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In recent years it has become fashionable to apply field-theoretical techniques
to the many-body problems one encounters in solid state physics and nuclear
physics. This is not surprising because in a quantized field theory there is
always the possibility of pair creation (real or virtual), which is essentially a
many-body problem. We are familiar with a number of close analogies be-
tween ideas and problems in elementary particle theory and the correspond-
ing ones in solid state physics. For example, the Fermi sea of electrons in a
metal is analogous to the Dirac sea of electrons in the vacuum, and we speak
about electrons and holes in both cases. Some people must have thought
of the meson field as something like the shielded Coulomb field. Of course,
in elementary particles we have more symmetries and invariance properties
than in the other, and blind analogies are often dangerous.
I will begin by a short story about my background. I studied physics at the University of Tokyo. I was attracted to particle physics because of the three famous names, Nishina, Tomonaga and Yukawa, who were the founders of particle physics in Japan. But these people were at different institutions than mine. On the other hand, condensed matter physics was pretty good at Tokyo. I got into particle physics only when I came back to Tokyo after the war. In hindsight, though, I must say that my early exposure to condensed matter physics has been quite beneficial to me.
Spontaneous (dynamical) symmetry breaking

Figure: Elastic rod compressed by a force of increasing strength
## Other examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>physical system</th>
<th>broken symmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ferromagnets</td>
<td>rotational invariance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crystals</td>
<td>translational invariance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superconductors</td>
<td>local gauge invariance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superfluid $^4$He</td>
<td>global gauge invariance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When spontaneous symmetry breaking takes place, the ground state of the system is degenerate.
One day before publication of the BCS paper, Bob Schrieffer, still a student, came to Chicago to give a seminar on the BCS theory in progress. . . . I was very much disturbed by the fact that their wave function did not conserve electron number. It did not make sense. . . . At the same time I was impressed by their boldness and tried to understand the problem.
The BCS theory assumed a condensate of charged pairs of electrons or holes, hence the medium was not gauge invariant. There were found intrinsically massless collective excitations of pairs (Nambu-Goldstone modes) that restored broken symmetries, and they turned into the plasmons by mixing with the Coulomb field.
Quasi-particles in superconductivity

Electrons near the Fermi surface are described by the following equation

\[ E \psi_{p,+} = \epsilon_p \psi_{p,+} + \phi \psi_{-p,-} \]
\[ E \psi_{-p,-} = -\epsilon_p \psi_{-p,-} + \phi \psi_{p,+} \]

with eigenvalues

\[ E = \pm \sqrt{\epsilon_p^2 + \phi^2} \]

Here, \( \psi_{p,+} \) and \( \psi_{-p,-}^\dagger \) are the wavefunctions for an electron and a hole of momentum \( p \) and spin +
Analogy with the Dirac equation

In the Weyl representation, the Dirac equations reads

\[ E\psi_1 = \sigma \cdot p \psi_1 + m\psi_2 \]
\[ E\psi_2 = -\sigma \cdot p \psi_2 + m\psi_1 \]

with eigenvalues

\[ E = \pm \sqrt{p^2 + m^2} \]

Here, \( \psi_1 \) and \( \psi_2 \) are the eigenstates of the chirality operator \( \gamma_5 \).
Nambu-Goldstone boson in superconductivity

Approximate expressions for the charge density and the current associated to a quasi-particle in a BCS superconductor

\[ \rho(x, t) \simeq \rho_0 + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \partial_t f \]
\[ \mathbf{j}(x, t) \simeq \mathbf{j}_0 - \nabla f \]

where \( \rho_0 = e \Psi^\dagger \sigma_3 Z \Psi \) and \( \mathbf{j}_0 = e \Psi^\dagger (p/m) Y \Psi \) with \( Y, Z \) and \( \alpha \) constants and \( f \) satisfies the wave equation

\[ \left( \nabla^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \partial_t^2 \right) f \simeq -2e \Psi^\dagger \sigma_2 \phi \Psi \]

Here, \( \Psi^\dagger = (\psi_1^\dagger, \psi_2) \)
The Fourier transform of the wave equation for $f$ gives

$$\tilde{f} \propto \frac{1}{q_0^2 - \alpha^2 q^2}$$

The pole at $q_0^2 = \alpha^2 q^2$ describes the excitation spectrum of the Nambu-Goldstone boson.

