

Received by ORNL

ANL-HEP-PR-87-54

May 22, 1989

JUN 21 1989

NOETHER'S THEOREM FOR LOCAL GAUGE TRANSFORMATIONS

Debra L. Karatas^{**†} and Kenneth L. Kowalski^{**†}

**High Energy Physics Division
Argonne National Laboratory
Argonne, IL 60439

[†]Department of Physics
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, IL 60611

Abstract

The variational methods of classical field theory may be applied to any theory with an action which is invariant under local gauge transformations. What is the significance of the resulting Noether current? This paper examines such currents for both Abelian and non-Abelian gauge theories and provides an explanation for their form and limited range of physical significance on a level accessible to those with a basic knowledge of classical field theory. Several of the more subtle aspects encountered in the application of the residual local gauge symmetry found by Becchi, Rouet, Stora, and Tyutin are also considered in detail in a self-contained manner.

MASTER

*Work supported by the U.S. National Science foundation and by the U.S. Department of Energy, Division of High Energy Physics, Contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

[†]On leave from the Department of Physics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106.

I. INTRODUCTION

DE89 013674

The continuous symmetries of classical field theories along with the equations of motion for the fields imply the existence of conserved currents from which one can construct conserved charges. This is usually called Noether's theorem,¹⁻¹¹ which in both its classical and operator forms is very important for classifying the general physical characteristics of quantum field theories.⁵⁻¹¹ A brief review of the theorem is given in Sec. II. Nevertheless, the theorem does not seem to apply in a straightforward manner when the symmetry of interest is local gauge invariance.^{7,11,12}

Why this is so is not explored in any of the standard texts on field theory which almost exclusively confine themselves to global gauge transformations when applying Noether's theorem.¹³ Brandt¹⁴ and Jackiw¹¹, e.g., have determined the Noether currents for Abelian and non-Abelian local gauge transformations, but their treatments are not readily accessible to students at the introductory level of field theory. In the present article we present a simple and self-contained discussion of the implications of Noether's theorem for local gauge transformations associated with Abelian and non-Abelian internal symmetries. This is intended to supplement the standard expositions available in introductory works on quantum field theory. Several unusual features of the general Noether currents and charges corresponding to local gauge transformations are pointed out in Sec. III that are of interest even though the physics implicit in a gauge theory can be extracted only after introducing constraints which destroy the gauge symmetry.

In the classical case gauge-fixing is required in order to integrate the equations of motion for the electromagnetic potentials. The quantization of a gauge field theory can only be achieved after the gauge degrees of freedom are suitably restrained. In this last instance, however, a remarkable residual local gauge symmetry¹⁵ has been a useful technical device for the analysis of the physical content of such theories. Noether's theorem will, of course, yield the current and charge corresponding to what is referred to as Becchi, Rouet, Stora, and Tyutin (BRST) symmetry.¹⁵

The implications of Noether's theorem in the case of BRST symmetry are certainly well known.^{12,14,16} However, the application of the relevant formalism in this case is sufficiently subtle as to warrant the introductory expositions we carry out in Sec. IV and Sec. V. We point out several unusual, but important aspects of both the Noether and Lagrangian formalisms in this case. We also compare the BRST current with the usual current result-

ing from gauge symmetry and the source current in the field-tensor equation of motion. A summary is presented in Sec. VI.

II. NOETHER'S THEOREM

Let us consider a classical field theory characterized by a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}[\phi_a(x), \partial_\mu \phi_a(x)]$ involving the fields $\phi_a(x)$ at the space-time point $x = (x^0, \vec{x})$ and their first-order space-time derivatives. For the sake of simplicity we ignore any explicit dependence of \mathcal{L} on x . Here the index a enumerates the different field types including reference to their transformation properties with respect to the Lorentz group (scalar, spinor, vector, etc.). Also $\partial_\mu = \partial/\partial x^\mu$, where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and we employ the metric $g_{00} = -g_{jj} = +1$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ to raise and lower the vector index μ .

A signature of the symmetry of a classical field theory is the invariance of the action integral

$$S_{21}[\phi] = \int_1^2 d^4x \mathcal{L}[\phi_a(x), \partial_\mu \phi_a(x)], \quad (2.1)$$

taken between two space-like surfaces under the associated transformations of the fields. Hamilton's principle then implies that the equations of motion are also invariant under these transformations. Noether's theorem refers to the local implications of a symmetry and these are determined by exploring the consequences of the invariance

$$\delta S_{21}[\phi] = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

under the infinitesimal transformations

$$\phi_a(x) \rightarrow \phi_a(x) + \delta\phi_a(x). \quad (2.3)$$

The variations are assumed to vanish on the boundary surfaces 1 and 2.

Corresponding to (2.3) we have the variation in the Lagrangian density

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\phi_a(x)} \delta\phi_a(x) + \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu\phi_a(x))} \delta[\partial_\mu\phi_a(x)], \quad (2.4)$$

where summation over any repeated index is implied. If we suppose that we can interchange the δ and ∂_μ operations, (2.2) and (2.4) together with the equations of motion

$$\partial_\mu \left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\partial_\mu\phi_a(x)} \right] - \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\phi_a(x)} = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

imply that

$$0 = \int_1^2 d^4x \partial_\mu \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi_a(x))} \delta \phi_a(x) \right]. \quad (2.6)$$

Since the integrand of (2.6) vanishes on the boundary surfaces and involves otherwise arbitrary variations of the fields induced by the symmetry transformations, it follows that

$$\partial^\mu j_\mu(x) = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

where¹⁷

$$j_\mu(x) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi_a(x))} \delta \phi_a(x) \quad (2.8)$$

is the conserved Noether current. Evidently we can always define a Noether current corresponding to (2.3) whether or not (2.2), and therefore (2.7), is realized.

