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T.F. Schildgen*a, D. Cosentino*bc, B. Bookhagend, S. Niedermanne, C. Yıldırıme, H. Echtlere, H. Wittmann,e, M.R. Strecker*a

Abstract

Uplifted Neogene marine sediments and Quaternary fluvial terraces in the Mut Basin, southern Turkey, reveal a detailed history of surface uplift along the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau from the Late Miocene to the present. New surface exposure ages (10Be, 26Al, and 21Ne) of gravels capping fluvial strath terraces located between 28 and 135 m above the Göksu River in the Mut Basin yield ages ranging from ca. 25 to 30 ka, corresponding to an average incision rate of 0.52 to 0.67 mm/yr. Published biostratigraphic data combined with new interpretations of the fossil assemblages from uplifted marine sediments reveal average uplift rates of 0.25 to 0.37 mm/yr since Late Miocene time (starting between 8 and 5.45 Ma), and 0.72 to 0.74 mm/yr after 1.66 to 1.62 Ma. Together with the terrace abandonment ages, the data imply 0.6 to 0.7 mm/yr uplift rates from 1.6 Ma to the present. The different post-Late Miocene and post-1.6 Ma uplift rates can imply increasing uplift rates through time, or multi-phased uplift with slow uplift or subsidence in between. Longitudinal profiles of rivers in the upper catchment of the Mut and Ermenek basins show no apparent lithologic or fault control on some knickpoints that occur at 1.2 to 1.5 km elevation, implying a transient response to a change in uplift rates. Projections of graded upper relict channel segments to the modern outlet, together with constraints from uplifted marine sediments, show that a slower incision/uplift rate of 0.1 to 0.2 mm/yr preceded the 0.7 mm/yr uplift rate. The river morphology and profile projections therefore reflect multi-phased uplift of the plateau margin, rather than steadily increasing uplift rates. Multi-phased uplift can be explained by lithospheric slab break-off and possibly also the arrival of the Eratosthenes Seamount at the collision zone south of Cyprus.

1. Introduction

Understanding the history of surface uplift at an orogen scale is among the most challenging tasks in the geosciences, particularly in terms of identifying the roles of crustal versus mantle processes in producing and maintaining high topography. Paleoaltimetry studies have demonstrated that the magnitude of surface uplift can often only be estimated with large uncertainties (Quade et al., 2007; Riihimaki and Libarkin, 2007; Sahagian and Proussevitch, 2007). Higher precision estimates have been derived from uplifted, datable marine and terrestrial reference surfaces (Abbott et al., 1997; Bookhagen et al., 2006a; Cosentino and Gliozzi, 1988; Cosentino et al., 2009; Dethier et al., 1995; Gardner et al., 1992; Jordan et al., 2010; Melnick et al., 2009; Merritts and Bull, 1989; Pazzaglia and Brandon, 2001; Pazzaglia and Brandon, 2001; Seyrek et al., 2008; Wegmann and Pazzaglia, 2009; Westaway et al., 2004), from fluvial strath terraces (Lavé and Avouac, 2001; Pazzaglia and Brandon, 2001; Schildgen et al., 2009a; Seyrek et al., 2008; Wegmann and Pazzaglia, 2009; Westaway et al., 2004), and from river incision through regional paleosurfaces (Clark et al., 2005; Gubbels et al., 1993; Schildgen et al., 2007, 2009b). River longitudinal profiles are also increasingly being used to infer changes in uplift (Barke and Lamb, 2006; Harkins et al., 2007; Hilley and Arrowsmith, 2008; Hoke et al., 2007; Kirby et al., 2003; Molin et al., 2004; Seeber and Gornitz, 1983; Wobus et al., 2006). Where channel forms can be calibrated to erosion or uplift rates, they
can be used to semi-quantitatively assess changes in uplift rates through time or space (Duvall et al., 2004; Kirby and Whipple, 2001; Lague and Davy, 2003; Snyder et al., 2000). The southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau (Fig. 1) is ideally suited for surface uplift studies spanning multiple timescales. Miocene marine sediments onlap basement rocks at elevations up to 2 km (Cosentino et al., in press), and Early Pleistocene marine sediments crop out as high as 1.2 km (Yıldız et al., 2003). In the same area, fluvial strath terraces that are preserved between 28 and 135 m above the Göksu River record the most recent river incision. However, the details of the younger uplift history and the mechanisms underlying regional uplift are not yet well understood. The Anatolian plateau lies at the intersection of a complex tectonic regime, just north of the triple junction between the Arabian, African, and Eurasian plates (Fig. 1), where modern topography has likely integrated the effects of both tectonic processes (Clark and Robertson, 2002, 2005; Jaffey and Robertson, 2005; Robertson et al., 2009; Şengör and Yılmaz, 1981) and upper mantle processes (Faccenna et al., 2006; Keskin, 2003; Şengör et al., 2003). As such, it represents an ideal testing ground for discerning the nature of geodynamic processes through reconstructions of surface uplift. Our multidisciplinary approach to exploring surface uplift at the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau utilizes uplifted marine sediments, fluvial strath terraces, and river profile analysis. We report the first strath terrace abandonment ages from the region using cosmogenic \(^{10}\)Be, \(^{26}\)Al, and \(^{21}\)Ne exposure dating of fluvial gravels capping the terraces. Ages of uplifted marine successions are derived from published data (Cosentino et al., in press; Yıldız et al., 2003) as well as our reinterpretations of microfossil assemblages originally reported by Yıldız et al. (2003). We use uplift constraints from the marine sediments and fluvial terraces to semi-quantitatively assess uplift rates that are recorded in relict portions of channel profiles throughout our study area. Our integrated approach provides an unprecedented look into surface uplift of the southern plateau margin over multiple timescales, as well as clues to the mechanisms underlying uplift and plateau development.

2. Regional deformation and uplift

The modern topography of the Central Anatolian plateau is the result of crustal-scale deformation with probable contributions from mantle and lithospheric-scale processes. The Central Taurides, which define the plateau's southern margin (Fig. 1), were accreted to crustal blocks to the north starting in the Eocene (Jaffey and Robertson, 1984, 1985; Yılmaz et al., 1997), while closure of the Neotethys Ocean to the south and associated Arabia–Eurasia collision (Ballato et al., 2011; Hüsing et al., 2009; Kelling et al., 1987; Robertson, 2000; Şengör et al., 1985; Williams et al., 1995) resulted in westward “escape” of the Anatolian microplate along the North and East Anatolian faults (Dewey and Şengör, 1979; Şengör et al., 1985). Some uplift of Central Anatolia likely resulted from this plate-scale deformation, both along the southern margin prior to the Middle Miocene (Clark and Robertson, 2002, 2005; Jaffey and Robertson, 2005) and at the northern margin due to strain accumulation along the broad restraining bend of the North Anatolian Fault (Yıldırım et al., 2011).

