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Summary

Mantle-wide heterogeneity is largely controlled by deeply penetrating thermal convective currents. These thermal currents are likely to produce significant lateral variation in rheology and this can profoundly influence overall material behavior. How thermally related lateral viscosity variations impact models of glacio-isostatic and tidal deformation is largely unknown. An important step toward model improvement is to quantify, or bound, the actual viscosity variations that characterize the mantle. Toward this goal, two approaches are considered. The first involves simple scaling of viscosity to shear wave velocity fluctuation. Map-views of long wavelength viscosity variation give a general quantitative description and aid in estimating the depth-dependence of rheological heterogeneity throughout the mantle. The upper mantle is probably characterized by two to four orders of magnitude variation (Jwk-to-peak). Discrepant time scales for rebounding Holocene shorelines of Hudson Bay and southern Iceland are consistent with this characterization. A second approach is to bound extreme negative viscosity variation by considering both seismologically based information and dynamic models of plumes, back-arcs and mid-ocean ridges. Results are given in terms of a local average viscosity ratio, $\Delta\bar{\eta}_i$, of volumetric concentration, $\Phi_i$. For the upper mantle deeper than 340 km the following reasonable limits are estimated for $\Delta\bar{\eta}_i \approx 10^{-4}$; $0.01 \leq \Phi \leq 0.15$. A spectrum of ratios $\Delta\bar{\eta}_i < 0.1$ at concentration level $\Phi_i \approx 10^{-4}$ - $10^{-9}$ in the lower mantle imply a spectrum of shorter time scale deformational response modes for second degree spherical harmonic deformations of the Earth. This spectrum of spatial variation allows a purely Maxwellian viscoelastic rheology to simultaneously explain all solid tidal dispersion phenomena and long-term rebound-related mantle viscosity. Composite theory of multiphase viscoelastic media is used to demonstrate this effect.

Key Words: Mantle Viscosity, Heterogeneity, Constitutive Theory, Q, 1 xmg-Period Tides, Shear Modulus Dispersion
1. Introduction

Recent developments in global seismic tomography provide three-dimensional views of S-wave structure throughout the mantle. [Tanimoto 1990; Su & Dziewonski 1991; Su, Woodward & Dziewonski 1994]. The origin of lateral variation in seismic velocity is likely to involve both temperature and chemistry. To the extent that lateral structures are related to temperature fluctuations, they imply corresponding fluctuation in viscosity. In this paper we explore the limit in which deviations from spherically symmetric S-wave velocity ($\delta v_S$) arise from temperature alone and can, therefore, be related to diffusion controlled creep processes. Since density and shear velocity must be related, predictions of temperature fluctuation, $\delta T$, from $\delta v_S$ rely on geoid and plate velocity modeling [Hager & Clayton 1989; Ricard & Wuming, 1991]. Poor resolution of S-wave structure, poorly constrained activation parameters and uncertainty in lower mantle thermal structures suggests that any detailed portrayal of the three-dimensional viscosity field is unjustified. Geodynamic models of solid tidal deformation and glacio-isostasy, however, require assessment of lateral viscosity variations at an order-of-magnitude level. Map-views of a long wavelength three-dimensional viscosity field can be constructed from simple sealing relations. These are used as instructive guides. They indicate the magnitude of viscosity variability and help set criteria for estimating bounds. A significant portion of upper mantle seismic heterogeneity is associated with features of smaller scale (< 300 km) [Aki 1982; Gudmundsson, Davies & Clayton 1990; Ducker, Humphreys & Biasi 1993]. Some of the smaller scale features are resolved in the surface wave model of Zhang & Tanimoto (1992). This information, along with other seismic tomographic results, aid in constraining shorter wavelength viscosity anomalies. Models of magnetogenesis at mid-ocean ridges, hotspots and back-arc basins are also relevant to lower bounding the volumetric concentration and magnitude of negative (weak) viscosity anomalies in the shallow upper mantle. So weak are the, effective viscosities of some parts of the mantle that their natural viscoelastic response time scales fall close to many of the well-known orbitally forced tidal periods.

Although solid Earth deformation models incorporate a viscoelastic shear modulus softening, they do so with completely ad-hoc assumptions about viscosity. Low frequency softening is usually estimated by extending seismic absorption band models across the tidal band [Wahr & Bergen 1986; Mathews & Shapiro 1992]. These models are based on superpositions of one-dimensional analogue viscoelastic springs and dash-porns. An exemplary $Q$ - $\omega$ diagram is shown in Figure 1. A deficiency common to all such models is their reliance on a large number of free parameters. This absorption band construct is often referred to as the "$\omega$ - power law" for $Q$ and shear modulus dispersion.
A major goal of geodynamics is to develop a constitutive theory that bridges seismological and glacial rebound time-scales [Yuen & Peliter 1982; Zschau & K. Wang 1986; Könnig & Müller 1989]. In this paper we approximate lateral variations using a viscoelastic composite theory for multiphase media and show that the frequency-dependence of shear modulus dispersion, 
\[
\delta \mu = \mu(\omega) - \mu(\omega_0)^1/\mu(\omega_0)
\]
and intrinsic attenuation, \(Q^{-1}_\mu(\omega)\), is adequately predicted across the entire tidal frequency band. The background matrix viscosity in these models is equal to that employed in post-glacial rebound calculations.
2. Method for Long Wavelength Structure

2.1 Seismological and Flow Model Inversions

1 Horizontal thermal fluctuations in high Rayleigh number convection experiments reveal a depth-dependence that is, qualitatively, similar to observed velocity anomaly magnitudes in the mantle [Honda 1987; Machetel 1990] and this supports the notion that thermal expansivity, \( \alpha \), connects aspherical temperature, \( \delta T \), to seismic velocity variations. All tomographic images of the upper mantle show long-wavelength structure beneath the Indian and Pacific ocean that diminishes with age away from spreading centers [Su & Dziewonski 1991; D. Anderson, Tanimoto & Zhang 1992], providing further evidence that seismic anomaly and the pattern of thermal convection are related.

Joint inversion of seismic tomography, long-wavelength geoid, topography and plate velocity data provide some information for constraining lateral mantle structure. Ratio of anomalous local density, \( \delta \rho(r,0,\lambda)\rho_o(r) = \ln \rho \), to shear velocity, \( \delta v_s(r,0,\lambda)\nu_s(r) = \ln v_s \) (subscript ‘0’ indicates horizontal average) is estimated by laboratory experiments and successful inversions. Hager & Clayton [1989] and Dziewonski et al. [1993] suggest that \( \ln v_s / \ln \rho \) may have considerable radial-dependence. Other geoid and plate velocity model inversions indicate that a radially uniform value of \( \ln v_s / \ln \rho \) is appropriate. Ricard & Wuming [1991] assume \( \ln \mu / \ln \rho = 9.4 \) while King & Masters [1992] prefer a value of 6.0. The later value is consistent with estimates based on laboratory measurements [D. Anderson 1987] and theoretical models [Isaak, D. Anderson & Cohen 1992]. Useful scaling constants are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{c_1}{\ln \mu} & = \frac{\ln \rho}{\ln \rho}, \\
\frac{c_2}{\ln v_s} & = \frac{\ln v_p}{\ln \rho}, \\
\frac{d \ln v_s}{\ln \rho} & = (c_1 - 1) \frac{d \ln \rho}{2}, \\
\frac{d \ln v_p}{\ln \rho} & = (c_1 - 1) \frac{d \ln \rho}{2c_2}.
\end{align*}
\]

Quantification of lateral viscosity variation requires additional scaling information having greater uncertainty than \( c_1 \) or \( c_2 \). Here only S-wave models are considered and \( c_2 \) can be ignored.
2.2 Parameterization of Solid State Rheology

