Possible evidence for partial differentiation of asteroid Lutetia from Rosetta
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Abstract
The petrologic diversity of meteorites demonstrates that planetesimals ranged from unmelted, variably metamorphosed aggregates to fully molten, differentiated bodies. However, partially differentiated bodies have not been unambiguously identified in the asteroid belt. New constraints on the density, composition, and morphology of 21 Lutetia from the Rosetta spacecraft indicate that the asteroid’s high bulk density exceeds that of most known chondritic meteorite groups, yet its surface properties resemble those of some carbonaceous and enstatite chondrite groups. This indicates that Lutetia likely experienced early compaction processes like metamorphic sintering. It may have also partially differentiated, forming a metallic core overlain by a primitive chondritic crust.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Chondritic meteorites are aggregates of primitive materials formed in the solar nebula. However, it has long been known that nearly all chondrites experienced varying degrees of postaccretional aqueous alteration and thermal metamorphism on their parent planetesimals (Anders, 1964). These processes led to textural, chemical and mineralogical changes that form the basis of a petrologic classification scale (types 1–7) that reflects increasing degrees of thermal equilibration (types 3–7) (Huss et al., 2006) and aqueous alteration (types 1–2) (Brearley, 2006). The heat sources that drove these processes were most likely short-lived radionuclides (Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Huss et al., 2006) and aqueous alteration (types 1–2) (Brearley, 2006). The heat sources that drove these processes were most likely short-lived radionuclides (Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Huss et al., 2006) and, to some extent, meteoroid impacts (Davidson et al., 2010; Keil et al., 1997; Rubin, 2004). Thermal modeling of asteroid metamorphism from radionuclide decay has motivated the onion shell model in which the planetesimal’s interior forms a radially layered structure with a highly metamorphosed deep interior overlain by progressively less heated outer layers. However, despite the ubiquitous meteoritic evidence for thermal metamorphism, it has been difficult to identify evidence for this process on extant asteroids. A key difficulty is the lack of detailed in situ observations of bodies that are sufficiently large to retain their large-scale structures intact from the early solar system.

A second longstanding problem in asteroid science is that the great majority of known meteorite parent bodies melted and formed metallic cores, but very few differentiated asteroids have been identified in the asteroid belt (Burbine et al., 2002). Three possible explanations for this discrepancy are that the meteorite suite is not representative of the present-day asteroid belt (Burbine et al., 2002), that few differentiated asteroids have survived to the present day (Bottke et al., 2006), or that some asteroid spectral classes typically associated with chondritic bodies also contain differentiated members (Gaffey et al., 1993a). A fourth possibility is that partially differentiated asteroids, with metallic cores and partially or totally melted mantles...
overlain by unmelted chondritic crusts, formed in the early solar system (Carporzen et al., 2011; Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Sahijpal and Gupta, 2011; Weiss et al., 2010) and are extant but undiscovered in the asteroid belt. However, the latter scenario is at odds with the traditional view that chondrites, whose aggregational textures require that they never melted, formed on smaller and/or younger bodies that never differentiated.

Large-scale melting of rocky asteroids is thought to have been driven by heating from short-lived radionuclides on bodies larger than \( \sim 10–30 \) km in radius that accreted within \( \sim 1.5–2 \) million years (Ma) after the formation of calcium aluminum inclusions (CAIs) (Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Sahijpal et al., 2007; Sahijpal and Gupta, 2011). With triaxial ellipsoid dimensions of \( \sim 126 \times 103 \times 95 \) km\(^3\) (Sierks et al., in press), 21 Lutetia is the first asteroid unambiguously in the size regime capable of large-scale melting and metallic core formation to be visited by a spacecraft. The next two largest asteroids previously encountered, 253 Mathilde and 243 Ida, have mean radii of 26.5 and 15.7 km, respectively (Davis, 1999; Thomas et al., 1996; Veverka et al., 1997). Asteroids with radii greater than \( \sim 20–30 \) km have collisional lifetimes (e.g., mean time between impacts capable of breaking an asteroid into fragments whose largest piece has a mass less than half of the parent asteroid) greater than the age of the solar system (Bottke et al., 2005; Marchi et al., 2006). Therefore, Lutetia is also the first asteroid visited by a spacecraft that is of sufficient size to have potentially retained most of its original large scale structure against impact disruption. This means that Lutetia may have retained a mostly intact record of any early metamorphic and melting processes. Whether Lutetia actually melted, was just thermally metamorphosed, or remained unheated would have depended predominantly on when it began to accrete and on its initial composition.

