Magnesian tourmalines from plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite metaevaporite layers in dolomite marble near Prosetín (Olešnice Unit, Moravicum, Czech Republic)
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Radial aggregates of blue–grey tourmaline were found in plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite metaevaporite layers in dolomite marble near Prosetín (Olešnice Unit, Moravicum, Czech Republic). It occurs in association with plagioclase (An15–37), muscovite, scapolite, phlogopite, vermiculite, pumpellyite-(Al), and clinozoisite. Electron-microprobe analyses of tourmaline show dravite composition with very high content of Mg (1.92 to 2.77 apfu), Al (up to 6.71 apfu), low content of Fe (up to 0.39 apfu) and variable amounts of vacancies (0.09 to 0.47) and Ca (0.03 to 0.29 apfu) in the X-site. Some analyses correspond to “oxy-dravite” and some others almost attain magnesio-foitite compositions. The proportion of X-site vacancy decreases from the crystal cores to their rims while Ca content increases. Generally, charge excess due to the high Al-contents is balanced either by an increasing X-site vacancy or by deprotonization of WOH; the WO2– content calculated from charge-balanced formula attains 0.71 apfu. Lattice parameters [a = 15.9116(6) Å; c = 7.1987(4) Å] and deduced average bond lengths (⟨Y-O⟩ = 1.995 Å; ⟨Z-O⟩ = 1.929 Å) indicate a relatively high Al–Mg disorder. Three main substitution mechanisms are inferred to operate in the studied magnesian tourmalines: (1) CaMg(NaAl)–1, mainly in Ca-enriched dravite, (2) □Al(NaMg)–1 in nearly magnesio-foititic compositions, and (3) AlO(MgOH)–1 in “oxy-dravitic” members. The tourmaline is relatively poor in trace elements; only Ti, Sr, and Ga exceed 100 ppm according to LA-ICP-MS study. There is a pronounced positive correlation between Sr and Ca (r² = 0.77), which suggests that Sr accumulated in Ca-enriched zones of dravite. The pale blue–grey color of the studied tourmalines is most likely a result of Fe²⁺ crystal field transitions along with the absence of significant amounts of other chromophores. Trace-element contents, mineral assemblage and compositional zoning of tourmalines as well as host-rock mineral association suggest prograde metamorphic growth and support metaevaporitic origin of the plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rocks.

Keywords: tourmaline, dravite, oxy-dravite, crystal chemistry, metaevaporites, Bohemian Massif

Received: 17 May 2012; accepted: 14 September 2012; handling editor: M. Novák

1. Introduction

Extremely magnesian tourmaline including dravite, “oxy-dravite” and magnesio-foitite is confined to specific genetic environment. It requires high atomic X_Mg [Mg/(Mg + Fe)] ratio in the host rock, and thus is characteristic of metatulframacic rocks, metapyroxenites, or metacarbonates (Henry and Guidotti 1985). Another typical host for highly magnesian tourmalines are metaevaporites, where oxy-dravite and dravite frequently occur (Henry et al. 1999, 2008; Záček et al. 2000; Bačík et al. 2008). This compositional feature of tourmaline is attributed to the influence of oxidizing, highly saline, boron-bearing fluids associated with such lithologies (Henry et al. 2008). Formation of tourmaline is a result of subsequent metamorphic events, whereby the high X_Mg ratio is determined by the bulk composition of the host Mg-rich marine evaporite.

Plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rock layers in dolomite marble near Prosetín (Olešnice Unit, Moravicum, Czech Republic) host tourmaline which belongs to dravite–oxy-dravite and dravite–magnesio-foitite solid solutions. Although it has been studied previously by powder X-ray diffraction (XRD), wet chemical analysis (Povondra and Novák 1986) and also electron microprobe analysis (EMPA) (Opletal 2009), we bring new detailed mineralogical and crystallochemical data resulting from application of EMPA, powder XRD, and Laser Ablation Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS). These provide new insights on the tourmaline composition, structural properties, origin, and on the chromophores responsible for its blue–grey color.
2. Geological setting

