



**HAL**  
open science

# Constraining the Early History of Mercury and Its Core Dynamo by Studying the Crustal Magnetic Field

Joana Oliveira, Lon Hood, Benoît Langlais

► **To cite this version:**

Joana Oliveira, Lon Hood, Benoît Langlais. Constraining the Early History of Mercury and Its Core Dynamo by Studying the Crustal Magnetic Field. *Journal of Geophysical Research. Planets*, 2019, 124, pp.2382 - 2396. 10.1029/2019JE005938 . hal-02285493

**HAL Id: hal-02285493**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02285493>**

Submitted on 13 Nov 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# 1            **Constraining the Early History of Mercury and its** 2            **Core Dynamo by Studying the Crustal Magnetic Field**

3            **Joana S. Oliveira<sup>1,2</sup>, Lon L. Hood<sup>3</sup>, Benoit Langlais<sup>4</sup>**

4            <sup>1</sup>ESA/ESTEC, SCI-S, Keplerlaan 1, 2200 AG Noordwijk, Netherlands

5            <sup>2</sup>CITEUC, Geophysical and Astronomical Observatory, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

6            <sup>3</sup>Lunar and Planetary Laboratory, 1629 E. University Blvd., Univ. of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

7            <sup>4</sup>Laboratoire de Planétologie et Géodynamique, Université de Nantes, Université d'Angers, CNRS, UMR

8            6112, Nantes, France

## 9            **Key Points:**

- 10            • We analyze crustal magnetic anomalies that are likely thermoremanent and ob-  
11            tain the corresponding paleopole positions.
- 12            • All best fitting paleopoles are found in the Southern Hemisphere.
- 13            • Our study strongly suggests that Mercury has evolved with time.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to

Corresponding author: Joana S. Oliveira, [Joana.Oliveira@esa.int](mailto:Joana.Oliveira@esa.int)  
differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi:  
10.1029/2019JE005938

## Abstract

Low altitude magnetic field data acquired by MESSENGER over a small portion of Mercury's surface revealed weak crustal magnetic field signatures. Here we study the crustal magnetic anomalies associated with impact craters on Mercury. We assume that the sources of these anomalies consist of impact melt, enriched in impactor iron. We assume that the subsurfaces of Mercury's impact craters have cooled in the presence of a constant global magnetic field, thus becoming thermoremanently magnetized. We invert for the crustal magnetization direction within five craters using a unidirectional magnetization model which assumes that the melt impact rocks recorded the constant core magnetic field present when the crater was formed, and that the crater's magnetization has not been altered since its formation. From the best fitting magnetization direction we then obtain the corresponding north magnetic paleopole position assuming a centered core dipolar field. Results show that all five magnetic paleopoles lie in the Southern Hemisphere but are not required to be located near the present-day magnetic pole, which lies near the south geographic pole. Accounting for the uncertainties, we show that our results all agree in a common small region that excludes the current magnetic pole. This strongly suggests that the dynamo has evolved with time. Our results represent valuable information for understanding the evolution of Mercury, and emphasize the importance of including more anomaly analyses to complete and refine our conclusions.

## 1 Introduction

The MESSENGER spacecraft orbited Mercury during roughly 4 terrestrial years acquiring important information on the internal magnetic field of Mercury. Recent studies have shown that the core magnetic field of Mercury is dipolar with a strong quadrupolar component (Anderson et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 2015; Thébault et al., 2018). The lack of small scales is an astonishing observation (Oliveira et al., 2015; Thébault et al., 2018), and is very difficult to be explained by dynamo models. Several numerical dynamo simulations have tried to explain such observations but mostly fail to produce all observed characteristics. Those models include dynamos operating in a thin shell (Stanley et al., 2005; Takahashi & Matsushima, 2006), a strong dynamo with a stably-stratified layer in the top of the core (Christensen, 2006; Christensen & Wicht, 2008), snow iron processes in the core (Vilim et al., 2010), or even a heterogeneous heat flux pattern at the core-mantle boundary (CMB) (Cao et al., 2014). However, using specific dynamo pa-

46 rameters, most of the models explain at least some of the characteristics of the observed  
47 field. Recently, numerical simulations combining double-diffusive convection with a sta-  
48 bly stratified layer reproduced the present magnetic field of Mercury (Takahashi et al.,  
49 2019) showing that the equatorial asymmetry could last for millions of years. More im-  
50 portantly, to date, none of those models use observational constraints for the early stages  
51 of the dynamo.

52 Only during its low altitude campaign MESSENGER acquired important informa-  
53 tion on the crustal magnetic field of Mercury. However, the small magnetosphere of the  
54 planet (Johnson et al., 2012; Anderson et al., 2012), the strong field variability due to  
55 external sources (Korth et al., 2012), and the relatively weak crustal fields (Purucker et  
56 al., 2009; Hood, 2015, 2016; Hood et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2015) combined with the  
57 very eccentric spacecraft orbit represent obstacles for investigating the nature of the crustal  
58 field. Indeed, available crustal magnetic field maps only span a small portion of the Her-  
59 mean surface, between  $35^\circ$  and  $75^\circ$  North over all longitudes. Crustal magnetic field maps  
60 reveal anomalies heterogeneously distributed within the (mapped) surface. The strongest  
61 intensities at 40 km altitude of,  $\sim 10$  nT, are found within the Caloris basin. Many of  
62 the anomalies are not found to correlate either with the topography, surface geology, or  
63 gravity (Hood, 2016; Hood et al., 2018). Some important exceptions are found for anoma-  
64 lies within some craters (e.g., Rustaveli and Vyasa) and basins (e.g., Caloris), however  
65 (Hood, 2016; Hood et al., 2018).

66 The exact nature of crustal magnetic field sources is difficult to determine when  
67 using solely spacecraft measurements. The sources generating the observed crustal fields  
68 could, in principle, be either ancient remanent magnetization or merely induced mag-  
69 netization (IM) caused by permeability contrasts in the presence of Mercury's existing  
70 core dynamo field. Ancient remanent magnetism could be caused by different processes  
71 such as shock remanent magnetization (SRM) and thermoremanent magnetization (TRM).  
72 TRM and IM would record the ancient or the present core field direction, respectively.  
73 The early history of planets can be assessed by studying the crustal magnetism, only when  
74 the sources are remanently magnetized. Many crustal field studies for the Earth, Mars,  
75 and the Moon have allowed constraints to be placed on the early history of those bod-  
76 ies. For instance, on Earth, studies on the Atlantic Ridge crustal fields revealed that the  
77 terrestrial dynamo has undergone many resersals of polarity (Vine & Matthews, 1963).  
78 For Mars and Moon, true polar wander (TPW) events, dynamo polarity reversals, a dif-

79 ferent morphology dynamo field, and, in the lunar case, evidence for iron-rich impactors,  
80 have been inferred (Arkani-Hamed, 2001; Takahashi et al., 2014; Wieczorek et al., 2012).

31 Contrary to these bodies, Mercury, like the Earth, possesses a core magnetic field.  
32 The major difficulty when studying the crustal magnetic field of such a body is to dis-  
33 tinguish how the sources are magnetized. In this respect, calculations concerning the de-  
34 pendency of Curie temperature on depth have shown that at least part of the crustal field  
35 of Mercury is generated by TRM sources (Johnson et al., 2015; Hood et al., 2018). In  
36 the other hand, as for the lunar case (Wieczorek et al., 2012), it was suggested that impactor-  
37 delivered iron could be the main source material of crater-associated magnetic anoma-  
38 lies on Mercury. If the main source material of the Hermean crater-associated anoma-  
39 lies is impactor iron, then the IM source signal is too weak to explain the observed anomaly  
40 amplitudes (Hood et al., 2018). Therefore, the anomalies associated with craters are the  
41 best option to choose if one wishes to study the ancient magnetic field.

