ANISOTROPY OF MAGNETIC SUSCEPTIBILITY

Magnetization of Isotropic Substance $M_1 = k H_1$ $M_2 = k H_2$ $M_3 = k H_3$



Magnetization of Anisotropic, Linearly Magnetic Substance

$$\begin{split} M_1 &= k_{11} \ H_1 + \ k_{12} \ H_2 \ + k_{13} \ H_3 \\ M_2 &= k_{21} \ H_1 + \ k_{22} \ H_2 \ + k_{23} \ H_3 \\ M_3 &= k_{31} \ H_1 + \ k_{32} \ H_2 \ + k_{33} \ H_3 \end{split}$$

In Matrix Notation



Magnetization Vector, Susceptibility Tensor, Field Intensity Vector

Principal Susceptibilities, Principal Directions

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{M}_1 &= \mathbf{k}_{11} \; \mathbf{H}_1 + \; \mathbf{k}_{12} \; \mathbf{H}_2 \; + \; \mathbf{k}_{13} \; \mathbf{H}_3 \\ \mathbf{M}_2 &= \mathbf{k}_{21} \; \mathbf{H}_1 + \; \mathbf{k}_{22} \; \mathbf{H}_2 \; + \; \mathbf{k}_{23} \; \mathbf{H}_3 \\ \mathbf{M}_3 &= \; \mathbf{k}_{31} \; \mathbf{H}_1 + \; \mathbf{k}_{32} \; \mathbf{H}_2 \; + \; \mathbf{k}_{33} \; \mathbf{H}_3 \end{split}$$

For each tensor such a coordinate system exists where

$$M_1 = k_{11} H_1 M_2 = k_{22} H_2 M_3 = k_{33} H_3$$



Axes of this system are parallel to the susceptibility ellipsoid axes, in which magnetization is parallel to the field.

Susceptibilities along ellipsoid axes are **Principal Susceptibilities** Directions of ellipsoid axes are **Principal Directions**

AMS Parameters and Plots

 $P = k_1 / k_3$ $L = k_1/k_2$ $F = k_2/k_3$ $T = (2n_2 - n_1 - n_3)/(n_1 - n_3)$ shape parameter

degree of AMS magnetic lineation magnetic foliation

$$k_1 \ge k_2 \ge k_3$$

 $n_1 = lnk_1, n_2 = lnk_2,$ $n_3 = lnk_3$

Flinn Type Plot

Jelinek Type Plot



ORIENTATIONS OF MAGNETIC FABRIC ELEMENTS equal-area projection on lower hemisphere



AMS of Minerals 1



Grain AMS is due to the crystal lattice (magnetocrystalline AMS)

```
AMS of Minerals 2
```



Biotite $k_1 = k_2 > k_3$ P = 1.2-1.6

Muscovite $k_1 = k_2 > k_3$ P = 1.3-1.4

Chlorite $k_1 = k_2 > k_3$ P = 1.2-1.8

Grain AMS is due to the crystal lattice (magnetocrystalline AMS)

AMS of Minerals 4



Magnetite is internally isotropic in weak field.

 $P = (1 + \kappa N_c) / (1 + \kappa N_a)$

P = 1.1 - 3.0

κ – intrinsic susceptibility
N – demagnetizing factor
(controlled by grain shape)

Grain AMS is due to the grain shape (shape AMS)

Effects of Grain AMS and Preferred Orientation: a model



Rock degree of AMS, Grain degree of AMS, Concentration Parameter

AMS OF SEDIMENTARY ROCKS



Fig. 5. Parallelism of magnetic lineation direction with channel axis, fluvioglacial sediments, Kingussie, Scotland. After Hamilton and Rees (1970). Courtesy of Academic Press Ltd.



Fig. 6. Comparison of magnetic and sedimentary fabric, Rosario Formation, La Jolla, California. Crosses: minimum susceptibility directions, open circles: maximum susceptibility directions. Equal area projection on lower hemisphere (projection plane = bedding plane). Adapted from von Rad (1971). Courtesy of the author.

Flume Depositions



2. Flow-rate volve.	6 Collecting boxes.	IO Differential Monometer
3 Outflow top.	7. Messenger	11. Messenger release
4. Baffle plate.	8. Sand Hopper	12 Wein (mechanism.

Fig. 1. Recirculating flume used for the depositions from running water (experiments 1-6).



Fig. 2. Apparatus used for the density current depositions (experiments 13-16).

Experiments 13,15



density current, flat bed N/A

density current, flat bed

AMS in Turbidites



Flysch Belt of West Carpathians – geol. scheme



Flysch Belt of West Carpathians - orientations bedding corrected for tilt



Magnetic vs. Sedimentary Lineations

Ždánice Formation

Magura Flysch



relatively good correlation in both cases

Palaeography of Ždánice – Hustopeče Formation



Geol map of Slovakia



P, T and f Parameters



Introcorpothion Palaeogene



Liptovská kotlina - Pa



Skorušinské vrchy - Pa



Zázrivská deprese - Pa



VOLCANICS AND DIKES



Degree of AMS is extremely low, typically P<1.05, indicating very weak preferred orientation not detectable clasically

Magnetic foliations and lineations are related to lava flow directions

LAVA FLOWS (Chřibský les L.F.)



