

A First Look at Supersymmetry

Andrew James Bruce

January 7, 2025

Abstract

These are expanded notes for a short series of lectures, presented at the University of Luxembourg in 2017, giving an introduction to some of the ideas of supersymmetry and supergeometry. In particular, we start from some motivating facts in physics, pass to the theory of supermanifolds, then to spinors, ending up at super-Minkowski space-times. We examine some salient mathematical issues with understanding supersymmetry in a classical setting and make no attempt to discuss phenomenologically interesting models. Moreover, the presentation is “light” in the sense that nothing is carefully proved. The audience of the seminars ranged from Ph.D. students to more experienced postdocs in mathematics. The audience was assumed to have a working knowledge of differential geometry, elementary category theory, and basic ideas from classical & quantum mechanics. No knowledge of supersymmetry and supergeometry is assumed.

Contents

0 Prerequisites	2
1 Introduction	2
2 Supersymmetric Mechanics	4
2.1 N=1 supermechanics in superspace	4
2.2 N=2 supermechanics in superspace	6
2.3 Remarks	7
3 Supermanifolds and the functor of points	8
3.1 Recap	8
3.2 Supermanifolds	8
3.3 The functor of points	10
3.4 The Cartesian product	11
3.5 Generalised supermanifolds and the inner Homs	12
3.6 Anticommuting fields revisited	13
4 Space-time and spinors	14
4.1 Recap	14
4.2 Minkowski space-time and the Poincaré group	14
4.3 Clifford algebras	15
4.4 The Clifford algebra of space-time and spinors	15
4.5 Anticommuting Majorana spinor fields	17
4.6 An Aside: The Dirac and Klein–Gordon equations	17
5 Real super-Minkowski space-times	18
5.1 Recap	18
5.2 The $N = 1$ super Poincaré algebra	18
5.3 Constructing super-Minkowski space-time	18
5.4 The SUSY generators and covariant derivatives	19
5.5 The SUSY structure	19
5.6 Aside: Chiral Superspace	20

arXiv:2412.07799v2 [math.DG] 6 Jan 2025

6 Round-up and Conclusion	21
A Appendix	21
A.1 Lie Superalgebras	21
A.2 Grassmann Algebras	22
A.3 Calculus with Anticommuting Variables	22
A.4 The Berezinian	23

Disclaimer *These notes contain no original material and the author has made no attempt at providing a comprehensive list of references.*

0 Prerequisites

Given that these lectures are aimed at graduate students and postdocs in mathematics, we assume basic knowledge of the following:

- General Topology - topologies, open sets and topological spaces.
- Differential Geometry - manifolds, vector fields and Lie groups.
- Category Theory - categories and functors.
- Lie Theory - Lie algebras and their representations.
- Classical Mechanics - Lagrangians, Hamiltonians and Equations of Motion.
- Quantum Mechanics - Hilbert spaces and Hermitian operators.

No particular deep results from the above will be employed, but a general working knowledge will be necessary. We will not need much from Algebraic Geometry and we will not assume any knowledge of ‘supermathematics’. We will not deal with Quantum Field Theory at all.



1 Introduction

In nature there appears to be two kinds of particles¹: *bosons* with integer spin, and *fermions* with half-integer spin. These two families are very different when it comes to their statistics. In particular, any number of bosons can be placed into a given quantum state, while for fermions, we have the famous Pauli exclusion principle – no more than one fermion can occupy a given quantum state.

At the classical level we know that bosons can be described by commuting objects, while fermions require anticommuting objects. The reason for the use of anticommuting objects can be quickly justified from the Pauli exclusion principle and the classical limit of the canonical anticommutation relations. Throughout these notes, we will, generally, employ natural coordinates in which $c = \hbar = 1$.

Consider a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_F , which we equip with creation and annihilation operators c^\dagger and c . Naturally, these operators act on the vacuum (lowest energy state) as

$$\begin{aligned} c^\dagger|0\rangle &= |1\rangle, \\ c|0\rangle &= \mathbf{0}, \\ c|1\rangle &= |0\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $|1\rangle$ is the one-particle state. As we insist that no more than one fermion can be placed in a given state, it must be the case that

$$c^\dagger|1\rangle = \mathbf{0},$$

¹There are other mathematical possibilities called *Green-Volkov para-particles*, see [9, 22]. However, there is no evidence that (fundamental) particles with non-standard statistics are realised in nature.

which loosely means that forcing another fermion into an occupied state destroys the state. A general state is then a linear combination of these two states – the empty state and one filled state. The direct consequences of this are that

$$\begin{aligned}(cc^\dagger + c^\dagger c)|0\rangle &= c|1\rangle = |0\rangle, \\ (cc^\dagger + c^\dagger c)|1\rangle &= c^\dagger|0\rangle = |1\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Then, assuming we have normalised the vacuum state, we see that $(cc^\dagger + c^\dagger c) = \mathbf{1}$. The classical limit – rather hands-wavily – means that we are looking for objects that satisfy $\xi^1\xi^2 + \xi^2\xi^1 = 0$. Thus, we encounter anticommuting objects – this leads us to consider so-called *Grassmann algebras*. Clearly, one cannot find real numbers, other than zero, that represent these anticommuting objects, Dirac referred to ‘anticommuting classical numbers’.

The basic idea of *supersymmetry* (c.f. [7, 8, 18, 24]) is to mix bosons and fermions. Quantum mechanically, consider a Hilbert space with a decomposition into a bosonic and fermionic subspaces

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_B \oplus \mathcal{H}_F.$$

Now, suppose that we have self-adjoint operators $Q_I = Q_I^\dagger$, ($I = 1, 2, \dots, N$), such that

$$Q_I\mathcal{H}_B \subseteq \mathcal{H}_F, \quad Q_I\mathcal{H}_F \subseteq \mathcal{H}_B,$$

and satisfy the *supersymmetry algebra*

$$\{Q_I, Q_J\} \propto \delta_{IJ}H, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$[Q_I, H] = 0, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$[H, H] = 0, \quad (1.1c)$$

where $[A, B] = AB - BA$ is the *commutator*, and $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$ is the *anticommutator*. Here H is the *Hamiltonian* operator for our system under study. Some immediate remarks are:

1. The Q ’s are the ‘‘square-roots’’ of the Hamiltonian. This means that supersymmetry is related to a space-time translation – you apply one of the generators Q twice and you end up acting with the Hamiltonian (the generator of time evolution of our system).
2. We can write $H = 2Q_I^\dagger Q_I$ (no sum here) and so the expectation value of the energy is

$$\langle\psi|H|\psi\rangle = 2\langle\psi|Q_I^\dagger Q_I|\psi\rangle = 2\|Q_I|\psi\rangle\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Thus, the energy spectrum is always non-negative. The vacuum energy is an order parameter for symmetry breaking. That is, if the vacuum (ground) state is supersymmetric then

$$Q_I|0\rangle = \mathbf{0},$$

and the vacuum energy is zero. Otherwise the energy of the vacuum is non-zero (but positive).

The simplest supersymmetric quantum mechanical theory one can think of is the $N = 1$ *supersymmetric oscillator* (see [16]). Here the Hamiltonian is simply the sum of the standard bosonic oscillator and the standard fermionic oscillator. In particular, on the Hilbert space we have bosonic creation and annihilation operators a^\dagger and a , and fermionic creation and annihilation operators c^\dagger and c subject to the standard commutation/anticommutation relations

$$[a, a^\dagger] = \mathbf{1}, \quad \{c, c^\dagger\} = \mathbf{1}.$$

We supplement this with the condition $[a, c] = \mathbf{0}$, which basically says that the two sectors do not interact. The Hamiltonian is taken to be

$$H = a^\dagger a + c^\dagger c.$$

The SUSY generator is then given by

$$Q = c^\dagger a + a^\dagger c.$$

One can show that as $a^\dagger|0\rangle$ is a one boson state that $Qa^\dagger|0\rangle$ is a one fermion state and so on.

It must be stated that to date, supersymmetry has not been found in nature. However, methods of supersymmetry have been applied to condensed matter physics, nuclear and atomic physics, and optics. Wider than that, supersymmetry has inspired many developments in mathematics, especially in geometry as we shall see.

In practice writing down interacting supersymmetric quantum theories is difficult, if not impossible. A better tactic is to examine classical theories and then quantise these – say via path integrals and perturbation theory. As the classical limit of a fermionic degree of freedom is an anticommuting object (think “coordinate”), *supermanifolds* become essential. To quote Witten (see [26])

Formulating a supersymmetric field theory in superspace – that is on a supermanifold – is, when possible, often very helpful.

Recent advances in using supermanifolds to build and understand supersymmetric theories include [3, 4, 5]. We remark that the literature is constantly growing.

The idea of this short series of lectures is to support the idea that supermanifolds are useful in physics, and to make sense of some of the mathematical gaps usually found in introductory physics texts. Very loosely, if we consider classical configuration or phase spaces of systems that include fermions, we require anticommuting coordinates and this leads to the idea of supermanifolds. Heuristically, supermanifolds are ‘manifolds’ with commuting and anticommuting coordinates. We will further motivate the use of anticommuting coordinates and describe supersymmetry, before passing to supermanifolds a bit more carefully.



2 Supersymmetric Mechanics

2.1 N=1 supermechanics in superspace

As already stated, the idea is to find some classical action that is invariant under supersymmetry and then pass that over to the ‘black box’ of quantisation. In these lectures I will say nothing about the quantum theory and just highlight some of the supergeometric aspects of the classical theory. In order to build some intuition, and find some interesting mathematical gaps, we first concentrate on a simple model in one dimension. This will allow us to highlight some issues to cover in later lectures without the clutter of indices and knowledge of relativity and spinors. In fact, all the subtle issues are already present in this simple model.

