

Monazite control on Th, U and REE
redistribution during partial melting:
experiment and application to the deeply
subducted crust

Aleksandr S. Stepanov

February 2012

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the Australian National University



Declaration

The work presented in this thesis was carried out during my time in the Australian National University. I certify that this thesis is my own work except where otherwise acknowledged. Some of the ideas presented have benefited from discussions with my supervisors and other colleagues, but all interpretations and conclusions are my own.

Aleksandr S. Stepanov

Dedicated to my family and science

Acknowledgements

I would firstly like to thank my supervisors, Daniela Rubatto and Joerg Hermann. They offered me a fantastic project, provided background idea, methodology and access to world class research facilities. At same time I enjoyed real freedom in my research activities and received guidance only when I needed it. Daniela and Joerg were very fast in making perfect corrections to my manuscripts and discussions with them greatly enriched my understanding of the science. Andrey Korsakov from the Institute of Geology and Mineralogy, Novosibirsk, Russia allowed access to his comprehensive collection of Kokchetav samples, and generously provided for this study the best samples ever. Andrey was always available to share his knowledge regarding Kokchetav and UHP petrology. Our numerous discussions greatly contributed to this work.

Bob Rapp is a man with unique insight into this project, as around 25 years ago he published two papers on monazite solubility inherently relevant to this study. Bob's assistance was also crucial in achieving such accurate REE measurements by electron microprobe. The advice I received from Ian Williams, Trevor Ireland, Hugh O'Neill and Ian Campbell regarding experimental techniques and monazite mineralogy is greatly appreciated. Bill Hibberson, Dean Scott and Dave Clark provided technical support and assistance in performing piston cylinder experiments. Under their comprehensive instruction I was able to advance from a rather miserable 50% success rate, to 100% at the close of my experimental program. The Centre for Advanced Microscopy at the Australian National University, and Frank Brink in particular, is acknowledged for support and access to SEM facilities. Charlotte Allen provided invaluable instruction and support regarding LA-ICP-MS analysis. Terry Mernagh from Geoscience Australia assisted with Raman spectroscopy. My thanks also go to Harri Kokkonen and Shane Paxton for access to their lab facilities and for their sound advice on how to handle the most problematic samples.

The help provided by David H. Green on my arrival in Canberra is something I shall never forget.

The support of my fellow students at RSES is something I have greatly appreciated, in their assistance with all aspects of my research project and in their friendship during my time in Australia. Jesse Jones, Seann McKibbin, Evan Gowan, Paolo Sossi, Paul Millsted, Kate Kiseeva, Jason Doull, Kate Boston, Jeremy Wykes, Tanya Ewing and Alex Mccoy-West contributed to the somewhat difficult editorial task of revising drafts of my manuscript. Don Dingwell

and an anonymous reviewer for the journal “Chemical Geology” are gratefully acknowledged for the editorial handling of what is the first chapter of this work.

I also wish to acknowledge the lecturers from my Alma Mater, the Novosibirsk State University, located in Novosibirsk Akademgorodok, Central Siberia. Natalia Artemova Kulik, Olga Turkina, Vladimir Vasilievich Khlestov, Genadiy Grigorievich Lepezin and Sergei Kargopolov introduced to me both the fundamentals and unresolved issues of petrology. Their lessons were truly modern, progressive and informative. Thanks to their influence, I had little difficulty in comprehending the new areas of research I was exposed to while attending seminars or throughout the course of my own project.

Finally I wish to thank my family — Irina and Alisa. They are the beauty and joy of my life. Irina and I have always been able to count on the support of our parents in pursuing a scientific career, and I am deeply grateful to them. Our parents also played a role in the production of this thesis through the crucial task of babysitting Alisa on many occasions. HuiJuan, Magda, Juan Pablo, Tsuyoshi, Gleen and the many other I became acquainted with during my residence in Australia, you made my time in Canberra both enjoyable and memorable.

