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Abstract

An analysis of the theoretical displacement field around a single dip-slip fault at depth reveals that normal and reverse fault drag develop by perturbation flow induced by fault slip. We analytically model the heterogeneous part of the instantaneous displacement field of an isolated two-dimensional mode II fault in an infinite, homogeneous elastic body in response to fault slip. Material on both sides of the fault is displaced and ‘opposing circulation cells’ arise on opposite sides of the fault, with displacement magnitudes increasing towards the center of the fault. Both normal and reverse drag can develop at the fault center depending on the angle between the markers and the fault; normal drag develops there for low angles (\( \langle 30–40^\circ \)) and reverse drag for higher angles. A comparison of the theoretical results with published models and natural examples reveals that the characteristics of normal and reverse fault drag are largely insensitive to the scale and rheology of the faulted rocks and that drag forces generated by frictional resistance need not be the primary cause of fault drag. Fault drag has some interesting geometric implications for normal and reverse fault terminology emphasizing the importance for discrimination of vertical separation and throw. Furthermore, our results lead us to propose an alternative model for the formation of rollover anticlines above normal faults.
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1. Introduction

Fault drag refers to the deflection of curved markers adjacent to a fault (e.g. Kearey, 1993). Normal drag (Fig. 1) refers to markers that are convex in the direction of slip and reverse drag to markers that are concave in the direction of slip (e.g. Hamblin, 1965). Normal drag is probably the more commonly recognized phenomenon. Several explanations have been proposed to explain reverse drag, such as pre-brittle failure followed by reversal of movement on the fault, elastic and isostatic rebound, diapirism, sagging, differential compaction, and topological irregularities represented by fault overlap zones. Recognizing that reverse drag is not an abnormal structure but a common feature associated with normal faults, Hamblin (1965) suggested a model in which normal slip along a listric fault results in the formation of a rollover anticline. This model has appealed to petroleum geologists because of the potential of the anticline to form a hydrocarbon trap (e.g. Tearpock and Bischke, 2003) and has been widely accepted in structural geology textbooks (e.g. Twiss and Moores, 1992). However, Barnett et al. (1987) suggested that reverse drag results from a local decrease in displacement in the fault-normal direction and warned that hanging wall rollover anticlines cannot be used to distinguish listric from planar normal faults. Furthermore, Reches and Eidelman (1995) have shown by means of numerical modeling that fault drag reflects non-uniform deformation near a fault and that reverse drag may also form above anti-listric faults. While Reches and Eidelman (1995) demonstrated that drag effects can change along a single fault from reverse at its center to normal at its termination, they concluded (a) that reverse drag is mainly associated with ‘short’ faults (of unspecified length), and (b) that there is no consistent rule-of-thumb for fault drag. Grasemann et al. (2003) investigated with a finite element model the deflection of markers around a fault of finite length in a linear viscous medium. They considered various far-field velocity boundary conditions and
We use predictions of standard linear elasticity of large strain, complex flanking structures, which may field caused by fault slip. For the progressive developments investigating the heterogeneous part of the deformation development of fault drag along a single fault by major goal of this study is to explain the instantaneous explanation why normal or reverse drag forms is given. Our aim here is to demonstrate how normal and reverse drag can develop naturally because of heterogeneous deformation around a fault, in accord with previous suggestions (Barnett et al., 1987; Reches and Eidelman, 1995). We use predictions of standard linear elasticity theory to describe the displacement fields around a fault idealized as a mode II fracture. Note that we do not consider fault-inception folds (e.g. van der Pluijm and Marshak, 2003) showed that the drag of a central marker is only a function of the angle $\theta$, the acute angle measured from the fault to the undeformed central marker (anticlockwise angles are positive). At low angles ($|\theta| < \sim 30^\circ$) faults develop a normal drag but if the marker meets the fault at higher angles ($|\theta| > \sim 30^\circ$) reverse drag develops (compare Fig. 1). Surprisingly, the model results suggest that the type of fault drag is independent of the kinematic vorticity number of the far-field deformation, but no further explanation why normal or reverse drag forms is given and therefore its origin is still unknown. Our aim here is to demonstrate how normal and reverse drag can develop naturally because of heterogeneous deformation around a fault, in accord with previous suggestions (Barnett et al., 1987; Reches and Eidelman, 1995). We use predictions of standard linear elasticity theory to describe the displacement fields around a fault idealized as a mode II fracture. Note that we do not consider fault-inception folds (e.g. van der Pluijm and Marshak, 2004) that include all folds that developed during ductile deformation preceding faulting (e.g. fault folds, flexure faults). Furthermore, we do not model drag folds, which are folds that have formed by shear parallel to layering (Ramberg, 1963) but focus on folds that develop in response to single slip along a fault. However, we are aware that fault-inception folds, drag folds or pre-brittle failure followed by reversal of movement on the fault might result in similar geometric pictures discussed in this work. The major goal of this study is to explain the instantaneous development of fault drag along a single fault by investigating the heterogeneous part of the deformation field caused by fault slip. For the progressive developments of large strain, complex flanking structures, which may record rotation of faults and fault slip reversals, the readers are referred to the work of Exner et al. (2004) and references cited therein.

