

Magneto–Fluid Coupling — Eruptive Events in the Solar Corona

Shuichi Ohsaki¹, Nana L. Shatashvili^{2,0} and Zensho Yoshida³

The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

and

Swadesh M. Mahajan⁴

Institute for Fusion Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712

ABSTRACT

By modelling the coronal structures by ”slowly” evolving Double–Beltrami two–fluid equilibria (created by the interaction of the magnetic and velocity fields), the conditions for catastrophic transformations of the original state are derived. It is shown that, at the transition, much of the magnetic energy of the original state is converted to the the flow kinetic energy.

Subject headings: Sun: flares — Sun: corona — Sun: magnetic fields

1. Introduction

The latest TRACE and SOHO/EIT observations have brought the solar corona into sharp focus. The observations reveal: 1) the structures that constitute the solar corona are in constant motion; they are full of fast–moving gases, and are heated primarily at their footpoints (base) very close to the solar surface. The heating occurs in few minutes in the

⁰*Permanent address:* Plasma Physics Department, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi 380028, Georgia

¹Electronic mail: ohsaki@plasma.q.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

²Electronic mail: nana@plasma.q.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp nanas@iberiapac.ge

³Electronic mail: yoshida@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp

⁴Electronic mail: mahajan@mail.utexas.edu

first ten to twenty thousand kilometers above the surface, i.e, in a rather small fraction of the bright part of the anchored structure. In direct contradiction to the predictions of some theories, the heating is neither uniform (throughout the loops) nor does it happen preferentially near the top. A direct quote sums up the situation aptly: "Moreover, not only heat is deposited low down, but the gas is often actually thrust upward very rapidly. It does not merely 'evaporate' into the coronal structures, it is often actually thrown up there. Exactly how that happens is still a puzzle" (Schrijver et al. 1999), 2) the loops are composed of clusters of filamentary structures which are not, as believed before, static bodies supported by interior gas pressure and heated along their lengths (Rosner, Tucker and Vaiana 1978). They fill and drain so quickly that the gas in them must be moving nearly ballistically (see latest TRACE news and e.g. (Schrijver et al. 1999)) along the substructures, rather than being "quiescently heated". From a detailed study of the loops with different characteristic parameters one concludes that the heating process is quite non-uniform (Aschwanden et. al. 2000).

Transient brightenings, with their associated flows of cool and hot material, are also a very common phenomenon in the TRACE movies. These relatively fast (violent) happenings vary from small events in the quiet Sun to major flares in active regions; brightenings which are more than 10^5 km apart often occur within the same exposure that typically lasts for 10 to 30 s (Schrijver et al. 1999). This kind of a coincidence in the events at distant locations is suggestive of fast particle beams propagation along separate magnetic loops which come together at the flaring site. The flaring sites are generally assumed to be reconnection sites although observations have not establish a causal connection: "Direct evidence for reconnection in flares is difficult to find, despite the fact that it is thought to be the primary process behind flares" (Schrijver et al. 1999). It is remarkable that often the post-flare loop systems begin to glow at the TRACE EUV wavelengths without substantial distortion: reconnection that probably took place appears to be (largely) completed by the time the loops are detected.

These observations pose a new challenge for the theories of quiescent as well as not so quiescent coronal structures and events. In this paper we examine the conjecture that

the formation and primary heating of the coronal structures as well as the more violent events (possibly flares, erupting prominences and coronal mass ejections (CMEs)) are the expressions of different aspects of the same general global dynamics that operates in a given coronal region (Mahajan et al. 2001). It is stipulated that the coronal structures are created from the evolution and re-organization of a relatively cold plasma flow emerging from the subcoronal region and interacting with the ambient solar magnetic field. The plasma flows, the source of both the particles and energy (part of which is converted to heat), in their interaction with the magnetic field, also become dynamic determinants of a wide variety of plasma states; it is likely that this interaction may be the cause of the immense diversity of the observed coronal structures (Mahajan et al. 2001; Mahajan and Yoshida 1998; Yoshida and Mahajan 1999). Preliminary results from this magneto-fluid approach reproduce several of the salient observational features of the typical loops: the structure creation and primary heating are simultaneous – the heating takes place (by the viscous dissipation of the flow kinetic energy) in a few minutes, is quite non-uniform, and the base of the hot structure is hotter than the rest.

