# ORIGINAL PAPER

P. Comodi · G. D. Gatta, · P. F. Zanazzi · D. Levy W. Crichton

# Thermal equations of state of dioctahedral micas on the join muscovite-paragonite

Received: 28 January 2002 / Accepted: 5 April 2002

Abstract Powder diffraction measurements at simultaneous high pressure and temperature on samples of 2M1polytype of muscovite (Ms) and paragonite (Pg) were performed at the beamline ID30 of ESRF (Grenoble), using the Paris-Edinburgh cell. The bulk moduli of Ms, calculated from the least-squares fitting of V-P data on each isotherm using a second-order Birch-Murnaghan EoS, were: 57.0(6), 55.1(7), 51.1(7) and 48.9(5) GPa on the isotherms at 298, 573, 723 and 873 K, respectively. The value of  $(\partial K_T/\partial T)_P$  was -0.0146(2) GPa K<sup>-1</sup>. The thermal expansion coefficient  $\alpha$  varied from 35.7(3)  $\times$  $10^{-6} \text{ K}^{-1}$  at *P* ambient to  $20.1(3) \times 10^{-6} \text{ K}^{-1}$  at *P* = 4 GPa  $[(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T = -3.9(1) \times 10^{-6} \text{ GPa}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}]$ . The corresponding values for Pg on the isotherms at 298, 723 and 823 K were: bulk moduli 59.9(5), 55.7(6) and 53.8(7) GPa,  $(\partial K_T/\partial T)_P$  -0.0109(1) GPa K<sup>-1</sup>. The thermal expansion coefficient  $\alpha$  varied from 44.1(2) × 10<sup>-6</sup> K<sup>-1</sup> at *P* ambient to  $32.5(2) \times 10^{-6}$  K<sup>-1</sup> at *P* = 4 GPa [ $(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T = -2.9(1) \times 10^{-6}$  GPa<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>]. Thermoelastic coefficients showed that Pg is stiffer than Ms; Ms softens more rapidly than Pg upon heating; thermal expansion is greater and its variation with pressure is smaller in Pg than in Ms.

**Keywords** Muscovite · Paragonite · Compressibility · Thermal expansion · Synchrotron powder diffraction

P. Comodi · G. D. Gatta · P. F. Zanazzi (⊠) Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università di Perugia, 06100 Perugia (Italy) Fax: +39 075 5852603 Tel.: +39 075 5852612 e-mail: zanazzi@unipg.it

D. Levy Dipartimento di Scienze Mineralogiche e Petrologiche,

Università di Torino, 110125 Torino (Italy)

W. Crichton ESRF, B.P. 220 Grenoble Cedex (France)

## Introduction

"White" dioctahedral micas play a crucial role in most petrologic processes, in both magmatic and metamorphic environments. Understanding their thermoelastic behaviour is important to provide a reliable basis for interpretation and prediction of phase equilibria, as these minerals are used as geothermometers and geobarometers. Nonetheless, only few studies by in situ high-pressure and high-temperature experiments on muscovite, paragonite and phengites are available in literature. The only P-V-T equation of state (EoS) is referred to be on phengite-3T (Pavese et al. 1999).

As a first approximation, the rock-forming white micas can be described as crystalline solutions among the three end members muscovite, paragonite and margarite. The present study concerns the join muscovite-paragonite. The ideal chemical formula of muscovite (Ms) is KAl<sub>2</sub>(AlSi<sub>3</sub>)O<sub>10</sub>(OH)<sub>2</sub>. Paragonite (Pg), ideally  $NaAl_2(AlSi_3)O_{10}(OH)_2$ , is the Na analogue of Ms. Between these two end members there is a partial solid solution with a slightly asymmetric unmixing solvus. Many attempts have been performed to use the partitioning of Na and K between coexisting Ms and Pg as a geothermometer (Guidotti and Sassi 1976). Difficulties arise from using solvus curves that are not accurate enough to model the thermodynamic properties of these two micas. Inasmuch as the exact shape of the solvus and how it changes in function of pressure and temperature are not well known, thermometric estimates are often inconsistent. The molar volumes of the terms along the Ms-Pg join and how they change with pressure and temperature must be exactly known before a more accurate phase diagram can be drawn. Recent studies by Comodi and Zanazzi (1995, 1997) contributed to the knowledge of the molar volumes of muscovite and paragonite-2M1 polytypes and of their variation with P through compressibility measurements on single crystals in a diamond-anvil cell at room temperature. These data, together with thermal expansion coefficients

measured at room pressure for Ms (Symmes 1986; Guggenheim et al. 1987; Catti et al. 1989) and Pg (Comodi and Zanazzi 2000) allowed a definition of an approximate P-V-T equation of state for K- and Na-dioctahedral micas. However, these are only an indication of volumetric behaviour at the boundaries of the P-T conditions achieved in rocks in the Earth's crust. To determine more accurately the behaviour of Pg-Ms micas it is essential to verify if there are any "non-linear effects" when both P and T are high.

