Formation of pyroxenite layers in the Totalp ultramafic massif (Swiss Alps) – Insights from highly siderophile elements and Os isotopes
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Abstract

Pyroxenitic layers are a minor constituent of ultramafic mantle massifs, but are considered important for basalt generation and mantle refertilization. Mafic spinel websterite and garnet–spinel clinopyroxenite layers within Jurassic ocean floor peridotites from the Totalp ultramafic massif (eastern Swiss Alps) were analyzed for their highly siderophile element (HSE) and Os isotope composition.

Aluminum-poor pyroxenites (websterites) display chondritic to suprachondritic initial \( ^{187}\text{Os} / ^{188}\text{Os} \) (160 Ma) of \(-2\) to \(+27\). Osmium, Ir and Ru abundances are depleted in websterites relative to the associated peridotites and to mantle lherzolites worldwide, but relative abundances (Os/Ir, Ru/Ir) are similar. Conversely, Pt/Ir, Pd/Ir and Re/Ir are elevated.

Aluminum-rich pyroxenites (clinopyroxenites) are characterized by highly radiogenic \( ^{187}\text{Os} / ^{188}\text{Os} \) with initial \( ^{187}\text{Os} / ^{188}\text{Os} \) between \(+20\) and \(+170\). Their HSE composition is similar to that of basalts, as they are more depleted in Os, Ir and Ru compared to Totalp websterites, along with even higher Pt/Ir, Pd/Ir and Re/Ir. The data are most consistent with multiple episodes of reaction of mafic pyroxenite precursor melts with surrounding peridotites, with the highest degree of interaction recorded in the websterites, which typically occur in direct contact to peridotites. Clinopyroxenites, in contrast, represent melt-dominated systems, which retained the precursor melt characteristics to a large extent. The melts may have been derived from a sublithospheric mantle source with high Pd/Ir, Pt/Ir and Re/Os, coupled with highly radiogenic \( ^{187}\text{Os} / ^{188}\text{Os} \) compositions. Modeling indicates that partial melting of subducted, old oceanic crust in the asthenosphere could be a possible source for such melts.

Pentlandite and godlevskite are identified in both types of pyroxenites as the predominant sulfide minerals and HSE carriers. Heterogeneous HSE abundances within these sulfide grains likely reflect subsolidus processes. In contrast, large grain-to-grain variations, and correlated variations of HSE ratios, indicate chemical disequilibrium under high-temperature conditions. This likely reflects multiple events of melt–rock interaction and sulfide precipitation. Notably, sulfides from the same thick section for the pyroxenites may display both residual-peridotite and melt-like HSE signatures. Because Totalp pyroxenites are enriched in Pt and Re, and depleted in Os, they will develop excess radiogenic \( ^{187}\text{Os} / ^{188}\text{Os} \), compared to ambient mantle. These enrichments, however, do not possess the requisite Pt–Re–Os composition to account for the coupled suprachondritic \( ^{186}\text{Os} / ^{187}\text{Os} \) signatures observed in some Hawaiian picrites, Gorgona komatiites, or the Siberian plume.
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 Clinopyroxenites and websterites occur as layers or dykes in peridotite massifs, mantle tectonites associated with ophiolites, and mantle xenoliths. They comprise about 1–5% of peridotite massifs (e.g. Kornprobst, 1969; Pearson and Nowell, 2004; Downes, 2007), but are rarely found in association with abyssal peridotites (Dantzas et al., 2007). Past studies have suggested that pyroxenite layers in the mantle may play an important role during the genesis of basaltic magmas at mid-ocean ridges (Hirschmann and Stolper, 1996) and intra-plate settings (Lassiter et al., 2000; Hirschmann et al., 2003; Sobolev et al., 2005). In order to estimate the influence pyroxenites may have on basal genesis and upper mantle refertilization, the formation of pyroxenite layers must be better understood.

A number of processes might lead to the formation of pyroxenites in the mantle, including: (a) formation as tectonically emplaced slices of subducted eclogitic crust, or residues of in situ partial melting of such eclogites (Polvé and Allègre, 1980; Loubet and Allègre, 1982; Allègre and Turcotte, 1986; Blichert-Toft et al., 1999; Morishita et al., 2003; Obata et al., 2006), (b) crystal accumulation at high pressures from asthenosphere-derived magmas passing through the lithosphere (Obata, 1980; Irving, 1980; Sinigoi et al., 1983; Bodinier et al., 1987, 1990; Takahashi, 1992; Vaselli et al., 1995; Becker, 1996; Kumar et al., 1996; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999), whereby the magmas may be derived from partial melting of subducted crust (Davies et al., 1993; Pearson et al., 1993), (c) in situ metamorphic segregation of pyroxene from the host peridotite (Dick and Sinton, 1979) or in situ crystallization of partial melts from peridotite wall rock (Sinigoi et al., 1983; Voshage et al., 1988), (d) melt–rock reaction between existing pyroxene, host peridotite and percolating melt (Garrido and Bodinier, 1999), or reaction of melt derived from subducted eclogotic oceanic crust with peridotite in the asthenosphere (Yaxley and Green, 1998).

Pyroxenites and associated peridotites often show evidence for a depleted mantle origin. Depletion of light rare earth elements (REE), compared to heavy REE, is commonly seen in both pyroxenites and associated peridotites (Bodinier et al., 1987; Bodinier, 1988; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999; Bodinier and Godard, 2003). Initial ratios of \(^{87}\text{Sr}/^{86}\text{Sr}\) and \(^{143}\text{Nd}/^{144}\text{Nd}\) show considerable variation, and overlap with data for mantle peridotites, forming a cluster in the depleted mantle eNd (e.g. Voshage et al., 1988; Downes et al., 1991; Mukasa et al., 1991; Pearson et al., 1993; Downes, 2007). Because of these broad similarities, lithophile incompatible trace elements and isotope systems may provide only limited information about pyroxenite formation processes. Highly siderophile elements (HSE; including Os, Ir, Ru, Pt, Pd and Re) and the long-lived Re–Os isotope system are provided with a different perspective on pyroxenite formation. Under upper mantle conditions, these elements mostly show chalcophile behavior and a wide range of compatibility during mantle melting. While Os, Ir and Ru are considered compatible during partial mantle melting in the presence of sulfides, Pt and Pd can behave compatibly as well as incompatible, whereas Re is moderately incompatible (Morgan and Lovering, 1967; Morgan et al., 1981; Roy-Barman and Allègre, 1994). Peridotites as mantle residues often show depletion in Pt, Pd and Re (e.g. Pearson et al., 2004; Luguet et al., 2007), whereas mantle melts, represented by basalts, are enriched in those elements compared to the more compatible Os, Ir and Ru (Rehkämper et al., 1999a; Bézos et al., 2005; Dale et al., 2008).

Because of the large difference in partitioning behavior between Os and Re, partial melts with high Re/Os develop radiogenic \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) over time, while mantle residues often display unradiogenic \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\). The large differences in Os isotopic composition and HSE signatures between melts and residues allow the use of HSE for the study of pyroxenite formation and melt–rock interaction in the Earth’s mantle.

Field and petrographic observations from the Jurassic Totap massif, eastern Switzerland, combined with major element, Sm–Nd and Re–Os isotopic data for the host peridotites provide evidence for refertilization of the host spinel lherzolites by melts related to the pyroxenite layers (Peters and Stettler, 1987; Müntener et al., 2004; van Acken et al., 2008). Refertilization of the massif may have occurred in the spinel lherzolite–spinel–garnet pyroxenite facies of the former oceanic lithosphere beneath the Tethys ocean basin in a regime, transitional between lithosphere and asthenosphere. In the present study, abundances of Os, Ir, Ru, Pt, Pd and Re and Os isotope compositions from websterite and clinopyroxenite samples of the Totap massif were obtained, to constrain melt–rock interaction, pyroxenite formation and the origin of the infiltrating mafic melts.

2. GEOLOGY AND PETROLOGY

The Totap ultramafic massif in eastern Switzerland consists of serpentinitized spinel lherzolites associated with layered and folded spinel and spinel–garnet clinopyroxenites, spinel websterites, and more rarely spinel orthopyroxenites. The massif forms part of the Arosa imbricate zone, which separates the Penninic and Austroalpine units (e.g. Schmid et al., 2008). It was emplaced on the ocean floor of the Jurassic Piedmont-Liguria branch of the Tethys Ocean. The Piedmont-Liguria ocean basin underwent a period of spreading from 210 to 160 Ma and attained a maximum width of ~500 km (Stampfl and Borel, 2004; Schmid et al., 2004). For a detailed geological overview and a geological map see, for example, Desmurs et al. (2002) and Schmid et al. (2004); for paleogeographical reconstructions see Manatschal and Bernoulli (1998) and Stampfl and Borel (2004).

