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[1] In order to extend the range of conditions that can be obtained in experiments, we have measured the viscoelastic properties of polycrystalline organic borneol, as an analogue to mantle rock. Using a custom fabricated apparatus, the Young’s modulus $E$ and attenuation $Q^{-1}$ were measured accurately over a broad frequency range ($10^{-4} \leq f (\text{Hz}) \leq 2.15$) and at low strain amplitude ($10^{-5}–10^{-6}$). Creep experiments were performed with the same apparatus to measure the steady state viscosity. Anelasticity and viscosity were measured at high homologous temperatures ($T = 22–48^\circ\text{C}; T/T_m = 0.61–0.67$) and various grain sizes ($3–22 \mu\text{m}$), the growth of which was controlled by annealing. Using the measured viscosities $\eta$ and the unrelaxed modulus $E_U$, determined from ultrasonic experiments, the frequency of the entire data set was normalized by the Maxwell frequency $f_M = E_U/\eta$, resulting in $E$ and $Q^{-1}$ master curves. The $Q^{-1}$ data from previous studies on olivine-dominated samples also collapse onto the same curve when scaled by $f_M$, demonstrating the universality of anelasticity for polycrystalline materials. The similitude by the Maxwell frequency scaling indicates that the dominant mechanism for the anelasticity observed in this study and in previous studies is diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding. A generalized formulation for this similitude is provided to extrapolate the experimental data to velocity and attenuation of seismic shear waves.


1. Introduction

[2] In the past, the elastic properties of rocks at high temperatures and pressures have been measured using ultrasonic techniques or Brillouin scattering methods and, hence, have been limited to high frequencies (MHz–GHz) [e.g., Isaak, 1992; Jacobsen et al., 2008]. Because seismic waves have much lower frequencies (10–10^{-3} Hz), the frequency dependence (or dispersion) of elastic wave velocities is an important issue to be clarified. Velocity dispersion and associated attenuation are collectively referred to as “anelasticity” [e.g., Anderson, 1989]. For a one-dimensional seismological structure, such as PREM [Dziewonski and Anderson, 1981], experimentally measured wave velocities agree well with seismologically measured velocities, and detailed studies on mantle mineralogy have been successfully performed via direct comparison of seismological and high frequency experimental data [e.g., Duffy and Anderson, 1989; Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni, 2005]. This suggests that velocity reduction by dispersion at seismic frequencies is small enough to interpret one-dimensional seismological structure in the Earth. Therefore, relatively small attention has been paid to rock anelasticity. However, recent progress in seismology has revealed highly resolved, three-dimensional velocity and attenuation structures [e.g., Nakajima and Hasegawa, 2003; Tsumura et al., 2000; Wiens et al., 2006]. Because dispersion plays a significant role in causing small perturbations in seismic wave velocity through thermal and/or chemical heterogeneity in the Earth [Karato, 1993; Karato and Jung, 1998], and also because anelasticity influences attenuation structure, renewed interest in the laboratory study of anelasticity has been prompted.

[3] Experimental studies at seismic and subseismic frequencies have greatly expanded our understanding of rock anelasticity at high homologous temperature [e.g., Gribb and Cooper, 1998; Tan et al., 2001; Jackson et al., 2002, 2004; Sundberg and Cooper, 2010]. In order to minimize thermal cracking, these studies used natural and synthetic olivine-dominated aggregates with much smaller grain size ($d = 3–150 \mu\text{m}$) than that of mantle rocks ($d \sim 1 \text{ mm}$). Therefore, extrapolation of experimental data to mantle conditions is contingent on our assessment of the appropriate grain size sensitivity of anelasticity. It has been widely known that there exists similitude in anelasticity, such that frequency, temperature, grain size, and pressure dependences can be captured by a single “master variable.” Characterization of the master variable is essential to identifying the underlying mechanism of anelasticity and to applying laboratory-
derived insights to seismology. However, a consensus among researchers has not yet been reached about this issue. Gribb and Cooper [1998] first proposed the idea of similitude based on the classic model of anelasticity by diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding [Raj and Ashby, 1971; Raj, 1975]. They suggested that the master variable is normalized frequency, that is, frequency scaled by the Maxwell relaxation frequency defined by diffusion creep viscosity. Jackson et al. [2002] demonstrated the similitude with the attenuation spectra measured for various grain sizes and temperatures. Although many of their observations are consistent with predictions from the model of diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding, the master variable obtained from their data exhibited a different grain size dependence than what is expected from this mechanism. Recently, Morris and Jackson [2009a] extended the test of similitude by examining multiple data sets on olivine-dominated samples from several laboratories and applying the Maxwell frequency scaling. However, due to a lack of viscosity measurements for some of the studies, the estimated Maxwell frequencies were subject to large uncertainty.

As discussed above, a detailed analysis of anelasticity requires accurate and reliable measurement of elasticity and viscosity. However, anelasticity data with reliable viscosity data measured under known creep mechanisms are still lacking. In this study, we use an organic polycrystalline material as an analogue to mantle rock to accurately measure anelasticity and viscosity at various grain sizes and temperatures. This organic material has been shown to be an appropriate analogue to earth materials and detailed measurements of its elasticity have previously been performed [Takei, 2000]. In the companion paper, we discuss a new apparatus for measuring attenuation and Young’s modulus with great precision over a broad range of frequencies. Here we report experimental data from a suite of experiments performed within this apparatus. Detailed analyses of the data, including a test of the similarity principle and extrapolation to seismic frequencies, are reported.

2. Experimental Details

2.1. Sample Fabrication

Polycrystalline samples were created using borneol (C_{10}H_{18}O; T_m = 204.5°C), which is classified as a plastically crystalline organic that deforms by the same kinds of dislocation and diffusion processes as minerals, metals and ceramics [Sherwood, 1979]. Very fine borneol powder (~3 μm) obtained from a cold ball-milling procedure (~40°C, 6 days) was placed in a cylindrical die and pressed to 13.9 MPa at ambient temperature for ~48 h to produce fully dense, polycrystalline right circular cylinders (height = 60–70 mm; diameter = 30 mm). A Teflon inner sleeve allowed removal of the sample from the die without fracture. This method resulted in translucent (i.e., nonporous) samples with very uniform and fine initial grain size (~3 μm). After attaching two end platens, the sample and platens were sealed in a non-reactive plastic bag to prevent sublimation during mechanical testing and annealing. A mirrored crossbar and steel base plate were clamped tightly to the platens. We will refer to these components together as the “sample assembly” (Figure 1). The sample assembly is described in greater detail in the companion paper [Takei et al., 2011].

2.2. Mechanical Testing

In order to explore the mechanical properties of the analogue material borneol over the full range of its viscoelastic response (elasticity, anelasticity and viscosity), a variety of tests were employed. In a previous study, the shear and longitudinal wave velocities (V_s and V_p, respectively) were measured in pure borneol samples at ultrasonic frequency (f ≳ 1 MHz at 18 ≤ T(°C) ≤ 60) [Takei, 2000]. From such data, the complete set of elastic constants, including the unrelaxed Young’s modulus E_{UC}, was obtained. Because E_{UC} represents the crystal property, it does not depend on grain size but was found to have a temperature dependence of the form: E_{UC}(T(°C)) = 2.574 (GPa) − 0.00334 (GPa°C) × T(°C). In this study, forced oscillation and creep tests were performed to measure anelasticity and viscosity, respectively.

