

# Magnetic susceptibility and permeability

Monday, April 8, 2019 4:28 PM

For paramagnetic and diamagnetic materials the fields  $\vec{B}$  and  $\vec{M}$  are proportional to each other. However, while for paramagnetic materials the vectors  $\vec{B}$  and  $\vec{H}$  are parallel, for diamagnetic materials the vectors  $\vec{B}$  and  $\vec{H}$  are antiparallel. In those cases one can define the magnetic susceptibility such that

$$\vec{M} = \chi_m \vec{H}$$

$\chi_m \equiv$  magnetic susceptibility

The magnetic susceptibility can be either positive or negative.

One can then insert the above in the relation between  $\vec{H}$  and  $\vec{B}$

$$\vec{B} = \mu_0 (\vec{H} + \vec{M}) = \mu_0 (1 + \chi_m) \vec{H} \equiv \mu \vec{H}$$

$\equiv \mu$  magnetic permeability

In vacuum  $\mu = \mu_0$ ; this explains why  $\mu_0$  is called the permeability of free space. (there is no magnetization in vacuum.)

Observe that even in linear media the fact that the divergence of  $\vec{B}$  is zero does not imply that the divergence of  $\vec{H}$  is zero:

$$\underbrace{\vec{B} = \mu \vec{H}}_{\text{linear medium}} \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{B} = 0 \quad \not\Rightarrow \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{H} = 0$$

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{H} = \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \vec{B} \right) = \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \cdot \vec{B} + \vec{B} \cdot \left( \nabla \frac{1}{\mu} \right) = \vec{B} \cdot \left( \nabla \frac{1}{\mu} \right)$$

$\vec{H}$  is not divergenceless at points where  $\mu$  is changing (for example at a boundary between two media)

Observe that within a linear material

$$\vec{j}_b = \nabla \times \vec{M} = \nabla \times (\chi_m \vec{H}) = \chi_m \nabla \times \vec{H} = \chi_m \vec{j}_f$$

$$\vec{j}_f = 0 \implies \vec{j}_b = 0$$

All of the bound current will be on the surface.

A very similar thing happens in electrostatics

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_b &= -\nabla \cdot \vec{P} = -\nabla \cdot (\epsilon_0 \chi_e \vec{E}) = -\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon} \chi_e \vec{D} \right) \\ &= -\frac{\epsilon_0 \chi_e}{\epsilon} \underbrace{\nabla \cdot \vec{D}}_{\rho_f} = -\frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon} \chi_e \rho_f \end{aligned}$$

Remember that

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_0 (1 + \chi_e) \implies \chi_e = \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_0} - 1$$

$$\frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon} \chi_e = 1 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon}$$

$$\rho_b = -\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon}\right) \rho_f$$

Therefore, if

$$\rho_f = 0 \implies \rho_b = 0$$

In the bulk of a uniform linear dielectric, the bound charge shadows the free charge so that

$$\rho_{\text{TOT}} = \rho_b + \rho_f = \left(-1 + \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon} + 1\right) \rho_f = \frac{\epsilon_0}{\epsilon} \rho_f$$

If the free charge is simply a point charge placed in the dielectric, the field in the dielectric differs from the field in vacuum because of the permittivity

$$E_{\text{vac}} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{Q}{r^2} \implies E_{\text{diel.}} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon} \frac{Q}{r^2}$$