2. Conceptual model

When a fault slips, heterogeneous stress and displacement fields develop in the surrounding rock (Pollard and Segall, 1987). In order to understand the associated drag effects, we idealize a fault as a simple two-dimensional crack with plane strain sliding displacement (mode II) in an infinite elastic body. We also postulate that the driving stress $\Delta \sigma$, the difference between the shear traction on the fault before and after slip (Pollard and Segall, 1987), is uniform. The slip distribution on such a fault is elliptical, reaching a maximum at the center of the fault and dropping to zero at the fault tips (Rippon, 1985; Barnett et al., 1987; Pollard and Segall, 1987; Walsh and Watterson, 1989). A nearly elliptical slip pattern also is conceivable for a fault that is more than two fault lengths below the surface. Decidedly non-elliptical and asymmetric slip distributions can arise, however, for many reasons (Bürgmann et al., 1994), such as non-uniform driving stresses, irregular fault geometries, interactions with other faults, or intersections with a free surface (e.g. the earth’s surface). Where the slip distribution is not elliptical, the complete displacement field will yield drag patterns different to those we describe here. We focus on certain first-order processes that lead to fault drag, and do not address important questions pertaining to the initiation and propagation of faults. Nor do we investigate the progressive development of fault drag along slip surfaces, which rotate or even may record a reversal of fault slip (Exner et al., 2004). We also ignore complex fault geometries. For modeling purposes we assume that all displacement except along the fault is accommodated by continuous deformation, although we are aware that on many natural faults a significant amount of discontinuous deformation is accommodated through secondary syn- and antithetic faults, secondary fracturing, or solution precipitation mechanisms (e.g. Walsh and Watterson, 1991; Martel and Boger, 1998).
geometries of fault drag in different lithologies and in a wide range of non-to high-grade metamorphic rocks (Passchier, 2001) suggest that certain basic characteristics of fault drag are largely scale independent. Existing theoretical treatments also reveal only a minor dependence on the rheology of the host rock (e.g. Barr and Houseman, 1992; Grasemann and Stüwe, 2001). In light of these findings, we contend that an elastic analysis should provide insight into fault drag.

Because we are interested in the instantaneous development of fault drag, which is caused by heterogeneous deformation induced by the fault slip, we ignore the homogeneous part of the deformation, which is a common procedure in analytical solutions (e.g. ignoring the second part of eq. 28.8 which is related to the remote stress in Pollard and Segall (1987)). In other words we focus on the heterogeneous deformation caused by the relative motion of a mode II crack ignoring any homogeneous background field. This displacement field is similar to the perturbation flow (e.g. Cobbold, 1975; Mancktelow, 1991), which has been recently used by Passchier et al. (2005) to classify natural structures. As a consequence the homogeneous background field and its orientation are immaterial for the origin (not the sense of slip, magnitude of drag, etc.) of fault drag, because homogeneous deformation cannot bend/fold/drag initially linear marker lines. For the further progressive development of fault drag the readers are referred to analogue and numerical models published elsewhere (Grasemann et al., 2003; Exner et al., 2004; Wiesmayr and Grasemann, 2005; Passchier et al., 2005).

