

# **Relative Dating and Classification of Minerals and Rocks Based on Statistical Calculations Related to Their Potential Energy Index**

Mikhail M. Labushev

Department of Ore Deposits Geology and Prospecting, Institute of Mining, Geology and Geotechnology,  
Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation

Alexander N. Khokhlov

JSC “Geeconomy”, Krasnoyarsk, Russian Federation

## **ABSTRACT**

Index of proportionality of atomic weights of chemical elements is proposed for determining the relative age of minerals and rocks. Their chemical analysis results serve to be initial data for calculations. For rocks of different composition the index is considered to be classification value as well. Crystal lattice energy change in minerals and their associations can be measured by the index value change, thus contributing to the solution of important practical problems. There was determined the effect of more rapid increase of potential energy of limestone with relatively low lattice energy as compared with the others.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The history of relative dating of rocks is associated with the names of Nicolas Steno, 1669; James Hutton, 1795; Georges Cuvier and Alexandre Brongniart, 1811; William Smith, 1815; Charles Lyell, 1830 and Henry Clifton Sorby, 1858. To determine relative age of rocks the following principles of relative chronology [1, 2, 3, and 4] are used:

- superposition
- original horizontality
- lateral continuity
- cross-cutting relationships
- intrusive relationships
- inclusions of igneous rocks
- inclusions and components
- faunal succession
- included fragments

We note that the use of these principles assumes the measurement at nominal or ordinal scales of measurement. New developments in the relative dating field seem to have a large scientific and practical

significance, since the well-known principles have different conditions of application and therefore can complement each other and be used to verify the findings. New principles, using ratio or interval scales are particularly important.

We propose the definition of the relative age of rocks, based on the calculation of the index of proportionality of the atomic weights of chemical elements of minerals and rocks in the interval scale of measurement.

## METHOD

There are three approaches to the energy stability of crystals considering:

- ionic lattice energy (energy required to break crystal into free ions)
- separation into individual atoms (energy required to break crystal into free neutral atoms)
- bonding frames and elektrids [5]

The third approach suggests that a crystal contains atomic frames consisting of nuclei and internal electrons, being not involved in chemical bonding, and elektrid composed of bonding or shared valence electrons as well as nonbonding or unshared ones. In this case we can approximately calculate the energy of any chemical bond in crystals regardless of its type.

As the result of additions and clarifications of the ion lattice classical formula [6, 7], there was derived a formula of adhesion energy of frames and elektrids (MJ/mol) for the general case of crystalline compounds [5]:

$$W = -\frac{1.389\alpha^R q^0 q^e \tau p}{d}$$

where: 1.389 – constant for the expression of the adhesion energy of frames and elektrids in MJ/mol;  $\alpha^R$  – the reduced Madelung constant;  $q^0$  – total effective nuclear charge acting on the valence electrons of atom;  $q^e$  – charge of elektrid;  $\tau$  – repulsion coefficient equal to 0.1-0.7;  $p$  - coefficient characterizing bond covalence, equal to  $(1-f_i^2)^{1/2}$ , where  $f_i$  – bond ionicity;  $d$  - metal - nonmetal internuclear distance in crystal. For complex crystalline compounds there should be used averaged parameters  $q^0, q^e, f_i, d$ .

The formula shows the inversely proportional dependence of the potential energy of crystals and their associations on metal - nonmetal internuclear distance. It is of importance that instead of the changeable the Madelung constant the formula contains the less variable the reduced Madelung constant. These calculations are of practical interest for the study of minerals and rocks. The change of crystal lattice

energy in mineral associations can be probably measured by the averaged internuclear distances change, thus contributing to the solution of important practical problems.

For this purpose it is proposed to calculate  $I_{av}$  index [8] as well. It was established experimentally that the values of the index for minerals and rocks are also inversely proportional to the energy of crystal lattice while being directly proportional to the metal - nonmetal internuclear distance in the studied minerals and rocks. The program named Agemarker can be used for the computing with the online version being available for free calculations at <http://www.skyproject.org/Agemarker/Program>.

To calculate  $I_{av}$  index, the contents of oxides of chemical elements (in nominal mass %) are recalculated in the contents of chemical elements, being then divided into the atomic weights of the respective elements. Each quotient is multiplied by an integer - a multiplier with value being taken from 3 to 30 mln depending on the number of chemical elements in minerals and rocks and the type of the problem considered. To solve a practical problem, multiplier of 3 mln can be taken for a theoretically pure mineral, while for rocks it is recommended multiplier of 10 mln and in theoretical calculations it should be increased to 30 mln.

