

## THE ODD COMET 157P/TRITTON AND ITS MISUNDERSTOOD FRAGMENTATION

ZDENEK SEKANINA

La Canada Flintridge, California 91011, U.S.A.; [ZdenSek@gmail.com](mailto:ZdenSek@gmail.com)

Version September 6, 2023

### ABSTRACT

Comet 157P is a faint object with a history of being prone to unfortunate situations, circumstances, and/or coincidences. Several weeks after its 1978 discovery the comet disappeared and remained lost nonstop for twenty five years. Rediscovered in 2003 as a new comet, it was about 500 times brighter than in 1978, caught apparently in one of its outbursts. The comet was not detected 200 days after its 2016 perihelion, being fainter than mag 20, but 80 days later it was mag 16 and gradually fading back to mag 20 over a period of four months. The comet did not miss the opportunity to have a close encounter with Jupiter, having approached it to less than 0.3 AU on 2020 February 10. The 2017 outburst or surge of activity appears to have accompanied an event of nuclear fragmentation. The birth of a second companion is dated to the months following the Jupiter encounter. The series of weird episodes culminated near the 2022 perihelion, when one companion brightened to become observable for two weeks and after another two weeks the other flared up to be seen for the next two weeks. Unnoticed, this incredible coincidence fooled some experts into believing that a single object, designated 157P-B, was involved, even though its orbit left large residuals. I now offer representative fragmentation solutions for the two companions, the mean residuals amounting to  $\pm 0''.4$  and  $\pm 1''.0$ , respectively.

*Subject headings:* split comets; individual comets: 157P; methods: data analysis

#### 1. A SHORT, PECULIAR HISTORY OF COMET TRITTON

Even though periodic comet Tritton, officially designated 157P, was discovered only 45 years ago, it appears to have experienced strange events and have become part of bizarre situations at a rate higher than any other periodic comet. The single exception is that it has not disintegrated, not yet.

The unusual incidents began with the discovery plate taken by K. Tritton, U.K. Schmidt Telescope Unit, Coonabarabran, on 1978 February 11: Marsden & Green (1985) remarked that this was the first time ever that images of *three* comets were known to have appeared on the same exposure. Designated as comet 1978d, Tritton shared the plate with 4P/Faye and C/1977 D1 (Lovas).

Since Tritton was faint, of apparent magnitude 19–20, and, as it turned out, some 3.5 months after perihelion at discovery, few observations were made in 1978 and a total of only seven astrometric positions became available, spanning an arc of 31 days. And even though the comet received the definitive designation 1977 XIII (Marsden 1979), its orbital period was not determined accurately enough to provide a reliable ephemeris for the next perihelion return in 1984.

The situation was in fact much more critical, because the comet was missed not only in 1984, but in 1990 and 1996 as well. It became a long-lost comet and in the new designation system, introduced in the mid-1990s, Tritton was referred to as comet D/1978 C2 (e.g., Marsden 1995), where the prefix D meant that the object was unworthy of serious recovery efforts.

In 2003, P. Holvorcem, Campinas, Brazil, reported the discovery of a fast-moving object by C. W. Juels, Fountain Hills, Arizona, with a 12-cm refractor on October 6. For a day or so, before identity was established (Green 2003), the accidentally rediscovered comet Tritton had been masquerading as comet Juels or Juels-Holvorcem.

The prefix D was dropped and, yet again, the comet was assigned a new designation — P/2003 T1. Compared to 1978, the comet was substantially brighter at this apparition, reaching a peak magnitude of approximately 11, even though it was nearly 1.7 AU from the Earth when first detected.

The rediscovery was instrumental in that the orbital period could accurately be determined and the comet prevented from getting lost again. Indeed, since 2003 it has been observed at every return. Monitored extensively, it did not get brighter than magnitude  $\sim 15$  near perihelion in 2010. Worse yet, it was of magnitude 20 when recovered more than nine months before its perihelion in 2016. Interesting developments took place following the perihelion passage: whereas H. Sato failed to detect the comet on 2016 December 28, about 200 days after perihelion, on an exposure that reached magnitude 20,<sup>1</sup> the object was near magnitude 16 and getting rapidly fainter some 80 days later, when it already was more than 3 AU from the Sun.

In its most recent display of bravado, Tritton passed 0.265 AU from Jupiter on 2020 February 10,<sup>2</sup> and upon arrival at its September 2022 perihelion it exhibited a secondary nucleus between August 21 and September 2 and again between September 15 and 28. As I show in Section 3, suspicion based on cursory data inspection that the comet was preparing yet another surprise for us is supported by computations.

