## A STUDY OF LEACHING EFFECTS UPON THE NEASURED AGE

## OF A CAMBRIAN GLAUCONITE

by

W. Kirby Gowen, Jr.



Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of<br>Bachelor of Science and Master of Science in Geology

at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology<br>(1958)



#### **ABSTRACT**

Titles **A** Study **of** Leaching **Effects** upon the leasured Age of a Cambrian Glauconite.

Authort **W.** Kirby **Gowen,** Jr.

Submitted to the Department of Geology and Geophysics on<br>August 28, 1958, in partial fulfillment of the requirements<br>for the degree of Bachelor of Science and Master of Science **in** Geology.

**<sup>A</sup>single** glauconite of Upper Cambrian **age** from the **Birk mos** member **of** the Franoonia formation from Wisconsin has **been** meehanioelly tpurfited **and** split into **six** fractions, **Ages** have been determined for four of these fractions by using both the Bb/Sr and K/A methods. The four portions were treated in the following manner: G3280A (2a) was leached in 25% HAc for 17 hours, **G3280A** (4) was heated at 970C for 25 hours, **G3280A** (5) was not treated, and **03280A** (6) which was composed of fines and contained **a** large amount **of** calcium **carbonate,** was **un-** treated **also.**

**The** Rb/Sr age **for 03280A** (2a) was **in** excellent agreement **with 03280&** (4 **and 5)** althgh its normal strontium content was reduced from 12 ppm to  $\frac{2}{5}$  ppm. The K/A ages for G3280A (2a, 4, and 5) showed excellent agreement so that heating, at least at **ta** temperature **of 970C** has no effect on the argon content. The Rb/Sr **ratio** for **63280A (6) was less** than one- tenth **of** that measured **for** the other three fractions, and the were highly erroneous. The K/A age for this portion was in excellent agreement with the Rb/Sr ages but thirty-five mil-<br>lion years too high for the rest of the K/A ages.

The calculated ages for three of the fractions show good agreement with the Holmes **B** Time Scale. The age of the Birk**mose** member of the Pranconia formetion **ie** 455 **(20)** million the K/A method, is 425 ( $\frac{1}{22}$ ) million years, but the potassium values may be slightly high. The average age for both methods is 440 ( $\frac{1}{2}$ 0) million years which is in perfect agreement with the Holmes B Time Sca

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author would **like** to thank **the** following people whose support has been deeply appreciated:

Professor P.M., Hurley, who as my thesis supervisor originally **suggested** that **I** make **a** *study* of strontium varietions in the crust and mantle. When it became evident that this study could not be successfully completed, he suggested the present topic, Throughout the course of this investigation **his** 3dvice and suggestions have been invaluable.

Professor W.H. Pinson, who gave freely of his time and knowledge to teach me the chemical prodedures and mass spectrometry necessary for the successful completion of this **study,**

Professor H,W. Pairbeirn, who **did** part of the analytical work for this reseerch and made several helpful recommendations during the course of this study.

Professor E. Mencher, who collected the sample used **In this** investigation,

Students Stanley Hart, who made the argon measurements reported here, and **John** Moore, who **did** the mechanical preparation and performed the leaching process on the sample.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, whose funds supported this study.

**My wife,** Carol, whose cooperation and, above all, typing made the completion of this thesis possible.

**-it**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS



# LIST OF TABLES



# LIST OF FIGURES

 $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$  .



#### INTRODUCTION

The usefulness of the mineral glauconite as a means **of** measuring absolute sedimentary **rook ages has been ex** plored by several workers. Wasserburg et al (1955) and Lipson (1956) started the K/A work while Herzog et al (1958) began the initial Rb/Sr investigations with Cormier develop**ing** this method further as **a** Doctor's thesis **(1956).** These analyses which range from Cambrian to Roent **in age** show good agreement **in aost eases** with Holmes' **8** Time **Scale** (Figure 2). **A** good swmary of the previous work done on the age determination of sedimentary rocks has been present**ed** by Herzog **et al (1958).** 

Past **studies** on the origin **and** formation of the mineral gleueonite **by** nuerous investigators have **all** shown that certain limiting conditions prevailed. Warshaw (1957) has summarized these conditions as followst

'The site **of** formation **to in** moderately shallow marine waters which are slightly reduoing due to deeying organie matter.

**'The** formation takes place during times of **decreased** or negligible sedimentation **of** detrital material.

**"After or** during formation 4lauconite is **usually** reworked **by** wave **action,** which **any** be that of transo **grassing** or regressing **seas,**

"Olaueonite develops largely **by** the replacement **of** pre-eisting tilieates; however the **type** of source material **and** manner of its renlecoeent vary.

**If** glauconite is formed **as** an alteration product, any **radiogenit** Sr" present in the **original** mineral **must be** removed before the glauconite **to** formed, An isotope dilution

 $\mathbf{1}$ 

analysis of a recent sediment glauconite from the North Atlantie **Oeen',by** Corater showed no measureable amount of radiogenic  $sr^{87}$ .

Reasured normal **strontium** content for the glauoonites analyzed by Cormier varied so greatly (from 4,2-163 ppm), and microscopic determinations of the impurities were **made,** It was found that most **of** the glauconites observed contained calcium carbonate **as** a cement coating on the grains or fill**ing** cracks within the grains themselves.

**To test** this hypothesis, Cormier **leached a** portion **of** the lewos glauconite from Leningrad, Russia, with **1.5** *N* **Hol** for three minutes while the rest was left untreated. Mass spectrometric determinations on both fractions showed that the normal strontium content had dropped from **28.9** ppm for the untreated portion to **4,2** ppm for the leached portion or **by** a factor of **7.** Because the *ages* for the two fractions agreed within experimental error (460 and 471 million years), the leaching in this case **did** not effect the radiogenic **Sreba <sup>7</sup>**ratio. **According to** geologic **and paleontologic** evidence, the Iswos is Lower Ordovician; but, according to Cormier, it is analytically older than the Franconia formation.

The present investigation was begun with **a** threefold purpose which is outlined below,

The first purpose was to obtain further information on the effects of leaching of a glauconite with particular

#### attention paid to the following:

- **a.** the measured amounts of rubidium to **see if** there **is any lose** from acid leaching. **A** difference could **be due** to the presence of rubidium in the carbonate oement or the leaching of rubidium **from** the glauoonite itself.
- **b,** the measured amounts of normal strontium (to **de**termine how **much** normal strontium) **in** the untreated portion was contained in the carbonate cement.
- **c.** the measured amounts **of** radiogenic strontium to **make** sure that it **was all** present in the glauconite **and not pertly in the** cement.
- **d.** the measured \*Sr <sup>8</sup> <sup>7</sup> /Rb <sup>8</sup> <sup>7</sup> , which **to** the ratio **used** to determine the final age of the glauconite.

