The apparent friction of granular fault gouge in sheared layers
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Abstract. Data are presented from a series of experiments on layers of granular quartz gouge in the double-direct-shear geometry at a normal stress of 25 MPa. The apparent friction of a layer, defined as the ratio of the applied shear and normal stresses, shows considerable variability depending on the thickness of the layer and the particle size distribution of the gouge. Measurements of layer thickness during the experiments also show that the layers thin as shearing proceeds. Layer thinning is attributed to the processes of extrusion and densification, and by analyzing these processes the observed variations in apparent friction are reconciled with a constant coefficient of internal friction for quartz gouge. For thinning due only to extrusion, the principal assumption made is that the deviatoric stress and plastic strain rate are coaxial. When densification is also admitted, a simple flow law with one adjustable parameter is required to relate the volumetric and shear strain rates. The results and analysis show that (1) extrusion and densification must be considered when interpreting the measured frictional properties of gouge layers; (2) shear localization is inhibited in these experiments; and (3) the apparent friction of a natural fault zone may be less than \( \tan \phi \), where \( \tan \phi \) is the coefficient of internal friction of gouge in the fault zone.

Introduction

Natural faults are in general marked not by a sharp planar contact between walls of intact country rock but rather by a finite layer of damaged fault rock. Fault gouge, a granular material found in many fault zones, is formed by fragmentation of the intact country rock as the fault develops. Shear motion may be accommodated by distributed strain in the gouge layer or by slip on localized surfaces within the gouge; in either case, the frictional properties of the fault zone are presumably controlled by the gouge.

A distinction can be made between granular gouge and clay gouge. In granular gouge, the mineralogy of the country rock (typically dominated by quartz) is unchanged, although a large proportion of the gouge is very fine grained. In clay gouge, the mineralogy of the gouge is also substantially altered from that of the country rock. This study is concerned with the mechanical behavior of granular gouge.

A number of experimental studies of rock friction have been directed toward assessing the effect of a gouge layer on the frictional properties of a simulated fault zone. The experimental geometries used include double direct shear [Dietrich, 1981; Biegel et al., 1989; Marone and Kilgore, 1993], triaxial sawcut [Engelder et al., 1975; Summers and Byerlee, 1977; Byerlee et al., 1978; Logan et al., 1979; Shimamoto and Logan, 1981; Marone et al., 1990], and rotary shear [Mandl et al., 1977; Tullis et al., 1989].

Much of this work has focused on understanding the time dependence and rate dependence of friction. The associated variations in friction are small (1–2%), if the sliding rate changes by an order of magnitude, but they control the stability of frictional slip and hence the seismic potential of faults. Here, our focus is on variations in the basic, rate-independent frictional strength of gouge layers. The strength variations we discuss are independent of those due to variations in pore fluid pressure [e.g., Byerlee, 1990; Rice, 1992].
The following phenomena are discussed in many of the studies listed above and are of particular interest in this study.

1. The frictional strength of a gouge layer depends on its thickness, the grain size distribution, and to a lesser extent on the roughness of the solid surfaces that confine the layer [e.g., Dietrich, 1981].

2. Grain fragmentation is an active process in gouge deformation and results in a power law distribution of grain size regardless of the initial state [e.g., Biegel et al., 1989].

3. Oblique Riedel shears are ubiquitous in sheared layers after moderate amounts of strain [e.g., Logan et al., 1979].

4. During shear, the orientation of stress in a gouge layer (either measured or inferred from the microstructure) evolves to bring the maximum compressive stress to an angle of 45° to the layer, regardless of the orientation of stress outside the layer [e.g., Mandl, 1977].

In this study we present observations and analysis that reveal the mechanics linking these phenomena. Detailed observations of the thinning of gouge layers during double-direct-shear experiments show a strong correlation between the amount of lateral thinning and the frictional strength. This behavior is analyzed using rate-independent Mohr-Coulomb plasticity, extending an approach suggested by Byerlee and Savage [1992]. The observations are found to be consistent with a constant coefficient of internal friction for quartz gouge in plane strain.

Experiments

We carried out experiments in a double-direct-shear apparatus, described in detail by Dietrich [1981] and by Linker and Dietrich [1992]. In this geometry, a pair of identical gouge layers are sandwiched between three solid sample blocks (see Figure 1). This assembly is compressed laterally by a servo-controlled hydraulic ram, maintaining a constant normal stress on the gouge layers. The central sample block is then forced down between the gouge layers by a second servo-controlled ram, while the side sample blocks are restrained from moving vertically. The motion of the central sample block is resisted only by the gouge layers and the experiment therefore provides an accurate measurement of the frictional strength of the gouge layers.

The exposed edges of the gouge layers are unconfined, and gouge could in principle escape up, down, or laterally. In practice, most of the gouge lost from a layer is carried beyond the lower edge of the side sample blocks by the larger central sample block, as sketched in Figure 1. This observation is significant in the analysis of these experiments, because it indicates that the gouge is deforming in plane strain.

Table 1 lists the experimental conditions used in 23 experiments. Results from some of these experiments have already been reported by Marone and Kilgore [1993], who discuss aspects of the rate dependence of friction in gouge layers.

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the double-direct-shear experimental geometry, showing the sample assembly before and after an experiment.

Sample Preparation

Gouge. Most of the experiments reported here were performed using simulated gouge consisting of Ottawa sand, a pure (>99.9%) quartz sand available commercially from U.S. Silica Company, Ottawa, Illinois.

### Table 1. Experimental Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Gouge Type</th>
<th>h, mm</th>
<th>Sample Blocks (Roughness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>u01</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westerley (50 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u04</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westerley (0.2 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u08</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u09</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u10</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u11</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Westerley (0.2 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u23</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u26</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u27</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u29</td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u02</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westerley (0.2 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u03</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westerley (50 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u07</td>
<td>ultrafine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westerley (50 μm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u12</td>
<td>ultrafine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u13</td>
<td>ultrafine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u14</td>
<td>ultrafine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u22</td>
<td>ultrafine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u15</td>
<td>fractal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u16</td>
<td>fractal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u17</td>
<td>fractal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u31</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u32</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u33</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grooved steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four different initial grain size distributions were used: (1) coarse gouge (ASTM C-190), containing well-sorted grains with diameters in the range of 400-800 μm, (2) medium gouge, prepared by crushing and sieving the coarse gouge to leave grains with a range of diameters below 106 μm, (3) ultrafine gouge (Silcosil #400 mesh), with median and maximum grain diameters of 1.4 μm and 10 μm, respectively [see Marie and Kilgore, 1993], and (4) fractal gouge, intended to simulate the power law grain size distribution found in natural fault gouge [Samsis et al., 1987, Samsis and Biegel, 1989]. Crushed sand was sieved into size fractions each having a size range of approximately a factor of 2: <45 μm, 45-90 μm, 90-175 μm, 175-350 μm, and 350-710 μm. These fractions were then remixed in measured proportions to produce a power law grain size distribution (see Biegel et al. [1989] for details).

