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## INTRODUCTION

## Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the noncarbonate mineralogy of representative samples of limestone screenings from eastern Kansas quarries. The carbonate mineralogy was determined in some cases if the sample contained a relative abundance of magnesium. The non-carbonate minerals of limestones, which are normally present in minor amounts, are very significant in determining the suitability of the limestone for engineering and industrial uses.

Secondly, the author has attempted to determine the significance of the clay mineral associations found in the limestone samples. Although the non-carbonate minerals in limestones are present in minor amounts, valuable information may be obtained by a study of the mineral association. Because of the lack of information concerning the clay mineralogy of limestones, particular emphasis was placed on the association of these minerals in the limestone samples.

Methods Used

In this study the non-carbonate mineralogy was determined by petrographic analysis, binocular microscope study, and X-ray diffraction. The portion of the insoluble residue used for petrographic analysis was divided into the heavy and light mineral fractions and the mineral frequencies were determined for each
sample. The coarser material was examined with a binocular microscope. X-ray diffraction analysis was used to determine the mineralogy of the clay-size fraction. In the high magnesium limestones the carbonate mineralogy was determined by stain test and $X$-ray diffraction.

## REVIEN OF LITERATURE

## Limestones

The term limestone, originally a lay word for any rock that may be burned to produce lime, has been adopted by geologists and redefined to make it of greater scientific usefulness. Fodgers (1954) stated that in its geologic use limestone has had, in general, two distinct meanings:
a. all rocks in which the mineral calcite and/or dolomite are the dominant constituents,
b. those rocks within group (a) in which ealcite predominated over dolomite.

The latter meaning has been in more common useage.
Rodgers (1954) made a survey of the opinions of several geologists to standardize the terminology of rocks composed of calcite and dolomite. As a result of this survey, he arrived at the following definition of limestone:

A sedimentary rock containing 50 percent of the minerals calcite (plus aragonite) and dolomite (including ankerite) in which calcite (plus aragonite) is more abundant than dolomite.

This survey also revealed that the term dolomite was generally accepted as the term applied to rocks dominated by the
mineral dolomite. Dolostone was preferred by some authors while others preferred dolomitic limestone or dolomite rock. The definition of dolomite according to Rodgers (1954) was as follows:

Dolomite (the rock) or dolostone--a sedimentary rock containing more than 50 percent of minerals calcite (plus aragonite) and dolomite (including ankerite) in which the mineral dolomite is more abundant than calcite.

Further subdivisions of limestone and dolomite may be made on the basis of the relative percentages of calcite and dolomite in the carbonate fraction (Rodgers, 1954 ; Pettijohn, 1957 ; Heinrich, 1956).

## Genetic Classification

Limestones may be formed by physical or chemical processes and, after deposition, they may be profoundly modified by diagenesis. They may be classified according to the method of accumulation of calcareous material. The method of accumulation and the classification according to Twenhofel (1950), p. 356, and Pettijohn (1957), pp. 393-4.11 is as follows:

Method of accumulation
Accumulation of calcareous shells and skeletal structures' formed in place.

Photosynthesis
Bacterial activity of denitrifying bacteria.

Evaporation
Loss of carbon-dioxide

## Twenhofel

Chemical organic

Chemical organic

Chemical Miscellaneous cheminorganic ical limestones

## Method of accumulation

Clastic limestones including transported and sorted shell fragments.

Limestones formed or modified by replacement and alteration.

## Twenhofel

Mechanical Allochthonous
A. Calcirudite
B. Calcarenite
C. Calcilutite

Dolomitic Metasomatic limestones limestones

Twenhofel (1950), p. 357, stated that most calcitic limestones (limestones in which calcite is the principle carbonate) are of organic origin. The precipitation of calcium carbonate by organic methods does not require a saturated solution.

Because of contrasting opinions concerning the origin of dolomitic limestones (metasomatic limestones) further mention should be made. The literature concerning this subject is extensive (Pettijohn, 1957, p. 421).

The replacement origin of dolomite is quite widely held. It is believed that the replacement is a metasomatic process in which the dolomite replaces the calcite volume for volume. If the replacement were molecule for molecule, there would be a 12 percent decrease in volume. Ramberg (1952), p. 230, in a discussion of metasomatism, stated that "there are no known possibilities for forming a primary sediment with the 50 percent of $\mathrm{MgCO}_{3}$ needed to give dolomite".

In contrast to this belief, Sloss (1953) and Chilingar
(1956) presented the concept that some dolomites may be primary. Chilingar presented evidence that the mineral dolomite may be precipitated directly out of sea water upon evaporation at high
carbon dioxide pressure.
Other authors have presented evidence to support the replacement origin of dolomite (Fairbanks, 1957).

Environment of Deposition

Limestones may develop in many environments. Twenhofel (1950), p. 355 , has written that calcareous sediments may be deposited in seas, lakes, rivers, and on the lands. The most widespread deposits occur on the bottom of the sea. Limestones may be produced and deposited in the same environment, or if detrital, may be produced in one enviromment and deposited in another. Factors which effect the deposition of calcareous material are temperature, circulation, and the entrance of argillaceous, arenace ous, and ferruginous materials from the lands (Twenhofel, 1950, p. 355). Sloss (1947), p. 109, divided the limestones into three categories on the basis of their depositional environment: (1) platform, (2) basin, and (3) geosynclinal.

## Chemical Composition of Limestones

The limestones are primarily calcite, therefore, the content of CaO and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is high. Another constituent which may be high is Mg0. If the amount of MgO exceeds one to two percent, there is a good possibility that the mineral dolomite is present (Pettijohn, 1957, p. 383).

The magnesium in limestones is a function of both the magnesium content of skeletal material of fossils and postdepositional
chemical changes. Clarke (Pettijohn, 1957, p. 383) found that the average limestone contains 7.90 percent MgO , equivalent of 16.5 percent $\mathrm{MgCO}_{3}$. Analyses have shown that most limestones contain less than four percent $\mathrm{MgCO}_{3}$ or more than 40 percent $\mathrm{MgCO}_{3}$. Most limestones are, therefore, very calcitic or very dolonitic.

An excess of silica indicates the presence of considerable amounts of detrital quartz or chert. Pettijohn (1957), p. 384, listed 2.55 and 7.41 percent as representative percentages.

If both alumina and silica are abnormally high, argillacee ous material would be a probable contaminating constituent. If argillaceous material is present, the amount of potash and combined water may also be abnormally high due to such minerals as illite.

Limestones may also be rich in other constituents such as phosphorous, iron oxide, or sulfide.

Pettijohn (1957), p. 384, lists the chemical analyses of several types of limestones. Runnels and Schleicher (1956) presented the chemical analyses of several eastern Kansas limestones.

