ELLIOTT H. LIEB



THE STABILITY OF MATTER IN QUANTUM MECHANICS



CAMERIDGE

CAMBRIDGE www.cambridge.org/9780521191180

This page intentionally left blank

THE STABILITY OF MATTER IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

Research into the stability of matter has been one of the most successful chapters in mathematical physics, and is a prime example of how modern mathematics can be applied to problems in physics.

A unique account of the subject, this book provides a complete, self-contained description of research on the stability of matter problem. It introduces the necessary quantum mechanics to mathematicians, and aspects of functional analysis to physicists. The topics covered include electrodynamics of classical and quantized fields, Lieb–Thirring and other inequalities in spectral theory, inequalities in electrostatics, stability of large Coulomb systems, gravitational stability of stars, basics of equilibrium statistical mechanics, and the existence of the thermodynamic limit.

The book is an up-to-date account for researchers, and its pedagogical style makes it suitable for advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in mathematical physics.

ELLIOTT H. LIEB is a Professor of Mathematics and Higgins Professor of Physics at Princeton University. He has been a leader of research in mathematical physics for 45 years, and his achievements have earned him numerous prizes and awards, including the Heineman Prize in Mathematical Physics of the American Physical Society, the Max-Planck medal of the German Physical Society, the Boltzmann medal in statistical mechanics of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, the Schock prize in mathematics by the Swedish Academy of Sciences, the Birkhoff prize in applied mathematics of the American Mathematical Society, the Austrian Medal of Honor for Science and Art, and the Poincaré prize of the International Association of Mathematical Physics.

ROBERT SEIRINGER is an Assistant Professor of Physics at Princeton University. His research is centered largely on the quantum-mechanical many-body problem, and has been recognized by a Fellowship of the Sloan Foundation, by a U.S. National Science Foundation Early Career award, and by the 2009 Poincaré prize of the International Association of Mathematical Physics.

THE STABILITY OF MATTER IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

ELLIOTT H. LIEB AND ROBERT SEIRINGER Princeton University



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521191180

© E. H. Lieb and R. Seiringer 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2009

ISBN-13 978-0-511-65437-4 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-19118-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

То

Christiane, Letizzia and Laura

Contents

	Pre	face		xiii		
1	Prologue			1		
	1.1	Introd	uction	1		
	1.2	Brief	Outline of the Book	5		
2	Intr	oductio	on to Elementary Quantum Mechanics and Stability			
	of tl	of the First Kind				
	2.1	2.1 A Brief Review of the Connection Between Classical and				
		Quant	um Mechanics	8		
		2.1.1	Hamiltonian Formulation	10		
		2.1.2	Magnetic Fields	10		
		2.1.3	Relativistic Mechanics	12		
		2.1.4	Many-Body Systems	13		
		2.1.5	Introduction to Quantum Mechanics	14		
		2.1.6	Spin	18		
		2.1.7	Units	21		
	2.2 The Idea of Stability			24		
		2.2.1	Uncertainty Principles: Domination of the Potential			
			Energy by the Kinetic Energy	26		
		2.2.2	The Hydrogenic Atom	29		
3	Many-Particle Systems and Stability of the Second Kind			31		
	3.1	Many	Many-Body Wave Functions			
		3.1.1	The Space of Wave Functions	31		
		3.1.2	Spin	33		
		3.1.3	Bosons and Fermions (The Pauli Exclusion			
			Principle)	35		

		3.1.4 Density Matrices	38	
		3.1.5 Reduced Density Matrices	41	
	3.2	Many-Body Hamiltonians	50	
		3.2.1 Many-Body Hamiltonians and Stability: Models with		
		Static Nuclei	50	
		3.2.2 Many-Body Hamiltonians: Models without Static		
		Particles	54	
		3.2.3 Monotonicity in the Nuclear Charges	57	
		3.2.4 Unrestricted Minimizers are Bosonic	58	
4	Lieb–Thirring and Related Inequalities			
	4.1	LT Inequalities: Formulation	62	
		4.1.1 The Semiclassical Approximation	63	
		4.1.2 The LT Inequalities; Non-Relativistic Case	66	
		4.1.3 The LT Inequalities; Relativistic Case	68	
	4.2	Kinetic Energy Inequalities	70	
	4.3	The Birman–Schwinger Principle and LT Inequalities	75	
		4.3.1 The Birman–Schwinger Formulation of the		
		Schrödinger Equation	75	
		4.3.2 Derivation of the LT Inequalities	77	
		4.3.3 Useful Corollaries	80	
	4.4	Diamagnetic Inequalities	82	
	4.5	Appendix: An Operator Trace Inequality		
5	Eleo	ctrostatic Inequalities	89	
	5.1	General Properties of the Coulomb Potential	89	
	5.2	Basic Electrostatic Inequality	92	
	5.3	Application: Baxter's Electrostatic Inequality	98	
	5.4	Refined Electrostatic Inequality	100	
6	An	Estimation of the Indirect Part of the Coulomb Energy		
	6.1	Introduction	105	
	6.2	Examples	107	
	6.3	Exchange Estimate	110	
	6.4	Smearing Out Charges	112	
	6.5	Proof of Theorem 6.1, a First Bound	114	
	6.6	An Improved Bound	118	