Here we use recent Rosetta observations, ground-based astronomical measurements, and meteorite data to demonstrate that Lutetia experienced at least large scale thermal metamorphism and possibly even partial differentiation and core formation.

2. Composition of Lutetia’s surface

The composition and nature of Lutetia have long been perplexing (Barucci and Fulleghnoni, 2009). Ground-based visible-near-infrared reflectance spectra and new infrared spectra from VIRTIS onboard Rosetta (Coradini et al., in press) are flat and nearly featureless [spectral class Xc (Demeo et al., 2009)], compatible with some carbonaceous chondrites (Belskaya et al., 2010; Birlan et al., 2006) and enstatite chondrites (Ockert-Bell et al., 2010) but distinct from all other meteorite groups with the possible exception of iron meteorites (Cloutis et al., 2010). Some Lutetia spectra (Birlan et al., 2006) show a weak \( \sim 1 \) \( \mu \)m absorption feature like that observed for some carbonaceous chondrites (Clark et al., 2009; Gaffey, 1976) and enstatite chondrites (Gaffey, 1976), although this feature is not present in many other spectra including that of VIRTIS (Coradini et al., in press).

The mean visible geometric albedo measured by the OSIRIS camera onboard Rosetta is 0.19 \( \pm 0.01 \). This is consistent with bidirectional reflectance measurements of enstatite chondrites (Ockert-Bell et al., 2010). Although it has been suggested that Lutetia’s visual geometric albedo is too high to be consistent with carbonaceous chondrites (Vernazza et al., 2009), the reflectance of CK, CO, CR, and CV chondrites are actually known to range from 0.5 to 0.22 (Chapman and Salisbury, 1973; Clark et al., 2009; Gaffey, 1976). Because laboratory experiments have typically either measured the bidirectional reflectance at phase angles larger than 5–10° [e.g., Clark et al. (2002)] or else the directional-hemispherical reflectance [e.g., Clark et al. (2009)], such experiments should place lower limits on the inferred geometric albedo (which is defined at zero phase angle) due to the opposition effect. Using the phase function for Lutetia determined by OSIRIS observations (Sierks et al., in press), the asteroid’s mean albedo is in fact only 0.13 at a phase angle of 5° and much lower at higher phase angles (Coradini et al., in press). Therefore, as pointed out by Drummond et al. (2010), Lutetia’s geometric albedo is in agreement with high-albedo (CO, CK, and probably CV and CR) carbonaceous chondrites as well as enstatite chondrites (Fig. 1).

Lutetia’s polarization properties differ from those of all other measured asteroids but are distinctively similar to CV and CO chondrites and different from other chondrite groups as well as all known achondrites (Belskaya et al., 2010). Moreover, Spitzer Space Telescope 8–38 \( \mu \)m emissivity spectra of Lutetia show a clear Christiansen peak at 9.3 \( \mu \)m that is typical of CO and CV carbonaceous chondrites (Barucci et al., 2008) and differs from that of enstatite and ordinary chondrites and stony achondrites (whose Christiansen peaks are known to range from 8.3–8.9 \( \mu \)m (Izawa et al., 2010; Salisbury et al., 1991). The lack of a deep 3 \( \mu \)m absorption for much of Lutetia’s surface (Barucci and Fulleghnoni, 2009; Coradini et al., in press) does not favor a connection with hydrated carbonaceous chondrites (CL, CM, CR, CH, and CB) [although the other face of Lutetia that was not visible to Rosetta may show this hydration feature (Rivkin et al., 2011)]. Finally, two measurements of the OC radar albedo of Lutetia obtained values of 0.19 \( \pm 0.07 \) (Magri et al., 1997) and 0.24 \( \pm 0.07 \) (Shepard et al., 2010) (1σ uncertainties), implying bulk regolith densities of 1900–2900 and 2300–3300 kg m\(^{-3}\), respectively [using equation (8) from Shepard et al., 2010]). Assuming 40–50% regolith total porosity, the radar measurements of Magri et al. (1997) and

