

How We Learned to Date the Past

QTC-017 · From Quarks to Consciousness

The Universe, Life, and How We Found Out

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v1.0 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Current scientific interpretation

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Radiometric dating is often compressed into a simple story: radioactive atoms decay at known rates, so a laboratory reads a rock's age. The real achievement is more exacting. A date belongs to a mineral, an isotope system and a physical event; it depends on initial composition, closure, calibration, contamination control and a geological interpretation that can be tested. This article follows that chain from exponential decay and mass spectrometry through isochrons, closure temperature, U–Pb concordia, argon and radiocarbon clocks, and the metrology behind modern uncertainties. It also explains why discordant results can preserve history rather than represent failure. The strongest chronology is not one spectacular number, but agreement earned among clocks with different sensitivities and independently examined assumptions and uncertainties.

In 60 Seconds

A radioactive parent isotope decays into a daughter isotope with a characteristic probability. That supplies a clock, but chemistry decides when the clock starts: crystallization, cooling, eruption or metamorphism separates elements and may close a mineral to later exchange. Measuring today's ratios then requires a mass spectrometer, correction for contamination and fractionation, and a model for any daughter isotope present at the start. Isochrons can solve for that initial component, but a straight line is not automatically an age. Minerals can inherit older domains or lose daughter products during heating. U–Pb dating is unusually powerful because two uranium decay chains can test one another; concordance strengthens an interpretation, while discordance can reveal lead loss. Other clocks answer other questions. Argon often records cooling or eruption. Carbon-14 follows recent carbon exchange and reaches roughly 55,000 years, not planetary formation. Precision comes from clean laboratories, calibrated tracers, standards, uncertainty propagation and interlaboratory agreement. A defensible date therefore names the sample, event, clock, model and uncertainty.

Why This Question Matters

Deep time became quantitative only when physics, chemistry, geology and measurement learned to constrain one another. The distinction matters beyond geochronology. A number can be extremely precise yet attached to the wrong event; two measurements can disagree because a rock preserved two episodes; a tiny contaminant can dominate a tiny sample. Dating teaches a general lesson about evidence: instruments do not eliminate interpretation, but disciplined interpretation makes assumptions visible, tests failure modes and turns disagreement into information. Those habits are what let later articles place planetary changes in sequence rather than merely narrate them.

1. An Age Belongs to an Event and a System

The Question

If a zircon is older than the rock around it, which age is the rock's age? The question exposes the first rule of geochronology: laboratories measure isotope systems, while geology decides which event those systems recorded.

Radioactive decay is stochastic at the scale of one nucleus but regular across a large population. Rutherford and Soddy established that radioactivity represents atomic transformation, and Boltwood connected uranium's products to geological time.[1,2] If N parent atoms remain, their expected abundance follows an exponential law. The law is the clockwork; it is not yet the date.

A half-life is the time in which half a large parent population is expected to decay. It is related to the decay constant by $t_{1/2} = \ln(2)/\lambda$. Uranium half-lives and the conventions used in geochronology have been measured and standardized with finite uncertainties.[4,6,7] Changing a decay constant changes every calculated absolute age that depends on it, even when the measured isotope ratios remain identical.

Those ratios come from mass spectrometry. Dempster's positive-ray method separated ions by mass-to-charge behavior; modern instruments count or integrate isotope beams with far greater sensitivity.[3,18,19] Yet the machine does not output an event. Analysts correct mass fractionation, detector behavior, laboratory blank and tracer contribution before a decay equation can translate ratios into time.

The result therefore has a subject and a verb: this mineral crystallized, cooled, recrystallized or lost an isotope at a stated time. A whole rock may contain several such subjects. Closure models and U–Pb practice make the same point from different directions: an age is assigned to a recorded event, then connected to the larger object through geological evidence.[14,36]

Calling a rock 'four billion years old' can be useful shorthand, but only after the dated phase and event have been identified. The apparent simplicity of a date rests on a chain of definitions. The next question is what physical operation starts that chain rather than merely allowing radioactive atoms to continue decaying.

