UNIVERSITY^{OF} BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

New insights into landslide processes around volcanic islands from Remotely Operated Vehicle observations offshore Montserrat

Watt, Sebastian; Jutzeler, M; Talling, P.J; Carey, S.N; Sparks, R.S.J; Tucker, M; Stinton, A.J; Fisher, J.K; Wall-Palmer, D; Hühnerbach, V; Moreton, S.G

DOI: 10.1002/2015GC005781

License: None: All rights reserved

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Watt, S, Jutzeler, M, Talling, PJ, Carey, SN, Sparks, RSJ, Tucker, M, Stinton, AJ, Fisher, JK, Wall-Palmer, D, Hühnerbach, V & Moreton, SG 2015, 'New insights into landslide processes around volcanic islands from Remotely Operated Vehicle observations offshore Montserrat', *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 2240–2261. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GC005781

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Watt, S. F. L., et al. "New insights into landslide processes around volcanic islands from Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) observations offshore Montserrat." Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems (2015), which has been published in final form at http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GC005781. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving

Checked October 2015

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1	New insights into	landslide proces	ses around vol	canic islands fr	om Remotely
-		Filler Proces			0111 1101110 0013

2 Operated Vehicle (ROV) observations offshore Montserrat

3

4 Watt, S.F.L.¹, Jutzeler, M.², Talling, P.J.², Carey, S.N.³, Sparks, R.S.J.⁴, Tucker, M.⁴,

5 Stinton, A.J.⁵, Fisher, J.K.⁶, Wall-Palmer, D.⁶, Hühnerbach, V.², Moreton, S.G.⁷

6

⁷ ¹ School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham,

- 8 Birmingham B15 2TT, UK
- 9 ² National Oceanography Center, Southampton SO14 3ZH, UK
- ³ Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, RI 02881, USA.
- ⁴ School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1RJ, UK
- ⁵ Montserrat Volcano Observatory, Flemmings, Montserrat, West Indies
- ⁶ School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Plymouth University,
- 14 Plymouth PL4 8AA, UK

⁷ NERC Radiocarbon Facility (East Kilbride), Scottish Enterprise Technology Park, East

- 16 Kilbride G75 0QF, UK
- 17
- 18 s.watt@bham.ac.uk

19 Abstract

20 Submarine landslide deposits have been mapped around many volcanic islands, but 21 interpretations of their structure, composition and emplacement are hindered by the challenges of investigating deposits directly. Here, we report on detailed observations of 22 four landslide deposits around Montserrat collected by Remotely Operated Vehicles, 23 24 integrating direct imagery and sampling with sediment-core and geophysical data. These 25 complementary approaches enable a more comprehensive view of large-scale mass wasting processes around island-arc volcanoes than has been achievable previously. The 26 most recent landslide occurred at 11.5-14 ka (Deposit 1; 1.7 km³) and formed a radially-27 28 spreading hummocky deposit that is morphologically similar to many subaerial debrisavalanche deposits. Hummocks comprise angular lava and hydrothermally-altered 29 30 fragments, implying a deep-seated, central subaerial collapse, inferred to have removed a 31 major proportion of lavas from an eruptive period that now has little representation in the subaerial volcanic record. A larger landslide (Deposit 2; 10 km³) occurred at ~130 ka and 32 transported intact fragments of the volcanic edifice, up to 900 m across and over 100 m 33 34 high. These fragments were rafted within the landslide, and are best exposed near the 35 margins of the deposit. The largest block preserves a primary stratigraphy of subaerial 36 volcanic breccias, of which the lower parts are encased in hemipelagic mud eroded from 37 the seafloor. Landslide deposits south of Montserrat (Deposits 3 and 5) indicate the wide 38 variety of debris-avalanche source lithologies around volcanic islands. Deposit 5 39 originated on the shallow submerged shelf, rather than the terrestrial volcanic edifice, and is dominated by carbonate debris. 40

41

42 **1. Introduction**

Extensive submarine landslide deposits are common around volcanic islands [Moore et 43 44 al., 1989; Deplus et al., 2001; Masson et al., 2002; Coombs et al., 2007; Silver et al., 2009]. Such landslides profoundly modify island morphology and affect the marine 45 46 environment through sudden deposition of material. They also pose major hazards 47 through direct inundation [Siebert, 1984], their potential association with explosive volcanic blasts [Bogoyavlenskaya et al., 1985], and tsunamis [Ward and Day, 2003; 48 Satake, 2007]. Much of our current understanding of large landslide deposits around 49 50 volcanic islands is based on geophysical surveys [e.g., Deplus et al., 2001; Coombs et al., 51 2007; Watt et al., 2012a] and distal core samples of associated turbidites [Hunt et al., 52 2011; Trofimovs et al., 2013]. Only a few submarine volcanic landslide deposits have 53 been observed or sampled directly [Yokose, 2002; Morgan et al., 2007; Croff Bell et al., 54 2013; Day et al., 2015]. Such observations provide structural and lithological information 55 relating to the landslide source and emplacement processes that cannot be obtained by 56 other means.

57 In this paper, we summarise results from two Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of four landslide deposits offshore the volcanic island of Montserrat. Our aim is to 58 provide detailed information on the source (e.g., subaerial edifice, submarine flank, 59 60 surrounding seafloor), lithology (e.g., pyroclastic rock, dense lava, carbonate reef) and 61 structure (e.g., heterogeneous, disaggregated material; intact primary blocks) of material 62 within the deposits. This informs our understanding of the relationship between the 63 dominant lithology and morphology of landslide deposits [cf. Masson et al., 2006] and 64 helps interpret landslide emplacement processes and interaction with the seafloor, which is a significant control on the magnitude of landslide-generated tsunamis [*Watt et al.*,
2012a].

67

68 1.1. Data collection

Two research expeditions of the RRS James Cook (JC83; March 2013) and the R/V 69 70 Nautilus (NA037; October 2013) deployed Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROVs) offshore 71 Montserrat to investigate submarine landslide deposits through high-definition video 72 filming, still images, and a remotely manipulated sampling arm. Expedition JC83 73 deployed the Isis ROV, collecting footage during four dives SE of Montserrat (Figure 1; 74 Isis dive numbers are prefixed I). Dimensions of outcrops and rocks were estimated using two laser points in the ROV field of view, which are 10 cm apart. A vibrocore attachment 75 76 collected a single core during Dive I213, but this attachment, as well as the manipulator 77 arm, was not operational during the remainder of the cruise. Expedition NA037 [Carey et al., 2014] deployed a two-vehicle ROV system (Hercules and Argus) during three dives 78 south and east of Montserrat. In addition to imagery, it collected 61 samples via a 79 80 manipulator arm (Figure 1; Hercules/Argus dive numbers are prefixed H). The largest 81 rocks or consolidated-sediment samples that could be collected were 20 cm in diameter. 82 ROV-based technology has been used in Hawaii to investigate submarine volcanic-island

landslide processes [*Yokose*, 2002; *Coombs et al.*, 2004; *Yokose and Lipman*, 2004; *Morgan et al.*, 2007], but our work is among the first to apply such methods elsewhere
[cf. *Croff Bell et al.*, 2013].

86

Following past studies around volcanic islands [e.g., Moore et al., 1989; Masson et al., 88 89 2002] we use *landslide* as a general term for any slope failure and the resulting mass 90 movement. The landslide deposits described here originated as failures of rock on the subaerial and submerged island flanks, which fragmented to form a *debris avalanche*, 91 where the disintegrating mass is dispersed between clearly defined source and 92 93 depositional regions. Progressive fragmentation and spreading results in the characteristic 94 hummocky topography of debris-avalanche deposits [Siebert, 1984; Glicken, 1996; Paguican et al., 2014], but the specific character of the debris avalanche (and its deposit) 95 96 may depend on the nature of material within the landslide (e.g., density, strength, 97 homogeneity) [Naranjo and Francis, 1987; Masson et al., 2006; Dufresne and Davies, 2009; Watt et al., 2014]. Debris avalanches originating in clay-rich terrains, such as 98 99 hydrothermally altered portions of volcanic edifices, may be relatively cohesive. The 100 incorporation of basal sediment (e.g., hemipelagic mud from the seafloor) may also promote more cohesive flow characteristics. For simplicity, we use *debris-avalanche* 101 deposit to refer to all deposits, rich in volcanic rock fragments, that directly result from 102 the initial landslide. In marine environments, seafloor-sediment failure [Watt et al., 103 104 2012b, 2014] associated with debris-avalanche emplacement may produce more 105 extensive deposits. In addition, landslides around volcanic islands may generate dilute 106 and highly mobile *turbidity currents* [Talling et al., 2012] from the mixing of primary 107 landslide material or disrupted marine sediment with seawater, depositing *turbidites*.

108

109 2. Study region

Montserrat is located in the northern Lesser Antilles Arc and comprises four volcanic 110 111 centers dating back to at least 2.5 Ma (Figure 1) [Harford et al., 2002]. The andesitic 112 Soufrière Hills volcano has been active since 250 ka [Harford et al., 2002, Smith et al., 2007], interrupted by a short episode of basaltic volcanism at ~130 ka that formed the 113 South Soufrière Hills center. An important aspect of the geological history of Soufrière 114 115 Hills (and of Montserrat in general) is the occurrence of large landslides. Several debrisavalanche deposits, with volumes between 0.3 and 10 km³, have been identified offshore 116 southern Montserrat from geophysical surveys [Le Friant et al., 2004; Lebas et al., 2011; 117 Watt et al., 2012a,b]. In addition to these surveys, the identification and correlation of 118 119 tephra fall deposits and turbidites within marine sediment cores provides a detailed record of past activity on the island [Le Friant et al., 2009, 2015; Trofimovs et al., 2013; Cassidy 120 121 et al., 2013; Wall-Palmer et al., 2014]. These studies provide age constraints on landslide 122 deposits and contribute to understanding the context of major landslides in the broader volcanic history of the island. However, direct core sampling of the block-rich volcanic 123 landslide deposits has been unsuccessful, because of their coarse and heterogeneous 124 125 nature.

The 1995-to-recent eruption of Soufrière Hills has involved the growth and collapse of a series of andesitic lava domes, generating pyroclastic flows [*Wadge et al.*, 2014]. The largest dome collapse, in 2003, involved >0.21 km³ of material [*Herd et al.*, 2005]. East of Montserrat, submarine deposits from several collapse-driven pyroclastic flows have formed lobes with a cumulative thickness of 100 m, extending 7 km from the coastline [Figure 1; *Trofimovs et al.*, 2008; *Le Friant et al.*, 2009].

