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ABSTRACT

At the Crescencia showing in the Pyrenees, Spain, three stages of mineral deposition can be distinguished: stage I: nickeline and pararammelsbergite, stage II: gersdorffite, and stage III: uraninite. Gersdorffite has been subdivided into seven groups on the basis of textural and compositional criteria. Some of these groups of gersdorffite clearly show disequilibrium processes that may have been induced by secondary reactions associated with a re-equilibration of the system during cooling. Formation and subsequent growth of gersdorffite nuclei on the nickeline (0001) surface, self-organization, or a coupled dissolution-and-reprecipitation moving interface through pararammelsbergite or nickeline are some of the processes invoked during the re-equilibration. Thus, the compositional variations found in the seven groups of gersdorffite are likely due to intermediate steps during the bulk of the replacement and re-equilibration processes at low temperature, rather than a direct precipitation from the ore-forming fluids under different conditions.
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INTRODUCTION

In the foothills of the Pyrenees belt in northeastern Spain, we have found two groups of small-scale Ni–Co deposits hosted by metasomatized Paleozoic limestones, depending on whether Co or Ni is dominant; cobalt is dominant in the San Juan de Plan deposit studied by Fanlo et al. (2004), whereas nickel is dominant at the Crescencia showing, the subject of this communication.


In general, the influence of mineral replacement as a consequence of re-equilibration processes is not considered as a major process in explaining the composition of minerals. In this paper, we focus on textures and compositional variations of gersdorffite at the Crescencia showing. These features may provide evidence for a series of re-equilibration processes at low temperature, rather than a direct precipitation from the ore-forming fluids of different composition under distinct conditions of temperature.

GEOLOGY OF THE DEPOSIT

The Crescencia showing is located in the central part of the Pyrenees (longitude 42°31'53.8" N, and latitude 0°34'17.5" E), a doubly verging collisional mountain belt that resulted from the interaction between the Ibero-African and European plates in Mesozoic and Cenozoic times. Even now, the Ibero-African plate margin is converging at a rate of 4 mm/year.

The oldest rocks in the area comprise a monotonous sequence of sedimentary rocks of Cambrian–Ordovician age. Pre-Variscan augen gneisses and granitic gneisses occur as elongate east–west domes surrounded by Variscan aureoles. An overlying Devonian sequence consists of grey limestone and shale, locally calcareous. These rocks are conformably overlain by Carboniferous chert, nodular limestone and, unconformably, by dark shale and flysch sequences. Batholiths of granodiorite were emplaced in the Paleozoic rocks. Triassic redbeds lie unconformably on the Hercynian basement, with a basal conglomerate horizon filling an erosional surface. Limestones of Cretaceous age rest unconformably on the Triassic redbeds or directly on the basement. These limestones have been strongly deformed during Alpine thrusting and locally possess a mylonitic fabric.

The Crescencia ore is hosted by limestone of the early Devonian sequence, which alternates with black shale. This ore-bearing unit is extensively dolomitized. The deposit consists of a horizontal east–west-striking vein, 50 m long and 10 cm wide, located along the contact between the limestone and black shale. An irregular and discordant zone of disseminated mineralization occurs along the vein. The Hercynian structure of both host rocks and ore is disrupted by an east–west Alpine thrust fault verging to the south. The deposit is not obviously related to an intrusive body. Nickel was extracted from artisanal workings toward the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

MINERALOGY AND PETROGRAPHY

The mineral assemblage at the Crescencia showing is characterized by Ni sulfarsenides, arsenides and diarsenides, together with late uraninite. The gangue minerals consist of ankerite and dolomite.

Three stages of mineral deposition can be distinguished on the basis of mineralogical and textural studies: Stage I: nickeline (NiAs, Nc) and pararammelsbergite (NiAs2, Prr); Stage II: gersdorffite (ideally NiAsS, Gdf), and Stage III: uraninite (UO2, Urm). The black shales adjacent to the vein contain a dissemination of pyrite (Py) rimmed by gersdorffite, although a relation between these minerals in the shale and in the vein assemblage is not evident.

