

# Which Symmetry? Noether, Weyl, and Conservation of Electric Charge

*Katherine Brading  
St. Hugh's College  
Oxford, OX2 6LE*

katherine.brading@st-hughs.ox.ac.uk

## 1 Introduction

The idea of connecting conservation of electric charge with gauge symmetry goes back to 1918 and to Hermann Weyl's attempt to produce a unified theory of electromagnetism and gravitation by generalising the geometry on which General Relativity is based (Weyl, 1918a; see also Weyl, 1918b). It is well known that this attempted unification failed, and that Weyl re-applied the gauge idea in the context of quantum theory in 1929,<sup>1</sup> there giving us his 'gauge principle' which has been so powerful in the latter half of this century.<sup>2</sup> According to the standard account, Weyl's claim to have connected conservation of electric charge with gauge symmetry comes to fruition in relativistic field theory.

The question addressed in this paper springs from the following observation. In his 1918 theory Weyl introduced local gauge transformations (transformations that depend on arbitrary functions of space and time), and it is *local* gauge symmetry that he connects with conservation of electric charge. According to the standard modern account, however, *global* gauge symmetry is invoked to deliver conservation of electric charge (see, for example, Leader and Predazzi, 1996; Ryder, 1985; Sakurai, 1964; Schweber, 1961; Sterman, 1993; Weinberg, 1995). Which is the correct symmetry to connect with charge conservation? This question might seem straightforward on the surface, but it turns out that a rather interesting story lies behind any satisfactory answer. The story involves a triangle of relationships, none of which has been adequately addressed in the literature to date. This triangle involves Weyl's work, relativistic field theory, and Noether's theorems.

---

<sup>1</sup>The term 'gauge' originates from the translation of Weyl's work into English, and a better translation of the original idea might perhaps have been 'scale'. The use of the term 'gauge' in quantum theory has nothing to do with scale, of course, and is just an accident of history.

<sup>2</sup>Weyl, 1929. For a discussion of this paper, and of the work which preceded it by Schroedinger, London and Fock, see O'Raifeartaigh, 1997.

## 1.1 Background to the problem, and the plan of attack

In the same year that Weyl published his original paper connecting conservation of electric charge with gauge symmetry, Emmy Noether published a paper (Noether, 1918) that is now famous for ‘Noether’s theorem’. This theorem makes a general connection between conserved quantities and continuous symmetry transformations that depend on constant parameters (for example, a spatial translation in the  $x$ -direction,  $x \rightarrow x' = x + a$ , where  $a$  is a constant); such a transformation is a global transformation. This theorem is in fact the first of two theorems proved in the 1918 paper. The second theorem is less well known, and applies to symmetry transformations that depend on arbitrary functions and their derivatives (for example, the transformation may depend on an arbitrary function of  $x$ , the spatial location); such a transformation is a local transformation.

The first theorem works straightforwardly for the continuous symmetries of space and time in classical mechanics, giving conservation of linear and angular momentum, energy, and so forth. However, when we come to gauge symmetry and conservation of electric charge, things are not so straightforward, since both theorems come into play. The first theorem applies to global gauge symmetry and the second theorem applies to local gauge symmetry. In modern relativistic field theory, the standard account connects conservation of electric charge with gauge symmetry via Noether’s first theorem. Any connection using Noether’s first theorem must come by applying it to the rigid subgroup of the local gauge group (i.e. to the global gauge symmetry). This leaves us with the following questions: what is the role of the second theorem in locally gauge invariant theories, and what is the relationship between the second theorem and the first theorem (as applied to the rigid subgroup)? Although Noether’s first theorem has received thorough treatment in the literature (see especially Hill, 1951, and Doughty, 1990), very little attention has been given to her second theorem (and to cases where both theorems apply). Clarifying the roles of the first and second Noether theorems in relation to modern relativistic field theory gives us one arm of the triangular relationship.

Although the modern-day connection goes via global gauge symmetry, in 1918 Weyl claimed to have connected conservation of electric charge to local gauge symmetry. Despite perennial interest in Weyl’s 1918 work, and the recent revival in interest in the early history of gauge theory (see especially O’Raifeartaigh, 1997), the relationship, if any, between Weyl’s 1918 work and Noether’s second theorem has never been made clear. This is the second arm of the three-way relationship, and we will clarify it here. The final arm that will be addressed is between Weyl’s 1918 work and modern relativistic field theory, where Weyl’s 1918 work is usually said to come to fruition. Again, despite the interest in Weyl’s 1918 work, the relationship between (a) Weyl’s 1918 connection between local gauge invariance and conservation of electric charge, and

(b) the modern connection between global gauge invariance and conservation of electric charge, has never been clarified. That it stands in need of clarification is emphasised by the fact that the latter proceeds via Noether's first theorem, and the former does not.

So, the question before us is: which symmetry is the correct symmetry to associate with conservation of electric charge - global gauge symmetry or local gauge symmetry? In order to address this question we begin by stating Noether's two theorems precisely (section 2). We will then see how a careful understanding of Noether's two theorems bears on the case of electromagnetism and conservation of electric charge. In section 3 we discuss the modern textbook derivation, and in section 4 we examine the relationship between Weyl's work and Noether's theorems. Section 5 discusses the relationship between Weyl's work and relativistic field theory, and section 6 tackles the application of Noether's second theorem in relativistic field theory. Section 7 takes a brief look at a distinction made by Noether between 'proper' and 'improper' conservation laws, and section 8 draws all these strands together to address the question 'Which Symmetry?'

## 2 Noether's Two Theorems

As already mentioned, Noether's second theorem has received very little attention. It is not discussed in the standard history of field theory and gauge theory literature: there is no discussion in O'Raifeartaigh 1997, Vizgin 1985, Moriyasu 1982, or Hill 1951, for example; and, although the second theorem is cited in Kastrup's excellent 1987 paper, it is not discussed in any detail. There is, however, a recent paper by Byers (1999) that discusses the relationship between the second theorem and General Relativity. In the Noether literature itself, the second theorem again receives almost no attention. For example, in *Emmy Noether: A Tribute to Her Life and Work* (Brewer and Smith (eds.), 1981), McShane's chapter on the calculus of variations discusses the first theorem in detail but merely states the second theorem without proof or discussion. In the introduction to Noether's *Collected Papers* (Jacobson (ed.), 1983), the commentary on the 1918 paper consists of an extensive quote from Feza Gursey, with no mention of the second theorem. If we turn to the physics literature, Noether's first theorem is widely cited, but the second theorem is not in any of the standard relativistic field theory textbooks which appeal to Noether's first theorem (usually referred to as 'Noether's theorem') and which discuss local symmetries, nor is it mentioned in Doughty's excellent book *Lagrangian Interaction* (1990) where he gives a thorough presentation of Noether's first theorem. Nevertheless, there is an excellent paper by Trautman (1962) that discusses the second theorem in the context of General Relativity. Reviving interest in Noether's second theorem is of more than historical interest: failure to appreciate the domains of

applicability of these two distinct theorems has given rise to ongoing mistakes and confusion in the physics literature (see section 3 and Appendix A, below, for two examples), and current discussions on conservation of energy in General Relativity would benefit from a thorough general understanding of the two theorems. Furthermore, Noether’s original paper is difficult to get hold of in English translation. For these reasons, and because the substance of this paper requires an accurate reading of Noether’s 1918 paper, I begin by presenting the content of Noether’s two theorems as given by Noether herself.