We obtain the numbers of atomic weights (atoms) of each element in proportion to their content in the initial sample by rounding each multiplication result to integer. For further calculations the amount of atoms of all chemical elements must be a multiple of 8, so the numbers of atoms are multiplied by 8. From this array 8 atomic weights are randomly taken, being then moved into a matrix with three rows and three columns. The ninth element of the matrix is obtained by summing the eight selected atomic weights. The information coefficient of proportionality  $I_p$  is calculated for all the elements. For the rest of the array the information coefficients of proportionality are calculated similarly.

For example, we define  $I_{av}$  indicator for theoretically pure quartz. The initial data is entered into **Oxides Table**, or alternatively, instead of it there can be entered the contents of Si and O into **Elements table**. We set **Multiplier** of 3000000 and use default **Logarithmic base**: e (natural logarithms).

**Oxides Table**

[№]	[Oxide]	[Content, mass %]
1	SiO2	100
2	TiO2	0
3	Al2O3	0
.....		
53	Rb2O	0

## Elements table

[№]	[Element]	[Atomic weight]	[Content, mass %]
1	H	1.008	0
2	He	4.002602	0
3	Li	6.94	0
.....			
95	Am	243.06	0

**Multiplier:** 3000000

**Logarithmic base:** e

AgeMarker calculates theoretical contents of oxygen and silicon for quartz, 53.25633% and 46.74367% respectively. After dividing these quantities by atomic weights of the corresponding elements we obtain 3.3287287 and 1.6643643. Then multiplying by 3000000 and rounding the results to integers we obtain the intermediate numbers of atomic weights 9986186 and 4993093. After multiplying these numbers by 8 we get 79,889,488 and 39,944,744 of atomic weights of oxygen and silicon respectively.

### Atomic weights (total)

[№]	[Atomic weight]
1	0
2	0
3	0
.....	
8	79889488
.....	
14	39944744
.....	
95	0
<b>Atomic weights (total sum):</b>	119834232

The program randomly selects 8 atomic weights from the **total sum** of atomic weights and places them in a 3 x 3 matrix to determine Ip index and **Ip Squareroot** as well as frequency of the calculated Ip index. The resultant distribution is symmetrized by square root extraction. The initial values of Ip indexes can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of data symmetrization. The resultant indicators are considered

to be  $I_{av}$  **Ip Squareroot (Average)** and **Standart deviation (Ip squareroot)** of **Ip Squareroot** distribution. Expected values  $I_{av}$  of symmetrized distributions of sets of information coefficients of proportionality  $I_p$  for atomic weights of minerals and chemical compounds are proposed to be used as main index of the calculations.

[№]	[Ip]	[Ip Squareroot]	[Frequency]
1	0.099772264	0.3158674786	584411
2	0.0923207361	0.3038432756	292803
3	0.1655827922	0.4069186554	584556
4	0.0905180565	0.3008621885	1168087
5	0.1235748975	0.351532214	1170030
6	0.0735236189	0.2711523906	584692
7	0.126016232	0.3549876505	584412
8	0.173626176	0.4166847441	291972
9	0.1420545833	0.3769012912	1168535
10	0.1895919516	0.4354215792	291463
11	0.1155315136	0.3398992698	1169486
12	0.1171954151	0.342338159	146268
13	0.1484078718	0.3852374226	876494
14	0.0564526157	0.2375975919	292608
15	0.1042890843	0.3229382051	219534
16	0.1101189103	0.3318416947	587580
17	0.0988927211	0.3144721308	146367
18	0.1606005409	0.400749973	291746
19	0.0976366955	0.3124687112	583701
20	0.1663667687	0.4078808266	291774
21	0.1796040937	0.4237972318	73175
22	0.1072237919	0.327450442	293292
23	0.1183699904	0.3440494011	146430
24	0.1384144667	0.3720409476	145526
25	0.1409563439	0.3754415319	582217
26	0.1315333699	0.3626752955	18409
27	0.0837856815	0.2894575643	291936
28	0.1199959733	0.3464043494	72999
29	0.071076287	0.2666013634	292252
30	0.113309201	0.3366143209	291982
31	0.0768448784	0.2772090879	291782
32	0.13476582	0.3671046444	293129
33	0.0923971236	0.3039689518	73008
34	0.1454787113	0.3814167161	73384
35	0.1551215649	0.3938547511	36785
36	0.1241362182	0.352329701	146154
37	0.1346859848	0.3669958921	73320
38	0.1149248861	0.3390057317	72852
39	0.041555131	0.2038507567	36952