The fault in our two-dimensional model extends along the x-axis from \( x = -a \) to \( x = a \). Displacements are confined to the \( x, y \)-plane and do not vary in the \( z \)-direction (i.e. we consider a plane strain case). Slip occurs if the ambient remote shear stress parallel to the fault differs from the shear traction on the fault, the difference of both is known as the driving stress \( \Delta \sigma \). However, the uniform ambient stress field causes a homogeneous deformation field that does not contribute to fault drag (planar markers can be deformed but they remain planar). Therefore, we focus on the displacement field associated with slip on the fault, which results in a non-homogeneous deformation field responsible for the fault drag.

2.1. Stress functions for a mode II fault

We calculate the displacement field around a fault that has slipped using Westergaard stress functions (Westergaard, 1939; Tada et al., 2000). The interested reader can consult (Pollard and Segall, 1987; Bürgmann et al., 1994; Martel, 1997, 1999) for more detailed mathematical and physical aspects of these functions.

The displacement components \( u_x \) and \( u_y \) are found from two complex functions, and \( Z \) (Tada et al., 2000):

\[
\begin{align*}
  u_x &= \frac{1}{2G}(2(1-\nu)\text{Im} \, Z + y \, \text{Re} \, Z) \\
  u_y &= \frac{1}{2G}((-1-2\nu)\text{Re} \, Z - y \, \text{Im} \, Z)
\end{align*}
\]  

(1a)

where \( \nu \) is Poisson’s ratio, \( G \) is the modulus of rigidity (i.e. shear modulus), and

\[
Z = \frac{d\bar{Z}}{dz}
\]

(2)

The stress functions that yield the displacement field solely due to slip on a fault with a uniform driving stress are (Tada et al., 2000):

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{Z} &= \Delta \sigma \left( \sqrt{z - a\sqrt{z} + a - z} \right) \\
Z &= \Delta \sigma \left( \frac{z}{\sqrt{z - a\sqrt{z} + a}} - 1 \right)
\end{align*}
\]  

(3a, 3b)

where \( z = x + iy \). Note, that the term \( \sqrt{z^2 - a^2} \) is factored as \( \sqrt{z - a\sqrt{z} + a} \) in order to yield correct values for the stress functions in all four quadrants of the complex plane (for a detailed discussion see Martel (1997)).

2.2. Displacement field near the center of a fault

The displacement field associated with fault slip is complex and heterogeneous. As a result, slip on a fault will cause an offset marker to be deformed as well. In order to describe this deformation as clearly as we can, we discuss the \( x \)- and \( y \)-components of the displacement field separately (Fig. 2). We pay particular attention to the effects on a marker that passes through the center of a fault; we henceforth call such a marker a central marker. As we will show, the deformation near the center of a fault is relatively uniform, so a marker does not need to pass precisely through the center of a fault to display the drag characteristics we discuss below.

First consider the displacement in the \( x \)-direction of a central marker perpendicular to the fault (Fig. 2a). The displacements along the marker are exclusively in the \( x \)-direction (\( u_y = 0 \)) and increase towards the fault:

\[
u_{_x}_{|_{\gamma = 0}} = \frac{\Delta \sigma \, a}{2G} \left[ 2(1-\nu)\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\gamma}{a}\right)^2} - (3 - 2\nu)\frac{\gamma}{a} \right] \text{sgn}(\gamma)
\]

(4a)

The radical terms can be expanded using the binomial theorem. Dropping terms of \( (\gamma/a) \) higher than first order yields a simpler approximate expression:

\[
u_{_x} \approx \frac{\Delta \sigma \, a}{2G} \left[ 2(1-\nu) - (3 - 2\nu)\frac{\gamma}{a} \right]
\]

(4b)

This matches eq. 8.59b of Pollard and Segall (1987) for the approximate value of \( u_y \) anywhere within roughly half a fault length from the fault center. Interestingly, Eq. (4b) is
not a function of $x$, reflecting the fact that $u_x$ changes little with $x$ near the center of the fault. The term in square brackets corresponds to the fault wall displacement at the center of the fault (i.e. half the maximum slip). The remainder of the expression reveals a nearly linear decay in $u_x$ with distance from the fault; note that the terms containing Poisson’s ratio are positive because $\nu$ is less than 0.5. The fault-parallel component of displacement causes a central marker perpendicular to the fault to be bent concave in the direction of slip: a reverse drag contribution develops. The same conclusion applies to fault-perpendicular markers near the fault center in light of Eq. (4b), as well as to originally planar markers of other orientations.