## Mineralogy of Limestones

Minerals in sedimentary rocks may belong to one of two main groups: detrital or chemical (Pettijohn, 1957, p. 108). The detrital minerals are those which have been weathered from the source rock, transported, and deposited. The chemical minerals are those which have been precipitated by physical or organic
methods.
Pettijohn (1949) had previously used allogenic and authigenic to describe the two main classes of minerals. Allogenic minerals originate outside of the sediment and are transported to the place of deposition. Authigenic minerals, on the other hand, originate in the place where they are now found.

Detrital and Chemical Minerals Other Than Clays. In Table 1 the author has attempted to list and classify the more common minerals found in limestones according to Pettijohn (1957). The list of detrital minerals is not complete. Complete lists and descriptions of common detrital minerals have been compiled by Milner (1952) and Krumbein and Pettijohn (1938). The clay minerals have been purposely omitted from this table for separate discussion.

Clay Minerals in Limestones. Clay materials form one of the most common contaminates of carbonate rocks and are represented by material less than onemtwo hundredth of a millimeter (. 005 mm ) in size (size classification of United States Bureau of Soils). This clay material may include colloidal sized quartz, feldspar, and other minerals plus the clay minerals.

The clay minerals consist of extremely small particies of a limited number of erystalline minerals ( $\mathrm{Grim}, 2953$, p. 16). It was not until 1920 to 1925 that adequate research tools became available to positively identify the clay minerals. Several investigators have contributed to the fundamental worik on the clay mineral groups. Fundamental work on the kaolinite group has been

Table 1. Detrital and chemical minerals of limestones other than clays.

| Detrital : Chemical : Precipitate: |
| :---: |

## Carbonates

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Calcite } \\ \mathrm{CaCO}_{3} \end{array}$ | XXX | Forms the bulk of limestones. May be detrital (calcarenites). May also be an authigenic modification of aragonite. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dolomite } \\ & \operatorname{CaMg}\left(\mathrm{CO}_{3}\right)_{2} \end{aligned}$ | XXX | Intimately associated with calcite in limestones. Prom duct of postdepositional re* placement. (Refer to discussion of origin of dolo mitic limestones.) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Aragonite } \\ \mathrm{CaCO}_{3} \end{gathered}$ | XXX | Unstable form of $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$. occurs in pelecypod and gase tropod shells and some corals. Also occurs as minute needles. May be detrital in both cases. Alters to calcite in a short period of time. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Siderite } \\ \text { FeCo } \end{gathered}$ | XXX | Not common in limestones unless they have been "sideritized" |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ankerite } \\ & \mathrm{Ca}(\mathrm{Mg} \cdot \mathrm{Fe}) \quad\left(\mathrm{CO}_{3}\right)_{2} \end{aligned}$ | XXX | Often referred to as ferriferous dolomite. farely reported in limestones. |

Noncarbonates
Quartz
$\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$$\quad \mathrm{XX}$

Chalcedony
$\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$

X

Detrital quartz is usually rare in limestones except in arenaceous limestones. Chemically precipitated quartz may occur as secondaxy overgrowths on detrital quartz, as doubly terminated crystals. or it may be derived from the chalcedony of cherts.

Dominant constituent of most cherts. It is commonly fibrous.

Table 1. (concl.)

## Noncarbonates

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Opal } \\ & \text { SiO. nito } \end{aligned}$ | X | Dccurs in some cherts. It is amorphous silica. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feldspars XX | X | Detrital feldspar is a very minor constituent in most limestones. The authigenic feldspars usually take the form of minute euhedra or secondary growths on detrital grains. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Glauconite } \underset{\mathrm{KMg}(\mathrm{Fe}, \mathrm{Al})\left(\mathrm{SiO}_{3}\right)^{\prime} 6 \cdot 3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}{\text { (One of the illites.) }} \end{aligned}$ | X | Notable occurrence in clastic limestones. May al.so occur as an envelope on heavy grains. |
| Pyrite and Marcasite $\mathrm{FeS}_{2}$ | x | Minor constituent in most limestones. May occur as nodules, as scattered crysm tals or spherulites, and as disseminated grains. Both will undergo oxidation. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Celestite } \\ & \mathrm{SrSO}_{4} \end{aligned}$ | X | Present as authigenic mineral in some limestones. (Twiss, 1955.) |
| Collophane Tricalcium phosphate with variable composition | X | Occurs primarily as phosphatic skeletal debris and as oolites. |
| Volcanic Debris $X$ |  | Very minor constituent in <br> limestones. Volcanic ash and various forms of silica discussed by Wilbur (1956). |
| Organic matter --- | - | Found as a minor constituent in limestones. |

done by Ross and Kerr (1931); on the montmorillonite group by Ross and Heindricks ( 1945 ); the illite group by Grim, et. al., (1937) ; and the chlorites by Mac Ewan (1948).

Investigators of the clay minerals in recent years have been able to establish some relationship with respect to the clay minerals present in rocks and the environment of deposition, the age, and the lithology.

Millot (Grim, 1953, p. 351) has presented evidence that the calcium in an alkaline marine environment tends to block the formation of kaolinite. This environment tends to favor the formation of illite, montmorillonite, and chlorite. Millot found that illite was invariably present in sediments of marine origin.

Millot (Grim, 1953, p. 351) further showed that an environment of low cation content is more favorable for kaolinite, whereas a higher cation content favors montmorillonite.

Grim (1953), p. 356, stated that montmorillonite is generally absent in sediments older than Mesozoic. Volcanic ash falls which have altered to montmorillonite are responsible for the bentonites found in Mesozoic sediments. Grim explained the absence of montmorilionite in older sediments as the result of the collapse and dehydration of the montmorillonite structure with subsequent extraction of potassium and magnesium from the environment to become an 111ite-like clay.

Evidence has been presented, however, that montmorillonite is not restricted to Mesozoic and younger sediments. Hartig (1954), Swineford (1955), and McPherron (1956) have found
montmorillonite in Permian rocks in Kansas.
Studies of recent marine sediments by Grim, et. 21. (1949) and Murray and Harrison (1956) revealed that montmorillonite has widespread occurrence. Murray and Harrison found montmorillonite to be the dominent clay mineral in the Sigsbee Deep in the Gulf of Mexico.

The literature concerning the clay mineralogy of limestones is not extensive. One reason for this may be the solubility of some clay minerals in acid. It is frequently necessary to dissolve away the carbonates in order to concentrate the clay minerals to get adequate analytical data. Acid treatment was not used in the research reported in this thesis.

Grim, et. al. (1937) found in an analysis of 35 Paleozoic limestones that illite was present in all of them. Kaolinite was present in about one-half of the samples in minor amounts. The glycol method was not developed at the time of investigation and, therefore, no montmorillonite was reported.

Weaver (1956), in an analysis of over 6,000 sedimentary rock samples, has shown that randomly interstratified clays are abundant. He estimates that over 70 percent of the samples contain some variety of mixed-layer clay. Illite-montmorillonite and illite-chloritemontmorillonite are the most abundant and chlor-ite-montmorillonite and chlorite-vermiculite are common. Mixedlayer clays may form in all possible combinations of different layers (illite-montmorillonite, illite-chlorite, chlorite-montmorillonite, illite-chlorite-montmorillonite.)

