EVALUATION OF PARTIAL MELTING **MODELS** OF THE ORIGIN OF SOME AUSTRALIAN BASALTS: TRACE ELEMENT EVIDENCE.

by

STEPHEN DONALD ROY

S.B., Massachusetts Institute of Technology

1973

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE **DEGREE** OF

MASTER OF **SCIENCE**

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF **TECHNOLOGY**

January, **1975**

-2-

EVALUATION OF PARTIAL MELTING MODELS OF THE ORIGIN

OF **SOME** AUSTRALIAN **BASALTS:** TRACE **ELEMENT** EVIDENCE

by

STEPHEN **DONALD** ROY

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ABSTRACT

Ten samples of Australian basalts, ranging from olivine melilite nephelinite to onartz tholeiite have been analyzed for their content of rareearths (REE) Sc, Cr, Co, **Hf,** Ta and Th.

The results of experimental studies in high-temperature, high-pressure petrology have led to the hypothesis that basaltic magma is the result of partial melting of upper mantle peridotite and that different degrees of silica-saturation are due to different degrees of partial melting. This study was an attempt to test the theories of Dr. D.H. Green concerning specific degrees of partial melting from a specific source (pyrolite), **by** using trace element geochemistry, particularly the REE, and certain models of trace-element partitioning between minerals and liquid.

It was found that the nepheline-normative rocks could be generated by this method, with the assumption of **1)** partition coefficients, 2) chondritic RE distribution in the source and 3) a total equilibrium model. Limits can then be placed on the degree of partial melting and the RE content of the source: exact specification depends on which model one chooses.

It was also determined that the tholeiitic rocks could not be renerated in this manner and that the assumption of a chondritic distribution of REE in the source of the tholeiites was untenable.

Thesis Supervisor: **F.A.** Frey Title: Associate Professor of Geochemistry

TABLE OF **CONTENTS**

List of Tables

Page

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac$

 $\Delta \phi = 0.0000$ and $\Delta \phi = 0.0000$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\sigma_{\rm{max}}$ and $\sigma_{\rm{max}}$

LIST OF TABLES

 $\bar{\lambda}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim

 $-5-1$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \,$

 \sim \sim

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{$

LIST OF FIGURES

-07-

 $\ddot{}$

Evaluation of Partial Melting Models of the Origin

of Some Australian Basalts: Trace Element Evidence

I. INTRODUCTION

The results of experimental studies in high-temperature, high-pressure petrology **(eg.,** Green 1973a,b, Irving **1971,** Ito and Kennedy **1967)** have lead to the *hypothesis* that basaltic magma is the result of partial melting of upper mantle peridotite and that different degrees of silica-(under)saturation are due to different degrees of partial melting. Both the crystallization behavior of basaltic magmas at high pressure (e.g., Green 1973ab, Green and Ringwood **1967)** and the melting behavior of peridotites (e.g., Kushiro et **al., 1972,** Kushiro et al. **1968,** Green 1973a,b, and O'Hara and Yoder **1967)** have been extensively studied; attempts have been made to synthesize this data, notably **by** Green and Ringwood **(1967)** with the pyrolite model. Green **(1970b, 1971)** has published a "petrogenetic grid", sumarizing the petrogenetic implications of melting studies. This is shown- in Figure **1,** which indicates pressure (depth) **of** origin versus percent melting of a pyrolite composition source. Figure 2 shows a more recent version from Green **(1973b),** but for our purposes, the more detailed presentation shown in Figure **3** from Green **(1970b)** will be more useful, since it illustrates possible relationships between basalt magma types, indicates possible P-T conditions, and therefore source mineralogy, and also indicates paths of fractional crystallization and partial melting.

Trace-element geochemistry, particularly studies of the rare-earth elements (REE) has been utilized as a tool to decipher igneous petrogene-

 $-8-$

Figure 1: Petrogenetic Grid from Green 1970a (Green's Caption): "A petrogenetic grid for mantle-derived basaltic magmas. Various basalt magma types are assigned to a **%** Melt, Pressure grid (implying also specific $%$ H₂O and temperature of melting $...$) in which they are regarded as partial melting products of a pyrolite composition containing 0.1% H₂0. The numbers placed with each basalt type refer to the normative olivine content of this liauid at its depth of origin- because of the expansion of the olivine crystallization field at low pressure most basalts will precipitate olivine before other phases if fractionation occurs at lower pressures. The dashed boundaries marked with a mineral name show that this mineral will occur among the residual phases remaining after extraction of magma types to the left of the boundary. Olivine is present in equilibrium, i.e. is a residual phase in the pyrolite composition for all the magma types **.... "**

Figure 2: Petrogenetic Grid from Green **1973b** (Greenis Caption): "Diagram summarizing the petrogenetic applications of the melting studies on pyrolite composition. The column to the left illustrates the mineralogical character of the lithosphere and depth to the onset of partial melting in the island arc situation and the normal oceanic crust-mantle situation. In the right side of the diagrams, the character of magma derived **by** partial melting of pyrolite is plotted as a function of depth of magma segregation and degree of partial melting. Numbers in parentheses adjacent to basalt names refer to the normative olivine content of the partial melt. The hatched areas illustrate the range of conditions over which quartznormative magmas may be derived **by** direct partial melting and magma segregation from pyrolite. **(A)** is compiled for melting under water-undersaturated conditions, with a water content in the source pyrolite of about 0.2% . (B) is compiled for melting

> under water-saturated conditions. The asterists denote the specific liquid compositions calculated at **10 kb** and 20 **kb** in this

paper."

-.11

 \overline{B}

٠,

Figure **3:** Petrogenetic Grid from Green **1970b** (Green's Caption): "Diagrammatic synthesis of relationships between basalt magma types. The rectangular boxes denote magmas related **by** crystal fractionation processes operating at various depth or pressure regimes. They are also derived **by** possible partial melting processes from a ϵ pyrolite source. The appraximate mineralogy of the pyrolite source at **115Oc, 9 kb; 12500c, 15 kb** and **125oC, 27 kb** is shown. This is not necessarily the immediate subsolidus mineralogy involved in the melting processes- both the mineralogy and the temperature of the solidus will be dependent on P_{H20} , P_{Load} relationships."

PARTIAL MELTING OF PYROLITE AND

FRACTIONATION OF BASALTIC MAGMA AT VARIOUS PRESSURES

sis for different senuences of rocks: for the Hawaiian Islands (Schilling and Winchester **1969,** Reid and Frey **1971),** for Gough Island (Zielinski and Frey **1970),** for Steens Mountain in Oregon (Helmke and Haskin **1973),** etc. This study is an attempt to determine what can be learned **by** combining the results of experimental petrology and its implications regarding major elements in igneous processes and trace-element studies of natural basalts. Based upon the work of Green $(1970a, b, 1973a, b)$ on the melting of pyrolite as a source for basaltic magmas, limits can be placed on the degrees of partial melting required to generate specific lavas. Using an equilibrium partial melting model, trace-element contents can be calculated from the data on trace-element partitioning between solid phases and a liquid phase. The analyses of natural basalts can then be compared with these calculations to determine the fit of the model.

II. PREVIOUS WORK

The samples used in this study are ten basaltic rocks: six from the Newer Volcanics in Victoria, Australia (Irving **1971,** Singleton and Joyce **1969)** and four from the Cenozoic volcanic province ,in Tasmania (Sutherland **1969).** The nomenclature used in this paper follows that of Green (1970a,b) and is based on the normative mineralogy. Briefly:

> Tholeiite: basalt with normative hypersthene Quartz tholeiite: basalt with normative hypersthene and quartz Olivine tholeiite: basalt with normative hypersthene and olivine, hypersthene greater than **3%** Olivine basalt: basalt with normative olivine and with *0-3%* normative hypersthene; no normative nepheline Alkali olivine basalt: basalt with normative olivine and nepheline; nepheline less than **5%** Basanite: basalt with normative olivine, nepheline and albite, with nepheline greater than **5%** and albite greater than 2% Olivine nephelinite: basalt-like composition with major

normative olivine and nepheline; albite less than **2%,** normative orthoclase and/or leucite but no normative larnite;

Olivine melilite nephelinite: basalt-like composition with normative olivine, nepheline, leucite and $larn^*$. (Green **1970b, p.** 221).

On this basis, the samples studied range from quartz tholeiite to olivine melilite nephelinite and thus cover the Hawaiian spectrum, but from a continental environment. Sample locations are shown in Figure μ . The samples were obtained from **Dr. D.H.** Green.

A. Sample Descriptions

Since all samples were obtained as powders, all petrographic data are from Irving **(1971)** or Irving and Green (1974).

1. Quartz tholeiite **2177,** Mt. Eckersley: this is the only quartz

tholeiite found in the province.

"The minor **(15)** normative quartz is possibly a primary feature, but may alternatively be a consequence of the secondary alteration particularly evident in this sam**ple.** The rock is relatively rich in plagioclase which, with uncommon olivine (partly iddingsitized), form phenocrysts in a medium-grained intersertal groundmass of plagioclase, pale brownish clinopyroxene, opaque laths, and interstitial turbid material (possible altered glass) (Irving **1971)."**

2. Olivine tholeiites: **69-1018** Mt. Gellibrand, **2152** Marida Yallock,

and **69-1026** Mt. Widderin:

"The tholeiites of **...** Mt. Gellibrand are distinctly richer in normative hypersthene and poorer in olivine than the tholeiitic flows near Mt. Widderin, ..., Λ and Marida Yallock **....** The rocks of this second group are transitional to olivine basalts. **All** these rocks consist of plagioclase with pale greenish-brown clinopyroxene, granular or rod-like opaques and rare turbid altered glass (?) Most of these rocks have a doleritic aspect (Irving **1971)."**

Figure 4: Map showing Victoria and Tasmania, Australia and the locations of the ten samples used in this study. **2177** Mt. Eckersley 69-1018 Mt. Gellibrand **2152** Marida Yailock **69-1026** Mt. Widderin $\frac{1}{2}$. ϵ **69-1036** Mt. Frazer **2128** Mt. Porndon 2854 Scottsdale **2860** Scottsdale **2896** Flinders Island **2927** Happy Jack Marsh

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

3. Alkali olivine basalt **69-1036,** Mt. Frazer:

"The alkali olivine basalts from Mt. Frazer ... all contain $\sqrt{\text{o}}$ livine-rich $\sqrt{\text{o}}$ lherzolite xenoliths $\sqrt{\text{with }}$ Cr-diop $side$. The lavas consist of olivine phenocrysts in a groundmass of olivine, plagioclase, titanaugite, titanomagnetite and minor apatite (Irving **1971)."**

4. Nepheline basanite 2128, Mt. Porndon:

"The rocks forming the conspicuous scoria and lava cones of Mt. Porndon ... are nepheline basanites (The eruptive centre *[is]* characterized by the presence of $\sqrt{\text{o}}$ livine-rich $\vec{7}$ lherzolite xenoliths $\sqrt{\text{with Cr}-\text{dipside}}\vec{7}$; the majority also have wehrlite xenoliths and pyroxene and anorthoclase megacrysts. ... Microscopically, the basanites are characterized **by** plagioclase of andesinelabradorite composition and **by** groundmass containing apatite with interstitial brown glass and/or nepheline (Irving **1971)."**

No detailed petrography is available for the Tasmanian rocks. For a general review of the Tasmanian volcanics, including chemistry and petrology, see Sutherland (1969). The olivine nephelinites 2854 (Scottsdale) and **2896** (Flinders Id.) and the olivine melilite nephelinite **²⁹²⁷** (Happy Jack Marsh) aU have lherzolite inclusions at the sample localities.

B. Chemical Analyses

Irving **(1971) did** extensive geochemical and high-pressure experimental studies on the xenoliths, megacrysts and basalts from southeastern Australia; his major element analyses on the six Victorian rocks, along with the major element analyses of the Tasmanian rocks supplied **by** Green (personal communication) are shown in Table I, with the CIPN norms (calculated with tihe **USGS** rock norm program **M0015).** Fe203/FeO weight percent ratios have in each case been recalculated to 0.2 to counter the effects of oxidation during or after eruption. Irving **(1971)** chose 0.2 because some of the least oxidized rocks (samples that may be primary magmas, see below) have

TABLE I

Major element analyses NEWER VOLCANICS OF VICTORIA

All major element chemical analyses from Irving 1971. Fe2O3/FeO ratios have been recalculated to 0.2 to counter the effects of oxidation. * indicates Fe2O3 as actually determined (Mg-value as determined).

TABLE I Continued

Major element analyses
TASMANIA

All major element analyses from Green (personal communication). See other notes on page 20.

 \bullet

 $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ \mathcal{A} Fe203/FeO ratios approaching or approximately equal to 0.2; it is believed that this value is appropriate for the Tasmanian rocks also. **All** samples are considered as one suite since similar parent magmas are hypothesized to be involved (Sutherland **1969).** As an aid to visualizing the nomenclature and the major element abundances, a normative plot, of the type used **by** Coombs **(1963)** is shown in Figure **5.** Irving (personal communication) also did scme trace element analyses, and these are shown in Table II.

TABLE II

 $\stackrel{\bullet}{\circ}$.

Trace element analyses of **A.J.** Irving (unpublished)

All analyses are emission spectrography unless otherwise indicated. **All** numbers are **ppm.**

Figure 5: Coombs plot

 $\sim 10^7$

C. Basalt Petrogenesis

For the Newer Volcanics, Irving **(1971)** concluded the following: only the basanites and the olivine nephelinites could have been primary melts **of** upper mantle peridotite. This conclusion is based upon the high $Mg/(Mg+Fe⁺²)$ atomic ratios (the Mg-value) and the presence of lherzolite nodules in these samples. Using data of Roeder and Emslie **(1970)** on the partitioning of Fe and **Mg** between olivine and liquid, Irving derived the following expression for the distribution of Fe and **Mg** between olivine and liquid:

$$
x_{o1} = x_{L} / (x_{L} + \kappa (100 - x_{L})),
$$

where X is the Mg-value, and K = $(Mg/Fe)_{L}/(Mg/Fe)_{01}$. Roeder and Emslie **(1970)** determined K to b'e 0.3. Estimates of the chemical composition of the undepleted upper mantle (e.g., Ringwood 1966, Nicholls 1967, Carter **1970)** have Mg-values between **87.5** and **89.3.** Olivines of these peridotitic assemblages would have similar ratios; if the range Fo₈₆ to Fo₉₁ is considered, Irving's expression implies equilibrium with basaltic liquids with Mg-values between **65** and **76.** See either Kesson *(1973)* or Irving **(1971)** for more details.

Basanite 2128 (and olivine nephelinites 2854 and **2896** and olivine melilite nephelinite **2927)** meet these criteria. Alkali olivine basalt **69-1036** does also, but Irving (personal communication) feels that some xenocrystal olivine from the lherzolite xenoliths common in the hand specimens (Irving **1971)** may have been included in the analysis.

