

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

## **Influence of arsenic on iron sulfide transformations**

**M. Wolthers<sup>1\*</sup>, I.B. Butler<sup>2,3</sup>, D. Rickard<sup>2</sup>**

**<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, PO Box 80021, 3508 TA,  
Utrecht, The Netherlands**

**<sup>2</sup> School of Earth, Ocean and Planetary Sciences, Cardiff University, Park  
Place, Cardiff CF10 3YE, U.K.**

**Published in *Chemical Geology*, 2007.**

**\* Corresponding author: Fax: +31-(0)30-2535302; E-mail: wolthers@geo.uu.nl**

---

<sup>3</sup> Current address: School of Geosciences, Grant Institute, The King's Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JW, U.K.

## ABSTRACT

16

17

18 The association of arsenate, As(V), and arsenite, As(III), with disordered  
19 mackinawite, FeS, was studied in sulfide-limited (Fe:S = 1:1) and excess-  
20 sulfide (Fe:S = 1:2) batch experiments. In the absence of arsenic, the sulfide-  
21 limited experiments produce disordered mackinawite while the excess-sulfide  
22 experiments yield pyrite with trace amounts of mackinawite. With increasing  
23 initially added As(V) concentrations the transformation of FeS to mackinawite  
24 and pyrite is retarded. At S:As = 1:1 and 2:1, elemental sulfur and green rust  
25 are the end products. As(V) oxidizes S(-II) in FeS and (or) in solution to S(0),  
26 and Fe(II) in the solid phase to Fe(III). Increasing initially added As(III)  
27 concentrations inhibit the transformation of FeS to mackinawite and pyrite and  
28 no oxidation products of FeS or sulfide, other than pyrite, were observed. At  
29 low arsenic concentrations, sorption onto the FeS surface may be the reaction  
30 controlling the uptake of arsenic into the solid phase. Inhibition of iron(II)  
31 sulfide transformations due to arsenic sorption suggests that the sorption sites  
32 are crucial not only as sorption sites, but also in iron(II) sulfide transformation  
33 mechanisms.

34

35 Keywords: iron sulfides, pyrite, arsenate, arsenite

36

37

38

## 1. INTRODUCTION

39

40 During oxic to anoxic transitions, arsenic is released from dissolving iron  
41 hydroxides into the surrounding pore water or groundwater. While many metals  
42 form insoluble sulfides in sulfidic environments, arsenic is distinctive in being  
43 relatively soluble at  $\text{pH} > 5.5$ , and is mobile over a wide range of redox  
44 conditions (Smedley and Kinniburgh, 2002). Consequently, sorption onto  
45 particulate phases is a crucial control on arsenic mobility (Mok and Wai, 1994),  
46 especially iron (II) sulfides, which are ubiquitous in anoxic sulfidic settings. At  
47 present, there are limited published data concerning the influence of arsenic  
48 during iron sulfide mineral transformations at ambient temperatures.

49

50 Pyrite, the most stable iron(II) sulfide phase in the Earth's surface environment,  
51 can incorporate large amounts of arsenic (Huerta-Diaz and Morse, 1992;  
52 Morse and Luther, 1999), retarding arsenic migration in anoxic environments.  
53 Huerta-Diaz and Morse (1992) found arsenic concentrations in marine  
54 sedimentary pyrite of up to 0.93 wt.%, as inferred from sequential extractions.  
55 Their results indicated that pyrite is an important arsenic sink, even if only  
56 minor pyrite formation has taken place.

57

58 Arsenic sorption onto metal oxides has been examined intensively (e.g. Pierce  
59 and Moore, 1982; Waychunas et al., 1996; Fendorf et al., 1997; Hiemstra and

60 Van Riemsdijk, 1999; Swedlund and Webster, 1999; Ding et al., 2000). By  
61 contrast, relatively few studies of arsenic sorption onto Fe(II) sulfides exist  
62 (Farquhar et al., 2002; Bostick and Fendorf, 2003). Farquhar et al. (2002)  
63 investigated the mechanisms of aqueous As(III) and As(V) (pH 5.5–6.5)  
64 interaction with crystalline mackinawite (tetragonal FeS) and pyrite (FeS<sub>2</sub>)  
65 surfaces using As *K*-edge XAS. At low As(V) and As(III) concentrations, they  
66 observed similar surface complex structures for both As species.. At higher  
67 As(V) and As(III) concentrations, Farquhar et al. (2002) observed the  
68 formation of different surface complexes along with poorly crystalline arsenic  
69 sulfide. Bostick and Fendorf (2003) studied reactions of As(III) with troilite  
70 (hexagonal FeS) and pyrite surfaces. At low pH and low As(III) concentrations,  
71 Langmuir–type isotherms were obtained, although XAS analyses indicated  
72 surface precipitates at all arsenic concentrations. Their data showed As(III)  
73 reduction and a structural environment similar to As in arsenopyrite (FeAsS).  
74 Although H<sub>3</sub>AsO<sub>3</sub><sup>0</sup> or H<sub>2</sub>AsO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> dominated the aqueous As(III) speciation in  
75 their experiments (pH 3-11), they observed a pH-dependence typical of cation  
76 sorption (e.g. Stumm, 1991) i.e. sorption increased with pH. They explained  
77 this behavior by the formation of ferrihydrite associated with FeAsS  
78 precipitation.

79

80 The mineralogy of solid phase arsenic in sediments has been mostly inferred  
81 from indirect measurements using selective chemical extraction (cf. Huerta–  
82 Diaz and Morse, 1992), and so structural information on arsenic incorporation

83 into pyrite is absent and results may be biased (Wilkin and Ford, 2002). By  
84 contrast, hydrothermal arsenian pyrites have been studied in detail. From XAS  
85 studies, it was proposed that arsenic substitutes for sulfur in pyrite (Tingle et  
86 al., 1996; Savage et al., 2000; Bennet and Benning, 2004). The arsenic  
87 concentration in arsenian pyrite studied by Savage et al. (2000) was on average  
88 1.2 wt.%, with a range from ~0 to 5 wt.%. These concentrations were  
89 insufficient to cause local structural transformation of pyrite to arsenopyrite,  
90 although lattice deviations from pyrite towards the orthorhombic structure of  
91 arsenopyrite were observed (Savage et al., 2000).