If the effects of P and T on the volumetric properties of Ms–Pg micas were precisely known for the full range of P-T conditions of geologic interest, it would be possible to accurately calculate effects on the Pg–Ms solvus. Relatively small changes in excess molar volume could have significant effects on solvus limb positions, particularly in the 600 to 700 °C range.

The aim of this study is the determination of the molar volume behaviour of muscovite and paragonite at simultaneous high P and T.

#### **Experimental method**

Muscovite and paragonite samples were kindly supplied by Professor C. Guidotti. Ms (equivalent to sample 7–8/7/63 in Evans and Guidotti 1966) came from Western Maine (USA). Its composition, very near to the ideal one, is  $K_{1.79}Na_{0.16}Al_{3.63}Ti_{0.08}Fe_{0.15}^{3+}$  Mg<sub>0.17</sub>Al<sub>1.94</sub>Si<sub>6.06</sub>O<sub>20</sub>(OH)<sub>2</sub> (Evans and Guidotti 1966). Approximately 10 mg of 2 $M_1$  Ms and Pg were accurately selected under microscope and ground under acetone. The same preparation procedure was followed for Pg, which came from a jadeitite from the Motagua Fault Zone, Guatemala (American Museum of Natural History, catalogue number AMNH104213; equivalent to sample MVJ84-9C described by Harlow 1994) and has the composition Na<sub>1.84</sub>K<sub>0.10</sub>Ca<sub>0.03</sub>Al<sub>3.95</sub>Ti<sub>0.01</sub>Fe\_{0.15}^{3+}Mg\_{0.04}Al\_{2.05}Si\_{5.95}O\_{20}(OH)\_2 (C.V. Guidotti, personal communication).

The Ms and Pg powders were mixed with NaCl in proportion 3:1 by weight. The diffraction measurements were performed in the angle-dispersive mode at the beamline ID30 of the European Synchrotron European Facility (ESRF, Grenoble). High pressure and high temperature were achieved by means of a large-volume Paris-Edinburgh cell. The cell assembly used has been described in detail elsewhere (Besson et al. 1992; Mezouar et al. 1996; Le Godec et al. 2000). The heating was obtained by a graphite-element resistance. Temperature was monitored by a CrAl thermocouple placed at the centre of the microfurnace (uncertainty up to  $\pm 3 \text{ K}$ ). The data were recorded by an MAR3450 imaging plate (IP, 100-µm pixel resolution). The beam was monochromated by an Si(111) crystal, obtaining a  $\lambda = 0.2647$  Å, and focused into a  $0.1 \times 0.1$ mm<sup>2</sup> spot on the sample. Exposure times were about 50 s. Measurements were carried out along the isotherms 298, 573, 723 and 873 K for Ms, and 298, 423, 723, 823 K for Pg. The temperatures of the highest isotherms were chosen to avoid dehydroxylation processes, which become relevant in Ms above 900 K (Guggenheim et al. 1987; Mazzucato et al. 1999) and in Pg above 850 K (Comodi and Zanazzi 2000). Pressure was increased in steps of 0.5-0.7 GPa in the range 0-6 GPa and was calibrated by the EoS of NaCl (Birch 1986) using lattice parameters determined from X-ray diffraction profiles for each P-T point. The uncertainty in pressure was estimated to be less than 0.1 GPa.

For each isotherm an individual sample was prepared, packing the powder into a boron nitride (h-BN) can of 1 mm diameter and 2 mm length. The container was inserted in the graphite microfurnace, and the assembly was placed into a boron-epoxy gasket between the tungsten carbide anvils. For each data point, a time of about 20 min was allowed to reach the equilibrium; data recording and readout took about 5 min for each diffraction pattern.

The diffraction rings collected on the IP were integrated in the part not shadowed by the WC anvils and converted into standard  $2\theta$  patterns using FIT2D program (Hammersley 1995; Hammersley et al. 1996) and then analyzed by means of the multiphase profilefitting technique using the GSAS software package (Larson and Von Dreele 2001). An example of the diffraction image and the corresponding experimental and calculated powder diffraction pattern is shown in Fig. 1. The unit-cell parameters of Ms, Pg, NaCl and h-BN were refined by the Le Bail method (Le Bail et al. 1988). The background curve was fitted with a Chebyshev polynomial with 20 coefficients. The pseudo-Voigt profile function proposed by Thomson et al. (1987) was used to fit the experimental pattern. For Ms and Pg the asymmetry correction according to Finger et al. (1994) and the preferred orientation correction along the diffraction vector [001], using the formulation of Dollase-March (Dollase 1986) were applied. To account for the observed broadening of diffraction effects with  $k \neq 3n$ , due to the presence of stacking faults frequent in micas (Nespolo and Ferraris 2001), two Lorentzian coefficients for the anisotropic broadening were refined to better fit the Bragg peaks for the two different classes of reflections (k = 3n and  $k \neq 3n$ ).

