

Uniqueness in Relativistic Hydrodynamics

Peter Kostädt and Mario Liu*

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hannover,
30167 Hannover, Germany
(February 14, 2021)*

The choice of the 4-velocity in the relativistic hydrodynamics proposed by Landau and Lifshitz is demonstrated to be the only one satisfying all general principles. Especially the far more widely adopted Eckart choice has to be abandoned.

ITP-UH-11/96

Three reasons come to mind for seeking a covariant formulation of the hydrodynamic theory for simple fluids: In a fundamental vein, we want hydrodynamics as a basic theory to be covariant; in fact, this was one of the first few tasks tackled after the birth of special relativity. More practically, relativistic hydrodynamics is increasingly employed in cosmology and astrophysics to study dissipative processes, such as the relaxation of inhomogeneities in the early universe, or its viscosity-driven, inflationary expansion [1]. Finally, any residual ambiguities in the relativistic hydrodynamics are an indication of our less-than-perfect grasp also of the Galilean version. They require close scrutiny.

Covariant hydrodynamics can be found in most textbooks on relativity and astrophysics. Better ones give two versions, one due to Eckart [2,3], the other by Landau and Lifshitz (LL) [4]. While Eckart pins the macroscopic 4-velocity u^μ to the total particle current, LL set it proportional to the total energy flux. So there is no dissipative particle current in the Eckart version, in direct analogy to the non-relativistic case; while LL — at first sight somewhat odd — do have one, and they refrain from a dissipative energy current instead. In the literature, the Eckart version is much more widely employed [1,3,5], it seems the more traditional theory. Yet, both reduce to the familiar non-relativistic hydrodynamics for $c \rightarrow \infty$; besides, standard textbooks (eg. Weinberg [3]) regard the two versions as equivalent, as being related by a simple transformation of the velocity. Clearly, one need not worry about a mere difference in the reference frame.

This equivalence, however, is a fallacy. Let us recall how the velocity is defined in hydrodynamic theories, consider first the non-relativistic case. The standard Gibbs relation, valid not only when equilibrium reigns, takes the entropy density s as a function of five conserved densities, energy ϵ , momentum \mathbf{g} , and mass ϱ ,

$$T ds = d\epsilon - \mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{g} - \mu d\varrho. \quad (1)$$

It states unequivocally that the velocity is a thermodynamic quantity, $\mathbf{v} \equiv -T(\partial s / \partial \mathbf{g})$, known if the local entropy density is. It contains only equilibrium information. This is of course the concept of local equilibrium, one of the few founding principles of the hydrodynamic

theory: It takes far less time to establish equilibrium locally than globally; the first is a microscopic time τ (referred to as the collision time in dilute systems), the other grows with the system dimension and is macroscopic. As long as the frequency is small enough, $\omega\tau \ll 1$, the Gibbs relation holds, and all thermodynamic variables ϵ , \mathbf{g} , ϱ , and their conjugate variables T , \mathbf{v} , μ contain only information about the local equilibrium state. Especially, they possess a well defined parity under time reversal. The relativistic description is hardly different: The velocity \mathbf{v} becomes the 4-velocity, $u_\mu \equiv -T(\partial s^\nu / \partial T^{\mu\nu})$, with s^μ and $T^{\mu\nu}$ being the equilibrium entropy 4-vector and energy-momentum tensor, respectively. So u^μ too contains only equilibrium information.

Now, the difference between the two 4-velocities mentioned above is clearly in dissipative quantities, so at least one contains non-equilibrium information and cannot be the correct hydrodynamic velocity. This argument agrees with the prima facie evidence that the two versions of relativistic hydrodynamics have different types of differential equations. For example, the equation for the transverse velocity is elliptic in the Eckart version, and parabolic in that of LL. (In the so-called extended thermodynamic theories — cf. discussion below — the equation can be rendered hyperbolic for either choice of the 4-velocity. Still, as these are extensions of different hydrodynamic theories, they remain distinctly different.)