Recent experimental studies (e.g., Ito and Kennedy **1967,** Green 1973a, etc.) indicate that basanites with about **25%** normative olivine and about **10%** normative nepheline may be derived **by** small degrees **(5-65)** of partial

 $-25-$

melting of hydrous mantle peridotite at pressures of about **25** to **30 kb.** Experimental evidence also suggests that olivine nephelinite magmas may be derived **by** extremely small degrees (less than **5%)** of partial melting of hydrous peridotite at pressures of 20 to **30 kb** (Bultitude and Green **1968).**

The tholeiites and olivine basalts of the Newer Volcanics are too Ferich to be primary melts of a peridotite mantle produced **by** high degrees (greater than 20%) of partial melting. The tholeiites have Mg-values of 59.4 to 59.6-and are poor or lacking in normative olivine and are most likely low pressure (less than **5 kb)** fractionates of more olivine-rich tholeiitic magmas. The olivine basalts and the olivine tholeiites transitional to them have slightly higher Mg-values (61.4 to **62.0)** and very much higher normative olivine contents **(15.2** to **17.7%).** Such differences are explicable in terms of different degrees of partial melting of source peridotite and thus different olivine/hypersthene proportions for parental magmas, with the further complication of variable olivine or olivine plus pyracene fractionation at low pressures. The quartz tholeiite is seen as a low pressure fractionate also.

The major objective of this research was to utilize trace-element data to evaluate melting models based on major-element data.

III. **ANALYTICAL DATA**

Table III shows the trace-element analyses along with the chondritenormalized values for the REE for all samples. The analytical determinations were all done **by** instrumental neutron activation analysis, as described **by** Gordon et al. **(1968).** The photopeaks used for analysis, counting times and similar information can be found in Appendix I. The^t values shown

-26.

TABLE III

Trace element analyses

Chondrite-normalized REE analyses

* WC contamination in sample produces anomalous Co abundance.

** La, Eu, Yb (sometimes) and Ta are the averages of two determinations from different gamma-ray peak; errors in parentheses indicate the net differences. Chondrite values are from Haskin et al. (1968): La 0.330, Ce 0.880, Nd 0.600, Sm 0.181, Eu 0.069, Tb 0.047, Ho 0.070 , Tb 0.200, Lu 0.034.

TABLE III Continued

Rock Type Sample No Locality	Basanite 2128 Mt. Porndon	O1 Neph 2854 Scotts- dale	Neph 2860 Scotts- dale	Ol Neph 2896 Flinders Island	01 Melil 2927 Happy Jack Marsh			
Sc $c_{\mathbf{r}}$ $Co_{\star\star}$ La Ce Nd $Sm_{\star\star}$ Eu Tb Ho ₩ Yb Lu Hf $Ta**$ Th	19.61 t 0.05 385=3 71.30.1 48.120.5 82.523.8 44.123.8 9.520.06 2.96 t (0.1) 1.26=0.05 1.1120.21 1.020.11 0.350.22 7.480.19 11.32(0.1) 5.730.15	19.2020.06 42823 77.20.5 61.842.1 116.723.3 57.322.8 12.06±0.20 4.02(0.36) $1.60*0.08$ $* * * *$ $1.87 - 78$ 0.1020.10 $8.78 - 23$ 15.72(0.6) 6.9120.20	10.46 0.04 14.61 0.05 11.01.7 44.20.3 100.911.1 133.1±6.6 $66.1*6.1$ 2.55=0.08 1.5020.22 0.180.06 $10,70$ ^{\bigstar} 0.22 14.92(0.5) 12.620.3	545年4 83.20.5 64.840.1 114.323.2 59.82.9 16.9820.11 12.6020.17 $6.34(0.17)$ 4.20 $\text{L}(0.12)$ $1.63*0.07$ $*$ 1.75(0.21)1.8720.90 0.26 ± 0.16 9.31 m , 22 14.8(0.9) 3.830.16	23.320.07 ∏∂∏∓⊺ 83.320.5 72.121.3 127.823.5 59.52.9 12.14 ² 0.17 3.682(0.06) 1.7720.08 *** 1.2820.85 0.2920.15 5.82m . 21 13.05(0.9) 13.60.3			
主 Chondrite-normalized REE analyses								
La 0e Nd Sm Eu Tb Ho Yb Lu	14721.5 93.8 ± 1.7 73.65.3 53.000.3 42.92(2.0) 26.71.1 15.923.0 5.320.6 10.156.3	18726.3 13324 95.54.7 66.6m .1 58.2 ≤ 5.2) 34.0 1.6 $***$ 9.323.9 3.022.9	30623.3 151≢8 110210 93.80.6 $91.9*(2.5)$ 54.321.8 21.423.1 8.71(1.0) 5.321.8	19710.3 130th 99.624.8 69.61.0 60.92(6.1) 34.721.6 *** 9.321.5 7.64.7	21953.9 14564 99.214.9 66.620.9 $53.4*(0.87)$ 37. 72.8 $***+$ 6.121.2 8.524.4			

Trace element analyses

*** Due to scheduling difficulties with the counting equipment, analysis for Ho in these three samples was not possible. See other notes on page 27.

 $\epsilon_{\rm{eff}}$

in Table III are derived from counting statistics after the method of Wasson (quoted in Baedecker **1971).** The chondrite normalized patterns are shown in Figure **6** for the nephelinitic rocks and in Figure **7** for the tholeiitic group.

In order to test the accuracy and precision of the analyses, three separate analyses of BCR-1 were done. The data, corrected for **flux** variations, are presented in Table IV, with the average of the three, the standard deviation of the three analyses, the error from counting statistics and a survey of analyses of BCR-1 in the current literature.

Accuracy: For the following elements, the average of the three analyses is within **5%** of Flanagan's **(1973)** recommended values: Co, **Nd,** Sm, **Eu,** Yb and Lu; for Ba, La, Ce, Th, **Hf,** Ta, and Th, the average is within **10%,** *for Sc* within 15% and for Ho, within 20%. The Cr analysis is out of line with the literature values, being 39% too low. No obvious explanation presents itself, but the low amount of Cr in the sample, along with the uncertainty of the Cr content in the standard is probably responsible.

Precision: The standard deviation $\left(\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(x_i - m)^2}{m-1}}\right)$, m=mean) is shown in column **5** of Table **IV.** Column **6** shows the error from counting statistics (see Appendix II). It is of interest to compare the two: in **17** out of 22 cases, the error from counting statistics is greater than or approximately equal to the standard deviation of the three analyses, indicating that there can be high confidence in the analysis within the limits of the counting statistics.

There seems to be a systematic error in Ce, in that the chondritenormalized Ce value is in every case but one **(69-1026)** lower than expected **by** interpolation between the La and **Nd** values, **for** no known reason.

-29-

Figure 6: Chondrite-normalized REE patterns for the nephelinitic rocks: A

Common D

Olivine nephelinite 2854

O---O

Nephelinite 2860

C---O

Nephelinite 2860

C---O

Nephelinite 2860 $-\Delta$ Basantie 2128 $x - -x$ Olivine melllite nephelinite 2927 All data taken from Table III.

Figure **7:** Chondrite-normalized REE pattern for the tholeiitic rocks: **W -*-** - Alkali olivine basalt **69-1036** $+ \cdots +$ Olivine basalt $69-1026$ O- - **0** Olivine tholeiite **²¹⁵²** \cdots **a** Olivine tholeiite 69-1018 **X-X** Quartz tholeiite 2177 **All** data taken from Table III.

 \sim

 \overline{a}

TABLE IV

Analyses of BCR-1

	Photopeak (keV)	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{2}$		average
Sc	889	37.2120.15	37.29	35.39	36.63±1.07
c_{r}	320	9.51 4.3	11.8	9.1	10.1 ± 1.5
Co	1332	39.6 ± 0.5	39.1	38.1	38.9 ± 0.8
Ba	216	778 2137	930	777	828 288
Ba	496	$677 + 134$	558	6ν	161 626
La	487	21.520.5	23.8	22.6	$23.621.0$ $24.121.6$
La	1595	25.7 ± 0.4	24.2	$2l_1$.1	24.7 ± 0.97
Ce	11.5	50.322.3	48.9	53.3	50.8 2.2
Nd	92	26.0 ± 2.4	29.3	29.6	28.3 22.0
Sm	103	6.4920.04	6.44	6.68	6.54 co.13
Eu	122	2.0520.07	2.01	1.83	
Eu	1408	1.9620.10	1.76	-1.84	1.96±0.12>1.90±0.18 1.8520.10
Тb	298	1.0220.11	1.17	1.16	1.1210.08
Ho	81	1.4220.19	1.39	1.54	1.4520.08
Yр	283	3.5720.56	3.12	3.50	3.4020.21
YЪ	396	3.7620.28	3.21	3.46	3.480.28-3.440.24
Lu	208	$0.537*0.04$	0.567	0.559	0.554 t 0.016
Hf	133	$5.03*0.31$	4.71	5.16	4.9720.23
Hf	482	5.3610.52	5.8h	5.15	5.2120.59 5.1520.35
Ta	1189	1.3 ± 0.5	0.5	0.1	$0.7 * 0.5$
Ta	1222	0.7320.25	0.88	0.88	0.8320.09
Th	313	$5.81 - 39$	5.50	5.63	5.6520.16

All figures have been corrected for flux variations by means of an Fe wire flux monitor. All such corrections were less than 3%. The plus/minus value in column one is the statistical error associated with the analysis; it is identical for the three samples. The plus/ minus value with the average is the standard deviation of the three

$$
\verb+analyses+
$$

$$
sigma = \sqrt{\sum_{1}^{3} (m - x_1)^2 / 2}
$$

TABLE IV Continued

		\overline{c}	٦			6	7	8
Sc $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{r}$ \mathbf{Co} Ba La Ce Nd Sm Eu Tb Ho Yb Lu Hf Ta Th	32 36 700 26 53 7.0 $2.0 -$ 0.96 3.6 0.55 4.7 0.71	700 26.1 54.9 28.8 6.7 ₁ 1.96 3.68 0.590	$31.9_0.6$ 19 ₂₅ 35.80.7 656 t μ 25.2 L1. 0 51.222.2 30.514.3 7.230.37 1.9720.01 1.1520.05 1.3120.12 3.4820.12 0.52620.15 5.2320.24 0.9020.09	646 53.9 28.6 6.62 1.942 3.38 0.536	$54-3$ 27.7 6.38 1.91 3.35 0.546	697 21.4 54.3 28.9 6.72 1.98 3.39 0.501	53.7 29.0 6.7 ₄ 2.02 3.49	$33*$ $17.6*$ $38*$ 675 $26*$ 53.9 $29 -$ $6.6*$ 1.94 1.0 $1.2**$ $3.36*$ 0.55 $4.7*$ 0.91 6.0

Analyses of BCR-1 in the literature

- 2. Gast et al. 1970 (average of 2)
3. Haskin et al. 1970 (average of 2)
4. Philpotts et al. 1970b
5. Arth 1973
6. Nakamura and Masuda 1973
	-
-

-
- $7.$ Shimizu 1974
- 8. Flanagan 1973: * indicates an average value, ** a magnitude; all others are recommended values.

The uncertainty in the Ce content of the standard may be responsible; alternatively an unidentified interference may be present in the gammaray spectrum.

Additional analyses of five samples from the Hawaiian Islands (supplied **by D.** Clague) were done, but the results are not interpreted in this thesis. They are shown as Appendix III, together with a literature survey **of** similar data.

IV. PARAMETERS INVOLVED IN **MODELS** FOR TRACE **ELEMENT** BEHAVIOR A. **ANATEXIS**

ANATEXIS is a computer program for calculating trace-element concentrations in a melt phase and up to ten coexisting solid phases initially present in specified weight fractions which are allowed to form the liauid according to specified liquid weight fractions (i.e., melting proportions). Both Doerner-Hoskins (Rayleigh fractionation) and Berthelot-Nernst equilibria are calculated, using equations of Shaw **(1970).** The program was written **by** R. Kay in **1970** and modified **by F.A.** Frey, R.A. Zielinski and **D.N.** Skibo in **July 1972. All** computer runs were made on the MIT IBM **370/165.** To run ANATEXIS. three basic quantites must be specified: the initial weight fractions, the melting proportions and the partition coefficients for the specified phases. Other control variables which must be specified are the initial melt percent, the final melt percent and the increment to be used. When any phase is exhausted, the program automatically goes on to the next element.

B. Initial Upper Mantle Mineralogy

Tnitial upper mantle mineralogy is dependent upon composition, pressure
and temperature. Green and Ringwood **(1963)** presented calculated mineralogies for several different anhydrous pressure-temperature regimes based on pyrolite I. Later papers (e.g., Green and Ringwood **1970)** have not presented any quantitative mineralogy: Green (1970b) gave approximat: mineralogies for plagioclase pyrolite, pyroxene pyrolite and garnet pyrolite, but stated that they were not necessarily the immediate subsolidus mineralogies involved in the melting of pyrolite, since both the mineralogy and the temperature of the solidus are P_{H2O} and P_{Load} dependent. Therefore the starting compositions used with ANATEXIS were derived in the following ways: **1)** directly from Green and Ringwood **(1963);** 2) directly from Green **(1970b);** and **3) by** using Doherty and Wright's **(1971)** Mineral Distribution program with mineral compositions from Green (1973a and **b).**

Mineral Distribution is a program designed to calculate rock modes and to model schemes of magmatic differentiation **by** the least-souares solution of an overdetermin^{ed} system of linear equations. The program fits the chemical composition **of** a rock **by** calculating proportions of two or more minerals that make up the rock. Mineral Distribution was used to determine what combination of high-temperature, high-pressure olivine, orthopyroxene, garnet and amphibole could best match pyrolite III (Green 1973a). Clinopyroxene was omitted and amphibole included since Irving's **(1971)** model calls for a hydrous source, and Green's **(1973b)** phase diagram for pyrolite with 0.2% H20 (Figure **8)** has this mineralogy at pressures above 20 **kb.** This approach is made difficult **by** the lack of appropriate analyses. The mineral compositions used with the computer program are shown in Table V and are from Green (1973a) for a **30 kb, 12500,** 0.32.0.1%

-37-

Figure 8: Phase Diagram for pyrolite plus 0.2% H₂0 (Green 1973b) (Green' Caption): "Experimental determination **of** solidus for waterundersaturated (at P< **30 kb)** melting of pyrolite minus 40% olivine and of sub-solidus and above-solidus mineralogy for a water content in pyrolite equivalent to approximately 0.2%. The "dotted" curve shows the position of the solidus deduced from preliminary data on amphibole stability in pyrolite and in the melting interval of undersaturated basaltic compositions. The data points are shown **by** heavy dots and the minerals present in the subsolidus disappear during melting along the dashed curves marked with the mineral names. Amphibole disappears at the solidus (within the limints of the experimental points) for $P < 30$ kb."

 \mathcal{V}_A

 $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $-39-$

TABLE V

Pyrolite \equiv olivine + orthopyroxene + amphibole: I

	OL.	OPX	GA	AMPH		Pyrolite Calculation	Difference
S10 ₂	41.20		55.85 41.60	42.89	45.43	45.36	0.08
A1203	0.00		3.40 21.10	11.35	3.48	3.16	0.33
Fe0	12.10	7.10	9.20	5.68	8.75	9.18	-0.72
MgO	μ 6. μ 0	31.27	20.70	22.48	37.68	37.28	0.40
CaO	0.00	1.70	5.80	11.24	3.09	3.05	0.04
Na ₂ O	0.00	0.20	0.00	1.96	0.60	0.53	0.07
H ₂ 0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.76	0.20	0.43	-0.22
T10 ₂	0.00		$0.50 - 1.40$	2.58	0.70	0.73	-0.02
M _n O	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.11	0.10	0.03	0.08

Solution: **52.28 25.63 -2.29** 24.40

Olivine composition taken from Green 1973a, Table **5.**

Orthopyrarene and garnet compositions taken from Green 1973a, Table **3.**

Amphibole composition taken from Green **1973b,** Table **6.**

Adjustments have been made to the **MgO** and FeO values to reflect more realistic equilibrium Mg-values.