132

6

133 2.1. Terrestrial morphology and landslide scars

Prior to its recent activity, Soufrière Hills consisted of a series of lava domes surrounding 134 135 a prominent crescent-shaped collapse scar (English's Crater). This scar was open to the east and led directly into the Tar River valley (Figure 1). English's Crater has been the 136 location of lava extrusion since 1995, and is presently occupied by a lava dome with a 137 volume of >0.19 km³ [Stinton et al., 2014]. Dating of material within English's Crater 138 139 shows that two eruptive or mass-wasting events, of unconstrained size, occurred at ~2 ka and ~6 ka [Smith et al., 2007; Boudon et al., 2007]. This indicates that the crater formed 140 141 at ≥ 6 ka.

142 East of the Tar River valley, a 3.5-km-wide chute is cut into the submerged SE flank of Montserrat [Figure 1; Le Friant et al., 2004]. This chute is attributed to a large landslide 143 144 that formed an elongate offshore deposit named Deposit 2 [Le Friant et al., 2004]. Within 145 the northern part of the chute, a 1.2-km-wide depression aligns closely with the Tar River valley and English's Crater. Collectively, these structures may mark the source and 146 pathway of an offshore landslide deposit named Deposit 1 [Le Friant et al., 2004; Lebas 147 et al., 2011]. Deposit 1 has a volume of 1.7 km³, whilst English's Crater represents ~0.5 148 km³ of missing rock [Le Friant et al., 2004]. The submerged chute has a volume of ~0.5 149 to 1.1 km³ [Watt et al., 2012b] but may be partly infilled by later aggradation. 150 151 Notwithstanding the large uncertainties (owing, for example, to a lack of constraints on 152 pre-existing topography), these estimated volumes suggest that Deposit 1 comprises both 153 subaerial material from English's Crater and submerged material from the northern part of the chute. A reduced bulk density and seafloor-sediment incorporation may account for 154 155 some increase in the deposit volume versus the inferred failure volume.

Two further landslide deposits, termed Deposits 3 and 5, are located south of Montserrat (Figure 1; note that Deposit 4 is buried beneath Deposit 3 and is not discussed further here). These deposits align with scars in the island shelf but are not associated with any visible subaerial collapse structures.

160

161 2.2. Morphological description of landslide deposits

Deposits 1, 2, 3 and 5 are all defined by mounded, irregular areas of seafloor (Figure 1).
Within each deposit, the mounded surface may either represent hummocks – hills of
amalgamated landslide material, typical of subaerial debris-avalanche deposits [*Siebert*,
1984] – or individual scattered blocks, representing largely intact fragments of the initial
landslide mass [cf. *Watt et al.*, 2014].

167

168 *2.2.1. Deposit 1*

The margin of Deposit 1 is defined as the limit of a hummocky, fan-shaped deposit that extends 10.5 km offshore the Tar River valley, to water depths of 1000 m, and covers ~50 km². The deposit contains many tens of hummocks that are up to 200 m long and protrude tens of meters above surrounding seafloor. The hummocks are evenly distributed, without preferential accumulation at the margins or center of the deposit. Seismic reflection data resolve no prominent internal structures within Deposit 1 [*Crutchley et al.*, 2013; *Karstens et al.*, 2013].

176

177 2.2.2 Deposit 2

Deposit 2 is partially buried beneath Deposit 1 and is more extensive and voluminous than the other deposits considered here, comprising ~10 km³ of material [*Lebas et al.*, 2011; *Watt et al.*, 2012a,b]. It has been proposed that the central, blocky part of Deposit 2 originated as a collapse of the volcanic edifice, which then triggered extensive failure of the surrounding seafloor sediment [*Watt et al.*, 2012b; 2014]. IODP drilling (Figure 1) confirms that the distal part of Deposit 2 comprises seafloor sediment [*Le Friant et al.*, 2015].

Here, we attribute the notably large blocks to the east of Montserrat to Deposit 2 (Figure 185 186 1), based on interpretations of available seismic and bathymetric data [*Watt et al.*, 2012b]. 187 The most prominent of these blocks lies close to the eastern margin of Deposit 1, and has an angular, steep-sided form that contrasts with the rounded hummocks of Deposit 1. It is 188 189 900 m long, 700 m wide and 100 m high, and may have a similar buried extent, indicating a total volume of ~0.05–0.08 km³ [Crutchley et al., 2013]. To place this 190 191 volume into context, it is approximately ten times that of Wembley Stadium in London 192 (0.004 km³), one of the world's largest sports grounds. A 2-km arc of blocks with comparable dimensions to the "Wembley" block (as it is referred to here) marks the 193 194 proximal southern margin of Deposit 2 (Figure 1). More very large blocks or hummocks 195 occur further east, within the central part of Deposit 2, but are partially buried by younger 196 sediment.

197

198 *2.2.3. Deposit 3*

Deposit 3 extends 10.5 km to the south of Montserrat, reaching water depths of 950 m.Seismic reflection profiles suggest that it is thinner than Deposit 1, and mainly comprises

scattered large blocks [*Lebas et al.*, 2011; *Watt et al.*, 2012b] with a total volume of <1
km³.

203

```
204 2.2.4. Deposit 5
```

Deposit 5 has a poorly constrained volume of ~0.3 km³ [*Le Friant et al.*, 2004] and is associated with a scar on the submerged coastal shelf on the south-western side of Montserrat. It is defined by a hummocky field of debris that can be traced 7 km offshore to a water depth of about 830 m.

209

210 2.3. Ages of landslide deposits

Dating of submarine landslide deposits is best achieved by constraining the age and 211 212 accumulation rate of hemipelagic sediment both above and below the deposit. However, 213 given the difficulties of coring through landslide deposits, ages are often based either on the oldest sediment overlying the deposits or on the age of turbidites that have been 214 215 correlated with them. In the former approach, the distance between the base of a sediment 216 core and the top of the landslide deposit may be unknown, and any age thus derived is a 217 minimum. In the latter approach, it is potentially difficult to correlate a specific turbidite 218 with a landslide deposit, given that neither necessarily has a unique composition in terms 219 of chemistry or componentry.

220

221 *2.3.1. Deposit 1*

The best direct age constraint for Deposit 1 comes from core JR123-54 (collected in
2005; Figures 1 and 2) [*Trofimovs et al.*, 2013], located on a hummock. The basal unit in

the core is a mixed bioclastic and volcaniclastic turbidite, the lowest part of which comprises poorly-sorted gravel containing altered lava clasts, which may correspond to the top surface of Deposit 1 [*Trofimovs et al.*, 2013]. Multiple radiocarbon dates (Table 1) indicate an age of ~11.5 ka for this turbidite (a potentially bioturbated sample within the uppermost part of the turbidite provides a maximum age of 12.3 ka).

Deposit 1 may correlate with a large (> 0.4 km^3) turbidite that extends over 30 km to the 229 230 south of Montserrat (Figure 1), dated by multiple radiocarbon ages at 12-14 ka [Trofimovs et al., 2013]. The turbidite is by far the largest-volume and most erosive event 231 232 in the offshore stratigraphy during the past 110 ka, and its thickest part coincides with the 233 margin of Deposit 1. The timing, distribution and magnitude of the two deposits thus support their correlation. The stratigraphy of the turbidite is complex and spatially 234 235 variable [Trofimovs et al., 2010], but taken as a whole it comprises equal proportions of 236 biological (calcium carbonate) and volcanic clasts. This contrasts with turbidites derived 237 from pyroclastic flows in the present eruption of Soufrière Hills, which are >95% volcaniclastic [Trofimovs et al., 2008]. Thus, the source event of the 12-14 ka turbidite 238 239 must have mobilized a significant proportion of submarine, carbonate-rich material, 240 either by contemporaneous failure and disaggregation of carbonate-rich lithologies (i.e. 241 from the island's carbonate shelf), or by erosion of carbonate-rich seafloor sediment. 242 Combining the age determinations from JR123-54 and the mixed turbidite, Deposit 1 243 occurred at 11.5–14 ka.

244

245 *2.3.2. Deposit 2*

Sediment cores from IODP Expedition 340 (Figure 1) [*Le Friant et al.*, 2015] place the
top of Deposit 2 at ~130 ka [*Cassidy et al.*, 2015], based both on oxygen isotope
stratigraphy of younger hemipelagic mud and on the correlation of basaltic deposits,
which immediately overlie Deposit 2, with volcanism at South Soufrière Hills (dated at
130 ka by Ar-Ar ages of subaerial lavas [*Harford et al.*, 2002]). This age is consistent
with an earlier estimate of ~140 ka derived from regional sediment accumulation rates
[*Watt et al.*, 2012b].

253

254 *2.3.3. Deposit 3*

A spatial correlation with a mafic volcaniclastic turbidite [*Cassidy et al.*, 2014], dated at 60–130 ka, provides a possible age constraint for Deposit 3. If correct, the correlation implies a mafic source lithology for the landslide. Seismic reflection profiles indicate a sedimentary cover of 5–10 m over Deposit 3, implying an age of 100–200 ka [based on local sedimentation rates of 0.05 m kyr⁻¹; *Watt et al.*, 2012b].

260

261 *2.3.4. Deposit 5*

The thickest part of a mixed volcaniclastic and bioclastic turbidite is co-located with Deposit 5, suggesting a correlation between the two deposits [*Cassidy et al.*, 2013]. The high bioclastic content of the turbidite is consistent with the identified landslide source scar on the submerged coastal shelf. The turbidite has an erosive base in hemipelagic sediment dated at 35 ka, and lies directly beneath a volcaniclastic turbidite dated at 8–12 ka. Deposit 5 is therefore similar in age to Deposit 1. The cluster of landslide and turbidite deposits at 8–14 ka suggests a period of relatively heightened mass-wastingactivity at Montserrat.

- 270
- 271 **3.** New ROV-based Observations

The principal ROV observations for each landslide deposit are described and interpreted in this section. This interpretation draws on data from pre-existing core samples and geophysical data. More specific discussion of landslide processes relating to Deposits 1 and 2 is provided in Section 4. In addition to the figures described here, short video files of key exposures are provided as Supporting Information.

277

278 3.1. Deposit 1

279 *3.1.1. Hummock exposures*

ROV observations made on seven hummocks in Deposit 1 (Figure 1) indicate broadly similar mixtures of lithologies, with representative images shown in Figure 2. The top of individual hummocks provide the best outcrops; a talus of scattered rocks and partially eroded sedimentary drape obscure surrounding slopes. Outcrops expose volcanic breccia, with wide variation in grain size, sorting, presence or absence of a fine matrix, presence or absence of layering, clast shape and alteration. Lithologically diverse domains occur at a range of scales, both within and between hummocks.

A poorly sorted and matrix-supported breccia is the dominant lithology, displaying a range of colorations and with generally sharp, but occasionally diffuse, irregular boundaries between colored domains. Pale colored domains are interpreted as hydrothermally altered volcanic breccias; the diverse coloration (white and pale-yellow are the most common, but green, yellow, orange and brown also occur) indicates a range of mineral assemblages, and suggests that different zones of hypogene alteration in the failure region [cf. *John et al.*, 2008] were efficiently mixed during debris-avalanche emplacement. Undulose boundaries (Figure 2c,d) indicate shearing and stretching of altered domains during transport.