40	0.1400823481	0.3742757647	146025
41	0.0630994573	0.2511960535	73188
42	0.0848703817	0.2913252163	18030
43	0.2067173055	0.4546617484	36361
44	0.0797992945	0.282487689	36574
45	0.1536317302	0.3919588374	18608
46	0.0970657487	0.3115537654	18390

**Ip (Average):** 0.1196745928

**Variance:** 0.0009143832

**Standart deviation:** 0.0302387703

**Ip Squareroot (Average):** 0.3430699931

**Variance (Ip squareroot):** 0.0019775727

**Standart deviation (Ip squareroot):** 0.0444699084

Minerals and rocks are characterized by unimodal distributions of  $I_p$  indices, which are satisfactorily symmetrized by the extraction of square root from each coefficient. Expected values  $I_{av}$  of the symmetrized  $I_p$  distributions for minerals and rocks **Ip squareroot (average)** are proposed to be used both as an indicators of the change of the potential energy of minerals and rocks, and as classification indices.


To characterize theoretically pure quartz, dolomite and calcite there were carried out  $I_{av}$  indices calculations (Table 1), which were compared with the Si-O internuclear distance in  $\alpha$ -quartz, Ca-O and MgO internuclear distances in dolomite and Ca-O one in calcite as well as with their lattices energy.

**Table 1:** Energy characteristics and  $I_{av}$  indices for theoretically pure quartz, calcite and dolomite

Characteristics	Purity Silica	Purity dolomite	Purity calcite
Crystal lattice energy (kJ/mol)	12535 [9]	6600.8 [10]	3163.5 [10]
Internuclear distance, nm	0.161[11]	0.2268*	0.2381[12]
$I_{av}$	0.3430	0.3501	0.3587

Note. \* Internuclear distance for dolomite is taken as a weighted average of Ca - O and Mg - O internuclear distances, equal to 0.2381 and 0.2081, respectively [13] on the theoretical content of CaO and MgO in dolomite.

All calculated  $I_{av}$  indices are directly proportional to Si-O internuclear distance in  $\alpha$ -quartz, Ca-O and MgO internuclear distances in dolomite and Ca-O one in calcite and inversely proportional to the lattice energy. The regularities are shown grafically in Figure 1.



**Figure 1:** Relation between the lattice energy and indices:  $I_{av}$  and the internuclear distance in molecules.

The similar calculations were made for the reference materials of natural quartz, dolomite and limestone of the British Chemical Standard-Certified Reference Material (BCS-CRM) [14] (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Reference materials of natural quartz, dolomite and limestone BCS-CRM

Components	Description				
	High Purity Silica 313/1 (...)	Dolomite 512 (...)	Dolomite ...(782-1)	Limestone 513 (...)	Limestone 393 (752-1)
SiO <sub>2</sub>	<b>99.78</b>	<b>0.379</b>	<b>0.266</b>	<b>0.228</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	<b>0.036</b>	<b>0.055</b>	<b>0.104</b>	<b>0.108</b>	<b>0.12</b>
TiO <sub>2</sub>	<b>0.017</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.0042</b>	0.004	<b>0.009</b>
Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.0275</b>	<b>0.045</b>
MnO	<b>0.00013</b>	<b>0.0036</b>	<b>0.081</b>	<b>0.0095</b>	<b>0.01</b>
CaO	<b>0.006</b>	<b>30.61</b>	<b>30.34</b>	<b>55.59</b>	<b>55.4</b>
MgO	<b>0.0013</b>	<b>21.59</b>	<b>21.29</b>	<b>0.182</b>	<b>0.15</b>

