

# A study of RW Ursae Minoris shell

H.H. Esenoglu<sup>1</sup>, A.T. Saygac<sup>1</sup>, A. Bianchini<sup>2</sup>, A. Retter<sup>3</sup>, M.T. Özkan<sup>4</sup>, and M. Altan<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Istanbul, Faculty of Science, Department of Astronomy and Space Sciences, 34452 University-Istanbul, Turkey (esenoglu@istanbul.edu.tr)

<sup>2</sup> University of Padova, Department of Astronomy, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Keele University, Physics Department, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, UK

<sup>4</sup> Istanbul University Observatory Research and Application Center, 34452 University-Istanbul, Turkey

<sup>5</sup> Anadolu University, Satellite and Space Sciences Research Institute, Muttalip, Eskisehir, Turkey

Received 11 July 2000 / Accepted 5 September 2000

**Abstract.** We find an expansion parallax for the slow nova RW UMi (Nova Ursae Minoris 1956). A narrow-band  $H_{\alpha}$  image shows that the diameter of the nova shell in 1995 was  $2.94_{+0.37}^{-0.49}$  arcsec. We derive a distance of  $5250_{+590}^{-1050}$  pc, and an absolute magnitude at maximum of  $M_v = -7.7_{+0.3}^{-0.4}$  which are consistent with previous estimates for the nova. We also revised known relations between various parameters of nova systems.

**Key words:** stars: distances – stars: individual: Nova Ursae Minoris 1956 – stars: individual: RW UMi – stars: novae, cataclysmic variables

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Nova shells

Nova outbursts are believed to occur in all Cataclysmic Variables (CVs). In about 35% of the classified CVs nova outbursts have been observed (Downes et al. 1997). Classical novae at maximum magnitude appear to obey a luminosity-rate of decline relationship (Cohen 1985). The most reliable distance determinations for galactic novae are those obtained from the angular expansion of nova shells, of which 24 are cited in the literature.

Given that every nova should be surrounded by an expanding cloud of ejecta, it is perhaps surprising that the literature contains few images of classical nova remnants; in fact only 30 among the 200 or so known classical novae shells have been detected (Wade 1990; Gill & O'Brien 1998). This is presumably a consequence of the rarity of survey observations (the only previous published studies of this kind is by Cohen 1985; Cohen & Rosenthal 1983; and Duerbeck 1987a). The eruption of a classical nova results in the ejection of  $\sim 10^{-4} M_{\odot}$  of material at velocities of up to several thousands kilometers per second (Warner 1989). The study of this ejected material is important for broad areas of interest such as distance determination, the chemical evolution of the interstellar medium, the physics of dust formation, and gas dynamics. It can also provide additional insight into otherwise

unobservable processes that occur during the outburst itself. Our understanding of such mass ejection processes is relevant not only to novae, but also to other objects in which similar mechanisms may be at work, such as planetary nebulae and some supernovae.

### 1.2. RW UMi

The unusual old slow nova RW UMi (Nova Ursae Minoris 1956) was a high galactic latitude nova of  $b = +33^{\circ}$  (Downes & Shara 1993). It has received so far little attention from observers and it has been a very poorly studied nova for which little information is available in the literature. Its outburst, which took place in September 1956, was discovered only seven years later on old sky-patrol plates by Kukarkin (1962). Before September 8th, 1956 the star was invisible (plate limit  $12^m.5$ ). On September 24, 1956 the star had a magnitude of about 6.0 and in September 1957 its brightness was about  $11^m.5$ . The star became later invisible again. The actual maximum brightness of the nova is unknown. There seems also to be some differences in its minimum brightness. According to Kaluzny & Chlebowski (1989) B and V brightness estimates magnitudes of RW UMi from photometric observations were derived as 18.70 and 18.64, respectively (see, Table 2). However, broad-band Johnson-Kron V magnitude is defined by Ringwald et al. (1996) as 18.9, and according to Duerbeck (1987b) its photographic magnitude is equal to about 21. Other V magnitudes during 1988, October the 17th and 18th, were estimated by Howell & Kreidl (1988) as about 21–21.5.

Cohen (1985) assumed that the shell emits only in  $H_{\alpha}$ , not in  $[N II]\lambda 6584$  or  $\lambda 6548$ , in order to derive the intrinsic shell of RW UMi. The spatially resolved shell of the nova using image observations with a digital detector was marginally first found by Cohen who derived a radius of  $1.0_{-0.3}^{+0.7}$  arcsec in 1984. He used the 4-shooter detector mounted at the Cassegrain focus of the 5-m Hale Telescope, giving an image scale of 0.33 arcsec per pixel and used a narrow filter ( $16 \text{ \AA}$  FWHM) centred  $H_{\alpha}$  for 1800 s.