Let us start from the supersymmetry algebra (see Appendix A.1 for Lie superalgebras)

$$\{Q, Q\} = \frac{1}{2}P, \quad [P, P] = 0, \quad [Q, P] = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that I have changed the normalisation here as compared with earlier. This is rather unimportant and other conventions can be found in the literature. The fundamental idea is to realise this algebra as vector fields on some supermanifold – a concept we introduce properly in the next lecture. Indeed, the algebra here is a Lie superalgebra, so a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded generalisation of a Lie algebra. Thus, one might expect to be able to integrate this to a ‘Lie supergroup’. This can be done, but requires some mathematics that we will discuss in a later lecture. For now, as is common in physics, lets work formally and not worry about the exact mathematical meaning.

I claim that one can realise Q and P as vector fields on the supermanifold $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$. Without a proper definition, we can think of $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$ as a ‘manifold’ with one commuting and one anticommuting coordinate, (t, θ) , say. In particular, we have $t\theta = \theta t$ and $\theta^2 = \theta\theta = -\theta\theta = 0$. And so, all functions on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$ are simply of the form

$$f(t, \theta) = f_0(t) + \theta f_1(t).$$

One can justify this from several points of view, but we can think of Taylor expanding a function in θ and noting the nilpotent property of anticommuting coordinates, i.e., $\theta^2 = 0$ and so higher-order terms in any expansion vanish. Note that a general function decomposes into a bosonic and fermionic part. If we assign the number 0 to anything bosonic and the number 1 to anything fermionic then we observe that the space of functions is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded². As an aside, by supergeometry in a general sense, we mean geometry in which everything is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded – this is not always an obvious extension of geometry!

Now, one can show that

$$P = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad Q = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{4}\theta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad (2.2)$$

gives a representation of (2.1), i.e., these vector fields (first-order differential operators) satisfy the supersymmetry algebra. Here we take the derivative with respect to t to have its standard meaning, while derivatives with respect to θ are defined algebraically – functions are just linear in θ and so this is no problem. In more generality, functions in odd/anticommuting variables will be polynomials, and so derivatives can be defined algebraically.

We need to be a little bit careful here with the commutator of vector fields as we are in the ‘super-world’ - everything is \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded. We can deduce the parity, so if a vector field is even/bosonic or odd/fermionic, by counting the number of anticommuting coordinates and their derivatives (mod 2 when required). Thus, P is even/bosonic and Q is odd/fermionic. This means that we should consider the standard commutator between P and itself, and between P and Q . However, we need the anticommutator between Q and itself, i.e.

$$\{Q, Q\} = QQ + QQ.$$

As we have a vector field that represents the supersymmetry generator, we can think about its Lie derivative. In particular, allowing an anticommuting infinitesimal parameter ϵ , we can geometrically understand supersymmetry as the infinitesimal diffeomorphism

$$t \mapsto t' = t + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon\theta, \quad (2.3a)$$

$$\theta \mapsto \theta' = \theta + \epsilon. \quad (2.3b)$$

But what has this got to do with our physics understanding of supersymmetry? The idea now is to encode the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom into one object on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$ – a so called *superfield*. The theory we will build will have one bosonic field $q(t)$ and one fermionic field $\psi(t)$. With this in mind let us consider an even superfield on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$, which in coordinates must be of the form

$$\Phi(t, \theta) = q(t) + \theta\psi(t). \quad (2.4)$$

Note that we require this whole object to be even/commuting. This means that we require $\psi(t)$ to be anticommuting. This is of course natural in light of the spin-statistics theorem – “fermions have anticommuting fields”. However, this means that we *cannot* think of Φ simply as a function on the superspace $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$. How can we build odd/anticommuting fields that only depend on a commuting coordinate? We can also consider odd superfields, but this does not remedy the situation.

The resolution to this question of odd fields, as we have already done with understanding infinitesimal diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$, is to allow ‘external odd constants’. The best and most mathematically sound way to do this is to employ a more categorical framework to supermanifolds – namely the functor of points and internal Homs. We will come to this in the next lecture. For now, let us agree that we can work formally and not worry about the extra oddness.

In *component form* we define the N=1 supersymmetry transformations via

$$\delta_\epsilon \Phi(t, \theta) := \epsilon Q(\Phi(t, \theta)),$$

²Recall that as a set $\mathbb{Z}_2 := \{0, 1\}$.

which is really just the Lie derivative of the superfield in the ‘direction’ of Q . Written out we have

$$\delta_\epsilon q(t) = \epsilon \psi(t), \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\delta_\epsilon \dot{\psi}(t) = -\frac{1}{4} \epsilon \dot{q}(t), \quad (2.5b)$$

where ‘dot’ is the derivative with respect to t . Thus, we see that supersymmetry mixes the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom, as we wanted!

We want to use this encoding of our fields/degrees of freedom into a geometric object on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$ to build a classical action that is invariant under supersymmetry – that is, invariant under (2.5a) and (2.5b). As we want something dynamical we should take derivatives of the superfield and build some action from there.

The slight complication here is that derivatives with respect to θ transform non-trivially under supersymmetry – check this yourself! The situation is formally the same as encountered when introducing connections and covariant derivatives in differential geometry. Thus, one needs to introduce a *SUSY covariant derivative*

$$\mathbb{D} := \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} - \frac{1}{4} \theta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \quad (2.6)$$

You should notice that this is almost the same as Q , but with a minus sign difference – this is quite a generic feature. We want to build actions from the superfield and its first derivatives (we will not consider higher-order derivatives as these are generally problematic in physics)

$$\left\{ \Phi, \dot{\Phi}, \mathbb{D}\Phi \right\}.$$

Just about the only sensible action we can build is

$$S[\Phi] = - \int D[t, \theta] \mathbb{D}\Phi \dot{\Phi}.$$

For odd variables integration is the same as differentiation (see Appendix A.3), and then integrating out θ we are left with an action

$$S = \int dt \left(\frac{1}{4} \dot{q}^2(t) - \dot{\psi}(t) \psi(t) \right), \quad (2.7)$$

which gives (up to some choice in the mass) the standard kinetic term for a particle in one dimension and the one dimensional Dirac-like term.

Via direct calculation you can show that the Lagrangian is quasi-invariant under supersymmetry: $\delta_\epsilon L = \frac{1}{4} \epsilon \frac{d}{dt} (\dot{q}\psi)$. However, by construction we already knew that the action is invariant!

Remark 2.1. The one issue we have ‘brushed under the carpet’ is the invariance or not of the integration measure under supersymmetry. To do this carefully, we need to introduce the *Berezinian* which is the super-generalisation of the determinant. At this stage, we will just state that the integration measure is invariant. For completeness, we include the calculation in Appendix A.4.

2.2 N=2 supermechanics in superspace

The N=1 action we obtained is not particularly interesting – it is just the sum of the free actions for a boson and a fermion. The N=2 case follows from similar reasoning, but we have a much more interesting theory. I will just sketch the theory, making note that the basic mathematical questions already pose themselves for the N=1 case.

The N=2 supersymmetry algebra is given by (noting our conventions) as

$$\{Q_I, Q_J\} = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{IJ} P, \quad (2.8a)$$

$$[Q_I, P] = 0, \quad (2.8b)$$

$$[P, P] = 0, \quad (2.8c)$$

where $I = 1, 2$. In this case we can take the supermanifold needed to realise this algebra to be $\mathbb{R}^{1|2}$. That is the supermanifold which we can equip with coordinates (t, θ^1, θ^2) . The θ coordinates are odd/anticommuting and so $\theta^1\theta^2 = -\theta^2\theta^1$ and $(\theta)^2 = 0$. I claim, and one should check (I mean you!) that we have the representation

$$P = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad Q_I = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^I} + \frac{1}{4}\theta^J\delta_{JI}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \quad (2.9)$$

Geometrically, we understand supersymmetry as the infinitesimal diffeomorphisms

$$t \mapsto t' = t + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^I\theta^J\delta_{JI}, \quad (2.10a)$$

$$\theta^I \mapsto \theta'^I = \theta^I + \epsilon^I. \quad (2.10b)$$

This means that we have two supersymmetries and require two anticommuting parameters. Again, just as for the N=1 case we need SUSY covariant derivatives

$$\mathbb{D}_I = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^I} - \frac{1}{4}\theta^J\delta_{JI}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}.$$

An even superfield is then of the form

$$\Phi(t, \theta) = q(t) + \theta^1\psi_1(t) + \theta^2\psi_2(t) + \theta^1\theta^2F(t).$$

This we see that we have two bosonic degrees of freedom and two fermionic ones, as we would expect. It will turn out that F is an auxiliary field, meaning it can be removed using its equations of motion. In component form the (off-shell) supersymmetry transformations are

$$\delta q(t) = \epsilon^1\psi_1(t) + \epsilon^2\psi_2(t), \quad (2.11a)$$

$$\delta\psi_1(t) = -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^1\dot{q}(t) + \epsilon^2F(t), \quad (2.11b)$$

$$\delta\psi_2(t) = -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^2\dot{q}(t) - \epsilon^1F(t), \quad (2.11c)$$

$$\delta F(t) = \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^1\dot{\psi}_2(t) - \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^2\dot{\psi}_1(t). \quad (2.11d)$$

To build an invariant action we consider

$$S[\Phi] = \int D[t, \theta] (\mathbb{D}_1\Phi\mathbb{D}_2\Phi - W(\Phi)).$$

Expanding out in terms of the θ 's and then integrating (see Appendix A.3) gives

$$S = \int dt \left(\frac{1}{8}\dot{q}^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\dot{\psi}_1\psi_1 + \dot{\psi}_2\psi_2) + F^2 - FW'(q) + \psi_1\psi_2W''(q) \right).$$

One can then remove F using its equation of motion giving

$$S = \int dt \left(\frac{1}{8}\dot{q}^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\dot{\psi}_1\psi_1 + \dot{\psi}_2\psi_2) - \frac{1}{4}(W'(q))^2 + \psi_1\psi_2W''(q) \right), \quad (2.12)$$

which is related to Witten's model of supersymmetric quantum mechanics (see [25]).