92

93 Wolthers et al. (2005 a) synthesized pyrite in the presence of aqueous arsenite  
94 at conditions and concentrations approaching those in ambient environments, in  
95 a continuous-flow reaction system at pH 6 and 25°C. They observed no  
96 unequivocal effect of As(III) on the amount of pyrite or on the textures formed.  
97 Pyrite growth in these experiments resulted in a continued uptake and  
98 incorporation of arsenic, implying the formation of a stable arsenic sink, which  
99 would only release incorporated arsenic during oxidative dissolution. At  
100 ambient temperatures, pyrite may form via several pathways (cf. Rickard,  
101 1975; Luther, 1991; Rickard and Luther, 1997), with iron(II) monosulfide, FeS,  
102 being the initial precipitate for kinetic reasons (cf. Rickard, 1969; Schoonen  
103 and Barnes, 1991). Wolthers et al. (2003) have shown that the first FeS  
104 precipitate is nanoparticulate mackinawite with an average primary particle size  
105 of ~ 5 nm. Ofhuji and Rickard (2006), confirmed this using high resolution

106 transmission electron microscopy (TEM). In the literature, this material has  
107 been variously referred to as FeS, amorphous FeS (FeS<sub>am</sub>) and disordered  
108 mackinawite. The characteristic broad, low-intensity Bragg peaks associated  
109 with X-ray powder diffraction of this material are a consequence of its  
110 nanoparticulate size and an expanded lattice relative to crystalline mackinawite.  
111 Herein we refer to this material as FeS. The hydrated FeS surface was  
112 described by strongly acidic mono-coordinated, and weakly acidic tri-  
113 coordinated sulfur sites as the reactive sites within a surface chemistry model  
114 (Wolthers et al., 2005 b). This model has subsequently been applied to As(V)  
115 and As(III) sorption onto FeS (Wolthers et al., 2005c). Analogous to pyrite,  
116 FeS has been recognized as a scavenger of trace elements in anoxic  
117 environments (Kornicker, 1988; Morse and Arakaki, 1993; Arakaki and Morse,  
118 1993; Morse and Luther, 1999; Watson et al., 2000; Wharton et al., 2000).

119

120 In this study, batch experimental techniques were used to study the behavior  
121 and influence of As(V) and As(III) at various concentrations during the  
122 transformation of FeS to mackinawite and the reaction of FeS to form pyrite.  
123 The arsenic concentrations were chosen to cover the range from natural arsenic  
124 concentrations in anoxic sulfidic environments to arsenopyrite stoichiometry.  
125 The results are interpreted and discussed in terms of arsenic uptake  
126 mechanisms, redox reactions and the effect of arsenic uptake on iron(II) sulfide  
127 transformation mechanisms.

128

128

129

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

130

### 131 2.1. Materials

132

133 All reagents were analytical grade and used without further purification.

134 Solutions were prepared in 18 M $\Omega$  distilled deionized water which was sparged

135 for 60 minutes with O<sub>2</sub>-free grade N<sub>2</sub> (O<sub>2</sub> < 1ppm). O<sub>2</sub>-free N<sub>2</sub> was scrubbed

136 with pyrogallol to remove traces of O<sub>2</sub>. A 0.01 M pH 6.00  $\pm$  0.01 tri-sodium

137 citrate pH-buffer solution was used as the reaction matrix solution and was

138 purged for 60 minutes with O<sub>2</sub>-free N<sub>2</sub> gas before use. The initial reaction

139 redox potential was poised with Ti(III) citrate solution (Zehnder and Wuhrman,

140 1976). Addition of 2 mL Ti(III) citrate solution poised the initial reaction redox

141 potential below -400 mV (cf. Zehnder and Wuhrman, 1976; Rickard, 1997).

142 However, over the course of the experiment, the redox potential was likely to

143 be controlled by the S(-II)/S(0) (in excess sulfide experiments), the

144 Fe(II)/Fe(III) (in sulfide limited experiments) and, at high arsenic

145 concentrations, possibly by the As(V)/As(III) redox couples.

146

147 Freeze-dried FeS reactant was prepared by mixing 100 mL Fe(II) solution (0.6

148 M Fe(NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O) with 100 mL S(-II) solution (0.6 M Na<sub>2</sub>S·9H<sub>2</sub>O)

149 under N<sub>2</sub>(g), filtering the suspension within minutes after mixing on a

150 Whatman<sup>TM</sup> No.1 filter, and freeze drying the product for 3 to 4 days.  
151 Effectively, the freeze-dried FeS has aged for less than half an hour (cf.  
152 Wolthers et al., 2003). After freeze drying, the FeS was stored under an N<sub>2</sub>  
153 atmosphere at -18°C before use.

154

155 As(III) and As(V) solutions were prepared fresh for each batch of experiments  
156 by dissolving Na<sub>2</sub>AsO<sub>2</sub> and Na<sub>2</sub>HAsO<sub>4</sub>·7H<sub>2</sub>O in purged 18 MΩ water while  
157 constantly purging with O<sub>2</sub>-free N<sub>2</sub>.

158

## 159 **2.2. Batch experimental method**

160

161 The batch reactions were performed following the method of Rickard (1997)  
162 and Butler and Rickard (2000). Under an N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere in a glove box, 0.40 g  
163 of freeze-dried FeS was weighed into in 100-mL long-necked pyrex ampoules.  
164 Subsequently, the ampoules were filled with 2 mL Ti(III) citrate, 10 mL arsenic  
165 solution, and 40 mL of pH-buffer solution. The reaction ampoule was then  
166 attached to a gas transfer manifold.

167

168 The manifold and it's operation are described by Rickard (1997). It permits  
169 gases to be added and extracted from the reaction ampoules under strictly O<sub>2</sub>-  
170 free conditions. After attachment to the manifold, the reaction ampoules were  
171 evacuated and flushed with O<sub>2</sub>-free N<sub>2</sub> three times. The third time, the vessel

172 was either filled with N<sub>2</sub> to slightly less than atmospheric pressure (sulfide-  
173 limited experiments 1a to 1e and 3a to 3e, Tables 1 and 2) or filled with N<sub>2</sub>,  
174 evacuated and filled with an H<sub>2</sub>S/N<sub>2</sub> gas mixture to atmospheric pressure  
175 (excess-sulfide experiments 3a to 3e and 4a to 4e, Tables 1 and 2). H<sub>2</sub>S was  
176 generated by acid decomposition of Na<sub>2</sub>S•9H<sub>2</sub>O in serum bottles as described  
177 by Rickard (1997). Finally, the reaction ampoule was hermetically sealed with  
178 a glass-blowers torch and the ampoule was detached from the manifold. The  
179 ampoules were fitted to an orbital shaker in an oven at 25°C. The orbital shaker  
180 was set to ~300 rpm, which was sufficient to keep the solids in suspension, and  
181 the experiments were run for four weeks.

182

183 At the end of the experiments, the ampoule neck was broken and the solid  
184 products collected on a 0.02 μm Millipore™ filter under flowing N<sub>2</sub>. The solid  
185 product was freeze-dried for ~24 hrs and stored under an N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere at  
186 -18°C before analysis. The supernatant pH was measured using an Orion™  
187 Ross combination glass pH electrode. A 5 mL sample of the supernatant was  
188 stored in a sealed glass vial at 4°C until acidification and analysis.

