

## FORMATION AND EVOLUTION OF THE STREAM OF SOHO KREUTZ SUNGRAZERS. I. HISTORY AND PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS

ZDENEK SEKANINA

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

Version January 4, 2024

### ABSTRACT

The nearly continuous stream of miniature comets dominated by the Kreutz sungrazers has been an unexpected great bonanza for cometary science initiated by the launch of the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory (SOHO) in 1995. Over the nearly 30 years since the time, no serious attempt has been made to formulate a self-consistent model for the formation and evolution of this stream of Kreutz comets — the goal of the present two-part investigation. Part I describes historical highlights of the research that has been relevant to the problem of SOHO sungrazers (including the major contributions by Hubbard, Kreutz, and Marsden) and furnishes preliminaries of diagnostic value that are intended to facilitate, and provide critical information for, the work in Part II. Formerly noted issues, such as the high frequency of close pairs in the SOHO database, are proposed to be products of a broader process of swarming, seen in both the nodal longitude and time. I present examples of tight swarms revealed by high arrival rates of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers, primarily from Population I.

*Subject headings:* individual comets: X/1106 C1, C/1843 D1, C/1880 C1, C/1882 R1, C/1963 R1, C/1965 S1, C/1970 K1, C/2011 W3; methods: data analysis

### 1. THE HISTORY

Knowledge of the Kreutz sungrazer system, a stream of comets that approach the Sun to less than  $2 R_{\odot}$  at perihelion and move in orbits of a joint line of apsides, has grown explosively since the beginning of the era of Sun-exploring space missions. Whereas the number of the known members did not exceed a dozen (including a few questionable ones) in the late 1960s, as noted by Marsden (1967), it grew to nearly 30 by 1990, to more than 350 by the end of 2000, to more than 1700 by the end of 2010, and to more than 4300 by the end of 2023, thanks mainly to imaging with the C2 and C3 coronagraphs on board the *Solar and Heliospheric Observatory* (SOHO). Very recently, sungrazers undetected by SOHO were observed by the *Parker Solar Probe* (e.g., R. Pickard’s remark in Facebook’s *Sungrazer Comet Section* on 2023 Nov. 9).


Even though this system of sungrazing comets has been named after him, H. Kreutz was not the first scientist to study the orbital properties of the members in some detail. The motion of the Great March Comet of 1843 (C/1843 D1) had extensively been examined by Hubbard (1849, 1850, 1851, 1852), who accounted for the perturbations by six planets (Mercury to Saturn) and derived two sets of orbital elements; one based on all available astrometric observations made with a filar micrometer, the other with either a filar or ring micrometer. For an osculating orbital period Hubbard obtained in the two cases, respectively,  $533 \pm 135$  yr (Elements VII; the mean error converted from the used probable error) and 803 yr (Elements VI; with no error given, but the uncertainty admittedly somewhat higher).

Kreutz’s (1901) “definitive” orbit for this 1843 sungrazer, with the planetary perturbations unaccounted for and the observations lumped up into only seven normal places, has been less informative than Hubbard’s. However, a useful feature of Kreutz’s paper was the discrimination of the astrometric observations into quality cat-

egories, exploited by Sekanina & Chodas (2008) to compute the comet’s new set of orbital elements by using only the best-quality data with the comparison-star positions from the modern catalogues. These results offered an optimum osculating orbital period of  $654 \pm 103$  yr. A forced period of 742 yr, needed in order to successfully link C/1843 D1 with X/1106 C1, increased a mean residual very insignificantly, from  $\pm 2''.57$  to  $\pm 2''.58$ . Varying a cutoff for the residuals from  $2''$  to  $7''$  offered nominal osculating periods between 625 yr and 790 yr.

As a witness to the arrivals of additional spectacular members of the sungrazer system in the 1880s, Kreutz was in a position that Hubbard (1823–1863) was denied. And it should be emphasized that Kreutz’s (1891) orbital solutions for the four nuclear fragments of the Great September Comet of 1882 (C/1882 R1) observed extensively after perihelion, are a masterpiece, especially given that they are based on mediocre observations by today’s standards. Of particular interest is his orbit for fragment B (or No. 2), the best candidate by far for the principal nucleus (presumably the most massive object of the four). Marsden’s (1967) integration of its orbit back to the 12th century indicated that perihelion was reached in April 1138, merely a few months (!) earlier than the estimated perihelion time of the Chinese comet of 1138 [No. 403 in Ho’s (1962) catalogue], proposed by Sekanina & Kracht (2022) to have been the previous appearance of C/1882 R1 and Ikeya-Seki (C/1965 S1).

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Kreutz (1901) was convinced that the sungrazers observed between 1843 and 1887 were distinct fragments of a common parent, not returns of the same object. And even though he commented on the differences in their nodal longitudes to support his view, he was not in a position to discern the subgroups. That could only be accomplished after reliable orbits were determined for additional sungrazers, which arrived in the second half of the 20th century. It



**Figure 1.** The relationship between the nominal longitude of the ascending node and orbit inclination for more than 1500 SOHO Kreutz sungrazers for which a parabolic orbit was computed by Marsden. The Great March Comet of 1843 is located at the center of an oversized open circle, while the positions of three bright sungrazers — C/1965 S1, C/1970 K1, and C/2011 W3 — are marked by the large solid circles. The passing curve connects all orbits whose line of apsides has the same position, the perihelion coordinates given by  $L_\pi \simeq 283^\circ$ ,  $B_\pi \simeq +35^\circ$  (Equinox J2000). The dots mark the SOHO sungrazers. Most of them make up a thick band that runs through the position of C/1843 D1 and would line up along the apsidal-line curve if rotated by about  $15^\circ$  to  $16^\circ$  counterclockwise. Sparcely populated branches of data, parallel to the main band, are seen to pass through the positions of the three bright sungrazers as well. (From Sekanina & Kracht 2015.)

was Marsden (1967) and others who seized the opportunity and recognized the existence of Subgroups I and II.

