A re-evaluation of the great Aleutian and Chilean earthquakes of 1906 August 17
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SUMMARY

We investigate two great earthquakes that occurred in the Aleutian Islands and Chile, within 30 min of each other, on 1906 August 17, based on a collection of seismograms compiled shortly after the events by scientists at Strasbourg. The method of Preliminary Determination of Focal Mechanisms (PDFM) is applied to 14 mantle waves from seven stations, in order to resolve the moment tensors of the two shocks. It is complemented by examination of body wave polarities at Japanese stations to lift the remaining indeterminacy in focal mechanism. The Chilean earthquake, occurring second, is a regular subduction event, whose moment (2.8 $\times$ 10$^{28}$ dyn cm) is revised downwards from previous estimates (except Kanamori’s), suggesting that its rupture did not involve more than $\sim$200 km of fault. The Aleutian earthquake, occurring first, has a larger moment (3.8 $\times$ 10$^{28}$ dyn cm), but features mantle wave radiation patterns and body wave polarities incompatible with both underthrusting at the Aleutian subduction zone and tensional buckling at the outer rise. Rather, we suggest that it is an intraplate, somewhat deeper (\$50 km) earthquake: this is supported by tentative relocation of available arrival times north of it. The origin of the earthquake may be related to the presence of the Bowers ridge north of the Amchitka pass in the epicentral area. Finally, hydrodynamic simulations using our source mechanisms support the observation that the Chilean event was the source of the reported transpacific tsunami; the report of a 3.5-m wave at Maui constitutes a misassociation, as its timing is shown to be non-causal for both events.
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1 INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL BACKGROUND

On 1906 August 17, two earthquakes later assigned magnitudes in excess of 8 by Gutenberg & Richter (1954) took place within 30 min of each other, in the Aleutian Islands and Chile, respectively. Their coincidence in time, which we take as fortuitous, remains unique in the annals of historical seismology for events of this magnitude, and has led to significant confusion regarding the relative size of the two shocks and even their respective role in generating a Pacific-wide tsunami.

The exceptional character of the simultaneous occurrence of a duo of such large earthquakes was not lost on the leaders of the International Seismological Association, who entrusted the Imperial Central Station for Earthquake Research in Strasbourg$^1$ with the compilation and publication of a worldwide collection of copies of the original records. The result was a remarkable set of records from 78 stations, published on heavy photographic paper and accompanied by meticulous descriptions of their instrument characteristics (Rudolph & Tams 1907). The present study uses this data set to conduct a modern seismological reassessment of these two events, including an inversion of their focal mechanism using the Reymond & Okal (2000) method of Preliminary Determination of Focal Mechanisms (PDFM). We conclude that the Aleutian earthquake was the larger of the two, but that it could not have been an interplate thrust earthquake. Rather, we propose that it is somehow associated with the lateral heterogeneity in the subduction process located at the Amchitka pass, in a pattern reminiscent of the 1994 Shikotan earthquake in the Kuril Islands. The far-field tsunami was generated by the Chilean event.

1.1 The earthquakes

Various reports summarized by Rudolph & Tams (1907) establish that the Aleutian earthquake occurred in the vicinity of Amchitka island around 00:11 GMT, whereas the Chilean shock took place near Valparaíso at 00:41 GMT. Epicentral parameters were estimated for the Aleutian shock by Zöppritz (1906) as 50$^\circ$N, 180$^\circ$E, 00:10:47 and by Omori (1907) as 50$^\circ$N, 175$^\circ$E, 00:11:44. Estimates for the Chilean event are derived from Steffen (1907a) who does not

$^1$Then Straßburg im Elsaß, (Prussian) Imperial Lands. Throughout this paper, names and spelling of geographical sites will reflect present political boundaries.
quote a precise epicentre, but only an origin time as 00:41:22 GMT. The earthquakes are listed by Gutenberg & Richter (1954) at 51° N, 179° E; 00:10:42 and 33° S, 72° W; 00:40, respectively, based on Gutenberg’s own calculations, documented on his personal notepads (Goodstein et al. 1980).

In very general terms, the 1906 Aleutian earthquake occurred at the eastern end of the rupture zone of the great 1965 Rat Island earthquake (Stauder 1968a; Beck & Christensen 1991), essentially a location close to the recent event on 2003 November 17. The 1906 Chilean earthquake is generally interpreted as located in the same area as the 1822 and 1985 Valparaiso events (Lomnitz 1970; Comte et al. 1986).

There are no usable reports of the local effects of the Aleutian earthquake, because of the remoteness of its epicentral area (Rudolph & Tams 1907). By contrast, the Chilean event is well documented, notably by Steffen (1907a,b). Many investigators have interpreted his descriptions and maps in terms of a possible rupture length, but their estimates vary greatly, from 245 km (Kelleher 1972) to 330 km (Nishenko 1985) and even 365 km (Comte et al. 1986). The longer rupture would make the 1906 event significantly larger than the 1985 and probably the 1822 earthquakes.