A better approximation reveals that, due to the Coulomb force, this spectrum is shifted to the plasma frequency $e^2 n$, where $n$ is the number of electrons per unit volume. In this way the field $f$ acquires a mass.
The axial vector current

Electromagnetic current  \[ \bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi \]  Axial current  \[ \bar{\psi}\gamma_5\gamma_\mu\psi \]

The axial current is the analog of the electromagnetic current in BCS theory. In the hypothesis of exact conservation, the matrix elements of the axial current between nucleon states of four-momentum \( p \) and \( p' \) have the form

\[ \Gamma^A_\mu(p', p) = (i\gamma_5\gamma_\mu - 2m\gamma_5q_\mu/q^2)F(q^2) \quad q = p' - p \]

Conservation is compatible with a finite nucleon mass \( m \) provided there exists a massless pseudoscalar particle, the Nambu-Goldstone boson.
In Nature, the axial current is only approximately conserved. Nambu’s hypothesis was that the small violation of axial current conservation gives a mass to the N-G boson, which is then identified with the $\pi$ meson. Under this hypothesis, one can write

$$\Gamma_{\mu}^A(p', p) \simeq \left( i \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu - \frac{2m \gamma_5 q_\mu}{q^2 + m_\pi^2} \right) F(q^2) \quad q = p' - p$$

This expression implies a relationship between the pion nucleon coupling constant $G_\pi$, the pion decay coupling $g_\pi$ and the axial current $\beta$-decay constant $g_A$

$$2mg_A \simeq \sqrt{2} G_\pi g_\pi$$

This is the Goldberger–Treiman relation.
It was experimentally known that the ratio between the axial vector and vector $\beta$-decay constants $R = g_A/g_V$ was slightly greater than 1 and about 1.25. The following two hypotheses were then natural:

1. under strict axial current conservation there is no renormalization of $g_A$;
2. the violation of the conservation gives rise to the finite pion mass as well as to the ratio $R > 1$ so that there is some relation between these quantities.

Under these assumptions a perturbative calculation gave a value of $R$ close to the experimental one. More important, the renormalization effect due to a positive pion mass went in the right direction.
The Lagrangian of the model is

\[ L = -\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \partial_\mu \psi + g \left[ (\bar{\psi} \psi)^2 - (\bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi)^2 \right] \]

It is invariant under ordinary and \( \gamma_5 \) gauge transformations

\[ \psi \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \psi, \quad \bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi} e^{-i\alpha} \]
\[ \psi \rightarrow e^{i\alpha \gamma_5} \psi, \quad \bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi} e^{i\alpha \gamma_5} \]
The spectrum of the NJL model

Mass equation

\[
\frac{2\pi^2}{g\Lambda^2} = 1 - \frac{m^2}{\Lambda^2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{m^2} \right)
\]

where \( \Lambda \) is the invariant cut-off

Spectrum of bound states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nucleon number</th>
<th>mass ( \mu )</th>
<th>spin-parity</th>
<th>spectroscopic notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0(^-)</td>
<td>( ^1S_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2( m )</td>
<td>0(^+)</td>
<td>( ^3P_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \mu^2 &gt; \frac{8}{3} m^2 )</td>
<td>1(^-)</td>
<td>( ^3P_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pm 2 )</td>
<td>( \mu^2 &gt; 2m^2 )</td>
<td>0(^+)</td>
<td>( ^1S_0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other examples of BCS type SSB

- $^3\text{He}$ superfluidity
- Nuleon pairing in nuclei
- Fermion mass generation in the electro-weak sector of the standard model

