12/31

1	Cordierite under hydrostatic compression: Anomalous elastic behavior as a precursor for a
2	pressure-induced phase transition (REVISION 1b)
3	
4	Ronald Miletich <sup>1</sup> , G. Diego Gatta <sup>2</sup> , Thomas Willi <sup>3,*</sup> , Peter W. Mirwald <sup>4</sup> , Paolo Lotti <sup>2</sup> ,
5	Marco Merlini <sup>2</sup> , Nicola Rotiroti <sup>2</sup> , and Thomas Loerting <sup>5</sup>
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Institut für Mineralogie und Kristallographie, Universität Wien, Althanstrasse 14, A-1090 Wien,
8	Austria
9	<sup>2</sup> Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Botticelli 23, I-20133
10	Milano, Italy
11	<sup>3</sup> Institut für Geowissenschaften, Universität Heidelberg, Im Neuenheimer Feld 234-236, D-69120
12	Heidelberg, Germany
13	<sup>4</sup> Institut für Mineralogie und Petrographie, Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52, A-6020 Innsbruck,
14	Austria
15	<sup>5</sup> Institut für Physikalische Chemie, Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria
16	* Present address: Institut für Geowissenschaften, Goethe Universität, Altenhöferallee 1, D-60438
17	Frankfurt a.M., Germany
18	
19	Abstract
20	The high-pressure behavior of cordierite was investigated by means of in-situ experiments
21	using piston-cylinder press and diamond-anvil cell. Static compression in diamond-anvil cells was
22	conducted with various penetrating and non-penetrating pressure media (H <sub>2</sub> O up to 2 GPa, argon
23	and 4:1-methanol-ethanol up to 7 GPa). The measurement of lattice parameters revealed neither a
24	significant influence on the elasticity nor any indication for effects in analogy to over-hydration
25	within the experimental pressure ranges. Volumetric compression experiments at constant rates up

12/31

26 to 1.2 GPa in a piston-cylinder apparatus insinuate subtle irregularities in the low-pressure range at 27 around ~0.35 and ~0.85 GPa. The  $\Delta V/V$  contribution related to the anomalous compression behaviour in that pressure range is of the order of  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ . The results obtained from single-crystal 28 X-ray diffraction between  $10^{-4}$  and 7 GPa revealed an unexpected and anomalous linear volume 29 30 decrease, corresponding to  $K_{T,298} = 131\pm1$  GPa for the bulk modulus and  $K = -0.4\pm0.3$  for its 31 pressure derivative for a third-order Birch-Murnaghan equation of state. The compressional behavior of the main axis directions is anisotropic with  $\beta_a^{-1} \approx \beta_b^{-1} > \beta_c^{-1}$  for an initial pressure 32 33 regime up to  $\sim 3$  GPa. At pressures above  $\sim 4$  GPa, the compression of the a and b-axis starts to 34 differ significantly, with the *b*-axis showing elastic softening as indicated by negative values for 35  $\partial(\beta_b^{-1})/\partial P$ . The diversification between the *a*- and *b*-axis is also expressed by the pressuredepending increase of the distortion parameter  $\Delta$ . The pronounced elastic softening in both the b-36 axis and c-axis directions  $(\partial(\beta_b^{-1})/\partial P = -4.3\pm0.9, \partial(\beta_c^{-1})/\partial P = -1.2\pm0.8)$  are responsible for the 37 38 apparent linear bulk compression, which indicates the structural instability and precedes a so far not 39 reported ferroelastic phase transition to a triclinic polymorph, following a primitive lattice above the 40 critical transition at ~6.9 GPa.

41

# 42 Keywords

43 cordierite, high pressure, compressibility, elastic softening, phase transition

44

### 45 Introduction

The mineral physics and structure-property relationships of the silicate mineral cordierite, corresponding to (Mg,Fe)<sub>2</sub>Al<sub>4</sub>Si<sub>5</sub>O<sub>18</sub> in a simplified form, has received considerable attention for various outstanding physical properties. The eminent properties of cordierite include the pronounced stability at high temperatures and the remarkable robust thermal shock resistance. The ability to sustain large temperature gradients and temperature changes on a short timescale is the

12/31

51 consequence of relatively low thermal expansion (Hochella et al. 1979, Mirwald 1981, Ikawa et al. 52 1986, Camerucci et al. 2001). Another prominent aspect of the thermodynamic properties is related 53 to the polymorphism at high temperatures (Miyashiro 1957, Langer and Schreyer 1969). The 54 associated order/disorder phase transition, which originates from the Al,Si distribution within the 55 alumosilicate (Al,Si)<sub>6</sub>O<sub>18</sub> subunits, is accompanied by a symmetry change from orthorhombic (Cccm) to hexagonal (P6/mcc) symmetry above the critical temperature of ~1750 K (Meagher and 56 57 Gibbs 1977, Putnis 1980a, Armbruster 1985a, Redfern et al. 1989, Daniels et al. 1994, Malcherek et 58 al. 2001). Apart from the Al,Si ordering on tetrahedral sites and the mechanism of the 59 transformation, numerous investigations focused on the structural origins of optical absorption 60 properties, in particular on the remarkable macroscopic pleochroism in crystals. This includes the Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Fe<sup>3+</sup> distribution (Fave et al. 1968, Goldman and Rossmann 1977, Abs-Wurmbach et al. 1989, 61 62 Geiger et al. 2000a, 2000b, Khomenko et al. 2001) and, most recently, the radiocoloration and 63 changes of the optical properties induced by irradiation (Vance and Price 1984, Nasdala et al. 2006, Weikusat et al. 2008, 2010, Miletich et al. 2010). In addition to the complex crystal chemistry, the 64 65 microporous nature of the framework structure reveals the possibility for structural storage of a variable amount of extra-framework atoms ( $Na^+$ ,  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ ) and molecules, such as of H<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub>, Ar 66 67 or N<sub>2</sub> (Bulbak et al., 2002; Cohen et al. 1977, Medenbach et al. 1980, Armbruster and Bloss 1980, 68 1982, Armbruster 1985b, 1986, Vry et al. 1990). This provides a high flexibility of the structure for substitutions according to  $^{Ch}(Na^+,K^+)_{m+n} [^{[6]}((Mg,Fe^{2+},Mn^{2+})_{2-m}Li^+_m) [^{[4]}((A1,Fe^{3+})_{4-n}Be^{2+}_n) [^{[4]}Si_5O_{18}]$ . 69 70  $(H_2O)_{\leq 2}(CO_2)_{\leq 0}$  stoichiometries (Bertoldi et al., 2004).

The majority of experimental studies are devoted to property changes related to the crystal chemistry and/or variations with temperature, in particular involving high temperatures. Investigations on cordierite at high-pressure conditions originated from the need to understand thermodynamic stability conditions, but are limited to only a few individual experimental studies (Mirwald and Maresch 1980, Mirwald 1982, Mirwald et al. 1984, Koepke and Schulz 1986). Most

12/31

76 recently, Likhacheva et al. (2011, 2013) performed static compression on polycrystalline cordierite 77 in aqueous media and describe a discontinuity in the volume properties in the pressure range between 4 and 5 GPa together with changes of the pressure-induced shifts of Raman modes above 78 79 4.7 GPa. Both experimental observations have been attributed to pressure-induced over-hydration 80 by excess H<sub>2</sub>O contents (Likhacheva et al. 2013). Potential structural changes assigned to the extraframework channel content have also been presumed to be responsible for small volume 81 82 discontinuities as observed on isothermal compression and decompression in piston-cylinder 83 apparatus (PCA). Mirwald and Maresch (1980) and Mirwald (1982) described two discontinuities, which are supposed to occur at ~0.22 and ~0.90 GPa with a  $\Delta V/V$  discontinuities of about -0.05 to -84 85 0.3 vol-% in volumetric measurements. Diffraction studies on single crystals in diamond-anvil cells 86 later supported only the subtle discontinuity at 0.90±0.06 GPa, claiming unusual low 87 compressibility for the pressure interval below. It is noteworthy to mention that no structural 88 changes were observed. In addition, the possible influence of the type of pressure medium was 89 suggested, by interaction with the structure through the open pores (Mirwald et al. 1984, Koepke 90 and Schulz 1986). Nevertheless, the restricted number of data points, their scattering and the 91 uncertainties of individual data points are somewhat too large with respect to the reported small 92 volume changes, and leave some certain doubt about the significance of the existence of transitions 93 related to structural changes. The determination of the coefficients of the elastic tensor and 94 measurements of elastic moduli (Toohill et al. 1999, Bubeck 2009) complement the view on 95 elasticity from static compression studies. Most recent results provide even a picture of the 96 temperature-dependency of the elastic properties at 1 bar (Haussühl et al. 2011).

97 Compared to the earlier experimental investigations, both the PCA and DAC high-pressure 98 techniques have significantly improved and, in addition, single-crystal techniques can be expected 99 to reveal much better constraints on subtle effects. The purpose of the present study is to re-100 investigate the static elasticity and to compare the compressional behavior in various nominally

12/31

101 penetrating and non-penetrating pressure media (according to Gatta, 2008) under hydrostatic 102 conditions. This includes compression of a large single-crystal sample in a PCA but also that of 103 single-crystal samples in DACs. One focus of these investigations is to tackle the earlier proposed 104 discontinuities and to extend the investigated pressure range. High-pressure structure investigations 105 were carried out to monitor the structural evolution related to the possible interpenetration of 106 molecular species from the pressure medium into the open framework structure. The required 107 accuracy is achieved by employing state-of-the art single-crystal X-ray diffraction (XRD) 108 techniques, with a sufficient density of data points across the critical pressure regions to determine 109 high-resolution equations of states (EoSs) within the hydrostatic limits of uniform pressure 110 conditions.

111

### 112 Materials and methods

# 113 Sample material and oriented crystal specimen

114 Single-crystal samples used in this study correspond to the sample material from Madagascar 115 with oriented crystal specimen of homogeneous sodium-poor Na<sub>0.03</sub>[(Mg<sub>1.78</sub>Fe<sub>0.25</sub>)Al<sub>3.98</sub>Si<sub>4.99</sub>O<sub>18</sub>)] 116  $(H_2O)_{0.45}(CO_2)_{0.07}$  (sample Tsi1) and  $Na_{0.03}[(Mg_{1.90}Fe_{0.12})Al_{3.99}Si_{4.98}O_{18})](H_2O)_{0.54}(CO_2)_{0.04}$  (sample 117 Tsi2) according to Miletich et al. (2010). The Fe/(Mg+Fe) composition of individual crystal 118 specimen was checked by energy-dispersive X-ray analyses on using a scanning-electron 119 microscope. Crystal orientation was provided by means of polarized microscopy and conventional 120 X-ray oscillation photographs. Double-sided polished crystal platelets, approximately 40 to 70 µm 121 thick, were prepared from thin sections parallel (hk0)-, (001)- and (010)-plane directions 122 (corresponding to the sample notations "Tsi1", "Tsi2 b" and "Tsi2 c"). The (hk0) section of Tsi1 123 approximates a crystallographic (810)-plane direction. Several cylindrically shaped flat disks (120 124 to 220 µm in diameter) were prepared using a microdrill device as described by Förtsch et al. 125 (1992). For the piston-cylinder experiments a non-oriented 1.889 g cylinder (diameter: 9.60 mm;

height: 7.06 mm) was drilled out from a crystal specimen from Soto, Argentina (composition: Na<sub>0.004</sub>[(Mg<sub>1.23</sub>Fe0<sub>0.74</sub>Mn<sub>0.05</sub>)Al<sub>4.02</sub>Si<sub>4.95</sub>O<sub>18</sub>](H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>0.41</sub>(CO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>0.08</sub>, Schreyer at al. 1979; Mirwald et al., 128 1984).

# 129 Static compression measurements in DACs

130 All high-pressure loadings were carried out using ETH-type DAC with Be backing plates 131 and steel gaskets (stainless steel, material type 1.4310, pre-indented from initial 250 µm to the 132 starting thickness given in Table 1). Crystal specimen equilibrated in air, without additional 133 treatment prior to loading, were pressurized at room temperature using either liquid water, 134 cryogenically liquefied argon, or a water-free (4:1)-methanol-ethanol mixture acting as hydrostatic 135 pressure medium. Pressures were adjusted by means of laser-induced fluorescence following the 136 ruby scale (Mao et al. 1986). Precise pressure values were derived from the  $V/V_0$  ratio of the unit-137 cell volumes of quartz (Angel et al. 1997) as determined from a synthetic SiO<sub>2</sub> standard crystal. All 138 lattice parameters were measured with customized Huber 5042 four-circle diffractometers using 139 non-monochromatized Mo-radiation. The setting angles of diffracted Bragg peaks were recorded 140 with a point detector, using motorized slits  $(2 \times 6 \text{ mm})$ , employing the method of eight-position 141 diffracted-beam centering (King and Finger 1979), and using the fitting routines as implemented in 142 the SINGLE software (Angel and Finger 2011). The results of symmetry-constrained vector-least 143 squares refinements for 5 different series of individual high-pressure loadings (series A and B in 144 H<sub>2</sub>O, series C and D in argon, series E in methanol-ethanol mix) are listed in Table 2.

Additional data points, in particular at pressures above the observed transition, were collected on beamline ID09A at the *European Synchrotron Radiation Facility* (ESRF, Grenoble) using the synchrotron X-ray beam from an undulator source. The horizontally and vertically focussed beam, being monochromatized at ~30 keV ( $\lambda = 0.414384$ Å), gives an almost parallel beam of approximately 30 × 30 µm<sup>2</sup> on the sample. Tiny hand-selected crystal fragments were pressurized in membrane-type DACs with Boehler-Almax anvils of 0.6 mm culet size.

12/31

151 Measurements were performed with the DAC being mounted on a  $\omega$ -rotation goniometer collecting 152 1°-frames in the ±30° rotation range, recording all diffraction patterns with the Mar 555 flat-panel 153 detector (fixed 20=0° at a distance of 310 mm from the sample). Single-crystal sample images were 154 finally processed with the *Crysalis* software (Agilent 2012) using more than 700 observed 155 reflections.

156 Volumetric experiments with a piston-cylinder apparatus

157 The volumetric measurements at ambient temperature (298 K) were conducted with an 158 electronically controlled piston-cylinder apparatus using a steel vessel with a 10 mm bore 159 (Salzmann et al. 2006). The sample was enveloped in 2.28 g Pb-foil and accommodated inside the 160 bore of the steel vessel. The pressure-change rate of the isothermal compression runs was 31 161 MPa/min. Pressure, piston displacement (pd) as a measure of volume change ( $\Delta V$ ) and temperature 162 are simultaneously recorded in 0.5-second intervals during the experiment. Besides a controlling 163 inspection of the piston displacement versus pressure loop, the data analysis mainly relies on a 164 difference technique developed from differential pressure analysis (Mirwald and Massonne 1980, 165 Mirwald 2005a, 2005b, 2008) where the changes in piston displacement ( $\Delta pd$ ) per a chosen time 166 interval ( $\Delta t$ : e.g. 15 s) are used as parameters (cf. Fig. 1). The difference quotient of  $\Delta pd/\Delta t$  as a 167 parameter of the compression behavior represents a qualitative (dV/dP) compressibility coefficient. While the reading resolution of pressure is at  $10^{-6}$  GPa due to the electronic recording technique, its 168 relevant precision is at  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  GPa. The accuracy of the pressure determination is estimated to be 169 170 within 50 MPa. The reading resolution of the piston displacement (Apd), the second crucial parameter is at  $10^{-5}$  mm, the relevant precision is  $5 \times 10^{-4}$  mm. Since the piston displacement 171 measurements are of relative nature, the precision of  $(\Delta pd)$  allows the tracing of volume changes in 172 the range of  $5 \times 10^{-2}$  mm. This corresponds to a volume change of 0.02 mm<sup>3</sup>, thus providing a 173 precision in ( $\Delta V/V$ ) in the order of 10<sup>-4</sup> for our 706 mm<sup>3</sup> cordierite sample. The low compression 174

and decompression rates and the use of lead as a soft pressure transmitting material keeps the

176 friction at about 20 MPa, which implies a subordinate role in the pressure determination.

