

University of Groningen

The high-mass end of the Tully-Fisher relation

Noordermeer, E.; Verheijen, M. A. W.

Published in:
Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society

DOI:
[10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.12369.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.12369.x)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2007

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Noordermeer, E., & Verheijen, M. A. W. (2007). The high-mass end of the Tully-Fisher relation. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 381(4), 1463-1472. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2007.12369.x>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

The high-mass end of the Tully–Fisher relation

E. Noordermeer^{1,2*} and M. A. W. Verheijen²

¹University of Nottingham, School of Physics and Astronomy, University Park, NG7 2RD Nottingham

²Kapteyn Astronomical Institute, University of Groningen, PO Box 800, 9700 AV Groningen, the Netherlands

Accepted 2007 August 15. Received 2007 July 13; in original form 2007 May 24

ABSTRACT

We study the location of massive disc galaxies on the Tully–Fisher (TF) relation. Using a combination of *K*-band photometry and high-quality rotation curves, we show that in traditional formulations of the TF relation (using the width of the global H I profile or the maximum rotation velocity), galaxies with rotation velocities larger than 200 km s⁻¹ lie systematically to the right of the relation defined by less massive systems, causing a characteristic ‘kink’ in the relations. Massive, early-type disc galaxies in particular have a large offset, up to 1.5 mag, from the main relation defined by less massive and later-type spirals.

The presence of a change in slope at the high-mass end of the TF relation has important consequences for the use of the TF relation as a tool for estimating distances to galaxies or for probing galaxy evolution. In particular, the luminosity evolution of massive galaxies since $z \approx 1$ may have been significantly larger than estimated in several recent studies.

We also show that many of the galaxies with the largest offsets have declining rotation curves and that the change in slope largely disappears when we use the asymptotic rotation velocity as kinematic parameter. The remaining deviations from linearity can be removed when we simultaneously use the total baryonic mass (stars + gas) instead of the optical or near-infrared luminosity. Our results strengthen the view that the TF relation fundamentally links the mass of dark matter haloes with the total baryonic mass embedded in them.

Key words: galaxies: elliptical and lenticular, cD – galaxies: fundamental parameters – galaxies: kinematics and dynamics – galaxies: spiral – galaxies: statistics.

1 INTRODUCTION

The notion of a tight correlation between absolute luminosities of spiral galaxies and their rotational velocities has been with us for about 30 years now (Tully & Fisher 1977). This ‘Tully–Fisher’ (TF) relation has been confirmed to hold over many decades in luminosity (Courteau 1997; McGaugh et al. 2000; Verheijen 2001, hereafter V01) and in different galaxy environments (Giovanelli et al. 1997; Willick 1999). Barred and unbarred galaxies share the same TF relation as well (Courteau et al. 2003), as do high and low surface brightness galaxies (Sprayberry et al. 1995; Zwaan et al. 1995). Although spirals of different morphological types do follow different TF relations (Roberts 1978; Rubin et al. 1985; Hinz, Rix & Bernstein 2001; Mathieu, Merrifield & Kuijken 2002; Russell 2004), these offsets disappear almost entirely when using near-infrared photometry, rather than optical luminosities (Aaronson & Mould 1983; Peletier & Willner 1993), indicating that most of the differences at bluer wavelengths can be attributed to variations in star formation history along the Hubble sequence and the resulting differences in stellar populations. Similarly, when dynamical models are used to derive

circular velocities for elliptical galaxies, it is found that the latter follow a similar TF relation to spirals, but offset to lower luminosities. This offset can again be explained from differences in the stellar mass-to-light ratios (Gerhard et al. 2001; de Rijcke et al. 2007).

The TF relation has become one of the most widely used relations in extragalactic astronomy. It has been commonly used as a powerful tool to estimate distances to galaxies (e.g. Tully & Pierce 2000, and references therein). As a statistical correlation between fundamental properties of spiral galaxies, it has also been used to constrain numerical simulations of galaxy formation (Dalcanton, Spergel & Summers 1997; Navarro & Steinmetz 2000; Bullock et al. 2001; Pizagno et al. 2006; Portinari & Sommer-Larsen 2007), probe galaxy evolution on cosmological time-scales (Vogt et al. 1997; Ziegler et al. 2002; Milvang-Jensen et al. 2003; Böhm et al. 2004; Bamford, Aragón-Salamanca & Milvang-Jensen 2006; Weiner et al. 2006; Chiu, Bamford & Bunker 2007) or study the structure and stellar populations of nearby galaxies (Franx & de Zeeuw 1992; Courteau & Rix 1999; Bell & de Jong 2001).

Traditionally, the TF relation was studied using the width W of a galaxy’s global neutral hydrogen line profile as a probe for its rotational velocity (Tully & Fisher 1977). With larger samples of spatially resolved kinematics (rotation curves) becoming available,

*E-mail: edo.noordermeer@nottingham.ac.uk

the rotation velocities can be directly measured and recent studies tend to use the maximum rotation velocity (V_{\max}) instead. This subtle shift has the added advantage that the TF relation can be measured at cosmological distances, using optical spectroscopic observations of high-redshift galaxies (see references above).

Most spiral galaxies have flat rotation curves and for these systems, both kinematic measurements (W and V_{\max}) generally yield nearly equivalent velocities. However, this is not the case for all galaxies. In galaxies whose rotation curves are rising or declining at large radii, it is not clear a priori which kinematic parameter yields the best results. V01 presented an extensive study, based on a sample of 31 galaxies in the Ursa Major cluster with well-defined rotation curves and K -band photometry, of the influence of the shape of a rotation curve on the location of a galaxy on the TF relation. Galaxies with declining rotation curves were found to lie systematically on the high-velocity side, when using the maximum rotation velocity V_{\max} or the width of the H I profile. Since these are typically bright systems with high rotation velocities, this result suggests that there may be a change in slope in the TF relation at the high-luminosity end, a possibility also hinted at by Peletier & Willner (1993). Clearly, the existence of a ‘kink’ in the TF relation has important consequences and, if not corrected for, will lead to systematic biases when deriving cosmological distances or probing galaxy evolution.

However, V01 also showed that the systematic offset at the high-mass end disappeared when, instead of V_{\max} , the asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} in the outer, flat parts of the rotation curve was used. Bearing in mind that the asymptotic rotation velocities are determined by the dark matter haloes, V01 interpreted this result as a strong indication that the TF relation fundamentally links the total baryonic content of (disc) galaxies with their dark matter haloes, and that as far as this relation is concerned, there is no fundamental difference between low- and high-mass galaxies.

Unfortunately, the sample of V01 only contained a small number of galaxies with declining rotation curves and the declines were modest. Thus, the change in slope of the high-luminosity end of the TF relation when going from V_{\max} to V_{asympt} was small and his results only gave a first indication for how to interpret the curvature at the high-mass end of the TF relation in terms of the kinematics of the galaxies. Recently, however, a sample of high-quality rotation curves for high-luminosity early-type disc galaxies (S0–Sab) has become available (Noordermeer et al. 2007, hereafter N07). This sample contains many strongly declining rotation curves where the difference between the maximum and asymptotic rotation velocities is much larger than in Verheijen’s galaxies. In this paper therefore, we combine Noordermeer’s sample with the data for the galaxies with flat and declining rotation curves from V01, with the aim of further investigating the change in slope at the bright end of the TF relation and its relation with the shapes of rotation curves. We also include the recent sample of rotation curves from Spekkens & Giovanelli (2006, hereafter S06) in our analysis; these are all massive late-type spiral galaxies with flat rotation curves and provide a valuable benchmark at the high-luminosity end of the TF relation.

