

The Thermal X-ray Spectra of Cen X–4, Aql X–1, and 4U 1608–522 in Quiescence

Robert E. Rutledge¹, Lars Bildsten², Edward F. Brown², George G. Pavlov³,
Vyatcheslav E. Zavlin⁴

ABSTRACT

We re-analyze the available X-ray spectral data of the type I bursting neutron star transients Aql X–1, Cen X–4, and 4U 1608–522 using realistic hydrogen atmosphere models. Previous spectral fits assumed a blackbody spectrum; because the free-free dominated photospheric opacity decreases with increasing frequency, blackbody spectral fits overestimate the effective temperature and underestimate, by as much as two orders of magnitude, the emitting area. Hydrogen atmosphere spectral models, when fit to the available observational data, imply systematically larger emission area radii, consistent with the canonical 10 km radius of a neutron star. This suggests that a substantial fraction of the quiescent luminosity is thermal emission from the surface of the neutron star. The magnitude of the equivalent hydrogen column density toward these systems, however, presents a considerable systematic uncertainty, which can only be eliminated by high signal-to-noise X-ray spectral measurements (e.g., with *AXAF* or *XMM*) which would permit simultaneous determination of the equivalent hydrogen column density, emission area, and thermal temperature.

Subject headings: accretion, accretion disks — stars: neutron — stars: individual(Aql X–1, 4U 1608–522, Cen X–4)

¹ Space Radiation Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, MS 220-47, Pasadena, CA 91125; rutledge@srl.caltech.edu

² Department of Physics and Department of Astronomy, 601 Campbell Hall, Mail Code 3411, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720; bildsten@fire.berkeley.edu, ebrown@astron.berkeley.edu

³ The Pennsylvania State University, 525 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802; pavlov@astro.psu.edu

⁴ Max-Planck-Institut für Extraterrestrische Physik, D-85740 Garching, Germany; zavlin@xray.mpe.mpg.de

1. Introduction

What distinguishes a transient X-ray binary from a persistent one is ill-defined physically, but observationally it may be defined as an object whose flux changes by more than 2–3 orders of magnitude (for recent reviews, see Tanaka & Lewin 1995; Chen et al. 1997; Campana et al. 1998b). Many neutron star (NS) and black hole (BH) transients go through X-ray outbursts, separated by long periods (months to years) of relative quiescence. The origin of these outbursts remains under debate, although most mechanisms rely in some form on an accretion instability (van Paradijs 1996; King et al. 1996).

Whatever the cause of an X-ray outburst, these objects eventually return to quiescence. Several NS and BH transients have been detected in quiescence, with typical luminosities for the NSs being $\sim 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Here, we consider the low-magnetic field (as inferred from the presence of type I X-ray bursts) NS transients.

The first NS transient detected in quiescence was Cen X–4 (van Paradijs et al. 1987, hereafter VP87). It was argued that radiative cooling from the NS surface could not be the emission mechanism, based on two observations. First, the inferred radius of the emitting area, using a blackbody (BB) spectrum, assuming a distance of $d=2.3 \text{ kpc}$ (Blair et al. 1984), was $0.83_{-0.40}^{+0.72} \text{ km}$ (90% confidence), smaller than that expected from a $\sim 10 \text{ km}$ NS. Second, the quiescent luminosity observed by the *Einstein* IPC was a factor of ~ 2 –4 lower than the later *EXOSAT* CMA observation (the exact factor depends on the assumed spectrum); because the core temperature cannot appreciably change in just a few years, the thermal heat flux from a hot core should also remain stable over this time scale. It was therefore suggested that the emission is caused by continued accretion over a fraction of the surface.

More recently, quiescent X-ray spectral measurements have been made of Aql X–1 with the *ROSAT*/PSPC (Verbunt et al. 1994) and of Cen X–4 and 4U 1608–522 with *ASCA* (Asai et al. 1996b). The X-ray spectrum of Aql X–1 (0.4–2.4 keV) was consistent with a BB spectrum, a bremsstrahlung spectrum, or a pure power-law spectrum (Verbunt et al. 1994). For 4U 1608–522, the spectrum (0.5–10.0 keV) was consistent with a BB ($kT_{\text{BB}} \sim 0.2$ –0.3 keV), a thermal Raymond-Smith model ($kT = 0.32_{-0.5}^{+0.18} \text{ keV}$), or a very steep power-law (photon index 6_{-2}^{+1}). Similar observations of Cen X–4 with *ASCA* found its X-ray spectrum consistent with these same models, but with an additional power-law component (photon index ~ 2.0) above 5.0 keV (recent observations with *BeppoSAX* of Aql X–1 in quiescence also revealed a power-law tail; Campana et al. 1998a). In all three sources, BB fits implied an emission area of radius $\sim 1 \text{ km}$. A thermally emitting region this small is difficult to explain, unless one assumes that the NS accretes onto only a fraction of its surface during quiescence.

