

HIGHLIGHTS AND BREAKTHROUGHS

Seeking the most hydrous, primitive arc melts: The glass is half full

Matthew Steele-MacInnis^{1,*}

¹Dept. of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB Canada

*steelema@ualberta.ca

Keywords: Melt inclusions, glass, volatiles, quenching, H₂O

Experimental studies and petrologic constraints suggest that H₂O contents of deep, primitive melts in subduction settings may reach up to >15 wt% H₂O (e.g., Krawczynski et al., 2012). But curiously, mafic glasses preserved in melt inclusions – commonly the best available tool to analyze H₂O contents of melts – seem to be limited to much lower values, mostly <6 wt% (Plank et al., 2013). This apparent conundrum suggests that empirical results defy predictions, and challenges our view of H₂O in subduction-related magmatism. To address this issue, Gravilenko et al. (2019) experimentally tested the quenching behavior of hydrous, mafic melts. Their results demonstrate that quenching to glass becomes difficult at high H₂O concentrations, and that mafic melts exceeding ~9 wt% H₂O are essentially unquenchable at realistic cooling rates. This implies that glasses preserved in melt inclusions provide only a partial record of the volatile contents of deep-seated melts, and are incapable of recording the deepest, most hydrous melts. This work thus elegantly reconciles what previously appeared to be a stark contradiction between prediction and observation, and adds a key piece to our evolving understanding of how to analyze and interpret melt inclusions.

The H₂O concentrations of melts exert a strong control on properties such as buoyancy (Ochs and Lange, 1999), viscosity (Schulze et al., 1996), chemical diffusivity (Watson, 1994) and explosivity (Sparks, 1978), as well as the ore-forming potential of arc magmas (Hedenquist and Lowenstern, 1994). The H₂O contents of arc magmas are also central to quantifying and interpreting global geochemical cycling between Earth's surface and deep interior (Bodnar et al., 2013). Moreover, H₂O contents of melts are widely used to evaluate depths of magmatic

32 plumbing systems, based on the thermodynamic relationship between pressure and solubility of
33 volatiles (Audétat and Lowenstern, 2014, and references therein). However, the H₂O contents of
34 pre-eruptive melts are also elusive parameters. Experimentally calibrated proxies have been
35 developed to estimate H₂O contents of melts based on mineral equilibria (e.g., Krawczynski et
36 al., 2012), but commonly, the only available tool to directly quantify the H₂O (and other volatile)
37 contents of pre-eruptive melts is by analysis of melt inclusions (Audétat and Lowenstern, 2014).

38 In recent years, a growing body of theoretical, experimental and analytical studies has
39 contributed new insights into the systematics of volatiles in melt inclusions, and how to best
40 analyze and interpret them. It is now widely recognized that bubbles within melt inclusions can
41 host a preponderance of the bulk CO₂ (Moore et al., 2015) and H₂O (Esposito et al., 2016), and
42 that H₂O concentrations can be rapidly modified by diffusive reequilibration (Gaetani et al.,
43 2012). Careful attention to these phenomena has helped elucidate the record of pre-eruptive
44 volatiles and degassing. Yet even in light of these developments, still the growing body of
45 analytical data presents some enigmatic results.

46 One of the crucial and fundamental questions that has confounded our view of volatiles in
47 subduction-related melt inclusions arises from the growing recognition that H₂O (as well as CO₂)
48 contents of glasses preserved in melt inclusions seem to show an unexpectedly restricted range.
49 Specifically, mafic glasses in melt inclusions from arc settings seem to be limited to H₂O
50 contents mostly less than ~6 wt%, and never exceeding ~9 wt% (Plank et al., 2013). In contrast,
51 experimental phase equilibria consistently predict much higher H₂O contents, up to >15 wt%
52 (Krawczynski et al., 2012). This apparent contradiction fundamentally challenges our view of
53 either the fidelity of melt inclusions, or how well our experiments reproduce nature, or both.

54 Although some H₂O is likely partitioned into bubbles (Esposito et al., 2016), such
55 partitioning is unlikely to have such a dramatic effect on the measured H₂O concentration in the
56 glass (Steele-MacInnis et al., 2011). Diffusive reequilibration also likely plays a role in reducing
57 water contents in melt inclusions (Gaetani et al., 2012). But neither process is not expected to
58 yield such a consistent threshold of H₂O across the breadth of thousands of reported analyses,
59 which is moreover so far below experimental predictions. What then limits melt inclusion H₂O
60 contents? Could it be that magmas related to subduction have only half the amount of water
61 implied by experimental studies?

