

$$(c) \quad W = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} P \, dt = \frac{\mu_0 \alpha^2 l w}{4c} \int_{d/x}^{(d+h)/c} (ct-d)^2 \, dt = \frac{\mu_0 \alpha^2 l w}{4c} \left[ \frac{(ct-d)^3}{3c} \right]_{d/c}^{(d+h)/c} = \boxed{\frac{\mu_0 \alpha^2 l w h^3}{12c^2}}.$$

Since  $1/c^2 = \mu_0 \epsilon_0$ , this agrees with the answer to (a).

**Problem 10.3**

$$\mathbf{E} = -\nabla V - \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t} = \boxed{\frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{q}{r^2} \hat{\mathbf{r}}}, \quad \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \boxed{0}.$$

This is a funny set of potentials for a stationary point charge  $q$  at the origin. ( $V = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{q}{r}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} = 0$  would, of course, be the customary choice.) Evidently  $\rho = q\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ ;  $\mathbf{J} = 0$ .

**Problem 10.4**

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} &= -\nabla V - \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t} = -A_0 \cos(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}(-\omega) = \boxed{A_0 \omega \cos(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}}, \\ \mathbf{B} &= \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [A_0 \sin(kx - \omega t)] = \boxed{A_0 k \cos(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{z}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$  ✓,  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$  ✓.

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [A_0 \omega \cos(kx - \omega t)] = -A_0 \omega k \sin(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{z}}, \quad -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} = -A_0 \omega k \sin(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{z}},$$

so  $\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}$  ✓.

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = -\hat{\mathbf{y}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [A_0 k \cos(kx - \omega t)] = A_0 k^2 \sin(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} = A_0 \omega^2 \sin(kx - \omega t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}.$$

So  $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t}$  provided  $\boxed{k^2 = \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \omega^2}$ , or, since  $c^2 = 1/\mu_0 \epsilon_0$ ,  $\boxed{\omega = ck}$ .

**Problem 10.5**

$$V' = V - \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} = 0 - \left( -\frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{q}{r} \right) = \boxed{\frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{q}{r}}; \quad \mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A} + \nabla \lambda = -\frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{qt}{r^2} \hat{\mathbf{r}} + \left( -\frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} qt \right) \left( -\frac{1}{r^2} \hat{\mathbf{r}} \right) = \boxed{0}.$$

This gauge function transforms the “funny” potentials of Prob. 10.3 into the “ordinary” potentials of a stationary point charge.

**Problem 10.6**

Ex. 10.1:  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$ ;  $\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = 0$ . Both Coulomb and Lorentz.

Prob. 10.3:  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = -\frac{qt}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r^2} \right) = -\frac{qt}{\epsilon_0} \delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ ;  $\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = 0$ . Neither.

Prob. 10.4:  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$ ;  $\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = 0$ . Both.

**Problem 10.7**

Suppose  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} \neq -\mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V}{\partial t}$ . (Let  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} + \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = \Phi$ —some known function.) We want to pick  $\lambda$  such that  $\mathbf{A}'$  and  $V'$  (Eq. 10.7) do obey  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}' = -\mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V'}{\partial t}$ .

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}' + \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V'}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} + \nabla^2 \lambda + \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} - \mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial^2 \lambda}{\partial t^2} = \Phi + \square^2 \lambda.$$

This will be zero provided we pick for  $\lambda$  the solution to  $\square^2 \lambda = -\Phi$ , which by hypothesis (and in fact) we know how to solve.

We *could* always find a gauge in which  $V' = 0$ , simply by picking  $\lambda = \int_0^t V dt'$ . We *cannot* in general pick  $\mathbf{A} = 0$ —this would make  $\mathbf{B} = 0$ . [Finding such a gauge function would amount to expressing  $\mathbf{A}$  as  $-\nabla \lambda$ , and we know that vector functions *cannot* in general be written as gradients—only if they happen to have curl zero, which  $\mathbf{A}$  (ordinarily) does *not*.]

**Problem 10.8**

From the product rule:

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}) + \mathbf{J} \cdot \left( \nabla \frac{1}{r} \right), \quad \nabla' \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} (\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{J}) + \mathbf{J} \cdot \left( \nabla' \frac{1}{r} \right).$$

But  $\nabla \frac{1}{r} = -\nabla' \frac{1}{r}$ , since  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$ . So

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}) - \mathbf{J} \cdot \left( \nabla' \frac{1}{r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}) + \frac{1}{r} (\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{J}) - \nabla' \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right).$$

But

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial J_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial J_y}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial J_z}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial J_x}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial t_r}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial J_y}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial t_r}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial J_z}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial t_r}{\partial z},$$

and

$$\frac{\partial t_r}{\partial x} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial r}{\partial x}, \quad \frac{\partial t_r}{\partial y} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial r}{\partial y}, \quad \frac{\partial t_r}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial r}{\partial z},$$

so

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} = -\frac{1}{c} \left[ \frac{\partial J_x}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial r}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial J_y}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial r}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial J_z}{\partial t_r} \frac{\partial r}{\partial z} \right] = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial t_r} \cdot (\nabla r).$$

Similarly,

$$\nabla' \cdot \mathbf{J} = -\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial t_r} \cdot (\nabla' r).$$

[The first term arises when we differentiate with respect to the *explicit*  $\mathbf{r}'$ , and use the continuity equation.] thus

$$\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial t_r} \cdot (\nabla' r) \right] + \frac{1}{r} \left[ -\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial t_r} \cdot (\nabla' r) \right] - \nabla' \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) = -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \nabla' \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right)$$

(the other two terms cancel, since  $\nabla r = -\nabla' r$ ). Therefore:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int \frac{\rho}{r} d\tau - \int \nabla' \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \right) d\tau \right] = -\mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ \frac{1}{4\pi \epsilon_0} \int \frac{\rho}{r} d\tau \right] - \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \oint \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \cdot d\mathbf{a}.$$

The last term is over the surface at “infinity”, where  $\mathbf{J} = 0$ , so it’s zero. Therefore  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = -\mu_0 \epsilon_0 \frac{\partial V}{\partial t}$ . ✓