Refraction of light and conservation laws

R. Dengler *

March 7, 2025

Abstract

The refraction of light by dispersion-free dielectric media can be modeled using well-localized macroscopic wave packets, enabling a description in terms of pseudo-particles. This approach is often used in thought experiments to illustrate aspects of the Abraham-Minkowski debate. This work uses the particle picture to show at an elementary level how different types of momenta come into play, and how light refraction can be explained at the level of particles. A special exactly solvable microscopic model is used to illustrate the interplay and tension between microscopic physics and the conventional effective-medium Maxwell equations.

1 Introduction

In Newton's corpuscular theory of light, light is composed of of tiny, massive corpuscles, and the sine law of refraction is explained using a mechanical model (proposition 95 of book 1 of his Principia (1686)). In modern terms, Newton proposed that a refracting body acts as a potential well of constant depth for the corpuscles, causing a higher speed within the medium due to energy conservation. Upon entering the medium the perpendicular component of momentum changes, while the component p_{\parallel} parallel to the surface remains unchanged. This relationship is expressed as

$$p_{\parallel} = p \sin \alpha = p' \sin \alpha',\tag{1}$$

where p is total momentum in vacuum, p' total momentum in the medium, and α and α' are the angle of incidence measured from the normal vector, see Fig. 1. If p is constant then p' only depends on the type of medium, and also is constant, and equation (1) is Snell's law, the law of sines.

The corpuscular theory of light gradually lost its status in favor of the wave theory of light, largely due to the work of C. Huygens, T. Young, and A. J. Fresnel. The possibility to measure wavelengths also demonstrated that light propagates in matter with a speed reduced by a factor n, the refractive index, while Newton's

^{*}ORCID: 0000-0001-6706-8550

model requires greater speed in the medium, in contradiction also to special relativity. Nevertheless, the concept of light particles reemerged in the form of photons within the framework of quantum field theory. Newton's original model cannot be reconciled with modern physics. However, by considering the refraction of localized wave packets with definite momentum and energy, it should be possible to explain the kinematics of refraction in terms of particles, wave packets of light in vacuum and pseudo-particles ¹ in the medium. This would again represent a valid mechanistic model for refraction.

The basic assumptions for an idealized physical scenario can be summarized as follows:

- Wave packets are small, with a narrow frequency range, system can be large.
- Dispersion can be ignored.
- Transverse polarization does not play a role.
- Interactions are local.
- Quantum randomness does not play a role (surfaces can have an anti-reflection coating).
- Electrostriction is negligible.
- Dissipation is negligible.
- Refraction does not transfer momentum in directions parallel to the surface.

The last condition is not as intuitive or self-evident as it might seem. Translational invariance in the direction parallel to the surface requires only conservation of the component of total momentum in this direction. A counterexample is a charged particle in a continuous resistive medium.

The essential additional input is that the wavelength λ in a medium with refractive index n is reduced by a factor 1/n. Correspondingly, the signal speed becomes c/n, where c, is the speed of light in a vacuum.

2 Conservation laws

Under these assumptions, wave packets behave like macroscopic particles with localized energy and momentum, and therefore must satisfy the standard conservation laws.

2.1 Momentum conservation

If the component of signal momentum parallel to the surface is conserved, and if p represents signal momentum in vacuum, then Snell's law implies that signal momentum in the medium is given by

$$p' = pn. (2)$$

 $^{^{1}}$ One could also speak of photons in the vacuum and quasiparticles in the medium, but what is meant here are macroscopic classical signals, which can be measured and observed along their path like classical particles.



Figure 1: Law of refraction in the corpuscular theory of light. Conservation of the parallel component of momentum (p_{\parallel}) at the surface of incidence, assuming constant total momentum p outside and p' inside the medium, leads to the law of sines.

Newton explained this by conceiving the medium as a potential well, but this contradicts the lower signal speed in the medium. Instead, the signal in the medium must be interpreted as a different type of particle. The momentum (2) for a signal in a medium also is referred to as *Minkowski momentum* [2, 3, 4, 10].