Where That Leaves Us

Decay supplies a stable mathematical relation, but neither the equation nor the instrument chooses the event. That choice begins with chemistry: elements enter minerals differently, parent and daughter are separated, and later exchange may stop. To understand when an isotope clock starts, we must follow the material before we follow the arithmetic.

2. Decay Gives a Clock, Chemistry Starts It

Crystallization sorts elements. Cooling can slow diffusion until a mineral retains them; eruption can quench a melt; metamorphism can open an older system and create a new one. These are candidate starting events, not interchangeable labels.[14,36,37] Radioactive decay occurred before and after them. The dated interval begins when the relevant chemical distribution and retention model begins.

A hand specimen can combine minerals that formed at different times. A zircon core may be inherited from older crust, its rim may grow in a younger magma, and still later fluids may alter damaged domains.[10,11,36] Dissolving everything together can average those histories. Imaging and spot analysis can locate them, while bulk dissolution can measure selected fractions with exceptional precision.

Daughter isotope may also be present at the beginning. An isochron can estimate that initial ratio from related samples, while other methods subtract a common component or select minerals that strongly exclude the daughter.[9,13] Apollo 14 basalts showed why the issue is not bookkeeping: total-rock model ages failed to equal crystallization ages when initial lead had a more complicated history.

At small scale, laboratory material becomes geological material. A few picograms or femtograms of contaminant lead can be important beside the sample signal. Low-contamination zircon chemistry, reproducibility studies and Patterson's experience all show that preparation rooms, reagents and vessels form part of the measurement system.[15,21,34] The clock does not stop at the mass spectrometer door.

Chemistry starts the clock and contamination can rewrite its starting inventory. One method responds by comparing several related materials rather than trusting a single assumed initial daughter value. That graphical escape—the isochron—works only if the materials truly share the history that its line claims.

Where That Leaves Us

A parent–daughter ratio is meaningful only inside a chemical history. Minerals can start together, inherit older components or reopen later, and contamination can add an artificial initial inventory. Isochrons were designed to estimate one hidden starting value, but their power depends on demanding more from a line than visual straightness.

3. Initial Daughter and the Isochron Escape

The Question

Several analyses fall on a beautiful straight line, and the software reports a precise slope. Is that an age? Only if the points began with the same daughter ratio, record one event and avoided later exchange or deceptive mixing.

In a conventional isochron, related samples or minerals are plotted using isotope ratios that normalize parent and daughter to a stable isotope. If they began with one daughter ratio and remained closed, decay moves them onto a line. Its slope contains $\exp(\lambda t) - 1$ and therefore the age; its intercept estimates the initial daughter ratio.[8,9] One graph can solve for two unknowns.

The geometry needs leverage. Samples with nearly identical parent-to-daughter ratios cluster together and poorly constrain a slope. Modern regression must also treat uncertainty in both axes and the correlations created by common denominators and corrections.[8,9] A small printed standard error is not a substitute for a wide, geologically justified spread in composition.

Mixing can also draw a line. Materials from two end members may plot linearly even if no single decay interval connects them, while variable initial daughter or diachronous closure can create an

errorchron.[9,13] Residual scatter, petrology, field relations and the plausibility of a shared initial reservoir decide whether a slope deserves an age label.

Derek York's correlated-error regression made the statistics more honest; current implementations also model overdispersion rather than forcing every point to fit analytical errors.[8,9,19] Excess scatter may signal understated measurement uncertainty, inherited components or genuinely different closure times. The correct response is to expose the extra variation and test explanations, not to make the error bar cosmetically small.

The isochron removes one assumption by estimating an initial ratio, but it adds a demanding claim about shared history. Even a valid line dates the event that established or last equilibrated that system. To decide whether later heating preserved, blurred or erased it, chronology must become thermochronology.