Having clarified that both versions are inequivalent, we obviously need to address the question: Which, if any, is the correct theory for relativistic dissipative fluids? In seeking uniqueness in a relativistic theory — since the $c \rightarrow \infty$ limit proves inconclusive — it is natural to examine how uniqueness is achieved in the Galilean version. Unfortunately, this is something of a red herring, as the lack of a dissipative particle current in the Galilean hydrodynamics, or $\mathbf{j} = \varrho \mathbf{v}$, is more a statement of microscopic plausibility, and maybe the bold summary of countless experiments; it is not the result of a cogent and general deduction. In fact, a classic paper by Dzyaloshinskii and Volovik [6] proposes to include the dissipative term $\mathbf{j} - \varrho \mathbf{v} \sim \nabla \mu$.

Nevertheless, a footnote by LL, in §49 of [4], states that the mass current \mathbf{j} should always be equal to the

momentum density $\mathbf{g} = \varrho \mathbf{v}$, and therefore cannot possess any dissipative terms. Their line of argument, regrettably, falls short of being ironclad: Starting from the continuity equation and the center-of-mass motion, they assert the validity of $\int dV \mathbf{g} = \int dV \mathbf{j}$, where the integration volume is that of the total system. The reader is left wondering especially about the alleged equivalence to the local relation $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j}$.

In this paper, we shall ameliorate both aspects. We provide a clear cut proof of $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j}$, demonstrating the rigorous validity of the standard form of the Galilean hydrodynamics; and we demonstrate that only the LL version of the relativistic hydrodynamic theory conforms to all general principles. The proof $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j}$ takes place in very much the same way as deducing the symmetry of the momentum flux, or stress tensor, from local angular momentum conservation. The relevant conserved density here is $\mathbf{i} \equiv \varrho \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{g}t$, with \mathbf{x} and t denoting the space and time coordinates, respectively. While \mathbf{i} is known to be additive, conserved, and the direct consequence of the invariance under Galilean boosts [7], it has not been hitherto included in thermodynamic and hydrodynamic considerations. As will become clear soon, this is a serious omission. Its inclusion not only establishes the form of the mass flux, but also leads to general thermodynamic equilibrium conditions that are valid for any reference frame. Surprisingly, these simple yet fairly fundamental relations are new.

Relativistically, the information of $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j}$ is automatically included in the symmetry of the energy-momentum tensor, though \mathbf{j} is now the inertial mass current, ie. the total energy flux including the rest mass. Since the momentum density remains a thermodynamic variable, with a negative parity under time inversion, neither the momentum density nor the inertial mass current may contain any dissipative terms (in the local rest-frame). This excludes any covariant theory that does not adopt the LL 4-velocity.

Two pieces of information were needed in each of the above cases: (i) The equality of the momentum density to the (rest or inertial) mass current; (ii) the fact that the momentum density is a thermodynamic variable with a well defined parity. It is ironic that while the condensed matter people were wondering about the first piece, which for the relativists is a trivial consequence of the 4-notation, the latter ignored the second, something the former group never does. We physicists are indeed a community divided by notations. Piercing both pieces together, the kinship to be expected between the two versions of hydrodynamics becomes evident. For instance, repeating the relativistic mistake in the non-relativistic theory, ie. violating the second condition while upholding the first, leads to, as will become clear soon,

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j} = \varrho \mathbf{v} - \chi (\nabla \mu + \partial_t \mathbf{v}). \quad (2)$$

This is in striking similarity to the momentum density in

the Eckart theory, the dissipative part of which has the form $\tau^{i4} = -\chi (T^{-1} \partial_i T + \partial_t u_i)$ [3]. Yet Eq. (2) is manifestly unphysical: The total and conserved momentum must remain $\int d^3x \varrho \mathbf{v}$, irrespective whether the system is in equilibrium or not, or what its acceleration is.

Of the three issues plaguing the relativistic hydrodynamics — uniqueness, causality and stability — we focus on the first. But we need to comment on the other two, as they have been the starting points of worthwhile efforts in the past that partially tie in with our results. First, causality. Strictly speaking, the diffusion equation implies signals with infinite velocity, or horizontal “world lines”. While unphysical generally, this defect is aggravated in relativity: When viewed from a different frame, the world lines tilt, implying signals that go backwards in time. To repair this, extended thermodynamic theories [5,8] were put forward which start from the hydrodynamic theories but include additional dynamic variables. The resultant larger set of coefficients can be chosen such that all the differential equations are hyperbolic, ensuring causality. The price for this nice feature is a rather more complicated theory, and the difficulty of finding a universally valid and accepted set of additional variables — except perhaps in dilute systems.

