# M agnetoelliptic Instabilities

Norman R. Lebovitz

M athem atics D epartm ent, University of Chicago

Chicago, IL 60637, USA

norman@math.uchicago.edu

and

Ellen Zweibel

A stronom y D epartm ent and C enter for M agnetic Self-O rganization

University of W isconsin, M adison, W I 53706 USA

zweibel@astro.wisc.edu

## ABSTRACT

We consider the stability of a con guration consisting of a vertical magnetic eld in a planar ow on elliptical stream lines in ideal hydrom agnetics. In the absence of a magnetic eld the elliptical ow is universally unstable (the \elliptical instability"). We nd this universal instability persists in the presence of magnetic elds of arbitrary strength, although the grow thrate decreases som ew hat. We also nd further instabilities due to the presence of the magnetic eld. One of these, a destabilization of A liven waves, requires the magnetic parameter to exceed a certain critical value. A second, involving a mixing of hydrodynam ic and magnetic modes, occurs for all magnetic- eld strengths. These instabilities may be important in tidally distorted or otherwise elliptical disks. A disk of nite thickness is stable if the magnetic eldstrength exceeds a critical value, sim ilar to the eldstrength which suppresses the magnetorotational instability.

Subject headings: accretion discs { instabilities: elliptical, hydrom agnetic

# 1. Introduction

The problem of momentum transport in accretion disks is widely believed to require hydrodynam ic or hydrom agnetic turbulence for its resolution. The origin of this turbulence m ay be sought in the instability of lam inar solutions of the equations of hydrom agnetics, solutions that are compatible with the geometry of accretion disks. The recent history of these e orts has taken the form of rst recognizing such an instability mechanism, and then trying to incorporate that mechanicsm into realistic disk models.

The magnetorotational instability (MRI) mechanism, originally discovered by Velikhov (1959) and Chandrasekhar (1960) and rst applied to accretion disks in Balbus & Hawley (1991), is of this kind (see Balbus & Hawley (1998) for a review). It appears in rotating, magnetized systems in which the speci c angularm on entum increases outward and in which the magnetic eld is weak enough that rotational elects are not overwhelmed by magnetic tension.

A second mechanism, that of the elliptical instability considered by G oodm an (1993) and others (Lubow, Pringle, and Kerswell 1993; R yu and G oodm an 1994; R yu, G oodm an, and V ishniac 1996), is also consistent with the accretion-disk setting. This instability mechanism has been reviewed by Kerswell (2002). In the setting considered by G oodm an et. al., it appears to require a secondary in order to enforce departure from rotational symmetry of the stream lines via a tidal potential. This is certainly appropriate for binary systems but it is likely that, even in the absence of a secondary, the lam inar motion in the plane of the disk would not be accurately circular, so the elliptical-instability mechanism would appear to be a candidate of considerable generality. It does not require a magnetic eld. O ne of the conclusions of the present paper is that it further persists in the presence of a magnetic eld. In the idealized setting of the present problem, the latter m ay be of arbitrarily large strength. However, we also argue that in the setting of a disk geom etry, there m ay indeed be a limit on the eld strength.

In this paper we therefore investigate the interaction of a vertical magnetic eld with ow on elliptical stream lines, on the ground that both magnetic elds and noncircular stream lines are likely ingredients in accretion-disk settings. There are similarities with and di erences from previous work on e ect of magnetic elds on the elliptical instability (Kerswell 1994), which are discussed in x6.

# 2. Form ulation

We consider ow on elliptical stream lines together with a magnetic eld and investigate linear stability theory. The underlying equations are the Euler equations of uid dynamics

$$u_t + u r u = r p + (curl B) B$$
 (1)

and the induction equation

$$B_t + u r B = B r u: \qquad (2)$$

We shall assume that div u = 0 and div B = 0 and that the uid is unbounded.

It is easy to check that the following steady elds represent a solution of the preceding system :

U = 
$$\frac{a_1}{a_2} x_2; \frac{a_2}{a_1} x_1; 0$$
; B = (0;0;B); P =  $\frac{2}{2} x_1^2 + x_2^2$ : (3)

Here and B are constants, and a constant m ay also be added to the pressure term . More general exact solutions of the combined uid/m agnetic equations exist in an unbounded dom ain (C raik 1988); the case in hand is probably the sim plest of these.

# 2.1. The perturbed system

Let u;B;p be replaced by U + u;B + b;P + p in equations (1, 2) above, and linearize. The resulting perturbation equations are

$$u_t + U r u + u r U = r p + (curlb) B$$
 (4)

and

$$b_t + U \quad rb = B \quad ru + b \quad rU; \tag{5}$$

together with the conditions that u and b be solenoidal. These equations allow rotating-wave solutions of the form

$$u = v(t) \exp i(k(t);x); b = w(t) \exp i(k(t);x); p = (t) \exp i(k(t);x)$$
 (6)

where the expression (k;x) denotes the inner product. Because u and b are solenoidal, the conditions

$$(k (t); v (t)) = 0; (k (t); w (t)) = 0$$
(7)

must be satis ed.

W rite

$$U = Ax \text{ where } A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E & 0 \\ E & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{1} E = a_{1} = a_{2}:$$
(8)

Then on substituting the rotating-wave expressions from equation (6) into the perturbation equations one nds

$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{A}^{\mathrm{t}}\mathbf{k}; \tag{9}$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} \quad \mathbf{i}\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{i}\mathbf{B} (\mathbf{k} \quad \mathbf{w}) \quad \mathbf{g}$$
 (10)

$$\underline{w} = i(k_3 B) v + Aw :$$
 (11)

Equation (9) can be solved to give

$$k = (\cos(t); E \sin(t); k_3);$$
 (12)

where  $k_3$  and are constants. The pressure coe cient can be eliminated with the aid of the solenoidal condition (7). One nds

$$i( + B w_3) = 2k^2 A^t k; v :$$
 (13)

