

A Multiscale Model of Partial Melts 1: Effective Equations

G. Simpson

Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 2E4,
Canada.

M. Spiegelman

Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia
University, New York, New York, USA. Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory,
Palisades, NY 10964, USA.

M. I. Weinstein

Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia
University, New York, New York, USA.

G. Simpson, Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 2E4,
Canada. (simpson@math.toronto.edu)

M. Spiegelman, Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia Univer-
sity, New York, NY 10027, USA. Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY 10964, USA.
(mspieg@ldeo.columbia.edu)

M. I. Weinstein, Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia Univer-
sity, 200 Mudd, New York, NY 10027, USA. (miw2103@columbia.edu)

Abstract. In this paper a model for partial melts is constructed using two-scale homogenization theory. While this technique is well known to the mathematics and materials communities, it is relatively novel to problems in the solid Earth. This approach begins with a grain scale model of the medium, coarsening it into a macroscopic one. The emergent model is in good agreement with previous work, including D. McKenzie's, and serves as verification. This methodology also yields a series of Stokes problems whose solutions provide constitutive relations for permeability and viscosity. A numerical investigation of these relations appears in a companion paper.

1. Introduction

Partial melts, such as asthenospheric magma flows, can be modeled as a viscously deformable porous medium. Such models consist of macroscopic equations for the conservation of mass, momentum and energy of each phase. Models, motivated by the magma application, appear in *McKenzie* [1984]; *Scott and Stevenson* [1984, 1986]; *Fowler* [1985, 1989]; *Spiegelman* [1993a]; *Stevenson and Scott* [1991]; *Bercovici et al.* [2001a, b]; *Ricard et al.* [2001]; *Hier-Majumder et al.* [2006]; *Bercovici and Ricard* [2005, 2003]; *Ricard and Bercovici* [2003]; *Ricard* [2007]. Those authors begin their models on a scale much greater than that of the grain. Consequently, material properties, such as permeability and viscosity, are posited quantities, constrained only by the agreement of the model and with the observations.

In this and the companion paper, *Simpson et al.* [2008], we present a model for partially molten rock beginning with a grain scale description of the medium. We assume both phases are incompressible, with linearly viscous rheologies. Each is thus governed by the Stokes equations, and the two phases are coupled at their interface. We coarsen this into macroscopic effective equations using the methods of homogenization theory; for an introduction to the subject, see *Bensoussan et al.* [1978]; *Sanchez-Palencia* [1980]; *Hornung* [1997]; *Cioranescu and Donato* [1999]; *Pavliotis and Stuart* [2008]; *Torquato* [2002].

Our strategy has several advantages. Among them, it clarifies the relationship between an idealized grain scale rheology and the large scale rheology. It also yields systems of differential equations whose solutions are the bulk viscosity, shear viscosity, and permeability

of the medium. Indeed, though permeability and bulk viscosity are undefined at the grain scale, they naturally emerge through homogenization. Lastly, the methods presented are naturally adaptable to other fine scale rheologies and physics.

Our main result is that, in a certain parameter regime, we systematically derive a model in good agreement with *McKenzie* [1984], whose model is henceforth referred to as M84. In our companion paper, we computationally estimate relationships between the effective viscosities the permeability and the porosity. In particular, we conclude that the effective bulk viscosity of the medium is inversely proportional to the porosity.

An outline is as follows. In Section 2, we will review models of partial molten rock. Our work is presented in Section 3. In particular, our macroscopic equations are given in Section 3.4. We then offer some comparisons and remarks in Section 4. In the companion paper, we numerically explore how macroscopic material parameters, such permeability and bulk viscosity, depend on the porosity. Finally, we synthesize these computations with the homogenized equations.

2. Deformable Porous Flow Models: a Review

In deformable porous flow models of partially molten rock, the rock is assumed to have already undergone partial melting. This generates both magma and a residual porous rock through which the melt can flow. The remaining porous rock is often referred to as the matrix. Like the mantle, the matrix deforms viscously in response to body forces. Unlike the mantle, the melt and the matrix act on one another via surface stresses; this couples the two phases. A depiction of the two dimensional cross-section of such a medium appears in Figure 1.

Let us review some of the previous models for later comparison with our work. These earlier attempts all pose the problem on a sufficiently large length scale that properties such as porosity and permeability are well defined. The notation of this section is summarized in Table 1. *Although the matrix is viscous, we will often refer to it as the solid phase, using s subscripts and superscripts to signify field variables associated with it. The melt is referred to as the fluid, and its field variables appear with f subscripts and superscripts.*

We first derive equations for conservation of mass. The density of the melt is ρ_f and the density of the matrix is ρ_s . To determine the mass per unit volume of the mixture, the densities must be multiplied by the appropriate volume fraction – ϕ for the melt and $1 - \phi$ for the matrix. The equations for conservation of mass are thus:

$$\partial_t (\rho_f \phi) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_f \phi \mathbf{v}^f) = \Gamma \quad (1a)$$

$$\partial_t [\rho_s (1 - \phi)] + \nabla \cdot [\rho_s (1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^s] = -\Gamma \quad (1b)$$

Γ is a mass transfer term that captures thermodynamics. *Bercovici et al. [2001a, b]; Bercovici and Ricard [2003]; Bercovici [2003]; Bercovici and Ricard [2005]; Bercovici [2007]; Hier-Majumder et al. [2006]; Ricard et al. [2001]; Ricard and Bercovici [2003]; Ricard [2007]* omit it. We also ignore mass transfer, focusing our attention on the problem of mechanical deformation.

Turning to momentum, at the pore scale, the Reynolds number for the melt is small, $\lesssim O(10^{-5})$. In the matrix, it is even smaller, perhaps as low as $O(10^{-30})$. Given these estimates, using data from Table 1, we drop the inertial and advective terms from the conservation of momentum equations of both phases. Thus, the forces on both phases instantaneously balance, and all time dependence is due to changes in the material parameter ϕ and its relation to the constitutive relations.

The divergence of stress on each phase balances against gravity and an interphase force.

In their most general form, the momentum balance equations are:

$$\phi \rho_f \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{I}^f + \nabla \cdot (\phi \sigma^f) = 0 \quad (2a)$$

$$(1 - \phi) \rho_s \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{I}^s + \nabla \cdot [(1 - \phi) \sigma^s] = 0 \quad (2b)$$

78 Constitutive relations for the stresses and the interphase forces must be selected; M84 and
 79 the models from *Bercovici et al.* [2001a, b]; *Bercovici and Ricard* [2003]; *Bercovici* [2003];
 80 *Bercovici and Ricard* [2005]; *Bercovici* [2007]; *Hier-Majumder et al.* [2006]; *Ricard et al.*
 81 [2001]; *Ricard and Bercovici* [2003]; *Ricard* [2007] diverge here. The model in *Fowler*
 82 [1985, 1989] is different. Rather than formulate an exclusively mechanical closure and
 83 subsequently coupling it to thermodynamics, a thermodynamic closure is introduced. As
 84 we are interested in the mechanical problem, we will not further explore Fowler's model.

2.1. McKenzie Models

In M84, no surface tension or other stress discontinuity between phases appears; the interphase forces are equal and opposite,

$$\mathbf{I}^f = -\mathbf{I}^s = \mathbf{I}. \quad (3)$$

Applying the principle of frame indifference (see *Drew and Segel* [1971]; *Drew and Passman* [1999]; *Drew* [1983, 1971]; *Homsy et al.* [1980]), a particularly simple force is

$$\mathbf{I} = C_1 \Delta \mathbf{v} + p \nabla \phi \quad (4)$$

The symmetry, with respect to phases, is now broken. The fluid pressure is assumed to dominate its viscous stresses, while the matrix is given the macroscopic rheology of a

linear compressible fluid

$$\sigma^f = -pI \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^s &= -pI + \zeta_s \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s I \\ &+ \mu_s \left(\nabla \mathbf{v}^s + (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s)^T - \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s I \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Equations (2a), (3), (4), and (5) imply the first macroscopic equation:

$$\mathbf{v}^f - \mathbf{v}^s = -\frac{\phi}{C_1} \nabla (p + \rho^f g z) \quad (7)$$

In the limit of a rigid matrix, $\mathbf{v}^s = 0$, (7) reduces to Darcy's Law provided

$$C_1 = \frac{\mu_f \phi^2}{K} \quad (8)$$

85 A desire to recover Darcy's law motivated the choices of (4) and (8).

Combining (6) with (4) and (8), we obtain the second macroscopic equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &[(1 - \phi)\rho^s + \phi\rho^f] \mathbf{g} - \nabla p \\ &+ \nabla \left[(1 - \phi) \left(\zeta_s - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s \right] \\ &+ \nabla \cdot \left[(1 - \phi) \mu_s \left(\nabla \mathbf{v}^s + (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s)^T \right) \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

86 In many derivations, $(1 - \phi)\zeta_s$ and $(1 - \phi)\mu_s$ are written as ζ'_s and μ'_s . We retain the
87 explicit dependence to more easily compare this formulation with other models, including
88 our own.

This is almost a closed set of equations for porosity, pressure, and velocity:

$$\partial_t (\rho_f \phi) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_f \phi \mathbf{v}^f) = \Gamma \quad (10a)$$

$$\partial_t [\rho_s (1 - \phi)] + \nabla \cdot [\rho_s (1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^s] = -\Gamma \quad (10b)$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{v}^f - \mathbf{v}^s) = -\frac{K}{\mu_f} (\nabla p - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (10c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla p + \nabla \cdot \left[(1 - \phi) \mu_s \left(\nabla \mathbf{v}^s + (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s)^T \right) \right] \\ &+ \nabla \left[(1 - \phi) \left(\zeta_s - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s \right] \end{aligned} \quad (10d)$$

Γ , K , μ_s , and ζ_s remain to be specified. Permeability should depend on porosity. The viscosities may be functions of both porosity and velocities. Related and derivative versions of (10a – 10d) appear in *Scott and Stevenson* [1984, 1986]; *Scott* [1988]; *Stevenson and Scott* [1991]; *Spiegelman* [1993a, b]; *Katz et al.* [2007]; *Spiegelman et al.* [2007].

2.2. Bercovici et al. Models

One shortcoming of M84 is that it captures only one macroscopic metric of the microscopic structure, the porosity. Forces depending on interfacial area may be poorly captured, if at all. The models in *Bercovici et al.* [2001a, b]; *Ricard et al.* [2001]; *Hier-Majumder et al.* [2006]; *Bercovici and Ricard* [2005, 2003]; *Ricard and Bercovici* [2003]; *Ricard* [2007] attempt to rectify this. Additional notation needed for these models is given in Table 2.

The main differences between M84 and the Bercovici models come from the choices of constitutive relations and interphase forces. In the Bercovici models, each phase has stress

$$\sigma = -pI + \tau \quad (11)$$

and

$$\tau = \mu \left[\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T - \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} I \right]. \quad (12)$$

There are now *two* pressures, p^f and p^s . The introduction of the second pressure requires an additional equation. This is similar to the models in *Scott and Stevenson* [1984, 1986]; *Scott* [1988]; *Stevenson and Scott* [1991], though they immediately assume a relation between p^f and p^s , rendering the system nearly equivalent to M84.