Aside from luminosity due to low-level accretion, thermal emission from transiently accreting NSs would be observable during quiescence if the NS core were sufficiently hot (VP87; Verbunt et al. 1994; Asai et al. 1996a; Campana et al. 1998b). H/He burning alone cannot heat the core to the interior temperatures of a steadily accreting star. The heat released from hydrogen/helium burning in the upper atmosphere leaves immediately during the unstable burning (Hanawa & Fujimoto 1986; Fujimoto et al. 1987), and the time between accretion outbursts is much longer than the cooling time of the NS atmosphere. However, compression-induced electron captures, neutron emissions, and pycnonuclear reactions in the deep crust (Haensel & Zdunik 1990) will maintain the core at a temperature $\approx 10^8 \langle \dot{M}/10^{-10} M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1} \rangle^{0.4} \text{ K}$ (Bildsten & Brown 1997). A core at this temperature will make the NS incandescent even after accretion halts (Brown, Bildsten & Rutledge 1998), at a level of $10^{32} - 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. This luminosity is *unavoidable*, unless neutrino emission is much stronger than the standard modified Urca (such as may occur from a pion condensate in the NS core; cf. Zdunik et al. 1992).

A resolution of the conflict between this expected thermal emission and both the inferred small emitting area and the variability of the quiescent luminosity is clearly needed. In this paper, we demonstrate that both observational objections can be alleviated by consideration of two points.

First, the emitted spectrum from a non-accreting, low-magnetic field NS atmosphere is not that of a blackbody. The strong surface gravity quickly ($\sim 10 \text{ s}$) stratifies the atmosphere (cf. Alcock & Illarionov 1980; Romani 1987). For accretion rates $\lesssim 2 \times 10^{-13} M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (corresponding to an accretion luminosity $\lesssim 2 \times 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$), gravity removes metals faster than the accretion flow supplies them (Bildsten, Salpeter & Wasserman 1992). As a result, the photosphere is nearly pure hydrogen. At temperatures $< 0.5 \text{ keV}$, the free-free absorption, which is strongly frequency (ν) dependent (approximately $\propto \nu^{-3}$), dominates the opacity. Because of this frequency dependence, higher energy photons escape from greater depths, where $T > T_{\text{eff}}$ (Pavlov & Shibano 1978; Romani 1987; Zampieri et al. 1995). Spectral fits of the Wien tail with BB curves then overestimate T_{eff} and underestimate the emitting area, by as much as orders of magnitude (Rajagopal & Romani 1996; Zavlin et al. 1996). Application of these models to the isolated neutron star in SNR PKS 1209-52 resulted in a source distance consistent with that measured through other means (assuming a 10 km NS radius), a lower surface temperature, and an X-ray measured column density which was consistent with that measured from the extended SNR (while the column density measured with an assumed BB spectrum was not consistent; Zavlin et al. 1998).

The second overlooked point is that there are large systematic uncertainties in the equivalent hydrogen column density (N_{H}). Successive X-ray observations of 4U 1608–522

in outburst, separated by ~ 1.5 years, produced different galactic absorptions toward the transient ($N_{\text{H}} = (1.0 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $(1.5 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$). The change was attributed to outflows from the transient X-ray source itself (Penninx et al. 1989). If so, the changes in the column depth are sufficient ($\delta N_{\text{H},22} \sim 0.5$, where $N_{\text{H},22} \equiv N_{\text{H}}/10^{22} \text{ cm}^{-2}$) to account for the reported variabilities in the quiescent luminosity of Cen X–4 (VP87; Verbunt et al. 1994). For example, a change from $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.3$ to $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.8$ will alter the observed flux from a BB spectrum of temperature 0.3 keV by a factor of 2.5 in the 0.1–1.5 keV passband.

To summarize, the NS core, heated to a temperature of $T \sim 10^8$ K, emits a thermal spectrum which, if mis-interpreted as due to a BB instead of a pure H-atmosphere spectrum, implies an emitting area smaller than the area which actually produced the spectrum. A reanalysis of the X-ray spectra obtained from quiescent NSs, using the H atmosphere models of Zavlin et al. (1996) is thus warranted, to investigate that the spectral fits produce the expected larger emitting areas, to check for the consistency of the size of the emitting areas in the observed spectrum with a 10 km radius NS, and to consider possible systematic uncertainties, such as the equivalent hydrogen column density.

In Sec. 2, we describe the methodology used to re-analyze the archival data. We then re-fit the data for Cen X–4 (Sec. 3.1), Aql X–1 (Sec. 3.2), and 4U 1608–522 (Sec. 3.3), and show that the re-fitted emitting areas are consistent with a NS surface area. In Sec. 4, we discuss these results and present conclusions.

2. Data and Analysis

Brief descriptions of the analyzed observations are in Table 1. Data were obtained from the public archive at HEASARC/GSFC (<http://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/>). We used two separate observations of Aql X–1 while it was in quiescence using the *ROSAT*/PSPC, which have been previously analyzed (Verbunt et al. 1994), plus two observations of Aql X–1 using *ASCA*: one while it was in quiescence and the other in outburst (which we analyzed to obtain a measurement of the column density toward Aql X–1). We also re-analyze *ASCA* observations of 4U 1608–522 and Cen X–4 in quiescence (Asai et al. 1996b). We did not attempt to re-analyze quiescent observations of MXB 1730–335 (the Rapid Burster), as contamination from a nearby object was found in the original investigation to make spectral analysis infeasible (Asai et al. 1996a).