# **Results and discussion**

The lattice parameter data for Ms obtained at pressures up to 5 GPa on the isotherms 298, 573, 723 and 873 K are shown in Table 1. Cell-volume data are plotted in Fig. 2. The same data for paragonite along the isotherms 298, 423, 723 and 823 K are reported in Table 2 and Fig. 3. Only few points were measured on the isotherm at 423 K, because of the breaking of the thermocouple, which made it impossible to obtain a reliable value for compressibility of paragonite at this temperature.

Volume–pressure data of Ms and Pg at 298 K were fitted with the Birch–Murnaghan EoS.

A plot of the "normalized stress" defined as  $F_E = P/[3f_E(1+2f_E)^{5/2}]$  versus the finite strain  $f_E = [(V_0/V)^{2/3}-1]/2$  obtained from the P-V data is linear (Fig. 4a, b) for both micas, and shows that a second-order truncation of the EoS could describe the measured data adequately (Angel 2000).

The  $F_E/f_E$  plots of Fig. 4 show that a second-order EoS is reliable to fit data also at higher *T*. Therefore, fixing K' = 4, we obtained the cell volumes  $V_0$  and  $V_0(T)$ and the bulk moduli  $K_0$  and  $K_0(T)$  listed in Table 3.

#### Muscovite

The bulk modulus of Ms at 298 K, 57.0(6) GPa, can be compared with the reported values in literature, which are quite scattered. These values are 58.2 GPa (Vaughan and Guggenheim 1986, by Brillouin spectroscopy); 52.0 GPa (K' = 3.2; Sekine et al. 1991, by shock wave); 56.0 GPa (K' fixed at 4; Catti et al. 1994, by static compression neutron powder diffraction); 61.4 GPa (K' = 6.9; Faust and Knittle 1994, by static compression powder diffraction); 56.0 GPa (Comodi and Zanazzi 1995, by Fig. 1 a The diffraction pattern of muscovite at 873 K and 3.6 GPa on the image plate, and b the converted intensity vs. 2-theta plot, with the experimental (*crosses*), calculated (*solid line*) and difference pattern. The peak positions of h-BN (*upper bars*), NaCl (*intermediate bars*) and muscovite (*lower bars*) are reported



static compression single-crystal diffraction;  $K_0$  calculated as the inverse of the compressibility coefficient); 57.0 GPa (K' = 9.2; phengite  $2M_1$ ; Smyth et al. 2000, by single-crystal diffraction). The differences can be ascribed to the different methods used in experiments and calculations and the different composition of the samples. It is known that a phengitic component can increase the stiffness of mica for the higher tetrahedral silicon contents (Smyth et al. 2000), as well the Na content (Comodi and Zanazzi 1995, 1997).

The bulk moduli on the isotherms at 573, 723 and 873 K were, respectively, 55.1(7), 51.1(7) and 48.9(5) GPa (Table 3; Fig. 5). Therefore the first derivative of  $K_0$  versus temperature,  $dK_0/dT$ , is -0.0146(2) GPa K<sup>-1</sup> and  $(\partial\beta T/\partial T)_P$  is 5.1(9) × 10<sup>-6</sup> GPa<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>.

The thermal expansion coefficient  $\alpha$  of Ms, measured between 298 and 873 K, varied from  $3.57(3) \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$ at *P* ambient to  $2.01(3) \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$  at *P* = 4 GPa [ $(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T = -3.9(1) \times 10^{-6}$  GPa<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>]. The value of  $\alpha$  at ambient *P* is in good agreement with that found by Guggenheim et al. (1987) ( $3.54 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$ ) and is slightly smaller than those of Catti et al. (1989) ( $4.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$ ) and Symmes (1986) ( $4.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$ ).

## Paragonite

The bulk modulus of Pg at 298 K is 59.9(5) GPa, at variance with the value 54.6(4) GPa (recalculated by fixing K' = 4 from *P*–*V* data of Comodi and Zanazzi 1997).

The values of  $K_0(T)$  measured at 723 and 823 K were 55.7(6) and 53.8(7) GPa, respectively (Table 3 and Fig. 5).  $dK_0/dT$  is -0.0109(1) GPa K<sup>-1</sup> and  $(\partial \beta_T/\partial T)_P$  is 3.4(5) × 10<sup>-6</sup> GPa<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>.