![Fig. 1. Mean observed bulk densities and surface observational properties of various meteorite groups as compared to those of asteroid 21 Lutetia (Patzold et al., in press; Sierks et al., in press). Vertical position of each circular symbol gives bulk density, while quadrants in each symbol denote agreement with four different compositional constraints on the surface of Lutetia: top-left = visible near infrared reflectance spectra (0.5–3.0 \( \mu \)m) (best studied constraint), top-right = mid–far infrared reflectance spectra (> 3 \( \mu \)m), bottom-left = visible polarimetry, and bottom-right = OC radar-albedo (second best studied constraint). IDPs = interplanetary dust particles.](image-url)
Shepard et al. (2010) imply grain densities ranging from 3167–5800 and 3833–6600 kg m\(^{-3}\), respectively. The total density range spanned by these two measurements is consistent with a porous regolith composed of carbonaceous (e.g., CO, CV, CK, CR, CH, CB), ordinary, and enstatite chondrites, as well as basaltic, primitive, and stony iron achondrites, but inconsistent with an iron meteorite and CM and CI carbonaceous chondrite composition (Consolmagno et al., 2008). In summary, Lutetia’s surface is unambiguously not a pure composition of known ordinary chondritic, basaltic achondritic, or iron meteoritic materials. Rather, current constraints favor a primitive surface similar to that of CV, CO, and CK carbonaceous chondrites, although an enstatite chondrite composition cannot be ruled out (Fig. 1). As we will see below, our conclusions about the nature of Lutetia’s interior are robust for either CV/CO/CK carbonaceous or enstatite chondrite surface compositions, both of which indicate a primordial, unmelted chondritic crust.

3. Constraints on interior of Lutetia

There are no unambiguous exposures of bedrock or variegated interior compositional units visible in OSIRIS images (Sierks et al., in press) and VIRTIS spectral maps (Coradini et al., in press). The nature of Lutetia’s interior must therefore be constrained indirectly using gravity, shape, and magnetic data. The Rosetta OSIRIS and RSI experiments have now determined that Lutetia has a bulk density of 3400 ± 300 kg m\(^{-3}\) (Pätzold et al., in press; Sierks et al., in press). This is among the largest densities known for any asteroid and within error of that of the differentiated asteroid 4 Vesta (Kuzmanoski et al., 2010) and the X-type asteroid 22 Calliope (Decamps et al., 2008).

The two Rosetta magnetometers RPCMAG and ROMAP found that the magnetic field of Lutetia was less than 1 nT at the closest approach distance of ~3170 km (Richter et al., in press). Following Baumgartel et al. (2007) and Simon et al. (2006), this indicates that the net dipole moment of the asteroid must be <10\(^{12}\) Am\(^2\) (Richter et al., in press). If we assume a uniform magnetization throughout the asteroid, this would indicate a maximum magnetization of 6 × 10\(^{-7}\) Am\(^2\) kg\(^{-1}\). However, if the fine-scale magnetization of Lutetia is not unidirectional, as expected for the product of an internally generated field (Runcorn, 1975), its intensity could be orders of magnitude stronger than this value. Given that the natural remanent magnetizations of small body stony, stony iron, and iron meteorites range between ~10\(^{-1}\) and 10\(^{-6}\) Am\(^2\) kg\(^{-1}\) (Auster et al., 2010), it is not possible to establish from these data whether Lutetia has substantial fine-scale remanent magnetization that expected from an internal core dynamo (Weiss et al., 2008) or externally generated fields in the early solar system (Weiss et al., 2010).