Examination of the physical behavior of comet Tritton since Sato's nondetection in late 2016 and presentation of a hypothesis for the reported features are the objectives of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> See website <https://groups.io/g/comets-ml/messages>, Sato's message #26432 dated 2017 April 24.

<sup>2</sup> See website [https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb\\_lookup.html#/?des=157P](https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb_lookup.html#/?des=157P).


## 2. POST-PERHELION LIGHT CURVE IN 2016 RETURN

The observing conditions during the 2016 return of comet Tritton were singularly unfavorable. The perihelion occurred on June 10, and between late February and late October the comet stayed at solar elongations smaller than  $30^\circ$ . Observations made long before perihelion, in September–December 2015 showed the comet at nuclear magnitude  $\sim 20$  with only minor variations.

The noted negative observation by Sato in late December 2016 suggested that at heliocentric distances near 2.4 AU the comet was even fainter after perihelion than before it. But when the observers at the ATLAS-HKO Station on Haleakala, Maui, pointed their 50-cm f/2 Schmidt at the comet on 2017 March 19.6 UT, about 80 days after Sato, it was brighter than magnitude 17. From March 23 on the comet was observed worldwide; the astrometric and brightness data have been published by the Minor Planet Center (MPC Staff 2017).

The unusual feature of these data is that, unlike for other comets, most observers have reported the total, rather than nuclear, magnitudes. The anomaly is readily understood when one inspects the comet’s appearance at the time. In Figure 1 I reproduce an image obtained by J.-F. Soulier with his 30-cm f/3.8 reflector at Maisoncelles, France, on April 27. The picture shows the comet as a disk-like object approximately  $15''$  across with only traces of a very faint coma.

The comet was observed from March 19 until July 18 from about two dozen observatories, from 15 of them more than once. (By a single observation is meant here an average magnitude from a set of two, three or more exposures separated from one another by tens of seconds to several minutes, as is common practice these days.) Since the aperture sizes and color systems of the mea-



**Figure 1.** Comet 157P/Tritton imaged by J.-F. Soulier with his 30-cm f/3.8 reflector at Maisoncelles, France, on 2017 April 27.96 UT. Note the disk-like appearance, with only a faint coma. The field measures  $5'.5$  along the diagonal. North is up, east to the left. (Courtesy of J.-F. Soulier.)

**Table 1**  
Corrections to Magnitude Observations of Comet 157P  
in March–July 2017

Obs. code	Mag. type <sup>a</sup>	Mag. corr.	Obs. code	Mag. type <sup>a</sup>	Mag. corr.	Obs. code	Mag. type <sup>a</sup>	Mag. corr.
349	T	0.0	C10	N	-1.0	Q65	N	-1.0
367	T	-0.2	D95	T	-0.4	Q68	N	0.0
372	T	-0.3	F51	T	-2.0	T05	T	-1.0
585	N	-0.3	Q11	T	0.0	T08	T	-0.8
A71	N	-0.8	Q62	T	+0.3	W96	N	-0.9

**Note.**


<sup>a</sup> N = nuclear magnitude, T = total magnitude.

sured magnitudes differ, the reported results by different observers vary. To reduce the scatter, I refer the magnitude observations from the 15 observatories to a common system by applying empirical corrections. A reported magnitude  $H(\text{code}, \text{type})$ , where the type is either a nuclear (N) or total (T) magnitude, is thus converted to a standard apparent magnitude  $H_{\text{app}}$  by

$$H_{\text{app}} = H(\text{code}, \text{type}) + \text{corr.}(\text{code}, \text{type}). \quad (1)$$

The applied corrections are presented in Table 1, where I chose  $\text{corr.} = 0$  for the magnitudes reported by K. Kadota (code 349). From my earlier experience, his CCD magnitudes have fairly consistently been about 1 to 1.5 mag fainter than visual estimates made with the naked eye or small binoculars.

The 48 data points of  $H_{\text{app}}$  obtained in this fashion are plotted as a function of time in Figure 2. For comparison, Sato’s nondetection is also depicted, showing that the comet’s outburst or flare-up had an amplitude of at least 4 mag and that it began between early January and mid-March of 2017. From mid-April on, the brightness was subsiding at an average rate of 0.043 mag per day; thus, the fading was rapid but not precipitous.



**Figure 2.** Post-perihelion light curve of 157P based on 48 observations made between 2017 March 19 and July 18. Comparison with Sato’s nondetection in late December 2016 suggests an amplitude of the outburst of at least 4 mag. After mid-April the comet was fading rapidly, at an average rate of 0.043 mag per day.