189

189

## 190 **2.3. Analysis**

191

### 192 *2.3.1. Solution analysis*

193

194 Supernatant samples were analyzed for total dissolved arsenic using a Perkin  
195 Elmer™ Elan 5000 inductively coupled plasma (ICP) mass spectrometer. The  
196 detection limit was  $6.5 \times 10^{-9}$  M, taken as the average blank plus five times its  
197 standard deviation. The matrix used for As analyses was 2% HNO<sub>3</sub>. Total  
198 dissolved iron was measured using a Varian Spectra 300 acetylene–air–flame  
199 atomic absorption spectrometer. Since citric acid has been reported to suppress  
200 the absorbance by iron up to 50% (Roos and Price, 1971), calibration solutions  
201 were made using the tri-sodium citrate pH-buffer solution and were acidified  
202 similar to the supernatant samples. The detection limit was  $7.4 \times 10^{-9}$  M, taken  
203 as the average blank plus five times its standard deviation.

204

### 205 *2.3.2. Solid phase characterization*

206

207 XRPD was carried out using a Philips™ PW170 diffractometer (CuK $\alpha$   
208 radiation, 35 kV, 40 mA). Approximately 50 mg of freeze-dried FeS was  
209 dispersed in acetone and loaded onto a glass slide under an N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere  
210 within a glove-box. XRPD patterns, in the range of 3–80° 2 $\theta$ , were collected

211 under air using the following settings: 0.1 mm receiving slit, 0.4 s/0.02° 2θ  
212 counting time. A conservative estimate of the detection limit for crystalline  
213 phases is ~10%. Characterization of the patterns was performed using the  
214 JCPDS library.

215

216 TEM images, selected-area electron diffraction patterns (SAED) and energy-  
217 dispersive X-ray (EDX) analyses of freeze-dried FeS were collected on a  
218 Philips™ CM200 FEG-TEM (200 kV). Approximately 0.5 mg of solid sample  
219 dispersed in acetone was quickly loaded in air onto a carbon-coated copper grid  
220 and loaded into a low-background specimen microscope holder. Since the  
221 particles may be smaller than the interaction volume of the 200 kV electron  
222 beam and since no calibration could be done, the EDX data were used  
223 qualitatively; the estimated detection limit is 1 wt.% for As. SAED patterns and  
224 TEM images were recorded photographically. In the SAED patterns, reciprocal  
225 lattice distances were measured manually and converted to lattice *d*-spacings  
226 according to  $d = L\lambda R^{-1}$ ; where *L* is the camera or diffraction length of 0.92 m,  $\lambda$   
227 is  $2.508 \times 10^{-12}$  m and *R* is the measured lattice distance (Grundy and Jones,  
228 1976).

229

230

230

231

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

232

233 Two sets of batch experiments were performed: (i) freeze-dried FeS was  
234 reacted with  $10^{-7}$  to  $10^{-1}$  M solutions of As(V) and As(III), and (ii) freeze-dried  
235 FeS was reacted with  $10^{-7}$  to  $10^{-1}$  M solutions of As(V) and As(III) and with  
236  $\text{H}_2\text{S}_{(\text{aq})}$ . The first set of experiments, with an Fe(II) to S(-II) ratio of 1:1, are  
237 referred to as the *sulfide-limited experiments* and have experiment numbers 1a  
238 to 1e, and 3a to 3e (Tables 1 and 2). The second set of experiments, with an  
239 Fe(II) to S(-II) ratio of approximately 1:2, are referred to as the *excess-sulfide*  
240 *experiments* and have experiment numbers 2a to 2e, and 4a to 4e (Tables 1 and  
241 2).

242

#### 243 3.1. As(V)

244

245 The supernatant analysis results are listed in Table 1. The amount of arsenic  
246 associated with the solid phase,  $[\text{As}]_s$ , was calculated by difference between the  
247 amount of As(V) initially added,  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$ , and the concentration measured in  
248 the supernatant at the end of the experiments,  $[\text{As}]_{\text{aq}}$ . As can be seen in Table 1,  
249  $[\text{As}]_s$  in the sulfide-limited and excess-sulfide experiments is similar and  
250 decreased with decreasing  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$ .

251

252 Typical XRPD patterns for the experiments with different  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$  are shown  
253 in Figure 1. A summary of the XRPD results is listed in Table 3. The color of  
254 the solid end products changed with increasing  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$  from black to grayish-  
255 green in the sulfide-limited experiments (1d to 1a; Table 1), and from grayish-  
256 black to yellowish-green in the excess-sulfide experiments (2d to 2a; Table 1).  
257 This is generally consistent with the results from the XRPD observations. In  
258 experiment 1a, the black FeS was replaced by elemental sulfur (white, orange)  
259 and green rust (Fig.1a). The yellow color observed may have been caused by  
260 arsenic sulfide precipitation (O'Day et al., 2004), however, this was not  
261 observed in the XRPD data. Similarly, in experiment 2a, the grayish-black  
262 pyrite and black FeS was replaced by elemental sulfur and green rust (Fig. 1b).  
263 It can be concluded from these observations that, at  $[\text{As(V)}]_0 > 10^{-3}$  M, iron(II)  
264 sulfides are oxidized to elemental sulfur and Fe(III). At these high arsenate  
265 concentrations, an increase in iron concentration of two orders of magnitude  
266 was found (Table 1). This may be explained by a higher solubility of green rust  
267 (e.g. Bourrie et al., 1999) compared to FeS (e.g. Wolthers et al., 2005 b).  
268 Alternatively, increasing arsenic-sulfide complexation may have resulted in  
269 less sulfide being available to react with iron.

270

271 Detailed examination of the iron(II) sulfides from experiments 1d and 2d  
272 (Table 1) was conducted using TEM (Fig. 2). Multiple particles, representative  
273 of the solid end products formed, were imaged. Figure 2a shows an example of  
274 a rectangular particle from experiment 1d (Table 1). EDX measurement of this

275 particle yielded an Fe:S intensity ratio of  $\sim 0.99$ , calculated from the peak  
276 surface areas in the spectra. The SAED pattern (Fig. 2b) is consistent with  
277 crystalline mackinawite. Figure 2c shows a crystalline particle formed in  
278 experiment 2d (Table 1). EDX measurement yielded an Fe:S ratio of  $\sim 0.67$ .  
279 The SAED pattern (Fig. 2d) is consistent with pyrite. The imaging, SAED and  
280 EDX analyses are consistent with the XRPD observations. For all particles  
281 from experiments 1d and 2d, As was below the detection limit of the EDX  
282 analyses.