# 177 Data collection and structure refinements at 1 bar

178 Both sample crystals used for the high-pressure structure investigations were examined prior 179 to loading into the pressure cell by performing a full structure refinement at ambient pressure (air) 180 from the samples being mounted on glass fibres. X-ray intensity data collections were performed 181 using an Xcalibur - Oxford Diffraction diffractometer with instrument specifications as listed in 182 Table 3. In order to maximize data coverage and redundancy, a combination of  $\omega$  and  $\varphi$  scans was 183 chosen. Integrated intensities were corrected for Lorentz-polarization (Lp) and for absorption 184 effects (analytical absorption corrections by Gaussian integration based upon the physical 185 description of the crystal) using the CrysAlis software package (Agilent 2012). The structure 186 refinement using anisotropic displacement parameters was performed with the SHELX-97 program 187 (Sheldrick 1997), starting from the atomic coordinates of Miletich et al. (2010), and using neutral 188 atomic scattering factors for Si, Al, Mg, Fe, and O from the *International Tables of Crystallography* 189 (Wilson and Prince 1999). A full Si/Al-ordering was confirmed at the tetrahedral sites (*i.e.*  $T_1$ ,  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ). 190 T<sub>2</sub>1, T<sub>2</sub>3, T<sub>2</sub>6). A mixed scattering curve of Mg and Fe was used to model the octahedral M site, but 191 this did not lead to a significant fraction of Fe, and so the scattering curve of Mg alone was used in 192 the last cycles of the refinement. Two extra-framework sites (here labeled as Ch1  $\frac{1}{4}$  and Ch2  $\frac{1}{4}$ ) as 193 found in the difference-Fourier map were assigned using the scattering curve of oxygen as being 194 potentially occupied by  $H_2O_1$ , and a further one (labeled as Na) following reported site allocations 195 (e.g. Miletich et al. 2010). All extra-framework sites were modeled with isotropic displacement 196 regime. Data pertaining to the XRD intensity data collection are listed in Table 3, resulting site 197 coordinates, occupancy and displacement parameters are listed in Table 4, bond distances and other 198 structure parameters are given in Table 5.

199 XRD intensity data collection at pressures < 7 GPa

200 An ETH-type DAC was used for all high-pressure intensity data collections using anvils 201 with C=0.6 mm. Loading of the sample in  $H_2O$  was performed in a DAC with a low-background 202 assembly using synthetic type-Ib single-crystal diamond backing plates (Miletich et al. 2000, 2005, Krauss et al. 2005, Periotto et al. 2011). The sample pressurized in methanol-ethanol mix, was 203 204 loaded in a DAC equipped with standard Be-backing plates. Spherical standard rubies (Chervin et 205 al. 2002) served as optical pressure sensors. The four intensity data collections of the sample in  $H_2O$ 206 at 0.39(6), 1.41(8) and 1.75(5) GPa, including one measurement in the DAC at 1 bar without 207 pressure medium, were performed with a KUMA-diffractometer using the scan settings reported in Table 3. Integrated intensity data up to  $2\theta_{max} \sim 70^{\circ}$  were corrected for Lp and absorption effects 208 209 using the ABSORB6.0 program (Angel 2004). The empirical absorption corrections for the sample 210 crystal and the DAC components was carried out in agreement with the correction applied by Hejny 211 et al. (2012). The seven intensity data sets of the sample in methanol-ethanol mix were collected between 10<sup>-4</sup> GPa (with the crystal in the DAC without any pressure medium) and 6.98(5) GPa 212 213 (Table 3). Data collections were performed with the same Xcalibur - Oxford Diffraction 214 diffractometer used for the measurements at 1 bar, based on the equivalent data collection strategy, 215 but with an exposure time of 60 s/frame. The refinements were performed with the SHELX-97 216 (Sheldrick 1997), starting from the structure model refined at room-P (with the crystal in air) and 217 using isotropic displacement parameters. Only one channel site (*i.e.* Ch1  $\frac{1}{4}$ ), was successfully 218 located for the sample in methanol-ethanol mix, while the Fourier summations yielded no 219 significant electron densities for any channel site in the sample pressurized in H<sub>2</sub>O (Table 4a and 220 4b). Site coordinates, occupancies and displacement parameters pertaining to the refinements are 221 listed in Table 4; bond distances and other structure parameters are listed in Table 5.

222

#### 223 **Results and Discussion**

#### 224 Volume compression measurements in piston-cylinder pressure apparatus

225 Since Mirwald et al. (1984) reported a discontinuous compression behaviour at pressures 226 below 1 GPa, we re-examined that pressure range by piston-cylinder compression experiments with 227 the aim to provide a better volumetric resolution due to the very improved data acquisition 228 technique. Because of the qualitative character of the volumetric technique, calibration experiments 229 have been conducted with Pb and NaCl, both well-studied materials (Birch 1966). The continuous 230 monitoring of compression provides (i) a good survey on the pressure characteristic of the apparatus 231 ("apparatus function") and (ii) allows the detection of even very small changes in the compression 232 behavior relatable to volume discontinuities or to compression anomalies of materials to be 233 investigated.

234 Fig. 1 shows, as a calibration example, a compression-decompression run on Pb up to 1.5 235 GPa. The piston displacement (dp) versus loop (Fig. 1, top) shows the typical behaviour, i.e. in the 236 low-pressure range up to 0.2 GPa the loop is strongly influenced by the stress-strain characteristic 237 of the vessel plus the sample set up. The upstroke and down stroke track of Pb show a smooth 238 course without any irregularity, apart from a slight kink on the beginning of the down stroke, which 239 reflects the termination of the stress-strain reversal of vessel-sample set up. This situation is also 240 reflected by the difference parameter  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$  when plotted versus pressure (Fig. 1, bottom). This 241 difference parameter is obtained by slight displacement of the pressure loop equivalent to a time 242 interval of usually 15 seconds. This appears in the plot of piston displacement versus pressure in 243 Fig. 1 (top) as a slightly displaced second loop. The  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$  track of the calibration run on lead is 244 very smooth. Only at low pressure and on the down stroke side of the pressure loop, the above-245 mentioned features related to the apparatus function are noticed. The compression-decompression 246 results on NaCl, the second material used for calibration, are similar.

In Fig. 2 the  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$  tracks (upstroke and down stroke) for the investigated cordierite sample are given. The related loop of piston displacement (dp) versus pressure loop (Fig.1, top) appears smooth. However, the inspection of the  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$ -tracks reveals two irregularities in the compression

12/31

250 behavior of cordierite, at 0.36 and at 0.75 GPa on compression, and at 0.75 and 0.33 GPa on 251 decompression. Instead of a smooth, slightly curved course as indicated in the plot by a curved line 252 serving as a guide to the eye, the experimental data of the compression track shows a sort of bump 253 between the two pressures, while the decompression track exhibits an almost linear behaviour in 254 that pressure interval. The two  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$ -discontinuities on the compression and decompression track 255 show no clear hysteresis. Since the dp versus P tracks show no discrete volume change, the two 256 irregularities are interpreted as a slight change in compressibility of cordierite. Based on a very 257 detailed evaluation of the compression stroke of the dp-P-loop, the deviations in volume were 258 calculated inferring a linear compression behavior in this pressure interval. The  $\Delta V/V$  obtained is in the order of 5  $\times 10^{-4}$ . This suggests a subtle compression irregularity, which is contained by two 259 260 compressibility anomalies. The implication for the overall compression behavior of cordierite is 261 small as demonstrated in Fig.3. Considering the given experimental precision, a more quantitative 262 analysis of these volumetric data is therefore limited. Nevertheless, the analytical findings re-263 confirm in principle the occurrence of subtle irregularities in the compression behaviour in a similar 264 fashion as reported by Mirwald et al. (1984).

265 The volumetric data obtained in the PCA experiments give again evidence of this 266 phenomenon due to the fact to represent a continuous volumetric record on compression and 267 decompression. Despite all improvements of experimental techniques, including pressure 268 corrections, the data obtained here suggest subtle irregularities in the compressibility, but no evident 269 volume discontinuity. The specific volume dV/V change attributed to the anomalous compression behavior between 0.35 and 0.85 GPa lies in the order of  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ . Considering the circumstances that 270 271 the PCA experiments were performed under water-free conditions, one can exclude to a certain 272 extent the influence of external fluid to control the compression behaviour of cordierite. For compression at room temperature, the elastic behavior is similar to "dry" cordierite (Mirwald 1982), 273

12/31

and interpenetration of molecular species from the pressurizing fluids apparently requires at low
pressures additional high temperatures (Le Breton and Schreyer 1993).

276

# 277 Equations of state and the role of pressure media

278 The results of high-precision XRD measurements of the lattice parameters and unit-cell volumes on static compression are summarized in Table 2. Compression data sets of single-crystal 279 280 cordierite in the particular pressure media comprise various loadings of the same or equivalent 281 sample crystals, i.e. series A and B in H<sub>2</sub>O, and series C and D in Ar. Fig. 4 shows the evolution of 282 the three different P-V data sets according to the (quasi)hydrostatic compression in H<sub>2</sub>O, argon, and 283 methanol-ethanol pressure fluids. Compression in H<sub>2</sub>O was achieved under true hydrostatic 284 conditions in liquid water up to 0.9 GPa, followed by quasi-hydrostatic compression in soft ice-VI 285 up to 2.1 GPa, which represent the equilibrium phase boundary between ice-VI and ice-VII (Chen 286 and Yoo 2011, and references therein). Data points measured above this critical pressure boundary are characterized by increasing deviatoric stress as this is manifested through significant peak 287 288 broadening of XRD Bragg peak profiles. For the given quality we did not regard these 289 measurements as relevant. Compression in argon and methanol-ethanol mix was achieved within 290 the quasihydrostatic regime as reported by Angel et al. (2007). Nevertheless, regardless of the use 291 of fully hydrostatically acting pressure media, the intensities of Bragg reflections significantly 292 dropped for all samples at  $P \ge 6.9$  GPa, along with drastic peak broadening, together with changes 293 in the peak profiles, which indicate metrical changes, the existence of more than one crystal 294 domain, and structural gradients across domain boundary walls.

Apart from a minor shift of the *P-V* compression data in argon due to the small difference Mg/Fe ratio of the Tsi1 and Tsi2 samples, the three *P-V* data sets reveal almost identical compression behavior with no visible differences for -dV/dP. It appears that, within the experimental error of the measurements, all samples show identical volume dependencies being

299 independent on the type of medium used for pressurization. The isothermal bulk moduli,  $K_{0.298}$ , for 300 compression at room temperature (298K) yield  $K_{0.298}$ = 137.8±1.5 GPa (in H<sub>2</sub>O), 127.7±2.3 GPa (in 301 Ar) and 131.0±1.3 GPa (in 4:1-ME) for a parametrized fit to the P-V data sets according to a 3rd-302 order Birch-Murnaghan EoS (Angel 2000). These results reveal almost identical compressibility 303 within the given standard deviations and considering correlation between  $K_0$  and K' (=dK/dP) fit 304 parameters. The pressure derivatives K' result in remarkable values of  $-6\pm 2$ ,  $+0.4\pm 0.9$  and  $-0.5\pm 0.4$ , 305 respectively, which corresponds to the apparent linear pressure dependency (Fig. 4). In this context, 306 the larger value for the bulk modulus in water ( $\sim$ 138 GPa) appears to correlate with the large 307 negative value of dK/dP (-6±2), as a fit with K' set 0 yields 132.1±0.7 GPa for the bulk modulus. 308 The bulk moduli obtained here are then similar to the values of 129(1) GPa (Toohill et al. 1999) and 309 129(2) GPa (Haussühl et al. 2011), considering them to be adiabatic bulk moduli as determined 310 from Brillouin scattering and resonant ultrasound spectroscopy, respectively. In a similar fashion, 311 the discrepancy of isothermal bulk modulus  $K_0$  being only 115(1) GPa, as reported by Likhacheva 312 et al. (2013), can be explained as a result of fitting the P-V data to a second-order Murnaghan EoS with fixing K' to 4. The re-evaluation of the data up to 4 GPa fitting  $K_0$  with setting K'=0 gives  $K_0$  = 313 314 127.6 GPa for the bulk modulus, which is in perfect agreement with the results of this and earlier 315 studies (Toohill et al. 1999, Haussühl et al. 2011). Comparison of all experimental data (Fig. 4) 316 shows that, for compression at room temperature, the choice of pressurizing media is not critical. 317 This certainly applies to a water-free methanol-ethanol mixture, but also to argon in the 318 quasihydrostatic pressure regime up to 9 GPa. Using pure H<sub>2</sub>O within the range of apparent 319 hydrostaticity (P < 2 GPa), neither the equation of state nor structure refinements give evidence for 320 a pressure-induced over-hydration. Although previous experimental studies at high P and T clearly 321 showed that Ar and H<sub>2</sub>O can be hosted by the cordierite structure (Schreyer et al. 1960, Schreyer 322 and Yoder 1964, Armbruster 1985b), we find no evidence for interpenetration of excess Ar and 323 H<sub>2</sub>O within the investigated pressure ranges up to 7 and 2 GPa, respectively, at room-T. Using pure

H<sub>2</sub>O within the range of apparent hydrostaticity (P < 2 GPa), neither the equation of state nor structure refinements give evidence for a pressure-induced over-hydration. This might be easily understood as we remained well below the critical pressure of over-hydration (above ~4 GPa, Likhacheva et al. 2013).

328 The evaluation of P-V data clearly suggests an elastic anomaly obviously related to the 329 observed structural change at ~6.9 GPa. The unusual linear compressibility is even confirmed by 330 the compressibility data collected in  $H_2O$  with a high density of data points within a small pressure range between  $10^{-4}$  and 2.01 GPa (Fig. 5). At first glance, the high-resolution *P*-*V* data sets, which 331 332 correspond to individual measurements of the unit-cell volume with small pressure increments, do 333 not reveal a discontinuity, neither in the volume nor for the individual axis directions. In particular, 334 around 0.22 GPa the data suggest a smooth line with no indication for any changes in the slope 335 (Fig. 5), i.e. neither a significant change of the bulk nor of the axial compressibilities. Plotting the 336 calculated compressibility, i.e. as derived from  $\Delta V$  and  $\Delta P$  between neighbouring data points (Fig. 337 3), the inspection of the almost linear appearance might give hints of possible irregularities at 0.35 338 and at 0.85 GPa. The analysis of the unit-cell volume data suggests two to three sections, and linear 339 fits to the volume data of the different sections yield very small differences for the slopes by  $\sim 2-3\%$ . 340 While the slope for the interval below 0.35 GPa is evolving in a positive fashion indicating slightly 341 increasing stiffening, the evolution of bulk modulus for P>0.35 GPa follows a constant line, which 342 approximates dK/dP=0. The deviation of two data points at 0.851 and 0.864 GPa (black in Fig. 3) 343 might be considered as outliers within an applied  $3\sigma$  criteria for the given errors, and hence not 344 being significant in order to prove a change in the compressional behavior related to the previously 345 suspected discontinuity at ~0.85 GPa.

