# The Universality of Initial C onditions for G lobular C luster Form ation

Sergey Mashchenko<sup>1</sup> and Alison Sills<sup>1</sup>

# ABSTRACT

We investigate a simplem odel for globular cluster (GC) form ation. We simulate the violent relaxation of initially hom ogeneous isotherm all stellar spheres and show that it leads to the form ation of clusters with radial density process that m atch the observed process of GCs. The best m atch is achieved for dynam ically unevolved clusters. In this model, all the observed correlations between global GC parameters are accurately reproduced if one assumes that all the clusters initially had the same value of the stellar density and the velocity dispersion. This suggests that the gas which form ed GCs had the same values of density and temperature throughout the universe.

Subject headings: globular clusters: general | m ethods: N -body simulations

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

G bbular clusters (GCs) are massive, dense clusters of stars, and in many galaxies they are the oldest datable objects. They contain important clues to early star formation in the universe, and to the formation history of our Miky W ay and other galaxies. The dynamical evolution of GCs has been studied formany decades, and is considered to be well-understood. However, the formation of GCs is still an open question.

The internal structure and dynam ics of G alactic GCs are well described by a fam ily of lowered isotherm alm odels (so-called K ing m odels, K ing 1966). The radial proles of K ing m odels have a lower (characterized by a core radius  $r_0$ ) and a sharp cut-o at a tidal radius  $r_t$ . GCs are presently in dynam ical equilibrium. Initially they could have form ed in some non-equilibrium con guration which relaxed to a K ing m odel through violent relaxation (M eylan & H eggie 1997) followed by a slow evolution in the galactic tidal eld.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, M cM aster University, H am ilton, ON, L8S 4M 1, C anada; syam ,asills@physics.mcm aster.ca

Currently no models of GC form ation explain all the observed properties of these star clusters (D jorgovski & M eylan 1994; M cLaughlin 2000). Correlations between parameters which are not signicantly a ected by the dynamical evolution of a cluster (such as halfmass radius, central velocity dispersion and binding energy) are thought to reject the initial conditions for GC form ation. Therefore, any model of cluster form ation should aim to address the observed correlations.

In this paper, we investigate the simplest possible model for GC formation: the dynamical evolution of a hom ogeneous isothermal stellar sphere. Simulations of the collapse of hom ogeneous stellar sphere with constant velocity dispersion were performed twenty years ago (van A lbada 1982) with the intention of reproducing the  $r^{1=4}$  density distribution of elliptical galaxies. Those e orts were not very successful | the collapse produced instead a core-halo structure, somewhat like a GC. In this paper, we compare a family of such models with the observed density pro les of GCs, and attempt to use the family of such models to reproduce correlations between parameters of GCs in the Milky W ay.

## 2. MODEL

We propose a hom ogeneous isotherm al stellar sphere as an initial non-equilibrium conquration for GCs. To test this idea, we evolve stellar spheres with a total mass M, an initial density initial velocity dispersion initial crossing times  $t_{cross} = (R_{ini}^3 = M)^{1=2}$ , where  $R_{ini} = (3M = 4_{ini})^{1=3}$  is the initial radius of the system. (In this Letter we assume a system of units where the gravitational constant G = 1.) We use the parallel N-body tree-code GADGET (Springel, Yoshida & W hite 2001) to run the simulations. The stars in the cluster are represented by  $N = 10^5$   $10^6$  equalmass particles. The velocities of the particles have a M axwellian distribution. The gravitational potential is softened with a softening length of  $= 0.77R_hN^{-1=3}$ , where  $R_h$  is the initial half-mass radius of the cluster. (G ravity is softened to m in im ize num erical noise due to two-body interactions between the particles.) The individual timesteps are equal to 2 = a, wherea is the acceleration of a particle, and the parameter is made small enough to ensure the total energy conservation to better than 1%. This con guration is the simplest realization of possible initial conditions for GCs, and yet results in remarkably good agreem ent with current cluster param eters.

