APPENDIX to Circular-Letter No. 4 - H of 1954

THE HARMONIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE TIDE - GENERATING POTENTIAL

by A.T. DOODSON, D.Sc., Tidal Institute, the University of Liverpool. (Communicated by Prof. H. Lamb., F .R .S. Received June 12, 1921.) (Reprinted from the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, A. vol. 100)

§ 1. *Introduction.*

The harmonic development of the tide-generating potential is the basis of most work on tidal observations, and since 1883 the development given by Sir G.H. Darwin has been universally used and has been of remarkable value. But discrepancies between prediction and observation are serious and have been attributed to faulty « harmonic constants » ; it has been assumed that if these were improved better predictions would be obained, and it has also been tacitly assumed that it is only necessary to consider the harmonic constituents as given by Darwin. Recent work, however, especially at the Tidal Institute, has shown that when the « Darwinian constituents » are removed from the tidal height there is a residue composed of constituents which are not included in his schedules. These are such that any slight improvements possible in the « constants » usually obtained are comparatively negligible.

The obvious course, therefore, was to make a more thorough development of the potential, and in view of the unknown nature of the residues great accuracy was obviously desirable, especially as the possibility of resonance has always to be considered. The development given in this paper, even if it proves to be needlessly thorough for practical tidal work, will cover the needs of research work, since it includes all terms whose coefficients (relatively to the greatest coefficient) are greater than 0.00010.

Darwin used the old lunar theory and referred everything to the orbit rather than to the ecliptic; his results are all given in the algebraic form, arithmetic being used only to decide what terms to omit. His development is a quasi-harmonic development because he retains factors in the coefficients and terms in the arguments which are considered as constant over fairly long intervals of time, such as a year, but which are really slowly variable. The present method **[p. 306]** of development uses the results of the modern lunar theory and is essentially a numerical method throughout. The theoretical expansions for the longitude and latitude of the moon referred to the ecliptic, as given by Brown*, have been used, and the development is truly harmonic. Ferrel's development, published in 1874, was also truly harmonic, but it included only the most important terms.

The new schedules of constituents, as compared with the old schedules, contain many terms which, for modern purposes, are too large to be ignored; this matter is dealt with in \S 9, and Table VI gives a comparison of the main terms as given in the old and in the new schedules. It is of interest to note that J.C . Adams verified Darwin's work and carried out the development so as to include more terms, but this work does not seem to have been published.

^{*} Monthly Notices Roy. Astron. Soc., vol. 65, p. 285 (1905).

One great aim of the author has been to reduce the subject to its very simplest form, and what credit is due for this must be equally shared with Prof. J. Proudman, for whose criticism and advice the author is deeply indebted.

A great deal of attention has been paid to the matters of notation and presentation of results; a prominent feature in both is the adoption of a special notation for the arguments, which is such that any argument is represented by a number and, what is very striking, if the terms in the expansions are arranged according to the argument-number, they are thereby automatically arranged according to « speed », which is very convenient.

The application of the new development to the analysis of observations and to predictions is not fully dealt with in this paper. Certain suggestions are made, however, concerning future practice.

§ 2. *Development of the Lunar Tide-generating Potential.*

**

[p. 307]

Then

$$
V = \frac{\mu M \rho^2}{r^3} \left(P_2 + \frac{\rho}{r} P_3 + \frac{\rho^2}{r^2} P_4 + \dots \right) = V_2 + V_3 + V_4 + \dots,
$$
 (2)

where

 $P_2 = 1/2$ (3 $\cos^2 2 - 1$), $P_3 = 1/2$ (5 cos³ \approx -3 cos \approx). $P_4 =$ $1/8$ (35 cos⁴ \approx $-$ 30 cos² \approx $+$ 3), $=$ geocentric zenith distance of the moon from P , S attraction between unit masses at unit distance apart and *n* **=** $=$ ga²/E.

The ultimate result of the development of V is a series of terms harmonic in time, and as only the relative values of these are usually of importance, it is convenient to have the greatest numerical coefficient approximately unity; hence we write

$$
G = \frac{3}{4} \frac{M}{E} \cdot \frac{ga^{2\rho}}{c^3},
$$
 (3)

and therefore

$$
V_2 = 2/3 (3 cos2 5 - 1) . G (c/r)3
$$

\n
$$
V_3 = 2/3 (5 cos3 5 - 3 cos 5) . G (c/r)4 (\rho/c)
$$

\n
$$
V_4 = 1/6 (35 cos4 5 - 30 cos2 5 + 3) . G (c/r)5 (\rho/c)2
$$
 (4)

The factor ρ/c is small and can be taken as equal to the value of the sine of the mean equatorial horizontal parallax, whose numerical value is $3422''.70 \div 206265'' = 0.0165937.$

The first stage in the further development of these functions is the separation of the long-period, diurnal, semi-diurnal, ter-diurnal, and quarter-diurnal species of constituents. Referring to fig. 1, let γ be the first point of Aries, M the place

of the moon, C the north Pole, P the given place, and A the intersection of the meridian of P with the equator, $\mathcal{L} = \gamma$ A. Also let θ , z , $z \zeta$, and γ be respectively the geocentric zenith distances γM , MC, MP, MA and γA .

Then, from the spherical triangle MGP we have

 $\cos \theta = \sin \lambda \cos z + \cos \lambda \sin z \cos C$,

and since the angle C increases at the rate of approximately 360° per mean lunar day, the expansion of V_2 , V_3 , and V_4 in terms of cos C, cos 2C, cos 3C, and cos 4C will separate the species of constituents ; these expansions are expressed as series of terms involving functions of λ and G, multiplied by functions of z and C. The former will be called « geodetic coefficients », and it is desirable that these should all be expressed with the same maximum value, G, so that the numerical coefficients; of the harmonic constituents ultimately obtained will give the chief index of their relative importance.

