

Cornerstones of a theory of anomalous scaling in turbulence

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

1996 Phys. Scr. 1996 131

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/1402-4896/1996/T67/026>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 132.76.61.22

This content was downloaded on 06/09/2016 at 16:16

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

You may also be interested in:

[Anomalous scaling and anisotropy in turbulence](#)

Willem van de Water and Janine A Herweijer

[Intermittency and non-gaussian statistics in turbulence](#)

Zhen-Su She

[Analytical and numerical approaches to structure functions in magnetohydrodynamic turbulence](#)

Rainer Grauer and Christiane Marliani

[Correlators of Velocity Differences and Energy Dissipation as an Element in the Subcritical Scenario for Non-Kolmogorov Scaling in Turbulence](#)

V. S. L'vov and I. Procaccia

[Anomalous Scaling in Kolmogorov-1941 Turbulence](#)

V. S. L'vov and V. V. Lebedev

[Comprehensive measurements of the intermittency exponent in high Reynolds number turbulent flows](#)

Alexander Praskovsky and Steven Oncley

[Extended self-similarity of intermittent turbulence in edge magnetized plasmas](#)

V.P. Budaev, N. Ohno, S. Masuzaki et al.

Cornerstones of a Theory of Anomalous Scaling in Turbulence

Victor L'vov and Itamar Procaccia

Department of Chemical Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

Received February 15, 1996; accepted April 22, 1996

Abstract

In this short note we present a brief overview of our recent progress in understanding the universal statistics of fully developed turbulence, with a stress on anomalous scaling.

1. Introduction

Modern concepts about high Re number turbulence started to evolve with Richardson's insightful contributions [1] which contained the famous "poem" that paraphrased J. Swift: "*Big whirls have little whirls that feed on their velocity, and little whirls have lesser whirls and so on to viscosity-in the molecular sense*". In this way Richardson conveyed an image of the creation of turbulence by large scale forcing, setting up a cascade of energy transfers to smaller and smaller scales by the nonlinearities of fluid motion, until the energy dissipates at small scales by viscosity, turning into heat. This picture led in time to innumerable "cascade models" that tried to capture the statistical physics of turbulence by assuming something or other about the cascade process. Indeed, no one in their right mind is interested in the full solution of the turbulent velocity field at all points in space-time. The interest is in the statistical properties of the turbulent flow. Moreover the statistics of the velocity field itself is too heavily dependent on the particular boundary conditions of the flow. Richardson understood that universal properties may be found in the statistics of velocity differences $\delta u(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \equiv \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}_2) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}_1)$ across a separation $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1$. In taking such a difference we subtract the non-universal large scale motions (known as the "wind" in atmospheric flows). In experiments (see for example [2–7]) it is common to consider one dimensional cuts of the velocity field, $\delta u_l(R) \equiv \delta u_l(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \cdot \mathbf{R}/R$. The interest is in the probability distribution function of $\delta u_l(R)$ and its moments. These moments are known as the "structure functions" $S_n(R) \equiv \langle \delta u_l(R)^n \rangle$ where $\langle \dots \rangle$ stands for a suitably defined ensemble average. For Gaussian statistics the whole distribution function is governed by the second moment $S_2(R)$, and there is no information to be gained from higher order moments. In contrast, hydrodynamic experiments indicate that turbulent statistics is extremely non-Gaussian, and the higher order moments contain important new information about the distribution functions.

Possibly the most ingenious attempt to understand the statistics of turbulence is due to Kolmogorov who in 1941 [8] proposed the idea of universality (turning the study of small scale turbulence from mechanics to fundamental physics) based on the notion of the "inertial range". The idea is that for very large values of Reynolds number Re there is a wide separation between the "scale of energy