Of the sungrazers whose orbits were determined accurately or fairly accurately, C/1843 D1, C/1880 C1, and C/1963 R1 belonged to Subgroup I, while C/1882 R1 and C/1965 S1 to Subgroup II. Unfortunately, a disconcerting pattern of perpetually catching up with the ever widening range of orbital properties of newly discovered naked-eye sungrazers seems to have begun to proliferate after Marsden’s (1967) pioneering work: only three years later, a new bright sungrazer, White-Ortiz-Bolelli (C/1970 K1), was discovered to move in an orbit that defied the classification into two subgroups, compelling Marsden (1989) to introduce a third subgroup, IIa. And one year after Marsden’s untimely passing away, T. Lovejoy discovered another sungrazer that became visible to the naked eye, C/2011 W3, moving in an orbit that defied the expanded, three-subgroup classification, necessitating the introduction of a fourth subgroup, III (Sekanina & Chodas 2012).

Even though it remains to be seen whether this perplexing pattern will continue in the future, the chance is that it will not. Clear footprints of the Kreutz system’s morphology much more complex than formerly believed became in the meantime apparent from a select subset of the SOHO Kreutz database, which offered compelling evidence not only for the four subgroups noted above, but for five additional ones as well (Sekanina 2021, 2022). At the same time, as the Kreutz membership was exponentially climbing first into hundreds and more recently into thousands of objects, the term *subgroup* seemed ever less appropriate. Eventually I replaced it in my papers with a term *population*.

## 2. THE SOHO KREUTZ DATABASE AND ORBITAL PROPERTIES OF THE SUNGRAZERS


Most Kreutz sungrazers that we know are boulders estimated at 10 meters or less across as they are detected

on their doomed journey to perihelion. Indeed, none has as yet been observed to survive, all having disintegrated shortly before reaching it. Because of their tiny dimensions, they are often referred to as *dwarf* sungrazers. Only a single Kreutz comet visible to the naked eye from the ground and marginally surviving perihelion has been observed in the 50+ years since 1970.

More than 20 years ago I remarked that too many close pairs of SOHO Kreutz objects had been reported to explain their existence as random events; instead, these instances of episodic nature appear to have been products of secondary (or higher-generation) fragmentation at large heliocentric distance (Sekanina 2000). While this conclusion is hard to argue with, the details (such as the separation velocities of up to  $6 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ) could be problematic. And in any case, most SOHO Kreutz sungrazers have not arrived at perihelion in very close pairs, so the *probability* of occurrence of such fragmentation episodes would appear to be low. In the early days of SOHO’s operations, little was known about the meaning and usefulness of Marsden’s orbital elements, about the magnitude of the nongravitational acceleration, and especially about the fragmentation history of the Kreutz system and its populations to offer far-sighted predictions.

### 2.1. The Line of Apsides Paradox

Once Marsden’s orbits were available for a large number of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers (Marsden & Williams 2008), a baffling pattern became apparent in a plot of the inclination against the longitude of the ascending node in Figure 1: the condition of a shared position of the line of apsides, often serving in orbital studies as a sign of potential genetic relationship between two or more independent objects, and satisfied by all bright members of the Kreutz system observed from the ground, is ostensibly defied by most SOHO sungrazers, which are seen to line up along a curve that makes up an angle of  $15^\circ$  to  $16^\circ$  with the curve of the fixed apsidal line. Only the



**Figure 2.** The relationships between the nominal longitude of the ascending node, on the one hand, and the perihelion longitude,  $L_\pi$ , and perihelion latitude,  $B_\pi$ , on the other, for the same 1500+ SOHO Kreutz sungrazers. While the perihelion longitude is seen to be statistically independent of the longitude of the ascending node, the perihelion latitude appears to be linearly increasing at a rate of approximately  $3^\circ$  per  $10^\circ$  increase in the longitude of the ascending node. Note the secondary branches above the main band. (From Sekanina & Kracht 2015.)

SOHO sungrazers located in the figure in close proximity of C/1843 D1 satisfy, at least approximately, the apsidal-line condition. This likewise applies to the SOHO sungrazers in the figure that relate to any of the other three bright, naked-eye objects in the same manner as do the above SOHO sungrazers in the main band to C/1843 D1.

The paradox suggests that the least-squares fit by a set of purely gravitational parabolic elements (referred to in this paper as *nominal*), applied by Marsden to satisfy the measured positions of a SOHO sungrazer over the short arc of its path, was forced to respond to the strong orbital constraint from a culprit at the expense of the more subdued condition of the shared line of apsides. The nature of the culprit is not difficult to guess, given the minuscule dimensions and relatively high activity of the SOHO dwarf sungrazers: an obvious candidate is a major, sublimation-driven nongravitational acceleration. Furthermore, given that the paradox is involving a plot of two *out-of-plane* elements, the culprit apparently was the *neglected* nongravitational acceleration's normal component. This suspicion appears to be confirmed by plots of the nominal perihelion longitude,  $L_\pi$ , and latitude,  $B_\pi$ , against the nominal longitude of the ascending node,  $\Omega$ , displayed in Figure 2: whereas the perihelion longitude is statistically constant, independent of the longitude of the

ascending node, the perihelion latitude varies with the nodal longitude systematically, in a linear fashion.

Sekanina & Kracht (2015) selected eight individual SOHO Kreutz objects, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph, whose nominal longitudes of the ascending node spanned the entire range in Figures 1 and 2, from  $300^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$ , at intervals that averaged some  $10^\circ$  to  $15^\circ$ . The task was to fit each object's motion by applying Marsden et al.'s (1973) standard nongravitational model (Style II), forcing the normal component of the water-ice sublimation acceleration,  $A_3$ , and searching, by trial and error, for an orbital solution offering an orientation of the line of apsides that agreed with the standard position as closely as possible. This orbital solution provided representative estimates for values of the *true* elements and for the parameter  $A_3$  of the presumably dominant out-of-plane component of the nongravitational acceleration.

The results for the eight selected objects were consistently astonishing: (i) the *true* orbital elements strongly resembled — the angular ones within degrees — those of C/1843 D1, which meant that in the extreme cases the longitude of the ascending node got changed by  $50^\circ$  or more (!) from the nominal value; (ii) the out-of-plane nongravitational acceleration was on the average at least three orders of magnitude higher than the radial

nongravitational accelerations in the motions of ordinary comets and the peak value was *comparable to the solar gravitational acceleration* at the given heliocentric distance; (iii) the standard position of the line of apsides was always closely approximated; and (iv) the quality of the fit provided by the nongravitational orbit to the used C2 coronagraphic observations, expressed in terms of a mean residual, was comparable to that achieved by Marsden’s nominal gravitational orbit.