It is convenient to express the mass of a cluster M in units of the virial mass M  $_{vir}$ : M = M  $_{vir}10$ , where is a mass parameter. For a hom ogeneous sphere M  $_{vir} = \frac{3}{ini}(4 _{ini}=375)^{1=2}$ . The total energy of the system becomes positive (and the system becomes form ally unbound) for < 0:45.

We ran a set of 17 di erent models (see Table 1) with the same values of  $_{ini}$  and  $_{ini}$ , and parameter ranging from {0.8 to 2. (The corresponding initial virial parameter  $_{2K}$  =W = 10  $^{2}$  =<sup>3</sup> is = 3.4 to 0.046, where K and W are initial kinetic and potential energy.) M odels with = {0.8 are completely unbound throughout the simulation, whereas m odels with = ({0.7, {0.6, {0.5} form a bound cluster, containing less than 100% of the total m ass, after the initial expansion phase. M odels with 0 initially collapse to a sm aller half-m ass radius  $r_{min}$  (see Table 1), and then bounce. A llm odels with 0:7 experience phase m ixing and/or violent relaxation, and within 10 { 100 crossing times reach an equilibrium state with a at core and sharply declining density at large radii. The projected surface density pro les of equilibrium clusters closely resemble the pro les of G alactic GCs. The m atch is the best for the GCs which have experienced little dynam ical evolution (see F igure 1).

Our models t the observed surface density pro les of GCs very well, despite the lack of a tidal radius as present in King models. We do not include an external tidal eld in our simulations, so this lack is expected. The tidal cuto in surface density is observed in very few GCs (Trager et al. 1995), due to the contam ination with background stars at the outskirts of the clusters.

A swe will show in Section 3, all realGCs should have experienced an adiabatic collapse (when the orbital angular momentum is conserved for individual stars). To make sure that our models are in the same collapse regime as the real clusters, all our models should satisfy the following adiabaticity criterion (A arseth, Lin, & Papaloizou 1988):

$$_{ini} \& N = R_{ini}^{1=6} (M = R_{ini})^{1=2}$$
: (1)

In our case, this condition can be expressed as  $(1=2) \log N$   $(3=2) \log 5$ . The adiabatic collapse criterion is then .1.5 for  $N = 10^5$  and .2.0 for  $N = 10^6$ . A coording to this criterion, all our models undergo an adiabatic collapse (see Table 1). In our models, the collapse factor C  $R_h = r_m$  in correlates well with the virial parameter : C / . The value of the exponent = 0.95 0.02 is very close to the adiabatic value of = 1 (A arseth et al. 1988).

From our set of models, we obtained the following correlations between the projected half-mass radius  $r_h$ , projected central velocity dispersion  $_0$ , central surface density  $_0$ , central density  $_c$ , K ing core radius  $r_0$ , binding energy  $E_b$ , and mass M (the uncertainties in the exponents are . 0:01):

$$r_{h} \quad \text{constant;} \quad {}_{0} / M^{0:57}; \quad {}_{0} / M^{1:39};$$

$${}_{c} / M^{1:68}; \quad r_{0} / M^{0:27}; \quad E_{b} / M^{1:95}; \quad (2)$$

$$E_{b} / {}_{0}^{3:55}:$$

These correlations are valid for 0, with the last relation being valid for 0:6. Most of correlations become non-linear in log-log space for < 0 (corresponding to > 1). A lineage for our coldest models,  $r_h$  scales (as expected) as the initial radius (and hence as  $M^{1=3}$ ), the total variation in  $r_h$  over two orders of magnitude in system mass ( = 0 2) is only 0:12 dex (see Table 1; please note that  $R_{ini} / M^{1=3}$ ).

Another very interesting correlation is  $r_0$  '  $r_{m in}$  within the measurement errors for

0.2 (Table 1). The above correlation can be understood if we rewrite the theoretical result C  $R_h = r_{m \ in} / \frac{1}{A}$  (A arseth et al. 1988) for the case of constant  $_{ini}$  and  $_{ini}$ :  $r_{m \ in} / M$   $^{1=3}$ . The theoretical relation is very close to the model relation  $r_0 / M$   $^{0.27}$ , resulting in  $r_0 / r_{m \ in}$  as observed.

