

**THE  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  DATING TECHNIQUE FOR METEORITES**

N. Dalcher<sup>1</sup>, K. C. Welten<sup>2</sup>, K. Nishiizumi<sup>2</sup>, R. Wieler<sup>3</sup>, N. Vogel<sup>3</sup>, I. Leya<sup>1</sup>, M. W. Caffee<sup>4</sup>. <sup>1</sup>Institute of Physics, Space Research & Planetary Science, University of Bern, 3012 Bern, Switzerland. E-Mail: nathalie.dalcher@space.unibe.ch. <sup>2</sup>Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-7450, USA. Institute of Geochemistry and Petrology, ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland. <sup>4</sup>Department of Physics, PRIME Laboratory, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1396, USA.

**Introduction:** The  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  exposure age dating technique (e.g., [1,2]) is self-correcting for shielding and to some extent also for sample chemistry. However, comparisons of  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  ages of meteorites with ages determined by the  $^{36}\text{Cl}$ - $^{36}\text{Ar}$  method, which is also self-correcting for shielding [3], revealed significant age differences (up to 25% with large uncertainties) between both methods [4]. Possible explanations are: 1) the production rates for  $\text{Kr}$ , obtained from lunar samples, are not valid for stony meteorites either due to different concentrations of the main target elements (Rb, Sr, Y, Zr and Nb) and/or due to different irradiation conditions. 2)  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  ages of the former study [4] were compromised by high amounts of trapped  $\text{Kr}$  and relatively low exposure ages. Here we further compare  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  ages (obtained on bulk samples) with  $^{36}\text{Cl}$ - $^{36}\text{Ar}$  ages (obtained on metal separates) from selected ordinary chondrites.

**Methods and Samples:** Samples were selected according to the following criteria: ordinary chondrites (sufficient metal for  $\text{Cl}$ - $\text{Ar}$  dating), high petrographic type (H5, L5, L6, to minimize trapped  $\text{Kr}$  contributions), low weathering grade and long exposure age. To determine  $^{36}\text{Cl}$ - $^{36}\text{Ar}$  ages, we analysed  $^{10}\text{Be}$ ,  $^{26}\text{Al}$ , and  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  by AMS and  $^3\text{He}$ ,  $^{21,22}\text{Ne}$ , and  $^{36,38}\text{Ar}$  by noble gas mass spectrometry in clean metal separates of fourteen meteorites. So far,  $^{81}\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  ages (as well as  $\text{He}$ ,  $\text{Ne}$ , and  $\text{Ar}$  isotopes) were determined in bulk samples of seven of these meteorites. **Results and discussion:** Cosmogenic  $^{81}\text{Kr}$  (~100 times above blank levels) was detected in all seven bulk samples ( $1\text{--}3 \times 10^{-14}$  ccSTP/g), which also show well-resolvable contributions of stable cosmogenic  $\text{Kr}$  isotopes ( $^{83}\text{Kr}/^{86}\text{Kr} > 0.8$ ;  $^{84}\text{Kr}/^{86}\text{Kr} > 3.3$ ). Corrections for trapped  $\text{Kr}$  (air or Q) are ~30% ( $^{78}\text{Kr}$ ) and ~70% ( $^{83}\text{Kr}$ ), respectively. Cosmogenic  $^{81}\text{Kr}/^{83}\text{Kr}$  ratios have uncertainties of 2-7%. Using the  $\text{Kr}$  isotope data and the  $^{36}\text{Ar}$ - $^{36}\text{Cl}$  exposure ages, calculated after [5] with uncertainties of 2-6%, we determine a new empirical equation for the production rate ratio  $^{81}\text{Kr}/^{83}\text{Kr}$  as a function of  $^{78}\text{Kr}/^{83}\text{Kr}$ . The slope of the new equation is in agreement within 2% with that given by [6] and within 13% with the relation proposed by [4].

**Outlook:** The agreement between the different equations adds more reliability to the  $\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  dating system. Our new data, in combination with new model calculations for cosmogenic production rates of  $\text{Kr}$  isotopes [5] will help reducing uncertainties on the final  $\text{Kr}$ - $\text{Kr}$  dating. This will be of great importance for exposure age studies, e.g., on chondrules and CAIs [e.g., 7]

**References:** [1] Marti K. 1967. *Physical Review Letters* 18: 264-266. [2] Eugster O. et al. 2006. in: *Meteorites and the Early Solar System II*: 829-851. [3] Graf Th. et al. 2000. *Icarus* 150: 181-188. [4] Leya I. et al. 2004. *Antarctic Meteorite Research* 17:185-199. [5] Leya, I and Masarik, J. 2009. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science* 44: 1061-1086. [6] Lugmair, G.W. and Marti, K. 1971. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 13:32-42. [7] Vogel, N. et al. 2009. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science* 43, suppl., A212.