Actually since arbitrary variations of the fields are involved Eq. (2.8) defines an entire family of currents as well as the charges

$$Q(x_0) \equiv \int d^3x j_0(x), \quad (2.9)$$

which are also conserved,

$$\frac{dQ(x_0)}{dx_0} = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

as a consequence of (2.7) provided $j_\mu(x)$ vanishes sufficiently quickly in space-like directions at infinity.¹⁸ This uninteresting diversity is usually eliminated by parametrizing the variations $\delta \phi_a(x)$ by a space-time independent infinitesimal parameter ϵ so that

$$\delta \phi_a(x) = \epsilon f_a[\phi(x)], \quad (2.11)$$

where $f_a[\phi]$ is some function of all the $\phi_a(x)$'s. The content of Noether's theorem can then be stated in a form that reflects the intrinsic character of the symmetry transformation rather than factoring in irrelevant information about the parameters that particularize it. That is equations of the same form as (2.7), (2.8), and (2.10) hold as before but now in terms of what may be called the *intrinsic* Noether current:

$$j_\mu(x)_N \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial [\partial_\mu \phi_a(x)]} f_a[\phi(x)], \quad (2.12)$$

with which is associated the Noether charge

$$Q(x_0)_N \equiv \int d^3x j_0(x)_N. \quad (2.13)$$

If $j_\mu(x)_N$ is conserved the time-independent charge Q_N given by (2.13) can be regarded as an intrinsic observable of the system. On the other hand, given any tensor field $R_{\mu\nu}(x)$ that falls off sufficiently rapidly in space-like directions the conserved current

$$j'_\mu(x)_N = j_\mu(x)_N + \partial^\nu (R_{\mu\nu} - R_{\nu\mu}) \quad (2.14)$$

determines the same charge Q_N because

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^3x \partial^\nu (R_{0\nu} - R_{\nu 0}) &= \int d^3x \partial^i (R_{0i} - R_{i0}) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

This device of adding the divergence of an antisymmetric tensor¹⁹ can be used to “improve” the original canonical Noether current so as to attain some other property, such as the indicial symmetry of the energy-momentum tensor while maintaining current conservation and the same value of the Noether charge.^{10,11}

We will see in the next section that local gauge transformations are unusual in two respects with regard to Noether’s theorem. Generally one cannot disentangle the parameters that define the transformations from the local gauge Noether current. Furthermore, we find that the canonical Noether current in this case is itself the divergence of an antisymmetric tensor and so meaningful Noether charges can arise only from long-ranged contributions in space-like directions.

III. LOCAL GAUGE TRANSFORMATIONS

By definition gauge transformations of any sort do not represent physical symmetry operations. Rather they probe the phase relationships within the model space of a physical theory. The intrinsic conserved charges that accompany the gauge invariance of a theory generally are observable provided they are themselves gauge invariant. These two aspects do not conflict because the range of values of the charges do not represent different possible states of a particular system, as would be the case for angular momentum or energy, for example.

Rather, the values of the charges define different classes of possible systems, namely all those with definite values of the charges.

A. Abelian Gauge Groups

Several properties of general gauge theories in regard to Noether's theorem are already present in the trivial example of a free electromagnetic field with

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the antisymmetric electromagnetic field tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ is expressed in terms of the gauge fields $A_\mu(x)$ in the usual manner

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu. \quad (3.2)$$

Evidently (3.2) and thus (3.1) are invariant under the $U(1)$ group of Abelian gauge transformations

$$A_\mu(x) \rightarrow A_\mu(x) + \partial_\mu \theta(x). \quad (3.3)$$

For infinitesimal $\theta(x)$ the Noether current (2.8) is

$$j_\mu(x)_N = \partial^\nu [F_{\nu\mu}(x)\theta(x)], \quad (3.4)$$

which is manifestly conserved by virtue of the antisymmetry of $F_{\mu\nu}(x)$.

We see that because of the derivative operation on the gauge parameterizing function $\theta(x)$ we generally cannot factor out the incidental attributes of the transformation. For constant $\theta(x)$, namely global, or rigid, gauge transformations, we see that (3.4) vanishes by the equations of motion and we always have zero intrinsic charge. The charges one would try to infer from (3.4) are not defined except for special gauge functions θ .

The point is that the time-independent charge integral

$$Q[\theta] = \int d^3x \partial^i [F_{i0}\theta(x)] \quad (3.5)$$

will not exist for an arbitrary free field tensor F_{i0} unless $\theta(x)$ is suitably well-behaved. Then the three-dimensional spatial integral (3.5) can be converted into a surface integral whose value depends upon $\theta(x)$. If θ is a constant then obviously $Q(\theta) = 0$, but otherwise the value of $Q[\theta]$ depends both on the particular gauge and field functions that enter into (3.5). Thus

the infinity of conserved charges (3.5) do not represent *useful* observables of the system. This is because they fail in what is the signal function of a conserved charge, namely, to provide a labeling of equivalence classes of systems governed by the same underlying dynamics. The explicit gauge dependence of (3.5) is of course a direct reflection of this failure.

