<sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg systematics of chondrules: Progresses and issues from the last 5 years. K. Nagashima<sup>1</sup>, N. T. Kita<sup>2</sup>, and T.-H. Luu<sup>3</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA (kazu@higp.hawaii.edu), <sup>2</sup>Department of Geoscience, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA, <sup>3</sup>School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, BS8 1RJ, UK.

**Introduction:** The short-lived radionuclide decay system <sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg (half-life ~0.7 Myr) has been considered to be a high precision chronometer to date processes in the protoplanetary disk. Since the first report of excesses of <sup>26</sup>Mg due to *in situ* decay of <sup>26</sup>Al in a chondrule [1], <sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg chronometer have been applied to chondrules from several chondrite groups. If their initial <sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al ratios ((<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub>) represent the timing of their formation, <sup>26</sup>Al ages of chondrules provide important cosmochemical constraints such as lifetime of the protoplanetary disk, chondrule-forming processes, and chondrite accretion processes. The <sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg systematics of chondrules and implications to the evolution of protoplanetary disk have been summarized based on the data obtained before 2012 [2]. This abstract serves as a summary for the recent progresses and issues on <sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg systematics of chondrules from the last 5 years.

<sup>26</sup>Al abundances in chondrules inferred from internal isochrons: The (26Al/27Al)<sub>0</sub> in chondrules from three ordinary and carbonaceous chondrite groups (LL3.0, CO3.0, and Acfer 094 ungrouped C3) are  $\sim 6.7 \times 10^{-6}$  [2]. Since then, reliable (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> have been obtained for chondrules from CR2-3 [3-5], CH3 [6], and CV3.1 [7]. The (26Al/27Al)<sub>0</sub> from CR2-3 and CH3 chondrules are distinctly different from those in LL3.0 and CO3.0. While a few chondrules have  $(^{26}Al/^{27}Al)_0$  of  $\sim 6\times 10^{-6}$ , most of them are systematically lower than  $3\times10^{-6}$ . The (26Al/27Al)<sub>0</sub> of chondrules in Kaba (CV3.1) have  $(4.8\pm1.1)\times10^{-6}$ , similar to/slightly lower than those of LL3.0 and CO3.0. The  $(^{26}Al/^{27}Al)_0$  of the chondrules from the chondrite groups decrease in the order of LL ~ CO ~ Acfer  $094 \ge CV \ge CR \sim CH$ . In addition, each chondrite group may have multiple populations of chondrules [4].

<sup>26</sup>Al abundances for chondrule precursors inferred from bulk chondrules: The model ( $^{26}\text{Al}^{27}\text{Al}$ ) ratios of chondrule "precursors" have been estimated from bulk chondrules  $^{26}\text{Al}^{-26}\text{Mg}$  isotope analyses that range from  $\sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $\sim 1 \times 10^{-5}$  [8,9]. Luu et al. [9] suggested the minimum value ( $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ ) corresponds to the time that formation of the precursors stopped or were separated from a nebular reservoir. The difference of ( $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al}$ )<sub>0</sub> between the bulk and *in situ* data may correspond to a time difference between the precursor formation and the last melting of chondrules.

Homogeneous/heterogeneous distribution of <sup>26</sup>Al in the disk: To convert (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> values to relative <sup>26</sup>Al ages, we have to assume that <sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al was homogeneously distributed throughout the disk. This assumption has been challenged and is highly controversial. Recent studies on multiple chronometers (<sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg, <sup>182</sup>Hf-<sup>182</sup>W, <sup>206</sup>Pb-<sup>207</sup>Pb) of CAIs, chondrules and achondrites suggest consistent relative ages that support the homogeneous distribution of <sup>26</sup>Al throughout the disk and its chronolog-

ical significance. For example, the Allende CV3 chondrule ages determined from <sup>182</sup>Hf-<sup>182</sup>W systematics (2.2±0.8 Myr after CV CAIs [10]) and U-corrected Pb-Pb age (1.8±0.9 Myr after CV CAIs [11]) are in good agreement with 2.5 (-0.4/+0.7) Myr obtained from the (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> of Kaba CV3 chondrules [7]. In contrast these are largely inconsistent with the old Pb-Pb ages of Allende chondrules [12], that might be due to the Pb-Pb ages compromised by the common Pb [13].

On the other hand, the Al-Mg and U-corrected Pb-Pb ages of volcanic angrites determined by Schiller et al. (2015) indicate <sup>26</sup>Al-<sup>26</sup>Mg and <sup>207</sup>Pb-<sup>206</sup>Pb ages compared to CV CAIs are inconsistent by ~1.5 Myr. The U-corrected Pb-Pb ages of individual chondrules range from 0 to ~3-4 Myr after CAIs, and their (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> are much lower than those expected from their Pb-Pb ages, supporting the reduced abundance of <sup>26</sup>Al in the disk regions where chondrules originated [12,14].

Because of this controversy, it is not clear what the differences in (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> among and within chondrite groups represent: spatial heterogeneity of <sup>26</sup>Al abundances in chondrule-forming region(s) and/or reflect multiple generations of chondrules formed at different times.

**Implication for thermal history of parent asteroids:** Despite the possibility of heterogeneous distribution of <sup>26</sup>Al in the disk, the (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> recorded in chondrules potentially provide an upper limit on <sup>26</sup>Al abundances available as a heat source of their parent asteroids due to decay of <sup>26</sup>Al. The inferred (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> of chondrules are similar to/slightly higher than those indicared from thermal modeling of their parent asteroids [15], suggesting rapid accretion of chondrules into their parent bodies after their formation. The (<sup>26</sup>Al/<sup>27</sup>Al)<sub>0</sub> in the Kaba chondrules is too low to melt a CV parent asteroid [7] and contradicts the existence of a molten core (e.g., [16]).

We will present more details at the workshop and in a chapter of the forthcoming book.

References: [1] Hutch eon and Hutchison (1989) *Nature* 337, 238–241. [2] Kita and Ushikubo (2012) *MAPS*. 47, 1108-1119. [3] Nagashima et al. (2014) *Geochem. J.* 48, 561-570. [4] Schrader et al. (2016) GCA, in press. [5] Tenner et al. (2013) *LPSC*, 47, #2010. [6] Krot et al. (2014) *LPSC*, 45, #2142. [7] Nagashima et al. (2016) GCA, in press. [8] Bizzarro et al. (2004) *Nature*, 431, 275-278. [9] Luu et al. (2015) *PNAS*, 112, 1298-1303. [10] Budde G. (2016) *PNAS*, 113, 2886-2891. [11] Huyskens et al. (2016) *LPSC*, 47, #2727. [12] Connelly et al. (2012) *Science*, 338, 651-655. [13] Kita (2015) *MAPS*, suppl. #5360. [14] Bollard (2015) *MAPS*, suppl. #5211. [15] Sugiura and Fujiya (2014) *MAPS*, 49, 772-787. [16] Elkins-Tanton et al. (2011) *EPSL*, 305, 1-10.