The studied locality belongs to Olešnice Unit, Moravicum, which is a part of the Moravo–Silesian Zone in the eastern Bohemian Massif. The Moravo–Silesian Zone represents a Hercynian nappe complex which is structurally underlying the Moldanubian metamorphic complex (Neubauer and Handler 2000; Finger et al. 2007; Schulmann et al. 2008). The Moravo–Silesian Zone represents a NE–SW trending belt of Neoproterozoic to Lower Paleozoic sheared and metamorphosed rocks derived from the Brunia microcontinent (Kalvoda et al. 2008). This ~300 km long, 30 to 50 km wide belt consists of three NE–SW-elongated tectonic windows emerging through structurally overlying high-grade rocks of the Moldanubian–Lugian domain: southern Thaya Window; central Svrata Window and northern Silesian domain (Schulmann et al. 2008). The Moravo–Silesian Zone developed during Carboniferous dextral-oblique thrusting of the Moldanubian–Lugian domain (Schulmann et al. 1991).

The lithotectonic structure of the Svrata Window (including the Olešnice Unit) is, from bottom to top and from the East to the West, as follows: (1) The Parautochthonous domain (chlorite zone), (2) Lower Moravian Nappe (biotite zone), and (3) Upper Moravian Nappe (garnet zone). Consequently, the Svrata Window is characterized by inverted Barrovian metamorphic zonation (Ulrich et al. 2002). The Olešnice Unit (Olešnice–Vranov Unit) represents a variegated lithologic sequence of predominantly Devonian (?) metamorphic rocks, mainly mica schists and paragneiss, graphicmetapelites, quartzites, calcite and dolomite marbles, rarely amphibolites and metagabbros (Sekanina 1965s; Opletal et al. 2007). The tremolite-bearing marbles of the Olešnice Unit build the upper parts of the Upper Moravian Nappe, where they form large bodies (up to 50 m thick) set in a complex of dominant muscovite–biotite metapelites (mica schists and gneisses) metamorphosed in amphibolite facies (garnet zone). The P–T–X conditions of metamorphism of these marbles were estimated from stability of the assemblages tremolite + calcite + quartz and tremolite + dolomite, corresponding to $T_{max} = 580–620 \degree C$ at $X(CO_2) = 0.2–0.7$ and $T_{min} = 480–530 \degree C$ at $X(CO_2) = 0.2–0.6$ at $P_{total} = 500 \text{ MPa}$ (Houzar et al. 2000; Houzar and Leichmann 2003).

At the disused Prosetín quarry, the studied locality (49.534933° N, 16.398883° E, 613 m above sea level), two parallel layers of concordant muscovite–plagioclase–scapolite rock are enclosed in dolomite marble; the layers are usually c. 30 cm, locally up to 50 cm thick. Elsewhere, their thickness reaches only 10 cm or they wedge out completely (Opletal et al. 2007; Opletal 2009).

There are two hypotheses regarding the origin of plagioclase–muscovite rock layers in dolomite marble near Prosetín. Sekanina (1965b) considered the plagioclase–muscovite rock layers to be intrusions of $SiO_2$-poor apilites (oligoclasites) and explained the scapolite- and tourmaline-bearing mineral association as a result of interaction of hydrothermal fluids with oligoclasite. In contrast, Opletal et al. (2007) showed that plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rock layers may be of metaevaporitic origin. The latter hypothesis is supported e.g. by the absence of Mg skarns with diopside and/or forsterite zones, which are otherwise a typical product of the interaction between granitic–pegmatitic magma and dolomites (e.g., Shabynin 1973), absence of lateral veins characteristic of pegmatites and inferred high activity of Cl required for crystallization of the Cl-enriched marialite (Mar$_{23–37}$) present in the assemblage (Opletal et al. 2007). Two metamorphic phases in the plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rocks – (1) prograde, producing association of scapolite, phlogopite, part of clinozoisite and plagioclase with An$_{33–37}$, and (2) retrograde, with albite, chlorite, muscovite and vermiculite – generally correlate with evolution of the surrounding dolomite marble. Plagioclase associated with tourmaline is altered to muscovite, albite, epidote and calcite; the tourmaline assemblage was formed likely at the end of the prograde or at the beginning of the retrograde phase (Opletal et al. 2007; Opletal 2009).