input" L and the typical "viscous dissipation scale" η at which viscous friction become important and dumps the energy into heat. In the stationary situation, when the statistical characteristics of the turbulent flow are time independent, the rate of energy input at large scales (L) is balanced by the rate of energy dissipation at small scales (η), and must be also the same as the flux of energy from larger to smaller scales (denoted $\bar{\epsilon}$) as it is measured at any scale R in the so-called "inertial" interval $\eta \ll R \ll L$. Kolmogorov proposed that the only relevant parameter in the inertial interval is $\bar{\epsilon}$, and that L and η are irrelevant for the statistical characteristics of motions on the scale of R . This assumption means that R is the only available length for the development of dimensional analysis. In addition we have the dimensional parameters $\bar{\epsilon}$ and the mass density of the fluid ρ . From these three parameters we can form combinations $\rho^x \bar{\epsilon}^y R^z$ such that with a proper choice of the exponents x, y, z we form any dimensionality that we want. This leads to detailed predictions about the statistical physics of turbulence. For example, to predict $S_n(R)$ we note that the only combination of $\bar{\epsilon}$ and R that gives the right dimension for S_n is $(\bar{\epsilon}R)^{n/3}$. In particular for $n = 2$ this is the famous Kolmogorov "2/3" law which in Fourier representation is also known as the "–5/3" law. The idea that one extracts universal properties by focusing on statistical quantities can be applied also to the correlations of gradients of the velocity field. An important example is the rate $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}, t)$ at which energy is dissipated into heat due to viscous damping. This rate is roughly $\nu |\nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2$. One is interested in the fluctuations of the energy dissipation $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}, t)$ about their mean $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\hat{\epsilon}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \epsilon(\mathbf{r}, t) - \bar{\epsilon}$, and how these fluctuations are correlated in space. The answer is given by the often-studied correlation function $K_{\epsilon\epsilon}(R) = \langle \hat{\epsilon}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}, t) \hat{\epsilon}(\mathbf{r}, t) \rangle$. If the fluctuations at different points were uncorrelated, this function would vanish for all $R \neq 0$. Within the Kolmogorov theory one estimates $K_{\epsilon\epsilon}(R) \simeq \nu^2 \bar{\epsilon}^{4/3} R^{-8/3}$, which means that the correlation decays as a power, like $1/R^{8/3}$.

Experimental measurements show that Kolmogorov was remarkably close to the truth. The major aspect of his predictions, i.e. that the statistical quantities depend on the length scale R as power laws is corroborated by experiments. On the other hand, the predicted exponents seem not to be exactly realized. For example, the experimental correlation $K_{\epsilon\epsilon}(R)$ decays according to a power law, $K_{\epsilon\epsilon}(R) \sim R^{-\mu}$ for $\eta \ll R \ll L$, with μ having a numerical value of 0.2–0.3 instead of 8/3 [4]. The structure functions also behave as power laws, $S_n(R) \simeq R^{\zeta_n}$, but the numerical values of ζ_n deviate progressively from $n/3$ when n increases [3, 5]. Something fundamental seems to be missing. The uninitiated reader might think that the numerical value of this

exponent or another is not a fundamental issue. However one needs to understand that the Kolmogorov theory exhausts the dimensions of the statistical quantities under the assumption that $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the only relevant parameter. Therefore a deviation in the numerical value of an exponent from the prediction of dimensional analysis requires the appearance of another dimensional parameter. Of course there exists two dimensional parameters, i.e. L and η which may turn out to be relevant. Indeed, experiments indicated that for the statistical quantities mentioned above the energy-input scale L is indeed relevant and it appears as a normalization scale for the deviations from Kolmogorov's predictions: $S_n(R) \simeq (\bar{\epsilon}R)^{n/3}(L/R)^{\delta_n}$ where $\zeta_n = n/3 - \delta_n$. Such form of scaling which deviates from the predictions of dimensional analysis is referred to as "anomalous scaling". The realization that the experimental results for the structure functions were consistent with L rather than η as the normalization scale developed over a long time and involved a large number of experiments; recently the accuracy of determination of the exponents increased appreciably as a result of a clever method of data analysis by Benzi, Ciliberto and coworkers [5]. Similarly a careful demonstration of the appearance of L in the dissipation correlation was achieved by Sreenivasan and coworkers [4]. A direct analysis of scaling exponents ζ_n and μ in a high Reynolds number flow was presented by Praskovskii and Oncley, leading to the same conclusions [6].