It is easy to verify, either directly, or by using the theory of spherical harmonics, that

$$
V_2 = (c/r)^3 (G_0H_0 + G_1H_1 + G_2H_2)
$$

\n
$$
V_3 = (c/r)^4 (0.004947G_0'H_0' + 0.011425G_1'H_1'
$$

\n
$$
+ 0.031935G_2'H_2' + 0.013828G_3'H_3')
$$

\n
$$
V_4 = (c/r)^5 (0.000046G_0''H_0'' + 0.000121G_1''H_1'' + 0.000148G_2''H_2'' + 0.000522G_3''H_3'' + 0.000201G_4''H_4'')
$$
 (5)

where

$$
G_0 = 1/2 G (1 - 3 sin^2 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_2 = G cos^2 x
$$

\n
$$
G_3 = 1.11803G sin x (3 - 5 sin^2 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_1' = 0.72618G cos x (1 - 5 sin^2 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_2' = 2.59808G sin x cos^2 x
$$

\n
$$
G_3' = G cos^3 x
$$

\n
$$
G_3' = G cos^3 x
$$

\n
$$
G_3'' = 0.12500C (3 - 30 sin^2 x + 35 sin^4 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_1'' = 0.47346G sin 2 x (3 - 7 sin^2 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_2'' = 0.77778G cos^2 x (1 - 7 sin^2 x)
$$

\n
$$
G_3'' = 307920G sin x cos^3 x
$$

\n
$$
G_4'' = G cos^4 x
$$

\n
$$
...
$$

\n
$$
H_0 = 2/3 - 2 cos^2 z
$$

\n
$$
H_1 = sin 2 z cos C = 2 cos z cos \zeta
$$

\n
$$
H_2 = sin^2 z cos 2 C = 2 cos^2 \zeta - sin^2 z
$$

\n
$$
H_1' = sin z cos C (1 - 5 cos^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_1' = sin z cos C (1 - 5 cos^2 z) = cos z (1 - 5 cos^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_2' = sin^2 z cos z cos 2 C = cos z (2 cos^2 \zeta - sin^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_3' = sin^3 z cos 3 C = cos \zeta (4 cos^2 \zeta - 3 sin^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_4'' = sin 2 z cos C. (3 - 7 cos^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_4''' = sin^2 z cos 2 C. (1 - 7 cos^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_4''' = sin^2 z cos 2 C. (1 - 7 cos^2 z)
$$

\n
$$
H_4''' = sin^2 z cos 2
$$

The numerical factors in the geodetic coefficients are necessary for uch coefficient to have the same maximum value.

The seconds forms of the expressions for H_1 , H_2 , H_1' , H_2' and H_3' are obtained by using

$$
\sin z \cos C = \cos \zeta,
$$

derived from the spherical triangle MCA. The corresponding expressions for H_0 "... H_4 " are not given, simply because they are not used; obviously there are simple relations between these and H_0 , H_1 and H_2 , and those are used, as will be shown later.

The development in terms of cos z and cos ξ is required in order to use the known harmonic expansions for the longitude and latitude of the moon referred to the ecliptic. Referring to fig. 1, let γ L be the ecliptic and let

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}\n0 & = & \gamma \ L = & \text{longitude of moon} \\
\delta & = & LM = & \text{latitude of moon} \\
\omega & = & \text{angle A}\gamma L = & \text{inclination of ecliptic to equator} \\
\omega' & = & \text{angle L}\gamma M\n\end{array}\n\tag{7}
$$

Then we have

 $\cos z = \sin \theta' \sin (\omega + \omega').$ cos $\zeta = \cos \theta' \cos \lambda' + \sin \theta' \sin \lambda' \cos (\omega + \omega'),$

and
$$
\cos \theta' = \cos \theta \cos \delta,
$$

$$
\sin \theta' \sin \omega' = \sin \delta,
$$

$$
\sin \theta' \cos \omega' = \sin \theta \cos \delta;
$$

whence

$$
\begin{array}{l}\n\cos z = \sin \omega \cos \delta \sin \theta + \cos \omega \sin \delta \\
\cos \zeta = \cos \delta \cos \theta \cos \zeta + (\cos \omega \cos \delta \sin \theta - \sin \omega \sin \delta) \sin \zeta\n\end{array}\n\tag{8}
$$

[p. 310J

It is, of course, possible to expand V_2 , V_3 , and V_4 in terms of θ and δ direct, but a good deal of analysis would be necessary ; in addition to losing the present simplicity of the analysis, no real saving of arithmetical work would be achieved. The arithmetical expansions of cos *z* and cos *X,* are first obtained from the expressions of the longitude and latitude of the moon, and the rest of the work simply consists of carrying out systematically the operations involved in (5) and (6). The value of ω used in (8) is the value on January 1, 1900, viz., $\omega = 23^{\circ}27'8'''26.$

§ 3. *Choice of Variables for Arguments.*

The expansions for V_2 and V_3 necessarily involve six independent variables in the arguments, and considerable attention has been paid to the choice of these. For reasons which will be appreciated later, the independent variables adopted are defined as follows —

$$
\tau = \text{local mean lunar time reduced to angle}
$$

s — moon's mean longitude

- *^h—* sun's mean longitude
- $p =$ longitude of moon's perigee

 $N' = -N$, where N is the longitude of the moon's ascending node

 (9)

 p_1 = longitude of sun's perigee

These are taken in preference to the variables ordinarily used in lunar theory.

Mean solar time will be taken as commencing at midnight, and, analogously, local mean lunar time will be measured from the lower transit of the « mean moon ». Then if we write

$$
t =
$$
Greenwich mean solar time

we have $\chi = 15^\circ t + h = 180^\circ - L$ (10)

and $\tau = \frac{7}{4} - s + 180^\circ = 15^\circ t + h - s - L$

At first sight the choice of t rather than τ as an independent variable seems simpler, but there are many conveniences attached to the choice of the argument of the principal lunar constituent as one of the independent variables, both in the presentation of the schedules and in actual application.