The thermal expansion coefficient  $\alpha$  measured between 298 and 823 K varied from 4.41(2) × 10<sup>-5</sup> K<sup>-1</sup> at *P* ambient to 3.25(2) × 10<sup>-5</sup> K<sup>-1</sup> at *P* = 4 GPa  $[(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T = -2.9(1) \times 10^{-6}$  GPa<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>]. The value of  $\alpha$  found for Pg at ambient *P* by the single-crystal method (Comodi and Zanazzi 2000) is 5.9 × 10<sup>-5</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>; Symmes (1986) reported  $\alpha = 4.9 \times 10^{-5}$  K<sup>-1</sup> by powder diffraction.

These results are on the whole quite significant, even if it must taken into account the experimental difficulties of HP-HT study on micas, and care must be used in interpreting data. As pointed out by Pavese et al. (1999), the possible causes of error lie in the layer nature of these silicates, yielding preferred orientation especially **Table 1** Lattice parameters and cell volume values (Å<sup>3</sup>) as a function of pressure (GPa) and temperature (K) for muscovite. The  $V_0$  value on each isotherm is calculated from the second-order BM EoS, since the instrumental setting did not allow diffraction data collection at room pressure

P (GPa)	<i>T</i> (K)	a (Å)	b (Å)	<i>c</i> (Å)	β (°)	$V(\text{\AA}^3)$
0.0	298(3)	_	_	_	-	933.0(1)
0.7(1)	298(3)	5.210(1)	8.961(1)	19.811(3)	95.12(1)	921.2(2)
1.4(1)	298(3)	5.185(2)	8.952(1)	19.654(3)	95.30(1)	908.4(3)
2.1(1)	298(3)	5.172(1)	8.946(2)	19.582(3)	95.47(2)	901.9(2)
2.9(1)	298(3)	5.157(2)	8.938(1)	19.462(4)	95.63(1)	892.8(3)
3.3(1)	298(3)	5.140(2)	8.929(2)	19.377(3)	95.82(2)	884.7(3)
3.7(1)	298(3)	5.131(1)	8.928(3)	19.348(5)	96.03(1)	881.4(3)
4.0(1)	298(3)	5.12/(2)	8.926(2)	19.31/(4)	96.18(2)	8/8.9(4)
4.3(1)	298(3)	5.110(2)	8.918(3)	19.255(5)	96.15(3)	8/2.4(3)
4.0(1)	298(3)	5.105(3)	8.916(3)	19.180(5)	96.25(3)	868.0(4)
0.0	573(3)	-	-	-	-	938.0(2)
0.8(1)	573(3)	5.198(1)	9.030(2)	19.742(2)	95.63(2)	922.2(2)
1.5(1)	573(3)	5.192(1)	9.022(1)	19.601(4)	95.66(1)	913.7(3)
1.9(1)	573(3)	5.188(2)	9.011(1)	19.506(3)	95.69(2)	907.4(2)
2.4(1)	5/3(3)	5.181(1)	8.994(2)	19.445(3)	95.72(1)	901.6(3)
2.9(1)	5/3(3)	5.165(3)	8.987(2)	19.397(5)	95.73(3)	895.9(3)
3.2(1)	5/3(3)	5.160(1)	8.970(3)	19.288(4)	95.76(3)	888.2(4)
3.3(1)	5/5(5)	5.158(2) 5.152(2)	8.964(3)	19.2/1(5) 10.244(6)	95.77(2)	880.5(5)
3.8(1)	575(5)	5.133(3) 5.149(2)	8.930(2)	19.244(0) 10.187(6)	93.77(2)	885.0(4) 870.6(4)
4.0(1)	575(5)	5.148(5)	8.931(3)	19.187(0)	95.80(5)	8/9.0(4)
0.0	723(3)	-	-	-	-	944.1(3)
0.2(1)	723(3)	5.215(1)	9.052(1)	20.049(3)	95.71(2)	941.7(3)
0.9(1)	723(3)	5.201(1)	9.033(1)	19.838(3)	95.73(1)	927.4(3)
1./(1)	723(3)	5.188(1)	9.021(2)	19./08(5)	95.78(2)	917.7(4)
2.3(1)	723(3)	5.1/1(2)	9.011(1)	19.5/3(4)	95.83(2)	907.3(3)
2.8(1)	723(3)	5.110(3) 5.154(2)	8.999(3)	19.433(4) 10.241(5)	95.88(5)	897.0(4)
3.4(1)	723(3)	5.134(2) 5.145(2)	8.991(3)	19.341(3) 10.251(5)	93.97(2)	891.4(4)
3.8(1)	723(3)	5.143(3) 5.120(3)	8.970(2)	19.231(3)	96.10(3)	883.9(3)
4.1(1)	723(3)	5.139(3) 5.133(4)	8.970(4)	19.222(0) 19.028(5)	90.14(4) 96.38(3)	860 7(5)
4.0(1)	723(3)	5.155(4)	8.900(4)	19.020(5)	90.38(3)	009.7(3)
0.0	8/3(3)	-	-	-	-	952.5(2)
0.6(1)	8/3(3)	5.225(1)	9.038(2)	20.043(4)	95.69(1)	941.9(3)
1.2(1)	8/3(3)	5.212(1)	9.019(1)	19.880(5)	95.71(1)	930.1(3)
1.5(1)	8/3(3)	5.210(2)	9.014(2)	19.845(4)	95.75(2)	927.2(4)
2.0(1)	8/3(3)	5.199(2)	9.006(2)	19.783(4) 10.660(5)	95.70(1)	921.0(3)
2.3(1)	8/3(3)	5.180(2) 5.178(2)	8.994(2)	19.009(3) 10.612(5)	95.81(2)	912.7(3)
2.0(1) 3.2(1)	873(3)	5.170(3) 5.160(2)	8.980(3) 8.070(2)	19.015(5) 10.400(5)	95.85(2) 95.07(3)	907.0(4) 900.1(4)
3.2(1)	873(3)	5.109(2) 5.161(2)	8.979(2) 8.965(3)	19.499(3) 10.364(6)	95.97(3)	801.0(5)
3 9(1)	873(3)	5.101(2) 5.154(3)	8 968(4)	19.304(0)	96.02(2)	886 3(3)
42(1)	873(3)	5.157(3)	8 959(4)	19.272(6)	96.12(2)	884 5(5)
44(1)	873(3)	5 148(4)	8 949(3)	19.240(7)	96 13(4)	881 3(5)
4.6(1)	873(3)	5.140(4)	8.940(5)	19,192(7)	96.15(4)	876.8(6)
	0,0(0)	2.1.1.0(1)	0.5 .0(2)		,	0,0.0(0)

