

UREILITES: MIXES OF A VESTA-LIKE PARENT BODY AND AN IMPACTOR FROM PROTO-MARS.

S. J. Desch¹, J. G. O'Rourke¹, L. K. Schaefer², T. G. Sharp¹, and D. L. Schrader^{1,3}. ¹School of Earth and Space Exploration, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287 USA. ²School of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford CA 94035. ³Center for Meteorite Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287. Corresponding author: steve.desch@asu.edu

Ureilites: Ureilites are unusual and enigmatic meteorites. They are as carbon-rich (~3 wt% C [1]) as carbonaceous chondrites, but compositionally resemble ordinary chondrites [2]. Their ⁵⁰Ti and ⁵⁴Cr abundances place them in the inner solar system [3], near 2.7 AU [4]. They are achondrites but saw only partial (~15%) extraction of melt [2]. Most (95%) ureilites are monomict with olivines of uniform Mg# varying from 74 to 96, strongly peaked at 80. Several properties (e.g., $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$, Fe/Mn ratios), correlate with Mg# [5]. The range of Mg# has been attributed to “smelting”: $(\text{Mg,Fe})_2\text{SiO}_4 + \text{CaO (melt)} + \text{SiO}_2 \text{ (melt)} + \text{C} \rightarrow (\text{Mg,Ca})\text{SiO}_3 + \text{Fe} + \text{CO (gas)}$. The equilibrium Mg# depends on pressure and depth in the ureilite parent body (UPB) [6,7], but why ureilites would so preferentially sample Mg# of 80 is a mystery [8]. C content does not correlate with Mg# [9]. Pyroxene thermometers suggest the UPB last equilibrated at about 1050-1100°C [10], after peak temperatures $\approx 1200\text{-}1300^\circ\text{C}$ [2,11,12]. Thermal models including melt migration reproduce these temperatures if the UPB had radius $\approx 100\text{-}250$ km and formed at $t=0.6$ Myr (relative to CAIs) [13]. Soon after $t=5$ Myr [14], the UPB was catastrophically disrupted by impact at ~ 5 km/s (consistent with typical S4 shock stages; [15]), as inferred from reduction rims around olivines attributed to “smelting” initiated by release of pressure by an unroofing event, followed by a quench in temperatures. The UPB must have broken into chunks < 10 m in size [16] that reassembled into ureilite daughter bodies (UDBs) [2,17], from which ureilites derive. Impact shock would have produced the copious nanodiamonds in ureilites [18], but this does not explain the large (100 μm) single-crystal diamonds with $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ zoning observed in the polymict ureilite Almhata Sitta MS-170, which formed in metallic melt in a planetary mantle at pressures ≈ 4 GPa [19,20].

Model for Ureilite Origins: We hypothesize the following. The UPB formed at 2.7 AU at $t=0.6$ Myr. Disk models predict it was 1.3wt% CAIs [21]. Its initial composition was like 0.63 H+0.33 CV+0.04 CI chondrites, similar to the 0.75 H+0.25 CV mix inferred for Vesta [22]. This composition yields Mg# 80 olivines and $\sim 1\text{wt}\%$ C. Some silicates at low pressures underwent equilibrium smelting, forming high-Mg# olivines. The smelted fraction constrains the peak pressure; we infer the UPB radius was 173 km. We interpret the $\approx 25\%$ of olivines with Mg# < 80 to be from the impactor, mixed in during the impact. Its composition corresponds to end-member “A” of [5]. The impactor had 30% the mass of the UPB, consistent with [8], and had radius ≈ 115 km. It delivered metal and abundant C, including large diamonds. During reassembly into UDBs, temperatures were $\approx 1100^\circ\text{C}$, so that silicates did not melt, but metallic melts from both bodies mixed, explaining HSE abundance trends [23]. Carbon was redistributed by the melt.

Largest Daughter Body: We further hypothesize that 15 Eunomia at 2.64 AU is the largest UDB. Based on the radii above and the 5 km/s impact speed, using [24] we estimate a radius of the largest UDB ≈ 139 km; Eunomia's radius is 132 km. Although the polymict ureilite Almahata Sitta derived from the F-type asteroid 2008 TC₃ [25], most ureilites are spectrally associated with S-type asteroids [26]; Eunomia is the largest S-type asteroid. 15 Eunomia has an extensive and ancient collisional family with a dynamical pathway to deliver fragments to 2.55 AU [27]. We suggest the F-type asteroid 438 Zeuxo at 2.55 AU is from the Eunomian family, and 2008 TC₃ derived from it and underwent drifted to the 3:1 resonance at 2.5 AU to reach Earth, consistent with its inferred dynamics [25].

Impactor Origin: Finally, we suggest the impactor derived from the proto-Martian surface at $t\sim 5$ Myr, after magma ocean crystallization but before mantle overturn [28]. It would be Fe-rich bulk Mars, plus late-accreted carbonaceous chondrite material, with Mg# $\approx 74\text{-}80$. We find in oxygen isotopes, Mg#, and Fe/Mn it would match end-member “A” of [5]. The compositional similarity between the UPB (Mg# = 80) and the impactor is somewhat coincidental, but they did derive from similar starting materials. Ejection by the Borealis basin impactor would have generated > 100 fragments larger than 100 km in radius that would have impacted objects out to 2.9 AU at 5 km/s [29]. The impactor could have delivered diamonds, formed in Mars's mantle at $P > 4$ GPa, to the UPB and UDBs.

References: [1] Hudon, P et al. (2004) *LPSC* 35, 2075. [2] Goodrich, C et al. (2015) *MAPS* 50, 782. [3] Warren, P (2011) *GCA* 75, 6912. [4] Yamakawa, A et al. (2010) *ApJ* 720, 150. [5] Barrat, J et al. (2017) *EPSL* 478, 143. [6] Walker, D & Grove, T (1993) *Metics*. 28, 629. [7] Singletary, S & Grove, T (2003) *MAPS* 38, 95. [8] Michel, P et al. (2015) *P&SS* 107, 24. [9] Goodrich et al. 1992. [10] reference. [11] Goodrich, C (2004) *ChEG* 64, 283. [12] Goodrich et al. 2007. [13] Wilson, L et al. (2008) *GCA* 72, 6154. [14] Goodrich, C et al. (2010) *EPSL* 295, 531. [15] Stoeffler et al. (1991) *GCA* 55, 3845. [16] Herrin, J et al. (2010) *MAPS* 45, 1789. [17] Downes, H et al. (2008) *GCA* 72, 4825. [18] Lipschutz, M (1964) *Science* 143, 1431. [19] Miyahara, M et al. (2015) *GCA* 163, 14. [20] Nabiei, F et al. (2018) *Nat Comm* 9, 1327. [21] Desch, S et al. (2018) *ApJS* 238, 11. [22] Righter, K & Drake, M (1997) *MAPS* 32, 929. [23] Goodrich, C & Desch, S (2019) this conference. [24] Leinhardt, Z & Stewart, S (2012) *ApJ* 745, 79 [25] Jenniskens, P et al. (2010) *MAPS* 45, 1590. [26] Gaffey, M et al. (1993) *Icarus* 106, 573. [27] Carruba, V et al. (2007) *A&A* 473, 967. [28] Elkins-Tanton, L et al. (2003) *MAPS* 38, 1753. [29] Hyodo, R & Genda, H (2018) *ApJ* 856, L36.