The Bar{Halo Interaction {II. Secular evolution and the religion of N-body simulations

Martin D.W einberg[?] and NealKatz[?]

D epartm ent of A stronom y, U niversity of M assachusetts, Am herst, 01003, U SA

20 M arch 2024

ABSTRACT

This paper explores resonance-driven secular evolution between a bar and dark-m atter halo using N-body simulations. We make direct comparisons to our analytic theory (Weinberg & Katz 2005) to dem onstrate the great di culty that an N-body simulation has representing these dynamics for realistic astronom ical interactions. In a darkmatter halo, the bar's angular momentum is coupled to the central density cusp (if present) by the Inner Lindblad Resonance. 0 wing to this angularm om entum transfer and self-consistent re-equilibration, strong realistic bars W ILL modify the cusp pro le, low ering the central densities within about 30% of the bar radius in a few bar orbits. Past results to the contrary (Sellwood 2006; M cM illan & Dehnen 2005) may be the result of weak bars or num erical artifacts. The magnitude depends on many factors and we illustrate the sensitivity of the response to the dark-matter pro le, the bar shape and m ass, and the galaxy's evolutionary history. For example, if the bar length is comparable to the size of a central dark-m atter core, the barm ay exchange angular momentum without changing its pattern speed signi cantly. We emphasise that this apparently simple example of secular evolution is remarkably subtle in detail and conclude that an N-body exploration of any astronom ical scenario requires a deep investigation into the underlying dynam ical mechanisms for that particular problem to set the necessary requirements for the simulation parameters and method (e.g. particle num ber and Poisson solver). Sim ply put, N-body sim ulations do not divinely reveal truth and hence their results are not infallible. They are unlikely to provide useful insight on their own, particularly for the study of even m ore complex secular processes such as the production of pseudo-bulges and disk heating.

K ey words: stellar dynamics | dark matter | cosm ology:observations, theory | galaxies: form ation | Galaxy: kinem atics and dynamics

1 IN TRODUCTION

Current theoretical work in galaxy evolution attempts to relate the epoch of galaxy formation to the state of galaxies today. This requires understanding an approximately ten gigayear interval over which disk galaxies are in a slowly changing near equilibrium state. Although this equilibrium will be punctuated by m inor mergers, the formation of bars, and the excitation of spiral structure, the disk's existence tells us that these perturbations must be relatively mild.

As in N ature itself, cosm obgical simulations often produce barred disks. This has led to a cacophony of predictions about the importance and implications of bars to the overall evolution of galaxies in the presence of cuspy dark matter habes. To summarise, theory predicts that bars can transfer angular momentum to habes through resonances and most groups agree that the bar does slow (Sellwood 1981; W einberg 1985; H emquist & W einberg 1992; D ebattista & Sellwood 2000; Sellwood 2003; A thanassoula 2003; H olley-Bockelm ann et al. 2005) although Valenzuela & K lypin (2003, hereafter VK) nd a more modest slow down. D ebattista & Sellwood (2000) use this and the observational evidence that bars are not slow rotators to constrain the density of the present day dark-matter halo. W einberg & K atz (2002, hereafter W K 02) argue that the angular

[?] E-m ail:weinberg@astro.um ass.edu (M D W); nsk@astro.um ass.edu (N K)

m om entum deposited in the halo will change the halo density pro le. This latter work was criticised by Sellwood (2006) and M dM illan & D ehnen (2005) who argue that the results of W K 02 do not occur in there simulations.

The goal of this paper and the previous companion paper, W einberg & K atz (2005, hereafter Paper I), is an exposition of the underlying dynam ical principles that govern secular evolution and their application to N body simulations. In m any cases of interest, the secular evolution is mediated by resonances and the implicit time dependence of an evolving system a ects the subsequent evolution. We use a num erical technique in Paper I for solving the perturbation theory that allows arbitrary time dependence to be included. In other words, the history of the system does matter and time-asymptotic results (e.g. Landau damping or the Lynden-Bell & Kalna's 1972 theory, hereafter LBK) do not give accurate results (W einberg 2004). Guided by the num erical requirements derived in Paper I, we perform a series of simulations to illustrate the special features of the bar-halo resonant interaction, its dependence on the properties of the halo and the bar, and the implication for N-body simulations to properly model this interaction. W e hope that our results will help to clarify and reconcile some of the apparently disparate indings of other research groups (op. cit.). M ost importantly, we show that the details of the torque depend on all aspects of the interaction, the halo pro le, the bar shape, bar strength, bar pattern speed and history and cannot simply be predicted by an application of the Chandrasekhar dynam ical friction or LBK form ula. For example, dynam ical theory predicts that a bar inside of a hom ogeneous core will not slow appreciably, which contradicts the naive dynam ical friction analogy; we also dem onstrate this using an N-body simulation below.

An N-body simulation adds two additional complications to the dynamics of secular evolution. First, an individual particle passing through a resonance receives a perturbation that depends sensitively on its initial position in phase-space. The correct secular evolution is the net average of many such trajectories. In Nature, a dark matter halo most likely has N ! 1 from the perspective of any simulation and, therefore, has no di cultly averaging over all of phase-space. The simulation, however, must have a su cient number of particles in the vicinity of the resonance to obtain the correct net torque. Paper I calls the resulting requirem ent on the num ber of particles the coverage criterion. Second, representation of the dark-m atter and stellar components by an unnaturally small number of particles leads to uctuations in the gravitational potential. For modern sinulations, the magnitude of these uctuations yields a very long relaxation time but the interaction region for a resonance has a very small phase-space volume. Paper I shows that the noise is su cient to cause orbits to random walk through resonances. Of course, if some orbits walk out of the resonance, others walk in. How ever for some resonances, ILR in particular, orbits should linger near the resonance for many rotation periods. This increases the am plitude and changes the dependence of the torque on the phase-space distribution. The uctuation noise prevents this lingering and in so doing changes both the amplitude of the net torque and the location of the orbits in phase space receiving the torque. Paper I shows that natural noise sources like satellites and subhaloes will not destroy the lingering orbits. The existence of multiple regin es underlines the necessity of understanding the dynam ical mechanism s before fully trusting the results of a simulation constructed to investigate unknown dynam ics. Paper I develops two criteria, a small-scale noise particle num ber criterion that treats the scale typical of gravitationally softened particles and a large-scale noise criterion that describes scales typical of basis expansions.

For simulations in this paper, we will use a basis expansion code (also known by the Hemquist & O striker 1992 m oniker self-consistent eld (SCF) code) to solve the Poisson equation. Our variant of this method is reviewed in x2 along with the details of our initial conditions and the bar perturbation. We choose the expansion technique for three reasons: 1) it is fast, scaling as 0 (N) with sm all overhead; 2) it restricts spatial sensitivity to the scales of interest; and 3) it facilitates direct com parison to perturbation theory. Paper I shows that the coverage criterion and the sm all-scale noise criterion dom inates for the bar problem considered here. The expansion technique eliminates the small-scale noise and, therefore, in this paper we are only able to address the breakdown of the coverage criterion. We encourage groups with particle-particle and particle-mesh codes to test their codes as outlined in Paper I for the e ects of sm all-scale noise. We investigate centring in x3 and concur with Sellwood (2006) and M cM illan & Dehnen (2005) that a rotating quadrupole xed to be centred on one position leads to an m = 1 artifact in the halo. This can be remedied by giving the bar a monopole component, i.e. a mass, which allows it to establish its own centre naturally by conserving linear momentum, removing the m = 1 artifact. In x4, we simulate a bar's slow down, angular momentum transfer, and the subsequent evolution of the dark matter halo using a large bar. We show that a strong Inner Lindblad Resonance (ILR) exists in a cuspy dark-matter halo (e.g. Navarro et al. 1997, hereafter NFW). The coupling at the ILR together with the self gravity of the a ected orbits drives the evolution of the inner cusp pro le. A large bar decreases the particle num ber requirem ents derived in Paper I and, because our inner dark-m atter halo has a scale-free (power law) pro le, the same results should obtain with little dependence on the bar size for an appropriately scaled barm ass. We use this to investigate and corroborate the predictions by decreasing and the size and m ass of the bar in x5.1. Then, in x5.2 we investigate the dependence on bar shape and pattern speed, and in x5.3 investigate the dependence on the dark matter halo prole. We compare with other published ndings in x6 and end with a discussion and sum mary in x7.

