minimal among all choices with $\sum N^k = N$, and by introducing a Lagrange multiplier vector μ^* for the constraints, we see that in equilibrium, the derivative of $\sum (G(T, P, N^k) - \mu^* \cdot N^k)$ with respect to each N^k must vanish. This implies that

$$\mu^k = \frac{\partial G}{\partial N^k}(T, P, N^k) = \mu^*.$$

Thus, in equilibrium, all μ^k must be the same. At constant T , V , and N , one can apply the same argument to the Helmholtz potential, and at constant S , V , and N to the Hamilton potential. In each case, the equilibrium is characterized by the constancy of the intensive parameters.

The degree to which macroscopic space and time correlations are absent characterizes the amount of **macroscopic disorder** of a system. Global equilibrium states are therefore macroscopically highly uniform; they are the most ordered macroscopic states in the universe rather than the most disordered ones. A system not in global equilibrium is characterized by macroscopic local inhomogeneities, indicating that the space-independent global equilibrium variables alone are not sufficient to describe the system. Its intrinsic complexity is apparent only in a microscopic treatment; cf. Section 7.6 below. The only macroscopic shadow of this complexity is the critical opalescence of fluids near a critical point (ANDREWS [11], FORSTER [79]). The contents of the second law of thermodynamics for global equilibrium states may therefore be phrased informally as follows: *In global equilibrium, macroscopic order (homogeneity) is perfect and microscopic complexity is maximal.* In particular, the traditional interpretation of entropy as a measure of disorder is often misleading. Much more carefully argued support for this statement, with numerous examples from teaching practice, is in LAMBERT [150].

4.4.3 Theorem. (Entropy form of the second law)

In an arbitrary state of a standard thermodynamic system

$$S \leq S(H, V, N) := \min \{T^{-1}(H + PV - \mu \cdot N) \mid \Delta(T, P, \mu) = 0\},$$

with equality iff the state is an equilibrium state. The remaining thermal variables are then given by

$$T^{-1} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial H}(H, V, N), \quad T^{-1}P = \frac{\partial S}{\partial V}(H, V, N), \quad T^{-1}\mu = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial N}(H, V, N), \quad (4.25)$$

$$U = H = TS(T, V, N) - PV + \mu \cdot N. \quad (4.26)$$

Proof. This is proved in the same way as Theorem 4.4.1. □

This result implies that when a system in which H , V and N are kept constant reaches equilibrium, the entropy must have increased. Unfortunately, the assumption of constant H , V and N is unrealistic; such constraints are not easily realized in nature. Under different constraints⁶, the entropy is no longer maximal.

In systems with several phases, a naive interpretation of the second law as moving systems towards increasing disorder is even more inappropriate: A mixture of water and oil spontaneously separates, thus "ordering" the water molecules and the oil molecules into separate phases!

Thus, while the second law in the form of a maximum principle for the entropy has some theoretical and historical relevance, it is not the extremal principle ruling nature. The irreversible nature of physical processes is instead manifest as **energy dissipation** which, in a microscopic interpretation, indicates the loss of energy to the unmodelled microscopic degrees of freedom. Macroscopically, the global equilibrium states are therefore states of least free energy, the correct choice of which depends on the boundary condition, with the least possible freedom for change. This macroscopic immutability is another intuitive explanation for the maximal macroscopic order in global equilibrium states.

4.5 The approach to equilibrium

Using only the present axioms, one can say a little bit about the behavior of a system close to equilibrium in the following, idealized situation. Suppose that a system at constant S , V , and N which is close to equilibrium at some time t reaches equilibrium at some later time t^* . Then the second law implies

$$0 \leq H(t) - H(t^*) \approx (t - t^*) \frac{dH}{dt},$$

so that $dH/dt \leq 0$. We assume that the system is composed of two parts, which are both in equilibrium at times t and t^* . Then the time shift induces on both parts a reversible transformation, and the first law can be applied to them. Thus

$$dH = \sum_{k=1,2} dH^k = \sum_{k=1,2} (T^k dS^k - P^k dV^k + \mu^k \cdot dN^k).$$

Since S , V , and N remain constant, we have $dS^1 + dS^2 = 0$, $dV^1 + dV^2 = 0$, $dN^1 + dN^2 = 0$, and since for the time shift $dH \leq 0$, we find the inequality

$$0 \geq (T^1 - T^2)dS^1 - (P^1 - P^2)dV^1 + (\mu^1 - \mu^2) \cdot dN^1.$$

⁶For example, if one pours milk into a cup of coffee, stirring mixes coffee and milk, thus increasing complexity. Macroscopic order is restored after some time when this increased complexity has become macroscopically inaccessible. Since T, P and N are constant, the cup of coffee ends up in a state of minimal Gibbs energy, and not in a state of maximal entropy! More formally, the first law shows that, for standard systems at fixed value of the mole number, the value of the entropy decreases when H or V (or both) decrease reversibly; this shows that the value of the entropy may well decrease if accompanied by a corresponding decrease of H or V . The same holds out of equilibrium (though our equilibrium argument no longer applies); for example, the reaction $2 \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2 \text{H}_2\text{O}$ (if catalyzed) may happen spontaneously at constant $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$ and $P = 1 \text{ atm}$, though it decreases the entropy.

This inequality gives information about the direction of the flow in case that all but one of the extensive variables are known to be fixed.

In particular, at constant V^1 and N^1 , we have $dS^1 \leq 0$ if $T^1 > T^2$; i.e., "heat" (entropy) flows from the hotter part towards the colder part. At constant S^1 and N^1 , we have $dV^1 \leq 0$ if $P^1 < P^2$; i.e., "space" (volume) flows from lower pressure to higher pressure: the volume of the lower pressure part decreases and is compensated by a corresponding increase of the volume in the higher pressure part. And for a pure substance at constant S^1 and V^1 , we have $dN^1 \leq 0$ if $\mu^1 > \mu^2$; i.e., "matter" (mole number) flows from higher chemical potential towards lower chemical potential. These qualitative results give temperature, pressure, and chemical potential the familiar intuitive interpretation.

This glimpse on nonequilibrium properties is a shadow of the far reaching fact that, in nonequilibrium thermodynamics, the intensive variables behave like potentials whose gradients induce forces that tend to diminish these gradients, thus enforcing (after the time needed to reach equilibrium) agreement of the intensive variables of different parts of a system. In particular, temperature acts as a thermal potential, whose differences create thermal forces which induce thermal currents, a flow of "heat" (entropy), in a similar way as differences in electrical potentials create electrical currents, a flow of "electricity" (electrons)⁷. While these dynamical issues are outside the scope of the present work, they motivate the fact that one can control some intensive parameters of the system by controlling the corresponding intensive parameters of the environment and making the walls permeable to the corresponding extensive quantities. This corresponds to standard procedures familiar to everyone from ordinary life, such as: heating to change the temperature; applying pressure to change the volume; immersion into a substance to change the chemical composition; or, in the more general thermal models discussed in Section 7.1, applying forces to displace an object.

The stronger nonequilibrium version of the second law says that (for suitable boundary conditions) equilibrium is actually attained after some time (strictly speaking, only in the limit of infinite time). This implies that the energy difference

$$\delta E := H - U(S, V, N) = H - TS - A(S, V, N) = H - TS + PV = G(S, V, N)$$

is the amount of energy that is dissipated in order to reach equilibrium. In an equilibrium setting, we can only compare what happens to a system prepared in a nonequilibrium state assuming that, subsequently, the full energy difference δE is dissipated so that the system ends up in an equilibrium state. Since few variables describe everything of interest, this constitutes the power of equilibrium thermodynamics. But this power is limited, since equilibrium thermodynamics is silent about when – or whether at all – equilibrium is reached. Indeed, in many cases, only metastable states are reached, which change too slowly to ever reach equilibrium on a human time scale.

Description levels. As we have seen, extensive and intensive variables play completely different roles in equilibrium thermodynamics. Extensive variables such as mass, charge, or

⁷See Table 7.1 for more parallels in other thermodynamic systems, and FUCHS [83] for a thermodynamics course (and for a German course JOB [127]) thoroughly exploiting these parallels.

volume depend additively on the size of the system. The conjugate intensive variables act as parameters defining the state.

A system composed of many small subsystems, each in equilibrium, needs for its complete characterization the values of the extensive and intensive variables in each subsystem. Such a system is in global equilibrium only if its intensive variables are independent of the subsystem. On the other hand, the values of the extensive variables may jump at phase space boundaries, if (as is the case for multi-phase systems) the equations of state allow multiple values for the extensive variables to correspond to the same values of the intensive variables. If the intensive variables are not independent of the subsystem then, by the second law, the differences in the intensive variables of adjacent subsystems give rise to thermodynamic forces trying to move the system towards equilibrium.

A real nonequilibrium system does not actually consist of subsystems in equilibrium; however, typically, smaller and smaller pieces behave more and more like equilibrium systems. Thus we may view a real system as the continuum limit of a larger and larger number of smaller and smaller subsystems, each in approximate equilibrium. As a result, the extensive and intensive variables become fields depending on the continuum variables used to label the subsystems. For extensive variables, the integral of their fields over the label space gives the bulk value of the extensive quantity; thus the fields themselves have a natural interpretation as a density. For intensive variables, an interpretation as a density is physically meaningless; instead, they have a natural interpretation as field strengths. The gradients of their fields have physical significance as the sources for thermodynamic forces.

From this field theory perspective, the extensive variables in the single-phase global equilibrium case have constant densities, and their bulk values are the densities multiplied by the system size (which might be mass, or volume, or another additive parameter), hence scale linearly with the size of the system, while intensive variables are invariant under a change of system size. We do *not* use the alternative convention to call extensive any variable that scales linearly with the system size, and intensive any variable that is invariant under a change of system size.

We distinguish four nested levels of thermal descriptions, depending on whether the system is considered to be in global, local, microlocal, or quantum equilibrium. The highest and computationally simplest level, **global equilibrium**, is concerned with macroscopic situations characterized by finitely many space- and time-independent variables. The next level, **local equilibrium**, treats macroscopic situations in a continuum mechanical description, where the equilibrium subsystems are labeled by the space coordinates. Therefore the relevant variables are finitely many space- and time-dependent fields. The next deeper level, **microlocal**⁸ **equilibrium**, treats mesoscopic situations in a kinetic description, where the equilibrium subsystems are labeled by phase space coordinates. The relevant variables are now finitely many fields depending on time, position, and momentum; cf. BALIAN [15]. The bottom level is the microscopic regime, where we must consider **quantum equilibrium**. This no longer fits a thermodynamic framework but must be described in terms of quantum dynamical semigroups; see Section 7.2.

⁸The term microlocal for a phase space dependent analysis is taken from the literature on partial differential equations; see, e.g., MARTINEZ [1].

The relations between the different description levels are discussed in Section 7.2. Apart from descriptions on these clear-cut levels, there are also various hybrid descriptions, where some part of a system is described on a more detailed level than the remaining parts, or where, as for stirred chemical reactions, the fields are considered to be spatially homogeneous and only the time-dependence matters.

In global equilibrium, all thermal variables are constant throughout the system, except at phase boundaries, where the extensive variables may exhibit jumps and only the intensive variables remain constant. This is sometimes referred to as the zeroth law of thermodynamics and characterizes global equilibrium; it allows one to measure intensive variables (like temperature) by bringing a calibrated instrument that is sensitive to this variable (for temperature a thermometer) into equilibrium with the system to be measured. For local or microlocal equilibrium, the same intuition applies, but with fields in place of variables. Then extensive variables are densities represented by distributions that can be meaningfully integrated over bounded regions, whereas intensive variables are nonsingular fields (e.g., pressure) whose integrals are physically irrelevant.

Chapter 5

Quantities, states, and statistics

When considered in sufficient detail, no physical system is truly in global equilibrium; one can always find smaller or larger deviations. To describe these deviations, extra variables are needed, resulting in a more complete but also more complex model. At even higher resolution, this model is again imperfect and an approximation to an even more complex, better model. This refinement process may be repeated in several stages. At the most detailed stages, we transcend the frontier of current knowledge in physics, but even as this frontier recedes, deeper and deeper stages with unknown details are imaginable.

Therefore, it is desirable to have a meta-description of thermodynamics that, starting with a detailed model, allows to deduce the properties of each coarser model, in a way that all description levels are consistent with the current state of the art in physics. Moreover, the results should be as independent as possible of unknown details at the lower levels. This meta-description is the subject of **statistical mechanics**.

This chapter introduces the technical machinery of statistical mechanics, Gibbs states and the partition function, in a uniform way common to classical mechanics and quantum mechanics. As in the phenomenological case, the intensive variables determine the state (which now is a more abstract object), whereas the extensive variables now appear as values of other abstract objects called quantities. This change of setting allows the natural incorporation of quantum mechanics, where quantities need not commute, while values are numbers observable in principle, hence must satisfy the commutative law.

The operational meaning of the abstract concepts of quantities, states and values introduced in the following becomes apparent once we have recovered the phenomenological results of Chapter 4 from the abstract theory developed in this and the next chapter. Chapter 7 discusses in more detail how the theory relates to experiment.

5.1 Quantities

Any fundamental description of physical systems must give account of the numerical values of quantities observable in experiments when the system under consideration is in a specified state. Moreover, the form and meaning of states, and of what is observable in principle, must be clearly defined. We consider an axiomatic conceptual foundation on the basis of quantities¹ and their values, consistent with the conventions adopted by the International System of Units (SI) [238], who declare: *"A quantity in the general sense is a property ascribed to phenomena, bodies, or substances that can be quantified for, or assigned to, a particular phenomenon, body, or substance. [...] The value of a physical quantity is the quantitative expression of a particular physical quantity as the product of a number and a unit, the number being its numerical value."*

In different states, the quantities of a given system may have different values; the state (equivalently, the values determined by it) characterizes an individual system at a particular time. Theory must therefore define what to consider as quantities, what as states, and how a state assigns values to a quantity. Since quantities can be added, multiplied, compared, and integrated, the set of all quantities has an elaborate structure whose properties we formulate after the discussion of the following motivating example.

5.1.1 Example. As a simple example satisfying the axioms to be introduced, the reader may think of an N -level quantum system. The **quantities** are the elements of the algebra $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ of square complex $N \times N$ matrices, the **constants** are the multiples of the identity matrix, the **conjugate** f^* of f is given by conjugate transposition, and the **integral** $\int g = \text{tr } g$ is the **trace**, the sum of the diagonal entries or, equivalently, the sum of the eigenvalues. The standard basis consisting of the N **unit vectors** e^k with a one in component k and zeros in all other component corresponds to the N levels of the quantum systems. The Hamiltonian H is represented by a diagonal matrix $H = \text{Diag}(E_1, \dots, E_N)$ whose diagonal entries E_k are the **energy levels** of the system. In the nondegenerate case, all E_k are distinct, and the diagonal matrices comprise all functions of H . Quantities representing arbitrary nondiagonal matrices are less easy to interpret. However, an important class of quantities are the matrices of the form $P = \psi\psi^*$, where ψ is a vector of norm 1; they satisfy $P^2 = P = P^*$ and are the quantities observed in binary measurements such as detector clicks; see Section 7.5. The **states** of the N -level system are represented by a **density matrix** $\rho \in \mathbb{E}$, a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix with trace one. The **value** of a quantity $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is the number $\langle f \rangle = \text{tr } \rho f$. The diagonal entries $p_k := \rho_{kk}$ represent the probability for obtaining a response in a binary test for the k th quantum level; the off-diagonal entries ρ_{jk} represent deviations from a classical mixture of quantum levels.

5.1.2 Definition.

(i) A ***-algebra** is a set \mathbb{E} together with operations on \mathbb{E} defining for any two quantities

¹We deliberately avoid the notion of observables, since it is not clear on a fundamental level what it means to 'observe' something, and since many things (such as the fine structure constant, neutrino masses, decay rates, scattering cross sections) which can be observed in nature are only indirectly related to what is traditionally called an 'observable' in quantum mechanics. The related problem of how to interpret measurements is discussed in Section 7.4.

$f, g \in \mathbb{E}$ the **sum** $f + g \in \mathbb{E}$, the **product** $fg \in \mathbb{E}$, and the **conjugate** $f^* \in \mathbb{E}$, such that the following axioms (Q1)–(Q4) hold for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and all $f, g, h \in \mathbb{E}$:

(Q1) $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$, i.e., complex numbers are special elements called **constants**, for which addition, multiplication and conjugation have their traditional meaning.

$$(Q2) \quad (fg)h = f(gh), \quad \alpha f = f\alpha, \quad 0f = 0, \quad 1f = f.$$

$$(Q3) \quad (f + g) + h = f + (g + h), \quad f(g + h) = fg + fh, \quad f + 0 = f.$$

$$(Q4) \quad f^{**} = f, \quad (fg)^* = g^*f^*, \quad (f + g)^* = f^* + g^*.$$

(ii) A $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} is called **commutative** if $fg = gf$ for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$, and **noncommutative** otherwise. The $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} is called **nondegenerate** if

$$(Q5) \quad f^*f = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad f = 0.$$

(iii) We introduce the notation

$$-f := (-1)f, \quad f - g := f + (-g), \quad [f, g] := fg - gf,$$

$$f^0 := 1, \quad f^l := f^{l-1}f \quad (l = 1, 2, \dots),$$

$$\operatorname{Re} f := \frac{1}{2}(f + f^*), \quad \operatorname{Im} f := \frac{1}{2i}(f - f^*),$$

for $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$. $[f, g]$ is called the **commutator** of f and g , and $\operatorname{Re} f$, $\operatorname{Im} f$ are referred to as the **real part** (or **Hermitian part**) and **imaginary part** of f , respectively. $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is called **Hermitian** if $f^* = f$.

(iv) A $*$ -homomorphism is a mapping ϕ from a $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} with unity to another (or the same) $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E}' with unity such that

$$\phi(f + g) = \phi(f) + \phi(g), \quad \phi(fg) = \phi(f)\phi(g), \quad \phi(\alpha f) = \alpha\phi(f),$$

$$\phi(f^*) = \phi(f)^*, \quad \phi(1) = 1.$$

for all f, g in \mathbb{E} and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

Note that we assume commutativity only for the product of numbers and elements of \mathbb{E} . In general, the product of two elements of \mathbb{E} is indeed noncommutative. However, general commutativity of the addition is a consequence of our other assumptions. We prove this together with some other useful relations.

5.1.3 Proposition.

(i) For all $f, g, h \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$(f + g)h = fh + gh, \quad f - f = 0, \quad f + g = g + f \tag{5.1}$$

$$[f, f^*] = -2i[\operatorname{Re} f, \operatorname{Im} f]. \tag{5.2}$$

(ii) For all $f \in \mathbb{E}$, $\operatorname{Re} f$ and $\operatorname{Im} f$ are Hermitian. f is Hermitian iff $f = \operatorname{Re} f$ iff $\operatorname{Im} f = 0$. If f, g are commuting Hermitian quantities then fg is Hermitian, too.

Proof. (i) The right distributive law follows from

$$\begin{aligned} (f + g)h &= ((f + g)h)** = (h^*(f + g)^*)^* = (h^*(f^* + g^*))^* \\ &= (h^*f^* + h^*g^*)^* = (h^*f^*)^* + (h^*g^*)^* \\ &= f^{**}h^{**} + g^{**}h^{**} = fh + gh. \end{aligned}$$

It implies $f - f = 1f - 1f = (1 - 1)f = 0f = 0$. From this, we may deduce that addition is commutative, as follows. The quantity $h := -f + g$ satisfies

$$-h = (-1)((-1)f + g) = (-1)(-1)f + (-1)g = f - g,$$

and we have

$$f + g = f + (h - h) + g = (f + h) + (-h + g) = (f - f + g) + (f - g + g) = g + f.$$

This proves (5.1). If $u = \operatorname{Re} f$, $v = \operatorname{Im} f$ then $u^* = u$, $v^* = v$ and $f = u + iv$, $f^* = u - iv$. Hence

$$[f, f^*] = (u + iv)(u - iv) - (u - iv)(u + iv) = 2i(vu - uv) = -2i[\operatorname{Re} f, \operatorname{Im} f],$$

giving (5.2).

(ii) The first two assertions are trivial, and the third holds since $(fg)^* = g^*f^* = gf = fg$ if f, g are Hermitian and commute. \square

5.1.4 Definition.

(i) The $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} is called **partially ordered** if there is a partial order \geq satisfying the following axioms (Q6)–(Q9) for all $f, g, h \in \mathbb{E}$:

(Q6) \geq is reflexive ($f \geq f$), antisymmetric ($f \geq g \geq f \Rightarrow f = g$), and transitive ($f \geq g \geq h \Rightarrow f \geq h$).

(Q7) $f \geq g \Rightarrow f + h \geq g + h$.

(Q8) $f \geq 0 \Rightarrow f = f^*$ and $g^*fg \geq 0$.

(Q9) $1 \geq 0$.

We introduce the notation

$$f \leq g :\Leftrightarrow g \geq f,$$

$$\|f\| := \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \mid f^*f \leq \alpha^2, \alpha \geq 0\},$$

where the infimum of the empty set is taken to be ∞ . The number $\|f\|$ is referred to as the **(spectral) norm** of f . An element $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is called **bounded** if $\|f\| < \infty$. The **uniform topology** is the topology induced on \mathbb{E} by declaring as open sets arbitrary unions of finite intersections of the **open balls** $\{f \in \mathbb{E} \mid \|f - f_0\| < \varepsilon\}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and some $f_0 \in \mathbb{E}$.

5.1.5 Proposition.

(i) For all quantities $f, g, h \in \mathbb{E}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$f^*f \geq 0, \quad ff^* \geq 0. \quad (5.3)$$

$$f^*f \leq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|f\| = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad f = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

$$f \leq g \quad \Rightarrow \quad h^*fh \leq h^*gh, \quad |\lambda|f \leq |\lambda|g, \quad (5.5)$$

$$f^*g + g^*f \leq 2\|f\| \|g\|, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\|\lambda f\| = |\lambda|\|f\|, \quad \|f \pm g\| \leq \|f\| \pm \|g\|, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\|fg\| \leq \|f\| \|g\|. \quad (5.8)$$

(ii) Among the complex numbers, precisely the nonnegative real numbers λ satisfy $\lambda \geq 0$.

Proof. (i) (5.3)–(5.5) follow directly from (Q7) – (Q9). Now let $\alpha = \|f\|$, $\beta = \|g\|$. Then $f^*f \leq \alpha^2$ and $g^*g \leq \beta^2$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (\beta f - \alpha g)^*(\beta f - \alpha g) &= \beta^2 f^*f - \alpha\beta(f^*g + g^*f) + \alpha^2 g^*g \\ &\leq \beta^2 \alpha^2 \pm \alpha\beta(f^*g + g^*f) + \alpha^2 g^*g, \end{aligned}$$

$f^*g + g^*f \leq 2\alpha\beta$ if $\alpha\beta \neq 0$, and for $\alpha\beta = 0$, the same follows from (5.4). Therefore (5.6) holds. The first half of (5.7) is trivial, and the second half follows for the plus sign from

$$(f + g)^*(f + g) = f^*f + f^*g + g^*f + g^*g \leq \alpha^2 + 2\alpha\beta + \beta^2 = (\alpha + \beta)^2,$$

and then for the minus sign from the first half. Finally, by (5.5),

$$(fg)^*(fg) = g^*f^*fg \leq g^*\alpha^2g = \alpha^2g^*g \leq \alpha^2\beta^2.$$

This implies (5.8).

(ii) If λ is a nonnegative real number then $\lambda = f^*f \geq 0$ with $f = \sqrt{\lambda}$. If λ is a negative real number then $\lambda = -f^*f \leq 0$ with $f = \sqrt{-\lambda}$, and by antisymmetry, $\lambda \geq 0$ is impossible. If λ is a nonreal number then $\lambda \neq \lambda^*$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ is impossible by (Q8). \square

5.1.6 Definition. A **Euclidean *-algebra** is a nondegenerate, partially ordered *-algebra \mathbb{E} , whose elements are called **quantities**, together with a complex-valued **integral** \int defined on a subspace \mathbb{S} of \mathbb{E} , whose elements are called **strongly integrable**, satisfying the following axioms (EA1)–(EA6):

$$(EA1) \quad g \text{ bounded, } h \text{ strongly integrable} \quad \Rightarrow \quad h^*, gh, hg \text{ strongly integrable,}$$

$$(EA2) \quad \int h^*h > 0 \text{ if } h \neq 0,$$

$$(EA3) \quad (\int h)^* = \int h^*, \quad \int gh = \int hg,$$

$$(EA4) \quad \int h^*gh = 0 \text{ for all strongly integrable } h \quad \Rightarrow \quad g = 0 \quad (\text{nondegeneracy}),$$

$$(EA5) \quad \int h_i^* h_i \rightarrow 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int g h_i \rightarrow 0, \quad \int h_i^* g h_i \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(EA6) \quad h_i \downarrow 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \inf \int h_i = 0 \quad (\text{Dini property}).$$

Here, integrals extend over the longest following product or quotient (while later, differential operators act on the shortest syntactically meaningful term), the **monotonic limit** is defined by $g_i \downarrow 0$ iff, for every strongly integrable h , the sequence (or net) $\int h^* g_i h$ consists of real numbers converging monotonically decreasing to zero.

Note that the integral can often be naturally extended from strongly integrable quantities to a significantly larger space of integrable quantities.

5.1.7 Proposition.

$$g \in \mathbb{E}, \quad \int g f = 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{E} \quad \Rightarrow \quad g = 0. \quad (5.9)$$

For strongly integrable f, g ,

$$\int (gh)^*(gh) \leq \int g^* g \int h^* h. \quad (\text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality}) \quad (5.10)$$

In particular, every strongly integrable quantity is bounded.

Proof.

If $\int g f = 0$ for all $f \in \mathbb{E}$ then this holds in particular for $f = hh^*$. Thus $0 = \int g h h^* = \int h^* g h$ by (EA2), and (EA4) gives the desired conclusion (5.9). (5.10) holds since by (EA2), $\int g^* h$ defines a positive definite inner product on \mathbb{S} , and directly implies the final statement. \square

We now describe the basic Euclidean $*$ -algebras relevant in nonrelativistic physics. However, the remainder is completely independent of details how the axioms are realized; a specific realization is needed only when doing specific quantitative calculations.

5.1.8 Examples.

(i) (**N -level quantum systems**) The simplest family of Euclidean $*$ -algebras is the algebra $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ of square complex $N \times N$ matrices; cf. Example 5.1.1. Here the quantities are square matrices, the constants are the multiples of the identity matrix, the conjugate is conjugate transposition, and the integral is the trace, the sum of the diagonal entries or, equivalently, the sum of the eigenvalues. In particular, all quantities are strongly integrable.

(ii) (**Nonrelativistic classical mechanics**) An atomic N -particle system is described in classical mechanics by the phase space \mathbb{R}^{6N} with six coordinates – position $x^a \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and momentum $p^a \in \mathbb{R}^3$ – for each particle. The algebra

$$\mathbb{E}_N := C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{6N})$$

of smooth complex-valued functions $g(x^{1:N}, p^{1:N})$ of positions and momenta is a commutative Euclidean $*$ -algebra with complex conjugation as conjugate and the **Liouville integral**

$$\int g = C^{-1} \int dp^{1:N} dx^{1:N} g_N(x^{1:N}, p^{1:N}),$$

where C is a positive constant. Strongly integrable quantities are the Schwartz functions in \mathbb{E} . The axioms are easily verified.

(iii) (**Classical fluids**) A fluid is classically described by an atomic system with an indefinite number of particles. The appropriate Euclidean $*$ -algebra for a single species of monatomic particles is the direct sum $\mathbb{E} = \bigoplus_{N \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_N$ whose quantities are infinite sequences $g = (g_0, g_1, \dots)$ of $g_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$, with \mathbb{E}_N as in (i), and weighted Liouville integral

$$\int g = \sum_{N \geq 0} C_N^{-1} \int dp^{1:N} dx^{1:N} g_N(x^{1:N}, p^{1:N}).$$

Here C_N is a symmetry factor for the symmetry group of the N -particle system, which equals $h^{3N} N!$ for indistinguishable particles; $h = 2\pi\hbar$ is Planck's constant. This accounts for the Maxwell statistics and gives the correct entropy of mixing. Classical fluids with monatomic particles of several different kinds require a tensor product of several such algebras, and classical fluids composed of molecules require additional degrees of freedom to account for the rotation and vibration of the molecules.

(iv) (**Nonrelativistic quantum mechanics**) Let \mathbb{H} be a Euclidean space, a dense subspace of a Hilbert space. Then the algebra $\mathbb{E} := \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of continuous linear operators on \mathbb{H} is a Euclidean $*$ -algebra with the adjoint as conjugate and the **quantum integral**

$$\int g = \text{tr } g,$$

given by the trace of the quantity in the integrand. Strongly integrable quantities are the operators $g \in \mathbb{E}$ which are trace class; this includes all linear operators of finite rank. Again, the axioms are easily verified. In the quantum context, Hermitian quantities f are often referred to as **observables**; but we do not use this term here.

We end this section by stating some results needed later. The exposition in this and the next chapter is fully rigorous if the statements of Proposition 5.1.9 and Proposition 5.1.10 are assumed in addition to (EA1)–(EA6). We prove these propositions only in case that \mathbb{E} is finite-dimensional². But they can also be proved if the quantities involved are smooth functions, or if they have a spectral resolution; cf., e.g., THIRRING [240] (who works in the framework of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras).

5.1.9 Proposition. *For arbitrary quantities f, g ,*

$$e^{\alpha f} e^{\beta f} = e^{(\alpha+\beta)f} \quad (\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}),$$

$$(e^f)^* = e^{f^*},$$

$$e^f g = g e^f \quad \text{if } f \text{ and } g \text{ commute,}$$

$$f^* = f \quad \Rightarrow \quad \log e^f = f,$$

²We'd appreciate to be informed about possible proofs in general that only use the properties of Euclidean $*$ -algebras (and perhaps further, elementary assumptions).

$$f \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sqrt{f} \geq 0, \quad (\sqrt{f})^2 = f,$$

For any quantity $f = f(s)$ depending continuously on $s \in [a, b]$,

$$\int_a^b ds \int f(s) = \int \left(\int_a^b ds f(s) \right),$$

and for any quantity $f = f(\lambda)$ depending continuously differentiable on a parameter vector λ ,

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int f = \int df/d\lambda.$$

Proof. In finite dimensions, the first four assertions are standard matrix calculus, and the remaining two statements hold since $\int f$ must be a finite linear combination of the components of f . \square

5.1.10 Proposition. Let f, g be quantities depending continuously differentiable on a parameter or parameter vector λ , and suppose that

$$[f(\lambda), g(\lambda)] = 0 \text{ for all } \lambda.$$

Thus, for any continuously differentiable function F of two variables,

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int F(f, g) = \int \partial_1 F(f, g) \frac{df}{d\lambda} + \int \partial_2 F(f, g) \frac{dg}{d\lambda}. \quad (5.11)$$

Here $\partial_1 F$ and $\partial_2 F$ denote differentiation by the first and second argument of F , respectively

Proof. We prove the special case $F(x, y) = x^m y^n$, where (5.11) reduces to

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int f^m g^n = \int m f^{m-1} g^n \frac{df}{d\lambda} + \int n f^m g^{n-1} \frac{dg}{d\lambda}. \quad (5.12)$$

The general case then follows for polynomials $F(x, y)$ by taking suitable linear combinations, and for arbitrary F by a limiting procedure. To prove (5.12), we note that, more generally,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \int f_1 \cdots f_{m+n} &= \int \frac{d}{d\lambda} (f_1 \cdots f_{m+n}) \\ &= \int \sum_{j=1}^{m+n} f_1 \cdots f_{j-1} \frac{df_j}{d\lambda} f_{j+1} \cdots f_{m+n} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m+n} \int f_1 \cdots f_{j-1} \frac{df_j}{d\lambda} f_{j+1} \cdots f_{m+n} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m+n} \int f_{j+1} \cdots f_{m+n} f_1 \cdots f_{j-1} \frac{df_j}{d\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

using the cyclic commutativity (EA3) of the integral. If we specialize to $f_j = f$ if $j \leq m$, $f_j = g$ if $j > m$, and note that f and g commute, we arrive at (5.12). \square

Of course, the proposition generalizes to families of more than two commuting quantities; but more important is the special case $g = f$:

5.1.11 Corollary. For any quantity f depending continuously differentially on a parameter vector λ , and any continuously differentiable function F of a single variable,

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \int F(f) = \int F'(f) \frac{df}{d\lambda}. \quad (5.13)$$

5.2 Gibbs states

Our next task is to specify the formal properties of the value of a quantity.

5.2.1 Definition. A **state** is a mapping $\bar{\cdot}$ that assigns to all quantities f from a subspace of \mathbb{E} containing all bounded quantities its **value** $\bar{f} =: \langle f \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$(E1) \quad \langle 1 \rangle = 1, \quad \langle f^* \rangle = \langle f \rangle^*, \quad \langle f + g \rangle = \langle f \rangle + \langle g \rangle,$$

$$(E2) \quad \langle \alpha f \rangle = \alpha \langle f \rangle,$$

$$(E3) \quad \text{If } f \geq 0 \text{ then } \langle f \rangle \geq 0,$$

$$(E4) \quad \text{If } f_l \in \mathbb{E}, f_l \downarrow 0 \text{ then } \langle f_l \rangle \downarrow 0.$$

Note that this formal definition of a state – always used in the remainder of the book – differs from the phenomenological thermodynamic states defined in Section 4.1. The connection between the two notions will be made in Section 6.2.

Statistical mechanics essentially originated with Josiah Willard Gibbs, whose 1902 book GIBBS [90] on (at that time of course only classical) statistical mechanics is still readable. See UFFINK [246] for a history of the subject.

All states arising in thermodynamics have the following particular form.

5.2.2 Definition. A **Gibbs state** is defined by assigning to any $g \in \mathbb{E}$ the value

$$\langle g \rangle := \int e^{-S/\bar{k}} g, \quad (5.14)$$

where S , called the **entropy** of the state, is a Hermitian quantity with strongly integrable $e^{-S/\bar{k}}$, satisfying the normalization condition

$$\int e^{-S/\bar{k}} = 1, \quad (5.15)$$

and \bar{k} is the Boltzmann constant

$$\bar{k} \approx 1.38065 \cdot 10^{-23} \text{ J/K}. \quad (5.16)$$

Theorem 5.2.3 below implies that a Gibbs state is indeed a state.

The Boltzmann constant defines the units in which the entropy is measured. In analogy³ with Planck's constant \hbar , we write \bar{k} in place of the customary k or k_B , in order to be free to use the letter k for other purposes. By a change of units one can enforce any value of \bar{k} . Chemists use instead of particle number N the corresponding **mole number**, which differs by a fixed numerical factor, the **Avogadro constant**

$$N_A = R/\bar{k} \approx 6.02214 \cdot 10^{23} \text{ mol}^{-1},$$

where R is the universal gas constant (4.8). As a result, all results from statistical mechanics may be translated to phenomenological thermodynamics by setting $\bar{k} = R$, corresponding to setting $1 \text{ mol} = 6.02214 \cdot 10^{23}$, the number of particles in one mole of a pure substance.

What is here called entropy has a variety of alternative names in the literature on statistical mechanics. For example, GIBBS [90], who first noticed the rich thermodynamic implications of states defined by (5.14), called $-S$ the *index of probability*; ALHASSID & LEVINE [5] and BALIAN [15] use the name *surprisal* for S . Our terminology is close to that of MRUGALA et al. [176], who call S the *microscopic entropy*, and HASSAN et al. [109], who call S the *information(al) entropy operator*. What is traditionally (and in Section 4.1) called entropy and denoted by S is in the present setting the value $\bar{S} = \langle S \rangle$.

5.2.3 Theorem.

(i) A Gibbs state determines its entropy uniquely.

(ii) For any Hermitian quantity f with strongly integrable e^{-f} , the mapping $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ defined by

$$\langle g \rangle_f := Z_f^{-1} \int e^{-f} g, \quad \text{where } Z_f := \int e^{-f}, \quad (5.17)$$

is a state. It is a Gibbs state with entropy

$$S_f := \bar{k}(f + \log Z_f). \quad (5.18)$$

(iii) The **KMS condition** (cf. KUBO [143], MARTIN & SCHWINGER [166])

$$\langle gh \rangle_f = \langle hQ_f g \rangle \quad \text{for bounded } g, h \quad (5.19)$$

holds. Here Q_f is the linear mapping defined by

$$Q_f g := e^{-f} g e^f.$$

Proof. (i) If the entropies S and S' define the same Gibbs state then

$$\int (e^{-S/\bar{k}} - e^{-S'/\bar{k}}) g = \langle g \rangle - \langle g \rangle = 0$$

for all g , hence (5.9) gives $e^{-S/\bar{k}} - e^{-S'/\bar{k}} = 0$. This implies that $e^{-S/\bar{k}} = e^{-S'/\bar{k}}$, hence $S = S'$ by Proposition 5.1.9.

³As we shall see in (14.20) and (6.42), \hbar and \bar{k} play indeed analogous roles in quantum mechanical and thermodynamic uncertainty relations.

(ii) The quantity $d := e^{-f/2}$ is nonzero and satisfies $d^* = d$, $e^{-f} = d^*d \geq 0$. Hence $Z_f > 0$ by (EA2), and $\rho := Z_f^{-1}e^{-f}$ is Hermitian and nonnegative. For $h \geq 0$, the quantity $g = \sqrt{f}$ is Hermitian (by Proposition 5.1.9) and satisfies $g\rho g^* = Z_f^{-1}(gd)(gd)^* \geq 0$, hence by (EA3),

$$\langle h \rangle_f = \langle g^*g \rangle_f = \int \rho g^*g = \int g\rho g^* \geq 0.$$

Moreover, $\langle 1 \rangle_f = Z_f^{-1} \int e^{-f} = 1$. Similarly, if $g \geq 0$ then $g = h^*H$ with $h = \sqrt{g} = h^*$ and with $k := e^{-f/2}h$, we get

$$Z_f \langle g \rangle_f = \int e^{-f} h h^* = \int h^* e^{-f} h = \int k^* k \geq 0.$$

This implies (E3). the other axioms (E1)–(E4) follow easily from the corresponding properties of the integral. Thus $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ is a state. Finally, with the definition (5.18), we have

$$Z_f^{-1}e^{-f} = e^{-f - \log Z_f} = e^{-S_f/k},$$

whence $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ is a Gibbs state.

(iii) By (EA3), $\langle hQ_f g \rangle_f = \int e^{-f} h Q_f g = \int Q_f g e^{-f} h = \int e^{-f} g h = \langle g h \rangle_f$. \square

Note that the state (5.17) is unaltered when f is shifted by a constant. Q_f is called the **modular automorphism** of the state $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ since $Q_f(gh) = Q_f(g)Q_f(h)$; for a classical system, Q_f is the identity. In the following, we shall not make use of the KMS condition; however, it plays an important role in the mathematics of the thermodynamic limit (cf. THIRRING [240]).

Z_f is called the **partition function** of f ; it is a function of whatever parameters appear in a particular form given to f in the applications. A large part of traditional statistical mechanics is concerned with the calculation, for given f , of the partition function Z_f and of the values $\langle g \rangle_f$ for selected quantities g . As we shall see, the basic results of statistical mechanics are completely independent of the details involved, and it is this basic part that we concentrate upon in this book.

5.2.4 Example. A **canonical ensemble**⁴, is defined as a Gibbs state whose entropy is an affine function of a Hermitian quantity H , called the **Hamiltonian**:

$$S = \beta H + \text{const},$$

with a constant depending on β , computable from (5.18) and the partition function

$$Z = \int e^{-\beta H}$$

⁴ Except in the traditional notions of a microcanonical, canonical, or grand canonical ensemble, we avoid the term **ensemble** which in statistical mechanics is de facto uses as a synonym for state but often has the connotation of a large real or imagined collection of identical copies of a systems. The latter interpretation has well-known difficulties to explain why each single macroscopic system is described correctly by thermodynamics; see, e.g., SKLAR [228].

of $f = \beta H$. In particular, in the quantum case, where f is the trace, the finiteness of Z implies that S and hence H must have a discrete spectrum that is bounded below. Hence the partition function takes the familiar form

$$Z = \text{tr} e^{-\beta H} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} e^{-\beta E_n}, \quad (5.20)$$

where the E_n ($n \in \mathcal{N}$) are the **energy levels**, the eigenvalues of H . If the spectrum of H is known, this leads to explicit formulas for Z . For example, a **two level system** is defined by the energy levels $0, E$ (or E_0 and $E_0 + E$, which gives the same results), and has

$$Z = 1 + e^{-\beta E}. \quad (5.21)$$

It describes a single **Fermion mode**, but also many other systems at low temperature; cf. (6.56). In particular, it is the basis of laser-induced chemical reactions in photochemistry (see, e.g., KARLOV [129], MUROV et al. [178]), where only two electronic energy levels (the ground state and the first excited state) are relevant; cf. the discussion of (6.56) below.

For a **harmonic oscillator**, defined by the energy levels nE , $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and describing a single **Boson mode**, we have

$$Z = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-n\beta E} = (1 - e^{-\beta E})^{-1}.$$

Independent modes are modelled by taking tensor products of single mode algebras and adding their Hamiltonians, leading to spectra which are obtained by summing the eigenvalues of the modes in all possible ways. The resulting partition function is the product of the single-mode partition functions.] From here, a thermodynamic limit leads to the properties of ideal gases. Then nonideal gases due to interactions can be handled using the cumulant expansion, as indicated at the end of Section 5.3. The details are outside the scope of this book.

Since the Hamiltonian can be any Hermitian quantity, the quantum partition function formula (5.20) can in principle be used to compute the partition function of arbitrary quantized Hermitian quantities.

5.3 Kubo product and generating functional

The negative logarithm of the partition function, the so-called generating functional, plays a fundamental role in statistical mechanics.

We first discuss a number of general properties, discovered by GIBBS [90], PEIERLS [190], BOGOLIUBOV [33], KUBO [144], MORI [174], and GRIFFITHS [100]. The somewhat technical setting involving the Kubo inner product is necessary to handle noncommuting quantities correctly; everything would be much easier in the classical case. On a first reading, the proofs in this section may be skipped.

5.3.1 Proposition. *Let f be Hermitian such that e^{sf} is strongly integrable for all $s \in [-1, 1]$. Then*

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f := \langle g E_f h \rangle_f, \quad (5.22)$$

where E_f is the linear mapping defined for Hermitian f by

$$E_f h := \int_0^1 ds e^{-sf} h e^{sf},$$

defines a bilinear, positive definite inner product $\langle \cdot; \cdot \rangle_f$ on the algebra of quantities, called the **Kubo** (or **Mori** or **Bogoliubov**) **inner product**. For all f, g , the following relations hold:

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f^* = \langle h^*; g^* \rangle_f. \quad (5.23)$$

$$\langle g^*; g \rangle_f > 0 \quad \text{if } g \neq 0. \quad (5.24)$$

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f = g \langle h \rangle_f \quad \text{if } g \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (5.25)$$

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f = \langle gh \rangle_f \quad \text{if } g \text{ or } h \text{ commutes with } f, \quad (5.26)$$

$$E_f g = g \quad \text{if } g \text{ commutes with } f, \quad (5.27)$$

If $f = f(\lambda)$ depends continuously differentiablely on the real parameter vector λ then

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} e^{-f} = - \left(E_f \frac{df}{d\lambda} \right) e^{-f}. \quad (5.28)$$

Proof. (i) We have

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f^* = \langle (g E_f h)^* \rangle_f = \langle (E_f h)^* g^* \rangle_f = \left\langle \int_0^1 ds e^{sf} h^* e^{-sf} g^* \right\rangle_f = \int_0^1 ds \langle e^{sf} h^* e^{-sf} g^* \rangle_f.$$

The integrand equals

$$\int e^{-f} e^{sf} h^* e^{-sf} g^* = \int e^{sf} e^{-f} h^* e^{-sf} g^* = \int e^{-f} h^* e^{-sf} g^* e^{sf} = \langle h^* e^{-sf} g^* e^{sf} \rangle_f$$

by (EA3), hence

$$\langle g; h \rangle_f^* = \int_0^1 ds \langle h^* e^{-sf} g^* e^{sf} \rangle_f = \left\langle h^* \int_0^1 ds e^{-sf} g^* e^{sf} \right\rangle_f = \langle h^* E_f g^* \rangle_f = \langle h^*; g^* \rangle_f.$$

Thus (5.23) holds.

(ii) Suppose that $g \neq 0$. For $s \in [0, 1]$, we define $u = s/2, v = (1-s)/2$ and $g(s) := e^{-uf} g e^{vf}$. Since f is Hermitian, $g(s)^* = e^{vf} g^* e^{-uf}$, hence by (EA3) and (EA2),

$$\int e^{-f} g^* e^{-sf} g e^{sf} = \int e^{vf} g e^{-2uf} g^* e^{vf} = \int g(s)^* g(s) > 0,$$

so that

$$\langle g^*; g \rangle_f = \langle g^* E_f g \rangle_f = \int_0^1 ds \int e^{-f} g^* e^{-sf} g e^{sf} > 0.$$

This proves (5.24), and shows that the Kubo inner product is positive definite.

(iii) If f and g commute then $ge^{sf} = e^{sf}g$, hence

$$E_f g = \int_0^1 ds e^{-sf} e^{sf} g = \int_0^1 ds g = g,$$

giving (5.27). The definition of the Kubo inner product then implies (5.26), and taking $g \in \mathbb{C}$ gives (5.25).

(iv) The function q on $[0, 1]$ defined by

$$q(t) := \int_0^t ds e^{-sf} \frac{df}{d\lambda} e^{sf} + \left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} e^{-tf} \right) e^{tf}$$

satisfies $q(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt} q(t) = e^{-tf} \frac{df}{d\lambda} e^{tf} + \left(\frac{d}{d\lambda} e^{-tf} \right) f e^{tf} + \frac{d}{d\lambda} (-e^{-tf} f) e^{tf} = 0.$$

Hence q vanishes identically. In particular, $q(1) = 0$, giving (5.28). \square

As customary in thermodynamics, we use differentials to express relations involving the differentiation by arbitrary parameters. To write (5.28) in differential form, we formally multiply by $d\lambda$, and obtain the **quantum chain rule** for exponentials,

$$de^{-f} = (-E_f df) e^{-f}. \quad (5.29)$$

If the $f(\lambda)$ commute for all values of λ then the quantum chain rule reduces to the classical chain rule. Indeed, then f commutes also with $\frac{df}{d\lambda}$; hence $E_f \frac{df}{d\lambda} = \frac{df}{d\lambda}$, and $E_f df = df$.

The following theorem is central to the mathematics of statistical mechanics. As will be apparent from the discussion in the next chapter, part (i) is the abstract mathematical form of the second law of thermodynamics, part (ii) allows the actual computation of thermal properties from microscopic assumptions, and part (iii) is the abstract form of the first law.

5.3.2 Theorem. *Let f be Hermitian such that e^{sf} is strongly integrable for all $s \in [-1, 1]$.*

(i) **The generating functional**

$$W(f) := -\log \int e^{-f} \quad (5.30)$$

is a concave function of the Hermitian quantity f . In particular,

$$W(g) \leq W(f) + \langle g - f \rangle_f. \quad \text{(Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality)} \quad (5.31)$$

Equality holds in (5.31) iff f and g differ by a constant.

(ii) *For Hermitian g , we have*

$$W(f + \tau g) = W(f) - \log \langle e^{-f - \tau g} e^f \rangle_f. \quad (5.32)$$

Moreover, the **cumulant expansion**

$$W(f + \tau g) = W(f) + \tau \langle g \rangle_f + \frac{\tau^2}{2} (\langle g \rangle_f^2 - \langle g; g \rangle_f) + O(\tau^3) \quad (5.33)$$

holds if the coefficients are finite.

(iii) If $f = f(\lambda)$ and $g = g(\lambda)$ depend continuously differentiably on λ then the following **differentiation formulas** hold:

$$d\langle g \rangle_f = \langle dg \rangle_f - \langle g; df \rangle_f + \langle g \rangle_f \langle df \rangle_f, \quad (5.34)$$

$$dW(f) = \langle df \rangle_f. \quad (5.35)$$

(iv) The entropy of the state $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ is

$$S = k(f - W(f)). \quad (5.36)$$

Proof. We prove the assertions in reverse order.

(iv) Equation (5.30) says that $W(f) = -\log Z_f$, which together with (5.18) gives (5.36).

(iii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} d\int g e^{-f} &= \int d g e^{-f} + \int g d e^{-f} = \int d g e^{-f} - \int g E_f d f e^{-f} \\ &= \int (d g - g E_f d f) e^{-f} = Z_f \langle d g - g E_f d f \rangle_f. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $d\int g e^{-f} = d(Z_f \langle g \rangle_f) = dZ_f \langle g \rangle_f + Z_f d\langle g \rangle_f$, so that

$$dZ_f \langle g \rangle_f + Z_f d\langle g \rangle_f = Z_f \langle d g - g E_f d f \rangle_f = Z_f \langle d g \rangle_f - Z_f \langle g; d f \rangle_f. \quad (5.37)$$

In particular, for $g = 1$ we find by (5.25) that $dZ_f = -Z_f \langle 1; d f \rangle_f = -Z_f \langle d f \rangle_f$. Now (5.35) follows from $dW(f) = -d \log Z_f = -dZ_f/Z_f = \langle d f \rangle_f$, and solving (5.37) for $d\langle g \rangle_f$ gives (5.34).

(ii) Equation (5.32) follows from

$$e^{-W(h)} = \int e^{-h} = \int e^{-h} e^f e^{-f} = \int e^{-f} e^{-h} e^f = (\int e^{-f}) \langle e^{-h} e^f \rangle_f = e^{-W(f)} \langle e^{-h} e^f \rangle_f$$

by taking logarithms and setting $h = f + \tau g$. To prove the cumulant expansion, we introduce the function ϕ defined by

$$\phi(\tau) := W(f + \tau g),$$

From (5.35), we find $\phi'(\tau) = \langle g \rangle_{f+\tau g}$ for f, g independent of τ , and by differentiating this again,

$$\phi''(\tau) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \langle g \rangle_{f+\tau g} = - \left\langle g \frac{E_f d(f + \tau g)}{d\tau} \right\rangle_{f+\tau g} + \langle g \rangle_{f+\tau g}^2.$$

In particular,

$$\phi'(0) = \langle g \rangle_f, \quad \phi''(0) = \langle g \rangle_f^2 - \langle g E_f g \rangle_f = \langle g \rangle_f^2 - \langle g; g \rangle_f. \quad (5.38)$$

A Taylor expansion now implies (5.33).

(i) Since the Cauchy-Schwarz equation for the Kubo inner product implies

$$\langle g \rangle_f^2 = \langle g; 1 \rangle_f^2 \leq \langle g; g \rangle_f \langle 1; 1 \rangle_f = \langle g; g \rangle_f,$$

(5.38) implies that

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} W(f + \tau g) \right|_{\tau=0} \leq 0$$

for all f, g . This implies that $W(f)$ is concave. Moreover, replacing f by $f + sg$, we find that $\phi''(s) \leq 0$ for all s . The remainder form of Taylor's theorem therefore gives

$$\phi(\tau) = \phi(0) + \tau\phi'(0) + \int_0^\tau ds(\tau - s)\phi''(s) \leq \phi(0) + \tau\phi'(0),$$

and for $\tau = 1$ we get

$$W(f + g) \leq W(f) + \langle g \rangle_f. \quad (5.39)$$

(5.31) follows for $\tau = 1$ upon replacing g by $g - f$.

By the derivation, equality holds in (5.39) only if $\phi''(s) = 0$ for all $0 < s < 1$. By (5.38), applied with $f + sg$ in place of f , this implies $\langle g \rangle_{f+sg}^2 = \langle g; g \rangle_{f+sg}$. Thus we have equality in the Cauchy-Schwarz argument, forcing g to be a multiple of 1. Therefore equality in the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality (5.31) is possible only if $g - f$ is a constant. \square

As a consequence of the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality, we derive an important inequality for the entropy.

5.3.3 Theorem. *Let S_c be the entropy of a reference state. Then, for an arbitrary Gibbs state $\langle \cdot \rangle$ with entropy S ,*

$$\langle S \rangle \leq \langle S_c \rangle, \quad (5.40)$$

with equality only if $S_c = S$.

Proof. Let $f = S/k$ and $g = S_c/k$. Since S and S_c are entropies, $W(f) = W(g) = 0$, and the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality (5.31) gives $0 \leq \langle g - f \rangle_f = \langle S_c - S \rangle/k$. This implies (5.40). If equality holds then equality holds in (5.31), so that S_c and S differ only by a constant. But this constant vanishes since the values agree. \square

The difference

$$\langle S_c - S \rangle = \langle S_c \rangle - \langle S \rangle \geq 0 \quad (5.41)$$

is known as **relative entropy**. In an information theoretical context (cf. Section 7.6), the relative entropy may be interpreted as the amount of information in a state $\langle \cdot \rangle$ which cannot be explained by the reference state. This interpretation makes sense since the relative entropy vanishes precisely for the reference state. A large relative entropy therefore indicates that the state contains some important information not present in the reference state.

Approximations. The cumulant expansion is the basis of a well-known approximation method in statistical mechanics. Starting from special reference states $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ with explicitly known $W(f)$ and E_f (corresponding to so-called explicitly solvable models), one obtains inductively expressions for values in these states by applying the differentiation rules. (In the most important cases, the resulting formulas for the values are commonly referred to as a **Wick theorem**, cf. WICK [260], although the formulas are much older and were derived in 1918 by ISSERLIS [118]. For details, see textbooks on statistical mechanics, e.g., HUANG [115], REICHL [205].)

From these, one can calculate the coefficients in the cumulant expansion; note that higher order terms can be found by proceeding as in the proof, using further differentiation. This gives approximate generating functions (and by differentiation associated values) for Gibbs states with an entropy close to the explicitly solvable reference state. From the resulting generating function and the differentiation formulas (5.34)–(5.35), one gets as before the values for the given state.

The best tractable reference state $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ to be used for a given Gibbs state $\langle \cdot \rangle_g$ can be obtained by minimizing the upper bound in the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality (5.31) over all f for which an explicit generating function is known. Frequently, one simply approximates $W(g)$ by the minimum of this upper bound,

$$W(g) \approx W_m(g) := \inf_f \left(W(f) + \langle g - f \rangle_f \right). \quad (5.42)$$

Using $W_m(g)$ in place of $W(g)$ defines a so-called **mean field theory**; cf. CALLEN [49]. For computations from first principles (quantum field theory), see, e.g., the survey by BERGES et al. [119].

5.4 Limit resolution and uncertainty

Definition 5.2.1 generalizes the expectation axioms of WHITTLE [259, Section 2.2] for classical probability theory. Indeed, the values of our quantities are traditionally called expectation values, and refer to the mean over an ensemble of (real or imagined) identically prepared systems.

In our treatment, we keep the notation with pointed brackets familiar from statistical mechanics, but use the more neutral term *value* for $\langle f \rangle$ to avoid any reference to probability or statistics. This keeps the formal machinery completely independent of controversial issues about the interpretation of probabilities. Statistics and measurements, where the probabilistic aspect enters directly, are discussed separately in Chapter 7.2.

The key to an interpretation of the values of quantities as objective, observer-independent properties is an analysis of the uncertainty inherent in the description of a system by a state, based on the following result.

5.4.1 Proposition. *For Hermitian g ,*

$$\langle g \rangle^2 \leq \langle g^2 \rangle. \quad (5.43)$$

Equality holds if $g = \langle g \rangle$.

Proof. Put $\bar{g} = \langle g \rangle$. Then $0 \leq \langle (g - \bar{g})^2 \rangle = \langle g^2 - 2\bar{g}g + \bar{g}^2 \rangle = \langle g^2 \rangle - 2\bar{g}\langle g \rangle + \bar{g}^2 = \langle g^2 \rangle - \langle g \rangle^2$. This gives (5.43). If $g = \bar{g}$ then equality holds in this argument. \square

5.4.2 Definition. The number

$$\text{cov}(f, g) := \text{Re}\langle (f - \bar{f})^*(g - \bar{g}) \rangle$$

is called the **covariance** of $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$. Two quantities f, g are called **uncorrelated** if $\text{cov}(f, g) = 0$, and **correlated** otherwise. The number

$$\sigma(f) := \sqrt{\text{cov}(f, f)}$$

is called the **uncertainty** of $f \in \mathbb{E}$ in the state $\langle \cdot \rangle$. The number

$$\text{res}(g) := \sqrt{\langle g^2 \rangle / \langle g \rangle^2 - 1}, \quad (5.44)$$

is called the **limit resolution** of a Hermitian quantity g with nonzero value $\langle g \rangle$.

Note that (E3) and (5.43) ensure that $\sigma(f)$ and $\text{res}(g)$ are nonnegative real numbers that vanish if f, g are constant, i.e., complex numbers, and $g \neq 0$. This definition is analogous to the definitions of elementary classical statistics, where \mathbb{E} is a commutative algebra of random variables, to the present, more general situation; in a statistical context, the uncertainty $\sigma(f)$ is referred to as **standard deviation**.

There is no need to associate an intrinsic statistical meaning to the above concepts. We treat the uncertainty $\sigma(f)$ and the limit resolution $\text{res}(g)$ simply as an absolute and relative uncertainty measure, respectively, specifying how accurately one can treat g as a sharp number, given by this value.

In experimental practice, the limit resolution is a lower bound on the relative accuracy with which one can expect $\langle g \rangle$ to be determinable reliably⁵ from measurements of a single system at a single time. In particular, a quantity g is considered to be **significant** if $\text{res}(g) \ll 1$, while it is **noise** if $\text{res}(g) \gg 1$. If g is a quantity and \tilde{g} is a good approximation of its value then $\Delta g := g - \tilde{g}$ is noise. Sufficiently significant quantities can be treated as **deterministic**; the analysis of noise is the subject of **statistics**.

5.4.3 Proposition. For any state,

$$(i) \quad f \leq g \quad \Rightarrow \quad \langle f \rangle \leq \langle g \rangle.$$

⁵The situation is analogous to the limit resolution with which one can determine the longitude and latitude of a city such as Vienna. Clearly these are well-defined only up to some limit resolution related to the diameter of the city. No amount of measurements can reduce the uncertainty below about 10km. For an extended object, the uncertainty in its position is conceptual, not just a lack of knowledge or precision. Indeed, a point may be defined to be an object in a state where the position has zero limit resolution.

(ii) For $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{cov}(f, g) &= \operatorname{Re}(\langle f^*g \rangle - \langle f \rangle^* \langle g \rangle), \\ \langle f^*f \rangle &= \langle f \rangle^* \langle f \rangle + \sigma(f)^2, \\ |\langle f \rangle| &\leq \sqrt{\langle f^*f \rangle}.\end{aligned}$$

(iii) If f is Hermitian then $\bar{f} = \langle f \rangle$ is real and

$$\sigma(f) = \sqrt{\langle (f - \bar{f})^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle f^2 \rangle - \langle f \rangle^2}.$$

(iv) Two commuting Hermitian quantities f, g are uncorrelated iff

$$\langle fg \rangle = \langle f \rangle \langle g \rangle.$$

Proof. (i) follows from (E1) and (E3).

(ii) The first formula holds since

$$\langle (f - \bar{f})^*(g - \bar{g}) \rangle = \langle f^*g \rangle - \bar{f}^* \langle g \rangle - \langle f \rangle^* \bar{g} + \bar{f}^* \bar{g} = \langle f^*g \rangle - \langle f \rangle^* \langle g \rangle.$$

The second formula follows for $g = f$, using (E1), and the third formula is an immediate consequence.

(iii) follows from (E1) and (ii).

(iv) If f, g are Hermitian and commute the fg is Hermitian by Proposition 5.1.3(ii), hence $\langle fg \rangle$ is real. By (ii), $\operatorname{cov}(f, g) = \langle fg \rangle - \langle f \rangle \langle g \rangle$, and the assertion follows. \square

Formally, the essential difference between classical mechanics and quantum mechanics in the latter's lack of commutativity. While in classical mechanics there is in principle no lower limit to the uncertainties with which we can prepare the quantities in a system of interest, the quantum mechanical uncertainty relation for noncommuting quantities puts strict limits on the uncertainties in the preparation of microscopic states. Here, *preparation* is defined informally as bringing the system into an state such that measuring certain quantities f gives numbers that agree with the values $\langle f \rangle$ to an accuracy specified by given uncertainties.

We now discuss the limits of the accuracy to which this can be done.

5.4.4 Proposition.

(i) **The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality**

$$|\langle f^*g \rangle|^2 \leq \langle f^*f \rangle \langle g^*g \rangle$$

holds for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$.

(ii) **The uncertainty relation**

$$\sigma(f)^2 \sigma(g)^2 \geq |\operatorname{cov}(f, g)|^2 + \left| \frac{1}{2} \langle f^*g - g^*f \rangle \right|^2$$

holds for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$.

(iii) For $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$\text{cov}(f, g) = \text{cov}(g, f) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma(f+g)^2 - \sigma(f)^2 - \sigma(g)^2), \quad (5.45)$$

$$|\text{cov}(f, g)| \leq \sigma(f)\sigma(g), \quad (5.46)$$

$$\sigma(f+g) \leq \sigma(f) + \sigma(g). \quad (5.47)$$

In particular,

$$|\langle fg \rangle - \langle f \rangle \langle g \rangle| \leq \sigma(f)\sigma(g) \quad \text{for commuting Hermitian } f, g. \quad (5.48)$$

Proof. (i) For arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \langle (\alpha f - \beta g)^*(\alpha f - \beta g) \rangle \\ &= \alpha^* \alpha \langle f^* f \rangle - \alpha^* \beta \langle f^* g \rangle - \beta^* \alpha \langle g^* f \rangle + \beta^* \beta \langle g^* g \rangle \\ &= |\alpha|^2 \langle f^* f \rangle - 2 \text{Re}(\alpha^* \beta \langle f^* g \rangle) + |\beta|^2 \langle g^* g \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\beta = \langle f^* g \rangle$, and obtain for arbitrary real α the inequality

$$0 \leq \alpha^2 \langle f^* f \rangle - 2\alpha |\langle f^* g \rangle|^2 + |\langle f^* g \rangle|^2 \langle g^* g \rangle. \quad (5.49)$$

The further choice $\alpha = \langle g^* g \rangle$ gives

$$0 \leq \langle g^* g \rangle^2 \langle f^* f \rangle - \langle g^* g \rangle |\langle f^* g \rangle|^2.$$

If $\langle g^* g \rangle > 0$, we find after division by $\langle g^* g \rangle$ that (i) holds. And if $\langle g^* g \rangle \leq 0$ then $\langle g^* g \rangle = 0$ and we have $\langle f^* g \rangle = 0$ since otherwise a tiny α produces a negative right hand side in (5.49). Thus (i) also holds in this case.

(ii) Since $(f - \bar{f})^*(g - \bar{g}) - (g - \bar{g})^*(f - \bar{f}) = f^*g - g^*f$, it is sufficient to prove the uncertainty relation for the case of quantities f, g whose value vanishes. In this case, (i) implies

$$(\text{Re}\langle f^*g \rangle)^2 + (\text{Im}\langle f^*g \rangle)^2 = |\langle f^*g \rangle|^2 \leq \langle f^*f \rangle \langle g^*g \rangle = \sigma(f)^2 \sigma(g)^2.$$

The assertion follows since $\text{Re}\langle f^*g \rangle = \text{cov}(f, g)$ and

$$i \text{Im}\langle f^*g \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\langle f^*g \rangle - \langle f^*g \rangle^*) = \frac{1}{2}\langle f^*g - g^*f \rangle.$$

(iii) Again, it is sufficient to consider the case of quantities f, g whose value vanishes. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(f+g)^2 &= \langle (f+g)^*(f+g) \rangle = \langle f^*f \rangle + \langle f^*g + g^*f \rangle + \langle g^*g \rangle \\ &= \sigma(f)^2 + 2 \text{cov}(f, g) + \sigma(g)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

and (5.45) follows. (5.46) is an immediate consequence of (ii), and (5.47) follows easily from (5.50) and (5.46). Finally, (5.48) is a consequence of (5.46) and Proposition 5.4.3(iii). \square

If we apply Proposition 5.4.4(ii) to scalar position q and momentum p variables satisfying the **canonical commutation relation**

$$[q, p] = i\hbar, \quad (5.51)$$

we obtain

$$\sigma(q)\sigma(p) \geq \frac{1}{2}\hbar, \quad (5.52)$$

the **uncertainty relation** of HEISENBERG [110, 212]. it implies that no state exists where both position q and momentum p have arbitrarily small uncertainty.

Chapter 6

The laws of thermodynamics

This chapter rederives the laws of thermodynamics from statistical mechanics, thus putting the phenomenological discussion of Chapter 4 on more basic foundations.

We confine our attention to a restricted but very important class of Gibbs states, those describing thermal states. We introduce thermal states by selecting the quantities whose values shall act as extensive variables in a thermal model. On this level, we shall be able to reproduce the phenomenological setting of the present section from first principles; see the discussion after Theorem 6.2.3. If the underlying detailed model is assumed to be known then the system function, and with it all thermal properties, are computable in principle, although we only hint at the ways to do this numerically. We also look at a hierarchy of thermal models based on the same bottom level description and discuss how to decide which description levels are appropriate.

Although dynamics is important for systems not in global equilibrium, we completely ignore dynamical issues in this chapter. We take a strictly kinematic point of view, and look as before only at a single phase without chemical reactions. In principle, it is possible to extend the present setting to cover the dynamics of the nonequilibrium case and deduce quantitatively the dynamical laws of nonequilibrium thermodynamics (BERIS & EDWARDS [29], OETTINGER [186]) from microscopic properties, including phase formation, chemical reactions, and the approach to equilibrium; see, e.g., BALIAN [15], GRABERT [97], RAU & MÜLLER [203], SPOHN [231].

6.1 The zeroth law: Thermal states

Thermal states are special Gibbs states, used in statistical mechanics to model macroscopic physical systems that are homogeneous on the (global, local, microlocal, or quantum) level used for modeling. They have all the properties traditionally postulated in thermodynamics. While we discuss the lower levels on an informal basis, we consider in the formulas for notational simplicity mainly the case of global equilibrium, where there are only finitely many extensive variables. Everything extends, however, with (formally trivial but from a

rigorous mathematical view nontrivial) changes to local and microlocal equilibrium, where extensive variables are fields, provided the sums are replaced by appropriate integrals; cf. OETTINGER [186].

In the setting of statistical mechanics, the intensive variables are, as in Section 4.1, numbers parameterizing the entropy and characterizing a particular system at a particular time. To each admissible combination of intensive variables there is a unique thermal state providing values for all quantities. The extensive variables then appear as the values of corresponding extensive quantities.

A basic extensive quantity present in each thermal system is the **Hamilton energy** H ; it is identical to the **Hamiltonian** function (or operator) in the underlying dynamical description of the classical (or quantum) system. In addition, there are further basic extensive quantities which we call X_j ($j \in J$) and collect in a vector X , indexed by J . All other extensive quantities are expressible as linear combinations of these basic extensive quantities. The number and meaning of the extensive variables depends on the type of the system; typical examples are given in Table 7.1 in Section 7.2.

In the context of statistical mechanics (cf. Examples 5.1.8), the Euclidean $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} is typically an algebra of functions (for classical physics) or linear operators (for quantum physics), and H is a particular function or linear operator characterizing the class of systems considered. The form of the operators X_j depends on the level of thermal modeling; for further discussion, see Section 7.2.

For qualitative theory and for deriving semi-empirical recipes, there is no need to know details about H or X_j ; it suffices to treat them as primitive objects. The advantage we gain from this less detailed setting is that a much simpler machinery than that of statistical mechanics proper suffices to reconstruct all of *phenomenological* thermodynamics.

It is intuitively clear from the informal definition of extensive variables in Section 4.5 that the only functions of independent extensive variables that are again extensive can be linear combinations, and it is a little surprising that *the whole machinery of equilibrium thermodynamics follows from a formal version of the simple assumption that in thermal states the entropy is extensive*. We take this to be the mathematical expression of the zeroth law and formalize this assumption in a precise mathematical definition.

6.1.1 Definition. A **thermal system** is defined by a family of Hermitian **extensive variables** H and X_j ($j \in J$) from a Euclidean $*$ -algebra. A **thermal state** of a thermal system is a Gibbs state whose entropy S is a linear combination of the basic extensive quantities of the form

$$S = T^{-1} \left(H - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j X_j \right) = T^{-1} (H - \alpha \cdot X) \quad (\text{zeroth law of thermodynamics}) \quad (6.1)$$

with suitable real numbers $T \neq 0$ and α_j ($j \in J$). Here α and X are the vectors with components α_j ($j \in J$) and X_j ($j \in J$), respectively.

Thus the value of an arbitrary quantity g is

$$\bar{g} := \langle g \rangle = \int e^{-\beta(H - \alpha \cdot X)} g, \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$\beta = \frac{1}{kT}. \quad (6.3)$$

The numbers α_j are called the **intensive variables conjugate to X_j** , the number T is called the **temperature**, and β the **coldness**. $\overline{S}, \overline{H}, \overline{X}, T$, and α are called the **thermal variables** of the system. Note that the extensive variables of traditional thermodynamics are in the present setting not represented by the extensive quantities S, H, X_j themselves but by their values $\overline{S}, \overline{H}, \overline{X}$.

Since we can write the zeroth law (6.1) in the form

$$H = TS + \alpha \cdot X, \quad (6.4)$$

called the **Euler equation**, the temperature T is considered to be the intensive variable conjugate to the entropy S .

6.1.2 Remarks. (i) As already discussed in Example 4.1.4 for the case of temperature, measuring intensive variables is based upon the empirical fact that two systems in contact where the free exchange of some extensive quantity is allowed tend to relax to a joint equilibrium state, in which the corresponding intensive variable is the same in both systems. If a small measuring device is brought into close contact with a large system, the joint equilibrium state will be only minimally different from the original state of the large system; hence the intensive variables of the measuring device will move to the values of the intensive variables of the large system in the location of the measuring device. This allows to read off their value from a calibrated scale.

(ii) Many treatises of equilibrium thermodynamics take the possibility of measuring temperature to be the contents of the zeroth law of thermodynamics. The present, different choice for the zeroth law has far reaching consequences. Indeed, as we shall see, the definition implies the first and second law, and (together with a quantization condition) the third law of thermodynamics. Thus these become theorems rather than separately postulated laws.

(iii) We emphasize that the extensive quantities H and X_j are independent of the intensive quantities T and α , while S , defined by (6.1), is an extensive quantity defined only when values for the intensive quantities are prescribed. From (6.1) it is clear that values also depend on the particular state a system is in. It is crucial to distinguish between the quantities H or X_j , which are part of the definition of the system but independent of the state (since they are independent of T and α), and their values $\overline{H} = \langle H \rangle$ or $\overline{X}_j = \langle X_j \rangle$, which change with the state.

(iv) In thermodynamics, the interest is restricted to the values of the thermal variables. In statistical mechanics, the values of the thermal variables determine a state of the microscopic system. In particular, the knowledge of the intensive variables allows one to compute the values (6.2) of *arbitrary* microscopic quantities, not only the extensive ones. Of course, these values don't give information about the position and momentum of individual particles but only about their means. For example, the mean velocity of an ideal monatomic gas at temperature T turns out to be $\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0$, and the mean velocity-squared is $\langle \mathbf{v}^2 \rangle = 3kT$.

(v) A general Gibbs state has an incredibly high complexity. Indeed, in the classical case, the specification of an arbitrary Gibbs state for 1 mole of a pure, monatomic substance such as Argon requires specifying the entropy S , a function of $6N_A \approx 36 \cdot 10^{23}$ degrees of freedom. In comparison, a global equilibrium state of Argon is specified by three numbers T, p and μ , a local equilibrium state by three fields depending on four parameters (time and position) only, and a microlocal equilibrium state by three fields depending on seven parameters (time, position, and momentum). Thus global, local, and microlocal equilibrium states form a small minority in the class of all Gibbs states. It is remarkable that this small class of states suffices for the engineering accuracy description of all macroscopic phenomena.

(vi) Of course, the number of thermal variables or fields needed to describe a system depends on the true physical situation. For example, a system that is in local equilibrium only cannot be adequately described by the few variables characterizing global equilibrium. The question of selecting the right set of extensive quantities for an adequate description is discussed in Section 7.2.

(vii) The formulation (6.1) is almost universally used in practice. However, an arbitrary linear combination

$$S = \gamma H + h_0 X_0 + \dots + h_s X_s \quad (6.5)$$

can be written in the form (6.1) with $T = 1/\gamma$ and $\alpha_j = -h_j/\gamma$, provided that $\gamma \neq 0$; indeed, (6.5) is mathematically the more natural form, which also allows states of infinite temperature that are excluded in (6.1). This shows that the coldness β is a more natural variable than the temperature T ; it figures prominently in statistical mechanics. Indeed, the formulas of statistical mechanics are continuous in β even for systems such as those considered in Example 6.2.5, where β may become zero or negative. The temperature T reaches in this case infinity, then jumps to minus infinity, and then continues to increase. According to LANDAU & LIFSHITZ [151], states of negative temperature, i.e., negative coldness, must therefore be considered to be hotter, i.e., less cold, than states of any positive temperature. On the other hand, in the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, a system becomes infinitely cold, giving intuition for the unattainability of zero absolute temperature.

(viii) In mathematical statistics, there is a large body of work on *exponential families*, which is essentially the mathematical equivalent of the concept of a thermal state over a commutative algebra; see, e.g., BARNDORFF-NIELSEN [22]. In this context, the values of the extensive quantities define a *sufficient statistic*, from which the whole distribution can be reconstructed (cf. Theorem 6.2.4 below and the remarks on objective probability in Section 5.4). This is one of the reasons why exponential families provide a powerful machinery for statistical inference; see, e.g., BERNARDO & SMITH [30]. For recent extensions to quantum statistical inference, see, e.g., BARNDORFF-NIELSEN et al. [23] and the references there.

(ix) For other axiomatic settings for deriving thermodynamics, which provide different perspectives, see CARATHÉODORY [51], HAKEN [107], JAYNES [124], KATZ [132], EMCH & LIU [71], and LIEB & YNGVASON [156].

6.2 The equation of state

Not every combination (T, α) of intensive variables defines a thermal state; the requirement that $\langle 1 \rangle = 1$ enforces a restriction of (T, α) to a manifold of admissible thermal states.

6.2.1 Theorem. *Suppose that $T > 0$.*

(i) *For any $\kappa > 0$, the **system function** Δ defined by*

$$\Delta(T, \alpha) := \kappa T \log \int e^{-\beta(H - \alpha \cdot X)} \quad (6.6)$$

is a convex function of T and α . It vanishes only if T and α are the intensive variables of a thermal state.

(ii) *In a thermal state, the intensive variables are related by the **equation of state***

$$\Delta(T, \alpha) = 0. \quad (6.7)$$

*The **state space** is the set of (T, α) satisfying (6.7).*

(iii) *The values of the extensive variables are given by*

$$\bar{S} = \Omega \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial T}(T, \alpha), \quad \bar{X} = \Omega \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial \alpha}(T, \alpha) \quad \text{for some } \Omega > 0, \quad (6.8)$$

*and the **phenomenological Euler equation***

$$\bar{H} = T\bar{S} + \alpha \cdot \bar{X}. \quad (6.9)$$

(iv) *Regarding \bar{S} and \bar{X} as functions of T and α , the matrix*

$$\Sigma := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \alpha} \\ \frac{\partial \bar{X}}{\partial T} & \frac{\partial \bar{X}}{\partial \alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.10)$$

*is symmetric and positive semidefinite; in particular, we have the **Maxwell reciprocity relations***

$$\frac{\partial \bar{X}_i}{\partial \alpha_j} = \frac{\partial \bar{X}_j}{\partial \alpha_i}, \quad \frac{\partial \bar{X}_i}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial \alpha_i}, \quad (6.11)$$

*and the **stability conditions***

$$\frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial T} \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial \bar{X}_j}{\partial \alpha_j} \geq 0 \quad (j \in J). \quad (6.12)$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.3.2(i), the function ϕ defined by

$$\phi(\alpha_0, \alpha) := \log \int e^{-(\alpha_0 H - \alpha \cdot X)} = -W(\alpha_0 H - \alpha \cdot X)$$

is a convex function of α_0 and α . Put $\Omega = \bar{k}/\kappa$. Then, by Proposition 4.1.1,

$$\Delta(T, \alpha) = -\kappa TW(\beta(H - \alpha \cdot X)) = \kappa T \phi\left(\frac{1}{\bar{k}T}, \frac{\alpha}{\bar{k}T}\right) \quad (6.13)$$

is also convex. The condition $\Delta(T, \alpha) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\int e^{-S/\bar{k}} = \int e^{-\beta(H - \alpha \cdot X)} = e^{\Delta/\kappa T} = 1,$$

the condition for a thermal state. This proves (i) and (ii).

(iii) The formulas for \bar{S} and \bar{X} follow by differentiation of (6.13) with respect to T and α , using (5.35). Equation (6.9) follows by taking values in (6.4), noting that T and α are real numbers.

(iv) By (iii), the matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial T^2} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial T \partial \alpha} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial \alpha \partial T} & \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial \alpha^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is the Hessian matrix of the convex function Δ . Hence Σ is symmetric and positive semidefinite. (6.11) expresses the symmetry of Σ , and (6.12) holds since the diagonal entries of a positive semidefinite matrix are nonnegative. \square

6.2.2 Remarks. (i) For $T < 0$, the same results hold, with the change that Δ is concave instead of convex, Σ is negative semidefinite, and the inequality signs in (6.12) are reversed. This is a rare situation; it can occur only in (nearly) massless systems embedded out of equilibrium within (much heavier) matter, such as spin systems (cf. PURCELL & POUND [200]), radiation fields in a cavity (cf. HSU & BARAKAT [114]), or vortices in 2-dimensional fluids (cf. MONTGOMERY & JOYCE [172], EYINCK & SPOHN [74]). A massive thermal system couples significantly to kinetic energy. In this case, the total momentum p is an extensive quantity, related to the velocity v , the corresponding intensive variable, by $p = Mv$, where M is the extensive total mass of the system. From (6.8), we find that $\bar{p} = \Omega \partial \Delta / \partial v$, which implies that $\Delta = \Delta|_{v=0} + \frac{M}{2\Omega} v^2$. Since the mass is positive, this expression is convex in v , not concave; hence $T > 0$. Thus, in a massive thermal system, the temperature must be positive.

(ii) In the application, the free scaling constant κ is usually chosen as $\kappa = \bar{k}/\Omega$, where Ω is a measure of **system size**, e.g., the total volume or total mass of the system. In actual calculations from statistical mechanics, the integral is usually a function of the system size. To make the result independent of it, one performs the so-called thermodynamic limit $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$; thus Ω must be chosen in such a way that this limit is nontrivial. Extensivity in single phase global equilibrium then justifies treating Ω as an arbitrary positive factor.

In phenomenological thermodynamics (cf. Section 4.1), one makes suitable, more or less heuristic assumptions on the form of the system function, while in **statistical mechanics**,

one derives its form from (6.7) and specific choices for the quantities H and X within one of the settings described in Example 5.1.8. Given these choices, the main task is then the evaluation of the system function (6.6), from which the values of all quantities can be computed. (6.6) can often be approximately evaluated from the cumulant expansion (5.33) and/or a mean field approximation (5.42).

An arbitrary Gibbs state is generally not a thermal state. However, we can try to approximate it by an equilibrium state in which the extensive variables have the same values. The next result shows that the slack (the difference between the left hand side and the right hand side) in (6.14), which will turn out to be the microscopic form of the Euler inequality (4.2), is always nonnegative and vanishes precisely in equilibrium. Thus it can be used as a measure of how close the Gibbs state is to an equilibrium state.

6.2.3 Theorem. *Let $\langle \cdot \rangle$ be a Gibbs state with entropy S . Then, for arbitrary (T, α) satisfying $T > 0$ and the equation of state (6.7), the values $\overline{H} = \langle H \rangle$, $\overline{S} = \langle S \rangle$, and $\overline{X} = \langle X \rangle$ satisfy*

$$\overline{H} \geq T\overline{S} - \alpha \cdot \overline{X}. \quad (6.14)$$

Equality only holds if S is the entropy of a thermal state with intensive variables (T, α) .

Proof. The equation of state implies that $S_c := T^{-1}(H - \alpha \cdot X)$ is the entropy of a thermal state. Now the assertion follows from Theorem 5.3.3, since $\langle S \rangle \leq \langle S_c \rangle = T^{-1}(\langle H \rangle - \alpha \cdot \langle X \rangle)$, with equality only if $S = S_c$. \square

As the theorem shows, everything of macroscopic interest is deducible from an explicit formula for the system function. Hence one can use thermodynamics in many situations very successfully as a phenomenological theory without having to bother about microscopic details. It suffices that a phenomenological expression for $\Delta(T, \alpha)$ is available. In particular, the phenomenological axioms from Section 4.1 now follow by specializing the above to a **standard system**, characterized by the extensive quantities

$$H, X_0 = V, \quad X_j = N_j \quad (j \neq 0), \quad (6.15)$$

where, as before, V denotes the (positive) **volume** of the system, and each N_j denotes the (nonnegative) number of molecules of a fixed chemical composition (we shall call these **particles of kind j**). However, H and the N_j are now quantities from \mathbb{E} , rather than thermal variables. We call

$$P := -\alpha_0 \quad (6.16)$$

the **pressure** and

$$\mu_j := \alpha_j \quad (j \neq 0) \quad (6.17)$$

the **chemical potential** of kind j ; hence

$$\alpha \cdot X = -PV + \mu \cdot N.$$

Specializing the theorem, we find the phenomenological Euler equation

$$\overline{H} = T\overline{S} - PV + \mu \cdot \overline{N}; \quad (6.18)$$

Note that $\bar{V} = V$ since we took V as system size. For reversible changes, we have the first law of thermodynamics

$$d\bar{H} = Td\bar{S} - PdV + \mu \cdot d\bar{N} \quad (6.19)$$

and the Gibbs-Duhem equation

$$0 = \bar{S}dT - VdP + \bar{N} \cdot d\mu. \quad (6.20)$$

A comparison with Section 4.1 shows that dropping the bars from the values reproduces for $T > 0$, $P > 0$ and $\bar{S} \geq 0$ the axioms of phenomenological thermodynamics, except for the extensivity outside equilibrium (which has local equilibrium as its justification). The assumption $T > 0$ was justified in Remark 6.2.2(i), and $\bar{S} \geq 0$ will be justified in Section 6.5. But there seem to be no theoretical arguments which shows that the pressure of a standard system in the above sense must always be positive. (At $T < 0$, negative pressure is possible; see Example 6.2.5.) We'd appreciate getting information about this from readers of this book.

Apart from boundary effects, whose role diminishes as the system gets larger, the extensive quantities scale linearly with the volume. In the thermodynamic limit, corresponding to an idealized system infinitely extended in all directions, the boundary effects disappear and the linear scaling becomes exact, although this can be proved rigorously only in simple situations, e.g., for hard sphere model systems (YANG & LEE [266]) or spin systems (GRIFFITHS [100]). A thorough treatment of the thermodynamic limit (e.g., RUELLE [218, 219], THIRRING [240], or, in the framework of large deviation theory, ELLIS [70]) in general needs considerably more algebraic and analytic machinery, e.g., the need to work in place of thermal states with more abstract KMS-states (which are limits of sequences of thermal states still satisfying a KMS condition (5.19)). Moreover, proving the existence of the limit requires detailed properties of the concrete microscopic description of the system.

