Solid Earth Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-99-AC1, 2019

Solid Earth
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Determining the Plio-Quaternary uplift of the southern French massif-Central; a new insights for intraplate orogen dynamics" *by* Oswald Malcles et al.

Oswald Malcles et al.

oswald.malcles@umontpellier.fr

Received and published: 27 September 2019

Modified manuscript is provided in supplement

Reviewer 1

This article from Malcles et al., presents a nice example of how cosmogenic dating of burial sediments can be used for landscape reconstruction. The multi-methodological approach is particularly interesting, coupling cosmogenic and magnetostratigraphic data with geomorphological analysis and numerical model of lithospheric scale uplift. The article is globally well written and consistently illustrated, even if as I point

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

out below, some of the figures can be improved to provide a better understanding of the different datasets The paper is reasonable organized the data are produced and interpreted state-of-the art and the line of arguments is generally consistent and convincing, and supports discussion and conclusions. However, some improvement is required with respect to a couple of problems, such as the erosion trend used as input data in the numerical model. The paper of Malcles et al. contributes substantially to reconstruct the landscape evolution and uplift history of the French Massif Central. The paper fits excellently in the profile of Solid Earth, and I would suggest publication after moderate modifications. Some general suggestions are listed below, and are complemented by specific comments in the attached pdf text file.

Q1: My main remark is related in the interpretation of the onset of the regional uplift. I find that the data well constrain the Plio-Quaternary incision rates but the onset of the uplift is not well demonstrated.

A1: Although we agree with the reviewer #1, the time period covered by our samples is unfortunately following the onset of the uplift and any conclusion on the onset of the uplift would be nothing more than an hypothesis loosely supported by the data. For instance, the area is part of the lithospheric-scale structure which is the Massif Central and it makes sense that the local evolution is linked to the regional evolution. We agree that this question is important to address for a better understanding of the regional dynamic, and hence, for stable continental area deformation driving processes, but it is out of the scope of the paper. We made it clearer in the paper. Line 59-60: adding “Further studies should aim to address the problem of uplift onset, giving more clues concerning the stable continental area but owing the data we presently have, discussing such onset is out of the scope of the paper.”

Q2: Introduction The introduction does not follow a classical organization, and introduction is merged with the tectonic setting and with the list of hypothesis to prove. I do not dislike it, but I suggest to separate in a sub paragraph the discussion of the hypothesis that the authors want to test.

A2: In order to make it clear, we split the Introduction in two parts: 1.1 Introduction (line 36) and 1.2: Working hypothesis (line 95)

Q3: About the three scenarios proposed I would like address your attention on the case of old uplift. The uplift could have started early and you could record only the last <5 Ma history of incision, a probably increase in the incision rates. The attached sketch explain the two alternative scenario and a possible relationship with the flat surface.

A3: First, we agree that the incision-rate is probably not linear if looking at higher frequencies, and could have started earlier. For example, such incision-rate variations have been proposed for the Alps (See Saillard et al., 2014; Rolland et al., 2017; Line 386). There is not any possibility to test, based on our data, if there was an increase in the last 5 Myrs, but we can not rule out a marginal increase over the last 5Myrs. Concerning the flat surfaces, we understand this comment as rising the question of possible apparent dip due to diffusion processes and not due to differential uplift. First, we point out that surfaces present southward dipping on both river-sides (if the dipping is due to diffusion processes, we expect dipping toward the river). Second, diffusion processes will mark the surfaces edges first, creating convex topography. This convex shape (and probable increasing dip) would be discarded either by automatic recognition or by manual control of the surface robustness. To take into account this remark we added for clarity: " Diffusion processes could create apparent tilt of remnant horizontal surfaces. However, we avoid that problem by completing the automatic selection and correction with a final check to make sure that the residuals are randomly distributed over the surface (see below)." (Lines 283-285).

Q4: The age and the geological meaning of the flat upper surface is relevant to reconstruct the onset of uplift.

A4: Agree, but because of the strong uncertainties concerning the ages of the upper surface (e.g. possible important time-lag between the surface formation and the uplift onset), we chose not to discuss it in the paper that deals mainly with the Plio-

Quaternary dynamic.

Q5: Moreover, the relationship of the cave galleries with the upper flat surface and with the geomorphological markers should be better described. Karst model One of the main point in using the cave galleries as ancient base level is to show that cave passages were really connected to the base level and that they are not only a perched level of preferable karst dissolution. For this reason I would like to see the profiles of the cave systems and its relationship with the river and eventually some photos testifying the phreatic style of the passages.

A5: We agree with possible alteration-driven karstification but, we do not propose to discuss the cave formation. Indeed, to our knowledge, there is no way to date the void created by karst galleries, therefore we use them only as empty pockets trapping sediments without any doubt, and now located on canyon wall as already done by Granger et al., (1997, 2001). This is the case at least for the Rieutord caves and the Garrel, for the Leicasse cave we refer the reader to Camus (2003) where the link to fluvial transport has been shown. Therefore, we think that adding more pictures of the caves and figures would not bring a significant gain in clarity. We refer the reader to publication where these relations are discussed e.g. Audra et al., (2001) or Moccochain (2007) and the link to fluvial transport has been shown (Camus, 2003). To allow the reader to have a look at the geometry of the caves we added a link to a university hosted database with a doi where the caves are available in 3D. Line 1548-154: Karst3D (2019). Karst3D data base. https://doi.org/10.15148/940c2882-49f1-49db-a97e-12303cace752

Q6: Why haven't you dated samples from the Leicasse cave, that is placed at high elevation? Higher levels exist (betwen 600 and 700 m) in the same region suggesting an old history of the uplift and incision.

A6: Dating of other samples is in progress and should be subject to publication when obtained. Furthermore, we point out that to our knowledge quartz bearing infilling are

not present at 600-700m a.s.l. In the explored caves. Highest known quartz cobbles in the Leicasse cave are located c.a. 450 a.s.l.

Q7: To show the sampling sites within the caves and the location of the caves on the topographic maps could help the reader.

A7: See above for topographic survey database. (Sampling site will be added).

Q8: Geomorphological analysis I found this part interesting and useful to put quantitative data in a regional scenario. I have some doubts about the paragraph organization: the three working hypothesis shown at the beginning seem a bit extraneous in a paragraph where the authors should explain how to extract the data and show the results. I suggest to rethink this organization.

A8: The paragraph structure has been rewritten in order to make it clear with in order: methods, expectations and results. Line 257 to 267 have been moved to Line308-320.

Q9: Also the title of the paragraph seems a bit out of context, better “analysis” instead of “evidences”, for example.

A9: Changed to “Geomorphometrical approach” Line 276.

Q10: I wonder to see some pictures of the analyzed and discussed markers.

A10: We added as supplementary some pictures of the discussed flat surfaces.

Q11: The limit of 2âŮę of slope is questionable. For me the problem is the topographic gradient of the entire margin. Along a NNW-SSE directed profile from Aigoual summit to the Cevennes fault the mean gradient is about 2âŮę, with important local variations that show topographic gradient up to 4âŮę (few kilometers SE to the summit of the Mt Aigoual for example). I would like to see if tilted plans between 2âŮę and 4âŮę exist. The limit of 2âŮę is reasonable for Plio-Quaternary marker, but it is possible that older geomorphological marker could be more tilted.

A11: We agree that using 2° as slope cut-off will limit the detection of some surfaces

and lead to miss some markers. But we focus on the Plio-Quaternary evolution, therefore the 2° cut-off could even be seen as a proxy for older (and polyphased) surface filter. For instance, old surface in the Larzac plateau have been proposed by Bruxelles (2001) but we didn't include them in our analysis because of their expected old ages and so forth, possible strong alterations, plural-deformation registration, etc.

Q12: How the slope of each marker have been calculated?

A12: As explained in lines 280-302 we use automatic and manual delimitation of surface, iterative plan fitting using extracted DEM points and statistical outliers suppression, and robustness criterions filter. We have modified these lines to make it clearer.

Q13: Numerical modeling The approach is interesting and perfectly reasonable even if I am not the right person to evaluate the details. However, I have same remarks on the input data for the modeling. The authors used a regional distribution of erosion that do not correspond exactly to the published data. In figure 11 the maximum of erosion is placed at the top the Mt Aigoual, with value of 0.08 mm/yr (or 80 m/Myr) (please, change the dimension to homogenize text and figure). But, the values on top reach the minimum values testified also by the oldest thermochronological ages (long-term erosion) of Barbarand et al., 2001 and Gautheron et al., 2009. Also the cosmogenic denudation rates of Olivetti et al. 2016 suggest that the erosion on the top of the massif close to the margin is very limited (values of about 0.04 mm/yr). The values increase along the flank, toward the lower elevation samples, confirmed by your new data set of incision rates.

A13: Dimensions in figure have been changed for consistency. We extended the explanations in the text to explain the erosion-profile setting (lines 352-360): "This profile is a simplification of the one that can be expected from Olivetti et al. (2016) and do not aim at matching precisely the published data because of, first, the explored time-span ($\sim$ 1 Myrs) is not covered by thermochronological data (> 10Myrs) or cosmogenic denudation rate (10s-100s kyrs). Second, we assume that erosion rates are correlated to

the first order to the local (10s km2) slopes, that are higher near the drainage divide. This allows to include any kind of erosion processes (e.g. landslides). Third, the model supposes a cylindrical structure perpendicular to the cross section, this implies to average the high-frequency lateral variations of slope, elevation, etc. to derive the actual denudation rate based on these proxies. Concerning this erosion profile, a parametric study with highest erosion rate ranging from 1 to 1000 m.Myrs-1 led to the same first order interpretations.."

Q14: Therefore, the input data of the erosion distribution that the authors used for the modeling is a bit different from the measured data. I think that an erosion trend resulting bigger at lower elevation and minor at high elevation is not consistent with a process of isostatic uplift induced by erosion, supporting event more clearly the authors conclusions.

A14: Using numerous erosion profiles, but with always a pattern of erosion on the relief and deposit off-shore won't change the first order results since they are mainly controlled by the Elastic parameters. We extended description of the choice of the erosion profile to make it clear (lines 352-360. (See A13 above).

Q15: I suggest to be more rigorous in the description of the geodynamic model: for instance the flexural response to the gulf of Lion extension is complicated to invoke, for the distance between the high topography and basin. The role of the mantle upwelling has been proposed by many authors (that have to be cited) that worth to be discussed a bit more in detail (dynamic or isostatically supported, the Massif Central thin lithosphere suggests, in my opinion, a clear contribution of the mantle in the present topography).

A15: We agree that mantle or deep processes are involved in the uplift onset. However, we developed a conceptual to test the role of the erosion-induced isostatic adjustment and not to elaborate more complicated models with too many parameters compared to the constraints that we have. For instance, we cannot decipher if the thin and slightly hot lithosphere is related to dynamic topography with ongoing mantle upwelling or if it

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

is supported by thermal isostasy being a remnant of past processes like the opening of the Gulf of Lion.

Discussion Q16: Lines: 376 is not clear for me.

A16: “Hence, the incision rate has to be balanced to the first order by the uplift rate”. Explanation has been added for better clarity Lines 420 – 424: “Hence, back to the three conceptual models presented in part 1 (Fig.2), we can discard, at first order, the models A (Old uplift-recent incision) and B (Old uplift-old incision) because the obtained incision rate shows recent incision and surface tilting tend to prove a current uplift. Therefore, the incision rate has to be balanced to the first order by the uplift rate. Eustatic variations magnitudes are of too low (100-120 m) to explain the total incision (up to 400m). “

Q17: The only way that I know to re-equilibrate a river profile is a regressive erosion that move from the base level upstream. If the river is full equilibrated means that regressive erosion reached the uppermost part of the profile. Moreover the lack of knickpoint does not prove that incision rate and uplift are in equilibrium, if the landscape undergoes a long topographic degradation.