A few experiments were performed using natural gouge from the Lopez fault in the San Gabriel fault zone, California. A site description is given by Samsis et al. [1987]. The Lopez gouge is mostly quartz, with minor albite and 5-10% smectite [Scott et al. 1994]. Samsis et al. [1987] and Samsis and Biegel [1989] measured grain sizes in Lopez gouge and found that there is a power law distribution over the size range of 5-1000 μm.

The grain size distribution of the gouge layers evolves during the experiments due to grain fragmentation. In particular, the coarse gouge was quickly crushed to produce finer grains.

Sample blocks. Most of the experiments were performed using grooved steel sample blocks (see Table 1). The surfaces of the steel facing the gouge layers were roughened by a regular array of square grooves 250 μm wide, 500 μm deep, and spaced 250 μm apart. The grooves were oriented perpendicular to the direction of shearing.

A few experiments were performed using Westerley granite sample blocks with different surface roughnesses, including some with very smooth surfaces (#600 grit polish, 0.2 μm rms surface roughness).

Initial layer thickness. The gouge layers were prepared, using a jig, to give an initial thickness of between 1 and 10 mm at room pressure (see Table 1). The thinnest layers of coarse gouge were initially a monolayer of grains separating the sample blocks. The initial thicknesses of the two layers in an individual experiment differed by no more than 5%. All the gouge layers were initially 50 mm in length and width, matching the dimensions of the smaller side sample blocks.

After the total thickness of the assembly on the bench was measured, the assembly was inserted into the load frame and a small normal load was applied. From this point, relative changes in the combined thickness of the two layers were measured with a displacement transducer (DC LVDT). Note that the layer thickness data presented below were measured at a normal stress of 25 MPa and are therefore smaller than the initial thicknesses, even before shearing.

Typical Results

During each experiment the applied normal and shear stresses, layer thickness, and shear displacement were continuously recorded by a microcomputer. The shear displacement was measured with a displacement transducer and later corrected for elastic distortion of the experimental apparatus. In all the experiments, the normal stress was held constant at 25 MPa by servo control. The shear displacement rate was also servo-controlled. Typical results for a single experiment are shown in Figure 2.
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Figure 2. Results from a single experiment (u16) that used simulated quartz gouge with a fractal grain size distribution, and rough steel sample blocks. All the quantities are shown plotted against shear strain, which was calculated by integrating $\delta X/2h$, using equation (1). The total shear displacement $X$ was 10 mm. (a) Apparent friction $\mu_a$, defined as the ratio of the applied shear and normal stresses. The small fluctuations in the latter part of the experiment are associated with changes in the sliding velocity. (b) Thickness $h$ of one layer. This layer was 3 mm thick at room pressure and 2.1 mm thick under a normal stress of 25 MPa at the initiation of shear displacement. (c) Rate of change of layer thickness with respect to shear displacement (the thinning ratio) $T = dh/dX$, as a solid line. This derivative is calculated over increments of 0.5 mm in shear displacement in order to provide some smoothing. The dashed line is the predicted rate of "geometric thinning" due to extrusion $T_{GT}$, from equation (42). (d) Volumetric strain, estimated from the difference between the observed and "geometric" rates of thinning, using equation (49).
Shear strain. The data shown are plotted against shear strain rather than shear displacement; the shear strain $\epsilon_{xy}$ is defined as follows:

$$\epsilon_{xy} = \int \frac{dX}{2h}$$

where $X$ is the shear displacement, and $h$ is the layer thickness. The coordinates $x$ and $y$ are parallel and perpendicular to the layer, respectively (see Figure 3a).

In the example shown in Figure 2, the final shear displacement was 10 mm and the average layer thickness was 2 mm, so the final shear strain was around 2.5.

Apparent friction. The apparent friction $\mu_a$ of a layer is defined as the ratio of the applied shear stress $\sigma_{xy}$ and normal stress $\sigma_{yy}$:

$$\mu_a = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{|\sigma_{yy}|}.$$ 

The applied stresses are shown in Figure 3a. It is assumed that these stresses are uniform across both layers and across the entire area of each layer.

The apparent friction of the layers initially rises rapidly (see Figure 2a). By the time the shear strain has reached about 0.3, the apparent friction has reached a steady level, although some slow evolution is observed during the remainder of the experiment.

Thinning ratio. The rate of change of layer thickness is quantified by the thinning ratio $T$, which is defined as the rate of change in layer thickness $h$ with respect to shear displacement $X$:

$$T = \frac{dh}{dX}.$$ 

It is assumed that both layers thin at the same rate.

During the transient rise in apparent friction the layers thin rapidly, by about 10% of their initial thickness (see Figure 2b). After the initial transient, the layer thickness decreases more slowly, but layer thinning continues at a steady rate.

This observation is crucial; the continuing thinning demonstrates unambiguously that strain is distributed throughout the gouge layers. If strains were confined, for example, to the boundary between the gouge layers and the sample blocks, the steady thinning of the layers would not occur. The observation of layer thinning is the foundation of the analysis presented below.

Summary of Results

Figure 4 shows a summary of results from all the experiments listed in Table 1. Each experiment is represented by a single symbol in each plot. A representative point was chosen from the latter, steady state part of each experiment, and the apparent friction, thinning ratio, and instantaneous layer thickness were recorded. These data are presented as plots of the apparent friction versus thinning ratio (Figure 4a) and the layer thickness versus thinning ratio (Figure 4b). In Figure 4b, the layer thickness is scaled by the length of the side sample blocks $L$, which is 50 mm in all the experiments (see Figure 1).

Figure 4a shows a large range in apparent friction and a clear negative correlation between the apparent friction and the thinning ratio. There are no major departures from this trend as a function of the gouge type, although the lowest values of apparent friction are all for coarse gouge. The types of sample block are not shown in Figure 4, but no significant variations were found as a function of the type or roughness of the sample blocks. For example, experiments u02 and u03 gave almost identical results; both used 3 mm layers of medium gouge, but the Westerly sample blocks were rough in one case and very smooth in the other (see Table 1).

Figure 4b shows that the higher thinning ratios are associated with thicker layers. Also, at a given layer
thickness, the coarse gouge shows a higher thinning ratio than do the other types.

Analysis

The goal of this analysis is to account for the trends in apparent friction and layer thinning shown in Figure 4. This is accomplished by considering the two mechanisms that could be responsible for layer thinning: (1) extrusion of gouge from the center out to the unconfined edges of the layer and (2) densification of the gouge by grain rearrangement and fragmentation. The analysis is developed in two stages. First, we assume that the gouge density remains constant so that all the thinning is attributed to extrusion. Second, densification of the gouge is permitted providing an additional mechanism for layer thinning.

The geometry used for this analysis is shown in Figure 3a. A Cartesian coordinate system $(x, y, z)$ is used such that $x$ is parallel to both the layer and the direction of shearing, $y$ is perpendicular to the layer, and $z$ is parallel to the layer and perpendicular to the direction of shearing. The layer has thickness $h$ in the $y$ direction and length $L$ in the $x$ direction (see Figure 1). We follow the convention that compressive stresses are negative.

