

Revisiting Taylor relaxation

Anthony Yeates

with Alexander Russell & Gunnar Hornig (Dundee)

UKMHD, Newcastle, 21-May-2021

The Dundee braiding experiment

• Idea: start with a complex magnetic structure and let it relax under resistive MHD.



highly "mixed"

- unstable: launches torsional Alfvén waves generating turbulence with thin current sheets and reconnection
- final state shows self-organisation into two oppositely-twisted flux tubes

[Review: Pontin et al., PPCF 58, 054008, 2016]

Taylor relaxation

Classical theory for turbulent magnetic relaxation: assume total (magnetic) helicity is the only invariant, implying a linear force-free final state, ∇ × B = λ₀B.



[Taylor, *Rev Mod Phys* 58, 741, 1986]

$$\lambda = rac{\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{B}}{|\mathbf{B}|^2}$$



Topological degree

- Preservation of two tubes is a consequence of spatial localisation of the dynamics.
- Degree of the field line mapping is determined by its initial structure in the ideal region around the edge where it remains unchanged. [+ continuity]



[Yeates, Hornig & Wilmot-Smith, *PRL* **105**, 085002, 2010; Yeates, Russell & Hornig, *Proc R Soc* **471**, 20150012, 2015]

Substructure of the tubes?

Field line helicity is a useful measure. $\mathcal{A}(L) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\int_{V_{\epsilon}(L)} \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} \, \mathrm{d}V}{\Phi(V_{\epsilon}(L))} = \int_{L} \mathbf{A} \cdot \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{I}$

[Berger, Astron Astrophys 201, 355, 1988; Aly, Fluid Dyn Res 50, 011408, 2018]

- For this type of magnetic field, it is a "complete" invariant (same field line mapping iff same FLH).
 [Yeates & Hornig, Phys Plasmas 20, 012102, 2013]
- Taylor knew that FLH is an ideal invariant, but conjectured it uninteresting for relaxation because individual values could be changed by reconnection.
- But FLH evolution equation suggests values are primarily redistributed for high Rm. [Russell et al., Phys Plasmas, 22, 032106, 2015]

Substructure of the tubes?

Field line helicity is a useful measure. $\mathcal{A}(L) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\int_{V_{\epsilon}(L)} \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B} \, dV}{\Phi(V_{\epsilon}(L))} = \int_{L} \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{I}$

[Berger, Astron Astrophys 201, 355, 1988; Aly, Fluid Dyn Res 50, 011408, 2018]

- For this type of magnetic field, it is a "complete" invariant (same field line mapping iff same FLH).
 [Yeates & Hornig, Phys Plasmas 20, 012102, 2013]
- Taylor knew that FLH is an ideal invariant, but conjectured it uninteresting for relaxation because individual values could be changed by reconnection.
- But FLH evolution equation suggests values are primarily redistributed for high Rm. [Russell et al., Phys Plasmas, 22, 032106, 2015]



New results

1. Final FLH pattern seems to converge with increasing Lundquist number.



2. FLH is strikingly uniform/flat within each of the final flux tubes.





Cause of the flatness?

• Hypothesis: uniform FLH is caused by the Taylor relaxation tendency:

- constant j_z implies uniform-twist field which has constant FLH.
- > FLH is the average winding with all other field lines, so less sensitive to fluctuations.

[cf. Prior & Yeates, Astrophys J 787, 100, 2014]



• e.g. simple toy model (uniform twist + local fluctuations):

Conclusions

 Magnetic braids seem to relax to flux tubes with uniform field line helicity (independent of Lundquist number).

• **Open question**: how general is this behaviour?

A.J.B. Russell, A.R. Yeates, G. Hornig & A.L. Wilmot-Smith, Evolution of field line helicity during magnetic reconnection, *Phys Plasmas* **22**, 032106, 2015.

A.R. Yeates, A.J.B. Russell & G. Hornig, Evolution of field line helicity in magnetic relaxation, *in preparation.*

