

HIGHLIGHTS AND BREAKTHROUGHS

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

MATTHEW STEELE-MACINNIS^{1,*}

¹Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, T6G 2E3 Alberta, Canada

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

In recent years, a growing body of theoretical, experimental, and analytical studies has contributed new insights into the systematics of volatiles in melt inclusions and how to best analyze and interpret them. It is now widely recognized that bubbles within melt inclusions can host a preponderance of the bulk CO₂ (Moore et al. 2015) and H₂O (Esposito et al. 2016), and that H₂O concentrations can be rapidly modified by diffusive re-equilibration (Portnyagin et al. 2008; Gaetani et al. 2012). Careful attention to these phenomena has helped elucidate the

record of pre-eruptive volatiles and degassing. Yet even in light of these developments, still the growing body of analytical data presents some enigmatic results.

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

Although some H₂O is likely partitioned into bubbles (Esposito et al. 2016), such partitioning is unlikely to have such a dramatic effect on the measured H₂O concentration in the glass (Steele-MacInnis et al. 2011). Diffusive re-equilibration also likely plays a role in reducing water contents in melt inclusions (Portnyagin et al. 2008; Gaetani et al. 2012). But neither process is expected to yield such a consistent threshold of H₂O across the breadth of thousands of reported analyses, which is moreover so far below experimental predictions. What then limits melt inclusion H₂O contents? Could it be that magmas related to subduction have only half the amount of water implied by experimental studies?

On page 936 of the July issue, Gavrilenko et al. (2019) test an alternative hypothesis that the upper limit of H₂O contents of glasses preserved in melt inclusions reflects a quench control. Specifically, Gavrilenko et al. (2019) hypothesize that wetter melts are more difficult to quench, and that the wettest melts simply cannot be quenched. This hypothesis is rooted in the well-known relationships between H₂O concentration, viscosity, and the glass transition (Mysen and Richet 2005): wetter melts are less viscous, and less viscous melts are less easily quenched, requiring either greater degrees of undercooling or faster cooling rates to be quenched as glass. Gavrilenko et al. (2019) test this hypothesis by conducting rapid-quench experiments on mafic melts over a wide range of H₂O contents. Importantly, the cooling rates achieved in their experiments (20–90 K/s) are consistent with best estimates for cooling rates during the eruption (maximum ~22 K/s; Lloyd et al. 2013). The results are remarkable. Melts that contain modest H₂O concentrations up to ~6 wt% consistently quench to form optically clear glass. Melts containing from ~6 to ~9 wt% H₂O are somewhat difficult to quench, and consistently form crystallites in addition to glass. Melts exceeding 9 wt% H₂O do not quench to glass and instead

* E-mail: steelema@ualberta.ca

form friable aggregates of crystallites, vapor bubbles, and material resembling devitrified glass. And compellingly, the limiting values of H₂O concentrations align perfectly with the empirical results from melt inclusions.

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

The major implication of the results by Gavrilenko et al. (2019) is that wetter melts are unlikely to form glassy melt inclusions, which in turn implies that glassy inclusions are incapable of preserving a complete record of the deepest, wettest melts. On the one hand, this is a sobering message. But on the other hand, this work illuminates a fundamental control, and by understanding this phenomenon, we stand a better chance of obtaining robust interpretations of water contents of melts. This conclusion underscores the need to analyze melt inclusions in the context of robust petrographic and geochemical constraints on the timing of trapping and post-entrapment processes (Esposito et al. 2014) and provides the impetus for development and application of complementary techniques that are not reliant on glassy inclusions. In any case, previous empirical observations showing a restricted range of H₂O contents can be viewed as a natural consequence of “quenchability.” This result neatly reconciles the observations with experimental predictions, without undermining the fidelity of glassy melt inclusions or predicted H₂O contents of arc magmas—instead, indicating that the elusive, H₂O-rich primitive arc melts may simply be missing from the record of glassy melt inclusions. Interestingly, this does not necessarily preclude the possibility of more H₂O-rich, non-glassy melt inclusions, which would appear as being partially crystal-

lized or devitrified. Such inclusions may be easily overlooked or discarded, but future workers seeking wet, primitive melts may be wise to search for and specifically target such inclusions.

