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ABSTRACT. This paper attempts to throw some light on what is the correct choice of sources for Einstein’s field equations for the gravitational metric, and on the definition of the Cauchy-Noether energy-momentum tensor of relativistic field theories, the natural source of Einstein’s equation.

The paper opens with a brief review of the development of an idea first advanced by Maupertuis (1741): the Dynamical Action Principle. The story reached a turning point with the creation of Einstein’s theory of General Relativity. The associated work of Noether served as an inspiration for particle physics for 100 years. The discovery of gravity waves (LIGO 2016) showed that Gravity is a phenomenon akin to, and part of, particle physics, to be treated as a canonical field theory, and eventually quantized.

Here the subject is the theory of the classical metric field in interaction with extended distributions of matter. We determine a class of Noetherian field theories that provide extended sources for Einstein’s equations and action integrals for classical hydrodynamics. The intimate relationship between hydrodynamics and General Relativity is emphasized.

Results: The 2-form gauge theory of Ogievetskij and Polubarinov (1964) makes a crucial contribution to the matter source of gravity. Multiple, unexpected roles are played by ‘permittivities’. There is a unique, relativistic hydrodynamics with 4 degrees of freedom that includes vorticity, the equation of continuity and a generalization of the Bernoulli equation. It is based on an action principle and it reduces, in the non relativistic limit, to a simple generalization of Lagrange theory of 1760, with just one free parameter.
I. Introduction

First of all, to justify a review, we shall argue that there are challenging problems, in each of three closely intertwined areas of theoretical physics.

Hydrodynamics

The Navier - Stokes equation has been the most important tool in the theory of flows. It is based on an invention by Cauchy, the stress - energy tensor. The main idea is that this tensor is divergence - less, a property that is related to conservation laws. But the Navier - Stokes equation is not a complete dynamical theory; supplemental equations have always been needed, including an expression for the energy. Unfortunately, we do not have any guidance for choosing this expression. Attempts to construct expressions for the energy density of simple systems lead to internal contradictions, as has been pointed out recently. As the system under study gets more complicated the internal inconsistencies become more serious; while at the same time the degree of arbitrariness grows and we lose all predictive power.

Thermodynamics

A beautiful theory was developed during the 19'th century, applicable to one-component homogeneous fluids at equilibrium. But so far there is no uniform approach to binaries, to metastable configurations and to systems out of equilibrium. The common approach is to investigate one phenomenon at a time, applying a different method for each, with little concern for overall consistency. This leaves too much freedom and the result is, again, limited predictive power.

Gravitation

General Relativity was created between 1905 and 1915. The milestone that was reached at the end of that period was the discovery of an action for the metric field. Unlike Hilbert and many others, Einstein was not looking for an action principle but for a set of differential equations. But the equations are very complicated, while the action is simple, so the action principle became the accepted way to look at it, in the early years.

The result was a beautiful theory for the metric, applicable to the case that no matter is present (Einstein 1917). It is based on an action principle with the action

$$A[g] = \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} R[g],$$

where $R[g]$ is the Riemannian curvature scalar. Variation of the action with respect to the metric gives

$$\delta A[g] = \int d^4 x \delta (\sqrt{-g} R) = \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} \delta g_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}$$
General Relativity will become a general theory of gravitation when we know the source \( (T_{\mu\nu}) \) in the equation
\[
G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}.
\]

This is where Noether’s work comes in. Following the path that her work suggests leads to the sources of gravity and to progress in 3 major areas.

Much important work has been done in all of these fields and our intention is to continue that work, with a strong and unusual emphasis on their interdependence. We shall take particle physics as a model, and ask: **to what principal feature does that discipline owe its amazing power of prediction?** Is there a chance of emulating its success in other fields?

We hope to show that the slower rate of development in other disciplines is due to the approach having been more easy going; fundamental principles have not been as strictly implemented. We insist that the interaction of the metric with matter fields must be in the framework of a Noetherian field theory and we show that this emphasis has a strong effect in related fields. Most dramatic is the development of Hydrodynamics, with the discovery of a classical Noetherian field theory that includes flows with vorticity and predicts internal stresses in fluids.

Progress in the theory of gravity will have an immediate application in the non relativistic limit: hydrodynamics. Conversely, a formulation of hydrodynamics as an action principle points to a relativistic theory of gravitation.