The outline of the remainder of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we describe the selection of galaxies from the three different samples for the present study, together with the photometric and kinematic ingredients for the TF analysis. In Section 3, we present the TF relations and show that there is indeed a change in slope around 200 km s^{-1} in the relations with W and V_{\max} . We also show that this ‘kink’ is largely, but not entirely, removed when we use the asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} . In Section 4, we search for possible explanations for the observed change in slope and show

that, when we consider the total baryonic mass (stars + gas) in our galaxies, an entirely linear relation is recovered. Finally, we discuss some implications of our results in Section 5.

2 SAMPLE SELECTION AND OBSERVATIONAL DATA

2.1 Sample

We combine data from the three separate studies by V01, S06 and N07. The main criteria for inclusion of galaxies from these subsamples in the present study are that their rotation curves are of good quality and that the maximum and asymptotic rotation velocities are well defined. We thus select the 22 galaxies from V01 with flat or declining rotation curves. For galaxies whose rotation curves rise until the last measured point, the maximum and asymptotic rotation velocities are ill defined, so we excluded galaxies from V01 with such rotation curves. We include all galaxies from the sample of massive, late-type spiral galaxies from S06, except UGC 2849, which appears to be interacting with a companion and whose kinematics are lopsided. The remaining seven galaxies have well-defined rotation curves, some of which appear to be weakly declining in the outer regions. However, given the uncertainties in the inclination of the gas layer at large radii, they are also consistent with being entirely flat. Finally, we include all 19 galaxies from N07. These are all early-type disc galaxies (S0–Sab), and mostly massive ($V_{\max} \gtrsim 200 \text{ km s}^{-1}$). Many of these systems have declining rotation curves, with large differences between V_{asympt} and V_{\max} .

Our final sample consists of 48 galaxies. They are listed, together with the photometric and kinematic data, in Table 1.

2.2 Photometric data

We have chosen to study the TF relation using K -band photometry. Near-infrared photometry has a number of clear advantages over conventional optical data. Foremost, the effects of dust extinction are strongly reduced. Several galaxies in our sample are highly inclined with respect to the line of sight, such that a large fraction of the light is absorbed by internal dust. In the optical bands, this effect can be very significant ($\gtrsim 1 \text{ mag}$), leading to large uncertainties in the derived absolute luminosities. In the near infrared, these uncertainties are less severe. In addition, recent bursts of star formation can have a large effect on the optical luminosity of a galaxy, whereas the K band is much less sensitive to such events.

Deep K -band photometry for the galaxies from V01 is available from Tully et al. (1996, hereafter T96). Neither S06 nor N07 had private near-infrared photometry at their disposal, but all galaxies from these subsamples have been observed in K in the framework of the Two-Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS).¹ Although 2MASS is a very homogeneous survey, it is also less deep than the data from T96. To judge the reliability of the 2MASS photometric data, and to ensure that we do not introduce systematic differences between our various subsamples, we compared the K -band magnitudes from T96 with the total extrapolated magnitudes from 2MASS, for all systems which were detected in both surveys.

Fig. 1 shows that there is good agreement between the 2MASS photometry and Tully’s data for high surface brightness (HSB)

¹ 2MASS (<http://www.ipac.caltech.edu/2mass/>) is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Centre/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation.

Table 1. Photometric and kinematic properties used for the TF analysis: (1) galaxy name; (2) total apparent K -band magnitude and error, taken from T96 (Verheijen’s galaxies) and the 2MASS galaxy catalogue (Spekkens’ and Noordermeer’s galaxies); (3) correction for galactic foreground extinction, taken from Schlegel et al. (1998); (4) correction for internal extinction, calculated using equation (1); (5) assumed distance; (6) magnitude error due to distance uncertainty; (7) resulting absolute magnitude; (8) maximum and (9) asymptotic rotation velocities from the rotation curve and (10) width of global H I profile, corrected for instrumental broadening, random gas motions and inclination.