The equation for v now takes the form

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{C} \quad (\mathbf{t}) \, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{i} \, (\mathbf{k}_3 \mathbf{B}) \, \mathbf{w} ; \tag{14}$$

where

$$C (t) = 2 = k^{2} (0) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ E & 1k_{1}k_{2} & E & k_{1}^{2} & 0 & 0 & E & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & E & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ E & 1k_{2}^{2} & E & k_{1}k_{2} & 0 & A & 0 \\ E & 1k_{3}k_{2} & E & k_{1}k_{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (15)$$

It's convenient to break the six-dimensional system consisting of equations (14) and (11) into two, one of size four and the other of size two:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} v_{1} &=& 2 = k^{2} k_{1} E k_{1} v_{2} & E^{-1} k_{2} v_{1} + E v_{2} + \operatorname{im} w_{1}; \\ v_{2} &=& 2 = k^{2} k_{2} E k_{1} v_{2} & E^{-1} k_{2} v_{1} & E^{-1} v_{1} + \operatorname{im} w_{2}; \\ w_{1} &=& \operatorname{im} v_{1} & E w_{2}; \\ w_{2} &=& \operatorname{im} v_{2} + E^{-1} w_{1}; \end{array}$$

where  $m = k_3 B$ : These four equations are self-contained and the remaining equations,

~

$$\underline{v}_{3} = 2 = k^{2} k_{3} E k_{1} v_{2} E^{1} k_{2} v_{1} + im w_{3}; \qquad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{3} = \operatorname{im} \mathbf{v}_{3} \tag{17}$$

m ay be integrated once the expression

$$c_1 = k_1 v_2 = E^{-1} k_2 v_1$$
 (18)

is found by solving the four-dimensional system above. Equations (9), (10), (11) and (13) in ply that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(k;v) = im(k;w) \text{ and } \frac{d}{dt}(k;w) = im(k;v):$$

Thus in solving this system we need to impose the conditions that these inner products are zero initially; this will thereafter maintain the incom pressibility conditions (7).

The incompressibility condition provides an alternative way of nding  $v_3$  and  $w_3$  once the equations for  $v_1; v_2; w_1; w_2$  have been solved, provided that  $k_3 \notin 0$ : The only cases for which  $k_3$  can vanish are those for which the combinations  $k_1v_1 + k_2v_2$  and  $k_1w_1 + k_2w_2$  are also found to vanish on solving the four-dimensional system above. It is not discut to show that there can be no instability associated with such a solution (see in particular the equivalent system (20) below). A coordingly, we henceforth consider only perturbations with vertical wave number  $k_3 \notin 0$ :

# 2.2. Change of variables

We change to new variables to facilitate subsequent calculations<sup>1</sup>.

$$c_{1} = E k_{1}v_{2} E^{-1}k_{2}v_{1};$$

$$c_{2} = k_{1}v_{1} + k_{2}v_{2} (= k_{3}v_{3});$$

$$c_{3} = E k_{1}w_{2} E^{-1}k_{2}w_{1};$$

$$c_{4} = k_{1}w_{1} + k_{2}w_{2} (= k_{3}w_{3}):$$
(19)

This is a time-dependent (periodic) change of variables since k is periodic in t. The equations to be solved take the form

$$\underline{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{D} \quad (\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{c} \tag{20}$$

in these variables, with (we have put = 1 here to agree with earlier conventions)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The origin of this change of variables is related to the existence of the rotating-wave solutions.

## 2.3. General Considerations

The coe cients of the matrix D depend on the phase angle appearing in the expressions (12) above for the wave vector k. For purposes of studying stability, we may set  $= 0^2$ . This is easily seen by making the substitution  $t^0 = t$ , which eliminates from the equation. For the remainder of this work we take = 0:

The system (20) presents a F loquet problem (cf. Yakubovich and Starzhinsii (1975)): the stability of the chosen steady solution U; B depends on whether there are solutions of this system that grow exponentially with time. This is settled by noting the F loquet multiplier matrix M. The latter is de ned as follows. Let (t) be the fundamental matrix solution of equation (20) that reduces to the identity at t = 0. Then, since the periodicity of D is 2, M = (2): If any eigenvalue of M has modulus exceeding one, this implies that there is indeed an exponentially growing solution.

It is fam iliar in conservative problem s that

P roposition 1 W henever is an eigenvalue of the F loquet m atrix, so also are its inverse  $^{1}$  and its complex conjugate .

The rst statement of this proposition is a typically a consequence of canonical H am iltonian structure, the second a consequence of the reality of the underlying problem. However, the system (20) is not canonical, and the matrix appearing in it is not real. We can nevertheless establish these fam iliar properties of the eigenvalues directly from the system (20), as follows. The time-reversal invariance of the physical problem is rejected in the existence of a reversing symmetry R = diag(1; 1; 1; 1) of the matrix D above: RD(t) = D(t)R, implying that whenever c(t) is a solution so also is Rc(t). Since the solutions of the F loquet problem have the structure  $c(t) = p(t) \exp(t)$ , there must also be a solution  $p(t) \exp(t)$ . This shows that if is an eigenvalue of M, so also is  $\exp(2) = 1^{-1}$ .

Similarly, under matrix transformation S = diag(1;1; 1; 1), D goes to its complex conjugate. This shows that  $M = S\overline{M}S^{-1}$ , i.e., that M and its conjugate have the same eigenvalues.

Im m ediate consequences of Proposition 1 are the following: rst, in the stable case, eigenvalues of M lie on the unit circle; second, if, as parameters change, an eigenvalue is

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ On the other hand, for purposes of solving the initial-value problem, which involves integrating over initial wave vectors, we would need to retain it.

at the onset of instability, it must have multiplicity two (or higher). The latter conclusion is because, in the complex plane, the dangerous eigenvalue must have the unit circle simultaneously with  $\overline{\phantom{0}}^{1}$ , which lies along the same ray as and therefore coincides with it when they both lie on the unit circle. Thus a necessary condition for the onset of linear instability is a resonance where two F loquet multipliers coincide.