Stage I comprises masses of allotriomorphic-granular aggregates of nickeline, showing a random orientation and variable grain-size. The nickeline shows a distinct (0001) cleavage and, occasionally, an incipient lamellar twinning. In some crystals, this lamellar twinning is made more prominent by alteration or destabilization of the grains (Fig. 1A). Pararammelsbergite occurs as roundish, poorly developed crystals included in nickeline or along the contact between nickeline and gersdorffite. The pararammelsbergite does not show twinning and exhibits rotation tints rich in various shades of brown. Both nickeline and pararammelsbergite are found as remnants of resorption in gersdorffite.

Stage II is dominated by gersdorffite, which overgrows or replaces grains of nickeline and fills small cracks in them. We recognize seven groups of gersdorffite on the basis of mode of occurrence and compositional variability. The groups are named gersdorffite A, B, C, D, E and F throughout the text, tables and figures. The black-shale-hosted gersdorffite overgrowing pyrite crystals is described as gersdorffite G.

Euhehedral grains of gersdorffite A, generally of small size (<20 μm), are scattered in the masses of nickeline (Fig. 1B), or aligned among the grains of nickeline (Figs. 1C, D). Along the contact between the relics of
nickeline and the euhedral gersdorffite, resorbed remains of pararammelsbergite are observed. As the euhedral crystals replaced nickeline and, locally, pararammelsbergite, they coalesced, growing outward and leading to irregular and inhomogeneous masses of gersdorffite enclosing the relics of nickeline and pararammelsbergite (Fig. 1E). **Gersdorffite B** consists of small irregular crystals with complex twinning (Fig. 1F); under crossed nicols, all the crystals are optically isotropic. **Gersdorffite C** also replaces nickeline and pararammelsbergite, forming a rhythmic development of reaction rims; the rims are irregularly distributed and closely spaced with respect to each other (Figs. 1G, H). **Gersdorffite D** forms homogeneous masses of coarse, subhedral aggregates; it occasionally contains inclusions of nickeline or pararammelsbergite (Fig. 1I). **Gersdorffite E** consists of irregular patches of As-rich gersdorffite in contact with masses of nickeline. Far from the interface between nickeline and gersdorffite E, the patches become smaller until they practically vanish. In these zones, gersdorffite D predominates (Fig. 1I). Euhedral crystals of **gersdorffite F** are included in nickeline, and they show irregular growth-bands (Fig. 1J). **Gersdorffite G** consists of euhedral crystals overgrowing the pyrite grains disseminated in the black shales close to the vein (Fig. 1K).

Stage-III mineralization is characterized by the deposition of uraninite following a recrystallization front affecting both nickeline and gersdorffite (Fig. 1L). Texturally, uraninite forms concentric structures of a few micrometers across (5–10 μm), which may coalesce and produce tabular aggregates. In some cases, these aggregates grow along crystallographic directions of gersdorffite crystals (Fig. 1M). The uraninite seems unaltered, and where the crystals are observed with both reflected-light microscopy and SEM, they do not display variations in brightness, which are characteristic of homogeneous compositions and indicative of absence of alteration or recrystallization (Fayek et al. 2002).

**Analytical Methods**

Fifteen samples were studied by reflected-light microscopy, electron-probe micro-analysis and X-ray diffraction (XRD), and back-scattered-electron images were used to characterize textural features of the samples. X-ray powder-diffraction studies were carried out using a Philips PW–1729 diffractometer with a monochromatic CuKα radiation and equipped with an X-ray-diffraction analysis program (Martin 2004). Chemical compositions of the Ni-bearing minerals were determined by wavelength-dispersion electron-probe micro-analysis using a CAMECA SX–50 instrument at the University of Barcelona. The ore minerals were analyzed for Fe, Co, Ni, Sb, As and S; the elements Cu, Bi, Zn, Pt and Pd were found to be below the detection limit. We monitored the peaks FeKα, CoKα, NiKα, SKα, AsKα, SbKα, CuKα, ZnKα, BiLα, and PbLα. Operating conditions included an accelerating voltage of 20 kV and a beam current of 20 nA. The counting times were 20 s on TAP/PET and 30 s on LiF crystals. ZAF corrections were performed using the program supplied by CAMECA. Pyrite, GaAs, NiO, as well as pure Co metal were used as primary standards. Chemical compositions of uraninite samples were established using an accelerating voltage of 20 kV and a beam current of 100 nA in order to increase counts. Peaks were counted for 10 seconds on TAP/PET and LiF crystals except for Pb, for which the peak was counted for 100 seconds. We used the Mβ line for U to avoid interference from ThL, ZrKα, FeKα and Pbβ lines. The Kα lines were used for Si, Ca, P, Mg, Al, K, Mn, Ti and Fe; the Lα for Y, and Zr, and the Mα for Th and Pb. We used as standards synthetic UO₂, ThO₂, ZrO₂, CaMoO₄, InAs and minerals (orthoclase for K, Al and Si, apatite for P, galena for Pb, rutile for Ti, spessartine for Mn). The proportion of oxygen was obtained by stoichiometry. The maximum, minimum, mean and representative results of the point analyses in the grains numbered in Figures 1, 2 and 3 are given below in tables.