The second purpose was to determine **on** age for the glauconite and the sedimentary rock from which it was taken. By analyzing the glauconite **by** both the Rb/Sr and K/A **methods of age** determinations, an excellent opportunity was afforded to test the amount of agreement which could **be** ex**pected** for **a** gleuconite.

The **third** purpose **was to** study the effect heating would have upon the argon content of the glauconite. It was believed that diffusion **of** argon **would** occur at elevated temperatures.

It was with these purposes **in** mind that the **following** specifications were set **up.**

- **1.** A large sample of at least **100** grams so that all portions would contain at least 20 grams.
- 2. A **high** *Rb/SF* ratio so that **small** variations in the n night hotel of the content, which is formed from the **decay of Rb 7, would be** measurable with **a small** analytical error.
- 3. **A** well-orystellized gluconite with a **basal** lattice spacing  $d(001)=10.1$  A.

**By** using **x-ray** powder diffraction photographs, Warshaw **(1957)** has **clastifled glaueonites** In **the** following **manners**



The well-crystellized glauconite occurs as lobate, globular grains in dolomite, chert, or arenaceous rooks, while the less ordered varieties occur **as ire** regular, porous greins.

#### CHAPTER I. SAMPLE PREPARATION

### A. SELECTION OF A GLAUCONITE

A Cambrian glaueonite **03280 was** selected for the

following reasons:

- 1. Sample is stratigraphically and paleontologically **well** dated,
- 2, It **was** known to have **a** Rb/Sr ratio of roughly 20 **from a** previous isotope dilution analysis **by Corner (1956).**
- *3.* **It** was analyzed **by** x-ray powder diffraction photog- raphy (Moore, 1958) and found to have a basal lattice spacing **of 10.1 A.**
- $4.$  A similar sample has been independently analyzed in another laboratory (Wasserburg and Hayden, 1955).
- **5.** It **was of** sufficient size **(500** grams) to insure **that** enough pure glauconite **would be** obtained after mechanical concentration.
- *6.* It **also** offered an excellent opportunity to refine **Cormier's Cambrian** and Ordovician ages which ranged from 380-480 million years.

Sample R3?80 from Hudson, Wisconson, was collected **by** Professor **E.** Mencher of M.I.T. during the Geological Society of America's **Field** Trip No. 2, 1956 and came from the Birkmose Member of the Franconia Formation of Upper Cambrian age. This exposure of the Birkmose is described in the Guidebook (Berg 1956) as the type locality. The Franconia formation is shown in Figure **I** and consists of five members. Starting with the oldest they are: the Woodhill- **a** crossbedded, medium to coarse-grained sandstone; the Birkmose**a** glauconitic, fine-grained sandstone; the Tomeh- a very fine-grained sandstone plus interbedded shale; the Reno-



FIGURE I - UPPER CAMBRIAN FORMATIONS

Berg (1956)

<sup>a</sup>glauconitic, fine-grained sandstone; **and** the Mazomanie- a thin-bedded or cross-bedded sandstone.

**Under the binooular** miorosoope **the** crushed, **untreated** sample was **seen** to consist of 60.70% grass-green gleuconite, coated with a reddish-yellow cement. Disseminated quartz grains were also present.

# **B. MECHANICAL PREPARATION**

Student John Moore of M.I.T. did the mechanical separation which is described here. A 500 gram sample was crushed pertly **by** finger, and **by** rolling under an iron pestle on an iron surface **end** later on a plestic table top.

The sample was then sereened. **The +48** mesh size was recrushed, the **-48+100** and \*100+200 **mesh** sizes were run through a Frantz magnetic separator, while the  $-200$  mesh sizserws **also** *retained,* **Eventually** all but about **50** grams **passed the** +48 **mesh soreen,**

The non-magnette portion was collected and labeled **R3280B. The** magnetic portion, composed **of** approximately 100 grams of glauconite some with a reddish carbonate coating, **was** collected **and** labeled **G0380A.**

The sample was then split into 20 gram portions for the following treatments:

- 03280A (1). This portion was separated in bromoform,<br>whose density was adjusted with acetone, so that quartz floated while dolomite sank. Most of the sample sank.
- *03280A* (2). This portion was divided in **half.** a. Because acetic acid is known to leach carbonate and adsorbed ions on **clay,** this fraction was **leached** in **80** ml. of **25% HAco** for **17** hours.

b, This fraction was left in **100 ml.** of demineralizod water for **17** hours.

The solutions were stirred once, allowed to **sit** for **17** hours **and then teouum filtered. The HAo leahed fracotionewas washed** several times dried **in air** at a temperature of 35-40°C

- **03280A (3).** This portion was heated for **25 hours at 16000 and** lost approximotely 0.4 of **e** gram in weight, probably adsorbed water, This **sample** was not used **because it** was felt that **a high 16e** of argon would **be** encountered.
- 03280A (4). This portion **was** heated **for 25** hours at **97<sup>0</sup> <sup>C</sup>** and lost approximately 0.3 of a gram in weight.
- **03280A (5).** This portion was left untreated.
- **Q3280A (6).** This portion is composed of the -200 mesh fraction of **the** original **sample and** was washed **in** acetone to oleon the grains of any minute particles which might **be** present.

A binocular inspection **of** the treated smples **showed** no apparent changes **except** that the **HAe** leached fraction contain**ed less** carbonate-coated grains.

**Of** the seven fractions described above, the four listed below were chosen **to be** analysed **for** this study.

- **03280A** (2a). This fraction was of prime importance because it would show if leahing the calcareous cement surrounding a mineral affected the radiogenic strontium or rubidium content of **the** mineral itself. **By** also measuring the potessium and argon content and comparing it **with G3280A (5) any** variations **in** the abundance of either element could **be** noted.
- **03280A (4).** This fraction was chosen to **test** the effeot in the glauconite. The rubidium, strontium, **and** potassium concentrations should remain unchanged, these elements not being volatile from silicatep at this low temperature.

- **03280A (5).** This unheated fraction was used **as** the standard so that any differences **in** the other portions could **be** noted.
- **03280A (6). This** fraction, **whieh** wee only about 5O604 glauconite, was chosen to study how much a large amount of non-radiogenic strontium, which was present in the carbonate **oement, would** effect the precision of measurement of the radiogento strontium content and also the age.

### C. CHEMICAL PREPARATION

**1.0** gram samples **for** Sr-Rb isotopic dilution analyses **and** 0.4 gram samples for K analyses **are** accurately weighed **to W0.2** ag. while roughly **3.0** grams are **used** for **the strontium** isotopic **ratio** analyses.

**All** weighings **are** then placed in platinum **dishes with the** isotopic dilution samples receiving a known amount of  $Sr^{84}$  and **Rb8 7 spike solutions whose** oompositions **and** concentrations are given in **Tables 1 and** 2. **The** samples are deomposed in reagent grade hydrofluorid and sulfuric acid. The samples are taken almost **to dryness, end then 15** ml. more of hydrofluoric are **added** to **sake sure that** all **the** silicon **has** been removed. The samples are then **taken to** complete dryness.

