OUR SUN. I. THE STANDARD MODEL: SUCCESSES AND FAILURES[1]

I.-Juliana Sackmann, Arnold I. Boothroyd,[2] and William A. Fowler
W. K. Kellogg Radiation Laboratory, Caltech

ABSTRACT

We have computed a number of standard solar models. Our best Standard Sun has $Y = 0.278$, $Z = 0.0194$, and $\alpha = 2.1$, using $L_\odot \equiv 3.86 \times 10^{33}$ erg/sec, $R_\odot \equiv 6.96 \times 10^{10}$ cm, $t_\odot = 4.54$ Gyr, and the Grevesse (1984) value of $Z/X = 0.02766$; we used LAOL opacities, including molecular opacities, Caughlan and Fowler (1988) nuclear rates, and neutrino capture cross sections from Bahcall and Ulrich (1988). We predict a ^{37}Cl neutrino capture rate of 7.7 SNU's, which would be observed if all solar neutrinos reach the earth (i.e., in the absence of such effects as the MSW neutrino oscillation effect which could reduce the flux of electron neutrinos). This is in agreement with results of other authors, but a factor of four larger than the average observed rate. We predict neutrino capture rates for other targets: 26 SNU's for ^{81}Br, 17 SNU's for ^{98}Mo, 125 SNU's for ^{71}Ga, 615 SNU's for ^{115}In, and 47 SNU's for ^{7}Li.

We have investigated the sensitivity of the standard solar model to uncertainties in the solar luminosity, solar age, and observed Z/X ratio, as well as to changes in molecular opacities, pressure ionization effects in the envelope, and non-equilibrium ^{3}He energy contributions. Of these, only the uncertainty in Z/X has a significant effect on the solar Y value and the ^{37}Cl neutrino capture rate: use of the old Ross and Aller (1976) value of $Z/X = 0.02282$ decreases Y by 0.014 and decreases the ^{37}Cl rate by 1.5 SNU's. While the recent work of Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989) has shown that Y can be significantly affected by the choice of stellar interior opacities, we find that even large changes in the *low-temperature molecular opacities* have *no* effect on Y, nor even on conditions at the *base* of the convective envelope. The large molecular opacities *do* cause a large increase in the mixing length parameter α, but do *not* cause the convective envelope to reach deeper. The temperature remains too low for lithium burning, and there is no surface lithium depletion, let alone the observed depletion of a factor of 100: the lithium problem of the standard solar model remains.

I. INTRODUCTION

The initial impetus for creating standard solar models came from our interest in creating non-standard solar models. Guzik, Willson, and Brunish (1987) have produced very interesting non-standard solar models: they considered the possibility of large amounts of mass loss during the early main sequence stage. We wished to look at this possibility in more detail (see Boothroyd, Sackmann, and Fowler 1990, hereafter Paper II). A standard model was clearly required for comparison purposes. It is also of considerable interest in its own right. Therefore we made an effort to use the current (observed) solar composition values, as well as up-to-date input physics, nuclear reaction rates, and opacities.

The ratio Z/X of solar metallicity to solar hydrogen abundance is fairly well determined by observations. However, the solar helium abundance is not constrained very tightly. Another important quantity, which is not directly observable at all, is the parameter $\alpha \equiv l/H_p$, the ratio of the convective mixing length to the pressure scale height. This parameter determines the depth of the outer convective envelope, and therefore stongly affects the radius of a stellar model. Fortunately, two key boundary conditions allow us to determine these quantities: the luminosity $L_\odot$ and radius $R_\odot$ of the Sun at the present age, which are relatively well determined by observations.

[1] This work was supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation PHY-8817296.
[2] Now at the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, University of Toronto.

It has only recently been demonstrated conclusively (Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque 1989) that the value obtained for the presolar helium abundance changes significantly (from $Y \approx 0.24$ to $Y \approx 0.28$) if one uses interior opacities from the Los Alamos Opacity Library (LAOL) rather than the older opacities of Cox and Stewart (1970). (This had been suspected earlier, from a comparison of solar models of different authors: see, e.g., Lebreton and Maeder [1986]). The molecular opacities at temperatures below about 10^4 K are still very uncertain; a number of recent authors have included molecular opacities, from a number of different sources (see discussion in Section III). We wanted to investigate whether this uncertainty in the molecular opacity would also have a large effect on the solar models. There is some uncertainty in the solar composition, age and luminosity, so we tested the effect of varying these also. We also tested the effect of adding pressure ionization effects ("depression of the continuum") to our model, and the effect of non-equilibrium ^{3}He-burning on the nuclear energy production.

We constructed evolutionary tracks from the zero age main sequence (ZAMS) up to the solar age. Each track requires an input value for the initial helium abundance Y and metallicity Z, as well as for the value of the mixing length parameter α. Holding either Z or Z/X fixed, we varied Y and α until our tracks had the solar luminosity and effective temperature (and thus radius) at the solar age. This determined a unique value for Y, Z, and α for our Standard Sun. We couldn't resist exploring the Sun's future fate: for our best Standard Sun, we carried the evolution up through the red giant stage and core helium burning stage to the asymptotic giant branch stage. Details of this, and of the future of the non-standard solar models of Paper II, will be presented in Sackmann, Boothroyd, and Kraemer (1990: hereafter Paper III).

In Section II we describe in more detail our methods, the input physics, and the measured and observed quantities. In Section III we present our results for the Sun at its present age, and compare our results with those of other authors. In Section IV we summarize our conclusions and point out key uncertainties in the input physics, in the computing techniques, and in the observations.

II. METHOD

a) Nuclear Physics

Our stellar evolutionary program is described in some detail in Boothroyd and Sackmann (1988*a*). It already included non-equilibrium CNO-burning, following ^{12}C, ^{14}N, ^{16}O, and ^{18}O; for the solar work, we added the isotopes ^{13}C and ^{17}O. In addition, we added non-equilibrium burning of ^{3}He and ^{7}Li in the proton-proton chain, although for these we did not in general include the non-equilibrium effects on the energy generation rate. (Non-equilibrium ^{3}He energy generation *was* included in one of our solar models, but we were not completely satisfied that our algorithm for including this energy was stable enough numerically to give accurate results.) The nuclear burning rates were updated to values provided by Fowler (1987), which have since been published by Caughlan and Fowler (1988). Screening corrections are included, according to the prescription of Salpeter (1954).

b) Opacities

The opacities, as in our previous work (Boothroyd and Sackmann 1988*a*), were Rosseland mean opacities κ obtained from the Los Alamos Opacity Library (LAOL). We interpolated among these tables in metallicity Z and hydrogen abundance X in order to obtain the opacity corresponding to the composition at each point in our models: the opacity κ was interpolated linearly in Z and in X. Keady (1985) supplied us with Los Alamos tables for hydrogen-rich ($X = 0.7$) and hydrogen-poor ($X = 0$) mixtures, for metallicities $Z = 0.02$, $Z = 0.001$, and $Z = 0.0001$. These tables include both *molecular* and atomic cross sections, as well as broadening due to turbulence (thermal and collisional broadening are also included, but are less important than turbulence broadening). The opacities due to a number of molecules are included, namely H^-, H_2, H_2^+, H_2^-, H_2O, N_2, CO, and CN. The following molecules were also included in the equation of state, but their opacities were *not* available yet: OH, C_2, O_2, NO, CO_2, NO_2, and CH. High-temperature ($T > 10^4$ K) Los Alamos opacities for $Z = 0.03$ and $X = 0.7$, $X = 0.3$, and $X = 0$ were obtained from Huebner (1976); low-temperature extensions to these tables were obtained by extrapolation in Z (see Sackmann and Boothroyd 1985) of Los Alamos opacity tables (with *molecular* effects included) that were published by Meyer-Hofmeister (1982). Note that the opacity tables of Huebner (1976) use the same heavy element *abundance* ratios as Cox and Stewart (1970), and thus are not completely consistent with the tables of Keady (1985), who used the heavy element abundance ratios of Ross and Aller (1976) (see Table 1). This inconsistency had no effect on the present work, since none of our models had a metallicity in excess of $Z = 0.02$, and therefore all models of the present work used the Keady (1985) opacities.

c) Solar Abundances

The ratio Z/X at the Sun's surface can be inferred from observations of the photospheric spectrum. Ross and Aller (1976) provided a table of the abundances of heavier elements relative to hydrogen, $n_i/n_{\rm H}$; these can be used to obtain a value of $Z/X = 0.02282$. Typical quoted uncertainties in the major components of Z were of order 15% to 30%, implying an uncertainty of roughly 20% in Z/X. More recently, the abundances reported by Grevesse (1984) yield a value of $Z/X = 0.027665$, while those of Aller (1986) yield $Z/X = 0.02739$. The quoted errors here are somewhat smaller; Grevesse (1984) quotes standard deviations of a few percent for the best-determined elements, but gives no error estimate at all for those that may be less accurate. It seems reasonable to follow the lead of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988), and consider the difference (of about 19%) between the Ross and Aller (1976) value and the values of Grevesse (1984) and of Aller (1986) to be a three-sigma error. One thus infers a one-sigma error of about 6% in these more recent values of Z/X.