We tested the num erical convergence of our results by making two additional nuns for = 1:6. In the softening length of log( $=R_{ini}$ ) = 1:88. Despite the fact that this nun had the most poorly resolved \crunch" among all our models ( $r_{min}$  = '3:6), all the derived model parameters were identical to the original run parameters within measurement errors. In the second nun, we again used a reduced number of particles N = 10<sup>5</sup>, but the parameter was made much smaller than the optimal value: log( $=R_{ini}$ ) = 2:67. In this nun, the crunch is resolved very well |  $r_{min}$  = '23, but again we did not see signi cant deviations from the original run parameters. The results of the additional runs suggest that the number of particles N and the value of the softening length we use in our runs are adequate for resolving the violent relaxation process.

# 3. COMPARISON W ITH OBSERVATIONS

We assume that the mass-to-light ratio M = L is a constant, which is well-established for observed GCs (log M = L] = 0:16 0:03, M cLaughlin 2000). Then we derive the same correlations for observed clusters as in equations (2) using the online version of the M ilky W ay GC catalogue of W. E. Harris (Harris 1996). We used data for 109 non-core-collapsed GCs. Forty- ve of these clusters have a measured <sub>0</sub>. B inding energies were calculated using equations (5a-c) of M cLaughlin (2000). The observed correlations are:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} r_{\rm h} & \text{constant;} & _{0} / M & ^{0:43} & ^{0.05}; & _{0} / M & ^{1:31} & ^{0:10}; \\ r_{\rm c} / M & ^{1:53} & ^{0:17}; & r_{\rm 0} / M & ^{0:28} & ^{0:07}; & E_{\rm b} / M & ^{2:03} & ^{0:08}; \\ & & E_{\rm b} / & ^{3:61} & ^{0:15}: \end{array}$$

$$(3)$$

The theoretical exponents di er from the observational values by one sign a or less (with the exception of the  $_0$  M ] correlation, where the di erence is 3 sign a).

The closeness of the model correlations (equations [2]) to the observed correlations (equations [3]) can be understood if we assume that in their initial non-equilibrium con guration, all G alactic GCs had the same values of stellar density initial non-equilibrium dispersion initial control of the same values of stellar density in the values of stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar density is a stellar density is a stellar density in the values of stellar density is a stellar

To estim ate the values of the universal parameters ini and ini, one can use in principle any two or more pairs of model/observational correlations from equations (2) and (3). However, one has to keep in mind that few GC parameters are well suited for comparing the model and observed correlations. Most G alactic GCs are in advanced stages of their dynamical evolution. As GCs evolve, some of their parameters deviate from initial equilibrium values. This process a ects mainly the central core region of a cluster where encounters between stars are the most frequent. Analytical and numerical calculations show that at some point a GC should experience a runaway core collapse due to gravotherm al instability (Spitzer 1987). A round 20% of G alactic GCs are believed to be in a post-core-collapse state (Harris 1996). The analytical theory of core collapse (Spitzer 1987) can be used to nd GC parameters which are least a ected by dynamical evolution. We obtained the follow ing relations:

$$_{\rm c}$$
 /  ${\rm r_0}^{221}$ ;  $_{\rm 0}$  /  ${\rm r_0}^{121}$ ;  $_{\rm 0}$  /  ${\rm r_0}^{0.10}$ : (4)

To obtain an analogous relation for binding energy  $E_b$ , we used equations (5a-c) of M cLaughlin (2000). A ssum ing that during core collapse the tidal radius  $r_t$  does not change, we derived

$$E_{\rm b} / r_0^{0.05};$$
 (5)