2.3 Remarks

I have been very sketchy in this first lecture. The key message is that supergeometry can help with the construction of classical actions that exhibit supersymmetry.

The main issues that we saw are the following:

- What are supermanifolds?
- How do we make sense of superfields and especially odd fields?

I hope that the next lecture will answer these questions – to some reasonable extent.



3 Supermanifolds and the functor of points

3.1 Recap

Supersymmetry at the quantum level relates bosons (integer spin particles) with fermions (half integer spin). As these particles are very different in the essence, the theoretical existence of such a symmetry is quite remarkable. However, constructing interesting quantum theories from scratch is difficult and one usually resorts to classical theories first. The “particle–field correspondence” (together with the “spin–statistics theorem”) tells us

- Bosons $\longrightarrow q(t, x)$ commuting fields
- Fermions $\longrightarrow \psi(t, x)$ anticommuting fields

The questions we shall address in this lecture are the following

1. Can we *geometrically* treat commuting and anticommuting degrees of freedom on equal footing?
2. Can we really make sense of $\psi(t, x)$ being anticommuting if it seems to be ‘build’ only from *commuting* variables?

Motivation for these questions comes from classical mechanics and field theory where differential geometry plays a central rôle. We need some kind of ‘manifold’ that has both commuting and anticommuting coordinates. Mathematicians took (hijacked?) the nomenclature *super* from supersymmetry and developed the theory of *supergeometry*, which is now a respectable, if not a very popular, branch of mathematics.

3.2 Supermanifolds

The very informal working definition of a supermanifold is a ‘manifold’ with commuting and anticommuting coordinates. One can work with coordinate charts and patch them together, much as one would with a manifold. From there various geometric objects can be defined via their local description in terms of coordinates. Everything looks very much like the theory of manifolds, at first glance. To make these loose statements more meaningful mathematicians developed at least two approaches to this. First is the DeWitt–Rogers approach where one gives a non-Hausdorff topology to Grassmann algebras and then builds supermanifolds from the according local model. There are some complications here with the general theory and in particular, one has to take some care in defining (different classes of) smooth functions and vector fields. However, for application in physics, the DeWitt–Rogers approach, also known as the concrete approach, is seemingly sufficient. For a review the reader can consult Rogers [17].

The other is the ringed space approach where one follows a more algebraic geometry route and modifies the sheaf of (continuous) functions on a topological space. It is this ringed space approach that we will adopt as this is known to be more ‘mathematically sound’ and is the favoured approach by mathematicians today. In fact, it is known that sorting out the issues of the concrete approach leads one back to sheaves, and so the initial advantage of a less abstract language is actually not there. The ringed space approach goes back to Berezin (1931–1980) who is recognised as the father of supermathematics. While there had been some hints in physics literature prior to Berezin’s contributions, he was the first to have the foresight to envisage treating commuting and anticommuting variables on equal footing. The definition of a supermanifold, as we understand it, is due to Berezin and Leites (see [1, 11]). Other useful references include [2, 6, 10, 14, 21].

Definition 3.1. A (smooth) *supermanifold* of dimension $n|m$ is a locally superringed space $M := (|M|, \mathcal{O}_M)$, which is locally isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{n|m} := (\mathbb{R}^n, C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\infty \otimes \Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^m))$, where $C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\infty$ is the sheaf of smooth functions on \mathbb{R}^n , and $\Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^m)$ is the Grassmann algebra (over the reals) with m generators, i.e., the generators satisfy $\xi^i \xi^j = -\xi^j \xi^i$, which implies $(\xi)^2 = 0$. *Morphisms of supermanifolds* are morphisms of locally ringed spaces,

$$(\phi, \phi^*) : (|M|, \mathcal{O}_M) \longrightarrow (|N|, \mathcal{O}_N)$$

Thus, they consist of two pieces:

1. A continuous map $\phi : |M| \rightarrow |N|$;

2. A family of superring morphism $\phi_{|V|}^* : \mathcal{O}_N(|V|) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_M(\phi^{-1}(|V|))$, where $|V| \subset |N|$ is open, that commute with the restriction maps. Via composition of morphisms of supermanifolds we obtain the *category of supermanifolds* \mathbf{SMan}



Let us decipher some of this...

In the definition of a supermanifold we have a ringed space of some kind, i.e., $|M|$ is a topological space. In fact, from the definition it turns out that $|M|$ is a *smooth manifold*. One can justify this by ‘throwing away’ the coordinates ξ and observing that we have the definition of a manifold!

Given any smooth manifold, $|M|$, we can consider its sheaf of smooth functions. That is, given any open $|U| \subset |M|$,

$$\mathcal{O}(|U|) = C^\infty(|U|, \mathbb{R}) =: C^\infty(|U|).$$

As any ‘small enough’ open $|U|$ is homomorphic to some subset in \mathbb{R}^n , we really are considering multi-variable smooth functions, i.e., we can use local coordinates. Mod details, this means that we can always think of functions locally in a consistent way. The interested reader should look up the properties of sheaves, however we will not need any details here.

The idea of a supermanifold is to modify the sheaf of smooth functions on a manifold to obtain a new kind of geometry – one ‘throws in’ generators of a Grassmann algebra

$$\mathcal{O}_M(|U|) \simeq C^\infty(|U|) \otimes \Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^m), \quad (3.1)$$

for ‘small enough’ opens $|U| \subset |M|$. This means that local sections of the *structure sheaf* of a supermanifold are of the form (using the isomorphism above and local coordinates on $|U|$)

$$f(x, \xi) = f(x) + \xi^i f_i(x) + \frac{1}{2!} \xi^i \xi^j f_{ji}(x) + \dots + \frac{1}{m!} \xi^{i_1} \dots \xi^{i_m} f_{i_m \dots i_1}(x).$$

We will write $C^\infty(M)$ for the global sections and call the *functions*. Note that any function written in local coordinates is a polynomial of maximal order m . The dimension of a supermanifold is $n|m$, where n is the dimension of the underlying manifold, and m is the number of generators of the Grassmann algebra.

As a warning, on some arbitrary open $|U| \subset |M|$ we know that $\mathcal{O}_M(|U|)$ is a (supercommutative) unital superring, but that that is about it. It is only on ‘small enough’ opens can we use coordinates - this is exactly the same as with manifolds.

Another thing to notice is that we need two parts to every morphism of supermanifolds. For smooth manifolds one can show that the only possible pullback of functions that is meaningful is that induced by the standard pullback by smooth maps between the manifolds. However, for supermanifolds, as we have modified the notion of functions this is no longer the case and the pullback needs to be specified.

What makes supermanifolds very workable from a differential geometry and physics perspective is that we can use *local coordinates* in much the same way as we can on a smooth manifold. Indeed, much of the theory of smooth manifolds can be directly translated to supermanifolds via local coordinates – not that this is always very elegant.

Theorem 3.2 (“Chart Theorem”). *We can use local coordinates on a supermanifold and morphisms of supermanifolds can be described locally by their effect on coordinates.*

That is, given any point on $|M|$ we can always find a ‘small enough’ open neighbourhood $|U| \subseteq |M|$ such that we can employ local coordinates $x^a := (x^\mu, \theta^i)$ on M , where x^μ and θ^i are, respectively, collections of commuting and anticommuting elements of $\mathcal{O}_M(|U|)$. Using the isomorphism (3.1) one can set x^μ to be a ‘standard coordinate’ on $|U| \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and θ^i are the generators of a Grassmann algebra. However, it is not usually instructive to think of x as ‘pure real’ and θ as ‘pure Grassmann’ as we have changes of coordinates that mix these two, as we will see by looking at more general morphisms.

Now suppose we have another supermanifold N and we equip it with local coordinates (y^λ, χ^δ) , the first being commuting coordinates and the latter being anticommuting coordinates. Then any morphism, which is usually written simply as

$$\phi : M \rightarrow N,$$

can be locally described as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^* y^\lambda &= y^\lambda(x, \theta), \\ \phi^* \chi^\delta &= \chi^\delta(x, \theta),\end{aligned}$$

where we have employed standard abuses of notation from standard differential geometry. Moreover, from the definition of a supermanifold we require that the morphism must preserve the *Grassmann parity*, i.e., the commuting or anticommuting nature of the local coordinates.

Example 3.3. Let us consider $\mathbb{R}^{1|2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1|1}$. In this case we can consider global coordinates (x, θ^1, θ^2) on $\mathbb{R}^{1|2}$, and (t, τ) on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$. Then using the standard abused of notation we write

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^* t &= t(x, \theta) = t(x) + \theta^1 \theta^2 s(x), \\ \phi^* \tau &= \tau(x, \theta) = \theta^1 \tau_1(x) + \theta^2 \tau_2(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $t(x), s(x), \tau_1(x)$ and $\tau_2(x)$ are smooth functions on the real line.

We remark that the ‘‘Chart Theorem’’ is a non-trivial statement. The fact that we have local coordinates follows directly from the definition of a supermanifold. The fact that morphisms of algebras are determined by morphisms of their generators in *part* establishes the theorem. In particular, if we were only dealing with polynomials in both even and odd coordinates then there theorem would be rather obvious: knowing what happens to the coordinates means we know what happens to the polynomials, and vice versa. However, we are allowing more general smooth functions in the commuting coordinates and this needs some subtle handling in order to establish the theorem – one uses the polynomial approximation to prove the theorem. We will not attempt prove in any rigorous way the ‘‘Chart Theorem’’ and simply take it as given.

