ON THE MEASUREMENT OF THE MAGNITUDE AND ORIENTATION OF THE MAGNETIC FIELD IN MOLECULAR CLOUDS

MARTIN HOUDE,¹ PIERRE BASTIEN,² JESSIE L. DOTSON,³ C. DARREN DOWELL,⁴ ROGER H. HILDEBRAND,^{5,6} RUISHENG PENG,¹

Thomas G. Phillips, $^4\,$ John E. Vaillancourt, $^5\,$ and Hiroshige Yoshida $^1\,$

Received 2001 November 8; accepted 2001 December 26

ABSTRACT

We demonstrate that the combination of Zeeman, polarimetry, and ion-to-neutral molecular line width ratio measurements permits the determination of the magnitude and orientation of the magnetic field in the weakly ionized parts of molecular clouds. Zeeman measurements provide the strength of the magnetic field along the line of sight, polarimetry measurements give the field orientation in the plane of the sky, and the ion-to-neutral molecular line width ratio determines the angle between the magnetic field and the line of sight. We apply the technique to the M17 star-forming region using a HERTZ 350 μ m polarimetry map and HCO⁺-to-HCN molecular line width ratios to provide the first three-dimensional view of the magnetic field in M17.

Subject headings: ISM: clouds — ISM: individual (M17) — ISM: magnetic fields — polarization — radio lines: ISM

On-line material: color figure

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we propose a method that will permit the determination of the magnitude and orientation of the magnetic field in the weakly ionized parts of molecular clouds. As it turns out, the magnetic field can be specified with three parameters: its magnitude *B*, the viewing angle α defining its orientation relative to the line of sight, and the angle β made by its projection on the plane of the sky (as defined relative to a predetermined direction, east from north; see Fig. 1). Until now, of these three quantities only the third could be measured. At submillimeter wavelengths this can be accomplished, for example, with polarization measurements of the continuum radiation emanating from elongated dust grains that are aligned by the local magnetic field (Davis & Greenstein 1951). The angle β is thus obtained from the angle of the polarization vector. The projection of the magnetic field vector in the plane of the sky is oriented at right angles to the polarization vector (Hildebrand 1988). The magnitude B cannot be measured directly; only the projection of the magnetic field vector to the line of sight B_{los} can be obtained with Zeeman measurements. Despite the inherent difficulties associated with this technique, numerous molecular clouds have lately been successfully studied using measurements of interstellar lines from the H I, OH, and CN species (e.g., Brogan & Troland 2001; Brogan et al. 1999; Crutcher et al. 1993, 1999; Heiles 1997). For general cases, where the magnetic field lies out of the plane of the sky, a determination of the viewing angle α , in combination with the meas-

¹Caltech Submillimeter Observatory, 111 Nowelo Street, Hilo, HI 96720; houde@submm.caltech.edu.

² Département de Physique, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC H3C 3J7, Canada.

³ SETI Institute, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035.

⁴ California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125.

⁵ Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.

⁶ Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.

urements for B_{los} and β , would provide a description of the magnetic field vector **B**. Up to now, this has been impossible to achieve.

Starting with the next section, we will show how the determination of the viewing angle α can be accomplished through a comparison of the profile of line spectra from coexistent ion and molecular species (we will use HCO+ and HCN). Our analysis will be based on the material presented by Houde et al. (2000a, 2000b), and we will show that the ion-to-neutral line width ratio, as defined by these authors, is a fundamental parameter and holds the key to the determination of the viewing angle. We will then apply and test our new technique with data obtained for the M17 molecular cloud. More precisely, we will combine our HCO⁺ and HCN spectroscopic data with an extensive 350 μ m continuum polarimetry map obtained with the HERTZ polarimeter (Dowell et al. 1998) at the Caltech Submillimeter Observatory (CSO) to provide the first three-dimensional view of the magnetic field in M17.

In this paper, we will focus more on the presentation and the discussion of our technique, rather than the interpretation of the magnetic field results for M17. That aspect will be treated in a subsequent paper.

2. ION-TO-NEUTRAL LINE WIDTH RATIO

Houde et al. (2000a, 2000b) have recently shown how a comparison of the line profiles of coexistent neutral and ion species can be used to detect the presence of the magnetic field in molecular clouds. Assuming a weakly ionized plasma, elastic collisions, and the presence of neutral flows or turbulence in the region under study, they arrived at the conclusion that in the core of molecular clouds, the width of line profiles of molecular ions should in general be less than that of coexistent neutral molecular species.

In considering an idealized situation where they investigated the behavior of an isolated ion subjected to the presence of a neutral flow, they found the following equations



FIG. 1.—Definition of the coordinate system (axes N for north, E for east, and LOS for line of sight) and of the angles α and β characterizing the spatial orientation of the magnetic field vector (*thick line and arrow*).

for the mean and variance of its velocity components:

$$\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel,i} \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\parallel,n} \rangle , \qquad (1)$$

$$\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,i} \rangle = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,n} \rangle + \langle \omega_{r,i} \rangle^{-1} (\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,n} \rangle \times \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{g,i} \rangle)}{1 + (\langle \omega_{g,i} \rangle / \langle \omega_{r,i} \rangle)^2} , \qquad (2)$$

$$\sigma_{\parallel,i}^{2} = \frac{a(\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,n}^{2} \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,i} \rangle^{2}) + b \ \sigma_{\parallel,n}^{2}}{m_{i}/\mu_{i} - 1} , \qquad (3)$$

$$\sigma_{\perp,i}^{2} = \frac{g(\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,n}^{2} \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,i} \rangle^{2}) + h \sigma_{\parallel,n}^{2}}{m_{i}/\mu_{i} - 1}, \qquad (4)$$

$$\sigma_{T,i}^2 = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,n}^2 \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{\perp,i} \rangle^2 + \sigma_{\parallel,n}^2}{m_i/\mu_i - 1} , \qquad (5)$$

with

$$\langle \omega_{g,i} \rangle = \frac{e \langle \boldsymbol{B} \rangle}{m_i c} ,$$
 (6)

$$\langle \omega_{r,i} \rangle \simeq \frac{\mu_i}{m_i} \nu_{c,i} , \qquad (7)$$

$$\sigma_{T,n}^2 = \langle \boldsymbol{v}_n^2 \rangle - \langle \boldsymbol{v}_n \rangle^2 , \qquad (8)$$

where m_i and μ_i are the ion mass and reduced mass, respectively. The ion and neutral flow velocities (v_i and v_n) were broken into two components, one parallel to the magnetic field ($v_{\parallel,i}$ and $v_{\parallel,n}$) and another ($v_{\perp,i}$ and $v_{\perp,n}$) perpendicular to it. The values $\langle \omega_{r,i} \rangle$, $\langle \omega_{g,i} \rangle$, and $\nu_{c,i}$ are the ion relaxation rate, mean gyrofrequency vector, and collision rate, respectively. Under the assumption that the neutral flow consists mainly of molecular hydrogen and has a mean molecular mass $A_n = 2.3$, we get $a \simeq 0.16$, $b \simeq 0.67$, g = 1 - a, and h = 1 - b.