2. Turbulence as a field theory

Theoretical studies of the universal small scale structure of turbulence can be classified broadly into two main classes. Firstly there is a large body of phenomenological models that by attempting to achieve agreement with experiments reached important insights on the nature of the cascade or the statistics of the turbulent fields [7]. In particular there appeared influential ideas, following Mandelbrot [9], about the fractal geometry of highly turbulent fields which allow scaling properties that are sufficiently complicated to include also non-Kolmogorov scaling. Parisi and Frisch showed that by introducing multifractals one can accommodate the nonlinear dependence of ζ_n and n [10]. However these models are not derived directly from the equations of fluid mechanics; one is always left with uncertainties about the validity or relevance of such models. The second class of approaches is based on the equations of fluid mechanics. Typically one acknowledges the fact that fluid mechanics is a (classical) field theory and resorts to field theoretic methods in order to compute statistical quantities. In spite of nearly 50 years of continuous effort in this direction, the analytic derivation of the scaling laws for $K_{zz}(R)$ and $S_n(R)$ from the Navier-Stokes equations, and the calculation of the numerical value of the scaling exponents μ and ζ_n have been among the most elusive goals of theoretical research. Why did it turn out to be so difficult?

To understand the difficulties, we need to elaborate a little on the nature of the field theoretic approach. Suppose that we want to calculate the average response of a turbulent fluid at some point r_0 to forcing at point r_1 . The field theoretic approach allows us to consider this response as an infinite sum of all the following processes: firstly there is the direct response at point r_0 due to the forcing at r_1 . This

response is instantaneous if we assume that the fluid is incompressible (and therefore the speed of sound is infinite). Then there is the process of forcing at r_1 with a response at an intermediate point r_2 , which then acts as a forcing for the response at r_0 . This intermediate process can take time, and we need to integrate over all the possible positions of point r_2 and all times. This is the second-order term in perturbation theory. Then we can force at r_1 , the response at r_2 acting as a forcing for r_3 and the response at r_3 forces a response at r_0 . We need to integrate over all possible intermediate positions r_2 and r_3 and all the intermediate times. This is the third-order term in perturbation theory. And so on. The actual response is the infinite sum of all these contributions. In applying this field theoretical method one encounters three main difficulties.

(A) The theory has no small parameter. The usual procedure is to develop the theory perturbatively around the linear part of the equation of motion. In other words, the zeroth order solution of the Navier-Stokes equations is obtained by discarding the terms which are quadratic in the velocity field. The expansion parameter is then obtained from the ratio of the quadratic to the linear terms; this ratio is of the order of Reynolds number Re . Since we are interested in $Re \gg 1$, naive perturbation expansions are badly divergent. In other words the contribution of the various processes described above increases as $(Re)^n$ with the number n of intermediate points in space-time.

(B) The theory exhibits two types of nonlinear interactions. Both are hidden in the nonlinear term $u \cdot \nabla u$ in the Navier-Stokes equations. The larger of the two is known to any person who watched how a small floating object is entrained in the eddies of a river and swept along a complicated path with the turbulent flow. In a similar way any fluctuation of small scale is swept along by all the larger eddies. Physically this sweeping couples any given scale of motion to all the larger scales. Unfortunately the largest scales contain most of the energy of the flow; these large scale motions are what is experienced as gusts of wind in the atmosphere or the swell in the ocean. In the perturbation theory for $S_n(R)$ one has the consequences of the sweeping effect from all the scale larger than R , with the main contribution coming from the largest, most intensive gusts on the scale of L . As a result these contributions diverge when $L \rightarrow \infty$. In the theoretical jargon this is known as "infrared divergences". Such divergences are common in other field theories, with the best known example being quantum electrodynamics. In that theory the divergences are of similar strength in higher order terms in the series, and they can be removed by introducing finite constants to the theory, like the charge and the mass of the electron. In the hydrodynamic theory the divergences become stronger with the order of the contribution, and to eliminate them in this manner one needs an infinite number of constants. In the jargon such a theory is called "not renormalizable". However, sweeping is just a kinematic effect that does not lead to energy redistribution between scales, and one may hope that if the effect of sweeping is taken care of in a consistent fashion, a renormalizable theory might emerge. This redistribution of energy results from the second type of interaction, that stems from the shear and torsion effects that are sizable only if they couple fluid motions of comparable scales. The second type of nonlinearity is smaller in

size but crucial in consequence, and it may certainly lead to a scale-invariant theory.