But we may also take a more perspective view, and accept that the diffusion equation is not an exact mathematical statement. Rather, it is an approximative description — confined to the hydrodynamic regime, with an accuracy of the order of thermal fluctuations. Taking this into account, (eg. considering only amplitudes of the variables that are above a minimal threshold,) the signal velocity never exceeds that of the constituent particles [9], excluding any acausal consequences.

Next, stability, first in the fluid’s rest frame: The LL theory is stable with respect to small fluctuations around an equilibrium configuration, not so the Eckart version [10], and remarkably, nor the non-relativistic theory that contains Eq. (2). In fact, both suffer from the same problem. Consider a small but spatially homogeneous velocity field with $\nabla p, \nabla \mu = 0$, the Navier-Stokes equation reduces to $\partial_t \mathbf{g} = 0$, or $\varrho \partial_t \mathbf{v} - \chi \partial_t^2 \mathbf{v} = 0$, which (in addition to the usual $\mathbf{v} = \text{const}$) obviously also contains the run-away solution $\sim e^{(e/\chi)t}$. Similarly, with a momentum density that contains the acceleration $\partial_t u_i$, the Eckart choice cannot help to avoid an analogous unstable solution.

This would represent an independent argument favoring the LL choice, except that — as observed by Hiscock and Lindblom [10] — in frames moving with respect to the fluid the diffusion equations in the LL theory also develop diverging solutions, which grow exponentially with microscopically short characteristic times. For lack of space, we briefly summarize our reasons for believing that this frame-dependent instability does not constitute sufficient ground to reject the LL choice, and promise a detailed account in a forthcoming paper. Consider the

parabolic diffusion equation, $\partial_t \vartheta - \alpha \partial_x^2 \vartheta = 0$. Its characteristics are the lines $t = \text{const}$, and only if the initial values are prescribed on one of these, do we have a single bound mode, $\delta \vartheta e^{ikx - \alpha k^2 t}$, with $k \in \mathbb{R}$ [11]. Initial data on a non-characteristic curve, say $x + \beta t = \text{const}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, generally produce two independent solutions. For the simplest case of $\beta = 0$, they are $\delta \vartheta_1 e^{-i(\Omega x + \omega t)} e^{\Omega x}$ for $x < 0$ and $\delta \vartheta_2 e^{i(\Omega x - \omega t)} e^{-\Omega x}$ for $x > 0$, with $\Omega \equiv (\omega/2\alpha)^{1/2}$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. In the respective wrong region, one solution appears unbound. Being invariant with respect to coordinate transformations, the characteristics of the boosted diffusion equation that Hiscock and Lindblom consider are $t = \gamma(\tilde{t} + v\tilde{x}) = \text{const}$, with t the proper time. The solutions they examine, however, satisfy initial data on the non-characteristic $\tilde{t} = \text{const}$, where \tilde{t} is the time in the moving frame. So the appearance of an unbound solution for $\tilde{t} \rightarrow \infty$ is a mathematical consequence to be expected. Nevertheless, the diverging mode, being absent in the rest frame, must not be observable in a moving one. And it is not, as it only exists for negative times \tilde{t} , and decays for $\tilde{t} \rightarrow -\infty$ within a microscopically brief period that is outside the hydrodynamic regime. In fact, this mode is just one of those signals discussed above that run backwards in time in moving frames. (These arguments do not apply to the Eckart instability. It happens in the fluid's rest frame, where any deviation from the non-relativistic hydrodynamics is worrisome.)

The extended theories are stable for both choices of the 4-velocity if linearized; though the Eckart version turns unstable again if non-linear terms are included [12].

We conclude: Within its range of validity, the relativistic hydrodynamics is just as healthy as the non-relativistic theory. If someone is willing to put up with a few acausal consequences, blatant but recognizably outside this range, he retains the benefit of a simpler theory. If not, he may resort to the extended theory — though it has to be one that adheres to the LL choice of the 4-velocity.