Send offprint requests to: H.H. Esenoglu

**Table 1.** Log of observations of RW UMi.

Start of JD	Exp (s)	Filter (Å)	Band pass (Å)
244 9781.51	3600	H $\alpha$	45
244 9781.56	1200	6670	50
244 9781.58	2400	6670	50

An optical deep imaging survey of old novae remnants carried out by Slavin et al. (1995) revealed previously unobserved features in the shells of 13 classical novae including RW UMi. They used an auxiliary port of the 4.2-m William Herschel Telescope with a binned EEV3 CCD, giving an image scale of 0.20 arcsec per pixel. They found the remnant of the nova as consisting in a bright central object surrounded by a diffuse region of material. This emission did not arise from the wings of the point spread function (PSF) of the central star. Slices across the frame of the nova suggested that the bulk of the emission was concentrated in a ring at a radius of about 1.5 arcsec. The maximum entropy method deconvolution confirmed it, revealing a ring of inhomogeneous material. They also showed that there were two regions of nebulous emission close to the main object but unconnected to the bulk of the nebula of the nova. The fainter of the two was about 3 arcsec north-west of the nova while the brighter, more extended region was about 8 arcsec directly west. They also noted that it was not clear whether these two regions were real or physically associated with the remnant of the nova.

The most recent CCD photometry of RW UMi in 1997 is reported by Retter (1999), who found a period of  $0.0591 \pm 0.0003$  day in the light curve of the nova.

In this work, we present a nebular expansion parallax and distance estimate for the slow nova RW UMi 38.5 years after outburst, and a brief discussion in the implications of these results.

## 2. Observations and reductions

We obtained direct images of RW UMi in 1995, March, 5th with the 1.82 m telescope at Asiago – Italy. We used a Tektronix TK512M CCD at the f/9 Cassegrain focus, which yielded a pixel scale of 0.3375 arcsec per pixel. The exposure times were 1200 and 2400 s in 6670 Å band (H $\alpha$ -off), and 3600 s with the H $\alpha$  filter (H $\alpha$ -on). The log of observations is shown in Table 1.

To determine the extent of the H $\alpha$  nebulosity we used an automatic procedure to measure the full width at half maximum (FWHM) for a number of stars in the field by using *clpackage* (*images – tv – imexamine*) of IRAF Package (Massey & Davis 1992). The center of each stellar-like object was found by centroiding, and then the shift from the surrounding pixels was calculated with this position. This resulted in an observed intensity versus radius plot, which was fitted with a Gaussian. At certain brightness threshold we found that the scatter of the mean seeing for the widths in the H $\alpha$  image became significantly larger, and the seeing systematically smaller (see, Table 2).

**Table 2.** The seeing values for RW UMi ( $D_o$ ) and five nearby stars (2, 3, 4, 5, 6) in the H $\alpha$ -on and -off bands. B, V magnitudes of the nova and two comparison stars from Kaluzny & Chlebowski (1989).

No	Seeing H $\alpha$ -on (arcsec)	Seeing H $\alpha$ -off (arcsec)	V (mag)	B (mag)
1 ( $D_o$ )	4.23	3.11	18.70	18.64
2	2.74	2.76	14.78	15.44
3	3.71	2.76		
4	3.14	2.44	17.16	17.58
5	2.81	3.08		
6	2.79	2.72		
Mean (PSF)	$3.04 \pm 0.41$	$2.75 \pm 0.23$		
Diameter (D)	$2.94_{+0.37}^{-0.49}$	$1.45_{+0.37}^{-0.56}$		

A CCD detector with the highest possible efficiently and lowest possible noise is required to detect the faint shell of RW UMi. Unfortunately, during the observations the seeing and noise values were high, and we could take only a bias frame. Therefore, neither the bias nor flat fields were subtracted from the images in a motivation to better determine the spatially extended structure of RW UMi. The images are shown in Figs. 1 and 2.


## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. The direct image

We determined the last estimated shell of the nova using the direct imaging observations with the CCD detector made in 1995. A new radius of the shell of  $1.47_{+0.18}^{-0.24}$  arcsec was found. We used the following method: The mean seeing (PSF) which was found from the FWHM Gaussian for the nearby field stars around RW UMi in the combined image of the 6670 Å filter was  $2.75 \pm 0.23$  arcsec, compared with 3.11 arcsec for RW UMi. These values yield a nebular diameter of  $1.45_{+0.37}^{-0.56}$  arcsec according to equation

$$D = \sqrt{D_o^2 - PSF^2} \quad (1)$$

where D and  $D_o$  are nebular diameter and seeing value of RW UMi respectively while is also the average seeing of the five nearby field stars. From the same analysis of the H $\alpha$  image we have measured the FWHM of RW UMi to be 4.23 arcsec, whereas the mean FWHM of the five nearby field stars gives  $3.04 \pm 0.41$ . Here, we consider the FWHM of RW UMi of a point source plus a shell. Therefore, a nebular diameter of 2.94 arcsec from its H $\alpha$  image for RW UMi was found. The results are listed in Table 2. All seeing values have a maximum error of  $-0.49$  arcsec,  $+0.37$  arcsec. The intrinsic point source of RW UMi depends somewhat on whether a standard deviation of the mean value of the nearby stars is obtained or some errors of the FWHM Gaussian in IRAF. Obviously the major error of the shell of RW UMi comes from the mean seeing rather than the FWHMs, and in this way it was computed the errors on our derived parameters.



**Fig. 1.** A direct image of RW UMi obtained in 1995, March, 5th through the  $H_\alpha$  filter with an exposure time of 3600 s. Numbers 1 and 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 in the figures show RW UMi and nearby stars, respectively.

In addition, B and V magnitudes of RW UMi and a few comparison stars were derived by Kaluzny & Chlebowski (1989) from their photometric observations on December 1986, May 23th, 1987 and June 1987. These stars are marked as 1, 2 and 4 in Figs. 1 and 2. The nova erupted in 1956.7. Assuming that the ejected material moves with a constant velocity of  $950 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (Cohen 1985) it should had a radius of 1.41 arcsec in 1995.2, at the time of our observations. The value measured from our direct images is  $1.47_{+0.18}^{-0.24}$  arcsec, which is in broad agreement with the predicted value.

### 3.2. Nebular expansion velocity


Faster novae are believed to occur on massive white dwarfs leading to higher, and occasionally Super-Eddington luminosities (Shara 1981). Massive white dwarfs also produce thermonuclear runaways with very low mass envelopes, which can be ejected with high velocities to turn off the visual outburst of the nova. Thus, brighter novae should fade faster than fainter novae. The observed ejection velocity- $t_3$  correlation can be also explained; it is a direct consequence of the equipartition of the energy flux of the radiation field and the ejected matter (Shara 1981). An empirical correlation between expansion velocity and  $t_3$  was shown by McLaughlin (1960) as

$$\log(V_{exp})[\text{km s}^{-1}] = 3.75 - 0.45 \log(t_3)[\text{days}]. \quad (2)$$

$V_{exp}$  of McLaughlin's equation is an average value and was obtained from absorption spectra. On the other hand, a theoretical  $V_{exp}$ - $t_3$  correlation was derived by Shara (1981) as

$$\log(V_{exp})[\text{km s}^{-1}] \simeq 4.28 - 0.5 \log(t_3)[\text{days}]. \quad (3)$$

For testing the expansion velocity values reliability of novae, we adopt Shara's attitude: We expect that fast novae have bigger expansion velocities. If the envelope expands faster then the space volume of the envelope is bigger. Thus, the number of coll



**Fig. 2.** A direct image through the 6670 Å filter that combines the two exposures of 1200 and 2400 s.

isions between emissive particles of the envelope decrease faster and consequently, the brightness of the envelope decreases. In Table 3, low and high quality nova samples, their nebular expansion velocities and their rates of decline are collected from the literature. In Fig. 3 we plot the expansion velocity versus the rate of decline for 29 novae with the parameters taken from Table 3. Filled circles show reliable expansion velocity and rate of decline parameters while open circles represent suspicious values. We applied least squares fit for only filled circles (solid line) and derived the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \log(V_{exp})[\text{km s}^{-1}] \\ = 3.48(\pm 0.08) - 0.45(\pm 0.05) \log(t_3)[\text{days}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.88$ . Dotted lines show error estimates as calculated by Bevington (1969). The calibration of McLaughlin's correlation was made using Eq. (4). By using this equation, we can estimate the expansion velocity values of novae that have reliable rate of decline values. As we see in Fig. 3, RW UMi doesn't fit correlation. Either its rates of decline or the expansion velocity cause this deviation from the other novae, therefore we suspected that one of this value might be wrong. In fact, two different values of the nova are cited in the literature for the time to decline 2 and 3 magnitudes:  $t_3 = 140$  days (Duerbeck 1987b) and  $t_2 = 200$  days (according to light curve of Kukarkin 1962 and Ahnert 1963 in Cohen's paper 1985). If we accept that Duerbeck's  $t_3$  value is correct then  $t_2$  is calculated to be 94 days. Therefore, the estimate of  $t_2=200$  days is almost certainly incorrect. We consider now the second parameter – the expansion velocity of RW UMi which was given by Cohen as  $950 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  but he noted that this value is suspicious. He determined this expansion velocity from an  $H_\alpha$  profile of RW UMi as was observed with the double spectrograph. Unfortunately, we found no other published information on the expansion velocities of RW UMi. Thus, according to the  $V_{exp}$ - $t_3$  correlation, Cohen's  $V_{exp} = 950 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  value may be smaller and this value in very large limit-interval is probably