		Contents	ix	
7	Stability of Non-Relativistic Matter		121	
	7.1	Proof of Stability of Matter	122	
	7.2	An Alternative Proof of Stability	125	
	7.3	Stability of Matter via Thomas-Fermi Theory	127	
	7.4	Other Routes to a Proof of Stability	129	
		7.4.1 Dyson–Lenard, 1967	130	
		7.4.2 Federbush, 1975	130	
		7.4.3 Some Later Work	130	
	7.5	Extensivity of Matter	131	
	7.6	Instability for Bosons	133	
		7.6.1 The $N^{5/3}$ Law	133	
		7.6.2 The $N^{7/5}$ Law	135	
8	Stal	139		
	8.1	Introduction	139	
		8.1.1 Heuristic Reason for a Bound on α Itself	140	
	8.2	The Relativistic One-Body Problem	141	
	8.3	A Localized Relativistic Kinetic Energy	145	
	8.4	A Simple Kinetic Energy Bound	146	
	8.5	Proof of Relativistic Stability	148	
	8.6	Alternative Proof of Relativistic Stability	154	
	8.7	Further Results on Relativistic Stability	156	
	8.8	Instability for Large α , Large q or Bosons	158	
9	Magnetic Fields and the Pauli Operator		164	
	9.1	9.1 Introduction		
	9.2	The Pauli Operator and the Magnetic Field Energy	165	
	9.3	Zero-Modes of the Pauli Operator	166	
	9.4	A Hydrogenic Atom in a Magnetic Field	168	
	9.5	The Many-Body Problem with a Magnetic Field	171	
	9.6	Appendix: BKS Inequalities	178	
10	The	Dirac Operator and the Brown-Ravenhall Model	181	
	10.1	The Dirac Operator	181	
		10.1.1 Gauge Invariance	184	
	10.2	2 Three Alternative Hilbert Spaces	185	
		10.2.1 The Brown–Ravenhall Model	186	

x	Contents		
	10.2.2 A Modified Brown–Ravenhall Model	187	
	10.2.3 The Furry Picture	188	
	10.3 The One-Particle Problem	189	
	10.3.1 The Lonely Dirac Particle in a Magnetic Field	189	
	10.3.2 The Hydrogenic Atom in a Magnetic Field	190	
	10.4 Stability of the Modified Brown–Ravenhall Model	193	
	10.5 Instability of the Original Brown-Ravenhall Model	196	
	10.6 The Non-Relativistic Limit and the Pauli Operator	198	
11	Quantized Electromagnetic Fields and Stability of Matter		
	11.1 Review of Classical Electrodynamics and its Quantization	200	
	11.1.1 Maxwell's Equations	200	
	11.1.2 Lagrangian and Hamiltonian of the Electromagnetic		
	Field	204	
	11.1.3 Quantization of the Electromagnetic Field	207	
	11.2 Pauli Operator with Quantized Electromagnetic Field	210	
	11.3 Dirac Operator with Quantized Electromagnetic Field	217	
12	The Ionization Problem, and the Dependence of the Energy on		
	N and M Separately	221	
	12.1 Introduction	221	
	12.2 Bound on the Maximum Ionization	222	
	12.3 How Many Electrons Can an Atom or Molecule Bind?	228	
13	Gravitational Stability of White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars	233	
	13.1 Introduction and Astrophysical Background	233	
	13.2 Stability and Instability Bounds	235	
	13.3 A More Complete Picture	240	
	13.3.1 Relativistic Gravitating Fermions	240	
	13.3.2 Relativistic Gravitating Bosons	242	
	13.3.3 Inclusion of Coulomb Forces	243	
14	The Thermodynamic Limit for Coulomb Systems		
	14.1 Introduction	247	
	14.2 Thermodynamic Limit of the Ground State Energy	249	
	14.3 Introduction to Quantum Statistical Mechanics and the		
	Thermodynamic Limit	252	

Contents	X1
14.4 A Brief Discussion of Classical Statistical Mechanics	258
14.5 The Cheese Theorem	260
14.6 Proof of Theorem 14.2	263
14.6.1 Proof for Special Sequences	263
14.6.2 Proof for General Domains	268
14.6.3 Convexity	270
14.6.4 General Sequences of Particle Numbers	271
14.7 The Jellium Model	271
List of Symbols	276
Bibliography	279
Index	290

Preface

The fundamental theory that underlies the physicist's description of the material world is quantum mechanics – specifically Erwin Schrödinger's 1926 formulation of the theory. This theory also brought with it an emphasis on certain fields of mathematical analysis, e.g., Hilbert space theory, spectral analysis, differential equations, etc., which, in turn, encouraged the development of parts of pure mathematics.