Hilbert was concerned about symmetries and conservation laws, and with an action that is invariant under all coordinate transformations, expecting that conservation laws must be the key. Einstein, at first unaware of the connection, did not expect conservation to be important, but he reached the same point of view a little later. Hilbert turned the problem over to Emmy Noether, an algebraist. She was familiar with the energy momentum tensor of Cauchy and she made a most capital discovery (Noether 1918):

**The natural context for a conserved energy momentum tensor is a field theory, defined by an action constructed from scalar fields and a Riemannian metric.**

\[^1\]Not just scalar field; some well known generalizations will be mentioned later.
constructed exclusively from fields $\phi, \psi, ..., \phi_\mu, \psi_\mu, ...$ with respect to the space time coordinates and the components of the metric.

At this point in the history of physics leading scientists turned their creative energy to the development of quantum theory, while the development of the general theory of gravitation developed slowly. This is clearly documented by Misner, Thorne and Wheeler (1972) in their influential textbook. We shall review this important development in the next section.

Quantum Theory and Particle physics

Let us digress for a moment to review the meteoric advance of what is today referred to as Particle Physics.

One feature that characterized quantum theory from the beginning was that it correlates experimental facts with amazing efficiency: a single parameter and Ohm’s law, in the context of Bohr’s atomic model, were enough to give a detailed, numerical account of atomic spectra. Dirac (1926) added a beautiful mathematical structure and the result was that quantum theory became axiomatic. Heisenberg and Pauli created the first quantum field theory (1929). This led to the demand for internal mathematical consistency, to an understanding of the Lamb shift, and to ultraviolet renormalization. What enabled them (Heisenberg and Pauli) to do this was a return to Hamiltonian mechanics; Faddeev and Popov (1967) took the same path to create perturbative quantum gravity. The associated Lagrangian and action became ever more prominent and essential for the progress that eventually led to the electro-weak theory, and the Standard Model.

The point that we wish to make is that the amazing power of prediction of quantum theories is strongly correlated to the fact that they were formulated as action principles. Equally important was the rigid attention to mathematical challenges. It is evident that to ignore ‘theoretical’ or aesthetic requirements is to lose predictive power.

During all of this development of quantum theory there was an acute awareness of the importance of conservation laws and of the debt that was Noether’s due. There are two aspects to her work. For Einstein and Hilbert it was invariance under the infinite dimensional group of general coordinate transformations that helped them understand their theory. Particle physics focused on the finite dimensional subgroup of transformations that leave the metric invariant, and it was this application of Noether’s work that was important in quantum theory, while invariance under general coordinate

\[\text{In this case: renormalizability.}\]
transformations played a lesser role. But this is what concerns us here, as we end the digression to particle physics.

II. A brief history of action principles

The first to formulate a principle of maxima or minima may have been Bernoulli (1738). The mathematical formulation was developed by Euler and Lagrange and led to what we call Lagrangian or Hamiltonian mechanics. An application to minimal surfaces is attributed to Plateau. (See Fomenko, 1989.) On the way a most important contribution was made by Maupertuis (1741) who invented the Action and was the first to formulate a dynamical variational principle, applicable to systems in motion.

According to the textbooks that were in use, 50 - 60 years ago, by students in their first years of physics, the work of Lagrange was motivated as follows. He was aware of the practical importance of changing coordinates, and impressed by the amount of labor that was involved. This led him to look for a reformulation of Newton's equation that would involve quantities with simpler transformation properties. The Lagrangian serves this purpose admirably, for it is a scalar with respect to coordinate transformations and only the Lagrangian needs to be transformed. It contains velocities but no accelerations, and it defines the dynamics. Today the standard way to deal with the Coriolis force and other complicated systems begins by transforming the Lagrangian to moving coordinates.

But there was another advantage. As Poincaré wrote:

"We cannot content ourselves with formulas simply juxtaposed which agree only by a happy chance; it is necessary that these formulas come as it were to interpenetrate one another. The mind will not be satisfied until it believes itself to grasp the reason of this agreement, to the point of having the illusion that it could have foreseen this." (Poicaré 1908)

In Lagrange's formulation of mechanics we are not confronted with a set of equations that agree by happy chance, but by a single function and a concise statement to the effect that actual motions follow the path with the smallest action integral. From this compact statement all the dynamical equations are derived. Also important: the general experience is that the set of equations derived from an action principle have a good chance of being internally consistent.