296 Altered breccias often lie in direct contact with dark gray, monomict, clast-supported to 297 marginally matrix-supported breccias. Clasts are angular to sub-angular and vary in size from a few meters to a centimeter (Figure 2b). This lithology is interpreted as unaltered 298 299 autoclastic breccia associated with lava dome extrusion. Pink to red lava breccias also 300 occur, with otherwise similar characteristics to the monomict gray breccias, and are 301 indicative of hematite formed in a subaerial setting. In one case (Figure 2e), narrow (10-302 30 cm) and irregular zones of alteration were observed passing through a large outcrop of 303 gray lava breccias.

Samples of the dense lavas (NA037-008 and -011; see Supporting Information) show a phenocryst assemblage dominated by plagioclase and orthopyroxene, with frequent amphibole largely replaced by an alteration assemblage. This assemblage is typical of Soufrière Hills andesites erupted since ~110 ka [*Harford et al.*, 2002]. We identified no unequivocal biological (carbonate) material or structures within Deposit 1. A sample of orange-brown hydrothermally altered rock (NA037-009; Figure 2a) contained abundant clay minerals and hydrothermally altered ferromagnesian and feldspar crystals.

311

312 *3.1.2. Deposit 1 sedimentary drape*

The sedimentary drape that overlies Deposit 1 is well exposed on the sides of several hummocks, where it has been eroded by bottom currents or local slope failures (Figure 3). Interpretations of these exposures have drawn on the extensive previous core sampling of the top ~5 m of seafloor sediment in the area, which comprises an interbedded sequence of hemipelagic mud and volcaniclastic, bioclastic or mixed turbidites [JR123; *Trofimovs et al.*, 2010, 2013].

319 The observed exposures comprise a mixture of fine-grained, white to pale-gray 320 hemipelagic sediment and interbedded sandy turbidites. Hemipelagic mud intervals 321 frequently contain coarse volcanic clasts (Figure 3), which are likely to be locally derived 322 (e.g. by reworking from upslope on a hummock). These poorly-sorted beds of outsized volcanic clasts set in hemipelagic mud are similar to the talus deposits at the base of the 323 324 SW Wembley-block exposures (Section 3.2.1; Figure 4d). Bed dips are parallel to the 325 local slope, and sometimes up to 40° (Figure 3b). These heterogeneous beds were not 326 sampled by the JR123 cores, but we note that some attempts at coring failed, perhaps due 327 to the coarse nature of this material.

328 In several exposures, the basal unit of the drape (i.e. the deposit immediately overlying 329 Deposit 1) is a well-sorted, monomict and clast-supported, matrix-free volcanic breccia 330 of dense, gray cm-scale andesite clasts. This unit appears to be relatively continuous over 331 Deposit 1 (Figure 3e). This immature, matrix-free breccia is similar to beds found within 332 volcanic blast deposits on the surface of some subaerial debris-avalanche deposits 333 [Hoblitt et al., 1981; Bogoyavlenskaya et al., 1985; Clavero et al., 2004; Belousov et al., 2007], and provides possible evidence of a lateral explosion accompanying the Deposit 1 334 335 landslide. An alternative possibility is that this unit represents a capping, coarse-grained

turbidite generated by the debris avalanche; it may correlate with the gray volcaniclastic
beds in the widespread 12–14 ka turbidite [cf. *Trofimovs et al.*, 2013].

338

339 *3.2. Deposit 2*

340 *3.2.1. Wembley block*

The Wembley block differs from the hummocks within Deposit 1 in its scale, componentry and shape. It also displays some differences in post-emplacement sedimentary cover. Its angular, steep-sided form suggests that it is a single fragment of the volcanic edifice. The exposed base of the block is not its true base, which may be as much as 100 m below the seafloor [cf. *Crutchley et al.*, 2013].

346

347 3.2.1.1. Surface exposures

348 Continuous exposures on the SE side of the Wembley block are summarized in Figure 5 (Dive I217). The lower half of the block exposes a largely structureless breccia of 349 angular, dense, gray andesite clasts set within a uniform, white to pale-gray fine-grained 350 matrix, which erodes with a sculpted, pitted appearance (Figure 4a,b,f). We interpret this 351 352 matrix as hemipelagic mud, because of its similar appearance to the hemipelagite 353 exposed in scarps that cut the seafloor east of the block (this mud has been sampled in 354 numerous cores [Trofimovs et al., 2013]). The exposures change abruptly 26 m above the 355 seafloor, to volcanic breccias of dense angular clasts, either gray or red in color, 356 displaying crude low-angle bedding (Figure 6d), but without any pale mud matrix (Figure 5). The volcanic breccias are similar in appearance to unaltered breccias in Deposit 1, but 357 358 hydrothermally altered rocks are absent. Some clasts show fractures (Figure 6e) that may

reflect in-situ brecciation acquired by vibration and collision during transport. Exposures vary from matrix- to clast-supported breccias. Although most are monomict, some beds contain mixtures of gray and red lava fragments, and are sub-rounded in parts. We interpret the monomict breccias as dome-collapse block-and-ash flow deposits, and the more mixed, rounded units, as reworking of the same material. The common occurrence of reddened lavas suggests a subaerial origin.

365 Very dark lava clasts are exposed near the base of the ESE side of the Wembley block (Dive I217). Based on samples with a similar appearance from Deposit 3, we interpret 366 367 these as blocks with ferromanganese surface encrustation (Figure 4e, 6c). Such 368 encrustation is likely to have formed after deposition, assuming that the block surfaces were not previously exposed in a submarine environment. It is unclear why this 369 encrustation is restricted to a single part of the Wembley block, but the formation of 370 371 ferromanganese crusts can be strongly dependent on water depth and local biological 372 activity [Hodkinson and Cronan, 1991].

The base of the Wembley block on its SW side (Dive H1308) also exposes volcanic 373 374 breccias within a hemipelagic mud matrix, but here they display crude, high angle 375 bedding, and unconformably overlie a monomict volcanic breccia without any mud 376 matrix (Figure 4d). We interpret the bedded mud-supported breccia as a post-377 emplacement talus of volcanic clasts mixed with continuously depositing hemipelagic 378 sediment, derived from periodic mass wasting of the steep slopes of the Wembley block. 379 The monomict breccia is thus the surface of the primary block. Higher up the SW side of the block, clast-supported volcanic breccias dominate (Figure 6a). Overall, these are more 380 381 angular than the breccias on the SE side. We interpret the whole sequence as autoclastic

and reworked lava breccias forming as talus around an active lava dome. The greater
prevalence of reworked breccias on the SE side of the block suggests a more marginal
facies than those on the SW, which is plausible given the 900-m dimensions of the block.
The entire block is thus a fragment of the subaerial volcano, transported intact to its
present position.

387

388 3.2.1.2. Seafloor interaction

Although the mud-supported breccias on the SW side of the block are clearly post-389 390 emplacement talus deposits, the mud-supported breccias on the SE side may be a syn-391 emplacement feature. Here, the mud matrix is present on sub-vertical and highly 392 irregular, gullied slopes, sometimes showing a gradational contact with monomict, clast-393 supported volcanic breccias (Figure 4), and is prevalent below a sharp and broadly 394 horizontal boundary. The SE side of the block was the frontal section during block emplacement, and seismic reflection data indicate that the emplacement of Deposit 2 395 involved substantial erosion of seafloor sediment [Watt et al., 2012a,b]. Incorporation of 396 397 mud into the brecciated surface of the block may have occurred during this process, 398 explaining the presence of this matrix in the lower and frontal part of the block. This 399 sediment injection is not necessarily deeply penetrating. We favour this interpretation 400 over alternative origins for the marine sediment matrix on the SE side of the Wembley 401 block. Hemipelagic mud characterizes marine sedimentation on the deep seafloor around 402 Montserrat; if a marine matrix was a primary characteristic of the block (and if we assume the block originated on the submerged island flanks), we would expect more 403 404 evidence of shallow water carbonate rocks, and for the volcanic breccias to be more

405 extensively reworked. Rare white fragments are observed in the hemipelagic mud (Figure
406 5), up to 2 cm across, but these may be deep water bivalves of the type observed (up to
407 0.5 cm across) on the south side of Montserrat.

408

409 3.2.1.3. Sample descriptions

A single lava sample from the block (NA037-001; see Supporting Information) comprises fresh, dense porphyritic andesite with a phenocryst assemblage of plagioclase, orthopyroxene and clinopyroxene. Hornblende is absent. This assemblage contrasts with the andesite mineralogy that has predominated on Montserrat since ~110 ka (and that occurs in Deposit 1), but is similar to rocks erupted before 130 ka [*Harford et al.*, 2002; *Zellmer et al.*, 2003].

416 Loose yellow clasts of highly indurated carbonate, up to 30 cm across, were observed on 417 the block surface near the top of the SW side of the block (Dive H1308; Figure 7). A sample of this material (NA037-002; see Supporting Information) is a coralgal limestone 418 consisting of a mixture of large (cm-sized) rhodoliths, benthic foraminifera (notably 419 420 Amphistegina and peneroplids) and other bioclasts (including gastropods, bivalves, 421 echinoids and calcareous red algal fragments) within a matrix of micrite. Microbialite-422 micritic filaments and peloids probably represent in-situ bacterial precipitates. Some 423 bioclasts have textures indicating replacement of original aragonite by neomorphic 424 calcite. The characteristics of this clast suggest formation at shelfal depths, but the 425 replacement of aragonite suggests diagenesis either in a meteoric environment or in its 426 current deep-water setting (900 m). A second sample (NA037-005) is a weakly indurated 427 micritic limestone with planktonic foraminifera (Globorotalia, Orbulina), planktonic

gastropods (including pteropods), minor fragments of shallow-water bioclasts (bivalves, 428 429 foraminifera, echinoids), and silt-sized volcanic crystals set in a micrite matrix with 430 conspicuous (mm-sized) burrow fills. The sample exterior has some tubeworm clasts and 431 small coral fragments. The mix of shallow and deep water fauna, with incorporation of 432 minor volcanic fragments and aragonite replacement all suggest transport from a shallow 433 to a deeper environment. We infer that these clasts were transported from shallow water 434 to their current position during emplacement of the Wembley block. They may represent material from the submarine shelf that was eroded during the passage of the volcanic 435 436 debris avalanche, which fell onto the surface of the block before being transported to 437 their present position.

