

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

10.1002/2015JE004878

## Key Points:

- Apollo basalt 12017 has a glass rind with an age <7 Ma old
- The 12017 glass has little or no stable natural remanent magnetization
- There is no robust paleomagnetic evidence for a lunar dynamo after ~3.56 Ga

## Supporting Information:

- Texts S1 to S2, Figures S1–S9, Tables S1–S5, and Data Set S1

## Correspondence to:

J. Buz,  
jbuz@gps.caltech.edu

## Citation:

Buz, J., B. P. Weiss, S. M. Tikoo, D. L. Shuster, J. Gattacceca, and T. L. Grove (2015), Magnetism of a very young lunar glass, *J. Geophys. Res. Planets*, 120, 1720–1735, doi:10.1002/2015JE004878.

Received 19 JUN 2015

Accepted 1 OCT 2015

Accepted article online 5 OCT 2015

Published online 30 OCT 2015

## Magnetism of a very young lunar glass


Jennifer Buz<sup>1,2</sup>, Benjamin P. Weiss<sup>1,3</sup>, Sonia M. Tikoo<sup>3,4</sup>, David L. Shuster<sup>3,4</sup>, Jérôme Gattacceca<sup>5</sup>, and Timothy L. Grove<sup>1</sup>
<sup>1</sup>Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, <sup>2</sup>Now at Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA, <sup>3</sup>Department of Earth and Planetary Science, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA, <sup>4</sup>Berkeley Geochronology Center, Berkeley, California, USA, <sup>5</sup>CNRS, Aix-Marseille Université, CEREGE UM 34, Aix-en-Provence, France

**Abstract** Recent paleomagnetic studies of Apollo samples have established that a core dynamo existed on the Moon from at least 4.2 to 3.56 billion years (Ga). Because there is no lunar dynamo today, a longstanding mystery has been the origin of magnetization in very young lunar samples (<~200 million years old (Ma)). Possible sources of this magnetization include transient fields generated by meteoroid impacts, remanent fields from nearby rocks magnetized during an earlier dynamo epoch, a weak late dynamo, and spontaneous remanence formed in a near-zero field. To further understand the source of the magnetization in young lunar samples, we conducted paleomagnetic, petrographic, and <sup>40</sup>Ar/<sup>39</sup>Ar geochronometry analyses on a young impact melt glass rind from the exterior of ~3.35 Ga mare basalt 12017. Cosmic ray track densities and our <sup>40</sup>Ar/<sup>39</sup>Ar and cosmogenic <sup>38</sup>Ar analyses constrain the glass formation age to be <7 Ma and most likely <20 thousand years (kyr), making it likely the youngest extraterrestrial sample yet studied with paleomagnetic methods. Despite its relatively high fidelity magnetic recording properties compared to most lunar rocks, we find that the glass carries no stable primary natural remanent magnetization and that it formed in a field <~7 μT (with a 2σ upper limit of <11 μT). Given the poor magnetic recording properties of the majority of lunar samples, this provides further evidence that many or perhaps even all previous paleointensity estimates for ≤1.5 Ga rocks are upper limits on the true paleofield and therefore require neither a protracted strong (>10 μT) core dynamo field nor impact-generated fields.

## 1. Introduction

Recent paleomagnetic studies of Apollo samples have demonstrated that the Moon had a core dynamo magnetic field of intensity ~20–110 μT between at least 4.25 and 3.56 billion years (Ga) [Cournède *et al.*, 2012; Garrick-Bethell *et al.*, 2009; Shea *et al.*, 2012; Suavet *et al.*, 2013; Weiss and Tikoo, 2014]. The dynamo field apparently declined precipitously to <4 μT by 3.19 Ga [Tikoo *et al.*, 2014]; it is currently unclear whether this inferred drop in paleointensity reflects a permanent decline (or cessation) of the lunar dynamo or a transient decrease in field intensity (i.e., resulting from magnetic field reversals or start-stop dynamo generation [Scheinberg *et al.*, 2015]). The low-fidelity magnetic recording properties [Lawrence *et al.*, 2008; Tikoo *et al.*, 2012] and poorly constrained thermal and deformational histories of the majority of young (<3.56 Ga) lunar rocks have thus far hindered paleomagnetic efforts to determine when the dynamo actually ceased [Weiss and Tikoo, 2014]. Most lunar thermal evolution models predict that a core dynamo powered solely by thermal convection could only persist to sometime between ~2.5 and 4.1 Ga [Evans *et al.*, 2014; Laneuville *et al.*, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2013] with the precise time depending sensitively on the critical heat flux for core convection and the amount of water in the lunar interior. A mechanical lunar dynamo driven by impact-induced rotational changes of the mantle could only generate fields until the end of the basin-forming impacts (~3.7 Ga) [Le Bars *et al.*, 2011]. On the other hand, a mechanical dynamo generated by mantle precession might last until as late as ~3.55–0.6 Ga depending on the poorly constrained lunar orbital evolution [Dwyer *et al.*, 2011; Tian *et al.*, 2014; Tikoo *et al.*, 2014]. Thus far, only lunar evolution models that consider thermochemical convection powered by core crystallization have found that the dynamo might persist beyond 0.6 Ga in either a continuous or start-stop regime [Laneuville *et al.*, 2014; Scheinberg *et al.*, 2015].

A key impediment to distinguishing between these hypothesized dynamo mechanisms is that there are presently no published modern paleointensity studies of lunar rocks with well-defined ages younger than 3.19 Ga. Nevertheless, an intriguing observation made by Apollo era (i.e., 1969 to early 1980s) lunar paleomagnetic studies is that rocks as young as ~2–200 million years old (Ma) appear to carry substantial remanent



**Figure 1.** Transmitted plane-polarized light photomicrograph of a 30  $\mu\text{m}$  thin section of Apollo sample 12017 (subsample, 63). The thin section transects the boundary from the basalt at the upper right to the vesicular glass rind at the lower left (boundary shown by red dashed line). We measured the pyroxene density and plagioclase [010] crystal widths (middle inset) to determine the cooling rate of the basalt (Figure S5). The augite rims (thick pink band surrounding darker core in right inset) surrounding the pigeonite are distinctive of the pigeonite basalt suite of lunar samples. The schlieren, apparent as dark bands in the glass (left inset), indicates an impact melt origin for the glass rind.

magnetization [see *Wieczorek et al.*, 2006, Figure 3.22]. If it is assumed that this magnetization is thermoremanent in origin, paleointensity estimates suggest that these rocks were magnetized in fields of  $\sim 1\text{--}20\ \mu\text{T}$  [*Cisowski et al.*, 1983, 1976, 1977; *Dunn and Fuller*, 1972; *Gose et al.*, 1973; *Sugiura and Strangway*, 1980; *Sugiura et al.*, 1979]. However, there are many uncertainties associated with these young Apollo era measurements. Most importantly, because all of the previously analyzed samples are petrologically heterogeneous, impact-modified lithologies [*Fuller and Cisowski*, 1987], the origin and ages of their magnetization and the associated paleointensities of their magnetizing fields are extremely uncertain, even by the standards of lunar paleomagnetism. Alternatively, if we consider the Apollo era paleointensities to be accurate, a challenge arises in identifying the origin of the magnetizing fields.