As noted, this model introduces surface physics with effective surface tension, κ , and interfacial area, α . These appear in the interphase forces:

$$\mathbf{I}^f = \mathbf{J} + \phi \nabla (\kappa \alpha) \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{I}^s = -\mathbf{J} + (1 - \phi) \nabla (\kappa \alpha) \quad (14)$$

\mathbf{J} , the equal and opposite part of the interphase force remains to be specified. Instead of making α an independent variable, Bercovici and collaborators relate it to the porosity,

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 \phi^a (1 - \phi)^b. \quad (15)$$

103 a and b are between zero and one.

These models generalize and symmetrize (4) in constructing \mathbf{J} , using a weighted average of the pressures;

$$\mathbf{J} = C_2 \Delta \mathbf{v} + [(1 - \omega)p^f + \omega p^s] \nabla \phi. \quad (16)$$

ω is another under-constrained variable that will be related to the porosity. C_2 is a symmetrization of C_1 appearing in (8):

$$C_2 = \left[\left(\frac{K(1 - \phi)}{\mu_s(1 - \phi)^2} \right) + \left(\frac{K(\phi)}{\mu_f \phi^2} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

ω also appears in an equation needed due to the second pressure:

$$\Delta p \frac{D_\omega \phi}{Dt} + \kappa \frac{D_\omega \alpha}{Dt} = -C_0 \frac{\mu_s + \mu_f}{\phi(1 - \phi)} \left(\frac{D_\omega \phi}{Dt} \right)^2 + f \Psi. \quad (18)$$

104 Ψ is a damage variable, measuring the deformation of the melt-matrix interface,

105 and f is a partitioning coefficient. Ψ also requires a closure, which we do not discuss. The

106 derivative D_ω/Dt is the total derivative along the characteristic $\mathbf{v}_\omega = \omega \mathbf{v}^f + (1 - \omega) \mathbf{v}^s$.

ω is underdetermined. In earlier publications, *Bercovici et al.* [2001a]; *Ricard et al.* [2001]; *Bercovici et al.* [2001b],

$$\omega = \phi. \quad (19)$$

107 We hereafter refer to models employing (19) as BRS01.

Bercovici and Ricard [2003] and subsequent publications used

$$\omega = \frac{\phi\mu_f}{\phi\mu_f + (1 - \phi)\mu_s}. \quad (20)$$

108 We call models employing (20), BR03. In the limit $\mu_s \rightarrow \mu_f$, (20) becomes (19). By adding
109 the viscosity weighting, ω captures some aspect of the material properties. Furthermore,
110 in an appropriate limit, BR03 is equivalent to M84; we elaborate in Section 2.3.2.

Regardless of the choice ω , the system is:

$$\partial_t \phi + \nabla \cdot (\phi \mathbf{v}^f) = 0 \quad (21a)$$

$$\partial_t (1 - \phi) + \nabla \cdot [(1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^s] = 0 \quad (21b)$$

$$-\phi(\nabla p^f - \mathbf{g}^f) + \nabla \cdot (\phi \tau^f) + C_2 \Delta \mathbf{v} \quad (21c)$$

$$+\omega [\Delta p \nabla \phi + \nabla (\sigma \alpha)] = 0$$

$$-(1 - \phi)(\nabla p^s - \mathbf{g}^s) + \nabla \cdot [(1 - \phi) \tau^s] - C_2 \Delta \mathbf{v} \quad (21d)$$

$$+(1 - \omega) [\Delta p \nabla \phi + \nabla (\sigma \alpha)] = 0$$

$$\Delta p \frac{D_\omega \phi}{Dt} + \sigma \frac{D_\omega \alpha}{Dt} = -C_0 \frac{\mu_s + \mu_f}{\phi(1 - \phi)} \left(\frac{D_\omega \phi}{Dt} \right)^2 + f \Psi \quad (21e)$$

$$(21f)$$

111 Subject to closures for Ψ , α , f , and K , this is a complete system of equations.

112 One of the philosophies behind this formulation is material invariance; the two phases
113 may be exchanged without altering the equations because everything is either symmetric
114 or antisymmetric with respect to phase. We see this in (17), a harmonic mean. This
115 principle seems well motivated for mixtures of similar materials, such as oil and water.

116 However, its applicability to partially molten rock, a true fluid flowing through a creeping
 117 crystalline solid, is uncertain.

2.3. Remarks on Deformable Porous Flow Models

118 2.3.1. Constitutive Relations

119 Several closures are required to complete these models. In M84, there are at least three
 120 material parameters: the permeability, K , the bulk viscosity of the matrix, ζ_s , and the
 121 shear viscosity of the matrix μ_s . In BRS01 and BR03 the permeability must also be
 122 specified, though the shear viscosities are assumed constant. While the bulk viscosity is
 123 absent from these models, ω must now be selected. Mechanisms, such as surface physics
 124 and damage, introduced in the Bercovici models also require closures, though we do not
 125 contemplate them. These closures are more extensively discussed in our companion paper,
 126 *Simpson et al.* [2008].

127 2.3.2. Comparison of Models

To equitably compare the M84, BRS01 and BR03, we make a few simplifications: $\mu_f \ll \mu_s$, $\kappa = 0$, $\Gamma = 0$, and $f = 0$. In BRS01, (21e) simplifies to

$$\Delta p = -C_0 \frac{\mu_s}{\phi(1-\phi)} \nabla \cdot [\phi(1-\phi) \Delta \mathbf{v}] \quad (22)$$

Combining (21a) with (21b),

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s = \nabla \cdot (\phi \Delta \mathbf{v})$$

Using this expression in the force equations, (21c–21d):

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{v}^f - \mathbf{v}^s) = & -\frac{K}{\mu_f} (\nabla p^f + \rho_f g \mathbf{z}) \\ & - \frac{KC_0}{\phi(1-\phi)} \frac{\mu_s}{\mu_f} \nabla \cdot [\phi(1-\phi) \Delta \mathbf{v}] \nabla \phi \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla p^f + \nabla \left[(1-\phi) \left(\frac{C_0 \mu_s}{\phi} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s \right] \\ & + \nabla \cdot [(1-\phi) \mu_s (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s + (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s)^T)] \\ & - \nabla (C_0 \mu_s \nabla \phi \cdot \Delta \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

128 Comparing these to (10c–10d) from M84, we see a significant difference in the appearance
129 of the $\Delta \mathbf{v}$ terms on their right hand sides, alt noted by *Ricard et al.* [2001]. They do agree
130 under the additional assumption that ϕ is constant.

However, in BR03, M84 is recovered, a result from *Bercovici and Ricard* [2003]. Indeed, if $\mu_f \ll \mu_s$, then $\omega \rightarrow 0$; the interphase force and pressure jump condition are:

$$\mathbf{I} = c \Delta \mathbf{v} + \left[\frac{\mu_s(1-\phi)p^f + \mu_f \phi p^s}{\mu_f \phi + \mu_s(1-\phi)} \right] \nabla \phi \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow c \Delta \mathbf{v} + p^f \nabla \phi \\ \Delta p = & -\frac{C_0 \mu_s}{\phi} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

If we identify $C_0 \mu_s / \phi$ with the bulk viscosity, the pressure jump is equivalent to that of SS84. Simplifying (21c–21d) with this weight:

$$\phi(\mathbf{v}^f - \mathbf{v}^s) = -\frac{K(\phi)}{\mu_f} (\nabla p^f - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla p^f + \nabla \left[(1-\phi) \left(\frac{C_0 \mu_s}{\phi} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s \right) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^s \right] \\ & + \nabla \cdot [(1-\phi) \mu_s (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s + (\nabla \mathbf{v}^s)^T)] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

131 The identifications $\zeta_s \equiv C_0 \mu_s / \phi$ and $p \equiv p^f$ recover (10c–10d).

3. A Homogenization Based Model

Magma transport by deformable porous flow has at least two spatial scales. Melting begins at the grain scale of millimeters, while the granular matrix deforms on the kilometer scale. We are interested in the large scale observable deformation; studying the evolution of the medium at the grain scale is impractical. The problem is only tractable by effective medium models, such as those discussed in the preceding section.

A deficiency of those models is their reliance on multiphase flow theory. By itself, multiphase flow theory cannot furnish the needed closures for either analytical or numerical study. Finding constitutive relations for multiphase flow is challenging and no universal solutions exist. However, there are certainly successes, such as dilute disperse flows; see *Drew and Passman* [1999]; *Brennen* [2005].

We feel the applicability of multiphase flow to this material is uncertain. It is a two phase medium where both phases are fully interconnected. Though the matrix deforms viscously, it is a cohesive material, retaining a coherent microstructure.

In this section, we use homogenization theory, particularly its multiple scale expansions, to formulate a model for partially molten rock undergoing viscous deformation. It is in good agreement with previous models, illuminating and clarifying certain details.

The goal of homogenization is to derive macroscopic descriptions of a media with fine scale features by starting with equations valid at that scale. The direct approach makes multiple scale expansions of the dependent variables, letting them depend on all length scales. Orders are then matched, and, under the right conditions, macroscopic equations are systematically deduced. Homogenization has been rigorously treated mathematically; see *Bensoussan et al.* [1978]; *Jikov et al.* [1994]; *Cioranescu and Donato* [1999]; *Cioranescu*

and Saint Jean Paulin [1999]; Hornung [1997]; Sanchez-Palencia [1980]; Torquato [2002];
 Chechkin et al. [2007]; Pavliotis and Stuart [2008].

In the present work, we adapt studies of sintering and partially molten metal alloys,
 Auriault et al. [1992]; Geindreau and Auriault [1999]. In the latter paper, both the “solid”
 and liquid are viscous and incompressible. The solid has a nonlinear, strain-rate dependent
 viscosity. We work in the linear case for magma, a novel application.

The linearity assumption reduces our model to two Stokes systems, coupled by their
 common boundary; this is presented in Section 3.2. The results for partially molten metals
 are based on earlier work in poro-elastic media, including Auriault [1987, 1991a]; Auriault
 and Boutin [1992]; Mei and Auriault [1989]; Mei et al. [1996]; Auriault and Royer [2002].

3.1. Macroscopic and Microscopic Domains

First, we construct domains for the phases. Denote the macroscopic domain by Ω ,
 with length scale L , containing both the melt and the matrix. Initially, we assume the
 matrix has a periodic structure. A two-dimensional version is pictured in Figure 2. Ω ,
 the bounded grey region, is tiled with fluid inclusions of period ℓ . ℓ is representative of
 the grain scale and is much smaller than L . We define the dimensionless parameter ϵ as

$$\epsilon = \frac{\ell}{L} \quad (29)$$

Let us now introduce the notion of the cell. The cell, appearing in Figure 3, is a scaled,
 dimensionless, copy of the periodic microstructure in Figure 2. A topologically connected
 three-dimensional cell is displayed in Figure 5. Y is intended to be a scaled representative
 elementary volume of the grain scale. It could be a single grain or a small ensemble of
 grains.