Despite the great success of quantum mechanics in explaining details of the structure of atoms, molecules (including the complicated molecules beloved of organic chemists and the pharmaceutical industry, and so essential to life) and macroscopic objects like transistors, it took 41 years before the most fundamental question of all was resolved: Why doesn't the collection of negatively charged electrons and positively charged nuclei, which are the basic constituents of the theory, implode into a minuscule mass of amorphous matter thousands of times denser than the material normally seen in our world? Even today hardly any physics textbook discusses, or even raises this question, even though the basic conclusion of stability is subtle and not easily derived using the elementary means available to the usual physics student. There is a tendency among many physicists to regard this type of question as uninteresting because it is not easily reducible to a quantitative one. Matter is either stable or it is not; since nature tells us that it is so, there is no question to be answered. Nevertheless, physicists firmly believe that quantum mechanics is a 'theory of everything' at the level of atoms and molecules, so the question whether quantum mechanics predicts stability cannot be ignored. The depth of the question is further revealed when it is realized that a world made of bosonic particles would be unstable. It is also revealed by the fact that the seemingly innocuous interaction of matter and electromagnetic radiation at ordinary, every-day energies - quantum electrodynamics - should be a settled, closed subject, but it is not and it can be understood only in the context of perturbation theory. Given these observations, it is clearly important to know that at least the quantum-mechanical part of the story is well understood.

It is this stability question that will occupy us in this book. After four decades of development of this subject, during which most of the basic questions have gradually been answered, it seems appropriate to present a thorough review of the material at this time.

Schrödinger's equation is not simple, so it is not surprising that some interesting mathematics had to be developed to understand the various aspects of the stability of matter. In particular, aspects of the spectral theory of Schrödinger operators and some new twists on classical potential theory resulted from this quest. Some of these theorems, which play an important role here, have proved useful in other areas of mathematics.

The book is directed towards researchers on various aspects of quantum mechanics, as well as towards students of mathematics and students of physics. We have tried to be pedagogical, recognizing that students with diverse backgrounds may not have all the basic facts at their finger tips. Physics students will come equipped with a basic course in quantum mechanics but perhaps will lack familiarity with modern mathematical techniques. These techniques will be introduced and explained as needed, and there are many mathematics texts which can be consulted for further information; among them is [118], which we will refer to often. Students of mathematics will have had a course in real analysis and probably even some basic functional analysis, although they might still benefit from glancing at [118]. They will find the necessary quantum-mechanical background self-contained here in chapters two and three, but if they need more help they can refer to a huge number of elementary quantum mechanics texts, some of which, like [77, 22], present the subject in a way that is congenial to mathematicians.

While we aim for a relaxed, leisurely style, the proofs of theorems are either completely rigorous or can easily be made so by the interested reader. It is our hope that this book, which illustrates the interplay between mathematical and physical ideas, will not only be useful to researchers but can also be a basis for a course in mathematical physics.

To keep things within bounds, we have purposely limited ourselves to the subject of stability of matter in its various aspects (non-relativistic and relativistic mechanics, inclusion of magnetic fields, Chandrasekhar's theory of stellar collapse and other topics). Related subjects, such as a study of Thomas–Fermi and Hartree–Fock theories, are left for another day. Our thanks go, first of all, to Michael Loss for his invaluable help with some of this material, notably with the first draft of several chapters. We also thank László Erdős, Rupert Frank, Heinz Siedentop, Jan Philip Solovej and Jakob Yngvason for a critical reading of parts of this book.

> Elliott Lieb and Robert Seiringer Princeton, 2009

The reader is invited to consult the web page http://www.math.princeton.edu/books/ where a link to errata and other information about this book is available.

Prologue

1.1 Introduction

The basic constituents of ordinary matter are electrons and atomic nuclei. These interact with each other with several kinds of forces – electric, magnetic and gravitational – the most important of which is the electric force. This force is attractive between oppositely charged particles and repulsive between like-charged particles. (The electrons have a negative electric charge -e while the nuclei have a positive charge +Ze, with Z = 1, 2, ..., 92 in nature.) Thus, the strength of the attractive electrostatic interaction between electrons and nuclei is proportional to Ze^2 , which equals $Z\alpha$ in appropriate units, where α is the dimensionless **fine-structure constant**, defined by

$$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{\hbar c} = 7.297\,352\,538 \times 10^{-3} = \frac{1}{137.035\,999\,68},\tag{1.1.1}$$

and where c is the speed of light, $\hbar = h/2\pi$ and h is Planck's constant.

The basic question that has to be resolved in order to understand the existence of atoms and the stability of our world is:

Why don't the point-like electrons fall into the (nearly) point-like nuclei?