Lutetia’s bulk density can be compared to the densities of meteorite groups to constrain its bulk composition under the assumption that the known meteorite suite is broadly representative of asteroid compositions. Its bulk density equals or exceeds both the bulk densities and the grain densities of all known meteorite groups with the exception of iron and stony iron meteorites and the rare CB carbonaceous chondrite group (Fig. 1). A pure composition of any of the latter three lithologies is in any case inconsistent with Lutetia’s visible-near infrared spectral properties (Caffey, 1976; Hiroi et al., 1993; Osawa et al., 2005) (Fig. 1). [Note that although it is more conservative to compare Lutetia’s bulk density to meteorite grain densities rather than meteorite bulk densities, such an approach is in fact overly restrictive because the overburden pressure in Lutetia should reach only 4 MPa even in the center of the asteroid—see equation (7) in Asphaug et al. (2002)—which is below the brittle compressive strength of essentially all measured meteorites except for some CI and CM chondrites and the most friable meteorites (Svetsov et al., 1995; Tsuchiyama et al., 1998; Petrovic, 2001). Therefore, meteorite bulk densities would not be significantly reduced by overburden pressures in Lutetia relative to laboratory measurements.] Given the uncertainty range for Lutetia’s bulk density, if the asteroid has more than ~13% macroporosity (presumably from large scale fracturing or brecciation), then the bulk densities of its constituent materials would exceed the mean bulk densities of all known chondrite, basaltic, and primitive achondrite meteorite groups excluding CB chondrites. In fact, there is indirect evidence that Lutetia has substantial macroporosity. Its thermal inertia of 10–30 \(\text{J} \text{K}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1/2}\) (Coradini et al., in press; Gulkis et al., submitted for publication; Sierks et al., in press) implies that at least its surface layer has dusty regolith-like porosities (>40%). The regolith imaged by OSIRIS has a thickness up to ~600 m around the crater in the Baetica region (Sierks et al., in press). Because this regolith layer is unlikely to be representative of most of Lutetia’s volume, other more indirect constraints are necessary to constrain the porosity of the interior. Firstly, the observed crater size frequency distribution suggests that a ~3 km thick fractured surface layer overlies more competent rock in the Achaia region (Sierks et al., in press). Secondly, estimates of local slopes on Lutetia (angle between surface normal and net acceleration vector from gravity and rotation) derived from OSIRIS images (Sierks et al., in press) find that only 5% of the surface is steeper than 33° (approximately the maximum angle of repose of sand) and only 0.1–1% of the surface is steeper than 40–50° (the angle of repose for talus and poorly sorted angular fragments) (Fig. 2). This compares with values of ~3–4% and 2%, respectively for Eros (Asphaug et al., 2002). Like Eros, Lutetia’s low slopes are consistent with a body whose outer layer is mostly strengthless at large scales. More importantly, scaling laws indicate that the minimum diameters of hypervelocity impactors that would catastrophically destroy and shatter Lutetia are ~22 km and ~1.6–3.8 km, respectively [see Holsapple (2009) and Table 1]. Using scaling laws for hard rock and assuming an impact in the strength regime, the bolide which formed the largest crater visible in OSIRIS images of Lutetia [which has a diameter of ~55 km (Sierks et al., in press)] would have a diameter of ~7.2–11.2 km [see Holsapple and Housen Fig. 2. Histogram of slopes (angle between surface normal and local gravitational acceleration vector) on Lutetia. Shown is the percentage of the surface with slope values within a given bin. The slopes were calculated using the OSIRIS-determined shape model and assuming an uniform density equal to that of the bulk asteroid. Shown for comparison are typical angles of repose for sand and poorly sorted, angular fragments (talus).]
rubble pile \[e.g., \text{Housen (2009)}\], consistent with our estimation "brick pile" structure and possibly even be a shattered, reaccreted indicate that Lutetia should have at least a thoroughly fractured assume a pure silicate rock interior. Therefore, these calculations would represent lower limits on the impactor size because they (2007) and Table 1]. If Lutetia has a metallic interior, then these would represent lower limits on the impactor size because they assume a pure silicate rock interior. Therefore, these calculations indicate that Lutetia should have at least a thoroughly fractured "brick pile" structure and possibly even be a shattered, reaccreted rubble pile \[e.g., \text{Housen (2009)}\], consistent with our estimation that the shattering lifetime for a body of Lutetia's size is likely less than the age of the solar system \(\text{Holsapple et al., 2002}\). This makes Lutetia similar to other asteroids previously visited by spacecraft, which also have abundant fractures and joints \(\text{Asphaug, 2009}\). These bodies were inferred to have macroporosities of \(~6–40\%\) \(\text{Consolmagno et al., 2008; Wilkison et al., 2008}\).
suggesting that Lutetia may have similarly substantial porosity. Furthermore, essentially all other asteroids of similar size to Lutetia (\(< \sim 10^{20}\) kg), with the possible exception of 20 Massalia, are thought to have macroporosities of \(> 5\% - 10\%\) and ranging up to \(\sim 80\%\) (Consolmagno et al., 2008).