The paradox was thereby fully resolved.

## 2.2. Populations of SOHO Sungrazers

I recognized that the apparently linear relationship between the nominal perihelion latitude and the nominal longitude of the ascending node in Figure 2 could potentially offer a gold mine of valuable data on the Kreutz system in the SOHO database. The weak point was considerable data scatter involved. Fortunately, much of it could be removed by limiting the acceptance to the SOHO sungrazers imaged exclusively by the C2 coronagraph, whose sensor has a pixel size nearly five times smaller (linearly) than the C3 coronagraph, thereby providing the much better astrometry. The apparent orbital arc in C2 is shorter, but only because of projection effects. On the other hand, the terminal part of the orbit is the one with the greatest curvature. The major shortcoming is the missing data from the months of January through March and July through September, when the path of a Kreutz comet in space is nearly perpendicular to the SOHO’s line of sight and the dwarf sungrazers disintegrate before they enter the C2 coronagraph’s field of view. To avoid unwanted effects of this kind, one should not get involved with distributions whose sampled base is divided into intervals shorter than one year but longer than several weeks.

Examining the relationship between the nominal longitude of the ascending node,  $\Omega$ , and perihelion latitude,  $B_\pi$ , among the SOHO sungrazers imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph, I was surprised to see how much did the morphology of the thick band in Figure 2 change. The data looked no longer smeared as they did before the objects whose orbits were based on the C3 coronagraphic images were eliminated. Significantly, it now became obvious that the data did not refer to a single population.

**Table 1**

Adopted Range of the True Longitudes of Ascending Node  $\hat{\Omega}$  for Nine Populations of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers<sup>a</sup> (Equinox J2000)

Population	Range of nodal longitudes $\hat{\Omega}$	Width	$N_{\text{obs}}$	Node of related naked-eye member
Pre-I	9°.5–14°.5	5°	14	.....
Pe	6°.5–9°.5	3°	29	7°.94 (C/1963 R1)
I	359°–6°	7°	71	3°.69 (C/1843 D1)
Ia	354°–359°	5°	34	.....
II	343°–354°	11°	26	347°–66 (C/1882 R1)
IIa	332°–343°	11°	24	337°–01 (C/1970 K1)
III	324°–332°	8°	13	326°–37 (C/2011 W3)
IIIa	~310°–~320°	~10°	6	.....
IV	~300°–~309°	~10°	3	.....

**Note.**

<sup>a</sup> From Sekanina (2022).

On the contrary, the band of the data appeared to be resolved into *four* discrete populations, which I designated I, Ia, Pe, and Pre-I. The boundaries between them became still clearer when the plotted entries were restricted to the objects with better orbits, based on a minimum of 12 observations for Populations I and Pe, 11 observations for Population Pre-I, and 10 observations for Population Ia. For the remaining five populations, all objects imaged at least five times were included. The complete set of the nine populations totaled 220 select SOHO Kreutz sungrazers. The memberships in Populations II, IIa, III, IIIa, and IV, were gradually declining (Sekanina 2021, 2022). Populations I, II, and IIa were identical with Marsden’s (1967, 1989) Subgroups I, II, and IIa, respectively. The total number of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers observed exclusively in the C2 coronagraph between 1996 and mid-2010, for which a parabolic orbit was determined by Marsden, was 753. Most of them, a little over 50 percent, belonged to Population I.


In the  $B_\pi(\Omega)$  plot, the members of the nine populations were distributed along parallel straight lines given by a common slope of  $dB_\pi/d\Omega = 0.28$ , which equals  $\tan 15^\circ.6$ , the angle between the two curves in Figure 1 (Sekanina 2021). For each SOHO object a *true* longitude of the ascending node was calculated from its nominal value, the slope, and a standard value of the perihelion latitude. I assigned each population a range of the true longitudes of the ascending node (Table 1) and used the 220 objects to construct a histogram of the populations (Figure 3), a major attribute of the Kreutz system among the SOHO sungrazers.

## 2.3. Implications

The investigation of the eight selected SOHO objects by Sekanina & Kracht (2015) and the subsequent examination of the  $B_\pi(\Omega)$  plot in Figure 2 thus showed that the longitude of the ascending node is a critical orbital element that describes the population and provides information on the fragmentation process and the evolution of the Kreutz system. This conclusion was not obvious after the first two or even three subgroups were defined by Marsden (1967, 1989), because the nodal line correlated with the perihelion distance. It was only the introduction of Population III that showed that the perihelion distance was not diagnostic, as there was little difference in this element between Comet Lovejoy (C/2011 W3; Population III) and the Great March Comet of 1843 (C/1843 D1; Population I).

The *true* perihelion distances of most SOHO Kreutz sungrazers are not known at this time, because no procedure is available for converting the nominal perihelion distances. Sekanina & Kracht (2015) indicated no systematic corrections to these values as a function of the nodal longitude. Thus, the typical perihelion distances of the populations whose major sungrazers have never been seen — Pre-I, Ia, IIIa, and IV — remain unavailable. And for Population IIa, for which C/1970 K1 suggests a perihelion distance of 1.91  $R_\odot$ , the perihelion-distance distribution of the SOHO sungrazers appears to potentially suggest two different sources, the other, IIa\*, having a perihelion distance similar to that of C/1843 D1.

Overall, the agreement in the position of the nodal lines (and, by definition, in the values of the other two angular elements) between a bright Kreutz sungrazer (or



**Figure 3.** Histogram of the true longitudes of the ascending node of 220 select SOHO sungrazers, imaged exclusively by the C2 coronagraph, showing nine populations of the Kreutz system. A peak at  $1^\circ$ , marked by a question mark, is probably a side branch of Population I, with no known associated naked-eye object. (From Sekanina 2022.)

sungrazers) and the related SOHO objects of the same population is very good, as is apparent from Table 1 and Figure 3.