169 Of course, a matrix consistent with field samples is not a periodic medium. Pore
 170 structures consistent with a peridotite appear in Figure 4. Since it is crystalline, there
 171 is some regularity, but it is closer to a *random* medium. While only the periodic case is
 172 treated here, the random one is of interest.

Let us define the several subregions of Ω in Figure 2:

$\Omega^{f,\epsilon}$ —The fluid portion of Ω .

$\Omega^{s,\epsilon}$ —The solid portion of Ω .

Γ^ϵ —The interface between fluid and solid in Ω .

173 Although topological connectedness is an important property, the particular microstruc-
 174 ture of Y does not play a significant role in the macroscopic equations. However, cell
 175 geometry does determine the magnitudes of the coefficients appearing in the equations.
 176 We use explicitly defined domains when numerically estimating the coefficients in the
 177 companion paper.

3.2. Exact Equations

Within Ω , we assume both phases satisfy the Stokes equations at the pore scale; each phase is approximated by an incompressible, linearly viscous, fluid. This is similar to the assumptions of the models of Section 2. We write the rheology as

$$\boxed{\sigma = -pI + 2\mu e_X(\mathbf{v})} \quad (30)$$

$e_X(\mathbf{v})$ is the symmetric gradient of velocity \mathbf{v} ,

$$\boxed{e_X(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_X \mathbf{v} + (\nabla_X \mathbf{v})^T)} \quad (31)$$

The subscript X appearing in these expressions denotes the dimensional spatial variable.

We will shortly switch to two dimensionless spatial variables. Components may be referred to by index notation:

$$e_{X,ij}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial X_j} + \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial X_i} \right)$$

$$\sigma_{ij} = -p\delta_{ij} + 2\mu e_{X,ij}(\mathbf{v})$$

178 We denote the stress in Ω_s^ϵ for the solid phase $\sigma^{s,\epsilon}$, with pressure $p^{s,\epsilon}$ and velocity $\mathbf{v}^{s,\epsilon}$.

179 Similarly, the fluid has stress $\sigma^{f,\epsilon}$, pressure $p^{f,\epsilon}$, and velocity $\mathbf{v}^{f,\epsilon}$ in Ω_f^ϵ .

The divergence of the stress within each phase balances body forces. As we are interested in buoyancy driven flow, the body forces $\mathbf{g}^s = -\rho_s g \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{g}^f = -\rho_f g \mathbf{z}$ are included. The force and incompressibility equations are therefore:

$$\nabla_X \cdot \sigma^{s/f,\epsilon} + \mathbf{g}^{s/f} = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{s/f}^\epsilon \quad (32a)$$

$$\nabla_X \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s/f,\epsilon} = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega_{s/f}^\epsilon \quad (32b)$$

Conditions at the interface between fluid and solid, Γ^ϵ , are still needed. As both media are viscous, we posit continuity of velocity and normal stress:

$$\mathbf{v}^{s,\epsilon} = \mathbf{v}^{f,\epsilon}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma^\epsilon \quad (33a)$$

$$\sigma^{s,\epsilon} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma^{f,\epsilon} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma^\epsilon \quad (33b)$$

180 Here, we have made a Boussinesq approximation, in taking the velocities to be continuous,
 181 as opposed to the momenta. These equations are exact in the sense that, subject to
 182 boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$, solving them would give the grain scale dynamics. We seek
 183 effective equations that do not require knowledge of the microscopic configuration.

3.3. Scalings

Our effective equations emerge from multiple scale expansions of the dependent variables. The dimensional spatial variable \mathbf{X} specifies a position within either Ω_s^ϵ or Ω_f^ϵ . We introduce two dimensionless spatial scales, \mathbf{y} , the fast spatial scale, and \mathbf{x} the slow spatial scale.

$$\mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{X}/\ell \quad (34a)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \equiv \mathbf{X}/L = \epsilon \mathbf{y} \quad (34b)$$

We wish to make a multiple scale expansion in all the dependent variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^\epsilon(\mathbf{y}) &= \Phi^{(0)}(\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + \epsilon \Phi^{(1)}(\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) \\ &+ \epsilon^2 \Phi^{(2)}(\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Such an expansion should capture the grain scale detail in the second argument, while permitting slow, macroscopic variations in the first argument. As we take our domain to be periodically tiled with scaled copies of the cell Y , we assume $\Phi^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is \mathbf{y} -periodic at all orders of j . We hope to derive equations that are only functions of \mathbf{x} ; these will be the effective macroscopic equations.

Before making series expansions in powers of ϵ , the equations must be scaled appropriately. In addition to ϵ , there are several other important dimensionless numbers. As motivation, let P^s, P^f, V^s, V^f be characteristic pressures and velocities for the solid and fluid phases. We write:

$$p^{s/f,\epsilon} = P^{s/f} \tilde{p}^{s/f,\epsilon} \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbf{v}^{s/f,\epsilon} = V^{s/f} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s/f,\epsilon} \quad (37)$$

The s/f superscript signifies that we are analogously defining these variables for both phases. The variables with tildes are dimensionless and $O(1)$. Using these definitions, we

non-dimensionalize (32a). On length scale ℓ , these two equations are

$$\nabla_y \cdot \left[-\tilde{p}^{s/f,\epsilon} I + \left(\frac{\mu_{s/f} V^{s/f}}{P^{s/f} \ell} \right) 2\tilde{\mu}_{s/f} e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s/f,\epsilon}) \right] + \frac{\rho_{s/f} g \ell}{P^{s/f}} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^{s/f} = 0 \quad (38)$$

This motivates defining several dimensionless numbers:

$$Q_\ell^{s/f} \equiv \frac{\mu_{s/f} V^{s/f}}{P^{s/f} \ell} \quad (39)$$

$$R_\ell^{s/f} \equiv \frac{\rho_{s/f} g \ell}{P^{s/f}} \quad (40)$$

The Q 's measure the relative magnitudes of the viscous forces and the pressure gradients, while the R 's measure the relative magnitudes of the body forces and the pressure gradients. The $\tilde{\mu}$'s and $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$'s remain in the equations as $O(1)$ constants, reminding us of the viscosity and forcing. Other meaningful parameters are:

$$V \equiv \frac{V^f}{V^s} \quad (41)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \frac{\mu_f}{\mu_s} \quad (42)$$

$$P \equiv \frac{P^f}{P^s} \quad (43)$$

We now estimate these parameters and express them in orders of ϵ . Up till now, the phases have been interchangeable. As will be argued, Q_ℓ^s and Q_ℓ^f are different orders of ϵ ; this breaks material invariance. A quantity Q is said to be $O(\epsilon^p)$ if

$$\epsilon^{p-1} \ll Q \ll \epsilon^{p+1} \quad (44)$$

First, we consider the forces on the matrix. At the macroscopic scale, the melt is $O(1\%)$ of the medium's volume. We thus argue that on this scale, the matrix is “close” to satisfying the Stokes equations; the pressure gradient, viscous forces, and gravity balance one another. On the L length scale, the dimensionless form of (32a) is

$$\nabla_x \cdot \left[-\tilde{p}^s I + \left(\frac{\mu_s V^s}{P^s L} \right) 2\tilde{\mu}_s e_x(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^s) \right] + \frac{\rho_s g L}{P^s} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^s = 0. \quad (45)$$

We define

$$Q_L^s \equiv \frac{\mu_s V^s}{P^s L} \quad (46)$$

$$R_L^s \equiv \frac{\rho_s g L}{P^s} \quad (47)$$

For the terms to be in balance, $Q_L^s = O(1)$ and $R_L^s = O(1)$. Using (46–47) and the definition of ϵ , the fast length scale parameters are:

$$Q_\ell^s = O(\epsilon^{-1}) \quad (48)$$

$$R_\ell^s = O(\epsilon^1) \quad (49)$$

In the absence of direct pressure measurements, we assume the pressures are the same order,

$$P = O(1). \quad (50)$$

An argument for this is given in *Drew* [1983]. Briefly, since the velocities of interest are far less than the speed of sound, it would be difficult to support large pressure gradients across the phases without surface tension. We make an additional assumption that there are $O(1)$ non-hydrostatic pressures in both phases; if $p^\epsilon = p_{\text{hydro}}^\epsilon + p_{\text{non-hydro}}^\epsilon$ then

$$\left| \frac{p^\epsilon}{p_{\text{non-hydro}}^\epsilon} \right| = O(1). \quad (51)$$

In the fluid, since $\rho_f/\rho_s = O(1)$, a consequence of $P = O(1)$ is

$$R_\ell^f = \frac{\rho_f g \ell}{P^f} = \frac{\rho_s g \ell}{P^s} \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_s} \frac{P^s}{P^f} = R_\ell^s \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_s} P = O(\epsilon^1) \quad (52)$$

The fluid's force ratio is

$$Q_\ell^f = \frac{\mu_f V^f}{P^f \ell} = O(P M V Q_\ell^s) = O(\epsilon^{-1} M V) \quad (53)$$

and

$$Q_L^f = M V \quad (54)$$

Using the data in Table 1:

$$\mathcal{M} \approx 10^{-21} - 10^{-14} \quad (55)$$

$$V \approx 10^1 - 10^3 \quad (56)$$

$$\mathcal{M}V \approx 10^{-20} - 10^{-11} \quad (57)$$

$$\epsilon \approx 10^{-7} - 10^{-2} \quad (58)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{M} \approx \epsilon^{11} - \epsilon^2 \quad (59)$$

$$V \approx \epsilon^0 - \epsilon^{-2} \quad (60)$$

$$\mathcal{M}V \approx \epsilon^{10} - \epsilon^1 \quad (61)$$

$$Q_\ell^f \approx \epsilon^9 - \epsilon^0 \quad (62)$$

The choice of dimensionless parameters can lead to one of several outcomes: *biphasic* media, *monophasic* media, and *non-homogenizable* media. This terminology, taken from *Auriault* [1991a, b]; *Geindreau and Auriault* [1999]; *Auriault et al.* [1992], warrants explanation. In the biphasic case, the macroscopic description possesses a distinct velocity field for each phase. In the monophasic case *both* phases have the same velocity field and we have a single, hybrid, material. In both biphasic and monophasic models, there is only one pressure. The non-homogenizable case is explained in Appendix A.

From here on, we assume

$$Q_\ell^f = O\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}V}{\epsilon}\right) = O(\epsilon) \quad (63)$$

This includes two biphasic cases, $(\mathcal{M}, V) = (\epsilon^2, 1)$ and $(\mathcal{M}, V) = (\epsilon^3, \epsilon^{-1})$ and a related monophasic case.