Now consider the displacement in the $y$-direction (Fig. 2b). We start by considering $u_y$ along the plane of the fault, which has a simple, exact analytical form (Pollard and Segall, 1987):

$$u_y \big|_{y=0} = \frac{\Delta \sigma}{2G} \left( 1 - 2\nu \right) x, \quad |x| \leq a \quad (5a)$$

$$u_y \big|_{y=0} = \frac{\Delta \sigma}{2G} \left( 1 - 2\nu \right) \left( x - \sqrt{x^2 - a^2} \right), \quad |x| > a \quad (5b)$$

Figs. 2b and 3 show a counterclockwise rotation of the medium containing the fault for the ‘apparent right-lateral’ sense of slip depicted. For an opposite sense of slip, the rotation would be clockwise. Adjacent to the fault ($|x| \leq a$, $y=0^{\pm}$) $u_x$ is directly proportional to the distance from the center of the fault and the driving stress (see Eq. (5a)). This
means that the rock bordering the fault experiences a uniform rotation, with the amount of rotation scaling with the driving stress (Martel, 1999). Pollard and Segall (1987) show that Eq. (5a) is also the first-order solution for $u_y$ anywhere within roughly half a fault length from the fault center. Analogous to the $u_x$ field near the fault being nearly independent of $x$, the $u_y$ field near the fault is nearly independent of $y$ (compare Fig. 2a and b). The $u_y$ field near the fault thus would cause a marker adjacent and parallel to the fault to be rotated but not bent. With increasing distance $r$ from the fault center though, $u_y$ (as well as $u_x$) decreases, eventually decaying as $a/r$. The rotation becomes negligible far from the fault. As a result, originally planar markers that are oblique to the fault are rotated more strongly near the fault center than they are far from the fault. This rotation change causes the marker to be bent (dragged) in a direction that is concave in the direction of slip. However, the fault-normal component of displacement causes a central marker oblique to the fault to be bent convex in the direction of slip: a normal drag contribution develops (this superposition of a normal drag on the reverse drag is discussed in more detail below, compare Fig. 7a and c). Although our focus is primary on deformation of a marker near a fault, we show one example of how deformation along a long marker can be complicated (Fig. 2b). Consider a marker that intersects the fault at a shallow angle: at $x=a$, $u_y$ attains its maximum amplitude (Eqs. (5a) and (5b)) and for $x>a$, $u_y$ decreases monotonically towards zero. The marker is deformed in a complex wave-like shape with an inflexion point opposite the fault tip. The total displacement field around a fault reflects a superposition of both the $u_x$ and $u_y$ components (Fig. 3). Whether a central marker displays normal or reverse drag will depend on the relative contributions of the displacement field to reverse drag and normal drag. Given the complexity of the displacement field around a fault, the sense of drag can vary with orientation of a marker, where a marker intersects a fault, and the position along the marker. The difference between normal drag and normal drag superposed on reverse drag is outlined in more detail in the discussion section.