Nambu calls the last entry

*my biased opinion, there being other interpretations as to the nature of the Higgs field*
A simple example (Englert, Brout). Consider a complex scalar field \( \varphi = (\varphi_1 + i\varphi_2)/\sqrt{2} \) interacting with an abelian gauge field \( A_\mu \)

\[
H_{\text{int}} = ie A_\mu \varphi^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{\partial_\mu} \varphi - e^2 \varphi^\dagger \varphi A_\mu A_\mu
\]

If the vacuum expectation value of \( \varphi \) is \( \neq 0 \), e.g. \( \langle \varphi \rangle = \langle \varphi_1 \rangle/\sqrt{2} \), the polarization loop \( \Pi_{\mu\nu} \) for the field \( A_\mu \) in lowest order perturbation theory is

\[
\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = (2\pi)^4 ie^2 \langle \varphi_1 \rangle^2 \left[ g_{\mu\nu} - (q_\mu q_\nu/q^2) \right]
\]

Therefore the \( A_\mu \) field acquires a mass \( \mu^2 = e^2 \langle \varphi_1 \rangle^2 \) and gauge invariance is preserved, \( q_\mu \Pi_{\mu\nu} = 0 \).
In hindsight I regret that I should have explored in more detail the general mechanism of mass generation for the gauge field. But I thought the plasma and the Meissner effect had already established it. I also should have paid more attention to the Ginzburg-Landau theory which was a forerunner of the present Higgs description.
Leptons interact only with photons, and with the intermediate bosons that presumably mediate weak interaction. What could be more natural than to unite these spin-one bosons into a multiplet of gauge fields? Standing in the way of this synthesis are the obvious differences in the masses of the photon and intermediate meson, and in their couplings. We might hope to understand these differences by imagining that the symmetries relating the weak and the electromagnetic interactions are exact symmetries of the Lagrangian but are broken by the vacuum.
The NJL model has been reinterpreted in terms of quark variables. One is interested in the low energy degrees of freedom on a scale smaller than some cut-off $\Lambda \sim 1$ Gev. The short distance dynamics above $\Lambda$ is dictated by perturbative QCD and is treated as a small perturbation. Confinement is also treated as a small perturbation. The total Lagrangian is then

$$L_{\text{QCD}} \simeq L_{\text{NJL}} + L_{\text{KMT}} + \varepsilon (L_{\text{conf}} + L_{\text{OGE}})$$

where the Kobayashi–Maskawa–’t Hooft term

$$L_{\text{KMT}} = g_D \det_{i,j} [\bar{q}_i (1 - \gamma_5) q_j + \text{h.c.}]$$

mimics the axial anomaly and $L_{\text{OGE}}$ is the one gluon exchange potential.
Unlike the internal quantum numbers like charge and spin, mass is not quantized in regular manner.

Mass receives contributions from interactions. In other words, it is dynamical.

The masses form hierarchies. Hierarchical structure is an outstanding feature of the universe in terms of size as well of mass. Elementary particles are no exception.
Einstein used to express dissatisfaction with his famous equation of gravity

\[ G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} \]

His point was that, from an aesthetic point of view, the left hand side of the equation which describes the gravitational field is based on a beautiful geometrical principle, whereas the right hand side, which describes everything else, . . . looks arbitrary and ugly.

. . . [today] Since gauge fields are based on a beautiful geometrical principle, one may shift them to the left hand side of Einstein’s equation. What is left on the right are the matter fields which act as the source for the gauge fields . . . Can one geometrize the matter fields and shift everything to the left?
The BCS mechanism is most relevant to the mass problem because introduces an energy (mass) gap for fermions, and the Goldstone and Higgs modes as low-lying bosonic states. An interesting feature of the SSB is the possibility of hierarchical SSB or “tumbling”. Namely an SSB can be a cause for another SSB at lower energy scale.

...[examples are]
1. the chain crystal–phonon–superconductivity. ...Its NG mode is the phonon which then induces the Cooper pairing of electrons to cause superconductivity.
2. the chain QCD–chiral SSB of quarks and hadrons–π and σ mesons–nuclei formation and nucleon pairing–nuclear π and σ modes–nuclear collective modes.
Update of the NJL model