

P. 393, Derivation of (36.3).

This derivation struck me as not completely obvious, so I present my version here.

$$\mathbf{d}\varphi(u, v) = \nabla_u \varphi(v) - \nabla_v \varphi(u)$$

$$= u^i \partial_i (v^j \varphi_j) - v^j \partial_j (u^i \varphi_i)$$

$$(\text{because } \nabla_u \rightarrow u^i \partial_i, \text{ and } v \rightarrow v^j \varphi_j)$$

$$= u^i v^j \partial_i \varphi_j - u^j v^i \partial_j \varphi_i$$

$$(\text{by linearity of components } u^i, u^j, v^i, v^j)$$

$$= \partial_i \varphi_j \{u^i v^j - u^j v^i\}$$

$$= \partial_i \varphi_j \{\mathbf{d}x^i(u) \mathbf{d}x^j(v) - \mathbf{d}x^j(u) \mathbf{d}x^i(v)\}$$

$$(\text{because } \mathbf{d}x^i(u) = u^i, \text{ pp. 356, 364 ln-6, p. 373, ¶3})$$

$$(\text{ex.: } \mathbf{d}x^2(u) = u^2, \mathbf{d}y(u) = u^2)$$

$$= \partial_i \varphi_j (\mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j)(u, v) \implies \mathbf{d}\varphi = \partial_i \varphi_j (\mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j) \quad (36.3)$$

$$(\text{by abstracting away from arbitrary vector fields } u \text{ and } v)$$

P. 394, §36.1. Show that $\mathbf{d}\varphi = \mathbf{d}(\varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j$.

φ_j is a set of zero forms, each of which is comparable to f.

$$\mathbf{d}f = \partial_i f \mathbf{d}x^i \implies \mathbf{d}\varphi = \partial_i \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^i \quad (\text{p. 394, ln 1})$$

$$\mathbf{d}\varphi = \partial_i \varphi_j (\mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j) = (\partial_i \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j$$

Or it can be derived with the Leibniz rule for forms (36.8) near the bottom of the same page.

$$\mathbf{d}\varphi = \mathbf{d}(\varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j + (-1)^0 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \quad (\text{because } \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}x^j) = 0)$$

P. 394, §36.2. We find [exercise] that (36.4) generalizes in a way that is clearly part of a larger pattern:

$$\mathbf{d}\Psi = \mathbf{d}(\Psi_{ij} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\Psi_{ij} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j$$

Derivation:

$$\mathbf{d}\varphi = \mathbf{d}(\varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^j) = \mathbf{d}\varphi_j \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \quad \text{From (36.4)}$$

$$\mathbf{d}\Psi(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3) = \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_1} \Psi(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3) + \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_2} \Psi(\mathbf{v}_3, \mathbf{v}_1) + \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_3} \Psi(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2) \quad \text{From ¶ 2 of 36.2}$$

Then abstract away vector fields, as in (36.3) and apply (36.4) to the 2-form.

$$= \mathbf{d}\Psi_{23} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^3 + \mathbf{d}\Psi_{31} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^3 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^1 + \mathbf{d}\Psi_{12} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2$$

$$= \mathbf{d}\Psi_{ij} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \quad \text{By abstraction of indices.}$$

P. 394, §36.3.P1. It is simple to verify [exercise] that if f is a function (0-form) then

$$\mathbf{d}(f\Psi) = \mathbf{d}f \wedge \Psi + f\mathbf{d}\Psi \quad (36.7)$$

The wedge product is not used for multiplication with 0-forms such as f . $\mathbf{d}f$ is a 1-form, so the wedge product can be used with other 1-forms and higher order forms. So this derivation is a simple application of the Leibniz rule for forms.

Suppose $f = 2x^2y$. Then $\mathbf{d}f(\mathbf{v}) = (4xy + 2x^2) \mathbf{d}x^i(\mathbf{v})$ for some $\mathbf{v} = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\mathbf{d}f(\mathbf{v}) = 4ab + 2b^2$.