AREA OF TNVESTIGATION

The limestone screenings were collected by the Limestone Aggregate Association in cooperation with the Kansas Geological Survey. They were collected from eleven selected quarry sites which were located generally in the eastern third of Kansas. Limestones which are suitable for engineering and industrial uses are readily available in this portion of Kansas. The Permian and Pennsylvanian limestones are exposed at the surface in this section of Kansas making them accessible for quarrying operations.

The locations of each quarry site and the stratigraphic units are listed in Table 2. The sample number designations had the prefix "DR 160 " which has been omitted in this thesis.

Table 2. Location of quarries and limestone units being quarried.

| Sample Number | : Member or : : Formation*: | System | Land Description | County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | Herington | Permian | Sec.12, T16S, R4E | Dickinson |
| 101 | Herington | Permian | Sec.17, T2S, R4E | Washington |
| 57 | Cresswell | Permian | Sec. 6, T20s, R4E | Marion |
| 31 | Towanda | Permian | Sec. 24, Tlos, R4E | Geary |
| 8 | Fort Rlley | Permian | Sec. 10, T29S, R4E | Butler |
| 9 | Neva. | Permian | Sec. $31, \mathrm{Tl} 9 \mathrm{~S}$, R8E | Chase |
| 43 | Topeka* | Pennsylvanian | Sec. $27, \mathrm{~T} 8 \mathrm{~S}, \mathrm{R} 16 \mathrm{E}$ | Jackson |
| 70 | Oread* | Pennsylvanian | Sec. $3,218 s$, R16E | Osage |
| 23 | Stoner | Pennsylvanian | Sec. $20, T 135, \mathrm{R} 21 \mathrm{~F}$ | Douglas |
| 30 | Capt.Creek | Pennsylvanian | Sec. 6, T17S, R19E | Franklin |
| 105 | Bethany Falls | s Pennsylvanian | Sec. $27 . \mathrm{TLIS.R24E}$ | Wyandotte |

## LABORATORY PROCBDURE

## Preparation of Samples for Microscopic Study

Since limestones are largely calcite or dolomite, the remaining constituents must be concentrated for study. The noncarbonate constituents may be concentrated by leaching the limestone sample with hydrochloric acid. That material which is not soluble in hydrochloric acid is referred to as "insoluble residue ${ }^{11}$.

Leaching. The samples were quartered to obtain a representative fraction of each limestone sample. Crushing was unnecessary for the samples represented limestone screenings. Two hundred grams of the quartered sample were placed in a one-gallon glass jar for leaching. To reduce the initial reaction with the acid, enough distilled water was added to cover the sample in the bottom of the container. Chemically pure hydrochloric acid was used for leaching the sample. The result of this leaching action was the break-down of the carbonates into water soluble chlorides, carbon dioxide, and the solution of some of the clay fraction.

Hydrochloric acid was added gradually until all effervescence ceased. During the addition of acid, it was frequently necessary to add distilled water to prevent the solution from effervescing over the top of the container. After all effervescence ceased, the acid solution was diluted and the insoluble residue was allowed to settle to the bottom. The acid solution was then decanted and distilled water added to wash the unused acid and
water soluble material from the residue. The water was later decanted and distilled water added again until four washings had been completed.

Separation and Sizing Insoluble Residue. After final decantation, the residue was wet-screened through a U. S. \#270 screen ( 53 microns). The residue which was collected on this sereen was waṣhed thoroughly to remove clay-sized particles which may hinder mineral identification. The clay size and fine to medium silt size particles which passed through the screen were dried and weighed.

The coarser material (greater than 53 microns) which was collected on the screen was washed into a 500 milliliter beaker and allowed to settle to the bottom. After settling, the excessive water was decanted. The residue was then transferred to a small electric oven to dry.

After drying, the insoluble residue was screened again using a U. S. 120 screen ( 125 microns). The material greater than 125 microns in size was weighed and then placed in labeled bottles and later used in the coarse residue analysis. The material less than 125 microns and greater than 53 microns in size was used in the heavy mineral separation.

Heavy Mineral Separation. Bromoform with a specific gravity of 2.7 was used as the separating medium. The apparatus for heavy mineral separation consisted of two conical funnels, one mounted above the other. The upper funnel was fitted with a hose and pinchcock to prevent the escape of bromoform. The lower
funnel was equipped with a filter paper to collect the mineral grains from the bromoform. Two such funnels were needed, one for the collection of heavy minerals and a second for the collection of light mineral grains. The upper funnel was filled with bromoform and a wetch glass placed over the top to prevent evaporation. The sample was heated prior to placing it in the bromoform. The purpose of heating was to remove absorbed moisture which may decrease the accuracy of the heavy mineral separation. The dried sample was placed in the bromoform and stirred every 15 minutes for two hours. It was then allowed to stand for one hour before filtration.

After filtration, the residue was washed three times; first with a bromoform-ethyl alcohol solution and twice with ethyl alcohol. The filter papers containing the heavy and light mineral. grains were folded and set aside to air dry. Arter drying, the residue was weighed to determine the approximate weights of each fraction.

Preparation of Slides. Canada balsam with an index refraction of 1.53 was used as the mounting medium. A small electric heater was used to heat the glass slide, cover glass, and balsam. The balsam was placed on the glass slide and heated until it reached the proper consistency. The proper consistency was determined by withdrawing a drop of balsam on a dissecting needle, allowing it to cool, and then pressing the thumbnail against it. The balsam was the proper consistency if it was firm and did not stick to the thumbnail.

After the balsam had reached the proper consistency, the mineral grains were sprinkled uniformly over the balsam and covered with a cover glass. The slide was then removed from the heater and allowed to cool. The slides were labeled with the sample number and a notation "heavy" or "light" to denote the heavy and light minerals.

Petrographic Study. The heavy and light minerals were identified with a petrographic microscope. A mechanical stage was used to traverse the slide. Minerals requiring more exact identification were placed in immersion oils and the indices of refraction determined by the Becke line method.

Two hundred grains or more were counted on each slide to determine the mineral frequency, which was expressed as a percentage of the total grains counted on each slide.

Binocular Microscope study. The coarse residue greater than 125 microns in size was examined with a binocular microm scope to determine the relative amount of each of the constituents.

Preparation of Clay-Size Material for X-ray Analysis

One of the problems in the laboratory preparation of limestone samples for clay mineral studies was the possible loss or modification of some of the clay minerals during the extraction of the carbonates with hydrochloric acid. Nontronite and hectorite of the montmorillonite group are soluble in hydrochloric acid. Chlorite may also be soluble if treated with warm
hydrochloric acid. Because of the solubility of these clay minerals in acid, no attempt was made to extract the carbonates by acid treatment. There are two possible disadvantages to this procedure; (1) the colloidal-size quartz and calcite may disrupt the preferred orientation of the clay minerals and (2) the claysize material may have to be concentrated to get adequate analytical data.