438

439 *3.2.2. Large southern block*

A large block south of Deposit 1, mapped as a marginal block within Deposit 2 [Figure 1,
Dive I213; *Watt et al.*, 2012b], comprises monomict lava breccias with dark coloration,
interpreted as ferromanganese encrustation. Gray volcaniclastic sand from the recent
Soufrière Hills eruption obscures much of the block surface. Our limited observations
suggest that the block is lithologically similar to the Wembley block.

445

446 *3.2.3. Wembley block sedimentary drape*

447 Approximately 3 m of marine sediment is exposed on top of the SE side of the Wembley
448 block (Figure 5). Prominent beds of white hemipelagic mud are interbedded with three
449 thicker, recessive gray sandy units, interpreted as turbidites, which are partly obscured by
450 deposits of recent volcaniclastic sand (Figure 6f). In comparison with the stratigraphy of

451 core JR123-21, collected on top of the Wembley block in 2005 [*Trofimovs et al.*, 2008,
452 2010], the drape on the SE edge of the block contains thicker turbidites and thinner
453 hemipelagite intervals (Figure 8). Both sequences are very different in terms of both layer
454 thickness and characteristics from the stratigraphy recovered in over 20 vibracores from
455 the surrounding seafloor [JR123; *Trofimovs et al.*, 2008, 2010, 2013] (Figure 8).

456 The youngest turbidites in the correlated stratigraphy from the surrounding seafloor are 457 much thicker than those from JR123-21. This may be explained by the elevated position of the block, where clast concentration in turbidity currents may have been lower 458 459 (resulting in thinner deposits). However, the sandy beds at the base of JR123-21 are 460 notably thick. These lower units are almost purely volcaniclastic, and do not correlate clearly with any turbidites in the local stratigraphy, which is well defined at ages <110 ka 461 462 [Trofimovs et al., 2013]. They may be the deposits of older turbidity currents generated 463 during the emplacement of Deposit 2.

The Wembley block is mapped as part of Deposit 2 [Watt et al., 2012a,b; Crutchley et al., 464 2013], but its location (Figure 1) suggests that it could be an outrunner block within 465 466 Deposit 1. Seismic reflection profiles and the regional turbidite record provide no 467 evidence of major landslides in the period between Deposits 2 (~130 ka) and Deposit 1 468 (11.5–14 ka). New radiocarbon dates from JR123-21 (Figure 8; Table 1) extend beyond 469 the limits of radiocarbon dating (43.5 ka), supporting interpretation of the Wembley block 470 as part of Deposit 2. However, the dates do not provide good constraints on turbidite ages 471 or hemipelagic sedimentation rates, because several ages cluster around 43 ka, and some are out of stratigraphic sequence (Figure 8). This suggests extensive bioturbation or the 472 473 possible reworking of material derived from bioclastic turbidites with background

474 hemipelagic sediment. The 1.2-m thickness of hemipelagic intervals in JR123-21 also 475 supports a pre-Deposit 1 age for the Wembley block: post-Deposit 1 hemipelagic mud on the surrounding seafloor has a cumulative thickness of 70-80 cm; and hemipelagic 476 sedimentation rates of 6.6 cm kyr⁻¹, estimated from a 45-cm vibrocore (JC83-VC1) on top 477 of the large southern block (Figure 1; Table 1) imply that the hemipelagite in JR123-21 478 479 represents >18 kyr. However, the sedimentary drape is surprisingly thin if the 480 emplacement age of the block is 130 ka. Thus, although the balance of observations suggests that the Wembley block lies within Deposit 2, several aspects of the sedimentary 481 482 drape remain puzzling.

483

484 *3.3. Deposit 3*

485 The surface of Deposit 3 (Dive H1310; Figure 1) is not well exposed, but occasional 486 clusters of meter-scale blocks, with features such as well-developed radial jointing (Figure 9a), protrude through younger sedimentary cover. The blocks are dense 487 porphyritic andesite lavas with a very dark surface coating, caused by thick (up to 3 mm) 488 489 manganese encrustations. Examination of two thin sections (NA037-037 and -042; 490 Supporting Information) indicates a phenocryst assemblage of plagioclase, clinopyroxene 491 and orthopyroxene. Orthopyroxene is less abundant than in the Wembley block sample 492 (NA037-001). The assemblage is comparable to that observed in the pre-130 ka and esites 493 of Soufrière Hills and in some of South Soufrière Hills rocks [Zellmer et al., 2003], 494 although olivine is absent. An origin from South Soufrière Hills would be consistent the previous correlation of Deposit 3 with a mafic volcaniclastic turbidite [Cassidy et al., 495 496 2014]. The prevalence of angular, fractured lava blocks suggests a subaerial source for the landslide; the absence of a visible source scar and a lack hydrothermally altered
material in the exposures suggests that this landslide may have been relatively shallowseated.

500

501 *3.4. Deposit 5*

502 Clusters of blocks in Deposit 5 are well exposed at depths of 750-830 m (Dive H1309; 503 Figure 1). Blocks comprise massive carbonate fragments (Figure 9f) and well-bedded carbonate-cemented volcaniclastic conglomerates. The well-rounded conglomerates 504 505 (Figure 9c) are comparable to beach cobbles and mature fluvial deposits, and the 506 carbonate fragments are similar to large slabs of hardground observed in separate dives at depths of 100–200 meters off the southern coast of Montserrat. A single large slab of reef 507 508 rock has karstic features (deeply incised channels) indicative of subaerial exposure, 509 perhaps during a low stand in sea level (Figure 9d,e).

One carbonate sample (NA037-026; Figure 10, Supporting Information) is a dense 510 limestone of encrusted volcanic clasts and bioclasts, including benthic and planktonic 511 foraminifera, calcareous red algae, mollusc fragments, serpulids, sponge spicules, 512 513 radiolaria, echinoid spines and pteropods, cemented by micritic-microsparitic-sparry 514 calcite cement. The encrusted grains (comparable to oncoids or rhodoliths) probably 515 formed by rolling in intermittent currents in shallow to moderate water environments, 516 consistent with the fossil assemblage. Encrusting foraminifera on red algal crust occur 517 with microbial filaments. Aragonitic gastropod and sponge fragments are replaced by coarse calcite, consistent with diagenetic alteration following transport to a deep-water 518 519 environment. Phosphate grains of probable microbial origin occur within cavities (sponge

520 borings) in calcareous algae. A further sample (NA037-025) is a well-sorted, porous 521 cemented bioclastic grainstone (medium to coarse sand) cemented by thin (20 to 50 μ m) 522 isopachous bladed calcite. Grains include shallow-water foraminifera (penerolids), calcareous algae (branched forms), green algae (Halimeda), minor bivalve fragments and 523 524 volcanic clasts. Areas of peloidal sediment are likely to be the result of bacterial 525 precipitation. Our observations support the previous conclusion [Le Friant et al., 2004; 526 Cassidy et al., 2013] that Deposit 5 originated as a shallow-seated collapse of the coastal shelf. 527

528

529 3.5. Sharp-faced depressions in young sediment

530 Numerous sharp-faced depressions, up to a few meters deep, occur on the seafloor 531 between hummocks in Deposit 5 and to the east of Deposit 1 [cf. Watt et al., 2012b]. 532 These structures are defined by arcuate scarps, in some cases forming fully enclosed, round depressions, exposing near-vertical cliffs through the seafloor sedimentary 533 sequence (Figure 11b,c). The depressions are at least tens of meters across in the vicinity 534 of Deposit 5, and up to hundreds of meters across to the east of Deposit 1. The 535 536 stratigraphy of scarps east of Deposit 1 (Figure 11c) comprises interbedded turbidites and 537 hemipelagic mud but is difficult to correlate precisely with the regional turbidite 538 stratigraphy (Figure 8). The good exposure of the scarps suggests that they cut through to 539 the youngest Holocene deposits and that they therefore formed (or have been actively 540 eroded) very recently.

541 The spatial distribution of the depressions and their fully enclosed shapes suggests that542 they are not simply scour structures, but have a genetic relationship with debris avalanche

deposition. The depressions east of Deposit 1 lie in a region where failure of the preexisting seafloor sediment occurred during the Deposit 2 landslide [*Watt et al.*, 2012b; *Crutchley et al.*, 2013]. The structures may be collapse pits in younger sediment produced
by seafloor subsidence or fluid venting driven by compaction within the underlying
landslide deposit.

548

549 **4. Implications for landslide processes**

550 4.1. The source and composition of Deposit 1

The rocks exposed in Deposit 1 include near-vent and subaerial lithologies, consistent with English's Crater being the major source of material in the deposit. This correlation places an age of 11.5–14 ka on the formation of English's Crater, which is significantly older that the 6 ka minimum age provided by dates of infilling deposits [*Smith et al.*, 2007; *Boudon et al.*, 2007].

556

557 4.1.1. Subaerial source region

558 English's Crater and the Tar River Valley display two volcanic facies [Harford et al., 559 2002]: near-vertical walls of massive lava crop out to the west (Chances Peak; age 560 unknown) and south (Galways Mountain, 112 ka; Perches Dome, 24 ka); and radiating 561 fans of crudely bedded lava breccias (rock fall and block-and-ash flow deposits) crop out 562 at the northern and lower margin of English's Crater and along the Tar River Valley. Block-and-ash flow deposits on the east coast, south of Spanish Point, have radiocarbon 563 ages of 19.7 and 24.0 ka [Roobol and Smith, 1998] and can be traced towards English's 564 565 Crater. They may be associated with Perches Dome, given their similar age. Similar lava

566 breccias between Chances Peak and Galways Mountain, as well as deposits dated at 16-567 19 ka on the west side of the island, in Fort Ghaut, suggest elevated levels of extrusive volcanism on Montserrat between 16 and 24 ka. However, the remains of Perches dome 568 are the only exposed Soufrière Hills lavas from this time period. It is possible that a much 569 more extensive lava-dome complex of this age formed the source of the Deposit 1 570 571 landslide, also removing sections of massive lava from older domes to form the near-572 vertical cliffs currently exposed around English's Crater. A relatively deep-seated collapse, centred on the vent region, is supported by the high proportion of 573 574 hydrothermally altered material in Deposit 1. At least three extensive fumarole and hot 575 spring systems existed inside English's Crater prior to 1995 (Lang's, Cow Hill New and Tar River), providing evidence of intense hydrothermal activity in this area [Roobol and 576 577 Smith, 1998].

578

579 *4.1.2. Incorporation of submarine material*

A single observation of a clast (Figure 2f) with contrasting surfaces of fresh andesite and 580 weathered, tube-worm encrusted andesite, provides the only direct evidence for the 581 582 incorporation of submarine material within Deposit 1. This conflicts with morphological observations: the maximum plausible subaerial failure volume of ~1 km³, based on 583 584 combining the Tar River Valley and English's Crater depressions, with pre-failure elevations of >1100 m, is too small to account for the volume of Deposit 1 (1.7 km³). The 585 586 chute cut into Montserrat's eastern flank also suggests that submerged material formed part of the landslide. Such material would likely comprise carbonate and reworked, 587

polymict volcanic clasts. The absence of these lithologies suggests that the surfaceexposures of Deposit 1 may not be representative of the deposit as a whole.

