European Research Council

erc



Gabriella De Lucia

INAF - Astronomical Observatory of Trieste



<u>A premise</u>

✓ Theoretical (and observational) studies trying to assess the influence of the environment on galaxy evolution have been mainly focused on galaxy clusters ("good" laboratories, "easy" to find, ...)

<u>A premise</u>

✓ Theoretical (and observational) studies trying to assess the influence of the environment on galaxy evolution have been mainly focused on galaxy clusters ("good" laboratories, "easy" to find, ...)

✓ Cluster studies have some "*drawbacks*" (biased environment, rare objects, ...). In addition, in order to really establish if some cluster-dependent physics is playing a role, one would need to establish a difference in the evolution of galaxies in clusters to that of "*identical*" galaxies in the field

<u>A premise</u>

✓ Theoretical (and observational) studies trying to assess the influence of the environment on galaxy evolution have been mainly focused on galaxy clusters ("good" laboratories, "easy" to find, ...)

✓ Cluster studies have some "*drawbacks*" (biased environment, rare objects, ...). In addition, in order to really establish if some cluster-dependent physics is playing a role, one would need to establish a difference in the evolution of galaxies in clusters to that of "*identical*" galaxies in the field

 ✓ An element sometimes overlooked in classical discussions about environmental effects: galaxy structures form "*hierarchically*". In this framework a simple distinction between "*nature*" and "*nurture*" is difficult to accomodate

Physical mechanisms

<u>Galaxy mergers</u>:

e.g. Negroponte & White '82, Barnes & Hernquist '91, '92, '96 Mihos & Hernquist '94, '96,

<u>Harassment</u>:

e.g. Spitzer & Baade '51, Richstone '76, Farouki & Shapiro '81, Moore et al. '96, Moore et al. '98

Gas stripping:

e.g. Gunn & Gott '72, Cowie & Songaila '77, Nulsen '82, Quilis et al. '00

Strangulation:

e.g. Larson, Tinsley & Caldwell '80, Balogh, Navarro & Morris '00

AGN heating:

e.g. Churazov et al. '01, Brueggen et al. '02, Della Vecchia et al. '04, Sijacki & Springel '06 +++++++++++

<u>Cannibalism</u>:

e.g. Ostriker & Tremaine '75, White '76, Makumuth & Richstone '84, Merritt '85 WHERE : field + low velocity dispersion groups WHAT : strong internal dynamical response

WHERE : in massive clusters
WHAT : some damage but less than mergers at least on luminous members

WHERE : any "larger" structure

WHAT : suppression of SF, indirect influence (time-scale longer than gas stripping?)

WHERE : centre of massive groups/clusters

WHAT : suppression of cooling flows

WHERE : groups and clusters WHAT : formation of BCGs?

INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

The hierarchical formation of BCGs



De Lucia & Blaizot 2007

Mergers and accretions



How large is the number of progenitors of elliptical galaxies? And how does this vary as a function of mass?

$$N_{\rm eff} = \frac{M_{\rm final}^2}{2\sum_i m_i M_{i,\rm form}}$$

In the case all stars formed in a single object: N=1. In general, it is a fractional value because of the weighting by the galaxy mass in which stars formed

N.B. This figure includes BCGs

De Lucia et al., 2006

How the BCGs gained their mass



Most of the stars of this BCG were not formed in the main branch, but were instead accreted steadily over time. Most of the mass growth is due to accretion -> most of the stars formed in separate entities mostly as a result of quiescent star 14 formation.

De Lucia & Blaizot 2007

The "radio-mode" of AGN feedback



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

The "radio-mode" of AGN feedback



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

Why it works (or not?)



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

A comment on cooling



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

Modeling mergers in SAMs



Different 'fudge' factors, different approximations about Coulomb logarithm and orbital distributions (not shown) are used in different SAMs.

Note this is important for the assembly history of massive galaxies, for the timing of bulge formation, and for evolution of the bright end of the mass function.

De Lucia et al. (2010)

INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste



INA OG Innomical Observatory of Trieste

Mass growth of BCGs

Observational data seem to be compatible with no or little growth since z~1, but recent work find evidence for recent accretion events

One important caveat: the intra-cluster light (see also Monaco et al. 2006)

Model magnitudes do not include stars stripped from other cluster galaxies and/or unbound during mergers



De Lucia & Blaizot 2007

The origin of intra-cluster stars

The production of the DSC is a cumulative process, with no preferred time-scale. There is a large halo-to-halo scatter. Bulk of it becomes unbound at z~1.





Formation of DSC parallels that of the BCGs: most of it comes from particles unbound during mergers, with a minor fraction coming from tidal stripping of satellites.

Murante et al. 2007 (see also Willman+ 2004, Rudick+ 2006, ...)

INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

<u>Caveats</u>

✓ The global fraction of DSC depends on the resolution (increases with higher resolution). Its value has not converged yet and it is generally higher than measured in observations.

 \checkmark It depends (albeit weakly) on the method that is adopted to distinguish between BCGs and DSC.

✓ A significant fraction of the DSC (up to 30%) forms in cold gas clouds stripped from infalling structures. It is not clear if (and how much of) this `intra-cluster star formation' is affected by numerical resolution. (Fluid instabilities might be able to destroy these clouds and suppress this star formation).

✓ Most of the DSC comes from mergers associated with massive galaxies but these simulations do not reproduce well the observed mass function.

Murante et al. 2007; Dolag et al. 2010; Puchwein et al. 2010

The diffuse component in semi-analytic models



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

The environmental history of galaxies



N.B. A significant fraction of the cluster galaxies are accreted onto the main progenitor of the final cluster when they are already satellites.

De Lucia et al., in preparation (see also Berrier et al. 2009, McGee et al. 2009)

Important piece of information when interpreting environmental studies. "Nature" and "nurture" difficult to disentangle in hierarchical cosmogony.



INAF – Astronomical Observatory of Trieste

The environmental history of galaxies

De Lucia et al., in preparation



Large halo-to-halo scatter that would reflect in a scatter in the observed fraction of red/passive galaxies. Trends do not depend significantly on galaxy mass.

The environmental history of galaxies

De Lucia et al., in preparation



But a clear dependence as a function of cluster-centric distance. This is a natural consequence of the incomplete mixing of cluster galaxy populations: galaxies closer to the centre were accreted earlier.

<u>Conclusions (and open issues)</u>

✓ Some suppression of gas condensation (at low z and in relatively massive haloes) is needed in order to explain the cooling flow problem. Current models implement "simple" recipes. Details (duty cycle, geometry, etc.) are still to be understood.

✓ Mergers (and accretions) play an important role in the formation of massive galaxies, but number of important mergers relatively low and still some uncertainties in the modelling.

✓ Formation of the intra-cluster light is associated with that of the massive cluster galaxies. More observational data (distributions, chemical compositions) are coming. Detailed theoretical predictions are needed.

✓ Difficult to understand the role of nature and nurture. One piece of the information that needs to be taken into account is the "environmental history of galaxies".