Where That Leaves Us

An isochron can turn an unknown initial daughter component into a measured intercept, yet it cannot certify its own geology. Composition, covariance and shared history must all cooperate. The next layer is physical retention: minerals do not simply switch from open to closed at one universal temperature, and partial reopening can preserve several chapters at once.

4. Minerals Close, Reopen and Remember

A mineral cools through a range in which diffusion becomes progressively slower. Dodson showed that an effective closure temperature depends on diffusion parameters, grain size, geometry and cooling rate.[14,37] It is therefore not a permanent label printed beside a mineral name. A small rapidly cooled grain and a large slowly cooled grain need not retain the same event at the same temperature.

Later heat can reopen some domains without homogenizing the whole crystal. Lead loss, argon loss, diffusion profiles and recrystallized zones can leave an analysis between its original and resetting ages.[10–12,14] The pattern may look discordant because the sample is not one clock that failed; it is several spatial or chemical clocks responding differently to one thermal history.

Inheritance produces the opposite-looking problem. A crystal incorporated into a younger magma may preserve an older core, so a numerically excellent old age can be correct for the grain and wrong for the host's emplacement.[10,36] Imaging, zoning, trace elements and field context identify which domains grew where. Precision cannot decide that spatial question by itself.

Discordance can consequently become a thermometer and history recorder. Several minerals with different diffusion behavior may bracket cooling; domains within one zircon may separate growth from later lead loss. Graphical solutions developed for discordant U–Pb ages made this inversion explicit.[10–12,14] The interpretation remains model-dependent, but discarding every disturbed analysis would throw away the disturbance itself.

Closure turns one geological history into several overlapping time records. U–Pb geochronology exploits this complexity especially well because uranium supplies two decay chains in the same mineral. Their agreement can certify a simple history; their disagreement can reveal when the system reopened.

Where That Leaves Us

Closure is a kinetic history, not a fixed mineral thermometer. Grain size, cooling rate and later heat determine what survives, while inheritance can preserve an event older than the host. Uranium–lead dating turns these complications into a structured test by placing two decay chains, common lead and discordance inside one analytical framework.

5. Uranium–Lead Turns Disagreement into Evidence

The Question

One uranium isotope decays to lead-206 and another to lead-207. When both clocks inhabit the same zircon, agreement is more than repetition: it tests whether the mineral’s measured history is compatible with two distinct decay rates.

Uranium-238 decays to lead-206 and uranium-235 to lead-207 through separate chains. Nier’s isotope measurements and later half-life work made both clocks quantitative.[4–6,36] Because their decay constants differ, one mineral can yield two age estimates. Agreement places the analysis on concordia; disagreement identifies a history that needs explanation rather than an average to conceal it.

Zircon is unusually useful because its crystal structure accepts uranium while ordinarily incorporating little initial lead. It can also survive weathering and melting that destroy other records.[15,16,21,36] But radiation damage opens pathways for lead loss, inherited cores carry older ages, and common lead can enter. Zircon is a resilient archive, not a perfect capsule.

Concordia describes combinations of uranium–lead ratios that agree at one age. If later lead loss moves analyses away from it, a discordia line may intersect concordia near the original crystallization and disturbance times.[10–12,36] Those intercepts are model results: several loss episodes, inheritance or mixed domains can imitate a simple line. Textures and residuals must support the chosen story.

Technique controls which part of that story is visible. Chemical abrasion removes many radiation-damaged, lead-loss-prone domains before isotope-dilution thermal ionization mass spectrometry. ID-TIMS can achieve extraordinary bulk precision; SIMS and laser-ablation ICP-MS preserve spatial resolution and throughput.[16–21] Decay constants, natural $^{238}\text{U}/^{235}\text{U}$ variation, tracer calibration and reference-material behavior still limit accuracy and comparability.