Another way of looking at the failure of local gauge invariance to provide any new observables is to realize that one has introduced into the problem redundant degrees of freedom by treating all four components of A_μ as independent fields in the variations. In classical field theory one is able to specify uniquely the functional form of the gauge field only after this arbitrariness is removed by some gauge-fixing condition. Imposing such a condition is equivalent to adding a gauge-fixing term to the Lagrangian, a type of term which is not locally gauge invariant. Therefore when one wishes to solve the equations of motion describing the gauge field, the local gauge invariance of the Lagrangian, and so the action, is destroyed along with the possibility of additional observables. On the other hand, global gauge invariance still holds and one is left with the corresponding intrinsic conserved current and charge. So while the demand for local gauge invariance motivates both the introduction of the gauge fields and their coupling to matter, it yields no new observable since one must eventually break the symmetry to solve for the gauge field uniquely. This is consistent with the requirement that all observables be gauge invariant.

In order to see that the situation is the same when minimally charged matter fields are included let us consider the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + [(\partial_\mu + ieA_\mu)\phi]^*[(\partial^\mu + ieA^\mu)\phi] + m^2|\phi|^2 \\ + \bar{\psi}(i\cancel{\partial} - e\cancel{A} - m)\psi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}$ is given by the free electromagnetic Lagrangian (3.1). The complex scalar field $\phi(x)$ represents charged scalar particles while the four-component spinor $\psi(x)$ corresponds to charged Dirac particles. The slash notation designates a contraction with respect to the gamma matrices γ^μ , for example $\cancel{A} = A_\mu \gamma^\mu$. Also $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger \gamma^0$, where the Hermitian adjoint operation includes a transposition with respect to the spinor indices, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in addition to complex conjugation, where we keep in mind that we are dealing with classical fields.

It should be noted that because of the asymmetrical structure of the Dirac term in (3.6), \mathcal{L} is not real. Symmetrization leads to a real Lagrangian which differs from (3.6) by an action-preserving total divergence. One subtlety in this occurs in connection with

calculations of variations such as (2.4) where all of the independent fields enter. When using (3.6), in effect, only the $\psi_\alpha(x)$ are regarded as independent fields. If the symmetrized \mathcal{L} were to be used then the $\psi_\alpha^*(x)$ fields as well would have to be taken to be independent. In the first case one obtains a real contribution to $\delta\mathcal{L}$ that is identical to the sum of the contributions in the second instance. Another subtlety concerns the Grassmann character of ψ in the quantized case; we remark about this in Sec. IV.

Local gauge transformations now entail phase changes in the charged fields to accompany (3.3), namely,

$$\phi(x) \rightarrow e^{-ie\theta(x)}\phi(x) \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow e^{-ie\theta(x)}\psi(x) \quad (3.7b)$$

One easily sees that for infinitesimal $\theta(x)$, the Noether current is

$$j_\mu(x) = \theta(x)J_\mu(x) - F_{\mu\nu}(x)\partial^\nu\theta(x), \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$J^\mu(x) = ie \left[\phi^* \partial^\mu \phi + 2ieA^\mu |\phi|^2 \right] + e\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (3.9)$$

is the gauge-invariant source current in the equation of motion for the electromagnetic field

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu}(x) = J^\nu(x). \quad (3.10)$$

We can then rewrite (3.8) as

$$j_\mu(x) = \partial^\nu [F_{\mu\nu}(x)\theta(x)], \quad (3.11)$$

which is just (3.4) again.

For constant gauge functions, θ ,

$$j_\mu(x) = \theta J_\mu(x), \quad (3.12)$$

so that $J_\mu(x)$ is the intrinsic Noether current. In contrast to the discussion of the free electromagnetic field, the Noether charge

$$Q = \int d^3x J_0(x) \quad (3.13)$$

is a useful observable because it does provide a means of classifying equivalence classes of systems. It is important to note that

$$Q = \int d^3x \partial^i F_{i0}(x), \quad (3.14)$$

so that for fields generated by localized charges and currents (3.14) can be converted into a surface integral at infinity which is finite and nonzero in general (Gauss' Law). As in the non-interacting case, the infinite family of conserved charges associated with the general current (3.11) represents, in essence, redundant observables and serves no practical purpose.

We note that any infinitesimal function $\theta(x)$ can be written in the form

$$\theta(x) = \epsilon[1 + f(x)], \quad (3.15)$$

where ϵ is an infinitesimal parameter and $f(x)$ is an arbitrary ϵ -independent function. Then

$$j_\mu(x) = \epsilon \{ J_\mu(x) + \partial^\nu [F_{\mu\nu}f(x)] \}, \quad (3.16)$$

so that the terms within the curly brackets resemble what we referred to as an intrinsic Noether current.⁷ The form (3.16), while it seems to show explicitly the form of the redundancy in the Noether currents that exists for local gauge transformations actually provides little insight over (3.11) as may be seen by taking $f(x)$ to be a constant. Equation (3.16) is, perhaps, more incisive if $f(x)$ is restricted to those functions that vanish at infinity in all space-like directions.

