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In 1870, Helmholtz published an article [34] (see also [35]) that was one of the first to cite Maxwell’s great paper of 1865 [29], and which also considered the electrodynamics of F. Neumann [14, 18], Weber [15, 19, 22, 23], Kirchhoff [24, 25] and C. Neumann [32, 33].¹ Here, we emphasize that Helmholtz used the electromagnetic potentials \( \varphi \) and \( A = (U, V, W) \) as a way of comparing these different visions, noting that these potentials can be subject to the (gauge) condition,² eq. (3a), p. 80 of [34],

\[
\nabla \cdot A = -\frac{k}{c} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \quad \text{(Helmholtz),}
\]

in Gaussian units, where \( c \) is a constant determined from electro- and magnetostatic experiments [23] equal to the speed of light in vacuum, and \( k \) is arbitrary.³,⁴ The gauge (1) considered by Helmholtz in 1870, well before the notion of a gauge was appreciated, is now called the \( \alpha \)-Lorentz gauge [52, 55, 60] or the velocity gauge [57, 58, 63].

The electrodynamics of the Neumanns, Weber and Kirchhoff did not include concepts of the electric and magnetic fields, \( E \) and \( B \),⁵ which are related to the potentials in Maxwell’s electrodynamics by

\[
E = -\nabla \varphi - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial A}{\partial t}, \quad B = \nabla \times A,
\]

¹F. Neumann, who introduced the concepts of self and mutual inductance in [14, 18], was the father of C. Neumann who eventually became an advocate of Maxwell’s theory [41].

²Helmholtz might have been alerted to the arbitrariness of the potentials by Maxwell’s discussion in secs. 98-99, p. 500, of [29], where the transformations \( A' = A - \nabla \chi \) and \( \Psi' = \Psi + \partial \chi / \partial t \) (= Maxwell’s \( \varphi \)) were presented in eqs. (75) and (77), with \( A = (F, G, H) \).

³Helmholtz introduced his parameter \( k \) in an expression for the interaction energy \( U_{12} \) of two closed circuits that carry electric currents \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \), writing in his eq. (1),

\[
U_{12} = \oint_1 \frac{I_1}{c} d\mathbf{l}_1 \cdot \oint_2 \frac{(1+k) I_2 + (1-k) \mathbf{r} \cdot d\mathbf{l}_2}{2cr} = \oint_1 \frac{I_1}{c} d\mathbf{l}_1 \cdot \mathbf{A}_2,
\]

where the vector potential \( \mathbf{A} \) was given by his eq. (1⁵),

\[
\mathbf{A} = \int \frac{(1+k) \mathbf{J} + (1-k) \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{J}}{2cr} d\text{Vol},
\]

in terms of the current density \( \mathbf{J} \) rather than current \( I \). The case of \( k = 1 \) in our eqs. (2)-(3) is consistent with sec. 11 of F. Neumann’s paper [14], and while Helmholtz claimed that \( k = -1 \) corresponds to the theory of Weber [15, 19] this is less evident.

⁴Discussions of the rest of Helmholtz’ paper include chap. 4 of [46], p. 446 of [49], [50], pp. 160-166 of [51], pp. 297-301 of [53], sec. 3 of [56], and sec. II B of [57]. See also [48, 54, 59].

⁵Kirchhoff, p. 199 of [24], expressed Ohm’s law [11] in a form equivalent to \( \mathbf{J} = \sigma (-\nabla \varphi - \partial \mathbf{A}/\partial t) \), where \( \sigma \) is the electrical conductivity, without relating this to an electric field \( \mathbf{E} \), such that \( \mathbf{J} = \sigma \mathbf{E} \).
and also obey the four Maxwell equations,\(^6\)
\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 4\pi \rho, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{J} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t}.
\]
(5)