346

### 347 Anisotropy of compression and of the elastic softening

348 According to the hexagonal topology of polyhedral arrangement, which follows the beryl 349 structure by ignoring the cation ordering on the T sites, the compressional anisotropy of the 350 framework structure reveals similar compression for the a and b axis, both being less compressible 351 than the c axis (Fig. 5). This behavior of the c-axis direction being comparably softer than the lattice 352 directions perpendicular to the *c*-axis has been reported for experimental investigations on beryl  $(\beta_{\perp} = 1.72(4) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1} \text{ and } \beta_{\parallel} = 2.10(9) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$ , Hazen et al. 1986) but also for measured and 353 calculated elastic moduli in beryl ( $C_{11} = 306.3$  GPa,  $C_{33} = 282.2$  GPa, Yoon and Newnham 1973, 354 355 Prencipe et al. 2011). The behavior of similar compression of the *a*- and *b*-axis direction (Table 6) 356 corresponds rather to the expectations from symmetry aspects and is also confirmed by the linear coefficients  $\beta_a = \beta_b = 2.4(1) \times 10^{-3}$  GPa<sup>-1</sup> and  $\beta_c = 3.1(1) \times 10^{-3}$  GPa<sup>-1</sup> in the pressure range below 3 GPa 357 (Likhacheva et al. 2013). Nevertheless, the similar compression in an initial stage at moderate 358 359 pressures starts to develop continuously into a diversification between the two axes at pressures 360 greater than 3 to 4 GPa (Fig. 6). While the *a*-axis gets the less compressible axis and shows conventional stiffening with pressure (i.e.  $(\partial(\beta_a^{-1})/\partial P = +11.2\pm 1.3 \text{ in argon and } +9.3\pm 0.9 \text{ in } 4:1$ 361 methanol-ethanol mix), the *b*-axis reveals anomalous behavior (i.e.  $(\partial(\beta_b^{-1})/\partial P - 4.3\pm 0.9 \text{ and} -$ 362 363 1.9±1.9) and clearly indicates to be involved in elastic softening associated with an upcoming structural instability. In addition to the *b*-axis, the *c*-axis compression shows an analogous behavior 364 with getting softer as expressed by the negative value for  $(\partial(\beta_c^{-1})/\partial P)$  (see Table 6). The pronounced 365 366 anisotropy within the *ab*-plane is similar to the compressional anisotropy observed for the over-367 hydrated cordierite above 5 GPa (Likhacheva et al. 2013), where the *a*-axis becomes the stiffest  $(\beta_a = 1.6(1) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1})$  in comparison to the *b*- and *c*-axis directions ( $\beta_b = 2.7(1) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$ ,  $\beta_c = 1.6(1) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$ ,  $\beta_c$ 368  $3.0(1) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$ ). 369

370 The diversification between the *a*- and *b*-axis is even more obvious when plotting the 371 distortion index  $\Delta$  (Putnis 1980b, Selkregg and Bloss 1980). Fig. 7 shows rather constant evolutions 372 for all three individual data sets below 3 GPa, but a clear change of the trend with a positive slope above 4 GPa, which appears to be the same within the accuracy of the data for compression in Ar and methanol-ethanol mixture. The distortion index  $\Delta$ , originally a measure for the deviation from hexagonality in 20 for selected reflections (Miyashiro 1957), was found to reach maximum values of 0.31° (Armbruster and Bloss 1980), with the value for  $\Delta$  decreasing with the incorporation of Na<sup>+</sup>, H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> into the structural channels (Schreyer et al. 1979, Armbruster and Bloss 1980, Selkregg and Bloss 1980). All values, determined here from the distortion with pressure, approach the reported maximum value but lie below 0.31°.

380 Summarizing these findings, the compressional behavior of the main axes yields an anisotropy following the beryl structure topology with  $\beta_a^{-1} \approx \beta_b^{-1} > \beta_c^{-1}$  for an initial pressure regime 381 up to  $\sim 3$  GPa. The compressional behavior of the *a*- and *b*-axis diversifies with increasing pressure 382 383 and reveals increasing anisotropy of deformation within the *ab*-plane, similar to the compressional 384 anisotropy reported for the over-hydrated cordierite (Likhacheva et al. 2013). Both the increasing 385 anisotropy and the bulk volume compression are characterized by remarkable elastic softening effects with significantly negative  $\partial(\beta^{-1})/\partial P$  coefficients, in particular obtained for the 386 387 compressibilities of the *b*- and *c*-axis directions.

### 388 Structure evolution up to 7 GPa

389 In response to the applied pressure, the structure of cordierite reacts mainly through inter-390 tetrahedral tilting, with oxygen atoms acting as flexible hinges, and through the polyhedral 391 compression of the Mg-octahedron. The evolution of the tetrahedral bond distances (Table 5) show 392 only a subtle compression within the pressure range investigated, suggesting that the Si/Al-393 tetrahedra act as rigid units, whereas the inter-tetrahedral angles (*i.e.* O<sub>2</sub>6-O<sub>2</sub>3-O<sub>2</sub>1, O<sub>2</sub>1-O<sub>2</sub>6-O<sub>2</sub>3; 394 Fig. 8, Table 5) change significantly. In particular, the angle  $O_2 1 - O_2 6 - O_2 3$  tends to increase with P, 395 whereas the angle  $O_26-O_23-O_21$  decreases (Fig. 8, Table 5). Such mechanisms reflect the evolution 396 of the ellipticity of the 6-membered rings of tetrahedra (6mR) perpendicular to [001]. The ellipticity 397 ratio [here defined as  $\varepsilon_{[001]} = 0.5 \cdot [(O_2 6 \leftrightarrow O_2 6) + (O_2 1 \leftrightarrow O_2 1)] / [(O_2 3 \leftrightarrow O_2 3)]$  is 1 for an ideal

undistorted ring (as expected for indialite) and a lower value indicates a higher ellipticity. Our structure refinements at high pressures show that  $\varepsilon_{[001]}$  is ~0.905 at ambient pressure and tends to decrease with *P* (Fig. 8, Table 5), reflecting an increase on the channel ellipticity as pressure

401 increases. The increase of the ring ellipticity was postulated by Gatta and Lee (2006) and Gatta 402 (2008) as an energetically less-costly mechanism, which somewhat accommodates the effect of 403 pressure in open-framework materials. However, only a modest deformation of the [001]-channel is 404 observed within the *P*-range investigated (Fig. 8). While the data scatter in the low-*P* range does not 405 reflect any clear deviation from linear trends, individual quantities (see Fig. 7 and 8) of the 406 structures above 6 GPa might be interpreted as a precursor effect for the transformation at 6.9 GPa.

407 The high-pressure structure refinements show a significant compression of the Mg-408 polyhedron, as shown in Fig. 9, Table 5. The compressibility coefficient of the Mg-polyhedron, here derived by linear regression through the data points, is  $\beta_{\text{poly}}(\text{MgO}_6) = 1.0(1) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GPa}^{-1}$ , 409 410 which leads to a polyhedral modulus of  $K_{\text{poly}}(\text{MgO}_6) = 100(9)$  GPa. It is remarkable to point out that 411 the Mg-polyhedron is, at a significant level, not deformed in response to the applied pressure, as 412 shown by the evolution of the polyhedron distortion coefficient with P ( $\xi$  in Table 5). This 413 someway reflects the hexagonal topology of the cordierite framework, which controls the almost 414 isotropic compression of the Mg-polyhedron.

415 The structure investigation under increasing  $H_2O$  pressure was mainly aimed to elucidate 416 any potential pressure-induced over-hydration in cordierite, such as recently reported by 417 Likhacheva et al. (2013). A careful inspection of the difference-Fourier maps of the electron density 418 of the HP-refinements did not give any evidence for a pressure-driven penetration of molecules of 419 the *P*-medium through the [001] channel, as previously observed in other classes of open-420 framework materials compressed in hydrous media (Gatta 2008, 2010). In response to the modest 421 applied  $P(H_2O)$  in this experiment (P < 2 GPa), as limited by the quasihydrostaticity of ice-VI 422 before transforming to ice-VII at 2.1 GPa, the structure of cordierite does not show any significant

423 deformation mechanism. The ellipticity ratio of the 6mR running along [001] is constant within the 424 *e.s.d.*, and even the softest unit of the cordierite structure, represented by the Mg-octahedron, 425 appears to be only marginally compressed. The structure refinements clearly suggest no pressure-426 induced changes related to the possible re-arrangement of  $H_2O$  molecules on extra-framework sites, 427 which would have been indicative for over-hydration effects.

-

# 428 Changes of lattice metrics above 7 GPa

429 Any attempt to increase the pressure to values above  $\sim 7.0$  GPa resulted in difficulties to 430 center XRD peak profiles, which show significant broadening and did not allow to obtain any 431 reliable high-precision data points for equation of state measurements. The optical inspection of the 432 pressurized sample indicated inhomogeneities, the formation of domains, and optically visible strain 433 across the sample crystals (Fig. 10). Using the strongest reflections of such a multi-domain crystal, 434 the refinement of unit-cell parameters clearly indicated small but significant deviations from 90° of 435 orthorhombic  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  angles. In order to overcome emerging strain in rather large crystals, tiny 436 micrometer-sized sample crystals were chosen for investigations using synchrotron radiation. The 437 sample loading of small crystal fragments provided almost unstrained single-domain crystals above 438 the transition. The determined unit cell proves the orthorhombic-to-triclinic transition with 439 consistent deviations from orthogonal lattice settings, in particular with the  $\beta$  angle around ~86.0° 440 and the  $\gamma$  angle at 89.0° for base-vector settings corresponding to the orthorhombic C-centered unit 441 cell at low pressures (Table 2). The lattice distortion appears to occur in a similar fashion such as 442 reported for beryl, where the hexagonal structure undergoes a transition to a structure of triclinic 443 symmetry above ~14 GPa (Prencipe et al. 2011). The unit-cell volume of cordierite here reveals a 444 clear discontinuity across the critical transition pressure showing a spontaneous  $\Delta V/V$  of approximately -6.9% as determined from unit-cell volumes measured at 7.53 and 9.0 GPa. The 445 appearance of such a significant volume discontinuity associated with the transformation clearly 446 447 suggests the structural transition to be first order in character. In this context, the pronounced

448 anomaly of the compression behaviour can be understood as elastic softening phenomenon typically 449 associated with first-order transitions. The changes at the individual crystallographic axes follow 450 the anisotropy observed for the compression of the orthorhombic polymorph. It is remarkable that 451 the evolving anisotropy, as expressed by the different behavior between the a- and b-axis directions, 452 leaves its trace even across the transition. A comparably large spontaneous shortening along the aaxis direction from ~98.5 % to ~91.0 % of the original value is the most striking change associated 453 454 with observed structural transformation. Any attempt to refine a triclinic structure model from the 455 collected XRD intensity data sets did not yield yet a satisfying structure refinement of appropriate 456 quality and will be reported elsewhere.

457

# 458 Implications

459 The experimental findings of this study allow improving the knowledge on the phase-stability and 460 elastic behaviour of cordierite. Up to date, the phase-diagram of cordierite was characterised by 461 only two distinct fields, associated to Al,Si-order/disorder phase transition with a low-T462 orthorhombic phase (Cccm, at T<1750 K, P=0.0001 GPa) and a high-T hexagonal phase (P6/mcc, at 463 T>1750 K, P=0.0001 GPa ) (Miyashiro 1957, Langer and Schreyer 1969, Meagher and Gibbs 1977, 464 Putnis 1980a, Armbruster 1985a, Redfern et al. 1989, Daniels et al. 1994, Malcherek et al. 2001). 465 Our results lead to an enrichment of the phase-diagram with a new high-P triclinic polymorph at 466 P>7 GPa and T=293 K. The orthorhombic-to-triclinic phase transition is governed by a volume 467 contraction of about 7%. We still do not know the effect of temperature on the transition pressure, 468 which will be investigated in the near future. In addition, the anomalous compressional pattern of 469 the orthorhombic cordierite (with a negative bulk modulus *P*-derivative) has now a realistic 470 explanation: it appears to be governed by the orthorhombic-to-triclinic transition. The results of this 471 study are expected to improve the modelling of phase equilibria of petrological interest, as 472 cordierite is a common mineral in medium and high-grade pelitic metamorphic rocks or as

473 porphyroblasts in hornfels found in contact metamorphic zones. Even in material sciences, where 474 cordierite has received considerable attention for its pronounced stability at high temperatures, low 475 thermal expansion and an uncommon robust thermal shock resistance (Hochella et al. 1979, 476 Mirwald 1981, Ikawa et al. 1986, Camerucci et al. 2001), our high-quality elastic data of the low-*P* 477 polymorph and the *P*-induced densification in response to the orthorhombic-to-triclinic phase-478 transition would open a new scenario with further potential applications of this ceramic material.

479

# 480 Acknowledgments

481 We thank Olaf Medenbach (Bochum) for the providing us crystal disks suitable for DACs, Herta 482 Effenberger (Vienna) for performing the oscillation film photographs, Ilona Fin (Heidelberg) and 483 Andreas Wagner (Vienna) for the sample preparation, Ilse Glass (Heidelberg) for EDX analyses, 484 and Angela Ullrich, Pascal Schouwink and Thomas Pippinger for their assistance in collecting 485 individual EoS data points at Heidelberg. We would like to thank Michael Hanfland (ESRF 486 Grenoble) for his generous support on beamline ID09A. R.M. wants to express his gratitude to the 487 Laboratorium für Kristallographie, ETH Zürich, to have facilitated the use of equipment in the former high-pressure X-ray crystallography lab for the compressibility measurements in H<sub>2</sub>O. T.L. 488 489 ist grateful to the European Research Council (ERC Starting Grant SULIWA) and the Austrian 490 Science Fund (START award Y391) for financial support. Finally we thank Anna Likhacheva, 491 Alexandra Friedrich and one anonymous referee for their valuable suggestions, which significantly 492 improved the manuscript.

493

#### 494 **References**

495 Abs-Wurmbach, I., Boberski, C., and Hafner, S. (1989) Zum Problem des Einbaus von

496 dreiwertigem Eisen in den Cordierit: Synthesen und Mößbauerspektroskopie. Fortschritte

497 Mineralogie, 66, 1

- 498 Agilent (2012) Crysalis Pro: User Manual. Agilent Technologies, Yarnton
- 499 Angel, R.J., Allan, D.R., Miletich, R., and Finger, L.W. (1997) The use of quartz as an internal
- pressure standard in high pressure crystallography. Journal of Applied Crystallography, 30, 461-466.
- 502 Angel, R.J. (2004) Absorption corrections for diamond-anvil pressure cells implemented in a
- 503 software package Absorb-6.0. Journal of Applied Crystallography, 37, 486-492
- 504 Angel, R.J., Bujak, M., Zhao, J., Gatta, G.D. and Jacobsen, S.J. (2007) Effective hydrostatic limits
- of pressure media for high-pressure crystallographic studies. Journal of Applied Crystallography,
  40, 26-32.
- 507 Angel, R.J. (2000) Equations of state. In: R.M. Hazen and R.T. Downs (Eds.) High-temperature and
- 508 high-pressure crystal chemistry, Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry, 41, 35-60.
- 509 Angel, R.J. and Finger, L.W. (2011) Single: a program to control single-crystal diffractometers.
- 510 Journal of Applied Crystallography, 44, 247-251
- 511 Armbruster, T. (1985a) Crystal structure refinement, Si,Al-ordering, and twinning in "pseudo-
- 512 hexagonal" Mg-cordierite. Neues Jahrbuch Mineralogie, Monatshefte, 1985, 255-267
- 513 Armbruster, T. (1985b) Ar, N<sub>2</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub> in the structural cavities of cordierite, and optical and X-
- ray single-crystal study. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 12, 233-245
- 515 Armbruster, T. (1986) Role of Na in the structure of low-cordierite: A single-crystal X-ray study.
- 516 American Mineralogist, 71, 746-757
- 517 Armbruster, T., and Bloss, F.D. (1980) Channel CO<sub>2</sub> in cordierite. Nature, 286, 140-141
- 518 Armbruster, T., and Bloss, F.D. (1982) Orientation and effects of channel H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> in
- 519 cordierite. American Mineralogist, 67, 284-291
- 520 Balic-Zunic, T., and Vickovic, I. (1996) *IVTON* a program for the calculation of geometrical
- 521 aspects of crystal structures and some crystal chemical applications. Journal of Applied
- 522 Crystallography, 29, 305-306