590 The correlation of Deposit 1 with the large-volume 12-14 ka turbidite east of Montserrat [Trofimovs et al., 2013] (see Section 2.3.1) also implies a submarine component to the 591 592 event. The turbidite comprises approximately equal proportions of volcaniclastic and 593 bioclastic grains, in contrast to the entirely volcanic lithologies exposed in Deposit 1. If 594 the two events are related, then the bioclastic component of the turbidite must derive from seafloor material disaggregated during landslide emplacement. The shelf chute 595 596 aligned with Deposit 1 provides supporting evidence of such a process. Given the 597 absence of submarine lithologies within surface exposures of the Deposit 1 hummocks, 598 the submarine component of the landslide may be concentrated disproportionately within 599 the unexposed matrix facies between the debris-avalanche deposit hummocks.

600

601 4.2. Emplacement mechanisms and comparison with subaerial debris avalanche 602 deposits

603 *4.2.1. Deposit morphologies*

Deposit 1 is morphologically and texturally similar to many subaerial debris-avalanche deposits. The rounded hummocks of the deposit, comprising heterogeneous mixtures of deformed and frequently altered monomict domains, are typical of many subaerial examples [e.g. *Glicken*, 1996; *Shea et al.*, 2008; *Clavero et al.*, 2002]. The fan-shaped morphology of Deposit 1 is comparable to freely spreading deposits such as those at Galunggung and Mombacho volcanoes [*Siebert*, 1984; *Shea et al.*, 2008], and indicative of granular avalanche emplacement processes [cf. *Paguican et al.*, 2014]. Landslide 611 mobility indices [cf. *Griswold and Iverson*, 2008; *Iverson et al.*, 2015] for Deposit 1 are 612 also within the range of typical values for subaerial volcanic debris avalanches (L/H = 7613 and $A/V^{\frac{2}{3}} = 36$, based on parameters in *Lebas et al.* [2011]) [*Legros*, 2002; *Griswold and* 614 *Iverson*, 2008].

In contrast to Deposit 1, Deposit 2 forms a continuous elongate deposit, and its mobility 615 is at the high end of the range defined by subaerial volcanic debris avalanches (L/H = 16)616 and $A/V^{\frac{2}{3}} = 47$, based on parameters in *Watt et al.* [2012b]), which partly reflects the 617 incorporation and secondary failure of large volumes of seafloor-sediment within the 618 619 deposit [cf. Watt et al., 2012a,b]. Deposit 2 has a central thickness of over 100 m, and a 620 surface marked by isolated blocks set within the more continuous landslide mass (as indicated by seismic reflection profiles [Crutchley et al., 2013]). Although this mass may 621 622 be disaggregated and mixed, the blocks are competent, intact fragments of the initial 623 volcanic failure region. They are hundreds of meters across, and have sub-vertical sides that reach over 100 m in height. Observations of the Wembley block and a large block to 624 the south show that they comprise bedded sequences of volcaniclastic breccia, suggestive 625 626 of marginal and probably near-surface portions of a subaerial lava-dome complex. The 627 blocks result in a prominent morphological front within the thick, central part of Deposit 628 2 [Watt et al., 2012b]; the well-exposed southern blocks are closely aligned with the 629 southern lateral margin of the deposit, and the Wembley block lies near the northern 630 margin (Figure 1). The deposit morphology is similar to the Icod debris avalanche deposit, north of Tenerife [Masson et al., 2002], which has several kilometer-scale blocks 631 at its lateral margins. Masson et al. [2002] conclude that the Icod deposit shape and block 632 633 distribution is characteristic of coarse-grained debris flow processes [cf. Major and *Iverson*, 1999], and suggest that this behavior reflects the high proportion of pyroclastic material in the landslide. Our observations do not show evidence that the Deposit 2 failure mass was significantly different to that of Deposit 1, or was rich in friable pyroclastic material, but there is good evidence of extensive seafloor-sediment failure concomitant with the volcanic landslide [cf. *Watt et al.*, 2012a,b]. This potentially produced a mixed landslide, with high proportions of fine-grained, clay-rich material.

640

641 *4.2.2. Large-block transport*

642 Hummocks in subaerial debris avalanche deposits are frequently cored by large, 643 deformed blocks of the failure mass [Crandell et al., 1984; Glicken, 1991; Paguican et al., 2014]. Partial disaggregation, extensional faulting and shearing of these blocks 644 645 produces the broadly rounded hummock form. The large blocks of Deposit 2 differ from 646 these hummocks in that they have undergone no deformation beyond the initial fragmentation that produced them. The vertical sides, and angular, upright form of the 647 Deposit 2 blocks, as well as their relatively long transport distance, also contrasts with 648 649 Toreva blocks, which occur in proximal regions of some debris-avalanche deposits and 650 are often rotated, with a morphology that reflects the extensional failure planes of the 651 fragmenting mass [Siebe et al., 1992; Wadge et al., 1996; Paguican et al., 2014].

The bedded breccias that characterize the Deposit 2 blocks might be expected to disaggregate relatively readily in a debris avalanche. Their preservation as intact fragments of the failure mass may therefore be evidence of an emplacement mechanism that limited block interaction and basal deformation (at least for the small number of outsized blocks near the deposit margins), and may also reflect damping of block 657 collision in the aqueous environment [cf. de Blasio, 2013]. Volcaniclastic breccias, as 658 massive and bedded units, also characterize the megablocks in landslide deposits north of 659 Oahu, Hawaii [Yokose, 2002], although the failure and transport mechanism is not necessarily similar to that of Deposit 2. Seismic reflection profiles show that the Deposit 660 661 2 blocks are rooted within a continuous landslide deposit (Figure 12), suggesting that 662 block emplacement is not explained by low-friction transport of individual fragments on a lubricated basal surface of wet sediment (i.e. as characterizes isolated outrunner blocks 663 in some submarine rock avalanches [de Blasio et al., 2006; de Blasio, 2013]). Rather, the 664 665 blocks appear to have been passively rafted within the main landslide mass, without any 666 clear evidence for rotation around a horizontal axis, and pushed towards the margins during continued landslide movement [cf. Major and Iverson, 1999]. The lack of 667 668 subaerial volcanic-debris-avalanche analogues for outsized intact blocks such as those in 669 Deposit 2 may indicate that the development of debris-avalanche masses with sufficient proportions of fine-grained, water-saturated sediment to maintain elevated pore-fluid 670 pressures may be more easily acquired in a submarine environment, via mixing and 671 672 entrainment of marine sediment.

673

674 **5. Summary and conclusions**

This study presents results of the first detailed ROV investigations of multiple submerged landslide deposits around an island-arc volcano. Coupled with other methods of investigation, such as coring, bathymetric mapping and geophysical data, the direct observations offered by ROVs significantly strengthen the interpretation of the sources of 679 material and the processes operating during the emplacement of large landslides around680 volcanic islands.

Our observations indicate that Deposit 1 (1.7 km³) is similar to many subaerial volcanic 681 682 debris-avalanche deposits, and is dominated by hydrothermally altered material likely to have originated from a collapse of the near-vent region of the Soufrière Hills volcano. 683 684 This is surprising, given the large proportion of bioclastic material in a turbidite that 685 correlates stratigraphically with Deposit 1, and a submerged eroded chute associated with the event. However, we infer that the bioclastic component within the turbidite is 686 687 predominantly derived from pre-existing seafloor sediment disrupted by the emplacement 688 of Deposit 1 and eroded by associated turbidity currents. Our observations suggest that Deposit 1 occurred at 11.5–14 ka through the collapse of altered lava domes erupted at 689 690 16–24 ka, the relics of which form Perches Dome.

691 A much larger (10 km³) landslide occurred at \sim 130 ka, forming Deposit 2. Although this 692 deposit was mostly inaccessible to ROV observation, we were able to study a large block of volcaniclastic breccias that represents a single intact fragment of the subaerial volcano. 693 694 Its petrology is consistent with pre-130 ka Montserrat lavas. The lower part of the block 695 exposes breccia set within a hemipelagic mud matrix, which was most likely acquired 696 through vigorous erosion of pre-existing seafloor sediment during block transport. The 697 intact, outsized blocks within Deposit 2 were rafted within a relatively mobile debris 698 avalanche mass, and are best exposed near the margins of this elongate deposit.

Two landslide deposits to the south of Montserrat have very different source lithologies.Deposit 3 is morphologically similar to Deposit 1, but comprises fresher, denser lavas.

- 701 We infer that it results from a shallower seated collapse, rather than a landslide that cut

deeply into a hydrothermally altered edifice. This is consistent with the absence of a prominent source scar for the deposit. Deposit 5 is dominated by blocks of reef rock, and demonstrates that large landslides on the flanks of volcanic islands may occur without involvement of the active volcanic edifice, but can arise from instabilities on the carbonate-dominated shelves that may form around these islands.

707

708 Acknowledgements

We thank Michelle Coombs and James Vallance for their constructive reviews of this 709 710 work. We acknowledge support from the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) 711 (SFLW: NE/I02044X/1 and NE/K000403/1; PJT: ISIS research cruise JC83 (NE/0176581), NE/F010478/1 and Radiocarbon Facility allocation 1759.1013), the 712 713 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Ocean Exploration 714 Trust (OET) (Cruise NA037 of the E/V Nautilus), the European Research Council (VOLDIEs project) and the Swiss National Science Foundation (MJ: PBSKP2-145907). 715 Data relating to this work are available from the following sources: ROV data from 716 717 NA037 by request through the Inner Space Center at the Graduate School of 718 Oceanography, University Rhode USA of Island, (Dwight Coleman: 719 dcoleman@gso.uri.edu); ROV data from JC83 from Peter Talling at the National 720 Oceanography Centre, Southampton, UK (peter.talling@noc.ac.uk).