| Galaxy | m_K (mag) | A_K^{fg} (mag) | A_K^i (mag) | D (Mpc) | δM_{dist} (mag) | M_K^c (mag) | V_{max} (km s $^{-1}$) | V_{asympt} (km s $^{-1}$) | $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ (km s $^{-1}$) |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| Galaxies from V01 | | | | | | | | | |
| UGC 6399 | 11.09 ± 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −20.33 | 88 ± 5 | 88 ± 5 | 172 ± 2 |
| UGC 6446 | 11.5 ± 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −19.88 | 82 ± 4 | 82 ± 4 | 174 ± 8 |
| NGC 3726 | 7.96 ± 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.45 | 162 ± 9 | 162 ± 9 | 330 ± 9 |
| NGC 3729 | 8.6 ± 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −22.78 | 151 ± 11 | 151 ± 11 | 295 ± 14 |
| UGC 6667 | 10.81 ± 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −20.65 | 86 ± 3 | 86 ± 3 | 167 ± 2 |
| NGC 3877 | 7.75 ± 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.76 | 167 ± 11 | 167 ± 11 | 335 ± 6 |
| NGC 3917 | 9.08 ± 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −22.40 | 135 ± 3 | 135 ± 3 | 275 ± 3 |
| NGC 3949 | 8.43 ± 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −22.98 | 164 ± 7 | 164 ± 7 | 320 ± 8 |
| NGC 3953 | 7.03 ± 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −24.41 | 223 ± 5 | 223 ± 5 | 446 ± 5 |
| UGC 6917 | 10.3 ± 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −21.10 | 104 ± 4 | 104 ± 4 | 224 ± 7 |
| NGC 3992 | 7.23 ± 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −24.21 | 272 ± 6 | 242 ± 5 | 547 ± 13 |
| NGC 4013 | 7.68 ± 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.83 | 195 ± 3 | 177 ± 6 | 377 ± 1 |
| NGC 4010 | 9.22 ± 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −22.31 | 128 ± 9 | 128 ± 9 | 254 ± 1 |
| UGC 6983 | 10.52 ± 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −20.87 | 107 ± 7 | 107 ± 7 | 222 ± 4 |
| NGC 4085 | 9.2 ± 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −22.27 | 134 ± 6 | 134 ± 6 | 247 ± 7 |
| NGC 4088 | 7.46 ± 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −24.00 | 173 ± 14 | 173 ± 14 | 362 ± 5 |
| NGC 4100 | 8.02 ± 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.48 | 195 ± 7 | 164 ± 13 | 386 ± 5 |
| NGC 4102 | 7.86 ± 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.57 | 178 ± 11 | 178 ± 11 | 393 ± 10 |
| NGC 4138 | 8.19 ± 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.22 | 195 ± 7 | 147 ± 12 | 374 ± 16 |
| NGC 4157 | 7.52 ± 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −24.04 | 201 ± 7 | 185 ± 10 | 398 ± 4 |
| NGC 4183 | 9.76 ± 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −21.74 | 115 ± 6 | 109 ± 4 | 228 ± 2 |
| NGC 4217 | 7.61 ± 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 18.6 | 0.17 | −23.90 | 191 ± 6 | 178 ± 5 | 381 ± 5 |
| Galaxies from S06 | | | | | | | | | |
| NGC 1324 | 9.15 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 74.2 | 0.08 | −25.40 | 305 ± 7 | 275 ± 9 | 604 ± 15 |
| ESO 563G21 | 8.89 ± 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 59.2 | 0.10 | −25.27 | 310 ± 11 | 300 ± 6 | 655 ± 12 |
| NGC 2862 | 9.27 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.22 | 55.9 | 0.10 | −24.70 | 280 ± 5 | 250 ± 10 | 574 ± 11 |
| NGC 2955 | 10.04 ± 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 95.3 | 0.06 | −24.93 | 265 ± 19 | 230 ± 17 | 546 ± 34 |
| IC 4202 | 10.41 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 97.2 | 0.06 | −24.76 | 245 ± 3 | 245 ± 3 | 517 ± 10 |
| NGC 6195 | 10.18 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 123.3 | 0.05 | −25.38 | 255 ± 17 | 255 ± 17 | 536 ± 37 |
| UGC 11455 | 9.23 ± 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 75.7 | 0.08 | −25.50 | 280 ± 9 | 270 ± 10 | 602 ± 10 |
| Galaxies from N07 | | | | | | | | | |
| UGC 624 | 9.26 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 65.1 | 0.09 | −24.94 | 300 ± 16 | 270 ± 30 | 599 ± 38 |
| UGC 2487 | 8.64 ± 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 67.4 | 0.09 | −25.61 | 390 ± 21 | 330 ± 24 | 755 ± 36 |
| UGC 2916 | 10.01 ± 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 63.5 | 0.09 | −24.13 | 220 ± 17 | 180 ± 17 | 501 ± 39 |
| UGC 2953 | 6.04 ± 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 15.1 | 0.38 | −25.07 | 315 ± 9 | 260 ± 16 | 603 ± 18 |
| UGC 3205 | 9.50 ± 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.11 | 48.7 | 0.12 | −24.24 | 240 ± 7 | 210 ± 5 | 451 ± 7 |
| UGC 3546 | 8.48 ± 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 27.3 | 0.21 | −23.78 | 260 ± 65 | 190 ± 12 | 421 ± 13 |
| UGC 3580 | 10.12 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 19.2 | 0.30 | −21.37 | 127 ± 5 | 125 ± 5 | 246 ± 7 |
| UGC 3993 | 10.33 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 61.9 | 0.09 | −23.66 | 300 ± 45 | 250 ± 40 | 550 ± 79 |
| UGC 4458 | 9.31 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 64.2 | 0.09 | −24.76 | 490 ± 75 | 240 ± 43 | 620 ± 93 |
| UGC 4605 | 8.46 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 20.9 | 0.28 | −23.30 | 225 ± 5 | 185 ± 4 | 412 ± 2 |
| UGC 5253 | 7.36 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 21.1 | 0.27 | −24.30 | 255 ± 20 | 210 ± 21 | 495 ± 34 |
| UGC 6786 | 8.70 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 25.9 | 0.22 | −23.48 | 230 ± 5 | 215 ± 10 | 456 ± 6 |
| UGC 6787 | 7.66 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 18.9 | 0.31 | −23.82 | 270 ± 10 | 250 ± 7 | 495 ± 7 |
| UGC 8699 | 9.74 ± 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 36.7 | 0.16 | −23.22 | 205 ± 6 | 180 ± 9 | 382 ± 10 |
| UGC 9133 | 8.80 ± 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 54.3 | 0.11 | −24.94 | 300 ± 15 | 225 ± 12 | 537 ± 18 |
| UGC 11670 | 7.72 ± 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 12.7 | 0.46 | −22.97 | 190 ± 5 | 160 ± 6 | 341 ± 6 |
| UGC 11852 | 10.69 ± 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 80.0 | 0.07 | −23.90 | 220 ± 16 | 165 ± 11 | 401 ± 29 |
| UGC 11914 | 6.83 ± 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 14.9 | 0.39 | −24.08 | 305 ± 43 | − ^a | 583 ± 85 |
| UGC 12043 | 10.81 ± 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 15.4 | 0.38 | −20.21 | 93 ± 6 | 90 ± 4 | 185 ± 3 |

^aThe rotation curve of UGC 11914 only extends out to about 3.3 R -band disc scalelengths and does not show the characteristic decline that is seen in other galaxies of similar type and luminosity (see N07). Since in many comparable cases, the decline in the rotation velocities sets in outside the optical disc only, it is possible that the rotation curve in UGC 11914 would also decline at larger radii if we were able to measure it. The asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} for UGC 11914 seems therefore ill defined and we excluded this galaxy from the sample for the asymptotic velocity relations.




Figure 1. Comparison of 2MASS K -band magnitudes with the data from T96. Data points show the difference between the total apparent magnitudes from 2MASS and those from T96; error bars show the combined errors. Open symbols indicate low surface brightness galaxies ($\mu_{0,K} > 18$ mag arcsec $^{-2}$) and filled symbols indicate HSB systems. Black and red vertical arrows indicate the 2MASS apparent magnitudes for the galaxies from N07 and S06, respectively.

galaxies. For the galaxies with measured central surface brightness $\mu_{0,K} < 18.0$ mag arcsec $^{-2}$, the average difference between 2MASS and T96's magnitudes is 0.01 mag, with a standard deviation of 0.14 mag. V01 reported, based on an internal comparison of their observations from different nights, an average photometric uncertainty of 0.08 mag in the K -band magnitudes of T96. This implies that the uncertainties in the 2MASS magnitudes must be approximately 0.11 mag, significantly larger than the average errors given by the 2MASS data base (typically 0.03 mag for the HSB galaxies in Fig. 1). Photometric errors of 0.03 mag seem somewhat optimistic, in particular since the 2MASS images are significantly less deep than those of T96.

Fig. 1 also shows that for low surface brightness galaxies, the 2MASS magnitudes are not reliable and sometimes deviate strongly from the values from T96. Inspection of the 2MASS images for these galaxies shows that they are of such low surface brightness that they are often barely detected (in fact, most of the LSB galaxies from Tully's sample are not detected at all by 2MASS). It appears that 2MASS has missed a large fraction of the flux of many LSB galaxies, compared to the deeper data from T96.

The galaxies from N07 and S06 are all luminous, HSB galaxies. For these objects, it seems safe to adopt the 2MASS magnitudes, but we assume an average photometric uncertainty of 0.11 mag instead of the smaller errors given by 2MASS.