The Totap ultramafic massif has been tectonically overturned, but is in primary contact with radiolarites and ophiolitic breccias (Weissert and Bernoulli, 1985). From \(^{39}\text{Ar}/^{40}\text{Ar}\) dating of phlogopite from pyroxenites, a formation age of the body of 160 Ma has been inferred (Peters and Stettler, 1987). U–Pb ages of 160 ± 1 Ma from zircons in oceanic gabbro from the nearby Platta locality (Schaltegger et al., 2002) suggest coeval magmatism, and thus, proximity to an ocean ridge environment at the time of emplacement.
Biostratigraphic correlation of overlying concordant sediments suggests emplacement at the ocean floor at approximately the same time (Weissert and Bernoulli, 1985). The presence of spinel in the lherzolites, and spinel and spinel–garnet assemblages in the pyroxenites combined with the absence of plagioclase in both lithologies indicate that the last equilibration occurred in the deeper lithospheric mantle, followed by rapid uplift. Equilibration temperatures between 830 and 975 °C, and a pressure of 10 ± 3 kbar were estimated for a last equilibration under spinel lherzolite facies conditions (Peters and Stettler, 1987).

During the Alpine orogeny, the ultramafic body was oboducted along with surrounding sediments and basaltic and gabbroic rocks (Peters and Stettler, 1987; Müntener et al., 2004; Stampfli and Borel, 2004). The pyroxenites are sometimes folded and concordant, or oblique to a high-temperature foliation (Peters, 1963), and occasionally show well-preserved igneous textures (Peters, 1963, 1968; Peters and Stettler, 1987). Extensive melt–peridotite interaction during episodes of melt migration has been suggested (Müntener et al., 2004; Piccardo et al., 2004; van Acken et al., 2008). Following Jurassic seafloor alteration and serpentization, the rocks underwent a very low grade metamorphic overprint in the course of the Alpine orogeny, with peak temperatures of about 100–150 °C (Fruh-Green et al., 1990).

Several hypotheses regarding the magmatic and tectonic history of the Totalp massif have been proposed: (a) emplacement in a fracture zone (Weissert and Bernoulli, 1985), (b) magmatic formation at an ultraslow-spreading emplacement in a fracture zone (Weissert and Bernoulli, van Acken et al., 2008). Following Jurassic seafloor alteration and serpentinization, the rocks underwent a very low grade metamorphic overprint in the course of the Alpine orogeny, with peak temperatures of about 100–150 °C (Fruh-Green et al., 1990).

### 3. METHODS

Sixteen websterites, spinel- and spinel–garnet pyroxenites from pyroxenitic layers of the Totalp massif were studied for major element compositions, HSE concentrations (Re, Os, Ir, Ru, Pt and Pd) and Os isotopic composition. Several samples were collected in association with adjacent peridotites or comprise profiles across modally layered pyroxenites. Layer thickness varies from few mm up to ca. 0.5 m. Detailed descriptions of Totalp pyroxenite samples from this study are given in the Electronic annex.

#### 3.1. Whole rock analyses

Some layered pyroxenites were cut using a diamond blade. The cut surfaces were abraded, using sand paper or sintered corundum in order to remove possible contamination from saw marks. Most samples were first disintegrated into chips using a ceramic jaw crusher. For some samples (TA11, TA13, TA61) a Mn steel jaw crushe was used. After cleaning with ultrapure water, sample chips were powdered in an agate disk mill.

Whole rock major element abundances, H₂O and C contents were determined using XRF, Karl-Fischer titration and IR-based CSA at Universität Karlsruhe (CSA302; Leybold Heräus; for details, see Becker, 1996) and GFZ Potsdam (LECO RC-412-Analyzer (H₂O, CO₂). Reproducibilities (2σ) are 2–3% for SiO₂, MgO and FeO, 5–8% for Al₂O₃, and CaO and 10–20% for Na₂O, TiO₂ and MnO. Accuracy was monitored using ultramafic rock standards (DTS-1, UB-N, PCC-1) that were included with each batch of samples and yielded results within quoted precisions. Sulfur concentrations were determined at the University of Leicester, using a LECO CS 230 Carbon/Sulfur Determinator.

For the determination of HSE abundances and Os isotope analysis, between two and three grams of sample powder were spiked with mixed ⁹⁹Ru, ¹⁰⁸Pd, ¹⁹⁵Ir, ¹⁹⁸Pt, and ¹⁸⁵Re–¹⁸⁰Os spikes prior to digestion. Digestion was performed using 2.5 ml conc. HCl and 5 ml conc. HNO₃ in sealed borosilicate glass Carius tubes at 220 °C for 24 h followed by high-pressure digestion at 320–345 °C for 48 h, using the technique outlined in Becker et al. (2006).

Osmium separation and analysis followed a modified procedure of Cohen and Waters (1996). After opening of the Carius tubes, Os was extracted from the acid phase into CCl₄ and then extracted back into HBr. A microdistillation technique (Birck et al., 1997) was used to further purify the Os fraction. After microdistillation, the sample Os was loaded in HBr onto baked Pt filaments (99.995% ESPi) and covered with NaOH–Ba(OH)₂ activator solution.

Osmium isotopic ratios were measured as OsO₃ using negative thermal ionization mass spectrometry (N-TIMS) at the Freie Universität Berlin (FUB), using a ThermoFinnigan Triton instrument, and at the University of Maryland (UMD) using a VG Sector-54 and a NBS-designed single collector thermal ionization mass spectrometer. Signals were detected on Faraday cups in static mode or by SEM in pulse counting mode, depending on signal intensity. All measured ratios were corrected for interferences from isobaric Os⁺⁺⁺⁺ molecules: oxygen isotope corrections were made using ¹⁸O/¹⁸O and ¹⁸O/¹⁶O of 0.00204 and 0.00037, respectively. Measured ratios were mass fractionation corrected to a ¹⁸²Os/¹⁸⁸Os ratio of 3.08271 (Shirey and Walker, 1998) using the exponential fractionation law. For the low-Os samples, ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os was corrected for spike contribution, which led to a slight increase in ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os in most samples, and to a substantial increase in samples TASSCI-1 and TA56. To verify these corrected ratios, unspiked duplicates of the low-Os pyroxenite samples were run (Table 1).

Multiple runs of Johnson–Matthey Os standard solution were measured along with every batch of samples analyzed. Over the course of several months, measured ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os of this standard at the FUB using faraday cups was 0.11381 ± 0.00007 (2σ, n = 29). Measurements with the SEM yielded ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os of 0.1138 ± 0.0003 (2σ, n = 5). At UMD, the Johnson–Matthey standard yielded ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os of 0.1138 ± 0.0002 for both the VG Sector-54 (faraday cup runs) and the NBS mass spectrometer (SEM runs). Total procedural blanks (n = 6) were 4.8 ± 2.0 pg for Os with an ¹⁸⁷Os/¹⁸⁰Os of 0.170 ± 0.040. Osmium blank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Al2O3</th>
<th>MgO</th>
<th>CaO</th>
<th>Mg#</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Os</th>
<th>Ir</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Pt</th>
<th>Pd</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>187Re/188Os</th>
<th>187Os/188Os</th>
<th>2 sd</th>
<th>187Os/188Os 160 Ma</th>
<th>γOs 160 Ma</th>
<th>TMa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA-11A1</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-11A2</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.1521</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1476</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.1518</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1475</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-11B</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.1514</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1457</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-13B</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.1618</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1589</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-13D</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.1643</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1607</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-36A</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1240</td>
<td>−1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-54A</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>0.1666</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1485</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-54B</td>
<td>Clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.2156</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1751</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-54C1</td>
<td>Clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-54C2</td>
<td>Clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.2953</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-54D</td>
<td>Clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-55C</td>
<td>spl-websterite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.1348</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.1298</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-55D1</td>
<td>spl-gt-clinopyroxenite</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-56</td>
<td>gt-clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2.265</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-61</td>
<td>gt-clinopyroxenite</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.d.: not determined.

Major element and S concentrations are given in wt%, HSE concentrations in ppb.

(a) Measured at UMD, (b) measured at FUB.
contributions to samples were <2% for Os-poor samples TA54C1 and TA56 and <1% for all other samples. Repeated determinations of $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ in Os-rich websterites agreed within <2%. However, for Os-poor clinopyroxenites $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ deviated by up to 23% for TA54C1, essentially due to large spike corrections.

For PGE and Re isotope dilution analyses, one third of the remaining acid phase fraction was carefully reduced in volume in Teflon beakers, converted to chloride by first using 8 ml 6 M HCl and then 8 ml 0.2 M HCl, and dried down. The samples were then taken up in 10 ml 0.2 M HCl and loaded onto ion exchange columns that contained 10 ml Eichrom AG50X-8 (100–200 mesh) cation exchange resin. While the PGE and Re passed the resin without interaction, most other elements were retained on the column (Meisel et al., 2003). The collected fraction was dried down on a hotplate at ~120 °C, taken up in 0.28 M HNO$_3$ and measured on an Element 2 (UMD) or Element XR (FUB) sector field ICP-MS instrument in low-resolution mode, using an Aridus membrane desolvation system. At FUB, Re was analyzed using a cyclonic glass spray chamber.