The α speeds ν of the variables are all positive, and, as they are written, are in descending order of magnitude. The chief variables are τ , *s*, and *h*, and it is a curious fact that if we classify in terms of τ , with a sub-classification with regard to s, and a further sub-classification with regard to h, the constituents are completely separated into groups with no over-lapping of speeds. It is still more $[p, 311]$ curious that to the order required the same process can be continued for all the variables. Owing to this, a rather elegant and very useful form of presentation of the result is possible.

§ 4. *Numerical Data for Arguments.*

The numerical data for the arguments is given by Brown, or may be obtained from the « Nautical Almanac », 1917 and 1923. The origin of time is taken as midnight at Greenwich on January 0-1, 1900:—

 $\tau = \frac{15}{t + h - s} - L$ $s = 277^{\circ} 0248 + 481267^{\circ} 8906T + 0^{\circ} 0020T^2 + \dots$ $h = 280^{\circ} 1895 + 36000^{\circ} 7689T + 0^{\circ} 0003T^2 + \dots$ $p = 334^{\circ} \cdot 3853 + 4069^{\circ} \cdot 0340$ T $-0^{\circ} \cdot 0103$ T² + ... $N' = 100^{\circ} 8432 + 1934^{\circ} 1420T - 0^{\circ} 0021T^2 + \dots$ $p_1 = 281^\circ.2209 +$ $f^\circ.7192T + 0^\circ.0005T^2 + ...$

where T is a Julian century of 36,525 mean solar days.

The speeds per mean solar day are as follows :—

The speeds per mean solar hour are not very important, and are omitted.

No provision is made in this paper for the discussion of observations other than those referred to Greenwich mean solar time.

§ 5. The Argument-Number.

The actual calculations have been facilitated very considerably by the use of a special notation for the arguments, and this notation has been retained in the schedules. All the arguments are linear functions of the standard variables, with integral coefficients, and it is very desirable to have a short method of writing such expressions as

$$
2\tau-3s+4h+p-2N'+2p_1.
$$

Now the various coefficients involved in the expressions for the arguments are only occasionally outside the range —4 to 4, and this suggests the use of a datum of five for each so as to avoid writing negative values as much as possible. In the case of τ , however, the coefficients are always taken as positive, and with this exception, if we add five to each of the coefficients in the above expression we shall get the *argument-number*

229637.

This number will serve to denote the argument and may also be used to denote the term as a whole. It is divided into two parts for reasons explained later

! . . . [P- 312] In rare instances the coefficients are outside the range —4 to 4 and in these cases we replace -6 by 1, -5 by 0, 5 by X and 6 by E. The addition (or subtraction) of arguments is quite simple; allowance has to be made for the datum 055 555, which should be subtracted (or added) either before or after the operation — the former method is most convenient when dealing with the addition of one argument to each of a series of arguments.

§ 6. *Methods of Calculation.*

The original data for the longitude, latitude and sine parallax of the moon were obtained from the Tables by Brown, and are given in Tables I to III in the notation of § 3 ; the coefficients in the expansions of the longitude and latitude were reduced to radians, and the coefficients in the sine parallax expansion divided by the absolute term $3422^{\prime\prime}$ -70 in order to get c/r . In these expansions the coefficients are given to six decimal places.

The procedure is substantially that indicated by equations (8), (5) and (6). It may be noted that H_0 and H_2 can be calculated together, since

$$
2 \cos^2 \zeta = H_2 + 1/2 H_0 + 2/3,
$$

In the case of the terms arising from V_3 , the expansions of $(c/r)^4$ cos z and $(c/r)^4$ cos ζ were determined and used as follows:—

$$
(c/r)^{4}H_{0}' = (4/3 + 5/2H_{0}) \cdot (c/r)^{4} \cos z,
$$

\n
$$
(c/r)^{4}H_{1}' = (-2/3 + 5/2H_{0}) \cdot (c/r)^{4} \cos \zeta,
$$

\n
$$
(c/r)^{4}H_{2}' = H_{2} \cdot (c/r)^{4} \cos z,
$$

and

 $(c/r)^4H_3$ ' = ter-diurnal part of $2H_2$. $(c/r)^4$ cos ζ .

The terms arising from V_4 were found in a similar manner; 4 $\cos^4 z$ was obtained from $(2/3 - H_0)^2$ and hence H_0'' was readily calculated; also we have

> $H_1^{\prime\prime} = (2/3 + 7/2H_0)$. H₁, $H_2'' = (-4/3 + 7/2H_0)$. H_2 . $H_3'' =$ ter-diurnal part of H_1H_2 , $H_4'' =$ quarter-diurnal part of $1/2$ H_2^2 .

The terms resulting from V_4 , however, were, except for one term, just too small to be incorporated in the schedules.

The order of variables adopted in § 3 was not altogether the best for actual calculations and certain modifications were made. Brown's arguments for $(0 - s)$, δ and c/r are given in the form

$$
a(s-h)+b(s-h)+c(s-N)+d(h-p_1),
$$
 [p. 313]

and if the variables be changed to s , h , p , N and p_1 , this expression takes the form

$$
As + Bh + Cp + DN + Ep1
$$

with the relation $A + B + C + D + E = 0$. If the datum 5 be used then the sum of the figures in each argument-number is 25 (*).

Knowing this, it was possible to omit systematically one figure of the argument-number, and so to save a considerable amount of writing. In the case of cos *z* and cos *I,* however, this relation was not the same for all terms, but they separated themselves into sets of which the characteristic was that the sum of the figures of an argument-number was constant within the set.

^{*} In the Tables, however, it should be noted that the variable there used is — N, and not N, so that the relation just mentioned does not hold.