The paradigm for Lagrangian mechanics is a theory with abstract variables $q_1, ..., q_n$ and a Lagrange function depending on the $q$'s and on the time
derivatives $\dot{q}_1, \ldots, \dot{q}_n$, with $2n$ degrees of freedom. Here we are exclusively interested in Lagrangian field theories, the first on record being the following, with $2$ field degrees of freedom.

**The first Action for Hydrodynamics**

The variables of classical hydrodynamics are a scalar field $\rho$, the density, and a vector field $\vec{v}$, a velocity. The fundamental equations are the equation of continuity

$$\dot{\rho} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

and an equation attributed to Bernoulli, Euler and Lagrange. To Lagrange alone is given the credit for having united the two equations in an action principle, with the action (Lagrange 1760)

$$A_1 = \int dtd^3x \mathcal{L}, \quad \mathcal{L} := \rho (\dot{\Phi} - \nabla \Phi^2/2 - \varphi) - W[\rho]. \quad (2.2)$$

In this theory the velocity field is restricted to the form of a gradient,

$$\vec{v} := -\nabla \Phi. \quad (2.3)$$

Here is one pair of canonically conjugate field variables, the density $\rho$ and the velocity potential $\Phi$. Gravity is represented by Newton’s gravitational potential $\varphi$; so far an external field. The two Euler-Lagrange equations are the equation of continuity (from variation of $\Phi$) and the Bernoulli equation (from variation of the density $\rho$),

$$\dot{\Phi} - \nabla \Phi^2/2 - \frac{\delta W[\rho]}{\delta \rho} = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

The two equations (2.1) and (2.4) are the core of classical and modern hydrodynamics. The action principle is evoked in some textbooks, as in Lamb (1932) and Fetter and Walecka (1980).

The strong appeal of this theory is evident in the development of the theory of aerodynamic lift. The limitation implied by Eq.(2.3) is vividly illustrated in Birkhoff’s review of wind tunnels (Birkhoff 1950). It soon became apparent that this restriction excludes any possibility of lift and drag. Considerable success has been achieved when this condition was applied only locally, but this amounts to a relaxation of axioms, not replaced by other principles. The power of prediction of the action principle were compromised and it has not yet been recovered. And that, we think, is the challenge that must be met.
Thermodynamics

The early development of hydrodynamics were followed by 100 years of decisive progress in thermodynamics. By the middle of the nineteenth century Massieu (1876) reached the conclusion that a thermodynamic system (at equilibrium) is completely defined by any one of a set of fundamental potentials, each of which is qualified to be called energy. This statement was underwritten by Gibbs and its general validity has not been challenged. By Gibbs’ time the energy concept was deeply entrenched and the idea that the energy defines the system was becoming explicit in treatises on thermodynamics. Some of the greatest minds of the 19th century made sustained attempts to formulate thermodynamics as an action principle; among them Helmholtz may have been the most persistent. Poincaré was another physicist who hoped to find an action for thermodynamics. Helmholtz work of 1883 was critically reviewed by Poincaré (1908) who devoted a whole chapter of his own book to it.

Gibbs paper of 1878 made minimum energy and maximum entropy the cornerstones of the theory. Maxwell was greatly inspired by Gibbs and was chasing an action principle when he died prematurely in 1879. See Ruckeyser (1942). But neither Gibbs, nor any of his numerous followers brought to light the action principle that was lying just under the surface of his work.

It is difficult to understand the lack of perseverance of these attempts of the 19th century, for both Gibbs and Helmholtz were very close. The feature of Gibbs’ approach that was most admired by Maxwell was his emphasis on the quartet of variables: \( S, P, V, T \). \(^3\) A part of the answer is in the action for a homogeneous system at rest,

\[
A(S, P, V, T) = F(V, T) + ST + VP. \tag{2.5}
\]

Here \( F \) is the free energy, supposedly given; the entropy \( S \) and the pressure \( P \) are fixed parameters and the manifold of physical configurations is defined by the Euler-Lagrange equations

\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial T} + S = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial V} + P = 0.
\]

The emergence of special relativity in 1905 captured most of the attention until we come to the pivotal discoveries of 1915-1918, Einstein’s - and Hilbert’s - theory of 1915, the great challenge of finding the source for the dynamical metric, and Noether’s treatise of 1918.