283

284 Savage et al. (2000) performed a TEM study on hydrothermal pyrite with 1.36–  
285 1.67 wt.% arsenic and observed arsenic-rich lamellae which, in the SAED  
286 pattern, showed lattice deviations from the cubic symmetry of pyrite towards  
287 the orthorhombic marcasite-type structure of arsenopyrite. An estimate of the  
288 As concentration in the pyrite, assuming all of the solid-phase As is present in  
289 pyrite and that  $\sim 60\%$  wt% of the total solid phase is pyrite, yielded an As  
290 concentration in the ppb (that is, less than  $10^{-4}$  wt.%) range. This explains the  
291 absence of both the lattice deviations in the SAED pattern (Fig. 2d) and the As  
292 peaks in the EDX spectra.

293

294

294

### 295 **3.2. As(III)**

296

297 The amount of As(III) associated with the solid phase from the sulfide-limited  
298 and the excess-sulfide experiments was similar (Table 2). It decreased with  
299 decreasing amounts of As(III) initially added. These results show the same  
300 trends as the As(V) results (Table 1). In contrast, the total dissolved iron results  
301 for the As(III) experiments (Table 2) differed from the As(V) experiments  
302 (Table 1). With increasing  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ , the iron concentration increased by one to  
303 two orders of magnitude before decreasing at the highest  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ . An  
304 explanation for this trend might be that at high As(III) concentrations the  
305 dissolution of FeS is inhibited. Alternatively, increasing arsenic-sulfide  
306 complexation may again have resulted in less sulfide being available to react  
307 with iron.

308

309 Figure 3 shows XRPD patterns for the reaction of As(III) in sulfide-limited  
310 (Fig. 3a) and excess-sulfide (Fig. 3b) experiments. A summary of the XRPD  
311 results is listed in Table 3. With increasing  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ , the color of the solid end  
312 products did not significantly change from black or grayish black, consistent  
313 with the XRPD observations. Figure 3a shows the broad Bragg peaks of  
314 disordered mackinawite at the lowest  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$  (spectrum 3d) and no change in  
315 the diffraction pattern with increasing  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ . At the highest  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ , a  
316 slight increase in diffraction intensity may have been caused by a more optimal

317 sample loading on the glass slide. All patterns are consistent with FeS  
318 (Wolthers et al., 2003). In Figure 3b, the diffraction intensity of the iron(II)  
319 sulfides weakens relative to the blank pattern with increasing  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ . At the  
320 highest  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$  ( $9.1 \times 10^{-2}$  M; spectrum 4a), only weakened and broadened  
321 FeS Bragg peaks remain. Apparently, pyrite formation was inhibited in the  
322 excess sulfide experiments. Implications of these results for pyrite formation  
323 pathways are discussed in section 4.1.2.

324

325 TEM was used to examine iron(II) sulfides from experiments 3c ( $9.0 \times 10^{-7}$  M;  
326 Fig. 4a) and 4c ( $9.0 \times 10^{-7}$  M; Fig. 4c). Multiple particles, representative of the  
327 solid end products formed, were imaged. EDX measurement of the solid  
328 formed in experiment 3c yielded an Fe:S ratio of 0.85, and the SAED pattern  
329 (Fig. 4b) showed diffraction rings, indicating an amorphous or nanoparticulate  
330 material (e.g. Ohfuji and Rickard, 2006), in agreement with the XRPD  
331 observations. For all particles analyzed from experiments 3c and 4c, the As  
332 concentration was below the EDX detection limit. In future studies on As  
333 interactions with Fe(II) sulfides, more sensitive analyses, also analyzing for As  
334 speciation, and higher resolution imaging techniques could further clarify the  
335 influence of As on iron sulfide mineral transformations, in particular for  
336 As(III).

337

337

### 338 **3.3. Arsenic uptake**

339

340 The solid phase As concentration in the end product of the As(V) experiments  
341 was independent of excess H<sub>2</sub>S (Table 1), suggesting that pyrite formation was  
342 not responsible for extra uptake of As(V). Thus, the uptake of As(V) may be  
343 controlled by the FeS reactant. Wolthers et al. (2005c) studied the sorption of  
344 As(V) onto FeS. They showed that As(V) sorption onto FeS at pH 7.5 can be  
345 described with the following Freundlich equation (solid line in Fig. 5a):

$$(1) \quad [\text{As(V)}]_{\text{ads}} = 0.021[\text{As(V)}]_{\text{aq}}^{0.90}$$

346 where  $[\text{As(V)}]_{\text{ads}}$  is adsorbed As(V) in mol g<sup>-1</sup> FeS, and  $[\text{As(V)}]_{\text{aq}}$  is the  
347 aqueous As(V) concentration in M. Their data and the Freundlich equation are  
348 plotted in Figure 5a.

349 To test if As(V) uptake by the solid phase in the present experiments is  
350 controlled by sorption onto FeS, the data for  $[\text{As(V)}]_{\text{s}}$  and  $[\text{As(V)}]_{\text{aq}}$  (Table 1)  
351 were plotted in the isotherm graph (Fig. 5a). The data for  $[\text{As(V)}]_0 < 1 \times 10^{-3}$   
352 M plot close to the Freundlich isotherm for the sorption data. It might be  
353 concluded from this agreement that As(V) sorption onto FeS controlled As  
354 uptake into the solid phase in the experiments. Alternatively, co-precipitation  
355 may be occurring, governed by adsorption to a growing surface. The data for  
356  $[\text{As(V)}]_0 \approx 9 \times 10^{-2}$  M plot below the Freundlich isotherm; at the same amount  
357 of arsenic in the solid, more arsenic was in the aqueous phase than described by  
358 equation (1). So, for these experiments, it can not be concluded if sorption onto

359 FeS was the uptake mechanism for arsenic into the solid. This is in agreement  
360 with the XRPD data which showed that all Fe(II) sulfides had been oxidized to  
361 elemental sulfur and green rust in these experiments.

362

363 Similar to the As(V) experiments, the amount of arsenic associated with the  
364 solid phase product of the As(III) experiments appeared independent of excess  
365 sulfide (Table 2). To test if the uptake of As(III) was controlled by the freeze-  
366 dried FeS reactant, the data from the experiments 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b (Table 2)  
367 were plotted on a sorption isotherm graph (Fig. 5b) with the data for As(III)  
368 sorption onto FeS (Wolthers et al., 2005c). The sorption data were previously  
369 described by the following Freundlich equation (solid line in Fig. 5b):

$$(2) \quad [\text{As(III)}]_{\text{ads}} = 0.026[\text{As(III)}]_{\text{aq}}^{0.98}$$

370 where  $[\text{As}]_{\text{ads}}$  is the amount of sorbed As(III) in  $\text{mol g}^{-1}$  FeS and  $[\text{As}]_{\text{aq}}$  is the  
371 dissolved As(III) concentration in M (Wolthers et al., 2005c). The data from  
372 experiment 4b (excess-sulfide,  $[\text{As(III)}]_0 = 4.5 \times 10^{-4}$  M) plot close to the  
373 sorption isotherm (equation 2), which may mean that arsenite sorption onto FeS  
374 is the pathway for uptake into the solid phase. However, the other data plot  
375 below the isotherm. This indicates that, for these experiments, sorption onto  
376 FeS surface was probably not the controlling uptake mechanism for arsenic.  
377 However, the XRPD spectra show the presence of FeS, and no other solid. So,  
378 from these result, no conclusions can be drawn regarding possible pathways of  
379 As(III) uptake.