An argument in favor of Minkowski momentum (2) is that it agrees with the quantum mechanical formula for the momentum $p_{QM} = \hbar k$ of a quasiparticle, where \hbar is Planck's constant and $k = 2\pi/\lambda$ is the wavevector. The momentum (2) also appears to agree with measurements in liquids or gases, for a review see [8].

Conservation of momentum implies that a momentum $\pm (p - p')$ is transferred to the surface of the medium when the signal enters or exits ². This sudden momentum transfer generates small sound waves propagating into the medium. It is not difficult to verify that these sound waves contain a negligible amount of energy in realistic situations (section 3). A superficial analysis might end here, but there is a caveat, and this is also where the Abraham-Minkowski controversy comes into play.

2.1.1 Connection to Abraham-Minkowski debate

For many scenarios propagation of light in a medium is well understood. If the wavelength is much larger than the distance between atoms, Maxwell's equations combined with the linear relation $D = \epsilon E$ between the electric displacement field D and the electric field E, are sufficient to derive the rules of optics. This includes the laws of reflection and refraction for different polarizations, as well as the intensities of reflected and transmitted light in both isotropic and anisotropic media [7, 9]. Complications include nonlinear dispersion, electro- and magnetostriction [1, 2, 12], which also transfer momentum to matter.

However, even the fundamental problem of disentangling electromagnetic and mechanical momentum is full of pitfalls. The root of the Abraham-Minkowski controversy are the expressions of Minkowski and Abraham for electromagnetic momentum in a medium, in terms of the electromagnetic fields D and B or E and H. The expression should contain or should not contain the material momentum, and one source of the difficulty are the phenomenological equations $D = \epsilon E$ and $H = B/\mu$. More recent reviews are [1, 8].

Yet, even after more than a century, the situation remains unsatisfactory. A more fundamental question concerns the validity [14] of the usual Maxwell equations in matter, which replace atomic matter with an

 $^{^{2}}$ In the natural scenario, without an anti-reflective coating, the *additional* incoming and reflected the signal also transfers momentum to the surface.





Figure 2: Left: A scheme for a light signal in a solid. The signal (the gray block) moves to the right, slightly accelerates atoms at its right front to the right, and slightly decelerates atoms at its left front, thus leaving behind a trace of atoms shifted to the right, but again at rest.

Right: A sequence of pendulums of elastic spheres as a metaphor for a system where particle and signal speeds differ, and where the signal leaves behind a trace of shifted spheres. Only the gray sphere is in motion and on the verge of transferring its momentum to the next sphere on the right.

averaged (coarse-grained) substance. Such an approximation is adequate for effects depending on average polarizability and magnetizability. Difficulties arise when attempting to calculate bilinear local microscopic quantities, such as the momentum of matter. This issue is examined in detail using a microscopic model in section 4. Before that, however, we continue with the conservation laws.

2.2 Center of energy

The center of energy of a system is a rarely used concept of special relativity, which enters here in two ways. The definition reads

$$\boldsymbol{X}(t) = \frac{\int \mathrm{d}^{d} x e\left(x, t\right) \boldsymbol{x}}{\int \mathrm{d}^{d} x e\left(x, t\right)},\tag{3}$$

where e(x) denotes relativistic energy density. The classical limit of X(t) is the center of mass.

One point is that any system (a wave packet, for example) behaves as though its entire energy is concentrated at its center of energy, at least with respect to translational degrees of freedom. More important here is the fact that $\boldsymbol{X}(t)$ of an isolated system is a linear function of time. A general proof of this fact makes use of the continuity equations for momentum and energy [11], but no such details are required here.

2.2.1 Constant speed of center of energy

The caveat mentioned above is the motion of the center of energy. It is useful to now consider a slab of thickness L and mass M perpendicular to the x-axis, and a short wave packet of momentum p and energy pc arriving from the left. To be able to compare the incoming and the refracted signal we assume an anti-reflective coating at both ends.