A17: We agree that the lack of knickpoints do not prove an equilibrium state (and that in general the term “equilibrium” is subject to debate) but it allows to dismiss a strong impact of regressive erosion due to recent sea-level variations or tectonic. To address the concern of long topographic degradation (assuming no uplift?), we point out that such degradation will lead to mass export, then lithospheric unloading and then isostatic-adjustment uplift, which is why we developed our conceptual model to test if this process could be responsible for our observations.

Q18: It could be interesting to know why the rivers profiles from northeastern margin of the Massif (Olivetti et al.) and from Ardeche (personal data) show knickpoints and Cevennes rivers not. If the authors want to discuss about the river profiles it could be interesting to show some data.

A18: This subject looks important and further study should be addressed in this sense. But discussion about the river profiles are beyond the scope of this paper and seems to us unnecessary, especially in a manuscript that is already long and complex. Indeed, for drawing robust conclusions, we should, as suggested by Reviewer #1 enlarge the study to other rivers surrounding the Massif Central and not only the ones in our study. As Reviewer #1we noticed the difference in knickpoints between the southern and eastern margin of the Massif-Central and we think that ot deserve a more complete study, notably to discuss a possible role of karstic dynamic given the major lithological difference between these two regions.

Q19: Onset of volcanism is placed about 13 Ma and even earlier if we consider the synrift volcanism (Michon and Merle 2001).

A19: We agree, according to Nehlig et al., the volcanism is started 65 Ma ago in some places. One of the many issues they highlighted was the diachronism of the volcanic activity throughout the Massif-Central. For example, they shown an activity spanning from 13 to 2Ma with a paroxysm at 8.5 Ma for the Cantal stratovolcano. Dautria et al. (2010) proposed younger ages of volcanic structures southward, etc. We chose 5 Ma as an average of increased activity throughout the area but not as the onset of the volcanisms which is on the other hand is of major importance in the discussion of the uplift onset, as previously discussed.

Q20: Figures: In general the figures are good, but sometimes they lack of useful information such as topographic names (summits, cities, ect). I would appreciate to see the location of the analyzed caves in a map (in the figure 9 for example) and also the profile in a vertical view of the caves to have a look of the general topographic trend, its relationship with the incised river, and to show the sampling sites.

A20: Changed accordingly with some geographical information, trying not to overload the figures. See modified figure.

Q21: Coordinates are lacking.

A21: Lacking coordinates are now provided in the figure 1 caption.

Figure 3 and 4 could be merged. Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2019-99/se-2019-99-RC1-supplement.pdf Modifications included, and answer in the section below.

Supplementary review 1:

SQ1: Line 43: I agree with the recent uplift, but it is still under debate. The topography could be also interpreted as a longlasting degradation of an ancient topography.

SA1: We agree. This hypothesis is presented latter in this section. We changed the sentence in order to present it as our chosen hypothesis but not the unique one possible.

SQ2: Line 58: 9 kms seem a bit too much, anyway big thickness is found in the depocenter basin, such as the center of Ales Basin, while along the Cevennes margin the thickness progressively decrease toward the NW. It is not proven that the entire Cevennes region was covered by Mesozoic sediments.

SA2: Noted and slight changes in the sentence (“reach several kilometers” instead of “be more than 9km”. The 9 kms are for the overall SE basins (southward of Ales Basin). Anyway, exact spatial coverage or thickness will not change our point given that the first order is sufficient to our study.

SQ3: Line 60: The uplift event is called Durancian uplift event while the Isthmus is the topographic high formed as a consequence, I think.

SA3: Noted and changed accordingly.

SQ4: Line 69: do you refer to Sanchis and Seranne?

SA4: Indeed, as an example of evolution induced by the extensional period, not as direct study of the watershed evolution.

SQ5: Line 70: To be meticulous, the events are three: the Mid-cretaceous uplift, the Pyrenean compression and the Oligocene extension.

SA5: We agree. The Durancian event (Mid-Cretaceous uplift) is presented before in the section but should mentioned here. Changed accordingly.

SQ6: Line 93:

SA6: Tilt –> Tilting

SQ7: line 55-56: I suggest to use Ma instead of Myrs ago

SA7: Changed accordingly.

SQ8: Line 132: It could be useful for the readers a briefly description of the morphological setting of the area, with the plateau, canyons ect.

SA8: Short descriptions are provided Line 54 to 59. We added call to figure 1 (for the provided topographic map) for visual insights into first order morphology.

SQ9: Line 136: sequence

SA9: Changed accordingly

SQ10: Line 140:

SA10: References writing changed

SQ11: Line 154:

SA11: Some precisions concerning the sediments protolith area are now provided.

SQ12: Line 594: fig. 9.

SA12: Changed accordingly

SQ13: Figure 1: It is not very clear the location of the Massif Central. It could be interesting to see the sampling location divided for methods, where you performed

cosmogenic analysis and where paleomagnetism.

SA13: Context map was changed with zoom over western Europe. More information added into the figure caption. See revised figure.

SQ14: Figure 11: change mm.yr-1 in m.Myr-1 "the studied area that include the studies zones" sounds a bit as tautology. It could be better to clarify. the simbol v is gone

SA14: Dimensions changed for consistency to m.Ma-1. Unclear sentence was removed. Symbol v has been added.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2019-99/se-2019-99-AC1-supplement.pdf

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-99, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Solid Earth Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-99-AC2, 2019

Solid Earth
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Determining the Plio-Quaternary uplift of the southern French massif-Central; a new insights for intraplate orogen dynamics" *by* Oswald Malcles et al.

Oswald Malcles et al.

oswald.malcles@umontpellier.fr

Received and published: 27 September 2019

Modified manuscript is provided in supplement.

Q1: This paper presents original data on an interesting geomorphological subject where quantification is difficult and rare. The overall conclusion that South Massif Central has seen an incision and related uplift of about 80 m/Myr in the last 4 Ma, associated with a tilt toward the south is sound and deserves publication. However, the way the data is presented is far from satisfactory (missing information, hard to understand figures, neglected data without justification, etc., see details below) and thus I suggest important revisions to be performed before acceptance. English needs also

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

significant improvement. I point a few points below.

A1: We took into consideration your comments and suggestions. We hope that our revisions and our answers below will clarify our work.The English has been reviewed. We would like to emphasis that one of the author is a native English speaker (Australia).

Q2: details“ 83.4+17.3/-5.4 “ is too precise ! 83+17 -5 is enough. . ..

A2: Agree, and change accordingly.

Q3: Burial dating using Terrestrial cosmogenic nuclides (TCN) are nowadays: change are to is. Line 38 (and elsewhere): Ân ÌĄ can’t Ân ÌĄ cannot is more advisable.

A3: Corrected

Q4: Fig.1 lacks latitude longitude and some landmarks (even myself who works in the area was not sure to locate the main structures) like main rivers, cities,. . .

A4: Additional informations have been added to the map, trying to fin a balance between information and clarity. See revised figure.

Q5: A geological map could be useful.

A5: At the scale of the study region and given the topic of the manuscript, we think that a topographic map is much more useful than a geological map to observe the overall morphology (besides, we mentioned clearly in the introduction and the tectonic setting that the geology of the studied area corresponds mainly to Mesozoic to lower Cenozoic limestones plateaus).

Q6: Also the localization of studied sites is poorly precised in this figure.

A6: Given the scale of Figure 1, it is not possible to locate precisely the studied points. We gave their precise geographical coordinates in the figure captions.

Q7: Could they be also indicated in e.g. fig.9?

A7: Yes, we added them.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Q8: Line 123-124: sentence needs a verb!

A8: “Creating” changed to “creates”.

Q9: Line 166-169 : strange practice to give results in the methods section (2.1) Please move them to section 2.2!

A9: We did it (see revised manuscript lines 211-214)

Q10: Line 216: 83±35 is enough precise. A table of paleomagnetic results with statistical parameters is mandatory. A10: We added the table in the supplementary material.

Q11: Fig.6 is hard to understand (especially not knowing how much paleomagnetic sites are available). I figure that on paleomag polarity is represented arbitrarily by a set of points fitted with chosen incision rate, allowing to see if the polarity is consistent with the scale, indicated as vertical grey strips. This is very badly explained !

A11: Almost all the part 2.2.2, the figure and the captions have been reworked for better clarity.

Q12: Line 219 “First, we note a good agreement between samples located at the same elevation,” I really don’t get how you derive such assertion!

A12: We added explanation Line 2541-242: “samples located at the same elevation and being part of the same stratigraphic layer (Camus, 2003). This syngenetic deposition allow, as best explanation to prevent from a possible partial endokarstic reworking”. Indeed, Some sampling sites are located at slightly different elevation but inside the same gallery and, as part of the same sedimentary layer they have to display the same polarity, that is the case. This consistency is not on its own a proof that the clay didn’t sediment in different period (with same polarity) but it is by far the most reasonable explanation. See supplementary material with analysis details.

Q13: Line 223-225: about this reverse-normal sequence, there is no way to see it on Fig.6! Again the table is mandatory! You have to comment on the reverse polarity at

≈40 m that you assign to Brunhes period. Why not putting Matuyama there?

A13: Given the poor quality of the data, we skipped it from the interpretation. See supplementary material.

Q14: Line 243: “Using a similar approach for the Rieutord crystalline samples,” I don’t get what you mean!

A14: We added simple explanations in the paragraph: “Using a similar approach for the Rieutord crystalline samples where we minimize the residual between the observed and the modeled ages based on the same incision-rate range than for the paleomagnetic samples”.

Q15: How do you compute average dip and azimuth of your geomorphological surfaces? If it’s arithmetic mean, that not acceptable. You have to make it using directional statistics (and show us a stereogram of dip lines)

A15: Given values are indeed not arithmetic mean. We checked again the computation and minor errors have been fixed (Average dip changed from $0.61 \pm 0.41^\circ$ with an azimuth of N150 $\pm$ 40°E tot $0.60 \pm 0.40^\circ$ with an azimuth of N128 $\pm$ 36°E). It does not change the interpretation. Errors was due to mistake in downward sign for 2 surfaces. Because of very low dip angle of the plane, the conventional representation through stereogram is useless and won’t provide the information brought by the histograms.

Q16: Is Fig.9 all markers or only the robust ones? The second option (38 data; but I count 45 on fig.9!) seems right. But then the azimuths exhibit in fig.9 does not fit Fig.10. There are northward dips!

A16: Fig. 9 doesn’t display only the robust values. We added different color in order to decipher in between the two sets. Note that some surfaces cannot be shown on the map because of their small size and their closeness. See revised figure 9.

Fig.10 scale “surface density” is a number of surfaces? Please make this clear.

A10: Yes. Modified accordingly.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2019-99/se-2019-99-AC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-99, 2019.

Determining the Plio-Quaternary uplift of the southern French massif-Central; a new insights for intraplate orogen dynamics.

Oswald Malcles[1], Philippe Vernant[1], Jean Chéry[1], Pierre Camps[1], Gaël Cazes[2,3], Jean-François Ritz[1], David Fink[3].

[1] Geosciences Montpellier, CNRS-University of Montpellier, Montpellier, France

[2] SEES, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

[3] Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation, Lucas Heights, Australia

Correspondence to: Oswald Malcles (oswald.malcles@umontpellier.fr)

Abstract.