The sum of the residuals squared is 0.855h .

H₂O experimental run for the olivine, orthopyroxene and garnet, and from Green **(1973b)** for an amphibole coexisting with olivine, orthopyroxene and clinopyroxene. Adjustments have been made to the **MgO** and FeO values to reflect more realistic equilibrium Mg-values.

The program yielded the results shown in the line labeled "solution" in Table V. The column labeled "Difference" is the difference between the composition to be matched (pyrolite) is the best fit-the-program came up with. with ("Calculation"). The fit is good, with the sum of the residuals squared being **0.85.** This solution indicates that garnet is not involved, and includes a very high percentage of amphibole (24.4) . This state of affairs is not entirely satisfactory. To determine the effects of this mineralogy on REE patterns, this composition was run with ANATEXIS, and the results are shown in Figure **9.**

For purposes of comparison, Green's mineral compositions (with unadjusted Fe/Mg ratios) were also run with Mineral Distribution; the results are shown in Table VI: the fit is not good; the olivine/orthopyroxene ratio is quite different, and the amount of amphibole is one-third lower. Garnet is still not involved. Mineral Distribution was rerun with an additional constraint: if the water is all in the amphibole $(1.6% H₂0$ in the amphibole), 12% amphibole is expected in pyrolite with 0.2% H20. This changes the **solu**tion slightly (Table VII), this time including **1.7%** garnet.

AU three of these starting compositions **(1,** 2, and **3** of Table VIII) were run with ANATEKIS and the REE patterns which result are shown in Figures **9, 10** and **11.** The melting proportions were chosen to reflect the belief that essentially amphibole alone is melting, since the phase dia-

 $-l_1l_$ –

Figure 9: Chondrite-normalized REE pattern produced by a source with composition 50% olivine, 25.6% orthopyroxene and 24.4% amphibole (Table V), melting in the proportions 1:1:8.
 $\Delta = \Delta$ 1.0% low p.c.
 $\Delta = -\Delta$ 1.0% light p.c.

7.5% low p.c.
7.5% high p.c. $o \cdots o$ \cdots $-\bar{\mathsf{X}}$ -7 15.0% low p.c.
 -4 15.0% high p.c. $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ 4

$-l_1l_1-$

TABLE VI

Solution: *73.60* 10.34 **0.00 16.07**

Olivine, orthopyraxene and garnet compositions taken from Green 1973a, Table **3,** with unchanged MgO and FeO values.

Amphibole composition taken frcm Deer, Howie and *Zussman,* analysis of a Tinaquillo amphibole, v. 2, Table 43, column **5, p. 286,** pargasite.

The sum of the residuals squared is **2.3065.**

TABLE VII

Pyrolite . olivine **+** orthopyraccene **+** amphibole ***** garnet

	OL.	OPX	GA	AMPH		Pyrolite Calculation	Difference
		5102 44.37 55.50 40.89		43.96	45.30	45.92	-0.62
	$A1_20_3$ 1.60		3.4020.85	15.23	3.51	3.82	-0.31
FeO	10.67		7.10 9.02	6.56	8.52	9.63	-1.11
MgO	42.78		$31.00 \quad 20.25$	16.64	37.58	37.53	0.05
CaO	0.50		1.70 5.82	11.90	3.11	2.11	0.97
Na ₂ O	0,00	0.20	0.00	2,83	0.61	0.38	0.23
H ₂ 0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.72	0.21	0.21	0.00
T10 ₂	0.10	0.50	1.41	1.11	0.71	0.31	0.40
MnO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.01	0.10
0r ₂ 0 ₃	0.00	0.60	1.81	0.00	0.41	0.12	0.29

Solution: **71.56** 14.79 1.65 12.00

Compositions used in this calculation are the same as those in Table **VI.** This solution *was* determined **by** having the computer fit olivine, orthopyroxene and garnet to an adjusted pyrolite. The adjusted pyrolite assumed that 12.0% amphibole was an unrariable component of the mineralogy. The computer fit was then recalculated to the form shown here. The sum of the residuals squared is **2.9630.**

 $\ddot{}$

$-l_16-$

TABLE VIII

Starting compositions used with **ANATEKIS**

gram for pyrolite plus 0.2% H₂O (Figure 8) indicates that the solidus is essentially defined **by** the amphibole breakdown curve. None **of** the patterns produced resemble the patterns actually shown **by** any of the rocks. **If** Figures **9** and **10** are compared with Figure 6, it is fairly clear that those patterns produced **by** starting compositions **1** and 2 are either too flat or have a rise between Ho and **Yb.** Using starting composition **3** (the one with **1.7%** *garnet)* the patterns produced (Figure **11) by** the low set of partition coefficients are too flat, and the patterns produced **by** the high set of partition coefficients are too flat for the LREE and too steep for the HREE. This last point is worthy of note: even the inclusion of small

 $\ddot{}$.

 $\ddot{}$

 $-48-$

Figure **11:** REE pattern produced **by** a starting composition of **71.5%** olivine, 14.8% orthopyrccene, 12% amphibole and **1.7%** garnet (see Table VII).

4-- **-** ' **1.0% low p.c.** \overline{D} - \overline{D} 1.0% high p.c. O--- --O *5.0% low P.C.* **0** - *5.0%* high **p.c. X--X 10.0% low** p.c. $+$ $+$ $10.0%$ high $p.c.$

amounts of garnet completely negates the rise in the HREE produced **by** the amphibole. Thus it would seem unlikely that any cobination of olivine, orthopyroxene, amphibole and garnet would yield a REE pattern similar to that shown **by** the rocks.

On the strength of this evidence, it is concluded that amphibole is not in equilibrium with any of these magmas. Amphibole may not be an important phase at the solidus because of its immediate breakdown, as mentioned above. In any case, once the amphibole has melted, its previous presence would be undetectable under conditions of total equilibrium (Harris et al. **1972).**

The three olivine-orthopyroxene-clinopyroxene-garnet assemblages used with ANATEXIS are derived from a) a Mineral Distribution type of fit of Green's (1973a) mineral composition to pyrolite (see Table IX) (starting composition 4 of Table VIII); **b)** from Table **3** in Green and Ringwood **(1963)** (starting composition **5);** and e) from the approximate mineralogy of Figure 2 in Green **(1970b)** (starting composition **6).**

It is to be noted that the procedure followed here'is distinctly different from that of Kay and Gast *(1973),* in that **I** am attempting to follow the conclusions of Irving and Green as closely as possible in order to test the applicability of their models (based on major element data) to trace element data. Kay and Gast **(1973)** determined the best fit of upper mantle models to their REE data **by** varying initial modal composition and the degree of melting. It should be pointed out that Kay and Gast **(1973)** base their results on Shaw's (1970) equation 1. (for fractional melting), whereas I am using Shaw's equation **15,** for batch melting, which I believe to be closer to Green's theories and experimental research.

-51-

TABLE IX

Pyrolite = olivine \rightarrow orthopyroxene \rightarrow clinopyroxene \rightarrow garnet

	OL.	OPX	CPX	GA		Pyrolite Calculation Difference	
S10 ₂	40.0	55.5	53.5 40.9		45.2	44.9	0.3
A1203	0.0	μ_{\bullet} O		5.2 21.0	3.5	3.5	0.0
Fe0	9.1	6.9		4.5 9.0	8.5	8.2	0.3
MgO	48.4	$30 - 8$		18.1 20.0	37.5	37.8	-0.3
CaO	0.0	1.7		$14.8\quad 6.0$	3.1	3.2	-0.1
Na ₂ 0	0,0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.3
TiO₂	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.5	0 _o 2
MnO	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
Cr ₂ O ₃	1.7	0.6	1.3	2.0	0.1	0.5	-0.1

Solution: 57.0 **17.5** *15.5* **10.0**

Compositions used in this calculation are taken from Green 1973a, Table **3** and Table **5.** This is a hand-calculated fit.

The sum of the residuals squared is 0.42 .

Ý

Models for the source region of the tholeiitic rocks are discussed in section V-B.

As a summary, Table VIII lists the major initial compositions used in the computer runs with ANATEXIS.

0. Partition Coefficients

1. REE: **A** survey of the available literature **(eg.,** Philpotts and Schnetzlar 1968a,b, **1972;** Schnetzlar and Philpotts **1968;** Grutzek et **al.** *1973;* Nagasawa et **al. 1969;** Jensen **1973;** Masuda and Kushiro **1970) quickly** reveals that the relative values of the partition coefficients are known with much more certainty than the absolute values; therefore, two sets of partition coefficients were used in the computer runs: a high set and a low set (see Table X), more or less covering the range of observed values.

Clinopyraxene: the two sets of partition coefficients were chosen to cover the range **found** in natural systems. The low set is a bit lower than that chosen **by** Kay and Gast **(1973)** but agrees with data of Frey **(unpublished)** and some data of Schnetzlar and Philpotts (1970). The high set is clinopyroxene megacryst/host alkalie olivine basalt (Takashima, Japan) data from Onuma et al. **(1968),** except **for** the Ho value, which is interpolated.

Orthopyroxene: the two sets of orthopyroxene/liquid partition coefficients were determined **by** choosing a set of orthopyroxene/clinopyroxene partition coefficients (Table XI) and then calculating

p opx/1 = p cpx/1/ p cpx/ q px

The low set so determined agrees somewhat with that of Kay and Gast **(1973);** the high set agrees with Onuma et al. (1968) and Frey's unpublished New Zealand megacryst/matrix data.

TABLE X

REE Solid/liquid partition coefficients

* only one set of partition coefficients was used for amphibole and apatite.

TABLE XI

REE Solid/solid partition coefficients

Garnet: the garnet/liquid partition coefficients were determined **by** the same method as the orthopyroxene/liouid coefficients. The garnet/ clinopyroxene partition coefficients were taken from mineral separate data of Haskin et **al. (1966),** Philpotts et al* **(1972)** and Early **(1973).** The Dgar/1 so calculated are consistent with an experimental study **by** Wilde-**1** man et al. **(1973)** and Kakanui garnet xenocryst/lava partition coefficients (Philpotts et al. **(1972).**

Olivine: olivine/clinopyroxene partition coefficients were taken from available pairs in the literature and the olivine/liquid partition coefficients calculated. The **low** set is similar to Kay and Gast *(1973)* and the high set to Higuchi and Nagasawa **(1969)** and Corliss **(1970).** .Since the olivine/liquid (and orthopyroxene/liquid) partition coefficients are so much less than **1,** the exact value used in the calculations is not critical.

Amphibole: amphibole/liquid partition coefficients are based on phenocryst/matrix data of Philpotts et al. **(1972)** and Higuchi and Nagasawa **(1969)** and are consistent with data of Lopez (unpublished).

Spinel: clinopyroxene/spinel partition coefficients were taken from Frey (1969) and spinel/liquid coefficients were calculated. Spinel partitioning of the REE is less well understood than that of the previous minerals, and seems to vary widely. Until more work is done with spinel, little confidence can be placed in any particular set of partition coefficients. Spinel was not considered **by** Kay and Gast **(1973).**

Apatite: apatite/liquid data is from Nagasawa **(1970)** and is from an acidic matrix, but it is the only data available.

2. Other trace elements: In order to evaluate the models using the

1. Wildeman's data was a personal communication.

other trace elements determined in this study **(Hf,** Ta, **Sc,** Co and Th) and in some unpublished work of Irving (personal communication)(V, Ni, Cu, Rb, Sr, Y, Zr and Ba) for some of the rocks, a brief literature search was conducted in an attempt to determine partition coefficients for these elements. Table XII shows those partition coefficients chosen. **A** complete presentation of the data found is made in Table XIII.

TAME XII

Trace-element (non-REE) solid/liquid partition coefficients

See Table XIII for sources.

$-57-$

TABLE XIII

 \mathcal{S}

Non-REE trace element partitioning data

TABLE XIII Continued

Non-REE trace element partitioning data

General notes: horizontal line indicates generally an average was used. Absence of numbers means that no data was found in the literature.

***** Y: geochemically *Y* behaves very similarly to Ho; since very little data concerning Y was found, the high set of Ho partition coefficients was used.

****** Zr: one value for ga/cpx was found: **1.1** (12); ga/1 was calaulated with this value. In recognition of the similarity with **Hf, 10** was also used.

\$ **Hf:** My original assumption that all **Hf** partition coefficients were zero lead to answers an order of magnitude off; therefore it was assumed that **Hf** would behave similarly to Lu; this is plausible since the ionic radius of **Rf* (0.91,** Whittakqr and Muntus **(1970))** is not too different from that of Lu^{*3} (1.05) and Sc^{*3} (0.95) and we know that both Sc and Lu are enriched in garnet. Therefore, the **Hf** partition coefficient for garnet was taken as **10.** For the other minerals, the partition coefficients were taken to be zero. **Hf** may also enter the pyroxenes (Vlasov **1966),** but as a first order calculation, this was not taken into account.

 $-59-$

TABLE XIII Continued

Non-REE trace element partitioning data

Ta: no data was found concerning Ta: all partition coefficients were assumed to be zero.

Th: very little data was found for Th: all partition coefficients were assumed to be zero due to the large size of the Th⁺⁴ ion (1.08-1.17A)

 \ddotsc

References:

- **(1)** Paster et al. 1974
- (2) Onuma et al. 1968
- (3) Ewart et at at 1973
- (4) Gunn **1971**
- **(5)** Henderson and Dale **1970**
- **(6)** Dale and Henderson **1971**
- **(7)** DeLong 1974
- **(8)** Philpotts and Schnetzlar 1970a
- **(9)** Shaw **1973**
- **(10)** Gill 1974
- **(11)** Taylor et al. **1969**
- (12) Colemanet~al. **1965**
- **(13)** Turekian~~andTarr **1960**
- (14) Wager and Mitchell **1951**

D. Melting Proportions

Melting proportions are difficult numbers to come **by,** since much of the melting actually takes place **by** means of complex incongruent melting reactions. For example,

orthopyr α ene $=$ olivine $+$ liquid

 $\text{garnet} = \text{orthopy} \text{rxene} + 1 \text{iquid}$

 clinopyr α ene clinopyr α ene - orthopyr α ene cliquid Experimental research (e.g., Ito, Green, Kushiro) indicates that phases such as clinopyroxene, garnet and amphibole all disappear before orthopyr- α are and olivine. Thus for the computer model, simple assumptions can be made. The importance of these assumptions can be tested **by** varying the melting proportions and comparing the resulting models. This was done using three sets of melting proportions:

The results for all such tests are essentially identical until one of the phases is exhausted, after which the pattern is determined **by** the three remaining phases, as reouired **by** the equilibrium assumptions. Since it is definite that olivine and orthopyroxene will be the last remaining phases they were given the least weight in all computer runs. The figures reported in the next section are based on Set No. 2, which is in agreement with the hypothetical mineralogy in Green's (1973a) Table **5.**

-60-

V. DISCUSSION

The results of this study will be considered in two sections: first, the rocks with greater than **5%** normative nepheline (the basanites, the olivine nephelinintes and the melilite nephelinite) and second, the rocks with less than **5%** normative nepheline (the tholeiites, the olivine basalt and the alkali olivine basalt).