**Table 3.**  $V_{exp} - t_3$  data for high and low quality nova samples.


Nova	$V_{exp}$ ( $kms^{-1}$ )	Ref.	$t_3$ (day)	Ref.	Nova	$V_{exp}$ ( $kms^{-1}$ )	Ref.	$t_3$ (day)	Ref.
high quality					high quality				
V603 Aql	1500	1	<b>8</b>	2	LW Ser	<b>600</b>	5	<b>50</b>	2
	1700	2			LV Vul	<b>860</b>	3	<b>37</b>	2
	< <b>1600</b> >				NQ Vul	<b>705</b>	5	<b>65</b>	2
V1229 Aql	575	3	32	2	PW Vul	<b>470±60</b>	15	97	2
	750	4	37	2				147 ± 6	23
	< <b>662.5</b> >		38?	1				< <b>122</b> >	
			< <b>34.5</b> >		low quality				
T Aur	400	1	<b>100</b>	2	V500 Aql	<b>1380</b>	3	<b>42</b>	2
	655	5			N Aql 1995	< <b>675</b> >	16	<b>12.8c</b>	16
	< <b>527.5</b> >							48c	24
V1500 Cyg	1180	3	<b>3.6</b>	2	V476 Cyg	725	2	16	1
	1500	6				790:	5	16.5	2
	1600	7				1070 <sup>a</sup> c		< <b>16.25</b> >	
	2000	8				1510 <sup>b</sup> c			
	< <b>1550</b> >					< <b>757.5</b> >			
V1668 Cyg	735	5	23	2	V1974 Cyg	<b>1250</b>	2	25.5c	25
	< 760 >	9	24.3	12		1500 ± 250	2	<b>42</b>	26
	< <b>747.5</b> >		30	13		1600 ± 100	17		
			< <b>25.8</b> >			~ 2080 ± 120	18		
HR Del	460	6	220	14	V533 Her	580	5	<b>44</b>	2
	520	5	230	2		1050	3		
	550	8	< <b>225</b> >			< <b>815</b> >			
	< <b>510</b> >				CP Pup	700	1	<b>8</b>	15
DQ Her	< 289.4 >	10	<b>94</b>	2		710	5		
	315	5				<b>1600</b>	19		
	320 ± 20	11			FH Ser	425 ± 25	20	<b>62</b>	2
	325	2				560	21		
	< <b>312.4</b> >					700	8		
V446 Her	<b>1235</b>	3	<b>16</b>	2		1100	6		
CP Lac	1300	1	<b>10</b>	2		< <b>762.5</b> >			
	1600	5			XX Tau	<b>650?</b>	3	<b>42</b>	2
	< <b>1450</b> >				RW UMi	<b>950?</b>	3	<b>140</b>	2
DK Lac	<b>1075</b>	3	<b>32</b>	2	QU Vul	1000	22	28 ± 4	23
BT Mon	<b>800</b>	5	<b>42</b>	1		1375	13	31	13
GK Per	<b>1200</b>	2	<b>13</b>	2		1380	22	40	2;27
V400 Per	<b>630</b>	5	<b>43</b>	2		1440 ± 100	13	< <b>34.8</b> >	
RR Pic	400	1	<b>150</b>	2		1570	13		
	475	5				~ 1700	13		
	< <b>437.5</b> >					< <b>1285</b> >			
V373 Sct	<b>840</b>	5	<b>85</b>	2					

<sup>a</sup> Calculated from Eq. (4)<sup>b</sup> Calculated from Eq. (5)*Notes:*

(i) Main sources: Duerbeck (1987b), Cohen &amp; Rosenthal (1983) and Cohen (1985).