Noether’s theorems apply to Lagrangians and Lagrangian densities depending on an arbitrary number of fields with arbitrary numbers of derivatives, but we will simplify our discussion to consider Lagrangian densities,  $L$ , depending on  $\psi_i$ ,  $\partial_\mu\psi_i$ , and  $x^\mu$ , and no higher derivatives of  $\psi_i$ , since this is all that we will need for the purposes of this paper.<sup>3</sup> The  $i$  indexes each field  $\psi_i$  on which the Lagrangian depends. Noether derives her theorems by considering the following variational problem, applied to the action  $S$ ,  $S = \int L d^4x$ . We begin by forming the first variation  $\delta S$ , in which we vary both the independent and the dependent variables ( $x^\mu$ , and  $\psi_i$ ,  $\partial_\mu\psi_i$  respectively, in our case), we include the boundary in the variation, and we discard the second and higher order contributions to the variation. We then require that the variation is an infinitesimal symmetry transformation, and hence set  $\delta S = 0$ .<sup>4</sup>

Before we proceed, I will introduce one piece of terminology and shorthand notation. Noether derives and presents both her theorems in terms of what she calls the ‘Lagrange expression’:

$$E_i := \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi_i} - \partial_\mu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi_i)} \right) \quad (1)$$

which, when set to zero, gives the Euler-Lagrange equations. We will use this terminology in what follows.

In deriving the consequences of the above variational problem, the first step - common to both theorems - is to show that if the action  $S$  is invariant under

---

<sup>3</sup>Noether’s own statement of the two theorems is as follows:

“I. If the integral I is invariant with respect to a  $G_\rho$ , then  $\rho$  linearly independent combinations of the Lagrange expressions become divergences - and from this, conversely, invariance of I with respect to a  $G$  will follow. The theorem holds good even in the limiting case of infinitely many parameters.

II. If the integral I is invariant with respect to a  $G_{\infty\rho}$  in which the arbitrary functions occur up to the  $\sigma$ -th derivative, then there subsist  $\rho$  identity relationships between the Lagrangian expressions and their derivatives up to the  $\sigma$ -th order. In this case also, the converse holds.”

In Noether’s terminology,  $G_\rho$  is a continuous group depending on constant parameters, and  $G_{\infty\rho}$  is a continuous group depending on arbitrary functions and their derivatives.

<sup>4</sup>In this context, a symmetry transformation is a transformation that preserves the explicit form of the Euler-Lagrange equations. The connection between this symmetry requirement and  $\delta S = 0$  (which is a sufficient condition for preserving the Euler-Lagrange equations) is explained in detail in Doughty (1990, sections 9.2 and 9.5), and follows from the requirement that the functional form of the Lagrangian be invariant (as stipulated by Noether, 1918, equation 1).

some group of transformations, then

$$\sum_i E_i \delta_0 \psi_i \equiv \sum_i \partial_\mu B_i^\mu \quad (2)$$

where

1.  $\delta x^\mu$  and  $\delta \psi_i = \delta_0 \psi_i + (\partial_\mu \psi_i) \delta x^\mu$  are the infinitesimal variations in  $x^\mu$  and  $\psi_i$  respectively, brought about by the symmetry transformation
2.  $\delta_0 \psi_i$  is the change in  $\psi_i$  at a fixed co-ordinate:  $\delta_0 \psi_i = \psi_i(x') - \psi_i(x)$ .
3.  $B_i^\mu$  has the form  $\left( L - \frac{\partial L}{\partial(\partial_\nu \psi_i)} \partial_\nu \psi_i \right) \delta x^\mu + \frac{\partial L}{\partial(\partial_\mu \psi_i)} \delta \psi_i$ .<sup>5</sup>

Note also that here, and throughout this paper, we use the following conventions:

1. the Einstein convention to sum over Greek indices; all other summations are expressed explicitly
2. the symbol ‘ $\equiv$ ’ to indicate those equations that hold independently of whether the Euler-Lagrange equations of motion are satisfied.

### Theorem 1

If the action  $S$  is invariant under a continuous group of transformations depending smoothly on  $\rho$  independent constant parameters  $\omega_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, \rho$ ),<sup>6</sup> then (2) implies the  $\rho$  relationships

$$\sum_i E_i \frac{\partial(\delta_0 \psi_i)}{\partial(\delta \omega^k)} \equiv \partial_\mu j_k^\mu \quad (3)$$

where  $j_k^\mu$  is the Noether current associated with the parameter  $\omega^k$ :

$$j_k^\mu = \sum_i \left( L - \frac{\partial L}{\partial(\partial_\nu \psi_i)} \partial_\nu \psi_i \right) \frac{\partial(\delta x^\mu)}{\partial(\delta \omega^k)} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial(\partial_\mu \psi_i)} \frac{\partial(\delta \psi_i)}{\partial(\delta \omega^k)}. \quad (4)$$

and where the ‘ $\delta$ ’ in  $\delta \omega_k$  *does not* indicate a variation, but is used to emphasise that we take infinitesimal  $\omega_k$  (the use of this potentially confusing notation being for consistency with Doughty (1990) and Weyl (1918a and 1918b)).

<sup>5</sup>If the equations of motion are satisfied, the left-hand side of (2) goes to zero, and we have  $\sum_i \partial_\mu B_i^\mu = 0$ . This is the expression used for conserved currents by Jackiw *et al.*, 1994. Discussion of the legitimacy of using this expression rather than proceeding to Noether’s theorems is deferred to Brading and Brown, 2000, since it is more properly addressed in the context of Noether’s theorems in general, rather than in the specific case of gauge symmetry and electric charge conservation.

<sup>6</sup>This is a global symmetry group.