For very small systems, typically atomic clusters or molecules, N is fixed and a **canonical ensemble** without the $\mu \cdot N$ term is more appropriate. For the thermodynamics of small systems (see, e.g., (BUSTAMANTE et al. [48], GROSS [102], KRATKY [140]) such as a single cluster of atoms, V is still taken as a fixed reference volume, but now changes in the physical volume (adsorption or dissociation at the surface) are not represented in the system, hence need not respect the thermodynamic laws. For large surfaces (e.g., adsorption studies in chromatography [131, 169]), a thermal description is achievable by including additional variables (surface area and surface tension) to account for the boundary effects; but clearly, surface terms scale differently with system size than bulk terms.

Thus, whenever the thermal description is valid, computations can be done in a fixed reference volume V_0 which we take as system size Ω , and the true, variable volume V can always be represented in the Euclidean $*$ -algebra as a real number, so that in particular $\bar{V} = V$. Then (6.6) implies that, for the reference volume,

$$\Delta(T, P, \mu) = \Omega^{-1}kT \log(e^{-\beta P\Omega}) \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)},$$

hence

$$\Delta(T, P, \mu) = \Omega^{-1}kT(\log Z(T, \mu) - P\Omega) = P(T, \mu) - P, \quad (6.21)$$

where

$$Z(T, P, \mu) := \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)} \quad (6.22)$$

is the so-called **grand canonical partition function** of the system and

$$P(T, \mu) := \Omega^{-1} kT \log Z(T, \mu), \quad (6.23)$$

while P without argument is the parameter in the left hand side of (6.21). With our convention of considering a fixed reference volume and treating the true volume V as the scale factor, $\Omega = V$ (otherwise a thermodynamic limit would be needed), this expression is independent of V , since it relates intensive variables unaffected by scaling. The equation of state (6.7) therefore takes the form

$$P = P(T, \mu). \quad (6.24)$$

Quantitative expressions for the equation of state can often be computed from (6.22)–(6.23) using the cumulant expansion (5.33) and/or a mean field approximation (5.42). Note that these relations imply

$$e^{-\beta P(T, \mu) V} = \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)}.$$

Traditionally (see, e.g., GIBBS [90], HUANG [115], REICHL [205]), the thermal state corresponding to (6.21)–(6.23) is called a **grand canonical ensemble**, and the following results are taken as the basis for microscopic calculations from statistical mechanics.

6.2.4 Theorem. *For a standard system in global equilibrium, values of an arbitrary quantity g can be calculated from (6.22) and*

$$\langle g \rangle = Z(T, \mu)^{-1} \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)} g. \quad (6.25)$$

The values of the extensive quantities are given in terms of the equation of state (6.23) by

$$\bar{S} = V \frac{\partial P}{\partial T}(T, \mu), \quad \bar{N}_j = V \frac{\partial P}{\partial \mu_j}(T, \mu) \quad (6.26)$$

and the phenomenological Euler equation (6.18).

Proof. Equation (6.23) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g \rangle &= \int e^{-S/k} g = \int e^{-\beta(H+PV-\mu \cdot N)} g \\ &= e^{-\beta PV} \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)} g = Z(T, V, \mu)^{-1} \int e^{-\beta(H-\mu \cdot N)} g, \end{aligned}$$

giving (6.25). The formulas in (6.26) follow from (6.8) and (6.21). \square

No thermodynamic limit was needed to derive the above results. Thus, everything holds – though with large limit resolutions in measurements – even for single small systems (BUSTAMANTE et al. [48], GROSS [102], KRATKY [140]).

6.2.5 Example. We consider the two level system from Example 5.2.4, using $\Omega = 1$ as system size. From (6.22) and (6.23), we find $Z(T, \mu) = 1 + e^{-E/kT}$, hence

$$P(T, \mu) = kT \log(1 + e^{-E/kT}) = kT \log(e^{E/kT} + 1) - E.$$

From (6.25), we find

$$\bar{H} = \frac{Ee^{-E/kT}}{1 + e^{-E/kT}} = \frac{E}{e^{E/kT} + 1}, \quad kT = \frac{E}{\log(E/\bar{H} - 1)}.$$

(This implies that a two-level system has negative temperature and negative pressure if $\bar{H} > E/2$.) The **heat capacity** $C := d\bar{H}/dT$ takes the form

$$C = \frac{E^2}{kT^2} \frac{e^{E/kT}}{(e^{E/kT} + 1)^2}.$$

It exhibits a pronounced maximum, the so-called **Schottky bump** (cf. CALLEN [49]), from which E can be determined. In view of (6.56) below, this allows the experimental estimation of the spectral gap of a quantum system. The phenomenon persists to some extent for multilevel systems; see CIVITARESE et al. [55].

6.3 The first law: Energy balance

We now discuss relations between changes of the values of extensive or intensive variables, as expressed by the first law of thermodynamics. To derive the first law in full generality, we use the concept of reversible transformations introduced in Section 4.1. Corresponding to such a transformation, there is a family of thermal states $\langle \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ defined by

$$\langle f \rangle_\lambda = \int e^{-\beta(\lambda)(H - \alpha(\lambda) \cdot X)} f, \quad \beta(\lambda) = \frac{1}{kT(\lambda)}.$$

Important: In case of local or microlocal equilibrium, where the thermal system carries a dynamics, it is important to note that reversible transformations are fictitious transformations which have nothing to do with how the system changes with time, or whether a process is reversible in the dynamical sense that both the process and the reverse process can be realized dynamically. The time shift is generally *not* a reversible transformation.

We use differentials corresponding to reversible transformations; writing $f = S/k$, we can delete the index f from the formulas in Section 5.2. In particular, we write the Kubo inner product (5.22) as

$$\langle g; h \rangle := \langle g; h \rangle_{S/k}. \quad (6.27)$$

6.3.1 Proposition. *The value $\bar{g}(T, \alpha) := \langle g(T, \alpha) \rangle$ of every (possibly T - and α -dependent) quantity $g(T, \alpha)$ is a state variable satisfying the **differentiation formula***

$$d\langle g \rangle = \langle dg \rangle - \langle g - \bar{g}; dS \rangle / k. \quad (6.28)$$

Proof. That \bar{g} is a state variable is an immediate consequence of the zeroth law (6.1) since the entropy depends on T and α only. The differentiation formula follows from (5.34) and (6.27). \square

6.3.2 Theorem. *For reversible changes, we have the first law of thermodynamics*

$$d\bar{H} = Td\bar{S} + \alpha \cdot d\bar{X} \quad (6.29)$$

and the Gibbs-Duhem equation

$$0 = \bar{S}dT + \bar{X} \cdot d\alpha. \quad (6.30)$$

Proof. Differentiating the equation of state (6.7), using the chain rule (4.10), and simplifying using (6.8) gives the Gibbs-Duhem equation (6.30). If we differentiate the phenomenological Euler equation (6.9), we obtain

$$d\bar{H} = Td\bar{S} + \bar{S}dT + \alpha \cdot d\bar{X} + \bar{X} \cdot d\alpha,$$

and using (6.30), this simplifies to the first law of thermodynamics. \square

Because of the form of the energy terms in the first law (6.29), one often uses the analogy to mechanics and calls the intensive variables **generalized forces**, and differentials of extensive variables **generalized displacements**.

For the Gibbs-Duhem equation, we give a second proof which provides additional insight. Since H and X are fixed quantities for a given system, they do not change under reversible transformations; therefore

$$dH = 0, \quad dX = 0.$$

Differentiating the Euler equation (6.4), therefore gives the relation

$$0 = TdS + SdT + X \cdot d\alpha. \quad (6.31)$$

On the other hand, S depends explicitly on T and α , and by Corollary 5.1.11,

$$\langle dS \rangle = \int e^{-S/k} dS = kd \left(\int e^{-S/k} \right) = kd1 = 0, \quad (6.32)$$

taking values in (6.31) implies again the Gibbs-Duhem equation. By combining equation (6.31) with the Kubo product we get information about limit resolutions:

6.3.3 Theorem.

(i) *Let g be a quantity depending continuously differentiable on the intensive variables T and α . Then*

$$\langle g - \bar{g}; S - \bar{S} \rangle = kT \left(\frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial T} - \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial T} \right\rangle \right), \quad (6.33)$$

$$\langle g - \bar{g}; X_j - \bar{X}_j \rangle = kT \left(\frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial \alpha_j} - \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \alpha_j} \right\rangle \right), \quad (6.34)$$

(ii) If the extensive variables H and X_j ($j \in J$) are pairwise commuting then

$$\langle (S - \bar{S})^2 \rangle = kT \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial T}, \quad (6.35)$$

$$\langle (X_j - \bar{X}_j)(S - \bar{S}) \rangle = kT \frac{\partial \bar{X}_j}{\partial T} \quad (j \in J), \quad (6.36)$$

$$\langle (X_j - \bar{X}_j)(X_k - \bar{X}_k) \rangle = kT \frac{\partial \bar{X}_j}{\partial \alpha_k} \quad (j, k \in J), \quad (6.37)$$

$$\text{res}(S) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{S}^2} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial T}}, \quad \text{res}(X_j) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{X}_j^2} \frac{\partial \bar{X}_j}{\partial \alpha_j}}, \quad (6.38)$$

$$\text{res}(H) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{H}^2} \left(T \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial T} + \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial \alpha} \right)}. \quad (6.39)$$

Proof. Multiplying the differentiation formula (6.28) by kT and using (6.31), we find, for arbitrary reversible transformations,

$$kT(d\langle g \rangle - \langle dg \rangle) = \langle g - \bar{g}; S \rangle dT + \langle g - \bar{g}; X \rangle \cdot d\alpha.$$

Dividing by $d\lambda$ and choosing $\lambda = T$ and $\lambda = \alpha_j$, respectively, gives

$$\langle g - \bar{g}; S \rangle = kT \left(\frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial T} - \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial T} \right\rangle \right), \quad \langle g - \bar{g}; X_j \rangle = kT \left(\frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial \alpha_j} - \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \alpha_j} \right\rangle \right).$$

(i) follows upon noting that $\langle g - \bar{g}; h - \bar{h} \rangle = \langle g - \bar{g}; h \rangle$ since by (5.25),

$$\langle g - \bar{g}; \bar{h} \rangle = \langle g - \bar{g} \rangle \bar{h} = (\langle g \rangle - \bar{g}) = 0.$$

If the extensive variables H and X_j ($j \in J$) are pairwise commuting then we can use (5.26) to eliminate the Kubo inner product, and by choosing g as S and X_j , respectively, we find (6.35)–(6.37). The limit resolutions (6.38) now follow from (5.44) and the observation that $\langle (g - \bar{g})^2 \rangle = \langle (g - \bar{g})g \rangle - \langle g - \bar{g} \rangle \bar{g} = \langle (g - \bar{g})g \rangle = \langle g^2 \rangle - \bar{g}^2$. The limit resolution (6.39) follows similarly from

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}^2 \text{res}(H)^2 &= \langle H - \bar{H}; H - \bar{H} \rangle = T \langle H - \bar{H}; S - \bar{S} \rangle + \alpha \cdot \langle H - \bar{H}; X - \bar{X} \rangle \\ &= kT \left(T \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial T} + \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial \alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that higher order central moments can be obtained in the same way, substituting more complicated expressions for f and using the formulas for the lower order moments to evaluate the right hand side of (6.33) and (6.34).

The extensive variables scale linearly with the system size Ω of the system. Hence, the limit resolution of the extensive quantities is $O(\sqrt{k/\Omega})$ in regions of the state space where

the extensive variables depend smoothly on the intensive variables. Since k is very small, they are negligible unless the system considered is very tiny. Thus, macroscopic thermal variables can generally be obtained with fairly high precision. The only exceptions are states close to **critical points** where the extensive variables need not be differentiable, and their derivatives may therefore become huge. In particular, in the thermodynamic limit $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$, uncertainties are absent except close to a critical point, where they lead to critical opacity.

6.3.4 Corollary. *For a standard thermal system,*

$$\text{res}(S) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{S}^2} \frac{\partial \bar{S}}{\partial T}}, \quad \text{res}(N_j) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{N}_j^2} \frac{\partial \bar{N}_j}{\partial \mu_j}}, \quad (6.40)$$

$$\text{res}(H) = \sqrt{\frac{kT}{\bar{H}^2} \left(T \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial T} + P \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial P} + \mu \cdot \frac{\partial \bar{H}}{\partial \mu} \right)}. \quad (6.41)$$

Proof. Apply (6.35), (6.37) and (6.41) to a standard system. \square

Note that $\text{res}(V) = 0$ since we regarded V as the system size, so that it is just a number.

The above results imply an approximate **thermodynamic uncertainty relation**

$$\Delta S \Delta T \geq kT \quad (6.42)$$

for entropy S and the logarithm $\log T$ of temperature, analogous to the Heisenberg uncertainty relation (5.51) for position and momentum, in which the Boltzmann constant k plays a role analogous to Planck's constant \hbar . Indeed (GILMORE [91]), (6.42) can be derived by observing that (6.40) may be interpreted approximately as $(\Delta S)^2 \geq kT \frac{\partial S}{\partial T}$; together with the first order Taylor approximation $\Delta S = \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \Delta T$, we find that $\Delta S \Delta T = (\Delta S)^2 \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \right)^{-1} \geq kT$. A similar argument gives the approximate uncertainty relation

$$\Delta N_j \Delta \mu_j \geq kT. \quad (6.43)$$

6.4 The second law: Extremal principles

The extremal principles of the second law of thermodynamics assert that in a nonthermal state, some energy expression depending on one of a number of standard boundary conditions is strictly larger than that of related thermal states. The associated thermodynamic potentials can be used in place of the system function to calculate all thermal variables given half of them. Thus, like the system function, thermodynamic potentials give a complete summary of the equilibrium properties of homogeneous materials. We only discuss the **Hamilton potential**

$$U(\bar{S}, \bar{X}) := \max_{T, \alpha} \{ T \bar{S} + \alpha \cdot \bar{X} \mid \Delta(T, \alpha) = 0, T > 0 \}$$

and the **Helmholtz potential**

$$A(T, \bar{X}) := \max_{\alpha} \{\alpha \cdot \bar{X} \mid \Delta(T, \alpha) = 0\};$$

other potentials can be handled in a similar way.

6.4.1 Theorem. (Second law of thermodynamics)

(i) In an arbitrary state,

$$\bar{H} \geq U(\bar{S}, \bar{X}),$$

with equality iff the state is a thermal state of positive temperature. The remaining thermal variables are then given by

$$T = \frac{\partial U}{\partial \bar{S}}(\bar{S}, \bar{X}), \quad \alpha = \frac{\partial U}{\partial \bar{X}}(\bar{S}, \bar{X}), \quad (6.44)$$

$$U = \bar{H} = U(\bar{S}, \bar{X}). \quad (6.45)$$

In particular, a thermal state of positive temperature is uniquely determined by the values of \bar{S} and \bar{X} .

(ii) Let $T > 0$. Then, in an arbitrary state,

$$\bar{H} - T\bar{S} \geq A(T, \bar{X}),$$

with equality iff the state is a thermal state of temperature T . The remaining thermal variables are then given by

$$\bar{S} = -\frac{\partial A}{\partial T}(T, \bar{X}), \quad \alpha = \frac{\partial A}{\partial \bar{X}}(T, \bar{X}), \quad (6.46)$$

$$\bar{H} = T\bar{S} + \alpha \cdot \bar{X} = A(T, \bar{X}) + T\bar{S}. \quad (6.47)$$

In particular, a thermal state of positive temperature is uniquely determined by the values of T and \bar{X} .

Proof. This is proved in the same way as Theorem 4.4.1; thus we give no details. \square

The additivity of extensive quantities is again reflected in corresponding properties of the thermodynamic potentials:

6.4.2 Theorem.

(i) The function $U(\bar{S}, \bar{X})$ is a convex function of its arguments which is positive homogeneous of degree 1, i.e., for real $\lambda, \lambda^1, \lambda^2 \geq 0$,

$$U(\lambda\bar{S}, \lambda\bar{X}) = \lambda U(\bar{S}, \bar{X}), \quad (6.48)$$

$$U(\lambda^1\bar{S}^1 + \lambda^2\bar{S}^2, \lambda^1\bar{X}^1 + \lambda^2\bar{X}^2) \leq \lambda^1 U(\bar{S}^1, \bar{X}^1) + \lambda^2 U(\bar{S}^2, \bar{X}^2). \quad (6.49)$$

(ii) The function $A(T, \bar{X})$ is a convex function of \bar{X} which is positive homogeneous of degree 1, i.e., for real $\lambda, \lambda^1, \lambda^2 \geq 0$,

$$A(T, \lambda\bar{X}) = \lambda A(T, \bar{X}), \quad (6.50)$$

$$A(T, \lambda^1\bar{X}^1 + \lambda^2\bar{X}^2) \leq \lambda^1 A(T, \bar{X}^1) + \lambda^2 A(T, \bar{X}^2). \quad (6.51)$$

Proof. This is proved in the same way as Theorem 4.4.2; thus we give no details. \square

The extremal principles imply energy dissipation properties for time-dependent states. Since the present kinematical setting does not have a proper dynamical framework, it is only possible to outline the implications without going much into details.

6.4.3 Theorem.

(i) For any time-dependent system for which S and X remain constant and which converges to a thermal state with positive temperature, the Hamilton energy $\langle H \rangle$ attains its global minimum in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) For any time-dependent system maintained at fixed temperature $T > 0$, for which X remains constant and which converges to a thermal state, the Helmholtz energy $\langle H - TS \rangle$ attains its global minimum in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 6.4.1. \square

This result is the shadow of a more general, dynamical observation (that, of course, cannot be proved from kinematic assumptions alone but would require a dynamical theory). Indeed, it is a universally valid empirical fact that in all natural time-dependent processes, energy is lost or dissipated, i.e., becomes macroscopically unavailable, unless compensated by energy provided by the environment. Details go beyond the present framework, which adopts a strictly kinematic setting.

6.5 The third law: Quantization

The third law of thermodynamics asserts that the value of the entropy is always nonnegative. But it cannot be deduced from our axioms without making a further assumption, as a simple example demonstrates.

6.5.1 Example. The algebra $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^m$ with pointwise operations is a Euclidean $*$ -algebra for any integral of the form

$$\int f = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N w_n f_n \quad (w_n > 0);$$

the axioms are trivial to verify. For this integral the state defined by

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_n,$$

is a state with entropy S given by $S_n = k \log w_n$. The value of the entropy

$$\bar{S} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^m S_n = \frac{k}{N} \log \prod_{n=1}^N w_n,$$

is negative if we choose the w_n such that $\prod w_n < 1$.

Thus, we need an additional condition which guarantees the validity of the third law. Since the third law is also violated in classical statistical mechanics, which is a particular case of the present setting, we need a condition which forbids the classical interpretation of our axioms.

We take our inspiration from a simple information theoretic model of states discussed in Section 7.6 below, which has this property. (Indeed, the third law is a necessary requirement for the interpretation of the value of the entropy as a measure of internal complexity, as discussed there.) There, the integral is a sum over the components, and, since functions were defined componentwise,

$$\int F(f) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} F(f_n). \quad (6.52)$$

We say that a quantity f is **quantized** iff (6.52) holds with a suitable **spectrum** $\{f_n \mid n \in \mathcal{N}\}$ for all functions F for which $F(f)$ is strongly integrable; in this case, the f_n are called the **levels** of f . For example, in the quantum setting all trace class linear operators are quantized quantities, since these always has a discrete spectrum.

Quantization is the additional ingredient needed to derive the third law:

6.5.2 Theorem. (Third law of thermodynamics)

If the entropy S is quantized then $\bar{S} \geq 0$. Equality holds iff the entropy has a single level only ($|\mathcal{N}| = 1$).

Proof. We have

$$1 = \int \rho = \int e^{-S/k} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} e^{-S_n/k} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \rho_n, \quad (6.53)$$

where all $\rho_n = e^{-S_n/k} > 0$, and

$$\bar{S} = \int S \rho = \int S e^{-S/k} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} S_n e^{-S_n/k} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} S_n \rho_n. \quad (6.54)$$

If $\mathcal{N} = \{n\}$ then (6.53) implies $\rho_n = 1$, $S_n = 0$, and (6.54) gives $\bar{S} = 0$. And if $|\mathcal{N}| > 1$ then (6.53) gives $\rho_n < 1$, hence $S_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, and (6.54) implies $\bar{S} > 0$. \square

In quantum chemistry, energy H , volume V , and particle numbers N_1, \dots, N_s form a quantized family of pairwise commuting Hermitian variables. Indeed, the Hamiltonian H has discrete energy levels if the system is confined to a finite volume, V is a number, hence has a single level only, and N_j counts particles hence has as levels the nonnegative integers. As a consequence, the entropy $S = T^{-1}(H + PV - \mu \cdot N)$ is quantized, too, so that the third law of thermodynamics is valid. The number of levels is infinite, so that the value of the entropy is positive.

A zero value of the entropy (**absolute zero**) is therefore an idealization which cannot be realized in practice. But Theorem 6.5.2 implies in this idealized situation that entropy and hence the joint spectrum of (H, V, N_1, \dots, N_s) can have a single level only.

This is the situation discussed in ordinary quantum mechanics (pure energy states at fixed particle numbers). It is usually associated with the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, though at absolute temperature $T = 0$, i.e., infinite coldness β , the thermal formalism fails (but low T asymptotic expansions are possible).

To see the behavior close to this limit, we consider for simplicity a canonical ensemble with Hamiltonian H (Example 5.2.4); thus the particle number is fixed. Since S is quantized, the spectrum of H is discrete, so that there is a finite or infinite sequence $E_0 < E_1 < E_2 < \dots$ of distinct energy levels. Denoting by P_n the (rank d_n) orthogonal projector to the d_n -dimensional eigenspace with energy E_n , we have the spectral decomposition

$$\phi(H) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \phi(E_n) P_n$$

for arbitrary functions ϕ defined on the spectrum. In particular,

$$e^{-\beta H} = \sum e^{-\beta E_n} P_n.$$

The partition function is

$$Z = \text{tr } e^{-\beta H} = \sum e^{-\beta E_n} \text{tr } P_n = \sum e^{-\beta E_n} d_n.$$

As a consequence,

$$e^{-S/k} = Z^{-1} e^{-\beta H} = \frac{\sum e^{-\beta E_n} P_n}{\sum e^{-\beta E_n} d_n} = \frac{\sum e^{-\beta(E_n - E_0)} P_n}{\sum e^{-\beta(E_n - E_0)} d_n},$$

hence values take the form

$$\langle f \rangle = \int e^{-S/k} f = \int \left(\frac{\sum e^{-\beta(E_n - E_0)} P_n}{\sum e^{-\beta(E_n - E_0)} d_n} \right). \quad (6.55)$$

From this representation, we see that only the energy levels E_n with

$$E_n \leq E_0 + O(kT)$$

contribute to a canonical ensemble of temperature T . If the temperature T is small enough, so that $kT \ll E_2 - E_0$, the exponentials $e^{-\beta(E_n - E_0)}$ with $n \geq 2$ can be neglected, and we find

$$e^{-S/k} \approx \frac{P_0 + e^{-\beta(E_1 - E_0)} P_1}{d_0 + e^{-\beta(E_1 - E_0)} d_1} = \frac{P_0}{d_0} + \frac{d_0 P_1 - d_1 P_0}{d_0(e^{\beta(E_1 - E_0)} d_0 + d_1)}. \quad (6.56)$$

Thus, the system behaves essentially as the two level system discussed in Examples 5.2.4 and 6.2.5; the **spectral gap** $E_1 - E_0$ takes the role of E . In particular, if already $kT \ll E_1 - E_0$, we find that

$$e^{-S/k} = d_0^{-1} P_0 + O(e^{-\beta(E_1 - E_0)}) \approx d_0^{-1} P_0 \quad (\text{if } kT \ll E_1 - E_0)$$

is essentially the projector to the subspace of minimal energy, scaled to ensure trace one.

In the **nondegenerate** case, where the lowest energy eigenvalue is simple, there is a corresponding normalized eigenvector ψ , unique up to a phase, satisfying the **Schrödinger equation**

$$H\psi = E_0\psi, \quad |\psi| = 1 \quad (E_0 \text{ minimal}). \quad (6.57)$$

In this case, the projector is $P_0 = \psi\psi^*$ and has rank $d_0 = 1$. Thus

$$e^{-S/k} = \psi\psi^* + O(e^{-\beta(E_1 - E_0)}).$$

has almost rank one, and the value takes the form

$$\langle g \rangle = \text{tr} e^{-S/k} g \approx \text{tr} \psi\psi^* g = \psi^* g \psi. \quad (6.58)$$

In the terminology of quantum mechanics, E_0 is the **ground state energy**, the solution ψ of (6.57) is called the **ground state**, and

$$\langle g \rangle = \psi^* g \psi \quad (6.59)$$

is the expectation of the observable g in the ground state.

For a general **state vector** ψ normalized to satisfy $\psi^*\psi = 1$, the formula (6.59) defines the values in the **pure state** ψ . It is easily checked that (6.59) indeed defines a state in the sense of Definition 5.2.1. These are not Gibbs states, but their idealized limiting cases.

Our derivation therefore shows that – unless the ground state is degenerate – *a canonical ensemble at sufficiently low temperature is in an almost pure state described by the quantum mechanical ground state.*

Thus, the third law directly leads to the conventional form of quantum mechanics, which can therefore be understood as the low temperature limit of thermodynamics. It also indicates when a quantum mechanical description by a pure state is appropriate, namely always when the gap between the ground state energy and the next energy level is significantly larger than the temperature, measured in units of the Boltzmann constant. (This is the typical situation in most of quantum chemistry and justifies the use of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in the absence of level crossing; cf. SMITH [230], YARKONY [267]). Moreover, it gives the correct (mixed) form of the state in case of ground state degeneracy, and the form of the correction terms when the energy gap is not large enough for the ground state approximation to be valid.

Chapter 7

Models, statistics, and measurements

In this chapter, we discuss the relation between models and reality. By necessity, the ratio between the number of words and the number of formulas is higher than in other chapters. Also, this topic is difficult and to some extent controversial since it touches on unresolved foundational issues about the meaning of probability and the interpretation of quantum mechanics.

We discuss in more detail the relation between different thermal models constructed on the basis of the same Euclidean $*$ -algebra by selecting different lists of extensive quantities.

Moreover, the abstract setting introduced in the previous chapters is given both a deterministic and a statistical interpretation through a careful discussion of the meaning of uncertainty and probability.

The interpretation of probability, statistical mechanics, and – today intrinsically interwoven – of quantum mechanics has a long history, which lead to a huge number of publications. Informative sources for the foundations of probability in general include FINE [78] and HACKING [104]. For statistical mechanics, see EHRENFEST [68], TER HAAR [239], PENROSE [191], SKLAR [228], GRANDY [264], and by WALLACE [254]. For the foundations of quantum mechanics, see the reprint collection by WHEELER & ZUREK [258] and STAPP [232], BALLENTINE [18], HOME & WHITAKER [113], PERES & TERNO [195], SCHLOSSHAUER [222].

7.1 Description levels

To be able to apply the theory developed in the previous chapters, it is necessary to know how quantities and states are related to reality. There is no fully objective way of defining this relation, since objectivity is always restricted to concepts, and these are imposed upon nature by us observers. The same object may be described from different perspectives and at different levels of faithfulness.

Therefore, the observer modeling a particular situation must make some basic choices, and

these choices are subjective: Different observers may choose to study different materials or different experiments, or they may study the same material or the same experiment in different levels of detail, or drawing the system boundary differently. For example, one observer may regard a measuring instrument as part of the system of interest, while for another observer it only serves as recording device.

We shall see that once the basic choices are made that unambiguously specify the system of interest, everything else can be described objectively. On the other hand, silently changing the definition of what constitutes the system of interest is a major reason for apparent paradoxes discussed in the literature, and it requires care to disentangle the problems involved and to arrive at a clear view.

In practice, relevant quantities and corresponding states are assigned to real life situations by well-informed and experimentally testable judgment concerning one's equipment. Indeed, from a practical point of view, *theory defines what an object is*: A gas is regarded as an ideal gas if it behaves to a satisfactory degree like the mathematical model of an ideal gas certain values of temperature, pressure and volume. Similarly, a solid is regarded as a crystal if it behaves to a satisfactory degree like the mathematical model of a crystal for suitable numerical values of the model parameters¹. In general, we know or assume on the basis of past experience, claims of manufacturers, etc. that certain materials or machines reliably produce states that, to a satisfactory degree for the purpose of the experiment or application, depend only on variables that are accounted for in our theory and that are, to a satisfactory degree, either fixed or controllable. The nominal state of a system can be checked and, if necessary, corrected by **calibration**, using appropriate measurements that reveal the parameters characterizing the state.

In the preceding chapter, we assumed a fixed selection of extensive quantities defining the thermal model. However, as indicated at the end of Section 4.1, observable differences from the conclusions derived from a thermal model imply that one or more conjugate pairs of thermal variables are missing in the model. So, how should the extensive quantities be selected? We first emphasize the flexibility of the thermal setting. While the zeroth law may look very restrictive at first sight, by choosing a large enough family of extensive quantities the entropy of an *arbitrary* Gibbs state can be approximated arbitrarily well by a linear combination of these quantities. This does not solve the selection problem but gives a useful perspective:

The zeroth law appears simply as an embodiment of OCKHAM's razor² [187], freely paraphrased in modern form: that we should opt for the most economic model explaining a phenomenon – by restricting attention to the relevant extensive quantities only. At each time t , there is – except in degenerate cases – a *single* Gibbs state, with entropy $S(t)$, say, which best describes the system under consideration at the chosen level of modeling. Assuming the description by the Gibbs state as fundamental, its value is the objective, true value of the entropy, relative only to the algebra of quantities chosen to model the

¹ cf. CALLEN [49, p.15]: “Operationally, a system is in an equilibrium state if its properties are consistently described by thermodynamic theory.”

² frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora

system. A description of the state in terms of a thermal system is therefore adequate if (and, under an observability qualification to be discussed below, only if), for all relevant times t , the entropy $S(t)$ can be adequately approximated by a linear combination of the extensive quantities available at the chosen level of description.

The set of extensive variables depends on the application and on the desired accuracy of the model; it must be chosen in such a way that knowing the measured values of the extensive variables determines (to the accuracy specified) the complete behavior of the thermal system. Thus, the choice of extensive variables is (to the accuracy specified) completely determined by the level of accuracy with which the thermal description should fit the system's behavior. This forces everything else: The theory must describe the freedom available to characterize a particular thermal system with this set of extensive variables, and it must describe how the numerical values of interest can be computed for each state of each thermal system.

In contrast to the information theoretic approach where the choice of extensive quantities is considered to be the subjective matter of which observables an observer happens to have knowledge of, the only subjective aspect of our setting is the choice of the resolution of modeling. This fixes the amount of approximation tolerable in the ansatz, and hence the necessary list of extensive quantities. (Clearly, physics cannot be done without approximation, and the choice of a resolution is unavoidable. To remove even this trace of subjectivity, inherent in any approximation of anything, the entropy would have to be represented without any approximation, which would require to use the algebra of quantities of the still unknown theory of everything, and to demand that the extensive quantities exhaust this algebra.)

In general, which quantities need to be considered depends on the resolution with which the system is to be modeled – the higher the resolution the larger the family of extensive quantities. Thus – whether we describe bulk matter, surface effects, impurities, fatigue, decay, chemical reactions, or transition states, – the thermal setting remains the same since it is a universal approximation scheme, while the number of degrees of freedom increases with increasingly detailed models.

In phenomenological thermodynamics, the relevant extensive quantities are precisely those variables that are observed to make a difference in modeling the phenomenon of interest. Table 7.1 gives typical extensive variables, their intensive conjugate variables, and their contribution to the Euler equation³. Some of the extensive variables and their intensive

³ The Euler equation, which contains the energy contributions specified in the table, looks like an energy balance. But since S is undefined, this formal balance has no contents apart from defining the entropy S in terms of the energy and other contributions. The energy balance is rather given by the first law discussed later, and is about *changes* in energy. Conservative work contributions are exact differentials. For example, the mechanical force $F = -dV(q)/dq$ translates into the term $-F \cdot dq = dV(q)$ of the first law, corresponding to the term $-F \cdot q$ in the Euler equation. The change of the kinetic energy $E_{\text{kin}} = mv^2/2$ contribution of linear motion with velocity v and momentum $p = mv$ is $dE_{\text{kin}} = d(mv^2/2) = mv \cdot dv = v \cdot dp$, which is exactly what one gets from the $v \cdot p$ contribution in the Euler equation. Since $v \cdot p = mv^2$ is larger than the kinetic energy, this shows that motion implies a contribution to the entropy of $(E_{\text{kin}} - v \cdot p)/T = -mv^2/2T$. A similar argument applies to the angular motion of a rigid body in its rest frame, providing the term involving angular velocity and angular momentum.

Table 7.1: Typical conjugate pairs of thermal variables and their contribution to the Euler equation. The signs are fixed by tradition. (In the gravitational term, m is the vector with components m_j , the mass of a particle of kind j , g the acceleration of gravity, and h the height.)

extensive X_j	intensive α_j	contribution $\alpha_j X_j$
entropy S	temperature T	thermal, TS
particle number N_j	chemical potential μ_j	chemical, $\mu_j N_j$
conformation tensor C	relaxation force R	conformational $\sum R_{jk} C^{jk}$
strain ε^{jk}	stress σ_{jk}	elastic, $\sum \sigma_{jk} \varepsilon^{jk}$
volume V	pressure $-P$	mechanical, $-PV$
surface A_S	surface tension γ	mechanical, γA_S
length L	tension J	mechanical, JL
displacement q	force $-F$	mechanical, $-F \cdot q$
momentum p	velocity v	kinetic, $v \cdot p$
angular momentum J	angular velocity Ω	rotational, $\Omega \cdot J$
charge Q	electric potential Φ	electrical, ΦQ
polarization P	electric field strength E	electrical, $E \cdot P$
magnetization M	magnetic field strength B	magnetical, $B \cdot M$
electromagnetic field F	electromagnetic field strength $-F^s$	electromagnetic, $-\sum F_{\mu\nu}^s F^{\mu\nu}$
mass $M = m \cdot N$	gravitational potential gh	gravitational, ghM
energy-momentum U	metric g	gravitational, $\sum g_{\mu\nu} U^{\mu\nu}$

conjugates are vectors or (in elasticity theory, the theory of complex fluids, and in the relativistic case) tensors; cf. BALIAN [17] for the electromagnetic field and BERIS & EDWARDS [29], ÖTTINGER [186] for complex fluids.

To analyze the relation between two different thermal description levels, we compare a coarse system and a more detailed system quantitatively, taking for simplicity the temperature constant, so that the T -dependence can be suppressed in the formulas, and states are completely determined by α .

The fine system will be written as before, the variables and quantities associated with the coarser system get an additional index c . In order to be able to compare the two systems, we assume that one is a refinement of the other, so that the extensive quantities of the coarse system are $X_c = CX$, with a fixed matrix C with linearly independent rows, whose components tell how the components of X_c are built from those of X . The entropy of the coarse system is then given by

$$S_c = T^{-1}(H - \alpha_c \cdot X_c) = T^{-1}(H - \alpha_c \cdot CX) = T^{-1}(H - \alpha^* \cdot X),$$

where

$$\alpha^* = C^T \alpha_c. \quad (7.1)$$

Thus, the thermal states of the coarse model are simply the states of the detailed model for which the intensive parameter vector α is of the form $\alpha = C^T \alpha_c$ for some α_c . Thus the coarse state space can simply be viewed as a lower-dimensional subspace of the detailed state space. Therefore one expects the coarse description to be adequate precisely when the detailed state is close to the coarse state space, with an accuracy determined by the desired fidelity of the coarse model. Since the relative entropy (5.41),

$$\langle S_c - S \rangle = \langle T^{-1}(H - \alpha_c \cdot CX) - T^{-1}(H - \alpha \cdot X) \rangle = \langle T^{-1}(\alpha - C^* \alpha_c) \cdot X \rangle, \quad (7.2)$$

measures the amount of information in the detailed state which cannot be explained by the coarse state, it is sensible to associate to an arbitrary detailed state α the coarse state α_c determine by minimizing (7.2). If $\alpha^* = C^T \alpha_c \approx \alpha$ then

$$S_c = T^{-1}(H - \alpha^* \cdot X) \approx T^{-1}(H - \alpha^* \cdot X) = S,$$

and the coarse description is adequate. If $\alpha^* \not\approx \alpha$, there is no a priori reason to trust the coarse model, and we have to investigate to which extent its predictions will significantly differ from those of the detailed model. One expects the differences to be significant; however, in practice, there are difficulties if there are limits on our ability to prepare particular detailed states. The reason is that the entropy and chemical potentials can be prepared and measured only by comparison with states of sufficiently known states. A first sign of this is the gauge freedom in ideal gases discussed in Example 4.1.4, which implies that different models of the same situation may have nontrivial differences in Hamilton energy, entropy, and chemical potential. This ambiguity persists in more perplexing situations:

7.1.1 Example. (The Gibbs paradox)

Suppose that we have an ideal gas of two kinds $j = 1, 2$ of particles which are experimentally indistinguishable. Suppose that in the samples available for experiments, the two kinds are mixed in significantly varying proportions $N_1 : N_2 = q_1 : q_2$ which, by assumption, have no effect on the observable properties; in particular, their values are unknown but varying. The detailed model treats them as distinct, the coarse model as identical. Reverting to the barless notation of Section 4.1, we have

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ N_1 \\ N_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = \begin{pmatrix} -P \\ \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and, assuming $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1 & c_2 \end{pmatrix}$ for suitable $c_1, c_2 > 0$,

$$X_c = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ N_c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ c_1 N_1 + c_2 N_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_c = \begin{pmatrix} -P \\ \mu_c \end{pmatrix}.$$

From the known proportions, we find

$$N_j = x_j N_c, \quad x_j = \frac{q_j}{c_1 q_1 + c_2 q_2}.$$

The mixture behaves like an ideal gas of a single kind, hence

$$PV = kTN_c, \quad H = h_c(T)N_c, \quad \mu_c = kT \log \frac{kTN_c}{V\pi_c}.$$

Now $N_c = (kT)^{-1}PV = \sum N_j = \sum x_j N_c$ implies that $x_1 + x_2 = 1$. Because of indistinguishability, this must hold for any choice of $q_1, q_2 \geq 0$; for the two choices $q_1 = 0$ and $q_2 = 0$, we get $c_1 = c_2 = 1$, hence $N_c = \sum N_j$, and the x_j are mole fractions. Similarly, if we use for all kinds j the same normalization for fixing the gauge freedom, the relation $h_c(T)N_c = H = \sum h_j(T)N_j = \sum h_j(T)x_j N_c$ implies for varying mole fractions that $h_j(T) = h_c(T)$ for $j = 1, 2$. From this, we get $\pi_j(T) = \pi_c(T)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Thus

$$H - H_c = \sum h_j(T)N_j - h_c(T)N_c = 0,$$

$$\mu_j - \mu_c = kT \log \frac{kTN_j}{V\pi_j} - kT \log \frac{kTN_c}{V\pi_c} = kT \log x_j,$$

the Gibbs energy satisfies

$$G - G_c = \sum \mu_j N_j - \mu_c N_c = \sum (\mu_j - \mu_c) N_j = kTN_c \sum x_j \log x_j,$$

and the entropy satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} S - S_c &= T^{-1}(H - PV + G) - T^{-1}(H_c - PV + G_c) \\ &= T^{-1}(G - G_c) = kN_c \sum x_j \log x_j. \end{aligned}$$

This term is called the **entropy of mixing**. Its occurrence is referred to as Gibbs paradox (cf. JAYNES [125], TSENG & CATICHA [244], ALLAHVERDYAN & NIEUWENHUIZEN [7], UFFINK [246, Section 5.2]). It seems to say that there are two different entropies, depending on how we choose to model the situation. For fixed mole fractions, the paradox can be resolved upon noticing that the fine and the coarse description differ only by a choice of gauge; the gauge is unobservable anyway, and the entropy is determined only when the gauge is fixed.

However, if the mole fractions vary, the fine and the coarse description differ significantly. If the detailed model is correct, the coarse model gives a wrong description for the entropy and the chemical potentials. However, this difference is observable only if we know processes which affect the different kinds differently, such as a difference in mass, which allows a mechanical separation, in molecular size or shape, which allows their separation by a semipermeable membrane, in spin, which allows a magnetic separation, or in scattering properties of the particles, which may allow a chemical or radiation-based differentiation. In each of these cases, the particles become distinguishable, and the coarse description becomes inadequate.

If we cannot separate the kinds to some extent, we cannot prepare equilibrium states at fixed mole fraction. But this would be necessary to calibrate the chemical potentials, since fixed chemical potentials can be prepared only through chemical contact with substances with known chemical potentials, and the latter must be computed from mole fractions.

Generalizing from the example, we conclude that even when both a coarse model and a more detailed model are faithful to all experimental information possible at a given description level, there is no guarantee that they agree in the values of all thermal variables of the coarse

model. In the language of control theory (see, e.g., LJUNG [159]), agreement is guaranteed only when all parameters of the more detailed models are observable.

On the other hand, all observable state functions of the detailed system which depend only on the coarse state must and will have the same value within the experimental accuracy if both models are adequate descriptions of the situation. Thus, while the values of some variables need not be experimentally determinable, the validity of a model is an objective property. Therefore, preferences for one or the other of two valid models can only be based on other criteria. The criterion usually employed in this case is Ockham's razor², although there may be differences of opinion on what counts as the most economic model. In particular, a fundamental description of macroscopic matter by means of quantum mechanics is hopelessly overspecified in terms of the number of degrees of freedom needed for comparison with experiment, most of which are in principle unobservable by equipment made of ordinary matter. But it is often the most economical model in terms of description length (though extracting the relevant information from it may be difficult). Thus, different people may well make different rational choices, or employ several models simultaneously.

The objectivity of a model description implies that, as soon as a discrepancy with experiment is reliably found, the model must be replaced by a more detailed (or altogether different) model. This is indeed what happened with the textbook example of the Gibbs paradox situation, ortho and para hydrogen, cf. BONHOEFFER & HARTECK [41], FARKAS [76]. Hydrogen seemed at first to be a single substance, but then thermodynamic data forced a refined description.

Similarly, in spin echo experiments (see, e.g., HAHN [105, 106], ROTHSTEIN [216], RIDDERBOS & REDHEAD [209]), the specially prepared system appears to be in equilibrium but, according to Callen's empirical definition¹ it is not – the surprising future behavior (for someone not knowing the special preparation) shows that some correlation variables were neglected that are needed for a correct description. Indeed, everywhere in science, we strive for explaining surprising behavior by looking for the missing variables needed to describe the system correctly!

GRAD [98] expresses this as "the adoption of a new entropy is forced by the discovery of new information". More precisely, the adoption of a new *model* is forced, since the old model is simply wrong under the new conditions and remains valid only under some restrictions. Thus this is not a property of entropy alone, but of all concepts in models of reality relating to effects not observable (in the sense of control theory discussed above).

Observability issues aside, the coarser description usually has a more limited range of applicability; with the qualification discussed in the example, it is generally restricted to those systems whose detailed intensive variable vector α is close to the subspace of vectors of the form $C^T \alpha$ reproducible in the coarse model. Finding the right family of thermal variables is therefore a matter of discovery, not of subjective choice. This is further discussed in Section 7.2.

7.2 Local, microlocal, and quantum equilibrium

As we have seen in Section 7.1, when descriptions on several levels are justified empirically, they differ significantly only in quantities which are negligible in the more detailed models, or by terms which are not observable in principle. Thus, the global equilibrium description is adequate at some resolution if and only if only small nonequilibrium forces are present, and a more detailed local equilibrium description will (apart from variations of the Gibbs paradox which should be cured on the more detailed level) agree with the global equilibrium description to the accuracy within which the differences in the corresponding approximations to the entropy, as measured by the relative entropy (5.41), are negligible. Of course, if the relative entropy of a thermal state relative to the true Gibbs state is large then the thermal state cannot be regarded as a faithful description of the true state of the system, and the thermal model is inadequate.

In statistical mechanics proper (where the microscopic dynamics is given), the relevant extensive quantities are those whose values vary slowly enough to be macroscopically observable at a given spatial or temporal resolution (cf. BALIAN [15]). Which ones must be included is a difficult mathematical problem which has been solved only in simple situations (such as monatomic gases) where a weak coupling limit applies. In more general situations, the selection is currently based on phenomenological consideration, without any formal mathematical support.

In equilibrium statistical mechanics, which describes time-independent, *global* equilibrium situations, the relevant extensive quantities are the additive conserved quantities of a microscopic system and additional parameters describing order parameters that emerge from broken symmetries or various defects not present in the ideal model. **Phase equilibrium** needs, in addition, copies of the extensive variables (e.g., partial volumes) for each phase, since the phases are spatially distributed, while the intensive variables are shared by all phases. **Chemical equilibrium** also accounts for exchange of atoms through a fixed list of permitted chemical reactions whose length is again determined by the desired resolution.

In states not corresponding to global equilibrium – usually called **non-equilibrium states**, a thermal description is still possible assuming so-called **local equilibrium**. There, the natural extensive quantities are those whose values are locally additive and slowly varying in space and time and hence, reliably observable at the scales of interest. In the statistical mechanics of local equilibrium, the thermal variables therefore become space- and time-dependent fields (ROBERTSON [212]). On even shorter time scales, phase space behavior becomes relevant, and the appropriate description is in terms of **microlocal equilibrium** and position- and momentum-dependent phase space densities. Finally, on the microscopic level, a linear operator description in terms of **quantum equilibrium** is needed.

The present formalism is still applicable to local, microlocal, and quantum equilibrium (though most products now become inner products in suitable function spaces), but the relevant quantities are now time-dependent and additional dynamical issues (relating states at different times) arise which are outside the scope of the present book.

In local equilibrium, one needs a hydrodynamic description by Navier-Stokes equations and

their generalizations; see, e.g., BERIS & ESWARDS [29], OETTINGER [186], EDWARDS et al. [67]. In the local view, one gets the interpretation of extensive variables as locally conserved (or at least slowly varying) quantities (whence additivity) and of intensive variables as parameter fields, which cause non-equilibrium currents when they are not constant, driving the system towards global equilibrium. In microlocal equilibrium, one needs a kinetic description by the Boltzmann equation and its generalizations; see, e.g., BORNATH et al. [43], CALZETTA & HU [50], MÜLLER & RUGGERI [177].

Quantum equilibrium. Full microscopic dynamics must be based on quantum mechanics. In quantum equilibrium, the dynamics is given by quantum dynamical semigroups. We outline the ideas involved, in order to emphasize some issues which are usually swept under the carpet.

Even when described at the microscopic level, thermal systems of sizes handled in a laboratory are in contact with their environment, via containing walls, emitted or absorbed radiation, etc.. We therefore embed the system of interest into a bigger, completely isolated system and assume that the quantum state of the big system is described at a fixed time by a normalized wave function ψ in some Hilbert space $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$. (Assuming instead a mixed state given by a density operator would not alter the picture significantly.) The value of a linear operator g in the big system is

$$\langle g \rangle = \psi^* g \psi; \quad (7.3)$$

cf. (6.58). The small system is defined by a Euclidean $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} of linear operators densely defined on $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$, composed of all meaningful expressions in field operators at arguments in the region of interest, with integral given by the trace in the big system. Since (7.3), restricted to $g \in \mathbb{E}$, satisfies the rules (R1)–(R4) for a state, the big system induces on the system of interest a state. By standard theorems (see, e.g., THIRRING [240]), there is a unique **density operator** $\rho \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $\langle g \rangle = \int \rho g$ for all $g \in \mathbb{E}$ with finite value. Moreover, ρ is Hermitian and positive semidefinite. If 0 is not an eigenvalue of ρ (which will usually be the case), then $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is a Gibbs state with entropy $S = -\bar{k} \log \rho$. To put quantum equilibrium into the thermal setting, we need to choose as extensive variables a family spanning the algebra \mathbb{E} ; then each such S can be written in the form (6.1).

Of course, ψ and hence the state $\langle \cdot \rangle$ depend on time. If the reduced system were governed by a Schrödinger equation then ρ would evolve by means of a unitary evolution; in particular, $\bar{S} = \langle S \rangle = -\bar{k} \operatorname{tr} \rho \log \rho$ would be time-independent. However, the system of interest does *not* inherit a Schrödinger dynamics from the isolated big system; rather, the dynamics of ρ is given by an integro-differential equation with a complicated memory term, defined by the projector operator formalism described in detail in GRABERT [97]; for summaries, see RAU & MÜLLER [203] and BALIAN [15]. In particular, one can say nothing specific about the dynamics of \bar{S} .

In typical treatments of such reduced descriptions, one assumes that the memory decays sufficiently fast; this so-called **Markov assumption** can be justified in a weak coupling limit (DAVIES [148], SPOHN [231]), which corresponds to a system of interest nearly independent of the environment. But a typical thermal system, such as a glass of water on a desk is held in place by the container. Considered as a nearly independent system, the

water would behave very differently, probably diffusing into space. Thus, it is questionable whether the Markov assumption is satisfied; a detailed investigation of the situation would be highly desirable. Apparently there are only few discussions of the problem how containers modify the dynamics of a large quantum system; see, e.g., LEBOWITZ & FRISCH [155], BLATT [32] and RIDDERBOS [208]. One should expect a decoherence effect (BRUNE et al. [73]) of the environment on the system which, for large quantum systems, is extremely strong (ZUREK [270]). A fundamental derivation should be based on quantum field theory; the so-called exact renormalization group equations (see, e.g., POLONYI & SAILER [198], BERGES [28]) have a thermal flavor and might be a suitable starting point.

However, simply assuming the Markov assumption as the condition for regarding the system of interest to be **effectively isolated** allows one to deduce for the resulting **Markov approximation** a deterministic differential equation for the density operator. The dynamics then describes a linear quantum dynamical semigroup. All known linear quantum dynamical semigroups (cf. DAVIES [148]) on a Hilbert space correspond to a dynamics in the form of a **Lindblad equation**

$$\dot{\rho} = \frac{i}{\hbar}(\rho H - H^* \rho) + P^* \rho \quad (7.4)$$

(LINDBLAD [157], GORINI et al. [95]), where the **effective Hamiltonian** H is a not necessarily Hermitian operator and P^* is the dual of a completely positive map P of the form

$$P(f) = Q^* J(f) Q \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{E},$$

with some linear operator Q from \mathbb{E} to a second $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E}' and some $*$ -algebra homomorphism J from \mathbb{E} to \mathbb{E}' . (STINESPRING [235], DAVIES [148, Theorem 2.1]). Their dynamics is inherently dissipative; for time $t \rightarrow \infty$, $P^* \rho$ can be shown to tend to zero, which usually implies that, apart from a constant velocity, the limiting state is a global equilibrium state.

Thus, the irreversibility of the time evolution is apparent already at the quantum level, being caused by the fact that all our observations are done in a limited region of space. The prevalence here on earth of matter in approximate equilibrium could therefore possibly be explained by the fact that the earth and with it most of its materials are extremely old.

For a system reasonably isolated (in the thermodynamical sense) from its environment, one would expect H to contain a confining effective potential well and P to be small. It would be interesting to understand the conditions (if there are any) under which the dissipation due to P can be neglected.

We now consider relations within the hierarchy of the four levels. The quantum equilibrium entropy S_{qu} , the microlocal equilibrium entropy S_{ml} , the local equilibrium entropy S_{lc} , the global equilibrium entropy S_{gl} denote the values of the entropy in a thermal description of the corresponding equilibrium levels. The four levels have a more and more restricted set of extensive quantities, and the relative entropy argument of Theorem 5.3.3 can be applied at each level. Therefore

$$S_{\text{qu}} \leq S_{\text{ml}} \leq S_{\text{lc}} \leq S_{\text{gl}}. \quad (7.5)$$

In general the four entropies might have completely different values. There are four essentially different possibilities,

$$(i) S_{\text{qu}} \approx S_{\text{ml}} \approx S_{\text{lc}} \approx S_{\text{gl}},$$

$$(ii) S_{\text{qu}} \approx S_{\text{ml}} \approx S_{\text{lc}} \ll S_{\text{gl}},$$

$$(iii) S_{\text{qu}} \approx S_{\text{ml}} \ll S_{\text{lc}} \leq S_{\text{gl}},$$

$$(iv) S_{\text{qu}} \ll S_{\text{ml}} \leq S_{\text{lc}} \leq S_{\text{gl}},$$

with different physical interpretations. As we have seen in Section 7.1, a thermal description is valid only if the entropy in this description approximates the true entropy sufficiently well. All other entropies, when significantly different, do not correspond to a correct description of the system; their disagreement simply means failure of the coarser description to match reality. (Again, we disregard variations of the Gibbs paradox which should be cured on the fundamental level.) Thus which of the cases (i)–(iv) occurs decides upon which descriptions are valid. (i) says that the state is in global equilibrium, and all four descriptions are valid. (ii) that the state is in local, but not in global equilibrium, and only the three remaining descriptions are valid. (iii) says that the state is in microlocal, but not in local equilibrium, and in particular not in global equilibrium. Only the quantum and the microlocal descriptions are valid. Finally, (iv) says that the state is not even in microlocal equilibrium, and only the quantum description is valid.

Thus, assuming that the fundamental limitations in obserability are correctly treated on the quantum level, the entropy is an objective quantity, independent of the level of accuracy with which we are able to describe the system. The precise value it gets in a model depends, however, on the model used and its accuracy. The observation (by GRAD [98], BALIAN [15], and others) that entropy may depend significantly on the description level is explained by two facts which hold for variables in models of any kind, not just for the entropy, namely (i) that if two models disagree in their observable predictions, at most one one of them can be correct, and (ii) that if two models agree in their observable predictions, the more detailed model has unobservable details. Since unobservable details cannot be put to an experimental test, the more detailed model in case (ii) is questionable unless dictated by fundamental considerations, such as symmetry or formal simplicity.

7.3 Statistics and probability

Recall from Section 5.4 that a quantity g is considered to be significant if its resolution $\text{res}(g)$ satisfies $\text{res}(g) \ll 1$, while it is considered as noise if $\text{res}(g) \gg 1$. If g is a quantity and \tilde{g} is a good approximation of its value then $\Delta g := g - \tilde{g}$ is noise. Sufficiently significant quantities can be treated as deterministic; the analysis of noise is the subject of statistics.

Statistics is based on the idea of obtaining information about a noisy system by repeated **sampling** from a **population**⁴ of independent systems with identical preparation, but

⁴Physicists usually speak of an **ensemble** in place of a population; but since in connection with the

differing in noisy details not controllable by the preparation. In the present context, such systems are described by the same Euclidean $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E}_0 , the same set of quantities to be sampled, and the same state $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$.

More precisely, the systems may be regarded as subsystems of a bigger system (e.g., the laboratory) whose set of quantities is given by a big Euclidean $*$ -algebra \mathbb{E} . To model identically prepared subsystems we consider injective homomorphisms from \mathbb{E}_0 into \mathbb{E} mapping each reference quantity $f \in \mathbb{E}_0$ to the quantity $f_l \in \mathbb{E}$ of the l th subsystem considered to be ‘identical’ with f . Of course, in terms of the big system, the f_l are not really identical; they refer to quantities distinguished by position and/or time. That the subsystems are **identically prepared** is instead modelled by the assumption

$$\langle f_l \rangle = \langle f \rangle_0 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{E}_0, \quad (7.6)$$

and that they are **independent** by the assumption

$$\langle f_k g_l \rangle = \langle f_k \rangle \langle g_l \rangle \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathbb{E}_0 \text{ and } k \neq l. \quad (7.7)$$

The following result is fundamental for statistical considerations:

7.3.1 Theorem. (Weak law of large numbers)

For a family of quantities f_l ($l = 1, \dots, N$) satisfying (7.6) and (7.7), the **mean value**

$$\hat{f} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N f_l$$

(which again is a quantity) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{f} \rangle &= \langle f \rangle_0, \\ \sigma(\hat{f}) &= \sigma(f) / \sqrt{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

Proof. We have

$$\langle \hat{f} \rangle = \frac{1}{N} (\langle f_1 \rangle + \dots + \langle f_N \rangle) = \frac{1}{N} (\mu + \dots + \mu) = \mu$$

and

$$\hat{f}^* \hat{f} = \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\sum_j f_j \right)^* \left(\sum_k f_k \right) = N^{-2} \sum_{j,k} f_j^* f_k.$$

Now

$$\langle f_j^* f_j \rangle = \langle f_j \rangle^* \langle f_j \rangle + \sigma(f_j)^2 = |\mu|^2 + \sigma^2,$$

and by (7.7) for $j \neq k$,

$$\langle f_j^* f_k + f_k^* f_j \rangle = 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle f_j^* f_k \rangle = 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle f_j \rangle^* \langle f_k \rangle = 2 \operatorname{Re} \mu^* \mu = 2|\mu|^2.$$

microcanonical, canonical, or grand canonical ensemble we use the term ensemble synonymous with state, we prefer the statistical term population to keep the discussion unambiguous.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\widehat{f})^2 &= \langle \widehat{f}^* \widehat{f} \rangle - \langle \widehat{f} \rangle^* \langle \widehat{f} \rangle \\ &= N^{-2} \left(N(\sigma^2 + |\mu|^2) + \binom{N}{2} 2|\mu|^2 \right) - \mu^* \mu = N^{-1} \sigma^2,\end{aligned}$$

and the assertions follow. \square

As a significant body of work in probability theory shows, the conditions under which $\sigma(\widehat{f}) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ can be significantly relaxed; thus in practice, it is sufficient if (7.6) and (7.7) are approximately valid.

The significance of the weak law of large numbers lies in the fact that (7.8) becomes arbitrarily small as N becomes sufficiently large. Thus the uncertainty of quantities when averaged over a large population of identically prepared systems becomes arbitrarily small while the mean value reproduces the value of each quantity. Thus quantities averaged over a large population of identically prepared systems become highly significant when their value is nonzero, even when no single quantity is significant.

This explains the success of statistical mechanics to provide an effectively deterministic description of ideal gases, where all particles may be assumed to be independent and identically prepared. In real, nonideal gases, the independence assumption is only approximately valid because of possible interactions, and in liquids, the independence is completely lost. The power of the abstract theory discussed in the preceding chapters lies in the fact that it allows to replace simple statistical reasoning based on independence by more sophisticated algebraic techniques that give answers even in extremely complex interacting cases.

The weak law of large numbers also implies that, in a context where many repeated experiments are feasible, states can be given a **frequentist** interpretation, in which $\langle g \rangle$ is the **expectation** of g , empirically defined as an average over many realizations. In this case (and only in this case), $\text{res}(g)$ becomes the standard deviation of g , divided by the absolute value of the expectation; therefore, it measures the relative accuracy of the individual realizations.

On the other hand, in equilibrium thermodynamics, where a tiny number of macroscopic observations on a single system completely determine its state to engineering accuracy, such a frequentist interpretation is inappropriate. Indeed, as discussed by SKLAR [228], a frequentist interpretation of statistical mechanics has significant foundational problems, already in the framework of classical physics.

Thus, the present framework captures correctly the experimental practice, and determines the precise conditions under which deterministic and statistical reasoning are justified:

Deterministic reasoning is sufficient for all quantities whose limit resolution is below the desired relative accuracy. Statistical reasoning is necessary precisely when the limit resolution of the average quantity is larger than the desired accuracy.

In this way, we delegate statistics to its role as *the art of interpreting measurements*, as in classical physics. Indeed, to have a consistent interpretation, real experiments must be designed such that they allow one to determine approximately the properties of the

state under study, hence the values of all quantities of interest. The uncertainties in the experiments imply approximations, which, if treated probabilistically, need an *additional* probabilistic layer accounting for measurement errors. Expectations from this secondary layer, which involve probabilistic statements about situations that are uncertain due to neglected but in principle observable details (cf. PERES [194]), happen to have the same formal properties as the values on the primary layer, though their physical origin and meaning is completely different.

Classical probability. Apart from the traditional axiomatic foundation of probability theory by KOLMOGOROV [139] in terms of measure theory there is a less well-known axiomatic treatment by WHITTLE [259] in terms of expectations, which is essentially the commutative case of the present setting. The exposition in WHITTLE [259] (or, in more abstract terms, already GELFAND & NAIMARK [89]) shows that, if the X_j are pairwise commuting, it is possible to define for any Gibbs state in the present sense, random variables X_j in Kolmogorov's sense such that the expectation of all sufficiently regular functions $f(X)$ defined on the joint spectrum of (X) agrees with the value of f . It follows that in the pairwise commuting case, it is always possible to construct a probability interpretation for the quantities, completely independent of any assumed microscopic reality.

The details (which the reader unfamiliar with measure theory may simply skip) are as follows. We may associate with every vector X of quantities with commuting components a time-dependent, monotone linear functional $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ defining the **expectation**

$$\langle f(X) \rangle_t := \int \rho(t) f(X)$$

at time t of arbitrary bounded continuous functions f of X . These functions define a commutative $*$ -algebra $\mathbb{E}(X)$. The **spectrum** $\text{Spec } X$ of X is the set of all $*$ -homomorphisms (often called **characters**) from $\mathbb{E}(X)$ to \mathbb{C} , and has the structure of a Hausdorff space, with the **weak- $*$ topology** obtained by calling a subset S of $\text{Spec } X$ closed if, for any pointwise convergent sequence (or net) contained in S , its limit is also in S . Now a monotone linear functional turns out to be equivalent to a multivariate probability measure $d\mu_t(X)$ (on the sigma algebra of Borel subsets of the spectrum Ω of X) defined by

$$\int d\mu_t(X) f(X) := \int \rho(t) f(X) = \langle f(X) \rangle_t.$$

Conversely, classical probability theory may be discussed in terms of the Euclidean \mathfrak{A} -algebra of **random variables**, i.e., Borel measurable complex-valued functions on a Hausdorff space Ω where bounded continuous functions are strongly integrable and the integral is given by $\int f := \int d\mu(X) f(X)$ for some distinguished measure μ .

If – as in quantum systems – the extensive quantities do not commute, a probabilistic interpretation in the Kolmogorov sense is no longer possible. In Section 7.5, we discuss what may take its place.

7.4 Classical measurements

A measuring instrument measures properties of a system of interest. However, the measured value is read off from the instrument, and hence is primarily a property of the measuring instrument and not one of the measured system. On the other hand, properties of the system are encoded in the state of the system and its dynamics. This state and what can be deduced from it are the only objective properties of the system.

In order that a measurement on a system deserves its name there must be a quantitative relation between the state of the system and the measured values. This relation may be deterministic or stochastic, depending on what is measured,

Measurements are therefore possible only if the microscopic laws imply relations between properties of the measured system and the values read off from the measuring instrument. These relations may be either deduced from a theoretical analysis, or they may be guessed from experimental evidence. In general, the theoretical analysis leads to difficult many-particle problems that can be solved only in a stochastic approximation of idealized situations; from such idealizations one then transfers insight to make educated guesses in cases where an analysis is too difficult.

The behavior required in the following discussion for a classical or a statistical instrument guarantees **reproducibility** of measurements, a basic requirement of natural sciences, in the sense that systems prepared in the same state will behave alike when measured. Here ‘alike’ is interpreted for classical instruments in the deterministic sense of ‘approximately equal within the specified accuracy’, and for statistical instruments in the sense of ‘reproducing in the long run approximately the same probabilities and mean values’.

When measuring classical or quantum systems that are **macroscopic**, i.e., large enough to be described sufficiently well to be described by the methods of statistical mechanics, one measures more or less accurately extensive or intensive variables of the system and one obtains essentially deterministic results. A **classical instrument** is a measuring instrument which measures such deterministic values within some margin of accuracy. Note that this gives an operational meaning to the term *classical*, although every classical instrument is, of course, a quantum mechanical many-particle system when modelled in full detail. Whether a particular instrument behaves classically can in principle be found out by an analysis of the measurement process considered as a many-particle system, although the calculations can be done in practice only under simplifying assumptions. For some concrete models, see, e.g., ALLAHVERDYAN et al. [6]. Thus there is no split between the classical and the quantum world but a gradual change from quantum to classical as the system gets larger and the limit resolution improves.

It is interesting to discover the nature of thermodynamic observables⁵. We encountered intensive variables, which are parameters characterizing the state of the system, extensive variables, values which are functions of the intensive variables and of the parameters (if

⁵We use the term observable with its common-sense meaning. In quantum mechanics, the term has also a technical meaning which we do not use, denoting a self-adjoint linear operator on a Hilbert space.

there are any) in the Hamiltonian, and limit resolutions, which, as functions of values, are also functions of the intensive variables. Thus all thermodynamic observables of practical interest are functions of the parameters defining the thermal state or the hamiltonian of the system. Which parameters this are depends of course on the assumed model.

By a natural step of extrapolation, substantiated later (in Section 13.1) by the Dirac-Frenkel variational principle, we may consider, for an arbitrary model of an arbitrary system, as the basic numbers whose functions define the observables of the model the parameters characterizing a family of Hamiltonians and a family of states which describe the possible states of a system. We call these parameters the **model parameters**; the values of the model parameters completely characterize a particular system described by the model.

Thus we may say that a classical instrument is characterized by the fact that upon measurement the measurement result approximates with a certain accuracy the value of a function F of the model parameters. As customary, one writes the result of a measurement as an **uncertain number** $F_0 \pm \Delta F$ consisting of a main value F_0 and a deviation ΔF , with the meaning that the error $|F_0 - F|$ is at most a small multiple of ΔF . Because of possible systematic errors, it is generally not possible to interpret F_0 as mean value and ΔF as standard deviation. Such an interpretation is valid only if the instrument is calibrated to satisfy the implied statistical relation.

In particular, since $\langle f \rangle$ is a function of the model parameters, a measurement may yield the value $\langle f \rangle$ of a quantity f , and is then said to be a classical instrument for **measuring** f . As an important special case, all readings from a photographic image or from the scale of a measuring instrument, done by an observer, are of this nature when considered as measurements of the instrument by the observer. Indeed, what is measured by the eye is the particle density of blackened silver on a photographic plate or of iron of the tip of the pointer on the scale, and these are extensive variables in a continuum mechanical local equilibrium description of the instrument.

The measurement of a tiny, **microscopic** system, often consisting of only a single particle, is of a completely different nature. Now the limit resolutions do not benefit from the law of large numbers, and the relevant quantities often are no longer significant. Then the necessary quantitative relations between properties of the measured system and the values read off from the measuring instrument are only visible as stochastic correlations. In a single measurement of a microscopic system, one can only glean very little information about the state of a system; conversely, from the state of the system one can predict only probabilities for the results of a single measurement. The results of single measurements are no longer reproducably observable numbers; reproducably observable – and hence the carrier of scientific information – are only probabilities and statistical mean values.

To obtain comprehensive information about the state of a single microscopic system is therefore impossible. To collect enough information about the prepared state and hence the state of each system measured, one needs either time-resolved measurements on a single system (available, e.g., for atoms in ion traps or for electrons in quantum dots), or a population of identically prepared systems,

Extrapolating from the macroscopic case, it is natural to consider again the parameters characterizing a family of states which describe the possible states of a system as the basic numbers whose functions define observables in the present, nontechnical sense. This is now a less well-founded assumption based only on the lack of a definite boundary between the macroscopic and the microscopic regime, and an application of Ockham's razor to minimize the needed assumptions.

Measurements in the form of clicks, flashes or events (particle tracks) in scattering experiments may be described in terms of a **statistical instrument** characterized by a discrete family of possible measurement results a_1, a_2, \dots which may be real or complex numbers, vectors, or fields, and nonnegative Hermitian quantities P_1, P_2, \dots satisfying

$$P_1 + P_2 + \dots = 1 \quad (7.9)$$

such that the instrument gives the result a_k with probability

$$p_k = \langle P_k \rangle \quad (7.10)$$

if the measured system is in the state $\langle \cdot \rangle$. The nonnegativity of the P_k implies that all probabilities are nonnegative, and (7.9) guarantees that the probabilities always add up to 1.

An instructive example is the **photoelectric effect**, the measurement of a classical free electromagnetic field by means of a photomultiplier. A detailed discussion is given in Chapter 9 of MANDEL & WOLF [161]; here we only give an informal summary of their account.

Classical input to a quantum system is conventionally represented in the Hamiltonian of the quantum system by an interaction term containing the classical source as an external field or potential. In the semiclassical analysis of the photoelectric effect, the detector is modelled as a many-electron quantum system while the incident light triggering the detector is modelled as an external electromagnetic field. The result of the analysis is that if the classical field consists of electromagnetic waves (light) with a frequency exceeding some threshold then the detector emits a random stream of photoelectrons with a rate which, for not too strong light, is proportional to the intensity of the incident light. The predictions are quantitatively correct for normal light.

The response of the detector to the light is statistical, and only the rate (a short time mean) with which the electron are emitted bears a quantitative relation with the intensity. Thus the emitted photoelectrons form a statistical measurement of the intensity of the incident light.

The results on this analysis are somewhat surprising: The discrete nature of the electron emissions imply that a photodetector responds to classical light as if it were composed of randomly arriving photons (the explanation of the photoeffect for which Einstein received the Nobel prize), although the semiclassical model used to derive the quantitatively correct predictions does not involve photons at all!

This shows the importance of differentiating between prepared states of the system (here of classical light) and measured events in the instrument (here the amplified emitted electrons). The measurement results are primarily a property of the instrument, and their interpretation as a property of the system needs theoretical analysis to be conclusive.

7.5 Quantum probability

Although quantum mechanics generally counts as an intrinsically statistical theory, it is important to realize that it not only makes assertions about probabilities but also makes many deterministic predictions verifiable by experiment.

These deterministic predictions fall into three classes:

(i) Predictions of numerical values believed to have a precise value in nature:

- The most impressive proof of the correctness of quantum field theory in microphysics is the **magnetic moment** of the electron, predicted by quantum electrodynamics (QED) to the phenomenal accuracy of 12 significant digit agreement with the experimental value. It is a universal constant, determined solely by the two parameters in QED, the electron mass and the fine structure constant.
- QED also predicts correctly emission and absorption spectra of atoms and molecules, both the spectral positions and the corresponding line widths.
- Quantum hadrodynamics allows the prediction of the masses of all isotopes of the chemical elements in terms of models with only a limited number of parameters.

(ii) Predictions of qualitative properties, or of numerical values believed to be not exactly determined but which are accurate with a high, computable limit resolution.

- QED predicts correctly the color of gold, the liquidity of mercury at room temperature, and the hardness of diamond.
- Quantum mechanics enables the computation of thermodynamic state equations for a huge number of materials. Equations of states are used in engineering in a deterministic manner.
- From quantum mechanics one may also compute transport coefficients for deterministic kinetic equations used in a variety of applications.

Thus quantum mechanics makes both deterministic and stochastic assertions, depending on which system it is applied to and the state or the variables to be determined. Statistical mechanics, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, is mainly concerned with deterministic prediction of class (ii) in the above classification.

Interestingly, our definition of classical instruments also covers joint position-momentum measurements of **coherent states**, the quantum states discussed in 14.7. They are parameterized by position and momentum, and describe single quantum particles with essentially classically trajectories, such as they can be seen as particle tracks on photographic plates or in bubble chambers. The deterministic nature of the recorded tracks is due to the interaction of such a particle with the many-particle system formed by the recording device.

Predictions of class (i) are partly related to spectral properties of the Hamiltonian of a quantum system, which we shall discuss in Chapter 17, and partly properties deduced from form factors, which are deterministic byproducts of scattering calculations. In both cases, classical measurements account adequately for the experimental record.

Particle scattering itself, however, is a typical stochastic phenomenon. The same holds for radioactive decay, when modelled on the level of individual particles; it needs a stochastic description as a branching process, similar to classical birth and death processes in biological population dynamics. In the remainder of this section, we consider the fundamental aspects of this stochastic part of quantum mechanics.

A **statistical instrument** in the quantum case is mathematically equivalent to what is called in the literature a **positive operator-valued measure**, short **POVM**, defined as a family P_1, P_2, \dots of Hermitan, positive semidefinite operators satisfying (7.9) (or a continuous generalization of this). They originated around 1975 in work by **Helstrom** [112] on quantum detection and estimation theory and are discussed in some detail in PERES [194]. They describe the most general quantum measurement of interest in quantum information theory. Which operators P_k correctly describe a statistical instrument can in principle be found out by suitable **calibration measurements**. Indeed, if we feed the instrument with enough systems prepared in known states $\langle \cdot \rangle_j$, we can measure approximate probabilities $p_{jk} \approx \langle \mathbf{P}_k \rangle_j$. By choosing the states diverse enough, one may approximately reconstruct P_k from this information by a process called **quantum tomography**. In quantum information theory, the Hilbert spaces are finite-dimensional, hence the quantities form some algebra $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$; then N^2 values $\langle \mathbf{P}_k \rangle_j$ for linearly independent states suffice for this reconstruction. The optimal reconstruction using a minimal number of individual measurements is the subject of **quantum estimation theory**, still an active frontier of research,

Before 1975, quantum measurements used to be described in terms of **ideal** statistical measurements, the special case of POVMs where the P_k form a family of **orthogonal projectors**, i.e., linear operators satisfying

$$P_k^2 = P_k = P_k^*, \quad P_j P_k = 0 \quad \text{for } j \neq k,$$

on the eigenspaces of a selfadjoint operator A (or the components of a vector A of commuting, self-adjoint operators) with discrete spectrum given by a_1, a_2, \dots . In this case, the statistical instrument is said to perform **ideal measurements of A** , and the rule (7.10) defining the probabilities is called **Born's rule**. The rule is named after Max Born who derived it in 1926 in the special case of pure states (defined in (6.59)) and was rewarded for this at that time crucial insight into the nature of quantum mechanics with the Nobel prize in 1954.

Ideal measurements of A have quite strong properties since under the stated assumptions, the instrument-based statistical average

$$\overline{f(A)} = p_1 f(a_1) + p_2 f(a_2) + \dots$$

agrees for all functions f defined on the spectrum of A with the model-based value $\langle f(A) \rangle$. On the other hand, these strong properties are bought at the price of idealization, since it results in effects incompatible with real measurements. For example, according to Born's rule, the ideal measurement of the energy of a system whose Hamiltonian H is discrete always yields an exact eigenvalue of H , the only statistical component is the question which of the eigenvalues is obtained. This is impossible in a real measurement; the precise measurement of the Lamb shift, a difference of eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian of the hydrogen atom, was even worth a Nobel prize (1955 for Willis Lamb).

There is, however, an important special case of Born's rule which frequently applies essentially exactly. An **ideal binary statistical measurement**, e.g., the click of a detector, is described by a single orthogonal projector P ; the POVM is then given by $P_1 = P$ for the measurement result $a_1 = 1$ (click) and by $P_2 = 1 - P$ for the measurement result $a_2 = 0$ (no click). In particular, a **test for a state** φ with $\varphi^* \varphi = 1$ is an ideal binary statistical measurement with orthogonal projector $P = \varphi \varphi^*$; the reader should check that indeed $P^2 = P = P^*$. By the above, such a test turns out positive with probability $p = \langle \varphi \varphi^* \rangle$. In particular, if the system is in a pure state ψ then (6.59) implies that

$$p = \langle \varphi \varphi^* \rangle = \psi^* \varphi \varphi^* \psi = |\varphi^* \psi|^2.$$

This is the well-known **squared probability amplitude** formula, the original form of Born's rule. As a consequence, the test for φ always turns out positively if the measured system is in the pure state φ . However, it also turns out positively with a positive probability if the measured system is in a pure state different from φ , as long as it is not orthogonal to it.

By a suitable sequence of ideal binary measurements, it is possible in principle to determine with arbitrary accuracy the state in which a stationary source of particles prepares the particles. Indeed, this can be done again with quantum tomography. In case of N -level systems represented by $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$, a general state is characterized by its **density matrix** ρ , a complex Hermitian $N \times N$ -matrix with trace one, together with the trace formula

$$\langle f \rangle = \text{tr } \rho f.$$

This implies that a set of $N^2 - 1$ tests for specific states, repeated often enough, suffices for the state determination. Indeed, it is easy to see that repeated tests for the states e^j , the unit vectors with just one entry one and other entries zero, tests the diagonal elements of the density matrix, and since the trace is one, one of these diagonal elements can be computed from the knowledge of all others. Tests for $E^j + e^k$ and $e^j + ie^k$ for all $j < k$ then allow the determination of the (j, k) and (k, j) entries. Thus repetition of a total of $N - 1 + 2 \binom{N}{2} = N^2 - 1$ tests determines the full state. The optimal reconstruction using a minimal number of individual measurements is again a nontrivial problem of quantum estimation theory.

7.6 Entropy and unobservable complexity

The concept of entropy also plays an important role in **information theory**. To connect the information theoretical notion of entropy with the present setting, we present in this section an informal example of a simple stochastic model in which the entropy has a natural information theoretical interpretation. We then discuss what this may teach us about a non-stochastic macroscopic view of the situation.

We assume that we have a simple stationary device which, in regular intervals, delivers a reading n from a countable set \mathcal{N} of possible readings. For example, the device might count the number of events of a certain kind in fixed periods of time; then $\mathcal{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

We suppose that, by observing the device in action for some time, we are led to some conjecture about the (expected) relative frequencies p_n of readings $n \in \mathcal{N}$; since the device is stationary, these relative frequencies are independent of time. If \mathcal{N} is finite and not too large, we might take averages and wait until these stabilize to a satisfactory degree; if \mathcal{N} is large or infinite, most $n \in \mathcal{N}$ will not have been observed, and our conjecture must depend on educated guesses.

Clearly, in order to have a consistent interpretation of the p_n as relative frequencies, we need to assume that *each* reading is possible:

$$p_n > 0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (7.11)$$

and *some* reading occurs with certainty:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n = 1. \quad (7.12)$$

For reasons of economy, we shall not allow $p_n = 0$ in (7.11), which would correspond to readings that are either impossible, or occur too rarely to have a scientific meaning. Clearly, this is no loss of generality.

Knowing relative frequencies only means that (when $\mathcal{N} > 1$) we only have incomplete information about future readings of the device. We want to calculate the information deficit by counting the expected number of questions needed to identify a particular reading unknown to us, but known to someone else who may answer our questions with yes or no.

Consider an arbitrary strategy s for asking questions, and denote by s_n the number of questions needed to determine the reading n . With q questions we can distinguish up to 2^q different cases; but since reading n is already determined after s_n questions, reading n is obtained in 2^{q-s_n} of the 2^q cases (when $s_n \leq q$). Thus

$$\sum_{s_n \leq q} 2^{q-s_n} \leq 2^q.$$

If we divide by 2^q and then make q arbitrarily large we find that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} 2^{-s_n} \leq 1. \quad (7.13)$$

It is not difficult to construct strategies realizing the s_n whenever (7.13) holds.

Since we do not know in advance the reading, we cannot determine the precise number of questions needed in a particular unknown case. However, knowledge of the relative frequencies allows us to compute the average number of questions needed, namely

$$\bar{s} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n s_n. \quad (7.14)$$

To simplify notation, we introduce the abbreviation

$$\int f := \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} f_n \quad (7.15)$$

for every quantity f indexed by the elements from \mathcal{N} , and we use the convention that inequalities, operations and functions of such quantities are understood componentwise. Then we can rewrite (7.11)–(7.14) as

$$p > 0, \quad \int p = 1, \quad (7.16)$$

$$\bar{s} = \int p s, \quad \int 2^{-s} \leq 1, \quad (7.17)$$

and

$$\bar{f} = \langle f \rangle := \int p f. \quad (7.18)$$

is the average of an arbitrary quantity f indexed by \mathcal{N} .

We now ask for a strategy which makes the number \bar{s} as small as possible. However, we idealize the situation a little by allowing the s_n to be arbitrary nonnegative real numbers instead of integers only. This is justified when the size of \mathcal{N} is large or infinite since then most s_n will be large numbers which can be approximated by integers with a tiny relative error.

7.6.1 Theorem. *The entropy S , defined by*

$$S := -\bar{k} \log p, \quad \text{where } \bar{k} = \frac{1}{\log 2}, \quad (7.19)$$

satisfies $\bar{S} \leq \bar{s}$, with equality if and only if $s = S$.

Proof. (7.19) implies $\log p = -S \log 2$, hence $p = 2^{-S}$. Therefore

$$2^{-s} = p 2^{S-s} = p e^{(S-s) \log 2} \geq p(1 + (S-s) \log 2),$$

with equality iff $S = s$. Thus

$$p(S-s) \leq \frac{1}{\log 2} (2^{-s} - p) = \bar{k} (2^{-s} - p)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S} - \bar{s} &= \int p(S-s) \leq \int \bar{k} (2^{-s} - p) \\ &= \bar{k} \int 2^{-s} - \bar{k} \int p \leq \bar{k} - \bar{k} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\bar{s} \geq \bar{S}$, and equality holds iff $s = S$. \square

Since (7.19) implies the relation $p = e^{-S/k}$, we have $\langle f \rangle = \int p f = \int e^{-S/k} f$. Thus, the expectation mapping is a Gibbs state with entropy S , explaining the name. Note that $s = S$ defines an admissible strategy since

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} 2^{-S_n} = \int 2^{-S} = \int p = 1,$$

hence $2^{-S_n} \leq 1$, $S_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, the entropy S is **the unique optimal decision strategy**. The **expected entropy**, i.e., the mean number

$$\bar{S} = \langle S \rangle = \int p S = -k \int p \log p \quad (7.20)$$

of questions needed in an optimal decision strategy, is nonnegative,

$$\bar{S} \geq 0. \quad (7.21)$$

It measures the **information deficit** of the device with respect to our conjecture about relative frequencies. Traditionally, the expected entropy is simply called the *entropy*, while we reserve this word for the random variable (7.19). Also commonly used is the name *information* for \bar{S} , which invites linguistic paradoxes since ordinary language associates with information a connotation of relevance or quality which is absent here. The classical book on information theory by BRILLOUIN [46] emphasizes this very carefully, by distinguishing absolute information from its human value or meaning. KATZ [132] uses the phrase *missing information*.

The information deficit says nothing at all about the quality of the information contained in the summary p of our past observations. An inappropriate p can have arbitrarily small information deficit and still give a false account of reality. For example, if for some small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$p_n = \varepsilon^{n-1}(1 - \varepsilon) \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (7.22)$$

expressing that the reading is expected to be nearly always 1 ($p_1 = 1 - \varepsilon$) and hardly ever large, then

$$\bar{S} = k \left(\log(1 - \varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \log \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus the information deficit can be made very small by the choice (7.22) with small ε , independent of whether this choice corresponds to the known facts. The real information value of p depends instead on the care with which the past observations were interpreted, which is a matter of data analysis and not of our model of the device. If the data analysis is done poorly, the resulting expectations will simply not be matched by reality. This shows that the entropy reflects objective properties of the stochastic process, and – contrary to claims in the literature – has nothing to do with our knowledge of the system, a subjective, ill-defined notion.

Relations to thermodynamics. Now suppose that the above setting happens at a very fast, unobservable time scale, so that we can actually observe only short time averages

(7.18) of quantities of interest. Then $\bar{f} = \langle f \rangle$ simply has the interpretation of the time-independent observed value of the quantity f . The information deficit simply becomes the observed value of the entropy S . Since the information deficit counts the number of optimal decisions needed to completely specify a (microscopic) situation of which we know only (macroscopic) observed values, the observed value of the entropy quantifies the **intrinsic** (microscopic) **complexity** present in the system.