To finish this section, a few words about the limitations in the use of Marsden’s parabolic orbits for ephemerides of the SOHO sungrazers and similar purposes. As long as the nodal longitude and orbit inclination show that the object’s position in Figure 1 is very close to the apsidal-line’s curve, Marsden’s elements are likely to provide a fair approximation to the actual path in space. If this condition is not satisfied, the elements should not be used for such purposes. In these cases one can only trust the *true* longitude of the ascending node converted from the nominal value (with help of the standard coordinates of the line of apsides) as explained. In addition, the nominal perihelion time could approximately be converted into a true perihelion time by applying the following correction (in days), derived from the eight investigated objects by Sekanina & Kracht (2015):

$$\text{corr}(t_\pi) = -0.0037 - 0.0017(\Omega - \hat{\Omega}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\Omega$  and  $\hat{\Omega}$  are, respectively, the nominal and true longitudes of the ascending node (in degrees). The correction applies in the range of  $-70^\circ < \Omega - \hat{\Omega} < +20^\circ$  and it is expected to be good to  $\pm 0.01$  day.


### 3. TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF SOHO SUNGRAZERS

Battams & Knight (2017) presented the statistics of the *Sungrazer Project* up to the end of 2015. Because they did not distinguish between the Kreutz sungrazers seen in C2, C3, and combined C2+C3, and ignored the populations, their results are mostly irrelevant to the present investigation, except for the numbers of full-resolution images returned per year separately for the C2 and C3 coronagraphs. Their Table 3 shows that among the comets for which Marsden computed the orbits (1996 through mid-2010), a meaningful statistical sample should be based on the data from the period of 2000–2009, when the number of useful images returned by C2 was in a fairly narrow range between 21.2 and 24.5 thousand per year.

I determined the number of Kreutz sungrazers in each of the nine populations detected each year between 2000 and 2009, and scaled these numbers to 25 thousand useful images per year. I thereby obtained the normalized statistics of SOHO Kreutz discoveries displayed in Figures 4 and 5. One does not need to apply any rigorous statistical criteria to readily discover enormous variations from year to year in any of the populations whose total number of members in the set is large enough that such variations should be deemed meaningful. Three populations with a total of about 20 members or more — Pre-I, II, and IIa — suggest that no members were observed in some of the years, while a peak rate of each population in a single year equaled  $\frac{1}{4}$  its total number of objects observed in the entire decade. For Population Ia, growing rapidly with time, and Pe the maximum-to-minimum rate ratios were nearly 10:1 and 4:1, respectively.


For Population I, the most abundant one among the SOHO sungrazers, the maximum-to-minimum rate ratio over the period of 10 years was 2.3:1, peaking in 2006 on a gradually increasing background. Among the members are eight 2006 objects (C/2006 K18, K19, K20, L3, L4, L6, M6, and M9) that arrived at perihelion between May 26 and June 27 (see Table 5 of Sekanina 2022). The  $56^\circ$  wide interval of the nominal nodal longitudes (from Marsden’s parabolic orbits), ranging from  $345^\circ$  to  $41^\circ$ , was reduced — after the effects of the out-of-plane component of the nongravitational acceleration had been allowed for — to merely  $6^\circ$ , centered on a true nodal longitude of  $3^\circ$ , a fraction of a degree away from the nodal longitude of the Great March Comet of 1843.

Figure 5 compares the histogram for the genuine Population I with the histogram for the combined Populations I, Ia, Pe, and Pre-I — what could formally be called Population I+, based on the appearance in the plot that includes the low-quality C3 data. Remarkably, even though each of the four populations that make up Population I+ displayed profound variations in the C2 data between 2000 and 2009, their sum was much flatter, exhibiting a maximum-to-minimum rate ratio of only 1.5:1 and in the years 2003, 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2009 their combined rates being nearly constant.




**Figure 4.** Histograms for eight populations of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers from the years 2000–2009, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph and for which a parabolic orbit was computed by Marsden. The data are normalized to an equal number of useful images per year. Note the large, uneven year-to-year variations.

To sum up the findings from Figures 4 and 5, the histograms display very strong relative variations in the incoming flux of the individual populations of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers on a time scale of years, perhaps even



**Figure 5.** Histogram for Population I (top) and a sum of Populations I, Ia, Pe, and Pre-I of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers from the years 2000–2009, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph and for which a parabolic orbit was computed by Marsden. The data are normalized to an equal number of useful images per year.

somewhat shorter. The interpretation of this important result is left for Part II. Here I focus on collecting all evidence that supports a self-consistent model for the formation and evolution of the stream of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers.



**Figure 6.** Histogram of true longitudes of the ascending node for 390 SOHO Kreutz sungrazers of Population I, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph from 1996 to mid-2010. Note the three major peaks, below  $1^\circ$ , between  $1^\circ$  and  $3^\circ$ , and beyond  $3^\circ$ , separated by deep minima.

Before I investigate apparent swarming<sup>1</sup> of the SOHO sungrazers over very short periods of time, a topic that essentially expands the issue of close pairs (Section 2), I examine the phenomenon of swarming of the sungrazers in the longitude of the ascending node.

### 3.1. Swarming of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers in the Nodal Longitude

As will become obvious from Part II of this investigation, the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers' swarming in the parametric space of the true longitude of the ascending node (or another angular element) is as important for understanding the formation of the sungrazers' stream as is their swarming in time. For the largest Population I, a histogram of the distribution of true nodal longitudes is displayed in Figure 6. It includes 390 objects imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph between 1996 and mid-2010, for which Marsden's nominal elements were available.

The histogram shows that the distribution potentially consist of three distinct swarms, centered at the nodal longitudes of, respectively, less than  $1^\circ$ , near  $2^\circ$ , and well beyond  $3^\circ$ . The last swarm appears to be the widest and most massive. It is likely that at least most objects in each of the three groups are more closely related to one another than the objects across the boundaries. It is impossible to follow the histories of the individual fragments but below I use a *dispersion*, defined as a mean quadratic difference between all fragments in a swarm, as a measure of random scatter in the given quantity. The dispersion in the true longitude of the ascending node,  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$ , is defined by

$$\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} (\hat{\Omega}_j - \hat{\Omega}_i)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $n$  is the number of objects in the swarm and  $i \neq j$  emphasizes that  $\hat{\Omega}_i$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_j$  are any two different objects in the set, although of course in practice the result is the same regardless of whether the rule is honored or not.

<sup>1</sup> I deliberately am avoiding the term *clustering*, which has been used in connection with the sungrazers for another phenomenon.

