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Abstract

Diamond inclusions sample the otherwise inaccessible archive of Earth’s deep interior. The geochemical and petrological diversity of diamond inclusions reflects either pre-metasomatic upper mantle heterogeneity or metasomatism coeval with diamond formation. We focus on the origin of lithospheric garnet and clinoxyroxene inclusions by simulating metasomatic reactions between eclogitic fluids and mantle peridotites at 5 GPa, 1000 °C, and across a range of redox conditions ([logO2] = −1 to −6 ΔFMQ). Our results demonstrate that fluid-rock interaction can result in the formation of eclogitic, websteritic, and peridotitic silicates from a single fluid during a single diamond-forming metasomatic event. Ergo, the petrogenesis of diamond and their inclusions can be syngenetic, and the petrological diversity of diamond inclusions can reflect metasomatism coeval with diamond formation. Furthermore, during the metasomatism, refractory peridotite can be converted to fertile websterite which could become a pyroxenitic mantle source for oceanic basalts.

Introduction

Mineral inclusions in diamonds provide the geological context for diamond formation. These invaluable samples reveal that diamond formation spans more than 75 % of Earth’s history (Gurney et al., 2010) with most diamonds forming in the keel of the sub-continental lithospheric mantle (120–180 km; Stachel and Harris, 2008). The diversity of the petrological characteristics of diamond-hosted mineral inclusions either reflect [1] pre-metasomatic mineralogical heterogeneity in the upper mantle (Cartigny et al., 2001; Nestola et al., 2017), [2] fluid (Mikhail et al., 2019a,b) and/or melt metasomatism (Aulbach et al., 2002; Kiseeva et al., 2016) coeval with diamond formation, or [3] a combination of both options. The ambiguity arises because the relationship between diamond and inclusion can be protogenic (Nestola et al., 2017) or syngenetic (Harris, 1968; Mikhail et al., 2019a). We proceed here without assuming either a single protogenetic or syngenetic origin for all diamond inclusions.

Diamond-hosted mineral inclusions are diverse, including, but not limited to, sulfides, silicates, oxides, carbonates, and metallic phases (Stachel and Harris, 2008) and several of these mineral families can be sub-divided into three groups, termed inclusion paragenesis. These are [1] peridotitic (i.e. Cr-rich pyrope, diopside, enstatite, olivine), [2] eclogitic (i.e. Cr-poor pyrope-almandine, Na-rich omphacite), and [3] websteritic (intermediate compositions; Meyer and Boyd, 1972; Sobolev et al., 1973; Gurney et al., 1984) (Fig. 1a–d). The assignment of inclusion paragenesis is an empirical and subjective classification scheme which does not inform on process, sensu stricto. Herein, we focus on garnet and clinoxyroxene data because these two inclusion types are present in significant abundances in all three paragenetic groups. The boundaries between peridotitic and eclogitic suites are only as clear as the contrast between the symbol shape and colour selected for the plot (Fig. 1a–d). For example, there is less of a distinction between peridotitic and eclogitic clinoxyroxenes than is apparent for peridotitic and eclogitic garnets (Fig. 1a–d). In Figure 1c,d it can be seen that garnets and clinoxyroxenes show an apparent continuum between the peridotitic and eclogitic suites charted by websteritic garnets (Fig. 1). Herein, we examine two key assumptions: [1] the different silicate inclusion parageneses are genetically distinct, and [2] silicate inclusion and host diamond paragenesis are syngenetic.