2.1 Potential solver

The disk and dark matter halo are evolved using a three-dimensional self-consistent eld algorithm (W einberg 1999). This potential solver uses an orthogonal function expansion to represent the density and potential eld. Truncation of this expansion, then, lim its the spatial resolution scale. These expansions are very e cient computationally but are not adaptive. In most Nbody m ethods, either the gravitational softening, introduced to decrease two-body scattering, or the grid cell size determ ines the spatial resolution. In such codes, it is the number of such spatial resolution elements within the simulation volume that determ ines the e ective number of degrees of freedom, typically a very large number. Expansion codes lim it the degrees of freedom, causing a large decrease in the small-scale noise, i.e. two-body relaxation, making this class of code ideal for sin ulating the long term evolution caused by resonant dynam ics (Earn & Sellwood 1995; Clutton-Brock 1972, 1973; Kalnajs 1976; Polyachenko & Shukhm an 1981; Fridm an & Polyachenko 1984; Hemquist & Ostriker 1992; Hemquist et al. 1995; Brown & Papaloizou 1998; Eam 1996). As dem on strated in Paper I, the relaxation times for this code, when used with a radial and angular basis truncation su cient for resolving all the important resonances, are orders of magnitude longer than a softened direct sum m ation or tree code. Conversely, if one were to include enough radial and angular basis functions so that the sam e spatial resolution as a softened particle code were approached, the noise level and relaxation times would be comparable. The choice of a particular truncation introduces a bias by limiting the density and potential proles to those that can be represented by such a basis. Nonetheless, for near-equilibrium secular evolution, the overall changes are likely to be on large spatial scales and to be gradual and, therefore, less a ected by incom pleteness.

Our potential solver exploits properties of the Sturm -Liouville (SL) equation to generate a num erical bi-orthogonal basis set whose lowest order basis function matches the equilibrium model. M any important physical systems in quantum and classical dynamics reduce to the SL form,

$$\frac{d}{dx}^{n} p(x) \frac{d(x)}{dx}^{1} q(x) (x) = ! (x) (x);$$
(1)

where is a constant and !(x) is a known function called either the density or weighting function. If (x) and !(x) are positive in an intervala < x < b then the SL equation is satisfied only for a discrete set of eigenvalues $_j$ with corresponding eigenfunctions $_j(x)$ where j = 0;1;:::. The eigenfunctions form a complete basis set (Courant & Hilbert 1953) and can be chosen to be orthogonal with the following additional properties: 1) the eigenvalues $_n$ are countably in nite and can be ordered: $_n < _{n+1}; 2$) there is a smallest non-negative eigenvalue, $_1 > 0$, but there is no greatest eigenvalue; and 3) the eigenfunctions, $_n$, possess nodes between a and b, and the number of nodes increases with increasing n, e.g. the eigenfunction $_1(x)$ has no nodes, $_2(x)$ has one node, etc.

In the special case of P oisson's equation, we use the eigenfunctions to construct biorthogonal density and potential pairs, d_{k}^{lm} and u_{1}^{lm} given by:

$$\frac{1}{4 \text{ G}} drr^2 d_k^{\text{lm}} (r) u_j^{\text{lm}} (r) = _{jk} :$$
 (2)

The lowest order potential-density pair (j = k = 1, l = m = 0) is defined to be the equilibrium profe, and the higher order terms represent deviations about this profe. This approach m in in ises the number of radial terms that one requires to reproduce both the unperturbed equilibrium and large-scale variations from this equilibrium. Weinberg (1999) shows that by assuming a gravitational potential of the form $(r) = _0(r)f(r)$ with physical boundary conditions for Poisson's equation and $_0$ chosen to be the equilibrium eld, the equation for f(r) also takes the SL form and can be solved numerically to high accuracy using the Pruess & Fulton algorithm (Marketta & Pryce 1991; Pruess & Fulton 1993; Pryce 1993). Weinberg (1999) suggested the possibility of reconstructing the basis as the system evolves. A librough this procedure has some advantages for studying long-term evolution, one must exercise great care to ensure that transient features are not frozen into the basis. For the simulations here, we is the basis for the entire simulation.

We use a NFW prole truncated at large radii for our equilibrium halo model and as the zero-order radial basis function. We obtain a self-consistent phase-space distribution function for this model as follows. We use an Eddington inversion (e.g. B inney & Trem aine 1987) to derive the phase-space distribution function for the truncated prole, $_0$ (r) and $_0$ (r), and integrate this distribution over velocities to get $_1$ (r) and $_1$ (r). We then repeat the inversion to get a new distribution function and integrate to get $_2$ (r) and $_2$ (r) and so on. In practice, this procedure converges in several iterations. In many cases, we add an additional spherical component to the gravitational potential that represents the enclosed disk mass. The initial conditions are generated from random variates R by inverting the mass prole R = M (r) to get a spatial position and by using the acceptance-rejection method along with the phase-space distribution function function function to get a velocity. Models constructed this way are usually in good virial equilibrium to start, with $2T = W + 1j^{<} 0.01$ typically for N = 10^{6} particles.

To improve the elective particle number in the dynamically important central density cusp, we generate initial conditions whose spatial number density is $n(r) / r^{2:5}$, steeper than the spatial mass density of the inner NFW prole. We do this by determining the phase-space distribution function for this new number density prole by Eddington inversion as described above. The assigned mass is then the mean mass per particle multiplied by the ratio of the mass phase-space distribution



F igure 1. The ratio of the e ective num ber of equal m ass particles to the actual num ber of particles as a function of halo radius for our multim ass equilibrium. The ratio is near unity for r & 0.01 but increases to alm ost 1000 for the m ost bound particles in the simulation.

function to the num ber phase-space distribution function. At any given radius, we can then de ne the e ective particle num ber, $N_{eff}(r) = M = hm i_r$ where hm i_r is the mean particle mass at radius r. The ratio of N_{eff} to the total particle num ber N is shown in Figure 1. The values of N_{eff} in the cusp everywhere exceeds N. For example, an $N = 10^6$ multimass particle phase space is equivalent to a $N_{eff} = 10^8$ equal mass particle phase space for r 6 0.001.

We retain hab basis terms up to $n_{max} = 20$ and $l_{max} = 4$. Particles are advanced using a leapfrog integrator, with a time step 1/50 of the smallest orbital oscillation period. Such a small time step is required owing to the small interaction region around each resonance. This requirement varies with the bar model, as described later. We compared orbits integrated in the exact potential and using the perturbation approach from Paper I with the results of the N-body simulation to con rm our choice of time step and verify the insigni cance of noise.

2.2 Details of the bar perturbation

We choose the bar to be a hom ogeneous ellipsoid with axes $a_1;a_2;a_3$ and ratios $a_1:a_2:a_3:10:y:1$ with 2 6 y 6 7. As described in x4, we choose our bar perturbation to be the monopole and quadrupole parts of this potential. The assumption of a hom ogeneous ellipsoid does not limit the applicability of our work to realistic bars owing to the weak dependence of the monopole and quadrupole components to the details of the ellipsoid. Rather, the ellipsoid sets the overall scale. The initial conditions are then constructed by adding the monopole to the NFW prole and performing the iterative Eddington inversion procedure. This allows the NFW density prole to be approximately maintained as the quadrupole part of the perturbation is slow by turned on over several bar rotation times.

The quadrupole is assumed to have the functional form :

$$_{1}$$
 (r; ;) = Y₂₂ (;)U₂₂ (r)

where

$$U_{22}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{b_1 \mathbf{r}^2}{1 + (\mathbf{r} = b_5)^5}$$
(4)

This form has the correct solution to Laplace's equation at very sm all and very large values of r and is a good t to the exact quadrupole (see x2.3). The derivation of b_1 and b_5 follows from the exact potential in terms of elliptic integrals (see W einberg 1985). U₂₂ peaks at $r = (2=3)^{1=5}b_5$ with the value $(2^2 3^3)^{1=5}b_1b_5^2=5$. For this potential, the projected surface density along the m inor axis is

$$(x;y) = \frac{3M_{b}p}{2 ab} \frac{p}{1 x^{2} = a^{2} y^{2} = b^{2}}$$
(5)

where M_{b} is the total barm ass. This form approximately describes the observed surface brightness of bars (K orm endy 1982). How ever, alternative profession betwith equation (4) or the more general form below (eq.7).

2.3 Comparison with bar quadrupole from Hernquist & Weinberg

W e used the quadrupole form of equation (4) in W K, but a di erent form,

(3)



F igure 2.C om parison of the quadrupole potential thing form ula from HBW K, W K, and HW with the exact quadrupole potential of the hom ogeneous ellipsoid whose projected surface density is given in eq.5.N otice that the HBW K bar, from a fully consistent disk + halo N-body simulation is indistinguishable from the exact hom ogeneous ellipsoid at quadrupole order.