380

### 381 **3.4. Redox reactions**

382

383 In the As(V) experiments, the XRPD results showed the oxidation of S(-II) and  
384 Fe(II). Bostick and Fendorf (2003) suggested a redox reaction for arsenite with  
385 FeS, in which ferrihydrite and pyrite are formed. Hence, this reaction is only  
386 favorable at sufficiently basic conditions, where ferrihydrite would be stable.  
387 While a mechanism for iron(II) sulfide oxidation by As(V) or As(III) at more  
388 acidic conditions has not been previously reported, it might be discussed based  
389 on the existing literature for the mechanism of S(-II) oxidation by As(V) in the  
390 aqueous phase (Rochette et al., 2000) and XAS data for As(V) and As(III)  
391 sorption and coprecipitation onto mackinawite (Farquhar et al., 2002). Rochette  
392 et al. (2000) have studied the rate and mechanism of As(V) reduction by S(-II)  
393 at pH 4 and a sulfide to arsenate ratio similar to experiment 1a (Table 1). They  
394 described the reduction to occur the formation of thioarsenite and subsequent  
395 reduction to thioarsenite by release of S(0). Dithioarsenate and thioarsenite  
396 complexes at the surface of mackinawite may have been observed by Farquhar  
397 et al. (2002). Their coprecipitation experiments with a sulfide to arsenate ratio  
398 similar to experiment 2a (Table 1), resulted in arsenic coordinated to 2.5  
399 oxygen atoms in the first shell at 0.170 nm, to 1.5 sulfur atoms in the second  
400 shell at 0.233 nm and four arsenic atoms in the third shell at 0.335 nm. This can  
401 be explained by a mixture of thioarsenate and dithioarsenate species at the  
402 mackinawite surface. In their experiments with a sulfide to arsenite ratio

403 comparable with experiment 4a (Table 2), the observed arsenic coordination at  
404 the surface of mackinawite can be explained as a dithioarsenite species.

405

406 A similar mechanism for As(V) reduction in the present, slightly acidic (pH 6),  
407 FeS-system can be envisaged, either in solution or at the surface of FeS or  
408 pyrite. Elemental-sulfur formation, and the absence of ferrihydrite formation, in  
409 the present experiments, as observed in the XRPD analyses (Figure 1), would  
410 be in support of a mechanism like the one proposed by Rochette et al. (2000).

411

411

### 412 **3.5. Limitations**

413

414 At initiation of the experiments, reactants, buffers and poises were mixed, the  
415 ampoule was sealed and, after four weeks, the solid end products and the  
416 supernatant were analyzed. No information about intermediate reaction  
417 conditions or products could be collected. After poisoning the initial Eh, the  
418 oxidation–reduction potential in the system likely changed during the  
419 experiments, as was discussed in section 2.1. Furthermore, the concentration  
420 and thus distribution of all species varied strongly over the course of an  
421 experiment and, consequently, the ionic strength and mineral saturation states  
422 co-varied. Estimating the ionic strength,  $I$ , at the start and end of the As(V)  
423 experiments, by assuming that aqueous species are not complexed, showed  
424 variations of  $0.06 < I < 0.08$  M in the highest  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$  experiments and  $I \approx$   
425  $0.015$  M in the other As(V) experiments. In the As(III) experiments, higher  $I$ 's  
426 were caused by the increase in dissolved iron:  $0.106 < I < 0.107$  M at highest  
427  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$ , and  $I$  decreases with decreasing  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$  concentration to  $I \approx 0.015$   
428 M.

429

429

430

## 4. IMPLICATIONS

431

### 432 4.1. Iron(II) sulfide transformations

433

#### 434 4.1.1. Ageing of FeS to mackinawite

435

436 FeS ages to mackinawite (Berner, 1964; Rickard, 1989; Lennie and Vaughan,  
437 1996; Benning et al., 2000) and this ageing is observed in the blank  
438 experiments with excess sulfide (2e and 4e, Tables 1 and 2). However, in all  
439 other experiments, this ageing was not observed. For hydrous ferric oxides,  
440 As(V) sorption has been found to stabilize the solid with respect to  
441 transformations to more stable crystalline phases due to the modification of the  
442 local environment of the iron in the solid (Waychunas et al., 1996; Rancourt et  
443 al., 2001). For iron(II) disulfide surfaces, sorption of protons has been reported  
444 to distort the S geometry around Fe, causing the pH dependent formation of  
445 marcasite in preference to stable pyrite (Tossell et al., 1981). Analogously,  
446 Lennie and Vaughan (1996) proposed the pH dependent occurrence of cubic  
447 FeS and troilite by interaction of surface bound protons with the electronic  
448 structure in the solid. Possibly, sorption of As(V) and As(III) influences the  
449 electronic structure of FeS, preventing the ageing of FeS to mackinawite.  
450 Alternatively, the sorption of As(V) and As(III) may influence the ageing of  
451 FeS to mackinawite by blocking reactive surface sites or through co-

452 precipitation on the FeS surface that are important in the ageing of FeS to  
453 mackinawite, resulting in an inhibition of the recrystallisation or of the stacking  
454 of nanoparticulate FeS to form mackinawite.

455

#### 456 *4.1.2. The mechanism of pyrite formation*

457

458 In experiments without As, mackinawite and pyrite were readily formed,  
459 similarly to Rickard (1997), Benning et al. (2000), and Butler and Rickard  
460 (2000). The rate of pyrite formation in this type of experiment is dependent  
461 upon the sulfide activity and the FeS concentration (Butler and Rickard, 2000).  
462 Progressive increases in As concentration caused the reaction product to  
463 deviate from the blank result (Table 3). Therefore, As retards and inhibits  
464 pyrite formation.