- 523 Bertoldi, C., Proyer, A., Garbe-Schönberg, D., Behrens, H., and Dachs, E. (2004) Comprehensive
- 524 chemical analyses of natural cordierites: implications for exchange mechanisms. Lithos, 78, 389525 409
- 526 Birch, F. (1966) Compressibility, elastic constants. In Clark, S.P., Handbook of physical constants.
- 527 Geological Society of America, Memoir 97, 97-173.
- 528 Bubeck, C. (2009) Direction dependent mechanical properties of extruded cordierite honey-combs.
- Journal of European Ceramical Society, 29, 3113-3119
- 530 Bulbak, T.A., Shvedenkov, G.Y., Lepezin, G.G. (2002) On saturation of magnesian cordierite with
- alkanes at high temperatures and pressures. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 116, 140-154
- 532 Camerucci, M.A., Urretavizcaya, G., and Cavalieri, A.L. (2001) Mechanical behaviour of cordierite
- and cordierite-mullite materials evaluated by indentation techniques. Journal of European
- 534 Ceramic Society, 21, 1195-1204
- 535 Chen, J.Y., and Yoo, C.S. (2011) High density amorphous ice at room temperature. Proceedings of
- the National Academy of Sciences, 108, 19, 7685-7688
- 537 Chervin, J.C., Canny, B. and Mancinelli, M (2002) Ruby-spheres as pressure gauge for optically
- transparent high pressure cells. High Pressure Research, 21, 305-314
- 539 Cohen, J., Ross, F., and Gibbs, G.V. (1977) An X-ray and neutron diffraction study of hydrous low
- 540 cordierite. American Mineralogist, 62, 67-78
- 541 Daniels, P., Wunder, B., Sahl K., and Schreyer, W. (1994) Changing lattice metrics of synthetic
- 542 cordierites: the metastable hexagonal to orthorhombic transformation sequence during isothermal
- 543 annealing. European Journal of Mineralogy, 6, 323-335
- 544 Faye, G.H., Manning, P.G., and Nickel, E.H. (1968) The polarized optical absorption spectra of
- 545 tourmaline, cordierite, chloritoid and vivianite: ferric-ferrous electron interaction aqs a source of
- 546 pleochroism. American Mineralogist, 53, 1174-1201

- 547 Förtsch, E., Uhr, W., and Wondratschek, H. (1992) A novel application of the spindle stage.
- 548 Microscope 40, 31-36
- Gatta, G.D. (2008) Does porous mean soft? On the elastic behaviour and structural evolution of
  zeolites under pressure. Zeitschrift für Kristallographie, 223, 160–170.
- 220 Zeonies under pressure. Zeusennit für Kristanographie, 223, 100–170.
- 551 Gatta G.D. (2010) Microporous materials at high pressure: Are they really soft? In: E. Boldyreva
- and P. Dera (eds.), High-Pressure Crystallography: From Fundamental Phenomena to
- 553 Technological Applications, NATO Science for Peace and Security Series B (Physics and
- 554 Biophysics), p. 481-491, Springer Science, ISBN 978-90-481--9257-1 (doi:10.1007/978-90-481-
- 555 9258-8\_39).
- 556 Gatta, G.D. and Lee, Y. (2006) On the elastic behavior of zeolite mordenite. A synchotron powder
- diffraction study. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 32, 726–732.
- 558 Geiger, C.A., Rager, H., and Czank, M. (2000a) Cordierite: III. the site occupation and
- 559 concentration of Fe<sup>3+</sup>. Contributions in Mineralogy and Petrology, 140, 344-352
- 560 Geiger, C.A., Armbruster, T., Khomenko, V., and Quartieri, S. (2000b) Cordierite: I. The
- 561 coordination of  $Fe^{2+}$ . American Mineralogist, 85, 1255-1264
- 562 Goldman, D.S., and Rossmann, G.R. (1977) Channel constituents in cordierite. American
- 563 Mineralogist, 62, 1144-1157
- Haussühl, E., Vinograd, V.L., Krenzel, T.F., Schreuer, J., Wilson, D.J., and Ottinger, J, (2011) High
- 565 temperature elastic properties of Mg-cordierite: Experimental studies and atomistic simulations.
- 566 Zeitschrift für Kristallographie, 226, 236-253
- 567 Hazen, R.M., Au, A.Y., and Finger, L.W. (1986) High pressure crystal chemistry of beryl
- 568 (Be<sub>3</sub>Al<sub>2</sub>Si<sub>6</sub>O<sub>18</sub>) and euclase (BeAlSiO<sub>4</sub>OH). American Mineralogist, 71, 977-984
- 569 Hejny, C., Miletich, R., Jasser, A., Schouwink, P., Crichton, W., and Kahlenberg, V. (2012) Second
- 570 order  $P_{\overline{6}}$  c2-P31c structural transition and structural crystallography of the cyclosilicate
- 571 benitoite, BaTiSi<sub>3</sub>O<sub>9</sub>, at high pressure. American Mineralogist, 97, 1747-1763

- 572 Hochella, M., Brown, G., Ross, F., and Gibbs, G. (1979) High temperature crystal chemistry of
- 573 hydrous Mg- and Fe-cordierites. American Mineralogist, 64, 337–351.
- 574 Ikawa, H., Otagiri, T., Imai, O., Suzuki, M., Urabe, K., and Udagawa, S. (1986) Crystal structures
- and mechanism of thermal expansion of high cordierite and its solid solutions. Journal of the
- 576 American Ceramic Society, 69, 492-498
- 577 Khomenko, V.M., Langer, K., and Geiger, C.A. (2001) Structural locations of the iron ions in
- 578 cordierite: a spectroscopic study. Contributions in Mineralogy and Petrology, 141, 381-396
- 579 King, H.E., and Finger, L.W. (1979) Diffracted beam crystal centering and its application to high-
- 580 pressure crystallography. Journal of Applied Crystallography, 12, 374-378
- 581 Krauss, G., Reifler, H., and Steurer, W. (2005) Conically shaped single-crystalline diamond
- backing plates for a diamond anvil cell. Review in Scientific Instruments, 76, 105104, 1-5
- 583 Koepke, J., and Schulz, H. (1986) Single crystal structure investigation under high pressure of the
- 584 mineral cordierite with an improved high-pressure cell. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 13,
- 585 165-173
- 586 Langer, K., and Schreyer, W. (1969) Infrared and powder X-ray diffraction studies of the
- 587 polymorphism of cordierite. American Mineralogist, 54, 1442-1459
- 588 Le Breton, N. and Schreyer, W. (1993) Experimental CO<sub>2</sub> incorporation into Mg-cordierite:
- 589 nonlinear behaviour of the system. European Journal of Mineralogy, 5, 427-438
- 590 Likhacheva, A.Yu, Goryainov, S.V., Krylov, A.S., Bul'bak, T.A., and Prasad, P.S.R. (2011) Raman
- 591 spectroscopy of natural cordierite at high water pressure up to 5 GPa. Journal of Raman
- 592 spectroscopy, 43, 559-563
- 593 Likhacheva, A.Yu, Goryainov, S.V., and Bul'bak, T.A., (2013) An X-ray diffraction study of the
- 594 pressure-induced hydration in cordierite at 4-5 GPa. American Mineralogist, 98, 181-186
- 595 Makovicky, E., and Balic-Zunic, T. (1998) New Measure of Distortion for Coordination Polyhedra.
- 596 Acta Crystallographica B, 54, 766-773

- 597 Malcherek, T., Domeneghetti, M.C., Tazzoli, V., Ottolini, L., McCammon, C., and Carpenter, M.A.
- 598 (2001) Structural properties of ferromagnesian cordierites. American Mineralogist, 86, 66-79
- 599 Mao, H.K., Xu, J., and Bell, P.M. (1986) Calibration of the ruby pressure scale to 800 kbars under
- 600 quasihydrostatic conditions. Journal of Geophysical Research, 9, 4673-4676
- 601 Meagher, E.P., and Gibbs, G.V. (1977) The polymorphism of cordierite: II. The crystal structure of
- 602 indialite. Canadian Mineralogist, 15, 43-49
- 603 Medenbach, O., Maresch, W.V., Mirwald, P.W., and Schreyer, W. (1980) Variation of refractive
- 604 index of synthetic Mg-cordierite with H<sub>2</sub>O content. American Mineralogist, 65, 367-373
- 605 Miletich, R., Reifler, H., and Kunz, M. (1999): The "ETH diamond-anvil cell" design for single-
- 606 crystal XRD at non-ambient conditions. Acta Crystallographica, A55: Abstr. P08.CC.001
- Miletich, R., Allan, D.R., and Kuhs, W.F. (2000) High-pressure single-crystal techniques. In R.M.
- 608 Hazen (ed.) "High-Temperature and High-Pressure Crystal Chemistry", MSA Reviews in
- 609 Mineralogy and Geochemistry, 41, 445-520
- 610 Miletich, R., Hejny, C., Krauss, G., and Ullrich, A. (2005) Diffraction techniques: Shedding light
- on structural changes. In R. Miletich (ed.) Mineral Behaviour at Extreme Conditions, EMU
- 612 Notes, Volume 7, Eötvös University Press, pp 281-338
- 613 Miletich, R., Gatta, G.D., Redhammer, G.J., Burchard, M., Meyer, H.P., Weikusat, C., Rotiroti, N.
- 614 Glasmacher, U.A., Trautmann, C. and Neumann, R. (2010) Structure alterations in microporous
- 615 (Mg,Fe)<sub>2</sub>Al<sub>4</sub>Si<sub>5</sub>O<sub>18</sub> crystals induced by energetic heavy-ion irradiation. Journal of Solid State
- 616 Chemistry, 183, 2372–2381.
- 617 Mirwald, P.W., and Massonne, H.J. (1980) The low-high quartz and quartz-coesite transition to 40
- 618 Kbars between 600 and 1600°C and some reconnaissance data on the effect of NaAlO<sub>2</sub>
- 619 component on the low quartz-coesite transition. Journal of Geophysical Research, B85, 6983-
- 620 6990.

- 621 Mirwald, P.W., and Maresch, W.V. (1980) Ein Hochdruckphasenübergang in Cordierit.
- 622 Naturwissenschaften, 67, 253-254
- 623 Mirwald, P.W. (1981) Thermal expansion of anhydrous Mg-cordierite between 25 and 900°C.
- 624 Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 7, 268-270
- 625 Mirwald, P.W. (1982) A high-pressure phase transition in cordierite. American Mineralogist, 67,
- 626 277-283
- 627 Mirwald, P.W., Malinowski, M., and Schulz, H. (1984) Isothermal compression of low-cordierite to
- 628 30 Kbar (25° C). Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 11, 140-148.
- 629 Mirwald, P.W. (2005a) The fine-structure of the dehydration boundary of brucite (Mg(OH)<sub>2</sub> up to
- 630 2.5 GPa Indications of not-smooth PVT behaviour of supercritical H<sub>2</sub>O. European Journal of
- 631 Mineralogy, 17, 537-542.
- 632 Mirwald, P.W. (2005b) Evidence of anomaly boundaries of water at high pressure from
- 633 compression and NaCl\*2H<sub>2</sub>O dehydration experiments. Journal of Chemical Physics 123,
- 634 124715, 1-6.
- 635 Mirwald, P.W (2008) Experimental study of the dehydration reactions gypsum-bassanite and
- bassanite-anhydrite at high pressure: Indication of anomalous behaviour of H<sub>2</sub>O at high pressure
- 637 in the temperature range of 50-300 °C. Journal of Chemical Physics, 128, 074502, 1-7.
- 638 Miyashiro, A. (1957) Cordierite-indialite relations. American Journal of Science, 255, 43-62
- 639 Nasdala, L., Wildner, M., Wirth, R., Groschopf, N., Pal, D.C., and Möller, A. (2006): Alpha particle
- haloes in chlorite and cordierite. Mineralogy and Petrology, 86, 1-27
- 641 Periotto, B., Nestola, F., Balic-Zunic, T., Angel, R.J., Miletich, R., and Olsen, L.A. (2011)
- 642 Comparison between beryllium and diamond backing plates diamond anvil cells: Application to
- 643 single-crystal X-ray diffraction high-pressure data. Review in Scientific Instruments, 82,
- 644 055111, 1-5

12/31

- 645 Prencipe, M., Scanavino, I., Nestola, F., Merlini, M., Civalleri, B., Bruno, M., and Dovesi, R.
- 646 (2011) High-pressure thermo-elastic properties of beryl (Al<sub>4</sub>Be<sub>6</sub>Si<sub>12</sub>O<sub>36</sub>) from ab initio
- 647 calculations, and observations about the source of thermal expansion. Physics and Chemistry of
- 648 Minerals, 38, 223-239
- 649 Putnis, A. (1980a) Order-modulated structures and the thermodynamics of cordierite reactions.
- 650 Nature, 287, 128-131
- Putnis, A. (1980b) The distortion index in anhydrous Mg cordierite. Contributions in Mineralogy
- and Petrology, 74, 135-141
- 653 Redfern, S.A.T., Salje, E.K.H., Maresch, W., and Schreyer, W. (1989) X-ray powder diffraction and
- 654 infrared study of the hexagonal to orthorhombic phase transition in K-bearing cordierite.
- 655 American Mineralogist, 74, 1293-1299
- 656 Salzmann, C., Loerting, Th., Klotz, S., Mirwald, P.W., Hallbrucker, A, and Mayer, E. (2006)
- Isobaric annealing of high-density amorphous ice between 0.3 and 1.9 GPa: in situ values and
- 658 structural changes. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 8, 386-397.
- 659 Schreyer, W., Gordillo, and C.E., Werding, G. (1979) A new sodian-beryllian cordierite from Soto,
- 660 Argentina, and the relationship between distorsion index, Be content, and state of hydration.
- 661 Contributions Mineralogy Petrology 70, 421-428.
- 662 Schreyer, W., Yoder, H.S.Jr., and Aldrich, L.T. (1960) Synthesis of argon-containing cordierite.
- Annual Report of the Geophysical Laboratory, 1959-1960, Carnegie Institute of Washington
- 664 Year Book, 59, 94-96
- 665 Schreyer, W., and Yoder, H.S.Jr. (1964) The system Mg-cordierite-H<sub>2</sub>O and related rocks. Neues
- Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Abhandlungen, 101, 271-342
- 667 Selkregg, K.R., and Bloss, F.D. (1980) Cordierites: compositional controls of Δ, cell parameters,
- and optical properties. American Mineralogist, 65, 522-533

12/31

- 669 Sheldrick, G.M. (1997) SHELXS-97. Program for the Solution of Crystal Structures. University of
- 670 Göttingen, Germany 1997.
- 671 Toohill, K., Siegesmund, S., and Bass J.D. (1999) Sound velocities and elasticity of cordierite and
- 672 implications for deep crustal seismic anisotropy. Physics and Chemitry of Minerals, 26, 333-343
- 673 Vance, E.R., and Price, D.C. (1984) Heating and radiation effects on the optical and Mössbauer
- 674 spectra of Fe-bearing cordierites. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 10, 200-208
- 675 Vry, J.K., Brown, P., and Valley, J. (1990) Cordierite volatile content and the role of CO<sub>2</sub> in high-
- 676 grade metamorphism. American Mineralogist, 75, 71-88
- 677 Weikusat, C., Glasmacher, U.A., Miletich, R., Neumann, R., and Trautmann, C. (2008) Raman
- 678 spectroscopy of heavy ion induced damage in cordierite. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in
- 679 Physical Research B, 266, 2990-2993
- 680 Weikusat, C, Miletich R., Glasmacher, U.A., Trautmann, C., and Neumann, R. (2010) Heavy ion
- 681 irradiation on crystallographically oriented cordierite and the conversion of molecular CO<sub>2</sub> to
- 682 CO A Raman spectroscopic study. Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 37, 417-424
- 683 Wilson, A.J.C., and Prince, E. (1999) International Tables for Crystallography, Volume C,
- Mathematical, physical and chemical tables (third edition), 578 p., Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- 685 Yoon, H.S., and Newnham, R.E. (1973) The elastic properties of beryl. Acta Crystallographica
- 686 A29, 507-509

Table 1. Details of the high-pressure DAC loadings (pressure range, pressure-chamber dimensions) and of the individual crystal specimen
 (crystal material, orientation, dimensions).