F igure 3. C om parison of the W K quadrupole potential thing form ula for bars with various axis ratios b=a with xed c=a = 1=20. A sm aller b=a yields a deeper quadrupole potential inside the bar radius, which increases the torque for sm all energy cusp orbits.

$$U_{22}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{b_1 r^2}{\left[1 + r = b_5\right]^5};$$
(6)

in Hemquist & W einberg (1992, hereafter HW). Both of these can be included in the more general form

$$U_{22}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\mathbf{b}_{1}\mathbf{r}^{2}}{\left[1 + (\mathbf{r}=\mathbf{b}_{5})\right]^{5=}}$$
(7)

while still maintaining the same asymptotic radial dependence consistent with the Laplace equation. Equation (6) results for = 1 and equation (4) results for = 5. Figure 2 compares these two tting form ula to the exact potential of a hom ogeneous ellipsoid. In both cases b_1 and b_5 are chosen to match the exact potential at sm all and large r. Holley-Bockelm ann et al. (2005, hereafter HBW K) nd stellar bars, form ed self-consistently in N-body simulations, have 4. As shown in the gure, the quadrupole from the ellipsoid is a very good match to the quadrupole derived from the N-body bar. Equation (4) nearly matches the exact potential for the ellipsoid while equation (6) underestimates the peak of the potential by more than an order of magnitude. This di erence would have a signi cant e ect on the total torque.

D i erent bar pro les may require tuning the value of . Increasing values of in equation (7) increases the sharpness of the turn over between the r^2 and r^3 tails; the pro le becomes a discontinuous broken power law as ! 1 . K orm endy (1982) reports that along the major axis the surface brightness is nearly constant interior to a sharp outer edge, while along the minor axis the pro le is steep, as in an r^{1-4} law. The approximation (x;y) above is, therefore, a good representation of the major axis although it falls o more gradually along the projected minor axis. One can compensate for this by decreasing the ratio of $a_2=a_1$. M oreover, our ducial choice of $a_2=a_1 = 1=5$ (see x2.2) is similar to those of many bars (K orm endy 1982). Figure

6 Weinberg & Katz

3 shows that a smaller $a_2=a_1$ gives a larger amplitude quadrupole inside the bar radius, which will increase the e ciency of coupling to lower energy orbits.

3 DIPOLE RESPONSE AND THE EXPANSION CENTRE

Application of equation (3) as a bar perturbation requires a prior know ledge of the galaxy's centre. A blough our simulations contain su cient particles such that the root m ean square drift of the centre will be negligible, inclusion of the l = 1 term in the potential solver with a xed-centre quadrupole promotes an instability between the bar and halo, which changes the angular momentum exchange by amplifying the o set of their two centres. A small shift between the quadrupole and halo centre, which could be generated by particle noise, converts some of the bar's angular momentum into linear momentum of the halo cusp. This increases the l = 1 amplitude and leads to a run away. The consequences of this were noted by Sellwood (2003). This instability may be removed by adding the monopole term to equation (3):

$_{1}$ (r; ;) = Y_{00} (;) U_{00} (r) + Y_{22} (;) U_{22} (r)

(8)

where r is the coordinate the bar fram e and U_{00} is the monopole part of the bar potential. We compute the origin of the bar frame by conserving linear momentum in the combined bar{hab mass distribution. The restoring force resulting from the addition of inertial and gravitational mass causes the bar to oscillate weakly about the centre and damps the m = 1 instability. We have performed simulations both without the l = 1 term and using only the even 1 terms and, when one includes the monopole part of the bar potential, we obtained nearly identical torque curves $L_z = L_z$ (t) as when all the terms are included. In most cases, we choose the monopole and quadrupole to be consistent with a single hom ogeneous ellipsoid, how ever, this is not a requirement. As long as the m = 1 instability does not grow, the quadrupole amplitude can be adjusted independently of the monopole to m in ic a bar that lengthens and changes shape.

By adding the monopole component to the bar potential we successfully damped the m = 1 instability. However, since the bar centre and central density cusp can now be o set, the central density cusp is no longer necessarily centred on the Poisson expansion, which could introduce another problem. If the o set from the expansion centre became large enough then our nite number of expansion terms would cause the gravitational forces within the cusp to be underestim ated and the cusp could articially dissolve. We check the position of the cusp relative to the expansion origin by computing the centre of mass of the most bound particles such that we include a mass fraction of $5 - 10^4 M_{vir}$. For example, for 10^6 equalm ass particles within the virial radius, we compute the centre for the 500 m ost bound particles. Even if the bar is free to move relative to the density cusp, the typical o set of the density cusp from the expansion centre is only several hundredths of a percent of the virial radius. For the number of terms we keep in our Poisson expansion, i.e. $n_{max} = 20$ and $l_{max} = 4$, the central cusps of equilibrium NFW halos evolved with o sets from the expansion centre of this size remain in equilibrium for over 5 G yrs, mitigating any need for concern.

We choose the pattern speed of the bar, $_{p}$, to be the circular frequency in the unperturbed halo at som emultiple of the bar length, a_{1} . The angular momentum of the bar is then:

$$L_{z,bar} = I_{z};$$

$$I_{z} = \frac{1}{5} (a_{1}^{2} + a_{2}^{2}) M_{b};$$
(9)
(10)

The pattern speed at any future time is determined directly from momentum conservation for the combined bar{hab system as follows. Initially, we compute the total angular momentum content of the hab $(L_{z,hab})$, add this to the bar angular momentum, $(L_{z,hab})$, and keep this constant. The pattern speed is then

$$p = (L_{z;bar} + L_{z;halo} \quad L_{z;t}) = I_z$$
(11)

where $L_{z,t}$ is the angular m om entum of the halo at time t. This model, of course, neglects angular m om entum transport between the bar and the rest of the disk; this is explicitly investigated and quanti ed in HBW K.

4 FIDUCIALRUN

O ur ducial run uses an NFW halo with a concentration parameter of c = 15.0 ur ducial bar has a length equal to the NFW scale length r_s , a mass equal to 1/2 the mass of the halo enclosed within that radius, and a shape $a_1 : a_2 : a_3 :: 10 : 2 : 1$. The perturbation is turned on over approximately a bar rotation time. The bar pattern speed is adjusted during the simulation to conserve the total angularm on entum of the bar{halo system (eq. 11). This bar radius is unrealistically large compared to present-day bars, but this choice ensures that all of the particle number criteria obtained in Paper I are satis ed. How ever, because the NFW pro le is scale free inside of r_s , one should not expect signi cant di erences for sm aller bars scaled to the sam e enclosed dark-matter mass. W e will discuss sm aller present-day-sized bars in $x \le 1$.



Figure 4.D istribution of L $_z$ for the slowing ducial barw ith the locations of low-order resonances $l_1 : l_2$ at the pattern speed of peak torque overlayed.

The bar perturbation is turned on over several bar rotation times using an error function as follows:

$$A(t) = \frac{A_o}{2}fl + erf[(t \ b) =]g$$
(12)

where A (1) = A₀ is the nal quadrupole amplitude. The amplitude of the monopole term, now integral to the overall equilibrium, is not adjusted. For the simulations described below, we set $t_0 = 1=2$ and = 1=4 unless otherwise stated. In Paper I we used a slower turn on to investigate the detailed dynam ical mechanism. Here, our turn on rate is motivated by bar form ation times observed in self-consistent simulations (HBW K). Scaled to the M ilky W ay, one time unit is approximately 2 Gyr. Variations in t_0 and or the choice A (t) = constant do not make large di erences in the results since the strongest coupling is driven by the slowing of the bar (W einberg 2004). To compare models with di erent parameters t_0 and , we de ne a scaled time $\int_0^0 dtA(t)$. This is the equivalent time for a full-strength bar. In an N-body simulation without the bar perturbation, the dark matter halo pro le is indistinguishable from the initial pro le after 3 time units (approx. 6 Gyr for the M ilky W ay).

We use 10^6 multimass particles for investigating the large bars with ducial parameters but smaller bars require larger N as we will see in later sections. The criteria calculations from Paper I predict that N 10^6 equalmass particles within the virial radius are needed for ILR and N $< 10^6$ equalmass particles for the other low-order resonances. The elective particle number in the vicinity of ILR (see Paper I) for N = 10^6 is between 10^7 and 10^8 equalmass particles within the virial radius and this provides su cient coverage for all but possibly the most eccentric orbits near the ILR for our large ducial bar. How ever, this particle number is not su cient for a scale-length sized bar, which requires N $> 10^9$ equalmass particles.

