## **General Disclaimer**

# One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

Produced by the NASA Center for Aerospace Information (CASI)

Earth Models Consistent with Geophysical Data

### Frank Press

Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Cambridge, Mass. U.S.A.

N70-	27127
ACCESSION NUMBER)	(THRU)
INASA CR OR TMX OR AD NUMBERI	(CATEGORY)

#### ABSTRACT

A suite of the most recently available geophysical data are .inverted by an improved Monte Carlo procedure. The data are derived from surface waves for oceanic paths, eigenvibrations of the earth, elastic wave travel time and  $dt/d\Delta$  data, mass and moment of inertia of the earth. A low velocity zone is required for the suboceanic mantle as is a high density lithosphere. The high density is related to eclogite fractionation from the underlying, partially molten asthenosphere in a process involving the creation and spreading of the lithosphere. If the asthenosphere is pyrolite or peridotite then an increase of mean atomic weight across the transition zone seems required. Fairborn's new  $dt/d\Delta$  data for the lower mantle seem to show a higher shear velocity gradient than previously supposed. If correct, a compensatory lower density gradient is required. This may indicate a depletion of iron with depth in the lower mantle. The density at the top of the core is surprisingly well constrained to the range 9.9-10.2 gm/cc, a value appropriate for a mixture of iron and about 15 wt % silicon.

\_\_\_\_\_

#### I. Introduction

A major goal of geophysics is to uniquely specify the distribution of two elastic velocities and density with depth in the earth and to relate these distributions to variations in composition, phase, and temperature in the interior. Impediments which block these achievements are many. It has not been proved in the mathematical sense that a unique solution can be obtained, although BACKUS and GILBERT (1968) have shown that under certain circumstances stable weighted averages (over depth) can be calculated. Furthermore, the data set available for recovering earth structure is incomplete and imprecise. Finally the equations of state available for interpreting elasticity and density distributions in terms of composition, state, etc.are tentative ones based on uncertain theories and assumptions and limited laboratory data.

Despite these difficulties it may be possible even with the presently available data to make some meaningful statements about the interior. In this paper we explore this possibility using the most recent and best available data in a Monte Carlo inversion procedure. Our results and conclusions supersede those presented in earlier papers (PRESS, 1968 a & b) because we are able to fit models to new, more extensive and accurate data with greater speed and better precision.

### II. Method

The Monte Carlo method uses random selection to generate large numbers of models in a computer, subjecting each model to a test against geophysical data. Only those models are retained whose properties fit the data within a prescribed tolerance. The procedure offers the advantage that successful models are found without bias, preconceived ideas or uncertain assumptions of equations of state or composition. If the program is efficient so that a very large number of models are examined, the retained models can be considered as representative of the family of successful models which fit the data. When the successful models fall in a narrow band, geophysically meaningful conclusions can often be reached despite our inability to specify a single unique model. Under certain conditions (BACKUS and GILBERT 1968) a single successful model can provide unique, local averages of density or velocity.

We have modified the Monte Carlo procedure reported last year (PRESS, 1968 a) speeding up the process by 1-2 orders of magnitude. This improved efficiency enabled us to find a larger number of successful models fitting a more extensive suite of data with better precision. The flow diagram of the currently used system (fig. 1) is printed with each run of the program and provides diagnostics so that controlling constants can be set for maximum efficiency. The figure shows the diagnostics following a run of 3347 seconds on an IBM 360-65 computer which yielded 11 successful models at a cost of about \$10 per successful model. SLMD is the random selection procedure for compressional velocity (alpha), shear velocity (beta) and density (rho). TTT is a test of the model against observed travel times using BULLEN'S (1961) method in which the earth is treated as a multilayered sphere, the velocity varying according to a power law within each layer. VRPR uses a table of variational parameters (WIGGINS 1968) stored permanently in a data cell of the computer to test the perturbation of the eigenperiods due to velocity, density or core radius perturbations. This test is made after the selection of density and velocity models, the latter in order to eliminate early in the process those models which cannot be brought into agreement with eigenperiod data by density perturbations. MASMOM tests each density model against mass and moment of inertia of the earth. The flow diagram shows branching

according as the several tests are passed or failed. Each box shows the number of times the corresponding step was repeated, the average time and total time for each step and the percentage of model passing. Thus the time distribution over the various components of the program is available for adjustment of input constants for maximum efficiency and insight is provided as to how the various geophysical constraints figure in the elimination of models. A key requirement of the Monte Carlo method is that the selection procedure produce an unbiased, representative suite of models for examination. Figures 2, 3, and 4 show a run in which 25 models were generated, bypassing tests against geophysical data. It is seen that the velocity and density space between the permissible bounds is nearly uniformly filled. Since millions of earth models were generated and examined in this study it would be surprising if continued operation of the program would produce a successful model significantly different from those presented later in this paper. Some additional features of the program and procedures used are as follows:

 The earth is assumed to be spherically symmetrical and isotropic, with an oceanic crust-upper mantle structure. The radius of the core is selected randomly for each model in the range 3473 <sup>±</sup> 25 km.
 Although a, A, G could be varied at 88 points in the earth, we chose the time saving device of randomly varying 19 points, (see fig. 5, section D for their location) obtaining the remaining values by linear interpolations.

3. The fluid core was assumed to be adiabatic. The density selection procedure for the mantle below 1000 km eliminated models with extreme density gradients. The gradients in  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\beta$  were restricted to a maximum number of reversals in sign (typically 2 or 4) to restrict the complexity of models. 4. The rigidity for the inner core only affects the mode  $s_2$ . Although zero rigidity was assumed in this paper, the systematic, negative residuals for  $s_0^2$  found in our models will be used to infer a rigidity for the inner core.

5. Several exact calculations of eigenperiods were made to check the accuracy of the variational parameter method. The differences were small and well within the uncertainty of the data.

#### III. The Data

Successful models were required to fit the following data: 1. Earth mass, M=5.976 x  $10^{27}$  grams; dimensionless moment of inertia I/Ma<sup>2</sup>= .3308

2. Compressional velocity distribution in the mantle fixed very close to the models determined by JOHNSON (1969) and FAIRBORN (1969), based on dt/dA analyses of array data. P and PcP travel times fit the latest data (HERRIN <u>et al</u>. 1968) to  $\frac{+}{2}$  1 sec. The compressional velocity distribution in the core was fixed to the recent model of HUSEBYE and TOKSÖZ (1969).