The evolution of intra-plate orogens is still poorly understood. Yet, this is of major importance for understanding the Earth and plate dynamic, as well as the link between surface and deep geodynamic processes. The French Massif Central is an intraplate orogen with a mean elevation of 1000m, with the highest peak elevations ranging from 1500m to 1885m. However, active deformation of the region is still debated due to scarce evidence either from geomorphological or geophysical (i.e. geodesy and seismology) data. Because the Cévennes margin allows the use of karst sediments geochronology and morphometrical analysis, we study the vertical displacements of that region: the southern part of the French Massif-Central. Geochronology and morphometrical results, helped with lithospheric-scale numerical modelling, allow, then, a better understanding of this intraplate-orogen evolution and dynamic.

Using the ability of the karst to durably record morphological evolution, we first quantify the incision rates. We then investigate tilting of geomorphological benchmarks by means of a high-resolution DEM. We finally use the newly quantified incision rates to constrain numerical models and compare the results with the geomorphometric study.

We show that absolute burial age ($^{10}Be/^{26}Al$ on quartz cobbles) and the paleomagnetic analysis of karstic clay deposits for multiple cave system over a large elevation range correlate consistently. This correlation indicates a regional incision rate of 83~~.4~~ $^{+17~~.3~~}/_{-~~5.4~~}$ m.Ma^{-1} during the last ca 4 Myrs (Plio-Quaternary). Moreover, we point out through the analysis of 55 morphological benchmarks that the studied region has undergone a regional southward tilting. This tilting is expected as being due to a differential vertical motion between the north and southern part of the studied area.

Numerical models show that erosion-induced isostatic rebound can explain up to two-thirds of the regional uplift deduced from dating technics and are consistent with the southward tilting obtain from morphological analysis. We presume that the remaining part is related to dynamic topography or thermal isostasy due to the Massif Central plio-quaternary magmatism.

1 Introduction and Tectonic Setting

1.1 Introduction

Since the past few decades, plate-boundary dynamics is to a first order, well understood. Such is not the case for intraplate regions, where short-term (10^3-10^5 yrs.) strain rates are low and the underlying dynamical processes

are still in debate (e.g. Calais et al., 2010; Vernant et al., 2013; Calais et al., 2016; Tarayoun et al., 2017). On geological time-scales, transient phenomenon that are classically used to explain intraplate deformations (as seen through the seismic activity) can, not be a satisfactory explanation though, this then raises the question of the origin of the high finite deformations observed in many parts of the world as for instance the Ural mountains in Russia, the Blue Mountains in Australia or the French Massif Central.

In this study we focus on the Cevennes Mountains and the Grands Causses regions that form the southern part of the French Massif Central, located in the southwestern Eurasian plate (fig.1). The region is characterized by a mean elevation of 1000 m with summits higher than 1500 m. Such topography is likely to be the result of recent, active uplift and as the Cevennes mountains experiences an exceptionally high mean annual rainfall (the highest peak, Mount Aigoual, records the highest mean annual rainfall in France of 4015 mm) it raises the question of a possible link between erosion and uplift as previously proposed for the Alps (Champagnac et al., 2007; Vernant et al., 2013; Nocquet et al., 2016). This region currently undergoes a small but discernible deformation, but no significant quantification can be deduced due to the scarcity in seismicity (Manchuel et al., 2018). In addition, GPS velocities are below the uncertainty threshold of GPS analyses (Nocquet et Calais, 2003; Nguyen et al., 2016).

South and West of the crystalline Cevennes mountains, prominent limestone plateaus, named Grands Causses, rise to 1000m and are dissected by few canyons that are several hundreds of meter deep (Topographic font in figure 1 show first order topography and morphology). The initiation of incision, its duration and the geomorphic processes leading to the present-day landscape remain poorly constrained. A better understanding of the processes responsible for this singular landscape would bring valuable information on intraplate dynamics, especially where large relief exists.

The oldest formations in the area were formed during the Variscan orogeny (late Palaeozoic, ~300 M yrs ago; Brichau et al., 2007) and constitute the crystalline basement of the Cevennes. Between 200 and 40 M yrs ago (Mesozoic and lower Cenozoic), the region was mainly covered by the sea ensuring the development of an important detrital and carbonate sedimentary cover, which can reach several be more than 9 km thick in some locations (Sanchis and Séranne, 2000; Barbarand et al., 2001). During the Mesozoic era, an episode of regional uplift and subsequent erosion and alteration (called the Durancian isthmus event) is proposed as being at the origin of the flat, highly elevated surface that persists today across the landscape (Bruxelles, 2001; Husson, 2014).

The area is also affected by the major NE-SW trending Cevennes fault system. During the Pyrenean orogeny, 85 to 25 Ma (Tricart, 1984; Sibuet et al., 2004), several faults and folds affected the geological formations south of the Cevennes fault, while very few deformations occurred further north within the Cévennes and Grand Causses areas (Arthaud and Laurent, 1995). Eventually, the Oligocene extension (~30 M yrs ago) led to the counter-clockwise rotation of the Corso-Sardinian block and the opening of the Gulf of Lion, re-activating some of the older compressive structures as normal faults. The main drainage divide between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea is located in our study area and is inherited from this extensional episode (Séranne et al., 1995; Sanchis et al., 2000).

Superimposed at the inheritance from Durancian event, the last These two major tectonic episodes which are the (Pyrenean compression and the Oligocene extension are the main geodynamic processes that) shaped the large-scale structural morphology of the region. Afterwards during the Plio-Quaternary period, only intense volcanic activity has affected the region, from the Massif Central to the Mediterranean shoreline. This activity is charac-

terised by several volcanic events that are well constrained in age (Dautria et al., 2010). The last eruption occurred in the Chaîne des Puys during the Holocene (i.e. the past 10 kyrs (Nehlig et al., 2003; Miallier et al., 2004). Some authors proposed that this activity is related to a hotspot underneath the Massif Central (Granet et al., 1995; Baruol and Granet, 2002) leading to an observed positive heat-flow anomaly and a possible regional plio-Quaternary uplift.

Despite this well described overall geological evolution the onset of active incision that has shaped the deep valleys and canyons (e. g. Tarn or Vis river, Fig 1) across the plateaus, and the mechanisms that controlled this incision are still in debate. One hypothesis proposes that canyon formation was driven by the Messinian salinity crisis with a drop of more than 1000m in Mediterranean Sea level. This, however, would then not explain the fact that the Atlantic watersheds show similar incision. Other studies suggested that the incision is controlled by the collapse of cave galleries that lead to fast canyon formation mostly during the late Quaternary, thus placing the onset of canyon formation only a few hundreds of thousands of years ago (Corbel, 1954). In contrast, it has also been proposed more recently (based on relative dating techniques and sedimentary evidence) that incision during the Quaternary was negligible (i.e. less than a few tens of meters), and that the regional morphological structures seen today occurred around 10 M~~yrs ago~~a (Séranne et al., 2002; Camus, 2003).

1.2 Working hypothesis

In this paper, we provide new quantitative constraints on both the timing of incision and the rate of river down-cutting in the central part of the Cévennes and of the Grands Causses that has resulted in the large relief between plateau and channel bed. We employ two methods, cosmogenic $^{10}Be/^{26}Al$ burial dating quartz cobbles that have been transported by rivers and paleomagnetic analyses along vertical profiles of endokarstic clay both of which have been deposited in multiple cave systems at the time cave entry was at river channel elevation. In parallel, by analysing a high-resolution DEM (5m), we show that the region is affected by a regional tilting. Our results allow to quantify the role of the Plio-Quaternary incision on the Cévennes landscape evolution and to constrain numerical modelling from which we derive the regional uplift rates and a tilt of geomorphological markers.

One important point of this study is the integration of multi-disciplinary approaches in order to constrain intraplate deformation. Such an approach is necessary to bring new insights into the lithosphere behaviour of slow dynamic regions. If the uplift is easily recognisable in the landscape (1000 m high plateaus), quantifying its timing and evolution rates is harder and can't be performed by classical technics (e.g. GPS). This is why we aim to quantify the incision rate over the longest possible period thanks to the karstic immunity. Dealing with long-term incision rates (up to 5 Myrs) should permit to smooth possible climatic-driven incision rate variations (with time-span of several kyrs).

If incision is initiated by uplift centred on the North of the area where elevations are maximum, it will lead to tilting of fossilised topographic markers as strath terraces. Our method of analyses provides an opportunity to select between three possible explanations for the current terrain morphology. The first is based on old uplift and old incision (Fig. 2.A). In this case, apparent incision rates would be very low. For instance, if incision commenced 10 M~~yrs ago~~a (Serrane et al., 2002), we would find surface tilting but cosmogenic burial dating with $^{10}Be/^{26}Al$ which cannot discern ages older than ~ 5Ma due to excessive decay of 26Al, would not be possible. The second possibility (Fig. 2.B) is that the uplift is old, and incision consequently follows but with a time lag.

Here the incision rate would be rather fast but no tilting is expected for the river-related markers because no differential uplift occurs after their formation. Finally, the third possibility (Fig 2.C) is that uplift and incision are concurrent and recent (i.e. within the time scale of cosmogenic burial dating) and thus we would expect burial ages < 5 Myrs relatively high incision rates, and tilting of morphological markers. These different proposals for the temporal evolution of the region will then be compared using numerical modelling.

2. Determining the incision rates in the Cévennes and the Grand Causses Region

2.1. Principles and methods

2.1.1. Karst model

No evidence of important aggradation events has been reported in the literature for the studied area. Therefore we base our analysis on a per descensum infill model of the karst networks whereby sediments are transported and then deposited within cave galleries close to base level. When cave-systems and entry passages are near the contemporaneous river channel elevation (including higher levels during floods), the deposition into caves of sediments, from clay to cobbles occurs, especially during flood events. SWith subsequent river incision into bedrock creates a relative base level drop (due to uplift or sea-level variations). The galleries associated with the former base-level are now elevated above the new river course and become disconnected from further deposition. Hence fossilised and trapped sediments throughout the cave network represent the cumulative result of incision. In this commonly used model (Granger et al., 1997; Audra et al., 2001; Stock et al., 2005; Harmand et al., 2017), the higher the gallery elevation (relative to the present-day base level) the older the deposits in that gallery. As a result, the objective here is to quantify a relative lowering of the base level in the karst systems, with the sediments closest to the base level being the youngest deposits, and note that we do not date the cave network creation which may very well pre-date river sediment deposition.

Within individual canyons, successions of gallery networks across the full elevation range from plateau top to modern river channel, were not always present and often sampling could not be conducted in a single vertical transect. Thus we make the assumption of lateral altitudinal continuity i.e. that within a watershed, which may contain a number of canyons, the sediments found in galleries at the same elevation were deposited at the same time. Inside one gallery, we use the classical principle of stratigraphy sequence (i.e. the older deposits are below the younger ones). More informations and detailed relationship concerning the karstic development and geometric relationship between karstic network and morphological markers could be find in Camus (2003) or #####. In any cases, our aim is not to date the galleries formation, neither to explain the formation processes (e.g. past preferential alteration layer); but to use the time information brought by the sediment that have been trapped into the cave system. Therefore, we apply the common used model (example in Harmand et al., 2017) that had been proved by Granger et al., (1997, 2001). For cave topographic survey, we refer the reader to https://data.oreme.org/karst3d/karst3d_map providing 3D survey.

2.1.2. Burial ages

Burial dating using Terrestrial cosmogenic nuclides (TCN) isare nowadays a common tool to quantify incision

rates in karstic environment (Granger and~~et~~ Muzikar, 2001; Stock et al., 2005; Moccochain., 2007; Tassy et al., 2013; Granger et al., 2015; Calvet et al., 2015; Genti, 2015; Olivetti et al., 2016; Harmand et al., 2017; Rovey II et al., 2017; Rolland et al., 2017; Sartégou, 2017; Sartégou et al., 2018). This method relies on the differential decay of TCN in detrital rocks that were previously exposed to cosmic radiation before being trapped in the cave system. With this in mind, the ^{10}Be and ^{26}Al nuclide pair is classically used as (i) both nuclides are produced in the same mineral (i.e. quartz), (ii) their relative production ratio is relatively well constrained (we use here a standard ^{26}Al/^{10}Be pre-burial ratio of 6.75, see Balco et al., 2008) and (iii) their respective half-lives (about 1.39 Myr and 0.70 Myr for ^{10}Be and ^{26}Al, respectively) are well suited to karstic and landscape evolution study, with a useful time range of ~100 ky to ~5 Myr.