However, the unobservable high frequency fluctuations of the device do not completely disappear from the picture. They show up in the fact that generally $\overline{g^2} \neq \bar{g}^2$, leading to a nonzero limit resolution (5.44) of Hermitian quantities. This is precisely the situation characteristic of the traditional treatment of thermodynamics within classical equilibrium statistical mechanics, if we assume that the system is **ergodic**, i.e., that population averages equal time averages. Then, all observed values are time-independent, described by equilibrium thermal variables. But the underlying high-frequency motions of the atoms making up a macroscopic substance are revealed by nonzero limit resolutions. However, the assumption that all systems for which thermodynamics works are ergodic is problematic; see, e.g., the discussion in SKLAR [228].

Note that even a deterministic but chaotic high frequency dynamics, viewed at longer time scales, looks stochastic, and exactly the same remarks about the unobservable complexity and the observable consequences of fluctuations apply. Even if fluctuations are observable directly, these observations are intrinsically limited by the necessary crudity of any actual measurement protocol. For the best possible measurements (and only for these), the resolution of f in the experiment is given by the limit resolution $\text{res}(f)$, the size of the unavoidable fluctuations.

Due to the quantum structure of high frequency phenomena on an atomic or subatomic scale, it seems problematic to interpret thermodynamic limit resolutions in terms of a simple short time average of some underlying microscopic reality. Thus an information theoretic interpretation of the physical entropy seems questionable.

7.7 Subjective probability

The formalism of statistical mechanics is closely related to that used in statistics for random phenomena expressible in terms of exponential families; cf. Remark 6.1.2(viii). Exponential families play an important role in Bayesian statistics. Therefore a Bayesian, subjective probability interpretation to statistical mechanics is possible in terms of the knowledge of an observer, using an information theoretic approach. See, e.g., BALIAN [16] for a recent exposition in terms of physics, and BARNDORFF-NIELSEN [22, 23] for a formal mathematical treatment. In such a treatment, the present integral plays the role of a **noninformative prior**, i.e., of the state considered to be least informative. This noninformative prior is often improper, i.e., not a probability distribution, since $\int 1$ need not be defined.

Motivated by the subjective, information theoretic approach to probability, JAYNES [122, 123] used the maximum entropy principle to derive the thermodynamic formalism. The

maximum entropy principle asserts that one should model a system with the statistical distribution which maximizes the expected entropy subject to the known information about certain expectation values. This principle is sometimes considered as a rational, unprejudiced way of accounting for available information in incompletely known statistical models. Based on Theorem 5.3.3, it is not difficult to show that when the known information is given by the expectations of the quantities X_1, \dots, X_n , the optimal state in the sense of the maximum entropy principle is a Gibbs state whose entropy is a linear combination of 1 and the X_k .

However, the maximum entropy principle is an unreliable general purpose tool, and gives an appropriate distribution only under quite specific circumstances.

7.7.1 Example. If we have information in the form of a large but finite sample of realizations $x(\omega_k)$ of a random variable x in N independent experiments ω_k ($k = 1, \dots, n$), we can obtain from it approximate information about all moments $\langle x^n \rangle \approx N^{-1} \sum x(\omega_k)^n / N$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$). It is not difficult to see that the maximum entropy principle would infer that the distribution of x is discrete, namely that of the sample.

If we take as uninformative prior for a real-valued random variable x the Lebesgue measure, $\int f(x) := \int f(x) dx$, and only know that the mean of x is 1, say, the maximum entropy principle does not produce a sensible probability distribution. If we add the knowledge of the second moment $\langle x^2 \rangle = 1$, say, we get a Gaussian distribution with mean 1 and standard deviation $1/\sqrt{2}$. Adding the further knowledge of $\langle x^3 \rangle$, the maximum entropy principle fails again to produce a sensible distribution. If, on the other hand, after knowing that $\langle x \rangle = 1$ we learn that the random variable is in fact nonnegative and integer-valued, this cannot be accounted for by the principle, and the probability of obtaining a negative value remains large. But if we take as prior the discrete measure on nonnegative integers defined by $\int f(x) := \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} f(x)/x!$, the supposedly noninformative prior has become much more informative, the knowledge of the mean produces via the maximum entropy principle a Poisson distribution.

If we know that a random variable x is nonnegative and has $\langle x^2 \rangle = 1$; the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}_+ as noninformative prior gives for x a distribution with density $\sqrt{2/\pi} e^{-x^2/2}$. But we can consider instead our knowledge about $y = x^2$, which is nonnegative and has $\langle y \rangle = 1$; the same noninformative prior now gives for y a distribution with density e^{-y} . The distribution of $x = \sqrt{y}$ resulting from this has density $2xe^{-x^2/2}$. Thus the result depends on whether we regard x or y as the relevant variable.

We see that the choice of expectations to be used as constraints reflects prior assumptions about which expectations are likely to be relevant. Moreover, the prior, far from being uninformative, reflects the prejudice assumed in the complete absence of knowledge. The prior which must be assumed to describe the state of complete ignorance significantly affects the results of the maximum entropy principle, and hence makes the application of the principle ambiguous.

The application of the maximum entropy principle becomes reliable only if the information is available in form of the expectation values of a sufficient statistics of the true model;

see, e.g., BARNDORFF-NIELSEN [22]. Which statistical model may be considered sufficient depends on the true situation and is difficult to assess in advance.

In particular, a Bayesian interpretation of statistical mechanics in the manner of Jaynes is appropriate if and only if (i) correct, complete and sufficiently accurate information about the expectation of all relevant quantities is assumed to be known, and (ii) the noninformative prior is fixed by the constructions of Example 5.1.8, namely as the correctly weighted Liouville measure in classical physics and as the microcanonical ensemble (the trace) in quantum physics. Only this guarantees that the knowledge assumed and hence the results obtained are completely impersonal and objective, as required for scientific results, and agree with standard thermodynamics, as required for agreement with nature. However, this kind of knowledge is clearly completely hypothetical and has nothing to do with the real, subjective knowledge of real observers.

Part III

Lie algebras and Poisson algebras

Chapter 8

Lie algebras

Part III introduces the basics about Lie algebras and Lie groups, with an emphasis on the concepts most relevant to the conceptual side of physics.

This chapter introduces Lie algebras together with the slightly richer structure of a Lie $*$ -algebra usually encountered in the mechanical applications. We introduce tools for verifying the Jacobi identity, and establish the latter both for the Poisson bracket of a classical harmonic oscillator and, for quantum systems, for the commutator of linear operators.

Further Lie algebras arise as algebras of matrices closed under commutation, as algebras of derivations in associative algebras, as centralizers or quotient algebras, and by complexification. An overview over semisimple Lie algebras and their classification concludes the chapter.

In finite dimensions, the relation is almost one-to-one, the "almost" being due to the fact that the so-called universal covering group of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra (defined in Section 10.4) may have a nontrivial discrete normal subgroup.

Many finite-dimensional Lie groups arise as groups of square invertible matrices, and we discuss the most important families, in particular the unitary and the orthogonal groups. We introduce group representations, which relate groups of matrices (or linear operators) to abstract Lie groups, and will turn out to be most important for understanding the spectrum of quantum systems.

Of particular importance for systems of oscillators are the Heisenberg groups, the universal covering groups of the Heisenberg algebras. Their product law is given by the famous Weyl relations, which are an exactly representable case of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula valid for many other Lie groups, in particular for arbitrary finite-dimensional ones. We also discuss the Poincaré group. This is the symmetry group of space-time, and forms the basis for relativity theory.

8.1 Basic definitions

We start with the definition of a Lie algebra over a field \mathbb{K} , usually implicitly given by the context. In our course, \mathbb{K} is either the field \mathbb{C} of complex numbers, occasionally the field \mathbb{R} of real numbers. Lie algebras over other fields, such as the rationals \mathbb{Q} or finite fields \mathbb{Z}_p for p prime, also have interesting applications in mathematics, physics and engineering, but these are outside the scope of this book. To denote the Lie product, we use the symbol \lrcorner introduced at the end of Section 1.2. (This replaces other, bracket-based notations common in the literature.)

8.1.1 Definition.

(i) A **Lie product** on a vector space \mathbb{L} over \mathbb{K} is a bilinear operation on \mathbb{L} satisfying

$$(L1) \quad f \lrcorner f = 0,$$

$$(L2) \quad f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) + g \lrcorner (h \lrcorner f) + h \lrcorner (f \lrcorner g) = 0 \text{ for all } f, g, h \in \mathbb{L}.$$

Equation (L2) is called the **Jacobi identity**.

(ii) For subsets A, B of \mathbb{L} , we write

$$A \lrcorner B := \{f \lrcorner g \mid f \in A, g \in B\},$$

and for $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$A \lrcorner g := A \lrcorner \{g\}, \quad f \lrcorner B := \{f\} \lrcorner B.$$

(iii) A **Lie algebra** over \mathbb{K} is a vector space \mathbb{L} over \mathbb{K} with a distinguished Lie product. Elements $f \in \mathbb{L}$ with $f \lrcorner \mathbb{L} = 0$ are called **(Lie) central**; the set $Z(\mathbb{L})$ of all these elements is called the **center** of \mathbb{L} . A **real (complex)** Lie algebra is a Lie algebra over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$). Unless confusion is possible, we use the same symbol \lrcorner for the Lie product in different Lie algebras.

Clearly, if $f \lrcorner g$ defines a Lie product of f and g , so does $f \lrcorner_{\iota} g := \iota(f \lrcorner g)$ for all $\iota \in \mathbb{K}$. Thus the same vector space may be a Lie algebra in different ways.

In physics, finite-dimensional Lie algebras are often defined in terms of basis elements X_k called **generators** and **structure constants** c_{jkl} , such that

$$X_j \lrcorner X_k = \sum_l c_{jkl} X_l. \tag{8.1}$$

By taking linear combinations and using the bilinearity of the Lie product, the structure constants determine the Lie product completely. Conversely, since the generators form a basis, the structure constants are determined uniquely by the basis. They depend, however, on the basis chosen. Frequently, there are distinguished bases with a physical interpretation in which the structure constants are particularly simple, and most of them vanish. If a basis and the structure constants are given, many Lie algebra computations can be done automatically; important software packages include LIE (VAN LEEUWEN et al. [251]) and LTP (TORRES-TORRITI [242]). In this book, we usually prefer a basis-free approach,

resorting to basis-dependent formulas only to make connections with traditional physics notation.

As a consequence of (L1) (and in fact equivalent to it), we have the following antisymmetry property:

$$f \lrcorner g = -g \lrcorner f.$$

This follows from observing that $f \lrcorner 0 = 0 \lrcorner f = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (f + g) \lrcorner (f + g) = f \lrcorner f + f \lrcorner g + g \lrcorner f + g \lrcorner g \\ &= f \lrcorner g + g \lrcorner f. \end{aligned}$$

Using the antisymmetry property of the Lie product one can write the Jacobi identity in two other important forms, each equivalent with the Jacobi identity:

$$f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) = (f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h + g \lrcorner (f \lrcorner h), \quad (8.2)$$

$$(f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h = (f \lrcorner h) \lrcorner g + f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h). \quad (8.3)$$

These formulas say that one can apply the Lie product to a compound expression in a manner familiar from the product rule for differentiation.

An important but somewhat trivial class of Lie algebras are the **abelian** Lie algebras, where $f \lrcorner g = 0$ for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$. It is trivial to check that (L1) and (L2) are satisfied. Clearly, every vector space can be turned into an abelian Lie algebra by defining $f \lrcorner g = 0$ for all vectors f and g . In particular, the field \mathbb{K} itself and the center of any Lie algebra are abelian Lie algebras.

A subspace \mathbb{L}' of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is a **Lie subalgebra** if it is closed under the Lie product, i.e., if $f \lrcorner g \in \mathbb{L}'$ for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}'$. In this case, the restriction of the Lie product \lrcorner of \mathbb{L} to \mathbb{L}' turns \mathbb{L}' into a Lie algebra. That is, a Lie subalgebra is a subspace that is a Lie algebra with the same Lie product. (For example, the subspace $\mathbb{K}f$ spanned by an arbitrary element f of a Lie algebra is an abelian Lie subalgebra.) A Lie subalgebra is **nontrivial** if it is not the whole Lie algebra and contains a nonzero element.

The property (L1) is usually easy to check. It is harder to check the Jacobi identity (L2) for a proposed Lie product; direct calculations can be quite messy when many terms have to be calculated before one finds that they all cancel. Since we will encounter many Lie products that must be verified to satisfy the Jacobi identity, we first develop some technical machinery to make life easier, or at least more structured. For a given binary bilinear operation \circ on \mathbb{L} , we define the **associator** of $f, g, h \in \mathbb{L}$ as

$$[f, g, h] := (f \circ g) \circ h - f \circ (g \circ h). \quad (8.4)$$

8.1.2 Proposition. *If the associator of a bilinear operator \circ on \mathbb{L} satisfies*

$$[f, g, h] + [g, h, f] + [h, f, g] - [f, h, g] - [h, g, f] - [g, f, h] = 0, \quad (8.5)$$

then

$$f \lrcorner g := f \circ g - g \circ f$$

defines a Lie product on \mathbb{L} .

Proof. Define

$$J(f, g, h) := f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) + g \lrcorner (h \lrcorner f) + h \lrcorner (f \lrcorner g),$$

and define

$$S(f, g, h) := [f, g, h] + [g, h, f] + [h, f, g] - [f, h, g] - [h, g, f] - [g, f, h].$$

Writing out $S(f, g, h)$ and $J(f, g, h)$ with $f \lrcorner g := f \circ g - g \circ f$, one sees $J(f, g, h) = -S(f, g, h)$ and hence if $S(f, g, h) = 0$ for all f, g and h , then the Jacobi identity is satisfied for all f, g and h . The antisymmetry property $f \lrcorner f = 0$ is trivial. \square

8.1.3 Theorem. *The binary operation \lrcorner defined on the vector space $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ by*

$$f \lrcorner g := f_p g_q - g_p f_q,$$

where $f_p = \partial f / \partial p$ and $f_q = \partial f / \partial q$, is a Lie product.

Proof. We calculate the associator for the bilinear operator $f \circ g = f_p g_q$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} [f, g, h] &= (f \circ g)_p h_q - f_p (g \circ h)_q \\ &= (f_p g_q)_p h_q - f_p (g_p h_q)_q \\ &= f_{pp} g_q h_q + f_p g_{qp} h_q - f_p g_{pq} h_q - f_p g_p h_{qq} \\ &= f_{pp} g_q h_q - f_p g_p h_{qq} \end{aligned}$$

Writing the cyclic permutations we get

$$\begin{aligned} [f, g, h] + [g, h, f] + [h, f, g] &= f_{pp} g_q h_q + g_{pp} h_q f_q + h_{pp} f_q g_q \\ &\quad - f_p g_p h_{qq} - g_p h_p f_{qq} - h_p f_p g_{qq}, \end{aligned}$$

which is symmetric in f, g ; hence the identity (8.5) is satisfied. Proposition 8.1.2 therefore implies that \lrcorner is a Lie product.

The reader is invited to prove this result also by a direct calculation. \square

We end this section by introducing some concepts needed at various later points but collected here for convenience. If \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}' are Lie algebras we call a linear map $\phi : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}'$ a **homomorphism** (of Lie algebras) if

$$\phi(f \lrcorner g) = \phi(f) \lrcorner \phi(g)$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$. Note that the left-hand side involves the Lie product in \mathbb{L} , whereas the right-hand side involves the Lie product in \mathbb{L}' . An injective homomorphism is called an **embedding** of \mathbb{L} into \mathbb{L}' . We call two Lie algebras \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}' **isomorphic** if there is a homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}'$ and a homomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{L}' \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ such that $\psi \circ \phi$ is the identity on \mathbb{L} and $\phi \circ \psi$ is the identity on \mathbb{L}' . Then ϕ is called an **isomorphism**, and ψ is the inverse isomorphism.

Given a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} and a subalgebra \mathbb{L}' , the **centralizer** $C_{\mathbb{L}'}(S)$ in \mathbb{L}' of a subset $S \subset \mathbb{L}$ is defined by

$$C_{\mathbb{L}'}(S) = \{f \in \mathbb{L}' \mid f \lrcorner g = 0 \text{ for all } g \in S\}.$$

In words, $C_{\mathbb{L}'}(S)$ consists of all the elements in \mathbb{L}' that Lie commute with all elements in S . One may use the Jacobi identity to see that $C_{\mathbb{L}'}(S)$ is a Lie subalgebra of \mathbb{L}' .

An **ideal** of \mathbb{L} is a subspace $I \subseteq \mathbb{L}$ such that $f \lrcorner g \in I$ for all $f \in \mathbb{L}$ and for all $g \in I$. In other notation $\mathbb{L} \lrcorner I = I \lrcorner \mathbb{L} \subseteq I$. Note that 0 and \mathbb{L} itself are always ideals; they are called the trivial ideals. Also, the center of a Lie algebra is always an ideal. A less trivial ideal is the **derived Lie algebra** $\mathbb{L}^{(1)}$ of \mathbb{L} consisting of all elements that can be written as a finite sum of elements of $\mathbb{L} \lrcorner \mathbb{L}$. If $I \subseteq \mathbb{L}$ is an ideal in \mathbb{L} one may form the quotient Lie algebra \mathbb{L}/I , whose elements are the equivalence classes $[f]$ of all $g \in \mathbb{L}$ such that $f - g \in I$, with addition, scalar multiplication, and Lie product given by

$$\alpha[g] := [\alpha g], \quad [f] + [g] := [f + g], \quad [f] \lrcorner [g] := [f \lrcorner g].$$

It is well-known that the vector space operations are well-defined. The Lie product is well-defined since $f' \in [f]$ implies $f' - f \in I$, hence $(f - f') \lrcorner g \in I$ and $[f'] \lrcorner [g] = [f' \lrcorner g] = [f \lrcorner g + (f' - f) \lrcorner g] = [f \lrcorner g]$.

If \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}' are Lie algebras, their **direct sum** $\mathbb{L} \oplus \mathbb{L}'$ is the direct sum of the vector spaces equipped with the Lie product defined by

$$(x + x') \lrcorner (y + y') = x \lrcorner y + x' \lrcorner y'$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{L}$ and all $x', y' \in \mathbb{L}'$. It is easily verified that the axioms are satisfied.

8.2 Lie algebras from derivations

Equation (8.2),

$$f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) = (f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h + g \lrcorner (f \lrcorner h).$$

resembles the product rule for (partial) differentiation;

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(gh) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}h + g\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}.$$

To make the similarity more apparent we introduce for every element $f \in \mathbb{L}$ a linear operator $\text{ad}_f : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$, the **derivative in direction** f , given by

$$\text{ad}_f g := f \lrcorner g.$$

The notation reflects the fact that the operator $\text{ad} : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ defined by

$$\text{ad}f := \text{ad}_f$$

is the **adjoint representation** of \mathbb{L} ; see Sections 10.3 and 10.6.

Note that an element $f \in \mathbb{L}$ is in the center $Z(\mathbb{L}) = C_{\mathbb{L}}(\mathbb{L})$ of \mathbb{L} if and only if the linear operator ad_f is zero.

8.2.1 Example. For f in the Lie algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ constructed in Theorem 8.1.3, we have

$$\text{ad}_f g = f \lrcorner g = f_p g_q - f_q g_p = \left(f_p \frac{\partial}{\partial q} - f_q \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \right) g. \quad (8.6)$$

The vector field X_f on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ defined by the coefficients of ad_f is called the **Hamiltonian vector field** defined by f ; cf. Chapter 12. In particular, the Hamiltonian derivative operators with respect to p and q take the explicit form

$$X_p = \frac{\partial}{\partial q}, \quad X_q = -\frac{\partial}{\partial p},$$

and we have

$$\text{ad}_f = f_p X_p + f_q X_q.$$

With the convention that operators bind stronger than the Lie product, the Jacobi identity can be written in the form

$$\text{ad}_f(g \lrcorner h) = \text{ad}_f g \lrcorner h + g \lrcorner \text{ad}_f h.$$

The Jacobi identity is thus equivalent to saying that the operator ad_f defines for every f a derivation of the Lie algebra.

8.2.2 Definition.

(i) A **derivation** of a vector space \mathbb{A} with a bilinear product \circ is a linear map $\delta : \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ satisfying

$$\delta(f \circ g) = \delta f \circ g + f \circ \delta g,$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{A}$. We denote by $\text{Der } \mathbb{A}$ the set of all derivations of \mathbb{A} . (In the cases of interest, \mathbb{A} is an associative algebra with the associative product as \circ , or a Lie algebra with the Lie product as *circ*.)

(ii) If \mathbb{E} is an associative algebra \mathbb{E} , a **(left) \mathbb{E} -module** is an additive abelian group \mathbb{V} together with a multiplication mapping which assigns to $f \in \mathbb{E}$ and $x \in \mathbb{V}$ a product $fx \in \mathbb{V}$ such that

$$f(x + y) = fx + fy, \quad (f + g)x = fx + gx, \quad f(gx) = (fg)x$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$.

8.2.3 Proposition. *The commutator of two derivations is a derivation. In particular, $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$ with Lie product*

$$\delta \lrcorner \delta' := [\delta, \delta'].$$

Moreover, if $\delta \in \text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ and $f \in \mathbb{E}$ then the **product** $f\delta$ defined by

$$(f\delta)g := f(\delta g)$$

is a derivation, and turns $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ into an \mathbb{E} -module.

Proof. Since $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ is a linear vector space, and since the antisymmetry property and the Jacobi identity are already satisfied in $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$, we only need to check that the Lie product of two derivations is again a derivation. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta \lrcorner \delta')(fg) &= (\delta\delta')(fg) - (\delta'\delta)(fg) \\ &= \delta((\delta'f)g + f(\delta'g)) - \delta'((\delta f)g + f(\delta g)) \\ &= (\delta\delta'f)g + f\delta\delta'g - (\delta'\delta f)g - f\delta\delta'g \\ &= (\delta \lrcorner \delta'f)g + f(\delta \lrcorner \delta'g) \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part. The second part is straightforward. \square

8.2.4 Proposition. *The centralizer of a subset S of $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$, defined as*

$$C(S) := \{ \delta \in \text{Der } \mathbb{E} \mid A \lrcorner \delta = 0 \text{ for all } A \in S \},$$

is a Lie subalgebra of $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$.

Proof. As before, we only need to prove that the Lie product closes within $C(S)$. If $\delta, \delta' \in C(S)$, the Jacobi identity in the form (8.2) implies

$$A \lrcorner (\delta \lrcorner \delta') = (A \lrcorner \delta) \lrcorner \delta' + \delta \lrcorner (A \lrcorner \delta') = 0.$$

\square

8.3 Linear groups and their Lie algebras

In quantum mechanics, linear operators play a central role; they appear in two essentially different ways: Operators describing time evolution and canonical transformations are linear operators U on a Hilbert space, that are **unitary** in the sense that $U^*U = UU^* = 1$, and hence bounded¹. The unitary operators form a group, which in many cases of interest is a so-called Lie group.

On the other hand, many important quantities in quantum mechanics are described in terms of unbounded linear operators that are defined not on the whole Hilbert space but only on a dense subspace. Usually, the linear operators of interest have a common dense domain \mathbb{H} on which they are defined and which they map into itself. \mathbb{H} inherits from the Hilbert space the Hermitian inner product, hence is a complex **Euclidean space**, and the Hilbert space can be reconstructed from \mathbb{H} as the **completion** $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ of \mathbb{H} by equivalence classes of Cauchy sequences, in the way familiar from the construction of the real numbers from rationals. We therefore consider the algebra $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of continuous linear operators on a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} , with composition as associative product.

¹The bounded operators on a Hilbert space a so-called C^* -algebra; see for example RICKART [207], BAGGETT [14], or WERNER [257]. But we do not use this fact.

In this section, we define the basic concepts relevant for a study of groups and Lie algebras inside algebras of operators. Since for these concepts neither the operator structure nor the coefficient field matters in most cases - as long as the characteristic is not two -, we provide a slightly more general framework. In the next section, we apply the general framework to the algebra $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{C}^n$ of complex $n \times n$ -matrices, considered in the standard way as linear operators on the space \mathbb{C}^n of column vectors with n complex entries. Many of the Lie groups and Lie algebras arising in the applications are naturally defined as subgroups or subspaces of this algebra.

An **(associative) algebra** over a field \mathbb{K} is a vector space \mathbb{E} over \mathbb{K} with a bilinear, associative multiplication. For example, every $*$ -algebra is an associative algebra over \mathbb{C} . As traditional, the product of an associative algebra (and in particular that of $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$) is written by juxtaposition. An associative algebra \mathbb{E} is called **commutative** if $fg = gf$ for all $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$, and **noncommutative** otherwise. In many cases we assume that such an algebra has a unit element 1 with respect to multiplication; after the identification of the multiples of 1 with the elements of \mathbb{K} , this is equivalent to assuming that $\mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$. If \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}' are associative algebras over \mathbb{K} with 1, then a \mathbb{K} -linear map $\phi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}'$ is an algebra homomorphism if $\phi(fg) = \phi(f)\phi(g)$ and $\phi(1) = 1$. Often we omit the reference to the ground field \mathbb{K} and assume a ground field has been chosen.

We now show that every associative algebra has many Lie products, and thus can be made in many ways into a Lie algebra. For commutative Lie algebras, the construction is a bit cumbersome and only leads to abelian Lie algebras.

8.3.1 Theorem. *Let \mathbb{E} be an associative algebra. Then, for every $J \in \mathbb{E}$, the binary operation \triangleright_J defined on \mathbb{E} by*

$$f \triangleright_J g := fJg - gJf$$

is a Lie product. In particular ($J = 1$), the binary operation \triangleright defined on \mathbb{E} by

$$f \triangleright g := [f, g]$$

where

$$[f, g] := fg - gf$$

*denotes the **commutator** of f and g , is a Lie product.*

Proof. We compute the associator (8.4) for the bilinear operation $f \circ g := fJg$:

$$[f, g, h] = (f \circ g)Jh - fJ(g \circ h) = fJgJh - fJgJh = 0,$$

by associativity. Hence the associator of \circ satisfies (8.5). Hence \triangleright_J is a Lie product. \square

Note that $Jf \triangleright Jg = J(f \triangleright g)$. Hence the corresponding Lie algebras are isomorphic when J is invertible.

If \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}' are two associative algebras with unity, we may turn them into Lie algebras by putting $f \triangleright g = [f, g]$ in both \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}' . We denote by \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}' the Lie algebra

associated to \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{E}' , respectively. If ϕ is an algebra homomorphism from \mathbb{E} to \mathbb{E}' then ϕ induces a Lie algebra homomorphism between the Lie algebras \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}' . Indeed $\phi(f \lrcorner g) = \phi(fg - gf) = \phi(f)\phi(g) - \phi(g)\phi(f) = \phi(f) \lrcorner \phi(g)$.

Theorem (8.3.1) applies in particular to $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$. The Lie algebra $\mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$ with Lie product $f \lrcorner g := [f, g]$ is called the **general linear algebra** $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ over \mathbb{K} . If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, we simply write $gl(n) = gl(n, \mathbb{C})$; similar abbreviations apply without notice for the names of other Lie algebras introduced later.

8.3.2 Definition.

(i) A **Hausdorff *-algebra** is a *-algebra \mathbb{E} with a Hausdorff topology in which addition, multiplication, and conjugation are continuous. An element $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is called **complete** if the initial-value problem

$$\frac{d}{dt}U(t) = fU(t), \quad U(0) = 1 \quad (8.7)$$

has a unique solution $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$. Then the mapping U is called a **one-parameter group** with **infinitesimal generator** f , and we write $e^{tf} := U(t)$; this notation is unambiguous since it is easily checked that $e^{t(sf)} = e^{(ts)f}$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. An element $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is called **self-adjoint** if $f^* = f$ and the product if with the imaginary unit is complete. We call an element $g \in \mathbb{E}$ **exponential** if it is of the form $g = e^f$ for some complete $f \in \mathbb{E}$. We call a Hausdorff *-algebra \mathbb{E} an **exponential algebra** if the set of exponential elements in \mathbb{E} is a neighborhood of 1.

(ii) A **linear group** is a set \mathbb{G} of invertible elements of some associative algebra \mathbb{E} such that $1 \in \mathbb{G}$ and

$$g, g' \in \mathbb{G} \quad \Rightarrow \quad g^{-1}, gg' \in \mathbb{G}.$$

If \mathbb{E} is given with a topology in which its operations are continuous, we consider \mathbb{G} as a topological group with the topology induced by calling a subset of \mathbb{G} open or closed if it is the intersection of an open or closed set of \mathbb{E} with \mathbb{G} .

(iii) A **linear Lie group** is a closed subgroup of the group \mathbb{E}^\times of all invertible elements of an exponential algebra \mathbb{E} . A **Lie group** is a group $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}$ with a Hausdorff topology that is **isomorphic** to some linear Lie group \mathbb{G} , i.e., for which there is an invertible mapping $\phi : \tilde{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ such that ϕ and ϕ^{-1} are continuous and $\phi(1) = 1$, $\phi(gg') = \phi(g)\phi(g')$ for all $g, g' \in \tilde{\mathbb{G}}$.

For all exponential algebras \mathbb{E} , the group \mathbb{E}^\times is a linear Lie group. Note that the law $e^f e^{f'} = e^{f+f'}$ holds if f and f' commute but not in general. In particular,

$$e^f e^{-f} = e^0 = 1.$$

If \mathbb{E} is a **Banach algebra**, i.e., if the topology of \mathbb{E} is induced by a norm $\|\cdot\|$ satisfying $\|fg\| \leq \|f\| \|g\|$, it is not very difficult to show that every $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is complete, and we have for all $f \in \mathbb{E}$ the absolute convergent series expansion

$$e^f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^k}{k!},$$

and that $f = \log g$, where

$$\log g := - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-g)^k}{k} \quad \text{for } \|1-g\| < 1,$$

provides an f such that $g = e^f$. Therefore every Banach algebra is exponential. Note that the **exponential mapping**, which maps a matrix $f \in \mathbb{E}$ to $e^f \in \mathbb{E}^\times$, is usually not surjective.

The above applies to the case $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ with the maximum norm, which is a Banach algebra, which covers all finite-dimensional Lie groups. In infinite dimensions, however, many interesting linear Lie groups are not definable over Banach algebras.

8.4 Classical Lie groups and their Lie algebras

This section is not yet in a good form.

A **matrix group** is a linear group in an algebra $\mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$. In this section, we define the most important matrix groups and the corresponding Lie algebras. Although we get Lie algebras no matter which field is involved, we get Lie groups in the sense defined above only when \mathbb{K} is the field of real numbers or the field of complex numbers².

8.4.1 Example. The group $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ of all invertible $n \times n$ -matrices over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ is a linear group. The subgroup of $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ consisting of the matrices with unit determinant is denoted by $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$. In other words, $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the kernel of the map $\det : GL(n, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^*$, where \mathbb{K}^* is the group of invertible elements in \mathbb{K} . The Lie algebra of $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is denoted by $sl(n, \mathbb{K})$ and consists of the traceless $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} . By Theorem 8.3.1, the algebra of $n \times n$ -matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} is a Lie algebra the commutator as Lie product; this Lie algebra is denoted by $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$. The center of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ is easily seen to be the 1-dimensional subalgebra spanned by the identity matrix, $Z(gl(n, \mathbb{K})) = \mathbb{K}1 = \mathbb{K}$.

Every subspace of a Lie algebra closed under the Lie product is again a Lie algebra. This simple recipe provides a large number of useful Lie algebras defined as Lie subalgebras of some $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$. Conversely, the (nontrivial) **theorem of Ado**, not proven here but see e.g. JACOBSEN [121], states that every finite-dimensional Lie algebra is isomorphic to a Lie subalgebra of some $gl(n, \mathbb{R})$.

²For the real and complex fields, because exponentials can be defined, the groups have a natural differential geometric structure as differentiable manifolds; cf. Section 11.7. For general fields, there are no exponentials, and one needs to replace the differential geometric structure inherent in Lie groups by an algebraic geometry structure, and may then interpret general matrix groups as so-called **groups of Lie type**. In particular, for finite fields, one gets the **Chevalley groups**, which figure prominently in the classification of finite simple groups.

The group $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is one of the most important finite-dimensional linear groups and all finite-dimensional linear groups are isomorphic to subgroups of $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ for some n . If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ then every closed subgroup \mathbb{G} of $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is a Lie group. These Lie groups have associated Lie algebras $\mathbb{L} = \log \mathbb{G}$ of infinitesimal generators. For any Lie subgroup G of $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ one gets the Lie algebra by looking at the vector space of those elements X of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ such that $e^{\varepsilon X}$ is in G for ε small enough. This criterion is very useful since we can take ε so small that we only have to look at the terms linear in ε so that we don't have to expand the exponential series completely. If the subgroup $\mathbb{G} \subset GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is connected and either compact or nilpotent, then the exponential map can be shown to be surjective, see e.g. KNAPP [137].

The Lie algebra $sl(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the Lie subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ given by the traceless matrices. The dimension is $n^2 - 1$ and we have

$$sl(n, \mathbb{K}) \cong gl(n, \mathbb{K})/\mathbb{K}.$$

The quotient is well defined and is a Lie algebra because \mathbb{K} is the center and thus in particular an ideal.

If \mathbb{L} is a Lie algebra over \mathbb{R} then by taking the tensor product with \mathbb{C} and extending the Lie bracket in a \mathbb{C} -linear way, one obtains the **complexification** of \mathbb{L} , denoted $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{C}}$. The process of complexification is also called **extension of scalars**. In particular, if we write $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{L}$ then in $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{C}}$ the Lie bracket is given by $(\alpha \otimes x) \lrcorner (\beta \otimes y) = \alpha\beta \otimes (x \lrcorner y)$. The reverse process is called **realization** or **restriction of scalars**; we clarify the process of restriction of scalars by an example.

8.4.2 Example. Consider $\mathbb{L} = sl(2, \mathbb{C})$. We wish to calculate $sl(2, \mathbb{C})^{\mathbb{R}}$. A basis of $sl(2, \mathbb{C})$ is given by the elements

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This basis is as well a basis for $sl(2, \mathbb{R})$; therefore we see $sl(2, \mathbb{C})^{\mathbb{R}} \cong sl(2, \mathbb{R}) \oplus_{\mathbb{R}} i sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ as real vector spaces. The Lie product of $f + ig$ and $f' + ig'$ for $f, f' \in sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $ig, ig' \in i sl(2, \mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$(f + g) \lrcorner (f' + g') = f \lrcorner f' - g \lrcorner g' + i(f \lrcorner g' + f' \lrcorner g).$$

The reader who has already some experience with Lie algebras is encouraged to verify the isomorphism $sl(2, \mathbb{C})^{\mathbb{R}} \cong so(3, 1)$.

8.4.3 Example. Suppose we have a symmetric bilinear form B on \mathbb{K}^n . The Lie algebra $so(n, B; \mathbb{K})$ is the subspace of all $f \in sl(n, \mathbb{K})$ satisfying

$$B(fv, w) = -B(v, fw). \tag{8.8}$$

We leave it to the reader to show that if f and g satisfy (8.8), then so does $fg - gf$; thus we have indeed a Lie algebra. In the special case where $B(v, w) = v^T w$, the Lie algebra $so(n, B; \mathbb{K})$ is called the **complex orthogonal Lie algebra** $so(n, \mathbb{K})$. In matrix language,

$so(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the Lie algebra of antisymmetric matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} and has dimension $n(n-1)/2$.

An **orthogonal matrix** is a matrix Q satisfying

$$Q^T Q = 1. \quad (8.9)$$

The orthogonal $n \times n$ -matrices with coefficients in a field \mathbb{K} form a subgroup of the group $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$, the **orthogonal group** $O(n, \mathbb{K})$. Since (8.9) implies that $(\det Q)^2 = 1$, orthogonal matrices have determinant ± 1 . The orthogonal matrices of determinant one form a subgroup of $O(n, \mathbb{K})$, the **special orthogonal group** $SO(n, \mathbb{K})$. The corresponding Lie algebra is $so(n, \mathbb{K}) = \log O(n, \mathbb{K}) = \log SO(n, \mathbb{K})$, the Lie algebra of antisymmetric $n \times n$ -matrices. In particular, the group $SO(3) = SO(3, \mathbb{R})$ consists of the rotations in 3-space and was discussed in some detail in Section 1.6.

For a **nondegenerate** B (i.e., one where $B(v, w) = 0$ for all v implies $w = 0$) and $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ (or any algebraically closed field), we can always choose a basis in which the bilinear form is represented as the identity matrix. Therefore all $so(n, B; \mathbb{K})$ with nondegenerate B are isomorphic to $so(n, \mathbb{K})$.

Over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, symmetric bilinear forms are classified by their signature, i.e., the triple (p, q, r) consisting of the number p of positive, q of negative, and r of zero eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix A representing the bilinear form B ; $B(v, w) = v^T A w$. The form B is nondegenerate if and only if $r = 0$. Bilinear forms with the same signature lead to isomorphic Lie algebras. In particular, $so(p, q)$ denotes a Lie algebra $so(p+q, B, \mathbb{R})$ where B is a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form B on \mathbb{R}^n of signature $(p, q, 0)$. The basis can always be chosen such that the representing matrix A is

$$I_{p,q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_p & 0 \\ 0 & -1_q \end{pmatrix},$$

where 1_p and 1_q are the $p \times p$ and $q \times q$ identity matrix, respectively. In this basis, the Lie algebra $so(p, q)$ is the subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{R})$ consisting of elements f satisfying

$$f^T I_{p,q} + I_{p,q} f = 0.$$

Note that if $f \in so(p, q)$ then

$$0 = \text{tr}((f^T I_{p,q} + I_{p,q} f) I_{p,q}) = 2 \text{tr}(f I_{p,q}^2) = 2 \text{tr}(f)$$

and hence $so(p, q) \subset sl(n, \mathbb{R})$.

8.4.4 Example. Let V be a vector space over a field \mathbb{K} . Suppose V is equipped with a symmetric or antisymmetric nondegenerate bilinear form B . There is a symmetry group associated to the bilinear form consisting of the linear transformations $Q : V \rightarrow V$ such that

$$B(Qv, Qw) = B(v, w)$$

for all v, w in V . If B is symmetric one calls the group of these linear transformations an **orthogonal group** and denotes it by $O(B, \mathbb{K})$. The associated Lie algebra is $o(B, \mathbb{K})$. Indeed, e^{tf} transforms x, y into

$$\begin{aligned} B(e^{tf}x, e^{tf}y) &= B(e^{tf}x, e^{tf}y) \\ &= B((1+tf)x, (1+tf)y) + O(t^2) \\ &= B(x, y) + tB(fx, fy) + O(t^2). \end{aligned}$$

8.4.5 Example. When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, one has for symmetric bilinear forms another subdivision, since B can have a definite signature (p, q) where $p + q$ is the dimension of V . If B is of signature (p, q) , this means that there exists a basis of V in which B can be represented as

$$B(v, w) = v^T A w, \quad \text{where } A = \text{diag}(\underbrace{-1, \dots, -1}_{p \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{q \text{ times}}).$$

The group of all linear transformations that leaves B invariant is denoted by $O(p, q)$. The subgroup of $O(p, q)$ of transformations with determinant one is the so-called **special orthogonal group** and is denoted by $SO(p, q)$. The associated real Lie algebra is denoted $so(p, q)$ and its elements are linear transformations $A : V \rightarrow V$ such that for all $v, w \in V$ we have $B(Av, w) + B(v, Aw) = 0$. The Lie product is given by the commutator of matrices.

The group of all translations in V generates together with $SO(p, q)$ the group of **inhomogeneous special orthogonal transformations**, which is denoted $ISO(p, q)$. One can obtain $ISO(p, q)$ from $SO(p, q + 1)$ by performing a contraction; that is, by rescaling some generators with some parameter ϵ and then choosing a singular limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ or $\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$. The group $ISO(p, q)$ can also be seen as the group of $(p + q + 1) \times (p + q + 1)$ -matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } Q \in SO(p, q), \quad b \in V.$$

The Lie algebra of $ISO(p, q)$ is denoted $iso(p, q)$ and can be described as the Lie algebra of $(p + q + 1) \times (p + q + 1)$ -matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } A \in so(p, q), \quad b \in V.$$

Again, the Lie product in $iso(p, q)$ is the commutator of matrices.

We define the **symplectic Lie algebra** $sp(2n, \mathbb{K})$ as the Lie subalgebra of $gl(2n, \mathbb{K})$ given by the elements f satisfying

$$f^T J + J f = 0, \tag{8.10}$$

where J is the $2n \times 2n$ -matrix given by

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1_n \\ 1_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We leave it to the reader to verify that if f and g satisfy (8.10), then so does $fg - gf$. Another useful exercise is to prove $sl(2, \mathbb{K}) \cong sp(2, \mathbb{K})$. (Caution: The reader is warned

that in the literature there are different notational conventions concerning the symplectic Lie algebras. For example, some people write $sp(n, \mathbb{K})$ for what we and many others call $sp(2n, \mathbb{K})$.

If B is antisymmetric in the example 8.4.4, the group is called a **symplectic group** and one writes $Sp(B, \mathbb{K})$. The associated Lie algebra is $sp(B, \mathbb{K})$. If V is of finite dimension m one writes $Sp(B, \mathbb{K}) = Sp(m, \mathbb{K})$. Note that m is necessarily even.

Other real Lie algebras that play a major role in many areas of physics are the **unitary Lie algebras** and the **special unitary Lie algebras** – called so because they are the generating algebras of the groups of (special) unitary matrices, a term that will be explained in Section 11.7. The unitary Lie algebra $u(n)$ consists of all antihermitian complex $n \times n$ matrices. The special unitary Lie algebra is defined as the antihermitian $n \times n$ complex traceless matrices and is denoted $su(n)$. It is clear that $su(n) \subset u(n)$. It might seem weird to call a Lie algebra real if it consists of complex-valued matrices. However, as a vector space the antihermitian complex $n \times n$ matrices form a real vector space. If f is a antihermitian matrix, then if is Hermitian. The dimension (as a real vector space) of $su(n)$ is $n^2 - 1$, and the dimension of $u(n)$ is n^2 . It is a good exercise to check that $so(3) \cong su(2)$ since these two Lie algebras will return very often. A hint: $so(3)$ consists of anti-symmetric real 3×3 matrices, so there are only three. Choosing an obvious basis for both $su(2)$ and $so(3)$ will do the job.

8.4.6 Example. A complex matrix U is **unitary** if it satisfies

$$UU^\dagger = 1,$$

where $(U^\dagger)_{ij} = \bar{U}_{ji}$. Since the inverse of a matrix is unique, it follows that also $U^\dagger U = 1$. By splitting all the matrix entries into a real and imaginary part $U_{ij} = A_{ij} + iB_{ij}$ we see that the set of $n \times n$ unitary matrices makes up a submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{2n^2} of dimension n^2 . The linear group of unitary $n \times n$ matrices is denoted $U(n)$.

$$U = e^A = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} A^k.$$

Then multiply A with a parameter t , take $t \rightarrow 0$ and keep only the linear terms: $U = 1 + tA + O(t^2)$. Then since U has to be unitary, we obtain

$$1 = (1 + tA + O(t^2))(1 + tA + O(t^2))^\dagger = 1 + t(A + A^\dagger) + O(t^2),$$

implying that A has to be antihermitian. Thus the Lie algebra of infinitesimal generators of $U(n)$ is $u(n)$.

The subgroup of $U(n)$ of all elements with determinant 1 is denoted by $SU(n)$ and is called the **special unitary group**. The dimension of $SU(n)$ is $n^2 - 1$. For the determinant we get

$$\det U = 1 + \operatorname{tr} tA + O(t^2),$$

and thus the trace of infinitesimal generators of $SU(n)$ has to vanish, and we see that the corresponding Lie algebra is $su(n)$. Note that the Lie algebra $u(n)$ contains all real

multiples of $i \cdot 1$, which commutes with all other elements. Hence $u(n)$ has a center, whereas $su(n)$ does not.

In the case $n = 2$ it is a nice exercise to show that each special unitary matrix U can be written as

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ -\bar{y} & \bar{x} \end{pmatrix}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{C}, \quad |x|^2 + |y|^2 = 1.$$

Writing $x = a + ib$ and $y = c + id$ for $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ we see that $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2 = 1$. This implies that there is a one-to-one correspondence between $SU(2)$ and the set of points on the unit sphere S^3 in \mathbb{R}^4 . Thus $SU(2)$ is as a manifold homeomorphic to S^3 . In particular $SU(2)$ is compact. Hence every element U of $SU(2)$ can be written as the exponent of a matrix A .

Physicists prefer to work with Lie algebras defined by Hermitian matrices, corresponding to Lie $*$ -algebras. In the applications, distinguished real generators typically represent important real-valued observables. Therefore they tend to replace the matrix A by iA for a Hermitian matrix A . This is one of the reasons why the structure constants for real algebras appear in the physics literature with an i , as alluded at the end of Section 8.2.

8.5 Heisenberg algebras and Heisenberg groups

A **Heisenberg algebra** is a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} with a 1-dimensional center and a distinguished Lie central element 1 called **one** or **identity**, such that every $f \triangleright g$ is a multiple of 1 for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$. There is an embedding of \mathbb{K} into \mathbb{L} given by $\alpha \mapsto \alpha 1$ which can be used to identify the multiples of 1 with the multipliers from the field, so that $\mathbb{K} = Z(\mathbb{L}) \subset \mathbb{L}$.

When we divide out the center of a Heisenberg algebra we obtain an abelian Lie algebra. More generally, let \mathbb{L} be any Lie algebra and let \mathbb{L}' be another Lie algebra with a subalgebra Z contained in the center of \mathbb{L}' . If \mathbb{L}'/Z is isomorphic to \mathbb{L} , one calls \mathbb{L}' a **central extension** of \mathbb{L} .³

Corresponding to any Heisenberg algebra there is an alternating bilinear form $\omega : \mathbb{L} \times \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ given by

$$f \triangleright g = \omega(f, g).$$

³In more abstract terms, central extensions are conveniently described by short exact sequences. Let A_i be a set of Lie algebras and suppose that there are maps $d_i : A_i \rightarrow A_{i+1}$;

$$\dots \longrightarrow A_{i-1} \xrightarrow{d_{i-1}} A_i \xrightarrow{d_i} A_{i+1} \longrightarrow \dots \quad (8.11)$$

We call the sequence **exact** if $\text{Ker } d_i = \text{Im } d_{i-1}$ for all i where there are d_{i-1} and d_i . As an exercise, the reader is invited to verify the following assertion: The sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0$ is exact if and only if $A \cong B$ and the isomorphism is the map from A to B . A short exact sequence is a sequence of maps of the form

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0.$$

A **central extension** of \mathbb{L} is then a Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' such that there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \mathbb{L}' \rightarrow \mathbb{L} \rightarrow 0$ with Z abelian.

Conversely, given such a form on an arbitrary vector space \mathbb{V} not containing 1, this formula turns $\mathbb{L} := \mathbb{K} \oplus \mathbb{V}$ into a Heisenberg algebra. If ω is nondegenerate on \mathbb{V} it defines a **symplectic form** on \mathbb{V} .

The Heisenberg algebra $h(n)$ is the special case where $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{C}^{2n}$, and ω is nondegenerate. Thus $h(n)$ is a central extension of the abelian Lie algebra \mathbb{C}^{2n} and has dimension $2n + 1$. We can find a basis of \mathbb{V} consisting of vectors p_k and q_l for $1 \leq k, l \leq n$ such that $\omega(p_k, p_l) = \omega(q_k, q_l) = 0$ for all k, l and $\omega(p_k, q_l) = \delta_{kl}$; that is, ω is then the standard symplectic form on \mathbb{K}^{2n} represented by the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1cr1 \\ 0 & \end{pmatrix}$. Thus Heisenberg algebras encode symplectic vector spaces in a Lie algebra setting. Everything done here extends with appropriate definitions to general symplectic manifolds, and, indeed, much of classical mechanics can be phrased in terms of symplectic geometry, the geometry of such manifolds – we refer the reader to the exposition by ARNOLD [12] on classical mechanics and symplectic geometry.

8.5.1 Example. Let us write $t(n, \mathbb{K})$ for the Lie subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ consisting of upper-triangular matrices and $n(n, \mathbb{K})$ as the Lie subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ consisting of strictly upper-triangular matrices, which have zeros on the diagonal.

The Lie algebra $t(3, \mathbb{K})$ of strictly upper triangular 3×3 -matrices is a Heisenberg algebra with

$$1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

since

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha & \gamma \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \lrcorner \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha' & \gamma' \\ 0 & 0 & \beta' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \alpha\gamma' - \gamma\alpha' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \alpha\gamma' - \gamma\alpha'.$$

The Lie algebra $t(3, \mathbb{C})$ is called **the Heisenberg algebra**; thus if one talks about "the" (rather than "a") Heisenberg algebra, this Lie algebra is meant and is denoted $h(1)$. Introducing names for the special matrices

$$p := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we find that p, q and 1 form a basis of $t(3, \mathbb{C})$, and we can express the Lie product in the more compact form

$$(\alpha p + \beta q + \gamma) \lrcorner (\alpha' p + \beta' q + \gamma') = \alpha\beta' - \beta\alpha'. \quad (8.12)$$

Defining

$$(\alpha p + \beta q + \gamma)^* := \bar{\alpha} p + \bar{\beta} q + \bar{\gamma}$$

turns the Heisenberg algebra into a Lie $*$ -algebra in which Rp and q are Hermitian. Note that here $*$ is *not* the conjugate transposition of matrices!

(8.12) implies that p and q satisfy the so-called **canonical commutation relations**

$$p \lrcorner q = 1, \quad p \lrcorner p = q \lrcorner q = 0. \quad (8.13)$$

Since $f \lrcorner 1 = 0$ when 1 is Lie central, (8.13) completely specifies the Lie product. The canonical commutation relations are frequently found in textbooks on quantum mechanics, but we see that they just characterize the Heisenberg algebra.

The notation q and p is chosen to remind of position of momentum. Indeed, the canonical commutation relations arise naturally in classical mechanics. In the Lie algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ constructed in Theorem 8.1.3, we consider the set of **affine functions**, that is, those that are of the form $f(p, q) = \alpha_f p + \beta_f q + \gamma_f$, with $\alpha_f, \beta_f, \gamma_f \in \mathbb{C}$. In particular, the constant functions are included with $\alpha_f = \beta_f = 0$, and we identify them with the constants $\gamma_f \in \mathbb{C}$. Given another affine function $g(p, q) = \alpha_g p + \beta_g q + \gamma_g$, we find

$$f \lrcorner g = \alpha_f \beta_g - \beta_f \alpha_g \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Since $f \lrcorner g$ is just a complex number times the function that is 1 everywhere, it is a central element, that is, it Lie commutes with all other algebra elements. Thus the affine functions form a Heisenberg subalgebra of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$, and p and q satisfy the canonical commutation relations.

Suppose that a commutative Poisson algebra \mathbb{E} contains two elements p and q satisfying the canonical commutation relations (8.13). Then \mathbb{E} contains a copy of the Heisenberg algebra. The algebra of polynomials in p and q is then a Poisson subalgebra of \mathbb{E} in which (8.6) is valid. This follows from Proposition 9.1.5. Thus the canonical commutation relations capture the essence of the commutative Poisson algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$. But getting the bigger algebra requires taking limits which need not exist in \mathbb{E} , since with polynomials alone, one does not get all functions.

8.5.2 Example. An upper triangular $n \times n$ -matrix is called **unit upper triangular** if its elements on the diagonal are 1, and **strictly upper triangular** if its elements on the diagonal are zero. It is straightforward to check that the unit upper triangular $n \times n$ -matrices form a subgroup $T(n, \mathbb{K})$ of the group $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$, and the strictly upper triangular $n \times n$ -matrices form a Lie subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$, which we denote by $t(n, \mathbb{K})$. We have $t(n, \mathbb{K}) = \log T(n, \mathbb{K})$. In the following we shall look more closely at the case $n = 3$ which is especially important.

The **Heisenberg group** is the group

$$T(3, \mathbb{C}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & c \\ 0 & 1 & b \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \quad (8.14)$$

of unit upper triangular matrices in $\mathbb{C}^{3 \times 3}$; its corresponding Lie algebra is the Heisenberg algebra $t(3, \mathbb{C})$. Since the Heisenberg group is defined in terms of matrices, it comes immediately with a representation, the defining representation. Note that the defining representation is not unitary. [att group representations not yet defined.]

The relation between the Heisenberg algebra and the Heisenberg group is particularly simple since the exponential map has a simple form. Indeed, if $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ then

$$e^A = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k}{k!}, \quad (8.15)$$

where $A^0 = 1$ is the identity matrix and the series (8.15) is absolutely convergent. A note on the infinite-dimensional case: For linear operators A on a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} , the series converges absolutely only when A is bounded (and hence everywhere defined); for unbounded but self-adjoint A (which are only densely defined), convergence holds in a weaker sense giving

$$e^A \psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{A^k}{k!} \psi \quad (8.16)$$

for a dense set of vectors $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ that are analytic for A .

If $A \in \mathfrak{t}(3, \mathbb{C})$, then a direct calculation shows that A^2 is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence $A^3 = 0$ and the exponential of A is simply given by $e^A = 1 + A + \frac{1}{2}A^2$. Thus if A is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha & \gamma \\ 0 & 0 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the exponential is given by

$$e^A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha & \gamma + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\beta \\ 0 & 1 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The map $A \rightarrow e^A$ is clearly bijective. The inverse map is given by the logarithm, which is for matrices defined by

$$\log(1 + X) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k} X^k, \quad (8.17)$$

so that for the Heisenberg group \mathbb{G} we have

$$\log(X) = (X - 1) - \frac{1}{2}(X - 1)^2 = -2 + 2X - \frac{1}{2}X^2.$$

We are thus in the situation that both $T(3, \mathbb{C}) = \exp \mathfrak{t}(3, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{t}(3, \mathbb{C}) = \log T(3, \mathbb{C})$. This is not special to the Heisenberg group, neither does it hold in general. But there is a class of groups for which this holds. For example, the exponential map is surjective for all connected Lie groups that are compact or nilpotent (see below), see, e.g., HELGASON [111] or KNAPP [137]. The Heisenberg group is a noncompact but nilpotent Lie group.

Let us shortly repeat what it means when a group is nilpotent. Given any group G , we can form the commutator subgroup $G^{(1)}$, which is generated by all elements of the form

$aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ for all $a, b \in G$. We can also consider the commutator subgroup of $G^{(1)}$ and denote it by $G^{(2)}$. Repeating this procedure we get a sequence of groups

$$G \supseteq G^{(1)} \supseteq G^{(2)} \supseteq \dots$$

A group is nilpotent if the procedure ends in a finite number of steps with the trivial group $G^{(n)} = 1$. It is easy to see that the Heisenberg group is two-step nilpotent since $G^{(2)} = 1$.

Since the exponential map is bijective for the Heisenberg group, there exists a binary operation \oplus on $t(3, \mathbb{C})$, where $A \oplus B$ is the element with

$$e^A e^B = e^{A \oplus B}. \quad (8.18)$$

It is not difficult to give an explicit formula for $A \oplus B$. Since A and B are strictly upper triangular, we have $A^p B^q = 0$ for $p + q \geq 3$. We thus have

$$e^A e^B = (1 + A + \frac{1}{2}A^2)(1 + B + \frac{1}{2}B^2) = 1 + A + B + \frac{1}{2}(A^2 + B^2 + 2AB).$$

Applying (8.17) we find

$$\begin{aligned} A \oplus B &= \log(1 + A + B + \frac{1}{2}(A^2 + B^2 + 2AB)) \\ &= A + B + \frac{1}{2}(AB - BA), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$A \oplus B = A + B + \frac{1}{2}A \rhd B. \quad (8.19)$$

Thus we get from (8.18) the formula $e^A e^B = e^{A+B+\frac{1}{2}A \rhd B}$. Since $A \rhd B$ is central, it behaves just like a complex number, and we find the **Weyl relations**

$$e^{A+B} = e^{-\frac{1}{2}A \rhd B} e^A e^B. \quad (8.20)$$

In fact this result is also a direct consequence of the famous (but much less elementary) **Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff (BCH) formula** that gives for general matrix Lie groups a series expansion of $A \oplus B$ when A and B are not too large. Even more generally, the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula applies to abstract finite-dimensional Lie groups⁴ that are not necessarily matrix groups and says that for two fixed Lie algebra elements A and B and for small enough real numbers s and t there is a function C from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ to the Lie algebra such that we have

$$e^{sA} e^{tB} = e^{C(s,t)}.$$

The function $P(s, t)$ is given by a (for small s, t absolutely convergent) infinite power series, the first terms of which are given by

$$P(s, t) = sA + tB + \frac{st}{2}A \rhd B + \frac{st}{12}(sA \rhd (A \rhd B) - tB \rhd (A \rhd B)) + \dots$$

In fact, this series expansion may be derived from a closed form integral expression.

The Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula is of great importance in both pure and applied mathematics. It gives (where it applies; in particular in finite dimensions) the relation of a

⁴In infinite dimensions, additional assumptions are needed for the BCH-formula to hold.

Lie group with the associated Lie algebra. It for example says that the product of e^A and e^B for some A and B in the Lie algebra is again an element of the form e^C with C in the Lie algebra. Hence the exponents of the Lie algebra generate a subgroup of the corresponding Lie group.

For infinite-dimensional Lie algebras and groups, one has to use a refined argument centering around the Hille–Yosida theorem. Let $U(t)$ denote a one-parameter group of linear operators on a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} such that $t \rightarrow U(t)$ is **strongly continuous**, which means that $t \rightarrow U(t)\varphi$ is continuous for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{H}$. Then we can differentiate $U(t)$ to obtain the strong limit

$$A = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{U(t) - U(0)}{t}.$$

The object A is called **infinitesimal generator** of the one-parameter group $U(t)$. It turns out that A is a closed linear operator that is defined on a dense subspace in \mathbb{H} . The Hille–Yosida theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a closed linear operator A to be the infinitesimal generator of some strongly continuous one-parameter semigroup

$$U(t) = e^{tA},$$

since in general one might not get a group. The Hille–Yosida theorem is very useful for analyzing the solvability of linear differential equations

$$\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t) = A\psi(t), \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0,$$

examples of which are the Schrödinger equation or the heat equation. If the conditions of the Hille–Yosida theorem hold for A , the solution to this initial value problem takes the form

$$\psi(t) = e^{tA}\psi(0).$$

For the (hyperbolic, conservative) Schrödinger equation, $A = -\frac{i}{\hbar}H$ with a self-adjoint Hamiltonian H , the solution exists for all t , and the $U(t)$ form a one-parameter group. For the (parabolic, dissipative) heat equation, $A = k\Delta$ is a positive multiple of the Laplacian $\Delta = \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2$, the solution exists only for $t \geq 0$, and we only get a semigroup.

8.6 Lie *-algebras

Many Lie algebras of interest in physics have an additional structure: an adjoint mapping compatible with the Lie product.

8.6.1 Definition. A **Lie *-algebra** is a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} over \mathbb{C} with a distinguished element $1 \neq 0$ called **one** and a mapping $*$ that assigns to every $f \in \mathbb{L}$ an **adjoint** $f^* \in \mathbb{L}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f \lrcorner 1 &= 0, \\ (f + g)^* &= f^* + g^*, \quad (f \lrcorner g)^* = f^* \lrcorner g^*, \\ f^{**} &= f, \quad (\lambda f)^* = \bar{\lambda}f^*, \quad 1^* = 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. We identify the multiples of 1 with the corresponding complex numbers.

The reason why we include the 1 into the definition of a Lie *-algebra is that many physically relevant Lie algebras are equipped with a distinguished central element⁵. But the presence of 1 is not a restriction, since one can always adjoin a central element 1 to a Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' without nonzero central element and form the direct sum $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}' \oplus \mathbb{K}$.

An important Lie *-algebra for nonrelativistic quantum mechanics is the algebra $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of linear operators of a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} (usually a dense subspace of a Hilbert space $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$). The relevant Lie product is defined by Theorem 8.3.1 with the choice

$$J := \frac{i}{\hbar} = \frac{i}{\hbar} 1_{\mathbb{H}} \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{H},$$

where $1_{\mathbb{H}}$ is the identity operator on \mathbb{H} , and the conjugate of $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is given by the **adjoint** of f , defined as the linear mapping f^* satisfying $\phi^* f \psi = (f \phi)^* \psi$ for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{H}$. Dropping the index J in the Lie product, we get the **quantum Lie product**

$$f \triangleright g = \frac{i}{\hbar}(fg - gf) = \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, g] \quad (8.21)$$

of $f, g \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$, already familiar from (1.3). Note that the axioms require the purely imaginary factor in this formula, whereas the value of Planck's constant \hbar is arbitrary from a purely mathematical point of view. In quantum field theory, a different choice of J is sometimes more appropriate.

For any Lie *-algebra, the set

$$\text{Re } \mathbb{L} := \{f \in \mathbb{L} \mid f^* = f\}$$

is a Lie algebra over \mathbb{R} . When describing symmetries, physicists often work with Lie algebras over the reals; the present Lie *-algebras are then the complexifications of these real algebras, with a central element 1 adjoined if necessary.

The **complexification** of a real Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is the Lie *-algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{L}$ defined as follows. In case that a complex scalar multiplication is already defined on \mathbb{L} , one first replaces \mathbb{L} by an isomorphic Lie algebra in which $if \notin \mathbb{L}$ if $f \in \mathbb{L}$ is nonzero. Then one defines

$$\mathbb{C}\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L} \oplus i\mathbb{L},$$

extending scalar multiplication in a natural way to the complex field. That is, any element $f \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{L}$ is of the form

$$f = f_1 + if_2$$

with $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{L}$, and one defines

$$\alpha(\beta f) := (\alpha\beta)f, \quad \alpha f \triangleright \beta g := (\alpha\beta)f \triangleright g$$

⁵Many such Lie algebras are realized most naturally as central extensions of semisimple Lie algebras, corresponding to projective representations of semisimple Lie algebras. By including the 1 automatically we work directly in the central extension, and avoid the cohomological technicalities associated with the formal discussion of central extensions and projective representations.

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{L}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Conjugation is defined as

$$(f_1 + if_2)^* := f_1 - if_2 \quad \text{for } f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{L};$$

The axioms for a Lie $*$ -algebra are easily established if $1 \in \mathbb{L}$. Note that the real dimension of \mathbb{L} equals the complex dimension of $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{L}$. It is easy to check that

$$\text{Re } \mathbb{C}\mathbb{L} \cong \mathbb{L}.$$

Conversely, for a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} ,

$$\mathbb{C} \text{Re } \mathbb{L} \cong \mathbb{L}.$$

If a complex Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{L}$ as a Lie algebra, one says that \mathbb{L} is a **real form** of the complex Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' .

We leave it as an exercise to verify $\mathbb{C}su(n) \cong sl(n, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathbb{C}so(p, q) = so(p + q, \mathbb{C})$. In general, a complex Lie algebra has more than one real form as we can see since for $p \neq q, n - q$ the Lie algebras $so(p, n - p)$ and $so(q, n - q)$ are not isomorphic.

An **involutive Lie algebra** (NEEB [180]) is a Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ with Lie product $[\cdot, \cdot]$ and with an involutive, antilinear anti-automorphism σ , i.e., a mapping $\sigma : \tilde{\mathbb{L}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ satisfying

$$\sigma(\alpha f) = \alpha^* \sigma f, \quad \sigma(f \lrcorner g) = \sigma g \lrcorner \sigma f$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}, f, g \in \tilde{\mathbb{L}}$. Associated to an involutive Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ is the **real form** $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathbb{R}} = \{x \in \tilde{\mathbb{L}} \mid \sigma x = -x\}$. Our definition of a Lie $*$ -algebra is closely related and obtained as follows, after adjoining to $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ a central element 1 if necessary. We define \mathbb{L} as the vector space $\tilde{\mathbb{L}}$ equipped with the Lie product \lrcorner defined by $x \lrcorner y = \frac{i}{\hbar}[x, y]$. Then the mapping $x \mapsto i\hbar x$, with \hbar a positive real constant (in physical applications Planck's constant) is an isomorphism of Lie algebras. The map σ induces the conjugation $x^* = -\sigma x$ and $\text{Re } \mathbb{L} = \tilde{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

8.6.2 Remarks.

(i) The nomenclature of Lie $*$ -algebras is a bit tricky. If \mathbb{L} is a Lie $*$ -algebra, we therefore denote it (usually) with the name of the real Lie algebra $\text{Re } \mathbb{L}$. To avoid confusion, it is important to keep track of whether we are discussing real Lie algebras, complex Lie algebras or Lie $*$ -algebras.

(ii) In the physics literature, one often sees the defining relations (8.1) for real Lie algebras written in terms of complex structure constants,

$$X_j \lrcorner X_k = \sum_l i c_{jkl} X_l.$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and the c_{jkl} are real. That is, the Lie product takes values outside of the real Lie algebra! What is done by the physicists is that – as in the above definition of a Lie $*$ -algebra from an involutive Lie algebra – they multiply all elements in the Lie algebra by i . The reasons for making this seemingly difficult construction mainly has historical reasons. One is that in some real algebras the elements are antihermitian matrices. By multiplying with i one obtains Hermitian matrices and operators in quantum mechanics are represented as Hermitian operators.

The converse process of complexification is **realization**. Given a complex Lie algebra \mathbb{L} , one regards it as a real Lie algebra $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{R}}$ by restricting scalar multiplication to real factors. Since f and the imaginary scalar multiple if are linearly independent over \mathbb{R} , the real dimension of $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is twice the complex dimension of \mathbb{L} . In the finite-dimensional case, a convenient way to obtain the realization is as follows: Choose a basis t_1, \dots, t_n of \mathbb{L} and then form the elements $s_j = it_j$ for all j . All real linear combinations of s_j and t_j make up $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{R}}$. Given two elements f, g in $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{R}}$ one calculates their Lie product as if they were elements of \mathbb{L} ; the result can be written as

$$f \triangleright g = \sum (\alpha_j + i\beta_j)t_j.$$

The Lie product of f and g in \mathbb{L} is then defined as

$$f \triangleright g = \sum \alpha_j t_j + i \sum \beta_j s_j.$$

See also Example 8.4.2.

Chapter 9

Mechanics in Poisson algebras

This chapter brings more physics into play by introducing Poisson algebras, i.e., associative algebras with a compatible Lie algebra structure. These are the algebras in which it is possible to define Hamiltonian mechanics. Poisson algebras abstract the algebraic features of both Poisson brackets and commutators, and hence serve as a unifying tool relating classical and quantum mechanics. In particular, we discuss classical Poisson algebras for oscillating and rotating systems.

9.1 Poisson algebras

Many algebras that we will encounter have both an associative product and a Lie product, which are compatible in a certain sense. Such algebras are **Poisson algebras**, our definition of which is the noncommutative version discussed, e.g., in FARKAS & G. LETZTER [77]. (In contrast, in classical mechanics on Poisson manifolds, one usually assumes Poisson algebras to be always commutative.)

9.1.1 Definition. A **Poisson algebra** \mathbb{E} is a Lie algebra with an associative and distributive **multiplication** which associates with $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$ its **product** fg , and an **identity** 1 with respect to multiplication, such that the compatibility condition

$$f \lrcorner (gh) = (f \lrcorner g)h + g(f \lrcorner h) \tag{9.1}$$

holds. Equation (9.1) is also called the **Leibniz identity**. In expressions involving the associative product and the Lie product, the binding of the associative product is stronger than the Lie product, i.e., $f \lrcorner gh$ is interpreted as $f \lrcorner (gh)$, and $fg \lrcorner h$ as $(fg) \lrcorner h$.

9.1.2 Remarks. Since Poisson algebras have two products, neither of which is assumed to be commutative, we reserve the notation $[f, g]$ for the **commutator**

$$[f, g] := fg - gf$$

with respect to the associative product. If $[f, g] = 0$ we say that f and g **commute**. If $f \lrcorner g = 0$ we say that f and g **Lie commute**. An element which commutes (Lie commutes) with every element in \mathbb{E} is called **central (Lie central)**.

9.1.3 Example. We take $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ where the associative product is given by ordinary multiplication of functions, and where the Lie product is given by $f \lrcorner g = f_p g_q - f_q g_p$. To see that the Leibniz condition is satisfied we write

$$\begin{aligned} f \lrcorner gh &= f_p(gh)_q - f_q(gh)_p \\ &= f_p g_q h + f_p g h_q - f_q g_p h - f_q g h_p \\ &= (f \lrcorner g)h + g(f \lrcorner h). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ is a commutative Poisson algebra.

9.1.4 Example. For a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} we consider the space $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of continuous linear operators on \mathbb{H} . The Lie product is given by

$$f \lrcorner g = \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, g] = \frac{i}{\hbar}(fg - gf).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} f \lrcorner gh &= \frac{i}{\hbar}(fgh - ghf) \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar}(fgh - gfh + gfh - ghf) \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar}([f, g]h + g[f, h]). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ is a non-commutative Poisson algebra. In particular, taking $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C}^n$, we find that $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is a non-commutative Poisson algebra.

9.1.5 Proposition. *Let \mathbb{E} be a Poisson algebra. Then*

$$f \lrcorner 1 = 0,$$

and

$$f \lrcorner g^n = n g^{n-1}(f \lrcorner g) \quad \text{if } [f \lrcorner g, g] = 0.$$

Proof. We first take $n = 0$ and calculate

$$f \lrcorner 1 = f \lrcorner (1 \cdot 1) = (f \lrcorner 1)1 + 1(f \lrcorner 1) = 2(f \lrcorner 1),$$

from which it follows that $f \lrcorner 1 = 0$. Let us therefore suppose that the proposition is true for all k with $0 \leq k \leq n$, then for $k = n + 1$ we have

$$f \lrcorner (g^{n+1}) = (f \lrcorner g^n)g + g^n(f \lrcorner g) = n g^{n-1}(f \lrcorner g)g + g^n(f \lrcorner g) = n g^n(f \lrcorner g).$$

□

9.1.6 Definition. A **Poisson *-algebra** is a Poisson algebra that as a Lie algebra is a Lie *-algebra (defined in Definition 8.6.1) satisfying the additional rule

$$(fg)^* = g^*f^*.$$

Note the change of order in $(fg)^* = g^*f^*$.

9.1.7 Example. The commutative Poisson algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ is made into a Poisson *-algebra by defining

$$f^*(p, q) := \overline{f(p, q)}.$$

We have $(f^*)_p(p, q) = \overline{f_p(p, q)}$, and

$$(fg)^*(p, q) = \overline{fg(p, q)} = \overline{f(p, q)} \overline{g(p, q)} = (f^*g^*)(p, q),$$

hence $(fg)^* = f^*g^* = g^*f^*$ since the algebra is commutative. From these considerations it follows immediately that $C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ is a Poisson *-algebra.

9.1.8 Example. We make $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ with the quantum Lie product (8.21) into a non-commutative Poisson *-algebra by defining A^* to be the adjoint conjugate transpose of A , which is defined as the linear operator A^* such that

$$\langle A\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle \phi, A^*\psi \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \phi, \psi \in \mathbb{H},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product on \mathbb{H} . In particular, if $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C}^n$ then $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \phi^*\psi$ and A^* is the conjugate transpose of the matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$. For general \mathbb{H} , we have

$$\langle AB\phi, \psi \rangle = \langle B\phi, A^*\psi \rangle = \langle \phi, B^*A^*\psi \rangle,$$

from which we read off that $(AB)^* = B^*A^*$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A \lrcorner B &= \left(\frac{i}{\hbar} [A, B] \right)^* = -\frac{i}{\hbar} ((AB)^* - (BA)^*) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} (B^*A^* - A^*B^*) \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar} (A^*B^* - B^*A^*) = \frac{i}{\hbar} [A^*, B^*] = A^* \lrcorner B^*. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ is a Poisson *-algebra.

9.2 Rotating rigid bodies

The spinning top is the classical model of a spinning particle. Like a football, the top can be slightly deformed but when the external force is released it jumps quickly back to its equilibrium state. Molecular versions of a football are the fullerenes, the most football-like fullerene being a molecule with 60 carbon atoms arranged in precisely the same manner as the vertices that can be seen in the corners between the patches on the surface of an official football. In a reasonable approximation, the deformability can be neglected; the spinning top, and also the fullerene football, is most often treated as a rigid body.

The spinning top is treated in most undergraduate courses in mechanics; hence there is a rich literature on the topic.¹ Due to the abundance of classical treatments of the spinning top we pursue here a nonstandard approach based on Poisson algebras.

A rigid body can be moving as a whole, that is, its center of mass can have a nonzero velocity, but changing to comoving coordinates via a time-dependent translation, one may assume that the center of mass is not moving. The coordinate system in which the center of mass of the rigid body is fixed is in physics literature called the **center of mass coordinate system**. Without loss of generality we then assume the center of mass is at the origin $(0, 0, 0)$.

Having fixed the center of mass the rigid body can still rotate, but after rotating the coordinate system to the body-fixed one, no freedom is left. This means that the **pose** of a rigid body with fixed center of mass is completely described by a rotation $Q(t) \in SO(3)$.

Thus $Q(t)$ satisfies $Q(t)Q(t)^T = Q(t)^TQ(t) = 1$ and $\det Q(t) = 1$. Differentiating we get

$$\dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^T + Q(t)\dot{Q}(t)^T = 0.$$

Calling $\Omega(t) = \dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^T = \dot{Q}(t)Q(t)^{-1}$ we thus have

$$\Omega(t)^T = -\Omega(t),$$

that is Ω is antisymmetric. We can therefore parameterize Ω as

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\omega_3 & \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 & 0 & -\omega_1 \\ -\omega_2 & \omega_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then have $\Omega\mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{v}$, where $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is the vector $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)^T$. We view $\Omega(t)$ as a matrix $X(\boldsymbol{\omega}(t))$ depending on the vector $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$, called the **angular velocity**.

A rigid body in a conserved system has an energy that can depend on the position determined by $Q(t)$ and the velocity $\dot{Q}(t)$. Since $\dot{Q} = \Omega Q^{-T} = \Omega Q = X(\boldsymbol{\omega})Q$, the energy thus depends on Q and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$: the Hamiltonian $H = H(Q, \boldsymbol{\omega})$ is a function of Q and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

For a **freely rotating body**, the Hamiltonian only depends on the kinetic energy and is quadratic in the angular velocity;

$$H = H(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\omega}^T I \boldsymbol{\omega},$$

and we can always take I symmetric, $I = I^T$. The 3×3 -matrix I , called the **tensor of moments of inertia**, or just **inertia tensor**, has the meaning of an **angular mass matrix** analogous to the mass matrix M given in Chapter 2 for the case of an oscillating particle, where the kinetic energy was given by $H = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^T M \mathbf{v}$. The reason why it is called

¹Good accounts of the standard approach can be found, e.g., in ARNOLD [12], MARION & THORNTON [163], or GOLDSTEIN [94].

a tensor and not a matrix is because I is in fact a bilinear form.² Under a coordinate change I does transform as a bilinear form and not as a matrix. Indeed, under the change of coordinates $\omega \mapsto \tilde{Q}\omega$ for some $\tilde{Q} \in SO(3)$, the Hamiltonian is invariant and thus I transforms as $I \mapsto Q^{-T}IQ^{-1}$, that is, by a congruence transformation. In contrast, a matrix A transforms as $A \mapsto QAQ^{-1}$, which is a similarity transformation. By a coordinate change I can be made diagonal, so that we may assume that

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^3 I_k \omega_k^2.$$

The coefficients I_k are called the **principal moments of inertia**. To have a Hamiltonian that is bounded from below we require $I_i \geq 0$. In practice one has $I_k > 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, 3$; then I is invertible.

In analogy to the linear momentum $p = Mv = \frac{\partial H}{\partial v}$ for an oscillating particle with kinetic energy $H = \frac{1}{2}v^T Mv$, we define the **angular momentum \mathbf{J}** by

$$\mathbf{J} := \frac{\partial H}{\partial \omega} = I\omega.$$

We rewrite the Hamiltonian as a function of \mathbf{J} ;

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{J}^T I^{-1} \mathbf{J}, \quad (9.2)$$

in analogy to the formula $H = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^T M^{-1} \mathbf{p}$ for the oscillating particle. We have

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{J}} = I^{-1} \mathbf{J} = \omega, \quad (9.3)$$

in analogy with $\mathbf{v} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{p}} = M^{-1} \mathbf{p}$.

9.3 Rotations and angular momentum

In Section 1.6, we used the J_k as generators of the rotations; they are basis elements of the Lie algebra $\mathbb{L} = so(3)$. The J_k correspond to the angular momenta of a spinning particle (see Section 9.2). Thus there is a more physical interpretation; the J_k correspond to measurable quantities, the components of the angular momentum. We denote the observable that correspond to J_k with the same symbol J_k . Purely classical, the state of a rigid rotating body in its rest frame is defined by specifying a numerical value for $\mathbf{J} = (J_1, J_2, J_3)^T$, called the **angular momentum** of the rigid body. The state determines uniquely the value of every classical observable $f(\mathbf{J})$ (such as the angular velocity $\omega = I^{-1} \mathbf{J}$ of a spinning top, where I is a constant matrix called the inertia tensor). The dynamics is determined by the equation $\dot{\mathbf{J}} = \mathbf{J} \times \omega$. We thus see the angular momentum components J_i as functions on phase space. Therefore we want to study the **polynomial algebra** $\text{Pol } \mathbb{L}$ generated by 1

²The same holds for the mass matrix – but there the terminology has become traditional.

and the J_i and give this algebra the structure of a Poisson algebra. The recipe obtained will then be further generalized to cover arbitrary C^∞ -functions of \mathbf{J} .

Motivated by the $so(3)$ structure we define a product \lrcorner recursively, starting with the commutation relations of $so(3)$ with 1 adjoined,

$$1 \lrcorner J_k = 0, \quad J_k \lrcorner J_l = \sum_m \epsilon_{klm} J_m.$$

With the abbreviation $a_1 J_1 + a_2 J_2 + a_3 J_3 = a \cdot \mathbf{J}$, this gives

$$1 \lrcorner a \cdot \mathbf{J} = 0, \quad a \cdot \mathbf{J} \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J} = (a \times b) \cdot \mathbf{J}.$$

Having given the product on the generators of $\text{Pol } \mathbb{L}$, the product is completely determined by the Leibniz rule

$$a \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J} = (a \cdot \mathbf{J} \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J}) f(\mathbf{J}) + a \cdot \mathbf{J} (f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J})$$

for $f \in \text{Pol } \mathbb{L}$.

9.3.1 Lemma. *We have the identity*

$$f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J} = (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{J})}{\partial \mathbf{J}},$$

where \mathbf{J} as a vector in $(\text{Pol } \mathbb{L})^3$ means (J_1, J_2, J_3) .

Proof. The proof is by induction. For degree of f zero the statement is trivial. For degree 1 we have

$$a \cdot \mathbf{J} \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J} = (a \times b) \cdot \mathbf{J} = (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot a = (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot \frac{\partial a \cdot \mathbf{J}}{\partial \mathbf{J}}.$$

Here we use a vector notation, that is, we consider $\text{Pol } \mathbb{L}$. Now suppose the statement is true for some $n \geq 1$, then we consider next a homogeneous polynomial of degree $n+1$ and write it as $a \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J})$ (or a linear sum of such). Next we consider on the one hand

$$a \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner b \cdot \mathbf{J} = (a \times b) \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J}) + a \cdot \mathbf{J} b \times \mathbf{J} \cdot \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{J})}{\partial \mathbf{J}},$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{J}} (a \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J})) &= (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot a f(\mathbf{J}) + a \cdot \mathbf{J} (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{J}} f(\mathbf{J}) \\ &= (a \times b) \cdot \mathbf{J} f(\mathbf{J}) + a \cdot \mathbf{J} (b \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{J}} f(\mathbf{J}), \end{aligned}$$

and by inspection the two expressions are the same. \square

9.3.2 Lemma. *The product \lrcorner satisfies*

$$f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner g(\mathbf{J}) = \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{J} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} = \mathbf{J} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \right). \quad (9.4)$$

Proof. We again proceed by induction, this time on the degree of g . For degree ≤ 1 of g , the previous lemma gives the result. Now suppose the result holds for polynomials up to degree $n \geq 1$. Now consider the polynomials of degree $n + 1$ and write such a polynomial as a sum of terms $g(\mathbf{J})h(\mathbf{J})$ where g and h both have degree $\leq n$. Then for each such term we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner (g(\mathbf{J})h(\mathbf{J})) &= (f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner g(\mathbf{J}))h(\mathbf{J}) + g(\mathbf{J})(f(\mathbf{J}) \lrcorner h(\mathbf{J})) \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{J} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} h(\mathbf{J}) + g(\mathbf{J}) \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{J} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial (gh)}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \mathbf{J} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} = \mathbf{J} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \times \frac{\partial (gh)}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that (9.4) makes sense for arbitrary C^∞ functions of \mathbf{J} , although it was derived only for polynomials.

9.3.3 Proposition. *The algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and its subalgebra $Pol(\mathbb{L})$ are Poisson algebras. That is, the product (9.4) is a Lie product satisfying the Leibniz identity.*

Proof. The antisymmetry of the product \lrcorner is obvious on the generators, for the other cases we use Lemma 9.3.1 and Lemma 9.3.2 together with the observation that $u \cdot \mathbf{J} \times w = w \cdot u \times \mathbf{J} = -w \cdot \mathbf{J} \times u$. The Leibniz identity is a direct consequence of the product rule for partial derivatives. The Jacobi identity is a bit tedious to check. Using the notation $f_k = \frac{\partial f}{\partial J_k}$ and the Levi-Civita symbol, one writes the outer product for vectors as $(u \times v)_k = \sum_{lm} \epsilon_{klm} u_l v_m$. Then we find for the Lie product

$$f \lrcorner g = \sum_{klm} \epsilon_{klm} J_l \partial_m f \partial_k g,$$

from which the antisymmetry follows immediately. Using the identity

$$\sum_m \epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{mnp} = \delta_{kn} \delta_{lp} - \delta_{kp} \delta_{ln},$$

one obtains after some algebraic calculations

$$(f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h = \sum h_k f_k J_k g_l - h_k g_k J_l f_l + \sum \epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{abc} J_m J_c h_l (f_a g_{bk} + f_{ak} g_b),$$

where the summations are over all present indices. When summing over the cyclic permutations of f, g and h the first summation is easily seen to give zero. We write the second sum as

$$\epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{abc} J_m J_c \left(f_a g_{bk} h_l + f_{ak} g_b h_l + g_a h_{bk} f_l + g_{ak} h_b f_l + h_a f_{bk} g_l + h_{ak} f_b g_l \right),$$

and focus on the term with two derivatives on f

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{abc} J_m J_c \left(f_{ak} g_b h_l + h_a f_{bk} g_l \right) &= \epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{abc} J_m J_c \left(f_{ak} g_b h_l + h_k f_{la} g_b \right) \\ &= \epsilon_{klm} \epsilon_{abc} J_m J_c \left(f_{ak} g_b h_l - h_l f_{ka} g_b \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The other terms cancel similarly. \square

9.4 Classical rigid body dynamics

Many books on classical mechanics, see for example MARION AND THORNTON [163], ARNOLD [12] or GOLDSTEIN [94], present the standard approach to the dynamics of a spinning rigid body, resulting in the **Euler equations** for the spinning top. We take an alternative route. We write down the Lie product that determines the mechanics. We then derive the Euler equations and reproduce the same equations of motion. Thus we are giving an equivalent description.