A. Rocks with greater than **5%** normative nepheline **(2128, 2854,** 2860, **2896** and **2927)**

Green's **(1970b,** 1973a) experimental work has shown that **5 - 15%** partial melting of pyrolite with $0.2%$ H₂0 at $25 - 30$ kb and $1200 - 1300$ ^OC will generate strongly undersaturated nephelinitic or basanitic magma. These liquids (such as **2128,** 285h, **2896** and **2927)** are in equilibrium with olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyroxene and garnet as residual phases. With the exception of nephelinite **2860,** all of these rocks have Mg-values between **65** and **75** (see Table I) and have lherzolite inclusions; on the basis of this evidence, they are thought to be primary melts of upper mantle peridotite.

1. Basanite **2128:** under pressures of **25 - 30 kb,** the subsolidus mineralogy of pyrolite with 0,2% H₂0 (see figure 8) is olivine, orthopyroxene, garnet and amphibole (Green **1973b). As** pointed out in section IV, no pattern produced **by** this starting composition resembled any of the patterns actually exhibited **by** the rocks. Therefore, it is assumed that amphibole is not in equilibrium with any of the magmas investigated, that is, that the percent melt involved is always higher than that required for all the amphibole to disappear. Thus our assumption of equilibrium batch melting allows us to ignore the initial presence of amphibole since

the REE will redistribute themselves among the remaining phases (or phases now present, since clinopyroxene is added when the amphibole melts incongruently).

Thus the solid phases which are in equilibrium with the basanite magma are olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyroxene and garnet (Green 1973a). Using ANATEXIS with starting compositions 14, **5,** and **6** from Table VIII (these are the relevant ones, see above discussion and section IV-B), with the high and low sets of partition coefficients, the best fits of the calculated REE pattern with the rock **(2128)** pattern are shown in figures 12 and **13.**

In determining the fit the following method was used. The chondritenormalized REE pattern is usually characterized **by** a negative slope (La/Yb ratio greater than **1);** however examination of the **2128** REE pattern shows that there is a definite change in slope at **Tb,** and therefore the pattern was characterized by two numbers, the La/Tb ratio and the Tb/Yb¹ ratio. These ratios were calculated for the computer-generated "melts" and the ones with the closest match were chosen.

Table XIV gives a numerical comparison between the different models and the basanite, and also illustrates the method used. Although all of

ŧ

 λ^2

[.] L. Yb was used in these ratios, since using Lu presents problems: the statistical error of the Lu-177 208.4 key peak is fairly large, and often the determined value would cause a distinct change in slope between Yb and Lu. **Yb-175** has two peaks **(282.6** and **396.1** key) which almost always give results well within the statistical errors of the two peaks. An average of the values determined from the two peaks was used in the calculations, with the minor exceptions of those rocks whose Yb content was so low that the two **Yb-175** peaks were not detectable; in these cases an adjusted value of the Yb-169 63.3 kev peak was used. (The adjustment was made **by** comparing the **Yb-169** peaks with the **Yb-175** peaks in those samples **(by** far the greater majority) for which both isotopes yielded integratable peaks).

Figure 12: Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of basanite 2128 and
the pattern produced by starting composition 6 (Model A).

 λ

 2128 X.......X Model A low p.c.
+.....+ Model A high p.c.

Figure **13:** Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of basanite **2128** and the pattern produced by starting composition μ (Model B).

> $\bullet - \bullet 2128$ 4--6 Model B *low p.c.* \Box - \Box Model B high p.c.

 $-66-$

TABLE XIV

τ

 $\ddot{}$

Total equilibrium models **for** basanite **2128**

Notes **for** Table XIV are on page **70.**

 $\ddot{}$

J.

TABLE XIV Continued

Τ

Total equilibrium models for basanite **2128**

Notes for Table XIV are on page **70.**

TABLE XIV Continued

 \sim .

 $\overline{}$

 ϵ

Total equilibrium models for basanite 2128

Notes for Table XIV are on page 70.

بشبعه

 $\ddot{}$

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

 \mathbb{R}^2

 $\frac{1}{2}$

-70-

TABLE XIV Continued

Total equilibrium models for basanite **2128**

Notes for Table XIV: This table shows the best fits for basanite **2128** using all relevant starting compositions (see Table VIII). The first line in each section (labeled **"2128")** gives the REE chondrite-normalized abundances in the basanite; each page of the table tabulates a different starting composition, both high and low sets of partition coefficients.

SC is starting composition.

Rl is the ratio of the rock to the calculated pattern

M is the computer-generated value multiplied **by** the average value of R1 (the Model).

R2 is the ratio of the rock to the model.

Percent figures are the percent of partial melting required **by** the model.

The plus/minus values are one standard deviation.

Parentheses indicate values not included in computing the average.

Although Lu is fit well **by** model **A,** it was not included in the averages for consistency with the other starting compositions.

the models fit well on the average of all the elements, the standard deviation indicates the actual closeness of the fit.

The model with the best fit (smallest standard deviation), which I will call "Model **A",** uses starting composition **6** (Table VIII) with **low** partition coefficients, and calls for a **0.6%** melt. Assuming that the mantle REE pattern is not fractionated with respect to chondrites, this indicates an upper mantle RE content of 1.4 x chondrites. If high partition coefficients are used, **2.8%** melt is needed, and the RE content of the upper mantle is **6.3 x** chondrites. The fit is still acceptable.

Using starting composition μ , "Model B", with low partition coefficients, the data can be matched almost as closely as with Model **A:** the standard deviation is 0.144 versus 0.143. This model produces **0.9%** melt, and calls for an upper mantle REE content of 2.0 x chondrites. If we shift to the high partition coefficients, percent melt rises to 4.1 and the REE content of the upper mantle changes to **8.7 x** chondrites. The fit is still acceptable, and very comparable to the previous model.

It should be noted here that these are limits that the models place on the percent melt and RE content of the upper mantle: since the partition coefficients could be anywhere between the high and low values I have chosen, the percent melt and RE content of the upper mantle will fall within the limits indicated in each model.

Starting composition 5*(the one closest to Chen's **(1971)** mantle mineralogy) does not yield satisfactory results: the average fit is acceptable, but the standard deviation is too high. It is interesting to note that the parameters generated **by** this model (percent melt and upper mantle REE content) are very similar to those required **by** the two models which do fit the data well.

Although I feel that total equilibriumi follows Green's experiments more closely than surface equilibrium, it is worthwhile to consider surface equilibrium, if only to look at the complete picture. Reality may well be somewhere in between these two models.

Both Models **A** and B were examined. Model **A** gave good results: low partition coefficients required **1%** melting and **l.5** x chondrites. The standard deviation is **0.118,** quite good a fit. With high partition coefficients, 4% melting and an upper mante RE content of **6.3 x** chondrites are required. The fit isn't quite as good, with a standard deviation of 0.148. This data is presented in Table XV and Figure **14.** Note that Lu is fit with this model.

Interestingly, Model B did not yield an acceptable fit: with low partition coefficients the standard deviation was 0.254 and with high partition coefficients, 0.264 if Lu is included, and **0.182** and 0.206 respectively if we leave out Lu.

Other trace elements: Several other trace elements were determined in this study: **Sc,** Cr, Co, **Hf,** Ta and Th. The following is an attempt to fit these data to the two models.

Using estimates **of** Lopez-Escobar et al. (1974) for upper mantle abundances of **Sc** and Co, and of Shaw **(1973)** for Th, and using chondritic averages of Ehmann and Rebegay **(1971)** for **Hf,** and of Ehmann **(1971)** for Ta, (in each case times the appropriate facter determined above from the REE models), we can calculate the expected abundances of these trace elements and compare the results with the analytical determinations. For these calculations, the partition coefficients discussed in section IV-C-2

-72-

TABLE XV

Model A	La	$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{e}$	Nd	Sm	Eu
2128	11 ₁₇	93.8	73.6	53.0	42.7
$1.0%$ low	94.6	77.2	17.7	31.5	26.8
R1	1.555	1.216	1.545	1.682	1.600
M	137	112	68.3	45.7	38.9
$R2 -$	1.065	0.838	1.079	1.159	1.102
Model A	Tb	Ho	Yb	Lu	ave.
2128	26.7	15.9	5.3	μ_{\bullet} 1	
$1.0%$ low	20.8	11.3	4.3.	$2 - 7$	
R1	1.283	1.406	1.236	1.538	1.453
M	30.2	16.4	6.2	3.9	
R2	0.883	0.969	0.855	1.051	1.0001 ± 0.118
Model A	La	Ce	Nd	Sm	Eu
$4.0%$ high	23.6	19.3	11.7	6.51	6.11
R1	6.239	4.860	6.291	8.104	6.987
M	149	122	73.8	41.3	38.8
R2	0.986	0.768	0,998	1.283	1.103
Model A	\rm{fb}	Ho	Yb	Lu	ave.
$4.0%$ high	4.46	2.44	0.998	0.628	
R1	5.987	6.516	5.311	6.529	6.313
M	28,2	15.A	6.3	4.0	
R ₂	0.946	1.032	0.841	1.024	0.9979 ± 0.148

Surface equilibrium model for basanite 2128

Figure 14: Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of basanite 2128 and the pattern produced by a surface equilibrium model using starting composition 6. (Model A)

 $\pmb{\mathsf{s}}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

were used. See Table XII. The results are shown in Table XVI, and are not too bad, considering the assunmtions involved. Th agrees quite well using the models with the low percent melting; Sc is off **by** *less* than a factor of two, Co and **Hf by** about a factor of two, and Ta **by** a factor of three.

Basanite **2128** models: other trace elements

% is the percent of melting required **by** the model. **N** is the chondrite factor required **by** the REE models.

It is worth examining these results and the assumptions that led to them. The question of how well the partition coefficients are known has been dealt with in section IV-C, to some extent, **by** means of Table XIII. The other important assumption is the abundance of the element in the upper mantle. Each of the five elements will **be** considered in detail below.

Sc: The initial calculations used Lopez-Escobar's^o (1974) estimate of **16** ppm for the abundance of **Sc** in the upper mantle. Alternatively, **we** can derive a value for oyrolite **by** combining **a** value for the abundances in tholeiitic basalt and in peridotite.

Sc in ultramafics:

Sc in tholeiites:

Pyrolite **= 0.75** peridotite **+ 0.25** tholeiite (Ringwood **1966)**

Therefore, using an average of 12 ppm Sc for the peridotite and an average **of** 34 ppm **Sc** for the tholeiite, 0.75 **(12)+0.25** (34)=17.5. Thus Sc in pyrolite comes to about **17.5** ppm; this raises our results **by 9%** (Table XVII).

TABLE XVII

Basanite **2128 Sc** model: revised

These results are a little closer than the earlier ones. It is worth noting here the existence of "Sc provinces", found in the abundance of **Sc** in crustal rocks, which Frondel (1969) believes reflect inhomogeneities in

the **Se** abundance in the upper mantle. Thus this match may be fortuitous; at the same time the existence of **Sc** inhomogeneitites in the mantle makes the use of averages somewhat dubious.

Co: **A** brief survey of the literature found the following values for the abundance of Co in ultramafic rocks:

and the following values for the abundance of Co in tholeiites:

Using values of **110** ppm for the ultramafic componenet and **45** ppm for the tholeiitic component, pyrolite would have about **88** ppm Co. Using Vinogradovts values, pyrolite would have **160** ppm Co. Using both of these values for C_{0} , the abundance in the source, we get the results shown in Table XVIII. Vinogradov's values are in parentheses.

TABLE XVIII

Basanite **2128** Co model: revised

Using Vinogradov's numbers brings us closer to the rock value, while using a more average value brings us further away.

Hf: One note on the partition coefficients: the bulk partition coefficient **(D0** in Shaw's **(1970)** equations) for **Hf** comes to **0.5** for Model **A** and **1.0** for Model B. Helmke and Haskin **(1973),** in considering fractional crystallization models for the Steens Mtn basalts, calculate a bulk distribution coefficient of **0.56** for **Hf** when the average of fifty-two lavas is used; other calculations of theirs have **Hf** bulk partition coefficients between **0.18** and **0.66.** This seems to lend some support to the values of **0.5** and **1.0** used in this thesis.

Hf in ultramafics:

Hf in tholeiites:

Turekian et al. 1961: 2.0 ppm Brooks **1970: 3.3** Helmke et al. **1973:** 4.8 This paper (appendix III) μ_{\bullet} 9

Using Brooks' numbers, **Hf** in pyrolite is **1.55** ppm; using Goles' and Helmke and Haskin's numbers, **Hf** in pyrolite is **1.85** ppm. Using **1.7** as an average yields the following results (Table XIX). This change in C₂ does not really change the results.

One problem arises when the **Hf** content of the nephelinites is compared with the **Hf** content of the tholeiites: if the tholeiites are to be derived from a source of identical chemical composition (but'different mineralogical composition) to that of the nephelinites, then if **Hf** is in the garnet phase for the nephelinites and doesn't go into the other phases, then the

TABLE XIX

Basanite **2128 Hf** models revised

Model	Ъ	Hf
Basanite 2128		7.5
Model A	0.6 2.8	3.4 3.4
Model B	0.9	1.7 1.7

Hf content of the nephelinites should be less than the **lif** content of the tholeiites. **A** glance at Table III indicates that this is not the case. One possibility is that the two types of basalts come from different types of mantles; this is discussed briefly under Conclusions.

Ta: There is not much data available **for** Ta.

Ta in ultramafics:

Ta in tholeiites:

Turekian et al. **1961: 1.1 ppm** Vinogradov¹⁹⁶²: 0.5 This paper (appendix III) **2.5**

Therefore Ta in pyrolite is about **1** ppm (Using Turekian et al.) or about 0.4 ppm (using Vinogradov). We get the following results (Table XX).

This improves the results of the calculation somewhat (compare Table XX with Table XVI) and gives support to the high partition coefficient models. The uncertainty in C_o more than covers the range allowed **by** the models.

Th: The following data was collected for Th:

TABLE XX

Basanite 2128 Ta model: revised

Model	Х	Ta^*	Tа
Basanite 2128			11.3
Model A 0.6 163		2.8 36	60 13
Model B 0.9 116		24	հ3

* using Turekian et al. 1961 **** Using Vinogradov 1962**

Th in ultramafics:

Th in tholeiites:

Turekian et al. 1961:
Vinogradov 1962: 4 ppm 3 Rogers et al. 1969: 0.69 0.95 This paper (appendix III) 1.4

Using 0.06 for peridotite and 1.0 for tholeiites, we get 0.29 ppm Th in pyrolite. The results of the calculations are shown in Table XXI.

This value for C_o improves our results if we consider the high percent partial melting (which means the high set of REE partition coefficients in our model), as did Ta.

As one last calculation, if we consider a chondritic abundance of Th we can get another estimate of C_{o^*} Using data of Margan (1971) and estimates of Wakita et al. (1967) and Green et al. (1968) of the chon-

TABLE XXI

Basanite **2128** Th model: Revised I

dritic abundance of Th and multiplying **by** the factor determined from the REE models, we get the following results (Table XXII).

TABLE XXII

Basanite **2128** Th model: revised II

where $C_0 = 0.05N$, where N is the chondrite factor.