Young’s modulus and attenuation of borneol samples were measured in cyclic compressive loading tests as functions of frequency, using the custom-fabricated apparatus (Figure 1) fully described in the companion paper [Takei et al., 2011]. A piezoelectric actuator applied a series of sinusoidal cycles, in addition to an offset stress, starting with the highest frequency and systematically working to the lowest frequency at logarithmically equally spaced frequencies (three per decade). At f ≥ 0.0464 Hz about 30 cycles were used in testing; between 0.0464 > f (Hz) ≥ 0.00215, about 10 cycles were tested; between 0.00215 > f (Hz) ≥ 0.000215 about 5 cycles were tested; and, due to oscilloscope data logging capacity, only 2.4 cycles were tested for f = 10^{-4} Hz. Stress was monitored by load cells and the response of the sample was measured by a pair of laser displacement meters with resolution of 10^{-8} m (with a 60–70 mm sample height, this corresponds to strain resolution of ~10^{-3}) and with sampling frequencies larger than 500 × f. The offset stress was 0.28 MPa and the amplitude of the

![Figure 1. Schematic of the custom-fabricated, cyclic compressive, forced-oscillation apparatus. During testing, the whole apparatus rests in a temperature-controlled incubator.](image)
Table 1. Experimental Conditions for This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Grain Size, d (μm)</th>
<th>Temp. T °C</th>
<th>Thermal History, (°C) (days)</th>
<th>Corrected Viscosityb (Pa s)</th>
<th>Maxwell Relaxation Timec (τM s)</th>
<th>Accumulated Straind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.8±1.5</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>b. 7.22 × 10^{−2} (±0.1)</td>
<td>3004</td>
<td>0.0309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.35 (0.15)</td>
<td>23.6 (±0.3)</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>a. 7.80 × 10^{−2} (±0.1)</td>
<td>937.2</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.15 (0.25)</td>
<td>23 (±0.3)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
<td>b. 2.04 × 10^{−1} (−1.4)</td>
<td>2217.2</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.06 (0.24)</td>
<td>22.7 (±0.1)</td>
<td>30 (4)</td>
<td>a. 2.34 × 10^{−1} (−0.2)</td>
<td>2217.2</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.99 (0.53)</td>
<td>22.4 (±0.2)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (0.8)</td>
<td>b. 5.28 × 10^{−2} (−0.5)</td>
<td>3390.3</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9 (0.82)</td>
<td>22.9 (±0.05)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (2.8)</td>
<td>a. 5.81 × 10^{−2} (0)</td>
<td>3309.3</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.3 (0.89)</td>
<td>23 (±0.4)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8)</td>
<td>b. 8.29 × 10^{−2} (−0.2)</td>
<td>6263.6</td>
<td>0.0335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.7 (1.29)</td>
<td>22.6 (±0.3)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8);45 (5)</td>
<td>a. 1.51 × 10^{−3} (−0.4)</td>
<td>10335</td>
<td>0.0349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.00 (0.27)</td>
<td>23.7 (±0.2)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8);45 (5);50 (6)</td>
<td>a. 1.62 × 10^{−3} (−0.2)</td>
<td>12182</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.00 (0.27)</td>
<td>31.4 (±0.1)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8);45 (5);50 (6)</td>
<td>b. 2.63 × 10^{−3} (−0.7)</td>
<td>16498</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.00 (0.27)</td>
<td>41.4 (±0.05)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8);45 (5);50 (6)</td>
<td>b. 5.09 × 10^{−3} (0.3)</td>
<td>20332</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.00 (0.27)</td>
<td>45.4 (±0.1)</td>
<td>30 (4);40 (8.8);45 (5);50 (6)</td>
<td>b. 1.96 × 10^{−3} (−0.1)</td>
<td>7839</td>
<td>0.0401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Tf</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 6.22 × 10^{−2} (−0.1)</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Tf</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 5.10 × 10^{−2} (−0.05)</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3 (0.2)</td>
<td>23.5 (±0.3)</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3 (0.1)</td>
<td>23 (±0.3)</td>
<td>30 (4)</td>
<td>b. 4.09 × 10^{−2} (−1.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3 (0.1)</td>
<td>23 (±0.3)</td>
<td>30 (4)</td>
<td>a. 4.18 × 10^{−2} (−0.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>22.5 (±0.3)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>b. 1.06 × 10^{−3} (−0.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>30.8 (±0.05)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>b. 5.25 × 10^{−4} (−0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>39.4 (±0.5)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>a. 1.90 × 10^{−3} (−0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>47.7 (±1)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>b. 8.01 × 10^{−2} (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>47.7 (±1)</td>
<td>60 (14)</td>
<td>b. 3.37 × 10^{−2} (−0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aValues in parentheses are measures of error in μm for grain size and °C for temperature.

bViscosity measured before “b” and after “a” anelasticity testing. In parentheses is temperature in degrees above or below the value of the anelasticity test (in Temp. column).

The average of the before and after viscosities divided by temperature-dependent E(U).

At the onset of anelasticity runs, i.e., the final value of the previous creep test.

The temperature error of Sample 11 is large because this run is performed before improvements made to the apparatus for thermal insulation.

T represents the grain size measurements of testing samples.

sinusoidal stress (zero-to-peak) was 0.055 MPa, which was nearly constant for all testing frequencies. As discussed in the companion paper, the offset stress slightly decreases during a set of cycles as the sample shortens by creep. At the beginning of each new set of cycles, the movable stage (Figure 1) was programmed to rise until the desired offset stress was again obtained. Therefore, at low frequencies, the data acquisition was delayed for a predetermined length of time to omit transient effects associated with the reapplied stress.

Using the same apparatus, viscosity η (Pa s) was measured via creep tests, in which a nominally constant stress (σ = 0.28 ± 0.01 MPa) was applied and the shortening of the sample was measured over time. The stress was controlled by adjustments to the height of the movable stage, and sample displacement was measured by the total steps applied to raise the stage and by the displacement meters, both of which gave consistent results. Because the initial stress of each creep test was not always zero and the sampling rate was less than 10 Hz, creep data were only used to obtain the steady state viscosity and not any transient properties.

The entire apparatus was placed in a temperature-controlled incubator, which was placed on a vibration-free tabletop. The temperature of samples during testing, which was monitored by a thermocouple placed in the top of the movable stage (T1) and a thermocouple in the air surrounding the sample (T2), is expressed as T = (T1 + T2)/2 ± |T1 − T2|/2. As discussed in the companion paper, the temperature distribution inside the incubator represents a tradeoff between the heating of some apparatus components and the cooling of compressed air circulating through meter housings. However, for each run, airflow was held constant and the temperature of the entire system was allowed to equilibrate for ~8 h (without load), so that temporal temperature deviation during testing was <0.2°C. Spatial deviation |T1 − T2| was <0.6°C for all tests, except at the highest temperature, where the deviation was approximately 2°C.

2.3. Experimental Procedures

In Table 1 we summarize the experimental conditions of this study. One notable aspect of our approach is that mechanical tests were made on the same polycrystalline sample at various grain sizes (“grain size tests”) and temperatures (“temperature tests”). This continuity enabled a detailed investigation of temperature and grain size dependences without any fabrication influences.

2.3.1. Grain Size Tests

Anelasticity and viscosity were measured at approximately constant temperature in the range T = 22.4–23.7°C and at various grain sizes from 3.4 μm to 22 μm (Figure 2). A sample without any thermal history (“initial” in Table 1)
was loaded into the sample assembly and tightly fixed to the apparatus, a uniaxial stress (0.28 ± 0.01 MPa) was applied, and the sample deformed for one or two days under nominally constant stress to ensure good contact with the two end platens. In this temperature range, grain growth is negligible even for the smallest grain size samples. After measuring anelasticity and viscosity at the initial grain size, the sample was isothermally annealed at temperatures between 30°C and 60°C for various durations within a temperature-controlled incubator. During the anneal, the sample remained fixed in the sample assembly, but all compressional load was removed. Uniaxial creep tests were conducted both before and after each series of forced oscillation tests, allowing us to confirm that no undesired change in viscosity (due to evolution of grain size or defect structure) had occurred during the course of the run.

2.3.2. Temperature Tests

After the grain size tests were completed, coarse-grained samples were used to measure anelasticity and viscosity at constant grain size (d = 22 μm) and at various temperatures from 22 to 48°C, which represent homologous temperatures 0.61 < T/T_m < 0.68. Considering the relatively long anneal times and elevated temperatures used for grain growth during the grain size testing stage, grain growth during the temperature tests was predicted to be negligibly small. That results from temperature tests pertain to constant microstructure was confirmed by the reproducibility of anelasticity and viscosity once the specimen was returned to low temperature, as well as by microstructural analysis of the miniature and testing samples once the temperature tests were completed.

