A fault surface exposed on Mercury
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ABSTRACT

Mercury’s tectonic history has been dominated by global contraction as the planet shrinks and cools. Previously, fault dips have been indirectly estimated by measuring offsets to the rims of craters displaced by fault movement. Here we present the first observations of a fault surface exposed in three dimensions, in this case within a volcanic vent. We use shadow measurements to determine the depth of the vent and have measured the dip of the fault as 28° ± 5. This is towards the shallower end of previous dip estimates used to estimate global contraction. If it is representative, it suggests global contraction at the higher end (5.7–7.1 km) of previously published estimates.

1. Introduction

Tectonic and volcanic processes have shaped Mercury’s surface over its geological history (Strom et al., 1975; Head et al., 2008, 2009; Watters et al., 2015). Tectonism is manifest in shortening landforms such as lobate scarps, wrinkle ridges, and high relief ridges, which are the dominant surface expression of the planet’s global contraction (Dzurisin, 1978; Melosh and McKinnon, 1988; Watters et al., 2009).

A lobate scarp is an asymmetrical ridge that is the surface expression of a thrust fault. They are known to be up to 2 km high on Mercury (Strom et al., 1975; Watters and Nimmo, 2010; Massironi et al., 2015). Wrinkle ridges have a similar surface expression to lobate scarps, but tend to be smaller and more symmetrical (Strom et al., 1975; Watters and Nimmo, 2010; Koroteniemi et al., 2015). High relief ridges are broad, symmetrical topographic features, interpreted as high angle reverse faults (Dzurisin, 1978). Initially thought to be a distinct tectonic landform, subsequent observations show high relief ridges can often transition into lobate scarps and thus are part of a continuum of landforms (Melosh and McKinnon, 1988; Watters et al., 2009; Byrne et al., 2014; Massironi and Byrne, 2015).

Key terminology related to faults in this manuscript includes: the fault plane, which is the surface separating the blocks and along which movement has occurred; strike, the azimuth at which the fault plane intersects the horizontal; and the dip, the angle at which the fault plane descends below the horizontal (Neuendorf et al., 2005).

The stresses in Mercury’s crust that have generated this contractional tectonism have multiple possible origins, including global contraction (Watters and Nimmo, 2010), tidal despinning (e.g. Melosh and Dzurisin, 1978), true polar wander (Matsuyama and Nimmo, 2009), and mantle convection (King, 2008). Some of the faulting is localised at the junction between regional geochemical terrains (Galluzzi et al., 2019), or at the edges of smooth plains confined within impact basins (Pegan et al., 2017). Although a combination of factors probably influences many of the visible faults, the dominant cause of contractional tectonics on Mercury is widely accepted to be global contraction of the planet (Klimczak et al., 2015). Mercury’s relatively high ratio of surface area to volume means that it has undergone significant cooling, which has led to shrinking (Watters and Nimmo, 2010). Thermal and compositional models of the planet provide a wide range of estimated shrinking; the planet could have shrunk by between 0.6 and 10 km radially (Solomon, 1977; Watters and Nimmo, 2010; Grott et al., 2011).

Byrne et al. (2014) calculated Mercury’s global contraction from a global inventory of contractional features combined with estimates of fault dips associated with each type of surface expression. The amount of horizontal movement across a thrust fault can be determined from the measured displacement of features on either side, most usefully offset crater rims (Galluzzi et al., 2015). The steeper the average fault dip, the less horizontal movement is accommodated by each fault of a given horizontal offset, and so the lower the amount of global contraction necessary to account for it. The derived reduction in global radius recorded by Mercury’s crust is 7.1 km if the average fault dip is 25°, but as little as 4.7 km if the average fault dip is 35° (Byrne et al., 2014).