The relative contributions of the individual metals to the total metallicity (Z_i/Z) vary much less than the ratio Z/X from Ross and Aller (1976) to Grevesse (1984). The largest change is for Ne, up by more than a factor of two (which, however, is only 4% of Z); the others all change by less than 2% of Z (see Table 1). One should note that the Keady (1985) opacities used Z_i/Z values from Ross and Aller (1976), with the exception of the value for Fe, which lay about half way between the Ross and Aller (1976) value and the Grevesse (1984) value. We used the Grevesse values of C/Z, N/Z, and O/Z for the initial composition of our models.

The initial CNO isotopic ratios were selected according to the observed solar system number ratios: $^{12}C/^{13}C = 90$ and $^{16}O/^{17}O = 2660$ (Dominy and Wallerstein 1987), and $^{16}O/^{18}O = 500$ (Dominy, Wallerstein, and Suntzeff 1986). The initial ^{7}Li abundance by mass was taken to be $X_{\rm Li} = 4 \times 10^{-9}$, as implied by the number ratio $^7{\rm Li/H} = 8 \times 10^{-10}$ obtained from observations of Pop I stars (Boesgaard and Steigman 1985); this is also consistent with computations of Big Bang nucleosynthesis (see, e.g., Malaney and Fowler 1988). For initial ^{3}He, we used the solar system number ratio of $(^2{\rm H} + {}^3{\rm He})/^4{\rm He} = 4.0 \times 10^{-4}$ (Boesgaard and Steigman 1985); since our code does not follow deuterium explicitly, and since deuterium burns very rapidly to ^{3}He in the solar interior, we defined the initial number ratio of $^3{\rm He}/^4{\rm He}$ to be 4.0×10^{-4}.

d) Equation of State; Degeneracy and Pressure Ionization

The equation of state in the interior ($\log T > 6.3$ for our solar models) included a perfect gas with electron degeneracy effects and radiation pressure, and carbon and oxygen ionization effects (with full ionization of hydrogen and helium). The equation of state in the envelope included a perfect gas with radiation pressure and the partial ionization of hydrogen, helium, and carbon and the formation of H_2 molecules. Electron degeneracy and pressure ionization have only a very small effect in the Sun, but their effects are not completely neglible, so they were added to the envelope equation of state for one of the solar models of this work. The static envelope was based on the prescription of Paczyński (1969), which was modified as described in Sackmann and Boothroyd (1985) and Boothroyd and Sackmann (1988*a*). We included the effects of degeneracy in the static envelope according to a relatively simple prescription of Henyey, LeLevier, and Levee (1959), as corrected by Rappaport, Joss, and Webbink (1982). One may write the degeneracy-corrected electron pressure as

$$P_e = n_e k_{\rm B} T \left(1 + \frac{F_{1/2}}{\sqrt{8\pi}(1 + bF_{1/2})^{1/3}} \right) , \qquad \text{where} \quad b = \frac{125}{144}(2\pi)^{-3/2}$$
$$\text{and} \quad F_{1/2} = \frac{\rho h^3}{4\pi m_{\rm H} \mu_e (2 m_e k_{\rm B} T)^{3/2}} = \frac{n_e h^3}{4\pi (2 m_e k_{\rm B} T)^{3/2}} \ . \qquad (1)$$

This formula is good for *all* degeneracy levels; its maximum innacuracy is a few percent, at intermediate degeneracy levels. In addition, the factor e^η (due to degeneracy) in the Saha ionization equation may be approximated by

$$e^\eta \approx y(1 + 0.3536y + 0.0576y^2) , \qquad \text{where} \quad y = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} F_{1/2} . \tag{2}$$

This is accurate to about 5% for $F_{1/2} \lesssim 2$. Pressure ionization was included via the prescription of Copeland, Jensen, and Jørgensen (1970) for "depression of the continuum" (see also Stewart and Pyatt 1966). In the Saha equation, the ionization energy of the $r^{\rm th}$ ionization stage of an element was reduced by an amount Δ_r, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_r &= k_{\rm B} T \left\{ [3(z^* + 1)K_r + 1]^{2/3} - 1 \right\} \frac{f}{2(z^* + 1)} , \\ \text{where} \quad K_r &= \frac{z_r e^2}{r_{\rm D} k_{\rm B} T} , \qquad z_r = r + 1 , \qquad z^* = \frac{\langle z^2 \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} , \\ \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r_{\rm D}} &= \left[\frac{4\pi e^2}{k_{\rm B} T} \sum_i (z_i^2 + z_i) n_i \right]^{1/2} . \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Note that f is a factor of order unity, whose value varies between 0.95 and 1.2; we took it to be exactly unity. It should be noted that this method of "depression of the continuum" is not a fully self-consistent method for including pressure ionization. For this reason, we also ran an evolutionary track without pressure ionization, for comparison purposes (see Section III). Recently, Hummer and Mihalas (1989), Däppen *et al.* (1989), and Mihalas, Däppen, and Hummer (1989) claim to have obtained a complete and self-consistent equation of state, which should clear up the uncertainties in the formulation of pressure ionization; but this should have little effect on solar models, since pressure ionization is a small effect in the Sun.

e) *Solar Neutrinos*

We created a separate routine to compute the neutrino flux at the Earth's orbit from the neutrinos produced by the *p-p* chain and the CNO-cycle (assuming the Sun to be completely transparent to neutrinos). Absorbtion cross sections from Table VII of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988) were used to compute the capture rate that would result for targets of ^{7}Li, ^{37}Cl, ^{71}Ga, ^{81}Br, ^{98}Mo, and ^{115}In.

The capture cross sections for neutrinos from the reaction $^{18}\mathrm{F}(e^+, \nu)^{18}\mathrm{O}$ were not given in Bahcall and Ulrich (1988). We estimated these cross sections by interpolating in the capture cross sections for neutrinos produced by the *p-p*, ^{13}N, ^{17}O, and ^{17}F reactions as a function of the Q-value of these reactions. Since the flux of ^{18}F neutrinos is negligible, uncertainties in the capture cross sections for ^{18}F neutrinos have no effect on our results.

f) *The Evolutionary Tracks*

i) Initial Models and the Zero Age Main Sequence

The starting models for all evolutionary runs were "pre-main sequence" uniform-composition models, assumed to be in hydrostatic equilibrium with no gravitational energy generation. The initial ^{3}He abundance is very close to its *p-p* chain equilibrium abundance, but the CNO isotopes are far from their CNO-cycle equilibrium abundances. In particular, ^{12}C is far above its equilibrium value relative to ^{14}N, and ^{13}C is far below its equilibrium value relative to ^{12}C. Thus the $^{12}\mathrm{C}(p,\gamma)^{13}\mathrm{N}(e^+\nu_e)^{13}\mathrm{C}$ reaction contributes significantly to the energy generation at the star's center. There is a short (about 12 million year) and perhaps not very meaningful phase during which the star evolves slightly downwards and to the red in the H-R diagram, before reaching what may be considered the zero age main sequence. Our models at this point had a small convective core ($\approx 0.036\, M_\odot$); inside this core, ^{13}C was in equilibrium relative to ^{12}C, but ^{12}C and ^{13}C were still far from equilibrium relative to ^{14}N.

The explanation for this pre-main sequence behavior of our models is relatively straightforward. The $^{12}\mathrm{C}(p,\gamma)^{13}\mathrm{N}(e^+\nu_e)^{13}\mathrm{C}$ reaction yields only 3.45 MeV, while the $^{13}\mathrm{C}(p,\gamma)^{14}\mathrm{N}$ reaction yields 7.55 MeV. Thus, initially, the growing ^{13}C abundance more than compensates for the declining ^{12}C abundance, and the total amount of energy generated by the sum of these two reactions grows. Since these reactions are *much* more temperature sensitive than the *p-p* chain, their energy generation is much more sharply peaked at the star's center. The increase in central energy generation causes the core to expand and cool slightly; this causes the *p-p* energy generation rate to decrease. Since most of the star's luminosity comes from the *p-p* chain, the star's total luminosity decreases and the outer layers contract. When ^{13}C comes into equilibrium with ^{12}C (after about 12 million years), and both isotopes decline in concert, the central energy generation rate from their burning declines: the core thus contracts and heats, and the *p-p* chain burning rate increases, causing the total luminosity to increase and the outer layers of the star to expand. We consider this to be the zero age main sequence point.

ii) Convergence to a Standard Sun

One of the objects of this paper was to obtain a value for the initial solar helium abundance Y. However, one must choose some specific composition values for any particular evolutionary sequence. For most of the comparison solar models, we chose to fix the metallicity Z, and varied the initial helium abundance Y and the mixing length α until the model matched the observed solar luminosity $L_\odot$ and effective temperature T_e at the solar age $t_\odot$. To obtain a good Standard Sun, we fixed the initial Z/X ratio at the Grevesse (1984) value of 0.02766, varying Y and Z in concert to maintain this ratio, and of course also varying α, until the model matched $L_\odot$ and T_e at the age $t_\odot$.