Although core crystallization could account for a global dynamo field after  $\sim 0.6\ \text{Ga}$ , it would be surprising if the dynamo persisted until just a few million years ago because this would appear to suggest that we are presently in a special observation window just after the dynamo vanished. There are at least three possible alternatives for how this young magnetization could have arisen. The first scenario is that the rocks were magnetized by fields transiently generated by recent meteoroid impacts. In particular, plasmas generated by the small-scale impacts expected after 3.7 Ga have been theoretically proposed to be capable of producing fields possibly reaching several milliteslas and lasting for  $\sim 1\ \text{s}$  or less [*Crawford and Schultz*, 1999; *Schultz and Spudis*, 1983; *Srnka et al.*, 1979; *Tikoo et al.*, 2014]. Such a transient field could be recorded as a thermoremanent magnetization (TRM) by a sample cooling more rapidly than this timescale or as a shock remanent magnetization (SRM) by a sample subjected to high pressures [*Gattacceca et al.*, 2010]. However, evidence for impact-generated fields has yet to be identified even in terrestrial impact craters [*Carporen and Gilder*, 2006; *Carporen et al.*, 2012; *Louzada et al.*, 2008; *Weiss et al.*, 2010] and the physical processes by which they might be generated are highly uncertain. A second alternative is that young lunar rocks were magnetized by remanent crustal fields emanating from nearby magnetized rocks. However, the measured crustal fields at the Apollo sites appear to be too weak (ranging from  $\sim 330$  to  $<6\ \text{nT}$ ) to account for the reported paleointensities [*Dyal et al.*, 1974]. Finally, given that the majority of young samples were analyzed using alternating field (AF) demagnetization, the inferred magnetizations may simply be artifacts due to acquisition of spurious laboratory anhysteretic remanent magnetization (ARM) or gyroremanent magnetization (GRM) during the demagnetization experiments [*Tikoo et al.*, 2012]. Related to this, it is also possible that the apparent natural remanent magnetization (NRM) in rocks containing a small number of large metal grains

is actually spontaneous remanence formed in a near-zero field. In the latter two cases, the inferred paleointensities would simply be upper limits and therefore would provide no evidence at all for a paleofield.

To resolve these ambiguities, we conducted paleomagnetic, petrographic, and  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  chronometry analyses on a very young lunar impact glass from Apollo 12 sample 12017. We selected this sample because it is both petrographically simple compared with many other impactites (which are commonly multigeneration breccias) and is, within measurement uncertainties, the youngest lunar sample yet analyzed with paleomagnetic studies. Its extremely young age makes it very unlikely to have recorded a lunar dynamo, making it an ideal sample for distinguishing between the impact fields, crustal remanence, and zero-field magnetization hypotheses.

An overview of the NRM demagnetization data for this sample was presented in a previous study on the magnetic fidelity of lunar samples [Tikoo *et al.*, 2012]. The present work greatly expands the analysis of the demagnetization data, provides new petrologic data, and reports the first robust age and thermal history constraints on both the basalt and glass portions of the sample using  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  thermochronometry, cosmic ray and surface exposure ages. Additionally, we provide a complete interpretation of the glass NRM components and develop a quantitative numerical model for the remanent field of the underlying basalt. This allows us to understand in detail the possible origin of any magnetization in the glass.

## 2. Sample Description


### 2.1. Sampling, Petrography, and Age

The focus of this study is a ~0.05–5 mm thick glassy rind overlying one of the exterior faces of the ~3.3 Ga quartz-normative, porphyritic, pigeonite basalt 12017 (Figures 1 and S3 in the supporting information) [Horn *et al.*, 1975; Horz and Hartung, 1971; Warner, 1970]. Sample 12017 was collected during the Apollo 12 mission, which landed in Oceanus Procellarum. Although not identified in photographs from the lunar surface, 12017 is thought to have been retrieved from a small glass-coated mound (Figure S4) because it is the only sample with a glassy exterior mentioned in the Apollo 12 astronaut transcripts.

The glass rind on 12017 consists of a homogeneous shiny black layer containing 0.1 to 3 mm diameter vesicles overlain by a minor quantity of second-generation darker glassy ellipsoids <1 mm to 2 mm in diameter [Horz and Hartung, 1971; Warner, 1970]. The glass contains some entrained crystals associated with schlieren, indicating that it is an impact melt (see Figure 1). No shock features such as microfracturing of plagioclase or the development of multiple twin lamellae in clinopyroxene are present in the interior of the basalt portion of 12017, indicating that it experienced maximum shock pressures of <5 GPa [Sclar, 1971]. Likewise, the lack of fracturing in the glass demonstrates that it too has been essentially unshocked since its formation. These textural observations, along with elemental compositional differences between the glass and basalt, indicate that the glass was splashed onto the basalt from a nearby impact rather than being formed by in situ shock melting of the underlying basalt [Morgan *et al.*, 1971]. This glass may have formed during the small impact that created the mound on which 12017 was discovered [Warner, 1970].

The glass apparently formed very recently. The bottom and top surfaces of the basalt have surface exposure (e.g., cosmic ray track) ages of 1.0 and 0.7 million years (Ma), respectively [Fleischer *et al.*, 1971]. These ages suggest that the basalt was likely flipped over into its present configuration at 0.7 Ma. The density of micrometeorite craters on the exterior surface of the glass, which overlies the top surface of the basalt, indicates a surface exposure age between 4 and 20 thousand years (kyr) [Morrison *et al.*, 1972], consistent with a 9 kyr surface exposure age inferred from cosmic ray track densities in the glass [Fleischer *et al.*, 1971]. This age is also consistent with our measured  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  cosmic ray exposure age for the glass of  $0.017 \pm 0.023$  Ma (see section 4).

The 4–20 kyr surface ages should set a minimum age for the formation of the glass. In fact, we propose that they likely represent the formation age itself. This is because the glass, being splatter from a nearby impact, must have been emplaced while the rock was on the surface. If the exposure age is not an igneous formation age and instead reflects relic exposure from an earlier period of surface residence, then the glass would be required to have been exposed at the surface for at least two separate episodes lasting for a cumulative time of 4–20 kyr and buried or at least flipped over and then exhumed again in between these episodes. This is highly unlikely because for >90% of the rocks with the size of 12017, such a turnover event only occurs every



**Figure 2.** Backscattered scanning electron microscope images of thin section 12017,63 showing habit and textures of metal grains (bright phases) and surrounding silicate minerals (darker phases). Numbers in each correspond to microprobe compositional measurements identified in Table S2.

few million years [Horz *et al.*, 1975], longer than the cumulative surface exposure time of the basalt. Therefore, it is likely that the rock was excavated to the surface for the first time at 1.7 Ma (as given by the sum of exposure ages of the bottom and top of the basalt), flipped over at 0.7 Ma, and then splashed with glass at 4–20 kyr ago [Fleischer *et al.*, 1971]. As shown later, this chronology is consistent with our measured  $<7$  Ma  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  age of the glass. The extraordinarily young age of the glass portion of the sample makes it a fascinating and unique target for investigating the source of magnetization formed during recent lunar history.

## 2.2. Ferromagnetic Mineralogy

We used rock magnetic and electron microscopy measurements to determine the identity and mean crystal size of the ferromagnetic minerals in the glass and basalt. Our backscattered electron microscopy and wavelength dispersive spectroscopy (Figure 2 and Table S2) indicate that the primary ferromagnetic minerals in the basalt portion of 12017 are  $\sim 3$ – $5$   $\mu\text{m}$  diameter kamacite ( $\alpha$ -Fe) grains associated with troilite and  $\sim 50$   $\mu\text{m}$  diameter isolated nearly pure Fe kamacite grains with composition  $\text{Fe}_{0.99-1}\text{Ni}_{0-0.01}$  [Tikoo *et al.*, 2012]. The glass rind contains  $\leq 1$   $\mu\text{m}$  diameter grains of nearly pure Fe kamacite and  $\sim 20$   $\mu\text{m}$  diameter grains of iron phosphide with inclusions of  $\leq 1$   $\mu\text{m}$  diameter iron sulfide [see Tikoo *et al.*, 2012, supplementary section 2.2]. Our hysteresis loops indicate that both lithologies are dominated by grains in the multidomain size range (see supporting information section 1.1 in Text S1) [Tikoo *et al.*, 2012].