3. Shear velocities below 800 km were restricted to lie within the narrow bounds reported by FAIRBORN (1969) who used Monte Carlo methods to interpret travel time and  $dt/d\Delta$  data obtained from the Large Aperture Seismic Array (LASA). Wider bounds were used above 800 km. Travel times of S and ScS were required to fit FAIRBORN'S data to within  $\frac{+}{2}$  5 sec at 10 distances between  $25^{\circ}$  and  $100^{\circ}$  and a single failure was sufficient to reject a model. These travel time data primarily constrair the mantle below 800 }

<sup>A</sup> Eigenperiods tested were  $_{0}S_{0}$ ,  $_{0}S_{2}$  through  $_{0}S_{22}$ ,  $_{1}S_{2}$ ,  $_{1}S_{3}$ ,  $_{1}S_{5}$ ,  $_{1}S_{6}$ ,  $_{1}S_{8}$ ,  $_{1}S_{12}$ ,  $_{2}S_{4}$ ,  $_{2}S_{6}$ ,  $_{2}S_{10}$ ; toroidal oscillations tested were  $_{0}T_{3}$ ,  $_{0}T_{21}$ ,  $_{0}T_{2}$  not being used because of its uncertain value; models were also required to fit surface wave phase velocities for predominantly oceanic paths as follows: Rayleigh waves in the period range 125-325 seconds (BEN-MENAHEM, 1965); Love waves in the period range 80-340 seconds (TOKSOZ and ANDERSON, 1966). We used the eigenperiod data as reviewed and summarized by DERR (1969) except as follows:  ${}_{O}S_{2}^{-} 3229.0$  seconds,  ${}_{O}S_{11}^{-} 537.5$  seconds. The uncertainty in the eigenperiod and dispersion data was taken to be  ${}^{\pm}$  0.4% due to asphericity, rotational splitting and experimental errors (DAHLEN 1968). An error analysis of the oceanic surface wave data indicates than an accuracy better than 1% was achieved. Comparison with phase velocities for other oceanic paths verified this for Love and Rayleigh waves. The fit of  ${}_{O}S_{O}$  was required to be within  ${}^{\pm}$  0.1%. Actually the final models fit most of the data to about half these tolerances. Figure 5 shows the computed eigenperiods and the residuals for a typical model.

### IV. Results

The results reported here supersede our earlier conclusions (PRESS 1968) because of the new and more extensive data set inverted in this paper. The effects of lateral variation were reduced by deriving higher mode data from oceanic surface wave phase velocities. Moreover the new procedure enabled us to find a much larger number of successful models and therefore a more representative selection from the set of successful models.

The shear velocity and density distribution are plotted in figs. 6,7, and 8 and are also tabulated (together with the fixed compressional velocity distribution) in figs. 9-13.

V. The Upper Mantle Under Oceans

Without exception every successful model contains a low velocity zone for shear waves which centers at depths between 150 and 250 km. If the lid of this zone is characterized by  $\beta > 4.5$  km/sec, then its thickness is 50-100 km. We failed to find a single model without a low velocity zone despite a special search in which 162,000 monotonic shear velocity models were examined. A low velocity zone seems required by our data since essentially every possible<sup>-</sup> mcdel without it was examined and eliminated. Nevertheless, HADDON and BULLEN (1969) reported a successful monotonic model, probably because: (1) they only use modes through n=44, whereas our data go to n=105; (2) our Love wave phase velocities trend towards lower values than the HB data (see fig. 14).

The several mechanisms which might account for the low velocity

7 Press

partial (grain boundary) melting for the following reasons: (1) shear velocity and Q are sensitive to the presence of small amounts of melt along grain boundaries; (2) data presented at this conference by several investigators show that the temperature at which melting begins in the wet state for candidate upper mantle mineral assemblages is sufficiently low to be reached by the geotherm for most thermal models of the earth; (3) the partial melting product of candidate mineral assemblages can account for basaltic vulcanism; (4) a partially molten, low strength zone would serve to mechanically decouple the lithosphere from the underlying mantle as is required by some proposed mechanisms for the spreading sea floor.

The density values shown in figs. 7 and 15 fill the entire permissible range at the M-discontinuity indicating a lack of constraint by the geophysical data. However, the initial density gradients are all positive and in the vicinity of 100 km all the values fall in the narrow band 3.5-3.6 gm/cm<sup>3</sup> in the upper part of the permissible range. As a check on this result a special search was made without success to find models with densities below 3.4 gm/cm<sup>3</sup> in this depth range. For additional confirmation of this result we applied the BACKUS and GILBERT (1968) & -ness criterion using weighting functions computed for our data by WIGGINS (1969). According to Backus and Gilbert, if the weighting functions are concentrated over narrow depth intervals, a stable local average can be obtained from a single model. Using this procedure every one of the models yielded an average density in the range 3.5-3.6 g/cm<sup>3</sup> for the depth interval 75-125 km. Presumably the average density near 100 km is uniquely determined in the sense that any model computed from our data set should give the same value.

Unfortunately the density resolution deteriorates below 100 km as can be seen by the wider band of Monte Carlo solutions. At

More complex models were found involving two low velocity or two low density zones in the upper mantle. However, these models yield the same indication of high density near 100 km.

The indicated density for the lithosphere near 100 km is so high as to narrow the range of its possible composition to an eclogitic facies. This follows of the selection is made from the current petrologic hypotheses for the constitution of the upper mantle. In fig. 15 densities computed by CLARK and RINGWOOD (1964) for a mantle composed of pyrolite (peridotite or dunite would give about the same values) and eclogite. Only the eclogite model is consistent with our results between 80 and 150 km. Either model is acceptable above this region and the pyrolite model is weakly favored near 300 km. A more extended discussion of these results can be found in another paper (PRESS 1969) where a hypothesis is proposed in which eclogite fractionation from the underlying, partially molten asthenosphere is involved in the creation and spreading of the sub-oceanic, rigid, lithospheric plate. BIRCH (1969) also interpreted these results to imply an eclogitic composition.

### VI. The Transition Zone

Seismic array data have been used recently to establish rapid velocity changes near 400 and 700 km (see for example JOHNSON, 1967). These results have been incorporated in our models by fixing the compressional velocity and narrowing the range of permissible shear velocities at these depths to conform to the rapid increases, as seen in fig. 6. Although no such restrictions were placed on the density values the rapid increase in density across the transition zone is evident on all models in fig. 7. This increase is due to compression, and to phase changes and possibly to composition changes. Phase transitions are/inferred from the laboratory verification of the olivine-spinel phase change at pressures corresponding to depths near 400 km and by the theoretical and experimental indications for a post-spinel phase transformation. (See for example, D.L. ANDERSON (1967) or H. FUJISAWA (1968)).