Beyond these crustal-scale processes, seismic evidence for a thin or absent mantle lithosphere beneath Eastern Anatolia (Al-Lazki et al., 2003, 2004; Gök et al., 2003, 2007; Lei and Zhao, 2007) and regional volcanism close to the presumed onset of uplift (Pearce et al., 1990) inspired suggestions that slab steepening, delamination, and break-off induced Late Miocene uplift of Eastern Anatolia (Keskin, 2003; Şengör et al., 2003). P-wave seismic tomography in Central Anatolia is consistent with a slab break-off beneath Eastern Anatolia extending as far west as the longitude of Cyprus (Biryol et al., 2011; Gans et al., 2009) with a potential tear between the Cyprean and Aegean slabs (Biryol et al., 2011); subsequently, delamination (Bartol et al., 2011) and slab break-off (Cosentino et al., in press) have been suggested to explain surface uplift since the Late Miocene in Central Anatolia as well. An additional phase of deformation affected the easternmost Mediterranean (Cyprus, and areas to the north and east) since Early to Middle Pleistocene time (Harrison et al., 2008; Kinnaird et al., 2011; Robertson, 1998; Schattner, 2010). The timing is broadly coincident with the arrival of the Eratosthenes seamount in the collision zone south of Cyprus, which currently separates the Eurasian (Anatolian) and African plates.

3. Setting of the Göksu River and the Mut Basin

The Göksu River, with its 11,200 km\(^2\) drainage basin, is the largest river that crosses the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau. Along its course across the margin through the Mut Basin (Fig. 2), the river has exposed Oligocene to Early Miocene continental sediments and Miocene to Pleistocene marine sediments that unconformably overlie Mesozoic and older basement lithologies. Cosentino et al. (in press) reported a biostratigraphic age of ca. 8 Ma for marine sediments that cap the southern plateau margin at ca. 2 km elevation near the town of Basyayla, revising estimates that marine sedimentation had continued through at least Langhian (16 to 13.6 Ma, Bassant et al., 2005) or Serravallian (13.6 to 11.6 Ma, Tanar and Gökçen, 1990)
time. The Late Miocene marine sediments are warped into a broad, 100-km wide drape fold, with minor dip-slip and oblique normal faulting (Cosentino et al., in press). The start of uplift can probably be further limited by the 5.45 Ma onset of rapid subsidence and sedimentation in the Adana Basin (Cosentino et al., 2010), south of the uplifted margin (Fig. 1). Considering that both ages limit the start of uplift to between 8 and 5.45 Ma, the margin experienced an average long-term uplift rate of 0.25 to 0.37 mm/yr.

Southeast of the town of Mut (Fig. 2), younger marine sediments onlap the Middle to Late Miocene shallow- and deeper-water marine deposits (Mut and Köşelerli Formations, respectively). Uplift since deposition of the younger sequence has raised the onlap surface to 1.2 km elevation. Micropaleontological investigations by Yıldız et al. (2003) on these deposits pointed to a Pliocene to Pleistocene sedimentation age, and to a Calabrian age (1.8 to 0.7 Ma) for the highest part of the sections near the villages of Sarıkavak and Hacıahmetli (Fig. 2A).

4. Fluvial terraces of the Mut Basin

Fluvial terraces of the Göksu River record the most recent river incision through the older sedimentary units of the Mut Basin. The terrace surfaces range from 200 to 30,000 m² in extent at heights between 28 and 135 m above the modern thalweg, between ca. 150 and 50 km inland from the coast (Fig. 2). We identified terraces based on the occurrence of fluvial gravels of relatively uniform thickness (typically 1.5 to 2.5 m) capping a beveled surface cut into the older sedimentary sequence. These relatively thin gravels likely represent the mobile alluvial cover of a bedrock channel (Pazzaglia and Brandon, 2001), which would imply that the beveled surfaces beneath the gravels are “strath” terraces (Bull, 1991). No similar deposits were identified within the older stratigraphy, except near the basin margins, where finer grained sediments transition to coarse sandstones and pebbles. The fluvial gravels are dominated by carbonate clasts, with rare occurrences (ca. 1%) of red chert. The gravels are generally well-cemented, except for the lowest terrace gravels, which show carbonate accumulations on the undersides of clasts. Although most of the gravels are not covered by finer sediments, in the central portion of some terraces there is a ca. 10 to 30 cm thick deposit of fine-grained sand and silt, which may be the remnant of an overbank deposit.

The low (28 to 34 m) and intermediate (ca. 50 to 100 m) terraces exhibit relatively smooth, flat surfaces of cemented river gravels (Fig. 3A) generally 1.5 to 2.5 m thick. Preservation of the gravels seems primarily controlled by erosion of the relatively soft sediments beneath them, which results in the overlying gravels breaking off in blocks. In contrast, the 110-m terrace gravels (sample 09MUT17) are cemented, but with an irregular surface (Fig. 3B), a reduced thickness (ca. 0.5 to 1 m) and a higher concentration of chert (ca. 10%) compared to the lower terrace gravels, suggesting that the surrounding carbonates may have been dissolved. The highest sample site (135 m, 09MUT18) contained no cemented gravels, but was a cultivated surface with sparse, rounded chert clasts.

5. Methods and approaches

5.1. Samples for cosmogenic nuclide analysis

We collected chert samples for cosmic ray exposure dating (\(^{10}\)Be, \(^{26}\)Al, and \(^{21}\)Ne) from the surfaces of gravel deposits overlying fluvial straths. Single amalgamated samples from each surface consisted of 30 to 50 clasts between 1 and 3 cm in diameter, which should represent the mean surface concentration (Repka et al., 1997). Details of sample processing are given in the Supplementary material. Accelerator mass spectrometry measurements were made at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. We rely on the original ICN standard (Nishizumi et al., 2007). We calculated surface ages using the Cronus online calculator version 2.2.1 (available at http://hess.ess.washington.edu/, with documentation in Balco et al., 2008), which includes variations in altitude, latitude, and topographic shielding in calculating production rates from spallation and muons, and assumes reference \(^{10}\)Be production rates that depend on the selected scaling scheme (Balco et al., 2008). Errors in the reference production rates are estimated at ca. 10% (Balco et al., 2008). Table A1 lists sample input parameters and measured \(^{10}\)Be and \(^{26}\)Al concentrations with analytical errors. Ages based on various production rate scaling schemes are summarized in Table A2. Although seasonal snow cover can shield surfaces from cosmogenic nuclide accumulation (Schildgen et al., 2005), such effects are insignificant at low elevations of the Eastern Mediterranean. We calculated \(^{21}\)Ne production rates using a value of 0.232 ± 0.009 for the ratio of \(^{10}\)Be/\(^{21}\)Ne production (Goethals et al., 2009) to correspond to a 1.387 Ma \(^{10}\)Be half-life (Chmeleff et al., 2010; Korschinek et al., 2010), and using the \(^{10}\)Be production rates derived from the Lal (1991)/Stone (2000) constant production rate scaling with a total reference \(^{10}\)Be production rate (from spallation and muon production) of 4.58 ± 0.43 atoms/(g yr). Stepwise heating Ne data are given in Table A3, and \(^{21}\)Ne ages are summarized in Table A4.
In calculating corrections to exposure ages related to erosion of material above the sampled surfaces, we considered the relationship

\[ P(x) = P_n(0) \exp \left(-\frac{\rho x}{\Lambda_n}\right) + P_\mu(0) \exp \left(-\frac{\rho x}{\Lambda_\mu}\right) \]  

(1)

where \( P(x) \) is production at depth \( x \) (cm), \( P_n(0) \) is the surface production rate for neutron spallation (atoms/(g yr)), \( \rho \) is the density of the overlying material (g/cm\(^3\)), \( P_\mu(0) \) is the surface production rate for muons (atoms/(g yr)), calculated to be ca. 4% of total production at surface using Cronus (version 2.2.1), \( \Lambda_n \) is the attenuation length for fast neutrons (160 g/cm\(^2\), Balco et al., 2008), and \( \Lambda_\mu \) is the attenuation length for muons. We combined the contributions from negative muons and fast muons, as both can be reasonably described with an attenuation length of 1500 g/cm\(^2\) in the upper ca. 10 m of rock (Gosse and Phillips, 2001).