A stringent upper limit on Lutetia’s macroporosity of \(\sim 52\%\) is provided by a model in which the entire asteroid below a very thin chondritic surface layer is made of pure iron. However, given that impact craters visible on Lutetia have excavated hundreds of meters to several kilometers deep into Lutetia, the lack of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planetaryesimal radius</td>
<td>50 km(^1)</td>
<td>(Sierks et al., in press)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe metal abundance(^2)</td>
<td>5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 vol%</td>
<td>(Scott and Krot, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (Fe metal) material density(^3)</td>
<td>7500 kg m(^{-3})</td>
<td>(Britt et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulate mantle silicate density(^4)</td>
<td>3300 kg m(^{-3})</td>
<td>(Consolmagno et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porous crust total porosity(^5)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>(Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Sahijpal et al., 2007; Yomogida and Matsui, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sintered crust total porosity(^5)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>(Consolmagno et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of unmelted crust(^6,7)</td>
<td>2-50 km</td>
<td>(Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional macroporosity</td>
<td>10, 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) This is likely a lower limit on Lutetia's post-accretional radius since the body has probably been subsequently reduced in size due to impacts.

\(^2\) Chondrites other than CB, CR, and CH chondrites have metal abundances ranging from \(< 0.01\) to 15 vol%.

\(^3\) Typical for iron meteorites.

\(^4\) Typical for basaltic achondrites.

\(^5\) Typical for chondrites other than CM and CI carbonaceous chondrites, all of which have been heated to at least 200 °C (Cody et al., 2008; Huss et al., 2006).

\(^6\) This can range widely depending on the time at which accretion initiates and its duration.

\(^7\) The crustal density is calculated as \(7500 \times (1 - \text{porosity}) \times (\text{metal volume fraction}) = 3300 \times (1 - \text{metal volume fraction})\) where 7500 and 3300 are the assumed densities of the metal and silicate fractions, respectively, in kg m\(^{-3}\). This relation assumes that the metal and silicate portions of the crustal material are equally porous (probably not strictly correct but producing an insignificant error).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetesimal radius</td>
<td>50 km(^1)</td>
<td>(Sierks et al., in press)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe metal abundance(^2)</td>
<td>5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 vol%</td>
<td>(Scott and Krot, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (Fe metal) material density(^3)</td>
<td>7500 kg m(^{-3})</td>
<td>(Britt et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulate mantle silicate density(^4)</td>
<td>3300 kg m(^{-3})</td>
<td>(Consolmagno et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porous crust total porosity(^5)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>(Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Sahijpal et al., 2007; Yomogida and Matsui, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sintered crust total porosity(^5)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>(Consolmagno et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of unmelted crust(^6,7)</td>
<td>2-50 km</td>
<td>(Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional macroporosity</td>
<td>10, 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For references on meteorite bulk densities see Table 1. For constraints on the density of Lutetia’s surface from radar, see discussion in text, Magri et al. (1997) and Shepard et al. (2010).
exposures of differentiated rocks suggests that the chondritic crust is likely at least several kilometers thick. For such a body with an enstatite or non-CB/CH carbonaceous chondrite-like bulk metal content, a more realistic upper limit on the macroporosity is \( \sim 25\% \) (see Section 4.2).