This brings us further from the rock value, but not much. Rogers et al. **(1969)** discuss Th provinces; if Th provinces do indicate Th inhomogeneities in the mantle, then the same comments made about Sc provinces are relevant here.

In general these five trace elements support the partial melting models put forth above, although discrepancies certainly do exist, and further work along these lines is definitely required.

Irving (personal communication) did some trace element analyses of two samples of the Mt. Porndon basanite, which are shown in Table II. We will consider this data briefly to see if it supports the REE models.

V: V in ultramafics:

V in tholeiites:

Using **60** ppm for the V content of peridotite and **300** ppm for the tholeiite yields 120 ppm V for pyrolite. The results are shown in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

Basanite 2126 V model

V is off **by** a factor of two.

Ni: Ni in ultramafics:

Ni in basalts:

Using **1600** ppm Ni in peridotite and **100** ppm Ni in tholeiites we get about 1200 ppm Ni in pyrolite. Lopez-Escobar (1974) and Shaw **(1973)** give estimates of'1500 ppm Ni in the upper mantle. Using both these estimates we get the results shown in Table XXIV..

TABLE XXIV

Basanite **2128** Ni model

* C **= 1**200 ppm Ni **⁰**Co **:.1500 ppm** Ni

Percent melt differences insignificant.

The qalculation is off **by** a factor of two; there is less difference between the two models than between the two C_o values.

Cu: Cu in ultramafics:

-8h-

Cu in basalts:

Using **175** ppm Cu in tholeiites and **30** ppm Cu in peridotite yields **66 ppm** Cu in pyrolite. The results are shown in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV

Basanite Cu model

This calculation is further off than any other, well over an order of magnitude. The partition coefficients indicate that almost all of the Cu will go into the liquid, while the abundance data indicate that a bulk distribution coefficient of about **3** would be required. Alternatively, **my** estimate of the upper mantle abundance of Cu may be at fault. If we back-calculate C using the basanite value and the given partition coefficients, we get **⁰** an upper mantle abundance **of 3.7** ppm Cu, much lower than indicated **by** any of the ultramafic analyses. Cu is the least understood of the elements discussed here, and these calculations highlight this fact, a sulfide may be involved.

Rb: Rb in ultramafics:

fb in basalts:

Therefore, using 0.2 **ppm** for Rb in peridotite and **8** ppm for Rb in thol-

elite, we get 2.1 ppm **Rb** in pyrolite. The *results* are shown in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI

Basanite **Rb** model

The calculations fit the data quite well.

Sr: Sr in ultramafics:

Sr in basalts:

Using 20 ppm Sr for peridetite and 500 ppm Sr for tholeiite yields 140 ppm Br in pyrolite, Shaw *(1973)* estimates **25** ppm Sr in the mantle. Using both estimates we get the results shown in Table XXVII.

TABLE **XXVII**

Basanite Sr model

 $*$ $C_0 = 25$ ppm

The calculations with the model pyrolite are off **by** a factor of 2 to h; the calculations using Shaw's estimate fit the datafairly well.

T: Y in ultramafics:

Y in basalts:

Using **2.5** ppm Y for peridotite and **30** ppm Y for tholeiite we get 9.h ppm Y for pyrolite. The results of the calculations are shown in Table XXVIII. Model **A** is a bit low, while model B is low **by** a factor of 2. Considering the variation in the data on which these calculations are based, this is good agreement.

Zr: Zr in ultramafics:

, TABLE XXVIII

Basanite Y model

Zr in basalts:

Using 34 ppm Zr for peridotite and **170** ppm Zr for thoeliite yields **68** ppm Zr in pyrolite. Using the two different ga/1 partition coefficients, the results are shown in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

Basanite Zr model

Agreement is within a factor of two for Zr^, and between two and five for $2r^{\#}$.

Ba: Ba in ultramafics:

 \sim \sim

-88-

Ba in basalts:

Therefore, using **5** ppm Ba in peridotite and 240 ppm Ba in tholeiite we get 64 ppm Ba in pyrolite. The results are shown in Table XXX.

Basanite Ba model

The calculations are high be a factor of 2 to **5.** Shaw **(1973)** estimates Ba in the mantle to be 0.4 ppm. Using this value for C_0 brings the calculated value down to **10** to 20, even worse than the original assumption.

Thus of Irving's eight analyses $(V, M, Cu, Rb, Sr, Y, 2r, Ba)$ all but Cu fit the data within a factor of 2 in one of the models.

2. Olivine nephelinites 2854 and 2896: these two rocks have almost identical REE patterns (see Figure **6),** and therefore I am discussing them together. Examination of the RE patterns reveals a change in slope at Eu (Ho was not determined due to counting schedule problems). Following a procedure similar to that outlined above, La/Eu and Eu/Yb ratios were calculated and one starting composition gave acceptable resnlts: **6,**

better than with **2128.** Starting composition 4 did not yield any patterns which fit the rock data well, and is considered marginal.

The model with the best fit is again model **A:** using low partition coefficients **0.8%** melt is needed, with the upper mantle having a RE content 2.1 x chondrites; using high partition coefficients, **3.5%** melt is required, with an upper mantle RE content of 9.0 x chondrites. Model B with low partition coefficients produces **1.3%** melt, from an upper mantle **2.9** x chondrites; with high partition coefficients **5.3%** melt is called for from a mantle with a RE content **11.9 x** chondrites. The two models are compared numerically in Table XXXI, and graphically in Figure **15;** olivine nephelinite **2896** is shown in Figure **16** for example only.

Table XXXII shows the **Sc,** Co, **Hf,** Ta and Th data, and how they fit the model. **Sc** and Th and off **by** less than a fac tor of two, **Hf** and Co are **off by** a factor of two and Ta **by** a factor of three: the same results as for basanite 2128. The figures in parentheses incorporate the changes discussed in the **Hf** and **Sc** sedtions under basanite **2128** above.

TABLE XXXII

Olivine nephelinite 2854 models: other trace elements

See text **for** meaning of parentheses.

-90-

TABLE XXXI	

Total equilibrium models for olivine nephelinite 2854

Ho is an interpolation, since it could not be determined due to scheduling difficulties with the detector. See notes to Table **xIV.** $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{}$

 \sim

$-92-$

TABLE XXXI Continued

Total equilibrium models for olivine nephelinite 2854

Model A	La	$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{e}$	Nd	Sm	Eu
2854	187	133	95.5	66.6	58.2
SC6 0.8% low	$87 - 7$	68.0	42.9	29.3	25.2
R1	2.13	1.95	2.24	2.29	2.34
M	186	Щ	$90 - 8$	62.0	53.1
R2	1.007	0.924	1.057	1.081	1.105
Model A	Tb	Ho	Yb	Lu	ave.
2854	34.0	(20, 0)	9.3	3.0	
SC6 0.8% low	19.9	11.2	4.35	2.71	
R1	1.71	(1.79)	2.16	(1.10)	2.127
N	42.1	23.5	9.21	5.7	
R ₂	0,808	0.851	1.010	(0.526)	0.99920.103
Model A	La	$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{e}$	Nd	Sm	Eu
$SC6$ 3.5% high 20.6		16.3°	10.4	6.23	5.91
R1	9.078	8.160	9.183	10.69	9,848
M	185	146	93.3	55.9	53.0
R ₂	1.011	0.911	1.024	1.191	1.098
Model A	Tb	Ho	Yb	Lu	are.
$SC6$ 3.5% high μ . $\mu\mu$		2.63	1.14	0.73	
R1	7.658	(7,60)	8.158	(L.098)	8,968
M	39.8	23.6	10.2	6,6	
R ₂	0.854	0.847	0.912	(0.457)	1.0043520.110

Figure **15:** Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of olivine nephelinite 2854 and the pattern produced **by** Model **A,**

> ***-- *** 2854 *X-----K* Model **A** *low* **p.c.** 4 ''*. Model **A** high p.c.

Figure **16:** Example of the fit of the Model **A** pattern to the REE pattern of olivine nephelinite 2896; R2=1.000±0.122. Ho is an interpolation, since Ho could not be determined due to scheduling difficulties with the detector. Small horizontal lines are error'bars.

> **-● 2896 o.Q--** model (0.8%, Model **A** *low* p.c.)

3. Olivine melilite neohelinite **2927:** This REE pattern has *its* change in slope at Tb; the method described above (La/Tb and Tb/Yb ratios) was used, with one problem being that the heavy RE trend is not as well defined as I would have liked. Figure **17** *shows* two lines for the HREE trend: one passing through the center of Yb and through the lower section of the Lu error bar, and the other passing through the upper Yb limit and close to the center of the Lu analysis. The same two starting compositions (l_1, l_2, l_3) **6)** yield satisfactory models of this rock: model **A** using low partition coefficients and **0.5%** melt requires an upper mantle RE content **1.9** x chondrites; using high partition coefficients and 2.7% melt requires an upper mantle RE content 8.4 x chondrites. Model B with low partition coefficients requires **0.7%** melt and an upper mantle RE content of 2.h **x** chondrites; with high partition coefficients it requires **3.7%** melt and an upper mantle RE content **11.0** x chondrites. Starting composition **5** does not yield satisfactory results. These two models are compared numerically in Table XXXIII and graphically in Figure 17.

Table XXXIV shows the **Sc,** Co, **Hf,** Ta and Th data. In general the agreement between the models and the data is slightly worse than the two previous cases.

4. Nephelinite **2860:** Green (personal communication) hypothesizes that nephelinite **2860** might be a low pressure fractionate **of** olivine nephelinite 2854, since they are from the same locality and have similar major element chemistry, with the very notable exception of MgO. Using the Doherty-Wright **(1971)** Mineral Distribution program with three **dif**ferent olivines and three different olivine plus clinopyroxene pairs

-m97-

Figure **17:** Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of olivine melilite nephelinite **2927** and the patterns produced **by** models **A** and B.

> *--. **2927** X ···· X Model A low p.c.
+····+ Model A high p.c. **As--** Model B *low* p.c. 0-- Model B high **p.c.**

> > ~ 10

 $\ddot{}$.

-100-

TABLE XXXIII

Total equilibrium models for olivine melilite nephelinite 2927

 \overline{a}

Ho is an interpolation, since i position and principle with the **XIV.** could not detector, be determined due to **So@** notes to Table

 $\ddot{}$

 α

$-101-$

TABLE XXXIII Continued

 \sim

 $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

$-102-$

TABLE XXXIV

Olivine melilite nephelinite **2927** models: other trace elements

%	Sc	Co.	H	Ta	Th	N
	23.3	83.3	5.8			
				6.3		
				5.3		1.9 8.4
				5.8		7.1 2.4
				5.1		1.4 11.0
		0.5 13.8 (16.3) $2.7 \quad \text{14.6} \ (17.1)$ 0.7 11.1 (13.6) 3.7 11.8 (14.3)		32.5 1.0 (3.4) $32.9 \quad 4.2 \quad (3.3)$ $31.6 \t 0.6 (1.7)$ 32.2 2.8 (1.7)		13.0 13.6 10.0 1.9

See text for meaning of parentheses (under basanite **2128).** (taken from Irving **1971,** Green 1973a and **b),** it was determined that nephelinite **2860** could be roughly matched to olivine nephelinite 2854 **by** fractional crystallization of approximately **30%** olivine. Table XXIV shows one of the computer fits. The match is not especially good; in all the three cases where both olivine and clinopyroxene were used, clinopyroxene was added to 2854 to yield **2860,** but not improving the match in general. See Table XXVI as an example.

The effect of crystallization of **30%** olivine on the RE pattern can **be** calculated using the equation from Gast **(1968).** The choice of high or low partition coefficients makes negligible difference under these circumstances. Figure **18** shows the **2860** RE pattern and the calculated pattern. The fit is not acceptable.

Locking at the K_2O_5 P_2O_5 and Th data, it seems a reasonable conclusion that obtaining **2860** from 2854 requires approximately **50%** crystallization of certain phases not incorporating these elements. With this assump-

TABLE XXXV

Derivation of 2860 from 2854: olivine

Solution: **131.81 -31.80**

Olivine composition from Irving **1971.**

This is one of the three olivines used in this attempt; the other two calculations reouired the removal of **29.9** and **28.9%** olivine.

The sium of the residuals squared is **7.2832.**

$-101-$

TABLE XXXVI

Derivation of 2860 from 2854: olivine-clinopyroxene

The olivine and clinopyroxene compositions used in this calculation are taken from Irving **1971;** they are a coexisting pair.

This is one of three olivine-clinopyroxene pairs used in this attempt; the other two calculations required i) the removal of **33.99%** olivine and the addition of **20.23%** clinopyroxene; and ii) the removal of 29.84% olivine and the addition of 11.02% clinopyroxene.

The sum of the residuals squared is $6.1491.$

Figure 18: Graphical comparison of the REE pattern of nephelinite 2860 and four attempts to match the pattern by fractional crystallization.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

unany.

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{}$

 φ

 $\ddot{}$

 \overline{a}

 $\sqrt{285}$
 $\sqrt{285}$

tion, an attempt was made to calculate the bulk composition of the crystallizing phases. See Table XXXVII for the results.

TABLE XXVII

Derivation of 2860 from 2854: Bulk chemical change

Several different procedures were tried in an attempt to figure out a possible mineralogy for this composition. First it was assumed that all of the TiO₂ and Fe₂O₃ with sufficient FeO would form an ilmenite-magnetite solid solution (as implied in Table XXXV). The aplagioclase was formed to use the Na₂0, A1₂0₃ and some of the CaO, or alternately, all of the **A12 ⁰³**and sufficient CaO to form anorthite. Olivine was then formed with the remaining SiO₂ and the MgO (requiring about 25% olivine, very similar

-108-

to the Wright-Doherty results). Other attempts were made using diopside to remove CaO. The end result is that in every attempt a sizable fraction of the composition could not be taken care of, indicating that the derivation of **2860** from 2654 most probably involves some phases not considered.

Table XXXVIII compares the other trace element data.

TABLE XXXIII

Comparison of **285h-2860:** other trace elements

The evidence is ambiguous: Co will be enriched in olivine, indicating that olivine crystallized out; Ni data would be invaluable in confirming this and in setting limits on the amount of olivine that would have had to crystalize out. **Sc** and Cr will both go into clinopyroxene: both go down, indicating crystallization of clinopyroxene, in conflict with the major element data. Using Gast's **(1968)** equation for fractional crystallization, we can estimate **25%** of the residue (the crystallizing phases) to be clinopyroxene. Cr indicates only **11%,** but Cr may very well be going into a spinel phase, throwing this calculation off. **Hf** and Ta are approcimately the same in the two rocks, indicating the bulk solid/liquid distribution coefficient is approximately one. Since **Hf** and Ta are not taken into the olivine or clinopyrorene, perhaps they are being taken into the opaques. Th (and K20, **P205** and La), as mentioned above has increased **by** a factor **of** two, indicating at least **50%** crystallization of minerals not containing
these elements.