Watters (2021) uses a more conservative number of faults on Mercury to claim a maximum global contraction of only 1–2 km, but this too is based on average fault dips of 25°–35°. Thus, an understanding of the average dip of the faults on Mercury is vital to constrain contraction estimates and
therefore to understand Mercury’s thermal history. Estimates of fault dips range between $6^\circ$ and $57^\circ$ with an average of $25^\circ$ (Galluzzi et al., 2015, 2019) were made using the shortening and vertical offset of craters that straddle faults on lobate scarps. Crane (2020) used topographic data and modelling to estimate a dip for 29 faults; all results being less than $20^\circ$, with average dips ranging from $3^\circ$ to $10^\circ$. Until now no fault dip on Mercury has been measured by direct means.

2. A fault’s dip revealed

Here we describe the first reported example on Mercury where the local topography exposes a fault scarp sufficiently well that its dip of the

![Fig. 1. Selection of volcanic vents that are coincident with contractional structures, but which do not adequately reveal the fault geometry. Red arrows point to scarps. a: image: EN1014936140M, centre: 148$^\circ$E, 24$^\circ$N. b: image: EN1048654092M centre: 67$^\circ$W, 21$^\circ$N. c: image: EN1021068336M centre: 105$^\circ$W, 24$^\circ$N. d: image: EN0258310462M centre: 162$^\circ$W, 17$^\circ$S. e: image: EN0257073440M centre: 112$^\circ$W, 15$^\circ$N. f: image: EN0131771793M centre: 30$^\circ$E, 27$^\circ$N. Alone among these, example (a) is the only one where the available images contain hints about fault dip within the vent (towards the east in that case), but no image with sufficient resolution, shadows, or stereo pair is available to measure it.](image)
fault plane can be measured. Our example comes from the inner wall of a pit interpreted as an explosive volcanic vent.

Explosive volcanism is manifest on Mercury through endogenic pits (vents) that are up to tens of kilometres across and several kilometres deep. The vents are often surrounded by faculae: high albedo, spectrally red features that are probably explosive ejecta from the eruptions (Head et al., 2008; Goudge et al., 2014). Unlike impact craters, these vents tend to be non-circular and lack a raised rim, and hence we refer to the break of slope at the edge of a pit as the ‘brink’ to avoid confusion with the rim of an impact crater. High-resolution studies of these vents suggest that they did not form through caldera collapse (Rothery et al., 2014; Thomas et al., 2014b), in which the emptying of a magma chamber leads to subsidence creating a large volcanic crater. Instead, the vents are interpreted to be excavated by explosive eruption, perhaps analogous to kimberlite pipes on Earth (White and Ross, 2011).

Explosive volcanism peaked during Mercury’s Calorian (3.9–3.5–3.0 Ga) and Mansurian (~3.5–3.0 to ~1.0–0.28 Ga) epochs but continued into the Kuiperian (Thomas et al., 2014a; Joziwick et al., 2018), which may have begun as recently as 280 Ma (Banks et al., 2017). As Mercury’s lithosphere has cooled, it has thickened (Peplowski et al., 2011), and contraction hinders volcanism by impeding magma ascent (Solomon, 1978). The formation of volcanic vents on Mercury therefore probably requires crustal weakness to aid continued rising of the magmas (Klimczak et al., 2018), which are generally presumed to be volatile-rich to account for the explosivity of these eruptions (e.g. Kerber et al., 2009; Weider et al., 2016). Possible crustal weaknesses include fractures associated with impact craters, and faulting. Vents are found both within impact craters and on lobate scarps (Thomas et al., 2014b; Goudge et al., 2014). There is a significant correlation between impact craters and vents, but the high density of tectonic features on Mercury means it is not

Fig. 2. a: Image EN0261054374M, showing the location of panels c and d. (red box) Image centre: 147°E – 65.5°N. b: interpreted geological map of area in a. showing vents and fault location and section line (purple) and label of ridge on crater floor between the two possible faults. c: Close up of vent within which the fault trace is visible. d: same area as c. with fault trace measured highlighted in red. e: illustrative diagram looking northwest showing the view of the crater floor, ridge and fault.
possible to distinguish from random whether there are also tectonic controls on the locations of vents (Klimczak et al., 2018).