For all but one of our solar models we used the $L_\odot$ value given by Bahcall *et al.* (1982), namely $L_\odot \equiv (3.86 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{33}\,\mathrm{erg/sec}$; their determination included the results of the Nimbus 7 satellite (Hickey *et al.* 1980) and the NASA Solar Maximum Mission Spacecraft (Willson *et al.* 1981), as well as two separate rocket flights (Willson, Duncan, and Geist 1980) and a weighted average of previous measurements (Willson and Hickey 1977). This resulted in $\log T_e = 3.7612$, as obtained from a black body with $L = L_\odot$ and $R = R_\odot \equiv (6.960 \pm 0.0007) \times 10^{10}\,\mathrm{cm}$ (Allen 1963). We made certain that our models were within a tenth of a percent of these values at the solar age. For comparison purposes, we computed one solar model with the older Allen (1963) value for $L_\odot \equiv (3.90 \pm 0.04) \times 10^{33}$ erg/sec, which implies $\log T_e \equiv 3.7623$ (see Section III).

For our Standard Sun case, we used a value of $t = 4.55 \times 10^9$ yr for the time from our initial model to our "present sun"; this is the value obtained for the age of the meteorites (see, e.g., Wasserburg *et al.* 1977, 1980). Note that our initial models have a uniform chemical composition, and require about 12 million years of "pre-main sequence" evolution to bring ^{13}C to equilibrium with ^{12}C in the core. (This would normally occur while the sun was contracting to its zero age main sequence point.) Thus, counting from the zero age main sequence, our models have ages of $t_\odot \approx (4.55 - 0.012)\,\mathrm{Gyr} \approx 4.54\,\mathrm{Gyr}$. This is close to the age value of $t_\odot = (4.49 \pm 0.04)\mathrm{Gyr}$ derived recently by Guenther (1989), who argued that the older meteorites must have formed during the pre-main sequence stage while the sun still had a dense accretion disk, so that the age of the sun must be *less* than the age of the oldest meteorites. The opposite has been commonly assumed, and ages of 4.6 Gyr (see, e.g., Bahcall and Ulrich 1988) or 4.7 Gyr (see, e.g., Bahcall *et al.* 1982) have been used. Fortunately, differences of this size in the solar age have very little effect on solar models. We used $t = 4.6\,\mathrm{Gyr}$ (resulting in $t_\odot \approx 4.59\,\mathrm{Gyr}$) for four of our comparison solar runs, and also tested the effect of varying the solar age by computing one solar model using $t = 4.7$ Gyr (resulting in $t_\odot \approx 4.69$ Gyr). We found that increasing the solar age by 0.1 Gyr had a negligible effect on the solar model (see Section III).

iii) Space and Time Step Sizes in Our Models

The maximum difference that we allowed between adjacent layers of the model was 2% for temperature, radius, and luminosity, and 6% for density; the Henyey iterations were converged until changes in these quantities from one iteration to the next were less than 2×10^{-5} (or 6×10^{-5} for density), or to an accuracy of 10^{-4} in the equations of stellar structure, whichever came first (usually both were satisfied). The compositions X, Y, ^{12}C, and ^{16}O were allowed to change by 0.02, while ^{14}N, ^{13}C, ^{17}O, and ^{18}O were not allowed to change by more than 1% of Z. This resulted in $200 - 250$ mass layers in the interior (i.e., $\log T \geq 6.3$, which comprises about 98% of the solar mass). The surrounding static envelope was integrated inwards numerically, starting at a density of $\log \rho = -12$, and using the same integration step size restrictions for temperature, radius, and density as in the interior; additionally, the step size in $(M - M_r)$ was restricted to 15%, the change in the number of free (ionized) electrons per nucleon was restricted to 0.02, and outside the photosphere the change in optical depth was restricted to 10%. This resulted in about 200 integration steps outside the photosphere, and about another 350 integration steps in the envelope.

The maximum allowed change in physical quantities and compositions for the same mass layer at successive time steps was the same as the maximum allowed difference between adjacent mass layers in the interior. There were some additional constraints on the size of the time step, but none of these had any effect on the time step except the constraint that the convective core should not change by more than 2% of its maximum extent (and this came into play only in the early main sequence, since the convective core disappeared at an age of about 60 million years). Due to these constraints on the time step size, about 130 time steps were needed to reach the solar age (the maximum time step size was about 125 million years, occurring just prior to the solar age: near the beginning of the evolution, time steps were considerably smaller).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a) The Presolar Helium Abundance and Metallicity

We computed three self-consistent solar models with the Grevesse (1984) value of $Z/X = 0.02766$ and a solar age of $t_\odot = 4.54\,\mathrm{Gyr}$ (first three lines of Table 2). For our *Standard Sun* (case 1) we obtain values for the presolar (initial) helium abundance and metallicity, and the convective mixing length to pressure scale height ratio, of

$$Y = 0.278\,, \qquad Z = 0.0194\,, \qquad \text{and} \quad \alpha = 2.1\,. \tag{4}$$

This is in excellent agreement with recent results of other authors: our Y value is close to the value of $Y = 0.281$ obtained by Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989) and the value of $Y = 0.276$ obtained by Turck-Chièze *et al.* (1988) (see Table 2). The value of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988) is somewhat lower, namely $Y = 0.271$. All these authors (like ourselves) used the Grevesse (1984) Z/X ratio, and all used the LAOL opacities in the solar interior.

The earlier solar model of Bahcall *et al.* (1982) also obtained a somewhat low Y value, when they used the lower value of $Z/X = 0.0228$ (Ross and Aller 1976); even when they corrected Y to the value that *would* have been obtained using the Grevesse (1984) Z/X value, they still obtained a slightly low value, $Y = 0.267$ (see Bahcall and Ulrich 1988). This is a bit lower than their more recent value of $Y = 0.271$, perhaps due to the overcorrection of the Diesendorf (1970) reduction to the Thompson electron scattering used in their first paper. The reason why their Y values are consistently lower than those of other authors is not obvious. It is true that their outer boundary conditions are based on a grid of envelope calculations that use Vardya (1964) opacities; but we found that that even very large differences in the atmospheric opacities have no effect on Y (see Section IIIc below). Again, it is true that Bahcall and Ulrich (1988) used only seven timesteps to reach the solar age; however, Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989) performed runs both with 10 and with 80 timesteps, and found very similar results for these two cases.

There are non-negligible uncertainties in the solar age, luminosity, and composition, and different authors have used different values for these as shown (for recent papers) in Table 2. We investigated the effects of varying each of these in turn, as well as some effects having to do with the input physics of the solar model. Adding the effects of pressure ionization (case 2: "depression of the continuum") to the equation of state had *no effect* on the solar model, except that a slightly larger α was required (2.3 rather than 2.1). Increasing $L_\odot$ by 1% (case 3), which is twice the quoted uncertainty of Bahcall *et al.* (1982), led to only a small increase in Y (of 0.001).

To investigate the effects of the other uncertainties, we computed a number of solar models, changing one input at a time. For convenience, and to eliminate Z-interpolation in opacity tables, we arbitrarily chose to fix Z at a value of 0.02 (close to our solar value of 0.0194), rather than fixing Z/X; we also used a slightly different age (4.59 Gyr, which results from subtracting our pre-main sequence time from an evolution time of 4.6 Gyr: see

Section II*f*ii). For these, our reference model is case 4 of Table 2. To test the effect of the large uncertainty in low temperature opacities (due to molecules), we artificially reduced the opacity at temperatures below 10^4 K by an amount $\Delta(\log \kappa) = (4 - \log T)/0.7$; this would amount to reduction in κ by a factor of 10 at $\log T = 3.3$ (the lowest temperature for which we had opacities), or slightly more than a factor of two at the solar photosphere. Surprisingly, in view of the large effects of interior opacities found by Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989), we found that even our extreme changes in the low-temperature opacities had absolutely *no effect* on the helium abundance Y and the interior quantities of our model, although they resulted in a considerable reduction in α (1.5 rather than 2.1). This is case 5 of Table 2. In contrast to us, Lebreton and Maeder (1986) *did* find a small effect when they replaced their molecular opacities (below 1 eV) with old opacities (without molecules): they stated that a reduction in Y of 0.003 was necessary to match $L_\odot$. However, they do not say whether they matched T_e in this model (by changing α). Changing α *does* have a small but not completely negligible effect on the luminosity, so that a model which matches only the solar luminosity but not the effective temperature will have a slightly incorrect value of Y. Note also that their changes in the low-temperature opacities were probably rather larger than ours, and also extended deeper into the star.

To check the effect of varying the solar age, we computed a solar model with the age increased by 0.1 Gyr (case 6 of Table 2). This resulted in a small decrease in Y, of about 0.001.

We had always followed the non-equilibrium abundance of ^{3}He, but the *p-p* chain *energy generation rate* was always computed as if ^{3}He was at its equilibrium abundance. For one solar model, we investigated the effect of non-equilibrium ^{3}He energy generation (case 7 of Table 2). This again had only a small effect, causing an increase in Y of only about 0.001; however, we are not completely certain of the numerical stability of our present algorithm for including ^{3}He non-equilibrium energy generation; the true effect may be smaller.