Using eq. (4) in (5), we obtain second-order differential equations for the potentials,
\[
\nabla^2 \phi + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}) = -4\pi \rho, \quad \nabla^2 \mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{A}}{\partial t^2} - \nabla \left( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} \right) = -\frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{J}.
\]
(6)

Then, using Helmholtz’ condition (1), the wave equations for the potentials become (in Maxwell’s theory),
\[
\nabla^2 \phi - \frac{k}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} = -4\pi \rho, \quad \nabla^2 \mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{A}}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} (\nabla \phi) = -\frac{4\pi}{c} \mathbf{J} \quad \text{(Helmholtz).}
\]
(7)

Thus, in the Helmholtz gauge (1) (and in Maxwell’s theory), the scalar potential propagates with speed \(c/\sqrt{k}\) where \(k\) is arbitrary (even negative!), while the vector potential has a piece that propagates at speed \(c\), and another piece (related to \(\nabla \phi\)) that propagates at speed \(c/\sqrt{\kappa}\). Of course, the fields \(\mathbf{E}\) and \(\mathbf{B}\) propagate at speed \(c\), as follows directly from the Maxwell equations (5), which can be combined into the wave equations,
\[
\nabla^2 \mathbf{E} - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{E}}{\partial t^2} = 4\pi \nabla \rho + \frac{4\pi}{c^2} \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla^2 \mathbf{B} - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{B}}{\partial t^2} = -\frac{4\pi}{c} \nabla \times \mathbf{J}.
\]
(8)

When using eq. (1) to compute the fields from the potentials, the piece of \(\mathbf{A}\) that propagates at speed \(c/\sqrt{k}\) does not affect the propagation of \(\mathbf{B}\), and its effect on the propagation of \(\mathbf{E}\) is canceled by the contribution from \(-\nabla \phi\).

Maxwell favored use of the Coulomb gauge, \(k = 0\) in eqs. (1) and (7),\(^7\) as was noted by Helmholtz in [34, 35].\(^8\)

Helmholtz did not cite Lorenz’ paper of 1867 [31] that corresponded to use of \(k = 1\) in our eq. (1) (shortly before eq. (8) of [31]), in which gauge both the scalar and vector potentials propagate with velocity \(c\). Instead, he claimed that F. Neumann assumed \(k = 1\) (in our eqs. (2)-(3)), as remarked in footnote 3 above.

Already in 1857, Kirchhoff [24, 25] had used the velocity gauge, \(k = -1\) in our eq. (1), which work was cited by Helmholtz but not identified with any choice of \(k\).\(^9\)\(^10\) However, Helmholtz attributed the use of \(k = -1\) in our eqs. (2)-(3) to C. Neumann and Weber.

\(^6\)In [29], the first and fourth Maxwell equations were expressed in terms of \(\mathbf{D} = \varepsilon \mathbf{E}, \rho_{\text{free}}, \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{B}/\mu \) and \(\mathbf{J}_{\text{free}}\), where \(\varepsilon\) and \(\mu\) are the relative permittivity and permeability.

\(^7\)The Maxwellian vector potential for magnetostatics in the Coulomb gauge corresponds to \(k = 1\) in our eqs. (2)-(3).

\(^8\)Surprisingly, Maxwell did not seem bothered by the “instantaneous” propagation of the scalar potential in the Coulomb gauge, having convinced himself that such behavior was not a type of periodic phenomenon such as light (see Appendix A.4.3 of [61]).

\(^9\)It remains impressive that Kirchhoff [24, 25] was able to build on Weber’s electrodynamics [15] to deduce a wave equation for the current and charge on current elements (conductors), finding the wavespeed to be \(c\). In Kirchhoff’s analysis, the electric charge density was zero, in which case the (Maxwell) equations (7) for the potentials with \(k = -1\) are consistent with \(\phi = 0\), and with \(\mathbf{A}\) (and \(\mathbf{J}\), the source of \(\mathbf{A}\)) propagating at velocity \(c\). However, as Weber’s electrodynamics was based on action-at-a-distance, and was not a field theory in the sense of Faraday, Weber and Kirchhoff did not infer that, since waves of electric current \(\mathbf{J}\) in wires move at light speed, light must be an electromagnetic phenomenon.