#### 2.4. Param eters

There are three dimensionless parameters that gure in this problem . We call them  $\ ; \ ;$  and  $\ :$ 

$$= \frac{1}{2} E E^{-1}; = k_3 = k_0; \text{ and } = k_0 B:$$
 (22)

Thus represents the departure of the stream lines of the unperturbed ow from axial symm etry. In these equations  $k_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k_3^2}$  and represents the length of the wave vector if = 0. The magnetic parameter depends not only on the strength of the unperturbed m agnetic eld but also on the wavelength of the perturbation.

In the matrix D above, the magnetic eld enters through the parameter  $m = k_3 B$  (which is a measure of the magnetic tension force), and we shall continue to use this notation for the present, on the understanding that  $m = \dots$ . It is also clear that we can use E rather than to measure the departure from rotational symmetry, and we shall do this in some cases.

#### 3. Analysis

The Floquet matrix is

$$M (;;;) = (2;;;;):$$

One could map out the stability and instability regions in the parameter space num erically by integrating the system (20) system atically for many values of these parameters. We in fact do this for a selection of parameter values in x4 below. However, in this and the following section we present the outlines and results of an asymptotic analysis based on regarding as a small parameter (details are presented in the Appendices). This is more revealing than the num erical results on their own. It is also of considerable in portance in interpreting the num erical results, and is quite accurate even for values of that are not very small (cf. Figure 1 below). The calculation proceeds in two steps; nding M, and calculating its eigenvalues.

## 3.1. The Floquet M atrix

The asymptotic analysis is facilitated by the circum stance that, if we put = 0, the coe cient matrix D<sub>0</sub> (say) of equation (21) becomes constant. We not the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of D<sub>0</sub> in Appendix A 1. There are two complex conjugate pairs of modes. One pair reduces to the ordinary hydrodynamic modes in the lim it ! 0. The second pair are magnetic modes with zero frequency at = 0. In the weak eld lim it, the ratio of magnetic to kinetic energy is 0 ( $^2$ =4) for the modi ed hydrodynamic modes are near equipartition for both types of mode.

We now turn to a brief description of the asymptotic (or perturbation) procedure. In what follows the parameter will be held xed so, to simplify the notation, we suppress the dependence of the F loquet matrix on this parameter: M = M (;) = (2;;). We shall need the Taylor expansion

$$M (;) = M (0;_{0}) + M (0;_{0}) + M (0;_{0}) (0;_{0}) + M (0;_{0}) (0;_{0}) + K (23)$$

where the dots indicate higher-order terms in and  $_0$ . The reason for allowing variations with as well as variations with is that the region in the plane where instability occurs is typically a wedge with apex at a point (;) = (0; \_0) and boundaries = \_0 + , where the slopes \_+ and are to be found. (cf. Figure 1 below). We will therefore consider of the form

$$= _{0} + +$$
 (24)

where may be regarded as a xed parameter to be chosen later. This will lead us to the widest of wedges in the plane, of width 0 (), excluding other wedges of width 0  $\binom{n}{}$  with m 2. These higher-order wedges typically occupy a tiny fraction of the parameter space (see Figure 4 below). As a result of the representation (24) we may write

$$M = M_0 + M_1 +$$
(25)

where

$$M_0 = M_{(0; 0)} \text{ and } M_1 = M_{(0; 0)} + M_{(0; 0)} :$$
 (26)

The matrix M<sub>0</sub> is given in Appendix A 1, together with an expression for M . We elect a change of basis, which diagonalizes M<sub>0</sub> and simplifies the calculation of M , in Appendix A 2. The elements of M<sub>1</sub> are calculated in Appendix A 4.

## 3.2. The characteristic polynom ial

D enote by

$$p(;) = M()$$
 Ij (27)

the characteristic polynom is lofthe F loquet multiplier matrix M () and its roots by  $_1$ ;  $_2$ ; A necessary condition for stability is that each root lie on the unit circle. To explore the onset of instability for various parameter values, we shall obtain the characteristic polynom is p in the form

$$p(;) = p() + p_1() + p_2()^2 +$$
 (28)

and exploit our know ledge of the roots of  $p_0$  to obtain the roots of p(;) in the form of a Puiseux expansion in (Hille 1972)).

The nature of this expansion depends on the multiplicities of the roots  $f_kg$  of  $p_0$ , the characteristic polynom ial of the unperturbed F loquet matrix M<sub>0</sub>. These roots are given by the expressions  $_k = \exp 2 _k$  where the f<sub>k</sub>g are the eigenvalues of the matrix D<sub>0</sub> given in Appendix A.1 (equation A.3); they are all distinct. However, it is possible for the multipliers f<sub>k</sub>g to be repeated even when, as in the present case, the f<sub>k</sub>g are distinct: if  $_k _1 = ik$  for an integer  $k \in 0$ , then  $_k = _1$ .

A necessary condition for the onset of instability is that there be a double (or higher) root of the characteristic equation, and we henceforth restrict consideration to the case of double roots<sup>3</sup>. For de niteness, we suppose  $_2 = _1$ . Then the Puiseux expansion takes the form

$$_{1}() = _{1} + _{1=2}^{1=2} + _{1} +$$
 (29)

$${}^{2}_{1=2} = 2p_{1}(1) = p_{0}^{0}(1) :$$
(30)

The two values of  $_{1=2}$  give the generic expressions for the change in a double eigenvalue, yielding a pair of roots branching from the double root  $_1$ . However, if  $p_1(_1) = 0$ ; this expression is inadequate and one must proceed to the next term in order to determ ine the e ect of the perturbation on the stability. Under the present assumptions, it is indeed the case that  $p_1$  vanishes at  $_1$ , as we show in Appendix A  $3^4$ .

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ H igher order zeros are not ruled out in this problem , since there are three independent param eters, but we do not pursue this here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>This \nongeneric" behavior can be traced to the circum stance that the perturbation expansion takes place at a codim ension-two point, i.e., where two relations must hold among the parameters.