3.4. Main Results

Before proceeding with the expansions, we state our main results. The dependent variables are $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$, the leading order velocity in the matrix, $p^{f(0)}$, the leading order pressure in the melt, and $\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f$, the cell-averaged leading order velocity in the fluid,

$$\boxed{\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{Y^f} \mathbf{v}^{f(0)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}}. \quad (64)$$

Recall Y^f is the portion of the unit cell occupied by fluid.

The following systems of equations are derived in Sections 3.6–3.9. They employ an additional assumption that the cell domain, Y , is invariant under rigid rotations and reflections.

Biphasic-I: In the first biphasic case, $V = 1$ and $\mathcal{M} = \epsilon^2$, the leading order non-dimensional equations are:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \nabla_x \left[\left(\zeta_{\text{eff.}} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s (1 - \phi) \right) \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \right] \\ & + \nabla_x \cdot [2(1 - \phi) \mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})] \end{aligned} \quad (65a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \nabla_x \cdot [2\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})] \\ \langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f - \phi \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = & - \frac{k_{\text{eff.}}}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f) \end{aligned} \quad (65b)$$

$$\nabla_x \cdot [\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f + (1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}] = 0 \quad (65c)$$

$k_{\text{eff.}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{eff.}}$ are scalars and $\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm}$ is a second order tensor. These material properties, defined in terms of microscale “cell problems” have been simplified through the domain symmetries.

Omitting melting and making the identifications

$$\phi \mathbf{v}^f \leftrightarrow \langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f$$

$$\mathbf{v}^s \leftrightarrow \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$$

$$p \leftrightarrow p^{f(0)}$$

in (10a–10d), the resemblance of (65a–65c) to M84 is clear. The permeability K is $k_{\text{eff.}}$,
 and $(1 - \phi)\zeta_s$ is $\zeta_{\text{eff.}}$. One difference is the $\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm}$ tensor. $\eta_{\text{eff.}}$ is a fourth order tensor (since
 each $\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm}$ component is second order) capturing the grain scale anisotropy. Such a term is
 absent from M84, BRS01, BR03, and other earlier models.

Biphasic-II: In the second biphasic case, $V = \epsilon^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \epsilon^3$, the system is:

$$0 = \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \nabla_x \left[\left(\zeta_{\text{eff.}} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s (1 - \phi) \right) \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \right] \\ + \nabla_x \cdot [2(1 - \phi) \mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})] \quad (66a)$$

$$+ \nabla_x \cdot [2\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})] \\ \langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f = -\frac{k_{\text{eff.}}}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (66b)$$

$$\nabla_x \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f = 0 \quad (66c)$$

$\zeta_{\text{eff.}}$, $\eta_{\text{eff.}}$, and $k_{\text{eff.}}$ are as above. The first equation is the same as (65a) from the Biphasic-I
 model. The differences of the other two equations from (65b – 65c) reflect that when the
 fluid velocity is sufficiently greater than the solid velocity, there is decoupling.

Monophasic: In the limit that the melt becomes disconnected, Biphasic-I limits to a
 monophasic system:

$$0 = \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} \quad (67a)$$

$$+ \nabla_x \cdot [2\mu_s (1 - \phi) e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) + 2\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})] \\ \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = 0 \quad (67b)$$

²¹² η_{eff} is as above.

3.5. Expansions

We write (38), along with the dimensionless versions of (32b),(33a) and (33b), as:

$$\nabla_y \cdot [-\tilde{p}^{s,\epsilon} I + 2\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{\mu}_s e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s,\epsilon})] + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^s = 0 \quad (68a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot [-\tilde{p}^{f,\epsilon} I + 2\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{\mu}_f e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon})] + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^f = 0 \quad (68b)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s,\epsilon} = 0 \quad (68c)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon} = 0 \quad (68d)$$

$$[-\tilde{p}^{s,\epsilon} I + 2\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{\mu}_s e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s,\epsilon})] \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (68e)$$

$$= [-\tilde{p}^{f,\epsilon} I + 2\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{\mu}_f e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon})] \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad (68f)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s,\epsilon} = V \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon}$$

We introduce series expansions for $\tilde{p}^{s,\epsilon}$, $\tilde{p}^{f,\epsilon}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{s,\epsilon}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon}$, as in (35), into the equations.

All dependent variables are functions of both \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . Periodicity in \mathbf{y} is imposed.

Derivatives act on both arguments,

$$\boxed{\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} + \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} \quad (69)$$

Divergence, gradient, and strain rate operators become:

$$\nabla_y \cdot \mapsto \nabla_y \cdot + \epsilon \nabla_x \cdot \quad (70a)$$

$$\nabla_y \mapsto \nabla_y + \epsilon \nabla_x \quad (70b)$$

$$e_y \mapsto e_y + \epsilon e_x \quad (70c)$$

We now drop tildes. The strain rate tensors expand into:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s/f,\epsilon}) &\mapsto \epsilon^0 [e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s/f(0)})] \\
&+ \epsilon^1 [e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s/f(0)}) + e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s/f(1)})] \\
&+ \epsilon^2 [e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s/f(1)}) + e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s/f(2)})] + \dots \\
&\equiv \epsilon^0 e^{s/f(0)} + \epsilon^1 e^{s/f(1)} + \epsilon^2 e^{s/f(2)} + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

The stress tensors become:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{s,\epsilon} &\mapsto \epsilon^{-1} [2\mu_s e^{s(0)}] + \epsilon^0 [-p^{s(0)} I + 2\mu_s e^{s(1)}] \\
&+ \epsilon^1 [-p^{s(1)} I + 2\mu_s e^{s(2)}] + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{72a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\equiv \epsilon^{-1} \sigma^{s(-1)} + \epsilon^0 \sigma^{s(0)} + \epsilon^1 \sigma^{s(1)} + \dots \\
\sigma^{f,\epsilon} &\mapsto \epsilon^0 [-p^{f(0)} I] + \epsilon^1 [-p^{f(1)} I + 2\mu_f e^{f(0)}] \\
&+ \epsilon^2 [-p^{f(2)} I + 2\mu_f e^{f(1)}] + \dots \\
&\equiv \sigma^{f(0)} + \epsilon^1 \sigma^{f(1)} + \epsilon^2 \sigma^{f(2)} + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{72b}$$

Matching orders of (72a) and (72b) in (68a) and (68b)

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{-1} \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(-1)} + \epsilon^0 (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(-1)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(0)}) \\
+ \epsilon^1 (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(1)} + \mathbf{g}^s)
\end{aligned} \tag{73a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \dots = 0 \\
\epsilon^0 \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} + \epsilon^1 (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} + \mathbf{g}^f) \\
+ \epsilon^2 (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(2)})
\end{aligned} \tag{73b}$$

$$+ \dots = 0$$

Substituting the expansions into (68c–68d), the incompressibility equations are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^0 \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s/f(0)} + \epsilon^1 (\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s/f(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s/f(1)}) \\
+ \dots = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

The leading order of (74), $\nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s/f(0)} = 0$, reflects that at the fine scale both phases are incompressible. (68e) is

$$\epsilon^{-1} \sigma^{s(-1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \epsilon^0 (\sigma^{s(0)} - \sigma^{f(0)}) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \dots = 0. \tag{75}$$

When $V = O(1)$, the velocity boundary condition is

$$\epsilon^0(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)} - \mathbf{v}^{f(0)}) + \epsilon^1(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)} - \mathbf{v}^{f(1)}) + \dots = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (76)$$

In this case, the velocities couple at all orders. If instead $V = O(\epsilon^{-1})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{-1}\mathbf{v}^{f(0)} + \epsilon^0(\mathbf{v}^{f(1)} - \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \\ + \epsilon^1(\mathbf{v}^{f(2)} - \mathbf{v}^{s(1)}) + \dots = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

213 In contrast to the $V = O(1)$ case, the leading order fluid velocity is independent of the
214 solid, and there is subsequent cross coupling across orders.

These expansions can be written as a hierarchy of systems to be solved successively:

$$O(\epsilon^n) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(n)} + \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(n-1)} \quad (78a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \delta_{n,1} \mathbf{g}^s = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \\ O(\epsilon^{n+1}) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(n)} + \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(n-1)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \end{aligned} \quad (78b)$$

$$O(\epsilon^n) : \quad \sigma^{s(n)} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma^{f(n)} \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (78c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{s(n)} &\equiv -p^{s(n)} I \\ &+ 2\mu_s [e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(n)}) + e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(n+1)})] \end{aligned} \quad (78d)$$

Treating $\sigma^{s(n-1)}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{s(n-1)}$ as known, the equations can be interpreted as an inhomogeneous Stokes system for $\mathbf{v}^{s(n)}$ and $p^{s(n)}$. A necessary condition for this system to be solvable at order n is

$$\int_{\Gamma} \sigma^{f(n)} \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = - \int_{Y^s} (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(n-1)} + \delta_{n,1} \mathbf{g}^s) d\mathbf{y} \quad (79)$$

215 The enforcement of (79) maintains the separation of scales and steers us to the macroscopic
216 system. Physically, this insists that the surface stresses of the fluid on the solid be
217 compatible with the body forces felt by the solid.

The corresponding hierarchy of equations in the fluid is:

$$O(\epsilon^n) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(n)} + \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(n-1)} + \delta_{n,1} \mathbf{g}^f = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (80a)$$

$$O(\epsilon^{n+1}) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(n)} + \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(n-1)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (80b)$$

$$O(\epsilon^n) : \quad \mathbf{v}^{f(n)} = V^{-1} \mathbf{v}^{s(n)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (80c)$$

$$\sigma^{f(n)} \equiv -p^{f(n)} I + 2\mu_f (e_y(\mathbf{v}^{f(n-1)}) + e_x(\mathbf{v}^{f(n-2)})) \quad (80d)$$

The solvability condition is

$$\int_{Y^f} \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(n)} d\mathbf{y} = - \int_{\Gamma} (\delta_{V,1} \mathbf{v}^{s(n)} + \delta_{V,\epsilon} \mathbf{v}^{s(n-1)}) \cdot \mathbf{n} dS \quad (81)$$

218 This equation mandates that the flow of the solid at the boundary balance the dilation
219 or compaction of the fluid.