During the process of reviewing volcanic vents on Mercury (Pegg et al., 2020) we identified several vents that occur directly on a tectonic fault (Fig. 1). The fault scarp is not usually visible within such vents. There are many factors that could contribute to this, such as: the vent post-dating the fault movement, space weathering, volcanic activity or rockfalls covering the scarp, poor illumination and/or low image resolution, lack of shadows or stereo pairs. However we have identified one vent within Vazov crater (147.6°E, –65.6° N) that shows what we interpret as a small fault scarp visible beyond the north side of the vent and expressed also on the internal vent wall and on the vent floor (Fig. 2). This situation enables us to reconstruct the geometry of the fault plane from the fault’s intersection with the topographic surface.

Outside of the vent on the crater floor there is a contractional ridge 3 km wide, 30 km long, which strikes NW-SW. The topographic feature continues as a ridge NW of the crater. Because it is expressed by a symmetrical ridge, the facing direction of the fault would be uncertain if that were the only evidence, but fortunately in this case the scarp of the NE dipping fault is apparent inside the vent. The section revealed in the vent wall shows that the main fault dips north. The fault trace is visible on the west wall of the vent but is hidden by the vent-wall shadow in the bottom and east of the vent (Fig. 2a, c).

3. Geological setting

To study the fault, we used images from the Narrow-Angle Camera (NAC) onboard MErcury Surface, ENvironment, GEochemistry, and Ranging (MESSENGER) spacecraft (Solomon et al., 2001). The vent’s location in the southern hemisphere means no laser altimeter data are available. We processed the image data using the USGS’s Integrated Software for Imagers and Spectrometers (v 3.5.1.7995) and produced a geologic map of the vent site based on image EN0231657081M (resolution of 163 m/pixel) using ESRI’s ArcGIS software. We chose a sinusoidal projection centred on the vent. We used the mapping methods and units outlined by (Galluzzi et al., 2016) following USGS (Tanaka et al., 2011) and Planmap (Rothery et al., 2018) guidelines and classified crater degradation state using (Kinczyk et al., 2020).

The geological map (Fig. 2) and image data show that the faulted vent is one of several vents within and around a degraded impact crater. Beyond the vent, on the crater floor, the fault is clearly marked by the SW side of a 4 km wide ridge. A slope on the north side of the ridge, may represent an antithetic fault on the hanging wall behind and forming a slight step. Other possible interpretations are that there has been post-eruption movement on a pre-existing fault to produce the step, or that the fault could have been initiated entirely after the vent formation.

4. Measuring the fault dip

We produced a digital terrain model (DTM) for the vent site using the AMES stereo pipeline (Broxton and Edwards, 2008) using images: EN0231657081M and EN0231356027M. We could not provide vertical control for this DTM due to the lack of laser altimeter data, so we could not eliminate the possibility that systematic tilts related to uncertainties in the spacecraft pointing remained in these data. Thus, we did not use these data to perform dip measurements. Instead, we used shadow measurements on images EN0246250635M (176 m/pixel) and EN0261431434M (197 m/pixel). These are the highest resolution close stretch to nadir images of this feature that MESSENGER obtained. Although we examined off-nadir images as well, we elected not to attempt to use these via the method of Barnouin et al. (2012) as we would have had to correct both the shadow and horizontal measurements, and this would likely compound any errors from any uncertainty in spacecraft pointing.

As shown in Fig. 4, we constructed a line propagating the fault strike from the NW over the vent. Then we produced a second line (x) orthogonal to the strike to where the shadow from the vent intersects the fault trace. Finally, we constructed a line to record the length of the shadow from the intersection of the fault trace with the vent shadow, to the brink of the vent. We drew this line orthogonal to the shadow to get the shadow length at the point where the shadow intersects the fault trace. The incidence angle could then be used to calculate the depth of the shadow (and thus the depth of the fault trace) below the vent brink at this point (ΔZ). This could then be combined with x to get the dip angle.