Let us now consider the hydrodynamics in greater details, starting again with the non-relativistic version. The equations of motion for the thermodynamic variables of Eq. (1) are,

$$\partial_t s + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{f} = R/T, \quad \partial_t \epsilon + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_t g_i + \partial_k \Pi_{ik} = 0, \quad \partial_t \varrho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0. \quad (4)$$

We explicitly include the conserved quantity

$$\mathbf{I} \equiv \int d^3x (\varrho \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{g} t) = M \mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{G} t \quad (5)$$

in our consideration, where M , \mathbf{G} , and $\mathbf{X}(t)$ denote the total mass, the total momentum, and the center-of-mass coordinate, respectively. Clearly, \mathbf{I}/M is the initial coordinate of the center of mass, so we may perhaps refer to \mathbf{I} as the center-of-mass inertial coordinate (COMIC), and to $\mathbf{i} \equiv \varrho \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{g} t$ as the COMIC density.

Neither the angular momentum nor the COMIC requires an independent equation of motion. Writing $\partial_t(\varepsilon_{ikm} x_k g_m) = -\partial_n(\varepsilon_{ikm} x_k \Pi_{mn}) + \varepsilon_{ikm} \Pi_{mk}$, one finds that the angular momentum density $\varepsilon_{ikm} x_k g_m$ obeys a continuity equation only if $\Pi_{ik} = \Pi_{ki}$. Analogously, $\partial_t(\varrho x_i - g_i t) = -\partial_k(j_k x_i - \Pi_{ik} t) + j_i - g_i$ holds for the COMIC density, a locally conserved quantity, hence $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j}$. This concludes the clear cut and simple proof we were looking for.

Next we deduce thermodynamic equilibrium conditions including the conservation of the COMIC \mathbf{I} . Maximizing the total entropy $S = \int d^3x s$ subject to the conservation of energy, momentum, mass, angular momentum, and COMIC, we have $\int d^3x \{\delta s - \lambda_1 \delta \epsilon + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1 \cdot \delta \mathbf{g} + \lambda_2 \delta \varrho + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2 \cdot \delta(\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{g}) - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 \cdot \delta(\varrho \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{g} t)\} = 0$, where the eleven coefficients $\lambda_{1,2}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{1,2,3}$ are constant Lagrange parameters. Employing Eq. (1), we deduce, for arbitrary variations $\delta \epsilon$, $\delta \varrho$ and $\delta \mathbf{g}$ (with $\delta \mathbf{x} = \delta t = 0$),

$$1/T = \lambda_1, \quad \mu/T = \lambda_2 - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 \cdot \mathbf{x}, \quad (6a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}/T = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2 \times \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 t. \quad (6b)$$

The last expression does not imply an accelerating momentum, as Dixon concluded in Ch.4 §4d of Ref. [5]. To see this directly, consider uniform space and time translations: Setting now $\delta \mathbf{x}$, $\delta t = \text{const}$, and requiring that the equilibrium conditions remain unaltered, we arrive at

$$M \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 = -\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2 \times \mathbf{G} \quad (6c)$$

and the dependent $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 \cdot \mathbf{G} = 0$. Together, the equilibrium conditions (6) are explicitly Galilean covariant: Introducing the chemical potential $\mu_0 = \mu + \frac{1}{2}v^2$ of the local rest-frame, they can be expressed as $T = \bar{T}$, $\mu_0 = \bar{\mu} + \frac{1}{2}[\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{X})]^2$, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{V} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} \times (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{X})$, with $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}(t)$ being the center-of-mass coordinate, and \bar{T} , $\bar{\mu}$, \mathbf{V} , $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ redefined constants. Clearly, μ_0 (and hence the density ϱ) only depends on the rotation velocity in the center-of-mass frame, and not on the center-of-mass motion. Without including the COMIC \mathbf{I} (ie. setting $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_3 = 0$ above) LL obtained, in a similar calculation [13], $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{V} + \boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{x}$, and concluded that the equilibrium velocity \mathbf{v} of a general frame has to be a constant of time. But this is clearly only correct in special frames, when $\mathbf{V} \parallel \boldsymbol{\Omega}$.