Figure 3 shows a plot of the corrected magnitude, now normalized to a distance of 1 AU from the Earth,  $H_{\Delta}$ , as a function of heliocentric distance,  $r$  (on a log scale). Resembling Figure 2, it demonstrates that the outburst began between 2.4 AU and 2.9 AU from the Sun, probably closer to the latter limit. The fading after mid-April followed on the average an inverse 17th power of heliocentric distance, confirming that it was very steep but not abrupt.

Comet Tritton was observed on a number of occasions in 2021, between July 17 and October 26, 419 to 318 days before the 2022 perihelion, always of magnitude 20–21 (MPC Staff 2021, 2022a). It was next detected on 2022 July 12, 59 days before perihelion and followed until at least 2023 April 13, 216 days after perihelion (MPC Staff 2022b, 2023). Near perihelion the comet’s brightness peaked at magnitude 16. As of the time of this writing, there has been no evidence of another outburst.

3. MISLEADING OBJECT 157P-B

Discovery of a second condensation was reported by Jäger (2022) on images taken with a 28-cm f/2.2 reflector at Martinsberg, Austria (code G00) on 2022 September 18 and 23 (Figure 4). These and independent detections of a companion on August 21 through September 2 by the Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF 2022), using the Oschin 122-cm f/2.4 Schmidt telescope at Palomar (code I41), and on September 15 at the Xingming Observatory with a 60-cm f/8 Ritchey-Chrétien reflector (code N88) were all published by the MPC at the same time and assigned to a **single object**, designated 157P-B.


The complete database for 157P-B consists of 30 astrometric observations on nine nights. The ZTF contributed 15 data points on four nights, Jäger eight points on two nights, and the Xingming Observatory two points on a single night. Two observations from the night of September 28 were subsequently reported from the iTelescope Observatory (code H06). This set of 27 observations, including the relevant data for 157P (needed to compute the separations of 157P-B from 157P in the equa-




**Figure 4.** Image of the fragmented comet 157P/Tritton taken by M. Jäger with his 28-cm f/2.2 reflector at Martinsberg, Austria, on 2022 September 23.12 UT. Comet 157P-B is 16'' from the principal nucleus in a position angle of about 290° and is approximately 0.5 mag fainter. North is up, east to the left. The field measures some 3' along the diagonal. (Courtesy of M. Jäger.)

torial coordinates), has been made available (MPC Staff 2022b). Three positions for 157P-B were reported from the SATINO Remote Observatory, Haute Provence (code C95) on September 26, but because the relevant positions of 157P are missing, these data could not be used in this investigation.

Figure 5 is a plot of the motion of 157P-B relative to 157P in right ascension and declination. It shows that an essentially linear trajectory of 157P-B to the southwest of 157P between August 21 and September 2 was followed by a nearly stationary trajectory to the northwest in the second half of September. Although variable rates of companions’ apparent motions are fairly common among fragmented comets, primarily because of projection effects, **I have never seen a case like this one**. The perplexing relative motion of 157P-B in Figure 5 looks like **yet another anomaly** displayed by this comet.



**Figure 3.** Post-perihelion light curve of comet 157P, based on the 48 observations made between 2017 March 19 and July 18. The magnitude has been normalized to 1 AU from the Earth. Comparison with Sato’s nondetection suggests that the outburst began between 2.4 AU and 2.9 AU from the Sun. Note that beyond 3.1 AU the comet’s elevated normalized brightness subsided approximately as an inverse 17th power of heliocentric distance.



**Figure 5.** Motion of companion 157P-B relative to the principal comet 157P (marked A) in projection onto the plane of the sky between 2022 August 21 and September 28 (equinox J2000). The companion was to the southwest of the main mass in late August and early September, but to the northwest of it in late September, a dramatic difference. The plot shows that there is no way to link all positions by the motion of a single object.

**Table 2**  
Residuals from Nakano’s Orbital Solution to 23 Observations  
of Comet 157P-B (Equinox J2000)

Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Residual <sup>a</sup>		Obs. code	Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Residual <sup>a</sup>		Obs. code
	RA	Dec			RA	Dec	
Aug 21.493	+0 <sup>o</sup> .4	+0 <sup>o</sup> .5	I41	Sept 2.500	(+3 <sup>o</sup> .2	−1 <sup>o</sup> .4)	I41
21.496	+0.7	+0.5	I41	2.503	+1.7	−1.0	I41
21.498	+0.5	+0.7	I41	2.505	+2.9	−1.8	I41
25.493	(−4.1	+0.6)	I41	18.105	−0.2	+1.9	G00
25.496	(−3.8	+1.1)	I41	18.120	(+0.9	+3.6)	G00
30.497	−1.6	−0.3	I41	18.123	−0.2	+2.6	G00
30.499	−2.3	−0.1	I41	18.125	−0.8	+1.0	G00
30.502	−1.8	+0.7	I41	23.117	−0.4	−0.6	G00
30.504	−1.8	−0.1	I41	23.122	−0.7	−0.2	G00
30.507	−2.6	+0.1	I41	23.125	+0.6	−1.6	G00
Sept 2.495	+2.0	−0.5	I41	23.130	+0.9	−0.8	G00
2.498	+2.8	−1.1	I41				

**Note.**

<sup>a</sup> Parenthesized residuals refer to rejected observations.