\(^3\)Entropy, pressure, volume and temperature.
III. Einstein, Hilbert and Noether

Einstein alone is credited with the creation of General Relativity, but Hilbert independently discovered the action

\[ A[g] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R, \]

only 5 days later. The two men competed, but they collaborated as well, and Hilbert’s influence may have been decisive; it was Hilbert who recruited Emmy Noether to assist in unraveling the mystery of symmetry and conservation laws. Noether must surely have been influenced by Cauchy (1789-1857), whose stress tensor was essentially phenomenological.

What concerns us here is Noether’s second theorem and invariance under general coordinate transformations. The great contribution of Noether was the discovery of the natural environment of the energy momentum tensor.

The second theorem (Noether 1918). Given a Riemannian space with the metric connection. On this space consider a theory of scalar and tensor fields defined by an action

\[ A_{\text{matter}}[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi, \psi, ..., \phi_{\mu}, \psi_{\mu}, ...] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} L, \tag{3.1} \]

constructed from the components of the metric tensor, scalar fields \( \phi, \psi, ... \) and their first order derivatives \( \phi_{\mu} = \partial\phi/\partial x^\mu, ... \) invariant under general transformations of the coordinates.

Suppose further that the fields \( \phi, \psi, ... \) satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations of the action \( A_{\text{matter}} \), with the metric fixed.. Then the tensor field with components

\[ \hat{T}^\mu_{\nu} := \sum_\phi \phi_{\mu} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_{\nu}} - \delta^\mu_\nu L \tag{3.2} \]

satisfies the covariant divergence condition

\[ (\hat{T}^\mu_{\nu})_{;\nu} = 0. \tag{3.3} \]

The proof is an easy calculation in the case that the metric coefficients are independent of the coordinates; it then amounts to calculating the integrals \( \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \partial_\mu L \), the principal step being an integration by parts and the use of the Euler-Lagrange equations. When the components of the metric do depend on the coordinates, one uses the fact that the connection is the
natural one: the covariant derivatives of the metric tensor vanish.\(^4\) Then the
calculation goes through by interpreting the derivatives of the matter fields
as covariant derivatives. The covariant derivative acts as a derivation on the
tensor algebra and the partial integrations are carried through as before.

The lack of uniqueness of the conserved tensor defined by (3.3) alone
is notorious. It is a general experience that this ambiguity is of no physical
significance and that there is one that is symmetric.

We omit details of the proof but illustrate the statement in the special
case of the relativistic action associated with Lagrange’s theory, when

\[
A_2 = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{\rho}{2}(g^{\mu\nu}\psi_\mu\psi_\nu - c^2) - W[\rho] \right).
\] (3.4)

The action (2.2) is the non relativistic limit of (3.4), with (Fronsdal 2007a)

\[
\psi = c^2 t + \Phi, \quad g_{00} = c^2 - 2\varphi.
\] (3.5)

In this case the Noetherian energy momentum tensor is

\[
\hat{T}_{\mu\nu} = \rho\psi_\mu\psi_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}.
\] (3.6)

We call attention to the factor \(\rho\), interpreted as a mass density. It plays the
same role as the permittivity \(\varepsilon\) in electrodynamics, but in hydrodynamics it
is an essential dynamical variable. In empty space \(\rho\) is a constant and the
theory reduces to one of the free field theories of Particle Physics.

The significance of these results will become clear in the next section.

**IV. The field equations**

Variations of the metric action,

\[
A[g] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R
\] (4.1)

with respect to the metric,

\[
\delta A[g] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \delta g^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu},
\] (4.2)

defines the Einstein tensor

\[
G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta R}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R,
\]

\(^4\)See Misner, Thorne and Wheeler (1972).
and gives a unique field equation

\[ G_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad \text{Einstein’s equation in vacuo} \quad (4.3) \]

It is a set of second order differential equations for the components of the metric, an elaborate generalization of Poisson’s equation for the Newtonian potential. It makes no reference to any other fields or sources; it characterizes the metric field in a space time that is empty (a ‘vacuum’) except for the metric itself.

The discovery of field equations for the gravitational metric in empty space was a milestone in the development of a Theory of Gravitation. It has received a direct confirmation only recently, with the discovery of traveling gravitational waves (LIGO 2016). But it is not yet a theory of gravitation. Just as the mass density \( \rho \) appears as a source for the potential in Newton’s theory, we need to add sources to the right hand side of (4.3). This hydrodynamical source has remained obscure for 100 years.

The key to the problem and to its solution is the Bianchi identity.