To quantify the incision rate of the limestone plateau of the Cevennes area, we analysed quartz cobbles infilling from four caves of the Rieutord canyon (Fig. 1), this canyon is well suited for such study because horizontal cave levels are tiers over 200 m above the current river-level and are directly connected to the canyon, leading to a straight relationship between river elevation and the four cave infilling that we have sampled (Cuillère cave, Route cave, Camp-de-Guerre cave and Dugou cave). Furthermore, cobbles source is well known and identified: the upstream part of the Rieutord river, some tens of kilometres northward, providing a ~~uniform~~unique sediment origin composed of granite and metamorphic rocks embedding numerous quartz veins.. All samples (Example Fig. 3) were collected far enough away (>20m) from the cave entrance and deep enough below the surface (>30m) to avoid secondary in-situ cosmogenic production of ^{10}Be and ^{26}Al in the buried sediments.

The quartz cobbles were first crushed and purified for their quartz fraction by means of sequential acid attack with Aqua-Regia (HNO_3 +3HCl) and diluted Hydrofluoric acid (HF). Samples were then prepared according to ANSTO's protocol (see Child et al. 2000) and ~300µg of a ^{9}Be carrier solution was added to the purified quartz powder before total dissolution. AMS measurements were performed on the 6MV SIRIUS AMS instrument at ANSTO and results were normalised to KN-5-2 (for Be, see Nishiizumi et al., 2007) and KN-4-2 (for Al) standards. Uncertainties for the final ^{10}Be and ^{26}Al concentrations include AMS statistics, 2% (Be) and 3% (Al) standard reproducibility, 1% uncertainty in the Be carrier solution concentration and 4% uncertainty in the natural Al measurement made by ICP-OES, in quadrature. Sample-specific details and results are found in table 1.

~~and 0.21 ± 0.1 Myrs respectively. 097, 0.63 ± 0.37, 0.95 ± 0.14For the four caves, we observed a good relationship between burial ages and incision, except for the Camp-de-Guerre cave (CDG) site, the higher the cave is, the older the burial ages are. Burial ages for the Cuillère cave, Dugou cave, Camp-de-Guerre cave and Route cave are 2.16 ± 0.15~~

2.1.3. Paleomagnetic analysis

In parallel with burial dating, we analyzed the paleomagnetic polarities within endokarstic clay deposits ~~twointo collected 141 clay infilling samples~~ within two main cave systems: the *Grotte-Exsurgence du Garrel* and the *Aven de la Leicasse* (Fig. 1). These two ~~sites~~ cave systems allowed us collecting samples along a more continuous range of elevations than the one provided by the Rieutord samples (for burial age determination) and also ~~allowed~~ extending the spatial coverage to the Southern Grands Causses region. Thanks to the geometry of these two cave systems, we sampled a 400m downward base level variation. The sampling was done along verti-

cal profiles from a few ten of centimeters to 2 meters high by means of Plexiglas cubes with a 2 cm edge length (Fig. 4) used as a pastry cutter. We weren't able to analyse clay samples from Rieutord canyon because no reliable clay infilling was found in the Rieutord caves.

Demagnetisation was performed with an applied alternative field up to 150mT using a 2G-760 cryogenic magnetometer, equipped with the 2G-600 degausser system controller. Before this analysis, each sample remained at least 48h in a null magnetic field, preventing a possible low coercivity viscosity overprinting the detrital remanent magnetisation (DRM) (Hill, 1999; Stock et al., 2005; Hajna et al., 2010). If the hypothesis of instantaneous locked in DRM seems reasonable compared with the studied time span, it is important to keep in mind that the details of DRM processes (as for instance the locked in time) is not well understood (Tauxe et al., 2006; Spassov et Valet, 2012) and could possibly lead to small variations (few percents) in the following computed incision rates.

Because fine clay particles are expected being easily reworked in the cave, careful attention was paid to the site selection and current active galleries were avoided. Clays deposits had to show well laminated and horizontal layering in order to prevent analysis of in-situ produced clays (from decalcification) or downward drainage by an underneath diversion gallery that could strongly affect the obtained inclination (and also the declination to a minor extent). Note that for paleo-polarities study alone, small inclination or declination variations won't result in false polarities

2.2 Quantifying the average incision rates

2.2.1. Rieutord incision rate from burial ages

The relationship between burial ages and incision is shown in Figure 5. ~~Except for the Camp-de-Guerre cave (CDG) site, the higher the cave is, the older the burial ages are.~~ For the four caves, we observed a good relationship between burial ages and finite incision, except for the Camp-de-Guerre cave (CDG) site, the higher the cave is, the older the burial ages are. Burial ages for the Cuillère cave, Dugou cave, Camp-de-Guerre cave and Route cave are 2.16 ± 0.15, 0.95 ± 0.14, 0.63 ± 0.1 and 0.21 ± 0.1 Myrs respectively. This is consistent with the supposed cave evolution and first-order constant incision of the Rieutord canyon. CDG age has to be considered with caution. The CDG cave entrance located in a usually dry thalweg can act as a sinkhole or an overflowing spring depending on the intensity of the rainfall. The sample was collected in a gallery showing evidence of active flooding ~10 m above the Rieutord riverbed, therefore the older than expected age, given the elevation of the cave, is probably due to cobbles that came from upper galleries during flood events. Forcing the linear regression to go through the origin, leads to an incision rate of 8~~32.8~~ ± 3~~54.9~~ m.Ma^{-1}. These results show that at least half of the 300 m deep Rieutord Canyon is a Quaternary incision. Extrapolating the obtained rate yields an age of 4.4 ± 1.9 Ma for the beginning of the canyon incision, which suggests that the current landscape has been shaped during the Plio-Quartenary period. To extend our spatial coverage and bring stronger confidence into our results, we combine Rieutord burial ages with paleomagnetic data from watersheds located on the other side of the Herault watershed.

2.2.2. South Grands Causses incision rate from paleomagnetic data

A total of 10041 clay-infilling samples distributed over of 13 sites (i.e. profiles) were ~~heOf the two cave systems, t~~studied. The lowest sample elevation above sea level (a.s.l.) is in the Garrel (ca 190 m) and the highest in

the Leicasse (ca 580 m a.s.l.). ~~Given the very marginal difference in elevation between the local base levels from these two caves, we assume that they have the same local base level reference.~~ In the Leicasse cave system, we sampled 8 profiles ~~for a totalsites~~ totalizing ~~of~~ 60~~1~~ samples. ~~Their~~ Profiles elevations are located between ca 200 m and ca 400 m above the base level (a.b.l.), which corresponds ~~defined as~~ to the elevation of the Buèges river spring at 170 m ~~above sea level~~a.s.l.

In the Garrel cave system, we sampled ~~From~~ 5 ~~sites~~profiles totalizing ~~, the~~ 480 ~~Garrel~~ samples that~~, encompass elevations~~ range between 20 m and 80 m a.b.l. defined by the Garrel spring at 180 m a.s.l. Given the very marginal difference in elevation between the local base levels from these two caves, we assume that they have the same local base level. At each studied sites, if all the profile samples have the same polarity, the site is granted with the same polarity, either normal or reverse. If not (i.e. the profile displays normal and reverse polarities), we consider it as a transitional site. Figure 6 shows the results plotted with respect to the paleomagnetic scale (x axis) for the past 7 Ma, and their elevation above the base level (y axis). The measured paleomagnetic polarities on each sites is plotted several times for given incision rates supposed to be constant through times (this allows determining different age models and analyze their correlation with the distribution of paleomagnetic data, see below).

~~by individual sites, in respect with their elevation a.b.l. If all the samples of one site have the same polarity, the site is granted with the same polarity. If not, that is to say if the site displays normal and reverse polarities, we consider it as a transitional site.~~

~~for each 13the figure 6 represents the magnetic polarities can count between 3 to 15 samples (fig. 4), thateon site is a vertical profile of samples andeachBecause~~

~~-~~First, we note a good agreement between samples located at the same elevation elevation and being part of the same stratigraphic layer (Camus, 2003). This syngenetic deposition allow, as best explanation to ~~,~~preven~~tting~~ from a possible partial endokarstic reworking. Second, the different elevations of the galleries where we collected the samples allow ~~us to~~ proposinge that the Leicasse ~~and the Garrel~~ deposits encompass at least three chrons, while the Garrel deposits encompass ~~and one~~only one ~~polarity chrons, respectively~~. Third, ~~Furthermore,~~a transitional signal comprised between a reversal signal (lower samples) and a normal signal (upper ones) is observed at ~~-~~Les Gours sur Pattes (LGP) sampling site~~"normalbeing "reverse", the upper ones "lower samples , the a reversal signalrecord transitional signal and the sample in between show a~~ (Fig. 7). This ~~specific site~~ provides a strong constraint~~s~~ on the age of the sediment emplacement in the Leicasse with respect to ~~in~~ the magnetostratigraphic timescale (Fig. 6).

Compared to the Leicasse cave system, the elevation/polarity results for the Garrel are less constrained. Only ~~Although poorly constrained since it relies on a single~~one ~~sample~~ site ~~with~~ shows a reverse polarity at ~~(~~90 m a.b.l.~~)~~, and the transitional polarity found at 40 m a.b.l. is unclear (tab, suppl mat.). The rest of the polarities (72 samples) are all normal. ~~Given that a agrees with elevation/polarity results for the Garrel the ~~,~~~~U-Th ages younger than 90 kyrs was obtained for two speleothems (Camus, 2003) ~~that~~ covering our sample~~sd~~ ~~clays~~ collected ~~in the Garrel~~ at ~~ca~~ 40 m a.b.l. ~~(Camus, 2003)~~ (Fig. 6), ~~speleothems despite 72 collected samples, the reversed polarities have been found beneath clear . Since no~~ we ~~assume~~ consider that the emplacement of ~~these~~ the clays deposits occurred during the most recent normal period and are therefore younger than 0.78 Ma (Figure 6).~~-~~ The transition between the highest normal sample and the reversed one is located somewhere between 78 m and 93 m a.b.l. suggesting a maximum base level lowering rate of 109~~.6~~ ± 9 m.Ma^{-1}~~sample with probable reverse polarity but poor quality.b.l. is so only because of one aMat ca. 40and located as reversal signal ed Note that the site display.~~

To go further in the interpretation of our data, and better constraint the incision rate, we ~~analyzed~~performed a correlation analysis ~~various incision rates the~~ between observed and modelled polarities for a 0 - 200 m.Ma-1 incision-rate range (linear rate, each 1m.Ma-1). Modelled polarities are found ~~and computed a correlation factor based on the consistency between the observed polarities and the modelled ones. ,for each sample related to the previously computed age, from both the Garrel and the Leicasse cave systems, as a function of various incision rates ranging from 0 to 200 m.Ma^{-1} with a 1 m.Ma^{-1} step.~~

~~Then, from the magnetostratigraphic timescale, we extracted the theoretical polarity for every clay sample,we computed theoretical age models position of the sample a.b.l. knowing the us from studying possible variations of the incision rate through time. Given our results for the Rieutord samples we assume that the incision rate can be considered to the first order as linear through time.~~

~~Therefore, s sampling resolution prevent~~~~our~~~~the~~~~Unfortunately~~

~~.ay block or an excursion signall can be explain for instance by a local remobilization of a cthe Matuyama period we prefer not to give a strong weigh to this unique sample thatre, if we can propose it as being part of Therefo~~

using the intersection between sample elevation and incision-rate line.