It is due to the very special properties of minimally coupled gauge theories in generating interactions that the Noether current associated with a gauge symmetry transformation of all the fields can be expressed in terms of the field strengths with no explicit reference to the matter fields. In the electromagnetic case the underlying reason for this to happen is the validity of identities such as

$$\frac{\partial X(\phi, \phi^*, A_\nu)}{\partial A_\mu(x)} = ie\phi(x) \frac{\partial X(\phi, \phi^*, A_\nu)}{\partial [\partial_\mu \phi(x)]} - ie\phi^*(x) \frac{\partial X(\phi, \phi^*, A_\nu)}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi^*(x))}, \quad (3.17)$$

where X is any function which involves only the matter fields $\phi(x)$ and $\phi^*(x)$ minimally coupled electromagnetically. Equation (3.17) is a variational differential form of the minimal coupling prescription. It is Eq. (3.17) and a similar one involving ϕ , ϕ^* , and ψ_α that are responsible for the connection between the source current of the gauge fields and the Noether current associated.

B. Non-Abelian Gauge Group

Non-Abelian gauge theories are distinguished from the Abelian ones by a multiplicity of gauge fields, self-interactions, and gauge transformations that involve the gauge fields in

addition to the functions that parameterize them. This adds to the technical complexity of determining the consequences of gauge invariance. Nonetheless, for the Noether currents and charges the results are essentially identical to the Abelian case except for trivial multiplicities produced by the group indices so long as any matter fields that enter into the theory are coupled to the gauge fields minimally.

It is convenient to follow Cheng and Li²⁰ in their conventions for the phases and coupling constants for the gauge fields $A_\mu^a(x)$ as well as the gauge transformations that characterize them. We consider the least complicated situation corresponding to a gauge group G generated by a compact, simple Lie group with N Hermitian generators T^a , $a = 1, \dots, N$ that satisfy

$$[T^a, T^b] = iC_{abc}T^c. \quad (3.18)$$

The structure constants C_{abc} are completely antisymmetric in their indices.

The gauge fields transform globally according to the adjoint representation of G and so are enumerated in the same manner as the generators. In the absence of matter fields the dynamics of the gauge fields are generated by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F_a^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.19)$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + gC_{abc}A_\mu^b A_\nu^c \quad (3.20)$$

is the field strength. Since

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial (\partial_\mu A_\nu^a)} = -F_a^{\mu\nu}, \quad (3.21a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial A_\nu^a} = -gF_b^{\nu\lambda}C_{bad}A_\lambda^d \quad (3.21b)$$

the equations of motion are

$$\partial_\mu F_a^{\mu a} = gF_b^{\nu\lambda}C_{bad}A_\lambda^d. \quad (3.22)$$

Under an infinitesimal local gauge transformation parameterized by the (infinitesimal) functions $\theta^a(x)$ the change in A_μ^a is

$$\delta A_\mu^a = C_{abc}\theta^b A_\mu^c - \frac{1}{g}\partial_\mu\theta^a. \quad (3.23)$$

With (3.19a) and (3.21) it is now straightforward to show that the Noether current corresponding to an infinitesimal local gauge transformation is

$$j_\mu(x)_N = \left(-\frac{1}{g} \right) \partial^\nu \left(F_{\nu\mu}^a(x) \theta^a(x) \right). \quad (3.24)$$

This differs from our Abelian result (cf. Eq. (3.4)) only in the appearance of the factor $(-\frac{1}{g})$ which results from the different phase and coupling constant conventions used in the two instances. If we make the transformations $g \rightarrow -g$ and $\theta \rightarrow g\theta$ in Eqs. (3.20)–(3.24) we obtain a convention consistent with the one used in the Abelian case.

We next show that (3.24) is still valid when matter fields are introduced provided that their coupling to the gauge fields is minimal. The scalar (ϕ) and fermion (ψ) matter fields are presumed to transform globally according to arbitrary finite-dimensional irreducible representations of G that correspond to matrix realizations, L^a , of the generators T^a . The matrix elements L_{ij}^a as well as the field components ϕ_i and ψ_i are labeled by indices with ranges appropriate to the individual representations; the spinor indices are suppressed. It is only necessary to suppose that there is one scalar and one spinor multiplet and that they both transform according to the same representation of G . Then the complications entailed in the generalizations to arbitrary numbers of multiplets of either Lorentz types are trivially indicial.

Generally we have a Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}, \quad (3.25)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}$ is given by (3.19) and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} = (D^\mu \phi)^\dagger (D_\mu \phi) + \bar{\psi} i \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi - V. \quad (3.26)$$

The potential $V(\phi^*, \phi, \bar{\psi}, \psi)$ includes all mass terms and the non-gauge couplings of the scalar and fermion fields. The minimal gauge coupling is manifested by the covariant derivative

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig L^a A_\mu^a, \quad (3.27)$$

which is a matrix in the finite-dimensional representation space.

The Noether current corresponding to local gauge transformations for the system represented by \mathcal{L} is

$$j_\mu(x)_N = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu A_\nu^a)} \delta A_\nu^a + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_i)} \delta \phi_i + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_i^*)} \delta \phi_i^* + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \psi_i)} \delta \psi_i. \quad (3.28)$$

Here δA_ν^a is given by (3.23) as before while

$$\delta \phi_i = -i L_{jk}^a \theta^a \phi_k \quad (3.29)$$

and

$$\delta \psi_i = -i L_{jk}^a \theta^a \psi_k \quad (3.30)$$

are the infinitesimal changes of the matter fields. We have suppressed the spinor indices in the last term on the right-hand side of (3.28).