The true perihelion time,  $\hat{t}_\pi$ , is approximated by a formula


$$\hat{t}_\pi = t_\pi + \text{corr}(t_\pi), \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{corr}(t_\pi)$  is given by Equation (1). The dispersion in the true perihelion time,  $\text{disp}(t_\pi)$ , referred to from now on as the dispersion in time, equals


$$\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} [(\hat{t}_\pi)_j - (\hat{t}_\pi)_i]^2}. \quad (4)$$

I leave out a similar expression for  $\text{disp}(\hat{q})$ , because the true perihelion distances  $\hat{q}_i$ ,  $\hat{q}_j$  are unknown.

It is clearly of interest to learn whether the other populations do behave alike or differently from Population I and what any potential disparities may mean in terms of the populations' formation and evolution. A meaningful experiment of this nature could be performed only for populations with a sufficiently large membership. Below I have selected a minimum of 50 members, which allows




**Figure 7.** Histogram of true longitudes of the ascending node for 110 SOHO Kreutz Population Ia sungrazers, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph from 1996 to mid-2010. Note the dramatic difference in comparison with Population I.



**Figure 8.** Histogram of true longitudes of the ascending node for 122 SOHO Kreutz Population Pe sungrazers, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph from 1996 to mid-2010. Unlike the histograms in Figures 6 and 7, the distribution is essentially random, possibly with a very gradual decreasing tendency toward the greater longitudes.

comparisons of Population I with Ia in Figure 7, Pe in Figure 8, and Pre-I in Figure 9. It turns out that in terms of the true nodal longitude, no two populations have been behaving alike. For Populations Ia and Pe it is impossible to discern any potential sub-swarms, but the membership distributions in the two populations are dramatically different: the number of members in Population Ia is growing rapidly with the nodal longitude, in the direction of Population I. On the other hand, the membership distribution in Population Pe appears to be almost entirely random. Population Pre-I is very unusual. It seems to consist of two nodal-longitude streams of vastly different properties, as described below.



**Figure 9.** Histogram of true longitudes of the ascending node for 57 SOHO Kreutz Population Pre-I sungrazers, imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph from 1996 to mid-2010. The distribution appears to discriminate into two streams with contradictory properties (see the text).

The derived values of the dispersions  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$  and  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$  for the four populations and their swarms are presented in Table 2. The dispersions in the nodal longitude for the swarms of Population I are approximately proportional to the chosen ranges of the longitudes, while the dispersions in time differ insignificantly from one another, suggesting that the sungrazers in each swarm are distributed more or less randomly. The dispersions in the nodal longitude for Populations Ia and Pe are comparable given that Pe is more compact, but the dispersions in time show Population Pe to be much tighter than Ia. As already remarked, the results for the two swarms of Population Pre-I are most controversial, with the dispersions in the nodal longitude and time displaying sharply opposite tendencies. The dispersion in time for Swarm Pre-I/2 is particularly anomalous, amounting to only one-third the value for Population Ia. This anomaly is presumably linked to the histogram of Population Pre-I in Figure 4. To the extent that the swarms of a population play an important role in the evolution of the Kreutz system, the dispersion values of that population as a whole may become less diagnostic; two such potential instances in Table 2 have been parenthesized. The significance and implications of disparities among the computed dispersions of the populations and their swarms are left to be discussed in Part II.

The last numerical exercise in this subsection involves potential detection of swarms in narrow intervals of the nodal longitude with the highest rates of SOHO sungrazers from Population I. The widths of the nodal-longitude intervals have been chosen to equal  $0^\circ.2$ ,  $0^\circ.1$ , and  $0^\circ.05$  and the peak arrival rates found to be 20, 12, and 8 objects, respectively, for more than one interval in each group. Somewhat surprisingly, the computed dispersions  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$  and  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$  in Table 3 appear to be inversely correlated, with the notable exception of the interval of  $\Omega$  between  $359^\circ.83$  and  $359^\circ.88$ .

### 3.2. Swarming of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers in Time

The focus of interest is next shifted toward the SOHO sungrazers that did arrive at perihelion nearly simultaneously, so that their dispersion in time is extremely small. I compute  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$  and  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$  for several swarms (with a minimum of four objects), restricting this part of the study to Populations I and Pe only.

**Table 2**

Dispersions in True Longitude of Ascending Node,  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$ , and in Time,  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ , for Populations I, Ia, Pe, and Pre-I of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers and Their Swarms (C2 Coronagraph Only) from 1996 to mid-2010 (Equinox J2000)

Population/ Swarm	Range of nodal longitudes $\hat{\Omega}$	$\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$	$\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ (days)	No. of objects
Population I	$359^\circ.5 - 6^\circ.5$	(2 <sup>o</sup> .68)	(1950)	390
Swarm I/1	$359.5 - 1.2$	0.68	1943	75
Swarm I/2	$1.2 - 3.0$	0.72	2035	115
Swarm I/3	$3.0 - 6.5$	1.26	1897	200
Population Ia	$354.5 - 359.5$	1.64	2105	110
Population Pe	$6.5 - 9.5$	1.21	1631	122
Population Pre-I	$9.5 - 14.5$	(1.63)	(957)	57
Swarm Pre-I/1	$9.5 - 10.8$	0.49	1247	24
Swarm Pre-I/2	$10.8 - 14.5$	1.23	694	33



**Table 3**  
Dispersions  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$  and  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$  for Narrow Nodal-Longitude Intervals with Peak Rates of SOHO Sungrazers of Population I (Equinox J2000)

Width of $\hat{\Omega}$	Interval of $\hat{\Omega}$	$\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$	$\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ (days)	No. of objects
0°-20	1°49–1°69	0°102	1854	20
	1.59–1.79	0.085	1932	20
	1.64–1.84	0.086	2138	20
0.10	359.81–359.91	0.036	2451	12
	3.89–3.99	0.042	1775	12
	4.36–4.46	0.042	1836	12
	4.39–4.49	0.044	1561	12
0.05	359.83–359.88	0.025	2475	8
	1.64–1.69	0.023	841	8
	6.02–6.07	0.015	1804	8
	6.03–6.08	0.015	1804	8

Also, two novelties are being introduced, the purpose of which becomes obvious in Part II. One is adding the dispersion in the *nominal*<sup>2</sup> perihelion distance,  $\text{disp}(q)$ , in units of the solar radii ( $1 R_\odot = 0.00465 \text{ AU}$ ):

$$\text{disp}(q) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} (q_j - q_i)^2}. \quad (5)$$

The other is inclusion in tabular material of a limited number of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers imaged by the C3 coronagraph, or, rather, by both the C2 and C3 coronagraphs. To distinguish them clearly from the objects imaged exclusively by the C2 coronagraph, they are marked with an asterisk.