REFERENCES CITED

- Audétat, A., and Lowenstern, J.B. (2014) Melt inclusions. *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 13, 143–173.
- Bodnar, R.J., Azbej, T., Becker, S.P., Cannatelli, C., Fall, A., and Severs, M.J. (2013) Whole Earth geohydrologic cycle, from the clouds to the core: The distribution of water in the dynamic Earth system. *Geological Society of America Special Paper*, 500, 431–461.
- Esposito, R., Hunter, J., Schiffbauer, J., Shimizu, N., and Bodnar, R.J. (2014) An assessment of the reliability of melt inclusions as recorders of the pre-eruptive volatile content of magmas. *American Mineralogist*, 99, 976–998.
- Esposito, R., Lamadrid, H., Redi, D., Steele-MacInnis, M., Bodnar, R.J., Manning, C.E., De Vivo, B., Cannatelli, C., and Lima, A. (2016) Detection of liquid H₂O in vapor bubbles in melt inclusions: Implications for magmatic fluid composition and volatile budgets of magmas? *American Mineralogist*, 101, 1691–1695.
- Gaetani, G.A., O’Leary, J.A., Shimizu, N., Bucholz, C.E., and Newville, M. (2012) Rapid reequilibration of H₂O and oxygen fugacity in olivine-hosted melt inclusions. *Geology*, 40, 915–918.
- Gavrilenko, M., Krawczynski, M., Ruprecht, P., Li, W., and Catalano, J. (2019) The quench control of water estimates in convergent margin magmas. *American Mineralogist*, 104, 936–948.
- Hedenquist, J.W., and Lowenstern, J.B. (1994) The role of magmas in the formation of hydrothermal ore deposits. *Nature*, 370, 519–527.
- Lloyd, A.S., Plank, T., Ruprecht, P., Hauri, E.H., and Rose, W. (2013) Volatile loss from melt inclusions in pyroclasts of differing sizes. *Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology*, 165, 129–153.
- Krawczynski, M.J., Grove, T.L., and Behrens, H. (2012) Amphibole stability in primitive arc magmas: effects of temperature, H₂O content, and oxygen fugacity. *Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology*, 164, 317–319.
- MacLennan, J. (2017) Bubble formation and decrepitation control the CO₂ content of olivine-hosted melt inclusions. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, 18, 597–616.
- Moore, L.R., Gazel, E., Tuohy, R., Lloyd, A., Esposito, R., Steele-MacInnis, M., Hauri, E.H., Wallace, P.J., Plank, T., and Bodnar, R.J. (2015) Bubbles matter: An assessment of the contribution of vapor bubbles to melt inclusion volatile budgets. *American Mineralogist*, 100, 806–823.
- Mysen, B.O., and Richet, P. (2005) *Silicate Glasses and Melts*. Elsevier, 560 pp.
- Ochs, F.A., and Lange, R.A. (1999) The density of hydrous magmatic liquids. *Science*, 283, 1314–1317.
- Plank, T., Kelley, K.A., Zimmer, M.M., Hauri, E.H., and Wallace, P.J. (2013) Why do arc magmas contain ~4 wt% water on average? *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 364, 168–179.
- Portnyagin, M., Almeev, R., Matveev, S., and Holtz, F. (2008) Experimental evidence for rapid water exchange between melt inclusions in olivine and host magma. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 272, 541–552.
- Schulze, F., Behrens, H., Holtz, F., Roux, J., and Johannes, W. (1996) The influence of H₂O on the viscosity of a haplogranitic melt. *American Mineralogist*, 81, 1155–1165.
- Sparks, R.S.J. (1978) The dynamics of bubble formation and growth in magmas: A review and analysis. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 3, 1–37.
- Steele-MacInnis, M., Esposito, R., and Bodnar, R.J. (2011) Thermodynamic model for the effect of post-entrapment crystallization on the H₂O-CO₂ systematics of vapor-saturated, silicate melt inclusions. *Journal of Petrology*, 52, 2461–2482.
- Watson, E.B. (1994) Diffusion in volatile-bearing magmas. *Reviews in Mineralogy*, 30, 371–411.

MANUSCRIPT RECEIVED MAY 21, 2019

MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTED MAY 30, 2019

MANUSCRIPT HANDLED BY DON BAKER