**The** Isotopio dilution and ratio fractions **are taken into solution** usinga small volume **of** 6 **N. MC1** and is heated for **over** an hour to insure removal of **all** fluoride **tons.**

The potassium fractions are taken into solution **using a** demineralised water solution containing 1.2 ml. of H2SO4 **per** liter. **All HCl** used in this study has been distilled in vycor glassware and stored in polyethylene **bottles,** All water has **been** passed through **an ton** exchange resin demineralizer and **contains** less than **0.3 ppm** electrolytes **as NaC1,** Isotopip

dilution analyses of this water **disclosed the** presence **of** 0.04 ppm potassium, 0.0005 ppm rubidium, and **0.0003 ppm** strontium (Pinson **1958).**

Roughly **5 ml.** of radloactive Sr 85 tracer are **added** to the isotopic dilution and ratio **samples** before they are placed on the ion exchange columns for monitoring purposes. This tracer was produced **by** deuteron bombardment of reagent grade rubidium chloride in the **M.I.T.** cyclotron **end** has been described **by** Winchester **(1957).**

The **ton** exchange columns were constructed using Dowex **50, 8** oro sseinked, 200-400 mesh cation exchange **resin,** The columns are made of vycor glass one inch in diameter and con**tain** approximately **?12 of** resin, The columns are eluted with <sup>2</sup>**N. HIC1** throughout. Because rubidium enrichment occurs as the last of the potassium leaves the column, **a** platinum wire was used **to** locate the rubidium by monitoring the elution for potassium. The strontium **is** located **by** monitoring the column for the Sr<sup>85</sup> tracer with a Geiger counter. Before being **placed** on the tntalum filament **of** the mass spectrometer source, the rubidium is converted to nitrate and the strontium to oxalate. The conversions of rubidium and strontium chloride to nitrate and oxalate respectively have been fully described **by** Pinson **(1957).**

Once the potassium fractions have been taken into solu**tion, they are** transferred to volumetric pyrex **flasks end diluted** to exactly **300** ml, with a solution containing 1.2 **ml.** of sulfuric **acid** per liter of wster. *<sup>A</sup>***50** ml. aliquot of

this solution **ts** pipetted into a volumetric **flask** and <sup>5</sup>ml. of a standard solution containing **16, 000** ppm lithium **is added.** The resulting mixture **is** diluted to **100.0 al.** This solution **is** then **ready** for **flame** photometric analysis. Potassium standards, containg lithium plus synthetic biotite, were prepared using reagent grade potassium phthalate and lithium nitrate **and** the synthetic biotite described by Pinson (1958). The lithium is used **as** an internal standard,

CHAPTER II - INSTRUMENTATION AND ISOTOPIC ABUNDANCES

## A. MASS SPECTROMETRY

The mass spectrometer used in this study was a Nier type, 60<sup>0</sup> sector, 6 inch radius, direct-focussing instru $m$ ent. Thermionic emission is used to produce positive ions whlch are accelerated between two **half** plates at a 2500 volt negative potential **and passed** through a sectored magnotio field of 6" radius and about 4000 gauss. As the ions or charged particles enter the magnette **field** they **are** split *late several* **beams with** each representing a certain **mass/** Oharge ratio. **The beams** then sontaue up the tube; and, **as the** strength **of** the sagnetto **field is** varied, the different mass beams pass over the collector slit. The resulting current is amplified by a vibrating reed electrometer (Applied Physios Corporation Model **30) and** fed to **a** Brown strip **chart** recording potentiometer. A detailed discussion of the mass spectrometer used in this study has been written by Cormier **( 196).**

# B. FLAME PHOTOMETRY AND ARGON SYSTEM

The **flame** photometer used in this study was a Perkin Elmer Model 146. This instrument was just recently purehased, **and** for the **first set** of analyses **was** not **function**ing properly. There **is** still **a sall amount of** drift present **in** the defleetion **needle. Because** propane **gas was recommended** for potassitu analyses, a tank **of** propane **was** adapted

**for** the photometer. It was used during **ell** of the **analyses** reported **in** this study.

**The operational** procedure **to described** fully **in** the Perkin Elmer **hadbook** and will only **be** briefly outlined here. The flame photometer **to** turned **on** 45~0 minutes beforehand, A lithium solution **in atomized, and** the instrument is adjusted to give the recommended sensitivity. The slope of the curve for the potassium standards is determined, **and** the instrument **is** then **ready** for analysis. The potassium unknowns are run alternately with nearby standards. Although the handbook mentions that no **cleaning of** the atomizer **to** nees sary between runs (except when it **it ologged), a** smell amount of **the** next solution to be run was used to clean the atomizer anyway.

Student Stanley Hart of M.I.T. ran the argon analyses reported **in** this study on the argon system which has been described **by** Hurley **(1957) and (1958).**

#### ISOTOPIC ABUNDANCES OF STRONTIUM AND RUBIDIUM AND  $\mathbf{c}_{\perp}$ **CALIBRATION OF SPIRES**

**A** number **of** pure **Sc <sup>4</sup>and Rb 7 spike** samples have **been** mess spectrometrically analyzed by this laboratory in order to determine the relative abundances of the isotopes in the spikes, These values **are** listed in **Table 1, All samples** analyzed in this work were spiked with the same Rb<sup>87</sup> and  $\text{Sr}^{\text{84}}$  spike solutions, in the concentrations shown in **Table** 2.

The normal relative abundances of rubidium and strontium

isotopes shown in Table 1 are those reported by Nier (1950) and Bainbridge and Nier (1950). For the age calculation on Sr<sup>87</sup> relative abundance of 0.0700, instead of 0.0702 was used, on the basis of Herzog and Pinson's (1956) and Schumacher's (1956) calculated value of 0.0683-0.0010 for the abundance of  $\text{Sr}^{87}$  in total terrestrial strontium 4.7 billion years ago and Bainbridge and Nier's (1950) calculated value of 0.0702 for the relative abundance of  $5r^{87}$  in terrestrial strontium today. A graph was drawn up with the change in Sr<sup>87</sup>/Sr plotted as a function of time. It was from this graph that the normal Sr<sup>87</sup> abundance used in this study was taken.

#### TABLE

![](_page_18_Picture_46.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_47.jpeg)

Because the quantities of spike obtained from the Atomic Energy Commission are small and therefore the error in weighing great, it is necessary to calibrate them. The calibration is explained in detail by Cormier (1956) and will only be outlined here. Large amounts (0.2 grams) of reagent grade normal rubidium are weighed out and put into solution separately. This makes any error in weighing negligible, Aliquots of these solutions are then mixed with a known amount of the Rb<sup>87</sup> and Sr<sup>84</sup> spike solutions and analyzed on **the mass** spectrometer, The calibrated concentrations of **the spike** solutions used **are** given in **Table** 2.