All X-ray spectra were fit using the XSPEC X-ray spectral analysis package (Arnaud 1996), using the standard BB (the model known as “bbodyrad”) or a tabulated H-atmosphere model (Zavlin et al. 1996); the galactic hydrogen column density (model known

as “wabs”), and, when needed, the power-law (“powerlaw”). The tabulated H-atmosphere model used was for a neutron star with surface gravity $2.4 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm s}^{-2}$ (appropriate for a NS of gravitational mass $1.4M_{\odot}$ and radius 10 km), and a pure hydrogen atmosphere, with the effective unredshifted temperature (kT) and apparent emission area radius left as free parameters. The spectral resolution and signal-to-noise of the present data are insufficient to constrain the additional parameters of NS mass, radius, and material metallicity. By fitting to this model, we are searching for consistency of the data with a 10 km NS emission area radius. Note especially that the kT for the H-atmosphere model is the (*un*-redshifted) surface temperature of the NS while the kT_{BB} is the temperature of the NS as observed at an infinite distance (i.e. the effect of redshifting is not removed). For a 10 km, $1.4M_{\odot}$ NS, the redshift factor to correct the BB temperature is 0.76.

A perhaps dominant systematic uncertainty in spectral fits of this type is the uncertainty in the equivalent hydrogen column density. The N_{H} is strongly covariant with other parameters in an assumed BB spectral model of $kT_{\text{BB}} \sim 0.3 \text{ keV}$, and becomes a particular problem in low S/N data with few spectral channels below 1.0 keV where, if N_{H} is left as a free variable during spectral analysis, it can produce relative uncertainties of order unity in other parameters. The effect on spectra of NSs in quiescence with BB temperatures of $\sim 0.1\text{--}0.3 \text{ keV}$ is that the N_{H} is strongly covariant with the object size, with lesser effect on the object temperature. Thus, it is not unusual for observers to hold this parameter fixed at a N_{H} value found from earlier observations (either when the X-ray source was bright, or taking the value from optical measurements of $E(B - V)$ and using an average conversion factor found statistically from measurements of the $E(B - V)$ and N_{H} toward other objects; Predehl & Schmitt 1995; Gorenstein 1975), which produces smaller error bars on other parameters. This is done based on the assumption that the column density is due largely to material distributed between the observer and the object, and is not affected by gas that the object may eject into the surrounding environment – or, if it is, that the amount which is ejected does not vary over time.

As we note in Sec. 1, X-ray observations during successive outbursts of 4U 1608–522 have measured values of N_{H} which differed by $N_{\text{H},22} \sim 0.5$. Changes of this same magnitude in N_{H} toward Aql X–1 during an outburst over short time-scales have also been reported (Czerny et al. 1987); differences were noted between the measured column density in the tail of type I X-ray bursts when compared with the column density in the 2000 sec prior ($N_{\text{H},22}=0.4$ vs. 1.0), and observed decay in this parameter in $\sim 1000 \text{ s}$ following the type I burst.

In addition to a possible time variability in N_{H} , there are systematic uncertainties in calibration of the X-ray absorption (mostly from photoelectric absorption in metals) with

optical reddening (from dust). The X-ray absorption can, in principle, be estimated from reddening of the binary companion or a nearby star because the equivalent hydrogen column density N_{H} strongly correlates with the optical extinction A_{V} . For instance, Predehl & Schmitt (1995) obtained $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.179A_{\text{V}}$ (with a formal uncertainty of 0.003) from *ROSAT* observations of X-ray halos around persistent sources. However, the value of the conversion factor depends on the average dust-to-gas ratio along the line of sight, which may be different for different directions and distances; this is demonstrated by considerable scatter of individual points in the $N_{\text{H}}-A_{\text{V}}$ diagrams (Savage & Mathis 1979). In addition, the value of the conversion factor obtained by Predehl & Schmitt (1995) is different from that obtained by Gorenstein (1975, $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.222A_{\text{V}}$), which was attributed to systematic effects in both studies. Thus, systematic uncertainties in this conversion factor are at least $\sim 25\%$.

In the specific case of Aql X-1, a measurement of $E(B - V) = 0.37$ mag (Thorstensen et al. 1978) (implying $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.205 \pm 0.003$, using the formal $N_{\text{H}}-A_{\text{V}}$ uncertainty) is based on the optical reddening of the quiescent K0 counterpart. However, it was noted by the authors that this measurement was discrepant with that of a normal, nearby (1/4) B-star, for which optical reddening was measured to be $E(B - V) = 0.73$ mag, implying $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.404 \pm 0.006$. This discrepancy is greater than the formal uncertainty and the $\sim 25\%$ systematic uncertainty in the $A_{\text{V}}-N_{\text{H}}$ conversion. As we show in Sec. 3.2, the higher column density is consistent with that which we measure with an assumed X-ray spectrum during an X-ray outburst. The difference in N_{H} from these measurements translates into a factor of two in the fitted emission area radius; while important, this uncertainty is smaller than the difference between a BB and a H atmosphere.

One must also keep in mind that the magnitude of the X-ray measured column density depends on the assumed spectrum as well; if the assumed spectrum is not the correct intrinsic spectrum, then the X-ray measured column density can be different from its true value.

If the column density can be reliably measured during an X-ray observation, then the spectral parameters which are covariant with the column depth can also be reliably measured. However, for the presently investigated observations with the *ROSAT*/PSPC and *ASCA*, the signal-to-noise is not high enough to measure the column density to within a factor of two, which results in a systematic uncertainty in the derived emitting radius of a factor of 2 or more. To investigate how this uncertainty affects the interpretation of our spectral results, we adopt the practice of freezing N_{H} at a range of values, some historically measured, others higher than these by $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.5$. While this complicates interpretation of the best-fit spectral models, it does not diminish our ability to investigate the systematic differences in X-ray emitting areas between BB and H-atmosphere models.

