# Fe **OXIDATION AND** WEATHERING STUDIES OF **ANTARCTIC AND SNC** METEORITES

**by**

Teresa Christine Solberg

B.S., California Institute of Technology **(1985)**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the

## Degree of

## MASTER OF **SCIENCE**

at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

May, **1987**

(® Massachusetts Institute of Technology **1987 j I**

Signature of Author Departmen $\ell$  of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences Certified **by** Thesis Supervisor  $\mathcal{I}$ Accepted **by Chairman, Department Committee**<br>
OF TECHNOLOGY<br>
OF TECHNOLOGY **JUN 0 <sup>1987</sup>** LIBRARIES

#### **ABSTRACT**

In recent years, there has been much debate over the origin of **SNC** meteorites, and many attempts have been made to prove or disprove the existence of preterrestrial weathering products. In order to address this problem, a Mossbauer study of the Nakhla meteorite and shergottites **EETA79001** and **ALHA77005** (from the Antarctic meteorite collection) was carried out to look for possible preterrestrial ferric phases occuring in these meteorites.

In order to understand these results, one must understand the processes that take place in the unique weathering environment of Antarctica. To this end, the first large scale study of Fe weathering products in Antarctica is presented here, encompassing H, L, and LL chondrites, eucrites, and diogenites, as well as the nakhlite and shergottites previously mentioned. Samples were obtained in all weathering categories, and control samples were obtained from falls of each type. **All** samples were studied **by** room temperature Mossbauer spectroscopy; the most weathered samples were studied **by** XRD and Mossbauer spectroscopy at **77K** as well.

Results of this study show that weathering in Antarctica is much more extensive than previously believed. As much as **30%** ferric Fe is found in some samples, and those samples classified as "unweathered" **by** thin section examination typically contain **2-5%** ferric Fe. This weathering occurs all through the meteorite, as samples for Mossbauer analysis were taken as far away from the surface as possible. The Antarctic weathering classification scheme is shown to be inaccurate and should be used only as a rough guide to

 $\overline{2}$ 

weathering, because variations exist within the categories due to differences in mineralogy and Antarctic place of origin. It is shown, based on low temperature Mossbauer studies, that the ferric phase consists largely of microcrystalline FeOOH **(<200A).** It was also found that the control samples, classified as falls, had undergone Fe oxidation during museum storage, pointing out the need for better environmental controls and handling procedures than have previously been used.

None of the **SNC** meteorites was found to have >2% ferric Fe in any of their lithologies. This is particularly important with respect to the glass lithology **C** of **79001,** as previously published microprobe studies assumed this glass to be ferric-rich, and will need to be revised. It is concluded that the **SNC** meteorites studied here are not surface rocks, but may have originated from deeper in the crust of Mars. It is clear, however, that the natural weathering processes these **SNC** meteorites have been subjected to in Antarctica are large enough to obscure any preterrestrial oxidation that may have taken place.

## TABLE OF **CONTENTS**



Chapter **1.** Introduction

Antarctic meteorite collecting has had an unusually exciting history--so much has happened in so little time. The first Antarctic meteorites were found in the early days of exploration, 1912-1964, but their significance was not realized until Japanese teams of researchers discovered over a thousand more specimens in only a few years--half as many as have been found in the whole history of the rest of the earth! Because of these discoveries, yearly expeditions to Antarctica began in **1976** for the sole purpose of collecting meteorites. Since then, **U.S.,** Japanese, and German teams have found over **7000** fragments, probably comprising 1200 to **3500** separate events<sup>1</sup>. It is interesting to note that these meteorites have been found to have differences in trace element abundance from non-Antarctic meteorites, possibly indicating that the polar regions receive samples from different cosmic sources<sup>2</sup>. The reason meteorites collect in such numbers in Antarctica is still something of a mystery. It is thought that the meteorites are subducted deep within the ice sheets and carried along, only to be brought up to the surface when the ice runs into a barrier, such as a mountain range (see Figure **1).** This explains why vast numbers of meteorites are found in certain areas of Antarctica. In addition, they are very easy to see against the blue ice.

These specimens have made possible a whole new wave of meteorite studies. Among the meteorites found are many which are unique or constitute groups previously unknown; for instance, the first lunar meteorites were found in **1979** and **1981** and represent a section of the moon not previously sampled. The most interesting,

Figure **1:** Process of Antarctic meteorite accumulation

Meteorites fall onto the Antarctic ice sheet and are subducted along with it much as rocks are carried along **by** glaciers. When the ice sheet runs up against a barrier, such as a mountain range, the meteorites are forced to the surface, where they are easily seen against the blue ice.

Diagram from the Lunar and Planetary Institute, Houston



however, are the shergottites **EETA79001** and **ALHA77005,** recent additions to the class of meteorites known as SNC's, and thought to have their origin on Mars. **EETA79001** is particularly unusual, as it is the only meteorite known which includes a contact between two distinct igneous lithologies.

SNC's (Shergottite-Nakhlite-Chassignite) have been known for a long time to be unusual. They have a formation age of **1.3by,** in contrast to all other meteorites, which formed between 4.4 and 4.6by ago<sup>3</sup>. This indicates that they are not of primordial nature. In addition, they are related **by** having an unusually high volatile content, a fact which fits well with possible Martian origin. They also contain higher-Ca pyroxenes, higher-alkali feldspar, and a higher oxidation state than other achondrites<sup>4</sup>. These meteorites contain igneous textures and rare earth element fractionation patterns which require a large parent body, roughly the size of Mars. The oxidation state of these meteorites has been shown to vary between the WM and **QFM** buffers, indicating an origin similar to the upper mantlelower crust of earth<sup>5,6</sup>. The chemical composition of the SNC's is very similar to that deduced for the mantle of Mars, and Mars is believed to have experienced vulcanism at about the right time.

This evidence, though convincing, was not considered conclusive. However, one of the Antarctic specimens, **EETA79001,** contains a glass-rich fraction labeled lithology **C** in which trapped gases reside--gases which appear very similar to Martian atmosphere in their elemental and isotopic composition. Studies on noble gases, nitrogen and CO<sub>2</sub> abundances all come close to Martian values<sup>7,8,9,10</sup>. In addition, a major difficulty was removed when it was demonstrated that an abundance of volatiles greatly decreases the strength of an impact needed to eject material from a planet such as  $Mars<sup>11</sup>$ .

**All** of this evidence has greatly increased the credibility of Martian origin for the **SNC** meteorites, and has prompted several researchers to search for preterrestrial compounds in these meteorites which may give clues to the types of weathering processes occurring on Mars. Ostertag *et a112* noted that the brown color of olivine in **ALHA77005** was due to *-5%* Fe+3 in the olivine. However, the origin of this ferric Fe is not clear. They argued that because the color is spread evenly throughout the sample, it is of preterrestrial origin<sup>12</sup>. In addition, the original petrologic description of this sample states that there is "no sign of weathering"(see **p. 23).** However, other researchers found evidence for alteration of olivine and chromite grains throughout the sample and concluded that this was a result of Antarctic weathering  $13$ .

Later, James Gooding began his search for preterrestrial minerals in EETA79001, particularly in lith C<sup>7,14</sup>. Using SEM/EDS and pyrolysis techniques, he found oxidized sulfur and chlorine-rich aluminosilicates in lith **C** which he believes to be of Martian origin. He cited lack of gypsum and other Antarctic weathering products shown to occur on the surface of this sample as evidence for the unweathered state of lith **C7 .** However, in a later abstract, he reported the occurence of gypsum in lith  $C^{14}$ . Although textural and petrologic arguments argue strongly for the origin of these minerals being Martian, Gooding's results illustrate some of the confusion on this subject.

During the last five years, weathering studies have begun on Antarctic meteorites, although none included more than six samples or measurements on the interiors of the samples--the part most likely to be used in a research project. One study used six Antarctic **H6** and **L6** chondrites which were classified as having moderate to extreme weathering and compared them to the Holbrook L6 meteorite which weathered in an Arizona desert<sup>15</sup>. Samples studied were taken from the outer 20mm of the specimens. Minerals identified were mainly hydrated **Mg** carbonates and sulfates, ferric sulfates, and occasional goethite. However, because XRD was used, presence of other possible Fe oxides such as hematite or magnetite could not be determined due to overlap of their peaks **by** olivine, hypersthene, and troilite. No relationship was found between terrestrial age and degree of weathering, suggesting that the meteorites do not weather uniformly upon reaching the surface of the earth. **A** later study added a group of "clay-mineraloids" resembling smectite, gypsum, and possibly zeolites to the list of observed weathering products<sup>16</sup>. Many of these products argue for liquid water somehow entering into the weathering process, in spite of the extremely cold, dry environment of Antarctica.