42 On Earth, the majority of impact molten rocks contain remains of the projectiles,  
43 with projectile abundances in the melt sheet reaching several percent in weight (Tagle  
44 & Hecht, 2006; Tagle et al., 2009). We assume that this could also be the case for Mer-  
45 cury, as was also suggested by Hood et al. (2018). The Hermean surface is generally metal  
46 iron poor (Weider et al., 2014), and the magnetic anomalies could be a result of impactor-  
47 metal iron that was carried to the surface of Mercury. Anomalies within the center of  
48 relatively fresh complex impact craters are the most appropriate for paleopole studies.  
49 Complex impact craters are large enough to contain a melt sheet with the thickest re-  
50 gion in its center (e.g., Cintala and Grieve (1998)). This melt sheet would have cooled  
51 slowly with time scales of about a million year. Compared to long-lived core dynamo time  
52 scales, crater melt sheets cool fast enough to record thermoremanently a constant and  
53 unidirectional surface field. In addition, studying anomalies associated with fresh craters  
54 reduces the probability of potential demagnetization processes, such as other impacts,  
55 unstable terrain near the crater boundaries and, space weathering. On the other hand,  
56 considering that the crust was previously magnetized, the vertical extent of the crater  
57 center corresponds to the region that suffers high levels of shock and pressure demag-  
58 netization. It was observed in laboratory experiments, under certain conditions, that the  
59 demagnetization of the rocks can reach levels above 50% (Gattacceca et al., 2010; Beza-  
60 eva et al., 2010).

111 Crater-associated anomalies on Mercury can be used to estimate the direction of  
112 magnetization. If these anomalies are of TRM origin, converting the magnetization di-  
113 rection to paleomagnetic pole positions, would give valuable insights. The present day  
114 Mercury core dynamo field has its magnetic north pole located near the geographic south  
115 pole (e.g., Anderson et al. (2012)). Therefore, if the paleopoles are not found close to  
116 the geographical poles, true polar wander events or a different magnetic field morphol-  
117 ogy could explain such results. Alternatively, if some paleopoles are found in the North-  
118 ern Hemisphere, this would suggest not only that the dynamo underwent polarity rever-  
119 sals but also proves that the sources are unequivocally TRM in origin. In all cases, this  
120 would be indicative that the ancient dynamo field was different from that of nowadays.

121 Small and isolated crustal magnetic field anomalies on Mercury can be used to in-  
122 fer the magnetization direction based on the unidirectional assumption. Here we invert  
123 for the direction of crustal magnetization associated with Hermean isolated anomalies  
124 within craters using the approach initially developed by (Parker, 1991). In this method,  
125 the only assumption made is that the magnetization direction is constant within the an-  
126 alyzed region of the crust. The strength of this method is that it makes no assumptions  
127 about the source geometry. Recently, this approach has been applied to planetary mag-  
128 netic crustal fields to determine paleopole locations for the Moon (Oliveira & Wieczorek,  
129 2017) and Mars (Thomas et al., 2018). Another slightly different application has com-  
130 bined the unidirectional model with laboratory thermoremanent experiments to deter-  
131 mine iron abundances within basins on the Moon (Oliveira et al., 2017).

132 In this work, we make use of a global crustal magnetic field model based on MES-  
133 SENDER low altitude campaign measurements (Hood, 2016; Hood et al., 2018) and ap-  
134 ply the technique of (Parker, 1991) to the Hermean isolated magnetic anomalies asso-  
135 ciated with craters. In section 2, we describe the methodology of inverting crustal mag-  
136 netic field data for a unidirectional magnetization distribution (Parker, 1991) and how  
137 it is applied to Mercury. Next, in section 3 we show the results for all the anomalies as-  
138 sociated with craters. In section 4, different hypotheses that could account for our de-  
139 rived distribution of paleopoles are discussed. Finally, we make our concluding remarks  
140 on how our results might help to place constraints on the Hermean evolution models.

## 2 Method

In order to determine new constraints on the early history of Mercury we investigate isolated magnetic anomalies associated with impact craters. We use the method of Parker (Parker, 1991) which was first applied to estimate the magnetization direction of terrestrial seamounts. This method assumes a unidirectional magnetization volume source model, consistent with the hypothesis of a melt sheet cooling down in a stable global ambient field. For a melt sheet occupying the interior of a large basin such as Caloris, this might not be a valid assumption because: 1) different areas and/or different depths of the basin may have cooled at different rates and the core dynamo field may have changed between one TRM acquisition event and another; 2) the direction of the core dynamo field is changing over the surface of the planet. For instance, (Parker, 1991) showed that when inverting for the magnetization direction of synthetic samples with mixed polarity magnetizations, the method did not retrieve a single solution. However, for single anomalies within craters, such as those to be considered here, it is reasonable to assume that the melt sheet cooled uniformly in a constant dynamo field. As shown by (Parker, 1991), a volume (i.e., continuous distribution) of unidirectional magnetization is mathematically equivalent to discretized unidirectional dipoles placed at the volume's boundary (i.e., its top surface), reducing significantly the dimensionality of the problem. The magnetic moments of the unidirectional dipoles distribution are allowed to vary with position, and therefore the magnetization is described as,

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{s}_i) = \hat{\mathbf{m}} m(\mathbf{s}_i), \quad m(\mathbf{s}_i) \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$  is the unit vector of magnetization  $\mathbf{M}$ , and  $m(\mathbf{s}_i)$  is the dipole moment at vectorial position  $\mathbf{s}_i$ . Note that we arbitrarily impose positive dipoles instead of negative ones.

In his initial study, Parker (1991) analyzed the field component that is aligned with the global field. Lunar and martian studies that used the same method analyzed a single component because none of those bodies contain a present global field. In the case of Mercury, though a global field is present, we choose to follow the lunar and martian studies using the radial component. The magnetic field  $d$  in the radial direction  $\hat{r}$  at observation point  $j$  is calculated as the sum of the contributions from the dipoles located

170 at positions  $\mathbf{s}_i$

$$d_j = \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} g_j(\mathbf{s}_i) m(\mathbf{s}_i), \quad j = 1, \dots, N_{obs} \quad (2)$$

171 where the contribution of a single dipole at location  $i$  is given by

$$g_j(\mathbf{s}_i) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left( \frac{3\hat{\mathbf{m}} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{s}_i) \hat{\mathbf{r}}_j \cdot (\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{s}_i)}{|\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{s}_i|^5} - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{m}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_j}{|\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{s}_i|^3} \right). \quad (3)$$

172  $N_{obs}$  and  $N_d$  correspond to the number of observations and the number of dipoles at the  
 173 surface, and  $\mathbf{r}_j$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$  are the vector positions of the observations and dipoles relative  
 174 to a fixed planetocentric origin, respectively. The equations 2 and 3 may be combined  
 175 into a matrix form as

$$\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{G}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}) \mathbf{m}, \quad (4)$$

176 where  $\mathbf{d}$  is a vector of the magnetic field observations projected in the radial direction,  
 177 the matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  depends upon the assumed direction of magnetization  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$  and contains the  
 178 elements given by eq. 3, and  $\mathbf{m}$  is a vector that contains the dipole moments of the sur-  
 179 face dipoles at locations  $\mathbf{s}_i$ . All dipole moments are taken to be positive.

180 Following Parker (1991), with the elements of vector  $\mathbf{m}$  positive we use the tech-  
 181 nique of nonnegative least squares analysis developed by (Lawson & Hanson, 1974) to  
 182 solve equation 4. One of the advantages of this technique is that only a maximum of  $N_{obs}$   
 183 out of  $N_d$  dipoles are needed to explain the magnetic field observations. Therefore, us-  
 184 ing a number of  $N_d$  surface dipoles larger than the number of observations ( $N_{obs}$ ), al-  
 185 lows the nonnegative least squares (nnls) technique to determine automatically which  
 186 dipoles have nonzero values.

187 In practice, we follow the same modelling procedures as those used by (Oliveira &  
 188 Wieczorek, 2017) and (Oliveira et al., 2017) in lunar studies. First, a grid of homoge-  
 189 neously distributed dipoles (Katanforoush & Shahshahani, 2003) of  $0.4^\circ$  resolution is placed  
 190 in the planet's surface within a circle of radius  $r_d$  around the crater center. Here we fix  
 191  $r_d$  to be equal to the crater rim radius, as TRM sources (i.e., the crater melt sheet) are  
 192 supposed to lie within this boundary. The magnetic field data used in the inversion scheme  
 193 are contained within a circle of radius  $r_{obs}$  that is  $1^\circ$  larger than the dipoles circle ra-  
 194 dius,  $r_d$ . As shown by (Oliveira & Wieczorek, 2017) this difference in the circles radii  
 195 avoids strong edge effects of the modeled field. Taking into account the nnls property  
 196 mentioned above, we choose the initial number of dipoles ( $N_d$ ) to be much larger than  
 197  $N_{obs}$ , allowing the technique to determine the dipoles that are positive.