**The Bianchi identity**

**Theorem.** The Einstein tensor, defined by (4.2), satisfies the following equation,

\[ D_\nu G^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad \text{Bianchi identity} \quad (4.4) \]

identically. The operator \( D_\nu \) is the covariant derivative, with the metric connection.

**Proof.** The action (4.1) is invariant under infinitesimal coordinate transformations,

\[ \delta x^\mu = \xi^\mu, \]

under which

\[ \delta g_{\mu\nu} = D_\mu \xi_\nu + D_\nu \xi_\mu. \]

Hence

\[ \delta A[g] = 2 \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} (D_\mu \xi_\nu) G^{\mu\nu} \quad (4.5) \]

is identically zero. An integration by parts gives

\[ \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} \xi_\mu D_\mu G^{\mu\nu} = 0. \]

Since the vector field \( \xi \) is arbitrary this validates the statement (4.4).
Implications of the Bianchi identity

Let us add a source to Einstein’s equation (4.3):

\[ G_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu}. \] Einstein's Equation cum fontibus \hspace{1cm} (4.6)

Taking the covariant divergence we find

\[ D_{\nu}G^{\mu\nu} = D_{\nu}T^{\mu\nu} = 0. \] \hspace{1cm} (4.7)

The first expression is identically zero; therefore an inevitable consequence is that there can be no solution of Einstein’s equation for any source unless, by virtue of the field equations of the matter fields,

\[ D_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} = 0. \] The Bianchi constraint \hspace{1cm} (4.8)

Eq. (4.8) is a condition of integrability. At first, this condition was treated with great respect and led to the first examples of interactive gravitation theory, among the most important a theory of the metric tensor field interacting with the vector field of electromagnetism, Einstein-Maxwell theory.

This is where Emmy Noether entered history. We have seen that, if a matter action of the type (3.1) is constructed from the metric and from matter fields only, then there is a tensor field

\[ \hat{T}_{\nu}^{\mu} = \sum_{\phi} \phi_{\mu} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_{\nu}} - \delta_{\nu}^{\mu}L \] \hspace{1cm} (4.9)

that satisfies the ‘conservation law’ (3.3) on shell. This equation is identical with the Bianchi constraint (4.8) and the first idea is to identify \( T_{\mu\nu} \) with \( \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \). The first example bears this out. In the case that the matter Lagrangian is (3.4)

\[ T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} A[g] \] \hspace{1cm} (4.10)

coincides with the Noether tensor (3.6). But if we try to extend this success to invent a coupling between the metric and electromagnetism then we find that in that case \( \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \) is not symmetric, while (4.10) clearly is. Misner, Thorne and Wheeler (1972) turned away from electromagnetism at this point but it is well known that the conserved tensor of Maxwell’s theory can be modified to make it both symmetric and conserved.

Therefore, let us explore the action

\[ A_{\text{total}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g}R + k A_{\text{matter}}, \quad k = \text{const}. \]
The field equation is
\[-\frac{1}{k} G^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} A_{\text{matter}} = T^{\mu\nu}.\]

This tensor is not always proportional to the Noether tensor, but it is evidently symmetric, and it is conserved.

**Proof.** Calculate the total variation of the matter Lagrangian under an infinitesimal coordinate transformation \( \delta x^\mu = \xi^\mu \). On shell, that is, by virtue of the matter field equations it is,
\[
\delta A_{\text{total}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \delta g_{\mu\nu} T^{\mu\nu} - k \xi^\mu D_\nu \mathring{T}^{\mu\nu} \right).
\]
This quantity is zero by invariance; the last term is zero by Noether’s theorem; therefore the first term on the right is also zero. \( QED \)

For example, in the case of the electromagnetic field,
\[
\mathcal{L} = F^2, \quad T_{\mu\nu} = 2 g^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\mu} F_{\beta\nu} - \frac{1}{2} F^2 g_{\mu\nu},
\]
and, on shell
\[
(T^{\nu}_{\mu})_{;\nu} = F^{\alpha\beta}(dF)_{\beta\alpha\mu} = 0.
\]

**Conclusion**

We have verified the (well known) fact that a class of relativistic field theories, the Noetherian field theories defined in (3.1), provide sources for Einstein’s field equation. It would be satisfying to be able to state that this is the only way. This we cannot do, as the following is intended to show.