It was the study of this set of equations that led Houde et al. (2000a) to the conclusion that the presence of a magnetic field in the weakly ionized part of molecular clouds will generally lead to ion molecular line profiles of narrower width when compared to those of coexistent neutral species. This fact was expressed more quantitatively in their subsequent paper (Houde et al. 2000b), in which expressions for the ion and neutral line widths were derived for the special case where the region under consideration has an azimuthal symmetry about the axis defined by the direction of the magnetic field and a reflection symmetry across the plane perpendicular to this axis. In such instances, the line widths $(\sigma_{l,n} \text{ and } \sigma_{l,i} \text{ for the neutrals and ions, respectively})$ can be expressed by their variance as

$$\sigma_{l,n}^{2} = \sum_{k} C^{k} \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{n}^{k} \rangle^{2} \left[\cos^{2}(\theta^{k}) \cos^{2}(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} \sin^{2}(\theta^{k}) \sin^{2}(\alpha) \right] ,$$

$$(9)$$

$$\sigma_{l,i}^{2} \simeq \sum_{k} C^{k} \langle \boldsymbol{v}_{n}^{k} \rangle^{2} \left\{ \cos^{2}(\theta^{k}) \cos^{2}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin^{2}(\theta^{k})}{m_{i}/\mu_{i} - 1} \left[a \cos^{2}(\alpha) + \frac{g}{2} \sin^{2}(\alpha) \right] \right\} ,$$

$$(10)$$

where it was assumed that the different neutral flows of velocity \boldsymbol{v}_n^k at an angle θ^k relative to the axis of symmetry do not have any intrinsic dispersion. The term C^k is the weight associated with the neutral flow k, which presumably scales with the particle density (we assume ions and neutrals exist in similar proportions). An example of such a configuration is shown in Figure 2. It is important to realize that although the type of geometry presented in this figure (a bipolar outflow) has the aforementioned characteristics, we are not lim-



FIG. 2.—Example of a neutral flow configuration. The flows (*thin lines and arrows*) are all contained within a cone of angular width $\Delta\theta$ centered on the symmetry axis as defined by the orientation magnetic field vector (*thick line and arrow*).

ited to this model. What matters is the relative orientation of the individual neutral flows and not their position in space; i.e., all the flows shown in Figure 2 could be arbitrarily repositioned and equations (9) and (10) would still apply (as long as all the flows are contained in the region under study).

An important feature that can be assessed from equations (9) and (10) is that the line width ratio $\sigma_{l,i}/\sigma_{l,n}$ is not only a function of the orientation of the neutral flows but also of the viewing angle α . It is easy to show that $\sigma_{l,n} \simeq \sigma_{l,i}$ when the magnetic field is oriented parallel to the line of sight (i.e., when $\alpha = 0$) and that the line width ratio is minimum when the magnetic field is in the plane of the sky (when $\alpha = \pi/2$), with

$$\frac{\sigma_{l,i}}{\sigma_{l,n}} \simeq \left(\frac{g}{m_i/\mu_i - 1}\right)^{1/2} \simeq 0.26$$

for HCO⁺ (with $\theta^k \neq 0$ for at least one value of k; Houde et al. 2001).

We present in Table 1 the line width ratios measured for a relatively large sample of molecular clouds. As can be seen, with the exception of HH 7–11 and Mon R2, which have ratios of very nearly unity, every source shows the ion molecular species as having a narrower line width than the corresponding coexistent neutral species.

This aspect is made even more evident by studying Figure 3, where we plotted the ion line width against the corresponding neutral line width for every object and pair of



FIG. 3.—Ion line width vs. the neutral line width for every pair of spectra obtained for the sources presented in Table 1. HCO⁺ is plotted against HCN and H¹³CO⁺ against H¹³CN. The two straight lines correspond to the upper and lower limits discussed in the text, where the line width ratio is $\simeq 1$ and $\simeq 0.26$, respectively. The cluster of open circles pertains to spectra obtained on the same object (M17, which will be discussed later).

	Coor (B1	dinates 950.0)	1)	(Ratio)	
Source	R.A.	Decl.	$({\rm km}{\rm s}^{-1})$	Thick ^a	Thin ^b
W3 IRS 5	02 21 53.3	61 52 21.4	-38.1	0.43	0.39
Gl 490	03 23 38.8	58 36 39.0	-13.4	0.61	0.69
НН 7–11	03 25 58.2	31 05 46.0	8.4	1.02	
NGC 1333 IRAS 4	03 26 05.0	31 03 13.1	8.4	0.32	
L1551 IRS 5	04 28 40.2	18 01 41.0	6.3	0.89	
OMC-1	05 32 47.2	-052425.3	9.0	0.55 ^c	0.22
OMC-3 MMS 6	05 32 55.6	-050325.0	11.3	0.51	0.48
OMC-2 FIR 4	05 32 59.0	-05 11 54.0	11.2	0.76	0.27
L1641N	05 33 52.5	-062400.0	7.5	0.65	
NGC 2024 FIR 5	05 39 12.7	-01 57 03.3	11.5	0.95	
NGC 2071	05 44 30.2	00 20 42.0	9.5	0.93	0.64
Mon R2	06 05 20.3	-062247.0	10.5	1.03	
GGD 12	06 08 23.9	-061104.0	10.9	0.78	
S269	06 11 46.4	13 50 33.0	19.2	0.69	
AFGL 961E	06 31 59.1	04 15 09.0	13.7	0.95	
NGC 2264	06 38 25.6	09 32 19.0	8.2	0.85	0.88
M17 SWN	18 17 29.8	-16 12 55.0	19.6	0.90	0.81
M17 SWS	18 17 31.8	-161505.0	19.7	0.90	0.78
DR 21(OH)	20 37 13.0	42 12 00.0	-2.6	0.80	0.69
DR 21	20 37 14.5	42 09 00.0	-2.7	0.98	0.58
S140	22 17 40.0	63 03 30.0	-7.0	0.80	0.85

 TABLE 1

 Ion-to-Neutral Line Width Ratios in Star-forming Regions

NOTE.—Units of right ascension are hours, minutes, and seconds, and units of declination are degrees, arcminutes, and arcseconds.

^a From the ratio of HCO⁺ to HCN line width.

 $^{\rm b}$ From the root mean square of ratios of $\rm H^{13}CO^+$ to $\rm H^{13}CN$ line width.

^c We have corrected the previous value of 0.19 published by Houde et al. 2000b.

molecular species studied so far (HCO⁺ is plotted against HCN and H¹³CO⁺ against H¹³CN). The two straight lines correspond to the upper and lower limits discussed above; the steeper of the two (with a slope of \simeq 1) arises when the magnetic field is oriented in a direction parallel to the line of sight, while the other (with a slope of \simeq 0.26) arises when the field lies in the plane of the sky. As can be readily seen from this figure, the data obtained so far are in excellent agreement with the Houde et al. (2001) model and the prediction it makes. Even the lower limit of \simeq 0.26 for the line width ratio predicted by the simple model defined earlier appears to be fairly accurate, since only two of the more than 90 plotted points have a ratio lower than this value, and then only slightly.