4.1 Description and theoretical interpretation

The resonant angular exchange mechanism deposits (or extracts) angular momentum in (from) the dark matter halo at speci c regions in phase space. Hence, as we discuss in Paper I, plotting the change in angular momentum over a nite time is a good way to see the important resonances. In Figure 4, we show the ensemble change in the z component of the angular momentum

 L_z in phase-space during the evolution of the ducial bar. An equilibrium phase-space distribution in a spherical halo is described by two conserved quantities and for a clearer presentation we use the energy E and the angular momentum scaled to the maximum for a given energy $J=J_{max}(E) \ge [0;1]$. This gure is made by rst computing L_z for each orbit as a function of its initial values of E and . We then use kernel density estimation with cross validation (Silverman 1986) to



F igure 5. The torque L $_z$ = t versus scaled time from the ducial model compared with the perturbation theory predictions from P aper I for the total torque and for the torque from individual resonances.

estimate the smoothing kernel. We increase and decrease this estimate to ensure that the resulting density eld is not over smoothed. In the gure, we also indicate the positions of the low-order resonances, calculated at the bar pattern speed when the torque is largest. However, since the bar pattern speed changes with time so will the position of the resonances in phase space. This makes the ILR less obvious because it is spread over a large range in energy owing to the time-dependence of the frequency spectrum of the slowing bar. This resonance, $(1;2;2)^1$, has a particularly interesting degeneracy. As p! 0, there is always some value ! 0 such that $l_1 r + l_2 ! m p$. The limiting case is a purely radial orbit. In a cuspy prole, the orbital frequencies j increase as the energy decreases so that there is also some bit of phase space near resonance. This resonance track continues to smaller values of E and . Unlike the non-degenerate low-order resonances, for ILR a small change in p can have a large e ect on the relative location of the resonance track.

In an evolving system, the frequency spectrum is broadened, and this promotes coupling to the LLR over a large range of radii. Paper I describes the application of canonical perturbation theory to time-dependent secular evolution using a num erical procedure. The perturbation theory allows investigation of each resonance separately. We compare the perturbation theory predictions to our ducial bar simulation in Figure 5. The perturbation theory predicts that the ILR is responsible for approximately half of the total torque during the rapid phase of bar slowing. However, since the strength of the bar perturbation causes the interaction to be nonlinear, the linear perturbation theory is scaled beyond its dom ain of validity, which results in the mism atch at early times (< 02). Because we do not expect the perturbation theory to match the stronger bar simulation precisely as it did for the weak bars considered in Paper I, the exact com parison is less useful here than are the relative contributions of each resonance. A fler the initial nonlinear phase, the ILR, the direct radial resonance (1;0;2) [hereafter, DRR], and the (2; 2;2) resonances account for approximately 25% of the total torque each and corotation and OLR are 15% and 10% of the total, respectively. Also note that the (2; 2;2) resonance supplies angular momentum to the bar. A fler the bar slows substantially, the ILR becomes a less e cient angular momentum sink, requiring increasingly high-eccentricity orbits for coupling to the cusp and the rem aining low -order resonances m ove to large radii where the coupling is also weak. As we show in Paper I, the ILR is the most num erically di cult resonance to reproduce in N-body simulations. If num erical de ciencies cause the ILR to be m issed or weakened, the net torque on the bar can be greatly reduced. Since, of the remaining resonances, DRR and (2; 2;2) have comparable strengths but opposite signs and e ect similar radii, in this num erically comprom ised case only the net e ect of corotation and OLR will slow the bar and the angular momentum will be deposited at larger radii in the halo, at about the bar radius.

We plot the bar pattern speed evolution in Figure 6. The initial bar period is 0.3 time units and the bar reaches half of its full amplitude at t = 0.5 (= 0.07). At about this time the bar begins to slow rapidly. As described above, the

¹ The resonance condition m ay be written $l_1 + l_2 = m_p$ for a spherical model. We denote a particular resonance by the triple $(l_1; l_2; m)$. When we are considering m = 2 speci cally, we shorten the designation to $(l_1; l_2)$.



Figure 6. Evolution of the ducial bar's pattern speed in physical time t (lower axis) and scaled time (upper axis).



Figure 7. Evolution of the halo density pro le shown as function of time T. The initial bar period is 0.3 time units.

angular m om entum loss is dom inated by the LLR (1;2;2) and DRR.As we discussed in W K 02, the addition of this angular m om entum causes the halo density pro le to evolve. We show the bar-driven evolution of the dark m atter density pro le for the ducial model in Figure 7a. The orbits a ected by the LLR have characteristic radii well inside the bar radius. The corotation radius begins at the end of the bar and slow ly m oves outward as the bar slow s, while the LLR m oves inwards. The DRR occurs close to but inside of corotation. The initial bar radius is $r_s = 0.067$ and the peak of the pro le evolution occurs at a radius of 0.01, a factor of six sm aller in radius. Note that this pro le evolution occurs even though we added a monopole component to the bar potential and hence rem oved the m = 1 instability.

Even if the bar does not slow at all the halo density pro le still evolves. We plot the evolution of the pro le for this xed-pattern-speed case in Figure 7b and it shows the same overall trend as for the evolving bar. However, the evolution in the xed-pattern case is driven only by the evolving halo and the creation of the bar and not by the pattern speed evolution and, therefore, is weaker. For times longer than t & 1, the evolution of the inner pro le ceases for our ducial bar, since the bar has mostly stopped slowing at this time. We restarted a fresh bar in the evolved phase space at t = 1 and the evolution



F igure 8. The distribution of z-angularm om entum change (L $_z$) in the halo phase space plotted as a function of $r_{\rm circ}$ and $= J=J_{m ax}$ predicted by perturbation theory. The quantity $r_{\rm circ}$ is the radius of a circular orbit with the same energy.



F igure 9. The evolution of the halo pro le shown as a function of time T after adding the distribution of L $_z$ shown in F igure 8 over one time unit.

continued for another time unit. This indicates that the nite life time of the bar is spreading power to lower frequencies, where it can be resonantly absorbed by the halo cusp; we have predicted this transient analytically using the methods of Paper I.

4.2 Pro le evolution explained

Figure 8 shows the phase-space distribution of angular momentum change L $_z$ during one time unit (in units with M $_{vir} = R_{vir} = 1$) for the LR as the bar slows. This distribution was computed using the perturbation theory approach used in Paper I and plotted as in Figure 4. Rather than plotting energy E and scaled angular momentum $J=J_{max}$, however, we plot the radius of the circular orbit with the same energy E, called r_{circ} . For 1, the radius of the actual orbit will be well approximated by r_{circ} , but for 0, the pericentric radius will be much smaller than r_{circ} , making the apocentric radius 0 (r_{circ}). Since the largest values of L $_z$ occur at small values of , the torqued radial orbits have an e ect on the cusp well inside r_{circ} . O f course, to follow the e ect on the new equilibrium probe one must allow the phase space to self consistently readjust to the new equilibrium. C om paring Figures 7 and 8 shows that the radii that have the greatest probe evolution are the same radii with the greatest angular momentum change, suggesting that the probe evolution owes to angular momentum transfer at LR.

As further evidence, we perform a simulation in which we add the perturbation theory predicted change in angular m om entum (from Figure 8) at each point in phase space to an equilibrium NFW halo, continuously over one time unit and allow the system to reach a new equilibrium . M ore precisely, at each time step we use Figure 8 to estimate the time-averaged torque $T_z = L_z = t$, then we compute the values of E and for each particle, then we compute T_z by interpolation, and nally we accelerate the particle in azim uth to reproduce $L_z = T_z t$. The resulting density proles are shown in Figure 9 and are a very close m atch to those in Figure 7a, demonstrating that the deposition of angular momentum at ILR and subsequent re-equilibrium prole. The change in the cusp appears dram atic because of the low overall speci c angularm om entum of the ILR-coupled cusp orbits relative to the bar angularm om entum and the crucial role these orbits play in sustaining the self gravity of the cusp. The response would presum ably be smaller for a steeper cusp, which would have a larger fractional binding energy.

5 DEPENDENCE ON MODEL PARAMETERS

5.1 Variation of bar size and bar m ass

In the past section we discussed the results for our ducial bar, which is much larger than bars found in galaxies today. Here, we discuss the evolution of both shorter bars and those with di erent m asses. The di erent bar lengths and m asses that we investigate are presented in Table 1. Since the inner parts of a NFW pro leare a power law, it is scale free inside of r_s , which is the length of our largest bar. Therefore, the evolution of shorter bars should scale as the bar remains the same fraction of the enclosed m ass, and the corotation radius remains the same number of bar lengths. Perturbation theory predicts a well-de ned scaling of the overall angular momentum evolution with bar mass, more precisely with the perturbation strength. How ever, the scaling depends on the nature of the resonant interaction. If the evolution is fast enough, an orbit passes through



Figure 10. The change in L_z for slowing bars of di erent masses and sizes scaled to the ducial run labelled as Length= 1, Mass= 1. The circles represent the evolution of the Length= 1/6 case using 5 times more particles.