Now Eq. (2) is derived. First we remark that the unusual form of the thermodynamic force $\nabla \mu + \partial_t \mathbf{v}$ is a natural consequence of Eqs. (6): This combination vanishes in equilibrium and may therefore serve as a legitimate thermodynamic force. More technically, given the existence of $\mathbf{j}^D = \mathbf{j} - \varrho \mathbf{v}$, both \mathbf{g} and ϵ acquire a dissipative part, $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{g}^{Eq} + \mathbf{j}^D$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon^{Eq} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{j}^D$. Substituting Eqs. (3) and (4) into the Gibbs relation, $T \partial_t s = \partial_t \epsilon^{Eq} - \mathbf{v} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{g}^{Eq} - \mu \partial_t \varrho$, one obtains the entropy production $R = -\mathbf{j}^D \cdot (\nabla \mu + \partial_t \mathbf{v}) + \dots$, from which Eq. (2) [with $\chi > 0$, such that $R > 0$] results.

Turning our attention to special relativity, the relevant hydrodynamic equations (1), (3), and (4) generalize to

$$T ds^\mu = -u_\nu dT^{\nu\mu} - \mu dn^\mu, \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_\mu(s^\mu + \sigma^\mu) = R/T, \quad (8)$$

$$\partial_\nu(T^{\mu\nu} + \tau^{\mu\nu}) = 0, \quad \partial_\mu(n^\mu + \nu^\mu) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Notations: Greek indices run from 1 to 4, Latin indices only to 3; the speed of light is unity; the metric is $\eta^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, -1)$; the coordinate 4-vector is $x^\mu = (\mathbf{x}, t)$, so $\partial_\mu = (\nabla, \partial_t)$; the 4-velocity is $u^\mu = \gamma(\mathbf{v}, 1)$ with $\gamma \equiv (1 - v^2)^{-1/2}$, hence $u^\mu u_\mu = -1$; σ^μ , $\tau^{\mu\nu}$, and ν^μ are the respective dissipative parts of the entropy 4-flux, energy-momentum tensor, and particle 4-flux, they have a different parity under time reversal from their reactive counterparts and vanish in equilibrium.

In the laboratory frame, in which the local fluid velocity is \mathbf{v} , the reactive, equilibrium terms are: $s^\mu = su^\mu$, $T^{\mu\nu} = (e + p)u^\mu u^\nu + p\eta^{\mu\nu}$, and $n^\mu = nu^\mu$, where $p = -e + Ts + \mu n$ is the pressure, $e = \epsilon_0 + \varrho$ the density of total energy, $n = \varrho/m$ the particle number density, and s as before the entropy density, all taken from a local comoving frame. The last three are related by $Tds = de - \mu dn$, so $\mu = m(\partial\epsilon_0/\partial\varrho) + m$ has a different definition than in the Galilean case, but p does not. The relativistic version of the Gibbs relation, Eq. (7), is obtained by multiplying the rest-frame relation with u^μ . The conservation of the 4-angular momentum is ensured by the symmetry of the energy-momentum tensor: $T^{\mu\nu} = T^{\nu\mu}$ and $\tau^{\mu\nu} = \tau^{\nu\mu}$. As discussed, this includes the equality of the momentum density and the total energy flux.

Now consider the explicit form of the dissipative terms σ^μ , $\tau^{\mu\nu}$, and ν^μ . They are determined by the rate of entropy production R , a positive Lorentz scalar. Inserting Eqs. (8) and (9) in (7), and requiring R to be a sum of products of thermodynamic fluxes and forces, we arrive at $T\sigma^\mu = -u_\nu \tau^{\nu\mu} - \mu \nu^\mu$ and

$$R/T = -\tau^{\mu\nu} \partial_{(\mu}[u_{\nu)}/T] - \nu^\mu \partial_\mu(\mu/T), \quad (10)$$