689 600

69	U
69	1

692 693 694 695	HP-measurement	DAC type/ backing plates/ anvils <sup>‡</sup>	P range (GPa)	crystal	orientation	dimensions (µm)	pressure chamber (µm)
696							
697	EoS in $H_2O$ (series A)	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6mm	0.07-0.21	Tsi1#1	disk //(hk0)	$\emptyset = 155, H = 45$	$\emptyset = 230, H = 75$
698	EoS in H <sub>2</sub> O (series B)	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6mm	0.06-2.01	Tsi1#1*	disk //(hk0)	Ø = 155, H = 45	Ø = 235, H = 85
699	EoS in Ar (series C)	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6mm	1.28-6.44	Tsi2_b#1	plate //(010)	$210\times100\times65$	Ø = 250, H = 115
700	EoS in Ar (series D)	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6 mm	0.89-4.67	Tsi2_b#2	plate //(010)	$165 \times 80 \times 65$	$\emptyset = 250, H = 95$
701	EoS in M-E (series E)	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6 mm	1.05-6.61	Tsi1#1*	disk //(hk0)	Ø = 155, H = 45	Ø = 250, H = 105
702	$P > P_c$ (series F and G)	mDAC/ / BA, C=0.6mm	> 7.0	Tsi2_c**	plate //(001)	$30 \times 30 \times 10$	$\emptyset = 250, H = 80$
703	Structure in H <sub>2</sub> O	ETH/ diaBP/ sbc, C=0.6 mm	0.39-1.75	Tsi2_b#3	plate //(010)	$160 \times 140 \times 60$	$\emptyset = 300, H = 120$
704	Structure in M-E	ETH/ polyBe/ sbc, C=0.6 mm	1.07-6.98	Tsi1#2	disk //(hk0)	$\emptyset = 195, H = 50$	$\emptyset = 300, H = 120$
705							

706

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations: "ETH" = ETH diamond-anvil cell, "mDAC" = membrane-type diamond-anvil cell, "polyBe" = polycrystalline beryllium backing plate,
 <sup>708</sup> "diaBP" = Sumicrystal UP7020 diamond backing plate, "sbc" = standard brilliant-cut diamond anvil, "BA" = Böhler-Almax diamond anvil, "C" = unbevelled culet-face diameter

\* same crystal as used for series A \*\* several micro-size crystal fragments from Tsi2\_c used for synchrotron XRD

12/31

711 Table 2. Lattice parameters, unit-cell volumes and calculated distortion parameter  $\Delta$  of cordierite in 712 air and at pressurized in water, argon and 4:1 methanol-ethanol mixture.

713 714

715 = 716 V-Qz (Å<sup>3</sup>) b (Å) c (Å)  $V(Å^3)$ P (GPa) a (Å)  $\Delta$  (°) no. 717 718 cordierite in air  $A00^{\ddagger}$ 719 0.0001 17.0719(4) 9.7224(3) 9.3489(2) 1551.74(6) 0.2540 --- $B00^{\ddagger}$ 720 0.0001 17.0721(8) 9.7211(8) 9.3496(8) 1551.66(14) 0.2567 --- $C00^{\ddagger}$  $\frac{721}{722}$ ---0.0001 17.0738(8) 9.7193(8) 9.3451(8) 1550.78(15) 0.2619 723 cordierite in water 724  $B43^{*1}$ 113.048(16) 0.0001 17.0717(9) 9.7230(6) 9.3493(6) 1551.87(16) 0.2527 9.3457(4) 725 B16 112.888(33) 0.060(16)17.0710(6) 9.7239(4) 1551.35(9) 0.2502 726 A02 0.2513 112.874(19) 0.065(14)17.0710(6) 9.7233(4) 9.3462(3) 1551.34(9) 727 B04 112.872(20) 0.066(10)17.0715(6) 9.7232(5) 9.3457(4) 1551.29(10) 0.2521 728 B03 0.2519 112.868(20) 0.067(10)17.0715(5) 9.7233(4) 9.3457(3) 1551.30(8) 9.7222(4) 729 1550.85(9) B07 112.770(20) 0.100(10)17.0701(6) 9.3448(3) 0.2524 730 B05 112.753(23) 0.105(12)17.0694(5)9.7227(3) 9.3449(3) 1550.89(8) 0.2507 731 B08 0.2523 112.709(33) 0.120(16)17.0688(5) 9.7215(3) 9.3445(3) 1550.58(7) 732 A03 112.650(22) 0.140(11)17.0680(5) 9.7212(4) 9.3439(3) 1550.35(8) 0.2520 733 B06 112.592(31) 0.160(15)17.0671(5) 9.7211(4) 9.3432(3) 1550.15(9) 0.2512 734 9.3419(3) 0.2502 B02 112.499(23) 0.191(11)17.0667(5) 9.7214(3) 1549.94(8) 735 B17 112.499(22) 0.191(11)17.0668(6) 9.7204(4) 9.3423(4) 1549.85(10) 0.2522 736 B01 0.199(11)9.3421(4) 0.2513 112.475(22) 17.0659(7)9.7204(5) 1549.74(10) 737 0.2519 A01 112.448(19) 0.209(9)17.0661(5) 9.7202(3) 9.3420(3) 1549.70(7) 738 17.0656(5) 9.7199(4) 1549.53(8) B10 9.3415(3) 0.2519 112.421(41) 0.218(20)739 B15 0.219(13) 17.0647(7) 9.7195(5) 9.3417(4) 1549.42(11) 0.2517 112.417(27) 740 B18 112.380(22) 0.232(11)17.0646(5) 9.7188(4) 9.3418(3) 1549.31(8) 0.2528 741 B09 112.376(22) 17.0638(5) 9.3415(3) 0.2520 0.233(11)9.7188(4) 1549.19(8) 742 B14 112.336(27) 0.247(13)17.0641(3)9.7186(3) 9.3414(3) 1549.17(8) 0.2527 743 B13 112.296(27) 0.261(13) 17.0631(5) 9.7188(4) 9.3402(3) 1548.91(8) 0.2512 744 B12 112.227(24) 0.284(12)17.0621(5) 9.3395(3) 1548.51(8) 0.2524 9.7176(4) 745 B11 0.2520 112.087(32) 0.333(16)17.0602(5)9.7167(4) 9.3385(3) 1548.04(8) 746 B19 111.931(26) 0.388(13)17.0600(7)9.7166(5) 9.3376(4) 1547.84(11) 0.2520 747 B20 17.0543(5) 9.3339(3) 1546.22(8) 0.2516 111.640(27) 0.491(13)9.7135(3) 748 B22 111.590(44) 0.509(22)17.0535(14) 9.7130(9) 9.3339(8) 1546.08(23) 0.2517 749 B23 111.432(20) 0.566(10)17.0523(6) 9.7119(4) 9.3316(4) 1545.42(10) 0.2525 750 B24 17.0491(6) 9.7101(4) 9.3302(3) 1544.60(9) 0.2524 111.268(27) 0.626(13)751 B25 111.051(22) 0.706(11)17.0462(5) 9.7088(5) 9.3279(4) 1543.75(10) 0.2517 752 B21 111.004(26) 0.724(13)17.0450(6) 9.7084(4) 9.3273(3) 1543.48(9) 0.2511 753 B26 9.3239(4) 1542.35(10) 0.2526 110.667(15) 0.851(8) 17.0426(7) 9.7062(5) 754 B28 110.632(20) 0.864(10)17.0415(7)9.7059(5) 9.3228(4) 1542.01(11) 0.2520 755 B29 110.587(48) 0.881(24) 17.0379(6) 9.7044(4) 9.3231(3) 1541.52(8) 0.2509 1541.11(9) 756 B30 9.3217(3) 0.2524 110.476(25) 0.924(12)17.0377(5) 9.7035(4) 757 B27 110.443(33) 0.937(17)17.0363(6) 9.7034(4) 9.3211(3) 1540.88(9) 0.2511

12/31	
-------	--

B31	110.150(27)	1.051(13)	17.0330(5)	9.7010(3)	9.3178(3)	1539.64(7)	0.2520
B32	2 109.975(17)	1.120(8)	17.0295(6)	9.6990(4)	9.3160(3)	1538.71(9)	0.2520
B33	109.896(17)	1.150(8)	17.0282(5)	9.6988(3)	9.3150(3)	1538.40(7)	0.2509
B34	109.744(14)	1.212(7)	17.0266(5)	9.6970(4)	9.3139(3)	1537.78(8)	0.2526
B35	5 109.641(17)	1.254(8)	17.0240(5)	9.6960(3)	9.3125(3)	1537.15(7)	0.2517
B36	5 109.325(12)	1.383(6)	17.0204(5)	9.6939(4)	9.3090(3)	1535.93(8)	0.2517
B37	109.108(20)	1.473(10)	17.0160(6)	9.6914(4)	9.3061(4)	1534.66(9)	0.2516
B38	3 108.814(19)	1.598(9)	17.0112(8)	9.6886(5)	9.3029(5)	1533.24(12)	0.2517
B39	0 108.645(17)	1.670(8)	17.0076(6)	9.6863(4)	9.3002(3)	1532.12(9)	0.2521
B40	) 108.435(19)	1.761(9)	17.0055(10)	9.6854(6)	9.2976(6)	1531.36(15)	0.2515
B41	108.149(22)	1.887(11)	17.0002(7)	9.6823(5)	9.2943(4)	1529.84(11)	0.2516
B42	2 107.863(40)	2.013(20)	16.9955(10)	9.6800(6)	9.2915(6)	1528.60(16)	0.2508
cor	diarita in argan						
D05	$3*^2$	0.0001	17 0727(5)	9 7200(4)	9 3436(4)	1550 54(10)	0 2594
D01	110 546(25)	0.889(12)	17.0727(5) 17.0318(6)	9,7006(13)	9.3188(8)	1530.54(10) 1539.64(25)	0.2574
C01	109502(22)	1.275(9)	17.0318(0) 17.0123(8)	9.6877(17)	9.3085(8)	1537.04(23) 1534.13(31)	0.2515
C02	109.302(22)	1.275(7)	16.9886(7)	9.6377(17)	9.2023(0)	1537.13(31) 1527.62(32)	0.2340
D02	107.432(18)	1.000(17)	16.9773(6)	9.6709(10)	9.2923(7)	1527.02(52) 1524.02(22)	0.2491
D02	107.432(18)	2.212(9) 2.220(12)	16.9773(0)	9.0099(11)	9.2855(7)	1524.02(22) 1511.58(22)	0.2500
C03	103.210(23)	3.550(12)	10.9344(7) 16.9201(6)	9.0430(11) 9.6343(14)	9.2339(7) 9.2421(7)	1511.58(25)	0.2329
C03	104.490(23)	3.038(14)	16.9201(0) 16.0073(10)	9.0343(14)	9.2421(7) 0.2224(11)	1500.58(20) 1502.83(28)	0.2549
D04	$\begin{array}{c} 103.729(19) \\ 102.023(28) \end{array}$	4.092(11)	16.9073(10)	9.0270(21)	9.2324(11) 9.2146(7)	1302.83(38) 1404.00(24)	0.2550
D04	102.923(20)	4.074(14)	10.0040(0) 16.9529(10)	9.0088(11)	9.2140(7) 0.1872(10)	1494.99(24) 1492.60(20)	0.2044
C05	5 101.207(32)	5.030(22)	10.8338(10) 16.8277(15)	9.3821(22) 9.5597(36)	9.1872(10) 9.1633(16)	1463.09(39)	0.2013
Cuu	5 100.107(43)	0.439(32)	10.8277(13)	9.3397(30)	9.1055(10)	1474.08(01)	0.2932
core	dierite in 4:1 me	thanol-ethano	l mix				
E09	)* <sup>3</sup> 112.994(12)	0.0001	17.0716(7)	9.7234(10)	9.3494(6)	1551.94(17)	0.2518
G00	)	0.0001	17.0930(6)	9.7289(4)	9.347(5)	1554.4(8)	0.2648
E01	110.071(16)	1.052(6)	17.0246(6)	9.7008(11)	9.3224(6)	1539.61(20)	0.2432
E08	109.081(15)	1.454(6)	17.0087(5)	9.6912(8)	9.3111(7)	1534.79(15)	0.2440
E02	108.242(19)	1.813(9)	16.9933(6)	9.6835(9)	9.3010(6)	1530.53(18)	0.2418
E07	105.646(17)	3.050(8)	16.9441(7)	9.6536(14)	9.2686(7)	1516.08(23)	0.2446
E03	103.909(18)	3.994(9)	16.9081(7)	9.6234(10)	9.2473(6)	1504.66(17)	0.2625
E06	102.465(14)	4.859(7)	16.8784(7)	9.6022(10)	9.2225(7)	1494.69(18)	0.2701
E04	101.753(20)	5.549(10)	16.8551(8)	9.5832(11)	9.2041(7)	1486.70(24)	0.2806
G01		5.73(2)**	16.9025(5)	9.6209(3)	9.175(3)	1492.0(5)	0.2610
E05	99.876(13)	6.613(7)	16.8229(9)	9.5590(13)	9.1648(9)	1473.79(28)	0.2913
G02	2	7.84(2) **	15.566(2)	9.625(4)	9.085(5)	1257 5(1 1)	1
E01		0.0(1)**	$\alpha = 90.36(4)^{\circ}$	$p = 85.90(2)^{\circ}$ p = 574(3)	$\gamma = 89.16(2)^{\circ}$	1357.5(1.1)	n.a.
101		9.0(1)	$\alpha = 90.02(2)^{\circ}$	$\beta = 85.99(2)^{\circ}$	$\gamma = 88.90(3)^{\circ}$	1337 4(8)	n d
			0.02(2)	p (00.55)(2)	00.30(3)	1557.1(0)	11.4.
Not	e: distortion para	meter $\Delta = 1.09$	4 ( <i>a</i> - $\sqrt{3}b$ ), Selkr	egg and Bloss (	(1980)		
<sup>‡</sup> at	1 bar, crystal mo	unted on glass	fibre * at 1b	oar, crystal mou	nted in DAC w	ithout pressure	medium
** I	pressure determin	ed by ruby flue	prescence method	2 -	<b>.</b> .		
' aft	ter compression in	$h H_2 O = 2^2 afte$	er compression in	argon 'after	compression in	ethanol-metha	nol