3. Sources

The results of our spectral fits are presented in Table 2. This table contains: (1) the dataset number (cf. Table 1); (2) the assumed (or fit) N_{H} ; (3) the best-fit spectral parameters for the H-atmosphere model, including the *un*-redshifted effective NS surface temperature (kT) and apparent emission area radius (r_e), as well as the reduced χ^2_ν for that model; (4) the best fit spectral parameters for the BB model, including the redshifted NS surface temperature (kT_{BB}), and emission area radius r_e , and the reduced χ^2_ν for that model; (5) when used, the best fit photon power-law spectral parameters, including the photon power-law spectral slope (α) and model normalization.

For compactness, we sometimes list both the best-fit H-atmosphere model on the same line as the best fit BB model, when we used the same value of N_{H} for these. We do not list the two separate models on the same line when we also add to the fit a power-law spectral model, to clarify that the parameters of the best-fit power-law spectral model are different depending on whether one uses the H-atmosphere model or the BB model. Finally, when we tie together all but one of the model parameters of three different data-sets (in the case of Aql X–1) we use the caret (“”) on subsequent lines to indicate this, while the parameter which is permitted to vary between the three data-sets is listed distinctly on the line corresponding to that data-set.

In general, for assumed values of N_{H} the H-atmosphere emission area radii are systematically larger than those of the BB model, by factors between 4–10. While the exact radius implied depends on the assumed N_{H} , those of the BB model cannot be made consistent with a ~ 10 km NS emission radius for the range of N_{H} we assume here based on past observations and allowing for some variability, while those of the H-atmosphere model can be made consistent with a 10 km NS emission radius.

3.1. Cen X-4

A previous optical reddening observation in Cen X–4 ($E(B - V)=0.1$ mag; Blair et al. 1984), implies a column density of $N_{\text{H},22}=0.055$, consistent with the best published X-ray constraint on this value from these observations ($N_{\text{H},22}<0.03\text{--}0.2$, depending on assumed spectrum; Asai et al. 1996b).

We used the standard data products spectra for the SIS0, SIS1, GIS2, and GIS3 detectors. For the GIS2+3 data we subtracted background taken in four, $5'$ radius circular regions surrounding the source, with no region overlapping any area within $5'$ of the source, using the screened events. For the SIS0+1 data, we subtracted background from two rectangular

regions, one about $1'.9 \times 12'$, the other $2'.5 \times 5'.2$, whose edges were $2'.5$ away from the object at their closest, and at least 10 pixels from the edge of the detector, using the screened events. We ignored energy channels below 1.0 keV in the GIS2+3 detectors, to conservatively avoid energy regions of calibration uncertainties.

As found previously by Asai et al. (1996b), a power-law is required to account for emission above 5 keV (without it, the best fit χ^2 is 250 for 130 degrees of freedom).

We successively hold the N_{H} constant at the optical reddening value $N_{\text{H},22}=0.055$, and at the 2σ upper limit ($N_{\text{H},22}=0.2$; Asai et al. 1996b). The best fit BB spectrum is consistent with that found previously with the same data. For the BB model, the implied apparent radius is $1.2^{+0.15}_{-0.2}$ km for $N_{\text{H},22}=0.055$, and is $2.9^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$ km for $N_{\text{H},22}=0.2$. For the H-atmosphere model, the implied apparent radius is $7.8^{+1.9}_{-1.7}$ km when $N_{\text{H},22}=0.055$, and is 32^{+13}_{-8} km when $N_{\text{H},22}=0.2$.

For the best-fit H atmosphere model with $N_{\text{H},22}=0.055$, the unabsorbed (0.5–10.0 keV) luminosity is $(1.6 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{32} (d/1.2 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, for the thermal component only.

3.2. Aql X–1

For the *ROSAT* observations (#2 and #3; cf. Table 1), we extracted the source spectrum from within a circle $30'$ in radius, centered on the object. The background was taken from a nearby $200''$ circular region in the inner part of the PSPC detector. For observation #2, spectral fits of a BB with galactic absorption were consistent with those found previously with the same data (Verbunt et al. 1994). We find a source emission region of apparent radius of $0.62^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$ km (for $N_{\text{H},22}=0.2$; 90%), increasing to 1.3 ± 0.3 km for $N_{\text{H},22}=0.4$. Using the H-atmosphere model, we find the emission region has an apparent radius of $2.4^{+0.9}_{-0.6}$ km ($N_{\text{H},22}=0.2$), which increases to $8.7^{+4.1}_{-2.7}$ km for the higher assumed absorption ($N_{\text{H},22}=0.4$). These results are consistent with those of observation #3. For an assumed spectrum of a black-body with $N_{\text{H},22}=0.4$, we find a flux of $2.9 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (0.5–2.0 keV); for observation #3, the same assumed spectrum produces a flux of $5.5 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

For the *ASCA* quiescent observation (#4) of Aql X–1, we used the standard data products source energy spectrum from the SIS0+1 and GIS2+3 detectors. For the GIS background, we used three circular areas $5'$ in radius, each centered approximately at an equal distance from the GIS detector center as the source, and which do not overlap any area to within $5'$ of the source, using the screened events. We excluded all energy channels below 1.0 keV for the GIS data from the fit. For the SIS background, we used 3 rectangular areas, each at least $2.5'$ away from the source center, and 10 pixels from the edge of the detector,

using the screened events (we examined a background spectrum using only detector area at least $3'$ from the source, and found no significant difference between the two background spectra). The measured BB spectrum produces a smaller area than that found from the *ROSAT*/PSPC observations ($0.57^{+0.10}_{-0.08}$ km for $N_{\text{H},22}=0.40$) and a higher temperature (0.32 ± 0.02 keV). As with the *ROSAT*/PSPC observations, the larger assumed column density results in a larger emission area, which is marginally consistent with the *ROSAT*/PSPC measurement. The H-atmosphere model produces a larger emission area radius than the BB model (2.6 km vs. 0.57 km, for an assumed distance of 2 kpc). However, to produce a radius consistent with ~ 10 (d/2 kpc) km, the column density must be $N_{\text{H},22} \sim 0.8$.