We also computed a solar model with a lower Z value (of 0.016), which corresponds to a Z/X ratio of 0.0222, close to but slightly lower than the old Ross and Aller (1976) value of 0.0228 (case 8 of Table 2). This resulted in a *considerable* change in the solar Y value, reducing it by about 0.018. This change corresponds to

$$\frac{\partial Y}{\partial Z} = 4.6\,, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial Y}{\partial (Z/X)} = 2.8\,, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial \ln Y}{\partial \ln (Z/X)} = 0.28\,. \tag{5}$$

This is in good agreement with the value of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988): they give $\partial \ln Y / \partial \ln(Z/X) = 0.30$, obtained from Bahcall *et al.* (1982). We also agree well with Cahen (1986), who obtained $\partial Y/\partial Z = 4$. Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989) made changes in the abundances of the *individual* heavy elements, which resulted in a change in Z, but also in the *relative* abundances of the components of Z; they were the only authors up to now who computed the separate opacity contribution from each of the heavy elements. When they changed Ne (holding all other heavy elements fixed: see their Table 3), they found $\partial Y/\partial Z_{\rm Ne} \approx 4.1$, similar to the $\partial Y/\partial Z$ values of other authors. However, when they switched from $Z = 0.0169$ with the relative abundances of Ross and Aller (1976) to $Z = 0.0194$ with the relative abundances of Grevesse (1984) (using LAOL opacities in both cases), they obtained $\partial Y/\partial Z_{\rm mix} \approx 1.2$. This leads to the disturbing conclusion that the changes in the individual mixes cancelled most of the effect of changing Z as a whole. This is especially puzzling in that the largest difference in the makeup of Z was in Ne.

Three other recent papers used the same Z and same $L_\odot$ as our case 4, and almost the same age $t_\odot$ (see Table 2); they also used LAOL opacities. This allows another direct comparison of the resulting solar Y: we obtained $Y = 0.280$ for our case 4, while values of 0.287, 0.285, and 0.282 were obtained respectively by Lattanzio (1989), Cahen, Doom, and Cassé (1986), and Lebreton and Maeder (1986). Note that Cahen, Doom, and Cassé (1986) are the other three authors of Turck-Chièze *et al.* (1988), whose value of Y was slightly lower than ours.

Wambsganss (1988) and VandenBerg (1983) used different solar parameters from any of our cases (most importantly, different Z/X ratios: see Table 2). When we apply the shifts in Y (described above) caused by the different solar age, luminosity, and Z/X, we find that our model would have a Y value larger than that of Wambsganss

(1988) by about 0.005, if we had matched his solar parameters; correspondingly, our Y value would be lower than that of VandenBerg (1983), by about the same amount. Note that Wambsganss (1988) investigated the effect of diffusion; he found that the presolar Y value was negligibly affected (being reduced by only 0.002), although diffusion further decreased the surface helium abundance by a non-negligible amount (about 0.014) over the solar age.

In conclusion, all recent papers (described in Table 2) point to a presolar helium content in the range $0.271 \leq Y \leq 0.285$ at the Grevesse (1984) value of Z/X, with our Standard Sun having a value of $Y = 0.278$. Note that it mainly is one's choice of Z/X ratio that determines the value of Z: $Z = (1 - Y)(Z/X)[1 + (Z/X)]^{-1}$, where $(1 - Y) \sim 0.72$, so that $\Delta Z/Z \approx -\Delta Y/0.72$; thus variations in Y of order $\pm$ 0.01 change Z by only 1.4%. Thus all models using the Grevesse (1984) value of Z/X and LAOL opacities will result in similar values of Z, close to $Z \approx 0.0194$.

The presolar helium abundance should be larger than the primordial value. Boesgaard and Steigman (1985) give $Y_p = 0.239 \pm 0.015$, obtained from observations of galactic and extragalactic H II regions. The inhomogeneous Big Bang computations of Malaney and Fowler (1988) give a similar value, namely $Y_p = 0.25 \pm 0.01$. Galactic chemical evolution will cause enhancement of both helium and metals. With our value of $Y = 0.278$ and $Z = 0.0194$ for the presolar nebula, we obtain $\Delta Y/\Delta Z = 2.0 \pm 0.8$ for the former value of Y_p, and $\Delta Y/\Delta Z = 1.5 \pm 0.5$ for the latter. These helium-to-metals enrichment ratios are in good agreement with galactic evolutionary models of Maeder (1984), who estimated $1 \lesssim \Delta Y/\Delta Z < 2.3$.

b) Central Conditions and the Neutrino Problem

Table 2 contains the central conditions for the standard solar models obtained in the present work as well as those of other authors. Most models find fairly similar central conditions. For our *Standard Sun* the predicted ^{37}Cl neutrino capture rate is 7.7 SNU's, consistent with the Bahcall and Ulrich (1988) value of 7.9 SNU's (note 1 SNU $\equiv 10^{-36}$ captures/sec per target atom). Turck-Chièze *et al.* (1988) obtained a significantly lower value of 5.8 SNU's, partly due to their use of the Barker and Spear (1986) value for the ^{7}Be(p, γ) cross section, which is 13% lower than the value we used (from Caughlan and Fowler 1988). Their earlier work (Cahen, Doom, and Cassé 1986), using the same cross section as we did, yielded a value of 7.4 SNU's, in fairly good agreement with our results and those of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988). Lebreton and Maeder (1986) obtained a high neutrino rate of 13.3 SNU's, presumably due to their unusually high central temperature.

From our different models, it is clear that uncertainties in the solar age and in molecular opacities have negligible effect on the neutrino rate (see Table 2); nor does inclusion of pressure ionization effects or non-equilibrium ^{3}He energy contributions have any significant effect. A fairly small increase of 0.6 SNU's resulted from a 1% increase in the value used for $L_\odot$. The largest effect was obtained from changing Z/X: using cases 4 and 8 of Table 2, one can calculate that reducing Z/X from the Grevesse (1984) value to the Ross and Aller (1976) value would result in a reduction in the ^{37}Cl neutrino capture rate of about 1.5 SNU's.

In all cases, ours and those of other authors, the theoretical models yield ^{37}Cl neutrino capture rates several times higher than the observed rate, which is 2.1 ± 0.3 SNU (Davis 1964; Davis 1978; Rowley, Cleveland, and Davis 1985; Davis 1986; Davis *et al.* 1989). In other words, *the case of the missing solar neutrinos* (Fowler 1982) has not been solved by the standard solar models: one must invoke some "non-standard" mechanism to reduce the predicted ^{37}Cl neutrino rate.

Bahcall and Ulrich (1988) looked at some such "non-standard" mechanisms. They considered the possibility of inhomogeneous solar composition, i.e., with $Y \sim 0.12$ and $Z \sim 0.0024$ throughout most of the interior; this model fixed the neutrino problem, but was inconsistent with helioseismological data, let alone requiring a Y value a factor of two smaller than the Big Bang primordial value and a similarly unreasonable Z value. They also considered the possibility of additional energy transport in the solar interior by (hypothetical) weakly interacting massive particles (WIMP's) left over from the Big Bang: this also could fix the neutrino problem. There are other exotic possibilities, ranging from enhanced diffusion of elements (e.g., turbulent diffusion arising from differential rotation) to a postulated black hole at the Sun's center (see, e.g., Bahcall, Bahcall, and Ulrich 1969; Rood 1978; Schatzman and Maeder 1981; Schatzman 1985; Michaud 1985; Roxburgh 1985*a*,*b*; Cox, Kidman, and Newman 1985; Newman 1986; Lebreton 1986). Note that Cox, Kidman, and Newman (1985) and Lebreton (1986) both conclude that sufficient turbulent diffusion mixing in the core to solve the neutrino problem would lead to models inconsistent with solar oscillation data. Wambsganss (1988) showed that including pressure diffusion, temperature diffusion, and concentration diffusion of hydrogen and helium in a *non-rotating* solar model caused an increase in the central temperature, making the neutrino problem worse.

Another, and perhaps more attractive, solution to the neutrino puzzle invokes the Mikhayev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein (MSW) effect (Mikheyev and Smirnov 1986; Wolfenstein 1978). It involves the conversion of electron neutrinos (ν_e) into muon or tau neutrinos (ν_μ or ν_τ) as they pass through the dense solar interior, due to the fact that neutrino oscillations are modified by the presence of matter. This mechanism and its possible consequences for observations of solar neutrinos is discussed in, e.g., Bethe (1986), Boehm and Vogel (1987), Bahcall, Davis, and Wolfenstein (1988), and Wolfenstein and Beier (1989).

Table 3 gives predicted the neutrino flux from our Standard Sun (in $\mathrm{cm}^{-2}\mathrm{sec}^{-1}$ at the Earth's orbit) from each of the neutrino-producing reactions. Also given are the expected capture rates for six types of targets (namely ^{7}Li, ^{37}Cl, ^{71}Ga, ^{81}Br, ^{98}Mo, and ^{115}In), assuming no conversion of ν_e's to other flavours of neutrinos. We used the neutrino capture cross sections presented in Bahcall and Ulrich (1988).