3.6. Leading Order Equations

The leading order equations are the same in all of our parameter regimes. From (78a), (78b), (78c), and (80a), the leading order equations are:

$$O(\epsilon^{-1}) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(-1)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (82a)$$

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (82b)$$

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (82c)$$

$$O(\epsilon^{-1}) : \quad \sigma^{s(-1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (82d)$$

Using (78d) and (80d), the stresses are

$$\sigma^{s(-1)} = 2\mu_s e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})$$

$$\sigma^{f(0)} = -p^{f(0)} I$$

Multiplying (82a) by $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ and integrating by parts over Y^s ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{Y^s} \partial_{y_j} v_i^{s(0)} \sigma_{ij}^{s(-1)} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\Gamma} v_i^{s(0)} \sigma_{ij}^{s(-1)} n_j dS - 2\mu_s \int_{Y^s} |e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})|^2 d\mathbf{y} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Applying the boundary condition (82d), we obtain

$$\int_{Y^s} |e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})|^2 d\mathbf{y} = 0.$$

This implies that $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ is constant in \mathbf{y} ,

$$\mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (83)$$

$\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ automatically satisfies (82c). Turning to (82b),

$$\nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} = \nabla_y \cdot (-p^{f(0)} I) = -\nabla_y p^{f(0)} = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$p^{f(0)} = p^{f(0)}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (84)$$

3.7. Successive Orders in the Solid Phase

At the next order in (78a–78c),

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (85a)$$

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (85b)$$

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad \sigma^{s(0)} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma^{f(0)} \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (85c)$$

From (78d),

$$\sigma^{s(0)} \equiv -p^{s(0)} I + 2\mu_s (e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)}) + e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}))$$

Condition (79) is satisfied because $p^{f(0)} = p^{f(0)}(\mathbf{x})$ yielding

$$\int_{\Gamma} (-p^{f(0)} I) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0.$$

It is helpful to define $q = p^{s(0)} - p^{f(0)}$. $\mathbf{v}^{s(1)}$ and q solve

$$\nabla_y \cdot (-qI + 2\mu_s e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)})) = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (86a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} = -\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (86b)$$

$$(-qI + 2\mu_s e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)})) \cdot \mathbf{n} = (-2\mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)})) \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (86c)$$

We treat the two inhomogeneous terms, $\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ in (86b) and $2\mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$ in (86c), independently by linearity. The complete solution is:

$$\mathbf{v}^{s(1)} = 2e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \bar{\chi}^{lm} \quad (87)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - (\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \bar{\xi} \\ q = p^{s(0)} - p^{f(0)} = & 2\mu_s e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \pi^{lm} \\ & - \mu_s (\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \zeta \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

$\bar{\chi}^{lm}$, π^{lm} , $\bar{\xi}$, and ζ are defined in the next two subsections.

(88) is interesting for two reasons. First, it agrees with models that permit the pressures to be unequal, as in *Scott and Stevenson* [1984, 1986]; *Scott* [1988]; *Stevenson and Scott* [1991]; *Bercovici et al.* [2001a, b]; *Ricard et al.* [2001]; *Hier-Majumder et al.* [2006]; *Bercovici and Ricard* [2005, 2003]; *Ricard and Bercovici* [2003]; *Ricard* [2007]. Second, it captures that part of any pressure jump is due to the macroscopic compaction of the matrix. Such a relation was also discussed in *Spiegelman et al.* [2007]; *Katz et al.* [2007].

We now formulate cell problems, boundary value problems on Y^s . Cell problems may be interpreted as the response of the medium to forcing from a particular source term. The variables $\bar{\chi}^{lm}$, π^{lm} , $\bar{\xi}$, and ζ in (87) and (88) are the solutions of these problems.

3.7.1. Surface Stresses on Solid

This problem tackles the boundary stress in (86c). Let $\bar{\chi}^{lm}$, π^{lm} be \mathbf{y} periodic functions solving

$$\nabla_y \cdot (-\pi^{lm} I + 2e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm})) = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (89a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \bar{\chi}^{lm} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (89b)$$

$$(-\pi^{lm} \delta_{ij} + 2e_{y,ij}(\bar{\chi}^{lm})) n_j = -\frac{1}{2} (\delta_{il} \delta_{jm} + \delta_{im} \delta_{jl}) n_j \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (89c)$$

Because of the tensor on the right hand side of (89c), operating on \mathbf{n} , is symmetric, the solution to problem (l, m) is the same as the solution for problem (m, l) .

3.7.2. Dilation Stress on Solid

This addresses the term $\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ in (86b). This is a less common Stokes problem, with a prescribed function in the divergence equation. Such problems are briefly discussed in *Temam* [2001]. Let $\bar{\xi}$, ζ be \mathbf{y} periodic functions solving

$$\nabla_y \cdot (-\zeta I + 2e_y(\bar{\xi})) = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (90a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \bar{\xi} = 1 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (90b)$$

$$(-\zeta I + 2e_y(\bar{\xi})) \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (90c)$$

3.8. Macroscopic Force Balance in the Matrix

At the next order of (78a–78c), the equations are:

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{s(1)} + \mathbf{g}^s = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (91a)$$

$$O(\epsilon^2) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} + \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(2)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^s \quad (91b)$$

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \sigma^{s(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma^{f(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (91c)$$

And $\sigma^{s(1)}$ is given by (78d),

$$\sigma^{s(1)} = -p^{s(1)} + 2\mu_s [e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)}) + e_y(\mathbf{v}^{v(2)})] \quad (92)$$

Checking condition (79),

$$\int_{\Gamma} \sigma^{f(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = - \int_{Y^s} (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} + \mathbf{g}^s) d\mathbf{y} \quad (93)$$

By (91c) $\sigma^{s(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sigma^{f(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ on Γ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Y^s} (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} + \mathbf{g}^s) d\mathbf{y} &= - \int_{\Gamma} \sigma^{f(1)} \cdot \mathbf{n} dS \\ &= \int_{Y^f} \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} d\mathbf{y} \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Appealing to (73b), $\nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} = -\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f$ in Y^f , hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{Y^s} (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)}) d\mathbf{y} + \int_{Y^f} (\nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)}) d\mathbf{y} \\ + (1 - \phi) \mathbf{g}^s + \phi \mathbf{g}^f = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Commuting the integration and divergence operators,

$$\begin{aligned} - \nabla_x [\langle p^{s(0)} \rangle_s + \langle p^{f(0)} \rangle_f] \\ + 2\mu_s \nabla_x \cdot [\langle e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \rangle_s + \langle e_y(\mathbf{v}^{s(1)}) \rangle_s] \\ + \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

If we substitute (87) and (88) for $p^{s(0)}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{s(1)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} \\ &\quad - \nabla_x \{ 2\mu_s e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \langle \pi^{lm} \rangle_s - \mu_s \langle \zeta \rangle_s \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \} \\ &\quad + 2\mu_s \nabla_x \cdot \{ (1 - \phi) e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) + 2e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm}) \rangle_s \} \\ &\quad - 2\mu_s \nabla_x \cdot \{ \langle e_y(\bar{\xi}) \rangle_s \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \} \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

234 We now have an equation for $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ and $p^{f(0)}$, both functions of \mathbf{x} . Multiplying this equation

235 by P^s/L restores dimensions.

236 *Note we did not solve (91a–91c)!* (97) is merely the equation that must be satisfied for

237 (91a–91c) to have a solution.

3.9. Macroscopic Force Balance in the Fluid: Biphasic and Monophasic Regimes

(97) includes two unknowns, $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ and $p^{f(0)}$. Another equation is needed to close the system. Returning to (80a – 80d), the fluid equations at the next order are

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} + \mathbf{g}^f = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (98)$$

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (99)$$

with stress

$$\sigma^{f(1)} = -p^{f(1)} I + 2\mu_f e_y(\mathbf{v}^{f(0)})$$

and either

$$\mathbf{v}^{f(0)} = \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (100)$$

or

$$\mathbf{v}^{f(0)} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (101)$$

depending on V .

Recall the terms biphasic and monophasic from Section 3.3. In the two biphasic cases, the effective macroscopic description includes a velocity for each phase. Only the solid phase's velocity field appears in the monophasic case. In all cases, only $p^{f(0)}$ appears in our equations.

3.9.1. Biphasic-I: Equal Velocities at the Interface

We now consider the case $V = O(1)$ and $\mathcal{M} = O(\epsilon^2)$, leading to boundary condition (100). Letting $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} - \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ in (98 – 99), \mathbf{w} and $p^{s(1)}$ solve

$$-\nabla_y p^{f(1)} + \mu_f \nabla_y^2 \mathbf{w} = \nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (102a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (102b)$$

$$\mathbf{w} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (102c)$$

244 The terms on the right hand side of (102a) drive an incompressible Stokes system with
 245 homogeneous boundary conditions. This is the classic homogenization problem of flow
 246 in porous media, leading to Darcy's Law; see *Hornung* [1997]; *Torquato* [2002]; *Chechkin*
 247 *et al.* [2007]; *Bensoussan et al.* [1978]; *Sanchez-Palencia* [1980].

Compatibility condition (81) is trivially satisfied since $\mathbf{w}|_\Gamma = 0$,

$$0 = \int_{Y^f} (\nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{w}) d\mathbf{y} = \int_\Gamma \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = 0.$$

Again, we solve via cell problems. Let q_i, \mathbf{k}^i be \mathbf{y} periodic functions solving:

$$-\nabla_y q^i + \nabla_y^2 \mathbf{k}^i = -\mathbf{e}_i \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (103a)$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{k}^i = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (103b)$$

$$\mathbf{k}^i = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (103c)$$

\mathbf{e}_i is the unit vector in the i -th direction. Using these functions,

$$\mathbf{w} = -\frac{1}{\mu_f} \mathbf{k}^i \left(\partial_{x_i} p^{f(0)} + g_i^f \right) \quad (104)$$

$$p^{f(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = -q^i \left(\partial_{x_i} p^{f(0)} - g_i^f \right) \quad (105)$$

Averaging over Y^f , we get another macroscopic equation,

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f - \phi \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = -\frac{\langle k \rangle_f}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (106)$$

k is the matrix

$$k = [\mathbf{k}^1 \quad \mathbf{k}^2 \quad \mathbf{k}^3] \quad (107)$$

and

$$\langle k \rangle_f = [\int_{Y^f} \mathbf{k}^1 d\mathbf{y} \quad \int_{Y^f} \mathbf{k}^2 d\mathbf{y} \quad \int_{Y^f} \mathbf{k}^3 d\mathbf{y}] \quad (108)$$

While the leading order solid velocity is \mathbf{y} -independent, the leading order fluid velocity remains sensitive to the fine scale. For a macroscopic description, it can only be defined as an average flux; this is the Darcy velocity of the fluid.

This is not yet a closed system. Advancing to the next order of (80a – 80c), we have

$$O(\epsilon^2) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(1)} + \nabla_y \cdot \sigma^{f(2)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (109)$$

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} + \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(1)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (110)$$

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad \mathbf{v}^{f(1)} = \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (111)$$

The solution must satisfy (81),

$$\int_{Y^f} \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} = - \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = 0 \quad (112)$$

Combining this with (85b), we get

$$\nabla_x \cdot [\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f + (1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}] = 0 \quad (113)$$

This is the volume compatibility condition. (97), (106), and (113) form a closed system.

Dimensions may be restored to (106) by multiplying by V^f and (113) by V^f/L ; a factor of ℓ^2 will appear in front of $\langle k \rangle_f$, as expected.