The signal traverses the slab in a time $t_1 = Ln/c$, while a free signal or photon would have reached position Ln in this time. In other words, refraction has shifted the contribution of the wave packet with momentum

p to the center of energy by

$$\Delta X_{\gamma} = (1-n) Lpc/\left(Mc^{2} + pc\right) \cong (1-n) Lp/\left(Mc\right)$$

$$\tag{4}$$

to the left. This must be compensated by a shift of the center of energy (or mass) ΔX_{slab} of the slab to the right. The dilemma now is that the slab had momentum p - pn during time t_1 , which gives

$$\Delta X_{\text{slab}} \cong \left(n - n^2\right) Lp/\left(Mc\right) < 0,\tag{5}$$

and thus $\Delta X_{\gamma} + \Delta X_{\text{slab}} < 0$, an apparent contradiction.

The way out is to recognize that the Minkowski momentum (2) includes a material part in such a way that the center of energy X moves with constant speed. This requires a contribution

$$\Delta X_{\text{matter}} = -\Delta X_{\gamma} - \Delta X_{\text{slab}} = \frac{Lp}{Mc} \left(n^2 - 1 \right).$$
(6)

It may seem confusing that there are now two material contributions to ΔX , i.e. ΔX_{slab} and ΔX_{matter} . However, ΔX_{matter} arises from the signal itself, and only involves a small fraction m_{matter} of the total slab mass M, so it does not conflict with the expression for ΔX_{slab} .

One might argue that for the signal to have material momentum the signal would have to carry some mass with itself with signal velocity c/n, which is absurd in an insulator, where electrons and atoms essentially stay at their place. Fig. 2 shows how the signal actually can be accompanied by a mass flow (similar illustrations can be found in [10, 13]). The signal slightly accelerates the atoms at its front (on the right) and decelerates the atoms on its rear. Atoms within the signal volume temporarily are in motion, contributing both to momentum and mass flow. The signal leaves behind a trace of atoms at rest, but slightly shifted to the right. (The experiment involving a sequence of pendulums shown in Fig. 2 on the right is a metaphor for a signal leaving behind a trace of shifted particles.) The momentum of the atoms within the signal volume is

$$\Delta p_{\text{matter}} = M \Delta X_{\text{matter}} / t_1 = p \left(n - \frac{1}{n} \right). \tag{7}$$

This is Minkowski momentum (2) minus something else, namely Abraham momentum p/n. This suggests interpreting Abraham momentum as the electromagnetic component of the signal's momentum in the medium. As required $\Delta p_{\text{matter}} > 0$ overcompensates the momentum p(1-n) < 0 of the slab as a whole.

But how does this work for a continuous signal? In case of a continuous signal, all transmitted photons are delayed by the slab, yet there are no visible wave fronts that accelerate or decelerate the atoms. The solution is that the initial wave front has accelerated the atoms in its trace, and the momentum of these atoms, wherever it has gone, compensates the delay of the photons. This continues until the terminating wave front has passed through the medium.

2.2.2 Accelerating force

The general picture displayed in Fig. 2 was deduced from conservation laws. Qualitatively, the force accelerating matter can be explained by the longitudinal radiation pressure. This pressure or stress is constant

within signal. However, the pressure gradient at the signal front generates a force that acts on the medium. Alternatively, the force can be interpreted as the Lorentz force $j \times B$, acting on the polarization current $j = \gamma \partial E/\partial t$, where γ represents polarizability and E and B are electric and magnetic fields. This force averages to zero within the signal, but not at the boundaries.

3 Orders of magnitude, dissipation

The wave packet kinematics examined above is not strictly reversible. The momentum mismatch $\pm (p' - p)$ at the boundaries generates small acoustic shock waves. Additionally, the trace of shifted atoms left behind by the wave packet (Fig. 2) will relax with the speed of sound. These relaxation processes respect conservation of momentum and the linear movement of center of energy, and do not invalidate the general considerations. However, for consistency, the order of magnitude of the implied dissipation should be evaluated.

3.1 Momentum transfer at the boundaries

At the boundaries it is natural to assume that the momentum $\pm (pn - p)$ is passed to a volume of approximately the same size as the signal wave packet. If a significant part of the momentum p = E/c of a light signal with energy E is transferred to a mass m then the mass acquires kinetic energy $T = \frac{1}{2}E^2/(mc^2)$. Of interest is the ratio $E/(mc^2)$.