2.3.3. Linearity Tests

To ensure the linearity of our data, tests were performed on a fine grain sample to determine Young’s modulus and attenuation as functions of stress/strain amplitude. A series of sinusoidal cycles at decreasing frequencies, with only one oscillation frequency per decade, was applied to a sample (in addition to the constant offset stress) at T = 27.8°C. The series was repeated for a total of four different stress/strain amplitudes, in random order.

2.4. Data Analysis

Several formulae used in this section assume linearity of the samples, which was confirmed in the experiments.

2.4.1. Forced Oscillation Tests

Typical raw experimental data are shown in Figure 3. The monotonic upward trend of the strain data (contraction positive) is steady state creep associated with the offset stress curve. The linear trend of the stress curve shows the gradual relaxation of the offset stress due to the sample creep.

Slight sublimation at grain boundaries at ambient pressure and temperature obviated the need for etching (Figure 2). Images containing no fewer than 100 grains were analyzed to measure mean grain size using the line intercept method with a correction factor of 1.5 [Gijkins, 1970]. Two researchers analyzed each specimen in at least two positions each and the values obtained were averaged. The grain size error listed in Table 1 constitutes the deviation from this mean.
stress and the monotonic downward trend of the stress data (compression positive) is the relaxation of the offset stress due to such creep. These linear trends were removed from the data by determining the slope during each cycle based on the change in value of a specific point in adjacent cycles. With this method, any variation of slope from one cycle to the next can be taken into account. However, this method cannot be used when the slope changes within one cycle, as is often the case in early cycles of very low frequency testing (<10⁻³ Hz) of samples with small grain size or at high temperatures (i.e., conditions in which the sample is very soft). In such cases, these cycles were removed from the analysis. At the lowest frequency (10⁻⁴ Hz), removal of any portion of the already short data set (only 2.4 cycles) can affect the experimental results. The error associated with this procedure is discussed in more detail in section 3.1.

Once the linear trends are removed from the data, stress and strain can be expressed as

\[
\sigma(t) = \sigma_0 \cos(\omega t - \Phi_\sigma)
\]

\[
\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0 \cos(\omega t - \Phi_\varepsilon)
\]

where \(\omega = 2\pi f\). Amplitudes \(\sigma_0\) and \(\varepsilon_0\) and phases \(\Phi_\sigma\) and \(\Phi_\varepsilon\) were determined by least squares fitting of equations (1) and (2) to \(\sigma(t)\) and \(\varepsilon(t)\), respectively. Detailed equations used in this calculation are presented in Appendix A of the companion paper [Takei et al., 2011]. Using the assumption of constant volume, a correction was applied to sample length and area to account for accumulated strain, the magnitude of which is provided in Table 1. Young's modulus \(E\) and inverse quality factor \(Q^{-1}\) are calculated by

\[
\begin{align*}
E &= \frac{\sigma_0}{\varepsilon_0} \\
Q^{-1} &= \tan \delta
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\delta = \Phi_\varepsilon - \Phi_\sigma\) represents the phase lag of strain from stress. We further introduce the complex compliance \(J^*(f)\) given by

\[
J^*(f) = J_1(f) + \imath J_2(f) = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\sigma_0} e^{i\delta}
\]

the real and imaginary parts of which are termed the “storage compliance” and “loss compliance,” respectively, defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
J_1(f) &= \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\sigma_0} \cos \delta = \frac{1}{E(f) \sqrt{1 + (Q^{-1}(f))^2}} \\
J_2(f) &= \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\sigma_0} \sin \delta = \frac{Q^{-1}(f)}{E(f) \sqrt{1 + (Q^{-1}(f))^2}}
\end{align*}
\]

The present tests were performed under \(\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{zz}\), \(\sigma = \sigma_{zz}\) and \(\sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy} = 0\). To emphasize these experimental conditions, \(Q^{-1}\) and \(J^*\) introduced above can be written as \(Q_E^{-1}\) and \(J_E^*\), respectively, where subscript \(E\) represents Young’s modulus. When \(Q^{-1}\) and \(J^*\) corresponding to bulk and shear moduli are written as \(Q_E^{-1}\) and \(J_E^*\), and \(J_E^*\) is related to \(J^*\) by \(J_E^* = J_E^*/J^*3/9 + J^*/J^*3/3\). Therefore, \(Q_E^{-1} = \frac{J_E^*}{J^*} \) is related to \(J_E^*\) by \(\frac{J_E^*}{J} = \frac{J_E^*}{J} \) as

\[
Q_E^{-1} = \xi Q^{-1} + (1 - \xi) Q^{-1}
\]

where

\[
\xi = \frac{J_1^*}{J_1^* + 3J_E^*}.
\]

Factor \(\xi\) depends on the Poisson’s ratio. Using the Poisson’s ratio of borneol at ultrasonic frequency (0.37) [Takei, 2000], we obtain \(\xi = 0.086\). Therefore \(Q_E^{-1}\) contains very little contribution from bulk attenuation and is a good approximation of \(Q^{-1}\).

2.4.2. Creep Tests

With constant stress \(\sigma\) and strain rate \(\dot{\varepsilon}\), steady state viscosity is calculated as \(\eta = \sigma/\dot{\varepsilon}\). As in section 2.4.1, a correction was applied to the data to account for the change in sample length and area as a result of accumulated strain, the magnitude of which is provided in Table 1. Viscosity \(\eta\) can be described through a combined power law and Arrhenius equation of the form

\[
\eta = \eta_0 \left(\frac{d}{d_0}\right)^m \exp \left[\left(\frac{U}{R} (\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_r})\right)\right]
\]

where \(d\) is grain size, \(m\) is the grain size exponent, \(U\) is the activation energy for creep, \(R\) is the gas constant, \(T\) is temperature, and subscript \(r\) refers to the reference grain size and temperature. Just as in section 2.4.1, \(\eta\) for this study can be written as \(\eta_E\), and is related to shear viscosity \(\eta_\mu\) as

\[
\eta_E = 3\eta_\mu
\]

where bulk viscosity \(\eta_\mu\) is assumed to be infinite.

2.5. Application of the Kramers-Kronig Relations

Compliances \(J_1\) and \(J_2\) introduced in section 2.4.1 are related by the Kramers-Kronig relations as

\[
\begin{align*}
J_1(\omega) &= J_U + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\tau=0}^{\tau=\tau} X(\tau) \left(1 + (\omega\tau)^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d\tau}{\omega^2} \\
J_2(\omega) &= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\tau=0}^{\tau=\tau} X(\tau) \left(1 + (\omega\tau)^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d\tau}{\omega^2}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(J_U\) is the unrelaxed elastic compliance and \(X(\tau)\) represents the so-called relaxation spectrum at time scale \(\tau\) [Novick and Berry, 1972, p. 78]. Parameter \(J_1\) is related to the unrelaxed Young’s modulus \(E_U\) as \(J_U = 1/E_U\). Because \(J_1\) and \(J_2\) are measured almost independently from amplitude ratio and phase delay, respectively, this theoretical relationship can be used to check the internal-consistency of the data. In previous studies, this relationship was used in limited form in the Andrade model and an extended Burgers model, which assume \(X(\tau)\) as power law \((\tau^\alpha)\) and box-car × power law functions, respectively, with a constant power \(\alpha\) [e.g., Tan et al., 2001; Jackson et al., 2002; Gribb and...
Figure 4. $E$ and $Q^{-1}$ for three borneol samples at nearly constant grain size and temperature. The multiple symbols for sample 16 correspond to tests conducted on successive days (closed symbol was first). Error bars correspond to the average and standard deviation of three separate calculations of $E$ and $\delta$ using various windows of time.

3. Experimental Results

3.1. Reproducibility and General Form

[21] Figure 4 shows experimental data for three samples with similar grain sizes (4.15–4.8 $\mu$m) and temperatures (23–27.8°C) evidencing the reproducibility of both modulus and attenuation data. As discussed in the companion paper, the discrepancy in the absolute value of $E$ that is attributed to random error of the apparatus (likely due to meter sensitivity) is 5–6% over all frequencies. The discrepancy in $E$ between similar samples (e.g., at $f = 2.15$ Hz in Figure 4) is consistent with this random error, the magnitude of which must therefore exceed any sample fabrication or assemblage error. Over the range of testing conditions, the modulus relaxes by ~60% of the published unrelaxed modulus.