(C) Nonlocality of interaction in r space. One recognizes that the gradient of the pressure is dimensionally the same as $(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$, and the fluctuations in the pressure are quadratic in the fluctuations of the velocity. This means that the pressure term is also nonlinear in the velocity. However, the pressure at any given point is determined by the velocity field everywhere. Theoretically one sees this effect by taking the divergence of the Navier-Stokes equations. This leads to the equation $\nabla^2 p = \nabla \cdot [(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}]$. The inversion of the Laplacian operator involves an integral over all space. Physically this stems from the fact that in the incompressible limit of the Navier-Stokes equations sound speed is infinite and velocity fluctuations in all distant points are instantaneously coupled.

Indeed, these difficulties seemed to complicate the application of field theoretic methods to such a degree that a wide-spread feeling appeared to the effect that it is impossible to gain valuable insight into the universal properties of turbulence along these lines, even though they proved so fruitful in other field theories. The present authors (as well as other researchers starting with Kraichnan [17] and recently Midgal [11], Polyakov [12], Eyink [13] etc.) think differently, and in the rest of this paper we will explain why.

The first task of a successful theory of turbulence is to overcome the existence of the interwoven nonlinear effects that were explained in difficulty (B). This is not achieved by directly applying a formal field-theoretical tool to the Navier-Stokes equations. It does not matter whether one uses standard field theoretic perturbation theory [14], path integral formulation, renormalization group [15] ϵ -expansion, large N -limit [16] or one's formal method of choice. One needs to take care of the particular nature of hydrodynamic turbulence as embodied in difficulty (B) *first*, and *then* proceed using formal tools.

The removal of the effects of sweeping is based on Richardson's remark that universality in turbulence is expected for the statistics of velocity *differences across a length scale* R rather than for the statistics of the velocity field itself. The velocity fields are dominated by the large scale motions that are not universal since they are produced directly by the agent that forces the flow. This forcing agent differs in different flow realizations (atmosphere, wind tunnels, channel flow etc.). Richardson's insight was developed by Kraichnan who attempted to cast the field theoretic approach in terms of Lagrangian paths, meaning a description of the fluid flow which follows the paths of every individual fluid particle. Such a description automatically removes the large scale contributions [17]. Kraichnan's approach was fundamentally correct, and gave rise to important and influential insights in the description of turbulence, but did not provide a convenient technical way to consider all the orders of perturbation theory. The theory does not provide transparent rules how to consider an arbitrarily high term in the perturbation theory. Only low order truncations were considered.

A way to overcome difficulty (B) was suggested by Belinicher and L'vov [18] who introduced a novel transformation that allowed on one hand the elimination of the sweeping that leads to infrared divergences, and on the other hand allows the development of simple rules for writing down any

arbitrary order in the perturbation theory for the statistical quantities. The essential idea in this transformation is the use of a coordinate frame in which velocities are measured relative to the velocity of *one* fluid particle. The use of this transformation allowed the examination of the structure functions of velocity differences $S_n(R)$ to all orders in perturbation theory. Of course, difficulty (A) remains; the perturbation series still diverges rapidly for large values of Re , but now standard field theoretic methods can be used to reformulate the perturbation expansion such that the viscosity is changed by an effective "eddy viscosity". The theoretical tool that achieves this exchange is known in quantum field theory as the Dyson line resummation [20]. The result of this procedure is that the effective expansion parameter is no longer Re but an expansion parameter of the order of unity. Of course, such a perturbation series may still diverge as a whole. Notwithstanding it is crucial to examine first the order-by-order properties of series of this type.

Such an examination leads to a major surprise: every term in this perturbation theory remains finite when the energy-input scale L goes to ∞ and the viscous-dissipation scale η goes to 0 [20]. The meaning of this is that the perturbative theory for S_n does not indicate the existence of any typical length-scale. Such a length is needed in order to represent deviations in the scaling exponents from the predictions of Kolmogorov's dimensional analysis in which both scales L and η are assumed irrelevant. In other areas of theoretical physics in which anomalous scaling has been found it is common that already the perturbative series indicates this phenomenon. In many cases this is seen in the appearance of logarithmic divergences that must be tamed by truncating the integrals at some renormalization length. Hydrodynamic turbulence seems at this point different. The nonlinear Belinicher-L'vov transformation changes the underlying linear theory such that the resulting perturbative scheme for the structure functions is finite order by order [18, 20]. The physical meaning of this result is that as much as can be seen from this perturbative series the main effects on the statistical quantities for velocity differences across a scale R come from activities of scales comparable to R . This is the perturbative justification of the Richardson-Kolmogorov cascade picture in which widely separated scales do not interact.