Abstract

Rare earth elements (REE), Th and U are elements with similar geochemical properties. In crustal rocks these elements are hosted by the light REE (LREE) phosphate mineral monazite. Piston-cylinder experiments were conducted to constrain monazite solubility and monazite/melt partitioning in hydrous granitic melts at conditions relevant to anatexis at crustal conditions and in subduction zones. Monazite has strong preference for LREE and Th; REE heavier than Nd have decreasing compatibility in monazite, and U is less compatible than LREE and Th. New experimental data and reconciliation with previous studies led to a new formulation of LREE solubility in granitic melts as a function of temperature, pressure, monazite composition and water content in melt.

The behaviour of monazite during high-pressure and ultra-high pressure (UHP) metamorphism was studied using a suite of rocks from the Kokchetav massif, Kazakhstan. Detailed petrographic and geochronologic study of the samples from the UHP Kokchetav complex was combined with investigation of trace element geochemistry and mineral inclusions of garnet, monazite and zircon. These data demonstrated that (a) on prograde evolution rocks did not experience a linear increase of pressure and temperature (P and T), but had stages of almost isothermal increase of pressure and heating stage with a small increase of pressure, (b) exhumation produced a close association of UHP gneisses with rocks that experienced metamorphism at lower PT conditions and/or along different paths from typical UHP rocks.

The geochemistry of the UHP gneisses of the Kokchetav complex is a perfect target for the application of the new experimental data, because these rocks experienced metamorphism and melting at the highest PT conditions recorded in crustal rocks. Bulk rock geochemistry of the UHP gneisses shows pronounced depletion in LREE, Th and U, and a smaller degree of depletion or enrichment in other elements that are often considered as incompatible. The variation in composition of UHP gneisses is explained by a new petrological model, which takes into account the fact that restites are composed of residual assemblage together with a residual melt. It is demonstrated that together with the residual mineral association, the degree of melting and melt extraction efficiency play an

important role in controlling of trace element behaviour.

Polyphase inclusions trapped in garnet were found in samples of some UHP gneisses. The original composition of inclusions was obtained by high pressure rehomogenisation experiments. The experiments demonstrated that polyphase inclusions represent former melts of variable compositions, varying from high temperature high-LREE melts formed at peak conditions to low-LREE melts formed during exhumation. These inclusions are the first natural examples of melts formed by melting of sediments at subarc depth. This partial melting led to the complete dissolution of monazite and a strong depletion of LREE, Th and U in the UHP gneisses. Melt inclusions and bulk rock geochemistry provide evidence for the release of high LREE melts from melting of crustal metasediments. Partial melting is thus an important process changing the physical and chemical properties of deeply subducted crustal rocks.

Foreword to the Internet edition

I would like to thank three reviewers for thorough and detailed assessment of this work. Corrections were made where possible and number of uncorrected issues will be improved or changed in publications produced from this manuscript. The text is still based on NIST values from Pearce et al. (1997) and concentrations will be corrected for new NIST values in journal versions of the chapters. However to the best of my knowledge these issues do not affect validity of observations and conclusions presented in this work.

September 2012, Canberra

Contents

Abstract	v
Introduction	1
0.0.1 Abbreviations and symbols	5
1 Experimental study of monazite/melt partitioning with implications for the REE, Th and U geochemistry of crustal rocks	7
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Experimental and analytical techniques	9
1.2.1 Starting compositions	9
1.2.2 Experimental methods	10
1.2.3 Analytical methods	10
1.2.4 Experimental challenges and estimation of analytical errors	14
1.3 Results	15
1.3.1 Phase relationships	15
1.3.2 Monazite solubility in melts	18
1.3.3 Monazite composition	19
1.3.4 Monazite/melt partitioning	20
1.4 Discussion	25
1.4.1 Assessment of data quality and approach to equilibrium . .	25
1.4.2 Phase relationships	28
1.4.3 Comparison with previous experimental studies of monazite solubility	29
1.4.4 The general form of monazite solubility equation	29
1.4.5 New expression for monazite solubility	35
1.4.6 Monazite/melt partitioning	37
1.5 Implications of the experimental results	41
1.5.1 Implications for fractional crystallisation of granites	41
1.5.2 Implications for crustal melting	43
1.5.3 Implications for melting in subduction zones	45
1.6 Conclusions	48

