Large sulfur isotope fractionation in lunar volcanic glasses reveals the magmatic differentiation and degassing of the Moon
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Sulfur isotope variations in mantle-derived lavas provide important constraints on the evolution of planetary bodies. Here, we report the first in situ measurements of sulfur isotope ratios dissolved in primitive volcanic glasses and olivine-hosted melt inclusions recovered from the Moon by the Apollo 15 and 17 missions. The new data reveal large variations in $^{34}S/^{32}S$ ratios, which positively correlates with sulfur and titanium contents within and between the distinct compositional groups of volcanic glasses analyzed. Our results uncover several magmatic events that fractionated the primordial sulfur isotope composition of the Moon: the segregation of the lunar core and the crystallization of the lunar magma ocean, which led to the formation of the heterogeneous sources of the lunar magmas, followed by magma degassing during generation, transport, and eruption of the lunar lavas. Whether the Earth’s and Moon’s interiors share a common $^{34}S/^{32}S$ ratio remains a matter of debate.

INTRODUCTION

The extent, timing, and composition of lunar magmatism are fundamental pieces of information to understand the evolution of the Moon’s interior. Two main types of lunar basalts have been studied: lava flows (i.e., mare basalts) and associated volcanic glass-rich pyroclastic deposits. Mare basalts and volcanic glasses define a large compositional range from high-Ti, to low-Ti, to very low–Ti magmas (1). Results from those studies inferred that the cooling and crystallization of the lunar magma ocean (LMO) created layered igneous cumulates and a late-stage layer component (urKREEP and ilmenite-rich) enriched in titanium and incompatible elements. Rayleigh-Taylor instabilities may have caused either the sinking of the late-stage dense layer that mixed with the earlier cumulates or a full overturn of the cumulate pile, generating the heterogeneous source region responsible for the compositionally diverse lunar volcanism (1).

The sulfur isotopes of the lunar magmatism provide fundamental insights into the thermal and compositional evolution of the Moon’s interior: from the Moon-forming giant impact event, to core segregation and the crystallization of the LMO, to the processes responsible for the lunar magmas (2). The sulfur isotope composition of the Moon’s interior is most directly reconstructed from the record preserved in the lunar mare basalts and pyroclastic deposits. However, this reconstruction is complicated by magmatic processes that modify the initial composition of the lavas (e.g., magmatic degassing and differentiation during transport and eruption, as well as magma interaction with shallow level reservoirs).

There have been considerable efforts to measure sulfur concentrations and $\delta^{34}S$ ($\delta^{34}S = \left(\frac{^{34}S/^{32}S}{^{34}S/^{32}S}_{\text{sample}}\right)_{\text{V-CDT}} - 1\right) \times 1000$, where V-CDT is the Vienna-Canyon Diablo Troilite standard) in lunar samples returned by the Apollo missions (2–21). These studies found that lunar mare basalts, representing a range in major element compositions, have a remarkable uniform whole-rock acid-volatile (extraction with 3 M HCl) sulfur isotope ratios with a mass-dependent mean isotopic composition of $\delta^{34}S = +0.58 \pm 0.05\%$ (2). This mean value is within the range measured for carbonaceous chondrites but is heavier than that reported for the Earth’s mantle ($\delta^{34}S = −1.28 \pm 0.33\%$) (22), suggesting a different $\delta^{34}S$ value between the Earth’s and Moon’s interiors. A full compilation of mare basalt whole-rock $\delta^{34}S$ values, irrespective of the analytical technique used (different acid-volatile extraction, combustion in an oxygen atmosphere, or a combination of both), has a similar average but with a larger uncertainty ($\delta^{34}S = +0.47 \pm 1.5\%$, 22) (2, 6–12, 14, 15), yet part of the reported $\delta^{34}S$ range (2 to 2.5%) could be caused by systematic analytical discrepancies between laboratories (6). These studies found a clear correlation between sulfur and titanium contents in mare basalts (5), and although never directly stated, the compiled published data on mare basalt hint to a correlation between titanium content and the $\delta^{34}S$ values.

In contrast to the mare basalts, reported bulk-sample $\delta^{34}S$ values of the lunar high-Ti volcanic glasses (74220 and drive tube 74001/2) range to significantly lighter values, with $\delta^{34}S$ from +0.69 to −2.6% (3, 4). These studies found that sulfur concentration increases and $\delta^{34}S$ values decrease with decreasing the grain size fraction of the sample analyzed (fig. S1) (4). They concluded that the unusual light $\delta^{34}S$ values of the volcanic glasses indicate the presence of a surface component produced by the condensation of a volcanic gas cloud onto the surface of the glass beads. Furthermore, they found that the sulfur concentration and $\delta^{34}S$ value of the sample decrease with increasing depth within the drive tube, suggesting more degassed volcanic glasses with depth. Two main factors have limited the interpretation of these data. First, the bulk-sample analysis makes it difficult to determine the contribution of the surface and the interior components to the total measured $\delta^{34}S$ value of the volcanic glasses. Second, the origin of the measured $\delta^{34}S$ is unclear. For example, a heavy $\delta^{34}S$ component was also measured during the bulk-sample analysis of some of the finest fractions and during leaching experiments of the high-Ti glasses (3, 4). The heavy $\delta^{34}S$ values indicate that the bulk-sample analysis had a fraction of mature regolith in it, whereas the leaching experiment points to the presence of a second surface component with heavy $\delta^{34}S$ (possibly due to interaction with the lunar regolith) on the glass surface (4).
RESULTS