To convert the apparent magnitudes to absolute luminosities, we first correct for extinction effects. Corrections for Galactic foreground extinction were taken from Schlegel, Finkbeiner & Davis (1998); they are generally small (≤ 0.1 mag for 85 per cent of the galaxies). Several correction schemes exist to determine the amount of *internal* extinction; the most commonly used methods are based on those of Tully & Fouqué (1985) or Giovanelli et al. (1994). Here, we follow V01, who employed the following relation, originally derived by Tully et al. (1998) for the internal extinction parameter:

$$A_{\lambda}^{i \rightarrow 0} = -\gamma_{\lambda} \log \left(\frac{b}{a} \right), \quad (1)$$

with b/a the observed minor-to-major axis ratio of the optical image. γ_{λ} is wavelength dependent and was found by Tully et al. (1998) to

depend also on the absolute luminosity of the galaxy: brighter galaxies contain on average more dust than fainter ones. These authors used the TF relation itself, in an iterative way, to express the absolute luminosity in terms of the H I linewidth, and give the following description for γ_{λ} :

$$\gamma_{\lambda} = \alpha_{\lambda} + \beta_{\lambda} (\log W_{20,R}^{c,i} - 2.5), \quad (2)$$

where $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ is the H I linewidth, corrected for inclination and broadening due to instrumental effects and random gas motions (see below). For the wavelength-dependent parameters α_{λ} and β_{λ} , we use the values given by Tully et al. (1998). Note that even in the K band used here, we find significant internal extinction corrections, although they do not exceed 0.1 mag except in the most inclined systems.

Distances for our galaxies were derived as follows. All galaxies in V01 belong to the Ursa Major cluster and have therefore roughly equal distances; throughout this study, we adopt Verheijen's value of 18.6 Mpc (taken from Tully & Pierce 2000). For the galaxies from N07, we used the distances as derived by Noordermeer et al. (2005), which were based on a simple Hubble-flow model, corrected for Virgo-centric infall and assuming a Hubble constant of 75 km s $^{-1}$ Mpc $^{-1}$. For the galaxies from S06, we used the same method.²

In Table 1, we give for each galaxy the raw apparent magnitudes and photometric errors, the galactic foreground and internal extinction parameters, A_K^{fg} and A_K^i , the assumed distances and the resulting corrected absolute magnitudes used in the remainder of this paper.

Finally, in addition to the photometric errors, we also account for the uncertainties in the absolute magnitudes which arise from errors in our distance estimates. For the galaxies from V01, these are defined by the depth of the Ursa Major cluster; here, we adopt Verheijen's estimate of 0.17 mag. For the other galaxies, we estimate the distance uncertainties by assuming a typical peculiar velocity of 200 km s $^{-1}$. The resulting errors on the absolute magnitude δM_{dist} are given in Column 7 of Table 1 and were added quadratically to the photometric errors to obtain the total uncertainties used for the subsequent analysis.

Note that we have not included the uncertainties in the internal extinction corrections in our error budget here. Especially for the highly inclined systems in our samples, the corrections A_{λ}^i are significant and galaxy-to-galaxy variations of γ_{λ} can cause substantial deviations from the corrections used here. However, without additional information about the dust content of our galaxies, the corrections listed in Table 1 are the best possible estimate and the uncertainties are very difficult to quantify. We will ignore these uncertainties for the subsequent analysis here, but note that some of the scatter in our TF relations might be explained by the uncertainties in the internal extinction.

2.3 Kinematic data

We use three kinematic parameters for our TF analysis. The first is the inclination-corrected width of the H I line profile. For this, we used the instrumental broadening corrected measurements from Verheijen & Sancisi (2001), S06 and Noordermeer et al. (2005),

²Note that our distance estimates for the galaxies from S06 are slightly different from those given in the original paper. Part of the discrepancy comes from the fact that we assume $h = 0.75$ instead of 0.70. Further differences arise from the treatment of Virgo-centric streaming motions, but are small (< 0.1 mag in all cases).




Figure 2. TF relations in the K band, using the corrected widths of the global H I profiles (left-hand panel) and the maximum (middle) and asymptotic rotation velocities (right-hand panel). Black and green data points show galaxies from V01 with flat and declining rotation curves, respectively; blue data points show galaxies from S06 and red points show galaxies from N07. The black lines show the fits from V01 to galaxies with flat rotation curves, while the magenta lines show the fits to the combined sample (see Table 2).

respectively. We apply an additional correction for broadening of the profiles caused by random gas motions in the gas discs, using the prescriptions given by Verheijen & Sancisi (2001, based on Tully & Fouqué 1985):

$$\begin{aligned} (W_{20,R}^c)^2 &= (W_{20}^c)^2 + W_t^2 \left[1 - 2e^{-\left(\frac{W_{20}^c}{W_c}\right)^2} \right] \\ &\quad - 2W_{20}^c W_t \left[1 - e^{-\left(\frac{W_{20}^c}{W_c}\right)^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with W_{20}^c the profile width corrected for instrumental broadening. W_c indicates the profile width where the transition from a Gaussian to a boxy shape occurs; we assume here $W_c = 120 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (de Vaucouleurs, de Vaucouleurs & Buta 1983). In practice, most of our galaxies have profile widths larger than W_c , such that equation (3) yields a linear subtraction of W_t , which gives the amount by which a profile is broadened due to the random gas motions. Verheijen & Sancisi (2001) present an extensive discussion about the suitable choice for W_t ; here, we simply copy their preferred value of $W_t = 22 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The derived profile widths $W_{20,R}^c$ were corrected for inclination using the values derived in the original papers; for warped galaxies we use the inclination in the inner regions where most of the gas is concentrated.

The two other kinematic parameters are the maximum rotation velocity V_{max} and the asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} (V_{flat} in V01), which are both derived directly from the rotation curves.

For the galaxies from V01, we copied the errors on the kinematic parameters without further modification. For the galaxies from N07, we used the inclination uncertainty derived in the original paper to estimate the errors on the profile widths. The errors on the two other kinematic parameters were estimated by eye, based on the errors in the rotation curves. The latter include contributions from measurement errors, kinematic asymmetries and inclination uncertainties; for the more face-on galaxies, the latter are usually dominant. Finally, for the galaxies from S06, we used the uncertainty in the ellipticity of the optical images, given in the original paper, to estimate the inclination uncertainty, but adopted a minimum of 5° to account for the possibility of undetected warps in the outer parts of the gas layer. The errors on V_{max} and V_{asympt} were again estimated by eye, based on the errors in the rotation curves.

All three kinematic parameters and corresponding errors for each galaxy are given in Table 1.

3 TULLY–FISHER RELATIONS

In Fig. 2, we show the TF relations for the combined sample of galaxies. Compared to the study in V01, our combined sample greatly increases the number of luminous galaxies, with our most luminous system, UGC 2487, being 1.2 mag brighter than the most luminous object in Verheijen’s sample.

We fitted direct linear relations of the following form to the combined data sets:

$$M_K^c = M_{2.6} + S(\log W - 2.6), \quad (4)$$

where M_K^c is the extinction-corrected absolute magnitude and W is either $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$, $2V_{\text{max}}$ or $2V_{\text{asympt}}$. We calculated the zero-point $M_{2.6}$ at $\log W = 2.6$, rather than 0, to avoid strong covariances between the two free parameters. The fits were done using a simple χ^2 -minimization procedure, taking the errors in both directions into account. They are indicated with the magenta lines in Fig. 2; for comparison, we also show (in black) the fits to the ‘F’-sample from V01, i.e. the fits made to galaxies with flat rotation curves only.

The results of the fits to the combined sample are summarized in Table 2. The scatter around each of the fits given in this table is a weighted rms scatter, with the weight for each data point given by $w_i = (\sigma_{M,i}^2 + S^2 \sigma_{\log W,i}^2)^{-1}$. Here, $\sigma_{M,i}$ are the magnitude errors, $\sigma_{\log W,i}$ are the errors in the parameters on the x -axes and S are the fitted slopes of the relations.

