51. Ibid., p. 150-152, 168-169, 674-677.

52. Ibid., p. 153-155, 165, 675-676.

53. Ibid., p. 155, 168-169.

54. Ibid., p. 154-155, 676.

55. Ibid., p. 196, 413, 425, 488, 508, 690, 1036-1037, 1205.

56. <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 425, 689-690, 705, 1046. Also Hsu, <u>When the Med-</u> iterranean, p. 19-31.

57. For further evidence that the evaporites were formed in very shallow water, see <u>Ibid.</u>, 465-466, 488, 490, 689-690, 704-706, 1037, 1203-1205, and 1210-1214.

58. Many oceanographers and geologists find evidence that the floor of the Mediterranean was some thousands of feet below sea level during this time, and nearly all agree that the water depth was shallow. It is true that R. F. Schmalz has set forth a hypothesis that major deposition of evaporites could be made at the bottom of a deep body of water, by the sinking of brines (and later salt crystals) from the surface of the body of water as normal evaporation proceeds. However, no case of appreciable deposition by such a process is known to exist at present, and it may well be that such deposition has never occurred anywhere. (Initial Reports, v. 13, p. 1208, 1211; and P. Sonnenfeld, "The Significance of Upper Miocene (Messinian) Evaporites in the Mediterranean Sea," Journal of Geology, v. 83 (1975), p. 302-303, 310.) Furthermore the fossiliferous marl layers, the nodular and stromatolitic nature of the anhydrite, and several other characteristics of these deposits provide outstanding evidence that they could have been formed only in a shallow, saline body of water. Even if the deep-water deposition hypothesis were true, all who propose such a process admit the necessity of extensive periods of evaporation in order to produce the concentrated brines from which the salts precipitate.

59. "Glomar Challenger Returns to the Mediterranean Sea," <u>Geotimes</u>, v. 20 (1975), August, p. 16-19. (This and other sources report that the sedimentary column found at Site 375, southwest of Cyprus, was very similar to that of Site 372.)

182