P. 395. 36.4.1. Prove that $\mathbf{d}^2 = 0$.

Let $i = 1, 2, \dots, p; j = 1, 2, \dots, p; \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j = 0$, where $i = j$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}^2 \varphi &= \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}\varphi) = \mathbf{d}[\partial_i \varphi_j (\mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j)] \\ &= \mathbf{d}\{\partial_i \varphi_j\} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \quad [\text{From Leibniz product rule for forms.}] \\ &= \{[\partial_k \partial_i \varphi_j] \mathbf{d}x^k \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i\} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \quad [\text{From } \mathbf{d}f = \partial_i f \mathbf{d}x^i, \text{ p. 394, ln 1. Sub } \partial_i \varphi_j \text{ for } f \text{ and } k \text{ for } i.] \\ &= \{\partial_1 \partial_1 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^1 + \partial_1 \partial_2 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2 + \partial_2 \partial_1 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^2 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^1 \dots + \partial_p \partial_p \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^p \wedge \mathbf{d}x^p\} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \\ &= \{0 + \partial_1 \partial_2 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2 - \partial_2 \partial_1 \varphi_j \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2 + \dots + 0\} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j \\ &= \{0 + 0 + \dots + 0\} \wedge \mathbf{d}x^j = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The k_i and k_j wedge products cancel because $\partial_i \partial_k \varphi_j = \partial_k \partial_i \varphi_j$ and $(\mathbf{d}x^k \wedge \mathbf{d}x^i) = -(\mathbf{d}x^i \wedge \mathbf{d}x^k)$. The square bracket notation in line 3 appears simply to signal a second level of partition within the curly brackets, but that seems unnecessary. One might use it to signal that the order of indices on the partial deriva-

tives changes as the 1-forms are multiplied out as wedge products. Alternatively, it may signal that the order does not have to change because the second derivatives are equal no matter the order of k_i or i_k . Or one could use it to group the lower indices in contrast to the upper indices.

P. 397. Prove each of the three following facts:

Box: If Υ and Φ are closed, then $\Upsilon \wedge \Phi$ is closed, too.

Show that $d(\Upsilon \wedge \Phi) = 0$.

$d\Upsilon = d\Phi = 0$ because Υ and Φ are closed

$$d(\Upsilon \wedge \Phi) = d\Upsilon \wedge \Phi + (-1)^{\deg \Upsilon} \Upsilon \wedge d\Phi \text{ by (36.8)}$$

$$= 0 \wedge \Phi + (-1)^{\deg \Upsilon} \Upsilon \wedge 0 = 0$$

Box: If Υ is closed, then $\Upsilon \wedge d\Phi$ is closed for all Φ .

Show that $d(\Upsilon \wedge d\Phi) = 0$ if Υ is closed.

$$d(\Upsilon \wedge d\Phi) = d\Upsilon \wedge d\Phi + (-1)^{\deg \Upsilon} \Upsilon \wedge dd\Phi \text{ by (36.8)}$$

$$= 0 \wedge d\Phi + (-1)^{\deg \Upsilon} \Upsilon \wedge 0 = 0 \text{ because } dd\Phi = 0$$

Box: If $\deg \Phi$ is even, then $\Phi \wedge d\Phi$ is closed.

$d\Phi \wedge d\Phi = 0$ only if Φ is of odd degree.

Show that $d(\Phi \wedge d\Phi) = 0$ if $\deg \Phi$ is even.

$$d(\Phi \wedge d\Phi) = d\Phi \wedge d\Phi + (-1)^{\deg \Phi} \Phi \wedge dd\Phi \text{ by (36.8)}$$

Since degree of Φ is even, degree of $d\Phi$ is odd. Therefore, $d\Phi \wedge d\Phi = 0$ by 35.7, and $dd\Phi = 0$, so one can write

$$d(\Phi \wedge d\Phi) = 0 + (-1)^{\deg \Phi} \Phi \wedge 0 = 0$$

So If $\deg \Phi$ is even, then $\Phi \wedge d\Phi$ is closed.