The upshot of the local structure and chart theorem is that you can think of a supermanifold as a space with both commuting and anticommuting coordinates...



... almost.

3.3 The functor of points

The only genuine points on a supermanifold M are the points on the underlying (or reduced) manifold $|M|$. Thus, not all the information about the supermanifold is contained in the set of point of $|M|$. This is in stark contrast with the classical case of manifolds. Loosely, once you know all the maps $*$ $\mapsto |M|$, you know the manifold. However, one has to be careful with point-wise constructions in the category of supermanifolds. However, we can clawback some classical intuition using Grothendiech’s *functor of points*.

The idea follows from more categorical nonsense (see Maclane [12]) and the *Yoneda embedding*, which works for all small categories (i.e., the hom-sets are sets). One considers a supermanifold to be a functor in the functor category $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}} := [\mathbf{SMan}^{\text{op}}, \mathbf{Set}]$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}M &: \mathbf{SMan}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Set} \\ S &\mapsto M(S) := \mathbf{Hom}(S, M)\end{aligned}$$

and for any $\phi \in \mathbf{Hom}(P, S)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}M(\phi) &: M(S) \longrightarrow M(P) \\ m &\mapsto m' := m \circ \phi.\end{aligned}$$

Yoneda's lemma says that this assignment of a functor to a supermanifold is full and faithful, hence \mathbf{SMan} is a full subcategory inside $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}$. In particular, morphisms of supermanifolds correspond to natural transformations between the associated functors – which really then reduce to considering maps between Hom sets.

Basically, no information is lost by thinking of a supermanifold as a functor. In fact, in general working with functor categories allows for ideas and constructions to be employed that are just not available in the original category. The big advantage with thinking of supermanifolds as functors is that we are now dealing with sets and this can allow us to start to work a bit more classically in terms of ‘generalised points on a supermanifold’ known as *S-points*. However, in general, some care must be taken here as $M(S)$ for a given supermanifold S is just a set and has no further structure. It is only by full knowledge of $M(-)$ as a functor, so how it acts on all supermanifolds (and morphisms) can we really fully recover M .

Remark 3.4. There is a nice particle physics analogy here with the functor of points, which we think is originally due to Ravi Vakil, though I stand to be corrected. Imagine that we want to discover all the properties of an unknown particle, and to this end we fire at it *all* possible test particles with a wide range of energies. By observing the results of the interactions with *all* the test particles over *all* energy scales, we can deduce *all* the properties of the unknown particle and thus characterise it completely. The functor of points allows us to ‘probe’ a given supermanifold by observing how, as a functor, it ‘interacts’ with all ‘test supermanifolds’. We further remark that the nomenclature ‘probe’ in this context goes back (at least) to Urs Schreiber pre-2008 online.

Clearly, not all functors in $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}$ come from the Yoneda embedding. We say that a functor in $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}$ is *representable* if it is naturally isomorphic to a supermanifold in the image of the Yoneda embedding – in simpler terms it is a genuine supermanifold. We will then refer to general (i.e., not necessarily representable) functors in $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}$ as *generalised supermanifolds*. In practice, it maybe easier to define some construction of a supermanifold as a generalised supermanifold and later show representability – this is also often the case in algebraic geometry more generally.

3.4 The Cartesian product

The Cartesian product of supermanifolds can be constructed using local coordinates in more-or-less the same way as one does for manifolds. We will just sketch the construction here.

Let $M = (|M|, \mathcal{O}_M)$ and $N = (|N|, \mathcal{O}_N)$ be two supermanifolds of dimension $p|q$ and $r|s$, respectively. First note that the Cartesian products $|U| \times |V|$, where $|U| \in |M|$, $|V| \in |N|$ are open, form a basis of the product topology of $|M| \times |N|$. We then pick coverings of M and N , labelling the opens as $|U_i|$ and $|V_j|$, such that we can employ local coordinates (x_i, ξ_i) and (y_j, η_j) on M and N , respectively. We denote the basis of the product topology generated by $|U_i| \times |V_j|$ as \mathcal{B} .

Definition 3.5. Let M and N be supermanifolds of dimension $p|q$ and $r|s$, respectively. The *product supermanifold* $M \times N$, of dimension $p + r|q + s$, is the supermanifold $(|M| \times |N|, \mathcal{O}_{M \times N})$, where $|M| \times |N|$ is equipped with the product topology, and $\mathcal{O}_{M \times N}$ is the sheaf glued from the sheaves $C_{|U_i| \times |V_j|}^\infty(x_i, y_j) \otimes \Lambda(\xi_i, \eta_j)$ associated to the base \mathcal{B} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{O}_{M \times N}|_{|U_i| \times |V_j|} \simeq C_{|U_i| \times |V_j|}^\infty(x_i, y_j) \otimes \Lambda(\xi_i, \eta_j).$$

The upshot of the construction is that we can employ local coordinates on M and N to build the Cartesian product $M \times N$. It can be shown that the Cartesian product is a categorical product (for those that know what that means).

An important and useful result is the canonical identification of the functor of points

$$(M \times N)(S) = M(S) \times N(S).$$

One application of the functor of points and the Cartesian product are *super Lie groups*, which can be defined a group objects in the category of supermanifolds. To define this

carefully, which we won't here, required the Cartesian product. Equivalently, we can define a super Lie group as a functor

$$G : \mathbf{SMan}^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Grp},$$

such that composition with the forgetful functor

$$\mathbf{Grp} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Set},$$

is a representable functor, that is, G is a genuine supermanifold. In simpler language, every $G(S)$ is a group and changing parametrisation yields a group homomorphism. We will encounter super Lie groups when dealing with supersymmetry.

We also require the Cartesian product for generalised supermanifolds and enriched morphisms of supermanifolds.

3.5 Generalised supermanifolds and the inner Homs

As already stated, a generalised supermanifold is an object in the functor category $\widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}$, whose objects are functors from $\mathbf{SMan}^{\text{op}}$ to the category \mathbf{Set} and whose morphisms are natural transformations. One passes from the category of finite-dimensional supermanifolds to the larger category of generalised supermanifolds in order to understand, for example, the *internal Homs* objects. In particular there always exists a generalised supermanifold such that the so-called *adjunction formula* holds

$$\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N)(\bullet) := \mathbf{Hom}(\bullet \times M, N) \in \widehat{\mathbf{SMan}}.$$

Heuristically, one should think of enriching the morphisms between supermanifolds to now have the structure of a supermanifold, however to understand this one passes to a larger category. In essence we will use the above to define what we mean by a *mapping supermanifold* and will probe it using the functor of points. We will refer to 'elements' of a mapping supermanifold as *maps* reserving morphisms for the categorical morphisms of supermanifolds.

A little more carefully, any arbitrary supermanifold S is sent to the set

$$\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N)(S) = \mathbf{Hom}(S \times M, N),$$

and any given morphism $\phi \in \mathbf{Hom}(P, S)$ induces the mapping between sets

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N)(\phi) : \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N)(S) &\longrightarrow \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N)(P), \\ \Psi_S &\longmapsto \Psi'_P := \Psi_S \circ (\phi, \mathbb{1}_M). \end{aligned}$$

In general, the mapping supermanifold will not be representable.

We can think of maps between two supermanifolds as a family of arrows $M \longrightarrow N$ consisting of both even and odd maps, or as standard supermanifold morphisms $S \times M \longrightarrow N$ parametrised by arbitrary supermanifolds S .

To clarify this, let us employ local coordinates (x^μ, θ^i) on M , (y^λ, ξ^δ) on N and (s^t, χ^v) on S (chosen arbitrarily). Then, any map $\Phi_S \in \mathbf{Hom}(S \times M, N)$ is locally (using standard abuses of notation) described by

$$y^\lambda = y^\lambda(z, \chi, x, \theta) =: y_S^\lambda(x, \theta), \quad \xi^\delta = \xi^\delta(s, \chi, x, \theta) =: \xi_S^\delta(x, \theta),$$

which are understood as collections of (local) even and odd functions on the Cartesian product $S \times M$, respectively. Note that with respect to the local coordinates on M the maps may be either even or odd: it is the Grassmann parity of the local coordinates on S that 'corrects' this discrepancy. Thus, the idea of even and odd maps is realised.

Example 3.6. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{Hom}(\{\emptyset\}, M) = |M|$, while $\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\{\emptyset\}, M) = M$.

Example 3.7. Another well-known example of a representable generalised supermanifold is the antitangent bundle $\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\mathbb{R}^{0|1}, M) = \Pi T M$. In fact, it is well-known that the generalised supermanifolds $\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(\mathbb{R}^{0|p}, M)$ are representable for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

As maps between supermanifolds are really functors, the composition of maps should be thought of in terms of a natural transformation

$$\circlearrowleft : \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, N) \times \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(N, L) \longrightarrow \underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(M, L), \quad (3.2)$$

defined, for any $S \in \mathbf{SMan}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}(S \times M, N) \times \mathrm{Hom}(S \times N, L) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(S \times M, L) \\ (\Phi_S, \Psi_S) &\longmapsto (\Psi \circ \Phi)_S := \Psi_S \circ (\mathbb{1}_S, \Phi_S) \circ (\Delta, \mathbb{1}_M), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and then letting S vary over *all* supermanifolds. Here $\Delta : S \longrightarrow S \times S$ is the diagonal of S and $\mathbb{1}_S : S \longrightarrow S$ is the identity.

3.6 Anticommuting fields revisited

Let us again reconsider mechanics with anticommuting degrees of freedom. We would like to make sense of anticommuting objects that depend on time only. In general, we will want to understand fields that depend on space also. For now, we want to understand how $\psi^\alpha(t)$ can be made anticommuting (see for example (2.4)). Clearly we cannot understand this as a categorical map $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{0|m}$ as the pullback of the odd coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^{0|m}$ to functions on \mathbb{R} will vanish – the only numerical value the generators of a Grassmann algebra can take are zero. We thus need an *odd map*.