The basic assumption is that density anomalies, $\delta \rho/\rho_o$, are adequately related to convecting temperature, $\delta T$, through the coefficient of thermal expansion, $\alpha$;

$$\delta \rho(r,0,\lambda) = - \alpha(r) \rho_o(r) \delta T(r,0,\lambda)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where $r$, $\theta$ and $\lambda$ express radial, latitudinal and longitudinal spatial-dependence, respectively. High temperature creep assumes a constitutive law:

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = \frac{\sigma}{\eta_{\text{eff}}} f,$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $\dot{\varepsilon}$ is strain-rate, $\sigma$, deviatoric stress, and $\eta_{\text{eff}}$ is a, generally, nonlinear effective viscosity. For creep controlled by dislocation motion the effective (stress averaged) viscosity is

$$\eta_{\text{eff}} f = <\sigma^{\text{dev}}>/A e^{G^*/R(T' + V S')}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

where $A$ is a constant, $n$ is a power law exponent ($\approx 3$), $G^*$ is the Gibbs free activation energy, $R$, the Gas Constant with pressure, $T'$, and temperature, $T$ [Sammis et al. 1977; Karato 1989]. Exponential-dependence occurs in all mantle creep processes wherein ionic diffusion controls rate. Using $G^* = E^* - PV^* - TS^*$ in (2.4) clarifies the temperature-dependence; introducing activation energy $E^*$, volume, $V^*$, and entropy $S^*$. At any mantle position, temperature may be divided into spherically symmetric part, $T_o(r)$, and a fluctuating component, $\delta T(r,0,\lambda) = T' - T_o$. Ratio, $\Delta \eta$, represents local deviation of viscosity from a global average. Defining a viscosity, $\eta_0(r)$, having spherical symmetry, and another, $\eta(r,0,\lambda)$, that does not, ratio, $\Delta \eta = \eta/\eta_0$, becomes:

$$\Delta \eta = e^{-\left[\frac{A}{n} (T' - T_o) + \frac{2}{3} T' + \frac{2}{3} \right]}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

with $A(r) \equiv [E^* + P(r)V^* + R] / R$. Note in (2.5) that hot anomaly ($\delta T > 0$) has $\Delta \eta < 1$ while cold anomaly ($\delta T < 0$) has $\Delta \eta > 1$. Equation (2.5) assumes lateral variation to be dominated by temperature and not by defect chemistry. Water-related point defects [Hobbs 1983; Karato 1989] probably affect mantle rheology beneath back-arc basins and marginal seas since subducting slabs actively dehydrate into this environment [Peacock 1990]. The fact that only temperature effects are estimated should be carefully noted, though, most of the influence of volatile chemistry is likely to be concentrated at higher spherical harmonic order and degree than is contained in the whole mantle seismic heterogeneity model employed below.
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An order of magnitude estimate of lateral viscosity variation can be obtained from

\[
\log_{10} \eta(r,0,\lambda) = \frac{2M}{c_1 - 1} \frac{a}{T_0} \frac{1}{(x_T_0 \delta v_S) \frac{\varepsilon(r,0,\lambda)}{\delta v_S}} \left[ 1 - \frac{2}{c_1 - 1} \frac{1}{\alpha T_0} \frac{\delta v_S}{v_S} \right]^{-1} = \frac{A^*}{1 - \varepsilon(r,0,\lambda)}
\]

with \( A^*(r) = M (a / T_0) e^\varepsilon(r,0,\lambda) \). \( \delta v_S / v_S \) is \( 2 (\alpha T_0)^{-1} \). \( M = \log_{10} e = 0.4343 \). Equation (2.6) provides insight into the depth and lateral parameter sensitivity involved. There is notable uncertainty in both the activation parameter, \( a \), and \( 'Dl \cdot A' \) parameter \( c_1 \). Radial variation of \( a \) and \( \delta v_S / v_S \) are estimable to within a factor of about two. However, equation (2.6) predicts a \( T_0^{-2} \) dependence and error in estimating \( T_0 \) is of concern. Activation parameters consistent with both upper and lower mantle viscosity inversions have been discussed recently by Ivins, Sammis & Yoder [19931 (V'able. 1, Fig. 1, therein). Parameter \( c_s \) is taken to be constant with depth, consistent with inversions for geoid and plate velocity by Ricard & Wuming [1991]. Estimates of thermal expansivity, \( a \), have been reviewed by O. Anderson, Isaak & Oda [1992] and experimental results with perovskite structure [Y. Wang et al. 1991; Morishima et al. 1994] are relevant to the lower mantle. Dimensionless parameter \( A^* \) exercises stronger control than the term \((1 - .)^{-1} \), consequently,

\[
A^* \approx \frac{A^*}{1 - c_s (Y,0,\lambda)}
\]

simplifying (2.6) to a linear scaling relation. For example, \( A^* = 100 \) implies that \( v_S \) anomalies of 1% correspond to 1 order of magnitude in lateral viscosity variation. While this linear approximation is useful, it becomes rather poor in the deepest mantle and is not assumed in map-views presented below.

Perhaps a superior model for extrapolation of creep laws to depth is accomplished by replacing the ratio of activation enthalpy to temperature, \( H^*/RT \), \( (E^* + PV^*/RT) \) with a homologous temperature, \( T_m/T \), \( (T_m \) is the melting temperature) multiplied by a dimensionless activation energy \( g \) [Sammis, Smith & Schubert 1981; Borch & Green 1987]. In this case

\[
a(r) = g(r) \cdot T_m (r)
\]

Recent creep experiments for perovskite analogues [Wright, Price & Poirier 1992] and diamond cell melting experiments for \( (\text{Mg}_2\text{Fe}_1)\text{SiO}_3 \) at lower mantle pressures [Zerr & Boehler 1993] allow for a reasonable estimate of depth-independent \( g \) and depth-dependent \( T_m \).
3. Maps of Viscosity Variation

Models of Tanimoto [1990] (MDL), Su & Dziewonski [1991] (S11425.2) and Su, Woodward & Dziewonski [1994] (S12Wh4 13) for $\delta v_s(r,0,\lambda)/v_{so}(r)$ are employed with (2.6) in order to produce map-views of $\Delta \eta$ at any depth in the mantle. Assuming approximation (2.7), equation (2.6) is

$$\log_{10} \Delta \eta(r,0,\lambda) = M \frac{a}{\alpha} \frac{\text{dln} \rho}{\text{dln} v_s} T_{o}^{-2} \frac{\delta v_s}{v_{so}}.$$  (3.1)

Before discussing the map-views it is important to quantify the $T_{o}(r)$-dependence and decipher differences between seismic tographic models. Physical constants used to generate depth-dependent spherical harmonic power spectra for two long, wavelength seismic models are given in Table 1. Figure 2 shows the power spectra for two seismic models and end-member mantle geotherms $T_{o}(r)$ that correspond to single and two-layer convective simulations. Geotherms are from Leitch & Yuen [1989] ('LY s.' in Figure 2b and c) and from Tackley et al. [1993] ('T d.l.' in Figure 2a) for whole mantle and (dominantly) layered convection, respectively. Coefficients, $\eta_{lm1}$ and $\eta_{lm2}$ are normalized $\cos(m \lambda)$ and $\sin(m \lambda)$ coefficients of a spherical harmonic expansion of (3.1). Figure 2 reveals the relative contributions of differences in seismic model versus differences in model $T_{o}(r)$. Whole mantle convective geotherms tend to be colder than those for double-layer, or intermittently penetrative, convection. Comparison of Figure 2(a) and (b) shows that colder geotherms predict stronger variation in deep mantle viscosity than hotter $T_{o}(r)$. Comparison of Figure 2(b) and (c) reveals that seismic models also affect predictions of viscosity variability, especially in the deep lower mantle.