In these studies, the question of Fe oxidation and weathering was not treated extensively, partly due to the difficulty of distinguishing diagnostic XRD lines from those of the major constituents of the rocks. In addition, microprobe data are not very useful in identifying these products or their oxidation states. There is a lack of quantitative data which could be used as a guide to other researchers, or a way of updating the **ABC** system currently being

 $10$ 

used **by** meteoriticists to identify degree of weathering. It should be determined how much weathering is present in the interior of the sample--the "best case" that researchers have to work with. Finally, a more extensive study needs to be done in order to give a more representative picture of Antarctic meteorites.

Mossbauer spectroscopy is an ideal tool for addressing these problems. Because it can distinguish easily between  $Fe<sup>0</sup>$ ,  $Fe<sup>+2</sup>$ , and  $Fe+3$ , it can provide a quantitative measure of the amount of oxidation in any given sample. In addition, Fe-oxides and sulfates are more readily identifiable in small amounts than with any other method utilizing bulk samples. Furthermore, it is a non-destructive and cost-efficient method of analysis.

The first paper on Mossbauer spectroscopy relating to meteorites appeared in **196417.** It pointed out that it is very difficult to obtain an analysis of iron partitioning between coexisting minerals using chemical methods--necessary assumptions and guesswork make the process inaccurate. On the other hand, the principal meteoritic iron phases (kamacite, taenite, troilite, olivine, and pyroxene) are easily identifiable using Mossbauer spectroscopy. Because the areas under the constituent peaks are directly related to the mole percentages of Fe-bearing minerals, this technique gives mineral proportions directly and thus provides a useful tool for meteorite classification 18.

The first mention of Mossbauer spectroscopy applied to terrestrial weathering products was in **196818,** when a German team noted the weathering of metallic Fe and troilite to sheet silicates, such as iddingsite or nontronite, and subsequently to goethite and

 $11$ 

magnetite. This weathering sequence was determined **by** looking for differences in mineralogy between groups of "finds" and groups of "falls". Later studies were used to further pin down the composition of the pyroxenes, identify minor Fe-compounds in NiFe meteorites, and identify other possible weathering products, such as maghemite, pyrrhotite, and other FeOOH polymorphs<sup>19,20</sup>. Unfortunately, there have been no Mossbauer studies done on weathering products of Antarctic meteorites until now.

This thesis encompasses a research project undertaken to address the problems of Antarctic meteorite weathering, with a view toward obtaining quantitative guidelines for amount and type of Fe oxidation products present, and applying these guidelines to the more specific problem of weathering in **SNC** meteorites- preterrestrial or Antarctic. Antarctic meteorite samples were obtained from both the most and least weathered categories available in all of the following classes: **H5&6, L3, L6, LL6,** eucrites, diogenites, and shergottites. In addition, non-Antarctic samples were obtained as falls in each of the above categories to act as control samples in addition to the "unweathered" Antarctic samples. Magnetic and non-magnetic spectra were taken and fitted for each sample, and ferric/ferrous ratios were obtained. Liquid nitrogen Mossbauer and XRD analyses were made in an attempt to further clarify the mineralogy of the ferric phases.

References:

**1.** Lipschutz **(1985)** Unique meteorites attract researchers Geotimes **30 no.11 p8-10**

2. Dennison, Lingner, and Lipschutz **(1986)** Antarctic and non-Antarctic meteorites form different populations Nature **319 p390- 393**

**3.** Wood and Ashwal **(1981) SNC** meteorites: Igneous rocks from Mars? Proc. Lunar and Plan. Sci. 12B **p1359-1375**

4. McSween and Stolper **(1980)** Basaltic meteorites Scientific American 242 no.6 **p54-63**

**5.** Delano and Arculus **(1980)** Nakhla: Oxidation state and other constraints Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XI p219-221**

**6.** Smith and Hervig **(1979)** Shergotty meteorite: Mineralogy, petrography and minor elements Meteoritics 14 p121-142

**7.** Gooding and Muenow **(1986)** Martian volatiles in shergottite **EETA79001 GCA 50 p1049-1059**

**8.** Bogard and Johnson **(1983)** Martian gasses in an Antarctic meteorite? Science 221 **p6 5 1 - 6 5 4**

**9.** Becker and Pepin (1984) The case for a Martian origin of the shergottites: nitrogen and noble gasses in **EETA79001** Earth Plan. Sci. Letters **69** p225-242

**10.** Carr, Grady, Wright, and Pillinger **(1985)** Martian atmospheric carbon dioxide and weathering products in **SNC** meteorites Nature 314 **p2 4 8 - 2 5 0**

**11.** O'Keefe and Ahrens **(1986)** Oblique impact: a process for obtaining meteorite samples from other planets Science 234 p346

12. Ostertag, Amthauer, Rager, and McSween (1983) Fe $±3$  in shocked olivine crystals **of** the **ALHA77005** meteorite Earth Plan. Sci. Letters **67 p1 6 2 -1 6 6**

**13.** Smith and Steele (1984) Achondrite **ALHA77005:** Alteration of chromite and olivine Meteoritics 19 no.3 p121-133

14. Gooding, Wentworth, and Zolensky **(1987)** Martian calcite and gypsum in shergottite **EETA79001** Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XVIII** (abstract)

*15.* Gooding **(1981)** Mineralogical aspects of terrestrial weathering effects in chondrites from Allan Hills, Antarctica Proc. Lunar and Plan. Sci. **12B p1105-1122**

**16.** Gooding **(1986)** Clay-mineraloid weathering products in Antarctic meteorites **GCA** *50* **p2 2 15 -2 2 2 <sup>3</sup>**

**17.** Sprenkel-Segel and Hanna (1964) Mossbauer analysis of iron in stone meteorites **GCA 28 p19 13 - 19 3 1**

**18.** Herr and Skerra **(1968)** Mossbauer spectroscopy applied to the classification of stone meteorites Meteorite Research (P. M. Millman, ed.) Austria **p106-122**

**19.** Ouseph and Groskreutz **(1979)** Mossbauer spectra for iron bearing phases in the meteorite Toluca Meteoritics 14 no.1 p97-108

20. Sprenkel-Segel **(1968)** Mossbauer investigation of the unequilibrated ordinary chondrites Meteorite Research (P. M. Millman, ed.) Austria **p93-106**

#### Chapter 2. Sample Preparation and Origin

Antarctic samples were obtained from the Antarctic meteorite collection at the Lunar and Planetary Institute. These samples were originally collected with teflon gloves and transported in separate bags, still frozen, to the Johnson Space Center, where they were documented and curated. The samples were handled with the same techniques as the moon rocks, and there is very little possibility of contamination. However, some of the earliest samples collected (in **1977),** including the shergottite **ALHA77005,** were left in the sun and the ice melted. Because of this, these meteorites came into contact with water, but were otherwise uncontaminated<sup>1</sup>.

Homogeneous powders were prepared **by** Eugene Jarosewich (Smithsonian Institution) in all but two cases, **EETA79002** and **ALHA77257,** which were obtained as chips and pulverized **by** the author. The powders had been separated into metal and metaldepleted fractions using a 100-mesh. Only the latter fractions were acquired and used in this study. Powders were prepared using only meteorite interiors, where possible.

The origins of the Antarctic meteorites are as follows (see map in Figure 2). **All** of these localities are encompassed **by** Victoria Land:





Figure 2: **Map** of Antartica and meteorite collection sites from Lunar and Planetary Science Institute, Houston

**A** list of the Antarctic meteorites obtained appears in Table **1.**

Reference meteorites were obtained from the Harvard Mineralogical Museum. The Harvard samples are classified as falls and were collected at various times ranging from **1825** to present. Their histories are, unfortunately, not well-documented. They are stored under normal room conditions in plastic bags. These samples were obtained whole, and powders were made from fresh interior chips **by** pulverizing with an agate mortar and pestle. Magnetic and non-magnetic fractions were separated with a small hand magnet.