Aql X–1 was observed during a bright phase with *ASCA* (12.76 ± 0.02 c/s in GIS2; Observation #5). For this observation, we used the standard products X-ray spectrum for GIS2+3 data, using only medium- and high-bitrate PH data, and neglected the background. (The SIS0+1 data were telemetry saturated). We excluded energy channels below 1.0 keV from the fits. The dead-time of the GIS2 was $\sim 12\%$ and the GIS3 was $\sim 14\%$ due to telemetry saturation, which affects the normalization of the models (which have been approximately corrected), but not the parameters (kT , N_{H}). We fit the average X-ray spectrum measured by the GIS2+3 detectors during this period with a BB plus power-law model with an equivalent hydrogen column density, which produced a column density of $N_{\text{H},22} = 0.425 \pm 0.02$ (90%). This value is comparable to those found for this object previously ($N_{\text{H},22}=0.53 \pm 0.01$, and 0.36 ± 0.02 ; Christian & Swank 1997). The best fit model corresponds to an average flux of 1×10^{-9} ergs cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ (0.5–10.0 keV), and an unabsorbed average luminosity (0.5–10 keV) of 6.9×10^{35} ergs s $^{-1}$ (d/2 kpc) 2 .

We investigated the consistency of all three quiescent data-sets having been produced by the same spectral model. We fit these simultaneously, using galactic absorption and a blackbody model. If we fix all three parameters simultaneously, the best fit model is formally unacceptable, with a probability (p) of producing a dataset this discrepant with the intrinsic spectrum of $p=10^{-6}$, with a χ^2 of 167 for 94 degrees of freedom. If we allow the column densities of the three observations to vary independently of one another while tying together the temperature and emitting area, we obtain a statistically acceptable fit ($p=0.93$) and similar column densities between observations 2 and 4, but a different one (by $N_{\text{H},22}=0.21 \pm 0.11$; 90% confidence) for observation 3. However, if we instead allow the BB temperatures to vary independently of one another while tying together the column density and emitting area, we also obtain a statistically acceptable fit ($p=0.37$), and the temperatures are consistent with one another at the 90% confidence level. Similarly, if we allow the emitting areas to vary while tying the column densities and temperatures together, the emitting area radii are consistent at the 90% confidence level. Thus, there is some variation in the intrinsic spectrum between these three observations, which could be caused

by significant (at the >90% level) changes in the column density, or by small changes in the either the temperature or the emitting area, or by a combination of changes in all three. Performing the same analysis using a H atmosphere X-ray spectrum with galactic absorption produces similar results.

We performed a combined fit of all three datasets of Aql X–1 in quiescence using galactic absorption and the H atmosphere model. When all three datasets are fit with the same spectral model, the spectra are again found to be inconsistent with being identical ($p=7\times 10^{-6}$; $\chi^2=150$ with 82 dof). When N_{H} is permitted to vary between the three datasets, but the intrinsic spectrum is held to be the same for all three, we find an acceptable fit, with the apparent radius $r_e=3.5^{+2.0}_{-1.2}$ (d/2 kpc) km (90%). This value is consistent with that expected from a 10 km NS, but only if the distance to Aql X–1 is toward the higher part of the 1.7–4.0 kpc range found by optical spectral-typing of the secondary (Thorstensen et al. 1978). Thorstensen et al. also argued that the discrepant reddening they observe between Aql X–1 and a nearby B star would be resolved if the companion in Aql X–1 were bluer than the median spectral type they assumed, thus more luminous and more distant, within their 1.7–4.0 kpc estimate. If the companion to Aql X–1 is at 4.0 kpc, the apparent radius is then $7.0^{+4.0}_{-2.4}$ km for the H atmosphere model. We interpret this result as favoring a 4 kpc distance to Aql X–1.

In the best combined-fit for the three datasets using a H atmosphere model with N_{H} permitted to vary but with the intrinsic spectra of the three models constrained as identical, the 0.5–10.0 keV unabsorbed luminosity was $(5.1\pm 2.3)\times 10^{32} (d/2 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

3.3. 4U 1608–522

We used the standard data products spectra for the SIS0+1 and GIS2+3 detectors. For the GIS2+3 background we used an annulus centered on the source of inner radius 3' and outer radius 12', using the screened events. For the SIS0+1 data, it was found by Asai et al. (1996b) that galactic ridge emission contributed significantly to the background, which required an off-source observation to estimate; we used the identical background spectrum for the present spectral analysis (kindly provided by K. Asai). For the GIS2+3 data, we ignored all energy channels below 1.0 keV. For the SIS0+1 data, we ignored all energy channels below 0.5 keV. Because of the lack of counts, we ignored all energy channels above 5 keV (Asai et al. 1996b).