For E = 1J and m = 1mg for a wave packet of volume 1mm³ in water one finds $E/(mc^2) \cong 5 \cdot 10^{-12}$. This means that only a minuscule fraction of the energy is lost at the boundaries.

3.2 Trace of shifted atoms

The attenuation caused by the shifted atoms is of different nature. The shift ΔX_{matter} of the center of energy of matter during the transmission of the signal from Eq. (6) actually is caused by the shifted atoms left behind by the signal, and not the entire slab mass M. If m_* is the mass of the atoms in the signal trace, then their shift

$$\Delta X_* \sim \frac{Lp}{m_*c} \sim \frac{E}{\rho A c^2} \tag{8}$$

is larger by a factor M/m_* . In the last expression we have used $m_* = \rho AL$, where ρ is mass density and A the cross-sectional area of the signal. For a signal in a cube of volume 1mm³ with energy E = 1J in water one finds the minuscule shift $\Delta X_* \sim 10^{-14}$ m.

The elastic energy of a cylinder in the slab of length L shifted by ΔX_* over a transverse distance \sqrt{A} is

$$E_{\text{elastic}} \sim G\sqrt{A}L \frac{\Delta X_*^2}{\sqrt{A}} \sim E \frac{v_t^2}{c^2} \frac{E}{(\rho c^2 A^{3/2}) A^{1/2}} L \sim EL/\ell.$$
(9)

Here G is shear modulus, and \sqrt{AL} the cylinder surface. In the second expression the velocity $v_t = \sqrt{G/\rho}$ of transverse sound and Eq. (8) were used. Eq. (9) says that the signal decays exponentially with some



Figure 3: An optical metamaterial or a wave guide consisting of thin polarizable layers perpendicular to the z-axis. Signals propagate in the xz-plane. The electric field E always points in y-direction, the magnetic field B is in the xz-plane.

characteristic length ℓ . A sound velocity $v_t = 1000^{\text{m}/\text{s}}$, a signal energy E = 1J, a signal extension $\sqrt{A} = 1$ mm and the mass density ρ of water give a decay length of 10^{19} m, certainly negligible also in other realistic situations.

4 An exactly solvable model

What still seems to be missing are exact solutions for microscopic models. Here, we examine an optical metamaterial consisting of thin polarizable layers oriented perpendicularly to the z-axis at positions $z \in a\mathbb{Z}$, where a is the spacing, Fig. 3. We only consider signals propagating in the x-z direction, with the electric field oriented in the y direction, parallel to the layers ³. There is no dependence on y. The medium could be restricted to a finite y range using two ideal conducting layers perpendicular to the y-axis, without affecting the signals. The medium then would be a planar capacitor or a planar wave guide parallel to the xz-plane. For wavelengths much large than the layer spacing a the signal only sees the average capacitance per area rather than the individual layers. In this limit the system thus effectively is a continuum, isotropic in the xz-plane, and should reproduce the signal speed and the law of refraction of the continuum model. This is indeed the case, however, the internal signal properties differ.

The polarization density is $a\gamma E_2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta(z - am)$, the current density is

$$j_2 = \gamma a \partial_t E_2 \sum_m \delta \left(z - am \right), \tag{10}$$

where E_2 is the electric field in *y*-direction and γ denotes polarizability. The polarization implies a potential energy $V = \frac{a}{2}\gamma E_2^2$ per layer area in the fictitious oscillators in the layer material. The electrons in the material follow the field in phase, their kinetic energy and momentum is negligible.

 $^{^{3}}$ A similar three dimensional system has been investigated in [6] using discrete dipole approximation (DDA).

One might object that infinitely thin layers with a finite polarizability do not constitute a truly microscopic model. However, physical approximations exist. One could envision a medium composed of atomic layers of a dielectric material, introducing an atomic length scale. The granularity affects the fields only in the immediate vicinity of the layers, within several atomic scales. Polarization still is proportional to the electric field near the layers, which is all that is required. This is a valid physical realization of the model, exhibiting all relevant dependencies. As shown below, knowing the fields between the layers suffices to determine the mechanical momentum. To get a finite index of refraction, the polarizability of the layers must be proportional to the layer spacing. In theory this can be achieved by adjusting atomic polarizabilities. The fact that this might be difficult with real atoms does not invalidate the microscopic model.