where the bracket denotes symmetrization, eg. $\partial_{(\mu}u_{\nu)} \equiv (\partial_\mu u_\nu + \partial_\nu u_\mu)/2$. Global equilibrium conditions are met if the two forces $\partial_{(\mu}[u_{\nu)}/T]$ and $\partial_\mu(\mu/T)$ vanish. Irreversible thermodynamics generally prescribes the Onsager ansatz, setting $\tau^{\mu\nu}$ and ν^μ as linear combinations of $\partial_{(\mu}[u_{\nu)}/T]$ and $\partial_\mu(\mu/T)$ — subject to the requirements that thermodynamic variables do not possess any dissipative counterparts in the local rest-frame (LRF). The thermodynamic variables of Eq. (7) reduce to $s^4 = s$, $T^{\mu 4} = (\mathbf{g}, e)$, and $n^4 = n$ in the LRF. So the lack of dissipative counterparts implies $\sigma^4 = \tau^{\mu 4} = \nu^4 = 0$, of which the covariant expressions are,

$$u_\mu \sigma^\mu = u_\nu \tau^{\mu\nu} = u_\mu \nu^\mu = 0. \quad (11)$$

These are the conditions implemented by LL, and the ones we need to heed while evaluating Eq. (10).

It must have been a source of confusion that \mathbf{g} itself vanishes in the LRF — reducing $T^{\mu 4}$ to $T^{44} = e$, and seemingly leaving only $\tau^{44} = 0$. This overinterprets the LRF. What we actually need is to examine the infinitesimal changes of the variables, $dT^{\mu 4} = (d\mathbf{g}, de)$, and understand that the LRF does not imply $d\mathbf{g} = 0$, as we must allow for $\partial_t \mathbf{g}$, $\partial_i g_k \neq 0$. Non-relativistically, of course, \mathbf{g} being a thermodynamic variable is never disputed.

It is not incidental that the conditions (11) rule out any time derivative in R . Violating (11), we find from Eq. (10): $\tau^{i4} \sim \partial_t u_i$, $\tau^{44} \sim \partial_t T$, $\nu^4 \sim \partial_t(\mu/T)$ in the LRF. In the equations of motion, each yields its own run-away solution, altogether five. Eckart's conditions, $u_\mu \sigma^\mu = u_\mu u_\nu \tau^{\mu\nu} = \nu^\mu = 0$, partly violate Eqs. (11), so it is not surprising that his “momentum of heat” $\tau^{i4} \sim \partial_t u_i$ gives rise to the instable solution discussed above.

The covariant hydrodynamic theory that entails the 4-velocity as proposed by LL is the appropriate theory to employ if the velocity difference in the system is no longer small when compared to light velocity. However, it does not consider charges and electric currents that are frequently present in astrophysical systems. For this, one needs in addition the covariant version of the dissipative Maxwell equations [14], to be published elsewhere.

We acknowledge financial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

* e-mail: kostaedt or liu@itp.uni-hannover.de

- [1] I. Brevik and L. T. Heen, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **219**, 99 (1994), and references given therein.
- [2] C. Eckart, *Phys. Rev.* **58**, 919 (1940).
- [3] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation* (J. Wiley, New York, 1972).
- [4] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1987).
- [5] W. G. Dixon, *Special Relativity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978).
- [6] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii and G. E. Volovik, *Ann. Phys.* **125**, 67 (1980).
- [7] N. A. Doughty, *Lagrangian Interaction* (Addison-Wesley, Singapore, 1990), Ch. 6.
- [8] W. Israel and J. M. Stewart, *Ann. Phys.* **118**, 341 (1979); R. Geroch and L. Lindblom, *ibid.* **207**, 394 (1991).
- [9] S. R. de Groot, W. A. van Leeuwen, and Ch. G. van Weert, *Relativistic Kinetic Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980), Ch. VI §1e.
- [10] W. A. Hiscock and L. Lindblom, *Phys. Rev. D* **31**, 725 (1985).
- [11] S. G. Mikhlin, *Mathematical Physics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970).
- [12] W. A. Hiscock and T. S. Olson, *Phys. Lett. A* **141**, 125 (1989).
- [13] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics*, Part 1 (Pergamon, Oxford, 1994), §10.
- [14] M. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3580 (1993); **74**, 4535 (1995); Y. Jiang and M. Liu, *ibid.* **77**, 1043, (1996).