A number of interesting results can be recognized from Fig. 2 and Table 2. First of all, our data strongly suggest a ‘kink’ in the TF relation: the TF relation seems to become shallower above a rotation velocity of about 200 km s^{-1} (equivalent to $M_K^c \approx -23.75$). This is consistent with the claim first made by Peletier & Willner (1993), but the effect is much more clearly visible here than in their data. The kink is most apparent when using the width of the global profile ($W_{20,R}^{c,i}$) or the maximum rotation velocity V_{max} as kinematic parameter. In the left-hand and middle panels in the figure, almost all galaxies from the S06 and N07 samples lie to the right of the relation defined by the intermediate-mass galaxies with flat rotation curves from V01. As a result, the fits to the

Table 2. Results from the least- χ^2 fits to the K -band TF relations shown in Fig. 2.

| Kinematic parameter | Number of points | $M_{2.6}$ (mag) | S | Scatter (mag) | χ^2_{red} | Q |
|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ | 48 | -23.69 ± 0.03 | -8.65 ± 0.19 | 0.38 | 2.89 | 3.3×10^{-11} |
| V_{max} | 48 | -23.64 ± 0.04 | -8.77 ± 0.22 | 0.44 | 2.98 | 7.2×10^{-12} |
| V_{asympt} | 47 | -23.95 ± 0.04 | -9.64 ± 0.25 | 0.36 | 1.76 | 5.4×10^{-4} |
| V_{asympt} (UGC 3993 and 6787 excluded) | 45 | -23.97 ± 0.04 | -9.71 ± 0.26 | 0.34 | 1.54 | 6.8×10^{-3} |

combined samples have a shallower slope than those from Verheijen to the galaxies with flat rotation curves. In particular, many of the massive, early-type disc galaxies from N07 lie far away from the relation defined by the later-type spirals from Verheijen and S06; when expressed in terms of a luminosity offset, their distance from the main relation can be as large as 2 mag.

However, the turnover is greatly reduced when using the asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} as kinematic parameter. Many of the galaxies in our sample with $V_{\text{max}} > 200 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, in particular the early-type discs from N07, have strongly declining rotation curves. Galaxies such as UGC 4458, 4605, 3546, which lie far to the right of the main relation in the left-hand and middle panels, shift to the left when the (lower) asymptotic velocity is used, thereby straightening the TF relation. This effect is also reflected in the values for the rms scatter and χ^2 of the data around the fits and the ‘goodness-of-fit’ parameters Q . Table 2 shows that the TF relations using V_{asympt} are much better represented by straight lines than the relations with the other two parameters.

It is important, however, to note that the kink does not disappear completely when using V_{asympt} as kinematic parameter. Even in the right-hand panel of Fig. 2, most galaxies at the bright end lie to the right of the relation defined by the less luminous galaxies with flat rotation curves from V01, indicating that the slope of the TF relation also changes when the asymptotic rotation velocities V_{asympt} are used. This is also confirmed when we fit linear relations to the subsamples of galaxies fainter and brighter than $M_K^c \approx -24$; in this case, we find that the slope changes significantly from -10.5 ± 0.5 to -7.7 ± 0.9 , respectively.

The scatter in our relation using the asymptotic rotation velocities is systematically larger than the corresponding value found by V01. This difference can partly be attributed to the fact that Verheijen’s galaxies all lie in the Ursa Major cluster, such that the distance uncertainties are small (at least in a relative sense). The galaxies from S06 and N07 lie predominantly in the field, where peculiar motions with respect to the Hubble flow lead to errors in the derived distances and absolute luminosities (see Table 1), and thus to additional scatter in the TF relations. More importantly, however, the scatter in our relations is artificially increased by the deviations from a straight line. Even in the relations using the asymptotic rotation velocity V_{asympt} , the kink around 200 km s^{-1} causes systematic deviations from the fitted straight lines. Since V01 had only two galaxies with $V_{\text{asympt}} > 200 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, the change in slope at the high-mass end had virtually no influence on the scatter around the fits for his data.

Finally, the scatter in the relations with V_{asympt} is heavily influenced by two galaxies with unusually large deviations from the main relation: UGC 3993 and 6787 (3.4σ and 3.0σ outliers, respectively). In Fig. 3, we show the deviations of the galaxies from our sample with respect to the M_K^c versus V_{asympt} fit described in Table 2. The error bars in the figure take the uncertainties of the points in both directions into account, and were calculated as $[\Delta(M - M_{\text{fit}})]^2 = (\Delta M)^2 + [\Delta \log(2V)]^2$, with $S = -9.64$ the slope of the fit.




Figure 3. Deviations of our objects with respect to the K band versus V_{asympt} TF relation from Table 2. Symbol colours are the same as in Fig. 2. Error bars are the effective errors, calculated by combining the magnitude and velocity uncertainties (see text). Dotted lines indicate the formal 3σ limits.

UGC 3993 is a nearly face-on galaxy ($i \approx 20^\circ$; see N07), with correspondingly large uncertainties in the derived rotational velocities (also reflected in the large error bars in Figs 2 and 3). The deviation of this galaxy may be due partly to a slight underestimation of the true inclination angle. It seems unlikely, however, that the inclination uncertainty is responsible for the full deviation of UGC 3993; to bring this galaxy to the middle of the relation would require an inclination angle of 30° , a value which seems to fall outside the range supported by the observational data (see N07).

The most likely explanation for the offset of UGC 6787 from the main relation lies in the distance determination. UGC 6787 lies close to the centre of the Ursa Major cluster, but has a redshift that is about 200 km s^{-1} higher than the high-velocity envelope of the cluster (T96). It may thus lie behind the main cluster, which might in turn imply that it is being drawn into the cluster and that the recession velocity is lower than expected in the case of pure Hubble flow. In that case, our adopted distance of 18.9 Mpc and the derived luminosities are too small, explaining the offset in the TF relations.

For completeness, we also list in Table 2 the results of fits to the TF relations with the asymptotic rotation velocities when UGC 3993 and 6787 are excluded from the sample. It is clear that the exclusion of the two points from the fits does not lead to significantly different slopes or zero-points. As expected, the scatter is reduced, but since the kink in the relations has not been removed by the exclusion of the two discrepant points, the values are still larger than the corresponding ones from V01, and the χ^2 and Q -parameter indicate that the deviations from a straight relation are still real.




Figure 4. Deviations of our objects with respect to Verheijen’s K band versus V_{asymp} TF relation for galaxies with flat rotation curves, as a function of inclination. Symbol colours are the same as in Fig. 2. The dotted lines show the adopted internal extinction corrections for fiducial galaxies with HI profile widths of 200, 400 and 600 km s^{-1} (top to bottom, respectively).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Systematic variations along the TF relation

What could be the origin of the change of slope in the TF relation? Does it truly indicate a break in the relation between baryons and dark matter, or could it be explained by other effects? An obvious possibility is that some of the corrections from Sections 2.2 and 2.3 are inaccurate for the brightest galaxies. Such an effect may lead to a systematic deviation of these galaxies from the TF relation for lower mass galaxies, precisely as observed.