Components	Description				
	High Purity Silica 313/1 (...)	Dolomite 512 (...)	Dolomite ...(782-1)	Limestone 513 (...)	Limestone 393 (752-1)
Na <sub>2</sub> O	<b>0.003</b>	0.1	...	<0.3	0.02
K <sub>2</sub> O	<b>0.005</b>	<0.02	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.02</b>
BaO	...	<0.02	0.0008	0.01	<b>0.006</b>
Cr <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	<0.0002	<0.001	<b>0.0009</b>	<b>0.0012</b>	...
PbO	...	<0.001	<b>0.0029</b>	<b>0.0009</b>	...
ZnO	...	<0.01	<b>0.0082</b>	<b>0.0014</b>	...
P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	...	<0.02	<b>0.0128</b>	0.005	0.005
ZrO <sub>2</sub>	0.002	...	...	...	...
S	...	<0.05	0.016	<b>0.0097</b>	<b>0.007</b>
L.O.I.	0.1	<b>46.8</b>	<b>47.25</b>	<b>43.61</b>	<b>43.4</b>
B <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	...	...	0.0039	...	...
Li <sub>2</sub> O	0.0005	...	...	...	...
SrO	...	<b>0.024</b>	...	<b>0.0176</b>	<b>0.019</b>
As	...	<0.003	...	<0.001	...
C	...	12.4	...	11.9	...
Cd	...	<0.0003	...	<0.001	...
F	...	0.01	...	0.002	<0.01
Ni	...	<0.001	0.0004	<0.001	...

Note. Chemical composition is given in nominal mass content in %. Figures in bold correspond to certified contents, while the rest ones characterize approximate contents. L.O.I. are set as losses on ignition and associated with the carbon content in reference materials.

For these reference materials  $I_{av}$  indices are also directly proportional to the Si-O internuclear distance in  $\alpha$ -quartz, Ca-O and MgO internuclear distance in dolomite and Ca-O one in calcite (Table 3), but natural formations differ from the theoretical pure ones in bigger  $I_{av}$  indices, as their impurities reduced the lattice energy.



**Table 3:**  $I_{av}$  indices for BCS-CRM reference materials of natural quartz, dolomite and limestone

Statistics	Description				
	High Purity Silica 313/1 (...)	Dolomite 512 (...)	Dolomite ...(782-1)	Limestone 513 (...)	Limestone 393 (752-1)
$I_{av}$	0.3431	0.3528	0.3549	0.3612	0.3640
Standart deviation	0.0445	0.0685	0.0711	0.0816	0.0839

### RELATIVE DATING RESULTS

We studied the records of geological sections of Cambrian, Ordovician and Upper Silurian and Lower Devonian limestones and dolomites in Virginia. [15] The results of chemical analyzes of these rocks were processed by AgeMarker program (Table 4). We analyzed the change in  $I_{av}$  indices for the rocks of different ages with the same composition and for the rocks of the same age with different composition.

**Table 4:** Characteristics of Virginia limestone and dolomite

Geologic Section No	Units No	AgeMarker Multiplier	Number of $I_p$ calculations	$I_{av}$	Standart deviation $I_p$	Rock	Thick-ness, feet	Mass content $SiO_2$ in %
2	7	10000000	49904153	0.3586(3)	0.0741	Ordovician limestone	144	0.33
2	3 and 4	10000000	49784803	0.3585(3)	0.0739	Ordovician limestone	92	0.74
2	1	10000000	53133141	0.3508(8)	0.0625	Ordovician dolomite	307	7.28
8	3	10000000	50025679	0.3584(5)	0.0738	Ordovician limestone	32	1.28
8	2	10000000	50063135	0.3583(5)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	65	1.46
9	10	10000000	50086178	0.3585(0)	0.0739	Ordovician limestone	70	0.84
9	9	10000000	52291947	0.3578(6)	0.0729	Ordovician limestone	7	5.04
9	8	10000000	50012161	0.3584(0)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	85	1.32
9	5	10000000	49824939	0.3583(1)	0.0736	Ordovician limestone	48	1.52
11	from 1 to 3	10000000	50017304	0.3582(9)	0.0736	Ordovician limestone	31	2.00