### 2.3. Cooling Rate Determination and Implications for NRM

As discussed previously [Garrick-Bethell *et al.*, 2009; Shea *et al.*, 2012; Suavet *et al.*, 2013], important evidence constraining the origin of NRM in lunar rocks is provided by their cooling rates. In particular, for samples with an NRM, a cooling timescale from the 780°C kamacite Curie point to ambient surface temperatures exceeding 1 day indicates that the magnetizing field was stable and long lived like that expected from a core dynamo or crustal magnetization rather than putative transient meteoroid impact-generated plasma fields. To estimate the cooling rate of the basalt, we measured widths of the [010] face of plagioclase laths and the areal number density of pyroxene crystals following Grove and Walker [1977] (Figure S5). Our measurements indicate a cooling rate of  $\sim 0.35^\circ\text{C}/\text{h}$  at 1120°C, yielding a minimum cooling time of  $\sim 2.5$  months from the kamacite Curie point (780°C) to the maximum daily surface temperature on the Moon ( $\sim 120^\circ\text{C}$ ), assuming a constant cooling rate. There have been no cooling rate studies of the glass rind. However, given the rind thickness of  $l = 0.05\text{--}5\text{ mm}$  and a typical silicate rock thermal diffusivity of  $D \sim 10^{-6}\text{ m}^2\text{ s}^{-1}$ , we estimate the time for cooling from the kamacite Curie point after deposition on the cold basalt [see Carslaw and Jaeger, 1959],  $\tau \sim l^2/D \sim 0.03\text{--}30\text{ s}$  (i.e., longer than any likely impact generated field at this time).

## 3. NRM Behavior


### 3.1. Introduction and Methods

We studied the magnetization of mutually oriented subsamples from both the glass and basalt portions of 12017. All of our subsamples originated from the exterior surface of two large pieces (12017,3 and 12017,4) cut from the main mass of 12017 at NASA Johnson Space Center (JSC) with a wire saw in 1970 (Figures S3a and S3b). In particular, our individual subsamples were prepared from three parent composite basalt-glass JSC subsamples: 12017,12 and 12017,13 (both from slab 12017,4), and 12017,59 (from slab 12017,3) (Figure S3b). Samples 12A, 12B, 13A, and 13B were all separated in 1970 at JSC, while we produced additional subsamples using a wire saw and chipping at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)  $\sim 40$  years later.

The mutual orientations of our subsamples were reconstructed from sketches and photographs of initial sample processing at JSC in 1970 (Figure S3). To facilitate accurate sample orientation during subsampling at MIT, this study employs a new orientation system that is rotated counterclockwise by  $16^\circ$  along the east axis relative to that used in the original saw cut diagrams (Figure S3c). After the arrival of the samples at MIT, nearly all sample preparation and NRM measurements were performed in a class 10,000 clean, magnetically shielded room (ambient magnetic field strength  $\sim 200\text{ nT}$ ) in the MIT Paleomagnetism Laboratory. The magnetometer used in this study has a sensitivity of approximately  $\sim 10^{-12}\text{ Am}^2$  and blank holder measurements are typically  $\sim 1\text{--}8 \times 10^{-12}\text{ Am}^2$  before vector subtraction.

Tikoo *et al.* [2014] recently showed that Apollo era cutting using a circular saw at JSC sometimes significantly contaminated the remanent magnetization of lunar samples with a weak NRM by leaving a residue of metal and/or heating the surface while in Earth's magnetic field. Although sample processing of 12017 used a wire saw and not a circular saw, we sought to mitigate any potential metal surface contamination by sanding the JSC saw cut faces of the four samples drawn from parent samples 12 and 13 (labeled 12A, 12B, 13A, and 13B) using silica carbide sandpaper in a magnetically shielded room. Parent sample 59 was not sanded because of its fragility. We measured the NRM of the four samples repeatedly throughout the course of sanding. As a control, we also sanded acid-washed, weakly magnetized, 2.5 cm diameter round Ge 124 quartz disks and found that the sanding process did not introduce any magnetization onto the disks ( $< 5 \times 10^{-12}\text{ Am}^2$  per disk).

Following sanding, we further subdivided parent samples 12A, 13A, and 13B to obtain 10 final subsamples for the demagnetization experiments, each individually composed of either pure basalt or pure glassy rind (Figure S3c and Table S3). Seven of these subsamples were selected for in-depth study and demagnetization analyses. All seven subsamples were subjected to static three-axis alternating field (AF) demagnetization up to at least 85 mT, with some subsamples further demagnetized to 290 mT. For each AF level, we first applied an AF in the three orthogonal directions to demagnetize the sample. Then AFs at the same field level were again applied along each axis individually, with the NRM measured after the AF application along each axis. This process was repeated between 2 and 4 times. The final magnetic moment for each AF step was




**Figure 3.** The effect of sanding on the NRM of 12017. Shown is a two-dimensional projection of the NRM vectors of basalt subsamples 12A and 13B and glass samples 12B and 13A during progressive sanding stages. Solid symbols represent the end points of the magnetization vector projected onto the horizontal north-east (N-E) planes, and open symbols represent projections onto the vertical up-east (U-E) planes. Points labeled “NRM” represent the magnetization prior to sanding, while subsequent points show the evolution of the magnetization during progressive sanding steps.

calculated as an average of the moments measured after each single-axis demagnetization following the Zijdeveld-Dunlop protocol, which mitigates the effects of spurious GRM and ARM acquisition [Stephenson, 1993]. All paleomagnetic measurements were acquired using a 2G Enterprises Superconducting Rock Magnetometer with automated sample handling and demagnetization equipment [Kirschvink *et al.*, 2008] in the MIT Paleomagnetism Laboratory.

We used principal component analysis (PCA) to determine the best fit directions of any observed magnetization components [Kirschvink, 1980]. We then compared the deviation angle (DANG) and maximum angular deviation (MAD) values [Tauxe and Staudigel, 2004] to qualitatively assess whether each component trended toward the origin. In this test, the angle between the component direction and a line connecting the origin to the centroid of the data (DANG) is compared with the MAD of the component. If the MAD is greater than the DANG, the component appears to be origin trending.

### 3.2. Previous Work on 12017

Prior to the analyses by Tikoo *et al.* [2012], the only previous AF demagnetization study of 12017 was conducted by Strangway *et al.* [1971], who analyzed two mutually oriented 12017 basalt subsamples. The latter study tentatively identified two NRM components: a low-coercivity (LC) magnetization blocked up to a peak AF field of 5 mT and a higher-coercivity (HC) magnetization blocked from 5 to 20 mT, respectively. After AF demagnetization to 20 mT, the magnetization directions of the two subsamples were roughly similar in orientation ( $\sim 30^\circ$  apart).




**Figure 4.** AF demagnetization over the coercivity range of the LC component for selected 12017 samples. The magnetization step labeled “postsanding” was measured after sanding but prior to further subdivision and scaled in intensity to the mass of the subsample relative to its parent sample, while the “0 mT” step was measured following subdivision but prior to beginning AF demagnetization. (a, b) Two-dimensional projection of the endpoints of the magnetization vectors during AF demagnetization. Solid symbols represent projection onto the horizontal N-E planes, and open symbols represent projections onto the vertical U-E planes. Peak fields for selected AF steps are labeled in milliteslas. The LC component is labeled with grey arrows. (c) Equal area stereographic projection of LC components obtained from PCA fits and their associated MAD ellipses. Open symbols and dashed lines represent the upper hemisphere, and solid symbols and solid lines represent the lower hemisphere. LC demagnetization data for all other subsamples are shown in Figure S6.

### 3.3. Sanding

The total mass lost from each 12017 sample during sanding at MIT ranged between 1 and 9% of the original sample mass (Table S4). Despite removing such small amounts of material, sanding resulted in dramatic changes in the magnetic moments of some samples (Figure 3): the moment intensities changed between 13% and 60% and the moment directions experienced large angular changes. The magnetization changes were nonlinear and noisy (PCA fits to the demagnetization trends had MAD values up to 27°). The magnetization directions of the subsamples were collectively scattered both before and after sanding.