This problem of classical mechanics was nicely summarized by Jeans in 1915 [97]:

"There would be a very real difficulty in supposing that the (force) law $1/r^2$ held down to zero values of r. For the force between two charges at zero distance would be infinite; we should have charges of opposite sign continually rushing together and, when once together, no force would be adequate to separate them... Thus the matter in the universe would tend to shrink into nothing or to diminish indefinitely in size." A sensitive reader might object to Jeans' conclusion on the grounds that the non-zero radius of nuclei would ameliorate the collapse. Such reasoning is beside the point, however, because the equilibrium separation of charges observed in nature is not the nuclear diameter (10^{-13} cm) but rather the atomic size (10^{-8} cm) predicted by Schrödinger's equation. Therefore, as concerns the problem of understanding stability, in which equilibrium lengths are of the order of 10^{-8} cm, there is no loss in supposing that all our particles are point particles.

To put it differently, why is the energy of an atom with a point-like nucleus not $-\infty$? The fact that it is not is known as **stability of the first kind**; a more precise definition will be given later. The question was successfully answered by quantum mechanics, whose exciting development in the beginning of the twentieth century we will not try to relate – except to note that the basic theory culminated in Schrödinger's famous equation of 1926 [156]. This equation explained the new, non-classical, fact that as an electron moves close to a nucleus its kinetic energy necessarily increases in such a way that the minimum total energy (kinetic plus potential) occurs at some positive separation rather than at zero separation.

This was one of the most important triumphs of quantum mechanics!

Thomson discovered the electron in 1897 [180, 148], and Rutherford [155] discovered the (essentially) point-like nature of the nucleus in 1911, so it took 15 years from the discovery of the problem to its full solution. But it took almost three times as long, 41 years from 1926 to 1967, before the second part of the stability story was solved by Dyson and Lenard [44].

The second part of the story, known as **stability of the second kind**, is, even now, rarely told in basic quantum mechanics textbooks and university courses, but it is just as important. Given the stability of atoms, is it obvious that bulk matter with a large number N of atoms (say, $N = 10^{23}$) is also stable in the sense that the energy and the volume occupied by 2N atoms are twice that of N atoms? Our everyday physical experience tells us that this additivity property, or linear law, holds but is it also necessarily a consequence of quantum mechanics? Without this property, the world of ordinary matter, as we know it, would not exist.

Although physicists largely take this property for granted, there were a few that thought otherwise. Onsager [145] was perhaps the first to consider this

kind of question, and did so effectively for classical particles with Coulomb interactions but with the addition of hard cores that prevent particles from getting too close together. The full question (without hard cores) was addressed by Fisher and Ruelle in 1966 [66] and they generalized Onsager's results to smeared out charges. In 1967 Dyson and Lenard [44] finally succeeded in showing that stability of the second kind for truly point-like quantum particles with Coulomb forces holds but, surprisingly, that it need not do so. That is, the *Pauli exclusion principle*, which will be discussed in Chapter 3, and which has no classical counterpart, was essential. Although matter would not collapse without it, the linear law would *not* be satisfied, as Dyson showed in 1967 [43]. Consequently, stability of the second kind does *not* follow from stability of the first kind! If the electrons and nuclei were all bosons (which are particles that do not satisfy the exclusion principle), the energy would not satisfy a linear law but rather decrease like $-N^{7/5}$; we will return to this astonishing discovery later.

The Dyson–Lenard proof of stability of the second kind [44] was one of the most difficult, up to that time, in the mathematical physics literature. A challenge was to find an essential simplification, and this was done by Lieb and Thirring in 1975 [134]. They introduced new mathematical inequalities, now called Lieb–Thirring (LT) inequalities (discussed in Chapter 4), which showed that a suitably modified version of the 1927 approximate theory of Thomas and Fermi [179, 62] yielded, in fact, a lower bound to the exact quantum-mechanical answer. Since it had already been shown, by Lieb and Simon in 1973 [129, 130], that this Thomas–Fermi theory possessed a linear lower bound to the energy, the many-body stability of the second kind immediately followed.

The Dyson–Lenard stability result was one important ingredient in the solution to another, but related problem that had been raised many years earlier. Is it true that the 'thermodynamic limit' of the free energy per particle exists for an infinite system at fixed temperature and density? In other words, given that the energy per particle of some system is bounded above and below, independent of the size of the system, how do we know that it does not oscillate as the system's size increases? The existence of a limit was resolved affirmatively by Lebowitz and Lieb in 1969 [103, 116], and we shall give that proof in Chapter 14.

There were further surprises in store, however! The Dyson–Lenard result was not the end of the story, for it was later realized that there were other sources of instability that physicists had not seriously thought about. Two, in fact. The eventual solution of these two problems leads to the conclusion that, ultimately, stability requires more than the Pauli principle. It also requires an upper bound on both the physical constants α and $Z\alpha$.¹

One of the two new questions considered was this. What effect does Einstein's relativistic kinematics have? In this theory the Newtonian kinetic energy of an electron with mass *m* and momentum p, $p^2/2m$, is replaced by the much weaker $\sqrt{p^2c^2 + m^2c^4} - mc^2$. So much weaker, in fact, that the simple atom is stable only if the relevant coupling parameter $Z\alpha$ is not too large! This fact was known in one form or another for many years – from the introduction of Dirac's 1928 relativistic quantum mechanics [39], in fact. It was far from obvious, therefore, that many-body stability would continue to hold even if $Z\alpha$ is kept small (but fixed, independent of *N*). Not only was the linear *N*-dependence in doubt but also stability of the first kind was unclear. This was resolved by Conlon in 1984 [32], who showed that stability of the second kind holds if $\alpha < 10^{-200}$ and Z = 1.