U–Pb is powerful because its redundancy makes disturbance testable, not because it is immune to disturbance. Its tradeoffs also show why no universal best clock exists. Some questions require a spatial map; others require the smallest uncertainty; still others concern elements and temperatures that zircon barely records.

Where That Leaves Us

Two uranium clocks can expose lead loss, while zircon chemistry and analytical choices determine what is measured. Concordance is earned through agreement; discordance can recover disturbance if the model is justified. The same principle extends beyond U–Pb: every chronometer couples one decay law to particular elements, materials, temperatures and events.

6. Different Clocks Answer Different Questions

The $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ method irradiates a sample so that potassium-39 produces argon-39, a proxy for potassium. A co-irradiated monitor establishes the irradiation parameter, tying the unknown to a standard.[22–25] Step heating can separate argon released from different domains. The result may date eruption or cooling, but excess argon, recoil, alteration and loss can create misleading plateaus or spectra.

Other systems exploit different chemistry. Rb–Sr isochrons can date differentiation or equilibration; Sm–Nd is relatively robust in many mafic materials and can preserve initial-reservoir information. The extinct ^{182}Hf – ^{182}W clock reaches into early metal–silicate differentiation because tungsten follows metal more strongly than hafnium.[26,27] Its inferred times are tied to initial Solar System ratios and models of accretion and equilibration.

Radiocarbon occupies a completely different scale. Living organisms exchange carbon with their environment; after exchange ends, carbon-14 declines. Libby, Anderson and Arnold established the method and tested it against objects of known age.[28–32] Modern atmospheric and marine calibration curves extend to about 55,000 calendar years, while Bayesian models combine measurements with stratigraphic or archaeological order. Reservoir offsets and contamination remain explicit.

Carbon-14's physical half-life is about 5,730 years. That makes it powerful for recent organic remains and selected carbonates, but exhausted for the age of Earth. The clock that dates a mammoth is not the clock that dates a planet.[30,31] Uranium's long-lived isotopes reach billions of years; carbon-14 follows recent carbon exchange. Material and event choose the clock before desired precision does.

A menu of clocks is therefore an advantage. Different elements and closure behaviors let geologists separate crystallization, cooling, eruption, alteration and reservoir evolution. But combining them requires knowing which uncertainties belong to the sample and which belong to the shared standards, decay constants and calibration infrastructure.

Where That Leaves Us

Argon, neodymium, tungsten and carbon do not compete to produce one generic age. Their chemistry makes them sensitive to different events and timescales. That diversity enables cross-checks, but it also exposes a metrological problem: precision must be built and uncertainty partitioned before two exquisitely measured numbers can be compared honestly.

7. Precision Is Built from Blanks, Standards and Calibration

The Question

Patterson's meteorites contained so little lead that ordinary laboratory air, reagents and dust overwhelmed the signal. Dating Earth accurately therefore required an unexpected invention: a cleaner environment than the samples had ever encountered in nature.

Patterson's 1956 lead-isotope result gave 4.55 ± 0.07 billion years for meteorites and Earth. It did not come from finding a surviving terrestrial rock stamped with the planet's birth date. He related meteorite lead compositions and terrestrial lead within a common Solar System history.[33,34] The

number was powerful because the measurement, reservoir model and independent astronomical context worked together.

Reaching it required about five years of microgram and submicrogram lead chemistry and mass spectrometry. Dusty rooms, reagents and vessels added more lead than the tiny samples could tolerate. Patterson developed exceptionally clean facilities at Caltech, helping establish practices that later became normal for ultra-trace work.[34] The apparatus included the room, air handling, distilled acids, containers and habits of the people inside.

The contamination problem opened a second history. Measurements pursued to control geological lead helped Patterson distinguish natural background from widespread industrial lead in air, oceans and people.[34,35] He did not act alone, and regulation was gradual, contested and institutional. The causal thread nevertheless matters: attempting to measure the distant past precisely revealed an unrecognized planetary-scale alteration of the present.