198 For each magnetization direction  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$  we perform the inversion to determine the dipoles  
 199 position, their dipole moments, and the RMS misfit between the observations and mod-  
 200 elled magnetic field. We vary the magnetization direction over all directions in a unit  
 201 sphere. Each vector is centered in a unit sphere pointing to each surface point spaced  
 202 of  $4^\circ$  over an equidistant spherical grid (Katanforoush & Shahshahani, 2003). Each mag-  
 203 netization direction is converted to the corresponding magnetic north paleopole position,  
 204 as explained by Butler (1992). We then plot a map of the RMS misfit as a function of  
 205 the paleopole position. The lowest RMS misfit value of the map corresponds to the best  
 206 fitting paleopole position.

207 We note that the instrument uncertainty and the Equivalent Source Dipoles (ESD)  
 208 model formal uncertainties are too small to give a reasonable uncertainty value for our  
 209 inversions. In practice, we calculate the RMS difference between the observed and mod-  
 210 elled radial field points located between the circles of radii  $r_d$  and  $r_{obs}$ , respectively. Our  
 211 uncertainty is obtained by calculating the maximum allowable misfit, i.e., the upper limit  
 212 of RMS values for which the corresponding solution is accepted, and is based on the as-  
 213 sumption that the magnetic field signal surrounding the isolated anomaly should not be  
 214 inconsistent with that calculated from the unidirectional model. All models with inver-  
 215 sion uncertainties lower than the allowable misfit are therefore a possible paleopole po-  
 216 sition.

217 By definition, for an isolated anomaly it is not expected to observe anomaly-related  
 218 signals far from the principal anomaly. If there is any signal that is inconsistent with the  
 219 modeled anomaly then the uncertainty would likely be larger. On the other hand, if the  
 220 signal of the surrounding area is weak, then the uncertainty is expected to be smaller.  
 221 Synthetic tests based on Parker’s method performed by Thomas et al. (2018), show that  
 222 in the presence of a secondary anomaly in the vicinity of the principal one, a solution  
 223 that includes half of the planet surface is obtained. We have extended the synthetic study  
 224 using synthetic magnetized sources instead of a single dipole as previously done, to un-  
 225 derstand if our estimations could be affected. The paleopole positions were retrieved cor-  
 226 rectly independently of the source body used. Weaker secondary anomalies are often  
 227 present in the vicinity of each studied crater, which could perturb our inversion results.  
 228 As the Parker method is designed to invert for the magnetization direction of a single  
 229 isolated anomaly, we chose to reduce the observations’ area circle size, when necessary,  
 230 to avoid secondary anomalies. This, in turn, affects the dipoles’ grid area circle, which

will be slightly smaller than the impact crater area itself. We expect that final results would not be affected by slightly reducing the study area, however.


### 3 Analysis of anomalies associated with craters

In this section, we first briefly present the input model of the hermean crustal magnetic field, specifying the anomalies studied here. Next, we show the results by discussing each anomaly in detail.

#### 3.1 Data

We use the gridded crustal magnetic field model at 40 km altitude derived by Hood (2016) and Hood et al. (2018), which uses magnetometer data from the low-altitude passes of the spacecraft during the last three months of the MESSENGER mission. This model is based on the equivalent source dipole (ESD) technique, which was applied to data previously long-wavelength and high pass filtered from non-crustal sources (e.g., internal core field and magnetosphere sources). The grid has  $1^\circ$  and  $0.5^\circ$  resolution in longitude and latitude, respectively, and only covers latitudes between  $35^\circ$  and  $75^\circ$  due to the spacecraft orbit configuration. In this study, we will make use only of the radial field component. To determine their model (Hood, 2016) and (Hood et al., 2018) made use of only the radial field measurements, as horizontal components are highly susceptible to contamination by non-crustal fields.

From our survey, we found five anomalies that are likely related to the crater forming process: Rustaveli, Vyasa, and three other unnamed craters. Note that we chose to follow the same terminology as that of Table 1 from (Hood et al., 2018) to identify the craters. Figure 1 shows the locations of the anomalies associated with craters analyzed in this study superposed with the crustal magnetic field intensity map. Note that we have access to the crustal magnetic field information over a small portion of latitudes of the planet only, due to the very eccentric MESSENGER spacecraft orbit configuration. Though important external field contamination is believed to prevail in the northern and southern boundaries of the map, the anomalies of this study are not located in their vicinity. In this section, we first describe the inversion steps for the craters in our study. We show the results for the five anomalies associated with craters. Following this, we show the global picture of the resulting paleopoles.



**Figure 1.** Crustal magnetic field strength of Mercury at 40 km altitude from (Hood, 2016; Hood et al., 2018) based on MESSENGER observations. White circles indicate the locations of the magnetic anomalies investigated in this study. Projection is global Mollweide, centered on the  $0^\circ$  meridian.

### 3.2 Results

We performed inversions for five anomalies that are associated with impact craters of diameter varying from 130 to 300 km. As mentioned above, we follow the same numbering order of craters as in (Hood et al., 2018) (See Figure 3b of that reference for a topographical map of the crater locations). Figure 2 shows, for each anomaly, the topographical map (left column), the magnetic field intensity at 40 km altitude (middle column) and, the location of the nonnegative dipoles retrieved by the inversion (right column). In all charts, we delimit the grid of observations and that of dipoles used in our inversions by a solid and dashed black circles of radii  $r_{obs}$  and  $r_d$ , respectively. For the sake of completeness, we show in the supporting information the radial magnetic field data component, the best fitting radial magnetic field (i.e., the modelled field), and the difference between the two. In addition to the circles we also plot the locations of the observations and the dipoles used in the inversion. Finally, Figure 3 shows how the misfit varies with the north magnetic pole position, where the star symbol denotes the best fitting solution and the white line corresponds to the uncertainty.

**Table 1.** Location (Lon, Lat), radii of observations ( $r_{obs}$ ) and dipoles ( $r_d$ ), number of observations ( $N_{obs}$ ) and dipoles ( $N_d$ ) used in the inversion, the number of non-zero dipoles ( $Nz_d$ ) of the best-fitting calculated model, North paleopole position ( $\phi_p, \theta_p$ ), the RMS misfit between the best-fitting model and the data, and the corresponding uncertainty.

#	Name	Lon (°)	Lat (°)	$r_{obs}$ (°)	$r_d$ (°)	$N_{obs}$	$N_d$	$Nz_d$	$\phi_p$ (°)	$\theta_p$ (°)	Misfit (nT)	$\sigma$ (nT)
1	Rustaveli	82.5	52.5	3.5	2.5	128	148	43	66.8	-62.6	0.715	1.195
2	Vyasa	275.0	50.0	3.5	2.5	110	155	44	246.8	-50.9	0.442	0.795
3	-	289.0	57.0	3.0	2.0	104	96	14	289.0	-2.2	0.487	0.780
4	-	295.2	46.8	2.0	1.0	37	27	5	240.9	-34.8	0.588	0.837
5	-	281.8	41.2	2.5	1.5	50	56	12	29.6	-50.6	0.324	0.594

In Table 1 we provide detailed information for each anomaly, including the center location (longitude and latitude) of the crater that is associated with the magnetic anomaly, the radius of the observations circle,  $r_{obs}$ , and that of the dipoles,  $r_d$ , the number of observations,  $N_{obs}$  and the number of dipoles,  $N_d$ , the nonzero dipoles retained by the inversion  $Nz_d$ , the north paleomagnetic pole position ( $\phi_p, \theta_p$ ), the RMS misfit, and the uncertainty value,  $\sigma$ .

### 3.2.1 *Rustaveli*

Rustaveli, (82.5°E, 52.5°N), is a crater of medium size with an approximate diameter of 200 km located in a relatively flat region with few small craters in its vicinity. Rustaveli is a good example of a magnetic anomaly correlated with an impact crater, not only because of its relatively strong field but also because it is an impact crater with relatively unaltered topography. Comparing the magnetic field signal with the topography of the crater we see that almost all of the magnetic anomaly is within the crater main rim. Though the strongest signal of the anomaly is confined to the crater rim, the entire anomaly is somewhat elongated toward the northeast of the crater or is not completely dissociated from a much weaker secondary anomaly outside the crater's main rim. We chose not to model this secondary anomaly because it is not located in the crater's melt sheet and therefore has undefined sources origin.