3.9.2. Biphasic-II: Unequal Velocities at the Interface

If $V = O(\epsilon^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{M} = O(\epsilon^3)$, then (101) applies. Following the scheme of the previous section, the macroscopic equations are

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f = - \frac{\langle k \rangle_f}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (114)$$

$$\nabla_x \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f = 0. \quad (115)$$

Multiplying (114) by V^f and (115) by V^f/L restores the dimensions of these equations.

3.9.3. Monophasic: Magma Bubbles

Lastly we consider a different kind of physical regime. As in Biphasic-I, we take $V = O(1)$ and $\mathcal{M} = O(\epsilon^2)$. However, we now assume that the fluid is not topologically connected. At the cell geometry, this corresponds to $\partial Y^f = \Gamma$. The equations are the same at all orders of ϵ as those appearing in Section 3.9.1.

Under this assumption on ∂Y^f , the permeability cell problems, (103a–103c), have trivial solutions. $\mathbf{k}^i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, so $\langle k \rangle_f = 0$. Because the melt is trapped it must migrate with the matrix,

$$\mathbf{v}^{f(0)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (116)$$

Combining (116) with (113), recovers the incompressibility of the matrix,

$$\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = 0 \quad (117)$$

Dropping the divergence terms from (97) completes the system:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \nabla_x [2\mu_s e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \langle \pi^{lm} \rangle_s] \\ & + 2\mu_s \nabla_x \cdot [(1 - \phi) e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) + 2e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm}) \rangle_s] \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

This is a homogenized Stokes system for a fluid with very low viscosity inclusions.

3.10. Symmetry Simplifications

The macroscopic equations can be simplified if we assume that the cell geometry is symmetric with respect to both reflections about the principal axes and rigid rotations. Under these two assumptions, (106) and (114) are

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f - \phi \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = -\frac{k_{\text{eff.}}}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (119)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f = -\frac{k_{\text{eff.}}}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} - \mathbf{g}^f) \quad (120)$$

(97) becomes

$$0 = \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \nabla_x \left[\left(\zeta_{\text{eff.}} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s (1 - \phi) \right) \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \right] + \nabla_x \cdot \left[2(1 - \phi) \mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) + 2\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \right] \quad (121)$$

$k_{\text{eff.}}$, $\zeta_{\text{eff.}}$, and $\eta_{\text{eff.}}$ are defined in terms of the solutions of the cell problems:

$$k_{\text{eff.}} = \langle k_1^1 \rangle_f \quad (122)$$

$$\zeta_{\text{eff.}} = \mu_s \langle \zeta \rangle_s - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s (1 - \phi) \quad (123)$$

$$\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} = 2\mu_s \langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm}) \rangle_s \quad (124)$$

$\eta_{\text{eff.}}$ is a fourth order tensor. It is a supplementary viscosity, capturing the grain scale anisotropy modeled by the cell domain. With these symmetry reductions, there are now only four material parameters to be solved for: $\langle k_1^1 \rangle_f$, $\langle e_{y,11}(\bar{\chi}^{11}) \rangle_s$, $\langle e_{y,12}(\bar{\chi}^{12}) \rangle_s$, and $\langle \zeta \rangle_s$. Additional details of the symmetry simplifications may be found in Appendix B.

4. Discussion

We have successfully derived three models for partial melts using homogenization. We now consider them further, discuss their weaknesses, and compare them with the models of Section 2.

4.1. Remarks on Homogenization Models

The differences amongst the three models of Section 3.4 arise from the assumptions on two dimensionless numbers, V and \mathcal{M} , and the topological connectedness of the medium. All three rely on the additional assumptions that $Q_\ell^f = O(\epsilon)$ and $P = O(1)$. It is helpful

to write the three models as a unified set of equations:

$$0 = \bar{\rho} \mathbf{g} - \nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \nabla_x \left[\left(\zeta_{\text{eff.}} - \frac{2}{3} \mu_s (1 - \phi) \right) \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} \right] \quad (125a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \nabla_x \cdot \left[2(1 - \phi) \mu_s e_x(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) + 2\eta_{\text{eff.}}^{lm} e_{x,lm}(\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}) \right] \\ &\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f - V^{-1} \phi \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = -\frac{k_{\text{eff.}}}{\mu_f} (\nabla_x p^{f(0)} + \mathbf{g}^f) \end{aligned} \quad (125b)$$

$$\nabla_x \cdot [\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f + V^{-1} (1 - \phi) \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}] = 0 \quad (125c)$$

As V varies from $O(\epsilon^0)$ to $O(\epsilon^{-1})$, we transition between Biphasic-I and Biphasic-II. Letting the pore network disconnect, $k_{\text{eff.}} \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, $\langle \mathbf{v}^{f(0)} \rangle_f \rightarrow V^{-1} \phi \mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ in (125b). This recovers macroscopic incompressibility in (125c), $\nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} = 0$. The divergence terms also drop from the matrix force balance equation. Making analytical sense of the transition between the connected and disconnected pore network is an important open problem. It is also interesting that the scalings do not fully describe the macroscopic equations; the connectivity of the medium is also key.

We return to our motivating problem, partially molten rock in the asthenosphere. For a given ϵ , the parameters V and \mathcal{M} include a range where a macroscopic description is possible; see Section 3.3. We lose our ability to homogenize when either $\mathcal{M}V \gg \epsilon^2$ or $\mathcal{M}V \ll \epsilon^2$. There may be interesting transitions here. That the two parameters must be related by $\mathcal{M}V = O(\epsilon^2)$ would seem an impediment; however, this constraint has a another interpretation.

The condition on $\mathcal{M}V$ stipulates that the length scales, viscosities, and velocities, be related by

$$L = \ell \sqrt{\frac{\mu_s}{\mu_f} \frac{V^s}{V^f}} \quad (126)$$

This also assumes $P = O(1)$. This can be reinterpreted as the macroscopic length scale on which, given the viscosities and characteristic velocities of a partially molten mix we

should *expect* a biphasic, viscously deformable, porous media. Based on our estimates on the viscosities, velocities, and grain scale in Table 1,

$$L \approx 10^{-1} - 10^5 \text{ km} \quad (127)$$

(126) differs from the compaction length of M84,

$$\delta_{\text{M84}} = \sqrt{\frac{K(1 - \phi)(\zeta_s + \frac{4}{3}\mu_s)}{\mu_f}} \quad (128)$$

δ_{M84} is porosity dependent through the permeability and the viscosities, making it dynamically and spatially varying. However, L is not a substitute for δ_{M84} ; such a subsidiary length scale may also appear. Under the assumption that $V = O(1)$, (126) bears resemblance to the compaction length of BRS01. From *Ricard et al.* [2001],

$$\delta_{\text{BRS01}} = \sqrt{\frac{K_0\mu_s}{\mu_f}} \quad (129)$$

K_0 is the prefactor in the permeability relationship $K = K_0\phi^2$ and $K_0 \propto \ell^2$.

4.2. Weaknesses of Homogenization

If the cell domains of Section 3 are independent of \mathbf{x} , then the porosity is constant:

$$\phi = \int_{Y^f} 1 d\mathbf{y}$$

However, a perfectly periodic microstructure is unrealistic. Additionally, once motion beings, the interface moves, likely breaking the periodic structure. If the domains do have \mathbf{x} dependence, $Y^f = Y^f(\mathbf{x})$, then we can have $\phi = \phi(\mathbf{x})$. This introduces difficulties in (91a), as additional terms for gradients with respect to the domain should now appear. See Appendix C for details.

A similar omission has been made in the poro-elastic literature; see *Lee and Mei* [1997a, b, c]; *Lee* [2004] for a discussion. As the elastic matrix deforms, the interface

moves, changing the cell geometry. Earlier work *Auriault* [1991a]; *Hornung* [1997]; *Mei*
and Auriault [1989] implicitly assumed that this deformation was small compared to the
 grain scale and could be ignored. This also bedevils the sintering and metallurgy papers
Auriault et al. [1992] and *Geindreau and Auriault* [1999].

Despite this obstacle, our equations are still of utility, and we offer several interpreta-
 tions. The first is that they are a macroscopic description of a constant porosity piece of
 material. Such a description has not been rigorously derived before for partially molten
 rock and thus interesting. It also acts as a tool for examining models that purport to
 permit variable porosity. Taking ϕ to be instantaneously uniform, such a model should
 reduce to our equations. Under the assumptions discussed in Section 2.3.2, M84, BRS01
 and BR03 satisfy this criterion, up to the η_{eff} term. The η_{eff} term highlights the omission
 of grain scale geometry from these current models.

Another interpretation is that our models are valid when porosity varies sufficiently
 slowly. Under such an assumption, the omitted terms would be higher order in ϵ and
 could be justifiably dropped. There is a certain appeal to this; it would not make sense
 to discuss the homogenization of a material in which there were tremendous contrasts in
 the porosity over short length scales. Moreover, the typical porosity is $O(1\%)$, so that if
 the porosity parameter were also scaled, these terms may indeed be small.

Our final interpretation is that the equations are part of a hierarchical model for partial
 melts. If we ignore melting and assume constant densities, conservation of mass can be
 expressed as

$$\partial_t (1 - \phi) + \nabla_x \cdot [(1 - \phi)\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}] = 0 \quad (130)$$

We might then assume that the grain matrix may be approximated by some periodic structure at each instant. This is consistent with observations. Although the matrix deforms viscously, it retains a granular structure. Our equations are then treated as the macroscopic force balances to determine $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$, and the system evolves accordingly.

One other problem with the homogenization approach is that though it illuminates how the effective viscosities and the permeability arise through the cell problems, there is little else that it can tell us. One would like to relate $\zeta_{\text{eff.}}$, $\eta_{\text{eff.}}$ and $k_{\text{eff.}}$ to the porosity, but, in general, we have no way to do this analytically. These relations are explored numerically in our companion paper, *Simpson et al.* [2008].

4.3. Comparison with Existing Models

There are several interesting and important differences between our results and M84, BRS01, BR03 and the related models. Most fundamental is that we begin with a grain scale model and macroscopic equations naturally arise. The constitutive laws also emerge from these assumptions. In contrast, previous models start at a scale much larger than the grain and must assume the constitutive relations.

Consider the Biphasic-I model, where $V = O(1)$ and $\mathcal{M} = O(\epsilon^2)$, given by equations (65a – 65c). Comparing with M84, (10a – 10d), there is good agreement in the absence of melting and if we identify make the identifications $\zeta_{\text{eff.}} \equiv \zeta_s$ and $k_{\text{eff.}} \equiv k$. The main difference is the $\eta_{\text{eff.}}$ term in (65a), reflecting our consideration of the microstructure. BR03 has same the similarities and differences. BRS01 disagrees with our model, except in the limit of constant porosity.

Recall that, in part, the disparity from BRS01 and BR03 arose from the assumed interphase forces. No interphase force is under scrutiny in our formulation, lending support

both to McKenzie’s equations and the revised Bercovici model. Furthermore, even if we attempted to include terms related to the spatial variations of porosity, they will only impact (65a) and not (65b); (65b) and (23) will never agree. We believe this disagreement between the Darcy equations indicates something is fundamentally wrong with BRS01.