Geologic Section No	Units No	AgeMarker Multiplier	Number of I <sub>p</sub> calculations	I <sub>av</sub>	Standart deviation I <sub>p</sub>	Rock	Thick-ness, feet	Mass content SiO <sub>2</sub> in %
15	16	10000000	49691119	0.3577(0)	0.0727	Ordovician limestone	109	6.68
15	from 13 to 15	10000000	49847621	0.3583(4)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	131	1.52
15	12	10000000	49865257	0.3578(9)	0.0729	Ordovician limestone	37	4.52
17	43, 45 and 46	10000000	49848900	0.3584(0)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	22	1.52
17	from 1 to 29	10000000	49959146	0.3573(1)	0.0721	Ordovician limestone	120	6.20
21	5	10000000	49892556	0.3584(1)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	60	1.12
21	1	10000000	50074539	0.3571(1)	0.0718	Ordovician limestone	49	6.56
29	12	10000000	50106520	0.3578(0)	0.0728	Ordovician limestone	40	4.52
29	from 9 to 11	10000000	49993043	0.3583(5)	0.0736	Ordovician limestone	32	1.64
34	4 и 5	10000000	49975547	0.3585(0)	0.0739	Ordovician limestone	112	0.43
34	2 and 3	10000000	49667484	0.3570(1)	0.0715	Ordovician limestone	48	9.77
34	1		49927934	0.3585(4)	0.0740	Ordovician limestone	25	1.03
36	30	10000000	49884089	0.3583(5)	0.0737	Ordovician limestone	104	1.00
36	from 28 to 29	10000000	50029229	0.3577(4)	0.0728	Ordovician limestone	51	3.40
37	5	10000000	49861590	0.3585(0)	0.0739	Ordovician dolomite	20	0.40
38	5	10000000	49773156	0.3584(0)	0.0738	* US and LD limestone	18	0.73
38	4	10000000	50007731	0.3577(2)	0.0728	US and LD limestone	34	3.55
40	9	10000000	49631495	0.3580(3)	0.0732	US and LD limestone	60	5.05
40	from 2 to 4	10000000	49665347	0.3563(8)	0.0705	US and LD limestone	34	14.64
43	6	10000000	49783189	0.3586(4)	0.0741	US and LD limestone	60	0.23
44	8	10000000	49680193	0.3582(7)	0.0736	US and LD limestone	38	2.83
44	6	10000000	49821944	0.3582(6)	0.0736	US and LD limestone	39	1.30
44	1	10000000	49939125	0.3579(8)	0.0731	US and LD limestone	7	3.57
45	5	10000000	49743343	0.3579(0)	0.0729	US and LD limestone	55	5.04

Geologic Section No	Units No	AgeMarker Multiplier	Number of I <sub>p</sub> calculations	I <sub>av</sub>	Standart deviation I <sub>p</sub>	Rock	Thick-ness, feet	Mass content SiO <sub>2</sub> in %
45	1	10000000	49978109	0.3580(0)	0.0731	US and LD limestone	50	3.75
46	16	10000000	49940850	0.3580(3)	0.0732	US and LD limestone	91	4.08
46	2	10000000	50064257	0.3577(1)	0.0727	US and LD limestone	50	4.61
48	from 6 to 7	20000000	99697801	0.3583(0)	0.0736	US and LD limestone	54	0.58
50	9 and 10	10000000	53974244	0.3505(0)	0.0621	Cambrian dolomite	298	3.48
50	6 and 7	10000000	53876383	0.3505(3)	0.0621	Cambrian dolomite	519	1.44
50	from 1 to 5	10000000	53852944	0.3510(5)	0.0632	Cambrian dolomite	391	1.00
51	from 1 to 4	10000000	54178825	0.3503(9)	0.0619	Cambrian dolomite	603	1.15
52	from 7 to 9	10000000	53854054	0.3504(4)	0.0619	Cambrian dolomite	535	4.84
52	from 1 to 6	10000000	53703292	0.3512(2)	0.0634	Cambrian dolomite	756	1.00
53	3	10000000	53699762	0.3502(4)	0.0614	Cambrian dolomite	530	9.04
53	2	10000000	53167694	0.3505(6)	0.0619	Cambrian dolomite	112	10.28
53	1	10000000	53709620	0.3502(9)	0.0615	Cambrian dolomite	155	7.52
54	from 2 to 4, 6	10000000	54018910	0.3504(8)	0.0620	Cambrian dolomite	688	1.03
55	2	10000000	53709620	0.3502(8)	0.0615	Cambrian dolomite	336	3.50
55	1	30000000	160821349	0.3506(8)	0.0623	Cambrian dolomite	395	4.48
59	from 28 to 35	10000000	53581833	0.3507(8)	0.0623	Ordovician dolomite	317	7.40
59	from 16 to 26	10000000	53470874	0.3502(9)	0.0613	Ordovician dolomite	296	11.40
59	from 4 to 15	10000000	53697244	0.3504(4)	0.0618	Ordovician dolomite	593	7.84
59	2 and 3	10000000	50270119	0.3569(9)	0.0717	Ordovician limestone	490	5.36
61	from 28 to 32	10000000	53631727	0.3507(2)	0.0624	Ordovician dolomite	199	5.72
61	from 18 to 27	10000000	53253881	0.3510(5)	0.0628	Ordovician dolomite	266	9.48