Our method retrieves well the radial magnetic field with an RMS misfit of 0.72 nT, which is much lower than the central anomaly strength ( $\sim 6$  nT). First, we observe that only few dipoles are retained to explain the radial field. Secondly, comparing the distribution of dipole moments with the magnetic field observations, we note that the strong dipoles are slightly offset towards the north when compared to the magnetic field strength's

299 peak. If the positions of the nonnegative dipoles are indicative of the sources' position,  
300 then the asymmetric nonnegative dipoles distribution might be explained by the process  
01 of a projectile that impacted the surface at an oblique angle, as shown in lunar simu-  
302 lations by (Wieczorek et al., 2012).

303 The best fitting magnetization direction is pointing down towards the planet's sur-  
304 face (inclination  $44^\circ$  and declination  $8^\circ$ ) resulting in a north magnetic paleopole posi-  
305 tion at ( $66.8^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $62.6^\circ\text{S}$ ). We note that for a core field predominantly generated by a cen-  
306 tral inducing dipole aligned with the rotation axis, the paleopole position is located at  
307 the geographic poles. Additionally, extrapolating the model of the present core magnetic  
308 field to the Southern Hemisphere, it is expected to find the magnetic north pole to be  
309 located at the geographic south pole. This is roughly  $30^\circ$  apart from our best fitting pa-  
310 leopole result. The calculated uncertainty of 1.2 nT is larger than the best fitting RMS  
311 misfit value of 0.72 nT. This results in having the entire Southern Hemisphere of the planet  
312 as a possible solution for the location of the palaeopole.

### 313 **3.2.2 Vyasa**

314 Vyasa, centered at ( $275^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $50^\circ\text{N}$ ), is our preferred case due to its high magnetic  
315 peak strength of roughly 7 nT. The anomaly peak is found within the crater rim but is  
316 displaced slightly to the south of its center. The magnetic anomaly is somewhat elon-  
317 gated towards the southern direction, slightly crossing the crater rim. Vyasa impact crater,  
318 with a diameter of approximately 300 km, has its rim degraded by two other smaller sec-  
319 ondary anomalies on the northeast and northwest sides. Additionally, we observe a weaker  
320 magnetic anomaly associated with the northwest secondary crater.

321 Our method explains well the radial magnetic field with an RMS misfit of 0.44 nT,  
322 again much lower than the peak strength of  $\sim 7$  nT. The magnetization vectors have an  
323 inclination of  $26^\circ$  and declination of  $18^\circ$ . The model, as for Rustaveli, needs few dipoles  
324 to explain the magnetic anomaly. The strongest retained dipoles are roughly distributed  
325 in the center of the impact crater and are not shifted towards the south as happens with  
326 the observed magnetic anomaly itself. The best fitting paleopole position is at ( $247^\circ\text{E}$ ,  
327  $51^\circ\text{S}$ ) which is farther from the geographic south pole than in the previous case. Tak-  
328 ing into account the uncertainty value, it is possible that the paleopole could be anywhere  
329 south of  $30^\circ\text{S}$ . Overall results, Vyasa has the best constrained paleopole position con-

330 consistent with the fact that its magnetic anomaly is the strongest among the five anoma-  
331 lies of this study. In addition, we also performed an inversion of the small anomaly re-  
332 lated to the secondary crater located northwest of Vyasa. Its best fitting paleopole po-  
333 sition is located at (275°E, 49°S) with an RMS misfit of 0.42 nT, which is only 18° from  
334 the Vyasa paleopole.

### 335 **3.2.3 Anomaly 3**

336 The anomaly 3 is correlated with a unnamed impact crater centered at (289°E, 57°N),  
337 with an approximate diameter of 136 km. We note that the impact crater is located in  
338 the vicinity of some elevated terrains associated with younger craters. The magnetic anomaly  
339 is shifted towards the north of the crater's center, and it shows a weak elongated signal  
340 which falls slightly outside of the crater rim in the same direction.

341 We model the radial component of anomaly 3 with an RMS misfit of 0.49 nT, which  
342 is low comparing to the anomaly peak strength of 3.5 nT. The magnetization vectors have  
343 an inclination of -50° and declination of 18°. Only 14 out of 96 dipoles within the crater  
344 rim are needed to describe the anomaly. The dipoles do not show any particular pref-  
345 erence in their distribution, but the strongest dipoles are lying roughly where the mag-  
346 netic anomaly is. The best fitting paleopole position is found near the geographic equa-  
347 tor at (289°E, 2°S), corresponding to a distance of about 90° from the geographic poles.  
348 In addition, accounting for the uncertainties, contrary to the other cases, the geographic  
349 south pole is excluded from the solution. Instead, the geographic north pole is a possi-  
350 ble solution for this case.

### 351 **3.2.4 Anomaly 4**

352 The anomaly 4 is related to the impact crater centered at (295°E, 47°N). The peak  
353 of the anomaly is shifted east of the center of the crater. This anomaly presents several  
354 differences in respect to the other cases, such as: 1) the crater morphology is more com-  
355 plex, showing several overlapping younger craters; 2) the crater size is the smallest of all  
356 the cases considered in this study; and 3) we use an area of observations smaller than  
357 the crater size to avoid a relatively strong and large magnetic anomaly, which appears  
358 to be related to the elevated terrain south-east of the crater.

359 The magnetic radial field is explained with an RMS misfit of 0.59 nT, smaller than  
360 the peak strength of  $\sim 3.5$  nT. The magnetization vector has an inclination of  $10^\circ$  and  
361 declination of  $42^\circ$ . Only 5 out of 27 available dipoles are necessary to explain the ob-  
362 served field. The nonnegative dipoles are placed east of the crater center, where the anomaly  
363 peak is found. The best fitting paleopole position obtained is located at ( $241^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $35^\circ\text{S}$ ).  
364 Not surprisingly, accounting for the uncertainty, more than half of the planet might con-  
365 tain the possible paleopole solution. Although this result is not robust, it was expected  
366 due to the limitations that this particular anomaly faces. However, similar to all the other  
367 cases except the anomaly 3, it contains the geographic south pole as a possible solution  
368 for the paleopole position.

### 369 **3.2.5 Anomaly 5**

370 The anomaly 5 is related to the unnamed impact crater centered at ( $282^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $41^\circ\text{N}$ ),  
371 corresponding to our southernmost case. The position of the crater is sufficiently far from  
372 the map limit so that the signal is not perturbed by edge effects. The impact crater mor-  
373 phology is perturbed by two other smaller impact craters southwest and south of the crater's  
374 center. However, none of those smaller craters seem to perturb the isolated magnetic anomaly  
375 signal. In addition, the magnetic field anomaly is relatively small, and it is roughly cen-  
376 tered on the impact crater.

377 The radial field component is explained with an RMS misfit of 0.3 nT, which is much  
378 weaker than the peak strength of  $\sim 3.5$  nT. The magnetization vectors have an inclina-  
379 tion of  $-50^\circ$  and declination of  $30^\circ$ . Only 12 dipoles from 56 available dipoles are used  
380 to describe the magnetic anomaly. The nonnegative dipoles are mainly distributed where  
381 the magnetic anomaly is, which is the case for the anomalies 3 and 4. The best fitting  
382 paleopole position obtained is located at ( $30^\circ\text{E}$ ,  $51^\circ\text{S}$ ). This corresponds to a distance  
383 of  $40^\circ$  from the geographic south pole, similar to the paleopole position found for Vyasa  
384 anomaly. Accounting for the uncertainty, a large part of the Southern Hemisphere could  
385 be a possible solution, similar to the Rustaveli case.

## 386 **4 Discussion: Constraining the early history of Mercury**

387 In this section, we first discuss the distribution of the paleopoles obtained for all  
388 the studied anomalies. Then, we consider the possibility that the anomaly sources might

389 be magnetized by induction in the present-day Mercury field. Finally, assuming that our  
390 sources carry thermoremanent magnetization, we consider and discuss separately two dif-  
91 ferent main hypotheses that can explain our paleopoles distribution: True polar wan-  
392 der process and ancient dynamo field morphology. Through out all section we discuss  
93 our results with three different perspectives: 1) our paleopoles within uncertainties which  
394 is a conservative approach but, is our preferred one as uncertainties should be associated  
395 to any result; 2) that our uncertainties are calculated in a conservative way, and there-  
396 fore we focus on paleopoles best fitting position for discussion purposes; and 3) that all  
397 our craters were formed during the same conditions field, and therefore we focus on the  
398 overlapping of results.