Table 1.Bar param eters

Length	M ass	Reallength (a)	M _b =M _{halo} (a)
1	1/2	0.067	0.25
1	1	0.067	0.5
1	2	0.067	1.0
1	3	0.067	1.5
1/2	1/3	0.033	1.0
1/3	1/10	0.02	0.5
1/6	1/20	0.01	0.5

the resonance quickly compared to the period of the resonant orbit. As long as the angular momentum is transferred in this fast limit (Trem aine & W einberg 1984, hereafter TW), the torque scales as M_{b}^{2} . We saw in Paper I that some resonances and especially ILR have contributions from the slow limit, for which the torque scales as M_{b}^{2} . We need to orbit strong bars, most of the low-order resonances are in the transition region between these two regimes, rapid slowing not withstanding. The interactions that lead to orbits exchanging angular momentum at resonance are described in Paper I. The total angular momentum of a bar is proportional to its mass:

$$L_z = I_{b p} / M_b R_b^2 p$$
⁽¹³⁾

If we assume that all angular momentum transfer is in the fast lim it, then

 L_z / M $_b^2$

and we can compare simulations of dimensional barm ass M_b, bar length a, and bar growth time A (t) as follows. Let the ratio of the barm ass to the halo mass inside of the bar radius be M $M_b=M$ (a). If we scale the time by M = p and the angular momentum, L_z , by $L_{z \text{ in it}}M$ then all the evolution histories should be the same. Remember that this is if the fast-limit scaling applies. A lternatively, if we assume that all the angular momentum transfer is in the slow limit, then

$$L_{z} / M_{b}^{1=2}$$
: (15)

and W e must scale the time by M¹⁼² = $_{p}$. Finally, we must take into account the bar growth time, A (t). Since the torque mechanism is secular, we expect the degree of evolution to be proportional to the time integral of the applied amplitude, = $_{0}^{h}$ dtA (t) as de ned in x4.

Figure 10a shows the evolution of L_z with for simulations with different bar lengths and m asses, labelled in units of the ducial model, as outlined in Table 1, and scaled for the fast limit. These simulations also use $N = 10^6$ multimass particles. Bar corotation occurs at a for t = 0 in all of these simulations. The station cases in the Figure show the scaled pattern speed evolution for the Length=1 bar with a range of m asses. In the last three cases we reduce both the bar length and the bar m ass. The smallest bar, Length=1/6, is approximately a disk scale length when scaled the M iky W ay. With the rescaling



F igure 11.D i erent particle num ber criteria from Paper I for a scale-length bar (Length=1/6) and the ducial bar (Length=1) for the ILR resonance in term s of equal mass particles within the virial radius. A lso show n are the elective num ber of particles for our multimass simulations using 10^6 and 5 10⁶ particles.

the evolutions look sim ilar, except for that of the Length= 1/6, M ass= 1/20 bar, which we discuss m one below. The residual di erences could be caused either by non-linear interactions, which could cause a breakdown in the linear scaling, numerical artifacts, or contributions by resonances in the slow lim it. W e m ake a rough test of the last possibility by taking a equal-part linear combination of the fast-lim it and slow lim it scalings in F igure 10b. Now all but two of the cases are almost identical; the two discrepant ones are the Length= 1/3, M ass= 1/10 and Length= 1/6, M ass= 1/20 bars. Since these two cases are for the least m assive bars it seems unlikely that their inappropriate scaling is related to non-linear e ects.

Even with these di erences, the scaling of L_z (t) is remarkably good over an order of magnitude in unscaled time and, therefore, many of these bars have very di erent rates of slow ing. This may be understood as follows. If we think of performing a periodogram on the bar perturbation, we will see a broadened line in frequency space; the broadening will be inversely proportional the change in $L_z=L_z$ since the amount of torque lost by the bar controls its instantaneous frequency. The nite time since the form ation of the bar also contributes to the broadening. However, the total power, determ ined by integrating under the broadened line, will be approximately the same since the total rotational kinetic energy is approximately the same. For most resonances, except ILR, the resonance occupies a narrow band in energy. However, for ILR, the energy range may be large. Rapid evolution and subsequent broadening in frequency space can further increase the importance of the ILR contribution (W einberg 2004, Paper I).

The scaling failure of the sm all length bars evolutionary histories is most likely caused by numerical de ciencies. In Paper I, we derived three requirem ents on particle number to model resonant dynam ics correctly within N-body simulations. We present these minimum particle number requirem ents for both the ducial, Length= 1 bar (right-hand side) and the scale-length, Length-1/6 bar (left-hand side) in Figure 11 as a function of radius. Each resonance has di erent requirem ents and we show those for the resonance that is most in portant for both bar slowing and dark matter cusp evolution, the LR .We only plot the criteria over the range in radii that dom inate the LR for each bar length. Since we plot the number of equal mass particles required within the virial radius, to compare with our multim ass simulations, we also plot the equivalent number of equal mass particles in our simulations. Note that in our SCF code, which has no direct two-body interactions, the sm all scale noise criterion does not apply. Nevertheless, for both bars the coverage criterion is the most stringent. For the sm all, Length=1/6 bar, one requires about 10^9 particles over the range of radii that dom inate the LR. The same coverage criterion dem ands only about 10^7 particles for the larger ducial bar. Comparing this with the elective number of particles in our 10^6 multim ass simulations, one can see that the ducial length bar has a su cient number of particles to follow the resonant dynam ics and the sm all, Length=1/6 bar simulation does not, as is born out in its poor scaling. To test this idea further, we repeated the Length=1/6 bar simulation using ve times more particles, i.e. $5 = 10^6$ multim ass particles, which according to Figure 11 should be su cient. Now the scaled evolutionary history follows that of the other simulations, plotted as the open



Figure 12. The density profile evolution for three shorter bars. Simulations in the fourth uses N = 5 10⁶ multimass particles.

circles in Figure 10. This demonstrates the extrem e sensitivity of the evolution to num erical de ciencies and the need for a detailed understanding of the dynam ics in order to trust the results of N-body simulations.

Like the longer ducial bar, the shorter bars, except for the Length=1/6 bar, also cause density pro le evolution, as shown in Figure 12abc. For the Length=1/2 (a = 0.033 or three disk scale lengths) bar and Length=1/3 (a = 0.02 or two disk scale lengths) bar one clearly sees the same pro le evolution as for the ducial bar in x4. A spredicted by Figure 11, there is no pro le evolution in the Length=1/6 (a = 0.033 or one disk scale length) bar simulation with 10^6 multim ass particles. How ever, once again if we use 5 10^6 multim ass particles, a su cient number to resolve the LR resonance responsible for the cusp density evolution according to Figure 11, density pro le evolution occurs just as in the three longer bars as shown in Figure 12d. For all four bar lengths the density is reduced within about 30% of the bar radius, independent of bar length if the num erical criteria are satis ed.

In sum mary, these examples also help clarify several important features of bar evolution in the simulations. For an astronom ically realistic bar ending at corotation, a naive estimate places the LR deep within the cusp. For a scale length bar, the particle number predictions from Paper I suggest that the LR should not be seen in our simulations with 10^6 multimass particles, and therefore there should be no density prole evolution and indeed there is not. How ever, for 5 10^6 particles, the excited number of particles near LR exceeds the coverage criterion and we again see density evolution. Even so, the proles in the simulations do not evolve at very small radii. It is now clear that these simulations cannot couple to these small radii.



Figure 13.Pro le evolution with bars of di erent axis ratio.Each curve is labelled by time.The initial bar rotation period is 0.3 time units.

solely for computational reasons. Finally, although the multim ass initial conditions used here improved the radial resolution and allowed us to recover the correct resonant dynam ics using fewer total particles, this technique must be cautiously because it can produce more noise at larger radii.

5.2 Variation in bar shape

Figure 3 clearly shows that a larger major to sem imajor axis ratio results in a smaller quadrupole amplitude inside of the bar radius. However, if the quadrupole amplitude becomes too small, there will no way of coupling to the inner halo. We present a series of simulations with $N = 10^6$ (without multimass) with an evolving bar pattern speed to investigate this anticipated trend. The evolution of the halo proles for dienent axis ratios is presented in Figure 13.0 there wise, parameters are those from the ducial run. Each panel shows a dienent axis ratio $a_2=a_1$ with xed $a_3=a_1$. There is little evolution in the prole for $a_2=a_1 \& 0.3$ there is no obvious evolution. How ever, there is clear inner prole evolution for $a_2=a_1 . 0.2$.

This behaviour is expected from on the criteria described in Paper I (see Fig. 14). The coverage criterion is dominant here as discussed earlier. The sharp threshold is the combined result of increasing am plitude with decreasing axis ratio and m ore rapid slowing with increasing am plitude. A sm aller am plitude perturbation in the vicinity of a resonance yields a sm aller resonance width and therefore a higher central particle number requirem ent. Sim ilarly, a weakly slowing bar will not broaden the ILR to lower frequencies and therefore larger radii where the coverage criterion is also less stringent. These runs suggest that our ducial simulation is close to the minimum necessary particle numbers. Changing $a_2=a_1$ from 0.2 to 0.5 m akes an order of magnitude decrease in the value of the inner potential. It is, therefore, no surprise that we see critical behaviour as we increase the am plitude of the quadrupole by decreasing the axis ratio $a_2=a_1$. The description of these trends were presented



Figure 14.Critical particle num ber criteria from Paper I for ducial bar (a = 0.067) and but with varying sem i-m inor to sem i-m a pr axis ratios.

in W K. The noise criterion for point particles is also shown in Figure 14. For these cases, the small-scale noise and coverage criteria have sim ilar magnitude. The noise criteria scales as the amplitude of the perturbation potential while the coverage criterion scales as the square root of this value; this explains the di erence in range with varying $a_2=a_1$. The values for the large-scale noise criterion, relevant to our simulation method, are negligible here.