The demonstration that (3.28) reduces to (3.24) follows immediately from the following two identities. The first merely generalizes the calculation employed in the pure gauge case:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu A_\nu^a)} \delta A_\nu^a = \left(-\frac{1}{g} \right) \partial_\nu (F_a^{\nu\mu} \theta^a) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}}{\partial A_\mu^a} \left(\frac{\theta^a}{g} \right). \quad (3.31)$$

The second corresponds to (3.17) and is a variational differential manifestation of minimal gauge coupling in the present context:

$$\left\{ \delta \phi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_i)} + \delta \phi_i^* \frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_i^*)} + \delta \psi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \psi_i)} \right\} \mathcal{L} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}}{\partial A_\mu^a} \left(\frac{\theta^a}{g} \right). \quad (3.32)$$

IV. BRST SYMMETRY

In order to facilitate our discussions we ignore matter fields and employ a well-known compact index-free notation with respect to the adjoint representation of the simple group G similar to that employed by Frampton,¹⁶ e.g., whose treatment we loosely follow. The field strength is written as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + g A_\mu \wedge A_\nu \quad (4.1)$$

where the cross product is defined as

$$(B \wedge K)_a \equiv C_{abc} B_b K_c, \quad (4.2)$$

where B_b and K_c are any two objects (“vectors”) that transform according to the regular representation of G . Then if a dot is used to denote the scalar product of vectors, the gauge Lagrangian (3.19) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu} \cdot F^{\mu\nu}. \quad (4.3)$$

We will need only the covariant derivative D_μ^{ab} in the regular representation:

$$D_\mu \xi = \partial_\mu \xi + g A_\mu \wedge \xi, \quad (4.4)$$

where ξ^a is a vector.

One method for quantizing the classical theory based on (4.3) leads to a (covariantly) gauge-fixed Lagrangian which contains so-called Faddeev-Popov ghosts which are denoted by c_a and c_a^+ and are regarded as independent mutually anticommuting (Grassmann) variables:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{FPG}}, \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} = -\frac{1}{2\alpha} (\partial^\mu A_\mu)^2, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FPG}} = \partial_\mu c^+ \cdot D^\mu c, \quad (4.7)$$

and α is a fixed parameter whose significance is immaterial for our considerations.

Obviously no statement can be made about the behavior of \mathcal{L} under an infinitesimal local gauge transformation,

$$\delta A_\mu = -\frac{1}{g} D_\mu \theta, \quad (4.8)$$

unless the transformation properties of c and c^+ are defined and the gauge parameters $\theta^a(x)$ suitably restricted. This is indeed the case for the BRST transformation appropriate to \mathcal{L} defined by choosing

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} \theta = g c \delta \lambda, \quad (4.9a)$$

so

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} A_\mu = -(D_\mu c) \delta \lambda, \quad (4.9b)$$

with

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} c \equiv -\frac{g}{2} (c \wedge c) \delta \lambda, \quad (4.9c)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} c^+ \equiv -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu \cdot A_\mu)\delta\lambda. \quad (4.9d)$$

Here $\delta\lambda$ is an infinitesimal Grassmann parameter which satisfies the anticommutative relations

$$\{\delta\lambda, c\} = \{\delta\lambda, c^+\} = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

Otherwise $\delta\lambda$ behaves like an ordinary number, namely,

$$\partial_\mu \delta\lambda = 0,$$

$$[A_\mu, \delta\lambda] = 0.$$

The role of $\delta\lambda$ is to render δ_{BRST} a bosonic variation which satisfies the usual form of the Liebnitz rule when acting on a product:

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}(\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2) = (\delta\mathcal{O}_1)\mathcal{O}_2 + \mathcal{O}_1(\delta\mathcal{O}_2). \quad (4.11)$$

The calculation of $\delta_{\text{BRST}}\mathcal{L}$ is simplified with the aid of vector identities that are straightforward generalizations of those of vector analysis in three-dimensional Euclidean space.

A. Vector Identities

The structure constants of the Lie algebra, C_{abc} are totally antisymmetric with respect to permutations of their indices. This attribute along with the fact that they also satisfy the group algebra (regular representation) implies that

$$C_{abk}C_{\ell pk} = \delta_{a\ell}\delta_{bp} - \delta_{ap}\delta_{b\ell}. \quad (4.12)$$

Antisymmetry and (4.12) suffice for the proof of all of the identities listed next in terms of the arbitrary vectors A, B, K .

Clearly

$$A \wedge B = \mp B \wedge A \quad (4.13)$$

with the upper (lower) sign if all the components of A and B are commuting (anticommuting).

There are three independent types of triple-scalar products:

(i) All components of A, B, K commute:

$$A \cdot (B \wedge K) = K \cdot (A \wedge B). \quad (4.14)$$

(ii) $[A^a, B^b] = [A^a, K^k] = 0$; $\{B^b, K^k\} = 0$:

$$A \cdot (B \wedge K) = -K \cdot (A \wedge B). \quad (4.15)$$

(iii) All components of A, B, K anticommute:

$$A \cdot (B \wedge K) \text{ is independent of ordering.} \quad (4.16)$$

There are two independent triple-vector products:

(i) $[B^b, K^k] = 0$:

$$A \wedge (B \wedge K) = (A \cdot K)B - (A \cdot B)K, \quad (4.17)$$

(ii) $\{B^b, K^k\} = 0$:

$$A \wedge (B \wedge K) = -(A \cdot K) \cdot B - (A \cdot B) \cdot K. \quad (4.18)$$

Two further identities that are repeatedly used in subsequent calculations are¹⁶

$$A \wedge (B \wedge B) = 2(A \wedge B) \wedge B \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\partial_\mu (B \wedge B) = 2(\partial_\mu B) \wedge B, \quad (4.20)$$

where B is a Grassmann vector,

$$\{B^b, B^a\} = 0. \quad (4.21)$$

Equation (4.19) follows trivially from (4.18), (4.13) and (4.17). Only (4.13) and the fact that ∂_μ obeys the usual Liebnitz rule suffice to prove (4.20). We use (4.14)–(4.21) repeatedly in what follows.