Clearly, Conlon's result needed improvement and this led to the invention of interesting new inequalities to simplify and improve his result. We now know that stability of the second kind holds if and only if *both* α and $Z\alpha$ are not too large. The bound on α itself was the new reality, previously unknown in the physics literature.

Again new inequalities were needed when it was realized that magnetic fields could also cause instabilities, even for just one atom, if $Z\alpha^2$ is too large. The understanding of this strange, and totally unforeseen, fact requires the knowledge that the appropriate Schrödinger equation has '*zero-modes*', as discovered by Loss and Yau in 1986 [139] (that is, square integrable, time-independent solutions with zero kinetic energy). But stability of the second kind was still open until Fefferman showed in 1995 [57, 58] that stability of the second kind holds if Z = 1 and α is very small. This result was subsequently improved to robust values of $Z\alpha^2$ and α by Lieb, Loss and Solovej in 1995 [123].

The surprises, in summary, were that stability of the second kind requires bounds on the fine-structure constant and the nuclear charges. In the relativistic case, smallness of α and of $Z\alpha$ is necessary, whereas in the non-relativistic case with magnetic fields, smallness of α and of $Z\alpha^2$ is required.

¹ If $Z \ge 1$, which it always is in nature, a bound on $Z\alpha$ implies a bound on α , of course. The point here is that the necessary bound on α is independent of Z, even if Z is arbitrarily small. In this book we shall not restrict our attention to integer Z.

Given these facts, one can ask if the *simultaneous* introduction of relativistic mechanics, magnetic fields, and the quantization of those fields in the manner proposed by M. Planck in 1900 [149], leads to new surprises about the requirements for stability. The answer, proved by Lieb, Loss, Siedentop and Solovej [127, 119], is that in at least one version of the problem no new conditions are needed, except for expected adjustments of the allowed bounds for $Z\alpha$ and α .

While we will visit all these topics in this book, we will not necessarily follow the historical route. In particular, we will solve the non-relativistic problem by using the improved inequalities invented to handle the relativistic problem, without the introduction of Thomas–Fermi theory. The Thomas–Fermi story is interesting, but no longer essential for our understanding of the stability of matter. Hence we will mention it, and sketch its application in the stability of matter problem, but we will not treat it thoroughly, and will not make further use of it. Some earlier pedagogical reviews are in [108, 115].

1.2 Brief Outline of the Book

An elementary introduction to quantum mechanics is given in **Chapter 2**. It is a thumbnail sketch of the relevant parts of the subject for readers who might want to refresh their memory, and it also serves to fix notation. Readers familiar with the subject can safely skip the chapter.

Chapter 3 discusses the many-body aspects of quantum mechanics and, in particular, introduces the concept of stability of matter in Section 3.2. The chapter also contains several results that will be used repeatedly in the chapters to follow, like the monotonicity of the ground state energy in the nuclear charges, and the fact the bosons have the lowest possible ground state energy among all symmetry classes.

A detailed discussion of Lieb–Thirring inequalities is the subject of **Chapter 4**. These inequalities play a crucial role in our understanding of stability of matter. They concern bounds on the moments of the negative eigenvalues of Schrödinger type operators, which lead to lower bounds on the kinetic energy of many-particle systems in terms of the corresponding semiclassical expressions. This chapter, like Chapters 5 and 6, is purely mathematical and contains analytic inequalities that will be applied in the following chapters.

Electrostatics is an old subject whose mathematical underpinning goes back to Newton's discussion in the *Principia* [144] of the gravitational force, which

behaves in a similar way except for a change of sign from repulsive to attractive. Nevertheless, new inequalities are essential for understanding many-body systems, and these are given in **Chapters 5 and 6**. The latter chapter contains a proof of the Lieb–Oxford inequality [125], which gives a bound on the indirect part of the Coulomb electrostatic energy of a quantum system.

Chapter 7 contains a proof of stability of matter of non-relativistic fermionic particles. This is the same model for which stability was first shown by Dyson and Lenard [44] in 1967. The three proofs given here are different and very short given the inequalities derived in Chapters 4–6. As a consequence, matter is not only stable but also extensive, in the sense that the volume occupied is proportional to the number of particles. The instability of the same model for bosons will also be discussed.

The analogous model with relativistic kinematics is discussed in **Chapter 8**, and stability for fermions is proved for a certain range of the parameters α and $Z\alpha$. Unlike in the non-relativistic case, where the range of values of these parameters was unconstrained, bounds on these parameters are essential, as will be shown. The proof of stability in the relativistic case will be an important ingredient concerning stability of the models discussed in Chapters 9, 10 and 11.