4. Implications for interior structure and evolution of Lutetia

Lutetia’s high bulk density and chondritic surface composition have major implications for the thermal evolution of the asteroid. A critical constraint is that Lutetia’s large scale radial structure could have remained mostly intact since it formed. This is indicated by the \( 3.6 \pm 0.1 \) Ga crater retention age for Lutetia’s Achaia region (Sierks et al., in press, Marchi et al., submitted for publication) and the fact that the collisional lifetime of Lutetia is well in excess of the age of the solar system [following Bottke et al. (2005) and Marchi et al. (2006)]. Furthermore, given that Lutetia’s macroporosity is likely \( < 25\% \) (see Sections 3 and 4.2), it is unlikely to have a rubble pile structure. Therefore, although Lutetia’s nonspherical shape may be the product of several major collisions, the asteroid mostly may have preserved its original large-scale structure. Using this conclusion, we next argue that the data collectively provide strong evidence for at least thermal metamorphism (Section 4.1) and possibly even large-scale melting in the interior (Section 4.2).

4.1. Evidence for thermal metamorphism

The constituents of chondrites are generally thought to have accreted as relatively fine, dusty aggregates that progressively grew to form high porosity (\( > 30\% \)) planetesimals (Bland et al., 2011; Ghosh et al., 2006; Hevey and Sanders, 2006; McSween et al., 2002; Sahijpal et al., 2007; Weidenschilling and Cuzzi, 2006). These porosities are greater than the mean porosities measured for chondrite groups, which range from \( 7\% \) to \( 25\% \) (Consolmagno et al., 2008). Sintering from post-accretionary thermal metamorphism to \( > 200–300 \) °C ( Cody et al., 2008; Huss et al., 2006; Yomogida and Takaful, 1983; Yomogida and Matsui, 1984) is thought to have been one of the dominant processes in ultimately reducing the microporosity of meteorite parent bodies to the low levels presently observed in chondrite groups. Only CI and CM chondrites, which have experienced the lowest levels of thermal metamorphism (\( < 150 \) °C ( Cody et al., 2008), have bulk porosities approaching the levels expected in primordial planetesimals.

As discussed in Section 3, compaction due to overburden pressures on Lutetia is unlikely to influence its macroporosity (given that proto-Lutetia should not have been much more massive than present-day Lutetia). On the other hand, early impacts, which should have locally produced pressures exceeding the compressive strengths of many ordinary and carbonaceous chondrites (Weidenschilling and Cuzzi, 2006), would also have inevitably compacted an early, porous asteroid via fracturing and possibly also some melting [see also Consolmagno and Britt (2004) and Sugita and Strangway (1983)]. Although it is difficult to quantify the effects of impacts, they seem to be most efficient at compacting meteoritic materials with porosities \( > 30\% \) (Housen and Holtsapple, 2003), suggesting that this is reasonably a lower limit on Lutetia’s porosity prior to any thermal metamorphism and aqueous alteration.

Despite the ubiquitous effects of the sintering process on chondrite groups, nearly all asteroids with chondrite-like surfaces [with the possible exception of 20 Massalia ( Britt et al., 2002) and 22 Calliope ( Decamps et al., 2008)] are thought to have much higher total porosities than their meteorite analogs. This is almost certainly because meteoroid impacts have produced substantial post-accretionary macroporosity in these bodies in the form of fracturing and/or brecciation. Therefore, it has been difficult to positively identify the effects of thermal metamorphism and