when P increases. The quality of data is degraded by the large volume of the cell. The full profile of diffraction is complicated by several diffracting phases belonging to the chamber elements and to the pressure-transmitting medium and calibrant. This makes the process of profile fitting more difficult. The pressure values have been derived from the internal calibrant with known EoS, and are affected by nominal uncertainties of about 0.1 GPa. Deviating stress and thermal and pressure gradients might be present across the cell. Non-hydrostatic conditions in the pressure cell when studying powder samples could be a significant source of error in latticeparameter determination (Fei and Wang 2000). Therefore, the quality of data obtainable from HP-HTexperiments is not excellent, and the esd of cell volumes is high, reflected in the high esd of bulk moduli and other coefficients.

The only study on mica under simultaneous HP-HT with a methodology similar to that used in the present

work is that on phengite-3T (Pavese et al. 1999). These authors found thermoelastic properties roughly similar to those found for Ms and Pg in the present study. They reported the bulk modulus in the range 58–51 GPa, depending on the EoS used in calculations; the value is quite similar to that found for Ms. The  $dK_0/dT$  value is -0.031 GPa K<sup>-1</sup>, which is smaller than the value found here for Ms and Pg. The bulk thermal expansion is  $3.0 \times 10^{-5}$  K<sup>-1</sup>, slightly smaller than the value found for Ms and significantly smaller than the value of Pg.

# Conclusions

On the basis of P-V-T data measured for muscovite and paragonite samples by powder diffraction on the ID30 beam line at ESRF synchrotron source (Grenoble), in spite of the difficulties of the experiment, we obtained



Fig. 2 Variation in cell volume  $(Å^3)$  of muscovite as a function of pressure (GPa) on the isotherms at 298, 573, 723 and 873 K. The *solid line* represents the fitting to the second-order Birch-Murnaghan EoS on each isotherm

thermoelastic parameters that allow the following conclusions:

- 1. Results confirm that Pg is stiffer than Ms, in agreement with the results from single-crystal studies at ambient T by Comodi and Zanazzi (1995, 1997). Taking into account the structure of dioctahedral mica, the smaller compressibility observed as Na content increases has been explained by stronger repulsion of the basal oxygen sheets on both sides of the interlayer ions, which are nearer in Pg than in Ms.
- 2. Furthermore, Ms softens more rapidly than Pg upon heating.
- 3. Thermal expansion coefficient is greater in Pg than in Ms and its variation with P is smaller in Pg than in Ms.

On the basis of thermoelastic parameters, it is possible to write an equation of state of the type:

$$V(P,T) = V_0(1 + \alpha \Delta T)(1 - \beta P)$$

**Table 2** Lattice parameters and cell volume values (Å<sup>3</sup>) as a function of pressure (GPa) and temperature (K) for paragonite. The  $V_0$  value on each isotherm is calculated from the second-order BM EoS, since the instrumental setting did not allow diffraction data collection at room pressure