Methods and Results

Modelling approach. Our conceptual geologic model involves a fluid that is initially in equilibrium with a mafic eclogite migrating and encountering peridotite with which it is not in equilibrium. As a consequence, irreversible chemical mass transfer occurs. This model is analogous to a fluid migrating from a subducting slab and metasomatising the sub-continental lithospheric mantle. Alternatively, the source of the fluid could be an upwelling transition zone (i.e. a plume), evolving water when hydrous wadsleyite converts to olivine + H2O and the fluid phase would rise buoyantly. We built on the long-standing tradition in theoretical aqueous geochemistry of modelling irreversible chemical mass transfer in crustal hydrothermal systems (Helgeson, 1970, 1979; Sverjensky, 1984, 1987). Here we used the aqueous speciation and solubility code EQ3 and the chemical
mass transfer code EQ6 (Wolery, 1992) modified for upper mantle temperatures and pressures using thermodynamic data from the extended Deep Earth Water model calibrated with experimental solubilities (Huang and Sverjensky, 2019) previously applied to the formation of Panda diamonds (Huang and Sverjensky, 2020). More detail is given in the Supplementary Information. We ran a series of models to simulate the reactions between eclogitic fluids and a variety of lherzolite, harzburgite, and dunite compositions (Tables 1, S-5) using empirical data for peridotites from the compilation of Pearson and Wittig (2014).

Model parameterisation. The input variables are the initial fluid geochemistry, and the abundances and solid solution compositions of minerals in the initial rock, with a fixed pressure of 5 GPa and fixed temperature of 1000 °C. The initial fluids were based on a calibration of the fluid chemistry in equilibrium with a mafic eclogite measured by Kessel et al. (2015) as documented in Huang and Sverjensky (2019) (Table S-1). We assumed ideal site mixing of pyrope, almandine, and grossular in garnet composition and a non-ideal mixing of diopside, hedenbergite, and clinoenstatite in clinopyroxene previously calibrated using known mineral and fluid chemistries to simulate diamond formation beneath the Panda mine in the Slave craton (NW Canada) at 950 °C and 4.5 GPa (Huang and Sverjensky, 2020). The pressure-temperature conditions adopted here (5 GPa and 1000 °C) are relevant to lithospheric diamond formation (Stachel and Harris, 2008). The temperature of 1000 °C is at the lower end of natural systems, where the average inclusion entrapment temperature is 1155 ± 105 °C (n = 444; Stachel and Luth, 2015). The initial oxygen fugacity ($f_{O_2}$) of the model fluids was varied from $-1$ to $-6$ log units relative to the Fayalite-Magnetite-Quartz reaction (abbreviated to ΔFMQ), a greater range than is calculated from lithospheric diamond inclusions (Stachel and Luth, 2015). Representative initial fluids are given in Tables S-1 and S-2. The model outputs the evolving chemistry of the fluid and the metasomatic minerals finishing when the fluid finally equilibrates with the initial rock. The final fluid compositions and modal abundances of the minerals produced are shown by representative results in Figures 2, 3 and Tables 1, S-3–S-5 (input and output files are available at https://doi.org/10.17630/32eb3d3c0-bba6-4aa1-9b6d-c53aa0a3b61e0).

The Nature of Diamond Inclusion Formation

Connecting eclogitic to peridotitic inclusions along a single reaction pathway. Fluid-rock interaction results in the compositional evolution of the fluid phase coupled to the continual precipitation of mineral phases with progressively more Mg-rich
garnet and clinopyroxene compositions (Fig. 2a–d). In fact, the major element geochemistry of garnets precipitated in our models traverses from eclogitic to peridotitic along the websteritic ‘bridge’ during a single reaction pathway (Fig. 3a). Importantly, it can be seen in Figure 3a that reaction pathways in lherzolite, harzburgite, and dunite follow the same compositional trend. Metasomatism of a single peridotite by a single eclogitic fluid will result in the progressive precipitation of garnets starting with eclogitic, then websteritic, and finally pyrope-rich peridotitic compositions (Fig. 3a). A similar observation is true for clinopyroxenes, where our models all travel from deep inside the eclogitic field and cross over the (poorly defined) websteritic data cluster and into the (also poorly defined) peridotitic cluster along a single reaction pathway (Fig. 3b). Our results for garnet and clinopyroxene compositional trends may not apply to all diamond-hosted mineral inclusions, but they demonstrate that the paragenesis for the inclusion and host diamond can be synoptic, and that the different inclusion parageneses can be genetically related and preserve a reaction pathway. Therefore, and on occasion, inclusion paragenesis does not serve as a bona fide proxy for provenance. For example, a peridotitic inclusion can precipitate from an eclogitic fluid, while an eclogitic inclusion will precipitate from an eclogitic fluid within a peridotite.