**Composition of the Minerals**

**Nickeline and pararammelsbergite (Stage I)**

Results of electron-microprobe analyses (Table 1) of nickeline reveal a nearly stoichiometric composition:
The composition of pararammelsbergite (Table 1) lies within the range Ni$_{0.96–1.01}$Co$_{0–0.02}$As$_{1.94–2.01}$Sb$_{0–0.02}$S$_{0–0.04}$. The S content in pararammelsbergite falls within the range established experimentally by Yund (1962).

Gersdorffite (Stage II)

Gersdorffite shows a compositional variability depending on its mode of occurrence. Over 275 spot analyses were made of the seven types of gersdorffite. The general formula corresponds to (Ni$_{0.57–1.05}$Co$_{0–0.39}$Fe$_{0–0.12}$)As$_{0.97–1.65}$Sb$_{0–0.07}$S$_{0.37–1.01}$; however, there are substantial differences among the seven types. The As:S ratio spans a wide range, from 0.96 to 4.46. (1.61 ± 0.83). Most crystals of gersdorffite show an As:S ratio greater than the ideal As:S, 1; they are devoid of Fe (except for gersdorffite G), and devoid of Co (types C, D and E).

Gersdorffite A (cubic crystals included in nickeline) exhibits the following compositional variability: (Ni$_{0.80–1.01}$Co$_{0–0.18}$As$_{1.01–1.55}$Sb$_{0–0.05}$S$_{0.40–0.99}$) (Table 2); the As:S ratio ranges from 1.03 to 3.88 (1.44 ± 0.84). There is a strong negative correlation between As and S (R = −0.99); however, there is no correlation between anion and cation proportions. Cobalt also is present in variable contents (from 0 to 6.61 wt%). The contents of As and Co are highly variable within a single grain (Fig. 1B, Table 2) and are inhomogeneous in their distribution.

Gersdorffite B (twinned crystals) is characterized by highly variable As and S contents among the different lamellae (Fig. 1F, Table 2). The As:S ratio ranges from 1.13 to 4.23 (2.97 ± 1.18) and displays contents of Co higher than in the other types of gersdorffite (from 3.00 to 7.43 wt.%), except for gersdorffite G. Its composition is (Ni$_{0.78–1.01}$Co$_{0–0.22}$As$_{1.07–1.65}$Sb$_{0–0.02}$S$_{0.39–0.95}$) (Table 2). The As:S variability is directly related to the Ni and Co contents, as there are positive correlations between As and Ni (R = 0.87) and, between S and Co (R = 0.88) (Fig. 2).

Gersdorffite C (reactions rims) displays the highest contents of As and Ni. The As:S ratio ranges between 1.82 to 4.46 (2.96 ± 0.56) (Table 3). Its composition is Ni$_{0.99–1.01}$As$_{1.29–1.65}$Sb$_{0–0.03}$S$_{0.37–0.71}$. Both gersdorffite B and C show As values very close to the maximum As content determined experimentally by Yund (1962). Only gersdorffite from San Juan de Plan (Fanlo et al. 2004) displays a higher content (66.29 wt% As) than that at the Crescencia mine (maximum 63.90 wt% As). Gersdorffite at both ore deposits spans the broad range in As:S ratios found in the literature although, as will be explained below, their respective conditions of formation are clearly different. As can be seen in Table 3 and Figures 3A–D, the inner rim of gersdorffite C (Fig. 3C, anal. 39, 49, 51 and 53), in contact with the core of pararammelsbergite, displays a higher As content than next to the nickeline cores (Figs. 3B, D). The Co and Fe contents are the lowest of all the different types.