721

722 References

Belousov, A., B. Voight, and M. Belousova (2007), Directed blasts and blast-generated
pyroclastic density currents: a comparison of the Bezymianny 1956, Mount St

725	Helens 1980, and Soufrière Hills, Montserrat, 1997 eruptions and deposits. Bull.
726	Volcanol., 69, 701-740.
727	Bogoyavlenskaya, G.E., O.A. Braitseva, I.V. Melekestsev, V.Y. Kiriyanov, and C.D.
728	Miller (1985), Catastrophic eruptions of the directed-blast type at Mount St.
729	Helens, Bezymianny and Shiveluch volcanoes. J. Geodyn., 3, 189-218.
730	Boudon, G., A. Le Friant, J.C. Komorowski, C. Deplus, and M.P. Semet (2007), Volcano
731	flank instability in the Lesser Antilles Arc: diversity of scale, processes, and
732	temporal recurrence, J. Geophys. Res., 112, B08205.
733	Bronk Ramsey, C. (2009), Bayesian analysis of readiocarbon dates. Radiocarbon, 51,
734	337-360.
735	Carey, S., K. Croff Bell, S. Sparks, A. Sinton, J. Ausubel, B. Phillips, N. Raineault, N.
736	Siu, C. Fandel, O. Graham, H. Ramsingh, R. Blake, S. Auscavitch, and A.
737	Demopoulos (2014). Impact of Volcanic Eruptions on the Seafloor around
738	Montserrat, West Indies. Oceanography, 27, 36-37.
739	Cassidy, M., J. Trofimovs, M.R. Palmer, P.J. Talling, S.F.L. Watt, S,G. Moreton, and R.N.
740	Taylor (2013), Timing and emplacement dynamics of newly recognised mass flow
741	deposits at ~8-12 ka offshore Soufrière Hills volcano, Montserrat: how submarine
742	stratigraphy can complement subaerial eruption histories, J. Volcanol. Geoth. Res.,
743	253, 1–14.
744	Cassidy, M., J. Trofimovs, S.F.L. Watt, M.R. Palmer, R.N. Taylor, T.M. Gernon, P.J.
745	Talling, and A. Le Friant (2014), Multi-stage collapse events in the South Soufrière
746	Hills recorded in marine sediment cores. In The Eruption of Soufrière Hills
747	Volcano, Montserrat from 2000 to 2010, edited by G. Wadge, R.E.A. Robertson and
748	B. Voight, Mem. Geol. Soc. London 39, 383–397.
749	Cassidy, M, S.F.L. Watt, P.J. Talling, M.R. Palmer, M. Edmonds, M. Jutzeler, D. Wall-
750	Palmer, M. Manga, M. Coussens, T. Gernon, and others (2015), Rapid onset of
751	mafic magmatism facilitated by volcanic edifice collapse. Geophys. Res. Lett., in
752	press, doi:10.1002/2015GL064519.
753	Clavero, J., R.S.J. Sparks, H.E. Huppert, and W.B. Dade (2002), Geological constraints
754	on the emplacement mechanism of the Parinacota debris avalanche, northern Chile,
755	Bull. Volcanol., 64, 3-20.

- 756 Clavero, J., R.S.J. Sparks, M.S. Pringle, E. Polanco and M.C. Gardeweg (2004),
- 757 Evolution and volcanic hazards of Taapaca Volcanic Complex, Central Andes of
 758 Northern Chile, *J. Geol. Soc*, 161, 1-17.
- Coombs, M.L., D.A. Clague, G.F. Moore, and B.L. Cousens (2004), Growth and collapse
 of Waianae Volcano, Hawaii, as revealed by exploration of its submarine flanks. *Geochem. Geophys, Geosyst.*, 5, Q08006.
- Coombs, M.L., S.M. White, and D.W. Scholl (2007), Massive edifice failure at Aleutian
 arc volcanoes. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 256, 403-418.
- 764 Crandell, D.R., C.D. Miller, H.X. Glicken, R.L. Christiansen, and C.G. Newhall (1984),
 765 Catastrophic debris avalanche from ancestral Mount Shasta volcano, California.
 766 *Geology*, 12, 143-146.
- 767 Croff Bell, K., S.N. Carey, P. Nomikou, H. Sigurdsson, and D. Sakellariou (2013),
 768 Submarine evidence of a debris-avalanche deposit on the eastern slope of Santorini
 769 volcano, Greece. *Tectonophysics*, 597-598, 147-160.
- Crutchley, G.J., J. Karstens, C. Berndt, P.J. Talling, S.F.L. Watt, M.E. Vardy, V.
 Hühnerbach, M. Urlaub, S. Sarkar and others (2013), Insights into the emplacement
 dynamics of volcanic debris avalanches from high resolution 3D seismic data
- offshore Montserrat, Lesser Antilles. *Mar. Geol.*, 335, 1-15.
- Day, S., P. Llanes, E. Silver, G. Hoffmann, S. Ward, and N. Driscoll (2015), Submarine
 landslide deposits of the historical lateral collapse of Ritter Island, Papua New
 Guinea. *Mar. Petr. Geol.*, in press, doi:10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2015.05.017.
- De Blasio, F.V., L.E. Engvik, and A. Elverhøi (2006), Sliding of outrunner blocks from
 submarine landslides. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L06614.
- 779 De Blasio, F.V. (2013), Dynamics , velocity and run-out of subaqueous rock avalanches.
 780 *Landsl. Sci. Pract.*, 5, 57-63.
- Deplus, C., A. Le Friant, G. Boudon, J.C. Komorowski, B. Villemant, C. Harford, J.
 Ségoufin, and J.L. Cheminée (2001), Submarine evidence for large-scale debris
 avalanches in the Lesser Antilles Arc, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 192, 145-157.
- Dufresne, A., and T.R. Davies (2009), Longitudinal ridges in mass movement deposits,
 Geomorphology, 105, 171-181.

- Glicken, H. (1991), Sedimentary architecture of large volcanic-debris avalanches. *SEPM Spec. Pub.*, 45, 99-106.
- Glicken, H. (1996), Rockslide-debris avalanche of May 18, 1980, Mount St. Helens
 Volcano. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report, 96-677.
- Griswold, J.P., R.M. Iverson (2008), Mobility statistics and automated hazard mapping
 for debris flows and rock avalanches (ver. 1.1, April 2014), USGS Sci. Inv. Rep.
 2007-5276, 59 pp.
- Harford, C. L., M. S. Pringle, R. S. J. Sparks, and S. R. Young (2002), The volcanic
 evolution of Montserrat using ⁴⁰Ar/³⁹Ar geochronology, In *The Eruption of Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat, From 1995 to 1999*, edited by T. H. Druitt and
- 796 B. P. Kokelaar, Mem. Geol. Soc. London, 21, 93–113.
- Herd, R. A., M. Edmonds, and V. Bass (2005), Catastrophic lava dome failure at
 Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat 12–13 July 2003, *J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res.*,
 148, 234–252.
- Hoblitt, R., D. Miller, and J. Vallance (1981), Origin and stratigraphy of the deposit
 produced by the May 18 directed blast, In: Lipman, P. and Mulineaux, D. (eds) *The 1980 Eruptions of Mount St. Helens, Washington.* US Geological Survey,
- 803 Professional Papers, 1250, 401–419.
- Hodkinson, R.A., and D.S. Cronan (1991), Regional and depth variability in the
 composition of cobalt-rich ferromanganese crusts from the SOPAC area and
 adjacent parts of the central equatorial Pacific. *Mar. Geol.*, 98, 437-447.
- Hunt, J.E., R.B. Wynn, D.G. Masson, P.J. Talling, D.A.H. Teagle (2011),
- Sedimentological and geochemical evidence for multistage failure of volcanic
 island landslides: A case study from Icod landslide on north Tenerife, Canary
 Islands. *Geochem., Geophys., Geosyst.*, 12, Q12007.
- Iverson, R.M., D.L. George, K. Allstadt, M.E. Reid, B.D. Collins, J.W. Vallance, S.P.
 Schilling, J.W. Godt, C.M. Cannon, C.S. Magirl, and others (2015), Landslide
 mobility and hazards: implications of the 2014 Oso disaster. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 412, 197-208.
- John, D.A., T.W. Sisson, G.N. Breit, R.O. Rye, J.W. Vallance (2008), Characteristics,
 extent and origin of hydrothermal alteration at Mount Rainier Volcano, Cascades

- 817 Arc, USA: Implications for debris-flow hazards and mineral deposits. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res., 175, 289-314. 818
- 819 Karstens, J., G.J. Crutchley, C. Berndt, P.J. Talling, S.F.L. Watt, J. Trofimovs, V.
- Hühnerbach, A. Le Friant, A., and E. Lebas (2013), Insights into pyroclastic flow 820 821 emplacement from high-resolution 3D seismic data offshore Montserrat, Lesser 822 Antilles. J. Volcanol. Geoth. Res., 257, 1-11.
- 823 Lebas, E., A. Le Friant, G. Boudon, S.F.L. Watt, P.J. Talling, N. Feuillet, C. Deplus, C. 824 Berndt, and M. Vardy (2011), Multiple widespread landslides during the long-term 825 evolution of a volcanic island: Insights from high-resolution seismic data, 826

Montserrat, Lesser Antilles, Geochem. Geophys, Geosyst., 12, Q05006.

- 827 Le Friant, A., C. Harford, C. Deplus, G. Boudon, R.S.J. Sparks, R. Herd, and J.-C. Komorowski (2004), Geomorphological evolution of Montserrat (West Indies): 828 829 importance of flank collapse and erosional processes, J. Geol. Soc. London, 161, 830 147-160.
- 831 Le Friant, A., C. Deplus, G. Boudon, J-C. Komorowski, J. Trofimovs, R.S.J. Sparks, and 832 P.J. Talling (2009), Submarine deposition of volcaniclastic material from the 1995-2005 eruptions of the Soufrière Hills volcano, Montserrat, J. Geol. Soc. London, 833 166, 171-182. 834
- 835 Le Friant, A., O. Ishizuka, G. Boudon, M.R. Palmer, P.J. Talling, B. Villemant, T. Adachi, M. Aljahdali, C. Breitkreuz, M. Brunet, and others (2015), Submarine record of 836 volcanic island construction and collapse in the Lesser Antilles arc: First scientific 837
- 838 drilling of submarine volcanic island landslides by IODP Expedition 340.
- 839 Geochem. Geophys, Geosyst., 16, 420-442.
- 840 Legros, F. (2002), The mobility of long-runout landslides. Eng. Geol., 63, 301-331.
- 841 Major, J.J., and R.M. Iverson (1999), Debris-flow deposition: Effects of pore-fluid
- 842 pressure and friction concentrated at flow margins. Geol. Soc. Am. Bull., 111, 1424-843 1434.
- 844 Masson, D.G., A.B. Watts, M.J.R. Gee, R. Urgeles, N.C. Mitchell, T.P. Le Bas, and M. Canals (2002), Slope failures on the flanks of the western Canary Islands. Earth-845 846 Sci. Rev., 57, 1-35.
 - 36