Thinning due to Extrusion at Constant Density

In this section, the density of the gouge is assumed to remain constant during shear deformation. Plane strain is also assumed, so that variations in the $z$ direction are not considered. The final assumption is that the plastic strain rate tensor is directly proportional to the deviatoric stress, which is the coaxiality assumption commonly made in plasticity [Hill, 1960].

Plastic strain. An increment $\delta X$ of shear displacement drives a change in layer thickness $\delta h$. The following components of the incremental plastic strain tensor can therefore be obtained directly:
\[
\delta \epsilon_{yy} = \frac{\delta h}{h}; \\
\delta \epsilon_{xy} = \frac{\delta X}{2h}.
\]

Because the density is constant and strain is confined to the \(x-y\) plane, the increment of extensional strain within the layer \(\delta \epsilon_{xx}\) is equal and opposite to \(\delta \epsilon_{yy}\). By dividing the strain increments by an arbitrary time increment, the strain rate tensor can be written as follows:

\[
\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} -2T & 1 \\ 1 & 2T \end{bmatrix}
\]

where the thinning ratio \(T\) is, as before, the rate of thinning of the layer with respect to shear displacement:

\[
T = \frac{dh}{dX} = \frac{\delta \epsilon_{yy}}{2\delta \epsilon_{xy}}.
\]

Note that \(T\) is negative when the layer is thinning. All the quantities in the expression for the strain rate tensor (6) are known.

**Stress.** The \(\sigma_{yy}\) and \(\sigma_{xy}\) components of stress are measured directly. The \(\sigma_{xx}\) component of stress is not measured, but it can be estimated by using a relationship between the stress and strain rate tensors. First, it is convenient to decompose the stress tensor into its isotropic and deviatoric parts:

\[
\sigma_{ij} = \bar{\sigma} \delta_{ij} + \sigma'_{ij}
\]

where \(\delta_{ij}\) is the Kronecker delta. The mean stress \(\bar{\sigma}\) is given by

\[
\bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_{xx} + \sigma_{yy})
\]

and the trace of the deviatoric stress tensor \(\sigma'_{ij}\) is zero.

This analysis now hinges on the assumption that the deviatoric stress tensor in equation (8) is coaxial with the strain rate tensor in equation (6), which can be simply stated as follows:

\[
\sigma'_{ij} = m \dot{\epsilon}_{ij}
\]

where \(m\) is an unknown scalar modulus that can vary (e.g., with the total shear strain). Using equation (10), the deviatoric stress can be written using the same tensorial form used for the strain rate in equation (6):

\[
\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} -2T & 1 \\ 1 & 2T \end{bmatrix}.
\]

By comparing the \(xx\) and \(yy\) components of this equation, the unknown \(\sigma_{xx}\) component of stress can be constrained:

\[
\sigma_{yy} - \sigma_{xx} = 4T \sigma_{xy}.
\]

The entire stress tensor is now determined.

Figure 5 shows a Mohr’s circle diagram representing this state of stress. The center of the stress circle is given by the mean stress \(\bar{\sigma}\); from equations (9) and (12), \(\bar{\sigma}\) can be written explicitly as follows:

\[
\bar{\sigma} = \sigma_{yy} - 2T \sigma_{xy}.
\]

**Figure 5.** Mohr diagram showing the state of stress in a sheared layer that is thinning by extrusion. The observed stresses (\(\sigma_{yy}\) and \(\sigma_{xy}\)) alone do not constrain the Mohr circle, but the observed strain can be used to estimate the \(\sigma_{xx}\) component of stress and hence to determine the stress circle. The apparent friction \(\mu_a\) obtained directly from the observed stresses is significantly smaller than the internal friction of the gouge, parameterized by \(\tan \phi\). In the limit of a layer that does not thin, the observed stress lies at the apex of the circle; in this case, \(\sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy}\) and \(\mu_a = \sin \phi\). The angles in this diagram and Figure 3 are correctly scaled for \(\sin \phi = 0.66\) and \(T = -0.2\).
Note that since \( \sigma_{xy} \) and \( \ddot{\sigma} \) are negative,
\[
|\ddot{\sigma}| = |\sigma_{xy}| + 2T\sigma_{xy} .
\] (14)

The radius of the stress circle \( \tau \) is an objective measure of the shear stress in the \( x-y \) plane and is defined by:
\[
\tau^2 = \sigma_{xy}^2 + \left( \frac{\sigma_{yy} - \sigma_{xx}}{2} \right)^2 .
\] (15)

Using equation (12),
\[
\tau = \sigma_{xy} \sqrt{1 + 4T^2} .
\] (16)

The magnitudes of the principal stresses (\( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \)) are \( \sigma \pm \tau \). In Figure 5, the principal stresses lie at the intersection of the stress circle with the horizontal axis. The orientation of the principal stresses is represented by the angle \( \theta \) between the direction of maximum compressive stress and the \( y \) direction, which is also shown in Figure 5. This angle can be obtained using equation (13) and the Mohr diagram:
\[
\tan 2\theta = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{|\sigma_{yy} - \sigma|} = \frac{1}{2T} .
\] (17)

The orientation of the principal stress axes in the layer is shown in Figure 3b. Note that when \( T = 0 \), \( \sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy} = \sigma \) and \( \sigma_{xy} = \tau \). In this case the principal axes of stress lie at \( 45^\circ \) to the layer; this result was observed directly by Mandl et al. [1977] in experiments on granular layers at low stress levels. Figure 3b and Figure 5 illustrate a case where \( T < 0 \), \( |\sigma_{yy}| > |\sigma| > |\sigma_{xx}| \) and \( \sigma_{xy} < \tau \). In such cases the direction of maximum compressive stress moves closer to the \( y \) direction, driving the layer thinning.

**Slip planes and internal friction.** According to standard Mohr-Coulomb plasticity, the strain that accompanies this state of stress is accommodated by displacement on sets of conjugate slip planes. As shown in Figure 3c, these slip planes are positioned symmetrically about the direction of maximum compressive stress, at angles \( \pm \psi \). Byerlee and Savage [1992] note that for the case of plane strain in an incompressible material, slip on two sets of distinct planes can be combined to give any macroscopic strain tensor.

The orientations of these slip planes are such that the ratio of shear stress to normal stress acting on them is a maximum. This ratio, \( \mu \), is an objective measure of the intrinsic, or internal, frictional strength of the gouge. The internal friction is conveniently parameterized by the angle of friction \( \phi \), where \( \mu = \tan \phi \).