The occurrence of composition changes in the transition zone are more difficult to establish. BIRCH (1961) used the velocity change  $\Delta \alpha$ , and the density change  $\Delta P$  to separately estimate the effects of phase and composition change. Using  $\Delta \alpha$  and  $\Delta \gamma$  values for each model between 333 and 871 km, allowing .36 gm/cc for compression and using Birch's values for  $(\partial \alpha / \partial g)_m$ ,  $(\partial \beta / \partial h)_T$ ,  $(\partial \alpha / \partial g)_m$ ,  $(\partial \alpha / \partial h)_T$ ,  $(\partial (\partial h)_T$ , A m was computed across the the change in mean atomic weight transition zone for each model. Those models with reduced densities in the asthenosphere ( $\beta < 3.4 \text{ gm/cc}$ ) showed an increase of 1-2 units in m. Thus for an asthenosphere with  $m \sim 21$ , and Fe/Fe + Mg  $\sim$  0.1, as would be the case for peridotite or pyrolote, the Fe/Fe + Mg ratio would increase to 0.2 or 0.3 across the transition zone. On the other hand, no increase in m was found models with a high density asthenosphere ( $\Im$  > 3.5 gm/cc). for those If the entire upper mantle is closer to eclogite in its iron content no increase in the Fe/Fe + Mg ratio seems to be required across the transition zone. In a recent paper D.L. ANDERSON (1968) proposed that  $\Delta m \sim 1.5$  and BIRCH (1961) gave  $\Delta m \sim 1.0$  for one model.

#### VII. The Lower Mantle

Our results for the lower mantle rest heavily on Fairborn's independent determinations of a band of shear velocity distributions consistent with  $dt/d\Delta$  and travel time data obtained at LASA. The range of shear velocities permitted by Fairborn's results is quite

#### 10 Press

narrow, as can be seem in fig. 6. This enables us to use eigenperiod data to constrain the density in the lower mantle to a greater degree than was possible before. Fairborn's shear velocity envelope shows a higher gradient than has usually been assumed (e.g. when compared to the Gutenberg model) and this requires a compensatory reduction in the density gradient in order to fit the spheroidal eigenperiod data. The results are shown in figs. 6 The density is constrained surprisingly well, to within and 7. about 0.2 gm/cc for most of the lower mantle. The density gradient is less than the adiabatic gradient as can be seen by comparison with the lower bound which approximates an adiabatic gradient. Figure 16 shows our band of solutions plotted against D.L. ANDERSON'S (1968) theoretical calculations for density of the solid solution series forsterite-fayalite and his summary of shock wave data. The band of density solutions is discordant with respect to profiles of constant composition, suggesting a change of mean atomic weight from 22-23 at the top of the lower mantle to 20-22 at the bottom of the mantle. This implies a depletion of iron with depth with the Fe/Fe + Mg ratio going from 0.2-0.3 to 0.1-0.2. Although superadiabatic temperature gradients might also account for the smaller density gradient, the augmented shear velocity gradient argues against this.

This can also be seen in figure 17 where the bulk sound velocity and density Ques for each model are plotted. The figure also shows the shock wave values for Twin Sisters dunite (m=20.9) and hortonolite dunite (m=25.1), as reduced by AHRENS, ANDERSON and RINGWOOD (1969). Although the data are scanty, a reduction in mean atomic weight from 22-23 at 871 km to 20-21 at 2898 km is indicated. The discordance with lines of constant composition seems too large to be accounted for by superadiabatic temperature gradients. WANG (1969) also suggested that these data might indicate decreasing m in the lower mantle. If subsequent studies do not establish Fairborn's shear velocity distribution as a world wide phenomenon, this conclusion will

ll Press

have to be changed.

#### VIII. The Mantle

The c-g graph illustrates the main features of the mantle discussed earlier. The olivine-spinel phase transformation is evidenced between 371 km and 421 km by models with increasing c and g. Between 421 km and 621 km models with large increases in g and with little change in c could be interpreted as the result of compression and increasing iron content, the two effects having the same sign for g and opposite signs for c. The increase in c and g between 621 km and 721 km implies a phase change as the major feature. Decomposition of the ferro-magnesium-alumininum silicate to close packed simple oxides, or transformations to structures such as ilmenite or perovskite have been suggested for this region (BIRCH 1952, D.L. ANDERSON 1967, RINGWOOD 1969).

The distributions for  $\phi$  and  $k/\mu$  in the mantle are given in figs. 18 and 19.

#### XI. The Core

Results for the core are shown in figs. 8 and 20. The assumption of adiabaticity in the fluid core and the constraints imposed by the data prescribe the densities to the surprisingly small range of .25 gm/cc. The  $\delta$  -ness criterion also indicates high resolving power for density at the top of the core. Using the shock wave data of McQUEEN and MARSH (1966) and BALCHAN and COWAN (1966) we see that iron alloyed with a miscible, abundant element such as silicon (15 wt %) would account for the core densities. There is no control on the density in the inner core with the data used here. Changes in the core radius ranged from -3 km to + 10 km.

The requirement for finite rigidity of the inner core was evidenced in an interesting way. Our procedure neglects core rigidity and the only mode affected by this assumption,  $_{O}S_{2}$  showed negative residuals for every model. Using ALSOP'S (1963) correction for rigidity resulted in a reduction of the residuals, for  $_{O}S_{2}$ , the largest discrepancy being .15%. This agrees with D.L. ANDERSON'S conclusions concerning rigidity in the inner core (1969).

#### X. Discussion

The question of uniqueness arises in all discussions of internal earth structure. The Backus-Gilbert  $\delta$  -ness criterion demonstrates how stable local averages can be computed for  $\measuredangle$  , A and 
 P using eigenperiod data. However with currently avail able data the resolving power is adequate at too few places in the earth. Also the procedure does not yet allow for travel time or dt/d& data which under certain circumstances have high resolving power, nor does it consider errors in data. The band of solutions provided by the Monte Carlo method, if sufficiently narrow and if derived without bias from a large and representative selection of models, can under certain circumstances lead to meaningful conclusions. Unfortunately one is never quite sure that continued search would not reveal models significantly different from those already found, vitiating the conclusions. The use of physical arguments, laboratory experiments, theoreticalempirical equations of state will eventually provide powerful constraints. However the poor state of knowledge of the behavior of materials at internal earth pressures and temperatures, though improving rapidly, is a severe, current limitation.

With regard to the present paper and the other studies cited, we believe the following results are firm if the assumptions and data are correct:

1. The low velocity zone for shear waves in the sub-oceanic upper mantle. The parameterization included sufficiently few elements so that all possible models without a low velocity zone

13 Press

could be tested and eliminated.