From (3), if the equations of motion are satisfied then there are  $\rho$  continuity equations

$$\partial_\mu j_k^\mu = 0, \quad (5)$$

one for every constant parameter  $\omega_k$  on which the symmetry group depends.<sup>7</sup>

As noted in the introduction, this first theorem is the one that is at work in the familiar derivations of conservation of linear momentum from spatial translation invariance and so forth. So, in fact what Noether discusses is not conserved quantities  $Q_a$  as such, but currents  $j_k^\mu$  satisfying continuity equations. Textbooks often move straight from the conclusion that  $j_k^\mu$  satisfies a continuity equation to an associated claim about  $Q_a$  being conserved, i.e. from the claim that  $\partial_\mu j_k^\mu = 0$  to  $\frac{d}{dt} Q_k = 0$  where  $Q_k := \int d^3x j_k^0(x)$ . This is valid only for appropriate boundary conditions, however.<sup>8</sup>

### Theorem 2

If the action  $S$  is invariant under a continuous group of transformations depending smoothly on  $\rho$  independent arbitrary functions  $p_k(x)$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $\rho$ ) and their first derivatives,<sup>9</sup> then (2) implies the  $\rho$  relationships

$$\sum_i E_i a_{ki} \equiv \sum_i \partial_\mu (E_i b_{ki}^\mu) \quad (6)$$

where  $a_{ki}$  and  $b_{ki}^\mu$  are functions of  $\psi_i$ ,  $\partial_\mu \psi_i$ , and  $x^\mu$ , as defined in what follows. Let  $\delta p_k$  and  $\partial_\mu(\delta p_k)$  together constitute infinitesimal symmetry transformations (the  $\delta$  here once again being used to emphasise that we take infinitesimal  $p_k$ , and not to indicate a variation). Then, since  $\delta_0 \psi_i$  is linear in  $\delta p_k$ , we can write

$$\delta_0 \psi_i = \sum_k \{a_{ki} \delta p_k + b_{ki}^\mu \partial_\mu (\delta p_k)\}. \quad (7)$$

Thus, Noether's second theorem gives dependencies between the Lagrange expressions (following Noether's terminology) (1), and their derivatives. What

<sup>7</sup>To see that  $j^\mu$  rather than  $B^\mu$  is the correct Noether current, see Brading and Brown, 2000.

<sup>8</sup>The integration process from the conserved current to the conserved charge goes via Gauss's theorem as follows. We have:  $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$ . Integrating  $\partial_\mu j^\mu$  over a space-like surface,  $\int d^3x \partial_\mu j^\mu = \int d^3x \partial_0 j^0 + \int d^3x \partial_i j^i = \frac{d}{dt} \int d^3x j^0 + \oint dS \hat{n}_i j^i$ , where we have used Gauss's theorem to convert a volume integral  $\int d^3x \partial_i j^i$  into a surface integral  $\oint dS \hat{n}_i j^i$ . Now, if the fields fall off with distance  $r$  such that, as  $r$  increases, the net outflow from the region enclosed by  $S$  falls off more quickly than the volume enclosed by  $S$  increases, then for sufficiently large  $r$  there will be no net outflow across the surface  $S$ , and  $\oint dS \hat{n}_i j^i = 0$ . This is our boundary condition, and, given the continuity equation, it can be met only if the region enclosed by  $S$  contains no sources. Then we have:  $0 = \partial_\mu j^\mu = \frac{d}{dt} \int d^3x \hat{n}_0 j^0 = \frac{d}{dt} Q$ . For further discussion of the role of boundary conditions in Noether's theorems, see Brading and Brown, 2000.

<sup>9</sup>This is a local symmetry group. The restriction to the first derivative is again imposed for convenience, since this is all that we will need in what follows. Noether's states and proves her results with no such restriction.

this means will become clear when we discuss specific applications of the theorem, below.

These are the two theorems as presented by Noether (with our restriction to  $L = L(\psi_i, \partial_\mu \psi_i, x^\mu)$ ). It is the first theorem, and not the second theorem, that is explicitly concerned with conserved quantities.

### Relationship between Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

Suppose that the action  $S$  is invariant under a continuous group of transformations depending on  $\rho$  arbitrary functions  $p_k$ , a local symmetry group, and that this group admits of a non-trivial rigid subgroup (where by rigid subgroup we mean a subgroup of transformations  $p_k = \text{constant}$ ). Then the second theorem applies to the local invariance group of  $S$ , and the first theorem applies to the rigid subgroup. The first theorem gives us divergence relations (3) and the second theorem gives us dependencies between the Lagrange expressions and their derivatives (6). Noether discusses this case in section 6 of her paper, and shows that the divergence relations must be consequences of the dependencies, and in particular linear combinations of the dependencies. She writes (Noether 1918; p.202 of the English translation, Tavel, 1971):

I shall refer to divergence relationships in which the  $j_k^\mu$  can be composed from the Lagrange expressions and their derivatives in the specified manner as ‘improper’, and to all others as ‘proper’.

Noether then discusses the specific case of energy conservation in General Relativity (see Brading and Brown, 2000); for our purposes, the general lesson is that conservation laws arrived at by applying the first theorem to the rigid subgroup of local group are ‘improper’ conservation laws, and we will discuss what this means in section 7, below, when we consider the specific case of electric charge conservation.<sup>10</sup>

## 3 Relativistic Field Theory and Noether’s First Theorem

The standard textbook presentation of the connection between conservation of electric charge and gauge symmetry in relativistic field theory involves Noether’s first theorem. It can be found, to various levels of detail, in most quantum field theory textbooks, such as those referred to in the introduction. All of these books discuss both global and local gauge symmetry, but none mentions

---

<sup>10</sup>See also Brading and Brown, 2000.

Noether's second theorem. For the purposes of simplicity, I begin by focussing on a single presentation by way of example, that of Ryder (1985). I choose Ryder because his is one of the more detailed presentations, and because his book is a popular textbook.

Ryder begins by applying Noether's first theorem to the Lagrangian associated with the Klein-Gordon equation for a relativistic complex scalar field,  $L_m$ :

$$L_m = \partial_\mu \psi \partial^\mu \psi^* - m^2 \psi \psi^* \quad (8)$$

This Lagrangian is invariant under global phase transformations of the wavefunction, and from this Ryder derives the corresponding Noether current:

$$j_{L_m}^\mu = i(\psi^* \partial^\mu \psi - \psi \partial^\mu \psi^*) \quad (9)$$

Integrating this to yield a conserved quantity, Ryder writes (1985, p.91):

"This (real) quantity *we should like* to identify with charge."