Here, using nanoscale secondary ion mass spectrometry (NanoSIMS) in situ analyses (23), we report the first $\delta^{34}S$ values measured in individual lunar volcanic glasses and olivine-hosted melt inclusions to evaluate the processes controlling their $\delta^{34}S$ variation. These samples, returned by the Apollo 15 and 17 missions, represent some of the best-studied and most primitive magmas generated from within the deepest regions of Moon (1). We measured $\delta^{34}S$ in the center of the exposed interiors of individual lunar volcanic glass beads and in olivine-hosted melt inclusions using a Cameca NanoSIMS 50L multicollector ion microprobe at the Carnegie Institution for Sciences (see Materials and Methods for a detailed description of the analytical techniques). The measured $\delta^{34}S$ value of the volcanic glass beads provides the isotopic composition of the magma at the time of fragmentation and eruption, before any interaction with the regolith and deposition of any surface coating. We examined three compositional groups: the very low- and low-Ti glasses from Apollo 15 (15426 and 15427) and the high-Ti glasses from Apollo 17 (74220). These glasses were previously characterized for major, trace, and highly volatile elements (24–28). Some olivine phenocrysts within the high-Ti glasses contain melt inclusions. These inclusions are small samples of magma trapped within the olivine that grew in the magma before eruption (25). Their $\delta^{34}S$ values and sulfur content are protected from modification by degassing and shallow-level contamination during eruption because of their enclosure within their host crystals. Thus, melt inclusions have the highest concentrations of sulfur, up to 884 parts per million (ppm), whereas the high-Ti glass beads contain 200 to 450 ppm sulfur. The low-Ti and very low-Ti glasses range from 250 to 750 ppm and 50 to 300 ppm sulfur, respectively. The $\delta^{34}S$ values vary from $+1.3$ to $−1.8\%$o in the high-Ti glasses, with their melt inclusions ranging from $+1.6$ to $−0.3\%o$, whereas the $\delta^{34}S$ values of low- and very low-Ti glasses vary from $−0.27$ to $−4.70\%o$ and from $−4.80$ to $−14\%o$, respectively (Figs. 1 and 2 and table S1). Moreover, we report $\delta^{34}S$ values for four of the five subgroups of very low-Ti glasses defined by Delano (29) (A to E). These glasses define two separate arrays in Mg/Si ratios [weight % (wt %)]. A low-Mg/Si (A to C) and a high-Mg/Si (D and E) arrays, possibly produced by either magma mixing or assimilation of LMO cumulate during melt transport (30). Both arrays show essentially the same range in $\delta^{34}S$ values, and within each separate array, the $\delta^{34}S$ value decreases with decreasing Mg#$_i$ (defined as $100 \times [\text{FeO}]/[\text{FeO} + \text{MgO}]$ in mol). Although we were not able to measure $\delta^{34}S$ in the compositional subgroup C, we expect it to be high in $\delta^{34}S$ due to its high Mg# and sulfur content (Fig. 3) (20, 24, 29).

Our new data in melt inclusions and volcanic glasses define a significant range in $\delta^{34}S$ and sulfur content within and among the three compositional groups. When combined with previously published geochemical data for lunar volcanic glasses (24–28), the $\delta^{34}$S values define positive correlations with the sulfur content within each group and with the sulfur and titanium contents among the different compositional groups (Figs. 1 and 2). The $\delta^{34}S$ variation among the three groups is generally smaller than the internal variation within each group. Although correlation between sulfur and titanium contents in lunar basalts has been previously reported (5, 20), our new data define a clear correlation between $\delta^{34}S$ values and titanium contents in lunar magmas (Fig. 2). These observations point to two main events that fractionated the $\delta^{34}S$ values of the lunar lavas. The first produced the difference in $\delta^{34}S$ among the different compositional groups, and the second caused the $\delta^{34}S$ values within each group.

DISCUSSION

Variations of $\delta^{34}S$ in volcanic rocks can be produced by both magmatic process and source composition variability. Thus, before the $\delta^{34}S$ value can be used as a source indicator for planetary sulfur, it is important to consider the magmatic processes that can change this value (2). Our data exhibit a positive correlation of $\delta^{34}S$ values with sulfur content within each compositional group (Fig. 1), a feature of the entire dataset independent of the compositional type of glass measured. This correlation points to a set of igneous processes that have modified the original $\delta^{34}S$ values in these lunar magmas during generation, transport, and eruption.

Solar wind implantation, gas condensation onto the surface of the volcanic glass bead, and cosmic ray spallation cannot be the source of the observed large $\delta^{34}S$ variation. The depth of implantation and gas condensation on the surface of the bead is $\approx 2 \mu m$ (3, 4, 31), but our in situ analyses are in the middle of glass beads, 70 to 240 $\mu m$ from the bead surface (table S1). Although there are reports of possible spallation effect on $\delta^{34}S$ and $\delta^{36}S$ in lunar basalts, there is no observable effect on $\delta^{34}S$ (2). Furthermore, interaction of the volcanic glasses with the lunar regolith or impact blanket material during eruption is expected to increase the $\delta^{34}S$ value, without producing any correlation with the sulfur content. This is due to the enriched $\delta^{34}S$ values in the regolith and to a lesser extent in the breccias compared to those of lunar basalts at similar range of sulfur content (figs. S2 and S3). Therefore, other magmatic processes are likely responsible for the measured $\delta^{34}S$ variation within each of the lunar glass compositional groups.

Two main magmatic processes could modify the $\delta^{34}S$ value and sulfur contents in the lunar glasses: sulfide saturation/segregation and magma degassing.