### 3.4. LC Magnetization

As previously mentioned, some samples were further subdivided following sanding. The magnetization directions of each of the subdivided samples sometimes were substantially different from the measurements of their predivided parent samples, indicating that the parent samples were nonunidirectionally magnetized (Figure 4). AF demagnetization of all sanded subsamples revealed a LC component blocked up to ~10 mT (Figures 4a, 4b, and S6). The LC magnetization was largely unidirectional across subsamples from parent JSC block 12017,4 (i.e., all subsamples except for 59) (Figure 4c). Glass sample 59A displayed two apparent LC magnetization components that we label LC1 and LC2, with the latter oriented like the LC components




**Figure 5.** Demagnetization of 12017 over the HC coercivity range. (a, b) Two-dimensional projection of the NRM vectors during AF demagnetization. Solid symbols represent the end points of the magnetization vector projected onto the horizontal N-E planes, and open symbols represent projection onto the vertical U-E planes. Selected AF field steps are labeled in milliteslas. HC demagnetization data for all other subsamples are shown in Figure S8. (c) Equal area stereographic projection of PCA fits to the MC and HC magnetization. Symbols represent fit directions, and surrounding ellipses represent associated MAD values. Open symbols and dashed lines represent the upper hemisphere, and solid symbols and solid lines represent the lower hemisphere.

of the other samples (Figures 4c and S6). DANG/MAD tests indicate that the LC components in all samples are not origin trending and are therefore unlikely to represent primary magnetization.

### 3.5. NRM Behavior at Higher Coercivities

We observed no unambiguous higher-coercivity NRM components (i.e., magnetization blocked above  $\sim 10$  mT) in either the basalt or glass portions of 12017 (Figures 5a, 5b, and S8). Despite the absence of stable NRM at high AF levels, *Tikoo et al.* [2012] tentatively fit HC magnetization components to the 12017 demagnetization data from the end of the LC component up to a maximum of  $\sim 85$  mT. Additionally, a potential medium-coercivity (MC) component for sample 13B1 can be fit from 12 to 54 mT, although the fit direction does not lie near any of the other fit components and does not pass the DANG/MAD test (Figure 5c). The HC magnetization fits for the glass subsamples were nonunidirectional (Figure 5c). The fit HC magnetization directions for the basalt subsamples, on the other hand, are somewhat clustered (within  $\sim 90^\circ$  of one another) (Figure 5c), broadly consistent with the prior observations by *Strangway et al.* [1971]. However, none of the MC or HC fits assigned by *Tikoo et al.* [2012] for either the basalt or glass lithologies are origin trending according to the DANG/MAD test [*Tikoo et al.*, 2012] and, as described in section 5.1 below, most of the HC paleointensities are within error of zero. Additionally, the large scatter in the NRM demagnetization data at high AF levels suggests that the samples are demagnetized, with any remaining magnetization potentially a result of spurious ARM. Therefore, the apparent clustering of the HC fit directions for the basalt hints at, but does not provide robust evidence for, an underlying NRM component blocked in the HC range.






**Figure 6.** Ar isotopic analyses of the 12017 basalt sample 12A. (a, b) Apparent  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  age and cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  exposure age release spectra for two basalt aliquots (1 and 2). Each spectrum is plotted against the cumulative release fraction of  $^{39}\text{Ar}$ . The  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  release spectrum is calculated following Shuster and Cassata [2015]. Dimensions of boxes indicate  $\pm 1\sigma$  (vertical) and the fraction of  $^{39}\text{Ar}$  released (horizontal). Error-weighted mean plateau ages and uncertainties are labeled. (c) Corresponding apparent Ca/K ratios.

#### 4. $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ and Cosmogenic $^{38}\text{Ar}$ Geochronology

To use the 12017 glass as a constraint on lunar paleointensities, we need to determine its formation age. Unfortunately, lunar impact glass is difficult to date using the  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  method due to large amount of trapped (i.e., nonradiogenic)  $^{40}\text{Ar}$  and solar wind  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  [e.g., Husain, 1974]. The only existing data constraining the formation time of the 12017 basalt appear in an abstract by Horn *et al.* [1975], who reported a  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  plateau age for the basaltic portion of 12017 of  $3.19 \pm 0.07$  Ga with few measurement details. To constrain the timing of glass formation, our strategy was to (i) determine the glass crystallization age and (ii) assess evidence for any late-stage reheating of the 12017 mare basalt host resulting from the glass splash event as recorded by  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  thermochronology applied to the basalt. Furthermore, we (iii) used the  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  exposure age of the host rock to place a conservative upper bound on the glass-forming impact event under the assumption that the impact glass formed at the lunar surface. We then (iv) applied  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  geochronology directly to the impact glass to place a less restrictive (i.e., due to the possibility of trapped Ar components), but nevertheless important constraint on the glass formation timing. Analytical details of the  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  and cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  measurements can be found in Text S2.

Analyses of two basalt aliquots produce remarkably similar  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  release spectra (Figure 6a). We calculated error-weighted  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  plateau ages of  $3347.1 \pm 5.1$  Ma and  $3343.7 \pm 4.9$  Ma from each aliquot, with a mean age of  $3345 \pm 5$  Ma between the aliquots (uncertainties here and below are  $1\sigma$ ; uncertainty in the decay constant and age of the fluence monitor are excluded). The release spectra also both show evidence of late-stage open system behavior in the K/Ar system, with initial step ages of  $1572 \pm 11$  Ma and  $1876 \pm 14$  Ma for each aliquot. If the discordance in  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  step ages resulted from diffusive loss of  $^{40}\text{Ar}$  at elevated temperature due to the glass splash event, these data require that the glass splash event occurred at, or more recently than,  $\sim 1570$  Ma [Shuster *et al.*, 2010]. The cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  release spectra for the two aliquots are also similar (Figure 6b), with a mean apparent exposure age of  $96.3 \pm 1.5$  Ma. Assuming



**Figure 7.** Apparent  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  age release spectrum for 12017 glass sample 13B2. The spectrum is plotted against the cumulative release fraction of  $^{39}\text{Ar}$ . Dimensions of boxes indicate  $\pm 1$  standard deviation (vertical) and the fraction of  $^{39}\text{Ar}$  released (horizontal). Error-weighted mean plateau age and uncertainty are labeled.

provide a crude upper bound of the glass formation timing. Taken together, the basalt and glass  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  and  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  data indicate that the glass most likely formed  $\leq 7$  Ma. Although poorly determined, our measured cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  exposure age for the glass ( $0.017 \pm 0.023$  Ma; Table S1) corroborates this finding. This is consistent with, although less restrictive than, the  $< 20$  kyr age inferred from surface exposure ages (section 2.1).

## 5. Paleointensity

### 5.1. Paleointensity Estimations

We employed the ARM and isothermal remanent magnetization (IRM) normalization methods to estimate the paleointensity of the fields in which the 12017 basalt and glass formed. Using the assumption that the NRM components have a thermally activated origin [e.g., TRM, partial TRM (pTRM), or viscous remanent magnetization (VRM)], the paleointensities may be calculated using the following formulas:

$$\text{ARM paleointensity in } \mu\text{T} = (\text{NRM}/\text{ARM}) \cdot (\text{dc bias field}) / f' \quad (1)$$


$$\text{IRM paleointensity in } \mu\text{T} = (\text{NRM}/\text{IRM}) \cdot a \quad (2)$$

where  $f'$  is the TRM/ARM ratio and  $a$  is a calibration constant with units of  $\mu\text{T}$  that is inversely proportional to the TRM/IRM ratio [Garrick-Bethell et al., 2009; Shea et al., 2012; Suavet et al., 2013].