which is accurate for the range of  $r_t=r_0 = 10$  100 corresponding to 75% of G alactic GCs. E quations (4) and (5) show that the parameters  $E_b$  and  $_0$  are least a ected by dynamical evolution. Numerical simulations of core collapse show that the half-m ass radius  $r_h$  is also a very slow by evolving parameter (Spitzer 1987). We used two following correlations to estimate the values of ini and ini:  $E_b$  (0) and  $r_h = constant$ . The <sup>2</sup> tring gave the following estimates:  $\log_{ini} = 1.14$  0.26, and  $\log_{ini} = 0.28$  0.11: (The units for ini and ini are M pc <sup>3</sup> and km s <sup>1</sup>.) The relation between them assess of real GCs and them odel mass parameter is then M '3.5 10 <sup>+4</sup> M . The corresponding minimum initial cluster mass resulting in a bound cluster (the model with = 0.7) is  $M_{min}$  6;900 M , with a one-sigma interval of 3,000 { 16,000 M . The criterion of an adiabatic collapse of A arseth et al. (1988) (equation [1]) can be reexpressed as M . 3  $_{ini}^{6} = (4 _{ini}m_1)$ , where  $m_1$  is a typical stellar mass in the cluster. For our values of ini and ini, a collapse is adiabatic if M . 1:6  $10^7$  M (we assumed  $m_1 = 0.6$  M ). As one can see, our adiabatic collapse models are adequate for the whole range of GC masses.

The simplest physical interpretation of the universal initial density value is to assume that the major burst of star formation in a contracting proto-GC molecular cloud occurs when the gas density reaches a certain critical value  $_{\rm cr} > _{\rm ini}$  (the non-equality sign is to account for less than a 100% elicient star formation and mass loss due to stellar evolution). The initial velocity dispersion  $_{\rm ini}$  can be assumed to be commensurable with the sound speed in the turbulent proto-GC cloud, and hence with its temperature T, at the moment when the star burst occurs. For a purely molecular gas of primordial composition (Y  $_{\rm p} = 0.291$ ), we obtained the following estimates of the universal gas density  $_{\rm cr}$  and temperature T for star-forming gas in proto-GCs:  $_{\rm cr} > 230$  cm<sup>-3</sup>, and T = 1,000 K. The corresponding gas pressure is P > 2:3 = 10<sup>5</sup> K cm<sup>-3</sup>.

In Figures 2{4 we compare three di erent observed correlations for G alactic G C s with the model predictions rescaled to log ini = 1:14 and log ini = 0:28:  $E_b(_0)$ ;  $E_b$  M ) and  $_0(_c)$ . In Figures 2 and 3 (showing the correlations between the least evolved cluster parameters) the agreement between the model and data is excellent, with a low statistical signi cance suggestion that the most evolved clusters, shown as open circles, tend to deviate from the model  $E_b$  M ) relation (Figure 3). Figure 4 shows a correlation between the most evolved cluster parameters | central surface density  $_0$  and central density  $_c$  (see equations [4]). The situation with Figure 4 is in accord with our model predictions: all clusters deviate from the model, "zero-age", relation in a systematic fashion, with more evolved clusters boated farther from the model line. (P lease note that the correlations from Figures 3 and 4 were not used to t the model to the data.)

## 4. SUMMARY

W e have shown that a simple model of violent relaxation of a constant density, constant velocity dispersion stellar sphere produces clusters which are remarkably similar to the ob-

served G alactic G C s. They have the correct surface density proles, and a large number of correlations between cluster parameters are accurately reproduced by our models as long as we assume a constant initial density and initial velocity dispersion. This result implies that all G C s were formed from gas with a universal value of density and temperature. In reality, the constant density, constant velocity dispersion initial setup of our models may correspond to isotherm all turbulent cores of giant molecular clouds with a G aussian density prole. Our simple picture of G C formation suggests that the conditions in the cluster-forming gas must be quite uniform across a large portion of the early universe.

We thank W.E.Harris, R.E.Pudritz, and D.E.McLaughlin for useful discussions, and the anonym ous referee for improvements to the paper. S.M. is partially supported by SHARCN et. The simulations reported in this paper were performed at CITA.