Separation of Clay Fraction From Limestone Samples. The limestone sample was crushed and sieved through a 0 . S. \#200 screen ( 74 microns). Two hundred grams of the sample less than 74 microns in size was used in this procedure.

The sample was disaggregated with a Waring Blender using 80 milliliters of sodium silicate and 400 milliliters of distilled water. The sample was agitated for 15 minutes in a Waring Blender. In one case, the Oread limestone sample, additional sodium silicate had to be added to get complete disaggregation.

The dispersed sample was then transferred to a sedimentation tube and distilled water added until the total volume reached 1,000 milliliters. The sedimentation tube was placed in a constant temperature bath, the temperature at approximately 20 degrees centigrade. The settling time allowed for the first separation was 12 hours for each 10 centimeters of settling distance. After 36 hours the upper 30 centimeters were siphoned from the tube and stored in a one-gallon glass jug. That portion of the sample in the bottom of the sedimentation tube was placed in the Waring Blender, agitated for one minute, and transferred back to
the sedimentation tube. The same procedure was followed for the second separation with the exception of the settling time which was reduced to 24 hours for the upper 30 centimeters. After 24 hours of settling time, the upper 30 centimeters were siphoned from the tube and placed in the one-gallon glass jar with the previously siphoned suspension. The material in the suspension siphoned from the upper 30 centimeters of the sedimentation tubes was taken as a representative fraction of the clay-size material. oriented slides. Oriented aggregates of the clay-size material were made by placing a small amount of the suspended material on a glass microscope slide with an eye dropper. The suspension was allowed to air dry under room conditions. Upon drying, the basal surfaces of clay minerals were oriented with the suxface of the slide. This orientation will give basal reflections in $X$-ray diffraction analysis.

Using the procedure outlined, it was found that colloidal sized quartz and calcite did not disrupt the preferred orientations of the slides. It was found, however, that in some cases the suspension had to be condensed to obtain more intense peaks on the $X$-ray diffraction pattern. The samples were condensed by placing a small amount of the suspension in an open beaker and evaporating the water with heat lamps. The condensed suspension was used in making oriented slides. The slides made of the condensed samples gave more intense peaks on the $X$-ray diffraction pattern.
$X-r a y$ Method. Identification of the clay minerals present
in the samples was done by X -ray diffraction using a North American Phillips diffraction unit. Nickel filtered copper radiation was used with a one degree slit system, rate meter scale factor of 400 , time constant of four seconds at 20 milliamps and 40 kilo volts. The scanning speed was one-fourth degree two theta per minute. The oriented slides were examined from 30 degrees two theta to three degrees two theta.

After being examined through this angular distance, the oriented slide was treated with ethylene glycol which was applied with a small atomizer. Ethylene glycol will form an organic complex with montmorillonite causing the basal spacings to expand to 17.7 angstroms. After the glycol treatment, the diffraction pattern was recorded from 15 degrees two theta to four degrees two theta. This range included the (OOL) of illite, kaolinite, and montmorillonite in its expanded position, and the (001) and the (002) reflections of chlorite and vermiculite.

The diffraction patterns obtained from these two runs were recorded on a strip chart in degrees two theta. This unit of measurement was converted to d-spacings using "Tables for Conversion of $X$-ray Diffraction Angles to Interplanar Spacings". The d-spacings were then compared with known and theoretical spacings of minerals which may occur in the clay-size range.

## DOLOMITE IN HIGH MANESIUM LIMESTONE SAMPLES

The chemical analysis of the limestone screenings was made by the state Geological Survey of Kansas in association with the

Limestone Aggregate Association. This analysis revealed that samples 101 (Herington), 43 (Topeka), 30 (Captain Creek) contained relatively high percentages of Mgo (refer to Table 3). Two methods were used to determine if the magnesium was present in the form of dolomites (1) staining tests and (2) $\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{ray}$ analysis.

## Stain Test

The staining test used was the method described by otto (Krumbein and Pettijohn, 1938, p. 496) as most reliable. A 10 percent solution of silver nitrate and a neutral solution of pom tassium chromate ( $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CrO}_{4}$ ) were used. Distilled water was used for both solutions. A ground surface of a known calcite sample was treated with the silver nitrate for three minutes. The sample wąs then washed carefully with distilled water to remove the nitrate. The washed sample was immersed in the neutral solution of potassium chromate for about one minute and washed again. This staining test colored the calcite a red-brown color. Dolom mite, or aragonite if present, will not be colored by this staining method.

A small fragment from sample 101, the Herington limestone from Washington County, was ground to have a flat surface and submitted to this staining procedure. The resulting color was a light reddish-tan, much lighter in color than the known calcite sample. This would indicate that there may be dolomite present. The stained fragment was examined closely under the binocular

Table 3. Chemical analysis of limestone screenings ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Sample No. | : Fm.or: Calc.:: Mbr. : $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calc.: Calc.: } \\ & \mathrm{MgCO}_{3} \mathrm{CaCoquiv}^{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | : Chemical analysis, percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | CaO: | MgO: | L. O.1. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ : | $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ : | $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}^{\mathrm{d}}$ : | $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ : | $: \mathrm{SO}_{3}$ | $S^{e}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ | :Total |
| 21 | ${ }_{\text {Hering }}^{\text {fon }}$ - 77.33 | 3.39 | 81.30 | 43.47 | 1.85 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.67 \\ 0.43 \\ 35.77 \end{array}$ | 13.86 | 2.06 | 0.94 | 0.34 | 0.17 | 0.10 | Nil | 0.03 | 100.23 |
| 101 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hering- } 43.85 \\ & \text { ton } \end{aligned}$ | 33.55 | 83.61 | 24.66 | 16.26 | $\begin{gathered} 0.71 \\ 0.48 \\ 36.79 \end{gathered}$ | 14.49 | 3.06 | 1.90 | 0.62 | 0.24 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 99.31 |
| 57 | Cress-84.56 wells | 1.19 | 85.91 | 47.48 | 0.44 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.46 \\ 0.55 \\ 37.80 \end{array}$ | 9.72 | 1.96 | 0.66 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 99.58 |
| 31 | Towanda 87.67 | 1.90 | 89.86 | 49.25 | 0.08 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.63 \\ 0.33 \\ 39.54 \end{array}$ | 5.91 | 1.60 | 0.92 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.11 | NiI | 0.04 | 99.56 |
| 8 | Fr.Riley 79.83 | 1.19 | 81.18 | 44.91 | 1.15 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.74 \\ 0.49 \\ 35.72 \end{array}$ | 12.52 | 2.75 | 1.12 | 0.56 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 100.27 |
| 9 | Neva 86.08 | 0.73 | 86.89 | 48.35 | 0.32 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.62 \\ 0.38 \\ 38.23 \end{array}$ | 9.87 | 1.01 | 0.61 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.05 | Nil | 0.04 | 99.62 |
| 43 | Topeka 71.23 | 7.34 | 79.89 | 40.04 | 3.50 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.75 \\ 0.52 \\ 35.15 \end{array}$ | 12.36 | 3.25 | 3.13 | 0.54 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 99.56 |
| 70 | Oread 75.69 | 4.02 | 80.41 | 42.66 | 1.96 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.70 \\ 0.60 \\ 35.38 \end{array}$ | 11.89 | 3.07 | 2.07 | 0.49 | 0.16 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 99.28 |
| 23 | Stoner 84.81 | 2.93 | 88.23 | 47.62 | 1.49 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.29 \\ 0.30 \\ 38.82 \end{array}$ | 7.59 | 1.84 | 1.28 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 99.71 |
| 30 | Captain 73.44 Creek | 6.61 | 81.18 | 41.34 | 3.49 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.39 \\ 0.50 \\ 35.74 \end{array}$ | 11.73 | 3.34 | 2.31 | 0.55 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 99.79 |
| 105 | Bethany 87.74 Falls | 2.20 | 90.30 | 49.20 | 1.45 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.26 \\ 0.39 \\ 39.73 \end{array}$ | 6.48 | 1.52 | 0.83 | 0.23 | 0.11 | Trace | 0.10 | 0.03 | 100.23 |