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
CrystalTsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Tsi2_b#4Mediumairairair*H2OH2OH2OPressure (GPa)10-410-40.39(6)1.41(8)1.75(5)						
Mediumair*air*H2OH2OH2OH2OPressure (GPa) $10^{-4}$ $10^{-4}$ $0.39(6)$ $1.41(8)$ $1.75(5)$ Space groupCccmCccmCccmCccmCccma (Å) $17.089(2)$ $17.094(2)$ $17.082(3)$ $17.029(3)$ $17.021(1)$ b (Å) $9.733(1)$ $9.691(7)$ $9.689(7)$ $9.662(7)$ $9.659(8)$ c (Å) $9.361(1)$ $9.360(3)$ $9.346(3)$ $9.322(3)$ $9.306(3)$ max. 2θ (°) $69.6$ $69.3$ $68.5$ $68.4$ $69.3$ (sinθ/ $\lambda$ )max (Å <sup>-1</sup> ) $0.8030$ $0.8000$ $0.7919$ $0.7909$ $0.8000$ Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°) $0.5$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ Scan speed (°/s)- $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ Exposure time (s) $20$ No. refls. $16112$ $3162$ $3215$ $3171$ $2951$ No. unique refls. $1597$ $300$ $259$ $307$ $288$ with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ $1222$ $229$ $251$ $235$ $217$ No. parameter $96$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $R_{int}$ $0.050$ $0.082$ $0.092$ $0.089$ $0.109$ wR <sup>2</sup> $0.052$ $0.116$ $0.133$ $0.138$ $0.141$ GooF $1.092$ $1.427$ $1.329$ $1.412$ $1.541$ </td <td>Crystal</td> <td>Tsi2_b#4</td> <td>Ts12_b#4</td> <td>Ts12_b#4</td> <td>Ts12_b#4</td> <td>Ts12_b#4</td>	Crystal	Tsi2_b#4	Ts12_b#4	Ts12_b#4	Ts12_b#4	Ts12_b#4
Pressure (GPa) $10^{-4}$ $10^{-4}$ $0.39(6)$ $1.41(8)$ $1.75(5)$ Space groupCccmCccmCccmCccmCccmCccma (Å) $17.089(2)$ $17.094(2)$ $17.082(3)$ $17.029(3)$ $17.021(3)$ b (Å) $9.733(1)$ $9.691(7)$ $9.689(7)$ $9.662(7)$ $9.659(8)$ c (Å) $9.361(1)$ $9.360(3)$ $9.346(3)$ $9.322(3)$ $9.306(3)$ max. 2θ (°) $69.6$ $69.3$ $68.5$ $68.4$ $69.3$ (sin $\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> ) $0.8030$ $0.8000$ $0.7919$ $0.7909$ $0.8000$ Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°) $0.5$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ Scan speed (°/s)- $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ Ko. refls. $16112$ $3162$ $3215$ $3171$ $2951$ No. unique refls. $1597$ $300$ $259$ $307$ $288$ with $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ $1222$ $229$ $251$ $235$ $217$ No. parameter $96$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $R_{int}$ $0.050$ $0.083$ $0.087$ $0.082$ $0.084$ $R_1, F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ $0.042$ $0.082$ $0.092$ $0.089$ $0.109$ were constrained on the standard stand	Medium	air*	air*	$H_2O$	$H_2O$	$H_2O$
Space groupCccmCccmCccmCccmCccma (Å)17.089(2)17.094(2)17.082(3)17.029(3)17.021(b (Å)9.733(1)9.691(7)9.689(7)9.662(7)9.659(8)c (Å)9.361(1)9.360(3)9.346(3)9.322(3)9.306(3)max. 2θ (°)69.669.368.568.469.3(sinθ/λ)max (Å <sup>-1</sup> )0.80300.80000.79190.79090.8000Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°)0.51.21.21.21.2Scan speed (°/s)-0.020.020.020.02Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR <sup>2</sup> 0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Pressure (GPa)	10-4	10 <sup>-4</sup>	0.39(6)	1.41(8)	1.75(5)
Space groupCccmCccmCccmCccmCccmCccmCccmCccm $a$ (Å)17.089(2)17.094(2)17.082(3)17.029(3)17.021(0) $b$ (Å)9.733(1)9.691(7)9.689(7)9.662(7)9.659(8) $c$ (Å)9.361(1)9.360(3)9.346(3)9.322(3)9.306(3)max. 20 (°)69.669.368.568.469.3 $(sin\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> )0.80300.80000.79190.79090.8000Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°)0.51.21.21.21.2Scan speed (°/s)-0.020.020.020.02Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0820.0920.0890.109wR <sup>2</sup> 0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	~					
$a$ (A)17.089(2)17.094(2)17.082(3)17.029(3)17.021(1) $b$ (Å)9.733(1)9.691(7)9.689(7)9.662(7)9.659(8) $c$ (Å)9.361(1)9.360(3)9.346(3)9.322(3)9.306(3)max. 20 (°)69.669.368.568.469.3 $(\sin\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> )0.80300.80000.79190.79090.8000Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°)0.51.21.21.21.21.2Scan speed (°/s)-0.020.020.020.020.02Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727R <sub>int</sub> 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084R_1, $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR^20.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Space group	Ссст	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	a (A)	17.089(2)	17.094(2)	17.082(3)	17.029(3)	17.021(3)
$c$ (A) $9.361(1)$ $9.360(3)$ $9.346(3)$ $9.322(3)$ $9.306(3)$ max. 20 (°) $69.6$ $69.3$ $68.5$ $68.4$ $69.3$ $(\sin\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> ) $0.8030$ $0.8000$ $0.7919$ $0.7909$ $0.8000$ Detector, scan typeCCD, $\omega/\phi$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ PD, $\omega$ Scan width (°) $0.5$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ $1.2$ Scan speed (°/s)- $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ $0.02$ Exposure time (s) $20$ No. refls. $16112$ $3162$ $3215$ $3171$ $2951$ No. unique refls. $1597$ $300$ $259$ $307$ $288$ with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ $1222$ $229$ $251$ $235$ $217$ No. parameter $96$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $27$ $R_{int}$ $0.050$ $0.083$ $0.087$ $0.082$ $0.084$ $R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ $0.042$ $0.082$ $0.092$ $0.089$ $0.109$ wR <sup>2</sup> $0.052$ $0.116$ $0.133$ $0.138$ $0.141$ GooF $1.092$ $1.427$ $1.329$ $1.412$ $1.541$ $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> ) $+0.40$ $+0.62$ $+0.69$ $+1.03$ $+0.68$	<i>b</i> (A)	9.733(1)	9.691(7)	9.689(7)	9.662(7)	9.659(8)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$c(\mathbf{A})$	9.361(1)	9.360(3)	9.346(3)	9.322(3)	9.306(3)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	max. 2θ (°)	69.6	69.3	68.5	68.4	69.3
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$(\sin\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> )	0.8030	0.8000	0.7919	0.7909	0.8000
Scan width (°)0.51.21.21.21.21.2Scan speed (°/s)-0.020.020.020.02Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR <sup>2</sup> 0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Detector, scan type	CCD, ω/φ	PD, ω	PD, ω	PD, ω	PD, ω
Scan speed (°/s)-0.020.020.020.02Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR²0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å-3)+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å-3)-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Scan width (°)	0.5	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Exposure time (s)20No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o>4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR²0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å-3)+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å-3)-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Scan speed (°/s)	-	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
No. refls.161123162321531712951No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR^20.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	Exposure time (s)	20	-	-	-	-
No. unique refls.1597300259307288with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR^20.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	No. refls.	16112	3162	3215	3171	2951
with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 1222229251235217No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR^20.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å-3)+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å-3)-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	No. unique refls.	1597	300	259	307	288
No. parameter9627272727 $R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_0 > 4\sigma(F_0)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109wR^20.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	with $F_0 > 4\sigma(F_0)$	1222	229	251	235	217
$R_{int}$ 0.0500.0830.0870.0820.084 $R_1, F_0 > 4\sigma(F_0)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109 $wR^2$ 0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	No. parameter	96	27	27	27	27
$R_1, F_0 > 4\sigma(F_0)$ 0.0420.0820.0920.0890.109 $wR^2$ 0.0520.1160.1330.1380.141GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{max}$ (Å-3)+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{min}$ (Å-3)-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	R <sub>int</sub>	0.050	0.083	0.087	0.082	0.084
wR2 $0.052$ $0.116$ $0.133$ $0.138$ $0.141$ GooF $1.092$ $1.427$ $1.329$ $1.412$ $1.541$ $\delta e_{max}$ (Å-3) $+0.40$ $+0.62$ $+0.69$ $+1.03$ $+0.68$ $\delta e_{min}$ (Å-3) $-0.39$ $-0.67$ $-0.86$ $-0.88$ $-0.89$	$R_1, F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$	0.042	0.082	0.092	0.089	0.109
GooF1.0921.4271.3291.4121.541 $\delta e_{\max}$ (Å-3)+0.40+0.62+0.69+1.03+0.68 $\delta e_{\min}$ (Å-3)-0.39-0.67-0.86-0.88-0.89	wR <sup>2</sup>	0.052	0.116	0.133	0.138	0.141
$\delta e_{\max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> ) +0.40 +0.62 +0.69 +1.03 +0.68 $\delta e_{\min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> ) -0.39 -0.67 -0.86 -0.88 -0.89	GooF	1.092	1.427	1.329	1.412	1.541
$\delta e_{\min}(\text{\AA}^{-3})$ -0.39 -0.67 -0.86 -0.88 -0.89	$\delta e_{\max}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )	+0.40	+0.62	+0.69	+1.03	+0.68
	$\delta e_{\min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.39	-0.67	-0.86	-0.88	-0.89

Table 3. Data pertaining to the XRD intensity data collections and structure refinement of cordierite compressed in different media 807

836 837

838

<sup>‡</sup> crystal mounted on glass fibre \* crystal in DAC Note:  $R_{\text{int}} = \sum |F_{\text{obs}}^2 - F_{\text{obs}}^2(\text{mean})| / \sum [F_{\text{obs}}^2]; R_1 = \sum (|F_{\text{obs}}| - |F_{\text{calc}}|) / \sum |F_{\text{obs}}|; wR_2 = [\sum [w(F_{\text{obs}}^2 - F_{\text{calc}}^2)^2] / \sum [w(F_{\text{obs}}^2)^2]]^{0.5}, w = 1 / [\sigma^2(F_{obs}^2) + (0.02^*P)^2], P = (\text{Max} (F_{obs}^2, 0) + 2^*F_{calc}^2) / 3$ 839 840

841 Table 3. (continued)

Crystal	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2	Tsi1#2
Medium	air <sup>‡</sup>	air*	4:1 M-E					
Pressure (GPa)	10 <sup>-4</sup>	10 <sup>-4</sup>	1.07(5)	2.31(5)	3.80(5)	5.20(5)	6.40(5)	6.98(5)
Space group	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm	Cccm
a (Å)	17.060(6)	17.098(16)	17.020(20)	16.973(13)	16.938(14)	16.890(15)	16.842(19)	16.840(16)
<i>b</i> (Å)	9.716(3)	9.698(4)	9.668(7)	9.657(7)	9.652(4)	9.622(4)	9.602(5)	9.583(4)
<i>c</i> (Å)	9.352(2)	9.354(5)	9.294(4)	9.285(5)	9.261(3)	9.215(4)	9.204(3)	9.179(3)
max. 2θ (°)	72.7	78.6	77.9	78.5	78.2	78.2	76.4	78.2
$(\sin\theta/\lambda)_{max}$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> )	0.8340	0.8912	0.8845	0.8902	0.8844	0.8844		
Detector, scan type	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ	CCD, ω/φ
Scan width (°)	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Scan speed (°/s)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exposure time (s)	20	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
No. refls.	16497	2675	2313	2342	2282	2254	2341	1998
No. unique refls.	1625	718	710	689	688	655	653	636
with $F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$	1294	292	264	264	263	246	242	212
No. parameter	83	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R <sub>int</sub>	0.0364	0.0569	0.0497	0.0630	0.0578	0.0549	0.0522	0.0546
$R_1 F_o > 4\sigma(F_o)$	0.0678	0.0690	0.0928	0.0648	0.0801	0.0702	0.0960	0.0708
wR <sup>2</sup>	0.0553	0.0779	0.1041	0.0798	0.0902	0.0881	0.0872	0.0758
GooF	1.445	1.052	1.121	1.415	1.091	1.122	1.021	1.187
$\delta e_{\max} (\text{Å}^{-3})$	+0.74	+0.52	+0.73	+0.55	+0.64	+0.46	+0.62	+0.80
$\delta e_{\min}$ (Å <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.62	-0.82	-1.12	-0.61	-0.81	-0.56	-0.78	-0.72

12/31

Site	x/a	y/b	z/c	$U_{ m iso}/U_{ m eq}$
10 <sup>-4</sup> CD <sub>2</sub> (in air)				
<b>10</b> GPa (in air)	0 1(259(5)	1/2	1/4	0.00(7(2))
	0.16238(3)	1/2	1/4	0.0067(2)
	1/4	1/4	0.23012(8)	0.0000(2) 0.0058(2)
T <sub>1</sub> 0	0 10258(4)	1/2	1/4	0.0038(2) 0.0056(2)
$1_{2}$ T 2	0.19236(4) 0.12522(4)	0.07797(8)	0	0.0030(2) 0.0055(2)
1 <sub>2</sub> 5	-0.13323(4)	0.23723(8) 0.20701(0)	0	0.0033(2)
$1_{20}$	0.03084(3)	0.30/91(9) 0.10215(12)	0 0.14106(12)	0.0030(2) 0.0091(2)
$O_1 I$	0.24739(7)	0.10313(13)	0.14100(12) 0.15108(12)	0.0081(3)
$O_1 O_2$	0.06213(7)	0.41000(14) 0.20007(14)	0.13108(12) 0.14144(12)	0.0084(3)
$O_1 S$	-0.1/323(7)	0.30997(14)	0.14144(13)	0.0088(3) 0.0127(4)
$O_2 0$	-0.04310(11)	0.24/34(21) 0.18425(21)	0	0.0127(4)
$O_2 I$	0.12230(11)	0.18433(21)	0	0.0122(4)
$O_{2}3$	-0.16462(11)	0.07967(20)	0	0.0118(4)
Ch1 1/4	0.0591(18)	0	1/4	0.07(1)
Ch2 1/4	0	0	1/4	0.08(1)
10-4 CD ( DAC)				
10 <sup>-</sup> GPa (in DAC)	0.1(0.47(10)	1 /2	1 / 4	0.0107(7)
M T 1	0.16247(19)	1/2	1/4	0.010/(7)
	1/4	1/4	0.2504(3)	0.0105(4)
I <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/4	0.0105(4)
1 <sub>2</sub> 1	0.19259(19)	0.07796(24)	0	0.0105(4)
1 <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1345(2)	0.23/1(3)	0	0.0105(4)
$T_26$	0.0508(2)	0.3088(3)	0	0.0105(4)
$O_1 I$	0.2472(3)	0.1024(3)	0.1416(3)	0.0103(6)
$O_1 6$	0.0627(2)	0.4178(3)	0.1505(3)	0.0103(6)
013	-0.1/33(3)	0.3099(3)	0.1423(3)	0.0103(6)
O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0423(3)	0.2457(6)	0	0.0103(6)
O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1228(4)	0.1870(5)	0	0.0103(6)
O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1641(5)	0.0793(5)	0	0.0103(6)
Ch1 1/4	0.0359(14)	0	1/4	0.0103(6)
1.07(5) GPa M-E	0.1(12(2))	1/0	1/4	0.0120(0)
M T 1	0.1613(3)	1/2	1/4	0.0139(9)
$T_1 I$	1/4	1/4	0.2510(4)	0.0134(4)
$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0134(4)
$T_2 l$	0.1931(3)	0.0769(3)	0	0.0134(4)
T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1346(3)	0.2377(3)	0	0.0134(4)
T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0520(3)	0.3069(3)	0	0.0134(4)
O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2472(3)	0.1020(4)	0.1427(4)	0.0119(6)

Table 4a. Atomic fractional coordinates and displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>) of cordierite compressed 872 in 4:1 methanol-ethanol (M-E) 873

This is a preprint, the final version is subject to change, of the American Mineralogist (MSA
Cite as Authors (Year) Title. American Mineralogist, in press.
(DOI will not work until issue is live.) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2138/am.2014.4487

12/31

918	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0619(3)	0.4164(5)	0.1498(4)	0.0119(6)
919	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1739(3)	0.3112(4)	0.1420(4)	0.0119(6)
920	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0422(4)	0.2464(7)	0	0.0119(6)
921	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1241(5)	0.1858(7)	0	0.0119(6)
922	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1643(7)	0.0806(6)	0	0.0119(6)
923	Ch1 1/4	0.0400(19)	0	1/4	0.0119(6)
924					
925	2.31(5) GPa M-E				
926	М	0.16230(19)	1/2	1/4	0.0128(6)
927	T <sub>1</sub> 1	1/4	1/4	0.2513(3)	0.0114(3)
928	T <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/4	0.0114(3)
929	T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1933(2)	0.0778(2)	0	0.0114(3)
930	T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1343(2)	0.2370(3)	0	0.0114(3)
931	T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0514(2)	0.3074(2)	0	0.0114(3)
932	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2475(3)	0.1025(3)	0.1418(3)	0.0102(5)
933	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0622(3)	0.4163(3)	0.1503(3)	0.0102(5)
934	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1729(3)	0.3100(3)	0.1428(3)	0.0102(5)
935	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0426(3)	0.2428(5)	0	0.0102(5)
936	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1223(4)	0.1848(5)	0	0.0102(5)
937	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1655(5)	0.0805(4)	0	0.0102(5)
938	Ch1 1/4	0.0363(14)	0	1/4	0.0102(5)
939					
940	3.80(5) GPa M-E				
941	М	0.1622(2)	1/2	1/4	0.0154(8)
942	$T_{1}1$	1/4	1/4	0.2526(3)	0.0132(4)
943	T <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/4	0.0132(4)
944	T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1945(3)	0.0772(3)	0	0.0132(4)
945	T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1335(3)	0.2370(3)	0	0.0132(4)
946	T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0518(3)	0.3070(3)	0	0.0132(4)
947	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2482(3)	0.1024(4)	0.1412(3)	0.0145(7)
948	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0623(3)	0.4173(4)	0.1507(4)	0.0145(7)
949	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1727(3)	0.3109(4)	0.1419(4)	0.0145(7)
950	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0416(4)	0.2433(7)	0	0.0145(7)
951	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1221(4)	0.1831(6)	0	0.0145(7)
952	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1665(6)	0.0804(5)	0	0.0145(7)
953	Ch1 1/4	0.0397(16)	0	1/4	0.0145(7)
954					
955	5.20(5) GPa M-E				
956	М	0.1622(3)	1/2	1/4	0.0183(8)
957	T <sub>1</sub> 1	1/4	1/4	0.2520(3)	0.0159(4)
958	$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0159(4)
~ - ~	1 -				
959	T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1943(3)	0.0767(3)	0	0.0159(4)
959 960	$ \begin{array}{c} T_2 1 \\ T_2 3 \end{array} $	0.1943(3) -0.1332(3)	0.0767(3) 0.2376(3)	0 0	0.0159(4) 0.0159(4)
959 960 961	$T_2 1$ $T_2 3$ $T_2 6$	0.1943(3) -0.1332(3) 0.0515(3)	0.0767(3) 0.2376(3) 0.3066(3)	0 0 0	0.0159(4) 0.0159(4) 0.0159(4)
959 960 961 962	$T_2 1$ $T_2 3$ $T_2 6$ $O_1 1$	0.1943(3) -0.1332(3) 0.0515(3) 0.2483(3)	0.0767(3) 0.2376(3) 0.3066(3) 0.1021(4)	0 0 0 0.1425(4)	0.0159(4) 0.0159(4) 0.0159(4) 0.0166(7)