62 On page XXXX of this issue, Gravilenko et al. (2019) test an alternative hypothesis, that
63 the upper limit of H₂O contents of glasses preserved in melt inclusions reflects a quench control.
64 Specifically, Gravilenko et al. (2019) hypothesize that wetter melts are more difficult to quench,
65 and that the wettest melts simply cannot be quenched. This hypothesis is rooted in the well-
66 known relationships between H₂O concentration, viscosity and the glass transition (Mysen and
67 Richet, 2005): Wetter melts are less viscous, and less viscous melts are less easily quenched,
68 requiring either greater degrees of undercooling or faster cooling rates in order to be quenched as
69 glass. Gravilenko et al. (2019) test this hypothesis by conducting rapid-quench experiments on
70 mafic melts over a wide range of H₂O contents. Importantly, the cooling rates achieved in their
71 experiments (20-90 K/s) are consistent with best estimates for cooling rates during eruption
72 (maximum ~22 K/s; Lloyd et al., 2013). The results are remarkable. Melts that contain modest
73 H₂O concentrations up to ~6 wt% consistently quench to form optically clear glass. Melts
74 containing from ~6 to ~9 wt% H₂O are somewhat difficult to quench, and consistently form
75 crystallites in addition to glass. Melts exceeding 9 wt% H₂O do not quench to glass, and instead
76 form friable aggregates of crystallites, vapor bubbles, and material resembling devitrified glass.
77 And compellingly, the limiting values of H₂O concentrations align perfectly with the empirical
78 results from melt inclusions.

79 The results by Gravilenko et al. (2019) strongly indicate that an apparent upper limit on
80 the H₂O contents of mafic melts is a consequence of the inability of wetter melts to form glassy
81 inclusions. Recently, Maclennan (2017) used numerical modeling to investigate an apparent
82 upper limit of CO₂ contents of melt inclusions from low-H₂O settings, and concluded that high
83 CO₂ concentrations (resulting from high trapping pressures) give rise to intense overpressure and
84 inevitable decrepitation during magma ascent. These two studies, Maclennan (2017) and
85 Gravilenko et al. (2019), indicate complementary phenomena that control and restrict the
86 observed ranges of both H₂O and CO₂ in melt inclusions. Similarly, Esposito et al. (2016) argued
87 that H₂O exsolved into vapor bubbles in melt inclusions rapidly reacts with the surrounding glass
88 causing devitrification, which would further obscure bulk volatile concentrations. It seems likely
89 that the quench control could work in tandem with exsolution of vapor, devitrification,
90 overpressure and decrepitation, as well as diffusive reequilibration, all conspiring to prevent
91 preservation of the most volatile-rich glasses in melt inclusions.

92 The major implication of the results by Gravilenko et al. (2019) is that wetter melts are
93 unlikely to form glassy melt inclusions, which in turn implies that glassy inclusions are incapable
94 of preserving a complete record of the deepest, wettest melts. On the one hand, this is a sobering
95 message. But on the other hand, this work illuminates a fundamental control, and by
96 understanding this phenomenon we stand a better chance of obtaining robust interpretations of
97 water contents of melts. This conclusion underscores the need to analyze melt inclusions in the
98 context of robust petrographic and geochemical constraints on timing of trapping and post-
99 entrapment processes (Esposito et al., 2014), and provides impetus for development and
100 application of complementary techniques that are not reliant on glassy inclusions. In any case,
101 previous empirical observations showing a restricted range of H₂O contents can be viewed as a
102 natural consequence of "quenchability." This result neatly reconciles the observations with
103 experimental predictions, without undermining the fidelity of glassy melt inclusions or predicted
104 H₂O contents of arc magmas—instead, indicating that the elusive, H₂O-rich primitive arc melts
105 may simply be missing from the record of glassy melt inclusions. Interestingly, this does not
106 necessarily preclude the possibility of more H₂O-rich, *non-glassy* melt inclusions, which would
107 appear as being partially crystallized or devitrified. Such inclusions may be easily overlooked or
108 discarded, but future workers seeking wet, primitive melts may be wise to search for and
109 specifically target such inclusions.

