

Single pulse of significant O₂ increase during the Great Oxidation Event – geochemical, isotopic and stratigraphic evidence from the Duitschland and Rooihooigte formations (South Africa)

**JULIUS C. HAVSTEEN¹, ILKA C. KLEINHANN²,
BENJAMIN EICKMANN³, NICOLAS BEUKES⁴ AND
RONNY SCHOENBERG¹**

¹University of Tuebingen

²University of Tuebingen, Geosciences

³Universidad de los Andes

⁴University of Johannesburg

Presenting Author: julius.havsteen@uni-tuebingen.de

Identifying the nature and temporal evolution of the Great Oxidation Event (GOE) as either an oscillating or sudden atmospheric change relies heavily on the correlation of sedimentary formations recording the loss of mass independent fractionation of sulfur isotopes (MIF-S) [1,2]. Two critical formations in this regard are the Duitschland and Rooihooigte formations in the Transvaal Basin (South Africa), which both record the loss of MIF-S, but have an unsettled stratigraphic relationship. A synchronous deposition of the Duitschland and Rooihooigte formations would indicate a sudden loss of a significant MIF-S signal in South African strata [3]. Contrary, a decoupled deposition, with the Duitschland Formation predating the Rooihooigte Formation, would point towards an oscillating nature of the GOE [4]. Here we present lithological, stratigraphic, major and trace element data as well as Sr and Nd isotope data from four drill cores intersecting critical strata of both the Duitschland and the Rooihooigte formations to answer this discrepancy. All collected data point to a contemporaneous deposition for the two formations and thus a sudden loss of MIF-S and an abrupt GOE, much in contrary to the oscillation model. Furthermore, bulk rock $T_{DM}(Nd)$ from the Duitschland and Rooihooigte formations show old (consistently Archean) model ages compared to the youngest zircon ages of 2342 ± 18 and 2353 ± 18 Ma respectively [5], and hence changes our understanding of key sediment sources to these formations.

[1] Guo et al. 2009 *Geology*, 399-402; [2] Luo et al. (2016) *Science Adv.* 2.5; [3] Schröder et al. (2016) *Precamb. Res.* 278, 362-393; [4] Gumsley et al. (2017) *PNAS* 114, 1811-1816; [5] Zeh et al. (2020), *Precambrian Research* 345, 105760