What else is needed before we can make this identification? Ryder's next step is to observe that  $L_m$  is not invariant under local phase transformations of the wavefunction. That is to say, although  $\psi \rightarrow \psi' = \psi e^{-i\theta}$  leaves  $L_m$  invariant if  $\theta$  is a constant (i.e. the transformation is global), if  $\theta = \theta(x, t)$  (i.e. the transformation is local) then the transformation from  $\psi$  to  $\psi'$  no longer leaves  $L_m$  invariant. In order to create a Lagrangian that remains invariant under a local transformation, we introduce a 'four-vector'  $A_\mu$  which we transform according to the rule  $A_\mu \rightarrow A'_\mu = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta$  whenever we transform  $\psi$  according to  $\psi \rightarrow \psi' = \psi e^{-iqi\theta}$ , where  $q$ , the charge on the electron, is introduced as a coupling constant.<sup>11</sup> Together, the transformations

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \psi &\rightarrow \psi' = \psi e^{-iq\theta} \\ \psi^* &\rightarrow \psi'^* = \psi^* e^{iq\theta} \\ A_\mu &\rightarrow A'_\mu = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (10)$$

form a gauge transformation. This enables us to construct a locally gauge invariant Lagrangian. Finally, we add an extra term in  $A_\mu$  but not in  $\psi$ , which is itself locally gauge invariant, giving us our total, locally gauge invariant Lagrangian

$$L_{total} = D_\mu \psi D^\mu \psi^* - m^2 \psi \psi^* - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \quad (11)$$

where  $D_\mu = (\partial_\mu + iqA_\mu)$  is the covariant derivative, and  $F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu$ . From here, there are two main ways in which to proceed. Ryder obtains the

<sup>11</sup>For reasons of overall consistency I differ from Ryder in placing  $q$  in the transformation of  $\psi$  rather than of  $A_\mu$ . This choice corresponds with widespread usage.

Euler-Lagrange equations for  $A_\mu$ , which are identified as the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = j^\mu \quad (12)$$

where  $j^\mu$  has the form<sup>12</sup>

$$j^\mu = iq(\psi^* D^\mu \psi - \psi D^\mu \psi^*) \quad (13)$$

Then, in virtue of the anti-symmetry of  $F^{\mu\nu}$ ,  $\partial_\mu \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu}$  vanishes and Ryder concludes that this modified current  $j^\mu$  is the conserved current associated with the Lagrangian (11). The other way of proceeding is via Noether's first theorem once again. Notice that  $L_{total}$  is invariant under global gauge transformations as well as local gauge transformations. This global symmetry is a special case of the local symmetry in which  $\theta = \theta(x, t)$  is set to  $\theta = \text{constant}$ ; as a result, the gauge transformation leaves  $A_\mu$  invariant and only the wavefunction  $\psi$  changes. If we apply Noether's first theorem to the global (that is to say, rigid) subgroup of the full gauge group of  $L_{total}$ , we get the modified conserved current (13).<sup>13,14</sup>

Before moving on, one final remark. Recall that in her paper Noether distinguishes between 'proper' conservation laws and 'improper' conservation laws. In Noether's terminology, therefore, conservation of electric charge in relativistic field theory, derived via the first theorem, is an 'improper' conservation law. We discuss the significance of this in section 7, below.

## 4 Weyl and Noether's theorems

The fact that the Lagrangian  $L_{total}$  of relativistic field theory is invariant under the full local gauge group means that Noether's second theorem comes into play. Before turning to the application of the second theorem to  $L_{total}$ , I first want to look at what Weyl was doing, because this sheds light on the application of Noether's second theorem in relativistic field theory. Weyl was clearly claiming

<sup>12</sup>This current differs from Ryder's by a factor of  $q$ , due to the placement of  $q$  in the gauge transformation of  $\psi$  rather than of  $A_\mu$ . The  $j^\mu$  quoted here is consistent with Maxwell's equations and with widespread usage.

<sup>13</sup>In 1990/91 there was an exchange in the American Journal of Physics (Karatas *et al.*, 1990; Al-Kuwari *et al.*, 1991) concerning whether local gauge symmetry adds any new Noether charges to those arising from global gauge symmetry. This exchange deserves a more detailed discussion, but the most important feature of the correct answer is already evident. Noether's first theorem applies only to global symmetries, and the conserved quantities arising in locally gauge invariant theories result from the application of the first theorem to the rigid subgroup of the gauge group (i.e., to the global symmetry). Therefore, in the standard approach, the same symmetry is in play in both cases, and the same Noether charge results.

<sup>14</sup>The case of Maxwell electromagnetism (i.e. electromagnetism without a gauge-dependent matter field) and conservation of electric charge is discussed in Appendix A, where it is pointed out that since there is no non-trivial rigid subgroup in this case, the first theorem cannot be used to derive conservation of electric charge in this way.

to connect conservation of electric charge to *local* gauge invariance, and the question at issue here is what the relationship is between Weyl's work and Noether's work. This will lead us into section 5, where we discuss the relationship between Weyl's work and the standard textbook account discussed in section 3, and into section 6, where we turn to the relationship between relativistic field theory and Noether's second theorem.

## 4.1 Weyl's 1918 theory

In his 1918 paper 'Gravitation and Electricity'<sup>15</sup> Weyl set out to provide a unified field theory by generalising the geometry on which General Relativity is based. Weyl sought to impose a 'rigorous locality' by introducing a geometry in which not only the orientation of vectors may be non-integrable (as in General Relativity) but also their lengths. Having developed his geometry, Weyl then goes on to discuss its proposed application to physics.<sup>16</sup> He writes (O'Raiifeartaigh, 1997, p.32):

We shall show that: just as according to the researches of Hilbert, Lorentz, Einstein, Klein and the author the four conservation laws of matter (of the energy-momentum tensor) are connected with the invariance of the Action with respect to coordinate transformations, expressed through four independent functions, the electromagnetic conservation law is connected with the new scale-invariance, expressed through a fifth arbitrary function. The manner in which the latter resembles the energy-momentum principle seems to me to be the strongest general argument in favour of the present theory - insofar as it is permissible to talk of justification in the context of pure speculation.

Bearing in mind what we have said so far about Noether's two theorems, can Weyl be right that he has connected conservation of electric charge with local gauge symmetry? In his excellent book on the history of unified field theories Vizgin (1985; English translation, Vizgin 1994, p96) insists:

In view of the fact that in accordance with Noether's first theorem conservation laws must be associated with finite-parameter continuous transformations, however, it must be recognized that,

---

<sup>15</sup>The English translation referred to here of Weyl, 1918a, is in O'Raiifeartaigh, 1997.

