REVISED THICKNESS OF THE LUNAR CRUST FROM GRAIL DATA: IMPLICATIONS FOR LUNAR BULK COMPOSITION. G. Jeffrey Taylor¹, Mark A. Wieczorek², Gregory A. Neuman³, Francis Nimmo⁴, Walter S. Kiefer⁵, H. Jay Melosh⁶, Roger J. Phillips⁷, Sean C. Solomon⁸, Jeffrey C. Andrews-Hanna⁹, Sami W. Asmar¹⁰, Alexander S. Konopliv¹⁰, Frank G. Lemoine³, David E. Smith¹¹, Michael M. Watkins¹⁰, James G. Williams², Maria T. Zuber¹¹. ¹Hawaii Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA (<u>gitaylor@higp.hawaii.edu</u>); ²Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, 94100 Saint Maur des Fossés, France; ; ³NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA; ⁴Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA; ⁵Lunar and Planetary Institute, Houston, TX 77058, USA; ⁶Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA; ⁷Planetary Science Directorate, Southwest Research Institute, Boulder, CO 80302, USA; ⁸ Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY 10964, USA; ⁹Department of Geophysics and Center for Space Resources, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401, USA; ¹⁰Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109-8099, USA; ¹¹Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.

Introduction: High-resolution gravity data from GRAIL have yielded new estimates of the bulk density and thickness of the lunar crust. The bulk density of the highlands crust is 2550 kg m⁻³ [1]. From a comparison with crustal composition measured remotely, this density implies a mean porosity of ~12%. With this bulk density and constraints from the Apollo seismic experiment, the average global crustal thickness is found to lie between 34 and 43 km [1], a value 10 to 20 km less than several previous estimates.

Crustal thickness is a central parameter in estimating bulk lunar composition. Estimates of the concentrations of refractory elements in the Moon from heat flow [e.g., 2], remote sensing and sample data [e.g., 3-5], and geophysical data [e.g., 6-7] fall into two categories: those with refractory element abundances enriched by 50% or more relative to Earth, and those with abundances the same as Earth. Settling this issue has implications for processes operating during lunar formation. The crustal thickness resulting from analysis of GRAIL data is less than several previous estimates. We show here that a refractory-enriched Moon is not required.

Al₂O₃ in the crust: From the average crustal thickness (34–43 km) and estimates of Al₂O₃ in the crust, we tested the limits of Al₂O₃ enrichment in the Moon. We first considered a one-layer model in which the crust consists entirely of ferroan anorthosite (FAN) with a porosity of 12% and containing 34 wt% Al₂O₃. This scenario is clearly unrealistic but provides an upper limit on the amount of Al₂O₃ in the crust. The contribution of the crust to the bulk lunar Al₂O₃ content (Fig. 1) ranges from 1.75 (34-km-thick crust) to 2.2 wt% (43-km-thick crust). We also examined a two-layer model. The upper layer corresponds to the megaregolith, for which we assume a thickness of 5 km and an Al₂O₃ content of 28 wt% (from lunar high-

land meteorites). We assumed that the lower crust is pure anorthosite [8] and contains 34 wt% Al₂O₃. The contribution to bulk lunar Al₂O₃ is not markedly different from the pure anorthosite case, ranging from 1.6 wt% (34-km-thick crust) to 2 wt% (43-km-thick crust). Note that in both models, a thick crust (>50 km), as previously thought, contributes substantially more to the bulk lunar Al₂O₃ abundance.



Fig. 1. Crustal contribution to bulk lunar Al2O3 as a function of crustal thickness [1].

The third case takes into account the supposition that there must be mafic (noritic) rock in the crust, as demonstrated by the occurrence of Low-K Fra Mauro (LKFM) "basalt," an impact melt common in the Procellarum KREEP Terrane and might be representative of the major-element composition of the interior of the South Pole-Aitken basin [3]. We adopted a three-layer model consisting of 5 km of megaregolith, 20 km of FAN, and the remainder consisting of rock with the composition of LKFM (18 wt% Al₂O₃). The thickness of LKFM varies from 9 km to 18 km for our estimated crustal thickness, almost certainly too high, but another useful limit. The presence of abundant mafic material such as LKFM results in a much lower contribution of the crust to bulk lunar Al₂O₃ (Fig. 1). Al₂O₃ in Lunar Mantle: From the crustal abundance and the assumption that the bulk Moon has the same abundance as the Earth, we can determine the mantle Al₂O₃ as a function of the thickness of the crust (Fig. 2). For our estimated crustal thickness, the mantle would contain between 2.2 and 2.5 wt% Al₂O₃ if the Moon has the same abundances of refractory elements as does the Earth. For a 50% enrichment compared with Earth, the lunar mantle would have 4.3–4.7 wt% Al₂O₃ (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2. Al_2O_3 in mantle as a function of crustal thickness, compared with estimates of Al_2O_3 in mare basalt source regions.