As with previous applications of these methods, the majority of the uncertainty in the ARM and IRM paleointensity estimates originates from the poorly constrained calibration values of  $a$  and  $f'$ , which vary due to grain size and shape. Here we adopt values of 1.34 for  $f'$  and  $3000 \mu\text{T}$  for  $a$  [Gattacceca and Rochette, 2004; Stephenson and Collinson, 1974]. Weiss and Tikoo [2014] compiled a comprehensive list of calibration values from the literature and found that 95% (i.e., within lognormally distributed  $2\sigma$  of the mean value) of multi-domain FeNi-bearing samples have  $a$  values between  $425 \mu\text{T}$  and  $10060 \mu\text{T}$  and  $f'$  between 0.9 and 1.8 (see Table S2 of their supplementary online material). We utilize this wider range of  $f'$  and  $a$  values to quantify the range of possible paleointensities given the uncertainties in the calibration constant values. A second source of uncertainty is associated with the least squares regressions in the paleointensity plots of NRM lost versus ARM gained or IRM lost. We estimated these by computing 95% confidence intervals using a two-tailed Student's  $t$  test [Weisberg, 1985] on the linear paleointensity slopes. The purpose of the  $t$  test is to establish whether the associated paleointensity values are distinguishable from zero (i.e., to demonstrate that the ancient field was not null).

the glass-forming event occurred during or after the sample was delivered to the surface, the glass would then be required to be  $\leq 96$  Ma.

Finally, the  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  release spectra of the 12017 impact glass are complex, with most extractions below the detection limit (indicative of low abundances of K and radiogenic  $^{40}\text{Ar}$ ) and evidence of parentless  $^{40}\text{Ar}$  released at the initial extractions (i.e., sequentially decreasing  $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$  step ages with cumulative  $^{39}\text{Ar}$ ; Figure 7 and Table S1). Despite these complexities, concordant step ages observed at the four highest temperature extractions provide an error-weighted mean of  $7.0 \pm 0.4$  Ma. Because they were observed at high extraction temperatures (between  $560$  and  $1325^\circ\text{C}$ ), these data most likely reflect gas derived from mineral inclusions (which have low Ar diffusivity) held within the impact glass. For this reason, and due to the possibility of nonradiogenic  $^{40}\text{Ar}$ , we consider the apparent plateau age to provide



**Figure 8.** ARM and IRM paleointensity experiments for 12017 basalt sample 12A2. Shown is NRM lost during AF demagnetization as a function of (a) ARM gained during stepwise ARM acquisition and (b) IRM lost during stepwise AF demagnetization of a saturating IRM. Points corresponding to the LC components are shown in blue, and data from higher AF levels (HC) are shown in red.

Similarly, using the wider range of calibration factors mentioned above, we get HC range paleointensities from  $0.2 \pm 4$  to  $198 \pm 100$  and  $1 \pm 0.1$  to  $43 \pm 13$   $\mu\text{T}$  for the basalt and glass, respectively. For the basalt portion, the linear regressions associated with most HC paleointensity estimates have uncertainties indicating that the paleointensities are within error of zero or the recording capabilities of the rock (section 6.3 and Table S5). For the glass portion, half of the inferred paleointensities using  $f' = 1.34$  (Table S5) are within error of the sample's  $\sim 7$   $\mu\text{T}$  paleointensity fidelity limit and are therefore also consistent with weak to null paleofields (section 5.2 and Table S5).


## 5.2. Paleointensity Fidelity Limit Tests

Samples with predominantly multidomain grains magnetized in the presence of weak to null magnetic fields are highly susceptible to the acquisition of spurious ARM during AF demagnetization [Tikoo *et al.*, 2012]. This is because, as the demagnetization experiment proceeds, the magnetic moment contribution from spurious ARM increases until the remaining NRM is obscured by noise at high AF levels. This ultimately means that a given sample has a minimum threshold paleointensity that can be accurately recovered using AF methods (which we refer to as the paleointensity fidelity limit). Here we seek to determine the maximum possible paleofield consistent with the observed lack of stable HC remanence in the basalt and glass portions of 12017.

Tikoo *et al.* [2012] previously reported paleointensity fidelity limits of  $\sim 15$  and  $\sim 7$   $\mu\text{T}$  for the basalt (subsample 12A1C) and glass (subsample 13A2) lithologies of 12017, respectively. These estimates were obtained by imparting the samples with laboratory ARMs using an AC field of 85 mT and DC bias fields ranging from 3 to 200  $\mu\text{T}$  (as an analog for TRM acquired in fields ranging from 2 to 150  $\mu\text{T}$ ). These laboratory ARMs were

Tikoo *et al.* [2012] reported NRM/ARM and NRM/IRM ratios for the LC magnetization observed in our 12017 subsamples. They also reported these ratios for their tentative HC fits and a separate specified range of AF levels for certain subsamples (typically 23–85 mT). Using  $f' = 1.34$  and  $a = 3000$   $\mu\text{T}$ , paleointensity values corresponding to the LC components of the basalt and glass portions range from  $57 \pm 23$  to  $223 \pm 35$   $\mu\text{T}$  and from  $22 \pm 8$  to  $295 \pm 33.3$   $\mu\text{T}$ , respectively. Using the aforementioned  $2\sigma$ , ranges of values for  $f'$  and  $a$  yield basalt LC paleointensities ranging from  $42.7 \pm 17.8$  to  $573 \pm 62$   $\mu\text{T}$  and glass LC paleointensities ranging from  $3.1 \pm 1.1$  through  $991 \pm 1116$   $\mu\text{T}$ . Note that these values were obtained under the assumption that the relevant magnetization components have a thermal origin, which is unlikely (section 6.2). The linear regressions of NRM lost versus ARM gained and NRM lost versus IRM gained associated with these LC paleointensity estimates have uncertainties which are less than the fitted values, indicating that they are not consistent with a null paleofield (Table S5).

Paleointensity values corresponding to the HC range (i.e., the AF levels from the end of the LC component up to 85 mT) range from  $4 \pm 4$  to  $22 \pm 13$  and from  $6 \pm 2$  to  $18 \pm 5$   $\mu\text{T}$  for the basalt and glass, respectively (Figures 8 and 9).



**Figure 9.** ARM and IRM paleointensity experiments for 12017 glass sample 12B. Shown is NRM lost during AF demagnetization as a function of (a) ARM gained during stepwise ARM acquisition and (b) IRM lost during stepwise AF demagnetization of a saturating IRM. Points corresponding to the LC components are shown in blue, and data from higher AF levels (HC) are shown in red.

The LC paleointensities (Table S5) exceed the above paleointensity limits, indicating that the LC magnetization is likely a true NRM component rather than spurious ARM, GRM, or spontaneous remanence from formation in a weak field. However, most of the apparent paleointensities (including uncertainties) for the HC magnetization range lie below or within error of the paleointensity fidelity limits (or even zero) for the two lithologies. Therefore, any paleointensities retrieved from the HC magnetizations in either the basalt or glass portions should be treated as upper limits on the field strength at the time when these lithologies last cooled to ambient temperatures.

## 6. Origin of the NRM

### 6.1. Sanding Components


As described in section 3.3, gentle sanding of 1970 JSC saw cut faces led to changes in the NRM intensity that greatly exceed the fraction of sample mass removed. We conclude that either these faces were locally remagnetized and/or contaminated by sample handling by the astronauts or at JSC, as has been documented for other Apollo 12 basalts by Tikoo *et al.* [2014]. Such contaminating magnetization is significant for 12017 because of the lack of a strong stable underlying lunar NRM (see below).

### 6.2. LC Components in Basalt and Glass

The approximately linear demagnetization trends of the LC magnetization suggest that it is a true NRM component rather than spurious remanence from the measurement process. This is consistent with the fact that the retrieved LC paleointensities are larger than the paleointensity fidelity limit in the LC range. Given that many of our subsamples (12A, 12B, 13A, 13B, and 59) were separated from one another more than 40 years

subsequently AF demagnetized, and the ARM method was used to retrieve a paleointensity estimate over the coercivity range from 0 to 85 mT.