One solution could be to allow anticommuting coefficients in the theory. That is, we will allow ‘constants’ that take their values in some ‘external’ Grassmann algebra. But, what Grassmann algebra should we pick? If we find one that is ‘large enough’ to describe the theory, then why not consider a larger one? If we expand $\psi^\alpha(t)$ in terms of these chosen parameters, then do the components have any physical meaning?

I argue that the choice of odd constants has no physical meaning – they are there just to ensure that everything is of the right nature with respect to being commutative or anticommutative. None of the physics should depend in any critical way on the choice of odd constants. Thus, don’t make a choice!

That is, we anticommuting (fermion) fields as *parametrised functors*, in particular in our mechanical situation they are functors from $\mathbf{SM}^{\mathrm{op}}$ to \mathbf{Set} that are parametrised by time: so we use the internal homs and write (rather abusing set theory notation) “ $\Psi \in \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{0|m})$ ”. To make sense of this one ‘probes’ the generalised supermanifold of fields and thinks of

$$\Psi_S : S \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{0|m}.$$

Let us then equip S with local coordinates (s^t, χ^v) , then one can write (via pulling back the coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^{0|m}$)

$$\psi^\alpha(s, \chi, t) := \psi_S^\alpha(t).$$

Thus the extra ‘anticommutingness’ is provided for by the local coordinates on S . In general, we don’t usually write out the coordinates on S explicitly, but it can be useful to do so when keeping track of some computations – in fact we have a theorem by Schwarz and Voronov [20, 23] that states that we only need probe things with Grassmann algebras, so supermanifolds of the form $\mathbb{R}^{0|p}$. Schwarz and Voronov refer to these ‘generalised points’ as Λ -points. In practice one can pick a ‘large enough’ Grassmann algebra to perform the required calculations, but as nothing should really depend on this, one should check the functorial nature of all following constructions.

Remark 3.8. With no details, there is an amazing link between the De-Witt–Roger’s approach to supermanifolds and the locally ringed space approach via Λ -points. Very loosely, the set of Λ -points for a given Grassmann algebra is a smooth manifold (with an extra structure on its tangent bundle), and smooth functions on it are smooth functions in the sense of Rogers. This was probably first spelt out by Schmitt [19] who was inspired by the more categorical approach of Molotkov [15]. I would not be surprised if this was known much earlier. For details consult Schmitt.

In more generality, fields whose targets are supermanifolds (irrespective of the source) need to be thought of in terms of the internal homs as parametrised functors. We will see this again.



4 Space-time and spinors

4.1 Recap

Via supermanifolds and generalised supermanifolds we have made sense of anticommuting degrees of freedom, although this is in terms of functors and natural transformations. Anticommuting fields are essential to describe physical fermions (e.g., the electron) in a classical setting. We will need to discuss spin and spinors if we really want to discuss fermions

4.2 Minkowski space-time and the Poincaré group

Maybe the most important group in physics is the *Poincaré group* as the positive energy unitary irreducible representations are indexed by mass (non-negative number) and spin (integer or half integer), and classify particles in quantum field theory. Thus, looking at representations of the Poincaré group, that is the group of isometries of Minkowski space-time, is essential in physics – we need *spinors* to understand the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ -particles. We will present the most direct route to spinors understood as things that *Clifford algebras* act on, and state that they do carry a representation of the Lorentz group (via the associated Lie algebra). This is only part of the much richer story.

Einstein took the idea of unifying space and time into one geometric entity very seriously and this led to special relativity and general relativity. We will only discuss special relativity in these lectures – that is we will forget gravity completely. We will work with the ‘mostly positive’ conventions for reasons that will be explained.

Minkowski space-time we will understand as the pseudo-Riemannian manifold $\mathbb{R}^{3,1} := (\mathbb{R}^4, \eta)$ where the metric in rectangular coordinates (‘inertial coordinates’) is

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, +1, +1).$$

The *space-time interval* (infinitesimal) is defined as

$$-\delta s^2 = -c^2 \delta t^2 + \delta x^2 + \delta y^2 + \delta z^2,$$

where c is the speed of light – we will set $c = 1$ from now on. All inertial observers will agree on the space-time interval between events, even if they don’t agree on the duration or distance. Everything is really encoded in the geometry of Minkowski space-time. In particular, the world line of light rays always satisfies $\delta s^2 = 0$ and this encodes the causal structure of special relativity.

Remark 4.1. We can work with Minkowski space-time of different spacial dimensions, for example in string theory 9+1 dimensions is needed. We will exclusively stick to 3+1 in these lectures and just remark that mod some technicalities with gamma matrices and spinors (see the next subsection) the ideas remain the same in any dimension.

The *Poincaré group* is the group of isometries of Minkowski space-time

$$O(3, 1) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^4,$$

which consists of 6 rotations + boost and 4 translations – we have a 10 dimensional non-compact Lie group. The *Lorentz group* is then the stabiliser subgroup of the origin, i.e., forget translations.

Infinitesimally, the Killing vector fields on Minkowski space-time of course form a Lie algebra – the *Poincaré algebra*. In rectangular coordinates the Killing equation is given by

$$\partial_\mu X_\nu + \partial_\nu X_\mu = 0.$$

Taking the derivative again and cycling over all indices, one can see that a Killing vector field must be of the form

$$X_\mu = x^\nu b_{\nu\mu} + a_\mu.$$

Substituting this back into the Killing equation we observe that $b_{\mu\nu} = -b_{\nu\mu}$ and so we have 10 independent vector fields given by choices of b and a . A convenient choice is to first

consider $b = 0$, and then $a = 0$ and $b_{\mu\nu} = 1$ when $\mu > \nu$. This leads to

$$P_\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$J^{\mu\nu} = x^\mu \eta^{\nu\lambda} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda} - x^\nu \eta^{\mu\lambda} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda}. \quad (4.2)$$

One can then show that the Poincaré algebra can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} [P_\mu, P_\nu] &= 0, \\ [P_\mu, J^{\lambda\sigma}] &= (\delta_\mu^\lambda \eta^{\sigma\rho} - \delta_\mu^\sigma \eta^{\lambda\rho}) P_\rho, \\ [J^{\mu\nu}, J^{\rho\sigma}] &= \eta^{\nu\rho} J^{\mu\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho} J^{\nu\sigma} - \eta^{\nu\sigma} J^{\mu\rho} + \eta^{\mu\sigma} J^{\nu\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Physically relevant fields will have nice transformations properties under the Poincaré group, or infinitesimally the fields will carry a representation of the Poincaré algebra – really just means we know how they transform under infinitesimal Lorentz transformations and translations. Amazingly, the (physically interesting) representations are not exhausted by tensor representations, we also have spinor representations.

4.3 Clifford algebras

Let V be a real vector space equipped with a symmetric bilinear form $B(-, -)$. The *Clifford algebra* associated with (V, B) , which we denote as $Cl(V)$ assuming no ambiguity in the bilinear form, is defined as follows. First, take the free tensor algebra

$$\bigotimes V := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} V^{\otimes j},$$

where we take $V^{\otimes 0} = \mathbb{R}$. Then consider the ideal \mathcal{I} in $\bigotimes V$ spanned by

$$\{x \otimes y + y \otimes x + 2B(x, y) \mid x, y \in V\}.$$

By picking a basis (e_1, \dots, e_2) of V , then as an algebra $Cl(V)$ is generated by $(\mathbb{1}, e_1, \dots, e_k)$ subject to the ‘Clifford condition’ (we drop \otimes from the notation)

$$e_i e_j + e_j e_i = -2B(e_i, e_j).$$

Example 4.2. If $B = 0$ then we have a Grassmann algebra. Thus in a loose sense, Clifford algebras are the quantisation of Grassmann algebras.

Example 4.3. Consider $V = \mathbb{R}$ and equipped with a normed basis ϵ (i.e., $\langle \epsilon, \epsilon \rangle = 1$). Then $Cl(\mathbb{R}) \simeq \{a + \epsilon b \mid a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as a vector space. However, as $\epsilon^2 = -1$ from the Clifford condition, as algebras $Cl(\mathbb{R}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$.

4.4 The Clifford algebra of space-time and spinors

We can use the Minkowski metric on $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ to define a symmetric bilinear form and then employ an orthonormal basis to slightly simplify the Clifford condition. In doing so we obtain the *Clifford–Dirac relation*

$$\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} := \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu = 2\eta^{\mu\nu} \mathbb{1}.$$

The crucial observation here is that we can build an abstract representation of the *Lorentz algebra*. If we define $\gamma^{\mu\nu} := \gamma^{[\mu} \gamma^{\nu]}$ $= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu - \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu)$, then $\Sigma^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\mu\nu}$ satisfies (we won’t give a proof here)

$$[\Sigma^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}] = \eta^{\nu\rho} \Sigma^{\mu\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho} \Sigma^{\nu\sigma} + \eta^{\mu\sigma} \Sigma^{\nu\rho} - \eta^{\nu\sigma} \Sigma^{\mu\rho}, \quad (4.4)$$

which you should then compare with (4.3). This is vital in understanding the importance of spinors in physics.

