

ISBN 978-2-87355-024-4

**Proceedings of the
International Meteor Conference
La Palma, Canary Islands, Spain
20–23 September, 2012**



Published by the International Meteor Organization 2013
Edited by Marc Gyssens and Paul Roggemans

Proceedings of the International Meteor Conference
La Palma, Canary Islands, Spain, 20–23 September, 2012
International Meteor Organization
ISBN 978-2-87355-024-4

Copyright notices

© 2013 The International Meteor Organization
The copyright of papers in this publication remains with the authors.

It is the aim of the IMO to increase the spread of scientific information, not to restrict it. When material is submitted to the IMO for publication, this is taken as indicating that the author(s) grant(s) permission for the IMO to publish this material any number of times, in any format(s), without payment. This permission is taken as covering rights to reproduce both the content of the material and its form and appearance, including images and typesetting. Formats may include paper and electronically readable storage media. Other than these conditions, all rights remain with the author(s). When material is submitted for publication, this is also taken as indicating that the author(s) claim(s) the right to grant the permissions described above. The reader is granted permission to make unaltered copies of any part of the document for personal use, as well as for non-commercial and unpaid sharing of the information with third parties, provided the source and publisher are mentioned. For any other type of copying or distribution, prior written permission from the publisher is mandatory.

Editing team and Organization

Publisher: The International Meteor Organization
Editors: Marc Gyssens and Paul Roggemans
Typesetting: L^AT_EX 2_ε (with styles from Imolate 2.4 by Chris Trayner)

Printed in Belgium

Legal address: International Meteor Organization, Mattheessenstraat 60, 2540 Hove, Belgium

Distribution

Further copies of this publication may be ordered from the Treasurer of the International Meteor Organization, Marc Gyssens, Mattheessenstraat 60, 2540 Hove, Belgium, or through the IMO website (<http://www.imo.net>).

Benešov bolide—surprising outcome of exceptional story after twenty years

Pavel Spurný¹, Jakub Haloda², and Jiří Borovička¹

¹ **Astronomical Institute, Academy of Sciences, Fričova 298, CZ-251 65 Ondřejov, Czech Republic**
spurny@asu.cas.cz and borovic@asu.cas.cz

² **Czech Geological Survey, Geologická 6, CZ-152 00 Prague, Czech Republic**
jakub.haloda@geology.cz

We report results of a new analysis of the very bright fireball of absolute magnitude -19.5 which was recorded by four all-sky cameras and two spectral cameras at three Czech stations of the European Fireball Network on May 7, 1991, at $23^{\text{h}}03^{\text{m}}48^{\text{s}}$ UT. This fireball is well known as the Benešov bolide.

1 Introduction

Very precise data on the Benešov bolide with regard to atmospheric trajectory, heliocentric orbit, fragmentation history, composition and possible impact location based on detailed analysis of these photographic observations were published in several papers (e.g., Spurný, 1994; Borovička and Spurný, 1996; Borovička et al., 1998a; Borovička et al., 1998b). It makes this event one of the best documented and studied bolides in history. Moreover, this bolide belongs to the rarest category of so called superbolides, i.e., events caused by meter-sized meteoroids with initial masses exceeding 1000 kg. This meteoroid penetrated very deep in the atmosphere (last photographed point was at 16.7 km), and, already from the initial analysis, it was evident that a non-negligible part of its mass had fallen on the ground. Despite great efforts and many attempts, no meteorite was found in the weeks and years after the fall. At that time, only three instrumentally observed meteorite falls were known: Příbram (Ceplecha, 1961), Lost City (McCrosky et al., 1971), and Innisfree (Halliday et al., 1978).

2 Results and discussion

In the spring of 2011, just before the twentieth anniversary of this extraordinary event, we re-measured all available all-sky records and re-analyzed these data. We used slightly different methods and new approaches which we gradually developed for the analysis of several recent instrumentally observed meteorite falls, as described by, e.g., Spurný et al. (2003), Borovička et al. (2003), Spurný et al. (2010), and Spurný et al. (2012). We obtained a new and consistent picture of the Benešov event, which resulted in a slightly revised impact location and suggested us a new strategy which could lead to the recovery of Benešov meteorites after 20 years. We realized that the largest number of meteorites should originate from catastrophic disruption at 24.3 km, where the bolide reached maximum brightness in a major flare (Borovička and Spurný, 1996; Borovička et al., 1998a). The vast majority of these meteorites should survive as

really small pieces in the mass range from 1 g to 10 g. According to our models, such cloud of small fragments could contain several thousands of pieces and, thanks to the almost vertical trajectory of the Benešov bolide, it remained relatively compact during about 7 minutes of dark flight. We found that the predicted impact area for these small fragments covers a cultivated field. If this scenario is correct, then, after 20 years of intensive agricultural utilization of this field, these fragments should be uniformly spread over an about 30 cm thick layer of soil, and at least some of them should be close enough to the surface to be detectable. From very detailed spectral records, we knew that the bulk composition of the meteoroid was chondritic (Borovička and Spurný, 1996). This justified the use of metal detectors for the search, because, after 20 years, meteorites might no longer be distinguishable visually from terrestrial stones and slags.