An analysis typically comprised 400 scans of masses 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 185, 187, 189, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198 and 199. Isobaric interferences caused by Cd, Os and Hg on Pd, Re and Pt were insignificant in all cases. A mixed Re–Ir–Ru–Pt–Pd in house standard solution with roughly chondritic abundance ratios and 99 ng/g Ir was analyzed multiple times during each analytical session and monitored over the course of several months. Isotopic ratios of samples were corrected for mass discrimination by the comparison of measured isotope ratios from the in-house standard solution with recommended values. Washout time between samples was set between 3 and 5 min. On-peak zeroes for 0.28 M HNO$_3$ were taken after every 4–5 samples to monitor potential memory effects and were insignificant in all cases. Total chemistry blanks run in the course of this study ($n = 7$) were 7–12 pg for Re, 2.8–6.9 pg for Os, 0.3–7 pg for Ir, 2–440 pg for Pt and 42–420 pg for Pd. Blanks for Pt and Pd were substantially affected by the batch of Carius tubes used. With the exception of Os and Ir in samples TA54C1, TA54D2, TA54D and TA56, blank corrections were negligible or minor (<1%). Due to the high Pt and Pd contents of the samples, even the highest Pt and Pd blanks contributed less than 2%. Duplicates agreed within 2% for Os, 5% for Ir, 5% for Ru, 3% for Pt and 5% for Pd concentrations, but were worse for Os and Ru in TA61 and for Pd in TA13B. Rhenium reproducibility was strongly variable in duplicates, with values between 2% (TA11A2; TA13B) and 30% (TA61), see Table 1.

### 3.2. Electron microprobe

Microprobe analyses of sulfide grains in thick sections for S, Fe, Ni, Co and Cu abundances were conducted using the JEOL 8900 Superprobe at the University of Maryland with an acceleration voltage of 15 kV and probe current of 50 nA. Multiple spots were analyzed in each grain from both cores and rims to ensure internal homogeneity of sulfides for the subsequent LA-ICP-MS. Beam diameter was 1 μm. Chalcopyrite was used as calibration standard for Cu, pyrite for Fe and S, and Co and Ni were calibrated using Co and Ni metals. Raw intensities were corrected using ZAF. All elements were analyzed for 20 s on peak and 10 s on background, with the exception of Ni and Co, which were analyzed for 30 s on peak and 15 s on background.

### 3.3. Laser ablation-ICP-MS

Laser ablation data on the same sulfide grains used for microprobe analysis were obtained using a 213 nm laser ablation (LA) system coupled with an Element2 ICP-MS at the University of Maryland using He as a carrier gas.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Grain #</th>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th># Analyses</th>
<th>S at% 2 sd</th>
<th>Ni at% 2 sd</th>
<th>Fe at% 2 sd</th>
<th>Co at% 2 sd</th>
<th>Cu at% 2 sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.2 0.6</td>
<td>21.2 0.4</td>
<td>21.8 0.5</td>
<td>0.76 0.5</td>
<td>0.08 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.3 0.6</td>
<td>20.7 0.1</td>
<td>22.5 0.5</td>
<td>1.34 0.09</td>
<td>0.10 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54.8 3.2</td>
<td>19.4 1.6</td>
<td>25.3 4.8</td>
<td>0.44 0.05</td>
<td>0.11 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.0 0.5</td>
<td>21.7 0.3</td>
<td>21.8 0.2</td>
<td>0.47 0.06</td>
<td>0.07 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.7  0.3</td>
<td>22.8 0.0</td>
<td>21.1 0.95</td>
<td>0.08 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.5 1.2</td>
<td>17.2 0.7</td>
<td>30.4 0.70</td>
<td>0.16 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pentlandite</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56.6 1.2</td>
<td>20.2 1.2</td>
<td>22.6 1.2</td>
<td>0.56 0.31</td>
<td>0.10 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nc 2/4</td>
<td>Native copper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.5 2.7</td>
<td>53.3 2.9</td>
<td>1.5 3.5</td>
<td>0.13 0.21</td>
<td>1.6 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.9 1.5</td>
<td>53.8 1.6</td>
<td>0.29 0.21</td>
<td>0.12 0.06</td>
<td>0.87 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.2 0.0</td>
<td>54.4 0.1</td>
<td>0.10 0.05</td>
<td>0.15 0.03</td>
<td>0.12 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.5  0.2</td>
<td>54.4 0.1</td>
<td>0.26 0.12</td>
<td>0.67 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.5 2.3</td>
<td>52.8 2.8</td>
<td>0.07 0.08</td>
<td>0.14 0.64</td>
<td>0.47 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.0 1.5</td>
<td>54.0 2.2</td>
<td>0.44 0.64</td>
<td>0.26 1.03</td>
<td>0.28 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Godlevskite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.3  0.3</td>
<td>53.3 0.3</td>
<td>0.60 0.10</td>
<td>0.10 0.00</td>
<td>0.68 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**nc 2/4,** native copper grain #2 (3 spots) and native copper associated with grain #4 (1 spot).
Table 3
Sulfide trace element compositions for websterites TA11A2 and TA54A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th>Spot size</th>
<th>Ru (ppm)</th>
<th>Pd (ppm)</th>
<th>Re (ppm)</th>
<th>Os (ppm)</th>
<th>Ir (ppm)</th>
<th>Pt (ppm)</th>
<th>Os/Ir</th>
<th>Pd/Ir</th>
<th>Ru/Ir</th>
<th>Re/Os</th>
<th>Re/Ir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 1</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 2</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>&lt;0.12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 2</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.21</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 3</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>&lt;0.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 3</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 3</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 3</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.08</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 4</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>&lt;0.16</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 5</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.11</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA11A2 5</td>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>&lt;0.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 4</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>&lt;1.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 6</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.78</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 6</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 6</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.11</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 6</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 7</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 7</td>
<td>Gdl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 2</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;2.04</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA54A 2</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>&lt;2.58</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>Iron meteorite</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan standard</td>
<td>Synthetic sulfide</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pn: pentlandite, Gdl: godlevskite; Cu: native copper.
The sample gas flow was merged with Ar before injection into the plasma. Baselines were measured for about 60 s before ablation. Laser intensity was set to 45% ($\sim 2 \text{ J/cm}^2$) with a frequency of 8 Hz. Depending on grain size, spot size ranged between 6 and 40 $\mu$m (see Table 3 for details). The following masses were measured: $^{57}\text{Fe}$, $^{59}\text{Co}$, $^{61}\text{Ni}$, $^{65}\text{Cu}$, $^{75}\text{As}$, $^{101}\text{Ru}$, $^{103}\text{Rh}$, $^{105}\text{Pd}$, $^{187}\text{Re}$, $^{188}\text{Os}$, $^{190}\text{Os}$, $^{193}\text{Ir}$, $^{195}\text{Pt}$ and $^{197}\text{Au}$.

Corrections for argides were minor for most analyses. Signals on $^{105}\text{Pd}$ in native Cu grains likely reflect interference from $^{65}\text{Cu}^{40}\text{Ar}$, and were discarded. Similarly, interference of $^{61}\text{Ni}^{40}\text{Ar}$ on $^{101}\text{Ru}$ in Ni-rich godlevskites in TA54A was too high to determine Ru concentrations.

For internal standardization, Fe concentrations obtained by electron microprobe were used. As an external standard, polished sections of the iron meteorite Coahuila and a synthetical NiS sulfide bead (Brenan internal reference at UMD) were run four times each with each thick section analyzed by LA. A maximum of twelve spots were analyzed in each thick section. Trace element abundances were calculated using LAMTRACE software. External precision of HSE concentrations (2 sd) as documented by the reproducibility of external standards was better than 4% for all elements for the Brenan Standard. Reproducibility for the Coahuila iron meteorite was between 11% for Ru and 20% for Pd (Table 3). As the concentrations in Coahuila are closer to the concentrations in the analyzed sulfides, the Coahuila analyses provide a better estimate for the analytical uncertainty of the sulfide measurements. Reproducibility of HSE ratios was better, between 5% for Os/Ir and 16% for Pd/Ir (Table 3).

4. RESULTS

4.1. Whole rock compositions

Volatile-free calculated major element and HSE abundances are listed in Table 1, with original major element data included in the Electronic annex. Major element, Os and Re abundances as well as Os isotopic compositions of samples TA11A2, TA13B, TA13D and TA61 have previously been reported by van Acken et al. (2008). In the subsequent discussion, volatile-free calculated major element data are used.