On the Mohr diagram (Figure 5) lines are shown at angles \( \pm \phi \) to the horizontal axis that are tangent to the stress circle. These lines represent the Mohr-Coulomb failure envelope for plastic shear deformation; states of stress outside these lines are not accessible. Note that we assume that the cohesion of the gouge is negligible. The slope of the failure envelope \( \mu \) is given by
\[
\mu = \tan \phi = \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 - \tau^2}} .
\] (18)

As shown in Figure 5, the angle of the slip planes \( \psi \) is related to the angle of friction \( \phi \) by
\[
2\psi = \frac{\pi}{2} - \phi \Rightarrow \cos 2\psi = \frac{\tau}{|\sigma|} .
\] (19)

If we note that the orientation of the maximum compressive stress is given by \( \theta \), the angles of the slip planes from the \( x \) direction, \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \), can be given by
\[
\alpha_1 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta + \psi ;
\] (20)
\[
\alpha_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta - \psi .
\] (21)

These angles are shown in Figure 3c and Figure 5. The shear planes defined by the angles \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) are referred to as Riedel shears. When the double-direct-shear samples are disassembled, the low-angle \( \alpha_1 \) Riedel shears can be seen as planes along which the gouge preferentially parts (see Figure 1).

**Apparent friction.** It has been noted previously that the apparent friction of a gouge layer, as defined by equation (5), is always less than the internal friction \( \mu \) of the gouge. In fact, the apparent friction is the sine of the angle of friction \( \phi \) rather than its tangent. This influence is implicit in a discussion by Logan et al. [1979] and has been stated explicitly by Hobbs et al. [1990] and Marone et al. [1992]. Byerlee and Savage [1992] discuss the matter in more detail; their analysis represents the limit where \( T = 0 \) and \( \theta = 45^\circ \), in which case the apparent friction is simply the ratio of the shear stress and mean stress:
\[
\mu_a = \frac{\tau}{|\sigma|} = \sin \phi .
\] (22)

A line with this slope is shown in Figure 5; it runs through the apex of the stress circle.

For cases where \( T < 0 \), we can obtain a relationship between the apparent friction \( \mu_a \) and the thinning ratio \( T \) by first using equations (14) and (16) to obtain the ratio of the shear and mean stresses:
\[
\frac{\tau}{|\sigma|} = \sin \phi = \frac{\sigma_{xy} \sqrt{1 + 4T^2}}{|\sigma_{yy}| + 2T\sigma_{xy}} .
\] (23)

Noting the definition of apparent friction (2) and rearranging, we obtain:
\[
\mu_a = \frac{\sin \phi}{\sqrt{1 + 4T^2} - 2T \sin \phi} .
\] (24)

A line with this slope is shown on the Mohr diagram for \( T < 0 \), \( \mu_a < \sin \phi \); it intersects the stress circle at a normal stress \( \sigma_{yy} \) and a shear stress \( \sigma_{xy} \).

The expression (24) contains only one adjustable material parameter, \( \sin \phi \), which is directly related to the internal friction \( \mu = \tan \phi \) and should therefore be constant for a given material. For example, if \( \mu = 0.88 \) (\( \phi = 41.3^\circ \)) the predicted apparent friction when \( T = 0 \) is \( \mu_a = 0.66 \). When \( T = -0.1 \), the predicted apparent friction drops to \( \mu_a = 0.57 \). In this case, equation (17) gives \( \theta = 39.3^\circ \), equation (19) gives \( \psi = 24.4^\circ \), and
equations (20) and (21) give $\alpha_1 = 26.3^\circ$ and $\alpha_2 = 75.1^\circ$,
respectively.

**Comparison with observations.** This simple theory goes a long way toward explaining the observed
anomalies in apparent friction as a function of the observed layer thinning. The solid line in Figure 4a shows
the apparent friction predicted by equation (24) with $\sin \phi = 0.66$ and provides an upper bound to all the
observations. If some random scatter were accepted, a slightly smaller value for $\sin \phi$ would fit most of the data
to $T \sim -0.1$. However, as the thinning ratio becomes large, the theory clearly predicts systematically
greater values for apparent friction than are observed. As is shown below, a further reduction in the apparent
friction is predicted when densification of the layer is occurring.

**Thinning due to Extrusion and Densification.**

In this section we augment the theory presented above, to assess the effect of gouge densification on the apparent
cut friction. The approach to this analysis is similar to that used for the constant density case.

1. Construct a strain rate tensor that admits changes in volume, but retain the assumption of plane strain in the $x-y$ plane.
2. Construct a stress tensor, again assuming that the stress and strain rate tensors are coaxial.
3. Use a flow law to relate the volumetric strain rate to the shear strain rate and the state of stress.

**Plastic strain.** As before, the $\epsilon_{yy}$ and $\epsilon_{xy}$ components of the plastic strain rate tensor are known. In plane strain, only the $\epsilon_{xx}$ component is unknown, representing longitudinal strain in the layer. Figure 6 shows a decomposition of the incremental strain into components of shear, extrusion, and densification. A strain rate tensor with these components may be written as follows:

$$
\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} -2T \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2T \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2T(1 - \alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$

(25)

where the three terms on the right-hand side describe shear, extrusion, and densification, respectively. $T$ is
again the thinning ratio $dh/dX$ and is negative. The variable $\alpha$ determines the distribution of the observed
thinning between extrusion and densification. When $\alpha = 1$, the density is constant and the thinning is attributed
entirely to extrusion. When $\alpha = 0$, there is no extrusion ($\dot{\epsilon}_{xx} = 0$), and the thinning is due entirely to
densification.

The form of the extrusion term in equation (25) implies anisotropy in the behavior of the layer parallel and
perpendicular to the direction of shearing, that is, extrusion is assumed to occur in the $x$ direction but not in the $z$ direction. It might be expected that once plastic strain had been mobilized by application of the shear
stress $\sigma_{xy}$, the extrusion component of strain might occur in both $x$ and $z$ directions. Similarly, the form
of the densification term in equation (25) assumes uniaxial compression across the layer rather than isotropic compression. These assumptions are adopted because they produce plane strain regardless of the value of $\alpha$, consistent with the experimental observation that relatively little gouge is driven out from the layers perpendicular to the direction of shearing (see Figure 1).

The terms in equation (25) may be combined to give:

$$
\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} \begin{bmatrix} -2T \alpha & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2T \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(26)

We now separate the strain rate into its isotropic and deviatoric parts:

$$
\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} \Delta \dot{\epsilon}_{ij} + \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} D_{ij}.
$$

(27)

The volumetric strain rate $\Delta$ is given by

$$
\Delta = 2T(1 - \alpha) \dot{\epsilon}_{xy}.
$$

(28)

The nondimensional tensor $D_{ij}$ describes the geometry of the deviatoric strain rate:

$$
D_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{2T(1+2\alpha)}{3} & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -\frac{2T(2+\alpha)}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2T(1-a) \end{bmatrix}.
$$

(29)

The nonzero $zz$ component of this tensor arises solely from the assumption of plane strain during densification.