By rearranging the order of the variables the terms of a set were separated into large groups in which the only effective variables were s and *h,* if *p* be ignored as mentioned above. The advantage gained by grouping was enormous because of the amount of writing thereby eliminated, and in fact the calculations were greatly facilitated by these methods of grouping.

The actual multiplication of series was quite an easy matter, and very efficient current checks were available; the greatest trouble was in connection with the collection of coefficients contributing to a term in the expansion, and this part of the work was always done twice. The author acknowledges with thanks the great assistance he has received from the staff of the Tidal Institute in this laborious arithmetical work.

Certain methods of checking were used which may be illustrated from Table III. Consider the calculation of $(c/r)^3$ from (c/r) ; if we suppose that all the variables are made zero except *s* then each of these expansions reduces to seven group-terms: all the coefficients of terms whose argument-numbers start with six would be added together, and so on. Taking the abbreviated expansion of (c/r) and cubing it should give an expansion for the abbreviated value of $(c/r)^3$ whose terms should be equal to the group-terms obtained from the full expansion. This method of checking, with appropriate modifications, has been used with the groupings explained above, and it has been very efficient indeed. The difference between any two such group-terms obtained by the two methods has always been less than 0000050; usually it has been much less than this. In the one case where the difference reached 0000050 no error could be found, but as coefficients less than 0000005 were ignored in this case the probability of serious error in any one term is not great. The coefficients in the final schedules are reduced to five decimals and terms with coefficients less than 0.00010 have been ignored; the figures given may be taken as accurate to within two in the last place.

The expansions of $(c/r)^3$, $(c/r)^4$, cos *z* and cos ζ are contained in the following Tables:—

Argument- number.	Coefficient.	Argument- number.	Coefficient.	Argument- number.	Coefficient.	Argument- number.	Coefficient.
55.654	5	555	-605	74.356	47	85.255	175.
753	1	654	-138	455	-41	475	-219
775	6	65.356	-2	554	-119	86.254	-3
$56 \cdot 356$	-12	455	0.109760	75.355	3728	$9\bar{1}$.755	3
455	90	554	87	454	6	90.556	9
554	-3243	653	-12	575	-1996	91.555	67
576	7	675	-192	76 354	-37	92 356	6
57.355	-1026	66 355	9	574	2	554	$^{-1}$
553	-37	454	-532	$77 \cdot 155$	-5	576	$^{-2}$
575	-267	575	3	375	3	93.355	70
58.354	-42	67.255	-64	81 657	2	575	-28
574	-11	453	-6	855		94.354	-- 1
59.353	-- 1	68.254	-2	80 656	$\overline{21}$	95.155	9
60.658		70.558	$\overline{2}$	81.457	4	375	-19
61.635	ı	756	13	655	186	595	2
657	36	71.557	40	82.456	71	\mathtt{XI} 655	$\overline{2}$
855	6	656	— 1	555	$\overline{2}$	X0 456	ı
62 436	-2	755	149	654	-3	X1 1455	10
535	-1	72.566	802	676	-2	675	-1
656	1000	655	-16	83.455	931	X3 255	$\overline{5}$
755	-6	754	-2	675	-46	475	-5
63.435	-31	73.335	-2	84.256	3	X5 275	-2
457	13	357		355	-3	E1 355	$\mathbf{1}$
556	-3	555	0.011490	454	-14		
655	0.022236	654		476	-1		
64.456	717	775	-3	575	ı		

Table I.—Expansion for the Longitude of the Moon: $(\theta - s)$. Coefficients of sines to six decimals.

 $[p. 314]$

Table II.—Expansion for the Latitude of the Moon: (δ). Coefficients of sines to six decimals.

number.	Argument Coefficient.	Argument- pumber.	Coefficient.	number.	Argument- Coefficient.	Argument- number.	Coefficient.
55.566	- 4	544	-59	466	33	84 366	4
665	-4847	566	24	565	-26	465	-3
56 444	-25	65 345	154	664	-6	564	-6
466	4	565	0.089504	75 245	8	85.365	300
565	23	66.344	-2	455	4897	585	-31
664	-27	465	$\overline{2}$	564	4	86 364	-3
57.245	-1	564	-31	685	- 14	90.666	$\boldsymbol{2}$
465	-808	67.365	-75	76 464	-26	91.445	$\overline{2}$
685		585	-11	77 265	-7	665	15
58 464	-36	68 364	-3	485	-2	92.466	6
59.463	-1	70.646	3	80.546	2	93.465	73
61 547	5	71 645	32	766		685	-1
745	3	667	2	81.545	18	94.161	-1
62.546	144	72 446	9	Ŷ, 567	$\boldsymbol{2}$	95 265	19
645	-2	545	-2	765	12	485	-5
63.545	3024	666	43	82.566	39	X1 565	6
765	-8	73.445	162	665	-1	X3.365	
64.346		665	967	83 345	10	$X5$ 165	
445	-3	74.444	-4	565	568	E1 .464	

Table III.—Expansions for (c/r) , $(c/r)^3$ and $(c/r)^4$. (Lunar.) Coefficients of cosines to six decimals, except for $(c/r)^4$, where the coefficients are given to four decimals. **[p. 315]**