2.3. Drag of markers

The sense of drag depends on whether a marker becomes concave or convex in the direction of slip. We investigate now how the relative orientation of a fault and a marker affects the direction of marker curvature near a fault using the exact analytical expressions for the displacement field obtained from Eqs. (1a), (1b), (3a) and (3b). We calculate the curvature vector by fitting an osculating circle with radius $R$ to three points on the deformed marker. The curvature $\kappa$, measured in dioptries ($m^{-1}$), is given by:

$$ \kappa = \frac{1}{R} $$

(6)

Close to the fault (i.e. within 1/10 of the fault half-length) our results show that normal drag (negative dioptries) at the fault center arises for fault-marker angles $\theta < \sim 40^\circ$, with reverse drag occurring for fault-marker angles $\theta > \sim 40^\circ$ (dotted line in Fig. 4). However, in natural examples the drag very close to the fault might be difficult to recognize and it has therefore been suggested to investigate fault drag up to a distance of about half the fault-length (e.g. Barnett et al., 1987). If the central marker is evaluated at a larger distance to the fault (e.g. within 3/4 of the fault half-length) normal drag arises for fault-marker angles $\theta < \sim 30^\circ$, with reverse drag occurring for fault-marker angles $\theta > \sim 30^\circ$ (solid line in Fig. 4), which is consistent with results from finite element solutions of Grasemann et al. (2003).

Although our focus is on the fault center, we also investigate how the sense of drag can vary with position along a fault. The theoretical results here allow four classes of drag structures to be distinguished (Fig. 5). However, in order to understand the heterogeneous deformation induced by slip along a fault, we modeled the heterogeneous part of the deformation field without an imposed background strain. Therefore, the instantaneous structures in Fig. 5 cannot be directly compared with finite structures represented by the natural examples in Fig. 6. However, analogue and numerical models of finite deformation and the comparison of model results with natural examples (Grasemann et al., 2003; Exner et al., 2004; Wiesmayr and Grasemann, 2005) show that at low finite strain the geometries are very similar to the instantaneous structures presented in this study. For this reason, we think it is useful to refer to natural examples in the following discussion of our modeled structures, although we are aware that a direct comparison is inadequate.

2.3.1. Normal fault-normal drag

Large-scale examples are so-called ‘low-angle’ normal faults, which commonly reveal a normal drag (e.g. Wernicke, 1981). Other natural examples of this structure at smaller scale are shear bands (Berthé et al., 1979; White, 1981).
1979), which are secondary synthetic slip surfaces. Statistically shear bands have low angles to the shear zone boundary (Passchier, 1984; Goscombe et al., 2004), but depending on the rheology, anisotropy and rotation during progressive deformation, shear bands may be also oriented at higher angles (Platt, 1984; Williams and Price, 1990; Stock, 1992). Typical natural examples of shear bands are illustrated in many publications. For example, Snoke et al. (1998) illustrate shear bands from many different rock types developed under a broad range of metamorphic conditions. Fig. 5a shows a central marker (in a heavy line) with normal drag from our model for $\theta = 20^\circ$. Interestingly, normal drag also develops along the fault in the two quadrants where slip results in a decrease in the mean compressive stress, whereas reverse drag develops in the quadrants where the mean compressive stress increases. Although the orientation of the fault in the field example given in Fig. 6a is higher than in the instantaneous solution (Fig. 5a), the overall geometry of the fault drag of marker lines matches the geometry predicted by our model fairly well.

2.3.2. Normal fault-reverse drag

Hamblin (1965), who coined the term ‘reverse drag’, provided a superb example from the Hurricane Fault (Grand Canyon, Arizona) nearly four decades ago. Grasemann and Stüwe (2001), Passchier (2001) and Grasemann et al. (2003)
described other examples of reverse drag-along faults with extensional slip. Surprisingly few studies exist, however, that focus on the origin of reverse drag (e.g. Hamblin, 1965). Fig. 5b shows a central marker (in a heavy line) with reverse drag from our model for $q_{Z}$40. Note that the sense of drag changes along the model fault in Fig. 5b in a manner analogous to that of Fig. 5a. Our analytical results, represented in Fig. 5b, are consistent with the numerical results of Grasemann et al. (2003), and also similar to the field example of Fig. 6b. Reverse drag associated with regional normal faults is commonly referred to as a rollover anticline. Rollover anticlines typically are attributed to slip along listric normal faults, even though many reported examples of reverse drag do not occur along listric faults. Our model shows that reverse drag does not require curved fault geometry. We discuss this point further below.