Geologic Section No	Units No	Iav	Rock	Mass content SiO <sub>2</sub> in %	Section_units, result of comparison (+, -)	Section_units, result of comparison (+, -)	Section_units, result of comparison (+, -)	Section_units, result of comparison (+, -)	Section_units, result of comparison (+, -)
43	6	0.3586(4)	US and LD limestone	0.23					
2	7	0.3586(3)	Ordovician limestone	0.33	43_6 +	38_5 -	48_6_7 -	44_6 -	2_3_4 +
34	1	0.3585(4)	Ordovician limestone	1.03	43_6 +	38_5 -	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	34_4_5 +
2	3 and 4	0.3585(3)	Ordovician limestone	0.74	43_6 +	38_5 -	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	2_7 +
37	5	0.3585(0)	Ordovician limestone	0.40	43_6 +	38_5 -	48_6_7 -	44_6 -	
34	4 и 5	0.3585(0)	Ordovician limestone	0.43	43_6 +	38_5 -	48_6_7 -	44_6 -	34_1 +
9	10	0.3585(0)	Ordovician limestone	0.84	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	9_8 + 9_5 +
8	3	0.3584(5)	Ordovician limestone	1.28	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	8_2 +
21	5	0.3584(1)	Ordovician limestone	1.12	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	
9	8	0.3584(0)	Ordovician limestone	1.32	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	9_10 + 9_5 +
38	5	0.3584(0)	US and LD limestone	0.73					
17	43, 45 and 46	0.3584(0)	Ordovician limestone	1.52	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	
8	2	0.3583(5)	Ordovician limestone	1.46	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	8_3 +
29	from 9 to 11	0.3583(5)	Ordovician limestone	1.64	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	
36	30	0.3583(5)	Ordovician limestone	1.00	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 -	
15	from 13 to 15	0.3583(4)	Ordovician limestone	1.52	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	
9	5	0.3583(1)	Ordovician limestone	1.52	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	9_8 + 9_10 +
11	from 1 to 3	0.3582(9)	Ordovician limestone	2.00	43_6 +	38_5 +	48_6_7 +	44_6 +	
48	from 6 to 7	0.3582(9)	US and LD limestone	0.58					
44	6	0.3582(6)	US and LD limestone	1.30					

Note. The table shows the relative age determined uniquely according to geological data. The last column shows the results of comparing the relative age of the same sections with duplicated results.

The relative age of rocks is identified correctly in 53 cases out of 70; hence, the content of quartz is dependent on the age of limestone. In five sections there were made 16 measurements for Ordovician and Silurian limestones with up to 2.83% silicon dioxide contents. It was found that  $I_{av}$  index is reduced by 0.0001 while increasing silicon dioxide in limestone by 0.19% on average, with variance equals to 0.027. The values of the quantity increase significantly to 0.53% average, with variance being 0.029 based on 14 measurement results, when the content of silicon dioxide in one of the compared rocks exceeds 2.83% (Table 6).

**Table 6:** Variation series of silicon dioxide content differences corresponding to limestone  $I_{av}$  index change by 0.0001

Content of silicon dioxide in the rock to 2.83%*	0	0	0	0.01	0.02	0.09	0.16	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.23	0.24	0.34	0.41	0.44	0.48
Silicon dioxide content in one of the compared rocks over 2.83%**	0.18	0.40	0.40	0.42	0.43	0.48	0.56	0.58	0.58	0.60	0.62	0.62	0.76	0.86		

Note. Every difference was calculated for a pair taken of the same section. \* On sections 2, 8, 9, 34 and 44; \*\* on sections 9, 15, 17, 21, 29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 44 and 46

Both samples don't deviate from normal distribution. Two-sample F-test for variance at significance level of 0.01 gives  $F = 1.07$  value with critical one-sided  $F = 3.61$ . We use the variances equality for two-sample t-test with equal variances for the same significance level. We get t-statistics value 5.73 with 2.47 for critical one-sided t. Consequently, the averages of the two samples differ significantly.