The ^{37}Cl experiment has been operating since 1970; although the average capture rate is 2.1 ± 0.3 SNU's, the most recent measurement is 4.2 ± 0.8 SNU's. This may be due to a statistical fluctuation, but there is an intriguing possibility that the measured capture rate is anticorrelated with the solar sunspot cycle (Davis 1964; Davis 1978; Rowley, Cleveland, and Davis 1985; Davis 1986; Davis *et al.* 1989). Future measurements during the sunspot maximum of 1990-1991 may resolve this question. The ^{37}Cl experiment is sensitive primarily to the high-energy neutrinos from ^{8}B (6 SNU's predicted) and ^{7}Be (1 SNU predicted), comprising 80% and 13% respectively of the total predicted capture rate (see Table 3).

The Kamiokande-II detector has been operating since the beginning of 1986, and actually has published some neutrino detection results (Hirata *et al.* 1989). This detector is an upgrade of the Kamiokande proton decay detector: it consists of 2140 tons of water, viewed by a surrounding array of photomultiplier tubes to detect Cherenkov light emitted when a neutrino scatters off an electron. The directional sensitivity of this experiment confirms that the neutrinos are actually coming from the Sun; it is the first observation in real time of solar neutrinos. Their analysis indicates a ^{8}B neutrino flux $0.46 \pm 0.13(\mathrm{stat.}) \pm 0.08(\mathrm{syst.})$ times the value predicted for the ^{8}B neutrino flux by the standard solar model of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988); this would also correspond to 0.46 of the ^{8}B neutrino flux predicted by the Standard Sun of the present work.

The proposed ^{81}Br experimental setup (Hurst *et al.* 1985) would be very similar to that of ^{37}Cl, with the complication that the product of neutrino capture (^{81}Kr) is long-lived and could not be measured by its radioactive decay. Hurst *et al.* (1985) predicted that the bromine experiment would be sensitive primarily to ^{7}Be neutrinos, with only a small contribution from ^{8}B neutrinos; with the updated neutrino capture cross sections this no longer holds true. As with the ^{37}Cl experiment, the bromine experiment would be sensitive primarily to neutrinos from ^{8}B (16 SNU's predicted) and ^{7}Be (8 SNU's predicted): 60% and 30% respectively of the total (see Table 3). Note that the neutrino absorbtion cross sections for ^{81}Br are uncertain by about a factor of two (Bahcall and Ulrich 1988).

The ^{98}Mo geochemical experiment is presently underway at Los Alamos National Laboratories (Cowan and Haxton 1982; Wolfsberg *et al.* 1985); the first results should have been available during 1989. This molybdenum experiment is sensitive to the ^{8}B neutrinos (17 SNU's predicted), with a negligible contribution from ^{3}He-p neutrinos (0.06 SNU's predicted); *no* other neutrino sources contribute. Unfortunately, the neutrino absorbtion cross section is again uncertain by a factor of two (Bahcall and Ulrich 1988).

Two ^{71}Ga experiments are under construction: an experiment in the Baksan underground laboratory in the Soviet Union (Barabanov *et al.* 1985), and the European GALLEX collaboration in the Gran Sasso underground laboratory in Italy (Hampel 1985; Kirsten 1986*a*,*b*). Statistically significant results may be available by the end of 1991. These gallium experiments are sensitive primarily to the (low-energy) *p-p* neutrinos (71 SNU's predicted), with sizable contributions from ^{7}Be (31 SNU's predicted) and ^{8}B (14 SNU's predicted): 57%, 25%, and 11% respectively of the predicted total (see Table 3).

The ^{115}In experiment is under development in Europe (Booth, Salmon, and Hukin 1985; Booth 1987; de Bellefon, Espigat, and Hukin 1985). This would be most sensitive to *p-p* neutrinos (468 SNU's predicted) and ^{7}Be neutrinos (105 SNU's predicted): 76% and 17% respectively of the predicted total (see Table 3).

A ^{7}Li experiment would be unique in that lithium is the only target with a sizable sensitivity to CNO neutrinos (9.5 SNU's predicted), 21% of the total, though the predominant contribution is still from ^{8}B (23 SNU's predicted), with sizable amounts from *pep* (8.5 SNU's predicted) and ^{7}Be (4.1 SNU's predicted) (see Table 3).

c) The Choice of Mixing Length and the Base of the Convective Envelope

The convective envelope of our Standard Sun comprised the outer 1.7% of the solar mass, and the outer 26% of the radius; at the base of the convective envelope, the temperature was $1.96 \times 10^6\,K$ and the density was $0.14\,\mathrm{g/cm^3}$. These values are in excellent agreement with the results of most other authors, as presented in Table 4. For our Standard Sun, the model required a mixing length ratio $\alpha = 2.1$ (see Table 4). Adding pressure ionization to the equation of state in the envelope caused a small increase in α (of 13%), but had no significant effect on conditions at the base of the convective envelope. Uncertainties in the solar luminosity and age had no significant effect on either α or the convective envelope; nor, as expected, did including non-equilibrium ^{3}He energy generation have any effect. As it turned out, only the uncertainty in Z/X had an effect on the *base* of the convective envelope (as well as on α), and even these changes were small (see Table 4).

In the Sun's outer envelope and atmosphere, *molecular opacities* can be significant, *increasing* the opacity by as much as a factor of *three* near the photosphere. Increased opacity in the outer layers tends to increase the stellar radius, requiring that one use a larger α to bring the Sun's radius back down to the observed value. For the "low κ" case 5 described in Section III*a* above, we simulated the effect of omitting molecular opacities by artificially reducing the opacities at low temperatures. This reduction amounted to just over a factor of two at the solar photosphere (with no reduction above a temperature of $10^4\,K$). As may be seen by comparing this "low κ" case with the "fixed Z" case (see Table 4), this reduction in the opacities required a much smaller α (1.5 rather than 2.1). Surprisingly, however, this resulted in *no change* in the conditions at the *base* of the convective envelope. This is consistent with the fact that the different authors presented in Table 4 use different molecular opacities, or none at all, but still obtain similar conditions at the base of the convective envelope. Thus the uncertainty in the molecular opacities would have little effect on any mechanism invoked for ^{7}Li depletion.

When Böhm-Vitense (1958) presented the mixing length formalism for convection, later adopted by most others, there was little reason to choose a mixing length ratio $\alpha \equiv l/H_P$ different from unity. Even fairly recent models, if they *do not* include molecular opacities, require relatively small values of α, generally in the range $1 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 1.5$. However, when molecular opacities *are* included, larger mixing length ratios result: generally in the range $1.5 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 2.3$ (see Table 4). Even though this considerable range in α (surprisingly) does not seem to affect conditions at the base of the *solar* convective envelope, this is *not* the case for red giant stars, where large values of α are also required by independent observations. Boothroyd and Sackmann (1988*a*,*b*) carried out exhaustive calculations of asymptotic giant branch (AGB) evolution, seeking to produce a carbon star in the observed luminosity range; with a value of $\alpha = 1$, not a single carbon star was produced. A value of $\alpha \gtrsim 1.5$ was necessary to produce a carbon star. Iben (1983) and Lattanzio (1987) also preferred larger α values (up to 1.5) to produce carbon stars. As found by Sackmann and Boothroyd (1990), the presence of molecular opacity makes dredge-up more difficult if one holds α fixed; but if one wishes to hold the effective temperature fixed (to try to account for observed locations in the H-R diagram), a *large* increase in α is required (more than a factor of two, at the AGB stage), which in turn makes dredge-up still easier.

The position of the red giant branch, given that molecular opacities are included, leads to fairly large values of α, namely $\alpha \gtrsim 2$ for the present work, $\alpha \approx 1.9$ for Maeder and Meynet (1989), and $\alpha \approx 1.6$ for Bessell *et al.* (1989).