The effect of sulfide saturation on $\delta^{34}S$ during the generation of the lunar magmas

Most experimental data suggest that lunar basalts were sulfide undersaturated during magma generation, transport, and eruption (32, 33). Furthermore, based on the chalcophile and siderophile element contents of lunar basalts, it is unlikely that sulfide saturation and segregation took place during magma generation, cooling, and crystallization (34). However, new experimental work has challenged this conclusion (35). This study shows that the lunar basalt could have been saturated with an immiscible sulfide liquid having two components, Fe and FeS, during magma generation. It reveals a significant decrease in the sulfur content at sulfide saturation (SCSS) of the silicate melt because of the change in the activity of FeS component in the sulfide metal bleb as Fe saturation is approached at the $f_{O_2}$ (oxygen fugacity) typical for the Moon interior ($\approx 1$ log unit below iron-wüstite buffer $f_{O_2} \sim \Delta IW ~−1$) (1). Therefore, whether sulfide saturation remained during lunar basalt generation and transport is debated; it depends critically on the initial sulfur content of the source and the extent of melting. We evaluate the effect that sulfide saturation would have on the sulfur content and the $\delta^{34}S$ value of the silicate melt and residue during basalt generation. We consider an initial sulfur content in the source of the lunar basalts of $\approx 75$ ppm (27), an extent of melting that ranges from 3 to 10% (36–39), and an $f_{O_2}$ of $\Delta IW ~−0.9$, just before saturation with Fe metal. Using
the Brenan et al. (35) model, the SCSS in the silicate melt will be approximately 1550 ppm at 2 GPa and 1450°C, within the range proposed for the generation of the lunar volcanic glasses [see compilation in (33)]. Under the restrictions of these initial conditions, the sulfide is exhausted as a residual phase after ~5% melting. We do not expect substantial changes in the major element composition of the melts generated between 1 and 5% melt fraction to significantly affect the SCSS, and therefore, the sulfur content of the silicate melt will remain relatively constant at ~1500 ppm as long as sulfide remains as a residual phase. In contrast, the $\delta^{34}$S value of both the residue and silicate melt is expected to change during melting. At the reducing conditions of the lunar magmas ($f_{O_2} \Delta IW \sim 0$ to ~2), the sulfur species dissolved in the silicate melt is only $S^{2-}$ (40). The expected equilibrium isotope fractionation factor between $S^{2-}$ in the silicate melt and FeS [$\alpha_{\text{melt-FeS}} = \frac{(\text{34S/32S})_{\text{melt}}}{(\text{34S/32S})_{\text{FeS}}}$] will range from 0.999 to 0.998 at 1450°C (section S1) (41). Note that

$$\delta^{34}S_{\text{melt}} - \delta^{34}S_{\text{FeS}} = \Delta^{34}S_{\text{melt-FeS}} = 1000(\alpha_{\text{melt-FeS}} - 1) \approx 1000 \ln \alpha_{\text{melt-FeS}}$$ (1)

The expected variation of $\delta^{34}$S in the melt over ~5% melting would range by $\leq 2\%$ for equilibrium to $\leq 7\%$ for fractional melting before sulfide exhaustion (table S2). The model data suggest that the $\delta^{34}$S value increases, whereas the sulfur content of the melt remains nearly constant with increasing extent of melting. This model fails to explain the positive correlation between $\delta^{34}$S values and sulfur contents within each compositional group of lunar glasses. Moreover, we would expect an inverse correlation between $\delta^{34}$S and very
incompatible element contents (e.g., cerium) in the melt with increasing extent of melting, which is not observed in our data. Although sulfide saturation during melt generation might have occurred, this was not the main process controlling the $\delta^{34}S$ variation within each compositional group of lunar volcanic glasses.

**The effect of magmatic degassing**

Magmatic degassing is the most likely mechanism responsible for the observed covariation of $\delta^{34}S$ values and sulfur contents within the compositional groups of volcanic glasses. Several lines of evidence from previously published data support this inference: (i) Bulk-sample analyses of high-Ti glasses show an increase in sulfur concentration and a decrease in $\delta^{34}S$ value with decreasing of the grain size fraction analyzed (fig. S1) (3, 4). These results were interpreted as evidence for the presence of a surface component with light $\delta^{34}S$ values produced by the condensation of the volcanic gas cloud onto the volcanic bead surface. These correlations are opposite to those defined by the lunar regolith, where the $\delta^{34}S$ value and the sulfur content increase as the grain size fraction analyzed decreases (fig. S3) (3). (ii) Recent whole-rock analyses of four mare basalts with $\delta^{34}S$ values below the lunar average +0.58 ± 0.05‰ are consistent with 40 to 60% degassing of a H$_2$S ± COS bearing gas (2). (iii) We observed correlations between the new $\delta^{34}S$ values and the volatile contents within and between the three compositional group of volcanic glasses (Figs. 4 and 5) (24–28). The best example is the high-Ti glasses, because data exist not only for the glasses but also for the olivine-hosted melt inclusions. These correlations are progressively less clear in the following order: S, F, Cl, H, and C contents. Two processes control the magmatic degassing of the lunar volcanic glasses: equilibrium degassing (close and/or open system) during melt transport and kinetic processes during bubble formation, melt fragmentation, and eruption (28). Not only the solubility of H and C species is much lower in basaltic melts but also their diffusivities are higher than those of Cl, F, and S, where F and S have the lowest diffusion coefficients (24–28). Thus, better correlations are found between $\delta^{34}S$ and S, and progressively less well-defined trends are observed with F, Cl, H, and C contents, which are increasingly more affected by degassing and kinetic processes (Fig. 2).