Gersdorffite D (massive) is the most abundant and homogeneous type, showing the As and S values closest to the ideal composition: (Ni$_{0.91–1.00}$Co$_{0–0.05}$Fe$_{0–0.03}$)As$_{0.97–1.17}$Sb$_{0–0.07}$S$_{0.83–1.01}$. The As:S ratio varies between 0.98 and 1.40 (1.09 ± 0.08). The Co and Fe contents are very low, below 1.73 wt% Co and 1.12 wt% Fe (Table 4).

Gersdorffite E consists of very irregular patches enriched in As (up to 57.50 wt%) where they are close to the masses of nickeline. As can be seen in Figure 1I and Table 4, however, far away from these masses, the patches have a composition similar to those of gersdorffite D (45.73 wt% As). The general composition is (Ni$_{0.94–1.01}$Co$_{0–0.05}$Fe$_{0–0.03}$)As$_{0.87–1.15}$Sb$_{0–0.07}$S$_{0.83–1.01}$. The As:S ratio varies between 1.11 and 2.65 (1.77 ± 0.52).

Gersdorffite F (euhedral crystals with growth bands) displays values of arsenic slightly lower than in gersdorffite A (Table 5). The general composition is: (Ni$_{0.84–1.00}$Co$_{0.13}$Fe$_{0–0.07}$)As$_{1.01–1.37}$Sb$_{0–0.03}$S$_{0.64–0.99}$.
with a As:S ratio ranging between 1.02 and 2.11 (1.49 ± 0.32). The inner bands of the idiomorphic crystals commonly display the highest S contents, whereas the outer bands, in contact with the masses of nickeline, show the highest As values (Fig. 1J); this variation is not accompanied by variations in metal contents.

_Gersdorffite G_ (overgrowth on pyrite crystals) shows the highest Co, Fe and lowest As contents and is the only Sb-free gersdorfite: \((\text{Ni}^{0.57-0.78}\text{Co}^{0.18-0.39}\text{Fe}^{0.02-0.12})\text{As}^{0.97-1.10}\text{S}^{0.90-1.01}\). The As:S ratio is in the range of 0.96–1.21 (1.11 ± 0.07) (Table 5).

_Uraninite (Stage III)_

The minimum, maximum and mean results of 20 electron-microprobe analyses of the uraninite found at the Crescencia showing, together with the calculated formula and the U–Pb chemical ages, are given in Table 6. U–Pb chemical ages of uraninite were calculated from the U, Th and Pb contents determined by electron-probe micro-analysis using the method of Bowles (1990). The chemical age is based on the assumption that the total Pb present in the sample is of radiogenic origin, the result of the decay of U and Th; the larger ionic radius of the Pb\(^{2+}\) (1.37 Å) compared with U\(^{4+}\) (1.05 Å) and their difference in valence preclude a straightforward incorporation of Pb into the structure of uraninite. The accuracy of analyses for Pb by the electron microprobe is ±0.1%, which results in errors of 10 Ma in the chemical ages. We have used the empirical formula of Ranchin (1968), which is best adapted for ages less than 200 Ma. As the sum of all oxides from EMPA (Σ) is invariably less than 100 wt%, Σ has been recalculated taking into account the excess of normalized cations (Σcat) and the number of oxygen ions (Σox) needed to compensate for them. An amount of U\(^{4+}\) has been converted to U\(^{6+}\) to compensate for Pb plus Ca (cf. Alexandre & Kyser 2005).

The uraninite grains show lead contents varying from 0.80 to 1.52 wt% PbO and have incorporated minor Ca, Ti, Si, Th, Y and Fe. Elements such as P, Zr, Mg, Mn and the rare-earth elements (REE) are low or below the detection limit, which is approximately 0.2 wt% (Table 6).

The increase in SiO\(_2\), CaO and FeO with decreasing age of uraninite, with a moderate negative correlation \((R = -0.70)\) (Fig. 4), suggests that uraninite underwent alteration by fluid-circulation events, and that this alteration occurred on a microscale. During this alteration process, uraninite may have been variably recrystallized, incorporating Ca, Si and Fe in some way (Fayek _et al._ 1997). However, taking into account...
that the circulation of fluids enhances the alteration of uraninite, leading to a loss of lead contents and a decrease in the total concentration of oxides, this alteration under oxidizing conditions was limited in the Crescencia deposit and relatively localized, because the analytical totals are relatively high (from 95 to 98 wt%, Table 6).