5.3 Variation in halo density pro le

The shape of the hab density pro k, which determ ines the existence and location of resonances for a given bar pattern speed, therefore, determ ines the magnitude and e ect of the angular momentum transfer. As an extreme example, we describe the evolution of a bar in a lowered, truncated isotherm all sphere (K ing 1966) with a core radius equal to r_s in the NFW model, using the same total mass as that within the virial radius in the ducial run. We consider two bar lengths: one with a length of 0.015 (1.5 scale lengths when scaled to the M ilky W ay) and one the same as the ducial bar with a length of 0.067 (6.7 scale lengths). The mass of each bar is 50% of the mass of the enclosed dark matter halo mass and initially corotation occurs at the end of the bar. Resonant dynamic theory (see Paper I) tells us that to have a resonance there must be orbits with the right frequency. In addition, within a constant density harm onic core, like in the central regions of a K ing model, there is no resonance unless $l_1 + l_2 = m = 0$. For the low order resonances, which are most in portant for the evolution, this is only true for the corotation resonance. How ever, as the bar slow s, the orbits with the right frequency move further out in the halo and the corotation resonance becomes very weak. Therefore, there is no ILR in either case. In addition, for the a = 0.015 bar, there are also no (1,0) or (2,-2) resonances, only a small region of 0 LR, and a weakening corotation resonance. Figure



Figure 15. Pattern speed evolution in a King model with $r_c = r_s$ and two di erent barm odels: the ducial barwith sem im a jor axis $a = 0.067 = r_s$ (6.7 disk scale lengths for the M ilky W ay) and a sm all barwith a = 0.015 (1.5 disk scale lengths).

15 shows the pattern speed evolution for the two bars. The di erence in evolution of the pattern speed, which owes to the di erent resonances present, is striking.

Next, we compare the evolution of a bar in a King model dark matter hab with the evolution in a NFW dark matter hab. We choose the King M odel to have the same mass and a similar concentration as the NFW hab. The bar has a length of 0.01 (one disk scale length when scaled to the M ilky W ay) and initially corotation occurs at the end of the bar. Figure 16a compares the two initial density proles. The dark matter density of the King model at one bar length is larger than that of the NFW model and the King density falls below the NFW density at approximate 1/30 of the bar radius. Figure 16b shows the evolution of the bar pattern speed. The bar in the King model does not slow much at all because there is no ILR or DRR, as shown in Figure 16c where we show the position of the torque. A lthough corotation, (2, -2), and OLR are active, their net contributions nearly cancel. Hence, these resonances merely redistribute the angular momentum but do not provide a signi cant net torque on the bar. This is an exam ple of a bar in massive dark matter hab that does not slow of slow of the bar slow down as Chandrasekhar dynam ical friction on two point masses, each with one half the bar mass, located at the bar radius (e.g. Sellwood 2004). In this case, such a prescription would have predicted that the King M odel bar would slow faster than the NFW . Local Chandrasekhar dynam ical friction does not apply to bar slow down, it is the result of resonant dynam ics.

We have seen that all aspects of the galaxy model all the bar and dark matter halo parameters can a ect the subsequent evolution. Therefore, when one compares the di erences in evolution between di erent scenarios, the values that are kept constant determ ine the outcome. For example, Figure 17a shows the dark matter halo evolution for our ducial bar in a H emquist dark matter halo, $/ r^1 (r + a)^3$, with $a = r_s$ and the same mass within the virial radius as our NFW halo. The pro le evolution is negligible. However, the mass enclosed within the bar radius is 2.5 times larger than than that in the NFW model. Increasing the mass of the bar by a factor of two, which makes the bar mass 40% of the enclosed halo mass, leads to obvious pro le evolution. For comparison, Figure 17c shows the evolution of the same model 17b but without self gravity. The pro le evolution only slightly and demonstrates the importance of self gravity in density pro le evolution.

As a nalexample, in Figure 18, we compare the pattern speed and density prole evolution of the ducial bar in a H emquist dark halo with that in a NFW halo. However, in this case we match the densities of the inner prole, making the mass inside of R_{vir} no longer the same in the two models. But since the main di erences between these halo models occurs at radii well beyond the bar, the bar slow down and density prole evolution haloes is nearly identical.

6 COMPARISON W ITH OTHER PUBLISHED W ORK

Recent work from di erent groups have reported a range of conclusions regarding halo induced bar slow down and the subsequent bar-induced halo evolution. As this and Paper I demonstrate, the theory of the dynamical interaction agrees with our simulations, demonstrating its conceptual soundness and applicability. Any di erences must either be the result of di erences in the simulated bar and halo, which can be in the halo prole, the bar shape, the bar mass, the pattern speed, or the evolutionary history, or to num erical de ciencies. x5 illustrates the diversity of evolutionary results that can result from a range of bar and halo models. We also demonstrated how not satisfying any of the three particle num ber criteria can result in underestimating bar slow down and the halo density prole evolution. How ever, if one uses an insulcient number of particles in a simulation, how the evolution proceeds relative to the correct solution will depend on the details of the N-body algorithm. Furtherm ore, the approach to the correct answer can be sudden, which means that the standard approach of convergence testing can be misleading. Only by fully understanding the underlying dynam ics can one fully trust the results of one's N-body simulation.

There are two main di erences reported in the literature: the rate of bar slowing and the resulting evolution of the halo pro le as a result of the angular momentum deposition. Most groups agree that the bar does slow in most circum stances (HW; Debattista & Sellwood 2000; Sellwood 2006; Athanassoula 2003; M cM illan & Dehnen 2005) although Valenzuela & K lypin (2003, hereafter VK) nd a more modest slow down. Besides our work (W K; Holley-Bockelm ann et al. 2005), no published simulation to date has shown a decrease in the halo central density owing to angular momentum loss from the bar. Of these, Sellwood (2006, hereafter S06) provides su ciently detailed information so that we can compare directly. S06 describes simulations with an external bar potential similar to those here and in W K. H is simulations that use an external bar potential are use two dark matter haloes: a H emquist model and NFW model. The bar is a t to an n = 2 Ferrers model (Ferrers 1887) also used by HW. S03 makes two main points relevant to our work here: 1) no pro le evolution is observed for bisym metric, even-parity forcing by the bar in either the NFW pro le, H emquist pro le or a self-consistently form ed N-body bar; and 2) pro le evolution is seen if the odd-parity forcing is included owing to a centring artifact. W e con m this latter artifact, attributable to the dipole response, does distort the pro le, and addressed this issue in detail (see x3). H owever, our ducial run (x4) does not su er from this artifact and still shows signi cant halo density evolution. M oreover, we nd that even in W K, there is pro le evolution before the dipole centring problem dom inates the evolution.

There are probably two main reasons for our di erence with the bisym metric (even term s only) runs from S06.First, the Ferrers model tused in S06 and HW has signi cantly lower amplitude than the one used here as described in x2.3.Figure 2 shows the t from HW to Ferrers n = 2 m odel compared with our current model using the same bar mass. The peak of the quadrupole potential di ers by a factor of 30. In addition, we have seen that narrow er bars have much larger inner quadrupole potentials than rounder bars (see Fig. 3). In particular, S06 and HW use b=a = 0.5 while in this paper we use b=a = 0.2, which is more typical of a moderate to strong bar. The inner quadrupole for the same hom ogeneous ellipsoid with these two axis ratios is an additional factor of 10 larger! W hen we evolve simulations using the parameters in S06 we obtain the same results: no measurable halo evolution. We expect that sim ilar considerations explain the lack of evolution reported in S03 from the self-consistent bar run.

M ore generally, the dynam ics described in Paper I and dem onstrated here in ply that halo evolution through bar{halo coupling depends on a variety of factors: 1) the underlying halo and disk m ass determ ines the radial location of com m ensurate frequencies; 2) the bar shape and pro le determ ine the strength of the quadrupole coupling at these resonances; 3) the history of the evolution, e.g. form ation and slow down rate, determ ines the duration of the coupling; and 4) all of the previous three determ ine the m agnitude of the halo evolution. An interesting example of this interplay, suggested by the simulations in S03, is the pro le evolution in a H emquist pro le compared to the NFW pro le absent the dipole-centring problem s. A naively analogous ducial model puts the bar at the H emquist model scale length a with the same m ass. Surprisingly, the pro le evolution for this model is negligible. However, the m ass enclosed within the bar radius is 2.5 times larger than that for the NFW pro le. Increasing the bar m ass by a factor of two gives m ore comparable enclosed m asses and the density pro le evolves.