The influence of spin and magnetic fields will be studied in **Chapter 9**. If the kinetic energy of the particles is described by the Pauli operator, it becomes necessary to include the magnetic field energy for stability. Again, bounds on various parameters become necessary, this time α and $Z\alpha^2$. It turns out that zero modes of the Pauli operator are a key ingredient in understanding the boundary between stability and instability.

If the kinetic energy of relativistic particles is described by the Dirac operator, the question of stability becomes even more subtle. This is the content of **Chapter 10**. For the Brown–Ravenhall model, where the physically allowed states are the positive energy states of the free Dirac operator, there is always instability in the presence of magnetic fields. Stability can be restored by appropriately modifying the model and choosing as the physically allowed states the ones that have a positive energy for the Dirac operator *with* the magnetic field.

The effects of the quantum nature of the electromagnetic field will be investigated in **Chapter 11**. The models considered are the same as in Chapters 9 and 10, but now the electromagnetic field will be quantized. These models are caricatures of quantum electrodynamics. The chapter includes a self-contained mini-course on the electromagnetic field and its quantization. The stability and instability results are essentially the same as for the non-quantized field, except for different bounds on the parameter regime for stability.

How many electrons can an atom or molecule bind? This question will be addressed in **Chapter 12**. The reason for including it in a book on stability of matter is to show that for a lower bound on the ground state energy only the minimum of the number of nuclei and the number of electrons is relevant. A large excess charge can not lower the energy.

Once a system becomes large enough so that the gravitational interaction can not be ignored, stability fails. This can be seen in nature in terms of the gravitational collapse of stars and the resulting supernovae, or as the upper mass limit of cold stars. Simple models of this gravitational collapse, as appropriate for white dwarfs and neutron stars, will be studied in **Chapter 13**. In particular, it will be shown how the critical number of particles for collapse depends on the gravitational constant *G*, namely $G^{-3/2}$ for fermions and G^{-1} for bosons, respectively.

The first 13 chapters deal essentially with the problem of showing that the lowest energy of matter is bounded below by a constant times the number of particles. The final **Chapter 14** deals with the question of showing that the energy is really proportional to the number of particles, i.e., that the energy per particle has a limit as the particle number goes to infinity. Such a limit exists not only for the ground state energy, but also for excited states in the sense that at positive temperature the thermodynamic limit of the free energy per particle exists.

Introduction to Elementary Quantum Mechanics and Stability of the First Kind

In this second chapter we will review the basic mathematical and physical facts about quantum mechanics and establish physical units and notation. Those readers already familiar with the subject can safely jump to the next chapter.

An attempt has been made to make the presentation in this chapter as elementary as possible, and yet present the basic facts that will be needed later. There are many beautiful and important topics which will not be touched upon such as self-adjointness of Schrödinger operators, the general mathematical structure of quantum mechanics and the like. These topics are well described in other works, e.g., [150].

Much of the following can be done in a Euclidean space of arbitrary dimension, but in this chapter the dimension of the Euclidean space is taken to be three – which is the physical case – unless otherwise stated. We do this to avoid confusion and, occasionally, complications that arise in the computation of mathematical constants. The interested reader can easily generalize what is done here to the \mathbb{R}^d , d > 3 case. Likewise, in the next chapters we mostly consider N particles, with spatial coordinates in \mathbb{R}^3 , so that the total spatial dimension is 3N.

2.1 A Brief Review of the Connection Between Classical and Quantum Mechanics

Considering the range of validity of quantum mechanics, it is not surprising that its formulation is more complicated and abstract than classical mechanics. Nevertheless, classical mechanics is a basic ingredient for quantum mechanics. One still talks about position, momentum and energy which are notions from Newtonian mechanics.

The connection between these two theories becomes apparent in the semiclassical limit, akin to passing from wave optics to geometrical optics. In its Hamiltonian formulation, classical mechanics can be viewed as a problem of geometrical optics. This led Schrödinger to guess the corresponding wave equation. We refrain from fully explaining the semiclassical limit of quantum mechanics. For one aspect of this problem, however, the reader is referred to Chapter 4, Section 4.1.1.

We turn now to classical dynamics itself, in which a point particle is fully described by giving its **position** $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3)$ in \mathbb{R}^3 and its **velocity** $\mathbf{v} = d\mathbf{x}/dt = \dot{\mathbf{x}}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 at any time *t*, where the dot denotes the derivative with respect to time.¹ Newton's law of motion says that along any mechanical trajectory its acceleration $\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \ddot{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies

$$m\ddot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, t), \qquad (2.1.1)$$

where F is the **force** acting on the particle and m is the **mass**. With $F(x, \dot{x}, t)$ given, the expression (2.1.1) is a system of second order differential equations which together with the initial conditions $x(t_0)$ and $v(t_0) = \dot{x}(t_0)$ determine x(t) and thus v(t) for all times. If there are N particles interacting with each other, then (2.1.1) takes the form

$$m_i \ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_i = \boldsymbol{F}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \tag{2.1.2}$$

where F_i denotes the sum of all forces acting on the *i*th particle and x_i denotes the position of the *i*th particle. As an example, consider the force between two charged particles, whose respective charges are denoted by Q_1 and Q_2 , namely the **Coulomb force** given (in appropriate units, see Section 2.1.7) by

$$F_1 = Q_1 Q_2 \frac{x_1 - x_2}{|x_1 - x_2|^3} = -F_2.$$
(2.1.3)