**DISCUSSION**

**Conditions of ore formation**

The nickeline – (para)rammelsbergite – gersdorffite assemblage is a common association in some ore deposits. Commonly, these minerals are intimately intergrown, or show complex textural and compositional variations, reflecting an environment of rapid fluctuations in temperature as well as in chemical activities (Oen et al. 1984, Choi & Imai 1985, Choi & Youn 2000, Wagner & Lorenz 2002, Power et al. 2004, Fanlo et al. 2004). The As:S ratio and cation contents have been used to distinguish the different variants of gersdorffite in high-temperature deposits. Moreover, Hem et al. (2001), Hem & Makovicky (2004) and (Fanlo et al. 2004) have suggested that both As and Ni contents in the gersdorffite–cobaltite solid solution are controlled by the fugacity of As in the mineralizing fluid at high temperature.

Other Ni–Co deposits hosted by Paleozoic limestones in the Pyrenees, such as the San Juan de Plan deposit, indicate temperatures of formation of approximately 600°C, as deduced from phase relations (Fanlo et al. 2004). The solvus diagram of Klemm (1965) is not applicable to systems that show extensive substitutions and disequilibrium textures. However, as gersdorffite G does not seem to display As-for-S substitution (As:S ratio in the range of 0.96–1.21) or re-equilibration, we plot these data in the system NiAsS–CoAsS–FeAsS (Klemm 1965). Gersdorffite G, with the highest content of Co, indicates a temperature of deposition around 400°C (Fig. 5). The other types of gersdorffite may have formed at lower temperatures; the extent of solid solution involving Ni and Co is very limited at low temperatures (<300°C), as documented by Hem & Makovicky (2004).

Bayliss (1982) described three structural variants of gersdorffite, and suggested their dependence on temperature: $P_2\overline{1}3$ is the low-temperature form, $P\overline{6}3$ is the high-temperature form, and $Pc\overline{2}1$ is an intermediate and metastable form. The last form is characterized by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositions (weight %)</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Sb</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gdf A min</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>99.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 12 max</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>60.64</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>100.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>101.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>46.96</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>100.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atoms per formula unit</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Sb</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Co</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>As:S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gdf A min</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 12 max</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites of the spot micro-analyses are indicated in Figures 1B and 1F.
VARIABILITY IN GERSDORFFITE FROM THE CRESCENCIA Ni–(Co–U) SHOWING, SPAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositions (weight %)</th>
<th>Atoms per formula unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdf C min</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdf C max</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites of the spot micro-analyses are indicated in Figures 3B, 3C, and 3D.
the presence of complex twins, high Co and Fe contents and the presence of the reflections 010 and 110 in the powder-diffraction pattern, whereas the $P2_13$ form is characterized by the reflection 110. In his heating experiments, Bayliss (1982) determined a structural change at 550° and 600°C with the loss of the 010 reflection first, and then the loss of the 110 reflection. With respect to the twinned crystals of gersdorffite B, if they were to represent the metastable gersdorffite, with space group $Pc2_1$, the diffraction patterns would show the 010 and 110 reflections. However, only the reflection 110, corresponding to the ordered phase $P2_13$ is present, which would indicate that the “twins” are not the result of a transformation twinning.

Taking into account the complex textures and the pronounced variations in As found in gersdorffite at the Crescencia showing, a question arises. Are the textures and compositional variability the result of a primary precipitation and, therefore, a consequence of variations in temperature and solution composition, or are they the result of re-equilibration processes?

Are the textural features acquired during primary deposition or by re-equilibration?

In general, the replacement of one mineral phase by another implies the role of a fluid phase, its interaction with the rock (or mineral), and therefore, the fluid: rock ratio is a variable. For instance, the introduction of a fluid with a higher activity of sulfur results in the destabilization of nickeline and the formation of gersdorffite.

