Processes and Mechanisms Governing Initiation and Propagation of CMEs

B. Vršnak

<u>Hvar Observatory</u>

Faculty of Geodesy, Kačićeva 26, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia



This work has been fully supported by *Croatian Scientific Fundation* under the project 6212 *"Solar and Stellar Variability"* (SOLSTEL).



Observations: (facts, requirements, constraints, guidelines) Theory: (general principles, concepts -> modeling) Theory/Observations



Observations: a) kinematics



EP

Observations: b) acceleration scaling



 a_{max} (m/s²)

Vršnak et al., 2006 SPh, 241, 85

Observations: c) propagation phase



$$v_0 (a_L > 0) > v_0 (a_L = 0)$$

 $a_L = k \Delta v_0$

Vršnak et al. 2004, A&A 423, 717





Observations: CME/flare relationship



Maričić et al. 2007, SPh 241, 99



Vrsnak et al. 2005, A&A 435, 1149



Vrsnak et al. 2004, SPh 225, 355

General concept Forces & Energies



 $\Delta E_{\rm mag} = \Delta E_{\rm kin} + \Delta E_{\rm pot} + W_{\rm drag}$

Scalings
non-pot. B !
(free energy)
max. velocity:
$$\rho v^2/2 \le B^2/2\mu \implies v \le v_A$$

acceleration: $\rho a \le B^2/2\mu r \implies a \le v_A^2/2r$
acc. time: $\tau = v/a = 2r/v_A \implies \tau = \tau_A = d/v_A$
acc. length: $\lambda = v^2/2a = r \implies \lambda = r$
AR
 $d = 10^5$ km, $v_A = 1000$ km/s
 $a = 10$ kms²; $\tau = 100$ s; $\lambda = 10^5$ km
QP
 $d = 10^6$ km, $v_A = 400-1000$ km/s
 $a = 100-1000$ ms⁻²; $\tau = 15-40$ min; $\lambda = 10^6$ km

3-D flux-rope models



"line-tying"



HXR, Ha



Mouschovias & Poland, 1978, ApJ 220, 675 Anzer & Pneuman, 1982, SPh 79, 1 Chen, J. 1989, ApJ 338, 453 Vrsnak, B. 1990, SPh 129, 295 Chen, J., Krall, J.: 2003, JGR 108, 1410

The driving force







Vršnak, 1990 SPh, 129, 295

 $X = \operatorname{tg} \, \theta = B_{\phi} / B_{//}$ $\Phi = l \, X/r, \ n = \Phi/2\pi$ $n = l / \lambda, \ n = const.$

 $a = a_{\rm L} - g - a_{\rm d}$ $a_{\rm L} = A (l/h + l/R - 2l/RX^2) \pm kI/lr$

$$A = \frac{\mu I^2}{4\pi M} = \frac{B_{\phi}^2}{\mu \rho l} = \frac{X^2 B_{\parallel}^2}{\mu \rho l} \approx \frac{v_A^2}{l} = \frac{l}{\tau_A^2} = l\omega^2$$

in the absence of reconnection:

 $\Phi_{\rm e} = {\rm const.} \propto I \, l \, [\ln(8R/r) - 2]$ $\Phi_{\rm i} = {\rm const.} \propto I \, l$

$$\Rightarrow I \propto l^{-1}, r \propto R, X \propto r/l$$

Loss of equilibrium







Loss of equilibrium: observations



Vršnak, Ruždjak & Rompolt 1991, SPh 136, 151

Eruption WITHOUT reconnection



Eruption WITH reconnection



Temmer et al. 2007

Sun - 1AU relationship

Qiu et al. 2007, ApJ 659, 758 : Φ_{recon} versus $\Phi_{1\text{AU}}$





Thank You For Your Attention!

2-D models: no eruption without reconnection!

Tether-cutting models (reconnection below ejection): Reduces magnetic tension of the overlying field and increases magnetic pressure below CME; enlarges the flux rope $(d\Phi_p/dt > 0)$



Break-out models (reconnection above ejection): Reduces magnetic tension and pressure of the overlying field; reduces the flux rope $(d\Phi_p/dt < 0)$



CME/flare process





Current sheet signatures: a) CME/flare of 15 May 2001



Vrsnak et al. 2004, SPh 225, 355







Current sheet signatures: b) "Rays"



SoHO-LASCO-C2/C3, MLSO-MK-IV & EIT obs.: (e.g., Lin et al. 2005, ApJ 622, 1251 and references therein) reconnection inflow (UVCS Ly α): $v_{in} = 10-100$ km/s

SoHO-UVCS obs. (e.g., Bempoard et al. 2006, ApJ 638, 1110; and references therein): $T_{CS}/T_c = 5 \rightarrow 3 \& n_{eCS}/n_{ec} = 7 \rightarrow 5$ in 0.3 \rightarrow 2.3 day interval (increasing β with height?)

Why reconnection is needed?