Modern metrology formalizes the lesson. Precision describes repeat measurements; accuracy concerns closeness to the correct value; repeatability and interlaboratory reproducibility ask different questions. Tracer calibration, decay constants, blank subtraction and covariance contribute different uncertainty terms.[18–21,38] A long string of digits can report counting performance while hiding a shared calibration limit or a wrong geological event.

Clean laboratories and calibrated tracers do not remove interpretation; they make one class of alternatives small enough to test the rest. A credible uncertainty budget must travel with the age. The final test then moves beyond one laboratory: independent clocks and laboratories must recover compatible histories without sharing every possible mistake.

Where That Leaves Us

Patterson's age was inseparable from a victory over contamination, and that victory exposed industrial lead beyond the laboratory. Modern precision likewise depends on rooms, reagents, tracers, constants, covariance and shared standards. Once those terms are visible, agreement across laboratories and different clocks becomes evidence rather than coincidence—and disagreement becomes a diagnostic experiment.

8. Agreement Is Earned across Independent Clocks

Two clocks are most persuasive when they respond differently to disturbance and do not inherit every calibration from the same source. U–Pb and $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ comparisons have exposed systematic offsets, revised mineral standards and improved decay-constant estimates.[23–25,38–40] Yet the ^{40}K decay scheme is still being calibrated: a once-overlooked ground-state electron-capture branch and alternative parameter sets can shift absolute ages at the sub-percent scale. Agreement is earned through visible revision, not by declaring the constants finished.

Disagreement can locate the missing process. A zircon may preserve crystallization while feldspar argon records cooling; lead loss may move U–Pb analyses off concordia; excess argon may make a volcanic mineral too old.[10,12,23,38] The first task is not to choose a favorite number. It is to ask whether the clocks dated different events or whether one calibration or geological assumption failed.

Interlaboratory comparison asks the same question across people and instruments. Shared synthetic solutions test analytical calibration; natural zircons test a mixture of analytical performance and sample heterogeneity. Reproducible high-precision results require explicit uncertainty components and reporting conventions.[21,38] A reference material that behaves perfectly in one method may not test the spatial or chemical bias relevant to another.

The full statement of an age is therefore longer than its headline: a named material recorded a named event through a named isotope system, analyzed by a stated procedure and interpreted with stated assumptions and uncertainty.[14,36,38] This does not weaken the result. It explains what makes the result portable, correctable and able to constrain other evidence.

Geochronology did not produce a universal device that reads ‘the past.’ It built a family of clocks whose disagreements can be understood and whose agreements can survive independent tests. QTC-018 will use those event-specific ages to reconstruct Earth’s changing surface and interior; the boundary matters because chronology measures when, while geology must still establish what happened.

Where That Leaves Us

A date becomes durable when its event, system, calibration and uncertainty remain visible and independent evidence can challenge them. Agreement among clocks is earned by surviving different failure modes; discordance can expose hidden history. With that metrological foundation, the next article can ask how Earth changed through time without mistaking chronology for the changes themselves.

What We Know, and How

- Radioactive decay follows a calibrated exponential law in large atomic populations, while every age still requires an initial condition and event model.[1–7]
- Isochrons can estimate initial daughter isotope, but cogenetic origin, compositional leverage, covariance and closure must be tested.[8,9,13,19]
- Mineral closure depends on diffusion, size and cooling history; partial resetting and inheritance can preserve several events.[10–14]
- U–Pb combines two decay chains, and modern preparation, tracers, standards and interlaboratory tests support high precision.[15–21]
- Argon, extinct-isotope and radiocarbon clocks answer different questions and timescales.[22–32]

What We Still Don’t Know

- The exact event represented by every published age when sample context or later alteration is incomplete.
- How much unresolved natural heterogeneity remains inside widely used reference materials.
- The best diffusion and resetting model for every complex mineral and thermal history.
- How far future decay-constant, tracer and cross-calibration revisions will move the most precise absolute ages.
- Which automated reporting standard will preserve full analytical and geological provenance across methods.