Here, we present a simple equilibrium open-system degassing model (41) for the lunar volcanic glasses and evaluate the effect of kinetic isotope fractionation due to diffusive transport of sulfur in the melt and evaporation/condensation processes. We consider open-system degassing consistent with the low viscosity of the melt, which allowed gas segregation during transport and eruption of the lunar volcanic glasses (42). The $\delta^{34}S$ values and the volatile contents of the different compositional groups of glasses point to different initial $\delta^{34}S$ values and S, F contents that have not been completely erased by degassing during melt transport and eruption (Figs. 4 and 5). We considered three different initial sulfur contents and $\delta^{34}S$ values based on the highest measured data for each compositional group, where the $\delta^{34}S$ value and the sulfur content decrease with decreasing titanium content. Thus, we estimated initial sulfur content of 900, 800, and 700 ppm and $\delta^{34}S$ values of +1.7, 0, and −1.5‰ for the high-, low-, and very low-Ti glasses, respectively. The most uncertain initial values are related to the very low–Ti glasses. The sulfur content was obtained from bulk-sample glass analyses (43), and $\delta^{34}S$ was assumed on the basis of the measured values for the very low–Ti glasses and mare basalts.

We used published experimental data (23, 41, 44) and thermochemical model (45) to estimate the equilibrium isotope fractionation factor $\alpha_{\text{gas-melt}}$ at a pressure and temperature range of 10$^3$ to 1 bar and 1300° to 1000°C and reducing conditions ($f$O$_2$, ΔIW ~ −1) relevant to lunar magmas (section S2). Under these conditions, the sulfur species in the silicate melt is S$^{2−}$ (40), and the coexisting major sulfur species in the gas are H$_2$S, COS, and S$_2$ (45). Depending on the pressure-temperature-$f$O$_2$ path of the melt gas, the proportion of H$_2$S + COS ranges between 94 and 37% of the total sulfur in the gas, whereas S$_2$ varies from 6 to 63% (45). Combining the proportions of the gas species with the estimated equilibrium fractionation factor between the silicate melt and pure gas species (table S3), we obtain a range in $\alpha_{\text{gas-melt}}$ from 1.0016 to 1.0042. In our model, for simplicity, we used a constant $\alpha_{\text{gas-melt}}$ with an intermediate value of 1.003. Clearly, this is an oversimplification of the problem, given
that the $\alpha_{\text{gas-melt}}$ will change with the pressure-temperature-$fO_2$ path during melt transport and degassing. However, the simple model reproduces the first-order variation of the measured data (Fig. 6). A more complicated model is unwarranted given the analytical uncertainty, the lack of experimental data on $\alpha_{\text{gas-melt}}$, and the changes of gas speciation in equilibrium with the melt as pressure, temperature, and $fO_2$ change during melt degassing.

Previous works have shown that single lunar glass beads have core-rim diffusion profiles for sulfur and other volatiles (24, 28). This suggests possible diffusion-limited kinetic isotope fractionation in a low-pressure environment following fragmentation of the magma during eruption (26). Therefore, it is important to consider how sulfur diffusion in the melt might affect the $^{34}\text{S}/^{32}\text{S}$ ratios of the magmatic sulfur contained in lunar volcanic glasses.

Fig. 5. S, H$_2$O, and F contents (ppm) in volcanic glasses. (A) S versus H$_2$O, and (B) S versus F for the lunar glasses and melt inclusions. Symbols as in Fig. 1. The two panels show the different effect that magmatic degassing had on H$_2$O relative to F and S contents. Error bars represent SD (2\(\sigma\)) uncertainties. Although the initial differences in H$_2$O and C among the different compositional groups of glasses have been erased by magmatic degassing, the initial differences in S, F (and to a lesser extent Cl) contents among the three compositional groups still remain. This is due to the lower effect that magmatic degassing has on the latter elements (see also Fig. 4). Data from (24–28). Symbols as in Fig. 1.
The mass dependence of diffusion of sulfur isotopes can be represented as
\[
\frac{D^{32} S}{D^{34} S} = \left( \frac{m_{34S}}{m_{32S}} \right)^{\beta_{32S/34S}}
\]
where \(D\) is the diffusion coefficient, \(m\) is the atomic or molecular mass of the diffusing species, and \(\beta\) is an empirical exponent that likely depends on sulfur speciation (40). In silicate melts and glasses, the value of \(\beta\) is generally found to be <0.5 and is correlated with the diffusivity of the element (46, 47). For ions with small diffusivity, i.e., similar to that of the ions that form the polymerized silicate network, the value of \(\beta\) is small, ~0.05. Ions that diffuse more rapidly than silicate network formers have larger values of \(\beta\), increasing toward 0.5 as the diffusivity becomes large. The explanation that has been put forward to justify this correlation is that slow diffusion ions are strongly coupled to the motion of the silicate network such that a large number of atoms must move in concert to allow these ions to diffuse (46, 47). The involvement of the other atoms reduces the isotopic mass dependence. On the basis of the empirical relationship between the diffusivity of a species and its isotope mass dependence (46), we used the experimentally determined diffusivity of sulfur ~1.76 \(\times\) \(10^{11}\) m\(^2\)/s (20, 48) and SiO\(_2\) ~ 4.55 \(\times\) \(10^{11}\) m\(^2\)/s (49) in lunar basalts at 1400°C to obtain a very small value of \(\beta \sim 0.015\) (46), which suggests very limited kinetic fractionation. The near-zero value for \(\beta\) has been supported with recent experimental data for diffusion of sulfur isotopes in basaltic melts at 1350° to 1500°C and 1 to 1.5 GPa (50). Therefore, we do not expect significant fractionation of sulfur isotopes due to sulfur diffusion within the melt.