---

**Fig. 3.** Predicted bulk density for a 50 km radius spherical planetesimal as a function of the amount of melting and differentiation. The body is assumed to have an unmelted crust that has a total porosity of either 50% (A) or 7% (B) (representative of sintered and unsintered chondritic material, respectively) overlying a doubly layered differentiated interior (silicate mantle and iron metal core) with zero macroporosity. The crustal density is calculated as \( 7500 \times (1 - \text{porosity}) \times (1 - \text{metal volume fraction}) + 3300 \times (1 - \text{metal density}) \) kg m\(^{-3}\), where 7500 and 3300 are the assumed densities of the metal and silicate fractions, respectively, in kg m\(^{-3}\). This relation assumes that the metal and silicate portions of the crustal material are equally porous (probably not strictly correct but producing an insignificant error). Each curve represents a particular assumed unmelted crust thickness (specified below the curve), with individual points corresponding to a particular iron metal abundance (ranging from 5–50 vol%). Also shown in (B) is the predicted bulk density assuming macroporosity of 10% and 20% (additional to the crustal porosity described above) distributed uniformly throughout the entire volumes of bodies with sintered crusts and 15% vol% metal (squares). No pressure effects on density are included in these calculations due to the low pressures expected in Lutetia. Also, explicit variations in iron sulfide and iron oxide abundances are not considered for simplicity. The full list of parameters used for these calculations are listed in Table 3.
other compaction processes using the measured densities of extant asteroids. It has also been difficult to use spectral observations for this purpose because the various chondrite petrologic types have generally similar absorption spectra ([Gaffey et al., 1993b]). For example, spectral variations among C, G, B, and F-type asteroids have been attributed to metamorphic heating ([Hiroi et al., 1996]), but the presence of absorption features from hydrated minerals complicates this interpretation (Vilas and Sykes, 1996).

Lutetia’s high bulk density provides clear evidence for the effects of early compaction processes. The asteroid’s density equals or exceeds the mean bulk densities of all known sintered chondrite groups (e.g., enstatite, ordinary, and carbonaceous chondrites other than CB chondrites) and far exceeds that of weakly heated chondrites (C1 and CM2 groups). This makes it the first well-characterized asteroid to directly reflect the early metamorphic, sintering, impact and other compaction processes, which have until now been mainly inferred from meteorites.

4.2. Possible evidence for a differentiated interior

Even if Lutetia has 0% macroporosity, its density would exceed the mean densities of all known non-CB, ~CH, and ~CR carbonaceous chondrite groups. Therefore, if Lutetia initially was composed completely of undifferentiated non-CB, ~CH, and ~CR carbonaceous chondritic materials, its interior would likely need to have melted and formed a metallic core as described in more detail below. By comparison, if Lutetia were initially completely composed of enstatite chondrite materials, interior differentiation would only be indicated for >13% macroporosity. Given the qualitative evidence presented in Section 3 that Lutetia’s macroporosity likely exceeds 13%, Lutetia’s bulk density implies that if it initially had a non-CB, ~CH, and ~CR carbonaceous chondrite bulk composition, its interior is certainly differentiated, while if it had initially an enstatite chondrite bulk composition, indicate interior differentiation is likely but not required.

Although melting alone mostly redistributes elements throughout the body without leading to substantial bulk density changes, differentiation leading to the formation of a metallic core could have increased the bulk density of Lutetia relative to that of the sintered, unmelted state through at least two effects. Firstly, measurements of meteorites indicate that melting usually leads to a further reduction of porosity: iron and stony iron meteorites have near-zero bulk porosity, basaltic achondrite groups have ~3–14% mean porosities, while as discussed in Section 4.1, sintered chondrite groups have mean porosities ranging from ~7–25% ([Consolmagno et al., 2008]). To quantify the implications of this for the bulk density of Lutetia, we estimated the bulk density of a Lutetia-sized spherical asteroid subject to post-accretionary heating (from the decay of short-lived nuclides such as 26Al). Such bodies melt from the inside outward ([Hevey and Sanders, 2006; Sahijpal et al., 2007]) and therefore may retain an unmelted chondritic crust of variable thickness ([Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011] (Figs. 3, 4A). If the body accretes instantaneously before ~0.8–1.5 Ma after the formation of CAIs, internal temperatures would reach the solidus of the constituent silicates (~1200 °C). Under these conditions, we assume a central metallic core could form quickly beneath the silicate magma ocean in a body of Lutetia’s size [see Sahijpal et al. (2007)]. For instantaneous accretion, only a thin (~<1 km thick) unmelted but mostly sintered chondritic crust may be retained ([Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011]), but if the body continuously accreted beginning before ~1.5 Ma after the formation of CAIs and extending over several Ma, it could build up a substantial (potentially many km thick) unmelted crust.