What Could Change Our Minds

- Revised decay constants or SI-traceable tracer calibrations that shift absolute ages beyond present uncertainty.
- Blind interlaboratory comparisons that reveal persistent offsets hidden by current standards.
- Spatial analyses showing that a supposedly single-age mineral population contains inherited or reset domains.
- Cross-clock disagreement that persists after calibration, closure and event-correlation assumptions are independently tested.
- New diffusion experiments or geological context that reassign an age from crystallization to cooling, alteration or mixing.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Radiometric dating does not read a rock's birthday. It measures an isotope system, models its start and disturbances, calibrates corrections, and earns an event age through context and independent agreement.

Related Articles

- QTC-007 — Deep Time
- QTC-016 — How to Build a Planet
- QTC-018 — The Planet That Moves

References

- [1] E. Rutherford; Frederick Soddy. LXXXIV.—The radioactivity of thorium compounds. II. The cause and nature of radioactivity. *Journal of the Chemical Society, Transactions* 81, 837–860 (1902). DOI 10.1039/CT9028100837. <https://doi.org/10.1039/CT9028100837>
- [2] B. B. Boltwood. Ultimate disintegration products of the radioactive elements; Part II, Disintegration products of uranium. *American Journal of Science* s4-23(134), 78–88 (1907). DOI 10.2475/ajs.s4-23.134.78. <https://doi.org/10.2475/ajs.s4-23.134.78>
- [3] A. J. Dempster. A new Method of Positive Ray Analysis. *Physical Review* 11, 316–325 (1918). DOI 10.1103/PhysRev.11.316. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.11.316>
- [4] Alfred O. Nier. The Isotopic Constitution of Uranium and the Half-Lives of the Uranium Isotopes. I. *Physical Review* 55, 150–153 (1939). DOI 10.1103/PhysRev.55.150. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.55.150>
- [5] Alfred O. Nier. The Isotopic Constitution of Radiogenic Leads and the Measurement of Geological Time. II. *Physical Review* 55, 153–163 (1939). DOI 10.1103/PhysRev.55.153. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.55.153>
- [6] A. H. Jaffey; K. F. Flynn; L. E. Glendenin; W. C. Bentley; A. M. Essling. Precision Measurement of Half-Lives and Specific Activities of ²³⁵U and ²³⁸U. *Physical Review C* 4, 1889–1906 (1971). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevC.4.1889. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.4.1889>

