

The Action Principle as the Description Language of Physical Law — From Particle to Field: One Grammar, Not One Equation — [Paper 87]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

ABSTRACT

Can the scattered laws of physics be written in "one description language"? This paper answers: **that language is not a constant shared by all laws but a grammar all laws obey**. That grammar is the **principle of least action**. Mechanics, electromagnetism, gravity, and field theory can all be written in a **single sentence**: "for an appropriate Lagrangian L , make the action $S = \int L$ stationary ($\delta S = 0$).". A particle: $S = -mc \int ds$; the electromagnetic field: $L = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}$; gravity: the Einstein–Hilbert action $S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int R \sqrt{-g} d^4x$ — each $\delta S = 0$ yields its equation of motion (Euler–Lagrange, Maxwell, Einstein). And Noether (Paper 80) attaches to each continuous symmetry of each S a conservation law. This is Paper 84 (least action in mechanics) **extended to fields**. **The crucial discipline**: this is **"one grammar," not "one equation."** Each L remains distinct and must be supplied by hand (from experiment or geometry). The action principle unifies the **form** of laws, not their **content** — a visualization of structure of the same type as Maxwell gathering $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}$ into one tensor, and NOT a GUT. **Scope**: this is a structural arrangement of the standard textbook fact of Lagrangian formalism; it produces no new mathematics and no new prediction. It does not solve "why nature obeys an action principle" (the same humility as Paper 84). The $4\pi/8\pi$ factors in each L 's couplings are Paper 86's **topological-root** quantities, distinct from the grammar ($\delta S = 0$). The Universe OS's "source-code grammar" is Layer-3 non-science.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural arrangement** of established physics (Lagrangian formalism, least action, Noether's theorem, field actions). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. **It exhibits "one grammar," not "one equation" (a unified field equation)** — each Lagrangian remains distinct. It does not infer identity of root from coincidence of value (Papers 58/48, 86). "Universe OS" is a Layer-3 non-science lens, not a claim of mechanism.

1. Introduction: Seek "One Description Language" in the Grammar, Not the Constant

To write the scattered laws of physics in one language is a natural, old wish. One may seek that language in a **constant** shared by all laws (in the corpus, Paper 13 tried this direction, and Paper 86 placed 4π on the **topological root (T)**). This paper offers another, firmer candidate.

What can be unified is not a **word (constant)** that all laws share, but a **grammar (principle)** that all laws obey. And physics does have one such grammar — the **principle of least action**. Paper 84 set it as the foundation of mechanics. This paper **extends it to fields** (electromagnetism, gravity), giving "one description language" the form of a **shared grammar**.

2. The Grammar: "For an Appropriate L , $\delta S = 0$ "

Standard Fact (the variational principle)

Defining for each system an action $S[\phi] = \int L d(\text{time or spacetime})$, the actual motion or field configuration is characterized as that which makes S **stationary** ($\delta S = 0$), equivalent to the corresponding **Euler–Lagrange equation**:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi} - \partial_\mu \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \right) = 0.$$

A vast range of physics is written in this **single sentence** — "choose an appropriate L and set $\delta S = 0$."

What matters is that this is **one syntax**. Across fields, only the content of L changes; the skeleton of the sentence — "make the action stationary" — does not. The "one description language" Paper 13 sought was this syntax.

3. A Census of Lagrangians: Same Grammar, Different Words

Into the same grammar we substitute each field's "word" (its Lagrangian).

Field	Lagrangian / action	Law from $\delta S = 0$
Non-relativistic particle	$L = \frac{1}{2} m \dot{q}^2 - V(q)$	$m \ddot{q} = -\nabla V$ (Newton)
Relativistic particle	$S = -mc \int ds$	geodesic equation (free motion)
Electromagnetic field	$L = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - J^\mu A_\mu$	$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = J^\nu$ (Maxwell)
Gravity	$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int R \sqrt{-g} d^4x$	$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$ (Einstein)

Newton's equation of motion, Maxwell's equations, Einstein's equations — these, so different in appearance, **all issue from the same single line " $\delta S = 0$."** This is the substance of "one description language." What is invariant across fields is the **grammar**; the **word L** is specific to each field.

4. The Ledger the Grammar Carries: Noether (Paper 80)

Observation 4.1 (the grammar brings conservation laws for free)

When a field's action S has a continuous symmetry, Noether's theorem (Paper 80) produces one conserved quantity for that field — time translation of a particle system $\rightarrow$ energy, gauge symmetry of the EM field $\rightarrow$ charge conservation, and so on. Thus the grammar " $\delta S = 0$ " **carries its own ledger of conservation laws**. The grammar (action) and the ledger (Noether) stand on the same Root (S) — the **symmetry root** of Paper 86.