#### 399 4.1 Paleopoles distribution

400 Figure 4 shows the distribution of the best-fit north magnetic paleopoles together  
401 with the corresponding uncertainties for all studied anomalies. We find the best fitting  
402 paleopoles at latitudes between 2°S and 62°S. The associated uncertainties are large, and  
403 cover approximately one hemisphere in most cases. Despite the individual large uncer-  
404 tainties, all paleopole solutions overlap in a relatively small common region. This com-  
405 mon region is located between 30°S and 80°S latitudes, and between 170°E and 300°E  
406 longitudes. This region could be perceived as the most probable solution, if we assume  
407 that our five craters formed with an Hermean magnetic field of similar morphology. We  
408 emphasize that the southernmost latitude of this overlapping region is only 10° away from  
409 the geographic south pole. Rather small angular distances between this possible pale-  
410 pole position and the geographical south pole can be explained by true polar wander  
events (see subsection 4.3).

412 Although our sample size is small with only five studied anomalies, they can nonethe-  
413 less be discussed as they offer consistent results. Four of the five anomalies results sug-  
414 gest that the paleopoles are located in the Southern Hemisphere. In addition, another  
415 interesting feature that we can observe is that the best fitting paleopoles do not seem  
416 to be randomly distributed across the Hermean surface, with the entire Northern Hemi-  
417 sphere showing a lack of magnetic best fitting paleopoles. Additionally, none are found  
418 in the immediate vicinity of the geographic poles as would be expected for a dipolar core  
419 field aligned with the planet's rotation axis. However, three best fitting paleopoles lie  
420 at latitudes exceeding 50°S, and can therefore be considered to be high-latitude pole po-



421 sitions. The anomaly 3 has its best fitting paleopole at an equatorial position, but this  
422 is also the poorest constrained result. For this particular anomaly, the geographic north  
423 pole is within the solution area. This would imply a geomagnetic north pole close to the  
424 geographic north pole, in contradiction to the other four results. This is however not un-  
425 expected, as polarity reversals are a very common feature of dynamos. Furthermore, we  
426 observe that the best fitting paleopoles for Rustaveli and anomaly 5 are very close to each  
427 other, despite the anomalies being far away. The same situation is found for both Vyasa  
428 and anomaly 4 (note that the paleopole for the secondary crater anomaly near Vyasa  
429 is also located nearby).

430 We conclude that our results do not exclude a reversal, but neither do they imply  
431 one. Future inversions of further anomalies of TRM origin are required to refine our con-  
432 clusions. In the following, we discuss the remanent or induced origin of the modeled anoma-  
433 lies. Next, we discuss the different hypotheses that can explain our results, which are usu-  
434 ally called to explain planetary evolution. In particular, we consider true polar wander  
435 events and different ancient dynamo morphology scenarios.

## 36 4.2 Anomaly source origin

437 As explained in the Introduction, in order to constrain the early history of Mer-  
438 cury's interior and axial orientation, we have to assume that our magnetic sources are  
439 related to ancient TRM rather than induced by permeability contrasts in the crust by  
440 the present-day core dynamo field. However, in practice, distinguishing IM from TRM  
441 sources is not straightforward. We also recognize that, if they exist, large-scale lithospheric  
442 field originated by deeper sources might be filtered out when constructing the magnetic  
443 field model. This in turn prevent us to access the contribution of unknown large-scale  
444 lithospheric field, and consequently preclude us from inferring correctly the magnetiza-  
445 tion direction (see (Vervelidou et al., 2017) for details). We expect, however, small ef-  
446 fects from the large-scales deep sources to the shallow ones studied here. On the other  
447 hand, under the assumption of an axial dipolar field, the paleopole position of induced  
448 sources would lie near the magnetic north pole, corresponding to the present geographic  
449 south pole. However, the present-day core field is not purely dipolar, as it has a strong  
450 quadrupole component (Anderson et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 2015; Thébaud et al., 2018).  
451 In order to better distinguish between a TRM and IM origin, we investigate the distri-

452 bution of paleopoles that would be obtained if the magnetic anomalies were actually due  
453 to IM acquired in the presence of the present-day core magnetic field.

454 In order to estimate the distribution of paleopoles that would be obtained if all sources  
455 were associated with IM, we use an Hermean core field model updated from Oliveira et  
456 al. (2015). This model uses 16 Hermean days of MESSENGER measurements correspond-  
457 ing almost to all mission available data. The magnetic field is modeled from the north  
458 pole down to  $5^{\circ}\text{N}$  latitudes, i.e., the region where the measurements are available. We  
459 use this model to compute the inclination and declination (I, D) for latitudes ranging  
460 from  $35$  to  $75^{\circ}\text{N}$  on a regular grid. Next, we use these angle pairs as if they were related  
461 to the magnetization direction associated with a centered dipole and compute the mag-  
462 netic paleopole position. Figure 5 shows the normalized probability of the paleopole dis-  
463 tribution, where the darkest area corresponds to a maximum 40% probability. The re-  
464 sulting paleopoles distribution shows that the poles are located over a relatively large  
465 area, from the south pole up to  $70^{\circ}\text{S}$ , instead of a single polar location as expected for  
466 a purely dipolar field. We also note that the paleopoles are preferentially distributed in  
467 a band of latitudes between  $70^{\circ}\text{S}$  and  $75^{\circ}\text{S}$ . None of our best fitting paleopole locations  
468 (Figure 4) is compatible with this small area around the geographic south pole. Con-  
469 sidering our uncertainties, however, we cannot rule out that our paleopole distribution  
470 is consistent with the IM hypothesis.

471 We conclude that, based on this study, paleopoles derived from IM sources cannot  
472 be distinguished from paleopoles corresponding to sources that have been magnetized  
473 by an ancient centered dipolar field. Such a distinction on the basis of paleopole esti-  
474 mates could only be possible if the paleopoles, accounting for their location uncertain-  
475 ties, are estimated to lie northward of  $70^{\circ}\text{S}$ . On the other hand, metal iron is the prob-  
476 able magnetic carrier present in Mercury's surface (Strauss et al., 2016). In addition, the  
477 abundance of metal iron present in the crater melt sheet is constrained by the crater's  
478 size. This is because the crater's structure is naturally related to the size, velocity and  
479 chemical composition of the impactor. Under the hypothesis that the metal iron was de-  
480 livered by the projectile, Hood et al. (2018) found that the signal of magnetic sources  
481 related with craters were too strong to be explained only by induced fields.

### 4.3 True Polar Wander Hypothesis

True polar wander is a common pattern that is believed to have happened in terrestrial planetary bodies. This physical process consists of a reorientation of the body in order to adjust the major principal axis with the rotation axis after a perturbation of its mass distribution. This can happen due to external processes, e.g., impactors or due to internal processes. (Matsuyama et al., 2014). In this work, our best fitting paleopole positions are distributed over the southern hemisphere, albeit with large uncertainties. Four of the five best fitting paleopoles are found at mid- to high-latitudes, between 35°S and 63°S. To account for these paleopole positions by considering only planetary reorientation, a true polar wander of 27 up to 55 degrees is required. If we wish to explain the anomaly 3 best fitting paleopole only by means of reorientation processes, then a true polar wander of nearly 90° would be necessary.

Considering the large impact basins and highlands formation, (Keane & Matsuyama, 2018) computed a true polar wander of roughly 20°. In particular, according to their model, Caloris and Sobkou basins together with the volcanic rise can already explain a polar wander of 5 to 10 degrees. We note that 10° corresponds to the lower bound of latitudes of our common solutions region. Under the hypothesis that all craters were formed when the core field morphology was similar, TPW process could easily explain the results. If we give a particular attention to the best fitting paleopole positions, we observe that Rustaveli best fitting paleopole is located only 7° from the maximum latitude value that true polar wander events can explain. However, the reorientation directions of 120°E up to 180°E from the models of (Keane & Matsuyama, 2018) do not agree with the paleopole position longitudes of 247°E. Another case hard to be explained by TPW is the equatorial paleopole. If it is due to reorientation process only, then other geological features must be considered. For instance, the translating inner core process might also play a role in the reorientation of Mercury (Abrahams et al., 2016). Accounting for the uncertainties, all our solutions indicate that the paleopoles could be located in the actual geographic south or north poles. We emphasize, however, that our uncertainties are probably calculated in a very conservative way. Therefore, we conclude that true polar wander events are not necessary to explain our results, if we consider that the dynamo was reversing.