1.1.1 The tsunami

While tsunami waves were detected throughout the Pacific in the aftermath of the two shocks, there remains some uncertainty as to their exact source. As compiled by Solov’ev & Go (1984), the tsunami was relatively minor along the Chilean coast, with run-up not exceeding 1.5 m. This figure is comparable to reports by Plafker (1985) following the 1985 event, although it may have to be corrected for transient coastal uplift, reported by Steffen (1907b) to be in the 80-cm range. The 1906 tsunami was detected on tidal gauges as far as Japan, with a maximum peak-to-peak amplitude of 44 cm. In the Hawaiian Islands, run-up was reported to have reached 1.5 m at Hilo and, most surprisingly, 3.5 m on Maui, while the tidal gauge amplitude in Honolulu did not exceed 10 cm. These reports led Lomnitz (1970) to propose that the transoceanic tsunami was generated by the Aleutian, rather than Chilean, shock. However, Solov’ev & Go (1984) argue that tsunami arrival times can be reconciled only with a Chilean origin. The matter is made more confused by inconsistencies in the timescales superimposed by Solov’ev & Go (1984) on the marigrams reproduced in their monograph. Also, as detailed in the Appendix, the inundation at Maui occurred too early to be associated with either earthquake.

In view of these uncertainties, we went back to the six original marigrams published by Honda et al. (1908). For each of them, we verified that the time is correctly expressed in local time (GMT +9 in Japan; GMT –10:30 in Hawaii; GMT –8 in California) by matching the oscillation of the tide, as computed from the interactive web site (www.shom.fr) of the Service Hydrographique et Oceanographique de la Marine of the French Navy. This revealed a number of errors in the timescales of fig. 29 (p. 129) of Solov’ev & Go (1984): times are labelled correctly at the Japanese stations, but for San Francisco, San Diego and Honolulu the local time (labelled with the Russian letter Tche) and the universal (GMT) time (labelled h) are both off by 12 hr. The onsets of the oscillations on figures of Honda et al. (1908) are in agreement with travel times from the Chilean epicentre at all five sites. No signal is present on the California marigrams at the times expected for a hypothetical Aleutian tsunami. At the Japanese and Hawaiian stations, such arrivals would fall before the beginning of the time-series plotted; however, it can be reasonably assumed that, had such signals been detectable, Honda et al. (1908) would have adjusted the time windows to include them.

Thus, we uphold the interpretation of Solov’ev & Go (1984) and reject that of Lomnitz (1970): the Aleutian earthquake did not generate a detectable far-field tsunami. On the other hand, the Chilean event generated a tsunami recorded Pacific-wide, including in Japan with decimetric amplitudes. This is an important observation, as we will conclude that the Aleutian earthquake is the greater of the two in terms of seismic moment.

1.1.2 Magnitude and moment estimates

Gutenberg & Richter (1954) assigned magnitudes $M = 8.0$ and 8.4 to the Aleutian and Chilean shocks, respectively. Abe & Noguchi (1983a,b) revised these estimates downwards, in an attempt to make the 1906 event generated a tsunami recorded Pacific-wide, including in Japan with decimetric amplitudes. This is an important observation, as we will conclude that the Aleutian earthquake is the greater of the two in terms of seismic moment.

Gutenberg & Richter (1954) assigned magnitudes $M = 8.0$ and 8.4 to the Aleutian and Chilean shocks, respectively. Abe & Noguchi (1983a,b) revised these estimates downwards, in an attempt to make them more in line with present-day $M_s$ values; Comte et al. (1986) further proposed $M_s = 8.3$ for the Chilean event. However, because of saturation of spectral amplitudes at 20 s (Geller 1976), $M_s$ is not expected to be an accurate measure of earthquake size in this range of magnitudes.

Kanamori (1977) lists a moment estimate of $2.9 \times 10^{28}$ dyne cm for the Chilean earthquake, based on ‘the aftershock area’; he probably means isoseismal areas, because to our best knowledge, no detailed epicentral information is available for aftershocks. Abe (1981) and later Comte et al. (1986) proposed moment estimates of $4 \times 10^{28}$ and $6.6 \times 10^{28}$ dyne cm respectively, based on tsunami magnitudes, but these probably give too much weight to the unrelated run-up at Maui and as such are biased upwards. Scaling laws (Geller 1976) would associate Kanamori’s (1977) estimate with a shorter rupture than given by Comte et al. (1986; 185 versus 365 km), who used the extent of coastal uplift reported by Steffen (1907a). However, the detailed examination of Steffen’s (1907b) isoseismal map reveals a more concentrated zone of maximum intensity (IX), extending no more than 200 km and more in line with Kanamori’s moment estimate.

More recently, Okal (1992a) derived mantle magnitudes $M_m$ for the Aleutian earthquake from Wiechert records at Uppsala; he noted a large discrepancy between Rayleigh and Love spectral amplitudes, which could not be reconciled with a regular interplate thrust mechanism. He was unable to extract surface waves of the Chilean earthquake from the Uppsala (UPP) records, further noted the absence of any detectable second passages and suggested a possible value of $1.5 \times 10^{28}$ dyne cm for the Aleutian earthquake, assuming its mechanism was that of an outer-rise shock.

2 Relocation

To our best knowledge, the only systematic effort at relocating the 1906 shocks is the work of Boyd & Lerner-Lam (1988) for the Aleutian event. These authors used Rudolph & Tams’ (1907) data set to derive an epicentre at 51.05° N, 179.69° W, with an error estimate of 50 km along the arc. However, their technique specifically included an arc proximity constraint, expressing the tacit assumption of interplate thrust faulting, which, as mentioned above, may be inadequate (Okal 1992a).