[22] Although random error affects $E$, it does not affect $Q^{-1}$. The error in determination of $Q^{-1}$ is primarily dependent on error in measuring the phase lag, which is very small. Consistently, $Q^{-1}$ measurements are highly reproducible and extremely robust. Even the small discrepancy in $Q^{-1}$ between samples 15 and 16 in Figure 4 is not attributed to scattering but rather can be supported by the small difference in the modulus dispersion. The error bars shown in Figure 4 represent the uncertainty produced by removal of linear trends from the data. As discussed in section 2.4.1, this error can be large at $f = 10^{-4}$ Hz but nearly zero for $f \geq 0.000464$. The general form of $Q^{-1}$ is that of a moderate power law relationship with frequency that accelerates slightly at low frequency and flattens at high frequency. The coverage of the data set allows us to see a smooth function over more than four decades of frequency, with no visible Debye peaks.
3.2. Linearity of the Viscoelastic Response

Figure 5 shows that, for a suite of tests conducted on sample 11 at constant grain size \((d = 4.8 \, \mu m)\) and constant temperature \((T = 27.8^{°}C)\) for multiple stress/strain amplitudes \((\sigma_0 = 0.077, 0.055, 0.030, \text{ and } 0.0045 \, \text{MPa})\), the measured modulus and attenuation are independent of strain amplitude. In a separate study, steady state uniaxial creep experiments performed on a borneol aggregate under similar conditions to our creep experiments \((d = 3.6 \, \mu m; T = 20^{°}C; \sigma = 0.11–0.38 \, \text{MPa})\) showed a stress exponent of nearly one \(Watanabe, 2011\). Therefore, the mechanical linearity of the viscoelastic response can be deduced for all frequencies studied. The amplitude independence justifies our use of a single value of driving stress amplitude \((\sigma_0 = 0.055 \, \text{MPa})\) for the rest of this study. The linearity of the response also justifies application of the Kramers-Kronig relations to our data.

3.3. Application of the Kramers-Kronig Relations

To analyze the quality of each data set, \(J_1\) and \(J_2\) curves were calculated using equation (5). Figure 6a displays representative curves from sample 16 at \(d = 4.3 \, \mu m\) and \(T = 23.5^{°}C\) (black symbols). Both \(J_1\) and \(J_2\) increase monotonically with decreasing frequency. The right hand side of equation (13) is calculated based on the \(J_2\) data and \(J_1(\sigma_0 = 1 \, s)\) and is plotted in Figure 6a as the “predicted \(J_1\)” (gray symbols). The difference between the two curves of \(J_1\) is \((\sigma_0\eta)^{−1}\) and thus, when plotted against period \(p = p_f\), viscosity \(\eta\) is estimated from the slope as \(\eta = 3.16–4.0 × 10^{12} \, \text{Pa} \, \text{s}\) (Figure 6c). We compare this viscosity obtained from the anelasticity data to the independently obtained viscosity measurements from creep tests \(\eta = 4.1 × 10^{12} \, \text{Pa} \, \text{s}\) (Table 1, sample 16, \(d = 4.3 \, \mu m\)) and see good agreement between the two. Generally, \(\eta\) estimated from the anelasticity data has larger error than \(\eta\) determined from creep tests, especially when there is large error in the data at the lowest frequency \((f = 10^{-4} \, \text{Hz}; \text{Figure 4})\).

In Figure 6d we compare \(J_2\) obtained from directly measured \(E\) and \(Q^{-1}\) data (black) to \(J_2\) after removal of the viscosity term \(\sigma_0/2\pi\eta\) (gray). The second equation of equation (12) shows that \(J_2\) corrected for the viscosity term represents \((\sigma_0/2\pi\lambda(\tau = 1/2\pi f))\), the purely anelastic response. In Figure 6b, we compare the measured \(J_1\) (black) to the predicted \(J_1\) (gray), which was calculated using the corrected \(J_2\). The good agreement between the two \(J_1\) curves in Figure 6b confirms the consistency between the \(J_1\) and \(J_2\) data (or \(E\) and \(Q^{-1}\) data) with respect to the Kramers-Kronig relations.
In the above mentioned method, the relaxation spectrum \( \chi(\tau) \) can be estimated directly from the data without assuming any specific functional form (Figure 6d, gray symbols). After correction for the viscosity term, the power law relationship shows a nearly constant slope at low frequency. However, at higher frequencies the slope decreases considerably.

### 3.4. Grain Size Results

Anelasticity data at various grain sizes (3.35–22 \( \mu \)m) and at approximately constant temperature (22.4–23.6°C) are shown in Figure 7a, which demonstrates the notable effect of grain size on the anelastic response of polycrystalline borneol (sample 15; see Table 1 for details). As grain size increases, modulus dispersion and attenuation generally decrease. However, the grain size sensitivity of modulus dispersion and attenuation is not constant over the entire range of frequencies tested; there is considerable grain size effect observed at low frequency with little to no effect at high frequency. Similar results were also obtained for sample 16, the data from which we provide in Appendix A to demonstrate the reproducibility of the grain size tests (Figure A1a).

Figure 8 shows unidirectional (steady state) creep data at various grain sizes, (3.35–22 \( \mu \)m) and at approximately constant temperature (22.4–23.6°C). The results show that as grain size increases, steady state viscosities increase significantly. A logarithmic plot of viscosity versus grain size was calculated in which two distinct relationships can be observed (Figure 8b). At small grain size \( (d < 7 \mu m) \) a cubic relationship is shown (i.e., \( m = 3 \) in equation (8)), whereas at larger grain size, this grain size relationship decreases to a shallower slope. The cubic relationship is consistent with steady state creep that is rate-controlled by grain boundary diffusion. That the sample was deforming by grain boundary diffusion creep was also supported by a separate study in which a stress exponent of nearly one was obtained with this same material under similar experimental conditions [Watanabe, 2011].

### 3.5. Temperature Results

Data for anelasticity at various temperatures in the range 23.7 to 45.4°C \( (T/T_m = 0.62–0.67) \) and at nearly constant grain size (22 \( \mu \)m) are shown for sample 15 in Figure 9a. As temperature increases, modulus dispersion and attenuation increase. Similar results were obtained for sample 17, the data from which we provide in Appendix A to demonstrate the reproducibility of the temperature tests (Figure A2a). Figure 10 shows unidirectional creep data at various temperatures and at constant grain size for sample 15. From the Arrhenius plot in Figure 10b, an activation energy (i.e., \( U \) in equation (8)) of \( \sim 85 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \) was calculated.

### 3.6. Normalization Results

In both grain size tests and temperature tests, strong correlation between anelasticity and viscosity was obtained; modulus dispersion and attenuation tend to increase with decreasing viscosity. Therefore, we normalized data from each
the sample and decreased radially. Miniature samples showed little to no porosity. That measured grain sizes of the inner \((d = 21.4 \mu m)\) and outer \((d = 21.6 \mu m)\) portions of the testing sample and the relatively pore-free miniature sample \((d = 22 \mu m)\) were consistent confirms that porosity did not affect grain growth. Based on the effective medium theory, assuming spherical cavities [Berryman, 1995], a 10% decrease in Young’s modulus is predicted with a porosity of 5%. As shown in Figure 11, this amount of porosity is roughly consistent with microscopic observation. Consequently, without a change in porosity, modulus data, too, are expected to collapse onto a single curve. This hypothesis is also supported by the perfect collapse of the modulus data from temperature tests (Figures 9b and A2b), which are considered to be at constant grain size (i.e., constant porosity). Scattering of attenuation spectra is much smaller than modulus data (Figure 7b), indicating that the effect of porosity on attenuation is small.

Figure 12 shows normalized modulus \(E/E_0(T)\) and attenuation \(Q^{-1}\) from both grain size tests and temperature tests as functions of normalized frequency for sample 15. All attenuation spectra collapse to a single master curve, demonstrating that both grain size and temperature effects can be captured by this simple Maxwell frequency scaling. The modulus data from temperature tests collapse onto the data from the larger grain sizes of the grain size tests, which again suggests that without porosity change, modulus data from both tests would collapse onto a single master curve.