This is a preprint, the final version is subject to change, of the American Mineralogist (MSA)
Cite as Authors (Year) Title. American Mineralogist, in press.
(DOI will not work until issue is live.) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2138/am.2014.4487

12/31

964	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1723(3)	0.3108(4)	0.1425(4)	0.0166(7)
965	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0410(4)	0.2404(7)	0	0.0166(7)
966	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1224(5)	0.1841(6)	0	0.0166(7)
967	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1657(6)	0.0807(6)	0	0.0166(7)
968	Ch1 1/4	0.0412(17)	0	1/4	0.0166(7)
969					
970	6.40(5) GPa M-E				
971	Μ	0.1618(2)	1/2	1/4	0.0099(8)
972	T <sub>1</sub> 1	1/4	1/4	0.2528(3)	0.0106(4)
973	T <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/4	0.0106(4)
974	T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1952(3)	0.0766(3)	0	0.0106(4)
975	T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1332(3)	0.2371(3)	0	0.0106(4)
976	T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0524(3)	0.3061(3)	0	0.0106(4)
977	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2500(3)	0.1015(4)	0.1415(4)	0.0108(6)
978	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0638(3)	0.4174(4)	0.1506(3)	0.0108(6)
979	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1714(3)	0.3124(4)	0.1426(4)	0.0108(6)
980	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0409(4)	0.2375(7)	0	0.0108(6)
981	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1236(5)	0.1833(7)	0	0.0108(6)
982	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1663(6)	0.0815(6)	0	0.0108(6)
983	Ch1 1/4	0.0355(16)	0	1/4	0.0108(6)
984					
985	6.98(5) GPa M-E				
986	М	0.1618(2)	1/2	1/4	0.0119(7)
987	T <sub>1</sub> 1	1/4	1/4	0.2534(3)	0.0105(4)
988	$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0105(4)
989	T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1948(3)	0.0758(3)	0	0.0105(4)
990	T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1334(3)	0.2366(3)	0	0.0105(4)
991	T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0522(3)	0.3049(3)	0	0.0105(4)
992	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2497(3)	0.1014(3)	0.1423(3)	0.0141(6)
993	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0637(3)	0.4162(4)	0.1513(3)	0.0141(6)
994	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1720(3)	0.3128(3)	0.1418(4)	0.0141(6)
995	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0406(4)	0.2360(6)	0	0.0141(6)
996	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1240(4)	0.1827(6)	0	0.0141(6)
997	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1687(6)	0.0830(5)	0	0.0141(6)
998	Ch1 1/4	0.0352(18)	0	1/4	0.0141(6)
999					
1000					

1000

1002 *Notes:* The scattering curve of Mg was used to model the M site, and the refined site occupancy at 0.0001 1003 GPa (in air, and then fixed at any pressure) was 12.72(8)e-; the scattering curve of Al was used to model the 1004 T<sub>1</sub>1 and T<sub>2</sub>6 sites, assuming a full occupancy; the scattering curve of Si was used to model the T<sub>1</sub>6, T<sub>2</sub>1 and 1005  $T_23$  sites, assuming a full occupancy; the scattering curve of O was used to model the Ch1 1/4 (s.o.f. 1006 1.14(9)e-) and Ch2 1/4 (s.o.f. 2.2(2)e-) sites. The Ch2 1/4 site was not detected at high-pressure conditions. 1007 The anisotropic displacement parameter at 0.0001 GPa (in air) are available in the CIF. For the HP structure 1008 refinements, the following constrains were applied:  $Uiso(T_11)=Uiso(T_16)=Uiso(T_21)=Uiso(T_23)=Uiso(T_26)$ 1009 and Uiso $(O_11)=U$ iso $(O_16)=U$ iso $(O_13)=U$ iso $(O_26)=U$ iso $(O_21)=U$ iso $(O_23)=U$ iso $(Ch1 \frac{1}{4})$ .

1010

Table 4b. Atomic fractional coordinates and displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>) of cordierite compressed 1011 in H<sub>2</sub>O.

Site	x/a	y/b	z/c	$U_{ m iso}/U_{ m eq}$
<b>10<sup>-4</sup> GPa</b> (in a	ir)			
M	0.16255(4)	1/2	1/4	0.0075(2)
$T_{1}1$	1/4	1/4	0.25015(9)	0.0075(2)
$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0068(3)
T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.19259(3)	0.07771(6)	0	0.0058(2)
T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.13517(3)	0.23739(6)	0	0.0061(2)
$T_26$	0.05094(4)	0.30813(7)	0	0.0088(2)
O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.24731(6)	0.10303(10)	0.14108(12)	0.0131(3)
O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.06229(6)	0.41632(11)	0.15122(12)	0.0129(3)
O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.17330(6)	0.31009(11)	0.14163(13)	0.0136(3)
O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.04314(8)	0.24833(17)	0	0.0174(4)
O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.12246(8)	0.18494(16)	0	0.0170(4)
O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.16466(9)	0.07955(15)	0	0.0161(4)
Ch1 1/4	-0.05980	0	1/4	0.11(1)
Ch2 1/4	0	0	1/4	0.07(1)
Na	0	0	0	0.04(1)
10 <sup>-4</sup> GPa (in D	DAC)			
Μ	0.16264(19)	1/2	1/4	0.0011(10)
$T_{1}1$	1/4	1/4	0.2500(6)	0.0044(5)
T <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/5	0.0044(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.19240(19)	0.0776(7)	0	0.0044(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1353(2)	0.2372(7)	0	0.0044(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0510(2)	0.3086(7)	0	0.0044(5)
O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2463(3)	0.1018(7)	0.1423(6)	0.0104(10).
O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0622(2)	0.4173(9)	0.1503(6)	0.0104(10).
O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1734(3)	0.3087(7)	0.1430(6)	0.0104(10).
O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0434(4)	0.2484(15)	0	0.0104(10)
O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1225(4)	0.1853(11)	0	0.0104(10)
O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1657(5)	0.0798(9)	0	0.0104(10)
0.39(6) GPa H	I <sub>2</sub> O			
М	0.1622(2)	1/2	1/4	0.0056(12)
$T_1 1$	1/4	1/4	0.2501(5)	0.0031(5)
T <sub>1</sub> 6	0	1/2	1/4	0.0031(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1926(2)	0.0779(7)	0	0.0031(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1353(2)	0.2372(7)	0	0.0031(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 6	0.0507(2)	0.3081(7)	0	0.0031(5)
O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2471(4)	0.1023(8)	0.1413(6)	0.0058(11)

This is a preprint, the final version is subject to change, of the American Mineralogist (MSA)
Cite as Authors (Year) Title. American Mineralogist, in press.
(DOI will not work until issue is live.) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2138/am.2014.4487

12/31

1057	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0623(3)	0.4159(9)	0.1512(7)	0.0058(11)
1058	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1735(3)	0.3094(7)	0.1414(6)	0.0058(11)
1059	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0427(4)	0.2444(16)	0	0.0058(11)
1060	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1223(5)	0.1846(13)	0	0.0058(11)
1061	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1651(6)	0.0792(9)	0	0.0058(11)
1062					
1063	1.41(8) GPa H <sub>2</sub> O				
1064	М	0.1625(2)	1/2	1/4	0.0053(12)
1065	$T_1 1$	1/4	1/4	0.2506(7)	0.0056(6)
1066	$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0056(6)
1067	$T_2 1$	0.1933(2)	0.0768(7)	0	0.0056(6)
1068	T <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1349(2)	0.2367(7)	0	0.0056(6)
1069	$T_26$	0.0514(2)	0.3088(7)	0	0.0056(6)
1070	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2471(4)	0.1025(8)	0.1420(8)	0.0076(11)
1071	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0623(3)	0.4142(9)	0.1526(7)	0.0076(11)
1072	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1735(3)	0.3101(7)	0.1401(6)	0.0076(11)
1073	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0419(4)	0.2446(16)	0	0.0076(11)
1074	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1235(5)	0.1858(12)	0	0.0076(11)
1075	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1653(6)	0.0793(9)	0	0.0076(11)
1076					
1077	1.75(5) GPa H <sub>2</sub> O				
1078	М	0.1626(3)	1/2	1/4	0.0081(14)
1079	$T_1 1$	1/4	1/4	0.2496(7)	0.0073(7)
1080	$T_16$	0	1/2	1/4	0.0073(7)
1081	$T_2 1$	0.1931(3)	0.0773(8)	0	0.0073(7)
1082	$T_23$	-0.1346(3)	0.2368(8)	0	0.0073(7)
1083	$T_26$	0.0512(3)	0.3065(8)	0	0.0073(7)
1084	O <sub>1</sub> 1	0.2471(4)	0.1023(9)	0.1417(7)	0.0091(13)
1085	O <sub>1</sub> 6	0.0622(3)	0.4139(11)	0.1522(9)	0.0091(13)
1086	O <sub>1</sub> 3	-0.1729(4)	0.3075(8)	0.1424(7)	0.0091(13)
1087	O <sub>2</sub> 6	-0.0424(5)	0.2464(20)	0	0.0091(13)
1088	O <sub>2</sub> 1	0.1234(6)	0.1858(14)	0	0.0091(13)
1089	O <sub>2</sub> 3	-0.1660(7)	0.0805(11)	0	0.0091(13)
1090					
1001					

1091 1092

1093 Notes: The scattering curve of Mg was used to model the M site, and the refined site occupancy at 0.0001 1094 GPa (in air, and then fixed at any pressure) was 12.00(4)e-; the scattering curve of Al was used to model the 1095 T<sub>1</sub>1 and T<sub>2</sub>6 sites, assuming a full occupancy; the scattering curve of Si was used to model the T<sub>1</sub>6, T<sub>2</sub>1 and 1096  $T_23$  sites, assuming a full occupancy; the scattering curve of O was used to model the Ch1 1/4 (s.o.f. 1.6(2)e-1097 ) and Ch2 1/4 (s.o.f. 2.2(3)e-) sites and that of sodium for the Na site (s.o.f. 0.45(7)e-). All the channel sites were not detected with the crystal in the DAC. The anisotropic displacement parameter at 0.0001 GPa (in air) 1098 1099 are available in the CIF. For the HP structure refinements, the following constrains were applied: 1100 Uiso $(T_11)=U$ iso $(T_16)=U$ iso $(T_21)=U$ iso $(T_23)=U$ iso $(T_26)$  and

1101  $Uiso(O_11)=Uiso(O_16)=Uiso(O_13)=Uiso(O_26)=Uiso(O_21)=Uiso(O_23)=Uiso(Ch1 \frac{1}{4}).$ 

1102

Table 5a. Selected bond distances (Å), ring "diameters" (Å) and other structural parameters of cordierite compressed in methanol-ethanol mix at different pressures. 1105

<i>P</i> (GPa),	0.0001	0.0001*	1.07(5)	2.31(5)
$M \cap 1 (x^2)$	2,008(2)	2,008(5)	2,005(7)	2.081(5)
$M = O_1 I_1 (X_2)$ $M = O_1 f_1 (X_2)$	2.098(2)	2.098(3)	2.093(7)	2.081(3)
$M-O_10(x_2)$	2.111(2)	2.101(3)	2.093(7)	2.097(3)
$M-O_13(X2)$	2.115(2)	2.109(4)	2.094(4)	2.095(3)
<m-0></m-0>	2.108	2.105	2.094	2.091
T <sub>1</sub> 1-O <sub>1</sub> 3 (×2)	1.756(2)	1.750(5)	1.737(6)	1.750(4)
$T_1 1 - O_1 1 (\times 2)$	1.754(2)	1.757(4)	1.751(5)	1.736(4)
<t<sub>11-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.755	1.754	1.744	1.743
$T_16-O_16$ (×4)	1.626(2)	1.628(4)	1.622(5)	1.620(4)
$T_2 1 - O_2 1$	1.580(3)	1.594(7)	1.578(9)	1.587(7)
$T_2 1 - O_2 3$	1.604(3)	1.601(6)	1.599(8)	1.600(6)
$T_21-O_11$ (×2)	1.635(2)	1.638(4)	1.633(6)	1.625(5)
<t<sub>21-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.614	1.618	1.611	1.609
$T_2$ 3- $O_2$ 6	1.574(2)	1.577(8)	1.574(9)	1.557(7)
$T_23-O_23$	1.611(3)	1.612(6)	1.601(8)	1.601(6)
$T_2$ 3- $O_1$ 3 (×2)	1.634(2)	1.646(4)	1.642(5)	1.638(4)
<t<sub>23-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.613	1.620	1.615	1.609
$T_26-O_26$	1.708(3)	1.706(7)	1.708(9)	1.714(7)
T <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 1	1.713(3)	1.707(7)	1.695(9)	1.688(7)
$T_26-O_16 (\times 2)$	1.771(2)	1.772(4)	1.757(5)	1.757(4)
<t<sub>26-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.741	1.739	1.729	1.729
$O_23 \leftrightarrow O_23$	5.826(3)	5.819(13)	5.806(18)	5.829(12)
$O_26 \leftrightarrow O_26$	5.026(3)	4.980(8)	4.976(10)	4.905(8)
$O_21 \leftrightarrow O_21$	5.504(3)	5.549(9)	5.545(12)	5.478(9)
ε <sub>[001]</sub>	0.904(1)	0.905(2)	0.906(3)	0.891(2)
$T_2 1 - O_2 1 - T_2 6$	176.3(1)	177.7(4)	178.2(6)	176.2(4)
$T_2$ 3- $O_2$ 3- $T_2$ 1	179.2(1)	179.4(4)	179.4(5)	177.8(3)
$T_26-O_26-T_23$	163.4(1)	162.0(4)	163.0(5)	160.6(4)
O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 1	112.51(9)	112.5(3)	112.8(3)	111.0(2)
O <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 6	117.87(9)	116.7(3)	116.6(4)	117.2(3)
O <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3	129.62(9)	130.8(3)	130.7(4)	131.8(3)
V <sub>polMg</sub> ,	11.77(2)	11.68(5)	11.53(6)	11.48(5)
ζ	0.0574	0.0576	0.0591	0.0586