465

466 Wolthers et al. (2005 a) observed no unequivocal effect of As(III) at a  
467 concentration of  $\sim 10^{-7}$  M (comparable to experiment 4c, Table 2) on the  
468 amount of pyrite or on the textures formed in chemostated experiments. At a  
469 similar arsenite concentration (experiment 4c, Table 2), pyrite was formed,  
470 albeit less than in the blank experiment (4e, Figure 3). In their chemostated  
471 experiments, the controlled conditions were less supersaturated with respect to  
472 pyrite than the present experimental conditions and a seed crystal was present  
473 to facilitate nucleation. So, while pyrite formation in the present experiments  
474 was nucleation dominated (Butler and Rickard, 2000), pyrite formation in the

475 chemostated experiments was dominated by crystal growth. Apparently, low  
476 concentrations of As(III) do not affect continued pyrite growth but can affect  
477 pyrite formation when no seed crystals are present.

478

479 Previously postulated pyrite formation mechanisms in aqueous solutions at  
480 ambient temperatures involve a dissolved stage (Rickard, 1975; Luther 1991;  
481 Rickard and Luther, 1997). Any process that affects the dissolved intermediates  
482 or the solubility of the disordered mackinawite reactant, will also affect the  
483 pyrite formation kinetics. This has been reported by Rickard et al. (2001), who  
484 showed that RCH=O in trace amounts inhibits pyrite formation by attacking, or  
485 preventing the formation of,  $\text{FeS}_{(\text{aq})}$ . Similarly, As(V) and As(III) may affect  
486 the pyrite forming mechanism. For example, the reactivity of the FeS surface  
487 will be changed by As(V) or As(III) sorption. Moreover, possibly the labile  
488  $\text{FeS}_{(\text{aq})}$  cluster complex reacts rapidly (Rickard, 1997) with As(V) or As(III)  
489 near the FeS surface to form arsenic-sulfide complexes (see section 3.4) or  
490 iron(II)-sulfide-arsenic complexes. This would lower the sulfide activity and  
491 could inhibit pyrite formation. Likewise, As(V) and As(III) sorption onto the  
492 reactant FeS surface may affect pyrite formation by decreasing the solubility of  
493 the reactant FeS, and, in the case of As(V), by oxidation of FeS. If the surface  
494 of the precursor is modified, and the  $\text{FeS}_{(\text{aq})}$  cluster complex is attacked or its  
495 formation is inhibited, then the rate of pyrite formation is expected to be  
496 reduced.

497

## 498 **4.2. Arsenic mobility in the anoxic environment**

499

500 At natural levels of aqueous arsenic, 0.02–4.01  $\mu\text{M}$  (Widerlund and Ingri,  
501 1995; Sullivan and Aller, 1996; Yan et al., 2000; comparable to our experiment  
502 numbers 1d, 2d, 3 and 4), arsenic uptake by a mixture of the environmentally  
503 most-abundant iron(II) sulfides seems to be controlled by the most reactive  
504 solid phase, FeS (Fig. 5). This uptake can be described using sorption isotherm  
505 notations, as was discussed by Wolthers et al. (2005c). Such isotherm data can  
506 be used in arsenic transport modeling, to predict the mobility and  
507 immobilization of arsenic in the anoxic sulfidic environment. Furthermore,  
508 results from this study suggest that the transformation of the precursor FeS to  
509 the most stable and ubiquitous iron(II) sulfide pyrite is retarded by As(V) and  
510 As(III) sorption, even at natural levels of aqueous arsenic. In this way, possibly  
511 depending on the degree of pyrite supersaturation, arsenic sorption may retard  
512 the rate of formation of a relatively more stable natural As sink, with  
513 implications for the medium term mobility of As in natural environments.

514

515 *Acknowledgements:* We gratefully acknowledge Anthony Oldroyd for his  
516 assistance with the experiments and XRPD measurements, Sarah Goldsmith for  
517 performing the ICP–MS analyses, Colin Lewis for conducting the AAS  
518 measurements and Herman van Roermund for his assistance with the TEM.  
519 Cornelis H. van der Weijden (Utrecht University) and Peter van der Linde  
520 (University of Professional Education Leiden) provided insightful discussions

521 over the course of this study. R. Wilkin (U.S. E.P.A) made valuable critical  
522 comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research was supported  
523 by the Netherlands Organization of Scientific Research (NWO/ALW grant  
524 750.197.06 to M.W) and by NERC grant NRE/L/S/2000/00611 to D.R. This  
525 research was conducted under the program of the Netherlands Research School  
526 of Sedimentary Geology.

527

527

**REFERENCES**

528

529 Arakaki, T., Morse, J.W., 1993. Coprecipitation and adsorption of Mn(II) with mackinawite  
530 (FeS) under conditions similar to those found in anoxic sediments. *Geochim.*  
531 *Cosmochim. Acta* 57, 9–14.

532 Bennet, A.J., Benning, L.G., 2004. Gold and arsenic interactions with pyrite in hydrothermal  
533 solutions. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 68, A293-A293.

534 Benning, L., Wilkin, R.T., Barnes, H.L., 2000. Reaction pathways in the Fe–S system below  
535 100°C. *Chem. Geol.* 167, 25–51.

536 Berner, R.A., 1964. Stability fields of iron minerals in anaerobic marine sediments. *J. Geol.*  
537 72, 826–834.

538 Bostick, B.C., Fendorf, S., 2003. Arsenite sorption on troilite (FeS) and pyrite (FeS<sub>2</sub>).  
539 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 67, 909–921.

540 Bourrie, G., Trolard, F., Jaffrezic, J.-M.R., Génin, A., Maitre, V., Abdelmoula, M., 1999. Iron  
541 control by equilibria between hydroxy-Green Rusts and solutions in hydromorphic  
542 soils. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 63, 3417–3427.

543 Boursiquot, S., Mullet, M., Abdelmoula, M., Génin, J.-M., Ehrhardt, J.-J., 2001. The dry  
544 oxidation of tetragonal FeS<sub>1-x</sub> mackinawite. *Phys. Chem. Min.* 28, 600–611.

545 Butler, I.B., Rickard, D., 2000. Framboidal pyrite formation via the oxidation of iron (II)  
546 monosulfide by hydrogen sulphide. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 64, 2665–2672.

547 Ding, M., de Jong, B.H.W.S., Roosendaal, S.J., Vredenberg, A., 2000. XPS studies on the  
548 electronic structure of bonding between solid and solutes: adsorption of arsenate,  
549 chromate, phosphate, Pb<sup>2+</sup>, and Zn<sup>2+</sup> ions on amorphous black ferric oxyhydroxide.  
550 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 64, 1209–1219.

551 Farquhar, M.L., Charnock, J.M., Livens, F.R., Vaughan, D.J., 2002. Mechanisms of arsenic  
552 uptake from aqueous solution by interaction with goethite, lepidocrocite, mackinawite,  
553 and pyrite: an X-ray absorption spectroscopy study. *Envir. Sci. Technol.* 36, 1757–  
554 1762.