P (GPa)	T (K)	a (Å)	b (Å)	c (Å)	β (°)	$V(\text{\AA}^3)$
0.0	298(3)	-	_	-	_	885.4(1)
0.7(1)	298(3)	5.124(1)	8.869(1)	19.346(3)	94.56(1)	876.4(2)
1.4(1)	298(3)	5.111(1)	8.836(2)	19.249(2)	94.60(1)	866.5(2)
1.9(1)	298(3)	5.099(2)	8.821(1)	19.201(3)	94.63(2)	860.8(3)
2.4(1)	298(3)	5.094(1)	8.806(2)	19.143(3)	94.65(1)	855.9(2)
2.7(1)	298(3)	5.092(1)	8.781(2)	19.089(4)	94.68(1)	850.7(3)
3.0(1)	298(3)	5.086(1)	8.777(1)	19.063(3)	94.69(2)	848.1(3)
3.3(1)	298(3)	5.078(2)	8.748(2) 8.746(2)	18.981(4)	94.74(2) 04.70(1)	840.3(4)
3.8(1)	298(3)	5.070(2)	8.740(2) 8.744(2)	18.944(3) 18.026(4)	94.79(1) 04.82(2)	837.0(3)
4.0(1)	298(3)	5.007(1) 5.060(2)	8.744(2) 8.730(3)	18.920(4) 18.864(5)	94.82(2) 94.88(2)	830.3(4)
4.3(1)	298(3)	5.000(2)	8.730(3)	18.852(5)	94.88(2) 94.89(3)	820.3(4)
4.7(1)	298(3)	5.050(2)	8.729(2) 8.722(2)	18.852(5) 18.826(4)	94.09(3)	826 3(5)
4.8(1)	298(3)	5.051(3)	8 717(3)	18.814(5)	94.97(3)	820.3(3) 825.1(4)
5.0(1)	298(3)	5.030(2) 5.041(3)	8.701(3)	18.781(6)	95.02(3)	820.4(5)
0.0	422(2)	01011(0)	01/01(0)	101/01(0)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	800.0(2)
0.0 0.1(1)	423(3)	= 5 141(1)	- 8 927(2)	- 10 $430(3)$	- 94 29(1)	890.9(2)
0.1(1) 0.8(1)	423(3)	5.141(1) 5.136(2)	8.927(2) 8.885(1)	19.430(3) 10.347(3)	94.29(1) 94.37(2)	880.3(2)
1.3(1)	423(3)	5.130(2) 5.133(1)	8.860(2)	19.347(3) 19.279(3)	94.37(2) 94.41(2)	874.2(3)
0.0	722(2)	5.155(1)	0.000(2)	19.275(3)	<i>y</i> (2)	800.4(2)
0.0	723(3)	-	-	- 10 410(2)	-	899.4(2)
1.5(1)	723(3)	5.132(1) 5.134(2)	8.931(1) 8.802(1)	19.419(3) 10.210(3)	94.00(2) 94.20(1)	893.3(3) 874.0(2)
2.0(1)	723(3)	5.134(2) 5.130(1)	8.872(1)	19.219(3) 10.141(2)	94.29(1) 94.40(2)	868 6(3)
2.0(1) 2.3(1)	723(3)	5.130(1) 5.122(2)	8.861(2)	19.141(2) 19.098(4)	94.42(2)	864.2(3)
2.3(1) 2.7(1)	723(3)	5.122(2) 5.112(2)	8.852(1)	19.050(4)	94.48(3)	860 1(4)
3.0(1)	723(3)	5.109(2)	8.844(2)	19.043(3)	94,50(2)	857.8(3)
3.3(1)	723(3)	5.101(1)	8.827(2)	19.017(4)	94,55(3)	853.6(4)
3.6(1)	723(3)	5.094(2)	8.815(1)	18.971(3)	94.56(2)	849.2(4)
3.9(1)	723(3)	5.088(3)	8.806(3)	18.918(4)	94.60(3)	844.9(5)
4.2(1)	723(3)	5.082(2)	8.797(2)	18.872(5)	94.59(2)	841.0(4)
4.4(1)	723(3)	5.078(3)	8.793(3)	18.831(6)	94.67(3)	838.0(6)
0.0	823(3)	_	_	_	_	906.0(3)
0.8(1)	823(3)	5.152(1)	8.937(1)	19.427(3)	94.01(3)	892.3(4)
2.0(1)	823(3)	5.133(2)	8.894(2)	19.214(4)	94.27(4)	874.7(3)
2.3(1)	823(3)	5.129(1)	8.876(2)	19.147(3)	94.41(4)	869.1(4)
2.7(1)	823(3)	5.120(2)	8.866(1)	19.104(4)	94.42(3)	864.6(4)
3.1(1)	823(3)	5.113(2)	8.860(3)	19.040(5)	94.48(3)	859.9(5)
3.7(1)	823(3)	5.104(2)	8.852(2)	18.929(4)	94.67(4)	852.4(6)
4.0(1)	823(3)	5.102(3)	8.844(3)	18.907(5)	94.93(4)	850.0(4)
4.4(1)	823(3)	5.093(3)	8.833(3)	18.835(7)	95.20(5)	843.8(6)