Here, we use the iterative interactive relocation algorithm of Wyssession et al. (1991), an approach admittedly less sophisticated than Boyd & Lerner-Lam’s (1988), but making use of a Monte Carlo algorithm, which injects Gaussian noise (with standard deviation $\sigma$) into the data set. We interpret the first and second advance phases in table III (‘1. u. 2. Vorl¨aufer’) of Rudolph & Tams (1907) as P and S times, respectively.

In the case of the Aleutian event, a set of 42 P and 44 S times converges on an epicentre at 50.60° N, 178.36° E with an
origin time of 00:11:00 GMT. The rms residual, $\sigma = 34.9 \text{ s}$, would be regarded as outrageous by the standards of today, but should be considered acceptable given the obvious scatter in the data. The solution is remarkably robust under the Monte Carlo algorithm, yielding an uncertainty ellipse with semi-axes approximately 200 km long, for $\sigma_G = 35 \text{ s} = \sigma$ (Fig. 1). The data set has no depth resolution, with constrained-depth epicentres being essentially undistinguishable in the depth range 10–100 km. The ellipse includes Boyd & Lerner-Lam's (1988) epicentre and, remarkably, the early estimate by Zöppritz (1906), who used only four stations. Omori's (1907) epicentre lies only 35 km outside the ellipse.

Following Boyd & Lerner-Lam (1988), we further explored the effect of imposing a cap on acceptable residuals $r$: we find that relocated epicentres move north, as the maximum $|r|$ is decreased, to 51.31°N, 177.62°E for $|r| \leq 75 \text{ s}$, and 52.07°N, 178.00°E for $|r| \leq 50 \text{ s}$, both within the original Monte Carlo error ellipse. The latter provides a reasonable constraint on the epicentre: while it gives an adequate picture of the location of the event along the arc, it provides no resolution in the transverse direction; the earthquake could be an interplate thrust event, or an outer-rise earthquake similar to the nearby event of 1965 March 30 (Stauder 1968b; Beck & Christensen 1991), or a deeper shock displaced arcwards of the trench and reminiscent of the 1994 Kuriles earthquake (Kikuchi & Kanamori 1995).

We also inverted the more limited set of 29 times on which Omori (1907) based his epicentral estimate and the 36 times listed on Gutenberg's notepads (Goodstein et al. 1980). For the Omori data set and after discarding three stations, we find a more southerly epicentre, at 46.49°N, 175.19°W; however, it is poorly constrained and its Monte Carlo ellipse ($\sigma_G = 35 \text{ s}$) grazes our own solution. Gutenberg's data set converges to a back-arc location (52.52°N, 177.19°E), with an rms residual of 17.8 s, only 75 km from the solution we achieve by imposing $|r| \leq 50 \text{ s}$ (Fig. 1). It is impossible to understand the origin of the 210-km discrepancy between Gutenberg's solution and our inversion of his data set, as we do not know how Gutenberg achieved his solution, i.e. which station(s) he may have discarded, or weighted low, in the process. However, it would be legitimate to assume that he was forcing the epicentre into the Aleutian seismic belt, in effect implementing a pencil-and-paper version of what Boyd & Lerner-Lam (1988) later called an ‘arc-proximity constraint’.

In summary, Fig. 1 confirms that the 1906 Aleutian earthquake occurred near Amchitka island, at the eastern end (and epicentral area) of the 1965 rupture. Its location is not resolved in the direction transverse to the arc, but both the relocation of Gutenberg’s data set and our own relocation excluding large residuals would suggest a trend towards a back-arc location.

Relocation efforts are less successful in the case of the Chilean earthquake, whose records fall in the coda of the Aleutian shock,
resulting in picks of a clearly much lower quality. Rudolph & Tams (1907) do not report any second advance phases (‘2. Vorläufer’), which suggests the possibility of confusion between \( P \) and \( S \) times; in addition, most European stations fall in the core shadow. As a result, our best location uses only six stations and converges on an inland location at 29.9° S, 69.3° W, OT 00:41:01 with an rms residual of 28.7 s. Most significantly, the Monte Carlo ellipse (\( \sigma_G = 35 \) s) has a NNE–SSW semi-axis of 670 km. The epicentre could be anywhere along the coast from Taltal in the north to Chanco in the south (Fig. 2). As in the case of the Aleutian event, we attempted to invert the data set of 11 \( P \) and two \( S \) times on Gutenberg’s notepads (Goodstein et al. 1980), but the algorithm failed to converge.

In summary, we could not relocate the Chilean event from available data sets; we will use the approximate epicentre (33° S, 72° W) proposed by Gutenberg & Richter (1954), which falls inside the zone of maximum felt intensity (MM IX) (Steffen 1907b).

3 M O M E N T T E N S O R I N V E R S I O N

We apply to both shocks the method of PDFM introduced by Reymond & Okal (2000), following an idea originally expressed by Romanowicz & Suárez (1983). In simple terms, it consists of inverting only the amplitude part of the spectra of mantle waves (both Rayleigh and Love) at a limited number of stations, while discarding the phase information. As discussed by Okal & Reymond (2003), this method is particularly well adapted to the analysis of historical earthquakes, because the correct interpretation of phase spectra requires accurate relative timing between stations and adequate epicentral information, both of which may not be available. In addition, information on the polarity of recordings at historical stations is occasionally lost; in particular, in Rudolph & Tams’ (1907) data set, it is given only for the Japanese stations (TOK and OSK).