5.2. River profiles

Across a wide range of tectonic and climatic settings, river channels tend to be characterized by the scaling relationship

\[ S = k_s A^{-\theta} \]  

(2)

where \( S \) is the slope (m/m), \( k_s \) is the steepness index (m\(^2\theta\)), \( A \) is the drainage area (m\(^2\)), and \( \theta \) is the concavity (Flint, 1974). Normalized steepness index values (\( k_{sn} \)) are steepness indexes calculated using a reference concavity (\( \theta_{ref} \)). An increase in uplift rate will produce a downstream increase in the channel gradient, and the “knickpoint” separating downstream and upstream reaches should migrate up-stream in a kinematic wave (Rosenbloom and Anderson, 1994). The downstream portion of the channel, which is adjusted to the new uplift rate, is typically characterized by a higher \( k_s \) (e.g., Snyder et al., 2000). In areas of relatively uniform climate and lithology and no dependence of \( \theta \) on uplift rate, the vertical component of knickpoint migration should be constant (Niemann et al., 2001). Observing knickpoints at a similar elevation within a drainage network is, therefore, one line of evidence to support a past base level drop or increase in uplift rate (Crosby and Whipple, 2006; Wobus et al., 2006).

We extracted river profiles from 90-m resolution Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) digital elevation model (DEM) data (Jarvis et al., 2008) using the Stream Profiler tool, available at www.geomorphtools.org, with procedures described in Wobus et al. (2006). Projection of the original DEM into the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) system yielded a final pixel size of 110 × 110 m.

Because graded rivers have adjusted their incision rates to match the background uplift rate, a simple scaling relationship exists between the change in channel elevations (\( \Delta Z \)) upstream from a knickpoint and the uplift rates prior to (\( U_f \)) and following (\( U_i \)) a sudden increase in uplift (Whipple, 2001; Whipple and Tucker, 1999):

\[ \Delta Z = \Delta t \left( U_f - U_i \right) \]  

(3)

where \( \Delta t \) is the time elapsed since the change in uplift rate. In essence, the upper portion of the channel is passively uplifted at the new uplift rate, but continues to incise at a rate that was set by the initial uplift rate. We projected upper channel segments to the modern outlet to determine \( \Delta Z \), such that we could explore relationships between \( U_f \) and \( U_i \) (Fig. %C). To make this projection, we first applied the scaling relationship in Eq. (2) using the \( k_s \) and \( \theta \) of the upstream channel section (derived from a curve fit of slope versus area data) and the drainage area along the modern channel to calculate the slopes along a projection of the upper channel; we then used the slopes to determine successive drops in channel elevation downstream from the knickpoint. Our final ranges of projected heights at the outlet incorporate the best-fit \( \theta \) value and 2\( \sigma \) errors in \( k_s \). We selected channels for projection throughout the catchment that had the lowest errors on \( k_s \) (based on the curve fit of the slope versus area data) to find representative but precise estimates for \( \Delta Z \).
6. Results

6.1. Age of the youngest marine sediments in the Mut Basin

Yıldız et al. (2003) reported two stratigraphic sections containing Pleistocene marine deposits close to the villages of Sarıkavak (600–650 m) and Hacıahmetli (1165 m) (Fig. 2A). Near Sarıkavak, the highest four samples in the section contain marker species for defining the age of the youngest marine sediments in the area. In the reported list of the microfossils, it is worthy to note the occurrence of Globigerinoides tenellus in the planktonic foraminifera assemblages, and Calcidiscus macintyre, Gephyrocapsa caribbeonica and Gephyrocapsa oceanica (medium Gephyrocapsa) in the calcareous nannofossil assemblages. In the Neogene Mediterranean biozonation (Iaccarino et al., 2007) the first occurrence (FO) of G. tenellus is at the base of the Globigerina cariacoensis Zone (1.79–0.94 Ma, Lourens et al., 2004), which defines the Calabrian stage of the Early Pleistocene. The occurrence of both C. macintyre and medium Gephyrocapsa allow us to better constrain the age of the top of the Sarıkavak section. Because the FO of medium Gephyrocapsa is at 1.73 Ma (Raffi, 2002) and the last occurrence (LO) of C. macintyre is calibrated at 1.66 Ma (Lourens et al., 2004), the Calabrian deposits of the Sarıkavak section should have ages between 1.73 and 1.66 Ma.

The reported microfossil associations from the Hacıahmetli section include no planktonic foraminifera, although calcareous nannofossil assemblages were found in four out of five collected samples. The lowermost sample of the Hacıahmetli section still contains C. macintyre, whereas in the upper part of the section, together with small Gephyrocapsa, only Calcidiscus leptopus were found. According to the calcareous nannofossil biochronology, the top of the Hacıahmetli section should be younger than the LO of C. Macintyre and older than the FO of large Gephyrocapsa (1.62 Ma, Lourens et al., 2004). The uppermost marine deposits of the Hacıahmetli section are younger than the Calabrian sediments at the top of the Sarıkavak section, and have ages between 1.66 and 1.62 Ma. Importantly, these youngest marine sediments, with their modern elevation of ca. 1.2 km, point to a surface uplift rate of 0.72 to 0.74 mm/yr after 1.66 to 1.62 Ma.

6.2. Exposure ages of gravels capping fluvial strath terraces

The exposure ages of the terrace-capping gravels cluster into two main groups: gravels between 28 and 34 m above the river are ca. 20 and 40 ka and those between 40 and 135 m above the river are ca. 70 to 130 ka (Table A2, Fig. 4). These clusters correspond to relative sea level high stands during Marine Isotope Stages 3 and 5 (Fig. 4). Al-though erosion may have reduced the exposure ages of all the gravels, the highly degraded nature of the two highest gravel units (09MUT17 and 09MUT18) implies that they are the most severely affected, and may yield ages much younger than their true ages.

The relatively large uncertainties on 21Ne ages are related to high concentrations of 20Ne, resulting in small excesses of 21Ne/20Ne in the 400 and 600 °C temperature steps (Table A3). Samples analyzed for 21Ne were also analyzed for 10Be and/or 26Al. Sample 09MUT12 shows similar 10Be, 26Al, and 21Ne ages, but the 21Ne age of 08TSERM04 is significantly older than its 10Be age. That 21Ne age is also the single old outlier within the dataset, which we have removed from our curve-fitting analysis. For 09MUT08, the 26Al age overlaps within error of the 21Ne age. This correspondence suggests that the sample may be a young outlier in the dataset, possibly as a result of surface erosion. During the stepwise heating of 09MUT08 and 09MUT12, both the total Ne concentrations and the 21Ne excesses were very low above 600 °C (Table A3), indicating that nucleogenic 21Ne is insignificant and our concentration estimates for cosmogenic 21Ne are robust within the stated error limits. In contrast, 08TSERM04 released ~35% of the total 21Ne excess in the 800 °C step, so we can- not exclude a nucleogenic 21Ne contribution for this sample.