<sup>16</sup>Weyl's 1918 theory is of interest for many reasons, including the issue at stake here (the connection between gauge symmetry and conservation of electric charge). It is well-known that Einstein was quick to point out difficulties with the theory, however (see Vizgin, 1994, p98-104; see also Brown and Pooley, 1999, section 5, for a strengthening of Einstein's critique).

strictly speaking, neither the energy-momentum conservation law follows from the invariance of the action with respect to arbitrary smooth transformations nor the charge conservation law from gauge invariance. The true symmetry of the charge conservation law was found to be gauge symmetry of the first kind.<sup>17</sup>

So what does Weyl actually do? He begins with the action associated with his unified theory of gravitation and electromagnetism, and an arbitrary variation of the dependent variables of the associated Lagrangian, vanishing on the boundary. The form of the action is not given; what Weyl requires is that, discarding boundary terms,

$$\delta S = \int (W^{\mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} + w^\mu \delta A_\mu) dx \quad (14)$$

where  $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$  is an arbitrary variation in the metric and  $\delta A_\mu$  is an arbitrary variation in the electromagnetic vector potential.

If we were to set  $\delta S = 0$  under this arbitrary variation, then we would have an application of Hamilton's principle;  $W^{\mu\nu} = 0$  and  $w^\mu = 0$  would be the resulting field equations. Weyl interprets  $W^{\mu\nu} = 0$  as the gravitational field equations and  $w^\mu = 0$  as the electromagnetic field equations, but again their form is yet to be specified.<sup>18</sup> In (14)  $W^{\mu\nu}$  and  $w^\mu$  are therefore the Lagrange expressions (using Noether's terminology, see (1) above) associated with the gravitational and electromagnetic equations respectively.

Weyl's purpose here is not, however, to obtain equations of motion via Hamilton's principle, but rather to investigate the consequences of imposing local gauge invariance on the action  $S$ . His next step, therefore, is to demand that the arbitrary variations be infinitesimal gauge transformations depending on the arbitrary function  $\rho(x^\mu)$ , and that the action be invariant under such a gauge transformation ( $\delta S = 0$ ). In Weyl's 1918 theory, a gauge transformation consists of an infinitesimal scale transformation

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho \quad (15)$$

---

<sup>17</sup>Gauge symmetry of the first kind is global gauge symmetry.

<sup>18</sup>In fact, Weyl chooses his Lagrangian to be  $L = R_{jkl}^i R_i^{jkl}$  as 'the most natural Ansatz we can make' for  $L$ . Earlier in the paper he constructed the geometrical curvature components  $R_{jkl}^i$  from considerations of parallel transport and length-preserving transport of a vector. This splits into two parts,  $R_{jkl}^i = P_{jkl}^i - \frac{1}{2} \delta_j^i F_{kl}$ , where  $F_{kl} = 0$  characterises the absence of an electromagnetic field (transfer of the magnitude of a vector is integrable) and  $P_{jkl}^i = 0$  characterises the absence of a gravitational field (transfer of the direction of a vector is integrable). As a consequence of choosing this Ansatz, and demanding that  $\delta S = 0$  under an infinitesimal gauge transformation, Weyl recovers Maxwell's equations, but not Einstein's. Weyl's gravitational equations are 4th-order (see Weyl, 1918, in O'Raifeartaigh, 1997, p.33-34).

combined with an infinitesimal transformation of the electromagnetic potential

$$\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu (\delta \rho). \quad (16)$$

Then, with  $\delta S = 0$  and substituting the gauge transformation (15) and (16) in (14), we have

$$\delta S = \int \{W^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho + w^\mu \partial_\mu (\delta \rho)\} dx = 0 \quad (17)$$

from which

$$\int \{W^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho + \partial_\mu (w^\mu \delta \rho) - (\partial_\mu w^\mu) \delta \rho\} dx \equiv 0 \quad (18)$$

where once again I use the symbol ‘ $\equiv$ ’ to indicate that we have not assumed any Euler-Lagrange equations of motion in forming this equality. Discarding the boundary term,

$$W^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho \equiv (\partial_\mu w^\mu) \delta \rho \quad (19)$$

hence

$$W_\mu^\mu \equiv \partial_\mu w^\mu. \quad (20)$$

This expresses a dependence between the Lagrange expressions associated with the gravitational field equations and the electromagnetic field equations.

In order to derive conservation of electric charge, Weyl now demands that the gravitational field equations are satisfied,  $W^{\mu\nu} = 0$ , so (20) becomes

$$\partial_\mu w^\mu = 0. \quad (21)$$

He then inserts the Lagrange expression associated with the inhomogeneous Maxwell equations

$$w^\mu = \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu \quad (22)$$

giving

$$\partial_\mu (\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu) = 0. \quad (23)$$

Then, since the antisymmetry of  $F^{\mu\nu}$  guarantees that  $\partial_\mu \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \equiv 0$ , we get

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0 \quad (24)$$

as desired. Notice that this derivation does not involve demanding that the Maxwell equations are satisfied. Instead, it relies on the gravitational field equations being satisfied, and on the fact that the gravitational equations and the Maxwell equations are not independent of one another (this lack of independence being a consequence of imposing local gauge invariance). In other words, there is some redundancy in the total set of field equations: the conservation law for electric charge can be obtained either from the Maxwell equations directly, or via the Maxwell Lagrange expression (22) and the gravitational field equations.

Having followed a similar derivation for the four energy-momentum conservation laws,<sup>19</sup> Weyl (1918a; p.33 of the translation in O’Raifeartaigh, 1997) writes:

The five conservation laws can be eliminated from the field equations since they are obtained in two ways and thereby show that five of the field equations are superfluous.

This is Weyl’s route to the conservation laws. Clearly, the means by which he connects conservation of electric charge with gauge symmetry is distinct from the routes in the modern literature, discussed in section 3, above. We will compare these methods in section 5, but in order to make the comparison precise we first need to look at the relationship between Weyl’s work and Noether’s theorems.

## 4.2 Weyl’s 1918 theory and Noether’s second theorem

Weyl’s derivation is essentially an application of Noether’s second theorem. In Noether’s second theorem we throw away the boundary terms, as Weyl does, and we get (6)

$$\sum_i E_i a_{ki} \equiv \sum_i \partial_\mu (E_i b_{ki}^\mu)$$

where  $a_{ki}$  and  $b_{ki}^\mu$  are given by (7)

$$\delta_0 \psi_i = \sum_k \{a_{ki} \delta p_k + b_{ki}^\mu \partial_\mu (\delta p_k)\}$$

For Weyl’s theory, our symmetry transformation depends on the arbitrary function  $\rho(x)$ , and in infinitesimal form we have (15) and (16). Consider first  $E_1 = W^{\mu\nu}$ . The Lagrange expression  $W^{\mu\nu}$  depends on the metric and so is affected by the infinitesimal transformation of the metric  $\delta g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho$ . So,  $\delta_0 \psi_1 = g_{\mu\nu} \delta \rho$  and we have a contribution to only the left-hand side of Noether’s second theorem:

$$E_1 a_1 = W^{\mu\nu} g_{\mu\nu} = W_\mu^\mu. \tag{25}$$

(where we drop the  $k$ -index since the transformation depends on only one arbitrary function  $\rho(x)$ ). Now consider  $E_2 = w^\mu$ . The Lagrange expression  $w^\mu$  depends on the vector potential  $A_\mu$  and so is affected by the infinitesimal transformation of the vector potential  $\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu (\delta \rho)$ . So,  $\delta_0 \psi_2 = \partial_\mu (\delta \rho)$ , and we have a contribution to only the right-hand side of Noether’s second theorem:

$$\partial_\mu (E_1 b_1^\mu) = \partial_\mu w^\mu. \tag{26}$$

---

<sup>19</sup>This parallel derivation is discussed in Brading and Brown, 2000.

