Traces of ancient mafic layers in the Tethys oceanic mantle
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ABSTRACT

Oceanic basalts are formed by melting of a chemically and isotopically heterogeneous mantle source. The oceanic mantle probably resembles a marble cake containing layers of mafic rock - perhaps recycled ocean crust - stored in the mantle for >1 billion years. Many questions about the nature and distribution of these mantle heterogeneities remain. Here we show that lithological and isotopic traces of ancient mafic layers can still be seen in mantle rocks that have melted to form oceanic crust at a spreading centre in the Tethys Ocean. We have found centimetre-scale heterogeneity in initial osmium isotope ratios in mantle rocks from the Pindos Ophiolite. Deformed pyroxenite layers have high \(^{187}\)Os/\(^{188}\)Os ratios (0.14-0.20) compared to adjacent host peridotites (\(^{187}\)Os/\(^{188}\)Os: 0.12-0.13). These layers were formed by a reaction between mantle rock and melt derived from ancient rocks with high Re/Os ratios. We interpret the pyroxenite layers as the wall rocks of billion-year old mafic layers that melted and transformed mantle peridotite into pyroxenite by melt-rock reaction. The pyroxenite layers are the melting residue of ancient metre-scale basaltic veins in a kilometre-sized marble cake domain in the oceanic mantle that has withstood homogenization on a billion-year time scale.

1. Introduction

The chemical and isotopic compositions of ocean island basalts (OIB) and mid-ocean ridge basalts (MORB) show that their source, the convecting oceanic mantle, is remarkably heterogeneous (e.g., Hofmann, 1997). The oceanic mantle probably contains unhomogenized domains of extensively melted mantle that record an ancient, Proterozoic and Archean melting history (Meibom et al., 2002; Harvey et al., 2006; Pearson et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2008; Dijkstra et al., 2010). Moreover, it is widely assumed that the oceanic mantle contains layers of basaltic composition, possibly subducted ocean crust, in the form of eclogitic or granulite pyroxenites (Hofmann & White, 1982; Allègre & Turcotte, 1986; Morishita et al., 2004, Kogiso et al., 2004; Donnelly et al., 2004; Meibom et al., 2004; Sobolev et al., 2007). This notion has led to the coining of the phrase ‘marble cake mantle’ (Allègre & Turcotte, 1986). Melting of a mixed peridotite-pyroxenite source underneath ocean islands and mid-ocean ridges can explain the composition of OIB and MORB (Hirschmann & Stolper, 1996; Niu & Batiza, 1997; Kogiso et al., 2004; Donnelly et al., 2004; Sobolev et al., 2007; Lassiter et al., 2000). Pyroxenite layers are also the most common lithological heterogeneities in mantle xenoliths and in peridotite massifs derived from the subcontinental lithospheric mantle (Jacob et al., 2005; Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Downes, 2007; Van Aken et al., 2010). These continental mantle pyroxenites are generally interpreted as high-pressure magmatic veins (Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Downes, 2007), but some may represent ancient recycled ocean crust (Blichert-Toft et al., 1999; Morishita et al., 2004; Jacob et al., 2005), or veins made from melts derived from recycled oceanic material (Pearson et al., 1993; Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Downes, 2007; Bodinier et al. 2008; Van Aken et al., 2010; Montanini et al., 2012).

Critically, the presence of isotopic heterogeneities associated with geologically old basaltic (mafic) lithologies in the oceanic mantle has not been confirmed directly in oceanic mantle rocks, even though it is a requirement of basalt petrogenesis models (e.g., Hirschmann & Stolper, 1996; Sobolev et al., 2007). In contrast to continental mantle, oceanic mantle is continuously stirred by convection, and the discovery of distinct ancient unhomogenized pyroxenite layers would place important limits on the effectiveness of this stirring in homogenizing the mantle. Samples of fossil oceanic mantle are widely available and easily accessible in ophiolites. Mantle pyroxenites are common in ophiolites, but so far it has never been shown that any of these are residues of ancient mantle heterogeneities that were present during partial melting at depth, i.e., mantle heterogeneities that contributed to basalt production. It is commonly assumed that ophiolitic mantle pyroxenites are late-stage igneous products of mantle melts that crystallized in the oceanic lithosphere at a spreading centre or off-axis (e.g., Dantas et al., 2007). It is also widely believed that mafic mantle heterogeneities, if present, melt out completely during mantle upwelling underneath spreading centres (Allègre & Turcotte, 1986).

We have tested whether lithological and isotopic relics of the marble cake mantle may have been preserved in
refractory mantle rocks from a ridge system. In our study we used the Re-Os radiogenic isotope system, because, due to the compatible behaviour of the daughter element Os and the long half-life of 42 Ga (Smoliar et al., 1996), the \(^{187}\text{Re}^{187}\text{Os}\) decay system is well-suited to study mantle rocks and has the potential to 'look through' recent melting and other ridge processes into the older mantle source history.

2. Geological setting

2.1. The Dramala Complex, Greece

We have carried out a field and geochemical study focusing on the Dramala Complex (figure 1), the uppermost of the main thrust sheets that make up the Mesozoic Pindos Ophiolite in Northern Greece. The Dramala Complex is dominated by mantle rocks, but an undisturbed intrusive contact with plutonic, mostly cumulate rocks with MORB-characteristics is locally preserved (Rassios & Moores, 2006). The Dramala Complex tectonically overlies another major thrust sheet, the Aspropotamos Complex, and the contact is marked by slivers of metamorphic sole rocks (see also figure SI-1 in supplementary information). The Aspropotamos Complex chiefly consists of plutonic and volcanic rocks with MORB, island arc tholeiite and boninitic affinities, and has therefore clear supra-subduction zone characteristics (Jones et al., 1991; Saccani and Photiades, 2004; Pe-Piper et al., 2004). Both the Dramala Complex and the Aspropotamos Complex overlie an ophiolitic melange unit, the Avdella Melange (Jones et al., 1991). The melange unit also contains some smaller bodies of (serpentinised) mantle rocks, possibly with supra-subduction zone affinities, but these have not been included in our study.