- [7] R. H. Steiger; E. Jäger. Subcommission on geochronology: Convention on the use of decay constants in geo- and cosmochronology. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 36, 359–362 (1977). DOI 10.1016/0012-821X(77)90060-7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(77\)90060-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(77)90060-7)
- [8] Derek York. Least squares fitting of a straight line with correlated errors. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 5, 320–324 (1969). DOI 10.1016/S0012-821X(68)80059-7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(68\)80059-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(68)80059-7)
- [9] Pieter Vermeesch. Errorchrons and anchored isochrons in IsoplotR. *Geochronology* 6, 397–407 (2024). DOI 10.5194/gchron-6-397-2024. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gchron-6-397-2024>
- [10] L. O. Nicolaysen. Graphic Interpretation of Discordant Age Measurements on Metamorphic Rocks. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 91(2), 198–206 (1961). DOI 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1961.tb35452.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1961.tb35452.x>
- [11] L. R. Stieff; T. W. Stern. Graphic and algebraic solutions of the discordant lead-uranium age problem. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 22, 176–199 (1961). DOI 10.1016/0016-7037(61)90116-8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(61\)90116-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(61)90116-8)
- [12] George W. Wetherill. Discordant uranium-lead ages, I. *Transactions, American Geophysical Union* 37, 320–326 (1956). DOI 10.1029/TR037i003p00320. <https://doi.org/10.1029/TR037i003p00320>
- [13] Fouad Tera; G. J. Wasserburg. U-Th-Pb systematics in three Apollo 14 basalts and the problem of initial Pb in lunar rocks. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 14, 281–304 (1972). DOI 10.1016/0012-821X(72)90128-8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(72\)90128-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(72)90128-8)
- [14] Martin H. Dodson. Closure temperature in cooling geochronological and petrological systems. *Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology* 40, 259–274 (1973). DOI 10.1007/BF00373790. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00373790>
- [15] T. E. Krogh. A low-contamination method for hydrothermal decomposition of zircon and extraction of U and Pb for isotopic age determinations. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 37, 485–494 (1973). DOI 10.1016/0016-7037(73)90213-5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(73\)90213-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(73)90213-5)
- [16] James M. Mattinson. Zircon U–Pb chemical abrasion (“CA-TIMS”) method: Combined annealing and multi-step partial dissolution analysis for improved precision and accuracy of zircon ages. *Chemical Geology* 220, 47–66 (2005). DOI 10.1016/j.chemgeo.2005.03.011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2005.03.011>
- [17] Joe Hiess; Daniel J. Condon; Noah McLean; Stephen R. Noble. ²³⁸U/²³⁵U Systematics in Terrestrial Uranium-Bearing Minerals. *Science* 335, 1610–1614 (2012). DOI 10.1126/science.1215507. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1215507>
- [18] D. J. Condon; B. Schoene; N. M. McLean; S. A. Bowring; R. R. Parrish. Metrology and traceability of U–Pb isotope dilution geochronology (EARTHTIME Tracer Calibration Part I). *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 164, 464–480 (2015). DOI 10.1016/j.gca.2015.05.026. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2015.05.026>
- [19] N. M. McLean; J. F. Bowring; S. A. Bowring. An algorithm for U-Pb isotope dilution data reduction and uncertainty propagation. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems* 12, Q0AA18 (2011). DOI 10.1029/2010GC003478. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GC003478>

- [20] Matthew S. A. Horstwood et al. Community-Derived Standards for LA-ICP-MS U-(Th-)Pb Geochronology—Uncertainty Propagation, Age Interpretation and Data Reporting. *Geostandards and Geoanalytical Research* 40, 311–332 (2016). DOI 10.1111/j.1751-908X.2016.00379.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2016.00379.x>
- [21] Urs Schaltegger et al. Long-term repeatability and interlaboratory reproducibility of high-precision ID-TIMS U–Pb geochronology. *Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry* 36, 1466–1477 (2021). DOI 10.1039/D1JA00116G. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1JA00116G>
- [22] Craig Merrihue; Grenville Turner. Potassium-argon dating by activation with fast neutrons. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 71, 2852–2857 (1966). DOI 10.1029/JZ071i011p02852. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JZ071i011p02852>
- [23] Kyoungwon Min; Roland Mundil; Paul R. Renne; Kenneth R. Ludwig. A test for systematic errors in $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ geochronology through comparison with U/Pb analysis of a 1.1-Ga rhyolite. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 64, 73–98 (2000). DOI 10.1016/S0016-7037(99)00204-5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037\(99\)00204-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037(99)00204-5)
- [24] Paul R. Renne; Roland Mundil; Greg Balco; Kyoungwon Min; Kenneth R. Ludwig. Joint determination of ^{40}K decay constants and $^{40}\text{Ar}^*/^{40}\text{K}$ for the Fish Canyon sanidine standard, and improved accuracy for $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ geochronology. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 74, 5349–5367 (2010). DOI 10.1016/j.gca.2010.06.017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.06.017>
- [25] K. F. Kuiper; A. Deino; F. J. Hilgen; W. Krijgsman; P. R. Renne; J. R. Wijbrans. Synchronizing Rock Clocks of Earth History. *Science* 320, 500–504 (2008). DOI 10.1126/science.1154339. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1154339>
- [26] G. W. Lugmair; K. Marti. Lunar initial $^{143}\text{Nd}/^{144}\text{Nd}$: Differential evolution of the lunar crust and mantle. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 39, 349–357 (1978). DOI 10.1016/0012-821X(78)90021-3. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(78\)90021-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(78)90021-3)
- [27] Thorsten Kleine et al. Hf–W chronology of the accretion and early evolution of asteroids and terrestrial planets. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 73, 5150–5188 (2009). DOI 10.1016/j.gca.2008.11.047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.11.047>
- [28] W. F. Libby; E. C. Anderson; J. R. Arnold. Age Determination by Radiocarbon Content: World-Wide Assay of Natural Radiocarbon. *Science* 109, 227–228 (1949). DOI 10.1126/science.109.2827.227. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.109.2827.227>
- [29] J. R. Arnold; W. F. Libby. Age Determinations by Radiocarbon Content: Checks with Samples of Known Age. *Science* 110, 678–680 (1949). DOI 10.1126/science.110.2869.678. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.110.2869.678>
- [30] Paula J. Reimer et al. The IntCal20 Northern Hemisphere Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curve (0–55 cal kBP). *Radiocarbon* 62, 725–757 (2020). DOI 10.1017/RDC.2020.41. <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2020.41>
- [31] Timothy J. Heaton et al. Marine20—The Marine Radiocarbon Age Calibration Curve (0–55,000 cal BP). *Radiocarbon* 62, 779–820 (2020). DOI 10.1017/RDC.2020.68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2020.68>