\(^10\)Riemann mentioned the condition (1) with \(k = -1\) in an 1861 lecture, p. 330 of [28].
While Maxwell’s electrodynamics is independent of the choice of gauge (i.e., choice of $k$), the electrodynamics of the other Germans considered by Helmholtz was not. Note that use of the potentials in eq. (1) implies the second and third Maxwell equations of (5), but not the first and fourth. The first Maxwell equation could be considered as compatible with all the various electrodynamic theories of the mid 1800’s, which were distinguished by their different proposals for extensions of Ampère’s electrodynamics to include time-dependent phenomena. Maxwell’s fourth equation of (5) contains the so-called displacement current $(1/4\pi) \partial \mathbf{E}/\partial t$, which was not consistent with any of the other theories cited.\textsuperscript{12}

A Appendix: Some History of Potentials

Lagrange, p. 348 of [2], may have been the first to note that Newton’s $1/r^2$ gravitational (vector) force law, pp. 108 and 390 of [1], can be related to the gradient of a scalar force function $V$ (of dimensions mass/distance for the force on a unit mass) as, in present notation,

$$\mathbf{F} = -\nabla V \quad \text{(Lagrange).}$$

(10)

Laplace, p. 25 of [5], added that in regions free from source masses, the force function obeys

$$\nabla^2 V = 0 \quad \text{(Laplace),}$$

(11)

and Poisson clarified that the force function is related to the source volume density $\rho$ according to, p 390 of [6],

$$\nabla^2 V = -4\pi \rho \quad \text{(Poisson).}$$

(12)

Coulomb noted that both static electric [3] and magnetic [4] forces between charges/poles obey a $1/r^2$ force law. Poisson applied Laplace’s equation (with $\varphi$ as the scalar function) to a theory of magnetism based on magnetic poles, p. 493 of [8], and then used Poisson’s equation with this theory on p. 463 of [10]. The force function was applied to electrostatics by Green, p. 9 of [12], who called it the potential function.

Following Örsted’s discovery [7] that electric currents exert forces on permanent magnets, Ampère [9] developed a theory that all magnetic effects are associated with electric currents. In separate elaborations of Ampère’s theory, Neumann (1845) [14, 18] and Weber (1846) [15] discussed scalar interaction energies that they called potentials, from which electromotive

\textsuperscript{11}Electro- and magnetostatic potentials are independent of the choice of $k$ within the velocity gauge, as can be seen from eq. (7). This may have led physicists in the 19th century to consider the potentials as “real” physical elements of their theories, rather than as “merely” useful mathematical functions. These physicists would have been disconcerted by Gibb’s remark (1896) [39] that one can define the scalar potential to be zero, in which case the vector potential in electro- and magnetostatics is given by

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{Gibbs}} = -ct \int \frac{\rho \mathbf{r}}{r^3} \, d\text{Vol} + \frac{1}{c} \int \frac{\mathbf{J}}{r} \, d\text{Vol}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

\textsuperscript{12}For example, Helmholtz used Weber’s theory to arrive at eq. (3), p. 80 of [34], which is our eq. (7) but without the term $-\partial^2 \mathbf{A}/\partial (ct)^2$ (which derived from the displacement current).
forces\textsuperscript{13,14} could be deduced by taking derivatives. Neumann’s potential (energy) for two closed currents $I_1$ and $I_2$, sec. 11 of [14], can be written (in Gaussian units) as

$$U_{\text{Neumann}} = \frac{I_1}{c} \oint_1 d\mathbf{l}_1 \cdot I_2 \oint_2 c \mathbf{r}_{12} = \frac{I_1}{c} \oint_1 d\mathbf{l}_1 \cdot \mathbf{A}_2,$$

(13)

where $c$ is the speed of light in vacuum ($= 1/\sqrt{\epsilon_0\mu_0}$ in SI units, with permittivity $\epsilon_0$ and permeability $\mu_0$ determined from static experiments), and

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{I}{c} \oint \frac{d\mathbf{l}}{r},$$

(14)

is the vector potential associated with a (steady) current $I$ that flows in a closed loop.