We computed new paleointensity limits using the revised method of Tikoo *et al.* [2014] which only includes AF levels above the end of the LC component. This new method is slightly more conservative because it estimates a fidelity limit for only the HC range rather than including lower coercivity ranges overprinted by recent remagnetization events. With this revision, we found that the glass portion of 12017 has a paleointensity fidelity limit of  $\sim 7 \mu\text{T}$  (subsample 12B) and the basalt has a limit of  $\sim 37 \mu\text{T}$  (subsample 12A1C), using a calibration constant  $f'$  of 1.34. Using a more conservative  $f'$  value of 0.9 (see above), the fidelity limits become  $\sim 55 \mu\text{T}$  for the basalt and  $\sim 11 \mu\text{T}$  for the glass. These paleointensity fidelity limits indicate that the strength of lunar surface fields at 3.3 Ga (the basalt formation age) and  $< 7 \text{ Ma}$  (the glass formation age) were likely  $< \sim 37 \mu\text{T}$  and  $< \sim 7 \mu\text{T}$ , respectively (or  $< \sim 55 \mu\text{T}$  and  $< \sim 11 \mu\text{T}$  using the extreme  $f'$  value). The basalt fidelity limits are broadly consistent with the more restrictive paleofield upper limit of  $\sim 4 \mu\text{T}$  at 3.19 Ga obtained from sample 12022 [Tikoo *et al.*, 2014].



**Figure 10.** (a) Three-dimensional digital model of 12017 whole rock made from triangular facets. (b) Predicted remanent magnetic field from 12017 basalt at locations of glass subsamples (red) compared to magnetization directions fit to HC range of each subsample (blue). Shown are the computed magnetic field directions assuming a unidirectionally magnetized volumetric model with intensity equivalent to that expected for a total TRM acquired in a paleofield of  $37 \mu\text{T}$  (upper limit on paleointensity recorded by basalt). Red ellipses denote estimated uncertainty of calculated field direction (see text), while subsample names are labeled next to each predicted field direction and measurement.

ago and have been in different orientations over the intervening period, the approximate unidirectionality of the LC component amongst all samples of both basalt and glass lithologies (including the LC2 component of 59A) demonstrates that it was likely acquired prior to subdivision at JSC in 1970. Therefore, we can exclude VRM acquired during exposure to the Earth's field as a possible explanation of the LC component. This conclusion is also supported by our laboratory VRM experiments (supporting information section 1.2 in Text S1), which suggest that VRM could only account for up to  $\sim 11\%$  of the total measured NRM and for up to 35% of the LC components. We have also considered SRM as a potential source of the LC magnetization but find that it is easily removed at very low AF steps, unlike our LC magnetization (supporting information section 1.3 in Text S1). The high ratios of NRM to IRM over the LC coercivity range (ranging up to 10%) (Table S5) support the origin of the LC component as an IRM acquired during transport from the Moon in the presence of strong fields in the spacecraft [Pearce *et al.*, 1973] and/or sample handling at JSC from exposure to strongly magnetized materials. As expected for a low-field IRM, it is much less stable to AF demagnetization than a saturation IRM (Figure S7). Although the LC component also demagnetizes like a laboratory ARM, it is unlikely to be a pTRM or TRM from sawing because 12017 has only been cut with a wire saw (unlike the circular saw that has been found to have heated other Apollo samples [Tikoo *et al.*, 2012]). In any case, the low-peak coercivity and nonorigin trending nature of the LC component indicate that it is highly unlikely to be a full TRM acquired during primary cooling of either 12017 lithology on the Moon.

### 6.3. HC Magnetization

The HC magnetizations in the basalt and glass lithologies demagnetized erratically and are not origin trending. Furthermore, for most subsamples, the HC paleointensities are within error of zero and/or below the paleointensity fidelity limits of  $\sim 37 \mu\text{T}$  and  $\sim 7 \mu\text{T}$  for the two respective lithologies. The erratic demagnetization behavior of the NRM is emphasized by comparison with that of laboratory IRM and ARM (Figure S9). Therefore, we find no compelling evidence for primary NRM in the basalt or the glass of 12017.

## 7. Comparison With Remanent Fields at Apollo 12 Site and From 12017 Basalt

The observed absence of stable HC magnetization indicates that ambient fields were likely  $< 7 \mu\text{T}$  (and almost certainly  $< 11 \mu\text{T}$ ) when the glass formed. This is broadly consistent with the very weak ( $\sim 38 \text{ nT}$ ) ambient surface field measured at the Apollo 12 landing site. We show next that this  $\sim 7 \mu\text{T}$  upper limit is also consistent with our estimates of the expected stray remanent field produced by the underlying 12017 basalt at the



location of the glass rind. To calculate the remanent field produced by the underlying basalt, we followed the methodology of *Barnett* [1976]. We first created a triangular faceted three-dimensional digital model of the basalt portion of 12017 (Figure 10a) from a plaster cast made of the whole rock prior to subsampling at JSC. We assumed that the basalt was uniformly magnetized throughout its entire volume in the direction of the putative mean HC magnetization direction obtained with PCA (declination =  $139.4^\circ$ , inclination =  $39.6^\circ$ ). We also assumed that the magnetization is that of a total TRM acquired in a paleofield given by our paleointensity upper limit of  $\sim 37 \mu\text{T}$  (section 5), which we estimated by scaling from our ARM acquisition measurements on the basalt with  $f' = 1.34$ . This corresponds to a magnetization of  $\sim 0.03 \text{ A/m}$ . We then calculated the strength and direction of the external basalt field at the locations of our glass samples. In particular, following *Barnett* [1976], we relied on the fact that the magnetic potential at a point outside a uniformly magnetized volume can be expressed as an integral over the surface of the volume, which we approximated with triangular facets (Figure 10a). To estimate the uncertainty on the predicted field, we then repeated this calculation for different magnetization directions distributed within the 95% confidence interval of the mean HC magnetization ( $21^\circ$ ).

The results show that the measured directions of the glass are collectively incompatible with the magnetic field arising from the basalt according to our model (Figure 10b). The scatter in the magnetization directions predicted by the remanent field model does not encompass the wide range in HC directions observed in the glass (Figure 10b). In particular, the predicted field directions are only consistent with the computed HC directions in two of our four glass samples. Even more importantly, the predicted magnetic field intensity at the locations of the glass subsamples is only  $\sim 140 \text{ nT}$ , comparable with the magnetic field in our shielded room and far less than the minimum retrievable paleointensity ( $\sim 7 \mu\text{T}$ ; see section 5). Therefore, remanent fields either from the large-scale crust at the Apollo 12 site (measured to be  $36 \text{ nT}$ ) [*Dyal et al.*, 1970] or the underlying 12017 basalt are likely incapable of producing a TRM in the glass that would be recoverable using our AF methods. Additionally, if the regional crustal fields were to magnetize the glass rind, we would expect a roughly unidirectional magnetization.

## 8. Implications

We conclude that the magnetization of the young glass rind on 12017 is unlikely to be a TRM formed in either a lunar dynamo or lunar crustal fields exceeding  $< \sim 7 \mu\text{T}$ . In fact, it is unlikely to be a record of ancient lunar fields at all and is instead mostly spontaneous magnetization formed in a near-zero field and/or spurious remanence introduced by laboratory AF demagnetization.