We plan to extend the scope of the magneto-fluid theory beyond the creation of the semi-quiescent coronal structures by seeking answers to the following: a) can the basic framework of this model predict the possibility of, and the pathways for the occurrence of sudden, eruptive, and catastrophic events (such as flares, eruptive prominences, CMEs) in the solar atmosphere, b) does the eventual fate, possibly catastrophic reorganization, of a given structure lie in the very conditions of its birth, c) is it possible to identify the range and relative values of identifiable physical quantities that make a given structure prone to eruption (flaring), d) will an eruption be the result of the conversion of the excess magnetic energy into heat and bulk plasma motion as is generally believed to happen in the solar atmosphere (Sakurai 1989; Parker 1996; Birn et al 2000; Chen and Shibata 2000; Choe and Cheng 2000; Roald, Sturrok and Wolfson 2000) ?

We begin by identifying the quasi-equilibrium state of a typical coronal structure with a slowly changing Double-Beltrami (DB) state (one of the simplest, non-trivial magnetofluid equilibrium). The slow changes may be due to changes in the sun which affect the local

magnetic fields, the interaction of various nearby structures, or disturbances in the solar atmosphere. The parameter change is assumed to be sufficiently slow that, at each stage, the system can find its local DB equilibrium (adiabatic evolution). The slow evolution must conserve the dynamical invariants: the helicity h_1 , the generalized helicity h_2 , and the total (magnetic plus the fluid) energy E . The problem of predicting sudden events (e.g. catastrophic eruption) then reduces to finding the range, if any, in which the slowly evolving structure may suffer a loss of equilibrium. The signature of the loss of equilibrium is quite easy to identify for the DB states; it happens at the transition point when the roots of the quadratic equation, determining the length scales for the field variation, go from being real to complex (implying change in the topology of the magnetic and the velocity fields — boundary separating the paramagnetic from the diamagnetic).

By analysing a simple analytically tractable model, we find affirmative answers to all the four questions we posed. We show that the invariants h_1, h_2 , and E , which label and alongwith the initial and boundary conditions determine the original state, hold the key to the eventual fate of a structure. If for a given equilibrium sequence, the total energy E is larger than some critical value (given in terms of h_1 , and h_2), the catastrophic loss of equilibrium could certainly occur. The trigger for the equilibrium loss could come, for instance, from nearby structures getting close to each other with an increase in their interaction energy. The catastrophe pushes a DB state to relax to a minimum energy single Beltrami (B) field. For coronal structures, the transition transfers almost all the short-scale magnetic energy to the flow energy.

2. Model

Within the framework of our approach, there are two distinct scenerios for eruptive events : a) when a "slowly" evolving structure finds itself in a state of no equilibrium, and b) when the process of creating a long-lived hot structure is prematurely aborted; the flow shrinks/distorts the structure which suddenly shines and/or releases energy or ejects particles. The latter mechanism requires a detailed time-dependent treatment and is not the subject matter of this paper. The following semi-equilibrium, collisionless magneto-fluid

treatment pertains only to the former case.

A given structure is supposed to correspond to the equilibrium solutions of the two–fluid system

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \boldsymbol{\omega}_j - \nabla \times (\mathbf{U}_j \times \boldsymbol{\omega}_j) = 0 \quad (j = 1, 2) \quad (1)$$

written in terms of a pair of generalized vorticities $\boldsymbol{\omega}_1 = \mathbf{B}$, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_2 = \mathbf{B} + \nabla \times \mathbf{V}$, and effective flows $\mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{V} - \nabla \times \mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{U}_2 = \mathbf{V}$, with the following normalizations: the magnetic field \mathbf{B} to an appropriate measure of the magnetic field B_0 , the fluid velocity \mathbf{V} to the corresponding Alfvén speed, and the distances to the collisionless ion skin depth l_i .