Besides, the samples differ in the quality of change of silicon dioxide content, as there are three cases recorded when limestone with silicon dioxide content of up to 2.83% and the contents difference from 0.22 to 1.53% have the same value of  $I_{av}$  index (sections 34, 44 and 9).

There were also made 58 and 71 similar calculations for limestone samples from different sections with silicon dioxide content up to 2.83% or more. For the sample with low silicon dioxide content we obtained the average and the variance of 0.15 and 0.024 with good approximation to normal distribution, while for the "silicified limestone" the average and the variance are 0.67 and 0.43 with a significant deviation from normal distribution. These results emphasize the similarity of processes of energy and matter

exchange for all limestone with low silicon dioxide content and are indicative of more complex processes in limestone with high silicon dioxide content.

Thus, based on the example of limestone, we determined the effect of more rapid increase of potential energy of rock with relatively low lattice energy compared with "high-energy" rock. This assumed effect of potential energy change can be associated with the known Mpemba effect that deals with kinetic energy of water. The Mpemba effect states that cold water can sometimes freeze slower than warm water.

Younger Ordovician or Silurian limestone is characterized by lower content of silicon dioxide and greater value of  $I_{av}$  index (sections 2, 8, 9, 34, 36, 38 and 44) compared with older limestone, if its silicon dioxide content doesn't exceed 4.5 %. The regularity is broken considering limestone with high silicon dioxide content. We do not interpret more complicated regularities because of the simplicity of our model.

The determination of relative age of rocks by chemical composition was first carried out for the Yenisei Ridge igneous rocks (south-western edge of the Siberian platform). Granites are characterized by decreasing the numerical value of  $I_{av}$  index [16] subject to the decreasing of their age. Tectonic stages correspond to certain intervals of  $I_{av}$  values (Table 7).

**Table 7:** Absolute age and values of  $I_{av}$  index for Yenisei Ridge granites

Maximum value $I_{av}$	Minimum value $I_{av}$	Absolute age, Ma
0.3471(1)	0.3463(9)	1900-1840
0.3459(2)	0.3454(3)	930-700
0.3454(1)	0.3446(8)	650-520

## DISCUSSION

The method of  $I_{av}$  calculating is proposed to be called Proportionality of Atomic Mass method (PAM). The changes of  $I_{av}$  are correlated qualitatively and quantitatively with the variation of silicon dioxide contents in limestone; the analogy with the Mpemba effect was found. Thus we suggest that the value of  $I_{av}$  index is in simple linear relation with the potential energy of minerals and rocks.


The potential energy of rock depends on the energy state of the earlier formed rocks, which transmitted energy or absorbed it to varying degrees. Using the effect it seems to be possible to identify interruptions in sedimentation and to compare energy conditions in different regions on the bases of comparing rocks of the same type.

Is it possible to use the calculation of  $I_{av}$  index for chemical compounds of non crystalline nature? The calculations for some heteronuclear diatomic molecules (Table 8) allow us to answer affirmatively.

**Table 8:** Bond dissociation energy, internuclear distances and  $I_{av}$  values for some heteronuclear diatomic molecules


Characteristics	LiH	NaH	KH	RbH	HF	HCl	HBr	HI
Bond dissociation energy, (kcal mole <sup>-1</sup> ) [17]	56	47	43	39	135.1	102.2	86.5	70.5
Internuclear distance, nm	1.5953	1.8873	2.244	2.367	0.9168 0	1.2744	1.4145	1.6090
$I_{av}$	0.4286	0.4899	0.5061	0.5209	0.4826	0.5035	0.5200	0.5254

$I_{av}$  indices and internuclear distances of diatomic heteronuclear molecules of alkali metal hydrides and halides are related to the bond dissociation energy by linear type dependence (Figures 2,3).



**Figure 2:** The relationship of  $I_{av}$  indices and internuclear distance with potential energy in heteronuclear diatomic molecules of alkali metals hydrides





**Figure 3:** The relationship of  $I_{av}$  indices and internuclear distances with potential energy in heteronuclear diatomic molecules of hydrogen halides

This relationship is similar to the one between the lattice energy and indices: « $I_{av}$ » and «internuclear distances in molecules.» (Figure 1).