VandenBerg (1983) found that a consistent value of α, namely $\alpha = 1.6 \pm 0.1$, was necessary to fit isochrones to globular clusters having a wide range of metallicities, from very metal-poor clusters such as M15 and M92 (fitted by $Z = 0.0001$) through intermediate ones such as M5 and M13 (fitted by $Z = 0.001$) to relatively metal-rich clusters such as 47 Tuc (fitted by $Z = 0.006$) and NGC 188 (fitted by $Z = 0.0169$). Note that VandenBerg (1983) also included molecular opacities (Alexander 1975, 1981) at low temperatures ($T \lesssim 10^4 K$). By interpolating in Y and extrapolating in Z for the evolutionary tracks of Fig. 2 of VandenBerg (1983), one can obtain the main sequence turn-off position and the base of the red giant branch for a $1\,M_\odot$ star that he would have obtained with our composition (but with $\alpha = 1$); by applying the corrections of Fig. 3 of VandenBerg (1983) to get $\alpha = 1.6$ (namely, $\Delta \log T_e \approx 0.027$ and $\Delta \log T_e \approx 0.042$) one finds a turn-off of $\log T_e \approx 3.775$ and a red giant base of $\log T_e \approx 3.690$. For the evolution of our standard solar model (case 2), we find corresponding values of $\log T_e = 3.770$ and $\log T_e = 3.685$, with our $\alpha = 2.34$. Note the gratifying agreement of the effective temperatures for these completely independent computations; but note also the large difference in the appropriate values of α: namely, $\alpha = 1.6$ for VandenBerg (1983) versus $\alpha = 2.34$ for our work. This 50% difference reflects differences in the molecular and atomic opacities, as well as (perhaps) differences in the details of the mixing length formalism in the two codes,

Vauclaire (1988) modeled lithium depletion on the main sequence due to the effects of *rotation-induced mixing*, and obtained $\alpha = 1.9$ from fitting the "gap" in lithium abundance in F stars.

d) The Case of the Missing Lithium

The observed solar surface abundance of ^{7}Li is depleted by a factor of about 100 from the presolar value of $X_{\rm Li} \sim 4 \times 10^{-9}$ (Boesgaard and Steigman 1985) obtained from the maximum, and presumed primordial, values observed in Pop I stars of different ages, in meteorites, and in the interstellar gas. The problem is that no non-rotating standard solar model predicts *any* significant surface ^{7}Li depletion, let alone a factor of 100. At a temperature of $2 \times 10^6\,K$ and a density of $0.13\,{\rm g/cm^3}$ (typical of the base of envelope convection), the timescale for ^{7}Li-burning is about 10^{12} years: at the solar age, no appreciable amount of ^{7}Li would have been burned. The usual solution to this problem is to assume that meridional circulation (produced by the observed slow solar rotation) is responsible, with diffusion perhaps having an effect also: this mechanism slowly transports Li-rich material downwards from the base of the convective envelope into regions where it can burn (see, e.g., Michaud 1985; Baglin, Morel, and Schatzman 1985; Lebreton 1986; Charbonneau and Michaud 1988; Vauclaire 1988). Pinsonneault *et al.* 1989 developed a new approach to compute angular momentum transport in rotating stellar models and the corresponding rotation-induced mixing: they used the observed solar surface ^{7}Li depletion as one of the constraints on the free parameters of their formalism. Kızıloğlu and Eryurt-Ezer (1985) found that strong overshooting during the pre-main sequence contraction phase of the sun could raise the temperature at the base of the convective zone sufficiently to account for the observed lithium depletion; however, this lithium depletion would be completed in less than 10^8 yr. This contradicts the lack of lithium depletion observed in solar type stars in the Pleiades with ages of nearly 10^8 yr. Another possible solution is that first proposed by Guzik, Willson, and Brunish (1987): rapid mass loss (starting from a $2\,M_\odot$ star) during the early solar main sequence would expose ^{7}Li-depleted layers. Their models yielded an overdepletion of ^{7}Li by many orders of magnitude in the surface layers at the solar age, so that they had to invoke ^{7}Li production via spallation reactions in solar flares to account for the observed ^{7}Li abundance. However, a less drastic amount of mass loss can account beautifully for the observed ^{7}Li abundance (Paper II).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. The presolar helium content is fairly well established today, to lie in the range $0.27 \leq Y \leq 0.285$; our result is $Y = 0.278$. This is in good agreement with Big Bang nucleosynthesis followed by galactic evolution.

2. The only uncertainties that seem to affect the presolar Y value significantly are those in: (*i*) the *observed* Z/X ratio, (*ii*) the individual abundances of the heavy elements, and (*iii*) the interior opacity. Before the standard solar models can be significantly improved, these uncertainties must be reduced. Both for the abundance observations and for the opacities, more emphasis needs to be placed on improving the atomic physics, where the largest uncertainties are. On the other hand, the large uncertainties in the low-temperature molecular opacities have *no* significant effect on Y.

3. The solar Z value is determined primarily by the *observed* Z/X ratio, and is affected very little by differences in solar models. The Grevesse (1984) Z/X ratio results in $Z \approx 0.0194$; this has the same uncertainty as the Z/X ratio, with an estimated one-sigma error of 6%.

4. The solar neutrino problem is still with us, with predicted ^{37}Cl capture rates, including our value of 7.7 SNU's, consistently several times the observed rate of 2.1 SNU's. New neutrino experiments should shed more light on the subject, particularly the ^{71}Ga and ^{115}In experiments which are sensitive primarily to *p-p* neutrinos: we predict capture rates of 125 SNU's and 615 SNU's, respectively.

5. Today's solar models for which molecular opacities have been included tend to require considerably larger mixing lengths than we were accustomed to previously, namely $1.5 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 2.3$. Surprisingly, however, this does *not* change the conditions at the base of the solar convective envelope: the solar lithium problem is still with us. These larger mixing lengths are also required to fit the position of the red giant branches of clusters, and to explain the existence of carbon stars.

We wish to thank Dr. Steven E. Koonin for the support supplied by the Kellogg Radiation Laboratory. One of us (A. I. B.) wishes in addition to thank Drs. Scott D. Tremaine and Peter G. Martin for the support provided by the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics.

We wish to express our gratitude to Drs. Bradley W. Philippone, Charles A. Barnes, and Ward Whaling for many insightful discussions.

It is high time that we acknowledge the graciousness and efficiency of Helen Z. Knudsen, Head Librarian of the Robinson Astronomy Library at Caltech, who would immediately locate even the most obscure and difficult of references.

One of us (I.-J. S.) is also indebted to Dr. Robert F. Christy, her husband, for stimulating suggestions and for his friendly, gentleman-like support with the tasks of daily life.

We wish to thank the referee for his constructive comments, and for bringing to our attention two newly-published papers.

This work was supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation PHY-8817296.

REFERENCES

Alexander, D. R. 1975, *Ap. J. Suppl.*, **29**, 363.

Alexander, D. R. 1981, private communication to D. VandenBerg.

Allen, C. W. 1963, *Astrophysical Quantities*, 2$^{\text{nd}}$ ed., (London: Athlone Press), p. 17.

Aller, L. H. 1986, in *Spectroscopy of Astrophysical Plasmas*, ed. A. Dalgarno and D. Layzer (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press), p. 89.

Baglin, A., Morel, P. J., and Schatzman, E. 1985, *Astr. Ap.*, **149**, 309.

Bahcall, J. N. 1978, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **50**, 881.

Bahcall, J. N., Bahcall, N. A., and Ulrich, R. K. 1969, *Ap. J.*, **156**, 559.

Bahcall, J. N., Davis, R., Jr., and Wolfenstein, L. 1988, *Nature*, **334**, 487.

Bahcall, J. N., Huebner, W. F., Lubow, S. H., Parker, P. D., and Ulrich, R. K. 1982, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **54**, 767.

Bahcall, J. N., and Ulrich, R. K. 1988, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **60**, 297.

Barabanov, I. R., Veretenkin, E. P., Gavrin, V. N., Danshin, S. N., Eroshkina, L. A., Zatsepin, G. T., Zakharov, Yu. I., Klimova, S. A., Klimov, Yu. B., Knodel, T. V., Kopylov, A. V., Orekhov, I. V., Tikhonov, A. A., and Churmaeva, M. I. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 175.

Barker, . C., and Spear, R. H. 1986, *Ap. J.*, **307**, 847.

Bessel, M. S., Brett, J. M., Scholz, M., and Wood, P. R. 1989, *Astr. Ap. Suppl.*, **77**, 1.

Bethe, H. A. 1986, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **56**, 1305.

Boehm, F. A., and Vogel, P. 1987, *Physics of Massive Neutrinos* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press).

Boesgaard, A. M., and Steigman, G. 1985, *Ann. Rev. Astr. Ap.*, **23**, 319.

Böhm-Vitense, E. 1958, *Zeitschrift für Astrophysik*, **46**, 108.

Booth, N. E. 1987, *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, **50**, 293.

Booth, N. E., Salmon, G. L., and Hukin, D. A. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 216.

Boothroyd, A. I., and Sackmann, I.-J. 1988*a*, *Ap. J.*, **328**, 653.

Boothroyd, A. I., and Sackmann, I.-J. 1988*b*, *Ap. J.*, **328**, 671.

Boothroyd, A. I., Sackmann, I.-J., and Fowler, W. A. 1990, to be published (Paper II).

Cahen, S. 1986, in *Advances in Nuclear Astrophysics*, ed. E. Vangioni-Flam, J. Audouze, M. Cassé, J. P. Chieze, and J. Tran Thanh Van (Gif sur Yvette, France: Editions Frontière), p. 97.

Cahen, S., Doom, C., and Cassé, M. 1986, in *'86 Massive Neutrinos in Astrophysics and Particle Physics*, ed. O. Fackler and J. Tran Thanh Van (Gif sur Yvette, France: Editions Frontières), p. 83.

Caughlan, G. R., and Fowler, W. A. 1988, *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables*, **40**, 283.

Charbonneau, P., and Michaud, G. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **334**, 746.

Copeland, H., Jensen, J. O., and Jørgensen, H. E. 1970, *Astr. Ap.*, **5**, 12.

