



14-8

To go deep one needs to go to space

Redshift Surveys

GHRS: The Goddard High Resolution Spectrograph (04.1990–02.1997)

• HSP: The High Speed Photometer (04.1990–10.1993)

 WFPC2 The Wide Field Planetary Camera 2 (12.1993–05.2009) WF/PC-1: Wide Field Planetary Camera 1 (04.1990–10.1993)











South, 10 d of total observ-1998: Hubble Deep Field ing time!



and Multi-Object Spectrometer (NICMOS); diameter: 3' (2 \times HDF) Near Infrared Camera $z\gtrsim 7$ IR reveals many red-dened objects long exposure of field galaxies visible, up to Deep Field, 1 Msec in Fornax. Uses updated HST with Ad-Surveys (ACS) and Limiting magnitude: vanced Camera for 2004: Hubble Ultra $30\,\text{mag},\sim\!10000$



Hubble Ultra Deep Field Details





same region as HUDF, "Hubble Ultra Deep Field September 2009: WFC3 2009 August 26 – 2009 deeper (data taken in Infrared"). Exposure: pushes HUDF even 48 h



⇒ low interstellar absorp-XMM-Newton, Hasinger et al., active galaxies with z!Lockman Hole: Northern Sky region with very low → "Window in the sky" blue: hard X-ray spectrum, → X-rays: evolution of 2001, tion $N_{\rm H}$



region in Fornax ($lpha_{
m J2000.0}$ = $3^{h}32^{m}28.0^{s}$, $\delta_{J2000.0} = -27^{\circ}48'30''$, coaligned with Chandra Deep Field South: 1 Msec (10.8 days) on one color code: spectral hardness Deepest X-ray field ever HDF-S

NASA/JHU/AUI/R. Giacconi et scale: $15' \times 15'$; courtesy al.





Joint multi-wavelength campaigns allow the measurement of broad-band spectra of

sources in the early universe!



COSMOS-field: large X-ray survey for Galaxy Clusters



 \Longrightarrow GOODS-Survey (Great Observatories Origins Deep Survey), centered on CDF-S (same image as before, this time smoothed)





GOODS

CXC/NASA

(-RAY & INFRAREI

-RAY &

IR, optical, and X-ray image of small fraction of

Chandra Deep Field South Chandra X-ray Observatory

Chandra and HST fields aligned



HST ACS observations of whole area of CDF-S

veys: Technology	D and 3D Surveys observing large part of sky	LCRS): 26418 redshifts in six $1.5 \times 80^{\circ}$ slices = 0.2. ies	galaxies, 10 ⁷ stars around SGP, 10% of sky, (Mt. Hopkins/CTIO) completed 2000 Octo-	llaxies, accompanying redshift survey (8dF, dedicated 2000 October 5, Apache Point	10 ⁸ objects, now in Google Earth .SST,…).	25		SDSS 2.5 m telescope at Apache Point Observatory
2D/3D Sur	Future for Large Scale Structure: 21 with dedicated instruments. Currently largest surveys:	Las Campanas Redshift Survey (around NGP and SGP, out to <i>z</i> = CfA Redshift Survey: 30000 galax	APM: (Oxford University) $2 \sim 10^6$ through $B = 21$ mag. 2MASS: IR Survey of complete sky	ber 25), 3 bands, $\sim~2~\times~10^\circ$ ga CfA) CfA) Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS):	Obs., NM, 25% of whole sky, ~ ⁻ And many more (e.g., Keck, ESO, L	Redshift Surveys		
					CDFS: blue boxes contain objects not visible in HST	\implies farthest black holes known		alescope STSc/Caltech 1/200th of the whole GOODS field in optical and IR

courtesy SDSS

Hubble Space

1



-20

-18 < M,

-23 < M, -22 < M, -22



(Tegmark et al., 2004, Fig. 4)

500

Comoving x [h⁻¹ Mpc] (towards ra=0)

0

-500

2D/3D Surveys: Technology

Galaxy distribution from the SDSS



Spectroscopy with grism (combination of prism and grating), light from objects via optical fibers and plug plate.