4.1.1 Internal extinction

The largest uncertainty in the corrections which we applied to our raw data lies, most probably, in the treatment of the internal extinction. We corrected for internal extinction following Tully et al. (1998). They derived their corrections from a sample of galaxies which spans a roughly similar luminosity range as ours and, importantly, observed no systematic deviations of the brightest galaxies. On the other hand, Giovanelli et al. (1995) *did* find a hint for excess extinction in the brightest spirals. Given the uncertainties, it is useful to explicitly verify whether the deviations of our most massive galaxies with respect to the TF relation for low- and intermediate-mass galaxies can be explained as being due to an underestimation of the internal extinction in these systems. This is done in Fig. 4, where we plot the deviations of all galaxies with respect to Verheijen’s TF relation for spirals with flat rotation curves, as a function of inclination.

Fig. 4 shows a tentative trend for the galaxies from S06 (blue points), with the edge-on systems deviating more than the galaxies with intermediate inclinations. To explain this trend, about a factor of 3 more extinction is required in these galaxies than assumed in Section 2.2. The galaxies from N07 (red points), however, do not follow an obvious trend, and strongly deviating cases are found among both near face-on and highly inclined galaxies.

Based on our data, we cannot strictly rule out the possibility that the internal extinction in the most massive spiral galaxies is higher than we assumed. However, Fig. 4 shows that if this is




Figure 5. Colour–magnitude relation for all galaxies in our sample for which $B - R$ colours is available. Colour information for galaxies from V01 was taken from the same paper, whereas Noordermeer & van der Hulst (2007) give colours for a subset of the galaxies from N07. The black line shows a least-squares linear fit to the data points.

indeed the case, it still cannot explain the deviations of the low-inclination galaxies. It therefore seems unlikely that the change of slope at the high-mass end of the TF relation can be explained purely as an effect of excess extinction in the most massive disc galaxies.

4.1.2 Stellar population variations

Another possibility which could explain a change of slope in the TF relation is that the most massive galaxies have stellar populations with higher mass-to-light ratios than the less luminous systems, such that they are underluminous for a given rotation velocity. To first order, such an effect is likely to be present in disc galaxies, given the well-known fact that bright galaxies tend to be redder than their less-luminous counterparts (Visvanathan 1981; Tully, Mould & Aaronson 1982). This colour–magnitude relation is also present in our own sample: in Fig. 5, we plot the $B - R$ colours as a function of absolute luminosity, for the subset of our galaxies for which the former are available.

The colour–magnitude relation itself cannot, however, be responsible for the kink in the TF relation. Fig. 5 shows that the colour changes linearly with absolute magnitude. Since mass-to-light ratio changes exponentially with colour (Bell & de Jong 2001), this gradient will translate in a linear effect in the TF relation. In other words, a linear colour–magnitude relation will introduce a change in the *global* slope of the TF relation. Specifically, using the fitted slope of the colour–magnitude relation in Fig. 5, in conjunction with the slope of the colour versus mass-to-light ratio relation from Bell & de Jong, it can be derived that the stellar *mass* TF relation will be 10 per cent steeper than the relations shown in Fig. 2 and Table 2. Importantly, however, a linear colour–magnitude relation cannot introduce a turnover in the TF relation. Only a break in the colour–magnitude relation at the same luminosity as the kink in the TF relation can explain the latter, but Fig. 5 shows that such a feature is not present in our sample.

4.2 The Baryonic Tully–Fisher relation

Having established that the observed change of slope in our K band versus V_{asymp} TF relation is not due to variations in internal extinction or the properties of the stellar populations, we now consider




Figure 6. Baryonic TF relation. The total K -band luminosity was converted to stellar mass, assuming a mass-to-light ratio of the stars of 0.8 (see text), and added to the neutral gas mass. Colours of symbols and lines are the same as in Fig. 2.

Table 3. Results from the least- χ^2 fits to the Baryonic TF relations shown in Fig. 6.

| Kinematic parameter | $(\log M)_{2.6}$ | S | Scatter (mag) ^d | χ^2_{red} | Q |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ | 10.78 ± 0.01 | 3.04 ± 0.08 | 0.32 | 2.17 | 2.2×10^{-6} |
| V_{max} | 10.77 ± 0.01 | 3.05 ± 0.09 | 0.40 | 2.57 | 2.4×10^{-9} |
| V_{asyp} | 10.88 ± 0.02 | 3.36 ± 0.10 | 0.36 | 1.92 | 7.7×10^{-5} |
| V_{asyp} (UGC 3993 and 6787 excluded) | 10.89 ± 0.02 | 3.38 ± 0.10 | 0.34 | 1.72 | 1.0×10^{-3} |

^dFor consistency with Table 2, we express the scatter in magnitudes. The scatter in $\log(M_{\text{bar}})$, as shown in Fig. 6, is a factor of 2.5 lower.

whether trends in relative gas content play a role. In this context, it is interesting to consider the so-called ‘Baryonic TF relation’, first discussed by McGaugh et al. (2000, see also McGaugh 2005). They showed that there exists another break in the TF relation at the low-luminosity end (around $V_{\text{rot}} = 90 \text{ km s}^{-1}$), below which galaxies are also underluminous. They were, however, able to restore a linear TF relation when, instead of using the stellar luminosity, they adopted the total observed baryonic mass (stars and gas). Since dwarf galaxies contain on average more gas than higher luminosity spirals (relative to the optical luminosity; e.g. Haynes & Giovanelli 1984; Verheijen & Sancisi 2001; Swaters et al. 2002; Geha et al. 2006), the former shifted upwards more than the latter, and the kink in the TF relation disappeared. Luminous galaxies, on the other hand, generally contain relatively little gas. In particular, in Noordermeer et al. (2005), it was shown that some of the early-type disc galaxies from N07 are very gas poor. In such galaxies, the baryonic budget is dominated by the stars and adding the gas contribution will not lead to a significant increase in brightness.

We have investigated whether the observed break at the high-mass end in our TF relations can be explained as a result of the relatively low gas content of the most luminous galaxies in our sample. To this purpose, we have converted the total K -band luminosities to stellar masses, assuming an average mass-to-light ratio of the stellar populations of 0.8. The choice of $M_*/L_K = 0.8$ was made following McGaugh et al. (2000), and is consistent with the average values found from maximum-disc fits from Verheijen (1997) and Palunas & Williams (2000). In reality, the values of M_*/L_K are expected to vary from galaxy to galaxy, but the variations will be modest in the K band and we ignore this variation for the moment. The possibility that the assumption of constant mass-to-light ratio gives rise to additional scatter in the baryonic TF relation is investigated below.

For the gas masses, we used the total H I masses as given by V01, Noordermeer et al. (2005) and S06, respectively, multiplied by 1.43 to account for the presence of helium. The stellar and gas masses were then added to obtain an estimate for the total baryonic mass content in our galaxies. The resulting baryonic TF relations are shown in Fig. 6 for the same three kinematic parameters as used before; the resulting least- χ^2 fits are summarized in Table 3.