Quartenary in age, flew in ancient valley of the Moravice river, flow direction is therefore very well known



Fig. 10. Directions of principal susceptibilities in two sampled sites of the Chribský les lava flow. (a) quarry 1, (b) quarry 2. ▲: maximum susceptibility direction, II: intermediate susceptibility direction, II: minimum susceptibility direction. After Kolofiková (1976). Courtesy of the author.

DIKES

(after Raposo & Ernesto, PEPI 1995)

Focus is on the relationship of the MF and ML to dike shape



Fig. 1. Generalized geological map of the Paraná Basin showing the Ponta Grossa Arch: (1) crystalline basement; (2) pre-volcanic sediments (mainly Palaeozoic); (basic to intermediate flood volcanics from the Serra Geral Formation; (4) acid lava flows (Palmas type); (5) acid lava flows (Chapecó type); (6) post-volcanic sediment (mainly upper Cretaceous); (7) arch-type structure; (8) tectonic and/or magnetic lineaments.

AMS Types

Type I: K3 | dike plane a) K1 horizontal b) K1 vertical free flow

Type II: K3, K1 || dike plane a) K1 horizontal b) K1 vertical

Type III: K3||, K1 | dike plane static compaction

Type IV: random orientation in K1, K3 partially solidified lava



SILL vs. RING DIKE

(after Halvorsen, EPSL, 1974)

Bastian a Ronnbeck Islands create an elliptic formation

Two hypotheses for its origin:1. islands are remanants of an irregularly sunken sill2. islands are remnants of a Ring Dike

Expectations: horizontal MF in case 1 steep MF in case 2

Method: AMS of the islands plus AMS of a doubtless sill



Fig. 11. Geological sketch map of the Hinlopen strait, Spitsbergen. After Halvorsen (1974). Courtesy of Elsevier Publishing Company.



Fig. 11. Geological sketch map of the Hinlopen strait, Spitsbergen. After Halvorsen (1974). Courtesy of Elsevier Publishing Company.

Principal Directions



Fig. 12. Directions of principal susceptibilities in the Lomfjorden sill (a) and in the Bastian and Rönnbeck islands (b). After Halvorsen (1974). Courtesy of Elsevier Publishing Company.

Bastian and Ronnbeck Islands are remnants of an irregularly sunken sill rather than remnants of a ring dike.

DIKES ABOVE MANTLE PLUMES



McKenzie Radiating Dike Swarm

sampling at several distances from swarm center, at 400,500,600, 800, 1000, 2000 km.



Magnetic Foliations and Lineations

Vertical flow at distances <= 600 km. Horizontal flow at distances > 600 km Complex AMS patterns at very large distances.

Conclusions:

Assuming that lava flows vertically above the mantle plume, then mantle plume under the MacKenzie dike swarm is much smaller in diameter than is the plume diameter. The lava flows vertcally above the plume, but in upper levels its flow changes into horizontal.

ČISTÁ-JESENICE PLUTON



Fig. 1. Synoptic map of the Čistá—Jesenice massif and surrounding formations with collection sites plotted, compiled from BRETŠNAJDR [2], HOLUBEC [6], KLOMÍNSKÝ [13], ZOUBEK [17]; I—collection sites, 2—boundaries between rocks, 3—faults, 4—course of the main Proterozoic structures (mentioned in the text), 5—Tis granite, 6—autometamorphosed facies of the Tis granite, 7—Čistá granodiorite, 8—young volcanics, 9—Proterozoic, 10—Permo-Carboniferous



AMS Parameters



N Mean Susceptibility





46 data N contours in%: 3.0 Tis Granite: ML 9.1 12.2 E body W body

Čistá stock: AMS Orientation



Fig. 4. Mean directions of principal susceptibilities in individual localities of the Čistá granodiorite stock; great circles: magnetic foliation

AMS AND CLEAVAGE



Axial plane cleavage, Mesozoic marls. Helvetic Alps, Valais, Switzerland. (Photograph by J. McManus.)

Nízký Jeseník - geol. scheme



Bedding only



Spaced Cleavage



Slaty Cleavage



Metamorphic Schistosity





Fold de-folding





Obr. 80. a 81. Dílčí diagram D₁ (obr. 80, vlevo) a D₂ (obr. 81, vpravo) z vrásy ve vápenci od Velké Klajdovky. Orientace $\perp B$, v obou případech 200 os a hustota osazení $> 4-3-2-1-\frac{1}{2}$ %. Podle J. Štelcla 1957, s. 440.

Buckle Fold NJ 12





Cleavage Fold NJ 23