The Dramala mantle rocks are, however, representative for typical abyssal peridotites (i.e., residues of MORB-source mantle) with regards to their moderately refractory character. Spinel Cr-numbers, i.e., molar ratios of 100Cr/(Cr+Al), in harzburgites are 30-55 (Pelletier et al., 2008), corresponding to moderate to moderately-high degrees (14-18\%) of near-fractional melting and melt extraction according to the relation of Hellebrand et al. (2001). Generally, spinel Cr-numbers>60 are considered indicative of mantle that melted to high-degrees in supra-subduction zone environments in the presence of a hydrous melt or aqueous fluid (e.g., Pearce, 2003). Importantly, Pelletier and co-workers (2008) showed that B (as well as Li and Be) concentrations in Dramala mantle rocks and in primary mantle minerals are identical to those in abyssal peridotites, ruling out any significant imprint of supra-subduction zone hydrous fluid input or of fluid flux-melting. Moreover, the Dramala Complex has no economically significant chromitite deposits, unlike typical ophiolites formed or strongly modified in supra-subduction zone spreading environments (Rassios & Moores, 2006; Brenker et al., 2003; Büchel et al., 2004).

Constraints on the age of melting and igneous activity at the Mesozoic spreading centre recorded in the Dramala peridotites, are indirect. Zircons from a plagiogranite from a block of plutonic rocks in the Avdella Melange Unit were dated at 171.3±3.1 Ma by means of U-Pb SHRIMP dating (Liati et al., 2004). As this sample is not from the Dramala Complex, it is unclear how this age relates to the age of melting of the Dramala peridotites. Metamorphic rocks that line the sole thrusts of the different thrust sheets in the Pindos Ophiolite, including that of the Dramala Complex, have been dated using Ar-Ar methods at 167±4 Ma (see Smith, 1993). As these ages are interpreted as the start of the ophiolite emplacement process, they give a minimum age for the age of melting in the Dramala mantle. Throughout the paper, an age of 170 Ma is assumed for the age corrections of the reported isotope measurements. Assuming a slightly older (i.e., late-Triassic, see figure SI-1 in supplementary information) age for the age of mantle melting would not change the conclusions in this paper.

2.2. Mantle layering in the Dramala Complex

Our studies have focused on a km-sized structural domain with predominantly coarse-grained mantle tectonites; immediately SE of a km-scale mantle shear zone and 1-2 km below the crust-mantle boundary in the NE part of the Dramala Massif (figure 1b). This domain is characterised by peridotites with olivine recrystallized grain sizes of 2-10 mm and well-organized olivine substructures, i.e., with straight, widely-spaced subgrain boundaries and without undulose extinction. These microstructures are indicative of low stress (<10 MPa) mantle flow at temperatures around or above the peridotite solidus (e.g., Ceuleneer & Rabinowicz, 1992) without any significant overprint of lower temperature deformation. At several localities in this domain, a distinctive 'mantle layering' has been preserved, consisting of 2-15 cm thick alternating layers of dunite, pyroxene-poor and pyroxene-rich harzburgite, and concordant pyroxenite, all transposed parallel to the mantle deformation fabric (figure 2a-c). The high-temperature mantle flow fabrics are the earliest deformation structures that we observed in the Dramala Complex, which makes the mantle layering the structurally oldest observed feature in the mantle. The mantle layering is cut by a suite of 2 cm to 10 m wide discordant, late-stage pyroxenites with cumulate textures (figure 2c). The mantle layering is also cut and deformed by a km-wide shear zone made of mylonitic mantle rocks (figure 1b) that is probably associated with the earliest emplacement of the Dramala Complex. The late-stage cumulate pyroxenites are seen to cross-cut mylonitic mantle rocks, and are thus structurally distinct from the older pyroxenites which are part of the mantle layering.

Pyroxenites from the early mantle layering are websterites consisting predominantly of orthopyroxene, with additionally 10-20\% modal clinopyroxene, 10-35\% olivine, 1-3\% spinel, and 0-3\% (Fe,Ni,Cu)-sulfide. These concordant websterites are very refractory, with 0.7-3.6
mass% Al₂O₃ and 0.5-0.9 mass% Cr₂O₃ (see supplementary data table SI-1). At the thin section scale, olivine is concentrated in mm-scale peridotite enclaves with irregular outlines within the pyroxenites, in cases rimmed by clinopyroxene-rich margins. Orthopyroxene grains within the pyroxenites contain abundant inclusions of clinopyroxene, olivine, and olivine+clinopyroxene. These inclusions form orientation families, and inclusions belonging to the same orientation family can be seen in adjacent orthopyroxene crystals (figure 2d). These textures indicate crystallization of clinopyroxene followed by formation of orthopyroxene at the expense of olivine and clinopyroxene. These textures are unlike typical igneous crystallization textures in cumulate pyroxenites. Instead, the textures clearly suggest that the concordant pyroxenites are replacive products of melt-rock reactions between peridotite and pyroxene-saturated melts. Such replacive origins have also been proposed for several types of pyroxenites in continental and in sub-arc mantle massifs (Burg et al., 1998; Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Berly et al., 2006; Garrido et al., 2007; Bodinier et al., 2008; Van Acken et al., 2010; Lambart et al., 2012; Marchesi et al., 2013).

3. Analytical methods

Highly altered zones were removed from the samples with a diamond disc saw. Pyroxenites were cut from the enclosing peridotites with a diamond disc saw and cut into 5-10 cm pieces; the outer 3-5 mm contact zones of the pyroxenites with the enclosing peridotites were not included in the pyroxenite sample. Cut blocks were then cleaned in an ultrasonic bath in distilled water for at least 30 minutes to remove contaminations from the saw blade.

To make powders we used a two-step approach. The first step was to crush the sample to <3mm sized fragments by means of a high-voltage pulsed process for selective fragmentation (“Selfrag”, Kerzers, Switzerland) at the University of Bern, Switzerland. A typical 1-3 kg sample immersed in water is fractured by frequent pulses of 125-135 kV electrical pulses. The size of the resulting fragments is controlled by a metal grid in the sample vessel, through which the fragments fall into a plastic sample bag in the lower sample vessel, by means of a high-voltage pulsed process for selective fragmentation (“Selfrag”, Kerzers, Switzerland). For analyses we used sub-boiled GR 30 % (m/m) hydrochloric and 65 % (m/m) nitric acids (Merek, Darmstadt). Two grams (±10%) of fine powdered samples were transferred into 50 ml quartz glass beakers, with the addition of a 99Ru, 106Pd, 187Re, 190Os, 187Ir, 190Pt mixed spike, and dissolved in a mixture of 5 ml HNO₃ and 2 ml HCl. Vials were closed leak-proof with Teflon tape and a quartz glass lid. In one digestion run, five samples, plus one reference material (i.e., Certified PGE Reference Material Diabase Rock Material TDB-1 (CANMET), Reference Materials komatite OKUM (IAG) and dunite GAS (CGL), and one blank, were dissolved in a High Pressure Asher (HPA) system (Anton Paar – Perkin-Elmer Instruments, Graz) at 300°C and at a pressure of 125 bar for four hours. Vials were weighed before and after entering HPA, to assess mass loss. After cooling of the solutions, the Os isotope ratio and concentration were measured as volatile OsO₄, which was sparged directly into the ICP-MS following the method of Hassler et al. (2000). The bias and precision of the Os isotope ratio measurements were monitored with 1 ng in total of LOsST Os solution also sparged into the intrument. Repeated measurement of this interlaboratory comparison material gave in average 0.1069 with an intermediate precision standard deviation of less than 1 %, which was considered fit-for-the-purpose. The residue was centrifuged and dried down on a hot plate. Subsequently, 1.5 ml 0.1 mol l⁻¹ HCl was added and the solution was heated. The solution was filtered and 1-1.5 ml of the solution was introduced into a cation-exchange resin column (Dowex AG50Wx8 200-400 mesh, Fluka, Switzerland). The column with a ca. 13 ml volume (1m long, 4.2 mm diameter tube) was under pressurized (2 bar) to ensure the passing of sample trough the resin. The exit was connected directly to the tubing system of the peristaltic pump of the mass spectrometer. For analyses a quartz nebulizer and Ni cones were used.