In this context I should remark that the MPC Staff (see MPEC 2022-T23 or MPC 160314), the JPL Solar System Dynamics Group,<sup>3</sup> and S. Nakano, an associate of the IAU Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams (see footnote 4 below), have independently derived similar orbits for 157P-B, based primarily or entirely on the astrometry provided by the ZTF and Jäger. Copied in Table 2 are the residuals left by an orbit computed by Nakano<sup>4</sup> from 19 observations between August 21 and September 23. In fact, Nakano had 23 observations available but, as the table shows, he rejected *four* that left residuals greater than 3<sup>o</sup>, including three observations made with the Palomar Schmidt! Several further observations left residuals greater than 2<sup>o</sup> and the mean residual came out to be as high as ±1<sup>o</sup>.4. If he did not reject the four observations, the mean residual would have climbed to ±1<sup>o</sup>.7.

Not only that residuals of several arcsec left by such a large fraction of quality observations have been unheard of in the 21st century, but Table 2 shows a still another peculiarity: on a given date, *all* residuals tend to be either acceptable (such as August 21 or September 23) or unacceptable (August 25, August 30 or September 2). This is in line with Figure 5, which shows that the same-day relative positions are consistent, often within 1<sup>o</sup>, particularly from the Palomar Schmidt images.

The arguments of either kind, whether based on evidence from Figure 5 or Table 2, are very compelling, and when combined they demonstrate conclusively that the August and late September sets of astrometry are utterly incompatible and should never have been mixed, as they portray the **motions of two different companions!** While it is not unusual for a split comet to display two or more companions at the same time, I have no recollection of a previous instance, in which the variations in activ-

<sup>3</sup> See a website [https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb\\_lookup.html#/?des=157P-B](https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb_lookup.html#/?des=157P-B),

<sup>4</sup> The residuals are copied from Jäger’s message #30895 to the comets mailing list, dated 2022 September 25, in which Nakano’s orbit for 157P-B was communicated; for URL see footnote 1. The file does not appear to exist among *Nakano Notes (NK)*.

ity of two companions of a comet were synchronized, so that the **disappearance of one** was followed two weeks later by the **transient appearance of the other**. Not only was this exactly what happened with P/Tritton in August–September 2022, but — as if not enough — this incredible coincidence fooled three highly reputable authorities on comet dynamics into computing orbits of the fake object 157P-B by failing to see through the trick!

#### 4. SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

The verdict is obvious: the companion of 157P/Tritton, which was designated 157P-B by the MPC, does not exist. Instead, there are two companions: one under observation only by the ZTF from August 21 through September 2, which below is being called **companion C**; and another, whose discovery was reported to the MPC by Jäger and which was detected between September 15 and 28 also at the Xingming Observatory, the SATINO Remote Observatory, and the iTelescope Observatory. In the following it is referred to as **companion D**.

Before I employ the software package of my standard model for the split comets (Sekanina 1978, 1982) to investigate the fragmentation conditions for companions C and D, I present in Table 3 the measured magnitude differences,  $\Delta H$ , between the two companions and the principal nucleus, based on the observers’ reports and listed by the MPC Staff (2022b):

$$\Delta H = H_{\text{companion}} - H_{\text{principal}}. \quad (2)$$

Averaging the tabulated brightness measurements, one finds that  $\langle \Delta H \rangle = +1.57 \pm 0.29$  mag for companion C and  $\langle \Delta H \rangle = +0.73 \pm 0.46$  mag for D. Because the brightness is not a robust measure of the companion’s dimensions, the systematic difference does not necessarily suggest that D is a more sizable fragment than C.