3. Analytical methods

The composition of tourmaline was established with CAMECA SX100 electron microprobe in wavelength-dispersion mode, at the State Geological Institute of Dionýz Štúr, Bratislava. The analytical conditions were: accelerating voltage 15 kV, beam current 20 nA, and beam diameter of 3 to 5 μm. The tourmaline samples were analyzed with the following standards: wollastonite (SiK$_{α}$, CaK$_{α}$), TiO$_2$ (TiK$_{α}$), Al$_2$O$_3$ (AlK$_{α}$), pure Cr (CrK$_{α}$), pure V (VK$_{α}$), fayalite (FeK$_{α}$), rhodonite (MnK$_{α}$), forsterite (MgK$_{α}$), willemite (ZnK$_{α}$), pure Ni (NiK$_{α}$), albite (NaK$_{α}$), orthoclase (KK$_{α}$), BaF$_2$ (FK$_{α}$) and NaCl (ClK$_{α}$). Lower detection limits of the measured elements varied between 0.01 and 0.05 wt. %; V, Cr, Mn, Zn, Ni, F, and Cl were also below their respective detection limits. The analytical data were normalized according to the PAP procedure (Pouchou and Pichoir 1985). The crystallo-chemical formulae of tourmaline were calculated on the basis of 15 $Y + Z + T$ cations, $O^-$ was obtained from the charge-balanced formula, OH was calculated as OH = 4 – Cl – $O$ apfu, B = 3 apfu.

Powder X-ray diffraction analyses were made on diffractometer BRUKER D8 Advance (Laboratory of
X-ray diffraction SOLIPHA, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava) under following conditions: Bragg–Brentano geometry (Theta–2 Theta), Cu anticathode (λ = 1.54060 Å), accelerating voltage 40 kV, beam current 40 mA. Ni Kβ filters were used for stripping of Kβ radiation on the primary and diffracted beam, and data were acquired by the BRUKER Lynx-Eye detector. The step size was 0.01° 2θ, the step time 5 s per step, and the range of measurement 4 to 65° 2θ. Measured data were evaluated with the DIFFRAC plus EVA software package. Analyzed scans were fitted by, and lattice parameters refined with, the DIFFRAC plus TOPAS software on a basis of dravite structure (sample 32008, Bloodaxe et al. 1999). Average bond lengths in octahedra were calculated from lattice parameters according to empirical formulae: $a = 13.045 + 1.437 <Y-O>$ Å; $c = 0.886 + 3.272 <Z-O>$ Å (Bosi and Lucchesi 2004). Subsequently, it allowed to calculate $^2$Mg in crystallo-chemical formulae according to empirical formula $^2$Mg = 49.697$<Z-O>$ – 94.845 (Ertl et al. 2010).

The LA-ICP-MS analyses were carried out by a laser ablation system UP 213 (New Wave, USA) attached to a quadrupole ICP-MS Agilent 7500 CE (Agilent, Japan), at the Central European Institute of Technology, Masaryk University, Brno. The Q-switched Nd-YAG laser emits radiation with wavelength of 213 nm. The sample gas flow of Ar (0.6 l/min) was admixed to the He carrier gas (1.0 l/min) behind the laser ablation cell. The LA-ICP-MS parameters were optimized using the glass reference material NIST SRM 612 to yield a maximum signal to noise ratio. Hole drilling mode of laser ablation was utilized with spot diameter 65 μm, laser beam fluency 18 J.cm⁻² and repetition rate 10 Hz, ablating for 40 s at each spot. All element contents were normalized using Si as an internal standard; its content was obtained by EMPA.

4. Results

Tourmaline from Prosetín forms radial aggregates of blue–grey prismatic crystals, up to 3 cm across (Fig. 1). It has very weak chemical zoning; three compositional types of tourmaline were recognized, occurring in variable proportions. Two zones can be distinguished in BSE: light one, generally forming cores of crystals (if they are defined by surfaces of prisms), and dark one, on the rim (Fig. 2). The light zone consists of two phases with different chemical compositions: (1) tourmaline with higher X-site vacancy and compositions changing from dravite toward magnesio-foitite, and (2) tourmaline with low X-site vacancy and Ca concentrations which attains the oxy-dravite composition (Tab. 1, Figs 2 to 4). The dark zone at the rim (Fig. 2 – phase no. 3) is formed by dravite with increased Ca (Tab. 1, Figs 2 to 4). The enrichment in Ca is likely the result of the uvite substitution mechanism, CaMg(NaAl)\_4 (Fig. 5a).