#### TABLE 2

# CALIBRATED SPIKE CONCENTRATIONS

![](_page_19_Picture_72.jpeg)

### **CHAPTER III - TREATMENT OF RUBIDIUM-STRONTIUM DATA**

**As only one ton baoo** strikes the collector slit of the mass spectrometer at any given time, it is possible to reoord the various **peaks** in succession on the Brown strip chart recorder. A large number of sets **of peaks** are neoessary in order to correot for the **small** variations which **ocour in** the **ian** ourrents. **A** single **sweep across** the **mass** range **of** the **element is** called a **set. A** rubidium **set** would **be** omuposed **of** two **peaks; a strontium set** of four peaks. From 25-60 sets were collected for rubidium analyses while from **50-120 sets were** colleeted **for** strontium **analyses,**

The **peak** heights were measured using **a** 50-seale **eongln** eering ruler and averaged in pairs to compensate for the rising or falling in ion current stength which is usually present. The pair averages are then used to calculate the following ratios: **85/87** for rubidium and 84/88, **86/88, 87/88,** and **87/86** for **stroattm.** These ratios are then totalled, a grand average for each for the whole run is calculated, and this is the number used to determine the amounts **of** rubidium **and** strertium **in** the isotope dilution and ratio **analyses.**

# A. CALCULATION OF NORMAL RUBIDIUM AND STRONTIUM

**In** order to ealoulato **a** Rb/Sr **age** for a mineral it is first necessary to determine the radiogenic Sr<sup>87</sup>/Rb<sup>87</sup> ratio. The total rubidium and Rb<sup>87</sup> present are obtained from the rubidiua isotope dilution analystis **in** the following manner:

- **Ift** IFnumber **of stems** of normal rubidium present S=number of atoms of spike rubidium present and the relative abundances of  $Rb^{85}$  and  $Rb^{87}$ given in Table **I are** used
- $Then:$  total  $Rb^{85}$  atoms=0.7215N+0.0450S total **Rb<sup>8</sup> <sup>7</sup>**atompO.2785N+0.9550S

For the analysis of  $G3280a$   $(4)$ , the measured  $85/87$ ratio of the spiked Rb was 0.5267. This analysis is referred to as **03280A** (4) Rb **IDI (a),** signifying the first isotope dilution **analysis** of **this sample.**

$$
\text{Then:} \quad 0.5267 \frac{0.7215N}{0.2785N} \div 0.0450S
$$

 $C$ ross multiplying:  $0.1467N + 0.5030S = 0.7215N + 0.0450S$ Collecting terms; **0.5748N -** *0.45805*

**and N/S a 0.7968** the atomic ratio **of** normal to **spike**

<sup>A</sup>difference **in** atomic weight of normal rubidium and **spike** rubidium due **to the** difference **in their** isotopic compositions **makes** it necessary to multiply the atomic ratio **by a** weight factor obtained **by** dividing **the** stomic weight of normal rubidium **by** the atomic weight of **spike** rubidium. This weight factor **isto** *0.98o,.*

Then,  $N_W/S_W = 0.7968 \times 0.9844 = 0.7844$ 

Since 5  $\text{ml. of } \text{Rb}^{87}$  spike of concentration 57.8  $\mu$ gm/ml were **added** to the sample,

 $N_{\text{M}} = 0.7844 \times 5 \times 57.8 = 226.7$  **Mgm Rb** 

Dividing **by the** weight of **the sample,** the concentration of rubidium is found to **bes**

 $\frac{226.7 \text{ m}}{1.0017 \text{ gm}}$  = 226.3 ppm Rb

**Rb IDI (b)** for **03280A** (4), **a** second rubidium run, gave **226.9 ppa Rb.**

Since Rb<sup>87</sup> is 28.32% of the total rubidium by **weight the amount of Rbe** present in this **sample** would **be:**

 $\frac{226.3 + 226.9}{2}$  **x** 0.2832 = 64.2 ppm  $\text{Rb}^{87}$ 

The strontium isotope dilution analysls **to** run primarily to determine the amount of normal strontium proesent **in** the sample and **is** calculated **in** the **same** manner as the rubidium.

> If: N=number of atoms of normal strontium present S=number of atoms of spike strontium present

and the relative abundances of Sr<sup>84</sup> and Sr<sup>88</sup> listed **In Table 1** are used

- Then: total  $Sr^{84}$  atoms  $= 0.0056N + 0.5348S$  and **total**  $\text{Sr}^{88}$  **atoms = 0.8256N + 0.2826S** 
	- **Ift the** measured **84/88** ratio **for 03280A** (4)  $Sr$   $IDI = 0.9961$
- Then:  $0.9961 = \frac{0.0056M + 0.1}{0.0056M + 0.1}$ **6-48256** *+* .28964

Cross multiplying **and** colleating **terms,**

 $0.8168N = 0.25335$ 

and  $N/S = 03101$  the atomic ratio **Since the <u>Weight of normal Sr</u> = 1.0253** 

Then:  $N_{w}/S_{w} = 03101 \times 1.0253 = 0.3179$ 

Although the **84/88** ratio is used **to** calculate **the normal** strontium present **in** the sample beeause the 84 and **<sup>88</sup> peaks** are usually about the **same** height and are **representa**tive of the spike and normal strontium concentrations, a

good check on the overall run is to calculate the N/S ratio using the 86/88 ratio from the isotope dilution analysis. These ratios yield ages which agree within a few percent, but the age based on the 84/88 measurement is considerably more reliable because the concentrations of the 86 isotope in the spike and normal strontium are about the same.

Using the relative strontium 36 and 88 abundances from Table 1 and the measured 86/88 ratio for G3280A (4) Sr IDI, the N/S ratio was found to be:

 $N/S = 0.3060$ 

The difference between this and the 84/88 N/S ratio is:  $\frac{0.004}{0.308}$  x 100  $z$  1.3%

Since 2 ml. of 19.8  $\mu$ gm/ml.  $5r^{84}$  spike was added to the 1,0017 gm sample, the total amount of normal strontium would be:

 $\frac{2 \times 19.8 \times 0.3179}{1.0017}$  = 12.6 ppm

### B CALCULATION OF RADIOGENIC STRONTIUM

The radiogenic Sr<sup>87</sup> can be calculated using the isotope dilution analysis if there is no rubidium present or if the ratio of 85/87 in the contaminating rubidium is known approximately. This ratio is difficult to know because of memory effects which are present in the mass spectrometer from previous runs. There was rubidium contamination throughout the entire isotope dilution run for  $G3280A$  (4) Sr IDI; but comparisons, between the end of the run where

the rubidium was almost gone and the beginning of the run, **made it possible** to **aporoxisete** the **89/87** ratio **for** rubidium to **be** about 2. The maximum error in age this assumption could **lead** to is rouglhy **100;** but, **since** a separate **isoBope** ratio analysis of the unspiked Sr is made, this error is. not Introduced. **The** isotopic dilution anplyses for **G3280A (6) and G3280A** (2e) both contained **sets,** free of eontasminating rubidium, which were used to calculate the isotopic dilution **age of** each. Rubidium contamination in **G3280A (5)** persisted throughout the run **and made** the caIoulation **of an tsotope** dilution age for this sample impossible to **do** with **any** degree of accuracy. Using this correction fact of 1/2 for the messured 87 peaks of **03280A** (4) and 87/88 ratio was found to be 0.1364. Because part **of** the **Sr8 <sup>7</sup>**atoms present in this run **are** contributed **by** the radioative **decy of RbS7, it is** neocesary to introduce **a third** term **(R) equal** to the number of atoms of radiogenic strontium **present.**

**Using** the relative strontium **87** and **88** abundances from **Table 1,** the

 $\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \frac{1}{2} \, dx$  atoms = 0.0700N + 0.0424S + *B* and  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Then:  $87/88 = 0.1364 = \frac{0.0700N + 0.0424S + R}{0.8256N + 0.2826S}$ Cross multiplying **and** collecting terms

> 0.04261 **=** 0.00395 + R  $B = 0.0426N - 0.0039S$

**But N** \* **0,3101S** from the 84/88 N/S calculation Substituting: **R** (0.0426 x **0.3101) S -** *0.0039S* **B** a **(0.0132 - 0.039) S** x 0.00938  $R/S = 0.0093$ 

The atomic weight of radiogenic Sr = 1.017 atomic weight of spike Sr and the atomic  $\text{Rw}/\text{Sw} = 0.0093 \times 1.017 = 0.00946$ The total amount of radiogenic strontium would be:

$$
\frac{0.00946 \times 39.6 \text{ mm}}{1.0017 \text{ gm}} = .374 \text{ ppm}
$$

The more accurate method for determining the radiogenic strontium content of a mineral is to supplement the isotopic dilution analysis with an isotopic ratio analysis and calculate an 87/86 ratio for the unspiked sample. The amount of common strontium is still determined by isotopic dilution analysis.

The 87/86 ratio for G3280A (4) Sr IDI was 1.0381. Then using the equation:  $R = 0.0969$  x Sr x (87/86 - 0.7099) 1.0116 Where  $R = the$  radiogenic  $Sr^{87} = (85r^{87})$  $0.0969$  = weight abundance of  $sr^{86}$  in common strontium  $Sr = amount of normal strontium present = 12.6 ppm$  $87/86$  = found by mass spectrometric analysis = 1.0381 0.7099 = initial atomic 87/86 ratio present in the mineral 1.0116 = the ratio of the atomic weight of  $Sr^{87}$  to the atomic weight of  $Sr^{86}$ 

The radiogenic strontium concentration would be:  $0.0969$  x 12.6 x (1.0381 - 0.7099) 1.0116 = 0.405 ppm The radiogenic Sr<sup>87</sup> concentration of an isotopic ratio analysis is more accurate for the following reasons:

In an isotope dilution analysis the measured amount a. of Sr<sup>87</sup> is dependent not only on the amount of normal and radiogenic Sr<sup>87</sup> present in the glauconite but also on the

amount of Sr<sup>87</sup> in the spike which is added. If the isotopic **abundance of** *Sr <sup>8</sup> <sup>7</sup>*in the spike **is** not known with great accuracy, it would **have** a noticeable effect upon the radiogenie strontium coneentration determined,

b. Sinace **the** rediogent strontium **is** assumed to **be** present only in the glauconite, not in the contaminating carbonate, any addition (2 ml. of  $\text{Sr}^{\text{84}}$  spike) to the total amount of strontium measured causes the ratio of **ratogent** strontium to toal strontium to decrease and introduces greater error. The isotopic ratio analysis has no  $Sr^{84}$ spike added,

oe **If the** calcareous cement surrounding a grsin **ts leached** away and the radiogenic strontium content of the grain itself is not disturbed, then the total amount of common strontium seasured **will be** reduced. The peroentage of radiogenic stron**tium** to teal strontium present would **be** increased, and the precision of measurement would also **be** improved.

# $c.$  CALCULATION OF AN AGE

**Now that the \*Sr87/Rb87 ratio has been** calculated; and, using the **decay** constant determined **by** Aldrich **(1956),** the **age** for **03280A** (4) **can be** calculated,

If:  $t = \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{85r^{87}}{8567} \right)$ 

Where  $t = age$  of the mineral

 $\lambda$  = the decay constant = 1.39 x 10<sup>-11</sup>/year  $*$ Sr<sup>87</sup> = radiogenic  $sr^{87}$  = 0.405 ppm  $Bb^{87} = 64.2$  ppm Then:  $t = \frac{1}{1.39 \times 10^{-11}}$  ln  $\left(1 + \frac{0.405}{64.2}\right)$ 

 $= 0.7194 \times 10^{11} \text{ln} (1.00631)$  $= 0.7194 \times 10^{11} \times 0.00630$  $= 453 \times 10^6$  years

# D. CALCULATION OF STANDARD ERRORS

The errors used for the various ratios, isotopic compositions, and spiking have been arrived at by running duplicate samples, standardizing laboratory procedures, interlaboratory checks on analyses, running occasional contamination checks, and by calculating the standard deviations for a large number of samples which have been run in this laboratory.

They are:

error in measurement ratios  $\approx 0.5\%$ error in isotopic composition of spike and normal element  $\approx 0.25%$ error in spike  $\approx 2\%$  $84/88 = 0.9961$  (<sup>1</sup>0.005) =  $\frac{0.0056N(\frac{1}{20.0025})+0.5348S(\frac{1}{20.0025})}{0.8256N(\frac{1}{20.0025})+0.2826S(\frac{1}{20.0025})}$ Cross multiplying:  $0.8224*0.2815S = 0.0056N*0.5348S$ Error in 0.8224  $\neq$  0.8224  $\sqrt{(0.005)^2 + (0.0025)^2}$  $= 0.0046$ Error in 0.2815 = 0.2815  $\sqrt{(0.005)^2 + (0.0025)^2}$  $= 0.0016$ Error in 0.0056 =  $0.0056(0.0025) = 0.00001$ Error in  $0.5348 = 0.5348(0.0025) = 0.0013$ Collecting terms and adding errors,  $0.8168N(10.0046) = 0.2533S(10.0029)$ 

 $N/S = 0.3101$ 

 $\sqrt{(9.9046)^2 + (9.0029)}$ Error in  $N/5$  0.3101

 $-0040$ 

and  $N/5 = 0.3101(20.0040)$ 

Converting to weight ratio

 $Nw/Sw = 0.3101(10.0040) \times 1.0253 = 0.3179(10.0041)$ The error in the spike = 39.6 ( $\frac{1}{20}$ , 79) ugm Nw =  $0.3179 \times 39.6 = 12.6$ Error in Nw = 12.6  $\sqrt{\frac{9.79}{39.6}} \left(\frac{0.0041}{0.3179}\right)^2$ 

 $= 10.30$ 

Since the error in sample weight is negligible compared to those already mentioned, the concentration of normal strontium is:

 $\frac{12.6}{1.0017}$   $\frac{12.6}{0017}$  = 12.6(<sup>t</sup>0.3) ppm

The error in the rubidium concentration was calculated in the same way as the normal strontium and is given below.