From a compositional and textural point of view, a simple process of primary precipitation cannot explain

---

**Fig. 3.** (A) Back-scattered-electron images showing crystals of gersdorffite C. All the spot analyses are referenced in Table 3. (B) Enlarged image of a gersdorffite C crystal replacing nickeline (anal. 1 to 10, Table 3) and a small grain of pararammelsbergite (anal. 26 to 34). (C) Enlarged image to show the various reaction-fronts. The spot analyses located in the same rim and closest to pararammelsbergite (e.g., anal. 39 and 49) display similar compositions and are richer in As than those farther away from the core (e.g., anal. 43 and 54). (D) The reaction rims around the nickeline core are partially altered, which may be due to a re-equilibration of gersdorffite C, which leads to a S enrichment (cf. anal. 58 and 59).
most types of gersdorfite that we find. Rather, mineral-replacement processes, chemical self-organization and changes in the sulfur fugacity \( f(S_2) \) of the fluids should be invoked. With respect to gersdorfite A, its formation may be consistent with a destabilization of nickeline in the presence of pervasive fluids with high \( f(S_2) \). Thus, the formation of a high proportion of nuclei and subsequent growth arose in the masses.

### Table 4. Statistical Results of Electron-Microprobe Analyses of Gersdorfite D and E and the Point Analyses of Figure 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositions (weight %)</th>
<th>Atoms per formula unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites of the spot micro-analyses are indicated in Figure 11.

Fig. 4. Relationship between SiO\(_2\) + CaO + FeO contents and chemical U–Pb ages of uraninite from the Crescencia showing (data from Table 6).

Fig. 5. Compositional plot of the gersdorfite G in the system NiAsS–CoAsS–FeAsS. Solvus lines at different temperatures are taken from Klemm (1965).
librium was attained, gersdorf from pararammelsbergite and nickeline, and a reaction may be the product of leaching of arsenic (and nickel) of As-enriched lamellae of gersdorf (Fig. 1F). If so, the lamellar twins in gersdorf is observed, which is indicative of a and sulfur. Thus, the arsenic-rich rim in gersdorf showing nearly stoichiometric proportions of arsenic and noise (port necessarily involves disequilibrium, feedback loops and degree of supersaturation at the interface, were the result of diffusion-controlled chemical gradients. However, although gersdorfite replaced rammelsbergite or nickeline, there was no substitution of As-for-S in the gersdorfite rims. Figures 3B–D and Table 3 show that the rims of gersdorfite are more As-enriched if the core is pararammelsbergite instead of nickeline. Far from the reaction rims, gersdorfite C did re-equilibrate, showing nearly stoichiometric proportions of arsenic and sulfur. Thus, the arsenic-rich rim in gersdorfite may be the product of leaching of arsenic (and nickel) from pararammelsbergite and nickeline, and a reaction with the residual solutions, enriched in sulfur. As equilibrium was attained, gersdorfite began to show an As: S ratio closer to 1, similar to those values displayed by gersdorfite D (anal. 1, 2, 8–10, 26, 27, 34, 37, 44, 45, 47, 55, 56, 57, 66 and 76 from Figs. 3B–D). Therefore, these reaction rims are likely to represent a replacement-induced reaction-front, moving through the pararammelsbergite or nickeline. Similar results were attained in experiments by Geisler et al. (2001) and encountered in studies of natural zircon by Tomaschek et al. (2001). In these studies, the reaction proceeded from the surface of the parent, and a sharp reaction-induced interface moved into the parent crystal, resulting in a pseudomorphic replacement. The reaction rims were found to be strongly enriched in some elements (as the As is in our case).

Gersdorfite types E and F represent an intermediate compositional situation with respect to types B, C and D (As:S ratio ≈ 1). Gersdorfite E resulted from a mineral-replacement reaction, which proceeds via a moving interface (Fig. 1I). The separation of As-enriched gersdorfite and nickeline by an interface suggests a coupled dissolution–reprecipitation process, rather than one controlled by diffusion or simple ion-exchange (Putnis 2002). Direct observations of this type of reaction on a molecular scale by AFM (Pina et al. 2000) showed that the rate of dissolution of the parent phase is enhanced by the nucleation of the product and by the porosity generated. Putnis (2002) suggested that the formation of porosity during such replacement reactions and the migration of cations through this fluid-filled pore-space allow the replacement to proceed. However, the replacive gersdorfite is nonporous, perhaps because the change in molar volume of the solids is positive, as the following reaction would indicate:

\[
\text{NiAsS}_{(\text{nc})} + \text{H}_2\text{S} + 1/2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NiAsS}_{(\text{gdf})} + \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]  

The molar volumes of nickeline and gersdorfite are 17.15 and 27.11 cm$^3$/mol, respectively. Therefore, the replacement of nickeline by gersdorfite on a mol-by-mol basis through reaction (1) would result in a volume increase of 58%, which would prevent the formation of porosity.