Wemust suppose then that the expansion of p(;) is carried out to second order in :

$$p(;) = p() + p() + ^{2}p_{2}() + (31)$$

Then in the Puiseux expansion above  $_{1=2} = 0$  so  $_1 = _1 + _1 + _1 + _2$ ; anish found by solving the quadratic equation

$$\frac{1}{2}p_0^{(0)}(_1) \quad {}_1^2 + p_1^0(_1) \quad {}_1 + p_2(_1) = 0:$$
(32)

In the case at hand, the common value of  $_1$  and  $_2$  lies on the unit circle. In order for the perturbed values of the F loquet multipliers to lie o the unit circle (and therefore imply instability), it is easy to verify that it is necessary and su cient that  $_1=_1$  have a nonvanishing real part. Thus if we de ne

$$= _{1} = _{1};$$
 (33)

we have the following criterion:

Proposition 2 Either is pure-in againary and we infer stability (to leading order in ), or Re  $\neq$  0 and we infer instability.

The magnitude of the real part of is also related to the grow thrate of the instability. If we de ne an instability increment

then = Re and the growthrate is equal to =2, to leading order in .

The long calculations that lead to the coe cients appearing in equation (32) are carried out in the Appendices. In the notation employed there, equation (32) therefore takes the form

<sup>2</sup> 
$$J_{11}^{*} + J_{22}^{*} + \frac{2}{2} i [!_1 + !_2] + J_{11}^{*} + 2 i = J_{12}^{*} = 0;$$
 (35)

In equation (35), has the meaning of Proposition 2 above, and the symbols  $J_{ij}$  are dened in Appendix A 2 (equation A15). There are obvious modi cations of this form ula if  $_{k} = _{1}$ instead of  $_{1} = _{2}$ .

## 3.3. The Resonant Cases

The resonant cases for = 0 (circular stream lines) are those parameter values (;) such that  $!_j : !_1 = k$ , where k is an integer. We'll nd that these can be written in the form = f() (e.g., equation (37 below). Since = 0, the values in question are those that were designated  $_0$  in equation (24) above. We no longer need the designation  $_0$  and, in the relations below, use the symbol in its place.

If  $k \in 2$  the matrix J' is diagonal (see equation A 25 below) and equation (35) has the roots  $= J_{11} + 2$  i  $!_1 =$  and  $= J_{22} + 2$  i  $!_2 =$  where  $j = i!_j$  for j = 1;2;3;4): It is easy to check that these diagonal entries are pure-in aginary (cf. equations A 26 and A 9 below) and therefore, in accordance with P roposition 2, there is no instability to leading order in . We therefore now consider the only cases (k = 2) that can lead to instability to this order.

Recall that the original parameters of the problem are { representing the departure from axial symmetry of the undisturbed stream lines {  $= k_3 = k_0$  { representing the vertical wavenum ber {and  $= k_0B$ . The auxiliary parameters  $m = and q = \frac{p}{1 + 2}$  are introduced to simplify the notation. W ith the frequencies taken in the order

$$(!_1;!_2;!_3;!_4) = (+q; q; q; +q)$$
 (36)

the replacement ! results in the same frequencies in the opposite order. We may therefore assume without loss of generality that > 0. Further scrutiny of the formula (36) shows that we need only consider the following four, distinct, k = 2 resonances.

# 3.3.1. Case 1. $!_1$ $!_2 = 2$

The resonant m odes are those that reduce, when = 0, to the purely hydrodynam ic m odes. This case therefore represents the m odi cation, due to the presence of the vertical m agnetic eld, of the universal elliptical instability. In this case  $!_1 = !_2 = +q = 1$ , im plying that

$$= \frac{p^{1}}{1+p^{1}}:$$
 (37)

This ratio changes from 1=2 at = 0 to 0 as  $! 1 \cdot E$  valuating the integrals dening  $J_{ij}$  (equation A 15 below) and solving equation (35) above, we nd

$$^{2} = \frac{h}{2} (1 + )^{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{2} (1 + )^{2}$$
 (1 + )<sup>2</sup>: (38)

This has a maximum instability increment (when  $= {}^{2}(1 + ) = 2$ ) given (suppressing a factor of ) by

$$m_{ax} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + 1)^2$$
:

In the pure-hydrodynam ic lim  $\ddagger$  = 0 we nd = 1=2 and therefore  $_{max}$  = 9 =8. Since the grow thrate is given by =2, this gives a maximum grow thrate of 9 =16, in agreement with previous results obtained by other methods (W ale e 1990; G oodman 1993). In the lim  $\ddagger$  1 this maximum instability increment tends to the nite lim  $\ddagger$  =2, about half its value in the pure-hydrodynam ic lim  $\ddagger$ .

This instability has a bandwidth (+) which is, for given and , the length of the -interval for which the unperturbed con guration is unstable. It is determined by the values of that make the real part of vanish. These may be read o equation (38) above:

$$_{+} = (1 + )(1 + 3) = 4; = 1$$
 <sup>2</sup> = 4:

In the lim it ! 0 (the pure-hydrodynam ic case) these give  $_{+} = 15=32$  and = 3=32. These values of can also be inferred from W ale e's treatment of the pure-hydrodynam ic case. In the lim it of large magnetic parameter , the width of the band tends to zero.

3.3.2. Case 2. 
$$!_1$$
  $!_3 = 2$ 

The resonant m odes consist of a hydrodynam ic m ode and a purely m agnetic m ode (one frequency would vanish if = 0). In this case q = 1, implying that  $!_1 = +1$ ,  $!_3 = 1$  and

$$= \frac{p}{1+\frac{1}{2}}:$$
 (39)

Thus the ratio changes from 1 at = 0 to 0 as ! 1. This represents a 'm ixed m ode', i.e., the resonance is between a purely hydrodynam ic m ode and a purely m agnetic one. Evaluating the integrals and solving the quadratic (35), we nd

$$= i \frac{2}{1+2} p \frac{p}{D}$$
 (40)

where

$$D = {}^{2} \frac{2}{-} \frac{1}{2} 1 {}^{4} \frac{2}{-} \frac{1}{2} 1 {}^{2} 3 {}^{2} 1 :$$

If D < 0 then is pure-in aginary and the unperturbed conguration is stable, so instability prevails if and only if D > 0.