Therefore, equating (25) and (26), Noether's second theorem gives us

$$W_{\mu}^{\mu} \equiv \partial_{\mu} w^{\mu},$$

exactly as Weyl showed (20).

Therefore, Weyl's 1918 connection between local gauge invariance and conservation of electric charge begins from an instance of Noether's second theorem. He then simply assumes that  $W_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$ , along with the form of the Maxwell Lagrange expression, and this allows him to complete his derivation (see section 4.1, above). This clarifies the relationship between Weyl's 1918 work and Noether's 1918 work.

### 4.3 Weyl's 1928/9 work and Noether's second theorem

In his 1929 paper 'Electron and Gravitation' Weyl follows exactly the same general strategy as in his 1918 work, applying it to his new unified theory of matter and electromagnetism (as opposed to the 1918 unified theory of gravity and electromagnetism). He requires that the variation in the action under a local gauge transformation be zero; discarding boundary terms this gives us a relation between the Lagrange expressions for the matter fields and the Lagrange expressions for the electromagnetic fields. If we then assume that the electromagnetic equations of motion are satisfied, we are left with a continuity equation from which conservation of charge can be derived.<sup>20</sup> Weyl's approach to charge conservation in his 1928 book is slightly different, but once again there is nothing that relies on global gauge invariance or that resembles an application of Noether's first theorem. He first discusses conservation of electric charge as a consequence of the field equations of matter (p.214), and only at the end of the section mentions his standard approach. Here, he states (Weyl, 1928, p.217),

The theorem of the conservation of electricity follows, as we have seen, from the equations of matter, but it is at the same time a consequence of the electromagnetic equations. The fact that [conservation of electricity] is a consequence of both sets of field laws means that these sets are not independent, i.e. that there exists an identity between them. The true ground for this identity is to be found in the gauge invariance...

He then sketches his standard derivation, the derivation that is essentially an application of Noether's second theorem.

---

<sup>20</sup>For details, see p.140-141 of the translation of Weyl (1929) in O'Raifeartaigh (1997).

In order to see how a conservation law results from the dependencies of Noether's second theorem, it is useful to look at the details of an example. We will do this below in section 6, where we apply Noether's second theorem in the context of modern relativistic field theory.

## 5 Weyl and Relativistic Field Theory

We are now in a position to clarify the relationship between Weyl's work and the standard modern connection between gauge invariance and conservation of electric charge, summarising what has been shown in the preceding sections. Weyl's 1918 connection between gauge invariance and conservation of charge is usually thought to come to fruition in relativistic field theory, and in particular through Weyl's own re-application of his 1918 ideas in his 1928/9 work. It is true that the connection between conservation of electric charge and gauge symmetry was first suggested by Weyl, and that he re-applied it in a new context in 1928/9. It is also true that this connection now has an established place in modern physics. However, it is not true that the connection in modern physics is made in the same way as that made by Weyl. Relativistic field theory appeals to global gauge invariance and Noether's first theorem; Weyl never used Noether's first theorem; he used local gauge invariance and (what we have now shown to be an instance of) Noether's second theorem.

## 6 Relativistic field theory and Noether's second theorem

There remains one arm of our three-way relationship which is in need of clarification: the application of Noether's second theorem in relativistic field theory.

Recall the relativistic Lagrangian for a complex scalar field interacting with an electromagnetic field (11):

$$L_{total} = D_\mu \psi D^\mu \psi^* - m^2 \psi \psi^* - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$

where  $L_{total} = L_{total}(A_\nu, \partial_\mu A_\nu, \psi, \partial_\mu \psi, \psi^*, \partial_\mu \psi^*, x^\mu)$ .<sup>21</sup>

This Lagrangian has been constructed to be invariant under local gauge transformations (10), as we have discussed in section 3, above.

---

<sup>21</sup>Here,  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  are treated as independent fields.

If we apply Noether's second theorem (6), we find that  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  give a contribution to the left-hand side of (6), and the  $A_\mu$  give a contribution to the right-hand side, as we will now see. Consider first the gauge transformation of  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  (see (10)). Infinitesimally,  $\delta_0\psi = -iq(\delta\theta)\psi$  and  $\delta_0\psi^* = iq(\delta\theta)\psi^*$ . Therefore, the contribution of these fields to Noether's second theorem is entirely to the left-hand side of (6), and we have:

$$\left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi} - \partial_\nu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\nu \psi)} \right) \right] (-iq\psi) + \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi^*} - \partial_\nu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\nu \psi^*)} \right) \right] iq\psi^*. \quad (27)$$

The contribution of the  $A_\mu$ , on the other hand, is entirely to the right-hand side of (6), since  $\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu(\delta\theta)$ , and we have:

$$\partial_\mu \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial A_\mu} - \partial_\nu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\nu A_\mu)} \right) \right]. \quad (28)$$

Noether's second theorem therefore delivers:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi} - \partial_\mu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi)} \right) \right] (-iq\psi) + \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi^*} - \partial_\mu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi^*)} \right) \right] iq\psi^* \\ & \equiv \partial_\mu \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial A_\mu} - \partial_\nu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\nu A_\mu)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

In other words, it says that not all the Lagrange expressions are independent of one another, and gives us the interdependency.