At the beginning and at the end of each analysis an internal standard solution containing all PGE and Re was measured, then a column blank to monitor the background values (usually about 50 counts s⁻¹). Subsequently, the sample was introduced into the column. The elution of PGE’s and Re typically took about 30 minutes. Peaks for other elements (ZrO₂, Cd, Hg and others) that could cause interferences on PGE and Re in the ICP-MS appeared much later. By monitoring it is possible to take just the interference-free part of the signal for the subsequent concentration calculations. Concentrations were calculated on different isotope ratios: for Ru: 101Ru/99Ru and 105Ru/99Ru; for Pd: 106Pd/108Pd, 106Pd/108Pd and 105Pd/108Pd; for Re: 187Re/186Re; for Os: 190Os/188Os; for Ir: 187Ir/189Ir and for Pt: 194Pt/195Pt, 195Pt/198Pt. This procedure has the advantage compared to other methods that on-line monitoring is possible, and that sample preparation work is relatively simple, allowing for instance to keep the blanks as low as the acid blanks used by HPA digestion.
Measurement uncertainties of the average of 7 independent concentration measurement of TDB-1 were found to be less than 15% relative. Concentrations of Os, Ir and Ru are not certified but compare very well with published ID-MS data. Too few data exists for OKUM to compare to our data set. As the HSE concentrations in our samples are generally in the 1-20 ng/g range, the combined uncertainty for measurement for all HSE in this range is estimated to be less than 15% relatively.

To test for any bias of the method described above with respect to other methods, we also analyzed a small sample sub-set using a modified ‘conventional’ measurement procedure, described by Birck et al. (1997) and Rehkamper et al. (1997). Repeaté measurements on Br-extracted Os isotopes were measured on a Triton (Thermo) Negative-ion Thermal Ionization Mass spectrometer (N-TIMS), and PGE and Re concentrations were measured on single-collector Element-2 (Thermo) ICP-MS, both in the Centre of Isotope Research in St.-Petersburg, Russia. For analyses, Merck analytical grade and suprapure acids were used, which were further purified 2-3 times by sub-boiling and bottle-to-bottle procedures. Two gram sample powders and 300 mg 186Re-187Os and 300 mg 188Os-189Ru-190Pt-192Pt-196Pd tracer were added together. After addition of 3 ml 11 mol/l HCl, samples were frozen by -20°C. Subsequently, 7 ml 14 mol/l HNO3 was added. As in the previous case the samples were dissolved in 90 ml quartz glass vials in a high pressure asher at 300°C, 125 bars for 16 hours. Os was eluted with a bromine extraction and microdistillation. After digestion samples were poured into 60 ml Savillex Teflon beakers with the addition of 1 ml bromine and left for one hour on a shaker. Br2 was drawn off by a pipette and evaporated with the addition of 1 ml conc. HBr. Subsequently, the sample was transferred in one drop of acetone onto a lid inside of a conic Savillex Teflon beaker and evaporated again. Subsequently, one drop of 40% (m/m) sodium dichromate in 12 mol/l H2SO4 was added, while 5 µl conc. HBr was stored on the conic part of the beaker. The vial was left conc. for four hours on a hot plate to concentrate Os in the HBr microdrop. For measurements, Os in form of bromides was transferred onto Pt tapes together with 0.2 µl Ba(OH)2+NaOH emitter. An installation for oxygen inlet (P = 2·10⁻⁷ bar) to the mass spectrometer chamber and cooling by liquid nitrogen were used under a vacuum of 7·10⁻⁴ bar. Temperature of tape heating was at 730-750°C.

The solution with the remaining platinum group elements and Re passed through a 2 ml ion-exchange column (1x8 AG BioRad, 100-200 mesh). The fractions were collected in series: Ru in 10 ml 11 mol/l HCl; Re in 14 ml 4 mol/l HNO3; Pd 10 ml 10 mol/l HNO3; Ir and Pt in 14 ml 14 mol/l HNO3. Once collected, the fractions were evaporated and transferred into 2 ml of 3 % (m/m) HNO3.

For analyses a quartz nebulizer and Ni cones were used. Measurements were run on the middle resolution in dynamic regime. For mass-bias correction the following elements with 1 µg/g concentration each were added: Mo for Ru, Ag for Pd, Ir and Re. Isotope ratios used for correction: 95Mo/97Mo = 1.6670, 107Ag/109Ag = 1.0764, 193Ir/191Ir = 0.5949, 185Pt/184Pt = 1.026238. 186Pt was corrected for 198Hg on 196Hg. Analytical blanks were at: Re - 0.15 ng, Os - 0.02 ng, Ru - 0.07 ng, Pd - 0.27 ng, Ir - 0.05 ng, Pt - 0.06 ng. Precision of element concentration measurements on duplicated samples were 1%-6%, and 0.5%-1% for the 187Os/185Os isotope ratio measurements.