Instability can indeed occur and has its maximal increment when  $= {}^{3}(1 {}^{2})=2$ . This maximal increment is (except for a factor of )

$$(\text{Re})_{\text{max}} = \frac{1}{2} (1)^2$$
:

This ranges from 0 when = 0 to = 2 as ! 1.

The width of instability band can be calculated as in the preceding case by nding the values of for which D = 0. These are

$$_{+} = \frac{1}{4} \quad 1 \quad {}^{4} \text{ and } = \frac{1}{4} \quad 1 \quad {}^{2} \quad 3 \quad {}^{2} \quad 1 :$$

3.3.3. Case 3. 
$$!_4$$
  $!_3 = 2$ 

These are the purely magnetic modes, which play no role if = 0. For this case we have q = 1 im plying, for xed that

$$= p \frac{1}{1 + 2}$$
(41)

Since cannot exceed 1, this resonance can only occur for su ciently large values of , namely

$$> \frac{p}{3}$$
: (42)

For a given wavelength  $k_0$  this would require a su ciently large magnetic eld B. When this condition is satisticated, we have  $!_4 = 1 = !_3$ : The formula for the instability increment

becom es

$${}^{2} = \frac{h}{2} (1 )^{2} {}^{2} {}^{2} \frac{2}{2} + (1 )^{2} (43)$$

The maximum instability increment for given is (again suppressing a factor of )

$$m_{ax} = \frac{1}{2} (1 )^{2};$$

which occurs for  $= {}^{2}(1) = 2$ : It vanishes in the limit = 0 and tends to = 2 as ! 1. The upper and low er edges of the band of instability are expressed by the form ulas  $= {}_{0}$ + where may be determined from equation (43) by requiring to vanish. One nds

$$=\frac{1}{4}$$
 (1 ) (1 3) and  $=\frac{1}{4}$  1 <sup>2</sup>:

The bandwidth is therefore

$$=\frac{1}{2}$$
 (1)  $(1)^{2}$ :

This vanishes both in the limit as  $! \frac{0}{15}$  and in the limit as ! 1. The maximum bandwidth occurs when = 1=3 or  $= \frac{p}{15}$ .

# 3.3.4. Case 4. $!_1$ $!_4 = 2$

For this = 1. It is clear from the expressions for the matrix J that the latter vanishes in this case. This leads to pure-imaginary values of and therefore there is no instability associated with this resonance.

# 4. Num erical results

In this section we present a selection of numerical results. These are obtained by integrating the system (20) to obtain the fundam entalmatrix solution (t; ; ; ) and evaluating it at t = 2 to get the F loquet matrix M (;;;). For xed , the eigenvalue of maximum modulus is found as a function of E (rather than ) and , and the regions of the E plane where this maximum modulus exceeds one are distinguished. We have carried this out to E = 1.6 ( = 0.4875) in the gures although there is no limitation on the size of E, or of , in this method.

In Figure 1, we have taken the magnetic parameter equal to zero in the left-hand panel, so this represents the purely hydrodynamic case studied originally by Bayly (1986) and Pierrehum bert (1986) and subsequently by others. For > 0, a mixed mode of interaction involving both hydrodynamic and hydrom agnetic modes comes into existence, and this is shown in the right-hand panel of Figure 1, where = 1. This is too small for the remaining leading-order instability to appear. That remaining instability, which represents a resonant interaction between two modes that owe their existence to the presence of the magnetic eld, is indicated in Figure 2 for a magnetic parameter = 2 (right-hand panel), slightly greater than the minimum value ( $\frac{P}{3}$ ) for the existence of this instability.

The asymptotic formulas imply that the maximal grow thrate (or equivalently the maximal instability increment ) for each of the wedges of instability tends to a xed value as the magnetic parameter increases. This is illustrated in Figure 3. However, the asymptotic formulas for the grow thrates are less accurate than those for the stability boundaries, for the larger values of E.

In identifying these tongues, we have made repeated use of the asymptotic formulas presented earlier. The numerical procedure also picks up some further tongues, related to higher-order resonances, that are excluded by the procedure leading to the asymptotic formulas. These we have mostly ignored on the ground that they are too weak and occupy too small a region of the parameter space to be significant, but we show one such resonance tongue for two values of in Figure 4



Fig. 1. On the left is the case = 0, i.e., the purely hydrodynam ic case considered earlier by several other authors. It is shown here to contrast it with the case when the magnetic eld is not zero. The lines of asterisks indicate the same stability boundaries obtained from the asymptotic form ulas  $= _0 +$ ; this approximation is seen to be quite good. It is typical of the other cases considered. On the right is the case = 1, showing both the eld of the magnetic eld on the hydrodynam ic mode and the existence of a new mode of instability that is due to the presence of the magnetic eld.



Fig. 2. On the left is the case = 2. Three regions of instability occur here. The lowest of these is the modi cation of the hydrodynam ic-mode instability indicated in Figure 1. The middle region refers to the mixed hydrodynam ic-magnetic mode. The uppermost region, very thin and labeled MAGNETIC MODE, exists only for values of exceeding  $P_{\overline{3}}$ , so is poorly developed for this value of . On the right is the case =  $P_{\overline{15}}$  3:873, for which the width of the uppermost, purely magnetic, mode band is at its greatest. Note however that the vertical scale is compressed relative to the diagram on the left, exaggerating the widths of these bands by about a factor of two.



Fig. 3. The left-hand panel shows the instability increment as a function of for a xed value of the magnetic parameter (=0) and the ellipticity (E = 1:3). The right-hand panel does the same except that  $=\frac{P}{15}$ .



Fig. 4. These show higher order wedges of instability. Both are cases of resonance between the two hydrodynam icm odes but with  $!_1 : !_2 = 4$ , rather than 2. The left-hand panel shows s the instability wedge when = 1, the right-hand panel show s the corresponding wedge when  $= \frac{P}{15}$ .

