

SPECTROSCOPIC STUDY OF C IV λ 1549 AND ITS RELATION WITH OPTICAL PARAMETERS IN ACTIVE GALACTIC NUCLEI

C. A. Negrete,¹ J. W. Sulentic,² R. Bachev,² P. Marziani,³ and D. Dultzin¹

We explore the relation between optical and UV parameters for all known types of broad line emitting AGN using our 4D Eigenvector 1 parameter space, in an attempt of a spectroscopic unification scheme. Black hole masses computed from $\text{FWHM}(\text{C IV}\lambda 1549_{BC})$ indicate that the C IV λ 1549 width is a poor virial estimator.

Our 4DE1 parameter space (Sulentic et al. 2007, hereafter S07) involves: (1) full width half maximum of broad $H\beta$ ($\text{FWHM } H\beta_{BC}$), (2) equivalent width ratio of optical Fe II and broad $H\beta$: $R_{\text{Fe II}} = W(\text{Fe II}\lambda 4570)/W(H\beta_{BC})$, (3) the soft X-ray photon index (Γ_{soft}) and a measure of (4) C IV λ 1549 broad line profile velocity displacement at half maximum ($c(1/2)$). We divide sources into two AGN populations using a division at $\text{FWHM } H\beta_{BC} = 4000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ with sources having lines narrower and broader than this value designated Population A and B respectively (Sulentic et al. 2000, hereafter S00). We use HST archival spectra for 130 sources with S/N high enough to permit reliable C IV λ 1549 broad component measures (S07).

$c(1/2)$ was chosen from among possible C IV λ 1549 profile measures (FWHM, $c(1/2)$ and EW) because: (1) it is not obviously luminosity dependent, (2) it showed the largest intrinsic dispersion and (3) it showed possible correlations with the other 4DE1 parameters. Line broadening may be due to both rotational and non-rotational velocity components especially if a disk + wind model is applicable to our sources. $c(1/2)$ on the contrary, is most likely related to the amplitude of any non-virial motions in the BLR. It is this parameter that adds a new element that can be argued to be physically orthogonal to previously defined E1 parameters: $\text{FWHM}(H\beta_{BC})$ estimates the virial broadening in the LIL-emitting part of the BLR; $R_{\text{Fe II}}$ measures the ionization conditions, while Γ_{soft} provides a




Fig. 1. (a) $c(1/2)$ of C IV λ 1549 $_{BC}$ vs. $\text{FWHM}(H\beta_{BC})$ (in km s^{-1}). (b) $c(1/2)$ normalized by EW C IV λ 1549 $_{BC}$ in order to emphasize the difference between Pop A and B sources which are denoted with filled and open symbols respectively; RL sources are represented by squares and RQ by circles. The vertical line in both panels marks the Pop A-B boundary. Dotted lines in (a) indicate $\pm 2\sigma$ confidence intervals.

measurement of the continuum shape.

In our 4DE1 we find that Radio Loud (RL) sources show broader $H\beta_{BC}$ and C IV λ 1549 $_{BC}$ profiles than Radio Quiet (RQ) AGN, while RQ sources show stronger $R_{\text{Fe II}}$, a Γ_{soft} and $c(1/2)$ than RL sample. 4DE1 also shows a restricted occupation as a strong concentration of RL sources in a small region of the $c(1/2)$ vs. $R_{\text{Fe II}}$ and Γ_{soft} planes. RL sources are rarely found with 4DE1 parameter values: $\text{FWHM}(H\beta_{BC}) \text{ km s}^{-1}$, $R_{\text{Fe II}}$, Γ_{soft} and $c(1/2) \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Figure 1 illustrates one of the correlations of the 4DE1 between $c(1/2)$ and $\text{FWHM}H\beta$. The complete correlations can be found in S07. The expanded C IV λ 1549 sample confirms this results which likely indicates a fundamental difference in BLR structure, kinematics and/or physics between RL and RQ populations.

On the other hand, we made estimations of M_{BH} using FWHM of $H\beta$ and C IV λ 1549 (S07). The result of the comparison of the masses using both lines, is an over estimation of M_{BH} when we use the C IV profile, which is noted mostly on Pop A.

REFERENCES

- Sulentic, J. W., Zwitter, T., Marziani, P., & Dultzin, D. 2000, *ApJ*, 536, L5 (S00)
 Sulentic, J. W., Bachev, R., Marziani, P., Negrete, C. A., & Dultzin, D. 2007, *ApJ*, 666, 757 (S07)

¹Instituto de Astronomía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Apdo. Postal 70-264, 04510 México, D. F., México (anegrete@astroscu.unam.mx).

²Dep. of Physics and Astronomy, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA (giacomo@merlot.astr.ua.edu).

³INAF, Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo dell'Osservatorio 5, I-35122 Padova, Italy (paola.marziani@oapd.inaf.it).