

**The Palmer Granite:
Geochronology, Geochemistry and Genesis**

**By
Dean Pluckhahn B.Sc.**

This Thesis is submitted as partial fulfillment for the
Honours degree of Bachelor of Science

Department of Geology and Geophysics
University of Adelaide
November 1993

National Grid Reference (SI-54).6728-III 1:50 000

Abstract

Various igneous bodies have intruded into the Palmer area throughout the Delamerian Orogeny. The earliest, the Rathgen Gneiss, intruded either before or during D1 which gave it the prominent foliation. D1 was also responsible for crenulations in migmatite veins throughout the area. These crenulated migmatite veins are in areas folded by D2 mesoscale folds. Some pegmatite veins are also folded by the D2 folds. The Palmer Granite intruded during D2 as is seen by shearing in a semi-crystalline state and a tectonic foliation that has been folded. The ballooning of the granite during emplacement deforms the surrounding sediments and the pre-granite folds hence their axis lie parallel to the contact of the granite. The effect of the granite intruding during the deformation has led to the axis of the D2 folds forming after the granite to have a degree of randomness about their axis. Migmatite grade was reached again after the intrusion of the granite causing melt veins to develop that disrupt the foliation. D3 formed a regional syncline of the area combined with some small scale folding within the granite, however a foliation did not form.

The emplacement of the granite and other igneous bodies throughout the area has been controlled by using the bedding plane of the Kanmantoo.

The geochemical trends throughout the Palmer granite is formed by two different groups fractionally crystallising zircon, amphibole, and biotite. This results in a decrease of normally incompatible elements. The two groups form by one group from a homogeneous source and the other a heterogeneous source. The xenoliths crystallised from a mafic magma. The amphibolites form two groups according to their differentiation and genetic relationship. They both form by fractional crystallisation however U and Pb are decreasing cannot be explained by this. Another possible mechanism is liquid un-mixing.

To tie all of the groups together a model of a mafic pluton that crystallises the xenoliths as a chilled margin. The mafic magma evolves some of the Palmer Granite whilst turbulently convecting hence homogenising the magma. A magma recharge forms the more evolved mafic and this forms more Palmer Granite which convects in a laminar fashion forming heterogeneities. Part of the mafics evolve enough to be caught up in the Palmer Granite and as it does not crystallise zircons all the fractional crystallisation of the Palmer Granite must have occurred in the ~~mafic pluton~~ magma chamber.

G: Grammar / style / wording — rephrase

"mafic" is an adjective, not a noun.

mafic +
intermediate

?

G

G

why not magma?

what

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Previous Investigations

Chapter 2 - Regional Geology

2.1 Regional Geology

2.2 Palmer Granite

2.3 Xenoliths

2.4 Amphibolites

Chapter 3 - Structural Geochronology

3.1 Introduction

3.2 D1

3.3 Amphibolite Dykes

3.4 D2

3.5 D3

3.6 Faulting

Chapter 4 - Emplacement

4.1 Regional

4.2 Granitic Dykes

Chapter 5 - Geochemistry and the Formation of Granites

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Trends and Relationships in Geochemical Data

5.3 Xenoliths

5.4 Mafics

5.5 Intermediates

5.6 Group 1 Palmer Granite

5.7 Group 2 Palmer Granite

5.8 Isotopic Evidence

10 Conclusions

Chapter 6 - Pluton Model

6.1 Introduction

6.3 Turbulent Pluton

6.4 Laminar Pluton

6.5 Fractional Crystallisation. Where?

Conclusions

References

List of Appendices

M Appendix 1 major and trace element concentrations as obtained from XRF

Appendix 2 CIPW normative mineral assemblages

Appendix 3 Analytical methods

L Appendix 4 location map

List of Figures

Figure 1 exposed igneous intrusions throughout the SAFB

Figure 2 geological map of the Palmer area

Figure 3 geological cross-section of the Palmer area

Figure 4 contact relationship between the Palmer Granite and the Kanmantoo

Figure 5 shearing in the Palmer Granite whilst in a partially molten state

Figure 6 mechanism of shearing in a partially molten granite

Figure 7 D1 crenulations folded by D2

Figure 8 cartoon showing possible emplacement mechanism of the Palmer Granite

Figure 9 cross-cutting mafic veins

Figure 10 tectonic fabric cut by melt veins

Figure 10(inset) fabric folded by D2 folds

Figure 11 melt veins folded by D3 fold

Figure 12 cartoon for emplacement of Palmer Granite by sills

Figure 13 possible pre-Palmer Granite fault

Figure 14 K₂O/CaO discrimination diag

Figure 15 effect on mineral assemblage when bulk composition of a magma is changed

Figure 16 elemental variation diag. comparing Palmer Granite Group 1 & 2

Figure 17 difference between real and apparent trends in data series

Figure 18 possible contaminate concentrations

Figure 19 elemental variation of xenoliths

Figure 20 K₂O/CaO cumulate trends

Figure 21 U/Zr, Pb/Zr trend of decreasing conc. in mafics

Figure 22 Fe/Zr, Mg/Zr variation in mafics

Figure 23 P/Zr showing apatite crystallisation

Figure 24 cartoon of turbulent and laminar mixing in pluton

Figure 25 fractional crystallisation models

Figure 26 Nd isotope variation

Figure 27 order of crystallisation for comparison with isotopes

Figure 28 trends of unrelated mafics with Palmer igneous to determine inbuilt field of rock type

Figure 29 cartoons of possible plutonic processes