An objective measure $\dot{\gamma}$ of the shear strain rate in the $x-y$ plane is defined using a similar form to that used
for the shear stress $\tau$ in equation (15):

$$
\dot{\gamma} = \dot{\epsilon}_{xy} + \left(\dot{\epsilon}_{yy} - \dot{\epsilon}_{xx}\right)^2 / 2.
$$

(30)

Expanding this expression using equation (26) gives

$$
\dot{\gamma} = F \dot{\epsilon}_{xy}
$$

(31)

where

$$
F = \sqrt{1 + T^2 (1 + a)^2}.
$$

(32)

**Stress.** Our knowledge of the stress tensor is, like the strain rate tensor, limited to the $\sigma_{yy}$ and $\sigma_{xy}$
components; we do not have a direct measurement of $\sigma_{xx}$. We again adopt the coaxiality assumption of plasticity,
so that the deviatoric stress tensor is coaxial with the deviatoric strain rate:

$$
\sigma'_{ij} = \sigma_{xy} D_{ij}.
$$

(33)

Equations (29) and (33) imply that the $\sigma'_{zz}$ is nonzero when densification is occurring ($a < 1$). This arises
from assumptions of coaxiality and plane strain. The $zz$ component of stress (which is the intermediate principal stress $\sigma_2$) is implicitly assumed to adjust to a value
between \( \sigma_{xx} \) and \( \sigma_{yy} \) (or \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \)), as necessary to maintain plane strain. From equation (29), the \( xx \) and \( yy \) components of equation (33) give

\[
\sigma_{yy} - \sigma_{xx} = 2T(1+a)\sigma_{xy} \quad (34)
\]

We now construct expressions for the mean stress and shear stress in the \( x-y \) plane. The mean stress in the \( x-y \) plane \( \bar{\sigma} \) is again defined by equation (9); using equation (34), we obtain

\[
\sigma = \sigma_{yy} - T(1+a)\sigma_{xy} \quad (35)
\]

and, since \( \sigma_{yy} \) and \( \sigma \) are negative,

\[
|\bar{\sigma}| = |\sigma_{yy}| + T(1+a)\sigma_{xy} \quad (36)
\]

As before, the shear stress in quantified by the radius \( r \) of the Mohr circle in the \( x-y \) plane. Using equations (15) and (34), we obtain

\[
\tau = F \sigma_{xy} \quad (37)
\]

where \( F \) is again given by equation (32).

As in equation (17), the orientation of the principal stresses can be obtained from equation (35) and is shown to depend on the rate of densification through the variable \( a \):

\[
\tan 2\theta = \frac{1}{(1+a)|T|} \quad (38)
\]

**Flow law.** At this point there is only one unknown in the problem: the variable \( a \) that determines the relative amounts of compaction and extrusion. The constant volume theory can be recovered by setting \( a = 1 \). To treat cases where \( a < 1 \), some relationship between the volumetric and shear strain rates must be introduced. The flow law used here is as follows:

\[
\Delta = R \left( \frac{\tau}{|\bar{\sigma}|} - \sin \phi \right) \dot{\gamma} \quad (39)
\]

where \( R \) is a dimensionless flow constant (we later suggest \( R \) is around unity). This flow law has the property that the volume change vanishes as the Mohr-Coulomb condition \( \tau/|\bar{\sigma}| = \sin \phi \) is reached. If the volume strain is negative (densification), \( \tau/|\bar{\sigma}| < \sin \phi \). In effect, the gauge has a reduced internal friction during densification. Similar flow laws are used in critical state soil mechanics [Brito and Gun, 1987]. The term "critical state" refers to the final state of constant-density deformation.

Note that the Mohr-Coulomb failure condition depends on the maximum and minimum principal stresses (in the \( x-y \) plane) but not on the intermediate principal stress (in the \( z \) direction). Consequently, the quantities \( \tau \) and \( \sigma \) in equation (39) are defined by equations (15) and (9) in terms of only the \( \sigma_{xx}, \sigma_{yy}, \) and \( \sigma_{xy} \) components of stress. In granular soils the intermediate principal stress affects the failure strength [Green and Bishop, 1969; Mandl, 1988]. The coefficient of internal friction obtained from plane-strain experiments such as ours is expected to overestimate the strength of a sample in triaxial compression.

Substituting from equations (28), (31), (36), and (37) into the flow law (39), we obtain

\[
\frac{2T(1-a)}{RF} = \frac{F \mu_a}{1+T(1+a)\mu_a} - \sin \phi \quad (40)
\]

where the apparent friction \( \mu_a \) is defined by equation (2). With some rearrangement, the apparent friction is given by

\[
\mu_a = \frac{RF \sin \phi + 2T(1-a)}{RF \sin \phi + 2T(1-a)} \quad (41)
\]

The apparent friction \( \mu_a \) and thinning \( T \) are the observed, independent variables in this expression. There are two adjustable material parameters: \( \sin \phi \) and \( R \). The quantity \( F \) is defined in terms of \( T \) and \( a \) by equation (32), but the variable \( a \) remains independent and is not directly observed. Below, we show that \( a \) can be estimated by further examination of the data.

In the limit where \( a = 1 \), equation (24) for thinning at constant density is recovered. The flow law constant \( R \) does not appear in this limiting case. The behavior in this limit may be used to estimate the material parameter \( \sin \phi \) and hence the internal friction \( \mu \) of the gauge.

With densification included in the analysis, gauge with a constant internal friction of \( \mu = 0.88 \) may display a wider range of values for apparent friction. At a constant thinning ratio of \( T = -0.1 \) the apparent friction ranges between \( \mu_a = 0.57 \) when \( a = 1 \) (extrusion only) and \( \mu_a = 0.47 \) when \( R = 1.2 \) and \( a = 0 \) (densification only). Under the same conditions, the orientation of the stress tensor changes from \( \theta = 39.3^\circ \) to \( \theta = 42.1^\circ \) (see equation (38)).

**Geometric thinning.** Inspection of the layers during and after the experiments shows that a band of gouge of comparable thickness to the layer is left behind on the larger sample block (see Figure 1). At the leading edge of the smaller sample block, the gouge neither extrudes out toward the edge nor falls behind to leave a gap containing no gouge. This observation suggests a process of "geometric thinning" (GT) in which, when the layer advances a distance \( \delta X \), a volume of gouge \( h \delta X \) is left behind at the trailing edge of the smaller sample blocks. A component \( \delta h_{GT} \) of the incremental thinning of the layer exactly balances this loss:

\[
h \delta X = -L \delta h_{GT} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{dh}{dX}_{GT} = \frac{-h}{L} = T_{GT} \quad (42)
\]

where \( L \) is the length of the side sample blocks. Equation (42) links the contribution of extrusion to layer thinning to the overall dimensions of the layer. The idea of GT can be exploited to produce an estimate of the variable \( a \), in cases where the observed thinning ratio \( T \) is larger than \( T_{GT} \).

First, consider the unique relationship between the
shear and extrusion components of strain illustrated in Figure 6. The $\varepsilon_{xx}$ component of strain rate has adjusted so that the right-hand edge of the layer advances with the smaller sample block while the left-hand edge remains in place on the larger sample block. The required increment in extensional strain is given by

$$\delta \varepsilon_{xx} = \frac{\delta X}{T}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

Note that the magnitude of $\varepsilon_{xx}$ is independent of rate of densification, which contributes only to $\varepsilon_{yy}$ (see equation (25)).