As pointed out by Romanowicz & Suárez (1983), Reymond & Okal (2000) and Okal & Reymond (2003), the method has an inherent indeterminacy of \( \pm 180° \) on both the strike and slip angles of the best-fitting double couple. It can be lifted by considering independent evidence such as polarization of body waves or interpretation in the geological context.

3.1 Choosing the stations

Because Reymond & Okal (2000) showed that the PDFM method can provide reliable solutions with as few as three stations offering adequate azimuthal coverage, we elected to choose a limited number of high-quality records from the data set of Rudolph & Tams (1907) and discarded many more, as a result of poor contrast, loss of the seismic trace going off scale after body waves, use of undamped (Milne type) instruments, exceedingly low gains, or rapid fall-off at long periods. Also, we emphasized high-quality records and adequate azimuthal coverage over redundancy at a given azimuth. In the end, we selected 14 phases from seven stations providing reasonable
Table 1. List of records used in the moment tensor inversion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Azimuth (°)</th>
<th>Back azimuth (°)</th>
<th>Phases used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>API</td>
<td>Apia, Samoa</td>
<td>Wiechert</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>G$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>R$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSK</td>
<td>Osaka, Japan</td>
<td>Omori</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R$_1$, G$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>Strasbourg, France</td>
<td>Wiechert</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>R$_1$, G$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>Tbilisi, Georgia</td>
<td>Zöllner</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>R$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOK</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>Omori</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R$_1$, G$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPP</td>
<td>Uppsala, Sweden</td>
<td>Wiechert</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>R$_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Stations used in the inversions of the Aleutian (left) and Chilean (right) events. Each map is an equidistant azimuthal projection of the whole Earth, centred on the epicentre of the event (shown as a star).

azimuthal coverage from both epicentres, as compiled in Table 1 and mapped on Fig. 3. Figs 4 and 5 show examples of the mantle phases used in the inversion. Records were digitized and interpolated at $\delta t = 1$ s. Instrumental characteristics were retrieved from Rudolph & Tams (1907).

Following the technique described by Reymond & Okal (2000), the records were processed through the $M_m$ algorithm (Okal & Talandier 1989, 1990) and the resulting spectral amplitudes smoothed by a cubic spline in the 100–200 s period range. Inversions were carried out at five periods between 100 and 180 s under an interactive iterative process; a small amount of damping was used to stabilize the process.

3.1.1 Results: Aleutian event

For the Aleutian event, we use six stations sampling 110° in azimuth (Fig. 3). The result of the inversion is shown on Fig. 6; our solution provides a nearly perfect fit to all spectral amplitudes, with the exception of the lowest-frequency Love wave at STR. The four possible orientations of the best-fitting double couple (mechanisms I–IV) are shown on the right of Fig. 6. Fig. 7 explores the influence of depth (which remains constrained during the inversion) on the solution. The quality of fit, expressed by the rms residual, is essentially constant. As expected, the inversion becomes poorly conditioned (Tarantola 1987) for the shallowest sources, expressing the classical surface singularity of the excitation of any seismic mode or wave by the $M_{xz}$ and $M_{yz}$ components of the moment tensor, with the inverted mechanism turning into pure dip-slip and the amplitude of $M_0$ artificially increased. Note that the condition number also increases around 70 km. At that depth, the coefficient $K_0$ characterizing the excitation of Rayleigh waves by the component $M_{zz}$ (Kanamori & Stewart 1976) vanishes for $T \approx 146$ s and remains small at the other periods. As $M_{zz}$ does not excite Love modes, this results in a singularity that turns the best-fitting double couple into nearly pure normal faulting. Our preferred solution, featuring a reliable, well-conditioned inversion and a good rms value, is at 50 km, with $M_0 = 3.8 \times 10^{28}$ dyn cm. Note that it is essentially stable between 40 and 60 km.

In order to study the effect of any remaining uncertainty in instrument responses and following Okal & Reymond (2003), we tested the robustness of the solution when station gains are increased or decreased, one at a time, by 25 per cent. We find that the inverted moment varies between $-13$ and $+12$ per cent about its unaltered value and that the geometry of the best-fitting double couple is rotated from the original solution at most 8° in the formalism of Kagan (1991). We also verified that our results do not depend on the amount of damping introduced in the inversion. We conclude that the solution is indeed robust.

Most importantly, our inversion confirms that the event cannot be an interplate thrust earthquake. Okal (1992a) had noticed that the large Love-to-Rayleigh spectral ratio at UPP was incompatible with such a geometry. We confirm this trend at station STR, which is only 10° in azimuth from UPP (see for example the remarkable Love wave record on Fig. 4). When imposing the geometry of the
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Figure 4. East–west Wiechert record of the Aleutian $G_1$ wave at Strasbourg. (a) Original record reproduced from Rudolph & Tams’ (1907) collection. Note the exceptional sharpness of the phase. (b) The same after digitization, suppression of pen curvature and slant, and equalization to $\delta t = 1\, \text{s}$.