Redshift Surveys

28



The complete LCRS survey (at *cz* large: reach mag. limit)



Galaxies in APM catalogue, color: avg. B in pixel: blue (18) – green (19) – red (20)





eROSITA (extended ROentgen Survey with an Imaging Telescope Array) on Spectrum-XG

- Launch: Nov 2014, 4 year survey + pointed phase.
- Collaboration: Germany (MPE, IAAT, AIP, FAU, Hamburg)+Russia
 - Extends ROSAT survey to 10 keV, 30× deeper
 3 000 000 supermassive black holes
 - 100 000 galaxy clusters $\Longrightarrow \Lambda, w$



2

Structures: Quantitative Description

Structures: Quantitative Description

က



Structures: Quantitative Description

S

Structures: Quantitative Description

 \sim



10

Structures: Quantitative Description

Structures: Quantitative Description

ດ

7



Structures: Quantitative Description



ო

Structure Formation

, -

Structure Formation

	14–55		
Linear Theory	$\left(\right)$		1641
Insert \overline{a} , $\overline{\rho}$ into Eq. (14.50):		A better derivation of the Jeans length comes from considering the evolution of a fluid in an expanding universe. Assuming that the initia we can use perturbation theory for obtaining deviations from homogeneity (estructures).	density perturbations were small
400 - 10/200 - 10 - 200		ln a Friedmann universe, for length scales < 1//H, dynamical equations are Newtonian to first order, but we need to still use the scale t Continutly equation:	stor, $a(t)$ in the fluid equations.
$-\frac{-\frac{100}{3}t^{-1/3}}{3}\left(\frac{\frac{200}{3}t^{-1/3}\delta + a_0t^{2/3}\delta}{3}\right) = \frac{300}{3}\rho_0t^{-2}a_0^2t^{4/3}\delta$	(14.52)	$\dot{ ho}+ abla\cdot(ho ho)=0$ Etler's equation:	(14.58
and simplify		$\dot{\mathbf{v}} + (v \cdot \nabla)v = -\nabla \left(\mathbf{\Phi} + \frac{c}{\sigma} \right)$	(14.59
$-t^{-2/3}\delta - t^{1/3}\dot{\delta} = 2\pi G ho_0 t^{-2/3}\delta$	(14.53)	Poisson's equation: $ abla^2 = 4\pi G ho$. Without perturbations (i.e., the zeroth order solution) is given by the normal Friedmann solutions:	(14.60
which gives		$ ho_0(t,\mathbf{r})=rac{ ho_0}{a^3(t)}$ (dilution by expansion)	(14.61
$t\dot{ extsf{k}} \pm (1+2\pi G_{0n})\delta = 0$	(14 54)	$\mathbf{v}_0(t,\mathbf{r}) = rac{\dot{a}(t)}{a(t)}\mathbf{r}$ (Hubble law)	(14.62
	(+)	$\Phi_0(t, \mathbf{r}) = \frac{2\pi G \rho_0 \mu^4}{3}$ (solin of Patsion with $\rho = \text{const.}$)	(14.63
The general solution of Eq. (14.54) is a power-law		Convert into comoving coordinates $(\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{r}/a(t))$ to get rid of the $a(t)$'s and write down perturbation equations:	
⇒ Growth of structure!		$p(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho_0(t) + \rho_1(t) =: \rho_0(t) (1 + \delta(t, \mathbf{x}))$ $\mathbf{v}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}_0(t, \mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}_1(t, \mathbf{x})$	(14.65 (14.65