Argument. number.	c/r coefficient.	$(c/r)^3$ coefficient.	$(c/r)^4$ coefficient.	Argument- number.	c/r coefficient.	$(c/r)^3$ coefficient.	$(c/r)^4$ coefficient.
55.555 654	1.000000	1.004736 7	1.0095	74:356	37	167	3
775		-34		455 554	-32	-143	-2
56.455	4	-42	-1 -1	75.355	-88 2970	-287 13442	-4 210
554	$-117 -$	-318	-4	454	۰Б	22	
57.355	-89	1463	32	575	-4	-48	-1
553	-3	-7		76 354	-30	-135	-2
575	-31	-105	-2	77.155	-- 4	-11	
58.354	-6	47	ı	375	-3	-13	
574	-2	-6		8I 855	1	6	
61.657	14	46	1	80.656	20	91	1
855	$\overline{2}$	26	ı	81.457	3	13	
62.656	422	1348	18	655	176	814	18
755	-3	-11		82 456	67	308	5
63.435	-14	-52	-1	555		-10	
457	$\boldsymbol{6}$	19		654	-3	-14	
655	0.010025	31475	430	83 455	902	4189	66
64.456	337	1014	14	675	- 3	-15	
555	-285	-866	-12	84 256	4	21	
654	-66	-208	-3	355	-3	-16	
65.455	0.054501	0.164395	2201	454	-14	$-.65$	- 1
554	44	133	2	85.255	182	1076	19
653	-6	-18		475		-4	
675	-209	-629	-8	86.254	-3	-16	
66.355	5 -278	13		$9\bar{1}$ $\cdot 755$	3	17	
454 575	$\overline{2}$	-846 6	-11	90.556 91 555	10	50 396	1
67.255	-35	-2	$\mathbf{1}$	92.356	76	36	6 1
453	-3	-9		554	6 -1	- 5	
475	-24	-77	-1	$93 - 355$	83	496	9
68.254	-1	-1		94.354	-1	-8	
70.756	9	43	ı	95.155	12	85	2
71.557	27	83	1	XI 655	3	15	
755	109	513	8	X0.456	$\overline{2}$	11	
72.556	561	1771	24	X1 .455	13	79	1
655	-11	-41	- 1	X2.256		3	
73.335	-1	-6		X3.255	7	52	$\mathbf{1}$
555	8249	26530	367	X5.055		4	
775	-4	-18		E1 355	ı	9	

 \bar{z}

48

[p. 316]

Table IV.—Expansion for cos z. (Lunar.) Coefficients of sines to six decimals.

[p. 317]

 $\ddot{}$

Table V.—Expansion for cos ζ . (Lunar.) Coefficients of cosines to six decimals.

§ 7. *D evelopm ent of the Solar Tide-generating Potential*

The tide-generating potential due to the sun is developed by methods similar to those already used, but the whole problem is much simpler in this case. The expansions for the longitude and sine-parallax of the sun contain very few terms, and the sun's latitude may be ignored.

Using subscripts to denote quantities corresponding to those used for the lunar potential, we have

$$
\theta_1 = h + 0.033501 \sin (h - p_1) + 0.000351 \sin 2 (h - p_1) \n+ 0.000005 \sin 3 (h - p_1) + ... \nc_1/r_1 = 1 + 0.016750 \cos (h - p_1) + 0.000281 \cos 2 (h - p_1) \n+ 0.000005 \cos 3 (h - p_1) + ...
$$
\n(11)

which may be obtained from the formulae of elliptic motion, with eccentricity 00167504.

The geodetic coefficients are the same as for the lunar potential, except that G is replaced by

$$
G_1 = \frac{3}{4} \frac{S}{E} \frac{ga^2 \rho^2}{c_1^3} = \frac{S}{M} \frac{c^3}{c_1^3} G, \qquad (12)
$$

where S, M, E are respectively the masses of the sun, moon and earth. It is desirable, however, to retain G as the common coefficient of both lunar and solar constituents, and to absorb the factor $(S/c₁³)+(M/c³)$ in the numerical coefficients of the solar constituents. Now, $1/c$ and $1/c₁$ are proportional to the sines of the mean equatorial horizontal parallaxes of the moon and sun, respectively; the former is accurately known, and its value is 3422" 70; also, it is definitely known and well established* that S/E multiplied by the cube of the mean equatorial horizontal parallax of the sun is equal to $2^{\prime\prime}\cdot26428\times10^8$. The mass of the moon is not very accurately known, but the best value** is apparently given by $E/M = 81.53 \pm 0.047$. We therefore obtain $G_1 = 0.46040$ G, and this numerical coefficient has been used.

The terms arising from the solar potential are given in the same schedules as those arising from the lunar potential, and are distinguished by inserting the appropriate geodetic coefficient for the solar terms, and leaving it as understood for the lunar terms.

§ **8** . *Explanation of the Schedules*.

The harmonic terms in the development of the potential are contained in four schedules, numbered 0 to 3. The number of the schedule denotes the species; for example, Schedules 1 and 2 contain respectively all the diurnal and semi-diurnal terms, whatever be their source — lunar or solar, V_2 or V_3 . Each term has a [p. 319] numerical coefficient and a geodetic coefficient, and the source of the term is indicated by the latter; terms arising from the lunar V_3 have geodetic coefficients G_0 ', G_1 ', G_2 ' or G_3 ', the suffix indicating the species. Terms arising from the

^{*} Ball, « Spherical Astronomy », pp. 309 and 310.

^{ «} Monthly Notices, Roy. Astron. Soe. », February, 1911.**

solar V_2 have geodetic coefficients G_0 , G_1 or G_2 , and so have the terms from the lunar V_2 : to distinguish between the two sources, the geodetic coefficient is not written in the schedules for the lunar V_2 terms, and at the top of each schedule is a note stating the geodetic coefficient that is supposed to be understood. The values of the geodetic coefficients, considered as functions of the latitude, are placed at the top of the schedule.

With each geodetic coefficient is associated either a sine or a cosine of the given argument; the necessary information is given at the top of the schedule; as examples, from Schedule 1 we have the terms

and

037689 G i sin j 145-555 j , —016817 G! sin jl65-555 J —000108 *G i* cos j 145 655

and from Schedule 2 we have terms

0 90812 G_2 cos $\{255\cdot555\}$, 042286 G_2 cos $\{273\cdot555\}$ and 0.000525 G_2 ' sin $\{265.555\}$,

curl brackets being used to denote the argument corresponding to the argumentnumber.

