









this is what my slides notes said but I need to check and see what this really was

















## Heat in the Earth

Heat moves from hot to cold. The rate at which moves—the **heat flow**—is proportional to the gradient in temperature and a constant, the thermal conductivity (k, about 2-3 W m<sup>-1</sup> °C<sup>-1</sup> for crustal rocks). With *z* positive down and temperature only varying with depth, we get

$$q = -k\frac{dT}{dz}$$







## Heat in the Earth

A key to solving this for the earth is to recognize that  $\sqrt{\kappa t}$  is dimensionally a length and so provides a natural length scale.

We are initially interested in a simple problem: the cooling of a half space of asthenosphere. We assume that the temperature is  $T_a$  in the asthenosphere and  $T_0$  at the top. We then solve for T(t,z)...

$$\frac{T-T_a}{T_0-T_a} = \operatorname{erfc} \frac{z}{2\sqrt{\kappa t}}$$

The erfc is the complementary of the error function which, if you care, is defined as

$$\operatorname{erfc}(\eta) = 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\eta} e^{-\eta'^2} d\eta'$$



So from this when depth is 4 times sqrt(kappa\*t), you are pretty unaffected from surface cooling. Lithospheric thickness then doubles when time quadruples (so thickness proportional to sqrt (t))

Curve is vs depth for a specified time (can flip it over to see temperature change over time at a specified depth)

Topography from cooling in the Earth

$$\frac{T - T_a}{T_0 - T_a} = \operatorname{erfc} \frac{z}{2\sqrt{\kappa t}}$$

While temperature can be interesting, we want topography. We have to appeal to isostasy and relate temperature to density.

First up, isostasy, which says that the pressure  $(P_c)$  at some depth of compensation  $(z_c)$  is the same everywhere. For terrain under the oceans, this can be expanded

$$P_c = \int_0^{z_c} \rho g \, dz = dg \rho_w + \int_d^{z_c} \rho g \, dz$$

Where d is the depth of the ocean at this point







Topography from cooling in the Earth

$$\frac{T - T_a}{T_0 - T_a} = \operatorname{erfc} \frac{z}{2\sqrt{\kappa t}}$$
$$w(\rho_a - \rho_w) = \int_{d_{ridge} + w}^{z_c} (\rho(z) - \rho_a) dz$$

Now we need to relate density to temperature...

 $\rho(z) - \rho_a = -\rho_a \alpha (T(z) - T_a)$ 

Where  $\alpha$  is the coefficient of thermal expansion. Now we combine these and integrate from seafloor down to get...

$$w(\rho_a - \rho_w) = \int_0^{z'_c} -\rho_a \alpha (T_0 - T_a) \operatorname{erfc} \frac{z'}{2\sqrt{\kappa t}} dz'$$
$$= \rho_a \alpha (T_a - T_0) \int_0^\infty \operatorname{erfc} \frac{z'}{2\sqrt{\kappa t}} dz'$$





This is using some crude numbers (kappa 3.1 x 10^7 m^2/My, alpha3x10^-5 K^-1, rho-a 3300 Ta 1300C, T0 0C





Challenging 2008 paper claiming half space works for everything. Raw data points...















"Uniform" refers to crust and mantle lithosphere strained the same. It is a 2-D sections beta=1 does go down because of adjacent areas. Point in paper was that form of the curve is not sensitive to the 2-D aspect.











Lower dots with error bars are delithified sedimentary thicknesses (error bars show range of max and min delithified thicknesses); dots between parallel lines are tectonic subsidence







So best fit about 560 Ma, overall errors considered 590-550 Ma for start of thermal subsidence. The age is largely determined by the change in slope of the "R1" (tectonic subsidence) curve.



Of course the timescale has been improved in subsequent years, so a proper age probably a bit younger (numerically)





But if rift-drift is at Noonday, which is 2000m below base of C, then how does this work?



An alternative might be multiple rifting episodes? One near 710 Ma, other near 550 Ma



Now can maybe go farther back and see how subsidence is including the "syn-rift" sediments. Seems to push things farther back.



Now can maybe go farther back and see how subsidence is including the "syn-rift" sediments. Seems to push things farther back.



So this interpretation is of slow rifting for about 200 my and then full creation of Laurentia.





Goal of the paper was to date late pC section, but this required looking at the subsidence history. Relation from strat thickness to tectonic subsidence from backstripping and assuming no large unconformities. Note upper left panel does not require time. Ages before Cambrian extrapolated but compare well to global glacial episode (e.g., Rainstorm Member). From this, infer that ~540 Ma extension is artifact of carbonate compression and expansion of oceans onto land (509–485 Ma rapid accumulation but little subsidence). That change in slope is what drove the pick from earlier models. (There is a lot of subtlety here. Estimate of the thermal decay timescale from 541 and 509 Ma points 55–53 m.y., comparable to Phanerozoic thermal decay times elsewhere, indicating a purely thermal subsidence is plausible. Explore models with and without underlying Pahrump group. They don't need time of start of subsidence.