The motivation for the form of the Lie product is determined by symmetry considerations. We have seen that the algebra of infinitesimal rotations – which must be involved in the differential equations describing the state of the spinning object – is $so(3)$, the Lie algebra of real, antisymmetric 3×3 -matrices. In Section 9.5, we have seen that we can obtain a Lie–Poisson algebra out of any Lie algebra and in Example 9.5.3 we have constructed the Lie–Poisson algebra of $so(3)$. Since the dynamical observables of a physical system form a Poisson algebra, we consider the Lie–Poisson algebra of arbitrarily often differentiable functions on \mathbb{R}^3 , with coordinates J_1 , J_2 and J_3 , equipped with the Lie product given in Section 9.3

$$f \lrcorner g := \left(\mathbf{J} \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{J}}$$

for $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Now that we have the Poisson algebra and the Hamiltonian (9.2) for the classical mechanics of the spinning top, we can apply the usual recipe. For an observable f the time-evolution is given by

$$\dot{f} = H \lrcorner f.$$

In particular, for the angular momentum we have from (9.3)

$$\dot{J}_k = H \lrcorner J_k = \left(\mathbf{J} \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{J}} \right) \cdot \hat{e}_k = (\mathbf{J} \times \boldsymbol{\omega})_k,$$

where \hat{e}_k is the unit vector in the direction k , and where we use $\partial H / \partial \mathbf{J} = I^{-1} \mathbf{J} = \boldsymbol{\omega}$. We thus have

$$\dot{\mathbf{J}} = \mathbf{J} \times \boldsymbol{\omega}.$$

Further, since $\mathbf{J} = I\boldsymbol{\omega}$ we find $I\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = I\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{\omega}$. Writing this out in components we find

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_1 \dot{\omega}_1 \\ I_2 \dot{\omega}_2 \\ I_3 \dot{\omega}_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_1 \omega_1 \\ I_2 \omega_2 \\ I_3 \omega_3 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_2 \omega_3 (I_2 - I_3) \\ \omega_1 \omega_3 (I_2 - I_1) \\ \omega_1 \omega_2 (I_1 - I_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (9.5)$$

The equations (9.5) are the **Euler equations** for the spinning top. The spinning direction is given by the vector $\mathbf{n} := \boldsymbol{\omega} / |\boldsymbol{\omega}|$ and the spinning speed is given by $|\boldsymbol{\omega}|$. Thus knowing the trajectory of $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ in the phase space \mathbb{R}^3 at all times implies knowing everything about the direction and speed of the spinning motion.

We claim that $\mathbf{J}^2 = \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{J}$ is a Casimir of the Lie algebra $so(3)$. Indeed, from (1.20) we have $J_1 \triangleright J_2 = J_3$ and the other commutation relations can be obtained by cyclic permutation. But then

$$J_1 \triangleright \mathbf{J}^2 = J_1 \triangleright J_2^2 + J_1 \triangleright J_3^2 = J_3 J_2 + J_2 J_3 - J_2 J_3 - J_3 J_2 = 0,$$

and for the other generators the results are similar. Since \mathbf{J}^2 is a Casimir of the Lie algebra, it is conserved by the dynamics. Indeed, calculating the time-derivative of \mathbf{J}^2 we find

$$\dot{\mathbf{J}}^2 = 2\mathbf{J} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{J}} = 2\mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{J} \times \boldsymbol{\omega} = 0.$$

Hence the motion preserves surfaces of constant \mathbf{J}^2 , which are spheres. The radius of the sphere is determined by the initial conditions.

Note that the phase space \mathbb{R}^3 is not an ordinary (i.e., symplectic) phase space; it is not even-dimensional. However, since we have a Poisson algebra, it is a Poisson manifold as described in Section 12.1. In the present case, the symplectic leaves (co-adjoint orbits) are the surfaces where the Casimir \mathbf{J}^2 has a constant value; hence they are the spheres on which the motion takes place. Indeed, 2-dimensional spheres in \mathbb{R}^3 have a natural symplectic manifold structure, on which the rotation group $SO(3)$ acts as a group of symplectic transformations.

Since the Hamiltonian is conserved (although for completely different reasons), the motion also preserves surfaces of constant $E = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{J}^T I^{-1}\mathbf{J}$, which are ellipsoids. If I is not a multiple of the identity, this forces the motion to be on curves of constant $\mathbf{J}^T I^{-1}\mathbf{J}$ on the co-adjoint orbit, i.e., on the intersection of the sphere defining the co-adjoint orbit with the ellipsoid $\mathbf{J}^T I^{-1}\mathbf{J} = 2E$, where E is again determined by the initial conditions. Then only the speed along these curves needs to be determined to specify the motion. Thus the free spinning rigid body motion is exactly solvable.

Let us consider affine functions on the Poisson algebra of the classical spinning top. We calculate (for $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$)

$$(\alpha + a \cdot \mathbf{J}) \triangleright (\beta + b \cdot \mathbf{J}) = (a \times \mathbf{J}) \cdot b = (b \times a) \cdot \mathbf{J},$$

which describes the Lie algebra $u(2)$. Looking only at linear functions, that is, the linear subspace spanned by \mathbf{J} , we find the Lie algebra $so(3)$. The two Lie algebras only differ by the center of $u(2)$ and thus $u(2) \cong su(2) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R} \oplus so(3)$. This coincidence is due to the sporadic isomorphism $so(3) \cong su(2)$.

9.5 Lie–Poisson algebras

In the above section we started from a the Lie algebra structure of $so(3)$ to construct an associated Poisson algebra. This program can be repeated for arbitrary real Lie algebras.

The formulation closest to the physical applications is in terms of a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} . It applies to arbitrary real Lie algebras such as $so(3)$ by taking their complexification and adding, if necessary, a central element 1, thus extending the dimension of the Lie algebra

by one. As usual, we write \mathbb{C} for the complex linear subspace spanned by the element 1. In case that \mathbb{L} is infinite-dimensional, we assume \mathbb{L} to be equipped with a topology in which all operations are continuous and that \mathbb{L} is reflexive (see below); in finite dimensions this is automatic.

We consider the dual space \mathbb{L}^* of continuous linear maps from \mathbb{L} to \mathbb{C} , and the bidual space \mathbb{L}^{**} of continuous linear maps from the dual space \mathbb{L}^* to \mathbb{C} . For finite-dimensional vector spaces we have canonically $\mathbb{L}^{**} = \mathbb{L}$, for infinite-dimensional vector spaces in general only $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{L}^{**}$; in both cases we have an injective map $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^{**}$ given by

$$\delta \in \mathbb{L}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{L}^* : \quad \delta(\xi) := \xi(\delta).$$

A normed vector space is called reflexive if $\mathbb{L}^{**} \cong \mathbb{L}$. We need \mathbb{L} to be reflexive for the construction that follows. We thus assume $\mathbb{L}^{**} \cong \mathbb{L}$ in the following.

For any real number λ (we shall need $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$), we define the family of parallel affine hyperplanes

$$M_\lambda := \{\xi \in \mathbb{L}^* \mid \xi(f^*) = \xi(f)^* \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{L}, \xi(1) = \lambda\}.$$

One should note that M_0 is a real linear subspace in \mathbb{L}^* . The affine hyperplane M_1 carries the structure of a real submanifold, with the tangent space at each point being isomorphic to M_0 .

If \mathbb{L} is the complexification of a real Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' , so that we have $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}' \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$, then the elements of M_0 are the linear functionals ξ on \mathbb{L}' that are zero on the element 1, and are extended to linear forms on \mathbb{L} by linearity: $\xi(a + bi) = \xi(a) + i\xi(b)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{L}'$. So we can identify M_0 in this case with the dual of the quotient Lie algebra \mathbb{L}'/\mathbb{R} , where \mathbb{R} denotes the real subspace spanned by the distinguished central element 1. Therefore the dual of M_0 is again \mathbb{L}'/\mathbb{R} . In the general case M_0 is a real subspace in $(\mathbb{L}/\mathbb{C})^*$, so that $M_0\mathbb{C} = M_0 + iM_0$ satisfies $(M_0\mathbb{C})^* \cong \mathbb{L}/\mathbb{C}$.

We consider for a non-empty open subset M of M_1 the commutative algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(M)$. We define for every $f \in \mathbb{E}$ and $\xi \in M$ a linear map $df(\xi) : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$df(\xi)v = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\xi + tv) - f(\xi)}{t} \quad \text{for all } v \in M_0.$$

So we have $df(\xi) \in \text{Lin}(M_0, \mathbb{C})$. Extending by \mathbb{C} -linearity we can view $df(\xi)$ as an element of $\text{Lin}(M_0\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$. Hence $df(\xi)$ defines an element in $(M_0\mathbb{C})^* \cong \mathbb{L}/\mathbb{C}$. We can find an element $Df(\xi)$ in \mathbb{L} such that under the projection $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}/\mathbb{C}$ the element $Df(\xi)$ goes to $df(\xi)$. The choice of $Df(\xi)$ is not unique, but another choice $D'f(\xi)$ differs from $Df(\xi)$ by an element in \mathbb{C} , which is contained in the center.

We now show how the object $Df(\xi)$ can be chosen. We choose an arbitrary element $\omega \in \mathbb{L}^*$ with $\omega(1) = 1$. Then we can write \mathbb{L}^* as a direct sum $\mathbb{L}^* = M_0\mathbb{C} \oplus W$ (as a complex vector space), where $W = \mathbb{C}\omega := \{\alpha\omega \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{C}\}$ is the 1-dimensional span of ω . Indeed, for an arbitrary element of $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^*$, the element $\xi' := \xi - \xi(1)\omega$ satisfies $\xi'(1) = 0$.

Now ξ' can be written as a linear combination $u + iv$ of two elements $u, v \in M_0$. Thus $\xi = u + iv + \xi(1)\omega \in M_0\mathbb{C} \oplus W$. For any fixed choice of ω we define $Df(\xi)$ by

$$Df(\xi)u := df(\xi)(u - u(1)\omega). \quad (9.6)$$

Note that $u - u(1) \in M_0\mathbb{C}$. The extended $Df(\xi)$ lies thus in \mathbb{L}^{**} . But \mathbb{L} was assumed to be reflexive, hence we have $Df(\xi) \in \mathbb{L}$.

We are now in a position to define a Lie product on \mathbb{E} by

$$(f \lrcorner g)(\xi) = (Df(\xi) \lrcorner Dg(\xi))(\xi) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in M \subset M_1,$$

where the Lie product on the right-hand side is that of \mathbb{L} . The left-hand side above is the complex number obtained by evaluating the function $h := f \lrcorner g$ for the argument $\xi \in M \subseteq M_1 \subset \mathbb{L}^*$. The right-hand side is the complex number obtained from the bilinear pairing between $df(\xi) \lrcorner dg(\xi) \in \mathbb{L}$ and the same ξ . Since the derivative of a smooth function is again smooth, $f \lrcorner g$ is again an element of \mathbb{E} .

We see that the Lie product $f \lrcorner g$ is independent of the choice of $Df(\xi)$ and $Dg(\xi)$, or equivalently, of the choice of ω in (9.6). Indeed, any other choice would differ only by an element in the center. But taking the Lie product in \mathbb{L} the dependence of the central element drops out.

We have the following theorem:

9.5.1 Theorem. *The algebra \mathbb{E} with the Lie product \lrcorner defined above is a Poisson algebra, called the **Lie–Poisson algebra** over \mathbb{L} . The restriction of the Lie product of \mathbb{E} to affine functions coincides with the Lie product of \mathbb{L} .*

Proof. (Sketch): The definition of \lrcorner is independent of ω . The antisymmetry of \lrcorner is clear, and the Jacobi identity follows from that of \mathbb{L} , using the fact that partial derivatives commute. The Leibniz identity follows from the Leibniz property of differentiation. The injection $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^{**}$ gives a map from the Lie algebra to the affine functions. We therefore regard the Lie algebra as a subalgebra of the affine functions. Since we assumed the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} to be reflexive the affine functions represent elements of the Lie algebra. Indeed, for an affine function f we obtain a linear function by subtracting $f(0)$ and thus defines an element f' of \mathbb{L} . But $f(0)$ is a multiple of 1 and thus also an element of the Lie algebra, therefore $f = f' + f(0) \in \mathbb{L}$. \square

We give two important examples.

9.5.2 Example. Consider $\mathbb{L} = h(1)$, the Heisenberg algebra, which is spanned by generators p, q and 1, with $p \lrcorner q = 1$ and all other Lie products between the generators vanishing. We identify the dual \mathbb{L}^* with \mathbb{C}^3 as follows,

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} (\alpha p + \beta q + \gamma) = x\alpha + y\beta + z\gamma,$$

for any choice α , β , and γ in \mathbb{C} . The affine hyperplane M_0 is in this case given by

$$M_0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

and similarly, for M_1 we find

$$M_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \mid x, y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

If f is a smooth function on M_1 , it is a smooth function $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $df(\xi)$, $\xi = (x, y, 1)^T$ and $v = (a, b, 0)^T$ we find

$$df(\xi)v = \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial x}a + \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial y}b.$$

The simplest choice for $Df(\xi)$ corresponding to writing $h(1) = \mathbb{C}p \oplus \mathbb{C}q \oplus \mathbb{C}$, is

$$Df(\xi) = \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial x}p + \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial y}q.$$

If g is another smooth function $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$Df(\xi) \lrcorner Dg(\xi) = \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial y} \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial x} \in \mathbb{C} \subset h(1),$$

and thus

$$(f \lrcorner g)(\xi) = \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial y} \frac{\partial g(x, y)}{\partial x},$$

which precisely corresponds to the Lie product associated to the dynamics of a single particle in one dimension.

More generally, an arbitrary Heisenberg algebra leads to general symplectic Poisson algebras on convenient vector spaces.

9.5.3 Example. We now show that for the choice $so(3)$ we recover the Lie product (9.4). We identify the real Lie algebra $so(3)$ with \mathbb{R}^3 equipped with the vector product. We adjoin a central element to obtain $so(3) \oplus 1$ and call \mathbb{L} the complexification of $so(3) \oplus 1$. We write an element of \mathbb{L} as (v, a) where $v \in \mathbb{C}^3$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}$, so that the Lie product is given by

$$(v, a) \lrcorner (w, b) = (v \times w, 0).$$

Of course, $v \times w$ is defined by extending the vector product on \mathbb{R}^3 by \mathbb{C} -linearity. We identify \mathbb{L}^* with \mathbb{C}^4 as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \\ t \end{pmatrix} (v, a) = xv_1 + yv_2 + zv_3 + ta, \quad v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we find that M_λ consists of the vectors $(x, y, z, \lambda)^T$ with x, y and z real numbers. A smooth function on M_1 is just a smooth function $\mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For any smooth $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $\xi = (x, y, z, 1)$ we define

$$\nabla f(\xi) = \left(\frac{\partial f(\xi)}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial f(\xi)}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial f(\xi)}{\partial z} \right)^T,$$

where we identify the vector $\xi = (x, y, z, 1)$ in M_1 with the vector (x, y, z) in \mathbb{R}^3 . We see that we can choose $Df(\xi) = (\nabla f(\xi), 0)$ and the Lie product on \mathbb{E} is then given by

$$f \lrcorner g(\xi) = \xi \cdot (\nabla f(\xi) \times \nabla g(\xi)),$$

which is precisely (9.4); $(x, y, z)^T$ corresponds to $(J_1, J_2, J_3)^T$.

The attentive reader might have noticed that in Example 9.5.3, the central element 1 played no role at all. As mentioned before, when a Lie algebra has no distinguished central element one can always add one. However, in this case one can also proceed directly as follows. For a real Lie algebra \mathbb{L} , we consider the dual \mathbb{L}^* and the algebra \mathbb{E} of real-valued smooth functions on \mathbb{L}^* . Let $f \in \mathbb{E}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^*$. The 1-form $df(\xi)$ is an element of the dual of the tangent space at ξ . Since \mathbb{L}^* is a vector space and \mathbb{L} is assumed to be reflexive, the dual of the tangent space at ξ is again \mathbb{L} . Hence $df(\xi)$ defines an element of the Lie algebra, which we also denote by $df(\xi)$. Then we define the Lie product on \mathbb{E} for $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$ as follows $(f \lrcorner g)(\xi) = \xi(df(\xi) \lrcorner dg(\xi))$, that is, to get $(f \lrcorner g)(\xi)$ the function ξ is evaluated at the Lie algebra element $df(\xi) \lrcorner dg(\xi)$. We leave it as an exercise that this gives the same result for real Lie algebras that do not have a distinguished central element.

It turns out that the majority of commutative Poisson algebras relevant in physics are Lie–Poisson algebras constructible from a suitable Lie algebra, or natural quotients of such algebras. In particular, this holds for the Poisson algebra of classical symplectic geometry in \mathbb{R}^N , which come from general Heisenberg algebras, and for all but one of the Poisson algebras for nonequilibrium thermodynamics constructed in BERIS AND EDWARDS [29].

9.6 Classical symplectic mechanics

A conservative physical system is completely characterized by three main ingredients: the kinematical algebra, the Hamiltonian, and the state. The **kinematical algebra** of the system is a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} which defines the kinematics, i.e., the structure of the quantities whose knowledge determines the system. The **Hamiltonian** H defines the dynamics. It is a Hermitian quantity in an associative algebra \mathbb{E} carrying a particular representation of the kinematical algebra, a Poisson representation in the classical case, and a unitary representation in the quantum case. The state encodes all properties of the physical state of an individual realization of the system at a fixed time.

The kinematical algebra determines the kinematical symmetries of a whole class of systems which differ in Hamiltonian and state. This means that applying a transformation of the

corresponding symmetry group transforms a system of this class into another system of the same class, usually with a different Hamiltonian. Those (often few) symmetries which preserve a given Hamiltonian are called symmetries of the system; applying a symmetry of the system changes possible state space trajectories of the system into other possible trajectories, usually affecting the states. Those (even fewer) symmetries which preserve the Hamiltonian and the state are symmetries of the particular realization of the system, and hence directly measurable.

The kinematical algebra may admit (up to isomorphism) one or many Poisson representations for classical systems, and one or many unitary representations for the corresponding quantum systems. For example, a Heisenberg algebra with finitely many degrees of freedom admits only one unitary representation, which is the content of the Stone–Von Neumann theorem.

In the nonrelativistic case, the Hamiltonian is an element of the Poisson algebra for classical systems, and for quantum systems the Hamiltonian is an element of the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie $*$ -algebra.

Let \mathbb{E} be the algebra determined by the physical system, that is, either \mathbb{E} is the Lie–Poisson algebra of the classical system, or $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ for a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} whose closure is a Hilbert space. Both the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} and the space-time symmetry group are represented inside \mathbb{E} .

We now consider the special case of classical N -particle systems describing the motions of a molecule.] The algebra \mathbb{E} consists of the complex-valued functions on phase space M and each point $z \in M$ in phase space determines a state $\langle \cdot \rangle_z$ by

$$\langle f \rangle_z := f(z),$$

called a **classical pure state**. Note that evaluation at a point $z \in M$ is more than a linear functional; an evaluation gives an algebra homomorphism $C^\infty(M; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ since $(fg)(z) = f(z)g(z)$; hence we have a character of the commutative algebra \mathbb{E} . If the phase space M is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n , the evaluations are the only characters of \mathbb{E} . This can be seen as follows. Take any algebra homomorphism $\varphi : C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be coordinates on M and denote by $a_i = \varphi(x_i)$ the images of the coordinate functions. The homomorphism φ thus determines a point $z = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in \mathbb{R}^n . We have to show $z \in M$. Suppose $z \notin M$, then

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_j (x_j - a_j)^2$$

is a function that does not vanish on M , and thus is an invertible element of $C^\infty(M)$. If an element x is invertible, then so is its image under any homomorphism. Indeed, if $xy = 1$, then $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y) = \varphi(1) = 1$. But the function f is mapped to zero under φ and hence cannot be invertible. Hence we arrive at a contradiction and the assumption $z \notin M$ is false.

A mixed classical state is a weighted mixture of pure classical states. That is, there is a real-valued function ρ on the phase space M , called the **density**, taking nonnegative values

and integrating to one

$$\int_M \rho(z) d\mu(z) = 1,$$

such that

$$\langle f \rangle = \int_M \rho(z) f(z) d\mu(z). \quad (9.7)$$

The integration measure $d\mu$ depends on the application. In symplectic mechanics, the symplectic Poisson bracket determines the Lie product, one uses the **Liouville measure**, defined in local coordinates (q, p) by

$$d\mu(z) = dq_1 \cdots dq_n dp_1 \cdots dp_n.$$

Consider a system containing N particles. Then each particle has a momentum and a position. Hence phase space is $6N$ -dimensional. The Lie algebra is given by the relations $p_{ia} \triangleright q_{jb} = \delta_{ij} \delta_{ab}$ where p_{ia} is the a th component of the momentum of the i th particle and q_{jb} is the b th component of the position of the j th particle. The obtained Lie algebra is the Heisenberg algebra $\mathfrak{h}(N)$.

In molecular mechanics, the Hamiltonian is of the simple form³

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m_i} + V(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N),$$

where the **potential** $V(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N)$ describes the potential energy of the configuration with positions $(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N)$.

The states in symplectic mechanics are precisely the states of the form (9.7). If the system is such that we can measure at one instant of time all positions and momenta exactly (obviously an idealization), the configuration is precisely given by the point $z = (\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N)$ in phase space, and $\langle f \rangle = f(z)$ for all $f \in \mathbb{E}$. Thus the density degenerates to a product of delta functions of each phase space coordinate. Thus classical pure states are equivalent to points z in phase space, marking position and momentum of each point of interest, such as the centers of mass of the stars, planets, and moons making up a celestial system.

9.7 Molecular mechanics

Consider a molecule consisting of N atoms. The molecule is chemically described by assigning bonds between certain pairs of atoms, reflecting the presence of chemical forces that

³The more general form $H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^N G_{ij}(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N) \mathbf{p}_i \mathbf{p}_j + V(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N)$, where G is a configuration-dependent inverse mass matrix, appears at various places in physics. When the potential V is constant (so that we can put it to zero), the physical system is sometimes called a **σ -model**. Such models play an important role in modern high-energy physics and cosmology. Some authors prefer to include a potential into the definition of a σ -model.




Figure 9.1: Bond vectors, bond angles, and the dihedral angle

– in the absence of chemical reactions which may break bonds – hold these atoms close together. Thus a molecule may be thought of as a graph embedded in 3-dimensional space, in which some but usually not all atoms are connected by a bond. The chemical structure of the molecule is thus described by a connected graph, the **formula** of the molecule. (In the following, we ignore multiple bonds, which are just a way to indicate stronger binding than for single bonds, reflected in the interaction potential.) We write $i \sim j$ if there is a bond between atom i and atom j and similarly we write $i \sim j \sim k$ if there is a bond connecting i and j and there is a bond connecting j and k . The notation is extended to longer chains: $i \sim j \sim k \sim l \sim \dots$

The interactions between the atoms in a molecule are primarily through the bonds, and to a much smaller extent through forces described by a pair potential and through multibody forces for joint influences of several adjacent bonds.

The geometry is captured mathematically by assigning to the j th atom a 3-dimensional coordinate vector

$$q_j = \begin{pmatrix} q_{j1} \\ q_{j2} \\ q_{j3} \end{pmatrix}$$

specifying the position of the atom in space. If two atoms with labels j and k are joined by a chemical bond, we consider the corresponding **bond vector** $q_j - q_k$, with **bond length** $\|q_j - q_k\|$. At room temperature, the bonds between adjacent atoms i and j are quite rigid, meaning that the deviation from the average distance r_{ij} is generally small and the force that tries to maintain the atoms at distance r_{ij} is strong. In chemistry this is modeled by a term

$$V_{\text{bond}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) = \sum_{i \sim j} \frac{a_{ij}}{2} (\|q_i - q_j\| - r_{ij})^2$$

in the Hamiltonian, where the a_{ij} are **stiffness constants**, parameters determined by the particular chemical structure.

Consider two adjacent bonds $i \sim j$ and $k \sim l$. The **bond angle** α is the angle between the bond vectors $q_j - q_i$ and $q_l - q_k$. The bond angle α can then be computed from the formulas

$$\cos \alpha = \frac{(q_i - q_j) \cdot (q_k - q_l)}{\|q_i - q_j\| \|q_k - q_l\|}, \quad \sin \alpha = \frac{\|(q_i - q_j) \times (q_k - q_l)\|}{\|q_i - q_j\| \|q_k - q_l\|},$$

and is thus invariant under the simultaneous action of the group $ISO(3)$ on all 3 vectors. In most molecules the bond angles are determined from the interaction between the atoms in the molecule. There is thus an $ISO(3)$ -invariant term

$$V_{\text{angle}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) = \sum_{i \sim j \sim k} a_{ijk} \Phi(q_i, q_j, q_k)$$

in the potential with $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^3)^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an $ISO(3)$ -invariant function, and a_{ijk} are some parameters.

Finally, the **dihedral angle** $\omega = \sphericalangle(i \sim j \sim k \sim l)$ (or the complementary **torsion angle** $2\pi - \omega$) measures the relative orientation of two adjacent angles in a chain $i \sim j \sim k \sim l$ of atoms. It is defined as the angle between the normals through the planes determined by the atoms i, j, k and j, k, l , respectively, and can be calculated from

$$\cos \omega = \frac{(q_i - q_j) \times (q_k - q_j) \cdot (q_j - q_k) \times (q_l - q_k)}{\| (q_i - q_j) \times (q_k - q_j) \| \| (q_j - q_k) \times (q_l - q_k) \|},$$

and

$$\sin \omega = \frac{|(q_i - q_j) \times (q_l - q_k) \cdot (q_k - q_j)| \|q_k - q_j\|}{\| (q_i - q_j) \times (q_k - q_j) \| \| (q_j - q_k) \times (q_l - q_k) \|}.$$

Again, the angle between the planes is $ISO(3)$ -invariant and therefore described by an $ISO(3)$ -invariant function $\Psi : (\mathbb{R}^3)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the positions of the four atoms. Hence to model the molecule there is a term

$$V_{\text{dihedral}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) = \sum_{i \sim j \sim k \sim l} a_{ijkl} \Psi(q_i, q_j, q_k, q_l)$$

in the Hamiltonian, with again a_{ijkl} parameters. The total Hamiltonian is then taken to be

$$H = \sum_i \left(\frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + V_{\text{bond}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) + V_{\text{angle}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) + V_{\text{dihedral}}(q_1, \dots, q_N) \right).$$

The above Hamiltonian is of a special type; it is a member of the family of Hamiltonians of the form

$$H = \sum_i \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} + V(q_1, \dots, q_N).$$

This family of Hamiltonians is favorable since there are no mixed terms between the momenta and the positions. Therefore, in the quantum theory there is no ambiguity in how the quantum mechanical Hamiltonian has to be written, since the momenta commute among themselves and the positions commute among themselves, too.

The group $ISO(3)$ plays an important role here purely on symmetry grounds; how and where a molecule is located in \mathbb{R}^3 does not determine the chemical properties. Hence the Hamiltonian should depend on $ISO(3)$ -invariant quantities only.

From the above we see that the one in practice is given a representation $j : G \rightarrow GL(V)$ of some group in a vector space. The construction of a suitable Hamiltonian can be facilitated

by knowing the invariants in the tensor representations $V \otimes V$, $V \otimes V \otimes V$ and so on. If V is irreducible, V might contain one or more one-dimensional subrepresentations on which G acts trivially; these are precisely the invariants in V . Hence knowing the irreducible representations of G is of great importance.

Now suppose that G has an irreducible representation j on V . Then $g \in G$ acts on $V \otimes V$ as follows: $g : v \otimes w \mapsto j(g)v \otimes j(g)w$, and similarly for higher order tensor products. It is almost never the case that the representation of G in tensor products of irreducible representations is again irreducible. But, in many cases, the decomposition of $V \otimes V$, $V \otimes V \otimes V$, etc. into irreducible representations is known.

In the case of $ISO(3)$ the representation is in \mathbb{R}^3 , which contains no invariants since all points of \mathbb{R}^3 form a single orbit. But, as we have shown in Section 9.7, $V \otimes V$, $V \otimes V \otimes V$ and $V \otimes V \otimes V \otimes V$ do have invariants: distances and angles.

9.8 An outlook to quantum field theory

Quantum field theory is the area in physics where fields are treated by quantum mechanics. The way physicists think of this is more or less as follows. As we have seen in Chapter 2, classical linear field equations, such as the Maxwell equations, can be seen as describing a family of harmonic oscillators labeled by a continuum of pairs (\mathbf{p}, s) of momenta \mathbf{p} and spin or helicity s . Therefore, what has been treated above is nice, but for quantum field theory it is not enough. One needs an infinite number of oscillators. Treating such a system becomes mathematically sophisticated, because topological details start playing a dominant role. A way to deal with this heuristically, often employed by physicists, is by discretizing space-time in a box. On each point of the lattice one places a harmonic oscillator; then there are just a finite number of oscillators. To get the quantum field theory, one considers the limit in which the size of the box goes to infinity and the spacing of the lattice goes to zero. Then the oscillators are not described by operators a_k and a_k^+ that are labeled by vectors k , but by operators $a(x)$ and $a^+(x)$ that are labeled by the continuous four-vector index x . The limit might not exist. . . .

In two space-time dimensions the limit is well-defined for interacting field theories, that is, for field theories where the different fields can interact. In case of four dimensions, the correct limit is only known for non-interacting field theories. From experience we know that there is interaction, of course, so our description shows serious shortcomings. After the preceding description of representations, it is interesting to note that, - in the field theory limits, the metaplectic representations still exist.

For 2-dimensional field theories with one space and one time dimension, this leads to satisfactory quantum field theories (such as conformal field theory) . But for 4-dimensional field theories, the metaplectic representation is restricted to a class of operators not flexible enough for capturing the physics. This is the main mathematical obstacle for formulating a consistent framework for 4-dimensional quantum field theories.

Chapter 10

Representation and classification

10.1 Poisson representations

Consider the Heisenberg algebra $\mathfrak{h}(n)$ with the usual generators 1 , p_i , and q_i , and the corresponding Lie–Poisson algebra $\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{h}(n))$. The subalgebra of all polynomials in q_i, p_j is closed under the Lie product, and hence a Poisson subalgebra. More interestingly, there are several Lie subalgebras of low degree polynomials, which we shall now explore. We write z for the $2n$ -tuple

$$z = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}$$

of all the generators except 1 . All linear polynomials without constant term can be written as $a \cdot z$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$. On \mathbb{C}^{2n} we introduce the antisymmetric bilinear form ω on \mathbb{C}^2 , represented in the given basis by the matrix J :

$$\omega(a, b) = a^T J b, \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the entries in J are $n \times n$ -matrices, i.e., $1 = 1_n$, etc.. The bilinear form ω is nondegenerate and antisymmetric, and we have

$$a \cdot z \lrcorner b \cdot z = \omega(a, b). \tag{10.1}$$

Any quadratic expression in $\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{h}(n))$ is a linear sum of expressions of the form

$$(a \cdot z)(b \cdot z).$$

We consider two such expressions and calculate their Lie product

$$\begin{aligned} (a \cdot z)(b \cdot z) \lrcorner (c \cdot z)(d \cdot z) &= a \cdot z((b \cdot z) \lrcorner (c \cdot z)(d \cdot z)) + (a \cdot z \lrcorner (c \cdot z)(d \cdot z))b \cdot z \\ &= (b \cdot z)(c \cdot z)\omega(a, d) + (b \cdot z)(d \cdot z)\omega(a, c) \\ &\quad + (a \cdot z)(c \cdot z)\omega(b, d) + (a \cdot z)(d \cdot z)\omega(b, c), \end{aligned}$$

which is a quadratic expression. Hence the homogeneous quadratic polynomials form a Lie subalgebra of $\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{h}(n))$. We show below that this Lie algebra is related to $\mathfrak{sp}(2n, \mathbb{C})$. We

proceed in physicist's fashion by looking at a conveniently chosen basis. In Section 15.4 we give a second derivation in a coordinate independent fashion, which generalizes to the fermionic case and gives Lie algebras related to the real orthogonal groups.

The generators of $h(n)$ are 1 , p_i and q_i . Consider the elements

$$Q_{ij} = q_i q_j, \quad P_{ij} = p_i p_j, \quad E_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(q_i p_j + p_j q_i),$$

of the universal enveloping algebra. We have $Q_{ij} = Q_{ji}$ and $P_{ij} = P_{ji}$. We find the commutation relations:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ij} \cap Q_{kl} &= 0, & P_{ij} \cap P_{kl} &= 0, \\ E_{ij} \cap E_{kl} &= -\delta_{il} E_{kj} + \delta_{jk} E_{il}, \\ E_{ij} \cap Q_{kl} &= \delta_{jl} Q_{ik} + \delta_{jk} Q_{il}, \\ E_{ij} \cap P_{kl} &= -\delta_{il} P_{jk} - \delta_{ik} P_{jl}, \\ Q_{ij} \cap P_{kl} &= -\delta_{ik} E_{jl} - \delta_{jk} E_{il} - \delta_{jl} E_{ik} - \delta_{il} E_{jk}. \end{aligned}$$

The Lie algebra $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ is given by the complex $2n \times 2n$ -matrices that preserve the above given J :

$$X \in sp(2n, \mathbb{C}) \Leftrightarrow X^T J + JX = 0.$$

Taking X in block form as

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix},$$

we find $X \in sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ if and only if $C = C^T$, $B = B^T$ and $D = -A^T$. If we introduce the $n \times n$ -matrices e_{ij} that are 1 on the ij -entry and zero elsewhere, we have $e_{ij} e_{kl} = \delta_{jk} e_{il}$ and the matrices

$$A_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & -e_{ji} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e_{ij} + e_{ji} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ e_{ij} + e_{ji} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

form a basis for $sp(n, \mathbb{C})$. We find the commutation rules

$$\begin{aligned} B_{ij} \cap B_{kl} &= 0, & C_{ij} \cap C_{kl} &= 0, \\ A_{ij} \cap A_{kl} &= -\delta_{il} A_{kj} + \delta_{jk} A_{il}, \\ E_{ij} \cap B_{kl} &= \delta_{jl} B_{ik} + \delta_{jk} B_{il}, \\ A_{ij} \cap C_{kl} &= -\delta_{il} C_{jk} - \delta_{ik} C_{jl}, \\ B_{ij} \cap C_{kl} &= \delta_{ik} E_{jl} + \delta_{jk} E_{il} + \delta_{jl} E_{ik} + \delta_{il} E_{jk}. \end{aligned}$$

Sending Q_{ij} to $-B_{ij}$, P_{ij} to C_{ij} and E_{ij} to A_{ij} we have an isomorphism between the algebras.

We now allow for inhomogeneous quadratic polynomials by adjoining the linear forms of the algebra $\mathbb{E}(h(n))$ to this Lie algebra. Everything commutes with the central element 1 , so we will not write down the commutation relations with 1 . The commutation relations of the other basis elements are found to be

$$Q_{ij} \cap q_k = P_{ij} \cap p_k = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{ij} \lrcorner p_k &= -\delta_{ik}q_j - \delta_{jk}q_i, \\
P_{ij} \lrcorner q_k &= -\delta_{ik}p_j - \delta_{jk}p_i, \\
E_{ij} \lrcorner q_k &= \delta_{ik}q_j, \\
E_{ij} \lrcorner p_k &= -\delta_{jk}p_i.
\end{aligned}$$

We define the Lie subalgebra \mathbb{L}' of $\mathbb{E}(h(n))$ as the Lie subalgebra of quadratic expressions in the generators and we define $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}'/\mathbb{C}$, so that in \mathbb{L} we have $q_i \lrcorner p_j = 0$. Using the previously established isomorphism with $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ it is not too hard to see that \mathbb{L} is isomorphic to the Lie algebra $isp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, which is defined as the Lie algebra of all $(2n + 1) \times (2n + 1)$ -matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & r \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with A a $2n \times 2n$ -matrix in $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ and r a $2n$ -vector. We have thus shown that \mathbb{L}' is a central extension of $isp(2n, \mathbb{C})$.

10.2 Linear representations

Of great interest in quantum mechanics are certain realizations of Lie algebras and of Lie groups by means of operators on vector spaces. We therefore address the concept of a representation of a Lie algebra. In the previous chapter we have already given a short discussion of finite-dimensional representations of finite-dimensional Lie algebras.

10.2.1 Definition.

(i) A **(linear) representation** of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} in an associative algebra \mathbb{E} is a linear map $J : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ such that

$$J(f \lrcorner g) = J(f)J(g) - J(g)J(f) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathbb{L}.$$

The representation is called **faithful** if J is injective. A **linear representation** on a (finite- or infinite-dimensional) vector space \mathbb{H} is a representation in the algebra $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$. In the case that \mathbb{E} is the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} one obtains the definition of Section 10.3. A linear representation is called **irreducible** when the only subspaces closed under multiplication by linear mappings of the form $J(f)$ are 0 and \mathbb{H} .

(ii) A **unitary representation** of a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} is a linear map $J : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ in the $*$ -algebra $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of continuous linear operators of a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} (with $*$ being the adjoint), satisfying

$$J(1) = 1, \quad J(f^*) = J(f)^*, \quad J(f \lrcorner g) = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left(J(f)J(g) - J(g)J(f) \right).$$

Note that by Proposition 8.2.3, an associative algebra \mathbb{E} becomes in a natural way a Lie algebra by defining $f \lrcorner g = [f, g] = fg - gf$. Hence a representation of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} in an algebra \mathbb{E} is a Lie algebra homomorphism from \mathbb{L} to \mathbb{E} , with \mathbb{E} regarded as a Lie

algebra. If the representation is faithful, the image of \mathbb{L} is a Lie subalgebra of \mathbb{E} isomorphic to \mathbb{L} . In this case, one often identifies the elements of \mathbb{L} with their images, and then speaks of an **embedding** of \mathbb{L} into \mathbb{E} . By the Theorem of Ado mentioned above, every finite-dimensional real Lie algebra has a faithful representation.

The enveloping algebra. In a representation, the elements of \mathbb{L} are represented by matrices or linear operators. From a given set of matrices we can form the algebra that these matrices generate, containing the unit matrix, all finite products and their linear combinations. This motivates us to consider an object that already encompasses this algebra for all representations: the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} . In general it is constructed by considering the tensor algebra $T(\mathbb{L})$, which is given by

$$T(\mathbb{L}) = \mathbb{K} \oplus \mathbb{L} \oplus (\mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L}) \oplus (\mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{L}) \oplus \dots = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{L}^{\otimes i}.$$

One makes $T(\mathbb{L})$ into an associative noncommutative algebra over the complex numbers by defining the product ab to be the tensor product $a \otimes b$.

Within $T(\mathbb{L})$ we consider the ideal \mathcal{J} generated by all elements of the form

$$x \otimes y - y \otimes x - [x, y]$$

for all x, y in \mathbb{L} . Thus an element in \mathcal{J} is a sum of elements of the form

$$a \otimes (x \otimes y - y \otimes x - [x, y]) \otimes b,$$

for some $a, b \in T(\mathbb{L})$. The **universal enveloping algebra** of \mathbb{L} is then defined as the associative noncommutative algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$ over the complex numbers given by

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L}) = T(\mathbb{L})/\mathcal{J}.$$

Another view on the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$ would be as follows. One chooses a basis $\{t_i\}$ for \mathbb{L} and considers the associative noncommutative polynomial algebra in the generators while imposing the relation

$$t_i t_j - t_j t_i = [t_i, t_j].$$

Thus we consider the associative algebra generated by 1 and by the generators of \mathbb{L} and impose the Lie product, which in this case is the commutator, by hand. The algebra we obtain in this way is canonically isomorphic to the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$.

The universal enveloping algebra thus contains the Lie algebra, i.e. envelopes the Lie algebra. This approach is very practical and therefore often used by physicists. There exists a more sophisticated definition, using a so-called universal property. One then proves that such an object is unique and that the given definition above has this universal property. We do not expand on the definition using the universal property but refer to the literature, see, e.g., JACOBSEN [121], KNAPP [137], or FUCHS & SCHWEIGERT [84]. It is because of this universal property that $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$ is usually called the universal enveloping algebra, and not just the enveloping algebra.

The main reason to define the universal enveloping algebra is to study the representations of the Lie algebra. Every representation of the Lie algebra induces a unique representation of the *associative* universal enveloping algebra, and conversely, every representation of the universal enveloping algebra induces a representation of the Lie algebra itself. In a sense, all finite-dimensional representations are maps of the associative universal enveloping algebra to the associative algebra of $n \times n$ -matrices for some n .

Casimir elements. An element $C \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$ in the center of the universal enveloping algebra, i.e. that commutes with all other elements of $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$, is called a **Casimir element**, or just Casimir and sometimes also Casimir operator. If \mathbb{L} has a representation in a vector space V , then for any $c \in \mathbb{K}$ the subspace $V_c = \{v \in V \mid Cv = cv\}$ is invariant under the action of \mathbb{L} , precisely because C is in the center of $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$. Hence if the representation V is irreducible, V_c must be the whole of V for some c and the other V_c are zero. That means, C acts diagonally in irreducible representations.

The classical analogue of the universal enveloping algebra is the Lie–Poisson algebra discussed in Chapter 9.5.

10.3 Finite-dimensional representations

We have already seen in Section 8.4 that the Lie algebra $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ has many interesting Lie subalgebras. Given an arbitrary Lie algebra \mathbb{L} it is interesting to see how we can represent \mathbb{L} as a Lie algebra of matrices. In this section we consider finite-dimensional Lie algebras and finite-dimensional representations in more detail.

For any vector space V over \mathbb{K} we denote $gl(V)$ the Lie algebra of linear maps from V to V with the Lie product given by the commutator $f \triangleright g = fg - gf$. If V is identified with \mathbb{K}^n we write $gl(V) = gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ (see Section 8.4). A Lie algebra homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V)$ is called a **finite-dimensional representation** of \mathbb{L} ; the vector space V is then called an **\mathbb{L} -module**. We call the representation complex if $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and real if $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. We have already seen that $su(n)$ has a complex representation, since it is defined as a (real) subalgebra of $gl(n, \mathbb{C})$.

Given a representation $\phi : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V)$ we call W an **invariant subspace** of V if $\phi(f)w \in W$ for all $f \in \mathbb{L}$ and all $w \in W$. The representation is called **irreducible** if the only invariant subspaces are 0 and V . We call the representation **decomposable** or **fully reducible**, if for any invariant subspace W there is a complementary invariant subspace W' such that $V = W \oplus W'$.

If $\phi_1 : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V_1)$ and $\phi_2 : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V_2)$ are representations of \mathbb{L} we can form the direct sum representation $\phi_{1 \oplus 2} : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V_1 \oplus V_2, \mathbb{K})$ by defining

$$\phi_{1 \oplus 2}(f)(v_1 + v_2) = \phi_1(f)(v_1) + \phi_2(f)(v_2)$$

for $f \in \mathbb{L}$ and $v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2$. It is easy to check the representation property. In terms

of matrices, the direct sum representation corresponds to the map given by

$$f \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1(f) & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_2(f) \end{pmatrix}$$

in block matrices.

If $\phi_1 : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(V)$ and $\phi_2 : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(W)$ are representations of \mathbb{L} we can form the tensor product representation $\phi_{1 \otimes 2}$ as follows: Each element f in \mathbb{L} is sent to the linear map

$$\phi_{1 \otimes 2}(f)(v \otimes w) = (\phi_1(f)v) \otimes w + v \otimes (\phi_2(f)w) \quad (10.2)$$

for all $v \in V$ and $w \in W$. It is easy to check that (10.2) defines a representation.

In Section 10.6 we have already mentioned the adjoint representation $\text{ad} : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow gl(\mathbb{L})$ defined by

$$\text{ad}_f : g \mapsto [f, g].$$

The map ad is clearly linear, and from the Jacobi identity we see

$$\text{ad}_x \text{ad}_y(z) - \text{ad}_y \text{ad}_x(z) = \text{ad}_{[x,y]}(z),$$

hence

$$[\text{ad}_x, \text{ad}_y] = \text{ad}_{[x,y]}.$$

We can now rephrase the definition of the ideal (see Section 10.6) as follows: $I \subset \mathbb{L}$ is an ideal if and only if I is an invariant subspace of the adjoint representation.

10.4 Representations of Lie groups

Lie group representations have a similar definition as Lie algebra representations.

10.4.1 Definition. A representation of a Lie group \mathbb{G} in an associative algebra \mathbb{E} with identity 1 is a map $U : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ such that

$$U(fg) = U(f)U(g), \quad U(1) = 1.$$

The representation is called **faithful** if U is injective. If $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$, one speaks again of a **linear representation** on \mathbb{H} . A linear representation is called **irreducible** if the only subspaces closed under multiplication by linear mappings of the form $U(f)$ are 0 and \mathbb{H} . A **unitary representation** of a Lie group \mathbb{G} is a linear representation in the $*$ -algebra $\mathbb{E} = \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ of continuous linear operators of a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} , satisfying

$$U(f)^* U(f) = 1.$$

It is easy to see that $U(f^{-1}) = U(f)^{-1}$, and in the unitary case, $U(f^{-1}) = U(f)^{-1} = U(f)^*$.

Note that the invertible elements of \mathbb{E} form a group and a Lie group representation of \mathbb{G} in \mathbb{E} is a group homomorphism of \mathbb{G} into this group. Again, if the representation is faithful, one

may identify group elements with their images under the representation, and then has an **embedding** of \mathbb{G} into the algebra \mathbb{E} . Thus if \mathbb{E} is the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} we get a group homomorphism of \mathbb{G} into $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$. For $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ the representation is unitary if the image of \mathbb{G} lies inside $U(n)$.

If a Lie algebra representation $J : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ is an embedding, we can get something that is close to a representation of the Lie group by exponentiation, i.e., by defining

$$U(e^f) := e^{J(f)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{J(f)^k}{k!},$$

provided this converges for all $f \in \mathbb{L}$ in the topology of \mathbb{E} . In Subsection 10.4 we go deeper into the question of how to get a Lie group representation from a Lie algebra representation and the problems one encounters. On the other hand, given a representation U of a Lie group \mathbb{G} with Lie algebra \mathbb{L} we can get a representation J of the Lie algebra by differentiation, i.e., by defining

$$J(X) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} U(e^{tX}) \right|_{t=0},$$

provided the derivative always exists. In finite dimensions, both constructions work generally; in infinite dimensions, suitable assumptions are needed to make the constructions work.

The group \mathbb{G} acts on the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} . We will discuss this shortly for groups of matrices. For every element $g \in \mathbb{G} \subset GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ we define $\text{Ad}(g)$ which is a linear transformation of \mathbb{L} given by

$$\text{Ad}(g) : X \mapsto gXg^{-1}.$$

It holds that $\text{Ad}(g)X \in \mathbb{L}$, which we will not prove. The interested reader is referred to KNAPP [137], HELGASON [111], FRANKEL [81], or KIRILLOV [134]. For all the examples discussed so far, the reader can check it by hand. The map $\text{Ad} : g \rightarrow \text{Ad}(g)$ clearly satisfies $\text{Ad}(gh) = \text{Ad}(g)\text{Ad}(h)$ and is thus a representation, which is called the **adjoint** representation of the group \mathbb{G} .

Universal covering group. For Lie algebra representations an important construct is the universal enveloping algebra. For Lie groups there is an analogue. Above we mentioned that by differentiating a representation of a Lie group, one obtains a representation for the corresponding Lie algebra. By exponentiating a representation of the Lie algebra one gets a representation for those group elements that can be written as exponents. If a group is not connected, one does not obtain a representation of the group in this way.

Other problems arise when the group is not simply connected. For example $SO(3)$ is not simply connected and therefore certain representations of the Lie algebra cannot be lifted to representations of the Lie group; the spin representations become multivalued. Even other problems arise when two Lie groups that are fundamentally different have isomorphic Lie algebras. Consider for example the group $U(1)$ of complex numbers of absolute value 1. As a manifold $U(1)$ is just the circle S^1 . The Lie group of $U(1)$ is the one-dimensional

abelian Lie algebra (there is only one). Now consider the Lie group \mathbb{R} where the group operation is addition $a \cdot b = a + b$. Then \mathbb{R} is a one-dimensional abelian Lie group with a one-dimensional Lie algebra. The Lie algebras of $U(1)$ and \mathbb{R} are isomorphic, but the Lie groups are totally different. When we want to lift a Lie algebra representation of either of them to a Lie group representation, which group do we choose then?

These topological considerations lead one to the question whether there is a unique simply connected Lie group for a given Lie algebra. The answer is positive: for every real finite-dimensional Lie algebra \mathbb{L} there is a unique simply connected Lie group \mathbb{G} with Lie algebra \mathbb{L} . So given a Lie group \mathbb{H} with Lie algebra \mathbb{L} one can construct a unique simply connected Lie group \mathbb{G} with Lie algebra \mathbb{L} . The group \mathbb{G} is called the **universal covering group** of \mathbb{H} . Then \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{G} are locally isomorphic; there are small neighborhoods of the origin in both groups on which \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{G} are diffeomorphic to each other. The Lie group \mathbb{H} is then a quotient of \mathbb{G} ; $\mathbb{H} \cong \mathbb{G}/D$ for some discrete normal subgroup D of \mathbb{G} .

The exponential map $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ is in general not surjective, however, the image of the exponential map generates an interesting subgroup of \mathbb{G} , the connected component of \mathbb{G} , denoted \mathbb{G}_0 . If $g \in \mathbb{G}$ lies in the connected component, we can write $g = e^{f_1} \cdots e^{f_r}$ for some Lie algebra elements f_1, \dots, f_r . Given a Lie algebra representation we can uniquely lift it to a representation of the connected component of the Lie group \mathbb{G}_0 if \mathbb{G}_0 is simply connected. Therefore, in this case, the representations of the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} are in a one-to-one correspondence with the representations of the universal covering group corresponding to \mathbb{L} .

Now let \mathbb{H} be a Lie group with Lie algebra \mathbb{L} and with universal covering group \mathbb{G} such that $\mathbb{H} \cong \mathbb{G}/K$ for some normal subgroup K of \mathbb{G} . Given a Lie algebra representation of \mathbb{L} , we get a Lie group representation of \mathbb{G} . If the normal subgroup K is in the kernel of the representation, we get a well-defined representation of \mathbb{H} as well. Conversely, given a representation of \mathbb{H} , we get a representation of \mathbb{G} by first projecting to \mathbb{G}/K , so that K is in the kernel. Hence, representations of \mathbb{H} are in one-to-one correspondence with representations of \mathbb{G} that map K to the unit matrix.

10.5 Unitary representations of the Poincaré group

This section is neither in a good form nor complete in contents.

Knowing the simple and semisimple Lie algebras is of course interesting, but in physics there are also important non-semisimple Lie algebras that play an important role. In this section we treat one of the most important Lie algebras in physics, the Poincaré Lie algebra. The Poincaré Lie algebra is not semisimple since it contains an abelian (and thus solvable) ideal.

In physics, the irreducible unitary representations of the Poincaré algebra correspond to **elementary particles**, more precisely to particles considered at distances so large that their internal structure can be safely ignored. Using the Casimir operators in the universal

enveloping algebra, one can label the different representations, since a Casimir must take a constant value in any irreducible representation.

There are two independent Casimirs. One is the number p^2 , which is an invariant since the Minkowski inner product is invariant. With our choice of signature $(-+++)$, one has $p^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 - p_0^2 = -(mc)^2$ for a constant m called the **mass** of the representation (or the associated particles); for the signature $(+---)$, we have instead $p^2 = p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = (mc)^2$. In physically relevant representations, $m \geq 0$ and $p_0 > 0$.

A second Casimir accounts for the **spin** s of the representation; for unitary representations, it is quantized, and takes nonnegative, half integral values. The particles are called **bosons** if the spin of this representation is integral, and **fermions** otherwise, i.e., if the spin is half an odd integer. For example, electrons have spin $s = 1/2$ and are fermions, while photons have spin $s = 1$ and are bosons. The name "spin" derives from relations to the representation theory of the rotation group; see Section 15.1, where also the dichotomic nature of integral and nonintegral spin is explained, which justifies using different names for bosons and fermions.

Clearly, representations which differ in mass or spin are nonequivalent. Less trivial is the fact that, among the **physical representations** (i.e., those with $m \geq 0$ and $p_0 > 0$), there is an up to equivalence unique irreducible representation for each combination $m > 0$ and $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_+$. In the massless case $m = 0$, there are precisely two for each $s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_+$, a right-handed and a left-handed one.

Given an irreducible unitary representation, we can choose a basis such that the components of p act diagonally, since they are Hermitian and commute. Thus we can assign to a vector in the representation the four momentum components. The momentum components will also be denoted p_ν . The number $E = p_0c$ is called the **energy**, and depends on the basis chosen, since the $so(3, 1)$ rotations mix the momenta. Having fixed a basis of the translations, there is only a $SO(3)$ subgroup that leaves the energy invariant. Intuitively this is clear, rotating a reference frame does not change the energies. In general, for a given basis, the subgroup of $so(3, 1)$ that leaves the vector $(1, 0, 0, 0)$ invariant is $SO(3)$ and the elements of the $SO(3)$ subgroup are rotations. There are three independent $SO(3, 1)$ elements that do not leave $(1, 0, 0, 0)$ invariant, these transformations and their linear combinations are called **Lorentz boosts** in the physics literature. The Lorentz boosts mix time and space coordinates. A basis of Poincaré Lie algebra thus consists of the generators of three rotations, three Lorentz boosts and four translations.

10.6 Finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras

For finite-dimensional Lie algebras a lot is known about the general structure; here we give an overview over the results most useful in physics. Since no details are given, this section may be skipped on first reading.

Classifying all finite-dimensional Lie algebras is in a certain sense possible; all finite-dimensional Lie algebras are a semidirect product of a semisimple and a solvable Lie algebra

(to be defined below). The classification of all semisimple real and complex Lie algebras is completely understood. It turns out that the semisimple complex Lie algebras can be classified by studying certain root systems. The semisimple real Lie algebras are obtained by applying the classification of complex Lie algebras to the complexified Lie algebras and then finding all ways of turning the resulting complex Lie algebras into a Lie $*$ -algebra; their real parts then give all semisimple real Lie algebras.

In the semisimple case, every representation is faithful; hence a representation is nothing more than an embedding into a matrix Lie algebra $gl(n, \mathbb{C})$, realizing the Lie algebra elements by matrices. Every Lie algebra \mathbb{L} comes with a canonical representation, the **adjoint representation**, denoted ad , which maps an element f to the Hamiltonian derivative ad_f in direction f , introduced in Section 8.2. Thus to each Lie algebra element f we assign a linear operator on a vector space. The vector space is the Lie algebra itself and an element f of the Lie algebra is represented by the linear transformation ad_f that maps an element $g \in \mathbb{L}$ to $f \triangleright g$. In the mathematical literature, one often writes the Lie product as a commutator. Then the definition takes the form

$$ad_x(y) = [x, y].$$

Due to the Jacobi identity this indeed defines a representation. For finite-dimensional Lie algebras, there is a canonical symmetric bilinear form called the **(Cartan–)Killing form**, which we write as B_{CK} and defined by

$$B_{CK}(x, y) = \text{tr}(ad_x ad_y).$$

Due to the Jacobi identity, the Killing form is invariant,

$$B_{CK}([x, z], y) = B_{CK}(x, [z, y]).$$

Recall that an ideal of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is a subspace I in \mathbb{L} such that $\mathbb{L} \triangleright I \subseteq I$. Thus an ideal is an invariant subspace under the adjoint action of the Lie algebra on itself. A Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is called **simple** if it is not one-dimensional and has no nontrivial ideals (distinct from 0 and \mathbb{L}). Thus the adjoint action of \mathbb{L} on itself has no nontrivial invariant subspace. A Lie algebra is **semisimple** if it is a direct sum of simple Lie algebras. There is a convenient criterion for a Lie algebra to be semisimple:

10.6.1 Theorem. (Lemma of Cartan)

A Lie algebra is semisimple if and only if its Killing form is nondegenerate.

Proof. The proof can be found in many Lie algebra textbooks such as JACOBSEN [121], HUMPHREYS [117], KNAPP [137], or FULTON & HARRIS [85]. \square

A finite-dimensional real Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is called **compact** if its Killing form is negative definite. In this case, the Lemma of Cartan implies that \mathbb{L} is semisimple. For example, the Lie algebra $so(3)$ is compact, whereas $so(2, 1)$ is noncompact. However, note that Lie algebras are vector spaces and therefore not compact as topological spaces in the usual topology.

For a given Lie algebra one may form the so-called **lower central series** (or **derived series**) of ideals:

$$\mathbb{L}_0 = \mathbb{L}, \quad \mathbb{L}_{n+1} = \mathbb{L}_n \cap \mathbb{L}_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

The Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is called **solvable** if there is an n such that $\mathbb{L}_n = 0$. A theorem of Levi says that every Lie algebra is a semidirect sum of a semisimple part P and a solvable ideal S (that is, S is a solvable Lie subalgebra that is an ideal in \mathbb{L}), such that $P \cong \mathbb{L}/S$. It follows that an important part of the classification of all Lie algebras is the classification of the simple Lie algebras.

The classification of the finite-dimensional complex simple Lie algebras can be done by classifying certain objects called finite **root systems**, associated to a choice of maximal commutative subalgebras called **Cartan subalgebras**. Associated to each root system is a finite **reflection group**, i.e., a group generated by elements whose square is 1. The finite reflection groups (also called **Coxeter groups**) which are not direct products of nontrivial smaller reflection groups arise as symmetry groups of regular polytopes. They have all been classified by Coxeter, and fall into five infinite families denoted by A_n (simplices), B_n , C_n , D_n (all three related to cubes and crosspolytopes), and I_n (polygons), and a few sporadic cases denoted by E_6, E_7, E_8, F_4, H_3 , and H_4 (H_3 is the symmetry group of the dodecahedron and the icosahedron).

Most of the finite reflection groups are also realized as symmetry groups of a root system. All root systems give rise to semisimple Lie algebras, and irreducible root systems lead to simple Lie algebras. The classification says there are four infinite series of Lie algebras denoted A_n, B_n, C_n for $n \geq 1$ and D_n for $n \geq 4$ and five exceptional Lie algebras called E_6, E_7, E_8, G_2 and F_4 . The corresponding reflection groups have the same labels, except for G_2 which corresponds to the hexagon I_6 . It is a highly nontrivial result – and one of the most beautiful pieces of mathematics – that this gives a complete classification of the finite-dimensional semisimple complex Lie algebras.

The four infinite series of Lie algebras, called the **classical Lie algebras**, are realized geometrically as infinitesimal symmetry groups of certain bilinear forms, i.e., Lie algebras of linear transformations with zero trace whose exponentials leave the form invariant. The Lie algebras A_n are isomorphic to the **special linear** Lie algebras $sl(n+1, \mathbb{C})$ of $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ -matrices with complex entries and trace zero. The Lie algebras B_n and D_n are the odd and even **special orthogonal** Lie algebras $so(m, \mathbb{C})$ ($m = 2n + 1$ and $m = 2n$, respectively), consisting of complex antisymmetric $m \times m$ -matrices. For the C -series we have $C_n = sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, where the **symplectic** Lie algebras $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ are given by the complex $2n \times 2n$ -matrices X satisfying $X^T J + JX = 0$ where J is the antisymmetric $2n \times 2n$ -matrix given in block form by

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

For each complex Lie algebra \mathbb{L} of the A -, B -, C - or D -series, there is an associated (simply connected) Lie group denoted by the same, but capitalized letters, whose complexified tangent space at the identity coincides with the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} .

There is some redundancy in the nomenclature for low-dimensional Lie algebras: $A_1 \cong B_1 \cong C_1$, $B_2 \cong C_2$. It is easy to check that $sp(2, \mathbb{C}) \cong sl(2, \mathbb{C}) \cong so(3, \mathbb{C})$. The Lie algebra

$so(2)$ is one-dimensional (and hence abelian) and therefore not simple. The Lie algebra $so(4, \mathbb{C})$ is in fact semisimple, $so(4, \mathbb{C}) \cong so(3, \mathbb{C}) \oplus so(3, \mathbb{C})$, and not simple since each $so(3, \mathbb{C})$ -factor is a nontrivial ideal. The Lie algebra $so(6, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to $sl(4, \mathbb{C})$. For the just mentioned reasons, one starts the D -series for $n \geq 4$; $so(8, \mathbb{C})$ is the first in the series that is not isomorphic to any other. In fact, $so(8, \mathbb{C})$ is very special in that it has a large automorphism group (related to **triality**). For the exceptional simple Lie algebras E_6, E_7, E_8, F_4 and G_2 , there is no simple geometric description as for those in the A -, B -, C - and D -series. However, the exceptional simple Lie algebras can be realized as infinitesimal symmetry groups of some algebraic structure. And to each exceptional Lie algebra \mathbb{L} one can associate a Lie group, such that \mathbb{L} is the complexification of the tangent space at the identity.

It is important to keep in mind over which field the Lie algebra is considered. For example, over the real numbers the Lie algebras $so(p, q) \equiv so(p, q; \mathbb{R})$ are non-isomorphic, apart from the trivial isomorphism $so(p, q) \cong so(q, p)$. Over the complex numbers we have $so(p, q; \mathbb{C}) \cong so(p+q, \mathbb{C})$, since over the complex numbers the sign of a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form is not invariant. Even more severe things are dependent of the field; the real Lie algebra $so(1, 3)$, which is extremely important in physics, is simple, but extending the field to the complex numbers we have $so(1, 3; \mathbb{C}) \cong so(4, \mathbb{C}) \cong so(3, \mathbb{C}) \oplus so(3, \mathbb{C})$, which is not simple. (For applications to physics, this is actually an advantage.) However, this is as bad as it can get from the structural point of view; if a Lie algebra is semisimple over some field \mathbb{K} , then it is semisimple over all fields containing \mathbb{K} . This follows from the Lemma of Cartan 10.6.1: If the Killing form is nondegenerate over some field, then extending the field does not change this property.

The (semi-)simple real Lie algebras can also be classified, albeit the classification is a bit more complicated. See for example the books of GILMORE [92] (or, for the more mathematically minded, HELGASON [111] or KNAPP [137]). If a real Lie algebra \mathbb{L} is simple, the complex extension – letting the scalars be complex – is either simple or of the form $S \oplus S$ for a simple complex Lie algebra S . Hence the classification of the real simple Lie algebras is still ‘close’ to the classification of the simple complex Lie algebras in the sense that no completely new structures appear. It is an amusing historical fact that Élie Cartan provided the classification of the complex simple Lie algebras and his son, Henri Cartan, finished the project so to say by classifying the real simple Lie algebras.

As we shall see in Chapter 14, the unitary representations of different real forms of the same complex Lie algebra can be quite different. The Lie algebra $so(2, 1)$ does not admit a finite-dimensional unitary representation, whereas $so(3)$ does. All compact Lie algebras admit a unitary representation, and in fact, the adjoint representation is already unitary. The main difficulty in the proof of this lies in establishing that all compact Lie algebras admit a Lie $*$ -algebra structure; this requires more theory and will not be discussed here. Since finite-dimensional unitary groups are compact, noncompact semisimple Lie algebras cannot have finite-dimensional unitary representations, apart from the trivial one which maps everything to zero.

10.7 Automorphisms and coadjoint orbits

The adjoint and coadjoint representations of a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} extend to elements $g \in \text{Aut } \mathbb{L}$ by defining

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^g &:= g\delta g^{-1} = \text{Ad}_g \delta \quad \text{for } \delta \in \mathbb{L} \\ \omega^g &= \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}^* \omega \quad \text{for } \omega \in \mathbb{L}^* \end{aligned}$$

with the properties

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta \lrcorner \varepsilon)^g &= \delta^g \lrcorner \varepsilon^g, \\ (\delta \lrcorner \omega)^g &= \delta^g \lrcorner \omega^g, \quad (\omega \lrcorner \delta)^g = \omega^g \lrcorner \delta^g, \\ \delta^g(\omega^g) &= \delta(\omega) \end{aligned}$$

and for continuous motions $g \in C^1([0, 1], \text{Aut } \mathbb{L})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau} \delta^{g(\tau)} &= \frac{dg}{d\tau}(\tau) \lrcorner \delta^{g(\tau)}, \\ \frac{d}{d\tau} \omega^{g(\tau)} &= \frac{dg}{d\tau}(\tau) \lrcorner \omega^{g(\tau)}; \end{aligned}$$

in short,

$$(\delta^g)^\bullet = \dot{g} \lrcorner \delta^g, \quad (\omega^g)^\bullet = \dot{g} \lrcorner \omega^g.$$

A set $\Omega \subseteq V$ is called **\mathbb{L} -invariant** (in a given representation Q of \mathbb{L} on V) if, for all $\delta \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{L})$ and all $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ there is a unique $\omega \in C^1([0, 1], \Omega)$ such that

$$\dot{\omega}(\tau) = Q(\delta(\tau))\omega(\tau), \quad \omega(0) = \omega_0. \tag{10.3}$$

The set of points $\omega(1)$ reachable from a fixed ω_0 in this way is called the **orbit** $\text{Orb}(\omega_0)$ of ω_0 . The orbits partition V , and Ω is invariant iff it is a union of orbits. The **coadjoint orbits** are the orbits in the coadjoint representation on \mathbb{L}^* . Apparently, $\Omega = \text{Orb}(\omega)$ is a manifold homeomorphic to $\text{Aut } \mathbb{L} / \text{Stab}(\omega)$, and the tangent space at ω is

$$T_\omega \Omega = \{Q(\delta)\omega \mid \delta \in \mathbb{L}\}.$$

The coadjoint orbits correspond to maximal subgroups and are symplectic manifolds with closed 2-form $\omega(f, g) := \text{tr } \rho(f \lrcorner g)$. The set of all $\omega \in \mathbb{L}^*$ for which a fixed set of casimirs takes fixed values is always invariant.

Part IV

Mechanics and differential geometry

Chapter 11

Fields, forms, and derivatives

In this chapter we introduce basic material on manifolds, the associated commutative algebra of scalar fields, and the Lie algebra of vector fields. All manifolds used in this book are arbitrarily often differentiable, real manifolds whose dimension need not be finite. However, we are very brief and sometimes incomplete in the technical details that need attention in the infinite-dimensional case; on first reading, the reader may restrict everything to the finite-dimensional case, where these details are not required.

We first recall some basics from differential geometry. Our approach differs from standard introductions to differential geometry since, consistent with the theme of the book, all definitions are given in an algebraic way. As a side benefit, this prepares the reader to noncommutative geometry, only briefly touched in this book, where a manifold structure is no longer available and all geometry enters in an algebraic way. Among other applications, noncommutative geometry gives an interesting geometric perspective to the quantum field theory of the standard model.

Vector fields on a manifold \mathbb{M} are essentially equivalent to derivations on the commutative algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of scalar fields. However, to be able to use the traditional terminology, where vector fields and the corresponding derivations (Lie derivatives) are distinguished, we introduce an abstract set $\mathbb{W} = \text{vect } \mathbb{M}$ of vector fields, whose elements are put into correspondence with derivations by means of a mapping $d : \text{vect } \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \text{Der } \mathbb{M}$ which is applied at the right. In this way, the calculus on manifolds can be formulated in a purely algebraic way, without any reference to the manifold.

We therefore formulate everything in terms of an arbitrary topological commutative algebra \mathbb{E} in place of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, and an arbitrary set \mathbb{W} in place of $\text{vect } \mathbb{M}$. However, the main situation that the reader should have in mind is where \mathbb{E} is an algebra of complex-valued, arbitrarily often differentiable functions on a finite-dimensional manifold, for example $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. But \mathbb{E} could also be the Schwartz space of arbitrarily often differentiable functions all of whose derivatives decay faster than polynomially at infinity.

As a result, our presentation is completely coordinate-free, except in some examples. For readers accustomed to differential geometry in index notation but not to the coordinate-free Cartan notation, we suggest that they translate the definitions and main results into

coordinates to understand their meaning, but to treat proofs as if the concepts introduce new abstract algebraic notions.

11.1 Scalar fields and vector fields

We introduce the objects, operators, and operations needed for presenting the traditional differential calculus in a purely algebraic framework: Lie derivatives applied to multilinear forms, and exterior products and the exterior derivative of alternating forms. As the most important special case, we consider manifolds and associated geometric notions, in particular diffeomorphisms.

Before giving the definitions, we discuss the letter conventions and priority rules used in the formulas.

We typically (i.e., when not forced by conflicts or tradition to do otherwise) use lower case letters from the middle of the alphabet, such as f, g, h , to denote scalar fields, capital letters from the end of the alphabet, such as X, Y, Z to denote vector fields, capital letters from the beginning of the alphabet, such as A , for general multilinear forms, but z , for linear forms, ω for alternating bilinear forms, and η for symmetric bilinear forms.

We use the convention that a Lie derivative acts on the shortest following expression which is syntactically a vector field or a multilinear form. Similarly, the exterior derivative operator d acts either on the right on a vector field, or on the left on the shortest following expression that is syntactically an alternating form. The wedge product \wedge has lower priority than the operations written as juxtaposition, but higher priority than $+$ and $-$.

11.1.1 Definition.

(i) A **differential geometry** consists of a commutative algebra \mathbb{E} containing \mathbb{C} , a left \mathbb{E} -module \mathbb{W} with an additional Lie product \lrcorner , both equipped with a topology such that all operations are continuous, and a continuous mapping d (written on the right), which maps $X \in \mathbb{W}$ to $Xd \in \text{Der } \mathbb{E}$, such that

$$(X + Y)d = Xd + Yd, \quad (fX)d = f(Xd), \quad (X \lrcorner Y)d = [Xd, Yd], \quad (11.1)$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{W}, f \in \mathbb{E}$. The differential geometry is called **(non-)commutative** if the multiplication in \mathbb{E} is (non-)commutative.

(ii) We refer to the elements of \mathbb{E} as **scalar fields**, and to the elements of \mathbb{W} as **vector fields**. The **Lie derivative** of a vector field X is the linear mapping L_X which maps a scalar field f to¹

$$L_X f := Xd f, \quad (11.2)$$

and a vector field Y to

$$L_X Y := X \lrcorner Y = -L_Y X. \quad (11.3)$$

¹As will become apparent in Section 11.3 (cf. Theorem 11.3.2), we may read the term $Xd f$ also as product of the vector field X with the exact linear form df . Until then, we shall write an explicit space after d to remind the reader of the correct way to group the letters.

The scalar field $L_X f$ (resp. the vector field $L_X Y$) is called the **directional derivative** of the scalar field f (resp. the vector field Y) in the direction of the vector field X .

11.1.2 Example. (Canonical differential geometries)

Let \mathbb{E} be an arbitrary topological algebra containing \mathbb{C} . We may give \mathbb{E} the structure of a differential geometry by picking an arbitrary set \mathbb{W} with the same cardinality as $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$, and choosing an arbitrary bijection d from \mathbb{W} to $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$. \mathbb{W} inherits all properties of $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ by means of the bijection d : We turn \mathbb{W} into a Lie algebra and a topological \mathbb{E} -module by defining

$$X + Y := (Xd + Yd)d^{-1}, \quad fX := (f(Xd))d^{-1},$$

$$X \lrcorner Y := [Xd, Yd]d^{-1}.$$

for $X, Y \in \mathbb{W}$ and $f \in \mathbb{E}$, and by calling a set $S \in \mathbb{W}$ closed if its image under d is closed in the topology of $\text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ induced by that of \mathbb{E} . The result is a differential geometry. We call differential geometries constructed in this way **canonical**.

The following example is responsible for the naming. Interpreting the set \mathbb{M} in the example as the domain of a chart of a finite-dimensional manifold, one can translate everything said here to general finite-dimensional manifolds by a process described in all books on differential geometry. Thus the example gives essentially the full intuition for our constructions, except for the complications that may arise in infinite dimensions.

11.1.3 Example. (Differential geometry of open subsets in $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$)

Let $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$ denote the vector space of row vectors² $x = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$ with n real components x^j , let \mathbb{M} be a nonempty, open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$, and let $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ and $\mathbb{W} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\times n})$, equipped with the weak topology. Thus scalar fields are real-valued functions, while vector fields are row vector valued functions. In terms of the partial differential operators ∂_j defined by

$$\partial_j f(x) := \partial f(x) / \partial x^j,$$

we define the **gradient** ∂f of a scalar field as the column vector with n entries

$$(\partial f)_j = \partial_j f.$$

It is not difficult to show that a derivation on the algebra of scalar fields can be uniquely expressed as a linear partial differential operator of the form

$$\delta = X\partial = \sum_{j=1}^n X^j \partial_j,$$

with a vector field X . Such a δ acts on scalar fields f as

$$\delta f = X\partial f = \sum_{j=1}^n X^j \partial_j f.$$

²The index notation corresponds to standard differential geometric practice when working in a chart of a manifold (which is essentially the situation we are discussing here). The interpretation in terms of rows (row vectors = **rovectors**, indexed by upper indices = **roindices**) and columns (column vectors = **covectors**, indexed by lower indices = **coindices**) makes the transition to standard linear algebra transparent.

Thus the mapping d which maps the vector field X to the differential operator $X\partial$ is a bijection of the type required in the previous example. Thus we have a canonical differential geometry; it is clearly commutative. The reader is invited to check that the Lie derivative takes the form

$$L_X f = X\partial f, \quad L_X Y = X\partial Y - Y\partial X. \quad (11.4)$$

A second, noncanonical differential geometry results by using in the above construction in place of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ the subalgebra $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of scalar fields with compact support, and in place of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\times n})$ the subspace $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\times n})$ of vector fields with compact support.

11.1.4 Proposition. The product rule

$$L_X(fg) = (L_X f)g + f(L_X g), \quad L_X(fY) = (L_X f)Y + f(L_X Y), \quad (11.5)$$

the commutation rule

$$[L_X, L_Y] = L_X \lrcorner Y, \quad (11.6)$$

and the equations

$$L_{fX} g = fL_X g, \quad (11.7)$$

$$L_{fX} Y = fL_X Y - XYd f \quad (11.8)$$

hold for $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$ and $X, Y \in \mathbb{W}$,

Proof. The first part of (11.5) is trivial since in this case $L_X = Xd$ is a derivation on \mathbb{E} . For the second part of (11.5), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} (L_X(fY))d g &= (X \lrcorner fY)d g = [Xd, fYd]g = Xd(f(Yd g)) - fYd(Xd g) \\ &= (Xd f)(Yd g) + fXd(Yd g) - fYd(Xd g). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$((L_X f)Y)d g = ((Xd f)Y)d g = (Xd f)(Yd g)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (f(L_X Y))d g &= (f(X \lrcorner Y))d g = f[Xd, Yd]g \\ &= f(Xd(Yd g) - Yd(Xd g)) = fXd(Yd g) - fYd(Xd g) \end{aligned}$$

Putting these three pieces together proves the second part of (11.5).

To prove (11.6), note that $L_Y f = Yd f$ is in \mathbb{E} , so $L_X L_Y f = L_X(Yd f) = Xd(Yd f)$. Interchanging X, Y we find for the commutator:

$$[L_X, L_Y]f = Xd(Yd f) - Yd(Xd f) = [Xd, Yd]f = (X \lrcorner Y)d f = L_{X \lrcorner Y} f.$$

Formula (11.7) is immediate from the definition, and (11.8) follows from the product rule $X \lrcorner fY = (Xd f)Y + f(X \lrcorner Y)$ by swapping X and Y , using the anticommutativity of \lrcorner . \square

In the following, we develop the differential calculus for commutative differential geometries only; thus, with exception of the remarks on noncommutative geometry in Section 11.5, **the algebra \mathbb{E} of scalar fields is always assumed to be commutative.** In this case, we extend the left module structure on vector fields to a bimodule structure by putting

$$Xf := fX$$

for $f \in \mathbb{E}$ and $X \in \mathbb{W}$. Note that some authors treat vector fields as synonymous with derivations and therefore write $X(f)$ for $Xd f$. This should not be confused with the present notation Xf for multiplying the vector field X with the scalar field f .

11.2 Multilinear forms

Apart from scalar and vector fields, differential geometry makes heavy use of multilinear forms and tensors, which we define next.

11.2.1 Definitions.

(i) A **linear form** ζ is a continuous, \mathbb{E} -linear mapping $\zeta : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ (written on the right³) which maps the vector field X to the scalar field $X\zeta$. We write \mathbb{W}^* for the \mathbb{E} -module consisting of all linear forms, (sometimes called the " \mathbb{E} -dual" of \mathbb{W}), with scalar multiplication of $\zeta \in \mathbb{W}$ by $f \in \mathbb{E}$ defined via

$$X(f\zeta) := f(X\zeta).$$

(ii) A **c -linear form** ϕ is a mapping $\phi : \mathbb{W} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ (with c factors of \mathbb{W} in the Cartesian product) such that the image⁴ $X_1 \dots X_c \phi$ of $(X_c, \dots, X_1) \in \mathbb{W} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}$ depends \mathbb{E} -linearly on each argument X_k , i.e., if, for all $X_j, Y, Z \in \mathbb{W}$ and $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$X_1 \dots (fY + gZ) \dots X_c \phi = fX_1 \dots Y \dots X_c \phi + gX_1 \dots Z \dots X_c \phi.$$

Here the unindexed argument between the dots replaces the k th argument X_k , for some k in $1, \dots, c$. In the degenerate case $c = 0$, we consider the 0-linear mappings to be the scalar fields.

³Strictly speaking, they should be called \mathbb{E} -linear forms, and a similar remark applies later to multilinear forms. Talking about a *form* rather than a mapping implies the assumption of continuity.

The standard notation for $X\zeta$ is $i_X \zeta = \zeta(X)$; the present notation simply replaces i_X by X . This way of writing the mapping generalizes standard matrix calculus if we use the intuition gained from Example 11.1.3 and think of vector fields as row vectors and of linear forms as column vectors, an intuition that extends to matrix fields. Since in the general situation, linear forms are often called **covectors**, we shall occasionally use the analogous word **rovector** to denote a vector field, although, strictly speaking, one should talk about covector fields and rovector fields. The same ambiguity is traditionally maintained for multilinear forms on manifolds, which refer both to the corresponding fields and to their values at a particular point.

⁴The traditional notation for $X_1 \dots X_c \phi$ is $i_{X_1} \dots i_{X_c} \phi = \phi(X_c, \dots, X_1)$; as for linear forms, the present notation simply replaces the i_X by X . Note the reverse order resulting in the arguments written in the traditional way, needed in order that (11.9) together with our definition (11.10) of insertion is consistent with the traditional definition $(i_X \phi)(X_1, \dots, X_{c-1}) = \phi(X, X_1, \dots, X_{c-1})$. In our notation translates into $X_{c-1} \dots X_1 (i_X \phi) = X_{c-1} \dots X_1 X \phi$.

(iii) We write⁵ \mathbb{W}_c for the \mathbb{E} -module of continuous c -linear mappings on \mathbb{W} . Scalar multiplication of $\phi \in \mathbb{W}_c$ by $f \in \mathbb{E}$ is defined via

$$X_1 \dots X_c(f\phi) := f(X_1 \dots X_c\phi) .$$

The elements of \mathbb{W}_c are called **multilinear forms** or **c -linear forms**; for $c = 2$ also **bilinear forms**. Note that $\mathbb{W}_0 = \mathbb{E}$ consists of scalar fields (or 0-forms), and $\mathbb{W}_1 = \mathbb{W}^*$ consists of linear forms (or 1-forms).

(iv) The **product** of a vector field $X \in \mathbb{W}$ and a c -linear form $\phi \in \mathbb{W}_c$ is for $c = 0$ the vector field $X\phi$ defined by scalar multiplication with the scalar ϕ , and for $c > 0$ the $(c - 1)$ -linear form $X\phi$ defined by

$$X_1 \dots X_{c-1}(X\phi) := X_1 \dots X_{c-1}X\phi , \quad \text{for all } X_1, \dots, X_{c-1} \in \mathbb{W}. \quad (11.9)$$

The operator i_X defined on multilinear forms ϕ by

$$i_X\phi := X\phi \quad (11.10)$$

is traditionally called the **insertion** of $X \in \mathbb{W}$; cf. footnote 11.2.1.

(v) A c -linear form ϕ is called **alternating** (or a **c -form**) if either $c \leq 1$ or $X\phi$ is alternating and $XX\phi = 0$ for all vector fields X . ϕ is called **symmetric** if either $c \leq 1$ or $X\phi$ is symmetric and $XY\phi = YX\phi$ for all vector fields X, Y . We write \mathbb{A}_c and \mathbb{S}_c for the space of alternating and symmetric c -linear forms, respectively. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 = \mathbb{W}_0 = \mathbb{E}, \quad \mathbb{E}_1 = \mathbb{W}_1, \quad \mathbb{E}_2 \oplus \mathbb{S}_2 = \mathbb{W}_2 .$$

(vi) The **transpose** of a bilinear form ϕ is the bilinear form ϕ^T defined by

$$XY\phi^T := YX\phi \quad (11.11)$$

for all vector fields X, Y . In particular, a bilinear form ϕ is symmetric iff $\phi^T = \phi$ and alternating iff $\phi^T = -\phi$. A bilinear form ϕ is called **nondegenerate** if every linear form $\zeta \in \mathbb{W}^*$ can be written as $\zeta = X\phi$ for a unique vector field X ; otherwise **degenerate**. A bilinear form ϕ may be considered as a linear mapping from \mathbb{W} to \mathbb{W}^* that maps the vector field X to the linear form $X\phi$. If ϕ is nondegenerate, this mapping is invertible, and the inverse ϕ^{-1} is a linear mapping from \mathbb{W}^* to \mathbb{W} , which maps a linear form ζ to the vector field $\zeta\phi^{-1}$ in such a way that

$$\zeta\phi^{-1}\phi = \zeta. \quad (11.12)$$

A nondegenerate bilinear form is called a **symplectic form** if it is alternating, and a **metric** if it is symmetric.

⁵Writing the “ c ” in \mathbb{W}_c as a subscript serves as a reminder that when an element ϕ of \mathbb{W}_3 (say) is written in index notation, it has 3 *lower* indices: “ ϕ_{ijk} ”. Indeed the “ c ” is intended to be suggestive of “covector”. Note that in terms of the direct products of c factors \mathbb{W} or \mathbb{W}^* , there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{W}^* \times \dots \times \mathbb{W}^* \cong (\mathbb{W} \times \dots \times \mathbb{W})^* = \mathbb{W}_c^*$.

(vii) A $[c, r]$ -**tensor field**⁶ T is a continuous \mathbb{E} -linear mapping $T : \mathbb{W}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_c$. The space of $[c, r]$ -tensor fields is denoted by⁷ $\mathbb{W}[c, r] = \mathbb{W}_c^r = \text{Lin}(\mathbb{W}_r, \mathbb{W}_c)$. A $[1, 1]$ -tensor field is called a **matrix field**.

11.2.2 Remarks. (i) Multilinearity implies

$$XY\omega = -YX\omega \quad \text{for alternating } c\text{-forms } \omega \text{ with } c > 1.$$

Thus, for $c \geq 2$,

$$i_X^2 = 0, \quad i_X i_Y = -i_Y i_X \quad \text{on alternating } c\text{-linear forms,} \tag{11.13}$$

whereas

$$i_X i_Y = i_Y i_X \quad \text{on symmetric } c\text{-linear forms.} \tag{11.14}$$

(ii) Note that there is a canonical identification of $\mathbb{W}[c, 0]$ with \mathbb{W}_c , and a canonical embedding of \mathbb{W} into $\mathbb{W}[0, 1]$. In the case of finite-dimensional manifolds, we may also identify $\mathbb{W}[0, 1]$ with \mathbb{W} .

(iii) The ordinary operator product of a $[c', c]$ -tensor and an $[c, r]$ -tensor is well-defined, and is a $[c', r]$ -tensor: $\mathbb{W}[c', c]\mathbb{W}[c, r] \subseteq \mathbb{W}[c', r]$. In particular, $\mathbb{W}[1, 1] = \text{Lin } \mathbb{W}_1$ is an algebra of matrix fields.