For simplicity we now use c = 1 for the speed of light. The Maxwell equations in vacuum lead to an equation for E_2 alone,

$$\partial_x^2 E_2 + \partial_z^2 E_2 = \partial_t^2 E_2 + \gamma_0 \partial_t^2 E_2 \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta(z - ma), \qquad (11)$$
$$\gamma_0 = \gamma a / \epsilon_0 = (n^2 - 1) a,$$

where n is the refractive index. The law of induction $\partial_t B_1 = \partial_z E_2$, $\partial_t B_3 = -\partial_x E_2$ allows to determine the magnetic field. Together with the equations $\partial_t P_m = F_m$ for the momenta P_m of the layers according to the forces F_m exerted on them, Eq. (11) forms a closed set of equations. The layers are assumed heavy, meaning they absorb momentum and remain in place.

4.1 Bloch solution

The Bloch ansatz $E_2 = e^{i(px+qz-\omega t)}\psi(z)$ with ψ continuous and periodic in a gives

$$\left(\partial_z^2 + 2iq\partial_z - p^2 - q^2 + \omega^2\right)\psi = -\gamma_0\omega^2\psi\sum_m\delta\left(z - ma\right),$$

$$\psi'\left(0^+\right) - \psi'\left(a^-\right) = -\gamma_0\omega^2\psi\left(0\right),$$
(12)

where we have also written down the boundary condition at the layer. In the interval $0 \le z < a$ the solution can be written in the form

$$\psi^{(0)}(z) = \alpha e^{-i(q-Q)z} + \beta e^{-i(q+Q)z}.$$
(13)

For wavelengths much larger than a (linear dispersion) the solution is

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + q/Q \right), \end{aligned} \tag{14} \\ \beta &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - q/Q \right), \\ Q &= \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{q^2 - (n^2 - 1) p^2}, \\ \omega &= \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{p^2 + q^2} = \sqrt{p^2 + Q^2}. \end{aligned}$$

(k_1,k_3)	$\overline{u^{\mathrm{vac}}}$	$\overline{u^{\mathrm{tot}}}$	$\overline{\Pi^{\mathrm{vac}}}$	$\overline{\Pi^{\mathrm{mech}}}$	$\overline{\Pi^{\mathrm{tot}}}$
$\begin{array}{ c c c c }\hline z < 0 & (p,Q) \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{q}{Q}$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{q}{Q}$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{q}{Q}$	0	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \frac{q}{Q}$
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c }\hline z > 0 & (p,q) \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}\left(n^2+1\right)$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}n^2$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}n$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}n\left(n^2-1\right)$	$\frac{\epsilon_0}{4}n\left(n^2+1\right)$

Table 1: Average energy densities u and average momentum densities Π . The latter are measured in the wavevector direction, (p, Q) or (p, q), respectively. Quantities for z < 0 are for the incoming signal in the case of an anti-reflective coating. The vacuum momentum density $\overline{\Pi^{\text{vac}}}$ coincides with the Poynting vector (apart from a factor c), $\overline{\Pi^{\text{tot}}}$ is the total momentum density.

The phase and group speeds are c/n, as expected.

4.2 Interpretation

A peculiar property of the model is that the Bloch solution also describes refraction. One can remove all layers at z < 0 and extend the solution (13) from the interval $-a \le z < 0$ to the entire range z < 0 without changing anything else. This gives an incoming wave with amplitude α , a reflected wave with amplitude β and the refracted $\alpha\beta$ signal in the medium at $z \ge 0$. The quantities (p, Q) and (p, q) are the x, z components of the wavevector in the vacuum and in the medium. The refraction rate is the usual β^2/α^2 , for normal incidence $(n-1)^2/(n+1)^2$.

What is unusual is that, on average, no force acts on the medium, particularly on the first layer. This follows from the fact that all layers see the same vacuum waves. (If one would add an additional anti-reflective layer with appropriate polarizability at some position z < 0 then a force would act on this layer.)