The numerical coefficients are given to five decimal places, and all terms with numerical coefficients less than 000010 are ignored. The latter rule just cuts out all the V₄ terms except one, a quarter-diurnal term, which has a coefficient of 000016. and this also is ignored.

As was mentioned in \S 3, the terms, when arranged according to the argument-number, are thereby automatically arranged according to speed, as may be easily verified from the speeds given in § 4. The full argument-number will be used to denote the associated term.

Considered from the point of view of analysis of tidal observations, and assuming that the terms in the tide correspond to the terms in the potential, it is possible, using one year's observations only, to distinguish between terms whose arguments differ by multiples of *h ,* but not between terms whose arguments differ by multiples of p , N' or p_1 . If, therefore, we have several terms whose arguments are the same so far as τ , *s* and *h* are concerned, these must necessarily be regarded as one *constituent.** The word *a* constituent » will be applied and restricted to a set of terms wholly inseparable within a year ; we can therefore appropriately speak of the first three figures of the argument-number as the « constituent-number », and it is convenient to apply the term *a* group-number » to the first two figures of the argument-number ; as an example, take the following :—

[p. 320]

argument-number: 265 555, constituent-number: 265, group-number : 26, species-number : **2** , i.e., semi-diurnal.

^{*} It is possible to infer the separate terms of a constituent if it be assumed that the harmonic terms in the tide have to one another the relations of corresponding terms in the potential, but this is a matter which hardly concerns us at the moment: the point is, that in actual analysis of records not exceeding one year, terms such as the above must be regarded as one.

It is impracticable, even were it desirable, to invent for each constituent a symbol corresponding to the symbols already in use; the constituent-number is much more serviceable than an initial can be, and it certainly conveys a great deal more. Certain symbols such as M_2 , S_2 , K_1 and O_1 are, however, well established, and may still be used. A list of Darwin's symbols, together with the corresponding constituent-number, is given later (Table VI). It should be remarked, however, that each tidal-constituent given by Darwin only includes a particular set of terms from the whole of the contributory terms to our constituents. Since, however, it is the same constituent that is dealt with, though his expression for it is not complete, there is no objection to regarding his symbols and our numbers as equivalent.

Two diagrams are given to illustrate the schedules. The first, Diagram A,

gives for the first three species a representation of the constituents, with speed in abscissa and the logarithm of the absolute value of the coefficient as ordinate, assuming that the contributory terms are additive regardless of sign. The logarithmic scale gives, to some extent, a false idea of the magnitude of the constituent, but the scale is convenient for representation; further, the difficulties of analysis are not caused by the large constituents, but by the small ones, and, from this point of view, the logarithmic scale does correspond roughly to the difficulties experienced **[P- 321]** by the harmonic analyses.

The speed scale is indicated by the figures at the top of the diagram ; these, with the species-number, give the group-numbers, and the places of the constituents in the diagram can then be readily found. An increment of 1 in the groupnumber coresponds to an increase in speed of about 13° per mean solar day; the **increase in speed for an increase of 1 in the constituent-number is about 1° per mean solar day.**

Diagram B gives, on a more open scale than Diagram A, a representation of constituents separable in a period of about nineteen years. Terms whose

DIAGRAM B: terms separable in about nineteen years. (a) : two distinct terms not **separable from one another (see § 7).**

arguments differ only in *pi* are regarded as one; in a few cases two terms may have nearly the same speed, though their arguments differ in p and N', as in the case of the two terms 145 455 and 145-535. The speed of the latter term is greater than that of the former by $p = 2N$, which is comparatively small; these terms are marked by *(a)* on the diagram. Only four groups are illustrated.

The speed scale is indicated by the figures at the top of the diagram; these, with the group-number, give the constituent-number, and an increment of unity in constituent-number corresponds to an increment in speed of nearly 1° per mean solar day.

SCHEDULE 0.

 $G_0 = \frac{1}{2} G (1 - 3 \sin^2 \lambda)$, *associated with coefficients of cosines to five decimals.* $G_0' = 1.11803 \text{ G} \sinh (3-5 \sin^2 \lambda)$, *associated with coefficients of sines to five decimals.*

(*When no geodetic coefficient is entered* **Go** *is understood.)*

54

 $[p. 322]$

SCHEDULE 1.

 $G_1 = G \sin 2\lambda$, associated with coefficients of sines to five decimals.

 $G_1' = 0.72618G \cos \lambda (1-5 \sin^2 \lambda)$, associated with coefficients of cosines to five $decimals.$

(When no geodetic coefficient is entered G_1 is understood.)

 $[p. 323]$

Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument- number.	Coefficient.	
17 (or J_1) group.			18 (or $OO1$) group.			19 group—contd.		
172.656 173 445 645 655 665 765 174 456 555 175.445 455' 465 475	-24 -17 18 -566 -112 -89 -18 16 -87 -2964 -587 13	G_1'	182.556 183 545 555 565 185 355 365 455 465 555 565 575 585	-32 -16 -492 -96 -240 -48 -40 -16 -1623 -1039 -218 -14	G' G'	-19 195 255 -311 455 -199 465 475 -42 $1X$ group. 1X3.555 -50 -32 565 1 X5.355	-41	
555 655	-241 46	G_1'	19 group.			365	-27	
665 675 176.454	29 17 15	12	191 655 193.455	-15 -78 -15 -59 -38		1E group.		
177.455			465 655 665			1E3:455	-12	

 S CHEDULE 1-continued.

SCHEDULE 2.