### REFERENCES

- Aarseth, S.J., Lin, D.N.C., & Papaloizou, J.C.B. 1988, ApJ, 324, 288
- D jorgovski, S., & Meylan, G. 1994, AJ, 108, 1292
- Harris, W. E. 1996, AJ, 112, 1487
- King, I.R. 1966, AJ, 71, 64
- M cLaughlin, D.E. 2000, ApJ, 539, 618
- Meylan, G., & Heggie, D.C. 1997, A& A Rev., 8, 1
- Spitzer, L. 1987, D ynam ical Evolution of G lobular C lusters (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)
- Springel, V., Yoshida, N., & White, S.D.M. 2001, New Astronomy, 6, 79
- Trager, S.C., King, I.R., & Djorgovski, S. 1995, AJ, 109, 218
- van Albada, T.S. 1982, MNRAS, 201, 939

This preprint was prepared with the AAS  $\square T_{E}X$  m acros v52.

Table 1: M odel param eters

Input param eters				D erived param eters					
Ν		t <sub>end</sub> t <sub>cross</sub>	log <sub>R in i</sub>	$\log \frac{r_{m in}}{R_{ini}}$	$\log \frac{r_0}{R_{ini}}$	$\log \frac{r_h}{R_{ini}}$	log <u> </u>	log <u> </u>	
10 <sup>5</sup>	3.4	5000	{1.88						
10 <sup>5</sup>	2.9	1000	{1.88		0.	50		{1.10	{2 <b>.</b> 9
10 <sup>5</sup>	2.5	1000	{1.88		0.	21 1	.09 {0	.58 {1	.3
10 <sup>5</sup>	22	1000	{1.88		0.	05 0	.34 {0	.37 {0	.7
10 <sup>5</sup>	1.8	1000	{1.88		{0.	06 0	.08 {0	25 {0	3
10 <sup>5</sup>	1.6	1000	{1.88		{0.	12 {0	.06 {0	.15 0	0.0
10 <sup>5</sup>	1.4	1000	{1.88		{0.	20 {0	.15 {0	.07 0	2
10 <sup>5</sup>	1.0	200	{1.88	{0.25	{0.31	{0.29	0.07	0.6	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.74	200	{1.88	{0.42	{0.42	{0.40	0.19	0.9	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.54	200	{1.88	{0.58	{0.57	{0.49	0.30	13	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.40	200	{1.88	{0.71	{0.70	{0.57	0.41	1.6	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.29	50	{1.88	{0.84	{0.79	{0.64	0.52	1.9	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.22	50	{1.88	{0 <b>.</b> 96	{0.92	{0.72	0.63	2.3	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.16	50	{1.88	{1.08	{1.03	{0 <b>.</b> 79	0.74	2.6	
10 <sup>5</sup>	0.12	50	{1.88	{1.19	{1.16	{0.84	0.85	2.9	
10 <sup>6</sup>	0.086	15	{2.21	{1.32	{1.28	{0 <b>.</b> 88	0.98	3.3	
10 <sup>6</sup>	0.046	10	{2.21	{1.54	{1.53	{0 <b>.</b> 94	1.20	4.0	
	$\begin{array}{c} 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{5} \\ 10^{6} \\ 10^{6} \\ 10^{6} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c c} N \\ \hline 10^5 & 3.4 \\ 10^5 & 2.9 \\ 10^5 & 2.5 \\ 10^5 & 2.2 \\ 10^5 & 1.8 \\ 10^5 & 1.6 \\ 10^5 & 1.6 \\ 10^5 & 1.4 \\ 10^5 & 1.0 \\ 10^5 & 0.74 \\ 10^5 & 0.74 \\ 10^5 & 0.54 \\ 10^5 & 0.40 \\ 10^5 & 0.29 \\ 10^5 & 0.22 \\ 10^5 & 0.16 \\ 10^5 & 0.12 \\ 10^6 & 0.086 \\ 10^6 & 0.046 \end{array}$	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ 10 <sup>5</sup> 3.4         5000           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.9         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.8         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.4         1000           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.74         200           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.54         200           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.29         50           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.16         50           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.12         50           10 <sup>6</sup> 0.086         15           10 <sup>6</sup> 0.046         10	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ log $\frac{1}{R_{ini}}$ $10^5$ 3.4         5000         {1.88 $10^5$ 2.9         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 2.5         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 2.5         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 2.2         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 1.8         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 1.6         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 1.6         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 1.4         1000         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.74         200         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.54         200         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.40         200         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.22         50         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.16         50         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.12         50         {1.88 $10^5$ 0.12         50         {1.88 $10^6$ 0.086         15         {2.21	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ $\log \frac{r_{m in}}{R_{ini}}$ $\log \frac{r_{m in}}{R_{ini}}$ 10 <sup>5</sup> 3.4         5000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.9         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.8         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.4         1000         {1.88           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.74         200         {1.88         {0.42           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.54         200         {1.88         {0.58           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.40         200         {1.88         {0.96           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.22         50         {1.88         {0.96           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.12         50         {1.88         {1.08           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.12         50         {1.88         {1.19	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ log $\frac{r_{min}}{R_{ini}}$ log $\frac{r_{0}}{R_{ini}}$ 10 <sup>5</sup> 3.4         5000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.9         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.9         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.8         1000         {1.88         0.           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88         {0.1           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.4         1000         {1.88         {0.42         {0.42           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.0         200         {1.88         {0.42         {0.42           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.54         200         {1.88         {0.58         {0.57           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.40         200         {1.88         {0.96         {0.92           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.22         50         {1.88         {0.96         {0.92           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.12         50	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ log $\frac{r_{n,i}}{R_{ini}}$ log $\frac{r_{n}}{R_{ini}}$ log $\frac{r_{0}}{R_{ini}}$ log $\frac{r_{1}}{R_{ini}}$ 10 <sup>5</sup> 3.4         5000         {1.88         0.50           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.9         1000         {1.88         0.21         1           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000         {1.88         0.21         1           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.5         1000         {1.88         0.05         0           10 <sup>5</sup> 2.2         1000         {1.88         0.05         0           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.8         1000         {1.88         0.05         0           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88         {0.20         {0           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.6         1000         {1.88         {0.20         {0           10 <sup>5</sup> 1.4         1000         {1.88         {0.25         {0.31         {0.29           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.74         200         {1.88         {0.42         {0.42         {0.40           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.40         200         {1.88         {0.58         {0.57         {0.49           10 <sup>5</sup> 0.22         50         {1.8	N $\frac{t_{end}}{t_{cross}}$ $\log \frac{r_{n}}{R_{ini}}$ $\log r_$	N $\frac{t_{enol}}{t_{ecross}}$ $\log \frac{r_{h}}{R_{hil}}$ $\log \frac{r_{0}}{R_{hil}}$ $\log \frac{r_{h}}{R_{hil}}$ $\log $