110

111

REFERENCE CITED

112

113 Audétat, A., Lowenstern, J.B. (2014) Melt inclusions. *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 13, 143–173.

114 Bodnar, R.J., Azbej, T., Becker, S.P., Cannatelli, C., Fall, A., Severs, M.J. (2013) Whole Earth
115 geohydrologic cycle, from the clouds to the core: The distribution of water in the
116 dynamic Earth system. *Geological Society of America Special Paper*, 500, 431–461

117 Esposito, R., Lamadrid, H., Redi D., Steele-MacInnis, M., Bodnar, R.J., Manning, C.E., De Vivo
118 B., Cannatelli C., Lima A. (2016) Detection of liquid H₂O in vapor bubbles in melt
119 inclusions: Implications for magmatic fluid composition and volatile budgets of magmas?
120 *American Mineralogist*, 101, 1691–1695.

- 121 Esposito, R., Hunter, J., Schiffbauer, J., Shimizu, N., Bodnar, R.J. (2014) An assessment of the
122 reliability of melt inclusions as recorders of the pre-eruptive volatile content of magmas.
123 American Mineralogist, 99, 976–998.
- 124 Gaetani, G.A., O'Leary, J.A., Shimizu, N., Bucholz, C.E., Newville, M. (2012) Rapid
125 reequilibration of H₂O and oxygen fugacity in olivine-hosted melt inclusions. Geology,
126 40, 915–918.
- 127 Gravilenko, M., Krawczynski, M., Ruprecht, P., Li, W., Catalano, J. (2019) The quench control
128 of water estimates in convergent margin magmas. American Mineralogist, in press.
- 129 Hedenquist, J.W., Lowenstern, J.B. (1994) The role of magmas in the formation of hydrothermal
130 ore deposits. Nature, 370, 519–527.
- 131 Lloyd, A.S., Plank, T., Ruprecht, P., Hauri, E.H., Rose, W. (2013) Volatile loss from melt
132 inclusions in pyroclasts of differing sizes. Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology,
133 165, 129–153.
- 134 Krawczynski, M.J., Grove, T.L., Behrens, H. (2012) Amphibole stability in primitive arc
135 magmas: effects of temperature, H₂O content, and oxygen fugacity. Contributions to
136 Mineralogy and Petrology, 164, 317–319.
- 137 MacLennan, J. (2017) Bubble formation and decrepitation control the CO₂ content of olivine-
138 hosted melt inclusions. Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 18, 597–616.
- 139 Plank, T., Kelley, K.A., Zimmer, M.M., Hauri, E.H., Wallace, P.J. (2013) Why do arc magmas
140 contain ~4 wt% water on average? Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 364, 168-179.
- 141 Moore, L.R., Gazel, E., Tuohy, R., Lloyd, A., Esposito, R., Steele-MacInnis, M., Hauri, E.H.,
142 Wallace, P.J., Plank, T. & Bodnar, R.J. (2015) Bubbles matter: An assessment of the
143 contribution of vapor bubbles to melt inclusion volatile budgets. American Mineralogist,
144 100, 806–823.
- 145 Mysen, B.O., Richet, P. (2005) Silicate glasses and melts. Elsevier. 560 pp.
- 146 Ochs, F.A., Lange, R.A. (1999) The density of hydrous magmatic liquids. Science, 283, 1314–
147 1317.
- 148 Schulze, F., Behrens, H., Holtz, F., Roux, J., Johannes, W. (1996) The influence of H₂O on the
149 viscosity of a haplogranitic melt. American Mineralogist, 81, 1155–1165.
- 150 Sparks, R.S.J. (1978) The dynamics of bubble formation and growth in magmas: A review and
151 analysis. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 3, 1–37.

- 152 Steele-MacInnis, M., Esposito, R. & Bodnar, R. J. (2011) Thermodynamic model for the effect
153 of post-entrapment crystallization on the H₂O-CO₂ systematics of vapor-saturated,
154 silicate melt inclusions. *Journal of Petrology*, 52, 2461–2482.
- 155 Watson, E.B. (1994) Diffusion in volatile-bearing magmas. *Reviews in Mineralogy*, 30, 371–
156 411.