Figure 3 shows contours of $\log_{10} \Delta \eta(r,0,\lambda)$ at a 0.5 level. A value of 1.0 reveals one order of magnitude deviation from model viscosity with spherically symmetric $T_{o}(r)$. Figure 3 also shows the variability in model prediction using pairs of parameters $a$ and $c_2(\text{dln} \rho/\text{dln} p)$ that inhibit lateral variations (Figure 3a, b) as opposed to those promoting $\Delta \eta$ (Figure 3c, d). For example, the two thermal expansivity values assumed are, respectively, near the differing high-temperature and high-pressure (Y phase) estimates for forsterite suggested by O. Anderson, Isaak & Oda /1992/1. Either of the two estimates of $c_2$ used in Figure 3c, d are consistent with geoid model inversion.

The most striking feature at 350 km depth is a coincidence of northern hemispheric viscosity maxima ($\Delta \eta \approx 102$) and the centers of the great Pleistocene ice sheets. At this depth map-view structural pattern mimics the S-wave velocity model. In Figures 3a, b and d note the strong gradient in viscosity away from maxima in Europe and North America. The gradient is particularly strong between...
the Great Lakes region and mantle beneath the southwestern coast of the United States. A strong gradient is found from Hudson Bay to the West Indies. Approximately one to two orders of magnitude decrease in viscosity is predicted from the eastern Baltic to the southern Red Sea. These upper mantle predictions are relatively unaffected by choice of seismic model. Fennoscandia and Laurentia are anomalous to great depths—700 km, though positive S-wave anomalies move toward the southeast and Fennoscandian anomaly is diminished. The southern hemisphere also has strong lateral variations at 350 km depth: Australia has higher than average viscosity and oceanic mantle accounting for most of the negative viscosity anomalies (Figure 3 c). Gasperini & Sabadini [1989] and Nakada & Lambeck [1991] have noted that long wavelength upper mantle S-wave structure and regional post-glacial shoreline emergence rates are correlated. While the present study supports this inference, the main objective here is to determine overall quantitative bounds revealed by simple scaling relationships.

Depth-dependence of lateral viscosity variability is represented by the power spectra shown in Figure 2. In the deep lower mantle S)1425.2 and S 12 WM 13 have better resolution since they use SS and ScS reflected phases. Figures 3e and 3f show predicted log10Δη(r,0,λ) at a depth of 2600 km with thermal expansivity near that suggested by Chapelas & Boehler [1992]. Predicted peak-to-peak viscosity variations are 3 to 4 orders of magnitude. The main long wavelength features of S)1425.2 are reflected in the higher resolution 12th degree spherical harmonic model S 12WM 13 (compare Figures 3e and 3f). The main inferences about the magnitude of lateral viscosity variability are little affected by employing the more highly resolved lower mantle tomographic image S 12WM 13. Parameters assumed in Figure 3 are best-cs-irnates and are not chosen to either maximize or minimize lateral variability in viscosity.

Maps of Figures 3f -- 3 h form an interesting intercomparison since all parameters are identical except those associated with high-temperature diffusion-controlled dislocation creep. While Figure 3f employs form (2.4) with G * 1", maps 3g and 3h employ homologous temperature form (2.8). Figures 3f and 3g, none-tbc-less, produce similar Δη(r,0,λ) at 2600 km depth. Comparison of maps 3g and 3h shows an enhanced log10Δη(0,λ) magnitude induced by larger activation parameter g. The latter differ only in the assumed slip systems determined from high temperature creep experiments with perovskite CaTiO3 by Wright, Price & Poirier [1992].
4. Fine Scale Heterogeneity

Map-views of long wavelength viscosity allow a quantification of rheological anomaly in terms of a concentration, \( \Phi \), and new ratio, \( \Delta \eta_i = <\eta_i>/<\eta_o> \), where \( <\ldots> \) is a spatial average. The value of \( <\eta_o> \) is an average of all viscosity greater than an isolated weak component \( <\eta_i> \) (see Table 2), with \( <\eta_o> > \eta_o \) and \( \Delta \eta_i < 1 \). Subscript ‘i’ indicates multiple pairing of ratios and concentration. Soft long wavelength anomalies are estimated to be \( \log_{10} \Delta \eta_i = -2 \pm 1 \) at concentration level \( \Phi \approx 0.1 \pm 0.05 \) in the upper mantle, and at top and bottom of the lower mantle. Attention is now turned toward short wavelength features with negative velocity anomaly. These involve more extreme \( \Delta \eta_i \) and smaller \( \Phi \) than do long wavelength features. Two scales are considered. First, are those with wavelength of order \( \approx 50 - 250 \) km, corresponding to features that are somewhat resolved in tomographic models of the, top half of the upper mantle. Secondly, there are smaller scale features of lateral dimension \( \approx 50 \) km to \( \approx 1 \) km with varying degrees of partial melt content. Rock strength is reduced by partial melt. Although seismic tomography cannot be applied as in the previous section, it provides some information for constraining \( \Phi \) in the shallow upper mantle.

4.1 Lower Bound on \( \Phi \) with \( \Delta \eta_i < 10^{-2} \)

Quantification of small scale heterogeneity is difficult and, generally, simple. Scaling relation (2.6) does not apply. Sato [1991] combined velocity and attenuation data with empirically based relations to infer an asthenospheric viscosity beneath very young (O - 5 Ma) and youthful (5 - 10 Ma) oceanic lithosphere near \( 10^{16} \) and \( 10^{19} \) Pa s, respectively. A reasonable estimate in the upper mantle is that 2-3 % negative S-wave anomalies represent 2 orders of magnitude in viscosity variation [Sato, 1991].

Zhang & Tanimoto [1992] employed 75 - 250 s surface waves to construct a refined map of the, upper 500 km of the mantle and produced a spherical harmonic degree 36 model. The model images structure beneath hotspots and mid-ocean ridge.s. Zhang & Tanimoto [1992] showed that the mapped slow S-wave, area, in vertical cross-section, beneath the ridge axes scaled with spreading rate. For our purposes this scaling concept is useful since all ocean basin spreading rates are available from global kinematic modeling [DeMets et al., 1990]. A detailed volume estimate can be constructed that includes sphericity, velocity structure from the degree 36 model cross-sectional areas, known oceanic ridge spreading half-rates and surface geometry. Sub-ridge material of diminished S-wave velocity of 2% (or greater) represents roughly 0.1 % of the mantle’s volume. Only lateral contrast is considered within the oceanic LVZ with PREM [Dziewonski & Anderson, 1981] as a reference model. The LVZ is likely
to represent a viscosity minimum in radial profile [Borch & Green 1987; Mitrovica & Peltier 1993] and, consequently, embedded viscosity anomalies are even stronger in three-dimensions. Again, this lower bound is arrived at by only considering sub-ridge mantle S-wave structure. This lower bound can be improved upon by considerations of back-arc basins, hotspots and mantle beneath continental extensional provinces.