This is of course rather abstract at this stage, one then usually chooses matrix representations of the γ ’s to build a matrix representation of the Clifford algebra, which we denote as $Cl(3, 1)$. There are many representations that one could choose – we will pick

real gamma matrices as we are interested in geometry and would like to avoid complex numbers at this stage. This is also reflected in our conventions with regards to the signature of the Minkowski metric: we cannot pick real gamma matrices with the ‘mostly negative’ conventions. As such we will choose the following *real Majorana representation*

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & +1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & +1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & +1 & 0 & 0 \\ +1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & +1 \\ 0 & 0 & +1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\gamma^2 = \begin{pmatrix} +1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & +1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & +1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ +1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These 4×4 real matrices act on \mathbb{R}^4 in the usual way. With this in mind, we adopt the convention of spin indices of $(\gamma^\mu)_\alpha^\beta$. We then define *Majorana spinors* as the “things” that these gamma matrices act on. We thus write $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{R}^4$ for the space of all Majorana spinors. We will conventionally choose the components of a Majorana spinor to have lower spin indices, and so we write u_α .

As Majorana spinors are “things” that $Cl(3,1)$ act on, then because of (4.4) we have an action of the Lorentz Lie algebra on spinors – we think of this as an action of infinitesimal Lorentz transformations. The specification of any infinitesimal Lorentz transformation (3 infinitesimal rotations and 3 infinitesimal boosts) is encoded in an antisymmetric tensor $\omega_{\mu\nu} = -\omega_{\nu\mu}$. One can then write

$$\delta_\omega u_\alpha = \frac{1}{4} \omega_{\mu\nu} (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_\alpha^\beta u_\beta,$$

where the numerical factor comes from a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ due to the antisymmetric properties of the tensors involved – to avoid over-counting.

By taking the exponential we obtain a finite Lorentz transformation (as we integrate a Lie algebra we only get the component connected to the identity, though this need not concern us)

$$u'_\alpha = \exp\left(\frac{1}{4} \omega_{\mu\nu} \gamma^{\mu\nu}\right)_\alpha^\beta u_\beta.$$

Remark 4.4. *Dirac spinors* are understood as the complexification of the Majorana spinors, $\mathbb{D} := \mathbb{M} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C} \simeq \mathbb{C}^4$. *Weyl spinors* are then defined in terms of a decomposition of the Dirac spinors into a direct sum $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{W}_+ \oplus \mathbb{W}_-$ defined by chirality. More explicitly, we first define $\gamma_5 := \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3$ (where we have used the Minkowski metric to lower the indices). The decomposition is then defined in terms of the eigenvalues of γ_5 . That is, $u \in \mathbb{W}_\pm$ if $\gamma_5 u = \pm i u$. Via this decomposition we see that $\mathbb{W}_\pm \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$.

As defined here, the Majorana spinor as *commuting objects*, they are described by the coordinates on \mathbb{M} considered as a linear manifold. In order to have *anticommuting Majorana spinors* – which are more common in physics – we need to employ the parity reversion functor. Thus, we consider anticommuting Majorana spinors to be described by the coordinates on $\Pi\mathbb{M} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{0|4}$.

The manifold \mathbb{M} (and/or the supermanifold $\Pi\mathbb{M}$) comes equipped with the *charge conjugation tensor* – this operator exchanges particles and antiparticles. The defining property is

$$C \gamma^\mu C^{-1} = -(\gamma^\mu)^t.$$

Or written more explicitly

$$C^{\alpha\gamma} (\gamma^\mu)_\gamma^\delta C_{\delta\beta} = -(\gamma^\mu)^\alpha_\beta,$$

Thus, considered as a matrix, in our chosen representation, $C = -\gamma^0$. To set some useful notation for later, we define $(C \gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta} := C^{\alpha\delta} (\gamma^\mu)_\delta^\beta$, and a direct computation shows that the resulting tensor is symmetric.

4.5 Anticommuting Majorana spinor fields

All fields in physics are understood as sections of the appropriate fibre bundles over space-time – in the setting of special relativity we can usually take these fibre bundles as being trivial. Anticommuting Majorana spinor fields we understand as sections of the trivial (vector) bundle whose typical fibre is $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{M}$, but we need to modify our notion of sections to capture the anticommuting nature of these fields.

Consider the trivial bundle $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{3,1} \times \mathbb{H}\mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3,1}$. For notational simplicity let us set $E := \mathbb{R}^{3,1} \times \mathbb{H}\mathbb{M}$. Then consider the pullback bundle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_M^* E & \xrightarrow{\hat{\pi}} & E \\ (\mathbb{1}_S, \pi) \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ S \times \mathbb{R}^{3,1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_M} & \mathbb{R}^{3,1} \end{array}$$

We have used the canonical identification $\pi_M^* E = S \times E$ in the above diagram. We then define Majorana spinor fields (from now we always assume spinor fields are anticommuting unless we explicitly say otherwise) parameterised by $S \in \mathbf{SM}$ to be sections of the above pullback bundle. More carefully, the generalised supermanifold of (global) Majorana spinor fields is the functor

$$\underline{\mathbf{Sec}}(E)(-) : \mathbf{SM}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$$

defined as

$$\underline{\mathbf{Sec}}(E)(S) := \{ \Psi_S \in \text{Hom}(S \times \mathbb{R}^{3,1}, E) \mid (\mathbb{1}_S, \pi) \circ \Psi_S = \pi_M \},$$

and for any $\phi \in \text{Hom}(P, S)$

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{Sec}}(E)(\phi) : \underline{\mathbf{Sec}}(E)(S) &\rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{Sec}}(E)(P) \\ \Psi_S &\mapsto \Psi'_P := \Psi_S \circ (\phi, \mathbb{1}_M). \end{aligned}$$

A little more explicitly, we can employ global coordinates (x^μ, ψ_α) on $\mathbb{R}^{3,1} \times \mathbb{H}\mathbb{M}$, and using the theorem of Schwarz and Voronov [20, 23] we can set $S = \Lambda := \mathbb{R}^{0|p}$ without loss of generality. Let us then employ global coordinates ξ^i on $\mathbb{R}^{0|p}$, and then we can write

$$(\xi^i, x^\mu, \psi_\alpha) \circ \Psi_\Lambda = (\xi^i, x^\mu, \psi_\alpha(\xi, x)).$$

It is customary to simply write $\psi_\alpha(\xi, x) := \psi_{\Lambda\alpha}(x)$, or drop reference to the Grassmann algebras (or more general supermanifolds) altogether.

The upshot is that we can not really think of a single Majorana spinor field, but rather we need to think in terms of a parametrised family of maps – such fields are best thought of as functors from \mathbf{SM}^{op} to \mathbf{Set} that are parametrised by space-time.

4.6 An Aside: The Dirac and Klein–Gordon equations

Spinors in physics were discovered by Dirac (1928) via ‘taking the square root’ of the *Klein–Gordon equation* (1926). Later, it was discovered that mathematicians, and of course Clifford himself, had already considered such things. To sketch, the relation let us start from the *Dirac equation*

$$(\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu + m)_\alpha^\beta \psi_\beta(x) = 0,$$

we have already sketched what $\psi_\beta(x)$ means, really we should be thinking of a family of Dirac equations parameterised by (at least) all finite dimensional Grassmann algebras. Then applying the operator on the left again, but this time with negative mass (the sign of the mass term is irrelevant in the Dirac equation) we obtain

$$(\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)_\alpha^\beta (\gamma^\nu \partial_\nu + m)_\beta^\gamma \psi_\gamma(x) = 0.$$

Using the Clifford–Dirac relation we obtain

$$(\eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \partial_\mu - m^2) \psi_\alpha(x) = 0,$$

or in more traditional notation

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + \nabla^2\right)\psi_\alpha(x) = m^2\psi_\alpha(x).$$

That is, if a spinor satisfies the Dirac equation then each of the components satisfies the Klein–Gordon equation.



5 Real super-Minkowski space-times

5.1 Recap

We have now gone from some mechanical motivations, through supermanifolds and then Clifford algebras and spinors to arrive at a position from which we can look at a version of super-Minkowski space-time – the geometric arena of supersymmetry. At the fundamental level, one extends Minkowski space-time by appending anticommuting spinor coordinates in order to geometrically realise the supersymmetry algebra.

5.2 The $N = 1$ super Poincaré algebra

We extend the Poincaré algebra by adjoining anticommuting *Majorana spinor* generators Q^α (see [8]). The resulting algebra under study is thus

$$[P_\mu, J^{\lambda\sigma}] = (\delta_\mu^\lambda \eta^{\sigma\rho} - \delta_\mu^\sigma \eta^{\lambda\rho})P_\rho, \quad (5.1a)$$

$$[J^{\mu\nu}, J^{\rho\sigma}] = \eta^{\nu\rho} J^{\mu\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho} J^{\nu\sigma} - \eta^{\nu\sigma} J^{\mu\rho} + \eta^{\mu\sigma} J^{\nu\rho}, \quad (5.1b)$$

$$[J^{\mu\nu}, Q^\alpha] = -\frac{1}{4}Q^\beta(\gamma^{\mu\nu})_\alpha^\beta, \quad (5.1c)$$

$$[Q^\alpha, Q^\beta] = \frac{1}{2}(C\gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta}P_\mu. \quad (5.1d)$$

All other Lie brackets are zero. The resulting algebra contains the Poincaré algebra as the degree zero/‘commuting’ component. Note that we have considered everything to be \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded and thus the bracket of two Q ’s is an anticommutator in ‘traditional’ language.

The first two equations are simply the standard Poincaré algebra. In particular, the second equation is the Lorentz subalgebra. The third equation tells us that the generators are spinors – this defines how they transform under infinitesimal Lorentz transformations. The third equation is the important one from our perspective – it shows that the supersymmetry generators Q are the ‘square root’ of the 4-momentum operator, i.e., the generator of translations in Minkowski space-time. It is this fourth equation (5.1d) that we focus on.

5.3 Constructing super-Minkowski space-time

The idea is to find a supermanifold that allows us to geometrically as vector fields realise the $N = 1$ super Poincaré algebra – or really we will focus on just realising Q ’s and P , that is we will forget about the Lorentz algebra. One can make educated guesses into what the supermanifold should be and then the form of the vector fields. We will however, take a slightly more formal route.