2. The high density for the lithosphere near 100 km. The S-ness criterion has high resolving power for density at this depth and the narrow spread of Monte Carlo solutions indicate that errors in surface wave data of about 20% do not weaken the constraint. As mentioned earlier, we believe this accuracy was achieved.

3. The rapid velocity increase near 400 km and its association with the olivine-spinel transformation: directly obtainable from dt/dA data (with minor depth uncertainty); the phase transformation was experimentally verified in the laboratory and olivine is almost certainly a major constituent of the upper mantle.

4. The rapid velocity increase near 700 km: directly obtainable from  $dt/d\Delta$  data (with some depth uncertainty).

5. The density at the top of the core is between 9.9 and 10.2 gm/cc. The  $\delta$  -ness criterion shows high resolving power and the spread of Monte Carlo solutions is small.

#### X1. Acknowledgements

Joel Karnofsky was an invaluable research assistant in this project. R.A. Wiggins kindly made his  $\delta$ -ness weighting functions available in advance of publication. D.L. Anderson, F. Birch, C. Wang, J. Fairborn, K.E. Bullen, J.Derr, M.N. Toksöz, made manuscripts available in advance of publication. A grant from the Australian National University made it possible for me to participate in this Symposium. The technique was developed as part of an inversion procedure for lunar data with support from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under grant NGR 22-009-123. The application to the earth was supported by the Advanced Projects Research Agency and monitored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under contract AF 49(638) -1632.

#### Figures

Figure 1 - Flow diagram of Monte Carlo program during a run in which 531, 881 density models and 5025 shear velocity models were tested and yielded 11 successful models.

Figure 2 - Twenty-five shear velocity models of the mantle not subjected to geophysical constraints to test distribution of randomly generated models.

Figure 3 - Unconstrained mantle densities (see Figure 2 caption). Figure 4 - Unconstrained core densities (see Figure 2 caption). Figure 5 - Results for a typical model. Section A line 1: mass and moment of inertia; lines 2-4:  $p, \Delta$ , theoretical times, model times and residuals for S and ScS. Section B: model eigenperiods and residuals against observed eigenperiods. Section C: model printout. Section D: depths at which parameters were varied and corresponding  $\square$  values. Figure 6 - Twenty-seven successful shear velocity models for the mantle. Ticks on upper and lower bounds show where parameter was randomly varied.

Figure 7 - Density in the mantle (see Figure 6 caption).
Figure 8 - Density in the core (see Figure 6 caption).
Figure 9 - Tabulated parameters of successful models. Change
in core radius shown in lower right corner. Each model has
fixed crustal layers for depth, alpha, beta and rho as follows:
0., 1.52, 0. 1.03; 3., 6.55, 3.73, 2.84; 10, 6.55, 3.73, 2.84.
Figure 10 - See Figure 9
Figure 11 - See Figure 9

Figure 12 - See Figure 9

Figure 13 - See Figure 9.

Figure 14 - Differences in Love wave phase velocity data used by Hadden and Bullen and by Press which accounts for latter's requirement of low velocity zone. Points show how models fit the data.

Figure 15 - Successful density models for the upper mantle plotted together with Clark and Ringwood models for pyrolite , and eclogite.

Figure 16 - D. L. Anderson's theoretical models and his summary of experimental data plotted with our density solutions shown by the shaded band.

Figure 17 - Bulk sound velocity-density plot for successful models of the mantle together with static and shock wave data for dunite and forsterite-fayalite.

Figure 18 - Seismic parameter  $\phi$  for the mantle obtained from successful models.

Figure 19 - Ratio K/ $\mu$  for the mantle obtained from successful models.

Figure 20 - Band of core densities from successful models together with shock wave density data for Fe, Ni and Fe+ 19.8 wt.% Si.

#### REFERENCES

- AHRENS, T.J., D.L. ANDERSON and A.E. RINGWOOD (1969), in press.
- ALSOP, L.E. (1963), Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 53, 503.
- ANDERSON, D. L. (1967), Science, 157, 1165.
- ANDERSON, D. L. (1968), Earth and Planet. Sci. Let., 5, 89.
- ANDERSON, D. L. (1969), this volume.
- BACKUS, G., and F. GILBERT (1968), Geophys. J., 16, 169.
- BALCHAN, A.S., and G.R. COWAN (1966), J. Geophys. Res., 71, 3577.
- BEN-MENAHEM, A. (1965), J. Geophys. Res., 70, 4641.
- BIRCH, F. (1952), J. Geophys. Res., 57, 227.
- BIRCH, F. (1961), Geophys. J., 4, 295.
- BIRCH, F. (1969), this volume.
- BULLEN, K.E. (1961), Geophys. J., 4, 93.
- CLARK, S. P., and A. E. RINGWOOD (1964), Rev. Geophys., 2, 35.
- DAHLEN, F.A. (1968), Geophys. J., 16, 329.
- DERR, J. (1969), in press, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.
- FAIRBORN, J.W. (1969), in press, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.
- FUJISAWA, H. (1968), J. Geophys. Res., 73, 3281.
- HADDON, R.A.W. and K.E. BULLEN (1969), in press.
- HERRIN, E., W. TUCKER, J. TAGGART, D.W. GORDON, and J.L. LOBDELL (1968), Bull. Scismol. Soc. Am., 58, 1273.
- HUSEBYE, E.S. and M.N. TOKSOZ (1969), in press, J. Geophys. Res.

JOHNSON, L.R. (1967), J. Geophys. Res., 72, 6309.

JOHNSON, L.R. (1969), in press.

McQUEEN, R.G. and S.P. MARSH (1966), J. Geophys. Res., 71, 1751.

PRESS, F. (1968a), J. Geophys. Res., 73, 5223.

PRESS, F. (1968b), Science, 160, 1218.

PRESS, F. (1969), in press, Science.

RINGWOOD, A.E. (1969), this volume.

TOKSOZ, M.N. and D.L. ANDERSON (1966), J. Geophys. Res., 71, 1649.

WANG, C. (1969), in press, J. Geophys. Res.

WIGGINS, R.A. (1968), Phys. Earth Planetary Interiors, 1, 201.

WIGGINS, R.A. (1969), in preparation.