Mantle beneath active marginal seas and back-arc basins of the western Pacific contain regions of S-wave anomaly at the 2 - 4.5 % level [Fukao et al. 1992; Hasegawa et al. 1993]. Material beneath western Pacific marginal seas and back-arcs contributes an additional 0.1 % to the lower bound for mantle material having viscosity contrast $\Delta \eta < 10^{-7}$ Plumes also contribute to improving the lower bound. Numerical and analytical simulation of hotspot dynamics /Olson, Schubert & C. Anderson 1993/ indicate that the Hawaiian plume has a viscosity reduced from surrounding mantle, by 2 to 4 orders of magnitude over short (≤100 km) lateral length scales. There are two classes of plumes: 24 corresponding to large oceanic hotspots [Chase 1985] and 18 weaker, yet classifiable, hotspots [Duncan & Richards 1985]. Lower bounds for mantle fraction with $\Delta \eta < 10^{-7}$ is raised to about 0.2 - 0.5 % by considering the total contribution from plumes. Asthenosphere beneath continental extensional regimes also contributes to the total lower bound. $P$-wave imagery of the western U.S. indicates variable structure to depths of at least 200 km with amplitudes of ±4% [Dueker, Humphreys & Biasi 1993]. The percentage of continental land area participating in active extension, however, is small (≤ 3 - 4%). Continental extensional regimes probably contribute no more than an additional 0.1 % to the mantle total. Our estimate of a lower bound with $\Delta \eta \leq 10^{-7}$ is 0.6 ± 0.3 % for the whole mantle and 1.5 ± 0.7 % for the upper mantle separately. These estimates are obviously very crude.

4.2 Estimate of Partial Melt Softening

The presence of partial melt enhances aggregate rock deformation. Cooper & Kohlstedt [1986] identify three mechanisms as important. The first is caused by increasing portion of hydrostatic load that can be supported by a liquid phase. At high melt fraction ($\phi_{pm} \geq 0.2$) this mechanism can cause a catastrophic decrease in strength since nearly all deformation is determined by relatively unobstructed motion of the liquid phase [Arzi 1978; van der Molen & Paterson 1979]. Other mechanisms are effective at smaller $\phi_{pm}$: crystalline interfacial sliding and creep enhancement by solution transport. These latter mechanisms are not, however, effective at reducing viscosity by more than factors of two to live for partial melt fraction, $\phi_{pm} < 0.1$ [Cooper & Kohlstedt 1986; Riley & Kohlstedt 1991; Beeman...
1993]. Order 1 to 5% melting, typical of the locus of mid-ocean ridge asthenospheric upwelling [McKenzie & Bickle 1988; Forsyth J 1993], could correspond to \( \eta_{\text{eff}} = 2 - 5 \times 10^{16} \) Pa s. The sec values are consistent with viscosities computed recently by Scott (1993) for mantle (plus melt) convection beneath mid-ocean ridges.

Kent, Harding & Orcutt [1993?] applied seismic reflection methods to a segment of the East Pacific Rise. The cse data place tight bounds on the dimensions of the axial magma chamber. The imaged magma chamber is characterized by axial lens of 0.7 km in width and a maximum thickness of about 0.05 km. Volumetric fraction of upper mantle occupied by the, world's mid-ocean ridge axial magma chambers is \( \phi = 10^{-8} \). Models of the surrounding axial crystalline/melt mush zone suggest dimensions of 60 km in depth extent of a conically shaped region that fans out laterally to a maximum width of about 120 - 200 km [McKenzie & Bickle 1988; Kent Hardin & Orcutt 1993] and has an average regional partial melt fraction \( \phi_{\text{pm}} \approx 0.05 - 0.07 \) [Forsyth 1993]. We conclude, with about an order of magnitude in uncertainty, that seismic images and flow models of the axial mush zone imply upper mantle \( \phi \approx 10^{-5} - 10^{-4} \) with \( \Delta \eta \approx 10^6 - 10^7 \). This is a lower bound since plume and back-arc thermal-melt structures contribute in a similar manner (see Watson & McKenzie 1991; Davies & Bickle 1991). Here no consideration has been made for partial melting that could exist in these structures or anywhere else in the mantle.

5. Lateral Heterogeneity as a Composite Media

Our view of lateral heterogeneity is, in essence, that the mantle contains a spatial spectrum of thermally activated creep strength. Weak parts of the space are actually well-represented by Figure 5 which is a view of \( \delta V_2/V_0 \) below 0.6% throughout the mantle [Su, Woodward & Dziewonski 1994]. Our composite models build from the conceptual framework seen in Figure 5. Weak (slow) anomalies (Figure 5) are viewed as a two-phase viscoelastic composite since the most intense anomalies are not captured by global tomography. The long wavelength anomalies are but one part of the weak phase. The surrounding mantle (unshaded in Figure 5) probably also contains weak spots and, therefore, is also modeled as a two-phase viscoelastic composite. Each of the two regions are analogies to the shaded and unshaded portions shown in Figure 6 and are each modeled as a generally self-consistent Maxwell viscoelastic composite. The two regions are combined using Hashin-Shtrikman upper bounds. The basic components of each of these two regions is described in Figure 6 (also see Appendix). Connection of scaled \( \Delta \eta \) to ratios of composite theory are given in Table 2.
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6. implications for Rheological Modeling of Isostacy and Low Frequency Geodynamics

6.1 Glacial Isostacy

The classical determination of mantle viscosity derives from modeling slow isostatic response to the Last Pleistocene deglaciation event. The highest quality data comes from Holocene shorelines that have large uplift amplitudes. These are located near the centers of the Last Pleistocene glacial epoch: The Gulf of Bothnia and Hudson Bay. Below the sc two inland seas are Archean crust and upper mantle of relatively fast seismic velocity. One criticism of inversions for mantle viscosity that utilizes shoreline data at the sc sites [Haskell 1935] is that a spatial bias is inherent. Recent inversions of Holocene shoreline data for Australia, Great Britain and south Pacific islands yield viscosity values lower than those relying more heavily on data from cratonic continental regions [Nakada & Lambeck 1991]. Tushingham & Peltier [1992] suggest that inversions using 392 global shorelines reveal systematic misfits to data along the east coast of North America that could be explained by an anomalously deep mechanical lithosphere. Rapid land emergence in response to melting of Icelandic Younger Dryas (11-10 ka BP) ice sheets indicate an upper bound of $1.0 \times 10^{19}$ Pa s for asthenospheric viscosity [Sigmundsson 1991]. Implied lateral variations in viscosity exceed two orders of magnitude and this is consistent with predictions that rely on long wavelength seismic tomography (MDLSH, S11425.2 and S12 WM13) and laboratory creep measurements.

Shoreline data alone do not provide the spatial coverage necessary to distinguish between long or short wavelength interpretations of lateral rheological variation. More importantly, seismic tomography also faces the criticism that global models reflect long-arc averages of features that are actually of smaller scale [Gudmundsson, Davies & Clayton 1990]. If seismic pictures of 3D structure are ‘blurred’, as suggested by Machetel [1990] (applying tomography to a numerical convection experiment), then a short wavelength interpretation of the Icelandic-Fennoscandian discrepancy is more apropos.

6.2 Low-frequency Geodynamics

There has been considerable effort recently to incorporate lateral variations in viscosity into flow models of the geoid [Ritzet & Jacoby 1992] and post-glacial rebound [Gasperini & Sabadini 1989]. There are other mantle deformations for which lateral variations could also be important. In particular, there are sub-seismic oscillations caused by external tidal forcing and rotational modes such as the 434 day Chandler wobble. Solid tidal $Q$ in this frequency range has a fairly flat response.
One explanation of this observation is to extend the absorption band for low-frequency seismic waves into the tidal band \cite{Smith&Dahlen1981}. However, in this extension to the tidal band the microphysics of attenuation and dispersion is assumed to be controlled by anelastic processes. Anelasticity is quite distinct from viscoelastic fluid rheology. In the former case as $\omega \to 0$, $Q \to \infty$ and the material is perfectly elastic. It is unlikely that this ‘solid’ rheology characterizes global deformations with periods of half a day to 18.6 years \cite{Karato&Spetzler1990}. Distinguishing between solid (anelastic) and fluid viscoelastic rheology (Figure 4) in computing frequency-dependent tidal Love numbers has, in fact, been recognized by Yuen & Pelletier \cite{1982} and Dehant & Zschau \cite{1989}. Sabadini, Yuen & Widmer \cite{1995} employed a radially stratified standard linear solid (SLS) mantle model to predict tidal Love number dispersion at the 18.6 year tidal period. Although perfectly elastic as $\omega \to 0$, the stratified SLS model demonstrated the importance of a weakest short-term viscosity, $\eta_2$ (see Figure 4), in a shallow 200 km-thick asthenosphere.