a. Chemical analysis made by State Geological Survey of Kansas
b. Loss on ignition from $105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $1000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

Top figure $105 \% 550^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
Middle figure $550 \% 600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
Bottom figure $600 \% 1000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (represents $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ )
c. Contains $\mathrm{TiO}_{2} \quad \mathrm{MnO}_{2}$ etc, if present
d. Total iron expressed as ferric oxide
e. Sulfide sulfur, reported in L.O.I.
microscope for unstained dolomite crystals. The small crystal size precluded the identification of dolomite crystals with the binocular microscope.

A test was made to determine the depth of staining. A stained fragment was polished using a dampened ground glass surface. One stroke across the glass was sufficient to remove most of the stain from the ground surface of the sample.

## X-ray Analysis

An X-ray analysis was made of samples 101,43 , and 30 to dem termine if dolomite was present. To prepare the sample for $X-r a y$ analysis, the sample was crushed and screened through a U. S. \#325 screen ( 44 microns). The material less than 44 microns in size was used in preparing an unoriented slide for X-ray analysis.

The unoriented sample was examined from 35 degrees two theta to 26 degrees two theta and the reflections were recorded on a strip chart in degrees two theta. This unit of measurement was converted to d-spacings and compared with known and theoretical d-spacings of common carbonate minerals. Sample 101, the Herington 11 mestone from Washington County, contained an abundance of dolorite with little or no calcite. Sample 43, the Topeka limestone, and sample 30 , the Captain Creek limestone, contained both calcite and dolomite with calcite being more abundant. The dolow mite-calcite ratio was not determined in this investigation, but may be determined by applying the method outlined by Tennant and Berger (1957).

## nonmearbonate mineralogy other than clays

## Heavy Minerals

Pyrite, celestite, and limonite were the most abundant minerals in the heavy mineral fraction of the limestone samples studied. No attempt was made to remove the limonite during the laboratory procedure. Magnetite, muscovite, biotite, chlorite, tourmaline, rutile, hornblende, epidote, zircon, zoisite, garnet, and corundum were present in minor amounts. Chalcedony and quartz were present in the heavy mineral fraction as coated grains.

Pyrite. Pyrite is an iron-disulfide $\left(\mathrm{FeS}_{2}\right)$ which is opaque and has a uniform, pale brass-yellow, metallic luster under reflected light. Marcasite is another iron-disulfide quite similar to pyrite, but differing in crystal habit. No attempt was made to distinguish between pyrite and marcasite in this investigation.

Pyrite, in the samples studied, occurred in several forms; as euhedral crystals, as a composite of small equidimensional crystals, as pyritized Possil fragments, as coatings on chalcedony and quartz grains, and in nodular form coating unidentified grains. The quartz grains which were coated with pyrite commonly exhibited wavy extinction in polarized light.

Celestite. Celestite is strontium sulfate ( $\mathrm{SrSO}_{4}$ ) with the following optical properties: biaxial positive, birefringence of .009, interference color white to straw yellow, and indices of
refraction greater than Canada balsam. The celestite occurred as cleavage fragments and as clay-coated grains. It was very commonly coated with a cryptocrystalline material which was tan in color. The author interpreted this material to be clay-size material which had been colored by ilmonite stain.

Limonite. Limonite is a hydrous ironooxide $\left(\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{nH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ and is an alteration product of iron-bearing minerals. It is commonly referred to as an amorphous mineral, but Winchell and Winchell (1951), p. 80, points out that much of it is actually eryptocrystalline goethite ( $\mathrm{aFe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ).
himonite was found in the limestone samples as hard, concretionary masses, soft, porous particles, and as a coating on other mineral grains. All stages of alteration were noted between pyrite and limonite and, in some cases, the limonite was pseudomorphous after pyrite. Pyrite seemed to be the principle source of the iron for limonite. The limonite coated grains listed in Table 4 represent grains which were coated to the extent that mineral identification of the coated grain could not be made.

Chlorite. Samples 21, the Herington limestone from Dickinson County, and 31, the Towanda limestone, contained mineral grains which were subrounded, platy, isotropic-appearing, and green to slight brownish-green. The indices of refraction were determined using immersion oils and the Becke Line method. The index of refraction of the grains which were green and more iso-tropic-appearing was approximately 1.62. The brownish-green
grains had a higher index of refraction, but never exceeded 1.65. In one case a brownish-green grain which was partially isotropic was observed to have a biaxial negative interference figure with a low 2 V . Reference was made to the classification of the varieties of chlorite on the basis of optical properties by Winchell and Winchell, (1951), p. 382. It was found that several varieties of chlorite may have birefringence of .000 which would make them isotropic-appearing.

The chlorite present in other limestone samples did not exhibit this low birefringence.

Hornblende. The Neva and Towanda limestone samples contained mineral grains which possessed all of the optical properties of hornblende except for the extinction angle, which was less than 12 degrees. These grains were brown to green-brown and were deeply pleochroic. They were listed in Table 4 as hornblende.

## Light Minerals

The light mineral fraction of the samples studied was predominantly chalcedony with quartz, plagioclase, or thoclase, and microcline in minor amounts. The chalcedony was colorless to yellow and was observed to have the characteristic aggregate polarization in polarized light.

The quartz was subdivided on the basis of extinction characteristics in polarized light. The subdivisions were quartz with wavy extinction and quartz with snappy extinction. The quartz grains observed in the petrographic analysis did not have
secondary overgrowths.
In samples in which the type of plagioclase could be determined, it was found to be the sodampich variety. Only one example was found of a feldspar grain showing secondary overgrowth; that was in the sample from the Cresswell 11 mestone.

## Coarse Residue

The most common constituent of the coarse residue was chalcedony which occurred as irregular fragments and as replaced skeletal structures. The Echnoid and Crinoid skeletal structures were common as chalcedonic fossil fragments.