Fig. 3 Variation of cell volume (Å<sup>3</sup>) of paragonite as a function of pressure (GPa) on the isotherms at 298, 423, 723 and 823 K. The *solid line* represents the fitting to the second-order Birch-Murnaghan EoS on each isotherm



**Fig. 4a, b** Plot of the "normalized stress", defined as  $F_E = P/[3f_E(1+2f_E)^{5/2}]$ , versus the finite strain  $f_E = [(V_0/V)^{2/3}-1]/2$  in muscovite (**a**) and paragonite (**b**) on the different isotherms. The esds were calculated according to Heinz and Jeanloz (1984)

 Table 3 Bulk moduli (GPa) at room pressure as a function of temperature (K) for muscovite and paragonite

Muscovite	Paragonite			
$T = 298 \text{ K } K_0 = 57.0(6) \text{ GPa}$ $T = 573 \text{ K } K_0 = 55.1(7) \text{ GPa}$ $T = 723 \text{ K } K_0 = 51.1(7) \text{ GPa}$ $T = 873 \text{ K } K_0 = 48.9(5) \text{ GPa}$	$T = 298 \text{ K } K_0 = 59.9(5) \text{ GPa}$ $T = 723 \text{ K } K_0 = 55.7(6) \text{ GPa}$ $T = 823 \text{ K } K_0 = 53.8(7) \text{ GPa}$			



**Fig. 5** Bulk moduli (GPa) at room pressure of muscovite on the isotherms at 298, 573, 723 and 873 K, and of paragonite at 298, 723 and 823

where  $V_0$  is the molar volume at 298 K and room pressure, *P* is the pressure in GPa and  $\Delta T$  is T(K) –298. Since  $\alpha = \alpha_0 + (\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T P$  and  $\beta = \beta_0 - (\partial \beta / \partial T)_P \Delta T$ , we obtain:

$$V(P,T) = V_0 [1 + \alpha_0 \Delta T - \beta_0 P + (\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T P \Delta T - (\partial \beta / \partial T)_P P \Delta T] .$$

Taking into account the values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  (K<sub>0</sub><sup>-1</sup>),  $(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T$ and  $(\partial \beta / \partial T)_P$  from the experiment (note the validity of the fundamental thermodynamic relationship  $(\partial \alpha / \partial P)_T$ =  $-(\partial \beta / \partial T)_P$  in the limits of esd), we obtain for Ms and Pg:

$$\begin{split} Ms \, V(P,T) &= V_0 [1 + 3.57(3) \times 10^{-5} \Delta T - 0.0175(2) P \\ &\quad - 3.9(1) \times 10^{-6} P \Delta T - 5.1(9) \times 10^{-6} P \Delta T] \\ Pg \, V(P,T) &= V_0 [1 + 4.41(2) \times 10^{-5} \Delta T - 0.0166(2) P \\ &\quad - 2.9(1) \times 10^{-6} P \Delta T - 3.4(5) \times 10^{-6} P \Delta T] \;. \end{split}$$

This is a significant datum concerning the shape of the Ms–Pg solvus at high P and T and its petrologic implications. Since Pg is less compressible than Ms, and this especially at high T, an increase of P and T affects the Na limb of the solvus with respect to the K side of the Ms–Pg join to a lesser extent, in agreement with chem-

ical data for natural Pg–Ms pairs from various parageneses (Guidotti et al. 1994).

Acknowledgements We thank Professor C.V. Guidotti for his interest and for providing several mica samples and the chemical analyses of Pg and Ms used in this work. Thanks are due to Dr. G. Harlow and to the American Museum of Natural History for supplying the Pg sample. We are grateful for comments from Ronald Miletich and an anonymous reviewer. The European Synchrotron Radiation Facility is acknowledged for allocating beamtime for experiment. This work was supported by CNR and MURST (project Transformations, reactions, ordering in minerals) grants to PFZ.