What, then, can the concept of lateral heterogeneity add to our understanding of dispersion and dissipation at tidal frequencies? First, the deformation induced by external gravitational tides is maximum at the bottom of the lower mantle \cite{Smith&Dahlen1981,Yoder&Ivins1988}; a region that we estimate to have enormous lateral rheological structure (see Figures 3e to 3h). Secondly, the weak components promote a significant shear enhancement within their interiors and within surrounding stronger mantle. The weakest components of this system may be akin to the asthenospheric S1S $\eta_2$ modeled by Sabadini, Yuen and Widmer \cite{1985} in that these readily induce a viscous softening that should be reflected as a detectably large long-period tidal potential Love number $k_2$.

### 6.3 A Role for Maxwell Viscoelastic Composite Theory

Isolated pockets of viscous fluid embedded in an elastic medium induce a viscoelastic-like behavior when the deformation length scale is much larger than that of the inclusions. The mixture of viscous and elastic processes produces a new time-dependent behavior that neither the inclusion nor the matrix have in isolation from one another. The mixture creates new relaxation modes that are induced by fluid-elastic interactions \cite{Frolich&Sack1946}. These modes can act resonantly and give substantial contribution to tidal $Q$ and dispersion \cite{Ivins&Sammis1994}. The amplitudes of resonant behavior is determined by concentration ($\Phi_i$) and strength ($\Delta\eta_i$) of heterogeneities in the media. This is well known in the case of wave attenuation and dispersion in partially molten rocks \cite{Shankland,O'Connell&Waff1981}. For periods of oscillation in the tidal band the simplest possible rheological assumption...
is that of Maxwellian viscoelastic behavior. With such an assumption short period behavior is dominated by elasticity and long periods by Newtonian viscous flow. Maxwell materials have infinite dissipation \((Q^\infty)\) at long period \((T)\) and zero at \(7^\infty \rightarrow 0\) (see Figure 4). Maxwell rheology captures the basic material behavior of the mantle. \([Peltier 1989]\) during isostatic response to Pleistocene glacial loading and unloading (period \(T \approx 10^3-10^5\) years). The main drawback in applying homogeneous Maxwell models to solid body tides is the sharpness in predicted modulus dispersion and dissipation as a function of frequency \([Lambeck & Nakiboglu 1983]\). By considering a laterally heterogeneous viscoelastic composite rheology this sharpness in the response disappears. This conceptual breakthrough is realized only through appreciation of lateral variability in mantle creep strength at the 2-3 three order of magnitude level.

Although a complete derivation of a composite constitutive theory for a medium consisting of a Maxwell viscoelastic matrix with embedded Maxwell viscoelastic inclusions is beyond the scope of this paper, the main results for a multi-component theory recently developed by \(Ivins & Sammis [1994]\) can be summarized as follows:

1. A generally self-consistent theory for a two-phase viscoelastic media consisting of cylindrical inclusions can be derived as a subset of a wider class of viscoelastic thin-film composites (see \(Thorpe & Jasiuk [1992]\)) originally given by \(Oldroyd [1957]\).

2. These analytic results are combined with upper bounds on effective composite viscoelastic moduli given by \(Hashin [1983]\). Finite element studies of viscoelastic composites by \(Brinson & Knauss [1992]\) establish the accuracy of these bounds.

6.4 Prediction of Frequency-dependent \(Q\) and \(\mu\)

Figure 7 shows predictions for \(Q_\mu\) (intrinsic shear quality factor) and shear modulus dispersion \((\delta\mu)\) for a hybrid model consisting of 4 phases (see Appendix A and Figure A-1). The elastic shear moduli, \(\mu^e\), for each of the four phases are identical. Only the viscosity, \(\eta\) (see Figure 4, top frame, and Figure 6), of the 4 phases differ in ratios that are guided by those estimated for the mantle in Sections 3 and 4. In Figure 7 the long-short dashed line corresponds to predictions of a single two phase viscoelastic material of inclusions with viscosity ratio \((\mu^\infty)^{R'} = 10^7\) at concentration \(\phi = 5 \times 10^3\) with a matrix viscosity \((\mu^\infty)^\eta = 1.0 \times 10^{22}\) Pa s. (This matrix viscosity is near a long-term a value for the lower mantle that satisfies a variety of geophysical data \([Peltier 1989]; King & Masters 1992; Mitrovica\) submitted --- Geophysical J. Int.
& Peltier 1993; Ivins, Sanmis & Yoder 1992.) A second two-phase Maxwell viscoelastic material (type ‘(2)’ see the long dashed line in Figure 7) is also considered. The type ‘(2)’ composite has a lower matrix viscosity \( 0.5 \times 10^{20} \text{ Pa s} \) and a very low viscosity \( (\eta^2 = 1.0 \times 10^{16} \text{ Pa s}) \) for the respective inclusion phase. Type (2) inclusion phase occurs with total concentration level 1.71% when all of type (2) phase is treated as a spherical inclusion phase to a matrix of type (1) two phase material. The exact relations for \( \delta \mu \) and \( Q_p \) are given in an Appendix. The solid line shown in Figure 7 shows the upper bound result for a 4-phase composite. Such a 4-phase composite begins to realize a fairly 'flat' attenuation spectrum \( Q \text{ vs. } \omega \) for the tidal band. The cross at the Chandler wobble (CW) frequency in Figure 7a shows an estimate based upon theory and observation (Smith & Dahlen 1981; Okubo 1982; Wilson & Vicente 1990). In Figure 7b the cross is at a shear modulus dispersion value determined by Smith & Dahlen [1981] to reconcile observed and predicted CW frequency.

Figure 8 is similar to Figure 7, the main difference being that a lower background (matrix) viscosity is assumed. Dispersion in solid Love number is primarily due to deep lower mantle shear deformation (Smith & Dahlen 1981; Okubo 1982). Solid tidal potential Love number, \( k_2 \) is proportional to ‘softness’ or effective shear compliance. Note the significantly different \( \delta \mu (\delta k_2) \) in comparing Figure 7b and 8b at the period of 18.6 years. \( \delta k_2 \) will come under tighter observational constraint from future satellite and VLIII-derived phase-lag and amplitude information (Watkins & Eanes 1993). This geodetic data might constrain models of lower mantle rheological structure.