δA)
i

<i>P</i> (GPa),	3.80(5)	5.20(5)	6.40(5)	6.98(5)
$M-O_11 (\times 2)$	2.073(6)	2.057(6)	2.038(6)	2.035(6)
$M-O_{1}6(\times 2)$	2.085(6)	2.079(6)	2.047(6)	2.047(6)
$M-O_13$ (×2)	2.090(4)	2.079(4)	2.061(4)	2.058(4)
<m-o></m-o>	2.083	2.072	2.049	2.047
$T_1 1 - O_1 3 (\times 2)$	1 737(5)	1 735(5)	1 742(5)	1 735(5)
$T_1 - O_1 1$ (x2)	1 760(4)	1 745(5)	1 756(5)	1 752(4)
<t<sub>11-O&gt;</t<sub>	1 749	1 740	1 749	1 744
111 0		1., 10		
$T_16-O_16$ (×4)	1.612(5)	1.613(5)	1.618(5)	1.618(5)
T <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 1	1 596(8)	1 594(8)	1 582(8)	1 572(8)
$T_{2}I = O_{2}I$	1 593(7)	1 589(7)	1 594(7)	1 584(7)
$T_{2}T_{0}O_{2}J_{0}$	1.555(7)	1.509(7) 1.618(5)	1.594(7) 1.613(5)	1 619(5)
$< T_{2} = 0   T(x_{2})$	1.603	1.605	1.601	1 599
121-02	1.005	1.005	1.001	1.577
T <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 6	1.558(9)	1.559(9)	1.554(8)	1.562(8)
$T_23-O_23$	1.611(7)	1.606(7)	1.595(8)	1.587(7)
$T_23-O_13$ (×2)	1.635(5)	1.630(5)	1.631(5)	1.628(5)
<t<sub>23-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.610	1.606	1.603	1.601
T <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 6	1.698(9)	1.687(9)	1.705(8)	1.697(8)
T <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 1	1.687(8)	1.680(8)	1.682(8)	1.684(8)
$T_26-O_16 (\times 2)$	1.764(4)	1.753(5)	1.761(4)	1.762(4)
<t<sub>26-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.728	1.718	1.727	1.726
$O_23 \leftrightarrow O_23$	5.850(15)	5.809(15)	5.816(15)	5.897(15)
$O_26 \leftrightarrow O_26$	4.904(10)	4.829(8)	4.764(10)	4.725(8)
$O_21 \leftrightarrow O_21$	5.441(9)	5.445(9)	5.452(10)	5.453(10)
£[001]	0.887(3)	0.878(3)	0.879(3)	0.875(3)
[***]				
$T_2 1 - O_2 1 - T_2 6$	174.7(5)	175.9(5)	175.8(5)	176.7(5)
$T_23-O_23-T_21$	177.0(4)	177.7(5)	177.3(5)	174.2(4)
$T_26-O_26-T_23$	161.0(5)	158.8(5)	157.4(5)	156.9(5)
O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 1	110.2(3)	110.1(3)	109.6(3)	107.8(3)
0 <sub>2</sub> 3-0 <sub>2</sub> 1-0 <sub>2</sub> 6	118.3(3)	117.1(3)	116.4(3)	116.8(3)
O <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3	131.5(4)	132.8(4)	134.0(4)	135.3(4)
	~ /	~ /	~ /	~ /
$V_{\rm polMg}$	11.36(5)	11.17(5)	10.86(5)	10.81(5)
5	0.0567	0.0586	0.0520	0.0548

1203 *Notes.* Ellipticity ratio:  $\varepsilon_{[001]} = 0.5 \cdot [(O_2 6 \leftrightarrow O_2 6) + (O_2 1 \leftrightarrow O_2 1)]/[O_2 3 \leftrightarrow O_2 3]$ ; Mg-polyhedral volume 1204  $(V_{\text{polMg}}, \text{Å}^3)$  and polyhedral distortion coefficient ( $\xi$ , dimensionless) according to Balic-Zunic and Vickovic 1205 (1996) and Makovicky and Balic-Zunic (1998). \* Crystal in the DAC without *P*-medium. 1206

1210 1211

1208 Table 5b. Selected bond distances (Å), ring "diameters" (Å) and other structural parameters of 1209 cordierite compressed in  $H_2O$  at different pressures. (\* Crystal in the DAC without *P*-medium).

<i>P</i> (GPa),	0.0001	0.0001*	0.39(6)	1.41(8)	1.75(5)
M-O <sub>1</sub> 1 (×2)	2.102(1)	2.100(5)	2.102(5)	2.089(6)	2.087(6)
$M-O_{1}6(\times 2)$	2.110(1)	2.112(5)	2.105(5)	2.103(5)	2.106(5)
$M-O_13$ (×2)	2.117(1)	2.115(6)	2.116(6)	2.110(6)	2.119(6)
<m-o></m-o>	2.110	2.109	2.108	2.101	2.104
T <sub>1</sub> 1-O <sub>1</sub> 3 (×2)	1.757(1)	1.745(5)	1.751(5)	1.753(5)	1.742(6)
$T_1 1 - O_1 1 (\times 2)$	1.758(1)	1.756(6)	1.756(6)	1.749(6)	1.745(6)
<t<sub>11-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.7575	1.7505	1.7535	1.7510	1.7435
T <sub>1</sub> 6-O <sub>1</sub> 6 (×4)	1.628(1)	1.626(4)	1.627(4)	1.624(4)	1.625(4)
T <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 1	1.589(1)	1.586(7)	1.584(7)	1.588(7)	1.583(8)
T <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 3	1.603(2)	1.592(8)	1.593(8)	1.582(8)	1.593(8)
$T_21-O_11 (\times 2)$	1.637(1)	1.637(5)	1.633(5)	1.628(5)	1.626(5)
<t<sub>21-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.6165	1.6130	1.6108	1.6065	1.6070
T <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 6	1.576(1)	1.575(6)	1.583(6)	1.586(7)	1.573(7)
$T_23-O_23$	1.617(2)	1.612(8)	1.614(8)	1.606(8)	1.602(9)
$T_2$ 3- $O_1$ 3 (×2)	1.638(1)	1.641(5)	1.632(5)	1.624(5)	1.627(5)
<t<sub>23-O&gt;</t<sub>	1.6173	1.6173	1.6152	1.6100	1.6073
T <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 6	1.710(1)	1.715(6)	1.711(7)	1.707(7)	1.695(8)
T <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 1	1.712(2)	1.709(7)	1.711(7)	1.708(7)	1.694(8)
$T_26-O_16 (\times 2)$	1.775(1)	1.768(5)	1.768(5)	1.760(5)	1.766(4)
<t26-o></t26-o>	1.7430	1.7400	1.7395	1.7338	1.7303
$O_23 \leftrightarrow O_23$	5.837(2)	5.872(12)	5.846(14)	5.835(14)	5.861(17)
$O_26 \leftrightarrow O_26$	5.054(2)	5.038(20)	4.956(21)	4.937(21)	4.967(27)
$O_21 \leftrightarrow O_21$	5.521(2)	5.517(12)	5.503(15)	5.530(15)	5.527(17)
E[001]	0.906(1)	0.899(4)	0.894(4)	0.897(4)	0.895(6)
T <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 1-T <sub>2</sub> 6	176.6(1)	176.8(6)	176.4(7)	177.4(7)	178.0(8)
$T_2$ 3- $O_2$ 3- $T_2$ 1	179.2(1)	177.8(7)	178.7(7)	178.7(8)	177.3(8)
$T_26-O_26-T_23$	163.9(1)	164.1(5)	161.4(5)	161.4(5)	163.1(6)
O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 1	112.7(7)	111.9(5)	111.5(5)	111.7(5)	111.5(6)
O <sub>2</sub> 3-O <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 6	117.95(7)	118.2(4)	117.5(4)	116.9(5)	117.4(5)
O <sub>2</sub> 1-O <sub>2</sub> 6-O <sub>2</sub> 3	129.35(7)	129.8(3)	130.9(4)	131.4(4)	131.2(5)
$V_{ m polMg}$	11.80(1)	11.76(6)	11.75(7)	11.63(7)	11.66(8)
ξ	0.0578	0.0600	0.0580	0.0587	0.0617

$V(\text{\AA}^3)$ ; a,b,c (Å)	$K_{\rm T=298}, \beta_{\rm i}^{-1}$ (GPa)	$\partial K/\partial P$ , $\partial (\beta_i^{-1})/\partial P$	$\chi^2_{\rm w}$	$ P_{obs} - P_{calc} $ (GPa			
	. 250) [ ( )	7 (1 - 7	<b>,</b> , ,,				
cordierite in H <sub>2</sub> O (	(10 <sup>-4</sup> to 2.01 GPa)						
$V_0 = 1551.83(3)$	$K_{\rm T=298} = 137.8(1.5)$	$\partial K/\partial P = -6.4(1.8)$	1.35	≤ 0.011			
$a_0 = 17.0732(2)$	$1/3 \beta_a^{-1} = 150.8(2.7)$	$1/3 \partial(\beta_a^{-1})/\partial P = -5.1(3.0)$	1.16	≤ 0.019			
$b_0 = 9.7243(2)$	$1/3 \beta_b^{-1} = 146.8(4.4)$	$1/3 \ \partial(\beta_{b}^{-1})/\partial P = -2.3(4.9)$	2.31	≤ 0.051			
$c_0 = 9.3483(2)$	$1/3 \beta_{\rm c}^{-1} = 105.2(1.6)$	$1/3 \ \partial(\beta_c^{-1})/\partial P = 4.5(1.9)$	0.95	≤ 0.013			
<b>cordierite in argon</b> $(10^{-4} \text{ to } 6.44 \text{ GPa})$							
$V_0 = 1550.56(15)$	$K_{\rm T=298} = 127.7(2.3)$	$\partial K/\partial P = 0.4(0.9)$	3.54	≤ 0.026			
$a_0 = 17.0728(7)$	$1/3 \beta_a^{-1} = 117.9(2.3)$	$1/3 \partial(\beta_a^{-1})/\partial P = 11.2(1.3)$	2.63	≤ 0.012			
$b_0 = 9.7198(4)$	$1/3 \beta_b^{-1} = 148.1.(2.8)$	$1/3 \ \partial(\beta_{b}^{-1})/\partial P = -4.3(0.9)$	1.04	≤ 0.053			
$c_0 = 9.3437(6)$	$1/3 \beta_{\rm c}^{-1} = 116.1(2.4)$	$1/3 \ \partial(\beta_{c}^{-1})/\partial P = -1.2(0.8)$	3.00	≤ 0.023			
cordierite in ethan	<b>ol-methanol</b> (10 <sup>-4</sup> to 6.61	GPa)					
$V_0 = 1551.97(15)$	$K_{\rm T=298} = 131.0(1.3)$	$\partial K/\partial P = -0.5(0.4)$	0.83	$\leq 0.008$			
$a_0 = 17.0722(8)$	$1/3 \beta_a^{-1} = 121.7(2.2)$	$1/3 \partial(\beta_a^{-1})/\partial P = 9.3(9)$	1.66	≤ 0.005			
$b_0 = 9.726(6)$	$1/3 \beta_b^{-1} = 133.4(7.8)$	$1/3 \partial(\beta_{b}^{-1})/\partial P = -1.9(1.9)$	5.83	$\leq 0.067$			
$c_0 = 9.348(2)$	$1/3 \beta_{\rm c}^{-1} = 129.9(4.9)$	$1/3 \partial(\beta_{c}^{-1})/\partial P = -3.5(1.0)$	11.3	$\leq 0.047$			



1289



**Figure 1.** Compression experiment of lead up to 1.5 GPa as calibration reference for the performed compression experiments on cordierite. Top: the solid line gives the loop (piston displacement versus pressure) obtained from compression (*P* up) - decompression (*P* down) run. The adjacent loop (dotted-dashed line) represents the dp-*P*-loop displaced by  $\Delta t$  (usually 15 seconds, here for better presentation  $\Delta t = 200$  s). Bottom: the  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$ -parameter plotted versus pressure. The hatched areas indicate regions of strong influences by the characteristics of the high-pressure apparatus (apparatus function).

12/31

12/31



1302

**Figure 2.** (*Left side*) The  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$  parameter derived from a compression run of Soto cordierite plotted versus pressure in comparison with  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$  data obtained from calibration runs on lead and NaCl.

1306 (*Right side*) The equivalent data obtained on decompression. While the reference materials lead and 1307 NaCl exhibit a linear behavior of the  $\Delta dp/\Delta t$ -parameter, the Soto cordierite reveals in each track two 1308 subtle irregularities at around 0.3 and 0.75 GPa encompassing a deviation n from the general 1309 compression trend (line as a guide to the eye).

1310

12/31



1314<br/>1315Figure 3. Cell volume (top) and compression coefficient dV/dP (bottom) obtained from cordierite<br/>(Tsi2\_b#3) pressurized in DAC with water as pressure medium. The dV/dP data give a vague hint<br/>for irregularities at around 0.35 and 0.85 GPa, which is next to the supposed volume discontinuities<br/>previously reported. Linear fits to the volume data truncated to the three sections (1,2, and 3) yield<br/>differences in the slope of about 2%.

12/31



Pressure (GPa)

Figure 4. Unit-cell volumes from single-crystal XRD of cordierite in H<sub>2</sub>O (open circles), in argon
(open diamonds), and 4:1 methanol-ethanol (full squares). Lines correspond to the fit of a thirdorder Birch-Murnaghan EoS to the individual *P-V* data sets.

1327



**Figure 5.** Lattice parameters *a*, *b*, *c* and unit-cell volume *V* of cordierite in H<sub>2</sub>O (in the hydrostatic pressure range 10<sup>-4</sup> to 2.01 GPa).  $a/a_0$  (open diamonds),  $b/b_0$  (open squares),  $c/c_0$  (open circles), and  $V/V_0$  (crosses). Plotted lines correspond to linear fits with  $\beta_i^{-1}$  (i = *a*, *b*, *c*) = 440.0, 438.3, 328.7 GPa and  $K_0$ = 132.1 GPa, respectively.





Pressure (GPa)

**Figure 6.** Lattice parameters *a*, *b*, and *c* of cordierite in methanol-ethanol mix (open symbols) and argon (full symbols). Plotted data correspond to normalized parameter  $a/a_0$  (diamonds),  $b/b_0$ (squares),  $c/c_0$  (circles); lines correspond to fits of a Birch-Murnaghan EoS with axial moduli  $\beta_i^{-1}$  (i a, b, c) and their pressure derivatives  $\partial(\beta_i^{-1})/\partial P$  (see Table 6).

1341



Pressure (GPa)

**Figure 7.** Evolution of the distortion index  $\Delta$  (°) = 1.094 ( $a - \sqrt{3}b$ ) (Miyashiro, 1957) with pressure for the data of cordierite compressed in H<sub>2</sub>O (open circles), argon (full diamonds) and methanolethanol mixture (open squares). Note the significant change in the trend with  $\Delta$  starting to increase with pressure above ~4 GPa.





**Figure 8**. (a) Evolution of the ellipticity ratio of the 6-membered rings of tetrahedra running along [001] (i.e.  $\varepsilon_{[001]}$ ) and of the inter-tetrahedral angles (b) O<sub>2</sub>6-O<sub>2</sub>3-O<sub>2</sub>1, (c) O<sub>2</sub>3-O<sub>2</sub>1-O<sub>2</sub>6, and (d) O<sub>2</sub>1-O<sub>2</sub>6-O<sub>2</sub>3 (°) with pressure. Lines represent the trends of evolution with pressure.



Figure 9. Evolution of (a) the polyhedral volume and (b) of the average <Mg-O> bond distances
(see Table 5) of the Mg-octahedron with pressure. Lines represent the trends of evolution with *P*.



**Figure 10.** Cordierite single crystal (sample Tsi2\_b#1, crystal on the left side) mounted together with quartz pressure standard (right side) below (~1.3 GPa) and above (~7.2 GPa) the transition at ~6.9 GPa (pressure medium: argon). Note the interference colors and gradual changes indicating strain across domain boundaries according to the orthorhombic-to-triclinic transition in comparison to the homogeneous single-domain crystal of orthorhombic symmetry at low pressure (image detail: 300  $\mu$ m x 300  $\mu$ m).

- 1372
- 1373
- 1374
- 1375





12/31



12/31