Major element concentrations for Totalp samples are within the range reported for websterites and clinopyroxenites from massifs and xenoliths worldwide (Bodinier et al., 1987; Piccardo et al., 1988; Pearson et al., 1993; Becker, 1996; Santos et al., 2002; Xu, 2002). HSE concentrations in Totalp clinopyroxenites are similar to previously published HSE data for pyroxenites from other localities (Beni Bousera, Kumar et al., 1996; Pearson and Nowell, 2004; Luguet et al., 2008; Lower Austria, Becker et al., 2004), with the exceptions of samples TA36A and TA54A. Pyroxenite TA54 is a composite pyroxenite comprised of a Mg rich and Ca poor websterite layer (TA54A), spinel clinopyroxenite and Ca rich garnet-spinel clinopyroxenite. Websterite TA54A has very high concentrations for all HSE, particularly of Pt, Pd and Re, while the spatially associated clinopyroxenite, samples TA54B through D, are comparatively poor in HSE (Table 1). HSE ratios, however, are similar throughout the TA54 sample suite, regardless of concentration, with Re and Pd strongly enriched relative to Os and Ir. The other unusual sample TA36A has a very high Os content coupled with normal concentrations of the other HSE (Table 1).

The HSE contents of both Totalp websterites and clinopyroxenites generally correlate positively with each other (Fig. 1), likely reflecting variable modal abundance of sulfides. Good correlations exist between Os, Ir and Ru ($R^2 > 0.98$, not shown), but correlations between Pt, Pd, Re and Ir are less clear. Totalp websterites and clinopyroxenites define two different trends in the Re–Ir diagram (Fig. 1a). Rhenium contents in Al-poor pyroxenites (websterites) correlate with Ir contents with a shallow positive slope, whereas Al-rich pyroxenites (clinopyroxenites) define a positive trend with a much steeper slope.

If websterites and clinopyroxenites are combined, broad negative covariations exist between $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ and Os, Ir, and Ru. Platinum and Pd show no covariation with $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ in

![Fig. 1. Plots of (a) Re (ppb) vs. Ir (ppb), open symbols: Al-poor pyroxenites (websterites), filled symbols: Al-rich clinopyroxenites (see Table 1), (b) Pt (ppb) vs. Ir (ppb), (c) Pd (ppb) vs. Ir (ppb). Error bars are symbol size or smaller, except where shown.](image)
the Totalp pyroxenites, while Re in high-Al$_2$O$_3$ clinopyroxenites tends to be higher than in low-Al$_2$O$_3$ websterites, with the exception of TA54A (Fig. 2). CI-normalized HSE/Ir ratios in the pyroxenites show broad positive correlations with Al$_2$O$_3$, with increasing scatter towards the Al-rich clinopyroxenites (Fig. 3), extending previously demonstrated correlations for lherzolites to higher Al$_2$O$_3$ values (Becker et al., 2006).

Totalp websterites show HSE patterns with moderate depletion of Os, Ir, Ru and Pt, compared to primitive mantle (PM) estimates, while Pd and Re are variably enriched. Some websterites have high Pd/Re, resulting sometimes in a positive Pd peak in the pattern (Fig. 4a), similar, but more pronounced, than the Pd excess found in some fertile lherzolites (e.g. Becker et al., 2006). Most HSE patterns in clinopyroxenites, except the anomalously Os-rich sample TA36A, show massive depletion in Os, Ir, Ru and Pt. While Pd and Re are enriched over the more compatible elements, these samples have low Pd/Re, reflecting a more “melt-like” or “basaltic” HSE pattern compared to the websterites (Fig. 4b; Bézos et al., 2005; Dale et al., 2008).

Measured $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os range from 0.1250 to 2.4, comparable to pyroxenites from other suites (Kumar et al., 1996; Becker et al., 2004; Pearson and Nowell, 2004; Melcher and Meisel, 2004). Corrections for radiogenic ingrowth after formation are significant due to the high Re/Os in most samples. Initial $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os calculated for a formation time of 160 Ma range from slightly subchondritic (0.1240) to extremely radiogenic (2.265), corresponding to $\gamma_{Os}$ (160 Ma) values ($\gamma_{Os} = \%$ deviation from average chondritic composition, Walker et al., 1989) of $-1.7$ to $+1700$. A broad correlation exists between $\gamma_{Os}$ (160 Ma) and $^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os (Fig. 5), with samples TA54C2 and TA54C3 offset to lower $\gamma_{Os}$ (160 Ma) compared to the main trend. High-Al clinopyroxenites generally have higher $\gamma_{Os}$ (160 Ma) than low Al websterites (Fig. 6) and associated peridotites (van Acken et al., 2008).

Fig. 2. (a–f) Plots of HSE abundances (ppb) vs. Al$_2$O$_3$ (wt%); open and filled symbols as in Fig. 1, TA54A not plotted in (d) and (e) for scale reasons. Error bars are symbol size or smaller, except where shown.
4.2. Sulfide compositions

Within the two analyzed websterite samples, major element compositions of sulfides from are remarkably homogeneous, both on thick section and grain scale (Table 2). Sulfide grains, found mostly on silicate grain boundaries, are anhedral and range from a few μm to 150 μm. Fe-bearing alteration phases such as magnetite and hematite occur along with sulfides in both thin sections.

Sulfides in TA11A2 are almost exclusively pentlandite with Ni and Fe in roughly the same proportion, while sulfides in TA54A predominantly consist of godlevskite (Ni₉S₈) intergrown with native copper and Ni-rich pentlandite in anhedral grains crosscut by serpentinite veins.

Sulfide grains in thick sections from TA11A2 and TA54A were analyzed for HSE by LA-ICP-MS (Table 3). Except for Pt, the HSE are about three orders of magnitude more abundant in sulfides than in whole rocks, as might be expected from their modal abundance. While major elements in sulfides are homogeneously distributed on the grain scale, this does not hold true for the HSE. Within section TA11A2, Re and Pd concentrations in sulfides show little variation, whereas concentrations of Os, Ir and Ru vary over about an order of magnitude. In TA54A, all HSE are heterogeneously distributed, with the range spanning over two orders of magnitude. While some sulfide grains show enrichment of all HSE determined, other grains show extreme enrichment of only Pd. HSE in sulfides show no systematic correlation with the major element composition of sulfides.

Two grains of native copper were sampled in TA54A. Because of the small grain sizes of native copper, smaller beam diameters had to be used and thus, lower signal intensities were achieved. Concentrations of Os, Re and Ru in native Cu are lower than the detection limit, while Ir is in a similar range compared to the pentlandites. High signals on Pd mass 105 likely reflect 65Cu40Ar.

![Fig. 3. (a–e): Plots of CI chondrite normalized HSE ratios vs. Al₂O₃ contents of the pyroxenites. The CI chondrite values in all figures are those of Horan et al. (2003); open and filled symbols as in Fig. 1. TA36A not plotted in a) for scale reasons. Error bars are symbol size or smaller, except where shown.](image-url)
None of the sulfides or native copper grains yielded detectable Pt signals. Calculated values are maximum values based on detection limits. Platinum has been shown to exsolve into micronuggets under subsolidus conditions (Luguet et al., 2001, 2003, 2007; Lorand et al., 2008; Dale et al., 2009). Subsequent BSE scans of the thick sections failed to detect any Pt-rich minerals in the section plane.

Os/Ir ratios in sulfides from both samples often lie within the chondritic range, with moderately subchondritic and suprachondritic values occurring as well. Ru/Ir was determined only in TA11A2, and ranges from chondritic to suprachondritic values. While some of the Ru data from TA54A were significantly affected by interferences from NiAr, high Ru/Ir in some TA11A2 sulfides is due to low Ir concentration in these grains. Most sulfides in these samples have lower Pd/Ir than the corresponding whole rock ratios of 13.6 and 33.3, thus balancing a few grains with extremely high Pd/Ir. Re/Ir in both samples scatter around the corresponding whole rock ratios (Table 3; Fig. 7).

The websterites are devoid of chalcopyrite, which has been observed to be a prominent sulfide and host of Pd in previous studies of mantle peridotites (Lorand, 1989; Alard et al., 2000; Luguet et al., 2001, 2003, 2007). This is unexpected in the context of the high Pd contents observed in Totalp pyroxenites, but may reflect different bulk compositions and subsolidus metamorphic reactions.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Modeling Totalp pyroxenite formation with HSE

Pyroxenites have been interpreted to represent residues of melting of eclogitic layers or to represent precipitates from melts related or unrelated to surrounding peridotites. Like many other pyroxenites and associated peridotites the Totalp samples display broadly linear major element covariations. These variations do not provide much information that might help in distinguishing the aforementioned formation models. Formation of the pyroxenites by in situ crystallization of partial melts of the host peridotite was suggested for some pyroxenites from the Balmuccia peridotite body (Sinigoi et al., 1983; Voshage et al., 1988). If this was the case for the Totalp pyroxenites, the peridotites and pyroxenites should have been in isotopic equilibrium at the
time of pyroxenite formation, which may have been the Jurassic or late Paleozoic (Peters and Stettler, 1987; Müntener et al., 2004). Large differences in initial $\gamma_{\text{Os}}$ between Totalp peridotites and pyroxenites (Table 1; Fig. 4), compared to PM, the pyroxenites are enriched in Re and Pd, and mostly depleted in Os, Ir and Ru. Most samples are also characterized by suprachondritic initial $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$. The two samples analyzed for in situ HSE distribution are characterized by a heterogeneous HSE distribution on the thin section scale, possibly indicating the presence of multiple sulfide generations or small scale heterogeneities due to a complex subsolidus history of the sulfides.