The broad absorption peaks that arise from lateral heterogeneity strengthen the argument that viscoelastic creep is an operative mechanism for dispersion throughout the tidal band. Such an interpretation is in accord with microphysical attenuation mechanisms (Karato & Spetzler 1990). However, all models that produce order 5% shear modulus dispersion, thus matching the Smith & Dahlen [1981] prediction at the Chandler period, require significant fractions (= 10 %) of the lower mantle to be weak by factors of 10^3 to 10^2. The viscosity reduction is not inconsistent with scaled seismic images (Sections 2 - 4), but is larger than any lower bound on concentration that can be formulated for the lower mantle separately. A remarkable property exhibited by the simple 4-phase, viscoelastic composite is its correct prediction (solid line in Figures 7 and 8) of geodynamical behavior over such a broad frequency spectrum. We conclude that a lower mantle with background viscosity of either \( 10^{21} \) or \( 10^{22} \text{ Pa s} \) that contain volumetrically significant (= 10 %) ‘soft’ zones predict tidal Love number dispersion consistent with all known constraints, but that the two background values produce very different predictions of \( k_2 \) at the 18.6 year tidal period.
7. Conclusions

The goal of this paper is to provide a quantitative assessment of viscosity variability and to demonstrate its importance to physical dispersion at tidal frequencies. Uncertainty in creep mechanics is a major obstacle to obtaining reliable viscosity estimates. It is possible, however, to construct some reasonable bounds separately for upper and lower mantle. A conservative estimate is that viscosity anomalies exist at the one to two order-of-magnitude level over lateral scales of many thousands of kilometers. Scaled mantle S-wave structure has been used to estimate \( \phi \approx 0.1 \pm 0.5 \) with \( \Delta \phi \approx 10^{-3} \). This estimate of \( \phi \) for the upper mantle ignores the top 350 km, thus, avoiding contamination from non-thermal sources [Boyd 1989]. However, it is precisely in this region that thermal fluctuation is likely to be largest since temperature advection is strongest within the thermal boundary layer of a rapidly convecting mantle. [Jarvis & Peltier 1987; Honda 1987]. Pressure promotes viscosity variability in the deepest mantle. The volume of lower mantle with \( \Delta \phi \leq 10^{-3} \) might be fairly large: \( \phi \leq 0.01 \) - 0.05. Improved tomographic resolution could make such estimates more reliable. We remark that corresponding \( \delta T \) in long wavelength models (Figure 2 and 3) are consistent with values predicted for shallow upper mantle \( (\geq 180 \ 'K) \) by Kaula [1987] and for the lower mantle \( (\leq 1201100 \ 'K) \) by Duffy & Ahrens [1992]. Recent computations of convective thermal fields that correlate with seismic observation [Cadet et al. 1994] indicate that lower mantle \( \delta T \) is substantially larger \( (\leq 1000 \ 'K) \) and this strengthens our suggestion that \( \Delta \phi \leq 10^{-3} \) occurs at a 1 - 10% volumetric concentration level.

If positive velocity anomalies beneath continental shields have thermal origin then glacio-isostatic rebound of Laurentia and Fennoscandia sample an anomalously "stiff" upper mantle rheology with respect to global spherically symmetric average values. Long wavelength viscosity anomalies in the shallow upper mantle explain the extremely rapid post-glacial emergence rates observed along Icelandic beaches. However, short wavelength variability might also explain the observed rate difference.

Mantle models with laterally heterogeneous viscosity are a key factor in properly assessing rheology in the tidal band. A 4-phase, Maxwell viscoelastic composite rheological model provides a simpler physical description of shear modulus dispersion and attenuation at tidal frequency than do \( \alpha \) - power law* models. We suggest that laterally heterogeneous Maxwell viscoelasticity may be a viable constitutive relation for periods as short as 12 hours and as long as a Milankovich cycle (O 100,000 yr). Future geodetic solutions for solid body tidal Love number dispersion \( (\delta k_2) \) might be used to constrain deep mantle lateral variation in viscosity.
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Appendix — Theoretical Attenuation and Dispersion

Below a brief sketch of the solutions for modulus dispersion ($\delta t$) and quality factor ($Q_p$) for two-phase and four-phase Maxwellian viscoelastic media is given.

Two-Phase Maxwell Viscoelasticity

The two-phase media is derived from generalized self-consistent theory [Christensen 1990]. A detailed derivation is given by Ivins & Sammis [1994]. The moduli are derived on the basis of a composite cylindrical assemblage. A ‘cmss-fiber’ shearing component (see Figure 6) is relevant to modeling mantle shear modulus dispersion. The inclusions and the matrix are compressible Maxwell viscoelastic with the same definition for viscoelastic compressibility as in Pelletier [1989]. The concentration, $\phi$, of the inclusions is dilute and there are no explicit interactions among inclusions. In a generally self-consistent scheme the moduli are derived through a ‘weak’ interaction hypothesis. This ‘weak’ interaction limit applies to all length scales of heterogeneity, provided the latter arc much smaller than a characteristic wavelength of the macroscopic deformation. This approximation is certainly realized in the case of $l=2$ deformation; the dominant mode of solid body tides.

The composite moduli are analytically tractable in the case when elastic bulk modulus, $\kappa^e$ and shear modulus, $\mu^e$, are identical. The elastic properties appear in the relations for viscoelastic moduli as a single ratio, $v = \kappa^e/\mu^e$. The only difference between the inclusions and matrix is the Newtonian viscosity of the analogue dashpot element (see Figure 4a). Thus, the composite moduli are expressed in terms of a ratio $R = -\eta'/\eta$, where $\eta'$ and $\eta$ are the viscosity of the inclusion and matrix phases. The creep function, $Y'$, in constitutive theory provides a nearly complete description of basic rheological properties [see Kanamori & D. Anderson, 1977 and references therein; Christensen 1982; Kornig & Miller 1989]. For the two-phase viscoelastic materials under discussion the creep function is:

$$Y'(\tau) = \Theta_0(v,\phi) + \Theta_1(R,\phi) \tau$$

$$+ \Theta_2(v,R,\phi) e^{-\lambda_{slow}(v,R,\phi)\tau} + \Theta_3(v,R,\phi) e^{-\lambda_{fast}(v,R,\phi)\tau}$$

where $\lambda_{slow}$ and $\lambda_{fast}$ arc transient time scales for response to a Heaviside step function increase in shear stress at $\tau = 0$ [Christensen 1982, Chapter 1; Ivins & Sammis 1994]. The term linear in $\tau$ represents a Newtonian viscous-like response and equation A-1 evaluated at $\tau = 0$ gives the instantaneous elastic shear strain response to a unit shear load. In equation A-1 time is dimensionless with a scale, $\eta/\mu$: the
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so-called Maxwell lime for the matrix material. Coefficients $\Theta_i$ are given in Tables A-1 and A-2. Parameters given in Table A-1 are coefficients of higher order time-operators of the viscoelastic composite: $a_n$'s and $b_n$'s are associated with Maxwellian stress and strain operators, respectively. For isostacy and tidal dispersion, an important mode is associated with the ‘fast’ decay lime, $1/\tau_{\text{fast}}$. Another time scale, $1/\tau_{\text{slow}}$, results from a ‘slow’ reaction. The latter mode is associated with deformation of boundaries of the heterogeneities and is controlled by the stiffer viscosity, $\eta_i$, of the matrix. (The theory is equally valid for stiff inclusions and in this case $1/\tau_{\text{fast}}$ is a not a fast decay time). The fast decay mode represents the ability of a soft heterogeneity to more easily deform. The overall amplitude of this mode of deformation is sensitive to the concentration $\phi$. A complete discussion of the se modes is given by Ivins & Sammis [1994].