As expected from the general trends of gas content with total luminosity mentioned above, the baryonic TF relations have a shallower slope than the standard stellar TF relations. But more importantly, the ‘kink’ in the TF relations from Fig. 2 is reduced. The relations with $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ and V_{max} are better represented by a straight line than the original relations in Fig. 2; the scatter and χ^2 are reduced with respect to the original values and the Q -parameters are higher. Thus, our data show that the concept of the Baryonic TF relation is not only useful to increase the linearity in the TF relation at the low-luminosity end, but that in addition, it also reduces the kink around 200 km s^{-1} . However, this effect is smaller than the one discussed in the previous section, and the Baryonic TF relations using $W_{20,R}^{c,i}$ or V_{max} are still worse than our original, *stellar* luminosity versus V_{asyp} relation shown in Fig. 2 and Table 2.

The inclusion of the gas does, however, remove the small kink that was still present in the latter relation as well, and the baryonic mass versus V_{asyp} TF relation appears to be consistent with a linear relation over the full extent of our data. However, at the same time, the scatter around the mean relation does not appear to have decreased and the formal quality of the fit, as measured with the χ^2 and Q -parameter, is actually reduced.

The scatter might be reduced if more accurate K -band mass-to-light ratios become available for individual galaxies instead of the constant value of $M_*/L_K = 0.8$ we assumed here. We investigate this




Figure 7. Deviations of our objects with respect to the baryonic mass versus V_{asympt} TF relation, as a function of the colour excess of each galaxy with respect to the linear fit shown in Fig. 5. Symbol colours are the same as in Fig. 2. The dotted line shows the behaviour predicted by the stellar population synthesis models from Bell & de Jong (2001).

possibility in Fig. 7, where we plot the deviation of each galaxy with respect to the baryonic mass versus V_{asympt} TF relation, as a function of its colour excess with respect to the linear fit shown in Fig. 5. As discussed in Section 4.1.2, the global colour–magnitude trend only leads to a change in slope of the TF relation. The deviations from this global trend, however, are expected to give rise to additional scatter in the TF relation, hence the use of the colour *excess* on the abscissa.

It is clear from Fig. 7 that there is little relation between the offsets from the baryonic TF relation and the colours. In particular, the data points do not follow the trend as predicted on the basis of the stellar populations synthesis models from Bell & de Jong (2001). Given the uncertainties in these models and in our own data, we cannot yet rule out the possibility that part of the scatter in the baryonic TF relation *is* related to variations in the mass-to-light ratios, but the current data suggest that this is not the main contribution. Thus, most of the scatter in the baryonic TF relation must be related to other observational effects, or be intrinsic.

Note that the value of the χ^2 parameter for the baryonic V_{asympt} TF relation (1.92 or 1.72, depending on whether or not the outlying UGCs 3993 and 6787 are included in the fit) implies that roughly 50 per cent of the scatter in this relation results from the observational uncertainties in the data points. This leaves an upper limit of approximately 0.25 mag (≈ 25 per cent luminosity) for the intrinsic TF scatter in our galaxies. Given the fact that we have not included the uncertainties in the internal extinction corrections or the mass-to-light ratios in our error bars and that there may well be additional uncertainties which we have ignored, it seems safe to assume that this is a conservative upper limit and that the intrinsic TF scatter is very small indeed.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this study, we have used K -band photometry and high-quality rotation curves to show that there is a ‘break’ in the TF relation around a rotation velocity of about 200 km s^{-1} (equivalent to $M_K^* \approx -23.75$, or $M_* \approx 0.7 \times 10^{11} M_\odot$), above which most galaxies rotate faster than expected (or equivalent, are less luminous). This kink is most pronounced in the traditional formulations of the TF relation, using stellar luminosities and the widths of the H I profiles

or the maximum rotational velocities, and we have shown that it is mainly due to massive early-type disc galaxies with declining rotation curves, which lie systematically to the right of the relation defined by less massive and later-type spiral galaxies. The kink is also present, albeit to a lesser extent, in the relation with the asymptotic rotation velocity at large radii. In this case, there is no systematic offset between early- and late-type spirals, and the change in slope appears independent of morphological type.

It is important to note that the ‘elliptical galaxy TF relation’ (using circular velocities derived from dynamical models rather than direct observations) shows a similar change in slope, at approximately the same location (Gerhard et al. 2001; de Rijcke et al. 2007). Thus, the change in slope of the stellar luminosity versus circular velocity relation appears to hold universally and along the entire Hubble sequence. Note, however, that due to the limited spatial extent of the dynamical tracers in elliptical galaxies, it is not generally possible to measure the asymptotic rotation velocity in these systems. It can therefore not be ruled out that the kink in the elliptical galaxy TF relation would (partly) disappear if one could use the circular velocity at radii comparable to the outer edges of the H I discs in spiral galaxies.

A change in slope at the high-luminosity end has important consequences for the use of the TF relation as a tool for estimating distances to galaxies or for probing galaxy evolution. In recent years, many studies have addressed the evolution of the TF relation on cosmological time-scales (i.e. between $z \approx 1$ and 0), although the results are still somewhat ambiguous. In their pioneering studies, Vogt et al. (1996, 1997) reported that galaxies at redshift $z \sim 1$ were on average 0.6 mag brighter (B band) than galaxies in the local universe. Other authors find much larger luminosity evolution (Milvang-Jensen et al. 2003; Bamford et al. 2006), up to 1.5–2 mag at redshifts of 0.25–0.45 (Rix et al. 1997; Simard & Pritchett 1998), whereas it has also been claimed recently that this is all due to observational effects, and that in reality, there has been no luminosity evolution whatsoever (Flores et al. 2006). Given the uncertainties in the measured zero-point offsets, it is not surprising that measurements of evolution in the TF slope disagree as well. Ziegler et al. (2002), Böhm et al. (2004) and Böhm & Ziegler (2006) claimed that the evolution in the TF relation is luminosity dependent, with high-mass galaxies ($V_{\text{max}} > 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) showing little or no evolution, but low-mass galaxies being up to 2 mag brighter at high redshift. In contrast, Weiner et al. (2006) found that massive galaxies evolve more than fainter ones.

Whatever consensus will be reached eventually, the presence of a change of slope in the local TF relation needs to be taken into account when interpreting the observed evolution. Our results indicate that high-mass galaxies are *under*-luminous in the local universe, compared to a simple extrapolation of the linear relation for lower luminosity galaxies. This offset is strongest for early-type discs, i.e. galaxies with a HSB bulge, and for the TF relation based on the maximum rotation velocity V_{max} . Crucially, high-redshift studies will often be biased towards such HSB galaxies. Moreover, when based on optical spectroscopic measurements, they will not be able to detect a declining rotation curve at large radii, and thus be forced to use V_{max} , rather than V_{asympt} . These two selection effects, when applied to our own data, give rise to an offset of high-mass galaxies from the main relation, defined by low-mass galaxies with flat rotation curves, of 1–2 mag (middle panel in Fig. 2). Thus, the luminosity evolution of high-mass galaxies may be much larger than derived by the authors mentioned above.

We have also shown that the ‘kink’ in the TF relation can be reduced in two different ways, namely (i) by using the asymptotic

rotation velocity from the rotation curve as kinematic parameter and (ii) by using the total baryonic mass (stars + gas) rather than luminosity. The first correction appears to be the most important one for high-mass galaxies, and the TF relations using the asymptotic rotation velocities show only a small deviation from linearity. However, the inclusion of the gas mass also improves the linearity and only when both refinements are used in conjunction does the ‘kink’ disappear completely and is a linear relation recovered.