Numerous particles with lace-like structure were noted in the coarse residue. These particles were interpreted as networks of siliceous and calcareous material. The calcareous material had been removed by acid leaching leaving a lace-like structure of siliceous material.

Organic residue was present in the coarse residue in all samples except the Fort Riley limestone. It was generally the case that samples containing greater quantities of organic residue also contained pyrite. All stages of alteration from pyrite to limonite were noted and pseudomorphs of 1 imonite after pyrite were common.

The Stoner limestone contained an abundance of detrital quartz. The quartz grains were well-sorted, subrounded, with a frosted surface. The frosted surface indicated that the grains had either been etched by wind erosion or etched by solution bew
fore or after deposition. The quartz grains present in the other samples were subrounded and well-sorted, but generally did not have frosted surfaces.

Table 4. Summary of heavy mineral analysis of insoluble residue in the size range from 53-125 microns. ${ }^{3}$


The heavy mineral fraction was less than five-tenths of one percent of the total weight.

Table 5. Sumary of light mineral anelysis of insoluble residue in the size range from $53-125$ microns.


Table 6. Sumary of coarse residue analysis of insoluble residue greater than 125 microns in size.


Scale of abundances Major, $X X X, X X, X$, Trace.

## CLAY MINERALOGY OF LIMESTONE SAMPLES

## X-Ray Analysis of the Clay-Size Fraction

The bulk of the clay minerals in the samples studied were three-layer silicates (montmorillonite, illite, and chlorite). X -ray identification of these clay minerals is based largely upon the variation in spacings of the reflections. Different interlayer components will occupy different volumes producing differences in the c-axis periodicities (basal reflections). The $X$-ray diffraction patterns of the oriented slides were recorded as basal reflections.

Illite was the most abundant clay mineral present in the limestone samples. It was abundant in all samples except sample 9, the Neva limestone, in which clay size calcite was the dominant component. Illite was identified on the basis of the characteristic $10-\mathrm{A}$ peak and other reflections of a $10-\mathrm{A}$ periodicity which remained unchanged after glycolation.

Chlorite was present in many of the samples and was identified by an integral series of basal reflections from $14-\mathrm{A}$. Chlorite, when identified by $X$-ray analysis, may be confused with kaolinite, montmorillonite, and vermiculite. The chlorite found in this investigation was commonly the iron-rich variety with weak first and third order reflections and strong second and fourth order reflections. The second and fourth order reflections at 7 A and $3.5-\mathrm{A}$ respectively, correspond to the first and second order reflections of kaolinite. Heat treatment was used to
distinguish between the two. Heating to 450 degrees centigrade for one hour resulted in the disappearance of the reflections of a $14-A$ periodicity. This indicated that kaolinite was not present in the limestone ssmples studied. Kaolinite, if present, will withstand heat treatment up to 600 degrees centigrade. Chlorite was distinguished from montmorillonite by glycolation treatment. Montmorillonite basal reilections expand when glycolated, whereas chlorite spacings are unaffected. Recently a swelling chlorite has been reported which has made the distinction between chlorite and montmorillonite more difficult (Brindley, 1951; Lippman, 1956). Brindley (1951), p. 116, however, has pointed out that the common types of chlorite do not show this swelling behavior.

Chlorite may be distinguished from vermiculite by the differences in the intensities of the basal reflections. The $14-\mathbb{A} r e$ flections of vermiculite is strong and subsequent reflections weaker. The basal reflections of chlorite may be of equal intensity except for iron-rich varieties.

Weaver (1956) pointed out the widespread occurrence of mixed-layer clays. Relatively stable mixed-layer structures may form because of the structural similarity of many of the clay minerals. There are several ways in which the mixed-layer structures may occur (Brindley, 1951, p. 66): (1) the existence of two different degrees of hydration, i.e., a mixture of micamtype layers with montmorillonoid-or vermiculite-type layers, (2) having
brucitelike layers mixed with mica-type layers, or layers of water molecules, i.e., in mixed vermiculite-chlorite structures, or (3) having two successive montmorillonoid "hydrates". There are three ways in which the layers may be distributed in mixedlayer clays: (1) regularly, (2) randomly, and (3) segregated into zones in the crystallites. The mixed-layer structures in the limestone samples studied in this investigation were ideritified as regularly interlayered chlorite and vermiculitemchlorite and randomly interlayered illite-montmorillonite, illite-chlorite, and chloritemvermiculite.

The mixed-layer clays gave reflections which were averages of the component clay minerals which were present. The regular mixed-layer was distinguished from the random mixed-1ayer by determining if the reflections from the (001) planes formed an integral or non-integral series. The regular mixed-layer will give a high spacing reflection and a series of sharp, higher order reflections which form an integral series. The random mixed-layer clays will give spacings which do not form an integral series.

Chlorite was identified as a regular mixed-layer clay mineral with an integral series of reflections from $14-A$ ( $\mathrm{Grim}, 1953$, p. 27). The mixed-layer structure of chlorite consists of alternating mica-like and brucite-like layers.

A random interlayering of illite-montmorillonite was recognized by the change in symmetry of the 10 m peak before and after glycolation. The X-ray spectrometer tracings in Plate II show this change in symmetry. The $10-\mathbb{A}$ peak before glycolation was
quite asymmetrical and became more symmetrical after glycolation. This was interpreted as a result of expansion of the montmorillonite layers in the interlayered structure. There are, however, other irregularities which may also cause some asymmetry of the 10 a peak, i.e., degraded illite or water layers interpolated between the illite sheets. There was also the possibility that a small amount of chlorite may be interlayered with illite causing some modification which would persist after glycolation.

Mixed-layer illite-chlorite was recognized by shoulders on the $10-\mathbb{A}$ peak which failed to expand after glycolation. In some cases distinct peaks were not present, but an asymmetrical 10-A peak persisted after glycolation. As previously mentioned, this may indicate a small amount of chlorite interlayered with illite. Plate III shows the $10-\AA$ peak of a sample containing interlayered illitewchlorite.

Mixed-layer clays with a $14-\mathrm{A}$ spacing which expanded to 15.5-A after glycolation were identified as vermiculite-chlorite. X-ray spectrometer tracings of samples containing mixed-layer vermiculite-chlorite are shown in Plates IV and V. A quantitative evaluation may be made by comparing the intensities of the $14.2-\mathrm{A}$ and 7.1-A peaks, but this method is subject to error because the intensity of the $14.2-\mathrm{A}$ and 7.1-A peaks of chlorite may vary with composition. For example, if iron-rich chlorite were present in the mixed-layer structure, a comparison of the $14.2-A$ and 7.1-A peaks would indicate a greater abundance of chlorite than was actually present.

In the X-ray spectrometer tracings shown in Plates IV and $V$, the $14.2-A$ peaks are much more intense than the $7.1-A$ peaks and indicated that vermiculite was the dominant component of the mixed-layer structure. There was evidence from the shift of the 7.1-A peak after glycolation that these structures were regularly interstratified.