Following the lead of Misner, Thorne and Wheeler, we invoke the Palatini formalism. In a Riemannian space with metric \( g \) and connection \( \Gamma \) let \( R[g, \Gamma] \) be the well known expression for the curvature scalar. Take
\[
A[g, \Gamma] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R[g, \Gamma].
\]
and let
\[
A_{\text{matter}}[g, \Gamma, \phi, \psi, ...]
\]
be the action of an invariant field theory. If \( \Gamma \) is not the metric connection, then the Bianchi identity is modified, for a coordinate transformation will affect both \( g \) and \( \Gamma \). There will, of course, be conditions of integrability, but
we have learned that it is nothing more than an expression of invariance. That is, the only (known) condition of integrability is that the action must be invariant.

However, there are other reasons why the metric connections is preferred, including the importance of geodesics. And no consistent theories of interacting fields of high spin are known.\textsuperscript{5} We shall probably not be making a mistake if we conclude that the Noetherian field theories must be the first choice for the source of Einstein’s equations. And this, finally, is what gives the theory its power of prediction.

V. Hydrodynamics

The action (3.4) is the simplest one possible. We can generalize it by adding the energy momentum tensors of any number of scalar field theories, but that will not bring in vorticity. What about field theories with spin?

The proof of Noether’s theorem depends on the fact that the matter action involves matter fields and the metric only, which is true of (3.4). This condition is also satisfied by Maxwell’s theory and any relativistic field theory in which the covariant derivatives can be replaced by ordinary derivatives, as in vector gauge theories. Finally it is true in the gauge theory of the relativistic 2-form that was studied by Ogievetskij and Polubarinov (1964).

If we restrict our attention to hydrodynamics the simplest possibilities are:

Type 1. The action for the spinless field is \( A_1[\rho, \Phi] \) in (3.4). The non relativistic limit is the Lagrange action (2.2) of 1760, the action of irrotational hydrodynamics, with 2 degrees of freedom.

Type 2. A 2-form field \( Y = (Y_{\mu \nu}) \) with the Lagrangian density \( dY^2 \) that was analyzed by Ogievetskij and Palubarinov (1964). It is mixed with electromagnetism in the following Lagrangian,

\[
A_3[Y, F] = \int d^4x \left( \sqrt{-g}(\rho dY^2 + \epsilon F^2) + \gamma dY dF \right), \quad (5.1)
\]

to give a mass to the photon. It does not have an equation of continuity and no conserved mass flow. This field theory, as well as its non relativistic limit, was used by Lund and Regge (1976) in their work on vortices in superfield Helium, with the density \( \rho \) uniform.

Type 3. Two or more Type 1 theories can be combined to describe hydrodynamic or thermodynamic mixtures, without vorticity.

\textsuperscript{5}For simplicity we have limited our discussion to bosonic field theories.
Type 4. Much more interesting is a combination of Type 1 and Type 2, including a mixing term,

\[ A_4[\rho, \Phi, Y] = A_2[\rho, \Phi] + A_3[\rho, Y] + \kappa \int d^4 x \rho dY d\psi. \]  

The non relativistic hydrodynamic limit in a physical gauge is

\[ A_4[\rho, \Phi, Y] = \int d^4 x \left( \rho (\dot{\Phi} + \frac{\vec{\nabla}^2}{2} + \kappa \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi - \vec{\nabla} \Phi \nabla^2/2 - \varphi) - W[\rho] \right). \]  

Here the electromagnetic fields have been omitted. Another mixing term (the \( \kappa \)-term) is included, for it is the source of vorticity. The vector field \( \vec{X}^i = \epsilon^{ijk} Y_{jk} \); the components \( Y_{0i} \) are zero in the physical gauge. This is a model of compressible hydrodynamics with an equation of continuity, vorticity (if \( \kappa \neq 0 \)) and internal stress.

Variation of the scalar potential gives the equation of continuity,

\[ \dot{\rho} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v}) = 0, \quad \vec{v} = \kappa \vec{X} - \vec{\nabla} \Phi. \]

Hence \( \vec{v} \), as defined here, is the velocity of mass flow. The vorticity is

\[ \vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{v} = \kappa \vec{\nabla} \wedge \vec{X}. \]

This is the only Noetherian field theory with 4 degrees of freedom, vorticity and a conserved mass flow.

It is the only choice for simple hydrodynamics.