Crustal field intensities measured at the Apollo 12, 14, and 15 landing sites were generally  $< 100 \text{ nT}$ ; the maximum surface field of  $327 \text{ nT}$  was measured at the Apollo 16 landing site [*Dyal et al.*, 1974]. This suggests that most of the high ( $1\text{--}20 \mu\text{T}$ ) paleointensities previously inferred for other young ( $\leq 1.5 \text{ Ga}$ ) Apollo samples [see *Wieczorek et al.*, 2006, Figure 3.22] were also not produced by remanent crustal fields. Given that *Tikoo et al.* [2012, 2014] found no evidence for a lunar magnetic field  $> \sim 4 \mu\text{T}$  by  $3.19 \text{ Ga}$  and that AF methods are incapable of accurately retrieving paleointensities  $< \sim 20 \mu\text{T}$  for the vast majority of lunar samples (whose magnetic mineralogies are dominated by multidomain kamacite), it is likely that few—if any—of the  $\leq 1.5 \text{ Ga}$  Apollo era paleointensity determinations are accurate. Therefore, at present there is no evidence that lunar samples aged  $\leq 3 \text{ Ga}$  formed in the presence of  $> \sim 4 \mu\text{T}$  magnetic fields from either a prolonged lunar core dynamo or meteoroid impacts.

## 9. Conclusions

1. Apollo 12 basalt 12017 is partially covered by an impact melt glass splash that formed  $< 7 \text{ Ma}$ . This glass is within error the youngest lunar sample studied with paleomagnetic methods.
2. The magnetization in both the 12017 glass and basalt is predominantly from a LC overprint acquired after sampling.
3. We could not identify a stable NRM carried by HC grains in either the basalt or glass lithologies of 12017. The magnetization in this range appears to be mostly a combination of spontaneous magnetization and spurious remanence introduced by the demagnetization process.
4. No fields likely stronger than  $\sim 37 \mu\text{T}$  were present at  $3.35 \text{ Ga}$  at the Apollo 12 site.
5. No fields likely stronger than  $\sim 7 \mu\text{T}$  were present at  $< 7 \text{ Ma}$  at the Apollo 12 site.
6. There is no evidence from sample 12017 for a core dynamo on the Moon at or after  $3.35 \text{ Ga}$ .

## Acknowledgments

We thank the JSC staff and the Curation and Analysis Planning Team for Extraterrestrial Materials for allocating our samples, N. Chatterjee for help with the microprobe analyses, and B. Carbone for administrative support. J.B., S.M.T., and B.P.W. thank the NASA Lunar Science Institute and the NASA Solar System Exploration Virtual Institute (grant NNA14AB01A). B.P.W. and D.L.S. thank the NASA Lunar Advanced Science and Exploration Research Program (grant NNX08AY96G) and the NASA Solar System Workings Program (grant NNX15AL62G). B.P.W. thanks the Miller Institute for Basic Research in Science for support. D.L.S. acknowledges the Ann and Gordon Getty Foundation for support. J.G. acknowledges the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (grant ANR-14-CE33-0012). We also thank Rob Coe and other anonymous reviewers for their comments. Demagnetization data for the studied samples are included in the supporting information.

## References

- Barnett, C. (1976), Theoretical modeling of the magnetic and gravitational fields of an arbitrarily shaped three-dimensional body, *Geophysics*, 41, 1353–1364, doi:10.1190/1.1440685.
- Carporzen, L., and S. A. Gilder (2006), Evidence for coeval Late Triassic terrestrial impacts from the Rochechouart (France) meteorite crater, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L19308, doi:10.1029/2006GL027356.
- Carporzen, L., B. P. Weiss, S. A. Gilder, A. Pommier, and R. J. Hart (2012), Lightning remagnetization of the Vredefort impact crater: No evidence for impact-generated magnetic fields, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, E01007, doi:10.1029/2011JE003919.
- Carslaw, H. S., and J. C. Jaeger (1959), *The Conduction of Heat in Solids*, Oxford Univ. Press, London.
- Cisowski, S., J. Dunn, M. Fuller, Y. Wu, M. Rose, and P. Wasilewski (1976), Magnetic effects of shock and their implications for lunar magnetism. II, in *Proceedings of the Seventh Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 3299–3320, Pergamon, New York.
- Cisowski, S., C. Hale, and M. Fuller (1977), On the intensity of ancient lunar fields, in *Proceedings of the Eighth Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 725–750, Pergamon, New York.
- Cisowski, S., D. Collinson, S. Runcorn, A. Stephenson, and M. Fuller (1983), A review of lunar paleointensity data and implications for the origin of lunar magnetism, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, A691–A704, doi:10.1029/JB088iS02p0A691.
- Cournède, C., J. Gattacceca, and P. Rochette (2012), Magnetic study of large Apollo samples: Possible evidence for an ancient centered dipolar field on the Moon, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 331, 31–42, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2012.03.004.
- Crawford, D. A., and P. H. Schultz (1999), Electromagnetic properties of impact-generated plasma, vapor and debris, *Int. J. Impact Eng.*, 23, 169–180, doi:10.1016/S0734-743X(99)00070-6.
- Dunn, J., and M. Fuller (1972), On the remanent magnetism of lunar samples with special reference to 10048,55 and 14053,48, in *Proceedings of the Third Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 2363–2386, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Dwyer, C. A., D. J. Stevenson, and F. Nimmo (2011), A long-lived lunar dynamo driven by continuous mechanical stirring, *Nature*, 479, 212–214, doi:10.1038/nature10564.
- Dyal, P., C. W. Parkinson, and C. P. Sonett (1970), Apollo 12 magnetometer: Measurement of a steady magnetic field on the surface of the Moon, *Science*, 169, 762–764, doi:10.1126/science.169.3947.762.
- Dyal, P., C. W. Parkinson, and W. D. Daily (1974), Magnetism and the interior of the Moon, *Rev. Geophys. Space Phys.*, 12, 568–591, doi:10.1029/RG012i004p00568.
- Evans, A. J., M. T. Zuber, B. P. Weiss, and S. M. Tikoo (2014), A wet, heterogeneous lunar interior: Lower mantle and core dynamo evolution, *J. Geophys. Res. Planets*, 118, 1061–1077, doi:10.1002/2013JE004494.
- Fleischer, R. L., H. R. Hart, G. M. Comstock, and A. O. Evwaraye (1971), The particle track record of the Ocean of Storms, in *Proceedings of the Second Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 2559–2568, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fuller, M., and S. M. Cisowski (1987), Lunar paleomagnetism, in *Geomagnetism*, vol. 2, edited by J. A. Jacobs, pp. 307–456, Academic Press, London.
- Garrick-Bethell, I., B. P. Weiss, D. L. Shuster, and J. Buz (2009), Early lunar magnetism, *Science*, 323, 356–359, doi:10.1126/science.1166804.
- Gattacceca, J., and P. Rochette (2004), Toward a robust normalized magnetic paleointensity method applied to meteorites, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 227, 377–393, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2004.09.013.
- Gattacceca, J., M. Boustie, L. Hood, J. P. Cuq-Lelandais, M. Fuller, N. Bezaeva, T. de Resseguier, and L. Berthe (2010), Can the lunar crust be magnetized by shock: Experimental groundtruth, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 299, 42–53, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2010.08.011.
- Gose, W., D. Strangway, and G. Pearce (1973), A determination of the intensity of the ancient lunar magnetic field, *Earth Moon Planets*, 7, 196–201, doi:10.1007/BF00578816.
- Grove, T. L., and D. Walker (1977), Cooling histories of Apollo 15 quartz-normative basalts, in *Proceedings of the Eighth Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 1501–1520, Pergamon, New York.
- Horn, P., T. Kirsten, and E. Jessberger (1975), Are there Apollo 12 mare basalts younger than 3.1 b.y. Unsuccessful search for Apollo 12 mare basalts with crystallization ages below 3.1 b.y., *Meteoritics*, 10, 417.
- Horz, F., and J. Hartung (1971), The lunar-surface orientation of some Apollo 12 rocks, in *Proceedings of the Third Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 2629–2638, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Horz, F., E. Schneider, D. Gault, J. Hartung, and D. Brownlee (1975), Catastrophic rupture of lunar rocks: A Monte Carlo simulation, *Moon*, 13, 235–258, doi:10.1007/BF00567517.
- Husain, L. (1974),  $^{40}\text{Ar}$ - $^{39}\text{Ar}$  chronology and cosmic ray exposure ages of the Apollo 15 samples, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 79, 2588–2606, doi:10.1029/JB079i017p02588.
- Kirschvink, J. L. (1980), The least-squares line and plane and the analysis of palaeomagnetic data, *Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc.*, 62, 699–718, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.1980.tb02601.x.
- Kirschvink, J. L., R. E. Kopp, T. D. Raub, C. T. Baumgartner, and J. W. Holt (2008), Rapid, precise, and high-sensitivity acquisition of paleomagnetic and rock-magnetic data: Development of a low-noise automatic sample changing system for superconducting rock magnetometers, *Geochim. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 9, Q05Y01, doi:10.1029/2007GC001856.
- Laneuville, M., M. Wieczorek, D. Breuer, and N. Tosi (2013), Asymmetric thermal evolution of the Moon, *J. Geophys. Res. Planets*, 118, 1435–1452, doi:10.1002/jgre.20103.
- Laneuville, M., M. A. Wieczorek, D. Breuer, J. Aubert, G. Morard, and T. Ruckriemen (2014), A long-lived lunar dynamo powered by core crystallization, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 401, 251–260, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2014.05.057.
- Lawrence, K., C. Johnson, L. Tauxe, and J. Gee (2008), Lunar paleointensity measurements: Implications for lunar magnetic evolution, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, 168, 71–87, doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2008.05.007.
- Le Bars, M., M. A. Wieczorek, Ö. Karatekin, D. Cébron, and M. Laneuville (2011), An impact-driven dynamo for the early Moon, *Nature*, 479, 215–218, doi:10.1038/nature10565.
- Louzada, K. L., B. P. Weiss, A. C. Maloof, S. T. Stewart, N. L. Swanson-Hysell, and S. A. Soule (2008), Paleomagnetism of Loner impact crater, India, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 275, 308–319, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2008.08.025.
- Morgan, J. W., J. Laul, R. Ganapathy, and E. Anders (1971), Glazed lunar rocks: Origin by impact, *Science*, 172, 556–558, doi:10.1126/science.172.3983.556.
- Morrison, D., D. McKay, G. Heiken, and H. Moore (1972), Microcraters on lunar rocks, in *Proceedings of the Third Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 2767–2791, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Pearce, G., W. Gose, and D. Strangway (1973), Magnetic studies on Apollo 15 and 16 lunar samples, in *Proceedings of the Fourth Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 3045–3076, Pergamon, Elmsford, N. Y.
- Scheinberg, A., K. M. Soderlund, and G. Schubert (2015), Magnetic field generation in the lunar core: The role of inner core growth, *Icarus*, 254, 62–71, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2015.03.013.