RAYS TESTED ALPHA TTT RFTA TTT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* : : 2 PASSING = 0.0 AV TIME = 0.0 TO TIME = 0.0 . AV TIME = 7.46 COUNT = T PASSING =+++++ AV TIME =0.00140 1561 -ALPHA VRPR ALPHA TTT ALPHA SLND • 1149 DIAGNOSTIC NUMBER 18 TIME SINCE LAST DIAGNOSTIC 191.61 SECONDS TOTAL COMPUTATION TIME 3347.42 SECONDS N 450 : : 50 \*\*\*\*\*\* ...... : 150 . \*\*\*\*\* : : 251 s : : : : • • 2 PASSING = 9.78 AV TIME =0.00667 TO TIME = 8.80 AV TIME = 0.00192 AV TIME =0.01588 TO TIME = 79.79 2 PASSING =26.25 COUNT = • 20 BETA VRPR BETA SLMD BETA TTT 50 5025 170 \*\*\*\*\* ...... 50 \*\*\*\*\* : : 5 NO 1319 : -COUNT = 531681 AV TINF =0.00380 TO TIME =2020.39 = \* PASSING =68.79 AV TIME =0.00121 TO TIME = 642.28 . RHO SLTHOD MASMON 12 00 • = 7 : \*\*\*\*\*\*\* 00 : : \*\*\*\*\* : : 5 NUMB PASS -1201-1500 1501-1800 1801-2100 2101-2400 T PASSING - 8.53 A B MODELS -5 2401-2700 FAILED COUNT = 365916 AV TIME =0.00085 TO TIME = 310.52 601- 900 LOUSS LIFE 0 101- 600 1- 300 7 VRPR 00 11.6 ŝ 129 00 = 5 0 0 ...... : 20 : 00

THE PROGRAM STARTS AGAIN WITH A NEW CORE AFTER 150 ALPHA TTT FAILURES, OR 10 BETA TTT FAILURES, OR 3000 RHD VRPH FAILURES



•

KM / SEC





NNNHHHO 0 MODEL 88446665554446667777777 1 6371.0 1.52 0.0 1.03 5 6361.0 8.00 4.62 3.44 9 6300.0 8.16 4.50 3.56 17 6100.0 8.54 4.38 3.59 17 6100.0 8.68 4.71 3.53 25 5900.0 9.92 5.50 3.93 33 5700.0 11.55 6.37 3.57 33 5700.0 11.55 6.37 4.29 54800.0 12.27 6.69 4.79 53 3600.0 13.75 7.28 5.37 51 3250.0 13.75 7.28 5.37 51 3250.0 13.75 7.28 5.37 51 3200.0 13.64 7.25 5.32 53 3600.0 13.75 7.28 5.37 1.400.0 10.9.69 0.0 10.69 53 1700.0 9.69 0.0 12.23 17 1.400.0 10.9.65 0.0 12.25 10.12 88FORE LAYER 2 867 A REVERSALS BEFORE LAYER 3 71.22.6 2 D . 0.047.02 285295 \*NI 5 4 5 5 1 N W N N NP 504.2 335.4 125.8 1308.4 1079.3 346.2 3221.5 181.1 1226.7 1473.5 146. 221. 296. 371. 921.8 MASS= 5.4 937.70 931.97 1260.32 1264.38 -7.5 22.6 16.3 97600 926.75 1256.00 1260.27 . 935.80 

 80
 80
 80

 80
 1.90

 75
 27

 27
 4.12

 27
 4.12

 3
 474.7

 3
 474.7

 19
 324.7

 19
 324.7

 19
 324.7

 19
 324.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 19
 360.7

 14
 477.3

 14
 477.3

 201408020101 2014020 \* w 1067.4 164.7 730.7 -0.9 -0.9 -0.6 5.8 3.4 1/MA2= . 13 16.6 6026 71 425 0 -10 ŝ 88 0 0.33080 24.22 3 55.22 6 83.69 575.9 820.3 429.9 321.6 139.4 963.7 813.0 427.0 305.7 205.0 734. 595.9 59 66 80 81 81 N 4.33.568 3.548 3.548 3.568 3.568 5.225 112.74 122.78 122.78 122.78 122.78 122.78 123.75 123.7 -0.8 2898. 2898. 3471. 3871. 5118. 5118. 1.3 \$ 3 579.83 1045.72 1375.71 Ū. 60.8 9997779999777999777999777799977779997779997779997779997779997779997779997779997779 55555N 886644 N8N080 48694 5 200000 0 = 2639.3 449.3 709.2 407.3 289.2 194.4 575.59 1039.71 1374.27 662.2 415.9 .1859 120.8 6.55 7.89 8.61 9.67 9.67 9.67 10.97 10.97 11.21 11.21 11.21 11.21 11.21 11.16 10.04 -0.2 -0.2 2.2 0.7 IC/MA2C= 4.23 D 58790 100 100 œ 0.38854 106.5 620.1 391.7 281.7 95.2 261.8 635.7 389.8 274.7 165.2 559.3 15.5 -0-1-1 0.10.0 3.9 32.49 65.22 94.14 

 63

 63

 64

 64

 64

 65

 65

 66

 66

 66

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 67

 700

 700

 60

 700

 60

 700

 60

 . 105 180 12 713.51 1173.89 1474.78 6.55 8.51 9.71 9.71 10.24 10.24 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 11.01 9.60 9.91 11.17 11.17 409.8 452.3 375.2 257.8 82.1 178.7 581.4 374.1 250.2 153.5 393 • -0.1 -0.4 709.28 1168.21 1470.89 2.84 3.542 3.542 3.542 3.542 3.548 4.523 3.548 4.528 4.528 4.528 4.528 110.528 111.4558 112.258 112.258 112.258 112.5558 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112.5588 112. 54013 3023 4.23 134.0 538.9 347.1 239.6 1:3.1 538.2 538.2 360.1 225.9 -----0..... C D G



KM / SEC



.