848 landslides: processes, triggers and hazard prediction. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A., 364, 849 2009-2039. 850 Morgan, J.K., D.A. Clague, D.C. Borchers, A.S. Davis, K.L. Milliken (2007), Mauna 851 Loa's submarine western flank: Landsliding, deep volcanic spreading, and 852 hydrothermal alteration. Geochem. Geophys, Geosyst., 8, Q05002. 853 Moore, J.G., D.A. Clague, R.T. Holcomb, P.W. Lipman, W.R. Normark, and M.E. Torresan (1989), Prodigious submarine landslides on the Hawaiian ridge. J. 854 855 Geophys. Res., 94,17465-17484. Naranjo, J.A., and P. Francis (1987), High velocity debris avalanche at Lastarria volcano 856 857 in the north Chilean Andes. Bull. Volcanol., 49, 509-514. Paguican, E.M.R., B. van Wyk de Vries, A. Lagmay (2014), Hummocks: how they form 858 859 and how they evolve in rockslide-debris avalanches. Landslides, 11, 67-80. 860 Reid, R.P., S.N. Carey, and D.R. Ross (1996), Late Quaternary sedimentation in the 861 Lesser Antilles island arc. Bull. Geol. Soc. Am., 108, 78-100. Reimer, P.J., E. Bard, A. Bayliss, J.W. Beck, P.G. Blackwell and others (2013), IntCal13 862 and Marine13 Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curves 0-50,000 Years cal BP. 863 864 Radiocarbon, 55, 1869-1887. Roobol M.J., and A.L. Smith (1998), Pyroclastic stratigraphy of the Soufrière Hills 865 866 volcano, Montserrat; implications for the present eruption, Geophys. Res. Lett., 25, 867 3393-3396. 868 Satake, K. (2007), Volcanic origin of the 1741 Oshima-Oshima tsunami in the Japan Sea. 869 Earth, Planets Space 59, 381-390. 870 Shea, T., B. van Wyk de Vries, M. Pilato, M. (2008), Emplacement mechanisms of 871 contrasting debris avalanches at Volcán Mombacho (Nicaragua), provided by 872 structural and facies analysis. Bull. Volcanol., 70, 899-921. 873 Siebe, C., J.C. Komorowski, M.F. Sheridan (1992), Morphology and emplacement of an 874 unusual debris-avalanche deposit at Jocotitlán volcano, Central Mexico. Bull. 875 Volcanol., 54, 573-589. 876 Siebert, L. (1984), Large volcanic debris avalanches: characteristics of source areas, deposits, and associated eruptions. J. Volcanol. Geoth. Res., 22, 163-197. 877

Masson, D.G., C.B. Harbitz, R.B. Wynn, G. Pedersen, and F. Lovholt (2006), Submarine

847

- Silver, E., S. Day, S. Ward, G. Hoffmann, P. Llanes, N. Driscoll, B. Appelgate, and S.
 Saunders (2009), Volcano collapse and tsunami generation in the Bismarck
- 880 Volcanic Arc, Papua New Guinea. J. Volcanol. Geoth. Res., 186:210-222.
- Smith, A.L., M.J. Roobol, J.H. Schellekens, and G.S. Mattioli (2007), Prehistoric
 stratigraphy of the Soufrière Hills–South Soufrière Hills volcanic complex,
 Montserrat, West Indies. *J. Geol.*, 115, 115–127.
- Stinton, A.J., P.D. Cole, H.M. Odbert, T. Christopher, G. Avard, and M. Bernstein (2014),
 Dome growth and valley fill during Phase 5 (8 October 2009 11 February 2010)
 at the Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat, in: Wadge, G., Robertson, R.E.A.,
- Voight, B. (Eds.), *The Eruption of Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat, from 2000 to 2010.* Geol. Soc., London, Memoirs, 39.
- Talling, P.J., D.G. Masson, E.J. Sumner, and G. Malgesini (2012), Subaqueous sediment
 density flows: depositional processes and deposit types. *Sedimentology* 59:19392003.
- Trofimovs, J., R.S.J. Sparks, and P.J. Talling (2008), Anatomy of a submarine pyroclastic
 flow and associated turbidity current: July 2003 dome collapse event, Soufrière
 Hills volcano, Montserrat, West Indies, *Sedimentology*, 55, 617-634.
- Trofimovs, J., J.K. Fisher, H.A. Macdonald, P.J. Talling, R.S.J. Sparks, M.B. Hart, C.W.
 Smart, G. Boudon, C. Deplus, J.C. Komorowski, A. Le Friant, S.G. Moreton, and
 M.J. Leng (2010), Evidence for carbonate platform failure during rapid sea-level
 rise; ca 14000 year old bioclastic flow deposits in the Lesser Antilles.
- 899 *Sedimentology*, 57, 735-759.
- 900 Trofimovs, J., P.J. Talling, J.K. Fisher, R.S.J. Sparks, S.F.L. Watt, M.B. Hart, C. Smart, A.
 901 Le Friant, M. Cassidy, S.G. Moreton, and M.J. Leng (2013), Timing, origin, and
- 902 emplacement dynamics of mass flows offshore SE Montserrat in the last 110 ka:
- 903 implications for landslide and tsunami hazards, eruption history, and volcanic
 904 island evolution, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 14, 385-406.
- Wadge, G., P.W. Francis, C.F. Ramirez (1995), The Socompa collapse and avalanche
 event. J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res., 66, 309-336.
- Wadge, G., B. Voight, R.S.J. Sparks, P. Cole, and S.C. Loughlin (2014), An Overview of
 the Eruption of Soufrière Hills Volcano from 2000-2010, In *"The Eruption of the*

909	Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat from 2000-2010" edited by Wadge, G.,
910	Robertson, R.A.E. and Voight, B. Geological Society Memoir 3, 1-40.
911	Ward, S.N., and S. Day (2003), Ritter Island Volcano – lateral collapse and the tsunami of
912	1888. Geophys. J. Int., 154, 891-902.
913	Wall-Palmer, D., M. Coussens, P.J. Talling, M. Jutzeler, M. Cassidy, I. Marchant, M.R.
914	Palmer, S.F.L. Watt, C.W. Smart, J.K. Fisher, and others (2014), Late Pleistocene
915	stratigraphy of IODP Site U1396 and compiled chronology offshore of south and
916	south west Montserrat, Lesser Antilles. Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems 15,
917	3000–3020.
918	Watt, S.F.L., P.J. Talling, M.E. Vardy, V. Heller, V. Huhnerbach, M. Urlaub, S. Sarkar,
919	D.G. Masson, T.J. Henstock, T.A. Minshull, and others. (2012a), Combinations of
920	volcanic-flank and seafloor-sediment failure offshore Montserrat, and their
921	implications for tsunami generation. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 319, 228-240.
922	Watt, S.F.L., P.J. Talling, M.E. Vardy, D.G. Masson, T.J. Henstock, V. Huhnerbach, T.A.
923	Minshull, M. Urlaub, E. Lebas, A. Le Friant, and others. (2012b), Widespread and
924	progressive seafloor-sediment failure following volcanic debris-avalanche
925	emplacement: Landslide dynamics and timing offshore Montserrat, Lesser Antilles,
926	Mar. Geol., 323-325, 69-94.
927	Watt, S.F.L., P.J. Talling, and J.E. Hunt (2014), New insights into the emplacement
928	dynamics of volcanic-island landslides. Oceanography, 27, 46-57.
929	Yokose, H. (2002), Landslides on the windward flanks of Oahu and Molokai, Hawaii:
930	SHINKAI 6500 submersible investigations. AGU Geophys. Mon., 128, 245-261.
931	Yokose, H., and P.W. Lipman (2004), Emplacement mechanisms of the South Kona slide
932	complex, Hawaii Island: sampling and observations by remotely operated vehicle
933	Kaiko. Bull. Volcanol., 66, 569-584.
934	Zellmer, G.F., C.J. Hawkesworth, R.S.J. Sparks, L.E. Thomas, C.L. Harford, T.S. Brewer,
935	and S.C. Loughlin (2003), Geochemical evolution of the Soufrière Hills Volcano,
936	Montserrat, Lesser Antilles volcanic arc. J. Petro., 44, 1349-1374.
937	
938	Figure Captions
939	Figure 1

39

- 940 Topographic and bathymetric map of Montserrat, showing the offshore debris-avalanche
- 941 deposits 1, 2, 3 and 5 [*Lebas et al.*, 2011; *Watt et al.*, 2012b]. Deposits 1, 3 and 5 are well
- exposed near the seafloor, while Deposit 2 is partially buried but evident from the
- 943 bathymetric expression of individual large blocks. Dive sites discussed in the text are
- marked: Isis dives, from cruise JC83, are prefixed I; Hercules dives, from cruise NA037,
- are prefixed H. Selected vibracore locations, collected on cruise JCR123 [Trofimovs et
- 946 *al.*, 2008, 2010], are also marked. Points prefixed NA037 show the location of samples
- 947 discussed in the text, and numbered points refer to images in subsequent figures. Isopachs
- 948 for the 12–14 ka turbidite are taken from *Trofimovs et al.* [2010].
- 949

950 **Figure 2**

ROV images from hummocks within Deposit 1. (a) Map of image locations (see Figure 951 952 1) in this and subsequent figures. Core locations have the prefix JR123, while NA037 953 marks sample locations referred to in the text. (b) A dense, shattered lava block in contact 954 with yellow, hydrothermally-altered material and fresh lava breccia along convolute 955 margins. (c) Dense lava breccias in contact with hydrothermally-altered red and yellow 956 deformed domains. (d) Sheared and stretched deformation within hydrothermally altered 957 domains. (e) Vein-like hydrothermal alteration cutting across clast-supported dense lava 958 breccias. (f) Lava block with clear division between fresh and colonized surfaces, 959 potentially indicating a submarine origin for some material mobilized in the Deposit 1 landslide. (**b**, **c**, **d** and **f** are from dive H1308 and **e** from I219.) 960

961

962 Figure 3

963 Images from a hummock at the northern edge of Deposit 1 (Figure 2; dive I219). (a)

964 Patchy erosion of the hemipelagic cover over Deposit 1, providing a window into the

965 hummock surface and exposures through the overlying sediment. (b) Top surface of

- 966 hummock, showing typical exposure of hydrothermally altered volcanic rock. (c)
- 967 Exposure through the sedimentary drape over Deposit 1, showing a basal layer of dense,
- 968 gray, angular clasts overlain by a bedded sequence of hemipelagic sediment and mixed
- 969 volcaniclastic gravel. (e) Coarse, hemipelagite-matrix-supported to clast-supported lithic

970 breccias beds overlying the hummock surface. The basal, monomict bed of angular gray971 lava clasts contrasts with the overlying polymict beds.