Second, an expression for $\delta \varepsilon_{xx}$ involving the variables $a$ and $T$ may be obtained from equations (5) and (26):

$$\varepsilon_{xx} = -2T \alpha \delta \varepsilon_{yy} = -\frac{T a \delta X}{h}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (44)

EQUITATING (43) AND (44) ELIMINATES $\delta X$ TO GIVE

$$a = -\frac{h}{T T}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)

Comparing equations (42) and (45) confirms that when thinning is due to extrusion alone ($a = 1$), $T$ is equal to $T_{GT}$. Equation (45) can be used to estimate $a$, thereby leaving only the material parameters $\sin \phi$ and $R$ as unknowns in equation (41).

**Comparison with observations.** There is good quantitative evidence to support the idea that the rate of extrusion is determined by GT.

1. Figure 2c shows a comparison of $T_{GT}$ from equation (42) and the observed thinning ratio during a single experiment; the observed rate steadily converges towards $T_{GT}$ as the shear strain increases.

2. Figure 4b shows the final thinning ratio plotted against the scaled layer thickness $h/L$ for all the experiments. Two theoretical lines representing equation (45) are also shown, for $a = 1$ and $a = 0.4$. The line $a = 1$ corresponds to constant gouge density and $T = T_{GT}$. With the exception of one very thin layer, the absolute thinning ratio is never smaller than $T_{GT}$. The one exception is a very thin layer between sample blocks of significant roughness, which makes a precise definition of the layer thickness problematic.

By using the the additional constraint provided by GT, the observations of apparent friction can be used to estimate the material parameter $R$. In Figure 4a, equation (41) is plotted for $a = 0, 0.4$, and 1. A value of $\sin \phi = 0.66$ was selected to fit the upper edge of the data in the region of small $T$. In Figure 4b, most of the data fall in the range $0.4 < a < 1$; noting this, a value of $R = 1.2$ has been selected so that the data in Figure 4a at large $T$ fall between the lines for $a = 1$ and $a = 0.4$. A more rigorous fitting of these parameters is not warranted at present. We suggest that $\sin \phi$ is correct to $\pm 5\%$ and $R$ is correct to $\pm 25\%$.

The experiments using coarse gouge are conspicuous in showing generally lower apparent friction and higher rates of thinning than the experiments using finer gouge or fractal gouge. This is consistent with the analysis presented, because the coarse gouge is expected to densify significantly as the large grains break down into smaller particles with a range of sizes that pack together more efficiently [e.g., Wong, 1990]. Quantitative estimates of the volumetric strain are given in the next section.

Further validation of the theory can be found by examining an individual experiment in greater detail. Figure 7 shows results from the experiment introduced in Figure 2, replotted on a diagram similar to Figure 4. These results match theoretical curves for a layer of constant thickness in which the variable $a$ steadily increases towards 1. This increase reflects a change from thinning dominated by densification early in the experiment to thinning dominated by extrusion late in the experiment. The results in Figure 7 suggest that the flow law is adequate even for the early part of the experiment, where $\mu_a$ is quite small and the rate of layer thinning is quite large.

**Volumetric strain.** The assertion that the rate of extrusion is determined by GT also provides a way to estimate the volumetric strain (or densification) of the gouge. An increment in the $yy$ component of strain can be divided into two contributions due to (1) densification and (2) extrusion at the rate determined by
GT. In plane strain, the latter contribution is equal and opposite to $\delta \epsilon_{xx}$. From equation (43),

$$
\delta \varepsilon_{yy}^{GT} = -\frac{\delta X}{L} .
$$

Because any densification is attributed to uniaxial compression of the layer, the increment in volumetric strain $\Delta$ can be obtained from the difference between the total increment in thinning and that attributed to extrusion.

$$
\delta \Delta = \delta \varepsilon_{yy} - \delta \varepsilon_{yy}^{GT} .
$$

Using equations (4) and (46),

$$
\delta \Delta = \frac{\delta h}{h} + \frac{\delta X}{L} .
$$

By integrating from an initial condition where $h = h_0$ and $X = 0$, the finite volumetric strain is given by

$$
\Delta = -\ln \left( \frac{h_0}{h(X)} \right) + \frac{X}{L} .
$$

The volumetric strain $\Delta$ can be used to relate the initial and final porosities ($f_0$ and $f$) of the gouge:

$$
f = 1 - (1 - f_0) \exp(-\Delta) .
$$

Figure 2d shows the progression of volumetric strain in a single experiment, calculated using equation (49) but plotted as a function of shear strain. Note that the volumetric strain rate is initially large but diminishes as the thinning ratio in Figure 2c approaches GT.

Using equation (50), the final volumetric strain $\Delta = -0.10$ shown in Figure 2d might correspond to a reduction in porosity from $f_0 = 0.35$ to $f = 0.24$. These values are reasonable but were not measured. It should be noted that by setting $f = 0$ in equation (50) we obtain a limit on the volumetric strain:

$$
\Delta_{\text{min}} = \ln(1 - f_0) .
$$

This equation sets a lower limit of around $-0.4$ on $\Delta$ if the initial porosity is in the range $f_0 = 0.3 - 0.35$.

The calculated progression of volumetric strain is shown for all the experiments in Figure 8. We can
Figure 8. Estimates of volume strain from all the experiments. Each line is calculated using equation (49) and shows the progressive volumetric strain for a single experiment (see also Figure 2d). Data from experiments using a range of layer thickness are shown together by using the shear strain on the horizontal axis; lines for the thickest layers terminate at a shear strain of about 1, whereas those for the thinnest layers run out to strains in excess of 5. The faint lines show data for the ultrafine gouge and typically show very little volume strain. The dashed lines show data for the medium, fractal, and Lopez gouge types and typically show a total volume strain of around 0.1. The heavy lines show data for the coarse gouge and show larger total volume strains. The estimates of volume strain for coarse gouge in thin layers may be unreliable (see text).

account for the trends shown by associating the process of densification with the evolution of the grain size distribution by fragmentation. Biegel et al. [1989] and Marone and Scholz [1989] demonstrated that gouge with a narrow range of grain sizes quickly develops a broad, power law grain size distribution by fragmentation when sheared. The fractal gouge is denser because the grains pack together more efficiently.

With one exception, the experiments using ultrafine gouge show minimal volumetric strain. This gouge has very small grains and also a reasonably large range in grain size. Many of the grains may be too small (1 μm) to fragment at the stress levels used in these experiments.

The experiments using coarse gouge show large amount of volume strain, passing well beyond our estimated limit of Δ = −0.4 in some cases. This gouge has a grain size of nearly 1 mm and is observed to undergo a great deal of grain fragmentation during experiments. The two cases showing the largest volume strains are layers whose initial thickness was about one grain diameter, between grooved steel sample blocks. In these cases, the initial porosity is probably anomalously large, so that more densification is permissible. Also, with such thin layers, loss of small grains into the grooves of the rough steel sample blocks probably causes a significant amount of anomalous thinning.

In the experiments with medium, fractal, and natural Lopez gouges, the volumetric strain lies between the extremes set by the ultrafine and coarse gouges.