For Mossbauer analysis, powders were pulverized and mixed under acetone with sugar to add bulk and reduce orientation effects. **50** to **100** mg of powder were used in each mount. Separate mounts were made of magnetic and non-magnetic fractions. Powders were used without further treatment for XRD analysis.

## References:

**1.** Antarctic Meteorite Newsletter (James Gooding, ed.) 1 no.2 Aug **1978** Johnson Space Center

<b>Specimen</b>		<b>Weathering Index</b>	<b>Meteorite Type</b>
<b>ALHA 77271</b>		$\mathbf C$	H6 chondrite
<b>ALHA 77294</b>		A	chondrite H <sub>5</sub>
<b>ALHA 77214</b>		$\mathbf C$	L3 chondrite
<b>EET</b> 83213		$\bf{B}$	chondrite L3
<b>ALHA 77216</b>		A/B	chondrite L3
<b>ALHA 81027</b>		$\mathbf C$	L6 chondrite
<b>ALHA 77155</b>		A/B	L6 chondrite
<b>ALHA 77297</b>		$\mathbf{A}$	L6 chondrite
<b>TIL</b> 82402		A/B	LL6 chondrite
<b>PCA</b> 82507		$\mathbf{A}$	LL6 chondrite
<b>EET</b> 83232		B	eucrite
<b>ALHA 80102</b>		$\mathbf{A}$	eucrite
<b>EETA</b> 79004		B	eucrite
<b>EETA</b> 79005		$\bf{B}$	eucrite
<b>ALHA</b> 77256		A/B	diogenite
<b>EETA</b> 79002		$\mathbf{A}$	diogenite
79001 <b>EETA</b>	lith A	unspecified	shergottite
79001 <b>EETA</b>	lith C	unspecified	shergottite
<b>ALHA 77005</b>		unspecified	shergottite

Table 1

#### Chapter **3.** Sample Descriptions

#### Antarctic Meteorite Collection

Guide to weathering classification<sup>1b</sup>:

A=none or minor rust halos around metal flecks, minor oxide staining along cracks

B=large rust halos around metal flecks, extensive oxide staining along cracks

C=uniformly stained brown, no evidence of metal

#### **ALHA77271 H6 C**

Surface covered with *25%* fusion crust, rest of surface is weathered dark brown. Chondrules sparsely distributed in a granular matrix. Interior weathered along fissures. Small areas and veins of "limonite". **01 32%,** opx **32%,** NiFe 20%, plag *5%,* troil **5%lb,2.**

## **ALHA77294 H5 A**

Surface completely covered with fusion crust. Polygonal fractures filled with white (evaporite?) material on one surface. Whitish-grey matrix with some oxide staining visible, chondrules and inclusions throughout up to 2mm diameter. **15-20%** metal. Mostly ol, opx, some NiFe, minor troilite.  $O = Fa_{17}$ ,  $pyx = Fs_{15}$ <sup>1c,2</sup>.

#### **ALHA77214 L3 C**

**30%** fusion crust. Surface fractured and fissured. Material around fissures very weathered. brownish-black. Oxide stains visible near fracture, fissures. Fe weathered to "limonite". Fluid-drop chondrules, easily visible, containing glass, olivine, pyx. Abundant troilite.  $O1 = Fa_1 - Fa_4$ , containing glass, olivine, pyx. Abundant troilite.  $O1 = Fa_1 - Fa_4$ , opx=Wo<sub>1</sub>Fs<sub>13</sub>En<sub>86</sub>. Possible hematite<sup>1a,2</sup>.

#### **EET83213 L3** B

Mostly covered with fractured fusion crust. Rest of surface weathered to reddish-brown 5mm thick. Grey interior with some oxidation. Abundant metal with staining. Chondrules up to *3.5* mm. Abundant plag= $An_{11}Ab_{84}Or_5$ . Abundant troilite. Two metal phases, and chromite. Ol=Fa<sub>24.5</sub>,  $pyx = Fs_{23}$ <sup>1j</sup>.

## **ALHA77216 L3** A/B

**50%** fusion crust. Greenish-grey with white-dark grey inclusions. Heterogeneous, fractured, various degrees of weathering. No visible metal. Chondrules .3-1.2mm. Mostly ol, pyx, minor troilite, limonite.  $O1 = Fa_{23-26}$ ,  $pyx = Fs_{10-19}1c,2$ .

## **ALHA81027 L6 C**

Mostly covered with fusion crust. Reddish-brown surface. Interior is very weathered. Plag is shocked to maskelynite, composition low-Na An<sub>10</sub>. Mostly ol, pyx, minor mask, NiFe, troil, lim. Ol=Fa<sub>25</sub>, opx=F<sub>s21</sub><sup>1h,4</sup>.

## **ALHA77155 L6** A/B

Partial fusion crust. Weathering slight to moderate-limonite staining on surface and around metal grains. Sparse, poorly defined chondrules. Orange-brown surface, light grey matrix, unfractured. Mostly olivine, opx, minor plag, NiFe, troil, diop, chrom, whitlockite. Ol=Fa<sub>24</sub>, opx=Fs<sub>21</sub>, plag=An<sub>11</sub><sup>1c,2</sup>.

## **ALHA77297 L6 A**

As above, but less weathered. **5%** metal with oxide halos. Ol=Fa<sub>24</sub>, opx=Fs<sub>20</sub>, plag An<sub>11</sub><sup>1c,2</sup>.

#### TIL82402 **LL6** A/B

Covered **by** fusion crust. Light grey matrix with light and dark chondrules. Mostly ol, opx, and minor plag, troil. Oxide halos around metal. Ol=Fa<sub>29</sub>, pyx=Fs<sub>24</sub>, plag=An<sub>10</sub><sup>1i</sup>.

#### **PCA82507 LL6 A**

Mostly covered with fusion crust. Rest of surface brownish. Blue-grey matrix with white and dark grey chondrules up to 5mm. **01** and pyx with minor plag, troil, **1%** NiFe. No trace of weathering. Ol=Fa<sub>30</sub>, pyx=Fs<sub>25</sub>, plag An<sub>11</sub><sup>1i</sup>.

#### **EETA79004** euc B

Thin fusion crust on most of surface. Medium-dark grey with light and dark clasts and vugs up to 1cm deep. Interior light grey. Spots of severe oxidation. Monomict breccia of pyx, feldspar in fine matrix, possibly recrystallized.  $Pyx=Wo_2En_{45}Fs_{53} - Wo_{40}En_{36}Fs_{24}$ ,  $Pyx=Wo_2En_{45}Fs_{53}-Wo_{40}En_{36}Fs_{24}$  $Fspr = Or<sub>1</sub>Ab<sub>6</sub>Ang<sub>3</sub>-Or<sub>1</sub>Ab<sub>14</sub>Ang<sub>5</sub><sup>3</sup>.$ 

## **ALHA80102** euc **A**

Covered with fusion crust. Many large vugs, grey, white, yellow, and black clasts. Polymict breccia of **pig,** plag, minor ilmenite. No sign of weathering.  $Pig=Wo_6Fs_{34}En_{60}-Wo_{12}Fs_{52}En_{36}$ ferroaugite=W033Fs30En37, plag=An76-An94<sup>1f,4</sup>.

## **ALHA77256** dio A/B

**15%** fusion crust, rest of surface weathered to yellow-brown. Patches of oxide staining. 97% opx clasts=Wo<sub>2</sub>Fs<sub>23</sub>En<sub>75</sub>, minor cpx, 1% plag, 1% troil, NiFe<sup>2</sup>.

## **EETA79002** dio **A**

Covered with fusion crust. Medium grey matrix with light clasts. Some oxidized areas- red-brown, many fractures, no metal. Angular breccia mostly opx, minor ol, possible ilm or chrom.  $Pyx=Wo_2En_{76}Fs_{22}$ , ol=Fo<sub>75</sub><sup>1d,3</sup>.

## **PCA82506** ure A/B

**75%** fusion crust. Greenish-brown surface with grey-green interior. Aggregate of ol, pyx, rimmed **by C** material, troilite, trace NiFe weathered to oxides. Ol=Fa<sub>21</sub>, pig=Wo<sub>6</sub>Fs<sub>18</sub>En<sub>76</sub><sup>1i</sup>.