##### 4.1. The Modeling

The fragmentation model, allowing one to determine up to five parameters to fit the motion of a secondary relative to the primary in projection onto the plane of the sky, was applied separately to companions C and D. The short arcs of their appearance available suggest that over most of their lifetimes both companions were too

**Table 3**  
Magnitude Difference between the Companions C and D  
and Main Mass A of 157P/Tritton

Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Mag diff., $\Delta H$	Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Mag diff., $\Delta H$	Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Mag diff., $\Delta H$
<i>Companion C</i>		<i>Companion C (cont.)</i>		<i>Companion D (cont.)</i>	
Aug 21.49305	+2.0	Sept 2.49521	+1.1	Sept 18.12005	+0.5
21.49556	+2.0	2.49773	+1.7	18.12313	+0.8
21.49807	+2.1	2.50025	+1.6	18.12544	+0.3
25.49347	+1.4	2.50277	+1.5	23.11672	+0.3
25.49592	+1.1	2.50529	+1.6	23.12234	+0.5
30.49653	+1.4			23.12515	+0.5
30.49905	+1.4	<i>Companion D</i>		23.12964	+0.4
30.50158	+1.5	Sept 15.91927	+1.0	28.47339	....
30.50410	+1.5	30.50410	+1.6	28.47794	+1.5
30.50662	+1.6	18.10532	+0.6		

**Table 4**  
Models for Motion of Companions C and D Relative to Principal Nucleus A of Comet 157P/Tritton

Parameter/Quantity	Companion C	Companion D(I)	Companion D(II)
Time of separation, $t_s - t_\pi$ (days)	$-848 \pm 23$	(-2010)	(-2060)
Date of separation (UT)	2020 May 14	(2017 Mar 9)	(2017 Jan 18)
Heliocentric distance (AU)	5.15	(2.92)	(2.59)
Acceleration ( $10^{-5}$ solar gravity)	$4.4 \pm 1.6$	$7.5 \pm 3.8$	$7.5 \pm 6.2$
Separation velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	$4.68 \pm 0.09$	$1.0 \pm 0.5$	$1.1 \pm 0.9$
Radial component ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	(+2.9)	(-0.2)	(-0.1)
Transverse component ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	$-2.37 \pm 0.14$	$-0.9 \pm 0.5$	$-1.0 \pm 0.9$
Normal component ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	$-2.81 \pm 0.10$	$+0.3 \pm 0.1$	$+0.3 \pm 0.1$
Mean residual	$\pm 0''.44$	$\pm 1''.03$	$\pm 1''.03$
Number of observations	15	12	12

**Note.**

$t_\pi$  is the perihelion time in 2022 (Sept 9.8 TT). Assumed parametric values are parenthesized. Solution D(I) assumes separation at onset of late outburst, Solution D(II) at onset of gradual surge of activity.

faint to detect with the telescopes typically used by the astrometric observers. In addition, neither companion was seen to be clearly receding from the main mass; D was essentially stationary, while C was unquestionably *approaching* the main mass in projection onto the plane of the sky. This kind of behavior is indicative of fragments that had separated from the parent nucleus long before (say, on the order of a year or longer) and were receding (in space) under a low and probably intermittent outgassing-driven nongravitational acceleration.

Because of the short extent of the orbital arcs over which the companions were temporarily activated (and therefore observed), it is not expected that a unique fragmentation solution could be derived for either object. Rather, I will aim to explore and try to exploit the options that the fragmentation model offers as well as to employ known properties of the split comets that past investigations succeeded to establish, in an effort to *constrain* the range of credible solutions as much as possible. The primary objective is to demonstrate that the observed motion of either companion could readily be fitted by the fragmentation model to the degree that a resulting solution offers a distribution of residuals that is entirely satisfactory, contrary to the unacceptable residuals in Table 2. Achievement of this goal will provide the ultimate proof that the problem of fragmentation of comet 157P/Tritton has successfully been resolved.

#### 4.2. Companion C

One cannot expect to get a high-quality fragmentation solution from a 12-day arc of the data on companion C, regardless of their astrometric quality. Indeed, a preliminary, reconnaissance run of the model demonstrated that the radial component,  $V_R$ , of the separation velocity — one of the model's five parameters — was poorly determined. I used a standard procedure by fitting the trajectory of C for a number of fixed values of  $V_R$ , an approach that the model allows, and determined the variations of the other parameters and diagnostic measures of the quality of fit as a function of  $V_R$ .

The fundamental parameter, the differential nongravitational acceleration  $\gamma$  of the companion, assumed to vary as an inverse square of heliocentric distance, is always positive (i.e., pointing away from the Sun). Ex-

pressed in  $10^{-5}$  units of the solar gravitational acceleration, it was found to be subjected to variations with  $V_R$  (in  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ ) that were with high accuracy approximated by a polynomial

$$\gamma = 70.00 - 22.71 V_R + 0.083 V_R^2, \quad (3)$$

where the errors of the coefficients were negligibly small. Positive accelerations require  $V_R < +3.1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ .

On the other hand, a complete velocity of separation,  $V_{\text{sep}} = \sqrt{V_R^2 + V_T^2 + V_N^2}$  (where  $V_T$  is its transverse component and  $V_N$  its normal, out-of-plane component), was found to vary as

$$V_{\text{sep}} = 6.63 - 1.18 V_R + 0.1226 V_R^2 + 0.01781 V_R^3. \quad (4)$$

The velocity  $V_{\text{sep}}$  of preferable solutions should be as low as possible, so I searched for a minimum of this expression. It took place at  $V_R = +2.935 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  and implied the values of  $V_{\text{sep}} = 4.67 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  and  $\gamma = 3.63 \times 10^{-5}$  units of the solar gravitational acceleration.

On the other hand, the mean residual,  $\mathfrak{R}$ , was increasing toward the negative values of  $V_R$ , but at an exceptionally slow rate,

$$\mathfrak{R} = 0''.4399 - 0''.00112 V_R. \quad (5)$$

More significant was the magnitude of the mean residual — the Palomar observations of the relative motion of companion C were fitted with a mean residual of  $\pm 0''.44$  in a wide range of  $V_R$ , confirming their high accuracy.

All solutions for  $V_R \sim +2.9 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  left essentially identical residuals. This value of  $V_R$  was selected below for the representative solution. Its interesting feature is that companion C separated from the parent nucleus around mid-May 2020, about three months after the comet had undergone a close encounter with Jupiter, with a miss distance of only 0.265 AU.

The parameters of the adopted fragmentation solution for companion C are presented in Table 4, while the residuals from the Palomar observations are listed in columns 4–5 of Table 5, which also shows the major deviation of the motion of C from the trajectory of the other companion. By the time of the last observation, the position was off by more than  $1'$ . Note that the nongravitational acceleration is predicted to be low, meaning the companion may survive until the next return to perihelion.

**Table 5**  
 Separations of Companions C and D from Principal Nucleus A of 157P/Tritton  
 and Residuals from Three Solutions in Table 4 (Equinox J2000)

Time of observation 2022 (UT)	Observed separation		Residual from C		Residual from D <sub>(I)</sub>		Residual from D <sub>(II)</sub>		Obs. code
	in R.A.	in Dec.	in R.A.	in Dec.	in R.A.	in Dec.	in R.A.	in Dec.	
Aug 21.49305	-27 <sup>''</sup> .13	-11 <sup>''</sup> .21	+0 <sup>''</sup> .08	+0 <sup>''</sup> .04	(-9 <sup>''</sup> .60	-15 <sup>''</sup> .08)	(-9 <sup>''</sup> .42	-14 <sup>''</sup> .97)	I41
21.49556	-26.76	-11.08	+0.44	+0.17	(-9.23	-14.96)	(-9.05	-14.84)	I41
21.49807	-27.43	-11.00	-0.23	+0.25	(-9.90	-14.88)	(-9.72	-14.76)	I41
25.49347	-20.74	-10.84	-0.18	-0.39	(-3.44	-15.13)	(-3.29	-15.04)	I41
25.49592	-20.57	-10.49	-0.01	-0.04	(-3.27	-14.78)	(-3.12	-14.69)	I41
30.49653	-11.64	-10.48	+0.28	-0.51	(+5.34	-15.26)	(+5.46	-15.18)	I41
30.49905	-12.17	-10.30	-0.26	-0.33	(+4.81	-15.08)	(+4.93	-15.00)	I41
30.50158	-11.82	-9.44	+0.08	+0.53	(+5.16	-14.22)	(+5.28	-14.14)	I41
30.50410	-11.96	-10.09	-0.06	-0.12	(+5.02	-14.87)	(+5.14	-14.79)	I41
30.50662	-12.66	-10.16	-0.77	-0.19	(+4.32	-14.94)	(+4.44	-14.86)	I41
Sept 2.49521	-7.06	-9.25	-0.48	+0.71	(+9.72	-14.29)	(+9.82	-14.22)	I41
2.49773	-6.27	-9.74	+0.31	+0.22	(+10.51	-14.78)	(+10.61	-14.72)	I41
2.50025	-5.62	-10.12	+0.96	-0.16	(+11.16	-15.16)	(+11.26	-15.10)	I41
2.50277	-7.32	-9.67	-0.75	+0.29	(+9.46	-14.71)	(+9.56	-14.65)	I41
2.50529	-5.98	-10.38	+0.59	-0.42	(+10.80	-15.42)	(+10.90	-15.36)	I41
Sept 15.91927	-17 <sup>''</sup> .5	+7 <sup>''</sup> .1	(-35 <sup>''</sup> .8	+19 <sup>''</sup> .4)	-1 <sup>''</sup> .7	+1 <sup>''</sup> .1	-1 <sup>''</sup> .7	+1 <sup>''</sup> .1	N88
15.92319	-17.3	+7.7	(-35.5	+20.0)	-1.4	+1.7	-1.4	+1.7	N88
18.10532	-14.7	+5.5	(-37.1	+18.5)	+0.9	-0.6	+1.0	-0.6	G00
18.12005	-14.7	+6.2	(-37.1	+19.2)	+0.9	+0.1	+1.0	+0.1	G00
18.12313	-15.1	+5.9	(-37.6	+18.9)	+0.5	-0.2	+0.5	-0.2	G00
18.12544	-15.4	+4.4	(-37.8	+17.4)	+0.3	-1.7	+0.3	-1.7	G00
23.11672	-15.1	+5.7	(-47.1	+20.6)	+0.2	-0.6	+0.2	-0.6	G00
23.12234	-14.8	+6.3	(-46.8	+21.2)	+0.5	0.0	+0.4	0.0	G00
23.12515	-14.0	+5.1	(-46.0	+20.0)	+1.3	-1.2	+1.3	-1.2	G00
23.12964	-15.0	+6.4	(-47.0	+21.3)	+0.3	0.0	+0.3	0.0	G00
28.47339	-15.4	+7.7	(-57.7	+25.0)	-0.5	+1.2	-0.5	+1.1	H06
28.47794	-16.3	+6.9	(-58.5	+24.2)	-1.3	+0.4	-1.4	+0.3	H06