All zones of the Prosetín tourmaline are strongly magnesian ($X_{Mg} = 0.85–0.92$, and up to 0.97 in Ca-enriched dravite; Tab. 1). The studied tourmaline has an increased content of Al relative to the ideal composition of dravite. In dravite to magnesio-foitite, it varies between 6.42 and 6.48 apfu, and between 6.28 and 6.72 apfu in oxy-draviteic zones. The lowest content of Al is in Ca-enriched compositions, but still reaches up to 6.25 apfu Al (Fig. 4, Tab. 1). The increased Al contents may be charge-balanced by the increase in X-site vacancy due to the $^3\Box Al(NaMg)_{1-x}$ substitution (Fig. 5b). However, this mechanism may be significant only in the dravite–magnesio-foitite phase, as the proportion of X-site vacancy in oxy-dravite is too...
### Tab. 1 Representative electron-microprobe analyses of tourmaline from Prosetin (in wt. % and apfu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>38.42</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td>37.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO₂</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>b.d.l.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂O₅*</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al₂O₃</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na₂O</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K₂O</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O₂*</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.15</td>
<td>99.35</td>
<td>100.33</td>
<td>99.40</td>
<td>99.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tab. 2 Powder X-ray diffraction pattern of Prosetin tourmaline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>d₃₃ (Å)</th>
<th>I (%)</th>
<th>d₃₃ (Å)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.967</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.582</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.210</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.970</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.003</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3946</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3728</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3378</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1853</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1586</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1071</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0519</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0370</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0147</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9864</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8736</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8448</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7770</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6574</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6378</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5943</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5902</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5833</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5428</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tab. 3 Lattice parameters and bond lengths of octahedral sites comparing tourmaline from Prosetin with published data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosetin, Czech Republic</td>
<td>this work</td>
<td>dravite to oxy-dravite</td>
<td>15.9116(6)</td>
<td>7.1987(4)</td>
<td>1578.37(8)</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>PXRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosetin, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Povondra and Novák (1986)</td>
<td>dravite</td>
<td>15.908(3)</td>
<td>7.192(3)</td>
<td>1576.17(8)</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>PXRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemerská Poloma, Slovakia</td>
<td>Bačík et al. (2011a)</td>
<td>dravite</td>
<td>15.9289(7)</td>
<td>7.2132(17)</td>
<td>1584.99(15)</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>PXRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forshammer, Sweden</td>
<td>Žavka et al. (in print)</td>
<td>dravite</td>
<td>15.9223(6)</td>
<td>7.1706(5)</td>
<td>1574.34(8)</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>SREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajkal, Russia¹</td>
<td>Bosi and Lucchesi (2004)</td>
<td>oxy-dravite</td>
<td>15.9030(7)</td>
<td>7.1951(4)</td>
<td>1575.89(8)</td>
<td>2.011</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>SREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Falls, USA²</td>
<td>Bloodaxe et al. (1999)</td>
<td>oxy-dravite</td>
<td>15.945(1)</td>
<td>7.169(1)</td>
<td>1578.58(8)</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>SREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinthaler, Austria³</td>
<td>Ertl et al. (2010)</td>
<td>fluor-dravite</td>
<td>15.9354(4)</td>
<td>7.1934(4)</td>
<td>1581.94(8)</td>
<td>2.011</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>SREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyonosawa, Japan</td>
<td>Hawthorne et al. (1999)</td>
<td>magnesio-foitite</td>
<td>15.884(4)</td>
<td>7.178(3)</td>
<td>1568.06(8)</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>SREF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹sample 9840f; ²sample Ru-T18-92; ³sample STE; lattice parameters from PXRD – powder XRD, SREF – structure refinement; * – bond lengths calculated according to empirical formulae by Bosi and Lucchesi (2004); *Mg obtained by the empirical formula of Ertl et al. (2010).
low to balance charge excess sufficiently. In contrast, the increase in the Al correlates with the $^6$O contents calculated from the charge-balanced formula (Tab. 1). This suggests a strong influence of the AlO(MgOH)$_{3-1}$ substitution.