P. 397, line -8. Show that $\mathbf{d}(f\mathbf{d}z) = (i\partial_x f - \partial_y f)\mathcal{A}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{d}(f\mathbf{d}z) &= \mathbf{d}f \wedge \mathbf{d}z \\
 &= \mathbf{d}(f\mathbf{d}z) = (\partial_x f \mathbf{d}x + \partial_y f \mathbf{d}y) \wedge (\mathbf{d}x + i\mathbf{d}y) \\
 &= \partial_x f \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}x + \partial_x f \mathbf{d}x \wedge i\mathbf{d}y + \partial_y f \mathbf{d}y \wedge \mathbf{d}x + \partial_y f \mathbf{d}y \wedge i\mathbf{d}y \\
 &= i\partial_x f \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y - \partial_y f \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y \\
 &= (i\partial_x f - \partial_y f) \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y = (i\partial_x f - \partial_y f)\mathcal{A}
 \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted.

P. 398, [exercise] (36.14).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{d}(\bar{z}\mathbf{d}z)\bar{z} &= \mathbf{d}\bar{z} \wedge \mathbf{d}z = \mathbf{d}(x - iy) \wedge (\mathbf{d}x + i\mathbf{d}y) = (\mathbf{d}x - i\mathbf{d}y) \wedge (\mathbf{d}x + i\mathbf{d}y) \\
 &= \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}x + \mathbf{d}x \wedge i\mathbf{d}y - i\mathbf{d}y \wedge \mathbf{d}x - i \cdot i\mathbf{d}y \wedge \mathbf{d}y \\
 &= 0 + i\mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y + i\mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y - 0 = 2i\mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}y = 2i\mathcal{A}
 \end{aligned}$$

P. 400, ¶4, leaving the simple proof [of (36.17) to you.

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} \wedge \boldsymbol{\Psi} = (\boldsymbol{\varphi} \bullet \boldsymbol{\Psi}) \mathcal{V} \quad (36.17)$$

$$\text{Let } \underline{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} = \varphi_i = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \\ \varphi_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{Let } \underline{\boldsymbol{\Psi}} = \Psi_j = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $A^1 = \mathbf{d}x^2 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^3$, $A^2 = \mathbf{d}x^3 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^1$, $A^3 = \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge \mathbf{d}x^2$ (see p. 399)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \boldsymbol{\varphi} \wedge \boldsymbol{\Psi} &= (\varphi_1 \mathbf{d}x^1 + \varphi_2 \mathbf{d}x^2 + \varphi_3 \mathbf{d}x^3) \wedge (\Psi_1 A^1 + \Psi_2 A^2 + \Psi_3 A^3) \\
 &= \varphi_1 \mathbf{d}x^1 \wedge (\Psi_1 A^1 + \Psi_2 A^2 + \Psi_3 A^3) + \varphi_2 \mathbf{d}x^2 \wedge (\Psi_1 A^1 + \Psi_2 A^2 + \Psi_3 A^3) + \varphi_3 \mathbf{d}x^3 \wedge (\Psi_1 A^1 + \Psi_2 A^2 + \Psi_3 A^3)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= (\varphi_1 \Psi_1 dx^1 \wedge A^1 + \varphi_1 \Psi_2 dx^1 \wedge A^2 + \varphi_1 dx^1 \wedge \Psi_3 A^3) + \dots + \dots$$

$$= (\varphi_1 \Psi_1 dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + \varphi_1 \Psi_2 dx^1 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + \varphi_1 dx^1 \wedge \Psi_3 dx^1 \wedge dx^2) + \dots + \dots$$

$$= (\varphi_1 \Psi_1 dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + 0 + 0) + (\varphi_2 \Psi_2 dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + 0 + 0) + (\varphi_3 \Psi_3 dx^3 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2 + 0 + 0)$$

$[dx^i \wedge dx^i = 0 \text{ by (35.4)}]$

$$= \varphi_1 \Psi_1 dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 + \varphi_2 \Psi_2 dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dx^1 + \varphi_3 \Psi_3 dx^3 \wedge dx^1 \wedge dx^2$$

$$= (\varphi_1 \Psi_1 + \varphi_2 \Psi_2 + \varphi_3 \Psi_3) dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \quad (\text{shift 2nd and 3rd basis terms by two positions to obtain } + dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3)$$

$$= (\underline{\varphi} \cdot \underline{\Psi}) V$$

P. 400, ¶5, [exercise] Derive $\nabla \cdot [f \underline{\Psi}] = (\nabla f) \cdot \underline{\Psi} + f \nabla \cdot \underline{\Psi}$ directly.