Reality completely confirmed all our assumptions and highly surpassed our expectations. Four small highly weathered fragments irregular in form and completely without fusion crust with a total mass of 11.7 grams, respectively weighing 1.54 g (H5), 7.72 g, 1.99 g, and 0.38 g (all three LL3.5), ordered according to time of find, were recovered exactly in the predicted impact area for the corresponding masses, namely within 40 m from the highest probability line (two during the first day of searching on April 9, 2011, the third one 10 days later, and the fourth one on April 25, 2012).

Although all fragments are very small and their weathering grade is high (W3 for all pieces), their interior was well preserved for reliable analysis (except for the smallest fragment, where only basic classification was possible). The meteorite is a polymict breccia containing three recognized lithologies with different texture, chemical, and mineralogical composition. The largest portion of the specimens found is an LL3.5 chondrite. The first recovered fragment was classified as an H5 ordinary chondrite. Fragmentary achondritic clast (of 4.8×2.6 mm in size) was found within a thick section of the largest sample, and is cemented to the LL3.5 chondrite lithology by irregular veins of impact melt.

3 Conclusions

The results presented in this paper are pioneering in many aspects. We proved that, in some special cases, it is still possible to predict and find meteorites a long time after the fall. However, the most important result is in the heterogeneity of the recovered meteorites. This case clearly shows that larger meteoroids can be compositionally very complicated bodies. We discovered that the Benešov meteoroid consisted of at least three different types of material. A similar heterogeneity was observed also for the Almahata Sitta meteorite (Bischoff et al., 2010). This case also implies that it is very useful to study as many fragments as possible from a single fall, because there can be significant differences among them.

References

- Bischoff A., Horstmann M., Packer A., Laubenstein M., and Haberer S. (2010). “Asteroid 2008 TC₃—Almahata Sitta: a spectacular breccia containing many different ureilitic and chondritic lithologies”. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, **45**, 1638–1656.
- Borovička J., Popova O. P., Golub’ A. P., Kosarev I. B., and Nemtchinov I. V. (1998b). “Bolides produced by impacts of large meteoroids into the Earth’s atmosphere: comparison of theory with observations. II. Benešov bolide spectra”. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **337**, 591–602.
- Borovička J., Popova O. P., Nemtchinov I. V., Spurný P., and Ceplecha Z. (1998a). “Bolides produced by impacts of large meteoroids into the Earth’s atmosphere: comparison of theory and observations. I. Benešov bolide dynamics and fragmentation”. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **334**, 713–728.
- Borovička J. and Spurný P. (1996). “Radiation study of two very bright terrestrial bolides and an application to the Comet S-L 9 collision with Jupiter”. *Icarus*, **121**, 484–510.
- Borovička J., Spurný P., Kalenda P., and Tagliaferri E. (2003). “The Morávka meteorite fall: 1. Description of the events and determination of the fireball trajectory and orbit from video records”. *Meteoritics and Planetary Science*, **38**, 975–987.
- Ceplecha Z. (1961). “Multiple fall of Příbram meteorites photographed. 1. Double-station photographs of the fireball and their relations to the found meteorites”. *Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of Czechoslovakia*, **12**, 21–47.
- Halliday I., Griffin A. A., and Blackwell A. T. (1978). “The Innisfree meteorite and the Canadian Camera Network”. *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada*, **72**, 15–39.
- McCrosky R. E., Posen A., Schwartz G., and Shao C. Y. (1971). “Lost City meteorite—Its recovery and a comparison with other fireballs”. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **76**, 4090–4108.
- Spurný P. (1994). “Recent fireballs photographed in Central Europe”. *Planetary and Space Sciences*, **42**, 157–162.
- Spurný P., Bland P. A., Shrubný L., Borovička J., Ceplecha Z., Singelton A., Bevan A. W. R., Vaughan D., Towner M. C., McClafferty T. P., Toumi R., and Deacon G. (2012). “The Bunburra Rockhole meteorite fall in SW Australia: fireball trajectory, luminosity, dynamics, orbit, and impact position from photographic and photoelectric records”. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, **47**, 163–185.
- Spurný P., Borovička J., Kac J., Kalenda P., Atanackov J., Kladnik G., Heinlein D., and Grau T. (2010). “Analysis of instrumental observations of the Jesenice meteorite fall on 9th April, 2009”. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, **45**, 1392–1407.
- Spurný P., Oberst J., Heinlein D. (2003). “Photographic observations of Neuschwanstein, a second meteorite from the orbit of the Příbram chondrite”. *Nature*, **423**, 151–153.