## **ALHA77257** ure **A**

*50%* fusion crust. Surfaces are brownish-black with areas of oxide stain. Hydromagnesite vein across surface. Interior fine black matrix with grains. **80%** olivine, *15%* pyx. **C** rims at grain boundaries, trace troilite, and NiFe partially altered to oxide. Ol=Fa<sub>9</sub>. 23,  $pyx=W_0pEn_81Fs_12^2$ .

**EETA79001** sherg lith **A** (see diagram of this specimen, Figure **3)**

Mostly covered with fusion crust. Surface white-grey and porous. Pig-mask groundmass with zoned pyx inclusions. Shocked; plag altered to mask. Interior weathered, possible uptake of  $H_20$ , CO<sub>2</sub>. Mostly pyx, some mask, trace chromite, troil, ilm.  $Pig=Wo_5En_{70}Fs_{25}-Wo_{12}En_{50}Fs_{38}$ , mask=Or<sub>1</sub>Ab<sub>42</sub>An<sub>57</sub>, ol=Fo<sub>75</sub><sup>1d,3</sup>.

## **EETA79001** sherg lith **C**

Surrounded **by** lith **A.** Glass with olivine, pyx, mask inclusions. Dark brown-black, with both glassy and microcrystalline textures.



**EETA 79001** 

Figure **3:** Sawcut of **EETA79001** from Antarctic Meteorite Newsletter Vol. **9,** no.1

Large vugs and small vesicles with light colored phases. Aluminosilicates rich in **S, Cl** not of terrestrial composition. No weathering or volatiles present. High concentration of S-species<sup>1d,k</sup>.

## **ALHA77005** sherg

**5%** fusion crust. Little evidence of weathering. Heterogeneous, some cumulate olivines and chromite enclosed **by** low and high-Ca **Mg** pyx. Other ol with interstitial mask, chrom, ilm, troil, whit, pyx. Plag shocked to mask. Olivine brown-colored, containing up to **5%** Fe<sup>+3</sup>. Chromite and olivine altered slightly to orange material. Weak preferred orientation of olivine grains. **55%** ol, **35%** pyx, **8%** mask; chrom, NiFe, ilm and troil 2%.  $O1 = Fa_{2}g$ ,  $pyx = Wo_5Fs_{2}gEn_{72}$ , mask=labradorite An<sub>53</sub><sup>1a,2,5,6</sup>.

## Harvard Mineralogical Museum Collection

Nanjemoy H

Unfortunately, no documentation exists for this meteorite; Harvard has it classified as an H-group meteorite.

#### Ehole H

Olivine-bronzite chondrite.  $O = Fa_{19}^7$ .

#### Forest City H

Olivine-bronzite chondrite, with minor clinobronzite. Well developed chondrules. Ol=Fa<sub>19</sub>, Pyx=Fs<sub>16</sub>, Plag=An<sub>10</sub><sup>8</sup>.

Mezo-Madaras **L3**

**Highly** brecciated olivine-hypersthene chondrite. **01 50%,** pyx *25%,* plag or mask **10%,** FeNi **8%,** troil *5%,* chrom, diop, whit, goethite. Ol=Fa<sub>16-30</sub>9.

Holbrook **L6**

Olivine, opx, troilite, FeNi, goethite<sup>8</sup>.

Dhurmsala **LL6**

Similar to Holbrook.

Juvinas euc

Fine-medium grained matrix. **56% pig,** 40% plag, **1%** silica.  $Plag = An_{80} 10$ .

Tatahouine dio

Hypersthene achondrite. Highly shocked.  $Pyx=En_75Wo_15^{11}$ .

Goalpara ure

**Highly** shocked, brecciated. **01 63.5%,** pyx **31.7%,** kama **1.6%,** troil **1.1%. 01=F078.6,** pig=En76Fs19Wo4.4 12.

## Nakhli nakhlite

Clear glass fusion crust. Mostly augite, some ol, plag, K-spar, Fe-Ti oxides, FeS, pyrite, chalcopyrite, iddingsite, magnetite **(?).** Cumulate texture. Fe-rich ol,  $pyx=Wo_3gEn_3gFs_{23}$ ,  $plag=Or_5Ab_{63}An_{32}$ , K-spar= $Or_{75}Ab_{22}An_3<sup>13</sup>$ .

## References:

**1.** Antarctic Meteorite Newsletter (James Gooding, ed.) Johnson Space Center

> a. **Vol.1** no.2 Aug **1978 b.** Vol.1 no.3 Nov **1978 c.** Vol.2 no.1 Jun **1979 d.** Vol.3 no.3 Aug **1980** e. Vol.4 no.1 Feb **1981 f.** Vol.4 no.2 Nov **1981 g.** Vol.5 no.1 Feb **1982** h. Vol.6 no.1 Feb **1983** i. Vol.7 no.1 Feb 1984 **j. Vol.8 no.1** Feb **1985 k.** Vol.9 no.1 Feb **1986**

2. Marvin and Mason, eds. **(1980)** Catalogue of Antarctic meteorites **1977-1978** Smithsonian Contributions to Earth Science no.23

**3.** Marvin and Mason, eds. **(1982)** Catalogue of meteorites from Victoria Land, Antarctica Smithsonian Contributions to Earth Science **no.24**

4. Marvin and Mason, eds. (1984) Field and laboratory investigations of meteorites from Victoria Land. Antarctica Smithsonian Contributions to Earth Science no.26

**5.** McSween, Stolper, et al **(1979)** Petrogenetic relationship between **ALHA77005** and other achondrites Earth and Plan. Sci. Letters 45 **p275-284**

**6.** Berkley and Keil **(1981)** Olivine orientation in the **ALHA77005** achondrite Amer. Min. **66 p12 3 3 - 12 3 <sup>6</sup>**

**7.** Jarosewich **(1966)** Chemical analyses of **10** stony meteorites **GCA 30 p12 6 1 -1 2 6 <sup>5</sup>**

**8.** Mason and Wiik **(1965)** The composition of the Forest City. Tennasilm, Weston, and Geidam meteorites Amer. Museum Novitiates 2220 **p1 -2 0**

**9.** Jarosewich **(1967)** Chemical analyses of **7** stony meteorites **GCA 31** p1 **103-1106**

**10.** Duke and Silver **(1967)** Petrology of eucrites. howardites. and mesosiderites **GCA 31** p1637-1665

**11.** Nord and Hewins **(1983)** Thermal and mechanical history of Tatahouine diogenite Meteoritics 18 no.4 p364-365 (abstract)

12. Berkley et al **(1980)** The nature and origin of ureilites **GCA** 44 **p1579-1597**

**13.** Bunch and Reid **(1975)** The nakhlites Part **1:** Petrography and mineral chemistry Meteoritics 10 no.4 p303-315

#### Chapter 4. Mossbauer Spectroscopy

The technique of Mossbauer spectroscopy uses gamma rays emitted from a <sup>57</sup>Co source to excite nuclear transitions in <sup>57</sup>Fe located in the sample of interest. **All** the gamma rays are transmitted, except those matching the nuclear spin state  $(I=3/2)$ 14.4KeV above the ground state  $(I=1/2)$ . These gamma rays are reemitted over all angles and the spectrum is measured in terms of absorbance. The nuclear energy levels of Fe have slightly different energies due to differences in coordination environment; in order to detect this, energy coming from the source is doppler-shifted **by** means of an oscillator,  $\pm 10$ mm/sec. Thus, different coordination environments appear at different energies and are separable into discrete peaks. This technique can detect differences in Fe oxidation state, coordination number, and size and shape of the coordination site.

The source used for this study was **5 7Co** in rhodium. The spectrometer is an Austin Science Associates model S3K3 with a 1024-channel multi-channel analyzer. The spectra use only **512** channels each, and are half of the mirror-image spectra normally obtained. Thus, two spectra may be run simultaneously, utilizing two sources set up on the same oscillator. The powder containing the sample is mounted with tape onto a plexiglass holder and shielded with lead. It is placed about 15cm from the source and 1-2cm from the detector. The samples are calibrated against Fe foil, and frequent calibration runs are made (once a month, or every time the system is set up differently) to guard against drift.

Liquid nitrogen runs are made **by** mounting the sample on a copper rod, shielding as usual, and inserting the rod into a 25-liter tank of liquid nitrogen. The sample and rod are insulated with styrofoam. Spectra can be run for a maximum of four days without changing samples, on one tank of liquid nitrogen. This configuration requires that the sample be moved 3-5cm farther away from the source than usual.