**Note.**

<sup>a</sup> Entries whose residuals are parenthesized have been rejected from the solution.

An ephemeris for companion C suggests that its projected distance from the principal mass reached a peak of nearly 100'' in position angle 205° at the beginning of September 2021, when the comet was under observation, even though it was extremely faint (mag ~21). Another peak of 108'' in position angle 226° occurred in early May 2022, when the comet could not be observed. Interestingly, the minimum separation, 10'' to the south of the principal nucleus, took place only a few days after the last reported observation at Palomar.

#### 4.3. Companion D

A look at Figure 5 makes it clear that the fragmentation solution for companion D, to the northwest of the principal mass (A), should still be much more uncertain than the solution for companion C. Orientation runs that included the radial ( $V_R$ ) and/or transverse ( $V_T$ ) components of the separation velocity as variables did indeed fail to provide meaningful parameters for companion D. Under these circumstances, the starting working run was one in which I solved for the separation time, the acceleration, and the normal component of the separation velocity. The acceleration came out to be lower than  $10^{-5}$  unit of the solar gravitational acceleration (probably unrealistically low) and the out-of-plane separation velocity was lower than  $1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . The most surprising was

the resulting separation time: although determined with a large uncertainty, the nominal date was 2017 January 6, consistent with the constraints on the timing of a post-perihelion brightening in early 2017, as established in Section 2. It appears that just like in many other comets, the brightening and the breakup were correlated.

If so, the companion was likely to have separated from the parent nucleus at the onset of brightening, which may have been either (i) a gradual surge of activity with progressively increasing amount of material in the coma (as displayed by comet C/2019 Y4), in which case the onset was probably nearer the beginning of the 80-day long period of uncertainty, i.e., in January 2017; or it was (ii) a typical outburst, with an extremely rapid raise of activity, in which case the onset time could be at any point of the period of uncertainty, including just a few days before 19 March 2017.

Accordingly, I chose to run two models for companion D with very different times of separation: one —  $D_{(I)}$  — on 2017 March 9, or 2010 days before the 2022 perihelion time; the other —  $D_{(II)}$  — 50 days earlier, on January 18, or 2060 days before perihelion; looking for a potential effect on the companion's motion. Such runs were still examined as a function of the radial component,  $V_R$ , of the separation velocity, but the three remaining parameters,  $\gamma$ ,  $V_T$ , and  $V_N$ , could have been solved for.