e110.	5119.	7971.	1221.	2008	2869	1-1-		771.	671.	471.	171.	276.	221.	146.	15	6371.	5110.	5119.	19.11		2000	.1.1.	1371.	871.	777	631.	**1.	296.	271.	146.	10	14.64	5118.	3871.	14 71 .	2908	71/1.	1371.	871	771.	621.	- 167	۲۳۲.	705	221.	11.	. 15.	
11.150	10.150	0.FJV	0, 110	7.950	13 770			10.070	10.000	0.670	UE 9 8	8.597	9.470	7.750	8.0.00	11.130	11.150	10.150	0.500	0.000	1 050	13.770	12.070	11.210	10.970	10.000	8.547	20.200	R.470	1.150	8.150		10.150	0.600	0.0.0	1 0.0	12.777	12.070	11.710	10.970	10.000	9.670	8.690		9 470	8. 16.0	R. (1017	
	0.0			2	7 3/ 2		n. 14.	1005	5.655	5.710	4.60.	4.484	101.7	6 622	4.399	n. n	;;		2	2		6.4C 4	A.509	6.236	5.979	5.755	111.4	4.475	4.360	4.320	4.613		20	2.0	<b>.</b>	2		6.575	6.727	2.493	5.734	· . 755	4 934		4. 36R	4.490		
12.302	12.162	1.466	11.013	10.007	9 1 2 9		4.54.	4.456	4.174	3.535	81.4.2	3.374	3.474	1 573	1. 4.90	13.432	12.679	17.185	11 774	- 20 4	10.067	1.1.1	4.956	4.507		3.857	3.010	3.291	3.461	3.610	1.407	 108.01	12.27?	11.446	11.036	10.138	111.5	4.753	4.406	4.414	4.168	194.5	3.490		1 170	1. 1. 1.	3.477	
					117.3	102 7	.4.7		57.4	57.3	47.1	46.R	\$5.0	34.1	40.0		5.1					110 3	95.4	73.8	74.3	55.9	47.1	46.9	46.5	15.7	18.2		r L					86.8	74.0	74.7	56.2	50.4	44.7		47.7	1.05	33.3	
15			1 1	į	2.17		1.44	2.12	1.79	2.11	7.77	2.33	2.18	1.75	2.1.2		81					70.0	1.00	1.97	2.15	1.69	1.0.5	2.34	2.44	1.99	1.80		27					2.01	1.01	2.14	1.71	1. 2.	99		2.64	19.1		
					2	304		r. 764	0.265	205.0	705.0	7.312	0.315	0.260	n. 749							1.241	0.284	0.276	0.200	0.252	0.707	0.313	r. 371	0.274	0.265						0.204	0.286	0.277	0.70g	0.255	611.0	0.275	N 300	1.332	1. /44	0.754	
5119.	· · · · ·	3P71.	3471.	PC46	2000	2171.	. 1 . 4	771.	671.	471.	371.	296.	221.	146	23	 6371.	5119.	5118.	3971	1478	2808	2000	1371.	971.	721	621.	.1.67	296.	271.	146.	27	 	5118.	3871.	34 71.	2898.	909C	13/1.	871.	721.	621.		371.		221.	14.		
11.150	10.150	0.600	000.6	7.91.0	17. 17		11.11	10.970	10.000	9.670	8.680	9.590	8.470	194.4	8.000	11.197	11.150	10.150	9.500	0.00	7 96 0	13.020	12.020	11.210	10.070	10.000	x. 7X	8.580	8.470	7.750	8.150	11.100	10.150	9.600	9.000	7.96.9	11.010	17.07	11.210	10.970	10.000	0.670	8.680	8 580	8.470	3.101	N. 11011	NNN
<b>.</b> ,	·	о • •	د. د	2	7 7 7 7 7		7.74 1	5.940	5.440	5. 374	4.613	4.637	4.113	4 175	4.574	0.0	0.0	د <u>د</u>	2.	2		× -11 - 1	K. 573	6.100	5.007	5.554	4.4.4	4.539	4.238	4.446	4.498	 <u></u>	2.0	0.0	0.0	2	7. 788	6.577	6.227	2.005	5.727	4.075	4.907		4. 208	4.0.12	4.502	
12.567	12.275	11.410	11.000	11-11-11	5 341		6. h 17	4.547	3.994	1.10	3.406	3. 306	3.555	10.4	1.474	 12.415	12.338	12.259	001 11 11	17 77	10. 757	3.114	4. 935	4.536	4.441	840.5	110.5	3.704	3.370	3. 503	3.563	 	12.200	11.473	11.004	10.007	1.111	4.705	4.615	4.439	3.950	1.419	3.538		3 4 94	3.575	3.374	
1.	L				117 0		11.1	74.0	50.5	25.0	47.0	44.0	44.0	37.0	34.7		3.					1.10.1	96.9	74.4	77.8	57.4	43.1	46.7	47.9	33.9	30.7		6				119.8		74.0	73.9	56.4	- 60.5	44.5		4.R. 1	35.0	37.0	
40							1.44	2.20	2. 75	1.90	2.21	2.00	2.52		1.70		62						2.01	1.94	2.17	1.79	1.04	2.24	2.66	1.71	1.97		. 92					2.01	1.01	2.12	1.77	2.44		101	2.73	1.11	1.47	
			NUMBER OF STREET						1.200	0.27	n. 30	n. 701	C. 37	100 0	1.76	 		-				2.14	0.78	0.28	-n-95	n. 35	0.21	7. 37	0. 33		2.28					• • •			n. 27	n. 201	0.25	-n-37	1.27			0.77	7.20	