Excluding the two highest samples and the single old 21Ne result, we used the remaining ages and heights to determine average river incision rates. We applied a York (1969) linear regression, including errors in calculated terrace abandonment ages (“external” uncertainties from the Cronus online calculator, Balco et al., 2008) and in measurements of terrace gravel height. Because different cosmogenic production rate scaling schemes yield slightly different calculated.

6.3. Potential errors and corrections on exposure ages

Surface erosion and nuclide inheritance complicate interpretations of cosmogenic exposure ages of landforms (Anderson et al., 1996; Nishiizumi et al., 1986). Carbonate cementation of the gravels is likely to have helped protect the gravel surfaces from postdepositional erosion. However, as carbonate is deposited first on the undersides of clasts, then progresses to fill voids within a deposit, meteoric water percolation is reduced, resulting in facilitated removal of any overlying material (Gile et al., 1966) and lower calculated exposure ages. Nonetheless, the ages should not be simply interpreted as minimum ages, as nuclides that accumulate in the
gravels during exhumation and transport through the catchment (“inherited” nuclides) have the opposite effect of increasing calculated ages (Repka et al., 1997). We can estimate a maximum correction for erosion (or shielding) by assuming that overbank material was removed just prior to sampling, hence applying Eq. (1) to compare surface production rates to rates beneath the surface. Correcting for the removal of 0.3 m of overbank material with a density of 1.8 g/cm³ would decrease the production rates, and thus increase all ages by 28%, raising the ages of the lower terrace gravels by 7 to 10 ka and those of intermediate gravels by 24 to 31 ka. A larger correction would be necessary for the highly degraded, two highest terrace gravels. For example, if 1 or 2 m of 2.0 g/cm³ gravels were removed from above those samples just prior to sampling, ages would increase by 69% or 89%, respectively. Nuclide inheritance can be assessed with depth profiles beneath a landform surface, as deep samples are largely shielded from postdepositional nuclide production (Anderson et al., 1996). The cementation of the gravels and rare occurrence of chert in the Mut Basin precluded such sampling. However, we can explore the inherited component of a four-sample depth profile (0- to 2-m-deep) from gravels capping a terrace 150 m above the thalweg near the city of Adana (Supplementary material Fig. A1, “ZIY” samples in Table A1).

To do this, we modeled fits to the depth profile following the approach of Braucher et al. (2003), testing reasonable values for erosion rate (5 to 12 m/Myr), surface age (50 to 300 ka), total erosion of the surface (b1 km), and deposit density (1.8 to 2.0 g/cm³). Over the full range of erosion rates, χ² values were minimized for an inherited component between ca. 88,200 and 91,100 ¹⁰Be atoms/g (Table A5). If the inherited components are broadly similar for the two neighboring catchments, we can use the modeled inheritance of the Adana terrace to estimate a correction of 18.8 to 20.6 ka for the Mut Basin terraces.

Changes in terrace abandonment ages would be greatest if there were erosion with no nuclide inheritance, or nuclide inheritance with no erosion. Both scenarios are highly unlikely. We therefore consider that the estimated corrections should at least partly cancel one another. Furthermore, the general simplicity of the age–height relationships of the uncorrected ages suggests that the magnitude of net corrections is relatively low. Considering the possible corrections to the ages, low and intermediate gravels still likely fall within Marine Isotope Stages 3 and 5, and the highest gravels may fall within Stage 7. Hence, the average slope of the age versus height plot (i.e., the incision rate) of 0.52 to 0.67 mm/yr is probably a fairly robust estimate of the latest Pleistocene to recent incision rates.

6.4. River profiles and channel projections

Most river profiles in the Mut Basin and the neighboring Ermenek Basin are characterized by downstream portions with high θref values (e.g., >90 for θref=0.45) that are separated by one or more knickpoints from upper sections with low θref values (e.g., <60 for θref=0.45) (Fig. 5A). We consider a single knickpoint separating these two channel segments to be a “major” knickpoint. Throughout the catchment, major knickpoints generally occur at 1.2 to 1.5 km elevation (Fig. 5B). They often correspond to the lithologic contact between the limestone caprock (Mut Formation) and softer marls (Köselerli Formation) or continental clastics beneath (Fig. 5A, Supplementary material Fig. A2). Major knickpoints along streams in the upper parts of the catchment, which incise through Mesozoic basement carbonates, also occur at elevations of ca. 1.2 to 1.5 km. These latter knickpoints do not appear to have any lithologic or fault control (Fig. 5A) as the knickpoints do not align with any lithologic contacts or tectonic structures. Downstream projections of the upper “relict” portions of channels above the knickpoints show variable results. Streams that incise through the Mut Formation limestone have concavities ranging from 0.42 to 0.80 and project to heights of 1145 to 1408 m above the modern outlet, while streams in the upper catchment that incise only basement have concavities of 0.51 to 0.70 and project to heights of 950 to 1197 m above the outlet (Fig. 5C, Table 1). Considering the scaling relationship between uplift rates and changes in the relict channel elevation (Eq. 3), we can use the projected heights above the outlet (∆Z) to estimate initial uplift rates (U) prior to the onset of faster uplift at ca. 1.6 Ma. If we assume an uplift rate of 0.74 mm/yr started at 1.63 Ma (based on the marine sediments uplifted to 1.2 km), the relict stream segments on the Mut Formation yield a range of U between −0.13 and 0.03 mm/yr, and relict streams in the basement yield U between 0.00 and 0.15 mm/yr (Table 1).

7. Discussion

7.1. Climatic and tectonic control on river incision and terrace formation

Clustering of the terrace abandonment ages during Marine Isotope Stages 3 and 5 (and possibly also 7) suggests that climate fluctuations associated with sea level oscillations and changes in base level played a role in terrace development. Studies of dated terrace sequences in active tectonic settings worldwide have noted that although sustained surface uplift is required for development of stepped strath terrace sequences, stages of individual terrace formation or abandonment tend to cluster during periods of known climate change (e.g., Bookhagen et
al., 2006b; Bridgland and Westaway, 2008; Bull, 1991; Fuller et al., 1998; Lavé and Avouac, 2001; Merritts et al., 1994; Pan et al., 2003; Pazzaglia and Brandon, 2001; Pazzaglia and Gardner, 1993; Schildgen et al., 2002; Wegmann and Pazzaglia, 2002, 2009).

This clustering likely results from climate-induced changes in sediment and water flux with associated changes between vertical and lateral channel incision, which has been shown to be necessary for strath formation and abandonment (Bogaart et al., 2003; Hancock and Anderson, 2002; Meyer et al., 1995; Tucker and Slingerland, 1997).

Climatic shifts or sea level change as a sole driver for terrace formation and long-term incision can be ruled out based on other dated terrace sequences in the eastern Mediterranean region, which record significantly lower incision rates over a similar time period. For example, along the Ceyhan River of southern Turkey, terraces between 50 and 75 km to the east and southeast of the city of Adana yield incision rates between ca. 0.25 and 0.4 mm/yr since 270 ka (Seyrek et al., 2008). Along the Gediz River in western Turkey, incision rates have been ca. 0.2 mm/yr since Middle Pleistocene time (Westaway et al., 2004). However, in southern Turkey, the similarities between fluvial incision rates (0.52 to 0.67 mm/yr) and post-1.6 Ma uplift rates constrained by the uplifted marine sediments (0.72 to 0.74 mm/yr) support the notion that relatively fast uplift has characterized the region since 1.6 Ma, and was the main factor driving long-term river incision, despite fluctuations in incision rate that could have resulted from glacial–interglacial cycles.