There are various ways to proceed from here. Straightforward substitution of the Lagrangian  $L_{total}$  into (29) yields

$$\partial_\mu \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \equiv 0. \quad (30)$$

This can be found in the literature (see for example Kastrup, 1987, and Byers, 1999), where the standard claim is that Noether's second theorem leads to 'Bianchi Identities' such as (30); further discussion can be found in Brading and Brown, 2000, and Trautman, 1962. For our present purposes, however, there is something more interesting that we can do. We can return to (29), and follow Weyl's procedure of demanding that one set of Euler-Lagrange equations is satisfied. Suppose we assume that the equations of motion for  $A_\mu$  are satisfied. Then, from (29),

$$\left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi} - \partial_\mu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi)} \right) \right] (-iq\psi) + \left[ \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi^*} - \partial_\mu \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi^*)} \right) \right] iq\psi^* = 0, \quad (31)$$

and substituting in  $L_{total}$  we get

$$\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0 \quad (32)$$

where  $j^\mu$  is the conserved current derivable via Noether's first theorem (13). Thus, as in Weyl's original case, the inter-dependence between the two sets of

field equations reveals itself in a conservation law. In this case, given local gauge invariance of the Lagrangian, satisfaction of the electromagnetic field equations is related to a constraint on the sources, i.e., that electric charge is conserved.<sup>22</sup>

## 7 Proper and Improper Conservation Laws

In section VI of her paper, Noether refers to a distinction made by Hilbert, a distinction which she claims is clarified by her work. In theories prior to General Relativity, such as classical mechanics and electrodynamics, the conservation laws are consequences of the equations of motion of the associated particles or fields. Hilbert contrasted this with General Relativity, remarking that here the conservation of energy of the matter fields can be obtained without the matter field equations being satisfied. In Noether's terminology, conservation of energy in General Relativity is an improper conservation law. The distinction between proper and improper conservation laws, and the case of General Relativity, are discussed in detail in Brading and Brown, 2000, and also in Trautman, 1962. Here, we simply note that conservation of electric charge in locally gauge invariant relativistic field theory is an improper conservation law, because it follows from local gauge invariance and the satisfaction of the field equations for  $A_\mu$ , independently of whether the matter field equations (the field equations for  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$ ) are satisfied. This is in contrast to the theory associated with the free complex scalar field, described by the Lagrangian  $L_m$  (see section 3, above), which is globally gauge invariant but not locally gauge invariant; in this case, conservation of charge holds only when the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  are satisfied, and it is therefore a proper conservation law.

## 8 Which Symmetry?

We began with the observation that there is an apparent conflict between relativistic field theory textbook treatments of the connection between gauge symmetry and conservation of electric charge, and claims made by Weyl, the father

---

<sup>22</sup>We could also follow Weyl's general procedure by starting from (29) and assuming that the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  are satisfied. Then, the left-hand side of (29) goes to zero and we get

$$\partial_\mu (\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} + j^\mu) = 0.$$

But since we know that  $\partial_\mu j^\mu = 0$  when  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations, we have that

$$\partial_\mu \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

However, following Weyl's procedure in this case is misleading because the validity of the conclusion does not depend on the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $\psi$  and  $\psi^*$  being satisfied. Rather, it is a consequence of the anti-symmetry of the  $F^{\mu\nu}$  term, and follows from Noether's second theorem when no Euler-Lagrange equations are assumed to be satisfied, as we saw earlier in this section.

of gauge theory. In the process of addressing this problem, we have successfully clarified the three-way relationship between Weyl's work, Noether's theorems, and modern relativistic field theory. We have used Noether's two theorems to show that there are two routes to conservation of electric charge in locally gauge invariant relativistic field theory: one is the standard route using global gauge invariance and Noether's first theorem, the other uses local gauge invariance and Noether's second theorem. The latter route is essentially the method used by Weyl in both 1918 and 1928/9. Therefore, although Weyl was the first to make the connection between gauge symmetry and conservation of electric charge, his connection is different from that found in modern relativistic field theory textbooks. Although the standard textbook route to conservation of electric charge via Noether's first theorem is correct, it is subtly misleading in locally gauge invariant relativistic field theory, since it implies that conservation of electric charge is dependent upon satisfaction of the equations of motion for the matter fields. In fact, conservation of electric charge can be derived without the matter field equations being satisfied, using local gauge invariance and the electromagnetic field equations instead. In short, conservation of electric charge in locally gauge invariant relativistic field theory is a consequence of the lack of independence of the matter and gauge fields (itself a consequence of local gauge invariance) rather than simply a consequence of the equations of motion of the matter fields. This understanding of the conservation law is immediately apparent from Noether's second theorem and Weyl's derivation, but it is an insight that might be missed from the standard textbook point of view.

## Appendix A: Maxwell electromagnetism - an apparent mystery resolved

This discussion of Maxwell electromagnetism (by which we mean electromagnetism without a gauge-dependent matter field) is included partly for the sake of completeness, partly because it is an example of where failure to appreciate the domain of applicability of the first theorem has led to confusion,<sup>23</sup> and partly because applying the second theorem to this case gives rise to an apparent mystery (a mystery which is nevertheless quickly dispelled).

For the Lagrangian associated with the Maxwell equations, the gauge transformation consists of a transformation of the vector potential  $A_\mu$  only:

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A'_\mu = A_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta. \quad (33)$$

This means that, unlike in the case of relativistic field theory, there is no non-trivial rigid subgroup to which Noether's first theorem applies. Only Noether's second theorem is of interest with respect to Maxwell electromagnetism.

---

<sup>23</sup>For example, Lanczos (1970, chapter XI, section 20) seeks to apply 'Noether's principle' to Maxwell electromagnetism in order to derive conservation of electric charge. He is apparently attempting to extend the first theorem to the domain of the second theorem, where he claims that 'Noether's principle' is 'equally valid'. His method involves treating the gauge parameter as an additional field variable; whether or not the derivation is successful, it is certainly not using either of Noether's theorems.

Recall Noether's second theorem: if the action  $S$  is invariant under a continuous group of transformations depending smoothly on the arbitrary functions  $p_k(x)$  and their derivatives, then (6)

$$\sum_i E_i a_{ki} \equiv \sum_i \partial_\nu (E_i b_{ki}^\nu)$$

where  $\delta_0 \psi_i = a_{ki} \delta p_k + b_{ki}^\nu \partial_\nu (\delta p_k)$ . For a Maxwell gauge transformation, with  $\psi = A_\mu$ , we have  $p(x) = \theta(x)$ , and so in this case  $a_{A_\mu} = 0$  and  $b_{A_\mu}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu$ . The Lagrange expression associated with Maxwell's equations (with sources) is  $E_{A_\mu} = \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu$ . Thus, Noether's second theorem gives us

$$\partial_\nu \{ [\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu] \delta_\mu^\nu \} \equiv \partial_\mu [\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu] \equiv 0. \quad (34)$$

from which we conclude via the anti-symmetry of  $F^{\mu\nu}$  that

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu \equiv 0. \quad (35)$$

So it appears at first sight that conservation of electric charge follows from Noether's second theorem (subject to the usual constraints on boundary conditions) for the Maxwell Lagrange expression, with no requirement that the Maxwell equations be satisfied. On the face of it, the derivation looks rather mysterious: we appear to have derived conservation of electric charge without requiring that *any* equations of motion be satisfied; surely this cannot be right.