Cowan, G. A., and Haxton, W. C. 1982, *Science*, **216**, 51.

Cox, A. N. 1981, private communication to Maeder and Meynet.

Cox, A. N., Kidman, R. B., and Newman, M. J. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 93.

Cox, A. N., and Stewart, J. N. 1970, *Ap. J. Suppl.*, **19**, 243.

Däppen, W., Mihalas, D., Hummer, D. G., and Mihalas, B. W. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **332**, 261.

Davis, R., Jr. 1964, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **12**, 303.

Davis, R., Jr. 1978, in "Proceedings of Informal Conference on Status and Future of Solar Neutrino Research," ed. G. Friedlander (Brookhaven National Laboratory Report No. 50879), Vol. 1, p. 1.

Davis, R., Jr. 1986, in *Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop on Grand Unification, ICOBAN '86*, Toyama, Japan (Tokyo: Japanese Press), p. 237.

Davis, R., Jr., Lande, K., Cleveland, B. T., Ullman, J., and Rowley, J. K. 1989, in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, Neutrino '88*, ed. J. Schneps *et al.* (Singapore: World Scientific), to be published.

de Bellefon, A., Espigat, P., and Hukin, D. A. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 227.

Diesendorf, M. O. 1970, *Nature*, **227**, 266.

Dominy, J. F., and Wallerstein, G. 1987, *Ap. J.*, **317**, 810.

Dominy, J. F., Wallerstein, G., and Suntzeff, N. B. 1986, *Ap. J.*, **300**, 325.

Fowler, W. A. 1982, in *AIP Conference Proceedings No. 96*, (Los Alamos: Science Underground), p. 80.

Fowler, W. A. 1987, private communication.

Grevesse, N. 1984, *Physica Scripta*, **T8**, 49.

Guenther, D. B. 1989, *Ap. J.*, **339**, 1156.

Guenther, D. B., Jaffe, A., and Demarque, P. 1989, *Ap. J.*, **345**, 1022.

Guzik, J., Willson, L. A., and Brunish, W. 1987, *Ap. J.*, **319**, 957.

Hampel, W. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 162.

Henyey, L. G., LeLevier, R., and Levee, R. D. 1959, *Ap. J.*, **129**, 2.

Hickey, J. R., Stowe, L. L., Jacobowitz, H., Pellegrino, P., Maschhoff, R. H., House, F., and Vonder Harr, T. H. 1980, *Science*, **208**, 281.

Hirata, K. S., Kajita, T., Kifune, K., Kihara, K., Nakahata, M., Nakamura, K., Ohara, S., Oyama, Y., Sato, N., Takita, M., Totsuka, Y., Yaginuma, Y., Mori, M., Suziki, A., Takahashi, K., Tanimori, T., Yamada, M., Koshiba, M., Suda, T., Miyano, K., Miyata, H., Takei, H., Kaneyuki, K., Nagashima, Y., Suzuki, Y., Beier, E. W., Feldscher, L., R., Frank, E. D., Frati, W., Kim, S. B., Mann, A. K., Newcomer, F. M., Van Berg, R., and Zhang, W. 1989, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **63**, 16.

Huebner, W. F. 1976, private communication.

Hummer, D. G., and Mihalas, D. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **331**, 794.

Hurst, G. S., Chen, C. H., Kramer, S. D., and Allman, S. L. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 152.

Iben, I., Jr. 1983, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **275**, L65.

Keady, J. 1985, private communication.

Kirsten, T. 1986*a*, in *'86 Massive Neutrinos in Astrophysics and Particle Physics*, ed. O. Fackler and J. Tran Thanh Van (Gif sur Yvette, France: Editions Frontières), p. 119.

Kirsten, T. 1986*b*, in *Advances in Nuclear Astrophysics*, ed. E. Vangioni-Flam, J. Audouze, M. Cassé, J. P. Chieze, and J. Tran Thanh Van (Gif sur Yvette, France: Editions Frontières), p. 85.

Kızıloğlu, N., and Eryurt-Ezer, D. 1985, *Astr. Ap.*, **146**, 384.

Kudritzki, R. P., and Reimers, D. 1978, *Astr. Ap.*, **70**, 227.

Lattanzio, J. C. 1987, *Ap. J. (Letters)*, **313**, L15.

Lattanzio, J. C. 1989, private communication.

Lebreton, Y. 1986, in *Advances in Nuclear Astrophysics*, ed. E. Vangioni-Flam, J. Audouze, M. Cassé, J. P. Chieze, and J. Tran Thanh Van (Gif sur Yvette, France: Editions Frontières), p. 105.

Lebreton, Y., and Maeder, A. 1986, *Astr. Ap.*, **161**, 119.

Lubow, S. H., and Ulrich, R. K. 1979, in *Proceedings of Informal Conference on Status and Future of Solar Neutrino Research*, ed. G. Friedlander (Brookhaven National Laboratory), Report No. 50879, p. 157.

Maeder, A. 1984, in *Stellar Nucleosynthesis*, ed. C. Chiosi and A. Renzini (Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel), p. 115.

Maeder, A., and Meynet, G. 1989, *Astr. Ap.*, **210**, 155.

Malaney, R. A., and Fowler, W. A. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **333**, 14.

Meyer, J. P. 1986, private communication to S. Cahen.

Meyer-Hofmeister, E. 1982, in *Landolt-Börnstein: Numerical Data and Functional Relationships in Science and Technology, New Series*, ed. K.-H. Hellwege, Group **VI**: *Astronomy, Astrophysics, and Space Research*, Vol. **2**, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, Subvol. **b**, *Stars and Star Clusters*, ed. K. Schaifers and H. H. Voigt (New York: Springer-Verlag), p. 152.

Michaud, G. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 75.

Mihalas, D., Däppen, W., and Hummer, D. G. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **331**, 815.

Mikheyev, S. P., and Smirnov, A. Yu. 1986, *Nuovo Cimento*, **C 9**, 17.

Newman, M. J. 1986, in *Physics of the Sun*, Vol. **3**, ed. P. A. Sturrock, T. E. Holzer, D. M. Mihalas, and R. K. Ulrich (Boston: Reidel), p. 33.

Paczyński, B. 1969, *Acta Astr.*, **19**, 1.

Pinsonneault, M. H., Kawaler, S. D., Sofia, S., and Demarque, P. 1989, *Ap. J.*, **338**, 424.

Rappaport, S., Joss, P. C., and Webbink, R. F. 1982, *Ap. J.*, **254**, 616.

Reimers, D. 1975, in *Problems in Stellar Atmospheres and Envelopes*, ed. B. Baschek, W. H. Kegel, and G. Traving (Springer: New York), p. 229.

Rood, R. T. 1978, in *Proc. Informal Conf. Status and Future of Solar Neutrino Research*, Vol. **1**, ed. G. Friedlander (Brookhaven National Laboratory), p. 175.

Ross, J. E., and Aller, L. H. 1976, *Science*, **191**, 1223.

Rowley, J. K., Cleveland, B. T., Davis, R., Jr. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, AIP Conference Proceedings No. 126, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 1.

Roxburgh, I. W. 1985*a*, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 88.

Roxburgh, I. W. 1985*b*, *Solar Phys.*, **100**, 21.

Sackmann, I.-J., and Boothroyd, A. I. 1985, *Ap. J.*, **293**, 154.

Sackmann, I.-J., and Boothroyd, A. I. 1990, to be published.

Sackmann, I.-J., Boothroyd, A. I., and Kraemer, K. E. 1990, to be published (Paper III).

Salpeter, E. E. 1954, *Austr. J. Phys.*, **7**, 353.

Schatzman, E. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 69.

Schatzman, E., and Maeder, A. 1981, *Astr. Ap.*, **96**, 1.

Stewart, J. C., and Pyatt, K. D. 1966, *Ap. J.*, **144**, 1203.

Turck-Chièze, S., Cahen, S., Cassé, M., and Doom, C. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **335**, 415.

VandenBerg, D. A. 1983, *Ap. J. Suppl.*, **51**, 29.

Vardya, M. S. 1964, *Ap. J. Suppl.*, **8**, 277.

Vauclair, S. 1988, *Ap. J.*, **335**, 971.

Wambsganss, J. 1988, *Astr. Ap.*, **205**, 125.

Wasserburg, G. J., Papanastassiou, D. A., and Lee, T. 1980, in *Early Solar System Processes and the Present Solar System* (Bologna: Corso Soc. Italiana de Fisica).

Wasserburg, G. J., Tera, F., Papanastassiou, D. A., and Huneke, J. C. 1977, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, **35**, 294.

Willson, R. C., Duncan, C. H., and Geist, J. 1980, *Science*, **207**, 177.

Willson, R. C., Gulkis, S., Janssen, M., Hudson, H. S., and Chapman, A. 1981, *Science*, **211**, 700.

Willson, R. C., and Hickey, J. R. 1977, in *The Solar Output and its Variation*, ed. O. R. White (Boulder: Colorado Associated Universities), p. 112.