## 5. Upper bound on eldstrength

The results of xx3.3 and 4 show that magnetoelliptic instability occurs in vertically unbounded systems whatever the eldstrength, and that the growth rates are relatively insensitive to the magnetic eldstrength parameter . The loci of instability in the (E; ) plane, however, do depend on As ! 1, the resonant , in all three cases, scales as <sup>1</sup> and the magnetic tension parameterm ! 1. This is a consequence of the resonant character of the instability. Since the mode frequency must be close to the rotational frequency, the A liven frequency m cannot be too large. As B ! 1, k<sub>3</sub> must approach zero.

In a system of nite vertical thickness H,  $k_3$  cannot drop below =H, where is a factor of order unity. Therefore, if  $v_A$  exceeds H =, we expect the magnetoelliptic instability to be suppressed. A precise upper bound on  $v_A$  follows from eqn. (A 3) and application of the resonance conditions; equations (37), (39), and (41). In Cases 1 and 2, instability requires  $\frac{m^2}{3}$  1. Case 3 requires  $m^2$  3. Therefore, magnetoelliptic instability requires  $\frac{m^2}{3}$  H = (there is a correction of order due to the nite bandwidth). The corresponding eldstrength is comparable to the maximum value of the eld at which the magnetorotational instability can operate (B albus & Hawley 1998).

# 6. Discussion

We have explored the e ect of a uniform, vertical magnetic eld on the stability of planar, incompressible ow with elliptical stream lines in an unbounded medium, in the approximation of ideal magnetohydrodynamics. In the absence of magnetic elds, ows with elliptical stream lines having ellipticity parameter [see equation (22)] are known to be unstable to perturbations with wavevectors that are transverse to the plane of the ow (the \elliptical instability"). Our rst conclusion is that this elliptical instability persists in the presence of a vertical magnetic eld: the latter decreases the maximum grow thrate but fails to suppress the instability, no matter how large the magnetic eld parameter becomes. It can be compared with the conclusion of K erswell (1994) that a toroidal magnetic eld has a stabilizing in uence. K erswell's analysis holds for small only and shows that the grow thrate decreases with magnetic eld in that limit. Our result, which holds for a vertical magnetic eld, shows a similar trend for small values of the magnetic-eld parameter, but this trend never results in complete stabilization of the elliptical instability with increasing magnetic eld.

A second conclusion is that there are further instabilities associated with the presence of the magnetic eld. One of these, for which the eigenvector is a mixture of hydrodynamic

and magnetic modes, occurs for all values of the magnetic eld parameter. Another, for which the eigenvector is a combination of magnetic modes only, sets in for values of the magnetic-eld parameter exceeding a certain threshold value ( > 13). In all three of these instabilities, for large magnetic elds, the wave vector makes only a small angle with the plane of the unperturbed ow, releasing the familiar tendency for dynamics to become nearly 2-dimensional in a strong, well ordered magnetic eld. This is releated in Figure 2, which shows that as increases, the unstable wedges are pushed to smaller . Although the unstable fraction of the (E; ) plane decreases with increasing (except for a very slight maximum at 2.18, re ecting the onset of instability between magnetic modes), the separation between the unstable wedges also decreases. W hile the nonlinear evolution of the unstable system is beyond the scope of this work, the destabilization of a nearly continuous swath of parameter space may have consequences for the interactions between unstable modes. In all three cases, the maximum instability increment tends to =2, i.e., the maximum grow thrate of the unstable modes tends, in dimensional units, to =4.

All three of these instabilities m ay be relevant in accretion-disk settings. In systems of nite thickness H, however, the instability is suppressed if the Alfven speed  $v_A$  exceeds a critical value of order H. M agnetorotational instabilities are quenched at approximately the same eldstrength (Balbus & Haw ley 1998). The grow thrate of magnetoelliptical instabilities is smaller than that of magnetorotational instabilities by a factor of order , and thus they are not necessarily the primary instability in magnetized disks. They may well play a secondary role by breaking up eddies or vortices generated by other mechanism s.

M agnetoelliptic instabilities m ay also occur in the inner parts of barred galaxies, in which the gas ow is slightly elliptical and the m agnetic eld, at least in the M ilky W ay, has a vertical component (M orris and Serabyn 1996). In such settings, the instabilities could be a source of turbulence, possibly a ecting the m ass supply to a central compact object.

W e are happy to acknow ledge the referee for useful comments. M aterial support for this work was provided by NSF grants AST-0098701, AST-0328821, PHY-0215581, and the G raduate School of the University of W isconsin, M adison.

# Appendices

We carry out calculations leading to the coe cients appearing in equation (32) in a series of steps. Since p() = M Ij, with M given by equations (25) and (26), we begin with the expression for M.

# A. The Expansion for M

# A.1. Zero-order Problem and Solution for M

The matrix D (t; ; ) has only two entries that depend on  $: D_{11}$  and D  $_{21}$ . If, therefore, we write the Taylor expansion

$$D (t; ;) = D_0 (t; ) + D (t; ) + (A1)$$

then

$$D_0$$
 (t; ) = D (t;0; ) and D (t; ) = D (t;0; );

where D = QD = Q. For  $D_0$  we not the constant matrix

$$D_{0} (t; ) = D_{0} () = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & \text{im} & 0 \\ B & 2^{2} & 0 & 0 & \text{im} \\ 0 & \text{im} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{im} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} (A2)$$

Its eigenvalues are

1 = i(+q); 2 = i(+q); 3 = i(-q); 4 = i(-q); (A3)

$$(D)_{11} = i 1 \quad {}^{2} e^{2it} e^{2it};$$
 (A4)

and

$$(D)_{21} = {}^{2} 1 {}^{2} e^{2it} + e^{2it} 2 + 2 ;$$
 (A5)

tFrom the matrices  $D_0$  and  $D_0$  we can construct the matrices  $M_0$  () and  $M_0$  () needed in the formula (26) for  $M_1$ . For  $M_0$  we simply have exp 2  $D_0$ . For  $M_0$  we proceed as follows. On the nite time-interval [0;2] we may write

$$(t; ;) = _{0}(t; ) + _{1}(t; ) + :::; _{1}(0; ) = 0:$$

Substituting this in the di erential equation (20), expanding to rst order in , using the variation of constants formula (cf. C oddington and Levinson (1955)) and setting t = 2, we get

$$M (;) = M_{0} () I + \int_{0}^{1} (s;) D (s;) \int_{0} (s;) ds :$$
(A6)

This expresses the F loquet m atrix correctly to linear order in  $\$ , and this will turn out to be su cient for our purpose. The form ula above identi es M (0; ):

$$\begin{array}{c} Z_{T} \\ M (0; ) = M_{0}()_{0}^{1}(s; ) D (s; )_{0}(s; ) ds: \end{array}$$
 (A7)

W e next proceed to sim plify this expression.