The tabulated data would be merely a major extension of the list of 15 comet pairs provided in Sekanina (2000), if in the meantime the existence of the enormous non-gravitational accelerations affecting the motions of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers (Sekanina & Kracht 2015) were not recognized and the method of transforming Marsden’s nominal nodal longitudes (Sekanina 2021) not developed and implemented. Because of this progress, a more meaningful interpretation of the SOHO database has become possible.

The problem that cannot be completely removed from the database is the difficulty of discriminating between objects that arrive nearly simultaneously because until recently they were one body or because of a coincidence. The only modus operandi for improving the degree of this discrimination is to incorporate the condition of shared population. Even this stipulation is not foolproof because neighboring populations may partly overlap.

Nine examples of SOHO sungrazers of Population I arriving at perihelion in tight swarms are listed in Table 4. The individual columns show: (1) the sungrazer’s official identifier (with an asterisk when the object’s orbit is not based exclusively on the astrometry from images in the C2 coronagraph); (2) the true perihelion time that generally differs slightly from the value in Marsden’s gravitational orbit, being derived from Equation (3) using the correction from Equation (1); (3) the true longitude of

**Table 4**  
Examples of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers of Population I Arriving at Perihelion in Tight Swarms Between 1996 and Mid-2010 (Equinox J2000)

Sungrazer Identifier	$\hat{t}_\pi$ 2006 (TT)	$\hat{\Omega}$	$\Omega - \hat{\Omega}$	$q$ ( $R_\odot$ )	$t_{\text{last}} - \hat{t}_\pi$ (day)
Swarm A: 4 objects arriving over 0.41 day					
C/2007 L7	June 11.15	3°53	−2°24	1.23	−0.34
C/2007 L6	11.16	4.67	+5.98	1.55	−0.31
C/2007 L8	11.24	4.54	+4.02	1.53	−0.24
C/2007 L9	11.56	4.40	+4.22	1.55	−0.27
Swarm B: 4 objects arriving over 0.59 day					
C/2007 U4	Oct. 24.50	4°74	−2°94	1.10	−0.25
C/2007 U3*	24.99	3.94	−4.97	1.12	−0.20
C/2007 U5*	24.99	4.91	−8.13	1.08	−0.24
C/2007 U6	25.09	2.51	−1.23	1.08	−0.30
Swarm C: 4 objects arriving over 1.36 days					
C/2001 U2	Oct. 17.71	2°98	+4°07	1.40	−0.26
C/2001 U4*	18.33	2.62	+0.37	1.03	−0.20
C/2001 U8	18.98	6.05	+2.51	1.05	−0.27
C/2001 U5*	19.07	3.05	+0.65	1.12	−0.23
Swarm D: 4 objects arriving over 1.43 days					
C/2006 Y14	Dec. 28.81	5°45	+2°92	1.05	−0.21
C/2006 Y13*	28.83	5.92	−1.11	1.08	−0.23
C/2006 Y16	29.76	3.57	−8.79	1.05	−0.22
C/2006 Y17	30.24	6.03	+7.44	1.38	−0.27
Swarm E: 6 objects arriving over 2.41 days					
C/2006 J6	May 9.25	1°67	+1°24	1.10	−0.29
C/2006 J4*	9.40	5.62	+0.23	1.08	−0.17
C/2006 J8	10.53	359.95	+3.91	1.08	−0.28
C/2006 J7	10.54	1.60	+3.44	1.08	−0.27
C/2006 J9	10.98	5.41	−4.52	1.18	−0.25
C/2006 J10	11.66	5.01	−8.31	1.23	−0.28
Swarm F: 5 objects arriving over 2.69 days					
C/1998 X12	Dec. 7.42	0°27	−5°46	1.03	−0.23
C/1998 X4*	8.25	2.23	+6.24	1.23	−0.31
C/1998 X11	9.22	359.85	+13.66	1.05	−0.34
C/1998 X5	9.58	1.10	−4.85	1.23	−0.29
C/1998 X6	10.11	0.63	−9.21	1.29	−0.26
Swarm G: 6 objects arriving over 3.18 days					
C/2007 U8*	Oct. 28.34	1°77	+1°37	1.05	−0.22
C/2007 U9*	28.70	4.28	−8.00	1.08	−0.27
C/2007 U10*	29.27	359.78	−1.00	1.08	−0.25
C/2007 U11	29.41	2.08	−7.95	1.12	−0.27
C/2007 U12*	31.04	2.21	+2.90	1.12	−0.26
C/2007 U13*	31.52	359.70	+1.25	1.08	−0.24
Swarm H: 7 objects arriving over 3.32 days					
C/2006 K11*	May 23.59	1°49	+6°13	1.25	−0.24
C/2006 K13	24.83	1.86	+3.45	1.12	−0.27
C/2006 K14	24.83	359.94	+6.11	1.12	−0.29
C/2006 K15	25.45	3.11	+14.24	1.38	−0.32
C/2006 K16	26.32	1.43	+7.59	1.08	−0.30
C/2006 K17	26.37	3.32	+11.97	1.10	−0.33
C/2006 K18	26.91	5.79	+2.98	1.53	−0.32
Swarm J: 6 objects arriving over 4.39 days					
C/1998 K10*	June 1.88	0°21	+0°50	1.25	−0.12
C/1998 K11*	2.06	5.24	−0.06	1.08	−0.14
C/1998 L2	3.97	3.97	+18.52	1.12	−0.28
C/1998 L3	4.53	0.87	+5.18	1.08	−0.30
C/1998 L5	5.88	4.56	−7.36	1.18	−0.24
C/1998 L6	6.27	5.68	+3.62	1.23	−0.23

<sup>2</sup> The true perihelion distance being of course unavailable.