 $G_2 = G \cos^2 \lambda$, associated with coefficients of cosines to five decimals. $G_2' = 2.59808 \text{ G} \sin \lambda \cos^2 \lambda$, associated with coefficients of sines to five decimals. **(** *When no geodetic coefficient is entered* **G**2 *is understood***.)**

Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument- number.		Coefficient.	
20 group.				22 group-contd.			24 (or N_2) group.		
207.855 209.655	15 18		228.654 229 455 $22\mathrm{X}$ 454	54 130 15		243 635 855 244 656	-15 -56		
	21 group.			23 (or $2N_2$) group.			- 147 - 63 -97	G_{2}	
215.955 217.755 $219 - 555$	27 111 69		234.756 235 535 645 655 745	-31 -14 -27 -156 -86	G_{2} G_2'	545 555 556 645 655 755	-569 14 -648 17387 11	G_2' G_{2}	
22 group.		755 236 556	2301 -40		246 456 555	- 33 - 94			
225.755 855 226.656 227 555 645 655	-27 259 -12 -27 -25 671	G_{2}' G_{\circ}	655 754 237 455 545 555 238 554 239 355	-25 36 -29 -104 2777 189 85	G_2'	654 247.445 455 555 655 665 248.454	163 -123 3303 15 17 -12 153	G_{2}	

Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument. Coefficient. number.			Argument- number.	Coefficient.		
25 (or M_2) group.				26 (or L_2) group-contd.			28 group.		
252.756 253.535 755 254.556 655 255 455 535 545 555 655 665 755 765	-11 -40 -273 -314 14 32 47 -3386 .90812 86 16 53 19	G_2' $\frac{G_2}{G_2}$	265 445 455 545 555 565 645 655 665 675 267 455 465	95 -2567 -31 525 99 -12 643 283 40 123 59	$\overset{\mathbf{G_2}^{\prime}}{\mathbf{G_2}^{\prime}}$	283 655 665 285.445 455 465 475 555 565	123 54 -12 643 280 30 48 31 29 group.	$\overset{G_2'}{G_2'}$	
256.554 257.355 455 555 565 575	276 -52 17 107 -51 18	G_2'	271.557 272 556 273 545 555	27 (or S_2) group. 101 2479 94	G ₂ G ₂	293 555 565 295 355 365 555 565 575	107 46 53 23 168 146 47		
26 (or L_2) group.		555 274 554 556	*42286 72 -354 92	G ₂ G ₂ G_2		$2X$ group.			
262 656 263.645 655 264 456 555	-33 24 -670 -10 17		275 .455 545 555 555 565 575 276 554 277.555	29 -147 7858 3648 3423 372 92 78	G_2 G, G ₂ G ₂	2X3.455 2X5 .455 465	17 32 28		

SCHEDULE 2-continued.

SCHEDULE 3.

 $G_3 = G \cos^3 \lambda$, associated with coefficients of cosines to five decimals.

$:$ Argument- number.	Coefficient.		Argument- Coefficient. number.		Argument- Coefficient. number.			
	32 group.			34 group.		36 group.		
327 655	-17 \cdot 33 group.	G_3'	345.645 655 347.455	18 -326 -61	G_3' G_3' G_3'	363 655 17 365.455 67 655 -25 665 -11		
335.755	-56	G_3'		35 group.		37 group.		
337.555 $\ddot{}$	-57	G_3'	355.545 555	66 -1188	G_3' G_3'	375.55 565	-155 -68	G_3' G_3'
							c ₂	

[p. 325]

§ 9. Comparison with Darwin's Results.

Darwin's schedules are not directly comparable with those now given, as his expansion is not purely harmonic. The constituents he gives are of the general form $\int \cos (st+u)$, where σ is the appropriate speed, \int is a function of the inclination of the moon's orbit to the equator, and u depends upon the position of the intersection of the equator and orbit. [p. 326]

Darwin's practice is to replace J and *u* by their mean values within the interval of time considered, and each set of observations is treated with different values of J and *u.* His theoretical « mean coefficient » is the mean value of J cos *u* over a period of about nineteen years, the period of revolution of the node. He shows that $J \cos(\sigma t + u)$ can be expanded in the form

$$
\Sigma
$$
 J_rcos($\sigma t + r \Omega$),

where Ω is the longitude of the node; \int_{r} is not quite constant, but partly depends upon the longitude of the node and upon the inclination of the orbit to the ecliptic. Darwin's mean coefficient is taken as equal to Jo in the above expansion. (This is not the mean value of J, however, which is somewhat larger than Jo : his theory and practice are not quite in conformity in this respect.)

Further expansion by the above method would be very difficult, but it can be shown that one of Darwin's constituent would yield ultimately a set of terms whose arguments would be identical, but for the part dependent on N'. On looking through the new schedules, such sets of terms can be readily picked out; the greatest numerical coefficient in each set should be very nearly equal to Jo, or Darwin's mean coefficient. It will be noticed, however, that in some cases several such sets of terms may be contributory to a « constituent » as defined in § 8. In all cases only one coefficient, the greatest, is extracted to represent each set, and in Table VI those terms (or representative terms) with coefficients greater than 0.00400 are set forth for comparison with Darwin's results. The constituentnumber only is given to represent the argument. In those cases where Darwin has compounded two terms to form one constituent the comparison is made separately; the compounded terms are bracketed. In the case of M_1 three terms are given, of which two are compounded by Darwin; the third term is the true M_1 .

Generally speaking, there is fair agreement, except in the case of μ_2 and the true M_1 ; the cause of the latter discrepancy has been ascertained to be due to certain approximations made by Darwin in expanding V_3 .

The constituents omitted by Darwin and indicated in Table VI are considered to be decidedly worthy of consideration; their combined effect is by no means negligible.