B. $\delta_{\text{BRST}} \mathcal{L}$

Since (4.9b) is a local gauge transformation we must have

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = 0, \quad (4.22)$$

as can be seen from

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}} F_{\mu\nu} = \theta \wedge F_{\mu\nu}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{BRST}}(F_{\mu\nu} \cdot F^{\mu\nu}) &= -\theta \cdot (F_{\mu\nu} \wedge F^{\mu\nu}) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the calculation is straightforward and one finds

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}\mathcal{L} = \partial^\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial^\nu A_\nu) \cdot (D_\mu c) \right] \delta\lambda, \quad (4.23)$$

namely the BRST variation of \mathcal{L} is a total divergence which is transformed into a surface term in the action and so has no effect on the dynamics which are BRST-invariant. We demonstrate this in a more direct manner in the Appendix. Another implication of the nonvanishing of the right-hand side of (4.23) is that the BRST-Noether current derived from \mathcal{L} is not conserved, but one that is can be constructed simply by subtracting the square-bracketed term in (4.23) from the original current.

In the course of establishing (4.23) one exploits the fact, which follows from (4.9), that

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}(D_\mu c) = 0, \quad (4.24)$$

which is just one of the nilpotency relations that characterize the BRST transformation:

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}^2(A_\mu) = 0, \quad (4.25a)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}^2 c = 0, \quad (4.25b)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}^2 c^+ = 0. \quad (4.25c)$$

We remark that (4.25c) follows using the equations of motion for c ; it is interesting to note however that $\delta_{\text{BRST}}^3 c^+$ vanishes independently of the equations of motion. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{BRST}}\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial(\partial_\mu A_\nu)} \cdot \partial_\mu(\delta_{\text{BRST}} A_\nu) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}}{\partial A_\nu} \cdot \delta_{\text{BRST}} A_\nu,\end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

it is seen that (4.22) follows from the validity of the useful identity

$$F_{\mu\nu} \cdot \partial^\mu(D^\nu c) = g (A^\lambda \wedge F_{\lambda\nu}) \cdot D^\nu c. \quad (4.27)$$

Of course (4.27) is valid independently of (4.22), (4.9) or the equations of motion which have as yet to be exploited. It should be possible to use instead of \mathcal{L} a Lagrangian which is BRST invariant. It is easily shown that

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}\mathcal{L}_i = 0, \quad (4.28)$$

where the invariant (i) Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} - \frac{1}{2\alpha} (\partial^\mu \cdot A_\mu)^2 - c^+ \cdot (\partial^\mu D_\mu c), \quad (4.29)$$

differs from \mathcal{L} by a total divergence. The problem with (4.29) is that it contains second derivatives which we examine in more detail within the next section since it then requires a modification of the usual Noether formalism.

Recall, however, that we have demonstrated here only one quite conventional method of gauge-fixing the Lagrangian, and that one may also consider other prescriptions. At the expense of introducing auxiliary scalar commuting bosonic fields f_a , for example, one may define a covariant gauge-fixing prescription which automatically leads to a vanishing BRST variation of \mathcal{L} . We thank the anonymous referee of this work for pointing out to us that for

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} = \partial_\mu f \cdot A^\mu + \frac{\alpha}{2} f \cdot f \quad (4.30)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FPG}} = \partial_\mu c^+ \cdot D^\mu c \quad (4.31)$$

one finds that the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{FPG}}$$

is invariant under the following set of transformations:

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}\theta = gc\delta\lambda \quad (4.32a)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}A_\mu = -(D_\mu c)\delta\lambda \quad (4.32b)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}c = -\frac{g}{2}(c \wedge c)\delta\lambda \quad (4.32c)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}c^+ = -f\delta\lambda \quad (4.32d)$$

$$\delta_{\text{BRST}}f = 0. \quad (4.32e)$$

This Lagrangian, we note, suffers from no higher derivative problem, and moreover that the nilpotency relations of the BRST transformations, Eq. (4.25) plus $\delta_{\text{BRST}}^2 f = 0$, formulated in this way are found to be satisfied without recourse to the ghost equations of motion.

