



# TITAN'S ROTATION: A 3-DEGREE OF FREEDOM THEORY

B. Noyelles<sup>1,2</sup>, A. Lemaître<sup>1</sup> & A. Vienne<sup>2,3</sup>

1 : University of Namur, Belgium

2 : IMCCE, CNRS UMR 8028, Paris Observatory, UPMC, USTL, Paris, France

3 : Laboratoire d'Astronomie de Lille, Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille, Lille, France



## Abstract

We here present a 3-degree of freedom theory of Titan's rotation, seen as a rigid body. Such a study is possible thanks to the Cassini data on the gravitational potential of Titan. We use for this purpose a semi-analytical model based on the recent analytical works of Henrard, numerical integration and identification of the solution by way of frequency analysis. Titan's orbital motion is modeled with TASS theory. We find that the equilibrium obliquity is nearly zero, and that the fundamental periods of the free libration around this equilibrium are respectively 2.2 days, 189 years and 346 years. Moreover, we enlight the influence of a 703-years period present in Titan's inclination, on its obliquity.

## Introduction

As most of the major natural satellites, Titan is locked in a 1 : 1 spin-orbit resonance. More precisely, its least axis of inertia is always pointed to Saturn. Moreover, the node of Titan on its orbital plane precesses at the same rate as its orbital ascending node. These two commensurabilities constitute an equilibrium state known as Cassini state.

Thanks to Cassini-Huyghens mission, and especially to Cassini fly-bys, we know some coefficients of its gravity field, more particularly  $J_2$  and  $C_{22}$  (Tortora et al. 2006 [6]), what allows a reliable study of its rotation.

Recently, analytical theories of the rotation of celestial bodies have been developed by Henrard & Schwanen (2004 [1]) for the general case of the synchronous bodies, that was later developed by Henrard for the particular cases of Io (2005 [2]) and Europa (2005 [3] and [4]). In this study, we start from the work of Henrard & Schwanen (2004 [1]) and compare it to an original numerical study.

## Analytical study

The analytical study starts from the following Hamiltonian :

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{nP^2}{2} + \frac{nP^2}{8} \left[ 4 - \xi_q^2 - \eta_q^2 \right] \left[ \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2} \xi_q^2 + \frac{\gamma_1 - \gamma_2}{1 - \gamma_1 + \gamma_2} \eta_q^2 \right] + n \left( \frac{d_0}{d} \right)^3 \left( 1 + \delta_s \left( \frac{d_0}{d} \right)^2 \right) [\delta_1(x^2 + y^2) + \delta_2(x^2 - y^2)] \quad (1)$$

with the following action-angle canonical variables:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= l + g + h & P &= \frac{G}{nC} \\ r &= -h & R &= \frac{G-H}{nC} = P(1 - \cos K) = 2P \sin^2 \frac{K}{2} \\ \xi_q &= \sqrt{\frac{2Q}{nC}} \sin q & \eta_q &= \sqrt{\frac{2Q}{nC}} \cos q \end{aligned}$$

where  $n$  is Titan's mean orbital motion,  $q = -l$ , and  $Q = G - L = G(1 - \cos J) = 2G \sin^2 \frac{J}{2}$ . The coefficients of the Hamiltonian are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= J_2 \frac{MR^2}{C} & \delta_1 &= -\frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{n^*}{n} \right)^2 \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_2 &= 2C_{22} \frac{MR^2}{C} & \delta_2 &= -\frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{n^*}{n} \right)^2 \gamma_2 \\ & & \delta_s &= \frac{5}{2} J_2 \bar{h} \left( \frac{R_{\bar{h}}}{d_0} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the angles can be seen on the figure above, reproduced from (Henrard [2]).




FIGURE 1: The angles (reproduced from Henrard [2]).

$x$  and  $y$  are the first two coordinates of the center of Saturn in the frame  $(\bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2, \bar{f}_3)$  bound to Titan. Then we use the model of Henrard & Schwanen

(2004 [1]) to obtain the equilibrium  $(K^*, P^*)$  and the fundamental periods of the 3 proper librations around it:  $T_u$ ,  $T_v$  and  $T_w$ . At the strict Cassini state,  $\sigma = p - \lambda + \pi = 0$ ,  $\rho = r + \varpi = 0$ ,  $\xi_q = 0$  and  $\eta_q = 0$  (ie the wobble angle  $J$  is null), where  $\lambda$  and  $\varpi$  are respectively Titan's mean longitude and ascending node in an inertial frame (bound to Saturn). Moreover, Titan's orbit around Saturn is considered as circular with a constant inclination and a constant precession of the nodes.

Unfortunately, the quantity  $\frac{C}{MR^2}$  remains unknown.  $C = 0.4MR^2$  corresponds to an undifferentiated body, its real value should in fact be lower. We use both  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$  and  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.35$ . For  $J_2$  and  $C_{22}$ , we use the values given by Tortora et al., ie  $J_2 = 3.15 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $C_{22} = 1.1235 \times 10^{-5}$ .

