

Accepted Manuscript

How far can we trust provenance and crustal evolution information from detrital zircons? A south African case study

Tom Andersen, Magnus Kristoffersen, Marlina Elburg

PII: S1342-937X(16)30026-0
DOI: doi: [10.1016/j.gr.2016.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2016.03.003)
Reference: GR 1591

To appear in: *Gondwana Research*

Received date: 20 November 2015
Revised date: 8 March 2016
Accepted date: 13 March 2016



Please cite this article as: Andersen, Tom, Kristoffersen, Magnus, Elburg, Marlina, How far can we trust provenance and crustal evolution information from detrital zircons? A south African case study, *Gondwana Research* (2016), doi: [10.1016/j.gr.2016.03.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2016.03.003)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

How far can we trust provenance and crustal evolution information from detrital zircons? A South African case study.

Tom Andersen^{1,2}, Magnus Kristoffersen¹, Marlina Elburg²

1: Department of Geosciences, University of Oslo, PO Box 1047 Blindern, N-0316 Oslo, Norway

2: Department of Geology, University of Johannesburg, South Africa

ABSTRACT

U-Pb and Lu-Hf data are routinely used to trace detrital zircon in clastic sediments to their original source in crystalline bedrock (the protosource), to map out paths of sediment transport, and characterize large-scale processes of crustal evolution. For such data to have a provenance significance, a simple transport route from the protosource in which the zircon formed to its final site of deposition is needed. However, detrital zircon data from Phanerozoic sedimentary cover sequences in South Africa suggest that this “source to sink” relationship has been obscured by repeated events of sedimentary recycling. Phanerozoic sandstones (Cape Supergroup, Karoo Supergroup, Natal Group, Msikaba Formation) and unconsolidated, Cenozoic sands in South Africa share major detrital zircon fractions of late Mesoproterozoic (940-1120 Ma, $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}} \approx 0$ to +15) and Neoproterozoic age (470-720 Ma, $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}} \approx -10$ to +8). A Permian age fraction (240-280 Ma, $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}} \approx -8$ to +5) is prominent in sandstones from the upper part of the Karoo Supergroup. All of these sequences are dominated by material derived by recycling of older sedimentary rocks, and only the youngest, late Palaeozoic fraction has a clear provenance significance (Gondwanide orogen). The virtual absence of Archaean zircon is a striking feature in nearly all suites of detrital zircon studied in the region. This indicates that significant events in the crustal evolution history of southern African and western Gondwana are not represented in the detrital zircon record. South Africa provides us with a record of recycling of cover sequences throughout the Phanerozoic, and probably back into the Neoproterozoic, in which the “sink” of one sedimentary cycle will act as the “source” in subsequent cycles. In such a setting, detrital zircon may give information on sedimentary processes rather than on provenance.

Keywords: Zircon; U-Pb; Lu-Hf; Provenance; Crustal evolution, South Africa

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6443312>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6443312>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)