

Field: Quantities Spread Over a Domain

IDE-009 · Fundamental Ideas

Concept essays for The Universe and Its Observers

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v0.5 EN · 19 September 2026

Status: Publication version

Article form: Concept essay

Scale / context: Continuum descriptions from laboratory to astrophysical scales

Boundary: The general organizing idea of a field; what a quantum field is and why particles are its excitations belong to IDE-021

Related works: IDE-021, IDE-002, IDE-018

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

Licence at publication: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

A field assigns a value to every point of a domain: a number, a vector, a tensor or a more elaborate object, defined over space, over space and time, or over another index set. The idea began as a way to replace action at a distance with something local. Faraday's lines of force and Maxwell's equations turned it from a picture into a dynamical theory in which the field carries energy and momentum and propagates at finite speed.[1,2] The same construction now organizes fluid velocity, temperature, stress and concentration. This article treats the field as an organizing idea: what it takes to define one, what makes the description powerful, when a field is a physical constituent rather than a bookkeeping device, and where the idea stops. What a quantum field is, and why particles are its excitations, belongs to IDE-021.

In 60 Seconds

A field is a map from a domain to a set of values. Name the domain, the values and the equations they obey, and you have a field theory. The move that made the idea indispensable was local: instead of one body pulling on another across empty space, each body sources a field, and the field acts where the other body is.[1,6] Maxwell's equations made that concrete, and they carry a consequence that action at a distance cannot deliver. Disturbances propagate at finite speed, so between emission and absorption the energy and momentum have to be somewhere, and the field is where they are.[2,3] That is the test which separates a field with physical standing from a convenient chart. A temperature field or a fluid velocity field is an averaged description of molecular degrees of freedom, useful above a resolution and undefined below it.[4] An electromagnetic field is not eliminable in the same way: it carries momentum that can be measured as radiation pressure.[5] The mathematics alone does not say which case you are in. The dynamics and the conservation laws do.

Why This Question Matters

Field language now covers so much ground that it hides a distinction worth keeping. Saying that something is described by a field says nothing about whether the field is a constituent of the world or a

summary of something else. Treat every field as a substance and you end up asking what the medium is made of; treat every field as bookkeeping and you lose the physical content of Maxwell's theory, in which momentum genuinely resides in the field between one charge and another. The distinction also settles humbler questions: what a boundary condition is, what a local law can constrain, and how much work the word local is doing.

1. What It Takes to Define a Field

A field is specified by three things: a domain, a target and a rule. The domain is the set of points at which the quantity is defined, usually a region of space or of spacetime but sometimes a surface, a lattice or a configuration space. The target says what sits at each point: a single number for a scalar field such as temperature or electrostatic potential, a directed quantity for a vector field such as fluid velocity, a matrix-valued object for a tensor field such as stress. The rule is the set of equations the assignment must satisfy.

The target is not a free choice of notation. It fixes how the values must transform when the description is rewritten in different coordinates, and that transformation law is what makes the field an object rather than a table of numbers. A temperature does not change when the axes are rotated; the components of a velocity do, and they do so in a determined way. Writing a field correctly means writing something whose physical content survives the change of description.[3]

The rule is usually a differential equation, and that choice carries a commitment. Differential equations relate what happens at a point to what happens in its immediate neighbourhood, so the moment a field is governed by one, influence has been made to travel through the domain step by step rather than to jump. Boundary and initial conditions then do the rest of the work: the same equation describes a guitar string and a cavity mode, and the difference is the boundary.

Where That Leaves Us

A field is a domain, a set of values with a transformation law, and equations connecting neighbouring points. That last element is not a technicality. Choosing a differential rule is choosing to make influence propagate through the domain instead of leaping across it, which is exactly the property that made physicists prefer fields to forces acting at a distance.