Consequently the main question still remains: how does a renormalization scale appear in the statistical theory of turbulence?

It turns out that there are two different mechanisms that furnish a renormalization scale, and that finally both L and η appear in the theory. The viscous scale η appears via a rather standard mechanism that can be seen in perturbation theory as logarithmic divergences, but in order to see it one needs to consider the statistics of gradient fields rather than the velocity differences themselves [21, 24]. For example, considering the perturbative series for $K_{\epsilon\epsilon}(R)$, which is the correlation function of the rate of energy dissipation $\nu |\nabla \mathbf{u}|^2$, leads immediately to the discovery of logarithmic ultraviolet divergences in every order of the perturbation theory. These divergences are controlled by an ultraviolet cutoff scale which is identified as the viscous-dissipation scale η acting here as the renormalization scale. The summation of the infinite series results in a factor $(R/\eta)^{2\Delta}$ with some anomalous exponent Δ which is, generally speaking, of the order

of unity. The appearance of such a factor means that the actual correlation of two R -separated dissipation fields is much larger, when R is much larger than η , than the naive prediction of dimensional analysis. The physical explanation of this renormalization [24, 25] is the effect of the multi-step interaction of two R -separated small eddies of scale η with a large eddy of scale R via an infinite set of eddies of intermediate scales. The net result on the scaling exponent is that the exponent μ changes from $8/3$ as expected in the Kolmogorov theory to $8/3 - 2\Delta$.

At this point it is important to understand what is the numerical value of the anomalous exponent Δ . In [21] there was found an exact sum that forces a relation between the numerical value of Δ and the numerical value of the exponent ζ_2 of $S_2(R)$, $\Delta = 2 - \zeta_2$. Such a relation between different exponents is known in the jargon as a “scaling relation” or a “bridge relation”. Physically this relation is a consequence of the existence of a universal nonequilibrium stationary state that supports an energy flux from large to small scales [21, 22]. The scaling relation for Δ has far-reaching implications for the theory of the structure functions. It was explained that with this value of Δ the series for the structure functions $S_n(R)$ diverge when the energy-input scale L approaches ∞ as powers of L , like $(L/R)^{\delta_n}$. The anomalous exponents δ_n are the deviations of the exponents of $S_n(R)$ from their Kolmogorov value. This is a very delicate and important point, and we therefore expand on it. Think about the series representation of $S_n(R)$ in terms of lower order quantities, and imagine that one succeeded to resum it into an operator equation for $S_n(R)$. Typically such a resummed equation may look like $[1 - \hat{O}]S_n(R) = \text{RHS}$, where \hat{O} is some integro-differential operator which is not small compared to unity. If we expand this equation in powers of \hat{O} around the RHS we regain the infinite perturbative series that we started with. However, now we realize that the equation possesses also homogeneous solutions, solutions of $[1 - \hat{O}]S_n(R) = 0$ which are inherently nonperturbative since they can no longer be expanded around a RHS. These homogeneous solutions may be much larger than the inhomogeneous perturbative solutions. Of course, homogeneous solutions must be matched with the boundary conditions at $R = L$, and this is the way that the energy input scale L appears in the theory. This is particularly important when the homogeneous solution diverge in size when $L \rightarrow \infty$ as is indeed the case for the problem at hand.

The next step in the theoretical development is to understand how to compute the anomalous exponents δ_n . The divergence of the perturbation theory for $S_n(R)$ with $L \rightarrow \infty$ forces us to seek a nonperturbative handle on the theory. One finds this in the idea that there exists always a global balance between energy input and dissipation, which may be turned into a nonperturbative constraint on each n -th order structure function [22]. Using the Navier-Stokes equations one derives the set of equations of motion

$$\frac{\partial S_n(R, t)}{\partial t} + D_n(R, t) = \nu J_n(R, t), \quad (1)$$

where D_n and J_n stem from the nonlinear and the viscous terms in the Navier-Stokes equations respectively. To understand the physical meaning of this equation note that $S_2(R)$ is precisely the mean kinetic energy of motions of size