11.2.3 Theorem. *For every vector field X , the Lie derivative can be extended uniquely to a linear operator L_X mapping⁸ vector fields to vector fields and c -linear forms to c -linear forms, and satisfying the **product rule***

$$L_X(f\phi) = (L_X f)\phi + f(L_X \phi), \quad L_X(Y\phi) = (L_X Y)\phi + Y(L_X \phi). \tag{11.15}$$

for $f \in \mathbb{E}$, $Y \in \mathbb{W}$, and $\phi \in \mathbb{W}$ or $\phi \in \mathbb{W}_c$. The extended Lie derivative satisfies the commutation rules

$$[L_X, L_Y] = L_X \lrcorner Y, \tag{11.16}$$

$$[L_X, i_Y] = i_X \lrcorner Y \tag{11.17}$$

for $X, Y \in \mathbb{W}$.

⁶An $[c, r]$ -tensor is also called a tensor of $[c]$ -valence (PENROSE & RINDLER [192]). With traditional index notation, a c -linear form is written with c lower (co)indices, and a $[c, r]$ -tensor is written with r upper (ro)indices and c lower (co)indices. E.g., a $[3, 2]$ -tensor T is written $T_{ijk}{}^{mn}$, and the image $T\phi$ of a bilinear form is written $(T\phi)_{ijk} = T_{ijk}{}^{mn}\phi_{mn}$, using the traditional **Einstein summation convention** (which deletes the explicit indication of the sum over m and n so as not to unnecessarily inflate the formulas without conveying any more information). In the more modern **abstract index notation** of PENROSE & RINDLER [192], such repeated indices denote instead an insertion (dual-pairing) *without* any implied connotation of summation over basis-dependent components, and such indices may be used to keep explicit track of the types of complicated objects.

⁷For the differential geometry of open subsets M of \mathbb{R}^n (Example 11.1.3), $\mathbb{W}[c, r] = \mathbb{W}_c^r$ is, in the traditional terminology, the space of sections of the tensor bundle $T_c^r M$.

⁸The Lie derivative can also be extended to tensors $T \in \mathbb{W}[c, r]$ by defining

$$(L_X T)B := L_X(TB) - TL_X B \quad \text{for } B \in \mathbb{W}_r.$$

We do not need such an extension for our limited applications; it would be needed, however, in a treatment of general relativity. The reader is invited to verify that $L_X T \in \mathbb{W}[c, r]$ and to formulate and prove the analogues to (11.15) and (11.16).

Proof. We first assume that the product rule holds, and show that this fixes the operation of L_X on all multilinear forms. By the product rule (11.15),

$$YL_X\phi = L_X(Y\phi) - (L_XY)\phi, \quad (11.18)$$

This formula shows that L_X is determined on c -linear forms by its action on $(c-1)$ -linear forms, and since it is given on scalar fields, it is unique if it exists at all.

Conversely, to show existence of the extension, we define L_X recursively by (11.18), starting with the known action of L_X on scalar fields.

Since $(fY)L_X\phi = L_X(fY\phi) - L_X(fY)\phi = (L_Xf)Y\phi + fL_X(Y\phi) - (L_Xf)Y\phi - f(L_XY)\phi = f(L_X(Y\phi) - f(L_XY)\phi) = f(YL_X\phi)$, we see inductively that $YL_X\phi$ is \mathbb{E} -linear in Y , so that $L_X\phi$ is indeed a tensor.

The first part of the product rule holds since, by (11.18), the equation $YL_X(f\phi) = L_X(Yf\phi) - (L_XY)(f\phi) = L_X(fY\phi) - (L_XY)(f\phi) = (L_Xf)Y\phi + fL_X(Y\phi) - (L_XY)f\phi - f(L_XY)\phi = Y(L_Xf)\phi + Yf(L_X\phi)$ holds for all vector fields Y . The second part of the product rule follows directly from (11.18).

To prove (11.16), we first note that by (11.18), we have $ZL_XL_Y\phi = L_X(ZL_Y\phi) - (L_XZ)L_Y\phi = L_X(L_Y(Z\phi) - (L_YZ)\phi) - (L_XZ)L_Y\phi = L_XL_Y(Z\phi) - (L_XL_YZ)\phi - (L_YZ)L_X\phi - (L_XZ)L_Y\phi$. The last two terms are symmetric in X, Y , hence cancel when taking the difference with $ZL_YL_X\phi$ in $Z[L_X, L_Y]\phi = ZL_XL_Y\phi - ZL_YL_X\phi = (L_XL_Y - L_YL_X)(Z\phi) - (L_XL_YZ - L_YL_XZ)\phi = [L_X, L_Y](Z\phi) - ([L_X, L_Y]Z)\phi$. Since (11.16) is already known by (11.6) to hold on vector fields and on scalar fields (0-linear forms), we assume that we know its validity for the action on c -linear forms. Taking for ϕ a $(c+1)$ -linear form, we may conclude that $Z[L_X, L_Y]\phi = L_X \lrcorner_Y(Z\phi) - (L_X \lrcorner_Y Z)\phi = ZL_X \lrcorner_Y\phi$ by (11.18). Since Z was arbitrary, we conclude that $[L_X, L_Y]\phi = L_X \lrcorner_Y\phi$ for $(c+1)$ -linear forms ϕ . By induction, (11.16) holds in general.

(11.17) follows from the product rule (11.15) since

$$[L_X, i_Y]\phi = L_X(Y\phi) - Y(L_X\phi) = (L_XY)\phi = (X \lrcorner Y)\phi = i_X \lrcorner_Y\phi.$$

□

The reader may wish to prove inductively that, for c' -linear forms ϕ with $c' \geq c$,

$$X_1 \dots X_c L_X \phi = L_X(X_1 \dots X_c \phi) - \sum_{k=1}^c X_1 \dots X \lrcorner X_k \dots X_c \phi.$$

11.2.4 Proposition. *The Lie derivative of an alternating c -form is again an alternating c -form.*

Proof. Indeed, for any alternating form ω ,

$$\begin{aligned} YYL_X\omega &= Y(L_X(Y\omega) - (L_XY)\omega) = YL_X(Y\omega) - Y(L_XY)\omega \\ &= YL_X(Y\omega) + (L_XY)Y\omega = L_X(YY\omega) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

11.3 Exterior calculus

In the case of differential geometry in $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$ (Example 11.1.3), the gradient operator $d = \partial$ behaves symbolically similarly to a covector, except for the nontrivial behavior implied by the Leibniz product rule. However, the gradient operator d , defined there on scalar fields only, cannot be extended to a gradient operator that associates with a general c -linear form ϕ a $(c + 1)$ -linear form $d\phi$ such that $L_X\phi = Xd\phi$ for all vector fields X . The existence of such an extension would imply that $L_{fX}\phi = fL_X\phi$. While this holds by (11.7) when ϕ is a scalar field, it fails already when ϕ is a linear form. For a linear form ζ , we have instead

$$L_{fX}\zeta = fL_X\zeta + dfX\zeta,$$

which follows as a special case of (11.21) below, or from

$$L_X\zeta = X(\partial\zeta)^T + \partial X\zeta$$

by substituting fX for X . However, the gradient can be generalized in a different way to alternating forms, leading to the exterior derivative.

The generalization is valid not only for Example 11.1.3, but in full generality. To define the exterior derivative we need some preparations.

11.3.1 Theorem. *For every linear form ζ , there is a unique \mathbb{E} -linear mapping $\zeta \wedge$ mapping alternating c -forms to alternating $(c + 1)$ -forms for $c = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and vector fields to zero, such that*

$$(X\zeta)\omega = X(\zeta \wedge \omega) + \zeta \wedge X\omega \tag{11.19}$$

for all vector fields X and all alternating c -forms ω . $\zeta \wedge \omega$ is called the **exterior product** or **wedge product**⁹ of ζ and ω . The exterior product satisfies the rules

$$\zeta \wedge \zeta' = -\zeta' \wedge \zeta, \tag{11.20}$$

$$L_X(\zeta \wedge \omega) = L_X\zeta \wedge \omega + \zeta \wedge L_X\omega \tag{11.21}$$

for alternating c -forms ω , linear forms ζ, ζ' , and vector fields X .

Proof. A necessary and sufficient condition for (11.19) to hold is that

$$X(\zeta \wedge \omega) = (X\zeta)\omega - \zeta \wedge X\omega; \tag{11.22}$$

in particular,

$$\zeta \wedge \omega = \zeta\omega \quad \text{for a 0-form } \omega, \tag{11.23}$$

This completely specifies the exterior product of a linear form ζ and an alternating $(c + 1)$ -form ω , given the exterior product with an alternating c -form. Therefore, if the exterior product exists, it is unique.

To prove the existence of the exterior product, we have to define the exterior product of a linear form ζ and an alternating c -form ω to be the expression $\zeta \wedge \omega$ defined for $c = 0$

⁹One can define an exterior product $\omega' \wedge \omega$ for arbitrary alternating forms ω, ω' , but we do not need it.

by (11.23) and for $c > 0$ recursively by (11.22). To show that we really get an alternating $(c + 1)$ -form, we need to show that $X(\zeta \wedge \omega)$ is alternating for $c > 0$ and any vector field X , and verify

$$(fX)(\zeta \wedge \omega) = f(X(\zeta \wedge \omega)) \quad (11.24)$$

and

$$XX(\zeta \wedge \omega) = 0. \quad (11.25)$$

□

11.3.2 Theorem. *There is a unique linear mapping d mapping vector fields to zero and alternating c -forms to alternating $(c + 1)$ -forms (for $c = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) such that¹⁰*

$$L_X\omega = Xd\omega + d(X\omega) \quad (11.26)$$

for all alternating c -forms ω and vector fields X . The alternating form $d\omega$ is called the **exterior derivative** of ω , and satisfies the **exactness relation**

$$dd\omega = 0 \quad (11.27)$$

and the **product rules**

$$d(f\omega) = fd\omega + df \wedge \omega, \quad (11.28)$$

$$d(\zeta \wedge \omega) = d\zeta \wedge \omega - \zeta \wedge d\omega, \quad (11.29)$$

$$L_fX\omega = fL_X\omega + df \wedge X\omega, \quad (11.30)$$

for all alternating forms ω , scalar fields f , linear forms ζ and vector fields X . Note the minus sign in (11.29)!

Proof. A necessary and sufficient condition for (11.26) to hold is that

$$X(d\omega) = L_X\omega - d(X\omega); \quad (11.31)$$

in particular,

$$X(d\omega) = Xd\omega = L_X\omega \quad \text{for a 0-form } \omega. \quad (11.32)$$

This completely specifies the exterior derivative of an alternating c -form. Therefore, if the exterior derivative exists, it is unique. To prove the existence of the exterior derivative, we have to define the exterior derivative of an alternating c -form ω to be the expression $d\omega$ determined for $c = 0$ by (11.32) and for $c > 0$ recursively by (11.31).

To show that we really get an alternating $(c + 1)$ -form, we need to show that $X(d\omega)$ is alternating for $c > 0$ and any vector field X , and verify

$$(fX)d\omega = f(Xd\omega) \quad (11.33)$$

¹⁰In particular, the relation $L_X = Xd$ valid on scalar fields fails to hold for the extension of L_X and d to alternating forms.

which shows that $Xd\omega$ is \mathbb{E} -linear in X , so that $d\omega$ is a $(c+1)$ -linear form, and

$$XXd\omega = 0 \quad (11.34)$$

which proves antisymmetry. The proof of (11.33) is based on (11.30). To prove (11.30), we get inductively $Y(L_{fX}\omega - fL_X\omega - df \wedge X\omega) = YL_{fX}\omega - fYL_X\omega - Ydf \wedge X\omega = L_{fX}(Y\omega) - (L_{fX}Y)\omega - f(L_X(Y\omega) - (L_XY)\omega) - ((Ydf)X\omega - df \wedge YX\omega)$. Using the induction hypothesis on the first term and (11.28) on the second term, one finds that all terms cancel. From (11.30) one obtains $(fX)d\omega = L_{fX}\omega - d(fX\omega) = fL_X\omega + df \wedge X\omega - (fd(X\omega) + df \wedge X\omega) = f(L_X\omega - d(X\omega)) = f(Xd\omega)$, showing that (11.33) holds. (11.34) follows inductively from

$$XXd\omega = XL_X\omega - Xd(X\omega) = XL_X\omega - L_X(X\omega) - d(XX\omega) = -(L_XX)\omega - d(XX\omega) = 0 - 0 = 0.$$

To prove the product rule (11.28), we , and then inductively $Xd(f\omega) = L_X(f\omega) - d(fX\omega) = (L_Xf)\omega + fL_X\omega - (fd(X\omega) + df \wedge X\omega) = f(L_X\omega - d(X\omega)) + (Xdf)\omega - df \wedge X\omega = fXd\omega + X(df \wedge \omega) = X(fd\omega + df \wedge \omega)$, completing the induction.

To prove the exactness relation (11.27), we need the formula

$$d(L_X\omega) = L_X(d\omega). \quad (11.35)$$

Indeed, $Yd(L_X\omega) = L_Y(L_X\omega) - d(YL_X\omega) = LYL_X\omega - d(L_X(Y\omega) - (L_XY)\omega)$, whereas $YL_X(d\omega) = L_X(Yd\omega) - (L_XY)d\omega = L_X(L_Y\omega - d(Y\omega)) - (L_{L_XY}\omega - d(L_XY)\omega) = LYL_X\omega + d((L_XY)\omega) - L_Xd(Y\omega)$ since $L_X \lrcorner Y = L_X \lrcorner Y = [L_X, L_Y] = L_XL_Y - L_YL_X$. Comparing the two expressions, one finds that $Yd(L_X\omega) - YL_X(d\omega) = d(L_X(Y\omega) - L_Xd(Y\omega))$, which vanishes inductively.

Now (11.27) follows inductively from the relation $Xd(d\omega) = L_Xd\omega - d(Xd\omega) = L_Xd\omega - d(L_X\omega - d(X\omega)) = L_Xd\omega - d(L_X\omega) + dd(X\omega) = -dd(X\omega)$, obtained by using (11.35). (For 0-forms, the dd -term is absent, which starts the induction.)

□

In particular, the exterior derivative of the linear form ζ is the alternating bilinear form $d\zeta$ with

$$YXd\zeta = YL_X\zeta - XL_Y\zeta + (X \lrcorner Y)\zeta,$$

since $YXd\zeta = Y(L_X\zeta - d(X\zeta)) = YL_X\zeta - L_Y(X\zeta) = YL_X\zeta - ((L_YX)\zeta + XL_Y\zeta) = YL_X\zeta - XL_Y\zeta - (Y \lrcorner X)\zeta$.

An alternating c -form ω is called **closed** if $d\omega = 0$, and **exact** if it can be written in the form $\omega = d\theta$ for some $(c-1)$ -form θ . In particular, a linear form ζ is exact if it has the form $\zeta = df$ for some scalar field f .

By (11.27), every exact c -form is closed. The converse is not generally valid but holds in simple cases, e.g., by the **Poincaré Lemma**, when $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, where \mathbb{M} is a nonempty, open and convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n .

11.4 Manifolds as differential geometries

A central notion for analysis on infinite-dimensional spaces is that of a convenient vector space. This notion is discussed in detail in KRIEGL & MICHOR [141], and refines the notion of a Hausdorff vector space, which is a vector space with the minimal amount of topological structure to allow the definition of a meaningful limit. A convenient vector space has in addition a meaningful notion of differentiability of paths, a property essential for differential geometry on manifolds. (For more details on basic notions from topology and functional analysis; see, for example, RUDIN [217].)

11.4.1 Definition. A vector space \mathbb{F} over \mathbb{R} is called **locally convex** if there is a family S of **seminorms**, i.e., mappings $s : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$s(\alpha x + \beta y) \leq |\alpha|s(x) + |\beta|s(y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{F}$ and all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, with the property that

$$s(x) = 0 \text{ "for all } s \in S \implies x = 0.$$

A locally convex vector space becomes a Hausdorff space by defining a **neighborhood** of $x \in \mathbb{F}$ to be a set containing for each $s \in S$ some set of the form $\{y \in \mathbb{F} \mid s(y - x) < r\}$ for some real number $r > 0$. Thus a sequence x_l ($l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) in \mathbb{F} converges to $x \in \mathbb{F}$ iff $s(x_l - x) \rightarrow 0$ for all $s \in S$. A path π , i.e., a continuous mapping $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, is called **smooth** or **arbitrarily often differentiable** if there are paths $\pi^{(k)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) such that

$$\pi(t + h) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{h^k}{k!} \pi^{(k)}(t) + O(h^{k+1})$$

for all $t, h \in \mathbb{R}$ and all natural numbers n . Clearly, $\pi^{(0)} = \pi$, and we write $\dot{\pi} := \pi^{(1)}$.

The reader should verify that, for any seminorm s and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{F}$,

$$s(0) = 0, \quad s(\alpha x) = |\alpha|s(x) \geq 0,$$

that in any locally convex vector space, addition and scalar multiplication are continuous, and that differentiation satisfies the traditional rules.

11.4.2 Definition. (iv) A **convenient vector space** is a locally convex vector space \mathbb{F} over \mathbb{R} such that every smooth path in \mathbb{F} is the derivative of another path in \mathbb{F} . A complex-valued function f on a nonempty and open subset \mathbb{M} of \mathbb{F} is called **smooth** or **arbitrarily often differentiable** if the complex-valued function $f \circ \pi$ is smooth for every smooth path $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. The space of smooth functions $f : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is denoted by $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$.

The reader should verify that in a convenient vector space there is a mapping $\partial : C^\infty(\mathbb{M}) \rightarrow \text{Lin}(C^\infty(\mathbb{M}), \mathbb{F}^*)$, called the **gradient** such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(\pi(t)) = \dot{\pi}(t) \partial f(\pi(t))$$

for all $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, all arbitrarily often differentiable paths $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

11.4.3 Example. The space $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}^n$ is convenient, with S consisting of the Euclidean norm only. Other examples of convenient vector spaces are Hilbert spaces and Schwartz spaces; see KRIEGL & MICHOR [142].

11.4.4 Definition. Let \mathbb{E} be a differential geometry with Lie algebra \mathbb{W} of vector fields.

(i) A **point** is an algebra homomorphism from \mathbb{E} to \mathbb{C} which maps 1 to 1. We write $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{E})$ for the set of points, and say that the point ξ maps the scalar field f to the **value** $f(\xi)$ of f at ξ .

(ii) If \mathbb{F} is a convenient vector space, an **\mathbb{F} -chart** is a homomorphism C from \mathbb{E} to $C^\infty(U(C), \mathbb{C})$ for some nonempty, open subset $U(C)$ of \mathbb{F} .

(iii) An **\mathbb{F} -manifold** is a differential geometry satisfying the axioms

(M1) If $f(\xi) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{E})$ then $f = 0$.

(M2) For all charts C and all $x \in U(C)$, there is a unique $\xi = \xi_C(x) \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{E})$ such that

$$f(\xi_C(x)) = (Cf)(x) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbb{E}.$$

(M3) For all charts C and all $\delta \in \text{Der } C_0^\infty(U(C))$, there is a unique $\widehat{\delta} \in \text{Der } \mathbb{E}$ such that

$$(\widehat{\delta}f)(\xi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \xi \notin \xi_C(U),$$

$$(\widehat{\delta}f)(\xi_C(x)) = (\delta Cf)(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in U.$$

Informally, property (M1) says that there are sufficiently many points to separate scalar fields. It implies not only that \mathbb{E} is commutative, since $(fg - gf)(x) = f(x)g(x) - g(x)f(x) = 0$ for all points x , but also excludes many other commutative algebras, such as nontrivial quotients of the algebra of polynomials in a single variable.

(M2) expresses that charts are sufficiently large to represent scalar fields locally, and (M3) says that there are sufficiently many derivations to reduce differentiation locally to charts.

11.5 Manifolds as topological spaces

11.5.1 Definition. (i) Let \mathbb{F} be a convenient vector space. A **manifold** modeled on \mathbb{F} (short **\mathbb{F} -manifold** or simply **manifold**¹¹ if \mathbb{F} is apparent from the context) is a set \mathbb{M} whose elements are called **points** together with a family \mathcal{C} of maps $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ from a (ξ -dependent) nonempty open subset U of \mathbb{F} to \mathbb{M} called **charts**, with the properties

(SM1) Every point of \mathbb{M} is in the **range** $\xi[U]$ of some chart $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$;

¹¹More precisely, this defines arbitrarily often differentiable, real manifolds whose dimension need not be finite. There are a number of other notions of a manifold which make somewhat different assumptions.

(SM2) A map $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is in \mathcal{C} if and only if ξ is injective and, for every nonempty open subset V of U and every chart $\xi' : U' \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ in \mathcal{C} with $\xi[V] \subseteq \xi'[U']$,

$$\xi'^{-1}\xi|_V \in C^\infty(V, \mathbb{F}).$$

The manifold is canonically a topological space by declaring as open sets arbitrary unions of finite intersections of ranges of charts.

(ii) The inverse of a chart is called a **local coordinate system**. An **atlas** is a family of charts whose ranges cover \mathbb{M} ; the family \mathcal{C} of all charts is the **universal atlas**.

(iii) The dimension of \mathbb{F} is called the **dimension** of \mathbb{M} . In particular, \mathbb{M} is called **finite-dimensional** (**d -dimensional**) if $\dim \mathbb{F} < \infty$ (resp. $\dim \mathbb{F} = d$).

(iv) A mapping F from \mathbb{M} to convenient some vector space \mathbb{U} is called **smooth** (or **infinitely differentiable**) if $F(\xi) \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{U})$ for every chart $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$. A **scalar field** on \mathbb{M} is a smooth complex-valued function on \mathbb{M} ; the algebra of all scalar fields on \mathbb{M} with pointwise operations is denoted by $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$. A **derivation** on \mathbb{M} is a mapping $\delta \in \text{Lin } C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ satisfying

$$\delta(fg) = (\delta f)g + f(\delta g) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}).$$

Thus a derivation on \mathbb{M} is an element of $\text{Der } C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, which we also denote by $\text{Der } \mathbb{M}$.

(v) A canonical differential geometry whose scalar fields form the algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of a manifold \mathbb{M} is called a **differential geometry** of \mathbb{M} .

Note that a chart ξ is injective, hence its inverse ξ^{-1} , the corresponding local coordinate system is well-defined on the range of the chart, and maps a nonempty, open subset of \mathbb{M} to an open subset of \mathbb{F} . In many treatments of differential geometry, the local coordinate system ξ^{-1} rather than ξ is called the chart.

11.5.2 Proposition.

(i) The set $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of all scalar fields on \mathbb{M} is a commutative $*$ -algebra under pointwise multiplication.

(ii) The set $\text{Lie } \mathbb{M} := \text{Der } C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of all derivations on \mathbb{M} with the commutator as Lie product is a Lie algebra.

Proof. This is left to the reader as a straightforward exercise. □

11.5.3 Theorem. \mathbb{F} -Manifolds in the sense of Definition 11.4.4(iii) and \mathbb{F} -manifolds in the sense of Definition 11.5.1(i) are equivalent concepts.

Proof. □

The motivating example defining the terminology is the surface of the earth, the **globe**, which may be regarded as a 2-dimensional manifold \mathbb{M} with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 2}$, the vector space

of 2-dimensional row vectors¹². Here the domain U of a chart $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ may be viewed as the paper on which the chart (a road map, say) is printed. The important points $q = (x, y) \in U$ correspond to Cartesian coordinates of marks on the road map labeled by towns. $\xi(q)$ denotes the location of the corresponding town on the globe. Note that our charts may have domains which are not neatly cut and may be disconnected or unbounded.

The simplest examples of manifolds are open, nonempty subsets of \mathbb{R}^n .

11.5.4 Example. We consider the concrete case where smooth manifolds modeled on the vector spaces \mathbb{R}^d for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ are embedded into a bigger vector space \mathbb{R}^n , and where membership in the manifold is characterized by m equations $F_k(x) = 0$ ($k = 1, \dots, m$). For example, a d -**sphere** is the set of points $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ satisfying the single ($m = 1$) equation $F(x) := x^T x - 1 = 0$, where the superscript T denotes the transpose.

Let \mathbb{M}_0 be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and let $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}_0, \mathbb{R}^m)$. The **gradient** at x of F is given by

$$dF(x) = F'(x)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} .$$

This generalizes the traditional terminology for the case where $m = 1$. The implicit function theorem implies that if the gradient has constant rank m , i.e., $\text{rk } dF(x) = m$ for all $x \in \mathbb{M}_0$, then the set \mathbb{M} given by

$$\mathbb{M} = \{x \in \mathbb{M}_0 \mid F(x) = 0\} ,$$

is a d -dimensional manifold with $d = n - m$. If \mathbb{M} defines a d -dimensional manifold given by an equation $F(x) = 0$, then the tangent space at a point $x \in \mathbb{M}$ is given by

$$T_x \mathbb{M} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n} \mid X \cdot dF(x) = 0\} .$$

Thus the tangent space consists of those vectors perpendicular to the gradient, that is, the tangent vectors at x are tangent to \mathbb{M} at x . Hence the name tangent space. The vector fields of \mathbb{M} are similarly given by

$$\text{vect } \mathbb{M} = \{X \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}) \mid X(x) \cdot dF(x) = 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{M}\} .$$

Given an \mathbb{F} -manifold \mathbb{M} and an \mathbb{F}' -manifold \mathbb{N} , we define $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N})$ as the set of maps $A : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\xi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ is a chart on \mathbb{M} and $\xi' : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a chart on \mathbb{N} such that $A(\xi(U)) \subseteq \xi'(V)$ implies $(\xi')^{-1} \circ A \circ \xi \in C^\infty(U, V)$. A **diffeomorphism** of \mathbb{M} is an invertible mapping in $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{M})$ with an inverse in $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{M})$; we write Ax for the image of a point $x \in \mathbb{M}$ under a diffeomorphism A .

We assume that the identity map on \mathbb{M} is in $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{M})$ and that the composition of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N})$ and $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}')$ is in $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N}')$, a condition¹³ automatically satisfied in

¹²It is convenient to think of points as row vectors; then tangent vectors are row vectors, too, and gradients of scalar fields are naturally column vectors. Thus later expressions like the directional derivative Xdf of a scalar field f in the direction of a vector field X have a natural interpretation as "scalar = row times colums" in terms of ordinary matrix algebra.

¹³In technical terms this says that the modeling vector spaces should admit a category of smooth manifolds.

finite dimensions. Then the set $\text{Diff } \mathbb{M}$ of all diffeomorphisms is a group under composition of maps. Additional conditions are needed to ensure that $\text{Diff } \mathbb{M}$ is a $\text{vect } \mathbb{M}$ -manifold and hence (in the terminology of Section refs. Lie groups below) a Lie group; see, e.g., NEEB [179], where one can find a detailed discussion of pathologies that can arise in infinite-dimensional Lie groups.

We define a **motion** on \mathbb{M} as a mapping $A \in C^\infty([0, 1], \text{Diff}(\mathbb{M}))$ such that $A(0) = 1$ is the identity. The intuition is that the points $x = A(0)x$ of an object (subset of \mathbb{M}) at time $t = 0$, the start of the motion, is moved by the motion to the point $A(t)x$ at time $t \in [0, 1]$, ending up in $A(1)x$ at the end of the motion. For every motion A and for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we define a vector field $\dot{A}(t)$ on \mathbb{M} by

$$\dot{A}(t)df : x \rightarrow \left. \frac{d}{ds} f(A(s)A(t)^{-1}x) \right|_{s=t}$$

for all scalar fields f and all $x \in \mathbb{M}$. Since the product rule holds for smooth functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, the object $\dot{A}(t)d$ is indeed a derivation on \mathbb{M} , and hence $\dot{A}(t)$ is a vector field. From the definition of $\dot{A}(t)$ we get the **chain rule**:

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(A(t)x) = \dot{A}(t)df(A(t)x).$$

If we are only interested in what happens in an infinitesimal neighborhood of a point $x \in \mathbb{M}$, the vector fields in

$$N(x) := \{X_0 \in \text{vect } \mathbb{M} \mid X_0 df(x) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M})\}$$

have no effect at x . Since $N(x)$ is a vector space, we can form the quotient space

$$T_x \mathbb{M} = \text{vect } \mathbb{M} / N(x),$$

called the **tangent space** or **tangent (hyper-)plane** at x . We denote with

$$X(x) := X + N(x),$$

the equivalence class of X with respect to the equivalence relation $X \sim Y \Leftrightarrow X - Y \in N(x)$. We call the equivalence class that contains the vector field X the **tangent vector** of X at the point x .

The union $T\mathbb{M}$ of all $T_x \mathbb{M}$ is naturally a manifold called the **tangent bundle** of \mathbb{M} .

The Lie derivative in the traditional approach. In the special case where $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ for some finite-dimensional manifold \mathbb{M} , there is an alternative, traditional route to the calculus on manifolds, using the following traditional definition of the Lie derivative.

For any vector field X , the initial value problem

$$\xi(0) = x, \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} \xi(\tau) = X(\xi(\tau)) \tag{11.36}$$

is solvable for every $x \in \mathbb{M}$, for τ in some x -dependent neighborhood of zero. This follows from the standard theory of ordinary differential equations, since differentiable vector fields are locally Lipschitz.

We denote by $e^{\tau X}$ the local diffeomorphism which maps x into the value $\xi(\tau)$ of the solution ξ of (11.36). Clearly, $e^0 = 1$ is the identity, but for fixed τ , the map $e^{\tau X}$ need not be defined everywhere. The latter is the case only when (11.36) is solvable for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$; in this case, the vector field is called **complete**, and the $e^{\tau X}$ form a 1-parameter group of diffeomorphisms. In general, we have, on the domain of definition,

$$e^{\tau X} e^{\tau' X} = e^{(\tau+\tau')X},$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} e^{\tau X} x = X(e^{\tau X} x).$$

We define the **directional derivative** $L_X \phi$ of a tensor field ϕ with respect to the complete vector field X by

$$(L_X \phi)(x) := \left. \frac{d}{d\tau} \phi(e^{\tau X} x) \right|_{\tau=0}.$$

This defines a linear differential operator L_X mapping tensor fields to tensor fields of the same type $[c, r]$, called the **Lie derivative** of X . Clearly,

$$(e^{\tau L_X} \phi)(x) = \phi(e^{\tau X} x).$$

It is not difficult to show the **chain rule**

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \xi(\tau) = X(\tau) \xi(\tau) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} \phi(\xi(\tau)) = L_{X(\tau)} \phi(\xi(\tau))$$

for every smooth path $x : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$. Here $\dot{\xi}(\tau)$ is the tangent vector of the path at $\xi(\tau)$. The chain rule implies the product rule (11.15) for the Lie derivative. Therefore Theorem 11.2.3 implies that the traditional concept coincides with our algebraic concept when \mathbb{E} is the algebra of scalar fields of a finite-dimensional manifold.

In the infinite-dimensional case, this approach can also be carried through, although it requires considerable technicalities to account for the fact that initial-value problems for differential equations in infinite-dimensional spaces are not always solvable. For details, see KRIEGL & MICHOR [141].

11.6 Noncommutative geometry

In this short section, we indicate how things generalize to noncommutative geometry, without giving details; the reader not familiar with the notions used may simply skip the section.

In noncommutative geometry, position measurements are limited by uncertainty relations. The notion of a point therefore loses its meaning, and the evaluation of functions and vectors at a point is no longer well-defined. Thus, in noncommutative geometry, a manifold of points

no longer exists, but in place of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ one has a noncommutative algebra \mathbb{E} whose elements behave in a way analogous to scalar fields. All constructions based only on this algebra rather than a manifold generalize in an appropriate way to the noncommutative situation. Thus most geometric notions extend formally, but they can be matched with true geometric concepts only in certain commutative subalgebras. The basic observation is that a point evaluation is a $*$ -homomorphism of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ to \mathbb{C} , and conversely, all such homomorphisms of $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ are obtained as point evaluations. Now, if \mathbb{E}_0 is a commutative normed $*$ -subalgebra of \mathbb{E} whose completion is a B^* -algebra (a term we shall not further use, and hence not introduce formally) then one can reconstruct on \mathbb{E}_0 a topological space \mathbb{M}_0 by calling the characters of \mathbb{E}_0 points; the B^* -algebra is then canonically isomorphic to the algebra of bounded continuous functions on \mathbb{M}_0 . If \mathbb{E}_0 admits sufficiently many derivations then \mathbb{M}_0 is a (smooth) manifold. When \mathbb{E}_1 and \mathbb{E}_2 are two such commutative subalgebras that do not commute, then, in contrast to the commutative situation, the corresponding manifolds \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 are not naturally embedded into a bigger manifold. Thus there may be many maximal manifolds embedded in a single noncommutative geometry.

11.7 Lie groups as manifolds

This section defines Lie groups in full generality. Differential equations defining the flow along a vector field naturally produce Lie groups and the exponential map, which relates Lie groups and Lie algebras.

11.7.1 Definition.

(i) A **Lie group** is a group \mathbb{G} which is at the same time a manifold, such that multiplication and inversion are arbitrarily often differentiable. A Lie group is both a manifold and a group and the two structures are compatible. The identity element in a Lie group will always be written as 1.

(ii) We canonically embed \mathbb{G} into $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{G})$ by associating to $A \in \mathbb{G}$ the map $B \rightarrow AB$, which is a diffeomorphism. For the definition of the Lie algebra associated with a Lie group, it is important to know that the group \mathbb{G} acts on $C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ by right multiplication, that is, to every $A \in \mathbb{G}$ we associate the map $R_A : C^\infty(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ given by

$$(R_A\varphi)(B) := \varphi(BA)$$

for all $B \in \mathbb{G}$, $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$. Of course, the group also acts by left-multiplication on $C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ but this action is not directly related to the Lie algebra.

(iii) The Lie algebra $\text{vect } \mathbb{G}$ contains the set

$$\log \mathbb{G} = \{X \in \text{vect } \mathbb{G} \mid R_B \triangleright Xd = 0 \text{ for all } B \in \mathbb{G}\}$$

of **invariant vector fields**.

It is not difficult to show that every Lie group in the above sense is a Lie group in the sense of Definition 8.3.2, since \mathbb{G} is canonically embedded into $\text{Lin } C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$. The converse is also valid but a bit more difficult to establish.

11.7.2 Proposition. *The invariant vector fields $\log \mathbb{G}$ form a Lie algebra.*

Proof. To check the statement, we only need to show that the Lie product $X \lrcorner Y$ of two invariant vector fields X and Y is invariant. But this follows from Proposition 8.2.4 since the invariant vector fields form the centralizer of the set $\{R_A \mid A \in \mathbb{G}\}$. \square

11.7.3 Proposition. *For any smooth motion $A \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{G})$, where \mathbb{G} is identified with a subset of $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{G})$, the vector field $\dot{A}(t)$ is an invariant vector field.*

Proof. We know that $\dot{A}(t)$ is a vector field. Hence we need to check that $\dot{A}(t)$ Lie commutes with R_B for all $B \in \mathbb{G}$. For arbitrary $B \in \mathbb{G}$ and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (R_B \lrcorner \dot{A}(t)d)\varphi(A(t)\zeta) &= R_B(\dot{A}(t)d\varphi)(A(t)\zeta) - \dot{A}(t)d(R_B\varphi)(A(t)\zeta) \\ &= \dot{A}(t)d\varphi(A(t)\zeta B) - \frac{d}{dt}(R_B\varphi)(A(t)\zeta) \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\varphi(A(t)\zeta B) - \frac{d}{dt}\varphi(A(t)\zeta B) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

11.7.4 Remarks. Note that an essential ingredient in the above proof is that the action of \mathbb{G} on $C^\infty(\mathbb{G})$ is defined from the right and the action of the vector field $\dot{A}(t)$ from the left.

11.7.5 Definition. A motion $A(t)$ is called a **uniform motion** if there exists a unique $f \in \log \mathbb{G}$ such that

$$\dot{A}(t) = fA(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \quad (11.37)$$

In this case we write e^f for the group element $A(1)$ and call it the **exponential** of f . Conversely, f is called the **infinitesimal generator** of the motion.

Formula (11.37) is a linear differential equation with constant coefficients; the initial condition $A(0) = 1$ is already part of the definition of a motion. In finite dimensions, such initial value problems are uniquely solvable; in infinite dimensions, unique solvability depends on additional conditions. It is easy to check that a uniform motion with infinitesimal generator $f \in \log \mathbb{G}$ is given by $A(t) = e^{tf}$.

11.7.6 Example. In any associative algebra, the set of invertible elements is a group. In many cases, the group of invertible elements is a Lie group. In particular, the group $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ of all invertible $n \times n$ -matrices over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ is a Lie group, since it is the open set of points in $\mathbb{K}^{n \times n}$ where the determinant does not vanish, so that any point has an open neighborhood on which the identity is a chart. We can choose coordinates x_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and then $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the open set where $\det(x_{ij}) \neq 0$. Any derivation is of the form

$$(Xf)(x_{ij}) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} X^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} f(x_{ij}),$$

for all $f \in C^\infty(GL(n, \mathbb{K}))$ and for some $X^{ij} \in \mathbb{K}$. One finds that $\log GL(n, \mathbb{K}) = gl(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the Lie algebra of all $n \times n$ -matrices over \mathbb{K} . It is easy to verify these properties by describing everything with matrices. The subgroup of $GL(n, \mathbb{L})$ consisting of the matrices with unit determinant is denoted by $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$. In other words, $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is the kernel of the map $\det : GL(n, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^*$, where \mathbb{K}^* is the group of invertible elements in \mathbb{K} . The Lie algebra of $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$ is denoted by $sl(n, \mathbb{K})$ and consists of the traceless $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} .

Chapter 12

Conservative mechanics on manifolds

We consider closed 2-forms in manifolds and their associated Poisson algebras. This naturally leads to symplectic geometry and a symplectic formulation of the dynamics of quantum mechanics. It also leads to classical Hamiltonian and Lagrangian mechanics, including constraints.

12.1 Poisson algebras from closed 2-forms

In general, a classical, conservative dynamical system is described in terms of motion on a manifold \mathbb{M} , called the **phase space**, such that some algebra of functions on it has a Poisson algebra structure; more precisely, $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ is equipped with a Lie product \lrcorner that is antisymmetric and satisfies the Jacobi identity and the Leibniz identity. Such a manifold is called a **Poisson manifold**; see, e.g., VAISMAN [248] or DA SILVA & WEINSTEIN [61]. Poisson manifolds provide a general setting for the study of the dynamics of classical conservative mechanical systems by differential geometric methods; for a more comprehensive discussion of different aspects see MARSDEN & RATIU [164], RATIU [202] and MORRISON [175].

Every symplectic manifold is a Poisson manifold since the symplectic structure gives rise to a natural Poisson bracket. In the symplectic case, a Hamiltonian is a function of some coordinates q_i and the conjugated momenta p_i . In such cases, the phase space is even-dimensional. In more general cases described, e.g., by Lie-Poisson algebras, the phase space need not be a symplectic manifold. Indeed, symplectic manifolds are always even-dimensional while the manifold $SO(3)$ of the spinning top (see Section 9.3 and Section 9.2) has dimension 3.

Many Poisson algebras of relevance in classical mechanics may be constructed via a uniform construction based on a closed 2-form characterizing the kinematics of the system of interest. The description is then completed by specifying the dynamics through a Hamiltonian in

the resulting Poisson algebra, and by selecting an initial state describing the preparation of the system. In this section, we discuss the general construction principle.

Let ω be a closed 2-form on a differential geometry \mathbb{E} . We call a scalar field $f \in \mathbb{E}$ **compatible** with ω if there is a vector field X_f such that

$$df = X_f \omega ; \quad (12.1)$$

any such X_f is called a **Hamiltonian vector field** associated with f . We write $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ for the set of all scalar fields $f \in \mathbb{E}$ which are compatible with ω . In general, X_f need not exist for all f , and if it exists, it need not be unique. Thus $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ may be a proper subspace of \mathbb{E} ; this situation is typical for examples arising from constrained Hamiltonian mechanics.

12.1.1 Proposition. *Let ω be a symplectic form. Then every scalar field f is compatible with ω ,*

$$X_f = df\omega^{-1}, \quad (12.2)$$

and $\mathbb{E}(\omega) = \mathbb{E}$.

Proof. Since ω is a symplectic form, ω is nondegenerate and has an inverse satisfying (11.12). The defining condition for X_f can therefore be solved uniquely for X_f , for all $f \in \mathbb{E}$, resulting in (12.2). \square

A vector field X is called **locally Hamiltonian** (with respect to ω) if the linear form $X\omega$ is closed, and **Hamiltonian** (with respect to ω) if $X\omega$ is exact (and hence closed). Thus, for any $f \in \mathbb{E}(\omega)$, the vector field X_f is Hamiltonian with respect to ω ,

12.1.2 Proposition. *If X, Y are locally Hamiltonian vector fields with respect to the closed 2-form ω then $X \lrcorner Y$ is Hamiltonian, and*

$$(X \lrcorner Y)\omega = d(XY\omega). \quad (12.3)$$

In particular, the locally Hamiltonian vector fields and the Hamiltonian vector fields form Lie subalgebras of \mathbb{W} .

Proof. Since ω and $X\omega$ are closed, (11.26) implies that $L_X\omega = Xd\omega + d(X\omega) = 0$. Again by (11.26), $d(XY\omega) = L_X(Y\omega) - Xd(Y\omega) = L_X(Y\omega) = (L_XY)\omega + YL_X\omega = (L_XY)\omega = (X \lrcorner Y)\omega$, using the closedness of $Y\omega$ and the product rule (11.15). This proves (12.3). The concluding statement is an immediate consequence. \square

12.1.3 Theorem. *For every closed 2-form ω over the manifold \mathbb{M} , the set $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ is a Poisson algebra, with Lie product given by*

$$f \lrcorner g := X_f dg = X_f X_g \omega = -X_g X_f \omega = -X_g df. \quad (12.4)$$

A Hamiltonian vector field associated with $f \lrcorner g$ is given by

$$X_{f \lrcorner g} := X_f \lrcorner X_g. \quad (12.5)$$

In particular, if ω is a symplectic form then

$$f \lrcorner g = df\omega^{-1}dg. \quad (12.6)$$

Proof. We first show that $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ is a subalgebra of the algebra \mathbb{E} . If $f, g \in \mathbb{E}(\omega)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ then $\lambda f, f \pm g, fg \in \mathbb{E}(\omega)$ since we may take

$$X_{\lambda f} = \lambda X_f, \quad X_{f \pm g} = X_f \pm X_g, \quad X_{fg} = fX_g + gX_f.$$

We next show that $f \lrcorner g$ is well-defined. Indeed, if X_f, X'_f are two Hamiltonian vector fields associated with f then $\omega(X'_f - X_f, Y) = 0$, hence $f \lrcorner g$ does not depend on the choice of the Hamiltonian vector fields associated with f and g .

Proposition 12.1.2 implies that (12.5) is a Hamiltonian vector field for $f \lrcorner g$; therefore $f \lrcorner g \in \mathbb{E}(\omega)$.

The operation \lrcorner defined by (12.4) is bilinear, antisymmetric, and satisfies the Leibniz identity. To conclude that $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ is a Poisson algebra it therefore suffices to show that the Jacobi identity holds. This follows since, with $X := X_f, Y := X_g$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h &= X_{f \lrcorner g}dh = (X_f \lrcorner X_g)dh = (X \lrcorner Y)dh = L_{X \lrcorner Y}h \\ &= [L_X, L_Y]h = L_X L_Y h - L_Y L_X h = X_f d(X_g dh) - X_g d(X_f dh) \\ &= f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) - g \lrcorner (f \lrcorner h) = (f \lrcorner h) \lrcorner g + f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if ω is a symplectic form, (12.2) implies that the Lie product (12.4) can be rewritten in the form (12.6). \square

Note that the Lie product can be extended to the case where one argument is in $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ and the other may be an arbitrary quantity from \mathbb{E} :

$$f \lrcorner g = X_f dg \quad \text{for } f \in \mathbb{E}(\omega), g \in \mathbb{E},$$

$$f \lrcorner g = -X_g df \quad \text{for } f \in \mathbb{E}, g \in \mathbb{E}(\omega).$$

Thus if f is compatible with ω , the Lie product is defined even when g is not compatible with ω .

In the manifold case, the above theorem defines, for each closed 2-form ω on an \mathbb{F} -manifold \mathbb{M} , a Poisson algebra $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ which is the set of functions $f \in \mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ which are compatible with ω . In the special case where ω is symplectic, we have seen that $\mathbb{E}(\omega) = \mathbb{E}$; thus we may define the **Poisson bracket**

$$\{f, g\} := g \lrcorner f = dg\omega^{-1}df \quad (12.7)$$

of $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$. This is the traditional Poisson bracket associated with the **symplectic space** (\mathbb{M}, ω) .

The affine functions, which map $\xi \in \mathbb{M}$ to $\xi u + \gamma$ for some $u \in \mathbb{F}$ and some $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$, satisfy

$$(\xi u + \gamma) \lrcorner (\xi v + \gamma') = u\omega - 1v \in \mathbb{C},$$

hence form a Lie subalgebra, which is a Heisenberg algebra. This provides a faithful classical Poisson representation of general Heisenberg algebras.

12.1.4 Example. We continue the discussion of Example 11.1.3, where scalar fields (resp. vector fields) are the smooth complex-valued (resp. row vector valued) functions on a nonempty, open subset \mathbb{M} of the space $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$ of rovectors of length n . In this case, it is natural to identify \mathbb{W}^* with the vector space $C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ of covector-valued fields via

$$(X\zeta)(x) = X(x)\zeta(x)$$

for $X \in \mathbb{W} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\times n})$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{W}^* = C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. In particular, the gradient $df = \partial f$ appears naturally as an element of \mathbb{W}^* , consistent with our abstract development.

Now let θ be a distinguished linear form. Then we can define its **Jacobian**, the x -dependent square array $\partial\theta$ whose entries are the partial derivatives

$$\partial_j \theta_k(x) = \frac{\partial \theta_k(x)}{\partial x^j}.$$

We now consider the exact 2-form $\omega = -d\theta$ (the minus sign is traditional). We have

$$YX\omega = Yd(X\theta) - Xd(Y\theta) + (X \lrcorner Y)\theta \quad \text{for } \omega = -d\theta \quad (12.8)$$

since $YX\omega = -YXd\theta = -Y(L_X\theta - d(X\theta)) = -YL_X\theta + Yd(X\theta) = -L_X(Y\theta) + (L_XY)\theta + Yd(X\theta)$ by (11.31) and (11.18). It is not difficult to show that now

$$(X\omega)(x) = \sum X^j(x)\omega_{jk}(x), \quad (12.9)$$

where

$$\omega_{jk}(x) = \partial_k \theta_j(x) - \partial_j \theta_k(x) \quad (12.10)$$

are the components of the antisymmetric expression $(\partial\theta)^T - \partial\theta$ in the Jacobian of θ .

As a consequence, $\omega = -d\theta$ is nondegenerate precisely when $(\partial\theta)^T - \partial\theta$ is nonsingular. If this holds, ω is a symplectic form, and all our results apply. This matches the present development with that found in standard treatises such as MARS DEN & RATIU [165].

12.2 Conservative Hamiltonian dynamics

We now apply the results of Section 12.1 to classical Hamiltonian mechanics of conservative systems. The phase space of a classical system is the set of all states that may be attained in some realization of the system. We begin with the unconstrained case, where the phase space is a cotangent bundle over a manifold \mathbb{M} , and then extend the discussion to the constrained case, where the phase space has a more complicated structure.

To avoid technicalities, we only treat the case where the manifold can be described by a single chart, so that it can be treated as an open subset of some topological vector space. However, using standard techniques from differential geometry, it is not difficult to lift the discussion to arbitrary manifolds. Thus, in the following, the **configuration space** \mathbb{M}_c is a nonempty, open subset of a convenient vector space \mathbb{F} over \mathbb{R} . Thinking of \mathbb{M}_c as a chart of a general manifold, everything we say here extends in a standard way to arbitrary \mathbb{F} -manifolds in place of \mathbb{M}_c .

We write the bilinear pairing between elements q from \mathbb{F} and elements p from the dual space \mathbb{F}^* as product $p \cdot q = q \cdot p$. We extend this product linearly to the complexifications \mathbb{CF} of \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{CF}^* of \mathbb{F}^* , and extend it further pointwise to \mathbb{CF} -valued or \mathbb{CF}^* -valued functions.

In this section, we consider the case of unconstrained dynamics. Here $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ and $\mathbb{W} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF} \times \mathbb{CF}^*)$ are the spaces of scalar fields and vector fields, respectively, on the **cotangent bundle** $\mathbb{M} = T^*\mathbb{M}_c := \mathbb{M}_c \times \mathbb{F}^*$ of \mathbb{M}_c .

The reader may think of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}^* = \mathbb{R}^n$ of vectors with n real components and bilinear pairing $p \cdot q = \sum_k p_k q_k$. As discussed in Section 2.2, this accounts for the mechanics of point particles. For field theories, \mathbb{F} is an infinite-dimensional function space.

A classical, conservative, **unconstrained mechanical system** is defined by a **Hamiltonian** $H \in \mathbb{E}$ and considering the full cotangent bundle \mathbb{M} as the **phase space** of the system. The point $x = (q, p) \in \mathbb{M}$ is called the **state** with **position** $q \in \mathbb{M}_c$ and **momentum** $p \in \mathbb{F}^*$. The **energy** of the system in the state (q, p) is the value $H(q, p)$ of the Hamiltonian at (q, p) .

The state of the system varies with **time** t , which we consider to be a number in the interval $[\underline{t}, \bar{t}]$, where \underline{t} is the **initial time** and $\bar{t} > \underline{t}$ is the **final time** for which the system is considered. The time dependence is modeled by a **trajectory**, a state-valued, arbitrarily often differentiable function of time, mapping $t \in [\underline{t}, \bar{t}]$ to $(p(t), q(t)) \in \mathbb{M}$. The position $q(t)$ and the momentum $p(t)$ at time t are constrained by the **Hamilton equations in state form**,

$$\dot{q} = \frac{dq}{dt} = \partial_p H, \quad \dot{p} = \frac{dp}{dt} = -\partial_q H. \quad (12.11)$$

Here $\partial_p = \partial/\partial p$ and $\partial_q = \partial/\partial q$ denote the gradient with respect to momentum p and position q , respectively. Note that if f is a scalar field then $\partial_p f(q, p) \in \mathbb{CF}$ and $\partial_q f(q, p) \in \mathbb{CF}^*$.

The Hamiltonian equations automatically imply the **conservation of energy**: $\frac{d}{dt} H(q, p) = \partial_q H \cdot \dot{q} + \partial_p H \cdot \dot{p} = 0$.

The Hamiltonian equations may be derived from a **variational principle**. We define the **action** as the functional on smooth paths in \mathbb{M} defined by

$$I(q, p) := \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(p(t) \cdot \dot{q}(t) - H(q(t), p(t)) \right), \quad (12.12)$$

and consider small variations δq and δp of the arguments q and p , respectively. Since we do not make further use of the principle, we assume without the discussion that the integral

can be manipulated as accustomed from the finite-dimensional case, where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}^n$. For variations vanishing at $t = \underline{t}$ and $t = \bar{t}$, we have, up to higher order terms,

$$\begin{aligned} I(q + \delta q, p) - I(q, p) &\approx \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(p(t) \cdot \delta \dot{q}(t) - \partial_q H(q(t), p(t)) \cdot \delta q \right) \\ &= \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(-\dot{p}(t) \cdot \delta q(t) - \partial_q H(q(t), p(t)) \cdot \delta q \right), \\ I(q, p + \delta p) - I(q, p) &\approx \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(\delta p(t) \cdot \dot{q}(t) - \partial_p H(q(t), p(t)) \cdot \delta p \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that the path (q, p) is a stationary point of the action if and only if the extended Hamiltonian equations (12.11) hold.

A vector field $X \in \mathbb{W}$ is a pair of functions $X = (X^q, X^p) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}^*)$; its value at the state (q, p) is $X(q, p) = (X^q(q, p), X^p(q, p))$. Associated with each vector field X is the derivation Xd defined by

$$Xd f := X^q \cdot \partial_q f + X^p \cdot \partial_p f.$$

Using the mapping d defined in this way, it is easily checked that we have a commutative differential geometry. In particular, a general linear form ζ is described by a pair of functions $(\zeta_q, \zeta_p) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}^*) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF})$ such that

$$X\zeta = X^q \cdot \zeta_q + X^p \cdot \zeta_p. \quad (12.13)$$

12.2.1 Theorem. *Let $\theta = (p, 0)$ be the linear form defined by*

$$(X\theta)(q, p) := X^q(q, p) \cdot p. \quad (12.14)$$

Then $\omega = -d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is an exact symplectic form satisfying

$$(YX\omega)(q, p) := X^q(q, p) \cdot Y^p(q, p) - Y^q(q, p) \cdot X^p(q, p) \quad (12.15)$$

for arbitrary vector fields X, Y . Its inverse satisfies

$$X = \zeta\omega^{-1} \Leftrightarrow X^q = \zeta_p, \quad X^p = -\zeta_q. \quad (12.16)$$

for arbitrary linear forms ζ . With the Lie product

$$f \lrcorner g := df\omega^{-1}dg = \partial_p f \cdot \partial_q g - \partial_p g \cdot \partial_q f, \quad (12.17)$$

the algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ of scalar fields on phase space \mathbb{M} is a Poisson algebra. \lrcorner , ω , and θ are called the **canonical Lie product**, the **canonical symplectic form**, and the **canonical linear form**¹ on phase space \mathbb{M} .

¹In the notation using components and the Einstein summation convention, we have $\theta = p_j dq^j$ and $\omega = dq^j \wedge dp_j$. Here the linear forms dq^j and dp_j , given by $Xdq^j := (X^q)^j$ and $Xdp_j := (X^p)_j$, are the gradients of the functions q^j and p_j mapping a general state (q, p) to the indicated components.

Proof. ω is an exact 2-form since $\omega = d(-\theta)$. To prove (12.15), we use (12.8) to work out $(YX\omega)(q, p) = Yd(X\theta) - Xd(Y\theta) + (X \lrcorner Y)\theta = Yd(X^q p) - Xd(Y^q p) + (X \lrcorner Y)^q p = Y^q \partial_q(X^q p) + Y^p \partial_p(X^q p) - X^q \partial_q(Y^q p) - X^p \partial_p(Y^q p) + (X \lrcorner Y)^q p$. Using $(X \lrcorner Y)^q = X \partial Y^q - Y \partial X^q = X_q \partial_q Y^q + X_p \partial_p Y^q - Y_q \partial_q X^q - Y_p \partial_p X^q$, which follows from (11.4), the product rule, and $\partial_p p = 1$, everything cancels except for $Y^p X^q - X^p Y^q$. This proves (12.15). By comparing (12.13) with (12.15), we see that

$$\zeta = X\omega \iff \zeta_q = -X^p, \quad \zeta_p = X^q. \tag{12.18}$$

Thus ω maps $X = (X^q, X^p)$ to $(-X^p, X^q)$, corresponding to right multiplication by the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since the equations (12.18) are uniquely solvable for X by (12.16), we conclude that ω is nondegenerate, hence symplectic.

Since every exact 2-form is closed, Theorem 12.1.3 applies and gives the final assertion. \square

Using the chain rule, the dynamics (12.11) is easily seen to be equivalent to the **Hamilton equations in general form**,

$$\dot{f} = \frac{df}{dt} = H \lrcorner f; \tag{12.19}$$

cf. Chapter 2.2.

12.3 Constrained Hamiltonian dynamics

In the constrained case, additional parameters (e.g., Lagrange multipliers) are needed to describe the possible states of the system. Therefore we take $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U})$ and $\mathbb{W} = C^\infty(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U}, \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}^* \times \mathbb{C}\mathbb{U})$, the spaces of scalar fields and vector fields, respectively, on an **augmented cotangent bundle** $\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U}$ of \mathbb{M}_c , where, as before, the phase space is $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}_c \times \mathbb{F}$, and \mathbb{U} is a convenient vector space.

A classical, conservative, **constrained mechanical system** is again defined by a **Hamiltonian** $H \in \mathbb{E}$. The point $x = (q, p, u) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U}$ is called the **state** with **position** $q \in \mathbb{M}_c$, **momentum** $p \in \mathbb{F}$, and **parameter** $u \in \mathbb{U}$; however, due to the constraints derived below from H , not all points in $\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U}$ are physical. As we shall see, the accessible phase space may also be smaller than \mathbb{M} . The **energy** of the system in the state (q, p, u) is the value $H(q, p, u)$ of the Hamiltonian at (q, p, u) .

The state of the system again varies with time $t \in [t, \bar{t}]$. The time dependence is modeled by a **trajectory**, a state-valued, arbitrarily often differentiable function of time, now defining position $q(t)$, momentum $p(t)$, and parameter $u(t)$ at time t . These are constrained by the **extended Hamiltonian equations**,

$$\dot{q} = \frac{dq}{dt} = \partial_p H, \quad \dot{p} = \frac{dp}{dt} = -\partial_q H, \quad 0 = \partial_u H. \tag{12.20}$$

Here $\partial_u = \partial/\partial u$ denotes the gradient operator with respect to the parameter u . Thus, in place of a system of ordinary differential equations in the unconstrained case we now have a system of **differential-algebraic equations (DAE)** involving the **holonomic constraints**

$$0 = \partial_u H(q, p, u). \quad (12.21)$$

Again the extended Hamiltonian equations automatically imply the **conservation of energy**: $\frac{d}{dt}H(q, p, u) = \partial_q H \cdot \dot{q} + \partial_p H \cdot \dot{p} + \partial_u H \cdot \dot{u} = 0$.

The case where the symmetric **Hessian matrix**

$$G := \partial_u^2 H(q, p, u)$$

is invertible is referred to as the **regular** case. Then, by the implicit function theorem, (12.21) can be solved locally uniquely for $u = u(q, p)$, which implies that (12.20) may be viewed as an ordinary differential equation in q and p alone. In the **singular** case where the Hessian G is not invertible, the constraints imply restrictions on p . Thus, not the whole phase space is dynamically accessible, and the analysis of solvability of the DAE is more involved. The details depend on the so-called **index** of a DAE, index 1 corresponding to the regular case, index > 1 to the singular case, and are beyond our treatment.

12.3.1 Example. We consider the constrained Hamiltonian system with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}$, defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, u) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}^2 + V(\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{q}) - (\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p})u,$$

where $V(\mathbf{E})$ is a potential energy function. The special case $V(\mathbf{E}) := \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}^2$, describes the dynamics of a single Fourier mode with wave vector \mathbf{k} of the free electromagnetic field. A straightforward calculation gives the dynamics

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}u, \quad \dot{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{k} \times \nabla V(\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{q}), \quad 0 = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}.$$

Since $G = \partial_u^2 H = 0$, this is a singular case. Indeed, the dynamically relevant part of the phase space is characterized by the **transversality condition** $0 = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$, whereas the multiplier u is completely undetermined by the dynamics. This implies that the dynamics of q is determined only up to an arbitrary multiple of \mathbf{k} ; in other words, only $\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{q}$ is determined at all times by the initial conditions.

Note that $H \lrcorner \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{k} \cdot (H \lrcorner \mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} = 0$, hence the constraint $0 = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ is automatically satisfied at all times if it is satisfied at some time. Thus, in the terminology of constrained mechanics, it is called a **first class constraint**, and gives rise to **gauge symmetries**. A **gauge transform** replaces \mathbf{q} by $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}s(\mathbf{q})$ with an arbitrary scalar field $s(\mathbf{q})$, and leaves everything of dynamical interest invariant. The **gauge invariant** quantities are those in the centralizer $C(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p})$ of the constraint. f belongs to the centralizer iff it Lie commutes with $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$, which is the case iff $\mathbf{k} \cdot \partial_q f = 0$, hence iff f depends only on p and $\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{q}$. Thus, the centralizer consists of all smooth functions of

$$\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{q}, \quad \mathbf{E} := -\mathbf{p},$$

and the dynamics of the gauge invariant quantities is determined by

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}} = -\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{E}} = \mathbf{k} \times \nabla V(\mathbf{B}), \quad 0 = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{E}. \quad (12.22)$$

The extended Hamiltonian equations may also be derived from a variational principle. Now the **action** is defined on smooth paths in $\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{U}$,

$$I(q, p, u) := \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(p(t) \cdot \dot{q}(t) - H(q(t), p(t), u(t)) \right). \quad (12.23)$$

Variations of the arguments show as before that the path (q, p, u) is a stationary point of the action if and only if the extended Hamiltonian equations (12.20) hold; the constraint equations derive from

$$I(q, p, u + \delta u) - I(q, p, u) \approx \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \left(-\partial_u H(q(t), p(t), u(t)) \cdot \delta u \right).$$

A vector field $X \in \mathbb{W}$ is now a triple of functions

$$X = (X^q, X^p, X^u) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}^*) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CU});$$

its value at the state (q, p, u) is $X(q, p, u) = (X^q(q, p, u), X^p(q, p, u), X^u(q, p, u))$. Associated with each vector field X is the derivation Xd defined by

$$Xd f := X^q \cdot \partial_q f + X^p \cdot \partial_p f + X^u \cdot \partial_u f.$$

It is again easy to check that this defines a commutative differential geometry. In particular, a general linear form ζ is described by a triple of functions $(\zeta_q, \zeta_p, \zeta_u) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}^*) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CF}^*) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{CU})$ such that

$$X\zeta = X^q \cdot \zeta_q + X^p \cdot \zeta_p + X^u \cdot \zeta_u. \quad (12.24)$$

In analogy to the unconstrained case, we define the linear form θ by

$$(X\theta)(q, p, u) := X^q(q, p, u) \cdot p.$$

Thus $\theta = (p, 0, 0)$ and a similar calculation as before gives the exact 2-form

$$\omega := -d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$(YX\omega)(q, p, u) := X^q(q, p, u) \cdot Y^p(q, p, u) - Y^q(q, p, u) \cdot X^p(q, p, u).$$

Since no differentiation by the parameters u is involved, the 2-form ω is now degenerate and hence no longer symplectic. As a result, $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ is strictly smaller than \mathbb{E} ; a scalar field f is found to be compatible with ω and hence in $\mathbb{E}(\omega)$ only if $\partial_u f = 0$, i.e., f is independent of u . Thus $\mathbb{E}(\omega) = C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$ is again the Poisson algebra of scalar fields on phase space, with Lie product (12.17).

The Hamilton equations (12.19) remain valid, too; note that by the general theory, $H \lrcorner f \in \mathbb{E}(\omega)$, although H depends on u .

If the Hamiltonian $H(q, p, u) = H(q, p)$ is independent of u , everything reduces to what we said about unconstrained Hamiltonian mechanics. Constrained Hamiltonian mechanics with unconstrained Hamiltonian $H_0(q, p)$ and u -independent holonomic constraints $C(q, p) = 0$ are obtained by introducing a vector u of Lagrange multipliers for the constraints and defining $H(q, p, u) = H_0(q, p) + C(q, p) \cdot u$. Note that $\partial_u H(q, p, u) = C(q, p)$ simply recovers the holonomic constraints. Thus, we see that the components of u which occur only linearly in H behave as multipliers of u -independent holonomic constraints.

Note that there is another class of models for conservative Hamiltonian dynamics, defined by so-called **nonholonomic constraints**. There the constrained dynamics is not given by (12.20) but instead by

$$\dot{q} = \frac{dq}{dt} = \partial_p H(q, p), \quad \dot{p} = \frac{dp}{dt} = -\partial_q H(q, p) + A(q)u, \quad 0 = \partial_p H(q, p) \cdot A(q),$$

where $A(q)$ maps a multiplier vector $u \in \mathbb{U}$ to an element from \mathbb{F} , and the Hamiltonian H again defines the energy. The energy is conserved since $\frac{d}{dt}H(q, p) = \partial_q H(q, p) \cdot \dot{q} + \partial_p H(q, p) \cdot \dot{p} = \partial_p H(q, p) \cdot A(q)u = 0$. However, now the dynamics can usually no longer be written in terms of a variational principle. Only the special **integrable** case where $A(q) = \partial_q C(q)$ corresponds to holonomic constraints of the form $C(q) = 0$ and a modified Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}(q, p, u) := H(q, p) - C(q) \cdot u$, which agrees on the space of trajectories with H . The most general conservative Hamiltonian system may have both holonomic and nonholonomic constraints; the reader may wish to write down the defining equations and generalize the above discussion accordingly.

12.4 Lagrangian mechanics

Frequently, and especially in relativistic field theory, a classical system is defined in terms of the Lagrangian approach to mechanics. We consider here the **autonomous** case only, where the Lagrangian is time-independent.

The basic object is now a **Lagrangian** $L \in C^\infty(T\mathbb{M}_c)$, a function of points in the tangent space $T\mathbb{M}_c$ of a configuration manifold \mathbb{M}_c . As in the Hamiltonian case, we restrict our attention to the case where \mathbb{M}_c is a nonempty, open subset of a convenient vector space \mathbb{F} over \mathbb{R} . Then the tangent space is $T\mathbb{M}_c = \mathbb{M}_c \times \mathbb{F}$, points in $T\mathbb{M}_c$ are pairs (q, v) consisting of a configuration point $q \in \mathbb{M}_c$ and a tangent vector $v \in \mathbb{F}$ at q , referred to as **velocity**, and the Lagrangian is a function with function values $L(q, v)$.

The Lagrangian approach to mechanics can be represented in the framework of constrained Hamiltonian dynamics by taking $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{F}$, and $u = v$. Then the choice

$$H(q, p, v) := vp - L(q, v) \tag{12.25}$$

for the Hamiltonian gives unconstrained Lagrangian mechanics. Constrained Lagrangian mechanics with holonomic constraints $C(q, v) = 0$ is similarly obtained by taking $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{U}_0$

and $u = (v, u_0)$ and $H(q, p, v, u_0) = pv - L(q, v) + u_0^T C(q, v)$, where u_0 is a Lagrange multiplier. However, in the following, we only discuss the unconstrained Lagrangian case.

Applying the general machinery of Section 12.3 to (12.25), we find as dynamical equations the **Euler-Lagrange equations**

$$\dot{q} = v, \quad \dot{p} = \partial_q L(q, v), \quad p = \partial_v L(q, v); \tag{12.26}$$

and the action (12.12) reduces on the submanifold defined by $\dot{q} = v$ to

$$I(q) := \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt L(q(t), \dot{q}(t)). \tag{12.27}$$

The Hamiltonian (12.25) is time invariant since

$$(p \cdot \dot{q})^\bullet = \dot{p} \cdot \dot{q} + p \cdot \ddot{q} = L_q \cdot \dot{q} + L\dot{q} \cdot \ddot{q} = L(q, \dot{q})^\bullet = \dot{L}.$$

It is easily verified directly that the condition for $I(q)$ to be stationary at the path q gives again the Euler-Lagrange equations (12.26); this is usually taken as the starting point of the Lagrangian approach.

12.4.1 Example. The Lagrangian $L(q, v) = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{1}{2}kq^2$ defines the harmonic oscillator, as can be seen by writing down the Euler-Lagrange equations. Note that the action need not be bounded below, as can be seen from the path $q(t) = s(1-t^2)$ in $[\underline{t}, \bar{t}] = [-1, 1]$, where $I(q) = (4m - \frac{8}{15}k)s^2$ diverges to $-\infty$ when $k > 7.5m$ and $s \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, it is inappropriate to refer to the stationary action principle as principle of least action, as often done for historical reasons.

If we change a Lagrangian $L(q, v)$ to

$$\tilde{L}(q, v) := L(q, v) + v\dot{\phi}(q)$$

for some smooth function ϕ , the action $I(q)$ remains unchanged apart from a boundary term arising through integration by parts. As a result, the new equations of motions and the old ones are equivalent. On the other hand, the momentum changes from p to $\tilde{p} = p + \partial_q \phi(q)$. This does not affect the equation of motion in the form (12.19) since the transformation from p to \tilde{p} is a canonical transformation leaving the Lie product invariant. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that the more general substitution of $p' = p + \chi(q)$ for p preserves the Lie product iff $\partial_q \chi(q)$ is symmetric. Necessity follows since for constants $a, b \in \mathbb{F}$,

$$a \cdot p' \lrcorner b \cdot p' = a \cdot \chi(q)b - b \cdot \chi(q)a$$

must vanish, and sufficiency can be established by a more involved computation.

We may work directly in the tangent manifold and define the linear form

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_L &= p = \partial_q L, \\ \theta_L(X) &:= Xp, \end{aligned} \tag{12.28}$$

and the canonical 2-form

$$\omega_L = -d\theta_L.$$

Then $d\omega_L = -ddp = 0$ implies that ω_L is closed, and hence Theorem 12.1.3 applies. If ω_L is non-degenerate, we can solve for \dot{q} in terms of p, q and get the Hamiltonian picture in the traditional way. The Poisson algebra becomes the standard Poisson algebra on the cotangent bundle. If ω_L is degenerate, we cannot solve for \dot{q} and compatibility restricts the space $\mathbb{E}(\omega_L)$ of quantities.

$$p = L_{\dot{q}} \in \mathbb{E} \otimes \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}$$

is the **canonical momentum**.

On $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(TM)$, any Lagrangian $L = L(q, \dot{q})$ defines a Lie product on $\mathbb{E}(\omega_L)$ which induces the Euler-Lagrange dynamics defined by the action $I = \int dtL$.

We rearrange the canonical 2-form as

$$\omega_L = dq \wedge dp = dq \wedge (p_q dq + p_{\dot{q}} d\dot{q}).$$

The condition for $f \in \mathbb{E}(\omega_L)$ to be compatible with ω requires the existence of a Hamiltonian vector field X_f with

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} = Gdq(X_f), \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} = -Gd\dot{q}(X_f), \quad (12.29)$$

with the symmetric **Hessian matrix**

$$G := \partial_q^2 L = \partial_q \partial_v L = \frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{q}} \quad (12.30)$$

CASE 1. In the *regular* case, i.e., if the Hessian matrix is invertible, we can solve the constraint equation $p = \partial_v L$ at least locally for v , getting an equation $\dot{q} = v(q, p)$. In this case, we find from (12.29) that

$$f \lrcorner g = \frac{\partial f}{\partial q} \cdot G^{-1} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \dot{q}} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial q} \cdot G^{-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}}, \quad (12.31)$$

where f, g are functions of q and \dot{q} . Note that

$$L_v(q, v(q, p)) = p,$$

and

$$H(q, p) = pv(q, p) - L(q, v(q, p))$$

has derivatives

$$H_p = v(q, p) + pv_p(q, p) - L_v(q, v(q, p))v_p(q, p) = v(q, p) = \dot{q},$$

$$H_q = pv_q(q, p) - L_q(q, v(q, p)) - L_v(q, v(q, p))v_q(q, p) = -L_q(q, \dot{q}) = -\dot{p},$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dt}f(q, p) = f_p \dot{p} + f_q \dot{q} = -f_p H_q + f_q H_p = H \lrcorner f,$$

with the canonical Lie product on phase space.

Since $H = (p|\dot{q}) - L$, we have for solutions q

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial H}{\partial \dot{q}} &= \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{q}}|\dot{q}\right) + p - L_{\dot{q}} = \frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{q}}\dot{q}, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial q} &= \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial q}|\dot{q}\right) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q} = \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial q}|\dot{q}\right) - \dot{p} \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial q}|\dot{q}\right) - \left(\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial q}|\dot{q}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{q}}|\dot{\dot{q}}\right)\right) = -\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial \dot{q}}|\dot{\dot{q}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$X_H = \left(\frac{d}{dt}q|\partial_q\right) + \left(\frac{d}{dt}\dot{q}|\partial_{\dot{q}}\right)$$

and

$$H \lrcorner g = dg(X_H) = \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial q}|\dot{q}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \dot{q}}|\dot{\dot{q}}\right) = (g(q, \dot{q}))^\bullet = \dot{g},$$

so that H generates the dynamics.

CASE 2. In the *singular* case, i.e., when the Hessian matrix (12.30) is not invertible, condition (12.1) is nontrivial, not all $f(q, \dot{q})$ are compatible with ω and hence in the Poisson algebra. Then (12.31) only holds for the generalized inverse and (12.29) requires that the partial derivatives are in the range of G . The Poisson manifold (or orbifold?) is the set of orbits of the gauge group; cf. M/R p. 325. Restrict \mathbb{E} accordingly, as in the symplectic case:]

The resulting Lie product (cf. (12.4)) is

$$f \lrcorner g = dg(X_f) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial q}dq(X_f) + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \dot{q}}d\dot{q}(X_f). \quad (12.32)$$

Note that the standard treatment in terms of symplectic manifolds requires regularity. In the singular case, complicated additional assumptions and arguments are needed to bring theories with gauge symmetries (which are always singular) into the framework of symplectic geometry.

Chapter 13

Hamiltonian quantum mechanics

In this chapter, Hamiltonian quantum mechanics is described in differential geometric, classical terms. In particular, this enables one to formulate dynamics for mixed quantum-classical systems in which – as in the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in quantum chemistry – slow degrees of freedom are modelled classically, while the fast motion (typically of electrons) is modelled by quantum mechanics.

Also discussed is the relation between classical mechanics and quantum mechanics in terms of quantization procedures.

13.1 Quantum dynamics as symplectic motion

As a particular case of dynamics in the Poisson algebra of a symplectic form we discuss here the dynamics of wave functions and expectations in quantum mechanics.

We consider the special case of the unconstrained setting of Section 12.2 where $\mathbb{M}_c = \mathbb{F}$. Then $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F} \cong \mathbb{M}$ is a complex Euclidean space in which we may do quantum mechanics. The isomorphism between \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{M} as real vector spaces is made explicit by writing

$$\psi = q + \iota p \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{F}, \quad (13.1)$$

where

$$\iota := \frac{i}{\hbar}. \quad (13.2)$$

Then

$$\bar{\psi} = q - \iota p, \quad (13.3)$$

and the Hermitian inner product in \mathbb{H} is

$$\phi^* \psi = \bar{\phi} \cdot \psi. \quad (13.4)$$

We may regard arbitrary smooth functions of ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ as functions of q and p by writing (with slight abuse of notation)

$$f(\psi, \bar{\psi}) = f(q + \iota p, q - \iota p). \quad (13.5)$$

The chain rule then implies the relations

$$\partial_\psi + \partial_{\bar{\psi}} = \partial_q, \quad (13.6)$$

$$\iota(\partial_\psi - \partial_{\bar{\psi}}) = \partial_p \quad (13.7)$$

for the partial derivatives. using these, it is an easy matter to rewrite the Lie product (12.17) in the form

$$f \lrcorner g = \iota(f_\psi \cdot g_{\bar{\psi}} - g_\psi \cdot f_{\bar{\psi}}). \quad (13.8)$$

Now we consider the classical Hamiltonian

$$H_c(\psi, \bar{\psi}) := \psi^* H \psi,$$

where $H \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ is a quantum Hamiltonian. Then we find

$$\dot{\psi} = H_c \lrcorner \psi = -\iota H \psi, \quad (13.9)$$

giving the **Schrödinger equation**

$$i\hbar \dot{\psi} = H \psi \quad (13.10)$$

as classical Hamiltonian equation of motion for the state vector $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$. Thus, quantum mechanics may be discussed in a classical framework. The variational principle for classical Hamiltonian systems discussed in the context of (12.12), rewritten for the present situation, is called the **Dirac-Frenkel variational principle** (DIRAC [63], FRENKEL [82]). The action takes the form

$$I(\psi, \bar{\psi}) := \int_{\underline{t}}^{\bar{t}} dt \psi^*(t) \left(i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} - H \right) \psi(t); \quad (13.11)$$

setting its variation to zero indeed recovers (13.10). The Dirac-Frenkel variational principle plays an important role in approximation schemes for the dynamics of quantum systems. In many cases, a viable approximation is obtained by restricting the state vectors $\psi(t)$ to a linear or nonlinear manifold of easily manageable states $|z\rangle$ (for example **coherent states**) parameterized by classical parameters z which can often be given a physical meaning. Inserting the ansatz $\psi(t) = |z(t)\rangle$ into the action (13.11) gives an action for the path $z(t)$, and the variational principle for this action defines an approximate classical Lagrangian (and hence conservative) dynamics for the parameter vector $z(t)$. Thus, the Dirac-Frenkel variational principle fits in naturally with the interpretation in Section 7.4 of the parameter vectors characterizing a state as the natural observables. An important application of this situation are the **time-dependent Hartree-Fock equations** which are at the heart of dynamical simulations in quantum chemistry.

We note that $\psi^* \psi$ is a constant of the motion, hence we may restrict the dynamics (13.10) to **normalized state vectors** ψ satisfying $\psi^* \psi = 1$. In this case, we may interpret the function $A_c \in \mathbb{E}$ defined for $A \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ by

$$A_c(\psi, \bar{\psi}) := \psi^* A \psi = \langle A \rangle$$

as the classical **value** of the quantity A in the pure state defined by the normalized state vector ψ , or, equivalently, by the rank one density matrix

$$\rho = \psi\psi^*. \quad (13.12)$$

The Lie product of two values is again a value, since one easily calculates

$$\langle A \rangle \cap \langle B \rangle = \langle \iota[A, B] \rangle = \langle A \cap B \rangle, \quad (13.13)$$

where the Lie product on the right hand side is the quantum bracket. In particular, the dynamics of the values is given by the **Ehrenfest equation**

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle A \rangle = \langle H \rangle \cap \langle A \rangle = \langle H \cap A \rangle = \frac{i}{\hbar}\langle [H, A] \rangle. \quad (13.14)$$

In the special case, where $H = T(p) + V(q)$ is expressible as a sum of a kinetic energy operator $T(p)$ depending on a momentum vector p and of a potential energy operator $V(q)$ depending on a position vector q , whose components are operators satisfying the traditional **canonical commutation rules**

$$q_j \cap q + k = p_j \cap p_k = 0, \quad p_j \cap q_k = \delta_{jk},$$

the special cases of the Ehrenfest equation,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle q \rangle = \langle \partial_p H(q, p) \rangle = \langle \partial_p T(p) \rangle, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\langle p \rangle = -\langle \partial_q H(q, p) \rangle = -\langle \partial_q V(q) \rangle,$$

often called the **Ehrenfest theorem**, are due to EHRENFEST [68]. The Ehrenfest equation, here derived in the Schrödinger picture, is valid also in the Heisenberg picture (or even more general interaction pictures); the dynamical objects of physical interest are neither the states nor the quantities, but the values. We may also compute the dynamics of the density matrix (13.12), and find the **Liouville equation**

$$i\hbar\dot{\rho} = [H(p, q), \rho]. \quad (13.15)$$

More generally, it is not difficult to check that taking (13.13) as a definition of the Lie product of values in arbitrary states (not necessarily pure states as in the above derivation) indeed turns the family of $\langle A \rangle$ with $\langle \cdot \rangle$ ranging over states defined by

$$\langle A \rangle = \text{tr } \rho A \quad (13.16)$$

for some strongly integrable density matrix ρ and A ranging over the elements of $\text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ into a Lie algebra. Therefore, the Ehrenfest equation is valid for arbitrary states, not only for pure states. By inserting (13.16) into the Ehrenfest equation and comparing coefficients, one also sees that the Liouville equation (13.15) remains valid.

13.2 Quantum-classical dynamics

There are many systems of practical interest which are treated in a hybrid quantum-classical fashion. The most important example is the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, where

nuclei are treated classically, while electrons remain quantized. Another truly quantum-classical system is a quantum Boltzmann equation with spin; here the spin is still an operator, represented by 4×4 matrices parameterized by classical phase space variables. On the other hand, the quantum-Boltzmann equation for spin zero is already a purely classical equation, since its dynamical variables are all commuting.

In the Liouville picture, where the density matrices are the dynamical variables, the basic equations for a large class of quantum-classical models are the **generalized Liouville equation**

$$i\hbar\dot{\rho} = [H(p, q), \rho],$$

and the **generalized Hamilton equations**

$$\dot{q} = \text{tr } \rho \partial_p H(p, q),$$

$$\dot{p} = -\text{tr } \rho \partial_q H(p, q).$$

Here $H \in C^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \text{Lin } \mathbb{H})$ is an operator valued function on a classical phase space \mathbb{M} . Thus $H(p, q)$ is, for any fixed vectors p, q , a linear operator on some Euclidean space \mathbb{H} , the **density matrix** $\rho = \rho(t)$ is a time-dependent trace-class operator on \mathbb{H} , and $q = q(t), p = p(t)$ are classical, time-dependent vectors, not quantum objects. The classical quantities are the functions of the values

$$\langle f(p, q) \rangle = \text{tr } \rho f(p, q)$$

where f is a (p, q) -dependent operator on \mathbb{H} . Expressed in terms of values, we have

$$\dot{q} = \left\langle \partial_p H(p, q) \right\rangle, \quad \dot{p} = -\left\langle \partial_q H(p, q) \right\rangle,$$

which looks like the Ehrenfest theorem, except that on the left hand side we have classical variables and no expectations. The equations are conservative equations for the evolution of values (the value $\langle H \rangle$ of the energy is conserved); dissipative systems and stochastic systems can be also modelled, but this is beyond the scope of the present exposition.

The quantum-classical dynamics preserves the rank of the density ρ . In particular, if ρ has the rank 1 form

$$\rho = \psi\psi^* \tag{13.17}$$

at some time, it has at any time the form (13.17) with time-dependent ψ . The fact that ρ has trace 1 translates into the statement that the state vector ψ is normalized to $\psi^*\psi = 1$. One easily checks that the Liouville equation holds iff the state vector ψ , determined by (13.17) up to a phase, satisfies the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\dot{\psi} = H(p, q)\psi.$$

In terms of the state vector, values take the familiar form

$$\langle f(p, q) \rangle = \psi^* f(p, q)\psi.$$

The reader is invited to formulate a Hamiltonian description of quantum-classical systems, by starting with a symplectic dynamics in which only a part of the position and momentum variables are complexified into a quantum state vector, and to derive the corresponding

Poisson algebra. Now the Lie product is the tensor product of that of the classical subsystem and that of the quantum subsystem treated as a classical Hamiltonian system. The **Ehrenfest equation** still has the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle A \rangle = \langle H \rangle \triangleright \langle A \rangle,$$

but the right hand side no longer simplifies to the value of a commutator; instead, one gets a nonlinear dependence on values. Such nonlinearities are common for reduced descriptions coming from a pure quantum theory by coarse graining. Usually, quantum-classical systems are regarded as reduced descriptions, and the same phenomenon occurs. There are plenty of other examples of practical importance, the primary one being the **Schrödinger-Poisson equations** in semiconductor modeling.

13.2.1 Examples. We mention two important examples, molecular quantum chemistry and a spinning electron.

(i) The **Born-Oppenheimer approximation** of the dynamics of molecules, widely used in quantum chemistry, is a typical quantum-classical system of the above kind. The nuclei are described by classical phase space variables, while the electrons are described quantum mechanically by means of a state vector ψ in a Hilbert space of antisymmetrized electron wave functions.

(ii) A **spinning electron**, while having no purely classical description, can be modelled quantum-classically by classical phase space variables p, q and a quantum 4-component spin. Then, with α, β as in the Dirac equation,

$$H(p, q) = \alpha \cdot p + \beta m + eV(q) \quad (13.18)$$

is a 4×4 matrix parameterized by classical 3-vectors $p = p(t)$ and $q = q(t)$, $\rho = \rho(t)$ is a positive semidefinite 4×4 matrix of trace 1, and the trace in the above equation is just the trace of a 4×4 matrix.