2. Locality: The Reason the Idea Took Over

Newtonian gravity works, and it is not a field theory in the strong sense. It gives the force between two masses directly, with no account of anything in between and no delay. Faraday, who distrusted action at a distance, described magnetic effects instead by lines of force filling the space around a magnet, and argued that those lines have a physical existence in the intervening space rather than being a diagram of forces on a test body. He stated that conclusion as one he held with hesitation. [1,7]

Maxwell turned that intuition into equations, and the equations produced something the older picture could not. They admit wave solutions that travel at a speed fixed by two measurable electrical constants, a speed that matched the measured speed of light.[2] Light became an electromagnetic disturbance, and the field stopped being a way of talking about forces and became the thing whose state is being tracked.

Finite propagation forces the accounting question. If a charge is shaken here and another charge responds later over there, the energy and momentum that crossed between them existed during the interval, and they were not in either charge. Classical electrodynamics assigns them to the field, with a definite energy density and a momentum flux, and the assignment is not decorative: radiation pressure is measurable, and momentum conservation for charges alone fails without it. [3,5]

Where That Leaves Us

The field concept won because it made influence local and finite in speed, and because that in turn forced energy and momentum to be attributed to the field itself. Faraday's picture and Maxwell's equations put physical content into the space between bodies. But not every field earns that standing, which raises the question of how to tell the two kinds apart.

3. Effective Fields and Fundamental Fields

A fluid velocity field assigns a velocity to each point of a fluid. There is no such thing as the velocity of the fluid at a mathematical point: the value is an average over a volume containing many molecules but small compared with the scale of the flow. The field is a genuine and predictive object within that window and has no meaning outside it, which is why continuum descriptions fail in rarefied gases where the mean free path becomes comparable to the apparatus.[4]

Temperature behaves the same way. It is defined for a region in local equilibrium, not for a single molecule, and a temperature field presupposes that equilibrium is established locally faster than the field itself changes. When that separation fails, the field does not become inaccurate; it becomes undefined, and a different description has to be used.

The electromagnetic field is not known to be an average of anything, and it is not eliminable from the accounting. This is a claim about current physics rather than a metaphysical guarantee, and its warrant is specific: the field has its own degrees of freedom, carries energy and momentum, and supports states, such as radiation propagating in empty space, with no sources present at all.[3,5] An effective field can be dispensed with in favour of its constituents; this one cannot.

Where That Leaves Us

Some fields summarize a substrate and are defined only above a resolution; others are, as far as present theory goes, constituents in their own right. The test is not the mathematics, which is shared, but whether the field carries independent degrees of freedom and conserved quantities. That same mathematics is why the construction travels so far beyond electromagnetism.

4. The Same Construction Elsewhere

Once the pattern is visible it appears everywhere a quantity varies continuously over a domain: concentration in a solution, stress in a loaded beam, pressure in the atmosphere, elevation over a landscape, population density over a range. In each case the discipline is identical. State the domain, state what is assigned, state the equation and state the resolution below which the assignment stops meaning anything.

The payoff is that solution methods transfer. Diffusion, heat conduction and the spreading of a population in a uniform habitat are governed by the same equation with different constants, so a

result proved once can be reused, and an intuition trained on one carries to another. This is a real economy of thought and a real hazard: shared mathematics does not imply a shared mechanism, and a diffusion equation fitted to a spreading population says nothing about why individuals move.

The discipline also exposes a common error. Drawing a field over a domain where the quantity is not actually defined at every point, for instance a smooth surface fitted through a handful of sampling stations, produces a picture with far more structure than the data support. The interpolation is a model, and the field inherits the model's uncertainty rather than replacing it.

Where That Leaves Us

The construction is portable because it is formal: a domain, an assignment and a local rule can be written for almost any continuously varying quantity. That portability transfers solution methods and also transfers a risk, since sharing an equation is not sharing a mechanism. Knowing what the field idea does not settle is the last piece.