Kinetic isotopic fraction during evaporation and condensation at the surface of the volcanic melt is another possible process that might affect the \(\delta^{34}\)S values of the lunar volcanic glasses (51, 52). The kinetic isotope fractionation depends on the degree of super/undersaturation of the gas medium surrounding the melt. The assumptions in the simplified approach taken here are as follows: (i) The melt during evaporation, and gas during condensation, remains homogeneous and well mixed; (ii) the isotopes of the same element have the same evaporation/condensation coefficients (i.e., \(\gamma^{34} = \gamma^{32}\)); and (iii) the coefficient of evaporation and condensation is equal as \(P/P_{sat}\) tends to 1, where \(P\) is the pressure of the evaporating species at the surface of the melt and \(P_{sat}\) is the saturation vapor pressure. When both equilibrium and kinetic isotope fractionation are taken into account during evaporation and condensation (52), the equations can be expressed by
\[
\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Evaporation}} = \Delta^{34} S_{\text{Equilibrium}} - \left(1 - \frac{P}{P_{sat}}\right) \Delta^{34} S_{\text{Kinetic}}
\]
\[
\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Condensation}} = \frac{P_{sat}}{P} \Delta^{34} S_{\text{Equilibrium}} + \left(1 - \frac{P_{sat}}{P}\right) \Delta^{34} S_{\text{Kinetic}}
\]
where
\[
\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Kinetic}} = 1000 \left( \frac{m_{34S}}{m_{32S}} \right) \left( \frac{D^{34} S}{D^{32} S} \right) - 1
\]

We used the previously estimated \(d_{\text{gas-melt}}\) of 1.003 during equilibrium magmatic degassing to obtain a \(\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Equilibrium}}\) of ~3‰. The \(\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Kinetic}}\) ranges from −29 to −16.5 to −15‰ considering H\(_2\)S, COS, and S\(_2\) as the gas species present, respectively. When we take into consideration the proportion of the different gas species (45), we obtain an intermediate \(\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Kinetic}}\) of ~22‰ (section S2). The calculated \(\Delta^{34} S_{\text{Evaporation}}\) over a range of \(P/P_{sat}\) from 1 to 0 (table S4) demonstrates that significant kinetic isotope fractionation during evaporation would produce a trend of increasingly heavy \(\delta^{34}\)S values with decreasing sulfur contents in the melt—a trend that is the opposite to that defined by the volcanic glass data. Only when \(P/P_{sat}\) closely approaches 1 (i.e., >0.9), the model would be consistent with the data, suggesting that kinetic isotope fractionation of sulfur during evaporation was not a significant factor. This is also consistent with the lack of correlation between \(\delta^{34}\)S and bead size (ranging from 140 to 480 μ; table S1) and the very limited core-rim diffusion profiles for sulfur in single lunar glass beads (24).

In the case of condensation, we considered two possible condensing species from the gas ZnS and native sulfur (53) and the proportion of H\(_2\)S, COS, and S\(_2\) in the gas at a range of pressure, temperature, and f\(_{O_2}\) from 1 to \(10^{-2}\) bar, 1300° to 700°C, and IW to IW-2 (41, 45), respectively. We estimated a range in \(\Delta^{34} S_{\text{solid-gas}}\) from 0 to 0.4 ‰.
(with an average of 0.15‰), indicating very limited equilibrium isotope fractionation between condensates and gas (table S3). In contrast, we estimate a large Δ34S kinetic of −10 and −30‰ for ZnS and S, respectively. The calculated Δ34S condensation over a range of P_fate/P from 1 to 0 (table S4) indicates that significant kinetic isotope fractionation should occur during condensation, producing the deposition of light δ34S condensates on the surface of the volcanic glass beads. These results are consistent with the inferred light δ34S values of the surface-correlated sulfur content of the high-Ti volcanic glasses (fig. S1) (3, 4).

An important feature of the data is the decreasing initial δ34S and sulfur values with decreasing titanium content for the three compositional groups of volcanic glasses analyzed (Figs. 1 and 2). This observation is consistent with the generation of the lunar basalts during melting of a heterogeneous LMO cumulate pile. The heterogeneous sources of the diverse lunar magmatism were produced by admixtures of early cumulates with variable amounts of ilmenite and urKREEP components generated during the latest stages of LMO crystallization (1).

The very low–Ti volcanic glasses with depleted trace elements and volatile contents, including low sulfur, most likely represent melts from the early LMO cumulate that did not interact with the late-stage ilmenite and urKREEP components (1). Therefore, these glasses might provide clues to the LMO’s sulfur isotopic composition. Several lines of evidence from geochemical analyses of the chalcophile and siderophile elements in lunar basalts, to experimental reports on phase equilibria on possible core materials, to physical studies (e.g., seismology and core dynamo), to geochemical and geophysical observations (e.g., seismicity and core dynamo), to geochemical analyses of the chalcophile and siderophile elements in lunar basalts, to experimental reports on phase equilibria on possible core materials, to physical studies (e.g., seismology and core dynamo), to geochemical results have been used to define the size and composition of the lunar core (54–56). These investigations suggest a lunar core of ~1 to 2.5 mass %, with low sulfur content of ~1 to 2 wt %. We considered for our model a core mass fraction in the range of 2 mass %, an initial bulk Moon sulfur content of 250 ppm, equivalent to that of the bulk silicate Earth (57), with a chondritic δ34S = 0 ‰, and a metal-silicate melt sulfur partition coefficient of ~100 (58, 59).