## A.2. A further transform ation

The characteristic polynom ialgiven in equation (27) above is the same in any coordinate system , so we shall choose one to simplify the unperturbed F loquet m atrix M  $_{\rm 0}$  ( ).

If  $\notin$  0 and  $\notin$  0 the eigenvalues f  $_k$ g given by equation (A 3) are all distinct, so the eigenvectors are linearly independent and the matrix T () formed from their columns diagonalizes D  $_0$ :

$$D_0 = diag(_1; _2; _3; _4);$$

where the tilde indicates the transform ed m atrix:  $D' = T^{-1}DT$ . We shall need to know T and T<sup>-1</sup> explicitly. It is a straightforward m atter to show that any eigenvector of D<sub>0</sub> m ust have the structure (up to a constant multiple)

Substituting the particular values of given in equation (A 3) gives the four columns of the matrix T, and from this we can construct its inverse. One nds

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ B & i_{1} & i_{2} & i_{3} & i_{4} \\ 0 & im & im & im & A \end{bmatrix};$$
 (A8)

and

$$T^{1} = \frac{1}{4mq} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & 1 \\ im & m = & _{3} & i _{3} = \\ B & im & m = & _{3} & i _{3} = \\ im & m = & _{1} & i _{1} = \\ im & m = & _{1} & i _{1} = \\ im & m = & _{1} & i _{1} = \\ \end{bmatrix}$$
(A9)

The matrices T and T  $^{1}$  depend on and on through the parameters

$$m = and q = {p - \frac{1}{2} + m^2} = {p - \frac{1}{1 + 2}};$$
 (A 10)

In place of equation (A 6) we now obtain

$$M^{\sim} = M^{\sim}_{0} I + J^{\sim}; \qquad (A 11)$$

where

$$J'() = \int_{0}^{Z_{2}} (t; )D'_{1}(t; )^{\sim}(t; )dt;$$
(A 12)

Because the eigenvalues f  $_k$ g are distinct, the matrix  $\sim = \exp D_0 t$  takes the simple, diagonal form

~ (t) = diag (exp (  $_1$ t); exp (  $_2$ t); exp (  $_3$ t); exp (  $_4$ t)) (A 13)

The ij entry of the matrix  $D_1$  is (since D has only two nonzero entries)

$$D_{1}^{*} = T_{1j} T_{1i}^{*} D_{11}^{*} + T_{i2}^{*} D_{21}^{*}$$
 (A14)

As a result, the ij entry of the matrix  $\mathcal{J}$  providing the leading-order perturbation of the F loquet matrix is

$$J_{ij} = T_{1j} T^{1} \prod_{i1}^{n} e^{(j i)t} (D)_{11} (t) dt + T_{1j} T^{1} \prod_{i2}^{n} e^{(j i)t} (D)_{21} (t) dt:$$
(A15)

This enables us to nd  $M^{\sim}(0;)$ .

For the matrix  $M_0^{\circ}$  ( ) we have the expression

$$M_{0}^{\circ}() = M^{\circ}(0;) = \text{diag}(_{1}();:::;_{4}())$$
 (A16)

with  $_{k} = 2$   $_{k}$ . Recall that in order to construct  $M_{1}$  we need also the derivative of this matrix with respect to ,

$$M_0^{0}() = M(0;) = \text{diag}(_1^{0}(); :::; _4^{0}()):$$
 (A17)

A coording to equations (A 3) and (A 10), each eigenvalue  $_k$  of D<sub>0</sub> is linear in . Therefore  $_k^0$  () =  $_k$  () = . Since  $_k = \exp(2 _k)$ , we have

$${}^{0}_{k}() = {}_{k}()2 {}_{k}() = {}_{k}2 i!_{k} = :$$
 (A18)

The form ulas of this section allow one to determ ine the matrices  $M_0$  and  $M_1$ . To produce from these the coe cients  $p_j$  () appearing in equations (31) and (32) above, we need form ulas for the derivatives of a determ inant. These are presented in Section B below and applied in the following section.

#### A.3. The Expansion for p(;)

We can now nd the required expansion for p(;) by identifying the matrix A of Section B below with M I and the coe cients  $q_k$  with the coe cients  $p_k$  () of equation (31). We obtain these coe cients by writing  $a_k = k$ ;  $A_{k1}^0(0) = M_1^{-1}$  and  $A_{k1}^0(0) = 2 M_2^{-1}$ . This gives for  $p_1$  the following expression (with n = 4):

$$p_{1}() = M_{1}^{\prime} (2) (3) (4) (4) (A19) (A19$$

and there is a similar, lengthier expression for  $p_2$  obtained by making the corresponding substitutions in equation (B5) below.

The developm ent thus far has required no assumptions regarding the multipliers f  $_k$ g. We now suppose that  $_1 = _2$ . It is then clear from the expression above that  $p_1 (_1) = 0$ ; as asserted in Section 3.2. The coe cients appearing in equation (32) are now easily found to be

$$p_{0}^{(0)}(_{1}) = 2(_{3} _{1})(_{4} _{1}); \qquad (A 20)$$

$$p_1^0(_1) = M_1^{-1} + M_1^{-1} (_3 _1) (_4 _1)$$
 (A 21)

and

$$p_{2}(1) = \begin{array}{ccc} M_{1}^{2} & M_{1}^{2} \\ 11 & 12 \\ M_{1}^{2} & M_{1}^{2} \\ 21 & 22 \end{array} (3 \ 1) (4 \ 1) : \qquad (A 22)$$

Equation (32) therefore takes the form

We note that the calculation of the perturbation of  $_1$  to rst order in , which requires expanding p to second order, requires the expansion of the F loquet m atrix M<sup>°</sup>() = M<sup>°</sup><sub>0</sub> + M<sup>°</sup><sub>1</sub> + only to rst order.