4. Results – Os isotopic mantle heterogeneity

Highly Siderophile Elements (HSE, i.e., Os, Ir, Ru, Pt, Pd, Re) and 187Os/188Os isotope ratios were measured in whole rock samples of concordant pyroxenite. For comparison, we also analyzed peridotite, as well as samples from late-stage, cross-cutting cumulate pyroxenite dykes. Results (table 1) show that concentrations of the compatible, Ir-like Platinum Group Elements (IPGE, i.e., Os, Ir, Ru) in concordant pyroxenites are high, similar to or up to three times higher than in peridotite (figure 3a,b). Some concordant pyroxenites also have peridotite-like Pt, Pd and Re concentrations, but most concordant pyroxenites show a variable enrichment in these more incompatible HSE, correlated with the observed abundance of secondary sulfides. Elevated Pt and Pd concentrations in concordant pyroxenite layers are not generally correlated with elevated IPGE concentrations, and there is evidence that Pt and Pd are ‘decoupled’ from the IPGE, and are probably hosted by different phases (see figure SI-2 and figure caption for some discussion). The two cross-cutting pyroxenite dykes have markedly different HSE concentration patterns from the peridotites and concordant pyroxenites, with very low concentrations of IPGE, high Pt, but low Re.

Peridotite samples without obvious mantle layering and peridotites from composite peridotite-pyroxenite samples have chondritic to subchondritic (Meisel et al., 1996) 187Os/188Os ratios (0.1207-0.1291) that are similar to slightly lower values found in other Mesozoic ophiolites (figure 3c-d; Walker et al., 2002). The two cross-cutting pyroxenites have peridotite-like 187Os/188Os ratios (0.1256-0.1308), suggesting that they formed by crystallization from peridotite-derived melt. This type of pyroxenite is therefore interpreted as cumulate formed at the ridge system. Because of low Re/Os ratios, corrections to the age of the ophiolite (170 Ma) are minor.

In contrast, the concordant pyroxenites are all supra-chondritic (187Os/188Os = 0.1418-0.1980), markedly more radiogenic than the samples of enclosing peridotite (figure 3), in many cases taken only centimetres away. The lowest value is found in a very thin (0.5 cm) pyroxenite. The Os isotope ratio measurements on the middle resolution (figure 3) are generally in the 1-20 ng/g range, the combined uncertainty for measurement for all HSE in this range is estimated to be less than 15% relatively.
character of the pyroxenites was not produced by radiogenic ingrowth within the pyroxenites themselves, but requires the presence of a radiogenic ‘exotic’ component.

5. Discussion

5.1. Hybrid pyroxenites formed by melt-rock reaction

Any petrological model for the formation of the concordant pyroxenite layers must account for: (1) their replacive textures, which indicate that they formed by melt-rock reaction; (2) their high, peridotite-like Os and Ru concentrations, requiring that they formed from peridotite; (3) their radiogenic Os isotopic signature; (4) the cm-scale Os isotope heterogeneity in the mantle layering domain, i.e., from pyroxenite layers into immediately adjacent peridotite. The only petrogenetic models that can explain all the above features involve a reaction between peridotite and an exotic silica-rich agent with a radiogenic $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ isotope ratio. Similar reactions between peridotites and silica-rich melts or fluids have been suggested to play a key role in the formation of pyroxenites within subcontinental mantle (Kelemen et al., 1998; Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Bodinier et al., 2008; Van Acken et al., 2010) and in supra-subduction zone oceanic mantle (Batanova & Sobolev, 2000; Berly et al., 2006; Garrido et al., 2007; Dhuime et al., 2007; Ackerman et al., 2009).

5.2. A slab-derived metasomatic agent?

In the case of supra-subduction zone mantle, it has been proposed that silica-rich aqueous fluid or hydrous melt, in part derived from slab-melting or dehydration, can react with shallow-level mantle wedge peridotite and precipitate pyroxene at the expense of olivine (Kelemen et al., 1998) thus producing reaction-type ‘hybrid pyroxenite’ (Berly et al., 2006; Ackerman et al., 2009). We explored the viability of this model for the Dramala case, even though it is inconsistent with the notion that there is no record of hydrous melting or hydrous metasomatism in the Dramala peridotites based on light element concentrations (Li, Be, B; Pelletier et al., 2008). In this model, the radiogenic Os isotopic character of the Dramala pyroxenites must ultimately be derived from the subducted slab and be carried over a large distance towards the mantle wedge. Metasomatized peridotite xenoliths from mantle wedge localities generally have more radiogenic $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ ratios than unmetasomatized mantle (figure 4), but there is an inverse relation between $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ and Os concentration, with radiogenic values around 0.15 so far only found in extremely Os-depleted (<0.03 ng/g) mantle wedge peridotites; Such unusual peridotites may have had their Os removed by oxidizing fluids before metasomatism by a slab-derived agent (Widom et al., 2003). Therefore, as emphasized by Righter and co-workers (2002), there is no support in natural mantle rocks for the existence of metasomatic agents in subduction zone settings that carry sufficient Os over large distances to produce pyroxenites with the unique combination of high Os concentrations (1-10 ng/g) and $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}=0.15$. Moreover, in the case of the Pindos oceanic basin at 170 Ma, subducted ocean crust from any of the Neo-Tethyan oceanic domains could not have been older than 60 Ma, as the opening of the Neo-Tethys started in the middle-late Triassic in the region. Subducted 60 Ma ocean crust with a realistic bulk $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ ratio of 50 (a typical value for eclogitic oceanic crustal rocks from Dale et al., 2007) could only have attained an $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ ratio of ~0.17-0.18 at the time of the ophiolite formation. A mixing model between peridotite (3.3 ng/g Os with $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}=0.1250$) and a realistic slab-derived melt or fluid (0.02 ng/g Os with $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}=0.16$) cannot explain the composition of the Pindos concordant pyroxenites (figure 5: model A), nor can a model involving a more radiogenic slab component ($^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}=0.20$) unusually rich in Os (0.1 ng/g; figure 5: model B). The formation of the Dramala concordant pyroxenites requires a metasomatic agent with $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ significantly higher than 0.20, considering that they are formed — in part — from peridotite having Os concentrations 100-1000 higher than any realistic source for the fluid or melt. Subducted sediments or basaltic liquids need less age to arrive at such radiogenic values, given their higher Re/Os ratios, but such rocks are too poor in Os (<0.01 ng/g; Brandon et al., 2007; Dale et al., 2007; Pennistion-Dorland et al., 2012), to be an important source of radiogenic Os in the postulated silica-rich hydrous melt or fluid. Given these constraints, we conclude that a slab origin for the silica-rich metasomatic agent is unlikely for the Dramala case.