We obtained 10 possible incision rates with the same best correlation factor (Fig. 8) spanning from 43 to 111 m.Ma^{-1} (mean of 87~~.2~~ ± 2~~43.8~~ m.Ma^{-1}). Taking into account the transitional signal of the LGP site in the Leicasse cave yields a linear incision rate of 83~~.4~~ $^{+17~~.3~~}/_{-5~~.4~~}$ m.Ma^{-1}. Proposed uncertainties are based on previous and next transition-related estimated incision rate.

Using a similar approach for the Rieutord crystalline samples, that is to say we compute, for the same incision-rate space, the distance in a least square sens between the modeled age and the measured ones in order to check the cost function shape and acuteness. -With this method, we determined a linear incision rate of 85 ± 11 m.Ma^{-1} (Fig 8). Those two results, based on independent computations, suggest the same first-order incision rate for the last 4 Ma of 84~~.2~~ $^{+2~~10.5~~}/_{-12.3}$ m.Ma^{-1}. Given that the Rieutord, Garrel and Buèges rivers are all tributaries of the Hérault river, we propose that this rate represents the incision rate for the Hérault river watershed, inducing approximately 300-350 m of finite incision over the Plio-Quaternary period.

If the landscape is at first order in an equilibrium state, that is to say, if we preclude our incision rates being a regressive erosional signal, the incision needs to be balanced by an equivalent amount of uplift. If the uplift rate is roughly correlated to the regional topography, lowest uplift rates would be expected in the south of our sampling sites inducing regional tilting of morphological benchmarks. In the next part, we search for such evidences that would suggest differential uplift.

2.3 **Geomorphometrical ~~evidence~~approach**

According to the Massif-Central centered uplift hypothesis, morphological markers such as strath terraces, fluvio-karstic surfaces or abandoned meanders should display a southward tilting due to differential uplift between the northern and the southern part of the region~~ , with the expected following signals:~~

~~- The dipping direction of the tilted markers should be parallel to the main gradient of the topography, i.e. between 150°E and 180°E for our studied region. This expectation is the most important one, regarding uncertainties on the uplift rate and lithospheric elastic parameters.~~

~~- A latitudinal tilting trend, i.e. an increase of the tilt angle along the topography gradient. Indeed, null or small tilts are expected near the shoreline and within the maximum uplift area of the Cevennes/Massif Central, while the maximum tilt is expected at a mid-distance between these two regions, i.e. about 50 km inland from the shoreline.~~

~~- A positive altitudinal tilting trend (an increase in dip angle with altitude). This trend would be representative of the accumulation of finite tilt. However, it supposes a linear relationship between the altitude and the age of the marker formation. If at first order, this straightforward hypothesis seems reasonable for river-controlled markers (e.g. strath terraces), other surfaces are hardly expected to follow such an easy relationship.~~

To investigate these different signals, we used the morphological markers available for the study area (Fig. 9). We used a 5 m resolution DEM analysis to identify the markers corresponding to surfaces with slope < 2°. This cut-off slope angle prevents to identify surface related to local deformation such as for example landslide or sinkhole. Other issue could be due to diffusion processes that could create apparent tilting. However that problem is adress by 1) the automatic selection and correction and the final manual check for residue random distribution (see below). The local river slope is on the order of 0.1° so the 2° cut-off angle is far from precluding to identify tilted markers. We also us a criterion based on an altitudinal range for a surface. This altitudinal span is set individually for each surface based on elevation, slope and curves map analysis, and encompass from few meters to tens of meters depending on the size of the marker. We checked 80% of the identified surfaces in the field in order to avoid misinterpretation. Some pictures are provided in supplementary material. The dip direction and angle of the surface in computed in a two steps approach. First, we ~~compute~~fit a plan using extracted points from the DEM inside the delimited surface. Second, based on this plan we remove the DEM points with residuals 3 times larger than the standard error and compute more accurate plan parameters (second fitting). This outlier suppression removes any inaccurate DEM points and correct for inaccurate surface delimitation (e.g. integration of a part of the edge of a strath terrace, diffusion processes marks, etc.).

Because no obvious initially horizontal markers are known, we propose to correct the marker current slope by the initial one to quantify the tilt since the marker emplacement. To do so we follow the method used by Champagnac et al. (2008) for the Forealps. We identify the drain related to the marker formation and compute its current local slope and direction. This method assumes that landscapes are at the equilibrium state and that the river slope remained constant since the marker formation. This assumption seems reasonable given the major river profiles and because most of the markers used are far from the watershed high altitude areas precluding a recessive erosional signal. Finally, we removed the local river plan from the DEM extracted surface.

Following this methodology, we obtained 61 surfaces. We then applied three quality criterions to ensure the robustness of our results: 1) The minimal surface considered is 2500 m^2 based on a comparison between the 5m resolution DEM and a RTK GPS survey over 3 strath terraces (Hérault river); 2) Final plans with dip angles larger than 2° are removed; 3) The residuals for each geomorphological marker must be randomly distributed without marker edge signal, or clear secondary structuration. Only 38 markers meet those 3 quality criterions.

If the identified and corrected markers had indeed registered an differential uplift between the north and the south, we expected the following signals:

- The dipping direction of the tilted markers should be parallel to the main gradient of the topography, i.e. between 150°E and 180°E for our studied region. This expectation is the most important one, regarding uncertain-

ties on the uplift rate and lithospheric elastic parameters.

- A latitudinal tilting trend, i.e. an increase of the tilt angle along the topography gradient. Indeed, null or small tilts are expected near the shoreline and within the maximum uplift area of the Cevennes/Massif Central, while the maximum tilt is expected at a mid-distance between these two regions, i.e. about 50 km inland from the shoreline.

- A positive altitudinal tilting trend (an increase in dip angle with altitude). This trend would be representative of the accumulation of finite tilt. However, it supposes a linear relationship between the altitude and the age of the marker formation. If at first order, this straightforward hypothesis seems reasonable for river-controlled markers (e.g. strath terraces), other surfaces are hardly expected to follow such an easy relationship.

Among the three expected signal, southward dipping is robustly recorded with ~~The results show~~ a mean tilt angle of 0.6~~0~~1 ± 0.4~~0~~1 ° with an azimuth of N128~~5~~0 ± 36~~4~~0°E (Fig. 10). Latitudinal trend and altitudinal trend are less robustly reached but that is not surprising because of the strong susceptibility to local phenomenon or even so lack of robust age constraint.

3 Numerical modelling

Both geomorphological and geochronological evidence suggest a Plio-Quaternary uplift of the Cevennes area. The origin of such uplift could be associated with several processes: erosion-induced isostatic rebound, dynamic topography due to mantle convection, thermal isostasy, residual flexural response due to the Gulf of Lion formation, etc. For the Alps and Pyrenees mountains, isostatic adjustment due to erosion and glacial unloading has been recently quantified (Champagnac et al., 2007, Vernant et al., 2013; Genti et al, 2016, Chery et al. 2016). Because the erosion rates measured in the Cevennes are similar to those of the Eastern Pyrenees (Calvet et al., 2015, Sartégou et al., 2018a), we investigate by numerical modelling how an erosion-induced isostatic rebound could impact the southern Massif Central morphology and deformation.

We define a representative cross-section parallel to the main topographic gradient (i.e. NNW-SSE) and close to the field investigation areas (Figure 11). We study the lithospheric elastic response to erosion with the 2D finite element model ADELI (Hassani et Chery, 1996; Chéry et al. 2016). The model is composed of a plate accounting for the elasticity of both crust and uppermost mantle. Although the lithosphere rigidity of the European plate in southern Massif central is not precisely known, vertical gradient temperatures provided by borehole measurements are consistent with heat flow values ranging from 60 to 70 $mW.m^2$ (Lucazeau et Vasseur, 1989). Therefore, we investigate plate thickness ranging from 10 to 50 km as done by Stewart et Watts (1997) for studying the vertical motion of the alpine forelands. We choose values for Young's and Poisson parameters of respectively 10^{11} Pa and 0.25, both commonly used values for lithospheric modelling (e.g. Kooi et Cloething, 1992; Champagnac et al. 2007, Chéry et al., 2001). This leads to long-term rigidity of the lithosphere model ranging from 10^{21} to 10^{25} N.m. Since the effect of mantle viscosity on elastic rebound is assumed to be negligible at the time scale of our models (1 to 2 Myrs), we neglect the visco-elastic behaviour of the mantle. Therefore, the base of the model is supported by an hydrostatic pressure boundary condition balancing the weight of the lithosphere (Fig. 11). Horizontal displacements on vertical sides are set to zero since geodetic measurements show no significant displacements (Nocquet et Calais, 2003; Nguyen et al., 2016). The main parameters controlling our

model are the erosion (or sedimentation) triggering isostatic rebound and the elastic thickness. The erosion profile (Fig. 11) is based on topography, our newly proposed incision rate and other studies (Olivetti et al., 2016 for onshore denudation and Lofi et al., 2003; Leroux et al., 2014 for offshore sedimentation). This profile is a simplification of the one that can be expected from Olivetti et al. (2006) and do not aim at matching precisely the published data because of, first, the explored time-span (~ 1 Myrs) is not covered by thermochronological data (> 10Myrs) or cosmogenic denudation rate (10s-100s kyrs). Second, we base our erosion rate as being linked with local (10s km^2) slopes, that are higher near the drainage divide. We, by this aim can invoke any kind of erosion processes (e.g. landslides). Third, the model suppose a cylindrical structure and then, high-frequency lateral variations in term or actual denudation rate or proxy (slope, elevation, etc.) must be averaged. Concerning this erosion profile, parametric study (highest erosion rate ranging from 1 to 1000 $m.Myrs^{-1}$) give no difference in the interpretation and, for few percent variations, only few percent variations in the modeled uplift-rate.

The flexural rigidity controls the intensity and wavelength of the flexural response and ranges from 10^{21} to 10^{25} N.m. It can be expressed as a variation in elastic thickness (Te) ranging from 4.4 to 96 km (Fig. 12). We also test a possible Te variation between inland and offshore areas. For the following discussion, we use an elastic thickness of 15km corresponding to a value of D of 3.75 $x10^{23}$ $N.m^{-1}$. In this case, the inland and offshore parts are largely decoupled and the large sedimentation rate in the Gulf of Lion does not induce a flexural response on the Cévennes and Grands Causses areas. With a maximum erosion rate of 80 $m.Ma^{-1}$ (Fig 11), the models display uplift rates of 50 $m.Ma^{-1}$ over more than 100 km. As previously explained, the finite incision is permitted by an equal amount of uplift considering that the incision is not due to regressive erosion. If all tested models show uplift, the modelled amplitudes are smaller than the expected ones. To obtain the same uplift rate than the incision rates, the applied erosion rate over the model must be increased. However, we assume that the landscape is at equilibrium, so, if the erosion rate is increased, it will be higher than the incision rate leading to the decay of relief over the area. No evidence of such evolution is found over the region and, if further studies need to be done to quantify the actual erosion rate, we mostly think that a second process is acting, inducing the rest of the uplift that can't be obtained by the erosion–induced isostatic adjustment. Finally, models predict a seaward tilt of the surface at the regional-scale (Fig. 13), in agreement with the observed tilting of morphological markers.