The only requirement we have put in is that the Lagrangian be invariant under gauge transformations. The Lagrangian associated with Maxwell electromagnetism (with sources) is:

$$L = \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} - J^\mu A_\mu \quad (36)$$

where  $J^\mu$  is the four-current, assumed to be a function of position.<sup>24</sup>

Applying a gauge transformation, we get

$$L' = \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} - J^\mu (A_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta) = L + J^\mu \partial_\mu \theta. \quad (37)$$

In fact, then, the Lagrangian is not invariant under gauge transformations. However, the extra term picked up makes no difference to the Euler-Lagrange equations for  $A_\mu$  because the extra term has no dependence on  $A_\mu$ . We can therefore regard the transformation as a symmetry transformation. However, this does not mean that we can apply Noether's second theorem. Noether's second theorem as stated by Noether requires that the Lagrangian be invariant. In fact, her derivation goes through so long as the Lagrangian is invariant up to

---

<sup>24</sup>Substitution of this into the Euler-Lagrange equations yields the Lagrange expression used above:  $w^\mu = \partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu$ .

a divergence term.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, we can apply Noether's second theorem only if we convert the extra term in the transformed Lagrangian to a divergence term. In other words, we must have that

$$L' = L + \partial_\mu(J^\mu\theta). \quad (38)$$

This will only be true if

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0. \quad (39)$$

Therefore, the requirement that Noether's second theorem be applicable implicitly embodies the restriction that  $J^\mu$  be a conserved current.

In short, although the derivation of the conserved current via Noether's second theorem does not involve claiming that the Maxwell field equations are satisfied, it does involve the prior assumption that  $J^\mu$  is conserved, and so the apparent mystery dissolves: we are only getting out what we put in, after all.

### Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Harvey Brown for his suggestion and encouragement to look at Noether's connection between symmetries and conserved quantities, and for our detailed and lengthy discussions of the material contained in this paper; to Steve Lidia and David Wallace for all their assistance; and to my relative Bjoern Sundt for his informal translation of Noether's 1918 paper. For further discussion, I would also like to thank Jean-Pierre Antoine, Guido Bacciagaluppi, Julian Barbour, Jeremy Butterfield, Nina Byers, Elena Castellani, Joy Christian, Jerry Goldin, Larry Gould, Roman Jackiw, Peter Morgan, Antigone Nounou, Lochlainn O'Raifeartaigh,<sup>26</sup> Wlodzimierz Piechocki, Oliver Pooley, and Erik Sjoqvist, along with those present at the Geometrical Methods in Physics conference in Bialowieza (1999) and at the Oxford Philosophy of Physics Seminar, where material from this paper has been presented. Finally, I am grateful to the A.H.R.B. and St. Hugh's College, Oxford, for financial support.

### References

Al-Kuwari, H. A., *et al.* (1991) 'Noether's theorem and local gauge invariance', *Am. J. Phys.* 59(4), 363-365.

Brading, K. A., and Brown, H. R. (2000) 'Noether's Theorems', in preparation.

Brown, H. R., and Pooley, O. (1999) 'The origin of the spacetime metric: Bell's 'Lorentzian pedagogy' and its significance in general relativity', gr-qc/9908048; to appear in *Physics Meets Philosophy at the Planck Length*, C. Callender and N.Huggett (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 2001.

<sup>25</sup>See Doughty, 1990; Brading and Brown, 2000.

<sup>26</sup>Following the recent death of Professor Lochlainn O'Raifeartaigh, I would like to dedicate this paper to his memory.

- Brewer, J. W., and Smith, M. K. (1981) *Emmy Noether: A Tribute to Her Life and Work*, Dekker.
- Byers, N. (1999) 'E. Noether's Discovery of the Deep Connection Between Symmetries and Conservation Laws', *Israel Mathematical Society Conference Proceedings*, vol. 12.
- Doughty, N. (1990) *Lagrangian Interaction*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hill, E. L. (1951) 'Hamilton's Principle and the Conservation Theorems of Mathematical Physics', *Reviews of Modern Physics* 23(3), 253-260.
- Jackiw, R., *et al.* (1994) 'Energy-momentum conservation in gravity theories', *Phys. Rev. D*, 49(10), 5173-5181.
- Jacobson, N. (ed.) (1983) *Emmy Noether: Collected Papers*, Springer-Verlag.
- Karatas, D. L., *et al.* (1990) 'Noether's theorem for local gauge transformations', *Am. J. Phys.* 58(2), 123-133.
- Kastrup, H. A. (1987) 'The Contributions of Emmy Noether, Felix Klein and Sophus Lie to the modern concept of symmetries in physical systems', *Symmetries in Physics (1600-1980)*, Universitat Autnoma de Barcelona, 113-163.
- Leader, E., and Predazzi, E. (1996) *An Introduction to Gauge Theories and Modern Particle Physics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Moriyasu, K. (1982) 'The Renaissance of Gauge Theory', *Contemporary Physics*, 23(6), 553-581.
- Noether, E. (1918) 'Invariante Variationsprobleme', *Nachr. d. Konig. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Gottingen, Math-phys. Klasse*, 235-257. English translation: Tavel (1971).
- O'Raiifeartaigh, L. (1997) *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Princeton University Press.
- Ryder, L. H., (1985) *Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- Sakurai, J. J. (1964) *Invariance Principles and Elementary Particles*, Princeton University Press.
- Schweber, S. S. (1961) *An Introduction to Relativistic Quantum Field Theory*, Row, Peterson and Co.
- Sterman, G (1993) *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- Tavel, M. A. (1971) 'Noether's theorem', *Transport Theory and Statistical Physics* 1(3), 183-207.
- Trautman, A. (1962) 'Conservation Laws in General Relativity', in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, L. Witten (ed.), John Wiley and Sons.
- Vizgin, V. P. (1985) Russian original of the English translation, Vizgin (1994).
- Vizgin, V. P. (1994) *Unified Field Theories in the first third of the 20th century*, trans. Julian Barbour, Birkhauser.
- Weinberg, S (1995) *The Quantum Theory of Fields*, vol 1, Cambridge University Press.

Weyl, H. (1918a) 'Gravitation und Elektrizitat', *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 465-480. English translation: 'Gravitation and Electricity', available in O'RaiFeartaigh (1997).

Weyl, H. (1918b) *Raum-Zeit-Materie*. English translation: Weyl (1952).

Weyl, H. (1928) *The Theory of Groups and Quantum Mechanics*, English translation, Dover edition 1950.

Weyl, H. (1929) 'Electron and Gravitation', English translation, available in O'RaiFeartaigh (1997).

Weyl, H. (1952) *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover. English translation of the 4th edition (1921) of Weyl (1918(b)).