555 Fendorf, S., Eick, M.J., Grossl, P., Sparks, D.L., 1997. Arsenate and chromate retention  
556 mechanism on goethite. 1. Surface structure. *Envir. Sci. Technol.* 31, 315–320.

557 Grundy, P.J., Jones, G.A., 1976. Electron microscopy in the study of materials. In: B.R. Coles  
558 (Ed.), *The structure of solids* 7, Arnold, London.

559 Hiemstra T., Van Riemsdijk W.H. 1999. Surface structural ion adsorption modeling of  
560 competitive binding of oxyanions by metal (hydr)oxides. *J. Colloid Interf. Sci.* 210,  
561 182–193.

562 Huerta-Diaz, M.A., Morse, J.W., 1992. Pyritization of trace metals in anoxic marine  
563 sediments. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 56, 2681–2702.

564 Kornicker, W.A., 1988. Interactions of divalent cations with pyrite and mackinawite in  
565 seawater and sodium–chloride solutions. Ph.D. thesis Texas A&M Univ.

566 Lennie, A.R., and Vaughan, D.J., 1996. Spectroscopic studies of iron sulfide formation and  
567 phase relations at low temperatures. *Min. Spectr.*, special publ. 5, 117–131.

568 Luther, III G.W., 1991. Pyrite synthesis via polysulfide compounds. *Geochim. Cosmochim.*  
569 *Acta* 55, 2839–2849.

570 Mok, W.M., Wai, C.M., 1994. Mobilization of Arsenic in Contaminated River Waters. In:  
571 Arsenic in the environment, Part I: Cycling and characterization (ed. J.O. Nriagu),  
572 Wiley N.Y., pp 99–118.

573 Morse, J.W., Arakaki, T., 1993. Adsorption and coprecipitation of divalent metals with  
574 mackinawite (FeS). *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 57, 3635–3640.

575 Morse, J.W., Luther III, G.W., 1999. Chemical influences on trace metal-sulfide interactions  
576 in anoxic sediments. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 63, 3373–3378.

577 O'Day, P.A., Vlassopoulos, D., Root, R., Rivera, N., 2004. The influence of sulfur and iron on  
578 dissolved arsenic concentrations in the shallow subsurface under changing redox  
579 conditions. *P. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 101, 13703–13708.

580 Ohfuji, H., Rickard, D., 2006. High resolution transmission electron microscopic study of  
581 synthetic nanocrystalline mackinawite. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 241, 227–233.

582 Pierce, M.L., Moore, C.B., 1982. Adsorption of arsenite and arsenate on amorphous iron  
583 hydroxide. *Water Res.* 16, 1247–1253.

584 Rancourt, D.G., Fortin, D., Pichler, T., Thibault, P.–J., Lamarche, G., Morris, R.V., Mercier,  
585 P.H.J., 2001. Mineralogy of a natural As-rich hydrous ferric oxide coprecipitate formed  
586 by mixing of hydrothermal fluid and seawater: Implications regarding surface  
587 complexation and color banding in ferrihydrite deposits. *Am. Mineral.* 86, pp 834–851.

588 Rickard, D., 1989. Experimental concentration–time curves for the iron(II) sulphide  
589 precipitation process in aqueous solutions and their interpretation. *Chem. Geol.* 78,  
590 315–324.

591 Rickard, D., 1997. Kinetics of pyrite formation by the H<sub>2</sub>S oxidation of iron (II) monosulfide  
592 in aqueous solutions between 25 and 125°C: The rate equation. *Geochim. Cosmochim.*  
593 *Acta* 61, 115–134.

594 Rickard, D., Luther III, G.W., 1997. Kinetics of pyrite formation by the H<sub>2</sub>S oxidation of iron  
595 (II) monosulfide in aqueous solutions between 25 and 125°C: The mechanism.  
596 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 61, 135–147.

597 Rickard, D., Butler, I.B., Oldroyd, A., 2001. A novel iron sulphide mineral switch and its  
598 implications for Earth and Planetary science. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 189, 85–91.

599 Rickard, D.T., 1969. The chemistry of iron sulphide formation at low temperatures. *Stockh.*  
600 *Contrib. Geol.* 20, 67–95.

601 Rickard, D.T., 1975. Kinetics and mechanism of pyrite formation at low temperatures. *Am. J.*  
602 *Sci.* 275, 636–652.

603 Rochette, E.A., Bostick, B.C., Li, G., Fendorf, S., 2000. Kinetics of As(V) reduction by  
604 dissolved sulfide. *Envir. Sci. Technol.* 34, 4714–4720.

605 Roos, J.H.T., Price, W.J., 1971. Mechanism of interference and releasing action in atomic-  
606 absorption spectrometry-I The effect of citric acid on iron. *Spectrochim. Acta* 26B,  
607 279–284.

608 Savage, K.S., Tingle, T.N., O'Day, P.A., Waychunas, G.A., Bird, D.K., 2000. Arsenic  
609 speciation in pyrite and secondary weathering phases, Mother Lode Gold District,  
610 Tuolumne County, California. *Appl. Geochem.* 15, 1219–1244.

611 Schoonen, M.A.A., Barnes, H.L., 1991. Reactions forming pyrite and marcasite from  
612 solution: II. Via FeS precursors below 100°C. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 55, 1505–  
613 1514.

614 Smedley, P.L., Kinniburgh, D.G., 2002. A review of the source, behaviour and distribution of  
615 arsenic in natural waters. *Appl. Geochem.* 17, 517–568.

616 Stumm, W., 1991. Chemistry of the solid–water interface, processes at the mineral–water and  
617 particle–water interface in natural systems. Wiley & Sons, NY, 428.

618 Sullivan, K.A.; Aller, R.C. 1996. Diagenetic cycling of arsenic in Amazon shelf sediments.  
619 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 60, 1465–1477.

620 Swedlund, P.J., Webster, J.G., 1999. Adsorption and polymerisation of silicic acid on  
621 ferrihydrite, and its effect on arsenic adsorption. *Wat. Res.* 33, 3413–3422.

622 Tingle, T.N., Waychunas, G.A., Bird, D.K., 1996. X-ray absorption spectroscopy (EXAFS) of  
623 arsenic solid solution in pyrite, Clio Mine, Mother Lodge gold district, Tuolumne  
624 county. *Abstr. w. Progr. – Geol. Soc. Am.* 28, 518.

625 Tossell, J.A., Vaughan, D.J., Burdett, J.K., 1981. Pyrite, marcasite and arsenopyrite type  
626 minerals: crystal chemical and structural principles. *Phys. Chem. Min.* 7, 177–184.

627 Watson, J.H.P., Cressey, B.A., Roberts, A.P., Ellwood, D.C., Charnock, J.M., Soper, A.K.  
628 2000. Structural and magnetic studies on heavy-metal-adsorbing iron sulphide  
629 nanoparticles produced by sulphate-reducing bacteria. *J. of Magn. and Magn. Materials*  
630 214, 13–30.