4. Discussion

We assume that the sediments collected in the karst were deposited per descensum, i.e. we do not know if the galleries existed a long time before or were formed just before the emplacement of the sediments, but the more elevated the sediments are, the older their deposit is. If there is no evidence of an important aggradation episode leading to more a complex evolution as proposed for the Ardèche canyon (Moccochain et al., 2007; Tassy et al., 2013), we point out that small aggradation or null erosion period could, however, be possible. Some processes could explain such relative stability: e.g. variation in erosion (due to climatic fluctuation) or impact of eustatic variations (in river profile, flexural response, etc.). Such transient variations have been shown for the Alps (Saillard et al., 2014; Rolland et al., 2017) and are proposed as being related to climato-eustatic variations and therefore should last 10 to 100 kyrs at most.

Based on our sampling resolution, we cannot evidence such transient periods and we must use an average base level lowering rate in the karst, which we correlate to the incision of the main rivers. The TCN-based incision

rate derived from the Rieutord samples (832.8 ± 354.9 m.Ma^{-1}) is consistent with the one derived from the Garrel (U-Th ages: 85.83 m.Ma^{-1} according to the sole U/Th exploitable result (Camus, 2003)) and from the Garrel-Leicasse combination (Paleomagnetic approach: 84.2 $^{+21}_{-12}$m.Ma^{-1}).

This mean incision rate of ca. 85 m.Ma^{-1} lasting at least 4 Ma, highlights the importance of the Plio-Quaternary period into the Cévennes and Grand Causses morphogenesis. Furthermore, the 300 to 400 m of incision precludes a relative base level controlled by a sea-level drop. Indeed, documented sea level variations are less than 100 m (Haq, 1988, Miller et al., 2005). Furthermore, the Herault river does not show any significant knickpoints or evidence of unsteadiness in its profile as expected if the incision was due to eustatic variations. Therefore, we propose that the incision rate of ~85 m.Ma^{-1} is due to a plio-quaternary uplift of the Cévennes and Grands Causses region.

Other river-valley processes could lead to a local apparent high incision rate as for instance major landslide or alluvial fan (Ouimet et al., 2008). This hypothesis of an epigenetic formation of the Rieutord is irrelevant because of i) none of the possible causes had been found in the Rieutord canyon and ii) the consistency of the TCN-based incision rate and the paleomagnetic-based incision rate for two other cave-systems. Indeed, the use of two independent approaches and three locations is a good argument in favour of the robustness of our proposed mean 85 m.Ma^{-1} incision rate. Yet, using more data, particularly burial dating colocalized with clays samples and adding sampling sites would give a stronger statistical validation. In the Lodève basin (Point 4, fig. 1), inverted reliefs allow another independent way to quantify minimal incision rate. K/Ar and paleomagnetic dated basaltic flows spanning from 1 to 2 Myrs old that were deposited at the bottom of the former valley (Dautria et al., 2010) are now located at ca 150 m above the current riverbed leading to an average incision rate of 776.5 ± 10 m.Myr^{-1}, in agreement with karst-inferred incision rates.

Furthermore, preliminary results from canyons on the other side of the Grands Causses (Tarn and Jonte) based on in-situ terrestrial cosmogenic dating suggest similar incision rates (Sartegou et al., 2018b) and confirm a regional base level lowering of the Cévennes and Grands Causses region during the Plio-Quaternary. This is consistent with the similarities of landscapes and lithologies observed both on the Atlantic and Mediterranean watersheds (e.g. Tarn river).

Once the regional pattern of the Plio-Quaternary incision established for the Cévennes-Grands Causses area, the next question is how this river downcutting is related to the regional uplift? First order equilibrium shape and absence of major knick points in the main river profiles preclude the hypothesis of regressive erosion. Hence, back to the three conceptual models presented in part 1 (Fig.2), we can discard, at first order, the models A (Old uplift-recent incision) and B (Old uplift-old incision) because obtain incision rate show recent incision and surface tilting tend to prove a current uplift. Therefore, the incision rate has to be balanced to the first order by the uplift rate. We add that eustatic variations are of too low magnitude (100-120 m) and can't explain such total incision (up to 400m). Furthermore, nNo obvious evidence of active tectonic is reported for the area raising the question of the processes responsible for this regional uplift. Very few denudation rates are reported for our study area (Schaller et al., 2001; Molliex et al., 2016; Olivetti et al., 2017), and converting canyon incision rates into denudation and erosion rates is not straightforward, especially given the large karst developed in the area. Using a first order erosion/sedimentation profile following the main topography gradient direction we have modelled the erosion-induced isostatic rebound. If this process could create between half and two third of the Plio-Quaternary uplift, a previously existent topography is needed to trigger erosion so it cannot explain neither

the onset of the canyon-carving nor the full uplift rates. Other, processes have to be explored such as dynamic topography or thermal anomaly beneath the Massif-Central, the magmatism responsible for the important increase in volcanic activity since ~ 6 Myrs (Michon et Merle, 2001; Nehlig et al., 2003) could play a major role, notably in the initiation of Plio-Quaternary uplift. Further studies should aim to address the problem of uplift onset, giving more clues concerning the stable continental area but owing the data we presently have, discussing such onset is out of the scope of the paper.

5. Conclusion

To the contrary of previous studies that focused on one cave, we have shown that combining karst burial ages and paleomagnetic analysis of clay deposits in several caves over a large elevation range can bring good constraints on incision rates. This multi-cave system approach diminishes the intrinsic limits of the two single methods: low sampling density (and analysis cost) for the TCN ages and difficulty to set the position of paleomagnetic results. Our estimated paleo base level ages are Plio-Quaternary (ca. last 4 Ma) and allow to derive a mean incision rate of $83.4^{+17.3}/_{-5.4}$ m.Ma^{-1} for the Cevennes area.

The landscape, and especially the river profiles suggest a first-order equilibrium allowing considering the incision rate as an uplift rate. We propose that related erosional isostatic adjustment is of major importance for the understanding of the southern French Massif-Central landscape evolution and explain a large part of the uplift. However, it is not the only process involved and we hypothesize that is could be especially combined with dynamic topography related to the Massif Central magmatism. Both mechanisms imply an uplift centered on the Massif Central and a radial tilt of the geomorphological surfaces. We have shown using a geomorphological analysis that at least south of the Cévennes, several surfaces are tilted toward the SSE. This kind of study had been performed before on large structures (Champagnac et al., 2007) or endokarstic markers (Granger et Stock, 2004) but it is the first time that it is performed at such scale with small markers. Numerical modelling yields the same pattern of SSE dipping, allowing more confidence in the geomorphometric results.

Our multi-disciplinary approach brings the first absolute dating of the Cévennes landscapes and suggests that the present-day morphology is partly inherited from the plio-quaternary erosion-induced isostatic rebound. A strong uplift impact is assumed to be due to magmatic-related dynamic topography that could explain another part of the uplift as well as the onset of such uplift that has afterward been accelerated by the erosion-induced isostatic rebound. These results enlighten the importance of surface processes into lithospheric-scale dynamic and vertical deformations in intra-plate domains.

An analysis at the scale of the Massif Central is now needed before nailing down our interpretations, but such study will more likely highlight the importance of erosion processes to explain uplift of intraplate orogens, and will show that another process is needed for the Massif Central, which will most likely be dynamic topography related to magmatism.

Code availability

Surface analysis was performed using QGIS version 2.18, MAtlab® code and IGN DEM (RGE Alti®) 5m). Modeling was performed using ADELI code (Hassani et Chery, 1996; Chéry et al., 2016). Data for TCN and paleomagnetic analysis are provided in the manuscript itself or in supplementary material.

Author contributions

OM, PV and GC did the sampling. GC and DF performed the TCN analysis. PC and OM did the magnetic measurements and interpretations. OM did the surface identification and analysis. OM, PV and JC performed the numerical model. OM, OV, JFR, GC, PC, JC and DF interpreted and wrote the article.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowlegdments

We are grateful to ANSTO for providing facilities for chemical extraction for the TCN analysis. We thanks the reviewers for useful remarks and comments that we think help to increase the level of the paper.

References

Arthaud F. et Laurent P.: Contraintes, déformations et déplacements dans l'avant-pays pyrénéen du Languedoc méditerranéen, Godin. Acta, 8, 142-157, 1995.

Audra P., Camus H. et Rochette P.: Le karst des plateaux de la moyenne vallée de l'Ardèche : datation par paléomagnétisme des phases d'évolution plio-quaternaires (aven de la Combe Rajeau). Bull. Soc. Géol. France, 2001, t. 172. N°1, pp. 121-129, 2001.

Balco, G., Stone, J.O., Lifton, N.A., Dunai, T.J., 2008. A complete and easily accessible means of calculating surface exposure ages or erosion rates from Be-10 and Al-26 measurements. Quat. Geochronol. 3, 174–195. 2008.

Barbarand J., Lucazeau F., Pagel M. Et Séranne M.: Burial and exhumation history of the south-eastern Massif Central (France) constrained by en apatite fission-track thermochronology. *Tectonophysics,* 335, 275-290, 2001.

Barruol G. et Granet M.: A Tertiary astenospheric flow beneath the southern French Massif Central indicated by upper mantle seismic anisotropy and related to the west Mediterranean extension. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 202 (2002) 31-47, 2002.

Brichau S., Respaut J.P. et Monié P.: New age constraints on emplacement of the Cévenol granitoids, South French Massif Central, Int J Earth Sci 97:725–738, doi: 10.1007/s00531-007-0187-x, 2007.

Bruxelles L.: Dépôts et altérites des plateaux du Larzac central : causses de l'Hospitalet et de Campestre (Aveyron, Gard, Hérault) Evolution morphogénétique, conséquences géologiques et implcations pour l'aménagement. Université d'Aix-Marseille I, Université de Provence, UFR Sciences géographiques et de l'aménagement. Thèse, spécialité : Milieux physiques méditerranéens, 2001.

Calais, E., Freed, A. M., Van Arsdale, R., & Stein, S. (2010). Triggering of New Madrid seismicity by late-Pleistocene erosion. Nature, 466(7306), 608–611. http://doi.org/10.1038/nature09258

Calais, E., T. Camelbeeck, S. Stein, M. Liu, and T. J. Craig (2016), A new paradigm for large earthquakes in stable continental plate interiors, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, doi:10.1002/2016GL070815, 2016.

Calvet M., Gunnell Y., Braucher R., Hez G., Bourlès D., Guillou V., Delmas M. et ASTER team: Cave levels as proxies for measuring post-orogenic uplift : Evidence from cosmogenic dating of alluvium-filled caves in the French Pyrenees. Geomorphology 246 (2015) 617- 633 ; doi : 10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.07.013, 2015.

Camus H.: Vallée et réseaux karstiques de la bordure carbonatée sud-cévenole. Relation avec la surrection, le volcanisme et les paléoclimats. Thèse de doctorat, Université Bordeaux 3, 692 p, 2003.

Champagnac J.D., Molnar P., Anderson R.S., Sue C. et Delacou B.: Quaternary erosion-induced isostatic rebound in the western Alps. Geology, March 2007 ; v.35 ; no. 3 ; p. 195-198, doi : 10.1130/G23053A.1, 2007.

Champagnac J-D. van der Beek P. Diraison G. et Dauphin S.: Flexural isostatic response of the Alps to increased Quaternary erosion recorded by foreland basin remnants, SE France. Terra Nova, Vol 20, No. 3, 213-220, doi : 10.1111/j.1365-3121.2008.00809.x, 2008.

Chéry J., Zoback M.D. et Hassani R.: An integrated mechanical model of the San Andreas Fault in central and northern California. J. Geophys. Res., 106(B10) :22051. 52,61, 2001.

Chéry, J., Genti, M. And Vernant, P. Ice cap melting and low-viscosity crustal root explain the narrow geodetic uplift of the Western Alps.Geophys. Res. Lett.43,1–8 (2016).

Child D.P., Elliott G., Mifsud C., Smith A.M and Fink D., Sample processing for earth science studies at ANTARES. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms 172(1-4):856-860 doi: 10.1016/S0168-583X(00)00198-1, 2000.