VK attribute the di erences between their simulations with other work and analytic estimates to the higher spatial resolution obtainable with their AMT (K ravtsov et al. 1997) Poisson solver. This conclusion is inconsistent at least in part with the dynam ics described here and in Paper I. The coupling between the bar and the halo is dominated by the lowest order even multipoles, l = 2 in particular, and the contribution for higher multipoles decreases exponentially with l beyond some m odest value of L.A lthough VK use a multimass halo phase space, their elective particle number falls below the coverage and sm all-scale noise criteria for the LLR, although it is just su cient for the DRR. The failure of one or more of these criteria m ay account for some of the discrepancy. A dditionally, it is probably worth investigating the numerical noise properties of the AMT algorithm. The simulations of M cM illan & D ehnen (2005) also do not have nearly enough particles to satisfy the coverage criterion for LLR, which is the resonance responsible for halo cusp evolution.

The underlying dynam ics described by Athanassoula (2003) is consistent with our discussion in Paper I although the emphasis and num erical experiments are quite di erent so we will not attempt a direct comparison here. However, given the

18 Weinberg & Katz

results with the H emquist pro les described above and the large scale of her bars relative to the halo scale length, we would expect that the m agnitude of the coupling to the inner cusp would be sm all.

7 DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This paper, together with Paper I, has three goals: 1) to explain and clarify the dynam ics of resonances in secular evolution; 2) to derive the criteria necessary for a N-body simulation to obtain these resonance dynam ics; and 3) to demonstrate the physics of resonances and the applicability of these criteria in N-body simulations. This paper emphasises the bar{halo interaction as a test case for resonant-driven secular evolution but the same techniques can be used generally. We come more prediction (Weinberg & Katz 2002, WK) that angular momentum transport can drive substantial cusp evolution within 30% of the bar radius, mediated by the inner Lindblad resonance. Our N-body simulations corroborate the particle-num ber predictions of Paper I and illustrate the failure of cusp evolution when the particle criteria are not met. A small number of low-order resonances dominate the angular momentum transport. Therefore, the features and magnitude of the evolution may vary considerably with the model depending on which resonances exist and can couple electively. More generally, this paper underscores the importance of a prior understanding of the underlying dynam ics to ensure a successful simulation.

The importance of resonances is easily motivated. Weak but large-scale perturbations from satellites, self-excited spiral arms, and bars break the axisymmetry of a near-equilibrium galaxy. These perturbations require resonances to redistribute angular momentum which drive the secular evolution. Conversely, without resonances, the torque would vanish and no evolution could ever be driven by these perturbations. For example, the existence of the bar forces an oscillation in the orbits but many of these orbits remain adiabatically invariant to the bar forcing. However, because the bar is slowing or changing at a nite rate, a measurable number of orbits end up with broken invariants and cause a net angular momentum change. However, the change in angular momentum of these orbits varies from positive to negative with initial phase. These larger variations cancel to leave the net positive contribution from the bar. Therefore, a simulation must have su cient particles to pick up the net e ect of this cancellation and su ciently low noise that an orbit remains coherent over many orbital periods during the resonant interaction.

W e have discussed this and several other key points to keep in m ind when considering resonant interactions. First, Paper I further elaborates how and why resonances govern the long-term evolution near-equilibrium of slow ly evolving galaxies. W ithout resonances, evolution would depend on astronom ical sources of scattering and scattering has an extrem ely long tim e scale for a quiescent galaxy. Second, resonances are broadened in frequency space by both the nite life time of the bar and the evolution of the bar. Therefore, no bar resonance is ever in nitely thin in frequency space, even one with a constant pattern speed. To rst approximation in the ratio of the evolution time scale to the characteristic period, the width of the frequency broadening has no e ect on the angular mom entum exchange. We dem onstrate this empirically in x5.1 using slowing bars of di erent sizes and m asses. This result can m otivated by an oscillator analogy. The resonance acts as a forcing whose frequency is changing with time. The rate of change for this forcing corresponds to the resonance sweeping through phase space. An orbit near resonance has the perturbation in posed on the natural orbitalm otion with a beat frequency. As the orbit approaches the resonance, this beat frequency decreases and the perturbation am plitude increases. The phase of the beat pattern as the beat frequency passes through zero then determ ines the torque. If the time to pass through the resonance is short, many orbits will be left with a torque from the bar although the change from each will be small. If the time to pass through is long, fewer orbits will receive a net torque but those that do will receive proportionately more angular momentum. In second-order perturbation theory, these two opposing trends precisely cancel and the torque is the same independent of waiting time. In other words, it is the integral under the frequency \line" that m atters, not its width. For example, the torque transferred in an idealised perturbation with a constant pattern speed (e.g. W einberg & K atz 2002) will have the sam e torque as those with a varying pattern speed over a few dynam icaltim es.

There are two additional conditions necessary for this to work: the angular momentum exchange per orbit must remain linear, j J = J 1, and the rate of change in pattern speed must be larger than the squared libration frequency for the resonance (the fast limit from TW). This simple explanation is complicated by the non-linear dynamics that plays a role when the amplitude of the perturbation is large or the bar evolves slow ly. This is the slow limit from TW and the resulting perturbation theory is no longer second-order. Paper I shows that this limit is important for the ILR, in particular, and angular momentum exchange in this regime is very susceptible to small-scale noise (see Paper I for details). For strong bars, m any of the low-order resonances are close to the transition between these two regimes.

These considerations motivated particle-number criteria for N-body simulations to accurately represent the resonance dynamics. The rst, the coverage criterion, ensures that phase space density be su ciently high that the sum of interactions with di erent phase accurately yields the net torque. The second and third criteria ensures that the gravitational potential uctuations are su ciently sm all that slow-lim it resonances can still occur in the simulation. We articially divide the noise

into two regimes: 1) sm all-scale noise refers to uctuations on interparticle scales or larger. This noise is typical of particle-

particle codes; 2) large-scale noise refers to uctuations on the scale of the inhom ogeneity of the galaxy equilibrium. This noise is typical of the basis expansion code used in this study.

D i erent com binations of these three criteria dom inate for di erent astronom ical scenarios and for di erent codes.W e nd here and in Paper I that the coverage and sm all-scale noise criteria dom inate. Since our work here uses the basis expansion, our simulations are only a ected by the coverage criterion.W e show that a scale-length bar (similar to the M ilky W ay) in an NFW halo with c = 15 requires N > 2 10° particles to recover the predicted evolutionary features.W e accomplish this large value of N with a multimass phase-space distribution (x2.1) which yields a large e ective particle num ber where it is needed.W e strongly encourage others to investigate the importance of these criteria and the noise criteria in particular for their favourite Poisson solver. It is possible, for example, that tree and grid codes m ight introduce sources of noise not considered here and in Paper I.

The shape and m ass of the bar a ects these estimates. A bar with the same size and shape as our ducial model but a smaller m ass will have a smaller resonance region and, therefore, require m ore particles to satisfy the coverage criterion. Paper I shows that this criterion scales approximately as $M_b^{1=2}$ and our simulations here are in good agreement with this scaling. Similarly, a bar with a 5:1 in-plane axis ratio and shallow or at surface density (similar to observed strong bars) can provide m one than an order of m agnitude stronger coupling that a weak oval with a falling surface density. We have illustrated these features with a suite of simulations for bars with di ering axis ratios and di erent particle num bers. We not that the coupling to the inner cusp appears at the bar strength predicted by our particle num ber criteria.

Resonance-driven secular evolution is related to dynam ical friction, which is also a secular process. Traditional Chandrasekhar dynam ical friction is non-periodic and works according to the classical scattering explanation. For quasi-periodic system s like galaxies, the correct physical picture is angular momentum transfer near resonances, as described in TW and Paper I at length. Technically, these dynamics can be understood as the superposition of many second-order secular Ham iltonian perturbation theory problem s, one for each resonance. In the lim it of a sm all scale perturbation, say a tiny satellite in orbit in a dark matter halo, one can show that these two views give identical results (W einberg 1986). So dynam ical friction operates in quasi-periodic systems because of resonances. This does not im ply that one can replace the dynamics described in Paper I with Chandrasekhar's dynamical friction formula. For example, suppose that we removed the band of phase space around some of the low-order resonances in Figure 5 in Paper I and led it in with unresponsive particles. The torque would vanish but the torque predicted by Chandrasekhar's form ula would only drop by a negligible am ount. Our num erical experim ent of a rotating bar inside of a King-m odel core (x5.3) shows that the torque is negligible even though the dark-m atter density is the same as the rapidly slowing bar in an NFW model, because too few low-order resonances are available to accept torque. A larger bar in the same m odel m ay be able to slow through the outer resonances but, without an ILR, the pro le evolution would be quite modest. Finally, all halo proles a ect the magnitude and location of the bar{halo torque through the existence of various resonances. For example, by eliminating the LLR and DRR resonances with a small bar-sized core in the dark-m atter halo, we can all but elim inate subsequent bar slowing. If, for example, an early bar could atten an initially cuspy pro le, the CDM bar slowing catastrophe (Debattista & Sellwood 2000) would be eliminated.