In light of the radiogenic Os isotope and HSE abundance characteristics outlined above, we more closely consider the other two models for Totalp pyroxenite formation: (a) formation as residues of partial melting of eclogitic oceanic crust (Dick and Sinton, 1979; Polvé and Allègre, 1980; Allègre and Turcotte, 1986; Blichert-Toft et al., 1999) and (b) formation as products of melt–rock reaction, either as cumulate precipitates or melt–rock interaction, between depleted mantle peridotite and mafic melt (e.g. Obata, 1980; Smigoi et al., 1983; Suen and Frey, 1987; Takazawa et al., 1999).

Derivation of the pyroxenites from recycled oceanic crust with high Re/Os (Roy-Barman and Allègre, 1994; Schiano et al., 1997; Escrig et al., 2005; Gannoun et al., 2007), either as residues of partial melting or as partial melts, is consistent with the radiogenic initial $\gamma_{\text{Os}}$ in most Totalp pyroxenites. Residues of partial melting should be characterized by enrichment in compatible HSE, such as Os, Ir and Ru over their precursor material, and accompanied by depletions in incompatible HSE, such as Pd or Re. In contrast, partial melts would be expected to be enriched in Pd and Re. If the pyroxenites are products of interactions between mafic melts and peridotite, the HSE signature of the resulting rocks to some degree should reflect the mixed HSE characteristics of the mafic melt and peridotite.

In order to distinguish between the two models of pyroxenite formation, we model HSE abundances in both a melt and a residue resulting from the partial melting of a basic rock with an original HSE composition similar to that of subducted MORB. A representative HSE composition of subducted oceanic crust was calculated from datasets of HSE abundances in MORB (Schiano et al., 1997; Rehkämper et al., 1999a; Bézos et al., 2005; Escrig et al., 2005; Gannoun et al., 2007; Dale et al., 2008). HSE abundances reported for lower oceanic crust, represented by gabbros or gabbroic eclogites, with higher Os abundances and similar Re abundances compared to MORB, were also taken into account (Blusztajn et al., 2000; Dale et al., 2007). As HSE concentrations in MORB vary by as much as two orders of magnitude, the choice of starting composition for the model strongly influences the model outcome (Fig. 8). For the modeling, we chose a representative MORB composition, which is listed in Table 4. Both batch and
fractional melting of MORB were modeled using equations derived by Shaw (1970). We will limit discussion to the fractional melting model, as batch and fractional melting produce similar results for these elements.

As noted above, the HSE are strongly chalcophile under upper mantle conditions (Garuti et al., 1984; Peach et al., 1990, 1994; Barnes, 1993; Bezmen et al., 1994; Fleet et al., 1999; Sattari et al., 2002; Andrews and Brenan, 2002; Pruseth and Palme, 2004; Brenan, 2008). Consequently, in the following models solid sulfide–liquid sulfide partitioning is assumed to control HSE distribution (e.g. Bockrath et al., 2004), and, with the exception of Re, silicate–sulfide partitioning of HSE is assumed to be negligible. While Os, Ir, Ru and Re are compatible in mss during partial melting, with $D_{\text{mss/sulfide melt}}^\text{mss}$ of about 2–10, Pt and Pd are incompatible with $D_{\text{mss/sulfide melt}}^\text{mss}$ of $\approx 0.1–0.25$ (Fleet et al., 1993; Li et al., 1996; Brenan, 2002, 2008; Bockrath et al., 2004; Mungall et al., 2005; Ballhaus et al., 2006). Subsequent separation of sulfide melt from residual mss can result in fractionated patterns in both melt and residual sulfide (Bockrath et al., 2004; Ballhaus et al., 2006).

Rhenium, as the most lithophile element among the HSE may be incorporated in silicate minerals (Righter and Hauri, 1998; Righter et al., 2004; Mallmann and O’Neill, 2007). Recent studies report a strong dependence of Re partitioning behavior on oxygen and sulfur fugacities, suggesting that Re behavior is controlled by both the redox state of Re and sulfur speciation in the mantle (Amosse et al., 2000; Brenan, 2002, 2008; Fonseca et al., 2007; Mallmann and O’Neill, 2007). Experimentally determined sulfide–silicate partition coefficients for Re vary over three orders of magnitude, depending on experimental conditions (Fleet et al., 1999; Sattari et al., 2002; Fonseca et al., 2007; Brenan, 2008). For typical lower oceanic lithosphere redox conditions of log $f_{\text{O}_2}$ values of $-1$ relative to the QFM buffer (e.g. Lee et al., 2003), the sulfide–silicate melt partition coefficient $D_{\text{Re}}$ may be as low as 300, compared to $D_{\text{Re}} > 1000$ at more reducing conditions, thus, resulting in a significant proportion of Re hosted in garnet and/or clinopyroxene (Righter and Hauri, 1998; Sattari et al., 2002; Fonseca et al., 2007; Mallmann and O’Neill, 2007). During melting of an eclogitic source, bulk partitioning of Re will, thus, be controlled by complex sulfide–sulfide melt–garnet–clinopyroxene–silicate melt partitioning, the solubility of sulfide in silicate melt, and sulfide exhaustion.

Sulfide contents of eclogites vary over a wide range, with a maximum around 900 ppm (Greau et al., 2008), which has been adopted as the model starting parameter. Rheinum concentration in sulfides varies widely between 30 and 4200 ppb (Richardson et al., 2001; Aulbach et al., 2009). A sulfide Re concentration of 400 ppb corresponds to 1 ppb whole rock concentration, in broad accordance with observed values in basalts (Roy-Barman and Allègre, 1994; Sciani et al., 1997; Escrig et al., 2005; Dale et al., 2008). A value of 600 for $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}^\text{mss}$ was chosen for Re distribution in the starting eclogite composition, in accordance with experimental studies (Fonseca et al., 2007; Brenan, 2008). For an eclogitic source rock with 80% clinopyroxene and 20% garnet (Pertermann and Hirschmann, 2003), this results in only 32% of Re residing in sulfide, compared to 55% in clinopyroxene and 13% in garnet. Additional minor phases studied during experimental melting of eclogite, such as quartz/coesite and rutile (Pertermann and Hirschmann, 2003), have not been considered for the melting model, as they are not significant hosts for HSE.

Fig. 8. (a) CI-normalized HSE patterns for typical mid-ocean ridge (dashed line), depleted peridotite (solid line, e.g. Pearson et al., 2004; Luguet et al., 2007); shaded area: range of MORB composition reported worldwide (Schiano et al., 1997; Rehkämper et al., 1999a; Bézos et al., 2005; Escrig et al., 2005; Dale et al., 2007; Gannoun et al., 2007). Depleted peridotite HSE composition: 4.5 ppb Os, 4.5 ppb Ir, 8 ppb Ru, 4 ppb Pt, 1 ppb Pd and 0.05 ppb Re. MORB HSE composition: 0.008 ppb Os, 0.01 ppb Ir, 0.04 ppb Ru, 0.3 ppb Pt, 0.5 ppb Pd, 1 ppb Re; (b) composition of residues for 1 to 50% fractional melting of subducted MORB; (c) corresponding partial melts. Equations for melting were taken from Shaw (1970). Thick solid line in (b) and (c): Primitive upper mantle composition (Becker et al., 2006); Light shaded field in (b) and (c): Totalp websterites; dark shaded field in (b) and (c): Totalp clinopyroxenites.
Both sulfide solidus and liquidus in sulfides at atmospheric pressure are around 850–1100°C. The sulfide solidus and liquidus temperatures for Ni-poor sulfides in eclogites display approximately the same degrees of melting at a given temperature and pressure. Sulfides in eclogites display relative solidus and liquidus temperatures for silicate and sulfide components, respectively. Dry eclogite compositions have experimentally been shown to have solidus temperatures at 3 GPa of approximately 1300 °C, and liquidus temperatures of 1425–1500 °C, with increasing temperatures with higher pressure (Yasuda et al., 1994; Pertermann and Hirschmann, 2003). Addition of H2O results in considerably lower solidus (as low as 800 °C) and liquidus (1100 °C) temperatures (e.g., Rapp and Watson, 1995).

Sulfide solidus and liquidus temperatures for Ni-poor sulfides at atmospheric pressure are around 850–1100 °C (Ballhaus et al., 2001). Both sulfide solidus and liquidus increase significantly with pressure, with Ni-rich sulfides at pressures up to 3 GPa having solidus temperatures of about 1300 °C, comparable to silicate compositions (Bockrath et al., 2004). Sulfides and silicates can thus be expected to display approximately the same degrees of melting at a given temperature and pressure. Sulfides in eclogites display a wide range of major element composition, with sulfide grains containing 4–25 at% Ni occurring in single eclogite samples (Aulbach et al., 2009). Nickel contents around 15% in sulfides are confirmed by Ni contents in clinopyroxene and garnet in eclogites (O’Reilly and Griffin, 1995) and D^Ni_sulfide/silicate values around 300 for mafic assemblages (Rajaman and Naldrett, 1978). The application of experimentally determined partition coefficients is thus legitimate for our models, as the sulfide compositions observed in basalts and eclogites (Roy-Barman et al., 1998; Richardson et al., 2001; Aulbach et al., 2009; Dale et al., 2009) and those used for experiments overlap (Fleet et al., 1999; Mungall et al., 2005; Ballhaus et al., 2006).