Under the restriction of these initial conditions and considering batch equilibration as well as open-system sulfur incorporation into the core, a δ34S value within ~1 to ~1.5‰ for the LMO implies (i) a final bulk silicate Moon with 83–33-ppm S, which is comparable to estimates based on the geochemistry of lunar basalts (27); (ii) a moon core sulfur content of 0.8 to 1.1 wt %, consistent with geochemical and geophysical observations (54–56); and (iii) a sulfur isotope fractionation factor αcore-LMO value of 1.0016 to 1.0007, values within the range of the limited experimental data available (60, 61). Therefore, all geochemical and geophysical observations are consistent with the hypothesis that the light δ34S of the very low–Ti volcanic glasses could have been produced by the Moon’s core segregation (Fig. 7).

In contrast, the high-Ti volcanic glasses with enriched trace elements and volatile contents, including high initial sulfur content and δ34S +0.8 to +1.6‰, point to a component generated during the late-stage crystallization of the LMO. The crystallization of the LMO will generate a late-stage ilmenite and urKREEP components enriched in incompatible elements and volatile contents, including S, which most likely reached sulfide saturation (34). Therefore, the addition of these late-stage components to the early LMO cumulate pile would increase the sulfur and δ34S values, as well as the titanium content, giving rise to the source of the high-Ti lunar magmas (1).

We evaluate the effect that sulfide saturation had on the δ34S value of the cumulates formed during the late stages of the LMO crystallization. Most models agree that by the end of the LMO crystallization (≥90%), the residual melt reached sulfide saturation (34). We use Ding et al. (33) model to determine the SCSS, and the reported major element composition and sulfur content of the urKREEP (62) representing the residual melt after ≥90% crystallization. We considered a pressure from 0.2 to 0.6 GPa, given that the base of the anorthosite crust would be 34 to 43 km (~0.14 to 0.18 GPa) (63), a temperature of 1000°C, and an fO2 ~ ΔIW −1 (64). Moreover, we assumed that the sulfide composition ranged between pure troilite and FeS with 10% Ni. Under these conditions, the SCSS for the silicate melt will range from 549- to 611-ppm sulfur, significantly below the estimated ~1220-ppm sulfur of the urKREEP. Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that the late-stage crystallization of the LMO reached sulfide saturation (34). We estimated a range in the FeS-silicate melt equilibrium isotope fractionation factor αFeS^melt

![Fig. 7. Core-LMO sulfur partitioning model in batch equilibrium or open system. The δ34S values (‰) of the LMO and lunar core are plotted against the ratio of the sulfur content of LMO during core segregation to that of the bulk Moon. In the open-system model, the core is treated as a cumulative product. We considered for our model a core mass fraction in the range of 2 mass % (54–56), an initial bulk Moon sulfur content of 250 ppm, with a chondritic δ34S = 0 ‰ (34), and a metal-silicate melt sulfur partition coefficient of ~100 (58, 59). The model indicates that if the LMO reaches a range in δ34S between ~1 and ~1.5‰ after core segregation, it will result in an LMO sulfur content between 83 and 33 ppm, a core S content of 0.8 and 1.1 wt %, and an equilibrium sulfur isotope fractionation factor αcore-mantle of 1.0016 and 1.0007 for batch equilibrium and open system, respectively. All output results are within values previously estimated or experimentally determined (34, 54–56, 60, 61).]
of 1.004 and 1.002 at 1000°C (see table S3) (41, 44). In our model, we used an intermediate $\delta_{\text{FeS-melt}}$ of 1.003 and a range for the initial $\delta^{34}S$ values of the LMO after core segregation from −1.5 to −1‰ (Fig. 7). A simple closed-system crystallization of the urKREEP suggests that cumulates formed by up to ~40% crystallization will have $\delta^{34}S$ values ranging from +0.3 to +1.5‰ and from +0.8 to +2‰, depending on the initial $\delta^{34}S$ of the LMO, respectively. These values are consistent with the expected cumulate layer that gave origin to the high-Ti lunar lavas with $\delta^{34}S$ +0.5 to +1.6‰. The sinking of the late-stage dense (urKREEP-ilmenite-rich) layer and the variable mixing with the earlier LMO cumulates will create variable source compositions, providing a reasonable explanation for the increasing initial $\delta^{34}S$ and sulfur values with increasing titanium content of the three compositional groups of lunar volcanic glasses.

Although the heterogeneous LMO cumulate pile can explain the sulfur and $\delta^{34}S$ variation among different compositional groups, there are differences between magmatic and volcanic glasses within a single compositional group (e.g., high-Ti basalts) that are harder to explain. For example, the $\delta^{34}S$ value in the high-Ti mare basalts remains relatively constant, while the sulfur content varies by 50% (2), whereas the $\delta^{34}S$ value in the high-Ti volcanic glasses change by ~4‰ over an equivalent variation in sulfur content. This difference points to distinct source compositions (e.g., proportion of urKREEP-ilmenite-rich component) and/or conditions (pressure, temperature, and fO2) of melt generation, melt transport, and eruption. How those differences affected sulfide saturation and sulfur degassing of the magmas and consequently their sulfur content and $\delta^{34}S$ values remains a matter of debate.