Paper I derives analytically and demonstrates num erically that noise from the nite num ber of particles leads to uctuations in the gravitational potential that can change the nature of the resonant interaction that would obtain in the limit N ! 1 . In Nature, galaxies have a variety of substructures and the sum total in uence of these may be described as noise. However, all noise does not have the same spatial and tem poral scales as particle noise and, therefore, will have a di erent im pact on the resonances. For example, consider a single satellite orbiting in the halo. We can consider its in uence on the galaxy using the perturbation theory described in Paper I and simulations by the methods described in this paper. If we add a few more satellites, the net e ect can be treated in the same way as one satellite. As long as the in uence of each satellite is coherent over particle orbital times, the same resonant dynamics obtains. As we begin to increase the number of satellites, the combined e ect will appear as rapid changes in the force in space and time. As these uctuations in the correlation length of the gravitational eld approach the size of the resonance potential and if the correlation tim es becom e sm aller than the orbital times, the net e ect on the resonances is the same as with sm all-scale noise. However, if we restrict the population of satellites to large radii, the spatial scales of the uctuations will be large and the tem poral correlations will be long; therefore, this population only weakly e ects the dynam ics of the inner galaxy. As another exam ple, molecular clouds in a disk, because they are con ned to the disk, only contribute noise on scales that are sm all relative to the dom inant halo resonances considered in Paper I. Noise owing to the nite num ber of simulation particles generates noise at all scales, and because this noise source is generated by the orbits them selves, it naturally couples to the spatial and tem poral noise scales in the most e ective combination to a ect the resonances. In sum mary, all noise is not alike; the spatial and tem poral properties of the noise are just as important as its total power. The most obvious sources of astronom ical noise molecular clouds in the disk and substructure in the halo are not likely to have the same e ect as particle noise. The power on various scales for some particular noise source may be computed using the method described in W einberg (2001).

Finally these stringent particle num ber requirem ents does not bode well for ab initio galaxy form ation simulations (e.g. Steinm etz N avarro X X and G overnato etal.05) to correctly capture the correct resonant dynam ics. W ithout doing so, results about disk sizes and rotation curves, some of the most controversial topics, are all suspect. For example, a typical such

20 Weinberg & Katz

simulation that focuses on the form ation of one galaxy requires about ve times more particles than those required within the virial radius to place the galaxy in its proper cosm ological context. Such simulations also use equal mass particles within the virial radius. This means that such a simulation would require at least 10 billion particles to correctly model the disk dynamics! This is just to model the bar-halo interaction. O ther processes would likely require even more particles. Such large simulations seem unlikely with our lifetime and hence astronomers will have to invent more clever approaches than pure brute force to make progress in this area of study.

This study motivates the importance of combining simulations with analytic theory to understand galaxy evolution. To recapitulate the introduction, the bar{halo problem was chosen for its overall structural simplicity and, therefore, its am enability to both perturbation theory and N-body simulation. To our surprise, the problem exhibited subtlety at every turn. From perturbation theory, we nd that two separate regimes apply: one that scales as the square of the perturbation strength and one that scales as the square root of the perturbation strength. Both regimes apply to problem sof astronom ical interest. From kinetic theory, we nd that these regimes can be a ected by relaxation for particle numbers currently used by simulations. We further show that the quantity of torque and the qualitative behaviour of the subsequent evolution depends on most aspects of the model including its history. Because of these subtleties, N-body simulation to study astronom ical scenarios that appear trickier than this one. For exam ple, the heating of a disk by a satellite m ay require proper representation of bending modes and subsequent dam ping through resonant coupling. The range of frequencies and scales in this latter problem is much broader than the bar{hab interaction considered here and, therefore, likely to present similar sorts of surprises that only a combined N-body {perturbation theory com parison will reveal. A dditional multiscale problem s include the satellite{hab interaction and resonant (pseudo-)bulge form ation, and these are likely to require similarly intense levels of dynam ical scrutiny.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

M any thanks to K elly H olley-B ockelm ann for suggestions, discussions and a careful reading of this m anuscript. M D W would also like to acknow ledge m any electronic discussions with Jerry Sellwood. M D W com pleted the early stages of this work at the Institute for A dvanced Study in P rinceton and thanks his host, John B ahcall, for his hospitality. This work was supported in part by N SF A ST -0205969 and A ST -9988146 and by NASA ATP NAG S-13308 and NAG 5-12038.

REFERENCES

Athanassoula E., 2003, MNRAS, 341, 1179 Binney J., Trem aine S., 1987, Galactic Dynam ics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey Brown M.J.W., Papaloizou J.C.B., 1998, MNRAS Clutton-Brock M ., 1972, A strophys. Space. Sci., 16, 101 Clutton-Brock M., 1973, A strophys. Space. Sci., 23, 55 Courant R., Hilbert D., 1953, Methods of Mathematical Physics. Vol. 1, Interscience, New York Debattista V.P., Sellwood J.A., 2000, ApJ, 543, 704 Eam D.J.D., 1996, ApJ, 465, 91 Eam D.J.D., Selwood J.A., 1995, ApJ, 451, 533 Ferrers N.M., 1887, Quart. J. Pure Appl. Math, 14, 1 Fridm an A.M., Polyachenko 1984, Physics of Gravitating System s II. Springer-Verlag, New York Hemquist L., O striker J.P., 1992, ApJ, 386, 375 Hemquist L., Sigurdsson S., Bryan G.L., 1995, ApJ, 446, 717 Hemquist L., W einberg M. D., 1992, ApJ, 400, 80 Holley-Bockelm ann K., W einberg M.D., Katz N., 2005, MNRAS Kalnajs A.J., 1976, ApJ, 205, 751 King I.R., 1966, AJ, 71, 64 Korm endy J., 1982, ApJ, 257, 75 K ravtsov A.V., K lypin A.A., K hokhlov A.M., 1997, ApJS, 111, 73 Lynden-BellD., KalnajsA.J., 1972, MNRAS, 157, 1 M dM illan P.J., Dehnen W ., 2005, ArX iv A strophysics e-prints Marletta M., Pryce J.D., 1991, Comp. Phys. Comm., 63, 42 Navarro J.F., Frenk C.S., W hite S.D.M., 1997, ApJ, 490, 493 Polyachenko V.L., Shukhm an I.G., 1981, Sov. A stron., 25, 533 Pruess S., Fulton C.T., 1993, ACM Trans. Math. Software, 63, 42

Pryce J.D., 1993, Num erical Solution of Sturm -Liouville Problem s. Oxford

- Sellwood J.A., 1981, A&A, 99, 362
- Sellwood J.A., 2003, ApJ, 587, 638
- Sellwood J.A., 2006, to appear in ApJ
- Silverm an B.W., 1986, Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis. Chapman and Hall, London
- ${\tt T\,rem\,aine\,S}$, W einberg M $\tt .D$, 1984, ApJ, 282, L5
- Valenzuela O., K lypin A., 2003, MNRAS, 345, 406
- W einberg M .D ., 1985, M N R A S, 213, 451
- Weinberg M.D., 1986, ApJ, 300, 93
- W einberg M .D ., 1999, A J, 117, 629
- W einberg M .D ., 2001, M N R A S, 328, 311
- W einberg M .D ., 2004, in ASP C onf. Ser. 317: M ilky W ay Surveys: The Structure and Evolution of our G alaxy F inding the milky way in 2m ass. p. 129
- W einberg M .D ., K atz N ., 2002, A pJ, 580, 627
- W einberg M .D ., K atz N ., 2005, M N R A S, 000, 000, submitted (Paper I)



F igure 16.C om parison of bar evolution in a K ing m odel dark halo with a N FW dark halo with sim ilar concentrations and the sam e m ass. Panel (a) shows dark-m atter density pro les, Panel (b) shows the evolution of the bar pattern speed and Panel (c) shows the distribution of angularm om entum change in phase space for the K ing m odel. W e also overlay the location of the prim ary resonances as labelled.



Figure 17. Pro le evolution in a Hernquist pro le. (a) The ducial bar from x4 with $a = r_s$. (b) Twice the mass of the ducial bar. (c) As in (b) but with no self gravity.



Figure 18.Com parison of evolution in NFW and Hemquist dark haloes with matched cusps. Left: evolution of pattern speed. Right: evolution of pro les in Hemquist halo (com pare with Fig.7).