The simplest and perhaps the most fundamental equilibrium solution to (1) is given by the “Beltrami conditions”, which imply the alignment of the vorticities and the corresponding flows ($\boldsymbol{\omega}_j // \mathbf{U}_j$),

$$\mathbf{B} = a(\mathbf{V} - \nabla \times \mathbf{B}), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{B} + \nabla \times \mathbf{V} = b\mathbf{V}, \quad (3)$$

with $a, b = \text{const}$. We have used constant density assumption for simplicity - extension to varying density is straightforward (Mahajan et al. 2001). Equations (2) and (3) combine to yield:

$$(\text{curl} - \lambda_+)(\text{curl} - \lambda_-)\mathbf{B} = 0, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{a} = 1/a$, $\nabla \times = \text{“curl”}$, and

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(b - \tilde{a}) \pm \sqrt{(b + \tilde{a})^2 - 4} \right]. \quad (5)$$

For sub–alfvenic flows (the flows we generally encounter in the solar atmosphere), the length scales (λ_{\pm}^{-1}) are quite disparate. We assume $\lambda_+^{-1} \gg \lambda_-^{-1}$ without loss of generality. The general solution to the “double Beltrami equations” (4) is a linear combination of the single Beltrami fields \mathbf{G}_{\pm} satisfying $(\text{curl} - \lambda)\mathbf{G} = 0$. Thus, for arbitrary constants C_{\pm} , the sum

$$\mathbf{B} = C_+ \mathbf{G}_+ + C_- \mathbf{G}_- \quad (6)$$

solves (4), and the corresponding flow is given by $\mathbf{V} = (\lambda_+ + \tilde{a}) C_+ \mathbf{G}_+ + (\lambda_- + \tilde{a}) C_- \mathbf{G}_-$.

The DB field encompasses a wide class of steady states of mathematical physics – from the force-free paramagnetic field to the fully diamagnetic field. The Beltrami conditions also demand “generalized Bernoulli conditions” which allow pressure confinement when an appropriate flow is driven (Mahajan and Yoshida 1998) (and references therein).

The DB field is characterized by four parameters: λ_+ , λ_- (eigenvalues), and C_+ , C_- (amplitudes). The three invariants Steinhauer and Ishida (1997): the helicity h_1 , the generalized helicity h_2 ,

$$h_1 = \frac{1}{2} \int (\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}) \, d\mathbf{r}, \quad (7)$$

$$h_2 = \frac{1}{2} \int (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{V}) \cdot (\mathbf{B} + \nabla \times \mathbf{V}) \, d\mathbf{r}, \quad (8)$$

(\mathbf{A} is the vector potential), and the total energy

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \int (\mathbf{B}^2 + \mathbf{V}^2) \, d\mathbf{r}. \quad (9)$$

will provide three algebraic relations connecting them (Yoshida et al. 2001). To predict the possibility of an eruptive event, interpreted as the termination of an equilibrium sequence (for solar flares, this kind of an approach, albeit in different contexts, has been followed in numerous investigations, see e.g (Forbes and Isenberg 1991; Kusano et al 1995) and references therein), we analytically investigate this system using the macro-scale (λ_+^{-1}) of the closed structure as a control parameter. This choice is physically sensible and is motivated by observations because in the process of structure–structure interactions, “initial” shapes do undergo deformations/distortions with rates strongly dependent on the initial and boundary conditions.

For simplicity we explicitly work out the system in a Cartesian cube of length L . We take \mathbf{G}_\pm to be the simple 2-D Beltrami ABC field (Arnold and Khesin 1998),

$$\mathbf{G}_\pm = g_{x\pm} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sin \lambda_\pm x \\ \cos \lambda_\pm x \end{pmatrix} + g_{y\pm} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \lambda_\pm y \\ 0 \\ \sin \lambda_\pm y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

with the normalization $(g_{x\pm})^2 + (g_{y\pm})^2 = 1$. For real λ_\pm , (10) represents an arcade–magnetic field structure resembling interacting coronal loops [in FIG.1]. Assuming $L = n_+(2\pi/\lambda_+) =$

$n_-(2\pi/\lambda_-)$ (n_\pm are integers), \mathbf{G}_\pm satisfy the following relations: $\int \mathbf{G}_\pm^2 d\mathbf{r} = L^2$, $\int \mathbf{G}_+ \cdot \mathbf{G}_- d\mathbf{r} = 0$, where $\int d\mathbf{r} = \int_0^L \int_0^L dx dy$.

