

Comment on ‘Vector potential of the Coulomb gauge’*

V Hnizdo

*National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health,
1095 Willowdale Road, Morgantown, WV 26505, USA*

E-mail: vbh5@cdc.gov

Abstract. The expression for the Coulomb-gauge vector potential in terms of the ‘instantaneous’ magnetic field derived by Stewart [2003 *Eur. J. Phys.* **24** 519] by employing Jefimenko’s equation for the magnetic field and Jackson’s formula for the Coulomb-gauge vector potential can be proven much more simply.

In a recent article [1], Stewart has derived the following expression for the Coulomb-gauge vector potential \mathbf{A}_C in terms of the ‘instantaneous’ magnetic field \mathbf{B}

$$\mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{\nabla}{4\pi} \times \int d^3r' \frac{\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (1)$$

Stewart starts with the expression (1) as an *ansatz* ‘suggested’ by the Helmholtz theorem, and then proceeds to prove it by substituting in (1) Jefimenko’s expression for the magnetic field in terms of the retarded current density and its partial time derivative [2] and obtaining, after some non-trivial algebra, an expression for \mathbf{A}_C in terms of the current density derived recently by Jackson [3]. In this comment, we give a more simple proof of the formula (1) using only the Helmholtz theorem.

According to the Helmholtz theorem [4], an arbitrary-gauge vector potential \mathbf{A} , as any three-dimensional vector field whose divergence and curl vanish at infinity, can be decomposed uniquely into a longitudinal part \mathbf{A}_\parallel , whose curl vanishes, and a transverse part \mathbf{A}_\perp , whose divergence vanishes

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{A}_\parallel(\mathbf{r}, t) + \mathbf{A}_\perp(\mathbf{r}, t) \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_\parallel(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0 \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}_\perp(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0. \quad (2)$$

The longitudinal and transverse parts in (2) are given explicitly by

$$\mathbf{A}_\parallel(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\frac{\nabla}{4\pi} \int d^3r' \frac{\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \quad \mathbf{A}_\perp(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{\nabla}{4\pi} \times \int d^3r' \frac{\nabla' \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (3)$$

Let us now decompose the vector potential \mathbf{A} in terms of the Coulomb-gauge vector potential \mathbf{A}_C as follows:

*This comment is written by V Hnizdo in his private capacity. No support or endorsement by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is intended or should be inferred.

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) = [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t)] + \mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t). \quad (4)$$

If the curl of $[\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_C]$ vanishes, then, according to equation (2) and the fact that the Coulomb-gauge vector potential is by definition divergenceless, the Coulomb-gauge vector potential \mathbf{A}_C is the transverse part \mathbf{A}_\perp of the vector potential \mathbf{A} . But because the two vector potentials must yield the same magnetic field, the curl of $[\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_C]$ does vanish

$$\nabla \times [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t)] = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0. \quad (5)$$

Thus the Coulomb-gauge vector potential is indeed the transverse part of the vector potential \mathbf{A} of any gauge. Therefore, it can be expressed according to the second part of (3) and the fact that $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$ as

$$\mathbf{A}_C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{A}_\perp(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{\nabla}{4\pi} \times \int d^3r' \frac{\nabla' \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} = \frac{\nabla}{4\pi} \times \int d^3r' \frac{\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (6)$$

The right-hand side of (6) is expression (1) derived by Stewart.

In closing, we note that there is an expression for the Coulomb-gauge scalar potential V_C in terms of the ‘instantaneous’ electric field \mathbf{E} that is analogous to expression (6) for the Coulomb-gauge vector potential

$$V_C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3r' \frac{\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}', t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (7)$$

This follows directly from the definition $V_C(\mathbf{r}, t) = \int d^3r' \rho(\mathbf{r}', t)/|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ of the Coulomb-gauge scalar potential and the Maxwell equation $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 4\pi\rho$. Expressions (6) and (7) may be regarded as a ‘totally instantaneous gauge’, but it would seem more appropriate to view them as the solution to a problem that is inverse to that of calculating the electric and magnetic fields from given Coulomb-gauge potentials \mathbf{A}_C and V_C according to

$$\mathbf{E} = -\nabla V_C - \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_C}{c\partial t} \quad \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_C. \quad (8)$$

The first equation of (8) gives directly the longitudinal part \mathbf{E}_\parallel and transverse part \mathbf{E}_\perp of an electric field \mathbf{E} in terms of the Coulomb-gauge potentials V_C and \mathbf{A}_C as $\mathbf{E}_\parallel = -\nabla V_C$ and $\mathbf{E}_\perp = -\partial \mathbf{A}_C/c\partial t$ (the apparent paradox that the longitudinal part \mathbf{E}_\parallel of a *retarded* electric field \mathbf{E} is thus a truly instantaneous field has been discussed recently in [5]).

- [1] Stewart A M 2003 Vector potential of the Coulomb gauge *Eur. J. Phys* **24** 519–24
- [2] Jefimenko O D 1989 *Electricity and Magnetism* 2nd edn (Star City, WV: Electret Scientific)
- Jackson J D 1999 *Classical Electrodynamics* 3rd edn (New York: Wiley)
- [3] Jackson J D 2002 From Lorenz to Coulomb and other explicit gauge transformations *Am. J. Phys.* **70** 917–28
- [4] Arfken G 1995 *Mathematical Methods for Physicists* (San Diego, CA: Academic)

- [5] Rohrlich F 2002 Causality, the Coulomb field, and Newton's law of gravitation *Am. J. Phys.* **70** 411–414
- Jefimenko O D 2002 Comment on 'Causality, the Coulomb field, and Newton's law of gravitation' *Am. J. Phys.* **70** 964
- Rohrlich F 2002 Reply to "Comment on 'Causality, the Coulomb field, and Newton's law of gravitation'" *Am. J. Phys.* **70** 964