

## Mollusc clumped isotope thermometry using a new approach

PRASANNA NAIDU K.<sup>1A</sup> AND PROSENJIT GHOSH<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(prasanna@ceas.iisc.ernet.in)

<sup>2</sup>(pghosh@ceas.iisc.ernet.in)

We present a new approach of calibrating clumped isotope thermometry for mollusc. In our study we sampled growth bands from live mollusc specimens (*Villorita cyprinoides* var. *cochinensis*) collected from Cochin back water estuary in India. The growth bands represent seasonal carbonate deposition at different temperatures during a year. Simultaneous collection of water samples and co-existing carbonate allowed calculation of temperature using Epstein thermometry [1]. The temperature estimated using this approach showed seasonal range of 20° C to 42 °C.

The  $\Delta_{47}$  values are derived using the method described in Ghosh *et al* 2006 [2] where heated gas equivalent together with carbonate standards (like NBS-19 and MAR J1) are analysed. The approach in producing this calibration curve varies from Henkes *et al.*, 2013 [3] where bulk samples of mollusc species collected from natural marine setup across latitudes along with specimens grown under monitored conditions were analysed for  $\Delta_{47}$  using carbon dioxide equilibrium scale. Our relation obtained as a function of temperature (in kelvin) is

$\Delta_{47} = 0.055 \times 10^6/T^2 + 0.02$  ( $r^2 = 0.8996$ ), which matches well with the inorganic calcite precipitation curve. We are monitoring the similar specimens at laboratory condition at different temperatures to further evaluate the thermometry equation.

[1] Kim, S.-T. & O'Neil, J.R. (1997) *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, **61**, 3461-3475. [2] Ghosh *et al* (2006), *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **70**(6), 1439-1456. [3] Henkes *et al* (2013), *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **106** (2013) 307-325.

## A first look at boron isotope based pCO<sub>2</sub> values from the eastern Arabian Sea for the last 22 kyr

S. S. NAIK<sup>1\*</sup>, P.D. NAIDU<sup>1</sup>, S. N. NAIK<sup>1</sup>  
AND G. L. FOSTER<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CSIR-National Institute of Oceanography, Goa, India 403004  
(\*correspondence: sushant@nio.org)

<sup>2</sup>Ocean and Earth Science, National Oceanography Centre  
Southampton, University of Southampton, SO14 3ZH,UK  
(Gavin.Foster@noc.soton.ac.uk)

The Arabian Sea is an unique region with semi-annual reversal of surface water circulation between southwest (SW) and northeast (NE) monsoons. The pCO<sub>2</sub> in the Arabian Sea is always in excess of that in the atmosphere, and the EAS is found to serve as a significant source of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere [1]. However nothing was known up to today about the past pCO<sub>2</sub> variations of the EAS.

We present here for the first time pCO<sub>2</sub> values from the eastern Arabian Sea for the last 22 kyr. We have used planktonic foraminifera species *Globigerinoides ruber* (*sensu stricto*) from a sediment core AAS9/21, collected at 1807m water depth (14°30.539'N, 72°39.118'E). We have analysed boron isotopes on a MC-ICPMS at the University of Southampton, UK. pH and pCO<sub>2</sub> were calculated from the boron isotopic values. Results show that pCO<sub>2</sub> varied from ~200 to ~440ppmv during the study period. A comparison with atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> data from Antarctic ice core [2] suggest that the EAS seems to have fluctuated between a source and sink of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in the past, with significant excess (w.r.t. the atmosphere) during the deglacial. Further comparison with western Arabian Sea (WAS) pCO<sub>2</sub> values [3] for the similar period reveals that during most of the time the WAS pCO<sub>2</sub> values were much higher as a result of intense upwelling which brings CO<sub>2</sub>-rich sub-surface waters to the surface. The large variations in pCO<sub>2</sub> from the EAS are probably be due to a combination of physical processes such as moderate upwelling, influx of freshwaters from rain and rivers, and winter convective mixing processes.

[1] Sarma V.V.S.S. *et al.* (1998)*Tellus*,**50B**, 179-184. [2] Monnin E. *et al.* (2004) *Earth Plan. Sci. Lett.*,**224**, 45-54. [3] Palmer M.R. *et al.* (2010) *Earth Plan. Sci. Lett.*,**295**, 49-57.