One gets the equations from Dirac's equation and Ehrenfest's theorem by an approximation involving coherent states for position and momentum. Note that this is just a toy example. More useful field theoretic quantum-classical versions lead to **Vlasov equations** for (p, q) -dependent 4×4 densities, describing a fluid of independent classical electrons of the form (13.18). With even more realism, one needs to add also a collision term accounting for interactions, resulting in a **quantum Boltzmann equation**; and for even more accurate modeling, (13.18) is no longer adequate but needs additional dissipative terms.

The quantum-classical dynamics, given in the Schrödinger picture, can also be written in the Heisenberg picture. The equivalent Heisenberg dynamics is

$$\frac{d}{dt}f = \partial_q f \langle \partial_p H \rangle - \partial_p f \langle \partial_q H \rangle + \frac{i}{\hbar}[H, f]$$

where now $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the fixed Heisenberg state. From this, one can immediately see that everything depends only on values by applying $\langle \cdot \rangle$ to this equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle f \rangle = \langle \partial_q f \rangle \langle \partial_p H \rangle - \langle \partial_p f \rangle \langle \partial_q H \rangle + \langle \frac{i}{\hbar}[H, f] \rangle.$$

This is now a fully classical equation for classical values of the quantum-classical hybrid model considered.

In the interpretation given in Chapter 7, densities are irreducible objects describing a single quantum system, not stochastic entities that make sense only under repetition. (This is analogous to the way phase space densities appear in the Boltzmann equation, though the analogy is not very deep.)

In general, values in the quantum-classical dynamics are to be interpreted as objects characterizing a single quantum system, in the sense of the consistent experiment interpretation, and not as the result of averaging over many realizations.

By design, in the Heisenberg picture, the state does not take part in the dynamics. What is new, however, compared to pure quantum dynamics is that the Heisenberg state occurs explicitly in the differential equation. In practical applications, the Heisenberg state is fixed by the experimental setting; hence this state dependence of the dynamics is harmless. However, because the dynamics depends on the Heisenberg state, calculating results by splitting a density at time $t = 0$ into a mixture of pure states no longer makes sense. One gets different evolutions of the operators in different pure states, and there is no reason why their combination should at the end give the correct dynamics of the original density. (And indeed, this will usually fail.) This splitting is already artificial in pure quantum mechanics since there is no natural way to tell of which pure states a mixed state is composed of. But there the splitting happens to be valid and useful as a calculational tool since the dynamics in the Heisenberg picture is state independent.

In contrast to the pure quantum case, there is now a difference between averaging results of two experiments ρ_1, ρ_2 and the results of a single experiment ρ given by $(\rho_1 + \rho_2)/2$. That, in ordinary quantum theory, the two are indistinguishable in their statistical properties is a coincidental consequence of the linearity of the Schrödinger equation, and the resulting state independence of the Heisenberg equation; it does no longer hold in effective quantum theories where nonlinearities appear due to a reduced description.

13.3 Deformation quantization

There are many ways to quantize a classical system.

An important algebraic approach is **Berezin quantization**, also called the **method of orbits**. Here classical Poisson representations of Lie algebras are lifted to unitary representations. We only hint at the constructions, and refer for details to BEREZIN [27], BAR-MOSHE & MARINOV [19], LANDSMAN [152], and KIRILLOV [135]. The construction of the Lie–Poisson algebra in Section 9.5 from a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} implies that the dual of \mathbb{L} becomes in a natural way a Poisson manifold; the corresponding symplectic leaves are the so-called **co-adjoint orbits**, the orbits of the universal covering group corresponding to \mathbb{L} in its co-adjoint action on \mathbb{L}^* . The canonical Poisson algebras on the co-adjoint orbits

carry an **irreducible Poisson representation** of \mathbb{L} , and any irreducible Poisson representation of \mathbb{L} arises in this way (up to equivalence). Thus, classifying the co-adjoint orbits is the classical analogue of classifying irreducible unitary representations. The quantization constructions mentioned above rely on close relations between co-adjoint orbits, coherent states over Lie groups, and irreducible unitary representations. These relations can even be generalized further, replacing the Lie algebra structure by a purely geometric setting, which then leads to the framework of **geometric quantization**, cf. WOODHOUSE [263].

Another possibility is **deformation quantization** which deforms a commutative product into a so-called **Moyal product**; for definitions and details, see, e.g., RIEFFEL [210]. Alternatively, deformation quantization may be viewed as a deformation of the quantities in a Poisson algebra \mathbb{E} obtained by embedding \mathbb{E} into the algebra $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$, identifying $f \in \mathbb{E}$ with the multiplication mapping M_f which maps g to $M_f g := fg$. This is the procedure we shall discuss in more detail.

Recall the linear operator $\text{ad}_f \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$ defined by

$$\text{ad}_f\{g\} := f \triangleright g. \tag{13.19}$$

For $f \in \mathbb{E}$, we define the **quantization** \widehat{f} of f by

$$\widehat{f} := f - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \text{ad}_f \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{E}, \tag{13.20}$$

writing for emphasis the arguments (in \mathbb{E}) of operators from $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$ (often referred to as **superoperators**) in curly braces. Note that the quantization preserves nonlinear operations (product and Lie product) only up to terms of formal order $O(\hbar)$. This reflects the ordering ambiguity in traditional quantization procedures. For an arbitrary Gibbs state on $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$, the expectation

$$\langle \widehat{f} \rangle = \langle f \rangle - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \langle \text{ad}_f \rangle$$

differs from those of f by a term of numerical order $O(\hbar)$, justifying an interpretation in terms of deformation.

13.3.1 Proposition. *For f, g in a not necessarily commutative Poisson algebra \mathbb{E} ,*

$$[\text{ad}_f, g] = [f, \text{ad}_g] = f \triangleright g, \tag{13.21}$$

$$[\text{ad}_f, \text{ad}_g] = \text{ad}_{f \triangleright g}. \tag{13.22}$$

$$[\widehat{f}, g] = [f, \widehat{g}] = [f, g] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} f \triangleright g. \tag{13.23}$$

$$[\widehat{f}, \widehat{g}] = [f, g] - i\hbar f \triangleright g - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \text{ad}_{f \triangleright g}, \tag{13.24}$$

Proof. We have, for all $h \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{ad}_f, g]\{h\} &= \text{ad}_f\{gh\} - g\text{ad}_f\{h\} \\ &= f \triangleright gh - g(f \triangleright h) = (f \triangleright g)h, \end{aligned}$$

hence $[\text{ad}_f, g] = f \lrcorner g$. Therefore, also $[f, \text{ad}_g] = -[\text{ad}_g, f] = -g \lrcorner f = f \lrcorner g$, so that (13.21) holds. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} [\text{ad}_f, \text{ad}_g]\{h\} &= \text{ad}_f\{\text{ad}_g\{h\}\} - \text{ad}_g\{\text{ad}_f\{h\}\} \\ &= f \lrcorner (g \lrcorner h) - g \lrcorner (f \lrcorner h) \\ &= (f \lrcorner g) \lrcorner h = \text{ad}_{f \lrcorner g}\{h\} \end{aligned}$$

by (S5), hence (13.22) holds. (13.23) follows from

$$[\widehat{f}, g] = \left[f - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \text{ad}_{f, g} \right] = [f, g] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} [\text{ad}_{f, g}] = [f, g] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} f \lrcorner g,$$

and

$$[f, \widehat{g}] = -[\widehat{g}, f] = -[g, f] + \frac{i\hbar}{2} g \lrcorner f = [f, g] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} g \lrcorner f.$$

Finally, since

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{f}, \widehat{g}] &= \left[f - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \text{ad}_{f, g} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \text{ad}_g \right] \\ &= [f, g] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} [\text{ad}_{f, g}] - \frac{i\hbar}{2} [f, \text{ad}_g] + \left(\frac{i\hbar}{2} \right)^2 [\text{ad}_f, \text{ad}_g], \end{aligned}$$

(13.24) follows from (13.21) and (13.22). \square

To actually quantize a classical theory, one may choose a Lie algebra of relevant quantities generating the Poisson algebra, quantize its elements by the above rule, express the classical action as a suitably ordered polynomial expression in the generators, and use as quantum action this expression with all generators replaced by their quantizations.

In general, the above recipe for phase space quantization gives an approximate Poisson isomorphism, up to $O(\hbar)$ terms. We now show that, however, Lie subalgebras are mapped into (perhaps slightly bigger) Lie algebras defining an abelian extension, and that one gets a true isomorphism for all embedded Heisenberg Lie algebras and all embedded abelian Lie algebras.

13.3.2 Theorem. (Quantization Theorem)

If \mathbb{E} is commutative then, with

$$M_f\{g\} := fg, \quad Q_f\{g\} := \widehat{f}\{g\} = fg - \frac{i\hbar}{2} f \lrcorner g,$$

the quantum Lie product

$$A \lrcorner B = \iota[A, B] \quad \text{for } A, B \in \text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$$

satisfies, for $f, g \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$Q_f \lrcorner Q_g = M_{f \lrcorner g} - \frac{i\hbar}{4} \text{ad}_{f \lrcorner g} = \frac{1}{2}(M_{f \lrcorner g} + Q_{f \lrcorner g}), \quad (13.25)$$

$$Q_f \triangleright M_g = M_f \triangleright Q_g = \frac{1}{2}M_{f \triangleright g}. \quad (13.26)$$

Any Lie subalgebra \mathbb{L} of \mathbb{E} defines a Lie algebra

$$\widehat{\mathbb{L}} = \{M_{f \triangleright g} + Q_h \mid f, g, h \in \mathbb{L}\} \quad (13.27)$$

under the quantum Lie product. If \mathbb{L} is an abelian Lie algebra or a Heisenberg Lie algebra then Q is a Lie isomorphism between \mathbb{L} and $\widehat{\mathbb{L}}$.

Proof. Since \mathbb{E} is commutative, the first term in (13.24) and (13.23) vanishes, and multiplication by $\iota = i/\hbar$ gives (13.25) and (13.26). The final statement is immediate from (13.25) and (13.26). \square

Note that by the so-called **Groenewold-van Hove Theorem** (GROENEWOLD [101], VAN HOVE [250], GOTAY et al. [96]), no quantization procedure can exist which possesses all features desirable from a naive point of view. The present quantization procedure sacrifices the exact preservation of commutation rules.

13.4 The Wigner transform

We now specialize the preceding to the standard symplectic Poisson algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, \mathbb{E} is a commutative Poisson algebra of phase space functions as discussed in Section 12.2. In this very important case, which covers N -particle quantum mechanics, the embedding discussed in Section 13.3 turns out to be equivalent to standard quantization. The equivalence is given in terms of the Wigner transform whose properties we derive now.

In the present special case, phase space quantization amounts to using the reducible representation

$$\widehat{p} = p - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial_q, \quad \widehat{q} = q + \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial_p$$

of the canonical commutation rules on phase space functions instead of the traditional irreducible **position representation** by

$$\widetilde{p} = -i\hbar\partial_x, \quad \widetilde{q} = x$$

on functions of configuration space, or of the irreducible **momentum representation** by

$$p' = p, \quad q' = i\hbar\partial_p$$

on functions of momentum space. Since the momentum representation is obtained from the position representation by the simple canonical transformation which interchanges x and p and then writing $q' = -\widetilde{p}$, $p' = \widetilde{q}$, it is enough to discuss in the following the transformation to the position representation.

By quantizing in phase space, one gives up irreducibility (and hence the description of a state by a *unique* density) but gains in simplicity. This may be compared to the situation in gauge theory, where the description by gauge potentials introduces some arbitrariness with which one pays for the more elegant formulation of the field equations but which does not affect the observable consequences.

We now show that these representations are related by a **Wigner transform** (cf. WIGNER [262]).

We consider the quantization of the commutative Poisson algebra $\mathbb{E} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ with standard Poisson bracket (12.17). Since for $f = f(p, q)$ we have

$$p \lrcorner f = \partial_q f, \quad q \lrcorner f = -\partial_p f, \quad (13.28)$$

the quantization rule amounts to

$$\widehat{p} = p - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial_q, \quad \widehat{q} = q + \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial_p. \quad (13.29)$$

By (13.25),

$$\widehat{p}_\mu \lrcorner \widehat{q}_\nu = p_\mu \lrcorner q_\nu = \delta_{\mu\nu}. \quad (13.30)$$

Thus we have a unitary representation of the standard Heisenberg algebra on phase space. To relate this representation to the traditional position representation given by

$$\widetilde{p} = -i\hbar\partial_x, \quad \widetilde{q} = x, \quad (13.31)$$

we introduce the **Wigner transform**

$$\widetilde{f}(x, y) := \int dp e^{ip^T(x-y)} f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \quad (13.32)$$

of a function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

13.4.1 Theorem. *The Wigner transform has the inverse transform*

$$f(p, q) = h^{-n} \int d\xi e^{-2ip^T\xi} \widetilde{f}(q + \xi, q - \xi), \quad (13.33)$$

where

$$h = 2\pi\hbar, \quad n = \dim p = \dim q, \quad (13.34)$$

and satisfies the rules

$$\widetilde{\widehat{p}f} = \widetilde{p}f, \quad \widetilde{\widehat{q}f} = \widetilde{q}f. \quad (13.35)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\xi e^{-2ip^T\xi} \widetilde{f}(q + \xi, q - \xi) &= \int d\xi e^{-2ip^T\xi} \int dk e^{2ik^T\xi} f(k, q) \\ &= \int dp \left(\int d\xi e^{2i(k-p)^T\xi} \right) f(k, q) \\ &= \int dp h^n \delta(k - p) f(k, q) = h^n f(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

proving (13.33). (13.35) follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{p}f(x, y) &= -i\hbar\partial_x \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= -i\hbar \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} \left(\iota p + \frac{1}{2}\partial_q\right) f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} \left(p - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial_q\right) f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} \widehat{p}f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) = \widetilde{\widehat{p}f}(x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{q}f(x, y) &= \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} \left(\frac{x+y}{2} + \frac{i\hbar}{2}\partial p\right) f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} \left(\frac{z+y}{2} - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\iota(x-y)\right) f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} x f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\
&= x \int dp e^{\iota p^T(x-y)} f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) = x\widetilde{f}(x, y) = \widetilde{q}f(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Thus the Wigner transform provides an isomorphism between the two representations. Note that the phase space representation is highly redundant since the position representation does not act at all on the y -coordinate. The redundancy is apparent from the fact that the algebra generated by \widehat{p} and \widehat{q} is much smaller than $\text{Lin } \mathbb{E}$, and in fact isomorphic (modulo convergence issues) to $\text{Lin } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ via the Wigner transform. However, this redundancy is very helpful since it makes the classical limit and the approximation by semiclassical techniques much simpler.

The Wigner transform can be applied to all nonlinear PDEs of Schrödinger or Dirac type. These have the form

$$I(\psi\psi^*)\psi = 0, \quad \psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (13.36)$$

where I is an operator-valued function of the density matrix

$$\widetilde{\rho} := \psi\psi^* \quad (13.37)$$

and can be rewritten in terms of it as the equation

$$I(\widetilde{\rho})\widetilde{\rho} = 0$$

which after an inverse Wigner transform becomes an equation

$$\bar{I}(\rho)\rho = 0 \quad (13.38)$$

in phase space. However, (13.37) loses the rank 1 condition implicit in (13.36), hence corresponds to a “mixing” of pure states.

13.4.2 Proposition. *The bilinear inner product*

$$(f|g) = \int dpdq f(p, q)g(p, q) \quad (13.39)$$

satisfies

$$(f|g) = \left(\frac{2}{\hbar}\right)^n \int dx dy \tilde{f}(x, y)\tilde{g}(y, x). \quad (13.40)$$

Proof. This follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \int dx dy \tilde{f}(x, y)\tilde{g}(y, x) &= \int dx dy \int dp e^{ipT(x-y)} f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \int dk e^{ikT(y-x)} g\left(k, \frac{y+x}{2}\right) \\ &= \int dp dk dx dy e^{i(p-k)T(x-y)} f\left(p, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) g\left(k, \frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\ &= \int dp dk dq dw e^{i(p-k)T w} f(p, q)g(k, q) \\ &= \int dp dk dq \left(\frac{\hbar}{2}\right)^n \delta(p-k) f(p, q)g(k, q) \\ &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{2}\right)^n \int dp dq f(p, q)g(p, q) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2}\right)^n (f|g). \end{aligned}$$

□

Under conjugation, we have directly from (13.32),

$$\tilde{f}^*(x, y) = \overline{\tilde{f}(y, x)} \Leftrightarrow f^*(p, q) = \overline{f(-p, q)}, \quad (13.41)$$

indicating that the complex combination

$$z = q + ip$$

behaves naturally.

13.4.3 Proposition. *The conditional expectation of an operator $A \in S(\Omega, \mathbb{L})$ at fixed x or k , respectively, defined by*

$$\langle A \rangle_x := \int dk \rho(k, x) A, \quad \langle A \rangle_k := \int dx \rho(k, x) A, \quad (13.42)$$

satisfies

$$\langle A(\mathbf{p}) \rangle_k = A(k) \langle 1 \rangle_k, \quad \langle A(\mathbf{q}) \rangle_x = A(x) \langle 1 \rangle_x \quad (13.43)$$

and

$$\langle A \rangle := \int dk dx A \rho(k, x) = \int dk \langle A \rangle_x = \int dx \langle A \rangle_k. \quad (13.44)$$

Thus \mathbf{p} is the momentum operator and \mathbf{q} the position operator.

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

13.4.4 Theorem. *With the pointwise convolution*

$$(f * g)(p, q) = \int dk f(k, q)g(p - k, q), \quad (13.45)$$

we have for the pointwise product

$$\widetilde{f\tilde{g}} = \widetilde{f * g}. \quad (13.46)$$

Proof. By (13.33), we have $\widetilde{f\tilde{g}} = \tilde{e}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} h^n e(p, q) &= \int d\xi e^{-2ip^T \xi} \widetilde{f}(q + \xi, q - \xi) \widetilde{g}(q + \xi, q - \xi) \\ &= \int d\xi e^{-2ip^T \xi} \int dk e^{2ik^T \xi} f(k, q) \int dl e^{2il^T \xi} g(l, q) \\ &= \int dk dl \left(\int d\xi e^{2i(k+l-p)^T \xi} \right) f(k, q) g(l, q) \\ &= \int dk dl h^n \delta(k + l - p) f(k, q) g(l, q) \\ &= h^n \int dk f(k, q) g(p - k, q) = h^n (f * g)(p, q). \end{aligned}$$

□

A comparison with (13.35) shows that, formally,

$$p * f = \widehat{p}f, \quad q * f = \widehat{q}f.$$

For a fully localized phase space function, (13.32) implies directly

$$f(p, q) = f(q) \Leftrightarrow \widetilde{f}(x, y) = h^n f(x) \delta(x - y), \quad (13.47)$$

corresponding to Lagrangian terms $\Phi(x)^T f(x) \Phi(x)$.

The symbol formulation. To extend the quantization rule to arbitrary smooth functions we need the symbol formulation of \widehat{p} and \widehat{q} .

Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ the classical phase space, and let

$$j = i\hbar/2. \quad (13.48)$$

13.4.5 Proposition. *If $\rho \in S'(\Omega, \mathbb{E}_0)$ then*

$$\rho(k, x) = \int \widehat{\rho}(k + p, x + q) e^{-p \cdot q / j} dp dq, \quad (13.49)$$

where

$$\widehat{\rho}(p, q) = (\pi\hbar)^{-2m} \int \rho(k + p, x + q) e^{k \cdot x / j} dk dx. \quad (13.50)$$

Proof. We use the formula

$$\int f(q)e^{-p\cdot q/j} dpdq = (\pi\hbar)^m f(0), \quad (13.51)$$

and find for $\widehat{\rho}$ defined by (13.50):

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \widehat{\rho}(k+p, x+q)e^{-p\cdot q/j} dpdq \\ &= (\pi\hbar)^{-2m} \int \rho(k'+k+p, x'+x+q)e^{k'\cdot x'-p\cdot q/j} dk' dx' dpdq \\ &= (\pi\hbar)^{-2m} \int \rho(k+p', x+q')e^{p'\cdot q'/j} e^{-p'\cdot q'/j} e^{-p'\cdot q'/j} dpdq' dqdp' \\ &= (\pi\hbar)^{-m} \int \rho(k, x+q')e^{-p\cdot q'/j} dpdq' \\ &= \rho(k, x). \end{aligned}$$

We used the substitution $k' = p' - p$, $x' = q' - q$. □

13.4.6 Proposition. For $A \in S(\Omega, \mathbb{E}_0)$, the symbol $A(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ defined by

$$A(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})\rho(k, x) := \int_{\Omega} A(k+p, x-q)\widehat{\rho}(k+p, x+q)e^{-p\cdot q/j} dpdq \quad (13.52)$$

is consistent with the interpretation

$$\mathbf{p} = k + j\partial_x, \quad \mathbf{q} = x - j\partial_k \quad (13.53)$$

when A is a normally ordered polynomial acting on $\rho(k, x)$ where all \mathbf{p}_μ are to the right of all \mathbf{q}_ν . Moreover, we have the canonical commutation rules (CCR)

$$\iota[\mathbf{p}_\mu, \mathbf{q}_\nu] = \delta_{\mu\nu}. \quad (13.54)$$

Proof. We can rewrite (13.49) as

$$\rho(k, x) = \int \widehat{\rho}(k', x')e^{-(k'-k)\cdot(x'-x)/j} dk' dx',$$

and find inductively for a monomial $\mathbf{q}^\alpha \mathbf{p}^\beta$ (with multiexponents)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}^\alpha \mathbf{p}^\beta \rho(k, x) &= \int (k')^\alpha (2x-x')^\beta \widehat{\rho}(k', x')e^{-(k'-k)\cdot(x'-x)/j} dk' dx' \\ &= \int (k+p)^\alpha (x-q)^\beta \widehat{\rho}(k+p, x+q)e^{-p\cdot q/j} dpdq. \end{aligned}$$

Now take linear combinations with coefficients from \mathbb{E}_0 to find (13.52).

The CCR follow since (with $f_u = \partial f / \partial u$)

$$\begin{aligned} p_\mu q_\nu f &= p_\mu(x_\nu f - j f_{k_\nu}) = k_\mu(x_\nu f - j f_{k_\nu}) + j(x_\nu f - j f_{k_\nu})_{x_\nu} \\ &= k_\mu x_\nu f + j(\delta_{\mu\nu} f + x_\nu f_{x_\mu} - k_\mu f_{k_\nu}) - j^2 f_{k_\nu} x_\mu, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} q_\nu p_\mu f &= q_\nu(k_\mu f + j f_{x_\mu}) = x_\nu(k_\mu f + j f_{x_\mu}) - j(k_\mu f + j f_{x_\mu})k_\nu \\ &= k_\mu x_\nu f + j(-\delta_{\mu\nu} f + x_\nu f_{x_\mu} - k_\mu f_{k_\nu}) - j^2 f_{k_\nu} x_\mu, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$[p_\mu, q_\nu]f = p_\mu q_\nu f - q_\nu p_\mu f = 2j\delta_{\mu\nu} f = i\hbar\delta_{\mu\nu} f.$$

This also implies (13.53). \square

Write $\text{Jm}(f) := \iota(f - f^*)$, so that

$$\text{Jm}(a + jb) := b \quad \text{if } a, b \in \mathbb{E}_0 \text{ are Hermitian.}$$

13.4.7 Proposition. *If*

$$\rho(-k, x) = \overline{\rho(k, x)} \quad \text{for all } (k, x) \in \Omega \quad (13.55)$$

then the dynamics

$$\dot{\rho} = \{H, \rho\}, \quad (13.56)$$

where

$$\{H, \rho\} = \frac{1}{2j} (H\rho - (H\rho)^*) = \text{Jm}(H\rho) \quad (13.57)$$

leaves the total density $\langle 1 \rangle$ invariant. Moreover, if for all A we have $\langle A^* A \rangle \geq 0$ at time $t = 0$ then $\langle A^* A \rangle \geq 0$ at all times $t \geq 0$.

13.4.8 Proposition. (Classical limit)

In the limit $j \rightarrow 0$,

$$A(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = A(k, x) + O(\hbar),$$

and

$$\{H(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}), \rho\}(p, q) = \partial_p H \partial_q \rho - \partial_q H \partial_p \rho + O(\hbar)$$

reduces to the classical Poisson bracket.

Note that

$$\{p, \rho\} = \rho_q, \quad \{q, \rho\} = -\rho_p$$

so this is consistent with

$$\dot{\rho} = (\dot{q}\partial_q + \dot{p}\partial_p)\rho = H_p \rho_q - H_q \rho_p$$

from Hamiltonian dynamics.

To get the density in a position representation, write

$$\underline{\rho}(x, x') = \int \widehat{\underline{\rho}}(p, x') e^{p \cdot x / i\hbar} dp$$

where

$$\widehat{\underline{\rho}}(p, x') = (2\pi\hbar)^{-m} \int \underline{\rho}(x, y) e^{-p \cdot x / i\hbar} dx$$

For normal ordered H , we have

$$H(\underline{\mathbf{p}}, \underline{\mathbf{q}})\underline{\rho}(x, y) = (2\pi\hbar)^{-m} \int H(p, x)\widehat{\underline{\rho}}(p, y)e^{p\cdot x/i\hbar} dp.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\rho}(k+p, k-p) &:= \int \rho(k, x)e^{p\cdot x/i\hbar} dx, \\ \rho(k, x) &= (\pi\hbar)^{-m} \int \underline{\rho}(k+p, k-p)e^{-p\cdot x/i\hbar} dx \end{aligned}$$

defines a CCR isomorphism with the momentum representation.

Note that in the position and momentum representation,

$$\underline{\rho}^*(x, x') = \overline{\underline{\rho}(x', x)}, \quad \underline{\rho}^*(k, k') = \overline{\underline{\rho}(k', k)}$$

while in the phase representation,

$$\rho^*(k, x) = \overline{\rho(-k, x)}.$$

This becomes natural in an analytic representation $z = x + ik$.

For numerical calculation, approximate $H \in S(\Omega, \mathbb{E}_0)$ by trigonometric functions (complex exponentials). This gives finite difference formulas. The initial density ρ can be just given, or it can be regularized (using a Husimi function? GMMP 1.24)

Part V

Representations and spectroscopy

Chapter 14

Harmonic oscillators and coherent states

Part IV applies the concepts introduced so far to the study of the dominant kinds of elementary motion in a bound system, vibrations (described by oscillators, Poisson representations of the Heisenberg group), rotations (described by a spinning top, Poisson representations of the rotation group), and their interaction. On the quantum level, quantum oscillators are always bosonic systems, while spinning systems may be bosonic or fermionic depending on whether or not the spin is integral. The analysis of experimental spectra, concentrating on the mathematical contents of the subject, concludes our discussion.

This chapter is a detailed study of harmonic oscillators (bosons, elementary vibrations), both from the classical and the quantum point of view. We introduce raising and lowering operators in the symplectic Poisson algebra, and show that the classical case is the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ of the quantum harmonic oscillator.

The representation theory of the single-mode Heisenberg algebra is particularly simple since by the Stone–von Neumann theorem, all unitary representations are equivalent. We find that the quantum spectrum of a harmonic oscillator is discrete and consists of the classical frequency (multiplied by \hbar) and its nonnegative integral multiples (overtones, excited states).

To make work in the representation where the harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian is diagonal, we introduce Dirac's bra-ket notation, and deduce the basic properties of the bosonic Fock spaces, first for a single harmonic oscillator and then for a system of finitely many harmonic modes.

We then introduce coherent states, an overcomplete basis representation in which not only the Heisenberg algebra, but the action of the Heisenberg group is explicitly visible. Coherent states are quantum states that behave as classically as possible, thereby making a bridge between the quantum system and classical systems. The coherent state representation is particularly relevant for the study of quantum optics, but we only indicate its connection to the modes of the electromagnetic field.

14.1 The classical harmonic oscillator

The classical one-dimensional harmonic oscillator without damping, introduced in Section 2.2, is defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(q), \quad (14.1)$$

where $V(q)$ is quadratic and bounded from below, so that there are constants q_0 , V_0 and $k > 0$ with

$$V(q) = V_0 + \frac{k}{2}(q - q_0)^2.$$

The number k is called the **stiffness**; the greater the constant k , the more difficult is it to move away from equilibrium. The Hamilton equations are:

$$\dot{q} = \frac{p}{m}, \quad \dot{p} = -V'(q) = -k(q - q_0).$$

A complex exponential ansatz shows that the solution of the Hamilton equations is:

$$q(t) = q_0 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(e^{i\omega t} x), \quad p(t) = \operatorname{Re}(i\omega m e^{i\omega t} x),$$

where x is a complex number depending on the initial conditions, and

$$\omega = \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}},$$

is the **frequency** of the harmonic oscillator. It is convenient to express the variables in terms of a so-called complex **normal mode**, the function $a(t)$ defined by

$$a(t) := \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\omega}}(q(t) - q_0) + i \frac{p(t)}{\sqrt{2m\omega}}.$$

One can recover q and p through

$$q(t) = q_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2\omega}{k}}(a(t) + a^*(t)), \quad p(t) = \frac{1}{2i} \sqrt{2m\omega}(a(t) - a^*(t)), \quad (14.2)$$

hence the description by a normal mode is equivalent to the original description. Differentiating $a(t)$ and using $\dot{q} = p/m$, we obtain

$$\dot{a}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\omega}} \frac{p(t)}{m} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2m\omega}} k(q(t) - q_0) = -i\omega a(t).$$

We conclude that $a(t)$ has to obey

$$a(t) = a(0)e^{i\omega t}.$$

We calculate the Lie product of a and a^* and find

$$\begin{aligned} a \lrcorner a^* &= \frac{\partial a}{\partial p} \frac{\partial a^*}{\partial q} - \frac{\partial a^*}{\partial p} \frac{\partial a}{\partial q} \\ &= 2i \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\omega}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m\omega}} \\ &= i, \end{aligned}$$

that is, we obtain the relation

$$a \rhd a^* = i. \quad (14.3)$$

The relation (14.3) is called the **canonical commutation relation** (CCR) for the harmonic oscillator. More generally, one finds for the Lie product of general functions f, g of a and a^* the formula

$$f \rhd g = i \frac{\partial f}{\partial a} \frac{\partial g}{\partial a^*} - i \frac{\partial f}{\partial a^*} \frac{\partial g}{\partial a}. \quad (14.4)$$

This will be seen later as a special case of a general principle for constructing so-called Lie–Poisson algebras from a Lie algebra.

14.2 Quantizing the harmonic oscillator

For a classical harmonic oscillator, the Lie product in the CCR (14.3) is defined via the Poisson bracket. To quantize the harmonic oscillator, all we do is replace the Lie product in the CCR by its quantum analogue. Thus we postulate the existence of an operator a and its conjugate a^* with the relation

$$\frac{i}{\hbar} [a, a^*] = i,$$

equivalently

$$[a, a^*] = \hbar. \quad (14.5)$$

Note that equation (14.5) has the right behavior under $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, since in the limit that \hbar goes to zero, we have to end up in the classical regime, where the operators a and a^* become functions on phase space and hence commute.

Equation (14.5) defines a $*$ -algebra, i.e., an associative algebra with unity and an involution $*$, generated by a with the relation $aa^* - a^*a = \hbar$. Later we look for representations in a Hilbert space, where the involution then corresponds to Hermitian conjugation. But already at this level, we call expressions in a and a^* operators.

The quantum mechanical Hamiltonian for the harmonic oscillator is the operator given by direct substitution of the p and q from (14.2):

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \omega \left(\frac{a - a^*}{2i} \right)^2 + \omega \left(\frac{a + a^*}{2} \right)^2 + V_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \omega (aa^* + a^*a) + V_0 \\ &= \omega a^*a + \frac{1}{2} \omega \hbar + V_0. \end{aligned} \quad (14.6)$$

Since only differences in energy are important, one often chooses $V_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega$ to get the simple formula $H = \omega a^*a$.

In the classical theory we have commuting variables a and a^* with a Lie product $a \rhd a^* = i$. That is, we have a commutative $*$ -Poisson algebra. In the quantum theory we have an associative algebra generated by a and a^* with the relation $aa^* - a^*a = \hbar$. Since in the

quantum theory two seemingly different polynomial expressions (such as aa^* and $a^*a + \hbar$) can be the same, there is a need for a preferred ordering of a and a^* in monomials. The **normal ordering** is that ordering of a and a^* in monomials where all a^* 's are moved to the left of the a 's. It is easy to see that every noncommutative polynomial in a and a^* can be normally ordered by repeated use of the relation $aa^* = a^*a + \hbar$; in the process of normal ordering, lower degree monomials are generated with higher powers of \hbar . We give the following proposition that guarantees that taking $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ we recover the classical theory:

14.2.1 Proposition. *Let f and g be noncommutative polynomials in a , a^* and \hbar . Viewing f and g as polynomials in commuting variables a and a^* , one can calculate $f \rhd g$ using (14.4). As noncommutative polynomials one can calculate the commutator $[f, g] = fg - gf$. The two results are related by:*

$$\frac{i}{\hbar}[f, g] = f \rhd g + O(\hbar). \quad (14.7)$$

One expresses this relation by saying that the quantum Lie product is a **deformation** of the classical Lie product.

Proof. The order of the a and a^* does not matter since changing the order we generate powers of \hbar . We use induction on the degree of the polynomials. For degree zero and one, (14.7) holds. Suppose it holds for degree of f smaller than n and degree of g one. If we write $f = a^*S + Ta$ for some normally ordered polynomials S and T with degrees smaller than n , we see that for $g = a^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} i[a^*S + Ta, a^*] &= ia^*[S, a^*] + i\hbar T + i[T, a^*]a \\ &= \hbar a^*S \rhd a^* + i\hbar T + \hbar T \rhd a^*a + O(\hbar^2) \\ &= \hbar(a^*S) \rhd a^* + \hbar(Ta) \rhd a^* + O(\hbar^2), \end{aligned}$$

and the result holds for f arbitrary and $g = a^*$. For $g = a$ it goes similar. Suppose the claim holds for all g with degree k , with $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then for degree $n + 1$ let us write $g = aP + a^*Q + R$, where P , Q and R are polynomials of degree strictly less than $n + 1$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, g] &= \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, aP + a^*Q + R] \\ &= \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, a]P + \frac{i}{\hbar}a[f, P] + \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, a^*]Q + \frac{i}{\hbar}a^*[f, Q] + \frac{i}{\hbar}[f, R] \\ &= f \rhd aP + af \rhd P + f \rhd a^*Q + a^*f \rhd Q + f \rhd R + O(\hbar) \\ &= f \rhd (aP) + f \rhd (a^*Q) + f \rhd R + O(\hbar) \\ &= f \rhd (aP + a^*Q + R) + O(\hbar). \end{aligned} \quad (14.8)$$

And the proof is complete. □

Extension to the anharmonic case. The anharmonic oscillator can in principle be treated in a similar fashion. Since the classical Lie product (the Poisson bracket) is the same, we may proceed exactly as before, except that the formulas involving the Hamiltonian

are no longer valid. In particular, since the frequency ω was determined by the Hamiltonian, it is now an arbitrary constant. Thus there are multiple, inequivalent ways of defining the quantities $a(t)$. Indeed, there is even more freedom since the only important property to be preserved is the canonical commutation relation.

Generalizing the affine form of $a(t)$ in the harmonic case, we choose it as an arbitrary affine combination of $q(t)$ and $p(t)$,

$$a = \lambda + \mu q + i\nu p \quad (14.9)$$

for suitable complex numbers μ , ν and λ . As can be easily verified, the canonical commutation relations (14.3) are reproduced, so that the classical Lie product takes again the form (14.4), exactly when the restriction

$$2 \operatorname{Re} \mu \bar{\nu} = 1$$

holds. Having made a choice, we obtain a classical Hamiltonian $H = H(a, a^*)$ in terms of a and a^* . Using the Heisenberg dynamics and (14.4), we obtain

$$\dot{a}(t) = H \triangleright a(t) = -i \frac{\partial H}{\partial a^*}. \quad (14.10)$$

We remark that if (14.3) holds for $t = 0$ then it holds for all t . Indeed, the derivative of the left-hand side of (14.3) vanishes identically.

Using a different choice of the parameters defining a we get a different variable a' , which is affinely related to the original a ,

$$a' = \alpha + \beta a + \gamma a^*. \quad (14.11)$$

The requirement that a' satisfies the same commutation relations as a leads to the restriction

$$|\beta|^2 - |\gamma|^2 = 1. \quad (14.12)$$

A transformation of the form (14.11) satisfying (14.12) is called a **Bogoliubov transformation**. Bogoliubov transformations have important applications; for example, they were at the heart of Hawking's proof that black holes radiate. The generalization of Bogoliubov transformations to systems of oscillating electron pairs in metals is an important ingredient for the theory of Cooper pairs, which explains superconductivity effects in metals at low temperature.

Different choices of the coefficients in the definition of a lead of course to different forms of $H(a, a^*)$; this means that different Hamiltonians $H(a, a^*)$ can describe the same oscillator. The particular choice above for the harmonic oscillator is the one leading to $H(a, a^*) = E_0 + \omega a^* a$, for which the dynamics (14.10) takes the simple form $\dot{a} = -i\omega a$. In theoretical physics there are different operators a_k and a_k^* labeled by some parameter k . One tries to find by means of Bogoliubov transformations the simplest form of the Hamiltonian. The preferred form is the form where H is diagonalized: $H = \sum_k a_k^* a_k + \dots$, where the dots contain terms of higher order in the operators a_k and a_k^* .

The quantization of an anharmonic oscillator is done as in the harmonic case. For each classical Hamiltonian polynomial in a and a^* , there is a unique normally ordered quantum

version. However, when modeling the same system both in a classical and in a quantum setting, the coefficients of the quantum system in a normal ordering of the operators must be taken to depend on \hbar , and the form of this dependence is not determined by the quantum-classical correspondence. Therefore, the best fit of coefficients of H to experimental data will generally produce different optimal values in the classical and the quantum case. In a quantum field theory, the coefficients will also be dependent on the scale at which frequencies remain unresolved, giving so-called **running coupling constants** which play an important role in renormalization techniques.

14.3 Representations of the Heisenberg algebra

We saw at the end of Section 14.1 that the Heisenberg algebra $t(3, \mathbb{C})$ can be considered as being generated by 1 , a , and a^* where a and a^* satisfy the CCR $a \triangleright a^* = i$.

In the classical case, we know a realization of these commutation relations in terms of a Poisson bracket. In the quantum case, we must find a representation in terms of operators in a Hilbert space. The representations of physical interest are the unitary representations, which represent the one as identity and behave properly under the $*$ -operation. In this section we construct a unitary representation of the Heisenberg algebra.

In the quantized version of a classical theory the functions on phase space become elements of some associative algebra \mathbb{E} . For a representation we want to realize the algebra \mathbb{E} as a subalgebra of an algebra of linear operators.

The approach of Schrödinger (1926) to this problem was to take as Hilbert space the space of square integrable complex-valued functions ψ on \mathbb{R}^3 ; then the Schrödinger equation for the dynamics of a pure state takes the form of a wave equation, which was familiar to physicists at that time and hence came to dominate quantum mechanics. The approach taken by Schrödinger proved to be very successful and is also presented in many quantum physics textbooks.

For a single particle, Schrödinger's representation is quite intuitive: the real-valued function $|\psi(x)|^2$ is the probability density for the presence of a particle at a point x in space. For multiparticle systems, the intuitive advantages of Schrödinger's representation is no longer given, as the wave functions are no longer in physical space \mathbb{R}^3 but, for n particles, in an abstract $3n$ -dimensional configuration space. For systems involving an unconserved number of particles, in particular for interactions with light, and for systems in the thermodynamic limit, things are even more complicated since the configuration space becomes infinite-dimensional, and the wave function representation becomes unwieldy. Nevertheless, there are interesting papers using the resulting functional Schrödinger equation to illuminate the relations between classical solitons and quantum bound states (see, e.g., JACKIW [120]).

One year earlier than Schrödinger, Heisenberg invented his infinite-dimensional matrix algebra. We present Heisenberg's approach since it generalizes easily to the most complex quantum systems, including the universe as a whole.

We now look at an arbitrary unitary representation $J : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \text{Lin } \mathbb{H}$ in a Euclidean space \mathbb{H} satisfying

$$J(a^*) = J(a)^*, \quad J(1) = 1.$$

We shall write the operators corresponding to a and a^* in the representation again by a and a^* (rather than using $J(a)$, etc.), in order to avoid clumsy notation. This will not cause problems since the representation turns out to be faithful. Then the operator

$$n := \frac{1}{\hbar} a^* a,$$

for reasons that will soon be apparent, is called the **number operator**, satisfies the commutation relations

$$[a, n] = a, \quad [a^*, n] = -a^*,$$

as is easily checked. This implies that the vector space generated by $1, a, a^*$ and n is closed under the commutator, and hence forms a Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} with the quantum Lie product, called the **oscillator algebra** $os(1)$. In this section (as always when classifying unitary representations), it will be more convenient to work directly with commutators.

We now illustrate an important technique in representation theory, which in many cases of interest provides all irreducible representations of a certain kind. See Section 16.4 for some other applications.

We define the **Verma module** corresponding to a complex number λ by

$$V_\lambda = \{ \psi \in \overline{\mathbb{H}} \mid n\psi = \lambda\psi \},$$

where the Hilbert space $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ is the closure of \mathbb{H} . Since V_λ is a vector space closed under multiplication by operators from \mathbb{L}_0 , the space V_λ is an \mathbb{L}_0 -module.

If $V_\lambda \neq 0$, i.e., if it contains a nonzero vector, then λ is an eigenvalue of n , and any nonzero $\psi \in V_\lambda$ is a corresponding eigenvector. Thus the nonzero Verma modules are just the eigenspaces of the eigenvalues of n . Since we consider here only unitary representations where $*$ is the adjoint, this implies that

$$\lambda = \frac{\psi^* n \psi}{\psi^* \psi} = \frac{\|a\psi\|^2}{\hbar \|\psi\|^2} \geq 0$$

is real and nonnegative. Noting that in general n is Hermitian, we now make the slightly stronger assumption that n is self-adjoint as a densely defined operator of the Hilbert space $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$. Then the spectral theorem implies that the infimum

$$\widehat{\lambda} = \inf_{\psi \neq 0} \frac{\psi^* n \psi}{\psi^* \psi}$$

is a real and nonnegative number, attained for some $\widehat{\psi} \neq 0$, and $\widehat{\psi}$ is an eigenvector of n corresponding to the eigenvalue $\widehat{\lambda}$. Thus $V_{\widehat{\lambda}} \neq 0$. Now consider an arbitrary λ with $V_\lambda \neq 0$ and a nonzero $\psi \in V_\lambda$. Then $n a \psi = (\lambda - 1) a \psi$, hence $a \psi \in V_{\lambda-1}$. If $a \psi = 0$ then

$$\lambda \psi^* \psi = \psi^* n \psi = \frac{1}{\hbar} \psi^* a^* a \psi = 0,$$

hence $\lambda = 0$; and if $a\psi \neq 0$ then $V_{\lambda-1} \neq 0$, and $\lambda - 1$ is an eigenvalue of n . In the latter case, we can repeat the step once, or more often. But since all eigenvalues are nonnegative, this can happen only a finite number of times, and ultimately we must end up with the other alternative. Hence zero is an eigenvalue (in particular $\hat{\lambda} = 0$) and $\lambda - n = 0$ for some nonnegative integer n . Thus the only possible eigenvalues are nonnegative integers. That all these actually are eigenvalues follows by a similar argument. Indeed, with ψ as before, we have

$$na^*\psi = ([n, a^*] + a^*n)\psi = (n+1)a^*\psi = (\lambda+1)a^*\psi,$$

hence $a^*\psi \in V_{\lambda+1}$. Since

$$\|a^*\psi\|^2 = \psi^*aa^*\psi = \psi^*(\hbar + a^*a)\psi = \hbar\|\psi\|^2 + \|a\psi\|^2 \geq \hbar\|\psi\|^2 > 0,$$

$V_{\lambda+1} \neq 0$ and $a^*\psi$ is an eigenvector for the eigenvalue $\lambda + 1$. By induction, we reach all positive integers from $V_{\hat{\lambda}} = V_0$. Thus we have proved the following theorem:

14.3.1 Theorem. *In a representation in which n is self-adjoint, a Verma module V_{λ} of the oscillator algebra \mathbb{L} is nonzero if and only if λ is a nonnegative integer.*

*In particular, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian $H = \omega a^*a$ of a quantum harmonic oscillator consists of the nonnegative integral multiples of $\omega\hbar$.*

The results obtained justify the following terminology. The operator a is called a **lowering operator**, since its application to an eigenstate of the number operator n lowers the associated eigenvalue by one. The operator a^* is called a **raising operator**, since its application to an eigenstate of the number operator n raises the associated eigenvalue by one. Together, the operators a and a^* are called **ladder operators**. A unit vector in the Verma module V_0 is called a **ground state** (in the second quantized language of quantum field theory a **vacuum vector**). For a **ground state**, i.e., a nonzero vector $\psi \in V_0$, we have $n\psi = 0$, hence $\|a\psi\|^2 = \psi^*a^*a\psi = \hbar\psi^*n\psi = 0$ and therefore $a\psi = 0$. Thus the ground state is annihilated by the lowering operator. Therefore a is also called an **annihilation operator**; if this term is used then a^* is called a **creation operator**.

14.4 Bras and Kets

In his groundbreaking work on quantum mechanics, Dirac introduced a notation for vectors and operators that is widely used by physicists but is quite different from what mathematicians are used to. Dirac's bra-ket calculus is not very well defined in the way actually used by physicists, since the basis vectors considered in the calculus do not necessarily lie in the Hilbert space in which everything should happen from a strictly axiomatic point of view.

We define here a precise version of Dirac's bra-ket calculus, which can also satisfy mathematicians. Instead of working in a Hilbert space we consider a fixed dense subspace which we denote by \mathbb{H} . Thus \mathbb{H} is a vector space with a Hermitian inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, antilinear in the first argument and linear in the second, such that $\langle \psi | \psi \rangle$ is always real and nonnegative, and the relation

$$\langle \phi | \psi \rangle^* = \langle \psi | \phi \rangle \tag{14.13}$$

holds, where α^* denotes the complex conjugate of a number $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. The inner product defines a Euclidean norm $\|\psi\| := \sqrt{\langle \psi | \psi \rangle}$, and the Hilbert space is the closure $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ of \mathbb{H} in the topology induced by this norm. We refer to the elements of \mathbb{H} as **smooth vectors** since they correspond in the important special case $\mathbb{H} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to arbitrarily often differentiable functions.

Every smooth vector ψ defines a continuous linear functional, denoted by ψ^* , which maps $\phi \in \mathbb{H}$ to the complex number

$$\psi^*(\phi) := \langle \psi | \phi \rangle. \tag{14.14}$$

Dirac’s idea was to turn this formula into a more suggestive form by splitting the bracket $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle$ into a **bra** $\langle \psi |$, standing for ψ^* , and a **ket** $| \phi \rangle$, standing for ϕ , and deleting the now superfluous parentheses. Then the formula becomes

$$\langle \psi | | \phi \rangle := \langle \psi | \phi \rangle, \tag{14.15}$$

which just asks us to replace two adjacent vertical bars by a single one.

If \mathbb{H} is itself a Hilbert space (and in particular, if the dimension of \mathbb{H} is finite) then it is not difficult to see that all continuous linear functionals arise in this way. However, in many interesting infinite-dimensional vector spaces \mathbb{H} , the situation is different. For example, if $\mathbb{H} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$ then the mapping δ_z which maps $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ to

$$\delta_z(\psi) := \psi(z)$$

is a continuous linear functional which cannot be obtained as ψ^* for some smooth vector ψ .

We can accommodate this in the bra-ket calculus by allowing as bras *all* continuous linear functionals rather than only those which have the form ψ^* with $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$. We simply need to label the continuous linear functional as bras $\langle \psi |$ with symbols ψ from a set \mathbb{H}^* such that the functionals of the form ψ^* with $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ get the label ψ . The set \mathbb{H}^* can be made canonically into a vector space containing \mathbb{H} as a subspace by requiring the mapping $*$: $\psi \rightarrow \psi^* := \langle \psi |$ to be antilinear. Then $\mathbb{H}^* = \mathbb{H}$ in case \mathbb{H} is a Hilbert space, but in general \mathbb{H} may be a proper subspace of \mathbb{H}^* . Since the inner product extends continuously from \mathbb{H} to the Hilbert space completion $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$, every element of $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ defines a continuous linear function. Thus, in general, the Hilbert space $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ sits somewhere in between \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{H}^* ,

$$\mathbb{H} \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{H}} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^*. \tag{14.16}$$

Frequently, some extra "nuclear" structure on \mathbb{H} is assumed which turns (14.16) into a so-called **Gelfand triple** or **rigged Hilbert space** (see, e.g., MAURIN [170], BOHM & GADELLA [34], and for applications to resonances KUKULIN et al. [147]); however, on the level of our discussion, we don’t need this extra structure.

If $\mathbb{H} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, physicists call the vectors $\psi \in \mathbb{H}^*$ **wave functions** – well being aware that they are not always functions in the standard sense –, and write them with a dummy argument x as $\psi(x)$. For example, they consider δ_z to be a **shifted delta function**, and write it as $\delta(x - z)$.

A wave function which is in the Hilbert space $\overline{\mathbb{H}} \subseteq \mathbb{H}^*$ is called **normalizable**, the remaining wave functions are called **non-normalizable**. In mathematical terms, the normalizable

wave functions are equivalence classes of square integrable functions, with two functions being regarded as equivalent when they differ only on a set of measure zero. The shifted delta functions are examples of non-normalizable wave functions.

For a general Euclidean space \mathbb{H} , we refer to the elements of \mathbb{H}^* as **rough vectors** since they correspond in the special case $\mathbb{H} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to functions that are less smooth, possibly not even continuous, and possibly (as in case of the δ_z) not functions at all.

Having extended the bra-ket notation to allow rough vectors as labels in bras, the symmetry property (14.13) is lost. To restore that, we simply extend the inner product to enforce the validity of (14.13) by defining $\langle \psi | \phi \rangle := \langle \phi | \psi \rangle^*$ if $\phi \in \mathbb{H}^*$ and $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$. This can be done consistently, and implies that now kets can be labeled by rough vectors, too. But now the formula (14.15) makes trouble. What is $\langle \psi | \phi \rangle$ when both ϕ and ψ are rough vectors? In general, there is no solution; this product cannot be always defined. However, one can consistently define it in certain cases, namely when ϕ is in some subspace $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}$ of \mathbb{H}^* and the linear functional ψ^* defined at first only on \mathbb{H} can be extended to $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}$ by some limiting procedure. We won't list here the various possibilities; our usage of bras and kets will be restricted to cases where at least one of the two labels in an inner product is smooth.

The main use of Dirac's notation is for the specification of vectors and matrices in a particular representation of the algebra of quantities. We first review the notation in the case where a countable orthonormal basis of smooth states is available. In this case there is a countable set K of **labels** such that the basis consists of the kets $|k\rangle$ with $k \in K$, and orthogonality implies that

$$\langle j | k \rangle = \delta_{jk},$$

and the **resolution of unity**

$$\sum_k |k\rangle \langle k| = 1.$$

In the finite-dimensional case, there is a close correspondence to the notation of linear algebra if we take $\langle k|$ to be the k th unit row vector with a 1 in position k and zeros elsewhere, and $|k\rangle$ to be its transpose, the k th unit column vector.

$$x = \sum_k x_k |k\rangle \quad \text{represents the vector } x = (x_k),$$

and

$$\langle k | x = x_k$$

gives the components of x .

$$A = \sum_{jk} |j\rangle A_{jk} \langle k| \quad \text{represents the matrix } A = (A_{jk}),$$

$$\langle j | A = \sum_k A_{jk} \langle k| \quad \text{represents } A_{j\cdot}, \text{ the } j\text{th row of } A,$$

$$A |k\rangle = \sum_j |j\rangle A_{jk} \quad \text{represents } A_{\cdot k}, \text{ the } k\text{th column of } A,$$

and

$$\langle j|A|k\rangle = A_{jk}$$

gives the matrix entries of A . Compared to the standard linear algebra notation there is no gain.

The situation is different when K is a structured set, for example a set of pairs (k, s) where k is a momentum label and s a spin label, or other such sets arising naturally in the dynamical symmetry approach of Section 17.6. Then the index notation becomes somewhat cumbersome to comprehend, and the more lengthy bra-ket notation is superior.

14.5 Boson Fock space

As we have seen in Section 14.3, every nice unitary representation of the oscillator algebra contains a ground state $\widehat{\psi}$ of norm 1, and hence the representation contains the vectors $(a^*)^k \widehat{\psi}$ ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$). Their span defines a Euclidean vector space \mathbb{F}_+ whose closure $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_+$ is a Hilbert space, called the **single mode bosonic Fock space**, or simply Fock space. Clearly, \mathbb{F}_+ is closed under the action of \mathbb{L} , hence we have a unitary representation of \mathbb{L} on \mathbb{F}_+ . It is not difficult to see that different choices of the ground state either define the same Fock space (if the ground states differ only by a phase) or orthogonal Fock spaces. Indeed, if $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{F}_+$ is an invariant submodule, it needs to have a vector $\widetilde{\psi}_0$, which necessarily coincides with the ground state of \mathbb{F}_+ up to a complex number. Thus an arbitrary unitary representation is a direct sum of Fock spaces. Thus the representations on a Fock space are *irreducible* representations. We shall show in a moment that the unitary representation on a Fock space is essentially unique. This is the content of the celebrated **Stone–Von Neumann theorem**, which actually is about the representation of the Heisenberg group.

Bosonic Fock spaces with more degrees of freedom are obtained by taking tensor products of the Fock space with one degree of freedom, and describe systems of quantum oscillators. As we shall see in Chapter 15, there is also a fermionic counterpart of Fock spaces, which are related to so-called Clifford algebras. The single mode case describes a so-called **qubit** and is simply the vector space \mathbb{C}^2 ; the general case is a tensor product of these, and describes systems of qubits.

We now study the structure of \mathbb{F}_+ for a given ground state $\widehat{\psi}$ of norm 1 in more detail. The properties found will lead to a construction of a Hilbert space which actually contains a representation of the Heisenberg algebra (which, so far, we simply had assumed).

14.5.1 Proposition. *The vectors*

$$|k\rangle := \frac{1}{k!} (a^*)^k \widehat{\psi} \quad (k = 0, 1, 2, \dots) \quad (14.17)$$

satisfy the relations

$$a^*|k-1\rangle = k|k\rangle, \quad a|k\rangle = \hbar|k-1\rangle, \quad n|k\rangle = k|k\rangle,$$

$$\langle k|k'\rangle = \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} \delta_{kk'}.$$

Proof. The first relation is just definition. For the second observe that $a\widehat{\psi} = 0$ and $[a, (a^*)^k] = k(a^*)^{k-1}$. For the third, just combine $n = \frac{1}{\hbar}a^*a$ and the first and second relation. For the fourth relation we have $\langle k| = \frac{1}{k!}(\widehat{\psi})^*a^k$ and $\langle k|k'\rangle = 0$ if $k \neq k'$ since eigenvectors of a Hermitian operator corresponding to different eigenvalues are orthogonal. So only the normalization needs to be checked:

$$\langle k|k\rangle = \frac{1}{k^2}\langle k-1|aa^*|k-1\rangle = \frac{1}{k^2}\langle k-1|\hbar + \hbar n|k-1\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{k}\langle k-1|k-1\rangle.$$

Using induction the fourth equality follows. \square

In the Fock space \mathbb{F}_+ , the vectors are by definition the linear combinations

$$\psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k |k\rangle, \quad \psi_k \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proposition 14.5.1 gives us the relations

$$(a\psi)_k = \hbar\psi_{k+1}, \quad (a^*\psi)_k = k\psi_{k-1}, \quad (n\psi)_k = k\psi_k, \quad (14.18)$$

and $\varphi^*\psi = (\sum \varphi_k |k\rangle)^* \sum \psi_l |l\rangle = \sum \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} \bar{\varphi}_k \psi_k$, hence

$$\varphi^*\psi = \sum \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} \bar{\varphi}_k \psi_k. \quad (14.19)$$

Equations (14.18) and (14.19) are an equivalent description of the equations of Proposition 14.5.1.

We now define \mathbb{H} as the closure of \mathbb{F}_+ . Then the operators a, a^* and n are defined on a dense subset. Previously we have seen that if the canonical commutation relations admit an irreducible representation, then it has to be of the form as described by Proposition 14.5.1. But now we can say more:

The set \mathbb{H} of vectors $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^\infty$ with finite norm

$$\|\psi\| := \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} |\psi_k|^2}$$

is a Hilbert space with inner product (14.19), on which the definitions 14.18 give densely defined operators a, a^*, n . The components of $a^*\psi$ grow significantly faster than those of ψ , so that $a^*\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ only for ψ in a proper subspace of \mathbb{H} . This subspace is dense, since it contains the dense subset of ψ with only finitely many nonzero entries. Note that the operators $1, a, a^*$ and n , and hence all elements of \mathbb{L} are represented by infinite tridiagonal matrices. This is the representation of the quantum harmonic oscillator discovered by Heisenberg in his groundbreaking paper [110].

It is now easy to check that the operators $1, a, a^*$ and n satisfy the canonical commutation relations, that a^* is the Hermitian conjugate of a , and that $n = a^*a$. Thus we have a

representation of \mathbb{L} . The representation is irreducible since acting repeatedly with $a^* \in \mathbb{L}$ on the vector $\widehat{\psi}$ with entries $\widehat{\psi}_k = \delta_{k0}$ (the ground state) gives a basis of \mathbb{H} . Combining this with the uniqueness statement obtained before, we arrive at the following theorem of Stone and Von Neumann (but essentially already obtained in [110]):

14.5.2 Theorem. *The canonical commutation relations admit an (up to equivalence) unique irreducible unitary representation on a Hilbert space such that the action of a , a^* and $n = a^*a$ is defined on a dense subspace and n is self-adjoint.*

The theorem holds with a similar proof for arbitrary finite-dimensional Heisenberg algebras coming from a nondegenerate alternating form. It fails spectacularly in infinite dimensions. In this case there are uncountably many inequivalent representations; see, e.g., BARTON [24] for an (in spite of the title of the book) elementary discussion of these. Their existence is one of the main stumbling blocks for extending quantum mechanics to quantum field theory.

14.6 Bargmann–Fock representation

We present an important but easy representation of the Heisenberg algebra $h(n)$, which will be useful to us when we study coherent states in Section 14.7. Consider the vector space of complex polynomials in n variables $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$. We then identify a_k and a_k^* with the operators defined by¹

$$(a_k p)(z_1, \dots, z_n) := z_k p(z_1, \dots, z_n),$$

and

$$(a_k^* p)(z_1, \dots, z_n) := \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} p(z_1, \dots, z_n).$$

It is easy to check that this indeed defines a representation. We can even make a unitary representation out of this. For that purpose we consider the vector space \mathbb{H} of all entire functions on \mathbb{C}^n with finite norm with respect to the inner product

$$\langle f | g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} \overline{f(z)} g(z) e^{-\bar{z} \cdot z}.$$

The space \mathbb{H} with the above inner product is a Euclidean space; its closure is a Hilbert space, the multi-dimensional version of the Bargmann–Fock space described in Section 14.5.

The operators a_k and a_k^* are adjoints of each other. An orthogonal basis is given by the monomials:

$$\langle z_1^{k_1} \dots z_n^{k_n} | z_1^{l_1} \dots z_n^{l_n} \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i! \delta_{k_i, l_i}.$$

From the discussion in Section 10.1 it follows that the quadratic expressions modulo the linear expressions in the elements z_i and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}$ form the Lie algebra $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$. Taking all

¹Remember the transformations $a_k = \frac{p_k - iq_k}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $a_k^* = \frac{p_k + iq_k}{\sqrt{2}}$.

quadratic expressions (so not modding out by the linear polynomials) in the elements z_i and $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}$ one obtains a central extension of $isp(2n)$.

The above representation is irreducible (one sees rather quickly that starting with 1, acting with p_k gives all entire functions) and is called the Bargmann–Fock representation. By the Stone–Von Neumann theorem, which says that there is only one irreducible representation of the Heisenberg algebra, the Bargmann–Fock representation is up to isomorphism the only irreducible representation of the Heisenberg algebra.

We have seen in Section 10.1 that the quadratic expressions (modulo linear terms) in the q_i and the p_k rotate the generators q_i and p_k into each other under the action of the Lie product. In other words, the action of the quadratic expressions builds a representation of $sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ inside the Bargmann–Fock representation. That this happens is not so strange. Let us consider the automorphism group of the Heisenberg algebra, consisting of all the invertible maps $h(n) \rightarrow h(n)$ preserving the Lie product. But from equation (10.1) we see that the automorphism group contains the group $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$. Now let us denote the above given Bargmann–Fock representation by $U : h(n) \rightarrow \text{Lin}(H)$, then using $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ we get a new representation of the Heisenberg algebra as follows. For each $g \in Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ we consider the representation

$$U_g : h(n) \rightarrow \text{Lin}(H), \quad U_g(x) = U(gx).$$

Since $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}) \subset \text{Aut}(h(n))$ the U_g are indeed representations. But the unitary irreducible representation of $h(n)$ is unique, up to isomorphism, and hence there must be a unitary operator $R(g)$ such that

$$U_g = R(g)UR(g)^{-1}.$$

It is clear that the $R(g)$ are determined up to a sign. Thus $R(g)R(h) = \pm R(gh)$ and we say that the $R(g)$ form a **projective representation** of the group $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$. This representation is called the **metaplectic representation**. The operators $R(g)$ themselves form a group, closely related to the **metaplectic group** $Mp(2n, \mathbb{R})$, the universal covering group of the Lie algebra $sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$. The metaplectic group is a two-fold cover of $Sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$, hence has a center of order 2, while our group has the multiplicative group of the reals as center. Factoring out the positive reals leaves the metaplectic group.

14.7 Coherent states for the harmonic oscillator

Coherent states were introduced in 1963 by GLAUBER [93], who recognized their importance in quantum optics; he received in 2005 the Nobel prize for his work in this direction. But the notion of a coherent state (without the name) was already introduced by Erwin Schrödinger [223] in 1926 when he was looking for solutions to the Schrödinger equation that satisfy the **Heisenberg uncertainty relation**

$$\Delta p \Delta q \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}, \tag{14.20}$$

where Δx denotes the variance of a quantity x . Schrödinger was looking for states that were as classical as possible, having equality $\Delta p \Delta q = \frac{\hbar}{2}$. The coherent states, and only these

satisfy equality; they therefore build a bridge between classical physics and quantum physics that deepened as the notion of coherent states was extended to more general situations.

To introduce Glauber's coherent states, we remind the reader that for the harmonic oscillator we constructed the Fock space \mathbb{H} of $\psi = (\psi_k)_{k \geq 0}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} \bar{\psi}_k \psi_k < \infty. \quad (14.21)$$

One may regard ψ either as a vector with infinitely many components, or as an infinite sequence. Equivalently, in Dirac's bra-ket notation, the ψ_k 's are the complex coefficients in the expansion of ψ with respect to an eigenbasis $|k\rangle$ of the number operator, $\psi = \sum \psi_k |k\rangle$. The inner product is given by

$$\varphi^* \psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar^k}{k!} \bar{\varphi}_k \psi_k.$$

The operators a , a^* and n act as $(a\psi)_k = \hbar \psi_{k+1}$, $(a^*\psi)_k = k\psi_{k-1}$ and $(n\psi)_k = k\psi_k$. We now define a **coherent state** for the harmonic oscillator to be a vector of the form

$$|\lambda, z\rangle := (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}\bar{z}, \bar{\lambda}\bar{z}^2, \dots); \quad (\lambda, z \in \mathbb{C})$$

in other words, a state ψ with coefficients $\psi_k = \bar{\lambda}\bar{z}^k$. By (14.17), we can write

$$|\lambda, z\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \bar{\lambda} \frac{\bar{z}^k}{k!} (a^*)^k \hat{\psi},$$

where $\hat{\psi}$ is the ground state. Even more, we have

$$|\lambda, z\rangle = \sum_{k \geq 0} \bar{\lambda} \bar{z}^k |k\rangle, \quad (14.22)$$

and we see that $\psi \in \mathbb{H}$ since

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \hbar^k |\lambda|^2 \frac{|z|^{2k}}{k!} = |\lambda|^2 e^{\hbar|z|^2} < \infty.$$

The inner product between two coherent states is given by

$$\langle \lambda', z' | \lambda, z \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hbar^k z'^k \bar{z}^k}{k!} \lambda' \bar{\lambda} = \lambda' \bar{\lambda} e^{\hbar z' \bar{z}}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\langle \lambda, z | n \rangle = \frac{\lambda \hbar^n z^n}{n!}.$$

Suppose ψ is an element of \mathbb{H} , then

$$\langle \lambda, z | \psi \rangle = \lambda \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\hbar z)^k}{k!} \psi_k \equiv \lambda \psi(z), \quad (14.23)$$

which defines the function $\psi(z)$ corresponding to ψ . Conversely, given an analytic function g

$$g(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(\hbar z)^k}{k!} g_k,$$

with $\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\hbar^2 |g_k|^2}{k!} < \infty$ we assign to g the element $\psi_g = (g_k)_{k \geq 0}$ in \mathbb{H} . We claim that $\psi \mapsto \psi(z)$ is a map from \mathbb{H} to the set of analytic functions. In order to prove the claim we have to prove that the power series (14.23) converges everywhere. We calculate the radius of convergence R

$$R = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt[k]{\hbar^k \psi_k}} = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[k]{\frac{k!}{\hbar^k \psi_k}} \rightarrow \infty$$

since ψ_k satisfies (14.21). Hence the function $\psi(z)$ is analytic everywhere. The state ψ is uniquely described by the function $\psi(z)$ in the sense that $\psi(z) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \psi = 0$, since

$$\frac{1}{\lambda \hbar^k} \frac{d^k}{dz^k} \psi(z) \Big|_{z=0} = \psi_k.$$

The inner product between φ and ψ now becomes

$$\varphi^* \psi = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k! |\lambda|^2 \hbar^k} \left[\frac{d^k}{dz^k} \overline{\varphi}(z) \frac{d^k}{dz^k} \psi(z) \right]_{z=0}.$$

So we can use the powerful theorems of complex analysis to deal with the states in the Hilbert space \mathbb{H} . For the relations between complex analysis and coherent states, including important generalizations to coherent states associated with other Lie groups, see PERELOMOV [193], UPMEIER [247], FARAUT & KORANYI [75].

Every element in \mathbb{H} is a linear combination of coherent states, but the combination is in general not unique. For the harmonic oscillator a set of finitely many coherent states $|\lambda, z\rangle$ with different z is linearly independent, since suppose

$$|v\rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i, z_i\rangle = 0, \quad \lambda_i \neq 0,$$

then it follows that

$$\langle \mu, w | v \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu \lambda_i e^{\hbar w z_i} = 0,$$

for all w . But a finite set of exponential functions is linearly independent. Hence it follows that a finite set of coherent states $|\lambda, z\rangle$ with different z is linearly independent. The set of linear combinations of finitely many coherent states is dense in \mathbb{H} . The coherent states form a kind of a “basis”, but an overcomplete set. Such a set is called a **frame**. Frames are widely used in wavelet analysis.

We can get a so-called **tight frame** by taking the coherent states with unit norm. A tight frame in a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} is a set of vectors $\{v_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$ in \mathbb{H} , where σ is some index set,

such that any vector f admits a unique expansion $V = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma} v_{\sigma}$. To demonstrate that the coherent states build a tight frame we simplify the notation and put $\hbar = 1$. Next we define

$$|z\rangle = |e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2}, z\rangle.$$

The vectors $|z\rangle$ have a unit norm; $\langle z|z\rangle = 1$. We calculate for an element $|f\rangle = \sum_k f_k |k\rangle$ the following

$$|z\rangle\langle z|f\rangle = \sum_{k,n} e^{-|z|^2} \bar{z}^n z^k \frac{f_k}{k!} |n\rangle.$$

The coefficient of each component $|n\rangle$ equals

$$\varphi_n = e^{-|z|^2} f(z) \bar{z}^n,$$

where $f(z)$ is defined as

$$f(z) = \sum_n \frac{z^n}{n!} f_n.$$

From the above discussion we know that $f(z)$ is analytic everywhere. Thus the vector $\sum_n \varphi_n |n\rangle$ is of finite norm;

$$\sum_n \frac{|\varphi_n|^2}{n!} = \sum_n e^{-2|z|^2} |f(z)|^2 \frac{|z|^{2n}}{n!} = e^{-|z|^2} |f(z)|^2 < \infty.$$

Hence $|z\rangle\langle z|f\rangle$ represents an element in \mathbb{H} and we can integrate each component to get

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}} |z\rangle\langle z|f\rangle d^2z = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}} |z\rangle f(z) e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2} dz = |f\rangle, \quad (14.24)$$

where the integration measure is $dz = d(\operatorname{Re}z)d(\operatorname{Im}z)$ and where we used

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} \bar{z}^n z^m e^{-|z|^2} dz = \pi n! \delta_{n,m}. \quad (14.25)$$

In physics literature one writes the result (14.24) as

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int |z\rangle\langle z| dz = 1.$$

In mathematics, such an expression is called a **resolution of the identity**. The fact that the coherent states admit a resolution of the identity makes them useful. We now wish to show that the expansion of $|f\rangle$ in coherent states is unique, thereby proving that the coherent states make up a tight frame. We use (14.24) to compute the inner product of $|f\rangle$ with a coherent state $\langle w|$

$$\langle w|f\rangle = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|w|^2} \int_{\mathbb{C}} e^{w\bar{z}-|z|^2} f(z) dz.$$

But f is an analytic function, so we first try $f = z^n$. Using (14.25) we obtain the identity

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}} e^{-|z|^2} e^{w\bar{z}} z^m dz = w^m.$$

Hence we derive the more general identity for analytic functions

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}} e^{-|z|^2} e^{w\bar{z}} f(z) dz = f(w),$$

from which we obtain

$$f(w) = e^{\frac{1}{2}|w|^2} \langle w | f \rangle.$$

Hence the expansion of f in coherent states is unique, since if $f = 0$, then all the $\langle z | f \rangle = 0$ and the expansion vanishes identically. Note that the above discussion only works for analytic functions f . If we admit a non-analytic f we get for example

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} |z\rangle \bar{z}^n e^{-\frac{1}{2}|z|^2} dz = 0,$$

for all $n > 0$. There is a relation between coherent states and the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ of analytic functions $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{C}} |f(z)|^2 e^{-|z|^2} dz < \infty,$$

for which the $(z^n)_{n \geq 0}$ form a basis. We refer the interested reader to GLAUBER[93], SEGAL[226], BARGMANN[20, 21]. We just remark that if $f \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and expand f as

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{f_n z^n}{n!}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{C}} |f(z)|^2 e^{-|z|^2} dz &= \int_{\mathbb{C}} \sum_{n, m \geq 0} \frac{\bar{z}^n z^m \bar{f}_n f_m}{n! m!} e^{-|z|^2} dz \\ &= \pi \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{|f_n|^2}{n!}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence f defines an element in the Fock space \mathbb{H} . (We have assumed one can change the order of integration and summation, but that can be made rigorous, see BARGMANN [20] for a readable explanation.) The above discussion on the uniqueness of the expansion of an analytic function in terms of coherent states was taken from GLAUBER [93], which is a very readable account on coherent states and the physics and mathematics behind them.

We now reinsert the constant \hbar to see some of the behavior of the coherent states. Remember the formula for q

$$q = 2\omega m^{-\frac{1}{2}}(a + a^*).$$

We see easily that $a|\lambda, z\rangle = \hbar\bar{z}|\lambda, z\rangle$. With a bit more work we see that

$$\langle \lambda, z | a^* | \lambda, z \rangle = \sum_{k, l} |\lambda|^2 \frac{z^i \bar{z}^j}{k! l!} \hat{\psi}^* a^k (a^*)^{l+1} \hat{\psi} = z |\lambda|^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{|z|^{2k}}{k!},$$

from which it follows that

$$\langle \lambda, z | a^* | \lambda, z \rangle = z \langle \lambda, z | \lambda, z \rangle.$$

We thus see that we can associate the real part of z with the position;

$$\langle \lambda, z | q | \lambda, z \rangle = 2\omega m^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z + z^*) \langle \lambda, z | \lambda, z \rangle.$$

In a similar fashion the imaginary part of z is related to the momentum p . Let us pause for a while to see what the above means. The harmonic oscillator has a very symmetric shape. One can show that the wave functions which are eigenvectors of the number operator n respect the symmetry $q \rightarrow -q$ in the sense that if $q \rightarrow -q$ then they change with a factor $(-1)^n$ (see any introductory book on quantum mechanics, e.g., GRIFFITHS [99]). This means that for all wave functions that are eigenfunctions of the number operator the average position is precisely in the middle, at q_0 . Therefore the momentum has zero expectation value. The coherent states represent shifted states; their position is not in the middle. Note that we have used the Heisenberg picture where the states are time-independent. To see the time-dependent behavior of the coherent states, we consider the product

$$e^{-iHt} |\lambda, z\rangle.$$

If we now shift the lowest energy to zero (that is, we choose $V_0 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega$), and use (14.22) and

$$e^{-i\frac{H}{\hbar}t} |n\rangle = e^{-i\omega nt} |n\rangle,$$

we see

$$e^{-i\frac{H}{\hbar}t} |\lambda, z\rangle = |\lambda, ze^{-i\omega t}\rangle.$$

The coherent states thus swing from left to right in the potential with a frequency ω and with amplitude $|z|/2m\omega$.

In order to see the action of the Heisenberg group on the coherent state, we calculate

$$(e^{\alpha n} \psi)_k = e^{\alpha k} \psi_k \Rightarrow e^{\alpha n} |\lambda, z\rangle = |\lambda, e^\alpha z\rangle.$$

From $a|\lambda, z\rangle = \hbar\bar{z}|\lambda, z\rangle$ it follows that

$$e^{\alpha a} |\lambda, z\rangle = e^{\hbar\alpha\bar{z}} |\lambda, z\rangle = |e^{\hbar\alpha\bar{z}} \lambda, z\rangle.$$

Further, we have

$$e^{\bar{\alpha}a^*} |\lambda, z\rangle = \sum_{k,l} \frac{\bar{\alpha}^k (a^*)^k}{k!} \bar{\lambda} \frac{\bar{z}^l (a^*)^l}{l!} \hat{\psi} = \sum_k \bar{\lambda} \frac{\overline{\alpha+z}^k}{k!} (a^*)^k \hat{\psi} = |\lambda, z + \alpha\rangle,$$

and also we have

$$e^\alpha |\lambda, z\rangle = |e^\alpha \lambda, z\rangle.$$

We summarize this and write

$$e^{\alpha n} |\lambda, z\rangle = |\lambda, e^\alpha z\rangle, \quad e^{\alpha a} |\lambda, z\rangle = |e^{\alpha\hbar\bar{z}} \lambda, z\rangle \quad (14.26)$$

$$e^{\bar{\alpha}a^*} |\lambda, z\rangle = |\lambda, z + \alpha\rangle, \quad e^\alpha |\lambda, z\rangle = |e^\alpha \lambda, z\rangle. \quad (14.27)$$

We can apply arbitrary group elements by taking products.

The **Glauber coherent states** introduced in the present section for the Heisenberg group, can be generalized. Indeed, the concept of coherent states extends to a large class of Lie groups acting on so-called co-adjoint orbits of the group. In each case, the co-adjoint orbit provides a manifold of labels for the coherent states on which the group acts, and the coherent states span in an overcomplete fashion a Hilbert space on which the group acts as an irreducible highest weight representation. We shall discuss highest weight representations in Chapter 16, but cannot give details for the general case mentioned here. Instead, we refer the reader to the book by PERELOMOV [193] and to the extensive survey by ZHANG et al. [269].

14.8 Monochromatic beams and coherent states

As indicated in Section 2.6 for the case of a beam of monochromatic light, the modes of the electromagnetic field play the role of the annihilation and creation operator of the quantum field. Classically the observables are functions on phase space, hence specified to a certain observable we have an operator on the configuration space. Namely a physical configuration is specified by giving the values of the observables, and to any observable we assign the operator that reads off the value of that observable. Thus if a configuration of a laser beam, which we suggestively denote $|\mathbf{E}\rangle$, is specified by an electric field $\mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t)$, then the operator $\mathcal{E}(x, y, z, t)$ reads off the values of the components of the electric field at the space-time point (x, y, z, t) :

$$\mathcal{E}(x, y, z, t)|\mathbf{E}\rangle = \mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t)|E\rangle.$$

In the transition from classical mechanics to quantum mechanics the role of the operator $\mathcal{E}(x, y, z, t)$ is played by the operator's positive frequency part of the electromagnetic field. The above equation then tells us that $|\mathbf{E}\rangle$ is an eigenvalue of the annihilation operator.

In a classical system there are many photons and the number of photons need not be constant, due to absorption and due to the constant photon production of the laser. Hence, from a micromechanical point of view, the quantum number n is no longer a good quantum number to assign to a system resembling a laser. However we know that the electric field is nearly perfectly constant, and if the beam goes in one direction we can take the classical expression

$$\mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) = a^* \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})^* e^{i\omega_k t},$$

for the electric field. Since the classical state of the laser has a well-defined value of the electric field, the quantum state $|\mathbf{E}\rangle$ that mimics the classical state the most is the one where

$$a^* \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})^* e^{i\omega_k t} |\mathbf{E}\rangle = \mathbf{E}(x, y, z, t) |\mathbf{E}\rangle.$$

But then $|\mathbf{E}\rangle$ is an eigenvector of a^* . This similarity between coherent states and classical states is what motivated Roy Glauber to investigate coherent states and apply his analysis to the (quantum and semiclassical) theory of light.

All this extends with suitable modifications to the other wave equations described in Sections 2.5 and 2.4. In each case, there are families of coherent states describing nearly classical ray-like behavior, and there are more exotic quantum states which behave quite unlike any classical system.

Chapter 15

Spin and fermions

This chapter discusses the quantum mechanics of spinning systems, where the only relevant degrees of freedom correspond to rotation.

The quantum version of the spinning top discussed in Section 9.4 can be obtained by looking for canonical anticommutation relations, which naturally produce the Lie algebra of a spinning top. As for oscillators, the canonical anticommutation relations have a unique irreducible unitary representation, which corresponds to a spin $1/2$ representation of the rotation group. The multimode version gives rise to fermionic Fock spaces; in contrast to the bosonic case, these are finite-dimensional when the number of modes is finite. In particular, the single mode fermionic Fock space is 2-dimensional.

Many constructions for bosons and fermions only differ in the signs of certain terms, such as commutators versus anticommutators. For example, quadratic expressions in bosonic or fermionic Fock spaces form Lie algebras, which give natural representations of the universal covering groups of the Lie algebras $so(n)$ in the fermionic case and $sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$ in the bosonic case, the so-called spin groups and metaplectic groups, respectively. In fact, the analogies apart from sign lead to a common generalization of bosonic and fermionic objects in form of super Lie algebras, which, however are outside the scope of the book.

Apart from the Fock representation, the rotation group has a unique irreducible unitary representation of each finite dimension. We derive these spinor representations by restriction of corresponding nonunitary representations of the general linear group $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ on homogeneous polynomials in two variables, and find corresponding spin coherent states.

15.1 Fermion Fock space

As we have seen in Section 9.4 the affine functions in the Poisson algebra of the spinning top make up the Lie algebra $u(2)$. One can thus expect that the quantization of the spinning top boils down to representation theory of $su(2)$ and $u(2)$ and indeed it does. In the following sections the representations of $su(2)$ and $u(2)$ play an important role. See for example

HUMPHREYS [117] or JACOBSEN [121] for a comparison of the methods used.

In this section, however, we look at a particular representation, the Fock representation of $u(2)$. It behaves in many respects like the Fock representation of the Heisenberg algebra, and gives the right generalization to the case of many fermionic modes, and in particular to quantum field theory.

In fact, there are many analogies between bosonic and fermionic systems – many formulas look alike, apart for the occurrence of additional minus signs in certain places.¹ Although very similar in many respects, there is a fundamental difference with basic representation theory of bosons and fermions. While bosons are characterized by canonical commutation relations, fermions are quantized using canonical anticommutation relations. We shall see in a moment that this naturally reproduces the Lie algebra $u(2)$ of a spinning top, and – just like for canonical commutation relations – uniquely fixes the representation.

We define a **signed commutator**

$$[f, g]_{\pm} := fg \mp gf;$$

the upper sign applies to ‘bosonic’ quantities f, g , and reproduces the ordinary commutator, $[f, g]_{+} = [f, g]$, while the lower sign applies to ‘fermionic’ quantities f, g , and reproduces the **anticommutator**

$$[f, g]_{-} = fg + gf.$$

Often, the anticommutator is written instead as $\{f, g\}$, which looks like a Poisson bracket, so that we don’t recommend this notation. In the theory of Lie superalgebras, the sign at the commutator is not written at all, since the context already determines the nature of the arguments, and hence implies which sign is implied.

To understand how anticommutators give rise to the $u(2)$ Lie algebra governing a spinning top, we impose the **canonical anticommutation relations** on operators a and $a^{*} = (a)^{*}$ in some Hilbert space

$$[a, a^{*}]_{-} = \hbar, \quad [a, a]_{-} = 0, \quad [a^{*}, a^{*}]_{-} = 0.$$

In particular we have $a^2 = (a^{*})^2 = 0$. The algebra \mathbb{E} spanned by $1, a$ and a^{*} is four-dimensional since these generators together with $aa^{*} - a^{*}a$ already span \mathbb{E} . Hence \mathbb{E} is isomorphic to the algebra of complex 2×2 -matrices; an explicit isomorphism is obtained by identifying a and a^{*} with the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively and $aa^{*} - a^{*}a$ with $i\sigma_3$. The Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} described by $1, a, a^{*}$ and $[a, a^{*}]$ is thus $u(2)$. Thus the anticommutation relation automatically produce the right Lie algebra for a spinning top, and $u(2)$ is the fermionic analogon of the oscillator algebra $os(1)$.

¹To see how this leads to the vast mathematical area of superalgebras and supergeometry we refer the interested reader to for example VARADARAJAN [252], SCHEUNERT [221], TUYNMAN [245], DELIGNE et al. [72] and references.

We can get the same result more formally on the quantum level in a way which is completely analogous to the bosonic case, by considering an arbitrary unitary representations of the canonical anticommutation relations, i.e., for linear operators a and a^* satisfying these relations. We introduce the operator

$$n := \hbar^{-1} a^* a,$$

and we let $\psi \in V_\lambda$ for some Verma module V_λ ; as in Section 14.3, this means $n\psi = \lambda\psi$. We obtain

$$na\psi = \hbar^{-1} a^* a a\psi = 0,$$

and hence $a\psi \in V_0$. Further,

$$na^*\psi = \hbar^{-1} a^* a a^*\psi = a^*\psi,$$

and therefore $a^*\psi \in V_1$. To compute λ we proceed

$$\hbar^2 n^2 \psi = a^* a a^* a \psi = \hbar a^* a \psi = \hbar^2 n \psi$$

and hence $\lambda^2 - \lambda = 0$, from which we deduce $\lambda = 0, 1$. Thus we have arrived at the remarkable conclusion that the canonical anticommutation relations lead to two-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

We take a basis vector $|0\rangle$ in V_0 and we define $|1\rangle = a^*|0\rangle$. The Lie $*$ -algebra \mathbb{L} acts on the space spanned by $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, which is isomorphic to \mathbb{C}^2 . This representation is called the **Pauli representation**. In the above we have thus shown that the Pauli representation is the unique irreducible unitary representation of the canonical anticommutation relations. This is the fermionic analogue of the Stone–von Neumann theorem.