The column density toward 4U 1608–522 has been measured to be variable (Penninx et al. 1989), between $N_{\text{H},22}=1.0$ and 1.5 (± 0.1). The measured optical reddening $E(B -$

$V=1.5$ mag (Grindlay & Liller 1978) implies a column density of $N_{\text{H},22}=0.8$. We assumed alternately $N_{\text{H},22}=0.8$ and 1.5.

For the low value of $N_{\text{H},22}=0.8$, the BB model produces an emission area radius of $1.7^{+0.5}_{-0.3}$ km, while the H-atmosphere model produces $9.4^{+4.5}_{-2.7}$ km. For the high value of $N_{\text{H},22}=1.5$, the BB-model radius is $4.6^{+1.6}_{-1.1}$ km, while the H-atmosphere model radius is 50^{+32}_{-20} km.

For the best-fit H atmosphere model, with $N_{\text{H},22}=0.8$, the unabsorbed (0.5–10.0 keV) luminosity is $(8.3 \pm 4.2) \times 10^{32} (d/3.6 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$; and for $N_{\text{H},22}=1.5$, it is $(7.3 \pm 4.7) \times 10^{32} d/3.6 \text{ kpc})^2$.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Using realistic hydrogen atmosphere models and accounting for systematic uncertainties in the absorption, we have reanalyzed the quiescent spectra of the transient NSs Aql X–1, Cen X–4, and 4U 1608–522. We find that the emission areas are always larger (by factors of 16–100) than implied by spectral fits that use a blackbody spectrum. These emitting areas are, within the large systematic uncertainty due to N_{H} , consistent with the surface area of a NS, and suggest that a substantial fraction of the quiescent luminosity is thermal emission from the NS surface. Even allowing for large deviations in the hydrogen column density cannot make the emission area inferred from BB fits commensurate with that of a NS.

If the thermal component of the quiescent spectra originates from the NS surface, then two likely causes are incandescence from the hot core (Brown et al. 1998) or accretion at low rates onto much of the NS surface (Zampieri et al. 1995). The latter interpretation requires a small magnetic field or a slow rotation rate to avoid a propeller effect (Illarionov & Sunyaev 1975). For Aql X–1, the rotation period must be $> 0.6 (B/10^9 \text{ G})^{6/7} \text{ s}$ (Verbunt et al. 1994) to allow accretion in quiescence. Interpreting the 549 Hz oscillation seen during a type I burst from Aql X–1 (Zhang et al. 1998a) as the spin frequency then implies that $B < 10^6 \text{ G}$. Alternatively, if accretion in spite of the propeller should occur, then magnetic funneling of the accretion flow onto the polar caps may produce variability in the thermal component at the NS spin frequency, as with accretion-powered pulsars (Zhang et al. 1998b). No such variability has been reported.

For Cen X–4 and Aql X–1, an additional emission mechanism is required to explain the hard power-law tail. This hard emission might emanate from the magnetopause, or from the interaction of a pulsar wind with ambient material, such as has been seen in the pulsar/Be star system PSR 1259–63 (Tavani & Arons 1997). There are presently no proposed models

in which these mechanisms produce a thermal spectrum in addition to the hard power-law tail, in particular one with an emitting area comparable to that of a NS; thus the power-law spectral component may exist – and its properties may vary – independently of the thermal component.

The large systematic uncertainty in the hydrogen column density dominates the results we present here. Unfortunately, the difficulty in determining N_{H} simultaneously with other spectral parameters in these low S/N data cannot be overcome by assuming historically measured column densities, because these are systematically uncertain by $N_{\text{H},22} \sim 0.5$, which is sufficient to change the implied radius by a factor of two, as are the distance measurements. Improved modeling of the X-ray binary optical spectra can perhaps correct the $N_{\text{H}}-A_{\text{V}}$ relation, but the uncertainty from time variability of the column will still remain. The only remedy is high signal-to-noise X-ray spectral data in a passband that covers both the energy range affected (0.5–2.0 keV) and the energy range unaffected (> 2 keV) by the absorption depths common to these sources ($N_{\text{H},22} \lesssim 1$). Both *AXAF* and *XMM* should be capable of these kinds of observations.

This research was supported by NASA via grant NAGW-4517 and through a Hellman Family Faculty Fund Award (UC-Berkeley) to LB. EFB is supported by NASA GSRP Graduate Fellowship under grant NGT-51662. GGP acknowledges support from NASA grants NAG5-6907 and NAG5-7017. This research has made use of data obtained through the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center Online Service, provided by the NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center. We are grateful to K. Asai for providing the background files for the analysis of 4U 1608–522 with the *ASCA*/SIS instruments.