These results have important implications for the study of the magnetic field in molecular clouds. Namely,

1. In the weakly ionized regions of turbulent molecular clouds, the neutrals drive the ions. If the opposite were true, we would expect the ion species to exhibit line profiles that would be at least as broad as those of coexistent neutral species and probably broader (Houde et al. 2001), contrary to observation.

2. The difference in the width of the line profiles of coexistent ion and neutral molecular species implies that *the coupling between ions and neutrals is poor in the core of molecular clouds*, at least at the scales probed by our observations (up to a few tenths of a parsec).

3. At the spatial resolution attained with our observations (we have a beam width of $\approx 20''$ in most cases), the diffusion between ions and neutrals can be studied through a comparison of the width of their line profiles. It then appears from our results that *the drift speed between ions and neutrals can often be significant in the core of molecular clouds* (on the order of a few km s⁻¹ at the gas densities probed with the molecular species used here, i.e., $n \gtrsim 10^6$ cm⁻³).

3. DETERMINATION OF THE VIEWING ANGLE α

From our previous discussion leading to equations (9) and (10) and the determination of the upper and lower limits for the line width ratio, one might infer that this parameter could possibly convey important information about the angle α that the magnetic field makes relative to the line of sight. More precisely, since the line width ratio is maximum at approximately unity when the field is aligned with the line of sight ($\alpha = 0$) and decreases to a minimum of $\simeq 0.26$ when the field lies in the plane of the sky ($\alpha = \pi/2$), we could be justified in hoping that it might be a well-behaved function that decreases monotonically with increasing α .

We can explore this proposition by using our earlier model of symmetrical neutral flow configuration. For example, we could define cases with different amounts of collimation for the neutral flows around the axis of symmetry specified by the orientation of the magnetic field. An example was shown in Figure 2, where all of the neutral flows are contained within a cone of angular width $\Delta\theta$. Using such a model, with the additional simplification that the neutral flow angle θ^k is independent of the velocity \boldsymbol{v}_n^k , theoretical line widths $\sigma_{l,n}$ and $\sigma_{l,i}$ can be calculated for different values of $\Delta\theta$ using equations (9) and (10). We then get for the square of the ratio

$$\frac{\sigma_{l,i}^2}{\sigma_{l,n}^2} \simeq \frac{e\cos^2\alpha + f\left(a\cos^2\alpha + g\sin^2\alpha/2\right)(m_i/\mu_i - 1)^{-1}}{e\cos^2\alpha + f/2\sin^2\alpha},$$
(11)

with

$$e = \frac{1 - \cos^3 \Delta \theta}{6},$$

$$f = \frac{2 - 3\cos \Delta \theta + \cos^3 \Delta \theta}{6}$$

Examples of such models are shown in Figure 4, where the line width ratio is plotted against the viewing angle α for neutral flow collimation widths of 20°, 40°, 60°, and 90° (no collimation). Note that every curve is monotonic and has a ratio of $\simeq 1$ at $\alpha = 0$ and $\simeq 0.26$ at $\alpha = \pi/2$, as was determined earlier. This implies that it would be, in principle, possible to determine the viewing angle as a function of the line width ratio if we knew the curve (or the amount of collimation) that corresponds best to the object or region under study. We show next how this can be done.

3.1. Line Width Ratio versus Polarization Level

As it turns out, there exists another parameter that is a function of the orientation of the magnetic field relative to the line of sight that can be readily obtained. This is the polarization level that is measured, for example, from the continuum emission from dust at submillimeter wavelengths. Indeed, since the (elongated) dust grains are presumably aligned by the magnetic field, the polarization level P detected by an observer studying a given region where the field is oriented with a viewing angle α can be expressed as

$$P = P_{\max} \sin^2 \alpha , \qquad (12)$$



FIG. 4.—Ion-to-neutral line width ratio vs. the viewing angle α for angles of neutral flow collimation of 20°, 40°, 60°, and 90° (no collimation). Every curve is monotonic and has a ratio $\simeq 1$ at $\alpha = 0$ and $\simeq 0.26$ at $\alpha = \pi/2$.

where P_{max} is the maximum polarization level that can be detected, i.e., when the field lies in the plane of the sky $(\alpha = \pi/2)$. Evidently, equation (12) can be inserted in equations (9) and (10) to eliminate $\sin^2 \alpha$ and express the ion-to-neutral line width ratio as a function of the normalized polarization level P/P_{max} . Figure 5 shows the relationship between those two parameters for the same four cases presented in Figure 4. Given the appropriate model for the neutral flow collimation, we would then expect a set of data (of the ion-to-neutral line width ratio vs. normalized polarization level) to fall along the corresponding curve. Or should we?

It is now well known that submillimeter (or far-infrared) polarization maps of molecular clouds usually show that the polarization level decreases toward regions of higher optical depth. This decrease in polarization is more than what could be expected from opacity effects and is not correlated with the dust temperature (Dotson 1996; Weintraub, Goodman, & Akeson 2000). Even though this phenomenon is poorly understood, there is some evidence that it is caused by either small-scale fluctuations in the magnetic field (Rao et al. 1998), decrease in grain alignment with increasing optical depth, or spherical grain growth. In view of this, we should not expect data (of ion-to-neutral line width ratio against normalized polarization level) to fall along a given curve, as shown in Figure 5, but rather within an area bounded by the $P/P_{\text{max}} = 0$ limit and the curve in question (for this, we use a value of P_{max} that would be found in a region that is unaffected by the depolarization effect). This is shown in Figure 5 for the model with a neutral flow collimation of $\Delta \theta = 90^{\circ}$, where the shaded region represents the area where we now expect the data to fall. Locations in a molecular cloud that are greatly affected by the depolariza-



FIG. 5.—Ion-to-neutral line width ratio vs. the normalized polarization level (P/P_{max}) for angles of neutral flow collimation of 20° , 40° , 60° , and 90° (no collimation). Every curve is monotonic and has a ratio $\simeq 1$ at $\alpha = 0$ and $\simeq 0.26$ at $\alpha = \pi/2$. The shaded part represents the region where we should expect corresponding data points to be located in cases where $\Delta\theta = 90^{\circ}$ (see text).

tion effect will tend to lie closer to the $P/P_{\text{max}} = 0$ boundary, whereas those that are affected little or not at all should fall close to theoretical curve (with $\Delta \theta = 90^{\circ}$ in this example).

Still, the curve that best fits a given set of data can be used to determine the viewing angle α as a function of the ion-toneutral line width ratio. Once this curve is identified, one merely has to invert the corresponding curve plotted in Figure 4 (or eq. [11]) starting with the line width ratio to obtain α . For cases where the field lies out of the plane of the sky, this information can in turn be combined with Zeeman and polarimetry measurements to determine the magnitude and the orientation of the magnetic field (the orientation of the field is not completely determined, since there is an ambiguity of 180° in the value of the angle β obtained from polarimetry).