In addition, it is crucial that we recognize that there are instances of pyroxenites that have high Os concentrations and an Os radiogenic character in mantle rocks that are not from subduction zone environments. A key example for our discussion is the Totalap massif (Switzerland), a fragment of subcontinental mantle lithosphere exhumed to Tethys ocean floor by rifting before the on-set of subduction in the Tethys domain (e.g., Van Acken et al., 2010). The massif contains websterites that have high Os concentrations (>1 ng/g) and radiogenic $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ isotope ratios (>0.15). These occur together with garnet-bearing clinopyroxenites, often with the websterites forming the margin of the clinopyroxenites. It has recently been shown that the Totalap pyroxenites formed by melt-rock reaction (Van Acken et al., 2010). Clearly, the occurrence of pyroxenites very similar to the Dramala pyroxenites within continental mantle rocks from a non-subduction zone environment points to the existence of a general petrogenetic process that does not necessarily involve a slab-component. The process that we propose below involves the melting of in-situ, pre-existing eclogitic layers within the mantle. This process may operate in continental mantle, in normal oceanic mantle, as well as in mantle wedge environments (e.g., Pearson et al., 1993). We do not rule out that some mantle wedge pyroxenites can form by reaction with a slab-derived component (McInnes et al., 1999; Batanova & Sobolev, 2000; Righter et al., 2002; Ackerman et al., 2009). However,
the eclogite model proposed below can also explain the presence of Os-rich, radiogenic pyroxenite in supra-subduction zone mantle without the need to invoke long-range (>1 km) transport of radiogenic Os by a slab-derived fluid/melt.

5.3. Hybrid pyroxenites and ancient mafic layers

A petrogenetic model that involves melting of in-situ, geologically old (>c. 1 Ga), silica-rich layers with moderate to high Re/Os ratios (figure 5) meets all the above requirements. A similar model involving eclogite-derived melts has been proposed for continental mantle pyroxenites (Garrido & Bodinier, 1999; Van Acken et al., 2010). It is supported by results from high-pressure sandwich experiments of peridotite in contact with an eclogitic mafic layer undergoing partial melting (Yaxley & Green, 1998; Yaxley & Sobolev, 2007; Mallik & Dasgupta, 2012). These experiments show that at high pressures (>2 GPa) partial melts of the mafic layer with high silica-activities layer react with the enclosing peridotite to form secondary hybrid pyroxenite, consisting of a garnet-clinopyroxenite centre with an orthopyroxene-rich zone in contact with unreacted peridotite. This is essentially due to variations in melt/rock ratios, with reactions with low melt/rock ratios at the contact with peridotite producing a relatively refractory orthopyroxene-rich marginal zone (see also Lambart et al., 2012). We propose that the concordant pyroxenite layers are the melting residues of such hybrid pyroxenites formed at high pressure in the upwelling mantle underneath a ridge system (figure 6). With ongoing low-pressure melting, for instance underneath a mid-ocean ridge system, any residue of the mafic layer and the garnet-clinopyroxenite should progressively melt-out or be transformed to peridotite or dunite (Lambart et al., 2012), leaving behind the relatively refractory outer orthopyroxene-rich reaction zone (Yaxley & Green, 1998). This two-stage process can explain the nature of the mantle layering observed in our study area (figure 2, 6). Based on our observations alone, we cannot rule out that the central silica-rich layers had a felsic or pelitic composition. However, trace element and isotope geochemistry of MORB suggest that mafic lithologies are a common component in the MORB-source region (e.g., Niu et al., 1997; Donnelly et al., 2004), whereas such evidence for felsic or pelitic components is rare. Mafic layers with ages in excess of c. 1 Ga can produce melts that are radiogenic enough ([Re/188Os~1] to produce radiogenic pyroxenites by reaction with peridotite, even if these melts carry very little Os. Mafic layers in continental mantle massifs such as Horoman, Ronda, Beni Bousera, and Taltalp - thought to represent ancient basaltic cumulates or recycled oceanic crust - have high [188Os/188Os] (0.8-2.3), with Os concentrations of 0.04-0.4 ng/g (Reisberg et al., 1991; Kumar et al., 1996; Saal et al., 2001; Pearson & Nowell, 2004; Van Acken et al., 2010).

We applied a modified version of the quantitative melt-hybridization model of Sobolev et al. (2008) to show that reaction between melts derived from the complete melting of 1-3 Ga old mafic layers, and wall-rock peridotite, followed by melting of the resultant hybrid pyroxenite, can produce the radiogenic composition and high Os concentration of the observed pyroxenite layers in Dramala. The model for the Os evolution of mafic layers in the mantle (table SI-2) is run with starting compositions for the mafic layers resembling aged basalts ([187Re/188Os~240] or bulk ocean crust ([187Re/188Os~50]). We have also taken the present-day composition of actual mafic layers in the Horoman, Beni Bousera peridotite and Taltalp massifs as the starting point for the next step. It is subsequently assumed that these layers melt completely at pressures in excess of 2 GPa (~ 65 km depth) underneath the Pindos spreading centre, and that the melt reacts with the wall-rock peridotites to form a hybrid pyroxenite. We use the most simple reaction model, i.e., one of mixing-assimilation of melt and peridotite; such a simple model is not meant to describe the behaviour of the lithophile elements during the reaction, but may, as a first approximation, give an insight in the behaviour of the IPGE such as Os (Sobolev et al., 2008). Different values for the fraction of peridotite-derived Os (X_peridot) in the hybrid pyroxenite are explored. It is then assumed that both the peridotite and the hybrid pyroxenite undergo further partial decompression melting at lower pressure during upwelling underneath the spreading centre. The melting is modelled as batch melting. The degree of low-pressure melting of the peridotite is fixed at 15%, and different values for the degree of melting of the pyroxenite (F_melt) are explored.

We find that model runs with mafic layers with basaltic or bulk ocean crustal compositions with ages between 1 and 3 Ga give final compositions for the pyroxenite after mid-ocean ridge melting that are similar to some of the Dramala concordant pyroxenites (187Os/188Os=0.14-0.18, Os~2-3 ng/g). The same applies to models involving mafic layers such as found in Horoman, Beni Bousera, and Taltalp, which have typical calculated model ages of 0.5-1.3 Ga. In general, the Os concentration constraint requires that the fraction of peridotite-derived Os in the hybrid pyroxenite (X_peridot) is high, 0.4-0.6, and that the degree of melting of the hybrid pyroxenite is also high, 0.4-0.7. This is in agreement with experimental data suggesting that pyroxenites start to melt at greater depth and melt faster in the MORB-source region than peridotites, due to their lower solidus temperatures and higher melt productivity (Hirschmann & Stolper, 1996; Pertermann & Hirschmann, 2003; Kogiso et al., 2004; Sobolev et al., 2008).