This theory has already been applied to several interesting problems, including cylindrical Couette flow, menisci on compressible fluids and fluid stress, and rotating planets (Fronsdal 2017, 218a,b, 2019). The relativistic version can be used for planets, other rotating heavy bodies including Black Holes, and for the dynamics of The Milky Way and other galaxies, to explain the anomalous velocities. Rotating planets have been studied in the Newtonian approximation, with the result that planetary rings appear naturally, without the need to invoke a cataclysmic history.

Apropos the scalar field \( \rho \)

Its inclusion of the density as a factor in Eq.(3.4), is clearly essential to obtain the correct non relativistic limit. It is an important novelty that was missing in early attempts to use particle-type field theories to construct sources for Einstein’s equation. It is analogous to the classical treatment
of electromagnetic fields in an extended medium. A version of electromagnetism has a dynamical permitivity (Fronsdal 2007b). It may have an application to the theory of electromagnetic fields on a background of a photon gas; or it may be used as an infrared regularizing device. Even gravity can be modified by including a density factor in the action. Infrared regularization is a prerequisite for quantization of Gravity (Weinberg 1970; Marciano and Sirlin 1975).

The existence of a large number of material fields has contributed to the tradition that draws a line separating hydrodynamic matter fields from the fundamental fields of particle theory. But the electromagnetic potential has a universal interaction with matter fields, distinguished only by charge. The fields $\Phi$ and $\vec{X}$ are non relativistic. To construct sources for the metric it was necessary to promote them to relativistic, propagating fields. The most economical approach by far is to regard the relativistic velocity fields $\psi$ and $Y$ as being fundamental fields to be grouped with the electromagnetic fields and the metric field. According to General Relativity the metric has a universal coupling to all forms of matter; apparently, so do the velocity fields. In empty space $\Phi$, $Y$ and $A$ are massless, in a massive medium it is the non relativistic formulation that is appropriate.

VI. Rotating bodies and spinning particles or strings.

The Milky way

Let us consider the non relativistic approximation to Einstein’s field equation. The metric action gives us the left hand side: $\Delta \varphi$. In the case that the matter action is just (3.4) the non relativistic approximation, for stationary flows, is

$$\frac{1}{k} \Delta \varphi = T_{00} = \rho c^2 + h.$$  

The first term is a unique contribution of the irrotational velocity field, so that this must always be present. It comes from the irrotational part of the matter Lagrangian.

Consider a heavenly fluid body, such as a rotating galaxy in a stationary state of motion. In general, for stationary flows and non relativistic velocities,

$$\frac{1}{k} \Delta \varphi = \rho c^2 + \dot{X}^2/2 + \nabla \Phi^2 + g \varphi.$$  

Only the velocity of mass flow, $\vec{v} = \kappa \dot{X} - \nabla \Phi$, is readily observable so this grants some freedom to adjust the relation between $v$ and $r$. (It is not expected that the two vector fields have the same dependence on the distance
r from the center.) A contribution of the field $\vec{X}$ will result in an anomalous velocity curve of the type that has been interpreted in terms of dark matter.

It is observed that an accumulation of dust tends to condense to a fluid or solid body. It has been conjectured that strings might form and it has been suggested that that the 2-form field may apply to vortex strings. If particle-like objects are formed one may ask if they move on geodesics. Another possibility is that the 2-form field is concentrated on a string, as was envisioned by Lund and Regge. The Newtonian potential of a long string is logarithmic; it would account perfectly for the galactic velocity curves.

**Particles**

What gives the Noetherian theory its great predictive power is the fact that the 2-form gauge theory has strong constraints and only one propagating mode. In otherwise empty space, with constant density, it is

$$\vec{X}(x, t) = \vec{k}e^{i(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x} - i|\vec{k}|t)}.$$ 

The stationary sector is characterized by the gauge constraint

$$\vec{\nabla} \wedge (\rho \vec{w}) = 0, \quad \vec{w} := \vec{X} + \kappa \Phi.$$ 

It is this constraint that reduces the number of degrees of freedom to just 2, giving the theory its very high predictive power. It has been applied to static phenomena (menisci, metastable configurations) and stationary flows (rotating planets, cylindrical Couette flows); applications to superfluids and sonoluminescence are planned. Applications to General Relativity include the hydrodynamic structure of Galaxies.

To finish on a speculative note: Having come to the conclusion that the proposed Noetherian theory is the most natural theory that includes interactions between Einstein’s metric and matter fields we must ask if this theory, with its Green-Schwartz term in (5.3), is renomalizable.
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