3.2. Nature of α

It is appropriate at this time to be more precise in defining the nature of the angle α in relation to actual measurements made in molecular clouds. All the equations presented so far dealt with a single mean component for the magnetic field $\langle B \rangle$ at a given point in space (and time) within a molecular cloud and its effect on the behavior of ions. The viewing angle α was then defined in relation to this mean field as follows:

$$\langle \boldsymbol{B} \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{B} \rangle (\boldsymbol{e}_{\parallel} \cos \alpha + \boldsymbol{e}_{\perp} \sin \alpha)$$

Since observations are done with a finite resolution, however, it is likely that the magnetic field could change orientation or that numerous magnetic field components $\langle B_i \rangle$ could be present within the region of the molecular clouds subtended by the telescope beam width and contribute equally in shaping the line profile of molecular ion species. Under such circumstances, equation (10) for the ion line width and subsequently equation (11) for the ion-to-neutral line width ratio can be modified easily to take this into account. This is done by simply replacing $\cos^2 \alpha$ and $\sin^2 \alpha$ in these equations by their average over all the components, namely:

$$\cos^2 \alpha \to \left\langle \cos^2 \alpha \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \cos^2 \alpha_i , \qquad (13)$$

$$\sin^2 \alpha \to \left\langle \sin^2 \alpha \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sin^2 \alpha_i , \qquad (14)$$

where the index i pertains to the different orientations or components of the magnetic field and N is their total number.

Notice also that α , as defined by equations (13) and (14), is an average over all volume elements. The value of α , so defined, may differ from the inclination of the uniform field that best fits the large-scale structure. For example, if the large-scale field is along the line of sight, any bend or dispersion in the field direction will result in a value of α greater than zero.

The values of α that will be obtained from the measurements presented in the next section should, therefore, be interpreted as representing the aforementioned average for the orientation or inclination of the magnetic field (within a beam width) in the regions under study.

4. OBSERVATIONAL EVIDENCE

An extensive 350 μ m polarimetry map of the M17 molecular cloud was obtained using the HERTZ polarimeter (Dowell et al. 1998) at the CSO on 1997 April 20–27 and 2001 July 19 and is presented in Figure 6. Beside the total flux (*contours*) and polarized flux (*gray scale*), this figure gives a detailed view (with a beam size of $\simeq 20''$) of the polarization vectors (or *E* vectors) across an area of more than $3' \times 4'$. All of the polarization vectors shown have a polarization level and error such that $P > 3\sigma_P$. Circles indicate cases where $P + 2\sigma_P < 1\%$. Overall, the appearance of this map is in good qualitative agreement with results obtained at 60 and 100 μ m by Dotson et al. (2000). Details of the data presented in Figure 6 can be found in Table 2.

As can be seen, both the magnitude and the orientation of the polarization vectors are "well behaved" across the map, in that, at this spatial resolution, the variations are smooth and happen on a relatively large scale. The amount of polarization is seen to vary from $\approx 0\%$ to a maximum of $\approx 4\%$, which is consistent with the bulk of observations made on other objects at this wavelength. Another feature that can easily be detected and that has important ramifications for our study is the depolarization effect discussed earlier. A visual inspection will convince the reader that regions of higher total flux have, in general, a significantly lower level of polarization associated with them. This will be made



FIG. 6.—HERTZ polarization map of M17 at 350 μ m. All of the polarization vectors shown have a polarization level and error such that $P > 3\sigma_P$. Circles indicate cases where $P + 2\sigma_P < 1\%$. The contours delineate the total continuum flux (from 10% to 90% with a maximum flux of \approx 700 Jy), whereas the underlying gray scale gives the polarized flux according to the scale on the right. The beam width ($\simeq 20''$) is shown in the lower left corner and the origin of the map is at R.A. = 18^h17^m31^s4, decl. = $-16^{\circ}14'25''_{\cdot}0$ (B1950.0).



FIG. 7.—Polarization level vs. the total flux taken from the 350 μ m HERTZ polarization map of M17 shown in Fig. 6. The polarization levels have $P > 3\sigma_P$ or $P + 2\sigma_P < 1\%$. The depolarization effect discussed in the text is clearly seen.

even clearer with the help of Figure 7, where we have plotted the polarization level against the total continuum flux at 350 μ m. As can be seen, there is an unmistakable anticorrelation between the two parameters with a significant reduction in the polarization levels for fluxes greater than approximately 250 Jy. This result is reminiscent of that published by Dotson (1996); see her Figure 6 for the polarization level as a function of the optical depth at 100 μ m for the same object.

We present in Figure 8 HCN and HCO⁺ maps of M17 in the $J \rightarrow 4-3$ transition made at the CSO, using the facility's 300-400 GHz receiver during a large number of nights in the months of 2001 March, May, June, and August. As can be seen, the two maps have a similar appearance and are also not unlike the 350 μ m continuum map presented in Figure 6. The beam size for these sets of observations is similar to the HERTZ beam at $\approx 20''$. This is a nice feature, since our analysis will rest on comparisons of polarimetry and spectroscopic data across the molecular cloud. We also show in Figure 9 typical cases of spectra obtained that were used to build these maps, along with a fit to their line profile. We can see the level of signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) needed to accurately fit the line profile (and their wings) and measure the line width ratio defined earlier (which uses the variance of the lines). Each spectrum used in this study required a minimum of 8-10 minutes of integration (on-source) and often much more.

4.1. Line Width Ratio and the Polarization Level

We are now in a position to test the model presented in \S 3 and the relationship it predicts between the ion-to-neutral line width ratio and the polarization level in molecular clouds.

We have, therefore, measured the widths $\sigma_{l,i}$ and $\sigma_{l,n}$ at every position of our M17 maps and plotted the HCO⁺/