4. Discussion

4.1. Similarity and Universality of Anelasticity

[33] The results of our study have demonstrated that both grain size and temperature effects on anelasticity are captured by the Maxwell frequency scaling. We found, too, that similitude in the anelastic response extends to samples with gross material differences. Figure 13 shows \(Q^{-1}\) spectra versus normalized frequency of various olivine-dominated aggregates measured in torsion [Tan et al., 2001; Jackson et al., 2002; Gribb and Cooper, 1998], in addition to those of organic aggregates from this study. Maxwell frequencies for the torsion experiments were calculated by \(f_M = \lambda \mu_0(\tau)\), using the following values: \(\mu_0 = 63 GPa\) for \(T = 1200°C\) [Isaak, 1992]; \(\eta_0 = 6.28 \times 10^{13} Pa s\) for \(d = 23.6 \mu m\) and \(T = 1200°C\) [Tan et al., 2001, #6381]; \(\eta_0 = 0.72 \times 10^{15} Pa s\) for \(d = 29 \mu m\) and \(T = 1200°C\) [Jackson et al., 2002, #6381]; and \(1/\tau = 414/4 s\) and \(59/4 s\) for \(d \approx 3 \mu m\) and \(T = 1200°C\) and 1250°C, respectively [Gribb and Cooper, 1998]. The consistency among the various normalized spectra is remarkable. The efficacy of this simple scaling demonstrates the true universality of the master curve to polycrystalline materials and also validates our use of borneol as an analogue to olivine in attenuation studies. Here, a direct comparison of modulus data was not performed because modulus data are generally subject to larger error than \(Q^{-1}\) data. However, in section 4.3, our modulus results are discussed in comparison with those of Jackson et al. [2002].

[34] These findings can be expressed as a “similarity rule.” Whereas the \(Q^{-1}\) spectrum represents a mixed effect of anelastic relaxation, modulus dispersion, and viscous deformation, the relaxation spectrum \(\lambda(\tau)\) introduced in
section 2.5 represents the strength of a purely anelastic relaxation at time scale $\tau$. Because modulus dispersion and viscous deformation are significant in experimental studies, the use of $X$ to describe similarity rather than $Q^{-1}$ greatly simplifies the formulation. We first introduce a normalized relaxation spectrum $X_n$, defined by

$$X_n = \frac{X}{J_U(T, P)}$$ \hspace{1cm} (15)

so that the formulation is applicable to any P-T condition in the Earth. Unrelaxed compliance $J_U$ is considered known as a function of $T$ and $P$. Subscript $n$ is used to denote normalized quantities. The similarity rule for anelasticity can be formulated such that the normalized relaxation spectrum $X_n$, which generally depends on time scale $\tau$, grain size $d$, temperature $T$, and pressure $P$, is a unique function of the normalized time scale $\tau_n$:

$$X_n(\tau, d, T, P) = X_n(\tau_n)$$ \hspace{1cm} (16)

where $\tau_n$ is defined by using a reference time scale $\tau_r$ as

$$\tau_n(\tau, d, T, P) = \frac{\tau}{\tau_r(d, T, P)}$$ \hspace{1cm} (17)

The nature of the reference time scale $\tau_r$ dependence on $d$, $T$, and $P$ provides valuable information about the mechanism causing the anelastic relaxation. We introduce $\tau_r$ independently from the Maxwell relaxation time scale $\tau_M$, so that the present formulation is applicable to the studies of Jackson et al. [2002] and Faul and Jackson [2005], in which $\tau_r \neq \tau_M$.

[35] An important consequence of the similarity rule is a mutual relationship between the frequency, grain size, temperature, and pressure dependences of anelasticity: by substituting equations (16) and (17) into the Kramers-Kronig relations (equation (12)), we obtain

$$J_1(f, d, T, P) = J_U(T, P) \left\{ 1 + \int_{\tau_n = 0}^{\tau_n = \infty} X_n(\tau_n) \frac{d\tau_n}{\tau_n} \right\}$$

$$J_2(f, d, T, P) = J_U(T, P) \left\{ \frac{\pi}{2} X_n(\tau_n = 1) \frac{1}{2\pi f_{n_0}} + \frac{1}{2\pi f_{n_M}} \right\}$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

where normalized frequency $f_n$ is defined by

$$f_n(f, d, T, P) = f \cdot \tau_r(d, T, P).$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

By taking the partial derivative of measurable quantities $J_1$ and $Q^{-1}$ ($= J_2/J_1$) with respect to each of $f$, $d$, $T$, and $P$, we obtain

$$\left[ \frac{\partial \ln J_1}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y, z, w} = \left[ \frac{\partial \ln J_U(T, P)}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y, z, w} \frac{2}{\pi} Q^{-1} \left[ \frac{\partial \ln f_n}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y, z, w}$$

$$\left[ \frac{\partial \ln Q^{-1}}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y, z, w} = - \left( \alpha - \frac{2}{\pi} Q^{-1} \right) \left[ \frac{\partial \ln f_n}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y, z, w}$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)
where parameter \( x \) for differentiation represents any one of the four variables \( f, d, T \), and \( P \), while the other three are shown by fixed variables \( y, z \) and \( w \). Factor \( \alpha \) is defined by

\[
\alpha = \frac{d \ln \chi_n(\tau_n)}{d \ln \tau_n}
\]  

(21)

which represents the time scale exponent of the normalized relaxation spectrum or, in other words, the slope of the \( \ln \chi_n \) versus \( \ln \tau_n \) curve. In equation (20), the effect of viscous deformation on \( Q^{-1} \), which is negligible at seismic frequency in the Earth, was neglected for simplicity.

\[36\] Once explicit functional forms of \( \tau_d(d, T, P) \) and \( \chi_n(\tau_n) \) are given, modulus and attenuation for any condition of \( f, d, T \), and \( P \) can be calculated by equation (18) and the individual dependences of these can be calculated by equation (20). The explicit forms of \( \tau_d(d, T, P) \) and \( \chi_n(\tau_n) \) are provided in sections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively. The present formulation is general in that equations (15)–(21) can be used regardless of whether parameters \( \chi, J^*, Q^{-1}, \eta, \) and \( \tau_M \) represent \( \chi_E, J_E^*, Q_E^{-1}, \eta_E, \) and \( \tau_M^E \) respectively, or \( \chi_m, J_m^*, Q_m^{-1}, \eta_m, \) and \( \tau_M^m \), respectively, and so on.

4.2. Reference Time Scale and Underlying Mechanism

\[37\] Although similitude in the anelastic response of polycrystalline materials has been recognized in previous studies [Gribb and Cooper, 1998; Jackson et al., 2002; Morris and Jackson, 2009a], determination of the appropriate reference time scale \( \tau_r \) is still under debate. Characterization of the reference time scale is essential to identifying the underlying mechanism of anelasticity and

---

**Figure 10.** Unidirectional creep data showing the temperature sensitivity of (a) creep curves for sample 15 and (b) viscosity in samples 15 and 17 (Table 1).

**Figure 11.** Light microscope image of borneol sample 15 post-deformation showing porosity (~6%) that has formed during the testing. Faint spots of light are interpreted as pores in the near subsurface. This image is from the center of the specimen. Porosity decreased with distance from the center.