- Schultz, P. H., and P. D. Spudis (1983), Beginning and end of lunar mare volcanism, *Nature*, 302, 233–236, doi:10.1038/302233a0.
- Sclar, C. (1971), Shock-induced features of Apollo 12 microbreccias, in *Proceedings of the Second Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 160–163, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Shea, E. K., B. P. Weiss, W. S. Cassata, D. L. Shuster, S. M. Tikoo, J. Gattacceca, T. L. Grove, and M. D. Fuller (2012), A long-lived lunar core dynamo, *Science*, 335, 453–456, doi:10.1126/science.1215359.
- Shuster, D. L., and W. S. Cassata (2015), Paleotemperatures at the lunar surfaces from open system behavior of cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  and radiogenic  $^{40}\text{Ar}$ , *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 155, 154–171, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2015.01.037.
- Shuster, D. L., G. Balco, W. S. Cassata, V. A. Fernandes, I. Garrick-Bethell, and B. P. Weiss (2010), A record of impacts preserved in the lunar regolith, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 290, 155–165, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2009.12.016.
- Srnka, L., G. Martelli, G. Newton, S. Cisowski, M. Fuller, and R. Schaaf (1979), Magnetic field and shock effects and remanent magnetization in a hypervelocity impact experiment, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 42, 127–137, doi:10.1016/0012-821X(79)90198-5.
- Stephenson, A. (1993), Three-axis static alternating field demagnetization of rocks and the identification of natural remanent magnetization, gyroremanent magnetization, and anisotropy, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 373–381, doi:10.1029/92JB01849.
- Stephenson, A., and D. Collinson (1974), Lunar magnetic field palaeointensities determined by an anhysteretic remanent magnetization method, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 23, 220–228, doi:10.1016/0012-821X(74)90196-4.
- Strangway, D., G. Pearce, W. Gose, and R. Timme (1971), Remanent magnetization of lunar samples, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 13, 43–52, doi:10.1016/0012-821X(71)90103-8.
- Suavet, C., B. P. Weiss, W. S. Cassata, D. L. Shuster, J. Gattacceca, L. Chan, I. Garrick-Bethell, J. W. Head, T. L. Grove, and M. D. Fuller (2013), Persistence and origin of the lunar core dynamo, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110, 8453–8458, doi:10.1073/pnas.1300341110.
- Sugiura, N., and D. Strangway (1980), Comparisons of magnetic paleointensity methods using a lunar sample, in *Proceedings of the Eleventh Lunar and Planetary Sciences Conference*, pp. 1801–1813, Pergamon, New York.
- Sugiura, N., D. Strangway, G. Pearce, Y. Wu, and L. Taylor (1979), A new magnetic paleointensity value for a “young lunar glass”, in *Proceedings of the Tenth Lunar Science Conference*, pp. 2189–2197, Pergamon, New York.
- Tauxe, L., and H. Staudigel (2004), Strength of the geomagnetic field in the Cretaceous Normal Superchron: New data from submarine basaltic glass of the Troodos Ophiolite, *Geochim. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 5, Q02H06, doi:10.1029/2003GC000635.
- Tian, B. Y., S. Stanley, S. M. Tikoo, and B. P. Weiss (2014), A precession-driven lunar dynamo, paper presented at AGU Fall Meeting, GP54A-04, AGU, San Francisco, Calif.
- Tikoo, S. M., B. P. Weiss, J. Buz, E. A. Lima, E. K. Shea, G. Melo, and T. L. Grove (2012), Magnetic fidelity of mare basalts and implications for a lunar dynamo, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 337–338, 93–103, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2012.05.024.
- Tikoo, S. M., B. P. Weiss, W. S. Cassata, D. L. Shuster, J. Gattacceca, E. A. Lima, C. Suavet, F. Nimmo, and M. D. Fuller (2014), Decline of the lunar core dynamo, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 404, 89–97, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2014.07.010.
- Warner, J. (1970), *Apollo 12 Lunar Sample Information*, NASA Curatorial Branch Publ., Houston.
- Weisberg, S. (1985), *Applied Linear Regression*, John Wiley, New York.
- Weiss, B. P., and S. M. Tikoo (2014), The lunar dynamo, *Science*, 346, doi:10.1126/science.1246753.
- Weiss, B., S. Pedersen, I. Garrick-Bethell, S. Stewart, K. Louzada, A. Maloof, and N. Swanson-Hysell (2010), Paleomagnetism of impact spherules from Lohr crater, India and a test for impact-generated fields, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 298, 66–76, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2010.07.028.
- Wieczorek, M. A., B. L. Jolliff, A. Khan, M. E. Pritchard, B. P. Weiss, J. G. Williams, L. L. Hood, K. Righter, C. R. Neal, and C. K. Shearer (2006), The constitution and structure of the lunar interior, *Rev. Mineral. Geochem.*, 60, 221, doi:10.2138/rmg.2006.60.3.
- Zhang, N., E. Parmentier, and Y. Liang (2013), A 3-D numerical study of the thermal evolution of the Moon after cumulate mantle overturn: The importance of rheology and core solidification, *J. Geophys. Res. Planets*, 118, 1789–1804, doi:10.1002/jgre.20121.