It is, again, interesting to note that the kink in the elliptical galaxy TF relation also disappears when using the total baryonic mass rather than stellar luminosity (Gerhard et al. 2001; de Rijcke et al. 2007), so that galaxies along the entire Hubble sequence appear to follow the same, linear, baryonic TF relation. Our results seem a strong confirmation of the idea that the baryonic TF relation is fundamentally a relation between the mass of the dark matter haloes (which define V_{asympt}) and the total baryonic mass in galaxies and that it holds universally, regardless of how the baryons are distributed within the haloes (cf. McGaugh et al. 2000; V01).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Kristine Spekkens for kindly providing the rotation curves for her rapidly rotating late-type spiral galaxies and for stimulating discussions which helped to significantly improve the paper. We are also grateful to Thijs van der Hulst, Renzo Sancisi and Pirin Erdogdu for helpful discussions during the early stages of this project. Finally, we thank the anonymous referee for helpful suggestions to improve the paper.

REFERENCES

Aaronson M., Mould J., 1983, *ApJ*, 265, 1
 Bamford S. P., Arag3n-Salamanca A., Milvang-Jensen B., 2006, *MNRAS*, 366, 308
 Bell E. F., de Jong R. S., 2001, *ApJ*, 550, 212
 B3hm A., Ziegler B. L., 2006, preprint (astro-ph/0601505)
 B3hm A. et al., 2004, *A&A*, 420, 97
 Bullock J. S., Kolatt T. S., Sigad Y., Somerville R. S., Kravtsov A. V., Klypin A. A., Primack J. R., Dekel A., 2001, *MNRAS*, 321, 559
 Chiu K., Bamford S. P., Bunker A., 2007, *MNRAS*, 377, 806
 Courteau S., 1997, *AJ*, 114, 2402
 Courteau S., Rix H., 1999, *ApJ*, 513, 561
 Courteau S., Andersen D. R., Bershadsky M. A., MacArthur L. A., Rix H., 2003, *ApJ*, 594, 208
 Dalcanton J. J., Spergel D. N., Summers F. J., 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 659
 de Rijcke S., Zeilinger W. W., Hau G. K. T., Prugniel P., Dejonghe H., 2007, *ApJ*, 659, 1172
 de Vaucouleurs G., de Vaucouleurs A., Buta R., 1983, *AJ*, 88, 764
 Flores H., Hammer F., Puech M., Amram P., Balkowski C., 2006, *A&A*, 455, 107
 Franx M., de Zeeuw T., 1992, *ApJ*, 392, L47
 Geha M., Blanton M. R., Masjedi M., West A. A., 2006, *ApJ*, 653, 240
 Gerhard O., Kronawitter A., Saglia R. P., Bender R., 2001, *AJ*, 121, 1936
 Giovanelli R., Haynes M. P., Salzer J. J., Wegner G., da Costa L. N., Freudling W., 1994, *AJ*, 107, 2036

Giovanelli R., Haynes M. P., Salzer J. J., Wegner G., da Costa L. N., Freudling W., 1995, *AJ*, 110, 1059
 Giovanelli R., Haynes M. P., Herter T., Vogt N. P., da Costa L. N., Freudling W., Salzer J. J., Wegner G., 1997, *AJ*, 113, 53
 Haynes M. P., Giovanelli R., 1984, *AJ*, 89, 758
 Hinz J. L., Rix H., Bernstein G. M., 2001, *AJ*, 121, 683
 Mathieu A., Merrifield M. R., Kuijken K., 2002, *MNRAS*, 330, 251
 McGaugh S. S., 2005, *ApJ*, 632, 859
 McGaugh S. S., Schombert J. M., Bothun G. D., de Blok W. J. G., 2000, *ApJ*, 533, L99
 Milvang-Jensen B., Arag3n-Salamanca A., Hau G. K. T., J3rgensen I., Hjorth J., 2003, *MNRAS*, 339, L1
 Navarro J. F., Steinmetz M., 2000, *ApJ*, 538, 477
 Noordermeer E., van der Hulst J. M., 2007, *MNRAS*, 367, 1480
 Noordermeer E., van der Hulst J. M., Sancisi R., Swaters R. A., van Albada T. S., 2005, *A&A*, 442, 137
 Noordermeer E., van der Hulst J. M., Sancisi R., Swaters R. A., van Albada T. S., 2007, *MNRAS*, 367, 1513 (N07)
 Palunas P., Williams T. B., 2000, *AJ*, 120, 2884
 Peletier R. F., Willner S. P., 1993, *ApJ*, 418, 626
 Pizagno J. et al., 2007, *AJ*, 134, 945
 Portinari L., Sommer-Larsen J., 2007, *MNRAS*, 375, 913
 Rix H.-W., Guhathakurta P., Colless M., Ing K., 1997, *MNRAS*, 285, 779
 Roberts M. S., 1978, *AJ*, 83, 1026
 Rubin V. C., Burstein D., Ford W. K., Thonnard N., 1985, *ApJ*, 289, 81
 Russell D. G., 2004, *ApJ*, 607, 241
 Schlegel D. J., Finkbeiner D. P., Davis M., 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 525
 Simard L., Pritchett C. J., 1998, *ApJ*, 505, 96
 Spekkens K., Giovanelli R., 2006, *AJ*, 132, 1426 (S06)
 Sprayberry D., Bernstein G. M., Impey C. D., Bothun G. D., 1995, *ApJ*, 438, 72
 Swaters R. A., van Albada T. S., van der Hulst J. M., Sancisi R., 2002, *A&A*, 390, 829
 Tully R. B., Fisher J. R., 1977, *A&A*, 54, 661
 Tully R. B., Fouqu3 P., 1985, *ApJS*, 58, 67
 Tully R. B., Pierce M. J., 2000, *ApJ*, 533, 744
 Tully R. B., Mould J. R., Aaronson M., 1982, *ApJ*, 257, 527
 Tully R. B., Pierce M. J., Huang J., Saunders W., Verheijen M. A. W., Witchalls P. L., 1998, *AJ*, 115, 2264
 Tully R. B., Verheijen M. A. W., Pierce M. J., Huang J., Wainscoat R. J., 1996, *AJ*, 112, 2471 (T96)
 Verheijen M. A. W., 1997, PhD thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
 Verheijen M. A. W., 2001, *ApJ*, 563, 694 (V01)
 Verheijen M. A. W., Sancisi R., 2001, *A&A*, 370, 765
 Visvanathan N., 1981, *A&A*, 100, L20
 Vogt N. P., Forbes D. A., Phillips A. C., Gronwall C., Faber S. M., Illingworth G. D., Koo D. C., 1996, *ApJ*, 465, L15
 Vogt N. P. et al., 1997, *ApJ*, 479, L121
 Weiner B. J. et al., 2006, *ApJ*, 653, 1049
 Willick J. A., 1999, *ApJ*, 516, 47
 Ziegler B. L. et al., 2002, *ApJ*, 564, L69
 Zwaan M. A., van der Hulst J. M., de Blok W. J. G., McGaugh S. S., 1995, *MNRAS*, 273, L35

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.