It remains to calculate the energy densities u and the momentum densities Π . For $z \ge 0$ this can be achieved with the fields

$$E_{2} = e^{i(px-\omega t)} \left(\alpha e^{iQz} + \beta e^{-iQz} \right) \cong e^{i(px-\omega t)},$$

$$B_{1} = e^{i(px-\omega t)} \left(-Q_{\omega}^{\alpha} e^{iQz} + Q_{\omega}^{\beta} e^{-iQz} \right) \cong -e^{i(px-\omega t)} q/\omega,$$

$$B_{3} = e^{i(px-\omega t)} \left(p_{\omega}^{\alpha} e^{iQz} + p_{\omega}^{\beta} e^{-iQz} \right) \cong e^{i(px-\omega t)} p/\omega.$$
(15)

in the first gap $0 \le z < a$. Actually Qz only changes by a negligible amount Qa in the interval, and one can set z = 0.

To simplify the comparison of the incoming and the refracted signal it recommends itself to simulate an anti-reflective coating. This corresponds to an incoming signal in the range $-\infty < z < 0$ with amplitudes $\alpha_{<} = \sqrt{\alpha^{2} - \beta^{2}}$ and $\beta_{<} = 0$ instead of α and β , with the same energy flow (incoming and reflected intensity β^{2} removed). The results are listed in table 1.

The overline denotes the time or space average calculated with the real parts (\Re) of the fields. A useful formula is $\Re(a) \Re(b) = \frac{1}{2} \Re(ab + ab^*)$. The condition for same energy flow at z = 0 reads $\prod_{<}^{\operatorname{vac}} Q = \prod_{>}^{\operatorname{vac}} q/n$. The dependence of the quantities for z < 0 on the direction is an artifact due to the normalization $\alpha + \beta = 1$. A more practical normalization has direction independent quantities for z < 0 and anisotropic quantities (a factor Q/q) in the medium.

4.3 Mechanical momentum

The energy densities u and the Poynting vector Π^{vac} in vacuum immediately follow from the fields. The more interesting quantity, the total momentum density in the medium, can been calculated with the help of the stress tensor $\sigma_{ij} = \epsilon_0 \left(-E_i E_j - B_i B_j + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \left(E^2 + B^2 \right) \right)$ in the gap $0 \le z < a$,

$$\overline{\sigma_{11}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \left(\overline{B_3^2 - B_1^2 + E_2^2} \right) = \frac{\epsilon_0}{4} \left(\omega^2 - q^2 + p^2 \right) / \omega^2,$$

$$\overline{\sigma_{13}} = \overline{\sigma_{31}} = -\epsilon_0 \overline{B_1 B_3} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} qp / \omega^2,$$

$$\overline{\sigma_{33}} = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \left(\overline{B_1^2 - B_3^2 + E_2^2} \right) = \frac{\epsilon_0}{4} \left(\omega^2 - p^2 + q^2 \right) / \omega^2.$$
(16)

The contraction with the unit vector $\hat{e} = (p/n\omega, q/n\omega)$ in propagation direction gives the momentum flow in the gap

$$\overline{\sigma_i^{\text{tot}}} = \sum_j \overline{\sigma_{ij}} e_j = \frac{\epsilon_0}{4} \left(n^2 + 1 \right) \hat{e}_i.$$
(17)

We now consider a plane wave with a wave front. Into an empty interval of length ℓ (in a time ℓn) flows momentum $\frac{\epsilon_0}{4} (n^2 + 1) \ell n = \overline{\Pi_{>}^{\text{tot}}} \ell$, which gives the expression for total momentum density $\overline{\Pi_{>}^{\text{tot}}}$. However, the electromagnetic momentum in this interval is only $\overline{\Pi_{>}^{\text{vac}}} \ell = \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} n\ell$, see table 1. The momentum surplus is the mechanical momentum $\overline{\Pi^{\text{mech}}} \ell$, see table 1. The mechanical momentum density can also be calculated from the Lorentz force acting on the polarization current in the layers, at the border of a signal, the result is the same. Instead of Eq. (2) the relation between total signal momenta in medium and vacuum is $p' = p_2^1 (n + 1/n)$. It can be checked with the results in table 1 that the center of energy of a finite signal is conserved and that the component of the momentum in the direction parallel to the surface is different outside and inside the medium. The condition of no momentum transfer parallel to the surface, used in a formal way in the isotropic case above, should therefore be checked and justified.