#### Chapter **5.** Mossbauer Data and Fitting Procedure

The spectra were fit using the programs READ and **STONE,** which use a least squares fitting procedure, written **by A.J.** Stone, *et al* **(1969),** modified **by F.E.** Huggins (1974)1. **All** peak shapes were assumed to be Lorentzian. When using this program, the operator enters "guesses" for the baseline parameters, peak positions, halfwidths, and areas. **A** number of constraints can be entered relating the center, halfwidth, or area of one peak to another; in addition, parameters can be fixed to a particular value. The program then proceeds through a series of iterations to the best fit for the initial parameters. The result is converted to mm/sec scale **by** comparison with a fitted Fe foil calibration.

In all fits, halfwidths of component quadrupole doublets were constrained to be equal among all peaks, except for the largest ferrous peak at high velocity  $(\sim 2.5 \text{mm/sec})$ , which consistently gave a better fit if allowed to vary (however, the areas of the pair were required to be the same). The halfwidth of this high velocity peak never deviated more than **3** channels from its mate, as it is very well-defined in the spectra. Areas of pairs of peaks were always constrained to be equal. Pairs of peaks which formed part of a magnetic sextet were constrained to have the area ratio **3:2:1.** This was necessary, as these peaks were not usually large, and the innermost two peaks were usually overlapped **by** other doublets. The outer two peaks are not visible in the velocity range we were using, however, the middle pair was sufficiently well-defined to give a good area assessment for the inner pair.

Because many of the inner peaks overlapped, especially in the ferric region, it was sometimes necessary to constrain peak positions. In this case, the first peaks to be constrained were always the ones with well-known parameters; i.e. ilmenite, metallic Fe, and troilite (in the case of the magnetic sextets, the positions of the inner peaks could be determined **by** their outer counterparts, and in the case of Fe, **by** the foil calibration). However, it was usually the case that the low velocity ferric peak almost directly coincided with the low velocity  $Fe<sup>+2</sup>$  pyroxene peak, so that the positions of these two peaks had to be constrained. When this was necessary, the position of the pyroxene peak was determined from the least oxidized spectrum, and the ferric peak subsequently adjusted to give the best fit. Examples of fitted spectra and constraints are provided in Figures 4- **6.**

Particular difficulties were encountered when it was necessary to fit two ferric doublets; it was determined that the second one was invariably overlapped **by** the low velocity olivine peak. Nevertheless, successful fits were obtained for these spectra. In addition, a minor amount of Fe metal occasionally remained in the sample, and it proved to be difficult to fit the two innermost peaks, in addition to the fitted troilite sextet, so that in most cases only the outer Fe peaks were fit. In no case did these missing peaks exceed **1%** of the area.

Goodness of fit was determined **by** the chi-squared value, and **by** the appropriateness of the final parameters to the minerals known to be present. For the SNC's, spectra were fitted to three  $Fe<sup>+2</sup>$ doublets, one Fe+<sup>3</sup> doublet, and ilmenite. The ferrous doublets are





 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

**RLHA77256 DIG A/B** 



and the company of the company of

 $\overline{5}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



SHERGOTTITE **79001** LITH **A**



 $33$ 

Figure **6:** 12 peaks, **36** constraints

baseline constraints	2
$\%$ gaussian = 0	12
areas of pairs $=$	6
area ratio of mag. sextet	$\mathbf{1}$
wdths $=$	11
positions of $2,3,4,5$	





ساويت وسواءها والمناسب

 $\sim 100$ 

assigned as follows: The outermost is attributed to olivine with a small contribution from the M1 sites of augite and orthopyroxene. The innermost doublet is attributed to the M2 sites of augite, pigeonite and hypersthene. Occasionally, a middle doublet was resolved arising from the pigeonite M1 site. Lith **C** of **EETA79001** contained an additional ferrous peak, assigned to  $Fe<sup>+2</sup>$  in the glass phase. The chondrites were fitted to the same three Fe+2 doublets, troilite, occasional Fe metal, and one or two ferric phases. **All** peak parameters are in agreement with previous literature values; due to variations in composition (of the pyroxenes, in particular) the parameters occasionally vary beyond experimental error. However, it is not really necessary to pin down the exact pyroxene parameters for this work. **All** of the other ferrous parameters are very wellconstrained and do not vary considerably. Unfortunately, the only set of peaks whose parameters could not be independently worked out were the ferric peaks, due to the nature of the overlap between their positions and other interior peaks. It was determined, **by** a series of successive fits, that this uncertainty in peak position did not unduly affect the areas involved. However, it became necessary to use other techniques to determine the mineralogy of the ferric phases.

The fitted Mossbauer spectra of all meteorites examined here are presented in Figures **7-30,** grouped **by** meteorite class. The fall specimen appears first in each group, followed **by** the Antarctic specimens in order of increasing degree of weathering. Table 2 summarizes the isomer shift and quadrupole splitting parameters
obtained, and Table **3** summarizes the areas under constituent doublets.

## References:

**1.** Stone, Parkin, and Dyar (1984) **STONE: A** program for resolving Mossbauer spectra **DEC** User's Society Program Library, **#11-270,** Marlboro MA

## Fitted Mossbauer Spectra

- Figures **7-10:** L3 chondrites. Fall, A/B, B, **C**
- Figures 11-14: **L6** chondrites. Fall, **A,** A/B, **C**
- Figures *15-17:* **LL6** chondrites. Fall, **A,** A/B
- Figures **18-20:** H chondrites. Fall, **A, C**
- Figures **21-23:** eucrites. Fall, **A,** B
- Figures 24-26: diogenites. Fall, **A,** A/B
- Figures **27-30:** SNC's. Nakhla, **ALHA77005, EETA79001** liths **A & C**

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 







and the company

39



 $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\overline{40}$ 





 $\overline{4}$ 





 $\omega$  and  $\omega$  is  $\omega$  .  $\omega$ 

 $42$ 



 $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is a spectral of  $\mathcal{A}$ 

HOLBROOK L6

 $43$ 



 $44$ 





 $45$ 



 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{1}} & \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{2}} & \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{1}_{3}} &$ 

**ALHA81027 L6 C** 



 $\sim$ 

 $\sigma$  -corrected and an analysis of  $\sigma$ 

DHURMSALA LL6

47

 $\sim 10^6$ 



 $\sim$   $-$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 

**PCR82507 LL6 A** 



 $\omega$ 

TIL82402 LL6 A/B

 $49$ 





 $\sim 100$ 

 $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$ 

 $50$ 



and a series where



 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



52

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 



 $\sim$ 

RESORBANCE

53

 $\bar{\psi}$ 

ALHABO102 EUC A



54





 $\sim$ 

55

 $\mathcal{L}$ 



 $\sim 10^6$ 

TATAHOUINE DIO

56

**EETA79002 DIO A** 



ALHA77256 DIO A/B



 $\omega_{\rm{max}}$  ,  $\omega_{\rm{max}}$ 

 $58$ 



NAKHLA

59

SHERGOTTITE 77005



SHERGOTTITE 79001 LITH A



 $\sigma_{\rm{eff}}=0.005$ 

 $\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 



 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

	$ol +$		pig				
Specimen	py M1	$py$ M <sub>2</sub>	M1	Fe <sup>±3</sup> 1	$Fe\pm32$	ilm	<u>troil</u>
L3 fall	$1.14*$	$1.12*$		$.39*$			$.83*$
	$2.91**$	$2.09**$		$.69**$			5.67#
$L3 \text{ A/B}$	1.14	1.14		.39			.83
	2.90	2.07		.67			5.72
L3B	1.13	1.13		.39			.84
	2.93	2.09		.71			5.70
L3 C	1.16	1.12		.42	.35		.82
	2.88	2.10		.58	1.25		5.70
L6 fall	1.14	1.14		.40			.84
	2.94	2.09		.63			5.70
L6 A	1.16	1.15		.42			.82
	2.90	2.04		.70			5.73
L6 A/B	1.17	1.16		.41			.82
	2.94	2.05		.68			5.73
L6 C	1.15	1.15		.41	.37		.83
	2.91	2.03		.62	1.32		5.72
LL6 fall	1.14	1.14		.38			.81
	2.90	2.07		.62			5.67
LL6 A	1.15	1.16		.37			.81
	2.93	2.10		.60			5.68
$LL6$ A/B	1.14	1.13		.38			.83
	2.93	2.10		.69			5.67
H fall	1.14	1.14		.42			.83
	2.95	2.09		.76			5.71
H A	1.14	1.14		.39			.82
	2.93	2.07		.75			5.72
HC	1.15	1.14		.39	.33		.83
	2.93	2.10		.60	1.30		5.68
euc fall		1.13	1.19	.40		1.11	
		1.98	2.42	.53		.70	
euc A		1.13	1.14	.41		1.10	
		1.98	2.33	.54		.70	
euc B		1,13	1.18	.41		1.11	
		1.99	2.38	.52		.70	
dio fall		1.14		.42			
		2.08		.67			
dio A		1.13		.49			.82
		2.11		.83			5.69

Table 2: Mossbauer parameters (in mm/sec)



\* isomer shift values listed first (above) in each pair

 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 

\*\* quadrupole splitting listed second (underneath) in each pair, except:

**#** values for troilite **=** splitting (in mm/sec) between the 2nd and 5th peaks in the sextet; included as a consistency check.