(ii) Values marked by “c” were calculated in this work. Symbol “&lt; &gt;” shows mean values. Symbols “:” and “?” show uncertain values. The bold values are used in Fig. 3.

1. Duerbeck (1981), 2. Duerbeck (1987b), 3. Cohen (1985), 4. Della Valle & Duerbeck (1993), 5. Cohen & Rosenthal (1983), 6. Seaquist (1989), 7. Becker & Duerbeck (1980), 8. Hjellming et al. (1979), 9. Stickland et al. (1981), 10. Baade (1940), 11. Ferland (1980), 12. Mallama & Skillman (1979), 13. Rosino et al. (1992), 14. Drechsel et al. (1977), 15. Ringwald & Naylor (1996), 16. Iijima et al. (1995), 17. Rosino et al. (1994), 18. Rafanelli et al. (1995), 19. Bowen (1956), 20. Esenoglu (1996), 21. Duerbeck (1992), 22. Taylor et al. (1987), 23. Andreä et al. (1994), 24. Greeley et al. (1995), 25. Harward et al. (1992), 26. Chocholl et al. (1993), 27. Saizar & Ferland (1994).




**Fig. 3.**  $V_{exp}$ - $t_3$  correlation. Filled circles represent novae with reliable  $V_{exp}$  and  $t_3$  parameters while open circles correspond to systems with suspicious parameters. The solid line is the least squares fit for the high quality sample (filled circles). Dotted lines show error estimates as calculated from (Bevington 1969).

most suspicious. However, these comments have to be checked using more observations. On the other hand, the shell radius indicates that the FWHM of the emission lines is a suitable measure of twice the expansion velocity of the shell (Cohen & Rosenthal 1983). Ringwald et al. (1996) found that  $\text{FWHM} = 2200 \pm 700 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  using by  $\text{H}\alpha$  emission line for RW UMi. This result yields an expansion velocity of  $1100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The expansion velocities of RW UMi might have therefore, overestimated according to Fig. 3.

### 3.3. Distance and absolute magnitude at maximum

We assume a constant expansion speed of  $950 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  since the nova outburst. This expansion velocity yields nova shell radii for RW UMi for 27.3 yr and 38.5 yr after its outburst of  $8.18 \times 10^{16}$  and  $1.15 \times 10^{17}$  cm, respectively. Taking also into account the expansion velocity, we find an average expansion rate of  $0.038_{+0.005}^{-0.006}$  arcsec per year and a distance of  $5250_{+590}^{-1050}$  pc from the observed diameter. These results are very consistent with the values of  $0.037 \text{ arcsec yr}^{-1}$  and 5470 pc obtained by Cohen (1985) and with Slavin et al. (1995) distance estimation of  $5000 \pm 2000$  pc by nebular expansion parallax from its nebular remnant.

These distances also in turn imply a distance from the galactic plane of  $z = 2850$  pc. In general, the characteristic of a nova outburst are determined by the mass and temperature of the white dwarf and the accretion rate (see, e.g., Prialnik & Kovetz 1995). Of these, in particular, the white dwarf mass is the most relevant parameter for this work since more massive-white dwarfs produce the more violent outburst thus smaller  $t_3$



**Fig. 4.**  $M_v(max)$ - $V_{exp}$  correlation. Filled circles represent reliable novae which were observed for more than two times. Open circles show suspicious novae which were observed during only one or two occasions. The solid line is the least squares fit for the high quality sample (filled circles). Dotted lines show error estimates as calculated from (Bevington 1969).

and higher expansion velocities. In contrast, less massive white dwarfs have weaker outburst therefore longer  $t_3$  and lower expansion velocities. Thus, RW UMi should probably contain a less massive white dwarf according to the results mentioned in Sect. 3. This suggestion is consistent with the short photometric period found by (Retter 1999) (Sect. 1.2) assuming that it is the binary period of the nova. Short orbital period CVs tend to have less massive primaries (Warner 1995). This implication for slow novae is supported by Della Valle et al. (1992), who found that slow novae containing low mass white dwarfs are located close to the galactic bulge, whereas RW UMi is located far away from the galactic plane at  $z = 2850$  pc.

RW UMi was poorly observed around its outburst event. Since the maximum observed magnitude of RW UMi was  $m_v = 6.0$  (Kukarkin 1962), our distance estimate suggests an absolute magnitude at maximum of  $M_v = -7.7_{+0.3}^{-0.4}$  with an interstellar extinction  $A_v = 0.1$  (Cohen 1985).