Since also <i>negative</i> PL indexes possible		$\Phi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi_0(t, \mathbf{x}) + \Phi_1(t, \mathbf{x})$ where $ \delta , \mathbf{v}_1 $, $ \Phi_1 $ small (δ is called density perturbation field).	(14.66
→ Some initial perturbations can be damped out!		Since the equations are spatially homogeneous, we can Fourier transform them to search for plane wave solutions. The general pert found by performing linear combinations of these plane waves.	bation solution can then later b
We need a better theory to do that in detail		$\delta(t,\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \delta(t,\mathbf{k}) \mathrm{d}^3\mathbf{k} \iff \delta(t,\mathbf{k}) = \int e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \delta(t,\mathbf{x}) \mathrm{d}^3x$	(14.67
		Inserting into hydro equatoris gives $\ddot{\delta}(t,\mathbf{k}) + 2\frac{\dot{\alpha}(t)}{\alpha(t)}\dot{\delta}(t,\mathbf{k}) + \left(\frac{k^2 d_s^2}{\alpha^2(t)} - 4\pi G_{P0}\right)\delta(t,\mathbf{k}) = 0$	(14.66
Structure Formation	4		
	14–56		
Linear Theory	$\left(\right)$	14-56	
Better linear theory: Use linearized equations of motion from hydrodynamics.		where the sound speed is $c_2^2 = (\partial p/\partial p)_{\rm methodsc}.$ Solutions to Eq. 14.68 grow or decrease depending on sign of	
Detailed theory very difficult, see handout for a few ideas of what is going on		$\kappa_{\rm J} = \left(\frac{\pi^2}{a^2(t)} - 4\pi G\rho_0\right)$	(14.6
Classical approach, considering a collapsing sphere:		inus, growm is any possible for $k > \lambda_3$ where $k_3 = \sqrt{4\pi G \rho_{0} \alpha^2(t)}$	(14.7
Potential energy and kinetic energy content of sphere:		or, in terms of physical wavelengths,	
$U = -\frac{1}{2} \int \rho(x) \Phi(x) \mathrm{d}^3 x \sim -\frac{16\pi^2}{15} G \rho^2 r^5 \text{and} T \sim \frac{c_{\mathrm{s}}^2}{2} \frac{4\pi r^3 \rho}{3}$	(14.55)	$\lambda_{\rm J}=\frac{excel}{k_{\rm J}}=c_{\rm s}\sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{\rm r}}{G\rho_{\rm b}}}$ the Jeans length.	(14.7
$c_{ m s}$: speed of sound; for neutral Hydrogen, $c_{ m s}=\sqrt{5T/3m_{ m p}}.$			
Sphere collapses for $\left U ight >T$, i.e., when			
$2r\gtrsim\sqrt{rac{5}{2\pi}}\sqrt{rac{c_{ m s}^2}{G ho}}\sim c_{ m s}\sqrt{rac{\pi}{G ho}}=:\lambda_{ m J}$	(14.56)		
$\lambda_{ m J}$ is called the Jeans length, the corresponding mass is the Jeans mass,			
$M_{\rm J}=rac{\pi}{6} ho\lambda_{ m J}^3$	(14.57)		
Structures with $m < M_{ m J}$ cannot grow.			
Note that $c_{ m s}$ is time dependent $\Longrightarrow M_{ m J}$ can change with time!			