Discussion

Regardless of the details of the discussion that follows, it should be emphasized that mechanical properties of gouge layers or fault zones are more complicated than those of bare rock surfaces. The gouge in fault zones is distinct from the surrounding country rock and should be treated as a finite continuum. It is misleading to parameterize the material properties of a finite fault zone in terms of the conventional coefficient of friction, which is basically a surface property.

Internal Friction and Apparent Friction

It is evident from our results that a clear distinction must be made between the internal friction μ of gouge, a material property, and the apparent friction μa of a gouge layer, a property of the entire system. The internal friction is more familiar and is the foundation of a quantitative predictive framework, but it is the apparent friction that is usually measured and that has real external significance.

We certainly concur with the view presented by Hobbs et al. [1990] and Byerlee and Savage [1992] that the maximum apparent friction of a gouge layer or a fault zone is the sine of the angle of friction rather than its tangent. The apparent friction may, however, be significantly less than this upper limit. Previous measurements of the frictional strength of gouge layers therefore represent lower bounds on sin φ rather than direct measurements of tan φ.
The apparent friction of a gouge layer in the laboratory is not uniquely determined by the internal friction. Our analysis of the relationship between the measured apparent friction and the inferred internal friction calls for additional information, namely, the rates of extrusion and densification of the gouge layer. Neither of these are directly observed in the double-direct-shear experiments, but both can be inferred from measurements of shear strain and layer thinning.

The interpretation of experiments of fault gouge in any experimental geometry should be conducted with these concepts in mind. They certainly apply to other double-direct-shear experiments and also to triaxial sawcut and rotary shear experiments.

The effect of densification. It was not possible to monitor the gouge density in the double-direct-shear apparatus used in this study; hence we have had to estimate the volumetric strain rate indirectly by using the concept of geometric thinning. For medium, fractal, and Lopez gouge, densification is inferred to be important during the initial stage of an experiment, up to a shear strain of about 0.3 (see Figures 2 and 8). For coarse gouge, densification is most rapid during this initial stage, but may persist for somewhat longer.

In triaxial sawcut experiments the pore volume, and hence gouge densification, can be measured directly. Such measurements are presented by Marone and Scholz [1989] and Marone et al. [1990] and are used here to confirm qualitatively the validity of our assertions about gouge densification. The gouge used in these studies was equivalent to our coarse gouge, and most of their experiments used normal stresses of 100 MPa, significantly greater than the normal stress of 25 MPa used here.

They always observed significant porosity reduction up to shear strains of around 0.3 (note also that they use the engineering definition of shear strain; their values are halved to be consistent with the definition used here). A rough inspection of their data during these initial stages suggests that our value of around unity for the flow constant B, which controls the rate of densification with respect to shear strain in equation (39), is consistent with their data.

After this initial stage, porosity reduction is succeeded by dilation in their experiments at 100 MPa. This is inconsistent with our results for coarse gouge, where densification continues to larger shear strains. However, Marone and Scholz [1989] performed a single experiment at 20 MPa normal stress, which showed continuing porosity reduction out to shear strains in excess of unity; this result is consistent with our inferences about the densification of coarse gouge. Comparing the results at 100 MPa and 20–25 MPa, it appears that full densification of coarse gouge is accomplished with less shear strain as the normal stress increases, because grain fragmentation is more efficient.

The effects of extrusion and layer thickness. Even after the gouge has attained a constant density, the apparent friction continues to be affected by the process of extrusion. This effect can be misinterpreted as simply being due to layer thickness, whereas the important variable is the ratio of layer thickness to length. Referring to Figure 4, extrusion has a significant effect on the apparent friction of layers whose thickness exceeds perhaps one-twentieth of their length (a thinning ratio of $-0.05$).

Dietrich [1981] and Biegel et al. [1989] report a decrease in the apparent friction of gouge layers with increasing layer thickness in double-direct-shear experiments. Their observations are in qualitative agreement with those presented here. Our analysis indicates, however, that layer thickness is not the key variable; it is the rate of change of thickness with shear displacement that is quantitatively related to the apparent friction. Only because thicker layers thin more rapidly is a correlation between layer thickness and apparent friction observed.

It is more difficult to monitor changes in the layer thickness precisely in triaxial sawcut experiments, because the sawcut cylinder is jacketed to isolate it from the fluid confining medium. However, as in our double-direct-shear results, the initial thickness of the gouge layer should provide an indication of the rate of thinning during the experiment. Shimamoto and Logan [1981] report the apparent friction of dolomite gouge layers with initial thicknesses of 0.5–2 mm. The normal stress and sample size (equivalent to the layer dimension L here) were also varied. They find no significant variation in the apparent friction with layer thickness in these experiments. Their result is surprising in light of this study but may reflect a difference in the behavior of quartz and dolomite gouge. Alternatively, it may be that in the confined triaxial apparatus, the gouge layer has less tendency to extrude; layer thinning by extrusion is perhaps a peculiarity of the double-direct-shear geometry, wherein the edges of the gouge layers are unconfined.

Summers and Byerlee [1977] report triaxial sawcut experiments on layers with a range of different mineral compositions. In most of these experiments the layer was not granular gouge but instead an intact wafer of material sandwiched between granite sample blocks. It is not clear whether our analysis applies to such experiments, because the strain may not be distributed throughout the gouge layer.

In rotary shear experiments, extrusion in the sense we have described is impossible; gouge cannot escape from an annular layer in the circumferential direction of shearing. Radial extrusion can also be prevented by correctly choosing the radial confining pressure (T. Tullis, personal communication, 1992). Hence the apparent friction should be affected by only the initial process of densification. We discuss this further in the following section.

Strain Localization in Gouge Layers

The presence of a gouge layer leads to strain localization in a general sense, because the solid material to either side does not deform plastically. Localization of the strain within gouge layers and natural fault zones has been discussed by many authors [e.g., Tchalenko, 1970; Mandl et al., 1977; Byerlee et al., 1978; Logan et
al., 1979; Groshong, 1988; Marone and Scholz, 1989]. Oblique Riedel shears are usually described, and their interpretation as Coulomb failure planes is well established. Layer-parallel shears, termed Y-shears by Logan et al. [1979], are also often described. A recent, detailed study by Gu and Wong [1994] provides quantitative documentation of the sequential appearance of Riedel and Y-shears in triaxial sawcut experiments on fine-grained gouge. The significance of both types of slip plane is discussed here.

Riedel shears. The observation of continuing layer thinning in our experiments has important implications for the process of shear localization. In the latter part of the experiments, the layer thinning is due to extrusion at constant density. This requires that strain be distributed both along and across the entire layer.

Displacements on a population of conjugate Riedel shears can produce the required strain field and satisfy the Mohr-Coulomb failure condition. However, because the Riedel shears are oblique to the layer, any single shear plane can accommodate only a displacement that is a small fraction of the layer thickness. The plane must then be abandoned and a new plane activated.

For this reason, we argue that localization is inhibited in these experiments. In gouge, like other granular materials such as sandy soil, shear strain spontaneously localizes into shear bands. However, the kinematic constraints imposed on gouge in a sheared layer are such that localization cannot persist in one place for very long.