2.3.3. Reverse fault-normal drag

Regional reverse faults with normal drag are widely recognized and are commonly attributed to folding that coincides with the upper tip of a thrust fault (e.g. Boyer, 1986; Suppe and Medwedeff, 1990). Passchier (2001) also presented natural examples of reverse faults with normal drag, terming the drag features ‘s-Type flanking folds’. An exceptional illustrative example from the Pin Valley in the NW-Himalayas is given in Fig. 6c. Most of the published examples are associated with a fault ramp that is connected to a flat detachment fault, and the footwall commonly is considered as undeformed (e.g. Jackson and McKenzie, 1983). We find that neither a flat detachment fault nor a rigid footwall is required for normal drag on a reverse fault. Footwall deformation along reverse faults generally has been interpreted as indicating folding preceding faulting during early development of break-thrust folds (Fischer et al., 1992). Nevertheless, McConnell et al. (1997) presented excellent natural examples of fault-related folds, where the hanging walls and footwalls are deformed, displacements decrease up- and down-dip from the centers of the faults,
and fault ramps do not join a flat-lying detachment. The kinematic model of McConnell et al. (1997) for folding yields geometric forms similar to our mechanical model (Fig. 5c). Note that normal drag of the central marker and at the leading edge of the reverse may be accompanied by reverse drag between the fault centers at the trailing tip. Our results thus should be distinguishable from folds considered to be break-thrust folds (Wiesmayr and Grasemann, 2005).

2.3.4. Reverse fault-reverse drag

Fig. 6d shows reverse drag along a reverse fault at a steep angle (≈ 60°) to a mylonitic foliation. Although this structure has been predicted by mechanical finite element models (Grasemann et al., 2003), to our knowledge no natural example has been previously published. In the upper part of the picture above the tip of the fault a leading edge fold can be recognized. Towards the middle of the picture, the slip along the fault increases, revealing a pronounced reverse drag effect. This field example is consistent with our model results of Fig. 5d.

3. Discussion

3.1. Drag forces versus flow perturbation

Explanations of normal drag commonly have appealed to intuition. A typical suggestion invokes a reduction in the flow velocity of the wall rocks owing to frictional resistance along the fault. Therefore fault drag has been used to infer the sense of slip along faults (e.g. Hills, 1963; Billings, 1972; Twiss and Moores, 1992). This practice seems highly suspect to us, especially since the sense of drag can change along the same side of a fault. If drag was produced by frictional resistance to slip, then the amount of drag should increase with frictional resistance. However, mechanical models predict that if frictional resistance to slip increases, the slip on a fault decreases (Pollard and Segall, 1987) but also the drag decreases (Reches and Eidelman, 1995; Grasemann and Stüwe, 2001). Thus if frictional resistance accounted for drag, then the largest fault drag would be expected along faults with vanishing amounts of slip (i.e. where faults are absent; compare Fig. 6a, b and d). This conclusion is untenable. Finally, our investigation reveals that both normal and reverse drag can occur along a single fault (e.g. Figs. 5b and 6d; see also Mansfield and Cartwright, 2000), and that normal drag can be superposed on reverse drag (Figs. 5a and 6a). Frictional resistance cannot account for these observations either. We therefore, reject frictional resistance as a primary cause for fault drag.

3.2. Normal drag sensu stricto, vertical separation, and throw

Our analyses (Fig. 5a and c) and our observations (Fig. 6a and c) of faults show that ‘normal drag’ is in fact a superposition of a normal drag on the reverse drag associated with the fault-parallel displacement field. This has some interesting geometric implications for normal and thrust fault terminology. In our discussion here we follow the terminology of Tearpock and Bischke (2003), which reflects usage in the petroleum exploration community. We take vertical separation (vs) to be the vertical distance between very widely spaced points, which lie in a section perpendicular to the fault plane on opposing sides of a fault along a once continuous horizontal marker (Fig. 7). Throw