Total Rb = 226.6( $\frac{1}{4}$ ,9) ppm and

 $Rb^{87}$  concentration = 0.2832 x 226.6(<sup> $\pm$ 4</sup>.9)= 64.2( $\pm$ 1.4) ppm

Assuming a maximum error of  $(1/8)$  in the measured 87/88 ratio for G3280A (4) Sr IDI, the error in radiogenic strontium content for this analysis was found to be  $0.374(1.038)$  ppm or 10.4%

Using an error of  $(20.5\%)$  for the measured and normal 87/86 ratios, the error in radiogenic strontium content for the isotopic ratio analysis was found to be  $0.405(\text{--}0.0144)$  ppm or 3.6%. The error in the age of this sample is calculated

in the following manner.

If: 
$$
\mathbf{t} = \frac{1}{1.39 \times 10^{-11}} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{0.405(\frac{1}{6}0.0144)}{64.2(\frac{1}{6}1.4)} \right)
$$
  
= 453 x 10<sup>6</sup> years

The error in **age** would **be:**

$$
453 \times 10^{6} \quad \sqrt{\left(\frac{9.0144}{0.405}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{14}{64}\right)^{2}}
$$
\n
$$
= 19 \times 10^{6} \text{ years} \quad \text{or} \quad 4.2\%
$$

But according to Gast **(1957)** as the number of analyses increases the error decreases **by** *\IY* where K equals the number of analyses.

Although the three samples **03280A (?a),** (4), and (5) were not intended to be repetitions at the start of this study, it is now apparent that their total rubidium to total strontium ratios are all quite similer, approximately twenty to one, For this reason they can be considered as a triplicate analysis of G3280A, and the formula Gast refers to can **be** applied.

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} = 0.5774
$$

The error for the three runs would then be

**0.5774** x 4.2% **-** *2.4%*

The error in age would be  $*11 \times 10^6$  years.

### CHAPTER IV. - TREATMENT OF POTASSIUM-ARGON DATA

In order to calculate a potassium-argon age, it is necessary to determine the ratio of  $A^{40}/K^{40}$  in the sample. Sample G3280A (4) is used as an example.

 $A^{40}/K^{40} = \frac{X \times N \times 10^{-10}(1 - 0.1058*R) (39.100)}{R N \cdot 8K N \cdot 10^{-2} \times 0.0119 \times 10^{-2}}$ where  $X =$  number of  $A^{38}$  atoms in spike = 87  $N = 6.02 \times 10^{23}$ 

 $0.1058$  = ratio of 40/38 in the spike gas 0.0119 x 10<sup>-2</sup> = isotopic abundance of  $K^{40}$ 

 $R = 38/40$  ratio after air correction = 0.311  $39.100$  = atomic weight of potassium

 $W =$  weight of sample = 5.00

 $K =$  potassium value in per cent = 6.74

Collecting all the constants together into one term

 $* 0.003285$ 

 $A^{40}/K^{40} = \frac{0.003285(87)(1-0.1058 \times 0.311)}{0.311 \times 5.00 \times 6.74}$ 

 $= 0.0264$ 

A. CALCULATION OF AN AGE

The equation used to calculate the age is:  $t = \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \left[1 + A^{40} / K^{40} \left( -\frac{1+R}{R} \right) \right]$ 

where t = age in years

 $\lambda$  = total decay constant = 5.28 x 10<sup>-10</sup>/year  $A^{40}/K^{40}$  = ratio as determined above = 0.0264  $R =$  branching ratio = 0.118 =  $\frac{\lambda e}{\lambda R}$  $\lambda$ e = 0.557 x 10<sup>-10</sup>/year  $\lambda$ B = 4.72 x 10<sup>-10</sup>/year

Substituting.

$$
t = \frac{1}{5.28 \times 10^{-10}}
$$
 ln [1+0.0264 ( $\frac{120.118}{0.118}$ )]  
=  $\frac{1}{5.28 \times 10^{-10}}$  ln 1.25  
= 424 x 10<sup>6</sup> years

#### B. CALCULATION OF STANDARD ERROR

The standard error assumed for the measured ratios are:

$$
38/40 = 20.1 - 0.3
$$
  

$$
36/38 = 210%
$$

The overall error in any one argon measurement is believed to be #2%. For runs with an air correction greater than 10%, the error may be as high as  $-5\%$ . These errors are mostly qualitative and are based on duplicate analyses, agreement with standards, and contamination checks. At present the largest single error in any age is still due to the potassium values. For this reason the project recently purchased a Perkin Elmer Flame Photometer Nodel 146. Although only A few samples and standards have been analyzed, it has greatly increased the accuracy of potassium determinations and has shown a high degree of reproducibility so far.

By atomizing several different potassium standards over a period of about 30 minutes, a working curve for the standards was set up; and the maximum deviation was found to be  $\mathcal{K}$ . This error is reduced by repetition of analyses. Several analyses of B3207, B3208, and B3209, three biotite standards whose potassium contents have been gravimetrically determined by Goldich (1957), show very good agreement with Goldich's

values.

If the error in chemistry of potassium =  $226$  and the error in determination of potassium =  $23\%$ The overall potassium error =  $\frac{1}{3}$ .6% and If the overall argon error =  $2.0\%$  for G3280A (4) Then total error =  $14.9\%$  or 21 x 10<sup>6</sup> years.

### CHAPTER V - BESULTS

The results for the four different portions of G3280A analyzed are given in Tables 3,  $k$ , 5, 6, 7, and 8, Tables  $3$  and  $4$  give the measured strontium and rubidium ratios, number of sets collected, and sample weight. Tables 5 and 6 contain the potassium and argon measurements. Tables 7 and 8 give the final results for both methods.

In Tables 7 and 8 the rediogenic Sr<sup>87</sup> and age determinations marked I.D. were calculated from the isotope dilution analyses, while the determinations marked I.E. were calculated from the isotope ratio analyses.

The standard error for rubidium concentrations was found to be roughly 2%, while for normal strontium it was approximately 2.5%. The standard error for any one of the analyses G3280A (2a, 4, or 5) is about  $4.2%$ . The errors reported in Table VII for G3280A (2a, 4, and 5) were based on the formula discussed by Gast (1957) which gives an error of  $2.4%$ .