## CONCLUSION

$I_{av}$  indices are proposed to use as indicators of minerals and rocks potential energy change related to their age, as well as new classification indicators with physical meaning. The proposed calculations give researchers important additional information about the potential energy of minerals and rocks, going beyond a laboratory. Moreover they show prospects of minerals and rocks relative dating on the basis of their chemical composition. AgeMarker can be used for theoretical research associated with the construction of the Periodic Table of Chemical Compounds [8].

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors thank Dr. A. Sazonov for the results of absolute dating of igneous rocks of the Yenisei Ridge. We are also grateful to Helen Phomina for a great job of proofreading the article in English and Timothy Labushev who coded AgeMarker.

## REFERENCES

1. Chandler, A. (2009). Relative Age Dating (with special emphasis on Arkansas materials). Arkansas Geological Survey Bekki White, Director and State Geologist, Little Rock, Arkansas, 17 p.
2. Hamblin, W.K. (1978). The Earth's Dynamic Systems, A Textbook in Physical Geology, by W. Kenneth Hamblin, BYU, Provo, UT, Illus. William L. Chesser, Dennis Tasa, Burgess Publishing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
3. Cross Cutting. World of Earth Science (2003). Ed. K. Lee Lerner and Brenda Wilmoth Lerner. Gale Cengage.
4. Levin, H.L. (2009). The Earth Through Time (9 ed.). John Wiley and Sons, p. 15.
5. Zuev, V.V., Potselueva L.N., & Goncharov Yu.D (2006). Kristalloenergetika kak osnova otsenki tverdotel'nykh materialov (vkluyuchaya magnezial'nye tsementy). Sankt-Peterburg: Al'fa-Pol, 137 s.
6. Urusov, V.S. (1975). Energeticheskaya kristallokhimiya. Moskva, Nauka, 335 s.
7. Harrison, W.A. (1980). Electronic Structure and the Properties of Solids: The Physics of the Chemical Bond. Dover Publ., 586 p.
8. Labushev, M. M. (2011). The Periodic Table as a Part of the Periodic Table of Chemical Compounds, 18. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.3972>
9. WWW-MINCRYST Institute of Experimental Mineralogy Russian Academy of Sciences Crystallographic and Crystallochemical Database for Minerals and their Structural Analogues. Retrieved from <http://database.iem.ac.ru/mincryst/>
10. Chai, L., & Navrotsky, A. (1996). Synthesis, characterization, and energetics of solid solution along the dolomite-ankerite join, and implications for the stability of ordered  $\text{CaFe}(\text{CO}_3)_2$ . *American Mineralogist*, Vol. 81, pp. 1141-1147.
11. Rykart, R. (1995). Quarz-Monographie - Die Eigenheiten von Bergkristall, Rauchquarz, Amethyst, Chalcedon, Achat, Opal und anderen Varietäten. Ott Verlag Thun, 2nd. Edition.
12. Rodriguez-Navarro, C., Ruiz-Agudo, E., Luque, A., Rodriguez-Navarro, A. B., & Ortega-Huertas, M. (2009). Thermal decomposition of calcite: Mechanisms of formation and textural evolution of CaO nanocrystals. *American Mineralogist*, Vol. 94, pp. 578-593.
13. Ross, N. L., & Reeder, R. J. (1992). High-pressure structural study of dolomite and ankerite. *American Mineralogist*, Vol. 77, pp. 412-421.
14. Certified Reference Materials. (September 2012). Catalogue No. 802a Bureau of Analysed Samples Ltd. Newham Hall, Newby, Middlesbrough, England.
15. Edmundson, R.S. (1958). Industrial Limestones and Dolomites in Virginia: James River District West of the Blue Ridge. Charlottesville, Virginia, 1958

16. Labushev, M.M., & Khohlov, A.N. (2011). Novyj podhod k opredeleniyu otnositel'nogo vozrasta magmatischenkih gornyh porod. V sb. Sovremennye tehnologii osvoeniya mineral'nyh resursov. Krasnoyarsk, s. 64-68.
17. DeKock, R. L. & Gray, H. B. (1989). Chemical Structure and Bonding. University Science Books, 491 p.