Our new data show that the $\delta^{34}S$ variability in lunar volcanic glasses is similar to that previously reported for $\delta^{32}Cl$ and $\delta^{66}Zn$ values (65, 66) and most likely associated to magmatic degassing. Several lines of evidence point to magmatic degassing as the main factor controlling not only $\delta^{32}Cl$ and $\delta^{34}S$ [(65) and this study] but also $\delta^{66}Zn$: (i) The analyses of high-Ti glasses (74220 and drive tube 74001/2) show that the variations in zinc content and $\delta^{66}Zn$ with the grain size fraction analyzed and with depth within the drive tube mirror the variations in sulfur contents and $\delta^{34}S$ values (figs. S1 and S4) (3, 4, 67). These correlations suggest that zinc and sulfur have been affected by magmatic degassing and later condensation of the volcanic gas cloud onto the surface of the volcanic glass beads. (ii) Detailed petrological study of Mg-suite and ferroan anorthosite lithologies in breccia sample 67016 and 67915 display evidence of sulfurization due to interaction with a magmatic sulfur-rich vapor (68–70). The sulfurization features are restricted to individual clasts, do not cut across the matrix surrounding the clasts, and therefore predate the breccia-forming event. The in situ SIMS analyses of the vein and replacement troilite within the clasts have light $\delta^{34}S$ values from −1.0 to −3.3‰, consistent with the whole-rock $\delta^{34}S$ of −3.4‰. In contrast, the matrix surrounding the clasts has a whole-rock $\delta^{34}S$ of 0‰ (69–70). If we consider that the $\delta^{34}S$ values of the replacement troilite were produced at temperature of 700°C (70) and use the corresponding equilibrium isotope fractionation $\alpha_{\text{FeS-H2S}} \sim 1.00026$ between sulfide and H2S magmatic gas (see table S3) (71), it will indicate a S-rich magmatic vapor with $\delta^{34}S$ values ranging from −1.3 to −3.6‰. This range is consistent with a magmatic vapor, produced by open-system degassing, in equilibrium with the $\delta^{34}S$ values of the volcanic glasses reported in this study. The brecciated anorthosite sample 67955, which comes from the same small boulder as sample 67915, has high zinc content ~6 ppm and very light $\delta^{66}Zn$ value −6.98‰ (66), mimicking the sulfur content of $\delta^{34}S$ in sample 67915. These observations suggest that both $\delta^{34}S$ and $\delta^{66}Zn$ values were related to a single process: the interactions between the early formed lunar crustal rocks and a latter high temperature vapor phase rich in light sulfur and zinc isotopes. Previous studies interpreted the light $\delta^{66}Zn$ in sample 67955 and in few other brecciated anorthosites to be driven by vaporization of an impact blanket (66). Several observations based on the sulfur data point to a magmatic, rather than impact, origin of the vapor. First, the correlation between $\delta^{66}Zn$ and $\delta^{34}S$ with grain size in the high-Ti volcanic glasses indicates condensation of a magmatic vapor with light $\delta^{34}Zn$ and $\delta^{34}S$ values. Second, the sulfurization process, which produced the light $\delta^{34}S$ isotope in sample 67915, is in the clasts rather than the matrix of the breccia. Third, approximately 30 breccias and impacted lunar rocks have been analyzed for $\delta^{34}S$, with ~90% of them showing heavy rather than light sulfur isotopes (fig. S2), suggesting that the impact processes might not be the source of the light $\delta^{34}S$ vapor phase. Therefore, it seems more likely that the ferroan anorthosite and Mg-suite plutonic rocks with light $\delta^{66}Zn$ and $\delta^{34}S$ values represent early lunar crust affected by percolating gas/fluids associated to a latter basaltic magmatism.

In summary, core segregation, LMO crystalization, and finally magmatic degassing during basalt generation, transport, and eruption have extensively modified the primordial sulfur isotope composition of the Moon; thus, estimations on the $\delta^{34}S$ value of the bulk silicate Moon are uncertain and model dependent. Therefore, whether the Earth’s and Moon’s interiors share a common $\delta^{34}S$ remains a matter of debate.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

We used a Cameca NanoSIMS 50L multicollector ion microprobe at the Carnegie Institution for Science to measure the $\delta^{34}S^{32}S$ ratios in the center of exposed sections of individual lunar olivine-hosted melt inclusions and volcanic glass beads from samples 74220, 15426, and 15427 (table S1). The glasses and melt inclusions were previously analyzed for major, trace, and volatile contents and hydrogen isotopes (24–28). The in situ measurements of the interiors of individual volcanic glass beads and inclusions, far removed from surfaces containing implanted solar wind, avoid terrestrial and solar contamination. The method of high-precision in situ SIMS analysis of sulfur isotopes in glasses down to a few hundreds of ppm of bulk sulfur has been previously established (23, 44, 72, 73). They demonstrated that the effects of varying bulk composition (major elements, water and sulfur contents) and oxidation states are negligible and do not influence instrumental mass fractionation. For the analyses reported here, our analytical methods follow routines previously described (23–26, 73). We obtained data in two different modes of SIMS operation: standard dynamic SIMS and scanning ion imaging SIMS. Analysis of glass beads was performed using standard dynamic SIMS, whereas the measurements of 74220 olivine-hosted melt inclusions were performed only with Scanning Ion Imaging SIMS. The errors in $\delta^{34}S^{32}S$ ratios measured by dynamic and scanning ion imaging SIMS were propagated by taking the square root of the sums of the 2-sigma analytical errors for unknowns and uncertainty in the standard values. The sulfur background measurements using Suprasil and Herasil silica glasses within the sample mounts ranged from 0.06 to 0.3 ppm, making background correction unnecessary.
Dynamic SIMS