**Figure 12.** Normalized \( E \) and \( Q^{-1} \) data for all grain sizes and temperatures for sample 15, as functions of frequency normalized to the Maxwell frequency.

where parameter \( x \) for differentiation represents any one of the four variables \( f, d, T \), and \( P \), while the other three are shown by fixed variables \( y, z \) and \( w \). Factor \( \alpha \) is defined by

\[
\alpha = \frac{d \ln \chi_n(\tau_n)}{d \ln \tau_n}
\]  

(21)

which represents the time scale exponent of the normalized relaxation spectrum or, in other words, the slope of the \( \ln \chi_n \) versus \( \ln \tau_n \) curve. In equation (20), the effect of viscous deformation on \( Q^{-1} \), which is negligible at seismic frequency in the Earth, was neglected for simplicity.

\[36\] Once explicit functional forms of \( \tau_d(d, T, P) \) and \( \chi_n(\tau_n) \) are given, modulus and attenuation for any condition of \( f, d, T \), and \( P \) can be calculated by equation (18) and the individual dependences of these can be calculated by equation (20). The explicit forms of \( \tau_d(d, T, P) \) and \( \chi_n(\tau_n) \) are provided in sections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively. The present formulation is general in that equations (15)–(21) can be used regardless of whether parameters \( \chi, J^*, Q^{-1}, \eta, \) and \( \tau_M \) represent \( \chi_E, J_E^*, Q_E^{-1}, \eta_E, \) and \( \tau_M^E \) respectively, or \( \chi_m, J_m^*, Q_m^{-1}, \eta_m, \) and \( \tau_M^m \), respectively, and so on.

4.2. Reference Time Scale and Underlying Mechanism

\[37\] Although similitude in the anelastic response of polycrystalline materials has been recognized in previous studies [Gribb and Cooper, 1998; Jackson et al., 2002; Morris and Jackson, 2009a], determination of the appropriate reference time scale \( \tau_r \) is still under debate. Characterization of the reference time scale is essential to identifying the underlying mechanism of anelasticity and
Figure 13. Measured $Q^{-1}$ versus normalized frequency $f / f_M$ from studies with gross material differences. For Gribb and Cooper [1998] $T = 1200$ and 1250°C; $d = 3 \mu$m. For Tan et al. [2001] $T = 1200$°C; $d = 23.6 \mu$m. For Jackson et al. [2002] $T = 1200$°C; $d = 2.9 \mu$m. These studies used olivine-dominated aggregates, whereas this study (black circles) used borneol aggregates at $T = 22.4$°C and $d = 3.4-22 \mu$m. The shaded area demonstrates that the normalized seismic frequency range is currently outside the range of experimental data.

also to extrapolating experimental data to a geophysical context. In this section we discuss the reference time scale, which we scrutinize for the operative mechanism of anelasticity. Implications for seismology are discussed in the next section.

[38] The experimental results of our study demonstrate that the reference time scale is a Maxwell time scale that is defined in terms of the steady state viscosity of diffusion creep (equation (8)):

$$\tau_r(d, T, P) = \tau_M(d, T, P) = J_U(T, P) \frac{d}{d_T}^m \cdot \exp \left[ \frac{U}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_r} \right) \right] \exp \left[ \frac{V}{R} \left( \frac{P}{T} - \frac{P_r}{T_r} \right) \right]$$

(22)

where the additional factor to equation (8) describes the pressure effect on viscosity with activation volume $V$ and reference pressure $P_r$. Using equation (22), the unspecified factors in equation (20) are explicitly written as

$$\left[ \frac{\partial \ln f_c}{\partial \ln x} \right]_{y,z,w} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x = f \\ m & \text{for } x = d \\ \frac{\partial \ln J_U}{\partial \ln T} \frac{U + PV}{RT} & \text{for } x = T \\ \frac{\partial \ln J_U}{\partial \ln P} \frac{PV}{RT} & \text{for } x = P \end{cases}$$

(23)

That the anelastic relaxation follows the same scaling as steady state diffusion creep points to a physical process that is due to the same diffusional mechanism [e.g., Raj, 1975; Gribb and Cooper, 1998]. This requirement is met by “diffusionaly accommodated grain boundary sliding,” which explains well many other experimental observations. Grain boundary sliding (“GBS”) is generally obstructed by grain edges and/or atomic-scale steps along the grain boundaries, causing local stress concentrations to build. With diffusionaly accommodated GBS, relaxation of these stress singularities by diffusive matter transport through grain boundaries and/or grains is considered to be the rate-limiting step to sliding. Evolution of the stress state involving a wide range of diffusion path lengths from the atomic scale to the grain scale explains well the continuous and peakless shape of the relaxation spectrum [e.g., Raj and Ashby, 1971; Morris and Jackson, 2009b]. Additionally, the large modulus reduction (60%) observed in this study is consistent with this mechanism [e.g., Zener, 1941].

[39] As Figure 13 demonstrates, the attenuation data for olivine aggregates at various temperatures and grain sizes, from various source regions and various laboratories, collapse onto a single curve when normalized by the Maxwell relaxation frequency. In each study, the obtained activation energy was similar to that of diffusion creep. Thus, we propose that diffusionaly accommodated GBS is operative in all of the studies shown in Figure 13. Any variations in the observed grain size dependences from one study to the next can be explained by equations (20) and (23). Specifically, the observation of approximately equal frequency and grain size exponents of $Q^{-1}$ in the work of Jackson et al. [2002] is thoroughly consistent with equation (23) and their observed grain size exponent of viscosity of nearly one ($m \approx 1$).

[40] This interpretation deviates slightly from that of previous researchers. At higher frequencies (and/or lower temperatures), grain boundary sliding is accommodated not by diffusion but instead by local elastic deformation of grains. This elastically accommodated GBS is considered to be rate limited by “grain boundary viscosity.” Although relatively well known in metal and ceramics, this process is poorly understood for rocks, and the relaxation strength and reference time scale $\tau_r$ are difficult to estimate. A simple elastic rebound model, for instance, predicts $\tau_r \propto d$. Based on such a model, the observation of approximately equal frequency and grain size dependences of $Q^{-1}$ data in the work of Jackson et al. [2002] was attributed to elastically accommodated GBS [Jackson et al., 2002; Karato, 2008]. As such, formulae with $\tau_r \neq \tau_M$ were used for the extrapolation of these data to mantle conditions [Faul and Jackson, 2005]. Contrary to this treatment, our experimental results show that the Maxwell frequency scaling is applicable for viscosities with a grain size exponent $m = 3$ ($d < 7 \mu$m), and for viscosities with a grain size exponent $m = 1$ ($d > 7 \mu$m), at all frequencies explored. Although $m \approx 1$ is contrary to what one would expect for diffusion creep, the nearly identical spectra obtained for fine grained ($m = 3$) and coarse grained ($m \approx 1$) samples do not indicate a drastic difference in mechanisms between the two regimes. Further, we see no indication in our data of a Debye peak that is associated with elastically accommodated GBS in metals and ceramics. In our assessment, for all frequencies and grain sizes tested, the need to attribute spectra to a separate mechanism, which relies on a poorly constrained parameter of grain boundary viscosity, is unwarranted.

[41] Because elastically accommodated GBS occurs at higher frequencies than diffusionaly accommodated GBS, there exists the possibility that the rate-limiting process of
relaxation changes at higher normalized frequencies than the experimental coverage. Indeed, attempts to detect such change have been performed [Jackson and Faul, 2010; Sundberg and Cooper, 2010]. In this study, the observation that the pore-free (d = 3.4 μm) modulus data approach $E_U$ at high frequency (Figure 12) suggests that anelastic relaxation between ultrasonic and forced oscillation experiments is not strong. However, as discussed in section 4.3, this intermediate frequency range is important for seismological application and has to be assessed in more detail.

4.3. Application to Seismology

[42] Proving that the Maxwell frequency is the universal scaling factor for anelasticity allows for extrapolation of laboratory data to mantle conditions. In the upper mantle, the Maxwell frequency is estimated as $10^{11}$ Pa $10^{20}$ Pa s $= 10^9$ Hz. Therefore, the normalized frequency corresponding to the seismic frequency range ($f = 10^{-3}$ Hz) is $f/M = 10^6 - 10^7$. Figure 13 shows that in normalized frequency space, experimental data cover a considerable range lower than, but do not include, the “seismic frequency range.” Although previous experimental studies in the range $f = 10^{-5}$ Hz have been considered to directly measure “seismic frequency,” the much smaller grain sizes and much smaller viscosities of those experimental samples correspond to a significantly higher Maxwell frequency than that of mantle materials. To appropriately scale experimental data to seismology, it is important to measure anelasticity at higher frequencies, so that the detailed shape of the master curve can be revealed at $f/M = 10^6 - 10^7$. The extent to which the observed mechanism and scaling law are applicable at high normalized frequencies is not evident, and must be assessed as well. With typical laboratory viscosities in the range of $10^{12} - 10^{13}$ Pa s, this corresponds to $f = 1$ kHz, which is unfortunately between the current coverage of typical forced oscillation and ultrasonic (~MHz) tests, but is covered by a resonance method [Lakes, 1999]. Higher normalized frequencies can also be achieved at lower temperatures and/or larger grain sizes, though direct measurement of viscosity becomes difficult. More research, in the form of experiments and/or modeling, is needed.