#### 4.4 Ancient Dynamo Field

In general, dynamo simulations usually show several possible scenarios of dynamo evolution, which depend on the chosen parameters and the initial conditions. To account for all scenarios we discuss the degree of compatibility of our methodological approach and of our results with the three main core magnetic field morphologies that could be present at the surface during the craters formation period: multipolar field; dipolar field; and, dipolar-quadrupolar field (e.g., morphology similar to the current stage).

Although a multi-polar field hypothesis gives rise to the question of how the dynamo evolved to its current axisymmetric state, there are arguments supporting such a configuration for an ancient core field. On Mercury, Hauck II et al. (2013) infer a shallow core mantle boundary at depths of solely 420 km. Though higher multipole components decay rapidly with distance compared to the dipole component, the planetary surface being close to the core eventually favors a multipolar component field case. In this work, we used the Parker's method which inverts for the magnetization direction through an unidirectional assumption. This is still valid for an ancient multipolar field case, because 1) those component scales are much larger than the crater sizes and 2) the magnetic field is supposed to evolve on longer time scales than the time the craters molten material takes to cool down to the Curie temperature within the crater rim. However, to convert the inverted magnetization direction to its corresponding paleopole position, we make a centered dipolar field assumption. This is in contradiction with the multipolar field hypothesis. The resulting paleopoles positions would not be clustering in a small region as shown in Figure 5 (see also Oliveira and Wiczorek (2017) for another example). Our paleopole solutions indicate that an ancient multi-polar core field may have existed.

Assuming that the ancient field morphology was dipolar, then the assumption made to convert from the magnetization direction to the corresponding paleopole position is valid. It is also known from numerical simulations and from paleomagnetic records that the dynamo might undergo polarity reversals. The reversal process is thought to be much faster than the period of time that the dynamo is stable, in particular with a dominating dipolar component. During the reversal process the field morphology is thought to be dominated by the nondipolar terms. Specifically, for the Earth, the dynamo-generated field spends most of its time in a single polarity and reverses in a short period of time

545 compared to the time it spends in the dipolar morphology. For a crater formed during  
546 a dynamo reversal, the resulting recorded paleopole would be an average of the many  
547 directions that the field would locally take during the reversal process. For example, the  
548 time scale for a lunar melt sheet to cool down under Curie temperature is roughly 10 mil-  
549 lions of years for 1 km thick layer (Le Bars et al., 2011). This is, however, unlikely to  
550 have happened for all craters, assuming that the dynamo spends most of its time in a  
551 dipolar configuration. The best fitting palaeolopes obtained do not cluster near the ge-  
552 ographic poles, as expected for a reversal dynamo of centered axial dipolar morphology,  
553 nor in a small region as expected for the non-axial centered dipolar field. Accounting for  
554 uncertainties, we find a common area for all magnetic anomalies. If we assume that the  
555 Hermean magnetic field kept its morphology during our craters formation, this region  
556 could be explained by a centered non-axial dipolar field, or by an axial dipolar field present  
557 before the planet suffers a true polar wander. Our results are not in disagreement with  
558 a reversing dynamo of axial dipolar morphology as the southern/northern poles are in-  
559 cluded in the solutions.

560 Recently, numerical simulations combining double-diffusive convection with a sta-  
561 bly stratified layer reproduced the present magnetic field of Mercury (Takahashi et al.,  
562 2019). This particular dynamo configuration reproduces a very stable magnetic equa-  
563 tor offset for some magnetic diffusion times (around 60.000 years). Even if exotic, it is  
564 possible that the Hermean dynamo is extremely stable with an almost frozen surface field  
565 configuration since the craters formation period. Note that temporal variations were not  
566 found when comparing observations of Mariner 10 and those of MESSENGER (Philpott  
567 et al. 2014). In this case, the ancient field would be of the same configuration as the cur-  
568 rent one. This would lead to the magnetization distribution of the crustal magnetic field  
569 sources being the same as in the case of an IM origin, discussed in section 4.2. Conse-  
570 quently, the paleopoles would be found in the small region around the geographic pole  
571 as shown in Figure 5. However, our best fitting paleopoles are not found in the region  
572 where the paleopoles would lie for a field with dipolar and quadrupolar components (shown  
573 in Figure 5). Nevertheless, as shown by Takahashi et al. (2019), the evolution of the dipo-  
574 lar and quadrupolar terms could vary in a way that maintains the equatorial asymme-  
575 try of the field, while changing (by increasing or decreasing) the extent of the region where  
576 the paleopoles would lie. Accounting for the uncertainties, all anomalies correspond to  
577 an area of admissible paleopoles that overlaps partially or entirely with the region of pale-

578 poles that corresponds to today's field, preventing us from excluding this scenario. Though  
579 this work shows that the dynamo can preserve the same configuration for a few million  
580 years, a study with a longer time period is needed to confirm whether the core field mor-  
581 phology is stable since the crater formation period.

582 The exact ancient dynamo morphology is still an open question according to our  
583 paleopoles within uncertainties results. The best we can conclude from our findings is  
584 that: if the ancient dynamo field had a dipolar morphology, a true polar wander is likely  
585 to have happened; the multipolar morphology is still a possibility; the dynamo field may  
586 vary very little in terms of its morphology.

## 587 **5 Conclusion**

588 Today the early history of Mercury is poorly constrained by in situ measurements.  
589 However, some constraints on the early history of Mercury might be found by analyz-  
590 ing its crustal magnetic field as measured by satellites. Magnetic anomalies that are gen-  
591 erated by thermoremanently magnetized sources possess information on the ancient core  
592 field, and therefore it is important to distinguish them from sources generated by other  
593 magnetization processes. Here we study magnetic anomalies that are associated with com-  
594 plex craters on Mercury as their centered melt sheets are likely to be thermoremanently  
595 magnetized rather than shockremanently magnetized. During the crater formation, the  
596 iron rich impactor is incorporated mostly in the melt sheet that cools down slowly, record-  
597 ing thermoremanently the ambient magnetic field. However, as argued by (Hood et al.,  
598 2018), the amount of iron that an impactor can plausibly deliver to Mercury's surface  
599 falls well short of that needed to explain the observed relatively strong crater-associated  
600 magnetic anomalies as being induced in the present-day core dynamo field. Addition-  
601 ally, not all craters are associated with magnetic field anomalies as the composition of  
602 the impactor is expected to vary in iron content.

603 Here we use the crustal magnetic field model of (Hood, 2016) and (Hood et al., 2018)  
604 based on low magnetic field measurements of the MESSENGER spacecraft and estimate  
605 magnetization directions, which we then convert to magnetic paleopole positions. We  
606 employed the method of (Parker, 1991), which assumes a unidirectionally magnetized  
607 source. This is in agreement with a stable core-generated dipolar field present when the  
608 crater was formed. An important characteristic of this method is that it does not require

609 any assumptions on the source geometry. We studied five anomalies associated with craters  
610 suitable for inversion, and we obtained the corresponding magnetic paleopoles. Most of  
611 the best-fitting paleopoles are found at middle to high latitudes in the Southern Hemi-  
612 sphere although one is very close to the equator. Accounting for the uncertainties, which  
613 are calculated in a very conservative way, we find that our results converge towards a  
614 small region that excludes the current magnetic (and geographic South) pole.

615 No single physical process can satisfactorily explain the finding that our best fit-  
616 ting paleopoles are located in the southern hemisphere only, but away from the geographic  
617 pole. Assuming a dipolar field aligned with the rotation axis, true polar wander events  
618 from 27 up to 88 degrees are required. Reorientation models can only explain up to 20°  
619 of true polar wander when accounting for important masses added by impactors. Alter-  
620 natively, their distribution might be also indicative of a different field morphology present  
621 at the surface of Mercury when the craters formed. However, it would be a major chal-  
622 lenge for dynamo modelers to account for an abrupt change from a multipolar field to  
623 a very stable axisymmetric field morphology as observed by MESSENGER today. We  
624 found that the five anomalies solutions all agree in a smaller common solutions area that  
625 excludes the current geographic poles. This could be explained by a centered non-axial  
626 dipolar field, or by an axial dipolar field present before the planet has suffered a true po-  
627 lar wander.