To test our result of the absolute magnitude at maximum, we used a similar way for nebular expansion velocity calculation. We expect that, fast novae have stronger outbursts and bigger expansion velocities than slow novae (previous section). Low and high quality nova samples, their absolute magnitudes at maximum and their expansion velocities were collected from the literature and given in Table 4. The relation between the absolute magnitudes at maximum and the expansion velocities is shown in Fig. 4 which is based on the data shown in Table 4. Using the linear relation (5), for the best values were selected from the literature. We were obliged to follow this way for some values because of their citing more than one time for a same parameter in the literature. In Fig. 4, filled circles represent reliable novae

**Table 4.**  $M_v(max)$ - $V_{exp}$  data for high and low quality nova samples.

Nova	$M_v(max)$	Ref.	$V_{exp}$ ( $km\ s^{-1}$ )	Ref.	Nova	$M_v(max)$	Ref.	$V_{exp}$ ( $km\ s^{-1}$ )	Ref.
high quality					high quality				
V500 Aql	-- <b>10.35</b>	1;2	<b>1380</b>	1	RR Pic	-6.9	4	400	4
V603 Aql	-9.3c		1500	2		-7.3	6;7	475	7
	-9.3	3	1700	13		-7.4c		< <b>437.5</b> >	
	-9.6	4	< <b>1600</b> >			<-7.2>			
V1229 Aql	<-9.4>				CP Pup	-9.55	6;7	700	4
	-6.6	1	575	1		-11.05	4	710	7
	-6.7	5	750	5		-11.2	18	<b>1600</b>	24
	-6.7c		< <b>662.5</b> >			-11.3c			
	<-6.7>					-11.5	4		
T Aur	-6.5	4;6	400	5		<-11.3>			
	-7.2c		655	7	FH Ser	-6.8	6;7	425 ± 25	22
	-7.7	6;7	< <b>527.5</b> >			-7.0c		560	19
	-7.9	6;7				-7.2	19	700	15
	<-7.3>					-7.3	19	1100	14
V1500 Cyg	-9.5	1	1180	1		-7.55	6;7	< <b>762.5</b> >	
	-9.94c		1500	14		-7.2	20		
	-9.95	2	1600	8		<-7.2>			
	-10	8	2000	15	RW UMi	-7.7 <sup>-0.4</sup> <sub>+0.3</sub>	21	<b>950?</b>	1
	-10.1	4	< <b>1550</b> >			-7.75c			
	-10.2	6				-7.8	1		
	<-9.95>					≤ -7.85	1		
V1974 Cyg	-7.0c			<b>1250</b> 13		<-7.8>			
	-8.1c		1500 ± 250	13	low quality				
	-8.47	9	1600 ± 100	16	HR Del	-5.05	6;7	460	14
	-8.5c		~ 2080 ± 120	17		-6.1c		520	7
	-8.8	10				< <b>5.6</b> >		550	15
	<-8.45>							< <b>510</b> >	
DQ Her	-5.2 to -5.8	3	< 289.4 >	3	V446 Her	-8.7	1	<b>1235</b>	1
	-6.1c		315	7		-9.2c			
	-6.2	6;7	320 ± 20	11		<-8.95>			
	-6.4c		325	13	DK Lac	-9.2c		<b>1075</b>	1
	-7.3	11;12	< <b>312.4</b> >			-9.35	1		
	≅ -7.3	12				<-9.3>			
	<-6.5>				BT Mon	-- <b>7.5</b>	7	<b>800</b>	7
V533 Her	-7.14	1	580	7	XX Tau	-8.05	1	<b>650?</b>	1
	-7.45	6;7	1050	1		-9.36	22		
	-7.7	1	< <b>815</b> >			<-8.05>			
	-7.8c				LV Vul	-- <b>6.8</b>	1	<b>860</b>	1
	-8.5	7			PW Vul	-6.2	23	<b>470±60</b>	23
	<-7.7>					-6.3 ± 0.3	23		
CP Lac	-9.15	4	1300	4		<-6.25>			
	-9.5c		1600	7	QU Vul	-- <b>10.25</b>	22	1000	25
	-9.6c		< <b>1450</b> >					1375	26
	-9.6	4						1380	25
	-9.8	6						1440 ± 100	26
	<-9.5>							1570	26
GK Per	-8.55	6;7	<b>1200</b>	13				~ 1700	26
	-8.6c							< <b>1285</b> >	
	-8.9	3							
	<-8.7>								

**Notes:**

(i) Main sources: Cohen &amp; Rosenthal (1983), Cohen (1985), Lang (1992) and Duerbeck (1981).