#### References

Angel RJ (2000) Equations of state. Rev Mineral Geochem 41: 35– 59

- Besson JM, Nelmes RJ, Hamel G, Loveday JS, Weill G, Hull S (1992) Neutron powder diffraction above 10 GPa. Physica (B) 180,181: 907–910
- Birch F (1986) Equation of state and thermodynamic parameters of NaCl to 300 kbar in the high-temperature domain. J Geophys Res 91: 4949–4954
- Catti M, Ferraris G, Hull S, Pavese A (1994) Powder neutron diffraction study of  $2M_1$  muscovite at room pressure and at 2 GPa. Eur J Mineral 6: 171–178
- Catti M, Ferraris G, Ivaldi G (1989) Thermal strain analysis in the crystal structure of muscovite at 700 °C. Eur J Mineral 1: 625– 632
- Comodi P, Zanazzi PF (1995) High-pressure structural study of muscovite. Phys Chem Miner 22: 170–177
- Comodi P, Zanazzi PF (1997) Pressure dependence of structural parameters of paragonite. Phys Chem Miner 24: 274–280
- Comodi P, Zanazzi PF (2000) Thermal behaviour of paragonite and its dehydroxylate: a high-temperature single-crystal study. Phys Chem Miner 27: 377–385
- Dollase W (1986) Correction of intensities for preferred orientation in powder diffractometry: application of the March model. J Appl Crystallogr 19: 267–272
- Evans BW, Guidotti CV (1966) The sillimanite-potash feldspar isograd in Western Maine, USA. Contr Mineral Petrol 12: 25– 62
- Faust J, Knittle E (1994) The equation of state, amorphization, and high-pressure phase diagram of muscovite. J Geophys Res 99: 19785–19792
- Fei Y, Wang Y (2000) High-pressure and high-temperature powder diffraction. Rev Mineral Geochem 41: 521–557
- Finger LW, Cox DE, Jephcoat AP (1994) A correction for powder diffraction peak asymmetry due to axial divergence. J Appl Crystallogr 27: 92–900
- Guidotti CV, Sassi FP (1976) Muscovite as a petrogenetic indicator mineral in pelitic schists. N Jb Mineral Abh 127: 97–142
- Guidotti CV, Sassi FP, Sassi R, Blencoe JG (1994) The effects of ferromagnesian components on the paragonite-muscovite

solvus: a semiquantitative analysis based on chemical data for natural paragonite-muscovite pairs. J Metamorph Geol 12: 779–788

- Guggenheim S, Chang YH, Koster Van Groos AF (1987) Muscovite dehydroxylation: high-temperature studies. Am Mineral 72: 537–550
- Hammersley AP (1995) ESRF internal report, EXP/AH/95-01, FIT2D V5.18 Reference manual VI.6
- Hammersley AP, Svensson SO, Hanfland M, Fitch AN, Hausermann D (1996) Two-dimensional detector software: from real detector to idealised image or two-theta scan. High Press Res 14: 235–248
- Harlow GE (1994) Jadeitites, albitites and related rocks from the Motagua Fault Zone, Guatemala. J Metamorph Geol 12: 49–68
- Heinz DL, Jeanloz R (1984) The equation of state of the gold calibration standard. J Appl Phys 55: 885–893
- Larson AC, Von Dreele RB (2001) GSAS: general structure analysis system. Report LAUR: 86–748, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, USA
- Le Bail A, Duroy H, Fourquet JL (1988) Ab-initio structure determination of LiSbWO<sub>6</sub> by X-ray powder diffraction. Mat Res Bull 23: 447–452
- Le Godec Y, Martinez-Garcia D, Mezouar M, Syfosse G, Itié JP, Besson JM (2000) Equation of state and order parameter in graphite-like h-BN under high pressure and temperature. In: Manghnani MH, Nellis WJ, Nicol MF (eds) Science and technology of high pressure. Proceedings of AIRAPT-17. Universities Press, Hyderabad, India, pp 925–928
- Mazzucato E, Artioli G, Gualtieri A (1999) High-temperature dehydroxylation of muscovite- $2M_1$ : a kinetic study by in situ XRPD. Phys Chem Miner 26: 375–381
- Mezouar M, Besson JM, Syfosse G, Itié JP, Hausermann D, Hanfland M (1996) Phase diagram of InSb at high pressures and temperatures. Phys Status Solidi (B) 198: 403–407
- Nespolo M, Ferraris G (2001) Effects of the stacking faults on the calculated electron density of mica polytypes – the Ďurovič effect. Eur J Mineral 13: 1035–1045
- Pavese A, Ferraris G, Pischedda V, Mezouar M (1999) Synchrotron powder diffraction study of phengite 3T from Dora-Maira massif: P-V-T equation of state and petrological consequences. Phys Chem Miner 26: 460–467
- Sekine T, Rubin AM, Ahrens TJ (1991) Shock wave equation of state of muscovite. J Geophys Res 96: 19675–19680
- Smyth JR, Jacobsen SD, Swope RJ, Angel RJ, Arlt T, Domanik K, Holloway JR (2000) Crystal structures and compressibilities of synthetic 2*M*1 and 3*T* phengite micas. Eur J Mineral 12: 955– 963
- Symmes GH (1986) The thermal expansion of natural muscovite, paragonite, margarite, pyrophyllite, phlogopite, and two chlorites: the significance of high *T/P* volume studies on calculated phase equilibria. BA Thesis, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts
- Thomson P, Cox DE, Hastings JB (1987) Rietveld refinement of Debye-Scherer synchrotron X-ray data from Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. J Appl Crystallogr 20: 79–83
- Vaughan MT, Guggenheim S (1986) Elasticity of muscovite and its relationship to crystal structure. J Geophys Res 91: 4657–4664