TABLE 2 M17 350 µm Results

TABLE 2—Continued

Flux^c

258.9

419.0

171.3

631.8

175.9

247.7

559.4

148.9

416.1

298.4

276.6

584.6

344.0

507.3

273.1

654.5

86.0

625.5

271.3

213.5

579.3

131.6

243.7

677.0

496.5

200.8

253.8

525.4

431.0

352.4

279.3

476.5

58.8

340.5

589.0

220.6

483.6

100.9

545.4

268.8

165.4

490.0

141.8

377.4

226.9

471.7

196.4

206.3

329.1

409.9

313.1

169.3

324.0

67.9

343.7

293.8

352.2

105.3

265.8

226.9

362.3

132.8

224.7

195.0

308.3

149.7

 $\sigma_{\mathrm{P.A.}}$

2.1

2.0

4.0

2.5

7.1

2.4

2.5

75.3

1.3

1.8

2.1

10.6

1.8

0.7

4.2

2.6

27.1

0.9

2.1

7.7

1.1

7.3

5.7

1.0

0.7

3.2

4.7

3.7

0.6

1.0

10.7

1.6

27.3

1.2

0.6

12.5

0.8

20.8

1.2

1.7

21.1

0.6

4.0 2.9

3.3

0.5

2.2

6.0

2.3

0.6

1.3

42.8

1.1

43.7

0.8

2.1

0.6

12.9

1.3

3.4

0.7

4.3

2.8

3.4

0.6

2.8

		M1733	ου μπι κεst	JL18			$\Delta \alpha^{\mathrm{a}}$	$\Delta \delta^{\mathrm{a}}$	Р	σ_P	P.A. ^b
$\Delta lpha^{ m a}$	$\Delta \delta^{\mathrm{a}}$	Р	σ_P	P.A. ^b	$\sigma_{\mathrm{P.A.}}$	Flux ^c				1	
							-42	-49	1.16	0.08	143.2
-120	95	0.84	0.57	151.9	19.5	255.7	-42	81	0.60	0.04	179.1
-115	-51	3.62	1.55	148.7	12.2	151.0	-39	-122	2.71	0.38	134.0
-115	78	0.76	0.61	112.9	22.8	249.6	-39	107	0.72	0.05	168.1
-110	-69	3.61	1.60	149.9	12.7	127.6	-39	137	0.52	0.13	5.4
-110	61	0.82	0.45	135.0	15.7	255.3	-3/	-66	1.01	0.08	143.5
-108	117	0.16	0.34	42.6	60.5	297.6	-3/	64	0.38	0.03	2.3
-105	-86	1.74	1.77	133.7	29.4	106.5	-34	-139	0.70	1.83	60.7
-105	44	1.47	0.41	140.1	8.0	284.0	-34	-10	1.35	0.08	165.7
-103	-29	3.21	0.96	149.9	8.5	206.3	-34	120	1.11	0.07	6.1
-103	100	0.64	0.28	145.9	12.4	310.3	-32	-83	1.26	0.09	148.9
-100	-103	0.60	1.60	91.6	76.3	94.3	-32	46	0.12	0.03	171.8
-100	27	1.62	0.42	123.3	7.4	368.4	-29	-27	1.15	0.08	159.0
-98	-47	3.78	0.39	143.0	2.9	214.3	-29	103	1.28	0.03	11./
-98	83	0.52	0.22	124.2	12.0	326.3	-27	-100	1.11	0.16	131.8
-95	-120	5.36	16.45	121.4	87.9	71.1	-27	29	0.37	0.03	157.3
-95	10	1.87	0.46	134.1	7.1	374.2	-27	159	0.45	0.43	65.3
-95	139	0.95	0.76	176.0	23.1	240.4	-25	86	0.87	0.03	9.4
-93	-64	3.62	0.29	139.3	2.3	206.0	-24	-44	0.81	0.06	153.8
-93	66	0.76	0.20	128.3	7.6	348.3	-22	-117	1.68	0.45	140.8
-91	122	0.35	0.13	69.5	10.7	315.3	-22	12	0.93	0.04	161.1
-90	-7	1.48	0.52	134.6	10.2	309.6	-22	142	0.66	0.17	12.6
-88	-81	3.30	0.34	135.8	2.9	171.9	-20	-61	0.34	0.07	156.3
-88	49	0.61	0.18	122.8	8.5	371.1	-20	68	0.80	0.03	11.5
-86	-25	2.36	0.25	152.5	3.0	264.2	-17	-5	1.42	0.03	167.1
-86	105	0.62	0.06	98.3	2.7	444.9	-17	125	0.91	0.10	7.9
-83	-98	2.91	0.37	142.2	3.6	151.1	-15	-78	0.48	0.08	143.2
-83	32	0.64	0.15	139.0	6.8	413.1	-15	51	0.39	0.03	174.3
-81	-42	2.87	0.18	143.5	1.7	252.4	-12	-22	1.71	0.04	171.4
-81	88	0.64	0.05	119.9	2.3	475.5	-12	108	1.18	0.04	7.4
-78	-115	1.67	0.56	140.7	9.6	116.5	-10	-95	0.31	0.12	130.8
-78	15	0.44	0.24	166.8	15.7	407.4	-10	34	0.71	0.04	156.9
-78	144	0.87	0.19	60.7	6.2	233.1	-10	164	0.86	0.82	68.7
-76	-59	3.50	0.16	140.8	1.3	261.6	-7	-39	1.17	0.05	174.5
-76	71	0.92	0.06	128.6	1.8	426.4	-7	90	1.31	0.03	4.8
-73	-132	0.92	1.62	131.2	50.9	105.7	-5	-112	0.62	0.27	123.5
-73	-3	0.94	0.62	157.0	18.5	365.0	-5	17	1.08	0.03	162.1
-73	127	0.46	0.07	66.3	4.5	304.9	-5	147	0.54	0.39	173.6
-71	-76	3.56	0.16	141.1	1.2	269.9	-3	73	0.83	0.03	177.8
-71	54	0.23	0.07	123.4	10.8	452.8	-2	-56	1.09	0.06	173.4
-69	110	0.12	0.05	63.8	11.8	416.9	0	-130	1.83	1.35	114.8
-68	-20	1.48	0.10	147.7	1.9	317.6	0	0	1.56	0.03	167.3
-66	-93	3.73	0.17	136.9	1.3	238.0	0	130	1.02	0.14	4.4
-66	37	0.26	0.09	11.6	9.6	533.1	2	56	0.49	0.05	6.6
-64	-37	1.84	0.11	138.6	1.6	283.5	3	-73	0.63	0.07	2.3
-64	93	0.47	0.05	161.5	3.1	424.7	5	-17	2.01	0.03	173.2
-61	-110	2.76	0.32	136.5	3.4	151.6	5	112	1.22	0.09	7.5
-61	20	0.65	0.07	177.0	3.1	567.3	7	-90	0.58	0.12	31.8
-61	149	0.03	0.20	88.9	12.2	169.0	7	39	0.79	0.10	175.4
- 59	-54	2.08	0.11	140.1	1.5	275.5	10	-34	2.13	0.05	177.1
- 59	76	0.45	0.05	151.3	3.1	368.7	10	95	1.18	0.05	5.6
-56	_127	2 36	0.05	130.5	7.0	130.7	12	-108	0.32	0.48	101.5
-56	2	0.87	0.10	164.5	2.5	485.7	12	22	1.36	0.05	177.3
-56	132	0.07	0.10	42.9	11.0	235.3	12	152	0.51	0.77	79.2
- 50	71	2 35	0.09	130.2	13	205.0	15	-51	1.83	0.05	178.6
54	- / 1	2.55	0.10	140 1	1.5	177 2	15	78	0.88	0.05	176.8
-51	_144	0.67	1 /0	178.0	62.1	125 5	17	5	1 97	0.00	177 7
-51	- 144	1.14	1.47	1/0.9	1 4	277 6	17	134	1.16	0.57	20.8
-31	-15	1.14	0.00	131.0 7 5	1.4 2 0	212 0	20	_68	1.10	0.52	10.0
- 31	113	2 14	0.00	140.7	2.0 1 4	217 5	20	-00	1.00	0.12	14.4
-49	-88	2.40 0.10	0.12	140./	1.4	517.5	20	. 12	2.12	0.12	179.7
-49	42	0.19	0.07	4.8	11.8	023.0	22	-12	2.13	0.05	1/0./
-4/	98	1.00	0.05	2.0	1.3	398.0	22	11/	1.00	0.24	12.4
-40	-32	1.33	0.07	143.0	2.0	226.2	24	. 96	1.11	0.11	20.0
-44	-105	2.13	0.17	141.6	2.5	230.2	23 27	-00	1.07	0.20	100.9
-44	24	0.41	0.03	7.7	3.8	/10.6	27	-29	2.24	0.05	14.0
-44	154	0.39	0.30	100.1	22.2	111.7	21	100	1.30	0.15	14.8