Overall, the wave guide model reproduces the signal speed and law of refraction of the corresponding continuum model, but the details differ. The polarization tensor of the corresponding three dimensional continuum model would be diagonal with components $(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0 n^2, \epsilon_0)$ or $(\epsilon_0 n^2, \epsilon_0 n^2, \epsilon_0)$, which makes no difference for the polarization in y-direction considered here. The continuum model does not give the correct total and mechanical momentum of a light signal for the metamaterial of Fig. 3.

5 Conclusions

Wave packets in dispersion-free media move in the direction of their momentum and obey momentum conservation like particles. This allows to describe refraction of light on a quasi mechanical level. In any case a substantial fraction of signal momentum is of mechanical nature, and it is important to understand the corresponding internal structure of wave packets.

Taking into account that atoms are accelerated but essentially remain in place after the signal has passed leads to an electromagnetic system with static matter. Despite this simplification, the problem remains full of pitfalls and complications, related to the Abraham-Minkowski debate. It is clear that most of the difficulties are due to limitations of the usual effective medium Maxwell equations [5, 14]. These equations are adequate for effects determined by average polarization and magnetization (linear in the fields), but not for bilinear local terms like mechanical momentum, at least not without further input.

We have used the exact solution for an anisotropic wave guide to demonstrate these limitations. We do not claim that the well known results for isotropic media are wrong, but what remains lacking is a better understanding of the connection between microscopic physics and the conventional effective medium theory. One could also speak of a complementarity between microscopic and effective medium theories [5], but the relation between the formulations has not been examined in detail.

6 Statements and declarations

No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

- B. Anghinoni, G. A. S. Flizikowski, L. C. Malacarne, M. Partanen, S. E. Bialkowski, and N. G. C. Astrath. On the formulations of the electromagnetic stress-energy tensor. *Ann. Phys.*, (443):169004, 2022.
- [2] N. G. C. Astrath, G. A. S. Flizikowski, B. Anghinoni, L. C. Malacarne, M. L. Baesso, T. Pozar, I. Brevik, D. Razansky, S. E. Bialkowski, and M. Partanen. Unveiling bulk and surface radiation forces in a dielectric liquid. *Light Sci Appl*, 11:103, 2022.
- [3] S. M. Barnett. Resolution of the Abraham-Minkowski dilemma. Phys. Rev. Lett., 104:070401, 2010.
- [4] S. M. Barnett and R. Loudon. The enigma of optical momentum in a medium. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A, 368:927 – 939, 2010.
- [5] I. Brevik. Eperiments in phenomenological electrodynamics and the electromagnetic energy-momentum tensor. *Phys. Rep.*, 52:133–201, 1979.

- [6] B. T. Draine and J. Goodman. Beyond Clausius-Mossotti: wave propagation on a polarizable point lattice and the discrete dipole approximation. Astrophys. J., 104(505):685–697, 1993.
- [7] J. D. Jackson. Classical electrodynamics. Wiley, 1975.
- [8] B. A. Kemp. Resolution of the Abraham-Minkowski debate: Implications for the electromagnetic wave theory of light in matter. J. Appl. Phys., 109:111101, 2011.
- [9] S. G. Lipson and H. Lipson. Optical physics. Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- [10] M. Mansuripur. Resolution of the Abraham-Minkowski controversy. Opt. Commun., 283(10):1997 2005, 2010.
- [11] C. Møller. The theory of relativity. Clarendon Press, 1952.
- [12] M. Partanen, B. Anghinoni, N. G. C. Astrath, and J. Tulkki. Time-dependent theory of optical electroand magnetostriction. *Phys. Rev. A*, (107):023525, 2023.
- [13] M. Partanen, J. Oksanen T. Häyrynen, and J. Tulkki. Photon mass drag and the momentum of light in a medium. *Phys. Rev. A*, (95):063850, 2017.
- [14] M. G. Silveirinha. Revisiting the Abraham-Minkowski dilemma. Phys. Rev. A, 96:033831, 2017.