Note. | Here  $r_0$ ,  $_0$ , and  $_c$  are the core parameters for relaxed models: King core radius, projected central velocity dispersion, and central density, respectively;  $r_{m in}$  is the minimum half-mass radius during the collapse, and  $r_h$  is the projected half-mass radius for relaxed models.



Fig. 1. Surface density pro le (solid line) for a model with = 0.4. This model matches well the surface density pro les of ve GCs (points, Trager, King & D jorgovski 1995) which are among the least dynamically evolved ones. Surface density is normalized to 1 at the center of the cluster. The vertical short-dashed and long-dashed lines show the values of the softening length and the model core radius  $r_0$ , respectively.



Fig. 2. Cluster binding energy as a function of velocity dispersion for 45 G alactic G C s with a measured  $_0$  (circles) and ourm odel (solid line). The open circles are the most dynam ically evolved clusters with log  $t_c < 8.3$ , where  $t_c$  is the core relaxation time in years.



Fig. 3. Cluster binding energy as a function of total cluster mass for 109 non-core-collapsed GCs (circles) and our model (solid line). The open circles are those clusters with  $\log t_c < 8.3$  (as in Figure 2).



Fig. 4. Central surface density as a function of central density for 109 non-core-collapsed GCs (circles) and our model (solid line). The open circles are more dynamically evolved clusters with  $\log t_c < 92$ .