In this mode of operation, only ion counts are recorded as data with no associated imaging. We tuned the mass spectrometer for a mass resolving power of ~6000 Mass Resolving Power (MRP), sufficient to resolve oxygen dimers from sulfur masses, $^{31}_{1}$P$^{1}$H from $^{32}$S, and $^{32}_{18}$S$^{2}$H$_{2}$ and $^{33}_{1}S$H from $^{34}$S. A typical ~15-min measurement used a Cs+ primary beam of 2 nA, accelerated to 8 kV and 2 µm diameter with collection of negatively charged secondary ions. A normal incidence electron gun was used to compensate excess charge. For each analysis, we first performed a p-sputtering routine with the primary beam rastered over a 25 µm by 25 µm area for 3 min to remove the gold coat and sputter through the surface layer. During this time, we monitored secondary ion images of $^{12}$C and $^{32}$S to avoid cracks that appear as bright features on the projected $^{12}$C image and dendritic crystals that appear as dark features on the projected $^{32}$S image. The pre-sputter was followed by a reduction in the raster size to 20 µm by 20 µm divided into regions of 64 × 64 pixels with 245-µs dwell time per pixel on each pixel (equivalent to ~1 s/frame) with simultaneous acquisition of data for $^{12}$C, $^{18}$O, $^{32}$S, and $^{34}$S in multicollection mode. Counting times were 1 s for all masses, and we collected 600 ratios (600 s total counting time). The average run precision is ±1.5‰, with a range from ±0.7 to ±3.5‰ ($\sigma$) that roughly inversely correlates with sulfur concentration. Pressure in the ion probe sample chamber was ~6 × 10$^{-10}$ torr during the analyses. We analyzed the basaltic glass standard after every two to three analyses of lunar glass beads to continuously monitor the instrumental drift and mass fractionation (IMF) of sulfur isotopes. Measured sulfur isotope ratios were corrected for the long-term analytical drift of the instrumental fractionation using a time-based linear interpolation of all $^{33}$S/$^{32}$S values of the standard glass ET83viii (23, 44, 72) analyzed within each analytical session (fig. S5A). Under these conditions, typical count rates on standard glass ET83viii (919-ppm S) were ~450,000 counts per second (cps) for $^{32}$S and ~20,000 cps for $^{34}$S. The IMF factor [$a_{\text{SIMS}} = (^{34}_{33}S/^{32}_{32}S_{\text{meas}})/(^{34}_{32}S/^{32}_{32}S_{\text{true}})$] measured from session to session ranges from 1.013 to 1.039. Changes in IMF factor measured during the single session for melt inclusion analyses was 1.014. The $^{34}$S reproducibility of the standard after drift and IMF corrections was 0.86‰ ($\sigma$, n = 12) (fig. S7B) and the accuracy was 0.5‰ ($\sigma$), producing a combined total uncertainty of ~1 % ($\sigma$).

Supplementary material for this article is available at http://advances.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/7/9/eabe4641/DC1

Scanning ion imaging

In this mode of operation, the instrument was used in an identical fashion as with dynamic SIMS, except that the sputter crater was divided into regions of 256 × 256 pixels. Beam blanking was not used. Data were recorded as scanning ion images obtained simultaneously on each mass ($^{12}$C, $^{18}$O, $^{32}$S, $^{34}$S); in this mode, acquisition of a single frame takes ~16 s and 40 frames were acquired at each analysis location, resulting in a total acquisition time of ~10 min. Data were extracted and processed from the ion images using the ImageJ software package for PV Wave written by L. Nittler (Carnegie institution for Science). Data were first corrected for system dead time, and the last 36 images were summed (the first four images were used as a pre-sputter). The images were ratioed to produce scanning isotope ratio images ($^{34}_{32}$S/$^{32}_{32}$S), and data were extracted from specific regions of interest (ROIs) located within the isotope ratio images. Each ROI consisted of a user-defined region that enclosed the entire melt inclusion without overlap onto surrounding olivine, daughter crystals (ilmenite, or vapor bubbles and without overlapping areas near the edge of the sputter crater containing surface contamination of volatiles (fig. S6). For isotope ratio images of melt inclusions, the NanoSIMS sample stage was adjusted so that the inclusion was centered in the sputter crater before pre-sputtering and image acquisition. Measured sulfur isotope ratios were corrected for the long-term analytical drift of the instrumental fractionation using a time-based linear interpolation of all $^{33}$S/$^{32}$S values of the ALV892-1 standard (23, 44, 72) within each analytical session (fig. S7A). The in-run precision for the melt inclusions was 0.8 to 0.9‰ ($\sigma$). We interspersed analyses of the basaltic glass standard between every two or three analyses of lunar melt inclusions to monitor the IMF of sulfur isotopes. For images of standard, ROIs were located in the center of the image. Average count rates per ROI on standard ALV892-1 glass (1606-ppm S) were 3.66 × 10$^{9}$ for $^{32}$S and 1.64 × 10$^{7}$ for $^{34}$S. The IMF factor measured during the single session for melt inclusion analyses was 1.014. The $^{34}$S reproducibility of the standard after drift and IMF corrections was 0.86‰ ($\sigma$, n = 12) (fig. S7B) and the accuracy was 0.5‰ ($\sigma$), producing a combined total uncertainty of ~1 % ($\sigma$).

Supplementary material for this article is available at http://advances.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/7/9/eabe4641/DC1
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