V. BRST NOETHER CURRENTS

The Noether formalism for the particular realizations of BRST symmetry considered in Sec. IV has two complications not encountered previously. One is the higher-derivative problem pointed out at the end of the last section. The other has to do with the fact that c and c^+ are anticommuting Grassmann quantities. So that for any variation, δ , of the fields we have, e.g.,

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \delta c^+ \cdot \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial c^+} + \delta c \cdot \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial c} + \dots, \quad (5.1a)$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial c^+} \cdot \delta c^+ + \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial c} \cdot \delta c + \dots, \quad (5.1b)$$

where $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial c$ and $\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}/\partial c$, e.g., denote the left and right-handed variational derivatives,²¹ respectively, of \mathcal{L} with respect to the Grassmann quantity c . Consequently, the relevant Noether currents are given by

$$j_\mu(x) = \delta c^+ \cdot \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c^+)} + \delta c \cdot \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c)} + \dots, \quad (5.2a)$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c^+)} \cdot \delta c^+ + \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c)} \cdot \delta c + \dots. \quad (5.2b)$$

The Lagrangian formalism holds as usual with respect to c^+ and c so long as either only right or only left variational derivatives are employed; evidently the same equations of motion are obtained either way.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c^+)} &= -\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c^+)} \\ &= -D^\mu c, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c)} &= -\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu c)} \\ &= +\partial^\mu c^+, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3b)$$

it follows that the BRST Noether current associated with \mathcal{L} is²²

$$[j_\mu(x)]_{\text{BRST}} = F_{\mu\nu} \cdot D^\nu c - \frac{g}{2}(\partial_\mu c^+) \cdot (c \wedge c) + \frac{2}{\alpha}(\partial^\nu A_\nu) \cdot D_\mu c, \quad (5.4)$$

where we have dropped an overall $\delta\lambda$ factor on the right side of (5.4). A conserved BRST current is obtained from (5.4) by subtracting the divergence (4.23) yielding (again without the overall $\delta\lambda$ factor)

$$j_\mu(x)_{\text{BRST}} = F_{\mu\nu} \cdot D^\nu c - \frac{g}{2} (\partial_\mu c^+) \cdot (c \wedge c) + \frac{1}{\alpha} (\partial^\nu A_\nu) \cdot (D_\mu c). \quad (5.5)$$

The verification that one also obtains (5.5) from the BRST-invariant Lagrangian \mathcal{L} requires the use of a higher-derivative Lagrangian and Noether formalisms which we quote, for simplicity, in terms of a scalar, non-Grassmann field $\phi(x)$. If

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi, \partial^2 \phi), \quad (5.6)$$

then the action principle implies the equations of motion

$$\mathcal{O}_L \mathcal{L} = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$\mathcal{O}_L = -\partial^2 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial^2 \phi)} \right) + \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}, \quad (5.8)$$

is the Lagrangian operator for this case. For any variation, δ , the Noether current is

$$j_\mu(x) = \left[\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^\mu \phi)} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^2 \phi)} \right) \right] \delta \phi + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^2 \phi)} \partial_\mu(\delta \phi), \quad (5.9)$$

which is conserved if $\delta \mathcal{L} = 0$. The adaptation of (5.6)–(5.9) to the Grassmann situation encountered in connection with \mathcal{L} and the BRST transformation (4.9) is clear from our treatment of ordering questions earlier in this section. One finds, for example, that

$$j_\mu(x)_{\text{BRST}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial(\partial^\mu A_\nu)} \cdot \delta_{\text{BRST}} A_\nu + J_\mu^c(x), \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu^c(x) &= \left[\frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial(\partial^\mu c)} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial^2 c)} \right) \right] \cdot \delta_{\text{BRST}} c \\ &\quad + \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial(\partial^2 c)} \cdot \partial_\mu(\delta_{\text{BRST}} c). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

One then obtains (5.5), with the aid of some of our previously quoted identities, which demonstrates the consistency of the two approaches.

As a further check on the validity of our result (5.5) it is instructive to directly verify that

$$\partial^\mu j_\mu(x)_{\text{BRST}} = 0 \quad (5.12)$$

using the explicit equations of motion:²³

$$\partial^\mu F_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{J}_\nu(x), \quad (5.13a)$$

$$\partial^\mu (D_\mu c) = 0, \quad (5.13b)$$

$$\partial^2 c^+ = g(\partial_\mu c^+) \wedge A^\mu. \quad (5.13c)$$

The conserved *source current* for the field strength,

$$\mathcal{J}_\nu(x) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} \partial_\nu(\partial \cdot A) + g(\partial_\nu c^+) \wedge c + gA^\lambda \wedge F_{\nu\lambda}, \quad (5.14)$$

is evidently quite distinct from the Noether current (5.5). Both of these currents, in turn, are each different from the conserved Noether current that is associated with the invariance

$$\delta_\theta \mathcal{L} = \delta_\theta \mathcal{L}_i = 0 \quad (5.15)$$

under the global (rigid) gauge transformation

$$\delta_\theta A_\mu = gA_\mu \wedge \theta, \quad (5.16a)$$

$$\delta_\theta c = g(c \wedge \theta), \quad (5.16b)$$

$$\delta_\theta c^+ = g(c^+ \wedge \theta), \quad (5.16c)$$

namely

$$J_\mu(x) = F_{\mu\nu} \wedge A^\nu + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\partial^\nu A_\nu) \wedge A_\mu - \partial_\mu c^+ \wedge c + c^+ \wedge D_\mu c. \quad (5.17)$$

Now $J_\mu(x)$ corresponds to the conservation of “charge”, although $J_\mu(x)$ and the conserved charge

$$Q = \int d^3x J_0(x) \quad (5.18)$$

are generally gauge variant.

VI. SUMMARY

We have elaborated upon the customary pedagogical treatments of Noether's theorem when it is applied to local gauge transformations. We have shown for both Abelian and non-Abelian gauge groups that the Noether currents associated with local gauge symmetry are expressed solely in terms of field strengths and are trivially conserved. The same form for the current is obtained whether or not the gauge fields are coupled to matter so long as that coupling is minimal. The resultant currents and their associated charges do not generally correspond to physical observables except for constant gauge parameters in which case they reduce to the currents and charges implied by global (or rigid) gauge symmetry. This is reflective of the lack of gauge fixing.