If Q_1Q_2 is positive the force is repulsive and if Q_1Q_2 is negative the force is attractive. Formula (2.1.3) can be written in terms of the **potential energy** function

$$V(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|},$$
 (2.1.4)

noting that

$$F_1 = -\nabla_{x_1} V$$
 and $F_2 = -\nabla_{x_2} V.$ (2.1.5)

As usual, we denote the gradient by $\nabla = (\partial/\partial x^1, \partial/\partial x^2, \partial/\partial x^3)$.

¹ We follow the physicists' convention in which vectors are denoted by boldface letters.

2.1.1 Hamiltonian Formulation

Hamilton's formulation of classical mechanics is the entry to quantum physics. **Hamilton's equations** are

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{p}}, \quad \dot{\mathbf{p}} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$$
 (2.1.6)

where H(x, p) is the **Hamilton function** and p the **canonical momentum** of the particle. Assuming that

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = -\nabla V(\mathbf{x}) \tag{2.1.7}$$

for some potential V then, in the case that the canonical momentum is given by

$$\boldsymbol{p} = m\boldsymbol{v},\tag{2.1.8}$$

Eq. (2.1.6) with

$$H = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{2m} + V(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{2.1.9}$$

yields (2.1.1). The function

$$T(\boldsymbol{p}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{2m} \tag{2.1.10}$$

is called the **kinetic energy** function. A simple computation using Eq. (2.1.6) shows that along each mechanical trajectory the function $H(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{p}(t))$ is a constant which we call the **energy**, *E*.

2.1.2 Magnetic Fields

Not in all cases is the canonical momentum given by (2.1.8). An example is the motion of a charged particle of mass *m* and charge -e in a magnetic field B(x) in addition to a potential, V(x). The **Lorentz force** on such a particle located at x and having velocity v is²

$$F_{\text{Lorentz}} = -\frac{e}{c} \boldsymbol{v} \wedge \boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{x}). \qquad (2.1.11)$$

² We use the symbol \wedge for the vector product on \mathbb{R}^3 , instead of \times , since the latter may be confused with \boldsymbol{x} .

The Hamilton function is then given by³

$$H(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{p}) = \frac{1}{2m} \left(\boldsymbol{p} + \frac{e}{c} \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right)^2 + V(\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad (2.1.12)$$

where A(x), called the vector potential, determines the magnetic field (more properly called the magnetic induction) B(x) by the equation

$$\nabla \wedge A(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{curl} A(\mathbf{x}) = B(\mathbf{x}).$$
 (2.1.13)

The fact that an arbitrary magnetic field can be written this way as a curl is a consequence of the fact that Maxwell's equations dictate that all physical magnetic fields satisfy

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \tag{2.1.14}$$

The parameter c in (2.1.12) is the **speed of light**, which equals 299792458 meters/sec.

The canonical momentum **p** is now *not* equal to mass times velocity but rather

$$m\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{p} + \frac{e}{c}\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{2.1.15}$$

It is a simple calculation to derive the Lorentz law for the motion of an electron in an external magnetic field using (2.1.6) with (2.1.12) as the Hamilton function.

The energy associated with this **B** field (i.e., the amount of work needed to construct this field or, equivalently, the amount of money we have to pay to the electric power company) is⁴

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{mag}}(\boldsymbol{B}) := \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{x})|^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$
 (2.1.16)

The units we use are the conventional *absolute electrostatic units*. For further discussion of units see Section 2.1.7.

³ We note that we use the convention that the electron charge equals -e, with e > 0, and hence the proper form of the kinetic energy is given by (2.1.12). In the formula $(p - eA(x)/c)^2/(2m)$, which is usually found in textbooks, *e* denotes a generic charge, which can be positive or negative.

⁴ The equation a := b (or b =: a) means that a is defined by b.

Since the only requirement on A is that it satisfy (2.1.13) we have a certain amount of freedom in choosing A. It would appear that the A has three degrees of freedom (the three components of the vector A) but in reality there are only two since B has only two degrees of freedom (because div B = 0). If we assume that $\mathcal{E}_{mag}(B) < \infty$ (which should be good enough for physical applications) then we can choose the field A such that (2.1.13) holds and

div
$$A = 0$$
 and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |A(\mathbf{x})|^6 d\mathbf{x} < \infty.$ (2.1.17)

A proof of this fact is given in Lemma 10.1 in Chapter 10. The condition div A = 0 is of no importance to us until we get to Chapter 10. All results prior to Chapter 10 hold irrespective of this condition. Its relevance is explained in Section 10.1.1 on gauge invariance.