Name.	Number.	Coefficient.	Darwia's coefficient.	Per cent. difference.
Mf Mf Mm Mın Mm Ssa	055 075 075 065 065 065 057	0.50458 0.15642 677 0.08254 466 -442 0 07287	0.50448 0.15654 0.08272 0.07286	0.0 0.1 0.2 0.0
Ter-mensual Evect. mthly. Msf $S_{\mathbf{a}}$	085 063 073 056 083 093 058	0.02995 0 01578 0.01370 0 01176 0.00569 0.00478 0.00427	0.03032 0.01510 0 01242	1.2 4.3 $9-3$
O ₁ \mathbf{K}_1 \mathbf{K}_1 P_1 $\frac{Q_1}{M_1}$ M_1 M_1 $\frac{J_1}{00}$ ρ_1 σ_1 $2Q_1$ S_1	145 165 165 163 135. 155 155 155 175 185 137 127 162 125 167 173 183 147 164 166	0.37689 -0.36233 -0.16817 0.17554 0 07216 -0.02964 -0.01065 -661 -0.02964 -0.01623 0.01371 0 01153 0.01029 0.00955 -0.00756 -0.00566 -0.00492 -0.00491 -0.00423 -0.00423	0 37712 -0.36230) -0.16814 0.17550 0.07302 -0.02970] -0.01044 -0.00990 -0.02970 -0.01624 001416 0.00000 0.00974	0 ¹ 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.2 0.2 2.0 49.8 0.2 0.0 3.3 21.9 2.0
\mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{S}_2 $\overrightarrow{N_2}\overrightarrow{K_2}$ \mathbf{K}_2 \mathbf{r}_2	255 273 245 245 275 275 247	0.90812 0.42286 0.17387 -569 0.07858 0.03648 0.03303	0.90852 0.42274 0.17592 0.07858 0.03646 \int 0.03412	0.0 0.0 1.2 0.0 0.1 0.3
\mathfrak{L}_2 $\mathbf{L_{2}}$ \mathbf{L}_2 \mathbf{T}_2 2Ν λ,	237 265 265 265 272 235 263 227 285	0.02777 -0.02567 643 525 0.02479 0 02301 −0 00670 0.00671 0 00643	0.02188 -0.02574] 646 I 0.02486 0.02346 -0.00660	21.2 0.3 0 5 0.3 2.0 1.5
M_{3}	355	-0.01188	-0.01198	0.8

Table VI.-Comparison of New Expansion with Darwin's.

The effect of taking mean values of J and u over a period of a year is readily investigated; the process is practically equivalent to taking a mean value of N' (or N) in the set of terms obtained by expanding $J \cos(\sigma t + u)$.

 $[p. 327]$

Suppose that

$$
\int \cos (ct + u) = \int_0 \cos ct + \int_1 \cos (ct + N) + \cdots; \qquad [P. 328]
$$

then, if bars denote mean values of functions of N, we have

$$
\begin{array}{l} \textbf{j} \ \cos \ (ct+u) - \overline{\textbf{j}} \ \cos \ (ct+u) \ = \ \textbf{j}_1 \ \cos \ (ct+N) - \textbf{j}_1 \ \cos \ (ct+N) \\ \text{ } = \ 2 \textbf{j}_1 \ \sin \ 1/2 \ (\overline{N}-N) \ \sin \ (ct+1/2 \ N \ + \ 1/2 \ \overline{N}). \end{array}
$$

Therefore the effect is to leave a residual harmonic term with coefficient approximately equal to J_1 sin $(N-N)$; at the ends of the yearly period this has the approximate value of $1/6$ J₁. Now the size of J₁ is not to be judged by the size of Jo, and large residues may be left by the smaller constituents. On looking through the schedules it will be found that there is a possibility of residuals of coefficients 0.011, 0.005, 0.005, \dots , in the long-period constituents, 0.012, 0.012, \dots , in diurnal constituents, and 0.006, ..., in semi-diurnal constituents⁻ These residues are by no means negligible, especially when there are other constituents of this order which are not taken into account; the total effect of these may be important.

§ 10. *Considerations regarding Application to the Analysis and Prediction of Tides*

The application of the schedules to the analysis and prediction of tides requires mature consideration, though it has been borne in mind during their preparation. In Darwin's paper on the abacus, he gives a method of analysis of the solar constituents which may be applied more generally. Essentially he regards the constituents of the 27 (or S**2**) group over a short interval of time as one constituent, and afterwards separates the various constituents T_2 , S_2 , R_2 , K_2 , by considering the variations in certain quantities derived by harmonic analysis. This method may be generalised with considerable advantage. Considering each constituent as effectively a function of τ , *s* and *h* only will simplify the application of such a method as this; it ought to simplify most methods.

If the variables p , N' and p_1 were absent, we should get constant coefficients for the constituents; actually their coefficients and arguments will vary very slowly, and it would probably be sufficient to tabulate for January 1 of each year the appropriate multiplying factor and change of phase; this would be a generalised form of $J \cos(\sigma t + u)$, as given by Darwin. But, for reasons already given, mean values over long periods are inadmissible ; if, however, the multiplying factor and phase-shift be changed slowly but discontinuously at short intervals of time, the errors may be made negligible. Linear interpolation in J and u should suffice for this purpose. There seems to be no difficulty in doing this, either in analysis or in prediction. $[p. 329]$

Referring to the constituent 265, the chief term is 265-455, whose speed differs by *p* from the speed of 265.555; but there is no reason why the speed of the constituent 265 should be modified on this account, as any correction necessary would be automatically applied in using the variable coefficients and phases as indicated aboveTo sum up, it is proposed—

(1) that the constituents be regarded as functions of τ , s , and h , with appropriate speeds;

(2) that analyses and predictions should be made with variable coefficients and phase corrections, automatically applied if possible, such coefficients and phase corrections being regarded as constants only over a sufficiently short interval of time.

The translation of these proposals into practical methods, however, is a matter for careful consideration.

ERRATA (1954)

Corrections have been made as follows : § 7 : Coefficient of 2".26428 is 10⁸. **Schedule 1 : Coefficient of 165.455 is** *G \.* **Schedule 2 : Coefficient of 277.555 is 78. In addition, Table VI should include : 157 0.00566.**