Figure 5. East–west Wiechert record at Apia. (a) Section of the original record showing prominently the Rayleigh arrival from the Chilean event (left). The Aleutian Love wave ($G_1$) is also discernable on the right, even though it is overprinted by the coda of the Chilean Rayleigh wave, about 1 hr later. The numbers (13 to 17) refer to hour marks expressed in local time (GMT $-11 : 27 : 04$). (b) and (c) Time-series used in the inversion after digitization, suppression of pen curvature and slant, and equalization to $\delta t = 1\, \text{s}$.
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\[ M_o = 3.8 \times 10^{28} \text{ dyn-cm} \]

1965 Rat Island main shock \((\phi_f = 290^\circ, \delta = 18^\circ, \lambda = 139^\circ); \) Wu & Kanamori 1973; also close to that of the recent event on 2003 November 17) and optimizing the scalar moment, we find that the radiation pattern is very poorly fit, as it predicts large Rayleigh-to-Love ratios in Europe (UPP, STR) and nodal Rayleigh waves at TOK, all of which are contradicted by our observations; the rms residual more than doubles, to 32.3 in the units of Fig. 7. The mechanism of Stauder (1968b) for a normal faulting outer-rise event \((\phi_f = 104^\circ, \delta = 47^\circ, \lambda = -118^\circ)\) fares only marginally better, poorly matching radiation patterns of both Rayleigh and Love waves.

### 3.1.2 Resolving the indeterminacy

The seismograms in Rudolph & Tams (1907) generally do not include information on the polarity of the recording and thus the direction of first motions cannot be assessed. Fortunately, the seismograms reproduced in Omori (1907) do carry this information, revealing decisive, impulsive first motions to south and west (away from the source) for the \(P\) waves at TOK and OSK (Fig. 8). For \(S\) waves, a sharp initial eastward motion is read at TOK and OSK, and a probable northward motion at TOK. In Table 2, we use the formalism of Kanamori & Stewart (1976) to compute the source radiation coefficients expected from mechanisms I–IV. To predict \(S\) polarities on the horizontal components, we further assume that the incidence angles at the stations are steep enough to allow a direct rotation of the \(SV\) and \(SH\) components (Okal 1992b).

Only mechanism I correctly predicts the polarities of the \(P\)-wave and eastward \(S\)-wave first motions. We therefore assign mechanism I \((\phi_f = 196^\circ, \delta = 80^\circ, \lambda = 304^\circ)\) to the Aleutian event. We also note that the interplate thrust mechanism (in the geometry of the 1965 or 2003 events) predicts a strong westward impulse for \(S\) and that the outer-rise mechanism would predict a dilatational \(P\) wave.

### 3.1.3 Results: Chilean event

For the Chilean event, we use four stations sampling 95° in azimuth (Fig. 3). The result of the inversion is shown on Fig. 9. As in the case of the Aleutian event, the rms residual is insensitive to depth in the 20–60 km range (Fig. 10), with the solution best conditioned between 30 and 50 km. By analogy with the 1985 Valparaiso earthquake, we favour a 40-km centroid depth, representative of interplate events in the area. The inverted moment \((M_o = 2.8 \times 10^{28} \text{ dyn cm})\) is in excellent agreement with the figure of 2.9 \(\times\) \(10^{28}\) dyn cm proposed by Kanamori (1977) on the basis of isoseismal

---

**Figure 6.** Result of the Preliminary Determination of Focal Mechanisms (PDFM) inversion for the Aleutian event. The four panels on the left give examples of the fit of spectral amplitudes at representative periods. On each diagram, the solid line is the theoretical azimuthal radiation pattern (north up) of Love waves by the inverted mechanisms. The solid triangles are the observed Love spectral amplitudes at individual stations. The dashed line and solid dots similarly represent the Rayleigh waves. The scales vary between periods but are common inside each panel to Love and Rayleigh waves, observed and predicted values. The beach-balls on the right show the four possible geometries of the best-fitting double couples resulting from the double indeterminacy in the preferred solution.
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3.1.4 Resolving the indeterminacy

In the case of the Chilean earthquake, no first motion polarities are available, as its body waves fall within the coda of the surface waves of the Aleutian event. From a tectonic standpoint, the earthquake could be interpreted as an interplate thrust event by selecting mechanism I on Fig. 9 (φft = 3°, δ = 15°, λ = 117°), or as an intraplate normal faulting event similar to the 1939 Chillan earthquake in the central valley, by selecting mechanism IV. The latter is within the range of geometries given by Beck et al. (1998) for the 1939 event. We favour the former interpretation on account of the damage reports (Steffen 1907b), which feature isoseismals centred on the coast line rather than the central valley, as well as coastal uplift between 32° S and 35° S.

4 DISCUSSION

Our inversions by the PDFM method establish that the Aleutian earthquake was the greater of the two large events of 1906 August 17. However, it was not an interplate thrust earthquake, but rather an intraplate one, probably at some depth, and thus the transpacific tsunami was generated by the Chilean earthquake. We discuss separately our results for each event, in the framework of their tectonic province.