Fractional melting of the silicate and sulfide portions of the eclogite source was modeled separately, and the resulting melts were combined. A detailed description of the modeling is given in the Electronic annex.

In order for sulfide melt–mss fractionation to be applicable, sulfide melt and sulfide solid must coexist throughout the melting process. Comparisons of S concentrations in eclogites and S solubility in silicate melt under pressures of 2 GPa or higher show that sulfide phases should be present throughout the melting process considered here (Haughton et al., 1974; Wendlandt, 1982; Wallace and Carmichael, 1992; Mavrogenes and O’Neill, 1999; Holzheid and Grove, 2002; O’Neill and Mavrogenes, 2002; Liu et al., 2007), making the HSE fractionalation model suggested by Bockrath et al. (2004) and Ballhaus et al. (2006) applicable.

Modeling is further complicated by uncertainty of the relative solidus and liquidus temperatures for silicate and sulfide components, respectively. Dry eclogite compositions have experimentally been shown to have solidus temperatures at 3 GPa of approximately 1300 °C, and liquidus temperatures of 1425–1500 °C, with increasing temperatures with higher pressure (Yasuda et al., 1994; Pertermann and Hirschmann, 2003). Addition of H2O results in considerably lower solidus (as low as 800 °C) and liquidus (1100 °C) temperatures (e.g., Rapp and Watson, 1995).

Sulfide solidus and liquidus temperatures for Ni-poor sulfides at atmospheric pressure are around 850–1100 °C (Ballhaus et al., 2001). Both sulfide solidus and liquidus increase significantly with pressure, with Ni-rich sulfides at pressures up to 3 GPa having solidus temperatures of about 1300 °C, comparable to silicate compositions (Bockrath et al., 2004). Sulfides and silicates can thus be expected to display approximately the same degrees of melting at a given temperature and pressure. Sulfides in eclogites display a wide range of major element composition, with sulfide grains containing 4–25 at% Ni occurring in single eclogite samples (Aulbach et al., 2009). Nickel contents around 15% in sulfides are confirmed by Ni contents in clinopyroxene and garnet in eclogites (O’Reilly and Griffin, 1995) and D^Ni_sulfide/silicate values around 300 for mafic assemblages (Rajaman and Naldrett, 1978). The application of experimentally determined partition coefficients is thus legitimate for our models, as the sulfide compositions observed in basalts and eclogites (Roy-Barman et al., 1998; Richardson et al., 2001; Aulbach et al., 2009; Dale et al., 2009) and those used for experiments overlap (Fleet et al., 1999; Mungall et al., 2005; Ballhaus et al., 2006).

Fractional melting of the silicate and sulfide portions of the eclogite source was modeled separately, and the resulting melts were combined. A detailed description of the modeling is given in the Electronic annex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Model parameters.</th>
<th>Os</th>
<th>Ir</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Pt</th>
<th>Pd</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Sulfide (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORB/eclogite</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depleted peridotite</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D^Ni/silicate</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(<strong>D^Ni/melt</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D^Ni/melt</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(<strong>D^Ni/sulfide solid/sulfide melt</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D^Ni/sulfide solid/sulfide melt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(<strong>D^Ni/silicate</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D^Ni/silicate</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HSE concentrations are in ppb.

One to 50% melting of a MORB-type source produces residues depleted in all elements except for Re (Fig. 8b), as compared to primitive mantle. While Re concentrations in model residues are within the same range as those of Totalp websterites, modeled concentrations of all other HSE are significantly lower than in the websterites. Depletions in Os, Ir and Ru are inherited from the starting composition of the model, while depletions in Pt and Pd result from their incompatibility and preferred partitioning into sulfide melt. The modeled HSE signatures from residues of partial melting of recycled oceanic crust contrast with the Pt, Pd, and Re-enriched signatures observed in Totalp websterites and clinopyroxenites (Figs. 3 and 4). As our model results did not take into account possible loss of HSE during subduction, (e.g., Becker, 2000; Dale et al., 2008), HSE concentrations might be even lower. An origin as residues from partial melting of subducted oceanic crust, thus, appears unlikely based on the HSE signatures of the pyroxenites.

A number of studies suggest a pyroxenite origin by cumulate precipitation (Irving, 1980; Bodinier et al., 1987, 1990; Takahashi, 1992; Pearson et al., 1993; Vaselli et al., 1995; Becker, 1996; Kumar et al., 1996; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999) or melt–rock reaction (Yaxley and Green, 1998; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999). While simple mixing of depleted peridotite and basaltic melt fails to reproduce the high concentrations of Pt, Pd and Re observed in some Totalp pyroxenites, cumulate precipitation of pyroxenes and sulfides in zones of increased melt flow may be a possible mechanism. Rehkämper et al. (1999b) suggested precipitation of sulfides from a basaltic melt during multiple episodes of melt–rock interaction in an open system. Based on Nd isotope systematics of refertilized Totalp peridotites, Müntener et al. (2004) suggested a MORB-like composition for the infiltrating melts.

For modeling accumulation and melt–rock interaction, a representative harzburgite composition was chosen as the depleted endmember, as even the most depleted Totalp lherzolites may have been affected by refertilization. The HSE patterns for the harzburgitic endmember used in the modeling are characterized by pronounced depletion of Pt, Pd and Re relative to Os, Ir and Ru (Table 4; Pearson et al., 2004; Luguet et al., 2007).

Using the melting model outlined above, model HSE patterns for partial melts of eclogic recycled crust are characterized by further enhancement of the Pt, Pd and Re enrichments inherited from their basaltic precursors. With increasing degrees of partial melting, HSE patterns in the melt trend towards the pattern of the basalt
Given the lower liquidus of eclogites and sulfides compared to mantle peridotite (Yasuda et al., 1994; Yaxley and Green, 1998; Pertermann and Hirschmann, 2003; Kogiso et al., 2003, 2004), large degrees of melting seem to be more applicable, resulting in melts of broadly basaltic melt composition.

For modeling sulfide precipitation from basaltic melts, we have adopted the model and parameters by Rehkämper et al. (1999b). Multiple batches of basaltic melt were assumed to precipitate 50 ppm of sulfide in equilibrium from each batch of S-saturated melt. Representative sulfide–silicate partition coefficients for PGE were chosen from experimental literature data ($D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}$: Os: 30,000; Ir: 40,000; Ru: 20,000; Pt: 15,000; Pd: 30,000) and $D_{\text{Re}}$ values show variation of at least half an order of magnitude. Some authors suggested several orders of magnitude higher based on HSE solubility in sulfide liquids and metal/silicate partitioning (Ru, Andrews and Brenan, 2002; Pt, Pruseth and Palme, 2004), experimental partitioning (Ir, Bezmen et al., 1994; Peach et al., 1994; Fleet et al., 1999; Andrews and Brenan, 2002; Sattari et al., 2002; Pruseth and Palme, 2004; Fonseca et al., 2007; Brenan, 2008). Published $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}$ values show variation of at least half an order of magnitude. Some authors suggested several orders of magnitude higher based on HSE solubility in sulfide liquids and metal/silicate partitioning (Ru, Andrews and Brenan, 2002; Pt, Pruseth and Palme, 2004), experimental partitioning (Ir, Bezmen et al., 1994) or observation in natural samples (Os, Hart and Ravizza, 1996). As even the lower $D$ values of around $10^4$ result in effective imprint of the melt signature on precipitating sulfide, use of the highest values up to $10^5$ has only minuscule effects on the model outcome.

Partitioning of HSE during melting of either peridotitic or mafic mantle sources may be controlled by mss–sulfide melt equilibrium under S saturated conditions (Bockrath et al., 2004). Due to increasing solubility of sulfur in silicate melt with decreasing pressure, melts may become S-under-saturated upon ascent (Mavrogenes and O’Neill, 1999; Holzheid and Grove, 2002; O’Neill and Mavrogenes, 2002). In a closed system, precipitation of sulfide from S-under-saturated melts needs to be preceded by precipitation of silicate phases to drive the melt toward S-saturation. Sulfide precipitates from a sulfur saturated melt should carry the HSE signature of the melt, as HSE abundances in sulfides would no longer be controlled by $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}$, but by $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}$.