(ii) Values marked by "c" were calculated in this work. Symbol "&lt; &gt;" shows mean values. Symbol "?" shows uncertain values. The bold values are used in Fig. 4.

1. Cohen (1985), 2. Della Valle (1991), 3. Baade (1940), 4. Duerbeck (1981), 5. Della Valle & Duerbeck (1993), 6. Lang (1992), 7. Cohen & Rosenthal (1983), 8. Becker & Duerbeck (1980), 9. Esenoglu (2000), 10. Paresce (1994), 11. Ferland (1980), 12. Martin (1989), 13. Duerbeck (1987b), 14. Seaquist (1989), 15. Hjellming et al. (1979), 16. Rosino et al. (1992), 17. Rafanelli et al. (1995), 18. Williams (1982), 19. Duerbeck (1992), 20. Della Valle et al. (1997), 21. This work, 22. Esenoglu (1996), 23. Ringwald & Naylor (1996), 24. Bowen (1956), 25. Taylor et al. (1987), 26. Rosino et al. (1992).

which were observed during more than two occasions and open circles correspond to less reliable objects which were observed during only one or two occasions. Error boundaries are shown by the two dashed lines. The absolute magnitude at maximum of RW UMi which is found in this work is consistent with the relation represented by Fig. 4 and Eq. (5), and with the data on other novae. We derive the following relation with a correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.92$

$$M_v(\max) = -5.332(\pm 0.415) - 0.003(\pm 0.0004)V_{exp}[km\ s^{-1}]. \quad (5)$$

$M_v(\max)$  of RW UMi of  $M_v = -7.7_{+0.3}^{-0.4}$  found in this work is in good agreement with  $M_v(\max) \leq -7.8$  given by Cohen (1985). An absolute bolometric magnitude at maximum is derived after applying a bolometric correction of  $-0.1$  (Livio 1994), yielding  $M_{bol}(\max) = -7.8_{+0.3}^{-0.4}$ . It is concluded that RW UMi slightly exceeded the Eddington luminosity according to the absolute magnitude as a slow nova since the Eddington limit of  $M_{bol}(\max)$  is  $-7$  for slow novae at maximum (Starrfield 1988).

#### 4. Summary

The main results of this work are as follows:

1. We observed the shell of RW UMi nearly 40 years after its outburst and found that the diameter of the nova shell in 1995 was  $2.94_{+0.37}^{-0.49}$  arcsec.
2. A distance of  $5250_{+590}^{-1050}$  pc and  $M_v = -7.7_{+0.3}^{-0.4}$  were obtained excluding the possibility of large systematic error in the expansion velocity. They are consistent with previous estimates for the nova. Notably, this work also indicates that accurate determination of the expansion velocity of RW UMi is required.
3. A few parameters for well-observed novae were collected from the literature to refine known relations between parameters of classical novae. These data were used to derive a new calibration for both the expansion velocity – the rate of decline relationship and the absolute magnitude at maximum – the expansion velocity relationship for galactic novae.
4. RW UMi seems to slightly exceed the Eddington luminosity.

Finally, the expansion phase in novae is still relatively poorly understood. Further studies of their expansion parallaxes with better conditions and perhaps a statistical approach will allow a better understanding of this phase. Because of the implications that the distribution has for the physics of the nova-phenomenon, it is important to improve the observational and correlational significance of the findings of the present work.

*Acknowledgements.* HHE gratefully thanks for the hospitality at Padova and Asiago Observatories during his stay there for one year and for the financial support of the Cooperation Scholarship of Italian Government Ministry of Foreign Affairs. AR is supported by PPARC. This work was supported by the Research Fund of the University of Istanbul. Project Numbers: O-III/31/150497 and 1110/010598.