However, the model cannot account for those concordant pyroxenites with high Os concentrations of 3-9.4 ng/g; these high concentrations, in particular those in excess of the typical Primitive Upper Mantle concentrations (~3.9 ng/g; Becker et al., 2006), probably require precipitation of Os-bearing cumulate phases such as (Os,Ir,Ru)-rich alloys from the eclogite-derived melt during the formation of the hybrid pyroxenites. Precipitation of such Os-rich alloys could have been a direct result of the reaction between mafic layer-derived melt with peridotites during the formation of the hybrid pyroxenites at depth.
Sulfide solubility in silicate melt is sensitive to the degree of polymerization of the melt, and a separate PGE-rich sulfide phase in a silica-rich melt can be dissolved in the silicate melt due to melt depolymerization (Ballhaus et al., 2006) associated with SiO2-loss as a result of the transformation of olivine to orthopyroxene in the reacted peridotite; PGE initially hosted in the sulfide phase can then precipitate as discrete alloy phases (Ballhaus et al., 2006). We propose that this process may scavenge a significant proportion of the PGE from the melted mafic layer.

The variations in 187Os/188Os isotope ratios that we measured can be explained by variations in peridotite proportions (or, in other words, variations in melt/rock ratios) in the hybrid pyroxenites in the above model. Qualitatively, we observed that the lowest Os isotope ratios are found in the thinner pyroxenites (<2 cm, table SI-2), suggesting that thinner hybrid pyroxenites contain a larger peridotite proportion.

6. Conclusions – a veined upper mantle domain

The proposed petrogenetic model is nearly identical to the recently proposed ‘double distillation’-type model for OIB petrogenesis, where it is argued that high-pressure melting of hybrid pyroxenites formed by melt-rock reactions produces the alkaline melt fractions that carry the HIMU (high 238U/206Pb) signature (Hirschmann et al., 2003; Sobolev et al., 2007; 2008; Mallik & Dasgupta, 2012). Estimates for the 187Os/188Os composition of the HIMU component in the mantle source are 0.14-0.16 (Reisberg et al., 1993; Hauri & Hart, 1993; Lassiter et al., 2000). Our data show that pyroxenite layers with such radiogenic Os isotope compositions do indeed exist on a <10 cm scale in the upper mantle, and that they can in part be preserved in highly refractory mantle rocks that have seen extensive melting and late-stage melt-percolation at an oceanic spreading centre.

Concordant pyroxenites in the Dramala Complex are very abundant in the km-scale study area, with typically at least one pyroxenite present in a metre-long section, but they are much rarer or absent in other areas in the same massif. If each of the concordant pyroxenites represents the refractory reacted wall rock of a melted eclogitic layer, then eclogitic layers were locally abundant in the oceanic mantle source rock before melting. A simple budget estimation suggests that each concordant hybrid pyroxenite with >1 ng/g Os containing a 50% contribution of Os from an eclogite precursor (as in the numerical model outlined above) must have concentrated the Os from a typical eclogite layer with ≤0.1 ng/g Os that was one order of magnitude thicker than the final hybrid pyroxenite. This suggests that a typical precursor eclogite layer with symmetrical hybrid pyroxenite margins had a thickness of 0.5-2 m. We conclude that the Dramala pyroxenite layers are the final melting residue of metre-scale, billion-year old ‘eclogite’ veins in a kilometre-scale marble cake domain in the oceanic mantle. The Dramala Complex may represent the melting residue of a mantle domain containing recycled ocean crust (Hofmann & White, 1982; Allègre & Turcotte, 1986; Morishita et al., 2004) or of a raft of continental mantle lithosphere stranded in the oceanic mantle after continental break-up (Coltorti et al., 2010). The preservation of abundant billion-year old lithological layers in the oceanic mantle suggests that mechanical mixing in the convecting mantle is ineffective even over long time-scales.
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Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data (tables SI-1 and SI-2, figures SI-1 and SI-2) and a KML-file with sample locations can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2013.10.039.
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Figure 1. Regional geology of the Pindos Ophiolite. A. Section across the Pindos Ophiolite, showing the Dramala Complex thrust sheet overlying the Aspropotamos Complex thrust sheet, with the tectonic contact marked by metamorphic sole rocks. The Dramala Complex has a Mid-Ocean Ridge (MOR), whereas the Aspropotamos has a Supra-Subduction Zone (SSZ) character. Approximate structural position of the mantle layering domain discussed in the text is also shown. Figure modified from Rassios and Moores (2006). B. Geological map of the northern part of the Dramala Massif in the Valia Kalda National Park, based on our own mapping and on the 1:100,000 map of the Pindos Ophiolite by Rassios & Grivas (c. 2007). Map shows sample locations and the traces of foliations in mylonite, fine-grained tectonite and coarse-grained tectonites (terminology of Ceuleneer & Rabinowicz, 1992) that we mapped in blue, purple and red respectively. The study area with coarse-grained peridotite tectonites and prominent mantle layering is marked by the circle. Roads/tracks and UTM coordinates (WGS’84 and Greek Map Datum GGRS – EGSA87) are from 1:50,000 topographic map, Valia Kalda sheet (Anavasi Publishers, Athens, 2006). See also KML file with sample coordinates in supplementary information.

Figure 2. Mantle layering in the Dramala Complex. A-B. Field aspect of mantle layering parallel to the S to SW-dipping tectonite foliation (dashed white line) described in the text. Pyroxenite layers are denoted with ‘pxt’, note the set of four closely-spaced parallel (transposed) pyroxenites and the thicker pyroxene-poor harzburgite above them in panel A. C. Field aspect of mantle layering with thin pyroxenites, cross-cut by two thin, late-stage cumulate pyroxenites. D. Photomicrograph in cross-polarized light of interior part of a concordant pyroxenite layer, showing orthopyroxene crystals (in shades of grey and pale brown) containing inclusions of clinopyroxene with nearly identical crystallographic orientations, a so-called orientation family (marked with white arrows).

Figure 3. Highly Siderophile Element (HSE) concentrations and Os isotope ratios of the studied samples. A. HSE concentrations, normalized to CI chondrite (Anders & Grevesse, 1989), in concordant pyroxenite samples. B. Normalized HSE concentrations in peridotites and in cross-cutting pyroxenite dykes. C. Present-day measured $^{185}$Os/$^{188}$Os isotope ratios versus SiO$_2$/MgO (indicative of pyroxene content) in whole rock samples of peridotite and pyroxenite. D. Present-day measured $^{185}$Os/$^{188}$Os isotope ratios versus Os whole rock concentration in peridotite and pyroxenite samples. Grey bar in C and D corresponds to the range of Os isotope ratios found in Mesozoic ophiolitic chromitites (Walker et al., 2002). Red cross indicates values for present-day Primitive Upper Mantle (Meisel et al., 1996). Black error bars in C and D indicate typical total uncertainties.