The standard error for the potassium-argon ages has already been described for G3280A (4). Because of the somewhat higher air corrections necessary for @3280A (2a and 6), maximum argon errors of 4% and 5% respectively were used.

![](_page_34_Picture_8.jpeg)

## RESULTS OF ISOTOPIC DILUTION ANALYSES OF THE GLAUCONITE

![](_page_34_Picture_9.jpeg)

**C** 

![](_page_35_Picture_8.jpeg)

# RESULTS OF ISOTOPIC RATIO ANALYSES OF UNSPIKED STRONTIUM FROM THE GLAUCONITE

![](_page_35_Picture_9.jpeg)

မွ

![](_page_36_Picture_16.jpeg)

## RESULTS OF POTASSIUM ANALYSES OF THE GLAUCONITE

Table 5

\* The K concentration is taken from the working curve which plots the concentration as a function of the internal standard reading. \*\* This analysis was run by Stanley Hart of M.I.T.

ξ

![](_page_37_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_12.jpeg)

RESULTS OF ARGON ANALYSES OF THE GLAUCONITE\*

\* All argon analyses reported here were run by Stanley Hart of M.I.T.

3<br>2

# Table 7

## FINAL RESULTS FOR BOTH METHODS

![](_page_38_Picture_16.jpeg)

 $**$  Used  $Sr^{86}/Sr^{88}$  ratio to compute N/S ratio because of contamination in the 84 peaks.

 $\tilde{\omega}$ 

# Table 8

# SUMMARY OF AGES BY BOTH METHODS FOR THE GLAUCONITE

![](_page_39_Picture_15.jpeg)

\* Used  $\frac{86}{5}$ /Sr<sup>88</sup> ratio for N/S ratio computation.

#### **A. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS**

The glauconite ages for the Franconia reported in Table 8 compare very favorably with those listed in Table 9. There are two glauconitic members present in the Franconia formation so that an exact comparison between the ages listed in the two tables is not possible.

#### TABLE 9

OTHER GLAUCONITE AGES FOR FRANCONIA FORMATION

\*Sr<sup>87</sup>/Rb<sup>87</sup>Age K<sup>40</sup>/A<sup>40</sup>Age Analyst Geologic Age Cormier (1956) Middle Upper Cambrian 436 x 10<sup>6</sup>yrs. Wasserburg &  $+460 \times 10^{6}$ Vrs **Hayden (1955)** Middle Upper Cambrian <sup>+A</sup> branching ratio of 0.118 was used

G3280A (2a). The strontium and rubidium analyses for this sample were quite good. The close agreement between the measured \*Sr<sup>87</sup> content for the isotopic dilution and ratio analyses supports this fact. The calculated 86/88 ratio (0.1192) for the isotope ratio analysis shows good agreement with the accepted value of 0.1194 (Bainbridge and Nier, 1950). The 87/88 ratio for the isotopic dilution analysis was calculated using the rubidium free portion of the run.

One of the potassium solutions was run four times bebause during the second set of analyses the galvanometer needle started drifting badly.

The portion analyzed for argon was placed in the furnace

and outgassed at room temperature overnight. None of the samples placed in the furnace were outgassed at elevated temp**eratues** prior to **fustion.**

**G3280A (4).** The duplicate rubidium analyses show excellent agreement. The strontium isotope dilution run contained rubidium contamination throughout. In order to calculate **sa** age for **this** rut **a** *rubidium* **83/87** ratio **had to** *be* **estimated, and the measured 87 peaks had to be corrected for** by subtracting the amount of  $Rb^{87}$  present. The emission, lduring the strontim isotope ratio analysis, *was* somewhat erratic as witnessed by the strontium 86/88 ratio of 0.1206 **as 6peared** to the normal value **of** 0.1194.

the potassian analyses for **this sample showed** exoellont agreement. The portion analyzed for argon was put in the furae and **pumped on** for tour **and one-half ays** with **no** heatiag.

**G3280A (5).** The rubidium analyses for this portion show greater variation than the two portions above but are still in good agreement. The strontium isotope dilution analysis **contained** rubidium oontasination throughout; **and,** because no rubidium peaks were scanned before the strontium emission started, the calculation of an age using this analysis would have a very large error. The strontium isotope ratio analysis for this portion was steady, and the strontium shows excellent agreement.

The potassium analyses show good agreement. The argon portion was allowed to outgas overnight at room **tomperature** under vacuum.

**A3280A (6).** The rubidium concentration is based on only one analysis. Two earlier attempts to analyze the rubidium **content** failed when **the** filament **on** the **mass** speetrometer burned out before the samples could be run. The strontium isotope dilution analysis **was a** very **good run** with exeollent resolution and no rubidium contamination from start to finish. The strontium isotope dilution analysis was a very **good run** with esellent resolution **and no** rubidium contamination from start to finish. The strontium isotope ratio run **was** fair. Beeause **no** strontium **88** peaks were **clleeted,** no **86/88** ratio could **be oeleulated** to **Oebk** against the normal strontium 86/88 ratio.

The potassium analyses show **good** agreement The argon portion was placed **in** the furnae and allowed to pump overnight.

## **8. CONCLUSIONS**

**1.** The b/Sr ages **for g3280A (2a,** *4,* **and 5)** show excellent agreement and prove that the acetic acid leaching for seventeen hours **hat no** effeot on the **age** of this particular glauonaito. The rubidium and radiogente strontium- ontent remained unchanged while the normal strontium content was lowered from 12 ppm to 8.6 ppm. By reducing the common strontim **present,** the percentage **of** \*Sr <sup>7</sup> /Sr **to** inoreased and the precision of measurement should be improved. Because of-the large amount of ealcium carbonate present, **the** matrix portion gave a much lower Rb/Sr ratio (<2) than the other **three** analyses which **gave retios of** about 20. This low **ratio** caused the errors to range from 32% for the isotope ratio age to over 100% for the isotope dilution age and made them

completely unreliable.

a. The  $K/A$  ages for  $G3280A$  (2a, 4, and 5) also show excellent agreement and prove that heating at 97°C for twenty-five hours does not effect the age. Although the  $A^{40}$  content listed in Table 6 for G3280A  $(4)$  is roughly 1.3% lower than G3280A (2a and 5), analyst Hart does not attribute this difference to the heating treatment which the sample received. It should also be noted that this fraction was outgassed for four and one-half days prior to being analyzed for argon. The matrix portion gave an age which is in excellent agreement with the Rb/Sr ages but is 35 million years older than the three other K/A analyses. The measured amounts of  $A^{40}$  and potassium were both proportionately lower because of the large amount of extraneous calcium carbonate present. This does not appear to have effected the age except to increase the error in the accuracy with which the smaller quantities of argon and potassium can be measured.

3. A plot of the three reliable Rb/Sr and K/A ages on the Holmes B Time Scale (Figure 2), which was taken from Cormier's thesis (1956), shows good agreement. The K/A ages appear to be slightly lower while the Rb/Sr ages are slightly higher. An average of the ages for the two methods gives  $440(120)$ million years which falls right on the line used by Holmes in his time scale.