Powder XRD data (Tables 2 and 3) are strongly influenced by the compositional variations of the studied tourmaline. However, based on BSE observations and EMPA study, oxy-dravite and magnesio-foitite phases are dominant and they differ only slightly in Al and Mg contents (Tab. 1). Average bond lengths in octahedral sites calculated from lattice parameters were compared to published data; the mean $<Y{-}O>$ bond length in the studied tourmaline is shorter than those published for dravite, “oxy-dravite” and fluor-dravite, but longer than in magnesio-foitite (Tab. 3). This corresponds well with the higher contents of Al in the Y site. In contrast, the $<Z{-}O>$ bond is relatively long, which could suggest a significant proportion of Mg$^{2+}$ with higher ionic radius than Al$^{3+}$ in the octahedral coordination (0.72 and 0.535 Å, respectively; Shannon 1976).

Tourmaline from Prosetín is relatively poor in trace elements. Only Ti, Sr, and Ga attain more than 100 ppm, the contents of Sc, Mn, Ni, Zn and Sn vary between 10 and 100 ppm (Tab. 4). The REE contents are even lower; only La, Ce, Nd and Y exceed their respective detection limits. There is an apparent correlation of Ti and Sr with Ca (Fig. 6), which suggests that the former two elements are accumulated in Ca-enriched zones of dravite.

Tab. 4 Contents of trace elements (ppm) in Prosetín tourmaline – analyzed by LA-ICP-MS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Limit of detection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nd</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3 – Classification diagram (Na + K)–Ca–X□ for minerals of tourmaline supergroup.
5. Discussion and conclusions

5.1 Crystal chemistry of tourmaline

Calculation of bond lengths in octahedral sites on a basis of empirical formulae from lattice parameters is appropriate method if no structure-refinement data are available. Besides giving partial information on the structure geometry, it also helps to solve problems with site occupancy and crystal chemistry of mineral. Site occupancy and cation distribution has many effects not only on the geometry of $Y$ and $Z$ octahedra but on the entire structure of tourmaline. Octahedral dimensions influence lattice parameters; the parameter $a$ correlates with $<Y-O>$ bond length, whereas $c$ is correlated with the $<Z-O>$ bond length (Bosi and Lucchesi 2004). The $<Z-O>$ bond length in octahedra entirely occupied by Al, as in elbaite, rossmanite, oleneite and foitite, varies between 1.90 and 1.91 Å (e.g., Grice and Ercit 1993; MacDonald et al. 1993; Burns et al. 1994; Selway et al. 1998; Cempírek et al. 2006). In contrast, the $<Z-O>$ bond length in Mg-bearing tourmalines is in the range of 1.92 to 1.93 Å (e.g., Bloodaxe et al. 1999; Hawthorne et al. 1999; Bosi and Lucchesi 2004; Ertl et al. 2010; Bačík et al. 2011a, in print). There is a good correlation between $\overline{2}$Mg content and the $<Z-O>$ bond length (Ertl et al. 2010): the $<Z-O>$ bond length increases with the $\overline{2}$Mg (or other cations with ionic radius larger than Al, if present). Significant amounts of Mg may enter the $Z$ site due to Al–Mg disorder even if the Al content exceeds 6 apfu and could be sufficient to fill the $Z$ site entirely (e.g., Grice and Ercit 1993; Hawthorne et al. 1993, 1999; Bloodaxe et al. 1999; Bosi and Lucchesi 2004; Ertl et al. 2010). The studied tourmalines have affinity to magnesio-foitite and oxy-dravite with a relatively high value of the $<Z-O>$ bond length (1.929 Å), despite of their Al-rich composition (up to 6.72 Al apfu). Therefore, the total amount of Al is not a key factor determining the $Z$-site occupancy in Mg-bearing tourmalines. The disorder of Al and Mg among the octahedral sites is controlled by different mechanisms, due to short-range bond-valence requirements (e.g. Hawthorne 2002); in any case, it is reflected by the $W$-site occupancy. If the $W$ site is fully occupied by OH, only $3R^2$ or $2R^{3+}+R^+$ cation structural arrangements are stable, in contrast to the $3R^+$ or $2R^{3+}+R^{2+}$...
cation arrangements which are found in \(^{9}\text{O}^-\)-dominant “oxy-tourmalines” (Hawthorne 2002). Calculated \(^9\text{O}\) proportion therefore suggests relatively large degree of Al–Mg disorder in the studied samples, at least in the oxy-dravite compositions. Significant role of deprotonized O in the \(W\) site of the Prosetin tourmaline was also confirmed by wet chemical analysis \((^{9}\text{O}^-\text{OH} = 3.68\ p.f.u.)\) of Povondra and Novák (1986). On the other hand, since the disorder is commonly present in \((\text{OH},\text{F})\)-dominant tourmalines, the disorder-controlling factor must be the thermodynamic stability of the \(Y,\ Z\) site configuration within the specific tourmaline composition. Good examples include the magnesio-foitite from Kyonosawa, Japan (Hawthorne et al., 1999), and fluor-dravite from Steinthaller, Austria (Ertl et al. 2010) which lack \(^9\text{O}\) but they seem to be medium to strongly disordered. Possible factors for \(Y\) site contents and Al–Mg disorder discussed in the literature include \(X\) site contents (e.g. Ertl et al. 2010), \(\text{Fe}/(\text{Fe} + \text{Mg})\) ratio (Grice and Ercit 1993), structure deformations (Foit 1989; Bosi and Lucchesi 2007) or temperature (Ertl et al. 2008; Bosi 2011). Besides a minor Ca-content (uvite component), the high amount of \(X\)-site vacancies plays a significant role in \(^9\text{O}\)-poor dravite–magnesio-foitite phase of the Prosetin tourmaline.