#### References

- Ahnert P., 1963, IBVS 19  
 Andreä J., Drechsel H., Starrfield S., 1994, A&A 291, 869  
 Baade W., 1940, PASP 52, 386  
 Becker G.J., Duerbeck H.W., 1980, PASP 92, 792  
 Bevington P.R., 1969, In: Data Reduction and Error Analysis for the Physical Science. McGraw-Hill Press, p. 92  
 Bowen S., 1956, In: Stellar Spectroscopy and Photometry. p. 338  
 Chocholl D., Hric L., Urban Z., et al., 1993, A&A 277, 103  
 Cohen J.G., Rosenthal A.J., 1983, ApJ 268, 689  
 Cohen J.G., 1985, ApJ 292, 90  
 Della Valle M., 1991, A&A 252, L9  
 Della Valle M., Bianchini A., Livio M., Orio M., 1992, A&A 266, 232  
 Della Valle M., Duerbeck H.W., 1993, A&A 275, 239  
 Della Valle M., Gilmozzi R., Bianchini A., Esenoglu H.H., 1997, A&A 325, 1151  
 Downes R.A., Shara M.M., 1993, PASP 105, 127  
 Downes R.A., Webbing R.F., Shara M.M., 1997, PASP 109, 345  
 Drechsel H., Rahe J., Duerbeck H.W., Kohoutek H.W., Seitter W.C., 1977, A&AS 30, 323  
 Duerbeck H.W., 1981, PASP 93, 165  
 Duerbeck H.W., 1987a, ESO Messenger 50, 9  
 Duerbeck H.W., 1987b, In: A Reference Catalogue and Atlas of Galactic Novae. Space Sci. Rev. 45, 1–2  
 Duerbeck H.W., 1992, Acta Astron. 42, 85  
 Esenoglu H.H., 1996, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Istanbul  
 Esenoglu H.H., 2000, in preparation  
 Ferland G.J., 1980, In: Notes from Observatories 100, p. 166  
 Gill C.D., O'Brien T.J., 1998, MNRAS 300, 221  
 Greeley B.W., Blair W.P., Long K.S., 1995, ApJ 454, L43  
 Harward T.L., Gehrz R.D., Miles J.W., Houck J.R., 1992, ApJ 401, L101  
 Hjellming R.M., Wade C.M., Vandenberg N.R., Newell R.T., 1979, AJ 84, 1619  
 Howell S.B., Kreidl T.J., 1988, IAU Circ. 4672  
 Iijima T., Esenoglu H.H., Rosino L., 1995, IAU Circ. 6135  
 Kaluzny J., Chlebowski T., 1989, Acta Astron. 39, 35  
 Kukarkin B.V., 1962, IBVS 18  
 Lang K.R., 1992, In: Astrophysical Data: Planets and Stars. Springer-Verlag Press  
 Livio M., 1994, In: Nussbaumer H., Orr A. (eds.) Interacting Binaries. Saas-Fee Advanced Course 22, Lecture Notes 1992, Springer-Verlag Press, p. 135  
 Mallama A.D., Skillman D.R., 1979, PASP 91, 99  
 Martin P.G., 1989, In: Bode M.F., Evans A. (eds.) Classical Novae. Overview of Nova DQ Her 1934, John Wiley & Sons Press, p. 93  
 Massey P., Davis L.E., 1992, A User's Guide to Stellar CCD Photometry with IRAF, 66  
 McLaughlin D.B., 1960, In: Greenstein J.L. (ed.) Stars and Stellar Systems. Vol. 6, University of Chicago Press  
 Paresce F., 1994, A&A 282, L13  
 Prialnik D., Kovetz A., 1995, ApJ 445, 789  
 Rafanelli P., Rosino L., Radowich M., 1995, A&A 294, 488  
 Retter A., 1999, IAU Circ. 7263  
 Ringwald F.A., Naylor T., 1996, MNRAS 278, 808  
 Ringwald F.A., Naylor T., Mukai K., 1996, MNRAS 281, 192  
 Rosino L., Iijima T., Benetti S., et al., 1992, A&A 257, 603  
 Rosino L., Rafanelli P., Iijima T., Esenoglu H.H., 1994, IAU Circ. 6049  
 Saizar P., Ferland G.J., 1994, ApJ 425, 755  
 Seaquist E.R., 1989, In: Bode M.F., Evans A. (eds.) Classical Novae, Radio Emission From Novae. John Wiley & Sons Press, p. 143

- Shara M.M., 1981, ApJ 243, 926
- Slavin A.J., Brien T.J., Dunlop J.S., 1995, MNRAS 276, 353
- Starrfield S., 1988, In: Multiwavelength Astrophysics, Cambridge University Press, p. 159
- Stickland D.J., Penn C.J., Seaton M.J., Snijders M.A.J., Storey P.J., 1981, MNRAS 197, 107
- Taylor A.R., Seaquist E.R., Hollis J.M., Pottasch S.R., 1987, A&A 183, 38
- Wade R.A., 1990, In: Cassatella A., Viotti R. (eds.) Physics of Classical Novae. Proc. IAU Colloq. 122, Springer-Verlag Press, p. 195
- Warner B., 1989, In: Bode M.F., Evans A. (eds.) Classical Novae. Wiley & Sons Press, p. 12
- Warner B., 1995, In: Cataclysmic Variable Stars. Cambridge University Press, p. 12
- Williams R.E., 1982, ApJ 261, 170