**Table 5**  
Examples of SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers of  
Population Pe Arriving at Perihelion in Tight Swarms  
Between 1996 and Mid-2010 (Equinox J2000)

Sungrazer Identifier	$\hat{t}_\pi$ 2006 (TT)	$\hat{\Omega}$	$\Omega - \hat{\Omega}$	$q$ ( $R_\odot$ )	$t_{\text{last}} - \hat{t}_\pi$ (day)
Swarm K: 4 objects arriving over 2.96 days					
C/2003 Q3*	Aug. 24.80	8°88	-0°93	1.14	-0.33
C/2003 Q2*	25.09	8.78	+0.34	1.05	-0.09
C/2003 Q4*	25.78	8.51	+0.76	1.10	-0.31
C/2003 Q5*	27.76	8.84	-0.21	1.08	-0.16
Swarm L: 4 objects arriving over 4.88 days					
C/2004 G5	Apr. 11.12	7°63	+0°80	1.12	-0.27
C/2004 G6	12.16	8.78	-1.47	1.10	-0.18
C/2004 G8	14.32	7.70	+0.51	1.08	-0.23
C/2004 G9	16.00	7.57	+1.28	1.12	-0.26

the ascending node; (4) the difference between the nominal and true nodal longitudes; (5) the uncorrected perihelion distance (in units of the solar radius); and (6) the time gap between the last image in C2 and perihelion.

The listed swarms show interesting features. The tightest Swarm A includes four sungrazers that would have passed perihelion over a period of less than 10 hours, two within 15 minutes of each other! The true longitudes of the ascending node of the four objects span a range only slightly wider than  $1^\circ$ , all belonging to Swarm I/3 in Figure 6. This contrasts with a range of more than  $9^\circ$  in the nominal nodal longitude, a huge difference. In fact, from the nominal values one would classify only one object to belong to Population I, two would be members of Population Pe, and one of Population Pre-I. The four sungrazers disintegrated between about 5 and 9 hours before perihelion. These times are typical for nearly all SOHO Kreutz comets, only the very bright ones among them did survive longer, to 3–4 hours before perihelion.

The second tightest Swarm B in Table 4 spans approximately 14 hours and two of the four sungrazers would have passed perihelion essentially simultaneously. Very close pairs (about 1 hour or less apart) are seen to be part of five among the tabulated swarms, besides A and B also D, E, and H; the last, with seven members over 80 hours, includes two very close pairs. Deliberately included is Swarm J, which contains the well-known pair of bright sungrazers C/1998 K10 and K11.

Table 5, which has the same format as Table 4, lists two examples of tight swarms of SOHO sungrazers of Population Pe. They exhibit similar properties as the tight swarms of Population I. I have also noticed a swarm of three SOHO sungrazers of Population Ia — C/2004 M2, M5, and M6 — over a period of 2.2 days. There is no doubt that swarms could be found in any Kreutz population of SOHO sungrazers, once a large enough set of these objects is available.

Table 6 presents the dispersions, computed from Equations (2), (4), and (5), for the SOHO sungrazers' swarms listed in Tables 4 and 5. The dispersions in time and in the nodal longitude are very different from those for the swarms in Table 3. Not only does now the dispersion in time drop three orders of magnitude and the dispersion in the nodal longitude balloons, but their *trends* have funda-

**Table 6**  
Dispersions  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ ,  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$ , and  $\text{disp}(q)$  for Swarms A–L of  
SOHO Kreutz Sungrazers (Equinox J2000)

Sungrazer Swarm	Population	$\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ (days)	$\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$	$\text{disp}(q)$ ( $R_\odot$ )	No. of objects
A	I	0.27	0°73	0.222	4
B	I	0.38	1.55	0.027	4
C	I	0.90	2.25	0.242	4
D	I	1.00	1.62	0.227	4
E	I	1.31	3.43	0.091	6
F	I	1.52	1.29	0.167	5
G	I	1.81	2.43	0.037	6
H	I	1.63	2.64	0.242	7
J	I	2.62	3.28	0.105	6
K	Pe	1.89	0.24	0.053	4
L	Pe	3.09	0.81	0.027	4

mentally changed. Whereas  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$  and  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$  for the swarms in Table 3 vary inversely with one another (separately in each width group and with one exception), their variations for the swarms in Table 6 are typically parallel, as shown in Figure 10. Contrary to this remarkable peculiarity, awaiting explanation in Part II, the dispersion  $\text{disp}(q)$  is seen to jump up and down about one order of magnitude, illustrating the lack of diagnostic value of an uncorrected nominal orbital element.


#### 4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although sungrazers have always attracted much attention of astronomers, information that actually would turn out to be relevant to in-depth investigations of the enormous SOHO sungrazer database has historically been accumulating very gradually. In the mid-1800s, Hubbard was the first to show that the Great March Comet of 1843 (C/1843 D1), which happens to be directly associated with the bulk of the stream of the SOHO dwarf comets, had an orbital period in a range of 500–800 yr. This result ruled out the then-popular hypothesis that this object was a return of the sungrazer C/1668 E1.

Nearly a half of a century later, the understanding of the SOHO sungrazer stream was aided by Kreutz's study of the multiple nucleus of the Great September Comet of 1882 (C/1882 R1)<sup>3</sup> and by his conclusion that the various spectacular 19th century sungrazers could not be returns of the same object. Although both results clearly implied *fragmentation* of a cometary nucleus, Kreutz never used the term.

In the second half of the 20th century, Marsden (1967, 1989) initiated another phase of research of what be-

<sup>3</sup> In retrospect, it is interesting to read the section *On the Cause of the Partition of a Cometary Nucleus* in Part II of his monumental treatise (Kreutz 1891). From the outset, he kept referring to the cause as a *disturbing force* but was vague about its nature. Only later in the section it became clear that his thinking was influenced by J. F. Encke's hypothesis of resisting medium. However, based on his computations he rejected this mechanism and concluded instead that the disturbing force "*was to be understood as a force that developed in the interior of the comet upon its approach to the Sun, which must have affected the individual cometary particles differently, thereby bringing about the partition of the nucleus.*" At the end of the section Kreutz admitted that "*based on current knowledge of the physical constitution of comets,*" the question of the nature of the disturbing force could not be answered.



