

From greenschist to granulite: A
mineral equilibria approach to
melting and melt loss

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of
Adelaide for an Honours Degree in Geology

Kiara Louise Bockmann

November 2015



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

FROM GREENSCHIST TO GRANULITE: A MINERAL EQUILIBRIA APPROACH TO MELTING AND MELT LOSS

RUNNING TITLE: MELT LOSS AND MELT REINTEGRATION MODELLING

ABSTRACT

Melt loss during regional high-grade metamorphism has important consequences for interpreting the metamorphic evolution of the lower crust and for understanding processes leading to the chemical differentiation of the crust. However, melt loss typically modifies the protolith; making it difficult to reconstruct the conditions of prograde metamorphism and the extent to which melt loss modified the rock composition. The Reynolds Range in central Australia preserves a rare example where a single melt-prone stratigraphic unit can be traced from greenschist to granulite grade conditions. Using this as a natural laboratory, *P–T* mineral equilibria forward models have been calculated to explore melt loss and melt reintegration where both the protolith and the residuum compositions are preserved. Incremental melt loss modelling from the protolith composition along an isobaric heating path at 5 kbar shows that the residual granulite facies rock composition is consistent with around 18% melt loss from the protolith. Large-scale, one-step melt loss from a closed rock system that had built up 18% melt resulted in a similar residual composition to incremental melt loss. The fertility of the open (incremental) system and the closed system showed the closed system produced 5.4% more melt along a heating path from 700–800 °C. Determination of the concentrations of K–U–Th with increasing metamorphic grade shows that K and U concentrations decreased with increasing metamorphic grade. Conversely, Th concentrations increased, resulting in a slight overall increase in heat production from the protolith to the residuum, despite around 18% volume loss associated with melt extraction. An implication for this is that for melt prone rocks such as metapelites, melt loss during granulite facies metamorphism does not deplete the concentration of heat producing elements in the lower crust as is typically assumed.

KEYWORDS

Metamorphic; Reynolds Range; pseudosection; melt loss; melt reintegration; THERMOCALC; catastrophic melting; heat production

MINERAL ABBREVIATIONS

bi, biotite; mu, muscovite; chl, chlorite; ma, margarite; g, garnet; opx, orthopyroxene; sill, sillimanite; ky, kyanite; and, andalusite; sp, spinel; mt, magnetite; cd, cordierite; liq, silicate melt; ksp, K-feldspar; q, quartz; pl, plagioclase; ep, epidote; ru, rutile; st, staurolite; hem, hematite; ilm, ilmenite.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From greenschist to granulite: A mineral equilibria approach to melting and melt loss ..	3
Running title: Melt loss and melt reintegration modelling	3
Abstract	3
Keywords	3
Mineral abbreviations	3
List of Figures and Tables.....	6
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Geological background	8
2.1. Geological setting	8
2.2. Field-based metamorphic geology.....	10
3. Analytical Methods	13
3.1. Bulk rock and mineral chemistry.....	13
3.2. Mineral equilibria modelling	14
3.2.1 Melt loss and melt reintegration modelling	16
3.3. KUTh concentration	18
4. Results.....	19
4.1. Metamorphic geology.....	19
4.1.1. Metamorphic petrography.....	19
4.1.2. Geochemistry and mineral chemistry	21
4.2. Pressure-temperature pseudosections	22
4.2.1. Melt loss.....	23
4.2.2. Melt reintigration	30
5. Discussion	36
5.1. Limitations of the modelling	36
5.2. Melt loss calculations	38
5.2.1. Catastrophic versus incremental melt loss calculations.....	41
5.2.2. Melt Fertility	43
5.2.3. Structural controls on the style of melt loss.....	44
5.3. Melt reintegration calculations	45
5.4. Implications for metamorphic induced differentiation of crustal heat production	47
6. Conclusions.....	47
7. Acknowledgments.....	48
References.....	49
Appendix 1: Heat production.....	55
Methods	57
Gamma Ray Spectrometers	57

Results	59
Outcrop determination of K-U-Th.....	59
Gamma ray spectrometer data	60
K–U–Th distribution and heat production	66
Representative monazite microprobe analyses	67
Discussion.....	69
KUTh distribution with progressive metamorphism	69
Implications for metamorphic induced differentiation of crustal heat production	70
Appendix 2: Whole-rock geochemistry	72
Appendix 3: Representative electron microprobe analyses	78
Appendix 4: Melt loss compositions.....	82
Appendix 5: Catastrophic melt loss	83
Appendix 6: Melt fertility	84
Appendix 7: Melt reintegration compositions	84

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. Geology of the Reynolds Range	10
Figure 2. Field photographs of the Pine Hill Formation at different metamorphic grades..	12
Figure 3. Photomicrographs of mineral relationships in the Pine Hill Formation.....	21
Table 1. Average bulk rock compositions from each traverse in wt%.....	22
Figure 4. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection for greenschist protolith.	24
Figure 5. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after first stage melt loss (6 % removed).	25
Figure 6. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after second stage melt loss (12 % removed).....	26
Figure 7. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after third stage melt loss (18 % removed).	27
Figure 8. Changing element concentrations with progressive melt loss.....	28
Table 2. Compositions of the melt that was extracted from each progressive melt loss model (Figures 4-6) in wt%.....	29
Figure 9. Elemental concentrations in residuum after varying amounts of catastrophic melt loss.	30
Figure 10. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection for the average granulite bulk composition.....	32
Figure 11. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after first melt reintegration (6% melt reintegrated).	33
Figure 12. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after second melt reintegration (12% melt reintegrated).	34
Figure 13. Calculated $P-T$ pseudosection after third melt reintegration (18% melt reintegrated).	35
Figure 14. Changing element concentrations with progressive melt reintegration.	36
Figure 15. Calculated $T-M_O$ section after third stage melt loss.....	40
Figure 16. Difference in melt fertility between the open system and the closed system.....	44