	$ol +$		pig				
Specimen	$py$ M1	$py$ M <sub>2</sub>	M1	Fe <sup>±3</sup> –1	$Fe\pm3$ 2	ilm	<u>troil</u>
L3 fall	62.98	23.52		1.54			11.98
$L3 \text{ A/B}$	63.15	20.74		7.81			8.31
L3B	67.24	19.86		5.32			7.56
L3 C	51.68	12.31		25.59	4.12		6.27
L6 fall	67.78	22.60		2.84			6.78
L6 A	63.78	23.92		4.74			7.55
L6 A/B	62.04	22.52		7.58			7.83
L6 C	58.42	22.00		10.08	1.42		8.31
LL6 fall	73.70	17.32		4.04			4.95
LL6 A	74.54	15.76		3.76			5.91
$LL6$ A/B	74.17	17.34		1.99			6.51
H fall	54.65	30.01		1.41			13.92
H A	54.56	30.01		4.28			11.13
HC	41.18	23.51		18.94	4.56		8.37
euc fall		69.00	27.23	.66		3.10	
euc A		55.56	42.67	.23		1.54	
$euc$ B		67.58	23.44	3.54		5.43	
dio fall		99.40		.60			
dio A		92.32		2.32			5.34
$dio$ $A/B$		97.64		2.36			
nakhla	48.76	49.64		1.58			
77005 sh	83.94	11.70		1.71		2.64	
79001 sh A	24.03	55.78	16.18	1.93		2.08	
sh 79001 $\mathsf{C}$	41.40	26.24	23.20			1.80	$7.36*$
							$*Fe+2$
							glass

Table **3: %** Areas Under Peaks

## Chapter **6.** Interpretation of the Mossbauer Data

In table 4, the data are summarized in the form of  $%Fe<sup>+3</sup>$  for each class of meteorite and weathering type included in the study. Many useful and interesting conclusions can be reached from this table. First, one notices that the "control" samples, non-Antarctic meteorites classified as falls, have undergone some oxidation of their own. This was at first glance surprising, as these samples should not have undergone any terrestrial weathering if they were, in fact, picked up right away (with the possible exception of the Holbrook sample, this is a pretty good assumption). Because each sample was extracted from the interior of the meteorite, oxidation products from the fusion crust can be ruled out. Except for Nakhla, these are all standard classes of meteorites which would not be expected to have any preterrestrial ferric phases whatsoever.

This, then, leaves only one alternative: the weathering occurred during museum storage **(!).** The possibility of museum weathering of specimens is corroborated in part **by** the discovery of a museum curator that meteorites "breathe"; that is, that they take up moisture from the air, causing measurable differences in weight from day to dayl. This has interesting implications for past and future studies of meteorites. The data in Table 4 show a range of ~0.5-4% Fe<sup>+3</sup>; these numbers are significant, especially if one is looking for small amounts of preterrestrial ferric phases. **A** possible error is introduced of up to 4% in any study of museum specimens. For instance, all ferric Fe reported in one large study (giving **0.3-1.2%** ferric Fe for ordinary chondrites) falls well within this range<sup>2</sup>.

<b>Class</b>	Fall	<u>A</u>	A/B	B	$\mathsf C$
L3	1.5		7.8	5.3	29.7
L <sub>6</sub>	2.8	4.7	7.6		11.5
H	1.4	4.3			21.2
LL6	4.0	3.8	2.0		
eucrite	1.5	0.2		3.6	
diogenite	0.6	2.3	2.4		
nakhla	1.6				
77005		1.7			
79001 A		1.9			
79001 C		0.0			

Table 4: %Ferric Fe **by** class

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}_z$ 

However, the problem of museum weathering should not exist in Antarctic samples, whose atmospheres have been quite carefully controlled during all stages of curation (with the possible exception of samples collected prior to **1978,** see **pg 16).**

One of the main objectives of this study was to provide quantitative data which would clarify the Antarctic weathering classification scheme currently in use **(ABC).** The study was successful in setting upper and lower bounds for these categories, although unfortunately the variation within each field is substantial. Another problem is that although the **ABC** categories are usually selfconsistent, this is not always the case. For instance, the **L3** specimen labeled B was less weathered than the **L3** specimen categorized as A/B **(A** should be least weathered, **C** most).

In order to arrive at numbers for classes of weathering, it can be seen from Table 4 that all meteorites cannot be treated alike; a division needs to be made between chondrites and achondrites, the achondrites being as a rule less weathered in a given category than chondrites. For instance, the eucrite labeled B is less weathered than any of the H or L meteorites labeled **A.** This principle is further illustrated **by** the fact that there are very few, if any, achondrite specimens available in the **C** class, while class **C** chondrites abound. This is partially because the weathering scheme is based on the amount of rust surrounding metal grains, a system which simply does not apply to many achondrites which do not contain significant metal. It is not clear why these meteorites were not all classified as **A,** other than the possibility that this type of weathering may appear to be more in thin section than it really is. Researchers should take

68

note of this discrepancy, and possibly the classification system should be changed to take it into account.

The reason for this difference can be easily explained **by** differences in mineralogy. Eucrites and diogenites contain only trace amounts of FeNi and troilite, the phases which one would expect to be the most easily weathered. On the other hand, most ordinary chondrites contain significant amounts of these minerals, sometimes up to **~20-25%.** The **SNC** meteorites have a mineralogy which falls between these two extremes; they contain various oxides and sulfides such as pyrite, chalcopyrite, and magnetite not found in the other achondrites, but in general these minerals constitute only **2-3%,** less than the chondritic Fe metal and troilite percentages.

It is possible that there are two different types of weathering going on, accounting in part for these differences. This is corroborated **by** that fact that all samples exceeding **8%** Fe+3 show spectral evidence for a second set of ferric peaks (spectra shown in Figures **31-33).** The first ferric doublet to appear is due to oxidation of the metallic Fe, a fact clearly shown **by** the thin section descriptions; most describe a weathering halo around FeNi grains. This probably makes up the bulk of the ferric phase in chondrites. The second type of weathering is either due to oxidation of troilite or of the silicates present, olivine and pyroxene. This may be the predominant type of oxidation in the achondrites, and explains why weathering is so slow to appear in these specimens. These two types of rust were reported **by** Gooding, classified as "metallic" and "sialic" respectively, based on microprobe compositional analysis<sup>3</sup>.

Figures **31-33**

These figures show the presence of two ferric doublets in all three spectra of meteorites classified as **C.** The first doublet to appear is the largest, and can be found in the region between **0** and 1 mm/sec. The second doublet has its high velocity peak just to the right of the high velocity peak of the first doublet,  $\sim 0.8$ mm/sec. The low velocity peak is offset more to the left, and can be found at  $\sim$ -0.3mm/sec.