I'm not sure what is meant by “directly”, but the following seems to work well.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot [f \underline{\Psi}] &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \\ \partial_2 \\ \partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} f \Psi_1 \\ f \Psi_2 \\ f \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 (f \Psi_1) \\ \partial_2 (f \Psi_2) \\ \partial_3 (f \Psi_3) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 f \Psi_1 \\ \partial_2 f \Psi_2 \\ \partial_3 f \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} f \partial_1 \Psi_1 \\ f \partial_2 \Psi_2 \\ f \partial_3 \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 f \\ \partial_2 f \\ \partial_3 f \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} + f \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \\ \partial_2 \\ \partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} = (\nabla f) \cdot \underline{\Psi} + f \nabla \cdot \underline{\Psi} = ((\nabla f) + f \nabla) \cdot \underline{\Psi} \end{aligned}$$

[The last part may not be valid notation after the final equal sign, but it does give a more vivid impression of the contributions of the gradients of f and $\underline{\Psi}$.]

Now derive $\nabla \times [f \underline{\Psi}] = (\nabla f) \times \underline{\Psi} + f \nabla \times \underline{\Psi}$ directly.

$$\nabla \times [f \underline{\Psi}] = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \\ \partial_2 \\ \partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} f \Psi_1 \\ f \Psi_2 \\ f \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 (f \Psi_3) - \partial_3 (f \Psi_2) \\ \partial_3 (f \Psi_1) - \partial_1 (f \Psi_3) \\ \partial_1 (f \Psi_2) - \partial_2 (f \Psi_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

Apply Leibnitz differentiation to every matrix entry and rearrange.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2(f) \Psi_3 + f \partial_2 \Psi_3 - \partial_3(f) \Psi_2 - f \partial_3 \Psi_2 \\ \partial_3(f) \Psi_1 + f \partial_3 \Psi_1 - \partial_1(f) \Psi_3 - f \partial_1 \Psi_3 \\ \partial_1(f) \Psi_2 + f \partial_1 \Psi_2 - \partial_2(f) \Psi_1 - f \partial_2 \Psi_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\partial_2(f) \Psi_3 - \partial_3(f) \Psi_2) + (f \partial_2 \Psi_3 - f \partial_3 \Psi_2) \\ (\partial_3(f) \Psi_1 - \partial_1(f) \Psi_3) + (f \partial_3 \Psi_1 - f \partial_1 \Psi_3) \\ (\partial_1(f) \Psi_2 - \partial_2(f) \Psi_1) + (f \partial_1 \Psi_2 - f \partial_2 \Psi_1) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2(f) \Psi_3 - \partial_3(f) \Psi_2 \\ \partial_3(f) \Psi_1 - \partial_1(f) \Psi_3 \\ \partial_1(f) \Psi_2 - \partial_2(f) \Psi_1 \end{pmatrix} + f \begin{pmatrix} \partial_2 \Psi_3 - \partial_3 \Psi_2 \\ \partial_3 \Psi_1 - \partial_1 \Psi_3 \\ \partial_1 \Psi_2 - \partial_2 \Psi_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 f \\ \partial_2 f \\ \partial_3 f \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} + f \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 \\ \partial_2 \\ \partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \\ \Psi_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= (\nabla f) \times \underline{\Psi} + f \nabla \times \underline{\Psi} = (\nabla f + f \nabla) \times \underline{\Psi}
\end{aligned}$$

[Same comment regarding validity of notation after final equal sign.]

P. 401. Discussion/review of page and the idea that we can use the above ideas to encapsulate Maxwell's complete laws of electromagnetism in just two equations.

The two **source-free** equations:

$\nabla \cdot \underline{\mathbf{B}} = 0$ Gradient of the coefficient functions $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$ of the 2-form magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ equals 0.

