

P.S. Perhaps should
tell you that I have
been ~~unpleasantly~~
in the belief ^{of} ~~the~~
further consequence
of this note
vortex theory
A reference to your
paper was necessary
and is undertaken
to put it into ~~your~~
hands
I was met by ~~some~~
difficulty

Cambridge College
March 5th 1877
9/2

May I venture to trouble you with
a difficulty about your paper
on the electromagnetic field in the
last vol of the Phil Trans.
You say (page 70) I shall assume with
Prof Maxwell etc and refer to
Electricity & Magnetism ii 824. Suppose
then that in your expression $\frac{dE}{dt} f + e$
the symbols have the same meaning
as with Maxwell and clearly your
expression may be got from his (see
7 & 826 by integration by parts
now with Maxwell $\int \eta \int$ have a definite
meaning being the displacements

of a particle of the medium you then
introduce for what the top page 703 a/2
the same expressions that you have already used
on 693 putting $\varphi = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda}$, but in this
expression ξ & η have an equally well
defined meaning being given by the equations
 $\xi = \int \alpha dt$ etc. Thus your assumption
would appear to be identical with

The hypothesis that the magnetic force
at any point is the rate of change of the
displacement of the medium. Your mag-
netic force however is the strength of a
vortex and I have some difficulty in
reconciling these two hypotheses

A further reference to Maxwell on page
703 leads to a further less impressive
that your ξ & η have the same meaning
as his. Maxwell's idea seems to me to
be quite clear. Magnetic effects may be

have been given as given by the equation
 $\xi' = \alpha$ etc I cannot see how without further
 assumptions your additional term
 $\frac{d\xi}{dt} f + \text{etc}$ is to arise I hardly think Max
 well's arguments can be applied to a body
 for its existence unless we suppose that
 $\xi \eta \zeta$ are translational displacements
 if however we take Maxwell's terms and
 substitute on the right hand your equa-
 tions the forces which arise from the
 elastic yielding of the medium and
 then form the equations for $\alpha \beta \gamma$ sup-
 posing them as in the molecular vortex
 theory to be ^{actually} the angular velocities of
 an element we arrive at your equation
 but this implies the additional assump-
 tion of fluid theory. a/2
 Apologizing for writing thus I remain
 Yours very truly
 F. Fitzgerald Esq
 R. T. Glazebrook

explained by vortices in a medium
a/2 When a wave of translational displace-
ment traverses the medium other
vortices are set up the original vor-
tices being displaced, and tension
volving the product of the angular
velocities of the two make their
appearance in the expression for
the kinetic energy of the medium.
The forces introduced by Maxwell in
Section 827 would appear to have
no connexion with electricity beyond
the fact that they arise from the
elastic yielding of the medium.
You however introduce forces depen-
ding on the electrostatic energy of the
field. Of course I may be wrong in my
hypothesis that you intend to make
E.H.F mean the same as Maxwell
It is the case so that you are all the