The invariants can now be readily evaluated and the results can be displayed in several equivalent forms. We find the following three equations to be the most convenient for further analysis ($h_2 = h_1 + \tilde{h}_2$, $\tilde{h}_2 = bE - \lambda_+ \lambda_- h_1$):

$$\tilde{h}_2 = \frac{E}{2} \left[(\lambda_+ + \lambda_-) \pm \sqrt{(\lambda_+ - \lambda_-)^2 + 4} \right] - \lambda_+ \lambda_- h_1, \quad (11)$$

$$C_+^2 = D^{-1} \{ E - [1 + (\lambda_- + \tilde{a})^2] \lambda_- h_1 \} \lambda_+, \quad (12)$$

$$C_-^2 = D^{-1} \{ E - [1 + (\lambda_+ + \tilde{a})^2] \lambda_+ h_1 \} \lambda_-, \quad (13)$$

where we have removed the common factor $L^2/2$, and

$$D = [1 + (\lambda_+ + \tilde{a})^2] \lambda_+ - [1 + (\lambda_- + \tilde{a})^2] \lambda_- = (\lambda_+ - \lambda_-) b(b + \tilde{a}). \quad (14)$$

For given h_1 , E , \tilde{h}_2 (h_2) and λ_+ (control parameter), we can solve the preceding system to determine the physical quantities λ_- , and C_\pm which must all remain real for an equilibrium. Before we give an analytic derivation for the bifurcation conditions (leading to loss of equilibrium), we display in Fig.2 the plots of λ_- and C_\pm as functions of λ_+ for two distinct sets for the values of the invariants: we choose $h_1 = 1$, $h_2 = 1.5$, $E = 0.4$ for Fig.2(a), and $h_1 = 1$, $h_2 = 1.5$, $E = 1.3$ for Fig.2(b) (dashed lines correspond to the region of imaginary C_-). We find that the behavior of the solution changes drastically with E . For the parameters of Fig.2(a), λ_- and C_\pm remain real and change continuously with varying λ_+ implying that as the macroscopic scale of the structure ($1/\lambda_+$) changes continuously, the equilibrium expressed by (10) persists – there is no catastrophic or qualitative change. For Fig.2(b) with E changing from 0.4 to 1.3 (with same h_1 , h_2) we arrive at a fundamentally different situation; when λ_+ exceeds a critical value λ_+^{crit} , i.e, the macro-scale becomes smaller than a critical size, the physical determinants of the equilibrium cease to be real; the sequence of equilibria is terminated.

The condition for catastrophe turns out to be a constraint involving h_1 , h_2 and E , which will allow the λ_\pm curve represented by equation(11) to intersect with the line $\lambda_+ = \lambda_-$ for real λ_\pm . It is straightforward to show that the system has a critical point if

$$E^2 \geq E_c^2 = 4 \left(h_1 \pm \sqrt{h_1 h_2} \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

with $\lambda_+^{\text{crit}} = 0.5 \cdot \left[E \pm \sqrt{E^2 - 4h_1(\tilde{h}_2 \pm E)} \right]$.

Thus for $E > E_c$ (determined by helicities h_1 and h_2) when the macroscopic size of a structure shrinks below a critical value, it can go through a severe reorganization.

At the critical point, an expected but most remarkable transition occurs. Using the value of λ_+^{crit} , we find from equation(13) that the coefficient C_- , which measures the strength of the short scale fields, identically vanishes, and the equilibrium changes from Double Beltrami to a single Beltrami state defined by $\lambda_+ = \lambda_+^{\text{crit}}$, i.e., $\mathbf{B} = C_+ \mathbf{G}_+$ ($\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \lambda_+ \mathbf{B}$) with \mathbf{V} parallel to \mathbf{B} . The transition leads to a magnetically more relaxed state with the magnetic energy reaching its minimum with appropriate gain in the flow kinetic energy (see Fig.3).

3. Conclusions

By modelling quasi-equilibrium, slowly evolving coronal structures as a sequence of Double-Beltrami magnetofluid states in which the magnetic and the velocity field are self-consistently coupled, we have shown the possibility of, and derived the conditions for catastrophic changes leading to a fundamental transformation of the initial state. The critical condition comes out as an inequality involving three invariants of the collisionless magnetofluid dynamics. When the total energy exceeds a critical energy the DB equilibrium suddenly relaxes to a single Beltrami state corresponding to the large macroscopic size. All of the short-scale magnetic energy is lost having been transformed to the flow energy and partly to heat via the viscous dissipation of the flow energy.

This general mechanism in which the flows (and their interactions with the magnetic field) play an essential role could certainly help in advancing our understanding of a variety of sudden (violent) events in the solar atmosphere like the flares, the erupting prominences, and the coronal mass ejections. The connection of flows with eruptive events is rather direct: it depends on their ability to deform (in specific cases distort) the ambient magnetic field lines to temporarily stretch (shrink, destroy) the closed field lines so that the flow can escape the local region with a considerable increase in kinetic energy in the form of heat/bulk motion.