7.2. Changing uplift rates through time

Considering the elevations of the Late Miocene and Pliocene–Pleistocene marine sediments, the time-averaged uplift rate between 8 and 1.6 Ma was 0.13 mm/yr, and increased to ca. 0.7 mm/yr from ca. 1.6 Ma to the present. However, the marine sediments alone do not allow us to distinguish between surface uplift rates that steadily increased until 1.6 Ma, or multiple phases of uplift with intermittent quiescence or subsidence. The Pliocene–Pleistocene marine sediments in the basin could imply that the region was undergoing subsidence during their deposition, perhaps during a hiatus between different uplift phases. Alternatively, the basin alone may have experienced fault-controlled subsidence while the margin as a whole experienced increasing uplift rates. We observed normal faulting along the basin margin that affected parts of the younger marine succession, although the highest outcrop at 1.2 km elevation lies within the footwall of local normal faults. In yet another scenario, accommodation space may have been created following incision associated with the ca. 1.5 km drawdown of the Mediterranean Sea during the Messinian Salinity Crisis (5.96 to 5.33 Ma, e.g., Clauzon et al., 1996; Krijgsman et al., 1999) and associated isostatic effects (e.g., Govers, 2009). The latter scenario would imply that the Pliocene–Pleistocene section is at least partly a transgressive depositional sequence. River profiles offer a test of the multi-phased uplift versus increasing uplift rate scenarios. To a first order, major knickpoints along river channels that are not controlled by faults or lithologic contacts imply that incision rates must have increased at some point in the past (Whipple and Tucker, 1999). The common occurrence of knickpoints at the lithologic contact between the Mut limestone and the underlying marls suggests we should use caution in interpreting uplift rates derived from those channels. The basement channels, however, show no alignment of knickpoints with lithologic contacts or faults (Fig. 5A); they are thus more likely to reflect a transient incision/uplift signal.

The change in elevation of graded upper channel segments scales with the final uplift rate minus the initial uplift rate (Eq. 3), offering a semi-quantitative record of uplift rates prior to when they increased. Because the upper channel segments are largely outside of the modern basin, they should reflect uplift of the plateau margin itself, rather than being influenced by any fault-controlled subsidence within the basin. The widely varying projected channel heights demonstrate spatially variable uplift, and/or that the channels used for projection may not all be graded, as is required for the method. Graded channels should yield results that are broadly consistent with the uplift constraints from the marine sediments.

All projections from channels within the Mut Formation yield initial uplift rates that are either negative or much lower than the average 0.13 mm/yr uplift rate for the 8 to 1.6 Ma interval based on the uplifted marine sediments. Negative rates imply channel aggradation, while the very low rates may imply that the karst hydrology associated with the Mut Formation has impacted the ability of those channels to continue incising. Furthermore, the correspondence between the major knickpoints along the channels in the Mut Formation and the limestone caprock edges implies that those channel segments may not be reliable recorders of the pre-1.6 Ma uplift rate.

In contrast, the initial uplift rates derived from basement channels range from 0.00 to 0.15 mm/yr (Table 1). Interestingly, only those two basement channels with concavities of ca. 0.5 yield rates (0.13 to 0.15 mm/yr) that are consistent with constraints from the uplifted marine sediments, while those with higher concavities of 0.60 and 0.70 yield rates that are apparently too low (0.00 to 0.07 mm/yr).

Bedrock channels on uniform lithologies experiencing uniform uplift along their length should theoretically have concavities between 0.35 and 0.6, and most cluster very near 0.45 (Whipple and Tucker, 1999). Higher concavities may indicate that the channels are no longer graded after being affected by a downstream decrease in uplift rate or rock strength, transitions to alluvial conditions, or disequilibrium conditions following a decrease in uplift rates (Whipple, 2004). In summary, the high concavities of several upper channel segments preclude their
use for deriving accurate initial uplift rates, with only a few “ideal” cases (stream channels in non-karstified bedrock with moderate concavity values) where the results from channel projections agree with the stratigraphic constraints on uplift. Nonetheless, we emphasize that both the “ideal” channel projections and the major knickpoints along the basement channels are most consistent with a multi-phased uplift history with slow uplift prior to 1.6 Ma (Fig. 6), rather than steadily increasing uplift rates.

7.3. Uplift mechanisms and predicted surface uplift patterns

Our new data on the stratigraphic and geomorphic evolution of the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau can provide insight into the long-term deformation and uplift history of the region. Mechanisms that have been proposed to explain uplift in Central Anatolia or surrounding regions have some predictable effects on surface uplift patterns, rates, and magnitudes. For example, slab break-off with or without preceding lithospheric delamination is predicted to produce an asymmetric pattern of rapid km-scale surface uplift (within a few million years) with greatest uplift above the slab break-off (Duretz et al., 2011; Gögüs and Pysklywec, 2008), followed by slow thermal subsidence (on the order of 0.01 mm/yr) as the mantle cools to form new lithosphere (Avigad and Gvirtzman, 2009). Cosentino et al. (in press) pointed out that differences in the onset of surface uplift between Eastern and Central Anatolia are consistent with the lateral propagation rate of slab break-off (e.g., van Hunen and Allen, 2011) from the Bitlis–Zagros suture zone to the Mut Basin. If slab break-off induces changes in mantle flow patterns, this may also produce a distinct phase of uplift related only to mantle flow (e.g., Facenna and Becker, 2011).

The potential for uplift in southern Turkey resulting from the arrival of the Eratosthenes Seamount at the collision zone south of Cyprus is largely unknown. The seamount itself is underlain by ca. 28 km of continental crust (Aal et al., 2001; Ben-Avraham et al., 2002), Cyprus is underlain by ca. 35 km of continental crust (Makris et al., 1983), and to the southeast of the seamount there is either oceanic crust (Ben-Avraham et al., 2002) or highly attenuated continental crust (Gardosh and Druckman, 2006). The collision zone, which has been described as a N-dipping subduction zone (Woodside, 1977), has been more recently interpreted to be accommodating initial collision between the African and Eurasian plates (Robertson, 1998), possibly as a restraining bend along a continent–continent interface (Harrison et al., 2008). Uplift patterns that result from such a collision likely depend on local plate characteristics, and have not yet been explored in detail. Nonetheless, the prevalent Early to Middle Pleistocene structural modifications in the easternmost Mediterranean (see review by Schattner, 2010), including evidence for increased Pleistocene uplift rates in Cyprus (Kinnaird et al., 2011) and in southern Turkey, are broadly coeval with seamount collision with the trench starting in Early to Middle Pleistocene time. The multi-phased uplift of the southern margin of the plateau revealed by our data helps to limit the possible processes that produced uplift. A single mechanism may be invoked only if it can produce multiple uplift phases; i.e., delamination and/or slab break-off combined with changes in mantle flow patterns that result in distinct uplift phases. Alternatively, delamination and/or slab break-off must be invoked together with surface uplift resulting from collision of the Eratosthenes Seamount south of Cyprus, implying that deformation associated with seamount collision extends at least 250 km northward into southern Turkey.