The size of \(Y\) octahedron depends on the synergic effect of the various cations occupying the site. This is a net result of an interplay between the size contraction owing to the presence of smaller cations (\(^{3}\text{Al}^+, \ ^{3}\text{Li}^+\)) and size-expansion caused by \(^{3}\text{Fe}^+, \ ^{3}\text{Mg}^+, \ ^{4}\text{V}^+\) with larger ionic radii (Bosi and Lucchesi 2004). The \(<Y\text{O}>\) bond length may decrease to 1.96 Å in olenite with \(Y\) site dominated by Al (Hughes et al. 2000), 2.00 Å in elbaite with \(Y\) site occupied by Al and Li (Burns et al. 1994; Bosi et al. 2005), and 1.98 Å in magnesiofoitite with \(^{3}\text{Mg}\) and \(^{3}\text{Al}\) (Hawthorne et al. 1999). On the other hand, this parameter increases to 2.05 Å in \(^{3}\text{Fe}^\text{2+}\)-dominant schorl (Grice and Ercit 1993; Bloodaxe et al. 1999; Bosi and Lucchesi 2004). The typical value of the \(<Y\text{O}>\) bond length in \(^{3}\text{Mg}\)-dominant dravite–“oxydravite” tourmalines varies between 2.00 and 2.01 Å (Bloodaxe et al. 1999; Bosi and Lucchesi 2004; Ertl et al. 2010; Bačík et al. 2011a, in print). Thus, lower value of the \(<Y\text{O}>\) bond length in Prosetin relative to other dravitic tourmalines is obviously the cumulative effect of very low \(^{3}\text{Fe}^\text{2+}\) and relatively high \(^{3}\text{Al}\) contents owing to: (1) \(^{3}\text{AlO(MgOH)}\) substitution mostly in the “oxy-dravite” phase; (2) \(^{3}\text{Al(NaMg)}\) substitution mostly in the dravite–magnesio-foitite phase and (3) extensive Al–Mg disorder which even more enriches the \(Y\) site in Al and decreases the \(^{3}\text{Mg}\) content.