In analogy with the boson case, the representation space \mathbb{C}^2 is called the **single mode fermion Fock space**.

We shall see in Section 15.5 that the irreducible representations of $su(2)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the (finite) dimension of the representation space. For historical reasons, this dimension is usually denoted by $2j + 1$, and j is called the **spin** of the representation. Clearly, the spin j is half a nonnegative integer. In particular, the single mode fermionic Fock space has dimension 2 and hence spin $j = 1/2$.

In general, cf. Section 10.5, elementary particles are associated with an irreducible representation of the Poincaré algebra (or in the nonrelativistic limit the Galileo algebra), which is characterized by mass and spin. The spin assignment in these representations is such that, in the massive case, the restriction to a center of mass frame at a fixed time gives an irreducible representation of the Lie algebra $so(3) = su(2)$ of the same spin. (The massless case is not related to $u(2)$.)

Elementary particles of integral spin (bosons) are represented by a bosonic Fock space, those of nonintegral spin (fermions) by a fermionic Fock space. This fact is a consequence of the so-called **spin-statistics theorem** which holds under certain causality assumptions related to Poincaré invariance of a field theory. Fermionic particles obey the Pauli exclusion principle (PAULI [189], SCHWINGER [225], STREATER [237]).

15.2 Extension to many degrees of freedom

Suppose that the algebra of linear operators on some vector space \mathbb{H} contains, for some linearly ordered set² M of labels, quantities a_j and a_j^* ($j \in M$) satisfying the relations

$$[a_j, a_k]_{\pm} = [a_j^*, a_k^*]_{\pm} = 0, \quad [a_j, a_k^*]_{\pm} = \delta_{jk}, \quad (j, k \in M). \quad (15.1)$$

For the upper sign (the bosonic case), these are just the canonical commutation relations defining a Heisenberg algebra corresponding to harmonic oscillators with finitely many degrees of freedom. For the lower sign (the fermionic case), the relations (15.1) generalize the canonical anticommutation relations which we have met for the spinning top; we thus expect to get an analogue of the spinning top with n degrees of freedom.

In this section, we consider the fermionic case. We first assume that we have a unitary faithful representation and deduce enough properties that determine the representation uniquely. Then we use the properties deduced to construct the representation.

The canonical anticommutation relations imply that

$$a_j a_k = -a_k a_j, \quad a_j^* a_k^* = -a_k^* a_j^*, \quad a_j a_k^* = \delta_{jk} - a_k^* a_j, \quad (15.2)$$

and again we have in particular $a_j^2 = (a_j^*)^2 = 0$. To find the unitary representations of physical interest, we assume – in analogy to the bosonic case of the canonical commutation relations – the existence of a nonzero vector ψ_0 , the **ground state**, such that

$$a_j \psi_0 = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in M. \quad (15.3)$$

We next define for any finite set $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ of distinct labels $j_1 < \dots < j_l$ from M the vectors

$$|J\rangle := |j_1 \dots j_l\rangle := a_{j_1}^* \cdots a_{j_l}^* \psi_0 \quad |\emptyset\rangle = \psi_0. \quad (15.4)$$

Since we want a faithful representation, we may assume that $|J\rangle \neq 0$. Indeed suppose $|J\rangle = 0$ for $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$, then acting on $|J\rangle$ with $a_{j_{l-1}} \cdots a_{j_1}$ we see that $a_{j_l}^*$ acts as 0. Because of (15.2), we have

$$a_j |J\rangle = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_j(J) |J \setminus \{j\}\rangle & \text{if } j \in J, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \notin J, \end{cases} \quad a_j^* |J\rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \in J, \\ \varepsilon_j(J) |J \cup \{j\}\rangle & \text{if } j \notin J, \end{cases} \quad (15.5)$$

where the sign $\varepsilon_j(J)$ is defined to be +1 if there is an even number of indices in J that are smaller than j and –1 otherwise.

15.2.1 Proposition. *We have the following identities:*

$$\varepsilon_j(J \setminus \{j\}) = \varepsilon_j(J) \quad \text{for } j \in J, \quad (15.6)$$

$$\varepsilon_j(J \cup \{j\}) = \varepsilon_j(J) \quad \text{for } j \notin J, \quad (15.7)$$

$$\varepsilon_j(J) \varepsilon_k(J \cup \{j\}) = -\varepsilon_k(J) \varepsilon_j(J \cup \{k\}) \quad \text{for } j, k \notin J, \quad j \neq k, \quad (15.8)$$

$$\varepsilon_j(J) \varepsilon_k(J \setminus \{j\}) = -\varepsilon_k(J) \varepsilon_j(J \setminus \{k\}) \quad \text{for } j, k \in J, \quad j \neq k, \quad (15.9)$$

$$\varepsilon_j(J) \varepsilon_k(J \cup \{j\}) = -\varepsilon_k(J) \varepsilon_j(J \setminus \{k\}) \quad \text{for } j \notin J, \quad k \in J. \quad (15.10)$$

²A set M is a linearly ordered if there is a binary relation \leq such that for all $m, n, p \in M$: (1) $m \leq m$, (2) $m \leq n$ and $n \leq m$ then $m = n$, (3) $m \leq n$ and $n \leq p$ then $m \leq p$, (4) either $m \leq n$ or $n \leq m$.

Proof. This is a straightforward consequence of the definition, taking into account when $\varepsilon_j(J)$ and $\varepsilon_k(J)$ change sign if an index is removed or added to J . \square

We define $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ to be the vector space spanned by the $|J\rangle$. By definition, $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ consists of the finite linear sums of the elements $|J\rangle$.

15.2.2 Proposition.

(i) The vectors $|J\rangle$ are linearly independent.

(ii) The vector space $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ is an irreducible representation space for the canonical anti-commutation relations.

Proof. (i) Suppose that we have $\sum_J c_J |J\rangle = 0$ with finitely many nonzero coefficients. and let $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ ($j_1 < \dots < j_l$) be a set of maximal size among the sets with $c_J \neq 0$. In view of (15.5), multiplication by $a_{j_l} \cdots a_{j_1}$ leaves as only nonzero term $\pm c_J |\emptyset\rangle = 0$. Since the ground state ψ_0 is nonzero, we conclude that $c_J = 0$, contradiction. Therefore, the vectors (15.4) are linearly independent and form a basis of $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$.

(ii) Equations (15.5) imply that a_j and a_j^* map $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ into itself. Irreducibility of the representations follows since the same argument used in (i) implies that any invariant subspace of $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ containing a nonzero element contains the ground state, hence all $|J\rangle$, and hence all elements of $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$. \square

Since the $|J\rangle$ form a basis of $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$, we may identify a vector $\psi \in \mathbb{F}_-(M)$ with the **fermion wave function** ψ defined on the finite subsets of M whose value at $J \subseteq M$ is the coefficient $\psi(J)$ in the basis expansion

$$\psi = \sum_{J \subseteq M} \psi(J) |J\rangle,$$

where the summation is over all finite subsets J of M . Note that only finitely many coefficients $\psi(J)$ are nonzero.

15.2.3 Proposition. Under the assumption (15.3), the anticommutation relations (15.2) imply that the linear operators

$$a(u) := \sum_{j \in M} u_j a_j, \quad a^*(u) := \sum_{j \in M} u_j a_j^*,$$

defined for all vectors u indexed by M which have only finitely many nonzero entries, act on fermion wave functions according to

$$(a(u)\psi)(J) = \sum_{j \notin J} \varepsilon_j(J) u_j \psi(J \cup \{j\}), \quad (a^*(u)\psi)(J) = \sum_{j \in J} \varepsilon_j(J) u_j \psi(J \setminus \{j\}). \quad (15.11)$$

Proof. We have

$$a_j \psi = \sum_J \psi(J) a_j |J\rangle = \sum_{J \ni j} \psi(J) \varepsilon_j(J) |J \setminus \{j\}\rangle = \sum_{J \not\ni j} \psi(J \cup \{j\}) \varepsilon_j(J \cup \{j\}) |J\rangle,$$

and using (15.7), we find

$$(a_j \psi)(J) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j \in J, \\ \varepsilon_j(J) \psi(J \cup \{j\}) & \text{if } j \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Taking linear combinations proves the first assertion. Similarly,

$$a_j^* \psi = \sum \psi(J) a_j^* |J\rangle = \sum_{J \ni j} \psi(J) \varepsilon_j(J) |J \cup \{j\}\rangle = \sum_{J \ni j} \psi(J \setminus \{j\}) \varepsilon_j(J \setminus \{j\}) |J\rangle.$$

Using (15.6), we find

$$(a_j^* \psi)(J) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_j(J) \psi(J \setminus \{j\}) & \text{if } j \in J, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Taking linear combinations proves the second assertion. \square

For a unitary representation, we need that a_j is the Hermitian conjugate of a_k^* , which is the case if and only if the $|J\rangle$ are orthonormal. Indeed, suppose $J \neq J'$, then we may assume there is $j \in J$ that is not in J' (else turn the role of J and J' around). But then $\langle J|J'\rangle = \langle J \setminus \{j\} | a_j | J'\rangle = 0$. Hence we may assume that $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ has the inner product

$$\phi^* \psi = \sum_J \overline{\phi(J)} \psi(J). \quad (15.12)$$

To show that unitary representations with the desired conjugation and anticommutation relations actually exist, we start with the space $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ of complex valued functions ψ defined on finite subsets of an arbitrary set M such that only finitely many values $\psi(J)$ are nonzero. Then (15.12) defines an inner product on $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$, and the completion $\overline{\mathbb{F}_-(M)}$ of $\mathbb{F}_-(M)$ in the associated norm is a Hilbert space, called the **fermion Fock space** over M .

For a concise formulation of the result, we use a slightly more abstract notation. We introduce the Euclidean space \mathbb{H} of vectors indexed by M with finite support, equipped with the bilinear form

$$u^T v := \sum_{k \in M} u_k v_k,$$

and write $\mathbb{F}_-\mathbb{H} := \overline{\mathbb{F}_-(M)}$. In applications to quantum field theory, \mathbb{H} becomes the infinite-dimensional single-particle Hilbert space, and the sums become integrals over momentum vectors, but the formulas below remain valid with an appropriate interpretation.

15.2.4 Theorem. *The relations (15.11) define two linear mappings a, a^* from \mathbb{H} to the algebra $\text{Lin } \mathbb{F}_-\mathbb{H}$, and we have*

$$(a(u))^* = a^*(\bar{u}), \quad (15.13)$$

$$a(u)a(v) + a(v)a(u) = 0, \quad a^*(u)a^*(v) + a^*(v)a^*(u) = 0, \quad (15.14)$$

$$a(u)a^*(v) + a^*(v)a(u) = u^T v. \quad (15.15)$$

In particular, taking for u, v vectors with a single nonzero entry, we find the canonical anticommutation relations (15.2).

Proof. From the definitions (15.11) and (15.12), we find

$$\phi^* a^*(\bar{u})\psi = \sum_J \overline{\phi(J)} \sum_{j \in J} \varepsilon_j(J) \bar{u}_j \psi(J \setminus \{j\}).$$

Renaming the $J \setminus \{j\}$ to J , we get in view of (15.6) and (15.7)

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^* a^*(\bar{u})\psi &= \sum_J \sum_{j \notin J} \varepsilon_j(J \cup \{j\}) \bar{u}_j \overline{\phi(J \cup \{j\})} \psi(J) \\ &= \sum_J \sum_{j \notin J} \varepsilon_j(J) \bar{u}_j \overline{\phi(J \cup \{j\})} \psi(J) = (a(u)\phi)^* \psi. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (15.13). To prove (15.14), we note that in view of (15.8),

$$\begin{aligned} (a(u)a(v)\psi)(J) &= \sum_{j \notin J} \sum_{k \notin J \cup \{j\}} \varepsilon_j(J) \varepsilon_k(J \cup \{j\}) u_j v_k \psi(J \cup \{j, k\}) \\ &= - \sum_{k \notin J} \sum_{j \notin J \cup \{k\}} \varepsilon_k(J) \varepsilon_j(J \cup \{k\}) u_j v_k \psi(J \cup \{j, k\}) \\ &= -(a(v)a(u)\psi)(J). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first formula in (15.14), and the second formula follows with (15.13). Finally, to prove (15.15), we note that

$$(a(u)a^*(v)\psi)(J) = \sum_{j \notin J} \sum_{k \in J \cup \{j\}} \varepsilon_j(J) \varepsilon_k(J \cup \{j\}) u_j v_k \psi(J \cup \{j\} \setminus \{k\}), \quad (15.16)$$

and

$$(a^*(v)a(u)\psi)(J) = \sum_{k \in J} \sum_{j \notin J \setminus \{k\}} \varepsilon_k(J) \varepsilon_j(J \setminus \{k\}) u_j v_k \psi(J \setminus \{k\} \cup \{j\}). \quad (15.17)$$

The sets of pairs (j, k) over which the summation in the two equations is taken, contain the pairs with $j \notin J, k \in J$, for which the signs are opposite by (15.10). Thus the corresponding terms in the sums cancel when the two equations are added. The remaining terms consist in (15.16) of the terms with $k = j \notin J$ and in (15.17) of the terms with $j = k \in J$; for the corresponding terms in the sums, all signs are +1. Therefore, adding the two equations results in

$$(a(u)a^*(v)\psi)(J) + (a^*(v)a(u)\psi)(J) = \sum_{j \notin J} u_j v_j \psi(J) + \sum_{k \in J} u_k v_k \psi(J) = u^T v \psi(J).$$

□

15.3 Exterior algebra representation

We now show another important realization of the anticommutation relations, equivalent to that of the preceding section but phrased in a different language familiar from differential geometry.

For any vector space \mathbb{H} we consider the tensor algebra $\bigoplus \mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{H} \oplus (\mathbb{H} \otimes \mathbb{H}) \dots$, which is an associative algebra with unity where multiplication is the tensor product. We define the ideal \mathbb{J}_{\mp} to be the ideal generated by the elements $v \otimes w \mp w \otimes v$ for $v, w \in \mathbb{H}$. The quotients

$$\mathbb{H}/\mathbb{J}_- = \bigvee \mathbb{H}, \quad \mathbb{H}/\mathbb{J}_+ = \bigwedge \mathbb{H},$$

that we obtain by dividing out by the ideals \mathbb{J}_{\mp} are equipped with a natural algebra structure, since we divided out by ideals. We call $\bigvee \mathbb{H}$ the **symmetric algebra** and $\bigwedge \mathbb{H}$ the **exterior algebra**. The product in the exterior algebra is written as $v \wedge w$ in place of vw , and is then called the **exterior product** or **wedge product**. The product \wedge satisfies the anticommutative law

$$v \wedge w = -w \wedge v$$

for any two vectors $v, w \in \mathbb{H}$, but not for general elements of $\bigwedge \mathbb{H}$; $u \wedge v \wedge w = w \wedge u \wedge v$.

The symmetric algebra leads to a representation of the canonical commutation relations (see Section 14.6); the exterior algebra to one of the canonical anticommutation relations.

We concentrate on the latter, and restrict to finite-dimensional vector spaces. If \mathbb{H} is a vector space of finite dimension n we may choose a basis e_1, \dots, e_n . Using the anticommutation relations one easily verifies that the exterior algebra $\bigwedge \mathbb{H}$ has a basis consisting of the elements

$$1; \quad e_i; \quad e_i \wedge e_j \quad (i < j); \quad e_i \wedge e_j \wedge e_k \quad (i < j < k); \quad \dots; \quad e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n,$$

making a total of 2^n basis vectors. Thus the dimension of $\bigwedge \mathbb{H}$ is 2^n . We now introduce operators a_k given by

$$a_k(\omega) = e_k \wedge \omega \quad \text{for } \omega \in \bigwedge \mathbb{H};$$

in particular, $a_k(1) = e_k$. Similarly we define operators a_k^* as follows: On elements of the form $\omega = e_k \wedge \omega'$ we put

$$a_k^*(\omega) = a_k^*(e_k \wedge \omega') = \omega'$$

and if we cannot write ω into the form $\omega = e_k \wedge \omega'$ we put

$$a_k^*(\omega) = 0.$$

We now show that we have

$$a_k a_l^* + a_l^* a_k = \delta_{kl}. \quad (15.18)$$

First we assume that we cannot write ω in the form $e_k \wedge \omega'$ and neither in the form $e_l \wedge \omega''$. In this case we have

$$a_k \circ a_l^*(\omega) + a_l^* \circ a_k(\omega) = a_l^*(e_k \wedge \omega) = \delta_{kl} \omega.$$

If we can write ω as $e_k \wedge \omega'$ but not as $e_l \wedge \omega''$ then we have $k \neq l$ and

$$a_k \circ a_l^*(\omega) + a_l^* \circ a_k(\omega) = a_l^* \circ a_k(e_k \wedge \omega') = 0.$$

If $k = l$ and $\omega = e_k \wedge \omega'$ we have

$$a_k \circ a_k^* + a_k^* \circ a_k(e_k \wedge \omega') = a_k \circ a_k^*(e_k \wedge \omega') = \omega.$$

In the last case, when $k \neq l$ but we can write $\omega = e_k \wedge e_l \wedge \omega'$ we have

$$a_k \circ a_l^*(\omega) = a_k a_l^*(-e_l \wedge e_k \omega') = 0$$

and

$$a_l^* \circ a_k(\omega) = a_l^* \circ a_k(e_k \wedge e_l \wedge \omega) = 0.$$

Putting it all together we indeed have (15.18).

15.4 Spin and metaplectic representation

In analogy to the bosonic case treated in Section 10.1, we now show that quadratic expressions in anticommuting operators a and a^* make up well-known finite-dimensional Lie algebras, in this case the orthogonal algebras $so(2n)$ and $so(2n+1)$.

The method of derivation is different however. It works for bosons and fermions simultaneously, with differences only in certain signs, and gives in the bosonic case a construction of the metaplectic representation of $sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and the central extension of $isp(2n, \mathbb{R})$. In the sequel, the upper signs apply for the bosonic case, and the lower signs apply for the fermionic case. We use coordinate-independent notation, so that the method can be taken over almost literally to the infinite-dimensional case.

We assume that we have a linear mapping $a : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ that assigns to each α from some vector space \mathbb{H} an element $a(\alpha)$ in an associative algebra \mathbb{E} with identity 1 such that

$$[a(\alpha), a(\beta)]_{\pm} = a(\alpha)a(\beta) \mp a(\beta)a(\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (15.19)$$

For example, with the standard generators a_k, a_k^* in a bosonic or fermionic Fock space, we can take

$$a(\alpha) = \sum_k (\alpha_k a_k + \alpha_{-k} a_k^*).$$

For the bosonic case, (15.19) means that the Lie algebra that is obtained by equipping \mathbb{E} with the commutator as Lie product, contains a central extension of a commutative algebra.

The ground state on \mathbb{E} is a positive linear functional $\langle \cdot \rangle$ that satisfies $\langle 1 \rangle = 1$. Linearity implies that there is a linear operator G satisfying

$$\langle a(\alpha)a(\beta) \rangle = \alpha^T G \beta;$$

(15.19) then implies that

$$a(\alpha)a(\beta) \mp a(\beta)a(\alpha) = \alpha^T J \beta.$$

where

$$J := G \mp G^T, \quad J^T = \mp J.$$

In Section 10.1, the bilinear form ω was represented by an antisymmetric nondegenerate $2n \times 2n$ -matrix. This is the most interesting case, although in the first part of the discussion below J can be degenerate.

Any quadratic expression in the a_k and a_k^* is a sum of terms of the form $a(\alpha)a(\beta)$; this is nothing else than the statement that any matrix is a sum of matrices of the form $M = mn^T$ for some vectors m and n . We define the quadratic expression³

$$N(\alpha\beta^T) := \frac{1}{2} \left(a(\alpha)a(\beta) - \alpha^T G \beta \right).$$

and extend them by linearity (using a basis it is easy to see that the extension is unique and well-defined). We thus have $\langle N(f) \rangle = 0$ for all quadratic expressions f . We also have

$$a(\alpha)a(\beta) = 2N(\alpha\beta^T) + \text{tr}(G^T \alpha\beta^T).$$

Remember that in Section 10.1 we considered the symmetric combination $2E_{ij} = p_i q_j + q_j p_i$. Motivated by this we restrict our attention to $f = \sum_i \alpha_i \beta_i^T$ such that $f^T = \pm f$. For a single term $f = \alpha\beta^T = \pm f^T$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 2[N(f), a(\gamma)] &= a(\alpha)a(\beta)a(\gamma) - a(\gamma)a(\alpha)a(\beta) \\ &= \pm a(\alpha)a(\gamma)a(\beta) + a(\alpha)\beta^T J \gamma \mp a(\alpha)a(\gamma)a(\beta) - a(\beta)\gamma^T J \alpha \\ &= a(\alpha\beta^T J \gamma) - a(\beta\alpha^T J^T \gamma) \\ &= a(fJ\gamma - f^T J^T \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

so that by linearity,

$$[N(f), a(\gamma)] = N(f)a(\gamma) - a(\gamma)N(f) = a(fJ\gamma)$$

for $f = \pm f^T$. Similarly for $g = \gamma\delta^T = \pm g^T$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} 2[N(f), N(g)] &= [N(f), a(\gamma)]a(\delta) + a(\gamma)[N(f), a(\delta)] \\ &= a(fJ\gamma)a(\delta) + a(\gamma)a(fJ\delta) \\ &= 2N(fJ\gamma\delta^T) + \text{tr}(G^T fJ\gamma\delta^T) + 2N(\gamma(fJ\delta)^T) + \text{tr}(G^T \gamma(fJ\delta)^T) \\ &= 2N(fJg - gJf) + \text{tr}(G^T(fJg - gJf)), \end{aligned}$$

so that again by linearity,

$$\begin{aligned} [N(f), N(g)] &= N(fJg - gJf) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(G^T(fJg - gJf)) \\ &= N(fJg - gJf) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((G \pm G^T)fJg). \end{aligned}$$

Writing

$$(s, \alpha, f) = N(f) + a(\alpha) + s\mathbf{1},$$

we find for the bosonic case

$$[(s, \alpha, f), (s', \alpha', f')] = \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((G + G^T)fJf') + \alpha^T J \alpha', fJ\alpha' - f'J\alpha, fJf' - f'Jf \right)$$

³In infinite dimensions, this amounts to a renormalization step that is conventionally described as "subtracting infinite constants" arising at a later stage of the development. Our formulas are renormalized from the outset, and no infinite constants arise.

and for the fermionic case

$$[(s, \alpha, f), (s', \alpha', f')] = (S(f, f', \alpha, \alpha'), fJ\alpha' - f'J\alpha, fJf' - f'Jf + 2(\alpha\alpha'^T - \alpha'\alpha^T)) ,$$

where

$$S(f, f', \alpha, \alpha') = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left((G - G^T) f J f' \right) + \alpha^T J \alpha'.$$

Fermionic case. To exploit these formulas, we first focus on the fermionic case, and assume that J is nondegenerate; without loss of generality, we may choose J to be the $2n \times 2n$ identity matrix, $J = 1$.

We consider the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} defined by the quadratic elements modulo the constant term; that is, we factor out the center. We write (α, f) for the equivalence class of (s, α, f) . The quadratic expressions f are antisymmetric, $f^T = -f$, and thus correspond to $so(2n, \mathbb{C})$. Let us consider the map $u : \mathbb{L} \rightarrow sl(2n + 1, \mathbb{C})$ defined by

$$u : (\alpha, f) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} f & 2^{-1/2}\alpha \\ 2^{-1/2}\alpha^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The map u is injective and preserves the Lie product and thus is an isomorphism onto its image. The image under u of \mathbb{L} is the Lie algebra $so(2n + 1, \mathbb{C})$. It can easily be seen that matrices in the image satisfy

$$\begin{pmatrix} f & \alpha \\ \alpha^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \hat{J} + \hat{J} \begin{pmatrix} f & \alpha \\ \alpha^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad \hat{J} = \begin{pmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

since, for fermions, J is the $2n \times 2n$ identity matrix. Restricting this basis to the real numbers we obtain the real form $so(2n, 1)$. Summarizing, we have thus established that the quadratic elements (with center) form a central extension of $so(2n + 1, \mathbb{C})$. The purely quadratic expressions (no linear and constant terms) form the Lie algebra $so(2n, \mathbb{C})$. Note that the group $O(2n, \mathbb{C})$ is the automorphism group of the algebra defined by the relation

$$b_k b_l^* + b_l^* b_k = \delta_{kl}. \quad (15.20)$$

Going to the ‘real’ basis $a_k = b_k + b_k^*$, $a_k = i(b_k - b_k^*)$ we see that the real Lie group $O(2n)$ preserves the relations (15.20).

For a finite number of generators, the canonical anticommutation relations have a unique faithful unitary representation. Therefore as in Section 14.6 we can say something interesting about the automorphism group of the algebra defined by (15.20). Performing a rotation $b_k \mapsto b'_k := \sum g_{kl} b_l$ with $g = (g_{kl})$ an element of $SO(2n)$ on the generators b_k we get another representation of the canonical anticommutation relation, but since this representation is unique, there exists a unitary transformation $U(g)$ that relates the obtained representation with the original representation: $b'_k = U(g) b_k U(g)^{-1}$, where we simply wrote b_k for the representation of b_k . Again, $U(g)$ is not unique for a given g , since $-U(g)$ also does the job. In this way we get a double cover of the group $SO(2n)$, called the **spin group** $Spin(2n)$, just as in Section 14.6 we obtained the metaplectic cover.

Bosonic case. For the bosonic case we may proceed in an analogous way. Again, we assume that J is nondegenerate; this time, the normal form can be taken without loss of generality as an antisymmetric $2n \times 2n$ -matrix J that squares to -1 .

We again form the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} of inhomogeneous quadratic expressions and factor out the center. We then apply the map to the equivalence classes (α, f)

$$u : (\alpha, f) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} Jf & \alpha \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is clear that

$$(Jf)^T J + J(Jf) = -f^T + f = 0,$$

so that the map u is an isomorphism from \mathbb{L} to $isp(2n)$. We thus see that the inhomogeneous quadratic quantities form a central extension of the Lie algebra $isp(2n)$.

15.5 Spinor representations of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $SU(2)$

As a preparation for the construction of spin coherent states, we discuss the **spinor representations** of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$, see also STERNBERG [234]. By restricting to the unitary matrices we get unitary representations of the group $SU(2)$. As we shall see later in Section 16.3, these representations comprise all irreducible unitary representations of $SU(2)$.

Each complex 2×2 -matrix can be written as a complex linear sum of the Pauli matrices. We write (see also (1.23))

$$p \cdot \sigma_{\pm} = p_0 \sigma_0 \mp \mathbf{p} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (15.21)$$

where

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} p_0 \\ \mathbf{p} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{1,3} = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^3, \quad \sigma_{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_0 \\ \pm \boldsymbol{\sigma} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$. We note the formula

$$(p \cdot \sigma_-)(p \cdot \sigma_+) = p \cdot p \sigma_0 = \det(p \cdot \sigma_{\pm}) \sigma_0 \quad \text{for } p \in \mathbb{C}^{1,3},$$

where $p \cdot q$ is the $(+ - - -)$ Minkowski inner product

$$p \cdot q := p_0 q_0 - p_1 q_1 - p_2 q_2 - p_3 q_3.$$

We have

$$(p \cdot \sigma_{\pm})^* = \bar{p} \cdot \sigma_{\pm},$$

so that $p \cdot \sigma_{\pm}$ is Hermitian if and only if p is real-valued. Therefore we can identify the elements $p \cdot \sigma_{\pm}$ with $u(2)$;

$$u(2) = \{p \cdot \sigma_{\pm} \mid p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}\},$$

and letting p take complex values we get the whole of $gl(2, \mathbb{C})$. We obtain $su(2)$ for p real and $p_0 = 0$.

For $0 \leq s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ we denote with \mathbb{P}_s the space of all homogeneous polynomials of degree $2s$ in $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. The space \mathbb{P}_s has dimension $2s + 1$ since the monomials $z_1^k z_2^{2s-k}$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, 2s$) form a basis of \mathbb{P}_s . The group $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ of invertible complex 2×2 matrices acts on \mathbb{C}^2 in the natural way. On \mathbb{P}_s we get an induced representation of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ by means of the formula

$$(U(g)\psi)(z) := \psi(g^{-1}z) \quad \text{for } g \in GL(2, \mathbb{C}). \tag{15.22}$$

Then indeed $U(g)U(h)\psi(z) = U(h)h\psi(g^{-1}z) = \psi(h^{-1}g^{-1}z) = \psi((gh)^{-1}z) = U(gh)\psi(z)$. Taking infinitesimal group elements, we find that the Lie algebra $gl(2, \mathbb{C})$ acts on \mathbb{P}_s by means of the representation J defined by

$$(J(A)\psi)(z) = -(Az) \cdot \nabla\psi(z), \quad \text{for } A \in gl(2, \mathbb{C}). \tag{15.23}$$

The unitary case. By restricting in (15.21) to real-valued p , we represent $su(2)$. The resulting representation turns out to be unitary. To give \mathbb{P}_s the appropriate Hilbert space structure, we define on the unit disk

$$D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid z^*z \leq 1\}$$

of \mathbb{C}^2 the measure Dz by

$$\int Dz f(z^*, z) = \int_D dz^2 f(z^*, z). \tag{15.24}$$

Explicitly we thus have $Dz = dz_1 d\bar{z}_1 dz_2 d\bar{z}_2$, so that for example

$$\begin{aligned} \int Dz \bar{z}_1^k z_1^l \bar{z}_2^m z_2^n &= 4\pi^2 \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \int_{0 \leq x^2 + y^2 \leq 1} x^{2k+1} y^{2m+1} \\ &= \pi^2 \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} \int_{0 \leq s+t \leq 1} s^k t^m ds dt \\ &= \frac{\pi^2 k! m!}{(k+m+2)!} \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used

$$\int_0^1 x^a (1-x)^b dx = \frac{a! b!}{(a+b+1)!}.$$

15.5.1 Proposition. Dz is an $SU(2)$ invariant measure satisfying

$$\int Dz (z^*x)^{2s} (z^T y)^{2s} = \gamma_s (x^T y)^{2s}, \quad 0 \leq s \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}, \tag{15.25}$$

where

$$\gamma_s = \pi^2 / (2s+1)(2s+2). \tag{15.26}$$

Proof. Under a change of integration $z' = gz$ we have $dz'_1 d\bar{z}'_1 = \det g dz_1 d\bar{z}_1 = dz_1 d\bar{z}_1$. Hence if we use for $g \in SU(2)$ the substitution $z = gz'$, then the integral transforms in (15.25) into the same integral with $(x', y') = (\bar{U}x, Uy)$ in place of (x, y) . Thus it is invariant under $SU(2)$ and depends therefore only on $x^T y$. Indeed, we can always rotate x such that $x = (x_1, 0)$ and then clearly the right-hand side is a polynomial with terms $x_1^{2s} y_1^m y_2^{2s-m}$, which is only invariant under the diagonal $U(1)$ -subgroup if $m = 2s$. Hence the right-hand side of (15.25) is fixed up to the constant γ_s , which is found by looking at the special case $x = y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$:

$$\gamma_s = \int Dz (z_1^*)^{2s} z_1^{2s} = \int_D dz^2 |z_1|^{4s} = \frac{\pi^2 (2s)!}{(2s+2)!} = \frac{\pi^2}{(2s+1)(2s+2)}. \quad (15.27)$$

□

We make \mathbb{P}_s into a Hilbert space by giving it the inner product

$$\phi^* \psi = \langle \phi | \psi \rangle := \gamma_s^{-1} \int Dz \overline{\phi(z)} \psi(z). \quad (15.28)$$

We introduce the basis vectors $\pi_k^{(s)} = z_1^k z_2^{2s-k}$ for \mathbb{P}_s , in terms of which the inner product reads

$$\langle \pi_k^{(s)} | \pi_l^{(s)} \rangle = \frac{\delta_{kl}}{\binom{2s}{k}}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$, we define the **coherent state** $|x, s\rangle \in \mathbb{P}_s$ to be the functions

$$|x, s\rangle(z) = (x^* z)^{2s} = (\bar{x}_1 z_1 + \bar{x}_2 z_2)^{2s}. \quad (15.29)$$

Then we can restate (15.25) as

$$\langle x, s | y, s \rangle = (y^* x)^{2s} \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{C}^2. \quad (15.30)$$

In particular, the coherent state $|x, s\rangle$ is normalized to norm 1 if and only if x has norm 1. Directly from (15.29), we see that

$$|0, s\rangle = 0, \quad |\lambda x, s\rangle = \lambda^{2s} |x, s\rangle, \quad (15.31)$$

so that it suffices in principle to look at coherent states with x of norm 1. In particular, choosing the parametrization $x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ w \end{pmatrix}$ gives the traditional **spin coherent states** of RADCLIFFE [201]. For coherent states, (15.22) implies

$$U(g)|x, s\rangle = |g^{-1*}x, s\rangle \quad \text{for } g \in SL(2, \mathbb{C}), \quad (15.32)$$

Thus coherent states form a representation of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$; this is the **spinor representation** of $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$. We verify that we correctly have $U(g)U(h)|x, s\rangle = |g^{-1*}h^{-1*}x, s\rangle = |(gh)^{-1*}x, s\rangle = U(gh)|x, s\rangle$. One sees easily that only the subgroup $SU(2)$ is represented unitarily and we have

$$U(g)|x, s\rangle = |gx, s\rangle \quad \text{for } g \in SU(2).$$

Expanding $(x^*z)^{2s}$ using the binomial series we obtain

$$|x, s\rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{2s} \binom{2s}{m} \overline{\pi_m^{(s)}(x)} \pi_m^{(s)},$$

from which it follows

$$\pi_m^{(s)} = \gamma_s^{-1} \int_D Dx \pi_m^{(2s)}(x) |x, s\rangle,$$

so that the coherent states span \mathbb{P}_s . From (15.30) we find

$$\langle x, s | y, s \rangle = |y, s\rangle(x) \quad (15.33)$$

for all coherent states $|y, s\rangle$ and since these span \mathbb{P}_s , we have for all $\psi \in \mathbb{P}_s$

$$\langle x, s | \psi \rangle = \psi(x), \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathbb{P}_s.$$

In general, let \mathbb{H} be a Hilbert space of functions on some space Ω . Suppose we can write the evaluation map $ev_x : f \mapsto f(x)$ for all $x \in \Omega$ as $ev_x(f) = \langle g_x | f \rangle$ for some g_x in \mathbb{H} , then we say that \mathbb{H} has the **reproducing kernel property**. The space \mathbb{P}_s thus has the reproducing kernel property, which implies that we can reproduce elements as follows. For all $\phi \in \mathbb{P}_s$ we have

$$\langle \phi | \psi \rangle = \gamma_s^{-1} \int Dz \overline{\phi(z)} \psi(z) = \gamma_s^{-1} \int Dz \langle \phi | z, s \rangle \langle z, s | \psi \rangle, \quad (15.34)$$

from which it follows that we can reproduce ψ

$$\psi = \gamma_s^{-1} \int Dx \psi(x) |x, s\rangle \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathbb{P}_s. \quad (15.35)$$

Equation (15.35) implies the **completeness relation**

$$\gamma_s^{-1} \int Dz |z, s\rangle \langle z, s| = 1. \quad (15.36)$$

Thus all properties familiar from coherent states are valid.

We close this section by mentioning some further properties of spin coherent states. Because of the identity

$$|-x, s\rangle = (-1)^{2s} |x, s\rangle$$

fermions ($s \notin \mathbb{Z}$) are called **chiral**. The center of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is the group $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{-1, 1\}$ and the quotient $PSL(2, \mathbb{C}) = SL(2, \mathbb{C})/\{-1, 1\}$ is isomorphic to the **restricted Lorentz group** $SO(1, 3)^+$, which is defined to be the connected part of the group $SO(1, 3)$. In Section 15.6 we indicate why $SO(1, 3)^+ \cong PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$. Since fermions are chiral, they are not invariant under the \mathbb{Z}_2 -subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ and thus fermions do not constitute a representation of the restricted Lorentz group.

In quantum mechanics, an elementary particle with spin s is described by an element of the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{P}_s)$ of square integrable mappings from \mathbb{R}^3 to \mathbb{P}_s . The Hamiltonian for a particle with spin s in a magnetic field is given by

$$H = -\mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} = - \begin{pmatrix} B_3 & B_1 + iB_2 \\ B_1 - iB_2 & -B_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the action of σ is given by (15.23). The dynamics is described by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\dot{\psi} = H\psi.$$

Since H is an element of $su(2)$, equation (15.32) implies **temporal stability**, which means that if the initial wave function is a coherent state, then under the time evolution determined by H the wave function remains to be a coherent state. Since the norm of the wave function is invariant under the dynamics, too, one can work with normalized coherent states throughout.

15.6 The isomorphism $SO(3, 1)^+ \cong SL(2, \mathbb{C})/\mathbb{Z}_2$

We use the notation introduced in Section 15.5 and identify four-vectors $p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ with the 2×2 -matrices $p \cdot \sigma_+$. For any four-vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ the Minkowski norm is given by

$$\det(p \cdot \sigma_+) = p \cdot p.$$

The group $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ acts on $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ through

$$Ap \cdot \sigma_+ A^*, \quad \text{for } A \in SL(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

Clearly this defines for each $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ an element of $SO(3, 1)$, and hence we have a map $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow SO(3, 1)$. The group $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is a real connected manifold of dimension 6. Indeed, any complex 2×2 matrix has 4 complex entries making 8 real numbers. The constraint $\det A = 1$ gives two equations, for the real and imaginary part, and hence removing two dimensions.

Let us show that $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is connected. For $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ we can apply the Gram–Schmidt process to the column vectors of A . Looking at how the Gram–Schmidt procedure works, we see that any element of $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ can be written as a product of an upper triangular matrix N with positive entries on the diagonal and a unitary matrix $U \in U(2)$. We can write $U = e^{i\phi}U'$ with $U' \in SU(2)$ making clear that $U(2) \cong S^2 \times S^1$ so that $U(2)$ is connected and the matrix U can be smoothly connected to the identity. For N we may write

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$$

with $ac = 1$ and $a > 0$ and $c > 0$. Then $t \mapsto tN + (1-t)1_{2 \times 2}$ is a smooth path in $GL(2, \mathbb{C})$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ that connects the unit matrix to N . Dividing by the square root of the determinant gives the required path in $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. Hence $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is connected.

The map $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow SO(3, 1)$ is a smooth group homomorphism and thus any two points in the image can be joined by a smooth path. Hence the image is a connected subgroup of $SO(3, 1)$. Since the dimensions of $SO(3, 1)$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ are the same, the image contains an open connected neighborhood O of the identity (this is nothing more than the statement that the induced map $sl(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow so(3, 1)$ is an isomorphism). But the subgroup of $SO(3, 1)$

generated by a small open neighborhood of the identity is the connected component containing the identity. Indeed, call G' the group generated by the open neighborhood O . We may assume $O^{-1} := \{g^{-1}, g \in O\} = O$, since if not we just replace O by $O \cap O^{-1}$. If $x \in G'$ then $xO \subset G'$ is an open neighborhood containing x so that G' is open. If $x \notin G'$, then $xO \cap G' = \emptyset$, since if $y \in xO \cap G'$, then there is $z \in O$ such that $xz = y$, but then $x = yz^{-1}$ lies in G' . Hence G' is an open and closed subgroup of the component that contains the identity, but then G' is the component that contains the identity.

Hence the map $SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow SO(3, 1)^+$ is surjective and we only have to check the kernel. An element A is in the kernel if and only if $Ap \cdot \sigma_+ A^* = p \cdot \sigma_+$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. This is a linear equation in p so we may as well take $p \in \mathbb{C}^{1,3}$. Choosing $p \cdot \sigma_+ = \sigma_1 + i\sigma_2$ and writing

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

we find $a\bar{b} = 0$, $a\bar{d} = 1$ and $|c| = 0$. Hence $b = c = 0$ and $a\bar{d} = 1$. But since $\det A = 1$ we have $ad = 1$ so that $a^2 = 1$ giving $a = \pm 1$. The kernel is therefore the normal subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{1, -1\}$.

Chapter 16

Highest weight representations

This chapter discusses highest weight representations, providing tools for classifying many irreducible representations of interest. We extend the ladder technique used in Section 14.3 for determining the unitary representations of the oscillator algebra to some other small Lie algebras of interest, and indicate how the ideas generalize further.

The basic ingredient is a triangular decomposition, which exists for all finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras, but also in other cases of interest such as the oscillator algebra, the Heisenberg algebra with the harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian adjoined.

We look at detail at 4-dimensional Lie algebras with a nontrivial triangular decomposition (among them the oscillator algebra and $so(3)$), which behave almost like the oscillator algebra. As a result, the analysis leading to Fock spaces generalizes without problems, and we are able to classify all irreducible unitary representations of the rotation group. Various related material concerning $SO(3)$ and its universal covering group $SU(2)$ is also included.

16.1 Triangular decompositions

Let \mathbb{L} be a Lie $*$ -algebra. A **triangular decomposition** of \mathbb{L} consists of Lie subalgebras \mathbb{L}_- , \mathbb{L}_0 and \mathbb{L}_+ of \mathbb{L} satisfying the properties¹

$$(T1) \quad \mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_- \oplus \mathbb{L}_0 \oplus \mathbb{L}_+,$$

$$(T2) \quad \mathbb{L}_0 \cap \mathbb{L}_\pm \subseteq \mathbb{L}_\pm,$$

$$(T3) \quad \mathbb{L}_0^* = \mathbb{L}_0, \quad \mathbb{L}_\pm^* = \mathbb{L}_{\mp},$$

$$(T4) \quad \mathbb{L}_0 \text{ is abelian and contains the center } Z(\mathbb{L}).$$

¹Note that the present concept of a triangular decomposition is less demanding and hence more general than in the treatment by MOODY & PIANZOLA [173]. Their additional restrictions allow them to extend much of the finite-dimensional semisimple theory outlined below to the infinite-dimensional case.

Triangular decompositions generalize the properties of annihilation and creation operators in the oscillator algebra $os(1)$ to more general Lie algebras. The terminology derives from the following motivating examples.

16.1.1 Examples. (i) In the Lie algebra $\mathbb{L} = gl(n, \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, we can define a triangular decomposition by defining \mathbb{L}_0 to be the Lie subalgebra of diagonal matrices, \mathbb{L}_+ to be the Lie subalgebra of strictly upper triangular matrices, and \mathbb{L}_- to be the Lie subalgebra of strictly lower triangular matrices. Verification of the axioms is straightforward.

(ii) The oscillator algebra $os(1)$ has a triangular decomposition, given by

$$\mathbb{L}_- = \mathbb{C}a, \quad \mathbb{L}_0 = \mathbb{C}1 + \mathbb{C}n, \quad \mathbb{L}_+ = \mathbb{C}a^*.$$

A **triangulated Lie algebra** is a Lie $*$ -algebra with a distinguished triangular decomposition. We call the number $\text{rk } \mathbb{L} := \dim \mathbb{L}_0 / Z(\mathbb{L})$ the **rank**, and $\text{deg } \mathbb{L} := \dim \mathbb{L}_\pm$ the **degree** of the triangulated Lie algebra \mathbb{L} . The elements of the dual space² \mathbb{L}'_0 are called **weights**. A **highest weight representation** is a representation J of \mathbb{L} on a vector space \mathbb{V} with a distinguished element 1 , called the **ground state**³, such that

(HW1) $J(\alpha)1 = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{L}_-$, and

(HW2) $J(\alpha)1 \in \mathbb{C}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{L}_0$.

The elements of \mathbb{L}_- thus behave like annihilation operators. The defining properties imply that

$$w(\alpha) := J(\alpha)1, \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbb{L}_0,$$

defines a weight $w \in \mathbb{L}'_0$, called the **highest weight** of the representation. A highest weight representation is irreducible if and only if the elements $a_1^* \dots a_k^* 1$ with $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{L}_-$ span a dense subspace of \mathbb{V} . In an irreducible highest weight representation with highest weight w , all Casimir elements C of \mathbb{L} have a fixed value $C(w) \in \mathbb{C}$.

The **spectrum** of \mathbb{L} is the set $\Sigma(\mathbb{L})$ of weights w for which a unitary group representation exists, whose associated infinitesimal representation is a highest weight representation of \mathbb{L} with highest weight w . The spectrum of \mathbb{L} determines the possible spectra of each Casimir element C in arbitrary unitary representations of the universal covering group of \mathbb{L} , since the possible eigenvalues are precisely the possible $C(w)$ where w ranges over the spectrum of \mathbb{L} .

Note that a weight w belongs to the spectrum of \mathbb{L} iff there is a unitary (cf. Definition 10.2.1) highest weight representation of \mathbb{L} with highest weight w . In this case, there is a Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{V} , and without loss of generality, the ground state 1 may be assumed to be normalized.

²Since in the context of $*$ -Lie algebras, the notation V^* for the dual of V is ambiguous, we use in this section a prime to indicate the dual.

³In a quantum field theory context, the ground state is referred to as the **vacuum**.

The semisimple case. There are many examples of triangulated Lie algebras, related to finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras (see the outline below) and to important classes of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras.

We mention without proof (which can be found in many places, e.g., FUCHS & SCHWEIGERT [84], FULTON & HARRIS [85], HUMPHREYS [117], JACOBSEN [121], KNAPP [137], KIRILLOV [134]) a number of facts about finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras.

All finite-dimensional semisimple real Lie algebras have a triangular decomposition, which is unique up to automorphisms. In this case, \mathbb{L}_0 is a Cartan subalgebra (a maximal abelian subalgebra generated by diagonal matrices in the adjoint representation, for some choice of basis), which is unique up to conjugation, and the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} decomposes as

$$\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathbb{L}_\alpha,$$

where $\Delta \subset \mathbb{L}'_0$ is the set of **roots**. The roots are nonzero elements of the dual of the Cartan subalgebra such that the Cartan subalgebra acts diagonally on \mathbb{L}_α :

$$h \triangleright x = \alpha(h)x, \quad h \in \mathbb{L}, \quad x \in \mathbb{L}_\alpha.$$

\mathbb{L}_α is always 1-dimensional; any nonzero element in \mathbb{L}_α is called a **root generator**. For each root $\alpha \in \Delta$ the negative $-\alpha$ is also a root: for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{L}^*$, if $\mathbb{L}_\alpha \neq 0$, then $\mathbb{L}_{-\alpha} \neq 0$. Therefore there exists a choice of ordering such that Δ can be written as the union of the set of positive roots Δ^+ and the set of negative roots Δ^- and $\Delta^- = -\Delta^+$, in such a way that the cone of nonnegative linear combinations from Δ^+ and Δ^- intersect in 0 only. One defines

$$\mathbb{L}_\pm = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^\pm} \mathbb{L}_\alpha,$$

and finds (using further properties of the roots) that the semisimple Lie algebra is a triangulated Lie algebra.

16.1.2 Example. Take $\mathbb{L} = sl(n, \mathbb{C})$, the Lie algebra of $n \times n$ matrices with trace zero. Let us we write E_{ij} for the matrix that is 1 on the (i, j) -entry and zero everywhere else. Then the diagonal matrices that have trace zero make up the Cartan subalgebra, which is thus spanned by the matrices $E_{ii} - E_{i+1, i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ so that the rank is $n - 1$. We have for $h = \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathbb{L}_0$ in the Cartan subalgebra and for E_{ij} with $i \neq j$

$$h \triangleright E_{ij} = (h_i - h_j)E_{ij}.$$

Hence the roots are of the form $\lambda_i - \lambda_j$ where λ_i reads off the i th diagonal entry of an element of the Cartan subalgebra. We can choose a root $\lambda_i - \lambda_j$ to be positive if $i < j$. Then \mathbb{L}_+ are the upper triangular matrices, and \mathbb{L}_- the lower triangular matrices. The positive root generators are E_{ij} with $i < j$.

Associated with each semisimple Lie algebra is a **weight lattice**, which is a discrete additive subgroup of \mathbb{L}'_0 and whose elements are called **integral weights**. Additionally, there is a

distinguished subset of the weight lattice, which is closed under addition and whose elements are called **dominant integral weights**. In terms of these:

- (i) For each weight w , there is a Lie representation with w as highest weight.
- (ii) A highest weight representation is finite-dimensional if and only if the highest weight is dominant and integral.
- (iii) For compact finite-dimensional Lie algebras, that is finite-dimensional Lie algebras with a negative definite Cartan–Killing form (these are automatically semisimple, see Lemma 10.6.1), a highest weight representation is unitary if and only if it is finite-dimensional. The inner product is then uniquely determined by the requirement that the ground state 1 is normalized.
- (iv) The Lie algebra induces a unitary representation of the universal covering group \mathbb{G} if and only if w is a dominant integral weight. Thus the spectrum of \mathbb{L} consists of all dominant integral weights of \mathbb{L} .

In the context of an integrable classical theory associated with \mathbb{L} , (iv) is equivalent to the **Bohr–Sommerfeld quantization condition**. (This folklore result is never stated in a precise form, but see, e.g., VOROS [253], KOCHETOV [138], and GADIYAR [86].)

16.2 Triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree one

We have seen that the oscillator algebra $os(1)$ has a triangular decomposition of rank and degree 1. A general triangulated $*$ -Lie algebra of rank and degree 1 with center \mathbb{C} must be the direct sum of the algebras

$$\mathbb{L}_- = \mathbb{C}a, \quad \mathbb{L}_+ = \mathbb{C}a^*, \quad \mathbb{L}_0 = \mathbb{C} + \mathbb{C}h,$$

where h is a fixed element in $\mathbb{L}_0 \setminus \mathbb{C}$. The center \mathbb{C} commutes with everything, but h in general does not, which is the case we consider here. Then we may rescale h to obtain

$$a \lrcorner h = ia.$$

The operation $*$ then gives

$$a^* \lrcorner h = -ia^*.$$

For the Lie product of a and a^* we introduce complex numbers u and v and write

$$a \lrcorner a^* = i(uh + v),$$

but noting that $(a \lrcorner a^*)^* = -a \lrcorner a^*$ we see that $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$. It is easy to check that for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ the Jacobi identities are fulfilled and hence for all real numbers u, v we have a Lie $*$ -algebra.

For the two-parameter family of Lie $*$ -algebras just defined there are essentially four different cases;

1. $u = v = 0$. This is the $*$ -Lie algebra $iso(2) \oplus \mathbb{C}$.
2. $u = 0, v = \pm 1$. If $u = 0$ we can rescale the a and a^* as $a \mapsto \lambda a$ and $a^* \mapsto \lambda^* a^*$ to get $v = \pm 1$. By complex conjugation of the algebra we then can choose the sign of v and we find the $*$ -Lie algebra $os(1)$. For the oscillator algebra we have $h \sim a^*a$.
3. $u = 1$ and $v = 0$. This $*$ -Lie algebra is $so(2, 1) \oplus \mathbb{C}$. If u and v are both nonzero, we can redefine h as $h \rightarrow \alpha h + \beta$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ to obtain this case or the next one.
4. $u = -1$ and $v = 0$. This is the $*$ -Lie algebra $so(3) \oplus \mathbb{C}$.

Note that the elements a and a^* are abstract vectors from the point of view of Lie algebras. That means that we cannot say that a^* is the conjugate of a ; it is only in Lie $*$ -algebras, in the $*$ -Poisson algebras and in their unitary representations that we can say that a^* is the Hermitian conjugate of a . It is for these reasons that we have treated case 3 and case 4 separately. In a unitary representation we have $J(f \lrcorner g) = \frac{i}{\hbar}(J(f)J(g) - J(g)J(f))$, so that $J(f)^* = J(f^*)$ makes sense.

As alluded before $so(2, 1)$ and $so(3)$ are isomorphic as complex Lie algebras. If we define in $so(2, 1)$ the elements $r = ia, s = ia^*$ we obtain the relations

$$h \lrcorner r = -ir, \quad h \lrcorner s = is, \quad r \lrcorner s = -a,$$

which defines case 4 of the list above: $so(3)$. However, the map from $so(2, 1)$ to $so(3)$ does not preserve the $*$ -operation, since $r^* = (ia)^* = -ia^* \neq s$. That means that $so(2, 1)$ and $so(3)$ are not isomorphic as Lie $*$ -algebras.

Among the triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree 1 listed above, the most interesting cases for both classical and quantum mechanics are $os(1)$ and $so(3) \oplus \mathbb{C}$. As we have seen, the oscillator algebra $os(1)$ is related to the harmonic oscillator. The algebra $so(3) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ involves infinitesimal ordinary rotations and arises when dealing with the spinning top, as explained in Chapter 14. The algebra $so(2, 1) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ is less prominent in classical mechanics although it arises in the analysis of the celestial 2-body problem. The algebra $so(2, 1) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ has important applications to exactly solvable problems in quantum mechanics, and even appears in so-called gauged supergravity theories.

16.3 Unitary representations of $SU(2)$ and $SO(3)$

We now discuss the unitary representations of the Lie groups $SU(2)$ and $SO(3)$. The method presented below is often encountered in quantum physics textbooks. In Section 16.4 we discuss the highest weight representations of triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree 1, which shows a great similarity with the discussion here.

Since the group $SU(2)$ is compact it has an invariant **Haar measure** $d\mu(g)$. Therefore we can integrate over the group in an invariant way; invariance of the Haar measure means

$\int f(hg)d\mu(g) = \int f(g)d\mu(g)$. If $SU(2)$ acts on a vector space V with an inner product \langle, \rangle_0 we can integrate over the group to get an invariant inner product;

$$\langle v, w \rangle = \int_{SU(2)} \langle g \cdot v, g \cdot w \rangle_0 d\mu(g),$$

where we denoted the action of $g \in SU(2)$ on $v \in V$ by $g \cdot v$. It is a direct consequence of the invariance of the Haar measure that the inner product \langle, \rangle is $SU(2)$ -invariant. Hence we have realized $SU(2)$ by unitary matrices; every representation of $SU(2)$ is equivalent to a unitary representation.

Since the group $SU(2)$ is compact and simply connected there is a one-to-one correspondence between the representations of the group and the representations of the Lie algebra $su(2) \cong so(3)$. The Lie algebra consists of antihermitian matrices but multiplying them by i we obtain Hermitian matrices and we may use the Pauli matrices to describe $su(2)$. Finding all representations of the Lie algebra $su(2)$ therefore gives all representations of $SU(2)$.

We put $t_i = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and define $L_{\pm} = (t_1 \pm it_2)$ and obtain a triangulated algebra with trivial center;

$$t_3 \triangleright L_{\pm} = \pm L_{\pm}, \quad L_+ \triangleright L_- = 2t_3.$$

In a unitary representation we require that t_3 is Hermitian and $L_{\pm}^* = L_{\mp}$. If v is an eigenvector of t_3 with eigenvalue α , then L_-v is an eigenvector of t_3 with eigenvalue $\alpha - 1$. For a finite-dimensional representation we cannot lower the eigenvalue forever and hence there exists a vector v with $L_-v = 0$.

Assume that we have $t_3v = \alpha v$ for some complex number α . Acting on v with L_+ we get vectors with eigenvalues $\alpha, \alpha + 1, \alpha + 2, \dots$. Again this series has to terminate. Thus, there is an eigenvector w with eigenvalue $\alpha + N$ that is annihilated by L_+ . Since t_3 is Hermitian, vectors with different eigenvalues are orthogonal and hence linearly independent. Thus the $N + 1$ vectors with eigenvalues $\alpha, \dots, \alpha + N$ form an irreducible representation. The trace of t_3 is zero, since $\text{tr } t_3 = -i \text{tr}(t_1t_2 - t_2t_1)$. But then the sum of the eigenvalues should vanish:

$$0 = \sum_{n=0}^N \alpha + n = (N + 1)\alpha + \frac{1}{2}N(N + 1) = \frac{1}{2}(N + 1)(2\alpha + N).$$

It follows that $\alpha = -N/2$. Therefore the eigenvalues are the integers $-\frac{N}{2}, -\frac{N}{2} + 1, \dots, \frac{N}{2} - 1, \frac{N}{2}$. Conversely, for all integers N we find a representation by giving vectors e_{α} with $-N/2 \leq \alpha \leq N/2$ and defining the action of t_3 and L_{\pm} by the above rules. We then recover t_1 and t_2 by $t_1 = \frac{1}{2}(L_+ + L_-)$ and $t_2 = \frac{1}{2i}(L_+ - L_-)$. We can thus label the finite-dimensional representations of $su(2)$ by half-integers $j = 0, 1/2, 1, 3/2, 2, \dots$. We denote them by D_j ; note that we have $j = N/2$. The dimension of the representation D_j is $2j + 1$ and the eigenvalues of t_3 are $-j, -j + 1, \dots, j - 1, j$. The Casimir J^2 defined by

$$J^2 = t_1t_1 + t_2t_2 + t_3t_3 = L_+L_- - t_3 + t_3t_3$$

has the value $j(j + 1)$ on the representation D_j since acting on the state v with eigenvalue $-j$

$$J^2v = (L_+L_- - t_3 + t_3t_3)v = (0 + j + j^2)v = j(j + 1)v.$$

The number j is called the spin of the representation. Clearly D_j is irreducible.

The representations that correspond to nonintegral j cannot be lifted to representations of $SO(3)$. Although the Lie algebras $su(2)$ and $so(3)$ are isomorphic, the groups $SO(3)$ and $SU(2)$ are not! As mentioned before, $SU(2)$ is the universal covering group of $SO(3)$. In fact, we have $SO(3) = SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$. That means that there is an action of \mathbb{Z}_2 on $SU(2)$, such that $SO(3)$ is the manifold $SU(2)$ with the points that are related by the \mathbb{Z}_2 -action identified. In Section 1.5 we gave details on how $SO(3)$ and $SU(2)$ are related by a 2-1 map $SU(2) \rightarrow SO(3)$. If a representation of $SU(2)$ is such that \mathbb{Z}_2 -related points have the same image under the representation we have a well-defined representation for $SO(3)$; this thus precisely corresponds to the \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant representations. It turns out that only the representations with integer l correspond to \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant representations. In physics, particles are represented by fields that take values in an $su(2)$ -representation. The representations D_j for $j = 1/2, 3/2, 5/2, \dots$ correspond to fermions and for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ to bosons.

16.4 Some unitary highest weight representations

For the quantum theory one considers the unitary highest weight representations. We investigate the unitary highest weight representations for the triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree 1 listed in Section 16.2. We thus look for a realization of operators a , a^* , h and 1 such that 1 acts as the identity, h acts diagonally and is Hermitian, a^* is the adjoint of a and the following relations hold (see (8.21) and Definition 10.2.1):

$$[a, h] = \hbar a, \quad [a^*, h] = -\hbar a^*, \quad [a, a^*] = \hbar(uh + v).$$

Furthermore, we assume there is a vector $|0\rangle$ with

$$a|0\rangle = 0, \quad h|0\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle.$$

By acting with a^* on $|0\rangle$ we obtain the other vectors in the representation. We define

$$|k\rangle = \frac{(\hbar a^*)^k}{k!} |0\rangle,$$

so that

$$a^*|k-1\rangle = \hbar k|k\rangle.$$

It follows that

$$h|k\rangle = \hbar(k + \alpha)|k\rangle.$$

We have $a|k\rangle = c_k|k-1\rangle$ and we want to determine c_k . Since $aa^* = [a, a^*] + a^*a$ we find

$$\hbar k c_k |k-1\rangle = aa^*|k-1\rangle = \hbar \left((uh + v) + (k-1)c_{k-1} \right) |k-1\rangle,$$

from which it follows

$$k c_k - (k-1)c_{k-1} = \hbar(uk + u\alpha + v),$$

which is solved by

$$\begin{aligned} kc_k &= 0 + (1c_1 - 0c_0) + (2c_2 - 1c_1) + \dots + (kc_k - (k-1)c_{k-1}) \\ &= \hbar k \left(\hbar \alpha u + v + \frac{1}{2} \hbar u (k+1) \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$a|k\rangle = \left(\alpha \hbar u + v + \frac{1}{2} \hbar u (k+1) \right) |k-1\rangle.$$

The vectors $|k\rangle$ are orthogonal, as in the case of the harmonic oscillator. So we suppose $\langle j|k\rangle = N_k \delta_{jk}$, and calculate $\langle j|a^*|k\rangle$ in two ways:

$$\langle j|a^*|k\rangle = (k+1)\langle j|k+1\rangle,$$

$$\langle j|a^*|k\rangle = (v + \bar{\alpha} \hbar u + \frac{1}{2} \hbar u (k+1)) \langle j-1|k\rangle.$$

Choosing $k = j - 1$ we find

$$j \hbar N_j = \left(v + u \hbar \bar{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} (j+1) u \hbar \right) N_{j-1}.$$

For a representation we require that $N_j \geq 0$ for all j . We may normalize $N_0 = 1$ and it follows that we must have $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. To have a faithful representation we need $|1\rangle \neq 0$ and thus $N_1 > 0$. We distinguish further two cases:

CASE 1: $u \geq 0$. By assumption ψ_0 is a nonzero vector and thus has a positive norm. But then all N_j are positive. Hence we find nonzero vectors for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. An example of this case is given by $so(2, 1)$, which is a noncompact Lie algebra. More generally, noncompact Lie algebras (defined by having a Cartan–Killing form that is not negative definite) do not admit a finite-dimensional unitary representation.

CASE 2: $u < 0$. In this case N_j can become negative, unless it becomes zero for some integer j_m . Thus $(j_m + 1) + 2(\bar{\alpha} + \frac{v}{\hbar u})$. In this case we thus have a finite-dimensional unitary representation for every integer $j_m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The dimension of the representation is $j_m + 1$. If $j_m = 0$ the vector $|1\rangle$ is already zero, and hence a^* operates as 0 in this representation. Therefore, if $j_m \geq 1$ the representations are faithful.

For the triangulated Lie algebras of rank and degree 1, there is a Casimir operator of the form $C = \hbar a^* a - q(h)$ for some quadratic $q(h)$. From Section 16.3 we know that $so(3)$ has the Casimir $J^2 = 2aa^* + h^2 + ih$. And for the algebra $os(1)$ the element $C = \hbar a^* a - h$ is a Casimir. For the harmonic oscillator we then have $C = 0$, since h is precisely $\hbar a^* a$. For $so(2, 1)$ this does not work; there is no analogue of the number operator with only integer eigenvalues. That is, the Lie algebra $so(2, 1)$ does not admit a discrete Casimir.

Chapter 17

Spectroscopy and spectra

This final chapter applies the Lie theoretic structure to the analysis of quantum spectra. After a short history of some aspects of spectroscopy, we look at the spectrum of bound systems of particles. We show how to obtain from a measured spectrum the spectrum of the associated Hamiltonian, and discuss qualitative results on vibrations (giving discrete spectra) and chemical reactions (giving continuous spectra) that come from the consideration of simple systems and the consideration of approximate symmetries. The latter are shown to result in a clustering of spectral values.

The structure of the clusters is determined by how the irreducible representations of a dynamical Lie algebra split when the algebra is reduced to a subalgebra of generating symmetries. The clustering can also occur in a hierarchical fashion with fine splitting and hyperfine splitting, corresponding to a chain of subgroups. As an example, we discuss the spectrum of the hydrogen atom.

17.1 Introduction and historical background

In this chapter we show some features of spectra and spectroscopy. In the preceding chapters we discussed properties of systems. The Hamiltonian of a system has a spectrum consisting of the eigenvalues, but in practice we don't see this spectrum, but the energy differences. One perturbs the system by shining light on it for example and then observes some response. The responses give rise to the observed spectrum, the study of which is spectroscopy.

To study the structure of molecules and atoms, we often rely on destructive methods. The destructive nature of the experiments in chemistry was taken as a primitive distinction between chemistry and physics. Nowadays the situation is different. In high-energy physics, one also shoots particles at each other such that the original particles are destroyed and energy is converted into the creation of other particles. On the other side, in chemistry new laser-techniques are used where molecules are kept intact, and information about the structure of the molecular bonds is obtained.

With spectroscopy one can study properties of materials and mixtures without destructing the sample. There are crudely speaking two kinds of spectra, relying on different experimental methods. An emission spectrum is obtained by putting a system in a state of high energy. The system then falls back to a state with lower energy, and the energy difference is emitted in the form of light. Of course, in order to emit light, the system needs to interact with light. The kind of interaction then dictates which transitions are possible and hence which frequencies are emitted. For the absorption spectrum one more or less does the converse. One puts a system into a beam of (nearly) white light. The system then absorbs light and re-emits it again, but then in all directions.

In the 19th century Kirchhoff used an invention of the German chemist Robert Bunsen to heat up elements in a flame to study the emitted light. He passed light through a prism to study the intensity of light at different wavelengths. It turned out that the emitted spectrum of an element had quite clearly defined lines at certain wavelengths. In 1859 Kirchhoff pointed out that all the elements that he had been studying had a different emission spectrum. Hence disentangling the lines of an emission spectrum can help in finding the components an unknown mixture is made of. Figure 17.1 gives as example an emission and an absorption spectrum of Helium.




Figure 17.1: The emission (upper) and absorption (lower) spectrum of Helium.

Already much earlier, Isaac Newton had used in 1670-1672 a prism to study the decomposition of white light into a spectrum of different colors. In 1814 Joseph von Fraunhofer invented the spectroscope and identified 574 dark lines in the light of the sun. In fact, the Fraunhofer experiment can already be done with primitive equipment. On a sunny, cloudless day one sits in a dark room with one little hole through which the sun shines. In the beam of sunlight one places a prism and lets the light after the prism fall onto a white piece of paper. The observed spectrum can be seen to display dark lines; in Figure 17.1 the lines corresponding to helium are displayed. The Fraunhofer lines are a manifestation of the absorption spectrum. It was Kirchhoff who later explained the origin; light from the sun has to pass the atmosphere of the sun. In the atmosphere the elements that are present absorb certain parts of sunlight, at well-defined frequencies and re-emit it later, but then in all directions. Therefore the sunlight going in the forward direction – that is, away from the core of the sun – has lost intensity at certain well-defined frequencies. In this way, Kirchhoff showed that the atmosphere of the sun contained among others hydrogen

and sodium. The reason why the sunlight is almost white before entering the atmosphere of the sun we will not explain. When the light of the sun reaches the earth it is already so diluted that the elements in the earths' atmosphere give almost unobservable absorption lines. Therefore, the dark lines in the spectrum of the sun are due to the suns' atmosphere and not the earths' atmosphere.

In 1868, the French astronomer Pierre-Jules-Cesar Janssen observed a line in the spectrum of the sun that did not match any element known by then. The reason he observed it and not Fraunhofer was because Janssen used the better observing circumstances that a solar eclipse offers. Normally, the sun is too bright, but when the moon blocks the solar disc, one sees solely the atmosphere of the sun. The astronomer Joseph Norman Lockyear concluded that the new line must represent a new element. They tossed the name helium, from the Greek word "helios", which means sun. It was not until 1895 that the physicist John William Strutt, Lord Rayleigh – or in short John Rayleigh – proved that helium is also present on earth; he found it in samples of the mineral cleveite. He exposed the mineral to some acids that reacted with the material thereby producing gasses. Then he studied the contents of the gas mixtures, and he found that helium was present. The reason why he found helium was explained later. Cleveite is a mineral that contains uranium. The element uranium is radio-active; it can emit α -particles, which are the nuclei of helium atoms.

17.2 Spectra of systems of particles

We distinguish two kinds of spectra:

1. The spectrum in the sense of spectroscopy is the collection of frequencies emitted or absorbed by the system in its interaction with light or other electromagnetic (infrared, radio, X-ray) radiation.
2. The spectrum of a physical system is the collection of allowed energy values – the set of eigenvalues of the associated Hamiltonian.

The relation between the two is as follows. The observed spectrum (of spectroscopy) consists of the energy differences of the system: the observed spectra are of the form $\hbar\omega_{mn} = E_m - E_n$, where the energy levels of the system are E_n . In most systems the spectrum is discrete. Hence also the observed spectrum is discrete.

For systems that are made of constituents that can break apart, the spectrum contains continuous parts. Consider for example a molecule of two atoms like H_2 . At a certain frequency the molecule can break apart. Then the energy of the photon can also be put into the kinetic energy of both H -atoms, which is a continuous parameter.

If the Hamiltonian has some imaginary eigenvalues λ , then $\text{Im } \lambda < 0$ and the modes corresponding to λ are decaying modes. In a dissipative environment this results in energy loss, and the system can move from higher energy to lower energy.

On the other hand, a system can also be excited. It then absorbs energy from the environment. A typical example of excitation is an atom interacting with light. The energy levels of the atom are discrete, and hence only with a fine-tuned frequency the atom can absorb

a photon and attain a state with more energy. The energy difference between the ground state and the state with the second lowest energy is called the energy gap. If a photon has the frequency with the energy corresponding to the energy gap, it can be absorbed by the atom and the atom can be excited to the state above the ground state.

An excited atom cannot move down to a state with lower energy due to energy conservation, unless there is no interaction with light. Incorporating interaction with light into the Hamiltonian makes the energies acquire a small imaginary part, representing the possibility to decay. If an atom jumps down in energy, it emits a photon with the same energy. This process is called spontaneous emission. The nice feature of spontaneous emission is that we can observe it.

The interaction with light is not just any arbitrary interaction. The interaction term V_{int} in the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{tot}} = H_{\text{atom}} + H_{\text{env}} + V_{\text{int}}$$

needs to respect some symmetries like Galilean invariance. The result is that not all transitions but only a selected set of transitions is allowed. The rules that dictate which transitions are allowed are therefore called **selection rules**.

The interaction is often treated as a perturbation. The justification is that the interaction term in the Hamiltonian is small compared to the other terms. One introduces a dimensionless variable λ and re-writes V_{int} as $V_{\text{int}}(\lambda) = \lambda V_{\text{int}}$. One recalculates the spectrum and expands it in λ to find

$$E_k(\lambda) = E_k(0) + \lambda \Delta E_k^1 + \lambda^2 \Delta E_k^2 + \dots$$

Since the interaction is small, the first order correction often gives the interaction with light accurately enough. Using the techniques of perturbation theory one then finds the possible transitions, i.e. the selection rules, and the probabilities of the transitions. The probabilities gives the dominance in the observed spectrum; if a transition A is more probable than a transition B this will result in more spontaneous emission along transition A. Therefore the peak in the spectrum corresponding to A is bigger than the peak corresponding to B.

Observed spectra are often displayed by plotting, as in Figure 17.2, on the horizontal axis the frequency and on the vertical axis the observed intensity. Due to imperfections in measuring methods one never observes a real peak, but always a smeared out peak, that is, peaks have a width. However, there can be many reasons why a peak has a certain width. Imagine for example that one measures the spontaneous emission of a gas contained in cylinder. The gas atoms are moving around in the cylinder, with different velocities with respect to the measuring device. For each atom the spectrum is shifted due to the Doppler effect, known from a similar effect with sound, which can be observed when an ambulance passes by. Since one measures the emission of a whole population of atoms, the measured peak is a superposition of peaks that are distributed around a certain frequency. That is, the Doppler effect broadens a peak.

Technical imperfections of the measuring device also broaden peaks. Making the measuring equipment more and more accurate one can try to get a better and better resolved spectrum.




Figure 17.2: An example of a spectrum.

Doing this one might see that broad peaks resolve into a group of smaller peaks. One sees therefore more structure.

The result of a measurement is a list of data, the frequencies ω_l . Using the data one wants to obtain information of the system under study. If one knows the system already quite well, for example if one knows the parametric form of the Hamiltonian but not the precise values of the parameters, one may fit the measured energies to obtain a set of parameters that describes the measurements best. One therefore has to solve a data analysis problem. For each label l one has to find energies $E_{k(l)}$ and $E_{j(l)}$ with

$$\omega_l \approx E_{j(l)} - E_{k(l)},$$

within the experimental accuracy. Therefore, one solves the least-squares problem of minimizing the sum

$$S(E, j, k) := \sum_l q_l \left(\frac{E_{j(l)} - E_{k(l)}}{\hbar \omega_l} - 1 \right)^2,$$

for some weight factors q_l related to the inverse of the accuracy of the measurement of ω_l .

In general, both the list E of energy levels E_i and the functions j, k which determine the **assignment** of spectroscopic lines to transitions are unknown, and must be determined by minimizing $S(E, j, k)$. Usually, one starts with a preliminary list E of energy levels, and assigns each line l to a transition which minimizes the l th term, breaking ties arbitrarily. This defines preliminary assignment functions j, k . Fixing these turns the problem of minimizing $S(E, j, k)$ into a least squares problem for finding the energy levels, resulting in an improved E . Clearly, each cycle decreases the value of $S(E, j, k)$. The process is stopped when the assignments no longer change. Then $S(E, j, k)$ has reached a local minimum. Multiple lists of trial energy levels may be used to increase the likelihood that the assignment found corresponds to a global minimum. Frequently, one first assigns a subset of lines to a subset of levels to find good starting values.




Figure 17.3: Harmonic oscillator potential, with the eigenvalues indicated.




Figure 17.4: On the left a double well potential with the first energy levels indicated. On the right the Morse potential; the bound states have discrete energy but above the dissociation energy the spectrum is continuous.

17.3 Examples of spectra

The geometry of the molecule or atom under consideration strongly influences the spectrum, since the geometry determines the potential.

Consider a molecule of two atoms. We assume that the excitations inside each atom are of another magnitude than the excitations of the bond between the atoms. In that case we may consider the molecule as two balls connected by a spring. The spectrum is as in Figure 17.3, and the observed spectrum consists of one peak.

Consider now a system that has two local minima. An example of this would be a molecule C_2H_4 of which two versions exist, the cis and trans molecules. The molecular bond between the two C -atoms then behaves around each local minimum as a harmonic oscillator in some approximation. For higher energies however the two states start to interact and the molecule can change from cis to trans and vice versa. A typical spectrum then looks like Figure 17.4.




Figure 17.5: Sketch of the potential a proton experiences in the force field of a nucleus.

When there are asymptotically free states, one says that the system admits **dissociation**. Free states have continuous kinetic energy and hence the spectrum contains continuous parts. A potential showing dissociation is the Morse potential given by

$$V(r) = \alpha(e^{-\beta r} - \gamma)^2 - \alpha\gamma^2, r \geq 0$$

where r is the atomic distance and α , β , and γ are positive parameters, see Figure 17.4. The potential of the H_2 molecule discussed above is another example. Above the dissociation energy the spectrum is continuous; the bound states have discrete energy.

Quantum physics has a remarkable feature compared to classical mechanics, called **tunneling**. If a particle is in a local minimum at energy E_1 and another minimum is available with energy level $E_0 < E_1$, then there is a nonzero probability that the particle ‘travels through the barrier’ and ends up in the local minimum with lower energy. For example, the potential of the C_2H_4 -molecule discussed above admits tunneling since the potential has two local minima. The probability of tunneling decreases with the height of the barrier between the two energy levels. Another example where tunneling occurs is in nuclear physics; the potential of Figure 17.5 represents the energy a proton feels in the potential field of a nucleus. The diameter of the nucleus is roughly the distance between the two peaks in Figure 17.5. The difference to the C_2H_4 -molecule is here that the tunneling takes place between two states one of which is not integrable. Tunneling can go in two different directions; one direction is where the proton is shot at the nucleus with too little energy to classically penetrate the nucleus, the other direction is where the proton is inside the nucleus and classically cannot get out. In the latter case, there is a certain probability that the proton escapes the nucleus. This explains qualitatively the stochastic behavior of radio-active decay.

As another example, consider a chemical reaction of the form $AB + C \rightarrow A + BC$, that is, the molecule AB splits off a part B that then attaches to C to form BC . Here there are




Figure 17.6: 2D-Plot of the potential experienced in a chemical reaction $AB + C \rightarrow A + BC$. The potential depends on the distances $|AB|$ and $|BC|$. The upper part shows a cross-section of the potential. The red marker is the saddle point.

two important parameters. The distance $|AB|$ between A and B and the distance $|BC|$ between B and C . A possible potential is plotted in Figure 17.6. The plot shows two valleys separated by a saddle point, marked by a red cross. The horizontal valley corresponds to $|BC|$ constant, hence to the state $A + BC$. The other valley corresponds to $AB + C$, and at the saddle point part B is exchanged.

17.4 Dynamical symmetries

As discussed before, when one looks at a poorly resolved spectrum, one sees some rough features of the system under study. Improving the resolution allows one to study more structure of the system.

A similar process happens when one studies a hydrogen atom in an external magnetic field. Upon increasing the magnetic field one sees that many lines of the original spectrum split into several close lines. Thus what first seems to be one state in fact turns out to be an agglomeration of different states. The states first had energies that were so close together that they could not be recognized as belonging to different states – indeed, they have exactly the same energy. As we shall see, that these states (seemingly) agglomerate to one single state is due to symmetry reasons.

The rotational symmetry implies that the energies of different states related by a rotation have the same energy; more pictorially, whether an electron circles around the proton with

the rotation axis in the z -direction or the y -direction gives the same energy. Turning on the magnetic field results in breaking the symmetry; then the different states that first agglomerated to form a single state are disentangled and can be observed separately in the spectrum.

But as with the increasing resolution, taking a closer look at the hydrogen atom reveals more and more structure. In a first approximation, the electron in the hydrogen atom can be treated nonrelativistically. Treating the electron relativistically, one gets a correction to the spectrum. The first order corrections of special relativity go under the name of the **first radiative corrections**.

We shall look in some detail at the hydrogen atom once we have clarified the general principles.

Symmetry and broken symmetry. The most symmetric physical systems, in particular the standard 2-body problems (the classical Kepler problem and the quantum hydrogen atom) are exactly solvable. The Helium atom is already a three-body problem and is not exactly solvable.

A physical system is called **exactly solvable** (or **integrable**, or **completely integrable**) if it has “enough” constants of motion. Equivalently, if the centralizer $C_{\mathbb{E}}(H)$ of the Hamiltonian H in the algebra \mathbb{E} of observables is “large enough”. The effect of having enough central elements is that the system has enough conserved quantities to explicitly solve the differential equations of the system.

A **dynamical algebra** of a classical physical system is a Lie algebra \mathbb{L} that one can associate to the system such that the Hamiltonian H is contained in the Lie–Poisson algebra $C^\infty(\mathbb{L}^*)$. For a quantum mechanical system the corresponding requirement is that H is contained in the closure of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$ of \mathbb{L} , equipped with a locally convex topology such that potentials of the form e^{-x^2} are allowed.

For example, the Heisenberg algebra $\mathfrak{h}(n)$ is the dynamical algebra of symplectic classical systems with n position degrees of freedom, and of traditional Schrödinger quantum mechanics. The hydrogen atom has additional rotational symmetry, and the special properties of the Coulomb potential imply that one can in fact find a fairly big dynamical algebra, namely $\mathfrak{so}(2, 4)$, see e.g. WYBOURNE [265].

Now consider any Lie algebra \mathbb{L} as a dynamical algebra. Call \mathbb{E} the Lie–Poisson algebra associated to \mathbb{L} for a classical case or the universal enveloping algebra of \mathbb{L} in the quantum case. The **symmetry algebra** is the centralizer of the Hamiltonian in \mathbb{E} , written $C_{\mathbb{E}}(H)$. In the ‘nicest’ case one has $\mathbb{E} = C_{\mathbb{E}}(H)$, which means that H is a Casimir of \mathbb{L} . Normally, the Lie algebra \mathbb{L} describes the symmetries of the (unperturbed) system and thus one would expect that the nicest case is the general case.

However, a very symmetric system is rarely studied in isolation, and realistic systems are at best perturbations of nice systems. In this case one gets broken symmetries, meaning that the Hamiltonian is only almost a Casimir. Note that it might happen that the classical theory has a symmetry, but that in the quantum version of the theory the symmetry gets

broken. In case of a broken symmetry, one usually first tries to solve the symmetric problem and then perturb the solutions to get approximate solutions to the problem with broken symmetry. We will not go into details about the mathematics of perturbation theory, since this topic is amply treated in every book on quantum mechanics. But we will consider some of its qualitative implications.

Suppose we have solved a symmetric problem. Then the solutions are described as elements of some Hilbert space \mathbb{H} on which \mathbb{L} acts unitarily. We can decompose the Hilbert space into a direct sum of eigenspaces of the Hamiltonian; $\mathbb{H} = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathbb{H}_{\lambda}$. Let ψ be some eigenstate in \mathbb{H}_{λ} of the Hamiltonian and let $f \in \mathbb{L}$, then we see

$$Hf\psi = [H, f]\psi + fH\psi = [H, f]\psi + \lambda f\psi.$$

Since $[f, H] = 0$ we see that \mathbb{L} maps each eigenspace into itself. Thus all \mathbb{H}_{λ} are \mathbb{L} -modules.

We call the eigenvalue λ **nondegenerate** if the dimension of \mathbb{H}_{λ} is 1, and **degenerate** if it is bigger than 1. (Dimension zero means that λ is not an eigenvalue.)

If λ is degenerate, \mathbb{H}_{λ} has many essentially distinct bases of eigenvectors of H . One of these is usually distinguished by the concrete representation used to describe the module; H and usually a distinguished part of \mathbb{L} act diagonally. In general the perturbed Hamiltonian no longer acts diagonally on \mathbb{H}_{λ} , and as a result the level λ usually splits into several distinct levels. The energy level λ splits into new levels that are of the form $\lambda + \epsilon_j$ for some different but small values ϵ_j , giving rise to a fine structure. In general, a fine structure implies that either a symmetry is broken (the system reached a nonsymmetric state) or an external force that broke the symmetry explicitly has been applied.

The induced representation of \mathbb{L} on V_{λ} is unitary. Therefore knowing the irreducible unitary representations of \mathbb{L} can give information about the system under study.

17.5 The hydrogen atom

A hydrogen atom is a bound state of a proton (the nucleus) and an electron. It is most easily described by treating the much heavier nucleus as fixed (which amounts to neglecting recoil effects) and considering the electron as moving in the electrostatic Coulomb field generated by the nucleus.

The electron is a spin 1/2 particle, a fermion, meaning that it is described by the spin 1/2 representation of $so(3)$ on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{P}_1) \cong L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{P}_1$ defined in Section 15.5. Below we first discuss the orbital part of the wave functions, i.e. the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ -part. Then we discuss the dynamical symmetries and how they get broken.

The orbital quantum states are labeled by integers n , l and m . The integer n takes the values $1, 2, 3, \dots$ and the number l takes for each fixed value of n the values $0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Finally, the number m takes for each l the values $-l, -l+1, \dots, l-1, l$. Hence the (orbital) state of an electron is described by a state

$$|n, m, l\rangle \quad \text{where} \quad n \geq 1, \quad 0 \leq l < n, \quad -l \leq m \leq l. \quad (17.1)$$

The **quantum number** n determines (to a first approximation) the energy of the state:

$$E_n = -\frac{13.6eV}{n^2}. \quad (17.2)$$

The abbreviation eV means electron Volt and is a unit for energy. The quantum number l specifies a representation of $so(3)$. Thus we can make use of the representation theory of $so(3)$ developed in Section 16.3.

The electrostatic potential of the hydrogen atom is $SO(3)$ -invariant, hence it is not too surprising that $SO(3)$ -representations plays a role; the orbital part of the electron wave function can be decomposed in representations of $SO(3)$. The quantum number l corresponds precisely to the irreducible representation D_l of $so(3)$, that is, precisely to the representations of $so(3)$ that lift to $SO(3)$ -representations. The quantum number m labels the σ_3 -eigenvectors of the representation and corresponds to the eigenvalue m . The quantum number n thus determines which $SO(3)$ -representations are allowed, and the l and m then specify the representation and an eigenvector in this representation.