2	Association of rocks with different PT paths within the Barchi Kol' UHP block	59
2.1	Introduction	59
2.2	Geologic setting	60
2.2.1	Geology of the Kokchetav complex	60
2.2.2	Geology of Barchi Kol' unit	63
2.3	Analytical methods	65
2.4	Strategy	66
2.5	Sample descriptions	67
2.6	Results	70
2.6.1	Mineral compositions and zoning	70
2.6.2	Mineral inclusions	75
2.6.3	Monazite and zircon description and geochronology results	77
2.7	Discussion	88
2.7.1	Mineral inclusions in the Kokchetav rocks	89
2.7.2	Application of Ti-in-zircon thermometers to UHP rocks . .	90
2.7.3	Interpretation of garnet zoning	91
2.7.4	PT paths	93
2.7.5	Linking accessory minerals with metamorphic evolution . .	99
2.7.6	Origin of rocks with different PT path inside UHP terrain	104
2.7.7	Tectonic implications	106
2.7.8	Prograde PT path	110
2.7.9	Parallels with other UHP complexes	111
2.8	Conclusions	114
2.9	Supplementary materials	115
3	The geochemistry of Ultra High Pressure anatexis	117
3.1	Introduction	117
3.2	Geological background	118
3.3	Analytical methods	119
3.4	Sample description	121
3.4.1	Non-UHP samples	121
3.4.2	UHP samples	124
3.5	Results	125
3.5.1	Classification of non-UHP Kokchetav rocks	125
3.5.2	REE minerals in UHP gneisses	127

3.5.3	Compositions of UHP gneisses and comparison with potential protolithes	128
3.6	Discussion: General	136
3.6.1	Host minerals for REE, Th, U in UHP rocks	136
3.6.2	Geochemical features of the Kokchetav sediments	137
3.6.3	Constraining protolith composition	139
3.7	Discussion: Behaviour of elements during UHP melting	141
3.7.1	Major elements	141
3.7.2	REE, Th and U	141
3.7.3	Large Ion Lithophile Elements: Rb, Cs, Sr and Ba	143
3.7.4	High Field Strength Elements: Zr, Hf Nb and Ta	145
3.7.5	Phosphorus	147
3.7.6	Sulfur, chalcophile elements	147
3.7.7	Be	147
3.8	Discussion: Numerical estimates on melting of UHP gneisses . . .	148
3.8.1	Melting model	148
3.8.2	Estimate of melt loss	151
3.8.3	Efficiency of melt extraction	152
3.8.4	Modal abundances of minerals	153
3.8.5	Modal abundances of minerals and residual melt	153
3.8.6	Role of melting parameters on the behaviour of elements .	155
3.8.7	Melting history of the UHP gneisses	156
3.8.8	Nomenclature of the Kokchetav migmatites	158
3.8.9	Comparison of Kokchetav UHP gneisses with other restites	160
3.9	Implications	162
3.9.1	Implications for the exhumation of the Kokchetav UHP complex	162
3.9.2	Implications for the trace element signature of subduction zone	162
3.9.3	Implications for the isotopic signature of enriched mantle reservoirs	164
3.10	Conclusions	166
4	Polyphase inclusions in an UHP gneiss	171
4.1	Introduction	171
4.2	Analytical methods	172
4.3	Results	173

4.3.1	Sample description	173
4.3.2	Mineral compositions	174
4.3.3	Polyphase inclusions	181
4.4	Discussion	191
4.4.1	Origin of polyphase inclusions	191
4.4.2	Interpretation of homogenization experiments	193
4.4.3	Estimation of temperatures of inclusions formation	193
4.4.4	LREE, Th and U evolution during melting	194
4.4.5	Hosts for LILE and their behaviour during melting	196
4.4.6	Hosts for HFSE and their behaviour during melting	197
4.4.7	Hosts for Be and its behaviour during melting	199
4.4.8	Numerical estimates of melt loss	199
4.4.9	Comparison with other data on fluid/melt inclusions from other UHP rocks	202
4.5	Conclusions	206
5	Conclusions	215
	Bibliography	219