We have assumed that the coincident roots are the rst two,  $_1 = _2$ . If instead we should have  $_k = _1$ , equation (A 23) is modified by the replacement (1;2) ! (k;1).

Equation (A 23), together with equations (A 11), (A 16), (A 17) and (A 18) leads to equation (35) of the text. W hat remains is to evaluate the integrals de ning  $\mathcal{J}$ , and we now turn to this.

#### A.4. Calculating the E lem ents of $M_1$

By equations (26) and (A7) above (see also equation A12), the matrix  $M_1$  is given by the formula

$$M_{1}^{*} = M_{0}^{*} () J^{*} + M^{*} (0; )$$
 (A 24)

where the entries of J are given by equation (A15). From equations (A4) and (A5) it is a straightforward matter to carry out the integrations. W e'lluse for T the matrix given above in equation (A8). Since for this matrix  $T_{1j} = j = i!_j$ , the formula for the entries of J becomes

$$J_{ij}^{z} = \int_{j}^{z} T_{i1}^{1} e^{(j-i)t} (D_{11}) (t) dt + T_{i2}^{1} e^{(j-i)t} (D_{21}) dt : (A 25)$$

For the diagonal entries the exponential factors in the integrand reduce to unity and one nds

$$J_{jj} = 4^{2} 1^{2} j^{2} j^{1} j^{2} j^{2} j^{2} j^{2}; j = 1;2;3;4:$$
 (A26)

For the o-diagonal entries, the form ulas may be found generally, but we need them only in the resonant cases where, for some pair of indices (i; j),  $_{i}$   $_{j}$  = ki for a non-zero integer k.<sup>5</sup> It is clear from the form ulas (A 4) (A 5) and (A 25) that only resonances with k = 2 contribute o -diagonal terms to leading order in since for any other choice of k the integrals vanish: for k  $\leq 2$  the matrix J is diagonal.

# B. Determ inantal Derivatives

Consider an n matrix A () having the properties that it is a smooth function of and is diagonal at  $= 0:A(0) = diag(a_1;a_2;:::;a_n).$ 

We need the coe cients in the Taylor expansion of detA ( ) q():

$$q() = q + q_1 + q_1^2 + (B1)$$

where

$$q_0 = \dot{A}(0)j; q_1 = \frac{d\dot{A}()j}{d}j_{=0}; q_2 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2\dot{A}()j}{d^2}j_{=0};$$
 (B2)

Straightforward applications of the form ula for the derivative of a determ inant show that

$$q_{1} = A_{11}^{0} a_{2} a_{3} \qquad {}_{n} + A_{22}^{0} a_{1} a_{3} \qquad {}_{n} + a \qquad {}_{nn}^{0} + a_{1}^{2} a_{2} \qquad {}_{n-1}; a \qquad (B3)$$

$$q_{2} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11}^{0} a_{2} a_{3} & {}_{n} + A_{22}^{0} a_{2} a_{3} & {}_{n} + a \qquad {}_{nn}^{0} + a_{1}^{2} a_{2} & {}_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} a \qquad + A_{21}^{0} A_{12}^{0} a_{3} a_{4} \qquad {}_{n} + a \qquad {}_{A_{31}^{0}}^{0} A_{33}^{0} a_{2} a_{4} \qquad {}_{n} a \qquad (B4)$$

+ 
$$A^{0}_{(n-1)(n-1)} A^{0}_{(n-1)n} a_{1}a_{2} a_{2} a_{2}a_{3}$$
 (B5)

where the terms involving two-by-two determ inants represent the sum over k < l of the product of the fa<sub>j</sub>g,  $a_k$  and  $a_l$  om itted, with the determ inant

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^{0}_{kk} & A^{0}_{kl} \\ A^{0}_{lk} & A^{0}_{ll} \end{array}$$

and all derivatives are evaluated at the origin.

<sup>5</sup>Recall that  $i \notin j$  for any pair i; j so k = 0 is excluded.

## { 25 {

#### REFERENCES

- Balbus, S. & Hawley, J. 1991, ApJ, 376, 214
- Balbus, S. and Hawley, J. 1998, Rev. M od. Phys., 70, 1
- Bayly, B.J. 1986, Phys. Rev. Lett., 57, 2160
- Chandrasekhar, S. 1960, Proc. Nat. A cad. Sci. 46, 253
- Coddington, E. and Levinson, N. 1955, Theory of Ordinary Dierential Equations, New York: Addison-Wesley
- Craik, A D D . 1988, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 417, 235
- Kerswell, R.R. 1994, J.Fluid Mech. 274, 219
- Kerswell, R.R. 2002, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech 34, 83
- Goodman, J. 1993 ApJ, 406, 596
- Hille, E.1962, Analytic Function Theory, volum e II, New York: Ginn
- Lubow, S.H., Pringle, J.E., and Kerswell, R.R. 1993, ApJ, 419, 758
- Morris, M. & Serbyn, E. 1996, ARA&A, 34, 645
- Pierrehum bert, R.J. 1986, Phys. Rev. Lett., 57, 2157
- Ryu, D. and Goodman, J. 1994 ApJ, 422, 269
- Ryu, D., Goodman, J. & Vishniac, E.T. 1996, ApJ, 461, 805
- Velikhov, E.P. 1959, Sov. Phys. JETP, 36, 995
- W ale e, F. 1990, Phys. Fluids 2, 76
- Yakubovich, V A . and Starzhinsky, V M . 1975, Linear D i erential Equations with Periodic Coe cients, New York W iley

This preprint was prepared with the AAS  $IPT_EX$  m acros v5.0.