This is an unexpectedly rich part of Paper 13's wish. "One description language" not only unifies the form of laws but **supplies each field's conservation laws from the same principle**. Conservation laws that looked unrelated (energy, momentum, charge) line up as consequences of different sentences in one grammar.

5. The Line of Honesty: One Grammar, Not One Equation

Observation 5.1 (unification of form $\neq$ unification of content)

What the action principle unifies is the **form (the syntax $\delta S = 0$)**, not the **content (each L)**. L_{Maxwell} and L_{gravity} remain distinct, and both must be **supplied by hand** from experiment and geometry. The action principle does not derive "why the EM Lagrangian is $-\frac{1}{4} F^2$." Hence this is **not a unified field theory (GUT)** — it does not melt everything into one equation, but only shows that many equations share the **same way of being written**.

The "unification" by the action principle is of the same type as Maxwell gathering **E** and **B** into one tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$: no physical content is added, but **the structure becomes visible**. There is no new prediction. Even so, to know that scattered laws share one grammar has real value.

6. Connection to the Corpus: Extending 84 to Fields, Keeping 86's Distinct Roots

This paper extends Paper 84 (least action, the foundation of the phase-space trilogy in mechanics) to **fields** — electromagnetism and gravity. And it keeps Paper 86's distinct-roots discipline: the factors 4π , $8\pi G$ appearing in each **L**'s couplings are **Root (T) — topological** — quantities from Green's functions and the solid angle (Papers 86, 02/67), **distinct from the grammar ($\delta S = 0$) itself**. The grammar stands on Root (S) — symmetry/variation; the coefficients on Root (T) — topology/geometry. **Even within a single action, several roots coexist** — not mixing them is the point (Paper 86).

The Author's Personal Note (Layer 3, non-science label / not a claim of mechanism)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), the action principle looks like "the **grammar** of the Universe OS's source code" — the functions (**L**) differ by field, but the compile rule ($\delta S = 0$) is one. But **this carries the non-science label**. The pull to say "one grammar means there must be one source" and to melt everything into a single **L** is strong. **But the feeling that "it can't be unseen" is a signature, not a proof**. So the body stays at the sharing of grammar and does not step into the fusion of content. What is written here is neither mechanism nor prediction, but a self-caution toward not mixing form with content.

7. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive, structural):

- Mechanics, electromagnetism, gravity, and field theory can all be written in **one grammar**: "for an appropriate **L**, $\delta S = 0$ " (§§2–3). This is the honest form of Paper 13's "one description language."
- That grammar carries each field's conservation laws through Noether (80) (§4).
- Even within an action, the grammar is Root (S) and the coefficient 4π etc. are Root (T) — distinct roots (§6, Paper 86).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **Not a unified field theory (GUT)**. One grammar, not one equation. Each **L** remains distinct, supplied by hand (§5).
- **No new mathematics or theorem**. Lagrangian formalism, field actions, and Noether are all standard (textbook). This only provides a structural arrangement.
- **"Why obey an action principle" is not solved**. The path integral answers with "interference," but why quantum mechanics is so is an open edge (the same humility as Paper 84).

- **No new prediction.** Hence Layer 2 (structural interpretation). The OS metaphor is quarantined as Layer-3 non-science.

8. Conclusion

"One description language" lives not in a shared **constant** but in a shared **grammar**. What is unified is not the word (constant) but the **grammar (principle)** — the one-line syntax "for an appropriate L , $\delta S = 0$." Newton, Maxwell, and Einstein all issue from this one line. And Noether supplies each field's conservation laws as the grammar's ledger. This is Paper 84 extended to fields.

But the line is kept firmly: this is **one grammar, not one equation**. The action principle unifies the form of laws, while their content (each L) remains specific to each field, given by experiment and geometry. Even within a single action, the grammar (Root S) and the coefficient 4π (Root T) are distinct roots (Paper 86). Let go of the temptation to fuse, and quietly describe the shared grammar — together with the ledger of conservation laws it supplies. That is the road that carries this wish forward in accurate form.

References

1. Landau, L. D. and Lifshitz, E. M. (1975). *The Classical Theory of Fields*. Pergamon Press.
2. Hilbert, D. (1915). *Die Grundlagen der Physik* (the Einstein–Hilbert action). *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen*, 395–407.
3. Noether, E. (1918). *Invariante Variationsprobleme*. *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen*, 235–257.
4. Feynman, R. P. (1948). *Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 20, 367–387.
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Physical Law as a Description Language of the Universe OS (2nd ed.)* [Paper 13]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21404917.
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Conservation Laws Are the Shadow of Symmetry* [Paper 80]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21732957.
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Principle of Least Action* [Paper 84]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21741231.
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Four Roots of Necessity* [Paper 86]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21744839.

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)