Wolfenstein, L. 1978, *Phys. Rev.*, **D 17**, 2369.

Wolfenstein, L., and Beier, E. W. 1989, *Physics Today*, **42**, 28.

Wolfsberg, K., Cowan, G. A., Bryant, E. A., Daniels, K. S., Downey, S. W., Haxton, W. C., Nieson, V. G., Nogar, N. S., Miller, C. M., and Rokop, D. J. 1985, in *Solar Neutrinos and Neutrino Astronomy*, ed. M. L. Cherry, W. A. Fowler, and K. Lande (New York: AIP), p. 196.

Table 1

Components (by Mass) Z_i/Z of the Solar Metallicity [a]

element	$(Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{H}}$	$(Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{K}}$	$(Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{RA}}$	$(Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{G}}$	$(Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{G}} - (Z_i/Z)_{\mathrm{RA}}$
C	0.1408	0.2179	0.2177	0.2110	−0.0067
N	0.0463	0.0531	0.0530	0.0491	−0.0041
O	0.4198	0.4816	0.4813	0.4664	−0.0149
Ne	0.2984	0.0326	0.0326	0.0724	+0.0398
Na	0.0014	0.0019	0.0019	0.0018	−0.0001
Mg	0.0180	0.0421	0.0421	0.0331	−0.0089
Al	0.0013	0.0039	0.0039	0.0029	−0.0010
Si	0.0264	0.0546	0.0546	0.0357	−0.0188
S	——	0.0230	0.0221	0.0187	−0.0034
Ar	0.0392	0.0017	0.0017	0.0054	+0.0037
Ca	——	0.0041	0.0039	0.0033	−0.0006
Fe	0.0085	0.0835	0.0768	0.0937	+0.0169

[a] Note that H refers to the Huebner (1976) mix, K to the Keady (1985) mix, RA to the Ross and Aller (1976) abundance observations, and G to the Grevesse (1984) abundance observations; the last column shows the difference between the abundances of Ross and Aller (1976) and those of Grevesse (1984).

Table 2

The Presolar Composition, Central Conditions, and Predicted ^{37}Cl Neutrino Rates

Model (or author)	age (Gyr)	$L_\odot{}^a$	Y	Z	Z/X	T_c ($10^6\,K$)	ρ_c (g/cm^3)	X_c	$\nu(^{37}$Cl) (SNU)
Present work:[b]									
1. Standard Sun	4.54	3.86	0.2783	0.01943	0.02766	15.43	146.6	0.3629	7.68
2. "dep. co."	4.54	3.86	0.2783	0.01943	0.02766	15.43	146.4	0.3634	7.66
3. high $L_\odot$	4.54	3.90	0.2793	0.01940	0.02766	15.48	147.8	0.3589	8.28
4. "fixed Z"	4.59	3.86	0.2803	0.02	0.02858	15.47	147.5	0.3573	7.97
5. "low κ"	4.59	3.86	0.2803	0.02	0.02858	15.48	147.5	0.3574	8.00
6. high age	4.69	3.86	0.2794	0.02	0.02855	15.50	149.0	0.3525	8.17
7. $\varepsilon(^3\mathrm{He})_{\mathrm{nonequil}}$	4.59	3.86	0.2816	0.02	0.02864	15.45	145.8	0.3580	7.81
8. low (Z/X)	4.59	3.86	0.2619	0.016	0.02216	15.21	145.3	0.3819	5.92
Other authors:[c]									
1. Guenther...89	4.5	?	0.281	0.0194	0.0277	15.53[d]	145.7[d]		
2. Bahcall...88	4.6	3.86	0.2706	0.01961	0.02763	15.6	148.	0.3411	7.9
3. Turck-Chièze...88	4.6	3.86	0.276	0.0197	0.0280	15.51	147.7	0.3550	5.8
4. Lattanzio 89	4.6	3.86	0.287	0.02	0.0289	15.62	145.7	0.3395	
5. Cahen...86	4.57	3.86	0.285	0.02	0.02878	15.64	145.8	0.3474	7.4
6. Lebreton...86	4.6	3.86	0.282	0.02	0.02865	15.91	160.3	0.3353	13.3
7. Wambsganss 88	4.65	3.82	0.270	0.0189	0.02658	16.02			
8. VandenBerg 83	4.7	3.90	0.27	0.0169?	0.0237?				8.3
9. Bahcall...82	4.7	3.86	0.252	0.0167	0.0228	15.50	156.3	0.3545	7.6

[a] Value used for the present solar luminosity, in units of 10^{33} erg/sec.

[b] See text for full description of these cases.

[c] Standard Sun reference model was chosen from among those given by each author. Full references: 1. Guenther, Jaffe, and Demarque (1989); 2. Bahcall and Ulrich (1988); 3. Turck-Chièze *et al.* (1988); 4. Lattanzio (1989); 5. Cahen, Doom, and Cassé (1986); 6. Lebreton and Maeder (1986); 7. Wambsganss (1988); 8. VandenBerg (1983); 9. Bahcall *et al.* (1982).

[d] The quoted values were given for a less accurate version of their standard model, with slightly different initial parameters.

Table 3

Standard Sun: Predicted Neutrino Fluxes ($cm^{-2}sec^{-1}$ at Earth), and Capture Rates (SNU) [a]

Target	*p-p*	*pep*	^{7}Be	^{8}B	^{13}N	^{15}O	^{17}F	^{18}F [b]	^{3}He-p	Total
ν flux [c]	6.00+10	1.29+8	4.23+9	5.80+6	3.99+8	3.09+8	4.23+6	9.81+4	6.49+3	6.51+10
^{7}Li	0	8.48	4.1	23.	1.69	7.61	0.105	0	0.055	47.
^{37}Cl	0	0.21	1.0	6.15	0.068	0.21	0.0029	0	0.025	7.68
^{71}Ga	70.8	2.78	30.9	14.1	2.47	3.59	0.0495	0.00016	0.047	125.
^{81}Br	0	0.97	7.74	16.	0.578	1.14	0.0157	0	0.058	26.
^{98}Mo	0	0	0	17.4	0	0	0	0	0.065	17.5
^{115}In	468.	7.46	105.	15.	8.94	11.0	0.151	0.00087	0.040	615.

[a] Neutrino capture cross sections taken from Table VII of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988).

[b] Neutrino capture cross sections for $^{18}F(,e^{+}\nu)^{18}O$ neutrinos were estimated by interpolation in Q-value of the neutrino-producing reaction, using the *p-p*, ^{13}N, ^{17}O, and ^{17}F cross sections from Table VII of Bahcall and Ulrich (1988).

[c] Power-of-ten notation: $6.05{+}10 \equiv 6.05 \times 10^{10}$, $1.31{+}8 \equiv 1.31 \times 10^{8}$, etc.

Table 4

The Mixing Length and the Base of the Solar Convective Envelope [a]

Model (or author)	molecular opacities [b]	α ($\equiv l/H_p$)	T_b ($10^6\ K$)	ρ_b (g/cm^3)	R_b ($R_\odot$)	M_b ($M_\odot$)
Present work: [c]						
1. Standard Sun	Keady (1985)	2.07	1.961	0.137	0.740	0.9831
2. "dep. co."	Keady (1985)	2.34	1.967	0.138	0.738	0.9829
3. high $L_\odot$	Keady (1985)	2.09	1.961	0.136	0.740	0.9831
4. "fixed Z"	Keady (1985)	2.09	1.981	0.140	0.738	0.9826
5. "low κ"	(reduced below $10^4\ K$)	1.455	1.982	0.140	0.738	0.9825
6. high age	Keady (1985)	2.10	1.990	0.142	0.737	0.9823
7. $\varepsilon(^3\mathrm{He})_{\mathrm{nonequil}}$	Keady (1985)	2.09	1.992	0.142	0.737	0.9825
8. low (Z/X)	Keady (1985)	1.95	1.845	0.120	0.748	0.9853
Other authors: [c]						
1. Guenther...89	no	1.26	1.96 [d]	0.135 [d]		0.9831 [d]
2. Bahcall...88	Lubow & Ulrich (1979)	?	1.92	0.12	0.74	0.985
3. Turck-Chièze...86	Cox (1983)	1.55	2.04	0.153	0.739	0.981
4. Lattanzio 89	no	1.26	2.014	0.141	0.734	0.982
5. Cahen...86	Cox (1985)	1.54	2.02		0.733	
6. Lebreton...86	Cox (1981)	1.9 [e]	1.76		0.76	0.989
7. Wambsganss 88	Huebner	1.64				
8. VandenBerg 83	Alexander (1981)	1.5				
9. Bahcall...82	no	~ 1.8	2.0	0.15	0.73	~ 0.98

[a] Temperature T_b, density ρ_b, radius R_b, and M_r value M_b refer to the base of the convective envelope.

[b] These opacity references are to private communications to the authors, except for Lubow and Ulrich (1979).

[c] See notes to Table II.

[d] The quoted values were given for a less accurate version of their standard model, with slightly different initial parameters.

[e] They estimated that a value of $\alpha \approx 1.96$ would be required for their model to accurately match the solar effective temperature.