Figure 4. A. Os concentrations and $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios of Dramala pyroxenites and peridotites, compared to metasomatized mantle wedge peridotites and continental mantle pyroxenites. Mantle wedge peridotites and continental pyroxenites show very different trends originating at a common peridotitic source, as indicated by the pink arrows. Also shown are eclogitic 160 Ma oceanic gabbros and basalts (Dale et al., 2007), and pyroxenites from continental mantle massifs formed by reaction between peridotite and eclogite-derived melt (Reisberg et al., 1991; Bodinier et al., 2008; Van Acken et al., 2010). Model curves with age labels represent typical 0-4000 Ma bulk ocean crust ($^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os=50, [Os]$_{in}$=0.023 ng/g) and MORB ($^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os~240, [Os]$_{in}$=0.0086 ng/g; values from Brandon et al., 2007) at 170 Ma. Data for mantle wedge xenoliths from Brandon et al. (1996), McInnes et al. (1999), Widom et al. (2003), Handler et al. (2003) and Saha et al. (2005).

Figure 5. Results of simple mixing-assimilation modeling between peridotite and slab-derived melts/fluids or melts from complete melting of ancient mafic layer from Horoman, compared to Os (isotopic) compositions of peridotites and pyroxenites from the Dramala Complex. Outcomes of other models involving ancient mafic layers are given in table SI-2. PUM is Primitive Upper Mantle composition of Becker et al. (2006). Ticks on curves represent fraction of peridotite in the mix (0<Xperid<1). Grey areas to the left of the curves represent residues of up to 50% (F=0.5) batch melting of modeled mixtures. Models and parameters discussed in the text. Slab-derived fluids or hydrous melts are not radiogenic enough and carry only little Os and are unlikely sources of radiogenic Os in the Dramala concordant pyroxenites. In contrast, melts derived from geologically old (>c. 1 Ga) mafic layers in continental mantle massifs (e.g., Horoman) are much more radiogenic, and only relatively small fractions of such melt are required to explain the radiogenic isotope signatures and mantle-like Os concentrations in reaction-type pyroxenites. Inset diagram on top right shows enlargement of the most relevant part of the diagram, for Os concentrations between 1–10ng/g, and $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os = 0.12–0.22, for the case involving the melting of a mafic layer from Horoman. Horizontal dashed lines are for different values (0.4–1.0) of the peridotite fraction in the hybrid pyroxenite (Xperid) formed by the reaction between peridotite and melt derived from the mafic layer, whereas curved steep lines are for different values of the subsequent degree of melting (0<F<1.0) of the hybrid pyroxenite at low pressure.

Figure 6. Petrogenetic model for the formation of the mantle layering, including the inferred grain-scale tectural evolution. Billion-year old mafic layers (in red) melted at depth underneath the Mesozoic Pindos spreading center. Silicarich melts reacted with wall-rock peridotite (in dark green) to form secondary hybrid pyroxenite reaction zones (bright
green and grey). The thus formed hybrid pyroxenite melted in the MORB-source region at depths <65 km together with peridotite to form MORB. In the melting column, percolation of melts caused pyroxene-dissolving melt-rock reactions, eventually leading to a mantle layering consisting of dunite (in orange), harzburgite with varying modal pyroxene proportions, and relic concordant pyroxenite layers. Wiggly arrows indicate melt percolation; white circles represent melting.
Table 1. Highly siderophile element and Os isotope data for peridotite, pyroxenite samples and reference materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type/loc.</th>
<th>$^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os</th>
<th>Precision RSD in %</th>
<th>Al$_2$O$_3$, mass%</th>
<th>Os, nag</th>
<th>Ir, nag</th>
<th>Ru, nag</th>
<th>Pt, nag</th>
<th>Pd, nag</th>
<th>Re, nag</th>
<th>Re/Os</th>
<th>Re/Os 170$^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conodont pyroxenites</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>PO 49-1</td>
<td>0.1553</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>+25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 50</td>
<td>0.1900</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>+11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 52</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>+39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 60</td>
<td>0.1092</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 62</td>
<td>0.1578</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 204</td>
<td>0.1916</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>+16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 206</td>
<td>0.1944</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>+47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 207</td>
<td>0.1900</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 208</td>
<td>0.1558</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 209-1</td>
<td>0.1505</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 209-2</td>
<td>0.1418</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peridotites</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>PO 2</td>
<td>0.1236</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 37</td>
<td>0.1216</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 42</td>
<td>0.1244</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 48-2</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 48-2-1</td>
<td>0.1207</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 48-2-2</td>
<td>0.1196</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 211</td>
<td>0.1214</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 215</td>
<td>0.1205</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.8944</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-stage pyroxenites</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>PO 2</td>
<td>0.1098</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 33</td>
<td>0.1266</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO 53</td>
<td>0.1286</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials</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>TDB-1 (Sh)</td>
<td>0.1618</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUUM (m-f)</td>
<td>0.1962</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS (m-f)</td>
<td>0.1208</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measured by XRF.
* Percent deviation at 170 Ms from reservoir similar to ordinary and enstatite chondrite ($^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os=0.1287 and $^{186}$Os/$^{188}$Os=0.1223; Meisel et al., 1996).
* Calculated combining isotopic ratios and concentrations from two different runs.
* Assuming a Re/Fe ratio similar to that in the other peridotite samples.
* TDB-1, OUUM isotope ratio, concentrations and uncertainties are calculated as averages out of at least seven runs.
* Repeated sample subset measured by XRF and ICP-SFMS; all other analyses were done by ICP-QMS.
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Table SI-1. Whole rock compositions of the studied rock samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P049-1</th>
<th>P050</th>
<th>P052</th>
<th>P050C</th>
<th>P058</th>
<th>P062-4</th>
<th>P066</th>
<th>P068</th>
<th>P0207</th>
<th>P0208</th>
<th>P0208-1</th>
<th>P037</th>
<th>P049-2</th>
<th>P0209-2</th>
<th>P0211</th>
<th>P047</th>
<th>P053</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
<td>wt%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO2</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>70.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2O3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na2O</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2O</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDI</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRF whole rock data (wt%)</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nd: not determined
Table S1-2: Results of melt-hydrbization model after Sobolev et al. (2008) for different starting compositions of mafic layers, ages and other model parameters. Model assumes that melt from mafic layer reacts (is mixed) with peridotite to form a hybrid pyroxenite, which further melts under a mid-ocean ridge to produce a residual pyroxenite. The process is assumed to take only a few million years (i.e., negligible ingrowth of \({^{187}\text{Os}}/^{188}\text{Os}\) during the hybridization and melting).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mafic layer</th>
<th>Basalt-1</th>
<th>Basalt-2</th>
<th>Bulk OC*</th>
<th>Bulk OC*</th>
<th>Mafic</th>
<th>Horoman*</th>
<th>Beni B-1*</th>
<th>Beni B-2*</th>
<th>Total*</th>
<th>Av. Cont. crust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of mantle extraction (Ma)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>~1250</td>
<td>~540</td>
<td>~1300</td>
<td>~1050</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}_{\text{pre-melt}}) at time of extraction*</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>0.1275</td>
<td>0.1205</td>
<td>0.1099</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}_{\text{initial}}) in mafic layer (ng/g)</td>
<td>0.00856</td>
<td>0.00856</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}) in mafic layer at time of intrusion (170 Ma)*</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}) in mafic layer at time (ng/g)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}) in mafic layer at time (pg/g)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Batch melting of mafic layer:

| F (degree of melting of mafic layer) | 0.013 | 0.020 | 0.036 | 0.040 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.088 |
| \(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in melt (ng/g) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Hybridization of wall-rock peridotite:

| \(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in wall-rock peridotite | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |

| X_{\text{hyb}} | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

\(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in hybrid pyroxenite (ng/g) | 0.1407 | 0.1482 | 0.1408 | 0.1686 | 0.1832 | 0.1769 | 0.1783 | 0.1645 | 0.1719 | 0.1463 |

| Os \(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in hybrid pyroxenite resid (ng/g) | 1.66 | 1.96 | 1.67 | 1.34 | 1.71 | 1.72 | 1.43 | 1.37 | 2.11 | 1.96 |

Batch melting of hybrid pyroxenite at ridge:

| F (degree of melting of hybrid peridotite) | 0.013 | 0.020 | 0.036 | 0.040 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.088 |
| \(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in hybrid pyroxenite resid (ng/g) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

\(^{187}\text{Os}_{\text{in}}\) in hybrid pyroxenite resid (pg/g) | 2.48 | 2.49 | 2.50 | 2.52 | 2.57 | 2.58 | 2.36 | 2.29 | 2.88 | 2.52 |

* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in basalt based on Brandon et al. (2009).
* Based on typical epibasaltic oceanic crustal rocks from Dale et al. (2007). \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) ratio is based on mean of all data weighted by Os concentration.
* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in mafic layer based on typical values from mafic pyroxenites from Horoman & Beni Bousera (see below).
* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in mafic layer based on average of two mafic layers from Horoman in Sael et al. (2001).
* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in mafic layer based on pyroxenite G147M from Beni Bousera from Pearson & Nowell (2004).
* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in mafic layer based on pyroxenite G1 from Beni Bousera from Kumar et al. (1998).
* \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) and Os concentrations in mafic layer based on pyroxenite G1 from Beni Bousera from van Ark et al. (1998).
* Assuming \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) of the upper mantle at time of intrusion (~170 Ma) is 0.1250.
* Assuming that the original mafic/melt layer ratio is constant throughout the mafic layer.
* Partition coefficients for Os partitioning between melt and residue for sulfur-depleted (D>3) conditions (taken as in Sobolev et al., 2008).
* Weight fraction of Os derived from peridotite in the hybrid pyroxenite.
Figure SI-1. Tectonic evolution of the oceanic basin in which the Pindos Ophiolite was formed, based on reconstruction of Pe-Piper and Piper (The igneous rocks of Greece. The anatomy of an orogen. Gebrüder Borntraeger, Berlin, 2002). Note the position of the Dramala Complex (our study area) containing mostly mantle rocks associated with some lower crustal cumulates with Mid-Ocean Ridge character, and the Aspropotamos Complex, a tectonic unit comprised of volcanic and plutonic rocks with MORB, island arc tholeiite and boninite affinities. The juxtaposition of two such different thrust sheets, with clear suprasubduction zone characteristics and with mid-ocean ridge characteristics, can be explained by the tectonic-paleogeographic reconstructions shown above: in these reconstructions, the Dramala Complex represents either Late Triassic-Early Jurassic lower oceanic crust and underlying mantle of the Neotethys, formed by mid-ocean ridge spreading before the onset of subduction in the region, or Early-Middle Jurassic oceanic crust and oceanic mantle formed in a back-arc region of the newly formed supra-subduction zone Pindos Basin, where no influence of the subduction zone is detected in the mantle. In either case, the Dramala Complex is representative for oceanic mantle from which MORB-like magmas were extracted. The Aspropotamos Complex (and the nearby Vourinos Ophiolite) represents the ocean crust that was strongly modified or newly formed by proto-arc magmatism in the fore-arc.
Figure SI-2 A-E. Highly siderophile element correlation diagrams for studied samples from Dramala. Yellow square represents Primitive Upper Mantle (PUM). Panels A and B show good correlations between Iridium-like Platinum Group Elements (IPGE: Os, Ir, Ru). Panels C-E show that Pt, Pd and Re concentrations are much more variable, with values that exceed PUM, and their concentrations seem mostly decoupled from IPGE. We observed good correlations between elevated Pt, Pd and Re concentrations and the presence of grain boundary (Cu,Ni,±Fe)-sulfides in concordant pyroxenite samples. Samples enriched in Pt, Pd and Re probably contain a (late-stage?) (Cu,Ni)-sulphide melt phase. In contrast, IPGE are probably hosted in Fe-rich monosulfides and/or alloys (see Ballhaus, C., Bockrath, C., Wohlgemuth-Ueberwasser, C., Laurenz, V. & Berndt, J., 2006. Fractionation of the noble metals by physical processes. Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 152, 667-684).
Figure SI-2 continued (panels F-H). Selected highly siderophile element concentrations vs Cu concentrations for studied samples from Dramala. Symbols as in panels A (previous page). Dashed horizontal line represents Primitive Upper Mantle (PUM) value for the HSE. Cu is used as a proxy for the presence of (Cu,Ni)-sulfides, assumed to be the main host for Pt, Pd and Re. This is confirmed by good correlations in panels G and H. In contrast, Os (and Ru and Ir) are assumed to be hosted in Cu-poor monosulfides and/or alloys. Cu concentrations plotted at 1 µg/g are actually below detection limit (2 µg/g).