The Fourier transformed shear modulus, $\mu$, for this two-phase rheology is:

$$\mu(\omega) = \int_0^{\infty} \mu_D e^{-i\omega t} dt$$

$$= \frac{i \omega}{1 + \omega^2 a_1} + \frac{i \omega b_2 - \omega^2 b_3}{1 + \omega^2 a_2 - \omega^2 a_3 (1 + i \omega)}$$

where $\mu_D$ is the time-operator shear modulus:

$$\mu_D = \sum_{n=0}^{2} b_{n+1} D^{(n+1)}$$

$$+ \sum_{n=0}^{2} a_{n+1} D^{(n)} \left[ 1 + D^{(1)} \right]$$

with $D^{(n)} = d^n/d\omega^n$ [Ivins & Sammis 1994; Christensen 1982]. The Fourier transformed constitutive relation is

$$\tau = 2 i \omega \mu(\omega) \varepsilon$$

and with equation A-2 a phase-lagged shear strain response $\varepsilon$ that follows the stress $\tau$ by angle

$$\arctan(Q^{-1}_\mu$$). The symbol indicates half-sided Fourier transform as in equation (A-2). The inverse of the quality factor is

$$Q^{-1}_\mu = \frac{1}{\omega} \left[ \omega^2 (b_2/b_3) A(\omega) + B(\omega) C(\omega) \right]^{-1}$$

$$\left[ A(\omega) C(\omega) - (b_2/b_3) B(\omega) \right]^{-1}$$
where

\[ A(\omega) = a_2 + a_1 - \omega^2 a_3, \quad B(\omega) = a_1 - \omega^2(a_2 + a_3) \]

\[ C(\omega) = (b_1/b_3) - \omega^2. \]

The frequency-dependent complex shear modulus is \( \mu^* = i \omega \mu \) whose real part,

\[ \mu(\omega) = \text{Re}\left\{ \mu^*(i\omega) \right\}, \]

is the effective low frequency shear modulus.

**A 4-Phase Model with Hashin-Shtrikman Bounds**

Using an explicit finite element simulation of composite viscoelastic materials, Brinson & Knauss [1992] recently demonstrated that variational upper bounds provide a reasonably accurate prediction of modulus dispersion for a situation in which a 'stiff' matrix surrounds a set of 'soft' inclusions. The Hashin-Shtrikman (H-S) upper bounds then are appropriate to a more complicated composite rheology involving four phases instead of the two-phase composite that has been discussed so far. It allows a fundamental step to be taken toward realistic assessment of the frequency-dependence of \( Q \mu \) and shear modulus dispersion \( \delta \mu \) in light of seismic constraints on lateral heterogeneity and thermal convective simulations of mantle dynamics. A four-phase model is constructed from the two phase model as discussed in Section 5. Hashin [1983] gives relations for bounds on the shear modulus for both cylindrical and spherical inclusions. We find that the assumed shape has little impact on the overall results.

Expressions that use H-S bounds are indicated by superscript 'HS'. The H-S upper bound on the complex shear modulus \( \mu^* \) for spherical inclusions is

\[ \mu^{\text{HS}} = (2)^* \mu^*(i\omega) + \]

\[ \frac{1}{(2)^* \mu^*(i\omega) - (2)^* \mu^*(i\omega)} \]

\[ \left( \frac{1 - (2)^\nu}{6 (2)^\nu (3^\nu + 2 (2)^* \mu^*(i\omega))} \right)^2 \]

\[ \frac{1}{5 (2)^* \mu^*(i\omega) 3^\nu + 4 (2)^* \mu^*(i\omega)} \]

where the type "2" material is a two-phase inclusion of volume fraction \( (2)^\nu \) embedded in a two-phase matrix of volume fraction \( (1)^\nu \) with \( (1)^\nu + (2)^\nu = 1 \) (see Figure A-1). The bulk modulus is assumed to be dissipation free and equal in all four phases under consideration. Finally, we note:
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\[ Q_p^{HS} = \text{Re}\left\{ \mu^{HS}(i \omega) \right\} / \text{Im}\left\{ \mu^{HS}(i \omega) \right\} \]. \quad (A-7)

In order to apply the bound given by (A-6) the complete constitutive equation for the composite viscoelastic media occupying volume space \(Q_v\) must be considered, in light of the common reference time scale, \(\eta/\mu^*\), shared with viscoelastic composite occupying volume \(Q_v\). The complex shear modulus, \(Q_p^*(i \omega)\), uses a slightly modified form for the frequency-dependent functions identified in the two-phase model. In particular, it is required that

\[
Q_{1A}(\omega) = Q_{1a} \omega^{(Q)} R^* \left[ 1 - \omega^2 \right]^{(2)(13)}.
\]

\[
Q_{1B}(\omega) = Q_{1a} \left( Q_{1a} Q_{1a} + \omega^2 \right) - \omega^2 \left( Q_{1a} Q_{1a} + \omega R^{(2)} \right) (Q_{1a} Q_{1a} + \omega R^{(2)}) . \quad (A-8)
\]

In addition, \(Q_{1C}(\omega)\) and \(Q_{1C}(\omega)\) differ by their implicit dependence on different internal concentrations, \(Q_{1d}, Q_{1d}\) and viscosity ratios, \(Q_{1R}, Q_{1R}^*\). Two new viscosity ratios are introduced as

\[
Q_{1R} = \frac{(Q_{1d})}{(Q_{1d})}, \quad Q_{1R}^* = \frac{(Q_{1d})}{(Q_{1d})} . \quad (A-9)
\]

and material of type 1 has a corresponding ratio \((Q_{1d})/(Q_{1d})\) that simply replaces \(R\). For material of type 1 the constitute \(\eta\) coefficients in Table A-1 remain unchanged, while for material of type 2 has \(R\) replaced by \(Q_{1R}^*\) and each time derivative of the operator form of the constitutive equation contains a multiplicative rescaling \(Q_{1R}^*\) where \(p\) is the order of the time derivative. In other words, each \(Q_{1a} Q_{1a}\) and \(Q_{1b} Q_{1b}\) contain multiplicative coefficients \(Q_{1R}^*\) in contrast to those for type 1 given in Table A-1. The minor differences arise solely from the necessity for a common reference time scale for adjoining composite, viscoelastic fluids of types 1 and 2.

The concentration, \(Q_{1c}\), of two-phase viscoelastic fluid of type 2 is relatively unrestricted since the 1-5 bounds are a non-dilute theory [Brinson & Knauss 1992]. Our models of mantle shear modulus (Figures 7 and 8) take advantage of this fact. The full range of models for Love number dispersion in the tidal band must consider lateral viscosity contrast at levels exceeding the lower bounds determined in this paper. This will be particularly apropos for models of the \(D''\) layer.
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Figure Captions

Figure 1. $Q - \omega$ diagram for 'a power law'. Insert shows typical shear modulus and Love number ($k_2$) dispersion. Applications to seismic data involve radially-dependent amplitudes ($Q$ inside the absorption band) and cut-off frequencies ($\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$) [D. Anderson & Given 1982]. The cross shows how such a model could satisfy a specific $Q$ value at the Chandler wobble frequency.

Figure 2. Power spectra of $\log_{10}$ viscosity variation. Normalized coefficients $\eta_{lnq}$ are related to seismic velocity coefficients by proportionality factor given in equation (3.1). Depth-dependent parameters are summarized in Table 1. The normalization convention is the same as adopted by Tanimoto [1990] (MDL.S1) and Su & Dziewonski [1991] (also see Ievins, Sammis & Yoder [1993]).

Figure 3. $\log_{10}\Delta\eta(r,0,\lambda)$ in mid-upper mantle (a-d) and deep lower mantle (e–h). Seismic models are S1425.2 [Su & Dziewonski 1991]. MDL.S1 [Tanimoto 1990] and S 12WM 13 [Su, Woodward & Dziewonski 1994]. For frames a–c, equation (2.6) applies with parameters given in Table 1. Different 'DLA' - $\alpha$ pairs are contrasted in a, b, c and d. In all cases $T_0(r)$ corresponds to a convective simulation of Tackleyetal. [1993]. Frames e and f compare variability for lower mantle just above $D^\prime$ with two long-wavelength solutions. Frames g and h assume homologous temperature $T/T_m = 0.417$ (from Zerr & Boehler [1993]) while the dimensionless activation parameter $g = 15.2$ (g) and $g = 22.0$ (h) correspond to the perovskite CaTiO$_3$ (100) and (110) dislocation slip systems, respectively, as determined by Wright, I'rice & Poirier [1992]. (These values of $g$ are with respect to $T_m$ at 700 km depth as determined by Zerr & Boehler [1993]). All contour intervals are 0.5. The zero contour corresponds to a solid line.

