

*
**
Salih_alaa@yahoo.com

5	4	/	-	"	0.3 - 0.0
	1-	8	2.7	1.9	0.8
					(W ₄ W ₃ W ₂ W ₁)
		80	60	40	20
					(T ₄ T ₃ T ₂ T ₁)

(SAR)				(SiL SiCL)			
W ₂	W ₁	/	15.4	15	14.5	13.6	W ₄ W ₃
13.2	12.5	12	10.8	"	SiL	SiCL	W ₄ W ₃
ESP				W ₄ W ₃			
T ₃	T ₂	T ₁	16.5	ESP	"	20.1	19.5
19.27	19	17.7				17.51	15.6
SiCL				T ₄			
249	211	171	"	T ₄ T ₃ T ₂	T ₁	W ₄ W ₃ W ₂ W ₁	
SiCL				283			
W ₄	W ₃	W ₂	W ₁			284	244
				209			
				177			
				SiCL			
W ₃	W ₂	W ₁		(10 ⁶)× 30	45	67	147
				CFU			
10 ⁴ × 45.7	10 ⁴ × 68.7			W ₄ W ₃ W ₂ W ₁		10 ⁴ × 13	10 ⁴ × 39

تاريخ استلام البحث 2012 / 5 / 30
تاريخ قبول النشر 2012 / 11 / 20

()

"

(1976) Westcot Ayers

(1987)

"

"

(2003 Pearson)

"

(1998 Hillel)

SAR

ESP

0.1 Sub group (0.3-0)
 4 *Typic Torrifluvent* "
 0.5
 " 5
 1
 1- : 0.8 W₁ -1

1-	1.8	1	W ₂ -2
1-	2.7	2	W ₃ -3
1-	8		W ₄ -4

CRD

(1980)

1 ± 25

20 T₁ -1

40 T₂ -2

60 T₃ -3

80 T₄ -4

SAR ,ESP

Na⁺ Mg⁺⁺ Ca⁺⁺

page

(1965)

Black (1982)

.1

180	Sand	g Kg ⁻¹	
510	Silt		
310	Clay		
7.64	pH	-	
2.80	EC _e	dS m ⁻¹	
0.88	Na ⁺	Cmol.L ⁻¹	
0.22	K ⁺		
0.56	Ca ⁺⁺		
0.46	Mg ⁺⁺		
0.36	Cl ⁻		
0.27	HCO ₃ ⁻		
0.08	SO ₄ ⁼		
350	Sand	g Kg ⁻¹	
410	Silt		
240	Clay		
7.75	pH	-	
3.60	EC _e	dS m ⁻¹	
1.90	Na ⁺	Cmol.L ⁻¹	
0.18	K ⁺		
0.48	Ca ⁺⁺		
0.44	Mg ⁺⁺		
1.40	Cl ⁻		
0.88	HCO ₃ ⁻		
0.11	SO ₄ ⁼		

-1
-2
-3
-4


SAR 1

15.4 15 14.5 13.6 W₄ W₃ W₂ W₁ 1/2 /

13.2 12.5 12 10.8

10.8 13.6 T₁W₁ SAR

T₄W₄ 23 T₃W₃ 18.66 20.30 1/2 / SAR 18



LSD (0.05) = Texture = 0.907 Irrigation Water = 1.283 Time = 1.101 TWT = 3.081


SAR 1

2

ESP

20.1 19.5 17.51 15.6 ESP T₄ T₃ T₂ T₁

W₄ W₃ W₂ W₁



LSD (0.05) = Texture = 25.78 Irrigation Water = 2.283 Time = 1.184 TWT = 12.866

.3

4

W₂ W₁ 1- . 0.017 0.016 0.03 0.038

W₄ W₃

T₄ T₃ T₂ T₁ 1- . 0.01, 0.04 , 0.016 , 0.021


T₁W₁ 1- . 0.048

0.01 T₄W₁ 1- . 0.048

0.027 T₁W₁ 1- . 1-

1- . 0.008 T₄W₄ 1- .

Aoda (1976) Westcot Ayers ESP SAR
 .(2006) Wu و Ruiz-Vera (2001) Brock Bauder (1993)



LSD (0.05) = Texture = 0.0009 Irrigation Water = 0.001 Time = 0.002 TWT = 0.0477

.4

5

(10⁶)× 30 45 67 147 (colony forming unit) CFU
 W₄ W₃ W₂ W₁
 T₃ T₂ T₁ (10⁶)× 65 54 71 93 CFU
 T₄
 ESP SAR
 microhabitat

CEC

CFU 5
 (10⁶)× 33 76 92 114
 W₄ W₃ W₂ W₁
 (2002 Lebron)
 W₄T₄ (10⁶)× 32 (10⁶)× 150 CFU

CFU

W₁T₁

22 210


6

W ₄	W ₃	W ₂	W ₁	10 ⁴ ×45.7	10 ⁴ ×68.7	CFU	SiCL	SiL
10 ⁴ ×25	10 ⁴ ×13	10 ⁴ ×39	10 ⁴ ×67	CFU				10 ⁴ ×10
W ₂	W ₃	W ₁		CFU				W ₄
10 ⁴ ×51	10 ⁴ ×31	10 ⁴ ×52						10 ⁴ ×30
		SiCL	SiL		T ₄ ,T ₃ ,T ₂ ,T ₁			10 ⁴ ×36
	10 ⁴ ×21	10 ⁴ ×76		10 ⁴ ×23	10 ⁴ ×45	10 ⁴ ×47		SiCL
10 ⁴ ×72	W ₃ T ₄ , W ₁ T ₁			W ₃ T ₄ , W ₁ T ₁			SiCL	SiL
								10 ⁴ ×22
							SiCL	SiL