2.1.3 Relativistic Mechanics

It is straightforward to describe relativistic mechanics in the Hamiltonian formalism. The Hamilton function for a free relativistic particle is

$$T_{\rm rel}(\boldsymbol{p}) := c\sqrt{\boldsymbol{p}^2 + m^2 c^2} - mc^2, \qquad (2.1.18)$$

from which the relation between p and the velocity, v, is found to be

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \frac{\partial T_{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{p})}{\partial \boldsymbol{p}} = \frac{c \, \boldsymbol{p}}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{p}^2 + m^2 c^2}}.$$
(2.1.19)

Note that |v| < c. We can, of course, include a magnetic field in this relativistic formalism simply by replacing p by $p + \frac{e}{c}A(x)$.

A potential can be added to this $T_{rel}(\mathbf{p})$ so that the Hamilton function becomes

$$H_{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{x}) = T_{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{p}) + V(\boldsymbol{x}). \qquad (2.1.20)$$

Hamilton's equations (2.1.6) then yield a mathematically acceptable theory, but it has to be admitted that it is not truly a relativistic theory from the physical point of view. The reason is that the theory obtained this way is not invariant under Lorentz transformations, i.e., the equations of motion (and not merely the solutions of the equations) are different in different inertial systems. We shall not attempt to explain this further, because we shall not be concerned with true relativistic invariance in this book. In any case, 'energy' itself is not a relativistically invariant quantity (it is only a component of a 4-vector). We shall, however, be concerned with the kind of mechanics defined by the Hamilton function H_{rel} in (2.1.20) because this dynamics *is* an interesting *approximation* to a truly relativistic mechanics.

2.1.4 Many-Body Systems

There is no difficulty in describing many-body systems in the Hamiltonian formalism – with either relativistic or non-relativistic kinematics. As an example, consider the problem of N electrons and M static nuclei interacting with each other via the Coulomb force. The electrons have charge -e, and are located at positions $\underline{X} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N), x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$. The M nuclei have charges $e\underline{Z} = e(Z_1, \ldots, Z_M)$ and are located at $\underline{R} = (R_1, \ldots, R_M)$ with $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M$. Then the **potential energy function** of this system is $e^2 V_C(\underline{X}, \underline{R})$, with

$$V_C(\underline{X}, \underline{R}) = W(\underline{X}, \underline{R}) + I(\underline{X}) + U(\underline{R}), \qquad (2.1.21)$$

where

$$W(\underline{X}, \underline{R}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{Z_j}{|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{R}_j|}$$
(2.1.22)

$$I(\underline{X}) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le N} \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j|}$$
(2.1.23)

$$U(\underline{\mathbf{R}}) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le M} \frac{Z_i Z_j}{|\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j|}.$$
(2.1.24)

The three terms have the following meaning: $W(\underline{X}, \underline{R})$ is the electron-nucleus attractive Coulomb interaction, $I(\underline{X})$ is the electron-electron repulsive interaction and $U(\underline{R})$ is the nucleus-nucleus repulsive interaction. The total force acting on the *i*th electron is thus given by

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{i} = -e^{2} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_{i}} V_{C}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{R}). \qquad (2.1.25)$$

The Hamilton function is the sum of kinetic energy and potential energy

$$H(\underline{X}, \underline{P}) = T(\underline{P}) + e^2 V_C(\underline{X}, \underline{R}), \qquad (2.1.26)$$

where

$$T(\underline{\mathbf{P}}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\mathbf{p}_{j}^{2}}{2m}, \quad \underline{\mathbf{P}} = (\mathbf{p}_{1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{N})$$
(2.1.27)

in the non-relativistic case (or with the obvious change in the relativistic case). If the nuclei are dynamic, one also has to add the nuclear kinetic energy, of course.

In the case of static nuclei, \underline{R} are simply fixed parameters. We point out that when we study stability of the quantum analogue of this system, it will be essential to look for bounds that are *independent* of \underline{R} .

2.1.5 Introduction to Quantum Mechanics

On atomic length scales, position and momentum can no longer describe the state of a particle. They both play an important role as observables but to describe the **state of a quantum mechanical particle** one requires a complex valued function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{C}$, called the **wave function**. In the remainder of the present chapter we limit the discussion to a single particle. The discussion of *N*-particle wave functions, $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{3N} \to \mathbb{C}$ is deferred to Chapter 3.

In order to fix the state of an electron one has to specify infinitely many numbers (i.e., a whole function) – not just the six numbers p and x of classical mechanics. The function $x \mapsto |\psi(x)|^2$ is interpreted as a probability density and hence we require the **normalization condition**

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\psi(\mathbf{x})|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} = 1.$$
 (2.1.28)

The classical energy is replaced by an energy functional, $\mathcal{E}(\psi)$, of the wave function of the system:

$$\mathcal{E}(\psi) = T_{\psi} + V_{\psi}, \qquad (2.1.29)$$

where

$$T_{\psi} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \psi(\mathbf{x})|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}, \qquad (2.1.30)$$