at the state of the

Carl and a second second

1	. 03	4	11.417	נ נ נ נ נ נ	10.150	3071.		37	-2.	12.336		10.150	5118.
1			11.437	·	0.600	. 11 at				11	n.,		1011.
											>	0.00	70 71
			10.069	0.0	9.000	3471.				11.088	<b>.</b>	0.000	3471.
			9.976	3.7	7.960	7878.				10.148		7.960	2999
	2.01	119.3	0.00		13 770	A086		2 22	18.4	2006	1 11		2808
0.7	2.01	102.4	4. 41/	1.106	12.020	2171.	0.245	1.00	101 0	· · · · · ·	7.017	12.020	13/1.
n. 7	1.01	74.3	4.635	6.705	11.710	871.	0.774	1.98	77.5	125.9	6.256	11.210	R*1.
n. 20	2.11	73.7	4.569	5.014	10.977	771.	0.201	2.06	73.1	4.403	5.951	10.070	771.
0.7	1.01	59.0	4.117	5.550	10.000	671.	0.77R	1.07	50.1	4. 1 95	5.541	10.003	621.
	2.00	-57.1-	3.303	5.223	9.670		7.294	2.00	57.1	3.555	5.026	0.410	471.
n. 7	1.80	44.2	3.469	4.931	8. 687	371.	0. 282	1.96	44.9	3. 366	4.781	P.690	371.
·	2.60	48.7	3.436	4.306	8.5RN	206.	0.309	2.27	46.4	3.318	4.520	9. 590	296.
	2.51	47.5	3.551	4.755	P.470	221.	1.332	7.64	47.7	109.2	4.747	9.470	271.
	1.74		1.500	7.7.7	7.767-	1.4.	n.259	-1.14	34.1	3.609	4.437	041.1	1 \$6.
0.7	1.05	30.5	3.400	4.504	9.140	71.	0.277	1. 11	2.05	3.610	4.533	R. 167	
	1.58	34.8	1-17	4.683	4.00.4	10	N. 350	1.74	16.1	806.5	4-560	600.8	10
			12.096	ņ.,	11.190	6371.				12.353	0.0	11.100	6371.
			12.730	0.0	11.150	5118.		10		12.370	0.0	11.150	5118.
-	04	5.	12.226	0.0	10.150	2119.		38	2	17.711	0.0	10.150	5118.
			11.361	·).)	0. 600	3871.				11.479	•••	0.600	3871.
			17.040	0.0	0.000	. 1446				11.029	0.0	- 001-6	3671
			10.027	0.0	7.950	. 8084				10.135	0.0	7.960	7808.
n.31	2.17	117.0	5. 374	7.336	13.770	PROR.	0.300	2.17	117.3	5.744	7.362	13.770	2000.
0.2	2.08	103.5	5.089	7.052	13.030	2171.	0.293	2.09	113.5	5.109	7.051	13.030	2171.
0.7	2.94	87.4	4. 832	6.541	17.020	1371.	0.287	2.01	96.9	4.821	6.571	12.020	1371.
0.2	1.07	74.7	4.640	6.712	11.210	871.	0.280	1.93	74.4	4-544	4.201	11.210	871.
0. 7	2.15	74.3	4.561	5.874	10.970	721.	0.201	2.05	73.0	4. 184 -	202V	10.070	-121
0.2	1.91	57.6	3. 980	5.641	10.000	621.	0.277	1.91	29.0	3.953	2.250	10.000	621.
	2.00	57.1	3.296	5.229	9.670	421.	0.286	2.01	56.2	3.475	5.29	9.670	-127
0.2	2.08	45.9	3.209	4.698	8.680	371.	0.267	1.81	43.4	1.157	4 80 T	8.680	371.
2	12.6	46.7	3.404	4.404	8.587	296.			- 47 3			8 580	796
	14.2	45.5	1 2 3 3	4.4.17	8.470	271.	202	2.52	44.0	3-624	4 313	8 470	221
			-1-5-5-	4 108	1.760		0.384	1.08		- CE - E	196	7 760	
	1.03	10.1	1.571	4.520	8-160		0.00	1.00	37 0	3 507	1.101	0 140	10.
2	1 70	1 36	1 364	1 530	8 000		1 171			1 701	1 103	• 600	5
			12.745	0.0	11.100	ATT1.				13.231	0.0	11.100	6371.
			12.450	0.0	11.157	5119.				12.749	0.0	11.150	5119.
	21	6.	12.285	0.0	10.150	5118.		. 42	6	12.330	0.0	10.150	5118.
			11.424	3.7	9.600	3871.				11.399	3.0	0.400	3871.
			11.003	1.1	000.9	3471.		1		10.945	0.0	0.000	3471.
			17.087	0.0	7. 960	2808.			1	10.000	0.0	7.960	2808.
1.0	2.25	119.1	5.390	1.270	13.770	2809.	0.306	2.25	119.0	5.272	1.211	13.770	280R
	2.05	103.0	5.053	7.078	13.030	2171.	0. 202	2.08	103.4	5-116	7-057	13 030	21 71
2.0	1.00	RA	4 747	6.599	12 020-	1461	0.387		9.0	C 76 7	145 4	000 01	1111
		74.3	4.548	A 207	11 210	871	0.973	1.07	11.1	4 4 4 1 1	1.00.	11 210	871.
	3 00	72 6	01.04	1010	10.070	101.	1.0.0	1.10	7. 00	1.111	5 20 3	10.000	731
				J. [/*					J	3.740		4.010	
								1.1				8.010	311.
		***	1. 304	***	OHC. N		1. 333	2.05	40.1	3. 593	4. 707	e. 580	295
	1.17	44.1	3.492	4.209	N. 4/0		0.334	2.09	43.0	1.110	4.274	8.470	771.
	1.71		3. 53 4	4.451	1. 150	140.	0.257	1.17	34.0	3.550	4.4.4	7.760	146.
0.20	1.01	18.6	3.517	4. 545	4.160		n. 769	1.93	18.0	3.591	4.585	8.150	
0.2	1.84	37.1	3.271	4.400	8.000		0.264	1.78	36.6	3.245	4.533	R.000	10.

•

											and the second s	the state of the s	
			11.430	0.0	9.500	3871.				11.338	0.0	0.600	3871.
			10.073	0.0	9.000	3471.				10.008	۰. ۱	9.000	3471
			10.005		1 160	2809.				9.979		1.067	1909
10.174				4 340	13 770	2809					0.00		111.
0.700	2.04	R7.3	4.797	6.549	12.020	1311.	142.0	1.99	86.6	4. R.5.	6.500	12.070	1371.
0.279	1.92	74.2	4.571	6.717	11.710	.118	0.275	1.90	73.8	4.555	6.735	11.219	871.
7.201	2.04	73.0	4.455	5.958	10.970	.14	0.301	2.18	74.7	101.7	5.940	10.070	721.
0.202	2.09	60.9	3.855	5.416	10.000	621.	0.707	2.01	60.1	4.014	5.467	10.000	621.
N. 797	2.07	56.3	3.671	5.781	9.670	421	0.285	1.90	56.0	3.619	5.305	0.9.6	471.
0.272	1.96	43.8	3.474	4.860	9. 690	371.	0.294	2.09	43.0	3.237	4.689	5. 680	371
0110	2.43	47.5	3.347	4.424	8.580	296.	10.291	2.06	44.7	3.189	4-656	8.5R0	206
715.0	14.0	44.1	7.57R	4.394	8.470	221.	0. 326	2.54	47.1	1.512	101	8.470	221
7 204	2 00	a	3.567	101-2	7.760	146	102.01	2 15		3 6 6		7 760	144
0.260	1.75	37.9	3-466	4-647	R-160	71.	n 265	1 20	38.2	3 514	4.412	8 140	
0.243	1.66	35.5	1.417	4.675	8.000	16:	- 766	1-80	36-8	1.747		010 8	11
			12.872	0.9	11.140	n3/1.				12.341	0.0	11.100	5371.
			12.443		11.150	5118.		-	0.1	12.459	0.0	11.150	SILR.
	4	1.6.	12.201		10.150	5118.		7	1 7	614.21	0.0	10.150	5119.
			11.474	0.0	9.600	3871.				11.436	0.0	9.600	3871.
			11.002	0.0	9.000	3471.				11.037	0.0	0.000	34.71.
	+		10.087	3.3	7.960	SUUS.				10.150	3.3	7.96.0	Bog.
0.290	2.15	117.1	5.399	7.373	13.770	2808.	0.299	2.16	117.2	5.247	7.171	13.770	BOR.
n. 297	2.13	104.4	5.047	7.005	13.030	2171.	r.203	2.08	103.5	5.054	7.052	13.030	2171.
286.0	1.03	86.4	4.802	6.600	12.020		n. 288	2.03	87.1	4.662	6.550	17.020	371
n. 280	1.04	74.5	4.563	6.195	11.219	R71.	0.276	1.90	73.9	4.487	4.231	11.219	R71.
736.0	2.10	73.5	4.435	126.5	10.070	-121	0.291	2.05	11.1	4. 16	5 951	10.070	
7.267	1.75	56. P	4.012	5.694	10.000	621.	0.252	1.59	55.9	4 nov	5 59	10.000	621
0.10	2.20	59.1	3.440	180.5	0.670	421.	0.109	2.28	59.0	1.07	5.189	6.670	
0.277	1.01	44.3	3. 348	4 822	8.680	171.	0.295	2 17	46-1	1.115	1 1 1 1 1		271
			3 4 70		0 600	20%						3.410	221.
			3.017	1.000	8 470	221					4		
	1.00	34.1							14.7	3. 4.74		8.167	
0.257	1.73	36.1	3.345	4.573	8.000	10.	0.255	1.71	35.0	3.432	4.597	9.000	10.
			13.236	0.0	11.190	6371.				-11. 177	0.0	11.190	.111
	u	7.4	12.374	?	11.150	5118.		0	5.7	12.773	2	11,150	
			12.325	0.0	10.150	5118				76. 61-		10 157	
			11.403	3.3	9.600	3871.				11 170	2	0.000	R 71
			10.965	3	9.000	3471.				200 01			2 M -
			10.031	0.3	7.960	2898.				0.056		1 040	
202	2.10		100 5	1360	011 11	- A686	200						
			2008	7.085	13.030	2171	0.305		102.0			12.020	
									13.4		3.203	11.710	871.
1.745	2.11	13.	4.415	10.414	10.910		0. 300	2.11	74.0	4. 332	5.R60	19.970	721.
0.250	1.74	56.7	4.777	5.701	10.000	021.	0.269	1.83	57.9	4.145	5.472	13.000	671.
0.310	2.30	50.2	3. 355	5.070	9.670	471.	0.206	2.11	57.3	3.476	8.70R	C. 670	471.
7.302	2.20	46.9	3.478	4.620	8.6R)	371.	0.313	2.34	48. 7	3.503	4.527	N. 420	371 -
0. 200	2.15	45.4	3.446	4.593	8.580	296.	0.304	2.21	t. 57	3.404	4.556	9.580	206
146.0	2.44	46.5	3.472	4.350	9.470	221.	0.318	2.41	46.7	3.263	4. 376	8.470	771.
1. 273	1.05	35.1	3.492	4.363	7.760	146.	0.277	1.01	35.4	1.4.71	4.311	7.760	144.
C. 282	1.05	39.6	3.575	4.490	8.160	71.	0.277	1.91	19.7	107 6	4.534	8-1-10	1
		10.0	3			1	0./ 1		30.1	3.417	4.576	R. 000	1.