 $\epsilon_{\rm{eff}}$ 



**ALHA81027 L6 C** 

 $\overline{72}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$
H6 C ALHA 77271



 $\mathbb{Z}^2$ 

 $\sim$ 

In addition to the above effect, there also seems to be a clear difference in the amount of weathering undergone in the different localities of Antarctica. Those chondrites which are less weathered than most, both **LL6** samples and the previously mentioned anomalous **L3** B sample, are all from localities outside the Allan Hills area, whereas the remaining chondrites originated from the Allan Hills. In addition, the two **LL6** specimens originated from separate regions. It is also true that most, though not all, of the achondrites were collected outside of the Allan Hills area. This is very interesting, as it hints at differences in the ice field flows, surface exposure times, or terrestrial ages. Differences in terrestrial age have been reported between Victoria Land specimens and the other Antarctic localities<sup>4</sup>. Unfortunately, not enough data exist to compare ages of various localities within Victoria Land. However, specimens from the Allan Hills and Elephant Moraine are found in geographically close proximity (see Figure 2), but still exhibit quite large weathering variations. This evidence seems to argue strongly in favor of weathering taking place during burial; the greatest difference between sample histories is presumably not the amount of time they have spent at the surface, but the amount of time they spend buried in the ice sheet, this variable being controlled **by** the ice-flow kinetics at that site. More work needs to be done to solve the question of whether such burial weathering is possible, and to determine what makes the Allan Hills different from all other collection sites. Meanwhile, researchers should take note that Allan Hills specimens are likely to be more weathered than other specimens.

It is clear that the present classification scheme is inadequate; inaccuracies exist because of differences in mineralogy and origin. However, some useful guidelines can be put forward. The vast majority of samples now available for research are chondrites from the Allan Hills. For these specimens, the following categories can be set forth: **"A"** samples contain at least *4-5%* ferric phases, "B" samples from **7%** to **~8-10%, "C"** samples from **10%** to **30%** (the highest in this study). Specimens from other locations, as well as achondrites in general, will show lesser degrees of weathering.

Now that the groundwork has been laid, the other important objective of this study can be pursued--how do the SNC's fit into this scheme, and what can be learned about them using Mossbauer analysis? The nakhlites and shergottites in this study (except **EETA79001** lith **C,** which will be dealt with later) all fall between the chondrites and achondrites with respect to their ferric content. **If** preterrestrial weathering is ignored for the moment, this is just what would have been predicted based on their mineralogy. **(All** three samples fall within a narrow range:  $1.5{\text -}2\%$  Fe<sup> $+3$ </sup>, so the differences in their origin are probably unimportant.) From this, one must conclude that any Martian weathering products present are present in relatively small quantities, at most, **1%.** Unfortunately, it seems that Antarctic weathering processes are of sufficient magnitude, even in the most unweathered specimens, to make this level of detection impossible **by** Mossbauer spectroscopy, and difficult for other techniques as well. **SEM** petrologic evidence seems to hold out the only hope for such work, and is currently being pursued with interesting results by James Gooding, et al<sup>5</sup>. However, it can definitely be said that **SNC** meteorites found so far are not rocks from *the surface* of Mars, where one might expect to see much higher degrees of weathering, but probably have their origins in the crust or upper mantle.

One place where a larger amount of  $Fe<sup>+3</sup>$  might have been expected was in the glass-rich lith **C** of **EETA79001.** This glass is dark brownish-black in color and closely resembles the terrestrial glass-like material hisingerite, postulated to occur on Mars<sup>6</sup>. However, Mossbauer analysis failed to detect any Fe+3 phases at all; instead, a doublet corresponding to  $Fe<sup>+2</sup>$  in the glass phase appeared in addition to the peaks attributable to lith **A,** which was impossible to entirely separate from lith **C.** The absence of ferric-bearing glass is in contrast to the assumptions made in various microprobe analyses of lith C already performed which report Fe as  $Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$ , partly to compensate for low totals<sup>4</sup>. These analyses will need to be recalculated, as there is now no support for this assumption.

At this stage, it is important to address the question of the identity of the ferric phase or phases. Mossbauer analysis was thought to be an especially good tool for this determination, since many of the weathering products proposed in the literature would be easy to identify- -goethite, hematite, and magnetite all have six-line spectra at room temperature which are easily identifiable and distinguishable from the overlapping paramagnetic peaks. However, it is interesting to note that no magnetic peaks were detected in *any* sample, other than the original troilite and FeNi peaks.

The absence of additional sextets seemed to rule out any of these oxides; however, because the weathering products bear a

resemblance to rust in thin section, there was a possibility that the beta- or gamma-FeOOH minerals akaganeite and lepidocrocite were present. These minerals have been found as weathering products of certain kinds of meteorites not directly related to the SNC's. Moreover, the room temperature spectra of these FeOOH polymorphs comprise one ferric doublet. Alternatively, it was possible that the rust product was microcrystalline FeOOH **(<200A).** Other possibilities included Fe-sulfates, Fe-rich clays or other aluminosilicates.

In order to distinguish betweem these various possibilities, it was necessary to make use of XRD and low temperature Mossbauer spectroscopy. Results of these experiments are described in the following two chapters.

# References:

**1.** Lipschutz, M. **E.,** personal communication

2. Herr and Skerra **(1968)** Mossbauer spectroscopy applied to the classification of stone meteorites Meteorite Research (P. M. Millman, ed.) Austria **p106-122**

**3.** Gooding **(1986)** Clay-mineraloid weathering products in Antarctic meteorites **GCA** Vol **50 p2 2 <sup>15</sup> -2 2 2 3**

4. LPI Technical Report **86-01 (1986)** International Workshop on Antarctic Meteorites Johnson Space Center, Houston

**5.** Gooding, Wentworth, and Zolensky **(1987)** Martian **(?)** calcite and gypsum in shergottite **EETA79001** Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XVIII** (abstract)

**6.** Burns **(1986)** Hisingerite and iddingsite: Deuteric alteration products of basalts on Mars Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XVII p93-94** (abstract)

## Chapter **7.** X-ray Diffraction

X-ray diffraction experiments were run with two purposes in mind: to help identify the weathering product(s) present in the Antarctic specimens, and to search for unusual phases in the glassrich lith **C.** Six chondritic specimens were measured including one **A** and one **C** sample from each of the three meteorite classes in which **C** samples were available--H, **L3,** and **L6.** In addition, lithologies **A** and **C** from **EETA79001** were run.

X-ray powder diffraction measurements were obtained using a Phillips X-ray generator and DeBye-Scherrer cameras. Cobalt radiation was used, with an Fe filter. Experiments were run for a minimum of 12 hours, and XRD patterns recorded on film.

Unfortunately, these experiments were on the whole inconclusive. No extra lines could be detected in either the glass phase or in weathered **C** samples. However, a number of possibilities were ruled out **--** no lines corresponding to any of the FeOOH polymorphs were found. This left as possible ferric phases either microcrystalline FeOOH polymorphs, which do not appear in XRD, or clay-like silicates, whose XRD lines would be obscured **by** the predominant minerals in the meteorite and whose Mossbauer parameters would be similar to those recorded in Table 2. However, diagnostic **7** and **10** angstrom lines were missing from the XRD pattern, implying that sheet silicates were not present.

Chapter **8.** Liquid Nitrogen Mossbauer Spectroscopy

In order to distinguish between the ferric alternatives left to **us,** Mossbauer spectra were obtained at liquid nitrogen temperature **(77K). If** the ferric phase present were in fact microcrystalline FeOOH, magnetic six-line spectra would be expected to appear at low temperatures.

The Neel temperature for pure, well-crystallized goethite is ~400K, well above room temperature. Akaganeite has a Neel temperature of 293K, and lepidocrocite, **73K.** Thus, one would normally expect to see a sextet at room temperature in the Mossbauer spectrum of goethite, and doublets in that of akaganeite and lepidocrocite. However, there are various factors which can lower the Neel temperature of goethite, sometimes below room temperature. The most important of these effects relate to nonstoichiometry, small particle size, and the presence of structural defects <sup>1</sup> . For instance, substitution of **Al** for Fe beyond the **10%** level reduces the Neel temperature of goethite to below room temperature; particle sizes below **200A** have the same effect. (It is important to note here that such particle sizes are not large enough to allow coherent scattering of an X-ray beam, thus no lines will appear in XRD.)

**All** of these effects disrupt the antiferromagnetic coupling along the c-axis, causing the magnetic peaks to distort, and in some cases disappear altogether, with the corresponding appearance of a paramagnetic doublet in the ferric region. However, the Neel temperature is not lowered very far below room temperature, and liquid nitrogen temperatures should cause a reappearance of the magnetic lines. These lines are still not as sharp as in the spectra of perfectly crystalline goethite, but rather are broadened and a s y m m e t r i c a 1<sup>1</sup>. In addition, it has been shown, using microcrystalline hematite, that the appearance of the magnetic sextet as the temperature is lowered is a gradual effect--the paramagnetic peaks are not lost entirely until nearly 20K<sup>2</sup> .