REFERENCES

- Alcock, C. & Illarionov, A., 1980, *ApJ* **235**, 534
- Arnaud, K. A., 1996, in G. Jacoby & J. Barnes (eds.), *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems V*, Vol. 101, p. 17, ASP Conf. Series
- Asai, K., Dotani, T., Kunieda, H., & Kawai, N., 1996a, *PASJ* **48**, L27
- Asai, K., Dotani, T., Mitsuda, K., Hoshi, R., Vaughan, B., Tanaka, Y., & Inoue, H., 1996b, *PASJ* **48**, 257
- Bildsten, L. & Brown, E. F., 1997, *ApJ* **477**, 897
- Bildsten, L., Salpeter, E. E., & Wasserman, I., 1992, *ApJ* **384**, 143
- Blair, W. P., Raymond, J. C., Dupree, A. K., Wu, C. C., Holm, A. V., & Swank, J. H., 1984, *ApJ* **278**, 270
- Brown, E. F., Bildsten, L., & Rutledge, R. E., 1998, *ApJ* 504, L95
- Campana, S., Colpi, M., Mereghetti, S., Stella, L., & Tavani, M., 1998b, *A&A Rev.* **8**, 279
- Campana, S., Stella, L., Mereghetti, S., Colpi, M., Tavani, M., Ricci, D., Fiume, D. D., & Belloni, T., 1998a, *ApJ* **499**, L65
- Chen, W., Shrader, C. R., & Livio, M., 1997, *ApJ* **491**, 312
- Chevalier, C., Ilovaisky, S. A., van Paradijs, J., Pedersen, H., & Van Der Klis, M., 1989, *A&A* **210**, 114
- Christian, D. J. & Swank, J. H., 1997, *ApJS* **109**, 177
- Czerny, M., Czerny, B., & Grindlay, J. E., 1987, *ApJ* **312**, 122
- Fujimoto, M. Y., Hanawa, T., Iben, I., & Richardson, M. B., 1987, *ApJ* **315**, 198
- Gorenstein, P., 1975, *ApJ* **198**, 95
- Grindlay, J. E. & Liller, W., 1978, *ApJ* **220**, L127
- Haensel, P. & Zdunik, J. L., 1990, *A&A* **227**, 431
- Hanawa, T. & Fujimoto, M. Y., 1986, *PASJ* **38**, 13
- Illarionov, A. F. & Sunyaev, R. A., 1975, *A&A* **39**, 185

- King, A. R., Kolb, U., & Burderi, L., 1996, *ApJ* **464**, L127
- Nakamura, N., Dotani, T., Inoue, H., Mitsuda, K., Tanaka, Y., & Matsuoka, M., 1989, *PASJ* **41**, 617
- Pavlov, G. G. & Shibano, I. A., 1978, *Soviet Astronomy* **22**, 214
- Penninx, W., Damen, E., van Paradijs, J., Tan, J., & Lewin, W. H. G., 1989, *A&A* **208**, 146
- Predehl, P. & Schmitt, J. H. M. M., 1995, *A&A* **293**, 889
- Rajagopal, M. & Romani, R. W., 1996, *ApJ* **461**, 327
- Romani, R. W., 1987, *ApJ* **313**, 718
- Savage, B. D. & Mathis, J. S., 1979, *ARA&A* **17**, 73
- Tanaka, Y. & Lewin, W., 1995, in W. Lewin, J. van Paradijs, & E. Van Den Heuvel (eds.), *X-Ray Binaries*, Vol. 1, p. 126, Cambridge University Press
- Tavani, M. & Arons, J., 1997, *ApJ* **477**, 439
- Thorstensen, J., Charles, P., & Bowyer, S., 1978, *ApJ* **220**, L131
- van Paradijs, J., 1996, *ApJ* **464**, L139
- van Paradijs, J., Verbunt, F., Shafer, R. A., & Arnaud, K. A., 1987, *A&A* **182**, 47
- Verbunt, F., Belloni, T., Johnston, H. M., Van Der Klis, M., & Lewin, W. H. G., 1994, *A&A* **285**, 903
- Zampieri, L., Turolla, R., Zane, S., & Treves, A., 1995, *ApJ* **439**, 849
- Zavlin, V. E., Pavlov, G. G., & Shibano, Y. A., 1996, *A&A* **315**, 141
- Zavlin, V. E., Pavlov, G. G., & Trumper, J., 1998, *A&A* **331**, 821
- Zdunik, J. L., Haensel, P., Paczynski, B., & Miralda-Escude, J., 1992, *ApJ* **384**, 129
- Zhang, S. N., Yu, W., & Zhang, W., 1998a, *ApJ* **494**, L71
- Zhang, W., Jahoda, K., Kelley, R. L., Strohmayer, T. E., Swank, J. H., & Zhang, S. N., 1998b, *ApJ* **495**, L9

Table 1. X-ray Observations

Number	Satellite/Instrument	Obs Start Time (UT)	Live Time (ksec)	Avg Countrate ^a (c/s)
Cen X–4				
1	<i>ASCA</i> /SIS+GIS	27/02/94 04:11	28.0	0.017±0.001 (GIS2)
Aql X–1				
2	<i>ROSAT</i> /PSPC	15/10/92 13:19	14.4	0.029 ±0.002 (PSPC)
3	<i>ROSAT</i> /PSPC	24/03/93 04:41	12.5	0.055 ±0.002 (PSPC)
4	<i>ASCA</i> /SIS+GIS	21/10/96 11:00	37.6	0.012 ±0.001 (GIS2)
5	<i>ASCA</i> /GIS	30/04/94 15:25	30.2	12.76±0.02 (GIS2)
4U 1608–522				
6	<i>ASCA</i> /SIS+GIS	12/08/93 05:49	34.3	0.013±0.001 (GIS2)

References. — (1) Asai et al. 1996b; (2) Verbunt et al. 1994; (3) Verbunt et al. 1994; (4) and (5), the present work; (6) Asai et al. 1996b