Recall that given some Lie algebra we can integrate this to obtain a Lie group. The ‘Lie group–Lie algebra correspondence’ can be made quite explicit using the Campbell–Baker–Hausdorff formula, and this is especially true when we have a *nilpotent Lie algebra*, i.e., the nested Lie brackets varnish at some stage. In particular, there are no questions about convergence. The construction gives a local form (near the identity) of the group multiplication in coordinates.

We claim – without proof – that the same method can be applied to the case at hand. To make real sense of this one should appeal to the functor of points in order to make this rigorous, however we will simply proceed formally.

With these comments in mind, let us consider two general elements in the super translation algebra (forgetting the Lorentz part)

$$A = x^\mu P_\mu + \theta_\alpha Q^\alpha, \quad B = x'^\mu P_\mu + \theta'_\alpha Q^\alpha,$$

Note that x are taken to be even, while θ are taken to be odd. Thus, a general element we see is an even object. Then using the Campbell–Baker–Hausdorff formula, noting that we only need to consider terms up to one Lie bracket, we obtain

$$A \circ B = A + B + \frac{1}{2}[A, B] = \left(x^\mu + x'^\mu + \frac{1}{2}\theta'_\beta \theta_\alpha (C\gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta} \right) P_\mu + (\theta_\alpha + \theta'_\alpha) Q^\alpha. \quad (5.2)$$

From this one can formally read off the group structure in terms of coordinates, which justifies our very suggestive notation. The upshot of this analysis is that we have uncovered the basic structure of super-Minkowski space-time.

Definition 5.1. *Super-Minkowski space-time* $M^{3,1|4}$ is the supermanifold that can be equipped with global coordinates

$$(x^\mu, \theta_\alpha),$$

where the anticommuting coordinates are Majorana spinors.

Thus, given how we have defined Majorana spinors we have the identification (via a choice of coordinates)

$$M^{3,1|4} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{4|4} \simeq \mathbb{R}^4 \times \text{PIM}.$$

Via construction, the reduced manifold is given by standard Minkowski space-time.

From the (formal) group law given by (5.2) the supersymmetry transformations on $M^{3,1|4}$ are given by

$$x^\mu \mapsto x^\mu + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_\beta \theta_\alpha (C\gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (5.3a)$$

$$\theta_\alpha \mapsto \theta_\alpha + \epsilon_\alpha, \quad (5.3b)$$

where ϵ_α is a Majorana spinor-valued anticommuting parameter.

5.4 The SUSY generators and covariant derivatives

The goal is now to represent Q and P as vector fields on super-Minkowski space-time. From the group law we can proceed formally and write down the left invariant vector fields – this is just given by taking the derivative with respect to the primed variables. In this way we obtain

$$P_\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}, \quad Q^\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_\alpha} + \frac{1}{4}\theta_\beta (C\gamma^\mu)^{\beta\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}.$$

By ‘hand’ you can easily check that these satisfy the correct commutation rules.

As in the mechanical case, we need to construct covariant derivatives if we are really to work with supersymmetry. The method is quite simple, we look at the right invariant vector fields – this then comes down to taking the derivative of the group law with respect to the unprimed variables. In this way we obtain (and it might have been your first guess)

$$\mathbb{D}^\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_\alpha} - \frac{1}{4}\theta_\beta (C\gamma^\mu)^{\beta\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}.$$

5.5 The SUSY structure

From a geometric point of view the distribution spanned by the SUSY covariant derivatives is an object of central interest – as far as I know it was Manin who first took this point of view (see [13]). Interestingly, this distribution is *maximally non-integrable*.

Let us quickly recall the notion of maximally non-integrable distributions. A distribution is a subsheaf of the tangent sheaf that is locally a direct factor – we need not elaborate on this too carefully as we will have global structures. Let us decompose the module of vector

fields on super-Minkowski space-time as a direct sum of a distribution that we want to study, and another module of whatever is not in this distribution

$$\text{Vect}(M^{3,1|4}) = \mathcal{D} \oplus \mathcal{N},$$

with $\mathcal{N} := \text{Vect}(M^{3,1|4}) \setminus \mathcal{D}$. We define map

$$\phi : \text{Vect}(M^{3,1|4}) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}(M^{3,1|4})/\mathcal{D} =: \mathcal{N},$$

which is ‘remove anything in the distribution’. The *Frobenius curvature* is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} R : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{N} \\ (X, Y) &\mapsto \phi([X, Y]). \end{aligned}$$

Basically, one is looking how much Lie brackets of elements in the distribution lie outside the distribution. Of course, if the distribution is closed with respect to the Lie bracket then we say that the distribution is *integrable*. The characteristic distribution \mathcal{C} is defined as all $X \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $R(X, -) = 0$. If \mathcal{C} consists of only the zero vector field then \mathcal{D} is *maximally non-integrable*. This means that all Lie brackets of non-zero elements of \mathcal{D} fall outside of \mathcal{D} . Nothing in the above is particular to supergeometry or supersymmetry.

Now, let us specialise to the case of

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span} \{ \mathbb{D}^\alpha \}.$$

Clearly, this a distribution – you can check that any vector field on super-Minkowski space-time can be written using P_μ and \mathbb{D}^α as a basis. Moreover, the rank of \mathcal{D} is $(0|4)$, i.e., has a basis consisting of four odd vector fields. In slightly more generality, Manin calls such distributions *pre-SUSY structures* – we have an odd basis that is of maximal dimension. If this distribution is maximally non-integrable then we have a *SUSY structure*.

Directly we examine the Frobenius curvature by looking at $X = X_\alpha(x, \theta)\mathbb{D}^\alpha$ and \mathbb{D}^β , this is enough to get at the characteristic distribution. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} R([X, \mathbb{D}^\beta]) &= \phi(X_\alpha[\mathbb{D}^\alpha, \mathbb{D}^\beta] \pm (\mathbb{D}^\beta X_\alpha)\mathbb{D}^\alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}X_\alpha(C\gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we see that this is zero if and only if $X_\alpha = 0$, thus the characteristic distribution consists of only the zero vector and so \mathcal{D} is maximally non-integrable.

Remark 5.2. In the one dimensional case, i.e., mechanics, the distribution spanned by the SUSY covariant derivatives is still maximally non-integrable and this time of corank $(1|0)$. Thus we have a (super generalisation of a) *contact structure*. SUSY structures are a particular higher dimensional generalisation of contact structures.

5.6 Aside: Chiral Superspace

In practice, one often uses Weyl spinors instead of Majorana spinors (or their complexification, the Dirac spinors) when building supersymmetric field theories. Without details, the basic idea remains the same – one extends space-time by appending some anticommuting spinor coordinates, examines the associated supersymmetry transformations and build the generators and covariant derivatives. Modifications of the methods presented in the Section 2 allow one to build supersymmetric actions from superfields and covariant derivatives (often one needs further constraints on the superfields). All this is outside the scope of this first look at supersymmetry.



6 Round-up and Conclusion

In these lectures we have motivated some of the mathematics behind supersymmetry and in particular the use of supermanifolds. One aspect that we have explained is the nature of Grassmann odd fields as parametrised functors. This point of view is not usually stressed in the physics literature. From there we build odd spinor fields and defined super-Minkowski space-time as well as geometrically defining supersymmetry. Introductory texts on supersymmetry often stress the operational use of superspace but do not properly explain the language pertaining to differential geometry. It became clear to me during my Master's degree, while I was totally unaware of supergeometry, that supersymmetry should be formulated in a geometric way. The categorical approach to supermanifolds and odd maps is barely touched upon in the physics literature. Everything is understood formally or operationally and the attitude is that physicists need not worry about the exact nature of the objects pushed around by pencil on paper.

We have not attempted to build interesting and phenomenologically realistic models using superspace methods. Nor have we examined any quantum models. The aims of the lectures have been modest and provide a geometric glance at supersymmetry, albeit one that forces us to confront ideas in category theory early on.

Further reading

- C. Carmeli, L. Caston & R. Fiorese** Mathematical foundations of supersymmetry, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, *European Mathematical Society* (EMS), Zürich, 2011, xiv+287 pp. ISBN: 978-3-03719-097-5.
- D.A. Leites** Introduction to the theory of supermanifolds, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, **35**(1(211)):3–57, 255, 1980.
- Y.I. Manin** Gauge field theory and complex geometry, volume 289 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1997. Translated from the 1984 Russian original by N. Koblitz and J. R. King, With an appendix by Sergei Merkulov.
- V.S. Varadarajan** Supersymmetry for mathematicians: an introduction, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 11. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; *American Mathematical Society*, Providence, RI, 2004. viii+300 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-3574-2.
- S. Weinberg** The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 3: Supersymmetry, *Cambridge University Press*, 2000, ISBN:9781139632638.
- J. Wess & J. Bagger** Supersymmetry and Supergravity, *Princeton University Press*, Princeton, 1992, ISBN 0-691-02530-4.
- P. West** Introduction To Supersymmetry And Supergravity (Revised And Extended 2nd Edition), *Singapore: World Scientific Publishing*, 1990, ISBN 978-981-02-0098-5.

A Appendix

A.1 Lie Superalgebras

A Lie superalgebra is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded generalisation of a Lie algebra. Suppose we have a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space (over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} , say)

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1,$$

and that we define the parity of elements as $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ depending on what subspace the element A belongs to. In general, an element is the sum of both an even and odd element, and we extend the following to inhomogeneous elements via linearity. A *Lie superalgebra* is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space equipped with a bilinear product

$$[-, -] : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g},$$

called the *Lie bracket* that satisfies the following

1. $[\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{B}] = \widetilde{A} + \widetilde{B}$,
2. $[A, B] = -(-1)^{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}} [B, A]$,
3. $[A, [B, C]] = [[A, B], C] + (-1)^{\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}} [B, [A, C]]$.