Layer-parallel Y shears. The preceding argument leads to a paradox when we acknowledge that Y-shears are also observed in gouge layers. While Riedel shears are the first evidence of localization, Y-shears emerge as the shear strain becomes large. This is most obvious in rotary shear experiments [e.g., Mandl et al., 1977; Blanpied et al., 1988] but has also been observed in double-direct-shear and triaxial sawcut experiments with relatively large shear displacements. Y-shears sometimes form close to the boundary between the gouge and the solid wall but are often in the middle of the gouge layer.

It appears to make sense that a single Y-shear should form in a sheared layer, as it can accommodate indefinite amounts of shear strain. A Y-shear is not, however, optimally oriented for the stress field inferred here and observed by Mandl et al. [1977]. If the applied shear stress is sufficient to drive slip on a Y-shear, the optimally oriented Riedel shears should be well past failure, if the same coefficient of internal friction is used.

One of the assumptions made in the present analysis must break down when Y-shears develop. Their development may be involved with the development of heterogeneity within the gouge layer, as suggested by the transition in frictional behavior observed by Marone et al. [1992]. This heterogeneity might be in the stress field, but it is perhaps more likely that the material properties become heterogeneous. For example, a sublayer of finer-grained gouge might form, which for some reason has a lower internal friction than does the rest of the gouge. These explanations are far from precise, and the formation of Y-shears invites further study.

The Rate Dependence of Apparent Friction

The success of our analysis of apparent friction invites a brief discussion of its implications for the more subtle issue of frictional stability.

Rate- and state-dependent friction laws [Dieterich, 1981; Ruina, 1983] are the accepted framework for quantifying frictional stability, although for the most part these laws are phenomenological. For bare surfaces, a reasonably precise micromechanical justification for the phenomenology has been proposed, on the basis of the evolution of the population of asperities that provide the real contact between surfaces. Observations of asperities between sliding lucite blocks provide direct evidence of these micromechanical processes [Kilgore and Dieterich, 1992].

The micromechanics of rate dependence in the apparent friction of a gouge layer is presumably more complicated. The strain in a granular gouge layer may be accommodated by grain fragmentation and rotation as well as slip on intergranular asperities.

Experimental observations of gouge layers show that the rate dependence of friction and the critical displacement over which rate dependence evolves change with shear strain [e.g., Biegel et al., 1989; Marone et al., 1992]. This presumably reflects a change in the balance of mechanisms that accommodate strain. Our results provide an indicator of these same mechanisms. For example, when the rate of densification is high, grain fragmentation (a rate-strengthening process) is certainly very active. As the rate of densification decreases, we might expect to move toward rate-weakening behavior.

The evolution of strain localization discussed above probably affects the characteristic displacement. If extrusion is occurring, strain must be distributed throughout the layer, whereas if a Y-shear forms, then strain is localized within the layer; this transition probably leads to a reduction in the critical displacement.

The Strength of Natural Fault Zones

Extrapolating from carefully controlled laboratory conditions to natural fault zones is necessarily speculative. The mechanical processes we have analyzed are, however, sufficiently simple and general that there is no reason not to expect similar conditions to give rise to similar results on geological scales. We must therefore discuss the likelihood that anything resembling our experimental conditions might arise in nature.

A motivation for such a discussion is the apparent weakness of major crustal fault zones (see Hickman [1991] for a review). Observations of the heat flow and stress orientation associated with the San Andreas fault in California suggest that the frictional strength of this mature, active fault is low both in an absolute sense and relative to other faults in the immediate vicinity. These observations are most easily reconciled if the apparent friction of the fault zone is reduced to around 0.1.

While the results reported here do not offer values of apparent friction as low as 0.1, it is worth considering how large an effect the processes of extrusion and densification might have in nature.
Extrusion. To obtain an apparent friction of 0.1 for a layer of quartz gouge at constant density would require a thinning ratio of around ~2. It seems very unlikely that such a value would arise, or even less persist, in nature.

Furthermore, to appeal to any effect of extrusion in a natural fault zone requires an explanation of the fate of the extruded gouge. The fault zone presumably forms a closed system, so layer thinning in one place must be balanced by layer thickening nearby. The apparent friction of a thickening layer can be obtained using the same analysis (e.g., equation (24)) with positive values of the thinning ratio $T$. For values of $T$ less than about 0.2, a thickening layer strengthens with $T$ at about the same rate that a thinning layer weakens. Therefore a closed fault zone containing complementary thinning and thickening regions would have an average apparent friction of around $\sin \phi$. This value is 0.66 in the experiments presented here, far in excess of the low apparent friction suggested by the heat flow and stress orientation around “weak” faults.

There is also some possibility of lateral extrusion in a fault zone. We have not analyzed the mechanical consequences of such behavior in detail. If the gouge could somehow escape, perhaps through upward extrusion to the surface, layer thinning would occur without complementary layer thickening, and the fault zone would be weakened.

Densification. The densification effect is also clearly not sustainable in a uniform fault zone experiencing continuing displacement. It may, however, feature in the mechanics of a fault zone that is continuing to widen with time, incorporating more gouge by fragmentation of the surrounding country rocks. It is conceivable that the extremely low values of apparent friction seen in the early parts of our experiments (see Figure 7) might apply in such circumstances. It would be possible to develop the present analysis to describe such circumstances, with the introduction of additional constitutive assumptions for the rate of widening of the fault zone and the initial density of new gouge. The analysis should then, however, include the effects of dilution in the country rocks that would accompany fragmentation. By analogy with the preceding discussion of extrusion, complementary thinning due to densification and thickening due to dilatant fragmentation would probably cancel each other out.

Conclusions

1. Layer thinning observed in double-direct-shear experiments on granular quartz gouge can be attributed to extrusion and densification of the gouge layer. Thicker layers generally display more thinning and lower apparent friction.

2. In analyzing the process of extrusion, the observed strain can be used to estimate the orientation of the stress tensor and hence relate the apparent friction of the layer to the internal friction of the gouge. The assumptions of plane strain and of coaxiality of deviatoric stress and plastic strain rate are made in this analysis. Allowing only for extrusion, a constant value of internal friction ($\tan \phi = 0.88$) that fits experiments with less thinning systematically overpredicts the apparent friction for experiments with more thinning.

3. Extending the analysis to include thinning due to densification can reduce the predicted apparent friction (for the same value of internal friction) and improve the fit to the observations, particularly for coarse gouge in which considerable fragmentation occurs. This analysis introduces one additional material parameter, in the form of the constant $R$ in a flow law relating volumetric strain to shear strain and the state of stress.

4. The rate of thinning due to extrusion is probably controlled by the ratio of layer thickness to the overall layer length (“geometric thinning”). This effect may be peculiar to the double-direct-shear experimental configuration.

5. While is unlikely that the processes observed and analyzed here are directly applicable to natural fault zones, the mechanical analysis described here is quite general and should apply to experiments on gouge in other experimental configurations.
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