Neumann never factorized his potential into the second form of eq. (13), but is nonetheless generally credited with inventing the vector potential.

In contrast, Weber’s potential for a pair of moving charges $e$ and $e'$ separated by distance $r$ had the form, p. 230 of [19],

$$U_{\text{Weber}} = \frac{ee'}{r} \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{2c^2}\right).$$

(15)

In 1846, p. 63 of [16], W. Thomson described the electrical force due to a unit charge at the origin “exerted at the point $(x, y, z)$” as $r/r^3$, without explicit statement that a charge exists at that point to experience the force.\textsuperscript{15} He immediately continued with the example of a “point” magnetic dipole $\mathbf{m}$, whose (magnetic) scalar potential is $\Phi = \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{r}/r^3$, noting that the magnetic force $-\nabla \Phi$ on a unit magnetic pole $p$ can also be written as $\nabla \times \mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{r}/r^3$ (although Thomson did not assign a symbol to the vector $\mathbf{A}$, nor notice that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$). The vector $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ is the earliest mathematical statement of a magnetic field (although Thomson did not use the term “field” until p. 179 of [21] (1850)).

We have already mentioned that the first statement of a gauge condition was by Kirchhoff (1857) [24, 25],

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \quad \text{(Kirchhoff).}$$

(16)

The first statement of the Coulomb-gauge condition was by Maxwell (1861), eq. (57), p. 290 of [27],

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0 \quad \text{(Coulomb).}$$

(17)

\textsuperscript{13}The vector force on an electric charge or circuit was called an electromotive force, as also was the scalar quantity that we write as $\int \mathbf{E} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$ (and still call “the” electromotive force on occasion).

\textsuperscript{14}Grassmann’s contribution [13] should also be noted, that the force law between electric circuits can be expressed in a factorizable form, permitting identification of a magnetic field (not done by Grassmann), at the expense of abandoning Newton’s third law of action and reaction for current elements (moving charges, which had not yet been studied in Grassmann’s time, but first done by Rowland (1878) [37] while working with Helmholtz). For discussion of action and reaction in magnetic interactions, see, for example, [47].

\textsuperscript{15}In the view of this author, that statement is the first mathematical appearance of the electric field in the literature, although neither vector notation nor the term “electric field” were used by Thomson.
Lorenz stated his gauge condition in 1867, shortly before eq. (8) of [31], and gave expressions for the retarded potentials, following Riemann [30],

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \quad \text{(Lorenz).}$$

(18)

In 1870, Helmholtz introduced the velocity gauge, eq. (3a) of [34],

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = \frac{k}{c} \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \quad \text{(velocity).}$$

(19)

In 1896, Gibbs [39] introduced the gauge where the scalar potential is everywhere zero,

$$V = 0 \quad \text{(Gibbs).}$$

(20)

The arbitrariness of the potentials under gauge transformations was noted by Maxwell (1865) in secs. 98-99 of [29], but this was little appreciated for many years.\(^{16}\) Some awareness of this arbitrariness was expressed by Larmor (1900), sec. 77, p. 121 of [40], and by Macdonald (1902), p. 12 of [42] (where the Lorenz-gauge condition was invoked). The general gauge transformation was mentioned by Lorentz (1904) on p. 157 of [43], along with a statement of his preference for the Lorentz gauge (without attribution, such that this gauge became known to many as the Lorentz gauge). The influence of Lorentz was reflected, for example, by the discussion of Schott (1912), p. 3 of [44].

The term gauge invariance was invented by Weyl, p. 100 of the English version of [45].
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