$\nabla \times \underline{\mathbf{E}} + \partial_t \underline{\mathbf{B}} = 0$ Curl of coefficient functions $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ of electrical field $\mathbf{E}$ plus partial wrt time t of coefficient functions $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$ of 2-form magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ equals 0.

Needham presents the general differential $d\mathbf{f}$ of any function in four space-time dimensions in terms of $d\mathbf{s}$ (the spatial part) plus a differential on the time part t .

$$d\mathbf{f} = d\mathbf{s} f + \partial_t f dt$$

Then he says "Now consider the exterior derivative of the Faraday 2-form, (34.22):

$d\mathbf{F} = d(\epsilon \wedge d\mathbf{t}) + d\mathbf{B}$ " [ϵ should be the electric field 1-form $\epsilon = E_x d\mathbf{x} + E_y d\mathbf{y} + E_z d\mathbf{z}$ (34.19), if Needham has maintained that identity.]

The two summands of the Faraday 2-form are to be evaluated separately, and in turn, starting with $d\mathbf{s}(\epsilon) \wedge d\mathbf{t}$. The result should be the "[flux 2-form of $\nabla \times \underline{\mathbf{E}}$] $\wedge dt$ ", as shown in (36.5) and the equation in ¶4 of §36.5, with the substitution of $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ for φ .

$$d(\epsilon \wedge dt) = d_S(\epsilon) \wedge dt = (\partial_i E_j (dx^i \wedge dx^j)) \wedge dt \quad (\text{by 36.4 and 36.5})$$

One could also write this more iconically as

$$[(\nabla \times \underline{E})_i \cdot A_i] \wedge dt,$$

where $(\nabla \times \underline{E})_1 \cdot A_1 = (\partial_2 E_3 - \partial_3 E_2) dx^2 \wedge dx^3$. Needham writes it as the “[flux 2-form of $\nabla \times \underline{E}$] $\wedge dt$ ”.

The result is a 3-form. ?[Since dF is a sum of forms and itself a form, its second term dB must also be a 3-form.]

Needham reduces $d_S B$ to $(\nabla \cdot \underline{B}) V$. Then, to complete the general differential $df = d_S f + \partial_t f dt$, all that remains is to find $\partial_t B dt = \partial_t (B) \wedge dt$. By (34.20), B is the flux 2-form

$$B = B_x(dy \wedge dz) + B_y(dz \wedge dx) + B_z(dx \wedge dy).$$

Taking just the first term,

$$\partial_t [B_x(dy \wedge dz)] \wedge dt = \partial_t B_x(dy \wedge dz) \wedge dt$$

When all three terms are written, the result is written $\partial_t \underline{B} \wedge dt$. Needham points out that $\partial_t \underline{B}$ has the flux 2-form $\partial_t B$. I don't understand exactly what that is in terms of vectors. If one grants that $dB = (\nabla \cdot \underline{B}) V + \partial_t \underline{B} \wedge dt$, then one can write (in the order created),

$$dF = [(\nabla \times \underline{E})_i \cdot A_i] \wedge dt + (\nabla \cdot \underline{B}) V + \partial_t \underline{B} \wedge dt$$

then rearrange and put the two terms under wedge dt in curly brackets

$$= (\nabla \cdot \underline{B}) V + \{(\nabla \times \underline{E})_i \cdot A_i + \partial_t \underline{B}\} \wedge dt$$

This format appears to have the advantage of adding two time-dependent flux terms together before adding them to a strictly spatial divergence term. A very concrete space-time example would be useful at this point.

P. 402. In 4-space, these may be useful points of reference.

$$*J = -\rho V + \{\text{flux 2 - form of } \underline{j}\} \wedge dt \quad (36.18)$$

$$d * F = 4 \pi * J = 4 \pi [-\rho V + \{\text{flux 2 - form of } \underline{j}\} \wedge dt] \quad (\text{p. 402})$$

$$= 4 \pi [-\rho \, dx \wedge dy \wedge dz + \{j^1 \, dy \wedge dz + j^2 \, dz \wedge dx + j^3 \, dx \wedge dy\} \wedge dt]$$