Several other attempts were made to match the REE pattern, using some less likely minerals: amphibole was considered; apatite, orthopyroxene and plagioclase were tried; the calculated patterns are shown in figure **18,** and none of them matches the peculiar LREE pattern shown **by 2860.**

As one final exercise to find out about the residual phases, the REE were compared, and a bulk distribution coefficient calculated; see Table XXXIX and figure **19.**

TABLE XXXIX

Derivation of **2860** from 2854: REE bulk distribution

 $a = 1 + ln(\mathcal{C}^L/\mathcal{C}_o)/ln F$, where $F=0.50$

***** Yb value of 2854 may be lower than **9.3** x chon. see figure 12. About **7.6** x chon would fit a line between En and Lu, which would be within the error bars of Tb and Yb. The a value in parentheses uses **7.6** x chon.

Figure 19: Derivation of 2860 from 2854: REE bulk distribution coef-
ficients, calculated in Table XXXIX.

 $\ddot{}$.

 \sim

 χ

 $\ddot{}$

The bulk distribution coefficient for all nine elements is less than one, but has a peculiar shape. No attempt was made to fit this data to a mineralogy, since it is probable that a spinel is one of the crystallizing phases, and spinel partition coefficients are very poorly known (they seem to vary over several orders of magnitude).

In summary, I have not been able to satisfactorily explain the REE pattern in nephelinite **2860.**

5. Summary of results for the "nephelinites": If we begin with the assumptions that: **1)** partition coefficients are nonvarying and as shown in Table XII; 2) the REE abundances in the source region have chondritic relative abundances; and **3)** the melting proceeds under total equilibrium; then the results of this study can be summarized as shown in Table IL, which shows the best fits for the nepheline-normative rocks, for both models using both sets of partition coefficients.

Several trends can be seen in Table **XL.** In terms of percent melt reouired, the olivine melilite nephelinite is least, the basanite next, and the olivine nephelinite most. Using Green's models, one would have expected olivine melilite nephelinite **<** olvine nephelinite (basanite, if the three had come from the same source region. In terms of upper mantle RE content, the basanite requires the lowest concentrations, the olivine melilite neohelinite a medium amount, and the olivine nephelinites the most, though the difference between the olivine melilite nephelinite and the olivine nephelinites is usually less than between the basanite and the olivine melilite nephelinite. In going from low partition coefficients to high partition coefficients, both the percent melt and the RE content **of**

TABLE XL

Model **A:** (sc6):

58% olivine 22% orthopyroxene **15%** clinopyroxene **5%** garnet

Model B: $(SCl₄)$:

57% olivine **17.5%** orthopyroxene **15.5%** clinopyroxene **10%** garnet

Rock	melt	REE Upper Mantle Content $(x \text{ chon})$	
Basanite 2128	$0.9 - 4.1$	$1.9 - 8.7$	
01 Neph $2854*$	$1.3 - 5.3$	$2.9 - 11.9$	
01 Mel Neph 2927	$0.7 - 3.7$	$2.4 - 11.0$	

Assumptions:

1) Partition coefficients are nonvarying and as shown in Table XII;

2) The REE abundances in the source region are relatively chondritic;

3) Melting proceeds under total equilibrium.

***** This fit must be considered marginal.

of the upper mantle increase.

In comparing the models we find that for basanite 2128, model **A** with low partition coefficients fits best, with model B with low partition coefficients very close; olivine nephelinite 2854 fits best with model **A** with low partition coefficients, and doesn't really fit well with model B, high or low partition coefficients; and olivine melilite nephelinite *²⁹²⁷*fits best with model B with low partition coefficients. The main difference between these models is the clinopyroxene/garnet ratio: in model **A** it is **3.0,** and in model B it is **1.55.** Thus the general trend is that the basanite has a higher clinopvroxene/garnet ratio than the olivine melilite' nephelinite. This is in agreement with the findings of Kay and Gast **(1973)** who found the best fits for alkali basalts required a ratio of about **5,** the nephelinites a ratio between **1.0** and **1.5,** and the potassic basalts a ratio of about **0.3.** Looking at the other trace elements, things are ambiguous: we find that usually Co, **Hf** and Th overlap between model **A** and model B, with no clear preference for either degree of melting (sometimes high and sometimes low fits better). The **Se** and Th models do not overlap (exceot for **2927);** but the difference between the two models is not great. Usually model A is a little bit closer than model B, even for **2927.** Considering Irving's data for the Mt. Porndon basanite, the results are still ambiguous: of the seven elements that can be fit **by** the models, for four of them $(V, Rb, Sr$ and Ba), the models overlap, and three fit better with high percent melting and one with low percent melting. **Of** the other three elements, Ni calculations are about the same for the two models, for Y, model **A** is better, and for Zr, model B is better.

-114-

Reasons for these discrepancies are not immdeiately clear: one possibility is that surface equilibrium may be involved to a greater or lesser extent. Surface equilibrium was considered for basanite 2128, generally not changing the results very much: the percent melt was raised (from 0.65) to **1.0%** and from **2.8%** to 4.0%) and the "x chondrites" factor was also rasied slightly. Thus this does not seem to be too critical a factor for the REE.

It is appropriate at this time to compare the models presented here with those of Kay and Gast **(1973).**

TABLE XLI

- Comparison of Kay and Gast **(1973)** and this thesis

Nephelinites: **%** melt: **0.65 - 1.5;** x chon: 2.h **-** .5 K and Gast (1973) Alkali basalts: **1** melt: **0.8 - 2.9;** x chon: **1.9 1** Kay Nephelinites: low p.c.: **0.8 - 1.3%;** 2.1 **- 2.9** x chon high p.c.: **3.5 - 5.3%; 9.0 - 11.9** x chon This thesis Basanite: **low p.c.: 0.6 - 0.9%;** 1.h **- 1.9** x chon high p.c.: **2.8 -** 4.1%; **6.3 - 8.7 x** chon

If the low partition coefficient models of this thesis are considered, the results presented here and those presented **by** Kay and Gast **(1973)** are in good agreement. **My** high partition coefficient models on the other hand differ considerably (as would be expected, considering the partition coefficients used **by** Kay and Gast). Thus **I** feel that my work generally agrees with the conclusions of Kay and Gast (1973). This also supports my contention that surface eouilibrium vs. total eauilibrium modeling does not make very much difference in the conclusions one comes to with respect to undersaturated basalts.

In conclusion, it can be shown that the partial melting of a pyrolite source can generate strongly undersaturated nephelinitic or basanitic magmas when the REE are considered. The other trace elements considered here **(Sc,** Co, **Hf,** Ta and Th) on the whole support this hypothesis, but with considerably less consistency. Although the RE patterns may indicate possible source mineralogies, it is not possible at this time to distinguish between several acceptable models on this basis (due to the uncertainty in partition coefficients and melting models). When more is known about both the **RE** content of the upper mantle, and about the behavior of partition coefficients as a function of composition under upper mantle conditions, perhaps a definitive statement can be made.

B. Rocks with less than **5%** normative nepheline (69-1036, **69-1026, 2152, 69-1018** and **2177)**

If Figure **3** (page 14) is referred to, it can be seen that the low **A1203** olivine tholeiites can be derived either i) **by 25 - 30%** melting of pyrolite at **13 - 18 kb,** or ii) by **35 -** hO% melting of pyrolite at **18 - 27 kb,** followed **by** subsecuent crystallization of olivine and aluminous enstatite. This to investigate the origin of the tholeiitic rocks it is necessary to have a mineralogy for pyrolite under these conditions. Two sources were used: Green and Ringwood **(1963)** and Carter **(1970);** see Table VIII, page 46, starting compositions **7** and **8.**

Considering the first derivation mentioned above: Green's olivine tholeiite has 20 **- 28%** normative olivine and **5 - 15%** normative hypersthene. Olivine tholeiite **69-1018** has 14.5% normative hypersthene and **7.5%** normative olivine. Therefore if olivine tholeiite **69-1018** has fractionated from Green's olivine tholeiite, it has crystallized and lost **13 -** 22% olivine (Irving **1971)** *(we* already determined that olivine tholeiite **69-1018** could not be a primary melt of upper mantle *peridotite,* see discussion of basalt petrogenesis). This derivation can be checked as follows: the REE pattern for a 22 **-** *32%* partial melt of pyroxene pyrolite can be calculated, and this pattern can be mathematically subjected to crystallization of **13** - 22% olivine.

The first question is: with what mineralogy would this melt be in equilibrium. Green **(1970b)** states that "Tholeiitic magmas results if the degree of melting is sufficient to eliminate clinopyroxene from the residual phases (p. **230,** Green's emphasis)." Thus, the tholeiitic magma will be in equilibrium with olivine and orthopyroxene. This initial mineralogy (pyroxene pyrolite) has an olivine/orthopyroxene ratio approximately eoual to three. Therefore, ANATEXIS was run with an initial mineralogy of **67%** olivine and **33%** orthopyroxene, melting in equal proportions (at **30%** melt the olivine/orthopyroxene ratio will be three).

The REE patterns produced **by** ANATEXIS for the melting interval **15%** to **35%** are essentially flat: the La/Eu and Eu/Yb ratios vary from **1.01** to **1.00** and **1.05** to **1.01** respectively for low partition coefficients, and from **1.05** to 1.02 and from **1.25** to **1.07** respectively with high partition coefficients. This can be compared with the REE patterns of the rocks, shown in Figure **7** (page **33)** and summarized below in Table XLII. Thus we see that none of the tholeiitic rocks can be derived solely from olivine and orthopyroxene. The REE patterns of the rocks just cannot be matched **by** the eauilibrium melting of just these two minerals. This analysis applies also to the second possible derivation mentioned above, since this method

-117-

-118-

TABLE XLII

Summary of REE patterns of the tholeiitic rocks

also leads to equilibrium with only olivine and orthopyroxene. Fractional crystallization **of** olivine or olivine plus clinopyroxene will not change the patterns sufficiently to match the rock patterns.

It remains to be seen if a method can be found that will match the tholeiitic rock patterns.

If we go back to the starting composition used with the nephelinitic rocks, what can we find out? Using starting composition 4 **(57%** olivine, **17.5%** orthopyroxene, **15.5%** clinopyroxene and **10%** garnet) (model B), the La/Eu and Eu/Yb *ratios* were calculated for both high and low partition coefficients (see Figure 20 for the RE patterns): none of the calculations fit the rock data. When La/Eu is similar, the Eu/Yb ratio is much higher, indicating that a good match cannot be made. Either the LREE or the HREE will be completely out of line. This also holds true if one considers the La/Tb and Tb/Yb ratios. Using starting composition **6 (58%** olivine, 22% **or**thopyroxene, **15%** clinopyroxene and **5%** garnet) (model **A)** the same problem occurs: it is not possible to match both sections of the REE patterns.

Figure 20: REE patterns produced **by** partial melting of garnet peridotite: **0.5** to **27.0%** melt. Solid lines indicate low partition coefficients. One curve for high partition coefficients is indicated **by** the dashed line, equivalent to **0.5%** melt. Generally, the high partition coefficient curves behave similarly to the *low* partition coefficient curves, quickly flattening out, so that results for high degrees of melting are virtually identical for the two sets of partition coefficients. (The Yb abd Lu falues for the high partition coefficient curve are off scale.)

The other starting caposition (no. **5: 68%** olivine, **8%** orthopyroxene, **11%** clinopyracene and **13%** garnet) yields the same results. Thus it has been shown that the tholeiites cannot be produced 'with garnet in the source region: garnet's affinity for the HREE is too strong, and causes the slope of the HREE trend to be too steep to be able to match the tholeiitic trend. This finding agrees with Helmke and Haskin's **(1973)** conclusion that a **maximum** of **1.5%** garnet could be present in the source region of the Steens Mtn tholeiites.

As a third attempt, starting compositions with only olivine, orthopyroxene and clinopyroxene were considered. This says, in effect, that the degree of melting required is higher than that required to eliminate all the garnet from the source. This is supported **by** the Ta data, shown in Figure 21, where those rocks which can be produced **by** a source with garnet have a trend very different from the tholeitic rocks. If we begin with starting composition μ , and assume that the garnet and clinopyroxene melt in equal proportions $(0, h)$ and the olivine and orthopyroxene also melt in equal proportions **(0.1),** then the garnet would be exhausted at **25%** partial melting. The composition at this point would be **72.5%** olivine, 20.0 orthopyroxene and **7.5%** clinopyroxene. If these three remaining minerals melt in the proportions olivine: orthopyroxene:clinopyroxene::1:1:3, we can calculate the resulting REE pattern. The pattern is essentially flat: La/Yb varies from 1.04 to **1.15,** with the change in slope at Eu (or Tb) being less than **5%,** generally about **1%.** Figure 20 shows these patterns. Other three phase starting compositions were tried; principally Green and Ringwood's **(1963)** pyroxene pyrolite mineralogy (66.6% olivine, **16.1%** ortho-

-121-

Figure 21: Plot of Ta vs. **Yb:** note the two trends: the high Ta points are the nephelinitic rocks, whose REE pattern can be reproduced **by** a source with garnet; the low Ta points are the tholeiitic rocks, whose REE pattern cannot be duplicated **by** a source with garnet. It is known that Yb is partitioned into garnet.

> V Nephelinites **X** Tholeiites

 $\ddot{}$

 ω

pyraoene and **17.3%** clinopyroxene). This did not yield acceptable results: in every case the REE pattern is much too flat. The tholeiitic rocks have *Eu/Yb* ratios varying between 2.2 and **3.1;** the calculated patterns vary between **1.0** and **1.5.** Thus an olivine-orthopyraxene-clinopyroxene assemblage cannot control the HREE in these rocks. (This was further verified **by** considering **10** other starting compositions, varying from **53.9%** olivine, **22.5%** orthopyroxene and **23.6%** clinopyroxene to **87.9%** olivine, 7.4% orthopyroxene and $\mu_{\bullet}7\%$ clinopyroxene).

Another possible source for the tholeiites is olivine, orthopyraxene, clinopyraxene and spinel. Two spinel-bearing assemblages were considered: Green and Ringwood **(1963)** (see Table VIII: **SC 7)** and Carter **(1970) (SC 8).** Using the spinel partition coefficients shown in Table X , we find that neither of these two compositions can produce the required patterns. One problem here is that spinel partition coefficients seem to vary over several orders of magnitude; however, spinel is not likely to be important in the production of these basalts.

The specific figures quoted above refer to total equilibrium melting. The results do not change significantly when surface eauilibrium is considered. In each case the ratios are almost the same, and the difference decreases with increasing percent of melting.

We seem to have come to a dead end: four different mineralogical assemblages have been tried (olivine and orthopyroxene; olivine, orthopyroxene and clinopyroxene; olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyroxene and spinel; and olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyracene and garnet) and none of them produce a REE pattern which comes very close to the patterns exhibited **by** the rocks.

 $-124-$

When high degrees of melting required **by** Green's hypotheses are considered, the original composition (mineralogically) of the source makes only small differences in the calculated equilibrium REE pattern.

It can also be shown that the tholeiitic patterns cannot be produced **by** fractional crystallization from one of the nephelinitic magmas. The nephelinitic magmas have REE contents equal to or higher than the tholeiites. Unless one calls into account some mineral like apatite (which produces a Eu anomaly) or a RE mineral like monazite, fractional crystallization would tend to raise the RE content higher.