Corbel J.: Les phénomènes karstiques dans les Grands Causses. In : Revue de géographie de Lyon, vol. 29, n°4, pp. 287-315, doi : 10.3406/geoca.1954.1990, 1954.

Dautria J.M., Liotard J.M., Bosch D., Alard O.: 160 Ma of sporadic basaltic activity on the Languedoc volcanic line (Southern France): A peculiar cas of lithosphere-astenosphere interplay. Lithos 120 (2010) 202-222, doi: 10.1016/j.lithos.2010.04.009, 2010

Genti M.: Impact des processus de surface sur la déformation actuelle des Pyrénées et des Alpes. Géophysique [physics.geo-ph]. Université de Montpellier, 2015. Français. Thèse, 2016.

Granet M., Wilson M. et Achauer U.: Imaging a mantle plume beneath the French Massif Central. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 136 (1995) 281-296, 1995.

Granger, D. E., Fabel, D. and Palmer, A.N.: Pliocene-Pleistocene incision of the Green River, Kentucky determined from radioactive decay of comogenic 26Al and 10Be in Mammoth Cave sediments. *GSA Bulletin*; July 2001; v. 113; no. 7; p. 825–836

Granger, D. E., Kirchner, J. W., and~~et~~ Finkel, R. C.: Quaternary downcutting rate of the New River, Virginia, measured from differential decay of cosmogenic 26Al and 10Be in cave-deposited alluvium. Geology; February 1997 ; v. 25 ; no.2 ; p. 107-110, 1997.

Granger D.E., Gibbon R.J., Kuman K., Clarke R.J., Bruxelles L. and~~Et~~ Caffee M.W.: New cosmogenic burial ages for Sterkfontein Member 2 Australopithecus and Member 5 Oldowan, Nature Letter 2015, doi: 10.1038/nature14268, 2015.

Granger D.E. and~~et~~ Muzikar P.F.: Dating sediment burial with in situ-produced cosmogenic nuclides: theory, techniques, and limitations. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 188 (2001) 269-281, 2001.

Granger D.E. and Stock G.M.: Using cave deposits as geologic tiltmeters : Application to postglacial rebound of the Sierra Nevada, California. Geophysical Research Letters, vol. 31, L22501, doi : 10.1029/2004GL021403, 2004.

Zupan Hajna N., Mihevc A., Pruner P., and Bosák P. 2010. Palaeomagnetic research on karst sediments in Slovenia. International Journal of Speleology, 39(2), 47-60. Bologna (Italy). ISSN 0392-6672, 2010.

Haq B.U., Herdenbol J. and Vail P.R.: Mesozoic and cenozoic chronostratigraphy and cycles of sea-level change. Society Economic Paleontologists Mineralogists Special Publication, 42, 71-108, Tulsa, Oklahoma. 1988.

Harmand D., Adamson K., Rixhon G., Jaillet S., Losson B., Devos A., Hez G., Calvet M. and Audra P.: Relationships between fluvial evolution and karstification related to climatic, tectonic and eustatic forcing in temperate regions, Quaternary Science Reviews (2017) 1-19, doi : 10.1016/j.quascirev.2017.02.016, 2017.

Hassani R. and Chery J., Anaelasticity explains topography associated with Basin and Range normal faulting. Geology 24(12):1095. doi: 10.1130/0091-7613(1996)024<1095:AETAWB>2.3.CO;2. 1996.

Hill C.A., 1999.. Sedimentology and Paleomagnetism of sediments, Kartchner caverns, Arizona. Journal of Cave and Karst Studies 61(2) : 79-83, 1999.

Husson E.: Intéraction géodynamique/karstification et modélisation 3D des massifs carbonatés : Implication sur la distribution prévisionnelle de la karstification. Exemple des paléokarsts crétacés à néogènes du Languedoc montpelliérain. Sciences de la Terre. Université Montpellier 2- Sciences et techniques du Languedoc, 236 p, 2014.

Kooi H., Cloetingh S. et Burrus J.: Lithospheric Necking and Regional Isostasy at Extensional Basins 1. Subsidence and Gravity Modeling With an Application to the Gulf of Lions Margin (SE France), Journal of Geophysical Research , vol. 97, no. B12, Pages 17,553- 17,571, november 10, 1992.

Leroux E., Rabineau M., Aslanian D., Granjeon D., Droz L. et Gorini C.: Stratigraphic simulations of the shelf of the Gulf of Lions: testing subsidence rates and sea-level curves during the Pliocene and Quaternary. Terra Nova, Vol 26, No. 3, 230-238, doi: 10.1111/ter.12091, 2014.

Lofi J., Rabineau M., Gorini C., Berne S., Clauzon G;, De Clarens P., Dos Reis A.T., Mountain G.S., Ryan W.B.F, Steckler M.S. et Fouchet C.: Plio-Quaternary prograding clinoform wedges of the western Gulf of Lion continental margin (NW Mediterranean) after the Messinian Salinity Crisis., Marine Geology July 2003; 198 (3-4) : 289-317, doi: 10.1016/S0025-3227(03)00120-8, 2003.

Lucazeau F. and Vasseur G.: Heat flow density data from France and surrounding margins, In: V. Cermak, L. Rybach and E.R. Decker (Editors), Tectonophysics, 164 (1989) 251-258

Manchuel K., Traversa P., Baumont D., Cara M., Nayman E. Et Durouchoux C.: The French seismic CATalogue (FCAT-17), Bull Earthquake Eng (2018) 16:2227–2251, doi: 10.1007/s10518-017-0236-1, 2018.

Miallier D., Michon L., Evin J., Pilleyre T., Sanzelle S., et Vernet G.: Volcans de la Chaîne des Puys (Massif Central, France) : point sur la chronologie Vasset-Kilian-Pariou-Chopine. Comptes Rendus Géoscience, Elsevier

Michon L. et Merle O.: The evolution of the Massif Central rift: Spatio-temporal distribution of the volcanism. Bulletin de la Society Geologique de France, 2001, t. 172, n°2, pp. 201-211, dog: 102113/172.2.201, 2001.

Miller, K.G., Kominz, M.A., Browning, J.V., Wright, J.D., Mountain, G.S., Katz, M.E.,Sugarman, P.J., Cramer, B.S., Christie-Blick, N., Pekar, S.F.: The Phanerozoic record of global sea-level change. Science 310, 1293–1298, doi : 10.1126/science.1116412, 2005.

Mocochain L.: Les manifestations geodynamiques –Externes et internes- de la crise de salinité messinienne sur une plate-forme carbonatée peri-méditerranéenne : le karst de la basse ardèche (moyenne vallée du rhône ; France). Thèse de doctorat, Université Aix- Marseille I – Université de Provence U.F.R des Sciences géographiques et de l'aménagement Centre Européen de Recherches et d'Enseignement en Géosciences de l'Environnement., 196 p, 2007.

Molliex S., Rabineau M., Leroux E., Bourlès D.L., Authemayou C., Aslanian D., Chauvet F., Civet F. et Jouët G.: Multi-approach quantification of denudation rates in the Gulf of Lion source-to-sink system (SE-France). Earth and Planetary Science Latters 444 (2016) 101-115, doi : 10.1016/j.epsl.2016.03.043, 2016.

Nehlig P., Boivin P., de Goër A., Mergoil J., Prouteau G., Sustrac G. Et Thiéblemont D.: Les volcans du Massif central. Revue BRGM: Géologues, Numéro Spécial: Massif central, 2003.

Nguyen H. N., Vernant P., Mazzotti S., Khazaradze G. et Asensio E.: 3-D GPS velocity field and its implications on the present-day post-orogenic deformation of the Western Alps and Pyrenees. Solid Earth, 7 ; 1349-1363, 2016, doi : 10.5194/se-7-1349-2016, 2016.

Nocquet J.-M. et Calais E.: Crustal velocity field of western Europe from permanent GPS array solutions, 1996-2001. Geophys. J. Int. (2003) 154, 72-88, doi : 10.1046/j.1365-246X.2003.01935.x, 2003.

Nocquet J.-M., Sue C., Walpersdorf A., Tran T., Lenôtre N., Vernant P., Cushing M., Jouanne F., Masson F., Baize S., Chéry J. and Van der Beek P.A., Present-day uplift of the western Alps, Sci. Rep. 6, 28404; doi: 10.1038/srep28404 (2016).

Olivetti V., Godard V., Bellier O. et ASTER team : Cenozoic rejuvenation events of Massif Central topography (France) : Insights from cosmogenic denudation rates and river profiles. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 444 (2016) 179-191, doi : 10.1016/j.epsl.2016.03.049 0012-821X, 2016.

Ouimet, WB, Whipple, KX, Crosby, BT, Johnson, JP, Schildgen, TF. 2008. Epigenetic gorges in fluvial landscapes. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **33**: 1993– 2009. doi: 10.1002/esp.1650 Epigenetic. 2008.

Rolland Y., Petit C., Saillard M., Braucher R., Bourlès D., Darnault R. Cassol D. Et ASTER Team: Inner gorges incision history: A proxy for deglaciation? Insights from Cosmic Ray Exposure dating (10Be and 36Cl) of river-polished surfaces (Tinée River, SW Alps, France). Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Elsevier, 2017, 457, pp.271 - 281, doi : 10.1016/j.epsl.2016.10.007. <hal-01420882>, 2017.

Rovey II C.W., Balco G., Forir M. Et Kean W.F.: Stratigraphy, paleomagnetism, and cosmogenic-isotope burial ages of fossil-bearing strata within Riverbluff Cave, Greene County, Missouri. Quaternary Research (2017), 1-13, doi : 10.1017/qua.2017.14, 2017.

Saillard M., Petit C., Rolland Y., Braucher R., BOurlès D.L., Zerathe S., Revel M. Et Jourdon A.: Late Quaternary incision rates in the Vésubie catchment area (Southern French Alps) from in situ-produced ^{36}Cl cosmogenic nuclide dating: Tectonic and climatic implications, J. Geophys. Res. Earth Surf., 119, 1121–1135, doi:10.1002/2013JF002985. 2014.

Sanchis E. et Séranne M.: Structural style and tectonic evolution of a polyphase extensional basin of the Gulf of Lion passive margin : the Tertiary Alès basin, southern France. Tectonophysics 322 (2000) 219-242, doi : 10.1016/S0040-1951(00)00097-4, 2000.

Sartégou A.: Évolution morphogénique des Pyrénées orientales: apports des datations de systèmes karstiques étagés par les nucléides cosmogéniques et la RPE. Géomorphologie. Thèse de l'Université de Perpignan. Français <NNT : 2017PERP0044>. <tel-01708921> , 2017.

Sartégou, A., Bourlès, D. L., Blard, P.-H., Braucher, R., Tibari, B., Zimmermann, L., et al. (2018a). Deciphering landscape evolution with karstic networks_ A Pyrenean case study. Quaternary Geochronology, 43, 12–29. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.quageo.2017.09.005

Sartégou A., Mialon A., Thomas S., Giordani A., Lacour Q., Jacquet A., André D., Calmels L., Bourlès D.L., Bruxelles L., Braucher R., Leanni L. Et ASTER team.: When TCN meet high school students: deciphering western Cévennes landscape evolution (Lozère, France) sin g TCN on karstic networks. Poster 4th Nordic Workshop on Cosmogenic Nuclides. 2018b.

Schaller M., von Blanckenburg F., Hovius N. Et Kubik P.W.: Large-scale erosion rates from in situ-produced cosmogenic nuclides in European river sediments. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 188 (2001) 441-458, 2001.

Séranne M., Benedicto A., Labaum P., Truffert C. et Pascal G.: Structural style and evolution of the Gulf of Lion Oligo-Miocene rifting : role of the Pyrenean orogeny. Marine and Petroleum Geology, Vol. 12, No. 8, pp. 809-820, 1995.