8. Conclusions

Surface cosmogenic exposure ages of gravels covering strath terraces from the Mut Basin at the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau yield an average incision rate of 0.52 to 0.67 mm/yr since ca. 130 ka or potentially since as early as MIS7 (ca. 190 to 245 ka). The incision rate agrees with the average post-1.66 to 1.62 Ma uplift rate of 0.72 to 0.74 mm/yr based on uplifted marine sediments in the same area. The post-1.6 Ma uplift rate is 2 to 3 times faster than the average post-Late Miocene surface uplift rate documented by 8-Ma marine sediments that cap the southern margin of the plateau at ca. 2 km elevation (Cosentino et al., in press) and the onset of rapid sedimentation south of the margin at 5.45 Ma (Cosentino et al., 2010). Our analysis of river profiles throughout the Mut–Ermenek Basin, including both the identification of major knickpoints and channel projections, suggests that a slower phase of uplift of 0.1 to 0.2 mm/yr preceded the start of faster (0.5 to 0.7 mm/yr) uplift and incision at ca. 1.6 Ma. We suggest a multi-phased scenario for growth of the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau, involving (1) initial deformation of the Tauride basement that created paleotopography onto which Miocene marine sediments were deposited; (2) a phase of ca. 0.8 km of surface uplift starting between 8 and 5.45 Ma until 1.6 Ma; and (3) a phase of rapid uplift starting at ca. 1.6 Ma that has increased the margin elevation by ca. 1.2 km and likely continues to today. The uplift timing and magnitude can be constrained with the uplifted marine sediments, but they do not reveal the nature of any changes in uplift rates through time. On the basis of our river profile analysis and terrace abandonment ages, uplift clearly proceeded in distinct phases, rather than increasing steadily through time. The ca. 0.8 km uplift may have occurred above delaminated lithospheric mantle (Bartol et al., 2011) and/or slab break-off (Cosentino et al., in press), and the final ca. 1.2 km of uplift could be associated with either Early to Middle Pleistocene collision of the Eratosthenes
Seamount (continental fragment) with the trench south of Cyprus (Robertson, 1998; Schattner, 2010), or uplift associated with modified mantle flow patterns following slab break-off.

Supplementary materials related to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2011.12.003.
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Fig. 1. A: Regional simplified tectonic and topographic map and B: perspective view of topography across the Central Anatolian plateau and its southern margin with 7:1 vertical exaggeration, modified from Cosentino et al. (in press). Yellow pentagon in A indicates edges of the three-dimensional perspective topography in B, and yellow rectangle outlines map in Fig. 2A. Low topography within the yellow rectangle is the modern Mut Basin. NAF: North Anatolian Fault; EAF: East Anatolian Fault; DSF: Dead Sea Fault. In B, surface colors indicate elevation, except for the green overlay, which indicates the outcrop pattern of Late Miocene marine sediments; outcrop pattern and bedrock cross-section interpreted from 1:500,000 geology maps (Senel, 2002; Ulu, 2002). Offshore cross-section and 200-m bathymetric contours based on Aksu et al. (2005). Yellow star indicates Calabrian (Early Pleistocene) marine section (Yıldız et al., 2003). C-O: Cambro-Orodician; P: Permian; T: Triassic; J: Jurassic; E-K: Eocene to Cretaceous; M1: Miocene (pre-Messinian); M2: Miocene (Messinian); PI-Q: Plio-Quaternary. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 2. A: Map of the Mut Basin, showing the main branch of the Göksu River (light blue) and positions of fluvial terraces and uplifted Pleistocene marine sediments. Topography from 90-m resolution SRTM data (Jarvis et al., 2008) with 500 m contour intervals. B: River profile along the Göksu River, with projected positions of terraces and Pleistocene marine sediments. Gray and black lines (with area shaded between) indicate mean and maximum elevation values from the swath profiles shown in A. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
Fig. 3. Gravel-capped fluvial strath terraces of the Mut Basin. A: Intermediate height terraces showing cemented, flat top surfaces with thin cap of fine-grained (overbank) material. B: Degraded surface of the 110-m terrace of sample 09MUT17.

Fig. 4. Exposure ages for fluvial strath terraces of the Mut Basin. For $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al, boxes represent range of mean ages calculated using different scaling schemes (see Table A2). Bars on symbols show full range of 2σ errors. Y-axis errors are smaller than the symbol. Sea level variations from Bintanja et al. (2005) and δ$^18$O data from Lisiecki and Raymo (2005). Odd-numbered marine isotope stages (MIS) are highlighted with gray shading. Ages of circled samples (09MUT17 and 09MUT18) are interpreted as minimum ages (see text for explanation). Two solid gray lines show York (1969) regression fits to all data except the old $^{21}$Ne outlier and the two terraces with minimum ages, with (a) using the maximum calculated ages, and (b) using the minimum calculated ages (see Tables A2 and A4). Dotted gray lines (c and d) outline the range of fits acceptable within a 95% confidence interval for both maximum and minimum calculated ages.
Fig. 5. A: Map of channel steepness indexes that are normalized ($k_{sn}$) to a reference concavity ($\theta_{ref}$) of 0.45 throughout the Mut and Ermenek basins, calculated using the stream profiler tool (www.geomorphtools.org) with a smoothing window of 500 m. Geology from 1:500,000 scale maps (Senel, 2002; Ulu, 2002). Channels with numbered labels were used for projections. B: Longitudinal channel profiles with major knickpoints marked by circles. Knickpoints colored based on their position in the Mut or Ermenek sub-basin. C: Channel projections of upper, relict portions of channels to the position of the modern outlet. Ranges of final projected heights reflect $2\sigma$ errors in $k_s$ and a best-fit concavity value based on log (slope) versus log (area) plots of the upper channel segment.
Fig. 6. Schematic evolution of the southern margin of the Central Anatolian plateau, illustrating initial uplift of ca. 8 Ma marine sediments to an elevation of ca. 0.8 km followed by deposition of Pliocene–Pleistocene marine sediments, and an additional ca. 1.2 km of rapid uplift that continues to today. Channels within the basement respond to changing uplift rates, while channels in the Mut Formation (8 Ma limestones) are predominantly controlled by the lithologic contact. U: uplift rate; I: incision rate; \( k_{sn} \): normalized steepness index.
Table 1
Initial uplift rates derived from channel projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel #</th>
<th>Concavity</th>
<th>$k_s$ error (2σ)</th>
<th>$k_s$ (m)</th>
<th>$\Delta Z$ high $^a$ (m)</th>
<th>$\Delta Z$ high $^b$ (m)</th>
<th>$U_t$ high $^c$ (mm yr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$U_t$ low $^d$ (mm yr$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channels incising basement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4655</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channels incising Mut Formation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes $U_t = 0.74$ mm yr$^{-1}$ and $Δt = 1.63$ Ma.