4.1 The Chilean event: regular subduction of an ~200-km fragment of the Nazca Plate

Our results regarding the Chilean event are relatively straightforward, the earthquake representing an episode of simple subduction of the Nazca Plate under the central Chile coast. With respect to the 1985 event, we derive a slightly less pure mechanism, with a shallower dip and a slight component of strike-slip. These discrepancies could be genuine, or they could be an artefact of the source complexity suggested by felt reports (Steffen 1907b). Our principal result concerns the inverted seismic moment, $M_0 = 2.8 \times 10^{28}$ dyn cm, equivalent to that proposed by Kanamori (1977), but significantly less than proposed by Abe (1981) and Comte et al. (1986), and difficult to reconcile with the interpretation of the latter of a homogeneous rupture along a 365-km fault.

As discussed above, we believe that Steffen’s (1907b) isoseismal data could support a shorter rupture (~200 km), extending from 32.3° S to 34.1° S. We can only offer speculation as to the relationship of this segment to previous historical earthquakes (e.g. 1751, 1880), as the interpretation of their ruptures varies significantly among different researchers (Lomnitz 1970; Kelleher 1972; Comte et al. 1986).

4.2 The Aleutian event: a 1994-Kuriles-type earthquake?

Our most interesting results relate to the Aleutian event. We confirm our original suggestion (Okal 1992a) that it cannot be a regular
The interpretation of the 1906 event as displaced towards the backarc and the Bering sea is supported by the definite northward trend of our relocations when placing a cap on acceptable residuals and by our own relocation of Gutenberg's data set. We also note that Gutenberg & Richter's (1954) catalogue does include four neighbouring large shocks ($M \geq 6.9$) listed either at 60 km depth, or below and north of the arc, on 1905 February 14, 1912 January 4, 1913 March 31 and 1929 July 7. We relocated these events based on arrival times listed in Gutenberg's notepads (Goodstein et al. 1980) for the first three and the International Seismological Survey (ISS) for the last one. Only the 1905 event (given $M = 7.2$ by Gutenberg & Richter 1954) converges north of the arc, to 53.27°N, 177.36°W (Fig. 1). As the data set cannot resolve depth and modern-day seismicity at that location is exclusively intermediate-depth, it is legitimate to consider that the 1905 earthquake could be at least 100 and possibly 200 km deep. The relocation is good ($\sigma = 5.77$ s on 14 stations) but many arrivals, primarily of S waves, had to be discarded. On the other hand, the Monte Carlo ellipse (drawn with the same $\sigma_{ii} = 35$ s used throughout this study for turn-of-the-century events) does extend to the interplate seismic belt and the 1905 earthquake could be an interplate thrust event, as concluded by Boyd & Lerner-Lam (1988), although they were once again working under their self-imposed arc-proximity constraint. The other three shocks relocate to the line of shallow subduction and there is nothing in their traveltime data sets to suggest that they are anything but interplate thrust events. In short, there is some possible, but weak, evidence in the historical record for intraplate activity at large magnitudes arcwards of the central Aleutians.

The 1906 earthquake took place in a general location that has been recognized for several decades as the site of a structural discontinuity of the Aleutian arc. A channel known as the Amchitka pass separates the Andreanof Islands to the east, trending N78°E, from the Rat Islands group to the west, trending N110°E (Fig. 1). As a result, the subduction becomes more oblique to the west and the maximum depth of seismicity, reaching 250 km north of the De-larof Islands, tapers off to 180 km north of Amchitka and 135 km (with only three events below 100 km) west of Kiska (Engdahl et al. 1998). This geometry suggests that there exists at the very least a contortion, possibly a break, in the slab between longitudes 178°E and 179°W. Furthermore, longitude 180° effectively separates the inferred rupture zones of the megathrust events of 1965 and 1957 (Stauder 1968a; Johnson et al. 1994), and we know of no large earthquake whose rupture transgresses the Amchitka pass. This suggests that this locale may be acting as a "barrier" (Aki et al. 1977) along the subduction zone, itself possibly controlled by a lateral heterogeneity in the subduction process.

In this respect, we note that the epicentral area coincides with the intersection of the Aleutian chain with the Bowers ridge, a horn-shaped, arcuate feature extending 500 km into the Bering sea (Fig. 1). It is generally thought to be the remnants of a volcanic arc formed at a fossil subduction system (Kienle 1971; Karig 1972; Scholl et al. 1975), but conflicting models have been proposed regarding the location and timing of its generation (Ben-Avraham & Cooper 1981; Cooper et al. 1992). The shallow structure of the Bowers ridge has been determined from a variety of studies (Kienle 1971; Ludwig et al. 1971; Cooper et al. 1981). Its crust reaches a thickness of 29 km and one can only speculate as to the depth of any mantle root it may have kept to this day, notably in view of intriguing results obtained under other fossil volcanic structures (VanDecar et al. 1995; Richardson et al. 2000). The existence of the Bowers...
ridge could provide a framework for the development of a lateral heterogeneity in the subduction process, which in turn could lead to tearing of the slab, either by actual collision with an existing root, or under loading by the ridge structure. Such a context could possibly explain the location of the large intraslab earthquake of 1906.

