

COMMENT ON THE DEFINITION OF THE NONROTATING ORIGIN

HEINRICH EICHHORN
Observatoire de Paris¹
 61, ave. de l'Observatoire
 F-75014 Paris
 France

ABSTRACT. The paper gives a rigorous and purely formal derivation for the relationship between the “nonrotating” origin and the x-axis of the Q_1 system, i.e., the true equator system. Neglecting nutation, a nonrotating origin could also be achieved by putting $m=0$ in the formula for the time derivative of right ascension.

The condition defining the nonrotating origin is stated by Capitaine, Guinot and Souchay (1986) as “ σ is kinematically defined in such way that, as P moves in the CRS, $[Oxyz]$ has no component of instantaneous rotation with respect to the CRS around Oz .” This obviously means that the axis of instantaneous rotation must lie in the y - z plane of $[Oxyz]$.

We denote, for brevity, the CRS by K and the system $[Oxyz]$ by k . It is therefore clear, that the matrix $M(k,K)$, which transforms a given vector from k to K is

$$M(k,K) = R_3(-E-90^\circ)R_1(-d)R_3(S+90^\circ) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sin E \sin S + \cos E \cos S \cos d & -\sin E \cos S + \cos E \sin S \cos d & \cos E \sin d \\ -\cos E \sin S + \sin E \cos S \cos d & \cos E \cos S + \sin E \sin S \cos d & \sin E \sin d \\ -\cos S \sin d & -\sin S \sin d & \cos d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} a_{12} a_{13} \\ a_{21} a_{22} a_{23} \\ a_{31} a_{32} a_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

In this expression, E and d are longitude and colatitude, respectively, of the z^k -axis with respect to K , and S , which replaces $E + s$ of Capitaine, Guinot and Souchay, is the angle between the x^k -axis and the direction of the vector $(001)^T \times \hat{x}(E,d)^T$ with respect to K , i.e., that along the direction in which the x - y planes of K and k , respectively, intersect.

Since the matrix $M(k, K)$ is orthogonal, we have

$$M(K,k) = M^T(k,K).$$

We therefore have

$$x^k = M^T(k, K)x^K \quad \text{and} \quad x^K = M(k, K)x^k.$$

Since we assume x^K not to vary with time, we have

¹ On leave from the Department of Astronomy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

$$\dot{x}^k = \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial E} M(K,k) \right) \dot{E} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial S} M(K,k) \right) \dot{S} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial d} M(K,k) \right) \dot{d} \right] M(k,K) x^k,$$

which expresses the components of \dot{x}^k in terms of x^k itself, as well as of E , S , d , \dot{E} , \dot{S} and \dot{d} .

Routine calculations show that

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial E} M(K,k) \right) M(k,K) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{33} & -a_{32} \\ -a_{33} & 0 & a_{31} \\ a_{32} & -a_{31} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial S} M(K,k) \right) M(k,K) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and}$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial d} M(K,k) \right) M(k,K) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\cos S \\ 0 & 0 & -\sin S \\ \cos S & \sin S & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

One obtains the angular velocity vector ω (whose direction is in the axis of rotation) by taking the cross product of the vector with its velocity. Thus we get

$$\omega^k = \begin{pmatrix} -(\dot{E} \sin S \sin d - \dot{d} \cos S) xy + (\dot{E} \cos S \sin d + \dot{d} \sin S)(y^2 + z^2) + (\dot{E} \cos d - \dot{S}) xz \\ (\dot{E} \sin S \sin d - \dot{d} \cos S)(x^2 + z^2) - (\dot{E} \cos S \sin d + \dot{d} \sin S) xy + (\dot{E} \cos d - \dot{S}) yz \\ -(\dot{E} \sin S \sin d - \dot{d} \cos S) yz - (\dot{E} \cos S \sin d + \dot{d} \sin S) xz - (\dot{E} \cos d - \dot{S})(x^2 + y^2) \end{pmatrix}$$

This shows that ω depends on the vector; the requirement stated by Capitaine, Guinot and Souchay could therefore be changed to read:

“ σ is kinematically defined in such a way that, as P (i.e., the z-axis of k) moves with respect to K, the equatorial plane of k has no component of instantaneous rotation with respect to the z-axis of k.” Only for $z = 0$ will $\dot{E} \cos d = \dot{S}$ satisfy this requirement.

(Note that what I have done is to regard the motion of a vector (supposedly fixed in K) with respect to k, this mirrors the motion of the system with respect to the vector and is practically the same thing.)

There is a certain analogy of the whole situation with the precessional motion of the Q_m system with respect to the Q_0 system. The derivative of α with respect to time is given by $\dot{\alpha} = m + n \sin \alpha \tan \delta$. Even if we had a nonmoving origin for the right ascensions, which would be accomplished by setting the origin such that $m = 0$, we see that in general, $\dot{\alpha} = 0$ only on the instant equator, quite analogous to the situation we have described above.

Acknowledgement

I am indebted to my colleagues Nicole Capitaine and Suzanne Débarbat for comments and criticism.

Reference

Capitaine, N., Guinot, B. and Souchay, J. 1986. *Celest. Mech.* 39, 283.