5. Where the Idea Stops

The field concept does not by itself decide ontology. Hesse documents a historical transition from mechanical aether models toward autonomous electromagnetic-field concepts.[6]

Classical field theory also has internal difficulties that are not merely philosophical. The energy of the electromagnetic field of a point charge diverges, and the classical theory of a charged particle interacting with its own field is not consistent without modification.[5] These are problems in the classical framework, and part of what a deeper theory has to address.

That deeper theory is the subject of IDE-021, which asks what a field is when its excitations are quantized and particles appear as those excitations. IDE-009 stops at the classical and general idea: the structure, the reason locality made it dominant, and the difference between a field that summarizes and a field that constitutes.

Where That Leaves Us

A field is a disciplined way of putting a quantity everywhere in a domain and letting neighbouring values constrain each other. It replaced action at a distance, it earned physical standing where it carries conserved quantities, and it remains a summary where it averages a substrate. What happens when such a field is quantized is a different question, and it is the next one.

What We Know, and How

- A field is specified by a domain, a value type with a definite transformation law, and equations relating neighbouring points; the differential form is what makes influence propagate rather than jump.[3]
- Faraday's lines of force replaced action at a distance with a local account,[1,7] and Maxwell's dynamical theory turned it into equations yielding wave solutions that travel at the measured speed of light.[2]
- Finite propagation requires energy and momentum to be attributed to the field in transit;[3,5] radiation pressure and momentum balance make that attribution testable rather than formal. [5]

- Continuum fields such as fluid velocity and temperature are averages defined only above a resolution set by the substrate, and cease to be defined when that separation of scales fails.[4]

What We Still Don't Know

- Whether the classical divergences associated with point sources are an artefact of the classical framework alone or leave a residue in the theories that replace it.
- How best to characterize the resolution at which a continuum field description ceases to be defined in strongly driven or far-from-equilibrium systems, where local equilibrium is not established.
- Whether gravitational degrees of freedom are ultimately field-like in the same sense as electromagnetic ones, a question that belongs to the quantum treatment rather than to the classical concept.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A reproducible measurement of an influence propagating between separated bodies with no field-carried energy or momentum in the interval, after accounting for all known carriers, would undermine the physical reading of the field and return the problem to action at a distance.[3,5]
- A demonstration that electromagnetic radiation in a source-free region can be fully described without attributing independent degrees of freedom to the field would reclassify it as an effective description like fluid velocity.[5]
- Experiments in a rarefied regime showing continuum hydrodynamics remaining accurate where the mean free path exceeds the characteristic length would overturn the standard account of why continuum fields have a domain of validity.[4]

If You Remember Only One Thing

A field puts a value at every point of a domain and lets neighbours constrain each other; whether it is a constituent or a summary depends on what it carries.

Related Articles

- IDE-021 — What Is a Field?
- IDE-002 — Information
- IDE-018 — Connection

References

- [1] Michael Faraday. Experimental researches in electricity — Twenty-eighth series. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London 142, 25-56 (1852). DOI 10.1098/rstl.1852.0004.
- [2] James Clerk Maxwell. A Dynamical Theory of the Electromagnetic Field. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London 155, 459-512 (1865). DOI 10.1098/rstl.1865.0008.
- [3] Richard P. Feynman; Robert B. Leighton; Matthew Sands. The Feynman Lectures on Physics, New Millennium Edition, Vol. II, chapters 1-2, 12 and 27 (the field concept; electrostatic analogs; field energy and momentum). Basic Books (2011), ISBN 978-0-465-02416-2.
- [4] G. K. Batchelor. An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics. Cambridge University Press (1967).

- [5] John David Jackson. Classical Electrodynamics, 3rd ed. Wiley (1999), chapters 6, 7 and 16. ISBN 978-0-471-30932-1.
- [6] Mary B. Hesse. Forces and Fields: The Concept of Action at a Distance in the History of Physics. Thomas Nelson and Sons (1961).
- [7] Michael Faraday. On the physical character of the lines of magnetic force. The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science, series 4, 3(20), 401-428 (1852). DOI 10.1080/14786445208647033.