## 1 Introduction

Our knowledge of the structure and origin of magnetic fields in elliptical galaxies, groups and clusters is still cudimentary, but Faraday rotation of linearly-polarized radio emission can be used to probe the fields in ionized foreground gas. Here, we present an analysis of the magnetic-field fluctuations in the magnetoionic medium in front of the FRI radio galaxy $3 \mathrm{C} 31(z=0.0169)$ derived from rotation-measure $(R M)$ fits to high-resolution polarization images. We first verify that the Faraday rotation is due primarily to a foreground medium. We then characterise its spatial statistics using a combination of structure-function and residual depolarization measurements. Finally, we present a three-dimensional simulation of a tangled magnetic field in the hot plasma and use this to fit the variation of RM fluctuation amplitude across the source.

## 2 Observed Faraday rotation and depolarization

Our analysis is based on VLA observations at 6 frequencies in the range $1.4-8.4 \mathrm{GHz}$ with resolutions of 5.5 and 1.5 arcsec FWHM (Figs 1 and 2). We show images of normalized polarization gradient $p^{\prime}(0) / p(0)$ from fits to $p\left(\lambda^{2}\right)=p(0)+p^{\prime}(0) \lambda^{2}$, where $p\left(\lambda^{2}\right)$ is the degree of polarization at wavelength $\lambda$ and a prime denotes differentiation with respect to $\lambda^{2}$ (e.g. Fig. $3 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{c}$ ). We also show RM images derived from fits to $\chi\left(\lambda^{2}\right)=\chi(0)+\mathrm{RM} \lambda^{2}$ at $4-6$ wavelengths, where $\chi$ is the $\mathbf{E}$-vector position angle (e.g. Fig. 3d -f ). The residual depolarization at 1.5 arcsec resolution is very small $\left(p^{\prime}(0) / p(0)=-10 \mathrm{~m}^{-2}\right.$ corresponds to a 5 eduction in polarization at 1.4 GHz ) and the rotation is accurately proportional to $\lambda^{2}$, indicating almost completely resolved foreground rotation. There is a large asymmetry across the nucleus: the lobe with the brighter et shows a much smaller RM fluctuation amplitude on all scales than the counter-jet lobe, qualitatively as xpected from relativistic jet models [5]


## 3 Analysis

We quantify the spatial variation of RM using the structure function $S(\mathbf{r})=\left\langle\left[\mathrm{RM}\left(\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{r}^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{RM}\left(\mathbf{r}^{\prime}\right)\right]^{2}\right\rangle$, where $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}^{\prime}$ are separation vectors in the plane of the sky and $\left\rangle\right.$ denotes an average over $\mathbf{r}^{\prime}$. Our data are consistent with isotropy, so we plot $S$ as a function of scalar separation $r$ for five regions of 3 C 31 in Fig. 5 . We start from a model RM power spectrum $\hat{C}(k)$, where $k$ is the wave-number. Its Hankel transform is the RM autocorrelation function $C(r)$, and the structure function is $S(r)=2[C(r)-C(0)]$. A novel feature of our analysis is that we include the effects of the observing beam explicitly (this can be done straightforwardly provided that the rotation across the beam is small, as is the case for our observations). Our data are consistent with a power spectrum which has the same form everywhere, but varying normalization. We have found two acceptable functional forms for the power spectrum: $\hat{C}(k) \propto k^{-2.35}$ with a high-frequency cut-off at $k=0.5 \operatorname{arcsec}^{-1}$ scale of 12 arcsec or 4 kpc ) and a broken power-law form with $\hat{C}(k) \propto k^{-11 / 3}$ (as expected for Kolmogorov tur bulence) for $k>0.13 \mathrm{arcsec}^{-1}$ and $\propto k^{-1.5}$ at larger scales. The predicted structure functions are very similar if the effects of the beam are included (Fig. 6). This may explain why earlier studies have come to different conclusions regarding the index of the power spectrum on the basis of RM analysis alone [8, 9, 7, 3]. The cutoff power-law model with $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{k}) \propto \mathbf{k}^{-2.35}$ predicts significantly less residual depolarization, however, in better agreement with our data for 3C 31.
The easiest way to explain an asymmetry in RM fluctuation amplitude related to jet sidedness is to postulate that the rotation arises in a large-scale gas component surrounding the source - most plausibly the group-scale hot component. The asymmetry is then simply due to the differing path lengths through the gas to the approaching (brighter) and receding jets [5]. In order to model the asymmetry, we simulate the Faraday rotation rom an isotropic, random magnetic field with a power spectrum corresponding to that derived from the RM structure-function analysis embedded in ionized gas with a smooth density distribution (cf. [7]). We first assume spherically-symmetric density distribution with a core radius of 150 arcsec as fit to Rosat data for the 3C 31 group by [4]. An example RM distribution for a radio source of negligible thickness inclined by $52^{\circ}$ to the line of sight [6] is shown in Fig. 7 (d) - (f). The rms central magnetic field strength for this model is $\left\langle B_{0}^{2}\right\rangle^{1 / 2}=$ $0.21 \mathrm{nT}(2.1 \mu \mathrm{G})$. The predicted RM distribution shows an asymmetry, but there is no sharp change at the nucleus and the profile falls too rapidly with distance on the counter-jet side. The most plausible reason for the discrepancy is that the radio lobes have displaced the surrounding gas, which is therefore highly non-spherical.. Cavities in the X-ray-emitting gas associated with radio lobes are indeed observed in similar sources such as 3C 449 [1]. If we model the cavity as initially conical, with a half-opening angle of $\approx 55^{\circ}$ within 100 arcsec of the nucleus and thereafter cylindrical, we can approximately reproduce the RM distribution (Fig. $7 \mathrm{~g}-\mathrm{i}$ ). Such a cavity would not have been apparent in the existing X-ray data [4], but
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