Consequently, mss–sulfide melt equilibrium was assumed to have no influence on HSE behavior upon crystallization of sulfide. Segregation of sulfides that are not in equilibrium with surrounding silicate melt, either because of mechanical entrainment or because they are enclosed in silicates or oxides during their transport in the melt, would make it difficult to assess HSE compositions of parental melts (Campbell and Naldrett, 1979). Bulk rock HSE patterns of pyroxenites from Totalp display systematic behavior (e.g. clinopyroxenite samples TA 54 B to D with different major element compositions and variable $\gamma_{\text{Os-1}}$) and thus, do not support disequilibrium models that argue for arbitrary entrainment of sulfides.

Mixtures of model cumulates from multiple melt batches with small amounts of residual depleted peridotite containing 200 ppm sulfide (Pearson et al., 2004; Luguet et al., 2007) match the observed Totalp pyroxenite HSE patterns fairly well, although not perfectly. Websterites can be modeled as mixtures of 5–30% of depleted peridotites, with cumulates from 5–20 batches of melt derived from 20% partial melting of an eclogite source (Fig. 9a). Clinopyroxenites show an even stronger melt affinity and generally contain less than 5% contribution from peridotite host rock and 5–20 batches of basaltic melts formed by high degrees of partial melting (~80%) of an eclogite source (Fig. 9b). Formation of pyroxenites as cumulates in zones of high melt/rock ratio is thus most consistent with observed HSE signatures. Resulting sulfide abundances are between 400 and 1500 ppm, in good agreement with observations in Totalp websterites and pyroxenites, the sole exception being the anomalously sample TA54A (Table 1).
Several features observed in Totalp websterites and clinopyroxenites, however, could not be satisfactorily reproduced with this model. Neither the significant range of compatible HSE concentrations in clinopyroxenites nor the enrichment of Os over Ir, as observed in nearly all samples, can be replicated with the model. As these elements are largely controlled by the assumed concentration in the peridotite endmember, the variation may reflect the degree of heterogeneity in the peridotite wall rock. In order to produce Os/Ir such as observed in Totalp pyroxenites by the processes discussed above, either Os/Ir in the peridotite wall rock is required to be between 1.2 and 1.7, or $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}^{\text{Os}}$ needs to be as high as 150,000, compared to the value of ~30,000 derived from experiments. Similarly, high Ru/Ir values in Totalp pyroxenite require either Ru/Ir of 3 or higher in the wall rock peridotite or $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}^{\text{Ru}}$ of about 150,000–200,000, an order of magnitude higher than values commonly reported and than corresponding $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}^{\text{Ir}}$, but closer to the high $D$ values determined by Andrews and Brenan (2002). Neither of these explanations seems fully satisfactory, as both depleted peridotites with such high Os/Ir and Ru/Ir are rarely observed, and $D_{\text{sulfide/silicate}}^{\text{HSE}}$ values for Os and Ru on the one hand and Ir on the other hand have not been shown to differ by an order of magnitude.

In situ HSE data for sulfides from two websterites show a larger variability of Pd/Ir and Re/Os than of Os/Ir and Ru/Ir than whole rock samples. Furthermore, the sulfides show a spectrum of compositions that range from “lherzolitic” in Os/Ir, Ru/Ir and Re/Ir, to suprachondritic for HSE ratios (Fig. 7). Compositional variability within each sulfide grain (Table 3) most likely reflects subsolidus partitioning processes, as described in previous studies (Luguet and Lorand, 1999; Luguet et al., 2001). The variation of Os/Ir, Re/Os and Pd/Ir from grain to grain (Table 3), however, is consistent with the presence of two sulfide endmember compositions on the thin section scale. Sulfides with “peridotitic” Os/Ir, Ru/Ir, and Re/Os and moderately suprachondritic Pd/Ir (most notable in websterite TA11A2), contrast with melt-derived sulfides in which most ratios are suprachondritic. Os/Ir, which in sulfides ranges from subchondritic to suprachondritic, displays chondritic to suprachondritic values in whole rock compositions (Fig. 3). Because ratios of the HSE in whole rocks of the pyroxenites also indicate binary mixing of two distinct HSE components (Fig. 10), it is plausible that the whole rock variations are also controlled by two sulfide populations (Figs. 2, 3, 6 and 10). Websterites contain a larger fraction of HSE components derived from peridotite, whereas in clinopyroxenites, the inferred melt composition dominates the HSE budget. Curved correlations as evident in Fig. 10 d) indicate that in addition to mixing, chemical fractionation may have affected the distribution of some HSE (e.g. Pt vs. Re, Pd vs. Os); either during formation of the clinopyroxenites and/or during the evolution of their parental melts.

![Fig. 10. (a–d) Plots of HSE inter-element ratios; PM: primitive mantle estimate (Becker et al., 2006); TA36A not plotted in (a) and (b) for scale reasons; open and filled symbols as in Fig. 1. Error bars are smaller than symbol size.](image-url)
Sulfide grains of vastly different HSE compositions suggest disequilibrium on the sub-centimeter scale, as indicated by previous studies of sulfide populations in peridotites (Alard et al., 2000, 2002; Luguet et al., 2001, 2003, 2007; Lorand et al., 2008). Given that sulfides sited within 1 cm of each other may be in disequilibrium with respect to the HSE, single grain analyses of mantle sulfides may not be representative of the whole rock, especially for elements that show highly variable ratios such as Pd and Re. The heterogeneous distribution of HSE abundances, as well as the difficulty in identifying a Pt carrier phase, testifies to the difficulty of obtaining reliable mass balance constraints for the HSE on the basis of mineral compositions.

5.2. Websterite and clinopyroxenite formation

As demonstrated above, Totalp pyroxenites and their parental melts likely underwent a complex history of melting and mineral precipitation. Broad correlations of HSE with lithophile elements (Figs. 2 and 3) suggest coupled behavior of the HSE and lithophile elements. Totalp pyroxenites show both pyroxene macro- and megacryst cumulate textures and pyroxene clusters, interpreted to reflect remnants of trapped melt. Petrographic evidence from modally layered pyroxenites of several dm thickness (e.g. samples TA54, TA55) shows that websterites typically occur adjacent to peridotites, sometimes forming a "boundary" between peridotite and clinopyroxenite similar to observations from other studies (Bodinier et al., 1987; Kornprobst et al., 1990; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999; Becker et al., 2004).

These observations along with geochemical characteristics are most easily explained by open-system interaction of olivine-undersaturated melt with wall rock peridotite and precipitation of high-Al pyroxene, garnet, and occasionally spinel near the garnet–spinel peridotite transition to form pyroxenites (O'Hara, 1968). Both websterites and clinopyroxenites would, thus, represent strongly melt-influenced systems. While websterites represent products of melt–rock interaction at lower melt/peridotite ratios, clinopyroxenites can be considered melt-dominated systems with high melt/peridotite ratios, in accordance with their HSE signatures (Figs. 6, 9 and 10) and high abundances of moderately incompatible elements such as Ca and Al. This model is supported by HSE heterogeneity observed in sulfides in samples TA11A2 and TA54A, especially for the mobile HSE Pd and Re. Variation in initial \( \gamma_{Os} \) in clinopyroxenites suggests the presence of at least two different melt endmembers with very radiogenic Os isotopic compositions (Fig. 6). Differences in initial \( \gamma_{Os} \) may reflect different extent of interaction of parental melts with peridotite, differences in age of the pyroxenites, or differences in age and Re/Os of the sublithospheric mantle source of the parental melts. Reaction of early-formed websterites with further batches of mafic melt and concurrent precipitation of pyroxenes and sulfide is proposed to result in the generation of Al-rich clinopyroxenites, in accordance with model calculations above (Fig. 9c), effectively shielding most of the reacting melt from direct contact with the host peridotite.

5.3. HSE composition of parental melts

As sulfides in Totalp websterites are in disequilibrium with each other, and may reflect at least partially compositions inherited from peridotite, HSE compositions of melts parental to the websterites are difficult to estimate. Sulfides from clinopyroxenites may display compositions closer to melt composition, but were not analyzed in this study because of their small size (< 20 µm). Lithophile element compositions and radiogenic initial \( \gamma_{Os} \) indicate that bulk rock HSE compositions of Ca–Al-rich clinopyroxenites may approximate melt compositions. While the mostly subparallel patterns suggest similar relative abundances of the HSE in melts parental to the clinopyroxenites (Fig. 4, particularly samples TA 54 B to D), the behavior of Re warrants special attention. Sulfide-silicate partitioning coefficients for Re are substantially lower than for other HSE, and are dependent on oxygen fugacity and silicate phase composition more than other HSE, and thus may also be controlled by silicate phases (Righter and Hauri, 1998; Righter et al., 2004; Mallmann and O’Neill, 2007). Re/Ir values in the websteritic sulfides of the present study cover a range from chondritic to about two orders of magnitude higher. Whole rock values in the websterites vary not quite as much, about a factor of 20. A rough mass balance for Re in websterites TA11A1 and TA54A using Re and sulfur abundances in whole rocks from Table 1 and median Re abundances in sulfides from Table 3 indicates that sulfides contain a large fraction of Re in these samples.