For each image we repeated the measurements ten times to reduce measurement uncertainty from digitisation. We calculated the depth of vent at the intersection of the fault and the shadow using basic shadow measurement techniques e.g. (Pike, 1974; Chappelow and Sharpton, 2002) and then calculated the dip. Unfortunately, there are no markers that enable us to estimate the amount of displacement on the fault.

Our estimates for the fault plane dip from the two images are shown in a box and whisker plot (Fig. 5). The means for the two images suggests a mean dip of 28° ± 5°. Uncertainties associated with this method arise from (i) possible uncertainties in spacecraft pointing, (ii) measurement error, and (iii) image resolution limits. As a test of the pointing issues, we used two nadir images to make measurements, the comparison between two images acquired at different times allowing us to test whether there
was a pointing error offset. The dip measured in EN0246250635M has a mean of 27.8° and median of 27.4°. The dip measured in EN0261431434M has a mean of 27.7° and median of 27.5°. The similarity of the two measurements provides confidence in the technique. By making multiple repeat measurements we tested the repeatability of human operators to make the measurement and interpret the location of the strike and shadow intersection. This provides a measurement of the measurement error. In addition, we consider that no line can be drawn more accurately than 1-pixel width. A 1-pixel error would result in the equivalent of ±5.0/-4.7° error in dip for image EN0246250635M and ±5.4/-5.0° error in dip for EN0261431434M, (Fig. 5).

5. Discussion

With a dip of 28° ± 5°, this fault is slightly steeper than the mean value used by Galluzzi et al. (2019, 2015), but within the range of measured dips in their database. The upper end of the error for the dip measurement is consistent with the 30° predicted to be typical by the Anderson faulting model for a standard thrust fault (Anderson, 1905).

The scale of this fault is much smaller than that of Mercury’s most characteristic lobate scarps and its surface expression is similar to high relief ridges end members of the lobate scarp – high relief ridge continuum, and its dip suggests that it is a similar compressive feature to those larger examples. This dip measurement is greater than the 3-10° estimated by Crane (2020), however those are based on features within Smooth Plains units, which are likely layerd (Denevi et al., 2009) and prone to shallow décollements (Crane and Klimczak, 2019) that would tend to encourage gentler dipping structures. The dips of faults are known on parts of Mercury to be affected by local geochemical conditions (Galluzzi et al., 2019), however the location of this faulted vent in the southern hemisphere means the geochemical data from MESSENGER is to low resolution to make inferences (Nittler et al., 2020).

While measurement of a single fault is not conclusive, our data does lend credence to the view that, on Mercury, moderately dipping faults are more typical than steeper or very shallow ones. Additionally, this work demonstrates that measurements such as these are possible and can be made even in the absence of DEM data. The image resolution does not allow measurement of fault displacement, which would enable quantification of how much strain the fault has accommodated, but higher-resolution imaging data from BepiColombo (Rothery et al., 2020) may allow this. BepiColombo should provide sufficient data to make more measurements like this, for example in occurrences such as the example in Fig. 1a, generating a database of the fault geometries in locations across Mercury and allowing a more detailed assessment of global tectonic and thermal models. If measurements of other faults prove possible and are in line with this example, generalizing such a result to the model of Byrne et al. (2014) would suggest that global contraction is likely to be about 5.7–7.1 km, which at the higher end of the currently estimated range.

6. Conclusions

Direct measurements of the dip of a fault on Mercury find a value of ~28° ± 5°. This is within the range of fault dips calculated indirectly through measurements of crater displacement and for classical thrust fault models. Although only a single example, this dip estimate agrees
with the growing evidence to suggest that the higher-end estimates of radial shrinking by global contraction are more representative than lower estimates. BepiColombo will provide an opportunity to gain better data on this site and identify other locations where the volcanic vents expose fault surfaces in 3 dimensions, offering fuller insight into planetary tectonics.
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