[45] Nevertheless, strong efforts have been made to utilize laboratory measurements for interpreting regional and global seismological data [e.g., Dalton et al., 2009; Condor and Wiens, 2006]. The studies primarily rely on the experimentally based model of Faul and Jackson [2005], which is particularly useful because it provides a generalized empirical formula for the frequency, grain size, and temperature dependences that allow extrapolation to upper-mantle conditions. Therefore we, too, generalize our present experimental results and extrapolate to mantle conditions. The findings of Faul and Jackson [2005] suggest that low-velocity and high $Q^{-1}$ can be achieved by temperature variations alone. Because this model is being widely used in seismology, in particular to contest the need for partial melt, we feel it is important to carefully dissect the findings from that study and articulate the similarities and differences that we find with our results.

[44] Seismology is primarily concerned with relaxation of shear modulus $\mu$, causing dispersion and attenuation of seismic shear waves. Shear wave velocity $V_S$ and shear wave attenuation $Q_S^{-1}$ can be directly calculated from $J_l^u$ and $J_l^s$ as

$$\begin{cases}
J_S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega t}} \\
Q_S^{-1} = \frac{J_l^s}{J_l^u} (Q_S^{-1} \ll 1)
\end{cases}$$

(24)

where $\rho$ is density. (A more general form of equation (24), without the assumption of $Q_S^{-1} \ll 1$, is presented in Appendix B). When wave frequency $f$, grain size $d$, temperature $T$, and pressure $P$ are given, $J_l^u$ and $J_l^s$ can be calculated from equation (18), in which explicit functional forms of $\tau_r$ ($f$; $d$, $T$, $P$) and $X_\mu(\tau_s)$ are needed. Here, we present these explicit forms by generalizing our experimental results. The explicit form of $\tau_s$ is given by equation (22), where $d_l = 1$ mm, $m = 3$, $T_c = 1473$ K, $U = 505$ kJ mol$^{-1}$, $V = 1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ m$^3$ mol$^{-1}$, and $\eta_0 = 6.6 \times 10^{19}$ Pa s. These parameters are selected such that the experimental conditions for grain size and viscosity can be continuously connected to upper mantle conditions. The unrelaxed shear modulus of olivine is $1.19f(T)/\mu(T, P) = 82$ (GPa) + $1.8 \times P$ (GPa) $- 0.0136$ (GPa/K) $\times (T)$ [Isaak, 1992]. The explicit form of $X_\mu(\tau_s)$ is obtained from curve fitting to the master curve which yields

$$X_\mu(\tau_s) = \begin{cases}
0.32 \times \tau_s^{0.39-0.28/(1+2.6 \times 10^9 \tau_s)} & \tau_s \geq 10^{-11} \\
1853 \times \tau_s^{-0.5} & \tau_s < 10^{-11}
\end{cases}$$

(25)

and is shown in Figure 14 as “fit 1.” (Because $Q_S^{-1} \geq 1$ in the study, $X_\mu$ is obtained for $E$ is comparable to $X_\mu$ obtained for $\mu$.) In the seismic range (shaded region), this curve agrees quite well with the value of $X_\mu((3-2\pi^{-1}Q_S^{-1})$ expected from seismological $Q_S$ ($= 80$ in PREM; thick straight line) [Dziewonski and Anderson, 1981].

[45] For the ease of the reader, we provide a normalized $J_l$ curve that can be used to directly formulate $V_S$. The curve of $J_l(U)/J_l(U,T,P)$ versus $f_n$ calculated from $X_n$ of “fit 1” can be closely fit to a sixth-degree polynomial of $\ln f_n$:

$$J_s(T, P) = \sum_{k=0}^{6} a_k (\ln f_n)^k f_n \leq 10^{13}$$

for $f_n > 10^{13}$

(26)

with $a_0 = 0.55097$, $a_1 = 0.054332$, $a_2 = -0.0023615$, $a_3 = -5.7175 \times 10^{-5}$, $a_4 = 9.9473 \times 10^{-6}$, $a_5 = -3.4761 \times 10^{-7}$, and $a_6 = 3.9461 \times 10^{-9}$. This polynomial has perfect agreement with the original curve shown in Figure 15. Therefore, when $f$, $d$, $T$, and $P$ are given, by substituting $f_n$ calculated from equations (19) and (22) into equation (26), and also by using a known value of $J_l(T,P)$, $J_l$ (and therefore $V_S$) can be estimated easily. Also, by calculating $J_l$ from equations (18) and (25), $Q_S^{-1}$ can be estimated. Finally, by substituting $Q_S^{-1}$ into equation (20), partial derivatives can be estimated as well. Now, we have provided all information required to predict $V_S$ and $Q_S^{-1}$ as functions of $f$, $d$, $T$, and $P$. Before applying these predictions to the mantle, we compare the formulae with those of Faul and Jackson [2005], and also to our experimental data.
[46] In Faul and Jackson [2005], the grain size exponent of $\tau$ is nearly one (1.09) and is different from that of $\tau_M$. As a consequence, when scaled by $\tau_M$, the $X_n$ proposed by Faul and Jackson [2005] is no longer a unique function of norm- alized time scale, but explicitly depends on grain size. Figure 14 demonstrates that relaxation strength $X_n$ at the seismic range (shaded range) is considerably smaller in this study than it is in Faul and Jackson [2005] for $d = 1$ mm, whereas both are very close under the experimental condition ($d = 10 \mu$m). In other words, in this study the difference between laboratory attenuation and seismic wave attenuation comes from the difference in viscosity by about $10^{6}$, whereas in Faul and Jackson [2005] it comes from the difference in grain size by about $10^{2 \times 1.09}$. While $\alpha$ (equation (21)) depends on $\tau_n$ in our study, $\alpha$ is a constant (0.27) in Faul and Jackson [2005]. In summary, the largest difference between the two studies is in $\tau$ and $\alpha$.

