#### Cloud disruption via ionized feedback: testing simulations by tracing pillar dynamics in Vulpecula



#### Joseph Mottram

with Pamela Klaassen, Jim Dale & Attila Juhasz

Introduction: Pillars of Destruction

#### **Pillars: Historical Context**

- First discovered in the optical (Minkowski 1949)
- Associated with irradiated molecular clouds
- Multi-wavelength high resolution continuum studies only possible recently



Optical

#### **Pillars: Historical Context**

- First discovered in the optical (Minkowski 1949)
- Associated with irradiated molecular clouds
- Multi-wavelength high resolution continuum studies only possible recently



## Pillars: What do they tell us?

- How and at what rate ionising feedback destroys clouds affects:
  - global and local star formation efficiency
  - evolution of revealed protostars (and their disks)
  - early cluster evolution
  - impact of supernovae and propagation of enriched material
- Pillars are a diagnostic of initial density variations and current feedback conditions

- Starting from different initial conditions, all form pillars which look ok, so shape is not a discriminant
- Predict different kinematics



- Example 1 (G09):
  - Paper: Gritschneder+ 2009
  - RDI of a Bonnor-Ebert
    Sphere
  - Global pillar motion relative to cloud: negligible
  - Velocity dispersion: 1-2km/s
  - Internal flows: yes



- Example 2 (G10):
  - Paper: Gritschneder+ 2010
  - Planar ionising flux hitting a supersonic medium
  - Global pillar motion relative to cloud: negligible
  - Velocity dispersion: >3 km/s
  - Internal flows: yes

Colourscale = density



- Example 3 (D12):
  - Paper: Dale+ 2012
  - Ionising cluster inside a filamentary molecular cloud
  - Global pillar motion relative to cloud: 3 km/s
  - Velocity dispersion: ~1 km/s
  - Internal flows: no

## Vulpecula: Ideal for a proof of concept



- Active nearby (2.3 kpc) star formation region
- Many pillars in observations of various surveys



- Active nearby (2.3 kpc) star formation region
- Many pillars in observations of various surveys



- Active nearby (2.3 kpc) star formation region
- Many pillars in observations of various surveys



- Active nearby (2.3 kpc) star formation region
- Many pillars in observations of various surveys



- Active nearby (2.3 kpc) star formation region
- Many pillars in observations of various surveys

Cloud disruption via ionized feedback: tracing pillar dynamics in Vulpecula

Klaassen, Mottram, Dale & Juhasz, 2014, MNRAS, 441, 656

#### Observations

- Tip of VulP3 from Billot+, 2010 observed with CARMA D-array in <sup>12</sup>CO, <sup>13</sup>CO and C<sup>18</sup>O J=1-0
- Data from Exeter FCRAO CO survey (Brunt+, Mottram+, in prep.) used for zero-spacing



#### **Physical Conditions**

- Mean T<sub>dust</sub>=18K from greybody fits to Hi-GAL maps
- Mean N[H2] = 8×10<sup>21</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup> from <sup>13</sup>CO



#### **Physical Conditions**

- n~8×10<sup>3</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup> assuming pillar is a cylinder
- $M=94M_{\odot}$  from <sup>13</sup>CO,  $91M_{\odot}$  from dust



#### **Kinematics**

- <sup>12</sup>CO traces motions along pillar surface
- Velocity dispersion up to 1.4 km/s



#### **Kinematics**

- <sup>13</sup>CO & C<sup>18</sup>O trace pillar core with no internal flows
- Internal velocity dispersion ~0.3-0.5 km/s



#### **Kinematics**

 Pillar is offset from nearby cloud and ionising source by ~6km/s



### **Confronting the Models**

Model	Pillar Motion (km/s)	Velocity Dispersion (km/s)	Internal Flows
Obs	6	Internal: 0.3-0.5 Surface: <1.4	Surface only
G09			
G10			
D12			

### **Confronting the Models**

Model	Pillar Motion (km/s)	Velocity Dispersion (km/s)	Internal Flows
Obs	6	Internal: 0.3-0.5 Surface: <1.4	Surface only
G09	None	1-2	yes
G10	None	>3	yes
D12	3	~1	no

### **Confronting the Models**

Model	Pillar Motion (km/s)	Velocity Dispersion (km/s)	Internal Flows
Obs	6	Internal: 0.3-0.5 Surface: <1.4	Surface only
G09	None	1-2	yes
G10	None	>3 🗙	yes
D12	3	~1 🖌	no

- G10 model ruled out (too large velocity dispersion)
- Not able to distinguish between two others

Conclusions: A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step

#### **Conclusions & Next Steps**

- The gas kinematics of pillars are an important discriminant between models of ionising feedback
- For a pillar in Vulpecula, we have ruled out one model (G10)
- More likely that pillars are filaments being revealed rather than formed by feedback
- High resolution observations of a larger number of pillars are needed to reveal property distributions, enabling global conclusions -> ALMA

# Thank you for your attention. Any questions?



Klaassen, Mottram, Dale & Juhasz, 2014, MNRAS, 441, 656

#### Cores spaced by Jeans Length

- From n~8×10<sup>-3</sup> cm<sup>-3</sup>, T=18 K -> Jeans length is 0.3 pc
- Two cores seen in C<sup>18</sup>O are spaced by ~0.3 pc
- Masses ~15 M<sub>☉</sub> from <sup>13</sup>CO (corrected for τ using C<sup>18</sup>O)
- ~30% of mass of pillar is in cores, so overall SFE unlikely to exceed 10%



#### Rate of cloud destruction

- Assuming constant spherical expansion at 6km/s:
  - Clears 6×10<sup>-5</sup> pc per year
  - Alternatively, clears  $1pc^3$  in  $1.6 \times 10^4$  yrs
  - Given distance to ionising source of 16pc, suggests that ionisation began ~2.6×10<sup>5</sup> yrs ago
  - This is on the order of the Class 0 or MYSO lifetimes (Evans et al., 2009, Mottram et al., 2011b)
  - Thus, anything more evolved (e.g. Class I/II) must have started forming before onset of ionisation