4.4. Open Problems

There are several ways this work might be extended. A natural continuation is to model the partial melt as a random medium. This might more realistically model the pore structure of a rocks. Another question is what role the porosity plays in homogenization. When the melt fraction becomes sufficiently small, $O(\epsilon)$, it could influence the upscaling process. It is known that *singular* inclusions, those that vanish more rapidly than the length scale parameter ϵ , can introduce new terms in homogenized equations.

The equations for upscaling could also be augmented by giving the matrix a nonlinear rheology, as in *Auriault et al.* [1992]; *Geindreau and Auriault* [1999]. This may be particularly important for magma migration; a nonlinear matrix rheology was needed to computationally model physical experiments for shear bands in *Katz et al.* [2006].

The most serious question remains how to properly study a medium with macroscopic and time dependent variations in the structure. This would have implications for the many physical phenomena that also have *evolving microstructures*. Recent work in *Peter* [2007a, b, 2009] on reaction-diffusion systems in porous media may be applicable.

Finally, we remind the reader that in our companion paper, *Simpson et al.* [2008], we computationally explore the cell problems of Sections to see how these material parameters vary with porosity. We then combine these results with our homogenized equations and further explore the consequences.

Appendix A: Non-Homogenizable Regimes

When either $Q_\ell^f \gg \epsilon$ or $Q_\ell^f \ll \epsilon$, the system is non-homogenizable. By this we mean that it is not possible to upscale equations that faithfully preserve our physical assumptions. For instance, if $Q_\ell^f = O(1)$ the pressure gradient balances the viscous forces in the fluid and there is no scale separation. Working out the expansions, the leading order velocity and pressure in the fluid solve:

$$\nabla_y \cdot [-\tilde{p}^{f(0)} + 2\tilde{\mu}_f e_y(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(0)})] = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\nabla_y \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(0)} = 0, \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(0)} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma \quad (\text{A3})$$

The solution is $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(0)} = 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^{f,\epsilon} &= V^f \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f,\epsilon} \\ &= V^f (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(0)} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{f(1)} + \dots) \\ &= \epsilon V^f (\mathbf{v}^{f(1)} + \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

352 This implies that $|\mathbf{v}^{f,\epsilon}| = O(\epsilon V^f)$, contradicting our physical assumption that $|\mathbf{v}^{f,\epsilon}| =$
 353 $O(V^f)$. While this is mathematically reasonable, the model is unable to produce macro-
 354 scopic fluid velocities of order V^f . Other upscaling techniques may succeed here, but
 355 homogenization will not.

Suppose instead $Q_\ell^f = O(\epsilon^2)$ or smaller. The fluid equations are then:

$$O(\epsilon^0) : \quad -\nabla_y \tilde{p}^{f(0)} = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$O(\epsilon^1) : \quad -\nabla_y \tilde{p}^{f(1)} - \nabla_x \tilde{p}^{f(0)} + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^f = 0 \quad \text{in } Y^f \quad (\text{A6})$$

The first equation implies $\tilde{p}^{f(0)} = \tilde{p}^{f(0)}(\mathbf{x})$. Since $\nabla_x \tilde{p}^{f(0)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^f$ are independent of \mathbf{y} , $\nabla_y \tilde{p}^{f(1)}$ must also be independent. Since it is periodic in \mathbf{y} , it is zero. But this implies

$$-\nabla_x \tilde{p}^{f(0)} + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^f = 0 \quad (\text{A7})$$

The leading order macroscopic pressure gradient plays no role in balancing the viscous forces in the solid. This contradicts our assumption that there is *always* a leading order non-hydrostatic pressure gradient.

This assumption on the non-hydrostatic pressure gradient may seem arbitrary, but there is another important reason to identify cases without such a pressure as non-homogenizable. There are problems of interest where gravity plays little role *Spiegelman* [2003]; *Katz et al.* [2006]. For such problems, $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^f$ would be absent from our equations, including (A7). Under such circumstances,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x p^{f,\epsilon} &= \frac{P^f}{L} \nabla_x (\tilde{p}^{f(0)} + \epsilon \tilde{p}^{f(1)} + \dots) \\ &= \epsilon \frac{P^f}{L} \nabla_x (\tilde{p}^{f(1)} + \dots) \\ &= O(\epsilon \frac{P^f}{L}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the macroscopic fluid pressure gradient is not $O(P^f/L)$, as hypothesized.

Appendix B: Symmetries

Let us assume our cell domain is symmetric with respect to the principal axes and invariant under rigid rotations. This permits simplifications of some of the cell problems.

In the Darcy cell problem, the off-diagonal entries become zero while the diagonal entries are all equal. Thus:

$$k_{\text{eff.}} = \langle k \rangle_f = \langle k_1^1 \rangle_f I \quad (\text{B1})$$

For the surface stress problems, when $l \neq m$, $\langle \pi^{lm} \rangle_s = 0$. Only the l, m and m, l entries of the tensor $\langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm}) \rangle_s$ are non-zero. For $l = m$, $\langle \pi^{ll} \rangle_s = \frac{1}{3}(1 - \phi)$ and only the diagonal entries of $\langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{ll}) \rangle_s$ are non-zero. The trace of all $\langle e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm}) \rangle_s$ tensors is zero. More can be said about $e_y(\bar{\chi}^{lm})$, but it does not benefit the present analysis. See *Simpson* [2008] or *Simpson et al.* [2008] for more details.

In the dilation stress problem, the off diagonal terms in $\langle e_y(\bar{\xi}) \rangle_s$ vanish, and the diagonal entries are equal to $\frac{1}{3}(1 - \phi)$.

Appendix C: Spatial Variation in Cell Domain and Time Dynamics

If the cells have \mathbf{x} dependence, $Y^f = Y^f(\mathbf{x})$, then it is possible that $\phi = \phi(\mathbf{x})$. This introduces difficulties in (91a), as terms from gradients with respect to the domain now appear. Let us elaborate. For fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, we associate a particular cell $Y = Y(\mathbf{x})$, with fluid and solid regions defined by the indicator functions \mathbb{I}_f and \mathbb{I}_s :

$$\mathbb{I}_s : \Omega \times Y \mapsto \{0, 1\} \quad (\text{C1a})$$

$$\mathbb{I}_f : \Omega \times Y \mapsto \{0, 1\} \quad (\text{C1b})$$

Then

$$Y^f(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in Y \mid \mathbb{I}_f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 1\} \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$Y^s(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in Y \mid \mathbb{I}_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 1\} \quad (\text{C2b})$$

Returning to (91a),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Y^s} \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} d\mathbf{y} + \int_{Y^f} \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} d\mathbf{y} \\
&= \int_Y \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{s(0)} \mathbb{I}_s d\mathbf{y} + \int_Y \nabla_x \cdot \sigma^{f(0)} \mathbb{I}_f d\mathbf{y} \\
&= \nabla_x \cdot \int_{Y^s} \sigma^{s(0)} d\mathbf{y} - \int_Y \sigma^{s(0)} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbb{I}_s d\mathbf{y} \\
&\quad + \nabla_x \cdot \int_{Y^f} \sigma^{f(0)} d\mathbf{y} - \int_Y \sigma^{f(0)} \cdot \nabla_x \mathbb{I}_f d\mathbf{y}
\end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

Witness the appearance of the $\nabla \mathbb{I}_s$ and $\nabla \mathbb{I}_f$ terms. *This is only an issue for (91a). The other macroscopic equations remain valid when we allow cell variation.*

A second problem is manifest when we consider time dynamics.

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \phi &= \partial_t \int_{Y^f} 1 d\mathbf{y} = \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{v}^f \cdot \mathbf{n} dS \\
&= - \int_{\Gamma} \mathbf{v}^s \cdot \mathbf{n} dS = - \int_{\Gamma} (\mathbf{v}^{s(0)} + \epsilon \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} + \dots) \cdot \mathbf{n} dS
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{v}^{s(0)}$ is independent of \mathbf{y} , the first term drops. Substituting (87),

$$\partial_t \phi = -\epsilon \int \nabla_y \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(1)} d\mathbf{y} + O(\epsilon^2) = \epsilon \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{v}^{s(0)} (1 - \phi) + O(\epsilon^2)$$

To leading order, the matrix can only compact.

Acknowledgments. Both this paper and *Simpson et al.* [2008] are based on the thesis of G. Simpson, *Simpson* [2008], completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy at Columbia University.

The authors wish to thank D. Bercovici and R. Kohn for their helpful comments.

This work was funded in part by the US National Science Foundation (NSF) Collaboration in Mathematical Geosciences (CMG), Division of Mathematical Sciences (DMS), Grant DMS-05-30853, the NSF Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) Grant DGE-02-21041, NSF Grants DMS-04-12305 and DMS-07-07850.

References

- 380 Auriault, J., Nonsaturated deformable porous media: Quasistatics, *Transport in Porous*
 381 *Media*, 2(1), 45–64, 1987.
- 382 Auriault, J., Heterogeneous medium. Is an equivalent macroscopic description possible?,
 383 *International Journal of Engineering Science*, 29(7), 785–795, 1991a.
- 384 Auriault, J., Poroelastic media, in *Homogenization and Porous Media*, edited by U. Hor-
 385 nung, pp. 163–182, Springer, 1991b.
- 386 Auriault, J., and C. Boutin, Deformable porous media with double porosity. Quasi-statics.
 387 I: Coupling effects, *Transport in Porous Media*, 7(1), 63–82, 1992.
- 388 Auriault, J., and P. Royer, Seismic waves in fractured porous media, *Geophysics*, 67, 259,
 389 2002.
- 390 Auriault, J., D. Bouvard, C. Dellis, and M. Lafer, Modelling of Hot Compaction of Metal
 391 Powder by Homogenization, *Mechanics of Materials(The Netherlands)*, 13(3), 247–255,
 392 1992.
- 393 Bensoussan, A., J. Lions, and G. Papanicolaou, *Asymptotic Analysis for Periodic Struc-*
 394 *tures, Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 5, Elsevier, 1978.
- 395 Bercovici, D., The generation of plate tectonics from mantle convection, *Earth and Plan-*
 396 *etary Science Letters*, 205(3-4), 107–121, 2003.
- 397 Bercovici, D., Mantle dynamics past, present, and future: An introduction and overview,
 398 in *Treatise on Geophysics*, vol. 7, edited by G. Schubert, Elsevier, 2007.
- 399 Bercovici, D., and Y. Ricard, Energetics of a two-phase model of lithospheric damage,
 400 shear localization and plate-boundary formation, *Geophysical Journal International*,
 401 152(3), 581–596, 2003.

402 Bercovici, D., and Y. Ricard, Tectonic plate generation and two-phase damage: Void
403 growth versus grain size reduction, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 110(B3), 2005.

404 Bercovici, D., Y. Ricard, and G. Schubert, A two-phase model for compaction and damage,
405 1: General theory, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106(B5), 8887–8906, 2001a.