The Fort Riley 1imestone contained on interlayered structures with a doublet at $13.18-\mathrm{A}$ and 13.80 A . The $\mathrm{X}-$ ray spectrometer tracings are shown in Plate VI. After glycolation, there was a broad peak at 16.35 A which was identified as montmorill-onite-illite. A quantitative determination based on the amount of expansion indicated that this mixed clay was approximately 70 percent montmorillonite and 30 percent illite. The 14.48-A shoulder was identified as chlorite-vermiculite.

Two common non-clay minerals present in the clay-size range were quartz and calcite. Quartz was identified by the 4.2-A ree flections. The $3.35-\mathbb{A}$ reflection of quartz occurred as a modification of the (003) reflection of illite. Calcite was identified by a 3.03 -A reflection.

## EXPLANATION OF PLATE I

X-ray spectrometer tracings of sample 9, the Neva limestone from Chase County, showing the weak 10 m peak and randomly interlayered illite-montmorillonite $e_{\circ}$


## EXPLANATION OF PLATE IT

X-ray spectrometer tracings of sample 70, the Oread limestone, showing the change in symmetry of the 10 mA peak produced by glycolation. This plate also shows the relative intensities of the 14.24 mA and 7.13 mA peaks of iron-rich chlorite.


## EXPLANATTON OF PLATE ILI

Xesay spectrometer tracings of sample 101, the Herington limestone Erom Washington County, showing interlayered 1111techlorite. The expansion of 1111tew montmorillonite aftes glycolation has obscured the 14.24 a a peak.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PLaTE | III |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SAMPLE | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## EXPLANATION OF PLATE IV

X-ray spectrometer tracings of sample 21 , the Herington limestone from Dickinson County, showing the shift of the $14.24-A$ and 13.59 mA peaks after glycolation.


## EXPLANATION OF PLATE V

X-ray spectrometer tracings of sample 57, the Cresswell limestone, showing the shift of the $24.24-\mathrm{A}$ peak after glycolation. This plate also shows an indistinct peak at 17.76 A after glycolation.
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## EXPLANATION OF PLATE VI

X-ray spectrometer tracings of sample 8 , the Fort Riley limestone, showing the shift of $13.80-A$ and $13.18 \times$ A peaks after glycolation.
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Table 7. Sumary of the components of the claymsize fraction from limestone samples.
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## Genesis of Clay Minerals

The clay minerals found in the limestone samples were threelayer clay minerals which are characteristic of sediments that accumulated in an alkaline marine environment. Since the alkaline marine environment favored the preservation of three-layer clay minerals, there was the possibility of some three-layer clay minerals existing as allogenic or detrital minerals. Powers, (1954), p. 73, reported illite being transported as a well crystallized mineral and Grim and Johns (1954), p. 101, reported well-crystallized chloritic clay minerals as detrital.

The authigenic olay minerals are believed to have formed as a result of two processes (Murray, 1954, p. 63). The first is the formation of clay minerals from detrital skeletal aluminum silicate sheet structures. These structures are comparable to what Grim (1953), p. 351, referred to as "degraded illite and degraded chloritic mica". These degraded structures, which may be intrcduced into the marine environment as land-derived sediments, are partially leached of their constituent alkalies and alkaline earths during weathering and transportation. The leaching, however, is not sufficient to transform these structures into new minerals. These degraded structures have a strong negative charge and may utilize available potassium and magnesium ions in the salt water environment to build clay minerals. The second process involves the concentration and floculation of colloids of silica and aluminum hydroxide. This flocoulant
may form a loose colloidal sediment which may adsorb many cations, but only those cations which ifit into the clay structure are retained. Studies of recent marine sediments has revealed that montmorillonite is a common constituent and Marray (1954), p. 65, has pointed out that the poorly crystalline montmorillonite may represent the first stage in the formation of clay minerals from silica and aluminum colloids.

Authigenic illite may have formed from the degraded clay structures and from montmorillonite. The adsorption and fixation of potassium ions between the unit layers of degraded structures, particularly degraded illite, would have perfected the mica-like structure. The formation of lllite from montmorilionite may have been a slow process involving the dehydration and collapse of the montmorilionite structure after burial and subsequent adsorption of potassium and magnesium ions. Studies of recent marine sediments have revealed that the initial adsorption of potassium and magnesium may occur shortly after introduction into the marine environment. The process may heve, therefore, involved the initial adsorption of potassium ions with subsequent collapse of the structure during compaction. Intermediate stages in the dehydram tion and fixation of potassium ions in the interlayer position may have resulted in the illite-montmorillonite mixed-layers Which were common in this investigation.

Authigenic chlorite may form from montmorillonite (Murray, 1954 , p. 65), degraded illite (Powers, 1954, p. 73), degraded chlorite, and kaolinite (Grim, 1953, p. 352). The authigenic
chlorite may have formed from montmorillonite and the degraded clay structures by the interlayer adsorption of magnesium and hydroxyl ions as brucite sheets. The precipitation of brucite sheets in the interlayer space of montmorillonite has been accomplished under laboratory conditions (Grim and Johns, 1954, p. 101).

Kaolinite was absent in the limestone samples investigated and its absence may have been the result of diagenetic processes which transformed it to chlorite. Grim (1953), p. 351, has stated that the presence of calcium ions may block the formation of kaolinite. The rate of accumulation may have been an important factor explaining the absence of kaolinite. If the rate of accumulation of the sediments were rapid, kaolinite might have persisted in an environment which was unfavoreble. The slower rate of accumulation of the limestones probably resulted in the formation of chlorite from kaolinite. Grim and Johns (1954), p. 101, have stated that the process involves the shifting of every other silicon sheet and the replacement of some aluminum by magnesium ions within the structure.

The presence of iron-rich chlorite in the limestone samples investigated indicated that the chlorite was exposed to solutions containing iron. The presence of authigenic pyrite in some cases also indicates the presence of iron. Substitutions of ferrous iron for magnesium and ferric iron for aluminum in the octahedral sheets may have transformed the chlorita to the iron-rich variety,

The amount of chlorite formed and its degree of crystallinity
may have been, in part, a function of the magnesium in solution and the ratio of well-crystallized clay structures to degraded clay structures and montmorillonite. There was a notable relationship between the low Mgo content in the chemical analysis and the absence of chlorite in the clay-size fraction. The poorly crystalline nature of the chlorite was probably caused by poorly developed brucite sheets.

The presence of organic residue may also have been an important factor determining the degree of crystallinity of chlorite. Grim and Johns (1954), p. 101, have written that "in the presence of organic material, it would be expected that some organic molecules would be absorbed between the montmorillonite layers blocking the adsorption of the inorganic cations". This may be a possible explanation for the poor crystallinity of the chlorite in the limestone samples.

The limestone samples studied in this investigation which contained relatively larger amounts of chlorite also contained pyrite, more organic material, and a greater amount of insoluble residue less than 53 mierons in size. The chemical analysis showed that these samples contained 1.96 percent MgO or more.