[47] In order to compare the proposed extrapolation of $X_n$ to our own experimental data, we substitute equation (25) into equation (18) to calculate predicted $J_1/J_U$ and $J_2/J_U$ as functions of $f_n$ (Figure 15: solid lines), which we compare to our experimental data for $d = 8 \mu$m (Figure 15: symbols). Since $J_1$ represents the integration of $X_n(\tau_n)$ from $\tau_n = 0$, it contains short time scale information of $X_n(\tau_n)$ that is outside the experimental range. Figure 15 shows that although predicted and measured $J_2/J_U$ agree well, predicted $J_1/J_U$ is systematically larger than measured $J_1/J_U$. If we reverse our methodology and instead look for an extrapolation of $X_n$ that has good agreement to the measured $J_1/J_U$, such a spectrum is shown in Figure 14 as “fit2.” The only difference between fit1 and fit2 is the time scale at which the relaxation spectrum transitions to $\tau_n^{0.5}$, which we call the “short-time-scale cut-off.” In fit1, the cut-off occurs at $\tau_n = 10^{-11}$, while in fit2 it is at $\tau_n = 5 \times 10^{-6}$. Justification for cut-off times comes from a separate study, in which a theoretical model to describe the physics of diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding was developed [Takei and McCarthy, 2010]. In that model, GBS is obstructed by grain edges and atomic-scale steps along grain boundaries such that the cut-off time scale is determined by the size of each grain boundary step. The cut-offs in the mantle (fit1) and in the
experimental sample (fit2) are consistent with the preliminary result of this model that the cut-off time scale is about 100 Hz for a step size of about 10 nm. That fit2 has a considerably narrower band width than fit1 is a consequence of the fine grain size of experimental samples being closer to the step size (10 nm). [58] Figure 16 shows the temperature dependences of $V_S$ and $Q_S^{-1}$ for $f = 0.01$ Hz, $d = 1$ mm and $P = 1.5$ GPa predicted by this study (Figure 16, middle) and Faul and Jackson [2005] (Figure 16, bottom). Because this study predicts smaller $X_m$ (Figure 14), the predicted $Q_S^{-1}$ and anelastic effect on $V_S$ are significantly smaller than those of Faul and Jackson [2005]. Compared to the seismologically observed $V_S$ (Figure 16, top) [Priestley and McKenzie, 2006], the predicted temperature dependence of $V_S$ is slightly larger even at $T < 900^\circ$C, where the slope is determined by the anharmonic effect alone. However, the steepening of the slope at about $1050^\circ$C observed in the seismological data can be explained fairly well by the deviation from the anharmonic effect due to the anelastic effect predicted by this study. As demonstrated in Figure 16, the results of Faul and Jackson [2005] have an "extra anelastic effect" which does not exist in our results. Unlike our data, modulus data of Jackson et al. [2002] were found to have a temperature dependence that could not be reconciled with simple anharmonic temperature sensitivity; with normalization their modulus data do not collapse onto a single master curve. Thus, their model incorporates an adjustment term. Such a finding implies that similitude for anelasticity breaks down at higher frequencies than 1 Hz in their study. Recently, however, Jackson and Faul [2010] showed that new data collected after an improvement was made to their experimental system could be analyzed without this extra effect. Therefore, we can state that so far no experimental data have clearly indicated a break down of similitude. Even without any experimental data, however, similitude for anelasticity has long been assumed in seismology [e.g., Anderson and Given, 1982]. With similitude, as shown by equation (20), only anharmonic and anelastic effects exist, both of which can be evaluated accurately from experimentally measured unrelaxed modulus and seismologically measured $Q^{-1}$, respectively [e.g., Karato, 1993].

5. Future Directions

[49] The results from this study demonstrate the universal behavior of polycrystalline materials in response to a periodic load in which the offset stress and periodic stress amplitude were small enough that the sample behaved linearly in both viscosity and anelasticity. By keeping stresses small we ensured a minimal amount of dislocations were created during the experiment and thus the observed response was due primarily to the diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding mechanism discussed herein. Not included in our experiment, or in our discussion, is relaxation due to dislocations, the contribution from which is considered to be in addition to the relaxation at grain boundaries. Characterization of that mechanism remains for future studies.

[50] The role of partial melt in dissipation and dispersion was also omitted from this study but represents a goal of our ongoing research. Experiments have already commenced in which we take advantage of eutectic phase relationships in the binary system borneol-diphenylamine [Takei, 2000] to obtain partial melt at temperatures as low as 43°C.

6. Conclusions

[51] Using a custom fabricated forced oscillation apparatus, linear anelasticity of an organic analogue material at high homologous temperature ($T/T_m = 0.61–0.67$) was measured accurately over a wide frequency range (2.15–10$^{-3}$ Hz). Systematic effects of temperature and grain size on anelasticity were investigated, together with these effects on the steady state viscosity. At least for fine grain samples ($d < 7 \mu m$), the creep mechanism could be identified as grain-boundary diffusion creep ($m = 3$). Using the directly measured viscosity, the Maxwell frequency was calculated as a function of temperature and grain size. Once frequency is normalized by the Maxwell frequency, modulus dispersion curves and attenuation spectra for various grain sizes and temperatures collapse onto a single master curve (similitude). With this simple scaling, attenuation spectra of olivine-dominated aggregates collapse onto the same master curve, showing a universality of anelasticity for polycrystalline materials. A new method to estimate the detailed shape of the relaxation spectrum $\chi(\tau)$ directly from modulus

Figure 16. Schematic demonstrating the differences in temperature dependences of shear wave velocity and seismic attenuation between this study and Faul and Jackson [2005]. The temperature sensitivities of both $V_S$ and $Q_S^{-1}$ in the latter study are significantly greater than in our study.
and attenuation data was proposed by assuming smoothness of $X(t)$, whereas previous data analyses using Burgers model and Andrade model assume $X \sim t^\alpha$ with constant $\alpha$. Our results show that $\alpha$ is not constant, but instead gradually decreases with decreasing time scale $t$. The efficacy of the Maxwell frequency scaling, a continuous and peakless shape of the attenuation spectrum, and the large modulus reduction suggest that the dominant mechanism for the measured anelasticity is diffusionally accommodated grain boundary sliding. We generalize the obtained similitude and extrapolate the experimental data to mantle conditions. This Maxwell frequency scaling predicts a considerably smaller anelastic effect on seismic waves than in previous studies.

Appendix A: Reproducibility of Findings

In Figures 7 and 9 we show results from grain size and temperature tests, respectively, on a single polycrystalline sample (15 in Table 1). In order to test the veracity of these results, we repeated experiments at various grain sizes and temperatures for two additional samples (16 and 17). Here, we provide Figure A1 to demonstrate the reproducibility of the grain size results. The anelasticity of sample 16 was measured at two grain sizes (4.5 and 6.2 $\mu$m) and at approximately constant temperature (23–23.5°C). Normalization by the Maxwell frequency resulted in good convergence of modulus data (very little scatter or porosity effects) and a near perfect collapse of attenuation data.

In Figure A2, the reproducibility of temperature results is evidenced by the anelasticity data of sample 17 at various temperatures in the range 22.5–47.7°C ($T/T_m = 0.61–0.67$) and at nearly constant grain size (21.4 $\mu$m). As in Figure 9, the normalized modulus and attenuation data from temperature tests collapse onto single master curves.

Appendix B: Relationship Between Elastic Wave Properties and Material Properties

In order to relate shear wave velocity $V_S$ and shear wave attenuation $Q_S^{-1}$, we solve for the propagation of a plane wave in a linear solid. For simplicity, we consider a shear wave propagating in the $x$ direction being polarized in the $y$ direction. Then, the equation of the wave is given by

$$\rho u_y = \mu \frac{\partial^2 u_y}{\partial x^2}$$

where $\rho$ represents the shear modulus and $\rho$ represents the density. By considering a wave with angular frequency $\omega$ and wave number $k$, $u_y$ can be written as

$$u_y = u_0^y \exp(-i(\omega t - kx)).$$

Expressing $\mu$ as $1/\mathcal{J}^*(\omega)$ in the frequency domain, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\omega}{k}\right)^2 = \mathcal{J}^*(\omega).$$
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Figure A2. (a) Anelasticity data showing the temperature dependence of Young’s modulus and attenuation for sample 17 with constant grain size (d = 21.4 μm). (b) Same data as in Figure A2a, as functions of frequency normalized to the Maxwell frequency.

Solving equation (B3), we obtain

\[ u_p = u_p^0 \exp \left[ -\frac{\omega x}{2J_0} \left( 1 + J_2/J_1 \right)^{3/2} \right] \cdot \exp \left[ -i\omega \left( t - \frac{x}{v_p} \right) \right], \]  

\[ (B4) \]

Phase velocity \( V_S \) and quality factor \( Q_S \) of waves are defined as [e.g., Aki and Richards, 1980]

\[ u_p = u_p^0 \exp \left[ -\frac{\omega x}{2J_0} \right] \exp \left[ -i\omega \left( t - \frac{x}{v_p} \right) \right]. \]  

\[ (B5) \]

By comparing equations (B4) and (B5), \( V_S \) and \( Q_S^{-1} \) are given by

\[ V_S = (\mu J_1)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + (J_2/J_1)^2}}{2} \right)^{3/2}, \]  

\[ Q_S^{-1} = J_2/J_1 \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + (J_2/J_1)^2}}{2} \right)^{-1}. \]  

\[ (B6) \]

Therefore, when \( Q_S^{-1} \ll 1 \) (or \( J_2/J_1 \ll 1 \)), we obtain equation (24). Note that when \( Q_S^{-1} \) is not small, \( Q_S^{-1} \neq Q_{\mu}^{-1} \).
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