*Equilibrium and fundamental periods of libration analytically obtained.*

	$\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$	$\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.35$
$K^*$	$1.1205 \times 10^{-2}$ rad	$1.1205 \times 10^{-2}$ rad
$R^*$	$6.277 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.277 \times 10^{-5}$
$P^*$	1	1
$T_u$	2.0945 y	2.2258 y
$T_v$	167.366 y	188.9876 y
$T_w$	306.624 y	346.2365 y

## Numerical study

We perform numerical computations starting from the Hamiltonian (1), but with complete ephemeris for Titan, instead of assuming its orbit as circular. We use TASS1.6 theory (Vienne & Duriez 1995 [7]). Our initial conditions are taken very near the equilibrium estimated in the analytical study, but it is not the exact equilibrium. The reason is that we want to identify the free solution so as to numerically determine the fundamental periods associated. Then, a frequency analysis is being performed to identify the solutions.




FIGURE 2: Numerical simulation of Titan's obliquity over 9000 years, with  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ .




FIGURE 3: Numerical simulation of Titan's obliquity over 9000 years, with  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.35$ .

Fig. 2 and 3 give some solutions of the numerical integration with the two values of  $\frac{C}{MR^2}$ , while the two next tables give examples of solutions for

$\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ . The importance of the period of 703 years in the solution of  $\rho$  is striking. It is due to a forcing effect by the proper mode of TASS1.6  $\Phi_6$ , present in Titan's inclination. Moreover, we can see the high values taken by the wobble  $J$  for  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.35$  (Fig.3c). We can infer that we are in a quasi-resonant state that could force the free libration.

*Quasiperiodic decomposition of  $\rho$ , for  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ .*

	amplitude	phase (°)	period (y)	identification
1	0.18089837	175.64	167.49723	$\phi_v$ (free)
2	0.15667339	-170.90	703.52446	$-\Phi_6$ (forced)
3	0.11829380	-175.18	135.28724	$\phi_v - \Phi_6$ (free)
4	0.09023900	-161.92	351.75789	$2\Phi_6$ (forced)
5	0.07735641	-166.02	113.46712	$\phi_v - 2\Phi_6$ (free)
6	0.05226443	-152.60	234.50407	$-3\Phi_6$ (forced)
7	0.05058400	-156.89	97.70793	$\phi_v - 3\Phi_6$ (free)
8	0.03311443	-147.66	85.79329	$\phi_v - 4\Phi_6$ (free)
9	0.03060799	-143.30	175.88361	$-4\Phi_6$ (forced)

*Quasiperiodic decomposition of  $K$ , for  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ .*

	amplitude $\times 10^2$	phase (°)	period (y)	identification
1	1.25481164	$8.68 \times 10^{-10}$	$-2.65 \times 10^{13}$	constant
2	0.68465799	-170.92	703.51272	$-\Phi_6$ (forced)
3	0.17842225	175.02	167.49146	$\phi_v$ (free)
4	0.10246867	-161.88	351.76856	$-2\Phi_6$ (forced)
5	0.07264971	-15.67	219.80041	$\phi_v + \Phi_6$ (free)

The next table give a comparison between the numerical and the analytical results for  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ . We see a very good agreement for the fundamental periods of libration. On the contrary, a significant difference exists on the mean obliquity  $K^*$ . This might be due to a too simple analytical model.

*Comparison between our analytical and numerical results, for  $\frac{C}{MR^2} = 0.31$ .*

	analytical	numerical	difference
$K^*$ (rad)	$1.1204859 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.25481164 \times 10^{-2}$	12%
$T_u$ (y)	2.094508	2.09773	0.15%
$T_v$ (y)	167.36642	167.49723	0.08%
$T_w$ (y)	306.62399	306.33602	0.09%

## Conclusion

This work gives a first study of Titan's rotation, where Titan is seen as a rigid body. We obtain a quasiperiodic decomposition of the forced solution, that can be splitted from the free solution, in which Titan's obliquity plays an overwhelming role. Moreover, we find a good agreement between the free librations around the equilibrium, analytically and numerically evaluated. However, we have a slight difference in the equilibrium obliquity. Finally, we cannot exclude a resonance between the proper mode  $\Phi_6$  and Titan's wobble. The next fly-bys of Cassini spacecraft should give us more information on Titan's gravitational field, and so we should be able to perform a more accurate study on its rotation, that could include direct perturbations on the other Saturnian satellites. These perturbations are known to be small (see for instance Henrard 2005 [4]) and should be negligible compared to the uncertainties we have on Titan's gravitational parameters. After that, the next step is to consider Titan as a multilayer non-rigid body and to study the consequences of its internal dissipation on the rotation.

## References

## References

- [1] Henrard J. & Schwanen G., 2004, *Rotation of Synchronous Satellites: Application to the Galilean Satellites*, Cel. Mech. Dyn. Astr., 89, 181-200
- [2] Henrard J., 2005, *The rotation of Io*, Icarus, 178, 144-153
- [3] Henrard J., 2005, *The rotation of Europa*, Cel. Mech. Dyn. Astr., 91, 131-149
- [4] Henrard J., 2005, *Additions to the theory of the rotation of Europa*, Cel. Mech. Dyn. Astr., 93, 101-112
- [5] Noyelles B., Lemaître A. & Vienne A., 2007, *Titan's rotation: A 3-dimensional theory*, submitted to Astron. Astrophys.
- [6] Tortora P., Armstrong J.W., Asmar S.W. et al., 2006, *The determination of Titan's gravity field with Cassini*, DPS Meeting 38, 56.01
- [7] Vienne A. & Duriez L., 1995, *TASS1.6: Ephemerides of the major Saturnian satellites*, Astron. Astrophys., 297, 588-605