Grim and Johns (1954) found in a study of recent marine sediments in the Rockport, Texas area that the greatest abundance of chlorite occurred in an environment in which the magnesium content of the interstitial waters was relatively high and the pH relatively low. The lower pH was correlated with high organic content. Rowland (1952), p. 225, has reported that the
precipitation of brucite layers between the layers of fragmentary montmorillonite-1ike material may indicate a silica-poor, reducing environment. The association of chlorite with pyrite and organic residue, may therefore be a notable relationship.

The precipitation of magnesium hydroxide between layers of fragmentary montmorillonite-like structures, such as vermiculite, may have formed the vermiculite-chlorite mixed-layer structures. These structures may also have formed in a silica-poor, reducing environment (Rowland, 1952, p. 225). The association of chlorite With pyrite and organic residue may indicate that it was formed In an reducing environment, but the abundance of chalcedony would indicate that the environment may not have been silica-poor.

The illite-chlorite mixed-layers may have formed by the interlayer adsorption of magnesium and hydroxyl ions in degraded illite structures or by the interlayer adsorption of potassium Ions in degraded chlorite structures. The mixed layer structure of 1111temchlorite may have also formed by the partisl interlayer adsorption of $\mathrm{Mg}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$ in montmorillonite with subsequent collapse of the structure.

## SUMMARY

The non-carbonate mineralogy of samples of limestone screenings was determined by petrographic analysis, binocular microscope study, and X-ray diffraction. A mineral frequency determination was made of the insoluble residue in the size range from 53 to 125 microns. The most abundant minerals in this size range
were pyrite, celestite, limonite, and chalcedony. Minerals present in minor amounts were magnetite, muscovite, biotite, chlorite, tourmaline, rutile, hornblende, epidote, zircon, garnet, corundum, quartz, plagioclase, orthoclase, and microcline. The quantity of insoluble residue examined in the petrographic analysis represented less than two percent of the total weight of samm ple used.

Signigicant constituents of the coarse residue greater than 125 microns in size included pyritized and silicified fossil Pragments and organic residue.

There was considerable variation in the amount of Mgo in the samples. Larger percentages of Mgo was accompanied by larger percentages of $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$.

The carbonate mineralogy of the Herington (Washington County), Topeks, and Captain Creek limestones was determined. These samples contained the highest percentages of MgO. The Herington limestone from Washington County was nearly all dolomite. The chemical analysis revealed that Herington limestone sample from Dickinson County was nearly all calcite. The Topeka and Captain Creek limestones contained both calcite and dolomite with calcite far more abundant.

The clay-size material was not concentrated by acid leaching of the carbonates because of loss or possible modification of some of the montmorillonites and chlorite. The clay-size Praction, including clay-size calcite, was extracted by gravity sedimentation. The presence of clay-size calcite did not disrupt the
preferred orientation of the clay mineralse
Illite was the most abundant clay mineral and was present in every sample. The Neva limestone from Chase County contained the least amount of illite. Quantitatively, this sample contained the least amount of insoluble residue less than 53 microns in size and chemically, it contained the least amount of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$.

The presence or absence of chlorite in the clay fraction was related to the amount of Mgo in the chemical analysis. The samples containing the least amount of MgO and iron commonly contained little or no chlorite. The chlorite was iron-rich and poorly crystalline in all cases.

The most common mixed-layer structure was illitemontmorillonite which was present in all samples. Other mixed-layer structures consisting of $111 i t e-c h l o r i t e$ and chlorite-vermiculite were present, but were not common. Whether the chlorite in the mixedlayer clays was iron-rich or not could not be determined.

Calcite was a common non-clay constituent in the clay-size fraction because the samples were not subjected to acid treatment. It was present in all samples except the Herington limestone from Washington County which was a dolomite. Quartz was present in the clay-size fraction in a few of the samples, but occurred in minor amounts.

The clay mineralogy of the Herington limestone from Washington County, which was actually a dolomite, was not appreciably different from clays found in limestone samples investigated.

The three-layer clay minerals probably formed in an alkaline marine environment by interlayer adsorption of potassium and
magnesium ions in degraded illite, degraded chlorite, and montmorillonite. There was the possibility that some of the threelayer clay minerals represented allogenic or detrital minerals. An alkaline marine environment would have preserved these minerm als.

A summary of the genesis of the clay minerals in an alkaline marine environment appears in Table 8. This table was not meant to be a complete table, but represents information found in the review of iiterature during the course of this investigation.

Table 8. Summary of genesis of clay minerals in an alkaline marine environment.

| Parental Material | $\begin{gathered} \text { Barly or } \\ \text { Incomplete stages } \end{gathered}$ | : Late or more <br> 8 complete stages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Degraded 1111 te | Illite-montmorillonite Illitemchlorite Chlorite | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Illite } \\ & \text { Illite-chlorite } \\ & \text { Chlorite } \end{aligned}$ |
| Degraded chlorite | Chlorite-vermiculite Illite-chlorite Illite | Chlorite <br> Illitemchlorite <br> Illite |
| Montmorillonite | Illite-montmorillonite Chlorite-veraiculite | Illite Chlorite |
| Kaolinite | Chlorite <br> (Dioctahedral) | Chlorite |

Samples containing relatively larger amounts of chlorite also contained pyrite, larger amounts of organic residue, and larger amounts of the insoluble residue less than 53 microns in size. Although the amount of chlorite could be explained in part by the amount of insoluble residue, the presence of organic
residue and pyrite may have been indicative of important environmental conditions which favored the formation of chlorite. The presence of organic material may have been an important factor affecting the erystallinity of the chlorite. The absorption of organic molecules may have partially blocked the interlayer adsorption of magnesium ions.

There was some correlation between the clay minerals present (particularly chlorite) and the chemical composition, but the clay mineralogy could not be predicted from the latter. The presence of celestite and other minerals found in the insoluble residue was not apparent in the chemical analysis.
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The purpose of this investigation was to determine the non-carbonate mineralogy of representative samples of limestone screenings from eastern Kansas quarries and to determine the significance of the clay mineral assemblage. The carbonate mineralogy of high-magnesium limestones was determined.

The methods employed in this investigation included petrographic analysis, binocular microscope study, stain test, and $X-$ ray diffraction.

From this investigation the following observations were made:

1. The limestone samples containing 3.49 percent or more of Mg 0 contained dolomite in the carbonate fraction.
2. The Herington limestone sample from Washington County was a dolomite, whereas the sample from the same formation in Dickinson County was a limestone.
3. Illite was the most abundant clay mineral.
4. Discreet chlorite was iron-rich, poorly crystalline and associated with pyrite, organic residue, and larger amounts of insoluble residue.
5. There was some correlation between the clay mineralogy and the chemical analysis.
6. The presence of celestite and some other minerals in the insoluble residue was not apparent from the chemical analysis.

[^0]:    Scale of Abundances Major, XXX, XX, X, Trace.
    a Includes insoluble residue less than 5 microns in size.