(14.69)

(14.70) (14.71)

(14.58) (14.59) (14.60)

(14.61) (14.62) (14.63)

Structure Formation

ß

Ctructure Formation and DM	Structure formation with dark matter: DM unaffected by radiation pressure ==> collapse of smaller structures possible	⇒ bottom-up model	As long as DM is relativistic: $M_{\rm U,HDM} = \frac{\pi \rho_{\rm DM}}{6} \left(\frac{\pi c_{\rm DM}}{G_{\rm DM}} \right)^{3/2} \tag{1}$		Hot Dark Matter: $c_{HDM} \sim c/\sqrt{3}$ Cold Dark Matter: $c_{CDM} \ll c/\sqrt{3}$ Standard CDM Scenario:	 DM cools long before tree CDM structures form, M_J about galaxy mass, while baryons coupled to radiation → stay 	e t _{rec} : matter decouples, falls in DM gravity wells	Gives not exactly observed power spectrum → CUM and ADM	Structure Formation		Structure Formation and DM	Finally, the real linear theory has to be done in linearized or even full general	ativity	→ very, very complicated.	Full fledged, detailed structure formation is mainly done numerically.	<i>N</i> -body codes: describe particles (=galaxies) as points, compute mutual intetions in expanding universe	Requires massive computing power.	VIRGO consortium: USA, Canada, Germany, UK	followed by the Millenium Simulation (30 d CPU time)	see Springel et al. (2005), Springel et al. (2006) and
14-57	tarry universe: radiation dominates: $c_{\rm s}=c/\sqrt{3}$ and $ ho c^2=\sigma T^4$ (14.72)	ind therefore	$\lambda_{\rm J,rad} = c^2 \sqrt{\pi/3} G \sigma T^4 \propto \rho_{\rm r}^{-1/2} \propto a^2 \text{and} M_{\rm J} \propto \rho_{\rm m} \lambda_{\rm J,rad}^3 \propto a^3 \tag{14.73}$	In the early universe, the Jeans mass grows quickly.	it time of radiation – matter equilibrium, $\rho_{\rm m}=\rho_{\rm rad}=\sigma T_{\rm eq}^4/c^2 \tag{14.74}$	$M_{\rm J}(t_{\rm eq}) = \frac{\pi^{5/2}}{18\sqrt{3}} \frac{c^4}{G^{3/2}\sigma^{1/2}} \frac{1}{T_{\rm eq}} \sim \frac{3.6 \times 10^{16} (\Omega_0 h^2)^{-2} M_{\odot}}{(T/T_{\rm eq})^3} $ (14.75)	ssuming $1 + z_{eq} = 24000 \Omega_0 h^2$. \Rightarrow much larger than mass in galaxy cluster (\sim mass of (50 Mpc) ³ -cube)	Verdense regions with $m < M_{J,\text{rad}}$ are smoothed out by the radiation coupling to matter. fuch larger structures also cannot grow since λ is larger than horizon radius \Longrightarrow Mass spectrum of possible tructures.	structure Formation 6	14-58	Classical Structure Formation	(tter $t_{ m eq}$ not much happens until $T_{ m rec} \sim 3000$ K	⇒ recombination ⇒ Sound speed drops dramatically (radiation and matter decouple):		$c_{\rm s} \sim \frac{n_{\rm d}}{m_{\rm p}} \sim 5{\rm kms^{-1}}$ (14.76)	$\Rightarrow M_{ m J}$ drops by 10 ¹¹ : $M_{ m Loc} = rac{\piar{ ho}}{M} \left(rac{\pi kT_{ m rec}}{M} ight)^{1/2} \sim 5 imes 10^5 (\Omega_{ m c} h^2)^{-1/2} M_{\odot}$ (14.77)	ther that M_i drows because of expansion	bo, in a pure matter universe: huge structures (Zeldovich pancakes) form early, and then frag-	rent at recombination. —> top-down model Problem: This is not really what has been observed (i.e., galaxy clusters are not yet fully formed,	ut galaxies are) So <i>lution:</i> Dark matter

Structure Formation

 \sim

The Hubble Volume Simulation

 $\Omega=0.3, \Lambda=0.7, h=0.7, \sigma_8=0.9$ (ACDM)



1500 Mpc/h



ADM, pie shows SDSS size



Evolution of structure in a ACDM Universe (MPA/V. Springel)



(V. Springel/MPA)



The VIRGO Collaboration 1996



Todays dark matter distribution...(V. Springel/MPA)







... and corresponding galaxy distribution (V. Springel/MPA)



Zoom into the DM structure of the Millennium Simulation



Van Waerbeke, Heymans, and CFHTLens collaboration DM Distribution from CFHTLens project (spring 2011 region)



Flight through the DM structure of the Millennium Simulation (V. Springel)



14-76

Initial conditions

23

Structure Formation



Initial conditions

ო

Initial conditions

ß



CMBR

Expect following features:

- Large angle anisotropy: (small $\ell,$ scales \gtrsim horizon at decoupling): Flat part due to Sachs-Wolfe effect
- Smaller angular scales: (larger ℓ): Influenced by photon-baryon interactions: Matter falls in potential well
- ⇒ Pressure resists
- ⇒ acoustic oscillations
- ⇒ Power at selected scales!

Power from those density fluctuations which had their maximum amplitude at time of last scattering dominates \Longrightarrow acoustic peak

Also damping from photon diffusion (Compton scattering; Silk damping [after Joseph Silk])

Initial conditions





Enter: BOOMERANG (Balloon Observations of Milimetric Extragalactic Radiation and Geophysics), Flight in Antarctica 1998 December 29 – 1999 January 9

ശ



Other balloon missions: MAXIMA-1,...





Anisotropy Probe (WMAP): Launched 2001 June Wilkinson Microwave

- 30, measurements began 2001 August 10
- Orbit around 2nd Lagrange Point of Sun-Earth System
- Highly precise radiometers of high spatial resolution (best: 0.21°
 - FWHM in W-Band at 3.2 mm) in five wavebands

(see Bennett et al. 2003 for an overview).