Finally, the slip motion inverted in the present study is in general agreement with the deformation described by Geist et al. (1988);
as part of a pattern of block rotation of various provinces of the Aleutian Islands, these authors proposed a left-lateral strike-slip motion oriented $\sim 30^\circ$ NE at the eastern edge of the Rat Island block. An earthquake on 1966 July 4 in the Amchitka pass has precisely this mechanism (Stauder 1968a). It may be speculative to extrapolate this general motion to the inferred hypocentre of the 1906 event, but we cannot fail to notice that it is in agreement with the large strike-slip component of mechanism I.
In this section, we use our inverted focal geometries to consider plausible models of surface deformation and in turn simulate the transpacific tsunamis expected from our solutions. We justify that the Aleutian earthquake, despite a smaller seismic moment than the Aleutian one, was nevertheless the source of the transpacific tsunami. As for the Aleutian event, we confirm that it can be neither an interplate, nor a tensional outer-rise earthquake, based on mantle wave radiation patterns and body wave polarities in Japan. Following the 1994 Shikotan earthquake, Tanioka (1995) had raised the possibility that ‘many large events like (the Shikotan earthquake) occurred in the past but (had) been mistaken for underthrusting earthquakes’.

For the Aleutian event, we take the steep plane in mechanism I (Fig. 6) as the fault plane and model a source rupturing from 40 to 102 km depth, with a fault length of 200 km, a slip of 4 m and a rigidity $\mu = 7 \times 10^{11}$ dyn cm$^{-2}$, adequate for an upper-mantle event. We use the algorithm of Mansinha & Smylie (1971) to infer the resulting vertical surface deformation field in the epicentral area, whose extrema are $-75$ and $+46$ cm, in the vicinity of Kiska and western Amchitka, respectively (Fig. 11a).

In turn, the resulting displacement field is used as an initial condition for a hydrodynamic computation using the Method Of Splitting Tsunami (MOS) algorithm, which solves the non-linear shallow-water wave equations on a variably staggered grid with the method of fractional steps (Titov & González 1997; Titov & Synolakis 1998); a full description is given in Synolakis (2002). Our simulations are carried out in a region extending from 50° S to 56° N and from 130° E to 60° W, using Smith & Sandwell’s (1997) 2-min bathymetric grid. The tsunami is propagated for 24 hr in the Pacific ocean. Fig. 12(a) shows the field of maximum amplitude of the tsunami wave on the high seas. It is clear that it falls below 5 cm after approximately 1500 km or 2 hr.

For the Chilean event, we model a source rupturing from 23 to 45 km depth, with a fault length of 200 km and a slip of 5.3 m, with $\mu = 4.4 \times 10^{11}$ dyn cm$^{-2}$, adequate for a source in the crust. We use a focal geometry ($\phi_I = 8^\circ$, $\delta = 17^\circ$, $\lambda = 117^\circ$) slightly rotated from mechanism I, but remaining in the range of scatter as a result of fluctuations in instrument response. This predicts extremal vertical motions of $+1.83$ m and $-68$ cm (Fig. 11b). We position the source to best reproduce the strong uplift at Pichilemu (at least 2.5 m) and the minimal one at Llico (40 cm) reported by Steffen (1907b).

While we obtain a tentative fit of the order of magnitude of these displacements (Fig. 11b), we fail to reproduce the uplift reported farther north at Zapallar (80 cm). This misfit is most probably the result of source complexity and consequent slip heterogeneity on the fault plane. Using this displacement field as an initial condition, the tsunami simulation is carried out for 24 hr in the Pacific ocean. Fig. 12(b) shows the resulting maximum amplitude on the high seas. In the absence of detailed simulation of the response of specific bays and harbours, it is impossible to model the signals recorded at individual tide gauge stations, but the comparison of the two frames of Fig. 12 clearly shows that the Chilean source is a far more efficient far-field tsunami generator than the Aleutian one, despite an overall lower seismic moment, as expected from the deeper Aleutian focus and the location of the latter under the arc, its fault zone extending under the Bering sea and funnelling little tsunami energy into the Pacific basin.

5 CONCLUSION

The exceptional collection of seismograms compiled by Rudolph & Tams (1907) allows the resolution of the focal mechanisms of the two great earthquakes of 1906 August 17. The available data sets of compiled arrival times are of somewhat lesser value, because of their inherent scatter and of inconsistencies between various versions. We find that the Chilean event is a regular interplate thrust earthquake, but its moment, the lesser of the two, suggests a significantly shorter rupture length (~200 km) than previously advocated; it was nevertheless the source of the transpacific tsunami. As for the Aleutian event, we confirm that it can be neither an interplate, nor a tensional outer-rise earthquake, based on mantle wave radiation patterns and body wave polarities in Japan. Following the 1994 Shikotan earthquake, Tanioka et al. (1995) had raised the possibility that ‘many large events like (the Shikotan earthquake) occurred in the past but (had) been mistaken for underthrusting earthquakes’.

We believe that the 1906 Aleutian earthquake represents exactly this scenario.

Finally, no study of the 1906 events can evade the mention of a possible triggering of the Chilean earthquake by the Aleutian one;
this question is raised inextrably by their exceptional simultaneity, in the sense that the second earthquake took place during the passage in its epicentral area of body wavefronts from the first one. As first proposed by Chinnery (1963) and reviewed most recently by Stein (1999), it has become increasingly clear that mechanisms of stress transfer do exist and take place for the triggering of one earthquake by a previous shock, in the local to regional field. However, improvements to this class of models, including those involving viscoelastic and poroelastic effects, have been successfully used only in the regional field (Hill et al. 1993; Pollitz & Sacks 1997), or at most along an extended but continuous plate boundary (Stein et al. 1997; Pollitz et al. 1998). Alternating cycles of seismicity on a global scale (which could be regarded as a form of teleseismic triggering) have been recognized only on a timescale of years to decades and, at any rate, lack a clear understanding of their mechanism (Romanowicz 1993). In this framework and in order to be convincing, any investigation of the admittedly fascinating suggestion that the 1906 events may somehow be related to each other would have to reconcile the following facts.