628 Overall, our study strongly suggests that Mercury has evolved with time. Our re-  
629 sults cannot decipher between changes caused by a true polar wander or evolution af-  
630 fecting the dynamo process. It should be emphasized that our study is limited by the  
631 small area of low altitude measurements containing crustal information due to MESSEN-  
632 GER's eccentric orbit. New results and conclusions may arise with BepiColombo ESA/JAXA  
633 mission (Benkhoff et al., 2010) launched in October 2018. The mission will return mag-  
634 netic field measurements at low altitudes all around the planet. Hopefully, during this  
635 new mission or towards its end, other regions of Mercury's crustal magnetic field might  
636 be also measured and consequently increase our understanding of the early history of Mer-  
637 cury.

## 638 **Acknowledgments**

639 Maps used in this study are available at

640 <https://pds-ppi.igpp.ucla.edu/search/view/?f=yesid=pds://PPI/mess->  
641 [mag-field-maps](https://pds-ppi.igpp.ucla.edu/search/view/?f=yesid=pds://PPI/mess-mag-field-maps).

642 We would like to thank the reviewers Foteini Vervelidou and Vincent Lesur for their  
643 valuable comments that helped to improve a first version of this manuscript. JSO is funded  
644 by the ESA Research Fellowship programme in Space Science. JSO and BL acknowledge  
645 the ANR project MARMITE (ANR-13-BS05-0012). This work was supported at the Uni-  
646 versity of Arizona by the NASA DDAP. This study further benefited from the financial  
647 support from Région Pays de la Loire, project GeoPlaNet (convention 2016-10982).

## 648 References

- 649 Abrahams, J. N. H., Cao, H., & Stevenson, D. J. (2016, March). Inner Core Trans-  
650 lation, True Polar Wander, and Mercury's North-South Asymmetric Magnetic  
651 Field. In *Proc. lunar planet. sci. conf.* (Vol. 47, p. Abstract 2502).
- 652 Anderson, B. J., Johnson, C. L., Korth, H., Winslow, R. M., Borovsky, J. E., Pu-  
653 rucker, M. E., ... McNutt, R. L., Jr. (2012, December). Low-degree structure  
654 in Mercury's planetary magnetic field. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *117*, E00L12. doi:  
655 10.1029/2012JE004159
- 656 Arkani-Hamed, J. (2001). Paleomagnetic pole positions and pole reversals of Mars.  
657 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *28*, 3409-3412. doi: 10.1029/2001GL012928
- 658 Benkhoff, J., van Casteren, J., Hayakawa, H., Fujimoto, M., Laakso, H., Novara, M.,  
659 ... Ziethe, R. (2010). Bepicolombo—comprehensive exploration of mercury:  
660 Mission overview and science goals. *Planetary and Space Science*, *58*(1), 2  
661 - 20. Retrieved from [http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/  
662 pii/S0032063309002840](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0032063309002840) (Comprehensive Science Investigations of Mer-  
663 cury: The scientific goals of the joint ESA/JAXA mission BepiColombo) doi:  
664 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pss.2009.09.020>
- 665 Bezaeva, N. S., Gattacceca, J., Rochette, P., Sadykov, R. A., & Trukhin, V. I. (2010,  
666 Mar). Demagnetization of terrestrial and extraterrestrial rocks under hydro-  
667 static pressure up to 1.2 GPa. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*,  
668 *179*(1-2), 7-20. doi: 10.1016/j.pepi.2010.01.004
- 669 Butler, R. (1992). *Paleomagnetism: Magnetic domains to geologic terranes*. Black-  
670 well Scientific Publications. Retrieved from [https://books.google.co.in/  
671 books?id=q\NzQgAACAAJ](https://books.google.co.in/books?id=q\NzQgAACAAJ)



- 672 Cao, H., Aurnou, J. M., Wicht, J., Dietrich, W., Soderlund, K. M., & Russell, C. T.  
673 (2014). A dynamo explanation for mercury's anomalous magnetic field. *Geo-*  
674 *phys. Res. Lett.*, *41*. doi: 10.1002/2014GL060196
- 675 Christensen, U. R. (2006, December). A deep dynamo generating Mercury's mag-  
676 netic field. *Nature*, *444*, 1056-1058. doi: 10.1038/nature05342
- 677 Christensen, U. R., & Wicht, J. (2008, July). Models of magnetic field generation  
678 in partly stable planetary cores: Applications to Mercury and Saturn. *Icarus*,  
679 *196*, 16-34. doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2008.02.013
- 680 Cintala, M. J., & Grieve, R. A. F. (1998, July). Scaling impact-melt and crater  
681 dimensions: Implications for the lunar cratering record. *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.*,  
682 *33*, 889-912. doi: 10.1111/j.1945-5100.1998.tb01695.x
- 683 Gattacceca, J., Boustie, M., Lima, E., Weiss, B. P., de Resseguier, T., & Cuq-  
684 Lelandais, J. P. (2010, Sep). Unraveling the simultaneous shock magnetization  
685 and demagnetization of rocks. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*,  
686 *182*(1-2), 42-49. doi: 10.1016/j.pepi.2010.06.009
- 687 Hauck II, S. A., Margot, J.-L., Solomon, S. C., Phillips, R. J., Johnson, C. L.,  
688 Lemoine, F. G., ... Zuber, M. T. (2013). The curious case of mercury's  
689 internal structure. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, *118*(6), 1204-  
690 1220. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jgre.20091)  
691 [10.1002/jgre.20091](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jgre.20091) doi: 10.1002/jgre.20091
- 692 Hood, L. L. (2015, December). Initial mapping of Mercury's crustal magnetic field:  
693 Relationship to the Caloris impact basin. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *42*, 10. doi: 10  
694 .1002/2015GL066451
- 695 Hood, L. L. (2016). Magnetic anomalies concentrated near and within mer-  
696 cury's impact basins: Early mapping and interpretation. *Journal of Geo-*  
697 *physical Research: Planets*, *121*(6), 1016-1025. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005048)  
698 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005048](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005048) doi:  
699 [10.1002/2016JE005048](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005048)
- 700 Hood, L. L., Oliveira, J. S., Galluzzi, V., & Rothery, D. A. (2018). Investigating  
701 sources of mercury's crustal magnetic field: Further mapping of messenger  
702 magnetometer data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, *123*(10), 2647-  
703 2666. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018JE005683)  
704 [10.1029/2018JE005683](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018JE005683) doi: 10.1029/2018JE005683


- 705 Johnson, C. L., Phillips, R. J., Purucker, M. E., Anderson, B. J., Byrne, P. K.,  
 706 Denevi, B. W., . . . Solomon, S. C. (2015, May). Low-altitude magnetic field  
 707 measurements by MESSENGER reveal Mercury's ancient crustal field. *Sci-*  
 708 *ence*, *348*, 892-895. doi: 10.1126/science.aaa8720
- 709 Johnson, C. L., Purucker, M. E., Korth, H., Anderson, B. J., Winslow, R. M., Al  
 710 Asad, M. M. H., . . . Solomon, S. C. (2012, December). MESSENGER obser-  
 711 vations of Mercury's magnetic field structure. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *117*, E00L14.  
 712 doi: 10.1029/2012JE004217
- 713 Katanforoush, A., & Shahshahani, M. (2003). Distributing Points on the Sphere. *Ex-*  
 714 *per. Math.*, *12*, 199-209.
- 715 Keane, J. T., & Matsuyama, I. (2018, May). True Polar Wander of Mercury.  
 716 In *Mercury: Current and future science of the innermost planet* (Vol. 2047,  
 717 p. 6098).
- 718 Korth, H., Anderson, B. J., Johnson, C. L., Winslow, R. M., Slavin, J. A., Purucker,  
 719 M. E., . . . McNutt, R. L., Jr. (2012, December). Characteristics of the plasma  
 720 distribution in Mercury's equatorial magnetosphere derived from MESSEN-  
 721 GER Magnetometer observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Space*  
 722 *Physics)*, *117*, A00M07. doi: 10.1029/2012JA018052
- 723 Lawson, C. L., & Hanson, R. J. (1974). *Solving least squares problems*. Englewood  
 724 Cliffs, NJ 07632, USA: Prentice-Hall.
- 725 Le Bars, M., Wiczeorek, M. A., Karatekin, Ö., Cébron, D., & Laneuville, M. (2011,  
 726 November). An impact-driven dynamo for the early Moon. *Nature*, *479*, 215-  
 727 218. doi: 10.1038/nature10565
- 728 Matsuyama, I., Nimmo, F., & Mitrova, J. X. (2014). Planetary reorientation.  
 729 *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, *42*(1), 605-634. Retrieved  
 730 from <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-060313-054724> doi:  
 731 10.1146/annurev-earth-060313-054724
- 732 Oliveira, J. S., Langlais, B., Pais, M. A., & Amit, H. (2015). A modified equivalent  
 733 source dipole method to model partially distributed magnetic field measure-  
 734 ments, with application to Mercury. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*,  
 735 *120*(6), 1075-1094. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JE004734)  
 736 [.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JE004734](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2014JE004734) doi: 10.1002/2014JE004734
- 737 Oliveira, J. S., & Wiczeorek, M. A. (2017, February). Testing the axial dipole hy-