ESP SAR


(2002 ; 2000 Levy)

phosphatas Amylase Cellulase Chitinase



LSD (0.05) = Texture = 18 Irrigation Water =21.5 TWT = 41

.5



LSD (0.05) = Texture =20 Irrigation Water =23 TWT =20.8

.6

- .1980.
- .1983 .
- .1987 .
- .172-155:(2)18
- Tricoderma harzianum* .2002 .
- .2008 .
- Aoda, M., D. Nedawi and I. Abdel-Rassul. 1993. Salt effect on the water transport function in an unsaturated soil. *Iraqi J. Agric. Sci.* 24:20-29.
- Ayers, R. and D. Westcot. 1976. Water quality for agriculture. FAO. Irrigation and drainage. Paper 29. Food and Agriculture organization of the united nation.
- Bauder, J. and T. Brock. 2001. Irrigation water quality, soil amendment and crop effect on sodium leaching. *Arid Land Research and Management.* 15:101-113.
- Black,C.A.1965. Methods of soil analysis. Physical & mineralogical properties. ASA. Medison. Wisc. USA.
- Ezlit, Y. D. 2009. Modeling the change in conductivity of soil Associated with application of saline -sodic water. University of south Queensland
- Hillel, D. 1998. Environmental of soil physics. Academic press. Lnc. San Diego.
- Lebron, I. D. Suarez and T. Yoshida. 2002. Gypsum effect on the aggregate size and geometry of three sodic soils under reclamation. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 66:92-98.
- Levy, G. 2000. Sodcity in Sumner, M. E. Handbook of soil science CRC press. Pp: 663-672. Boca Raton. FL.
- Mays, D., and J. Hunat. 2005. Hydrodynamic aspects of particle clogging in porous media. *Environmental Science and Technology.* 39: 577-584.

- Page, A.L.; R.H. Miller, and D.R. Keeney. 1982. Soil analysis. Part 2 chemical and microbiological properties. ASA, SSSA .Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Pearson, K. 2003. The basics of salinity and Sodicity effect on soil physical prosperities. Water quality and irrigation management. Montana state university- Bozeman- water quality.
- Ruiz-Vera, V. and L. Wu. 2006. Influence of sodicity, clay mineralogy, pre wetting rate, and their interaction on aggregate stability. *Soil Sci .Soc. Am. J.* 70(6):1825-1833.
- Shainberg, I., G. Levy, P. Renga and H. Frenkel. 1992. Aggregate stability and seal formation as affected by deeps impact energy and soil amendments. *Soil Sci.* 154:113-119.

EFEECT OF WATER QUALITY AND SOIL TEXTURE ON SOME PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROPERTIES.

Baha A. Al-Hameed

Alaa S. Ati

* Dept. of Soil science and water resources- College of Agriculture - University of Baghdad. Salih_alaa@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

To study and know the effect of irrigation water quality texture on SAR, ESP in the soil on some of soil physical properties and its effect on population of soil microorganism. So that Lab experiment was conducted by using soil samples collected from the surface soil 0.0-0.3 m depth from the field of Agriculture College –Abu grab. Soil air dried and sieved 5 k.gm of soil was placed in open side's plastic pipes. The experiment included 4 levels of salt water W1, W2, W3 W4 which were 0.8 ,1.8,2.8,8 dS.m⁻¹ respectively and two texture of soil which were SiL ,SiCL with four replicates .CRD design was used saline soil were made through out the addition saline water to the columns of soil . Soil EC was measured through T1, T2, T3, T4 period which were 20,40,60,80 days respectively. ESP, SAR, modulus of rupture, hydraulic conductivity was measured and total bacteria and fungi population was counted. Results showed that SAR value was raised in SiL, SiCL soil with increase of water salinity at W1, W2, W3, W4 treatments which gave significant values 13.6, 14.5, 15, 15.4 mmol.L^{1/2} in SiCL soil. While the SiL soil gave decrease values which they were 10.8, 12, 12.5, 13.2 mmol.L^{1/2} for the above treatments respectively. also ESP gave these values 15.6,17.5 , 19.5, 20.1 for SiCL soil during T1, T2,T3, T4, period respectively while water quality gave ESP values which were 16.5 ,17.7 19, 19.27 for W1, W2, W3, W4, treatments respectively.

the mean of modules of raptures were increased for SiCL during the differences of incubation times which records T1,T2,T3,T4 treatments the values were 171,211,249,282 Kpas respectively. While water quality treatments gave 177, 209, 244, 284. Kpas. For W1, W2, W3, W4 treatments respectively. in the SiCL soil were significant decrease of total bacterial population with the differences of water quality which gave W1,W2,W3,W4 treatments CFU values 147 , 67,45, 30 (10^6) respectively . when the total of fungi population were 68.7, 45.7,30,13 (10^4) for W1, W2, W3, W4 treatments respectively so that through these results we can say using irrigation with water at high salinity for long time or period the soil structure will be at abed physical properties so that hydraulic conductivity will be very low and anaerobic condition will decrease fungi and bacterial population, organic matter will decrease therefore plant growth will failed.

Keyword: water quality, soil texture, SAR, ESP, modules of rapture, hydraulic conductivity and fungi and bacteria population