(i) Why only one occurrence? There have been more than 130 earthquakes with \( h \leq 100 \text{ km} \) and at least one reported \( M \geq 8 \) in the past 110 yr, yet only the 1906 twins are separated by less time than the typical duration of a classical seismogram (\( \sim 1 \text{ hr} \), corresponding to the passage of the major body waves and minor-arc surface waves). The immediate runner-up couples (1901 August 9 in Vanuatu and the Kuriles, and 1902 September 22–23 in the Marianas and Mexico) are separated by much longer intervals (5.5 and 43 hr, respectively) and at any rate the magnitudes of their first events, reported as 8.4 (Vanuatu) and 8.1 (Marianas), are eminently suspect, given the low magnitudes of present-day seismicity in loosely coupled subduction zones.

(ii) Why not the bigger earthquakes? At only \( 3.9 \times 10^{28} \text{ dyn cm} \), the 1906 Aleutian earthquake is far from being gigantic and much larger events (1960 Chile, 1964 Alaska) did indeed generate significantly larger teleseismic displacements, strains and stresses in principle capable of affecting potentially seismogenic areas in the far field. Yet the 1960 Chilean earthquake was not followed by a distant \( M \geq 8 \) event for more than 3 yr (1963 Kuriles) and the 1964 Alaska earthquake for 313 days (1965 Rat Island).

(iii) Why would seismic waves be a good trigger? The Aleutian body waves transiting the epicentral area of the Chilean earthquake at the time of its rupture are not expected to produce strong motion (because of attenuation along the seismic path), but could still conceivably affect local stresses. In this respect, their effect would be most similar to that of solid Earth tides. Despite decades of numerous investigations, there is still no consensus on the topic of tidal triggering of earthquakes, with the most recent results suggesting at best a very weak correlation (Vidale et al. 1998a,b); because of undersampling, no conclusion can be drawn for large (\( M \geq 8 \)) earthquakes. If there is no definitive evidence that large earthquakes can be triggered by tides, then why would relatively moderate waves from distant events do the job?

Because we can provide no acceptably deterministic answer to any of these questions, we prefer to consider the simultaneity of the two shocks as a random occurrence.
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APPENDIX A: THE CASE OF THE REPORT OF 3.5 m AT MAUI

The run-up of 3.5 m at Maui (Solov‘ev & Go 1984) constitutes the largest value reported Pacific-wide for the tsunami associated with the twin events. Because it dwarfs the amplitudes on the Chilean coast, it motivated Lomnitz (1970) to propose that the tsunami was generated by the Aleutian event, for which no near-field run-up data is available. Abe’s (1981) use of the figure of 3.5 m also resulted in a significant over estimate of the moment of the Chilean event. Finally, this height is in disagreement with other records in the Hawaiian
Islands. In this context, we decided to investigate in detail the sources of the report of Solov’ev & Go (1984).

The inundation of the coast of Maui is reported in the daily newspaper Pacific Commercial Advertiser (1906; now the Honolulu Advertiser) as the front page lead story of their issue for 1906 August 17, Friday, under the title ‘Twelve-foot tidal wave on Maui coast’. The crucial information is the dateline of the article, ‘KAHULUI, August 16—2:10 p.m.’, which has to be posterior to the inundation itself. The earliest arrival time at Maui for an Aleutian-generated tsunami would be 05:10 GMT, or 18:43 (6:43 pm on August 16), solar time in Maui. For a Chilean-generated tsunami, these times would be 13:37 GMT, or 03:10 solar time on August 17 in Maui. Although there remains the usual uncertainty as to the exact time being used in the Hawaiian Islands in 1906, an association of the reported phenomenon with the Aleutian earthquake would require that the time in use in Maui be at least 4.5 hr behind the Sun, which we dismiss. For the Chilean event to be the origin of the Maui wave, the clocks would have to be more than 13 hr behind the Sun.

We conclude that the wave at Maui is non-causal with respect to both events and that its origin must thus be sought in an independent phenomenon, which could have been a local underwater landslide. Additional evidence to support this interpretation includes the following.

(i) The report of the Chilean-generated tsunami at Hilo (with run-up of 1.5 m), from the next day’s (1906 August 18, Saturday) edition of the newspaper, datelined ‘HILO, August 17’ (no time given): ‘There was a five-foot tidal wave at Hilo this morning’, which is in agreement with travel times from Chile, but suffers a discrepancy of at least 10 hr with the report at Maui; they cannot be the result of the same source.

(ii) The extreme spatial concentration of the damage by the wave on Maui. As reported in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (1906), the wharf at Maalea bay was ‘destroyed’, that at McGregor Landing (about 7 km away) was ‘damaged’ and there was ‘no particular damage’ at Lahaina, 13 km farther away along the coast. While the non-linear response of the concave shoreline along Maalea bay may have enhanced run-up, such large lateral gradients in run-up distributions are characteristic of near-field tsunamis generated by landslides (Okal & Synolakis 2004).