We estimated the bulk density of these bodies using measurements of meteorites representing the expected lithology for the core, melted silicate mantle and primordial chondritic crust (iron meteorite, basaltic achondrites, and a wide variety of chondrite groups, respectively). We find that if Lutetia has a bulk metal abundance like that of nearly all known chondrites (~<15 vol% mean value for all groups except for the rare CB and CH chondrites [Scott and Krot, 2005]), a sintered but unmelted crust with densities similar to chondrites of petrologic type ≥3, and nominal 20% macroporosity throughout, more than ~80% of the body’s radius would be required to have melted in order to explain Lutetia’s high density (Fig. 3B). Given that the lack of bedrock of exposures of differentiated interior rocks indicates a minimum several km thickness for the chondritic crust, a body with a sintered crust and the latter metal abundance could have a maximum macroporosity of ~25% (Fig. 3B). Even a larger fraction of a body with a porous, unsintered crust and the same metal abundance would have to be melted (Fig. 3A). Alternatively, if we consider a metal abundance at the upper end of the range of non-CB and ~CH carbonaceous chondrite groups (~5 vol%), then even a body with a sintered crust and macroporosity of just ~9% would also require melting out to 80% of the body radius (Fig. 3B).
The second way the bulk density could be increased relative to the unmelted state is by the removal of the relatively low density silicate crust by hypervelocity impacts below the catastrophic disruption threshold (Holsapple, 2009). Because the present radius of Lutetia is fixed, this would roughly the present radius of Lutetia to become a body with larger radius than that presently observed, which was subsequently reduced to the present radius through removal (thinning) of its chondritic crust (Fig. 4B). Assuming this material is removed uniformly around the body without excavation of the differentiated interior, this is equivalent to a body with fixed present radius but with a thinner unmelted crust (more interior melting) (i.e., moving to a new curve to the right in Fig. 3). This would reduce the fraction of the original body that must have melted to explain the density described above, but would not change the requirement that 80% of the present radius must be melted. An extreme end member of this scenario, motivated by hit-and-run models for the formation of the IVA iron meteorite parent body (Asphaug, 2010), is complete removal of much or all of the silicate exterior (including any chondritic crust and possibly some of the differentiated silicate mantle) followed by deposition of a veneer of chondritic material (which would be equivalent to both moving both to a new curve and to a higher metal abundance in Fig. 3) (Fig. 4C). It is also conceivable that a fully differentiated body could be covered by chondritic material from a foreign impactor (Fig. 4C). Notably, because thermal models indicate that the unmelted chondritic crust could range in thickness up to tens of km (Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011), the impact craters now visible on Lutetia need not have penetrated the crust into the melted interior.

5. Conclusions

Lutetia’s high density and surface composition indicate that it has much lower porosity than that inferred for primordial fluffy accretional aggregates. This provides evidence for the action of sintering by postulated planetary heat sources (e.g., short-lived radionuclides) and impact-induced compaction. These asteroidal compaction processes have until now been inferred from the varied petrologic types (3–7) of chondrite groups (Huss et al., 2006) rather than from direct observations asteroids.

If Lutetia even has > ~13% macroporosity, a value modest for asteroids of Lutetia’s size and consistent with indications that it is thoroughly fractured, then it likely has a melted interior including a metallic core or at least large, metal-rich regions. Such a partially differentiated structure is predicted to be a natural outgrowth of prolonged accretion beginning before 1.5 Ma and extending for several Ma (Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Sahijpal and Gupta, 2011). This structure might also result from a scenario in which chondrules formed via the collisions of molten planetesimals and then accreted onto the surfaces of the colliding bodies (Asphaug et al., 2011) (a variant on scenario pictured in Fig. 4C). Previously, candidate partially melted asteroids have been tentatively identified based on spectral evidence, but density data for these objects do not suggest metallic core formation on these bodies [e.g., (Abell et al., 2007; McCoy et al., 2001)]. Partial differentiation and core formation on Lutetia would be consistent with the proposal that some chondrites and achondrites could have a common parent body origin, and also support recent arguments that the remnant magnetization observed in some metamorphosed carbonaceous chondrites could be the product of an internal core dynamo rather than the early nebula or sun (Carporzen et al., 2011; Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Weiss et al., 2010). It would further suggest that some asteroids whose surfaces are chondritic may in fact be partially differentiated, concealing an interior metallic core.
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