TABLE 2—Continued

$\Delta \alpha^{\rm a}$	$\Delta \delta^{\mathrm{a}}$	Р	σ_P	P.A. ^b	$\sigma_{\mathrm{P.A.}}$	Flux ^c
29	27	1.75	0.08	7.9	1.3	223.2
32	-46	1.91	0.06	6.7	0.9	298.4
32	83	1.35	0.25	9.2	5.4	157.3
34	10	2.20	0.08	5.0	1.0	240.9
37	-64	1.92	0.12	21.2	1.8	226.8
37	66	1.23	0.20	17.2	4.6	156.5
39	-7	2.05	0.07	3.0	1.0	238.2
42	-81	2.06	0.22	29.9	3.1	156.4
42	49	1.28	0.17	15.0	3.9	159.5
44	-24	1.99	0.09	5.9	1.2	232.0
44	105	1.10	0.36	14.6	9.5	112.8
46	32	1.73	0.26	6.7	4.2	168.5
49	-42	1.92	0.10	14.1	1.4	209.9
51	15	2.03	0.20	7.3	2.9	178.1
54	-59	1.87	0.13	22.5	2.0	168.2
54	71	2.33	0.42	24.5	5.1	114.4
56	-2	2.28	0.14	4.5	1.7	180.2
59	-76	2.32	0.30	35.1	3.7	130.7
59	54	3.17	0.48	24.3	4.3	118.0
61	-20	1.54	0.14	13.1	2.6	195.2
66	-37	1.17	0.14	22.2	3.4	198.9
71	-54	2.02	0.25	27.8	3.5	163.1

^a Offsets in arcseconds from 18^h17^m31^s.4, -16°14'25" (B1950.0).

^b Position angle of *E* vector in degrees east from north.

° Jy/20" beam.

HCN line width ratio against the polarization level. This is shown in Figure 10. Whenever the spectroscopic datum was not coincident in space with any of the polarimetry data, we have used a simple bilinear interpolation technique to determine the corresponding polarization level. Referring back to the spectra shown in Figure 9, we see that the line profiles can sometimes be complicated. We modeled each line with a multi-Gaussian profile and used it in its entirety to calculate $\sigma_{l,i}$ and $\sigma_{l,n}$; i.e., we have not chosen a particular velocity component when more than one were apparent, but used the whole fit to the line shape. This is consistent with the material presented in § 2 (and in Houde et al. 2000a, 2000b), since the method used when comparing molecular ion and neutral lines presupposes a large number of flows (and/or velocity components). It is also more consistent with the type of comparison made here between spectroscopic and polarimetry data, since it is not possible to discriminate between velocity components in the latter.

In Figure 10, we have used the normalized polarization level P/P_{max} with the maximum level of polarization set at $P_{\text{max}} = 7\%$. As was explained in § 3.1, this is necessary for the comparison of the line ratio to the polarimetry data. Our choice of P_{max} was not done arbitrarily and neither was its value determined so as to provide a fit to the data. We have based its value on the extensive polarimetry data already obtained with HERTZ, where we found that the highest levels of polarization detected so far at 350 μ m were



FIG. 8.—HCN and HCO⁺ ($J \rightarrow 4-3$) maps of M17. The lowest contour level has 12 K km s⁻¹ and the following levels increase linearly with an interval of 12 K km s⁻¹. The grid spacing of $\approx 20''$ is approximately the same size as the beam width (shown in the lower left corners) and the origin of the maps is at R.A. = 18^h17^m31^s4, decl. = $-16^{\circ}14'25''$ 0 (B1950.0).



FIG. 9.—HCN and HCO⁺ spectra of M17 at two different positions along with a fit to their line profile. The positions are shown in parentheses on the right side of the spectra and are relative to R.A. = $18^{h}17^{m}31^{s}4$, decl. = $-16^{\circ}14'25''_{.0}$ (B1950.0). [See the electronic edition of the Journal for a color version of this figure.]



FIG. 10.—HCO⁺/HCN line width ratio vs. the normalized polarization level (P/P_{max}) for M17. The value P_{max} is set at 7%, and the data are shown against a model of neutral flow collimation of $\Delta \theta = 34$ °.5. The polarization levels have $P > 3\sigma_P$ or $P + 2\sigma_P < 1\%$.

in the neighborhood of 7%. We assume that this applies well to M17 and that it corresponds to the hypothetical case in which the magnetic field lies in the plane of the sky $(\alpha = \pi/2)$ at a position unaffected by the depolarization effect. It should be noted that small variations in this parameter would not significantly change our results. Accompanying the data is a curve for a configuration of neutral flows with a collimation angle $\Delta \theta = 34^{\circ}.5$ similar to the models defined in § 3 and presented in Figure 5 resulting from a nonlinear fit to the points that delineates the "outer" limit of the data in Figure 10. The rest of the data fall neatly in the shaded area and are seen to be significantly affected by the depolarization effect discussed earlier.

While taking another look at Figure 7 for the polarization level as a function of the total flux, it should not be surprising that the clear majority of data points in Figure 10 does not take part in determining the curve that defines the collimation model. Indeed, most of them belong to regions where the flux is relatively strong and will most likely show a reduction in their respective polarization levels. We should, therefore, expect that only a limited number of points would partake in the determination of the collimation model. An extension of the map to fainter regions of the molecular clouds could possibly alleviate this issue along with bringing an increase in the number of vectors exhibiting higher polarization levels. This would be desirable since, admittedly, our map of M17 shows no points with a polarization level greater than 4% that would allow for a better determination of the proper configuration of neutral flows and a more stringent test to our technique. Still, the outcome is encouraging, and the results presented in Figure 10 are consistent with what was predicted by our model.

We show in Figure 11 a map of the orientation of the magnetic field in M17 at every observed position. The angle β , made by the projection of the magnetic field in the plane of the sky, was obtained from the polarimetry data by rotating the corresponding polarization angle (P.A.) by 90° and is represented on the map by the orientation of the vectors. The viewing angle α , or the angle made by the magnetic field to the line of sight, was obtained by using the fit discussed above and by inverting equation (11) with the HCO⁺/HCN line width ratio as input and can be read on the map by the length of the vectors (using the scale in the bottom right). Both angles are plotted on top of the 350 μ m continuum flux obtained with HERTZ.

The results are presented in more detail in Table 3. An estimate of σ_{α} , the error in the viewing angle, was calculated by converting the error in the HCO⁺/HCN line width ratio to that of the viewing angle through equation (11).

From Figure 11, we can observe some of the main features in the orientation of the magnetic field in M17. First, there is a gradual shift of some 40° in the orientation of the projection of the magnetic field on the plane of the sky from the southwest part of the map ($\beta \sim 50^{\circ}$) to the north ($\beta \sim 90^{\circ}$). On the other hand, the viewing angle is maximum at $\alpha \sim 65^{\circ}$ in the neighborhood of the region of peak continuum emission and smoothly decreases southwesterly to a local minimum, where the field is better aligned to the line of sight with $\alpha \simeq 30^{\circ}$ at R.A. offset $\simeq -50''$, decl. offset $\simeq -50''$. The field gradually approaches the plane of the sky, once again, in the south of the map.