Without diamond to preserve the reaction products as inclusions there would be no evidence for this pathway (i.e. the websteritic bridge) because the high temperatures of the mantle are in excess of the blocking temperature for these phases (Pearson and Wittig, 2014) which would result in post-fractionation homogenisation via diffusion. However, the highly refractory, low diffusivity, and inert nature of diamond, results in archives of this reaction pathway occasionally, and globally, in the geochemistry of diamond inclusions (Fig. 3a,b).

The formation of diamond along single reaction pathways (shown in Fig. 2b) involving subducted fluids reacting with ambient mantle peridotite, as presented here, is consistent with the several observations for the geochemistry of diamonds and their inclusions. Our models provide a single mechanistic explanation for the situation where single natural diamonds host disequilibrium inclusion assemblages, such as diamonds hosting inclusions of mixed parageneses (Gurney and Boyd, 1982; Wang, 1998; Dobosi and Kurat, 2010; Mikhail et al., 2019a). Furthermore, our models satisfy some stable isotope data, such as strong isotopic evidence for the role of both mantle and crustal sources within single samples and single sample populations. For example, mantle-like high 4He/3He is observed for diamonds with crustal-like 13N-enrichment and 13C-depletion (Gautheron et al., 2005; Mikhail et al., 2019b; Timmerman et al., 2019) and the occasional observation for coupled and progressive 15N-depletion and 18O-enrichment trends between diamond and inclusion (Schulze et al., 2013).

### Other Implications

**Isothermal and redox neutral diamond formation.** Diamond formation by the reduction or oxidation of carbon is difficult to express because lithospheric peridotites can only buffer $\Delta O_2$ systems where the fluid component is present in trace quantities (<50 ppm; Luth and Stachel, 2014). This led Stachel and Luth (2015) to propose a redox neutral mechanism where diamond forms during the cooling of a CO2 fluid as it crosses thermal gradient. Our data also show that diamond formation is feasible without the need for any shift in redox or pH of the fluid (log$O_2$ in our models shifts by ≤0.4 log units; Table 1). Contrary to the model in Stachel and Luth (2015), our dataset also demonstrates that a thermal gradient is not required. Our models predict isothermal and isotopic diamond formation during irreversible chemical mass transfer. The fundamental driving force for the metasomatism during the chemical mass transfer is provided by the initial chemical disequilibrium when a fluid leaves a mafic eclogitic rock and encounters a peridotite with which it must react.