When the gauge fields are constrained, as is necessary to obtain unique solutions of the classical equations or to quantize the theory, the local symmetry is destroyed and the consequences of Noether's theorem are much more limited. A particularly interesting case is when the quantization is carried out using the device of anticommuting Faddeev-Popov ghosts. The gauge-fixed Lagrangian still possesses a restricted local gauge symmetry, BRST invariance. The application of Noether's theorem in this case involves subtleties in Grassmann calculus and the higher-derivative Lagrangian formalism not usually explicated in introductory treatments of gauge theories. We have given a self-contained treatment that considers these points in detail and also considers the differences among the source current, and the two Noether gauge symmetry currents (global and BRST) that arise in a quantized gauge field theory. Two theorems concerning the nonuniqueness in the choice of field theory Lagrangians are proven in the Appendix.

APPENDIX

It is often stated that Lagrangians that differ by total divergences yield equivalent equations of motion because such terms are converted to surface terms in the action principle which can be discarded. The result, of course, is actually independent of the consideration of surface integrals. We explore this question here because it takes on a slightly different form for Lagrangians containing higher derivatives such as \mathcal{L}_i .

The usual result is that if we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi) + \partial_\mu f^\mu(\phi), \quad (A.1)$$

then, because

$$\partial_\mu f^\mu(\phi) = \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial \phi} \partial_\mu \phi, \quad (A.2)$$

we have

$$\mathcal{O}_L \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{O}_L \mathcal{L}, \quad (A.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{O}_L = \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}. \quad (A.4)$$

From (A.3) we see that the equations of motion will be the same for both \mathcal{L} and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$.

A number of generalizations of the preceding nonuniqueness (of the choice of Lagrangian) theorem to higher derivative Lagrangians are possible. The one we require, however, is where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}} &= \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi, \partial_\lambda \partial_\rho \phi) \\ &= \mathcal{L}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi) + \partial_\mu f^\mu(\phi, \partial_\nu \phi). \end{aligned} \quad (A.5)$$

Then since

$$\partial_\mu f^\mu = \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial \phi} \partial_\mu \phi + \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial(\partial_\nu \phi)} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi, \quad (A.6)$$

one finds, after a somewhat lengthy calculation, that

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_L \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_L \mathcal{L}, \quad (A.7)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_L = -\partial_\lambda \partial_\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\lambda \partial_\rho \phi)} + \partial_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}. \quad (A.8)$$

REFERENCES

1. E. Noether, "Invariante Variationsprobleme", Nach. kgl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, 235–257 (1918).
2. The review by E. L. Hill, "Hamilton's Principle and the Conservation Theorems of Mathematical Physics", Rev. Mod. Phys. **23**, 253–260 (1951), is intended to make accessible the early literature (Ref. 1 and Refs. 3,4) on the deduction of conservation theorems from variational statements of the dynamics. The theorem is discussed in virtually all contemporary texts and monographs on field theory and particle physics (Refs. 5–9 are representative works) as well as in specialized lecture notes (Refs. 10,11).

3. F. Klein, "Über die Differentialgesetze für die Erhaltung von Impuls and Energie in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie", Nach. kgl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, 171–189 (1918).
4. E. Bessel-Hagen, "Über die Erhaltungssätze der Elektrodynamik", Math. Ann. **84**, 258–276 (1921).
5. C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
6. P. Ramond, *Field Theory, A Modern Primer* (Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1981) pp. 37–40,64.
7. K. Huang, *Quarks, Leptons and Gauge Fields* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1982), p. 48.
8. T.-P. Cheng and L.-F. Li, *Theory of Elementary Particle Physics* (Oxford U. Press, New York, 1984).
9. G. G. Ross, *Grand Unified Theories*, (Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1985), pp. 32,36,80,469,470.
10. R. Jackiw, S. B. Treiman, R. Jackiw, and D. J. Gross, in *Lectures in Current Algebra and Its Applications* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972), p. 101.
11. R. Jackiw, in *Relativity, Groups, and Topology II*, Proceedings of the Les Houches Summer School Session XL, 1983, edited by B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora (North-Holland, New York, 1984).
12. J. C. Collins, *Renormalization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984), p. 17.
13. An exception is Ref. 7 where the Maxwell theory is discussed briefly. There may be others but we are not aware of them.
14. R. A. Brandt, "Gauge Invariance and Renormalization", Nucl. Phys. **B116**, 413–448 (1976).
15. C. Becchi, A. Rouet, and R. Stora, "Renormalization of Gauge Theories", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **98**, 287–321 (1976); I. V. Tyutin, Lebedev preprint FIAN, No. 39 (1975), unpublished.
16. P. H. Frampton, *Gauge Field Theories* (The Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1987), pp. 214–220.

17. Often $j_\mu(x)$ is defined as the negative of the expression (2.8).
18. This will not be the case for the long-ranged excitations that accompany the breaking of a symmetry.
19. The antisymmetric tensors are called *super-potentials* by Jackiw (Refs. 10,11).
20. See Ref. 8, pp. 229-235.
21. See Ref. 8, p. 25.
22. The corresponding expression obtained in Ref. 16 is incorrect.
23. The fact that one obtains the same equations of motion from \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_i is a special case of the nonuniqueness theorem proven in the Appendix.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.