If we consider fractional crystallization from the tholeiitic magmas (high degrees of partial melting) produced **by** ANATEIS, it is clear that olivine alone will not steepen the curve as required, although it will raise it absolutely. If we consider olivine and clinopyroxene, it is possible to calculate that if **90%** of the liquid crystallized as **16.5%** clinopyraxene and **83.5%** olivine, the REE pattern would match the given rock (olivine tholeiite **69-1018)** quite well (considering only the La/Yb ratio). This assumes high partition coefficients for both steps of the process (melting of peridotite and crystallizing olivine and clinopyroxene), and that the RE content of the upper mantle is one times chondrites. Raising this to two times chondrites shifts the parameters to **80%** crystallization, the crystals being 24.6% clinopyroxene and 75.4% olivine. Raising the RE content of the upper mantle to five times chondrites requires appraximately **60%** crystallization of **55.9%** elinopyroxene and *43.6%* olivine. This is still a high percentage of the rock to fractionally crystallize. (No attempt has been made to examine this process on a major element basis.)

The only obvious assumption that might be wrong is that of the chondritic abundance pattern of the source. It might alternatively be fractionated with respect to chondrites, and therefore be able to modify the slope of the REE pattern, necessarily extensively. One point against this

-125-

is that neither Kay and Gast **(1973)** nor this thesis was required to do this for the nephelinitic rocks. If we are to reconsider our conclusions regarding the nephelinitic rocks with this modification, we find that the degree of melting required to match the patterns will be raised, probably significantly. Any estime tes of how much the degree of melting would be raised would have to assume a) an assemblage to be in equilibrium with a certain rock, and **b)** a degree of melting which would produce this particular rock. Then a "fractionation factor" can be calculated for each of the **REE.** This procedure was followed **by** Hertogen and Gijbels (1974), using an olivine-orthopyroxene-clinopyroxene-horhblende-apatite source. They assumed their most undersaturated rock to be the product of 5% melting and then calculated C_o from this assumption. They were able to generate both the tholeiitic rocks and the nephelinitic rocks of their suite **by** this method. When I attempted this procedure, I was unable to reporduce the nephelinitic rocks.

Summary **for** the tholeiitic rocks: Considering source mineralogies: olivine and orthopyroxene; olivine, orthopyroxene and clinopyroxene; olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyroxene and spinel; olivine, orthopyroxene, clinopyroxene and garnet, no pattern like those exhibited **by** the tholeiitic rocks can be produced within the limits of our assumptions. This indicates that the REE pattern of the source is not chondritic, in agreement with Hertogen and Gijbels (1974) . One point worth consideration is the typicalness of these tholeitic rocks. Comparison of Table XLIII with Table III shows that only **69-1018** can be considered to be a typical tholeiite in terms of REE abundance. This agrees with the data shown in Figure 5, the Coombs plot, where **69-1018** is solidly in the olivine tholeiite part of the diagram. However, while the REE patterns of **2152** and **69-1026** are definitely steeper than typical patterns, the slopes of **2177** and **69-1036** (and **69-1018)** are quite similar to the typical pattern. I feel that there is enough similarity between the five basalts that when we can explain the origin of one of them, we will probably be able to explain them all.

-126-

ı	$\mathbf{2}$	$\mathbf{3}$	4	5.	6
64.2	76.3	16.1	27.5	42.5	135
60.2	61.6	25	35.2	43.6	162
53.3	50.8	21.3	30.9	37.5	70
40.3	39.9	20.7	26.7	31.0	45
31.9	28.6	18.4	24.3	30.4	33
2h.9	24.5	14.0	19.0	25.5	23
21.1	19.1	8.2	11.1	13.7	21
16.8	17.4	5.3	8.1	11.5	22
$u_{\bullet}5$	15.5	5.6	7.5	10.3	17

-127- TABLE XLIII Typical tholeiitic REE patterns

1. Helmke and Haskin **(1973):** average of **52** Steens Mtn tholeiites.

- 2. Helmke and Haskin **(1973):** BCR-1,
- *3, 4, 5.* Schilling **(1966),** Schmitt and Smith **(1961)** and Wildeman **(1971)** unpublished: column **3** is the lowest of *⁹*tholejites, column *4* the average, and column *5* the highest; all **9** samples were Hawaiian.

6. Frey et **al. (1968):** Deccan basalt.

In the analyses reported above, La/Yb varied from **2.37** to *6.14,* the average being **3.77.**

-128-

VI. **CONCLUSIONS**

1) Amphibole is not in eauilibrium with the rocks studied in this thesis.

2) The REE patterns of the **highly** undersaturated, nephelinitic rocks considered in this study can be generated **by** a partial melting model, be. ginning with reasonable partition coefficients and a reasonable source composition (both mineralogically and REE-wise). The degree of partial melting required, while generally in agreement with Green's models, is in detail slightly different.

3) The REE patterns of the tholeiitic, less undersaturated basalts considered in this study cannot be produced except **by** foregoing a chondritic RE abundance pattern in the source region.

Two possibilities to reconcile the last two conclusions exist:

A) The two basalt types come from very different mantles, in terms of REE abundance; this is possible, since consensus attributes the undersaturated basalts to greater depths than the tholeiitic rocks. This leaves **ul** s with the problem of generating these two distinct mantles.

B) Revising the model in such a way as to account for the tholeiitic rocks and then finding out whether such a model could generate the nephelinitic rocks. This may well be the proper alternative: **by** abandoning the chondritic REE distribtuion one may be able to develop a self-consistent set of models for trace elements and major elements for all basalt types.

FURTHER WORK

Several very basic problems were encountered in interpreting the data

in this thesis. For example, the behavior of partition coefficients for the REE as a function of comoosition, temperature and pressure is not well understood. Thus one can only handle the situation in a gross way **by** using a range of partition coefficients. It would be of great use if RE abundances and distributions could be measured in minerals under experimental petrological conditions. This is just as true for the other trace elements considered in this study.

Another basic difficulty was the lack of information on upper mantle abundances of trace elements. This is obviously a very difficult question to which we may never know the complete answer, but this sort of information would be very useful.

As a last suggestion, further work should be done on the origin of continental tholeiites. Petrological studies so far seem to have concentrated on the more undersaturated basalts.

ACKNOWLEDGfENTS

At this time I wish to express my deep appreciation to Prof. Fred Frey for his long-standing patience and his innumerable helpful suggestions and assistance. To **Dr.** D.H. Green and to **D.** Clague I express my gratitude for supplying the samples used in this study. Thanks also go to my fellow graduate students **D.N.** Skibo, R. Hon and H. Noyes; and especially to Bev Carroll, without whose constant encouragement and enthusiasm, I might not have finished this thesis.

-129-

-130-

APPENDIX' I

Analytical Details

All irradiations were done at the MIT Nuclear Research Reactor in Cambridge, Massachusetts between July **17, 1973** and October **29, 1973.** The counting schedule was as follows:

The following elements were determined:

TABLE Al-I

All data from Dams and Adams(1968).

The area under the photopeak is nade up of two components: the counts due to the element of interest and the background; therefore, when doing peak integration it is necessary to subtract out the component due to background.

$$
A = \sum_{-n}^{n} a_i - B,
$$

where A is the area of interest, a_i the counts in channel i, and B the total background. Background is, assumed to be linear beneath the peak since there is little evidence to justify fitting a higher-order curve to the raw data. For purposes of calculation, the background is taken as the average of the two points on either side of the peak:

$$
B! = \frac{b_n + b_{-n}}{2}
$$

where b_n is the count n channels higher than the center of the peak, and b_{-n} the count n channels lower than the center of the peak. B' is then multiplied by the number of channels used in the integration, 2n+l. Thus the area under the peak, A , is equal to

(1)
$$
A = \sum_{n=1}^{n} a_{1} - (\frac{b_{n} + b_{-n}}{2})(2n + 1),
$$

-131

Statistical error in the number of counts in any channel is equal to the square root of the number of counts in that channel (Friedlander et al. 1964). The error in the first term on the right side of equation **1** is

$$
\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{n} a_i}
$$

then

The error in a constant times an uncertain number is that constant times the error: $c(B\ddot{=}b)$ scB $\ddot{=}$ cb. Therefore the error in the background is

$$
\sqrt{(2n+1)^2 (b_n + b_{-n})/4}
$$

The error in the difference between two uncertain number is

$$
\mathbf{X} \mathbf{\pm} \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{\pm} \mathbf{y} \mathbf{\pm} \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{\pm} \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2}
$$

Therefore the error in the peak integration is\n
$$
\sqrt{\sum_{-n}^{n} \left(2n+1\right)^2 (b_n + b_{-n})/4}
$$

In doing the analysis, the area of the sample peak is compared to the area under the same peak in the standard; the error in this calculation is

$$
\frac{x \pm x}{x \pm y} = \frac{x}{y} (1 \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{x}{x}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{y}{y}\right)^2})
$$

For a more detailed discussion of statistical error, see Baedecker **1971,** Denechaud **1969,** or Quittner **1972.**

$-133-$

APPENDIX III

TABLE A3-I

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

These samples and this data courtesy of David Clague.

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

Figure A3-1: Chondrite-normalized REE patterns for the five Hawaiian rocks.

 $\begin{array}{l} \Delta \longrightarrow \Delta \text{ A7--}13-51 \\ \square \cdots \square \text{ A7--}55-29 \\ \blacklozenge \longrightarrow \text{C72 HIG}-37-1 \\ \blacklozenge \cdots \longrightarrow \text{A7--}141-5 \\ \chi \longrightarrow \text{A7--}51-20 \end{array}$

 $-135-$

TABLE A3-II

	9948	10396	10398	10403	2201
La	5.30	8.41	6.24	8.78	7.22
$c_{\mathbf{e}}$					25.83
Nd	12.78	19.31	14.59	20.9	20.11
Sm	3.71	5.26	4.09	5.06	4.94
Eu	1.28	2.03	1.31	1.77	1.77
Tb	0.663	1.00	0.728	0.868	0.847
Ho	0.57 ₄	0.746	0.666	0.787	0.852
YЪ	1.26	1.81	1.45	2.06	1.85
Lu	0.191	0.246	0.199	0.288	0.299
	Pelee's Hair	$C - 61$	$KT-22$	Kilauea	
La	11.42	9.7	10.5	14.04	
$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{e}$	33.68	22	35 ₁	$38 - 4$	
Nd	20.12	18.8	17.8	22.5	
Sm	5.41	5.2	μ_{\bullet} 2	5.62	
Eu	1.81	2.1	1.27	2.10	
Tb	1.20	1.19	0.66	0.872	
Ho	0.825	0.96	0.64	0.938	
Yь	1.67	2.3	1.05	1.53	
Lu	0.238	0:35	0,20	0.275	
Sources: 9948 10396 10398 10403 2201 $C - 61$ $KI-22$ Kilauea	Pelee's Hair	Tholeiite, Koolau series, Schilling 1966 n Ħ u Ħ n п Ħ Kohala Kilauea Iki, Schmitt and Smith 1961 Wildeman 1971, unpublished	u Ħ Mauna Loa Halemaumau	Ħ u n n n n	

REE analyses of Hawaiian rocks from the literature

-137-

REFERENCES

- Ahrens, L.H., ed., **1968,** Origin and Distribution of the Elements, Intern. Ser. Monographs Earth Sci. 30, Pergamon, New York.
- Arth, J.G., Jr., 1973, Geochemistry of Early Precambrian Rocks, Minnesota-Ontario, Ph.D. thesis, State Univ. of N.Y. at Stony Brook.
- Baedecker, P.A., **1971,** "Digital Methods of Photopeak Integration in Activation Analysis" in **A.O.** Brunfelt and **E.** Steinnes, eds., Activation Analysis in Geochemistry and Cosmochemistry, **p. 175-182.**
- Brooks, **C.K., 1970,** "The Concentrations of Zr and **Hf** in some igneous and metamorphic rocks and minerals", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 34: 411-416.
- Brunfelt, **A.O.** and **E.** Steinnes, eds., **1971,** Activation Analysis in Geochemistry and Cosmochemistry, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, **468-pp.**
- Bultitude, R.J. and D.H. Green, **1968,** "Experimental studies at high pressures on the origin of olivine nephelinite and olivine melilite nephelinite magmas", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters **3: 325-337.**
- Carter, **J.L., 1970,** "Mineralogy and chemistry of the earth's upper mantle based on the partial fusion-partial crystallization model", Geol. **Soc.** Am. Bull. **81:** 2021-2034.
- Chen, J.C., 1971, "Petrology and chemistry of garnet lherzolite nodules in kimberlite from South Africa", Am. Minerlogist **6:** 2098-2110.
- Coleman, R.G., D.E. Lee, L.B. Beatty and W.W. Brannock, **1965,** "Eclogites and eclogites: their differences and similarities", Geol. Soc. Am. Bull. **76: 483-508.**
- Coombs, **D.S., 1963,** "Trends and affinities of basaltic magmas and pyroxenes as illustrated on the diopside-olivine-silica diagram", Min. Soc. **Am.** Spec. Paper **1: 227-250.**
- Corliss, **J.B., 1970,** Mid-Ocean ridge basalts, Ph.D. thesis, **U.** of Calif., San Diego.
- Dale, I.M. and P. Henderson, **1972,** "The partition of transition elements in phenocryst-bearing basalts and implications about melt structure", in Twenty-fourth International Geological Congress Proceedings, Section **10, p. 105-111.**
- Dams, R. and F. Adams, **1968,** "Gamma-ray energies of radionuclides formed by neutron capture determined by Ge(Li) spectrometry", Radiochemica Acta **10: 1 - 11.**
- Deer, W.A., R.A. Howie, and **J.** Zussman, **1962,** Rock-Forming Minerals, **5** vols., Longman, Green and Co., Ltd, London.
- DeLong, **S.E.,** 1974, "Distribution of Rb, Sr and Ni in igneous rocks, central and western Aleutian Islands, Alaska", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **38: 245-266.**
- Denechaud, E.B., **1969,** Rare-Earth Activation Analysis: Improvement and **Ap**plication to Stretishorn Dike and Duluth Complex, Ph. **D.** Thesis, U. of Wisconsin.
- Doherty, **P.C.** and T.L. Wright, **1971,** Mineral Distribution Program- Mod II, Geological Survey Computer Contribution 7, **93** pp.
- Early, T.O., **1973,** "Rare earths in eclogites from the Roberts Victor kimberlite, South Africa", in preparation.
- Ehmann, W.D., 1971, "Tantalum" in Mason, ed., Handbook of Elemental Abundances in Meteorites, **pp.** 425-428.
- ---------- , and T.V. Rebagay, **1971,** "Zirconium and Hafnium" in Mason, ed., Handbook of Elemental Abundances in Meteorites, pp. **307-318.**
- Ewart, **A.,** W.B. Bryan and **J.B.** Gill, **1973,** "Mineralogy and geochemistry of the Younger Volcanic Islands of Tonga, S.W. Pacific", **J.** Petrol. $14: 429 - 465.$
- Fisher, D.E., O. Joensuu and K. Boström, 1969, "Elemental Abundances in Ultramafic Rock and their Relation to the Upper Mantle", **J.** Geophys. Res. 74: **3865-3873.**
- Flanagan, **F.J., 1973, "1972** values for international geochemical reference samples", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **37: 1189-1200.**
- Frey, **F.A. , 1969,** "Rare earth abundances in a high temperature peridotite intrusion", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **33: 1429-147.**
- -, M.A. Haskin, **J.A.** Poetz and **L.A.** Haskin, **1968,** "Rare earth abundances in some basic rocks", *J.* Geophys. Res. **73: 6085-6098.**
- Friedlander, G., *J.W.* Kennedy and **J.M.** Miller, 1964, Nuclear and Radiochemistry, 2nd edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 585p.