R . The term $D_2(R)$ whose meaning is the rate of energy flux through the scale R is known exactly: $D_2(R) = dS_3(R)/dR$. The term $\nu J_2(R)$ is precisely the rate of energy dissipation due to viscous effects. The higher order equation for $n > 2$ are direct generalizations of this to higher order moments. In the stationary state the time derivative vanishes and one has the balance equation $D_n(R) = \nu J_n(R)$. For $n = 2$ it reflects the balance between energy flux and energy dissipation. The evaluation of $D_n(R)$ for $n > 2$ requires dealing with the difficulty (C) of the nonlocality of the interaction, but it does not pose conceptual difficulties. It was shown [22] that $D_n(R)$ is of the order of dS_{n+1}/dR . On the other hand, the evaluation of $J_n(R)$ raises a number of very interesting issues whose resolution lies at the heart of the universal scaling properties of turbulence. Presently not all of these issues have been resolved, and we briefly mention here some ground on which progress has been made by the present authors.

From the derivation of eq. (1) one finds that $J_n(R)$ consists of a correlation of $\nabla^2 u$ with $n - 2$ velocity differences across a scale $R = |r_1 - r_2|$: $\langle \nabla^2 u(r_1) [\delta u_i(r_1, r_2)]^{n-2} \rangle$. The question is how to evaluate such a quantity in terms of the usual structure functions $S_n(R)$. Recall that a gradient of a field is the difference in the field values at two points divided by the separation when the latter goes to zero. In going to zero one necessarily crosses the dissipative scale. To understand what happens in this process one needs first to introduce many-point correlation functions of a product of n velocity differences:

$$F_n(r_0 | r_1, \dots, r_n) \equiv \langle \delta u_i(r_0, r_1) \dots \delta u_i(r_0, r_n) \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Next we need to formulate rules for the evaluation of such correlation functions of velocity differences when some of the coordinates get very close to each other. For example, a gradient $\partial/\partial r_\alpha$ can be formed from the limit $r_1 \rightarrow r_0$ when we divide by $r_{1,\alpha} - r_{0,\alpha}$. These rules are known in the theoretical jargon as “fusion rules”. The fusion rules for hydrodynamic turbulence were presented in [26]. They show that when p coordinates in F_n are separated by a small distance r , and the remaining $n - p$ coordinates are separated by a large distance R , then the scaling dependence on r is like that of $S_p(r)$, i.e. r^{ζ_p} . This is true until r crosses the dissipative scale. Assuming that below the viscous-dissipation scale η derivatives exist and the fields are smooth, one can estimate gradients at the end of the smooth range by dividing differences across η by η . The question is, what is the appropriate cross-over scale to smooth behaviour? Is there just one cross-over scale η , or is there a multiplicity of such scales, depending on the function one is studying? For example, when does the above n -point correlator become differentiable as a function of r when p of its coordinates approach r_0 ? Is that typical scale the same as the one exhibited by $S_p(r)$ itself, or does it depend on p and n and on the remaining distances of the remaining $n - p$ coordinates that are still far away from r_0 ?

The answer is that there is a multiplicity of cross-over scales. For the n -point correlator discussed above we denote the dissipative scale as $\eta(p, n, R)$, and it depends on each of its arguments [23, 26]. In particular it depends on the inertial range variables R and this dependence must be known when one attempts to determine the scaling exponents ζ_n of the structure functions. In brief, this line of thought leads to

a set of non-trivial scaling relations. For example we confirm the phenomenologically conjectured [7] “bridge relation” $\mu = 2 - \zeta_6$ (in close agreement with the experimental values) and predict that although the ζ_n are not Kolmogorov, they are nevertheless linear in n for large n .

3. Summary

It appears that there are four conceptual steps in the construction of a theory of the universal anomalous statistics of turbulence on the basis of the Navier-Stokes equations. First one needs to take care of the sweeping interactions that mask the scale invariant theory [18, 19, 20]. After doing so the perturbation expansion converges order by order, and the Kolmogorov scaling of the velocity structure functions is found as a perturbative solution. Secondly one understands the appearance of the viscous-dissipation scale η as the natural normalization scale in the theory of the correlation functions of the gradient fields [21, 24]. This step is similar to critical phenomena and it leads to a similarly rich theory of anomalous behaviour of the gradient fields. Only the tip of the iceberg was considered above. In fact when one considers the correlations of tensor fields which are constructed from $\partial u_\alpha / \partial r_\beta$ (rather than the scalar field ϵ) one finds that every field with a different transformation property under the rotation of the coordinates has its own independent scaling exponent which is the analog of Δ above [27]. The third step is the understanding of the divergence of the diagrammatic series for the structure functions as a whole [22]. This sheds light on the emergence of the energy-input scale L as a normalization length in the theory of turbulence. This means that the Kolmogorov basic assertion that there is no typical scale in the expressions for statistical quantities involving correlations across a scale R when $\eta \ll R \ll L$ is doubly wrong. In general both lengths appear in dimensionless combinations and change the exponents from the predictions of dimensional analysis. Examples of correlation functions in which both normalization scales L and η appear simultaneously were given explicitly [27]. Last but not least is the formulation of the fusion rules and the exposition of the multiplicity of the dissipative scales which should eventually result in a satisfactory description of all the scaling properties [23].

