

## Zircon as an oxy-barometer

A.J. BERRY AND A.D. BURNHAM

Research School of Earth Sciences, Australian  
National University, Canberra, ACT 2601,  
Australia (\*correspondence:  
Andrew.Berry@anu.edu.au)

The Ce anomaly in zircon,  $Ce/Ce^* = (Ce^{4+} + Ce^{3+})/Ce^{3+}$ , arises from the preferential partitioning of  $Ce^{4+}$  relative to the neighbouring rare earth elements (REE), which occur exclusively as  $REE^{3+}$ . The magnitude of the anomaly relates to  $Ce^{4+}/Ce^{3+}$  in the melt and hence the oxygen fugacity ( $fO_2$ ) at the time of crystallisation. An empirical expression relating the anomaly to  $fO_2$  has been proposed [1]. Here we determine  $Ce/Ce^*$ , and hence estimate  $fO_2$ , for a number of I- and S-type granites from the Lachlan Fold Belt of Eastern Australia.

$Ce/Ce^*$  was calculated for 13 I-type and 10 S-type granites. The concentrations of the REE were determined by LA-ICPMS.  $Ce^*$  was estimated by fitting the data for the trivalent REE to a lattice strain model. The average value of  $Ce/Ce^*$  was 115(107) for the I-types and 20(18) for the S-types. Using the expression in [1] this equates to values of  $fO_2$  relative to the fayalite-magnetite-quartz (FMQ) buffer of 4.3(2.6) and -2.6(3.3), respectively.

$Ce/Ce^*$  is clearly larger for the I-type than S-type granites, suggesting that the melts were more oxidised. This is consistent with differences in mineralogy and bulk rock values of  $Fe^{3+}/(Fe^{3+} + Fe^{2+})$ . The more reduced nature of S-type granites is attributed to the presence of graphite in the metasedimentary source.

The difference in the calculated average values of  $fO_2$  between the two granite types, and the standard deviation, is too large to be correct. The equation in [1] does not have the correct theoretical form.  $\ln(Ce/Ce^*)$ , strictly  $\ln(Ce/Ce^*-1)$ , must have a 0.25 dependence on  $\ln(fO_2)$ , rather than the value of 0.1156(50) quoted, due to the stoichiometry of the redox reaction  $CeO_{1.5} + 0.25O_2 = CeO_2$ . The error is probably the result of fitting to a very limited data set. The  $fO_2$  difference between the two suites is exaggerated by the incorrect coefficient and the range of values is so large as to be of limited use as an oxy-barometer. This is further illustrated by application of the oxy-barometer to the Bishop Tuff, for which an average value of  $2.4 \pm 3.0$  is obtained, compared to the value of  $1.3 \pm 0.3$  determined from Fe-Ti oxides. Extreme caution should be used when interpreting  $fO_2$ s obtained using this equation and further work is needed to calibrate  $Ce/Ce^*$  as an oxy-barometer.

[1] Trail *et al.* (2012) *GCA* **97**, 70-87.