The third property is called the *Jacobi identity*.

A.2 Grassmann Algebras

Definition A.1. A *Grassmann algebra* (over \mathbb{R}) with q generators $\Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q)$ consists, of a polynomials generated by the $\{\xi^\alpha\}$, subject to the relation

$$\xi^\alpha \xi^\beta = -\xi^\beta \xi^\alpha.$$

Note that the above relation implies that $(\xi^i)^2 = 0$ and thus the maximal order of a polynomial in $\Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q)$ is q . Specifically, a given generator can only appear at most once in a given monomial. Grassmann algebras are \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded, i.e.,

$$\Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q) = \Lambda_0(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q) \oplus \Lambda_1(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q).$$

The even elements $f \in \Lambda_0(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q)$ are polynomials consisting of monomials of even order, and odd elements $g \in \Lambda_1(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q)$ are polynomials consisting of monomials of odd order. Let us define the parity of elements as $\widetilde{f} \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ depending on what subspace the element f belongs to. In general, an element is the sum of both an even and odd element, and we extend the following to inhomogeneous elements via linearity.

Grassmann algebras are supercommutative superalgebras as

$$f \cdot g = (-1)^{\widetilde{f}\widetilde{g}} g \cdot f.$$

A.3 Calculus with Anticommuting Variables

Differentiation with respect to Grassmann generator is defined algebraically. In particular,

$$\frac{\partial \xi^\alpha}{\partial \xi^\beta} = \delta_\beta^\alpha.$$

As elements in a Grassmann algebra are polynomials, the above definition allows us to understand derivatives of general elements of the algebra. One has to be careful with minus signs. For example, as $\xi^\alpha \xi^\beta = -\xi^\beta \xi^\alpha$, we observe that

$$\frac{\partial \xi^\alpha \xi^\beta}{\partial \xi^\gamma} = \delta_\gamma^\alpha \xi^\beta - \xi^\alpha \delta_\gamma^\beta.$$

Similar reasoning shows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\beta} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\alpha}.$$

Note that this implies that $\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi}\right)^2 = 0$ for any given generator.

The integration of odd variables is similarly defined algebraically in the sense that is not a Lebesgue integral.

Definition A.2. The *Berezin integral* is the unique linear functional $\int D[\xi]$ — defined by the following properties

1. $\int D[\xi] \xi^1 \xi^2 \dots \xi^q = 1$, and
2. $\int D[\xi] \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi^\alpha} = 0$,

for any $f \in \Lambda(\xi^1, \dots, \xi^q)$.

Remark A.3. Other conventions with the normalisation appear in the literature. Also note that there is a choice in how we order the generator of the Grassmann algebra and this can change overall signs.

Writing (formally) $D[\xi] = D[\xi^q]D[\xi^{q-1}] \cdots D[\xi^1]$, the Fubini law is

$$\int D[\xi] f(\xi) = \int D[\xi^q] \left(\cdots \left(\int D[\xi^2] \left(\int D[\xi^1] f(\xi^1, \xi^2, \dots, \xi^q) \right) \right) \right).$$

Any monomial that does not depend on some chosen ξ^α can be written as $w(\xi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\alpha} (\xi^\alpha w(\xi))$. Thus, only highest order monomials are not automatically zero under integration. Then for a general element $f(\xi) = f_0 + \xi^1 f_1 + \cdots + \xi^1 \xi^2 \cdots \xi^q f_{q \dots 21}$, the Berezin integral is

$$\begin{aligned} \int D[\xi] f(\xi) &= \int D[\xi^q] \left(\cdots \left(\int D[\xi^2] \left(\int D[\xi^1] \xi^1 \xi^2 \cdots \xi^q f_{q \dots 21} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= \int D[\xi] \xi^1 \xi^2 \cdots \xi^q f_{q \dots 21} = f_{q \dots 21}. \end{aligned}$$

In short, upto normalisation and sign factors, the Berezin integral selects the coefficient of the top degree monomial of a general element of the Grassmann algebra. This implies the interesting relation that integration and differentiation are the same thing, i.e.,

$$\int D[\xi] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^q} \cdots \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^1}.$$

A.4 The Berezinian

Let us consider the Berezin integral on $\mathbb{R}^{p|q}$ defined in canonical coordinates (x, ξ) (we suppress indices for notation ease), $\int D[x, \xi] f(x, \xi)$. To evaluate this one first performs the integration over the odd variable and then performs the integration over the even variables as standard (here understood as the indefinite integral). The question is what happens to the integral if we change variables, say $y = y(x, \xi)$ and $\theta = \theta(x, \xi)$ using the common abuse of notation.

We define the *Jacobian matrix* (with no justification here) as

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} & -\frac{\partial y}{\partial \xi} \\ \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \xi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then define the Jacobian as the Berezinian (superdeterminant) of the Jacobian matrix, which is defined as

$$\text{Ber}(J) := \det(A - BD^{-1}C) \det(D)^{-1},$$

which is only defined if both block matrices A and D are invertible. The integration measures in the different coordinates are related by

$$D[y, \theta] = D[x, \xi] \text{Ber}(J).$$

As a specific example, consider integration on $\mathbb{R}^{1|1}$ and the supersymmetry transformations $t' = t + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon\theta$ and $\theta' = \theta + \epsilon$. Then

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial t'}{\partial t} & -\frac{\partial t'}{\partial \theta} \\ \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial t} & \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial \theta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{4}\epsilon \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and so $\text{Ber}(J) = 1$. The integration measure is invariant under supersymmetry.

Similarity, on $\mathbb{R}^{1,2}$ and the supersymmetry transformations $t' = t + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^I \theta^J \delta_{JI}$ and $\theta'^I = \theta^I + \epsilon^I$, the Jacobian matrix can quickly be deduced to be

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \star \\ 0 & \mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We do not actually care what the top right matrix is as the bottom left is the zero matrix. Clearly, $\text{Ber}(J) = 1$, and again the integration measure is invariant under supersymmetry.

References

- [1] F. A. Berezin & D.A. Leites, Supermanifolds, (Russian)*Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **224** (1975), no. 3, 505–508
- [2] C. Carmeli, L. Caston & R. Fiorese, Mathematical foundations of supersymmetry, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, *European Mathematical Society* (EMS), Zürich, 2011, xiv+287 pp. ISBN: 978-3-03719-097-5.
- [3] L. Castellani, R. Catenacci & P.A. Grassi, Supergravity Actions with Integral Forms, *Nucl. Phys. B*, **889** (2014), 419–442.
- [4] L. Castellani, R. Catenacci & P.A. Grassi, The geometry of supermanifolds and new supersymmetric actions, *Nucl. Phys. B*, **899** (2015), 112–148.
- [5] L. Castellani, R. Catenacci & P.A. Grassi, Hodge Dualities on Supermanifolds, *Nucl. Phys. B*, **899** (2015), 570–593.
- [6] P. Deligne & D.S. Freed, Supersolutions, in *Quantum fields and strings: a course for mathematicians*, Vol. 1, 2 (Princeton, NJ, 1996/1997), 227–355, *Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI*, 1999.
- [7] J.L. Gervais & B. Sakita, Field theory interpretation of supergauge in dual models, *Nuclear Physics B*. **34**(2) (1971), 632–639.
- [8] Yu.A. Golfand & E.P. Likhtman Extension of the Algebra of Poincare Group Generators and Violation of p Invariance, *JETP Lett.* **13** (1971) 323–326.
- [9] H.S. Green, A generalized method of field quantization, *Phys. Rev.* **90** (1953), 270–273.
- [10] D.S. Freed, Five lectures on supersymmetry, *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 1999. viii+119 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-1953-4.
- [11] D.A. Leites, Introduction to the theory of supermanifolds, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, **35**(1(211)):3–57, 255, 1980.
- [12] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [13] Y.I. Manin, *Topics in noncommutative geometry*, M. B. Porter Lectures, *Princeton University Press* (1991) 164 p.
- [14] Y.I. Manin, *Gauge field theory and complex geometry*, volume 289 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1997.
- [15] V. Molotkov, Banach supermanifolds, in *Differential Geometric Methods in Theoretical Physics* (Shumen, 1984), *World Sci. Publishing*, Singapore, 117–125 1986.
- [16] H. Nicolai, Supersymmetry and spin systems, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **9** (1976), 1497.
- [17] A. Rogers, Supermanifolds. Theory and applications, *Singapore: World Scientific*, ISBN 978-981-02-1228-5/hbk, xii, 251 p. (2007).
- [18] A. Salam & J. Strathdee, Super-gauge transformations, *Nucl. Phys. B* **76** (1974), 477–482.
- [19] T. Schmitt, Supergeometry and quantum field theory, or: what is a classical configuration?, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **9**, 993–1052, 1997.
- [20] A.S. Schwarz, On the definition of superspace, *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.*, **60**(1):37–42, 1984.
- [21] V.S. Varadarajan, Supersymmetry for mathematicians: an introduction, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 11. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; *American Mathematical Society*, Providence, RI, 2004. viii+300 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-3574-2.
- [22] D. V. Volkov, On the quantization of half-integer spin fields, *Soviet Physics. JETP* **9** (1959), 1107–1111
- [23] A.A. Voronov, Maps of supermanifolds, *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.*, **60**(1), 43–48, 1984.
- [24] J. Wess & B. Zumino, Supergauge transformations in four dimensions, *Nuclear Phys.* **B70** (1974), 39–50.
- [25] E. Witten, Dynamical breaking of supersymmetry, *Nucl. Phys. B* **188** (1981), 513.
- [26] E. Witten, Notes On Supermanifolds and Integration, *Pure Appl.Math.Quart.* **15** (2019) 1, 3–56.