Evidence for microcrystalline weathering products of Martian rocks has been recently presented by Agresti and Morris<sup>2,3</sup>. They noted that many of the features of reflectance spectra of Martian surface rocks are very closely correlated with the features of microcrystalline hematite spectra. Although this interpretation is controversial, it at least provides some evidence that Martian rocks could weather to microcrystalline compounds. Synthetic hematite was produced on silica gel, which provides spaces small enough to harbor the microcrystals. It might be mentioned at this point that some of the **SNC** meteorites are described in thin-section as having porous groundmasses (see **pg** 20). As for the mineralogy, it does not seem too surprising that the terrestrial weathering product might be the more hydrous Fe oxide, goethite.

Mossbauer spectra of the three most weathered **(C)** samples were taken at **77K** and compared to the previous room temperature runs. These spectra all showed a significant *(~50%)* decrease in the intensity of the paramagnetic ferric doublet; these spectra appear in Figures 34-41. The room temperature spectrum appears first, then the **77K** spectrum in each case. Unfortunately, the size of the ferric doublet compared to the baseline scatter makes it very difficult to

80

Figures 34-41

These figures show the reduction of the ferric doublets at **77K.** This reduction is most easily noticed in the region between **0** and 1 mm/sec.

Figures 34, **35:** L3 **C** normal scale. RT, **77K** Figures **36, 37:** L3 **C** expanded scale. RT, **77K** Figures **38, 39: L6 C** expanded scale. RT, **77K** Figures 40, 41: **H6 C** expanded scale. RT, **77K**



 $\mathcal{L}$ 



 $\sim$ 



 $\mathbf{r}$ 



 $\sim$ 





 $\alpha$ 





 $\sim$ 



 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ 

determine whether corresponding magnetic peaks have appeared, especially since the area lost under the paramagnetic doublet must be spread out among six magnetic peaks. However, there appears to be no other plausible explanation for the **50%** disappearance of these peaks. The FeOOH polymorph lepidocrocite can now be ruled out, since its Neel temperature is so low that one would not expect to see significant disappearance of its doublet at **77K.** The paramagnetic parameters of the ferric doublet (see Table 2) are consistent with either paramagnetic goethite or akaganeite, and on the basis of these studies these two possibilities cannot be distinguished between.

The possibility still exists that some of the remaining ferric phase is a form of ferric-rich clay-silicate, which could be expected to have parameters similar to those obtained. (Although there has been no work substantiating the existence of a microcrystalline clay, there is no reason to rule it out). This is likely, in view of the fact that in all of these samples the spectra are thought to contain two ferric phases. However, there is probably a paramagnetic FeOOH component left over as well, since the paramagnetic peak should not entirely disappear until a lower temperature.

## References:

**1.** Murad **(1982)** The characterization of goethite **by** Mossbauer spectroscopy Amer. Min. **67 p1007-1011**

2. Agresti, Newcomb, and Morris **(1987)** Mossbauer study of ultramicrocrystalline hematite Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XVIII p7-8** (abstract)

**3.** Morris et al **(1987)** Ultramicrocrystalline hematite: Properties and occurrence on the Martian surface Lunar and Plan. Sci. **XVIII p668- 669** (abstract)

## Chapter **9.** Summary and Conclusions

This project represents the first large-scale study of iron oxidative weathering in Antarctic meteorites, and leads to several important conclusions. Contrary to previous belief, nearly all Antarctic meteorites are weathered, containing at least **1%** and up to **30%** or more ferric Fe. Furthermore, this weathering occurs throughout the meteorites, even in the center.

Quantitative guidelines for weathering can be applied to the **ABC** system currently in use, with some modifications. The largest group of samples, chondrites from the Allan Hills area, have the following characteristics: **"A"** samples contain 4-5% ferric phases, "B" samples **7-10%,** and **"C"** samples up to **30%** or more. The Allan Hills chondrites are the most severely weathered of all the Victoria Land specimens.

Achondrites tend to have lesser degrees of weathering, probably because the first phases to weather (metallic FeNi, troilite) are much less abundant in these meteorites. In addition, meteorites from other localities in Antarctica are less weathered. This phenomenon is best explained **by** differences in ice-sheet flow causing the meteorites to spend varying amounts of time buried in the ice. The evidence supports the theory that it is possible for weathering to occur during burial as well as on the surface of the ice. However, it is also possible that these meteorites have different terrestrial ages, and thus experienced different periods of weathering. These factors cause anomalies in the **ABC** classification system, and should be taken into account **by** researchers interested in Antarctic meteorites.

It has been determined that oxidation of meteorites in the museum environment is a definite problem. Specimens classified as falls contain 0.5-4% ferric Fe, well above the range of detectability we must work with when studying **SNC** meteorites. Museum curators should become aware of this problem; ideally, meteorite falls should all be handled as carefully in the future as the Antarctic specimens are. At the very least, researchers should be warned of this inherent error in compositional calculations.

The identity of the ferric phase or phases has been narrowed down significantly. Normal crystalline hematite, goethite, and magnetite have all been ruled out, as they would be expected to produce six-line spectra, which were not observed. XRD eliminated other crystalline FeOOH polymorphs from the list of possibilities. Two legitimate candidates remain: microcrystalline FeOOH and Ferich clay-silicates. Since both have similar Mossbauer parameters and neither was identifiable **by** XRD, a final determination could not be made. It is probable that both exist, since two ferric-bearing phases were distinguished in samples containing over **8%** ferric Fe. The Fe-oxide phase would be expected to appear first, resulting from weathering of the metallic Fe, but the clay-like phase may be more predominant in the achondrites where little metal is present. In both cases,  $H_2O$  and  $O_2$  (now OH in microcrystalline phases) must have permeated the meteorites.

The existence of so much ferric Fe presents a particular problem with respect to study of the **SNC** meteorites thought to have their origin on Mars. **All** three samples studied here, one fall (Nakhla) and two shergottites from Allan Hills and Elephant Moraine, were found to contain only *1.5-2%* ferric phase. This lies at or below the possible error for these samples due to on-site or museum weathering, and indicates that preterrestrial oxidation cannot be conclusively shown **by** compositional studies alone. Rather, petrologic evidence from **SEM** studies is needed to confirm its presence.

The phase of special interest is lith **C** of **EETA79001,** due to the presence in it of trapped Martian gases, interesting silicate minerals, and possible preterrestrial compounds. However, no evidence for ferric phases were found within it.

On the basis of these studies, it can be concluded that these **SNC** meteorites do not contain any significant percentage of Martian surface material, but must have their origin in the crust or upper mantle of Mars.

The discoveries made in this thesis open up many promising avenues for further research. It seems that oxidation of metallic Fe in meteorites is a much faster process than previously realized, both inside and outside of museums. The weathering classification of meteorites in Antarctica badly needs revision; the implementation of an instrumental method of characterization would be helpful to many researchers. In addition, further study to help prevent museum weathering would be of use.

This work helps define some of the questions surrounding ice-sheet weathering. The implication seems to be that weathering can occur under the ice sheet, and that properties of ice flow differ at the various sites sufficient to create variations in weathering patterns. It would be interesting to study meteorites that are still entirely encased in ice; these samples have been spotted, but none have been excavated. Further studies of Antarctic meteorites classed **by** locality may also give clues to help understand the ways ice sheets are moving in Antarctica.

# Acknowledgments

**I** would first and foremost like to thank Roger Burns, for being one of the best advisors anyone could have. Through all my confusion and uncertainty he managed to keep me on track until **I** could find the answers for myself. It wasn't easy, and **I** appreciate that. **I** would also like to thank Sarah Kruse, Paul Filmer, and John Alexander for providing friendship, encouragement, and happiness. Without their help, things might never have gotten this far. Much love also goes to my family, for always being there and providing support for my education, in every way.

I would like to thank Carl Francis and Bill Metropolis at the Harvard Museum for supplying me with samples, answering questions, and being generally helpful. Likewise, I would like to thank Jim Gooding at Johnson Space Center for providing samples and ideas. Useful discussions and interesting ideas also came from Drs. Agresti, Morris, and Lipschutz, and **I** would like to thank them for their help.