The road ahead is not fully charted, but it seems that some of the conceptual difficulties have been surmounted. We believe that the crucial building blocks of the theory are now available, and they begin to delineate the structure of the theory. We hope that the remaining 4 years of this century will suffice to achieve a proper understanding of the anomalous scaling exponents in turbulence. Considerable work, however, is still needed in order to fully clarify many aspects of the problem, and most of them are as exciting

and important as the scaling properties. There are universal aspects that go beyond exponents, such as distribution functions and the eddy viscosity, and there are important non-universal aspects like the role of inhomogeneities, the effect of boundaries and so on. Progress on these issues will bring the theory closer to the concern of the engineers. The marriage of physics and engineering will be the challenge of the 21st century.

Acknowledgements

We profited from discussions and collaboration with Victor Belinicher, Adrienne Fairhall, Gregory Falkovich, Uriel Frisch, Omri Gat, Robert Kraichnan, Vladimir Lebedev and Evgeni Podivilov. This work has been supported in part by the US-Israel Bi-National Science Foundation, the German-Israeli Foundation and the Naftali and Anna Backenroth-Bronicki Fund for Research in Chaos and Complexity.

References

- Richardson, L. F., “Weather Prediction by Numerical Process”, (Cambridge, 1922).
- Monin, A. S. and Yaglom, A. M., “Statistical Fluid Mechanics: Mechanics of Turbulence” (The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1973) volume II.
- Anselmet, F., Gagne, Y., Hopfinger, E. J. and Antonia, R. A., *J. Fluid Mech.* **140**, 63 (1984).
- Sreenivasan, K. R. and Kailasnath, P., *Phys. Fluids A5*, 512, (1993).
- Benzi, R. *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **E48**, R29 (1993).
- Praskovskii, A. and Oncley, S., *Phys. Fluids* **6**, 2886 (1994).
- Frisch, U., “Turbulence: The Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov” (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
- Kolmogorov, A. N., *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR* **30**, 9 (1941).
- Mandelbrot, B. B., *J. Fluid Mech.* **62**, 331 (1974).
- Parisi, G. and Frisch, U., in: “Turbulence and Predictability in Geophysical Fluid Dynamics” (Edited by M. Ghil, R. Benzi and G. Parisi), (North Holland, Amsterdam 1985).
- Migdal, A. A., *Int. J. of Mod. Phys.* **A9**, 1197 (1994).
- Polyakov, A. M., *Nucl. Phys.* **B396**, 367 (1993).
- Eyink, G. L., *Phys. Lett.* **A172**, 355 (1993).
- Wyld, H. W., *Ann. Phys.*, **14**, 143 (1961).
- Yakhot, V. and Orszag, S. A., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 1722 (1986).
- Mou, C.-Y. and Weichman, P. B., *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 3738 (1995).
- Kraichnan, R. H., *Phys. Fluids* **8**, 575 (1965).
- Belinicher, V. I. and L’vov, V. S., *Sov. Phys. JETP* **66**, 303 (1987).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., in: “Fluctuating Geometries in Statistical Mechanics and Field Theory” (Edited by F. David, P. Ginsparg and J. Zinn-Justin) Les Houches session LXII, 1994 (Elsevier, 1995).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 3840 (1995).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 3858 (1995).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev.* **E53**, 3468 (1966).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev.* **E54**, 5 (1966).
- L’vov, V. S. and Lebedev, V., *Europhys. Lett.* **29**, 681 (1995).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2690 (1995).
- L’vov, V. S. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 2896 (1996).
- L’vov, V. S., Podivilov, E. and Procaccia, I., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 3963 (1996).