Now we shortly describe the relation between the quantum numbers and the orbital wave function of the electron in the hydrogen atom. We can give the hydrogen atom a coordinate system as follows. We put the proton in the center and describe the position of the electron by a radial coordinate r measuring the distance between the proton and the electron and by two angles $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ and $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$. The solutions to the Schrödinger equation for the hydrogen atom are then given by

$$\psi(r, \theta, \phi) = R_{n,l}(r)Y_{l,m}(\theta, \phi).$$

The radial part of the wave function $R_{n,l}$ is completely determined by the quantum numbers n and l and is given by

$$R_{n,l} = C_{n,l}e^{-\rho/2}\rho^l L_{n-l-1}^{2l+1}(\rho).$$

Here $C_{n,l}$ is some constant such that $R_{n,l}$ is normalized to integrate to one, the $L_q^p(\rho)$ are generalized Laguerre polynomials (one of the well-known families of special functions); ρ is the normalized radius $\rho = \frac{2r}{na_0}$, and a_0 is a constant called the **Bohr radius**. The angular part $Y_{l,m}$ of the wave function is given by

$$Y_{l,m}(\theta, \phi) = K_{l,m}P_l^m(\cos \theta)e^{im\phi},$$

where the $K_{l,m}$ are normalization constants, and the P_l^m are the **associated Legendre polynomials** given by

$$P_l^m(x) = \frac{(-1)^m}{2^l l!} (1-x^2)^{m/2} \left(\frac{d}{dx} \right)^{l+m} (x^2-1)^l.$$

Symmetries and symmetry breaking. Nonrelativistically the electron in an electromagnetic field is treated with the **Pauli equation**. The Pauli equation looks like the Schrödinger equation, but has some extra terms, describing the coupling of a spin 1/2 particle to the electromagnetic field. We now indicate why, in the case where the external electromagnetic field is switched off, the symmetry group of the Hamiltonian is $SO(4) \times SO(3)$.

The second factor in the symmetry group, the $SO(3)$, is the symmetry group that acts on the spin of the electron. That is, it acts on the $D_{1/2}$ part of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes D_{1/2}$.

The first factor in the symmetry group, the $SO(4)$, acts on the space-part $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of the wave function. The Hamiltonian of the hydrogen atom is rotationally invariant. Infinitesimal rotations are generated by the angular momentum $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}$, where \mathbf{r} is the radius and \mathbf{p} is the linear momentum and hence the angular momentum components describe the Lie algebra $so(3)$. However, there exists an additional vector whose length is conserved: the length of the **Lenz–Runge vector**. (Some people call it the Laplace–Runge–Lenz vector, or even Laplace vector.) This leads to the bigger group $SO(4)$; see e.g. GOLDSTEIN [94].

To treat the electron relativistically one uses the Dirac equation for a spin 1/2 particle coupled to an electromagnetic field. The coupling to the electromagnetic field can be done in a quite easy way. Starting with the Dirac equation

$$(\hbar\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \partial + mc)\psi = 0$$

one simply replaces the derivatives with $\partial_\mu - iqA_\mu$ where the zeroth component of A gives the Coulomb potential and the spatial \mathbf{A} components contain the magnetic field via $B = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$; the parameter q is interpreted as the charge. We obtain

$$(\hbar\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \partial - iq\hbar\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot A + mc)\psi = 0,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot A = \gamma^\mu A_\mu$.

The effect of having the fully relativistic coupling terms is that there is a coupling between the spin of the electron and the orbital angular momentum of the electron. The additional coupling terms in the Hamiltonian are called **spin-orbit coupling** terms. Due to the coupling the separate $SO(3)$ of the spin gets destroyed; without coupling there is a rotational symmetry group acting separately on the orbit and on the spin and due to the coupling, the two rotational symmetries are no longer independent. The angular momentum \mathbf{L} and the spin \mathbf{S} are no longer separately conserved in magnitude, but $(\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S})^2$ is constant. The symmetry group of the relativistic hydrogen atom is therefore $SO(4)$. The spectrum that is observed is called the **fine structure spectrum**.

Going even further and treating the hydrogen atom with quantum field theory results in a further breakdown of the symmetry to the group $SO(3)$. The group $SO(4)$ is isomorphic¹ to $SO(3) \times SO(3)$ and corrections from quantum field theory break it down to the diagonal subgroup $SO(3)$. The observed spectrum is called the **hyperfine structure spectrum**.

17.6 Chains of subalgebras

In more realistic situations, the Hamiltonian is not invariant under the total dynamical algebra \mathbb{E} , the universal enveloping algebra of \mathbb{L} . In this case, the Hamiltonian is not in

¹This isomorphism is proved along the same lines displayed in Section 1.5; first one proves $so(4) \cong so(3) \oplus so(3)$ and then notes that $so(4)$ is connected.

the center of \mathbb{E} , but we can consider the centralizer of H in \mathbb{L} . The centralizer of H in \mathbb{L} is a subalgebra of \mathbb{L} , and is therefore a Lie subalgebra of \mathbb{E} and we denote it by \mathbb{L}_1 . We thus have $H \in C_{\mathbb{E}}(\mathbb{L}_1)$. The Lie subalgebra \mathbb{L}_1 generates a subalgebra of \mathbb{E} , which we denote by \mathbb{E}_1 .

In simple applications, it often happens that the Hamiltonian H is a function $H(C_0, C_1)$ where C_0 is a Casimir of \mathbb{L} (that is, it is a central element of \mathbb{E}) and where C_1 is a Casimir of \mathbb{L}_1 (in the center of \mathbb{E}_1). In more complicated applications we have a series of approximations to the problem, as explained for the hydrogen atom before, where relativistic and quantum field theory effects modify the Hamiltonian. In each step one modifies the Hamiltonian by adding terms with fewer and fewer symmetries, and the symmetry algebra is reduced to correspondingly smaller subalgebras. We thus have a sequence of subalgebras

$$\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}_0 \supseteq \mathbb{L}_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathbb{L}_n = \hat{\mathbb{L}}.$$

The final subalgebra $\hat{\mathbb{L}}$ commutes with H . The generated subalgebra of \mathbb{E} , denoted $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ centralizes H in \mathbb{E} . If the Hamiltonian is a function $H = H(C_0, \dots, C_n)$ where C_k is a Casimir of \mathbb{L}_k , the scheme gives explicitly solvable problems. For example, for the nonrelativistic hydrogen atom without spin, one finds a series

$$so(4) \supset so(3) \supset so(2) \supset 1.$$

Of course, there are many Hamiltonians that cannot be represented as functions of a chain of Casimirs, but the above scheme covers many applications, and is a starting point for a perturbative treatment of many others.

In classical symplectic mechanics one relates the Lie algebra $\hat{\mathbb{L}}$ to so-called **action variables** and the steps to \mathbb{L}_0 are constructed using conjugate **angle variables**. We will not go into the details defining variables and the related techniques.

Consider the situation where $H = H(C_0, C_1)$, that is, the simple application. We write $H = H_0 + H_1$ where H_0 is only a function of C_0 and H_1 depends on C_0 and C_1 . As before, we suppose we have realized the elements of \mathbb{E} (and thus of \mathbb{L}) as operators on some Hilbert space \mathbb{H} . We assume that the subspaces \mathbb{H}_λ on which the Hamiltonian $H_0 = H_0(C_0)$ acts diagonally are finite-dimensional. This is for example the case for the hydrogen atom. We furthermore split up \mathbb{H}_λ in irreducible representations of \mathbb{L}_0 so that we may assume that \mathbb{H}_λ is irreducible. Modifying H_0 to $H_0 + H_1$ means that the symmetry algebra becomes smaller; it becomes \mathbb{L}_1 . We can restrict the representation of \mathbb{L}_0 on \mathbb{H}_λ to the subalgebra \mathbb{L}_1 to obtain a representation of \mathbb{L}_1 . In most cases this representation is reducible and we write the decomposition of \mathbb{H}_λ into \mathbb{L}_1 irreducibles as

$$\mathbb{H}_\lambda = \bigoplus_{\mu} \mathbb{H}_{\mu}^{(1)}.$$

More generally, suppose we have a sequence of subalgebras $\mathbb{L}_0 \supset \mathbb{L}_1 \supset \dots \supset \mathbb{L}_n$ and related Casimirs $C_i \in Z(U(\mathbb{L}_i))$. It follows that the C_i commute among each other; C_1 is in the center of $U(\mathbb{L}_1)$, which contains $U(\mathbb{L}_k)$ for $k \geq 2$ and hence C_1 commutes with C_2, C_3 , and so on. Thus on the irreducible representations of \mathbb{L}_1 the Casimirs act diagonally. Hence we can assign to each representation of \mathbb{L}_n appearing in the decomposition of the original

representation \mathbb{H} numerical values $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n$, corresponding to the eigenvalues of the C_i . Given a physical state v in a representation of \mathbb{L}_n corresponding to the label $(\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n)$ we see that the Hamiltonian acts as

$$H(C_0, \dots, C_n)v = H(\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n)v,$$

where on the right-hand side the Hamiltonian is an operator and on the right hand side $H(\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n)$ is a number.

Branching rules. In a lot of favorable cases, for example when the \mathbb{L}_i are simple, the decomposition of an irreducible representation of the large algebra into irreducible representations of a maximal subalgebra is known. These decompositions go under the name of **branching rules**; splitting up a representation under a subgroup or subalgebra is called **branching**.

Let us give an example of a branching rule and look at the fundamental representation of $su(3)$, that is, the 3-dimensional representation of $su(3)$ that defines the Lie algebra $su(3)$. The Lie algebra elements are faithfully represented as 3×3 -matrices X that are antihermitian; $X^\dagger + X = 0$. Now we consider the Lie subalgebra $su(2)$. There are different ways we can embed $su(2)$ into $su(3)$, but it turns out that all of them are equivalent. We can always choose a basis e_1, e_2, e_3 in \mathbb{C}^3 such that $su(2)$ only acts nontrivially on the subspace spanned by e_1 and e_2 . We thus realize $su(2)$ inside $su(3)$ as the following matrices in $su(3)$

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ c & d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in su(2).$$

We see that the three-dimensional representation of $su(3)$ splits into two irreducible representations of $su(2)$, the trivial one, spanned by e_3 and the two-dimensional (fundamental) representation spanned e_1 and e_2 . One writes this in shorthand as: $\mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{2} + \mathbf{1}$ under $su(2) \subset su(3)$. In the reference SLANSKY [229], one can find tables of branching rules.

Clebsch–Gordan coefficients. In an important special case one can relate the branching rules to the so-called Clebsch–Gordan coefficients, which are widely used in physics.

Let us explain the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients for $su(2)$. Given two representation D_k and D_l (see Section 16.3), we can form the tensor product $D_k \otimes D_l$. An $su(2)$ -element x acts on $v \otimes w$ by mapping $v \otimes w$ to $x(v) \otimes w + v \otimes x(w)$, where we write $x(v)$ for the action of x on v . In general, the representation $D_k \otimes D_l$ is not irreducible, and we have

$$D_k \otimes D_l = D_{k+l} \oplus D_{k+l-2} \oplus \dots \oplus D_{|k-l|}.$$

The precise decomposition of a vector $v \otimes w$, where v and w are eigenvectors of σ_3 , into the irreducible components is given by the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients. For the vector in the D_k representation with σ_3 eigenvalue m and norm one we write $|k, m\rangle$. If the representation D_K is inside the tensor product of D_{k_1} and D_{k_2} , we can decompose any vector $|K, M\rangle$ as a sum of vectors of the form $|k_1, m_1\rangle \otimes |k_2, m_2\rangle$ and the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients are then

the coefficients in the decomposition

$$|K, M\rangle = \sum_{k_1, k_2, m_1, m_2} C_{k_1 k_2 m_1 m_2}^{KM} |k_1, m_1\rangle \otimes |k_2, m_2\rangle.$$

More generally, the Clebsch–Gordan decompositions say how the tensor product of two irreducible representations V_1 and V_2 of a compact Lie group (or its Lie algebra) decompose into irreducible representations W_i as $V_1 \otimes V_2 = \oplus_j W_j$. The Clebsch–Gordan coefficients are the numerical coefficients in the projection from one of the summands W_j to $V_1 \otimes V_2$.

Now suppose that $\mathbb{L}_0 = \mathbb{L}' \oplus \mathbb{L}'$ decomposes into two copies of the same Lie algebra \mathbb{L}' . An important choice of \mathbb{L}_1 is the diagonal Lie subalgebra given by elements of the form (a, a) with $a \in \mathbb{L}'$. Then as a Lie algebra $\mathbb{L}_1 \cong \mathbb{L}'$. The irreducible representations of \mathbb{L}_0 are given by tensor products of representations of \mathbb{L}_1 . Therefore, decomposing the irreducible representations of \mathbb{L}_0 with respect to $\hat{\mathbb{L}}_1$ amounts to giving the Clebsch–Gordan decompositions.

Much more could be said on the topic of symmetries and broken symmetries in physics. A nice overview is given in a paper by BIJKER [31]. It shows how the symmetry concept organizes not only the world of atoms and molecules that we considered here, but also that of elementary particles. The isospin symmetry between protons and neutrons has a symmetry group $SU(2)$, which extends to the flavor symmetry group $SU(3)$ for the three light quarks.

Quantum field theory, culminating in the standard model, is also based on symmetries, namely the space-time symmetries of the Poincaré group, and a gauge group $U(2) \otimes SU(3)$ which combines the broken symmetry group $U(2) = U(1) \otimes SU(2)$ of the weak interaction (of which only a diagonal subgroup $U(1)$ encoding the electromagnetic charge is unbroken) with the unbroken color symmetry group $U(3)$ of the strong interaction.

While these topics lie far beyond the scope of this book, the interested reader will take the next step and consult deeper work of others who studies this in depth. Our journey is finished.

References

- [1] A. Aartinez. *An introduction to semiclassical and microlocal analysis*. Springer, New York, 2002. [90]
- [2] G. Alberti and L. Ambrosio. A geometrical approach to monotone functions in \mathbb{R}^n . *Math. Z.*, 230:259–316, 1999. [76]
- [3] R.A. Alberty. Use of Legendre transforms in chemical thermodynamics (IUPAC technical report). *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 73:1349–1380, 2001. [76, 85]
- [4] A.D. Aleksandrov. Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it (in russian). *Leningrad State Univ. Ann. Math. Ser.*, 6:3–35, 1939. [76]
- [5] Y. Alhassid and R. D. Levine. Connection between the maximal entropy and the scattering theoretic analyses of collision processes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 18:89–116, 1978. [102]
- [6] A.E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian, and T.M. Nieuwenhuizen. The quantum measurement process: Lessons from an exactly solvable model. [147]
- [7] A.E. Allahverdyan and T.M. Nieuwenhuizen. Explanation of the Gibbs paradox within the framework of quantum thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. E*, 73:066119, 2006. [138]
- [8] Carl D. Anderson. -. *Science*, 76:238, 1933. [62]
- [9] Carl D. Anderson. Cosmic-ray positive and negative electrons. *Phys. Rev.*, 44:406–416, 1933. [62]
- [10] Carl D. Anderson. The positive electron. *Phys. Rev.*, 43:491–494, 1933. [62]
- [11] T. Andrews. The bakerian lecture: On the continuity of the gaseous and liquid states of matter. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London*, 159:575–590, 1869. [87]
- [12] V. I. Arnold. *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*. Springer Verlag, 1978,1989. [176, 188, 192]
- [13] V.I. Arnol'd. *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Springer, New York, 1989. [84]

- [14] Lawrence W. Baggett. *Functional Analysis, A primer*. Marcel Dekker, Inc, 1992. Pure and Applied Mathematics, A Program of Monographs, Textbooks and Lecture Notes. [167]
- [15] R. Balian. Incomplete descriptions and relevant entropies. *Amer. J. Phys.*, 67:1078–1090, 1999. [90, 102, 115, 140, 141, 143]
- [16] R. Balian. Information in statistical physics. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 36:323–353, 2005.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0501322>. [156]
- [17] R. Balian. *From Microphysics to Macrophysics: Methods and Applications of Statistical Physics, 2 Vols*. Springer, Berlin, 2007. [82, 136]
- [18] L. E. Ballentine. The statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 42:358–381, 1970. [133]
- [19] D. Bar-Moshe and M. S. Marinov. Berezin quantization and unitary representations of Lie groups, 1994.
<http://www.citebase.org/abstract?id=oai:arXiv.org:hep-th/9407093>. [258]
- [20] V. Bargmann. -. *Commun. Pure and Appl. Math.*, 14:187, 1961. [288]
- [21] V. Bargmann. -. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.*, 48:199, 1962. [288]
- [22] O. Barndorff-Nielsen. *Information and exponential families in statistical theory*. Wiley, Chichester, 1978. [118, 156, 158]
- [23] O.E Barndorff-Nielsen, R.D. Gill, and P.E. Jupp. On quantum statistical inference. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B*, 65:1–31, 2003.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0307191>. [118, 156]
- [24] G. Barton. *Introduction to advanced field theory*. Wiley Interscience, New York, 1963. [283]
- [25] A.O. Barut and R. Raczka. *Theory of group representations and applications*. World Scientific, 1986. [viii]
- [26] R. Battino, L.E. Strong, and S.E. Wood. A brief history of thermodynamics notation. *J. Chem. Education*, 74:304–305, 1997. [76]
- [27] F.A. Berezin. General concept of quantization. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 40:153–174, 1975. [258]
- [28] J. Berges. Introduction to nonequilibrium quantum field theory. volume 739, pages 3–62, 2004.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0409233>. [142]
- [29] A.N. Beris and B.J. Edwards. *Thermodynamics of flowing systems with internal microstructure*. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1994. [115, 136, 141, 197]

- [30] J.M. Bernardo and A.F.M. Smith. *Bayesian theory*. Wiley, Chichester, 1994. [118]
- [31] R. Bijker. Symmetries in physics. *arXiv*, pages nucl-th/0509007, 1995. [333]
- [32] J.M. Blatt. An alternative approach to the ergodic problem. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 22:745–756, 1959. [142]
- [33] N.N. Bogoliubov. On a variational principle in the problem of many bodies (in russian). *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 119:244–246, 1958. [104]
- [34] A. Böhm and M. Gadella. *Dirac kets, Gamow vectors, and Gel'fand triplets*. Springer, berlin, 1989. [279]
- [35] A.R. Bohm. Time asymmetry and quantum theory of resonances and decay. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 42:2317–2338, 2003. [63]
- [36] N. Bohr. On the constitution of atoms and molecules (part 1 of 3). *Philosophical Magazine*, 26:1–25, 1913. [60]
- [37] N. Bohr. On the constitution of atoms and molecules, part iii. *Philosophical Magazine*, 26:857–875, 1913. [60]
- [38] N. Bohr. On the constitution of atoms and molecules, partii, systems containing only a single nucleus. *Philosophical Magazine*, 26:476–502, 1913. [60]
- [39] N. Bohr. The spectra of helium and hydrogen. *Nature*, 92:231–232, 1914. [60]
- [40] L. Boltzmann. Ableitung des Stefan'schen Gesetzes, betreffend die Abhängigkeit der Wärmestrahlung von der Temperatur aus der electromagnetischen Lichttheorie. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie, Bd. 22*, 1884. [65]
- [41] Bonhoeffer and P. Harteck. Para- and ortho hydrogen. *Z. Physikalische Chemie B*, 4:113–141, 1929. [139]
- [42] M. Born and P. Jordan. Zur quantenmechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Band XXXIV:858–888, 1925. [60]
- [43] T. Bornath, D. Kremp, W.D. Kraeft, and M. Schlanges. Kinetic equations for a nonideal quantum system. *Phys. Rev. E*, 54:3274–3284, 1996. [141]
- [44] F.P. Bowden and L. Leben. The nature of sliding and the analysis of friction. *Proc. Royal Society London. Series A*, 169:371–391, 1939. [35, 84]
- [45] H Breuer and Petruccione. *The theory of open quantum systems*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002. [64]
- [46] L. Brillouin. *Science and Information Theory. 2nd ed.* Acad. Press, New York, 1962. [155]
- [47] R. Brown. *Philosophical magazine* **4** 161-173 (1828), and **6** 161-166 (1829). [35]

- [48] C. Bustamente, J. Liphardt, and F. Ritort. The nonequilibrium thermodynamics of small systems. *Physics Today*, 58:43–48, 2005.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0511629>. [122, 123]
- [49] H.B. Callen. *Thermodynamics and an introduction to thermostatistics*, 2nd. ed. Wiley, New York, 1985. [75, 109, 124, 134]
- [50] E. Calzetta and B.L. Hu. Nonequilibrium quantum fields: Closed-time-path effective action, wigner function, and boltzmann equation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 37:2878–2900, 1988. [141]
- [51] C. Carathéodory. Untersuchungen über die Grundlagen der Thermodynamik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 67:355–386, 1909. [118]
- [52] J. Casas-Vásquez and D. Jou. Temperature in non-equilibrium states: a review of open problems and current proposals. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 66:1937–2023, 2003. [81]
- [53] W.G. Chapman, K.E. Gubbins, G. Jackson, and M. Radosz. SAFT:equation-of-state solution model for associating fluids. *Fluid Phase Equilib.*, 52:31–38, 1989. [86]
- [54] W.G. Chapman, K.E. Gubbins, G. Jackson, and M. Radosz. New reference equation of state for associating liquids. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 29:1709–1721, 1990. [86]
- [55] O. Civitarese, P.O. Hess, and J.G. Hirsch. Low temperature S-shaped heat capacities in finite nuclei. *Rev. Mex.*, 50:406–411, 2004. [124]
- [56] E. Clapeyron. Mémoire sur la puissance motrice de la chaleur. *J. l'Ecole Polytechnique*, 14:153–190, 1834. [79]
- [57] R. Clausius. Über die bewegende kraft der Wärme und die Gesetze, welche sich daraus fr die wärmelehre selbst ableiten lassen. *Ann. Phys. Chemie*, 79:368–397 500–524, 1850. [82]
- [58] R. Clausius. Über verschiedene für die Anwendung bequeme Formen der Hauptgleichungen der mechanischen Wärmetheorie. *Pogg. Ann.*, 125:353–400, 1865. [82]
- [59] CODATA. Internationally recommended values of the fundamental physical constants. Technical report.
<http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Constants/>. [79]
- [60] J.F. Cornwell. *Group theory in physics, Volumes I and II*. Academic Press, 1984. [viii]
- [61] A.C. da Silva and A. Weinstein. *Geometric Models for Noncommutative Algebras, Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes 10*. Amer. Math. Soc., Berkeley, 1999. [239]
- [62] R. d’Inverno. *Introducing Einstein’s relativity*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon. [25]
- [63] P.A.M. Dirac. Note on exchange phenomena in the thomas-fermi atom. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 26:376–385, 1930. [254]

- [64] P.A.M. Dirac. *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Clarendon Press, 1st edition edition, 1930. [7, 55]
- [65] B. Duplantier. Brownian motion, "Diverse and Undulating". [arXiv.org:0705.1951](https://arxiv.org/abs/0705.1951), page 201, 2005. [35]
- [66] F.J. Dyson. Divergence of perturbation theory in quantum electrodynamics. *Phys. Rev.*, (85):613–632, 1952. [11]
- [67] B.J. Edwards, H.C. Öttinger, and R.J.J. Jongschaap. On the relationships between thermodynamic formalisms for complex fluids. *J. Non-Equilib. Thermodyn.*, 23:301–333, 1998. [141]
- [68] P. Ehrenfest and T. Ehrenfest. Begriffliche Grundlagen der statistischen Auffassung in der Mechanik. *Enzykl. Math. Wiss.*, 2, 1911. [133, 255]
- [69] A. Einstein. Zur Theorie der Brownschen Bewegung. *Ann. der Physik*, 19(180), 1906. [35]
- [70] R.S. Ellis. An overview of the theory of large deviations and applications to statistical mechanics. *Scand. Actuarial J*, 1:97–142, 1995. [122]
- [71] G.G. Emch and C. Liu. *The Logic of thermostistical physics*. Springer, Berlin, 2001. [118]
- [72] Deligne et al., editor. *Quantum fields and strings: A course for mathematicians*. AMS, 1999. [294]
- [73] M. Brune et al. Observing the progressive decoherence of the "meter" in a quantum measurement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77:4887–4890, 1996. [142]
- [74] G.L. Eyink and H. Spohn. Negative-temperature states and large-scale, long-lived vortices in two-dimensional turbulence. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 70:833–886, 1993. [120]
- [75] J. Faraut and A. Korányi. *Analysis on symmetric cones*. Clarendon, Oxford, 1994. [286]
- [76] A. Farkas. *Orthohydrogen and Parahydrogen and Heavy Hydrogen*. Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1935. [139]
- [77] D. R. Farkas and G. Letzter. Ring theory from symplectic geometry. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 125, pages 155–190, 1998. [185]
- [78] T.L. Fine. *Theory of probability; an examination of foundations*. Acad. Press, New York, 1973. [133]
- [79] D. Forster. *Hydrodynamic fluctuations, broken symmetry, and correlation functions*. Benjamin, Reading, Mass., 1975. [87]
- [80] R.H. Fowler and E.A. Guggenheim. *Statistical thermodynamics*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1939. [80]

- [81] Theodore Frankel. *The Geometry of Physics*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition edition, 2003. ISBN 0521539277. [209]
- [82] I.I. Frenkel. *Wave Mechanics, Advanced General Theory*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1934. pp. 253, 436. [254]
- [83] H.U. Fuchs. *The dynamics of heat*. Springer, New York, 1996. [89]
- [84] J. Fuchs and C. Schweigert. *Symmetries, Lie algebras and representations, A graduate course for physicists*. Cambridge University Press, 1997. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. [viii, 206, 313]
- [85] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation Theory: A First Course*. Springer Verlag, 2004. Graduate Texts in Mathematics / Readings in Mathematics. [212, 313]
- [86] H. Gopalkrishna Gadiyar. A fresh look at the bohr-rosenfeld analysis and a proof of a conjecture of heisenberg. *arXiv*, hep-th:0104256, 2001. [314]
- [87] J. L. Garcia-Palacios. Introduction to the theory of stochastic processes and Brownian motion problems. 2007.
<http://www.citebase.org/abstract?id=oai:arXiv.org:cond-mat/0701242>. [35]
- [88] C.W. Gardiner. *Handbook of stochastic methods*. Springer, 2004. [64]
- [89] I.M. Gelfand and M.A. Naimark. On the imbedding of normed rings into the ring of operators in hilbert spaces (in Russian). *Mat Sbornik*, 12:197–213, 1943. [146]
- [90] J.W. Gibbs. *Elementary Principles in Statistical Mechanics*. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1902. Reprinted, Dover 1960. [6, 101, 102, 104, 123]
- [91] R. Gilmore. Uncertainty relations of statistical mechanics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31:3237–3239, 1985. [127]
- [92] Robert Gilmore. *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications*. Dover Publications, 2006. [viii, 214]
- [93] Roy J. Glauber. Coherent and incoherent states of the radiation field. *Physical Review*, 131(6):2766–2788, 1963. [284, 288]
- [94] Herbert Goldstein. *Classical Mechanics*. Addison–Wesley, 2nd edition edition, 1980 (first edition 1950). ISBN-10: 0201029189. [188, 192, 330]
- [95] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E.C.G. Sudarshan. Completely positive dynamical semigroups of N -level systems. *J. Math. Phys.*, 17:821–825, 1976. [142]
- [96] M.J. Gotay, H.B. Grundling, and G.M. Tuynman. Obstruction results in quantization theory. *J. Nonlinear Science*, 6:469–498, 1996. [261]
- [97] H. Grabert. *Projection Operator Techniques in Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics*. Springer Tracts in Modern Physics, Berlin, 1982. [82, 115, 141]

- [98] H. Grad. The many faces of entropy. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 14:323–354, 1961. [139, 143]
- [99] David J. Griffiths. *Introduction to quantum mechanics*. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1995. ISBN 0-13-124405-1. [289]
- [100] R.B. Griffiths. A proof that the free energy of a spin system is extensive. *J. Math. Phys.*, 5:1215–1222, 1964. [104, 122]
- [101] H.J. Groenewold. On the principles of elementary quantum mechanics. *Physica*, 12:405–460, 1946. [261]
- [102] D.H.E. Gross. Phase transitions in "small" systems – a challenge for thermodynamics. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 681:366–373, 2001. [122, 123]
- [103] H-Geiger and E. Marsden. On a diffuse reflection of the α -particles. *On a Diffuse Reflection of the α -Particles*, Series A 82:95500, 1909. [59]
- [104] I. Hacking. *The emergence of probability*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1975. [133]
- [105] E. L. Hahn. Spin echoes. *Phys. Rev.*, 80:580–594, 1950. [139]
- [106] E. L. Hahn. Free nuclear induction. *Physics Today*, 6:4–9, 1953. [139]
- [107] H. Haken. *An introduction*. Springer, Berlin, 1978. [118]
- [108] P. Hanggi and F. Marchesoni. 100 years of Brownian motion. 2005. <http://www.citebase.org/abstract?id=oai:arXiv.org:cond-mat/0502053>. [35]
- [109] S.A. Hassan, A.R. Vasconcellos, and R. Luzzi. The informational-statistical-entropy operator in a nonequilibrium ensemble formalism. *Physica A*, 262:359–375, 1999. [102]
- [110] W. Heisenberg. Über quantentheoretische umdeutung kinematischer und mechanischer beziehungen. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Band XXXIII:879–893, 1925. [60, 113, 282, 283]
- [111] S. Helgason. *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups, and Symmetric Spaces*. AMS, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 34, 2001. [178, 209, 214]
- [112] H. Helmholtz. *Über die Erhaltung der Kraft*. Reimer, Berlin, 1847. [82, 151]
- [113] D. Home and M.A.B. Whitaker. Ensemble interpretations of quantum mechanics. A modern perspective. *Physics Reports*, 210:223–317, 1992. [133]
- [114] W. Hsu and R. Barakat. Statistics and thermodynamics of luminescent radiation. *Phys. Rev. B*, 46:6760–6767, 1992. [120]
- [115] K. Huang. *Statistical Mechanics. 2nd ed.* Wiley, New York, 1987. [109, 123]
- [116] Kerson Huang. *Statistical Mechanics*. Wiley, 2nd edition edition, 1987. [67]

- [117] James E. Humphreys. *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*. Springer Verlag, 1972. [212, 294, 313]
- [118] L. Isserlis. On a formula for the product-moments coefficient of any order of a normal frequency distribution in any number of variables. *Biometrika*, 12:134–139, 1918. [109]
- [119] N. Tetradis J. Berges and C. Wetterich. Non-perturbative renormalization flow in quantum field theory and statistical physics. *Phys. Rep.*, 363:223–386, 2002. <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0005122>. [109]
- [120] R. Jackiw. Quantum meaning of classical field theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 49, pages 681–706, 1977. [276]
- [121] Nathan Jacobsen. *Lie algebras*. Dover Publishing, 1963. [170, 206, 212, 294, 313]
- [122] E.T. Jaynes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Phys. Rev.*, 106:620–630, 1957. [156]
- [123] E.T. Jaynes. Information theory and statistical mechanics II. *Phys. Rev.*, 108:171–190, 1957. [156]
- [124] E.T. Jaynes. *Probability Theory in Science and Engineering*. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Dallas, 1958. [118]
- [125] E.T. Jaynes. *Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods (C.R. Smith et al., eds.)*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1992. [138]
- [126] W.B. Jensen. The universal gas constant R. *Chem. Education Today*, 80:731–732, 2003. [79]
- [127] G. Job. *Neudarstellung der Wärmelehre*. Akad. Verlagsges, Frankfurt, 1972. [89]
- [128] J.P. Joule. On the calorific effects of magneto-electricity, and on the mechanical value of heat. *Philos. Mag. London*, 23:435–443, 1843. [82]
- [129] J.P. Joule. Laser-induced chemical reactions. *Applied Optics*, 13:301–309, 1974. [104]
- [130] Victor G. Kac. *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*. Cambridge University Press, 1994. [viii]
- [131] B.L. Karger, L.R. Snyder, and C. Horvath. *An Introduction to Separation Science*. Wiley, 1973. [122]
- [132] A. Katz. *Principles of statistical mechanics. The information theory approach*. Freeman, San Francisco, 1967. [118, 155]
- [133] B.D. Keister and W.N. Polyzou. Relativistic hamiltonian dynamics in nuclear and particle physics. *Adv. Nuclear Physics*, 20:226–479, 1991. [10]
- [134] A. Kirillov. Introduction to Lie groups and Lie algebras. <http://www.math.sunysb.edu/~kirillov/mat552/liegroups.pdf>. New York 2004. [209, 313]

- [135] A.A. Kirillov. *Lectures on the orbit method*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. [258]
- [136] C. Kittel. *Elementary Statistical Physics*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 1966. [67]
- [137] A.W. Knap. *Lie Groups Beyond an Introduction*. Birkhäuser, 2002. [171, 178, 206, 209, 212, 214, 313]
- [138] E.A. Kochetov. Quasiclassical path integral in coherent-state manifold. *J. Physics A: Math. Gen.*, 31:4473–4492, 1998. [314]
- [139] A. Kolmogorov. *Foundations of the Theory of Probability, 2nd English ed.* Chelsea, New York, 1956. [146]
- [140] K.W. Kratky. Fluctuation of thermodynamic parameters in different ensembles. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31:945–950, 1985. [122, 123]
- [141] A. Kriegl and P. Michor. *The convenient setting of global analysis*. American Mathematical Society, 1997., 1997. citeseer.ist.psu.edu/kriegl97convenient.html. [230, 235]
- [142] A. Kriegl and P. Michor. *The convenient setting of global analysis*. American Mathematical Society, 1997., 1997. citeseer.ist.psu.edu/kriegl97convenient.html. [231]
- [143] R. Kubo. Statistical-mechanical theory of irreversible processes. I. general theory and simple applications to magnetic and conduction problems. *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, 12:570–586, 1957. [102]
- [144] R. Kubo. Generalized cumulant expansion method. *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, 17:1100–1120, 1962. [104]
- [145] T.S. Kuhn. Carnot’s version of “carnot’s cycle”. *Amer. J. Phys.*, 23:91–95, 1955. [84]
- [146] T.S. Kuhn. La mer’s version of “carnot’s cycle”. *Amer. J. Phys.*, 23:387–389, 1955. [84]
- [147] V.I. Kukulín, V.M. Krasnopol’sky, and J. Horáček. *Theory of resonances. Principles and Applications*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1989. [279]
- [148] E.B. I. *Quantum theory of open systems*. Acad. Press, London, 1976. [141, 142]
- [149] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya. Sixth problem of the millennium: Navier-Stokes equations, existence and smoothness. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 58:251–286, 2003. [4]
- [150] F.L. Lambert. Disorder – a cracked crutch for supporting entropy discussions. *J. Chem. Education*, 79:187–192, 2002. [87]
- [151] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshits. *Statistical Physics: Part 1. 3rd ed.* Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980. [118]

- [152] N. P. Landsman. Strict quantization of coadjoint orbits. *J. Math. Phys.* 39, 6372-6383 (1998).
<http://www.citebase.org/abstract?id=oai:arXiv.org:math-ph/9807027>. [258]
- [153] J. Laskar. A numerical experiment on the chaotic behaviour of the solar system. *Nature*, 338:237–238, 1989. [4]
- [154] J. Laskar. Large scale chaos in the solar system. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 287, 1994. [4]
- [155] J.L. Lebowitz and H.L. Frisch. Model of nonequilibrium ensemble: Knudsen gas. *Phys. Rev.*, 107:917–923, 1957. [142]
- [156] E.H. Lieb and J. Yngvason. The physics and mathematics of the second law of thermodynamics. *Physics Report*, 310:1–96, 1999. [118]
- [157] G. Lindblad. On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 48:119–130, 1976. [142]
- [158] J.J. Lissauer. Chaotic motion in the solar system. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 71:835–845, 1999. [4]
- [159] L. Ljung. *System identification: theory for the user*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1986. [139]
- [160] W. Heisenberg M. Born, P. Jordan. Zur quantenmechanik ii. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Band XXXV:557–615, 1925. [60]
- [161] L. Mandel and E. Wolf. *Optical coherence and quantum optics*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995. [149]
- [162] F. Mandl. *Statistical Physics*. Wiley, 2nd edition edition, 1988. [67]
- [163] Jerry B. Marion and Stephen T. Thornton. *Classical dynamics of particles and systems*. Saunders College Publishing, 4th edition edition, 1995. [188, 192]
- [164] J.E. Marsden and T.S. Ratiu. *Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry*. Springer, New York, 1994. [239]
- [165] J.E. Marsden and T.S. Ratiu. *Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry*. Springer, New York, 1994. [242]
- [166] P.C. Martin and J. Schwinger. Theory of many-particle systems. i. *Phys. Rev.*, 115:1342–1373, 1959. [102]
- [167] I. Martinson and L.J. Curtis. Janne rydberg – his life and work. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research B*, 235:17–22, 2005. [59]
- [168] R.I. Masel. Bemerkungen ”uber die Kr”afte der unbelebten Natur. *Ann. Chem. Pharmacie*, 42, 1842. [82]

- [169] R.I. Masel. *Principles of Adsorption and Reaction on Solid Surfaces*. Wiley, New York, 1996. [122]
- [170] K. Maurin. *General Eigenfunction Expansions and Unitary Representations of Topological Groups*. Polish Scientific Publishers, Warsaw, 1968. [279]
- [171] N. Moiseyev. Quantum theory of resonances: calculating energies, widths and cross-sections by complex scaling. *Physics Reports*, 302:211–293, 1998. [63]
- [172] D. Montgomery and G. Joyce. Statistical mechanics of “negative temperature” states. *Phys. Fluids*, 17:1139–1145, 1974. [120]
- [173] R.V. Moody and A. Pianzola. *Lie algebras with triangular decompositions*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1995. [311]
- [174] H. Mori. Transport, collective motion, and Brownian motion. *Prog Theor Phys.*, 33:423–455, 1965. [104]
- [175] P.J. Morrison. Hamiltonian description of the ideal fluid. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 70, pages 467–521, 1998. [239]
- [176] R. Mrugala, J. D. Nulton, J. C. Schön, and P. Salamon. Statistical approach to the geometric structure of thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 41:3156–3160, 1990. [102]
- [177] I. Müller and T. Ruggeri. *Rational Extended Thermodynamics*, volume 37. Springer, New York, 1999. [141]
- [178] S.L. Murov, I. Carmichael, and G..L Hug. *Handbook of Photochemistry*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1993. [104]
- [179] K.-H. Neeb. Towards a Lie theory of locally convex groups. *Japan. J. Math.*, 1:291–468, 2006. [viii, 234]
- [180] Karl-Hermann Neeb. *Holomorphy and Convexity in Lie Theory*. Walter de Gruyter - Berlin - New York, 2000. [182]
- [181] W. Nernst. Über die Berechnung chemischer Gleichgewichte aus thermischen Messungen. *Nachr. Kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen*, 6:1–40, 1906. [82]
- [182] A. Neumaier. Molecular modeling of proteins and mathematical prediction of protein structure. *SIAM Rev.*, 39:407–460, 1997. [35]
- [183] A. Neumaier. Ensembles and experiments in classical and quantum physics. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B*, 17:2937–2980, 2003.
quant-ph/0303047. [vii, 7]
- [184] A. Neumaier. On the foundations of thermodynamics, unpublished manuscript. Technical report, 2007.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.3790>. [vii]
- [185] L.J. Norrby. Why is mercury liquid. *J. Chem. Educ.* 68, pages 110–113, 1991. [6]

- [186] H.C. Oettinger. *Beyond Equilibrium Thermodynamics*. Wiley, Hoboken, 2005. [115, 116, 136, 141]
- [187] W. of Ockham. *Philosophical Writings (P. Boehner, ed.)*. Nelson, Edinburgh, 1957. [134]
- [188] D. Papoušek and M.R. Aliev. *Molecular vibrational-rotational spectra*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1982. [viii]
- [189] Wolfgang Pauli. The connection between spin and statistics. *Phys. Rev.*, 58:716–722, 1940. [295]
- [190] R.E. Peierls. On a minimum property of the free energy,. *Phys. Rev.*, 54:918–919, 1938. [104]
- [191] O. Penrose. Foundations of statistical mechanics. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 42:1937–2006, 1979. [133]
- [192] R. Penrose and W. Rindler. *spinors and space-time, Vol. 1*. Cambridge University Press, 1987. [225]
- [193] A.M. Perelomov. *Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986. [286, 290]
- [194] A. Peres. *Pure states, mixtures, and compounds*. Acad. Press, New York, 1978. [146, 151]
- [195] A. Peres and D.R. Terno. Quantum information and relativity theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 76:93–123, 2004. [133]
- [196] M. Planck. On the law of distribution of energy in the normal spectrum. *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 4:p. 553, 1901. [64]
- [197] Max Planck. Entropy and temperature of radiant heat. *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 1(4):719–37, April 1900. [55]
- [198] J. Polonyi and K. Sailer. Renormalization group in internal space. *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 2005. [142]
- [199] J.M. Prausnitz, R.N. Lichtenthaler, and E. Gomes de Azevedo. *Molecular thermodynamics of fluid-phase equilibria*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1999. [86]
- [200] E.M. Purcell and R.V. Pound. A nuclear spin system at negative temperature. *Phys. Rev.*, 81:279–280, 1951. [120]
- [201] J.M. Radcliffe. Some properties of coherent spin states. *J. Phys. A: Gen. Phys.* 4, pages 313–323, 1971. [306]
- [202] T.S. Ratiu. A crash course in geometric mechanics. <http://www.math.univ-metz.fr/ecoles/monastir05-dir/notes/CoursTudorRatiu.pdf>, 2001. [239]

- [203] J. Rau and B. Müller. From reversible quantum microdynamics to irreversible quantum transport. *Physics Rep.*, 272:1–59, 1996. [82, 115, 141]
- [204] J.W.S. Rayleigh. Remarks upon the law of complete radiation. *Philosophical Magazine XLIX*, 1900. [66]
- [205] L.E. Reichl. *A Modern Course in Statistical Physics, 2nd. ed.* Wiley, New York, 1998. [67, 75, 109, 123]
- [206] H. Renon and J.M. Prausnitz. Local compositions in thermodynamic excess functions for liquid mixtures. *AIChE J.*, 14:135–144, 1968. [86]
- [207] C.E. Rickart. *General theory of Banach algebras.* Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1960. [167]
- [208] K. Ridderbos. The coarse-graining approach to statistical mechanics: how blissful is our ignorance? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 33:65–77, 2002. [142]
- [209] T.M. Ridderbos and M.L.G. Redhead. The spin-echo experiments and the second law of thermodynamics. *Foundations of Physics*, 28:1237–1270, 1998. [139]
- [210] M.A. Rieffel. Deformation quantization for actions of \mathbb{R}^d . *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 506, 1993. [259]
- [211] Walter Ritz. Recherches critiques sur l'électrodynamique générale. *Annales Chemie et de Physique*, 13, 1908. [55]
- [212] B. Robertson. Equations of motion in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. *Phys. Rev.*, 144:151–161, 1966. [113, 140]
- [213] R.T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996. [76]
- [214] R.T. Rockafellar. Second-order convex analysis. *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, 1:1–16, 1999. [84]
- [215] D. Roller. *The early developmewnt of the concepts of temperature and heat.* Harvard Univ. Press Cambridge, Mass, 1950. [80]
- [216] J. Rothstein. Nuclear spin echo experiments and the foundations of statistical mechanics. *Amer. J. Physics*, 25:510–518, 1957. [139]
- [217] Walter Rudin. *Functional Analysis.* McGraw–Hill, 1991. ISBN 0070542368. [230]
- [218] D. Ruelle. *Statistical mechanics. Rigorous results.* Imperial College Press, London, 1999. [122]
- [219] D. Ruelle. *Thermodynamic formalism. The mathematical structures of equilibrium statistical mechanics, 2nd. ed.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004. [122]
- [220] E. Rutherford. The scattering of α and β particles by matter and the structure of the atom. *Philosophical Magazine, Series 6* 21:669688, 1911. [59]

- [221] M. Scheunert. *The theory of Lie superalgebras*. Springer Verlag, Lecture notes in mathematics (716), 1979. [294]
- [222] M. Schlosshauer. Decoherence, the measurement problem, and interpretations of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 76:1267–1305, 2005. [133]
- [223] E. Schrödinger. Der stetige übergang von der Mikro- zur Makromechanik. *Naturwissenschaften*, 14(28):664–666, 1926. [284]
- [224] Erwin Schrödinger. An undulatory theory of the mechanics of atoms and molecules. *Phys. Rev.*, 28:1049, 1926. [60]
- [225] Julian S. Schwinger. Spin, statistics, and the TCP theorem. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 44:223–228, 1958. [295]
- [226] I. E. Segal. –. *Illinois J. Math.*, 6:520, 1962. [288]
- [227] B. Simon. Resonances and complex scaling: A rigorous overview. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 1978. [63]
- [228] L. Sklar. *Physics and Chance*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993. [103, 133, 145, 156]
- [229] R. Slansky. Group theory for unified model building. *Phys. Rept.*, 79:1–128, 1981. [332]
- [230] F.T. Smith. Diabatic and adiabatic representations for atomic collision problems. *Phys. Rev.*, 179:111–123, 1969. [132]
- [231] H. Spohn. Kinetic equations from Hamiltonian dynamics: Markovian limits. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 52:569–615, 1980. [115, 141]
- [232] H.P. Stapp. The Copenhagen interpretation. *Amer. J. Phys.*, 40:1098–1116, 1972. [133]
- [233] J. Stefan. Über die beziehung zwischen der Wärmestrahlung und der Temperatur. *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 79*, Wien 1897. [65]
- [234] S. Sternberg. *Group theory and physics*. Cambridge University Press, 1995. [viii, 304]
- [235] W.F. Stinespring. Positive functions on c^* -algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6:211–216, 1955. [142]
- [236] R.F. Strater. *Statistical dynamics*. Imperial College Press, London, 1995. [84]
- [237] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman. *PCT, spin and statistics, and all that*. Redwood City, USA: Addison-Wesley (Advanced book classics), 1989. [295]
- [238] B.N. Taylor. Guide for the use of the international system of units (si). *NIST Special Publication*, 811, 1995.
<http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Units/introduction.html>. [94]

- [239] D. ter Haar. Foundations of statistical mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 27:289–338, 1955. [133]
- [240] W.E. Thirring. *A Course in Mathematical Physics*, volume 4. Springer, Berlin, 1983. [99, 103, 122, 141]
- [241] W. Thomson. On a universal tendency in nature to the dissipation of mechanical energy. *Phil. Mag. (4)*, 4:304–306, 1852. [82]
- [242] M. Torres-Torriti. Ltp – lie tools package, 2008. <http://www.cim.mcgill.ca/~migueltt/ltp/ltp.html>. Web site. [162]
- [243] C. Truesdell. *The Tragicomical History of Thermodynamics*. Springer, New York, 1980. [80]
- [244] C.-Y. Tseng and A. Caticha. Yet another resolution of the Gibbs paradox: an information theory approach. volume 617, pages 331–339, 2002. [138]
- [245] G.M. Tuynman. *Supermanifolds and supergroups*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004. [294]
- [246] J. Uffink. Compendium of the foundations of classical statistical physics. Technical report, 2006. <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/archive/00002691/01/UffinkFinal.pdf>. [101, 138]
- [247] H. Upmeyer. *Toeplitz operators and index theory in several complex variables*. Basel, 1996. [286]
- [248] I. Vaisman. *Lectures on the Geometry of Poisson Manifolds*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994. [239]
- [249] B.L. van der Waerden. *Sources of quantum mechanics*. North-Holland Publishing Company, 1967. [viii, 58, 64]
- [250] L. van Hove. Sur certaines représentations unitaires d’un groupe infini de transformations. *Proc. Roy. Acad. Sci. Belgium*, 26:1–102, 1951. [261]
- [251] M.A.A. van Leeuwen, A.M. Cohen, and B. Lissers. Lie, a computer algebra package for lie group computations, 2008. <http://www-math.univ-poitiers.fr/~maavl/LiE/>. Web site. [162]
- [252] V.S. Varadarajan. *Supersymmetry for mathematicians: An introduction*. AMS, Courant Lecture Notes, 2004. [294]
- [253] A. Voros. Semiclassical approximations. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, 24:31–90, 1976. [314]
- [254] D. Wallace. Implications of quantum theory in the foundations of statistical mechanics. Technical report, 2001. <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/archive/00000410>. [133]

- [255] J. Walter. Über g. falks 'einfachere' definition des begriffs der entropie. *Europ. J. Physics*, 7:147–147, 1986. [84]
- [256] Steven Weinberg. *The quantum theory of fields, I, II and III*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. [viii]
- [257] Dirk Werner. *Funktionalanalysis*. Springer Lehrbuch, 1995. [167]
- [258] J.A. Wheeler and W.H. Zurek. *Quantum Theory and Measurements*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1983. [133]
- [259] P. Whittle. *Probability via expectation, 3rd ed*. Springer, New York, 1992. [109, 146]
- [260] G.C. Wick. The evaluation of the collision matrix. *Phys. Rev.*, 80:268–272, 1950. [109]
- [261] W. Wien. Proceedings of the imperial academy of science. *Berlin*, February 9, 1893. [65]
- [262] E. Wigner. On the quantum correction for thermodynamic equilibrium. *Phys. Rev.*, 40:749–759, 1932. [262]
- [263] Nicholas M. Woodhouse. *Geometric quantization*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992. [259]
- [264] Jr. W.T. Grandy. Some issues in thermodynamics. Technical report, 2001. <http://w3.uwyo.edu/~wtg/Issues/IssuesContents.htm>. [133]
- [265] B. G. Wybourne. *Classical groups for physicists*. John Wiley and Sons, 1974. [viii, 327]
- [266] C.N. Yang and T.D. Lee. Statistical theory of equations of state and phase transitions I. theory of condensation,. *Phys. Rev.*, 87:404–409, 1952. [122]
- [267] D.R. Yarkony. Diaboloic conical intersections. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 68:985–1013, 1996. [132]
- [268] Eberhard Zeidler. *Quantum Field Theory I, Basics in Mathematics and Physics*. Springer Verlag, 2006. [58]
- [269] W.M. Zhang, D.H. Feng, and R. Gilmore. Coherent states: Theory and some applications. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 62:867–927, 1990. [290]
- [270] W.H. Zurek. Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 75:715–775, 2003. [142]

Author index

- Alberti 76
 Alberty 76, 85
 Aleksandrov 76
 Alhassid 102
 Aliev viii
 Allahverdyan 138, 147
 Ambrosio 76
 Andrews 87
 Arnold 176, 188, 192

 Baggett 167
 Balian 82, 90, 102, 115, 136, 140, 141, 143, 156
 Ballentine 133
 Bar-Moshe 258
 Barakat 120
 Bargmann 288
 Barndorff-Nielsen 118, 156, 158
 Barton 283
 Barut viii
 Battino 76
 Berezin 258
 Berges 109, 142
 Beris 115, 136, 141, 197
 Bernardo 118
 Bijker 333
 Blatt 142
 Bogoliubov 104
 Bohm 63, 279
 Bonhoeffer 139
 Bornath 141
 Bowden 35, 84
 Breuer 64
 Brillouin 155
 Brown 35
 Brune 142
 Bustamente 122, 123

 Callen 75, 109, 124, 134
 Calzetta 141
 Carathéodory 118
 Casas-Vásquez 81
 Caticha 138
 Chapman 86
 Civitarese 124

 Clapeyron 79
 Clausius 82
 CODATA 79
 Cornwell viii
 Curtis 59

 da Silva 239
 Davies 141, 142
 Deligne 294
 d'Inverno 25
 Dirac 7, 254
 Duplantier 35
 Dyson 11

 Edwards 115, 136, 141, 197
 Ehrenfest 133, 255
 Einstein 35
 Ellis 122
 Emch 118
 Eswards 141
 Eyinck 120

 Faraut 286
 Farkas 139, 185
 Fine 133
 Forster 87
 Fowler 80
 Frankel 209
 Frenkel 254
 Frisch 142
 Fuchs viii, 89, 206, 313
 Fulton 212, 313

 Gadella 279
 Gadiyar 314
 Garcia 35
 Gardiner 64
 Gelfand 146
 Gibbs 6, 101, 102, 104, 123
 Gilmore viii, 127, 214
 Glauber 284, 288
 Goldstein 188, 192, 330
 Gorini 142
 Gotay 261
 Grabert 82, 115, 141
 Grad 139, 143
 Grandy 133

- Griffiths 104, 122, 289
 Groenewold 261
 Gross 122, 123
 Guggenheim 80

 Hacking 133
 Hahn 139
 Haken 118
 Hanggi 35
 Harris 212, 313
 Harteck 139
 Hassan 102
 Heisenberg 113
 Helgason 178, 209, 214
 Helmholtz 82
 Home 133
 Hsu 120
 Hu 141
 Huang 67, 109, 123
 Humphreys 212, 294, 313

 Isserlis 109

 Jackiw 276
 Jacobsen 170, 206, 212, 294, 313
 Jaynes 118, 138, 156
 Jensen 79
 Job 89
 Jou 81
 Joule 82
 Joyce 120

 Kac viii
 Karlov 104
 Katz 118, 155
 Kirillov 209, 258, 313
 Kittel 67
 Knapp 171, 178, 206, 209, 212, 214, 313
 Kochetov 314
 Kolmogorov 146
 Koranyi 286
 Kratky 122, 123
 Kriegl 230, 231, 235
 Kubo 102, 104
 Kuhn 84
 Kukulín 279

 Ladyzhenskaya 4

 Lambert 87
 Landau 118
 Landsman 258
 Laskar 4
 Leben 35, 84
 Lebowitz 142
 Lee 122
 Letzter, G. 185
 Levine 102
 Lieb 118
 Lifschitz 118
 Lindblad 142
 Lissauer 4
 Liu 118
 Ljung 139

 Mandel 149
 Mandl 67
 Marchesoni 35
 Marinov 258
 Marion 188, 192
 Marsden 239, 242
 Martin 102
 Martinez 90
 Martinson 59
 Maurin 279
 Mayer 82
 Michor 230, 231, 235
 Moiseyev 63
 Montgomery 120
 Moody 311
 Mori 104
 Morrison 239
 Mrugala 102
 Müller 82, 115, 141
 Murov 104

 Naimark 146
 Neeb viii, 182, 234
 Nernst 82
 Neumaier vii, 7, 35
 Nieuwenhuizen 138
 Norrby 6

 Ockham 134
 Oettinger 115, 116, 141
 Öttinger 136

- Palacios 35
 Papoušek viii
 Pauli 295
 Peierls 104
 Penrose 133, 225
 Perelomov 286, 290
 Peres 133, 146, 151
 Petruccione 64
 Pianzola 311
 Planck 12
 Polonyi 142
 Pound 120
 Prausnitz 86
 Purcell 120

 Raczka viii
 Radcliffe 306
 Ratiu 239, 242
 Rau 82, 115, 141
 Redhead 139
 Reichl 67, 75, 109, 123
 Renon 86
 Rickart 167
 Ridderbos 139, 142
 Rieffel 259
 Rindler 225
 Robertson 140
 Rockafellar 76, 84
 Roller 80
 Rothstein 139
 Rudin 230
 Ruelle 122
 Ruggeri 141

 Sailer 142
 Scheunert 294
 Schlosshauer 133
 Schweigert viii, 206, 313
 Schwinger 102, 295
 Segal 288
 Simon 63
 Sklar 103, 133, 145, 156
 Slansky 332
 Smith 118, 132
 Spohn 115, 120, 141
 Stapp 133
 Sternberg viii, 304

 Stinespring 142
 Streater 84, 295

 ter Haar 133
 Terno 133
 Thirring 99, 103, 122, 141
 Thomson 82
 Thornton 188, 192
 Torres-Torriti 162
 Truesdell 80
 Tseng 138
 Tuynman 294

 Uffink 101, 138
 Upmeier 286

 Vaisman 239
 van der Waerden viii, 58
 van Hove 261
 van Leeuwen 162
 Voros 314

 Wallace 133
 Walter 84
 Weinberg viii
 Weinstein 239
 Werner 167
 Wheeler 133
 Whitaker 133
 Whittle 109, 146
 Wick 109
 Wigner 262
 Wolf 149
 Woodhouse 259
 Wybourne viii, 327

 Yang 122
 Yarkony 132
 Yngvason 118

 Zeidler 58
 Zhang 290
 Zurek 133, 142

Index

- *-algebra, 94
- *-homomorphism, 95
- B^* -algebra, 236
- B_{CK} , (Cartan–)Killing form, 212
- $C^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, 232
- $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{M})$, 222
- $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\times n})$, 222
- $C_{\mathbb{L}'}(S)$, 165
- $GL(n, \mathbb{K})$, 170, 237
- $ISO(p, q)$, 173
- $O(3)$, 172
- $O(B, \mathbb{K})$, 173
- $O(p, q)$, 173
- $PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$, 307
- $SL(n, \mathbb{K})$, 170, 238
- $SO(3)$, 18, 172, 188
- $SO(3, 1)^+$, 307, 308
- $SO(n, \mathbb{K})$, 172
- $SO(p, q)$, 173
- $SU(n)$, 174
- $Sp(B, \mathbb{K})$, 174
- $Spin(2n)$, 303
- $T(\mathbb{L})$, 206
- $T(n, \mathbb{K})$, 177
- $T_x\mathbb{M}$, 233
- $U(n)$, 174
- X_f , 166
- $[f, g]$, 185
- $[f, g]_{\pm}$, 294
- Ad, 209
- CL, 181
- Diff \mathbb{M} , 234
- \mathbb{F} -chart, 231
- \mathbb{F} -manifold, 231
- \mathbb{F}_+ , 281
- \mathbb{K}^* , 170, 238
- Lin \mathbb{H} , 167
- \mathbb{L} -module, 207
- \mathbb{L} -invariant, 215
- $\mathbb{L}^{\mathbb{R}}$, 183
- \mathbb{P}_s , 305
- $\mathbb{R}^{\times n}$, 221
- ad, 165
- ad_f , 165
- α -particles, 42
- $\bigvee \mathbb{H}$, 300
- $\bigwedge \mathbb{H}$, 300
- δ_{ij} , 34
- Der \mathbb{A} , 166
- Der \mathbb{M} , 232
- \dot{x} , 33
- ϵ_{klm} , 18
- γ -factor, 24
- γ -matrices, 45
- \hbar , 7
- \hbar , 13
- \neg , 7, 162
- $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{L})$, 206
- σ , 18
- σ -model, 199
- vect \mathbb{M} , 233
- ad, 212
- c -linear, 223
- c -linear forms, 224
- d -sphere, 233
- e^k , 94
- $gl(n, \mathbb{K})$, 170, 237
- $h(n)$, 176
- $iso(p, q)$, 173
- $isp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, 205
- $sl(2, \mathbb{C})^{\mathbb{R}}$, 171
- $sl(n, \mathbb{K})$, 170, 238
- $so(n, \mathbb{K})$, 171
- $so(p, q)$, 172, 173
- $sp(2n, \mathbb{K})$, 173
- $su(n)$, 174

- $t(n, \mathbb{K})$, 176, 177
- $u(n)$, 174
- (N -level quantum systems), 98
- (Canonical differential geometries), 221
- (Cartan–)Killing form, 212
- (Classical fluids), 99
- (Classical limit), 267
- (Differential geometry of open subsets in \mathbb{R}^n), 221
- (Dini property), 98
- (Extremal principles), 85
- (Lemma of Cartan), 212
- (Lie) central, 162
- (Nonrelativistic classical mechanics), 98
- (Nonrelativistic quantum mechanics), 99
- (Phenomenological thermodynamics), 77
- (Quantization Theorem), 260
- (Second law of thermodynamics), 128
- (The Gibbs paradox), 137
- (Third law of thermodynamics), 130
- (Weak law of large numbers), 144
- (associative) algebra, 168
- (left) \mathbb{E} -module, 166
- (linear) representation, 205
- (non-)commutative, 220
- (nondegeneracy), 97
- (spectral) norm, 96
- random variables, 146
- abelian, 163
- absolute zero, 130
- absolutely stable, 36
- abstract index notation, 225
- action, 9, 243, 247
- action variables, 331
- activation energy, 36
- acts diagonally, 53
- adiabatic, 83
- adjoint, 180, 181, 209
- adjoint representation, 165, 212
- affine functions, 177
- algebra homomorphism, 168
- alternating, 224
- analytic signal, 49
- angle variables, 331
- angular mass matrix, 188
- angular momentum, 189
- angular velocity, 16, 188
- annihilation operator, 278
- anticommutator, 294
- Approximations., 109
- arbitrarily often differentiable, 230
- arrangement, 62, 355
- arrangements, 62
- assignment, 323
- associated Legendre polynomials, 329
- associator, 163
- atlas, 232
- augmented cotangent bundle, 245
- autonomous, 248
- Avogadro constant, 102
- axis of rotation, 19
- Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff (BCH) formula, 179
- Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula, 179
- Balmer series, 59
- Banach algebra, 169
- basic thermodynamic variables, 76
- Berezin quantization, 258
- bilinear form
 - nondegenerate, 172
- bilinear forms, 224
- black body, 64
- Bogoliubov, 105
- Bogoliubov transformation, 275
- Bohr radius, 329
- Bohr–Sommerfeld quantization condition, 314
- Boltzmann constant, 13
- Boltzmann distribution, 67
- Boltzmann’s constant, 66
- bond angle, 200
- bond length, 200
- bond vector, 200
- Born’s rule, 151
- Born–Oppenheimer approximation, 257
- boson, 211
- Boson mode, 104
- Bosonic case., 304
- bosons, 42, 211, 317
- bound states, 62

- bounded, 96
- bra, 279
- branching, 332
- Branching rules, 332
- branching rules, 332

- calibration, 134
- calibration measurements, 151
- caloric, 84
- canonical, 221
- canonical anticommutation relations, 42, 294
- canonical commutation relation, 113, 273
- canonical commutation relations, 42, 177
- canonical commutation rules, 255
- canonical ensemble, 13, 67, 103, 122
- canonical Lie product, 244
- canonical linear form, 244
- canonical momentum, 250
- canonical symplectic form, 244
- Carnot cycle, 81
- Cartan subalgebras, 213
- Cartan–Killing form, 212
- Casimir element, 207
- Casimir elements, 207
- Casimir operator, 207
- Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, 111
- Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, 98
- center, 162
- center of mass coordinate system, 188
- central, 162, 186
- central (Lie central), 186
- central extension, 175
- centralizer, 165, 167
- chain rule, 81, 234, 235
- channel, 63
- characters, 54, 146
- charts, 231
- chemical energy flux, 83
- Chemical equilibrium, 140
- chemical potential, 76, 121
- chemical work, 83
- Chevalley groups, 170
- chiral, 307
- classical Heisenberg equation, 40
- classical Heisenberg equation, 8
- classical instrument, 147
- classical Lie algebras, 213
- classical limit, 9
- classical Liouville equation, 14
- Classical probability., 146
- classical pure state, 198
- Clebsch–Gordan coefficients, 332
- Clifford algebra, 45
- closed, 83, 229
- co-adjoint orbits, 258
- coadjoint orbits, 215
- coherent state, 285, 306
 - Glauber, 290
- coherent states, 151, 254
- coindices, 221
- coldness, 117
- commutation rule, 222
- commutative, 95, 168
- commutator, 7, 95, 168, 185
- commutator subgroup, 178
- commute, 186
- compact, 212
- compatible, 240
- complete, 169, 235
- completely integrable, 327
- completeness relation, 307
- completion, 167
- complex orthogonal Lie algebra, 171
- complex scaling, 63
- complexification, 171, 181
- complexity, 156
- concave, 76
- conditional expectation, 264
- configuration space, 34, 243
- confinement, 63
- conjugate, 94, 95
- conservation of energy, 243, 246
- conservative dynamics, 35
- constants, 94, 95
- constrained mechanical system, 245
- continuum mechanics, 4
- convenient vector space, 230
- convex, 76
- correlated, 110
- correspondence principle, 9
- cotangent bundle, 8, 243

- covariance, 110
- covectors, 221, 223
- Coxeter groups, 213
- creation operator, 278
- critical points, 127
- cumulant expansion, 107
- curl, 47

- d'Alembertian, 44
- DAE, 246
- decomposable, 207
- decomposition
 - triangular, 311
- deformation, 274
- deformation quantization, 259
- degeneracy, 67
- degenerate, 224, 328
- degenerate eigenvalue, 328
- degree, 312
- delta function, 279
- density, 198
- density matrix, 7, 94, 152, 256
- density operator, 141
- derivation, 166, 232
- derivative in direction, 165
- derived Lie algebra, 165
- derived series, 213
- Description levels., 89
- deterministic, 110
- diffeomorphism, 233
- differential, 81
- differential geometry, 220, 232
- differential-algebraic equations, 246
- differentiation formula, 124
- differentiation formulas, 107
- dihedral angle, 201
- dimension, 232
- Dirac-Frenkel variational principle, 254
- direct sum, 165
- directional derivative, 221, 235
- dispersion relation, 43, 44
- dispersion relations, 47
- Dissipation, 63
- dissipation, 82
- dissipative dynamics, 35
- dissipative system, 9

- dissociation, 325
- dissociation threshold, 62
- divergence, 47
- dominant integral weights, 314
- dynamical algebra, 327
- Dynamics in phase space., 38

- effective Hamiltonian, 142
- effectively isolated, 142
- Ehrenfest equation, 255, 257
- Ehrenfest theorem, 255
- eigenfunctions, 52
- Einstein convention, 24
- Einstein's derivation., 68
- elasticity theory, 5
- electrons, 45
- elementary particles, 210
- embedding, 164, 206, 209
- energy, 211, 243, 245
- energy dissipation, 88
- energy gap, 12
- energy levels, 12, 94, 104
- ensemble, 103, 143
- entropy, 76, 101, 154
- Entropy form of the second law, 87
- entropy of mixing, 138
- equation of state, 77, 119
- equilibrium, 77, 90
- Equilibrium states, 77
- ergodic, 156
- Euclidean *-algebra, 97
- Euclidean space, 167
- Euler angles, 19
- Euler equation, 78, 117
- Euler equations, 192
- Euler inequality, 77
- Euler-Lagrange equations, 249
- exact, 175, 229
- exactly solvable, 327
- exactness relation, 228
- expectation, 145, 146
- expected entropy, 155
- exponential, 169, 237
- exponential algebra, 169
- exponential mapping, 170
- extended Hamiltonian equations, 245

- extension of scalars, 171
- Extension to the anharmonic case., 274
- extensive, 76
- extensive variables, 116
- exterior algebra, 300
- exterior derivative, 228
- exterior product, 227, 300
- faithful, 205, 208
- fermion, 211
- fermion Fock space, 298
- Fermion mode, 104
- fermion wave function, 297
- Fermionic case., 303
- fermions, 42, 211, 317
- final time, 243
- fine structure spectrum, 330
- finite-dimensional (d -dimensional), 232
- finite-dimensional representation, 207
- first class constraint, 246
- first law of thermodynamics, 82, 125
- first radiative corrections, 327
- fluctuation-dissipation theorems, 36
- force, 34
- forced harmonic oscillator, 55
- formula, 200
- four-vectors, 22
- frame, 286
 - tight, 286
- freely rotating body, 188
- frequency, 272
- frequentist, 145
- friction matrix, 34
- fully reducible, 207
- fundamental representation, 23
- Galilean spacetime., 21
- Galilean symmetry group, 21
- Galilei group, 21
- Galileo group, 21
- gas thermometer, 80
- gauge invariant, 246
- gauge symmetries, 246
- gauge theories, 8
- gauge transform, 246
- Geiger–Marsden experiment, 59
- Gel’fand–Maurin theorem, 52
- Gelfand triple, 53, 279
- general form, 39, 245
- general linear algebra, 169
- general relativity theory, 5
- General spacetime., 24
- generalized displacements, 125
- generalized eigenvectors, 53
- generalized forces, 125
- generalized Hamilton equations, 256
- generalized Liouville equation, 256
- generating functional, 106
- generator, 162
 - infinitesimal, 180, 237
- generators, 162
- geodesic, 5
- geometric quantization, 259
- Gibbs (free) energy, 82
- Gibbs potential, 85
- Gibbs state, 101
- Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality, 106
- Gibbs-Duhem equation, 82, 125
- Glauber coherent states, 290
- global equilibrium, 90
- globe, 232
- gradient, 76, 221, 230, 233
- gradient operator, 34
- grand canonical ensemble, 123
- grand canonical partition function, 123
- Groenewold-van Hove Theorem, 261
- ground state, 12, 132, 278, 296, 312
- ground state energy, 132
- groups of Lie type, 170
- Haar measure, 315
- Hamilton energy, 76, 116
- Hamilton equations, 39, 243, 245
 - general form, 39
- Hamilton potential, 85, 127
- Hamiltonian, 8, 37, 103, 116, 197, 240, 243, 245
- Hamiltonian energy, 34
- Hamiltonian function, 37
- Hamiltonian mechanics, 8
- Hamiltonian system
 - isolated, 39
- Hamiltonian vector field, 166, 240

- harmonic oscillator, 37, 104
- Hartree–Fock method, 13
- Hausdorff $*$ -algebra, 169
- heat capacities, 79
- heat capacity, 124
- heat flux, 83
- Heaviside function, 26
- Heisenberg algebra, 175, 176, 363
- Heisenberg equation, 40, 356
- Heisenberg group, 177
- Heisenberg picture, 13
- Heisenberg uncertainty relation, 284
- Helmholtz (free) energy, 82
- Helmholtz free energy, 67
- Helmholtz potential, 85, 128
- Helstrom, 151
- Hermitian, 95
- Hermitian part, 95
- Hessian, 76
- Hessian matrix, 246, 250
- highest weight, 312
- highest weight representation, 312
- holonomic constraints, 246
- homomorphism, 164
- Hooke’s law, 38
- hyperfine structure spectrum, 330

- ideal, 151, 165
- ideal binary statistical measurement, 152
- ideal gas, 79
- ideal gas law, 79
- ideal measurements of A , 151
- identically prepared, 144
- identity, 175, 185
- imaginary part, 95
- impermeable, 83
- Important:, 124
- in-eigenstates, 53
- independent, 144
- index, 246
- induced emission, 68
- inertia tensor, 188
- infinitely differentiable, 232
- infinitesimal generator, 169, 180, 237
- information deficit, 155
- information theory, 153

- inhomogeneous special orthogonal transformations, 173
- initial time, 243
- inner product, 105
- insertion, 224
- integrable, 4, 248, 327
- integral, 94, 97
- integral weights, 313
- integration by parts, 15
- intensive, 76
- intensive variables conjugate to, 117
- internal energy, 82
- intrinsic, 156
- invariant subspace, 207
- invariant vector fields, 236
- inverse temperature, 68
- involutive Lie algebra, 182
- irreducible, 205, 207, 208
- irreducible Poisson representation, 259
- isolated Hamiltonian system, 39
- isolation, 83
- isomorphic, 164, 169
- isomorphism, 164

- Jacobi identity, 7, 15, 162
- Jacobian, 242

- k , 46
- Kepler’s’ law, 4
- ket, 279
- Killing form, 15, 212
- kinematical algebra, 197
- kinetic energy, 24, 35
- Klein–Gordon equation, 44
- KMS condition, 102
- Kronecker delta, 25
- Kronecker symbol, 34
- Kubo, 105

- labels, 280
- ladder operators, 278
- Lagrangian, 248
- Lagrangian function, 8
- Lamb shift, 11
- Laplace operator, 43
- Leibniz identity, 15, 185
- Lenz–Runge vector, 330

- levels, 130
- Levi–Civita symbol, 17
- Lie \ast -algebra, 180
- Lie algebra, 162
 - classical, 213
 - derived, 165
 - involutive, 182
 - orthogonal, 171
 - quotient, 165
 - special linear, 213
 - special orthogonal, 213
 - special unitary, 174
 - symplectic, 173, 213
 - triangulated, 312
 - unitary, 174
- Lie central, 162
- Lie commute, 186
- Lie derivative, 220, 235
- Lie group, 169, 236
- Lie product, 7, 162
- Lie subalgebra, 163
- Lie–Poisson algebra, 195
- lifetime, 64
- limit resolution, 110
- Lindblad equation, 142
- Lindblad operators, 63
- linear form, 223
- linear group, 169
- linear Lie group, 169
- linear representation, 205, 208
- Liouville equation, 255
- Liouville integral, 98
- Liouville measure, 199
- local coordinate system, 232
- local equilibrium, 90, 140
- locally convex, 230
- locally Hamiltonian, 240
- Lorentz boosts, 211
- Lorentz contraction, 24
- Lorentz shape, 57
- lower central series, 213
- lowering operator, 278
- macroscopic, 147
- macroscopic disorder, 87
- magnetic moment, 11, 150
- manifold, 231
- Markov approximation, 142
- Markov assumption, 141
- mass, 211
- mass matrix, 34
- mathematical pendulum, 38
- matrix field, 225
- matrix group, 170
- maximal Lyapunov exponent, 4
- maximum entropy principle, 157
- Maxwell equations, 47
- Maxwell reciprocity relations, 78, 119
- mean field theory, 109
- mean value, 144
- measuring, 148
- mechanical energy flux, 83
- mechanical work, 83
- metaplectic group, 284
- metaplectic representation, 284
- metastable, 36
- method of orbits, 258
- metric, 224
- microlocal, 90
- microlocal equilibrium, 140
- microscopic, 148
- Minkowski metric, 22
- Minkowski spacetime, 22
- Minkowski spacetime., 22
- model parameters, 148
- Modern derivation., 69
- modular automorphism, 103
- module, 207, 354
- mole, 79
- mole number, 76, 102
- moment of inertia, 188
- momentum, 37, 243, 245
- momentum representation, 51, 261
- monochromatic, 47
- monochromatic beams, 41
- monotonic limit, 98
- Mori, 105
- motion, 234
- Moyal product, 259
- multilinear forms, 224
- multiplication, 185

- Navier–Stokes equations, 4
- neighborhood, 230
- nilpotent, 178
- noise, 110
- non-equilibrium states, 140
- non-normalizable, 279
- noncommutative, 95, 168
- noncommutative geometry, 235
- nondegenerate, 95, 132, 172, 224
- nondegenerate eigenvalue, 328
- nondegenerate spectrum, 12
- nonholonomic constraints, 248
- noninformative prior, 156
- nonrelativistic approximation, 24
- nonrelativistic limit, 24, 363
- nontrivial, 163
- normal mode, 272
- normal ordering, 274
- normalizable, 279
- normalized state vectors, 254
- nuclear spectral theorem, 52
- number operator, 41, 52, 277

- objective, 14
- observable, 39
- observables, 99
- on the statistical level, classical and quantum mechanics look formally simple and identical in structure, 15
- one, 175, 180
- one-parameter group, 169
- open balls, 96
- optical potential, 63
- orbit, 215
- orthogonal group, 172, 173
 - special, 173
- orthogonal Lie algebra, 171
- orthogonal matrix, 172
- orthogonal projectors, 151
- oscillator
 - forced, 55
 - harmonic, 37
 - simple anharmonic, 37
- oscillator algebra, 277
- out-eigenstates, 53

- parameter, 245
- partially ordered, 96
- particle-wave duality, 41
- particles of kind, 121
- partition function, 67, 103
- Pauli equation, 329
- Pauli exclusion principle, 42
- Pauli matrices, 18
- Pauli representation, 295
- phase, 12
- Phase equilibrium, 140
- phase space, 4, 37, 239, 243
- phase space density, 7
- phase transitions, 78
- phenomenological Euler equation, 119
- phlogiston, 84
- photoelectric effect, 149
- physical representations, 211
- Planck’s constant, 7
- Planck’s formula, 66
- Poincaré group, 22
 - physical representations, 211
- Poincaré Lemma, 229
- point, 231
- points, 231
- Poisson $*$ -algebra, 187
- Poisson algebra, 185
- Poisson algebras, 185
- Poisson bracket, 7, 40, 241
- Poisson manifold, 239
- polarization vectors, 49
- polarizations, 48
- polynomial algebra, 189
- population, 143
- pose, 188
- position, 243, 245
- position representation, 51, 261
- positive operator-valued measure, 151
- positrons, 45
- potential, 34, 199
- potential energy, 35
- POVM, 151
- Poynting vector, 48
- pressure, 76, 121
- principal moments of inertia, 189
- principle of least action, 249
- product, 95, 166, 185, 224

- product rule, 222, 225
- product rules, 228
- projective representation, 284
- pseudo-Riemannian metric, 24
- pure state, 132
- pure states, 12
- pure substance, 76

- quantities, 94, 97
- quantization, 11, 259
- quantized, 130
- quantum Boltzmann equation, 257
- quantum chain rule, 106
- quantum chemistry, 13
- quantum electrodynamics, 49
- quantum equilibrium, 90, 140
- Quantum equilibrium., 141
- quantum estimation theory, 151
- quantum field theory, 10
- quantum Heisenberg equation, 14
- quantum integral, 7, 99
- quantum Lie product, 181
- quantum Liouville equation, 13
- quantum number, 329
- quantum tomography, 151
- qubit, 281
- quotient Lie algebra, 165

- radiation-energy density, 65
- raising operator, 278
- range, 231
- rank, 312
- Rayleigh's law, 66
- real (complex), 162
- real form, 182
- real part, 95
- realization, 171, 183
- reflection group, 213
- regular, 246
- Relations to thermodynamics., 155
- relative entropy, 108
- representation, 205, 355
 - adjoint, 209, 212
 - decomposable, 207
 - finite-dimensional, 207
 - fully reducible, 207
 - fundamental, 23
 - highest weight, 312
 - irreducible, 205
 - linear, 205
 - metaplectic, 284
 - projective, 284
 - unitary, 205
- representation of a Lie group, 208
- reproducibility, 147
- reproducing kernel property, 307
- resolution of the identity, 287
- resolution of unity, 280, 287
- resonance
 - sharp, 57
- resonance frequency, 57
- resonances, 64
- rest energy, 24
- restricted Lorentz group, 307
- restriction of scalars, 171
- reversible transformation, 81
- rigged Hilbert space, 53, 279
- Rodrigues formula, 17
- roindices, 221
- root generator, 313
- root systems, 213
- roots, 313
- rough vectors, 280
- rovector, 221
- running coupling constants, 276
- Rydberg formula, 59
- Rydberg–Ritz combination principle, 55

- S-matrix, 53
- saddle point, 36
- sampling, 143
- scalar field, 232
- scalar fields, 220
- scattering states, 62
- Schottky bump, 124
- Schrödinger equation, 51, 132, 254
- Schrödinger picture, 13
- Schrödinger's cat, 10
- Schrödinger-Poisson equations, 257
- second law of thermodynamics, 82
- second quantization, 41
- selection rules, 322
- self-adjoint, 169

- semiclassical approximations, 10
- seminorms, 230
- semisimple, 212, 313
- sharp resonance, 57
- shifted delta function, 279
- signature, 173
- signed commutator, 294
- significant, 110
- simple, 212
- simple anharmonic oscillator, 37
- single mode bosonic Fock space, 281
- single mode fermion Fock space, 295
- single-particle modes, 40
- singular, 246
- smooth, 230, 232
- smooth vectors, 279
- solvable, 213
- special linear, 213
- special orthogonal, 213
- special orthogonal group, 16, 172, 173
- special relativity theory, 5
- special unitary group, 174
- special unitary Lie algebras, 174
- spectral density, 53
- spectral gap, 131
- spectral theorem, 12
- spectroscopy, 55, 62
- spectrum, 51, 55, 130, 146, 312
- speed, 24
- spin, 211, 295, 317
- spin coherent states, 306
- spin group, 303
- spin-orbit coupling, 330
- spin-statistics theorem, 295
- spinning electron, 257
- spinor representation, 306
- spinor representations, 304
- spontaneous changes, 81
- spontaneous decay, 68
- squared probability amplitude, 152
- stability conditions, 78, 119
- standard deviation, 110
- standard system, 121
- standard temperature, 80
- standard thermodynamic systems, 75
- state, 37, 101, 243, 245
- state form, 39, 243
- state space, 77, 119
- state variable, 81
- state vector, 132
- states, 94
- statistical instrument, 149, 151
- statistical mechanics, 93, 120
- statistics, 110
- Stefan's constant, 72
- Stefan's law, 65, 70
- stiffness, 272
- stiffness constants, 200
- Stone–Von Neumann theorem, 281
- Stone–von Neumann theorem, 295
- strictly upper triangular, 177
- strongly continuous, 180
- strongly integrable, 97
- structure constants, 162
- sum, 95
- superoperators, 259
- symmetric, 224
- symmetric algebra, 300
- Symmetries and symmetry breaking, 329
- symmetry algebra, 327
- Symmetry and broken symmetry., 327
- symplectic, 213
- symplectic form, 176, 224
- symplectic group, 174
- symplectic Lie algebra, 173
- symplectic space, 241
- system function, 77, 119
- system of damped oscillators, 34
- system size, 78, 120

- tangent (hyper-)plane, 234
- tangent bundle, 8, 234
- tangent space, 234
- tangent vector, 234
- temperature, 76, 117
- temporal stability, 308
- tensor algebra, 206
- tensor of moments of inertia, 188
- test for a state φ , 152
- the Heisenberg algebra, 176
- The nonrelativistic limit., 24

- the algebra \mathbb{E} of scalar fields is always assumed to be commutative., 223
- The enveloping algebra., 206
- The Lie derivative in the traditional approach., 234
- The Pauli matrices., 18
- The phase space formulation., 36
- The rotation group., 16
- The semisimple case., 313
- The symbol formulation., 265
- the unique optimal decision strategy., 155
- The unitary case., 305
- theorem of Ado, 170
- thermal contact, 80
- thermal energy flux, 83
- thermal state, 116
- thermal system, 116
- thermal variables, 117
- thermal work, 83
- thermodynamic limit, 12
- thermodynamic uncertainty relation, 127
- third law of thermodynamics, 82
- tight frame, 286
- time, 243
- time-dependent Hartree-Fock equations, 254
- time-dependent Schrödinger equation, 10
- time-independent Schrödinger equation, 12, 51
- time-reversal symmetry, 69
- torsion angle, 201
- trace, 94
- trajectory, 243, 245
- transpose, 224
- transversality condition, 246
- triality, 214
- triangular decomposition, 311
- triangulated Lie algebra, 312
- tunneling, 325
- turbulence, 5
- two level system, 104

- uncertain number, 148
- uncertainty, 110
- uncertainty relation, 111, 113
- unconstrained mechanical system, 243
- uncorrelated, 110

- uniform motion, 237
- uniform topology, 96
- unit upper triangular, 177
- unit vectors, 94
- unitary, 167, 174
- unitary Lie algebras, 174
- unitary representation, 205, 208
- universal atlas, 232
- universal covering group, 210
- Universal covering group., 209
- universal enveloping algebra, 206
- universal gas constant, 79
- unstable particles, 64

- vacuum, 41, 312
- vacuum vector, 278
- value, 94, 101, 231, 255
- variational principle, 243
- vector fields, 220
- velocity, 24, 34, 248
- Verma module, 277, 295
- Vlasov equations, 257
- volume, 76, 121

- wave function, 279
- wave functions, 279
- weak-* topology, 146
- wedge product, 227, 300
- weight lattice, 313
- weights, 312
- Weyl relations, 179
- Wick theorem, 109
- Wien's approximation, 65
- Wien's displacement law, 65, 70
- Wigner transform, 262

- zeroth law of thermodynamics, 80, 116