406 Bercovici, D., Y. Ricard, and G. Schubert, A Two-Phase Model for Compaction and
407 Damage, 3: Applications to Shear Localization and Plate Boundary Formation, *Journal*
408 *of Geophysical Research*, 106, 8925–8939, 2001b.

409 Brennen, C., *Fundamentals of Multiphase Flow*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

410 Chechkin, G., A. Piatnitski, and A. Shamaev, *Homogenization: Methods and Applications*,
411 Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 2007.

412 Cioranescu, D., and P. Donato, *An Introduction to Homogenization*, Oxford University
413 Press, 1999.

414 Cioranescu, D., and J. Saint Jean Paulin, *Homogenization of Reticulated Structures*,
415 Springer, 1999.

416 Drew, D., Averaged field equations for two-phase media, *Stud. Appl. Math*, 50(2), 133–
417 166, 1971.

418 Drew, D., Mathematical-modeling of 2-phase flow, *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech*, 15, 261–291,
419 1983.

420 Drew, D., and S. Passman, *Theory of multicomponent fluids*, Springer New York, 1999.

421 Drew, D., and L. Segel, Averaged equations for two-phase flows, *Stud. Appl. Math*, 50(3),
422 205–231, 1971.

423 Fowler, A., A mathematical model of magma transport in the asthenosphere, *Geophysical*
424 *& Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics*, 33(1), 63–96, 1985.

- 425 Fowler, A., Generation and Creep of Magma in the Earth, *SIAM Journal on Applied*
426 *Mathematics*, 49, 231, 1989.
- 427 Geindreau, C., and J. Auriault, Investigation of the viscoplastic behaviour of alloys in the
428 semi-solid state by homogenization, *Mechanics of Materials*, 31(8), 535–551, 1999.
- 429 Hier-Majumder, S., Y. Ricard, and D. Bercovici, Role of grain boundaries in magma
430 migration and storage, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 248(3-4), 735–749, 2006.
- 431 Homsy, G., M. El-Kaissy, and A. Didwania, Instability waves and the origin of bubbles in
432 fluidized beds, *Part, 2*, 305–318, 1980.
- 433 Hornung, U., *Homogenization and Porous Media*, Springer, 1997.
- 434 Jikov, V., S. Kozlov, and O. Oleinik, *Homogenization of Differential Operators and Integral*
435 *Functionals*, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- 436 Katz, R., M. Spiegelman, and B. Holtzman, The dynamics of melt and shear localization
437 in partially molten aggregates., *Nature*, 442(7103), 676–9, 2006.
- 438 Katz, R., M. Knepley, B. Smith, M. Spiegelman, and E. Coon, Numerical simulation of
439 geodynamic processes with the Portable Extensible Toolkit for Scientific Computation,
440 *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 163(1-4), 52–68, 2007.
- 441 Lee, C., Flow and deformation in poroelastic media with moderate load and weak iner-
442 tia, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical*
443 *Sciences*, 460(2047), 2051–2087, 2004.
- 444 Lee, C., and C. Mei, Re-examination of the equations of poroelasticity, *International*
445 *journal of engineering science*, 35(4), 329–352, 1997a.
- 446 Lee, C., and C. Mei, Thermal consolidation in porous media by homogenization theory—
447 I. Derivation of macroscale equations, *Advances in Water Resources*, 20(2-3), 127–144,

1997b.

Lee, C., and C. Mei, Thermal consolidation in porous media by homogenization theory—

II. Calculation of effective coefficients, *Advances in Water Resources*, 20(2-3), 145–156,

1997c.

McKenzie, D., The generation and compaction of partially molten rock, *Journal of Petrol-*

ogy, 25(3), 713–765, 1984.

Mei, C., and J. Auriault, Mechanics of Heterogeneous Porous Media With Several Spatial

Scales, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical*

Sciences, 426(1871), 391–423, 1989.

Mei, C., J. Auriault, and C. Ng, Some applications of the homogenization theory, *Advances*

in applied mechanics, 32, 277–348, 1996.

Pavliotis, G., and A. Stuart, *Multiscale Methods: Averaging and Homogenization*,

Springer, 2008.

Peter, M., Homogenisation of a chemical degradation mechanism inducing an evolving

microstructure, *Comptes rendus-Mécanique*, 335(11), 679–684, 2007a.

Peter, M., Homogenisation in domains with evolving microstructure, *Comptes rendus-*

Mécanique, 335(7), 357–362, 2007b.

Peter, M., Coupled reaction–diffusion processes inducing an evolution of the microstruc-

ture: Analysis and homogenization, *Nonlinear Analysis*, 70, 806–821, 2009.

Ricard, Y., Physics of mantle convection, in *Treatise on Geophysics*, vol. 7, edited by

G. Schubert, Elsevier, 2007.

Ricard, Y., and D. Bercovici, Two-phase damage theory and crustal rock failure: the

theoretical ‘void’ limit, and the prediction of experimental data, *Geophysical Journal*

471 *International*, 155(3), 1057–1064, 2003.

472 Ricard, Y., D. Bercovici, and G. Schubert, A two-phase model of compaction and damage,

473 2: Applications to compaction, deformation, and the role of interfacial surface tension,

474 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 106, 8907–8924, 2001.

475 Sanchez-Palencia, E., *Non-homogeneous media and vibration theory*, Lecture Notes in

476 Physics, 127, 1980.

477 Scott, D., The competition between percolation and circulation in a deformable porous

478 medium, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 93(B6), 6451–6462, 1988.

479 Scott, D., and D. Stevenson, Magma solitons, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 11(11), 1161–

480 1161, 1984.

481 Scott, D., and D. Stevenson, Magma ascent by porous flow, *Journal of Geophysical Re-*

482 *search*, 91, 9283–9296, 1986.

483 Simpson, G., The mathematics of magma migration, Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University,

484 2008.

485 Simpson, G., M. Spiegelman, and M. Weinstein, A multiscale model of partial melts 2:

486 Numerical results, submitted to *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 2008.

487 Spiegelman, M., Flow in deformable porous media. part 1: Simple analysis, *Journal of*

488 *Fluid Mechanics*, 247, 17–38, 1993a.

489 Spiegelman, M., Flow in deformable porous media. part 2: Numerical analysis, *Journal*

490 *of Fluid Mechanics*, 247, 39–63, 1993b.

491 Spiegelman, M., Linear analysis of melt band formation by simple shear, *Geochemistry,*

492 *Geophysics, Geosystems*, 4(9), 8615, 2003.

- 493 Spiegelman, M., R. Katz, and G. Simpson, An Introduction and Tutorial to the
494 “McKenize Equations” for magma migration, [http://www.geodynamics.org/cig/](http://www.geodynamics.org/cig/workinggroups/magma/workarea/benchmark/McKenzieIntroBenchmarks.pdf)
495 [workinggroups/magma/workarea/benchmark/McKenzieIntroBenchmarks.pdf](http://www.geodynamics.org/cig/workinggroups/magma/workarea/benchmark/McKenzieIntroBenchmarks.pdf), 2007.
- 496 Stevenson, D., and D. Scott, Mechanics of Fluid-Rock Systems, *Annual Review of Fluid*
497 *Mechanics*, *23*(1), 305–339, 1991.
- 498 Temam, R., *Navier-Stokes Equations: Theory and Numerical Analysis*, American Math-
499 ematical Society, 2001.
- 500 Torquato, S., *Random Heterogeneous Materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Proper-*
501 *ties*, Springer, 2002.
- 502 Wark, D., and E. Watson, Grain-scale permeabilities of texturally equilibrated, monomin-
503 eralic rocks, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *164*(3-4), 591–605, 1998.




Figure 1. A two-dimensional slice of the grain matrix and the pore network. In three-dimensions, the grains are fused and form a second connected network.

Table 1. Notation for models of partially molten rock.

Symbol	Meaning	Value
C_1	Interphase Force Coefficient	
$\Delta\rho$	Density Contrast, $\rho_s - \rho_f$	500 kg/m ³
ϕ	Volume Fraction of Melt	.01%– 10%
g	Gravity	9.8 m/s ²
\mathbf{g}	$-g\mathbf{z}$	
\mathbf{g}^f	$\rho_f\mathbf{g}$	
\mathbf{g}^s	$\rho_s\mathbf{g}$	
\mathbf{I}^f	Interphase Force on Melt	
\mathbf{I}^s	Interphase Force on Matrix	
K	Matrix Permeability	
ℓ	Grain Length Scale	1 –10 mm
μ_f	Melt Shear Viscosity	1–10 Pa s
μ_s	Matrix Shear Viscosity	10 ¹⁵ –10 ²¹ Pa s
Re_ℓ^f	Reynolds Number of Melt	10 ⁻⁸ –10 ⁻⁵
Re_ℓ^s	Reynolds Number of Matrix	10 ⁻³⁰ –10 ⁻²²
ρ_f	Melt Density	2800 kg/m ³
ρ_s	Matrix Density	3300 kg/m ³
$\bar{\rho}$	Mean Density, $\bar{\rho} = (1 - \phi)\rho_s + \phi\rho_f$,	
σ^f	Melt Stress Tensor	
σ^s	Matrix Stress Tensor	
\mathbf{v}^f	Melt Velocity	1 – 10 m/yr
\mathbf{v}^s	Matrix Velocity	1 – 10 cm/yr
$\Delta\mathbf{v}$	Velocity Contrast, $\mathbf{v}^s - \mathbf{v}^f$	
ζ_s	Matrix Bulk Viscosity	10 ¹⁵ –10 ²¹ Pa s

Table 2. Additional notation for the Bercovici models

Symbol	Meaning
α	Interfacial Area Per Unit Volume
C_0	An $O(1)$ Multiplicative Constant in Pressure Jump
C_2	Symmetrized Interphase Force Coefficient
Δp	Pressure Contrast, $p^s - p^f$
D_ω/Dt	Total Derivative along \mathbf{v}_ω Characteristic
f	Damage Partitioning Coefficient
κ	Effective Surface Tension
ω	Weighting Coefficient
Ψ	Damage
p^f	Fluid Pressure
p^s	Solid Pressure
σ	Surface Energy
τ^s	Trace Free Stress Tensor in Matrix
τ^f	Trace Free Stress Tensor in Melt
\mathbf{v}_ω	ω -Weighted Velocity, $\mathbf{v}_\omega = \omega \mathbf{v}^f + (1 - \omega) \mathbf{v}^s$




Figure 2. The macroscopic domain Ω . The matrix occupies the grey region while the melt occupies the white inclusions.




Figure 3. The cell domain, Y , divided into fluid and solid regions, Y^f and Y^s . The two phases meet on interface Γ .




Figure 4. SEM images of synthetic quartzites and marbles from Figure 5 of *Wark and Watson [1998]*.




Figure 5. A cell geometry in which both the fluid region, Y^f , and the solid region, Y^s , are topologically connected.