$^a$ From $k_s - 2σ$ value
$^b$ From $k_s + 2σ$ value
$^c$ Using low estimate for $ΔZ$
$^d$ Using high estimate for $ΔZ$
Appendix

Supplementary Material

Sample preparation and analysis for cosmic nuclides

Surface ages of sampled strath terraces were determined using standard analytical procedures from concentrations of in-situ produced $^{10}$Be, $^{26}$Al, and $^{21}$Ne in chert from capping alluvial gravels. We have streamlined previous processing methods (e.g., Kohl and Nishiizumi, 1992; von Blanckenburg et al., 2004). An updated, step-by-step manual is available at http://www.geog.ucsb.edu/~bodo/pdf/bookhagen_chemSeparation_UCSB.pdf. In short, after crushing the chert clasts, we cleaned the 0.25-1.0 mm size fraction first through a 12-hour bath in a 1:1 hydrochloric acid and water solution. Next, samples were leached at least four times in a 2% hydrofluoric acid solution in an ultrasonic bath to remove meteoric beryllium. Our cleaned samples were between ~40 and ~60 g. Because more than 50% of material was dissolved in each cleaning step, several samples (“undated terraces” of Fig. 2) yielded insufficient amounts of clean material for analysis. Approximately 3 g of the cleaned material were reserved for $^{21}$Ne analysis, and the remainder of material was processed to isolate $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al. Samples were dissolved in hydrofluoric acid, and after addition of a low-ratio $^9$Be carrier ($^{10}$Be/$^9$Be ratio of ~1x10^{-15}), Be and Al were separated by ion-exchange chromatography. Stable $^{27}$Al concentrations were determined by ICP-OES (Varian 720 ES) at GFZ Potsdam using mainly the 167.019 nm wavelength.

For cosmogenic $^{21}$Ne determination at GFZ Potsdam, samples were wrapped in Al foil and loaded in the sample carrousel above the extraction furnace, which was then baked at 100°C for about one week. The noble gases were extracted by stepwise heating (at 400, 600, 800, and 1200°C) for at least 20 minutes each. In addition, aliquots of 08TSERM04 and 09MUT12 were crushed in vacuo to determine the isotopic composition of the trapped (non-cosmogenic) Ne component. In each case, after gas extraction chemically active gases were removed in two Ti sponges and two SAES (ZrAl) getters, and He, Ne, and Ar-Kr-Xe were separated from each other by trapping in a cryogenic adsorber and subsequent sequential release. Noble gas concentrations and isotopic compositions were determined in a VG5400 sector field mass spectrometer, and were corrected for isobaric interferences, instrumental mass fractionation, and analytical blanks. Further details about the analytical procedures can be found in Niedermann et al. (1997).

The two crushing extractions yielded $^{21}$Ne/$^{20}$Ne ratios consistent with the atmospheric value 0.002959 (Table A3); therefore, all $^{21}$Ne excesses were calculated relative to atmospheric composition. In most heating steps, the $^{21}$Ne/$^{20}$Ne ratios are only moderately increased; however, the $^{22}$Ne/$^{20}$Ne ratios are considerably higher than atmospheric in the 800°C and 1200°C steps of 09MUT08 and 09MUT12. This could be due to strong isotope fractionation in the small fraction of ~3-4% of total Ne retained after the 600°C step (Table A3). On the other hand, a contribution of nucleogenic $^{22}$Ne produced by $^{19}$F($\alpha$,n)$^{22}$Na($^{\beta^+}$)$^{22}$Ne cannot be excluded. As cosmogenic Ne is typically degassed up to 800°C from quartz (Niedermann, 2002), we have calculated total cosmogenic $^{21}$Ne concentrations by summing up the $^{21}$Ne excesses up to 800°C, but only including 50±50% of the 800°C contributions (which are small anyway) for 09MUT08 and 09MUT12.
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## Sample locations and cosmogenic nuclide concentration measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Latitude (DD)</th>
<th>Longitude (DD)</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Thickness correction</th>
<th>$^{10}\text{Be}$ (10$^5$ atoms/g)</th>
<th>1σ error $^{10}\text{Be}$ (10$^5$ atoms/g)</th>
<th>$^{26}\text{Al}$ (10$^5$ atoms/g)</th>
<th>1σ error $^{26}\text{Al}$ (10$^5$ atoms/g)</th>
<th>$^{26}\text{Al}/^{10}\text{Be}$ Error</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM04</td>
<td>36.5216</td>
<td>33.5052</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>5.39 ± 0.12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM07</td>
<td>36.6264</td>
<td>33.3680</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1.78 ± 0.04</td>
<td>13.1 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.4 ± 1.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT05</td>
<td>36.6657</td>
<td>33.3656</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.12</td>
<td>6.0 ± 1.3</td>
<td>5.5 ± 1.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT07</td>
<td>36.5342</td>
<td>33.4503</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21.6 ± 3.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT08</td>
<td>36.5434</td>
<td>33.4650</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28.6 ± 2.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT09</td>
<td>36.5367</td>
<td>33.4579</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27.7 ± 2.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT10</td>
<td>36.5527</td>
<td>33.4359</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>5.16 ± 0.04</td>
<td>28.7 ± 5.4</td>
<td>5.6 ± 1.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT11</td>
<td>36.5556</td>
<td>33.4389</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>22.0 ± 5.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT12</td>
<td>36.5492</td>
<td>33.4381</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>4.17 ± 0.03</td>
<td>32.6 ± 5.8</td>
<td>7.8 ± 1.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT14</td>
<td>36.5447</td>
<td>33.4454</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>4.01 ± 0.11</td>
<td>24.7 ± 5.1</td>
<td>6.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT15</td>
<td>36.5456</td>
<td>33.4465</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>4.21 ± 0.18</td>
<td>23.6 ± 2.1</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT16</td>
<td>36.5283</td>
<td>33.4617</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1.63 ± 0.19</td>
<td>8.2 ± 2.0</td>
<td>5.0 ± 1.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT17</td>
<td>36.5030</td>
<td>33.5187</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>3.84 ± 0.10</td>
<td>19.9 ± 1.8</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT18</td>
<td>36.5030</td>
<td>33.5215</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>6.31 ± 0.04</td>
<td>31.6 ± 2.1</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIY-0</td>
<td>37.0753</td>
<td>35.3503</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>3.21 ± 0.09</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIY-30</td>
<td>37.0753</td>
<td>35.3503</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>2.23 ± 0.14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIY-100</td>
<td>37.0753</td>
<td>35.3503</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>1.31 ± 0.04</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIY-200</td>
<td>37.0753</td>
<td>35.3503</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.946 ± 0.043</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a means "Not available"; for $^{10}\text{Be}$ measurements, this was due to weak or no current on the AMS. Not all samples were prepared for $^{26}\text{Al}$ measurements.