The nongravitational acceleration varied rapidly, but essentially linearly, with  $V_R$ . In the same units as before,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &= 2.83 - 23.14 V_R \quad (\text{for } t_s - t_\pi = -2010 \text{ days}) \\ \gamma &= 4.59 - 29.49 V_R \quad (\text{for } t_s - t_\pi = -2060 \text{ days}),\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where  $t_s$  is the separation time of companion D and  $t_\pi$  is the comet's perihelion time in 2022. Similarly, the mean residual varied as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{R} &= 1''.0265 - 0''.0055 V_R \quad (\text{for } t_s - t_\pi = -2010 \text{ days}) \\ \mathfrak{R} &= 1''.0260 - 0''.0075 V_R \quad (\text{for } t_s - t_\pi = -2060 \text{ days}).\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

Both  $V_T$  and  $V_N$  came out to be very low, not exceeding  $1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , so the separation velocity was not an issue. Surviving longer than 5.5 years, D was a persistent companion (see Sekanina 1982) and its acceleration  $\gamma$  could hardly exceed  $\sim 10 \times 10^{-5}$  units of the solar gravitational acceleration. Adopting for either model a  $\gamma$  value of 7.5, the radial component of the separation velocity stays in the range of  $0.1\text{--}0.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ .

The parameters of the two fragmentation models presented in Table 4 show that the only major difference is the much higher errors in the case of Solution D<sub>(II)</sub>. However, in either case the parametric accuracy is unsatisfactory, which is necessarily the result of a very short period of time covered by the observations. Table 5 demonstrates that the distributions of residuals from the two solutions are practically identical. Given that most astrometric observations were made with a telescope whose resolving power was more than  $300''$  per mm, the residuals look more than satisfactory. There are possibly slight,  $1''\text{--}2''$ , systematic differences between the Martinsberg astrometry on the one hand and the Xingming and Mayhill astrometry on the other hand, but this should not be all that surprising, considering that the companion was a difficult object to measure (Figure 4), especially in telescopes of smaller sizes.

The uncertainties of the derived fragmentation solutions notwithstanding, the problem of 157P-B has clearly been successfully resolved.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The unorthodox behavior of comet 157P/Tritton culminated in 2022, when each of two companions that had separated at vastly different times brightened enough over short periods of time to be observable with telescopes of modest sizes. Two weeks after one of the companions faded, the other brightened for two weeks only to fade as well. The perfect coordination of the two entirely independent events made a false impression as if a single object, designated 157P-B by the MPC, was intermittently visible. The fundamental differences, such as

the positions and motions of the two companions relative to the principal mass, which exhibited unmistakable signs of incompatibility, were overlooked or ignored.

Among the results of the mixup were the meaningless orbits computed by highly reputable authorities from the positions of the two objects. As expected, the orbits left large residuals (up to  $4''$ ) from the astrometric positions that were accurate to a fraction of  $1''$ .

Because of the short lengths of the observed orbital arcs of the two companions, their fragmentation parameters could not accurately be derived, only constrained. Yet, it is likely that one of the two objects separated from the parent nucleus at the time of the major outburst or surge of activity in the first quarter of 2017. The other companion appears to have detached in 2020, following the comet's close encounter with Jupiter. Both objects appear to be persistent companions with low nongravitational accelerations.

This investigation has touched upon two issues worth commenting on. One is emphasis on negative observations of faint comets, which should be (but are seldom) reported. When a comet is caught in outburst or surge of activity, negative observations preceding the event can prove extremely useful in constraining its onset time.

The other issue is the idea of launching a campaign of imaging comets, with a powerful instrument (such as the HST's wide-field camera), at nearly random times, but at least months after a major outburst; this could prove highly rewarding in terms of detecting sizable but exceptionally faint fragments of the nucleus (apparent magnitude  $\gg 21$ ) that otherwise remain undetected.

## REFERENCES

- Green, D. W. E. 2003, IAU Circ. 8215
- Jäger, M. 2022, Minor Plan. Electr. Circ. 2022-T23
- Marsden, B. G. 1979, Catalogue of Cometary Orbits, 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, 88 pp
- Marsden, B. G. 1995, Catalogue of Cometary Orbits, 10th ed. Cambridge, MA: IAU Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams & Minor Planet Center, 108 pp
- Marsden, B. G., & Green, D. W. E. 1985, Quart. J. Roy. Astron. Soc., 26, 92
- Minor Planet Center Staff 2017, Minor Plan. Circ. 104100, 104101, 104983, 105338, and 105699
- Minor Planet Center Staff 2021, Minor Plan. Circ. 132831, 134067, and 135329
- Minor Planet Center Staff 2022a, Minor Plan. Circ. 136702 and 142106
- Minor Planet Center Staff 2022b, Minor Plan. Circ. 141285, 142106, 158657, and 158658
- Minor Planet Center Staff 2023, Minor Plan. Circ. 160514, 162180, and 163393
- Sekanina, Z. 1978, Icarus, 33, 173
- Sekanina, Z. 1982, in Comets, ed. L. L. Wilkening (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), 251
- Zwicky Transient Facility 2022, Minor Plan. Electr. Circ. 2022-T23