631 Waychunas, G.A., Fuller, C.C., Rea, B.A., Davis, J.A. 1996. Wide angle X-ray scattering  
632 (WAXS) study of "two-line" ferrihydrite structure: effect of arsenate sorption and

633 counter ion variation and comparison with EXAFS results. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*  
634 60, 1765–1781.

635 Wharton, M.J., Atkins, B., Charnock, J.M., Livens F.R., Patrick, R.A.D., Collison, D., 2000.  
636 An X-ray absorption spectroscopy study of the coprecipitation of Tc and Re with  
637 mackinawite (FeS). *Appl. Geochem.* 15, 347–354.

638 Widerlund, A., Ingri, J. 1995. Early diagenesis of arsenic in sediments of the Kalix River  
639 estuary, northern Sweden. *Chem. Geol.* 125, 185–196.

640 Wilkin, R.T, Ford, R.G. 2002. Use of hydrochloric acid for determining solid-phase arsenic  
641 partitioning in sulfidic sediments. *Envir. Sci. Technol.* 36, 4921–4927.

642 Wolthers, M., Butler, I.B., Rickard, D., Mason, P.R.D., 2005a.. Arsenic incorporation into  
643 pyrite at ambient environmental conditions: a continuous-flow experiment. In:  
644 *Advances in Arsenic Research: Integration of Experimental and Observational Studies*  
645 *and Implications for Mitigation* (Eds. P. A. O'Day, D. Vlassopoulos, X. Ming, L. G.  
646 Benning), American Chemical Society Symposium Series 915, 60–76.

647 Wolthers, M., Charlet, L., van der Linde, P.R., Rickard, D., van der Weijden, C.H. 2005b.  
648 Surface chemistry of disordered mackinawite. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 69, 3469–  
649 3481.

650 Wolthers, M., Charlet, L., van der Weijden, C.H. , van der Linde, P.R., Rickard D., 2005c.  
651 Arsenic Mobility in the Ambient Sulfidic Environment: Sorption of Arsenic(V) and  
652 Arsenic(III) onto Disordered Mackinawite. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 69, 3483–  
653 3492.

654 Wolthers, M., van der Gaast, S.J., Rickard, D., 2003. The structure of disordered  
655 mackinawite. *Am. Mineral.* 88, 2007–2015.

656 Yan, X–P.; Kerrich, R.; Hendry, M.J. 2000. Distribution of arsenic(III), arsenic(V) and total  
657 inorganic arsenic in porewaters from a thick till and clay-rich aquitard sequence,  
658 Saskatchewan, Canada. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 64, 2637–2648.

659 Zehnder, A.J.B., Wuhrman, K. 1976. Titanium(III) citrate as a non-toxic oxidation–reduction  
660 system for the culture of obligate anaerobes. *Science* 192, 1165–1166.  
661

662

## 663 FIGURE CAPTIONS

664

665 **Figure 1.** XRPD patterns at the same arbitrary scale for the end products of the reactions of  
666 various  $[\text{As(V)}]_0$  in (a) the sulfide-limited and (b) the excess-sulfide experiments. Spectrum  
667 labels refer to experiment numbers as listed in Tables 1 and 3. Py labels indicate  $2\theta$ -values for  
668 diffraction by pyrite (JCPDS file 06–0710), Mk for mackinawite (JCPDS file 15–0037), FeS  
669 for disordered mackinawite (Wolthers et al., 2003), S for elemental sulfur (JCPDS file 08–  
670 0247) and G for green rust (JCPDS file 13–0092).

671

672 **Figure 2.** (a) TEM image of a mackinawite crystal from experiment 1d (Table 1). The Fe:S  
673 ratio of this material determined by EDX analysis was 0.99. (b) SAED pattern obtained from  
674 the crystal in (a) parallel to (001);  $a^* \text{ Mk}$  and  $b^* \text{ Mk}$  are the translation vectors in reciprocal  
675 lattice which correspond to tetragonal-lattice parameters  $a$  and  $b$  for mackinawite and 020,  
676 220 and 200 points in the reciprocal lattice refer to the  $(hkl)$  planes in mackinawite. (c) TEM  
677 image of a pyrite crystal from experiment 2d (Table 1). The Fe:S ratio of this material  
678 determined by EDX analysis was 0.67. (d) SAED pattern from the crystal in (c) parallel to  
679 (001);  $a_1^* \text{ Py}$  and  $a_2^* \text{ Py}$  are the translation vectors in the reciprocal lattice which correspond  
680 to cubic-lattice parameters  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  for pyrite and the 400, 440 and 040 points in the  
681 reciprocal lattice refer to the  $(hkl)$  planes in pyrite.

682

683

684 **Figure 3.** XRPD patterns at the same arbitrary scale for batch-experiment end product from  
685 the reactions at various  $[\text{As(III)}]_0$  in (a) the sulfide-limited and (b) the excess-sulfide  
686 experiments. Spectrum labels refer to experiment numbers as listed in Tables 2 and 3. Py  
687 labels indicate  $2\theta$ -values for diffraction by pyrite (JCPDS file 06–0710), Mk for mackinawite  
688 (JCPDS file 15–0037), and FeS for disordered mackinawite (Wolthers et al., 2003).

689

690

691 **Figure 4.** (a) TEM image and (b) SAED rings pattern for the FeS end product from  
692 experiment 3c (Table 2). The Fe:S ratio of this material determined by EDX analysis was  
693 0.85. (c) TEM image for the solid end product from experiment 4c (Table 2). The Fe:S ratio  
694 of this aggregate was not determined, on average, the Fe:S ratio in end product, determined by  
695 EDX analysis, was  $1.2 \pm 0.3$ .

696

697 **Figure 5.** Sorption-isotherm graphs. **(a)** The As(V) data from experiments 1a to 1c (black  
698 triangles; Table 1) and experiments 2a and 2b (grey triangles; Table 1) compared to the  
699 sorption data for As(V) onto FeS at pH 7.5 (open triangles; data from Wolthers et al, 2005c).  
700 The solid line is the Freundlich isotherm describing the sorption data (equation 1). **(b)** The  
701 As(III) data from experiments 3a and 3b (black diamonds; Table 2) and experiments 4a and  
702 4b (grey diamonds; Table 2) compared to the sorption data for As(III) onto FeS at pH 7.4  
703 (open diamonds; data from Wolthers et al, 2005c). The solid line is the Freundlich isotherm  
704 describing the sorption data (equation 2). N.B.: For the sorption data and Freundlich isotherm,  
705 the  $[As(V)]_{ads}$  and  $[As(III)]_{ads}$  data are plotted on the same scale as  $[As]_s$ .