We can test these estimates against other data. Modeling of seismic data yields Al₂O₃ estimates that range from 2.2–3.1 wt% for the bulk mantle [9] to 2.0 wt% for the upper mantle and 6.7 wt% for the lower mantle [6]. The mantle source regions of mare basalt primary magmas (e.g., see list in [10]) provide complementary information. Multiple saturation experiments on these compositions show that pyroxenes in equilibrium with the magmas contain 1.4 to 6 wt% Al₂O₃, with most values in the range 2–3 wt%. If olivine (which is Al-free) constitutes less than half of the residue, then the source regions are left with 1-1.5 wt% Al₂O₃ after mare basalt magmas were removed. The magmas contained $\sim 8 \text{ wt\% Al}_2O_3$, indicating that the initial Al₂O₃ concentration was about 1.8–2.3 wt%, for 10% partial melting. A more elegant way to calculate the source region Al₂O₃ is to use the experimentally determined partitioning coefficient for orthopyroxene (the most abundant pyroxene), taking pressure into account [11]. Equilibrium partial melting of primary mare basalt magmas containing 8-13 wt% Al₂O₃ (including aluminous mare basalts) and 20-50% olivine gives an initial mantle source Al₂O₃ content of 0.8 to 3.5 wt%, as indicated in Fig. 2. Thus, essentially all mantle Al₂O₃ contents are in the expected range for an Earth-like abundance for crustal compositions in the range we estimate from GRAIL data.

Th in the mantle: If lunar refractory element abundances are the same as in Earth, we can estimate Th in the mantle from its abundance in the crust. We

used the approach taken earlier [5] to assess the crustal abundance of Th. Besides the thickness of the crust, the most important parameter is the proportion of the crust that is composed of LKFM and the Th content of LKFM. With judicious assumptions for these parameters, we estimate that bulk crustal Th ranges from 0.61 to 0.91 μ g/g (Fig. 3). The average Th in the mantle required for the Moon to have the terrestrial Th abundance (0.0795 µg/g [12]) ranges from 0.03 to 0.05 μ g/g. These values are somewhat higher than an earlier estimate [4]. We use Th concentrations in mare basalts to estimate Th contents of their source regions (Fig. 3) under 5 or 10% partial melting. The inferred range is very large, indicating that Th is heterogeneously distributed in the mantle. However, it is important to keep in mind that mare basalt source regions may not be representative of the entire mantle [4].

Implications: The crustal thickness derived from GRAIL data leads to the conclusion that the bulk Moon has abundances of refractory elements similar to Earth. Processes operating during lunar formation did not fractionate these elements. Geochemical uncertainties arise from the heterogeneous distribution of Al, and particularly Th in the crust and mantle, and a lack of knowledge of the composition of the lower mantle.



Fig. 3. Mantle Th content for a terrestrial abundance of refractory elements.

References: [1] Wieczorek M. A. et al. (2013) *Science*, 10.1126/science.1231530. [2] Langseth M. G. et al. (1976) *PLSC* 7th, 3143-3171. [3] Jolliff B. L. et al. (2000) *JGR05*, 4197-4216. [4] Warren P. G. (2005) *MAPS*, 40, 477-506. [5] Taylor S. R. et al. (2006) *GCA* 70, 5904-5918. [6] Kuskov, O. and Kronrod, V. (1998) *PEPI* 107, 285-306. [7] Lognonné P. et al. (2003) *EPSL*. 211, 27-44. [8] Yamamoto S. (2010) *Nature Geosci.* 3, 533. [9] Khan A. et al. (2000) *GRL*. 27, 1591-1598. [10] Longhi J. (1992) *GCA* 56, 2235-2251. [11] Shearer C. K. et al. (2006) in *New Views of the Moon*, ch. 4, p. 442. [12] McDonough W. F. and Sun S.-s. (1995) *Chem. Geol.* 120, 223-254.