Most interestingly, there is an important and localized decrease in the viewing angle of roughly 30° – 40° close to the position of steepest change in continuum (or HCN and



FIG. 11.—Orientation of the magnetic field in M17. The orientation of the projection of the magnetic field in the plane of the sky is shown by the vectors and the viewing angle is given by the length of the vectors (using the scale shown in the bottom right corner). The contours and the gray scale delineate the total continuum flux. The beam width ($\simeq 20''$) is shown in the lower left corner, and the origin of the map is at R.A. = $18^{h}17^{m}31^{s}4$, decl. = $-16^{\circ}14'25''_{.0}$ (B1950.0).

HCO⁺) emission where α reaches a minimum at approximately 10°. This region, located at R.A. offset $\simeq 0''$, decl. offset $\simeq 80''$, is also nearly coincident with the locations of H₂O and OH masers and the ultracompact H II region of the Northern Condensation, where Brogan & Troland (2001; see their Fig. 16) have obtained a value of $B_{\rm los} \simeq -300 \ \mu {\rm G}$ using OH measurements at 20 km s⁻¹.

It is important to realize that α does not provide us with the information concerning the direction of the magnetic field relative to the plane of the sky (i.e., is it going in or coming out of the plane?); this will be provided by Zeeman measurements. We know that for M17 the magnetic field is actually coming out of the plane of the sky (using the H I or OH Zeeman measurements at 20 km s⁻¹ from Brogan & Troland 2001). The values of α obtained here are therefore relative to an axis directed toward the observer. Finally, taking into account that the magnetic field can be directed away from the line of sight by as much as 60° in some parts of M17, we can see that a multiplicative factor of the order of 2 has to be applied to the Zeeman measurements of Brogan & Troland (2001) in order to evaluate the magnitude of the magnetic field. They obtained a maximum value of ≈ -750 μ G for B_{los} using H I Zeeman measurements at 20 km s⁻¹, implying that the magnitude of the field could be as high as $\approx 1.5 \text{ mG}$ for this object.

TABLE 3M17 Magnetic Field Orientation

-					
$\Delta \alpha^{\mathrm{a}}$	$\Delta \delta^{\mathrm{a}}$	α^{b}	σ_{α}	β^{c}	σ_{β}
-100	-60	59.9	5.5	52.6	5.5
-100	-40	68.8	0.3	55.3	5.1
-80	-80	51.8	1.4	48.8	1.2
-80	-60	61.0	0.4	50.5	1.1
-80	-40	60.2	0.5	53.9	1.7
-68	-20	67.8	0.3	57.5	13
-66	_93	51.8	2.5	46.9	1.3
_64	_37	62.6	1 1	48.8	0.8
-64	93	60.7	0.3	70.8	3.0
-60	20	61.7	0.5	87.6	1.6
_59	-54	37.7	8.7	50.1	1.0
_59	76	65.0	0.4	61.1	2.8
-55	2	59.6	0.7	74.2	2.0
-50	71	57.0	0.5	/4.2	2.5
- 54	26	69.1	1.5	49.2	2.9
-54	54	67.1	0.2	75.8	18.7
- 54	15	67.2	0.2	/ J.0 61 1	10.7
-51	-15	57.7	0.9	07.4	1.5
-31	00	557	0.0	50.7	1.5
-49	-00	50.7	2.1	50.7 02.5	1.0
-4/	20	50.5	0.9	92.5 52.2	1.1
-40	-32	20.1	0.0	52.0	2.0
-42	-49	20.4 65.2	5.5 0.1	55.0 76.0	2.1
-40	20	67.0	0.1	70.0 86.0	1.0
-40	20 40	68.0	0.1	88 /	1.5
-40	40	55 /	0.1	00.9	1.8
37	66	57.0	0.2	53.3	2.1
_37	-00 64	34.6	1.6	92.2	2.1
36	54	63.8	0.1	80.5	3.2
_34	_10	62.1	0.1	75 7	1.4
_34	120	57.4	0.4	96.1	1.4
_29	-27	53.7	17	69.3	1.0
_29	103	63.1	2.0	101.6	0.6
_24	_44	59.7	0.5	64.6	2.0
-20	0	64.4	1.0	75.6	0.8
-20	20	66.4	0.3	70.3	1.4
-20	40	63.2	0.2	72.0	2.7
-18	-18	62.3	0.3	78.7	0.7
-18	54	67.1	0.5	90.7	1.0
-18	72	57.7	0.2	99.6	0.8
-18	90	65.2	0.1	97.5	0.6
-18	108	55.0	0.7	99.0	0.7
-10	34	64.8	2.1	67.0	1.6
-7	91	50.5	1.5	94.8	0.2
-5	17	62.9	0.9	72.1	0.7
-3	73	9.4	6.9	88.3	0.4
0	-40	50.8	1.5	86.0	0.4
0	-20	66.5	0.3	83.0	0.4
0	0	55.2	2.4	77.3	0.5
0	60	62.3	1.4	92.7	1.8
0	100	9.4	6.9	95.7	0.6
7	39	67.3	1.3	85.0	2.1
10	95	49.9	2.5	95.5	1.1
12	22	71.5	1.2	87.1	0.3
15	78	64.1	1.4	87.3	1.5
17	5	49.5	10.0	87.6	0.1
18	-18	57.7	7.0	87.3	0.5

^a Offsets in arcseconds from 18^h17^m31^s4, -16°14′25″ (B1950.0).

^b Position angle in degrees of the magnetic field to the line of sight.

^c Position angle in degrees east from north.

5. DISCUSSION

In the previous sections, we have proposed a new technique, based on the work of Houde et al. (2000a, 2000b), for evaluating the orientation of the magnetic field in molecular clouds. The orientation of the field is specified by its inclination or viewing angle α (see § 3.2 for a precision concerning its definition) and the angle β made by its projection on the plane of the sky. Once determined, these parameters can be used also in conjunction with Zeeman measurements to obtain maps of the magnitude of the magnetic field. We applied this technique to spectroscopic and polarimetry data of M17 obtained at the CSO and found the results to be in good agreement with our predictions. As pleasing as this outcome may be, however, our treatment of the data rests on a number of assumptions that need to be addressed and discussed.

1. At the heart of our technique is the extensive comparison of polarimetry data measured from continuum dust emission at 350 μ m and line profiles of the HCN and HCO⁺ molecular species. It is, however, likely that the dust is optically thin at 350 μ m, whereas this is probably not true everywhere in M17 for the HCN and HCO+ transitions used in this study. This implies that we are, perhaps, not probing the same regions with both sets of observations; this is more likely to be true in the region of maximum HCN and HCO+ intensity. It is then probable that some errors are introduced in our analysis for that part of the cloud. Unfortunately, it is not possible at this point to say to what extent this is so. It might, therefore, be desirable to study this region of the cloud with species that are less abundant (as long as the pair of molecules used can be shown to be coexistent). Future studies using H¹³CN and H¹³CO⁺ might shed some light on this issue.