 \mathbf{I}

- Frondel, C., 1970, "Scandium", in K.H. Wedepohl, ed., Handbook of Geochemistry, vol. II, ch. 21.
- Gast, P.W., 1968, "Trace element fractionation and the origin of tholeiitic and alkaline magma types", Geochim. Cosmochim Acta **32: 1057-1086.**
- Gast, P.W., **N.J.** Hubbard and **H1.** Wiesman, **1970,** "chemical composition and petrogenesis of basalts from Tranquility Base", Proc. Apollo **11** Lunar Science Conf., v. **2, pp.** 11h3-1163.
- Gill, **J.B.,** 1974, "Role of underthrust oceanic crust in the genesis of a Fijian calc-alkaline suite", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. 43: 29-45.
- Goles, **G.G., 1967,** "Trace elements in ultramafic rocks", in **P.J.** Wyllie, ed., Ultramafic and Related Rocks
- Gordon, **G.E.,** K. Randle, **G.G.** Goles, **J.B.** Corless, **M.N.** Beeson and **S.S.** Oxley, **1968,** "Instrumental activation analysis of standard rocks with high-resolution gamma-ray detectors", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta *32:* **369-396.**
- Green, D.H., 1970a, "The origin of basaltic and nephelinitic magmas", **Trans.** Leicester Literary and Philosophical Soc. 6μ : 28-54.
- ----------- , **1970b, "A** review of experimental evidence on the origin of basaltic and nephelinitic magmas", Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors **3: 221-235.**
- **------- ~,** 1971, "Compositions of basaltic magmas as indicators of conditions of origin: application to oceanic vulcanism", Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. **A268: 707-725.**
- **--------- ,** 1973a, "Conditions of melting of basanite magma from garnet peridotite", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters **17:** 456-465.
- **-------, 1973b,** "Experimental melting studies on a model upper mantle composition at high pressure under water-saturated and water-undersaturated conditions", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters 1_9: *37-53.*
	- **-------, J.W.** Morgan and K.S. Heier, **1968,** "Thorium uranium and potassium abundances in peridotite inclusions and their host basalts", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters 4: **155-166.**
- **-,** and **A.E.** Ringwood, *1963,* "Mineral assemblages in a model mantle composition", **J.** Geophys. Res. **68:** *937-945.*
- **----------** and **------- , 1967,** "The genesis of basaltic magma", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. **15: 103-190.**
- and **---- , 1970,** "Mineralogy **of** peridotitic compositions under upper mantle conditions", **Phys.** Earth Planet. Interiors 3: 359- **371.**
- Grutzek, N.W.' **S.J.** Kridelbaugh and D.F. Weill, **1973,** "REE partitioning between diopside and silicate liquid", Trans. Am. Geophys. Un. *54:* 1222.
- Gunn, B.M., **1971,** "Trace element partition during olivine fractionation of Hawaiian basalts", Chem. Geol. **8: 1-13.**
- Hamilton, W., **1961,** "Columbia River basalt in the Riggins quadrangle, western Idaho", **USGS** Bull. 1141-L.
- Harris, P.G., R. Hutchison and D.K. Paul, **1972,** "Plutonic xenoliths and their relation to the upper mantle", Phil. Trans Roy. Soc. Lond. A271: **313-323.**
- Haskin, **L.A.,** F.A. Frey, R.A. Schmitt and R.H. Smith, **1966,** "Meteoritic, solar and terrestrial rare-earth distributions", Phys. Chem. Earth **7: 167-321.**
- ------- , 14.. Haskin, **F.A.** Frey and T.R. Wildeman, **1968,** "Relative and absolute terrestrial abundances of the rare earths" in **L.A.** Ahrens, ed., Origin and Distribution of the Elements, pp. 889-912.
- ----------, R.O. Allen, P.A. Helmke, T.P. Paster, M.R. Anderson, R.L. Korotev and **K.k.** Zwiefel, **1970,** "Rare earths and other trace elements in Apollo 11 lunar samples", Proc. Apollo 11 Lunar Sci. Conf. v. 2, pp. **1213-1231.**
- Heier, K.S., **1970,** "Rubidium", in Wedepohl, ed., Handbook of Geochemistry, ch **37B-E.**
- Helmke, P.A. and **L.A.** Haskin, **1973,** "Rare-earth elements, Co, **Sc** and Hf in the Steens Mountain basalts", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **37: 1513-1530.**
- Henderson, P. and I.M. Dale, **1970,** "The partitioning of selected transition element ions between olivine and groundmass of oceanic basalts", Chem. Geol. **5: 267-274.**
- Herrmann, A.G., 1970, "Yttrium and Lanthanides", in Wedepohl, ed., Handbook of Geochemistry, ch **39, 57-71** B-0.
- Hertogen, **J.** and R. Gijbels, 1974, "Trace element fractionation during partial melting", submitted for publication.
- Hess, H.H. and A. Poldervaart, eds., 1967, Basalts: The Poldervaart Treatise on Rocks of Basaltic Composition, 2 vols., Interscience, New York.
- Higuchi, H. and **H.** Nagasawa, **1969,** "Partition of trace element between rockforming minerals and the host volcanic rocks", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters **7: 281-287.**
- Hurley, P.M., ed., 1966, Advances in Earth Science, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Irving, **A.J., 1971,** Geochemical and high pressure exerimental studies of xenoliths, megacrysts and basalts from southeastern Australia, Ph.D. thesis, Australian Nat. Univ.
- Irving, **A.J.** and D.H. Green, 1974, "Geochemistry and petrogenesis of the Newer Basalts of Victoria and South Australia", in preparation.
- Ito, K., and **G.C.** Kennedy, **1967,** "Melting and phase relations in a natural peridotite to 40 kilobars", Am. **J.** Sci. **265: 519-538.**
- Jensen, B.B., **1973,** "Patterns of trace element partitioning", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **37:** 2227-22h2.
- Kay, R.W. and P.W. Gast, **1973,** "The rare earth content and origin of alkali-rich basalts", **J.** Geol. **81: 653-682.**
- Kesson, **S.E., 1973,** "The primary geochemistry of the Monaro alakaline volcanics, southeastern Australia; evidence for Upper Mantle heterogeneity", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. 42: 93-108.
- Kushiro, I., N. Shimizu, Y. Nakamura and **S.** Akimoto, **1972,** "Compositions of coexisting lioiiid and solid phases formed upon melting of natural garnet and spinel lherzolites at high pressure: a preliminary report", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters 14: **19-25.**
- ---------- , Y. Syono and **S.** Akimoto, **1968,** "Melting **of** a peridotite nodule at high pressures and high water pressures", **J.** Geophys. Res. **73: 6023.**
- Laul, **J.E.,** H. Wakita, D.L. Showalter, W.V. Boynton and R.A. Schmitt, **1972,** "Bulk,rare earth,and other trace elements in Apollo 14 and **15** and Luna **16** samples", Proc'. Third Lunar Sci. Conf., v.2, **pp. 1181-1200.**
- Lopez-Escobar, L. **F.A.** Frey and M. Vergara, 1974, "Andesites from centralsouth Chile: trace element abundances and petrogenesis", pre-print from Symposium Internacional de Volcanologia: Problemas volcanoligicos, Andinos **y** Antarticos, held in Santiage, Chile, Septermber 9-14, 1974.
- Mason, B., ed., 1971, Handbook of Elemental Abundances in Meteorites, Gordon and Breach, New York.
- Masuda,' **A.** and I. Kushiro, 1970, "Experimental determinations of partition coefficients of ten rare earth elements and barium between clinopyroxene and licuid in the synthetic silicate system at 20 kilobar pressure", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. **26:** 42-49.
- Morgan, **J.W., 1971,** "Thorium", in Mason, ed., Handbook of Elemental Abundances in Meteorites, **pp. 517-528.**
- Nagasawa, H., **1970,** "Rare earth elements in zircon and apatite in acidic volcanic and igneous rocks", Earth.Planet. Sci. Letters *9:* **359-364.**
- -.......-- , **H.** Wakita, H. Higuchi and **N.** Onuma, **1969,** "Rare earths in peridotite nodules: an explanation of the genetic relationship between basalt and peridotite nodules", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters **5: 377-381.**

 $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$

- Nakamura, **N., A.** Masuda, T. Tanoka, and H. Kurasawa, *1973,* "Chemical compositions and rare earth features of 4 Apollo **16** samples", Proc. Fourth Lunar Sci. Conf., v.2, **pp.** 1407-1414.
- Nicholls, **G.D., 1967,** "Geochemical studies in the ocean as evidence for the composition of the mantle" in S.K. Runcorn, ed., Mantles of the earth and terrestrial planets, **pp. 285-304.**
- Norman, **J.C.** and **L.A.** Haskin, **1968,** "The geochemistry of **Sc:** a comparison to the rare earths and Fe", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **32: 93-108.**
- OtHara, **M.J.** and **H.S.** Yoder, **1967,** "Formation and fractionation of basic magmas at high pressures", Scot. **J.** Geol. **3: 67-117.**
- Onuma, N., H. Higuchi, H. Wakita and H. Nagasawa, 1968, "Trace element partition between two pyroxene and the host lava", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters **5:** 47-51.
- Paster, T.P., **D.S.** Schauwecker and **L.A.** Haskin, 1974, "The behavior of some trace elements during solidification of the Skaergaard lyered series", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **38: 1549-1578.**
- Philpotts, **J.A.** and **C.C.** Schnetzlar, 1968a, "Europium anomalies and the genesis of basalt", Chem Geol. **3: 5-13.**
- ---- , and **---------- , 1968b,** "Genesis of continental diabases and oceanic tholeiities considered in light of rare earth and Ba abundances and partition coefficients", in **L.A.** Ahrens, ed., Origin and Distribution of the Elements.
- -------- , and ------ , 1970a, "Phenocryst-matrix partition coefficients for K, Rb, Sr and Ba, with applications of anorthosite and basalt genesis", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 34: **307-322.**
- ------ , and **---------- , 1970b,** "Apollo **11** lunar samples: K, Rb; Sr, Ba and rare-earth concentrations in some rocks and separated phases", Proc. Apollo **11** Lunar Sci. Conf., v.2, **pp.** 1471-1486.
- **--------, ---------, and H.H. Thomas, 1972, "Petrogenetic implications .** of some new geochemical data on eclogitic and ultrabasic inclusions", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **36: 1131-1166.**
- Prinz, M., 1967, "Geochemistry of basaltic rocks: trace elements" in H.H. Hess and **A.** Poldervaart, eds., Basalts, v. **1,** pp. 271-324.
- Puchelt, H., 1972, "Barium" in Wedepohl, ed., Handbook of Geochemistry, ch 56B-o.

 $\overline{1}$

Quittner, P., **1972,** Gamma-Ray Spectroscopy, Halsted Press, New York, **111 p.**

- Reid, J.B., Jr., and **F.A.** Frey, **1971,** "Rare earth distributions in lherzolite and garnet pyroxenite xenoliths and the constitution of the upper mantle", **J.** Geophys. Res. **76: 1184-1196.**
- Ringwood, A.E., **1966,** "The Chemical composition and origin of the earth", in P.M. Hurley, ed., Advances in Earth Science, **pp. 287-356.**
- Roeder, P.L. and R.F. Emslie, **1970,** "Olivine-liquid equilibrium", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. **29: 275-289.**
- Rogers, **J.J.** and **J.A.S.** Adams, **1969,** "Thorium", in Wedepohl, ed., Handbook of Geochemistry, ch 90B-0.
- Runcorn, S.K., ed., **1967,** Mantles of the Earth and Terrestrial Planets, Interscience, New York.
- Schilling, Jean-Guy, 1966, Rare-Earth Fractionation in Hawaiian Volcanic Rocks, Ph.D. thesis, M.I.T.
- **-,** and **J.W.** Winchester, **1969,** "Rare earth contribution to the origin of Hawaiian lavas", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. **23: 27-37.**
- Schmitt, R.A. and R.H. Smith, **1961, "A** program of research for the determination of rare-earth abundances in meteorites", General Atomic Report **GA-2782.**
- Schnetzlar, **C.C.** and **J.A.** Philpotts, **1968,** "Partition coefficients of rare-earth elements and barium between igneous matrix material and rock-forming mineral phenocrysts **-** I" in **L.A.** Ahrens, ed., Origin and Distribution of the elements, **pp. 929-938.**
- **,** and **, 1970,** "Partition coefficients of rare-earth elements between igneous matrix material and rock-forming mineral phenocrysts **-** II", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 34: 331-340.
- Shaw, D.M., 1970, "Trace element fractionation during anatexis", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 34: **237-2h3.**
- **---------- , 1973,** "Development of the early continental crust. Part **1.** Use of trace element distribution coefficient models for the **Proto**archean crust", Can. **J.** Earth Sci., *9:* 1577-1595.
- Shimizu, **N.,** 1974, "Rare earth elements in garnets and clinopyroxenes from garnet lherzolite nodules in kimberlites", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters in press.
- Singleton, O.P. and E.B. Joyce, 1969, "Cainozoic volcanicity in Victoria" Spec. Puble. Geol. Soc. Aust. 2: 145-15h.
- Sutherland, F.L., **1969, "A** review of the Tasmanian Cainozoic volcanic province", Spec. Publs. Geol. Soc. Aust. 2: 133-144.
- Taylor, S.R., M. Kaye, **A.J.R.** White, A.R. Duncan and A.Ewart, **1969,** "Genetic significance of Co, Cr, Ni, **Sc** and V content of andesites", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta **33: 275-286.**
- Turekian, K.K. and M.H. Carr, 1960, "The geochemistries of Cr, Co and Ni", Int. Geol. Cong. 21st session, Part 1, pp. **1t-29.**
- --------, and K.H. Wedepohl, 1961, "Distribution of the elements in some major units of the earth's crust", Bull. Geol. Soc. Am. **72: 175-192.**
- Vinogradov, A.P., **1962,** "Average contents of chemical elements in the principal types of igneous rocks of the earth's crust", Geochemistry **1962:** 641-664.
- *Vlasov,* K.A., ed., "Geochemistry and mineralogy of rare elements and genetic types of their deposits", vol. **1,** trans. from Russian **by** Israel program for scientific translations, Jerusalem **1966.**
- Wager, L.P. and R.L. Mitchell, **1951,** "The distribution of trace elements during strong fractionation of basic magam **-** a further study of the Skaergaard intrusion, East Greenland", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 1: **129-208.**
- Wakita, H., H. Nagasawa, **S.** Uyeda and H. Kuno, **1967,** "Uranium and thorium contents in ultrabasic rocks", Earth Planet. Sci. Letters 2: **377-381.**
- Wedepohl, **K.H.,** ed., **1970,** Handbook of Geochemistry, 2 vols., Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Whittaker, **E.J.W.** and R. Muntus, **1970,** "Ionic radii for use in geochemistry", Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 3h: **945-956.**
- Wyllite, P.J., ed., 1967, <u>Ultramafic and Related Rocks</u>, Wiley and Sons, New York, 464 pp.
- Zielinski, R.A. and **F.A.** Frey, 1970, "Gough Island: evaluation of a fractional crystallization model", Contr. Mineral. Petrol. **29:** 242-25.