972

973 **Figure 4**

974 Images of pale fine-grained sediment, interpreted as hemipelagic mud, within exposures 975 of the Wembley block (locations in Figure 2a). (a) Hemipelagic mud-rich interval of the 976 block surface, near the base of the SE side of the block (position on Figure 5), with lava 977 clasts defining crude stratification. (b) Mixed volcaniclastic breccia in the upper half of 978 the Wembley block, comprising dense grey, red and black lava clasts (position on Figure 979 5). Beneath a covering of recent grey volcaniclastic sand, pale mud (center) occurs in a 980 small isolated patch, encasing volcanic clasts. (c) Typical appearance of pale mud, with a pitted and sculpted surface, in places preserving stretched or sheared fabrics, suggestive 981 982 of a cohesive, clay rich hemipelagite. (d) Crudely bedded polymict, matrix-supported 983 breccia of volcanic clasts embedded in a white to pale hemipelagite mud matrix (outlined 984 in yellow), unconformably overlying a monomict clast-supported lava breccia at a high angle, at the base of the SW side of the block. The right hand panel shows schematic 985 986 interpretations of the contrasting hemipelagite-rich breccia at different exposures around 987 the Wembley block. In images **a** and **b**, the hemipelagic mud appears to form a matrix to 988 the primary lithology of the block (although how and when this is acquired is open to 989 interpretation - see text), but in image **d** it forms a post-emplacement talus derived from 990 reworked material.

991

992 Figure 5

993 A visual log, reconstructed from ROV imagery, of a transect up the exposed surface on 994 the SE side of the Wembley block (map in Figure 2). The surficial exposure may not be 995 representative of internal stratigraphy of the block. A white cohesive material encases 996 volcanic clasts across much of the lower half of the Wembley block, and is interpreted as 997 hemipelagic mud. This material is rare in the upper part of the block. The uppermost part of the block exposes interbedded grey volcaniclastic sands and pale hemipelagic mud, 998 999 very similar in appearance to material sampled in the JR123 vibrocores from the 1000 surrounding seafloor [Trofimovs et al., 2008, 2010]. Pie charts indicate the relative

proportions of exposed surface area accounted for by different components. Modal and
maximum lithic clast diameters, in centimeters, are given in italics and bold, respectively
(in several cases two modes are apparent).

1004

1005 Figure 6

1006 Images of the Wembley block lithologies (locations in Figures 2 and 5). (a) Monomict 1007 red and gray lava breccias and massive fresh angular lava blocks. (b) Massive single lava 1008 block within side of Wembley block. (c) Massive matrix-supported breccia of volcanic 1009 clasts within a white to pale hemipelagite mud matrix. Dark coloration may be due to Fe-1010 Mn encrustation (arrows). In some cases (lower arrow) the color contrast suggests 1011 variable encrustation in a single clast. (d) Succession of two monomict lava breccias (black overlain by red) in the upper part of the Wembley block, interpreted as block-and-1012 1013 ash flow deposits. (e) Andesite boulder with jig-saw fit fracture implying impact with 1014 nearby blocks during emplacement of the Wembley block. (f) Hemipelagic mud bed 1015 exposed at the top of the Wembley block, overlying a recessive bed of volcaniclastic sand 1016 (Figure 8). (**a-c** are from dive H1308, and **d-f** from I217)

1017

1018 Figure 7

1019 Images of carbonate samples (NA037-002 (975 m) and -005 (942 m); Figure 1) from the Wembley block. (a) NA-37-005: a pelagic limestone comprising planktonic foraminifera 1020 (including *Globorotalia*), planktonic gastropods (heteropods and pteropods). Rounded 1021 1022 patches of micrite with few bioclasts are likely burrow fills. Shallow-water benthic 1023 foraminifera are rare. (b) Hand specimen of NA037-002, a shallow-water limestone with 1024 rhodoliths of coralline algae and a variety of bioclasts. The same rock is shown in (c), 1025 where rhodoliths have been extensively bored by a clionid sponge, and shallow-water 1026 bioclasts including foraminifera and bivalves are present, along with abundant peloids of 1027 probable microbial origin, and in (d), where large benthic foraminifera (Amphistegina, 1028 upper right), coralline algae (center), bivalve fragments (original aragonite replaced by calcite spar, lower middle), and partially dissolved peneroplid foraminifera (lower left) all 1029 1030 occur within a matrix of micrite and calcite spar. Some volcanic crystals and rock 1031 fragments are also present.

42

1032

1033 Figure 8

Stratigraphic logs and new radiocarbon dates (Table 1) of core JR123-21 taken from the
top of the Wembley block (Figure 2) compared with ROV imagery from the eastern side
of the Wembley block (Figure 5), an exposure through seafloor sediment to the east
(Figure 11c), and stratigraphic logs of cores described in Trofimovs et al. [2013]. Site
locations shown in Figure 2.

1039

1040 **Figure 9**

Images of block exposures in Deposits 3 and 5 (Figure 1; dives H1309 and H1310). (a) 1041 1042 Radially-fractured dense lava block with dark Fe-Mn encrustation. This is the dominant 1043 lithology exposed at the surface of Deposit 3. (b) Polymict breccias of altered sub-1044 angular and scoriaceous volcanic clasts, forming a possible surficial deposit overlying 1045 Deposit 3. (c) Carbonate cemented conglomerate of rounded lava cobbles (beach type 1046 rock) in Deposit 5. (d) Karstic weathering in a reef block in Deposit 5. Field of view ~ 3 1047 m. (e) An overhead view of a weathered carbonate reef block in Deposit 5. (f) Slab-like 1048 carbonate blocks within Deposit 5. Similar lithologies were observed on the SW flank of 1049 Montserrat, encrusting the submerged flank of the island.

1050

1051 Figure 10

Images of carbonate samples (NA037-025 (806 m) and -026 (823 m); Figure 1) from 1052 1053 Deposit 5. (a) NA037-026, a limestone comprising coated rounded and sub-angular 1054 volcanic clasts in a carbonate matrix. In (b), the coating is shown to comprise a mixture 1055 of calcareous algae and other biota, whereas the surrounding matrix contains fine-grained 1056 volcanic material, micrite and calcite spar. A similar matrix and algal-coated grain is 1057 shown in (c), as well as shallow water fossils (e.g. benthic foraminifera Amphistegina, 1058 top left). The coating in sample -026 is shown in more detail in (d), where an algae 1059 nodule is encrusted by foraminifera, serpulid and microbial filaments. Sponge spicules occur in the surrounding matrix. (e) NA037-025, a well-sorted bioclastic grainstone, 1060 1061 comprising bioclasts and minor volcanic grains cemented by an isopachous fibrous

1062 calcite fringe (f). Bioclasts include peneroplid foraminifera, coralline algae and bivalve1063 fragments.

1064

1065 Figure 11

1066 ROV images of circular erosional or collapse structures forming within young seafloor 1067 sediment (locations in Figures 1 and 2). (a) Shallow dish-like pockmarks in Deposit 5, 1068 cutting a scarp in hemipelagic sediment all around the margin. (b) Overhead view of a relatively deep (~5m) pockmark in Deposit 5. A sharp, circular wall marks positive relief 1069 beyond the margin of the structure, with a streaking, radiating pattern on the seafloor 1070 1071 outside the structure. The wall cuts steeply through seafloor strata of interbedded 1072 hemipelagite and volcaniclastic sand. (c) Pockmark wall beyond the margin of Deposit 1, 1073 east of the Wembley block, and overlying part of Deposit 2 (Figure 1). This seafloor 1074 stratigraphy is exposed, showing four distinct hemipelagite layers, present throughout the 1075 region in cores collected in JR123 [Trofimovs et al., 2008, 2010] (Figure 8). Exposure of

- 1076 these young depositional layers suggests recent erosion.
- 1077

1078 Figure 12

- 1079 A schematic cross-section through the landslide deposits east of Soufrière Hills,
- 1080 Montserrat, summarising the main observations made for Deposits 1 and 2 in this study.
- 1081 The vertical section and scale are based on seismic profiles through the deposits [cf.

1082 *Crutchley et al.*, 2013; *Karstens et al.*, 2013].

1083

1084 **Table 1**

1085 Radiocarbon ages of monospecific planktonic foraminifera (*Globigerinoides ruber*)

1086	picked from he	mipelagi	c mud in core	samples constrain	ing the ages of Depo	sits 1 and 2.
	Sample name	Pub.	Depth below	Conventional age	Calibrated age range ^c	$\delta^{13}C_{VPDB}\%$
		code	core top (cm)	(yr BP) (1 <i>\sigma</i> error)	(cal yr BP)	±0.1

Sample name	Pub.	Depth below	Conventional age	Calibrated age range	$0 C_{VPDB}$ %0
	code	core top (cm)	(yr BP) (1 <i>s error</i>)	(cal yr BP)	±0.1
JC83-VC1-10 ^a	52752	10-11	1340 (37)	964–781	1.2
JC83-VC1-31 ^a	52753	31-32	3857 (37)	3930-3689	1.6
JC83-VC1-44 ^a	52754	44-45	5615 (37)	6135-5906	1.3
JR123-21-C10	402765	10-11	1870 (30)	1510-1331	0.5
JR123-21-C25	402766	25-26	4760 (30)	5188-4870	1.4
JR123-21-C39	402767	39-40	7450 (30)	7978-7833	1.2
JR123-21-C62	393246	62-65	38940 (400)	43139-42035	0.8
JR123-21-C84	402768	84-85	>43500	NA	0.4
JR123-21-B10	402769	99.5-100.5	>43500	NA	0.1
JR123-21-B22	393247	112-113	30280 (150)	34266-33692	0.6
JR123-21-B71	402770	160.5-161.5	39150 (410)	43311-42141	0.4

JR123-21-B76	402771	166.5	38390 (380)	42763-41710	0.5
JR123-21-B83	393248	173-174	39180 (320)	43191-42263	0.3
JR123-54 ^{a,b}	12994	235	6802 (35)	7406-7294	0.9
JR123-54 ^{a,b}	12995	242	6330 (35)	6895-6685	0.9
JR123-54 ^{a,b}	23055	273	8794 (<i>37</i>)	9525-9395	1.0
JR123-54 ^b	333973	280	8700 (40)	9465-9269	0.1
JR123-54 ^b	333974	284	8600 (40)	9391-9121	1.7
JR123-54 ^b	333975	294.5	9350 (40)	10272-10109	4.4
JR123-54 ^b	333976	303	10830 (50)	12534-12085	1.1

^a Analysed at the NERC Radiocarbon Facility in East Kilbride, UK, following the procedure described in *Trofimovs et al.* [2013]. Publication codes are SUERC- followed by the listed number; All other samples analysed at Beta Analytic Inc. Laboratories, Miami.

^b Ages previously published in *Trofimovs et al.* [2013].

1087

1088 Supporting Information

- 1089 **Table S1**
- 1090 Descriptions and locality information for samples discussed in the text.
- 1091 Videos S1 to S10
- 1092 Selected video clips from ROV dives shown in Figure 1.

^c Calibrated using OxCal4.2 [*Bronk Ramsey*, 2009] and the Marine13 calibration curve [*Reimer et al.*, 2013]. Calibrated ranges reported at the 95.4% confidence interval. BP refers to years before 1950 A.D.