![Fig. 7. Both vertical separation vs and throw t can be used to investigate possible fault drag geometries along normal ((a) and (c)) and reverse faults ((b) and (d)): if the throw is less than the vertical separation (\( t_1 < vs \)), then normal drag must exist (1 in (a) and (b)). If the throw equals the vertical separation (\( t_2 = vs \)), then no net drag occurs (3 in (a) and (b)). If throw exceeds the vertical separation (\( t_3 > vs \)) reverse drag must exist (6 in (a) and (b)). If \( vs = 0 \), then the throw must exceed the vertical separation (\( t_4 > vs \)) in (c) and (d) and an offset horizontal marker must record reverse drag. Superposed on this reverse drag could be normal drag (4), no drag (2) or reverse drag (5).](image-url)
Both vertical separation and throw can be used to investigate possible fault drag geometries of a marker through the center of a dip-slip fault (Fig. 7). Three cases are possible. First, the throw is less than the vertical separation \( t_1 < vs \), then normal drag must exist (Fig. 7a and b). Second, if the throw equals the vertical separation \( t_2 = vs \), then no net drag occurs. Third, if throw exceeds the vertical separation \( t_3 > vs \) reverse drag must exist. If no vertical separation occurs across a fault, then the throw must exceed the vertical separation \( t_{1,2,3} > vs \) in Fig. 7c and d). In such a case, an offset horizontal marker must record reverse drag. Superposed on this reverse drag could be normal drag \( t_1 \), no drag \( t_2 \) or reverse drag \( t_3 \). A major result of this simple geometrical observation is that any fault with no vertical separation must have fault drag. Additionally, if no drag occurs across a fault, then vertical separation must occur. Because the established terminology is insufficient to describe complex fault drag geometries, Coelho et al. (2005) have recently suggested a new quantitative descriptive terminology using cubic Bézier curves.

3.3. Listric faults and rollover anticlines

The concept of a listric (based on the Greek word listron or shovel), concave-up normal fault was introduced by Suess (1909) as part of his description of curved faults in the coal mines of Saint-Eloi and Léon (northern France). They are now recognized in many places around the world (e.g. Shelton, 1984). Three features have been considered as characteristic of listric normal faults: a flat detachment surface, a rigid footwall, and hanging wall strata with a dip that increases toward a normal fault (i.e. rollover anticline or reverse drag; Shelton, 1984). Balanced cross-section analyses of listric faults are widely applied to investigate these features, to quantify regional extension, and in the exploration for hydrocarbons (e.g. Tearpock and Bischke, 2003). Rollover anticlines, for example, are one of the most important hydrocarbon traps (Tearpock and Bischke, 2003 and references cited therein). Since these methods also are used to assess the geometry of normal faults, which can seal subsurface fluid flow, they are important in defining the volume of a hydrocarbon reservoir (Hardman and Booth, 1991). The impact and widespread use of listric fault models prompt us to re-examine two of the commonly held perceptions about these faults.

We start with the assumption that a hanging wall rollover implies a listric fault geometry (e.g. Shelton, 1984 and references therein). This assumption seems highly precarious to us. First, although listric faults appear common, not all normal faults have listric geometries. For example, seismic reflection data commonly indicate normal fault traces that are not concave up in cross-sections (e.g. Jackson, 1987). Additionally, earthquake data provide little evidence for the notion that large-scale normal faults invariably flatten with depth. Second, reverse drag and rollover-like geometries occur at all scales and within a broad range of different homogeneous and heterogeneous rheologies (compare the presented and referenced examples in this work), including faults that have non-listric geometries. Third, in addition to our results, many mechanical models of planar faults (King et al., 1988; Gibson et al., 1989; Ma and Kusznir, 1993; Reches and Eidelman, 1995; Grasemann et al., 2003) show reverse drag. So listric fault geometries are not a prerequisite for reverse drag to develop. Our results show instead that reverse drag can be a consequence of heterogeneous perturbation deformation as a result of fault slip. Although other mechanisms before, during or after faulting could affect the development of reverse fault drag, we are in accord with Barnett et al. (1987) who suggested that the displacement field associated with slip is the primary cause for reverse drag (e.g. Fig. 5b).