Gersdorfite F likely formed during the latter stages of evolution of gersdorfite A, once the cubic crystals had grown and coalesced. Following Ortoleva (1990) and Dewers & Ortoleva (1990), both the textures and composition of gersdorfite F may be explained in the framework of a self-organization theory: "the spontaneous transition of a non-equilibrium system from a non-patterned state to a patterned state without the intervention of a patterned external cause" (Chadam & Ortoleva 1990). In other words, a coupling between mechanical forces, chemical reactions and solute transport necessarily involves disequilibrium, feedback loops and noise (fluctuations).

Since the basis for the self-organization involves the enhancement of compositional perturbations through some type of destabilizing feedback-type mechanism,
the dissolution of nickeline and pararammelsbergite may be invoked. Consequently, this dissolution–precipitation mechanism could lead to the compositional self-organization in gersdorffite $F$, promoting As-rich areas close to the nickeline interface and stoichiometric bands ($\text{As:S}$ close to 1) in the core of the crystals (Fig. 1J, Table 5).

CONCLUSIONS

From a compositional point of view, we outline two different groups of gersdorffite (Fig. 6), one with high value of the $\text{As:S}$ ratio (types B and C), or the highest content of Co (type G), and another (types A, D, E and $F$) with an overlap in composition. This compositional variability of gersdorffite seems to be the result of intermediate steps during the processes of re-equilibration at low temperature, rather than a direct precipitation from the ore-forming fluids under distinct conditions of composition and temperature.

The destabilization of the (0001) surface of nickeline, due to pervasive fluids with high $f(S_2)$, led to the initial formation of gersdorffite nuclei (type A). We believe that the subsequent growth and coalescence of these cubic crystals, which had an inhomogeneous distribution of As, led to a compositional self-organization during the latter stages of evolution (gersdorffite $F$). Arsenic-rich gersdorffite of types B, C and E (the patches closest to nickeline) may represent the first products during the replacement process of nickeline (or pararammelsbergite in some cases of type C). Inasmuch as gersdorffite $E$ attained chemical equilibrium, a reduction in arsenic content was produced in the patches far from the interface with the nickeline. In the formation of gersdorffite $F$, a destabilizing feedback-type mechanism, such as dissolution–precipitation, seems to have led to compositional self-organization in gersdorffite. Finally, $\text{As:S}$ values close to 1 indicate that gersdorffite equilibrated with residual solutions (type D). The replacement process proceeded via crystallographic directions (type B) or a moving interface (types C and E).

Clearly, it is important to attempt to look deeply into the microtextural relations among minerals in ore deposits in order to detect signs of re-equilibration processes, which leads to changes in composition. These processes are common in ore deposits, and they must be identified to prevent erroneous interpretations.
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### TABLE 5. STATISTICAL RESULTS OF ELECTRON-MICROPROBE ANALYSES OF GERSDORFFITE F AND G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compositions (weight %)</th>
<th>Atoms per formula unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdf F min</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>45.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 44 max</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>57.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>51.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>52.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>49.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D58</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>55.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdf G min</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 17 max</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>48.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites of the spot micro-analyses are indicated in Figure 1J.

### TABLE 6. STATISTICAL RESULTS OF ELECTRON-MICROPROBE ANALYSES OF URANINITE FROM THE CRESCENCIA SHOWING, CENTRAL PYRENEES, SPAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compositions (weight %)</th>
<th>U-Pb chem. age Ma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO₂</td>
<td>PbO</td>
<td>CaO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>88.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>90.66</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sites of the spot micro-analyses are indicated in Figure 1J.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>oprdr</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Ti</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>U⁺⁺⁺</th>
<th>U⁺⁺⁺⁺</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Σ: The sum of all oxides from EMPA data. Σcat: normalized cations. Σox: normalized number of oxygen. ΣI: sum of all oxides recalculated taking into account Σcat and Σox.
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