**A metasomatic origin for mantle pyroxenites.** These data inadvertently predict that fluid metasomatism is a potential

---

**Table 1** Key parameters for representative metasomatic mass transfer modes presented in Figures 2, 3. The pressure and temperature for all runs was fixed at 5 GPa and 1000 °C with the starting fluid $F_O$ and fluid pH fixed at $\Delta FMO$—3 and pH 5.0, respectively. $\Delta O_2$ and $\Delta pH$ express changes in the final fluid relative to the initial. Note that these changes are very small even though the mineralogical changes in the rock are very large. A larger suite of results is provided in Table 5-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>$\Delta O_2$</th>
<th>$\Delta pH$</th>
<th>Initial Rock</th>
<th>Initial Mineralogy (vol %)</th>
<th>Final Mineralogy (vol %)</th>
<th>Final Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run 27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Lherzolite</td>
<td>Olivine (54.80), Opx (20.02), Cpx (20.20), Garnet (4.98)</td>
<td>Olivine (0.11), Opx (58.62), Cpx (31.71), Garnet (7.42), Diamond (0.05), Magnetite (2.09)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run 45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Lherzolite + aragonite</td>
<td>Olivine (52.52), Opx (19.18), Cpx (19.36), Garnet (4.77), Aragonite (4.17)</td>
<td>Olivine (0.09), Opx (40.55), Cpx (49.48), Garnet (7.62), Diamond (0.07), Magnetite (2.19)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run 75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Dunite + aragonite</td>
<td>Olivine (81.80), Opx (4.43), Cpx (4.62), Garnet (4.42), Aragonite (4.73)</td>
<td>Olivine (0.22), Opx (20.69), Cpx (62.87), Garnet (13.28), Diamond (0.06), Magnetite (2.88)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run 93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Harzburgite + aragonite</td>
<td>Olivine (67.89), Opx (22.73), Garnet (4.78), Aragonite (4.60)</td>
<td>Olivine (0.15), Opx (46.34), Cpx (39.92), Garnet (10.92), Diamond (0.07), Magnetite (2.60)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run 111</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Dunite</td>
<td>Olivine (85.86), Opx (4.65), Cpx (4.85), Garnet (4.64)</td>
<td>Olivine (58.29), Cpx (26.61), Garnet (12.40), Diamond (0.03), Magnetite (2.67)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run 117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Harzburgite</td>
<td>Olivine (71.16), Opx (23.83), Garnet (5.01)</td>
<td>Olivine (0.13), Opx (73.46), Cpx (13.53), Garnet (10.40), Diamond (0.04), Magnetite (2.44)</td>
<td>Websterite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2  Model results for the reaction pathway during metasomatism of lherzolite by an eclogitic fluid (Run 27; Tables 1, S-1–S-4). Each unit of the reaction progress variable (ξ) corresponds to destruction of 1.0 mole of each of the reactant minerals per 1.0 kg of H₂O in the initial fluid. (a) Changes in the total dissolved concentration of the major elements in the fluid; (b) Moles of new minerals precipitated from the fluid during the continuous reaction pathway; (c) and (d) The compositions of garnets and clinopyroxenes, respectively, as a function of reaction progress. Full results for all models are provided in the output files (available upon request). Olivine precipitates in the final stage of the model (Table 1) and is therefore absent in Figure 2b. Note change in scale for the x axis for a–b vs. c–d.

Figure 3  Selected model results for predicted (a) garnet and (b) clinopyroxene compositions during progressive metasomatism. Each model run refers to a single peridotite metasomatized by a single eclogitic fluid. Key parameters for the models shown are detailed in Tables 1, S-1–S-5, and the input and output files are available upon request.
candidate for the sub-solidus conversion of refractory peridote into fertile websterite (Fig. 2 and Table 1). The final amount of olivine is less than 1% in volume and produced only in the very last step of the models (Tables 1, S-5). Our models show the reaction pathway for mafic eclogitic fluids with garnet-bearing and garnet-free dunites, harzburgites, or lherzolites always results in the precipitation of a two-pyroxene dominated mineral assemblage (i.e. websterite; Tables 1, S-5). Interestingly, our metasomatic model producing pyroxenite and diamond is closely analogous to a pyroxenite-diamond connection previously suggested (Kiseeva et al., 2016) albeit with a sub-solidus fluid rather than a melt. Furthermore, the major element geochemistry of mid-ocean ridge and ocean island basalts has been used to posit a pyroxenite-bearing mantle source (very high pyroxene to olivine ratio; Hirschmann and Stolper, 1996; Sobolev et al., 2007). Thus pyroxenites produced by fluid metasomatism (this study) may not be common or vast in scale, but our model demonstrates a mechanism for the generation of a a pyroxenite source via the metasomatic conversion of peridotite into websterite, without the need to champion a mechanism involving high temperature melting of refractory eclogite.
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