The second perception that appears suspect to us is that the footwall of a normal fault is rigid. This assumption has no mechanical basis, and it certainly does not make sense in cases where rocks of similar lithology (or rheology) are juxtaposed by faulting (Kusznir et al., 1991). Indeed, geodetic measurements for single slip events, high-resolution three-dimensional seismic data sets, and detailed investigations of faults in outcrops commonly reveal reverse drag profiles in both the hanging wall and footwall (Kasahara, 1981; McConnell et al., 1997; Mansfield and Cartwright, 2000). A few reasons might contribute to the perception that fault footwalls are rigid.

The first is that displacements (and drag effects) in the footwall can be much less than those in the hanging wall. Such an association would be strong evidence for a stiffness difference for faults that are substantially deeper than their down-dip extent (i.e. faults that behave as though they were in an infinite body). Mechanical analyses of normal faults that intersect or interact with the earth’s surface, however, reveal decidedly different slip profiles from faults far from the surface. Surface-breaching faults or near-surface faults tend to have a slip maximum at or near the surface rather than near the fault center; they offset markers in a manner somewhat similar to that in the lower half of Fig. 5b. Perhaps more significantly though, unlike faults in an infinite elastic body with no free surface, normal faults in an elastic half-space generate an asymmetric displacement field, with greater displacement (and more pronounced drag) in the hanging wall than in the footwall (Ma and Kusznir, 1993; Roberts and Yielding, 1994; Langley, 2000). The contrast in displacement could be mistaken for an
increase in rigidity in the footwall, when it actually reflects a difference in the ‘effective thickness’ of the units on the opposing sides of the fault. For a fault near the surface, the hanging wall is thin relative to the ‘infinitely thick’ footwall. Rigidity (i.e. the shear modulus) is an intrinsic property of a rock and does not depend on the geometry of a rock body. It should not be confused with ‘flexural rigidity’, the resistance to bending, which is highly dependent on the geometry of a body (Turcotte and Schubert, 2002).

A second reason that might contribute to the perception that fault footwalls are rigid is that reverse drag on either side of the fault may be associated with little or no drag on the opposing side, especially if structural levels above or below the central marker are observed (compare Figs. 4 and 5).

A third reason relates to the ease of preparing physical models with rigid footwalls (e.g. McClay et al., 1991) that yield hanging wall deformation akin to that in outcrops or inferred in seismic cross-sections. The similarity in results does not mean that the footwalls of faults in the earth are rigid though.

Listric fault models and the associated hanging wall rollover have been extensively applied by many workers to quantify regional extension, probably due to the ease with which hanging wall collapse may be restored using the vertical shear construction or one of its many derivatives (Yamada and McClay, 2003). However, because these techniques commonly are predicted on the assumption of a listric fault geometry (Tearpock and Bischke, 2003), they will necessarily predict a listric geometry even for faults that are planar. A simple example how a listric fault can be balanced from a modeled planar normal fault with reverse drag is given in Fig. 8.

4. Conclusions

The presented analytical solutions of slip along mode II faults and the resulting fault drag are mechanically grounded predictable geometries, which match natural structures. Therefore, we conclude:

1. Slip along a fault causes a heterogeneous displacement field, with increasing displacement magnitudes towards the fault. This heterogeneous displacement field will cause marker units to be deformed in a manner consistent with what has been called fault drag.
2. Near the center of a fault, the sense of fault drag is mainly a function of the angle between the marker and the fault plane: low angles favor normal drag and high angles favor reverse drag.
3. Normal and reverse drag can develop along the same side of a single fault.
4. A comparison of model results, published models, and natural examples reveals that many key characteristics of normal and reverse fault drag are largely insensitive to the scale of a fault and the rheology of the host rock.
5. Frictional resistance to slip along a fault cannot explain observations of fault drag, and is therefore not the primary cause of fault drag.
6. Understanding the spatial geometry and development of fault drag is important for discrimination of vertical separation and throw of normal and thrust faults. Faults recording no vertical separation in the far field inherently have a reverse drag on which a normal drag can be superimposed.
7. The concept of rollover anticlines forming above listric extensional faults may be alternatively explained by reverse fault drag. The reverse drag model may be a superior explanation for rollover anticlines, especially for normal faults that do not flatten into a subhorizontal detachment or are not listric at all.
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