Figure 4. $Q^{-1} - T$ diagrams (inverse quality factor versus period of oscillation) for onedimensional spring-dashpot analogues rheologies. The diagrams only show qualitative features. The Maxwell and Burgers models are viscoelastic fluid models while Kelvin-Voigt and standard linear substances are viscoelastic, or 'anelastic', solids. The latter do not exhibit long-term creep behavior. The seismic absorption band is typically formulated as a superposition of standard linear elements whose properties are 'solve-for' parameters.

Figure 5. Volumes with -0.6 $\%$, or greater, anomalously slow S - waves throughout the mantle. (From Su, Woodward & Dziewonski [1994] - model S 12WM 13).

Figure 6. Two-phase composite model. Viscoelastic composite moduli (shear operator: $\mu^\ast$, and bulk compression operator: $k^\ast$) are analytically related to the inclusion and matrix Maxwell viscoelastic moduli ($\eta$, $\kappa$ and $\mu$) with and without primes, respectively. A generally self-consistent scheme evaluates composite operators from a solution at boundary $\zeta$. For two dimensions this is a three-phase cylinder model [Christensen 1990] (see Appendix for further discussion).
Figure 7. Predicted $Q_p(\omega)$ (a) and $\delta\mu = \frac{\mu(\omega) - \mu(\infty)}{\mu(\infty)}$ (b) of two and four-phase models (dashed and solid lines, respectively). Reference frequency $\omega_0$ corresponds to the $S_2$ free oscillation. The hand is shown spans the entire range of long period tides and extends to 60 seconds ($\approx 10^5\mu/s$) in the seismic range. Frame (a) shows experimental $Q_p$ determined at high temperature ($\geq 1000^\circ C$) and pressure ($\approx 300$ MPa for squares from Jackson, Paterson & FitzGerald [1992] using Aheimdunite and $\approx 20$ MPa for stars from Gueguen et al. [1989] using single crystal forsterite). Seismically determined mantle $Q_p$ are general by factors of 2 to 10 larger that experimental values. The value of $Q_p$ at the Chandler wobble period corresponds to that deduced by Smith & Dahlen [1981] and estimated parametrically by Wilson & Vicente [1990] (total bounds indicated by horizontal dashed lines). $Q_p$ differs from solid Q of the Chandler wobble by a scale factor less than 1.8 (Okubo 1982), but here this is ignored since it is inconsequential to the basic effect being demonstrated. The cross shows the preferred value of Wilson & Vicente [1990] (see their model 11-14). Tidal dispersion (measured by modeling $k_2$) is less than 1 percent for semi-diurnal ($M_2$) and 13.66 day ($M_f$) tidal frequencies [Robertson, Ray & Carter 1994; Charles F. Yoder, personal communication]. Refer to Table A-3 for viscosity ratio and concentration definitions for the 4-phase composite. The long dashed line and staggered long-short arc contributions from phases in volume 2 and 1, respectively. These volume contributions combine. (see equations A-6, 7) to form the 4-phase material response (solid line). Also shown is a curve (shortest dash) in (b) for a 'power-law' with an exponent of 0.09 (sec equation 7.4 of Smith & Dahlen [1981]) and a reference frequency, $\omega_0$, at $\delta S_2$ consistent with the other curves. Note that the power-law anelastic model easily fits the Chandler wobble frequency (CW) estimates (cross) by shifting reference frequency, $\omega_0$, well value above that for $\delta S_1$. However, the latter model lacks structure: a factor which may prove crucial to fitting the entire band.

Figure 8. Same as Figure 7 except lower matrix viscosity $\eta$ and lower type (1) inclusion viscosity $\eta$.

Figure A-1. Cartoon of a laterally heterogenous 4-phase viscosity mantle. Type (2) inclusions take the shapes of spheres in the model discussed in the, Appendix.
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Table 1. Depth-dependent parameters used for calculating lateral viscosity power spectra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>depth (km)</th>
<th>$A^*(10^2)$</th>
<th>$E_n/A$</th>
<th>$T_0^\dagger (10^3 \text{ K})$</th>
<th>$T_{\text{m}} (10^7 \text{ K})$</th>
<th>$\sigma (10^4 \text{ K})$</th>
<th>$\alpha (10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450.</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700.</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900.</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200.</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.296</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26a)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2835.</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.0(M4)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^\dagger$ Assumes intermittent double-layer convecting mean temperature calculated by Tackley et al. [1993].

$^\ddagger$ Single-layer convecting mean temperature calculated by Leitch and Yuen [1989].
### Table 2. Viscosity Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \eta$</td>
<td>$\eta(r,0,\lambda) / \eta_\text{eff}(r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \eta_{\text{il}}$</td>
<td>at concentration $\phi_i$, ratio of weak to average of remaining heterogeneous viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>composite idealization of $\Delta \eta_{\text{il}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See discussion in Sections 4 and 5*
Table A-1. Coefficients for Two-phase Maxwell Viscoelastic Composite*

\[ n \quad a_n \]

1 \[ \sqrt{(1 + R)} \cdot \phi (1 - R) \]

2 \[ \frac{1}{3} \left( (1 + 3R) + \phi (1 - R) (\frac{3}{2} + \nu) \right) \]

3 \[ 2R \cdot (\frac{3}{2} + \nu) \]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\hline
n & b_n \\
\hline
1 & \sqrt{\left( (1 - R) \cdot \phi (1 - R) \right)} \\
2 & \frac{1}{3} \left( (1 + 3R) + \nu (1 + 3R) - (1 - R) (\frac{3}{2} + \nu) \right) \\
3 & a_3 \\
\end{array}
\]

* Refer to equations (A-1) in (A-4)
Table A-2. General Creep Function for 2D Composite Rheology\textsuperscript{1}.

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_i \quad \text{Decay Spectra} \\
\{ \ast f_{\text{fast}} \} \\
\text{slow} \\

\begin{align*}
b_2 b_3 & \left[ \frac{1}{2} \pm \left( \frac{1}{4} - b_1 b_3 b_2^{-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\hline
m & \text{expressions} & \mathcal{E}_m \\
\hline
0 & b_2 - \frac{a_1}{b_3} \left( 1 - \frac{a_1}{b_3} \right) + \frac{a_3}{b_3} & \\
1 & \frac{a_1}{b_1} & \\
2 & b_3 \lambda_{\text{slow}}^2 \left( \lambda_{\text{slow}} - \lambda_{\text{fast}} \right) \left[ a_1 - ( b_2 + \frac{a_1}{b_3}) \lambda_{\text{fast}} + ( b_2 \lambda_{\text{fast}} + a_3 \lambda_{\text{fast}} ) \right] & \\
3 & b_3 \lambda_{\text{fast}}^2 \left( \lambda_{\text{slow}} - \lambda_{\text{fast}} \right) \left[ a_1 - ( b_2 + \frac{a_1}{b_3}) \lambda_{\text{fast}} + ( b_2 \lambda_{\text{fast}} + a_3 \lambda_{\text{fast}} ) \right] & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\textsuperscript{1}Refer to equations (A-1) to (A-4)
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Table A-3. Components of 4-Phase Composite Viscoelastic Rheology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) type (1) 2-phase (matrix) concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) type (2) 2-phase (inclusion) concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) η</td>
<td>type (1) matrix viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) η</td>
<td>type (2) matrix viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) η'</td>
<td>type (1) inclusion viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) η'</td>
<td>type (2) inclusion viscosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) ϕ</td>
<td>type (1) inclusion concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) type (2) inclusion concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Refer to Figures 6-8, A-1 and equations (A-6) to (A-9).