		and the second	Contraction and the second sec				
",	10.	8.000	4.610	3.363	35.7	1.69	0.251
12	71.	8.160	4.558	3.527	38.9	1.87	0.273
	146.	7.760	4.428	3.559	34.1	1.74	0.250
12	221.	R.470	4.151	3.580	48.R	2.83	0.342
	296.	9.580	4.594	3. 323	45.5	2.15	0.209
14	371.	8.680	4.770	3.392	45.0	1.08	0.284
	421.	9.670	5.050	3.767	59.5	2.33	0.312
в	621.	10.000	5.740	3.849	56.1	1.70	°. 254
	721.	10.970	5.930	4.471	73.5	2.09	0.294
14	871.	11.210	6.253	4.607	73.5	1.88	0.274
	1371.	12.020	6.545	4.799	87.4	2.04	0.789
12	2171.	13.030	7.025	5.007	104.0	2.11	0.295
	2898.	13.770	7.377	5.738	117.1	2.15	0.299
	2898.	7.960	0.0	10.155			
	3471.	9.000	0.0	11.076			•
19	3871.	9.600	0.0	11.501			
	5118.	10.150	0.0	12.373	-	3.41	
20	5118.	11.150	0.0	12.493			
	6371.	11.190	0.0	12.471			
	10.	8.000	4.55?	3.514	36.4	1.76	0.261
	71.	8.160	4.536	3.659	39.2	1.90	0.276
<i>u</i> ·	146.	7.760	4.332	3.598	35.2	1.89	n. 274
	221.	8.470	4.377	3.572	46.2	2.41	0.319
·····	296.	8.580	4.413	3.373	47.7	2.45	0.320
•	371.	8.680	4. 940	3.477	44.1	1.98	0.274
	421.	9.670	5.318	3.684	55.8	1.97	0. 293
•	621.	10.000	5.515	4.041	59.4	1.95	0.281
0	721.	10.970	5.933	4.308	73.4	2.09	0. 703
	871.	11.210	6.263	4.470	73.4	1.87	0.273
A	1371.	12.020	6.587	4.718	96.6	2.00	0.285
	2171.	13.030	7.048	5.086	103.5	2.08	0.293
<i>u</i>	2898.	13.770	7.343	5.341	117.7	2.18	0.301
	2898.	7.960	0.0	12.192			
<i>a</i>	3471.	9.000	0.0	11.976			
	3871.	9.600	0.0	11.476	-		
<i>n</i>	5118.	10.150	0.0	12.261		3.33	
•	5118.	11.150	0.0	12.449			
JU	6371.	11.190	0.0	12.300			
·····	10.	8.000	4.601	3.289	35.8	1.69	0.253
	71.	8.160	4.557	3.542	38.9	1.87	0.273
<i>M</i>	146.	7.763	4.316	3.513	35.4	1.90	0.276
	. 221 .	8.470	4.402	3.515	45.9	2.37	0.315
	296.	8.580	4.451	3.583	47.2	2.38	0.316
	371.	8.680	4.522	3.274	49.1	2.35	0.314
1	471.	9.670	5.257	3.686	56.7	2.06	0. 291
	621.	10.000	5.660	3.769	57.3	1.79	0.264
1	721.	10.970	5.891	4.484	74.1	2.13	0.207
	871.	11.210	6.202	4.644	74.4	1.93	0.279
,	1371.	12.020	6.598	4.807	86.4	1.99	0.284
	2171.	13.030	7.047	5.051	103.6	2.00	0.203
	2898	13.770	V.281	5.218	119.9	2.26	0.306
	. 2898.	7.960	0.0	10.041			
5	3471	9.000	0.0	10.994			
	3871.	9.600	0.0	11,450			
	5118.	10.150	0.0	12.426		4 28	
	5119.	11.150	0.0	12.579		4.20	
1	6371		2.0	12.952			
	0,.1.	110140		12. 733			









• • •





11 1