- [32] Christopher Bronk Ramsey. Bayesian Analysis of Radiocarbon Dates. *Radiocarbon* 51, 337–360 (2009). DOI 10.1017/S0033822200033865. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033822200033865>
- [33] Clair C. Patterson. Age of meteorites and the earth. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 10, 230–237 (1956). DOI 10.1016/0016-7037(56)90036-9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(56\)90036-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(56)90036-9)
- [34] George R. Tilton. Clair Cameron Patterson, 1922–1995. *Biographical Memoirs*, volume 74, National Academy of Sciences, 224–245 (1998).
<https://www.nasonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/patterson-clair-c.pdf>
- [35] Clair C. Patterson. Contaminated and Natural Lead Environments of Man. *Archives of Environmental Health* 11(3), 344–360 (1965). DOI 10.1080/00039896.1965.10664229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00039896.1965.10664229>
- [36] Blair Schoene. U–Th–Pb Geochronology. *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 2nd ed., volume 4, 341–378 (2014). DOI 10.1016/B978-0-08-095975-7.00310-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-095975-7.00310-7>
- [37] Ian McDougall; T. Mark Harrison. *Geochronology and Thermochronology by the $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ Method*. 2nd edition, Oxford University Press (1999).
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/geochronology-and-thermochronology-by-the-40ar39ar-method-9780195109207>
- [38] M. D. Schmitz; K. F. Kuiper. High-Precision Geochronology. *Elements* 9(1), 25–30 (2013). DOI 10.2113/gselements.9.1.25. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gselements.9.1.25>
- [39] Jack Carter; Ryan B. Ickert; Darren F. Mark; Marissa M. Tremblay; Alan J. Cresswell; David C. W. Sanderson. Production of ^{40}Ar by an overlooked mode of ^{40}K decay with implications for K-Ar geochronology. *Geochronology* 2, 355–365 (2020). DOI 10.5194/gchron-2-355-2020. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gchron-2-355-2020>
- [40] Jack N. Carter; Caroline E. J. Hasler; Anthony J. Fuentes; Andrew J. Tholt; Leah E. Morgan; Paul R. Renne. Bayesian calibration of the ^{40}K decay scheme with implications for ^{40}K -based geochronology. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 397, 149–163 (2025). DOI 10.1016/j.gca.2025.03.024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2025.03.024>