Foreground features of the microwave sky (Bennett et al., 2003). Sunyaev Zeldovich effect is expected to be strongest in Coma cluster, temperatures of -0.34 ± 0.18 mK in W and -0.24 ± 0.18 mK in K-band; barely detectable with WMAP, does not contaminate maps.



WMAP, Q-Band, λ = 7.3 mm, ν = 40.7 GHz, θ = 0.49° FWHM



WMAP, K-Band, $\lambda = 13$ mm, $\nu = 22.8$ GHz, $\theta = 0.83^{\circ}$ FWHM



WMAP, W-Band, $\lambda = 3.2$ mm, $\nu = 93.5$ GHz, $\theta = 0.21^\circ$ FWHM

 May 14, 2009: Launch of the <i>Planck</i> satellite (together with <i>Herschel</i>). Mapping the CMB with micro-Kelvin sensitivity (∆<i>T</i>/<i>T</i> = 10⁻⁶). Better separation of CMB from Galactic and extragalactic foreground radiation through multi-frequency mapping (27 GHz - 1 THz). Detect CMB anisotropies in polarized emission. First science results published in January 2011. Detector ran out of coolant in January 2012. 	
protection of Galaxy foreground radiation	Power Spectrum Best fit parameters for WMAP data after 7 years of measurements (Jarosik et al., 2010): $n_{0} = 0.0456(16)$ $\Omega_{0} = 0.0456(16)$ $\Omega_{0} = 0.0456(16)$ $\Omega_{0} = 0.0227(14)$ $\Omega_{0} = 0.0227(16)$ $\Omega_{0} = 0.023\pm 0.030$ Age = 13.75(11) Gyr $\Omega_{0} = 13.75(11)$ Gyr hower spectrum requires that Λ behaves like a cosmological con-
Different spectral sig	² ² ² ² ² ² ² ² ² ²

o

0.

> HFI 857 GHz

HFI 545 GHz

HFI 353 GHz

⇒ Very good agreement be-tween data and theory!

(WMAP, 7 year data; Larson et al., 2010, Fig. 1)

-94

WMAP

ω



Strauss, M. A., 1999, in Structure Formation in the Universe, ed. A. Dekel, J. P. Ostriker, (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press) Peebles, P. J. E., 1980, The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press) Jaffe, A. H., Ade, P. A. R., Balbi, A., et al. 2000, Phys. Rev. Lett., submitted (astro-ph/0007333) Jarosik, N., Bennett, C. L., Dunkley, J., et al. 2010, ApJ, in press (arXiv:1001.4744) Peacock, J. A., 1999, Cosmological Physics, (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press) Larson, D., Dunkley, J., Hinshaw, G., et al. 2010, ApJ, in press (arXiv:1001.4635) Tegmark, M., Blanton, M. R., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2004, ApJ, 606, 702 Springel, V., White, S. D. M., Jenkins, A., et al. 2005, Nature, 435, 629 Cole, S., Percival, W. J., Peacock, J. A., et al. 2005, MNRAS, 362, 505 Tucker, D. L., Oemler, A., Kirshner, R. P., et al. 1997, MNRAS, 285, L5 Bennett, C. L., Halpern, M., Hinshaw, G., et al. 2003, ApJ, submitted Springel, V., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 2006, Nature, 440, 1137 de Lapparent, V., Geller, M. J., & Huchra, J. P. 1986, ApJ, 302, L1 Iliev, I. T., Mellema, G., Pen, U.-L., et al. 2006, MNRAS, 369, 1625 Spergel, D. N., Verde, L., Peiris, H. V., et al. 2003, ApJ, submitted Spergel, D. N., Bean, R., Doré, O., et al. 2007, ApJS, 170, 377 Hamilton, A. J. S., & Tegmark, M. 2002, MNRAS, 330, 506 Strauss, M. A., & Willick, J. A. 1995, Phys. Rep., 261, 271 Bahcall, N. A., & Soneira, R. M. 1983, ApJ, 270, 20 Eisenstein, D. J., & Hu, W. 1999, ApJ, 511, 5



The End