^a Count-rates are background subtracted. For *ASCA*, count-rates are for GIS2 detector (0.8-10 keV), and for the *ROSAT*/PSPC, energy range is (0.4-2.4 keV)

Table 2: X-ray Spectral Parameters of Aql X–1, Cen X–4, & 4U 1608–522

Dataset Number	N_{H} (10^{22} cm $^{-2}$)	H Atmosphere			Ideal Blackbody			α^b	Norm c
		kT (keV)	r_e (km (d/d_0)) a	χ^2/dof	kT_{BB} (keV)	r (km (d/d_0)) a	χ^2/dof		
Cen X–4									
1	(0.055)	...	...	...	0.180 ± 0.0015	$1.2^{+0.15}_{-0.2}$	119/127	1.5 ± 0.35	$1.0^{+0.5}_{-0.35}$
	(0.2)	...	...	...	0.144 ± 0.012	$2.9^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$	126/127	$1.85^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$	$1.7^{+0.8}_{-0.5}$
	(0.055)	0.10 ± 0.012	$7.8^{+1.9}_{-1.7}$	124/129	...	...	...	$1.07^{+0.3}_{-0.15}$	$0.55^{+0.45}_{-0.25}$
	(0.2)	$0.063^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$	32^{+13}_{-8}	118/129	...	...	...	$1.4^{+0.45}_{-0.35}$	$1.0^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$
Aql X–1									
2	(0.2)	$0.19^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	$2.4^{+0.9}_{-0.6}$	25/18	0.29 ± 0.02	$0.62^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$	21/18	...	...
	(0.4)	0.12 ± 0.02	$8.7^{+4.1}_{-2.7}$	18/18	0.22 ± 0.02	1.3 ± 0.3	17/18	...	...
3	(0.2)	0.205 ± 0.02	$2.7^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$	30/18	0.295 ± 0.02	$0.75^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$	26/18	...	...
	(0.4)	0.13 ± 0.015	$9.3^{+3.1}_{-2.3}$	19/18	0.232 ± 0.015	$1.6^{+0.29}_{-0.24}$	17/18	...	...
4	(0.2)	0.25 ± 0.025	$1.5^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$	39/56	0.36 ± 0.02	$0.40^{+0.06}_{-0.05}$	40/56	...	...
	(0.4)	0.20 ± 0.025	$2.6^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$	38/56	0.32 ± 0.02	$0.57^{+0.10}_{-0.09}$	43/56	...	...
	(0.8)	0.14 ± 0.023	$7.5^{+3.0}_{-2.2}$	49/56	0.27 ± 0.02	$1.10^{+0.25}_{-0.19}$	59/56	...	...
2, 3, & 4	0.15 ± 0.06	...	...	...	0.346 ± 0.025	$0.43^{+0.10}_{-0.07}$	161/82	...	...
2, 3, & 4	$0.20^{+0.08}_{-0.06}$	0.22 ± 0.03	$2.0^{+0.8}_{-0.6}$	150/82	...	...	...	...	...
2	$0.44^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$	0.18 ± 0.03	$3.5^{+2.0}_{-1.2}$	87/80	...	...	...	...	...
(N_{H} vary) 3	0.22 ± 0.08	“	“	“	...	...	...	...	...
4	$0.44^{+0.12}_{-0.11}$	“	“	“	...	...	...	...	...
2	$0.35^{+0.12}_{-0.08}$	...	...	...	0.311 ± 0.025	$0.61^{+0.19}_{-0.12}$	101/80	...	...
(N_{H} vary) 3	$0.14^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$	...	...	...	“	“	“	...	...
4	$0.35^{+0.12}_{-0.09}$	...	...	...	“	“	“	...	...
2	0.16 ± 0.06	...	...	...	$0.31^{+0.03}_{-0.025}$	$0.48^{+0.13}_{-0.09}$	90/80	...	...
(kT_{BB} vary) 3	“	...	...	...	$0.36^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	“	“	...	...
4	“	...	...	...	$0.33^{+0.03}_{-0.027}$	“	“	...	...
2	$0.17^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$	...	...	...	0.336 ± 0.028	$0.42^{+0.11}_{-0.08}$	83/80	...	...
(r vary) 3	“	...	...	...	“	$0.56^{+0.15}_{-0.10}$	“	...	...
4	“	...	...	...	“	$0.46^{+0.12}_{-0.09}$	“	...	...
5	0.425 ± 0.02	...	...	...	$0.94^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$0.85^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	1954/1461	1.635 ± 0.035	1900 ± 90
4U 1608–522									
6	(0.8)	0.17 ± 0.03	$9.4^{+4.5}_{-2.7}$	70/61	$0.30^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$	$1.7^{+0.5}_{-0.3}$	70/61	...	...
	(1.5)	$0.105^{+0.02}_{-0.016}$	50^{+36}_{-20}	74/61	0.235 ± 0.020	$4.6^{+1.6}_{-1.1}$	39/61	...	...

Errors are 90% confidence; Values listed in parenthesis were fixed during the fits

a Assumed Distances: Aql X–1, $d_0 = 2\text{kpc}$ (Czerny et al. 1987); 4U 1608–522, $d_0 = 3.6\text{ kpc}$ (Nakamura et al. 1989); Cen X–4 $d_0 = 1.2\text{ kpc}$ (Chevalier et al. 1989)

b Power-law Photon Slope

c Normalization in 10^{-4} photons cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ keV $^{-1}$ at 1 keV.