For SMM this study was supported by US Department of Energy Contract No.DE-FG03-96ER-54366. The work of ZY was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture No.09308011. Work of NLS was partially supported by the Joint INTAS-Georgian Grant No.52. Authors thank Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy, where this work was started.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, V.I. and Khesin, B.A. 1998, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*, Springer-Verlag: New York Berlin Heidelberg 1998, 72.
- Aschwanden, M.J., Nightingale, R.W. and Alexander, R.W. 2000, *ApJ*, 541, 1059.
- Birn, J., Gosling, J.T., Hesse, M., Forbes, T.G. and Priest, E.R. 2000, *ApJ*, 541, 1078.
- Chen, P.F. and Shibata, K. 2000, *ApJ*, 545, 524.
- Choe, G.S. and Cheng, C.Z. 2000, *ApJ*, 441, 449.
- Forbes, T.G. and Isenberg, P.A. 1991, *ApJ*, 373, 294.
- Kusano, K., Suzuki, Y. and Nishikawa, K. 1995, *ApJ*, 441, 942.
- Mahajan, S.M., Miklaszewski, R., Nikol'skaya, K.I. and Shatashvili, N.L. 2001, *Phys. Plasmas*, 8, 1340.
- Mahajan, S.M. and Yoshida, Z. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 81, 4863.
- Parker, E.N. 1996, *ApJ*, 471, 489.
- Roald, C.B., Sturrock, P.A. and Wolfson, R. 2000, *ApJ*, 538, 960.
- Rosner, R., Tucker, W.H. and Vaiana, G.S. 1978, *ApJ*, 220, 643.
- Sakurai, T. 1989, *Solar Phys.*, 121, 347.

Schrijver, C.J., Title, A.M., Berger, T.E., Fletcher, L., Hurlburt, N.E., Nightingale, R.W., Shine, R.A., Tarbell, T.D., Wolfson, J., Golub, L., Bookbinder, J.A., Deluca, E.E., McMullen, R.A., Warren, H.P., Kankelborg, C.C., Handy B.N. and DePontieu, B. 1999, *Solar Phys.*, 187, 261.

Steinhauer, L.C. and Ishida, A. 1997, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 79, 3423.

Yoshida, Z. and Mahajan, S.M. 1999, *J. Math. Phys.*, 40, 5080.


Z. Yoshida, S.M. Mahajan, S. Ohsaki, M. Iqbal and N. Shatashvili. 2001, *Phys. Plasmas*, 8, No.5.



FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIG. 1. Magnetic field line structure of a 2-D ABC map resembling coronal arcades.





FIG. 2. (a) Plots of λ_- and C_{\pm} versus λ_+ for $E = 0.4 < E_c \simeq 0.45$, the critical energy. No catastrophe. (b) Plots of λ_- and C_{\pm} versus λ_+ for $E = 1.3 > E_c$. There is a critical point at $\lambda_+ \simeq 0.041$.

FIG. 3. Plots for λ_- , the magnetic and the flow energies versus λ_+ for the catastrophe-prone set $h_1 = 1$, $h_2 = 1.007$ and $E = 1.3 > E_c = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$. The scale lengths are highly separated $\lambda_+ \ll \lambda_-$. The initial choice makes $C_+ \sim O(\lambda_+/\lambda_-) \ll 1$ and $C_- \sim O(\lambda_-/\lambda_-) \sim 1$ from (12) and (13). If any interaction increases λ_+ (the size of the structure shrinks) the critical point ($\lambda_+ = \lambda_+^{\text{crit}}$) will be reached at which C_- is zero. The magnetic field energy ($\propto C_+^2 + C_-^2$) decreases to a very small value since $C_+^2 \ll 1$. Since the total energy is conserved, almost all the initial magnetic energy is transferred to the flow causing an eruption. Notice that for coronal plasma, the skin depth l_i is small $\sim 100\text{cm}$ ($l_i/\lambda_+ \sim 10^3\text{km}$), for a typical density of $\sim 10^9\text{cm}^{-3}$. A word of caution is necessary – as we approach the critical point, the quasiequilibrium considerations are just an indicator of what is happening – they must be replaced by a full time-dependent treatment to capture the dynamics; the changes are no longer slow.






0.1



(a)

(b)



Energy

