

Asymmetric Magnetic Reconnection in the Solar Atmosphere

Nick Murphy

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics

May 23–25, 2012

2012 US-Japan Workshop on Magnetic Reconnection

With thanks to: M. P. Miralles, C. L. Pope, J. C. Raymond,
H. D. Winter, K. K. Reeves, D. B. Seaton, A. A. van Ballegooijen,
J. Lin, and C. Shen

Introduction

- ▶ Most models of reconnection assume symmetry
- ▶ *Asymmetric inflow reconnection* occurs when the upstream magnetic fields and/or plasma parameters differ
 - ▶ Dayside magnetopause
 - ▶ Tearing in tokamaks, RFPs, and other confined plasmas
 - ▶ Merging of unequal flux ropes
 - ▶ 'Pull' reconnection in MRX
- ▶ *Asymmetric outflow reconnection* occurs, for example, when outflow in one direction is impeded
 - ▶ Flare/CME current sheets
 - ▶ Planetary magnetotails
 - ▶ Spheromak merging
 - ▶ 'Push' reconnection in MRX
- ▶ This talk covers reconnection with both asymmetric inflow and outflow during solar eruptions


NIMROD simulations of line-tied asymmetric reconnection

- ▶ Reconnecting magnetic fields are asymmetric:

$$B_y(x) = \frac{B_0}{1+b} \tanh\left(\frac{x}{\delta_0} - b\right) \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Initial X-line located at $(x, y) = (0, 1)$ near lower wall
- ▶ Magnetic field ratios: 1.0, 0.5, 0.25, and 0.125
- ▶ $\beta_0 = 0.18$ in higher magnetic field upstream region
- ▶ $-7 \leq x \leq 7$, $0 \leq y \leq 30$; conducting wall BCs
- ▶ High resolution needed over a larger area
- ▶ Caveats:
 - ▶ 1-D initial equilibrium with no vertical stratification
 - ▶ Single X-line in resistive MHD
 - ▶ Neglect 3-D effects
 - ▶ Unphysical upper conducting wall BC
- ▶ See Murphy et al. (2012, ApJ) for details


Reconnection with both asymmetric inflow and outflow



The location of the principal X-line helps determine where released energy goes


- ▶ The principal X-line is generally located near the lower base of the current sheet
 - ▶ Most of the released energy is directed upward
 - ▶ Consistent with numerical and analytical results by Seaton (2008), Reeves et al. (2010), Murphy (2010), & Shen et al. (2011)
 - ▶ However, during one guide field simulation the X-line drifted to the top of the current sheet
- ▶ The X-line usually drifts slowly into the strong field region
- ▶ X-line motion is tied intrinsically to derivatives of the out-of-plane electric field (Murphy 2010)

There is significant plasma flow across the X-line in both the inflow and outflow directions (see also Murphy 2010)




- ▶ $V_x(x_n, y_n)$ and $V_y(x_n, y_n)$ give the flow velocity at the X-line
- ▶ dx_n/dt and dy_n/dt give the rate of X-line motion
- ▶ X-line motion results from a combination of:
 - ▶ Advection by the bulk plasma flow
 - ▶ Diffusion of the magnetic field
- ▶ No flow stagnation point within the CS in simulation frame

The post-flare loops develop a skewed candle flame shape



- ▶ Magnetic flux contours for $B_L/B_R \in \{1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125\}$ when $y_n \approx 2.9$
- ▶ Dashed green line: loop-top positions
- ▶ Dotted red line: analytic asymptotic approximation

The Tsuneta (1996) flare is a famous candidate event



- ▶ Shape suggests north is weak **B** side


Asymmetric speeds of footpoint motion

- ▶ In 2-D models, the footpoints of newly reconnected loops show apparent motion away from each other as more flux is reconnected
- ▶ In 2-D, the amount of flux reconnected on each side of the loop must be equal to each other
- ▶ When the magnetic fields are asymmetric, the footpoint on the strong **B** side will move slowly compared to the footpoint on the weak **B** side
- ▶ Because of the patchy distribution of flux on the photosphere, more complicated motions frequently occur (e.g., Bogachev et al. 2005; Grigis & Benz 2005; Su et al. 2007; Yang et al. 2009)

Asymmetric hard X-ray (HXR) footpoint emission


- ▶ The standard model of flares predicts HXR emission at the flare footpoints from energetic particles (EPs) impacting the chromosphere
- ▶ Magnetic mirroring reflects energetic particles (EPs) preferentially on the strong **B** side
- ▶ More particles should escape on the weak **B** side, leading to greater HXR emission
- ▶ This trend is observed in $\sim 2/3$ of events (Goff et al.)
 - ▶ Additional factors include:
 - ▶ Asymmetry in initial pitch angle distributions of EPs
 - ▶ Directionality of the reconnecting electric field (Hamilton et al. 2005; Li & Lin 2012)
 - ▶ Different column densities (cf. Saint-Hilaire et al. 2008)
 - ▶ More detailed energetic particle modeling is required

The outflow plasmoid develops net vorticity because the CS outflow impacts it at an angle



► Velocity vectors in reference frame of O-point

Preliminary results: asymmetric inflow plasmoid instability



- ▶ Above simulation seeded with several initial X-lines
- ▶ The plasmoids develop preferentially into the weak field region
- ▶ Few new X-lines form
- ▶ Outward advection of plasmoids is inefficient
- ▶ How do the onset criterion, linear/nonlinear growth rates, and dynamics change with increasing Lundquist number?

Conclusions

- ▶ We simulate 2D reconnection in a line-tied asymmetric current sheet
 - ▶ Both the inflow and outflow are asymmetric
- ▶ The observational signatures of asymmetric reconnection during solar eruptions include:
 - ▶ Skewing/distortion of post-flare loops into a skewed candle flame shape
 - ▶ The footpoint in the weak field region moves more quickly and has stronger HXR emission than the footpoint in the strong field region
 - ▶ The X-line drifts slowly into the strong field region
 - ▶ Net vorticity in the rising flux rope
- ▶ Future work on this problem:
 - ▶ Energetic particle modeling of skewed post-flare loops
 - ▶ Test against observations from SDO/AIA, Hinode/XRT, and RHESSI
 - ▶ Plasmoid instability during asymmetric inflow reconnection