4. An age for the Birkmose member of the Franconia formation of the Upper Cambrian has been calculated as 455(-20) million

![](_page_44_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

**38a** 

 $\epsilon$ 

years using the Rb/Sr method. An age of  $425(222)$  million years has been calculated using the K/A method. At present the age calculated by the Bb/Sr method is slightly more accurate because of the uncertainity which is still present in the method used for potassium determination. If the potassium analyses reported in this study are actually 3% high, the calculated ages would all be roughly 12-15 million years older; but the disagreement with Wasserburg and Hayden's K/A age (Table 9) needs further investigation.

#### C. SUCGESTIONS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

1. Another sample or two from the Birkmose member should be analyzed in order to determine sample to sample reproducibility by both methods of age determination. 2. The portion G3280A (3) should be analyzed now to determine the effect of heating at a higher temperature prior to the

argon analysis.

3. A sample from the Reno member, which lies above the Birkmose (Figure 1) should be analyzed to test the precision and degree of resolution which can be obtained by the Rb/Sr and K/A methods.

4. In order to determine just how much material can be leached from a glaudonite, several glauconites should be split into three or four portions with all but one being treated by a different strength of hydrochloric or acetic ecid. The results from an analysis of this type would be helpful for two reasons.

**a)** It **may** show that **acids** above a certain **concentration** affect **the** \*Sr *?/Rb87* ratio. **If this is** *so,* then only acids below that concentration should **be** used, **b)** It may show that acids above a certain strength all leach the **same** amount of **common** strontium from the **rlaueonlte. If this** is **so, then one of** the weakest **of** these acids which leach the same amount could be used as a standard to leach all glauconites.

*5.* Professor Pian~L **of** MIT has suggested setting up **a** columa **siller to** an ton exchange column using **a** glauoonite **in** place of the resin. This glauconite would then be continuously eluted with an acid for several hours. This experiment **sounds like an excellent idea because it would simulate the** action **of ground** water **as** it flows through a permeable **bed. 6. Olauooites** of different lattice secings (some of **the** less ordered varieties) should also be leached and analyzed **by** both methods., The poorly orystallized varieties are likely to show a much greater spread between methods because of the probability **that less** of **the elements** from the glaueonite itself is more **likely** to occur

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Aldrich, L.T.; Wetherill, G.W.; Tilton, G.R.; and Davis, G.L., (1956) Half Life of Rb<sup>87</sup>, Phys. Rev., v. 103, p. 1045-7.
- Bainbridge, K.T. and Nier, A.O., (1950), Relative Isotopic<br>Abundances of the Elements, <u>Preliminary Report No. 9</u> Nuclear Science Series, National Research Council U.S., Washington D.C.
- Berg, R.R.; Nelson, C.A.; and Bell, W.C., (1956), "Upper Cambrian Rocks in Southeastern Minnesots", Lower Paleozoic of the Upper Miss, Valley, G.S.A. Guidebook Field Trip No. 2, 1956, Minneapolis, Minn. p. 1-10, 78.
- Cloud, P.E., Jr. (1955) Physical Limits of Glauconite Formation. Bull, Amer. Assoc. Pet. Geol. v. 39, p. 484-92.
- Cormier, R.F., (1956), Eubidium Strontium Ages of a Glauconite and Their Application to the Construction of an Absolute Post-Precembrian Time Scale, Ph.D.Thesis, M.I.T. (unpub.)
- Gast, P.W., (1957), Absolute Age Determination from Early Pre-Cambrian Rocks, Ph.D. Thesis, Columbia Univ. p. IV-7  $(unpublished)$
- Goldich, S.S., Basdsgard, H., and Nier, A.O., (1957) Investiga-<br>tions in A<sup>48</sup>/K<sup>48</sup> Dating: <u>Trans, Amer, Geophy, Union</u>,  $v. 38, p. 547-51.$
- Herzog, L.F., and Pinson, W.H. Jr., (1956), Rb/Sr Age, Elemental and Isotopic Abundance Studies of Stony Meteorites, Am. Jour of Sci, v. 254, p. 555.
- Herzog, L.F.; Pinson, W.H., Jr.; and Cormier, R.F., (1958), Sediment Age Determination by Rb/Sr Analysis of Glauconite, Bull. Amer. Assoc. Pet. Geol., v. 42, p. 717-33.
- Hurley, P.M., (1957), Argon 40-Potassium 40 Research, Fourth<br>Annual Progress Report for 1956-57, NYO-3937, U.S.Atomic Energy Commission, p. 17-25.
- Hurley, P.M., (1958), Progress Report on Argon Analysis,<br>Fifth Annual Progress Report for 1957-58, NY0-3938, U.S.Atomic Energy Commission, p. 17-25.
- Lipson, J., (1956), K-A Dating of Sediments, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, v. 10, p. 149-51.
- Moore, J., (1958), X-ray Diffraction Study of Glauconite. Fifth Annual Progress Report for 1957-58, NYO-3938, U.S.Atomic Energy Commission, p. 108-20.
- Nier, A.O., (1950), A Redetermination of the Relative Abundances of the Isotopes of Neon, Krypton, Rubidium, Xenon, and Mercury, Phys. Rev., v. 79, p.450.
- Pinson, W.H., (1957), Preparation of Rb. K. and Sr Samples Obtained from Rocks and Minerals for Solid Source Mass Spectrometric Analysis, Fourth Annual Progress Report<br>for 1956-57, NY0-3937, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission  $p.75-82.$
- Pinson, WWH., (1958) Flame Photometric Analysis for Potassium in Micas, Fifth Annual Progress Report for 1957-58, NYO-3938, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, p.26-45
- Schumacher,  $E_{.1}(1956)$ , Age of Meteorites by the Rb<sup>87</sup>/Sr<sup>87</sup> method. In. Nuclear Processes in Geologic Settings.<br>National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council<br>U.S., Publ. No. 400, Washington, D.C.
- Warshaw, C.M. (1957), The Mineralogy of Glauconite, Ph.D. Thesis, Penn State Univ. (unpublished)
- Wasserburg, G.J., and Hayden, R.J., (1955)A<sup>40</sup>K<sup>40</sup> Dating,<br>Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, v.7, p.51-60.
- Wasserhurs 40.J.; Hayden, R.J.and Jensen, K.J. (1956)<br>A<sup>48</sup> Pating of Igneous Rocks and Sediments. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, v. 10, p.153-65
- Winchester, J.W., (1957), Radiochemical Studies, Fourth<br>Annual Progress Report for 1956-57, NYO-3937, U.S.<br>Atomic Energy Commission, p.82-84.
- Instruction Manual Flame Photometer Model 146, The Perkin Elmer Corp., Norwalk, Conn., 1957.