Dravite from Prosetin has blue–grey color which is typical especially of Li-bearing and rather less frequent in Mg-dominant tourmalines. Similar blue dravite was also described from several localities of Li-poor granitic pegmatites and marbles in the Moldanubicum, Czech Republic (Povondra 1981; Novák 1998) and also from Szklary pegmatite, Poland (Pieczka 2007). It has been shown that the blue color in tourmaline is related to the
spin-allowed crystal field transitions of \( \text{Fe}^{2+} \) in deformed octahedral sites while usual inter-valence charge transfer transitions (\( \text{Fe}^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Ti}^{4+}, \text{Fe}^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{3+} \)) are responsible for brown and red–brown colors (e.g., Mattson and Rossman 1987; Cempírek et al. 2006; da Fonseca-Zang et al. 2008). High \( \text{Fe}^{3+} \) and \( \text{Ti}^{4+} \) contents cause dark (macroscopically black) color of Fe-rich tourmalines (e.g., Pieczka 2007; da Fonseca-Zang et al. 2008). All three tourmaline types from Prosetín are extremely Ti poor but contain significant amounts of \( \text{Fe}^{2+} \). Hence their blue–grey color is most likely a result of \( \text{Fe}^{2+} \) crystal field transitions along with the presence of only limited amounts of other chromophores.

### 5.2 Origin of tourmaline and plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rocks

The tourmaline composition, including trace elements, can be efficiently used to mark its genetic environment. The fibrous form of the Prosetín tourmaline and its low Ca content indicates fast non-equilibrium crystallization from Na-rich fluid, along with low degree of \textit{in situ} contamination. The zoning pattern with \( X \)-site vacant tourmaline core and dravitic rim resembles tourmalines grown in the prograde metamorphic environment (e.g., Henry and Dutrow 1996; Bačík et al. 2011b; Gieré et al. 2011). In contrast, tourmalines in granitic pegmatites usually display reverse zoning with rimward decrease in Ti and Mg and increase in Al and \( X \)-site vacancy, which indicate decreasing temperature and increasing degree of fractionation of the melt (e.g., Jolliff et al. 1987; Selway et al. 1999, 2000). Moreover, similar oxy-dravite to povondraite solid solution is typical of the metaevaporitic environment (Henry et al. 1999, 2008; Žáček et al. 2000; Bačík et al. 2008).

Contents of trace elements in tourmaline from Prosetín are relatively low, including the most abundant Ti, Sr and Ga (Tab. 4). Clearly, similar effective ionic radii of \( \text{Ga}^{3+} \) and \( \text{Al}^{3+} \) in octahedral and tetrahedral coordination (Shannon 1976) enable their mutual substitution in \( Y \)-, \( Z \)- and \( T \)-site positions of the tourmaline structure. Such a relationship between Al and Ga was observed also in tourmalines where Ga may attain tens to hundreds of ppm (e.g., Roda-Robles et al. 2004; Novák et al. 2011; Bačík et al. in print). Increased content of Sr can be related to the host-rock environment; Sr is one of the most abundant elements in seawater, c. 8 ppm (Faure 1977) which could support evaporitic origin of plagioclase–muscovite–scapolite rocks in Prosetín. The concentrations of other trace elements in the studied tourmalines, such as Mn, Zn, Sn and Li, are markedly lower compared to those reported from pegmatite tourmalines (e.g., Hellingwerf et al. 1994; Keller et al. 1999; Roda-Robles et al. 2004; Ertl et al. 2006; Novák et al. 2011; Bačík et al. in print).

The form of occurrence, major- and trace-element compositions of the Prosetín magnesian tourmaline imply rather non-magmatic (i.e., not aplitic or pegmatitic) origin. The new data support the idea of metaevaporitic source of the muscovite–plagioclase–scapolite rocks and formation of the magnesian tourmaline towards the end of the prograde metamorphic phase, as suggested by Opletal et al. (2007). Since the abundance of Cl- and B-rich minerals (scapolite and tourmaline) in some Moldanubian marbles and in associated metapelitic rocks points to their metaevaporitic origin (Kříbek et al. 1997; Houzar and Novák 2002), further detailed research of tourmaline crystal chemistry is desirable to improve our understanding of its behavior in metacarbonate systems.
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**Fig. 6** Binary diagrams of trace elements in Prosetín tourmaline (LA-ICP-MS data in ppm): a – Ti vs. Ca; b – Sr vs. Ca. Solid line represents the best linear fit to the data.
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\]

\[
\text{Sr} = 35.2284 + 0.0265 \times \text{Ca} \\
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\]
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