**Figure 10.** Relationships between the dispersions of swarms of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers of Population I in the nodal longitude and in time. The circles are the swarms detected in the narrow intervals of the nodal longitude, the stars are the swarms in which the sungrazers arrive at perihelion almost simultaneously. The relation between the dispersion in the true nodal longitude,  $\text{disp}(\hat{\Omega})$ , and the dispersion in time (i.e., in the perihelion time),  $\text{disp}(\hat{t}_\pi)$ , for the two kinds of swarms is very different: while the dispersion in time decreases with increasing dispersion in the nodal longitude for the former swarms, both dispersions exhibit the same trend for the latter swarms. The trends are marked with the dotted lines. The single data point inconsistent with the rest is parenthesized

came known as the Kreutz group. Marsden’s contribution with a highly beneficial impact on studies of the SOHO sungrazing stream was his introduction of two and later three subgroups, for which he proposed a rationale. Marsden also emphasized the fixed line of apsides, shared by the members known at the time. In the first of his two studies he demonstrated convincingly that C/1882 R1 and C/1965 S1 (Ikeya-Seki) were one object on the way to their previous perihelion in the 12th century, thus pointing to the propensity to perihelion fragmentation of C/1882 R1, C/1965 S1, and their parent. In the second paper, Marsden skillfully incorporated the early Solwind and Solar Maximum Mission (SMM) coronagraphic sungrazers into the expanded Kreutz group and proposed some rather unusual orbital schemes to accommodate the evolutionary aspects of his model. Significantly, MacQueen & St. Cyr (1991) noted that none of the SMM sungrazers survived perihelion; the same applied to the Solwind objects as well.

With the launch of SOHO, the sungrazer research began to pick up speed and soon reached a frantic pace. For the understanding of the stream of SOHO sungrazers, an important contribution at this time was the recognition that fragmentation was not limited to perihelion but proceeded along the entire length of the orbit (Sekanina 2000, 2002).

The next major step forward was Sekanina & Kracht’s (2015) solution to the line-of-apsides paradox, which led to the discovery of enormous nongravitational accelerations that the small SOHO sungrazers were subjected to, and subsequently to a new interpretation of Mars-

den’s gravitational elements for these objects, including a straightforward determination of the true longitude of the ascending node from a plot of the nominal perihelion latitude against the nominal nodal longitude. As an unexpected bonus, this procedure, implemented for a set of select Kreutz sungrazers imaged exclusively in the C2 coronagraph (to curtail scatter in the data), proved instrumental in pursuing new avenues of research on the Kreutz system, including the discovery of its nine populations (Sekanina 2021, 2022), tripling the number of subgroups previously introduced by Marsden. Each population is described by a narrow range of true longitudes of the ascending node, consistent with the nodal longitudes of the few bright, naked-eye sungrazers.

The discrimination of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers into the populations allowed me to investigate the temporal distribution of objects in each population on the scale of years between 2000 and 2009 by constructing bias-avoiding histograms. Population I showed a moderate peak in 2006 on a slowly increasing background, while Population Ia displayed a sharp increase throughout the decade. In general, the histograms suggested that the arrival rates varied substantially with time, with intervening minima and maxima.

Strong variations in the rates of arriving SOHO sungrazers prompted me to search for what I call swarms. To measure a degree of scatter, averaged over a swarm, in the true nodal longitude and time (represented by the true perihelion time), I introduced the *dispersions*. Unfortunately, because as yet there is no way to convert a nominal perihelion distance into a true perihelion dis-

tance (by accounting, at least approximately, for the major effect of the nongravitational acceleration), no dispersion in this element could be introduced.

The investigation of the distribution of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers in the true longitude of the ascending node began with Population I. The histogram showed it to apparently consist of three swarms, centered on a longitude very close to that of the Great March Comet of 1843. Of particular interest were the results of a search for potential swarms in very narrow windows of the nodal longitude, between  $0^{\circ}.05$  and  $0^{\circ}.2$ ; they showed that in each of these groups of Population I sungrazers, the dispersion in time varied inversely as the dispersion in the nodal longitude, contrary to expectation. The two swarms of Population Pre-I displayed the same kind of anomaly.

The examination of the SOHO Kreutz sungrazers that were arriving in tight formation showed that the dispersion in time could be as short as  $\sim 0.25$  day for swarms consisting of four members. In general, the dispersion in the nodal longitude was increasing with increasing dispersion in time, so these swarms behaved differently from the ones described above, apparently an attribute of the formation process of the stream of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers.

The limiting magnitude of the SOHO's C2 coronagraph provides a measure for the current lower limit to the size of boulders detected in the stream of sungrazers. Because of both better viewing geometry and

a more powerful instrumentation, future Sun-exploring spacecraft will undoubtedly be able to detect much fainter Kreutz sungrazers, as the early experience with the Parker Solar Probe appears to suggest. A model of the stream of SOHO Kreutz sungrazers may do well to take this prediction into account.

#### REFERENCES

- Battams, K., & Knight, M. M. 2017, *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A*, 375, 20160257  
 Ho, P.-Y. 1962, *Vistas Astron.*, 5, 127  
 Hubbard, J. S. 1849, *AJ*, 1, 10  
 Hubbard, J. S. 1850, *AJ*, 1, 24, 25, 57, 153  
 Hubbard, J. S. 1851, *AJ*, 2, 46, 57  
 Hubbard, J. S. 1852, *AJ*, 2, 153  
 Kreutz, H. 1891, *Publ. Kiel Sternw.*, 6  
 Kreutz, H. 1901, *Astron. Abhandl.*, 1, 1  
 MacQueen, R. M., & St. Cyr, O. C. 1991, *Icarus*, 90, 96  
 Marsden, B. G. 1967, *AJ*, 72, 1170  
 Marsden, B. G. 1989, *AJ*, 98, 2306  
 Marsden, B. G., & Williams, G. V. 2008, *Catalogue of Cometary Orbits 2008* (17th ed.) Cambridge, MA: IAU Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams and Minor Planet Center, 195pp  
 Sekanina, Z. 2000, *ApJ*, 542, L147  
 Sekanina, Z. 2002, *ApJ*, 566, 577  
 Sekanina, Z. 2021, eprint arXiv:2109.01297  
 Sekanina, Z. 2022, eprint arXiv:2212.11919  
 Sekanina, Z., & Chodas, P. W. 2008, *ApJ*, 687, 1415  
 Sekanina, Z., & Chodas, P. W. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, 127  
 Sekanina, Z., & Kracht, R. 2015, *ApJ*, 801, 135  
 Sekanina, Z., & Kracht, R. 2022, eprint arXiv:2206.10827