2. In the same vein, it is also not certain that given sets of spectrometric (or polarimetry) and Zeeman data would

always probe the same region of a molecular cloud. As far as a comparison with the HCN and HCO⁺ is concerned, Zeeman measurements made with the CN molecular species are likely to be a better match than others made with H I or OH.

3. Again, related to point 1 above is the fact that the line profiles from HCN and HCO⁺ are probably saturated in some regions of the molecular cloud. It is then likely that the line width ratio is to some extent subject to errors due to the different enhancement of the high-velocity wings between both species. Using a pair of less-abundant molecular species would also help in improving on this.

4. Small changes in the evaluation of the line width ratio can be important in determining both the appropriate neutral flow configuration to a set of data and ultimately the viewing angle. This puts stringent requirements on the modeling of the line profiles. It is extremely important that the high-velocity wings be well fitted. Since this is often difficult to do for a finite S/N, this is likely to be a source of error in the analysis. We did our best to minimize this and we feel confident about the quality of our modeling of the line profiles, but we cannot be entirely certain that this source of error has no impact on our results.

5. Contrary to what was assumed in our analysis, it is very likely that a single model of neutral flow configuration does not apply equally well to the different regions of the molecular cloud. It is probably better to think of the chosen model as some sort of picture representative of the object under study (it tells us the maximum amount of flow collimation expected in the area covered by the observations). This is certainly another source of errors. Unlike the others discussed previously, however, it is possible to get a glimpse as to how severe it is likely to be. To this end, we have purposely chosen a "bad" fit to our data, calculated a new set of viewing angles, and compared it with the one presented in Table 3. We show in Figure 12 histograms for the distribu-



FIG. 12.—Histograms showing the distribution of the viewing angle α in M17 for our fit to the data shown in Fig. 5 ($\Delta\theta = 34^{\circ}$ 5) (*left*) and another where $\Delta\theta = 60^{\circ}$ (*right*).

tion of the viewing angle for the "good" (left, with $\Delta \theta = 34^{\circ}.5$) and the "bad" fit, where we have arbitrarily chosen a neutral flow configuration model of $\Delta \theta = 60^{\circ}$ (*right*). (Alternatively, the model with $\Delta \theta = 60^{\circ}$ would be a good fit to the data if P_{max} were raised to approximately 15%.) As can be seen, there is a definite change in the distribution from one model to the other as the mean for the viewing angle changes from 54° for the good fit to 38° for the other. As can also be seen from a comparison of the histograms, however, the error occasioned by a bad selection of the neutral flow model is not likely to be much more than roughly $15^{\circ}-20^{\circ}$ in the cases where α is measured to be high, whereas it is fairly negligible when it is small. Our technique is, therefore, relatively robust to this kind of error.

6. Finally, as mentioned in the last section, M17 is lacking some higher polarization points that would allow us to test our technique farther out in polarization space.

In view of all this, it is important that tests be conducted on more objects to ensure the validity of the method. More precisely, we need to conduct similar studies on molecular clouds exhibiting higher levels of polarization and, if possible, use other less-abundant species (e.g., H¹³CN and $H^{13}CO^+$) to better match the continuum measurements. Although such programs require a significant amount of observing time, the expected benefits are such that we judge it to be imperative to push them forward. We list here some of the most obvious benefits.

1. As was mentioned earlier, combining the kind of study presented here with Zeeman measurements (subjected to point 2 above), it is now possible to make maps for the mag-

Brogan, C. L., & Troland, T. H. 2001, ApJ, 560, 821

- Brogan, C. L., Troland, T. H., Roberts, D. A., & Crutcher, R. M. 1999, ApJ, 515, 304
- Crutcher, R. M., Troland, T. H., Goodman, A. A., Heiles, C., Kazès, I., & Myers, P. C. 1993, ApJ, 407, 175 Crutcher, R. M., Troland, T. H., Lazareff, B., Paubert, G., & Kazès, I.
- 1999, ApJ, 514, L121 Davis, L. M., & Greenstein, J. L. 1951, ApJ, 114, 206

- Davis, L. M., & Oreenstein, J. L. 1951, ApJ, 114, 200
 Dotson, J. L. 1996, ApJ, 470, 566
 Dotson, J. L., Davidson, J., Dowell, C. D., Schleuning, D. A., & Hildebrand, R. H. 2000, ApJS, 128, 335
 Dowell, C. D., Hildebrand, R. H., Schleuning, D. A., Vaillancourt, J. E., Dotson, J. L., Novak, G., Renbarger, T., & Houde, M. 1998, ApJ, 504, 200
- 588
- Fiege, J. D., & Pudritz, R. E. 2000a, MNRAS, 311, 85

nitude and orientation of the magnetic field in molecular clouds.

2. It might also be possible to determine the topology of the magnetic field in molecular clouds and, perhaps, test the predictions made by different models (e.g., the helical field model of Fiege & Pudritz 2000a, 2000b).

3. As was hinted at in the previous section, a study of the variations in the orientation of the magnetic field through angles α and β in correlation to density or density gradients might help in revealing some of the interactions between the magnetic field and its environment (e.g., field pinching during collapse).

4. The knowledge of the curve relating the ion-to-neutral line width ratio and the normalized polarization (as in Fig. 10) would allow for a "correction" of the polarization levels across the source and possibly help in understanding the processes responsible for the depolarization effect observed in molecular clouds (e.g., differentiate between different grain models).

Time will tell how well our proposed technique fares and how much it can reveal concerning the nature of the magnetic field in molecular clouds. We might be justified, however, in being optimistic about a method that purposely uses three seemingly different and independent observational techniques and combines them in a way that takes advantage of and clearly exhibits their complementarity.

We wish to thank A. A. Goodman and C. L. Brogan for insightful comments on the subject. The Caltech Submillimeter Observatory is funded by the NSF through contract AST 99-80846, and the observations with HERTZ were supported by NSF grant 99-87441.

REFERENCES

- Fiege, J. D., & Pudritz, R. E. 2000b, MNRAS, 311, 105
 - Heiles, C. 1997, ApJS, 111, 245 Hildebrand, R. H. 1988, QJRAS, 29, 327
 - Houde, M., Bastien, P., Peng, R., Phillips, T. G., & Yoshida, H. 2000a, ApJ, 536, 857
- Houde, M., Peng, R., Phillips, T. G., Bastien, P., & Yoshida, H. 2000b, ApJ, 537, 245
- Houde, M., Phillips, T. G., Bastien, P., Peng, R., & Yoshida, H. 2001, ApJ,
- 547, 311 Rao, R., Crutcher, R. M., Plambeck, R. L., & Wright, M. C. H. 1998, ApJ, 502, L75
- Weintraub, D. A., Goodman, A. A., & Akeson, R. L. 2000, in Protostars and Planets IV, ed. V. Mannings, A. P. Boss, & S. S. Russell (Tucson: Univ. Arizona Press), 247