- 738 pothesis for the Moon by modeling the direction of crustal magnetization. *J.*  
739 *Geophys. Res. Planets*, 122, 383-399. doi: 10.1002/2016JE005199
- 40 Oliveira, J. S., Wicczorek, M. A., & Kletetschka, G. (2017). Iron abundances in  
741 lunar impact basin melt sheets from orbital magnetic field data. *Journal of*  
742 *Geophysical Research: Planets*, 122(12), 2429-2444. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005397)  
743 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005397](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005397) doi:  
744 10.1002/2017JE005397
- 45 Parker, R. L. (1991, September). A Theory of Ideal Bodies for Seamount Mag-  
746 netism. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 96, 16101-16112. doi: 10.1029/91JB01497
- 747 Purucker, M. E., Sabaka, T. J., Solomon, S. C., Anderson, B. J., Korth, H.,  
748 Zuber, M. T., & Neumann, G. A. (2009). Mercury's internal mag-  
749 netic field: Constraints on large- and small-scale fields of crustal origin.  
750 *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 285(3), 340 - 346. Retrieved from  
751 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X08007681>  
752 (MESSENGER's First Flyby of Mercury) doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2008.12.017)  
753 [j.epsl.2008.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2008.12.017)
- 754 Stanley, S., Bloxham, J., Hutchison, W. E., & Zuber, M. T. (2005). Thin shell  
755 dynamo models consistent with mercury's weak observed magnetic field.  
756 *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 234(1), 27 - 38. Retrieved from  
757 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X05001652>  
758 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2005.02.040>
- 759 Strauss, B. E., Feinberg, J. M., & Johnson, C. L. (2016). Magnetic mineralogy of  
760 the mercurian lithosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 121(11),  
761 2225-2238. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005054)  
762 [doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005054](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2016JE005054) doi: 10.1002/2016JE005054
- 763 Tagle, R., & Hecht, L. (2006, November). Geochemical identification of projectiles in  
764 impact rocks. *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.*, 41, 1721-1735. doi: 10.1111/j.1945-5100  
765 .2006.tb00448.x
- 766 Tagle, R., Schmitt, R. T., & Erzinger, J. (2009, August). Identification of the projec-  
767 tile component in the impact structures Rochechouart, France and Sääksjärvi,  
768 Finland: Implications for the impactor population for the earth. *Geochim.*  
769 *Cosmochim. Ac.*, 73, 4891-4906. doi: 10.1016/j.gca.2009.05.044
- 770 Takahashi, F., & Matsushima, M. (2006). Dipolar and non-dipolar dynamos


- 771 in a thin shell geometry with implications for the magnetic field of mer-  
772 cury. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33(10). Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL025792)  
773 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL025792](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2006GL025792) doi:  
774 10.1029/2006GL025792
- 775 Takahashi, F., Shimizu, H., & Tsunakawa, H. (2019). Mercury's anomalous magnetic  
776 field caused by a symmetry-breaking self-regulating dynamo. *Nature Commu-*  
777 *nications*, 10(1), 208. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08213-7)  
778 [08213-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08213-7) doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-08213-7
- 779 Takahashi, F., Tsunakawa, H., Shimizu, H., Shibuya, H., & Matsushima, M. (2014,  
780 June). Reorientation of the early lunar pole. *Nature Geosci.*, 7, 409-412. doi:  
781 10.1038/ngeo2150
- 782 Thébault, E., Langlais, B., Oliveira, J. S., Amit, H., & Leclercq, L. (2018). A  
783 time-averaged regional model of the hermean magnetic field. *Physics of the*  
784 *Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 276, 93 - 105. Retrieved from [http://www](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031920117300304)  
785 [.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031920117300304](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031920117300304) (Special  
786 Issue:15th SEDI conference) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pepi.2017.07.001>
- 787 Thomas, P., Grott, M., Morschhauser, A., & Vervelidou, F. (2018). Pale-  
788 opole reconstruction of martian magnetic field anomalies. *Journal of Geo-*  
789 *physical Research: Planets*, 123(5), 1140-1155. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005511)  
790 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005511](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2017JE005511) doi:  
791 10.1002/2017JE005511
- 792 Vervelidou, F., & Lesur, V. (2018). Unveiling earth's hidden magnetization. *Geo-*  
793 *physical Research Letters*, 45(22), 12,283-12,292. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL079876)  
794 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL079876](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2018GL079876) doi:  
795 10.1029/2018GL079876
- 796 Vervelidou, F., Lesur, V., Morschhauser, A., Grott, M., & Thomas, P. (2017, Decem-  
797 ber). On the accuracy of palaeopole estimations from magnetic field measure-  
798 ments. *Geophysical Journal International*, 211, 1669-1678. doi: 10.1093/gji/  
799 ggx400
- 800 Vilim, R., Stanley, S., & Hauck, S. A. (2010, November). Iron snow zones as a mech-  
801 anism for generating Mercury's weak observed magnetic field. *J. Geophys. Res.*  
802 *(Planets)*, 115, 11003. doi: 10.1029/2009JE003528
- 803 Vine, F. J., & Matthews, D. H. (1963, September). Magnetic Anomalies Over

804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812


- Oceanic Ridges. *Nature*, 199, 947-949. doi: 10.1038/199947a0
- Weider, S. Z., Nittler, L. R., Starr, R. D., McCoy, T. J., & Solomon, S. C. (2014). Variations in the abundance of iron on mercury's surface from messenger x-ray spectrometer observations. *Icarus*, 235, 170 - 186. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019103514001195> doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2014.03.002>
- Wieczorek, M. A., Weiss, B. P., & Stewart, S. T. (2012, March). An impactor origin for lunar magnetic anomalies. *Science*, 335, 1212. doi: 10.1126/science.1214773




**Figure 2.** Modeling summary for each of the five crater-associated anomalies: Left column: topography; middle column: observed magnetic field strength at 40 km altitude; right column: magnetic moments of the retained dipoles used in the inversions. Also shown in the supporting information is the radial magnetic field data component, the best fitting radial magnetic field (i.e., the modelled field), and the difference between the two. Black circles delimit the grid of observations (solid line) and dipoles (dashed line). Images are presented using a Lambert azimuthal equal-area projection.



**Figure 3.** Misfit as a function of north paleomagnetic pole position with the corresponding uncertainty denoted by a white solid line for Rustaveli (a), Vyasa (b), anomaly 3 (c), anomaly 4 (d), and anomaly 5 (e). The star denotes the best fitting solution. Results are presented using a global Molleweide projection with a central meridian of  $0^\circ$ .



**Figure 4.** North paleomagnetic pole positions for all studied crustal magnetic anomalies: (red) Rustaveli, (blue) Vyasa, (green) Anomaly3, (orange) Anomaly 4 and, (black) Anomaly5. The maps are: (left) in a Lambert Azimuthal Equal Area projection with the south pole in the center and, (right) in a Mollweide projection centered at  $0^\circ\text{E}$ . The darker yellow color corresponds to regions with a higher probability of containing the solution.




**Figure 5.** Distribution of paleopoles under the assumption of a dipolar field using a present day core field model for Mercury. The maps are: (left) in a Lambert Azimuthal Equal Area projection with the south pole in the center and, (right) in a Mollweide projection centered at  $0^\circ\text{E}$ . The maximum normalized probability corresponds to 40%.




Figure 1.






Accepted Article




Accepted Article




Accepted Article



Accepted Article




90°





This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.









Accepted Article












90°



This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