* Thickness correction factor based on sample thickness or depth below surface; topographic shielding was negligible for all samples.
Table A2
Terrain gravel $^{10}$Be and $^{26}$Al exposure ages from various scaling schemes calculated with the Cronus online calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^a$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^b$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^a$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^b$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^g$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^g$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^d$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^d$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^e$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^e$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^f$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^f$</th>
<th>$^{10}$Be Age $^*$</th>
<th>$^{26}$Al Age $^*$</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM04</td>
<td>120 ± 15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>118 ± 15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>117 ± 12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>111 ± 10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>116 ± 11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>95 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM07</td>
<td>40 ± 5</td>
<td>44 ± 8</td>
<td>40 ± 5</td>
<td>43 ± 8</td>
<td>43 ± 8</td>
<td>40 ± 4</td>
<td>37 ± 3</td>
<td>40 ± 7</td>
<td>38 ± 3</td>
<td>42 ± 7</td>
<td>34 ± 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT05</td>
<td>26 ± 3</td>
<td>21 ± 5</td>
<td>25 ± 3</td>
<td>21 ± 5</td>
<td>25 ± 3</td>
<td>21 ± 5</td>
<td>23 ± 2</td>
<td>19 ± 4</td>
<td>19 ± 4</td>
<td>23 ± 2</td>
<td>31 ± 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT07</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>74 ± 14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>73 ± 14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>73 ± 13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>68 ± 12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70 ± 12</td>
<td>40 ± 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT08</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>94 ± 13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92 ± 13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92 ± 12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>86 ± 10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89 ± 10</td>
<td>105 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT09</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>94 ± 14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92 ± 13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92 ± 12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>86 ± 10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89 ± 11</td>
<td>70 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT10</td>
<td>118 ± 15</td>
<td>99 ± 23</td>
<td>116 ± 14</td>
<td>97 ± 23</td>
<td>115 ± 12</td>
<td>97 ± 22</td>
<td>109 ± 9.7</td>
<td>91 ± 20</td>
<td>114 ± 10</td>
<td>95 ± 21</td>
<td>54 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>76 ± 21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75 ± 21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75 ± 20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70 ± 18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>72 ± 19</td>
<td>43 ± 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT12</td>
<td>95 ± 12</td>
<td>111 ± 25</td>
<td>93 ± 12</td>
<td>109 ± 25</td>
<td>93 ± 10</td>
<td>109 ± 23</td>
<td>87 ± 8</td>
<td>102 ± 21</td>
<td>91 ± 9</td>
<td>107 ± 22</td>
<td>71 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT14</td>
<td>92 ± 12</td>
<td>85 ± 21</td>
<td>90 ± 12</td>
<td>83 ± 21</td>
<td>90 ± 10</td>
<td>83 ± 20</td>
<td>84 ± 8</td>
<td>78 ± 18</td>
<td>88 ± 9</td>
<td>81 ± 19</td>
<td>68 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT15</td>
<td>98 ± 12</td>
<td>82 ± 13</td>
<td>96 ± 12</td>
<td>80 ± 12</td>
<td>96 ± 10</td>
<td>80 ± 11</td>
<td>90 ± 8</td>
<td>75 ± 9</td>
<td>93 ± 9</td>
<td>78 ± 10</td>
<td>53 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT16</td>
<td>39 ± 5</td>
<td>30 ± 8</td>
<td>38.2 ± 5</td>
<td>29 ± 8</td>
<td>38 ± 4</td>
<td>29 ± 8</td>
<td>35 ± 3</td>
<td>27 ± 7</td>
<td>36 ± 3</td>
<td>27 ± 7</td>
<td>28 ± 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT17</td>
<td>85 ± 10</td>
<td>66 ± 10</td>
<td>83 ± 10</td>
<td>65 ± 10</td>
<td>83 ± 9</td>
<td>65 ± 9</td>
<td>78 ± 7</td>
<td>60 ± 8</td>
<td>81 ± 7</td>
<td>62 ± 8</td>
<td>110 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT18</td>
<td>136 ± 17</td>
<td>103 ± 15</td>
<td>133 ± 16</td>
<td>101 ± 14</td>
<td>132 ± 14</td>
<td>101 ± 13</td>
<td>125 ± 11</td>
<td>94 ± 11</td>
<td>132 ± 12</td>
<td>99 ± 11</td>
<td>135 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Wrapper script version 2.2, main calculator version 2.1, constants version 2.2.1, muons version 1.1; errors represent "external" uncertainties.
$^b$ Desilets et al. (2006) time-dependent production.
$^d$ Lifton et al. (2005) time-dependent production.
### Table A3
Results of Ne analyses in chert separates from three strath terraces. Error limits are 2σ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Weight (°C)</th>
<th>T (10^-12 cm^3 STP/g)</th>
<th>20Ne (10^-5)</th>
<th>22Ne/20Ne (10^-5)</th>
<th>21Ne/20Ne (10^-5)</th>
<th>21Neex (10^6 atoms/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM04</td>
<td>0.80006 g crushed</td>
<td>364 ± 40</td>
<td>10.133 ± 0.041</td>
<td>0.305 ± 0.0052</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT08</td>
<td>0.70624 g</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>18.9 ± 1.2</td>
<td>10.32 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.334 ± 0.027</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400 ± 24</td>
<td>10.153 ± 0.036</td>
<td>0.3203 ± 0.0055</td>
<td>2.62 ± 0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>562 ± 33</td>
<td>10.226 ± 0.052</td>
<td>0.3069 ± 0.0053</td>
<td>1.67 ± 0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>67.8 ± 4.1</td>
<td>10.401 ± 0.083</td>
<td>0.309 ± 0.012</td>
<td>0.24 ± 0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049 ± 41</td>
<td>10.221 ± 0.032</td>
<td>0.3126 ± 0.0037</td>
<td>4.5 ± 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT12</td>
<td>0.71772 g</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>240 ± 12</td>
<td>10.244 ± 0.084</td>
<td>0.3054 ± 0.0073</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>269 ± 14</td>
<td>10.453 ± 0.074</td>
<td>0.3172 ± 0.0059</td>
<td>1.55 ± 0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>12.1 ± 1.1</td>
<td>10.91 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.329 ± 0.025</td>
<td>0.108 ± 0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>10.02 ± 0.65</td>
<td>10.99 ± 0.28</td>
<td>0.376 ± 0.033</td>
<td>0.216 ± 0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>531 ± 18</td>
<td>10.379 ± 0.054</td>
<td>0.3132 ± 0.0045</td>
<td>2.21 ± 0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT12</td>
<td>1.00102 g crushed</td>
<td>31.0 ± 2.3</td>
<td>10.32 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.301 ± 0.015</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Excess 21Ne over atmospheric abundances. Totals show estimated concentration of cosmogenic 21Ne, calculated based on the excesses in the 400 to 800 °C steps (see text in Supplementary Material).

### Table A4
Exposure ages calculated from 21Ne analyses and terrace heights above thalweg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>21Ne (10^6 atoms/g)</th>
<th>2σ error</th>
<th>10Be prod. rate (atoms/(g*yr))</th>
<th>21Ne prod. rate (atoms/(g*yr))</th>
<th>Exposure age (ka)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09MUT08</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.832</td>
<td>21.3 ± 2.2</td>
<td>130 ± 78</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08TSERM04</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.771</td>
<td>21.0 ± 2.2</td>
<td>219 ± 54</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09MUT12</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>20.7 ± 2.2</td>
<td>109 ± 36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 2σ error includes uncertainty in 10Be/21Ne production rate ratio and estimated 10% uncertainty in 10Be production rate.

b 2σ error includes uncertainty in 21Ne production rate and 21Ne concentration measurement.
### Table A5

Estimations of cosmogenic $^{10}$Be inherited component of Adana terrace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erosion rate (m/Myr)</th>
<th>Minimized $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Surface age (a)</th>
<th>Inherited component (atoms/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assuming density = 1.8 g/cm$^3$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>55,926</td>
<td>88,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>60,110</td>
<td>88,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>65,282</td>
<td>88,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>71,919</td>
<td>88,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>80,918</td>
<td>88,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assuming density = 2.0 g/cm$^3$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>56,529</td>
<td>90,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>61,398</td>
<td>90,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>67,630</td>
<td>90,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>76,042</td>
<td>90,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>84,768</td>
<td>91,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>