Séranne M., Camus H., Lucazeau F., Barbarand J. et Quinif Y.: Surrection et érosion polyphasées de la Bordure cévenole. Un exemple de morphogenèse lente. Bull. Soc. Géol. France, 2002, t. 173, n°2, pp. 97-112, 2002.

Sibuet J.-C., Srivastava S.P. et Spakman W.: Pyrenean orogeny and plate kinematics. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, Vol 109, doi: 10.1029/2003JB002514 , 2004.

Spassov S. et Valet J.-P.: Detrial magnetisations from redeposition experiments of different natural sediments. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 351-352 (2012) 147-157, dog: 10.1016/j.epsl.2012.07.016, 2012

Stewart J. and Watts A.B.: Gravity anomalies and spatial variation of flexural rigidity at mountain ranges. Journal of Geophysical research, vol 102, no. B3, Pages 5327-5352, march 10, 1997, doi: 10.1029/96JB03664, 1997.

Stock G.M., Granger D.E., Sasowsky I.D., Anderson R.S. et Finkel R.C.: Coomparison of U-Th, paleomagnetism, and cosmogenic burial methods for dating caves : Implications for landscape evolution studies. Earth en Planetary Science Letters 236 (2005) 388-403, doi : 10.1016/j.epsl.2005.04.024, 2005.

Tarayoun A., Mazzotti S., Gueydan F., Quantitative impact of structural inheritance on present-day deformation and seismicity concentration in intraplate deformation zones, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, Volume 518, 2019, Pages 160-171, ISSN 0012-821X, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2019.04.043., 2017.

Tassy A., Mocochain L., Bellier O., Braucher R., Gattacceca J., Bourlès D.: Coupling cosmogenic dating and magnetostratigraphy to constrain the chronological evolution of peri-Mediterranean karsts during the Messinian an the Pliocene: Example of Ardèche Valley, Southern France. Geomorphology, 189 (2013), pp. 81-92, doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.01.019, 2013.

Tauxe L., Steindorf J.L. et Harris A.: Depositional remanent magnetisation: Toward an improved theatrical and experimental foundation. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 244 (2006) 515-529, doi: 10.1016/J.epsl.2006.02.003, 2006.

Tricart P. : From passive margin to continental collision: A tectonic scenario for the western Alps. American journal of science, Vol. 284, February, 1984, P97-120, 1984.

Vernant, P., Hivert, F., Chéry, J., Steer, P., Cattin, R., & Rigo, A. (2013). Erosion-induced isostatic rebound triggers extension in low convergent mountain ranges. Geology, 41(4), 467–470. http://doi.org/10.1130/G33942.1



~~morphology respectively. dissected by canyon, and the rugged area with steep valley called the Cevenne. They are typical regional limestone and crystalline Note the south-western area with large plateau with~~

~~dated basaltic flows. Bottom panel is an example of typical topographic profile used for numerical model set up.~~

~~(43,669°N; 3.382°E)sins and 4) is the Lodève ba respectively, where paleomagnetic analysis have been done (43,835°N; 3.616°E) the Garrel Cave system 3) isand and (43,819°N; 3.56°E), the Leicasse Cave Systemsarei and 3), 2) where TCN measurements have been done (43,958°N; 3.709°E)) and numerated site 1) is the Rieutord Canyon89 area (Seuge Canyon) and b) limestone plateau (Tarn Canyon) Location of the restricted studied area in red box (fig. cristallinecrystalline~~

~~Figure 1: 30 m resolution DEM of the French Massif-Central and slope shadowed. Examples of finite incision typical of the French Massif-Central in a)~~

Figure 1: 30 m resolution DEM of the French Massif-Central and slope shadowed. Examples of finite incision typical of the French Massif-Central in a) crystalline area (Seuge Canyon) and b) limestone plateau (Tarn Canyon) Location of the restricted studied area in red box (fig. 9) and numerated site 1) is the Rieutord Canyon (43,958°N; 3.709°E) where TCN measurements have been done, 2) and 3) are the Leicasse Cave System (43,819°N; 3.56°E),and the Garrel Cave system (43,835°N; 3.616°E) respectively, where paleomagnetic analysis have been done and 4) is the Lodève basin (43,669°N; 3.382°E) with dated basaltic flows. Bottom panel is an example of typical topographic profile used for numerical model set up. Note the south-western area with large plateau dissected by canyon, and the rugged area with steep valley called the Cevenne. They are typical regional limestone and crystalline morphology respectively.



Figure 2: conceptual models for landscape evolution. Top panel is the initial stage (prior to uplift). Each panel represent a possible scenario explaining current morphology: A) Old uplift and old incision, B) Old uplift and recent incision and C) both recent uplift and incision. Blue arrow and associated ages show expected result (or absence of) for burial dating. Red level represents morphological markers that are fossilised when reaching the surface, accumulating afterward (or not) the differential uplift by finite tilting.

713 **Figure 3: Example of quartz cobbles sampled for burial dating. Location: Cuillère Cave**



714 **Figure 4: Example of clay sampling for the paleomagnetic study. Location at the entrance shaft (Highest**
715 **elevation of every samples (~580 m a.s.l.), Leicasse Cave system)**



716 **Figure 5: Relation finite incision-burial age for the Rieutord canyon. Finite incision is the elevation of the**
717 **sampling site relatively to the current riverbed. RTE for Route Cave, CDG for Camp de Guerre Cave,**
718 **DUG for Dugou Cave and CUI for Cuillère Cave**



719 ~~**Figure 6: Constraint on the incision rate from plural data set. Circles (Leicasse Cave system) and squares**~~
720 ~~**(Garrel Cave system) are paleomagnetic polarities from clay deposits. Black is for Normal polarity, white**~~
721 ~~**for Reversed polarity and grey for transitional signal.**~~
722 ~~**Each point is representative of one sampling profile including an average of 10 samples per site. Lines**~~
723 ~~**represent different linear incision rates with example of good correlation (red ones) and bad correlation**~~
724 ~~**(black ones). The horizontal dashed line shows the predicted polarities-age for one site located ~ 100m**~~
725 ~~**a.b.l. This measured reversed polarity match with theoretical red lines but fails with the three other**~~
726 ~~**exposed incision-rate.**~~
727 ~~**Green hexagons are representation of U/Th ages obtain in the Garrel (Camus, 2003). Burial ages from fig.**~~
728 ~~**4 are shown for comparison (Red points)**~~Figure 6. Constraining the incision rate in the Cevennes margin,
729 using paleomagnetic polarities from clay deposits (black, grey and white symbols) and burial ages (red crosses):
730 Circles are from the Leicasse cave with LGP being *les gours sur pattes profile (see text)*, squares are from the
731 Garrel cave. Black, grey and white symbols correspond to normal, transitional and reverse polarities,
732 respectively. Black linear straight lines define possible incision rates that are supposed stable thought time.

(numbers in white rectangles define the Cf values are Ccorrelation factor between the measured paleomagnetic polarities and the predicted paleomagnetic scale (see also Figure 8). Green hexagons show the U/Th ages obtained in the Garrel by Camus (2003).



Figure 7: Zijderveld Diagram for three samples from the Gours-sur-Pattes (Leicasse) site. Stratigraphical order is from a) (the older, base of the profile) to c) (the younger, top of the profile.



Figure 8: Best incision rate based on paleomagnetic data (blue~~R~~red) and burial ages (~~blu~~ered). The blue~~R~~red curve is the normalised smoothed (10 m/Ma sliding window for better visualisation) correlation between theoretical and observed polarities. The highest correlation corresponds to the best incision rates. The red~~blu~~e curve is the RMSE for the linear regression through the burial ages data set shown on Fig. 4.



Figure 9: Tilting map of geomorphological benchmark (~~yellow~~blue areas). Fond-map is 30~~5~~ m resolution DEM with slope shadow. ~~Red~~ A~~a~~rrows are orientating according to the marker downward dip and sized according to the corrected tilting angle (the bigger, the more the tilting). Yellow and brown arrows are for robust and rejected surfaces respectively. Several arrows are hidden because of their small size and too high proximity with bigger ones. Numerated site 1) is the Rieutord Canyon, 2) is the Leicasse Cave System, 3) is the Garrel Cave system and 4) is the Lodève basin with dated basaltic flows. See Fig. 1 for geographical coordinates.



Figure 10: Tilting and azimuth distribution. Left panel is density distribution for surface maximum tilting in degree. Right panel is azimuth of maximum dipping relative to the north. For each histogram, red and grey populations are for robust and primary detected markers.



Figure 11: Top panel: schematic topographic profile. ~~is delimited by zones studiedThe studied area that includes the~~ Tthe red box delimites the area shown fig. 1 and 9 ~~(cf fig. 1)~~. Middle panel, surface processes profile, negative values are for erosion and positive values for sedimentation. Bottom panel: model set-up

with two compartments (one for the Cevennes area and the second on for the gulf of lion). The base of the model is compensated in pressure and the right and left limits are fixed at zero horizontal velocities and free vertical ones. Te is the equivalent elastic thickness (in km), E (Pa) and —— ν are the Young modulus and the Poisson coefficient respectively whom values are independent in each compartment.



Figure 12: Modelled uplift according to different Te. Most probable Te are between 10 and 30 km.



Figure 13: Modelling result for Te= 15km. Erosion-sedimentation rate profile is the same as in fig. 6. Velocity field is shown using arrow for scale and orientation and colour code for value. Black values on top are distance relative to the sea-shore (positive value landward and negative values seaward). Red line represent the southward modelled tilting due to differential uplift.

Cave	Lat	Lon	Elevation	height (a.b.l)	^{10}Be conc (atom/g)	σ ^{10}Be (atom/g)	^{26}Al conc (atom/g)	σ ^{26}Al (atom/g)	26Al/10Be (and error)	Burial age (Ma)	Burial age error (Ma)
RTE	43,960	3,707	175	8	3,54E+04	1,18E+03	2,16E+05	1,47E+04	6,11 +/-0.46	0,20	+0.16/-0.15
CDG	43,955	3,710	185	10	8,87E+04	3,12E+03	4,29E+05	3,28E+04	4,83 +/-0.41	0,67	+0.18/-0.16
DUG	43,957	3,711	245	115	1,27E+04	5,68E+02	5,29E+04	6,36E+03	4,15 +/-0.53	0,99	+0.28/-0.25
CUI	43,959	3,711	354	175	1,70E+04	7,14E+02	3,75E+04	5,28E+03	2,20 +/-0.32	2,28	+0.33/-0.28

Table 1: Samples analytical results and parameters. Cave code are: RTE for the “de la route” Cave, CDG for the “Camp de Guerre” cave, DUG for the “Dugou” Cave and CUI for the “Cuillère” Cave. Main parameters are the geographical coordinate (Lat, Lon in decimals degree), the elevation (a.s.l), the height (a.b.l., computed relatively to the surface river elevation. The concentration (atoms/g quartz) of 10Be and 26Al in collected sand samples are all AMS 10Be/Be and 26Al/Al isotopic ratios corrected for full procedural chemistry blanks and normalised to KN-5-4 and KN -4-2, respectively.The error () is for total analytical error in final average 10Be and 26Al

concentrations based on statistical counting error s in final 10Be/Be (26Al/Al) ratios measured by AMS in quadrature with a 1% error in 9Be spike concentration (or a 4% error in 27Al assay in quartz) and a 2% (or 3%) reproducibility error based on repeat of AMS standards. Burial age (minimum) assuming no post-burial production by muons at given depth (all deeper than 30m) in cave below surface and assuming initial 26Al/10Be ratio is given by the production ratio of 6.75. The burial age error determined by using a +/-1σ range in the measured 26Al/10Be ratio