In summary, Totalp websterites contain sulfides that likely precipitated along with pyroxenes from infiltrating melts. Other sulfides in the websterites display Os/Ir or Ru/Ir similar to peridotites, but either Re/Ir or Pd/Ir are suprachondritic. This can be best explained if these sulfides have formed from hybrid melts containing larger quantities of peridotite-derived Os, Ir and Ru, as witnessed by the whole rock concentrations of these elements and the moderately radiogenic initial \( \gamma_{Os} \) (up to +28). Elevated Pt, Pd and Re contents in websterites and particularly in Al-rich clinopyroxenites are consistent with precipitation of sulfides from multiple melt batches. The clinopyroxenites apparently contain no peridotite-derived component and are dominated by the HSE signature of the mafic melts from which they precipitated. This interpretation is also supported by the highly radiogenic initial \( \gamma_{Os} \) values of as high as +1700.

5.4. Pyroxenites and the 186Os–187Os systematics of mantle rocks

Coupled suprachondritic 187Os/188Os and 186Os/188Os have been reported for several mantle-plume derived picritic and komatiitic lavas (Walker et al., 1997; Brandon et al., 1998, 1999, 2003; Brandon and Walker, 2005). Such coupled radiogenic isotope compositions require long-term isolation of a source with appropriate suprachondritic Re/Os and Pt/Os. Furthermore, long-term isolation is required, because of the low abundance and long half-life of 190Pt, the parent isotope of 186Os.
Entrainment of approximately 0.5% of outer core material with suprachondritic $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ and $^{186}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ into the source of these mantle plumes has been proposed as a viable model (Walker et al., 1997; Brandon et al., 1998, 2003, 2006; Bird et al., 1999; Brandon and Walker, 2005). However, several studies pointed out problems with a significant core contribution to the lowermost mantle to explain observed Os isotope characteristics: a young age of the inner core based on core-mantle heat flow considerations (Lassiter, 2006), the absence of $^{182}\text{W}$ anomalies in the same samples (Scherstén et al., 2004), and new experimental results on high-pressure partitioning of Os, Re and Pt between liquid and solid Fe metal (Van Orman et al., 2008). In a recent study, Luguet et al. (2008) suggested that pyroxenite-derived sulfides can show the appropriate Pt–Re fractionations, and may evolve coupled $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$–$^{186}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ systematics similar to that observed in some picrites and komatiites. The present study represents a substantial addition to the limited HSE database on pyroxenites, thus the feasibility of pyroxenites as contributing sources for plume-de-

![Fig. 11. (a) Pt/Os vs. Re/Os; squares: Totalp samples; crosses: Beni Bousera bulk rock pyroxenites from Luguet et al. (2008). Chondrite values from Horan et al. (2003); Primitive mantle from McDonough and Sun (1995), Walker et al. (1997) and Becker et al. (2006); Outer Core models from Brandon et al. (2003); Mn-numbers from Ravizza et al. (2001); MORB from Escrig et al. (2005) and Bézos et al. (2005); Reducing sediments from Ravizza and Pyle (1997) and Poirier (2006); (b) $^{186}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ vs. $^{187}\text{Os}$; shaded area: Hawaiian, Gorgona Island and Siberian samples from Brandon et al. (1999, 2003); lines represent isotopic evolution of pyroxenite samples from Totalp and Beni Bousera over time from chondritic values over 2 Ga; dotted lines: development of Beni Bousera samples GP87T and GP253 (Luguet et al., 2008) and TA11A2, TA56 and TA61 (this study). Most studied pyroxenites in both this study and Luguet et al. (2008) have too low Pt/Re and develop radiogenic $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ too rapidly compared to $^{186}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ to account for observed Os isotopic systematics attributed to core-mantle interaction. Therefore, mixing of a source containing these or similar pyroxenites and depleted mantle cannot reproduce the Hawaiian–Siberian trend of Brandon and Walker (2005).]
rived lavas with suprachondritic \(^{186}\text{Os} - {^{187}\text{Os}}\) systematics will be discussed here.

Pyroxenites from the Totalp massif show radiogenic initial \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) coupled with chondritic to strongly suprachondritic \(\text{Re/Os}\) between 0.08 and 12.8, and \(\text{Pt/Os}\) between 0.57 and 15.9 (Fig. 11a). The variations of both ratios are within the range reported for both whole rock pyroxenites and sulfides from pyroxenites from Beni Bousera reported by Luguet et al. (2008). \(\text{Pt/Re}\) ratios of the whole rocks range between 0.79 and 14.8, well within the range reported by Luguet et al. (2008) for Beni Bousera pyroxenites. Thus, Totalp pyroxenites have strongly suprachondritic \(\text{Re/Os}\) and \(\text{Pt/Os}\) and will, with time, produce elevated \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) and \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\), relative to chondrites. However, in order to match the coupled suprachondritic \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\)–\(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) data observed in picrites from Hawaii, Brandon et al. (1999) calculated a required \(\text{Pt/Re}\) of \(\sim 88 - 100\). Such high \(\text{Pt/Re}\) values are reported for only a few pyroxenite whole rocks or pyroxenite hosted sulfides (this study, Fig. 11a; Luguet et al., 2008). The majority of pyroxenite samples for which HSE data are available, will develop radiogenic \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) too rapidly (Fig. 11b). Mixtures of fertile herzolitic mantle and most pyroxenite compositions cannot explain the range from chondritic to suprachondritic Os isotopic ratios in Hawaiian picrites and Gorgona komatites (e.g. Brandon and Walker (2005). Another problem is related to the low-Os concentrations of many pyroxenites. To reproduce radiogenic \(^{184}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) observed in picrites by a mixed pyroxenite-peridotite source, the amount of pyroxenite in the melt source and thus, by inference, recycled crust needs to be as high as 90%. Although this estimate is strongly dependent on the pyroxenite composition, it may be unreasonably large (Walker et al., 1994, 1997; Luguet et al., 2008; Dale et al., 2009).

Some base metal sulfides and Pt-rich alloys from eclogite, pyroxenites or ophiolites have the appropriate \(\text{Pt/Re}\) ratios (Luguet et al., 2008) to produce the observed coupled \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\)–\(^{184}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) systematics after sufficient isolation time. How representative such compositions are for samples on the scale of hand specimen or even larger mantle domains, however, remains an important open question. The heterogeneity in sulfide and alloy compositions and the contrasts with bulk rock HSE compositions of pyroxenites reported here and in a variety of peridotites elsewhere (e.g. Alard et al., 2000, 2002) indicate that the mass balance of such phases must be well constrained before extrapolations to whole rock compositions or even larger scale processes can be considered reliable.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Modeling results suggest that pyroxenites of the Totalp ultramafic massif formed as cumulates from melts reacting to various extents with mantle peridotites in the spinel lherzolite facies, as suggested for other pyroxenite suites (Obata, 1980; Sinigoi et al., 1983; Bodinier et al., 1987, 1990; Takahashi, 1992; Davies et al., 1993; Pearson et al., 1993; Vaselli et al., 1995; Becker, 1996; Kumar et al., 1996; Garrido and Bodinier, 1999). Cumulate precipitation of sulfides bearing a melt signature is required to account for high Pt, Pd and Re concentrations and HSE fractionations observed (e.g. Rehkämper et al., 1999b). While the websterites precipitated from hybrid melts derived from reaction of small amounts of externally derived melt with peridotite, clinopyroxenites may have formed in a melt-dominated system by limited reaction of existing websterites with further batches of pyroxene-saturated melt, thus acquiring the HSE and radiogenic Os isotope signature of the melts. Multiple melt batches derived from reservoirs with suprachondritic, but disparate \(\text{Re/Os}\) and \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) are required to account for the variably radiogenic initial \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) of Al-rich clinopyroxenites.

The \(\text{Pd}\) and \(\text{Re}\) rich nature and radiogenic Os isotopic composition of Totalp pyroxenites are consistent with derivation of parental melts by partial melting of mafic components in the convecting mantle. Sulfide melt–mss partitioning of the HSE during partial melting of subducted oceanic crust can only generate appropriate HSE fractionations in partial melts if mss is stable in the source rocks. The variations in HSE abundances and their patterns are a complex function of variable degree of melting, melt–rock reactions, and variable melt source composition. In the present case, an origin as in situ melts of wall rock peridotite or as residues from partial melting of slices of recycled oceanic crust appears unlikely.

Pyroxenites or their sulfides as a source of plume-related lavas with high \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) and \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) remain a problematic proposition. While some base metal sulfides and Pt-rich alloys have sufficiently high \(\text{Pt/Re}\) to produce high \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) and \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) signatures over time (Luguet et al., 2008), small scale HSE heterogeneities in pyroxenites cast doubt on the representativeness of these analyses. Based on whole rock HSE compositions, by far most pyroxenites in the present study and others have too little Os and are too enriched in Re compared to Pt to account for the coupled \(^{186}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\) and \(^{187}\text{Os} / {^{188}\text{Os}}\)-enriched isotopic ratios observed in some mantle melts.
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